**Kairen Typology**

A logical, concise language for communicating with AI.

Let “word text” be the text that defines the word

I studied Toki Pona yesterday and concluded that because there are so few words in the language, there is a lot of ambiguity, too long sentences, and lack of lucidity of grammar. I think this almost defeats the idea of Toki Pona which is to simplify language. I don’t think there is a way to do that with only 123 words. So I’m going to use these lessons when I create Kairen.

There are a number of different paths I can take with developing Kairen. The most familiar one, would be to take the quasi Romance language route and make a language with separate preposition words (non agglutinating), well-defined parts of speech, suffixes to convert words between parts of speech (although there will be more than one for each if necessary), and similarities in word root between related words.

I was actually originally working on the language like this, but I felt weird somehow and I stopped. I think I was stuck on how to divide the emotions. I was also stuck on word building, and I didn’t want to require people to use hyphens when word building (because I knew and know that people won’t use them anyways), but I couldn’t figure out a good way to let them make them without them. (sigh).

I was also wanting the sentences that would need to be said a lot in a counter strike style game to be really short. This competes with my desire for the language to be precise and have a copula verb and require prepositions and other things. Now, I think that no matter how concise I make the original language, the adopted language for the game is going to need to be cut down for those sentences anyways. This means that I shouldn’t worry about making the sentences have less words. If I want to make things more concise, I should instead focus on making common words short.

I think I also was stuck on what the word text should be. I’m not great with making a bunch of things without thinking too much about each step. This means that I often get stuck on what the word text should be for each of the words. Conflict: originality of word text to make them easier to recognize and recall vs the ability of people to split spoken speech into words. Pro for 2: the language is mostly going to be typed because it will be used in a video game and there probably won’t be many people speaking it out loud and there won’t be many videos (if any) available in it. So I should probably go for originality of word text.

Originality is important because then people will be able to learn the language faster and come up with their own sentences faster

First, I should go on conlangworkshop and figure out what the parameters of my language are

I should know a few of them so i can have a basis of talking about the language from a macro perspective.

**Typology**

* Head-directionality: Primarily Head Initial:
  + I go **to the store**.
  + However, there may be a suffix to change prepositions to postpositions.
  + I go **the store** *to-post*
  + or, I go **store** *the-post to-post*
  + I will have to see which prepositions/little words would need that opportunity. Or if I give it, I should probably allow all of them to use the suffix for simplicity. I think I will have to decide on this later.
  + But it will definitely be primarily head-initial
* Adjective agreement: none
  + there is no gender, number, etc
* No alienability (no different classifications for alienable and non alienable possessees)
* Animacy Distinctions: none
* Consonant Inventory: average (not for me to change hehe)
* Coarticulated Consonants (consonant series): none
* **Copula Dropping:** this is an example of something i don’t know for sure I want to do.
  + I would like copula dropping for video games because brevity. However, people copula drop in English anyways. so idk
  + I would like to not copula drop because I feel like there would be ambiguous cases. I need to find those cases so I can list them here.
  + I’ll have to come back to this one (I know Turkish gets fine without it)
* Base counting system: 10 (decimal)
* Definite (indefinite) article: none
* **Demonstrative proximity**: choice between distal/proximal (english), distal/medial/proximal (japanese), etc.
  + This is probably the thing about the language that is going to be different from natural languages. In the game world, there are a myriad of possible locations for an item. It would be nice to have a bunch of demonstrative words to help with that.
    - Idea:
    - let d = distance between speakers
    - let c = close/far threshold (probably function of d)
      * demo1: close to me
        + Within 1/3 d circle of me
      * Demo2: close to you
        + within d/3 circle of you
      * Demo3: close to me and you
        + Within c distance around the middle 1/3 of d
      * Demo4: far from me and you
        + beyond c distances around the middle 1/3 of d
    - this means that there is no order of occurrence; as soon as an object fulfills one of these conditions, it is given the demonstrative. The only thing is demo3 takes precedence over demo1 and demo2.
* **Primary Directional System: Ahhhhh!**
  + This is going to be hard to do as well
  + I want both relative and absolute
  + I don’t know
  + probably the primary one would be relative egocentric (right/left), while the secondary one would be absolute cardinal (north, west)
* **Constituent Dislocation Possible: aaa?!**
  + Again…. I don’t know. I’ll think about it. It would be useful for people speaking colloquially. But I think there would be ambiguity. The only thing I can come up with now is
    - * [He] returned home, Mr. Wong.
        + mr. wong is subject
        + mr. wong is being spoken to
    - i’m going to say no for now
* double negatives: cancel each other
* **Coding of evidentiality:** This is also important! I really want to create a language that is emotionally healthy. Here we go!
  + Bulgarian verbs are cool
  + I don’t want conjugations, so no to that option
  + I want particles, like Laadan!
  + I will come up with a bunch, so i’m not selecting an option that locks me in.
  + I’m selecting “other”.
* Fixed Stress Location: none (there will be no stress)
* Genders: none (:) Turkish style)
* Gottalised consonants: none
* noun numbers: none :)
* Presence of b d g (hahah) yes
* click consonants: none
* **Inclusive/exclusive pronouns: distinct!**
  + This is important! I’m interested in a we exclusive and a we inclusive
* **mass nouns: no number distinction**
  + if there are no plural/singular distinctions in the language, I don’t know for sure what mass nouns would entail. I guess I wouldn’t be able to describe 20 water (or would I?).
  + i’ll have to think about what this entails for kairen
* Unmarked mood: AHHHH
  + I’m so ugh. I think this was another issue. I’m deciding between imperative and indicative.
  + Actually, I don’t even know if this is the issue I was dealing with.
  + the issue I had was I wanted to have “go” be a command and “you go” be an indication (you are going).
    - * however, I wanted “go” to be indicative too because I wanted to make indication easier than commands to encourage healthy speaking.
        + now that I think about it, it might not be a big deal if there need not be extra words to describe progressive tense, because that would make common indicative phrases smaller, so it might be ok.
    - so for this, i’m going to say indicative because that’s what I think it is based on the decision above.
* Morphological typology: ANALITIC I’m interested in keeping Kairen as isolating as possible. But i’m sure I’m going to add prefixes and suffixes and stuff, so idk
* Morphosyntactic Alignment: I’m deciding between accusative and neutral. I think I should say accusative because I know my brain will probably default to that when i’m composing sentences anyways.
  + all I know is that the subject/agent will be before the verb and the object after (SVO)
* Noun head-directionality: head initial (i thought I wrote this before)
* Noun adjective order: noun first (i thought about this for a bit; it might be more useful for the noun to be first, but idk EDIT: i’m going to make them noun first)
  + i feel like it would usually be more important to know the noun than adjective first.
  + “where is he”
  + he’s at red car
  + vs
  + he’s at car red
  + (usually car is what’s most indicative of where he is, then you kinda narrow down)
* No nasal phonemes
* negation marking: particle
* noun-numeral order: numeral first (i thought about having numeral second, but i feel like it would be confusing when you want to add things on paper, you like the numbers to line up. just feels more natural
* noun incorporation: none (probably i’m just going to have compound words)
  + this also brings the question of how to create compound words
  + i’m just going to decide right now, just stick them together; no abbreviation, no hyphen
    - plain and simple
* noun noun possession: sigh I guess dependent marking
  + I think there should be two words, one for ’s and of
    - * like car of david, david ’s car
      * kar non david, david no car
    - i wonder if the particle suffix i came up with earlier would be applicable here
    - (genitive case)
* number of nominal cases: one (chinese)
* number of pronominal cases: one (chinese)
* phonemic vowel length: none (i don’t like it)
* Phonation types: voiced voiceless (jesus hahaha)
* dual pluractional forms: none
* Suppletion in “ “: none leave me alone
* Pluractionality: noooöoooo
* polar question marker: particle (yass)
* pronoun noun possession: possessive adjective/pronoun
* Possessor-possessee order: varies (see above)
* possession distinctions: none who cares
* word order: SVO YEAHHH
* Pronoun dropping: YASSS
* pronoun numbers: singular/plural (only plural distinction in language)
* pronoun persons: 1/2/3/4th persons.
  + i’m going to add a 4th person for hypothetical (one must..)
* Polar question answers: yes/no
* Reciprocals: none (I thought about this, but I think adding them might make things more confusing because then you would have two options that mean the same thing)
* Reflexives: none (not even sure what this is)
* **Relative Clauses**: I also don’t know for sure. I think that I want the European form of them, where I mark them with “that” (the tempura that my sister made), because the Japanese way (although I kind of like it) disagrees with the fact that adjectives come after nouns in Kairen.
  + I then thought that I could just put the relative clause after the noun without the “that” (japanese is notable in that it doesn’t use a pronoun to indicate a relative clause
  + the tempura my sister made.
  + This is also ok, but I have a feeling that there might be ambiguity?
  + tempura my sister made is hot
  + NOUN <RELATIVE CLAUSE NOUN> VERB MAIN VERB
    - essentially, any time that there would be confusion resulting from two verbs in a row would be the problem of no “that”
    - however, if Kairen is going to have precise parts of speech (where adverbs would be clearly different from verbs), then there wouldn’t be as much of a problem. There would be more of a problem if Kairen was like Loglan in that there were only predicate words and little words, these kinds of shortenings would be more difficult.
  + I’m going to choose “yes, with no pronoun”
  + but wouldn’t this be confusing?
  + “i saw the man who is my friend”
  + I saw man is my friend.
  + Hmmmmmm
  + Ambiguity?: I saw that the man is my friend vs I saw the man who is my friend
  + According to the previous outline, it should actually be
  + I saw man my friend is
  + and the first ambiguity would be
  + I saw the man is my friend (if I take out “that” in this language which I forgot if i did)
* Goal: be able to relativize: all positions in the hierarchy like English (I actually like this about English ahaha). Currently the plan is to do this but without explicit relative pronoun. This would mean that I would be the omitted relative pronoun column
  + That’s the man ran away
    - That is man ran. = That is the man who ran.
  + That’s the man sister I know
    - That is man 노 sister I know
    - technically that means: “That is man’s sister I know” which is not really correct because it registers as that is (man’s sister) **who** I know (the problem here is that “that” is a man, not a sister).
  + You know what? I’ll go the English route and have a “that” for all cases. The genitive case will require a that 노 heheh. That way, it will avoid this confusion for the computer. It is not going to be used a lot in a video game so the brevity is ok. It can be omitted in casual conversation if need be. It’s FINE. I will think about the other pronoun I had to consider as well.
* Relative Pronoun Morphology: this must be particle/pronoun (probably going to have its own particle like Turkish “ki”) to be consistent with the previous decision
* Noun-relative clause order: noun first; just makes more sense to me
* stress marked? no :)
* Syllable structure? Cvc max (this is pretty general)
* **Marked tense (verb):** hmm, i want it, but i want it to be separate particles rather than conjugations.
  + at the same time, conjugations would make the words a lot smaller….
  + Hmmmm;
  + What’s a common scenario in a cslike
  + “Where is he” -> “where he” -> “where”
    - “he was in the tunnel” -> “he was (in) tunnel” -> “was tunnel”
    - let **pa** be the past tense marker after the verb
    - let **e** be 3rd person singular pronoun
    - let **tun** be tunnel
    - let **si** be is
    - he was in the tunnel (was tunnel) = si pa tun
  + METHOD TWO
    - let **a** be the past tense conjugation to the verb
    - he was in the tunnel (was tunnel) = sia tun
    - saves space and consonant, 2 characters
      * you could say, however, that you could just right “pa tun” to mean PAST tunnel to answer this question. However, that’s really vague…
    - The difference with this conflict versus the copula dropping conflict is that it is easy for people speaking casually to drop words. It is not easy for them to drop conjugations. It’s a lot more familiar for people to drop copulas than to drop the verb and only say its conjugation. sigh
  + I think I’m going to go with method 2: “a” is past tense suffix, “u” is future tense suffix
  + but then what about negation? Negation is also important.
    - Common scenario in cslike: “Is she there?” -> she there ka? (i am still thinking about question particles)
    - “no”
    - SORRY: rather: “where is she” -> “she where”/“where she”
    - “not here” -> negation particle here
    - “she was not (in) tunnels”
      * if we say “n” is the negation particle:
        + Si = is
        + Sin = is not
        + Sia = was
        + sian = was not
        + Siu = will be
        + Siun = will be not
      * now for a verb ending in a consonant: “tak” to talk (examples, chilllll)
        + Tak = is talking
        + Takn = is not talking -> takon ->? tako
        + Taka = was talking
        + Takan = was not talking
        + Taku = will be talking
        + Takun = will not be talking
      * There will have to be an exception for negative present. “o” will be a buffer vowel.
        + for brevity, i want to have the negative present take “o” instead of “n”
      * this also assumes VERB - TENSE - NEGATIVE which is ok with me; i think it makes more sense
      * This is nice, but consequently, this limits the words I can make, especially the suffixes i can add to these verbs to change them into nouns, adverbs, adjectives, etc.
      * I only have “i” and “e” left as vowels to append;
        + then, the cases where there are two identical vowels in a row need a case.

sii:

glottal stop between the two

insert buffer letter

must set universal grammatical buffer letter: “r” (probably what i’m going to do)

set situational grammatical buffer letter? ewww

elongate sound NOT CLEAR eww

* + so in conclusion: unmarked is present (progressive), -a is past, -u is future, -n is negation except with consonant verb in negative present, where it’s “o”
* Tone: no :)))))
* Verb agreement: no :)
* Marked aspect (verb): other
  + what i’m thinking of here, is that I want the progressives to be the default tense
    - example: paint = pan
    - pana = was painting
    - pan = is painting
    - panu = will be painting
  + there is also habitual which i am neglecting. I think it’s not as important, so it will be less brief. maybe have a habitual particle: hab (or i think that’s more of an adverb? no a particle)
    - hab pan = paints (habitually)
  + there is also simple past and future, but I don’t know if I want those
    - The purpose of a past progressive, present progressive that’s distinct is to indicate “i was doing something when this happened” and “i will be doing something when this will happen”
      * the problem (?) with kairen might be that the previous sentences would look like “i did this when this happened” “i will do this when this will happen”
        + to solve this, i’m going to go back to one of the first solutions i made in the language, and that’s the start and finish verbs: sa and fi or something
        + that way, the progressive can remain, and there are words to describe the beginning and end of time spans
        + something that is nearly instantaneous doesn’t need the distinction:
        + let “tap” be to tap
        + i tapped it when this happened, i was tapping it when this happened

hmm, these actually mean different things to most people, “was tapping” usually implies repeatedly, therefore, repeatedly might need to be a short word to aid this

* + - * + then something longer:

i was mowing the lawn when this happened (progressive, default)

i mowed the lawn when this happened (not in kairen)

i finished mowing the lawn when this happened (instant)

i started mowing the lawn when this happened (instant)

* + - therefore, if i have 2 letter verbs for to start and to end, there is no need for simple past and simple future.
* Future tense: verb conjugation (see above)
* verb head directionality: I thought i answered this already but head initial
* optative (eek): modal (/auxillary): i feel like i’m going to go the english route with “may”
  + but idk if there will be something like this, i can’t predict if i’ll add something so general
* Past Tense Remoteness distinctions: none (i’ll just use “ago” and “about” haha
* Perfect: Particle/auxilliary derived from already finish
* Marked person: none
  + I was thinking that maybe I might get even more brevity by marking person in the conjugations. But I think this might be complicated because here are the persons I want

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **singular** | **plural** |
| **1st person** | I | we (inclusive), we (exclusive) |
| **2nd person** | you (singular) | you (plural) |
| **3rd person** | he/she/it (gender/animacy neutral) | they |
| **4th person (hypothetical)** | one | ones?? (maybe, maybe not) I’m not sure if it’s going to be useful |

* + That means there are 8 - 9 personal pronouns. Then there are words like “anyone, no one, everyone”, etc that I don’t think i know which box they would be in. This means that there would be a lot of conjugations for people to memorize, as opposed to 3 previously. I think i’ll pass hahahaha
    - this means that there are no marked persons
* vowel inventory size: large ?? there are only 5?
* Tense/aspect suppleton: none :D i don’t like irregularity
* marked transivitity (verb): nah if it’s intransitive/transitive, you’ll know; its logical
* Valency decreasing voices: right when i thought I was done with all this…
  + passive, antipassive, and middle voice
  + I think these can all coexist, and frankly didn’t think of them before
    - passive is when A is removed from transitive verb sentence
      * the cake was baked.
    - antipassive is when P is removed from transitive verb sentence
      * John baked
    - middle is between the two when a intransitive verb is reflexive/causative (honestly, I don’t know how this is different from active, but whatever)
      * John shaved (himself)
        + because there are no reflexive pronouns in Kairen, this is probably one of three posibilities:

John shaved

John shaved him

John shaved John

* + - * + which to me is fine idk
* Valency increasing voices:
  + almost there
  + what I’m understanding is that there are two ways to increase valence in a sentence:
    - applicatives (promote oblique to core)
      * I’ll think about whether or not I should make a particle that does this, or if I should take the English route and make new words that simulate this, or if I should even have it at all
    - and **causatives**
      * I think that these are pretty important, but it’s probably just going to be a word like “make”
        + I am making him do that **which is** making a equal b.

I don’t know what I should do about “which is” when describing chains.

I need to think about that a lot because there is a lot of things I want to do to the way we talk about causations (PROS AND CONS) to make the language more precise and emotionally healthy and easier to describe techy systemy stuff.

* + - for now, I’m just going to enable both
* marked voice (verb): none; I think the passive and active voice can just be indicated by presence of agents
* Vowel Phonation: modal only (hmm I think that it would make things interesting if I tried to require people to figure out how to do a breathy and creaky voice)
* Primary Writing System: conscript AWWW YEAHH
* Script type: alphabet AWW YEAH

YES I FINISHED ALRIGHT!!