"Lacking" in Australian languages:
A survey of the nominal privative

Grace Ephraums

This Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the degree of Bachelor of Arts
with Honours in Linguistics

Linguistics and Applied Linguistics
School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics
MONASH UNIVERSITY
2021

DECLARATION

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree in any University. To the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by any other person, except where due reference is given in the text.

Signed:

Date: 29/10/21

Abstract

Two widely recognised grammatical categories in Australianist linguistics are the proprietive (denoting that an entity is present) and the privative (denoting that an entity is absent). The privative has been the subject of far less cross-linguistic study, meaning that there is little established understanding of how it behaves across languages. This thesis aims to partially fill this gap by presenting a survey of the nominal privative across a sample of 62 Australian languages. This survey examines several core morphosyntactic and semantic elements of the privative.

Firstly, the commonality of privative markers across this sample is recorded, before a more detailed examination of the morphosyntax of these markers. This consists of a survey of their morphological types (suffixes, enclitics, particles, postpositions and independent forms), and the domain marking positions of these markers. This is followed by a taxonomy of entities that can be privative-marked, demonstrating the semantic range of the category.

This thesis also aims to flag several areas in need of further study. These will yield a better understanding of the behaviour of the privative itself, and how it fits into the broader field of Australian negation.

Acknowledgements

First, I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which I researched and wrote this thesis, the Boonwurrung and Wurundjeri people of the Kulin nation. Sovereignty was never ceded.

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Alice Gaby, for her support, advice and guidance through the year. I've learnt so much from working with her, and I appreciate the attention and encouragement she has given this thesis.

Thank you to my honours cohort for company, encouragement and terrible jokes.

I also greatly respect and appreciate the many linguists and speakers who contribute to the study, preservation and revival of Australian languages.

Table of Contents

I. Abbreviations and glossing conventions

All abbreviations used in interlinear glosses are found below. Rare abbreviations or those that refer to a language-specific phenomena have citations, such as the formally distinct adnominal and relational privatives in Kuuk Thaayorre, and Kayardild's modal cases.

-	affix boundary
*	denotes reconstructed or unattested form
+	bound stem
=	clitic boundary
1	first person
3	third person
A	augmented [Limilngan (Harvey, 2001)]
A	A (semantic role)
ABL	ablative
abs	absolutive
acc	accusative
ACT	actual
adn.priv	adnominal privative [Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby, 2017)]
ADV	adverbial
ALL	allative
ANAPH	anaphora
ART	article suffix [Wardaman (Merlan, 1993)]
ASSERT	assertedly
ASSOC	associative
AUG	augmented [Nyulnyul (McGregor, 2011)]
aux	auxilliary
BUT	"now consider this one; on the other hand, by contrast; but" in Aranda (Wilkins, 1989, p. 10)
CAUS	causative
caus	causative
CFACT	contrafactual
CL	classifier
CM	conjugation marker
COBL	"complementizing function of oblique case" in Kayardild (Evans, 1995)
COMIT	comitative
COMP	complementary
CONJ	Conjunction
CONJ	conjunction
CONS	consequential
cont	continuous
CTRFCT	contrafactual

CTRFCT	contrafactual
CTS	continuous
DAT	dative
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DEPRIV	deprivative
DIR	directive
DIST	distal
do	present, motion neutral [Jingulu (Pensalfini, 2003)]
DS	different subject
du	dual
DUR	durative
e	elder (sibling) [Wambaya (Nordlinger, 1998a)]
ed	seemingly a type of past tense marker used in Breen's grammar of Bidyara and Gungabula (Breen, 1973).
EFF	effector
EMPH	emphatic
erg	ergative
ex	exclusive
EXC	exclusive
excl	exclusive
F	feminine gender
FAC	factitive
foc	focus
FREQ.rdp	'frequentative (reduplication)' in Aranda (Wilkins, 1989, p. 9).
fut	future
GenEvt	generic event [Aranda (Wilkins, 1989, p. 9)].
GER	gerund
GO & DO	go to a place and do verb action' in Aranda (Wilkins, 1989, p. 9)].
HAB	habitual
HAVING	comitative/proprietive
I	class I
II	class II
III	class III
IMMED	immediate
IMP	imperative
IMPF	imperfective
IMPV	imperfective
INCH	inchoative
INCHO	inchoative
inchoat	inchoative
INF	infinitive
INTR	intransitive

IO	indirect, oblique object [Bardi (Bowern, 2012)]
IRR	Irrealis
IV	class IV
KR	denotes use of Kriol in Pensalfini's grammar of Jingulu (Pensalfini, 2003).
LACK	wanyjirra "lack" suffix
LEST	"lest, 'so as not to ... '" [Jingulu (Pensalfini, 2003).]
LOC	locative
M	mother [Warrongo (Tsunoda, 2011).]
m	masculine gender
masc	masculine gender
MIN	minimal
MLOC	modal locative [Kayardild (Evans, 1995)]
MLOC	modal locative [Kayardild (Evans, 1995)]
MPROP	modal proprietive [Kayardild (Evans, 1995)]
n	neuter gender
nAbs	non-absolutive gender suffix in Wambaya (Nordlinger, 1998a)
NEG	negator
NEGIMP	negative imperative
negp	negative privative [Alyawarra (Yallop, 1977)]
nF	non-future tense
NF	nonfuture
NF	non-flnal
NFUT	non-future
NMZR	nominaliser
nom	nominative
nom	nominative
NOML	action/state nominaliser
NomNEG	nominal negator
NONPAST	non-past tense
npp	non-past progressive
ns	non-singular
NSG	non-singular
OBL	obligative
OBVCOMP	"obviative complementiser" in Warlpiri (Simpson, 2012, p. 437)
ONLY	restrictive
P	P (semantic role)
PASSP	passive perfective
pcon	past continuous
PERL	perlative
perm	permissive
pl	plural
PLIMP	plural imperative [Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha (Breen, 2015)]
plinc	plural inclusive [Panyjima (Dench, 1991)]

POSS	possessive
pot	potential
PRES	present-future tense
PRES	present verb suffix [Yankunytjatjara (Goddard, 1983)]
pres	present tense
PRES	present
PRIV	privative
PROG	progressive
PROM	prominence
PROP	proprietive
PROX	proximal
prs	present
PST	Past Tense
PSTHB	Past Habitual
purp	purposive
QUOT	quotative, hearsay
R	realis
rdp	reduplication
RE	reflexive/reciprocal
REAL	realis
REC.PST	recent past
REDUP	reduplication
rel.priv	relational privative [Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby, 2017)]
REM	remote
REMEMB	'you remember the one' in Aranda (Wilkins, 1989, p. 7)
RPC	remote past continuous [Djinang and Djinba (Waters, 1989)]
S	subject
S	S (semantic role)
sa	same actor
SEQ	sequence
sg	singular
ss	same subject
STAT	stative
TEXD	text deitic [Djambarrpuyngu (Wilkinson, 1991)]
TH	thematic consonant [Wambaya (Nordlinger, 1998a)]
THPRO	thematic prominence [Djinang and Djinba (Waters, 1989)]
TOKEN	"token of a type diectic" in [Diyari (P. K. Austin, 1981, p. xvii)]
top	topic
TR	transitivity morpheme [Bardi (Bowern, 2012)]
UNM	"unmarked" in [Djinang and Djinba (Waters, 1989)]
usit	usitative
YK	'you know' clitic [Martuthunira (Dench, 1994)]

1. Introduction and overview

1.1. Introduction

It is common for Australian languages to contain a pair of grammatical categories that encode the senses "having" and "lacking". These are the proprietive (or comitative) and privative. This pair of categories have become widely accepted within Australianist linguistics (e. g. Blake, 1987, 2004; Dixon, 1976; Nordlinger, 2014; Saulwick, 1996; Simpson, 2014, in press). While they have both been described in many individual languages, the privative has received far less cross-linguistic study than the proprietive.

The aim of this thesis is to lay some groundwork for filling this gap. This thesis presents a survey of certain core morphosyntactic and semantic aspects of the nominal privative in a sample of 62 Australian languages. All data is taken from reference grammars. For the purposes of the survey, the privative is defined as nominal marker that indicates the referent of the noun is somehow absent

This thesis prefaces the survey with an overview of existing literature surrounding the Australian privative and its relation to topics such as Australian case systems and negation. The continued use of the terms "property" and "proprietor" (Saulwick, 1996) is also proposed.

The design and results of the survey can be broadly divided into morphosyntactic (chapters 3 and 4)and semantic (chapter 5)

Firstly, this thesis finds the occurrence of nominal privative markers in 49 out of a genetically unbalanced sample of 62 languages.

Secondly, the morphological classifications of the privative markers appearing in the sample are surveyed. Suffixes, enclitics, particles, postpositions and independent forms are found, with suffixes being the most common. Following this is an examination of the domain marking positions (Dench & Evans, 1988) in which privative markers can appear: head marking, complete concord, pronominal marking, initial/final-marking and free-marking.

Semantic analysis of the privative is prefaced with a brief overview of the functions that privative-marked nominals can take (main predicate, adnominal function, etc.). This is followed by the main semantic analysis of the thesis: a taxonomy of entities (or "properties") that can be privative-marked. This analysis finds that privative constructions can be used to express the lack of a wide range of entities. It also finds that privative constructions have yielded idiomatic expressions in many languages, and that these show some homogeneity between them. The intersection of the privative and negative existentials constructions, as identified by Phillips (in press), is also examined.

The semantic section lastly offers an overview of rare markers found in Yankunytjatjara, Wanyjirra, Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay that are distinct from the privative but have a related semantic function, finding some similarity between these.

In the course of these findings, several areas are flagged for further study, and these are summarised in section 6.4. Some are specific to the privative and some concern how the privative fits into Australian negation more broadly (another under-researched area).

1.2. Aims

1.1.1. Research questions and scope

This thesis aims to describe certain aspects of privative markers across a sample of 62 Australian languages.

My analysis of this sample aims to address the following broad questions:

1) what is the morphosyntactic distribution of the privative markers in the sample?
2) what is the semantic range of the privative markers in the sample?

Questions 1 and 2 above are examined through a number of more specific questions (a-e below), which form the specific scope of the thesis.

a) How widespread is privative marking within the sample?
b) What are the morphological classifications of the privative markers?
c) What can the privative markers attach to?
d) What functions can privative-marked nominals take?
e) What relationships between property and proprietor can be encoded by privative constructions?

1.1.2. Defining the privative

Privative constructions are defined as follows:

1) A nominal form denotes some entity [N]
2) N is marked in some way to indicate that N is absent, lacked or not possessed [N+PRIV]

Both the syntactic and semantic aspects of this definition must be present to be considered privative marking. This definition does not exclude the possibility of privative marking on items other than nouns, but nominal marking is the only type of occurrence studied.

This definition forms the basis for how data was collected for my sample (see section 1.1.7).

Three examples of the privative construction are (1), (2) and (3).

(1) *mampu-majirri*

   hair-PRIV
   bald

Nyangumarta

(Sharp, 2004, p. 140)

(2) **Mungka-majirri   karru-majirri-pa   paru-majirri   *jungka   jakun.***

tree-PRIV   creek-PRIV-CONJ   spinifex-PRIV   ground   only
There were no trees, creeks or spinifex, only the ground (in that country).

Nyangumarta

(Sharp, 2004, p. 140)

(3) **Nguthu-pani   *nhutjadu   ngarru   kaku***

elder.brother-PRIV   3sg:NOM:THERE   only   elder.sister
He's got no brothers, only sisters.

Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha

(Breen, 2015, p. 116)

1.3. Background to the Australian privative

1.1.3.   Overview

A commonly described feature of Australian languages is the identifiable morphological encoding of two specific senses: one roughly meaning "having" and the other "lacking". These have become two widely accepted and identified grammatical categories in Australian linguistics (Blake, 1987, 2004; Dixon, 1976; Nordlinger, 2014; Saulwick, 1996; Simpson, 2014, in press). The second of these, the privative, is the focus of the present thesis.

Dixon (2002, p. 81) includes the privative in a list of four methods by which Australian languages "prototypically" encode negation. (Here he classes it as a derivational affix.) However, Phillips (in press) considers Dixon's list to be an incomplete taxonomy, flagging Australian negation as an area in need of more comprehensive study. Phillips recognises the privative as a nominal negator, related in at least some ways to negative existentials. Phillips also notes that negative imperatives (prohibitives) are sometimes syncretic with privative markers and other types of negation. Prohibitives are typically verbal markers that indicate that an action should not occur. This is discussed briefly in section 4.2 but is largely outside the scope of the nominal privative.

There is also evidence that privative forms can develop from other types of negation (Dixon, 2002, p. 170; Phillips, in press). Similarly, Bowern's description of Bardi (2012) offers

evidence that privative constructions can be "displaced" by other forms of negation, as interpreted by Phillips (in press), who posits a cyclical change.

Categories similar to the privative can also be found outside of Australia. Blake (2004, p. 176) notes the existence of the Uralic "abessive" case as a close equivalent. (See also Miestamo, 2017.) The "caritive" construction (Oskolskaya et al., 2020) is the subject of some recent typological work covering the Altaic language Evenki (Rudnitskaya, 2020) and dialects of Romani (Kozhanov, 2019), among others.

1.1.4. Case status

This thesis does not aim to confirm or deny the case status of the privative. I consider the privative to be, at minimum, a nominal marker. However, studies of Australian case frequently include the privative. The remainder of this section gives a brief summary of how the privative has been studied with regard to case.

In Dench & Evans's influential taxonomy of case functions, privative and proprietive fall under the adnominal case function (1988, p. 7). The purpose of adnominal case is to indicate the nature of a relationship between two nominals, and the privative performs this function by denoting that one entity (the privative-marked nominal) is lacked by or absent from some other entity.

This function of relating two entities also forms the basis for the privative often being considered a semantic case (e.g. Nordlinger, 1998b; Simpson, in press). The distinction between grammatical and semantic case is not always clear-cut (see Blake, 2004, p. 53). For the purposes of this discussion, I follow Simpson's delineations (in press). The distinction between the two is as follows: grammatical cases are purely concerned with encoding the syntactic function of the inflected item. For Blake, the grammatical cases are the nominative, accusative, genitive, dative and ergative (Blake, 2004, p. 53). Semantic cases have the additional function of encoding relational senses: some kind of semantic relationship between the case-inflected item and some other entity.

The question of whether certain adnominal markers should be classed as inflectional or derivational is an ongoing conversation in Australianist linguistics (e.g. P. Austin, 1985, 1991; Dench & Evans, 1988; Simpson, in press). Privative and proprietive markers in particular come up frequently in this discussion, as they exhibit features that make them difficult to categorise across languages. They are variously classed as inflectional (Dench & Evans, 1988) and derivational (Nordlinger, 1998b) and sometimes placed in the category of "pre-case" markers (Blake, 1987). This question of classification is outside the scope of the present thesis.

Among those who class the privative as derivational, it is not uncommon to see it described as creating adjectives. This comes from the idea that a privative-marked nominal has the "modifying function" of an adjective (Dixon, 2002, p. 146). This analysis is especially prevalent in Dixon's work, beginning with his early study of proprietive markers, in which he

describes them as deriving "an adjectival stem from a noun" (1976, p. 203). This perspective continues in his subsequent descriptions of proprietive and privative markers (Dixon, 1977, p. 115, 2002, p. 146). It is taken up by some other authors, who describe privative-marked nominals as derived or formed adjectives (e. g. Alpher, 1991 [Yir Yoront]; Giacon, 2014 [Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay]), or as something like "adjectival nouns" (Hercus, 1994, p. 94 [Arabana-Wangkangurru]; Merlan, 1993, p. 84 [Wardaman]). The word class membership of privative-marked forms is not central to the goals of this analysis. Therefore, I do not form any conclusions regarding this idea.

1.1.5.   Paucity of dedicated studies

It is impossible not to notice that the privative (or "lacking") category has received very little dedicated study, compared to the proprietive (or "having"). It is frequently mentioned as the counterpart to proprietive (Dixon, 1976; Nordlinger, 2014; Simpson, 2014), but with little elaboration.

Dixon (2002, p. 85) and Phillips (in press) both offer some exploration of the privative as part of broader discussions of Australian negation, but this is fairly limited. I am not aware of any surveys or other studies that have the specific goal of comprehensively studying the forms, syntactic behaviour, semantic range or anything else of the Australian privative. I briefly summarise two major studies of the proprietive below.

1.1.6.   Major work on the proprietive

The earliest dedicated study of the "having" sense was a topic at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies' 1974 biennial conference, convened by R. M. W. Dixon. Dixon subsequently published the collected papers (Dixon, 1976). This collection mostly consists of papers from various Australianist linguists examining how individual languages encode the "having" sense (covering 19 languages in total). It also includes a survey of cognates in "having" forms in 50 languages (Sutton, 1976) and a detailed discussion of "kin proprietives" (Breen, 1976).

This collection has been very influential, and its major conclusions can be summarised as follows: the identification of some formal correspondences arranged by geography; a preliminary list of parts of speech that can take "having" markers; the establishment of a core group of semantic roles (later expanded and revised); early discussion of "kin proprietives"; some investigation of the connection between the "having" sense and a reflexive/reciprocal one. It also helped to establish the term "proprietive". More broadly, the whole volume containing these papers has had a large influence on Australian linguistics. As Simpson (in press, p. 509) believes, it has helped to establish categories (including "having" and "lacking") that would become widely accepted and that subsequent grammar writers would tend to "look for".

In his 1996 B. A. Honours thesis, Saulwick offers a detailed taxonomy of the semantic functions of the proprietive, revising a list developed by Dixon (1976, 2002). He identifies

the semantic core of the proprietive as consisting of two senses: 1) "having characteristics" (such as a person having hair, or a place having trees); 2) "co-location" between a 'haver' and 'the thing had' (such as possessing an item or being accompanied by a person) (Saulwick, 1996, p. 80). Saulwick then traces the semantic extensions from these senses, which allows him to offer some diachronic suggestions, such as the likelihood of development from a proprietive sense to an instrumental one (Saulwick, 1996, p. 37). He also performs a survey of domain marking amongst proprietive markers, following Dench & Evans's marking conventions (1988).

These studies have yielded an overall understanding of the proprietive category that, while not complete, is far more extensive than anything that exists for the privative.

1.4. Methodology

1.1.7.   The sample

The data in this thesis is drawn from a sample of 62 reference grammars of Australian languages.

Some grammars included in the sample cover more than one language. I count each of these grammars as one entry in the sample. Entries are referred to as "languages" for convenience. Therefore, the sample is described as consisting of 62 languages. This decision was made because in all the multiple-language grammars in the sample, I found little to no difference in the description of the phenomena relevant to this thesis. This is not intended to ignore or erase the many other distinctions between these languages.

Out of the 62 languages, 49 display privative constructions that fit the criteria outlined in section 1.1.2. The other 13 do not. Throughout the thesis, these 13 are often omitted from tables/discussions where it is only relevant to consider languages with privative marking.

Privative constructions are defined according to the criteria laid out in section 1.1.2:

1) A nominal form denotes some entity [N]
2) N is marked in some way to indicate that N is absent, lacked or not possessed [N+PRIV]

Prototypical examples are shown in section 1.1.2 and in (4) below.

(4)   *ngatha*   ***mantu-pati***

1sgNOM   **meat-PRIV**
'I've got no meat.'

Panyjima

(Dench, 1991, p. 27)

The aim of the sample is to survey the largest amount of languages possible. This results in somewhat uneven sampling across language families and across the Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan groupings. My understanding of language families within the sample is taken from Bowern's Australian language classifications in The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages (Bowern, in press).

A full list of languages, grammars and language family information is found in appendix I (7).

1.1.8.   Citation of data

All language data is notated with the language name and a citation indicating the source grammar and page number. An example is (5). The data is presented in an interlinear gloss taken directly from the grammar. (Note that all abbreviations are listed at the beginning of

the thesis.) The language name and source appear underneath the data. The part of the gloss relevant to the analysis is in bold font (in this case, the privative-marked element).

When data comes from a grammar covering multiple languages, the language the data pertains to, if known, is in parenthesis. This is shown in (6).

(5)   *ngayu*   *jilba*   *dunga-y*   ***kangkal-kari-ji***

1sgNOM(S)   walk   go-NONPAST   **own child-PRIV-COMIT**
I go for a walk with the childless one.

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 102)

(6)   ***Arriwel***   *wukkuk*   *meyl*   *un-ar-mab*

NEG   water   NEG   3nO-3mA?-have
He has no water.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Mengerrdji)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

I do not include a citation for every mention of a language name in the thesis overall. Note that for each language, I adopt the name and orthography used in the corresponding reference grammar. A full list of data sources and further information about the sample can be found in appendix I (section 7).

1.1.9.   Limitations

As mentioned above in 1.1.7 and shown in appendix I (section 7), the sample is uneven across the Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan language groupings, and subgroups within these. The goal of this thesis is to survey the largest number of Australian languages possible, not to evenly cover all language groupings. Therefore, the uneven nature of the sample is acknowledged and taken into account during analysis of the findings, especially quantitative data. Future research that focuses on the privative in specific language families will be enlightening.

It is also important to address some limitations that come with using reference grammars as data sources.

Information for each language is limited to what is provided by the author of the relevant grammar. How the author structures their description; what information they foreground; their choice of terminology, and what data they include in examples and texts, all vary between grammars. Structural differences are especially apparent when comparing grammars written decades apart (see Cristofaro, 2006; Mosel, 2006 for a discussion of this

type of change.) This means that the type and amount of information across the sample can be uneven. For example, Bowern chooses not to class the Bardi privative suffix as a case, based on it being "very unproductive" (Bowern, 2012, p. 180). I cannot compare the productivity of equivalent markers across the rest of the sample, simply because many grammars do not offer enough information to tell how productive a marker is.

Grammars are also written for differing purposes, and under differing circumstances. For example, Breen's grammar of Bidyara and Gungabula (1973) is intentionally written to be mostly accessible to non-linguists, to aid language revival and preservation efforts. A number of the grammars in my sample are based on data from a very small number of language consultants, or cover a reconstructed language, a sad reality of Australia's linguistic situation.

The searchability of the grammars sometimes also presents limitations. Some grammars were only available to me in the form of hardcopy or scanned pages that were not searchable. This has implications for how much data could be drawn from these grammars. While I was able to include any data that was presented specifically to illustrate the phenomena I was analysing, it was not always possible to survey all other data that may have been incidentally useful to my analysis.

1.1.10. Terminology

I use the label "privative" to refer to phenomena that fits the criteria described in section 1.1.2.

The terminology for the positive counterpart of the privative has been subject to change and discussion over several decades. In this thesis, I refer to it as the "proprietive", following Saulwick (1996). However, I recognise there is merit to Dixon's argument for using "comitative" as an overall term, with "proprietive" being a subtype (1976, p. 9). I find that both terms have been used inconsistently throughout literature and reference grammars since Dixon's publication. "Concomitant" is also used very infrequently (Blake, 1979). The term "privative" seems to be unchallenged in the Australian context.

In all discussion of the privative henceforth, I use the terms "property" and "proprietor" to denote semantic referents. The property (abbreviated PY) is the entity denoted by the privative-marked element. The proprietor (PR) is the entity that lacks the PY. For example, in (7), the PY is *mantu* 'meat', which receives a privative suffix, and the PR is *ngatha* (the speaker). The proprietor is not always present, such as in (8), where the PY *ngankenykerl* 'meat' is modified by a privative particle. The PR 'we' is assumed. I use these terms following Saulwick's work with the proprietive (1996). The word "property", as Saulwick points out, has a "useful ambiguity", as it suggests two meanings that are applicable to the proprietive and privative: "something that is possessed" and "a characteristic or attribute of something". Additionally, I favour these terms over terminology that evokes possession, such as "possessor" and "posessum". While the semantic range of the privative does align within the range of possession in many languages, it is not useful to overall consider it in terms of possession.

(7)   *ngatha*   **mantu-pati**

     1sgNOM   **meat-PRIV**
     'I've got no meat.'

Panyjima

(Dench, 1991, p. 27)

(8)   *Ngankenykerl*   **arriwel**

     meat   **NEG**
     [We have] no meat.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Urningangk)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

2. Commonality of privative constructions

1.5. Background: pre-existing evidence

The commonality of the privative across all Australian languages is difficult to ascertain from the existing literature. The "having" and "lacking" categories are often said to be "virtually universal" in Australia (Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 8) or at least extremely common (Dixon, 2002; Nordlinger, 2014). They are described by Simpson (in press, p. 542), as the "most widespread and consistent way of expressing possession across the Australian continent", occurring across the Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan language groupings.

Based on previous studies, both categories are certainly attested very widely. For example, Saulwick samples 63 Australian languages that exhibit a nominal marker encoding "proprietive semantics" (Saulwick, 1996, p. 12) and Sutton's data (1976) contains "having" markers from 50 languages (the total number of his sample is not stated).

There is less information on the distribution of privative markers. Simpson (in press) finds proprietive forms in 21 languages of a sample of 30: 11 Pama-Nyungan languages out of 17, 10 non-Pama-Nyungan languages out of 13. Out of these 21, 11 are stated to also have privative forms (Simpson, in press, p. 543). Dixon (2002, p. 141) states that the only Australian languages he is aware of to have proprietive forms without privative fall into his "South Kimberley" subgroup, which consists of Bunuba and Gooniyandi. I can find no discussion of the occurrence of privative without proprietive.

1.6. Commonality of privative marking in the sample

As shown by Table 1, out of the sample of 62 languages, 49 display privative marking/privative constructions according to the criteria laid out in section 1.1.2. The other 13 do not. These criteria are reiterated below:

1) A nominal form denotes some entity [N]
2) N is marked in some way to indicate that N is absent, lacked or not possessed [N+PRIV]

The uneven sampling of Pama-Nyungan and non-Pama-Nyungan languages must be discussed here. There are 38 PN languages and 24 NPN languages in the sample overall. There are far more PN languages in existence than NPN: Bowern (in press) lists 384 PN languages and 106 NPN. Proportionately, this sample overrepresents NPN languages: it is not representative of the true proportions. However, from a genetic perspective, NPN languages are overrepresented.

However, it is striking that privative constructions occur in 92% of the PN languages in the sample, and 59% percent of the NPN languages, as shown in Table 1. This higher rate of occurrence in PN over NPN languages suggests that it is more widespread in that group. It is

worth recalling that the whole sample represents a small portion of the 490 Australian languages (excluding Tasmanian languages and new Indigenous languages) recognised by Bowern (in press).

Table 1 Occurrence of privative marking in the sample					
	All languages	**PN**		**NPN**	
Displays privative marking	49	35	92%	14	59%
Does not display privative marking	13	3	8%	10	41%
Total	62	38	100%	24	100%

3. Morphological classification of nominal privative markers

Table 2 below displays the morphological classifications of privative markers across my sample. Only languages with some form of privative marking are included: 49 languages out of the full sample (62).

The morphological types of privative markers found in my sample are suffixes, enclitics, postpositions, particles and independent forms. Each of these are discussed with examples in sections 1.7 - 1.11. None of the languages in my sample exhibit a prefixed privative marker (although several have a prefixed proprietive).

In most cases, the classifications listed in 2 are the same classifications made by the author of the relevant grammar. Exceptions to this are marked in 2 with a tilde (~) and discussed in the following sections relevant to the type of marker.

Where languages exhibit more than one type of privative marker, this is indicated in the table. This can take two forms. Where a language has different forms that each have different morphological classifications, this is marked with an asterisk (*). This occurs in Bardi; Warray; Bininj Gun Wok; Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay; Wirangu. Where a language shows one form that can take multiple classifications, this is marked with a hash sign (#). This is found only in the Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha.

Table 2:

Morphological classifications of privative markers

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Suffix	(d) Enclitic	(e) Postposition	(f) Particle	(g) Independent form
1.	Alyawarra	+				
2.	Arabana-wangkangurru	+				
3.	Bardi	+*				Y+*
4.	Bidyara and Gungabula	+				
5.	BilinaraBilinarra	+				
6.	Bininj Gun Wok	+*			+*	
7.	Diyari					+
8.	Djambarrpuyngu (a Yolngu Variety)	+				
9.	Djinang and Djinba	+ ~*				
10.	Guugu Yimidhirr	+				
11.	Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha	+#				+#
12.	Jingulu	+				
13.	Kalkatungu	+ ~				
14.	Kayardild	+				
15.	Kugu-Nganhcara		+			
16.	Kuku Yalanji	+~			Y	

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Suffix	(d) Enclitic	(e) Postposition	(f) Particle	(g) Independent form
	Table 2: **Morphological classifications of privative markers**					
17.	Kuuk Thaayorre		+			
18.	Limilngan					+
19.	Mantharta languages (Jiwarli, Thiin, Warriyangka, Tharrkari)	+				
20.	Marrithiyel				+	
21.	Martuthunira	+				
22.	Miriwung	+				
23.	Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)		+			
24.	Ngandi	+				+*
25.	Ngarla	+ ~*				
26.	Nhanda	+				
27.	Nyangumarta	+				
28.	Nyulnyul			+	+	
29.	Panyjima	+				
30.	Rembarnga	+				
31.	Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji: the Giimbiyu languages				+	
32.	Wagiman	+				

Table 2:
Morphological classifications of privative markers

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Suffix	(d) Enclitic	(e) Postposition	(f) Particle	(g) Independent form
33.	Wakaya	+				
34.	Wambaya	+				
35.	Wangkajunga	+				
36.	Wankumara (Galali)	+				
37.	Wanyjirra	+				
38.	Wardaman	+				
39.	Warlmanpa	+				
40.	Warlpiri	+				
41.	Warray	+*			+*	+
42.	Warrongo					+
43.	Wirangu	+*			+*	
44.	Yalarnnga	+				
45.	Yankunytjatjara			+		
46.	YidinYidiɲ	+~*				
47.	Yintyingka	+ ~				
48.	Yir Yoront	+				
49.	Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay	+*				+*

27

1.7. Suffixes

The most common form for privative marking in my sample is suffixes. They appear in 39/49 languages, in 33 of which it is the only type of privative marking exhibited. Privative suffixes attach to the end of a nominal that denotes the property entity. Typical examples are (9) - (12) below.

(9)   *ngatha*   **mantu-pati.**

       1sgNOM   **meat-PRIV**
       I've got no meat.

Panyjima
(Dench, 1991, p. 27)

(10)   *Ngarrirna*   *babanya*   **juwa-ajarna**

       1sgPOSS:II(NOM)   e.sister:II(NOM)   **man-PRIV(NOM)**
       My sister doesn't have a man/My sister is single.

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998a, p. 141)

(11)   *an-lung.ga*   **a-wik-miyn**   *dil-m-iyn*

       P-billabong   **CL-water-PRIV**   dry-Aux-PP
       The billabong is waterless. It has dried up.

Warray
(Harvey, n.d., p. 62)

(12)   **kilipi-nhawerri**

       deep-priv
       shallow

Wakaya

(Breen, 1974, p. 56)

As mentioned in section 3, a number of markers that are given a particular classification in the present analysis are not classed as such by the author of the relevant grammar. This includes suffixes in six languages: Kuku Yalanji; Yintyingka; Kalkatungu; Djinang and Djinba;

Ngarla; Yidiɲ. These are marked with a tilde (~) in 2 above. The remainder of this section discusses these markers and my reasons for classing them as suffixes.

In Yidiɲ (Dixon, 1977) and Djinang and Djinba (Waters, 1989), the privative marker is simply described as an "affix". These markers appear to behave like suffixes in all data given, for example in (13) and (14) below. Therefore, I class them as suffixes for the purposes of this analysis.

(13) *nayu*   *guman*   *ɡaliŋ*   ***bamagimbal***

I-SA   one-ABS   go-PRES   **person-PRIV-ABS**
I'm going alone, without company

Yidiɲ
(Dixon, 1977, p. 143)

(14) *"Ama!*   *Maḻu*   *djini*   *ngurrumi,*   *wini-Ø*

mummyUMN   [daddyUNM]NOM   thisUMN   PERF   return-PRES

kiri-mi   *gumbaḻa,*   ***djarak-nyirringi…"***
PROG-PRES   empty.handed   **spear-PRIV**
"Mum! Dad is now already on his way back empty handed and without spears.."

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 185)

The Ngarla privative is classed by Westerlund (2015, p. 80) as a "nominal modifier". I find no evidence that would exclude it from being a suffix for the purposes of this analysis. Examples are provided in (15) and (16) below.

(15) ***Jantu-yanya***   *yanangka-yan*   *pila-karni.*

weapon-PRIV   go-PRS   fight-ALL
'Without weapon (he) is going to (the/a) fight.'

Ngarla
(Westerlund, 2015, p. 17)

(16) *Nganarna*   *purlpi*   ***martumurri-yanya***   *ngarri-yan*

1PL.EXCL.NOM   well   **food-PRIV**   INCH-PRS
'Well, we are becoming without food (i.e. running out of food).'

Ngarla

(Westerlund, 2015, p. 129)

The privative markers in Kalkatungu and Yintyingka are simply described as "nominal morphology". Both appear to behave like suffixes, based the data provided. There are no instances of the markers appearing not attached to the end of the head noun. However, there is a paucity of data and information for both, so place these in the suffix category somewhat tentatively. Examples are (17) - (18) below. (Note that the Yintyingka forms are reconstructed, hence the asterisk.)

(17) **maḷi-iti**   ŋai   kuntu   punpati,   walpaḻaji   ŋa-ṯu

tongue-less   I   not   speak   lose   I ERG

I have no tongue; I (can) not speak. I lost it.

Kalkatungu

(Blake, 1979, p. 78)

(18)   paɲca-ja   ala   maa   jalaura-ṯati   **maa-iti**

very-IMP   eat:IMP   food   sick-INTR   **food-less**

Eat up your food, [you will] get sick if you don't eat.

Kalkatungu

(Blake, 1979, p. 78)

(19)   ŋa͡i-yu   **keni-gin-u̠**

ngayu   **keene-kinu***
1MIN.NOM   **tobacco-PRIV**
I have no tobacco.

Yintyingka

(Verstraete & Rigsby, 2015)

(20)   ŋa͡i-yu   **ko-ta-gino**

ngayu   **kuta-kinu***

1MIN.NOM   **tobacco-PRIV**
I have no humpy.

Yintyingka

(Verstraete & Rigsby, 2015)

Kuku Yalanji has a negative marker *-kari*, that can perform multiple functions. In general negative use, Patz classes it as a particle (Patz, 1982, p. 336), but notes that it takes the form of a suffix when in privative function, as shown in (21) and (22). Since only the privative use of this marker is relevant to the present analysis, I class it as a suffix.

(21) *yinya*   *bama*   **milka-kari**

       that-ABS(S)   Aborig.-ABS(S) **ear-PRIV**
       that Aborigine is deaf (literally: has no ears)

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 90)

(22) *ngayu*   **mani-kari**

       1sg NOM(S)   **money-PRIV**
       I have no money

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 90)

1.8. Enclitics

Privative enclitics occur three languages: Kuuk Thaayorre, Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda) and Kugu-Nganhcara. They are the only type of privative marker in each of these languages. These attach to the property nominal. Examples from each are found below in (23) - (25). In Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby, 2017, p. 145) and Kugu-Nganhcara (Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 394), the enclitic is identified as a dedicated privative form, while the Mparntwe Arrernte enclitic is described as a nominal negator that performs the privative function (Wilkins, 1989, p. 379).

The Kuuk Thaayorre privative enclitic has a formal variation that indicates whether it functions adnominally (*aar*) (23) or relationally (*kaar*). Discussion of this is largely outside the scope of this thesis, but it is interesting to note, as no other language in the sample displays this.

The Kugu-Nganhcara data in (24) also shows a phenomenon found in only one language in the sample. Privative-marked nouns are "often reduplicated", particularly if the head noun is the only element of the NP (Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 393).

(23) *pam*   **paanth=aar**

    man   **woman=adn.priv**
    'a single man'

Kuuk Thaayorre

(Gaby, 2017, p. 145)

(24) *ngaci*   *nhingkurum*   **kekeka-yi**

    father   2sgABL   **spearREDUP-PRIV**
    Your father hasn't got any spears.

Kugu-Nganhcara

(Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 394)

(25) *Itne*   **kwatye-kwenye**   *ane-me-le,*   *itne*   *ilwe-me*   *peke.*

    3plS   **water-NomNEG**   be-npp-SS   3pls   die-npp   maybe
    Because they have no water, they might die. [ie. 'they are without water']

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 379)

It must be noted that in the Kugu-Nganhcara (24) and Aranda (25) examples, the glosses show the privative marker attached with a hyphen symbol (-), which is usually associated with suffixation, instead of the more usual cliticisation symbol (=). The glosses are presented here exactly as they appear in the relevant grammars. The clitic status of both markers is explicitly stated by the authors, and justified with the reasons explained below.

The Kugu-Nganhcara privative is analysed as a case. In Kugu-Nganhcara, case marking is carried by the final element in (non-pronominal) NPs. They have an invariant structure: "Generic - Noun - Adjective - Quantifier - NP - Demonstrative", where the embedded NP is privative, comitative, dative or ablative (Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 388). Demonstratives have their own distinct "case forms". However, where the NP does not end with a demonstrative, the privative/comitative/dative/ablative is analysed by Smith and Johnson as an enclitic.

The Aranda privative marker (or "nominal negator") -*kwenye* is part of a large class of nominal and verbal markers that Wilkins describes as clitics. This is based on the fact that they can occur "post-inflectionally", and are not themselves seen as derivational or inflectional in Wilkins's analysis (1989, p. 369). (Clitics are contrasted with particles, which are free forms that alone take no inflection.)

1.9. Postpositions

The only language in my sample to display privative postpositions is the Yankunytjatjara dialect. Yankunytjatjara encodes privative meaning by "postposing the negative morpheme *wiya* to a nominal," (Goddard, 1983, p. 137), shown in (26) and (27) below. It can take suffixes, as evidenced by (26), in which *wiya* carries an ergative suffix and pronominal form -*na*.

(26)   *tuutji*   **wiya-ngku-ṉa**   *puṯu*   *nguri-ningi*

      torch   **NEG-ERG-1sg(ERG)**   IN VAIN   seek-PAST.IMPF
      Not having a torch I was searching in vain

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 137)

(27)   *ngayulu*   *pika/nyapi/purtju*   **wiya**

      1sg(NOM)   pain/boil/rash   **NEG(NOM)**
      I don't have a pain/boil/rash'

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 137)

1.10.   Particles

Privative particles are found in Nyulnyul; Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji; Marrithiyel; Wirangu; Bininj Gun Wok, Kuku Yalanji and Warray

Because Nyulnyul "lacks a privative derivational suffix" (McGregor, 2011, p. 425), the privative function is most commonly accomplished by the particle *arriyangkang.* The *arriyangkang* particle always occurs in NP-initial position, as shown by (28).

(28)   *arri*   *bur*   *i-la-jal*   **arriyangkang**   *jin*   *kilaj*

      not   place   3NOM-IRR-see   **without**   3MIN.OBL   glasses
      He can't see without his glasses.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 425)

There is also another particle in Nyulnyul with a similar function (*arri*). In most of McGregor's data, this generally occurs with an oblique pronoun that denotes the proprietor (29). This type of construction does not fit the criteria for analysis in the present thesis. However, there is the occasional occurrence of *arri* without any pronoun, where it appears to behave as a prototypical privative marker, preceding the property nominal. This is shown by (30) and (31). This only occurs in "in one or two instances", and may be analysed as the negation of "an ordinary presentative clause" (McGregor, 2011, p. 427).

(29)   *kumbarr*   **_arri-jan_**   *wilamay-ung*

       money   **not-1MIN.OBL**   food-ALL
       'I have no money for food.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 426).

(30)   *bin-ik*   *i-na-lungk*   *kaad*   **_arri_**   *wurl*

       that-LOC   3NOM-CM-dig   still   **not**   water
       'He dug there, but no water.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 427)

(31)   *liyan*   *nga-n-m-in*   *jan*   *dii*   **_arri_**   *maal*

       like   1MIN.NOM-CM-put-PRS   1MIN.OBL   tea   **not**   hot
       'I like my tea lukewarm.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 427)

The Giimbiyu languages, Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji, use negative particles to encode privative meanings. These vary formally between the three languages. Below, (8) shows *arriwel* used in Urningangk, and (6) shows *arriwel* in Mengerrdji, with *meyl* also acting as a verbal negator.

(32)   *Ngankenykerl*   **arriwel**

U   meat   **NEG**
           [We have] no meat.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Urningangk)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

(33)   **Arriwel** *wukkuk*   *meyl*   *un-ar-mab*

M   **NEG**   water   NEG   3nO-3mA?-have
           He has no water.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Mengerrdji)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

The usual privative method in Bininj Gun Wok is a suffix (see Table 2). However, there is also *yakki*, which for "some" speakers of the Gun-djeihmi dialect is "a productive negative particle" that can encode privative meanings: see (34).

(34)   *Ngudda*   **yi-mani-yakki**

           you   **2-money-nothing**
           You've got no money.

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 179)

Wirangu has a number of privative markers, two of which are particles. The particle *-maga*, shown in (35), can also be used in forming "double negatives" with the privative suffix *-yudu*, as in (36).

The other particle *-min.ga* is a now-rare negative marker that Hercus suggests may have been frequently used with the privative function before being displaced by *-yudu* (a borrowing from Kukata) The *-min.ga* particle is now used to encode "emphatic absence," as demonstrated by (37). See section 5.7 for discussion of emphatic privative meaning.

(35)   ***Nganha gidya-maga***

        child-not
        I haven't got any children

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

(36)   ***Maga***   *guma*   ***rabidi- yudu***

        not   one   **rabbit-without**
        (This place) is without a single rabbit.

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

(37)   ***Nganha barnda - min . ga***

        money - totally without
        I haven't got any money at all (I haven't got a cent)

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

The Marrithiyel particle *ambi* seems to encode privative meaning in addition to other negative senses. It is shown preceding the property nominal in (38), and following the property nominal with a purposive marker in (39).

(38)	*awu*	*gagan*	*afen*	*gaful*	*- ø?*
	meat	ANAPH	where	3s3 R lie	Pr

	wuy,	***ambi-ra***	*ngi*	*-wuki*	*-njsjan*
	no	**NEG meat**	1sS R ø	eat	now

	-a,	*wakay*	*-njsjan*
	Pst	finished	now

        Where's that meat?
        Nothing, there's no meat, I've eaten it, it's all gone.

Marrithiyel

(Green, 1989, p. 189)

(39)	*nada,*	*gawunj*	*-wuwu*	*-miri*	*- ø*	*-ya*
	alright	3nsS R sit	empty	eye	pl	Pst

	muku	*-wa,*	***ambi***	*muku*	*nada.*
	woman	PURP	**NEG**	woman	alright

Alright, the MalakMalak were pining for their women, they were without their women

Marrithiyel

(Green, 1989, p. 396)

Harvey's grammar of Warray is based mostly on two language consultants, and the methods of encoding privative meaning vary between the two (Harvey, n.d., p. 62). One consultant used the negator *amala* to perform the privative function. (The other consultant used a privative construction involving suffixation: see 2.)

The classification of *amala* is under question, because Harvey notes this consultant using it as a nominal and as a particle. Harvey's criteria for delineation is as follows: non-verbal stems (stems that cannot take aspect/mood suffixes and pronominal prefixes) are further divided into nominals and particles. Nominals can function as predicates in verbless clauses, while particles cannot (Harvey, n.d., p. 25). For the purposes of this analysis, I class it as a particle, based on the fact that the majority of privative occurrences of *amala* see it functioning as a particle, such as shown by (40). Harvey notes that *amala* in (41) is modifying the nominal *wik*, not the verbal clause *bat-ga-ga-ngi*. It does modify the VC *gat-yang* in (41), for which the "correct literal translation" would be "I do not have liking for him".

(41)	*gaji*	***amala***	*mulmek*	*gat-yang*	*a-garla-wu*

(40)	*ngek*	*wik*	***amala***	*bat-ga-ga-ni*
	1sg	water	**Neg**	1sg-SNP-PR-have-A

I have no water

Warray

(Harvey, n.d., p. 25)

(41)	*gaji*	***amala***	*mulmek*	*gat-yang*	*a-garla-wu*
	that	**Neg**	liking	IRR1sgS-be	NP CL-3sg-DAT

I do not like him.

Warray

(Harvey, n.d., p. 25)

1.11.   Independent forms

Independent forms are detailed in this section. They occur in Warrongo; Diyari; Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha; Limilngan; Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay; Bardi; Ngandi.

These markers have the most diversity within their descriptions. In several cases, the author of the relevant grammar assigns a word class to the form, such as the Bardi "adverb" and Diyari "adjective". As classifications, these are not relevant to the present analysis. They are mentioned on the grounds that they do help to understand the semantic nature of the markers. Aside from this, classifications are taken from the relevant grammars, to avoid further generalising, even where it may appear that there is reason to group "independent forms" with the particles in section 1.10. They are not grouped further in the interests of caution, and on the basis that it will not impede the overall goals of this thesis.

The privative function in Diyari is performed by the "independent adjective" *pani*, which Austin translates as "none" (1981, p. 117). This follows the property nominal. This combination (N + *pani*) is often used "adverbially" (P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 248), as shown in (42) and (43) but also occurs in examples like (44).

Austin analyses *pani* as an adjective rather than a suffix or particle for two reasons. Firstly, there is optional prestopping of the nasal in *pani*, and in Diyari this prestopping only occurs after the first vowel of "a phonological word". Secondly, *pani* and the noun preceding pani can both take case markers (P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 117).

(42)   *kupa-ni*   *ŋani*   *yaṯa-na*   *wara-yi*   *kaṯi*   ***pani-ni***

child-LOC   1SgS   speak-PART   AUX-PRES   clothes   **none-LOC**
I spoke to the child with no clothes (on).

Diyari

(P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 117)

(43)   *yaru-ka*   *ṇani*   *ṇiṉṯa*   ***pani***   *ŋama-na*   *wara-yi*

like that-TOKEN   sgFS   shame   **none**   sit-PART   AUX-PRES
She sat (there) shamelessly like that.

Diyari

(P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 249)

(44)   mada-ø   *wata*   *wakara-nani*   *[Monday]-ni*   *ŋayani*

stone-ABS   not   come-REL ds   -LOC   1Plexc1A

puka   **pani- ø**   *ŋama-lka-la*   *ŋana-yi*
food   **none-ABS**   sit-TR-FUT   AUX-PRES
If some money (li. stone) does not come on Monday, we will have no food.

Diyari

(P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 288)

Limilngan also employs a form described as an adjective. According to Harvey's analysis, -*ajan* encodes privative meaning when marked on or following the property nominal (Harvey, 2001, p. 78). The adjective appears to always follow the head noun denoting the property. It bears a prefix indicating the class of the property noun. Limilngan nouns do not themselves bear class markers (Harvey, 2001, p. 45) In (45), it bears the class II "animals" prefix, referring to the nominal *ngiliyi* 'dogs', and in (46) it bears the class IV "residual" noun class prefix, referring to *irarr* 'tooth'. This adjective is difficult to fully examine due to a paucity of data and discussion.

(45)   *uginy*   *ngiliyi*   ***d-ajan***

woman   dog   **II-nothing**
(That) woman has no dogs.

Limilgan

(Harvey, 2001, p. 78)

(46)   *da-wi-k*   *w-adlangan*   *irarr*   ***d-ajan***

DEF-I-DIST   3I-old male   tooth   **IV-nothing**
That old man has no teeth.

Limilgan

(Harvey, 2001, p. 78)

The Innamincka privative is most commonly expressed by the form -*pani* suffixed to property nominals (see 2). However, *pani* sometimes also occurs as a "separate word" following the property nominal (Breen, 2015, p. 116), as shown by (47).

(47)   *Ngarru*   *puka*   *ngandra*   *thayingatji*   *kathi*   ***pani***

only   tucker   1pl:in.NOM   eat-FUT-EMPH   meat   **nothing**

We've only got bread to eat, no meat.

Innamincka dialect

(Breen, 2015, p. 131)

The usual privative form in Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay is the suffix *-DHalibaa*. However, they also occasionally use the free form *maayrr* 'none'. This precedes the property nominal, and Giacon describes it as a "paraphrase" of the usual privative construction (Giacon, 2017, p. 78). Below, (48) shows this in use, contrasted with the more typical privative construction (49).

(48)   ***maayrr=laa***   *ngiyaningu*   *dhinggaa*   *gi-gi*

     none=DIR   1PL.DAT   meat   be-FUT

     There will be no meat for us;

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 79)

(49)   ***dhinggaa-dhalibaa***   *ngiyani*   *yanaa-y.la-y*

     meat-PRIV   1PL   walk-CTS-FUT

     we'll be without meat.

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 79)

Warrongo has an "adverb for negation" (*nyawa)* used for negating possession and for non-existentials. Tsunoda describes its semantic range as "'X has no Y' or 'There is no Y in X'" (2011, p. 658). With a few exceptions, *nyawa* immediately follows the property nominal. A typical example is (50). Two exceptions are (51) and (52): see section 4.1.2 for further discussion. Tsunoda finds evidence that it may be in the process of becoming an enclitic.

(50)　*yanga-na-Ø*　*yani-Ø*　*galbin-Ø*　**nyawa.**

M-KIN-NOM　come-NF　child-NOM　**NEG**
'The mother came without [her] child.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 663)

(51)　*yino*　　　　**nyawa**　　　*jolgi-Ø*

2SG.NOM　　　**NEG**　　　scrub-NOM
'[But] your country has no scrub' or 'There is no scrub in your country.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 219)

(52)　*gamo-Ø*　　　**nyawa**　　　*gorrgara-Ø*

water-NOM　　　**NEG**　　　billy.can-NOM
'The billy can has no water' or 'There is no water in the billy can.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 660)

Bowern describes the Bardi privative suffix *-(g)arda* as "very unproductive" (2012, p. 180). This suffix is listed in 2. Bowern finds that the privative function is more usually encoded the negator *arra* or by some of its derivatives.

One of these is the form *arrajina/arrijina*, shown in (53) below, which Bowern loosely classes as an adverb (2012, p. 615). It is commonly used for negating "possession" and "existential constructions", meaning it is most frequently in privative function. It is derived from *arra* and the possessive third person minimal pronoun *jina* 'his/her/its'.

There is also *arrang(a)*, glossed as "without" in (54), which is derived from *arra* in instrumental case. Because of its fixed position before the property head nominal, Bowern describes it as behaving "like an adverb or preposition" (2012, p. 614), but does not explicitly class it as either. For the purposes of this analysis, I class it as an adverb, along with *arrajina/arrijina*. However, it is the closest example in my data to a privative preposition.

(53)   **Arrajina**   *goolboo*

      not   rocks/money
      I've got no money.

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 615)

(54)   **Arranga**   *janggoorr*   *jan.*

      without   hat   1M.POSS
      'without my hat'

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 615)

Ngandi has a suffix that Heath analyses as privative (see section 1.7). However, the "negative adjectival noun" *yaku* also seems to have a privative function (Heath, 1978, p. 122). It is glossed as 'absent' in (55) and shown taking a compulsory pronominal prefix .

(55)   *ŋa-waʔ-ḍ-i,*   **ni-yaku**   *na-ki-ñ-uŋ*   *ni-ni-ŋic-ic*

      I looked   **he absent**   there   he did not sit
      'I looked (for him, but) he was not there.'

Ngandi

(Heath, 1978, p. 122)

1.12. Compound suffixes: combination of PRIV with PROP markers in Alyawarra

Alyawarra displays an unusual phenomenon. The marker *-uwinya* has a "broad negative function" which includes privative use, as shown in (56). However, it can also be combined with *-akirta,* one of the proprietive markers. This creates *-akirtuwinya,* which is a compound suffix with a privative meaning. Yallop describes the semantic function of this compound suffix in the same way as that of *-uwinya*: "'without' or 'lacking'" (Yallop, 1977, p. 84). Only two examples are used to illustrate this compound suffix, shown below in (57) and (58).

(56)   *anunanthirra*   *alhina*   **kwatjuwinya**   *angkithakwa*

we(plu exclu nom III)   go+pcon   **water+negp**   thirsty+nom

kwatjakirta   *amurra*   *alpiliwayntiya*
water+prop   good+nom   go away+cont+aux/sf+perm
we were walking along thirsty without water - with water we'll now travel all right

Alyawarra

(Yallop, 1977, p. 84)

(57)   **akirakirtuwinya**   *aniyla*

meat+prop+negp   sit+prc
(we) are sitting (here) without meat; we've no meat

Alyawarra

(Yallop, 1977, p. 84)

(58)   *arrula*   *alkurrina*   *aghirranta*   **bullock-akirtuwinya**

long ago   eat+plu+pcon   roo+nom+only   **b.+prop+neg**
long ago (we) used to eat only kangaroo when there were no bullocks

Alyawarra

(Yallop, 1977, p. 84)

4. Locus of privative marking

1.13.   Domain marking

4.1.1.   Domain marking in Australian languages

This section examines the nature of the domain marking exhibited by privative markers in my sample. This is divided into five types of domain marking. These types are listed in Table 3 and discussed individually in sections 4.1.3 - 4.1.8. These sections show prototypical examples of each type of domain marking from the sample and discuss any occurrences that are atypical or difficult to analyse.

I follow Dench and Evans (1988) in using the concepts and terminology "domain marking" and "scope". The type of domain marking that a marker participates in (generally) indicates its scope: what elements it modifies. This concept is demonstrated by a minimal pair of Martuthunira examples that Dench and Evans provide (1988, p. 7). These are reproduced below in a) and b). In a), the privative marker *wirriwa* appears on all elements of the NP, having phrasal scope. It denotes the absence of the shirt. The proprietive marker *marta* has lexical scope, only modifying *jirli* 'arm' to indicate that the shirt has sleeves. In the second example b), this is reversed. The proprietive has phrasal scope and the privative has lexical scope, indicating the absence of sleeves.

a) *kapunmarni-wirriwa   jirli-marta-wirriwa*

shirt-PRIV   arm-PROP-PRIV
'without a shirt having sleeves'

Martuthunira

(Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 7)

b) *kapunmarni-marta   jirli-wirriwa-marta*

shirt-PROP   arm-PRIV-PROP
'having a shirt without sleeves'

Martuthunira

(Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 7)

The domain marking shown by the privative constructions in the sample are listed and defined in Table 3. These are head-marking; complete concord; pronominal marking; initial/final marking; free-marking. No other clausal positions for privative markers were found in the sample. This list and the terminology used is largely based on Dench and Evans's domain marking conventions (1988, p. 3). Each of these types of domain marking are discussed in the following sections 4.1.3 - 4.1.8.

Table 3
Domain marking types

	Domain marking type	Section
a)	**Head marking.** Privative marking appears only on the head noun of the NP (excluding pronouns) denoting the property. This includes cases where the head noun is the only element of the NP.	4.1.3
b)	**Complete concord.** Privative marking appears on all elements of the NP denoting the property.	4.1.4
c)	**Pronominal marking.** Privative marking appears on a pronoun denoting the property. This can be a personal pronoun or interrogative pronoun.	4.1.5
d)	**Initial-marking/final-marking.** Privative marking occurs immediately before or immediately after the property NP. This occurs regardless of which NP constituent is at this edge: it is not necessarily the head noun.	4.1.6 / 4.1.7
e)	**Free-marking.** At least one subconstituent of the property NP must be marked, but placement can vary. This does not necessarily mean that there is no restriction on where the marker can occur, but that there are multiple attested options.	4.1.8

As established in chapter 3, the privative markers in the sample cover a range of morphological classifications (suffixes, enclitics, postpositions, particles and independent forms). A number of languages contain multiple markers with different classifications, and one (Innamincka) contains a marker that appears to function as two morphological types (see Table 2).

These morphological types behave differently regarding their domain marking positions. This chapter discusses these differences, but a full taxonomy of the domain marking positions possible with each privative marker in the sample is outside the scope of this analysis.

Beyond distinguishing pronouns from other nomina, this analysis does not further differentiate types or classes of nouns. In some languages, these types of distinctions are marked overtly. For example, Limilgan's privative adjectives bear prefixes that indicate the class of the property noun (Harvey, 2001, p. 78). However, these are language-specific phenomena, and any further analysis of how they relate to privative markers is outside the scope of this thesis.

Distinctions between head-marking, final-marking and complete concord can be difficult to determine. For the purposes of this analysis, final-marking is defined as a marker occurring on the final constituent of the property NP, regardless of whether this constituent is the head noun or not. Complete concord is defined as a marker occurring on all elements of the property NP. These definitions are taken from Dench and Evans (1988, p. 5).

This means that in order to differentiate final-marking from head-marking, it is necessary to see the marker modifying at least two types of NP: one in which the head noun is the final element, and one in which it is not. The same is true for complete concord. There must be examples of modified NPs in which the head noun is not the only element.

Some grammars do not provide this data for privative markers. Where there is insufficient data to differentiate between these things, categorisations can be made based on information given about the language more generally

4.1.3.   Head-marking

In this type of domain marking, the privative marking appears only on the head noun of the NP denoting the property. In this thesis, this excludes cases where the head noun of the property NP is a pronoun: this is discussed in section 4.1.5. However, this definition does not exclude participation in multiple case marking.

Head-marking generally occurs with suffixes, as shown in (59) - (61). However, Diyari presents an example of an independent form that always occurs in head-marking position (43).

(59) **Jantu-yanya**   yanangka-yan   pila-karni.

      weapon-PRIV   go-PRS   fight-ALL

      'Without weapon (he) is going to (the/a) fight.'

Ngarla

(Westerlund, 2015, p. 17)

(60)   **buya-murlung**

         body-PRIV
         'thin'

Bilinarra

(Meakins & Nordlinger, 2013, p. 156)

(61)   *ma-dalibirrman*   *mayin*   *nga-marn-bu-rri*   ***ma-nyalug-wagbawun***

        MA-tough-ABS   food-ABS   1SG-make-PST   **MA-soft-lacking**
        'I made tough food/bread, it's not soft'.

Wardaman

(Merlan, 1993, p. 85)

Diyari encodes privative meaning with the adjective *pani*. Unlike many of the other independent forms in my sample, *pani* is explicitly stated to always follow the head noun, and this combination [noun + *pani*] creates a NP (P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 249). An example of this is shown in (43). Therefore, *pani* can be analysed as a head-marking adjective.

(62)   *yaru-ka*   *n̪ani*   *n̪in̪t̪a*   ***pani***   *ŋama-na*   *wara-yi*

        like that-TOKEN   sgFS   shame   **none**   sit-PART   AUX-PRES
        She sat (there) shamelessly like that.

Diyari

(P. K. Austin, 1981, p. 249)

As mentioned above, the distinction between head-marking and full concord can be difficult to determine and sometimes relies on additional information. For example, (59) - (43) are examples of head marking in a language where this is the typical behaviour of privative markers. However (63) is an example of complete concord in a situation where the NP consists only of a head noun. This means it appears the same as head-marking.

(63)   *nga-ku-rra*   *warra-ju*   ***dangka-warri-wu***   *dulk-u*

        1-INC-du   go-POT   **person-PRIV-MPROP**   country-MPROP
        'We will go to uninhabited places.'

Kayardild
(Evans, 1995, p. 158)

4.1.4. Complete concord

In this type of domain marking, the privative marker appears multiple times: on all elements of the NP denoting the property. There are no examples in my sample of this occurring with an NP that has more than two elements.

The Kayardild data in (64) is a prototypical example. The privative marker *warri* occurs twice: on the pronoun *niwan* 'his' and the noun *wumburu* 'spear'.

(64)	*nginyinangkuru-ya*	*kiwali-ja*	***niwan-marri***	***wumburu-warri***
	why-MLOC	wade-ACT	**his-PRIV**	**spear-PRIV**

Why is he wading about without his spear?

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 158)

In the Kayardild example in (65), the privative marker *marri* appears both on the third person singular pronoun *niwan* and the nominalised verb *warran*. It might be possible to interpret this as two separate privative negations: something like "no sign of him" and "he is not going around". However, it seems more likely that *niwanmarri warranmarri* "him going around" forms an NP with privative marking on all elements.

(65)	*warirra-y*	*dulk-i*	*kurri-j,*	***niwan-marri***	***warra-n-marri***
	nothing-LOC	place-LOC	see-ACT	**3sg-PRIV**	**go-N-PRIV**

[dathin-inja   *kurrka-thurrk]COBL*
that-COBL   take-IMMED:COBL

'(They) can't see him anywhere, (no sign of) him going around, whom that one (Barrindindi) had just grabbed.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 521)

Wambaya speakers disagree about whether privative and proprietive marking can occur on all elements in a NP or not. For some, (66) is grammatical. However, for at least one speaker consulted by Nordlinger, it is unacceptable. Instead, they would use a construction shown below in (67), which is a verbal clause negated by *yangula*.

(66)	*Alaji*	**buguwa-aji**	*darranggu-waji*
	boy:I(NOM)	**big:IV:Abs-PRIV:I(NOM)**	**stick-PRIV:I(NOM)**

The boy doesn't have a big stick.

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998a, p. 142)

(67)	*Yangula*	gini	*yabu*	*buguwa*	darranggu.
	NEG	3sgmascA(Pres)	have(nF)	big:IV(ACC)	stick:IV(ACC)

He doesn't have a big stick.

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998a, p. 143)

4.1.5.   Pronominal marking

Privative pronominal marking is defined as follows: the privative marker in some way marks a pronominal form [PRO-PRIV] to encode the absence of an entity denoted by PRO. This applies to personal pronouns (section 4.1.5.1) and interrogative pronouns (section 4.1.5.2).

Examples (68) - (78), discussed in the following sections, show pronominal privative marking: six with personal pronouns and three with interrogative pronouns. The Bardi data in (75) is presented as a possible example and discussed.

4.1.5.1.   Personal pronouns

Personal pronouns modified by privative markers appears to be the more common construction. It encodes the absence of the referent of the pronoun, either the speaker [(68), (70), (71), (74)] and/or some other person (69). Example (70) from Warlpiri, (71) from Arabana-wangkangurru and (72) from Djambarrpuyngu show the construction being used to describe a time in which the speakers did not exist. This is discussed further in section 5.2.1.

(68)	**ngijin-marri-wu /**	dangka-warri-wu	*maraka*	*yuuma-thu*
	1sg-PRIV-MPROP /	person-PRIV-MPROP	CTRFCT	drown-POT

'Without me / had no-one been there (he) would have drowned.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 158)

(69) **nyandu-mulung**

'without him/her'
3MIN

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 203)

(70) *Nyurruwiyi*   *kuja-lpa-lu*   *nyina-ja*   *purlka-purlka*

past   thuS-IMPF-3ps   sit-PST   old-old

kamparru-warnu-patu   **nganimpa-nyangu-wangu-rla-wiyi.**   *Nganimpa*
front-ASSOC-PLUR,   **we.pe-POSS-PRIV-LOC-BEFORE**   we.pe

lawa-ngkarni-wiyi
nothing-OBVCOMP-BEFORE
In the past the old people were there, the ancestors, without us being there. Before, in our absence.

Warlpiri

(Simpson, 2012, p. 107)

(71) *Yarndi,*   **arniri-kirnda-padni-nganha.**

ancient   **us-DAT-without-from (elative)**
It is ancient and from before our time.

Arabana-Wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 95)

(72) *nhaltja+n*   *dhu*   *walal*   nhumalaŋ   *balanya+mirri+y*

do what+1st   FUT   3pl

*gunya*ŋa   *dha-dhuditj*   **ŋarra+PRIV+LOC**

think-1st   later on   **1sg+PRIV+LOC**
how they will think about you at such a time later on, without me (i.e. after my death)

Djambarrpuyngu (a Yolngu variety)

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 445)

(73)	*Nhanguwali-ma*	*nhumpala*		*ngunyi-npa-ma*	***ngiya-nhiya***
	do.what-PRES	2du		give-RE-PRES	**1sg-LESS**

	nhumpala-lu	*ngap(a)-atiyi.*
	2du-ERG	tell-IRR

'What are you two doing, giving things away without (consulting) me? You should have said.'

Yalarnnga

(Breen & Blake, 2007, p. 50)

(74)	*Nyuntu=ma=n*	*yarti*		*ka-mi*	***ngayu-jila***
	2=TOP=2SG.S	stay_in_camp		be-FUT	**1-WITHOUT**

You'll stay in camp without me.

Warlmanpa

(Browne, 2021, p. 136)

I tentatively analyse the Bardi example in (75) as an example of pronominal privative marking. It fits the syntactic criteria, because *-ard*, identified by Bowern as a (now unproductive) privative marker, is suffixed to *ginyingg,* a third-person minimal pronoun. The semantics of this clause are unclear to me, but a working hypothesis is that the privative-marked pronoun is co-referential with *jawal* 'story'. In this case, it would denote lack of existence of the story, which is translated as 'there is no more'. I do not have the knowledge necessary to understand what mental model the speaker had when using this construction.

(75)	***Ginyingg-ard=angarra***	*jawal.*
	3MIN-PRIV=JANGARR	story

There is no more to the story.

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 181)

4.1.5.2. Interrogative pronouns

In addition to (68) - (74), in which the property is a specific entity denoted by a personal pronoun, privative markers are also found modifying interrogative pronouns to encode a meaning that is something like "without what?".

The Djinang and Djinba privative marker can appear on the interrogative pronominal root *nyimi* ('what'). This creates *nyim-nyirring,* meaning 'lacking what?' (77) or 'lacking anything' (75).

(76) **nyim-nyirring**

what-PRIV
'lacking what?' / 'lacking anything'

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 46)

(77) *wirr,*   *ngununga…*   *buluki-nyirringa*   **nyim-nyirring+a,**

NEG   [thatUNM+DUR]LOC   cattle-PRIV+NF   **whatever-PRIV+NF**

yarraman-nyirring   *nganaparra-pm*   *libi*   *kurr-kurrpi-ni*   *kiri-ny*
horse-PRIV   [buffalo-THPRO]ACC   1plexcERG   REDUP-chase-RPC   PROG-RPC
None, (while) moving through that place, there were no cattle, no horses, nothing at all;
we were busy chasing just buffaloes.

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 85)

The Kayardild privative marker is also attested with the interrogative pronoun *ngaaka* 'who/what/which', shown in (78). (This is presented without the context of a larger utterance in the grammar.)

(78) **ngaaka-warri**

what-PRIV
'lacking what, without what'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 368)

4.1.6.   Initial-marking

Initial marking is generally associated with particles and free forms. The remainder of this section demonstrates this with particles in Nyulnyul and free forms in Bardi and Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay.

Nyulnyul's particles *arriyangkang* and *arri* occur in initial marking position. In (28), *arriyangkang* 'without' occurs immediately before *jin kilaj* 'his glasses'. In (31), *arri* occurs immediately before *maal* 'hot'.

(79)	*arri*	*bur*	*i-la-jal*	***arriyangkang***	*jin*	*kilaj*
	not	place	3NOM-IRR-see	**without**	3MIN.OBL	glasses

He can't see without his glasses.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 425)

(80)	*liyan*	*nga-n-m-in*	*jan*	*dii*	***arri***	*maal*
	like	1MIN.NOM-CM-put-PRS	1MIN.OBL	tea	**not**	hot

'I like my tea lukewarm.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 427)

Bardi has two privative free forms (or adverbs, for the purpose of this thesis): *arrang(a)* and *arrajina/arrijina*. Both are derivatives of the negator *arra*. They occur immediately before the head noun of the property NP. This is shown in (81) and (53).

(81)	*Manyarr*	*i-n-banyi-n=jin*	*ambooriny*	*gombol-nim*	***arranga***
	thirst	3-TR-finish-CONT=Sn.IO	person	white-clamshell.meat-ERG	**without**

	oola	*arr*	*mi-li.*
	water	go	2-IRR-do/say

'The white part of the [clamshell] meat will quench your thirst if you happen to be without water.'

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 347)

(82)	***Arrajina***	*goolboo*
	not	rocks/money

I've got no money.

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 615)

In Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay, the occasionally used free form *maayrr* 'none' occurs in initial-marking position. It is seen preceding the property NP in (48).

(83) **maayrr=laa**   *ngiyaningu*   *dhinggaa*   *gi-gi*

    none=DIR   1PL.DAT   meat   be-FUT

    There will be no meat for us;

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 79)

4.1.7.   Final-marking

Final-marking is found with enclitics, some particles and free forms, and the Yankunytjatjara postposition (the only language in the sample to have privative postpositions).

Final-marking is well-demonstrated by (84) and (85), in which the Kugu-Nganhcara privative enclitic appears on the final element of the property NP, serving to express the syntactic role of the whole phrase, not just the element to which it is attached. It has phrasal scope rather than lexical. In (84), the marker attaches to the third person singular pronoun (which is also ablative-inflected): the last element of the NP *ku'a nhingurumuyi* "his dog". In (85) it appears on *piˈan* 'big' in the same way.

(84) *nhila*   *ku'a*   **nhingurumu-yi**   *uwa*

    3sg-NOM   dog   **3sgABL-PRIV**   go
    He went without his dog.

Kugu-Nganhcara

(Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 423)

(85) *ngaya*   *minha*   *keń ke*   **piˈan-yi**

    1sgNOM   ANIMAL   fish   **big-PRIV**
    'I haven't got any big fish.'

Kugu-Nganhcara

(Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 425)

The same system of final-marking applies to the following examples of enclitics from Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda) (86) and Kuuk Thaayorre (87). Note that the clitic status of the Kugu-Nganhcara and Aranda markers (despite the use of a hyphen symbol in their glosses) is discussed in 1.8.

(86) *Itne*   **kwatye-kwenye**   *ane-me-le,*   *itne*   ilwe-me

      3plS   **water-NomNEG**   be-npp-SS   3plS   die-npp

      peke.
      maybe
      Because they have no water, they might die.[ie. 'they are without water']

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 379)

(87) *aawoy,*   *nhunt*   **kuuk=aar**   *nhiinhin*

      yes   2sg(NOM)   **WORD=ADN.PRIV**   sit:RDP:NPST
      'yes, you're sitting silent'

Kuuk Thaayorre

(Gaby, 2017, p. 366)

The Yankunytjatjara privative marker is a postposition (the only one found in the sample). It therefore displays final marking. It has a fixed position following the property NP, shown in (26), where it also takes ergative and pronominal marking.

(88) *tuutji*   **wiya-ngku-n̠a**   *pu̠tu*   *nguri-ningi*

      torch   **NEG-ERG-1sg(ERG)**   IN VAIN   seek-PAST.IMPF
      Not having a torch I was searching in vain

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 137)

The Bininj Gun Wok particle *yakki*, which for some speakers can have privative function, always appears in final-marking placement. There is a limited amount of data available.

(89) *Ngudda*   ***yi-mani-yakki***

     you   **2-money-nothing**
     You've got no money.

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 179)

The rare Wirangu privative particle *-min.ga* appears to have final-marking position, as shown in (90). There is limited data on this marker.

(90) *Nganha*   ***barnda-min.ga***

     I   **money-totally without**
     'I haven't got any money at all (I haven't got a cent).'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 58)

Limilngan's adjective *ajan* takes final marking position, as shown in (45). It also bears a prefix indicating the noun class of the property noun.

(91) *uginy*   *ngiliyi*   ***d-ajan***

     woman   dog   **II-nothing**
     (That) woman has no dogs.

Limilgan

(Harvey, 2001, p. 78)

The Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha contains a free form *pani* (an allomorph of a privative suffix). When occurring as a free form, it takes final-marking position, as seen in (92).

(92) *Ngapatji*   ***panda***

water-EMPH   **nothing-EMPH**

'There's no water [here].'

Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha

(Breen, 2015, p. 116)

The Warrongo adverb *nyawa* "almost always" follows the property NP (Tsunoda, 2011, p. 661), as demonstrated by (50) and (94). However, there are exceptions. Two of these are (51) and (96). For the purposes of this analysis, I consider *nyawa* a final-marking adverb, rather than free-marking or head-marking. This is because Tsunoda records very few exceptions to the usual configuration, and even finds that there is evidence the adverb is in the process of becoming encliticised.

(93) *yanga-na-Ø*   *yani-Ø*   *galbin-Ø*   ***nyawa.***

M-KIN-NOM   come-NF   child-NOM   **NEG**
'The mother came without [her] child.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 663)

(94)   *yori-Ø*   ***nyawa /***   *gajarra-Ø*   ***nyawa /***   *worriba-Ø*

kangaroo-NOM   **NEG**   possum-NOM   **NEG**   sugar.bag.bee-NOM

nyawa /   *barrbira-Ø*   ***nyawa /***   *jagay-Ø*   ***nyawa /***
NEG   echidna-NOM   **NEG**   sand-goanna-NOM   **NEG**
'There are no kangaroos, no possums, no sugar bag bees, no echidnas, [and] no sand goannas [in my country].'
Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 661)

(95) *yino*   ***nyawa***   *jolgi-Ø*

2SG.NOM   **NEG**   scrub-NOM
'[But] your country has no scrub' or 'There is no scrub in your country.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 219)

(96) *gamo-Ø*   **nyawa**   *gorrgara-Ø.*

water-NOM   **NEG**   billy.can-NOM
'The billy can has no water' or 'There is no water in the billy can.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 660)

4.1.8.   Free-marking

In free-marking, at least one constituent of the property NP is marked, but the placement of the marker can vary. This does not necessarily mean that there is no restriction on where the marker can occur, but that there are multiple attested options.

Two of Wirangu's privative markers, the suffix *-yudu* and the particle *-min.ga,* are considered head-marking and initial-marking respectively. The Wirangu particle *maga*, however, appears to either occur on the head noun (and glossed with a hyphen symbol, indicating suffixation) (97) or phrase-initially: (98) and (36). In the second of these examples, it participates in what Hercus describes as a "double negative" (1999, p. 57), but this type of construction does not seem necessary for phrase-initial use of this marker.

(97) *Nganha*   ***gidya-maga***

I   **child-not**
'I haven't got any children.'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

(98) ***maga*** *nyurnigu*   *ngura*   *nhala*

not   your   camp   here
'It's not your place here.'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 78)

(99) **Maga**   guma   rabidi- yudu

   not   one   rabbit-without
   '(This place) is without a single rabbit.'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

The Marrithiyel particle -*ambi* is seen to occur either immediately before (38) or immediately after (39) the property nominal.

(100)	awu	gagan	afen	gaful	- ø?
	meat	ANAPH	where	3s3 R lie	Pr
	wuy,	***ambi-ra***	*ngi*	*-wuki*	*-njsjan*
	no	**NEG meat**	1sS R ø	eat	now
	-a,	*wakay*	*-njsjan*		
	Pst	finished	now		

Where's that meat?
Nothing, there's no meat, I've eaten it, it's all gone.

Marrithiyel

(Green, 1989, p. 189)

(101)	nada,	gawunj	-wuwu	-miri	- ø	-ya
	alright	3nsS R sit	empty	eye	pl	Pst
	muku	*-wa,*	***ambi***	*muku*	*nada.*	
	woman	PURP	**NEG**	woman	alright	

Alright, the MalakMalak were pining for their women, they were without their women

Marrithiyel

(Green, 1989, p. 396)

The Giimbiyu languages (Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji) use a number of negative particles to encode privative meanings. These have extensive formal variation, and also vary in placement. Below, (8) shows *arriwel* following the property NP, and (6) shows it preceding the property NP.

(102)   *Ngankenykerl*   **arriwel**

U   meat   **NEG**
         [We have] no meat.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Urningangk)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

(103)   **Arriwel**   *wukkuk*   *meyl*   *un-ar-mab*

M   **NEG**   water   NEG   3nO-3mA?-have
        He has no water.

Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji (Mengerrdji)

(Campbell, 2006, p. 103)

The Warray nominal *amala*, used by one of Harvey's consultants, appears to have variable placement. I class it as free-marking in the absence of more definitively privative data. In (104), *amala* occurs after the property noun *muya* 'tucker'.

(104)   *muya*   ba-jujir-iyn   *ba-wul-iyn*   *muya*   **amala**

        tucker   3plS-eat-PI   3plS-finish-PP   tucker   **Neg**

        ba-wuli-wul-iyn   ngek-u

        3plS-R-finish-PP   1sg-DAT
        They have eaten all the tucker. They have finished it. There is no
        tucker. They have really finished it all up on me.
Warray

(Harvey, n.d., p. 117)

4.2. The intersection of verbal and nominal privative marking

As established in section 1.1.2 the privative marker is examined in the present thesis as a nominal marker. It modifies a nominal form to indicate that the referent is absent or lacked. However, there is overlap and sometimes ambiguity between nominal and verbal occurrences of the privative. This section briefly addresses some issues surrounding verbal use of the privative.

Some languages are described as having a privative marker that can appear on nouns and on verbs (e. g. Mparntwe Arrernte [Aranda]). Others have a more general negation marker that can serve the privative function on nominals as well as a comparable function with verbs (e. g. Kuku Yalanji, Yankunytjatjara). However, in some cases this type of detail is not offered, and this leads to ambiguity. The distinction between nominal and verbal forms in a language, if not stated by the relevant grammar, cannot be assumed.

Some are explicitly stated as being marked on verbs, as analysed by the author. An example is Jiwarli: this is stated to be the use of a privative marker on a verb to form a negative imperative (9).

(105)   *Warri*   *thurni-ngu-thu*   ***paapaa-rri-ngu-yirra.***

    not   laugh-imperfSS-def   **mad-inchoat-imperfSS-priv**

    'Don't be silly and laugh.'

4 Mantharta languages (Jiwarli)

(Austin, 2015, p. 50)

In some languages, verbal forms can be overtly marked with a nominaliser, and then privative-marked, such as *-ntye/-tye* in Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda) (106). The use of the privative with "nominalised" clauses is also mentioned by Dixon (2002, p. 84).

(106)   *Ayenge*   ***angke-tye-kwenye***   *ne-me,*   *kwetethe.*

    1sg S   **speak-NMZR-NomNEG**   be-npp,   always
    I'm not speaking anymore. [Lit. I am going to be without speaking]

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 154)

Similarly, "gerund markers" are sometimes conditioned by this verbal privative sense, such as in Wakaya (107), the Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha (108), and Bardi (109).

(107) ***kunjanhawerru***

      drink-ger-priv

      'He never had a drink.'

Wakaya

(Breen, 1974, p. 135)

(108) *Palthu*   **ngarndamini-panil**

      road   **block-CAUS-GER-PRIV**

      'Get out of the way!' (i.e. 'Don't block the road,' or perhaps better 'Unblock the road'.)

Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha

(Breen, 2015, p. 123)

(109)	***Arranga***	***ma-lamanka-n-ngan***	*boon-on*	*darr*	*i-n-ar-na*
	without	**GER-hear-CONT-ALL**	there-LOC	come	3-TR-spear-REM.PST
	baal-oon	*nirirr-jarra*	*bard*	*i-ny-jarrala-na*	
	boughshed-LOC	beach-PERL	off	3-PST-run-REM.PST	

      'Without hearing he went on and came to the boughshed and ran off along the beach.'

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 673)

An ambiguous example is (18). Blake's free translation 'if you don't eat' suggests a verbal interpretation. However, the privative-marked form *maa* is glossed as 'food', a different form to the imperative verb *ala* 'eat'. It is difficult to judge whether this should be interpreted as something closer to "if you don't perform the action of eating" or "if you are in a state without food".

(110)　paɲca-ja　　ala　　　maa　jalaura-ṯati　**maa-iti**

　　　very-IMP　　eat:IMP　food　sick-INTR　　**food-less**

　　　'Eat up your food, [you will] get sick if you don't eat.'

Kalkatungu
(Blake, 1979, p. 78)

Two main semantic functions are identifiable for these types of examples. The first is the negative imperative or prohibitive. It indicates that an action denoted by the verb should not or must not occur: see (9) and (108). The second function is referred to here as "verbal lack". This indicates the absence of an action denoted by the verb: the action does not occur. Examples are (106), (107) and (109).

Certain semantic functions of the privative, as identified in the subsequent chapter 5, do complicate the distinction between nominal and verbal. The "quality/state" function (5.2.7) and particularly the extended function of [body part-PRIV] (5.2.6.1) lend themselves to this ambiguity. An example is (111). This can be seen as the negation of a verbal concept (the ability to hear), although the privative-marked form *milka* 'ear' is nominal.

(111)　yinya　　　bama　　　**milka-kari**

　　　that-ABS(S)　Aborig.-ABS(S)　**ear-PRIV**
　　　'that Aborigine is deaf' (literally: 'has no ears')

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 90)

Ultimately, it is not always possible to know what mental models speakers have when using constructions like these. It may be closer to nominal or verbal. It may even vary between speakers, especially if there is gradual language change involved.

4.3. Multiple case marking

Multiple case marking is one of the most widely studied aspects of Australian case. It is also one of the most typologically interesting aspects of Australian languages: Australia is considered to display the most "extreme and complex form" of multiple case marking found anywhere in the world (Nordlinger, 2014, p. 247).

The phenomenon was first fully described and identified with Australian data by Dench and Evans (1988). It generally plays a role in descriptions of case written by Australianist scholars post-1988. The core idea of multiple case marking, as found by Dench & Evans, is that one constituent can take multiple case markers, with each indicating progressively higher relationships within the clause. Dench & Evans's understanding of how case markers indicate clausal relations at multiple levels has given rise to the study of Australian "case stacking". This was largely established by Sadler & Nordlinger (2006), and has been greatly expanded since (e. g. Andrews, 1996; Nordlinger, 1997, 1998b; Richards, 2013, among others).

In some languages in my sample, it is explicitly stated that privative markers cannot be followed by any other markers, which would presumably be analysed as a "morphological sequence constraint" (Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 35). This type of constraint is sometimes used as evidence for (e.g. Browne, 2021, p. 130: Warlmanpa) or against (e.g. Waters, 1989, p. 83: Djinang and Djinba) classing the privative as a case. In other languages, there are clear examples of the privative taking further case marking.

Despite this, multiple case marking is not further analysed in this thesis. There are two major reasons for this decision. Firstly, when taking all data from reference grammars, it is not possible to comprehensively record all the constraints on multiple case marking that privative markers can and cannot participate in. This kind of information is not consistently provided across grammars. Secondly, as Dench and Evans's work shows, while this phenomenon exists across many Australian languages, it operates in language-specific ways. An attempt to examine the multiple case marking in the sample would not aid the goals of this thesis: understanding the morphosyntax and semantics of the privative overall.

4.4. Functions of privative-marked nominals

The constructions in which privative-marked nominals can occur is largely outside the scope of analysis in this thesis. However, a brief overview is needed to inform the following semantic analysis in chapter 5. This overview also serves to bridge a gap between the morphosyntactic and semantic findings in this thesis.

Dench and Evans (1988) identify a taxonomy of Australian case functions (relational, adnominal, referential, complementizer, and associating). Recall that the privative is not necessarily treated as a case in this thesis. Analogously, Saulwick's analysis of the proprietive distinguishes five types of functions: main predicate, adnominal, secondary predicate, relational and T-complementizing (Saulwick, 1996, p. 11). He acknowledges that division of these types is sometimes problematic. In particular, the distinction between relational and secondary predication is difficult to resolve.

In the time since Saulwick's publication, the body of typological work on secondary predication has greatly expanded. In particular, Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann's establishment of "depictives" is influential (2005; 2004). However, this literature has revealed certain ambiguities that require language-specific knowledge to solve. For example, the distinction between relational case and referential function (which includes secondary predication) is not clear-cut across all languages, partially due to the commonality of discontinuous nominal modifiers in Australia (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann, 2004; Schultze-Berndt & Simard, 2012; Simpson, 2005). Therefore, the following overview of constructions is broad.

Below, i) - iv) list four constructions in which privative-marked NPs can occur.

i) As the main predicate. The privative-marked NP is predicated directly of the subject with no copular.

(112) *nyola*   *nyola*   *nyawa.*

    3SG.NOM   breath-NOM   NEG
    'She was short-winded.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 659)

ii) In adnominal function (this term is from Dench & Evans, 1988). The privative-marked nominal modifies a nominal within the same NP. In (113), *mara-yanya* [hand-PRIV] 'without a hand' modifies *palakarni marrungu* [DEM (mid) man] 'that man'.

(113) *Palakarni   marrungu   mara-yanya   pukul ma-rri-ya   jinta-ku.*

DEM (mid)   man   hand-PRIV   caretaker CAUS-PRS-3PL   others-ERG
'That man without (a) hand others are taking care of.'

Ngarla

(Westerlund, 2015, p. 85)

iii) In depictive function. This covers both what Dench and Evans (1988) define as "adverbial secondary predication" and what Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005) describe as depictive secondary predication and discontinuous modifiers. The privative-marked nominal is outside of the constituent containing the item it is modifying. Semantically, it serves to indicate the "manner" in which the action denoted by the verb occurs. An example is the NP *arriyangkang wul* 'without water' modifying the verb *marriny* 'walk' in the VP.

(114) *marriny   i-ngi-rr-jid   arriyangkang   wul*

walk   3NOM-PST-AUG-go   without   water
'They went walking without water.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 2011, p. 425)

iv) In ascriptive function. This is secondary predication with the ascriptive function described by Dench and Evans (1988). As with the depictive above, the privative-marked nominal is outside of the phrase containing the item it modifies. This secondary predication "allows a nominal predication about some NP to be incorporated into a verbal clause" (Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 14). Instead, the privative-marked NP modifies another nominal, as it does in adnominal function, but is in a separate phrase

It does not indicate the manner in which the action of the verb is carried out: that is the job of the depictive. An example is (28), in which the NP *djarak-nyirringi* [spear-PRIV] 'without spears' modifies *maḻu* [daddyUNM]NOM within the VP. This type of construction can be interpreted as two fused clauses, meaning 'dad is returning' and 'dad is without spears'.

(115) *"Ama!*   *Maḻu*   *djini*   *ngurrumi,*   *wini-Ø*

mummyUMN   [daddyUNM]NOM   thisUMN   PERF   return-PRES

kiri-mi   *gumbaḻa,*   **djarak-nyirringi…"**
PROG-PRES   empty.handed   **spear-PRIV**
"Mum! Dad is now already on his way back empty handed and without spears.."

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 185)

5. Semantic range of the privative

5.1. Overview

This section concerns the semantic range of the privative. It is divided into three major sections. First is an analysis of the sample organised by the types of nominals that can take privative marking: i.e. what types of properties can exist. This covers sections 5.2- 5.3. As established in section 1.1.10, in this thesis the term "property" refers to the "lacked" entity and "proprietor" to the entity from which the property is absent. A category is assigned to each broad type of property (such as "human" or "aspect of the environment"). These are listed in Table 4. Within these are subcategories based on finer distinctions of properties. Some further distinctions are also made by the types of proprietor that can be associated with certain properties (for example, as aspect of the environment as property can take either the broader environment or an animate entity as proprietor). Some preliminary notes on how the concepts of alienability and animacy are treated in this analysis are in 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. This analysis is designed to give a taxonomy of the privative-marked properties in the sample.

Following this more detailed analysis, idiomatic, instrumental, existential and emphatic uses of the privative are identified and discussed briefly in sections 5.4 - 5.7. These types can occur across multiple types of properties.

Lastly, a discussion of three markers that exist in addition to the privative, and have a related semantic function, begins in section 5.8. These are the Yankunytjatjara "deprivative", the Wanyjirra "lack" marker, and the Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay "caritative".

Note that similarities between the semantic range of the privative and the proprietive (especially as identified by Saulwick, 1996), are not discussed.

Table 4			
Properties encoded by the privative			
Category	Section	Category	Section
ANIMATE AND ANIMATE-RELATED PROPERTIES	5.2	PROPERTIES OTHER THAN HUMAN/ANIMAL	5.3
Human	5.2.1	Alienably possessed, inanimate item	5.3.1
Generic	5.2.1.1	Quality/characteristic of inanimate item	5.3.2
Specific	5.2.1.2	Environment	5.3.3
Non-human animate (animal)	5.2.2	Event in time	5.3.4
Body part	5.2.3	Distance/location	5.3.5
of a human	5.2.3.1	"Anything"/"whatever"	5.3.6
of a non-human animate	5.2.3.2		
Physical/visual attribute (other than body part	5.2.4		
Attribute (other than physical/visual)	5.2.5		
Inherent attribute	5.2.5.1		
Name	5.2.5.1.1		
Kin status	5.2.5.1.2		
Language	5.2.5.1.3		
Status	5.2.5.2		
Ability/knowledge	5.2.6		
Ability of a body part	5.2.6.1		
Quality/state	5.2.7		
Emotional state/mental attribute	5.2.8		

5.1.1.　Alienability

Alienable possession is generally considered to be a relationship in which the possessum could conceivably be detached or "unpossessed" (e. g. food, tools, houses). Inalienable possession describes possessums for which this cannot occur (e. g. family members, body parts). The difference lies in the degree of "conceptual distance" (Haiman, 1983, p. 781) between the possessor and possessum. Applied to common privative examples, this would mean that an utterance such as *yirra-wirraa-a* [teeth-PRIV-ACC] 'hasn't got any teeth' (Dench, 1994, p. 88: Martuthunira) is an example of inalienable possession, and *warrirti-wirraa* [spear-PRIV] 'without a spear' (Dench, 1994, p. 132: Martuthunira) is alienable.

In the present semantic analysis, I will not attempt to analyse the alienability of all relationships encoded by privative marking in the sample. Instead, the notion of alienability

is used to differentiate certain broad types of properties. Specifically it distinguishes inanimate properties (section 5.3) from other categories. For dedicated studies of alienability in the Australian context, see, for example, Chappell & McGregor (2011) and McGregor (1991).

5.1.2. Animacy

When considering the concept of animacy across a sample of languages of this size, overgeneralizing becomes a risk. As shown by multiple typoogical studies (e.g. Fauconnier & Verstraete, 2010; Harvey & Reid, 1997 among others), Australia has animacy hierarchies that vary greatly between languages. Distinctions are based on various cultural and sometimes mythological factors. Skilton's examination of semantic noun classes (in press) demonstrates this, and sheds light on some common and uncommon features.

The consideration of language-specific hierarchies is outside the scope of the current thesis. Therefore, the broad categories of property and proprietor in this analysis are used for analysing the semantic range of the privative. I recognise that these are (to varying degrees) not applicable to the animacy hierarchies of the individual languages in the sample. In particular, the grouping of all "humans" in one category is rare in Australian languages: most divide human nouns based on "social gender" (Skilton, in press, p. 462). (This refers to the gender of the human referent, as opposed to the gender classification of the noun.) Nouns for non-human animates, however, have extremely diverse divisions. A more fine-grained semantic analysis that examines how privative marking interacts with nouns of different animacy levels within individual languages, then compares them cross-linguistically, is a recommended future project.

5.2. ANIMATE AND ANIMATE-RELATED PROPERTIES

5.2.1.   Human

It is common for a NP denoting a person or multiple people to be privative-marked. I divide this into two main subcategories, based on whether the referent is generic or specific. Both of these groupings can include privative-marked kin terms.

5.2.1.1.   Generic

The following examples (116) - (124) show privative constructions in which the property is a person or group of people referred to generically. This category can include people that are specified in some way, if they are described in an indefinite sense. For example, healing agent' (119) and 'white man' (120) and 'Europeans' (121)are used indefinitely.

(116)   *Ngunha-purra-thu*   **mantharta-yirra-la-purra-thu**   *nyirnta*   *ngurra-ngka*

that-time-top   **person-priv-loc-time-top**   here.loc   world.loc

'At that time there were no human beings here in this country.'

4 Mantharta languages (Jiwarli)

(Austin, 2015, p. 49)

(117)   *ŋayu*   *guman*   *galiŋ*   **bamagimbal**

I-sa   one-ABS   go-PRES   **person-PRIV-ABS**
'I'm going alone, without company.'

Yidiɲ

(Dixon, 1977, p. 143)

(118)   *…*   *ingkirreke*   *purte-lhile-tye.lhe-rle,*   **nyente-kwenye;**   *ayeye*

…   all   cluster-CAUS-GO&DO-GenEvt,   **one-NomNEG;**   story

itne-ke   *imerte*   *nhenge*   *ile-me-le, …*
3pl-DAT   then   REMEMB   tell-npp-SS, …
'… (he) would go and gather everyone together, without exceptions; and then (he'd) tell a story to them, ..'

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 391)

(119) *"ngangkari   nyanga   wiya-ngka-mpa?"*

     healer   this   **NEG-LOC-INTEREST**
     "Is there no healing agent around?"

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 360)

(120) *Thana   kumpa-artu   wirta-nyjarri-purra   **walypala-yirra-la-purra***

     they-pl   live-usit   boy-pl.nom-time   **white man-priv-loc-time**

     'They used to be (that way) when they were young, when there were no white man.'

4 Mantharta languages (Jiwarli)
(Austin, 2015, p. 49)

(121) *Nyukurni-laju   kanyin-ma   mimi   **kartiya-parni-ngka.***

     before-1plexS   have-PSTHB   sore   **Europeans-PRIV-LOC**
     'Before, when there were no Europeans, we had sores.'

Wangkajunga

(Jones, 2011, p. 253)

This category can include the use of privative-marked kin terms if they are used generically (122) - (124). The semantic nature of the privative means that this type of construction occurs quite frequently, because the need to generically express the absence of kin is not uncommon.

It is relevant here to note that the privative does not appear to display the specialised functions with kin terms that have been identified for the proprietive (e. g. Breen, 1976; Evans, 2006; Merlan & Heath, 1982).

(122) *da-wi-k   uginy   **bi-jajan***

     DEF-I-DIST   woman   **3aA-nothing**
     'That (bloke) has no wives.'

Limilngan

(Harvey, 2001, p. 78)

(123) *Ngarrirna*   *babanya*   ***juwa-ajarna.***

      1sgPOSS:II(NOM)   e.sister:II(NOM)   **man-PRIV:II(NOM)**
      'My sister doesn't have a man / My sister is single.'

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998, p. 142)

(124) ***Alag-bajarna***

      child-PRIV:II(NOM)
      'Without children (II).'

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998, p. 88)

5.2.1.2.   Specific

In the following examples (69) - (130), the property is a specific human referent. This is most commonly encoded with personal pronouns, as discussed in section 4.1.5: see (69) and (71). However, there are also relatively few examples of a specific and definite human property without a pronoun, such as (39) 'their women' and (128) 'the kids'.

(125
)
      nyandu-mulung

      'without him/her'
      3MIN

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 203)

(126) *Yarndi,*   ***arniri-kirnda-padni-nganha.***

      ancient   **us-DAT-without-from (elative)**
      It is ancient and from before our time.

Arabana-wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 95)

(12 7)	*nada,*	*gawunj*	*-wuwu*	*-miri*	*- ø*	*-ya*
	alright	3nsS R sit	empty	eye	pl	Pst

muku	*-wa,*	***ambi***	*muku*	*nada.*
woman	PURP	**NEG**	woman	alright

Alright, the MalakMalak were pining for their women, they were without their women

Marrithiyel

(Green, 1989, p. 396)

(128)	*Wiliwili-ngan*	*arr*	*nga-n-joo-gal*	***arrang***	*baawa.*
	fishing-ALL	go	1-TR-do/say-REC.PST	**WITHOUT**	child

'I went fishing without the kids.'

Bardi

(Bowern, 2012, p. 614)

(129)	*yanga-na-Ø*	*yani-Ø*	*galbin-Ø*	***nyawa.***
	M-KIN-NOM	come-NF	child-NOM	**NEG**

'The mother came without [her] child.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 663)

(130)	*kinaa-n-ngarrba*	*wirdi-ja*	***kanthathu-warri***
	tell-N-CONS	remain-ACT	**father-PRIV**

'Having told/because she told, (she) became fatherless.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 482)

In the context of the story this utterance (130) is taken from, *kanthathu* refers to a specific father.

5.2.2.   Non-human animate (animal)

Examples of non-human animate properties (animals) are (131) - (134). As with the human properties (section 5.2.1) these can be generic (131), (133) (134) or specific (132).

(131) **yarramangarrbadha**   *gurra*   *gurrbala*

    horse-lacking-emph   back   come-ed
    '[He] came back without a horse.'

Bidyara and Gungabula

(Breen, 1973, p. 72)

(132) *nhila*   *ku'a*   **nhingurumu-yi**   *uwa*

    3sgNOM   dog   **3sgABL-PRIV**   go
    'He went without his dog.'

Kugu-Nganhcara

(Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 423)

(133) *bupini-nyirringi-li*

    mosquito-PRIV-ALL
    'to a place lacking mosquitos'

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 85)

(134) *Ngayu*   *nhawu-lha*   *mirtali-ngara-a*   *yirla,*   *mir.ta*

    1SG.NOM   see-PAST   big-PL-ACC   only   not

    kupuyu-marta-a,   **mirtily-wirriwa-a.**
    little-PROP-ACC   **neonate-PRIV-ACC**
    I'd seen only big ones (kangaroos), not any with little ones, only those without neonates (in their pouches). (trans.)

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1994, p. 89)

5.2.3.   Body part

5.2.3.1.   Of a human

It is common to find human body part nominals (hand, eye, head, etc.) taking privative marking. A clear semantic distinction can be drawn between two types of privative-marked body parts. I refer to these as "literal" and "extended" functions, following Wilkinson (1991, p. 444). The literal function of [body part-PRIV] is discussed here. The extended meaning, denoting some ability or function of a body part, is discussed in 5.2.6.

In the literal function, the privative marker denotes the lack of the body part itself. Examples are (135) - (137). In all these cases, it can be reasonably assumed that the meaning is purely literal. For instance, *wirrgil-mulung* [hair-PRIV] in (135) simply denotes a lack of hair.

(135)   nyila   **wirrgil-mulung**

       DIST1   **hair-PRIV**
       'That [man] has no hair.'

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 208)

(136)   **mampu-majirri**

       hair-PRIV
       'bald'

Nyangumarta

(Sharp, 2004, p. 140)

(137)   *Palakarni*   *marrungu*   **mara-yanya**   *pukul ma-rri-ya*   *jinta-ku.*

       DEM (mid)   man   **hand-PRIV**   caretaker CAUS-PRS-3PL   others-ERG
       'That man without (a) hand others are taking care of.'

Ngarla

(Westerlund, 2015)

5.2.3.2.   *Of a non-human animate*

There are relatively few examples of a body part of non-human animate taking privative marking. They are shown in (138) - (141). Surprisingly, there do not seem to be any examples of the extended function (discussed in section 5.2.6.1) where the proprietor is non-human. It is possible that examples such as 'earless dog' in (140) do have an extended meaning, but nothing in Browne's analysis or translation suggests this.

(138)   **mar-warri,**   *warra-ja*   *bardak*

        hand-PRIV   go-ACT   stomachNOM
        '(Of a worm):'(It) has no legs, it moves with its stomach.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 364)

(139)   **minh.punth=aar**

        wing=adn.priv
        'wingless (bird)'

Kuuk Thaayorre

(Gaby, 2017, p. 145)

(140)   *Wayi-nya=rla*   *ngayinya-ku*   *wangani-ku*   ***pijara-jila-ku.***

        search-PRES=3.OBL   1GEN-DAT   dog-DAT   **ear-WITHOUT-DAT**

        'I'm looking for my ear-less dog.'

Warlmanpa

(Browne, 2021, p. 137)

(141)   *Ngunhaa*   *mirntirimartapanyu-rru,*   ***punga-wirriwa-rru***   *nyina-layi.*

        that.NOM   goanna good-NOW   **guts-PRIV-NOW**   be-FUT

        That goanna is good now, now that it has been gutted (lit. has no guts).

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1988, p. 88)

5.2.4.   Physical/visual attribute (other than body part)

It is also common for privative marking to encode the lack of some physical or visual attribute of a person aside from body parts. The properties encoded in the examples below are wounds/ailments (142); (27), breath (144) (although Tsunoda (2011, p. 644) classes this under "body parts") and body smell (145).

(142)   **minbarra-warri=da**   *niya*   *burri-j*   *riya-th-i*   *kabara-y*

      wound-PRIV=SAME   3sgNOM   emerge-ACT   east-REM-LOC   saltpan-LOC

      'Still unharmed he emerged from the far eastern side of the saltpan.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 392)

(143)   *ngayulu*   *pika/nyapi/purtju*   **wiya**

      1sg(NOM)   pain/boil/rash   **NEG(NOM)**
      I don't have a pain/boil/rash'

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 137)

(144)   *nyola*   wola-n   *walngga-Ø*   *nyawa.*

      3SG.NOM   die-NF   breath-NOM   NEG
      'He died, not breathing.'

Warrongo
(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 663)

(145)   (The men washed themselves before going out for kangaroo hunting so
      that kangaroos could not smell their body smell.)
      ngoni-ngomay-Ø   *jana-Ø*   *yani-Ø*   *gabora-Ø*   **nyawa.**
      there-ABL-NOM   3PL-NOM   go-NF   body.smell-NOM   **NEG**
      'They went from there without body smell.'

Warrongo
(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 663)

5.2.5.   Attribute (other than physical/visual)

5.2.5.1.   Inherent attribute

5.2.5.1.1.   Name

In Wanyjirra, the construction [name-PRIV] may be used to denote a person whose name is taboo (146). In this thesis, I analyse the meaning as an extended function of "lacking a name". A comparison can be drawn to the Wambaya data in (147). This construction [name-PRIV] is not stated to have any connection to taboo names. However, the core meaning seems comparable, although it may lack an extended sense it has in Wanyjirra. These two examples are the only examples found in the sample in which a noun denoting 'name' is privative-marked.

(146)   **yini-mulung**

      name-PRIV
      'person whose name is taboo'

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 201)

(147)   **Yurula-ajarna**

      name-PRIV:II(NOM)
      'Without a name.'

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998, p. 140)

5.2.5.1.2.   Kin status

In Kayardild, the [kin-PRIV] construction only express the meaning "lack of kin", but in (136) appears to be something like "lack of kin status". Here *kunawuna-warri* [child-PRIV(NOM)], does not denote the absence of a child, but that the child in question is behaving as though he lacks the status of child denoted by *kunawuna.* Likewise, *wajiyangu-warri* 'he's not your betrothed' in (146), denotes that a person lacks the status or title of betrothed, not that the person himself is lacked.

(148)	*Ngarrawurna*		*nila-tha*	*ngumban-ji*	*maraka*	*ngumban-da*
	name		call-ACT	2sg-MLOC	CTRFCT	2sgPOSS-NOM

kunawuna-warri
child-PRIV(NOM)
'Ngarrawurna is calling you by name, as if he weren't your son (i.e. he is behaving as if he were in some other kin relation to you).'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 374)

(149)	*nyingka*	*kurrka-na*	*dan-da*	*dangka-a,*	*ngumban-da*
	2sgNOM	take-NEGIMP	this-NOM	man-NOM	your-NOM

wajiyangu-warri,   *bulbirdi*

betrothed-PRIV   wrongheadNOM
'Don't take this man (for a lover), he's not your betrothed, he's wronghead (to you).'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 159)

The Aranda privative seems to have a similar function in (150): it can interpreted as indicating that someone "lacks" a particular patrimoiety.

(150)	**Anwakerre-kwenye,**	*Malyenweke-arenye*
	SAME PATRIMOIETY-NomNEG	OPPOSITE-PATRIMOIETY-ASSOC

'(She's) not the same patrimoiety (as us), (she) belongs to the opposite patrimoiety.'

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 217)

5.2.5.1.3.   Language

It may be possible to interpret privative constructions meaning "without language" as belonging to the "ability/knowledge" category described in section 5.2.6. However, the examples found, shown in (151) and (152), appear to treat "language" more like an entity or attribute that can be possessed. In particular, Tsunoda's translation in (151) points to this: "You have no [Aboriginal] language?".

(151)   ('You, an Aboriginal man, speak English only. You don't understand our language.')

yinda   *gogo-Ø*   **nyawa?**
2SG.NOM   language-NOM   **NEG**
'You have no [Aboriginal] language?', i.e. 'You speak no [Aboriginal] language?'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 659)

(152)   **ka-warri**

language-PRIV
[no exact free translation given]

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 126)

5.2.5.2.   Status

Two examples are found that appear to encode the lack of a particular status. While it may be possible to interpret (153) as belonging to the "event in time" category 5.3.4., and (154) to the "body part" category 5.2.3, I analyse them as denoting a lack of the state of being uncircumcised or uninitiated.

(153)   **kala-a-n-marri-da**   *mardala-a-j*

cut-M-N-PRIV-SAME   paint-M-ACT

'(The initiates) were painted while still uncircumcised (before being circumcised).'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 392)

(154)   **kom-yak**

neck-PRIV
'uninitiated person'

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 150)

5.2.6.   Ability/knowledge

Privative markers can be used to express a lack of ability or lack of knowledge. This is generally found with human proprietors. It is common for this to fall into the category of potentially verbal constructions. For example, (155) has a probable verbal interpretation, with *binal* 'know' being a verb that takes privative marking. The same applies to *kalyurrumu-ngkujku-bija* [swim-HAVING-PRIV] in (156): nominal and verbal interpretations may be possible. See 4.2 for more discussion of the intersection of the nominal and verbal privative.

It is rare to find examples encoding a lack of ability/knowledge that are not either a) probably verbal or b) an extended use of [body part-PRIV] (see section 5.2.6.1 below).

(155)   *jana*   *nyiku*   **binal-kari**   *kuku-ku*

3pl NOM(S)   today   **know-PRIV**   language-DAT
'they don't know the language nowadays.'

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 334)

(156)   *Angkula*   *nyambala*   *nga-ju,*   *kabu*   *nga-mi*

NEG   DEM   1sg-do   ignorant.person   1sg.IRR

ngayirni,   **kalyurrumu-ngkujku-bija,**   *karningka*   *ngaruk birdki-ngirri-mi.*
1sg.ERG   **swim-HAVING-PRIV**   LEST   drown-lpl.Exc-IRR
'I can't do that, I don't know how, can't swim, we might drown.'

Jingulu

(Pensalfini, 2003, p. 120)

5.2.6.1.   Ability of a body part

The literal type of privative-marked body part construction is discussed in section 5.2.3. The other is the extended. In the extended meaning, [body part-PRIV] denotes lack of some function or ability of the body part, but not lack of the part itself. Typical examples are (157) - (162). The use of [eye-PRIV] in (157) denotes the lack of sight, a function of the eyes. It presumably does not signal the lack of eyes. People referred to by [body-priv] in (158) do not physically lack a body.

Semantically, this can range from a meaning that is fairly close to a literal privative reading, such as (157) and (111), to an extreme example such as (163), which is described as the

most "extended sense" for the Djambarrpuyngu privative (Wilkinson, 1991, p. 442). Another example of extreme extension is (220).

(157) *Yandu*   *ngi-n*   **murlu-wajanga-nka**

wait(nF)   1sgS(Pres)-Pr   **eye-PRIV:IInAbs-DAT**
'I'm waiting for the blind woman.'

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998, p. 142)

(158)   **buya-murlung**

body-priv
'thin'

Bilinarra

(Meakins & Nordlinger, 2013, p. 156)

(159) *yinya*   *bama*   **milka-kari**

that-ABS(S)   Aborig.-ABS(S)   **ear-PRIV**
'that Aborigine is deaf' (literally: 'has no ears')

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 90)

(160) *Unpa* **malyu-padni**

you   **brain-without**
'You are brainless.'

Arabana-Wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 94)

(161)	*Wanthari*	*paju*	*ngaliwa-a*	**paniya-wirraa-ma-lalha**	*ngaliwa-a?*
	how	REAL	1PL.INC-ACC	**eye-PRIV-CAUS-PAST**	1PL.INC-ACC

	Kalya-rninyji	*yirla*	*ngunhaa*	*kartungu,*	*parralhara.*
	bite-FUT	only	that.NOM	2sg.ACC	centipede

'How did it deceive us (lit. make us be without eyes)? It just bit you, that centipede (and we didn't know it was there).'

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1988, p. 88)

(162)   I'm stronger than you

ngaya	*gugirrii-biyaay*	*nginda=bala*	**gugirri-dhalibaa**
1sg	sinews-COM,	2SG=CTR	**sinews-PRIV**

'I have muscles (am strong) but you have no muscles (are weak).'

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 419)

(163)   **goŋmiriw**

hand+PRIV
'Unable to cook.'

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 442)

Djambarrpuyngu

An interesting case is presented by [stomach-PRIV] in (164). It appears that the relevant function of the stomach is something like 'fullness' or 'eating'. Therefore, the privative-marking indicates a lack of this function, which denotes hunger.

(164)	*kunawuna*	**bardaka-warri**	*wirdi-jarr,*	*bardaka-wuu-ja*	*wuran-d!*
	childNOM	**stomach-PRIV**	be-PST	stomach-giveIMP	food-NOM

"If the child is hungry, give him food!'"

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 321)

In rare instances, this extended use of body part nouns takes a semblative marker in addition to the privative. Shown in (165), it serves to convey that she was thrown to the

ground "as if she had no hands", not that she literally had no hands. This seems to be language specific: Dench states that, while the Martuthunira proprietive can indicate function or ability of a body part without semblative marking, privative constructions require it (Dench, 1988, p. 88). However, in most languages, the semblative or metaphorical sense seems to be understood without overt marking. This may be because idiomatic uses of the privative are common with this meaning (see section 5.4).

(165) *Yimpala-rru-wa*   *kanarra-lu*   *parnpiingku-yangu*   *wanti-layi.*   *Nyingkurlu-lpur*

      like that-NOW-YK   wind-EFF   throw.down.PASSP   lie-FUT   firstly-COMP

     warnu   **prri-wirraa**   *wantharra.*

     ASSERT   **hand-PRIV**   like

     'Just like that she lay, thrown to the ground by the wind. Firstly one must say it's as if she had no hands.'

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1988, p. 88)

This type of extended sense seems to operate in language-specific ways: there is no exact correspondence between languages of the extended meaning of any given privative-marked body part. It is possible for the same noun in one language to have a less extended and more extended meaning, as shown by the two Jingulu examples in (166) and (167). Both are clearly extended, as they do not literally mean that the person lacks ears, but their exact meanings are different and indicated by context.

(166) **Langa-jija**   *jamaniki-rni,*   *angkula*   *langkaj bil-ajka-nu*

     ear-PRIV   this(m)-FOC   NEG   hear-NOML(P)-did

     langkaj bila-nu   *kiwirra.*
     hear-did   none.
     'He's deaf, unhearing, he heard nothing.'

Jingulu

(Pensalfini, 2003, p. 238)

(167) Jamaniki   kijikijiba-jkal-a   **langa-jija**

this(m)-EMPH   annoy-NOML(A)-m   **ear-PRIV**
'He's a twerp, naughty to anyone.'

Jingulu

(Pensalfini, 2003, p. 200)

5.2.7.   Quality/state

Privative expressions encoding a lack of a quality or state are often ambiguous as to whether they should be interpreted as verbal or nominal. This is discussed in section 4.2.

While some data is explicitly stated in the relevant reference grammar to be an example of verbal privative marking, there are many unspecified examples. As an outsider, it is not always possible to know what mental model speakers may have when using a construction such as *kupalya-yanya-ngku* [sleep-PRIV-ERG] 'without sleep' in (168). It may be closer to a lack of an action (sleep) denoted by a verb or lack of a state (sleep) denoted by a noun. Beyond the guidance of the free translation provided, I do not have the information to conclusively classify it as nominal or verbal.

Similarly, the meaning of "hungry" in (169) is encoded by privative marking *nga* [eat]. This could be interpreted verbally ('without performing the action of eating') or nominally ('without food' = hungry).

(168)	*Warrukarti*	*nganarna*	*pana-nya*	*japartamu ja-n*	*jinyji~jinyji-lu*
	night	1PL.EXCL.NOM	3PL-ACC	shepherder CAUS-FUT	alternating-ERG

	karlajangu	**kupalya-yanya-ngku.**
	cattle	**sleep-PRIV-ERG**

'(In the) night(s) we will shepherd the cattle alternatingly (i.e. take turns herding the cattle) without sleep.'

Ngarla

(Westerlund, 2015, p. 132)

(169) *Kuyu* *kapi=rna-rla*   *yi-nyi,*   **nga-rninja-jila-ku.**

    meat   FUT=1SG.S-3.OBL   give-FUT   **eat-INF-WITHOUT-DAT**

    'I'll give meat to the hungry (one).'

Warlmanpa

(Browne, 2021, p. 137)

Similarly, the construction in (170) seems to have a nominal interpretation, with *ngiki* (cough/cold) expressed as something that one can have or not have, much like in English. This can be contrasted with an example such as (171) in Wambaya, in which the verb *gurda* is privative-marked indicating the lack of "being sick". (Because *gurda* is explicitly classed as a verb, this data is not included in the present analysis of the nominal privative). The same applies to (172) from Guugu Yimidhirr: "hunger" seems to be treated as something that can be possessed.

(170) *ngayu*   **ngiki-kari**   *ngulkurr-ma-ny*

    1sg NOM(S)   **cough/cold-PRIV**   good-INCHO-PAST
    'I don't have a cold, [I am] well again.'

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 329)

(171) **Gurda-j-bajarna.**

    be.sick-TH-PRIV:II(NOM)
    (She's) never sick.

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998, p. 230)

(172) *Nyulu*   **dingga-mul**

    3sg+NOM   **'hunger'-PRIV**
    'He's not hungry.'

Guugu Yimidhirr

(Haviland, 1979, p. 59)

Note that in (173), a proprietive-marked form meaning 'initiate' is negated using the Kayardild privative marker *-warri*. This is the same structure seen in (189), which also expresses something that can described as a state (inedible).

(173)   **wirrka-a-n-kuru-warri**

   initiate-M-N-PROP-PRIV
   'unable (e.g. not ready) to be initiated'.

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 464)

The Wanyjirra example in (174) presents an interesting case that may belong in this category. Two main hypothesis seem likely. It could be analysed as referring to a state that a person can be in ("off", which is presumably the state of leaving /being in the process of leaving), or it could be considered a verbal privative example.

(174)   **marri-mulung**

   off-PRIV
   [We] won't go away.
   LIT: Without being off.
Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 435)

5.2.8.   Emotional state/mental attribute

An emotional state of an animate proprietor can be privative-marked, as shown by the following examples (175) - (178). The encoding of "idea" as a property is found only in the idiomatic example (179), where being 'without ideas' is translated as 'thoughtless'. A similar meaning is often conveyed by the extended use of privative-marked body parts (160).

(175)   **Ngoyo**   **wenvm**

   fear   **PRIV**
   'I am not afraid [without fear]'.

Yir Yoront

(Alpher, 1991, p. 30)

(176) wiripu+n   ŋunhi   balanya+yi   warrakan'   barriri

       certain+SEQ TEXD   such+ANA   animals   fear

       dumurr   ga   wiripu+ny   nhakun   **barrari+miriw+nha**
       big   and   certain+PROM   like   **fear+PRIV+SEQ**

       latju+n   mel-butji+n
       nice+SEQ   [eye-?]"tame"+SEQ
       'some animals are really frightened and others are without fear, nice, tame'

Djambarrpuyngu

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 443)

(177) **ŋiɲ-kimiɲ-tə-∅**

       2min.S-shame-PRIV-STAT PRES
       'You are not ashamed./You've got no shame.'

Rembarnga

(McKay, 2011, p. 87)

(178) yaru-ka   nani   **ninta**   **pani**   ŋama-na

       like that-TOKEN SgFS   **shame**   **none**   sit-PART

       wara-yi
       AUX-PRES
       'She sat (there) shamelessly like that.'

Diyari

(Austin, 1981, p. 249)

(179) **mayali-nyirring**

       idea-PRIV
       'impolite'

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 85)

5.3. PROPERTIES OTHER THAN HUMAN/ANIMAL

5.3.1.   Alienably possessed, inanimate item

This category is the most broad and can be considered the most prototypical semantic function of the privative, based on existing literature. In this category, the property is something that is both inanimate and is (or can be assumed to be) alienably possessed. See 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 for discussions of alienability and animacy. Note that this category includes animals that are treated as meat/food in the context of the utterance: an example is 'fish' in (183).

Typical examples of this function of the privative are (180) - (186) below. The properties represented in these examples are a jumper, a house, a blanket, fish, water, bones (in meat) and a handle. The proprietor can be human (180)- (183), a non-human animate (184), or an inanimate (185), in which case there is often a part-whole meaning (186) or a sense of containment (187). Note that this last example does not appear to have a locative meaning, which would treat "in the billy can" as a location, and the two free translations provided by Tsunoda show that it can be interpreted as having a purely privative meaning 'the billy can has no water' or include an existential sense 'there is no water in the billy can.'

(180)   *ngayu   jampa-yaru   nyundu   **jampa-mulung***

1MIN   jumper-PROP   2MIN   **jumper-PRIV**
'I have a jumper. You don't have a jumper.'

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 557)

(181)   *nyulu   **bayan-kari**   jiba-badi-y*

3sg NOM(S)   **house-PRIV-ABS(s)**   be sad-NONPAST
'the homeless one is sad'

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 329)

(182)   *urila   ayntika,   **blanket-uwinya***

fire-loc   lie+past   **b+negp**
(I) lay by the fire without a blanket

Alyawarra

(Yallop, 1977, p. 84)

(183)   *nhila*   nga'a   *ka'im*   *yenta.*   *nhila*

        3sgNOM   fish   *NEG*   *spear*   *3sg*

        nga'a'a-yi   yupa   *wan ke-n*

        fish-REDUP-PRIV   FUT   return-CNC
        'He didn't spear any fish. He'll come back without any fish.'

Kugu-Nganhcara

(Smith & Johnson, 2000, p. 437)

(184)   *burluma*   *yu-ngku-rr-jimb*   **arriyangkang**   **wul**

       cattle   3NOM-FUT-AUG-die   **without**   **water**
       'The cattle will die without water.'

Nyulnyul

(McGregor, 1991)

(185)   *ngayu*   *wawu*   *bangkarr-ka*   **bajibay-kari-ka**

       1sg NOM(S)   want   meat/steak-DAT   **bone-PRIV-DAT**
       'I want meat without bones'

Kuku Yalanji

(Patz, 1982, p. 91)

(186)   *Kirnbilirdi*   *nyamarni-nu*   **arndil-ji ja-nu,**   *angkula*   *ngaba-ju*

       stone.axe   DEM(F)-did   **handle(Kr)-PRIV-did**   NEG   have-do

       darrangku --   *marndamarnda-mbili*   *dabila-nga-ju*   *kirnbilirdi*
       tree   hand-LOC   hold-1sg-do   stone.axe
       'These stone axes have no handles, no wooden part-you hold them in your hand.'

Jingulu

(Pensalfini, 2003, p. 133)

(187)   *gamo-Ø*   **nyawa**   *gorrgara-Ø.*

water-NOM **NEG** billy.can-NOM

'The billy can has no water' or 'There is no water in the billy can.'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 660)

(188) *nyipa-parlu*

clothes-PRIV

bare of clothes, naked

Arabana-Wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 95)

The Arabana-Wangkangurru example in (188) is one of a very few examples of the *-parlu* suffix. The usual definition of *parlu* is "bare" and it is used as a privative suffix "only when the actual idea of 'bare of' is involved" (Hercus, 1994, p. 95).

Examples fitting this category appear in 45 of the 49 languages in the sample that have privative markers. The four languages that do not exhibit this use of the privative are Wagiman, Yalarnnga, Bidyara and Gungabula and Wankumara (Galali). In these four languages, there is little privative data overall, and no evidence suggesting that this meaning cannot occur. Therefore, I tentatively suggest that it can be considered a ubiquitous semantic function of the Australian privative.

5.3.2. Quality/characteristic of inanimate item

Privative-marked qualities belonging to inanimate items also occur, in much the same semantic function as qualities and physical characteristics of animate proprietors. Examples are (189) - (192).

(189) *diya-a-n-kuru-warri*

eat-M-N-PROP-PRIV

'inedible'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 464)

(190)
yätjkurr	*dhuwal*	*\dhäwu*	*dhuwal*	*ga*
bad	PROX	story	PROX	and

rom	*mayali*	*märr gaŋga*	*ga*	**mayali+miriw**
law/practice	meaning	"somewhat"	and	**meaning+PRIV**

'this story and practice (which story is about) is bad, (it has) little meaning (i.e. is not sanctioned by traditional practise/belief) and is without meaning'

Djambarrpuyngu

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 443)

(191)
ma-dalibirrman	*mayin*	*nga-marn-bu-rri*	**ma-nyalug-wagbawun**
MA-tough-ABS	food-ABS	1SG-make-PST	**MA-soft-lacking**

'I made tough food/bread, it's not soft'.

Wardaman

(Merlan, 1993, p. 85)

(192)
yiwarlng	*wu-gid*	*dana*	*dirrba*	*yinge-we*
clothes-ABS	WU-narrow-ABS	this-ABS	stuck	1SG IRR-AUX

walba-wagbawun	*nganu-wo-ndi*
wide-lacking-ABS	2NSG/1SG-give-PST

'This dress is tight, I might get stuck, you gave me something not wide [enough]'.

Wardaman

(Merlan, 1993, p. 86)

5.3.3. Environment

An aspect of the physical environment can function as property. These aspects can be natural (e. g. trees, water, weather) or human-made (e. g. buildings, roads). The environment itself takes the role of proprietor (30) - (199). However, in some cases a human/animal entity existing within the environment is foregrounded as proprietor (202) - (204).

In the following examples (30) - (204) the environment is the proprietor in relation to some element of the environment. This can express that a part of the environment lacks some element, such as a lack of water in a river (30). It can also be used to identify a type of environment (197). Unnatural or human-made parts of the environment can also function as properties, such as buildings (198) and roads (199).

This use of the privative often includes examples that can be considered existential, because it can be interpreted to mean "there is no X". See section 5.5 for further discussion of existential privatives.

This often occurs with a locative marker, denoting that a location is without an entity (197), (196). One example of a non-visual/physical aspect of the environment is (201).

(193)   wilu-nggu   **apa-nyida**

        river-LOC   **water-PRIV**
        'There's no water in the river.'

Nhanda

(Blevins, 2001, p. 64)

(194)   **ŋuraʔ-tə-ni**

        fire-PRIV-STAT PAST
        'There was no fire (in the country at that (mythol.) time).'

Rembarnga

(McKay, 2011, p. 86)

(195)   There are no clouds.

        maayrr   gundaa /   **gundaa-dhalibaa**   nhama   gunagala.

        none   cloud /   **cloud-PRIV**   3.DEF   sky
        The sky has got no cloud in it.
        There are no clouds. The sky is cloudless
Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 79)

(196)   Yana-ra   kupa-yi   ngunhi   murduga   **yuwat-jirrangu-ra**

        go-fut   sit-purpSS   there.loc   car   **wind-priv-loc**
        'Let's go and sit in the car out of the wind.'

4 Mantharta languages (Jiwarli, Thiin, Warriyangka, Tharrkari)

(P. K. Austin, 2015, p. 93)

(197)　　*Mirra*　　　*ngi-n*　　　**murlu-wajanga-nka**

　　　　wait (nF)　　3plS-Pst　　**water-PRIV:IV:nAbs-LOC**
　　　　They lived in the desert.

Wambaya

(Nordlinger, 1998a, p. 142)

(198)　　*iriti*　　　　*wali*　　　　　*pupa-nytja*　　**wiya**

　　　　long ago　　building(NOM)　crouch-NOML　　**NEG**
　　　　'Long ago there were no buildings.'

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 39)

(199)　　*Ka-laju*　　　　**road-parni**　　*wana-rnu.*

　　　　CONJ-1plexS　　**road-PRIV**　　follow-PST
　　　　And we followed where there was no road.

Wangkajunga

(Jones, 2011, p. 69)

(200)　　**Maka-pani**　　*thambathambanakani*　　　*mayi*　　*yambarriyi.*

　　　　fire-PRIV　　play-play-lNCH-AWAY-PLIMP　　EMPH　　flat-LOC
　　　　'Play away from the fire, out on the flat.'

Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha

(Breen, 2015, p. 143)

The Innamincka example (200) is included here under the hypothesis that maka-pani fire-PRIV in this context can be interpreted as "in a place without fire".

(201) *ngalikuru karlpa-r* *ngunha-ngka* *malu-ngka* *panti-rta* **ngarlarla-pati-la-mu.**

1plinc go up-FUT that-LOC shade-LOC sit-LOC **noise-PRIV-LOC-THEN**

'We'll get up and sit in that shade, there will be no noise then.'

Panyjima

(Dench, 1991, p. 25)

In examples (202) - (204), some human or animal entity, existing within the environment, becomes the proprietor to some aspect of the environment. These examples all entail that the environment also lacks this aspect, such as in (30) -(199), but the lack being experienced by the human/animal is the focus of the utterance. For example, in (202), the environment as a whole lacks fire (it could be said that 'there was no fire'), but the people lacking fire is foregrounded. An example such as (203), in which there is no overtly marked proprietor, can also be interpreted as having the speaker as proprietor.

(202) *bama* *ɲinaɲina:ɲ* *gudaɽ/* **buɽigimbal**

person-ABS sit-REDUP-PAST cold-ABS **fire-PRIV-ABS**
'The people just sat around cold, with no fire.'

Yidiɲ

(Dixon, 1977, p. 143)

(203) *balmbi-wu* **warrngal-warri-r-i-ju,** *wambaji-wa-thu*

tomorrow-MPROP **wind-PRIV-FAC-M-POT** clear-INCH-POT
'Tomorrow it will become calm and clear.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 327)

(204) *ki-l-da* *karna-ja* *minal-i,* **karn-marri-wu** *rajurri-ju*

they-pl-NOM burn-ACT scrub-MLOC **grass-PRIV-MPROP** walk-POT
'They are burning off the scrub, so (they) can walk about unimpeded by grass.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 489)

5.3.4. Event in time

There are a few instances in which an event in time appears to take the role of property. In two cases, the privative marker appears to be serving to indicate that the event has passed: the time being referred to "lacks" the event: (206) and (205). In two other examples, it indicates that the event is yet to occur: (207) and (208).

The example in (205) could possibly be interpreted as something closer to "there is no water. The rain has finished" with the privative marker primarily indicating the lack of water, and the inchoative and non-future markers (*jarri-nyi*) carrying the function of indicating that the water-related event has finished. This is not specified either way by Sharp's analysis.

Note that the bracketing in (206) indicates a subordinate clause, not anything related to the use of *jila*, the 'without' marker.

(205) **Ngapa-kurlu**   *jarri-nyi-rri.*

       water-PRIV   INCH-NFUT-3SG.SUN
       'The rain has finished.'

Nyangumarta

(Sharp, 2004, p. 338)

(206) *Kuyu=rna*   *nga-rnu*   **[kupa-nji-jila-rlu].**

       meat=1SG.S   eat-PAST   **cook-INF-WITHOUT-ERG**
       'I ate the meat, having cooked it.'

Warlmanpa

(Browne, 2021, p. 430)

(207) **Ngawa-murlung-gula=rni.**

       water-PRIV-LOC=ONLY
       'Just before the rain.'

Bilinarra

(Meakins & Nordlinger, 2013, p. 155)

(208) **Mangarri-murlung-gulu =rni=rnalu**   *walyawalyag*   *yuwa-ni*

veg.food-PRIV-ERG=ONLY=1AUG.EXC.S   inside.REDUP   put-PST

'We yarded them before lunch.'

Bilinarra

(Meakins & Nordlinger, 2013, p. 155)

5.3.5.   Distance/location

A small number of occurrences in the sample appear to show distance or location being treated as a property. Examples are (209) - (213).

(209) *dan-ang-ki /*   ***dan-marri***   *babiju,*   *warra-a*

here-NEG-LOC   **here-PRIV**   grandmotherNOM   far-NOM
'Granny isn't here, she's a long way off.'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 376)

(210) *kenhe*   *relhe*   *re*   *kenhe*   *kwele*

BUT   woman   3sgS   BUT   QUOT

apmere   ***arrere-kwenye***   *ikwere-le*   *kwele*   *alhe-pe-lhe-rlenge*

place   **nearby-NomNEG**   3sgDAT-LOC   QUOT   go-FREQ.rdp-DS

utepe-utepe-kwele-irre-rlenge   *pmere*   *arlenge.*

turn back(rdp)-QUOT-INCH-DS   place   far

'His mother, however, was at this time wandering around at some place that was nowhere near the water-hole, and was just turning back.'

Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)

(Wilkins, 1989, p. 563)

(211) *Ngininiki-rni*   *kalirnimi-rni*   **nginduwa-jija** *ya-ju*   *duwa-ardi*

this(n)-FOC   tree-species-FOC   **this.way-PRIV** 3sg-do   rise-HAB
'The *kalirnimi* tree doesn't grow around these parts.'

Jingulu

(Pensalfini, 2003, p. 102)

(212) *yaka,*   **djinawa'+miriw**

NEG   **inside+PRIV**
'No (it's) not inside.'

Djambarrpuyngu

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 445)

(213) *la'an*   *ga'an*   *laruman*   **ŋatparra-ne'en**

camp   that   close   **far-PRIV**
'That camp is not far, it is just there.'

Wagiman

(Cook, 1987, p. 150)

5.3.6. "Anything"/"whatever"

There is also a relatively rare occurrence of a privative construction denoting the lack of something unspecified: more precisely, the lack of anything. This is encoded using interrogative pronouns, as discussed in 4.1.5.2. Examples are (77), (215) and (78).

(214)	*wirr,*	*ngununga...*	*buluki-nyirringa*	***nyim-nyirring+a,***
	NEG	[thatUNM+DUR$_{]LOC}$	cattle-PRIV+NF	**whatever-PRIV+NF**

yarraman-nyirring	*nganaparra-pm*	*libi*	*kurr-kurrpi-ni*	*kiri-ny*
horse-PRIV	[buffalo-THPRO]$_{ACC}$	1plexcERG	REDUP-chase-RPC	PROG-RPC

None, (while) moving through that place, there were no cattle, no horses, nothing at all; we were busy chasing just buffaloes.

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 85)

(215)	***nyim-nyirring***
	what-PRIV

'lacking what?' / 'lacking anything'

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 46)

(216)	***ngaaka-warri***
	what-PRIV

'lacking what, without what'

Kayardild

(Evans, 1995, p. 368)

5.4. Idiomatic privative expressions

In a number of languages, the privative has yielded expressions that can be described as "idiomatic" or "lexicalised". These expressions are not transparently analysable as [N-PRIV] on morphological and/or semantic grounds. In this analysis, I use the term "idiomatic" to describe these expressions, although other terms are sometimes used by the authors of the relevant grammars. As Blevins (2001, p. 64) describes it, while at some level these expressions are privative-marked, they can be seen as "unmarked": while they encode a privative sense, they are not typical examples of the [NOUN+PRIV] combination.

In a morphologically idiomatic expression, [NOUN+PRIV] is regarded as one complete unit with an accepted meaning. This generally means that the use of a privative marker is identifiable, while the nominal it modifies cannot be easily analysed.

An example of this lack of morphological transparency is found in Bininj Gun Wok. Evans describes a small number of lexicalised expressions that include the privative suffix *-yak*. Examples are (217), (218) and (219). However, in a few of these, the root to which *-yak* is suffixed is not attested elsewhere in the language. The form *warn* in (219) is one of these (Evans, 2003, p. 150).

(217) **kom-yak**

    neck-PRIV
    'uninitiated person'

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 150)

(218) **ngabbard-yak**

    father-PRIV
    'person recently bereaved of their father'

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 150)

(219) **warnyak**

    'warn' -PRIV
    'not want, not feel like'

Bininj Gun Wok

(Evans, 2003, p. 150)

In a semantically idiomatic expression, the use of [N+PRIV] is extended beyond a literal meaning. It takes a specific meaning that is known within a speech community. Examples are (220) and (221).

In Wardaman, *warlam-wagbawun* [skin-lacking] is used in an extended semantic function, seen in (220). It describes someone who, according to the speaker "is not selective about her sexual partners: she went 'anywhere' and had 'no skin' or subsection" (Merlan, 1993, p. 85). Other extended meanings of [body part-PRIV] are described in section 5.2.6.1, and are also semantically idiomatic.

(220)   *wurren-bi*   *wardirrg*   *wambarr-ma*   *0-yanggi*   **warlam-wagbawun**

        child ABS-ART   girl ABS-ART   anywhere-PS   3SG-goPST   **skin-lacking**
        'As a child, as a young girl, she went anywhere, no skin'.

Wardaman

(Merlan, 1993, p. 85)

Three further examples of semantically idiomatic expressions are (222), (223) and (221). In Arabana-Wangkangurru, the only context in which *palku*, generally translated as 'flesh', has a privative function is (221). The meaning 'without teeth' is conveyed by the literal 'tooth flesh', meaning 'one whose teeth are reduced to just the flesh (i.e. the gums)' (Hercus, 1994, p. 95).

(221)   *yakarra-palku*

        tooth flesh
        'without teeth' (literally: 'tooth flesh')

Arabana-Wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 95)

(222)   **dhuwarr-dhalibaa**   *yuulngindi*   *banaga-y.la-nha*

        bread-PRIV   hungry   run-CTS-PRS
        with no food, hungry; running around

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2014, p. 79)

(223)   *mayali-nyirring*

   idea-PRIV
   'impolite'

Djinang and Djinba

(Waters, 1989, p. 85)

Having discussed two widely attested semantic functions for the [body part -PRIV] construction, it is relevant to note that Djambarrpuyngu contains a set of terms used by brothers in reference to their "classificatory sisters", due to a constraint that sisters must not be referred to by name. One set of these terms consist of the [body part -PRIV] construction (Wilkinson, 1991, p. 444). Examples are *dulkun+miriw* [ankle+PRIV] and *likan+miriw* [elbow priv]. These are analysed as an extended function Djambarrpuyngu privative, as there is little semantic connection to the typical privative function. However, I draw a possible connection to _*murlu_miyn* [hip-PRIV] 'widow(er)' in Warray (Harvey, n.d., p. 6). Harvey notes that a language consultant who did not use Warray's privative suffixes did use this lexeme, suggesting that it may be a lexicalised expression.

5.5. Existential privative expressions

It is worth noting that a number of the property categories include what can be described as negative existential constructions. Negative existentials serve to negate existence: they indicate that an entity denoted by a NP does not exist (at least for the purposes of the utterance). Negative existentials do not have one consistent structure. Phillips (in press) identifies four common forms they take in Australian languages.

For the purposes of this analysis, and following Phillips (in press), negative existentials are considered a type of nominal negation. Privative marking can overlap with existentials. Existentials without the privative are possible and the privative without existential meaning is possible. The remainder of this section briefly discusses examples in the present sample that are both privative and existential.

The construction [NP+PRIV] alone sometimes forms a negative existential (224), while some languages use an additional existential marker (226). The Arabana-Wangkangurru example (224) points to one of the probable reasons for common overlap between privative and negative existentials. Hercus notes that in Arabana-Wangkangurru privative compounds, subject ellipsis is not possible because some part of the compound would "automatically be interpreted as subject". This applies to other types of constructions, for example a proprietive compound like *marni-thapu* [fat-having] would be interpreted as '(he is) very fat'. Therefore, (224) cannot be interpreted as '(he is) money-without' (Hercus, 1994, p. 290). While this restriction does not exist across privative constructions in all languages, where it is present, it governs the overlap between privative and existential.

(224)   *Kadnhaardi*   **padni**

money   **nothing**
There is no money.

Arabana-Wangkangurru

(Hercus, 1994, p. 290)

Conversely, the Warrongo example (225) demonstrates that in some cases, the same construction can be interpreted as an existential 'there is no' or as having a first person proprietor 'we have no'.

(225)   *yori-Ø*   *nyawa.*

kangaroo-NOM   NEG
'[We have/There is] no kangaroo [meat].'

Warrongo

(Tsunoda, 2011, p. 660)

(226)   *wariwu*   *-yile*   **-nda**   *nawu*   *djulang*

fierce   priv   **exist.**   he   dog
'The dog is not fierce.'

Miriwung

(Koford, 1978, p. 162)

Phillips (in press, p. 919) identifies a tendency for Australian negative existentials to predicate the "stance/motion of an NP". This appears in several privative examples in the sample. A verb indicating stance (sit, lie, crouch, etc.) is used to indicate existence of an entity, and this is then negated using a privative method to indicate nonexistence.

As shown by (55), "he was not there" can be literally translated as "he did not sit". Further examples are (228), (229) and (230). The Yankunytjatjara data in (228) shows the use of a stative verb *nyina* to either indicate stance or to create a negative existential.

Examples of this type of privative existential in the data seem to almost always have a human or animal property. An exception is 'buildings' in (230). A second possible exception is the Djambarrpuyngu data in (231), if *nhina* [sit-1st] can be interpreted as pertaining to the lack of cigarettes.

(227)   *ŋa-waʔ-ḏ-i,*   *ni-yaku*   *na-ki-ñ-uŋ*   **ni-ni-ŋic-ic**

I looked   he absent   there   **he did not sit**
'I looked (for him, but) he was not there.'

Ngandi

(Heath, 1978, p. 122)

(228)   *kungka/partjata*   *kuwari*   **nyina-nytja**   **yiya**

woman/quoll   now   **sit-NOML**   **NEG**
'The woman isn't sitting now/There aren't any quolls these days'

Yankunytjatjara
(Goddard, 1983, p. 245)

(229)   *tjalku*   *tjuta*   *kuwari*   **nyina-nytja**   **wiya**

bilby   many(NOM)   these days **sit_NOML**   **NEG**
'There are no bilbies these days.'

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 39)

(230)   *iriti*   *wali*   **pupa-nytja**   **wiya**

long ago   building(NOM)   **crouch-NOML**   **NEG**
'Long ago there were no buildings.'

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 39)

(231)   *ŋarali'+miriw*   *ŋarra*   *li*   *ga*   **nhina**

cigarette+PRIV   1sg   HAB   IMPV-1st   **sit-1st**
'(I get sleepy when) I haven't any cigarettes .'

Djambarrpuyngu

(Wilkinson, 1991, p. 443)

This thesis recommends further dedicated cross-linguistic study of negative existentials (privative or otherwise). I am also in agreement with Phillips' recommendation for more

extensive study of Australian negation in general. The "stance/motion" constructions are especially in need of study. For example, a survey of which languages permit this construction and which stative verbs are most commonly used, may be informative.

While it is not within the scope of this analysis of nominal existentials and privatives, Phillips (in press, p. 19) also draws on Croft's posit (1991) of a type of cyclical change of negation methods with three stages. In summary: 'standard negators' are used to negate both verbal and existential predicates (stage A), a suppletive 'negative existential' arises (stage B), and this marker comes to mark standard negation (stage C). Further study of evidence for or against this in Australian languages is needed.

5.6. Use of the privative in instrumental expressions

Another semantic distinction can be made between properties that have an instrumental function and those that do not. Note that at no point does the privative seem to have the function of solely indicating an instrumental sense. There are a number of examples in which the action denoted by the verb is carried out without a specific property. This is usually an instrument that is generally expected to be used. For example, in (232) and (233), the manner in which the kneading/cooking occurs is 'without water'. In (234), the breaking occurs with no axe.

(232)	*Ngunhu*	*wartirra*	*wiru*	*thanuwa-a*	*thurnta-rninyji*
	that.NOM	woman	wanting	damper-ACC	knead-FUT

kayulu-wirriwa-a *pinkarranyu-u.*
water-PRIV-ACC dry-ACC
'That woman wants to knead damper without water, dry.'

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1988, p. 90)

(233)	*Wantharni-rru*	*mungka-rninyji*	*yimpala-a-wa,*	*kampa-rnu-u*	***kayulu-wirriwa.***
	how-NOW	eat-FUT	like.that-ACC-YK	cook-PASSP-ACC	**water-PRIV.**

'How is she going to eat it like that, cooked without water.'

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1988, p. 126)

(234) *Ngarta-naku*   *parirr-ju,*   **yilipi-majirra-lu.**

break.off-PurpADV   hand-ERG   **axe-PRIV-ERG**
You break it off with your hand, without an axe.

Nyangumarta

(Sharp, 2004, p. 140)

(235) *Nhulaa*   *kanyara*   *nyina-nguru*   *puuthuni-*   *mulhaa-rninyji*

that   man   be-PRES   point-ACC   affix-FUT

warrirti-la   *pul.ya-ngk*   *yirla,*   **karntarra-wirriwa.**

spear-LOC   wax-EFF   only   **sinew-PRIV**
'That man is putting a point on the spear with just spinifex wax, without any sinew.'

Martuthunira

(Dench, 1994, p. 90)

Note that an example such as (236) can be interpreted as having instrumental meaning, but is not a typical example.

(236) *Ngarrka-ngu=ma*   *kula*   *la-njakurla*   *kuyu=ma*   **makiti-jila-rlu.**

man-ERG=TOP   NEG   shoot-CFACT   meat=TOP   **gun-WITHOUT-ERG**
'The man lacking a gun couldn't have shot the kangaroo.'

Warlmanpa

(Browne, 2021, p. 137)

No examples were found of the instrumental privative with nouns other than alienably possessed, inanimate items. The encoding of a body part as a privative instrument (something like "without using your hands") may be interesting to examine, given that the [body part -PRIV] construction has two other widely attested functions: see 5.2.3 and 5.2.6.1.

5.7. Emphatic privative markers

One of Wirangu's privative markers, the particle *min.ga*, has an emphatic function (Hercus, 1999, p. 57). It marks "emphatic absence". As one of Hercus's consultants explained it, if someone asks for money, you might say *nganha barnda-maga* 'I haven't got any money' (237), using a different, non-emphatic privative marker. If they 'keep pestering', you would say *nganha barnda-min.ga* 'I haven't got any money at all (I haven't got a cent)' (238). No other privative markers with an inherent emphatic function were found in the sample.

(237)   *Nganha*   **barnda-maga.**

      I   **money-not**
      'I haven't got any money.'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

(238)   *Nganha*   **barnda-min.ga.**

      I   **money-totally without.**
      'I haven't got any money at all (I haven't got a cent).'

Wirangu

(Hercus, 1999, p. 57)

5.8. Rare markers semantically related to the privative

Three languages in the sample display markers that exist in addition to the privative, and that perform a related semantic function. These are the Yankunytjatjara "deprivative", the Wanyjirra "lack" marker, and the Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay "caritative". They are formally and sometimes morphosyntactically distinct from the privative in each of these languages. They are discussed in the following sections 5.8.1, 0 and 5.8.3.

Some semantic similarity can be found between these three markers. They can all encode what seems to be a causative sense in addition to something close to a typical privative. These markers are noted as an area in need of further research, to determine their exact semantic range, how they intersect with the privative and other negators, and what their possible origins are.

5.8.1. Yankunytjatjara deprivative

Yankunytjatjara contains a suffix that Goddard identifies as "deprivative". The deprivative is a nominal marker that is formally different to the privative. It indicates that "lack of something involving the referent of the stem to which it is attached is the motive or reason for the action or event depicted by the main verb" (Goddard, 1983, p. 132). In this way it has a more inherent causative sense than the typical privative: it does not only denote the lack of something, but also that the lack is causing the main verb. This is demonstrated by (239) - (242). Note that it does not always encode a lack of something denoted by the marked nominal: for example, store-DEPRIV in (239) does not indicate the lack of a store, but a lack relating to a store. In (240) and (241), it appears to directly encode the lack of the marked entity (sleep and water/grass).

While the privative can occur in verbless clauses, the deprivative does not seem to. The deprivative takes the form of a suffix, unlike the Yankunytjatjara privative postposition (see 1.9).

(239) tjana   wari-ringa-nyi,   **tjuwa-tjiratja**

       3pl(NOM)   worry-INCHO-PRES   **store-DEPRIV(NOM)**
       They're worrying, on account of a lack in the store.

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 132)

(240) *kurun-na*   *kuya*   *ngara-nyi,*   **anku-tjiratja**

spirit(NOM)-1sg(NOM)   bad(NOM)   stand-PRES   **sleep-DEPRIV(NOM)**
I'm uneasy, for want of sleep.

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 132)

(241) *puluka*   *tjuta*   *nyurka-ri-ngu,*   **kapi-/putja-tjiratja**

cattle   many(NOM)   thin-INCHO-PAST   **water/grass-DEPRIV(NOM)**
The cattle got thin, lacking water/grass

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 132)

The deprivative also has a kinship application. When attached to a kinship term, it indicates that the action denoted by the main verb happened on account of "lack of care or proper treatment" of that relative. An example is (242).

(242) *pika-ri-ngu*   *paluru*   **katja-tjiratja**

angry-INCHO-PAST   DEF(NOM)   **son-DEPRIV(NOM)**
He got angry, over lack of proper treatment of his son

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 132)

The semantic functions demonstrated above do not seem to be restricted to the deprivative marker. Example (243) shows a combination of the privative/negative postposition *wiya* and a locative marker in causative function denoting that a lack of water was the reason for the car breaking down. This might presumably also be encoded by the deprivative. However, there seem to be no examples in Goddard's data of *wiya* involved in expressing a comparable meaning to the kinship deprivative (242) above.

(243) *mutaka*   *kuya-ri-ngu*   *kapi*   **wiya-ngka**

car(NOM)   useless-INCHO-PAST   water   **NEG-LOC**
The car broke down because of lack of water.

Yankunytjatjara

(Goddard, 1983, p. 81)

5.8.2.   Wanyjirra "lack" suffix

Wanyjirra has something described as a "lack" suffix (-*gunyja/wunyja*). This is semantically similar to the Wanyjirra privative suffix. (Senge, 2015, p. 157). However, unlike the privative suffix, the "lack" suffix is used especially if shortage or lack of the entity might physically affect someone or something": meaning that some entity is suffering from the lack or has a problem with the lack. It can be summarised as "(X) suffers from the lack of Y" (Senge, 2015, p. 157). It does not have any other semantic functions that the privative has. Based on this description, it seems comparable to the Yankunytjatjara deprivative, but without a specific kinship application. The 'lack' suffix appears to syntactically behave the same as the privative. It is shown in (244) and (245) below.

Specifically with body part terms, it can mark absence of usual body function (245). The Wanyjirra privative can perform the same function, but can also encode lack of the body part itself (discussed in 5.2.3). The 'lack' suffix cannot do this.

(244)	*yalu*	*mawun-du*	**ngawa-wunyja-lu**	*ngu*	*gambarn-ana*	*nalija*
	DIST2	man-ERG	**water-LACK-ERG**	REAL	burn-PRES	tea.ABS

That thirsty man is boiling tea.

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 157)

(245)	**milba-wunyja**
	eye-LACK

blind

Wanyjirra

(Senge, 2015, p. 158)

5.8.3.   Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay "caritative suffix"

Giacon's description of Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay contains something classed as a "caritative suffix" (Giacon, 2017, p. 82). This exists in addition to a privative suffix and free form (see chapter 3)which are formally and semantically distinct from the caritative. It is glossed as 'WANT', and "commonly translated" as "need/want". It occurs most commonly on nouns and interrogatives, and sometimes verbs.

The semantic difference between the caritative and privative in these languages seems to be the sense of "want". The caritative can be used to express want/need in a direct way: (246) and (247). However, there are also examples in which caritative seems to express something akin to the causative sense that can be encoded by the Yankunytjatjara deprivative (see 5.8.1). An example of this is (248), in which the "want" of water was the cause of dying. However, I can find no clear examples of a caritative-inflected item forming secondary predication in the way that the privative can (meaning something like 'I spoke to the person in want of food').

(246) I don't want it // i.e. the axe is not mine

*waal   ngaya   **dhamiyaa-nginda***

not   1SG   **tomahawk-WANT**
I don't want the tomahawk.

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 82)

(247) (The Bustard is taunting the Emu, and says:) *Wahl boonoong ninderh doorunmai.*

*waal   **bungun-nginda**   dhuurranmay.*

not   **wing-WANT**   chief
(Every bird flies.) The Dinewans, to be the king of birds, should do without wings. The king does not need wings.

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 82)

(248) Could you say he died from thirst?

gungan-nginda   */ nhama,   maadhaay   balu-nhi*

water-WANT   / 3.DEF,   dog   die-PST

It was from lack of water that the dog died.

Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay

(Giacon, 2017, p. 82)

6. Conclusion

In this thesis, I have surveyed the occurrence of the nominal privative across a sample of 62 Australian languages, and examined specific morphosyntactic and semantic aspects of the privative. Several conclusions can be drawn, and trends can be identified.

6.1. Occurrence of the privative

Firstly, nominal privative constructions are common within my sample: they occur in 49 of the 62 languages sampled. They are seen in 92% of the Pama-Nyungan languages in the sample, and 59% percent of the Non-Pama-Nyungan languages, suggesting that they may be more widespread in the PN grouping (section 1.6).

6.2. Morphosyntax

Suffixes are by far the most common morphological type of privative marker across all languages. The predominance of Pama-Nyungan languages may contribute to this. Enclitics, postpositions, particles and free forms are also found (section 3).

Privative markers appear in multiple domain marking positions (Dench & Evans, 1988, p. 3). The most common is head-marking, mostly accomplished by suffixes. Pronominal marking, which is largely found with definite and specific human referents, is not unusual. Initial-marking, final-marking and free-marking are also found (section 4.1.2)

While this thesis attempts to study the privative as a nominal marker, it is difficult to fully separate nominal from verbal, and many privative examples are ambiguous, as acknowledged in section 4.2.

6.3. Semantic range

In the existing literature, the sense conveyed by the privative is typically summarised as "lacking". The semantic analysis conducted in this thesis confirms this, but finds a number of functions that cannot be assumed from this description. An example of this is the encoding of an event in time as "not present" (section 5.3.4).

The most widespread semantic function of the privative appears to be marking the lack of inanimate, alienably possessed items (see 5.3.1). The range of properties that can be denoted by privative-marked nominals is broad. It can span animate and inanimate entities. The relationships between property and proprietor can be viewed on a cline of alienability.

The privative can overlap with negative existentials. This often includes the predication of stance/motion (e. g. 'he did not sit'): see section 5.5. This is in accordance with the findings of Phillips (in press).

Privative constructions have a tendency to take on an idiomatic status (section 5.4). These are divided into morphosyntactic idioms (the elements of the construction are not individually analysable; lexicalised) and semantic idioms (the meaning has been extended to something specifically known and accepted within a speech community). One of the most common semantic idioms is the [body part-PRIV] construction denoting a lack of function or ability of the body part.

A formally distinct emphatic variant of the privative marker is rare, but occurs in Wirangu (Hercus, 1999, p. 57).

6.4. Suggestions for further research

The survey style of this thesis is intended to facilitate further study into the morphosyntax and semantics of the privative. Several specific areas are flagged, and these are summarised below.

The origins of privative markers, while it is discussed thoroughly in some individual grammars, and touched on by Phillips (in press), is an area that will benefit from broad cross-linguistic study. In particular, the forms of privative markers are outside the scope of this thesis. An approach that focuses on the forms of the privative markers and possible shared origins may be informative.

A logical next point of interest may be a study comparing aspect of the privative to aspects of the proprietive/comitative. As mentioned (see 1.1.5) the privative has received far less dedicated study, and this thesis aims to partially fill this gap. Semantic comparison between the two is a particularly obvious area, given the existence of Saulwick's semantic description of the proprietive (1996).

Comparison of the morphosyntax and semantics of the Australian privative against the caritive found elsewhere will be of typological interest. The caritive appears to have a comparable function, and has been identified in Evenki (Rudnitskaya, 2020) and dialects of Romani (Kozhanov, 2019).

The semantic analysis found in chapter 5 is conducted making broad distinctions of alienability and animacy. These concepts have far more nuance than can be represented in this thesis. Therefore, a more detailed and language-specific study would be informative.

The appearance of some rare markers that are semantically related to the privative are also recommended for future research. These are the Yankunytjatjara deprivative marker, Wanyjirra "lack" suffix, which appears very similar to the deprivative, and the Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay "caritative suffix". These are only touched on in this thesis (see section 5.8). In all these languages, they exist in addition to a separate privative and perform different functions. These all appear to have some causative element to their semantic function.

Lastly, the present analysis of the privative has further highlighted the need for dedicated study of Australian negation in general.

7. Appendix I: the sample

This list is alphabetised by language name.

Some languages have been the subject of multiple grammars, such as Kuuk Thaayorre and Rembarnga, but I did not use more than one for any given language, in order to make the survey more practical. Only the grammars listed here were used as sources for this thesis.

Some grammars cover more than one language, such as Austin's grammar of four Mantharta languages, and Campbell's grammar of three Giimbiyu languages. I count each of these grammars as one entry in my sample (entries are referred to as languages for convenience). This decision was made because in all the multiple-language grammars, I found little to no difference in the description of the phenomena relevant to this thesis.

For all language names, I adopt the orthography used by the author of the relevant grammar.

All information in columns (d) and (e) is from Bowern's Australian language classifications in The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages (Bowern, in press).

Column (f) indicates whether the language displays privative marking, according to the criteria laid out in section 1.1.2.. The languages that do not display privative marking (13 out of 62) are often not included in tables that appear throughout my analysis where it is only relevant to consider languages with privative marking.

[1]Bowern (in press) acknowledges that there is uncertainty as to whether Tangkic should be considered a sister to Pama-Nyungan or a subgroup within it, largely based on evidence from a reconstructed pronominal system. It is classed as Pama-Nyungan for the purposes of her classifications, and for the present thesis.

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Source (reference grammar)	(d) Pama-Nyungan/non-Pama-Nyungan	(e) Language family	(f) Displays privative marking
1.	(Western) Garrwa	(Mushin, 2012)	NPN	Garrwan family	-
2.	Alyawarra	(Yallop, 1977)	PN	Aranda subset of Arandic family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+
3.	Arabana-wangkangurru	(Hercus, 1994)	PN	Northern subset of Karnic family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+
4.	Bardi	(Bowern, 2012)	NPN	Western subset of Nyulnyulan family	+
5.	Bidyara and Gungabula	(Breen, 1973)	PN	South Maric subset of Greater Maric family, Northern Pama-Nyungan.	+
6.	Bilinarra	(Meakins & Nordlinger, 2013)	PN	Ngumpin subset of Ngumpin-Yapa family.	+
7.	Binij Gun Wok	(Evans, 2003)	NPN	Gunwinygic subset of Gunwinyguan family	+
8.	Bunganditj	(Blake, 2003)	PN	Kulin family, Southeastern Pama-Nyungan.	-
9.	Bunuba	(Rumsey, 2000)	NPN	Bunuban family	-
10.	Diyari	(P. K. Austin, 1981)	PN	Western Karnic family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+
11.	Djambarrpuyngu (a Yolngu Variety)	(Wilkinson, 1991)	PN	(Yolngu) Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
12.	Djinang and Djinba	(Waters, 1989)	PN	Northern subset of Yolngu family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
13.	Gaagudju	(Harvey, 2011)	NPN	Gaagudju	-

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Source (reference grammar)	(d) Pama-Nyungan/non-Pama-Nyungan	(e) Language family	(f) Displays privative marking
14.	Giimbiyu languages: Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji	(Campbell, 2006)	NPN	Giimbiyu family	+
15.	Guugu Yimidhirr	(Haviland, 1979)	PN	Paman family	+
16.	Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha	(Breen, 2015)	PN	(Yandruwandha) Western subset of Karnic family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+
17.	Jingulu	(Pensalfini, 2003)	NPN	Eastern subset of Mirndi family	+
18.	Kalkatungu	(Blake, 1979)	PN	Kalkatungic family, Northern Pama-Nyungan.	+
19.	Kayardild	(Evans, 1995)	PN [1]	Tangkic family	+
20.	Kugu-Nganhcara	(Smith & Johnson, 2000)	PN	Middle paman family	+
21.	Kuku Yalanji	(Patz, 1982)	PN	Yalanjic family, Paman.	+
22.	Kunbarlang	(Kapitonov, 2019)	NPN	Gunwinygic subset of Gunwinyguan family	-
23.	Kuuk Thaayorre	(Gaby, 2017)	PN	Southwest Paman family	+
24.	Limilngan	(Harvey, 2001)	NPN	Darwin region family.	+
25.	Malakmalak	(Birk, 1976)	NPN	Northern Daly family	-
26.	Mantharta languages (Jiwarli, Thiin, Warriyangka, Tharrkari)	(P. K. Austin, 2015)	PN	Kanyara-Mantharta family, Western Pama-Nyungan	+
27.	Mara	(Heath, 1981)	NPN	Marran family	-
28.	Marrithiyel	(Green, 1989)	NPN	Western Daly family	+
29.	Martuthunira	(Dench, 1994)	PN	Ngayarta family, Western Pama-Nyungan	+
30.	Miriwung	(Koford, 1978)	NPN	Jarrakan family.	+

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Source (reference grammar)	(d) Pama-Nyungan/non-Pama-Nyungan	(e) Language family	(f) Displays privative marking
31.	Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda)	(Wilkins, 1989)	PN	Arandic family, central Pama-Nyungan.	+
32.	Ndjebbana	(McKay, n.d.)	NPN	Maningrida family	-
33.	Ngandi	(Heath, 1978)	NPN	East Arnhem subset of Ngalakgan family.	+
34.	Ngarla	(Westerlund, 2015)	PN	Ngayarta family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
35.	Nhanda	(Blevins, 2001)	PN	("Nhanda cluster") Kartu family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
36.	Nyangumarta	(Sharp, 2004)	PN	Marrngu family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
37.	Nyulnyul	(McGregor, 2011)	NPN	Western subset of Nyulnyulan family	+
38.	Panyjima	(Dench, 1991)	PN	Ngayarta family, Western Pama-Nyungan	+
39.	Rembarnga	(McKay, 2011)	NPN	Gunwinyguan family/ Ngalakgan family	+
40.	Umbugarla	(Davies, 1989)	NPN	Umbulgarlan subset of Darwin Region family.	-
41.	Ungarinjin	(Rumsey, 1982)	NPN	Ngarinyinic subset of Worrorran family.	-
42.	Wagiman	(Cook, 1987)	NPN	Wagiman family	+
43.	Wakaya	(Breen, 1974)	PN	Southern subset of Warluwaric family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
44.	Wambaya	(Nordlinger, 1998a)	NPN	Eastern subset of Mirndi family	+
45.	Wangkajunga	(Jones, 2011)	PN	Northern subset of Western Desert (Wati) family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
46.	Wankumara (Galali)	(McDonald & Wurm, 1979)	PN	Eastern subset of Karnic family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Source (reference grammar)	(d) Pama-Nyungan/non-Pama-Nyungan	(e) Language family	(f) Displays privative marking
47.	Wanyjirra	(Senge, 2015)	PN	Ngumpin subset of Ngumpin-Yapa family.	+
48.	Wardaman	(Merlan, 1993)	NPN	Wardaman family	+
49.	Warlmanpa	(Browne, 2021)	PN	Yapa subset of Ngumpin-Yapa family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
50.	Warlpiri	(Simpson, 2012)	PN	Yapa subset of Ngumpin-Yapa family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
51.	Warray	(Harvey, n.d.)	NPN	Gunwinyguan family.	+
52.	Warrongo	(Tsunoda, 2011)	PN	North Maric subset of Greater Maric Northern Pama-Nyungan	+
53.	Wirangu	(Hercus, 1999)	PN	Thura-Yura family, Central Pama-Nyungan.	+
54.	Woiwurrung	(Blake, 1991)	PN	Eastern subset of Wemba family, Southeastern Pama-Nyungan.	-
55.	Yalarnnga	(Breen & Blake, 2007)	PN	Kalkatungic family, Northern Pama-Nyungan.	+
56.	Yankunytjatjar	(Goddard, 1983)	PN	Western Desert (Wati) family, Western Pama-Nyungan.	+
57.	Yanyuwa	(Kirton & Charlie, 1996)	PN	Warluwaric subset of Yolngu, Western Pama-Nyungan.	-
58.	Yawuru	(Hosokawa, 1991)	NPN	Eastern subset of Nyulnyulan family	-
59.	Yidiɲ	(Dixon, 1977)	PN	Yidinyic family, Paman.	+
60.	Yintyingka	(Verstraete & Rigsby, 2015)	PN	Middle Paman	+

(a) No.	(b) Language	(c) Source (reference grammar)	(d) Pama-Nyungan/non-Pama-Nyungan	(e) Language family	(f) Displays privative marking
61.	Yir Yoront	(Alpher, 1991)	PN	Southwest Paman family	+
62.	Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay	(Giacon, 2014)	PN	Central-NSW family, Southeastern Pama-Nyungan.	+

8. References

Alpher, B. (1991). *Yir-Yoront lexicon: Sketch and dictionary of an Australian language*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Andrews, A. D. (1996). Semantic case-stacking and inside-out unification. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *16*(1), 1–55.

Austin, P. (1985). *Inflection and derivation in Australian languages*. Australian Linguistic Society annual conference, Brisbane.

Austin, P. (1991). Double case-marking in Kanyara and Mantharta languages western Australia. *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics*, *4*.

Austin, P. K. (1981). *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*.

Austin, P. K. (2015). *A reference grammar of the Mantharta languages, Western Australia*. Unpublished draft version 3.

Birk, D. (1976). *The Malakmalak language, Daly River (Western Arnhem Land)*. Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Blake, B. (1979). *A Kalkatungu grammar* (Vol. 57). Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Blake, B. (1987). *Australian Aboriginal grammar*. Routledge.

Blake, B. (1991). Woiwurrung. In B. Blake & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *The handbook of Australian languages* (Vol. 4, pp. 31–124).

Blake, B. (2003). *The Bunganditj (Buwandik) language of the Mount Gambier Region*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Blake, B. (2004). *Case*. Cambridge University Press.

Blevins, J. (2001). *Nhanda: An Aboriginal language of Western Australia*. University of

Hawai'i Press.

Bowern, C. (2012). *A grammar of Bardi*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Bowern, C. (in press). Australian language families and linguistic classifications. In C. Bowern

(Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages* (pp. i–xxxiv). Oxford University

Press.

Breen, G. (1973). *Bidyara and Gungabula grammar and vocabulary*. Monash University.

Breen, G. (1974). *Wakaya grammar*.

Breen, G. (1976). Proprietive markers and kinship terms. In *Grammatical categories in

Australian languages* (pp. 290–297). Humanities Press Inc.

Breen, G. (2015). *Innamincka Talk: A grammar of the Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha

with notes on other dialects*. A.N.U. Press.

Breen, G., & Blake, B. (2007). *The grammar of Yalarnnga: A language of western

Queensland*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National

University.

Browne, M. S. (2021). *A grammatical description of Warlmanpa: A Ngumpin-Yapa Language

spoken around Tennant Creek (Northern Territory)*. University of Queensland.

Campbell, L. (2006). *A sketch grammar of Urningangk, Erre and Mengerrdji: The Giimbiyu

languages of Western Arnhem Land*. University of Melbourne.

Chappell, H., & McGregor, W. (Eds.). (2011). *The grammar of inalienability: A typological

perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Cook, A. R. (1987). *Wagiman Matyin: A description of the Wagiman language of the

Northern Territory*. La Trobe University.

Cristofaro, S. (2006). The organization of reference grammars: A typologist user's point of view. In F. K. Ameka, A. Dench, & N. Evans (Eds.), *Catching language: The standing challenge of grammar writing* (pp. 137–170). Mouton de Gruyter.

Croft, W. (1991). The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics*, *27*, 1–27.

Davies, J. (1989). *Umbugarla: A sketch grammar*. Northern Territory University.

Dench, A. (1988). Complex sentences in Martuthunira. In P. Austin (Ed.), *Complex sentence constructions in Australian languages* (pp. 97–140). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dench, A. (1991). Panyjima. In R. M. W. Dixon & B. Blake (Eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages* (Vol. 4, pp. 124–243). Oxford University Press.

Dench, A. (1994). *Martuthunira: A language of the Pilbara region of Western Australia*. The Australian National University.

Dench, A., & Evans, N. (1988). Multiple case-marking in Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *8*(1), 1–47.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1976). Topic A: The derivational affix "having." In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages* (pp. 9–31). Humanities Press Inc.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1977). *A grammar of Yidiɲ*. Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. (2002). *Australian languages: Their nature and development*. Cambridge University Press.

Evans, N. (1995). *A grammar of Kayardild: With historical-comparative notes on Tangkic*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Evans, N. (2003). *Bininj Gun-wok: A pan-dialectal Grammar of Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune*. Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Evans, N. (2006). Dyadic constructions. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 24–28). Elsevier.

Fauconnier, S., & Verstraete, J. (2010). Distinguishing animacy effects for agents: A case study of Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *30*(2), 183–207.

Gaby, A. (2017). *A Grammar of Kuuk Thaayorre*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Giacon, J. (2014). *A grammar of Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay*. The Australian National University.

Giacon, J. (2017). *Yaluu. A recovery grammar of Yuwaalaraay and Gamilaraay: A description of two New South Wales languages based on 160 years of records*. School of Culture, History and Language, College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University.

Goddard, C. (1983). *A semantically-oriented grammar of the Yankunytjatjara dialect of the Western Desert language*. The Australian National University.

Green, I. (1989). *Marrithiyel: A language of the Daly River region of Australia's Northern Territory*. The Australian National University.

Haiman, J. (1983). Iconic and economic motivation. *Language*, *59*(4), 781–819.

Harvey, M. (2001). *A grammar of Limilngan: A language of the Mary River region, Northern Territory, Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National Library.

Harvey, M. (2011). *A grammar of Gaagudju*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Harvey, M. (n.d.). *Warray grammar*.

Harvey, M., & Reid, N. (1997). *Nominal classification in Aboriginal Australia*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haviland, J. B. (1979). Guugu Yimidhirr sketch grammar. In R. M. W. Dixon & B. Blake (Eds.), *Handbook of Australian languages: Vol. I*. A.N.U. Press.

Heath, J. (1978). *Ngandi grammar, texts, and dictionary*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies; Humanities Press.

Heath, J. (1981). *Basic materials in Mara: Grammar, texts and dictionary* (Vol. 60). Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Hercus, L. (1994). *A grammar of the Arabana-Wangkangurru language, Lake Eyre Basin, South Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Hercus, L. (1999). *A grammar of the Wirangu language from the west coast of South Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Himmelmann, N. P., & Schultze-Berndt, E. (2005). Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: An introduction. In *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives* (pp. 1–68). Oxford University Press.

Hosokawa, K. (1991). *The Yawuru language of West Kimberley: A meaning-based description*. The Australian National University.

Jones, B. (2011). *A grammar of Wangkajunga: A language of the Great Sandy Desert of north western Australia*. College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University.

Kapitonov, I. (2019). *A Grammar of Kunbarlang*. University of Melbourne.

Kirton, J., & Charlie, B. (1996). *Further aspects of the grammar of Yanyuwa, northern Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Koford, F. M. (1978). *The Miriwung language (East Kimberley): A phonological and morphological study*. University of New England.

Kozhanov, K. (2019). Caritive constructions in Romani dialects. *Moscow Journal of Linguistics*, *21*(7), 33–54.

McDonald, M., & Wurm, S. (1979). *Basic materials in Wankumara (Galali): Grammar, sentences and vocabulary*. Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

McGregor, W. (1991). External possession constructions in Nyulnyulan languages. In D. L. Payne & I. Barshi (Eds.), *External possession* (pp. 429–448). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

McGregor, W. (2011). *The Nyulnyul language of Dampier Land, Western Australia* (Vol. 632). School of Culture, History and Language, College of Asia and the Pacific, The Australian National University.

McKay, G. R. (n.d.). Ndjébbana. In R. M. W. Dixon & B. Blake (Eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages* (pp. 155–356). Oxford University Press.

McKay, G. R. (2011). *Rembarnga: A language of central Arnhem Land*. Lincom Europa.

Meakins, F., & Nordlinger, R. (2013). *A grammar of Bilinarra: An Australian aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Merlan, F. (1993). *A grammar of Wardaman: A language of the Northern Territory of Australia* (Vol. 11). De Gruyter Inc.

Merlan, F., & Heath, J. (1982). Dyadic kinship terms. In J. Heath, F. Merlan, & A. Rumsey (Eds.), *The languages of kinship in Aboriginal Australia*. University of Sydney.

Miestamo, M. (2017). Negation. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology* (pp. 405–439). Cambridge University Press.

Mosel, U. (2006). Grammaticography: The art and craft of writing grammars. In F. K. Ameka, A. Dench, & N. Evans (Eds.), *Catching language: The standing challenge of grammar writing* (pp. 41–68). Mouton de Gruyter.

Mushin, I. (2012). *A grammar of (Western) Garrwa*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Nordlinger, R. (1997). *Morphology building syntax: Constructive case in Australian languages*. LFG97 Conference, University of California, San Diego.

Nordlinger, R. (1998a). *A grammar of Wambaya, Northern Territory (Australia)*. Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Nordlinger, R. (1998b). *Constructive case: Evidence from Australian languages*. CSLI Publications.

Nordlinger, R. (2014). *The languages and linguistics of Australia: A comprehensive guide*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Oskolskaya, S. A., Zaika, N., Klimenko, S., & Fedotov, M. L. (2020). Defining caritive as a comparative concept. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, *3*, 7–25.

Patz, E. (1982). *A grammar of the Kuku Yalanji language of North Queensland. Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Pensalfini, R. (2003). *A grammar of Jingulu, an Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Phillips, J. (in press). Negation. In C. Bowern (Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages*. Oxford University Press.

Richards, N. (2013). Lardil "case stacking" and the timing of case assignment. *Syntax*, *16*(1).

Rudnitskaya, E. (2020). *The caritive construction in Evenki*. Caritive Constructions in the Languages of the World, St. Petersburg, Russia.

Rumsey, A. (1982). *An intra-sentence grammar of Ungarinjin, north-western Australia*. Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Rumsey, A. (2000). Bunuba. In *Handbook of Australian languages* (Vol. 5, pp. 34–152). Oxford University Press.

Sadler, L., & Nordlinger, R. (2006). Case stacking in realizational morphology. *Linguistics*, *44*(3), 459–487.

Saulwick, A. (1996). *To have and to hold: The semantics of the proprietive case in Australian languages*. Department of Linguistics, University of Melbourne.

Schultze-Berndt, E., & Himmelmann, N. P. (2004). Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology*, *8*(1), 59–131.

Schultze-Berndt, E., & Simard, C. (2012). Constraints on noun phrase discontinuity in an Australian language: The role of prosody and information structure. *Linguistics*, *50*(5), 1015–1058.

Senge, C. (2015). *A Grammar of Wanyjirra, a language of Northern Australia*. The Australian National University.

Sharp, J. (2004). *Nyangumarta: A language of the Pilbara region of Western Australia*. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Simpson, J. (2005). Depictives in English and Warlpiri. In *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives* (pp. 69–106). Oxford University Press.

Simpson, J. (2012). *Warlpiri morpho-syntax: A lexicalist approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Simpson, J. (2014). Pama-Nyungan. In R. Lieber & P. Štekauer (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. Oxford University Press.

Simpson, J. (in press). Semantic case. In C. Bowern (Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages*. Oxford University Press.

Skilton, A. (in press). Noun classes. In C. Bowern (Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages* (pp. 457–480). Oxford University Press.

Smith, I., & Johnson, S. (2000). Kugu Nganhcara. In R. M. W. Dixon & B. Blake (Eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages* (pp. 357–489). Oxford University Press.

Sutton, P. (1976). The "having" affix and other morphemes in fifty Australian languages. In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages* (pp. 297–305). Humanities Press Inc.

Tsunoda, T. (2011). *A grammar of Warrongo*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Verstraete, J., & Rigsby, B. (2015). *A grammar and lexicon of Yintyingka*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Waters, B. E. (1989). *Djinang and Djinba—A grammatical and historical perspective*. Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

Westerlund, T. (2015). *A grammatical sketch of Ngarla (Ngayarta, Pama-Nyungan)*. The Australian National University.

Wilkins, D. (1989). *Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda): Studies in the structure and semantics of grammar.* The Australian National University.

Wilkinson, M. P. (1991). *Djambarrpuyngu: A Yolngu variety of northern Australia*. University of Sydney.

Yallop, C. (1977). *Alyawarra: An Aboriginal language of Central Australia*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.