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1. Introduction: Topic

• This project focuses on inalienable possession, a topic where cognition and grammar seem to intertwine

• alienability contrasts show up in the expression of adnominal possession (e.g. Nichols 1988; Haspelmath 2017), e.g. (1) \(\rightarrow\) alienability split

(1a) \(ji\) syim

1SG arm

‘my arm’

(1b) \(ji\) bi nggwe

1SG poss garden

‘my garden’

Abun, West Papuan (Berry & Berry 1999: 77–78)

• The difference in morpho-syntactic marking between (1a) and (1b) has been explained in terms of alienability, with juxtaposition being used for inalienable possession (1a) and the linker construction for alienable possession (1b)
1. Introduction: Topic

Figure 1: Possessive classification in a 243-language sample (Nichols & Bickel 2013)

⇒ Alienability contrasts in yellow dots: fairly common in the languages of the world except in Eurasia
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2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

• Nichols (1988: 561): Terms ‘alienable’ and ‘inalienable’ (possession) standard and common in descriptions of North American and Pacific languages, and Russian equivalent terms are standard in Soviet grammars

• Alternative labels (references in Nichols 1988):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>inalienable</th>
<th>alienable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixon 1910 (on Chimariko)</td>
<td>Inherent</td>
<td>accidental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1911 (on Tlingit)</td>
<td>(non-transferrable)</td>
<td>transferrable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frachtenberg 1922 (on Siuslawan)</td>
<td>inseparable</td>
<td>separable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroeber &amp; Grace 1960 (on Luiseño)</td>
<td>Inherent</td>
<td>acquired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Almost never defined in language-specific treatments

• Yet: when a language shows an alienability contrast, it is always clear which member of the opposition will be called alienable, and which member inalienable
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition ➔ Anthropocentric bias
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2. Alienability contrasts in the literature
2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

- Alienable & inalienable possession: different interpretations:
  - **structural** types (language-specific; noun-class based), e.g. Abun, West Papuan (Berry & Berry 1999: 77–78)
    
    *syim* is inalienable noun; *nggwe* is alienable noun

    (1a)  
    ji syim  
    1sg arm  
    ‘my arm’

    (1b)  
    ji bi nggwe  
    1sg poss garden  
    ‘my garden’

- **semantic** opposition (universal; comparative concept):
  “Inalienable possession is generally seen as involving a fairly stable relation over which possessors have little or no control, alienable possession as comprising a variety of less permanent, more controlled relationships.” (Hollmann and Siewierska 2007: 410)
  - Highly abstract relations that are difficult to verify cross-linguistically
  - Many languages: some members of set of nouns with inalienable semantics (e.g. kin terms) are grammatically treated as alienable (e.g. *näŋ* ‘mother’ in Harakmbut)
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2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

- Alienable & inalienable possession: different interpretations:
  - **Structural** types (language-specific; noun-class based), e.g. Abun, West Papuan (Berry & Berry 1999: 77–78)
    
    \[
    \begin{align*}
    \text{syim} & \text{ is inalienable noun; nggwe is alienable noun} \\
    (1a) & ji \text{ syim} \\
    \quad & 1\text{sg} \text{ arm} \\
    \quad & \text{'my arm'} \\
    (1b) & ji \text{ bi} \text{ nggwe} \\
    \quad & 1\text{sg} \text{ POSS} \text{ garden} \\
    \quad & \text{'my garden'}
    \end{align*}
    \]

  - **Semantic** opposition (universal; comparative concept):
    “Inalienable possession is generally seen as involving a fairly stable relation over which possessors have little or no control, alienable possession as comprising a variety of less permanent, more controlled relationships.” (Hollmann and Siewierska 2007: 410)
    - Highly abstract relations that are difficult to verify cross-linguistically
    - Many languages: some members of set of nouns with inalienable semantics (e.g. kin terms) are grammatically treated as alienable (e.g. năŋ ‘mother’ in Harakmbut)
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

- In recent typological work on adnominal possession (e.g. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003; Haspelmath 2017): ‘comparative concepts’ → semantic distinction
  - Alienable possession: ownership
  - Inalienable possession: restricted to body parts and kinship terms
- Even if the two types are more broadly defined so as to include inanimate possessors as well (e.g. part-whole relations; spatial relations), example sentences for inalienable possession typically feature body parts or kin terms (e.g. Nichols 1988)

→ Anthropocentric bias → challenged by data from South American languages, e.g. bound nouns in Harakmbut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harakmbut</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wã-wê</td>
<td>‘liquid; river’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wã-ôŋ</td>
<td>‘powder’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wã-ëkôŋ</td>
<td>‘cavity, hole’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa-kupo</td>
<td>‘hill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa-ndagŋ</td>
<td>‘path’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

• Nichols (1988: 561):
  nouns treated as ‘inalienable’ form a closed set ↔ nouns treated as ‘alienable’ form an open set
  → ‘inalienable’ possession is the marked member of the alienability opposition (but at the same time sometimes zero-marked in specific languages)

• Nouns treated as inalienable: not restricted to body parts and kin terms!
  • Levy-Bruhl (1914) on Melanesian lgs: also spatial relations (front, top), objects needed for survival
  • Nichols (1988) on North American lgs: also part-whole relations, spatial relations, culturally basic possessed items → inalienable possession is inborn, inherent, not conferred by purchase
  • Chappell & McGregor (1996a: 4): also mention parts of inanimate wholes, personal ‘attributes’ like name, shadow, sickness, footprint, dreamings
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

• Yet, their description also suffers from an anthropological bias (Chappell & McGregor 1996a: 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inalienable possession</th>
<th>alienable possession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inextricable, essential or unchangeable relations between “possessor” and “possessum” → “possessors have little or no choice or control”</td>
<td>less permanent and less inherent associations between “possessor” and “possessum”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated by our human condition of being born and into a kin network and within a body – consisting of parts that we normally do not separate from and that can be viewed in terms of unchanging (non-deictic) spatial dimensions (front, back, side)</td>
<td>motivated by how we interact with material possession: transient possession, right to use or control an object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.1 Definition of possession & alienability opposition

Attempts at implicational hierarchy: alienability scale

- **Nichols** (1988: 572):
  - kin terms and/or body parts (inclusive disjunction)
    > part-whole and/or spatial relations
    > culturally basic possessed items (arrows, domestic animals)

  **But:**
  - counterexamples to be found (Chappell & McGregor 1996a: 8-9), e.g. Ewe, in which kin and spatial terms, but not body parts, are treated as inalienable (Ameka 1996)
  - often only subsets of kin terms, body part and spatial terms that are treated as inalienable in a given language

- **Tsunoda**’s (1996: 576) Possession cline (Japanese, Warrungo, English)
  - body part > inherent attribute (e.g. name, sickness) > clothing
    > kin > pet animal > product > other possessee
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.2 Motivation for alienability opposition

For the syntactic environment of adnominal possession: alienability split

- **Universal:**
  - “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)

- What motivates this universal? Two competing explanations:
  - **iconicity:** the formal distance between the item denoting the possessor and the item denoting the possessum in the linguistic structures reflects the cognitive distance between the possessor and possessum (Haiman 1983); adopted by many!
  - **Predictability/frequency:** inalienable nouns like ‘hand’ occur far more often in adnominal possession constructions than alienable nouns like ‘garden’ → less predictable possessive construction need additional marking compared to highly predictable ones (Haspelmath 2017)
Advantages of the predictability/frequency account (Haspelmath 2017):

• Initial plausibility on the basis of corpus studies (on languages that do NOT show alienability split) ratio possessed and unpossessed occurrences of kin terms and body parts vs ‘alienable’ terms

• Correctly predicts suppletive cumulative forms for highly frequent inalienables

- Juhoan (Kxa)  
  \[mi \, ùtò \, ‘my \, car’\]  
  \[taqè \, ‘mother’ \, vs.\]  
  \[āiā \, ‘my \, mother’\]  
  \(*mi \, taqè*)  
  (Dickens 2005: 35)

• Does not impose linear order of marking, while iconicity account wrongly predicts middle position of possessive marker

- Koyukon (Athabaskan)  
  \[se-tel-e’ \, 1SG-socks-POSSD \, ‘my \, socks’\]  
  \[se-tlee’ \, 1SG-head \, ‘my \, head’\]  
  (Thompson 1996: 654, 667)
Advantages of the predictability/frequency account (Haspelmath 2017):

• Correctly predicts distribution of long vs short possessive person forms

```
Juhoan (Khoisan)  mì tjù   m  bá
        I house    my father
         ‘my house’    ‘my father’
               (Dickens 2005: 35)
```

• Accounts for imposessible nouns, e.g. Yucatec Maya (Lehmann 1998: 57-58)

```
máak      ‘person’
xch’up    ‘woman’
suhuy     ‘virgin’
īik       ‘air, wind’
ka’n      ‘sky’
yóok’olkab ‘world’
```
## 2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

### 2.2 Motivation for alienability opposition

Advantages of the **predictability/frequency** account (Haspelmath 2017):

- Accounts for obligatorily possessed nouns or bound nouns, e.g. Harakmbut, Arawak lgs, Takanan lgs
  - ‘absoluble’ bound nouns: unpossessed meaning with dummy noun prefix or ‘antiposessive marked’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koyukon</th>
<th>-tlee’</th>
<th>se-tlee’</th>
<th>k’e-tlee’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Athabaskan)</td>
<td>1SG-head</td>
<td>APOSS-head</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘head’</td>
<td>‘my head’</td>
<td>‘head’</td>
<td>(Thompson 1996: 654, 667)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.2 Motivation for alienability opposition

➔ MANY advantages of the predictability/frequency account (Haspelmath 2017):

• BUT: let’s test this in languages that DO show an alienability split!

➔ corpus study on Mojeño Trinitario texts: exhaustive samples of random set of nouns (topic for internship in MA2)
2. Alienability contrasts in the literature

2.3 Alienability splits from a diachronic perspective

• Cristofaro (2020) gives two types of counterexamples to frequency-based explanations for the alienability split in adnominal possession à la Haspelmath (2017)

→ underlying economy principle of **optimization** of grammatical structure: overt possessive marking (in synchrony) is only used when it’s really needed, i.e., with nouns that are less frequently possessed

1) Development of individual markers: **not** driven by need to disambiguate type of possessive relation

2) Distribution of individual markers: **not** determined by the relative need to disambiguate the possessive relation in the relevant contexts (but by their etymology)
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2.3 Alienability splits from a diachronic perspective

1) Development of individual markers: not driven by need to disambiguate type of possessive relation (Cristofaro 2020)

• Two frequent sources for possessive markers dedicated to alienable possession:
  • attributive demonstratives modifying the possessee
    → ‘that house (of) John’ > ‘John’s house’, e.g. Kanakuru (Chadic)
  • appositive pronouns or nouns denoting the possessee, e.g. Suau (Oceanic)
  • → ‘house, that (of) John’ > ‘John’s house’;
    → ‘fish, John(’s) one/thing/food’ > ‘John’s fish’

→ original source cxn: zero-marked possessive relation
→ origin of possessive markers: modify/denote possessee
  → used to single out referents, which is not needed for kin terms (highly individuated) nor for body parts (not salient discourse referents)
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2.3 Alienability splits from a diachronic perspective

2) Distribution of individual markers: not determined by alienability contrast but by etymology of markers (Cristofaro 2020)

• E.g., in *inalienable possession*, markers derived from *locative elements* are used when the context implies a locative relation between possessor and possessee (part-whole relationships), but not when this is not the case (kin terms).

_Ewe (Niger-Congo)_

(a) *kofi phi njume, agbalé-á phi akpa*

Kofi POSS face book-DEF POSS cover

‘Kofi’s face, the cover of the book’ (Ameka 1996: 829; possessee located on possessor, the possessive marker originates from an item meaning ‘place’: Claudi and Heine 1989: 13)

(b) *qevi-á-wó tógbé*

child-DEF-PL grandfather

‘The grandfather of the children’ (Ameka 1996: 830: no locative relation)
Conclusions:

• Etymology of markers shows that they did not originally code the type of possessive relation (alienable as opposed to inalienable possession)

• Existence of different markers within a single type of possession goes against frequency-based explanations for the alienability split

• Rather, the etymology of markers with restricted distribution confirms the mixed-bag nature of inalienables, e.g. kinship terms (possessor & possessed are referentially distinct) vs body parts (spatial relation between possessor & possessed, which are typically not treated as referentially distinct)

→ Cristofaro (2020) criticises frequency-based explanations for the alienability split, but to a certain extent her diachronically informed account does not “explain” the alienability split either, but merely shifts the problem
  → why did these source constructions emerge in the first place?
Theoretical issue: status of alienability contrasts?

- Purely *lexical* property of nouns? (Nichols 1988: 574; Nichols & Bickel 2013)
- Embodied experience of types of inalienable possession high on the alienability cline → cognitive motivation → *universal*?
  (We have no “direct” embodied experience for part-whole relation in inanimate wholes, but we can metaphorically extend from our bodily constitution, cf. Johnson 1987)
- Cross-linguistic tendencies in how alienability contrasts surface in specific languages, but also wide range of diversity → *culturally specific*?
  → Membership of the ‘inalienable’ set of nouns can be predicted on the basis of cultural and pragmatic knowledge (Chappell & McGregor 1996a: 9)

Psycholinguistic reality: Do speakers have mental representations of nouns treated as inalienable in grammar different from those of nouns treated as alienable?
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

- 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 fieldwork stays in Puerto Luz, San Jose de Karene and Shintuya (Jul-Aug 2010, Aug-Sept 2011, Aug 2016) → Arakmbut/Amarakaeri variety
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.1 Bound versus independent nouns
3.2 Noun incorporation
3.3 N-N compounding
3.4 Noun modification
3.5 Conclusion

• Two unrelated languages of Western Amazonia (Rose & Van Linden 2017):
  • Harakmbut (isolate, Peru) ▲
  • Mojeño Trinitario (Arawak, Bolivia) ▲
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.1 Bound versus independent nouns

- common nouns divide into two morphologically defined classes: **potentially free** vs. **obligatorily bound nouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent nouns</th>
<th>Bound nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>may occur as nominal heads without morphology</strong></td>
<td><strong>never occur as nominal heads without morphology</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Harakmbut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>widn</em> stone</td>
<td>1SG-GEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘stone’</td>
<td>‘my stone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ndo?-edn widn</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mojeño Trinitario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>wiye</em> ox</td>
<td>1SG-ox</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘ox’</td>
<td>‘my ox’ (Rose 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n-wiye-ra</em> ox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Harakmbut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>wa-ndik NPF-name</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘name’</td>
<td>‘my name’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ndo?-edn-ndik</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mojeño Trinitario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jma-re sickness-NPSD</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘sickness’</td>
<td>‘my sickness’ (Rose 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n-juma</em> sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.1 Bound versus independent nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>potentially free nouns</th>
<th>obligatorily bound nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphological status</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>Semantics</td>
<td>Semantically heterogeneous</td>
<td>refer to parts of entities, such as body parts, plant parts, and landscape parts (cf. the class of e-nouns in Cavineña as described by Guillaume (2008: 409-416)), as well as basic shapes or qualities of entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun incorporation</td>
<td>Generally not incorporable into the verb (2 exceptions; NI type I only)</td>
<td>incorporable into the verb (all four types of NI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word formation</td>
<td>Rarely N2 in N-N compounds</td>
<td>typically N2 in N-N compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With prenominal modifiers</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>
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.1 Bound versus independent nouns

(a) Morphological status:

• *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. (2)

(2)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{wa-wedn} \\
\text{NMLZ-lie} \\
\text{‘bed’}
\end{array}
\]

• 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)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(a)} & \text{wa-}mba? \\
\text{NPF-hand} & \text{‘hand’}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(b)} & \text{e-}mba? \\
\text{NPF-hand} & \text{‘leaf’}
\end{array}
\]
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.2 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) \( \text{wa-mationka-eri} \quad \text{o-ak-yon-}\me \)
NMLZ-hunt-ANIM 3SG.IND-house-destroy-REC
‘The hunter hut-destroyed.’

transitive verb stem -yon + 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) \( \text{ndo?-edn} \quad \text{wa-nda-po} \quad \text{o-mē?-a?} \)
1SG-GEN NPF-fruit-CLF:round 3SG.IND-liver-say
‘My belly is making noise.’ (lit. ‘liver-says’)

30
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.3 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
• N1 is semantically subordinate; N2 is the formal and semantic head of the compound

Harakmbut
N1-N2
kaimãri- mbogñ
zungaro-lip
‘lip of a zungaro fish’

Mojeño Trinitario
N1-N2
su kasiki-yeno
ART.F cacique-wife
‘a cacique’s wife’
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.4 Noun modification

(b) 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
• Possessive modifier, e.g. my stone
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns
3.4 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. (4)-(5)

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

  (5) (a) \[ kate \quad wa-ndik \quad i?-\emptyset-\emptyset? \]
      \textit{what} \quad \textit{NPF-name} \quad \textit{2SG-be-DUB}
      ‘What is your name?’

  (b) \[ kate-ndik \quad i?-\emptyset-\emptyset? \]
      \textit{what-name} \quad \textit{2SG-be-DUB}
      ‘What is your name?’
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.4 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. (6)-(7)

(6) \( lh\)-yok-i \(*mbotta?\ kywa\ Luis-ta\)
  1SG-give-1.IND two dog Luis-ACC
  'I give two dogs to Luis.'

(7) (a) \( ìh\-tō-ē-ỹ \(*mbotta?\ wa\-mba?\)
  1SG.IND-SOC-be-1.IND two NMLZ-hand
  'I have two hands'

(b) \( mbotta?\-mba?\ \( ìh\-tō-ē-ỹ\)
  two-hand 1SG.IND-SOC-be-1.IND
  'I have two hands'
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns
3.4 Noun modification

e.g. with possessive modifiers, cf. (8)-(9)-(10)

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

(8) \( ndəʔ-edn \)  \( nəŋ \)
\[ 1\text{SG-GEN} \quad \text{mother} \]
‘My mother’ [independent noun in spite of being inalienably possessed!]

(9) \( ndəʔ-edn \)  \( wa-ndg-po \)
\[ 1\text{SG-GEN} \quad \text{NPF-fruit-CLF:round} \]
‘My belly’

(10) (a) \( arakmbut-en-ndik \)
\[ \text{people-GEN-name} \]
‘native lexical item’ (‘name of the people’)

(b) \( arakmbut \)
\[ \text{people;person} \]
‘people’, ‘person’

(c) \( wa-ndik \)
\[ \text{NPF-name} \]
‘name’
3. Alienability contrasts in Harakmbut: Bound nouns

3.5 Conclusion & outlook

• Distinction between bound and independent nouns: morphological phenomenon based on alienability semantics
• Distinct behavior 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
Bye bye Harakmbut
4. Alienability contrasts in cross-linguistic perspective

4.1 Alienability contrasts in grammar

- **Word-level**
  - Noun classes
  - Binominal lexemes
  - Incorporation of nouns into adjective roots, e.g. in Anindilyakwa (Leeding 1996)

- **Phrase-level**
  - Adnominal possession
  - Proprietary markers, e.g. in Warrungu (Tsunoda 1996)

- **Clause-level**
  - Dative of involvement constructions, e.g. in Middle Dutch (Burridge 1996)
  - Body part locative constructions, e.g. *Sam kissed Joe on the cheek*
  - Incorporation of nouns into verb roots
  - Predicative possession, e.g. in Japanese (Tsunoda 1996)
  - Double non-subject (object/locative/dative) constructions, e.g. in Warlpiri (Hale 1981)
  - Double subject intransitives (‘My face *am* burning!’), e.g. in Yawuru (Hosokawa 1996)
  - Quasi-passive, e.g. in Yawuru (Hosokawa 1996)
4. Alienability contrasts in cross-linguistic perspective

4.1 Alienability contrasts in grammar

• Phrase-level
  • Proprietary markers: ‘having’; ‘with’
  • Frequent in Australian Aboriginal languages
  • Occur on body parts, inherent attributes, clothing and kin terms
  • Do not occur on other nouns

• Warrungu (Pama-Nyungan): -tyi /-yi (Tsunoda 1996: 616)

(1) pirngka-yi-tu kamu-Ø pitya-lku pama-ngku
grey:hair-HAVING-ERG water-ABS drink-PURP man-ERG
‘The grey-haired men (that is, old men) want to drink water.’

(2) murran-tyi-Ø nyula wun-an
illness-HAVING-ABS 3SG:NOM lie-PAST/PRES
‘She is lying ill.’

(3) nyula tyakuli-n tyulpun-tyi-ku
3SG:NOM be sorry-PAST/PRES spouse-HAVING-DAT
‘He felt sorry for the married person (literally: one with a spouse).’
4. Alienability contrasts in cross-linguistic perspective

4.1 Alienability contrasts in grammar

Alienability contrasts in **grammar**:
- cross-linguistic survey of alienability phenomena at different levels of grammar
- drawing up a questionnaire for fieldworkers
4. Alienability contrasts in cross-linguistic perspective

4.2 Alienability contrasts in the lexicon

Alienability contrasts in **lexicon**:

- Interaction grammatical & lexical typology:
  Inventories of lexical items that are treated as inalienable in grammar
  → Where do individual languages have their “cut-off point” in the lexicon, i.e. to what extent is it culturally determined which items are grammatically treated as inalienably possessed?

  **Harakmbut:**
  
  - *wā-wē* ‘liquid; river’
  - *wā-ōŋ* ‘powder’
  - *wā-ēkōŋ* ‘cavity, hole’
  - *wa-kupo* ‘hill’
  - *wa-ndagŋ* ‘path’

  Tsunoda’s (1996: 576) **Possession cline:**
  Body part > inherent attribute (e.g. name) > clothing > (kin) > pet animal > product > other possesssee

- “traditional” lexical typology:
  Patterns of polysemy of inalienably possessed nouns?
  → pre-established list needed of inalienably possessed items
Greetings from Antwerp

Antwerpen

Hand-werpen  [folk etymology]
Hand-throw.INF
‘to hand-throw’

The Brabo fountain, in Antwerp. Brabo throws the severed hand of Druonn Antigoon into the Scheldt. Sculpture by Jef Lambeaux (in 1887)
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