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1. Introduction

In this paper I describe Moro noun phrases in detail, including descriptions of noun phrases, deixis, possession, enumeration, and attributive modification, with comments on bare nouns and word order. Moro is a member of the Western-Heiban subgroup of Kordofanian languages (Schadeberg 1981), indigenously spoken in the Nuba Mountains of Sudan just north of the recently-formed border with South Sudan. This paper describes noun phrases in Thetogovela, one of seven dialects of Moro.¹

Moro is a highly agglutinative language with rich inflectional morphology. One distinctive property of Moro is complex verbal morphology, involving alternations for tense, aspect, agreement with subjects, incorporated object pronouns, and valence-affecting suffixes marking passives, causatives, and applicatives. Phonologically, Moro is characterized by a (C)V(C) syllable template, allowing nasals, liquids, voiced fricatives, and geminates as codas. Moro is a tonal language with a privative high tone (Jenks & Rose 2011).

¹ The data in this paper represent the speech of Elyasir Julima and Ikhelas Elahmer of San Diego, California, collected during several elicitation sessions between 2008 and 2011. I am very grateful for their assistance, hospitality, and friendship. Sharon Rose and George Gibbard provided crucial suggestions and corrections for an earlier draft of this paper for which I am indebted to them. All mistakes are mine. This research is part of the Moro Language Project (moro.ucsd.edu) and was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant No. 0745973. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

Abbreviations: ADJ – adjectival final vowel; CL – weak noun class agreement and concord; FOC – focus prefix; CMP – complementizer; IPFV – imperfective; NSRC – non-subject relative clause; PAS – passive; PFV – perfective; POS – possessive – PST – past tense; PL – plural; REDUP – reduplication; RTC – root clause; SCL – strong concord; SG – singular; SRC – subject relative clause.
The outline of the paper is as follows: section 2 introduces Moro noun classes, section 3 discusses the distribution and interpretation of bare nouns, section 4 concerns demonstratives, section 5 possessives, section 6 numerals, and section 7 discusses adjectives and relative clauses. Section 8 briefly examines noun phrase-internal word order.

2. Noun classes

As in many Niger-Kordofanian languages, Moro nouns are organized into a large and complex system of noun classes or grammatical genders. Moro nouns fall into classes based on their behavior with respect to two basic diagnostics. The first diagnostic for noun class is the initial segment of the noun, a synthetic marker of gender and number. This initial segment generally narrows down the set of possible classes that the noun could be part of. The second, decisive, diagnostic for noun class is the markers of concord and agreement that appear on adnominal modifiers and verbs with a given noun.

The description of Moro noun classes in this section relies heavily on Gibbard et al. (2009, see also Black & Black 1971). Gibbard et al relate their noun classes to those proposed for the Heiban subgroup of Kordofanian by Stevenson (1955-6, see also Schadeberg 1981). This grouping is presented in Table 1. While Moro noun classes do coincide with Stevenson’s numbering system for Kordofanian to some extent, there are several noun classes that do not fit neatly into Stevenson’s. For this reason, I continue to use the concord segments to identify the noun classes, i.e. g/l-class rather than class 1 or class 2. In interlinear translations I use ‘CL’ to gloss noun class agreement and concord.

Table 1. Noun classes (from Gibbard et al. 2009:107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>SG/PL</th>
<th>Stevenson</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g/l</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>evaja</td>
<td>lvaja</td>
<td>'pauper'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>udó</td>
<td>loq'ó</td>
<td>'worm'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/ŋ</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>lvora</td>
<td>ṣavora</td>
<td>'stick'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>labú</td>
<td>ṣoóbó</td>
<td>'well'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j/j</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>ajén</td>
<td>ején</td>
<td>'mountain'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ṣdùní</td>
<td>iðùní</td>
<td>'hearthstone'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above shows that in many cases the plural of one noun class is the singular of another. For example, l-concord marks both plural nouns in the g/l class as well as singular in the l/ŋ and l/n classes.

Returning to the question of the initial segment on the noun itself, it is important to note that while this segment generally corresponds to the concord prefix, there are exceptions. The first large class of exceptions are nouns which control g concord. These nouns are usually vowel-initial. The exceptions involve an initial w- that always precedes a low-central vowel, e.g. wárá ‘fly, bee.’ This state of affairs likely arose due to an unconditioned loss of word-initial /gʷ-/ as observed by Stevenson for class 1 nouns. Before most vowels, both /g/ and /w/ were lost word-initially, though /w/ was apparently retained before /a/, explaining the exceptions. Non-central vowels are often reduced in the plural of the g/l-class as well, as seen in the ud̩ə́~lə̍d̩ʷə́ ‘worm’ and otʃː~nətʃː ‘milk pot’.

The second class of exceptions in terms of correspondence between the initial segment of the noun and the concord segment it controls involves the j/j class, whose members generally are vowel initial. However, the initial vowels in this class are systematic: singular nouns begin with central vowels, either /a~ʌ/, while the initial segment in plural nouns of this class is a front vowel, either /e~ɪ/. Whether the initial vowel is the higher or lower variant depends on the root’s status for controlling Moro vowel-height harmony (Gibbard 2006, Gibbard et al. 2009).

The members of these purely formal noun classes do show weak semantic cohesion, though there are many exceptions. Gibbard et al. (2009) observe that class g/l is generally human, class l/ŋ includes many long objects, and
small animals tend to cluster in class ŋ/ɲ. Mass nouns are generally unpaired class ð or ŋ.

In addition to these major classes, Moro also possesses smaller noun classes that do not take plurals or have only a few representatives. As these noun classes consist of some recombination of one of the concord prefixes from Table 1, I will put them aside for the remainder of this paper, and simply focus on the classes above.

3. Moro bare nouns as arguments

Moro lacks determiners or articles with unmodified nouns. Therefore, bare noun are used in argument position with a range of meanings including definite, indefinite, and generic. The following example demonstrates that bare nouns can be used both for novel and familiar noun phrases:

(1)  
   a. érêtá  í-g-A-satý-ú ówá  n-órářy
       yesterday 1SG-CL-RTC-see-PFV  SG.woman and-SG.man
       ‘Yesterday I saw a woman and a man.’
   b. órářy  gá-g-oval-á n-ówář  gá-g-obal-á
       SG.man PST-CL-tall-ADJ and-SG.woman PST-CL-short-ADJ
       ‘The man was tall, but the woman was short.’

There is an asymmetry between singular and plural nouns in their ability to receive generic interpretations. As in many Indo-European languages, plural nouns can be interpreted generically while singular forms of nouns cannot. This is shown in subject position in (2) and object position in (3):

(2)  
   a. eða  j-a-ŋar-á
       PL.meat CL-RTC-good-ADJ
       ‘Meat is good.’
   b. rða  r-a-ŋar-á
       SG.meat CL-RTC-good-ADJ
       ‘The/Some piece of meat is good.’

(3)  
   a. néně́ř  ná-ŋe-d-á úmĩ́ř  é-g-a-bwáŋ-á eða
       when CMP-1SG-be-PFV SG.boy 1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV PL.meat
       ‘When I was a boy, I liked meat.’
b. ŋéné ná-ne-dó umia, é-g-a-boya-ña rða
when CMP-1SG-be-PFV SG.boy 1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV SG.meat
‘When I was a boy, I liked the piece of meat.’

Using a singular noun in subject position in (2b) forces a referential reading for the subject, while the singular noun in (3b) results in a pragmatically odd sentence, namely, that the speaker liked a particular piece of meat when he was a boy. These examples show that bare singular nouns cannot be interpreted generically.

Bare singular noun phrases can receive non-specific interpretations in non-episodic environments, however. For example, in the following sentence a bare singular noun occurs in the subject and object position of a conditional:

(4) umía atə kért-ó rða, náj-s-é
SG.boy if CL-has-PFV SG.meat CMP-3SG-eat-SUB
‘If a boy has a piece of meat, then he eats it.’

This sentence can be used to discuss a hypothetical situation. Thus, in the antecedent of a conditional, singular noun phrases can felicitously receive true indefinite interpretations.

The distribution of bare nouns in Moro, in particular the asymmetry between bare singular and bare plurals, is typical of languages which lack articles but which do have a generalized number distinction. Examples of similar languages include Russian and Hindi (Dayal 2004).

4. Demonstratives

Moro distinguishes two demonstratives, one form proximal and the other distal. Demonstratives are marked with the noun class of their nominal head. Both forms occur immediately after the noun, and both phonologically fuse with the noun in regular speech:

(5) a. udadí
SG.person ‘the/a person’

b. udadí-kści
SG.person-scl ‘this person’

c. udadí-kści-atí-ksea
SG.person-scl-that-scl ‘that person’

(6) a. dámala
SG.camel ‘the/a camel’

b. dámala-dści-i
SG.camel-scl-this ‘this camel’

c. dámala-dści-atí-dści
SG.camel-scl-that-scl ‘that camel’
Two issues are of particular interest here. The first is the change in the vowel-quality on the final syllable of the root, visible in (5b-c) and (6b-c), and the change in its tone, visible on the final vowel of ðamala in both (6b) and (6c). The second issue is the geminate concord marker in the proximal form — glossed scl for “strong noun class concord” for reasons to be made clear. Wherever strong concord occurs, the geminated concord occurs in addition to high tone and vowel quality changes seen on final vowel of the nouns in (5) and (6).

In contexts where the noun is omitted, such as in fragment answers, demonstrative forms occur with an initial í:

(7)  a. Q: ŋʷ-ádámdá  g-ánga  n-á-b*áŋ-á
       FOC-SG.book  CL-which  CMP-2SG-want-IPFV
      ‘Which book is the one you want?’

      b. A: íkz-i
      c. A: íkz-átiükə
      ‘This one.’
      ‘That one.’

This clitic is also present in the demonstrative forms in (5-6), but it has fused with the final vowel of the noun. The morphological concatenation of the noun with í/ triggers a predictable process of vowel hiatus resolution while H tone is assigned to the noun (see Rose & Strabone to appear, ex. 12):

/í,í,í,í/ → [i], and /a,ʌ+í/ → [ʌ].

Evidence that the /í/ forms a morpheme with the geminate class prefix comes from the fact that they co-occur on all definite modified noun phrases in Moro, including demonstratives, possessives (section 5), and some relative clauses (section 7.1); one never occurs without the other. Evidence that this prefix is morphologically separate from the demonstrative itself comes from the existence of a second H tone on the distal demonstrative; Moro morphemes, whether bound or free, functional or lexical, have only been found to permit a single specification of H (Jenks & Rose 2011).

The geminate concord marker itself is usually just the geminated class marker which appears on verbs, though there are two exceptions:

Table 2. Demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>‘this’</th>
<th>‘that’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>íkci</td>
<td>íkz-átiükə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>íläi</td>
<td>ílä-átiükə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ínči</td>
<td>ínč-átiükə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first exception is the j-class, which provides reliable evidence for the existence of geminate concord as it is always pronounced /s/ in the geminated form, while verbal agreement occurs as /j/:

\[ \text{(8)} \quad \text{ajén} \quad s-\text{atí-sa} \quad j-\text{a-satí-ən-ú} \]

\text{SG.mountain} \quad \text{SCL-that-SCL} \quad \text{CL-RTC-see-PAS-PFV}

‘That mountain was seen.’

The j+s alternation will serve as an important diagnostic for geminate concord below as initial geminates are simplified following a consonant (8, see section 5.2). The second exception is the ɡ-class, which is always realized as /k/ in geminate forms, even when reduced.

While the geminated agreement form can usually be predicted from the simple agreement form, the /s/ and /k/ alternants are less straightforward. Gibbard et al. (2009) treat /s/ and /k/ as allomorphs of /j/ and /k/, respectively. As two forms of concord or agreement must be distinguished, I will introduce new terminology to refer to each form. The geminated form seen on demonstratives will be referred to as the strong form (glossed SCL), while the simple form seen on verbal subject agreement will be referred to as the weak form (glossed CL). Strong concord is always accompanied by an initial /í/ which attaches to the noun when possible, as described above.

\[ \text{2 An alternative would be to derive the geminated form from two simple forms which arose due to some morphological phenomenon. For example, the /í/-element may have its own agreement, íC, which becomes geminate with the agreement of the following modifier: íC-C-Mod. Yet this would require /jː→[s] to be an active synchronic rule in Moro, a surprising result as it would involves changes in voice, manner, and place of articulation.} \]
5. Possessors

Three separate forms of possessives must be distinguished in Moro. Which is chosen depends on whether the possessor is a full noun phrase or a pronoun on the one hand, and on the other whether the possessum belongs to a small closed class of kinship terms which take a distinct set of possessive suffixes. Like all modifiers in Moro, possessors occur postnominally. Section 5.1 deals with possessive noun phrases, section 5.2 with possessive pronouns, and section 5.3 with inalienably possessed nouns.

5.1 Possessive noun phrases

Possessive noun phrases in Moro are marked with strong concord followed by a H-toned schwa. Table 3 provides possessive noun phrase following nouns from each concord class from Table 1. (NB: Kuku and Tutu are common names for men in Moro).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>‘N of kuku’</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>užgá-k-ʼtůu</td>
<td>‘Tutu’s person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>lidget-ʼbıkúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s people’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>namerť-ʼnškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s horses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ajén-ʼsškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s mountain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>loser-ʼbškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s sticks’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋer-ʼpškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s child’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>ŋer-ʼpškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s children’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>dąpš-ʼdškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s friend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rąpš-ʼřškúkú</td>
<td>‘Kuku’s friends’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kertz (2006) is an earlier description of Moro possessives. In some cases, such as predicative possessives, she gives more details than I do here. In most cases, the forms and paradigms I provide are more complete.

‘Tutu’s person’ has the idiomatic meaning ‘Tutu’s wife,’ or ‘X’s husband’ were the possessor a woman.
The possessor was changed from kūku to ṭuṭu in the g-class above to avoid regressive voicing dissimilation, which applies to the first of two voiceless segments. Thus, the strong concord marker become voiced before a following voiceless stop, e.g. udš-g-ʲ-kūku.\(^5\) Additionally, gemination does not occur after a schwa or closed syllable, as discussed in section 4.

The downstep in possessive forms is triggered by the occurrence of two lexical H tones on adjacent syllables within a phonological phrase. This is a predictable environment for downstep in Moro, and is also found on adjacent H tones in the verb stem.

Possessive noun phrases induce the same changes on the final vowel of the root that arise before demonstratives, including raising of the vowel and the addition of a H tone. This can be seen in the l-class form laver in Table 3, which is underlyingly all L (cf. Table 1). The following example shows that, like with demonstratives, the changes on the final syllable of the noun can be attributed to an initial /í/ which fuses with the final vowel of the noun.

\[(9)\]
\[\text{a.} \quad \text{Q:} \quad \text{dámala} \quad \text{δ-άŋga} \quad \text{δ-έ-tʃon-ά} \quad \text{FOC-SG.camel} \quad \text{CL-which} \quad \text{CL-SRC-hungry-ADJ} \]
\[\text{‘Which camel is hungry?’}\]
\[\text{b.} \quad \text{A:} \quad \text{təː-ʃ-ʔkúkú} \quad \text{‘Kuku’s.’}\]

Thus, possessives and demonstratives form a natural class in Moro in that they are marked with strong concord, triggering changes on the final vowel of preceding nouns occurring with an initial /í/ in isolation.

While possessive noun phrases generally occur with strong concord (10a), they can also co-occur with demonstratives (10b-c). When this happens, the demonstrative precedes the possessive, with only the demonstrative taking strong concord. The possessive is marked with weak concord:

\[(10)\]
\[\text{a.} \quad \text{έ-γ-α-bʰ-άŋ-ά} \quad \text{jamal-άς-} \quad \text{PL.camel-RTC-like-IPFV} \quad \text{I like Kuku’s camels.’}\]
\[\text{b.} \quad \text{έ-γ-α-bʰ-άŋ-ά} \quad \text{jamal-άς-ι} \quad \text{j-ʃ-kúku} \quad \text{1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV} \quad \text{PL.camel-RTC-POSL-POS-Kuku}\]

\(^5\) For more on voicing dissimilation in Moro see Gibbard et al. (2009, fn.3), Jenks & Rose (2011, fn. 6), and especially Rose (2011).
Together these forms suggest that strong concord is unique to the first modifier after the noun. Confirmation for this idea comes from the fact that when multiple “possessives” occur, only the first is marked with strong concord:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(11)} & \quad \text{é-g-a-b\textsuperscript{w}án-á} & \quad \text{δápɔ\textsuperscript{2}-\dℓ\textsuperscript{2}-\dλa} & \quad \text{δ-\dλð-kúkú} \\
& 1\text{SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV} & \text{SG.friend-scl-that-scl} & \text{CL-POS-Kuku} \\
& \text{‘I like that friend of Kuku’s.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, we can conclude that the strong class marker is not an inalienable property of possessive modifiers, but rather that there is something special about the combination of certain definite modifiers with the head noun.

### 5.2 Possessive pronouns

Possessive pronouns have an identical syntactic distribution to possessive noun phrases and, like possessive noun phrases, show strong concord with their nominal head. Thus, the addition of a possessive pronoun to an all-L noun induces the addition of a root-final H tone and the raising of the final vowel, as introduced in section 3:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(12)} & \quad \begin{array}{ll}
& \text{a. l\textsuperscript{\textregistered}-\varepsilon-r\textsuperscript{2}} & \quad \text{\textsuperscript{\textregistered}-\varepsilon-\text{\textsuperscript{\textregistered}}-l\textsuperscript{\textregistered}} \\
& \text{SG.stick} & \text{SG.stick-scl-my-REDUP} \\
& \text{‘the/a stick’} & \text{‘my stick’}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

As before, the changes on the final vowel of the root are due to fusion of /\textsuperscript{\textregistered}/ with the final vowel of the noun:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(13)} & \quad \begin{array}{ll}
& \text{a. Q: ŋ\textsuperscript{w}-\dλ\textsuperscript{2}m\textsuperscript{2}l\textsuperscript{2}} & \quad \text{δ-\dgg} & \quad \text{δ-\dλð-t\textsuperscript{f}\textsuperscript{2}n-\dλ} \\
& \text{FOC-SG.camel} & \text{CL-which} & \text{CL-SRC-hungry-ADJ} \\
& \text{‘Which camel is hungry?’}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{b. A: \d\textsuperscript{\textregistered}-\varepsilon\textsuperscript{\textregistered}-\varepsilon\textsuperscript{\textregistered}} \\
& \text{‘Mine.’}
\end{align*}
\]
Moro possessive pronouns, as do all its pronouns, distinguish eight person-number combinations, including a inclusive-exclusive distinction for first person plurals and a dual inclusive form. The internal structure of possessive pronouns includes strong concord and a person-number formative marker followed by a monosyllabic reduplicant. While the internal structure is only shown for the first row in Table 4, the other forms have identical structure:

Table 4. Possessive pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>1DU_INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ɪkː-äŋ-kaŋ</td>
<td>ɪkː-alaŋ-ki</td>
<td>ɪkː-o-ke</td>
<td>ɪkː-öŋ-koŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ɪlaŋalŋη</td>
<td>ɪlaŋaŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪla</td>
<td>ɪlaŋalŋη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɪnaŋalŋη</td>
<td>ɪnaŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪnaŋe</td>
<td>ɪnaŋalŋη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ɪsamaŋaŋ</td>
<td>ɪsamaŋis</td>
<td>ɪsos</td>
<td>ɪsamaŋaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>ɪpəŋaŋ</td>
<td>ɪpəŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪpəŋe</td>
<td>ɪpəŋaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ɪnpaŋaŋ</td>
<td>ɪnpaŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪnpaŋe</td>
<td>ɪnpaŋaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ɪndaŋaŋ</td>
<td>ɪndaŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪndaŋe</td>
<td>ɪndaŋaŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>ɪraŋaŋ</td>
<td>ɪraŋalŋi</td>
<td>ɪraŋe</td>
<td>ɪraŋaŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several morphological and phonological processes are active in these forms. Beginning with phonology, the most pervasive alternation is a rule of schwa-epenthesis, wherein a schwa is inserted between a nasal and a heterorganic sonorant or voiced fricative. Thus, compare ɪpənen with ɪnen or ɪkenen. Only the first form undergoes schwa epenthesis because of the heterorganic /n + ñ/ sequence. The /l + ñ/ sequence does not undergo schwa-epenthesis because it is homorganic, while the /n + k/ sequence surfaces intact because /k/ is an obstruent. A second rule is the epenthesis of /d/ between /n + r/ sequences, only obviously alternating in rendren, but also likely active in the first person plural inclusive. This is a general phenomenon in Moro, [ndr]
sequences are common, but [nr] is unattested (cf. Gibbard et al 2009, p. 113). There is a third rule conditioning the appearance of geminates, which cannot co-occur with a coda in the previous syllable — i.e. they cannot occur after VC sequences. Additionally, geminates are not found to be reduced after the inserted schwa. While geminates do not seem to occur after schwa (cf. Table 3, for example), this could also be seen as arising due to the ordering of degemination before schwa epenthesis: ílə̃ŋ → ílə̃ŋə by degemination, ílə̃ŋə → ílə̃ŋə as schwa epenthesis, an instance of counterbleeding.

One difficult issue raised by these forms is whether the reduplicated final syllable arose due to some fossilized historical process or is the output of a productive morphological reduplication operation (cf. Kertz 2006). The functional status of pronouns and the rather idiosyncratic nature of the reduplicant support the fossilization analysis. Yet the form of the reduplicant is predictable, supporting the latter analysis. The generalization is as follows: if the whole class-pronoun sequence is a single syllable of the shape CVN, it is reduplicated in its entirety. Otherwise, the reduplicant is of the form –Ci or –Ce, as there is active vowel harmony between the base and reduplicant.

Further support for the productivity of reduplication comes from variation; shorter forms were sometimes provided as alternatives for the full CCVN reduplicant. Thus, lə̃ŋə as lə̃ŋələ̃ŋə, and lə̃ŋə as lə̃ŋəle. Further work is needed to determine whether these are free variants or whether they might represent dialectal differences.

5.3 Inalienable possession

There is a small class of Moro nouns which take the possessive pronouns as suffixes, an instance of inalienable (or obligatory) possession (Nichols 1988). Kertz (2006) observes that these forms only take nonsingular person suffixes which are syncretic for singular and plural possessors. Eight inalienably possessed nouns have been identified, all kinship terms, a unsurprising finding from a crosslinguistic perspective (cf. Bickel & Nichols 2011):

| Table 5. Inalienable possession: Singular forms |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| GLOSS            | 1.EX             | 1DU.IN           | 1PL.IN           | 2                | 3                |
| ’mother’         | lə̃ŋ-áñ          | lə̃ŋ-áñ          | lə̃ŋ-áñ-áñdr     | lə̃ŋ-áñ          | lə̃ŋ-áñ          |
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The translations provided for the kinship terms above are oversimplified; thus, et- ‘father’ can also be used to one’s father’s brother, while úd- ‘uncle/aunt’ is used to describe one’s mother’s brother. Nadel (1947: p. 209-10) provides a more detailed description of kinship terminology in Moro.6

One interesting property of these suffixes is that they control the vowel harmony of the root, revealing an asymmetry in the harmony system, as discussed by Gibbard (2006). While the high-vowel suffix –ə́ŋ conditions high-vowel harmony on the noun root, e.g. ur-ə́ŋ, the low-vowel suffixes do not condition low-vowel harmony, e.g. un-ə́ŋ. Additionally, the suffixes –áɲ and –ə́ń undergo active harmony conditioned by high-vowel roots, e.g. un-ɪ́ŋ, while -ə́lo does not. Furthermore, vowel raising is only triggered on these suffixes –ə́ń when the root is monosyllabic. Together, though, these facts indicate 1) that high vowels are marked and control vowel harmony in Moro, 2) that vowel harmony can be both root-controlled and affix-controlled, and 3) that affixes differ in whether they undergo harmony. Note too that the first person exclusive, second, and third person in Table 5 above are closely related to the pronominal formative in the corresponding possessive pronouns from Table 4.

Kertz (2006) also observes that the possessive pronouns can occur after the forms above to disambiguate the number of the possessor:

(14)  a. ləŋ-áɲ k-əŋkəŋ
     mother-1EX SCL-1SG.POSS
     ‘my mother’

     b. ləŋ-áɲ k-əŋkəŋ
     mother-1EX SCL-1PLX.POSS
     ‘our mother’

---

6 Thanks to George Gibbard for discussion of this issue and pointing me to this reference.
These examples demonstrate that the possessive suffix on the noun is an instance of agreement, and does not replace a full possessive pronoun. The same can be shown with a full possessive NP below:

(15) \[ \text{was-én} \quad k^{-1} \text{-tútu} \]
\[ \text{wife-3} \quad \text{scl-pos-Tutu} \]
\[ \text{‘Tutu’s wife’} \]

The nouns in Table 5 all control g-class concord, as shown in (14) and (15).

One difference between the possessive pronoun in the inalienably possessed nouns in Table 5 and the possessive pronouns in Table 4 is tone. While all inalienable possessive suffixes have a final H tone, only the first person dual inclusive form and the second person plural form have H tone in the possessive pronouns. The additional H tone could be related to the H contributed by the /í/ which accompanies strong concord.

One interesting fact in this regard is that the inalienably possessed nouns above cannot appear as a fragment answer to a constituent question. Instead, they take a suffix which is a reduced variant of the proximal demonstrative:

(16) a. \[ \text{Q:\ } \eta^{-} \text{-} \text{údz̩}kì \quad n\text{-}ï\text{b-}ïn \quad g\text{-}\text{é-tʃɔŋ-}á \]
\[ \text{FOC-who} \quad \text{CMP-SG.sib.in.law-3} \quad \text{CL-SRC-hungry-ADJ} \]
\[ \text{‘Whose sibling-in-law is hungry?’} \]

b. \[ \text{A:\ } \eta^{-} \text{-ib-}^{-1} \text{ŋ-}ki \quad g\text{-}\text{é-tʃɔŋ-}á \]
\[ \text{FOC-SG.sib.in.law-3-SCL-this} \quad \text{CL-SRC-hungry-ADJ} \]
\[ \text{‘It’s my sibling-in-law that’s hungry’} \]

c. \[ \text{A:\ } ìb\text{-}^{-}ŋ̩\text{-ki} \]
\[ \text{SG.sib.in.law-3-SCL-this} \]
\[ \text{‘My sibling-in-law.’} \]

d. \[ \text{A:\ } *îb\text{-}^{-}ŋ̩ \]
\[ \text{SG.sib.in.law-3} \]
\[ \text{‘My sibling-in-law.’} \]

The reduced demonstrative also occurs in equative and identificational copular clauses and clefts. Thus, ‘that person is Peter’ is rendered \textit{udz̩okatika bitiki}, and ‘Kuku is my brother-in-law’ is rendered \textit{kuku ibáŋki}. This suggests an answer to why \textit{ki} is required after the answer in (16c): inalienably possessed nouns must be definite noun phrases, rather than predicates. In contrast, demonstratives and possessive noun phrases can be predicative, perhaps a precondition to occurring in isolation with strong concord.

Returning to tone, the noun ‘wife’ is exceptional in that it conditions the displacement of this final H tone one syllable to the left: \textit{it-ʌŋ} vs. \textit{was-ʌŋ}. The noun meaning ‘husband’ is also unique in spreading its H onto the suffix
Noun Phrases in Moro

without deleting its final H: iʋəŋə-ʌŋ vs. údəɾ-ʌŋ. The latter phenomenon may be a case of tone doubling, which also occurs in Moro verb stems (Jenks & Rose 2011). The former displacement phenomenon is more surprising; I do not know of other equivalent processes in Moro.

The plural forms of inalienably possessed nouns introduce additional complications. For one, while most nouns take a plural l-class marker, the plural of ‘mother’ and ‘father’ is suppletive. Second, many of these forms take an additional plural suffix that occurs after the possessive pronoun:

Table 6. Inalienable possession: Plural forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>1.EX</th>
<th>1.IN.DU</th>
<th>1.IN.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'mothers'</td>
<td>el-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>il-ʌŋ-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>il-ʌŋ-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fathers'</td>
<td>er-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>iɾ-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>iɾ-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'wives'</td>
<td>l-ʌs-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>l-ʌs-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>l-ʌs-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'husbands'</td>
<td>la-vʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>la-vʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>la-vʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'offspring (pl.)'</td>
<td>li-vʌŋg-ʌn-ndr</td>
<td>li-vʌŋg-ʌn-ndr</td>
<td>li-vʌŋg-ʌn-ndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'siblings'</td>
<td>lo-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>lur-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>lur-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'uncles/aunts'</td>
<td>ld-å-ʌrl-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>ld-å-ʌrl-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>ld-å-ʌrl-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'parents-in-law'</td>
<td>ln-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>ln-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>ln-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'siblings-in-law'</td>
<td>le-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>le-ʌŋ-andá</td>
<td>le-ʌŋ-ʌndr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the –andá suffix is obligatory for many of these forms, it is optional for the first person exclusive and second person forms. Thus, elaló is an acceptable variant of elálandá. Another exception is l-ʌs-ʌn, an optional
variant of ‘his wives.’ In addition, we can see that the first person inclusive plural form is not marked with the –ándá suffix but –ñdr.

Black & Black (1971) observe that the –ándá suffix has other uses, appearing on nouns and proper names with the meaning ‘those with him/her,’ e.g. jasor-andá ‘Elyasir and his friends and family.’ This seems to be an instance of an associative plural (den Besten 1996). The fact that the plural attaches to nouns high in the animacy hierarchy, such as pronouns, proper names, and kinship terms, is unsurprising; Corbett (2000) observes that animacy is often implicated in the distribution of plural marking in languages with more than one system.

The one additional complication is the presence of an unexpected /l/ in the plural forms for ‘siblings,’ e.g. lorñándá, and ‘uncle/aunts,’ e.g. ldr̥ñandá. Forms such as erñanda ‘my fathers’ rule out the possibility of l-epenthesis between /r/ and a vowel, which means that the /l/ may be part of the plural root.

To summarize, this section has demonstrated that there are two separate strategies for marking possessives in Moro, either with a separate possessive noun phrase or pronoun, or with a possessive suffix. The latter strategy is restricted to a small closed class of kinship terms, and these suffixes can co-occur with full possessives as well. We saw that full possessives involve the same geminate concord as demonstratives and trigger the same alternations in the final vowel of the noun they modify.

6. Numerals

Like demonstratives and possessives, Moro numerals occur postnominally. Unlike demonstratives and possessives, on the other hand, Moro numerals do not all agree with the head noun, and when they agree, they show the simple agreement pattern seen on verbs rather than the concord geminate

Black & Black (1971:46) indicate that –ándá marks the plurality of the possessor, rather than the possessum. While this may be a dialectal difference between the Wërria dialect described by the Blacks and Thetogovela, the finding that putatively plural possessive suffixes would be exclusively singular with inalienably possessed nouns would be surprising.
pattern observed above. These properties of numeral modification can be seen in a noun phrase like *jamala i*ɡə́tʃín ‘three camels’; the geminate s-structure of the j-class is absent, as are the changes in the tone and vowel quality on the final syllable of the noun observed with demonstrative and possessive forms (cf. 6, Table 3). The initial /i/ on ‘three’ is due to a phonological process, /jə/ → [i,e], modulo vowel harmony.

With these properties of numeral modification in mind, the possible forms of the numerals 1-5 are given below based on the noun classes from Table 1:

**Table 7. Moro numerals: 1-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g/l</td>
<td>gʷənto</td>
<td>ləɡəʃan</td>
<td>ləɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/n</td>
<td>gʷənto</td>
<td>nəɡəʃan</td>
<td>nəɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j/j</td>
<td>ento</td>
<td>eɡəʃan</td>
<td>ɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l/ŋ</td>
<td>lnto</td>
<td>nəɡəʃan</td>
<td>nəɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ/ŋ</td>
<td>ŋʷənto</td>
<td>ɡəʃan</td>
<td>ɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð/ð</td>
<td>ðnto</td>
<td>rəɡəʃan</td>
<td>rəɡəʃín</td>
<td>marlon</td>
<td>dənón</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was noted before, the j-class forms occur with an initial [e] or [i], while the other classes surface with the simple (non-geminate) concord prefix followed by a L-tone schwa; note the /g/ in g-class forms rather than geminate /k/. Additionally, only the numerals ‘one’ through ‘three’ agree; the numerals ‘four’ and ‘five’ do not inflect at all. Note too that while ‘one’ agrees with the singular form, ‘two’ and ‘three’ agree with the plural form of the noun. However, the plurals of ‘two’ and ‘three’ surface with an initial /ŋ/ in the plural n-class rather than /ŋ/, e.g. ɡəʃín, due to nasal assimilation to the following velar stop.

In addition to lacking geminate concord and not inducing changes on the final vowel of preceding nouns, numerals allow H tone to spread from preceding H-toned nouns onto the first two syllables of L-toned numerals, compare ején éɡə́ʃan ‘three mountains’ to *jamala i*ɡə́tʃín ‘three camels.’

Additionally, when used in isolation, numerals do not occur with the initial /i/ which occurs with possessives and demonstratives in this environment:

---

8 Some nouns do not spread their H, e.g. rápá ɡəʃín ‘three friends.’ This difference may be lexical; Moro verb roots include a similar subclass (Jenks & Rose 2011:226).
Table 8 shows that complex additive numerals are formed via overt coordination with the second numeral following the coordinating proclitic na=. Note that na= does not occur before /l/-initial numerals for phonological reasons (see section 7.2). The second numeral agrees with the
noun class of its head; when the second numeral is ‘one’, such as in ‘six’ and ‘eleven,’ it shows singular agreement. The numeral ‘ten’ is suppletive and does not agree with its nominal head. The alternation between reð and reðə is due to the schwa-epenthesis rule introduced in section 5.2.

Numerals higher than 15 involve multiple instances of coordination:

\[(18)\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{a. } & \text{na-ðénə} & \text{na-ŋə-"ento} & \text{PL.child} \\
& \text{ten} & \text{and-five} & \text{and-Cl-one} \\
& \text{sixteen children’}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{b. } & \text{na-ðénə} & \text{na-p-əgəfan} & \text{PL.child} \\
& \text{ten} & \text{and-five} & \text{and-Cl-two} \\
& \text{seventeen children’}
\end{array}
\]

Moro multiples of ten are decimal rather than quinary; the multiplicative base is ndréəə, the plural of réð ‘ten’, where /nr/ becomes [ndr]⁹:

\[(19)\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{a. } & \text{ndréəə} & \text{na-p-əgəfan} & \text{PL.child} \\
& \text{two} & \text{PL_ten} & \text{two} \\
& \text{twenty children’}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{b. } & \text{ndréəə} & \text{reð} & \text{PL.child} \\
& \text{ten} & \text{PL_ten} & \text{ten} \\
& \text{one hundred children’}
\end{array}
\]

These examples show that the multiplicative base must precedes the cardinal multiplicand in Moro.

7. Adjectives and Relative Clauses

In this section I introduce Moro adjectives and relative clauses. In some cases the behavior of these modifiers is indistinguishable, hence, I have grouped them into a single section. I focus first on adjectives and subject relative clauses in section 7.1, then discuss object relative clauses in section 7.2.

⁹ Cf. the parallel reð ‘cloth’ vs. ndréð ‘clothes.’
7.1 Adjectives and Subject Relatives

Moro adjectives freely occur as subject relative clauses:

(20) a. jamalá -sɔ́-é'-wóndāt-a kūku j-a-bag-á
   PL.camel SCL-SRC-watch-IPFV Kuku CL-RTC-strong-ADJ
   ‘The camels that are watching Kuku are strong.’

b. jamalá -sɔ́-é-bag-á j-a-wóndāt-a kūku
   PL.camel SCL-SRC-strong-ADJ CL-RTC-watch-IPFV Kuku
   ‘The camels that are strong are watching Kuku.’

Examples (20a-b) form a minimal pair: the main predicate of (20a) is a subject relative clause in (20b), and vice versa. Both examples show that Moro adjectives consistently occur with a H on their final vowel. This final vowel is usually –á but other vowels also occur as part of the root, e.g. geđé ‘green’, koré ‘red,’ due to hiatus of –á with vowel-final roots.

The vowel following the class marker in Moro indicates a complex array of grammatical information, including finiteness; non-finite clauses lack this vowel and show a distinct paradigm of person prefixes. In root clauses, including complements of bridge verbs such as ‘say’ or ‘think’ this vowel is a/ʌ-. In subject relative clauses this vowel becomes é-. I gloss this vowel SRC for clarity despite the fact that it is also found in the complements of other verbs such as perception verbs (‘see’, ‘think’). Subject relative clauses also occur with geminate concord, shown in the distinction between s- and j-concord on the relative clause and the main predicates in (20). As before, geminate concord triggers changes on the final vowel of the preceding noun, which is jamala in citation form. The downstep on the subject relative é-prefix arises due to adjacency with the final H on the root.

As expected, subject relative clauses in isolation occur with an initial /í/:

(21) a. Q: ɲʷ-ðámala δ-ŋɡa δ-é-tʃon-á
    FOC-SG.camel CL-which CL-SRC-hungry-ADJ
    ‘Which camel is hungry?’

b. A: ñɔ́-é'-wóndāt-a kūku
    ‘The one that likes Kuku.’

Thus, subject relatives form a class with demonstratives and possessives.

The table below provides the paradigm for an adjectival subject relative:
Table 9. Moro adjective/subject relative clause inflection: bagá ‘strong’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>SG.N</th>
<th>CL-SRC-A</th>
<th>PL.N</th>
<th>CL-SRC-A</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g/1</td>
<td>udžl</td>
<td>'k-é-bagá</td>
<td>lidžl</td>
<td>'l-é-bagá</td>
<td>‘strong person(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/n</td>
<td>emetř́</td>
<td>'lébogá</td>
<td>nometř́</td>
<td>‘nébogá</td>
<td>‘strong horse(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j/j</td>
<td>ajén</td>
<td>‘sébogá</td>
<td>ején</td>
<td>‘sébogá</td>
<td>‘strong mountain(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l/ŋ</td>
<td>łnovř́</td>
<td>‘łébogá</td>
<td>n̄novř́</td>
<td>‘ńébogá</td>
<td>‘strong stick(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l/l</td>
<td>ław</td>
<td>‘łébogá</td>
<td>n̄aw</td>
<td>‘ńébogá</td>
<td>‘strong mosquito(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ/ŋ</td>
<td>n̄ér̄</td>
<td>‘ńébogá</td>
<td>n̄ér̄</td>
<td>‘ńébogá</td>
<td>‘strong child(ren)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ/r</td>
<td>δąpخت</td>
<td>‘δébogá</td>
<td>r̄ąpخت</td>
<td>‘řébogá</td>
<td>‘strong friend(s)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ/j</td>
<td>δamalč’</td>
<td>‘δągn̄am</td>
<td>jamalč’</td>
<td>‘sébogá</td>
<td>‘strong camel(s)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same observations apply as before, a final H is inserted on all-L roots, and final /a/ undergoes raising.

Like possessives (cf. 10-11), relative clauses can occur without geminate concord. This occurs in two contexts: if other modifiers intervene between relatives and their head noun, and in object position. The first context is shown below with an intervening demonstrative:

(22) jamalč’ ·szatśwa j-é-baǵ-ą j-a-j-ó PL.camēl SCL.that CL-SRC-big-ADJ CL-RTC-die-PFV ‘Those camels that are big died.’

In object position the presence of geminate concord correlates with definiteness or specificity (though which is unclear):

(23) a. é-g-a-b̥-dń-ą jamalč’ ·sz-é-bagá 1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV PL.camēl SCL-SRC-strong-ADJ ‘I like the camels that are strong.’

b. é-g-a-b̥-dń-ą jamalča j-é-bagá 1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV PL.camēl CL-SRC-strong-ADJ ‘I like camels that are strong.’

The absence of geminate concord in (23b) correlates with normal tone and vowel quality on the final syllable of jamalča ‘camels’, as expected. However, the modifier jébagá ‘which are strong’ is identifiable a subject relative clause based on the é- prefix. That the alternation in (23) is only permitted in object position is due to a requirement that Moro subjects must be definite or specific. Further evidence for this position is the fact that Moro does not allow wh-elements in situ in subject position.
7.2 Object relatives

An example of an object relative clause is provided below:

(24) \text{jamal-\text{-s}-a} \quad (n\dot{a} = \text{-})kúk\text{-u} \quad (n\dot{a} = \text{-})g-\dot{a}-\text{satf-}u

\text{PL.camel-\text{-SCL.-this} } \text{CMP = Kuku} \quad \text{CMP-CL-\text{-NSRC.-see-PVF}}

'The camel that Kuku saw.'

Several formal properties distinguish object relatives from subject relatives. Relatives formed on oblique arguments and adverbs such as \text{when} and \text{how} pattern with object relatives, so this is properly seen as a non-subject relative form (hence \text{NSRC} in the gloss). First, the vowel following the class marker is \text{-}\text{i} in object relatives, distinguishing them from the \text{-}\text{o} of main clauses or \text{-}\text{e} of subject relatives. Second, the head noun of an object relative takes a suffix segmentally identical to the proximal demonstrative (section 4). The final /í/ of this demonstrative reduces to schwa before an object relative. Contexts have not been found where this demonstrative suffix can be omitted. I take this suffix to be the realization of strong concord on a non-subject relative clause, syncretic here with the proximal demonstrative.

Object relative clauses optionally include the proclitic \text{nə́=} , analyzed as a complementizer due to the fact that it also introduces certain subordinate clauses. With full nominal subjects, \text{nə́=} can appear before both the subject and the verb phrase. While \text{nə́=} is usually optional, it becomes obligatory in some object relatives forms involving a pronominal subject:

(25) \text{damalí-ð}: \quad *(n) = l-satf-ú \quad -1\text{SG}- \quad 'the camel that I saw'

... *(n) = ə-satf-ú \quad -2\text{SG}- \quad '...that you saw'

... \quad *(n) = g-ə-satf-ú \quad -3\text{SG}- \quad '...that she saw'

... \quad *(n) = də-satf-ú \quad -1\text{DU.IN}- \quad '...that you and I saw'

... \quad *(n) = də-satf-ú-r \quad -1\text{PL.IN}- \quad '...that we (incl.) saw'

... \quad (n\dot{a}) = njə-satf-ú \quad -1\text{PL.EX} \quad '...that we (excl.) saw'

... \quad (n\dot{a}) = njə-satf-ú \quad -2\text{PL} \quad '...that you (pl.) saw'

... \quad *(n\dot{a}) = l-ə-satf-ú \quad -3\text{PL} \quad '...that they saw'

Following standard practice, the asterisk outside of parentheses indicates obligation while the asterisk inside of parentheses indicates that the clitic is disallowed. These examples illustrate that the varying optionality of \text{nə́=} is phonologically conditioned: \text{nə́=} is obligatory with vowel-initial prefixes and impossible before /l/ in 3rd person plural forms due to a /*nl/ co-occurrence constraint in Moro, apparently also active across schwa (cf. the numerals 12 and 13 in Table 8; see also Gibbard\text{ et al }2009, p. 113).
The forms in (25) also illustrate a distinction between object relative clauses on the one hand (and other embedded verbs taking the ə́-prefix) and root clauses and subject relatives on the other in that object relative clauses lack the “extra” g-class marker which occurs between first and second person prefixes and the clause-typing vowel (e.g. (23-24)).

Evidence that this demonstrative element in non-subject relative clauses is the correlate of strong concord comes again from fragment answers. As the answer to the question “Which camel is hungry?” (cf. 20a) one could respond ɓamalōdnisafj ‘the camel that I saw’ (cf. 24), but never *ińisafj. While ińisafj ‘this one that I saw’ is a grammatical noun phrase, it would not be an appropriate answer to the question in (20a). This might be because the demonstrative element ɓi ‘this’ is interpreted in such a response, resulting in too many foci.

8. Word order and strong concord

Word order in Moro noun phrases follows the schema below:

(26) Word order in Moro noun phrases

a. noun > (demonstrative, possessive) > numeral > adjective* relative clause*
b. nádám n-ʌ́tín n-əgtʃan n-óɾé
   PL.books SCL-those CL-two CL-red-ADJ
   ‘those two red books’

This word order is somewhat simplified. Examples (10-11) showed that possessive noun phrases can follow demonstratives if they do not take strong concord. This is not true for possessive pronouns, which cannot occur with demonstratives, e.g. *nádám n-ʌ́tín n-máŋgan ‘books those my.’ These elements must be followed by numerals and then by relative clauses and adjectives. The latter elements can recur, as indicated by the asterisk.

Evidence that the word order in (26) is the default word order in Moro comes from strong concord. Strong concord can occur on elements which are not directly adjacent to the adjective, but it must follow modifiers showing weak concord. I take such occurrences of strong concord to be instances of appositive, right-dislocated, modifiers:
(27) a. é-g-a-bwáŋ-á surí-s-átísá j-ógóñ-á ʃj-ʃ-ʃú-ʃ kúku
   1SG-CL-RTC-like-IPFV SG.picture-SCL-that CL-big-ADJ CL-POS-kuku
   ‘I like that big picture of Kuku.’

b. égabwáŋá surí-s-átísá j-ógóná ʃʃ-ʃ-ʃú-ʃ kúku
   I-like picture-SCL-that CL-big SCL-POS-Kuku
   ‘I like that big picture, the one of Kuku.’

c. égabwáŋá surí-s-átísá ʃʃ-ʃ-ʃú-ʃ kúku ʃʃ-jógoná
   I-like picture-SCL-that SCL-POS-Kuku SCL-big
   ‘I like that picture, the one of Kuku, the big one.’

d. *égabwáŋá surí-s-átísá ʃʃ-ʃ-ʃú-ʃ j-ógóná
   I-like picture-SCL-that SCL-POS-Kuku CL-big

First, note that the “possessive” noun phrase jókúku ‘of Kuku’ can occur noun phrase finally, after an adjective (27a). However, ‘Kuku’ in this noun phrase is not a possessor but rather an argument of súra ‘picture.’

The pattern in (27) show why multiple occurrences of strong concord should be considered instances of apposition or right dislocation. First, (27b-d) show that modifiers expressing weak concord cannot follow those showing strong concord. This reveals that second occurrences of strong concord interrupt the normal sequence of nominal modifiers in (26). Second, (27c) shows that the initial /í/ in recurrent instances of strong concord does not phonologically fuse with an earlier modifier, nor do these modifiers show ordering restrictions. This indicates that these secondary occurrences of strong concord are separate phonological phrases, syntactically distinct from the noun phrase proper.

More striking evidence comes from putative cases of extraposition, where a modifier is separated from its host noun phrase across a distinct syntactic constituent, such as the verb:

(28) ádám k-atíka g-id-ú ʃʃ-ʃ-ʃú-ʃ-̈ kú
   book SCL-that CL-RTC-fall-IPFV SCL-SRC-small-ADJ
   ‘That book fell, the small one.’

As in (27), the extraposed (right-dislocated) modifier must show strong concord with an unreduced initial /í/. In light of the data in (27-28), I conclude that secondary occurrences of strong concord are always instances of appositional right dislocation, and should not be seen as evidence for free word order within the noun phrase.
This excursus on right dislocation permits the articulation of a generalization about the position of strong concord within the noun phrase: strong concord must occur directly after the noun. In fact, we can reformulate the word order as below:

\[(29) \text{noun–scl–\{dem/pos/rel\} > cl\text{-num} > cl\text{-modifier}}^*\]

While one could attempt to identify all instances of strong concord with the proximal demonstrative, such a move would raise as many questions as it answered; not all noun phrases with strong concord are interpreted with proximal demonstrative meanings, making the connection tenuous. Instead, the proximal demonstrative appears to be grammaticalizing to a more general marker of definiteness/specificity in Moro noun phrases.

The initial /i/ on strong concord is of particular interest. One hypothesis about its status is as a cognate of the Bantu augment vowel, a noun prefix associated with definiteness or specificity in many Bantu languages (de Blois 1970, Dewees 1971, von Staden 1973, Hyman and Katamba 1993, Progovac 1993, a.o.). While augment prefixes generally occur on nouns, they also occur on modifiers in many Bantu languages.

An additional connection between Moro and Bantu is provided by the word order in (26) itself. While Greenberg (1963) observed that this word order is crosslinguistically dispreferred, the word order is common in many Bantu languages, e.g. Kiswahili (G.42, Carstens 1991 et seq.), Kĩtharaka (E.54, Muriungi 2008), Kikuyu (E.50, Greenberg 1963), Nkore-Kiga (J.10, Taylor 1985), and Xitsonga (S.53, Lee & Bibane 2011). Together, strong concord and the word order of Moro noun phrases provide a further connection between Moro and Bantu languages beyond the evidence from noun classes discussed by Schadeberg (1989).

9. Conclusion

To conclude, it is now clear that agreement/concord in Moro noun phrases can be split into two forms, a strong form, restricted to genitives, possessives, and definite modified noun phrases including subject relative clauses, and a weak form, which occurs elsewhere.

With regard to possession, Moro nouns were shown to split into alienable and inalienable, the latter class being distinguished by dedicated possessive suffixes. The Moro numeral system was shown to use a primary quinary
counting system with a decimal subsystem for multiples of ten. Subject relative clauses and adjectives were shown to formally identical in the cases examined. Object relative clauses are clearly distinct, not least in that they allow an overt complementizer, absent in subject relatives.
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