**General**:

Parameters in *italics* are not obligatory to fill in (they are rather for those cases where we can collect data from a native speaker of the language).

If the described marker is polyfunctional, then parameters are filled in (unless otherwise indicated: these cases are marked with #) only with respect to the caritive uses. For example, if a hypothetical marker when used adnominally means ‘without John’, and at the same time can be used with finite verbs to express plain verbal negation (‘didn’t come’), then one should not put a “1” value for the parameter “predicate / part of a predicate” in “Syntactic functions…”, based on the latter class of uses.

You can put the following codes in the “Value” column:

1 — “yes”

1? — “likely to be yes” (indirect conclusion or very little data)

0? — “likely to be no” (indirect conclusion or very little data)

0 — “no”

ND — no data neither in favour of “yes”, nor in favour of “no”

IRR — this parameter is irrelevant for the given language or marker. For example, parameter 5a (possibility to express classifying categories) is irrelevant for a language without classifying nominal categories.

The rest of the information should be put down in the column “Notes”.

**0.** “MARKER”: hereinafter we use the term “caritive marker/expression” in a broad sense, including affixes as well as complex clausal constructions. That is why the “marker” may contain several components.

**1.** “Level of realization of the caritive marker”: we refer to the level of the smallest (morpho)syntactic unit that contains the marker. This unit must also include the root/word/noun phrase expressing the absentee.

In the simple case, one should put “1” in the one row that corresponds to the syntactic level of realization of the whole caritive phrase (absentee + caritive marker).

For example, the caritive adjectivizing derivational affix *-less* in English would get “1” only in the row 1a, and “0” in all other rows. The caritive case affix *-ta* in Estonian would get “1” only in the row 1b. The Spanish preposition *sin* would also get only one “1”, but in the row 1c. A caritive applicative verbal marker (the case where caritive is head-marked) would get one “1” in the row 1d. A construction that introduces a dependent clause (like “He left, [not having money]”) would get “1” only in the row 1e.

However, “1” can be put in more than one row for this parameter, if the caritive marker contains several components.

For example, one of the ways to express caritive semantics in Gban is a combination of sentential negation plus a comitative postposition that introduces the absentee (similar to “He didn’t come with Mary”). Such a combination would get “1” in the row 1c “part of a constituent” (for the postpositional component) and “1” in the row 1d “part of the same clause” (for the negation marker), and “0” in the remaining rows. The Russian preposition *bez* would not only get “1” in the row 1c “part of a constituent”, but also “1” in the row 1b “part of the word — inflectional”, because the preposition *bez* obligatorily governs the genitive case of the noun.

Another complex case is attested in Enets: one of the negative predicative possessive constructions is formed by attaching a verbalizing suffix meaning ‘not to have X’ to a noun stem. And such derived verbs, with the addition of a participial suffix (which allows to use the clause based on this verb attributively), are used to express caritive semantics, lit. “house-not\_have-ing man” for ‘homeless man’. In such cases it is suggested to put “1” in the row 1a (because the verbalizing suffix itself is derivational) and “1” in the row 1e “part of an additional … clause” (because the caritive phrase is always realized as an additional dependent clause in this language).

**1a/b.** As for the row 1a, we should specify what is understood by the term “derivational”. In this case, “derivation” covers not only cases of non-productive or medium-productive derivation (according to the traditional view of the term), but also cases of ultra-productive derivation, similar to the participle and converb formation in Russian or English. Thus, the main criterion for “derivational” status is not (non-)productivity, but “derivation of a new word”, including also the cases where the part-of-speech properties of the stem are changed “on the fly” (without necessarily introducing a new token in the lexicon). But if the marker is highly productive and does not change the part of speech of the word, it is to be considered “inflectional” (1b). The degree of productivity itself is described separately in a different part of the questionnaire, see parameter 7.

In any case, one should describe the criteria according to which an (affixal) marker was considered to be “derivational” or “inflectional”, in the column “Notes” for the rows 1a or 1b (this description depends on the availability of such information, it can also be just “the author of the grammar states that the marker is derivational”).

**1d/e.** By “the same clause” in (1d) we understand the very same clause that also expresses the modified (anchor-)participant or the modified situation, — without any additional “ancillary” clause, as in (1e). In fact, this semantically “ancillary” clause may syntactically be a) dependent (cf. “John came, not having money on him”), b) independent (cf. “John came. He didn’t have money on him”), or even c) main (cf. ~“During John’s coming, he didn’t have money on him” ‘John came without money’).

**2**. Parameters 2a–2d are in many aspects parallel to 1a–1e, but they describe the caritive marker from the point of view of its own morphosyntactic status (with respect to the morpheme expressing absentee).

By “with respect to the morpheme expressing absentee” we mean, for example, that a verbal caritive-applicative affix would not be considered an affix here (hence “0” in the row 2a), it would only be considered a part of a clausal construction (“1” in the row 2c).

Additionally, one should provide detailed information on the positional properties of affixal and adpositional (clitic) markers: whether they are prefixes, suffixes, infixes, …; prepositions, postpositions; proclitics, enclitics. This information is put in the column “Notes” right after “1” in the column “Value”.

In this case, “1” can, too, be put in more than one row, if the caritive marker contains several components.

Thus, adpositions governing some specific case of the noun (e.g., the Russian preposition *bez* + gen) should get “1” in the row 2b “Clitic/adposition” and “1” in the row 2a “Affix”.

Additionally, one should state in the column “Notes” for the row 2a, which case marker is required in the given adpositional-case construction.

And one should also state in the column “Notes” for the rows 2a or 2b, which criteria were used to consider the marker an “affix” or a “clitic/adposition” (this description depends on the availability of such information, it can also be just “the author of the grammar states that the marker is an affix”).

**2d.** The row “OTHER” is to be used for exotic cases (caritive expressed by word order?).

**3/4.**Parameter 3 is rather applicable only to affixal or adpositional caritive markers. One should describe here whether it is possible to attach “on top of” the caritive marker (i.e. semantically “on top of” the whole caritive phrase) any additional grammatical markers that express meanings “external” to the caritive phrase as a whole. For example, agreement in gender/number/case, etc. with the nominal head (in an attributive use of the caritive phrase, cf. Finnish *suola-ttoma-****t****…* <salt-car.adj-**pl**> ‘unsaltedX’s’). Cf. also the caritive clitic in Dzhuen Nanai, that attaches a possessive marker expressing person-number of the anchor-participant: ***mi*** *ənə-həm-bi nasapto ana-****i*** <…glasses CAR-**1sg**> ‘**I** left **without** glasses’. Or gender/number/case of an implicit head in a headless use (cf. Chuvash *sumkə-zər-****i****-****zam*** <bag-car-**p\_3-pl**> ‘[**people**] without bags’, where caritive phrase first attaches a definite marker, and then a plural marker, which both relate to the zero head).

Parameter 4 is rather applicable only to adpositional caritive markers. Here one should describe whether the caritive marker itself can attach any (affixal) grammatical markers that refer to its syntactic relation to the absentee. Cf. adpositions in some languages that retain possessive markers expressing the person-number of the dependent.

**5a/5b.** In contrast to the parameter 3, these parameters describe which grammatical markers can be attached to the absentee itself, under the scope of the caritive marker.

**6.** Parameters 6a–6e (without #), like most of other parameters in the questionnaire, are filled only with respect to the caritive uses of the marker. But parameters 6f–6h (with #), on the contrary, re filled with respect to those uses of the same marker that are not proper caritive. Thus, in the rows 6f–6h we do not take into account semantically nominal (substantivized) uses (e.g., in the row 6h we do not take into account such uses as Russian *Ivan prišël bez mladšego* lit. “Ivan came without the youngest” [meaning ‘without his youngest son’], but we do take into account, for example, cases of “privative” negation like ‘unwise’).

**7.** Here by productivity we understand absolute productivity. It can be defined as absence of randomly distributed cases of incompatibility that cannot be well described by some rule (e.g., in terms of parts-of-speech classes, in terms of formal classes).

Only if the marker is absolutely productive, one should put “1”, and in case of any deviations from the absolute productivity, “0”.

**8a/8c.** The difference between depictive and adverbial uses is in the following: in the case of depictive uses, the caritive phrase characterizes (as its primary function) a participant, while in the case of adverbial uses there is no characterization of a participant (or this characterization is secondary), but the caritive phrase characterizes the main situation. Cf. a depictive example *John came without money* (~ ‘John came, and John was without money / John didn’t have money with him’) (possessee function) vs. an adverbial example *John opened a can without a knife* (~ ‘John opened a can without using a knife [in this situation]’) (instrument function). Companion uses (*John came without Mary*) are conventionally classified as adverbial.

(NB! “Depictive” here is understood in a purely semantic/syntactic way, **irrespective of morphological marking**: a verbal dependent that is semantically oriented first of all to one of the participants and less to the verb — i.e. it concerns primarily possessive relations such as *John came without money / It’s hard to live without a car* and those similar to them.)

**9.** Headless uses are derived from attributive uses with the nominal head left unexpressed (although it exists in the semantics). Cf. Russian *Ivan kupil dve rubaški,* ***sinjuju*** *ostavil sebe, a* ***zelënuju*** *podaril bratu*, lit. “Ivan bought two shirts, he left the **blue** [one] for himself and gave the **green** [one] to his brother” and *Ivan kupil dve rubaški,* ***s pugovicami*** *ostavil sebe, a* ***bez pugovic*** *podaril bratu*, lit. “Ivan bought two shirts, he left the [one] **with buttons** for himself and gave the [one] **without buttons** to his brother”.

**10/11.** By “dedicatedness” we understand first of all the case where expression of caritive semantics is the only or at least the principal function of the marker (i.e. in order to obtain “dedicated” status the marker must be semantically specialized). An additional necessary condition for this status is at least a minimal degree of grammaticalization.

The simplest case is case/derivational affixes and adpositions, that usually have only caritive (± peripheral caritive) semantics, cf. Russian *bez*, English *without*, etc. Markers with such morphosyntactic properties we by default consider sufficiently grammaticalized, too. Thus, such markers are to be coded as “dedicated”.

In more complex cases: if the construction is monofunctional and at least partly grammaticalized (formally or semantically), it is to be considered dedicated. Polyfunctional constructions may, too, comply with the semantic specialization requirement: if the use of a construction is more frequent in the central caritive contexts than in other contexts. However, if there is no (even indirect) information on prevalence of the caritive uses above its other uses, such a construction should be by default considered non-dedicated.

Parameters 10 and 11 interact with each other in the following way.

For example, the Russian construction *bez* + gen would get “1” in both rows (the construction is dedicated as a whole and it contains a dedicated preposition *bez* [and a non-dedicated genitive case affix]). Same with the Spanish preposition *sin*.

A clausal construction of the type “He left, [**not having** money]” would by default get “0” for both rows. The components of such a construction would be non-dedicated. And the construction as a whole, although it would be monofunctional, would most likely show no signs of grammaticalization and thus (unless it suddenly does show any) will not be considered dedicated either.

Different values (“1” for the row 10 and “0” for the row 11) can be assigned in the case of a caritive construction that consists only of non-dedicated components, but as a whole is dedicated (i.e. exactly the same combination of components is always or predominantly used to express caritive semantics and at the same time is to some extent grammaticalized). One possible example of such case is English *with no*, which consists of a comitative preposition and a negative quantifier. As a whole it seems to always express caritive semantics and it can be viewed as somewhat grammaticalized (for example, *with no* has distributional peculiarities: not every preposition can be combined in the same way with *no*).

NB! “1” in the row 10 is put only for positively dedicated constructions in the above sense. If it is the case, one should also put “IRR” in all the rows 12a–12e, and describe the structure of the construction in the rows 14–16. Thus, if English *with no* is indeed a dedicated caritive construction, it should **not** get “1” in the row 12a, although it consists of a comitative marker and a negative marker, — this fact is described instead in the rows 14 and 15. On the contrary, if some other construction also consists of a comitative marker and a negative marker, but does not show signs of grammaticalization and/or is not semantically specialized, i.e. can have non-caritive interpretations (e.g. ‘did not come with Mary [but with someone else]’, ‘did not come with Mary [= did not come at all]’), such a construction should get “0” in the row 10, and “1” in the row 12a. (Probably, it is the case in Gban.)

It seems that the combination of “0” in the row 10 and “1” in the row 11 is logically impossible. Thus, if “1” appears in the row 11, then “1” should also appear in the row 10.

**12.** By “equal” we understand synchronic identity to another item that has the indicated function (i.e. it is the same linguistic item, which sometimes expresses caritive semantics, and sometimes expresses standard negation/negative possession/etc.).

These parameters deal with fully non-dedicated constructions (those that have “0” for the parameter 10).

**13.** If it is stated in the source (or at least we assume so) that the marker is borrowed, it should get “1” (or “1?”). In this case one should write down the source of the borrowing (the language and the item) in the column “Notes”.

One should put “0” in this row only in the cases where one knows for sure that the marker is not borrowed (at least in the near past). In other case, one should put “ND” in this row.

**14/15/16.** Parameters 14–16 deal only with the cases where the construction is dedicated as a whole (it has “1” in the row 10), but contains separate (non-trivial) components that have a synchronic or historical source different from the caritive.

**19.** NB! Parameters 19 describe various functions of the marker: core caritive as well as peripheral caritive, and also non-caritive ones (19o–19r) (e.g., if this marker is used as a verbal negation marker, it should be described in the row 19s “OTHER”). In general, predicative examples are not taken into account here; if for a dedicated marker there are only predicative examples for one of the functions, one should put “1?”.

**19n.** “Cause” and “condition” cannot be considered as an independent meaning/role here, because it always combines with other meanings/roles as a secondary one. Cf. *You won’t be able to open the door without me*: non-involvement of a companion is a condition or a potential cause for the impossibility of opening the door. *They couldn’t open the bottle without a corkscrew*: non-involvement (impossibility of involvement) of an instrument became a cause for non-opening of the bottle.