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1 Introduction

Cushillococha Ticuna (CT) displays four noun classes, with additional distinctions by animacy within three of the classes. Both the verb phrase and the noun phrase participate in noun class agreement. Within the verb phrase, all verbs must bear proclitics agreeing in class with the subject, and the existential verb additionally displays suppletive allomorphy conditioned by the class of its subject. Within the noun phrase, four word classes participate in agreement: deictics, numerals, particles (monosyllabic grammatical words which appear between each word of the noun phrase), and pronouns. Nominalizations also participate in noun class agreement, both when they modify nouns and when they appear as the heads of noun phrases.

Two features of the system have special typological interest. First, all underived nouns belonging to three of the four classes -- labeled here as I/feminine, II/masculine, and III/manufactured object -- can be treated, for agreement purposes, as though they belonged to the fourth class, labeled here as IV/general. Class IV nouns, however, cannot be treated as members of the other classes. Second, all underived animate nouns may be treated, in agreement, as belonging to any of Class I, Class II, or Class IV. While the semantics of Class II and Class IV treatment of nouns in other classes is not clear, use of Class I agreement with prototypically non-Class I referents can convey two meanings: (a) a socially deictic meaning, most often indexing that the referent is a senior consanguineal relative of one of the SAPs, or (b) that the reference is non-specific.

This sketch of CT noun class is organized as follows. §2 describes the noun classes, their semantic characteristics, and the morphological criteria used to identify each class. §3 then outlines noun class agreement in nominalizations. I describe this domain of agreement first for two reasons: (a) nominalizations represent the only portion of the agreement paradigm in which there is no syncretism, and (b) nominalizer agreement does not interact with TAME. Adnominal deictics, particles, and the existential verb, on the other hand, fusionally expose both noun class agreement and a TAME contrast which I will refer to here as 'past tense' vs. 'non-past tense.' I describe existential verb, deictic, and particle agreement for both tense categories in §4 and §5. In §7, I discuss agreement on pronominal elements, including phonologically free pronouns, inalienable possession prefixes, and subject agreement proclitics. §8 then explores the dimensions of the noun class system which are flexible: the use of Class IV agreement with Class I, II, and III underived nouns; the use of Class I (and II) agreement with underived animate nouns of other classes; and the unusual class behavior of certain nominalizations.

While CT displays both noun class and a healthy number of noun classifiers, noun class and classification are orthogonal in the language. By ‘orthogonal,’ I mean two things. First, the clas-

---

1The 'past' vs. 'non-past' contrast clearly involves spatial deixis and aspect, and perhaps also evidentiality, in addition to tense. Nevertheless, for consistency with previous authors on CT and other varieties of Ticuna (e.g. Nimuendajú 1948, Anderson 1962, Faço Soares 2000, Montes Rodrigues 2004), I refer to it as 'tense.'
sifier which classifies a noun is not predictable from its class. Second, the morphological loci of noun class agreement and nominal classification are different. Noun class is exposed by obligatory agreement on the elements of the NP and VP listed above, while nominal classification is exposed by non-obligatory incorporation of classifiers into numerals, verbs, and deverbal nominalizations. I do not discuss nominal classification here.

2 Four noun classes

Table 1 lists the CT noun classes and provides an example of a grammatically inanimate and animate noun belonging to each class, except for Class III, which has no animate members. Classes I, II, and III have coherent sets of semantically predictable members. Class IV does not have focal members; it also contains the significant majority of inanimate nouns.

Note that the animate example nouns in Table 1 are all derived. I have chosen derived nouns as examples here for two reasons. First, the great majority of native-vocabulary human nouns in CT are either relational nouns such as kin terms (and therefore are inalienably possessed, which creates complications in eliciting deictics) or deverbal nominalizations. Non-deverbal, alienably possessed human nouns are almost all loans. I am aware of only four clearly undervived, non-relational, native vocabulary human nouns: ơ²ʔo⁴ (also ơ²ʔtʃa⁴na⁴) 'baby, toddler,' no³¹ʔẽ³ 'old woman,' ơ¹ʔN⁵ 'old man,' and jo³ʔa⁵ 'owner.' Concepts such as 'child,' 'man,' 'person,' 'young man,' and 'young woman' are expressed with deverbal nominalizations of stative verbs, e.g. bu³¹ 'be a child, be immature (of crop) > bu³ʔɨ ̃⁴ (be.child-nmlz:IV) 'child.' As such, the structure of the lexicon makes it necessary to employ deverbal nominalizations here. Second, as mentioned in §1, all underived animate nouns can be treated as belonging to any of the three classes with animate members. Deverbal nominalizations derived with the class nominalizers (§3), on the other hand, permit only agreement for the class of the relevant nominalizer. I therefore used noun phrases headed by deverbal nominalizations to elicit the agreement paradigms shown below, so as to avoid errors caused by switches in the class treatment of the head noun; the data reflects this.

A significant part of the nominal lexicon of CT is made up of loans from Tupi-Guarani (TG) languages, Spanish, and Portuguese. Loans can be assigned to any class. For example, the TG loan MITTED 'manioc flour' belongs to Class IV, while the Spanish or Portuguese loan di³ẽ³ru¹ 'money' belongs to Class I, ơfə³ra¹ 'saw' belongs to Class II, and na³ra³ɲa¹ 'orange' belongs to Class III. The semantic reasons for the assignment of these nouns to the particular classes involved are not clear to me. Loaned nouns which refer to vehicles and buildings are always treated as Class III, even when the loan is extremely recent or represents a nonce borrowing. This likely reflects analogy to the native vocabulary nouns ɲu³ʔe³ 'canoe' and ɨ³st 'house,' which belong to this class.
Table 1: Five noun classes defined by nominalizer agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Animate Member</th>
<th>Inanimate Member</th>
<th>Semantically Predictable Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/Feminine</td>
<td>ge⁴-e³ (be.female-NMLZ:I) 'woman'</td>
<td>ko²re¹ 'sweet potato'</td>
<td>most sweet fruit; diminutives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/Masculine</td>
<td>ge²ti⁴ki³ (be.unmarried.adult.man-NMLZ:II) 'young man'</td>
<td>do⁵wi¹ 'manioc bread'</td>
<td>celestial bodies, time periods, weather phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/Manufactured Object</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ḋu³ʔe³ 'canoe', i³ 'house,' ti¹ʔe¹ 'manioc'</td>
<td>all vehicles; most buildings and places; many cultigens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV/General</td>
<td>du³ʔe³ (be.person-NMLZ:IV) '(Ticuna) person'</td>
<td>ta³ra³ 'machete'</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides the division into native and borrowed vocabulary, the CT nominal lexicon is also divided into two morphological classes: alienable nouns, which can appear in isolation, and inalienable nouns, which must bear a pronominal possessive prefix or be suffixed to a noun or verb stem. Alienable and inalienable nouns participate in the noun class system in similar ways, although perhaps a greater proportion of inalienable nouns than of alienable nouns belong to Class IV. A word composed of an alienable noun and the inalienable noun which it possesses, such as \(i^3 \cdot a'ne' \cdot \text{town}\) -- composed of the alienable noun \(i^4 \cdot \text{house}\) and the inalienable noun \(a'ne' \cdot \text{land, environment}\) -- is typically assigned to the class of the alienable (possessor) noun.

3 Nominalizer agreement

3.1 Class nominalizers

CT displays six nominalizers. Four nominalizers are used to derive deverbal nominalizations which can modify nouns, function as the heads of noun phrases, or act as the verb of a relative clause. These nominalizers differ only in the class of noun which they derive, and for this reason I refer to them as 'class nominalizers.' The class nominalizers do not expone any nominal category other than noun class. They also do not expone TAME or verbal categories (e.g. voice).

The two other nominalizations are an agent/instrument nominalization and a zero nominalization, which generally derives an abstract noun denoting an event. The most important differences between these two nominalizations and the class nominalizations are that the agent/instrument and zero nominalizations (a) appear in my data exclusively as the heads of noun phrases, not as relative clauses or modifiers, and (b) pattern with underived nouns rather than class nominalizations for purposes of noun class agreement on modifiers. Therefore, I discuss only class nominalizations here, and describe the noun class attributes of the other nominalizations in §8.4.

When a class nominalization modifies another noun or participates in a copular construction with another noun, it must agree with that noun in class. Failure to agree results in ungrammaticality, except in the special cases involving changes in class treatment discussed in §8.

Class agreement on nominalizations is expressed by the segmental form of the nominalizer. Table 2 displays the nominalizer for each class in isolation and as an element of the universal quantifier, which is a nominalization of the verb root \(gu^1 \cdot \text{be complete, be finished, run out.}\) (1) provides examples with other lexical verbs. While there are no properly semantic differences between the class nominalizers, the class of noun which a given nominalizer derives can give rise to implicatures about the referent of a nominalization. For example, since human men are focal members of Class II, a Class II nominalization of a clause that plausibly has a human subject will tend to be read as referring to a man. Nominalizers for animate and inanimate referents within each class are the same.

| I/Feminine /gu^3 ma^3 'all (e.g. women)' | II/Masculine /gu^3 ki^3 ma^4 'all (e.g. men)' | III/Mfg Object /gu^5 ne^4 ma^3 'all' | IV/General /gu^3 ma^3 'all' |

(1) Class agreement on class nominalizers: examples (GE.DGG.20160803)

a. Class I: \(i^3 ru^5 ja^4 do^3 e^3\) (plantain.var NCL:I be.soft-NMLZ.I) 'soft guineo plantain'
b. Class II: \(te^3 ra^1 ja^4 te^5 ki^3\) (saw NCL:II be.sharp-NMLZ.II) 'sharp saw'
c. Class III: \( \text{\textit{ju}³¹e³ \textit{ja}² \textit{ma}³⁴\textit{ne}³} \) (canoe NCL:III be.long-NMLZ.III) 'long canoe'
d. Class IV: \( \text{\textit{ta}³\textit{ra}⁵ i⁴ \textit{te}⁵\textit{ti}⁴} \) (machete NCL:IV be.sharp-NMLZ.IV) 'sharp machete'

### 3.2 Allotony induced by class nominalizers

The nominalizers for each class are segmentally quite different, and the affixes themselves display different tones. However, all four class nominalizers induce the same set of tone changes on the final syllable -- and only the final syllable -- of the verb stem (i.e. the string consisting of the verb root and all of its word-class-preserving affixes, such as directionals, voice- and valence-changing morphology, incorporates, and clitics). The stem-final tone changes induced by the class nominalizers are shown in Table 3. Note that Table 3 includes data for only four of the language's five surface level tones and three of the four contour tones (31, 41, 43, and 51). Level tone 5 and contour tone 41 are omitted because their morphological distribution means they can never occur on the last syllable of a verb stem. I have not fully checked my data for all of the possible stem-final tones, and feel some doubt about whether all stem-final 2 and 4 syllables undergo the same alternations before the class nominalizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone in isolation</th>
<th>Preceding nominalizer</th>
<th>Tone in isolation</th>
<th>Preceding nominalizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same tone changes shown in Table 3 also occur on the final syllable of the verb stem in several types of subordinate clauses. These include purpose clauses; the complements of modal, perception, cognition, and speech verbs; and the clause-chaining construction with \(-\text{ʔi}⁴\), which is one of the language's five types of clause-chaining constructions. All of these subordinate clause types also involve marking the verb with the suffix \(-\text{ʔi}⁴\) or its utterance-final allomorph \(-\text{ʔ}\), which are (minimally) homophonous with the Class IV class nominalizer. In addition, Anderson (1962) states that the tone changes in Table 3 occur on the final syllable of the verb in a polar question. This is true, but epiphenomenal on the fact that polar questions are identical to chained clauses with \(-\text{ʔi}⁴\). The tone changes in Table 3 do not occur in any other context, including preceding the agent/instrument nominalizer and in other types of subordinate clauses (e.g. the temporal overlap construction). Inducing this allotony is a unique property of the class nominalizers.

Note that the paradigm of nominalizers shown in Table 2 exhibits a single nominalizer for every class, and that all of the nominalizers are composed of different segments. This is convenient, but atypical of the CT noun class agreement system. Nominalizers are the only portion of this system in which every class has precisely one form, and in which each class' form is segmentally distinct from the forms of all other classes. In most other parts of the system, Class II and Class III forms differ only in tone or are identical.
4 Existential verb agreement

4.1 Non-past contexts

The existential verb is used in existential predicates, some locative predicates, and one type of possession predicate. It undergoes suppletive allomorphy conditioned by the noun class, and in Class IV also by the animacy, of its subject. Table 4 and example 2 display the class agreement paradigm for the existential verb in non-past contexts.

I elicited these forms by permuting the noun in sentences of form analogous to 'Is there NP in your town/country?' and 'There is NP in my town/country.' In contexts which are more definite than this frame, such as locative predicates referring to known individuals, some of the existentials shown below are not felicitous. I discuss this following the tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>I/Feminine</th>
<th>II/Masculine</th>
<th>III/Mfg Object</th>
<th>IV/General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
<td>ji⁴e²ma³</td>
<td>ji²ma⁴</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ŋẽ⁴ma²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate</td>
<td>ji⁵e⁴ma³</td>
<td>ji²ma⁴</td>
<td>ji²ma²</td>
<td>ŋẽ²ʔma⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Class agreement on existential verb, non-past contexts: examples (GE.DGG.20160725)

a. Class I animate: ta⁴ji⁴e²ma³ ja⁴ ŋe⁴e³.
   ta⁴ = ji⁴e²ma³ ja⁴ ŋe² -e³
   3.1. SBJ = exist.I NCL:I be.female -NMLZ.I
   'There are women (in my country).'

b. Class I inanimate: ta⁴ji⁴e²ma³ ja⁴ ŋũ² i⁴ tʃau¹ tʃi⁵i¹ a¹ne¹wa⁵.
   ta⁴ = ji⁴e²ma³ ja⁴ ŋũ² i⁴ tʃau¹ *tʃi⁵i¹ *a¹ne¹ -wa⁵
   3.1. SBJ = exist.I NCL:I mocambo NCL:IV 1.SG.POSS- house land -ALL
   'There is mocambo fruit (Theobroma sp.) in my town/country.'

c. Class II animate: na⁴ji⁵ma⁴ ja⁴ ŋe²tɨ̰¹i¹ ki³.
   na⁴ = ji⁵ma⁴ ja⁴ ŋe²tɨ̰¹i¹ -ki³
   3. II. SBJ- exist.II NCL:II be.unmarried.adult.man -NMLZ.II
   'There are young men (in my country).'

d. Class II inanimate: na⁴ji⁵ma⁴ ja⁴ tʃe³ra¹.
   na⁴ = ji⁵ma⁴ ja⁴ tʃe³ra¹
   3. II. SBJ- exist.II NCL:II saw
   'There are saws (in my country).'

e. Class III inanimate: na⁴ji⁵ma² ta² ja² ŋu³¹e³.
   na⁴ = ji⁵ma² ta² ja² ŋu³¹e³
   3. III. SBJ = exist.III also NCL:III canoe
   'There are also canoes (in my country).'
f. Class IV animate: $na^4\eta^2\text{ʔ}ma^4$ $i^4$ $bu^3\text{-ʔ}i^4$ $i^4$ $tʃau^1$ $tʃi^5$ $i^4$ $a^1$ $ne^1$ $wa^5$.

$na^4=\eta^2\text{ʔ}ma^4$ $i^4$ $bu^3$ $\text{-ʔ}i^4$ $i^4$ $tʃau^1$ $tʃi^5$ $i^4$ $a^1$ $ne^1$ $\text{-wa}^5$
3.IV.SBJ- exist.IV.ANIM NCL:IV be.child -NMLZ.IV NCL:IV 1SG.POSS- house land -ALL
'There are children in my town/country.'

g. Class IV inanimate: $na^4\eta^2\text{ʔ}ma^2$ $ni^4$ $i^4$ $u^3i^1$.

$na^4=\eta^2\text{ʔ}ma^2$ $ni^4$ $i^4$ $u^3i^1$
3.IV.SBJ- exist.IV.INAM PRED.FOC NCL:IV manioc.flour
'Yes, there is toasted manioc flour (in my town/country).'
b. Class I inanimate: ŋɨ²ɨ̃⁴, ta⁴gu²ma³ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ ŋũ².
logical.yes 3.I.SBJ = exist.PST.I PRED.FOC PST mocambo
'Right, yes, there was/is mocambo fruit (Theobromasp).'

c. Class II animate: na⁴gu²ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ ŋe²tɨ¹i³ki³ ga⁴ je'ma².
na⁴ = gu²ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ ŋe²tɨ¹i³ -ki³ ga⁴
3.II.SBJ- exist.PST.II PRED.FOC PST be.unmarried.adult.man -NMLZ.II PST je'ma²
DEM.ADV:there
'Yes, there were/are young men there.'

d. Class II inanimate: ŋi³t²⁴, na⁴ŋe⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ tʃe³ra¹.
ŋi³t²⁴ na⁴ = ŋe⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ tʃe³ra¹
logical.yes 3.II.SBJ- exist.PST.II PRED.FOC PST saw
'Right, yes, there were/are saws.'

e. Class III inanimate: ŋi³t²⁴, na⁴gu²ma² ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ ŋu³¹e³.
ŋi³t²⁴ na⁴ = gu²ma² ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ ŋu³¹e³
logical.yes 3.III.SBJ = exist.PST.III PRED.FOC PST canoe
'Right, yes, there were/are canoes.'

f. Class IV animate: ŋi³t²⁴, na⁴je⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ du¹ɨ³ʔi³.
ŋi³t²⁴ na⁴ = je⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ du¹ɨ³ -ʔi³
logical.yes 3.IV.SBJ- exist.PST.IV PRED.FOC PST be.person -NMLZ.IV
'Right, yes, there were/are people.'

g. Class IV inanimate: na⁴je⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ u³i¹.
na⁴ = je⁴ma⁴ ni⁴¹ʔi⁴ ga⁴ u³i¹
3.IV.SBJ- exist.PST.IV PRED.FOC PST manioc.flour
'Yes, there was/is toasted manioc flour.'

Comparing Tables 4 and 5, we observe that the place of the initial consonant is the primary exponent of the past vs. non-past contrast in existentials. The non-Class IV existentials, which have initial palatals in the non-past, have initial velars in the past; conversely, the Class IV forms have velars in the non-past, but palatalts in the past. This maintains the association of the feature [bk] with the contrast between Class IV and non-Class IV, but inverts the value of [bk] associated with each value of the contrast. The additional change of the initial syllable nucleus from /i/ to /u/ for in Classes I, II, and III likely stems from the fact that /g/ does not occur before front vowels, while the change of the initial syllable nucleus in Class IV from nasal to oral reflects that nasal vowels do not occur immediately following oral stops in native-vocabulary words.

The only difference in tone between the past and non-past existential paradigms is that the Class IV inanimate existential is 42 in the non-past, but 44 in the past. This change maintains the tonal contrast between animate and inanimate forms in Class IV, but does not display the same association of 24 tones with animate and 42 with inanimate that we find in the non-past
existentials and the presentative demonstrative. In all other cells of the paradigm, the tones of the non-past and past existentials are identical.

For both non-past and past contexts, Class I animate nouns which have specific reference -- for example, which are possessed or which refer to a known, identified entity -- are not felicitous with the Class I existential. The Class IV animate existential must be used instead. The ban on Class I existentials with definite subjects probably reflects the association between Class I and non-specificity (§8.2). SAP pronouns also require Class IV existentials, as do the Class I third person pronoun and the Class II-III-IV third person pronoun (see §7 on the third-person pronouns).

5 Demonstratives

5.1 Presentative demonstrative

The presentative demonstrative, which is not sensitive to TAME, is best glossed with the English expressions 'here it is' and 'here you go.' I give the presentative demonstrative that name because it is the demonstrative conventionally used to present an interlocutor with an object or draw an interlocutor's attention to an object that has recently come to be in the here-space. The presentative, and all other CT demonstratives, can be used both in place of a noun and adnominally. In the pro-nominal use, it is also often used to draw attention to one member of a pair (like 'this one, that one' in English). In the adnominal use, with nouns referring to time periods (Class II) and locations (Class III), the presentative demonstrative means 'this period of time (that we are currently in)' or 'this place (that we are currently in).'</p>

In discourse, when speakers produce a presentative demonstrative that refers to a tangible item, it is very often the case that they are either (a) handling the referent of the demonstrative or (b) duratively hand-pointing at the referent in such a way that either the fingertips or a pointer held in the hand physically contacts the referent. I have not noticed lip, head, or full arm points in conjunction with the presentative; only on one occasion have I observed the presentative coinciding with a punctual point involving the forearm.

Crucially unlike 'here it is,' the presentative demonstrative cannot be used in a context where the speaker is drawing the interlocutor's attention to the location of the object in space, as opposed to the presence of the object somewhere in the here-space. When I attempted to elicit the presentative in contexts where the position of the object in space was salient or even previously mentioned, consultants rejected it and volunteered the general demonstrative or an adnominal use of a locative demonstrative adverb. In addition, consultants consistently rejected the presentative when, in attempting to elicit it, I performed full arm points, head tosses, and other deictic gestures that highlight the position of the object in space.

Table 6 and example 4 display the class agreement paradigm for the presentative demonstrative. I elicited these forms by permuting the noun in a sentence analogous to 'Here you go (take it), it's your NP.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I/Feminine</th>
<th>II/Masculine</th>
<th>III/Mfg Object</th>
<th>IV/General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animate</strong></td>
<td>da³¹e¹</td>
<td>da³¹a¹</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ɲa⁴a²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inanimate</strong></td>
<td>da³¹e¹</td>
<td>da¹a¹</td>
<td>da¹a¹</td>
<td>ɲa²a⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Class agreement on presentative demonstrative: examples (GE.LWG.20160726)
a. Class I animate: \(da^{31}e^1 \ t^i \ t^i \ j^a \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^e^e^3\)  
\(da^{31}e^1 \ \ i^4 \ j^a \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^e^e^3 \ -e^3\)  
PRESDEM.I 3.I.SBJ = COP NCL:I 2SG.POSS be.female-NMLZ.I  
'Here you go, it's your mistress (lit. woman).'</b>

b. Class I inanimate: \(da^{31}e^1, \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^u^2\)  
\(da^{31}e^1, \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^u^2\)  
PRESDEM.I 2SG.POSS mocambo  
'Here you go, (it's) your mocambo fruit.'</b>

c. Class II animate: \(da^{31}a^1 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^e^t^i^k^i^3\)  
\(da^{31}a^1 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^e^t^i^k^i^3\)  
PRESDEM.II.ANIM 2SG.POSS be.unmarried.adult.man -NMLZ.II  
'Here you go, (it's) your young man.'</b>

d. Class II inanimate: \(da'^1a^1 \ ku^{31}r^i \ t^f^e^r^a^1\)  
\(da'^1a^1 \ ku^{31}r^i \ t^f^e^r^a^1\)  
PRESDEM.II.INAM 2SG.POSS saw  
'Here you go, (it's) your saw.'</b>

e. Class III inanimate: \(da'^1a^1 \ ni^{41}\ t^i \ j^a^2 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^u^{31}e^3\)  
\(da'^1a^1 \ ni^{41} \ t^i \ j^a^2 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^u^{31}e^3\)  
PRESDEM.III 3.III.SBJ = COP NCL:IIII 2SG.POSS canoe  
'Here you go, it's your canoe.'</b>

f. Class IV animate: \(na'^2a^2 \ ni^{41}\ t^i \ i^4 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^b^u^{31}e^4\)  
\(na'^2a^2 \ ni^{41} \ i^4 \ i^4 \ ku^{31}r^i \ \eta^b^u^{31}e^4\)  
PRESDEM.IV.ANIM 3.IV.SBJ COP 2SG.POSS be.child -NMLZ.IV  
'Here you go, it's your adopted child (lit. child).'</b>

g. Class IV inanimate: \(na'^2a^2 \ ku^{31}r^i \ u'^i^1\)  
\(na'^2a^2 \ ku^{31}r^i \ u'^i^1\)  
PRESDEM.IV.INAM 2SG.POSS manioc.flour  
'Here you go, (it's) your toasted manioc flour.'</b>

The phonological oppositions between the forms in Table 6 bear a strong resemblance to the oppositions found in the class agreement paradigm of the non-past existential verb. The Class IV presentative forms have the same mapping between tone and animacy -- 42 for inanimates, 24 for animates -- as the Class IV forms of the non-past existential. Comparing across classes, the initial syllables of the Class IV and non-Class IV forms contrast in both nasality and place. The initial syllable of the non-Class IV forms is oral and alveolar, while the Class IV initial syllable is nasal and palatal. This is the same opposition in nasality as in the non-past existential paradigm. The place opposition is not identical with any other paradigm, but resembles the non-past existential paradigm in that the onset of the non-Class IV initial is front of the onset of the Class IV initial. Despite these similarities, the structure of the presentative paradigm differs from the non-past existential paradigm in two ways: the Class II forms display an animacy distinction marked by tone (there is no such distinction in the existentials) and the Class II inanimate and Class III forms are homophonous (while they are a minimal tone pair in the existentials).

Two oddities of the presentative deserve mention. First, SAP pronouns inherently require the Class I presentative (cf. they require Class IV for the existentials, §4). This obtains regardless of the social gender of the SAPs. Second, one of the two verbs used to introduce direct speech reports,
ɲa⁴a², is homophonous with the Class IV inanimate presentative. The fact that this morph is a verb stem and not a special use of the presentative is shown by the fact that it can be nominalized and adverbalized, two operations which are not possible with nominal deictics. Presumably related, it is common to use the Class IV inanimate presentative to draw attention to an immediately following portion of the discourse, for example in the conventional collocation diʔka² ɲa⁴a² (look! PRES.DEM.IV) 'pay attention to this (what I am about to say).'

5.2 General demonstrative

5.2.1 Non-past contexts

The general demonstrative, when used on the first mention of a referent, is best glossed by the English expression 'there it is.' This demonstrative is appropriate on first mention in a context in which the speaker is drawing the interlocutor’s attention to the referent’s presence in the here-space, but does not expect the interlocutor to do anything non-linguistic in response (compare this to the presentative, which often conveys that the speaker expects the hearer to start handling the referent). After the first mention of a referent, the general demonstrative is used adnominally and pronominally in a way similar to English ‘that.’ Unlike ‘that,’ however, the general demonstrative is acceptable in contexts where the referent is familiar and/or unique.

Like the presentative, the general demonstrative is not felicitous when the location of the referent is focal information. Speakers occasionally perform a head toss, punctual chin point, or punctual point with the finger or hand, but never a full arm point, while producing general demonstratives. They explicitly rejected my attempts to elicit these demonstratives while performing a full arm point.

A relevant hedge on the above is that I have very few examples of the Class I, II, and III general demonstratives, especially the non-past forms, in either texts or overheard speech. In fact, I did not know that the non-past forms existed until I attempted to combine the Class IV general demonstrative with a non-Class IV noun. Probably for similar reasons, the non-Class IV general demonstratives do not appear at all in Anderson (1962), and only one form from this paradigm appears in Montes Rodriguez (2004).

Table 7 and example 5 display the class paradigm of the general demonstrative for non-past contexts. I elicited these forms by permuting the noun in a sentence of the form 'There it is, your NP.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animate, Inanimate</th>
<th>I/Feminine</th>
<th>II/Masculine</th>
<th>III/Mfg Object</th>
<th>IV/General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gu⁴e²</td>
<td>gu⁴a²</td>
<td>gu⁴a²</td>
<td>nẽ⁴ma²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Class agreement on general demonstratives, non-past contexts: examples (GE.LWG.20160726)

a. Class I animate: gu⁴e², ku³¹rɨ³ bu³e³ (GEN.DEM.I 2SG.POSS be.child-NMLZ.I) 'There it is, your baby'

b. Class I inanimate: gu⁴e², ku³¹rɨ³ nũ² (GEN.DEM.I 2SG.POSS mocambo) 'There it is, your mocambo fruit'

c. Class II animate: gu⁴a², ku³¹rɨ³ nẽ⁴ʔqɨ³kɨ³ (GEN.DEM.II 2SG.POSS be.unmarried.adult.man-NMLZ.II) 'There he is, your young man'
d. Class II inanimate: $gu^2a^2$, $ku^3ri^3$ $te^3ra^1$ (gen.dem.II 2SG.POSS saw) 'There it is, your saw'

e. Class III inanimate: $gu^4a^2$, $ku^3ri^3$ $yu^3i^1e^3$ (GEN.DEM.III 2SG.POSS canoe) 'There it is, your canoe'

f. Class IV animate: $\eta^e^3ma^2$, $ku^3ri^3$ $bu^3$t$i^4$ (GEN.DEM.IV 2SG.POSS be.child-NMLZ.IV) 'There she/he is, your adopted child'

g. Class IV inanimate: $\eta^e^3ma^2$, $ku^3ri^3$ $u^3ti^1$ (GEN.DEM.IV 2SG.POSS manioc.flour) 'There it is, your toasted manioc flour'

The paradigm in Table 7 displays more syncretism than other any other deictic agreement paradigm in CT. There are no distinctions by animacy, and the Class II and III forms are fully identical. The primary phonological opposition between the Class IV and non-Class IV initial syllables is in the nasality of the onset, as in the non-past existentials and the presentative. There is no opposition in place between the Class IV and non-Class IV initials; this is the only paradigm without such an opposition.

5.2.2 Past contexts

Table 8 and example 6 now display the class paradigm of the general demonstrative for past contexts. I elicited these forms by permuting the noun in a sentence of the form $NP$ $ri^1$, $ma^3ri^3$ $na^4$ta$^2$$u^5$ma$^4$ NP, it doesn't exist any more.' It illustrates the non-temporal nature of the CT 'past tense' that speakers did not consistently produce past tense forms when I attempted to elicit this paradigm using frames with temporal adverbs such as $t^3pa^3$t$i^1$ 'a very long time ago.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animate, Inanimate</th>
<th>I/Feminine</th>
<th>II/Masculine</th>
<th>III/Mfg Object</th>
<th>IV/General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$gu^3e^3ma^3$</td>
<td>$gu^2ma^4$</td>
<td>$gu^2ma^2$</td>
<td>$\eta^e^3ma^4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Class agreement on general demonstrative, past contexts: examples (GE.DGG.20160801)

a. Class I animate: $gu^e^3ma^3$ $\eta^e^3$ (GEN.DEM.I be.female-NMLZ.I) 'that woman'

b. Class I inanimate: $gu^e^3ma^3$ $\eta^u^2$ (GEN.DEM.I mocambo) 'that mocambo fruit'

c. Class II animate: $gu^2ma^4$ $\eta^e^3ti^1$ $ki^3$ (GEN.DEM.II be.unmarried.adult.man-NMLZ.II) 'that young man'

d. Class II inanimate: $gu^2ma^4$ $te^3ra^1$ (GEN.DEM.II saw) 'that saw'

e. Class III inanimate: $gu^2ma^2$ $yu^3i^1$ (GEN.DEM.III canoe) 'that canoe'

f. Class IV animate: $\eta^e^3ma^4$ $du^3$ti$^2$t$i^4$ (GEN.DEM.IV be.person-NMLZ.IV) 'that person'

g. Class IV inanimate: $\eta^e^3ma^4$ $u^ti^1$ (GEN.DEM.IV manioc.flour) 'that toasted manioc flour'

This paradigm is segmentally and tonally identical to the past existential paradigm, except that the past existential distinguishes animacy (by tone) for Class IV nouns and the past general demonstrative does not. Lest this raise questions about whether the past general demonstrative is a nominalization of the past existential, I note that the past general demonstratives behave syntactically like deictics, and not like nominalizations, in terms of the distribution of noun class particles.
5.3 Distal demonstrative

In addition to the presentative and general demonstratives, classes I, II, and III display a third demonstrative which is segmentally and tonally identical to the non-past existential, but does not vary with TAME. Table 9 and example 7 display the class paradigm of this demonstrative. While I do not have enough examples of this demonstrative to characterize its semantics precisely, my impression is that when used on first mention, it conveys that the referent is outside the interlocutors' here-space. On subsequent mentions, its distribution seems similar to that of the general demonstrative. The Class I member of this paradigm also functions as one of two human non-specific nominal elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Class agreement on distal demonstrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate, Inanimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Class agreement on distal demonstrative: examples (GE.DGG.20160801)

a. Class I animate: ji⁴e²ma³ ne⁴e³ (DIST.DEM.I be.female-NMLZ.I) 'that woman'
b. Class I inanimate: ji⁴e²ma³ di³ẽ³ru¹ (DIST.DEM.I money) 'that money' (non-ideal example: this speaker finds it acceptable to treat di³ẽ³ru¹ as animate)
c. Class II animate: ji³ma⁴ ne⁵i¹ki³ (DIST.DEM.II be.unmarried.adult.man-NMLZ.II) 'that young man'
d. Class II inanimate: ji³ma⁴ tf⁵e⁵ra¹ (DIST.DEM.II saw) 'that saw'
e. Class III inanimate: ji³ma² ŋu³¹e³ (DIST.DEM.III canoe) 'that canoe'

The paradigm shown in Table 9 has two unusual features. First, while the distal demonstrative behaves morphosytactically like a noun, the form for each cell is phonologically identical to the non-past existential verb root for the same cell. The sole difference is that the distal demonstrative paradigm does not have a member for Class IV. The only demonstratives which can modify a Class IV noun are the presentative and the general demonstrative. When I attempted to elicit the Class IV member of the paradigm, speakers either did not produce a demonstrative or produced the nonpast general demonstrative and then commented that it was not like the forms shown in Table 9. This leads me to believe that there is a genuine gap in the paradigm for Class IV.

Second, when used (pro-nominally or adnominally) as the subject of a subordinate clause, the demonstratives in Table 9 force dedicated paradigms of subject proclitics on the verb. The Class I member of the paradigm and the Class II member trigger different paradigms, although the forms are syncretic in certain cells. I did not elicit the agreement for Class III, but from texts, believe that it is the same as for Class II. In main clauses, the Class I member of the paradigm triggers normal Class I agreement, and the Class II member triggers Class II agreement.

6 Particles

CT particles are monosyllabic grammatical words which fusionally expose noun class and past vs. non-past tense. Particles obligatorily intervene between all elements of the noun phrase, except that they are optional between a noun and a deictic modifying the noun (and here I suspect that the presence vs. absence of a particle reflects the difference between the noun and deictic forming a constituent vs. being apposed to one another). Particles also obligatorily precede postverbal
arguments and postposed possessors. In addition, they can optionally be used preceding topic NPs which have been dislocated to the left edge of the clause.

The paradigm of particles in non-past contexts is shown in Table 10 and example 8. It does not make distinctions in animacy, and is also the only paradigm in which classes I and II are syncretic. Classes II and III, as usual, are distinguished by the presence of a high tone on the Class II form. It is possible that I have missed animacy-based tone distinctions in this paradigm, especially in Class IV, as the Class IV particle \( i^4 \) tends to be realized simply as a palatal off-glide on the preceding vowel in all but very careful speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Class agreement on particles, nonpast contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate, Inanimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) Class agreement on particles, nonpast contexts: examples (repeated from 1)

a. Class I: \( i'ru^5 \) ja\(^4\) do\(^3\) e\(^3\) (plantain.sp NCL:I be.soft-NMLZ.I) 'soft guineo plantain'
b. Class II: \( te^r a^1 \) ja\(^4\) te\(^5\) ki\(^3\) (saw NCL:II be.sharp-NMLZ.II) 'sharp saw'
c. Class III: \( nu^3\) e\(^3\) ja\(^2\) ma\(^\tilde{t}\) n\(^e\)\(^3\) (canoe NCL:III be.long-NML.Z.III) 'long canoe'
d. Class IV: \( ta^3\) ra\(^i\) i\(^4\) te\(^\tilde{t}\) (machete NCL:IV be.sharp-NMLZ.IV) 'sharp machete'

In past contexts, class contrasts in particles are neutralized, and the particle ga\(^4\) is used for all classes. One older man that I briefly worked with categorically used a\(^4\) where other speakers would use ga\(^4\), and one of my more regular consultants also occasionally produced a\(^4\) instead of ga\(^4\) in texts. CT speakers say that a\(^4\) is simply an archaic form of ga\(^4\) and that the two morphs are identical in meaning. I am willing to believe this, given the distribution of my examples of a\(^4\).

7 Pronominal agreement

CT displays five SAP pronouns, which contrast singular and plural number, and third third person pronouns, which do not. Pronouns are insensitive to TAME. They can be distinguished from other nominal deictics by two morphological characteristics: (a) case marking is obligatory on pronouns and optional on other deictics, and (b) pronouns undergo root allomorphy conditioned by the element following the root, while deictics do not undergo root allomorphy.

The class paradigm of pronouns is shown in Table 11 and example 9. Pronouns are given in their nominative citation forms in Table 11 and in the accusative in (9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Class agreement on pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Class agreement on pronouns: examples (GE.LWG.20160726)

a. Class I: \( ti^{31}n^3 \) tfja\(^3\) dau\(^1\) ja\(^4\) ŋu\(^2\)
   ti\(^{31}\) -n\(^3\) tfja\(^3\) = dau\(^1\) ja\(^4\) ŋu\(^2\)
   3.I.PRO -ACC 1SG.SBJ = see NCL:1 mocambo
I saw it, the/a *mocambo* fruit.'

b. Class II feminine: \(\eta^{1}I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} d\bar{a}u^{1} ja^{4} p\bar{a}^{2}k\bar{i}^{3}\)
\(\eta^{1} -I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} = d\bar{a}u^{1} ja^{4} p\bar{a}^{2} -k\bar{i}^{3}\)
3.II.F.PRO -ACC 1SG.SBJ = see NCL:II be.unmarried.adult.woman -NMLZ.II
'I saw her, the/a young woman.'

c. Class II non-feminine: \(n^{31}I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} d\bar{a}u^{1} ja^{4} t\bar{e}^{3} r\bar{a}^{1}\)
\(n^{31} -I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} = d\bar{a}u^{2} ja^{4} t\bar{e}^{3} r\bar{a}^{1}\)
3.II.PRO -ACC 1SG.SBJ = see NCL:II saw
'I saw it, the/a saw.'

d. Class III: \(n^{31}I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} d\bar{a}u^{1} ja^{2} n\bar{u}^{3} e^{3}\)
\(n^{31} -I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} = d\bar{a}u^{1} ja^{2} n\bar{u}^{3} e^{3}\)
3.III.PRO -ACC 1SG.SBJ = see NCL:III canoe
'I saw it, the/a canoe.'

e. Class IV: \(n^{31}I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} d\bar{a}u^{1} i^{4} u^{3} i^{1}\)
\(n^{31} -I^{3} t\bar{f}a^{3} = d\bar{a}u^{1} i^{4} u^{3} i^{1}\)
3.IV.PRO -ACC 1SG.SBJ = see NCL:IV manioc.flour
'I saw it, the/some toasted manioc flour.'

The paradigm in Table 11 is highly syncretic, like the particle paradigm. The pattern of syncretism, however, is not the same. Particles display syncretism between Class I and Class II (the two classes with animate core members), while pronouns display syncretism between Classes II, III, and IV. There is no other paradigm in the system which exhibits this Class I vs. non-Class I pattern of syncretism.

The pronominal paradigm does not display animacy distinctions. It does, however, contain a pronoun which specifies both animacy and canonical noun class (overlapping but not coextensive with social gender). This is the feminine animate pronoun \(\eta^{i} ma^{2}\), which can refer only to feminine animate referents. This class of referents consists of human girls and women, female animals, and a small number of objects, such as knives and money, which are grammatically animate and are typically treated as belonging to Class I. Although all of these referents are prototypically treated as Class I/feminine, \(\eta^{i} ma^{2}\) is *not* a member of Class I. Instead, \(\eta^{i} ma^{2}\) displays a chimerical agreement pattern: it requires Class II agreement in nominalizations, but behaves like an underived Class I animate noun for purposes of agreement with other elements of the NP and VP. \(\eta^{i} ma^{2}\) shares this unusual agreement behavior with Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animate beings, which also depart from the typical behavior of Class II nominalizations (see §8.4.2).

Each pronoun shown in Table 11 has a corresponding inalienable possession prefix and subject agreement proclitic. The inalienable possession prefixes and the subject agreement proclitics for main clause, intransitive a-class verbs are shown in Table 12.

As I mentioned in 5.3, in subordinate clauses the distal demonstratives \(ji^{x3} ma^{3}\) (Class I), \(ji^{x2} ma^{4}\) (Class II), and \(ji^{x2} ma^{2}\) (Class III) trigger subject agreement proclitics distinct from those of the third-person pronouns. (In main clauses, these demonstratives trigger the same agreement as the third-person pronouns of the same class.) One could take this as evidence that the distal demonstratives are actually pronouns. I reject this analysis for three reasons. First, the distal demonstratives do
Table 12: Pronouns with corresponding inalienable possession and subject agreement prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II and IV, feminine animates</th>
<th>II-IV, underspecified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>tɨ³¹ma⁴</td>
<td>nɨ³¹ma⁴</td>
<td>ni³¹ma⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive Prefix</td>
<td>tɨ³¹ma⁴-</td>
<td>nɨ⁴-</td>
<td>na⁴=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Proclitic</td>
<td>ta⁴=</td>
<td>i⁴=</td>
<td>na⁴=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not have dedicated inalienable possession prefixes, but instead trigger the inalienable possession prefix for the corresponding noun class. Second, speakers do not employ the distal demonstrative on multiple successive mentions in a discourse. Instead, they typically employ the distal demonstrative on first mention of a referent and a third-person pronoun of the corresponding noun class on subsequent mentions. Third, distal demonstratives do not participate in the root allomorphy that is characteristic of all other CT pronouns.

A final note on the pronominal paradigm concerns Wh-indefinites. CT displays two Wh-indefinite elements, the animate Wh-indefinite te¹ʔe⁵ ‘who, whoever, someone’ and its inanimate counterpart ta²ʔa⁴kɨ³ ‘what, whatever, something.’ te¹ʔe⁵ is a member of Class I, while ta²ʔa⁴kɨ³ is a member of Class IV. Unlike other Class I animate nouns, te¹ʔe⁵ does not participate in the class-changing behavior described in §8; it rigidly requires Class IV agreement.

8 Flexibility in noun class assignment

There are three situations in which underived nouns may be treated as belonging to a class other than the one to which they are normally assigned. First, all Class I, II, and III underived nouns may be treated as Class IV; however, Class IV underived inanimate nouns may only be treated as Class IV. I describe this phenomenon in §8.1.

Second, all underived animate nouns may be treated as belonging to any of the classes with animate members -- Class I, Class II, or Class IV. Class I agreement with a noun that is typically not Class I can convey either a complex set of socially deictic meanings indexing the nature of the relationship between the SAPs and the referent, or the grammatical category of non-specificity. I discuss the use of Class I agreement with non-Class I animate nouns in §8.2. In §8.3, I show that it is also acceptable to use Class II agreement with Class I and Class IV nouns.

Third, in §8.4 I discuss the unusual class behavior of three kinds of deverbal nouns: (a) nouns derived with the agent/instrument nominalizer -ru⁵ɨ ̃¹, (b) nouns derived with the zero nominalization, and (c) nouns which are derived with the Class II nominalizer -kɨ³ and refer to feminine animate beings. I show that agent/instrument and zero nominalizations, alone among CT nouns, may be treated as either animate or inanimate, and as belonging to any noun class. Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animate beings are unique in that they do not permit Class II agreement; instead, they require Class IV agreement on some agreeing elements, and Class I on others.

8.1 Non-Class IV underived nouns with Class IV agreement

All underived nouns belonging to Class I, Class II, and Class III may also be used with Class IV agreement, as exemplified in (10). This is true of both animate (10a, c, f) and inanimate (10b, d, e) nouns. Class IV nouns, however, may not be used with non-Class IV agreement (11). Class IV is the only target of class-switching behavior by inanimate nouns: Class II inanimates, for example, cannot be treated as Class III. Note, additionally, that this flexibility is limited to underived nouns (and nouns derived with the agent/instrument and zero nominalizers, §8.4). Nouns derived with
a class nominalizer -- whether animate or inanimate -- may only be treated as belonging to the class of the nominalizer.\(^3\)

At the level of the noun phrase, there are no half measures in treating a non-Class IV noun as Class IV: it is unacceptable to mix Class IV agreement and non-Class IV agreement within a single noun phrase. Switching between Class IV and non-Class IV treatment of a non-Class IV noun across sentences in a discourse, however, is acceptable and common.

(10) Class IV agreement with non-Class IV nouns is acceptable

a. Class I animate (GE.LCS.20160722):
   
   \[\text{no}^{3i} \text{e}^{3} \text{ja}^{4} \text{me}^{3i}\text{e}^{3} \text{(old.woman NCL:I be.good-NMLZ.I) 'good grandmother'}\]
   \[\text{no}^{3i} \text{e}^{i} \text{me}^{3i}\text{e}^{4} \text{(old.woman NCL:IV be.good-NMLZ.IV) 'good grandmother'}\]

b. Class I inanimate (GE.DGG.20160803):
   
   \[i^{1}\text{ru}^{5} \text{ja}^{4} \text{do}^{3i}\text{e}^{5} \text{(plantain.var NCL:I be.soft-NMLZ.I) 'soft guineo plantain'}\]
   \[i^{1}\text{ru}^{5} \text{i}^{4} \text{do}^{3i}\text{e}^{4} \text{(plantain.var NCL:IV be.unripe-NMLZ.IV) 'unripe guineo plantain'}\]

c. Class II animate (GE.LWG.20160722):
   
   \[\text{ja}^{3i}\text{ti}^{3} \text{ja}^{4} \text{ta}^{3i}\text{ki}^{3} \text{(man NCL:II be.big-NMLZ.II) 'big (important) man'}\]
   \[\text{ja}^{3i}\text{ti}^{3} \text{i}^{4} \text{ta}^{3i}\text{t}^{4} \text{(man NCL:IV be.big-NMLZ.IV) 'big (important) man'}^{4}\]

d. Class II inanimate (GE.DGG.20160803):
   
   \[\text{te}^{3i}\text{ra}^{1} \text{ja}^{4} \text{te}^{5}\text{ki}^{3} \text{(saw NCL:II be.sharp-NMLZ.II) 'sharp saw'}\]
   \[\text{te}^{3i}\text{ra}^{1} \text{i}^{4} \text{te}^{5}\text{t}^{4} \text{(saw NCL:IV be.sharp-NMLZ.IV) 'sharp saw'}\]

e. Class III (GE.DGG.20160803):
   
   \[\text{nu}^{3i}\text{e}^{3} \text{ja}^{2} \text{ma}^{4}\text{t}^{4}\text{ne}^{1} \text{(canoe NCL:III be.long-NMLZ.III) 'long canoe'}\]
   \[\text{nu}^{3i}\text{e}^{3} \text{i}^{4} \text{ma}^{4}\text{t}^{4} \text{(canoe NCL:IV be.long-NMLZ.IV) 'long canoe'}\]

(11) Non-Class IV agreement with Class IV nouns is unacceptable

a. Class I unacceptable: \(^{*}\text{wt}^{3i}\text{e}^{3} \text{ja}^{4} \text{ta}^{3i}\text{ra}^{5} \text{(one-NCL:NCL:I machete), intended: 'one machete'} \) (GE.LCS.20160721)

b. Class II unacceptable: \(^{*}\text{i}^{2}\text{ma}^{4} \text{ta}^{3i}\text{ra}^{5} \text{(GEN.DEM.II machete), intended: 'that machete'} \) (GE.LWG.20160803)

c. Class III unacceptable: \(^{*}\text{da}^{4}\text{a}^{1} \text{u}^{4}\text{t}^{1} \text{(PRES.DEM.III manioc.flour), intended: 'this toasted manioc flour (take it!)'} \) (GE.LCS.20160722)

Speakers describe the meaning difference between Class IV treatment of non-Class IV nouns and regular class treatment of these nouns in a variety of ways. Some speakers say that there is no meaning difference between Class IV and regular class treatment of non-Class IV nouns. Others, and the same speakers at other times, say that treating a non-Class IV noun as Class IV conveys disrespect for the referent of the noun and/or for the addressee. This comment is especially common when speakers are discussing Class IV treatment of normally Class I nouns. I suspect that only substantial corpus work will clarify this issue.

Additionally, it bears mention that nouns which are Class I inanimate for some speakers are categorically Class IV inanimate -- rather than Class I with the possibility of Class IV agreement -- for some speakers. My consultant MFC, for example, treats nouns which are Class I inanimates for other speakers as Class IV inanimates, and considers Class I treatment of these nouns to index that the speaker is from Brazil (although I find this implausible for a number of reasons). Note that MFC still has inanimates in Class II.

\(^3\)There is an exception involving nouns which are derived with the Class II nominalizer but refer to female animates; this is discussed in §8.4.

\(^4\)Not an ideal example; one can argue that \(\text{ja}^{3i}\text{ti}^{3}\) is a zero nominalization of the verb root \(\text{ja}^{3i}\text{ti}^{3}\) 'be male.'
8.2 Non-Class I underived animate nouns with Class I agreement

Underived inanimate nouns can be treated as belonging to a maximum of two classes: the class which they are prototypically treated as belonging to (if other than Class IV), and Class IV. For underived animate nouns, on the other hand, the agreement possibilities are wider. In addition to the prototypical class and Class IV, all underived animate nouns can also be treated as Class I or Class II -- that is, an underived animate noun can be treated as belonging to any noun class with animate members. Animates can never be treated as Class III.

8.2.1 Social deixis meaning of Class I agreement

I begin with Class I treatment of non-Class I animate nouns. 12 illustrates that ɨʔi⁵ 'old man,' though prototypically Class II, and *mɨ̃ ki³ 'companion,' though prototypically Class IV, can both be treated as Class I. In these examples, the Class I treatment of the non-Class I head noun conveys a socially deictic meaning. It may index either that the referent is the senior partner in a kin relation with the SAP (12b) or that the speaker has affection for the referent (12d).

(12) Class I agreement with non-Class I nouns is acceptable

a. ɨʔi⁵ 'old man' is usually Class II (GE.LWG.20160722):
   ɨʔi⁵ ja⁴ ta³ ki³ (old.man NCL=II be.big-NMLZ.II) 'big/important old man'

b. But acceptable with Class I:
   tau⁴ e⁷ta³ ɨʔi⁵ ri¹ tʃo³ ki³ Lima-wa⁵ ta⁴ mi³ (ECG, ebu4:31)
   neg.exist-NMLZ:I - e⁷ -ta³ ɨʔi⁵ ri¹ tʃo³ - ki³ Lima -wa⁵ ta⁴ = mũ² 'My grandfather, who is (now) dead (lit. does not exist), he sent me to Lima.'

c. *mɨ̃ ki³ 'companion' is usually Class IV (GE.LWG.20160722):
   ni³ ma⁴ tʃo³ mĩ ki³ (3.IV.PRO NCL=IV 1SG.POSS-companion) 'him, my companion'

d. But acceptable with Class I (GE.LWG.20160722):
   ti³ ma⁴ ja⁴ tʃo³ mĩ ki³ (3.I.PRO NCL=I 1SG.POSS-companion) 'him, my fiancé'

In discourse as in (12b), speakers very conventionally use Class I agreement in referring to their consanguineal relatives of G + 1 and older generations, i.e. parents, grandparents, and kin classified as belonging to the parents' or grandparents' generation. While use of Class I agreement to refer to kin of these categories is much more common than use of non-Class I agreement, it is not obligatory in either a social or grammatical sense. When I have presented speakers with sentences that refer to senior consanguineal kin with non-Class I agreement, they sometimes comment that the non-Class I forms are impolite, but they do not treat such usage as problematic in actual discourse.

It is also common for speakers to use Class I agreement when referring to the senior consanguineal relatives of addressees and/or other discourse participants. For example, speakers who are talking about my kin to one another while I am present typically refer to them using Class I agreement, even when they are not addressing me or reporting my speech. This suggests that use of Class I agreement with non-Class I nouns indexes the existence of a junior-senior kinship relation between at least one of the discourse participants -- including, but not necessarily, the speaker -- and the referent.

However, as (12d) suggests, use of Class I agreement with non-Class I nouns does not exclusively index senior-to-junior kinship relations. In addition to the kinship use, it can also function as an index of the speaker’s positive affective stance toward the referent. For example, speakers
tend to use Class I agreement in reference to babies and small children, very old people, the protagonists of myths, and people who are being treated with exceptional care or pity in a specific discourse context. I observed an instance of this final use of Class I agreement while attending an evangelical Christian church service in Cushillococha on the morning of July 14, 2016. During this service, the pastor of the church (speaking in Spanish) pointed out a man who was attending the church for the first time in the audience, and announced that although previously the man, K, had been known as a drunk and a thief, he had decided to change his ways and become a member of the church. The pastor then called K forward and made him kneel in front of the pulpit, where several senior men and one senior woman from the church’s committee of deacons surrounded K in a circle and prayed (in CT, but not loud enough to be consistently audible), cried, and wailed over him for about twenty minutes. At the end of this event, the senior woman who had been in the circle, Elvira, took the pulpit and delivered a short speech in CT about how members of the congregation should now behave toward K (e.g. that they should visit him and offer to pray with him). Since K is male and junior to Elvira and all of the focal addressees of this discourse, Elvira would normally refer to him using Class II or Class IV agreement. However, throughout this speech, she referred to him exclusively using Class I agreement, indexing his status as the object of intense emotion in the immediately preceding activity.

Class I agreement is not an index of respect relationships other than senior-to-junior kinship relations. For example, most CT speakers display respect to teachers and people with other kinds of official government positions in various ways, such as avoiding their gaze, avoiding addressing and referring to them, and -- when such a person must be addressed or referred to by name -- employing an occupational title preceding the name, e.g. pa² maestro pa² Ling (voc Sp:teacher voc personal.name). However, speakers do not use Class I agreement to refer to teachers and other officials unless one of the other conditions for Class I agreement is met (i.e. the referent is a woman or a senior relative of a discourse participant). Christian CT speakers also do not generally use Class I agreement to refer to God and Jesus.

To summarize, Class I agreement with typically non-Class I nouns has two possible social deictic values. It may index either (a) specific senior-to-junior kinship relations between the referent of the noun and one or more of the discourse participants, or (b) the speaker’s positive affective stance toward the referent of the noun. Class I agreement can be used with these values both when the referent is also the addressee -- for example, speakers use Class I agreement with second-person reference when speaking to small children -- and when the referent is not the addressee or not present.

Note that because this socially deictic meaning derives from the Class I treatment of a noun that is prototypically not Class I, it is available only in speaking of men and boys. Nouns referring to women and girls are prototypically Class I; treating them as this class does not lead to the readings outlined above. I do not intend this to suggest that Class I treatment of such nouns has no socially deictic attributes, since social deixis is very likely involved in the contrast between Class I, Class IV, and Class II-like treatments of nouns referring to women and girls (see §8.4.2).

8.2.2 Non-specific meaning of Class I agreement

In addition to the social deixis usage described above, CT speakers also use Class I agreement for non-specific human reference. By this, I mean that Class I agreement in reference to an entity that is not prototypically Class I can convey either (a) that the speaker is referring to humans

\footnote{I find it more likely that (b) actually indexes a positive stance by any participant, as with (a), but I do not have the examples necessary to show this.}
in general rather than to a known set, or (b) that the speaker is referring to a particular set of humans, but without identifying them. The use of Class I agreement to convey non-specificity is presumably related to the fact that the human non-specific pronoun ji⁴e⁵ma³ (also the Class I distal demonstrative) and the human Wh-indefinite pronoun te⁵ʔe⁵ are members of Class I. The non-specific use of Class I agreement can occur in NPs that are headed by non-Class I referential nouns, but is much more common in NPs that are headed by nominalizations or pronouns; most of my examples below come from NPs of the latter type.

I will now discuss the two readings of Class I agreement listed above. First, the pronoun ji⁴e⁵ma³ and Class I agreement are used, to the total exclusion of other noun classes, in discourses which predicate states or activities of humans in general rather than of specific, known individuals (e.g. procedural texts). (13) provides some examples of the human generic use of Class I agreement.

(13) Class I agreement for generic human reference

a. ji⁴e⁵ma³ ni⁴³rɨ¹ ta⁴ ta⁴po³ku².
   ji⁴e⁵ma³  -ni⁴³  -rɨ¹  -ta⁴  -ta⁴  -po³ku².
   DIST.DEM.I steal -NMLZ.I TOP FUT 3.I.SBJ = be.imprisoned
   'Whoever steals, he will/should go to prison' / 'People who steal, they will/should go to prison.' (GE.LCS.20160712)

b. yeqe⁵ri⁵e⁵ma³ re³ ji⁴ wo³ka¹ã⁵e³ rɨ¹ ta⁴ na⁴ pa⁴ ta².
   yeqe⁵ri⁵e⁵ma³  -re³  -ji⁴  -wo³ka¹ã⁵e³  -rɨ¹  -ta⁴  -na⁴  -pa⁴  -ta².
   which.one.I = just NCL.I cow -have -NMLZ.I TOP 3.I.SBJ- 3.OBJ- hit.flank also
   'Whoever has a cow, they hit it on the flank' / 'People who have cows, they hit them on the flank.' (GE.SSG.20160713)

c. ri¹ yeqe⁴ma² ni⁴¹ʔi ̃ ⁴ wɨ⁴³ʔi⁴ i⁴ yeqe⁴tʃa¹ɨ ̃¹, kɨ²a⁴ na⁴, e³rɨ⁴ yeqe⁴tʃi⁴ tɨ³¹ʔɨ̃³ rɨ¹ ta² ni⁴¹ma̰¹.
   ri¹  yeqe⁴ma²  -ni⁴¹  -ʔi ̃ ⁴  -wɨ⁴³ʔi⁴  -i⁴  -yeqe⁴tʃa¹ɨ ̃¹  -kɨ²a⁴  -na⁴  -e³rɨ⁴  -yeqe⁴tʃi⁴  -tɨ³¹  -ʔɨ̃³  -rɨ¹  -ta²  -ni⁴¹  -ma̰¹.
   and.GEN.DEM.IV 3.IV.SBJ = COP one NCL:IV be.sad -NMLZ:state right?
   e³⁴ri⁴  -ŋi¹ri³  -ā⁴tʃi⁴  -ti³¹  -rɨ¹  -ta²  -ni⁴¹  -ma⁴ã³  -nɨ³¹  -ʔɨ̃³  -ni⁴¹.
   because possibility.modal -briefly?? 3.I.PRO -ACC TOP also 3.IV.SBJ = hit/kill
   'And that (what I was just talking about) is a bad thing, right, because they (intoxicated people) might kill people/one.' (SSG, iia 2:38)

Human generic reference is crucially different from reference to kinds of humans in CT. While human generic reference obligatorily requires Class I agreement, speakers typically use Class IV agreement in reference to kinds of humans, as exemplified by the Class IV nominalization on and agreement with the word bu⁵ʔɨ⁴ 'child' in (14).

(14) Class IV agreement for reference to kinds of humans yeqe⁴gu²ma³ na⁴ bu³¹ʔgu², wi⁴⁴ʔi⁴ i⁴ bu⁷ʔi⁴, ri¹ na⁴me⁴⁴ye⁵tʃi¹ i⁴ na⁴me⁴⁴ʔa⁷ ni⁴³ʔa⁷ na⁴ i⁴ bu⁷ʔi⁴. (dbu 0:23)
   yeqe⁴gu²ma³  -na⁴  -bu³¹  -ʔgu²  -wi⁴⁴ʔi⁴  -i⁴  -bu⁷ʔi⁴.
   and.then.NPST 3.IV.SBJ = be.child -SIMUL one NCL:IV be.child -NMLZ:IV TOP
   na⁴  -me⁴⁴  -ʔe⁵tʃi¹  -i⁴  -na⁴  -me⁴⁴  -ʔa⁷  -ni⁴³  -ʔa⁷  -na⁴  -i⁴  -bu⁷ʔi⁴.
   3.IV.SBJ = be.good = very NCL:IV 3.IV.PRO -COM/INST 3.IV.PRO -ACC COMP 3.IV.SBJ-
   u³  -ʔa⁷  -Sub
   'OK, so when a child (Class IV) is small, one (Class I) should tell him/her the following.'
Second, speakers also employ Class I agreement when they wish to refer to a known set of humans without identifying them. Such a situation can arise because the speaker lacks the evidence necessary to identify the referents (15a), because they cannot assert that the referents exist (15b), or because the identity of the referents is not topical in the discourse (15c).

(15) Class I agreement for unidentifiable human referents

a. Speaker has insufficient evidence to identify referent
   \[ ji^e^2ma^3 i^ta^aju^3 ri^1 ma^3ri^3 ti^3i^3 tja^3dau^1. \]
   DIST. DEM. I \( \text{VCL} = 3. I. SBJ = \text{arrive and now} \)
   3. I. PRO - ACC 1. SG. SBJ = see

   'I just saw someone arrive (but I don’t know who).' (GE.MFC.20160802)

b. Speaker cannot assert whether referent exists
   \[ ta^4tʃi^4 ja^4 ji^e^2ma^3 i^de^3tʃa^1i^3. \]
   3. I. SBJ = stand. up NCL. I \( \text{VCL} = \text{talk} \)
   'Anyonewho wants to talk should stand up.' (GE.MFC.20160802 based on OS 20160731)

c. Referent is potentially identifiable, but not actually identified (perhaps because of relevance -- following discourse is about the gardens, not their owners)
   \[ ki^3tʃi^3tu^1 -ki^3a^1 ta^4ma^3 na^3ja^3tʃi^3 ja^4 na^4 na^2ta^4tʃi^4 ga^4 gu^3ma^4 mu^3ki^3. ri^1 na^4a^3na^3tʃi^2gu^2 tʃi^2tʃa^4tʃe^3. \]
   (MFC, mkn 0:27)
   place.name -from.place \( \text{VCL} = \text{be.great} \)
   'The Cushillocochanos (Class IV) did not believe that it was going to be a heavy rainy season, and so some people (Class I) made gardens on the lake- and riverbanks.'

Many of my examples of the non-specific use of Class I agreement involve the use of the non-specific human pronouns \( ji^e^2ma^3 \) and \( te^2e^5 \) in subject position. This is unusual, since in other contexts CT speakers generally employ pronouns and deictics as stand-alone subjects only when the subject is also the topic or focus. It is possible that the use of these deictics serves to disambiguate non-specific uses of Class I agreement from social deixis uses and uses referring to a prototypically Class I entity. However, (13c) and (15c) show that the non-specific reading can still obtain in the absence of these two deictics.

A final, minor use of Class I agreement with non-Class I nouns is to convey that the referent of the noun is female. (16) exemplifies this use with a human and a non-human noun.

(16) Class I treatment of non-Class I nouns to convey female social gender

a. \( jo^7ra^5 \) ‘owner’ is usually Class IV: \( na^3a^2 jo^7ra^5 \) (PRES. DEM. IV owner) ‘this owner,’ \( jo^7ra^5 \)
   \( i^4 tʃi^3e^2tʃi^4 \) (owner NCL. I be.bad-NMLZ.IV) ‘ugly/bad owner’ (GE.LCS.20160722)

b. But acceptable as Class I: \( jo^7ra^5 ja^4 me^3e^5 \) (owner NCL. I be.good-NMLZ.I) ‘pretty/good owner (speaking of a woman)’ (GE.DGG.20160803)
c. *mai³ku⁵* 'Squirrel Monkey' is usually Class II: *da³¹a¹ mai³ku⁵* (PRES.DEM.II.ANIM Squirrel.Monkey) 'this Squirrel Monkey' (GE.LCS.20160721)

d. But acceptable as Class I: *da³¹e¹ mai³ku⁵* (PRES.DEM.I Squirrel.Monkey) 'this (female) Squirrel Monkey,' *ti³¹ma⁴ta³¹i²* (3.I.POSS-skin) 'its skin (speaking of a female Squirrel Monkey)' (GE.LCS.20160721)

8.3 Non-Class II underived animate nouns with Class II agreement

All underived animate nouns may also be treated as Class II. Treatment of an animate noun that is prototypically Class IV as Class II tends to convey that the referent is male, modulo modifiers indicating otherwise. Treatment of a non-human animate noun that is prototypically Class I as Class II also conveys that the referent is male. (17) and (18) respectively provide examples of Class II treatment of Class IV human nouns and Class I non-human animate nouns.

(17) Class II treatment of Class IV human nouns

a. *jo³ra⁵* 'owner' is usually Class IV: *ja³¹a² jo³ra⁵* (PRES.DEM.IV owner) 'this owner,' *jo³ra⁵ i⁴ tʃi⁴³e²ʔɨ ̃ ⁴* (owner NCL:IV be.bad-nmlz:IV) 'ugly/bad owner' (GE.LCS.20160722)

b. But acceptable as Class II: *jo³ra⁵ ja⁴ me³¹kɨ³* (owner NCL:II be.good-nmlz.II) 'pretty/good owner (speaking of a man)' (GE.DGG.20160803)

(18) Class II treatment of Class I non-human animate nouns (GE.LWG.20160803)

a. *o³ta⁵* 'hen, generic chicken' is usually Class I: *o³ta⁵ ja⁴ ta³¹e³* (chicken NCL:I be.big-nmlz.I) 'big hen/generic chicken'

b. But acceptable as Class II: *o³ta⁵ ja⁴ ta³¹kɨ³* (chicken NCL:I be.big-NMLZ.II) 'big rooster'

It is also acceptable to treat Class I underived nouns referring to female/feminine animate beings as Class II, as in *wt⁴³t⁴ ja⁴ tʃi³ũ³ra¹* (one-NCL:II/IV NCL:I/II lady) 'one lady' (GE.LWG.20160722).

However, almost all examples of Class II treatment of nouns referring to feminine animates in my data involve a Class II nominalization, either as the head of the noun phrase or as a modifier of an underived nominal head. I suspect that the grammaticality of Class II treatment of Class I nouns stems from the unusual agreement properties of Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animates. Therefore, I now turn to discussion of a set of nominalizations -- the agent/instrument nominalization, the zero nominalization, and Class II nominalizations referring to women -- which display outlier behavior in noun class agreement.

8.4 Nominalizations with unusual class behavior

8.4.1 Agent/instrument and zero nominalizations

I mentioned in §3 that the deverbal nouns derived with the class nominalizers -e³ (Class I), -ki³ (Class II), -⁴ne¹ (Class III), and -ʔɨ ̃ ⁴ (Class IV) must be treated as belonging to the class associated with the nominalizer. While all underived nouns belonging to Classes I, II, and III can be treated as Class IV, this is not possible for deverbal nominalizations with the class nominalizers. Likewise, deverbal nominalizations that are not Class I cannot be treated as Class I for either social deixis or indefinite purposes.

However, this greater degree of rigidity in class assignment is a property of the class nominalizers, not of deverbal nominalizations in general in the language. Deverbal nominalizations derived with CT’s two other nominalizing constructions -- the agent/instrument nominalizer -ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ and a zero nominalization -- may be treated as belonging to multiple noun classes.
I begin with agent/instrument nominalizations. The agent/instrument nominalizer -ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ applies to a verb stem and derives a noun which can denote either a person who characteristically performs the verb, or an instrument which is used to perform the verb: for example, kʷa̰¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ (know-NMLZ:ag/inst) means both 'signal' and 'human) guide.' Agent/instrument nominalizations may be treated as belonging to any noun class (19). When they are treated as Class I, the noun phrase headed by the nominalization can be read only as referring to a human female agent (19a). Treated as Class II, they may be read as referring either to a human, male agent or an inanimate instrument (19b). (On the instrument reading, note that Class II contains many nouns referring to tools. I imagine that an agent/instrument nominalization treated as Class I could also be read as inanimate if it plausibly referred to a kind of inanimate that is a semantically predictable member of Class I, such as a sweet fruit.) Treated as Class III, the agent/instrument nominalization can refer only to an inanimate instrument, reflecting the total absence of animates from Class III (19c). Finally, treated as Class IV, the nominalization can refer to either an agent (with minimal implicatures as to the agent's social gender) or an instrument.

(19) Agent/instrument nominalization may be treated as any noun class (GE.DGG.20160803)
   a. Class I: n̄a̰i tʃi⁵ ru¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ ɟa⁴ ɟa⁴ e³ (sew-NI:clothes-NMLZ:ag/inst NCL:I be.old-NMLZ.I) 'old seamstress,' *'old sewing machine'
   b. Class II: n̄a̰i tʃi⁵ ru¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ ja⁴ ja⁴ ki³ (sew-NI:clothes-NMLZ:ag/inst NCL:II be.old-NMLZ.II) 'old tailor,' *'old sewing machine'
   c. Class III: n̄a̰i tʃi⁵ ru¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ ja⁴ ta³¹ ʔɨ̃⁴ ne¹ (sew-NI:clothes-NMLZ:ag/inst NCL:III be.big-NMLZ.III) 'big sewing machine,' *'big person who sews'
   d. Class IV: n̄a̰i tʃi⁵ ru¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ i⁴ ja⁴ ʔɨ̃⁴ (sew-NI:clothes-NMLZ:ag/inst NCL:IV be.old-NMLZ.IV) 'old tailor/seamstress,' cf: n̄a̰i tʃi⁵ ru¹ ru⁵ɨ ̃ ¹ i⁴ ta³¹ ʔɨ̃⁴ (sew-NI:clothes-NMLZ:ag/inst NCL:IV be.big-NMLZ.IV) 'big sewing machine'

The zero nominalization is a morphological process which applies to a verb stem and derives a noun which is phonologically identical to the verb stem, but which takes case marking (like a noun) and cannot take subject or object proclitics or assign case (like a verb). When applied to a stative verb, the zero nominalization derives an abstract noun referring to the state denoted by the verb, as in n̄e⁵ ja⁴ i⁷ 'love someone (transitive verb), be sad (intransitive verb); sadness, love (noun).' With a dynamic verb, the zero nominalization usually refers to an event or state associated with the verb, but can also refer to a result of the verb. For example, the zero nominalization of the verb root ma̰¹ 'hit, kill' means both 'fight, event of hitting/killing' and 'wound, tangible result of being hit.' I analyze this phenomenon as zero nominalization, rather than as evidence of a weak distinction between nominal and verbal roots, because the process applies to verb stems which are derived with exclusively verbal morphology as well as to bare roots.

Event, state, and result zero nominalizations are always treated as Class IV in my data, as exemplified in (20). In this, they follow the (small number of) underived abstract nouns and event nouns in the language, all of which are also Class IV.⁶

(20) Zero nominalization referring to inanimate treated as Class IV (GE.DGG.20160803)
   wi⁴³ ʔi⁴ i⁴ ta³¹ ʔã⁵ e² i⁴ ta³¹ ʔɨ̃⁴ (*ja⁴ ta³¹ ki³, *ja⁴ ta³¹ e³)
   wi⁴³ ʔi⁴ i⁴ ta³¹ ʔã⁵ e² -0 i⁴ ta³¹ -ʔɨ̃⁴
   one NCL:IV be.big *NI:soul-NMLZ:state NCL:IV be.big -NMLZ.IV

⁶Note in (20) that noun incorporation in CT is word-class-preserving. It is the zero nominalization, not the incorporated noun, which allows the verb stem ta³¹ ʔã⁵ e² to participate in an NP and appear without subject marking.
'a great happiness'

In addition to zero nominalizations which derive event and result nouns, there are also minimally three zero nominalizations which refer to animates: \( j\alpha^3t^3 \) 'be male (verb), man (noun),' \( \eta e^2 \) 'be female (verb), woman (noun),' and \( du^3i^3 \) 'be a person, behave correctly (verb), person (noun).’ I analyze these words as nominalizations, rather than as underived nouns which happen to be homophonous with verb roots, because they cannot be used with Class I agreement. For example, to make non-specific reference to a man, one must use the Class I nominalization \( j\alpha^3t^3e^3 \) in place of the zero nominalization \( j\alpha^3t^3 \).

While my data on the animate zero nominalizations is incomplete, \( \eta e^2 \) is generally treated as Class IV, \( du^3i^3 \) always as Class II, and \( j\alpha^3t^i^3 \) as either Class II or Class IV (21). I do not have negative data on the possibility of treating \( \eta e^2 \) as Class I or II or \( du^3i^3 \) as Class IV, although the quantity of data showing Class II agreement with \( du^3i^3 \) suggests to me that it probably cannot be treated as Class IV.

(21) Class behavior of zero nominalizations referring to animates

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. \( \eta e^2 \) as Class IV: \( j\alpha^4ma^4 \eta e^2 \) (GEN.DEM.PST be.female-NMLZ:0) 'that woman' (GE.DGG.20160801)
  \item b. \( j\alpha^3t^3 \) as Class IV: \( j\alpha^3t^3 i^4 t\alpha^5\eta^4 \) (be.male-NMLZ:0 NCL.IV be.white-NMLZ.IV) 'light-skinned man' (GE.LCS.20160721)
  \item c. \( j\alpha^3t^3 \) as Class II: \( j\alpha^3t^3 j^4 t\alpha^5\eta^3 \) (be.male-NMLZ:0 NCL.II be.white-NMLZ.II) 'light-skinned man' (GE.LCS.20160721)
  \item d. \( du^3i^3 \) as Class II: \( da^3la^1 du^3i^3 \) (PRES.DEM.II be.person-NMLZ:0) 'here he/she is, the person' (GE.LCS.20160722, also SSG.20160723)
\end{itemize}

8.4.2 Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animates

Nouns referring to human women and certain notionally inanimate objects, including spears, knives, mirrors, and money -- what I will term "feminine animates" -- occupy an unusual place in the noun class agreement system. Underived nouns referring to feminine animates are prototypically treated as Class I; like other underived nouns, they may also be treated as Class IV. Similarly, Class I and IV nominalizations referring to feminine animates pattern with other class nominalizations in that they rigidly require agreement matching the class of the nominalization.

On the other hand, nominalizations which are formed with the Class II nominalizer \(-ki^3\) and refer to feminine animates, as well as the feminine animate pronoun \( \eta i^3ma^2 \), do not display Class II agreement. Instead, they pattern with Class I underived animate nouns. First, like underived Class I nouns, Class II feminine animate nominalizations and \( \eta i^3ma^2 \) permit Class I and Class IV agreement on demonstratives (22a, b). They do not allow Class II agreement (22c).

(22) Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animates: demonstrative agreement

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Class I acceptable: \( da^3la^1 pa^4ki^3 \) (PRES.DEM.I be.unmarried.adult.woman-NMLZ.II) 'this young woman,' \( gu^4e^2 pa^4ki^3, ji^4e^2ma^3 pa^4ki^3 \) (GE.LCS.20160722)
  \item b. Class IV acceptable: \( ja^a^2 pa^4ki^3 \) (PRES.DEM.IV be.unmarried.adult.woman-NMLZ.II) 'this young woman' (GE.LCS.20160722), \( ja^a^2 \eta e^4ki^3 \) (PRES.DEM.IV be.female-NMLZ.II) (GE.SSG.20160723)
  \item c. Class II unacceptable: \( *ji^3ma^4 \eta e^4ki^3 \) (DIST.DEM.II be.female-NMLZ.II), intended: 'that woman' (GE.DGG.20160801)
\end{itemize}
Second, and again like underived animate Class I nouns, Class II feminine animate nominalizations permit three pronouns in anaphora: the Class I pronoun, the dedicated feminine animate pronoun $\eta i^1 m a^2$ (allowing either a Class I/II or a Class IV particle), or the Class II-IV pronoun $n i^3 m a^4$ (requiring a Class IV particle) (23a, b, d). It is not possible to treat a Class II feminine animate nominalization as though it were a Class II noun for purposes of pronoun and particle agreement (23c).

(23) Class II nominalizations referring to feminine animates: pronoun and particle agreement

a. Class I $n i^3 m a^4$ acceptable: $d a u^1 k i^3 j a^4 t a^3$ 'side of mirror; $t i^3 m a^4 k i^3 w a^3$ (3.I.PRO-*side) its side (speaking of a mirror)' (GE.LCS.20160721)

b. $\eta i^1 m a^2$ and Class I/II particle acceptable: $\eta i^1 ? i^3 t f a^3 d a u^1 j a^4 p a^4 k i^3$ (GE.LWG.20160726)

The relevance of this phenomenon for a featural theory of CT noun class is that nouns must be specified for the feature [feminine] independent of their class membership. Absent this feature,
it would be impossible to generate a difference in agreement behavior between Class II nominalizations that do not refer to feminine animate entities (which rigidly require Class II agreement) and those that do.

The existence of Class II-like feminine animate nominalizations is also relevant to the pragmatics of noun class in the language. Recall from §8.1 and §8.2 that a noun referring to a specific male human may be treated as either Class II, which is the prototypical case; Class I, generating the social deixis readings described in §8.2.1; or Class IV. The data in this section show there are likewise three agreement possibilities for nouns referring to female animates. They may be treated as Class I, which does not yield the social deixis reading with nouns referring to males; they may participate in the agreement pattern seen with formally Class II nominalizations and the pronoun \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \); or they may be treated as Class IV.

The agreement pattern described in this section appears to be the most ‘marked’ treatment of feminine animate nouns, in two ways. First, the agreement pattern found with Class II nominalizations and \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \) is by far the least frequent (in all types of data) of the three possible patterns. Second, speakers often have strong metalinguistic reactions to choices between \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \) and related pro-forms on the one hand, and Class I or IV pro-forms on the other. For example, there were many moments in elicitation in which speakers found my proposed uses of \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \) to be funny but not ungrammatical, and many in transcribing texts where speakers expressed the desire to change a Class IV pro-form referring to a feminine animate to one of the forms agreeing with \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \). References to feminine animates with prototypical Class I agreement, on the other hand, were never funny and never involved, as either original or target form, in change requests.

This leads me to suspect that use of \( \text{ŋi}^{1}\text{ma}^{2} \) and the agreement paradigm described in this section may actually be an index of the SAPs' non-respect for the referent -- a socially deictic meaning opposite that found with Class I treatment of non-Class I nouns. Whether or not this is correct, the meaning of Class II-like agreement with feminine animate nouns must be calculated against the availability of Class I and Class IV agreement with such nouns.