Any morphosyntactic device allowing a non-nominal form to be used as a nominal, i.e. with referential function, but also as a nominal predicate or a noun modifier
DIVERSITY PUZZLE IN TRINITARIO

1. Nine nominalizing suffixes

(1) 
\[ \text{eto \hspace{0.5cm} n-lm'-o-gne \hspace{0.5cm} te \hspace{0.5cm} to \hspace{0.5cm} n-itori-s-ra} \]
PRO \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG-see-ACT-GEN.P.NZ \hspace{0.5cm} PREP \hspace{0.5cm} ART \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG-live-ACT-EV.NZ

‘This is what I have seen in my life.’

2. A fully finite clause (often preceded by a determiner)

(2) 
\[ \text{ni-kepripo \hspace{0.5cm} ni \hspace{0.5cm} t-ve-}'yo \hspace{0.5cm} to \hspace{0.5cm} ta-chuti.} \]
3M-arrive \hspace{0.5cm} ART.M \hspace{0.5cm} 3-take-ACT=FUT \hspace{0.5cm} ART.NH \hspace{0.5cm} 3NH-head

‘The one who was going to take the head arrived (lit. the he will take the head arrived).’

3. A classifier, sometimes preceded by a derivational formative

(3) 
\[ \text{t-eja-pue-k=po \hspace{0.5cm} te \hspace{0.5cm} pjo \hspace{0.5cm} s-epaji-t-mo.} \]
3-sit-CLF.ground-ACT=PFV \hspace{0.5cm} PREP \hspace{0.5cm} DEM \hspace{0.5cm} 3F-lie_down-DERIV-CLF.fabric

‘She sits on the blanket.’
DIVERSITY PUZZLE IN TRINITARIO

- Different constructions distributed in association with differences in:
  - Semantics ?
  - Nominality ? Finiteness ? (lexical vs clausal nominalization ?)
  - Syntactic distribution or function ?
  - Discourse continuity ?
Not a clear complementary distribution

- Especially between strategy 1 (with nominalizers) and strategy 2 (unmarked, only with determiner)
An important phenomenon in discourse:
- Strategy 1: 515 nominalizers / 3680 utterances (14%)
- Strategy 2: 41 finite clauses used as nominalizations / 239 verbs forms with a 3rd person subject (17%)
- Strategy 3:
  - 15 DERIV+ CLF / 3680 utterances (0.4%)
  - Only with CLF: not easy to count with present corpus/database.

100-sentence sample:
- 29 nominalizations
  - 9 with nominalizers
  - 18 with finite clauses
  - 2 with DERIV
- Only 3 other subordinate clauses

vs. Yukuna: 67 nominalizations/100 sentences (Lemus Serrano 2020)

OVERVIEW

- Preliminary information on Mojeño Trinitario
- The three nominalization strategies
- Semantics
- Morphosyntactic features
- Syntactic distribution
- Discourse cohesiveness
MOJEÑO TRINITARIO: USEFUL PRELIMINARY INFORMATION
MOJEÑO TRINITARIO

- Arawak, Lowland Bolivia

- Linguistic description
  - Dictionary (Gill 1993)
  - Handbook (Gill 1957)
  - Grammatical sketch (Rose 2015)
  - Papers [http://www.ddl.cnrs.fr/Rose](http://www.ddl.cnrs.fr/Rose)

- Documentation [https://www.ortolang.fr](https://www.ortolang.fr)

- Corpus
  - 6 hours of (semi)-spontaneous texts
  - 2 hours of stimuli-based sentences
  - 4920 elicited sentences

SYNTACTIC DISTRIBUTION OF NOUNS

- Nouns are mostly used as referential expressions
  
  (4) n-nos=yore te pjoka 'chope wkugi
  ISG-stay=FUT PREP DEM.NH.PROX big tree
  ‘I am going to stay in this big tree.’

- They can also be used as nominal predicates (Rose 2018)
  
  (5) wo paktara-ena j-ma-ro-no
  NEG peccary-IRR DEM-NH-MED-PL
  ‘These are not peccaries.’

- And less often as noun modifiers or adverbials
  
  (6) ñi 'chane 'jiro t-nok=po ñi-ye'e chompa
  ART.M person man 3-put=PFV 3M-GPN sweater
  ‘The man put on his sweater.’ S_Path_S.069

  (7) t-pui-iri-ko to yoti
  3-walk-APPROX-ACT ART.NH night
  ‘he walks at night’ 30.051

NOUNS VS VERBS

- Nouns and verbs can be functionally interchangeable
  - Nouns can be used as predicates without derivational morphology (with person suffixes for S vs person prefixes for S/A on verbs)

\[(8) \quad \text{jiro-nu} = \text{po} \\
\text{man-1SG} = \text{PFV}
\]

‘I was a man then’.

- Verbs can be used as referential expressions with or without nominalizers, but are then preceded by a determiner

\[(9) \quad \text{wo} \quad \text{na-(a)-wro} \quad \text{'o} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{t-siop-a-no} \quad \text{eno} \quad \text{tkomeriono.}
\text{NEG} \quad \text{3PL-IRR-want} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{3-enter-IRR-PL} \quad \text{PRO.PL} \quad \text{non-indigenous}
\]

‘They did not want the non-indigenous people to enter.’
Nouns and verbs share most of their morphology

Person affixes (Rose 2011, 2015)

- Same person suffixes for subject on nominal predicates, and object on verbs (NB: no third person markers)

- Same person prefixes for possessor on nouns, and subject on verbs
  - But non-specific third person suffix $t$- restricted to verbs
    - Intransitive verbs
    - Transitive verbs with a 1st or 2nd person object
    - On transitive verbs with a third person object, generally another prefix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>-vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>vi-</td>
<td>-ovi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>-'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M♀</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M♂</td>
<td>ñi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>s-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NH</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'other' po-</td>
<td>(on nouns only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Nouns and verbs also share TAME marking (Rose 2017):
- FUT, PAST, IPFV, PFV, HAB, RES, FREQ, PROG.GRAD, CONT, DUB, RPT

\[(10) \text{na-\text{naekcho}=po \hspace{1em} eto \hspace{1em} to \hspace{1em} 'resia=yore} \]
\[3\text{PL-start}=\text{PFV} \hspace{1em} 3\text{NH} \hspace{1em} \text{ART.NH} \hspace{1em} \text{church}=\text{FUT} \]

'They started (to build) the future church.'

But irrealis (IRR) marking differs on verbs (-a or a-) and non-verbs (-ina) (Rose 2014)
NOUNS VS VERBS

- No case marking on nouns, one preposition: ‘with, to, on, for, at, in..’ (Rose 2019)

  \((11) \quad na-esta-k=ri'i \quad te \quad to \quad chkote.\)
  
  \(3\text{PL-whip-}\text{ACT}=\text{IPFV} \quad 3\text{NH.PREP} \quad \text{ART.NH whip}\)
  
  ‘They were whipping him with the whip.’ T2.039

- Preposition can be analyzed as subordinator before finite clauses (Rose 2006, Rose 2019)

  \((12) \quad te \quad p-itekp-a=po, \quad p-iimui-gi-a\)
  
  \(\text{SUB} \quad 2\text{SG-arrive-IRR}=\text{PFV} \quad 2\text{SG-dance-}\text{ACT-IRR}\)
  
  ‘When you arrive, you will have to dance.’ T8.041


SYNCOPE

- Rhythmic syncope: vowel of weak moras may syncopate (Rose 2019)
- Consequences for morphology:
  - Most roots and morphemes have several variants, depending on which vowels syncopate (depending on their position within the word)
    
    Example: -gie$$\text{e}$$ GEN.P.NZ is realized either -gne, -gien or -gie$$\text{e}$$.
  - Many phonotactic rules to repair consonants clusters, among which C deletion and vowel lengthening
    - Example: -ru SP.P.NZ can be realized through lengthening of preceding vowel
  - Many homonyms

CLASSIFIERS

- 31 classifier suffixes (often –CV), categorizing nominal referents
- Generally abstract meanings (physical properties)
- One set with large distribution = multiple classifier system (Aikhenvald 2000)
  - On numerals
  - On adjectives
  - On nouns
  - In verbs
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGIES
(DET) Pers-V-NZ

- With one of a set of 9 nominalizer suffixes
- Base: **verbal stem** (including derivational material, and denominal verbs)
  - Some nominalizers also attach to copula and adjectives
  - Exceptional attestations on nouns (diachronic origin as nominal markers?)
- Always with a person prefix
- Typically used referentially, then preceded by a determiner (article or demonstrative)
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

(13) \( v\text{-}echji\text{-}s\text{-}'o=yre \) \( \text{to} \) \( ma\text{-}koyem\text{-}giene. \)
\( 1\text{PL-tell}\text{-}ACT\text{-}APPL=FUT \) \( \text{ART.NH} \) \( 3\text{M-undergo} \text{-} \text{GEN.P.NZ} \)
‘We are going to tell what happened to him (lit. what he underwent).’ 18.003

(14) \( p\text{-}ni\text{-}gia \) \( t\text{-}e\text{-}'o\text{-}ra'i \)
\( \text{DEM-M-PROX} \) \( 3\text{-hit}\text{-}ACT\text{-}HAB.A.NZ \)
\( \text{3M-stay} \text{-} \text{IPFV} \) \( \text{PREP.NH} \) \( \text{DEM-NH.SG-PROX} \)
‘This fighter is here again.’ 45.052

(15) \( ema \) \( v\text{-}iya \) \( mu\text{-}ejro\text{-}k=yore \) \( \text{to} \) \( ma\text{-}tume\text{-}wo=yre \)
\( 3\text{M} \) \( 1\text{PL-father} \) \( 3\text{M-give}\text{-}ACT=FUT \) \( \text{ART.NH} \) \( 3\text{M-strong} \text{-} \text{STAT.NZ=FUT} \)
‘God (lit. our father) is going to give him his strength.’ 21.016
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: (DET) PERS-V

- (DET) Pers-V (GN.S) (GN.O)
- Fully finite clause
- Typically used referentially, preceded by a determiner
  - Non-human determiner when referring to events
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: (DET) PERS-V

(16) *en-jo=pka no t-imkata-ko-no ma-wacho*
3PL-EXIST=DUB ART.PL 3-help-ACT-PL 3M-pay

*eno no 'po-mri-ono 'chane api-na-no*
3PL ART.PL other-CLF.group-PL person two-CLF.GEN-PL
‘If there are people who help, he pays at the two other men, with him, it's three.’
21.010

(17) *wo w-a-ato'o to vi-om-a*
NEG 1PL-IRR-sucede ART.NH 1PL-carry-IRR
‘We cannot carry it.’
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 3: (DET) PERS-V(-DERIV)-CLF

- (DET) Pers-V(-DERIV)-CLF
- Nominalization marked with one of 31 classifiers
  - And possibly a derivational formative DERIV –rV, with V harmonizing with the preceding vowel (because of syncope, sometimes just vowel lengthening)
- Base: V, Adj, N, DEM (in further sections, focus on deverbal nominalizations)
- Can take a person prefix or not (depending on whether the base takes one)
- Typically used referentially, preceded by a determiner
- Analytical ambiguity: when Pers-V-CLF (without DERIV), could be analyzed as strategy 2 or 3 (either the determiner/nominal position or the classifier has the « nominalizing » effect)
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 3: (DET) PERS-V(-DERIV)-CLF

- With derivational formative and classifier:

(18)  
\[ \text{to } \text{tə-jii-kó-ɾo-pi } \text{ty-amo} \]
\[ \text{ART.NH 3NH-swallow-ACT- DERIV-CLF.fili 3-swell} \]
‘Its larynx is swelling.’ 13.012

(19)  
\[ \text{je’e, } \text{i-ito-wo=po } \text{p-jo-ka } \text{’chosi-o-ro-pi } \text{rusrupaya} \]
\[ \text{VALD 3-finish-MID=PFV DEM-NH.SG-PROX old-?-DERIV-CLF.fili thank_you} \]
‘All right, the old story is over, thank you.’ 39.011

(20)  
\[ \text{eto } \text{p-ju-ena } \text{sache-re-}`yore} \]
\[ \text{3NH DEM-NH.SG-DIST SUB-DERIV-CLF.atmo=FUT} \]
‘this is the dry season.’ 14.021

(21)  
\[ \text{taj=puka=yo } \text{p-jo-kro-ɾo-pi=’i’i ?} \]
\[ \text{NH.INDT=DUB=FUT DEM-NH.SG-POT.LOC-DERIV-CLF.fili=IPFV} \]
‘What is it going to be about now?’ 20.070
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 3: (DET) PERS-V(-DERIV)-CLF

- Just with a classifier:

(22) n-wooˈɔ m-meto-ko-w=yore to ta-koyem-pi
1SG-want-ACT 1SG-inform-ACT-2SG=FUT ART.NH 3NH-happen_to-CLF.fili
‘I want to tell you the story’ 8.003

(23) v-yana v-tan-k-a to 'núgie-ˈi
1PL-go.IRR 1PL-look_for-ACT-IRR ART.NH high-CLF.atmo
‘We are going to look for a piece of land high up (without risk of inundation)’ elicited

(24) n-es-cho=oˈi to sawari-omo
d-serve_drink-ACT=IPFV ART.NH tobacco-CLF.liquid
‘I was giving (her) the tobacco juice.’ 12.12
RECAP

- Nominalization strategy 1: (DET) Pers-V-NZ
- Nominalization strategy 2: (DET) Pers-V
- Nominalization strategy 3: (DET) Pers-V(-DERIV)-CLF
SEMANTICS
SEMANTIC TYPES

- Argument vs event nominalization (Comrie & Thomson 2007, Shibatani 2019)
  - Event: DET = NH
  - Argument: DET = NH, M, F, H.PL

- Argument nominalization:
  - Agentive
  - Patientive
  - Oblique / Circumstancial (?)

- Aspectual distinctions

### NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ira</th>
<th>-wo</th>
<th>-ra'i</th>
<th>-giene</th>
<th>-ru /-re</th>
<th>-sare</th>
<th>-kore</th>
<th>-ine</th>
<th>-irare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV.NZ</td>
<td>STAT.NZ</td>
<td>HAB.A.NZ</td>
<td>GEN.PAT.NZ</td>
<td>SP.PAT.NZ</td>
<td>HAB.PAT.NZ</td>
<td>POT.PAT.NZ</td>
<td>SP.OBL.NZ</td>
<td>HAB.OBL.NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event**

**Patient**

**Argument**
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: EVENT NOMINALIZATION

- Generally, `EV.NZ -ira` with active verbs, and `STAT.NZ -wo` with stative verbs and adjectives

(25) `ene=puka=yo ta-ke=e'i to mu-etekp-ira`
   `this_way=DUB=FUT 3NH-be_like_this=IPFV ART.NH 3M-arrive-EV.NZ`
   `j-ma-ka 'iyo te to ma-peno`
   `DEM-M-PROX monkey PREP.NH ART.NH 3M-house.POSD`
   ‘The way the monkey arrives home must be like this.’

(26) `'nug'e mop'o-na metro to t-angie-wo to peti`
   `high three-CLF.GEN meter ART.NH 3NH-high-STAT.NZ ART.NH house.NPOS`
   ‘The house is three meters high (lit. the height of the house is three meters high).’
   07.010
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: AGENTIVE NOMINALIZATION

(27)  \( \tilde{n}i-ke=pripu=iji \)

\[ \text{3M-be\_like\_this=CONC.MOT.PFV=RPT} \]

‘The hunter was coming.’ 35.079

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{e}\text{n}\text{i} & \tilde{n}i & t-kasae-k-ra'i \\
\text{3M} & \text{ART.M} & \text{3-hunt-ACT-HAB.A.NZ} \\
\end{array} \]
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: PATIENTIVE NOMINALIZATION

- 4 patientive nominalizations
- Aspecto-modal distinction
  - Ex: \(ni(ko)\) ‘eat’ → food, meal, diet, edible products

(28) \(t\text{-}tan\text{-}u\text{-}ch\text{-}wo\text{-}no\) to \(na\text{-}ni\text{-}k\text{-}giene\)
3-look for-APPL3-ACT-MID-PL ART.NH 3PL-eat-ACT-GEN.P.NZ
‘[about three men who went hunting] they were looking for food.’ 19.001

(29) to \(t\text{-}ni\text{-}ko\text{-}m\text{=pu\text{=}iji\text{=}}\) \(n\text{-}onui\text{\text{e}}\) \(n\text{-}jomra\text{-}ch\text{=ri\text{\text{\text{=}}}i\text{\text{=}}\)j\text{i\text{=}}\)
ART.NH 3-eat-ACT-PL=PVF=REP 3M-also 3M-desire-ACT=IPFV=REP

   to \(na\text{-}ni\text{-}ru\)
ART.NH 3PL-eat-SP.P.NZ
‘When they ate, he too wanted their meal.’ 19.102

(30) \(wo\) \(s\text{-}ni\text{-}k\text{-}sare\text{-}na\text{=}\it{a\text{\text{\text{='}}}i\text{\text{=}}\)ie\text{\text{=}}\) \(s\text{-}ow\text{\text{\text{\text{=}}}wa\text{\text{=}}\)
NEG 3F-eat-ACT-HAB.P.NZ-IRR=IPFV PREP.NH 3F-village
‘(To be like this era, she should eat it.) It is not her usual diet in her country.’ 29.052

(31) \(taj\text{=}puka\text{=}ripka\text{=}eni\) \(p\text{-}ju\text{-}ena\) \(t\text{-}ni\text{-}k\text{-}kore\text{=}ri\text{\text{\text{=}}}i\text{\text{=}}\)
NH.INDT=DUB=DUB=PST DEM-NH.SG-DIST 3-eat-ACT-POT.P.NZ=IPFV
‘What can that be? something to eat?’ S_C&B_S 91
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: OBLIQUE NOMINALIZATION

(32) \[ \text{}\text{p-jo-ñgi} \quad \text{ñ-ow-ne}=\text{e'i} \quad \text{ñi} \quad \text{'chos-chicha} \]
\[ \text{DEM-NH.SG-PAST.EV} \quad \text{3M-live-SP.OBL.NZ}=\text{IPFV} \quad \text{ART.M} \quad \text{old-EMP} \]
‘(This… this is the same house, right?) that where the old man was.’ 40.216

(33) \[ \text{ty-uch-ko}=\text{po} \quad \text{eto} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{'uwe} \]
\[ \text{3-exit-ACT}=\text{PFV} \quad \text{3NH} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{frog} \]
\[ \text{te} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{t-ow-rare} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{une} \]
\[ \text{PREP.NH} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{3NH-live-HAB.OBL.NZ} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{water} \]
‘The frog had gone out of the water container.’ 18.011
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: (DET) PERS-V

- Event nominalization, agentive nominalization, patientive nominalization
- No formal difference
  - Cue for analysis: gender/number of determiner
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: EVENT

(34)  

\begin{align*}
\text{nuti} & \quad \text{n-imit-ko-w=yore} & \quad \text{to} & \quad \text{p-echji-k=yore} \\
1\text{SG} & \quad 1\text{SG-teach-ACT-2SG=FUT} & \quad \text{ART.NH} & \quad 2\text{SG-speak-ACT=FUT} \\
\text{te} & \quad \text{to} & \quad \text{v-echjiriwo} & \\
\text{PREP.NH} & \quad \text{ART.NH} & \quad \text{1PL-language} & \\
& \quad \text{‘I am going to teach you to speak our language.’ 20.041} 
\end{align*}
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: AGENTIVE/PATIENTIVE

(35) na-kopa-ko to na-ni-ko eno 'chañ-ono.
3PL-kill-ACT ART.NH 3PL-eat-ACT PRO.PL person-PL
‘They killed it for the people to eat.’

(36) na-kopa-ko to t-ni-ko eno 'chañ-ono.
3PL-kill-ACT ART.NH 3-eat-ACT PRO.PL person-PL
‘They killed the jaguar (lit. the one that eats people).’ elicited
With verb basis:

- Event nominalization (only with CLF –pi ‘rope’ → ‘activity’)
- Agentive nominalization
- Patientive nominalization
- Oblique nominalization (probably most frequent)
(37) \( n-it\-ko=wre \quad to \quad v\-’animá-ra\-pi \)
\( 1\text{sg}-\text{know-act}=\text{once}_\text{again} \quad \text{art.nh} \quad 1\text{pl}-\text{host-deriv-clf.fili} \)
‘I also know how to host/facilitate (religious ceremonies)’.

(38) \( to \quad t\-ijr\-omo \)
\( \text{art.nh} \quad 3\text{-be}_\text{hot-clf.liquid} \)
‘breakfast/dinner’
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 3: PATIENTIVE AND OBLIQUE

(39) \( n-\hat{n}om=po \quad Tajicho \quad to \quad s-o'-ri-ji \)
1SG-go=PFV because.of ART.NH 3F-vomit-DERIV-CLF.amorph
‘I went away because of her vomit’ elicited

(40) \( maatiyu \quad eto-po \quad p-ju-ena \quad \hat{n}-entone-re-pa \)
hammer 3NH-ADD DEM-NH.SG-DIST 3M-work-DERIV-CLF.needle
‘The hammer, it is also his tool.’ S_C&B_F 55
## COMPARISON OF STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>event</th>
<th>agentive</th>
<th>patientive</th>
<th>oblique</th>
<th>aspectual distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1 (NZ)</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻☻ in NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2 (V)</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td></td>
<td>☻ on V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3 (CLF)</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻</td>
<td>☻☻</td>
<td>☻ on N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MORPHOSYNTAX
Where do the different nominalization strategies fall on the finiteness scale?

- Finiteness scale

Canonical NP  - finite  Canonical main clause  + finite
- Prototypical nominalization (Givón 2009: 67):
  - a. The verb becomes a head noun.
  - b. The verb acquires *nominal* morphology.
  - c. The verb loses tense-aspect-modal marking.
  - d. The verb loses pronominal agreement marking.
  - e. The subject and/or object assume genitive case-marking.
  - f. Determiners may be added.
  - g. Adverbs are converted into adjectives.
MORPHOSYNTAX: FINITENESS

- Prototypical nominalization (Givón 2009: 67):
  - a. The verb becomes a head noun.
  - b. The verb acquires *nominal* morphology.
  - c. The verb loses tense-aspect-modal marking.
  - d. The verb loses pronominal agreement marking.
  - e. The subject and/or object assume genitive case-marking.
  - f. Determiners may be added.
  - g. Adverbs are converted into adjectives.

- Methodological issues for Mojeño Trinitario
  - a. OK
  - b. very little specifically nominal morphology, rather rare
  - c. TAME is also found on nouns
  - d. NS1 and NS2 all show person prefixes + possessive prefixes show the same form as some subject prefixes
  - e. no genitive case-marking, no difference in position and morphology between object and possessor (following V / head N)
  - f. true for the three strategies
  - g. very few adverbs
MORPHOSYNTAX: FINITENESS

- Relevant parameters:
  - Person prefixes
  - Person suffixes
  - Position of « subject » of transitive verb
  - Plural marking
  - Irrealis marking
  - Negation
MORPHOSYNTAX: PERSON PREFIXES

- On NS1, depends on the nominalizer.
- Nominal prefixes with most NZ, whatever the arguments → obligatorily possessed nouns

(41) to na-mi-ru
  ART.NH 3PL.-eat-SP.P.NZ
  ‘their meal’

(42) p-jo ñi-sos-rare
  DEM-NH.SG 3M-defecate-HAB.OBL.NZ
  ‘his toilets’ S_Loc_S 64

- HAB.A.NZ -ra’i and POT.P.NZ -kore take t-, whatever the arguments (impersonal reading) → non-possessible nouns

(43) to t-ni-k-kori-ono
  ART.NH 3-eat-ACT-POT.P.NZ-PL
  ‘edible items’

(44) to ‘moyo t-sok-ra’i
  ART.NH child 3-defecate-HAB.A.NZ
  ‘the boy with diarrhea’ 30.125
MORPHOSYNTAX: PERSON PREFIXES

- On NS2
  - If action nominalization, like in main clauses (t- vs specific 3rd prefixes)
  - If agentive nominalization, almost always t-

\[
\text{(46)} \quad \text{eno-po no awaresa-no t-echpojri-ko-no p-ju-ena } \text{'resia} \\
\text{3PL-ADD ART.PL old_woman-PL 3-look_after-ACT-PL DEM-NH.SG-DIST church} \\
\text{‘and to the old women that take care of that church’ 01.012}
\]

- If patientive nominalisation, almost always specific 3rd prefixes

\[
\text{(47)} \quad \text{to 'chatrope to ŋ-ɪjro-nu ŋi Aabeeto} \\
\text{ART.NH knife.NPOSD ART.NH 3M-give-1SG ART.M Alberto} \\
\text{‘the knife that Alberto gave me’ elicited}
\]
MORPHOSYNTAX: PERSON PREFIXES

- On NS3, unclear.
  - Some examples with t- (verbal), others with specific 3rd person prefixes (nominal).
    - Problem in identifying Strategy 3 with certainty.
  - Mostly seem to correspond to use in main clauses

\[(48)\]
\[ ma \quad ty-utsaru-si \]
\[ 3M \quad 3\text{-play-CLF:head} \]
\[ ‘the gamer/clown’ elicited \]

- In instrument nominalization, specific 3rd person prefixes are used on intransitive verbs $\rightarrow$ nominal

\[(49)\]
\[ t-eja-pue-k=po \quad te \quad pjo \quad s-epaji-i-mo. \]
\[ 3\text{-sit-CLF:ground-ACT=PFV} \quad \text{PREP} \quad \text{DEM} \quad 3F\text{-lie_down-DERIV-CLF.fabric} \]
\[ ‘She sits on the blanket.’ \]
MORPHOSYNTAX: PERSON SUFFIXES

Person suffixes for O on NS1 and NS2

(50) taa ta-koyem=ri'i to ŋ-imit-re-n=ri'i ŋi Alberto
    NH.INDT 3NH-happen_to=IPFV ART.NH 3M-teach-SP.P.NZ-1SG=IPFV ART.M Alberto
    ‘But then she asked: “What is it that Alberto has been teaching me?”’ 20.048

(51) viti v-yon=ñore je'chugne te 'to na-sam-a-wokovi
    1PL 1PL-go=FUT truly SUB ART.NH 3PL-listen-IRR-1PL

    eno viya-noviono te 'to na-ye'-om-poo'i comunidad.
    3PL men-PL.KIN PREP ART.NH 3PL-POSS-PL-DISTR community
    ‘We will truly go so that the men listen to us in each community.’’ 32.012
MORPHOSYNTAX: PERSON SUFFIXES

- Person suffixes for S of nominal predication on NS3

\[(52) \quad \text{'wo-sa-re-V-'o-nu}\\
\text{live-HAB.P.NZ-NPOS-DERIV-CLF.body-1SG}\\
\text{‘I am a village dweller.’ elicited}\]
MORPHOSYNTAX: SUBJECT POSITION

- In main clauses, with transitive verbs: SVO
- With either NS1 or NS2, S follows the nominalized verb. No data for NS3.

(53)  
\[ \text{taa} \quad \text{ta-koyem}=\text{ri}'i \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ni-imit-re}=\text{ni}'i \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{Alberto} \]
\[
\text{NH.INDT} \quad 3\text{NH-happen}_\text{to}=\text{IPFV} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad 3\text{M-teach-sp.p.nz-1sg}=\text{IPFV} \quad \text{ART.M} \quad \text{Alberto}
\]
‘But then she asked: "What is it that Alberto has been teaching me?" 20.048

(54)  
\[ \text{na-kopa-ko} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{na-ni-ko} \quad \text{eno} \quad \text{'chañ-ono.} \]
\[
\text{3PL-kill-act} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad 3\text{PL-eat-act} \quad \text{PRO.PL} \quad \text{person-pl}
\]
‘They killed it for the people to eat.’
MORPHOSYNTAX: PLURAL MARKER

- Plural –ono only compatible with 3rd person t- in NS2 → plural of the subject (verbal)

  (54)  
  
  taa  ta-koyem=ri’i  to  ty-ute-ko-m=po  
  NH.INDT 3NH-happen_to=IPFV  ART.NH 3-come-ACT-PL=PFV
  ‘Why did they come?’ 47.009

- Plural –ono compatible with any person prefix in NS1 and NS3 → plural of the noun (nominal)

  (55)  
  
  ene  en-jo  no  mu-echji-r-ono  
  and 3PL-EXIST ART.PL 3M-speak-SP.P.NZ-PL
  ‘And there are people with whom he spoke, others that are going to help sowing.’ 21.037

  (56)  
  
  t-choo=wore  s-noko  to  s-epko-pewo-no  
  3-go_back=once_again 3f-put ART.NH 3f-cover-CLF.foot-PL
  ‘She comes back to put her flip flop on again.’ S_Path_M 58
MORPHOSYNTAX: IRREALIS

- Verbal irrealis –a found on verbs in NS2
  
  (57) te to p-a-wro’o to p-etri-gi-a-nu
  
  3NH.PREP ART.NH 2SG-IRR-want ART.NH 2SG-pass-ACT-IRR-1SG
  
  juiti p-iimui-k=yore
  
  now 2SG-dance-ACT=FUT
  
  ‘If you want to pass me, you have to dance now.’ 19.157

- Non-verbal irrealis –ina found in NS1 (with some exceptions) and NS3

  (58) v-yosioo-ko=o’i to vi-uri-w-ina
  
  1PL-ask_low_voice-ACT=IPFV ART.NH 1PL-be_good-STAT.NZ-IRR
  
  ‘We are asking Him our well-being.’ 24.060

  (59) v-kommu ‘cheve, mateka, ene eto=po to v-en-ro-ve-na.
  
  1PL-need salt butter and 3NH=PFV ART.NH 1PL-fish-DERIV-CLF.pointed-IRR
  
  ‘we need salt, butter […] and also that for our fish hooks.’
Verbal negation with *wo* auxiliary in NS2

(61)  
\[ t\text{-}ko\text{-}topraw=ri'i \quad to \quad wo \quad t\text{-}(a)\text{-}oo=ri'i=ji \]
3-VZ-guilt=IPFV \quad ART.NH \quad NEG \quad 3-IRR-be_good=IPFV=RPT

\[ j\text{-}ma \quad na\text{-}ye'e \quad sertifikado \]
DEM-NH.PL \quad 3PL-GPN \quad certificate(sp)

‘The reason is that their certificates are not good apparently.’ 37.060
MORPHOSYNTAX: NEGATION

- In NS1, either privative privative prefix *mu*- (not found on underived nouns) or *wo* auxiliary (with non-verbal or verbal irrealis)

\[
\begin{align*}
(62) & \quad ta-eswoy-ko=po \quad to \quad na-mu-jpan-ra-wo \\
& \quad 3\text{NH-WOSEN-ACT}=PFV \quad \text{ART.NH 3PL-PRIV-have_pity-EV.NZ-MID} \\
& \quad \text{‘It went far, without any pity (for the animal).’} \quad 27.052
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(63) & \quad ema \quad ma \quad wo \quad t-O-ore-m-ra'\i, \\
& \quad 3M \quad \text{ART.M} \quad \text{NEG} \quad 3\text{IRR-be_good-CLF.fabric-HAB.A.NZ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \quad ma-muire \quad ta-kucho-ko \quad eto \quad to \quad kuñaro-gi \\
& \quad 3M\text{-also} \quad 3\text{NH-WAIT-ACT} \quad 3\text{NH} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{beast-CLF.cyl} \\
& \quad \text{‘the one who is not good, the beast will also wait for him’} \quad 30.049
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(64) & \quad wo \quad s-mi-k-sare-na=a'\i \quad te \quad s-owsa \\
& \quad \text{NEG} \quad 3\text{F-eat-ACT-HAB.P.NZ-IRR}=PFV \quad \text{PREP.NH} \quad 3\text{F-village} \\
& \quad \text{‘(To be like this ara, she should eat it.) It is not her usual diet in her country.’} \quad 29.052
\end{align*}
\]
COMPARISON OF STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DET</th>
<th>person prefixes</th>
<th>person suffixes</th>
<th>subject position</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>irrealis</th>
<th>negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS 1 (NZ)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/V (depends on NZ)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(some exceptions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 2 (V)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V (some exceptions)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 3 (CLF)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>not attested</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS1 with verbal internal morphosyntax and nominal external morphosyntax

- Finiteness scale

Canonical NP

- finite

NS3

NS1

NS2

Canonical main clause

+ finite
SYNTACTIC DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINALIZATIONS

- Based on Lemus Serrano (2020)
- Nominal distribution (expected)
  - head of noun phrase (referential function)
  - noun modifier
  - nominal predicate (equation – still encodes a participant)
- Adverbial clauses
  - With preposition/subordinator *te* (expected)
  - Without dedicated subordinator (expected ?)
- Main predicates – expresses an event (unexpected) ‘nominalization-based construction’

NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

- Found in all possible syntactic functions
- As modifier, and main event predicate, without a DET
- As adverbial without additional marking:
  - Essentially event nominalizations, with time, cause, and purpose meanings.
  - Occasionally argument nominalizations, often with cause meanings.
- As main predicate
  - Seems to be used with a special discourse function as a personal comment from the speaker (does not advance the narration)
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

- Modifying nominalization

(65) \[ t\text{-})echji\text{-}ri\text{-}ri\text{-}ko\text{-}wo\text{-}n=ri\text{'i} \quad p\text{-}no\text{-}ni, \]
\[ 3\text{-}speak\text{-}PLURACT\text{-}PLURACT\text{-}ACT\text{-}MID\text{-}PL=IPFV \quad DEM\text{-}H.PL\text{-}PROX \]
\[ p\text{-}no\text{-}n\text{-}ono \quad 'cha\text{'}i\text{-}ono\text{ v\text{-}im\text{'}o\text{-}gne\text{=e\text{'}i} \quad te \quad p\text{-}jo\text{-}ka \]
\[ DEM\text{-}H.PL\text{-}PROX\text{-}PL\ person\text{-}PL \quad 1\text{PL\ -}see\text{-}ACT\text{-}GEN\text{-}P.NZ=IPFV \ PREP.NH \ DEM\text{-}NH.SG\text{-}PROX \]
They talk, these men that we have seen here.

- Nominalization as nominal predicate

(66) \[ ema\ ma\ powre\ tata=eni, \quad ema\ t\text{-}ipruj\text{-}ri\text{-}k-ra\text{'i} \]
\[ 3M\ ART.M\ poor(Sp)\ my\_father=PST \quad 3M\ 3\text{-}medicine\text{-}PLURACT\text{-}CAUS\text{-}HAB.A.NZ \]
My poor late father, he was a healer.
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

- Adverbial function: with/without PREP, with/without DET

\[(67)\]  
\[
\text{ene} \quad \text{te} \quad \tilde{n}i-pui-s-ra=rine=jich=eji, \\
\text{and} \quad \text{PREP.NH} \quad 3M-walk-\text{ACT-EV.NZ}=\text{RESTR}=\text{INTENS}=\text{RPT}
\]
\[
e\tilde{n}i \quad t-yono \quad \text{te} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ewire}=\text{gne} \\
3M \quad 3\text{-go} \quad \text{PREP.NH} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad \text{far}=\text{INTENS}
\]
‘And walking so much (because he walked so much), he went very far away.’ 19.059

\[(68)\]  
\[
\text{ene} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ma-pls-ra} \quad \text{ema} \quad t\text{-ivenopo}=\text{po} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{’pog’e} \\
\text{and} \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad 3M\text{-be scared-EV.NZ} \quad 3M \quad 3\text{-fall}=\text{PFV} \quad \text{PREP.NH} \quad \text{ground}
\]
‘And being scared, he fell on the floor.’ 18.035

\[(69)\]  
\[
\text{ene} \quad \text{wo’i=ji} \quad \text{e\tilde{n}i} \quad \text{to} \quad \tilde{n}i\text{-jikp-a} \quad \tilde{n}i\text{-jich-giene}=\text{rl’i} \\
\text{and} \quad \text{no}=\text{RPT} \quad 3M \quad \text{ART.NH} \quad 3M\text{-answer-IRR} \quad 3M\text{-say-GEN.P.NZ}=\text{IPFV}
\]
‘And he (the father) did not answer, like he (the son) had said.’
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 1: (DET) PERS-V-NZ

- Nominalization-based main predicate: personal comment by the speaker, does not advance narration

(70)   \[ ta-rot-ira=richu \quad p-jo \quad mesa \]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
3NH & meet & EV.NZ=RESTR \\
DEM-NH.SG & table
\end{array}
\]
‘The table is completed.’ 45.026

(71)   \[ to \quad giore \quad t-pik-kore \quad jichu \quad wo \quad v-im-\textquoteleft-o-gne-na \]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{ART.NH} & \text{snake} & 3\text{-be_scared-POT.P.NZ} \\
\text{because} & \text{NEG} & 1\text{PL\text{-}watch-ACT\text{-}GEN.P.NZ-IRR}
\end{array}
\]
‘the snake, it is scary because we don't see it.’ 30.015

(72)   \[ ma-japanu-gne=pka=yo, \quad ma-japanu-gne \]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
3M\text{-}have\_pity\_GEN.P.NZ=\text{DUB=}? & 3M\text{-}have\_pity\_GEN.P.NZ
\end{array}
\]
‘[describing a man in jail on a picture] he is probably pitiable, he is arousing pity.’ 40.058

(73)   \[ wo \quad s-ni-k-sare-na=a'i \quad te \quad s-owsa \]
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NEG} & 3\text{F\text{-}eat-ACT\text{-}HAB.P.NZ-IRR=}\text{IPFV} & \text{PREP.NH} \quad 3\text{F\text{-}village}
\end{array}
\]
‘(To be like this ara, she should eat it.) It is not her usual diet in her country.’ 29.052
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: (DET) PERS-V

- Mainly as head of noun phrase
- Rarely as modifier
- Frequently adverbially
  - With or without DET
  - With or without PREP *te*
    - *te* DET clause = preposition; *te* clause = subordinator?
Modifying nominalization:

(74) api-‘e, moporo-‘e=puka to w-nok-a to penisilina
two-MULT three-MULT=DUB ART.NH 1PL-put-IRR ART.NH penicillin(sp)

v-yumtu-k-a, ene? to kwoyu t-ko-jma
1PL-sting-ACT-IRR TAG ART.NH horse 3-vz-disease
‘we give it penicillin tow or three times, we inject it, right? to the sick horse’ 13.023
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 2: (DET) PERS-V

- Adverbial function:
  - with/without PREP
  - with/without DET

(75) te to t-ipruj-ri-k=yore ema ma tata-eni,
PREP ART.NH 3-cure-PLURAC-ACT=FUT PRO.M ART.M father-PAST

e ne ty-om-mi te to t-ou’o to 'punji.
then 3-take-1SG PREP ART.NH 3NH-be.at ART.NH medecine

‘When my late father was going to cure people, he used to take me to the places where medecine plants are found.’

(76) te p-itekpk-a=po, p-iimui-gi-a
SUB 2SG-arrive-IRR=PFV 2SG-dance-ACT-IRR

‘When you arrive, you will have to dance.’

(77) jmani na-kommu-sare no ven-novioni to t-kojma-no.
DEM.NH.PL 3PL-need-HAB.P.NZ ART.PL Lady-PL.KIN ART.NH 3-be.sick-PL

‘These are the needs of the ladies when they are sick.’

(78) t-sióp-a=po, a-joch-a=po j-ma tapajó-no!
3-come_in-IRR=PFV 2PL-close-IRR=PFV DEM-NH.PL door-PL

‘When they come in, close the door!’
 Only in the prototypical functions of nouns
  - Head noun
  - Modifier
  - Nominal predicate

 A sign of lexical derivation ?
NOMINALIZATION STRATEGY 3: (DET) PERS-V(-DERIV)-CLF

- Modifying nominalization

\[(79)\] wi=p o no... na-a-mtu n-omuire to t-echji-gi-a-no
NEG=PFV ART.PL 3PL-IRR-all 3PL-also ART.NH 3-speak-ACT-IRR-PL

\[te'\] to v-echjiriwo \[trinran-ro-pi\]
PREP.NH ART.NH 1PL-language Trinitario-DERIV-CLF.fili
‘Not everybody speaks our language of us, Trinitario’ 31.010

- Nominalization as nominal predicate

\[(80)\] ene t-iñe-re'-o to toro
and 3-inspire awe-DERIV-CLF.body ART.NH bull
‘The bulls were fierceful.’
## COMPARISON OF STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>head</th>
<th>modifier</th>
<th>nominal predicate</th>
<th>adverbial without SUB/PREP</th>
<th>main(event) predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1 (NZ)</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2 (V)</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 3 (CLF)</td>
<td>😊😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCOURSE
Competition between NS1 and NS2 in subordinate clauses

"Non-finite syntax occurs in subordinate clauses that show maximal reference and T-A-M continuity vis-a-vis their main clause (Givón 2011)."

Tests not straightforward in Mojeño Trinitario, since:

- Nouns can take TAME markers
- Obligatory person marking in NS1 and NS2
  - \( \rightarrow \) non-finite ≠ fewer categories

One can only test the independency of person and TAME marking in subordinate clauses vis-à-vis the main clause

DISCOURSE: SUBJECT COREFERENCE

- S of nominalized clause co-referential or not with S of main clause, for NS1

(81) viti v-ponre-ri-ko to v-yon-ra=yre.
PRO.1PL 1PL-think-PLURAC-ACT ART.NH 1PL-go-EV.NZ=FUT
'We are thinking of how to go.'

(82) v-echji-s-o=yre to ma-koyem-giene.
1PL-tell-ACT-APPL=FUT ART.NH 3M-undergo-GEN.P.NZ
'We are going to tell what happened to him (lit. what he underwent).'</n
- S of nominalized clause co-referential or not with S of main clause, for NS2

(83) wo na-wro'=ri'i to t-siop-a-no eno t-komeri-ono,
NEG 3PL-IRR.want=IPFV ART.NH 3-enter-IRR-PL PRO.3PL 3-speak.Spanish-PL

na-woo'o to na-kopak-a eno.
3PL-want ART.NH 3PL-kill-IRR PRO.3PL
'They did not want the Spanish-speaking people to enter, they wanted to kill them.'
DISCOURSE: TAME

- Same or different TAME in nominalized clause and main clause, for NS1

(84)  wo  w-k-imot(to  ta-ko-jma-ra  to  kwoyu
NEG  1PL-IRR.NEG-know  ART.NH  3-VZ-illness-EV.NZ  ART.NH  horse
‘if we don’t know that the horse is sick’

(85)  viti  y-pounre-ri-ko  to  v-yon-ra=yre.
PRO.1PL  1PL-think-PLURAC-ACT  ART.NH  1PL-go-EV.NZ=FUT
‘We are thinking of how to go.’

- Same or different TAME in nominalized clause and main clause, for NS2

(86)  muti  n-it-ko  to  n-ipruj-ri-ko
PRO.1SG  1SG-know-ACT  ART.NH  1SG-cure-PLURAC-ACT
‘I know how to cure it.’

(87)  eto  p-woo’o  to  p-echo=yore  verno  Pransiska.
PRO.NH  2SG-want  ART.NH  2SG-know=FUT  Lady Francisca
‘This is what you want to know, Lady Francisca.’
No complementary distribution

Textual cohesion irrelevant to select NS1 or NS2 as subordinate clauses
Nice pair of examples for the lack of contextual impact on the selection of a nominalization strategy

(88)  
eto  
jmani  
n-im-’o-gne  
te’  
to  
n-itori-s-ra

PRO.NH  DEM.NH.PL  1SG-see-ACT-GEN.P.NZ  SUB  ART.NH  1SG-live-ACN.NZ

te  
to  
n-juu-s-ira.
PREP  ART.NH  1SG-grow-ACT-EV.NZ
‘These things I have seen in my life when I was growing up.’

(89)  
eto  
n-im-’o-gne  
te’  
to  
n-itori-s-ra

PRO.NH  1SG-see-ACT-GEN.P.NZ  SUB  ART.NH  1SG-live-EV.NZ

te  
to  
n-juu-ko-po.
PREP  ART.NH  1SG-grow-ACT-PFV
‘This is what I have seen in my life when I grew up.’
CONCLUSIONS
One minor strategy (DERIV-CLF)
- Lexical derivation?
  - Very nominal morphosyntactic features
  - But fixed meaning or interpretation depending on context?

Two major strategies, potentially in competition at all levels
- Good case study to check the idea that in a language with many nominalization strategies, these could be:
  - Semantically more specific (Yap et al. 2011: 4)
  - Morphosyntactically distinct: lexical vs clausal nominalization (Shibatani 2019)
  - In complementary distribution in discourse (Givon 2011)
Mojeño Trinitario shows that in a language with several nominalizations strategies (and various nominalizers):

- They are not semantically complementary, nor even specific
  - NS2 and NS3 with versatile meaning
  - Meanings of NS1, NS2 and NS3 overlap
- There is not a clear lexical vs. grammatical nominalization divide
  - but the three strategies show different levels of finiteness
- No clear-cut complementary syntactic distribution
  - Except NS3 only for nominal function
  - NS1 and NS2 also with adverbial functions
  - NS1 also develops into nominalization-based constructions
- No complementary distribution in terms of discourse cohesiveness