REGULATIONS ON USE

Stephen C. Levinson and Asifa Majid

This website and the materials herewith supplied have been developed by members of the Language and Cognition Department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (formerly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group). In a number of cases materials were designed in collaboration with staff from other MPI departments.

Proper citation and attribution
Any use of the materials should be acknowledged in publications, presentations and other public materials. Entries have been developed by different individuals. Please cite authors as indicated on the webpage and front page of the pdf entry. Use of associated stimuli should also be cited by acknowledging the field manual entry. Intellectual property rights are hereby asserted.

Background
The field manuals were originally intended as working documents for internal use only. They were supplemented by verbal instructions and additional guidelines in many cases. If you have questions about using the materials, or comments on the viability in various field situations, feel free to get in touch with the authors.

Contact
Email us via library@mpi.nl
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

APPENDIX
Hypotheses Concerning Basic Locative Constructions
and the Verbal Elements Within Them
Stephen C. Levinson

I. Hypotheses concerning zero-verb locative constructions ("TYPE 0")

1. Although languages may have this as the most frequent form of the locative, no language has a verbless construction as the exclusive means of locative statements (a verbal form always competes). (Stassen's hypothesis)
2. Where a verbless structure competes with a verby one, the verbless structure will be favoured in descriptions of stereotypical situations (Levinson's pragmatic prediction).
3. Languages which favour unmarked Ground nominals (no case or adposition) will not permit verb deletion (otherwise no marker of locativeness left).
4. Languages which do not allow locative verb deletion will in certain stereotypical circumstances allow contraction of the Ground phrase, e.g. adposition/locative-case deletion (e.g. Dutch *thuis*), article deletion ('at school'), etc. (Levinson's pragmatic prediction).

II. Hypotheses for single verb languages ("TYPE I")

1. Where a language has a general copula vs. positionals in competition (e.g. German), choice may be determined by the Positional hierarchy: (incorporating ideas of Jürgen in relation to David's BLC observations)

animates > free objects on surfaces > contained objects > attached objects
    Positional <-----------------liklihood-------------------------->Copula

2. Diachronically, single locative verbs may grammaticalize from a set of positionals, yielding suppletion under grammatical conditioning (tense, aspect, etc.)

III. Hypotheses concerning Multi-Verb Languages ("TYPE II")
    (with many 'dispositional' verbs in BLC Construction)

1. All such languages have one verb which may be used as the default verb if an appropriate dispositional is lacking - in Tzeltal this is the existential predicate. This default may be special in various ways - e.g. lack a causative "put" version.
2. Some dozen of these dispositional predicates are frequent and may have a distinct status (this may mirror the sortal vs. mensural distinction in classifiers);
3. Such dispositional predicates may be associated with either:
(a) 'Mass'-type semantics for 'middle-range' nominals (i.e. nominals that refer neither to undifferentiated substances like water, sand; nor to self-individuating, mobile entities like animals).
OR
(b) Just ONE or two adpositions, thus requiring topological distinctions to be made in the locative verbs (cf. Tzeltal, Likpe with one adposition).
4. In such languages, where an existential or general copula is also available, there will be a division of labour between the use of the general verb and the specific dispositional:
- the general locative verb will be used to indicate location in a space (e.g. 'in town', 'at home')
- the specific dispositional will be used to indicate location in/on other objects (e.g. 'on the table')
- the general locative will be used for abstract nominals (e.g. 'the sickness is in the village')
- the dispositionals will be used for (concrete) objects (e.g 'the bottle stands on the table')

Other contrasts may exist in e.g. marked past/future (general verb) vs. unmarked present tense (dispositional), animates (general verb) vs. inimate objects (dispositional), etc.
5. These dispositional predicates do not exhibit the presuppositional/assertional use-distinction to be found in the small-class positional verb languages. That is, the use of a dispositional verb commits the speaker to asserting that the subject nominal is currently in that disposition (rather than e.g. is normally in that canonical position). It is therefore not deletable. This contrasts with the languages with a small set of positionals, where there are both default presupposing uses, and marked uses of contrastive positionals which have assertive force. Consequently, in multi-verb languages we expect iconic gestures on the dispositional verb, in small-set positional languages we do not expect iconic gestures indicating the presupposed position.

IV *Hypotheses concerning Positional Verb Languages ("TYPE III")*

(1) Such positionals, forming a minor form-class, have a sortal character, i.e. they 'classify' their subject nominal concepts by semantic criteria, and thus constitute a kind of nominal classification;
(2) The classification typically draws on the human posture-describing verbs 'sit', 'stand', 'lie', but often also regularly involves a less anthropomorphic positional 'hang', and occasionally a verb glossable 'move' or 'inhabit' (describing the habitats of animate entities);
(3) What is classified is not the noun, and not primarily the referent, but rather the nominal concept. For physical objects, this is likely to be based on the orientation of the maximum axis of the object when in canonical position (i.e. the position in which an object normally occurs, is used or stored) -
perhaps generally: 'stand' when long axis is canonically vertical; 'lie' when long axis is canonically horizontal; 'sit' when there is no major axis, or object has a wide base in canonical position, and 'hang' when not suppoorted from below.
However, we can expect the details to vary culturally. For the locations of non-physical objects (such as mist, sorcery, knowledge) we can expect some assignment on an arbitrary basis or on some cultural 'logic'.
(4) Positional verbs typically have two uses, a presuppositional use vs. an assertional use:
(a) The presuppositional use is given by a default collocation of nominal concept and positional, either by convention, or in the case of physical objects by their canonical position according to the stereotypical orientation of axes. The test for the default collocation is use in negative locatives (or if the language here uses the same construction, in negative existentials): If, when you want to deny that the bottles are on the table you have to say "The bottles are not standing on the table", then bottles 'stand' by default.
(b) The assertional use usually involves a choice of some positional other than the default (e.g. "The bottle is lying on the table"), and asserts a non-canonical position for a physical object.In the presuppositional use, one asserts location and 'presupposes' orientation; in the assertional use one asserts orientation, and (perhaps) presupposes location. It follows that in most of these languages it will not be false in answer to a Where-Question to say the equivalent of "The bottles are standing on the table" even if one of them is lying on its side.
(5) In the set of positional verbs, there is likely to be one 'less marked' verb, offering a residual category.
In Arremte, Dutch and Rossel this is 'sit', and this may be the general tendency. The test is: "What did you say was sitting?/lying?/standing? on the table?"
As with Type II multi-verb languages, these positionals may be associated with languages which have (or did have) some other forms of nominal classification. Type II languages may have "massy" Nouns, with full numeral classifier type systems. Type III positional languages may have a more restricted range of semantically general nouns (e.g. 'wood/fire', 'river/water', 'tree species/fruit') which can be usefully disambiguated by positionals and a loose kind of nominal classifier (Arremte, Rossel). In this case the positional can, through classifying the orientation, make clear whether one is talking about wood or trees, coconuts or palms, pools or rivers. (But note Dutch, which then has to be seen as historical remnant of old IE pattern.)