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1. Introduction: Topic

- This talk focuses on **bound nouns** in Harakmbut
- Starting point: morphological distinction between independent and bound nouns

### Independent nouns

may occur as nominal heads without morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pĩã</th>
<th>ndo?-edn</th>
<th>pĩã</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>1SG-GEN</td>
<td>arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘arrow’</td>
<td>‘my arrow’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bound nouns

never occur as nominal heads without morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wa-ndik</th>
<th>ndo?-edn-ndik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPF-name</td>
<td>1SG-GEN-name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘name’</td>
<td>‘my name’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Describe the morphosyntactic behaviour of bound nouns
- Assess the explanatory power of alienability contrasts to account for this
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2. Harakmbut and its speakers

- Harakmbut is a language from the Peruvian Amazon, Madre de Dios and Cusco
- Genetic affiliation:
  - isolate/unclassified language (cf. Wise 1999: 307; WALS)
  - Adelaar (2000, 2007): genetically related to the Brazilian Katukina family
- Areality:
  - Some grammatical features are shared with languages from Guaporé-Mamoré linguistic area (Crevels & van der Voort 2008)
- Harakmbut live in ‘native communities’: patches of land entitled to them by the government
- subtropical climate
- around tributaries of the Madre de Dios River, which eventually flows into the Amazon River;
- About 1000 speakers left; distinct dialects
- Previous linguistic work: focus on Arakmbut/Amarakaeri dialect (Hart 1963; Helberg 1984, 1990; Tripp 1976ab, 1995)
3. Inventory of bound nouns

What do they look like? In their citation form, bound nouns either start with *wa-* or *e-*

- *wa-* and *e-* are semantically empty noun prefixes that derive independent nouns from bound ones

(AREALITY: less frequent prefix *e-* has the same form and function (in noun-based nominalization) as the dummy noun prefix *e-* in Cavineña and other Tacanan languages (Guillaume 2008: 409-416); cf. also semantically empty root *e-* in Kwaza, which serves as “a noun formative to lend independent status to classifiers” (Van der Voort 2005: 397))

- *wa-* and *e-* also serve in verb-based nominalization, e.g. (1)-(2)

(1)  
\[ wa-wedn \]  
NMLZ-lie 'bed'

(2)  
\[ e-wi? \]  
NMLZ-rain OR INF-rain 'rain' OR 'to rain'

- In (3), bound root *mba* gives rise to two distinct independent nouns whose referents show a similarity in shape and form an upper extremity of a living body (cf. Helberg 1984: 254, 437).

(3)  
(a)  \[ wa-mba? \]  
NPF-hand 'hand'

(b)  \[ e-mba? \]  
NPF-hand 'leaf'

(4)  
(a)  \[ wa-pidn \]  
NPF-rib 'rib' (Tripp 1995: 127)

(b)  \[ e-pidn \]  
NPF-spine ‘spine, thorn’ (Tripp 1995: 51)
3. Inventory of bound nouns

- Preliminary results of perusal of Tripp’s (1995) dictionary
- *wa*-nouns spread over 28 pages of 153 pages (ca. 1/5)
- *e*-words spread over 74 pages of 153 pages (ca. 1/2), but have not been looked at so far
- First 8 pages analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complex BN</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ + examples</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN_root</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other verb-based</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘amount of’ NUM + N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM_with_BN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Inventory of bound nouns

Bound noun root:

- *wa-ay?*
- NPF-bone
- ‘bone’

Complex BN:

- *wa-\text{mba-pih-ay}?*
- NPF-hand-digit-bone
- ‘finger bone’ [bone of the finger: inalienable possession [part-whole], non-human possessor]

- *wa-\text{mbo-siʔpo-ok}*
- NPF-youngster/stand-DIM-period
- ‘youth’

Adjective:

- *wa-\text{mbidn(-nda)}*
- NPF-large-NDA
- ‘large, tall’

- *wa-\text{mbidn-ʔi-pih-nda}*
- NPF-large-foot-digit-NDA
- ‘long(est) toe’
3. Inventory of bound nouns

Bound noun root:

- *wa-ayʔ*
  - NPF-bone
  - ‘bone’

Complex BN:

- *wa-mba-pih-ayʔ*
  - NPF-hand-digit-bone
  - ‘finger bone’ [bone of the finger: inalienable possession [part-whole], non-human possessor]

- *wa-mbo-siʔ-po-ok*
  - NPF-youngster/stand-DIM-period
  - ‘youth’

Adjective:

- *wa-mbidn(-nda)*
  - NPF-large-NDA
  - ‘large, tall’

- *wa-mbidn-ʔi-pih-nda*
  - NPF-large-foot-digit-NDA
  - ‘long(est) toe’

Some forms only occur in compounds, e.g. –*pih*

→ Need to posit a separate noun class?
3. Inventory of bound nouns

Analytical problems:

- `wa-ku`
  - NPF-head
  - ‘head’
- `wa-taʔmeh`
  - NPF-handle
  - ‘handle’
- `apotog-taʔmeh`
  - rifle-handle
  - ‘handle of a rifle’
= `wa-ku-taʔmeh`
  - NPF-head-handle
  - ‘back of the neck’

Some forms only occur in compounds, e.g. -`meh`

→ Need to posit a separate noun class?

- `wa-taʔmeh`
- `apotog-taʔmeh`
- `watey-taʔmeh`
  - axe-handle
  - ‘axe handle’

- `wa-ku-taʔmeh`
  - NPF-head-SPAT:base-hump
  - ‘back of the neck’

- `wa-mba-taʔ-meh(-po)`
  - NPF-hand-SPAT:base-hump(-CLF:round)
  - ‘wrist’
3. Inventory of bound nouns

Instrument nominalization

wa-mbewik
NMLZ-go.up
‘pole or ladder used to go up (and down again)’ (Tripp 1995: 110)

Result nominalization

wa-mbuey
NMLZ-die
‘corpse, dead person or dead animal’ (Tripp 1995: 111)

NOTE:

e-mbuey-mey
NMLZ-die-COL
‘those who died before, the dead’ (Tripp 1995: 307)
3. Inventory of bound nouns

Semantic fields of bound nouns:

- **wã-wẽ** ‘liquid; river’

- **wã-wẽ-ërĩ**
  - NPF-liquid-AN
  - ‘river spirit’

- **wãwẽmbedn** ‘red squirrel’ (Tripp 1995: 115)

- **wãwēsik** ‘gray squirrel’ (Tripp 1995: 115)

- **wã-õŋ** ‘powder’

- **wã-ĕkõŋ** ‘cavity, hole’

- **wa-kupo** ‘hill’

- **wa-ndagŋ** ‘path’

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal body part</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal kinterm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artefact</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute_colour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute_person</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily excretion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily secretion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body part</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food &amp; drinks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinship</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape part</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numeral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of a house</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant part</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality_person</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supernatural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent nouns</th>
<th>bound nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morphological status</strong></td>
<td>can stand on their own as a word form</td>
<td>require a noun prefix to obtain independent nominal status (wa- or e-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noun incorporation</strong></td>
<td>Generally not incorporable into the verb (1 exception; NI type I only)</td>
<td>incorporable into the verb (all four types of NI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-N compounding</strong></td>
<td>Rarely N2 in N-N compounds</td>
<td>typically N2 in N-N compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noun modification</strong></td>
<td>One construction type: two prosodic words</td>
<td>Two construction types: (i) two prosodic words (with noun prefix) (ii) one prosodic word (without noun prefix)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.1 Noun incorporation

Type I (lexical compounding)

- Noun becomes part of the verb form: incorporation into the verb
- found with many bound nouns, and only one free noun: (h)ak ‘house’ (cf. (11))

(11) wa-mationka-eri  o-ak-yonŋ-me
     NMLZ-hunt-ANIM   3SG.IND-house-destroy-REC
     ‘The hunter hut-destroyed.’

transitive verb stem -yonŋ + free noun (h)ak ‘house’ = intransitive verb that denotes a “name-worthy” activity of hunters (Mithun 1984: 849)

- Type I NI with incorporated body part noun, cf. (12)

(12) i-ʔidn-ket-on-i
     1SG-tooth-break-PFV.NVOL-1.IND
     ‘I broke a tooth.’ (lit. ‘I tooth-broke’)


4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.1 Noun incorporation

NI of type II (manipulation of case)

• Valency-changing mechanism: incorporation of noun “permits another argument of the clause to occupy the case role vacated by the IN” (Mithun 1984: 859)

• Type II only features bound nouns, e.g. body part noun in (13)

• This type typically involves possessors being advanced to (applied) object status, which position is vacated by the incorporated body part (cf. Mithun 1984: 857-858)

• Unlike in type I NI, the IN in (13) is identifiable; it is the speaker’s head

(13) Pomelo-a o-ku-ti-kot-ay Joeri-ta
    grapefruit-NOM 3SG.IND-head-SPAT:on-fall-AVRT Joeri-ACC
    ‘A grapefruit almost fell on Joeri’s head.’
NI of type III (manipulation of discourse structure)

- Type III is used “to background known or incidental information within portions of discourse” (Mithun 1984: 859)
- only features bound nouns in Harakmbut, typically with fairly general lexical reference

(14)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pera</th>
<th>o-n-ka</th>
<th>ānĩĩ</th>
<th>o-mbewik-po</th>
<th>eskalera-te,</th>
<th>ānĩĩ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pear</td>
<td>3SG.IND-SPAT-do</td>
<td>FILLER</td>
<td>3SG.IND-go.up-DEP</td>
<td>ladder-LOC</td>
<td>FILLER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

o-ma-nda-e-a,  
o-ma-nda-e-a  ānĩĩ,  
3SG.IND-VPL-fruit-get-TRVR 3SG.IND-VPL-fruit-get-TRVR | FILLER | basket-LOC |

‘He is picking pears, eh, going up on a ladder, eh, he is taking/collecting them (the fruits), eh, in a basket.’ [110913-lis_pear_0007] (spontaneous speech)

- 1st clause: 'the pears' are referred to with a full nominal
- 2nd clause: anaphoric reference to the pears through incorporated bound noun root -nda ‘fruit’ (referent of IN is identifiable by the hearer)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns
4.1 Noun incorporation

NI of type IV (classificatory noun incorporation)

• $N + V$ can be accompanied by a more specific external NP which identifies the argument implied by IN (Mithun 1984: 867); these nominals are classified according to the N stem that is incorporated to qualify Vs directed at them
• In Harakmbut: only bound nouns that indicate shape/quality of substance (no body-parts, unless they have acquired a more general meaning) → CLASSIFIERS

(15) $mbaso$ $o$-$puʔ$-$sak$-$on$-$ate$
glass(Sp) 3SG.IND-CFL:cylindrical.hollow-break-PFV.NVOL-NVIS
‘The drinking glass broke.’

(16) $men$ $kōsō$ $ya$-$poʔ$-$sak$-$on$?
which pot 3SG.DUB-CLF:round-break-PFV.NVOL
‘Which pot broke?’

IN specifies the shape of the S-argument (broken object) in (15)-(16)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.1 Noun incorporation

NI of type IV (classificatory noun incorporation)

• In Harakmbut: only bound nouns that indicate shape/quality of substance
• body-part noun root –mba in (17): two-dimensional object (more general meaning than 'hand/leaf')

(17) O-\textit{ta-mba}-toʔ-\textit{tiak-me-ne} \quad e-\textit{ma-mbo-e-a}  
1<>2SG-APPL-CFL:two-dimensional-SOC-come-REC.VIS-IND \quad NMLZ-VPL-stand-ITER-TRVR

‘I brought your photograph’

(no reference to hand/leaf, but shape of photograph)

(only one photograph; \textit{mba} does not function as VPL)

IN specifies the shape of the (applied) O-argument (brought object) in (17)
• Except for *hak* – morphological boundness is the formal prerequisite for nouns to be incorporable

• Body parts regularly occur in types I and II NI, as do plant parts, human attributes (e.g. ‘name’), and landscape parts (e.g. ‘earth’)

• Other semantic fields are hardly observed in types I and II NI; kinship terms, animals, are never incorporated

• it is only more general N stems that are found in types III and IV, specifically those referring to basic shapes or qualities of entities

→ only these elements belong to the category of classifiers in Harakmbut (Rose & Van Linden Forthc)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.2 N-N compounding

N-N compounds

- N1+N2, e.g. door + step = doorstep
- N2 is rarely an independent nouns; N2 is typically a bound noun, invariably WITHOUT noun prefix
- N1 is semantically subordinate; N2 is the formal and semantic head of the compound

N1-N2

kaimāri-mbogn
zungaro-lip
‘lip of a zungaro fish’ [inalienable possession]

wa-ay?-dŋku
NPF-bone-joint
‘joint’ [-dŋku is only found in compounds]

wa-mbagn-pidn
NPF-shoulder.blade-rib;spine
‘tip of the shoulder blade’ [inalienable possession]

ALSO with instrument nominalizations:

siro-mba-pe?
metal-VPL-eat
‘metal plate’ (something to eat from in metal)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.2 N-N compounding

N-N compounds

• N1+N2, e.g. door + step = doorstep
• N2 is rarely an independent nouns; N2 is typically a bound noun, invariably WITHOUT noun prefix
• Again, skewed distribution of N2 nouns over semantic fields
  • Typically body parts and plant parts in N2 → inalienable possession
  • landscape parts in N2 → may yield proper names (Karene-wê: Colorado River)
  • hardly any kinship terms in N2

• Also often shapes or substances in N2 (CLF) → ‘attribute-like’ relation

  *peraʔ-po [rubber-clf:round] ‘plastic ball’ (Hart 1963: 5)
  *siro-po [metal-clf:round] ‘tin can’ (Hart 1963: 1)
  *aymõrõ-po [honey-clf:round] ‘bee’
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.3 Noun modification

Morphosyntactic behaviour in prenominal modifier constructions:

- when combined with adnominal modifiers that obligatorily precede the nominal head when fully integrated in the NP (i.e. excluding discontinuous NPs):
  - free nouns show a single construction type: modifier and head noun form two prosodic words
  - bound nouns show two construction types:
    (i) one in which they attach to a noun prefix and follow the modifier like free nouns
    (ii) one without a noun prefix, in which they form one prosodic word with the modifier

  - Interrogative modifier, e.g. *Which food?*
  - Numeral modifier, e.g. *two dogs*
  - Quantifier, e.g. *all day*
  - Demonstrative modifier, deictic adjectives ‘other’, ‘same’, ...
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.3 Noun modification

- bound nouns show two construction types:
  (i) one in which they attach to a noun prefix and follow the modifier like free nouns
  (ii) one without a noun prefix, in which they form one prosodic word with the modifier

E.g. with interrogative modifier *kate?*, cf. (18)-(19)

(18)  
\[ \text{kate} \quad \text{gypo} \quad i?-pak-ika-Ø? \]
what food 2SG-want-HAB-DUB
‘What sort of food do you (sg) like?’

(19)  
(a)  
\[ \text{kate} \quad \text{wa-ndik} \quad i?-ē-Ø? \]
what NPF-name 2SG-be-DUB
‘What is your name?’

(b)  
\[ \text{kate-ndik} \quad i?-ē-Ø? \]
what-name 2SG-be-DUB
‘What is your name?’
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.3 Noun modification

- bound nouns show two construction types:
  (i) one in which they attach to a noun prefix and follow the modifier like free nouns
  (ii) one without a noun prefix, in which they form one prosodic word with the modifier

E.g. with numeral modifier *mbotta* 'two', cf. (20)-(21)

(20)  
\[ \text{i}h \text{-y}o\text{k-i} \quad \text{mbotta?} \quad \text{kywa} \quad \text{Luis-ta} \]
\[ 1\text{SG-give-1.IND} \quad \text{two} \quad \text{dog} \quad \text{Luis-ACC} \]
‘I give two dogs to Luis.’

(21)
(a)  
\[ \text{ĩh-tō-ė-ũ} \quad \text{mbotta?} \quad \text{wa-mba?} \]
\[ 1\text{SG.IND-SOC-be-1.IND} \quad \text{two} \quad \text{NMLZ-hand} \]
‘I have two hands’

(b)  
\[ \text{mbotta?-mba?} \quad \text{ĩh-tō-ė-ũ} \]
\[ \text{two-hand} \quad 1\text{SG.IND-SOC-be-1.IND} \]
‘I have two hands’
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.3 Noun modification

- bound nouns show two construction types:
  (i) one in which they attach to a noun prefix and follow the modifier like free nouns
  (ii) one without a noun prefix, in which they form one prosodic word with the modifier

  e.g. with quantifier aya ‘all’, cf. (22)-(23)

  (22)  
on-amba-titik-a-me        aya-nda mitayo
       3PL.IND-VPL-lose-TRNR-REC.PST all-NDA catch
       ‘they lost all the catch.’

  (23)  (a)  ĩh-tō-ē-ŷ          aya-nda waʔidn
         1SG.IND-SOC-be-1.IND all-NDA NMLZ-tooth
         ‘I have all my teeth.’

  (b)   ayaʔ-?meʔnoe
         all-day
         ‘all day’    [wa-?meʔnoe NPF-day ‘day’ (Tripp 1995: 124)]
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

e.g. with possessive modifiers, cf. (24)-(25)-(26)

attributive possession is reflected by dependent marking: (pro)nouns denoting the possessor are marked for genitive case; the possessed noun is unmarked

(24) ndoʔ-edn nāŋ
1SG-GEN mother
‘My mother’

[independent noun in spite of being inalienably possessed! BUT, there is also a bound noun for mother: wāyē]

(25) ndoʔ-edn wa-ndā-po
1SG-GEN NPF-fruit-CLF:round
‘My belly’

(26) (a) arakmbut-en-ndik
people-GEN-name
‘native lexical item’ (‘name of the people’)

(b) arakmbut
people;person
‘people’, ‘person’

(c) wa-ndik
NPF-name
‘name’

All examples here: inalienable possession; human possessors
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Semantically alienable possession
Human possessors: genitive marked; no pronoun/noun split

(27)  
Lupeʔ-(edn)  kurukuru-mbaʔ  
Lupe-GEN bijao-leaf
‘Lupe’s bijao leaves’

(28)  
doʔ-(edn)  kōsō  
1SG-GEN pot
‘my pot’

Animal possessors: also genitive marked

(29)  
apetpet- edn  hak  
jaguar-GEN house
‘the jaguar’s den’

No split for nominalized forms in wa- either:
Maribel-en  wa-wedn
Maribel-GEN NMLZ-lie
‘Maribel’s bed’

ndoʔ- edn wa-wedn  
1SG-GEN NMLZ-lie
‘my bed’
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Semantically alienable possession
Human possessors: genitive marked; no pronoun/noun split

(27) Lupeʔ-\textit{edn} \textit{kurukuru-mbaʔ}  
Lupe-GEN bijao-leaf  
‘Lupe’s bijao leaves’

(28) \textit{ndoʔ-} edn \textit{kōsō}  
1SG-GEN pot  
‘my pot’

Animal possessors: also genitive marked

(29) \textit{apetpet-} edn \textit{hak}  
jaguar-GEN house  
‘the jaguar’s den’

No split for \textit{nominalized} forms in \textit{wa-} either:

\begin{align*}
\text{Maribel-} & \textit{en wa-} \textit{wedn}  
\text{Maribel-GEN NMLZ-} & \text{lie}  
\text{‘Maribel’s bed’}  \\
\text{ndoʔ-} & \textit{edn wa-} \textit{wedn}  
1SG-GEN & \text{NMLZ-} \text{lie}  
\text{‘my bed’}
\end{align*}

Note the difference with N-N compound:

\begin{align*}
\text{apetpet-} & \textit{hak}  
\text{Jaguar-} & \text{house}  
\text{‘jaguar house’ (i.e. house in the shape of a jaguar)}
\end{align*}
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Semantically inalienable possession → possesses are bound nouns only

Human possessors: genitive-marked, no pronoun/noun split

(30) \( \text{Lupeʔ-} \text{edn-} \text{ku} \) \hspace{1cm} OR \hspace{1cm} \( \text{Lupeʔ-} \text{edn} \text{ wa-} \text{ku} \)
Lupe-GEN-head
‘Lupe’s head’
Lupe-GEN
‘Lupe’s head’

(31) \( \text{on-} \text{en-} \text{ku} \) \hspace{1cm} OR \hspace{1cm} \( \text{on-} \text{en} \text{ wa-} \text{ku} \)
2SG-GEN-head
‘your (sg)head’
2SG-GEN
‘your (sg) head’

Animal possessors: N-N compounding

(32) \( \text{mbawi-} \text{ku-} \text{pi} \)
deer-[head-CLF:stick],horn
‘a/the deer’s horn’

Inanimate possessors: N-N compounding

BUT: Note the difference with genitive marked possessor!

No alternative coding with semantic effects possible
4. Morphpo-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Semantically inalienable possession → possesses are bound nouns only
Human possessors: genitive-marked, no pronoun/noun split
No alternative construal for –mba ‘area; place’

Lupeʔ-‐edn-‐mba * Lupeʔ-‐edn wa-‐mba/e-‐mba/wa-‐mba-‐nda
Lupe-‐GEN-‐area
‘Lupe’s area’ (where she lives, where she grew up, etc.)

Inanimate possessors: N-N compounding

- ikkori-‐mba (cañabrabal o un lugar donde generalmente crece cañabravas
- kuwadn-‐mba (arenal, o lugar lleno de arena
- mins-‐mba (lugar donde hay o crece mullaya, un arbusto cuyo fruto es comestible)
- morikke-‐mba (lugar donde hay muchos árboles de castaña o generalmente crece mucho la castaña)
- Amiko-‐mba (sitio, lugar o espacio donde hay gente foránea)
- sorotata-‐mba (sitio, o lugar donde hay soldados)
- tare’-‐mba (yucal o lugar donde crece yucas)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Semantically inalienable possession → possesses are bound nouns only

Human possessors: genitive-marked, no pronoun/noun split

(33)  
\[ \text{ndoʔ-edn-siʔ-po} \quad \text{OR} \quad \text{ndoʔ-edn} \quad \text{wa-siʔpo} \]

1SG-GEN-(peel-clf:round)child 1SG-GEN NPF-peel-clf:round

‘my child’ ‘my child’

But other kinship terms do not seem to allow the one-word strategy!

(34)  
\[ \ast \text{ndoʔ-edn-mambuy} \quad \text{ndoʔ-edn} \quad \text{wa-mambuy} \]

1SG-GEN-same.sex.sibling 1SG-GEN NPF-same.sex.sibling

‘my sister (of female ego)’ ‘my sister (of female ego)’

→ Not all bound nouns behave similarly in a single syntactic domain

Note N-N compounding for nominalized forms in \textit{wa-}:

\[ \text{arakmbut-(h)a-te} \quad \text{arakmbut-en} \quad \text{wa-(h)a-te} \]

person;people-say-LOC person;people-GEN NMLZ-say-LOC

‘in the language of the people; in harakmbut’

‘in the language of the people’
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

ALIENABLE CONSTRUAL of semantically inalienable possession → possesses are bound nouns only

Human possessors (genitive-marked, no pronoun/noun split):

(35)  
Lupeʔ-edn-ku-wih
Lupe-GEN-head-hair
‘Lupe’s hair, still on her head’

Lupeʔ-edn     wa-ku-wih
Lupe-GEN       NPF-head-hair
‘Lupe’s head, still on her head’ OR
‘Lupe’s head, cut off’

(36)  
Maribel-en-okpo
Maribel-GEN-eye
‘Maribel’s eye, well in place’

Maribel-en     wa-kpo
Maribel-GEN     NPF-eye
‘Maribel’s eye, well in place’ OR
‘Maribel’s eye, removed in an attack’

→ So to refer to ‘severed’ body-parts (not in their normal place anymore), speakers use the only construal available for independent possessee nouns
→ The construal involving fusion is semantically ambiguous; it is not dedicated to inalienable possession
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

ALIENABLE CONSTRUAL of semantically inalienable possession → possesses are bound nouns only

Animal possessors: genitive-marked possessors vs. N-N compounding

(37)  
\[ \text{wadpiʔ-edn-sindak} \]
\[ \text{ocelot-GEN-skin} \]
\[ \text{‘the ocelot’s skin, removed from corpse’} \]
\[ \text{(infrequent use)} \]

(38)  
\[ \text{mokas-en-kutipo} \]
\[ \text{collared.peccary-GEN-thigh} \]
\[ \text{‘the collared peccary’s thigh, removed’} \]

\[ \text{wadpiʔ-sindak} \]
\[ \text{ocelot-GEN-skin} \]
\[ \text{‘the ocelot’s skin’ (still on the animal, dead or alive, or removed from its corpse)} \]

\[ \text{*wadpiʔ-wa-sindak} \]
\[ \text{ocelot-GEN-skin} \]
\[ \text{‘the ocelot’s skin’ (still on the animal, dead or alive, or removed from its corpse)} \]

\[ \text{mokas-kutipo} \]
\[ \text{collared.peccary-GEN-thigh} \]
\[ \text{‘the collared peccary’s thigh’ (still on the animal, dead or alive, or removed from its corpse)} \]

\[ \text{*mokas-wa-kutipo} \]
\[ \text{collared.peccary-GEN-thigh} \]
\[ \text{‘the collared peccary’s thigh’ (still on the animal, dead or alive, or removed from its corpse)} \]

Inanimate possessors: N-N compounding is only possible construal

(39)  
\[ \text{kumo-iwit} \]
\[ \text{barbasco-root} \]
\[ \text{‘the root of barbasco’} \]
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Inanimate possessors: N-N compounding is only possible construal

(40) \textit{wa-u-kupign}
NPF-breast-nipple
‘nipple; teat’

e’kupign, used to refer to anything that has the form or nipple (‘punta’)

(41) \textit{aroy-o-kupign} *\textit{aroy-kupign}
plantain-?-nipple \rightarrow linking vowel? 3SG.IND prefix?
‘the tip of a plantain’ (which has medicinal value)
4. Morpho-syntactic behaviour of bound nouns

4.4 Adnominal possession

Alienability cannot account for the full range of data!

“If a language has an adnominal alienability split, and one of the constructions is overtly coded while
the other one is zero-coded, it is always the inalienable construction that is zero-coded, while the
alienable construction is overtly coded.” (Haspelmath 2017: 199)

OK for animal possessors:

• N-N compounding is default for inalienable possession
• genitive marking of possessor is default for alienable possession
• genitive marking of possessor yields alienable interpretation of ‘inalienable’ possessees

But only partially OK for human possessors:

• genitive marking of possessor is default for alienable and inalienable possession
• one-word strategy is excluded for alienable interpretations,
• but lack of dedicated strategy for inalienable interpretation
• Kin terms predominantly use independent noun construal
5. Conclusion & outlook

• Distinction between bound and independent nouns: morphological phenomenon based on alienability semantics
• Distinct behaviour exceeds the grammatical environment of adnominal possession:
  • Different types of adnominal modifiers [phrase-level]
  • Noun incorporation [clause-level]
  • N-N compounding [word-level]
  • Diachronic source of classifiers (Rose & Van Linden 2017)

• Work to be done: how do bound nouns behave in spontaneously produced language?
  • Transcription of recordings made in the field
  • Concordances on nouns in these texts (methods from corpus linguistics)
  • Discourse motivations for competing morphosyntactic patterns
  • ... to corroborate findings based on questionnaires
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