Bound nouns but no alienability split: Assessing the explanatory power of the alienability contrast for Harakmbut

An Van linden
University of Liège & KU Leuven

19 May 2022
Workshop @ Sorbonne Université, Paris
1. Introduction

- This talk focuses on **bound nouns** in Harakmbut (isolate/unclassified, Peruvian Amazon)
- 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>ndoʔ-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>ndoʔ-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 common nouns at word/phrase/clause levels
  - bound nouns
  - independent nouns
  - deverbal nouns
- Assess the explanatory power of the **alienability contrast** to account for this
1. Introduction

The alienability contrast: different interpretations

- **Semantic/conceptual distinction** between alienable and inalienable possession (e.g. Chappell & McGregor 1996: 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inalienable possession</th>
<th>alienable possession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“either inextricable, essential or unchangeable relations” between possessor and possessee (possessors have little or no choice or control)</td>
<td>less permanent and less inherent associations between “possessor” and “possessee”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Semantic contrast invoked as **functional motivation** for coding split in adnominal possession as of Lévy-Bruhl’s (1914: 96) study of Oceanic lgs (‘my head’ vs. ‘my garment’); also in North American languages (Nichols 1988: 561)

(1a) $ji$ syim
1sg arm
‘my arm’

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

Abun, West Papuan (Berry & Berry 1999: 77–78): juxtaposition for inalienable possession (1a) and the linker construction for alienable possession (1b)
1. Introduction

The alienability contrast: different interpretations

- **Formal contrast**: binary pattern of linguistic organization, itself in need of explanation
  - Classes of nouns: alienable vs. inalienable nouns (closed set) (Nichols 1988: restricted to head-marking languages)
  - Types of construction: alienable vs. inalienable possessive cxns (= alienability split)
    
    
    “[t]he choice between inalienable and alienable constructions is seldom predictable from such general definitions” (Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1998: 38-39)]
  - Haspelmath (2017):
    - “in general the difference between alienable and inalienable possession [like in (1a) vs. (1b)] is simply a constructional split, with no clear semantic implications” (2017: 198-199)
    - Universal: “Possessive constructions with inalienable nouns tend to show zero coding, short coding, bound coding, and/or obligatoriness, while possessive constructions with alienable nouns tend to show overt coding, long coding, free coding, and/or impossibility” (2017: 218)

**Reflexes** of the alienability contrast: not limited to noun classes or adnominal possession, also other phenomena at word, phrase and clause level (e.g. N-N compounding, proprietive markers, external possession, noun incorporation)
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2. Bound, independent and deverbal nouns

Common nouns: two morphologically distinct classes, viz. bound and independent nouns

> reflex of the alienability contrast in terms of the semantic domains they cover?

- Unlike independent nouns, bound nouns do need a **noun prefix** in their citation form, viz. *wa(ʔ)*- or *e(ʔ)*- → these prefixes derive independent nouns from bound ones → “absolutivization” function (Nichols 1988: 597)

- Typically, one NPF per bound N root/stem (*wa-ndik*), but exceptionally also same root with with *wa-* & *e-* (2)-(3); referents of (a) & (b) show similarity in shape (cf. Van linden, Forthc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bound Noun</th>
<th>Independent Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>wa-mba?</em></td>
<td><em>e-mba?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPF-hand</td>
<td>NPF-hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘hand’</td>
<td>‘leaf’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>wa-pidn</em></td>
<td><em>e-pidn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPF-rib</td>
<td>NPF-spine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[generalization: referents of bound nouns with *e(ʔ)*- belong to the world of vegetation → derivation]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic domains</th>
<th>Bound nouns</th>
<th>Independent nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td><em>wa-koy</em> ‘cormorant’ (T119); <em>wa-kuwēŋ</em> ‘specific frog species’ (T120)</td>
<td><em>sūwīt</em> ‘hummingbird’; <em>kēmē</em> ‘tapir’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute</td>
<td><em>wa-ndari</em> ‘native land’; <em>wa-ndik</em> ‘name’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body part</td>
<td><em>wa-ay?</em> ‘bone’; <em>wa-ʔidn</em> ‘tooth’; <em>wa-kupi</em> ‘horn’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily emanation</td>
<td><em>wa-nokĩrẽŋ</em> ‘shadow of a person’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodily excretion</td>
<td><em>wa-ndawē</em> ‘semen’</td>
<td><em>iŋkusĩʔwẽ</em> ‘saliva’ (T339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinship</td>
<td><em>wa-mambuy</em> ‘same.sex.sibling’; <em>wa-siʔpo</em> ‘child’; <em>wā-ʔē</em> ‘mother’</td>
<td><em>nāŋ</em> ‘mother’; * pagŋ* ‘father’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape part</td>
<td><em>wa-kumbogŋ</em> ‘ravine’; <em>wa-kupo</em> ‘hill’; <em>wa-ndagŋ</em> ‘path’; <em>wā-wē</em> ‘river’</td>
<td><em>mbayako</em> ‘pool, lagoon’; <em>ntumba</em> ‘forest’; * widnmba* ‘pebble beach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-physical part</td>
<td><em>wa-nokĩrẽŋ</em> ‘spirit of a person’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other part</td>
<td><em>wa-ktaʔpe</em> ‘half’; <em>wā-ē(kōŋ)</em> ‘hole’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant part</td>
<td><em>e-amba?</em> ‘leaf’; <em>e?-mbih</em> ‘liana’ (generic term); <em>e-apidn</em> ‘thorn’; <em>wa-mbuh</em> ‘manioc root’; <em>wa-ʔiwit</em> ‘root’; <em>wa-kidn</em> ‘seed’; <em>wa-tioʔpi</em> ‘branch’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td><em>wa-po</em> ‘something round’; <em>wa-pu?</em> ‘tube’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social relation</td>
<td><em>wa-iri</em> ‘chief’; <em>wa-ndi</em> ‘friend’ (T32); <em>wa-nindi</em> ‘romantic partner’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial relation</td>
<td><em>wa-kĩrẽŋ</em> ‘interior’; <em>wa-topen</em> ‘below’ (T149)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substance</td>
<td><em>wā-ōŋ</em> ‘powder’; <em>wā-wē</em> ‘liquid’</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Bound, independent and deverbal nouns

Semantic domains covered by bound nouns:
bound nouns **predominantly** denote entities that are – in conceptual terms – inalienably possessed (body parts, plant parts, landscape parts, kinship terms, social and spatial relations, attributes, basic shapes, substances, and other parts of wholes)

→ Support for Nichols’s (1988: 572) implicational hierarchy for membership of the ‘inalienable’ noun class:
kin terms and/or body parts > part-whole and/or spatial relations > culturally basic possessed items
(the latter: invariably lexicalized as independent nouns in Harakmbut)

**Quirks** (support Nichols’ (1988: 574) claim that inalienability is lexical category rather than semantic property):
• **Animals**: in some languages treated as non-possessible (see Lehmann (1998) for wild animals in Yucatec Maya; in Harakmbut independent nouns far outnumber bound nouns
• **Kinship terms**: independent nouns in table are terms of address which have come to be used as reference terms (see Tripp 1995: 175-185) (cf. Bril (ms) on Kanak languages
• **Landscape parts**: bound nouns for elements determining the physical shape of a landscape; independent nouns for types of soil cover

By and large **semantically coherent class** → two noun classes: reflex of the alienability contrast surfacing at word level, albeit not a perfect one
2. Bound, independent and deverbal nouns

• *wa(ʔ)-* and *e(ʔ)-* also serve in verb-based nominalization (Van Linden 2019), e.g. (4)-(5) [*≠ bound nouns!]*

• Nominalization with *wa(ʔ)-*: participant nominalization, viz. instrumental (4) and objective nominalization (5) (cf. Comrie & Thompson 2007: 338-342), primarily used to produce nouns for NP-use (Van Linden 2019: 465-467)

  (4) *wa-wedn*  
  NMLZ-lie  
  ‘bed’

  (5) *waʔ-aʔ*  
  NMLZ-say  
  ‘speech, word, language’

• Nominalization with *e(ʔ)-*: event nominalization and participant nominalization, viz. objective nominalization (6) (see Van Linden 2019: 468-484)

  (6) *eʔ-mbaʔaʔ*  
  NMLZ-work  
  ‘work, job’

• In terms of semantic domains:
  • instrumental nominalizations will typically denote alienably possessed items (artefact in (4))
  • objective nominalizations are often inalienably possessed (attributes in (5)-(6))

  ➔ Deverbal nouns have same prefixes, but verb root and distinct behaviour from bound nouns
3. Adnominal possession

Also alienability at work at phrase level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent nouns</th>
<th>Bound nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>may occur as nominal heads without morphology</td>
<td>never occur as nominal heads without morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pĩã arrow</td>
<td>ndoʔ-ecn ndoʔ-ecn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘arrow’</td>
<td>1SG-GEN ‘my arrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa-ndik NPF-name</td>
<td>ndoʔ-ecn-ndik 1SG-GEN-name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘name’</td>
<td>‘my name’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the adnominal possession cxns: looks like alienability split:
Two-word strategy for independent nouns; one-word strategy for bound nouns
→ a tighter morpho-syntactic bond between the (human) possessor and possessee for inalienable possession
→ BUT THIS IS NOT THE FULL PICTURE → no alienability split!
3. Adnominal possession

Semantically alienable possession → possessees are independent nouns or deverbal nouns

**Human** possessors: genitive marked; no pronoun/noun split

(8) Lupeʔ-\(\text{edn}\) kurukuru-\(\text{mba}\)?
Lupe-GEN bijao-leaf
‘Lupe’s bijao leaves’

(9) \(\text{ndo}\)-\(\text{edn}\) kōsō
1SG-GEN pot
‘my pot’

deverbal nouns:
• No pronoun/noun split
• two-word strategy only!

**Animal** possessors: also genitive marked

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

\(\text{ndo}\)-\(\text{edn}\) wa-\(\text{wedn}\)
1SG-GEN NMLZ-lie
‘my bed’

*Maribel-en-wedn
Maribel-GEN-lie
‘Maribel’s bed’
3. Adnominal possession

Semantically inalienable possession → possessees are bound nouns or deverbal nouns

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

(11)(a) Lupeʔ-\text{-}edn-ku OR (b) Lupeʔ-\text{-}edn wa-\text{-}ku
Lupe-GEN-head Lupe-GEN NPF-head
‘Lupe’s head’ ‘Lupe’s head’

(12)(a) on-\text{-}en-ku OR (b) on-\text{-}en wa-\text{-}ku
2SG-GEN-head 2SG-GEN NPF-head
‘your (sg) head’ ‘your (sg) head’

deverbal nouns:
• No pronoun/noun split
• two-word strategy only!

Maribel-\text{-}en eʔ-\text{-}a-\text{-}pak
Maribel-GEN NMLZ-say-VBZ
‘Maribel’s voice’; ‘what M. said’

ndoʔ-\text{-}edn eʔ-\text{-}a-\text{-}pak
1SG-GEN NMLZ-say-VBZ
‘your voice’; ‘what you said’

*Maribel-\text{-}en-a-\text{-}pak
Maribel-GEN-say-VBZ
‘Maribel’s voice’; ‘what M. said’

Animal possessors: N-N compounding

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

Inanimate possessors: N-N compounding (word formation)
3. Adnominal possession

**Semantically inalienable possession → possessees are bound nouns or deverbal nouns**

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

(11)(a) \(\text{Lupeʔ-}\)\(\text{edn-}\)\(\text{ku}\) OR (b) \(\text{Lupeʔ-}\)\(\text{edn}\) \(\text{wa-}\)\(\text{ku}\)

Lupe-GEN-head

‘Lupe’s head’

Lupe-GEN NPF-head

‘Lupe’s head’

(12)(a) \(\text{on-}\)\(\text{en-}\)\(\text{ku}\) OR (b) \(\text{on-}\)\(\text{en}\) \(\text{wa-}\)\(\text{ku}\)

2SG-GEN-head

‘your (sg) head’

2SG-GEN NPF-head

‘your (sg) head’

**deverbal** nouns:
- No pronoun/noun split
- two-word strategy only!

\(\text{Maribel-en}\) \(\text{eʔ-}\)\(\text{a-}\)\(\text{pak}\)

Maribel-GEN NMLZ-say-VBZ

‘Maribel’s voice’; ‘what M. said’

\(\text{ndoʔ-}\)\(\text{edn}\) \(\text{eʔ-}\)\(\text{a-}\)\(\text{pak}\)

1SG-GEN NMLZ-say-VBZ

‘your voice’; ‘what you said’

\(\text{*Maribel-}\)\(\text{en-}\)\(\text{a-}\)\(\text{pak}\)

Maribel-GEN-say-VBZ

‘Maribel’s voice’; ‘what M. said’

**Animal** possessors: N-N compounding

(13) \(\text{mbawi-}\)\(\text{ku-}\)\(\text{pi}\)

deer-[head-\text{CLF:stick}]_{\text{horn}}

‘a/the deer’s horn’

**Possessor-governed split for bound-noun possessees**

**Inanimate** possessors: N-N compounding (word formation)
3. Adnominal possession

**ALIENABLE CONSTRUAL of semantically inalienable possession** → possessees are bound nouns only

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

(14)(a) \textit{wadpiʔ-	extit{edn-sindak}}
ocelot-GEN-skin
‘the ocelot’s skin, removed from corpse’
(infrequent use)

(15)(a) \textit{mokas-en-kutipo}
collared.peccary-GEN-thigh
‘the collared peccary’s thigh, removed’

(14)(b) \textit{wadpiʔ-	extit{sindak}}
ocelot-skin
‘the ocelot’s skin’ (still on the animal, dead or alive, or removed from its corpse)

(15)(b) \textit{mokas-kutipo}
collared.peccary-thigh
‘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, but no adnominal possession

(16) \textit{kumo-iwit}
barbasco-root
‘the root of barbasco’ (possessor is not referentially distinct)
3. Adnominal possession

**ALIENABLE CONSTRUAL of semantically inalienable possession → possessees are bound nouns only**

Human possessors

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

(18)(a) *Maribel-en-*okpo
Maribel-GEN-eye
‘Maribel’s eye, well in place’

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

(18)(b) *Maribel-en* wa-*kpo
Maribel-GEN NPF-eye
‘Maribel’s eye, well in place’ OR
‘Maribel’s eye, removed in an attack’

→ The construal involving fusion is dedicated to inalienable possession (‘in-situ’ body-parts)
→ So to refer to disembodied body-parts (not in their normal place anymore), speakers use the only construal available for independent-possessee nouns
→ The two-word construal is ambiguous between alienable and inalienable possession
Rather than an alienability split: possessor-governed coding split for bound-noun possessees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Possessee</th>
<th>Body-part possessee</th>
<th>Kin-term possessee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alienable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inalienable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>possessor</td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one-word structure</td>
<td>one-word structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noun-noun compounding</td>
<td>Genitive-marked two-word structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>possessor</td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one-word structure</td>
<td>one-word structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
<td>Genitive-marked two-word structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two-word structure</td>
<td>two-word structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lack of dedicated strategies for alienable and inalienable interpretations, for both animal and human possessors
3. Adnominal possession

Semantically inalienable possession ➔ possessees are bound nouns only

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

(19)(a) \( \text{ndoʔ-edn-siʔ-po} \) OR (b) \( \text{ndoʔ-edn \ wa-siʔpo} \)

1SG-GEN-(peel-clf:round)\text{child} \quad 1SG-GEN \quad \text{NPF-(peel-clf:round)child}

‘my child’ \quad ‘my child’

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

(20)(a) \*\( \text{ndoʔ-edn-mambuy} \) \quad (b) \( \text{ndoʔ-edn \ wa-mambuy} \)

1SG-GEN-same.sex.sibling \quad 1SG-GEN \quad \text{NPF-same.sex.sibling}

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

➔ Not all bound nouns behave similarly in a single syntactic domain
3. Adnominal possession - conclusion

- Harakmbut has no alienability split, but coding split according to humanness, restricted to body-part possessees
- Deverbal nouns – in spite of sharing same prefixes (and in some cases also inalienable semantics) with bound ones – pattern identically to independent nouns rather than bound ones in adnominal possession
- Pertaining to head vs. dependent marking: Harakmbut data form exception to Nichol’s (1988: 576) finding that there is no language that “has only dependent-marked possession and manifests an alienability opposition” (see also Bugaeva et al. 2021).
4. Other types of adnominal modification

• coding strategy exclusive to bound nouns in adnominal possession, i.e. the one-word, prefixless strategy, is also observed for other types of adnominal modifiers

→ further evidence for absence of alienability split:

  bound nouns show the same two coding strategies as observed for possessive modifiers when combined with other modifiers that obligatorily precede the nominal head in continuous noun phrases:

  (i) they either attach to a noun prefix and follow the modifier in a separate word, or

  (ii) they directly attach to this modifier, dropping the noun prefix

• Independent nouns and deverbal nouns will always use two-word strategy with adnominal modifiers

  • Interrogative modifier, e.g. *Which food?*
  • Numeral modifier, e.g. *two dogs*
  • Quantifier, e.g. *all day*
  • Demonstrative modifier, deictic adjectives ‘other’, ‘same’, ...

19

Other types of adnominal modification
4. Other types of adnominal modification

e.g. with interrogative modifier \textit{kate}? ‘what (sort of)?’, cf. (21)-(23)

(21) \textit{kate} \textit{aypo} \textit{i?-pak-ika-Ø}?
what food 2SG-want-HAB-DUB
‘What sort of food do you (sg) like?’

(22) \textit{kate} \textit{wa-wadn} \textit{i?-pak-ika-Ø}?
what NMLZ-sit 2SG-want-HAB-DUB
‘What sort of seat do you (sg) like?’

(23) (a) \textit{kate} \textit{wa-ndik} \textit{i?-ē-Ø}?
what NPF-name 2SG-be-DUB
‘What is your name?’
(b) \textit{kate-ndik} \textit{i?-ē-Ø}?
what-name 2SG-be-DUB
‘What is your name?’
5. Beyond adnominal modification

5.1 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 (modifier); N2 is the formal and semantic head of the compound

**N1-N2**

- *kaimāri-* *mbogn*  
  zungaro-lip  
  ‘lip of a zungaro fish’

- *wa-* *mbagŋ-* *pidn*  
  NPF-shoulder.blade-rib;spine  
  ‘tip of the shoulder blade’

**ALSO deverbal nouns in N2: drop prefix!**

- *siro-* *mba-* *peʔ*  
  metal-VPL-eat  
  ‘metal plate’ (something to eat from in metal)

- *arakmbut-* *(h)a-* *te*  
  person;people-*say*-LOC  
  ‘in the language of the people; in harakmbut’
5. Beyond adnominal modification

5.1 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

• But, skewed distribution of N2 nouns over semantic fields
  • Typically body parts and plant parts in N2
  • landscape parts in N2 → may yield proper names (Karene-wē: Colorado River)
  • hardly any kinship terms in N2

• Also often shapes or substances in N2 (CLF) → ‘attribute-like’ relation (Rose & Van linden 2017, Forthc.)
  \[
  \begin{array}{lll}
  \text{peraʔ-po} & \text{rubber-CLF:round} & \text{‘plastic ball’ (Hart 1963: 5)} \\
  \text{siro-po} & \text{metal-CLF:round} & \text{‘tin can’ (Hart 1963: 1)} \\
  \text{aymōrō-po} & \text{honey-CLF:round} & \text{‘bee’}
  \end{array}
  \]

• these observations cannot be meaningfully related to the alienability contrast
5. Beyond adnominal modification

5.2 Noun incorporation

• morphological boundness is the formal prerequisite for nouns to be incorporable (except for hak ‘house’)
• Bound nouns drop their prefix; deverbal nouns are not incorporable
• But not all bound nouns are found in all 4 types of noun incorporation (Mithun 1984):

Type II: manipulation of case relations → e.g. bodyparts (24)
• incorporation of noun “permits another argument of the clause to occupy the case role vacated by the IN” (Mithun 1984: 859)

(24)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Pomelo-a & o-ku-ti-kot-ay & Joeri-ta \\
grapefruit-NOM & 3SG.IND-head-SPAT:up-fall-AVRT & Joeri-ACC
\end{array}
\]

‘A grapefruit almost fell on Joeri’s head.’

[possessor is advanced to object status, which position is vacated by the incorporated body part ku- (cf. Mithun 1984: 857–858); non-incorporated counterpart would have Joeri-en-ku as direct object]
5.2 Noun incorporation

Type IV: classificatory noun incorporation → e.g. shapes (25)-(26)

• N + V 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)

(25) mbaso o-puʔ-sak-on-ate
    glass 3SG.IND-CFL:cylindrical.hollow-break-PFV.NVOL-INDIR.EVD
    ‘The drinking glass broke.’

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

IN specifies the shape of the S-argument (broken object) in (25)-(26)
5. Beyond adnominal modification

5.2 Noun incorporation

- morphological boundness is the formal prerequisite for nouns to be incorporable (except for *hak* ‘house’)
- But not all bound nouns are found in all 4 types of noun incorporation (Mithun 1984):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic fields</th>
<th>Type I NI (lexical compounding)</th>
<th>Type II NI (manipulation of case)</th>
<th>Type III NI (manipulation of discourse structure)</th>
<th>Type IV NI (classificatory NI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body parts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(√)</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(√)</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant parts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(√)</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape parts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(√)</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship terms</td>
<td>‘child’ / ✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substances</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cf. Rose & Van linden 2017, Forthc.; Van linden 2021
5. Beyond adnominal modification

5.2 Noun incorporation

• morphological boundness is the formal prerequisite for nouns to be incorporable (except for *hak* ‘house’)

• But not all bound nouns are found in all 4 types of noun incorporation (Mithun 1984)

• difference in incorporability of common nouns in verbs can be explained by the conceptual distinction between alienable and inalienable possession just as much as the simple-word level phenomenon of the two-way noun class system can

→ it is not a perfect explanation because of the independent-noun exception and the skewed distribution of nouns across semantic domains; not all inalienably possessed entities get incorporated (e.g. animals)
6. Conclusion: Explanatory potential of alienability contrast?

• [word] two-way noun class system: membership of common nouns to a great extent motivated by the conceptual distinction between inalienably and alienably possessed items. But exceptions → evidence for Nichols’s (1988: 574) position that inalienability is a lexical category rather than a semantic property (see also Nichols & Bickel 2013)

• [phrase] alienability contrast is irrelevant to adnominal possession and non-possessive adnominal modification coding split according to humanness for a set of bound nouns (i.e. body parts)
deverbal nouns // independent nouns

• [complex word] only statistical differences between bound and independent nouns in N1 and N2 in N-N compounding; deverbal nouns // bound nouns

• [clause] Inalienable semantics could be argued to determine the incorporability of nouns, but there are also exceptions
deverbal nouns // independent nouns
6. Conclusion: Explanatory potential of alienability contrast?

• although a language may manifest alienability oppositions at the lowest level of organisation, viz. the word, this does not necessarily entail the presence of an alienability split in adnominal possession

• Rather the relevance of the alienability contrast in Harakmbut seems to be limited to have motivated the morphological distinction between bound and independent nouns, which in turn motivates the distinct behaviour of bound and independent nouns in various grammatical environments
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