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Noun categorization devices denote properties of nouns and nominal referents. Languages share striking similarities concerning the types of semantic distinctions, the items that markers can be associated with, and the grammaticalization paths followed by those markers. Classificatory morphemes most likely provide information about animacy, sex, physical properties, and functionality (Denny 1976, Allan 1977, Croft 1994); they can generally occur on nouns, several modifier types, predicates, as well as pronouns (Aikhenvald 2000, Grinevald 2000). Nevertheless, there is wide cross-linguistic variation among the documented systems (Seifart 2010). The similarities and diversity of classificatory patterns raise questions regarding the extent to which they reflect the way we perceive and construe the world we live in, and to what extent the documented similarities reflect underlying, general cognitive processes in the human mind. A question of theoretical interest is whether classificatory systems can be accounted for by externally motivated explanations grounded in notions such as prototypicality, frequency, and ease of acquisition, and/or in terms of arbitrarily conventionalized facts about the grammar of individual languages.

While the categorization of nouns is a universal and pervasive aspect of human languages, typological proposals tend to highlight a finite set of grammatically relevant categorization devices: noun/gender classes, noun classifiers, numeral classifiers, genitive classifiers, verbal classifiers, locative classifiers (see, for example, Aikhenvald 2000, Dixon 1986, Grinevald 2000, Grinevald & Seifart 2004, among others). However, there are a number of other structural strategies that do not fall neatly within these more well-known types (Aikhenvald 2000, Grinevald 2015). In addition, multiple overlapping systems can co-exist in a single language, or a single system can have multiple functions in the same language (e.g. agreement and representation of referents, cf. Fedden & Corbett 2017, Contini-Morava 2013, respectively).

Noun classification has been extensively dealt with in terms of semantic and morphosyntactic variation. However, the pragmatic side of this phenomenon in general, and its role in communicative interaction in particular, have received much less attention (but see Seifart 2005, Contini-Morava & Kilarski 2013, Farmer 2015). This is surprising, considering that the primary functions of noun categorization devices are said to be classification, individuation, reference building, and reference tracking of entities in sustained discourse.
The proposed workshop can advance this debate by examining new bodies of data from languages under-represented in the literature. It can contribute to the development of a more fine-grained typology taking into consideration a multidimensional approach, as suggested by Seifart (2010) and Grinevald (2015), among others. We invited contributions from scholars of different theoretical orientations, on in-depth, preferably usage-based research of different aspects of noun categorization devices, including (albeit not exclusively):

- The motivation for using a classifier in narratives and conversation for certain referents is not always obvious. What are the discourse functions of noun categorization devices in a given language? How dependent are these devices on the pragmatic context, the interlocutors’ familiarity with the referent, specific cultural practices, and world views?
- Systems allow for some semantic heterogeneity within each “category”. This suggests a continuum within a given group, from prototypical to less prototypical exemplars. If the sorting is established according to perceptual properties, how much room is there for intra- and inter-speaker variation?
- While in some languages each noun is associated with one classifier, in other languages there is a degree of flexibility with regard to the choice of classifier in order to differentiate shades of meaning. How can pragmatics explain the choice of classifiers? And to what extent do these classifiers display inflectional and/or derivational characteristics for the creation of lexical items, agreement and cross-referencing?
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The discourse dynamics of agreement class assignment in Tikuna narratives (isolate, Western Amazonia)

Denis Bertet

San Martín de Amacayacu Tikuna (SMAT; Amazonas, Colombia) displays a system of five nominal agreement classes (CI-CV). Agreement for class, an obligatory and pervasive feature, is classically realized through the inflection of several adnominal and pronominal elements, both within the NP and on the predicative head.

A few nouns, because they always trigger agreement for the same class, may give the misleading impression of an Indo-European-like lexical gender system. Most nominal phrases (NPs), however, show the ability to alternatively trigger agreement for several of the five classes. In fact, although they are homogeneously realized from a morphosyntactic perspective, SMAT’s five agreement classes are functionally heterogeneous. While three of them do indeed correspond to genuine lexical genders (which can legitimately be called “masculine”, “feminine”, and “neuter”), the other two specify the referent for what can be roughly identified as “social deixis”, a pragmatic dimension (inclusion within vs. exclusion from the reference center’s personal sphere) orthogonal to gender (see Figure 1).

In actual speech, an NP may alternatively trigger agreement according to the lexical gender of its head (in which case it is underspecified for social deixis) or according to the desired social deixis effect (in which case its gender is left unrealized). It is common for the assignment of a referent to shift from a given agreement class to another along the social deixis axis within a single speech event.

In this talk, I will first give a brief outline of the local effects (or semantic functions, as identified by Contini-Morava & Kilarski 2013) of agreement class assignment in SMAT. I will then focus on the discourse dynamics (or discourse functions; Contini-Morava & Kilarski 2013) of agreement class assignment along the social deixis axis, i.e. not on the effects and functions of agreement class assignment in single or isolated mentions of a referent, but on the effects and functions of agreement class assignment and reassignment over repeated mentions of a referent in

Figure 1 | An outline of SMAT’s functionally two-dimensional system of nominal agreement classes
whole stretches of connected speech. As a first approach and for want of good-quality conversational data, scope will be restricted to narrative data.

What rules or tendencies underlie the evolution of agreement class assignment along the social deixis axis in SMAT narratives? How often does reassignment occur? Does it typically occur at pivotal moments from a narrative perspective, or does it mostly occur for ease of reference-tracking? Are some reassignment patterns more common than others (e.g. cIV at first mention then cI, rarely the opposite)? Does reassignment require the use of specific morphosyntactic devices (e.g. it might only be possible when referring to the referent by means of an independent pronoun or a full NP, not mere indexes on the predicative head)? These questions will be addressed through the systematic analysis (as illustrated in Table 1) of first-hand narrative texts from various genres collected in SMA from 2015 to 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NARRATIVE STEP</th>
<th>l. (1-22)</th>
<th>l. (23-28)</th>
<th>l. (29-47)</th>
<th>l. (48-71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUNTER</td>
<td>cII</td>
<td>cII</td>
<td>cI</td>
<td>cI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAGUAR</td>
<td>cIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>cII</td>
<td>cIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** | Evolution of the agreement class assignment of the hunter and the jaguar along a version of the tale of The Hunter and the Jaguar told by Loida Ángel Ruiz
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1 = first person; 3 = third person; AN = animate; ASS = assertive; CLS = classifier; COP = copula; F = feminine; FUT = future; N = non; NLZ = nominalizer; OBJ = object; PL = plural; PRES = present; PST = past; REP = reportative; S = singular; SBJ = subject; SS = same subject
The agreement using specific classifiers, illustrated in (5), is uncommon in Ecuadorian Siona: when speakers refer back to inanimate nouns that carry a classifier, they usually use a modifier that contains one of the general classifiers: -(k)o 'FEMININE' and -(k)i 'MASCULINE,' and -(j)e 'NEUTRAL.' The choice between the general classifiers seems to be based on the type of modifier. The choice between specific and general classifiers may depend on discourse factures, but it may also be related to language change.

The second morphological system that shows an animacy distinction is plural marking. Inanimate nouns have two plural markers: -ã, which is used in combination with a classifier, and -jã, which is used when an inanimate does not take any classifier. The animate nouns or pronominals referring to animate nouns take disyllabic plural suffixes, some of which seem to have recently grammaticalized, such as -wa'i coming from the word for ‘meat’ or ‘animal’ and -dowi coming from the word for ‘herd.’

The final category that shows an animate/inanimate distinction is case marking. Ecuadorian Siona shows differential case marking for, at least, subject, object, and goal marking. Only in the case of differential object marking animacy plays a role.Animate objects can be marked with the suffixes -ni (example (6)) or -de (example (7)). Inanimate objects can be marked with the object marker -de (example (8)) or can be unmarked (example (9)):

(6) Jɨ'=hõhtã-o-ñi kidi-dah-si'-i kaa-ni da-i'.
1s=niece-CLS:AN.F-OBJ take-come-FUT-N3S.ASS say-SS.PST come-N3S.PST.ASS
‘I came to take away my niece.’

(7) Hā́-bi te'e dōmi-o-de baa-i-jā.
He-SBJ one woman-CLS:ANLF-OBJ have-2/3S.M.PST.N.ASS-REP
‘He had a wife, they say.’

(8) Ji'i hūjā a'so-de baa-jī.
I green yucca-OBJ have-N3S.PRS.ASS
‘I have unripe yucca.’

(9) S'i-a-wa'i a'so-Ø beo-kua'i-a'-i.
All-pl yucca-Ø not.have-NLZ.PL-COP-N3S.ASS
‘(We) all don’t have yucca.’

The discourse plays a role in the choice of a marker. It seems that more active animate object is marked with -ni. In the case of the inanimate objects, specificity is a factor of influence.

In conclusion, I have argued that noun categorization does not only involve nominal classifiers in Ecuadorian Siona, but also plural marking and differential object marking. Taking into account these three systems the language shows a clear split between animate and inanimate nouns. Discourse plays a distinct role for animate and animate nouns in object case assigning.
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In this talk, I discuss the functions of nominal categorization in Kubeo, an Eastern Tukanoan language spoken in Northwest Amazonia. By investigating primarily discourse data, I show that Kubeo has a semantic transparent way to categorize nominal concepts and nominal referents, which is grammaticalized in two superordinate classes: Animate and Inanimate. Further sub-categorization strategies express Gender (or the biological sex: feminine and masculine) for Animates, and Classifiers (shape, dimension, and functionality, with 17 morphemes) for Inanimates and some Animates. These different categorization strategies are accomplished by a diverse set of means in Kubeo grammar and discourse. From a grammatical perspective, nominal categorization devices function in (1) word formation (noun inflection and derivation), (2) the syntax of the NP (occurring with most modifiers), (3) the grammatical relations of nouns as arguments or modifiers in the same sentence, and (4) the discourse relations between nouns, NPs, and predicates in different sentences.

While this general outline is true for almost every Tukanoan language (Gomez-Imbert 2007) and many languages from the Northwest Amazon (Seifart and Payne 2007), I argue that at least in Kubeo there is a grammatical asymmetry within the entire system, where Gender is subordinate to Animacy, but Classifiers have a more independent status. This suggests a grammatical organization where Classifiers often enter in competition with strategies pertaining to Animacy or Gender. In addition, Classifiers show a formal and functional ambiguity between the more inflectional-like Gender systems and the more lexical nature of free nouns. Of special interest here is the status of “repeaters”, which I analyze as regular nouns and not as classifiers in Kubeo.

Looking more directly at the semantics of discourse, the use of nominal classification devices is obligatory with all specifically referring NPs, while it is not obligatory with non-specific or generic NPs. However, nouns referring to kinds and in their citation form also carry nominal classification devices. I will show that this reflects the double function of these devices: on the one hand, (5) they semantically categorize nominal concepts; on the other hand, (6) they act as reference building devices at the NP level, reflecting the gradual nature of referentiality (Givón 2001).

When NPs are established as discourse referents, Kubeo employs several strategies for (7) reference tracking. These strategies are better analyzed as anaphora and cross-indexation, but in some cases they seem to become grammaticalized as canonical agreement. Many cases of reference tracking are also based on the (8) semantic recategorization of NPs. I will show that the recategorization of NPs is made by alternating from different nominal classification devices, in particular between inanimate marking to classifiers or between different kinds of classifiers, which supports the claim that Classifiers are in some sort of functional competition with other semantic categories.

We conclude by addressing a fundamental problem posed by Kubeo and related languages: how to analyze their system taking into consideration the different categorization schemes evident at different kinds of grammatical relations and discourse functions? We address this problem by discussing the status of the classifier system as
perhaps a new classifier type (cf. Grinevald 2000, Aikhenvald 2000) and whether one should analyze the Kubeo language as having (1) a single simple system, (2) a single, but integrated system of general and specific class markers, or (3) overlapping and competing systems which converge at similar grammatical domains and semantic-discursive functions (Seifart 2005, Fedden and Corbett 2017).
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Máihíki classifiers and non-asserted information

In this talk, I provide evidence for three potential syntactic analyses of the Máihíki construction verb root(s) + “relativizer” + classifier: as a nominalization; as a headless relative clause; and as the subordinated verb in a temporal adverbial clause. My immediate goal is to analyze the diverse morphosyntactic roles that classifiers play in Máihíki, some of which are yet undescribed. My broader goal is to explore whether these roles may be united under the umbrella of reference tracking, and to suggest that the “impoverished” yet specific semantics of classifiers (i.e. that they highlight only a particular attribute of an entity) makes them ideal for the contexts of backgrounded, common-ground, and otherwise non-asserted information.

Máihíki, a Western Tukanoan language of northern Peruvian Amazonia, exhibits a noun classification system that is typical of its region (per the descriptions, for instance, in Payne (1986), Seifart (2005), and Gomez-Imbert (2007)) in that classifiers blur the boundary between derivation and inflection, appear in a broad range of morphosyntactic contexts, exhibit a semantic split between ‘general’ and ‘specific’, and are involved in reference tracking (Farmer, 2015). In the construction that forms the focus of this talk, a verb root is marked with one of the relativizing suffixes listed below in Table 1, followed by a classifier that indicates a salient physical or cultural property of the entity denoted by the derived form. Examples of this construction are shown in (1), with classifiers in bold.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{PAST} & \text{NO TENSE} & \text{FUT} \\
\text{-chi} \sim \text{-se} & \text{-∅} & \text{-ha} \sim \text{-hai} \\
\end{array}
\]

Table 1: Máihíki relativizing suffixes

(1)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. gáhígará} & \quad \text{c. kwééchitó} \\
gáhí \text{-∅} -gara & \quad \text{kwéé} \text{-chi} \quad \text{-to} \\
\text{grab -REL -CL:clump} & \quad \text{chop -REL.PST -CL:pot} \\
b. bàséwè & \quad d. úkwáháibi \\
\text{bài -se} \quad \text{-we} & \quad \text{úkwá} \quad \text{-hai} \quad \text{-bi} \\
\text{live -REL.PST -CL:house} & \quad \text{give.drink -REL.FUT -CL:CONTAINER}
\end{align*}

These constructions are translated into Spanish by speakers of Máihíki in at least three distinct ways, as exemplified below in (2):

(2)  
\begin{align*}
\text{kwàkòkì óíí} \\
\text{kwàkò -ki óí -hì} \\
\text{cook -CL:masculine cry -3SG.PRS.DECL} \\
\text{a) “the cook is crying” (nominalization)} \\
\text{b) “the one who is cooking is crying” (relative clause)} \\
\text{c) “as he cooks, he cries” (adverbial clause)}
\end{align*}
Evidence for the nominal nature of these constructions is that they may take regular noun morphology (plural, object, and diminutive marking) and may serve as the arguments of finite verbs. Evidence for their verbal nature is that they take a nearly full range of verbal morphology (including suffixal negation and aspect marking) and may take nouns as their arguments. I draw from a corpus of 50 hours of recorded and translated Māhīki oral texts to elucidate the distribution of this versatile construction, and conclude that:

1. the “nominalization” translation is most common in (but not exclusive to) constructions with the “null” relativizer allomorph (i.e., where information about time is absent);
2. the “relative clause” interpretation is by far the most frequent; and
3. the “adverbial clause” interpretation (shown below in (3)) is emergent, infrequent, and perhaps restricted to the animate classifiers.

(3) kāmā yētēsēhūnā, kānu ńība ḫē
kāmā yētē -se -huna kānu ńī -bi ĳ -re
thus learn -REL:PST -CL:group that.time see -1PL.PST.DECL 3SG.MASC -OBJ
“At that time, when we were studying, we met him.” (sro 7.1)

A careful look at possible analyses of this construction provides insight into what unites the seemingly disparate functions of classifiers (as nominalizers, subordinators, and reference tracking devices). I suggest that the contexts in which classifiers appear have in common that they carry non-asserted information, and that the classifiers themselves contain minimal but salient information about a presupposed referent.
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The extent of nominal classification: a Canonical Typology approach

The discovery of exciting new systems prompts us to offer a typology of nominal classification; it is designed both to encompass gender and the various types of classifier, and to capture their similarities on the morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels.

The idea of an opposition between gender and classifiers was articulated clearly by Dixon (1982). But Seifart’s (2005) account of Miraña, which demonstrates straightforward characteristics of gender and of classifiers, made it hard to maintain the opposition. Reid’s (1997) account of Ngan’gityemerri provided other evidence, since classifiers can grammaticalize into gender values. Given this evidence, we relinquish a divide between gender and classifiers, and as a result we get a clearer picture of the range of possible systems. By decomposing the characteristics traditionally associated with gender systems, and those attributed to classifier systems, we see that they combine in many ways, including ways that fall between the old dichotomy. We therefore adopt a canonical perspective, in which we define the notion of canonical gender, and use this idealization as a baseline from which to calibrate the theoretical space of nominal classification. This allows us to situate the interesting combinations we find, and to capture both simple and extreme systems (Fedden & Corbett 2018).

According to the Canonical Gender Principle “each noun has a single gender value.” (Corbett & Fedden 2016: 503; cf. Dixon 1982: 166). Under this general principle there are two specific criteria:

Criterion “lexical”: the gender of a noun can be read unambiguously off its lexical entry. Nearest to canonical are strictly semantic systems, like those of Bagvalal (male human, female human, and other, Kibrik 2001: 64–66); in contrast, we find systems like Mawng (Singer 2016), where recategorization is readily available. Mawng has five genders: masculine, feminine, land, vegetation and edible genders. The noun jampakang ‘corrugated iron’ – like all nouns denoting metals – is masculine (1). But it can be referred to according to its purpose in an appropriate context: if it is used to make a shelter, then edible gender is found (2).

Mawng (Singer 2016: 63-64)

(1)  Marrik iw-atpi-ya ja jampakang.
    NEG 3PL>3M-HAVE-IRR2 M sheet.iron
    ‘They didn’t have any corrugated iron.’

(2)  Apu-warlkarri-nya-apa ta jampakang.
    3PL>3ED-put.high.up-PP-EMPH1 EDIBLE sheet.iron
    ‘They put corrugated iron on top.’

A similar recategorization is possible with the noun muru, which refers to a grass species. This noun would normally be vegetation gender, but again as with jampakang ‘corrugated iron’, when used to construct a shelter, muru takes edible gender. Such recategorization can also be found in small systems, as in the two-gender system of Savosavo (Wegener 2012). Furthest away from canonical we find systems like that of Burmese, where different numeral classifiers can be chosen to highlight different aspects of a referent in a given pragmatic context.

Criterion “constant”: canonically a noun has a unique gender value, that is, it takes the same gender agreement in all domains; nouns taking different agreements (lexical hybrids) are non-canonical. Here German comes close to canonical, having few hybrids, while Russian has many hybrids, like vrač ‘(woman) doctor’, which can take masculine and feminine agreements, in different syntactic domains.
Canonical agreement, on which canonical gender is based, contributes further helpful criteria:

Criterion “obligatory”: since canonical agreement is obligatory, this is a component of a canonical gender system, as in languages like Russian and Chichewa, where agreement in gender is fully obligatory. Less canonical are those where agreement can be optional, as in Ngan’gityemerri (Reid 1997). And classifiers of various types are frequently optional (rather, their inclusion has specific effects).

Criterion “obligatory values”: in addition to agreement being obligatory, canonical systems use the most specific feature value associated with the controller; such systems include Mian. Those which are less canonical, since they exhibit ‘superclassing’, include Bininj Gun-wok (Evans 1997) and Jingulu (Meakins & Pensalfini 2016). (This is an unusual instance where the canonical is also frequent.)

Criterion “orthogonal”: as with any morphosyntactic feature, gender is canonical to the extent that it is orthogonal to parts of speech. Indeed we find systems where almost all parts of speech show gender agreement (Archi is a dramatic example), and at the other end of this scale, systems where agreement is limited. One example is North Ambrym, where only the relational classifiers show relevant inflection (Franjieh 2016).

As we calibrate carefully, using these different criteria independently of each other (rather than aiming for two clusters of properties), we find that traditional gender languages and traditional classifier languages prove to be close in some respects, and more distant in others. This is a desirable outcome: Russian, Archi, Mawng and Ngan’gityemerri are profoundly similar in parts of their nominal classification system, and profoundly different in others. Our typology integrates the morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties of nominal classification systems; it helps to reveal the great diversity of systems (greater than was suspected even a few years ago), and the similarity of the phenomena that play out as variations on similar themes.
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**iClassifier** - A digital tool for systematic classifier analysis of classifier languages and scripts
Orly Goldwasser, Halely Harel, Dmitry Nikolaev

The graphemic classifier system evident in the ancient Egyptian script has been studied in the last two decades as having a parallel structure to that of classifier systems in classifier languages (Bauer 2017; Grinevald 2015; Goldwasser and Grinevald 2012; Lincke & Kammerzell 2012; first analysis as classifiers by Rude 1986, in Craig 1986). Within the framework of Israel Science Foundation grant 735/17, “Classifying the other: The classification of Semitic loanwords in the Ancient Egyptian script during the New Kingdom,” our team has developed a new digital research environment, [https://www.iclassifier.pw](https://www.iclassifier.pw), meant for the systematic study of classifiers in the Egyptian script and beyond. *iClassifier* aims to offer advanced platform for classifier analysis for diverse classifier scripts across all periods, such as (Egyptian, Chinese [Chen 2016], Cuneiform [Selz et al. 2017] or Anatolian hieroglyphs [Payne 2018]), as well as for the analysis of classifier languages (pilot for Nepali by Dörte Borchers). The database is an online research environment which will allow collaborative work among researchers around the globe. Each contributor will provide their data (while maintaining full copyrights), resulting in a detailed knowledge-organization maps for the respective cultures, all constructed through genuine *emic* data manifested by the classifier systems. The basic hypothesis is that each classifier represents a category head in its respective language. Our objective is to develop tools for the comparison of categorization systems evident in languages and scripts. For this end, each token in the database is studied for various aspects of the classifier-host relationship:

**Classifier type**: Semantic relation of classifier and its host - *taxonomic* or *schematic*. Cases of *zero classification* are also marked (after Goldwasser 2002; Goldwasser & Grinevald 2012).

**Classifier level**: level of classification: root, word form (e.g. deverbals, plural), specific referent, or *meta-textual* classifier (e.g.host classified as “foreign word” (Allon 2010; Lincke and Kammerzell 2012). Also *phonetic classifiers*, where the classifier serves as a phonemographic interpretant, are known in classifier scripts (Polis and Rosmerduc 2015: 168; Lincke & Kammerzell 2012, for this type of use in classifier languages, see Grinevald 2012: 49).

**Semantic roles**: Semantic roles singled out by a classifier, such as: AGENT, MOVER, EXPERIENCER, INSTRUMENT, UNDERGOER, GOAL, SOURCE, and LOCATION (after Kammerzell 2015).

**Context sensitivity**: The influence of *discourse, materiality* and of other metadata variables (*geography, date, genre*) on classifier interchangeability and use.

**False etymology**: Mismatch of classification due to homonymity or other factors.

**Reception and integration of loanwords**: To what extent and how loanwords are analysed and classified, if classified at all, in a given system.

These layers of analysis allows us to track the contexts in which different types of classification occur and identify tendencies in language structure and in metadata to which they correlate. Each language dataset will include the digitization of all lexical items studied into the comparative concepts (e.g. lexical field tagging after WOLD, see Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009). One will be able to track into which classifier categories a certain lexical field is dissected in the various classifier systems of different cultures.

In this talk, we will share examples for the above-mentioned varieties of classifier assignment in our pilot on the Ancient Egyptian script. We will demonstrate advanced context sensitive queries and will suggest how a digital tool such as *iClassifier* could advance classifier research as it exists today. As *iClassifier* is still in its cradle, we would gratefully welcome suggestions from other participants.
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A data-based study on universals of nominal classification systems

Dan Ke

Nominal classification systems are traditionally divided into gender systems and several classifier systems. Based on this tradition, linguists provide descriptions (Allan 1977; Corbett 1991; Aikhenvald 2000; Senft 2001; Grinevald 2002; Kilarski 2012; Di Garbo 2014; Kramer 2015) and suggest universals (Greenberg 1966) about the nominal classification systems. However, more and more linguists agree nowadays on the view that there are no crucial differences between gender and classifier systems (Contini & Kilarski 2013; Corbett & Fedden 2015; Singer 2016; Passer 2016; Fedden & Corbett 2017; Seifart 2018). I report here an examination of universals about nominal classification systems with a database of 200 languages and explore the possibility of proposing new universals and generalizations.

This 200 language sample is a worldwide core sample using the Genus-Macroarea-Method according to Miestamo et al. (2016). It covers most of the world at standard densities. The languages are chosen regardless of whether they have nominal classification systems and which kind of system they have. The database contains general information about the language and a range of properties of the nominal classification system in the language. If the language has more than one nominal classification system, each system has one record in the database. If the language has no nominal classification system, only general information about the language is noted.

I test preliminarily eight Greenbergian Universals (Greenberg 1966) about gender systems. Some universals are confirmed. Meanwhile for some other universals serious counterevidence has turned up. Universal 31 says that if either the subject or object noun agrees with the verb in gender, then the adjective always agrees with the noun in gender. Languages like Alamblak, Ama (Papua New Guinea), Barasano, Berik, Burushaski, Kiowa, and Yuchi do not have gender agreement in the adjective though they have subject or object indexes. Thus Universal 31 is highly questionable. Universal 36 states that if a language has the category of gender, it always has the category of number. This universal is confirmed insofar as every gender language in the database also has the number category. However, not only the gender languages but also the classifier languages and languages which do not have any nominal classification systems tend to have number category. Haspelmath (2005) underlines the importance of the number category that only 28 out of 133 languages (21.05%) do not have any nominal plural.

This study provides not only a clear distribution of nominal classification systems in the world’s languages but also investigates possible principles of human languages on the basis of real universals about nominal classification systems.
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The discursive and interactive origins of possessive nominal classes in Shiwiar

In many languages, nouns can be categorised into different possessive classes. A common distinction is that of alienably- versus inalienably-possessed nouns. Although the terms are commonly used cross-linguistically, the precise nature of the difference between ‘alienable’ and ‘inalienable’ nouns varies widely from language to language. Whereas in some languages, alienability is marked by different morphological possessive strategies, in other languages it is marked by the degree of morphological boundedness that different noun roots exhibit. Furthermore, to what extent the categories are rigid, or whether nouns can move between classes, also varies. This presentation will explore a complex system of possessive noun categorisation in Shiwiar, a language of northwest Amazonia, with particular focus on the discourse- and usage-based underpinnings of the noun class distinctions.

Shiwiar is a Chicham (Jivaraoan) language spoken by 1,200 people in the lowlands of eastern Ecuador and northern Peru. The data presented in this talk were collected as part of an ongoing documentation project which began in 2011. Examples and observations are drawn from a 30-hour audiovisual corpus of natural speech data, with over 9 hours of dialogue and a total of 30 speakers represented. The documented communicative events include day-to-day conversations, personal anecdotes, political discussions, radio shows, traditional stories, friendly advice, love songs, among many other genres.

There are two types of morphological distinctions which apply to possessive nouns in Shiwiar. First, Shiwiar nouns can be categorised by the type of possessive morphology that applies to them: for some nouns possession marking is a suffix (e.g. 1) whereas for other nouns possession is indicated by phonological changes (usually ablaut) within the noun stem (e.g. 2).

(1) *nan̩gámim támî. ísanírim waingam!*

[nan̩kámi-m tâ-mî] [ísaní-řim waín-ka-m]

[in.vain-2SG say.IPFV-2SG] [lover-POSS.2 see-PFV-2SG]

‘Don’t speak in vain, you must’ve seen your lover.’

(2) *nîna nawínga kuju̞át’ kuju̞át’ wímau tipúwai.*

nî = na *naw̩í = ka* kuju̞át kuju̞át wí-mau tip-a-wa-i

3 = OBJ *foot:POSS:3 = TOP IDEO go-NMLZ lie-IPFV-3-DECL*

‘Their (peccaries’) footprints are on the ground.’

Second, Shiwiar nouns can also be categorised as either bound or free. Bound nouns are obligatorily possessed (i.e. they never appear without possession marking), whereas morphologically free nouns can appear without possession marking (e.g. 3, where one noun is bound and the rest are free).

(3) *Las partes del cuerpo son: muûk, hî, kwîj, hâŋî, winwîr, jakâî…*

[las partes del cuerpo son] muûk hî kwîj hâŋî winwî-r jakâî

[the parts of the body are] dep head eye ear mouth *lip-POSS:1SG shoulder*

‘The parts of the body are: the head, the eyes, the ear, the mouth, the lips (lit. my lips), the shoulders…’
These two distinctions cross-cut each other, resulting in four noun classes: (a) bound nouns with stem-internal possession, (b) bound nouns with suffixing possession, (c) free nouns with stem-internal possession, and (d) free nouns with suffixing possession. The cline between categories (a), (b), (c) and (d) can be thought of as a continuum of alienability, where nouns in class (a) are typically classed as inalienable cross-linguistically (e.g. close kinship terms) and nouns in class (d) are typically classed as alienable. However, it is difficult to define each of the noun classes by the semantics of the nouns (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not possessed</td>
<td>Possessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Suffixing | áha  
garden  ‘garden’  | ahá-ři  
garden-POSS.3  ‘her garden’  |  |  
|         | | | apá-ři  
father-POSS.3  ‘father/her father’  |
| Stem-internal | nńŋka  
land  ‘land’  | nünkš  
land:POSS.3  ‘her land’  |  |  
|         | | | kāií  
sister:POSS.3  ‘sister/her sister’  |

Table 1. Possessive noun classes in Shiwiar

In this talk I will show that the underpinnings to possessive nominal categorisation in Shiwiar can be found in discourse and interaction. The frequency in which a noun is used in conversation correlates very well with the type of possessive morphology that it takes on: highly frequent nouns are usually possessed by stem-internal morphological changes, whereas less frequent nouns are usually suffixing. Furthermore, some bound nouns can appear as free in certain pragmatic contexts, relevant within Shiwiar culture. For example, in the Shiwiar kinship system, mothers and female aunts (this includes a father’s sister, a mother’s sister, a father’s brother’s wife or a mother’s brother’s wife) are referred to by the same word nuku-‘aunt’. However, when it refers to a biological mother, the noun is always bound; when it refers to an aunt, it may be unbound:

(4) viŋa nńńku hakńńvʲitįjai.
    wi=na  nńńku-r  ha-ka-u-it-a-i
    1SG-OBJ mother-POSS:1SG  die-PFV-NMLZ-COP-3-DECL
    ‘My mother passed away.’

(5) nńńku φlorentina centro de salud takńńkmawai.
    nńńku  Florentina  [centro de salud]  takńńk-m-wa-i
    aunt  Florentina  [health centre]SP  work-IPFV-3-DECL
    ‘Aunt Florentina works at the health centre.’

This shows that the key to understanding the nature (and therefore the diachronic origin) of the four possessive noun classes in Shiwiar lies in exploring communicative usage patterns. Grammatical structures are reflective of communicative practices and the cultural worldview that mediates them.
Between noun class and classifier: the case of Kamsá
Colleen Alena O’Brien
Freie Universität

Introduction

Kamsá, a language isolate of southern Colombia, has an unusual noun class system. Class markers are inseparable from their respective nouns, but adjectives may inflect differently to index agreement with nouns of different classes. Only a small percentage of the nouns in the language, however, exhibit membership to these nine or more classes; most nouns are unmarked for class (and adjectives that agree with them are also unmarked). Moreover, the Kamsá noun classes are semantically rather similar to noun classifier categories found in other languages of South America. In this paper I describe the noun class system of Kamsá, including the morphology, syntax, and semantics of the system, and situate it typologically. I then compare it with the systems of neighboring languages (Siona [Tucanoan], Guambiano [Barbacoan], Cofán [isolate]) and language families (Chibchan, Arawkan) to explore whether this system could have emerged in Kamsá due to contact.

Morphology

Morphologically, class markers in Kamsá are obligatory, bound suffixes. Thus, nouns such as *fsñëbë ‘eye’ (which exhibits the round-object class marker -be) and *jatjonëfja ‘walking stick’ (which exhibits the long-thin-object class marker -fja) would be ungrammatical as *fsñë and *jatjonë, respectively.

There are, however, minimal pairs (or triplets, etc.) of words that contrast based on word-class suffix alone, such as mashakbë ‘lulo fruit’ versus mashaktiy ‘lulo tree’ versus mashakwiy (the first reflecting the round-object class marker, the second the tree class marker, and the third the liquid class marker). There is no attested free form *mashak, however.

A particularly unusual characteristic of noun class in Kamsa is that at least three classes are marked with the prefix wa- in addition to their respective suffixes. These classes are -iyá and -jwa (both used for clothing items) and -shá (used for hairy things). Examples of nouns belonging to these classes are: wa-janshan-iyá ‘flag for carnival’, wa-batëtjonë-jwa ‘blouse for women’, and wa-jajonë-shá ‘nest’.

Syntax

Nouns that belong to one of the nine or more classes are indexed for agreement. This is manifest in adjectives that follow the noun they modify: such adjectives are always inflected with the matching the class marking of their referent. Adjectives that precede their nouns, however, are not in any way marked for class.

In the following two examples, the adjective exhibits the class marker when it follows the noun (1), but not when it precedes it (2).

(1) shëmnë-bé botaman-bé
good-CLF beautiful-CLF
‘beautiful egg’

(2) botaman shëmnë-bé
beautiful egg-CLF
‘beautiful egg’

When adjectives agree with nouns from the classes that exhibit the \textit{wa-} prefix, the adjective is marked both with the \textit{wa-} prefix and with the suffix associated with the particular class. In (3) and (4), the adjective has both the prefix and suffix. In (4), however, the adjective exhibits the prefix even though it is absent from the noun itself, revealing an irregularity in the system.

(3) \texttt{ch shlofiś e-nd-abomn wa-jajonē-sha wa-botaman-sha}
\texttt{DET bird 3SG-HAB-has CLF-nest-CLF CLF-beautiful-CLF}
‘The bird has a beautiful nest.’

(4) \texttt{bēŋ su-n-dawabēn yentşi-jwa wa-botaman-jwa}
\texttt{1PL 1-EVI-use cloth-CLF CLF-beautiful-CLF}
‘We use beautiful cloth.’

Determiners and other words take noun class markers to agree with their referents even when the referents themselves are not present in the clause. In (5), \textit{ch-be} has as its antecedent \textit{sunjanabe} ‘drum’, which occurred earlier in the discourse. Here the determiner \textit{ch}—marked for round-object noun class with the suffix \textit{-be}—indexes a round antecedent.

(a) \texttt{bwenyo yo-j-ts-otsobobwertana shashiny-iņe ch-be}
\texttt{well DIS-VBLZ-PROG-spin foam-LOB DET-CL}
‘Well, it spun around in the foam, that one.’ (McDowell 75)

Words borrowed from Spanish and Inga, a neighboring Quechuan language, often receive Kamsá morphology. Thus, \textit{chagllufja} ‘thin cane or rod to measure work’ derives from Inga \textit{chacla} plus the Kamsá classifier \textit{-fja}, which is used for long, thin things (similarly, Kamsá \textit{plautēfja} ‘flute’ from Spanish \textit{flauta}). Words for fruit, such as \textit{naranjabe} ‘orange’ (from Spanish \textit{naranja}) exhibit the suffix \textit{-be} for round objects.

\textbf{Semantics}

The semantic categories associated with these class markers are similar to those found in other languages with robust class systems. Thus, for example, there are classes for round things, hairy things, long things, and so on. Oddly, however, there are no classes to index gender or animacy. Human and other animate referents receive no class marking at all, whereas many inanimate objects (though not all) do have class marking.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Understanding Kamsá’s system will help us explore the possibilities of the spectrum of class and classifier. Its system is like that of class or gender in that it is obligatory and adjectives exhibit agreement, but it is also like that of classifier in that it is only with a limited number of nouns. The system also has some unusual characteristics, including the subset of classes that have the prefix \textit{wa-} in addition to the suffix of the respective class.
Social categorizers as reference tracking devices in Yanomama

Helder Perri Ferreira - Instituto Socioambiental (ISA) – Brazil

In this paper, we discuss the pragmatic and discursive uses of the reverential =rĩ/rĩ= and the affective diminutive =i/i= in Yanomama (YMA). Our discussion will be based on a corpus of 122 short narratives produced by 25 different speakers in the context of a retelling experiment1 carried out in the region of Paapiu, in the Brazilian state of Roraima.

The reverential (REV) and the affective diminutive (AFF.DIM) are non-obligatory social deictic markers that can be used either to address a 2nd person or to refer to 3rd ones. The pragmatic use of them depends on the speaker’s evaluation of 1) the kin or blood relationship she has with that human referent, 2) the marital status of both speaker and referent, and 3) the age difference between them. It is worth mentioning that in the Yanomami traditional society there is no such thing as “friends” or “acquaintances” as an interpersonal relationship category. Every human-being (i.e., a Yanomami person) is either a blood or a kin relative, according to previously established relationships with the relatives of that person. When a new friendly person arrives in the community, and there was no known relation between him (or his relatives) and the people of that community, the first person who talks to him will immediately evaluate the age difference between them and their marital status and choose the adequate kinship relation with that friendly foreigner. This first relation will determine in a cascade effect the kinship relations with all other members of that community. Therefore, and considering this great unrestrictedness of the YMA kinship system in including new members in the kin group, it was not surprising when we observed the REV and AFF.DIM being used by the speakers in our retelling experiment to refer to people who were unknown to them and from entirely different cultural contexts, such as those of the video-stimuli. Indeed, one of these two makers occurred in 62 narratives (51%) of our corpus.

Besides this cultural dimension of their pragmatic use, the REV and the AFFDIM are of particular interest for being the few morphemes of the language that can categorize nouns of human referents. In YMA there is no morphological gender and the noun classifiers, its major noun categorizing system, do not occur with any human noun. Moreover, many non-humans nouns are not classified under the YMA noun classifier system as well. That is, if it were not for the REV and the AFF.DIM, nouns of humans and of a multitude of referents would have the same opaque morphological treatment. We will argue that, despite not being required for grammaticality (i.e. they are totally optional markers), both REV and AFF.DIM are actively employed by the speakers as auxiliary – and sometimes supplementary – 3rd person indexes in the predicate, helping out other (obligatory) argument marking systems of the language in structuring the information and keeping track of the human referents in narratives.

To better understand this role is important to know that YMA relies on three strategies to indicate the grammatical relations of the arguments in a clause: 1) word order (which is SOV with strict OV order), 2) a

---

1 A set of seven short movies were used as stimuli: 1) The Pear film (Chafe, 1980); 2) The chicken film (Givón, 1990); 3) The red jacket on the tree (Kita, 1995); 4) The stolen ball story (Kita, 1995); 5) The mouse and the apple tree, 6) The mouse and the banana skin; 7) The mouse and the thorny fruit (the latter three are part of the cartoon series of the German television Die Sendung mit der Maus and edited by Kita, 1995).
system of nominal case markers (with ergative-absolutive alignment where only the ergative argument is marked and the absolutive one is $\emptyset$), and 3) a system of co-referential person indexes on the verb (with ergative-absolutive alignment for 3rd persons, where only 3rd person singular agent is $\emptyset$). However, YMA is a strongly pro-drop language. None noun phrase (NP), playing whichever thematic role, is grammatically required as a full NP in a sentence. As long as an adequate discursive and pragmatic context is provided, all NPs of a clause can be omitted, and the sentences will still be grammatical and with a similar referential meaning. Indeed dropping (pro)nouns seems not only to be a grammatically acceptable possibility but a clear tendency in the language in spontaneous speech. The statistics support this claim: we took a sample of 38 out of the 122 narratives of our corpus and counted each noun phrase (either a noun a or a pronoun) that were explicit or missing in the clauses. The sample totalized 2100 clauses, where 903 were intransitive, and 1197 were transitive. The result shows that 63% of the intransitive clauses of our sample do not explicitly have an NP subject and that 59% of the transitive clauses do not have either the NP agent nor the NP patient, while other 35% omit one of them. Only 72 transitive clauses (6%) have both a full NP agent and a full NP patient.

Having in mind these numbers, and from the listener’s perspective, one can consider word order and the case marking system somehow “peripheral” or “of-limited-use” devices for keeping track of “who is doing what to whom” in sustained discourse. In most clauses, besides the lexicosemantics of the verb and pragmatics, listeners can only count on the person indexes in the verb for making sense of the grammatical relations between the implicit arguments.

As mentioned before, number morphemes and noun classifiers are the obligatory morphemes that function as person indexes for 3rd persons, with ergative-absolutive alignment and a gap in the system for 3rd person singular agent (ergative), which is $\emptyset$. The REV and AFF.DIM system seems to fill this gap offering the possibility of indicating 3rd person singular agent on the verb, and with a surprising neutral alignment$^2$. The situation of a switch in the syntactic subject/agent in a chain of clauses is where the discursive role of these two morphemes will be most prominent. The following pair of clauses extracted from a narrative of our corpus illustrates the supplementary role of both REV and AFF.DIM (in bold) as person indexes in the verb and the combined use of them as a switch-reference device. Note that these morphemes are the only formal resources that allow the identification of a discontinuity of the nominative pivot in the clauses.

\[
\begin{align*}
3.3 & \quad a = \quad \textit{tẽ} \quad =\textit{rĩ} \quad =\textit{wei} \quad , \\
& \quad 3\text{SG} = \quad \textbf{AFF.DIM} = \quad \text{take} \quad =\text{PFV1} \quad =\text{NMZ} \\
3.4 & \quad a = \quad \textit{rĩ} \quad =\textit{rẽrẽ} \quad =\textit{ki} \quad =\textit{wei} \quad , \quad \ldots \\
& \quad 3\text{SG} = \quad \textbf{REV} = \quad \text{run} \quad =\text{PFV2} \quad =\text{NMZ} \\
& \quad \text{the gentlemen run [after him], \ldots}
\end{align*}
\]

$^2$ We actually identified a tendency to a nominative-accusative alignment of these morphemes, but there is number of counter-examples in our corpus of patient arguments being indexed either with the REV of AFF.DIM. When asked about those constructions, native speakers did not judge them ungrammatical.
Françoise Rose

The functions of Mojeño Trinitario verbal classifiers in discourse

Mojeño Trinitario, an Arawak language of Bolivia, has a set of 27 classifiers that express an abstract meaning, generally physical properties like shape. They are found in multiple environments (on numerals, nouns, adjectives and in verbs), as is typical of “multiple classifier systems” commonly found in the Arawak family (Aikhenvald 2000). The focus here is on verbal classifiers. They are not obligatory but frequent: searching four narrative texts, classifiers were present in 38% of the sentences, and half of them were verbal classifiers. These verbal classifiers categorize either the S of an intransitive verb or the P of a transitive verb, as is typical for verbal classifiers, or more surprisingly, an adjunct. Following Contin-Morava and Kilarski’s (2013) review of the functions of classifiers, the paper examines the following three discourse functions: reference management, referent identification, and representation of referents. The data examined consist of 8 hours of natural, first-hand textual data.

Reference management

Payne (1987) suggests that "the primary function of a noun classification system may be related to discourse level participant reference." A recurrent pattern presented in the literature is the following: a noun phrase is used to introduce a referent for the first time, and then a classifier is enough to mention the old information again (Mithun 1986, Seifart 2005). The pattern observed in Mojeño Trinitario narratives differs. First, to foreground a referent, verbal classifiers co-occur with a coreferential noun phrase. This can be done either to introduce a new topic as in (1) or to mention again as a topic a participant that was ‘given’ earlier in the text as in (2). This foregrounding effect led to the reanalysis as an applicative construction of some classifier construction involving an adjunct (Author 2018).

(1) ta-ni-k’ô 3NH-burn-CLF:rect.vol-ACT
   to ’santi ART.NH field
   ‘It (the fire) burns the field (it burns the forest to create a space for a field in it).’
   12.009 ['field-to-be’ never mentioned before]

(2) te to une t-ews-e-k-wo-m=po eto to uupi-ono
   PREP ART.NH water 3-throw-CLF:liquid-ACT-MID-PL=PFV 3NH ART.NH frog-PL
   ‘The frogs jumped into the water.’ 18.054 [ten sentences after previous mention of the river]

Second, because noun phrases can be omitted for discourse reasons, a verbal classifier can occur without a coreferential noun phrase. This is very common in Mojeño Trinitario: out of the 70 verbal classifiers to occur in four narrative texts, 49 occur without a noun phrase. This pattern has the function discussed by Mithun of mentioning a participant that is ‘old information’ (‘anaphoric use’) as in (3), but it also often serves to introduce of a new non-topical participant as in (4).

(3) na-nok=po 3PL-put-ACT=PFV to muiji, n(a)-oktaya-ji-k=po ART.NH straw 3PL-step_on-CLF:shapeless-ACT-PFV
   ‘They put the straw, they step on it.’ 20.026

(4) t-mopku-mo 3-be.dark-CLF:fabric
   ‘It (the sky) was dark.’ 19.53
Referent identification

When the referent is not overtly expressed, the classifier participates in referent retrieval in different manners. First, the referent is most often inferred from the background of the general situation rendered by the preceding stretch of discourse (anaphora). In some cases, the interpretation of the referent is based on metonymy (often meronymy): the referent is retrieved through bridging, or indirect anaphora (for instance, -si ‘round’ is interpreted as ‘the head’ when an animate participant is ‘given’). Second, the referent can be retrieved either as a ‘kind’ of entity, defined by the characteristics typically associated with the classifier (e.g. -e ‘liquid’ is often interpreted as ‘a body of water’), or as a prototypical member of the category. In a translation task of classifiers without coreferential noun phrase, consultants generally suggest a prototypical member of the class that fits well the verb event. Third, the retrieval of the referent can be exophoric, i.e. located deictically in the speech event, as in (5).

(5) v-eja-[pue-gi-a
1pl-sit-CLF:ground-ACT-IRR
‘Let’s sit on the ground.’ 24.099 [‘ground’ identified deictically as the space under the feet of the speech act participants]

Re-presentation of referents

In a stretch of discourse, different classifiers can track the same referent, showing either a change of properties of the referent, or a change in perspective by the speaker. Excerpts of texts will illustrate each sub-function.

This paper provides a rare comprehensive account of the discourse functions of verbal classifiers in an individual language. The discourse functions of Mojeño Trinitario verbal classifiers will be discussed and illustrated with a detailed description of examples in their textual context.

Shape-based semantic categorization in Atlantic languages of the Jóola group

Serge Sagna, Dunstan Brown

There is a common perception in the linguistics literature that noun class systems of the Niger-Congo type were historically semantically based on cognitive distinctions such as human, shape, size, plant, animal etc., but that they have been conventionalized over time (Givón, 1971: 33; Schadeberg, 2001: 8). For example, the fact that body parts are found in different noun classes in Bantu languages is often used as evidence that noun class semantics is no longer synchronically relevant. We argue that shape is a fundamental criterion of semantic categorization in Jóola languages of the Atlantic family of the Niger-Congo phylum, while recognizing that semantic categorization is often a matter of picking out certain features of an entity as salient and backgrounding others. We also show that noun class prefixes may develop evaluative functions that relate to shape categorization. These have an underlying semantic basis, although there is a degree of conventionalization, for which we provide tentative evidence from child language data.

We analyze the distribution of body parts and parts of entities such as plants, animals in different classes focusing on two Jóola languages; Eegimaa and Fogny (Sapir, 1993). Following Sagna (2008, 2011, 2012) for Eegimaa, we argue that noun classes are associated with semantic content and that the assignment of nouns denoting body parts into different classes is primarily semantically based on shape. For example, nouns denoting prototypically round shape as shown in (1) are assigned to class fu- in the singular, while those that denote clear flat shape take noun class prefix ga- (ka- in Fogny) as shown in (2).

(1) Eegimaa | Fogny
---|---
fu-how ‘head’ | fú-kow ‘head’
fu-la ‘buttock’ | fu-pat ‘buttock’

(2) ga-nnu ‘ear’ | ka-wos ‘ear’
ka-toj ‘leaf’ | ka-toj ‘leaf’

The integration of loanwords shows that shape is a fundamental and still productive criterion of semantic categorization in Eegimaa and Fogny. For example, nouns denoting borrowed objects and parts of things having an approximately round or flat shape, such as parts of vehicles, take fu- and ga- as noun class prefixes. This indicates that these nouns are semantically integrated into the Eegimaa and Fogny noun class systems based on shape, just as is the case with body parts (see examples (3) and (4)).

(3) Eegimaa | Fogny
---|---
fu-baloŋ ‘football’ | fu-baloŋ ‘football’
fu-volovŋ ‘steering wheel’ | fu-volovŋ ‘steering wheel’

(4) ga-hait ‘sheet of paper’ | ka-kait ‘sheet of paper’
ga-kkorijet ‘sheet of corrugated iron’ | ka-kkorijet ‘sheet of corrugated iron’

We show that prefixes that express shape are used as evaluative morphological markers to concomitantly express shape and large size, yielding augmentative meaning. The prefix fu- expresses round shape but also large size, with the additional meaning of fatness, as shown in (5) with data from Eegimaa and Fogny. As for the prefix ga-, it is used in Eegimaa to express the meaning of flat/wide/thin but also large size and derogatory quality/ugliness as in (1).

(5) Eegimaa | Fogny
---|---
ga-ñen ‘hand’ | fi-ñen ‘big/fat hand’
a-ññil ‘child’ | fi-ññil ‘big/fat child’
(6)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Eegimaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-bekkan</td>
<td>‘a bicycle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-telefon</td>
<td>‘telephone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gá-bekkan</td>
<td>‘old/damaged/detestable bicycle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gá-telefon</td>
<td>‘old/damaged/detestable phone’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluative forms are used in narratives in humour. Characters that display vices are described using ga-, whereas those that show heavy and slow behaviour are described with fu-. Furthermore, there may be some evidence from morphological development that children pick up on this evaluative property. In (7) a three-year-old child warns of the presence of a thorn.

(7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga-jeŋ</td>
<td>‘big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gá-mah</td>
<td>‘a bicycle’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uge</td>
<td>‘here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga-thorn</td>
<td>‘old/damaged/detestable bicycle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7)  

Here the child uses the prefix ga- on the noun, which also triggers agreement on the adjective associated with that class. However, in the adult language ga-jeŋ is not an acceptable form, although the use of the prefix to indicate that the thorn is ‘big/bad’ makes perfect sense. This suggests that the semantic classification is salient for the child, with conventionalized restriction of the noun in question (e-jeŋ ‘thorn’) occurring later in development. We conclude by relating shape-based classification in Jóola languages to noun class systems in Bantu languages, where shape has been shown to be one of the principles of semantic categorization (Contini-Morava, 1997; J. P. Denny & Creider, 1976; P. J. Denny & Creider, 1986). We also relate our finding to the broader typological literature on the role of shape as a criterion for semantic categorization in other systems of nominal classification (Adams & Conklin, Faires, 1973; Aikhenvald, 2000, 2012; Friedrich, 1970; Seifart, 2005).

References
Funciones semánticas y pragmáticas de los morfemas de clasificación en kamëntsá

(Leidy Sophia Sandoval Camargo, Universidad Nacional de Colombia)

Esta ponencia tiene como principal objetivo exponer las funciones semánticas y pragmáticas encontradas en los morfemas de clasificación nominal del kamëntsá (a.k.a. camsá, kamsá; ISO: kbh), a partir de la propuesta de Contini-Morava y Kilarski (2013). A su vez, se busca dar claves para entender los factores que intervienen en la elección y uso de dichos morfemas por parte de los hablantes. El kamëntsá es una lengua aislada hablada en el Valle de Sibundoy, ubicado en el Alto Putumayo, al suroccidente de Colombia. La lengua cuenta con una morfología compleja en la que las raíces nominales y verbales pueden afijar un número amplio de morfemas, tiene límites morfémicos bastante definidos y permite incorporar raíces nominales a los verbos.

El sistema de clasificación nominal de la lengua kamëntsá ya ha sido mencionado por algunos investigadores (Jamioy Muchavisoy, 1989; Juajibioy Chindoy & Wheeler, 1973; Juajibioy Mutumbajoy, 1995 y McDowell, 1994), aunque someramente, presentando propuestas del inventario de morfemas. La descripción morfosintáctica realizada por Sandoval Camargo (2017) plantea que este sistema de clasificación está compuesto por nueve morfemas, que refieren a parámetros de forma, consistencia, materia y configuración, como se muestra en la tabla 1. Tipológicamente, el sistema presenta características tanto de los sistemas de clases como de los de clasificadores: tiene un pequeño número de morfemas ligados, estos se sufijan a distintas palabras de la cláusula además del nombre y hay concordancia, pero, por otra parte, los nombres pueden ser categorizados por distintos morfemas de acuerdo a la intención del hablante y el contexto, hay variación en el uso de los morfemas y no es obligatoria su presencia. Si bien estas características resultan problemáticas para asignar este sistema a un solo tipo, también constituye una motivación más para estudiarlo a través de las funciones que ejerce en términos semánticos, pragmáticos y discursivos.

Los datos que se tienen en cuenta para esta propuesta provienen de elicitaciones controladas a través de una herramienta diseñada para este fin, narraciones y extractos del habla cotidiana. En cuanto a las funciones semánticas de los morfemas de clasificación, se ha podido evidenciar: 1. la creación de nuevos ítems léxicos, donde el cambio del morfema de clasificación que se sufija a una misma raíz léxica implica una nueva referencia; se presentan casos en lo que se distingue, por ejemplo, entre fruto/árbol o parte del cuerpo humano/parte de una planta. 2. La especificación o diferenciación del referente a través de distintas marcas de clasificación que expresan características no inherentes al nombre. 3. La asignación de valores afectivos al nombre, tanto positivos como despectivos, a través del uso de marcas de clasificación que no son prototípicas en determinados nombres. En estos casos, los morfemas de clasificación adquieren valores semánticos distintos a los ya mencionados y pueden presentar bastante variación entre los hablantes.

Respecto a las funciones discursivas se tiene registro de cómo las marcas de clasificación son usadas para seguir a referencia a través de su sufijación en palabras distintas al nombre (adjetivos, demostrativos, numerales y verbos). Así mismo, se muestra cómo el empleo de distintas marcas de clasificación sirve para “re-presentar” la referencia y señalar nuevos aspectos de esta. Las funciones anafóricas de las marcas de clasificación pueden presentarse, ya sea cuando el nombre aparece por primera vez explícito en el discurso (1) o cuando este no se nombra directamente, pero está implícito en el contexto (2).
El uso de los distintos momentos morfémicos de clasificación presenta grandes variaciones entre los hablantes y de acuerdo al contexto, por lo que las funciones señaladas anteriormente parecen mostrar que estas marcas de clasificación tienen la función de resaltar las características que para el hablante son relevantes para referirse a la entidad dentro un marco discursivo dado. Profundizar en estas cuestiones se hace relevante para aportar a la teoría de la clasificación nominal y vislumbrar, desde la interacción, la diversidad de mecanismos que tienen las lenguas para categorizar las entidades del mundo.

1. uta tsam-bé-t y kanje-bé mas buangan-bé
   dos frijol-CL1-DL CONJ uno-CL1 más rojo-CL1
   “[hay] dos frijoles y [hay] uno más rojo”

2. kem-soi n-ts-e-mne pseng-a-x
   DEM-cosa 3.SG.AG-ACER-APPROX-VAL-ser negro-v.cl2
   “esta cosa es negra” (refiriéndose a una barra de plastilina).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Marca de clasificación</th>
<th>Semántica</th>
<th>Parámetros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-bé</td>
<td>Forma redondeada</td>
<td>Forma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-x</td>
<td>Forma alargada y flexible</td>
<td>Forma y consistencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-fx</td>
<td>Forma alargada y rígida</td>
<td>Forma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-tʃ</td>
<td>Forma plana</td>
<td>Forma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-tʃʃ</td>
<td>Materia carnuda</td>
<td>Materia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-ʃʃ</td>
<td>Materia seca</td>
<td>Materia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-ʃ</td>
<td>Materia desmoronable</td>
<td>Materia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>Materia fluida</td>
<td>Materia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-ʃʃʃ</td>
<td>Parte de otro(s) elemento(s)</td>
<td>Configuración</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabla 1 Morfemas de clasificación nominal del kamëntsá
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Concurrent Nominal Classification: Sources and Subclasses

Ronald P. Schaefer and Francis O. Egbokhare
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville and University of Ibadan

Concurrent systems of nominal classification have attracted considerable attention in recent times (Fedden and Corbett 2017, Fedden, Audring and Corbett 2018). For Africa’s Niger Congo phylum, where Bantu gender has long dominated discussion, this is no less the case. Kiessling (2013), for example, has argued for incipient systems of nominal classification, i.e. numeral classifiers and class terms in compounds, as concurrent with declension and gender systems in which noun prefixes pair to express class and grammatical number (singular/plural) as well as control agreement assigned to adnominal forms and the subject-verb relation.

For this paper we investigate concurrent nominal classification in another Niger Congo language. We examine Emai, a minority Edoid language of West Benue Congo that is recently documented but remains under analyzed in several respects. Emai has an abbreviated system of noun class prefixes (i.e. eleven prefix pairs that cover 100+ nouns) where grammatical number remains active and agreement morphology assigned to NP internal elements and the subject-verb relation is tonal rather than segmental. In addition to noun class, Emai manifests a concurrent nominal classification system that engages elements of word formation. A significant part of this system reflects perceptual and functional semantic features. The perceptual subclass exploits three physical dimensions: size (augmentative and diminutive), aggregation of quanta (bundle and bunch), and disaggregation (fragment and remains). The functional subclass highlights two dimensions: goodness of quality and locality for accumulation of a substance.

Emai nominal classifiers are embedded in complex lexemes, where they exist as relationally dependent forms. The dependent elements consist of údù- ‘big,’ Úvbi- ‘small’ for size; Úkhùn- ‘bundle of,’ Úhiin- ‘bunch of’ for aggregation; ësèmì- ‘fragment of’ and Úgògò- ‘remains of’ for disaggregation; and Ògbègbè- ‘good,’ Ògù- ‘place for gathering’ for functions of goodness and locality for substance accumulation, respectively. These dependent forms occur, with varying degrees of productivity, in lexemes like údù-èmà ‘big yam,’ Úvbi-èwè ‘small goat,’ Úhiin-èdin ‘palm nut bunch,’ Ògù-ìtà́i ‘place for gathering mushrooms,’ and Ògbègbè-úkpùn ‘good cloth.’ Syntactically, several but not all such lexemes accept numerals as a modifier, e.g. ësèmì Úkpùn èvà‘two cloth fragments.’ None, however, permits any other adnominal modifier, i.e. adjective, demonstrative or relative clause.

We conclude with discussion of the historical source of Emai concurrent classifiers and the contrastive nature of their semantic features vis-à-vis Emai’s abbreviated noun class system. Diachronically, classifiers reflect divergent sources. Some derive from verbs (e.g. ú-khùn- from khùnn ‘to bundle’). Others retain a strong affinity to secondary noun class prefixes of the Proto-Bantu type (diminutive/small -vbi- from *pi-, augmentative/big -du- from *du-). Regarding feature type, Emai class and concurrent classifier systems respect Seifart’s (2005) distinction between general and specific. Its noun class system relies
primarily on ontological features such as human, animate, inanimate. Seifart identifies these as general. In contrast, its concurrent classifier system relies on features that pertain to size, aggregate and evaluation, considered by Seifart to be specific. Intriguing in this regard is that shape, which is a specific feature and is quite prevalent in numeral classifier systems (Adams and Conklin 1973, Allen 1977, Seifart 2010), does not appear as a feature of Emai’s class or concurrent classifier scheme. We remedy this apparent anomaly by considering synthetic compounds and their meronymic or partitive functions.

References
A first look at noun classification in Kotiria and Wa’ikhana conversation
Kristine Stenzel  Nick Williams
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro  University of Colorado Boulder

This paper discusses how noun categorization morphology is employed in everyday conversation among speakers of Kotiria (Wanano) and Wa’ikhana (Piratapuyo), two East Tukano languages spoken in the multilingual Upper Rio Negro region of northwestern Amazonia. It draws from a large corpus of data currently being collected through a documentation project specifically focused on informal multi-party interaction\(^1\) and presents observations and questions from our initial stages of analysis.

Complex noun categorization morphology is a prominent feature of East Tukano languages, whose systems present sets of noun class markers with characteristics of both gender-like (concordial) and more open-ended classifier types, reflecting what is rapidly being recognized as a pan-Amazonian profile. Such systems have challenged definitions of “canonical” gender marking and early typologies of classifiers (e.g. Allan 1977; Grinevald 2000), leading to a variety of analytical solutions that include “continuum” models (Gomez-Imbert 1982, 1996; Derbyshire & Payne 1990; Grinevald & Seifart 2004; Seifart 2005; Aikhenvald 2000; 2012) and more recent proposals for a reformulated typology of nominal classification that also comprises “concurrent” systems (e.g. Fedden & Corbett 2017).

Our discussion begins with an overview of the general properties of noun categorization morphology in these two languages as evidenced in (primarily) mono-speaker discourse genres such as narratives. These include markers that occur with derivational and inflectional functions at the lexical level (1); in NP syntax as obligatory agreement on modifiers (2); in the formation of predicate nominalss (3) and pronouns with both animate and inanimate referents (4); and as indexical syntactic nominalizers in adverbial, complement (5) and relative clauses (in (10) below). Thus, noun classification morphology pervades the grammar of these languages with concurrent lexical, syntactic, and discourse functions.

(1) a. \(\text{phuk-ó-ró}\)   b. \(\text{phuk-ú-ró}\)   c. \(\text{~yará-de}\)   d. \(\text{~sò-á-rí-ro}\)
   parent-F-SG   parent-M-SG   white.person-PL   red-NMLZ-SG

   e. \(\text{ahkó-dó}\)   f. \(\text{wuí-díá}\)   g. \(\text{buti-ri-pha’ta}\)   h. \(\text{hóá-dú}\)
   water-SG   fly-CLF:round   hard-NOM-CLF:flat   write-CLF:cyld

(2) \(\text{tí-do \ yá-kido \ dié-do \ ~dubú-dí-kido \ ihí-de}\)
   ANPH-SG   POSS-SG   dog-SG   hunt-NMLZ-SG   COP-VIS.IPFF.2/3
   ‘His dog is a hunter.’ [W]

(3) \(\text{bu’rá-riá \ ~dóá-riá \ hi-ra}\)
   morning.star-CLF:round   beautiful.be-CLF:round   COP-VIS.IPFF.2/3
   ‘The morning star is beautiful.’ [K]

(4) a. \(\text{ti-kódíó}\)   b. \(\text{ti-~phu}\)
   ANPH-FEM.SG   ANPH-CLF:leaf
   ‘3SGF’ (anaphoric) [W]   ‘the book’ [K]

(5) \(\text{~ebó-pe-de\ ~wehé-í \ wa’á-gú-tahá}\)
   macaco.guariba-CONTR-OBJ   matar-1/2SGM   ir-1/2SGM-IRR
   ‘I’m going to kill the monkey.’ [W]

With this basic profile in mind, we then turn to conversational data and offer some initial observations on the use of these same morphological resources in interactional contexts. Though analysis of the data is still ongoing, a few interesting contrastive tendencies are already apparent. In terms of reference-establishing and tracking functions, for instance, because conversation is often about things or people in the immediate, deictically-accessible context, we find more frequent use of deictic forms (6) and direct derivation of inanimate referents via classifiers (7), as well as referential forms built from the “alternate” root particle (8) or distinguished through use of the “contrastive” marker, also seen in (6). Interestingly, we also find frequent use of impersonal forms in conversation, employed pragmatically either because full identification may not be required for the speaker’s

\(^1\) NSF-DEL grant BCS-1664348. “Grammar and multilingual practices through the lens of everyday interaction in two endangered languages in the East Tukano family” (2017-2020).
interactional purpose (9) or because the speaker may deem it prudent to avoid direct identification in a particular situation (10).

(6) *a’ri-ro-se*

DEM.PROX-SG-CONTR
‘this other one . . . ’ (used while describing figures in a story-telling task) [K]

(7) ~kú-riá

yu’ü-(hi)da

yu=sihpiá

~yá-ria
tá-riá

one/a-CLF:round

1SG-EMPH

2SG.POSS=motor

bad-CLF:round

come-VIS.IPFV.2/3

‘One (canister of gas is what), I use coming (upriver with) my old motor’ (comment while transferring gasoline between canisters) [K]

(8) *oléro-a

apé-kido*

sp.catfish-PL

ALT-SG

‘Oleros (are a) different kind (of catfish)? (asked while pointing to a fisherman’s catch) [W]

(9) *saa-yé-do-tha

yabé-kido*

be.so-do-SG-EMPH

INT:what-SG

‘So, then, this guy (said) . . . ’ (at the beginning of an explanation) [W]

(10) *waá-re

yabá-ri-ro-kiro

~bú=~di-ri-ro-kiro*

go-VIS.PFV.2/3

INT:what-NMLZ-SG-SG.RSP

2SG.POSS=say-NMLZ-SG-SG.RSP

‘The guy you were talking about left’ [K]

We explore these and other phenomena mined from our rich and unusual corpus of spontaneous social interaction, drawing insights from both structural linguistic analysis and the theoretical and methodological framework of Conversation Analysis/Interactional Linguistics (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974; Sacks 1992; Clift 2016; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 2018). Our goal is to address questions related to how speakers employ and manipulate linguistic resources, such as noun categorization morphology, for specific interactional purposes in the most basic and universal — though still under-investigated — domain of language use: everyday conversation.


Verbal Classifier Constructions in Arikara and Pawnee
Logan Sutton
American Indian Studies Research Institute, Indiana University

Arikara [ari] and Pawnee [paw] (Northern Caddoan; North America) do not possess canonical
gender, noun class, or classifier constructions. However, they do show two orthogonal sets of
grammatical constructions that serve classificatory functions. These two classificatory systems are
expressed through 1) verb stems expressing posture and motion, along with related predicates, and 2)
noun incorporation constructions. This study analyzes the occurrence of both of these construction types
through the text corpora and elicited data of the closely related Arikara, Skiri Pawnee, and South Band
Pawnee. It describes the different, but overlapping, classification schemas expressed by the two systems,
along with their discourse functions within monologic narratives and their flexibility to permit alternative
construals of referents in different contexts.

Verbs of posture—prototypically sitting, standing, lying—are well noted cross-linguistically in
languages of those surveys, as well as more generally across languages (Stassen 1997), Arikara and
Pawnee commonly use their verbs of posture in intransitive predicates expressing presentation, location,
and possession. In addition, spatial deixis is expressed primarily through proclitics attached to relativized
verbal participles and the verbs of posture have become grammaticalized as demonstrative determiners,
increasing the potential for classificatory expression. In this function they are joined by basic verbs of
motion (e.g. come, go, among others). Both a presentative and determiner use of xa lie is seen in the
Arikara example in (1).

(1) tii=na-xa       tii=nee-xa    na-ux-raana‘uk-hu.
PRX=PRT-lie_SB  PRX=PRTST-lie_ST  PRT-PST-sing-IPF_SB
Here lies this [fold coyote] that was singing.
Arikara, Parks (1991), Text 120. Narrated by Dan Howling Wolf

Across all of these grammatical constructions, there are apparent categorizations of referents reflected in
the choice of posture verb, as well as to related verbs of setting and picking up. Some of these categories
reflect cross-linguistic tendencies (round things sit, long thing lie, cf. Croft (1994)); some are culturally
specific (celestial bodies stand); some are in between (hoofed quadrupeds stand, by default). However,
changing the posture verb can also reflect a change of construal: the moon regularly stands in the sky,
unless personified or referenced as an object, in which case He sits. The choice of posture (or motion)
verb among human and some other animate referents may also be determined by additional factors, such
as narrative dynamics and socio-cultural patterns.

Arikara and Pawnee make frequent use of Mithun’s (1984) noun incorporation types III and IV.
The classificatory use of noun incorporation in some languages has since been further acknowledged in
surveys of classifiers (Mithun 1986, Aikhenvald 2000: 150-1). In Arikara and Pawnee, the most regularly
incorporated nouns refer to body parts, natural features, foodstuff, and certain culturally important
references (Parks 1972, Parks and Pratt 2008). Among these is also a small set of highly frequent
incorporated nouns of generic meaning that may cooccur with an external non-incorporated referring
expression in the vain of traditional classifiers. The South Pawnee example in (2) illustrates the use of the
classificatory incorporated noun haak- wood, here marked plural, classifying the pipe being offered in
prayer.

(2) heru     irii=ti-ir-haak-rar-raawuʔ  raktaawiskaaruʔ.
then    DCT=IND-3PL-wood-PL-offer.IPF pipe
It was in this direction that they offered the pipe stems (in prayer).
South Band Pawnee, Weltfish (1937), Text 39, Narrated by Fanny Chapman
Noun incorporation serves various other discourse functions, primarily as a means of expressing nonfocal, usually inanimate referents (cf. Sasse 1987).

These two systems of classification cooccur in many utterances to subtly enrich a narrative presentation and create succinct semantic contrasts. The classificatory determiners may modify an incorporated noun, expressing a contrastive orientation of the referent. A noun may be incorporated onto a posture verb with the latter suggesting the rough physical shape or orientation of the referent. This is particularly common in the expression of locations and landscape features, as well as being used in creating bounded and partitive construals of non-count referents, as seen in the Arikara sentence in (3), where the classifier čiran- is incorporated into the posture verb kux, expressing the containment of the water.

(3) tii=wee=nee-čiran-kux
   PRX=EP=PRST-contained.water-sit.ST
   Here is some water [in a vessel]
   Arikara, Parks (1991) Text 43. Narrated by Alfred Morsette

This study will make use of the Parks Northern Caddoan text and lexical databases of the
American Indian Studies Research Institute at Indiana University, which the author has helped to develop since 2005. The databases are housed in .FLEx files, each consisting of morphologically analyzed monologic narratives in a variety of genres for Arikara (76,024 words), Skiri Pawnee (48,207 words), and
South Band Pawnee (34,716)\(^1\), cf. Parks (1977, 1991), Weltfish (1937). I extract all instances of the verbs of posture (and of motion, in the relevant constructions) and incorporated nouns, recording their referents and coding them for, among other factors, humanness, animacy, number, physical dimensionality,
grammatical role, and presence of—or distance to—a coreferential expression. Text data will be
supplemented with elicited material in the lexical databases. This analysis serves as input to a qualitative
description of the constructions’ use and distribution.
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\(^1\) Given the highly polysynthetic nature of Caddoan languages, a comparison of a Pawnee and Arikara text with their
free English translations correlates suggests that 1 Arikara or Pawnee word is roughly equivalent to 3.17 English
words. Thus, the combined 158,947 word Northern Caddoan text corpus may be approximately compared to a
500,000 word corpus of English.
Discourse functions of gender and numeral classifiers in Nepali

Following the morphosyntactically-oriented typologies of nominal classification systems proposed by, e.g., Grinevald (2000), more recent studies have focused on such issues as identifying functions that are either shared by diverse systems or depend on the means of expression (Contini-Morava and Kilarski 2013), establishing canonical morphosyntactic properties of nominal classification systems (Corbett and Fedden 2016) as well as identifying semantic and morphosyntactic properties of co-existing systems (Fedden and Corbett 2017). In this paper we investigate the discourse functions of gender and numeral classifiers in Nepali (Indo-European, Indic), based on the functional typology proposed by Contini-Morava and Kilarski (2013).

In view of the striking lack of agreement concerning the number of genders and numeral classifiers in Nepali that is reported in the literature (see, e.g., Acharya 1991; Corbett 1991; Manders 2007), our analysis is based on data elicited from five native speakers. Following Fedden and Corbett’s (2017) typology, we analyse the nominal classification systems in Nepali in terms of two gender systems and one numeral classifier system. The first gender system contrasts between feminine (female animates) and the residue (male animates and inanimates). Grammatical agreement involving this distinction is found on adjectives, possessive adjectives, verbs, ordinal numbers and the general classifier, as illustrated by the masculine and feminine forms of the adjectives in ramr-o keto (beautiful-m boy(m)) ‘handsome boy’ vs. ramr-i keti (beautiful-f girl(f)) ‘beautiful girl’. The second gender system is pronominal and distinguishes between human and non-human referents, as in u ‘he/she’ vs. tyo ‘it’. Finally, we distinguish 10 numeral classifiers, among which most occur with inanimates, except for the human classifier jana and the general classifier wot-a/wot-i, the latter being used with both animates and inanimates.

A functional analysis of the three co-existing nominal classification systems allows us to evaluate the principles of functionality proposed with regard to grammatical categories. In particular, the complementary distribution of gender vs. numeral classifiers has been interpreted in terms of a complexity trade-off (Sinnemäki in press). Since both types of systems have related functions, the fact that they are rarely combined in the same language can be explained in terms of economy and distinctiveness as avoidance of multiple patterns in the same functional domain. Here we examine a situation where two gender systems and a classifier system combine in a single language, which is an exception to the complementary distribution between gender vs. numeral classifiers. Still, even in this case the co-occurrence of the three systems can be accounted for in terms of economy and distinctiveness as they have a largely complementary functional distribution, where a) a function may be expressed by only one system; b) the gender systems and classifiers may be functionally exploited with different types of nouns, e.g., animate vs. inanimate; and finally, c) both gender systems and classifiers may be functionally exploited for the same function in the same category of nouns in which case, however, they convey different meanings.
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The functions of nominal classification in Secoya discourse

Rosa Vallejos
(University of New Mexico & Collegium de Lyon)

This talk focuses on the discourse use of the nominal classification system of Secoya (Western Tukanoan, ISO: sey), as spoken in Peruvian Amazonia. The hypothesis at play is that Secoya has a single but complex classification system. The data examined here suggests that the language has concurring subsystems that complement each other, in the sense of Gomez-Imbert (2007), Seifart and Payne (2007), and Fedden and Corbett (2017).

Secoya, as many other languages in the world, has formal mechanisms to organize nominal referents following three semantic parameters: animacy, biological sex, and shape. Animacy refers to the degree to which entities are capable of human-like volition behavior (Silverstein 1976). Gender is a complex socio-culturally constructed classification on the basis of biological differences between males and females (McConnell-Ginet 1988). Shape includes dimensionality, axial geometry, curved/straight edges, negative spaces, and oriented axis, properties that play a crucial role in object recognition, visual processing, and language acquisition (Seifart 2005). In Secoya, these three semantic parameters have ramifications in grammatical subsystems. They have their own markers, their own loci, but share the functional load.

Secoya does not display canonical agreement within the noun phrase or the clause. Shape-classifiers and gender-classifiers participate in lexicogenesis. At the clause level, gender/animacy-classifiers operate primarily as cross-indexes. At the sentence level, gender-markers are key in converbs, clause chains, and nominalized constructions. The three subsystems make anaphoric reference to established participants and contribute to identification and reference tracking in discourse.

The issue of cross-indexation variability is explored in connection with the structure of the discourse. For example, gender assignment for animals can vary across speakers, but also across different pragmatic contexts. Of particular interest is the recategorization of nominal referents; that is, the use of different classification morphemes for the same discourse referent. In Secoya storytelling, it is possible to identify some variability between the main narrative and direct quotes. A participant that triggers female agreement from the narrator’s perspective can trigger male agreement from the perspective of whoever is being quoted. In these contexts, gender markers allow for the speaker’s perspective to be construed in a layering fashion.
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<td><strong>François Rose</strong> (DDL, CNRS-Université Lumière Lyon 2) The functions of Mojéño Trinitario verbal classifiers in discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:30</td>
<td>Discussion / Future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-10:00</td>
<td><strong>Conference dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRIDAY 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00</td>
<td><strong>Leidy Sandoval</strong> (Universidad Nacional de Colombia) Funciones semánticas y pragmáticas de los morfemas de clasificación en kamëntsá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
<td><strong>Colleen O’Brian</strong> (Freie Universität Berlin) Functions of Nominal Categorization in Kubeo: from grammar to discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td><strong>Logan Sutton</strong> (Indiana University, Bloomington) Verbal Classifier Constructions in Arikara and Pawnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td><strong>Serge Sagna &amp; Dunstan Brown</strong> (University of York) Shape-based semantic categorization in Atlantic languages of the Jóola group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td><strong>Rosalie Juma</strong> (University of Cambridge) Senticity and classifier use in a classifier language: the case of low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td><strong>Sebastian Fedden &amp; Greville Corbett</strong> (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, University of Surrey) The extent of nominal classification: a Canonical Typology approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
<td><strong>Denis Bertet</strong> (DDL, CNRS-Université Lumière Lyon 2) The discourse dynamics of agreement class assignment in Tikuna narratives (isolate, Western Amazonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td><strong>Marc Tang &amp; Marcín Kilarski</strong> (Uppsala Universitet, Unwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza) Discourse functions of gender and numeral classifiers in Nepali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00</td>
<td><strong>Sebastian Fedden &amp; Greville Corbett</strong> (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, University of Surrey) The extent of nominal classification: a Canonical Typology approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td><strong>Françoise Rose</strong> (DDL, CNRS-Université Lumière Lyon 2) The functions of Mojéño Trinitario verbal classifiers in discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30</td>
<td>Discussion / Future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:30</td>
<td><strong>Conference dinner</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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