JS SUBMISSION FOR PUBLICATION
JOURNAL of HISTORICAL SYNTAX
PRE-REVIEW — SUBMITTED VERSION AS OF MAY 17, 2025

PARAMETER LIST*
Support material of "What are your Values? Default and asymmetry in parameter states"

P. CRISMA, G. FABBRIS, G. LONGOBARDI, C. GUARDIANO

Parameter Index

For readers who prefer a printed version of the article and/or the *Parameter List*, we list the parameter labels in alphabetical order with page numbers.

This file expands and updates the online *Appendix* of Crisma, Guardiano and Longobardi (2020)[1](available at: www.parametricomparison.unimore.it > MATERIALS > Parameter setting algorithm) with the addition of the overt evidence associated with the default state of each parameter, where existing.

* The parameters have been mostly assembled by Guardiano and Longobardi over the past fifteen years, and used in a number of publications. Crisma contributed to the reformulation of some of them, Fabbris investigated in particular the evidence for [−] for various parameters.

1 Syntactic diversity and language learnability *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* LVIII(2), pp. 99–130.

Parameter setting and implicational rules

Every parameter is associated with one or more manifestations expressed in the form of existential statements that set its state to [+]. Some parameters (those that are not subsetting in our terminology) are also associated with overt evidence for [−].

Finding evidence for one manifestation is sufficient to set the relevant parameter to [+] even if the parameter has multiple manifestation (the same holds for the overt evidence for [−]).

Owing to the network of implications among parameters, a given parameter may be neutralized in certain languages. If a parameter is implicationally neutralized in a certain language, the corresponding manifestations must be disregarded altogether, for they would be irrelevant and in some cases misleading or contradictory.

The implicational rules among the parameter is our dataset are listed here below, expressed in a Boolean form: either as simple values of other parameters, or as conjunctions (written ','), disjunctions ('or'), or negation ('¬') thereof. In the implicational rules, parentheses are used to explicitly signify the order of embedding of disjunctions (which are all logically inclusive: *vel*, not *aut*) with respect to conjunctions.

The list of parameters with their implications is to be read top-down, so that a given parameter may implicationally affect another parameter further down in the list, but not vice versa. This ordering is not to be interpreted as a hypothesis on the order of parameter setting in acquisition, a topic which we do not address.

FGM	±grammaticalized morphology	
FGA	±grammaticalized agreement	+FGM
FGK	±grammaticalized Case	+FGM
SPK	±grammaticalized (ultra)spatial Cases	+FGK
FGP	±grammaticalized Person	+FGM
FSP	±semantic Person	¬+FGP
FGN	±grammaticalized Number	+FGP
SCO	±spread group marker	+FGM, ¬+FGN
GDP	±grammaticalized distributive plurality	+FGM, ¬+FGN
FSN	±Number spread to N	+FGN
FNN	±Number on N	+FSN

FGT	±grammaticalized temporality	
FGG	±grammaticalized Gender	+FGN
FSG	±semantic Gender	+FGN
CGB	±unbounded singular nouns	
FPC	±grammaticalized perception	
DGR	±grammaticalized Specified Quantity	+FGN, −FPC
DGP	±grammaticalized text anaphora	¬+DGR
CGR	±long-distance Specified Quantity	−CGB, +DGR
NWD	±long-distance reference	−FSN or +DGR
FVP	±variable Person	+FGA, −NWD
DGD	±grammaticalized distality	−FSN or +DGR
DPQ	±free null partitive Q	+FNN, −CGB
DCN	±article-checking N	−FSN or +DGR
DNN	±null-N-licensing art	−DCN
DIN	±D-controlled inflection on N	+FSN
FGC	±grammaticalized classifier	¬+FGN
FGE	±grammaticalized bounding classifier	−FGM, +FGC
FCN	±Person spread to predicate nouns	+FGP
HMP	±NP-heading modifier	
ARR	±free reduced relatives	
GCN	±head-marking with Genitive	
GFN	±Person controlled marking	+FGP, +GCN
GFP	±agreement with all pronouns	+GFN
GP3	±agreement with all 3rd-person DPs	+GFP
GEI	±Genitive inversion	+GP3
CSE	±full c-selection	
EAL	±ergative alignment	+FGK, +CSE
CAL	±clausal alignment	+FGK, ¬+GP3, +CSE, ¬+EAL
LKA	±argument linker	
LKO	±oblique linker	−LKA
LKP	±predicative linker	

DMP	±def matching pronominal possessives	+DCN
DMG	±def matching Genitives	+DMP
GUN	±uniform Genitive	(−GCN or (+GFP, −GP3)), −CAL, −LKA
GAD	±free Gen	−LKA, ¬+GUN
GFL	±GenL	(−GCN or +GFN), ¬+GP3, ¬+EAL, ¬+GUN
PGL	±partial GenL	−GFL
GGH	±generalized GenH	−CGR, +NWD, ¬+GFP, ¬+GUN
GSI	±grammaticalized inalienability	
ALP	±alienable possession	−GSI
GIT	±Genitive-licensing iteration	
UST	±unstructured modifiers	+ARR
GPC	±gender-polarity cardinals	+FGG
PSC	±plural spread from cardinal quantifiers	+FSN, ¬+UST, ¬+GPC
PCA	±plural spread through cardinal adjectives	−PSC
PMN	±Person marking on numerals	+GFP
RHM	±Person marking on the head of relative clauses	+FGP
FRC	±finite relative clauses	
NRC	±participial relative clauses	+FRC
DOR	±definiteness on relatives	+DGR, +FRC
FFP	±feature spread to particles	+FGN, ¬+GFP, (+LKA or +LKP or +LKO or (−GUN, ¬−GAD))
NUP	±NP under non-genitive arguments	+FGP, (+CSE or +LKA or +LKO)
PNP	±complement under P	+FGP, (−CSE or −NUP)
NUD	±NP under D	+FGP
NUC	±N under cardinals	¬+UST, +PNP, +NUD
NM1	±N under M1 As	+NUC
EAF	±fronted high As	−NM1
NM2	±N under M2 As	+NM1
NUA	±N under As	+NM2
NGL	±N under GenL	((+FGP, +UST) or +NUA), (+GUN or +GFL or +PGL)

ACM	±class MOD	−ARR, −NGL
DSN	±definiteness spread to N	+DCN
DSA	±definiteness spread to ARR	+DGR, +ARR
DSS	±definiteness spread to structured categories	+DGR, (−ARR or +DSA)
DOC	±definiteness on cardinals	−NWD, +DCN, +NUC
NEX	±proper names in D	(−FSN or −CGR), −NWD, ¬+NUA
PEX	±personal proper names in D	+NEX
FEX	±partial personal proper names in D	+PEX
PDC	±D-checking possessives	+DGR, (¬−CGR or −NWD), ¬+GFP
PCL	±clitic possessives	+FGP, ¬+GFP, ¬+DMP, ¬+UST, (−PDC or ¬+DGR)
APO	±adjectival possessives	¬+GFP, ¬+UST
WAP	±Wackernagel possessives	¬+DMP, +NUD, −PDC, (−APO or (−NM1, +APO))
AGE	±adjectival genitive	+APO
OPK	±null possessive licensing article with kinship nouns	+DGR, −GSI
TSP	±split demonstratives	−FSN or +DGR
TDP	±split non-deictic demonstratives	+TSP
TDC	±D-checking demonstratives	−TSP
TSA	±structured demonstratives (adjectival)	¬+UST, ¬+TSP, ((+DGR, +NM1) or (−ARR, −NM1) or −NUC)
TAR	±unstructured demonstratives (adjectival)	+ARR, ¬+TSP
TLC	±demonstratives in Loc	¬+TSP, ¬+TDC, (+TSA or (+PNP, +TAR))
TND	±long distance D-checking demonstratives	+CGR, (+TSA or +TAR)
TDA	±definiteness spread to adjectival demonstratives	(+DSA or +DSS), (+TSA or +TAR)
TNL	±DP under Loc	+TSP or +TLC or (¬+TSP, ¬+TDC, ¬+TSA, ¬+TAR)

FGM, ±grammaticalized morphology
Distinguishes languages that have words containing bound morphemes for grammatical meanings (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic, Japanese) from languages that do not (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has affixes or regular phonological alternations that change the grammatical category of the base

ex: *danger-dangerous*
sing-song

b) The language has roots which take different affixes/phonological alternations encoding different closed-class interpretable/grammatical properties (tense, aspect, number, gender, gradation, case, etc.)

ex: *cat-cats*
sing-sang

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

FGA, ±grammaticalized agreement
Distinguishes languages that have distinct words agreeing in φ-features with each other (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic) from languages that do not (e.g., Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds alternations where a feature occurring on a word takes its value from ("agrees with", "concords with") another occurrence of the same feature on another word

ex. *this cat - these/those cats*

il	*gatto*	*nero*	ITALIAN
the.M.SG	cat.M.SG	black.M.SG	
'the black cat'			
la	*gatta*	*nera*	
the.F.SG	cat.F.SG	black.F.SG	
'the black she-cat'			
i	*gatti*	*neri*	
the.M.PL	cat.M.PL	black.M.PL	
'the black cats'			

ex. *I like - she likes*

tu	*cant**i***	ITALIAN
2SG.NOM	sing.2SG	
'you sing'		
voi	*cant**ate***	
2PL.NOM	sing.2PL	
'you-guys/y'all sing'		

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

FGK, ±grammaticalized Case
Distinguishes languages where the morphology of nouns, pronouns and/or determiners varies according to their being subjects/agents or objects or oblique complements (e.g., English, German, Hungarian, Japanese, Archi) from languages where such alternations are not attested (e.g., Garifuna, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The morphology of personal or relative pronouns occurring as arguments varies according to their being subjects/agents or objects or oblique complements

ex. ***I*** *like the teacher*

the teacher likes ***me***

b) In nominal arguments, the morphology of quantifiers, demonstratives, and/or definite/indefinite articles varies according to the argument being a subject/agent or an object or an oblique complement

ex. ***der*** *König traf die Gäste* GERMAN
the.NOM king met the guests
'the king met the guests'

ich habe ***den*** *König getroffen*
I have the.ACC king met
'I met the king'

c) In nominal arguments, the morphology of nouns varies according to the argument being a subject/agent or an object or an oblique complement

ex. ο βασιλι**άς** έφυγε GREEK
o vasiliás éfiye
the.NOM king.NOM left.3SG
'the king has left'

γνώρισα τον βασιλι**ά**
gnórisa ton vasiliá
met.1SG the.ACC king.ACC
'I met the king'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Items designating the speaker, the addressee and the non-participants (i.e. 1st-, 2nd- and 3rd-person pronouns) are all invariant with respect to their being subjects/agents or objects or oblique complements

ex. *eiha ha-ma-di-**na*** GARIFUNA
see they-have-DI-1SG
'They have seen me' (DI = relator)

*chülü-ha-di-**na***
arrive-PRF-DI-1SG
'I have arrived'

*wuriba-t-i-**na***
bad-PRET-I-1SG
'I am bad' (I = relator)
(all examples adapted from Devonish and Castillo 2002)

SPK, ±grammaticalized (ultra)spatial Cases
Distinguishes languages that mark nouns, pronouns, adjectives and/or determiners for morphological Cases encoding both simple spatial meanings (stative location, direction, source) and some more complex ones (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish, Udmurt, Even, Evenki) from languages that do not (e.g., English, Russian, Latin, Arabic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has morphological Case distinctions expressing spatial relations more complex than stative location, direction and source (e.g. adessive vs. inessive)

ex. *a ház-on* HUNGARIAN
the house.SUPERESSIVE
'on the house'

a ház-ban
the house.INESSIVE
'in the house'

a ház-nál
the house.ADESSIVE
'at the house'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) At least one of the simple spatial relations (stative location, direction, source) is expressed by means of adpositions

ex. *The children are at school*

The children are going to school

The children are coming from school

FGP, ±grammaticalized Person
Distinguishes languages that express Person distinctions on categories other than pronouns (e.g. English, Italian, Hungarian, Hebrew) from languages that do not (e.g., Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on the verb that depend on the speech-role of the subject

ex. *I* ***am*** *leaving*

you ***are*** *leaving*

Mary/she ***is*** *leaving*

b) One finds speech-role-sensitive clitics that double the subject of the verb

ex. (*ti*) ***te*** *ga* *magnà* TRIESTINO
2SG 2SG.CLI have eaten
'you have eaten'

Mario/Maria ***el/la*** *ga* *magnà*
Mario.M.SG/Maria.F.SG 3SG.M.CLI/3SG.F.CLI have eaten
'Mario/Maria has eaten'

Mario *e* *Maria* ***i*** *ga* *magnà*
Mario and Maria 3PL.CLI have eaten
'Mario and Maria have eaten'

c) One finds overt expletive items in subject function

ex. ***it*** *is summer*

it *is a pity that you have to leave*

it *seems that he has been arrested*

d) One finds overt resumptive items in (direct or indirect) object function

ex. *a* *Gianni* ***gli*** *ho* *dato* *una* *penna*
to Gianni.M.SG 3SG.M.DAT.CLI have.1SG given a.F.SG pen.F.SG
'I gave a pen to Gianni' ITALIAN

e) One finds items that can occur as referentially independent pronouns and can also occur as a variable bound by a quantified antecedent like 'no-one'/'everyone'

ex. *Mary likes him*

everyone$_i$ believes that Mary likes ***him***$_i$

f) Speech-role-designating items precede adjectives that are pre-nominal when a noun is present

ex. *some young scholars participated in the project*

we young *are all influencers now*

a krízis aggaszt-ott-a a magyar embere-ek-et
the crisis made.anxious-PAST-DEF the Hungarian people-PL-ACC
'the crisis made Hungarian people anxious' HUNGARIAN

a krízis aggaszt-ott ***mink-et*** ***magyar-ok-at***
the crisis made.anxious-PAST us-ACC Hungarian-PL-ACC
'the crisis made us Hungarians anxious'

g) The language has no article, but nominal arguments with a cardinal numeral following a possessive, an adjective meaning 'other', 'same/even' or 'unique', or the noun itself receive definite interpretation

ex. *moje trzy książki* POLISH
my three books
'my three books'= only definite interpretation (Rutkowski 2007)

trzy moje książki
three my books
'three books of mine'= indefinite interpretation (Rutkowski 2007)

h) One finds speech-role-designating morphemes alternating between a stressed and a clitic form

ex. *Claudio* ***lo*** *odia* ITALIAN
Claudio him hates
'Claudio hates him'

Claudio odia ***lui***
Claudio hates him
'Claudio hates him'= contrastive

i) Common nouns in non-argument function can occur bare, while the same nouns in argument function require the addition of some overt functional category
NEGATIVE EVIDENCE

ex. *Ronald Reagan was President of the United States from 1981 to 1989*

the President of the United States met with survivors of another deadly school shooting

**president of the United States met with survivors of another deadly school shooting*

si finge dottore ITALIAN
REFL fakes.3SG doctor
'he/she pretends to be a doctor'

il/un/quel dottore è scomparso
the/a/that doctor is disappeared
'the/a/that doctor has disappeared'

* dottore è scomparso

j) Proper names in non-argument function can occur bare, while the same proper names in subject function require the addition of some overt functional category
NEGATIVE EVIDENCE

ex. *si comportano da Juventus* ITALIAN
REFL behave.3PL as Juventus
'They act like Juventus'

la Juventus è insopportabile
the Juventus is unbearable
'Juventus is unbearable'

* *Juventus è insopportabile*

k) Nominal arguments with understood maximality denotation (definiteness) are overtly marked as such (typically, by a 'definite article', or some other source of definiteness, e.g. demonstratives, genitive/possessive arguments)

ex. *I met a family. The children were very nice.* (**Children were very nice.*)

I took a taxi. The driver was drunk. (**Driver was drunk*)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) One finds "indicative" (modus realis) clauses where the verb is invariable with respect to Person and the subject is null

ex. *piza-o* *tabemashita* JAPANESE
pizza-ACC ate
'I/you/he etc. ate pizza'

FSP, ±semantic Person
Distinguishes languages that express Person distinctions on pronouns (personal, reflexives) (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese) from languages that do not (e.g., Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on reflexives depending on the speech-role of their antecedents

ex. *wo* *chaoyue-le* *wo-ziji* MANDARIN
SPEAKER outdo-PERF SPEAKER-REFL
'I outdid myself'

ni *chaoyue-le* *ni-ziji*
ADDRESSEE outdo-PERF ADDRESSEE-REFL
'you (sg) outdid yourself'

Mali *chaoyue-le* *ta-ziji*
Mary outdo-PERF NONPARTICIPANT-REFL
'Mary outdid herself'

b) The language has a system of personal pronouns single-membered per each speech-role, with a dedicated morpheme encoding the non-uniqueness of the referent at least for some speech-roles

ex. *wo,* *ni,* *ta* MANDARIN
SPEAKER, ADDRESSEE, NONPARTICIPANT
'I, thou, he/she/it'

wo-men, *ni-men,* *ta-men*
SPEAKER-GROUP, ADDRESSEE-GROUP, NONPARTICIPANT-GROUP
'we, you (pl), they'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

FGN, ±grammaticalized Number
Distinguishes languages that obligatorily express at least singular/plural distinctions in nominal phrases (e.g., English, Finnish, Hebrew) from languages that do not (e.g., Kuikuro, Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on nominal arguments (on the head noun or a definite article/demonstrative/quantifier/adjective) that oppose singular to non-singular interpretation

ex. ***il*** *gatt**o*** (*miagola*) ITALIAN
the.M.SG cat.M.SG meow.3SG
'the cat (meows)'

i *gatt**i*** (*miagolano*)
the.M.PL cat.M.PL meow.3PL
'(the) cats (meow)'

b) One finds morphological alternations on the verb that depend on the singular/non-singular interpretation of the subject

ex. *il* *gatto* *miagol**a*** ITALIAN
the.M.SG cat.M.SG meow.3SG
'the cat meows'

i *gatti* *miagol**ano***
the.M.PL cat.M.PL meow.3PL
'(the) cats meow'

c) Within nominal arguments, one finds morphological alternations on adjectives that depend on the singular/non-singular interpretation of the noun (or of the definite article/demonstrative/quantifier)

ex. *il* *gatt**o*** *bianc**o*** (*miagola*) ITALIAN
the.M.SG cat.M.SG white.M.SG meow.3SG
'the white cat meows'

i *gatt**i*** *bianch**i*** (*miagolano*)
the.M.PL cat.M.PL white.M.PL meow.3PL
'the white cats meow'

d) One finds morphological alternations on 3rd-person reflexives that depend on the singular/non-singular interpretation of their antecedents

ex. *the boy likes himself*

the boys like themselves

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, nominal arguments are formally neutral between a singular and a non-singular interpretation

ex. *kangamuke iniluN-tagü* KUIKURO
child cry-DUR
'a/the child is crying / (the) children are crying'

kangamuke enge-tagü u-akunga-gü heke
child eat-DUR 1-shadow-POSS ERG
'my shadow is scaring (a/the) child/children' (Franchetto 2021: 5)

Hufei mai shu qu le MANDARIN
Hufei buy book go SFP
'Hufei went to buy a book/books' (SFP = sentence-final particle)

Wufei heoi maai syu CANTONESE
Wufei go buy book
'Wufei went to buy a book/books' (Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 510)

SCO, ±spread group marker
Distinguishes languages that have agreeing morphology on nouns and their modifiers that is optionally used to express group reading (e.g., Kuikuro) from languages that do not (e.g., Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where the noun bears an optional marker for 'group reading' that is doubled on its modifiers

ex. *itão-ko* *itütü-ko* KUIKURO
woman-GROUP nice-GROUP
'nice women'

itão-ko *hesini-ko*
woman-GROUP ugly-GROUP
'ugly women'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nominal modifiers have the same form regardless of whether they occur with nouns bearing group morphology or not

ex. *boku-wa* ***wakai*** *otoko-ni* *at-ta* JAPANESE
I-TOP young man-DAT meet-PAST
'I met the/a young man / (the) young men'

boku-wa ***wakai*** *otoko-tati-ni* *at-ta*
I-TOP young man-GROUP-DAT meet-PAST
'I met the/some young men'

GDP, ±grammaticalized distributive plurality
Distinguishes languages that systematically mark distributive interpretation with a morpheme on both the distributed and the quantified nominal argument (e.g., Korean) from languages that do not (e.g., Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In sentences containing an argument distributed over by another quantifying argument, the morpheme which functions as a marker of the distributive reading occurs both on the quantified and on the quantifying nominal

ex. *haksayng-(tul)-i* *phwungsen* *hana-lul* *sa-ss-ta*
student-GROUP-NOM balloon one-ACC buy-PAST-DECL
'the students bought a balloon' KOREAN

haksayng-tul-i* *phwungsen* *hana-lul-tul*** *sa-ss-ta*
student-GROUP-NOM balloon one-ACC-GROUP buy-PAST-DECL
'the students bought a balloon each'
*Obligatory as antecedent of the second occurrence.
**Locally bound (obeys Principle A). Goes after the Case morpheme when it is spread.

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) In a sentence where an argument is interpreted as distributed over another argument, the presence of one group marker suffices to obtain this interpretation

ex. *ano* *gakusei-tati-ga* (*sorezore*) *keeki* *hu-tatu-o* *tabeta*
those student-GROUP-NOM (singly) cake two-CLF-ACC ate
'the students ate two cakes each' JAPANESE

FSN, ±Number spread to N
Distinguishes languages that may mark Number distinctions on nouns (e.g., French, English, Italian) from languages that mark Number distinctions only on determiners (e.g., Basque, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has nouns that bear variable number morphology

ex. *il* *gatto* (*miagola*) ITALIAN
the.M.SG cat.M.SG meow.3SG
'the cat (meows)'

i *gatti* (*miagolano*)
the.M.PL cat.M.PL meow.3PL
'(the) cats (meow)'

adopter *un* *animal* *est* *une* *responsabilité*
adopt.INF a.M.SG animal.M.SG is a.F.SG responsibility.F.SG
'to adopt a pet is a responsibility' FRENCH

adopter *des* *animaux* *est* *une* *responsabilité*
adopt.INF of.the.M.SG animal.M.PL is a.F.SG responsibility.F.SG
'to adopt pets is a responsibility'

b) One finds bare nouns in (at least some) argument function

ex. *ho* *bevuto* ***acqua*** ITALIAN
have.1SG drunk water
'I drank water'

ho *incontrato* ***studenti*** *per* *tutto* *il* *giorno*
have.1SG met students for all the day
'I have been meeting students all day long'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, nouns are formally neutral between a singular/plural interpretation (which may however be expressed by a determiner), regardless of the phonetic environment

ex. *gu* ***sagarr****-a* *jaten* *ari* *dira* BASQUE
we apple-ART.SG eating PROGR are
'We are eating the/an apple'

gu ***sagarr****-ak* *jaten* *ari* *dira*
we apple-ART.PL eating PROGR are
'We are eating (the) apples'

Jon-ek ***etxe*** *gorri-a* *erosi* *du*
Jon-ERG house red-ART.SG bought has
'Jon bought the/a red house'

hiru ***etxe*** *gorri* *haiek*
three house red yonder
'those three red houses'

xaj *b-i* WOLOF
dog CLASS-DEF.PROX
'the dog'

xaj *y-i*
dog CLASS-DEF.PROX
'the dogs'

xaal *w-u* *réy* *w-i*
melon CLASS-LK big CLASS-DEF
'the big melon'

xaal *yi-u* *réy* *y-i*
melon CLASS-LK big CLASS-DEF
'the big melons'

FNN, ±Number on N
Distinguishes languages that have pervasive pronounced exponence of number morphology on nouns (e.g., English, Italian) from languages that do not (e.g., French)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has systematic exponence of number morphology distinguishing singular vs. plural number on nouns, not definable as a lexical/phonological idiosyncrasy

ex. *cat - cats*

gatto - gatti ITALIAN

gato - gatos SPANISH

b) One finds bare nouns in (at least some) argument function

ex. *ho* *bevuto* ***acqua*** ITALIAN
have.1SG drunk water
'I drank water'

ho *incontrato* *studenti* *per* *tutto* *il* *giorno*
have.1SG met students for all the day
'I have been meeting students all day long'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, nouns have the same phonetic form, regardless of their singular/plural interpretation, though Number distinctions on nouns may surface in given phonological contexts

ex. *le* *gros* *chien* - *les* *gros* *chiens* FRENCH
[lə ɡʁo ʃiɛ̃] [le ɡʁo ʃiɛ̃]
the.SG big dog the.PL big dogs
'the big dog - the big dogs '

un *livre* - *deux* *livres*
[œ̃ livʁ] [dø livʁ]
a/one book two books
'a/one book - two books'

FGT, ±grammaticalized temporality
Distinguishes languages that systematically express whether the property denoted by a noun holds/no longer holds/does not hold yet at the speech time through a bound morpheme in the nominal (e.g., Kuikuro) from languages that do not (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a dedicated bound morpheme that, when attached to nouns referring to natural kinds (animals, people, plants, ...) and material objects, signals that the property they denote is not true at the speech time even when a verb or adjective in the sentence already expresses the state-changing effect (through time) on the denotatum

ex. *oku-**pe*** *atsunkgili-pügü* *leha* KUIKURO
porridge-'ex' spoil-PRF CMPL
'the (rotten) porridge is spoiled'

kagaiha *heke* *kangamuke-**pe*** *e-lü*
white ERG child-'ex' kill-PNCT
'the white man killed the (dead) child'(adapted from Franchetto & Thomas 2016)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Nouns have the same form regardless of whether the property they denote is true or holds at the relevant time

ex. *I see the **child** over there*

*the white man killed the **child*** [*that now is dead*]

*I bought some **porridge***

*the **porridge** is spoiled* [*it has become rotten*]

FGG, ±grammaticalized Gender
Distinguishes languages that exhibit at least some agreement in Gender between a noun and a determiner or modifier (e.g., French, Italian, Wolof) from languages that do not (e.g., English, Uralic, Altaic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on articles/demonstratives/quantifiers that are controlled by the gender/noun class of the noun

ex. *il* *cucchiaio,* *questo* *cucchiaio,* *un* *cucchiaio*
the.M.SG spoon.M.SG, this.M.SG spoon.M.SG, a.M.SG spoon.M.SG

la *forchetta,* *questa* *forchetta,* *una* *forchetta*
the.F.SG fork.F.SG, this.F.SG fork.F.SG, a.F.SG fork.F.SG

ITALIAN

b) One finds morphological alternations on NP-modifying adjectives that are controlled by the gender/noun class of the noun

ex. *il* *cucchiaio* *pulito* ITALIAN
the.M.SG spoon.M.SG clean.M.SG
'the clean spoon'

la *forchetta* *pulita*
the.F.SG fork.F.SG clean.F.SG
'the clean fork'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Nominal determiners and modifiers (articles, demonstratives, quantifiers, adjectives) have the same form, regardless of any inherent lexical property (e.g. sex, animacy etc.) of the head noun they occur with

ex. *the main actor received a nomination*

the main actress received a nomination

the last movie received a nomination

FSG, ±semantic Gender
Distinguishes languages that contrast at least two 3rd-person pronouns encoding animacy and/or perceived biological sex (e.g., English) from languages that do not (e.g., Hungarian, Turkish, Even, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has distinct 3rd-person pronominal forms depending on the sex/animacy of the referent

ex. *everybody likes the king:* ***he*** *is really nice*

everybody likes the queen: ***she*** *is really nice*

everybody likes this book: ***it*** *is really interesting*

everybody praised the actor: ***he*** *is excellent*

everybody praised the actress: ***she*** *is excellent*

everybody praised the movie: ***it*** *is excellent*

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) 3rd-person pronouns have the same form regardless of animacy and/or biological sex of the referent

ex. *köpek* ***onu*** *ağac-ın altında buldu* TURKISH
dog him/her/it tree-GEN under found
'The dog found him/her/it under the tree'

ex. *Robert de Niro híres színész(*nő). **Ő** a kedvenc-em.* HUNGARIAN
Robert de Niro famous actor (*actress). 3SG the favorite-POSS.1SG
'Robert de Niro is a famous actor. He is my favorite.'

*Julia Roberts híres színész(nő). **Ő** a kedvenc-em.*
Julia Roberts famous actor (actress). 3SG the favorite-POSS.1SG
'Julia Roberts is a famous actress. She is my favorite.'

CGB, ±unbounded singular nouns
Distinguishes languages that have singular (or number-neutral, in languages without grammaticalized Number) count bare nouns with an unbounded reading, i.e. indefinite, scopeless, atelic in incorporated object position (e.g., Hungarian, Turkish, Hindi) from languages that do not (e.g., Russian, Icelandic, Celtic, Hebrew)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In a language with grammaticalized Number, one finds bare singular count nouns with an indefinite number-neutral reading occurring in the object position of an atelic predicate

ex. *a gyerek-ek almá-t szed-nek* HUNGARIAN
the child-PL apple-SG.ACC pick-INDEF.3PL
'the children are picking apples (=apple-picking)'
(adapted from Kenesei et al 1998: 330)

anu puure din cuuhaa pakaRtii rahii HINDI
Anu whole day mouse.SG catch.IMP PROGR
'Anu kept catching mice (different ones) the whole day'(Dayal 2011)

A: *John enna velai seigiraan?* TAMIL
John what work does
'What's John's job?'
B: *avan seerundhu virkindraan*
he car.SG sells
'He sells cars'

b) In a language without grammaticalized Number, bare nouns in subject position have a definite reading, while the indefinite, non-presuppositional, non-numeral reading is marked by a dedicated morpheme

ex. *gou yao guo malu* MANDARIN
dog want cross road
'the dog wants to cross the road'(cannot mean: 'a dog wants ...')

you gou yao guo malu
INDEF dog want cross road
'a dog/some dogs want(s) to cross the road'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

FPC, ±grammaticalized perception
Distinguishes languages in which nouns have an unbounded reading (like that of English existential bare plurals) whenever they are not accompanied by a morpheme functioning like English articles but encoding contrasts about the perceived position of the denotatum (e.g., Kadiweu) from languages that do not (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic, Japanese, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a functional morpheme (other than demonstratives) that attaches to arguments and encodes the speaker's perception of the position or movement of a nominal argument's referent, and whose absence results in an unbounded reading of the nominal

ex. *João yaa i-jo apolikaGana-Ga* KADIWEU
João 3.buy M-PERC horse-NOMINALIZER
'João buys a/the horse' (perceived as moving away from the speaker)

João yaa i apolikaGana-Ga
João 3.buy M horse-NOMINALIZER
'João buys (one or more) horses'

i-d:i ninyoGo-di
M-PERC water-NOMINALIZER
'a/the (unit of) water'
in a horizontally extended container/layer/vessel
(Sandalo & Michelioudakis 2016: 7-8)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Nominal arguments with definite/specific/bounded reference have the same form, regardless of the speaker's perception of the position or movement of the argument's referent

ex. *I can see the/a horse that is coming towards me*

I can see the/a horse that is running away from me

DGR, ±grammaticalized Specified Quantity
Distinguishes languages that obligatorily encode whether a nominal argument is definite, i.e. maximal in the domain of discourse, (e.g., English, German, Italian, French, Irish, Welsh, Classical Greek, Standard Greek, Hebrew, Arabic) from languages that do not (e.g., Polish, Russian, Hindi)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has an overt marker found with nominal arguments having a definite interpretation (= with maximal reading) denoting entities introduced in the domain of discourse but not directly mentioned; this marker is different from those found with arguments having non-maximal reading

ex. *I met a few families. **The** children were well-behaved.*
(as opposed to: ***Some** children were well-behaved. / **A** child was well-behaved*.)

*I took a taxi. **The** driver was drunk.*
(as opposed to: ***A** driver was drunk.*)

b) The language has an overt marker found with argument common nouns denoting a maximal specific entity considered unique by the speaker and the hearer (hence with definite interpretation); this marker is different from those found when the entity is not considered unique

ex. *The king addressed his cabinet*
(as opposed to: *A king and three presidents attended the peace conference*)

The sun is the center of our solar system
(as opposed to: *There is a beautiful sun, not too hot*)

c) The language has an overt marker found with nominal arguments headed by a singular count noun and referring to the whole kind named by that noun; this marker is different from those found with non-maximal (i.e. indefinite) readings

ex. *the dodo is extinct*
(as opposed to: *I saw a dodo*.)

d) The language has an overt marker found with nominal arguments headed by a mass/plural noun and referring to the whole kind named by that noun;

this marker is different from those found with non-maximal (i.e. indefinite) readings

ex. *i* *dinosauri* *sono* *estinti* ITALIAN
the.M.PL dinosaur.M.PL be.3PL extinct.M.PL
'Dinosaurs are extinct'

(as opposed to:
quel *pittore* *ha* *dipinto* (*dei*) *dinosauri*
that.M.SG painter.M.SG has.3SG painted of.the.M.PL dinosaur.M.PL
'That painter painted (s'm) dinosaurs')

l' *acqua* *fa* *bene*
the.F.SG water.F.SG do.3S well
'Water is healthy'

(as opposed to:
bere (*un'/dell'*) *acqua* *povera* *di* *sodio* *ti*
drink a.F.SG/of.the.F.SG water.F.SG poor.F.SG of sodium 2S.DAT
farebbe *bene*
do.3S.SBJV well
'It would be healthy for you to drink (a/some) water with little sodium')

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) One finds bare nominal arguments interpreted as definite (= with maximal reading)

ex. *kniga* *byla* *dorogoj* RUSSIAN
book.F.SG.NOM AUX.PAST.F.SG expensive.F.SG.INSTR
'The book was expensive'

b) One finds bare nominal arguments headed by a singular count/plural/mass noun that occur as the complement of a telic predicate and are interpreted as existential

ex. *John* *čital* *gazetu* *v* *dva* *chasa* RUSSIAN
John read newspaper in two hours
'John read a/the newspaper in two hours'

ja s'ela jabloki za den'
1SG ate apples behind day
'I ate some/the apples in a day'

ja vypila vino za den'
1SG drank wine behind day
'I drank some/the wine in a day'

DGP, ±grammaticalized text anaphora
Distinguishes languages that systematically encode a noun's previous mention in the discourse (e.g., Imbabura Quichua, Archi) from languages that do not (e.g., Latin, Russian, Hindi, Mandarin, Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a marker found with nominal arguments denoting an entity that has been mentioned in the previous context ('anaphoric reading'), which is not found when definiteness is determined from the pragmatic context

ex. (*shuj*) *alku-ta-mi* *riku-rka-ni.* *Chay* / *Kay* *alku-ka*
one dog-ACC-FOC see-PAST-1SG that / this dog-NOM
wakaju-rka-mi
bark-PAST-FOC
'I saw a dog. The dog was barking' IMBABURA QUICHUA

(as opposed to:

(*shuj*) *autubus-ta-mi* *japi-rka-ni.* *Kundujturr-ka* *machosh-ka-mi*
one bus-ACC-FOC take-PAST-1SG driver-NOM drunk-NOM-FOC
ka-rka
be-PAST
'I took a bus. The driver was drunk'

... *Chay/Kay* *kundujturr-ka* ...
... that/this driver-NOM ...
'... That/this driver ...' only possible if the driver is not the driver of the bus I took

indi-ka *achiyajun-mi* / *lusiru-mi*
sun-NOM shine-FOC / be.brilliant-FOC
'the sun is shining' **chay/kay indika ...*)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

CGR, ±long-distance Specified Quantity
Distinguishes languages that freely admit bare singular count indefinite arguments (e.g., Icelandic, Celtic, Semitic, Classical Greek) from languages that obligatorily mark a singular count indefinite argument through a dedicated morpheme (e.g., Romance, English, German, Mainland Scandinavian, Standard Greek)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds bare singular count nouns with an indefinite reading in subject position

ex. *kelev nashax oti* HEBREW
dog bit ECM.1SG
'a dog bit me'

b) One finds bare nominal arguments with a definite Genitive not occurring at their boundary that have a definite reading

ex. *lausn Péturs á vandamál-inu* ICELANDIC
solution Pétur.GEN of problem-the
'Pétur's solution of the problem' (Sigurðsson 2006: §2.4 ex. 7)

disgrifiad cywir y ddamwain WELSH
description accurate the accident
'the accurate description of the accident'
(adapted from Rouveret 1994)

c) One finds bare nominal arguments containing a demonstrative not occurring at their boundary

ex. *more ze šel ha-yeled* HEBREW
teacher this of the-boy
'this teacher of the boy'

d) One finds nominal arguments where a definiteness affix is attached to the noun occurring in a non-boundary position, and no other overt definite category appears at the boundary

ex. *rauðu bækur-nar um Napóleon* ICELANDIC
red books-the about Napoleon
'the red books about Napoleon' (adapted from Sigurðsson 2006)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

NWD, ±long-distance reference
Distinguishes languages in which nominal arguments headed by proper names and kind names can occur bare (e.g., English, German, Wolof) from languages that always fill the determiner position with the proper name itself or an article (e.g., Italian, Spanish, French, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) DP is head-initial, and one finds bare arguments headed by a proper name following an adjective

ex. *Ancient Rome was a powerful city*

b) One finds bare arguments headed by a plural/mass noun receiving a kind-referring interpretation

ex. *Dinosaurs are extinct*

Mme Curie discovered radium

c) One finds unmodified bare arguments headed by a plural/mass noun occurring in subject position with generic interpretation

ex. *Dogs are dangerous*

Water is the best thing to drink to stay hydrated

d) One finds definite specific bare nominal arguments containing a prenominal genitive non-agreeing in phi-features with the head noun

ex. *John's bike* (≠ *a bike of John's*)

e) DP is head-initial, and the language has definiteness affixes that occur on non-initial constituents of bare nominal arguments

ex. *stóra bók-in* ICELANDIC
large book-the
'the large book'

f) One finds possessives occurring without a determiner in argument phrases with no nominal head

ex. *mine is better*

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

FVP, ±variable Person
Distinguishes languages in which nominal phrases with Person-unmarked articles (or demonstratives) can denote first and second person entities (e.g., Spanish, Standard Greek) from languages that cannot, and use a personal pronoun in such cases (e.g., English, Italian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal subjects not overtly marked as 1st/2nd person that control 1st/2nd-person verb agreement

ex. *las/algunas mujeres* ***estamos*** *cansadas* SPANISH
the/some women be.1PL.PRES tired
'we women/some of us women are tired'

b) One finds nominals in topic position that are not overtly marked as 1st/2nd person but are resumed by a 1st/2nd-person pronoun

ex. *a los hombres siempre* ***nos*** *gusta exagerar* SPANISH
to the men always to-us pleases exaggerate
'we men always like to exaggerate'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DGD, ±grammaticalized distality
Distinguishes languages that must always specify whether the definite denotatum of a nominal is regarded as proximate or distal in space and time through different forms of their article (e.g., Wolof, western Basque) from languages that only have a deictically neutral article (e.g., English, German, Spanish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has different articles marking a distinction between proximate vs. non-proximate (in time or space), which are different from determiners encoding deictic/discourse-anaphoric features (e.g. demonstratives)

ex. *Gótik yi yàq nañu Rome bu jëkk*
Goths CLASS.PL.DEF destroy 3PL.PERF Rome CLASS.LK ancient
ba WOLOF
CLASS.SG.DEF.DIST
'the Goths destroyed ancient Rome'

*Rom-u tey **bi***
Rome-of today CLASS.SG.DEF
'contemporary Rome'

ex. *gizon-**ak*** W. BASQUE
man-ART.PL
'the men'

*gizon-**ok***
man-ART.PL.PROX
'we men, you men, the men here' (Trask 2003: 122)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) The article has the same form, regardless of the distality/proximity of the referent

ex. *The car here is new*

The car over there is new

DPQ, ±free null partitive Q
Distinguishes languages that, in affirmative sentences, use Case or an adposition to contrast two semantic types of bare complements (singular, plural or mass) - one denoting a subpart (some stages) of the denotatum of the head noun, the other denoting the whole entity - (e.g., Finnish) from languages that have only one form for these two interpretations (e.g., English, Italian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds Case/adposition alternations with singular count, plural and mass bare nominal arguments such that one of these Case/adposition assigns a partitive indefinite meaning

ex. *lu-i-n* *kirja-**n***
read-PAST-1SG book-GEN/ACC
'I read the/a book' FINNISH

lu-i-n *kirja-**a***
read-PAST-1SG book-PART
'I read a little (=a non-specified amount) of the/a book'

lu-i-n *kirja-**t***
read-PAST-1SG book-PL.NOM/ACC
'I read the books'

lu-i-n *kirjo-j-**a***
read-PAST-1SG book-PL-PART
'I read (a non-specified amount of) books'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) In affirmative sentences, indefinite arguments headed by a bare plural or mass noun have the same morphological make-up (i.e. are marked by the same Case or adposition) as their definite counterparts

ex. *ho* *incontrato* *studenti* *per* *tutto* *il* *pomeriggio*
have.1SG.PRES met students.M.PL for all the afternoon
'I have been meeting students all afternoon' ITALIAN

ho *incontrato* *gli* *studenti* *al* *bar*
have.1SG.PRES met the.M.PL students.M.PL at.the bar
'I met the students at the bar'

DCN, ±article-checking N
Distinguishes languages that have a definite article suffixed to the head noun or to the first adjective of the nominal phrase (e.g., Romanian, Bulgarian, Scandinavian) from languages in which the article occurs before or after the whole noun phrase (e.g., the rest of Romance, the rest of Germanic, Celtic, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a non-phrase-final morpheme that is suffixed to a head noun and functions as the only marker of the definite reading of the nominal phrase

ex. *pro-chetox* *kniga-ta* *za* *Napoleon* BULGARIAN
read-1SG.PAST.PERF book-the about Napoleon
'I read the book on Napoleon'

b) The language has a non-phrase-final morpheme that is suffixed to an attributive adjective and functions as the only marker of the definite reading of the nominal phrase

ex. *pro-chetox* *nova-ta* *kniga* BULGARIAN
read-1SG.PAST.PERF new-the book
'I read the new book'

pro-chetox (*edna*) *nova* *kniga*
read-1SG.PAST.PERF (one/a) new book
'I read a new book'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DNN, ±null-N-licensing art
Distinguishes languages in which a complement or a relative clause depending on an empty head noun can be constructed with an article (e.g., Spanish, Portuguese, Basque, Ancient Greek) from languages in which this function requires a demonstrative (e.g., most other Romance languages, Standard Greek)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) Articles appear in nominal arguments that contain no overt head noun (nor adjective) but contain one of its arguments realized as a non-pronominal Genitive

ex. *el* *de* *Juan* SPANISH
the.M.SG of Juan
'Juan's one'

b) Articles appear in nominal arguments that contain no overt noun (nor adjective) but contain an adpositional argument/adjunct

ex. *la* *exposición* *"Somos* *Monegros"* *se* *inaugura* *este*
the.F.SG exhibit.F.SG "Somos Monegros" IMPERS open this
viernes *dentro* *de* ***las*** *por* *el* *XX* *aniversario* *de* *la*
Friday inside of the.F.PL for the 20th anniversary of the
Comarca
Comarca
'The exhibit "Somos Monegros" opens this Friday within those for the 20th anniversary of the Comarca' SPANISH

c) Articles appear in nominals that contain no overt noun but contain a relative clause

ex. *el* *que* *salió* SPANISH
the.M.SG that go-out.3SG.PAST
'the one that went out'

el *que* *conocí*
the.M.SG that meet.1SG.PAST
'the one I met'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DIN, ±D-controlled inflection on N
Distinguishes languages that have a special inflection on the noun (and possibly also on adjectives) depending on the presence/absence/choice/interpretation of the determiner (e.g., nunation in Arabic) from languages in which head nouns have the same form with all determiners (e.g., Hebrew)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on the noun (and possibly also on adjectives) depending on the presence/absence of a definite determiner

ex. *qara'tu* *kitaab-a-n* *jamiil-a-n* ARABIC
PFV.read.1SG book.M.SG-ACC-INDEF beautiful-ACC-INDEF
'I read a beautiful book'

qara'tu *l-kitaab-a* *l-jamiil-a*
PFV.read.1SG the-book.M.SG-ACC the-beautiful-ACC
'I read the beautiful book'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nouns have the same form, regardless of whether they occur with a definite determiner or not

ex. *I've been meeting students for three hours*

I met the students at the cafeteria

FGC, ±grammaticalized classifier
Distinguishes languages that require a classifier to combine a cardinality expression with a noun (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese) from languages that do not (e.g., Chickasaw)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has lexically-selected classifiers encountered when numerals are combined with nouns denoting naturally atomic entities

ex. *san ge ren* MANDARIN
three CLF person
'three persons'

san zhi bi
three CLF pen
'three pens'

san ben shu
three CLF book
'three books' (Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 514)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) The relation between a cardinal and a noun denoting a naturally atomic entity is direct (i.e. not mediated by a dedicated morpheme which can be absent when no cardinal is there)

ex. *John has five dogs, three cats, two horses, four goats and six parrots*

FGE, ±grammaticalized bounding classifier
Distinguishes between two types of classifier languages, both types allowing sequences Classifier-Noun without a numeral ('bare classifiers'). In one type (e.g., Cantonese) bare classifiers have a bounded interpretation, definite or indefinite, while a completely bare noun only has the interpretations of English bare mass/plurals. In the other type (e.g., Mandarin) bare classifiers can only produce the interpretation of an indefinite quantifier, while a completely bare noun can either have the definite or indefinite reading

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds postverbal nominals with a 'bare classifier' receiving a definite interpretation

ex. *Wufei jam-jyun *(wun) tong la* CANTONESE
Wufei drink-finish CLF soup SFP
'Wufei finished drinking the soup' (Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 510)

Keoi maai-zo gaa ce
he sell-ZO CLF car
'He sold the car' (Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 524)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) One finds postverbal bare nominals without an overt classifier receiving a definite specific interpretation

ex. *Hufei he-wan-le tang* MANDARIN
Hufei drink-finish-LE soup
'Hufei finished the soup' (Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 510)

FCN, ±Person spread to predicate nouns
Distinguishes languages in which predicate nouns are inflected for Person, which is controlled by the subject of the predication, (e.g., Dravidian) from languages in which nouns do not inflect for Person (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on predicate nouns that are controlled by the Person feature of their subject

ex. *nuwwu manci-wāḍiwi* TELUGU
2SG good.person-2SG
'you are a good person'

āme manci-di
3SG good.person-3SG
'she is a good person'

wāḷḷu manci-wāḷḷu
3PL good.person-3PL
'they are good persons'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Predicate nouns have the same form regardless of the Person of their subject

ex. *tu sei una brava persona* ITALIAN
2SG be.2SG.PRES a good person
'I am a good person'

Maria è una brava persona
Maria be.3SG.PRES a good person
'Maria is a good person'

voi siete brave persone
2PL be.2PL.PRES good persons
'You are good persons'

loro sono brave persone
3PL be.3PL.PRES good persons
'You are good persons'

HMP, ±NP-heading modifier
Distinguishes languages in which adjectival modification is systematically expressed with the property realized as a a nominal(ized) head and the entity denoted by the nominal appearing as a modifier of the latter (e.g., Kadiweu, Kuikuro) from languages in which this construction is lexically exceptional or absent (e.g., Italian, English)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominals headed by a nominalized property such as shape, color or provenance and modified by an argument, and the whole nominal denotes the referent of the argument while the nominalized property is interpreted as an attribute of the argument

ex. *wëri* *kawë-no* *neejan* TIRIYÓ
woman tall–NOMINALIZER coming
'the tall woman is coming' (adapted from Meira 1999: 525)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nominals headed by a nominalized property (such as shape, color or provenance) denote that property and not an individual having that property (whether it is expressed or not)

ex. *the woman's tallness* does not mean: *the tall woman*

ARR, ±free reduced relatives
Distinguishes languages in which all adjectives can be used as reduced relative clauses, having the distribution of the latter (e.g., Wolof, Turkish, French, Spanish, Standard Greek), from languages in which reduced relative clauses are restricted to special categories (like verbal participles and branching phrases), or impossible at all (e.g. English, German)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language allows for free (truth-functionally synonymous/interchangeable) permutations of the order of the same two or more adjectives

ex. *oto* [*b-u* *bulo*] [*b-u* *bees*] [*b-u* *Alman*] WOLOF
car CLASS-LK blue CLASS-LK new CLASS-LK German
'a new blue German car'

possible variants:
oto bu bees bu bulo bu Alman
oto bu Alman bu bulo bu bees
oto bu Alman bu bees bu bulo

b) In indefinite nominal phrases, one finds adjectives to the left of a cardinal numeral that can also be found to its right

ex. *güzel* ***gri*** ***bir*** *kedi* TURKISH
beautiful grey a cat

güzel ***bir*** ***gri*** *kedi*
beautiful a grey cat
'a beautiful grey cat' (Bayirli 2018: 3)

c) One finds adjectives to the right of a post-nominal argument of N that can also be found to its left

ex. *la* *sorella* ***di*** ***Gianni*** ***bionda*** ITALIAN
the sister of Gianni blonde

la *sorella* ***bionda*** ***di*** ***Gianni***
the sister blonde of Gianni
'Gianni's blonde sister'

d) One finds argument adjectives in prenominal position, and one also finds postnominal adjectives (of any category)

ex. ενα γερμανικό αυτοκίνητο GREEK
éna germanikó aftokínito
a German car
'a German car'

ενα αυτοκίνητο πράσινο
éna aftokínito prásino
a car green
'a green car'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

GCN, ±head-marking with Genitive
Distinguishes languages in which nouns have a different morpho-phonological form, depending on whether they occur with a genitive argument or not (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish, Turkish, Yukaghir, Arabic, Hebrew, Wolof) from languages in which nouns do not exhibit this kind of alternation (e.g., IE, Japanese, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds some systematic morpho-phonological alternations on head nouns depending on the presence/absence of a non-adpositional genitive argument

ex. *ha* ***bayit*** HEBREW
the house
'the house'

beyt *ha* *more*
house the teacher
'the teacher's house'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, head nouns have the same form regardless of whether they occur with a non-adpositional genitive argument or not

ex. *I destroyed a car*

I destroyed my/your/Joe's car

GFN, ±Person controlled marking
Distinguishes languages in which nouns occurring with a genitive argument are marked through a Person agreement morpheme controlled by the Person feature of the Genitive (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish, Udmurt, Turkish, Yukaghir) from languages in which the allomorph of a noun constructed with a Genitive is not characterized by an agreement morpheme (e.g., Arabic, Hebrew)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on nouns modified by a genitive argument that are controlled by the Person feature of the genitive argument

ex. *Vanja-len* *kńiga-jez* UDMURT
Vanya-GEN book-3SG
'Vanya's book'

(*min-am*) *kńiga-je*
1SG-GEN book-1SG
'my book'

kńiga
book
'a/the book'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Head nouns modified by a genitive argument (or a possessive) have the same form regardless of the Person of the genitive/possessive argument

ex. ***beyt*** *ha* *more* HEBREW
house the teacher
'the teacher's house'

beyt *i*
house 1SG
'my house'

GFP, ±agreement with all pronouns
Distinguishes languages in which nouns occurring with a genitive argument are marked through a Person agreement morpheme whatever the Person of the genitive argument (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish, Turkish) from languages in which this marking only appears with 3rd-person Genitives (e.g., Yukaghir)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on nouns modified by a genitive argument depending on whether the genitive argument carries 1st- or 2nd-person features

ex. (*minu-n*) *velje-ni* *voitt-i* *auto-n* FINNISH
1SG-GEN brother-1SG.POSS win-PAST.3SG car-GEN
'my brother won a car'

(*sinu-n*) *veljie-si* *voitt-i* *auto-n*
2SG-GEN brother-2SG.POSS win-PAST.3SG car-GEN
'your brother won a car'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nouns have the same form regardless of whether they occur with a possessive in the 1st or 2nd person or without a genitive/possessive argument altogether

ex. *tet* *kniga* YUKAGHIR
2SG book
'your book / a book of yours'

kniga
book
'the/a book'

(as opposed to:
(*Vanya*) *kniga-gi*
Vanya book-POSS
'Vanya's/his/her book / a book of Vanya's/his/hers')

GP3, ±agreement with all 3rd-person DPs
Distinguishes languages in which nouns marked through a Person agreement morpheme controlled by a genitive argument admit any 3rd-person genitive nominal as a controller (e.g., Hungarian, Turkish, Yukaghir, Udmurt) from languages in which only possessives act as controllers (e.g., Finnish, Buryat)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on the noun that are controlled by the Person of its genitive/possessive argument

ex. *Vanja-len* *kńiga-jez* UDMURT
Vanya-GEN book-3SG
'Vanya's book'

(*min-am*) *kńiga-je*
1SG-GEN book-1SG
'my book'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nouns have the same form regardless of whether they occur with a non-pronominal genitive/possessive argument or not

ex. *Kadu-lla* *on* *auto* FINNISH
street-ADE be.3SG car.NOM
'There is a car in the street'

Matti-n *auto*
Matti-GEN car.NOM
'Matti's car'

GEI, ±Genitive inversion
Distinguishes languages in which nouns marked through an agreement morpheme controlled by a genitive argument systematically allow the latter to also occur in postnominal position (e.g., Yakut, which provides a clearest example but where the phenomenon is limited to possessives) from languages in which no such Genitive-noun inversion is possible (e.g., Hungarian, Turkish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds pre- or postnominal genitive/possessive arguments of the noun, and the noun agrees in Person with them

ex. *en* *oloppoh-uŋ* YAKUT
2SG chair-2SG

oloppoh-uŋ *en*
chair-2SG 2SG
'your chair'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

CSE, ±full c-selection
Distinguishes languages in which a head noun can take adpositional complements (e.g., IE, Semitic) from languages in which the noun's adpositional complements cannot be directly selected by it, and occur embedded in modifiers or extraposed (e.g., Ugric)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nouns constructed with two arguments (realized as possessive, non-pronominal Genitive or PP/oblique, whether or not independently licensed by a linker), neither of them in an extraposed position

ex. *John's conversation about Napoleon*

John's appointment with Mary at the library

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

EAL, ±ergative alignment
Distinguishes languages that extend the ergative/absolutive case system of their clauses to their nominal phrases with multiple arguments (e.g., Archi, Lak) from languages in which clauses are ergative/absolutive while in nominals direct arguments are in the genitive case (e.g., Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nouns with an internal argument that bears the same case morphology (e.g. absolutive) as the internal argument of a verb (*applies to languages that have ergative/absolutive alignment in clauses*)

ex. *Rasul-li* *tilivizor* *b-uš-mul* ARCHI
Rasul.I-SG.ERG TV.III.SG.ABS III.SG-buy-MASDAR
'Rasul's buying of a TV set'
(Polinsky, Radkevich and Chumakina 2017: 60)
MASDAR indicates a nominalizer

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

CAL, ±clausal alignment
Distinguishes languages that extend (at least part of) the accusative case system of their clauses to nominal phrases with multiple arguments (e.g., Hebrew, Tamil, Telugu) from languages in which clauses are nominative/accusative while in nominals direct arguments are in the genitive case (e.g., Latin, Polish, English, Spanish and the rest of IE, Arabic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nouns with an internal and an external argument, where the internal argument bears the same Case morphology (e.g. accusative) as the internal argument of a transitive verb, and this Case morphology is different from that found on the external argument (*applies to languages that have Nominative/Accusative alignment in clauses*)

ex. *ha-harisa šel ha-cava ʼet ha-ʼir* HEBREW
the-destruction of the-army ACC the-city
'the army's destruction of the city' (Siloni 1997: 27)

ha-cava haras ʼet ha-ʼir
the-army destroyed ACC the-city
'the army destroyed the city' (Siloni 1997: 27)

ha-ʼir nehersa ʼal-yedey ha-cava
the-city was.destroyed by the-army
'the city was destroyed by the army' (Siloni 1997: 89)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

LKA, ±argument linker
Distinguishes languages that must use a marker dedicated to adnominal modification, different from adpositions, to introduce most direct and oblique arguments of a noun (e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese, Wolof) from languages in which no such marker exists (e.g., Germanic, Romance, Slavic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that introduces arguments of head nouns, that is the same as the one used to introduce other modifiers and is distinct from Case marking, articles and from adpositions introducing arguments of the verb

ex. *oto* *(b-)u* *Maryam* WOLOF
car CLASS-LK Maryam
'Maryam's car'

oto *b-u* *bees*
car CLASS-LK new
'a new car'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Arguments of the noun are merged directly, or by means of adpositions and Case marking that can be found also with arguments of verbs

ex. *The arrest of John*

I often think of John

LKO, ±oblique linker
Distinguishes languages that must use a marker dedicated to adnominal modification, different from adpositions, to introduce only oblique arguments of a noun (e.g., Yukaghir, Basque) from languages in which no such marker is required (e.g., Germanic, Romance, Slavic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that introduces oblique arguments of the noun, and is distinct from Case marking, articles and from adpositions introducing arguments of the verb

ex. *Araba-ko zortzi urte-eta-ko zapone one-ko ardo-a* BASQUE
Alava-LK eight year-LOC-LK flavor good-LK wine-ART
'wine of good flavor (gathered) in eight years in Alava'

mendi-eta-ko handi haiek
mountain-LOC-LK big those
'those big ones in the mountains' (Trask 1997: 91)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Oblique arguments of the noun are merged directly, or by means of adpositions and Case marking that can be found also with arguments of verbs

ex. *A conversation with Koko*

I often chat with Koko

My gift to Koko

I gave some kittens to Koko

LKP, ±predicative linker
Distinguishes languages that must use a dedicated marker to introduce adjectives and relative clauses modifying a noun (e.g., Wolof, Mandarin, Cantonese, Yukaghir) from languages in which no such marker is required (e.g., Slavic, Semitic, Japanese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that introduces adnominal adjectives and is different from articles

ex. *bëgg naa jàng a-b téére b-**u** rafet*
want 1SG.PERF read INDEF-CLASS book CLASS-LK beautiful
'I want to read a beautiful book' WOLOF

*bëgg naa jàng téére b-**u** rafet b-i*
want 1SG.PERF read book CLASS-LK beautiful CLASS-DEF.PROX
'I want to read the beautiful book (here)'

bëgg naa jàng téére b-i
want 1SG.PERF read book CLASS-DEF.PROX
'I want to read the book (here)'

b) The language has a morpheme introducing relative clauses that is distinct from articles, wh-fronted elements and any complementizer introducing other subordinate clauses

ex. *téére b-**u** jàng naa b-i* WOLOF
book CLASS-LK read 1SG.PERF CLASS-DEF.PROX
'the book that I read'

*a-b téére b-**u** jàng naa*
INDEF-CLASS book CLASS-LK read 1SG.PERF
'a book that I read'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Adnominal adjectives and relative clauses are merged directly

ex. *I want to buy a new book*

the book that I read is boring

DMP, ±def matching pronominal possessives
Distinguishes languages in which a suffixed article licenses a Genitive Case on personal pronouns immediately following it (e.g., Romanian, Bulgarian, Norwegian, Icelandic) from languages in which a suffixed article does not have this licensing property (e.g., Danish, Faroese)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nouns or adjectives bearing a definiteness suffix that are immediately followed by a possessive

ex. *kniga-ta* *moja* BULGARIAN
book-the 1SG.POSS
'my book'

nova-ta *moja* *kniga*
new-the 1SG.POSS book
'my new book'

bok-en *min* NORWEGIAN
book-the 1SG.POS
'my book'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DMG, ±def matching Genitives
Distinguishes languages in which a suffixed article licenses a genitive case on an immediately following full nominal phrase introduced by an overt determiner (e.g., Romanian) from languages in which this licensing is limited to pronouns (e.g., Bulgarian, Norwegian, Icelandic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nouns or adjectives bearing a definiteness suffix that are immediately followed by a full genitive phrase whose determiner position hosts a genitive-marked element (i.e., either an overt determiner or a proper name in determiner position)

ex. *portret-ul* *student-ului* ROMANIAN
portrait-the.M.SG student-the.GEN
'the student's portrait'

portret-ul *Monnalisei*
portrait-the.M.SG Monalisa.GEN
'the portrait of Mona Lisa'

b) The language has a morpheme with the same phi-feature morphology as a definite article (though not necessarily semantically definite) that introduces genitive phrases that have a filled determiner position (i.e., either a nominal with an overt determiner or a proper name in determiner position)

ex. *un* *portret* *a-l* *Monnalisei* *a-l* *lui-Leonardo*
a portrait A-M.SG Monalisa.GEN A-M.SG 3SG.GEN-Leonardo
'a portrait of Mona Lisa by Leonardo' ROMANIAN

un *portret* *a-l* *student-ului*
a portrait A-M.SG student-the.GEN
'a portrait of the student'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

GUN, ±uniform Genitive
Distinguishes languages in which there is only one, non-adpositional, form of Genitive Case, which can be iterated and occur in several positions of the nominal phrase (e.g., Latin, Classical Greek, Finnish) from languages in which non-adpositional Genitives only occur in fixed, non-iterable positions (e.g., modern Germanic, Romance, Slavic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where a non-adpositional prenominal Genitive is in turn preceded by an adjective, and this Genitive has the same type of morphological realization as postnominal Genitives

ex. *ingens* *scolasticorum* *turba* LATIN
large.SG.NOM scholar.M.PL.GEN crowd.F.SG.NOM
'a large crowd of students' (Petr. *Satyricon* 6)

alio *genere* *Furiarum*
other.SG.ABL kind.SG.ABL Fury.F.PL.GEN
'another kind of Furies' (Petr. *Satyricon* 1)

repentinam *eius* *defensionem* *Gabini*
sudden.F.SG.ACC 3SG.GEN defence.F.SG.ACC Gabinius.GEN
'his sudden defence of Gabinius'
(Cic. Fam., 1,9, adapted from Gianollo 2005: 72)

b) One finds nominal arguments where two non-adpositional Genitives appear on one side of the noun, and these Genitives have the same type of morphological realization as Genitives found on the other side of the noun

ex. τὴν τοῦ Λάχητος τῶν
the.F.SG.ACC the.M.SG.GEN Laches.M.SG.GEN the.F.PL.GEN
νεῶν ἀρχὴν CLASS. GREEK
ship.F.PL.GEN command.F.SG.ACC
'Laches' command of the ships'
(Thuc, 3.115.6, adapted from Guardiano 2011: 130)

τὸν τρόπον τοῦ ἐπαίνου
the.M.SG.ACC way.M.SG.ACC the.M.SG.GEN praising.M.SG.GEN
'the way of praising'
(Plato 199 a 4, adapted from Guardiano 2011: 129)

c) One finds nominal arguments where two non-adpositional Genitives follow a postnominal adjective

ex. ἡ δὲ διαγνώμη αὕτη τῆς
the.F.SG.NOM PRT decree.F.SG.NOM this.F.SG.NOM the.F.SG.GEN
ἐκκλησίας τοῦ τὰς σπονδὰς
assembly.F.SG.GEN the.N.SG.GEN the.F.PL.ACC treaty.F.PL.ACC
λελύσθαι CLASS. GREEK
being-dissolved
'this decree of the assembly that the peace treaty be broken'
(Thuc, 1.87.6, adapted from Guardiano 2011: 130)

d) One finds nominal arguments where two non-adpositional Genitives precede a prenominal adjective (or adjectives). NOTE: in some phrases the same type of Genitive may also occur once more between the adjective(s) and the noun

ex. *Leonardo-n* *Louvre-n* *maailmankuuluisa* (*Mona* *Lisa-n*)
Leonardo-GEN Louvre-GEN famous Mona Lisa-GEN
muotokuva FINNISH
portrait
'Leonardo's famous portrait (of Mona Lisa) at the Louvre'

e) One finds nominal arguments containing three non-adpositional Genitives

ex. *eorum* *dierum* *consuetudine* *itineris*
that.M.PL.GEN day.M.PL.GEN habit.F.SG.ABL journey.N.SG.GEN
nostri *exercitus* *perspecta* LATIN
our.M.SG.GEN army.M.SG.GEN well-observed.F.SG.ABL
'having accurately observed our army's method of marching of those days' (Caes. *Gal*. 2.16, adapted from Gianollo 2005: 76)

Brutuksen *Julius* *Caesarin* *vuoden* *44EKr* (*häikäilemätön*)
Brutus.GEN Julius Caesar.GEN year.GEN 44BC pitiless
murha FINNISH
assassination
'Brutus' pitiless assassination of J. Caesar in 44 BC'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) The language has adpositional genitive arguments of the noun

ex. *The murder of John Lennon*

le livre de notre ami FRENCH
the book of our friend
'our friend's book'

artista hor-ren pailazo bat-en erretratu-a BASQUE
artist that-GEN clown one-GEN portrait-ART
'that artist's portrait of a clown'

b) The language has different formal realizations for the same genitive arguments of the noun

ex. *John Lennon's shocking murder is explored in a new TV documentary*

The murder of John Lennon is covered in a new Apple docuseries

GAD, ±free Gen
Distinguishes languages in which there is an adpositional Genitive Case, which can be iterated (e.g., English, Italian, Bulgarian, Basque), from languages in which Genitive is non-adpositional and occurs in fixed, non iterable positions (e.g., Standard Greek, Russian, Polish, Turkish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has adpositional genitive arguments of the noun

ex. *The murder of John Lennon*

le livre de notre ami FRENCH
the book of our friend
'our friend's book'

artista hor-ren pailazo bat-en erretratu-a BASQUE
artist that-GEN clown one-GEN portrait-ART
'that artist's portrait of a clown'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

GFL, ±GenL
Distinguishes languages in which there is a non-adpositional non-iterable Genitive Case that appears to the right of canonically ordered ("structured", see parameter NM1 below) adjectives (e.g., Standard Greek, Russian, Polish and most Slavic languages, Icelandic, German, Irish, Welsh) from languages in which Genitive does not have such properties (e.g, English, most of Romance, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where an adjective precedes a non-adpositional Genitive functioning as an argument or alienable possessor of the noun, whether or not the noun intervenes (*applies to languages with no reduced relative clauses in prenominal position: otherwise the relevant adjective must follow a numeral in an indefinite nominal argument*)

ex. *portread hardd y plentyn* WELSH
portrait beautiful the child
'the child's beautiful portrait'

(*šis*) *juodas Reginos automobilis* LITHUANIAN
(this.NOM) black.NOM Regina.GEN car.NOM
'(this) black car of Regina's' (Rutkowski 2008, 222-3)

το θαυμαστό πορτρέτο της κοπέλας GREEK
to thavmastó portréto tis kopélas
the beautiful portrait the.GEN girl.GEN

'the girl's beautiful portrait'

b) One finds nominal arguments where a non-adpositional Genitive functioning as an argument or alienable possessor of the noun follows the noun (nominals with 'home' as the head noun are irrelevant)

ex. το φόρεμα της κοπέλας GREEK
to fórema tis kopélas
the dress the.GEN girl.GEN
'the girl's dress'

harisat ha-migdal HEBREW
destruction the-tower
'the destruction of the tower'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

PGL, ±partial GenL
Distinguishes languages in which the non-adpositional non-iterable Genitive occupying the post-adjectival position (GenL) is restricted to few specified classes of phrases and head nouns (e.g., some Romance dialects of southern Italy, Old Romance) from languages in which it does not occur at all (e.g., English, French, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where an adjective precedes a non-adpositional Genitive, whether or not the noun intervenes, and the relation between the head noun and the Genitive is any of: kinship/part-whole/container-containee/inalienable possession

ex. *a* *buttigghja* *grossa/miricana/lorda* *u* *vinu* (*jancu*)
the bottle big/American/dirty the wine (white)
'the big/American/dirty bottle of (white) wine' VERBICARO
(adapted from Silvestri 2013: 142)

b) One finds nominal arguments where a non-adpositional Genitive follows the noun, and the relation between the head noun and the Genitive is any of: kinship/part-whole/container-containee/inalienable possession

ex. *a* *buttigghja* *u* *vinu* (*jancu*)
the bottle the wine (white)
'the bottle of (white) wine' VERBICARO
(adapted from Silvestri 2013: 142)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

GGH, ±generalized GenH
Distinguishes languages in which all full nominal phrases can occur as non-iterable Genitives in pre-adjectival position, i.e. in GenH (e.g., English, Mainland Scandinavian) from languages in which this construction is restricted to a class of simple head nouns (mostly proper names) capable of bearing a word-level suffix (e.g., German, Dutch, Afrikaans)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where a Genitive realized as a visibly branching phrase headed by a common noun precedes a prenominal adjective

ex. *the new King's first visit to Wales*

the new King's 'slimmed down' monarchy

The new King of England's sources of income

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) One finds nominal arguments containing two or more Genitives functioning as non-internal arguments (e.g. Possessor and Agent or two Possessors) of the noun

ex. *Marias* *Buch* *von* *ihrem* *Lieblingsautor* GERMAN
Maria.GEN book of her.DAT favourite-author
'Maria's book by her favourite author'

b) One finds nominal arguments where the noun has an unaffected internal argument realized as a passivized Genitive (i.e. it has the morphosyntactic properties characterizing Genitives functioning as the external argument of a transitive noun where the internal argument is also expressed: *John's knowledge of algebra*)

ex. *Roms* *Kenntnis* *ist* *für* *Archäologen* *sehr* *wichtig*
Rome.GEN knowledge is for archeologists very important
'Knowledge of Rome is very important for archaeologists' GERMAN

Roms *Eroberung* *Italiens*
Rome.GEN conquest Italy.GEN
'Rome's conquest of Italy'

c) One finds nominal arguments where the noun has an internal argument realized as a passivized Genitive and an understood agent argument which controls the understood subject of an infinitival subordinate

ex. *Dresdens Zerstörung, um die deutsche Bevölkerung zu terrorisieren* GERMAN
Dresden.GEN destruction for the German population to terrorize
'The Destruction of Dresden to terrorize the German population'

GSI, ±grammaticalized inalienability
Distinguishes languages that require inalienably possessable nouns to always occur with an affix agreeing in Person with the possessor, even if the latter is unexpressed and indefinite/arbitrary (e.g., Kadiweu) from languages that do not (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that is attached to inalienably possessed nouns and agrees with the possessor, even when the possessor is unexpressed and/or non-referential/arbitrary

ex. *e-ajike* KADIWEU
3.INDEF-face/chin
'somebody's face/chin, the face/chin' (Sandalo 1996)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Inalienably possessed nouns without an expressed possessor have the same morphological make-up as alienable or non possessed nouns, at least when the understood possessor is non-referential/arbitrary

ex. *I saw an ugly snake*

I saw an ugly face

ALP, ±alienable possession
Distinguishes languages that require possessed nouns to occur with a special affix, in addition to the normal marking of the genitive relation, if and only if the possession is alienable (e.g., Tungusic) from languages that do not (e.g., IE, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that is attached to possessed nouns to indicate that the object denoted by the noun is alienable from the possessor

ex. *dil-iβ* EVENKI
head-1SG
'my head'

dil-i-ŋi-β
head-EV-ALIEN.POSS-1SG
'the head (of an animal) that belongs to me'

ex. *Maša bödel-en* EVEN B
Maša leg-3SG
'Masha's leg'

Maša bödel-eŋ-en
Maša leg-ALIEN.POSS-3SG
'a leg that belongs to Masha (not part of Masha)'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Nouns have the same morphological make-up, regardless of whether they are inalienably possessed, alienably possessed or non-possessed

ex. *my car*

my mouth

the car / the mouth

GIT, ±Genitive-licensing iteration
Distinguishes languages that do not license more than one Genitive Case per head noun and need to resort to an additional nominal head to license a second genitive argument (e.g., the repeated head as in Kadiweu or a noun place-holder as Romanian *al*) from languages that do not use such strategies (e.g., the rest of IE, Uralic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments containing two non-adpositional Genitives, where the element that licenses the first one (the head noun or a nominal proform) is repeated to license the second one

ex. *portret-ul* *Sfintei* *Ecaterina* *a-l*
portrait-the.M.SG saint.F.SG.GEN Catherine.F.SG A-M.SG
Artemisiei
artemisia.F.SG.GEN
'Artemisia's portrait of St. Catherine' ROMANIAN

ex. *un* *portret* *a-l* *Sfintei* *Ecaterina* *a-l*
a.M.SG portrait.M.SG A-M.SG saint.F.SG.GEN Catherine.F.SG A-M.SG
Artemisiei
artemisia.F.SG.GEN
'Artemisia's portrait of St. Catherine'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) One finds nominal arguments where two non-adpositional Genitives modify the same, non-iterated (whether in itself or through a nominal proform), head noun

ex. *Leonardo-n* *Mona Lisa-n* *maailmankuuluisa* *muotokuva*
Leonardo-GEN Mona Lisa-GEN famous portrait
'Leonardo's famous portrait of Mona Lisa' FINNISH

UST, ±unstructured modifiers
Distinguishes languages that do not display linear ordering restrictions on prenominal adjectives to the right of numerals (e.g., Uzbek, some varieties of Turkish) from languages that do so (e.g., IE, Uralic, Semitic, other Altaic languages)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language allows for freely ordered (truth-functionally synonymous/interchangeable) sequences of adjectives between an indefinite numeral and the head noun

ex. *bir* *chiroyli* *kulrang* *katta* *mushuk* UZBEK
a beautiful grey big cat
'a beatiful big grey cat'

possible variants:

bir katta chiroyli kulrang mushuk

bir katta kulrang chiroyli mushuk

bir kulrang katta chiroyli mushuk

bir kulrang chiroyli katta mushuk

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

GPC, ±gender-polarity cardinals
Distinguishes languages that have systematic gender counter-agreement (masculine with feminine and viceversa) between cardinal numerals and nouns (e.g., Semitic) from languages in which no counter-agreement is observed (e.g., IE)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) As a general rule, cardinal expressions that inflect for Gender take a value that is the opposite of the noun's

ex. *thalaathatu* *rijaal-in* *jaaʔ-uu* ARABIC
three-F.NOM man-M.PL.GEN came-PAST-3M.PL
'three men came'

haa'ulaa'i *r-rijaalu* *l-'arba'atu*
this.PL the-man.M.PL.NOM the-four.F.NOM
'these four men'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, cardinal expressions that inflect for Gender take a value that is the same as the noun's

ex. ο Κώστας έχει τρεις γάτες GREEK
o *Kóstas* *échi* *tris* *gátes*
the Kostas has three.M/F.PL cat.F.PL
'Kostas has three cats'

ο Κώστας έχει τρία σκυλιά
o *Kóstas* *échi* *tría* *skiliá*
the Kostas has three.N.PL dog.N.PL
'Kostas has three dogs'

ex. ο Κώστας έχει τέσσερις αδελφούς/αδελφές
o *Kóstas* *échi* *tésseris* *aðelfús/aðelfés*
the Kostas has four.M/F.PL sibling.M.PL/sibling.F.PL
'Kostas has four brothers/sisters'

ο Κώστας έχει τέσσερα αδέλφια
o *Kóstas* *échi* *téssera* *aðélfia*
the Kostas has four.N.PL sibling.N.PL
'Kostas has four siblings'

b) Cardinal expressions have the same form regardless of the Gender of the noun they occur with

ex. *tre* *bambini* ITALIAN
three boy.M.PL
'three boys/children'

tre *bambine*
three girl.F.PL
'three girls'

PSC, ±plural spread from cardinal quantifiers
Distinguishes languages that use plural nouns after cardinal numerals occurring as indefinite quantifiers (e.g., most of IE, Tungusic) from languages that use singular ones (e.g., Uralic, Turkic, Farsi)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where a non-compound cardinal numeral higher than 'two' functions as an indefinite quantifier, and the noun bears plural marking

ex. *three boys*, *four boys*

one boy

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) One finds nominal arguments where a non-compound cardinal numeral higher than 'two' functions as an indefinite quantifier, and the noun is singular

ex. *vettem* *egy* *könyv-et* HUNGARIAN
buy.PAST.1SG one book.SG-ACC
'I bought a book'

vettem *öt* *könyv-et*
buy.PAST.1SG five book.SG-ACC
'I bought five books'

könyv-ek-et *vettem*
book-PL-ACC buy.PAST.1SG
'I bought books'

PCA, ±plural spread through cardinal adjectives
Distinguishes languages that use plural nouns after cardinal numerical adjectives (i.e. cardinals co-occurring with a demonstrative or other definite determiner, even a null one) (e.g., Farsi) from languages that use singular ones also in this case (e.g., Uralic, Turkic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominal arguments where a definite determiner cooccurs with a non-compound cardinal numeral higher than 'two', and the noun bears overt plural marking

ex. *se* *ta* *mænzel* FARSI
three CLF house
'three houses'

un *se* *ta* *mænzel-ha*
those three CLF house-PL
'those three houses'

b) One finds alternations in the interpretation of nominal arguments modified by a non-compound cardinal numeral higher than 'two' depending on the number marking on the noun: overt plural marking results in definite interpretation, while absence of plural morphology results in indefinite interpretation

ex. *se* *ta* *danešju* FARSI
three CLF student
'three students' (cannot mean: 'the three students')

se *ta* *danešju-ha*
three CLF student-PL
'three students' (cannot mean: 'three students')

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) One finds nominal arguments where a definite determiner cooccurs with a non-compound cardinal numeral higher than 'two', and the noun is singular

ex. *olvas-tam* *az* *öt* *könyv-et* HUNGARIAN
read-PAST.1SG the.PL five book.SG-ACC
'I read the five books'
(compare to:

olvas-tam *a* *könyv-ek-et*
read-PAST.1SG the book-PL-ACC
'I read the books')

PMN, ±Person marking on numerals
Distinguishes languages that mark 1st- and 2nd-person features on cardinal numerals to express meanings like e.g., English *we three* (e.g., Mari, Udmurt) from languages that never do so (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a morpheme that, when attached to cardinal numerals, forms "personal" numerals ('we three')

ex. (*aś-me-os*) *vit'-na-mi̯* *ik* *lingvist-jos* UDMURT
REFL-1PL-NOM five-DRV-1PL PRT linguist-PL
'(speaking of ourselves,) we five are linguists'

(*aś-te-os*) *vit'-na-di̯*
REFL-2PL-NOM five-DRV-2PL
'(speaking of you,) you five'

(*aś-se-os*) *vit'-na-zi̯*
REFL-3PL-NOM five-DRV-3PL
'(speaking of them,) the five of them'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) Cardinal numerals have the same morphological form regardless of whether they denote 1st-, 2nd- or 3rd-person referents

ex. *mi* *hárman* *nővérek* *vagyunk* HUNGARIAN
we three sisters are.1PL
'we three are sisters'

ti *hárman* *nővérek* *vagytok*
you three sisters are.2PL
'you three are sisters'

ők *hárman* *nővérek*
they three sisters
'the three of them are sisters'

RHM, ±Person marking on the head of relative clauses
Distinguishes languages in which nouns modified by a relative clause contain a possessor-marking person affix controlled by the subject of the relative (e.g., Hungarian, Yakut) from languages in which nouns do not have this kind of alternation (e.g., IE, Finnish, Estonian, Turkish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has a person agreement affix that is attached to the head noun modified by a relative clause and is controlled by an argument within the relative clause

ex. *a festelt polc-om* HUNGARIAN
the paint.PERF.PRTCP shelf-1SG
'the shelf that I painted'

a polc
the shelf
'the shelf'

bu Künnej kömölöh-ör kyyh-a YAKUT
this Künnej help-AOR girl-3SG
'this girl whom Künnej helps'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Nous have the same morphological make-up, whether or not they are modified by a relative clause

ex. *I saw the girl*

I saw the girl I helped last year

FRC, ±finite relative clauses
Distinguishes languages that have relatives as full finite clauses and normal clausal Case-assignment (e.g., IE, Semitic, Finnish, Japanese, Basque) from languages in which relatives only have a verb in the participle (e.g., Turkic, some conservative Uralic varieties)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds relative clauses whose predicate bears morphology specific to finite verb forms and the subject has the same Case as in simple clauses

ex. *the magazine that John bought/buys*
(compare to: *John bought/buys the magazine*)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

NRC, ±participial relative clauses
Distinguishes languages in which relatives have a verb in the participle, with a subject expressed through an adnominal Case, like Genitive, (e.g., Finnish, Pashto, Marathi, Japanese, Basque) from languages in which participial relatives only have a null subject controlled by the head nominal (e.g., Hungarian, Estonian, Arabic, Hebrew, most of IE)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds relative clauses constructed with a participle (rather than an inflected verb) and an overt subject which is not the head of the relative

ex. [[*nesi-s-tow* *γ^{wʕ}ay* *b-oxi-n*
DEM.I-GEN1-FOC dog.ABS.III III-run-PFV.CVB
bäk'i-ru-łi]*-s* *uži*
III-go-PAST.PTCP-NMLZ-GEN1 boy.ABS.I
'the boy whose dog has run away' (Polinsky 2015: 269) TSEZ

[*Saša-n* *košt-mo*] *pölem* MEADOW MARI
Sasha-GEN enter-PRTC room
'the room that Sasha walked in'

b) One finds relative clauses constructed with an overt transitive subject (other than the head of the relative) which is assigned an exclusively adnominal case (typically Genitive)

ex. [*so-len* *lydź-ono*] *kńiga-jez* UDMURT
he-GEN read-PRTC book-GEN
'the book that must be read by him/her'
(adapted from Winkler 2001: 58)

[*Saša-n* *košt-mo*] *pölem* MEADOW MARI
Sasha-GEN enter-PRTC room
'the room that Sasha walked in'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DOR, ±definiteness on relatives
Distinguishes languages that spread the definiteness marking of the head of a relative clause to an element introducing the relative (e.g., Arabic, Wolof) from languages in which relatives are not marked with respect to the definiteness of the head nominal (e.g., Hebrew, IE)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has elements introducing relative clauses that agree in definiteness with the head of the relative

ex. *laqii-tu l-mudarris-a sh-shaabb-a lladhii*
met-1SG the-teacher-ACC the-young-ACC that
wasaf-ta-hu l-ii ʔamsi ARABIC
described-2SG-3SG.M to-me yesterday
'I met the young teacher that you described to me yesterday'

laqii-tu mudarris-an shaabb-an wasafa-hu l-ii djuun ʔamsi
met-1SG teacher-ACC young-ACC described-3SG.M to-me John yesterday
'Today I met a young teacher that John described to me yesterday'

xaj [*b-i ma jënd*] *b-i* WOLOF
dog CLASS-DEF I bought CLASS-DEF
'the dog that I bought'

u-b xaj [*b-u ma jënd*]
INDEF-CLASS dog CLASS-INDEF I bought
'a dog that I bought' (Torrence 2013: 158-159)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Relative pronouns/complementizers have the same form regardless of the (in)definiteness of their antecedent (the head of the relative)

ex. *I saw the movie that Mary had recommended*

I saw a movie that Mary had recommended

FFP, ±feature spread to particles
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun agrees in phi-features with adpositions or linkers introducing its arguments/modifiers (e.g., Indo-Aryan, Wolof) from languages in which there is no such a feature spread (e.g., the rest of IE, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds morphological alternations on particles introducing arguments of a head noun (genitive adpositions or linkers) that are controlled by phi-features (at least Number) of the noun

xaal	*w-u*	*réy*	*w-i*	WOLOF
melon	CLASS-LK	big	CLASS-DEF	
'the big melon'				
xaal	*yi-u*	*réy*	*y-i*	
melon	CLASS-LK	big	CLASS-DEF	
'the big melons'				

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) Particles introducing arguments of a head noun (genitive adpositions or linkers) have the same morphological make-up, regardless of the gender/number of the head noun

ex. *the only solution **of** the problem*

*the various solutions **of** the problem*

il	*libro*	***di***	*Gianni*	ITALIAN
the.M.SG	book.M.SG	of	Gianni	
'Gianni's book'				
la	*macchina*	***di***	*Gianni*	
the.F.SG	car.F.SG	of	Gianni	
'Gianni's car'				

NUP, ±NP under non-genitive arguments
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun surfaces after its non-genitive complements and adpositional modifiers (e.g., Indo-Aryan, Udmurt, Altaic, Dravidian, Basque, Archi, Lak) from languages in which the noun surfaces before its non-genitive complements and adpositional modifiers (e.g., the rest of IE, Finnish, Estonian, Semitic, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) As a general rule, non-genitive arguments precede the head N

ex. *oine.z-ko bidaia bat* BASQUE
foot.by-KO journey one
'a journey on foot'

Tokio.ra-ko bidaia bat
Tokyo.to-KO journey one
'a journey to Tokyo'

tokyo se do achchhi yaatraen HINDI
Tokyo from two nice trips
'two nice journeys from Tokyo'

Napoleon s'arys' kńiga UDMURT
Napoleon about book
'a book about Napoleon'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, non-genitive arguments follow the head N

ex. *two journeys from Tokyo*

a book about Napoleon

my gift for his son

il mio regalo per tua figlia
the.M.SG my.M.SG gift.M.SG for your.F.SG daughter.F.SG
'my gift for your daughter' ITALIAN

PNP, ±complement under P
Distinguishes prepositional languages, in which the complement of particles (i.e. of an adposition or of a linker) normally surfaces after it (e.g., English, French, Russian, Hebrew, Malagasy) from postpositional ones, in which it normally surfaces before the particle (e.g., Turkish, Japanese, Basque, Mandarin, Hindi)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) As a general rule, an adposition precedes its complement

ex. *of John, with John, from John*

b) As a general rule, adpositional Genitive arguments follow their head noun

ex. *a picture of John*

c) As a general rule, in linker phrases a linker precedes its complement

ex. *bëgg naa jàng a-b tééré b-u refet*
want 1SG.PERF read INDEF-CLASS book CLASS-LK beautiful
'I want to read a beautiful book' WOLOF

d) As a general rule, linker phrases follow their head noun

ex. *bëgg naa jàng a-b tééré b-u refet*
want 1SG.PERF read INDEF-CLASS book CLASS-LK beautiful
'I want to read a beautiful book' WOLOF

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) As a general rule, an adposition follows its complement

ex. *oinez-ko bidaia bat* BASQUE
foot.by-KO journey one
'a journey on foot'

Tokiora-ko bidaia bat
Tokyo.to-KO journey one
'a journey to Tokyo'

tokyo se do achchhi yaatraen HINDI
Tokyo from two nice trips
'two nice journeys from Tokyo'

Napoleon s'arys' kńiga UDMURT
Napoleon about book
'a book about Napoleon'

b) As a general rule, adpositional Genitive arguments precede their head N

ex *artista hor-ren pailazo bat-en erretratu-a* BASQUE
artist that-GEN clown one-GEN portrait-ART
'that artist's portrait of a clown'

NUD, ±NP under D
Distinguishes languages in which the noun phrase normally surfaces after its determiner (e.g., IE, Semitic) from languages in which the whole noun phrase surfaces before its determiner (e.g., Basque, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In nominal arguments, the article occurs as the first word (except for 'all' and demonstratives) or affixed to the first word, and is followed by some other overt element belonging to the nominal phrase

ex. *il lupo grande di Gianni* ITALIAN
the wolf big of Gianni
'Gianni's big wolf'

Lup-ul mare a-l lui Ion ROMANIAN
wolf-the big A-M.SG he.GEN Ion
'Ion's big wolf'

b) In nominal arguments, one finds positional alternations affecting cardinal or numerical adjectives ('one', 'two', ..., 'many', 'few'…): they occur after a Genitive/possessive if the nominal phrase has a definite reading, and as the first word if it has an indefinite reading

ex. *moje trzy książki* POLISH
my three books
'my three books'(informationally unmarked)

trzy moje książki
'three books of mine' (informationally unmarked, Rutkowski 2007)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) In nominal arguments, the article occurs as the last word (except for 'all' and demonstratives) or affixed to the last word, and is preceded by some other overt element belonging to the nominal phrase

ex. *laguntzaile gazte-ek maíz irakasle zaharr-ak imitatzen*
assistant young-ART.PL.ERG often teacher old-ART.PL imitate
dituzte
AUX
'young assistants often imitate old professors' BASQUE

liburu	*ederr-ak*	*irakurri*	*didut*
book	beautiful-ART.PL	read	AUX

'I read beautiful books'

NUC, ±N under cardinals
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun normally surfaces after cardinal adjectives (e.g., IE, Uralic, Altaic) from languages in which the noun surfaces before some or all cardinal adjectives (e.g., Semitic, Malagasy) – NOTE: if the cardinal is a numeral noun heading the construction, as in *a dozen of N*, it does not count as a cardinal adjective.

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In definite nominal arguments, one finds cardinal adjectives preceding the noun

ex. *I saw those three new American cars*

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) In definite nominal arguments, one finds cardinal adjectives following the noun

ex *qaraʔ-tu* *l-kutub-a* *l-xamsat-a* ARABIC
read-1SG the-book.PL-ACC the-five-ACC
'I read [past] the five books'
(different from phrases where the numeral is a noun heading the construction, as in:
qaraʔ-tu *xamsat-a* *l-kutub-i*
read-1SG five-ACC the.book.PL-GEN
'I read [past] the five books')

NM1, ±N under M1 As
Distinguishes languages in which, given the crosslinguistically canonical sequence of *structured* adjectives [Speaker/Subject-oriented Adjective + Manner1 (e.g. quality/size) Adjective + Manner2 (e.g. shape/color) Adjective + Nationality Adjective], Manner adjectives can precede the head noun (e.g., Italian, French, Spanish, Walloon, Germanic, Slavic, Standard Greek) from languages in which they cannot (e.g., Farsi, some Romance dialects of Italy, Italiot Greek)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In discourse-neutral contexts (and without lexical restrictions), one finds quality/size adjectives that, as a general rule, precede the noun

ex. *une petite table de bois française* FRENCH
a small table of wood French
'a small wooden French table'

b) In discourse-neutral contexts, in nominal arguments with a visible definite article one finds possessives that precede the noun and follow a cardinal numeral

ex. *Gianni ha incontrato i tre suoi amici americani*
Gianni has met the three his friends American
'Gianni met his three American friends' ITALIAN

c) In discourse-neutral contexts, one finds two or more adjectives preceding the noun

ex. *una cara vecchia amica* ITALIAN
a.f.sg dear.f.sg old.f.sg friend.f.sg
'a dear old friend'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

EAF, ±fronted high As
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun surfaces to the left of nearly all adjectives, but a minority of adjectives occur before the noun (e.g., Celtic, some Romance dialects of Italy) from languages in which there are no such exceptions (e.g., some other Romance dialects)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds a few lexically-selected adjectives (e.g., with the meaning *former*, *present/current*, *fake*, *alleged*, *supposed*, *amusing/funny*, *little*, *additional*, *strange*, *old*, *new*) preceding the noun

ex. *canuscimmu* (*a*) *lu* *novu* *sindacu*
meet.1PL.PAST DOM the.M.SG new.M.SG mayor.M.SG
'we met the new mayor' R. CALABRIA

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

NM2, ±N under M2 As
Distinguishes languages in which, given the crosslinguistic *structured* sequence of adjectives (see NM1 above), MANNER2 adjectives can precede the head noun (e.g., Walloon) from languages in which they cannot (e.g., Italian, French, Spanish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In discourse-neutral contexts, one finds *shape/color* adjectives preceding the noun

ex. *a* (*nice new*) *blue* (*French*) *dress*

one	(*bèle*)	*bleuve*	*cote*	(*alemande*)	WALLOON
a	nice	blue	dress	German	

'a (nice) blue (German) dress'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

NUA, ±N under As
Distinguishes languages in which, given the crosslinguistic structured sequence of adjectives (see NM1 above), Nationality adjectives can surface to the left of the head noun (e.g., Germanic, Slavic, Standard Greek) from languages in which they cannot (e.g., Walloon)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In discourse-neutral contexts, one finds adjectives of *origin/nationality* preceding the noun

ex. *a (nice new blue) French dress*

ένα	(ωραίο)	γαλλικό	φόρεμα	GREEK
éna	*oréo*	*γallikó*	*fórema*	
a	nice	French	dress	

'a (nice) French dress'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

NGL, ±N under GenL
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun surfaces to the right of a Genitive in the GenL post-adjectival position (e.g., Lithuanian, Latin, Classical Greek, Finnish) from languages in which the noun always surfaces to the left of such a Genitive position (e.g., Standard Greek, Slavic, Celtic, German, Icelandic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In discourse-neutral contexts, one finds non-adpositional Genitives occurring between a *structured* adjective and a noun

ex. (*šsis*) *juodas* *Reginos* *automobilis* LITHUANIAN
(this.NOM) black.NOM Regina.GEN car.NOM
'(this) black car of Regina's' (Rutkowski 2008, 222-3)

ingens *scolasticorum* *turba* LATIN
large scholar.M.PL.GEN crowd
'a large crowd of students' (Petr. *Satyricon* 6)

jatkuva *papereitten* *tarkastus*
constant.SG.NOM documents.PL.GEN examination.SG.NOM
'a/the constant examination of the documents' FINNISH

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

ACM, ±class MOD
Distinguishes languages in which the head noun surfaces to the right of all structured adjectives except for those which can identify some established natural classes of objects (e.g., Polish) from languages in which it surfaces to the right even of these adjectives (e.g., Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian, Icelandic, German)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In discourse-neutral contexts, one finds postnominal adjectives denoting an established entity occurring between a head noun and a non-adpositional Genitive

ex. *Polski bank narodowy tego miasta* POLISH
Polish Bank National this-GEN city-GEN
'The Polish National Bank of this city'

b) One finds interpretive alternations affecting adjectives that denote an established natural kind if postnominal and are regular qualifying adjectives if prenominal.

ex. *niedźwiedź biały* [*classifying*] POLISH
bear white
'a polar bear' = an animal belonging to the species *Ursus maritimus*

ex. *biały niedźwiedź* [*qualifying*]
white bear
'a white bear' = a bear that happens to be white
(Rutkowski and Progovac 2005, 102)

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

DSN, ±definiteness spread to N
Distinguishes languages where definite articles affixed to the head noun, under certain conditions, can double an overt free-standing demonstrative/definite article (e.g., Norwegian, Faroese) from languages in which an affixed article on the head noun can never cooccur with an overt determiner (e.g., Danish)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds a definiteness suffix on the noun even when a non-suffixal article also occurs

ex. *Jeg møtte lærer-**en*** NORWEGIAN
I met teacher-the
'I met the teacher'

*Jeg møtte **den** unge lærer-**en***
I met the young teacher-the
'I met the young teacher'

b) One finds a definiteness suffix on the noun even when a demonstrative occurs at the boundary

ex. *Jeg møtte **denn** lærer-**en*** NORWEGIAN
I met this teacher-the
'I met this teacher'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) The language has a definiteness suffix on the noun that is absent when a non-suffixal article occurs

ex. *Jeg mødte lærer-**en*** DANISH
I met teacher-the
'I met the teacher'

*Jeg mødte **den** unge lærer*
I met the young teacher
'I met the young teacher'

b) The language has a definiteness suffix on the noun that is absent when a demonstrative occurs at the boundary

ex. *Jeg* *mødte* *lærer-**en*** DANISH
I met teacher-the
'I met the teacher'

Jeg *mødte* ***denne*** *lærer*
I met this teacher
'I met this teacher'

DSA, ±definiteness spread to ARR
Distinguishes languages in which the definite article of a nominal is reduplicated on adjectives occurring as reduced relative clauses (e.g., Classical and Standard Greek) from languages in which free reduced relatives occur without this reduplication (e.g., Romance, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) When the whole nominal argument is understood as definite, one finds definite articles replicated on the adjectives realized as reduced relative clauses

ex. διάβασα το βιβλίο το ωραίο GREEK
ðiávasa to vivlío to oréo
read.1SG the book the beautiful
(compare to:
διάβασα το ωραίο βιβλίο
ðiávasa to oréo vivlío
read.1SG the beautiful book
'I read the beautiful book')

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) When the whole nominal argument is understood as definite, the adjectives realized as reduced relative clauses are 'bare' (i.e. they do not exhibit definite articles)

ex. *il libro di Claudia nuovo* ITALIAN
the.M.SG book.M.SG of Claudia new.M.SG
'Claudia's new book'

DSS, ±definiteness spread to structured categories
Distinguishes languages in which the definite article of a nominal is reduplicated on all structured adjectives and on the head noun, if the latter is not already so marked as the first word of the phrase (e.g., Asia Minor Greek, Semitic), from languages in which no such reduplication occurs (e.g., Germanic, Romance)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) When the whole nominal argument is understood as definite, one finds definite articles replicated on the head noun and its adjectival modifiers, regardless of their position

ex. ***ta****-tría* ***ta****-ka* ***ta****-peškíra* PHARASIOT GREEK
the-three the-nice the-towels
'the three nice towels'

raʔay-tu ***s****-sayaarat-a* ***l****-ʔalmaaniyat-a* ***z****-zarqaaʔ-a* ***l****-jadiidat-a*
saw-1SG the-car-ACC the-German-ACC the-blue-ACC the-new-ACC
l-jayyidat-a
the-nice-ACC
'I saw the nice new blue German car' ARABIC

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
a) When the whole nominal argument modified by structured adjectives is understood as definite, one finds a definiteness mark at the boundary and/or on the head noun, while structured adjectives have no definiteness mark

ex. *the three nice towels*

I saw the nice new blue German car

Jeg møtte ***den*** *unge lærer-****en*** NORWEGIAN
I met the young teacher-the
'I met the young teacher'

DOC, ±definiteness on cardinals
Distinguishes languages in which a suffixed definite article may also be attached to cardinal numerals (e.g., Bulgarian) from languages in which it cannot be attached to cardinals (e.g., Romanian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds a definiteness suffix occurring on a prenominal cardinal numeral

ex. *tri-te* *knigi* BULGARIAN
three-the books
'the three books'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

NEX, ±proper names in D
Distinguishes languages in which some proper names can surface in the position of determiners (e.g., Italian, French, Basque) from languages in which some form of overt determiner is required with all proper names (e.g., Italiot Greek)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds 'bare' proper names in argument function

ex. *ho* *incontrato* *Mario* ITALIAN
have.1SG met Mario
'I met Mario'

ho *visitato* *Roma*
have.1SG visited Rome
'I visited Rome'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, proper names of cities occur with a visible article in argument function

ex. *ida* *tus* *Luppìu* SALENTO GREEK
see.PAST.1SG the.PL.ACC Lecce
'I saw Lecce'

PEX, ±personal proper names in D
Distinguishes languages in which some personal names can surface in the position of determiners (e.g., Italian, French, Basque) from languages in which some form of overt determiner is required with all personal names (e.g., Salentino)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds 'bare' proper first names referring to individuals in argument function

ex. *ho* *incontrato* *Mario* ITALIAN
have.1SG met Mario
'I met Mario (male)'

ho *incontrato* *Maria*
have.1SG met Maria
'I met Maria (female)'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, proper first names referring to male individuals occur with a visible article in argument function

ex. *lu* *Ggjuvanni* *ete* *avvocatu* SALENTINO
the.M.SG Giovanni is lawyer.M.SG
'Giovanni is a lawyer'

FEX, ±partial personal proper names in D
Distinguishes languages in which personal names can surface in the position of determiners (e.g., Italian, French, Basque) from languages in which some form of overt determiner is required with selected classes of personal names, typically feminine (e.g., some Romance varieties)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) Proper first names referring to female individuals occur 'bare' in argument function

ex. *ho* *incontrato* *Maria* ITALIAN
have.1s met Maria
'I met Maria (female)'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) As a general rule, proper first names referring to female individuals occur with a visible article in argument function

ex. *la* *Maria* *l'* *è* *andada* *a* *cà* CASALASCO
the.F.SG Maria 3SG.CLI BE.3SG gone.F.SG to home
'Maria went home'
(as opposed to: **Maria l'è andada a cà*)

PDC, ±D-checking possessives
Distinguishes languages in which some possessives have the distribution and the bounding and definiteness-assigning functions of definite articles, and therefore cannot cooccur with a visible determiner (e.g., Spanish, French), from languages in which a visible determiner cooccurs with possessives and is actually required in argument function (e.g., Italian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds definite nominal arguments containing a possessive occurring in the position of the definite article, and no visible article is present

ex. *mi nuevo libro* SPANISH
my new book
'my new book'

b) One finds indefinite nominal arguments containing a postnominal possessive that has non-contrastive/"neutral" reading (*applies to languages with prenominal structured adjectives and prenominal possessives*)

ex. *un libro mio* SPANISH
a book my
'a book of mine'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) In nominal arguments, one finds possessives which co-occur with an adjacent non-definite determiner

ex. *un/qualche mio libro* ITALIAN
a.M.SG/some.SG 1SG.POSS.M.SG book.M.SG
'a book of mine'

una tua macchina
a.F.SG 2SG.POSS.F.SG car.F.SG
'a car of yours'

PCL, ±clitic possessives
Distinguishes languages in which possessives are licensed as bound morphemes cliticizing on the head noun, or a stressed modifier of the noun, without agreement in features with it and with a distribution recognizably different from that of full genitive arguments (e.g., Greek, Farsi, Pashto, Wolof) from languages in which this possibility does not arise (e.g., Germanic, Romance)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In nominal arguments, one finds possessives non-agreeing in phi-features with the noun which are attached to a prenominal modifier and co-occur with non-pronominal non-adpositional genitives

ex. το πρότο-μου πορτρέτο της Μαρίας
to *próto-mu* *portréto* *tis* *Marías*
the.N.SG first.N.SG-1SG.GEN portrait.N.SG the..GEN Maria..GEN
'My first portrait of Maria' GREEK

b) In nominal arguments, one finds non-agreeing possessives immediately adjacent to the head noun and directly modifying it (i.e. with no linker - *only applies to languages that have argument linkers*)

ex. *sama tééré* (*b-i*) WOLOF
1SG book (CLASS-DEF)
'my book'

sa tééré (*b-i*)
2SG book (CLASS-DEF)
'your book'

(see also:
tééré-am
book-3SG.POSS
'his/her book')

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

APO, ±adjectival possessives
Distinguishes languages in which possessives have the distribution and often the agreement features of adjectives (e.g., Italian, some dialects of Sicily, Spanish, Latin, Ancient Greek, Slavic) from languages in which this kind of form/distribution is not found (e.g., English, Romanian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds postnominal possessives that co-occur with articles/demonstratives/quantifiers/numerals and are constructed in the same way as postnominal adjectives (with or without a linker, with or without reduplication of the article, etc., depending on the language)

ex. *a* *màchina* *mia* RAGUSA
the.F.SG car.F.SG my.F.SG
'my car'

(compare to:
a *màchina* *nova*
the.F.SG car.F.SG new.F.SG
'the new car')

καὶ ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ διαβολὴ
and that this.F.SG.NOM is the.F.SG.NOM denigration
ἡ ἐμὴ
the.F.SG.NOM my.F.SG.NOM
'and that this is the denigration of me' CLASS. GREEK
(Plato 24 a 8, adapted from Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 151)

(compare to:
τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην
the.F.SG.ACC nature.F.SG.ACC the.F.SG.ACC human.F.SG.ACC
'the human nature' Plato 191 d 3,
adapted from Guardiano and Stavrou 2019:149)

b) One finds prenominal possessives that co-occur with articles/demonstratives/quantifiers/numerals and are constructed in the same way as prenominal adjectives (with or without a linker, with or without reduplication of the article, etc., depending on the language)

ex. *Gianni ha incontrato (i) tre suoi amici americani*
Gianni have.3SG met the three his friends American
'Gianni met his three American friends/three American friends of his'
ITALIAN

Gianni ha incontrato (i) tre nuovi amici americani
Gianni have.3SG met the three new friends American
'Gianni met (the) three new American friends'

Ho parlato con ogni/qualche mio studente
have.1SG spoken with every/some my student
'I spoke with every/some student of mine'

Ho parlato con ogni/qualche nuovo studente
have.1SG spoken with every/some new student
'I spoke with every new student/some new students'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

WAP, ±Wackernagel possessives
Distinguishes languages that exhibit possessives licensed as bound morphemes enclitic on the determiner (essentially as 2nd position clitics) without agreement in features with the noun (e.g., several Romance dialects of Sicily) from languages in which this possibility does not arise (e.g., other Romance and Greek varieties)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds prenominal possessives not agreeing in phi-features with the head noun occurring between a visible determiner and a cardinal numeral

ex. *u* ***mo*** *libbru* / *a* ***mo*** *casa* RAGUSA
the.M.SG my book.M.SG the.F.SG my house.F.SG
'my book' / 'my house'

i ***mo*** *tri* *llibbra* / *i* ***mo*** *tri* *ccasi*
the.PL my three book.M.PL the.PL my three house.F.PL
'my three books' / 'my three houses'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) One finds prenominal possessives following a cardinal numeral, which in turn follows a visible determiner (i.e. the possessive is the third element of the sequence)

ex. τα τρία μου βιβλία GREEK
ta *tría* *mu* *vivlía*
the three my books
'my three books'

AGE, ±adjectival genitive
Distinguishes languages that productively form adjectives from personal proper and common nouns (like 'John, Mary, president etc.') and these adjectives can have the distribution and binding properties of adjectival possessives (e.g., Slavic languages, except for modern Polish) from languages in which this possibility does not arise (e.g., the rest of IE)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds nominals whose internal argument is realized as an adjective derived from a proper name or a common noun

ex. *Van-ino* *ranenie* RUSSIAN
Vanya-ADJ.GEN wounding
'Vanya's wounding'

b) One finds nominals where an argument adjective binds non-null personal anaphoric/pronominal expressions

ex. *Jovan-ova*$_i$ *strašna* *priča* *o* *seb-i*$_i$ SERBO-CROAT
Jovan-POSS.ADJ terrible story about self-LOC
'Jovan's terrible story about himself'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

OPK, ±null possessive licensing article with kinship nouns

Distinguishes languages in which a definite article introducing kinship nouns can be understood as a possessive (e.g., Scandinavian, Italian, Hebrew, Arabic) from languages in which this possibility does not arise (e.g., English, French, Slavic, Hungarian)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds singular kinship nouns introduced by a definite article and no visible possessive licensing a (3rd person) understood pronoun that can be interpreted as bound

ex. *Gianni è andato a trovare il nipote* ITALIAN
Gianni is gone to visit the nephew
'Gianni visited his nephew'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

TSP, ±split demonstratives
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives appear as two separate parts, one occurring in the position of determiners, and the other, usually encoding deictic contrasts, typically merged in a lower structural position (e.g., French, some Romance dialects of Italy, Malagasy) from languages in which this possibility does not arise (e.g., Italian, Standard Greek, English, Hebrew, Basque)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) The language has deictically neutral demonstratives that are formally distinct from those which encode deictic relations

ex. *Il trouva un champignon et fut étonné*
3SG find.3SG.PAST a mushroom and be.3SG.PAST surprised
car ***ce*** *champignon était très rare dans la*
because DEM mushroom be.3SG.PAST.IMPRF very rare in the
région FRENCH
region
'he found a mushroom and was surprised because this/that mushroom was very rare in the region' (Corblin 1985: 386)

(as opposed to:
passez moi ce livre ci / là
give.2P.IMPV me DEM book here / there
'Give me this/that book')

b) One finds deictic demonstratives realized as two separate words, one a copy of the other (the one at the boundary of the nominal possibly phonologically reduced)

ex. *ss' omə quessə / ll' omə quellə* TERAMANO
DEM man DEM.M.SG DEM man DEM.M.SG
'that man (near you)' / 'that man'

c) One finds deictically neutral demonstratives realized as two separate words

ex. *cla ca le con an grand gjarden l'*
DEM.F.SG house.F.SG there with a.M big garden 3SG.CLI
e che davsen
be.3SG here nearby
'That house with a big garden is nearby' CASALASCO

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) One finds deictic demonstratives realized as a single word

ex. *give me that book*

do you see this boy?

prendi-mi	*quel*	*libro*	ITALIAN
take.IMPERAT-1SG.DAT	that.M.SG	book.M.SG	

'give me that book'

vedi	*questo*	*ragazzo?*
see.PRES-2SG	this.M.SG	boy.M.SG

'do you see this boy?'

b) One finds deictic demonstratives co-occurring with articles

ex. αυτό	το	παιδί	GREEK
aftó	*to*	*peði*	
this.M.SG	the.M.SG	kid.M.SG	

'this kid'

TDP, ±split non-deictic demonstratives
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives appear as two separate parts, one occurring in the position of determiners, and the other typically merged in a lower structural position, even when not encoding deictic meaning, (e.g., some Romance dialects of Northern Italy) from languages in which the demonstrative appears as "split" only when encoding deictic contrasts (e.g., French, Malagasy)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds deictically neutral demonstratives realized as two separate words

ex. *cla ca le con an grand gjarden l'*
DEM.F.SG house.F.SG there with AM big garden 3SG.CLI
e che davsen
be.3SG here closeby
'That house with a big garden is closeby' CASALASCO

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
One finds deictically neutral demonstratives realized as one single word

ex. *Il trouva un champignon et fut étonné*
3SG find.3SG.PAST a mushroom and be.3SG.PAST surprised
car ***ce*** *champignon était très rare dans la*
because DEM mushroom be.3SG.PAST.IMPRF very rare in the
région FRENCH
region
'he found a mushroom and was surprised because this/that mushroom was very rare in the region' (Corblin 1985: 386)

TDC, ±D-checking demonstratives
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives can mark definiteness for the whole nominal and thus do not cooccur with definite articles (e.g., English, German, Italian) from languages in which they cooccur with a definite article (e.g., Greek, Celtic, Semitic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds demonstratives occurring at the boundary of an articleless nominal argument

ex. *I bought this/that nice little book with the red cover*

I bought these/those three nice little books with the red cover

ho	*comprato*	*questo/quel*	*bel*	*libro*	*di*
have.1SG	bought	this.M.SG/that.M.SG	nice.M.SG	book.M.SG	of
arte	*con*	*la*	*copertina*	*rossa*	
art.SG	with	the.F.SG	cover.F.SG	red.F.SG	

'this book / that book' ITALIAN

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) In nominal arguments, one finds demonstratives co-occurring with articles at the boundary

ex. αυτό	το	παιδί	GREEK
aftó	*to*	*peði*	
this.M.SG	the.M.SG	kid.M.SG	

'this kid'

TSA, ±structured demonstratives (adjectival)
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives can appear phrase-internally, in the positions of structured adjectives, (e.g., Celtic, Bulgarian, Romanian, Semitic) from languages in which demonstratives do not have the distribution of structured adjectives (e.g., Germanic, most of Romance, Greek)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds demonstratives following the noun and preceding Genitives and/or PPs (*applies to languages with postnominal adjectives and where adjectives are not realized as postnominal reduced relative clauses*)

ex. *l-mudarris-u* *hādā* *li-l-walad-i* ARABIC
the-teacher-NOM this of-the-boy-GEN
'this teacher of the boy'

b) One finds demonstratives occurring sometimes to the right and sometimes to the left of articles/numerals (*applies to languages with phrase-initial determiners where structured adjectives can be fronted to the left of D*)

ex. *ja* *poterjal-a* *tri* *te* *karandaš-a* RUSSIAN
1SG.NOM lost-F.SG three those.ACC pencil-SG.GEN
'I lost those three pencils' (discourse anaphoric/*deictic)

ja *poterjal-a* *te* *tri* *karandaš-a*
1SG.NOM lost-F.SG those.ACC three pencil-SG.GEN
'I lost those three pencils' (?discourse anaphoric/deictic)

c) One finds demonstratives occurring between a noun bearing a definiteness affix and an adjective (*applies to languages with phrase-initial determiners and phrase-initial enclitic definite articles*)

ex. *copil-ul* *acest-a* *frumos* ROMANIAN
child-the.M.SG this.M.SG-A lovely.M.SG
'this lovely child'

kniga-ta *onazi* *chervena(-ta)* *ne* *ja* *xaresax* BULGARIAN
book-the that red(-the) NEG 1SG like.PAST
'that red book I didn't like'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

TAR, ±unstructured demonstratives (adjectival)
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives can appear in the position of reduced relative clauses (e.g., Spanish, Latin, Ancient Greek, Standard Greek, Indo-Iranian, Turkic, Mandarin, Cantonese, Japanese) from languages in which demonstratives do not have the distribution of reduced relatives (e.g., most of Romance, Wolof)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) Demonstratives and adjectives/Genitives/relative clauses/numerals/PPs are freely ordered

ex. *el libro viejo/nuevo ese* SPANISH
the book old/new that

el libro ese viejo/nuevo
the book that old/new
'that old/new book' (Battlori and Roca 2000: 246)

el libro de matematicas ese/nuevo
the book of mathematics that/new

el libro ese/nuevo de matematicas
the book that/new of mathematics
'that/the new math book'
(adapted from Bernstein 2001: 15 and 25)

b) One finds demonstratives preceding articles or numerals in languages with phrase-initial determiners where reduced relative clauses can also precede articles/numerals

ex. αυτό το παιδί GREEK
aftó to peðí
this.M.SG the.M.SG kid.M.SG
'this kid'

(compare to:
το ψηλό το παιδί
to psiló to peðí
the.M.SG tall.M.SG the.M.SG kid.M.SG
'the tall kid')

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

None

TLC, ±demonstratives in Loc
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives that are not D-checking can appear in a dedicated boundary position to the left of the whole nominal argument (e.g., Ancient Greek, Arabic) from languages in which they cannot, and always occur in a lower adjectival position (e.g., Celtic, Hebrew)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds phrase-initial demonstratives

ex. *hada* *l-mudarris-u* *l-hasan-u* ARABIC
this the-teacher-NOM the-nice-NOM
'this nice teacher'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

TND, ±long distance D-checking demonstratives
Distinguishes languages in which demonstratives can mark the definiteness of the nominal argument at a distance, i.e. from an internal position (e.g., Hebrew), from languages in which a visible article is required (e.g., Arabic, Irish, Welsh)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) In articleless nominal arguments, one finds demonstratives not occurring at the boundary

ex. *bayit/more* *ze* *šel* *Dan* HEBREW
house/teacher this of Dan
'this house of Dan's/this teacher of Dan's'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None

TDA, ±definiteness spread to adjectival demonstratives
Distinguishes languages in which definiteness is spread to adjectival demonstratives (i.e, demonstratives that have the distribution of adjectives), which must accordingly be accompanied by a copy of the definite article, like other adjectives (e.g., Hebrew) from languages in which demonstratives satisfy the doubling requirement through their intrinsic definiteness (e.g., Ancient Greek, Standard Greek, Arabic)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds adjectival demonstratives introduced by a copy of the definite article of the whole nominal phrase

ex. *ha-bayit* *ha-nexmad* *ha-ze* *im* *shtey* *ginot* HEBREW
the-house the-nice the-that with two gardens
'that nice house with two gardens'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)

a) At least one of the following sequences is available in nominal arguments

Art	N	Dem	Art	Adj
Art	N	Art	Adj	Dem
Dem	Art	Adj	Art	N
Dem	Art	N	Art	Adj

ex. το βιβλίο αυτό το κόκκινο
to vivlío aftó to kókkino
the.N.SG book.N.SG this.N.SG the.N.SG red.N.SG

το βιβλίο το κόκκινο αυτό
to vivlío to kókkino aftó

?? αυτό το κόκκινο το βιβλίο
aftó to kókkino to vivlío

αυτό το βιβλίο το κόκκινο
aftó to vivlío to kókkino
'this red book'

TNL, ±DP under Loc
Distinguishes languages in which the whole nominal phrase including the article (if present in the language) follows the demonstrative that marks its boundary (e.g., Hungarian, Finnish, Polish, Arabic, Classical Greek) from languages in which the whole nominal phrase precedes such demonstratives (e.g., French, some Romance dialects of Italy, Chickasaw)

MANIFESTATIONS
Is any of the following true in the language?

a) One finds demonstratives occurring phrase-initially (and co-occurring with definite articles, if any)

ex. *tama* *mies* FINNISH
this.NOM man.NOM
'this man'

ez *a* *kedves* *öreg* *ember* HUNGARIAN
this the kind old man
'this kind old man'

Overt evidence for [−] (*the default state*)
None