

# A Grammar of Ayeri



# A Grammar of Ayeri

DOCUMENTING A FICTIONAL LANGUAGE

*by Carsten Becker*

---

*Benung. The Ayeri Language Resource*

© ⓘ ⓘ Carsten Becker, 2016.  
Published under CC-BY-SA 4.0 license.  
Last edited: December 4, 2016.

Set in Junicode and Fira Sans with Xe<sub>La</sub>TeX.

Ayeri is a fictional language spoken by fictional people in a fictional setting, and as such is not related to any naturally existing languages. It is thus not to be confused with *Azeri*, a Turkic language spoken in Azerbaijan and its surrounding countries. Ayeri's vocabulary is entirely *a priori*, this means, no real-world languages have been used specifically as sources of vocabulary. Ayeri is also not derived from any specific real-world language family by means of sound changes. Due to the language's sound and spelling aesthetic being inspired by Austronesian languages, however, occasional overlaps with words existing in those languages may happen, but only accidentally so.

🌐 <https://benung.nfshost.com>  
⚙️ <https://github.com/carbeck/ayerigrammar/>  
⚖️ <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

# Contents

---

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Glossing Abbreviations</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Preface</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>o Introduction</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1 Phonology</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Phoneme inventory . . . . .	7
1.1.1 Consonants . . . . .	7
1.1.2 Vowels . . . . .	10
1.2 Phonotactics . . . . .	12
1.2.1 Number of syllables per word . . . . .	13
1.2.2 Phonemic makeup of initial syllables . . . . .	16
1.2.3 Phonemic makeup of medial syllables . . . . .	20
1.2.4 Phonemic makeup of final syllables . . . . .	23
1.2.5 Phonemic makeup of single syllables . . . . .	26
1.2.6 Cross-syllable consonant clusters . . . . .	28
1.3 Notes on prosody . . . . .	31
1.3.1 Stress . . . . .	31
1.3.2 Intonation . . . . .	40
<b>2 Writing system</b>	<b>45</b>
2.1 Consonants . . . . .	47
2.2 Vowels . . . . .	48
2.3 Diacritics . . . . .	50
2.3.1 Subscript diacritics . . . . .	50

2.3.2	Prepended diacritics . . . . .	52
2.3.3	Superscript diacritics . . . . .	56
2.4	Numerals . . . . .	57
2.5	Punctuation and abbreviations . . . . .	57
2.6	Styles . . . . .	59
<b>3</b>	<b>Morphological typology</b>	<b>63</b>
3.1	Typology . . . . .	63
3.2	Morphological processes . . . . .	66
3.2.1	Prefixation . . . . .	66
3.2.2	Suffixation . . . . .	69
3.2.3	Reduplication . . . . .	69
3.2.4	Suprasegmental modification . . . . .	70
3.3	Marking strategies . . . . .	71
<b>4</b>	<b>Grammatical categories</b>	<b>75</b>
4.1	Nouns . . . . .	75
4.1.1	Gender . . . . .	76
4.1.2	Number . . . . .	78
4.1.3	Case . . . . .	81
4.1.4	Prefixes on nouns . . . . .	93
4.1.5	Compounding . . . . .	95
4.1.6	Reduplication . . . . .	104
4.1.7	Nominalization . . . . .	106
4.2	Pronouns . . . . .	111
4.2.1	Personal pronouns . . . . .	111
4.2.2	Demonstrative pronouns . . . . .	115
4.2.3	Interrogative pronouns . . . . .	119
4.2.4	Indefinite pronouns . . . . .	122
4.2.5	Relative pronouns . . . . .	129
4.2.6	Reflexives and reciprocals . . . . .	132
4.3	Adjectives . . . . .	133
4.3.1	Comparison . . . . .	133
4.3.2	Negation . . . . .	134
4.3.3	Adjectivization . . . . .	135
4.3.4	Other affixes . . . . .	136
4.4	Adpositions . . . . .	136
4.4.1	Prepositions . . . . .	136
4.4.2	Postpositions . . . . .	142
4.4.3	Adpositions and time . . . . .	144
4.5	Verbs . . . . .	145

4.5.1	Person–number marking . . . . .	145
4.5.2	Tense . . . . .	156
4.5.3	Aspect . . . . .	162
4.5.4	Mood . . . . .	167
4.5.5	Modal verbs . . . . .	171
4.5.6	Participle . . . . .	174
4.5.7	Other affixes . . . . .	175
4.6	Adverbs . . . . .	178
4.6.1	Attributive adverbs . . . . .	178
4.6.2	Degree and quantity . . . . .	179
4.6.3	Sentence adverbs . . . . .	179
<b>Bibliography</b>		<b>181</b>
<b>Index</b>		<b>186</b>

# List of Figures

---

0.1	First design for an Ayeri script . . . . .	4
0.2	First draft for Tahano Hikamu . . . . .	5
1.1	Consonant inventory . . . . .	8
1.2	Vowel inventory . . . . .	10
1.3	Syllabification of inflected verbs . . . . .	13
1.4	Declension paradigm for Ayeri <i>ṣ̣ niva</i> ‘eye’ . . . . .	31
1.5	Types of heavy syllables . . . . .	33
1.6	Stress patterns for [+ HEAVY, – LONG] in trisyllabic words . . . . .	36
1.7	Stress patterns for [± HEAVY, + LONG] in trisyllabic words . . . . .	37
1.8	Examples of stress patterns in compounds . . . . .	39
2.1	Box script and Hikamu . . . . .	46
2.2	The consonant graphemes . . . . .	47
2.3	Additional consonant graphemes . . . . .	48
2.4	Primary vowel graphemes . . . . .	48
2.5	Secondary vowel graphemes . . . . .	49
2.6	Bottom-attaching diacritics . . . . .	51
2.7	Obligatorily prepended diacritics . . . . .	53
2.8	Allographically prepended diacritics . . . . .	53
2.9	Superscript diacritics . . . . .	56
2.10	The numerals . . . . .	57
2.11	Common punctuation marks . . . . .	58
2.12	Less common punctuation marks . . . . .	58
2.13	Tahano Hikamu, ‘book style’ . . . . .	59
2.14	Tahano Hikamu, ‘angular style’ . . . . .	60
2.15	Tahano Hikamu, ‘hand style’ . . . . .	60
2.16	Tahano Hikamu, ‘blackletter style’ . . . . .	61



4.1	Declension paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>badan</i> ‘father’ . . . . .	75
4.2	Declension paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>māva</i> ‘mother’ . . . . .	76
4.3	Declension paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>kirin</i> ‘street’ . . . . .	76
4.4	Declension paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>pera</i> ‘measure’ . . . . .	77
4.5	Grammatical genders in Ayeri . . . . .	77
4.6	Personal pronouns . . . . .	112
4.7	Demonstrative pronouns . . . . .	116
4.8	Interrogative pronouns . . . . .	119
4.9	Declension paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>sinya</i> ‘who, what’ . . . . .	121
4.10	The implicational map for indefinite pronoun functions . . . . .	123
4.11	Indefinite pronouns . . . . .	123
4.12	Map of indefinite pronoun functions in Ayeri . . . . .	126
4.13	Relative pronouns . . . . .	129
4.14	Prepositions (simple) . . . . .	137
4.15	Prepositions (dynamic) . . . . .	140
4.16	Postpositions . . . . .	143
4.17	Adpositions with temporal meaning . . . . .	144
4.18	Conjugation paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>sob-</i> ‘learn, teach’ . . . . .	146
4.19	Conjugation paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>anl-</i> ‘bring’ . . . . .	146
4.20	Conjugation paradigm for ႁႃ႔ <i>no-</i> ‘want’ . . . . .	147
4.21	Verb inflection types in Ayeri . . . . .	152
4.22	The syntax and morphology of pronominal affixes . . . . .	154
4.23	Modal verbs and particles . . . . .	171

## List of Tables

---

1.1	Frequency of words with different numbers of syllables . . . . .	13
1.2	Frequency of syllable types per word . . . . .	15
1.3	Frequency of onsets in initial syllables . . . . .	17
1.4	Frequency of nuclei in initial syllables . . . . .	18
1.5	Frequency of codas in initial syllables . . . . .	19
1.6	Frequency of onsets in medial syllables . . . . .	21
1.7	Frequency of nuclei in medial syllables . . . . .	22
1.8	Frequency of codas in medial syllables . . . . .	23
1.9	Frequency of onsets in final syllables . . . . .	24
1.10	Frequency of nuclei in final syllables . . . . .	25
1.11	Frequency of codas in final syllables . . . . .	26
1.12	Frequency of onsets in single syllables . . . . .	27
1.13	Frequency of nuclei in single syllables . . . . .	29
1.14	Frequency of codas in single syllables . . . . .	29
1.15	Frequency of cross-syllable consonant clusters . . . . .	30
4.1	Compounds in the Ayeri dictionary . . . . .	95
4.2	Token frequencies of attested demonstrative pronouns . . . . .	116
4.3	Token frequencies of attested complex relative pronouns . . . . .	130

# Glossing Abbreviations

---

I	First person	INT	Intensifier
2	Second person	IRR	Irrealis
3	Third person	ITER	Iterative
A	Agent	LNK	Linker
ACC	Accusative	LOC	Locative
AFF	Affirmative	LOCT	Locative topic
AGR	Agreement	M	Masculine
AGTZ	Agentizer	N	Neuter
AN	Animate	NEG	Negative
AT	Agent topic	NFUT	Near future
CAUS	Causative	NMLZ	Nominalizer
CAUT	Causative topic	NOM	Nominative
COMP	Comparative	NPST	Near past
DAT	Dative	P	Patient
DATT	Dative topic	PL	Plural
DEF	Definite	PREP	Preposition
DIM	Diminutive	PROG	Progressive
DYN	Dynamic	PRS	Present
F	Feminine	PST	Past
FUT	Future	PT	Patient topic
GEN	Genitive	PTCP	Participle
GENT	Genitive topic	REFL	Reflexive
HAB	Habitative	REL	Relative
HORT	Hortative	RFUT	Remote future
IMP	Imperative	RPST	Remote past
INAN	Inanimate	SBJ	Subject
INDF	Indefinite	SG	Singular
INS	Instrumental	SUPL	Superlative
INST	Instrumental topic	TOP	Topic



# Preface

---

This is my latest attempt to write a grammar of Ayeri, a fictional language which I have been developing since December 2003. Getting to work on grammar writing again was triggered by a growing dissatisfaction with not having a central place of documentation, when the first thing people look for on my website is often the grammar, incomplete as well as partially inaccurate and outdated as it may be. In addition to that, there was a seminar on fictional languages at the University of Tübingen, Germany, in the summer semester of 2016 (Buch 2016). Ayeri was one of the languages that was chosen for students to explore and evaluate.

The student group who worked on Ayeri came to the conclusion that its documentation is severely lacking in the description of basic elements and assumptions, since whole chapters of the grammar had been missing to date (Boga et al. 2016: 12).<sup>1</sup> This is to say that previous attempts of writing a full-fledged grammar of Ayeri have been incomplete due to loss of enthusiasm and creeping neglect.

Although the *Ayeri Grammar* has so far been lying dormant for five years, I have written a whole number of blog articles detailing various grammatical issues (Becker 2016a: Blog). These articles have been taken into consideration here. This grammar writing attempt is thus not only a transferral to a different typesetting system, but constitutes an extension to previous formal documentation as well.

I hope that by transferring my previous grammar writing from LibreOffice to L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X, combined with using GitHub as a version control system, maintaining and editing will become faster, more transparent, and more elegant, since L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X operates on plain text files, and version control helps in keeping track of changes over time.

Carsten Becker  
Marburg, July 18, 2016

<sup>1</sup>  *Kutānas-ikan* ‘thanks a lot’ to Bella Boga, Madita Breuninger, Thora Daneyko, and Martina Stama-Kirr for their hard work on making sense of my published materials in spite of information being scattered all over the place, as well as their providing me with the presentation concluding their group work.



## o Introduction

---

In December 2003, the idea for a new fictional language was born, an idea that turned out to stick with me for over 10 years now.<sup>1</sup> At that time, my seventeen years old self was still fairly new to this whole making-up languages business, read things about linguistics here and there, and was not shy to ask questions about terminology (and, looking at old mails, a little impertinently teenager-like so), for example on *Conlang-L* and the *Zompist Bulletin Board*. One thing seemed to catch my interest especially: syntactic alignments other than the NOM/ACC of the few languages I was familiar with, that is, German, English, and French. Apparently this curiosity was big enough for me to grow bored with my second fictional language, Daléian (declared ‘quite complete’ after maybe half a year of work or so), and to start something new from scratch in order to put newly acquired knowledge to test.

I had read about “trigger languages” on *Conlang-L* and wanted to try my hands on making my own. I cannot remember how long it took me to come up with a first draft of an Ayeri grammar, however, I do remember having been told that a good language cannot be made in a summer. Of course, I still did not really know what I was doing then, even though I thought I had understood things and authoritatively declared “this is how it works” in my first grammar draft when things sometimes really do not work that way. But at least an interest had been whetted.

In order to illustrate the various stages from the beginnings to current Ayeri, I went through some old backups contemporary with the very early days. Here is a sentence from the oldest existing document related to it, titled “Draft of & Ideas for my 3rd Conlang”—the file’s last-changed date is December 14, 2003, though I remember having started work on Ayeri in early December. I added glossing for convenience and according to what I could reconstruct from the notes. This uses vocabulary and grammatical markers just made up on the spot and for illustrative purposes; little of it actually managed to make it into actual work on Ayeri:

<sup>1</sup> Most of the text here is taken from the blog article, “Happy 10th anniversary, Ayeri!” (Becker 2013) with some slight rephrasings and extensions.

- (1) *Ayevhoi agiaemaesim coyaielieðamavir vhaieloyajaiye.*  
 Ay-evhoi agia-ema-esim coyai-el-i-eðam-avir vhai-el-o-yaŋa-iye  
 3SG.AN-SBJ read-VERB-SBJ.AN book-NOUN-AN-INDF-P bed-NOUN-INAN-on-LOC  
 ‘He reads a book on the bed.’

According to the grammar draft of September 5, 2004, this would have already changed to:

- (2) *Ang layaiyain mecoyalei ling \*pinamea.*  
 Ang laya-iy-a-in me-coya-lei ling \*pinam-ea  
 A.SBJ read-3SG.AN<sub>1</sub>-a<sub>1</sub>-SBJ INDF.INAN-book-P.INAN top.of bed-LOC  
 ‘He reads a book on the bed.’

A word for ‘bed’—*pinam*—was only (re-)introduced on October 24, 2008, however. In the current state of Ayeri, I would translate the sentence as follows:

- (3) *Ang layaya koyaley ling pinamya.*  
 Ang laya=ya.Ø koya-ley ling pinam-ya  
 AT read=3SG.M.TOP book-P.INAN top.of bed-LOC  
 ‘He reads a book on a/the bed.’

As you can see, quite a bit of morphology got lost already early on, especially the overt part-of-speech marking (!) and animacy marking on nouns. Also, prepositions were just incorporated into a noun complex as suffixes apparently. Gender was originally only divided into animate and inanimate, but I changed that at some point because only being really familiar with European languages, it felt awkward to me not to be able to explicitly distinguish ‘he’, ‘she’, and ‘it’.

A feature that also got lost is the assignment of thematic vowels in personal pronouns to third-person referents: originally, every third-person referent newly introduced into discourse would be assigned one of /a e i o u/ to disambiguate, and there was even a morpheme to mark that the speaker wanted to dissolve the association. Constituent order was theoretically variable at first, but I preferred SVO/AVP due to familiarity with that. Later on, however, I settled on VSO/VAP. Also, I had no idea about what was called “trigger morphology” on *Conlang-L* for the longest time—essentially, this referred to the Austronesian, or Philippine, alignment. I am not claiming that I know all about it now, just that due to reading up on the topic, I have a slightly more informed understanding now. Orthography changed as well over the years, so ⟨c⟩ in the early examples encodes the /k/ sound, not /tʃ/ as it does today; diphthongs were spelled as ⟨Vi⟩ instead of modern ⟨Vy⟩.

What was definitely beneficial for the development of Ayeri was the ever increasing amount of linguistics materials available online and my entering university (to



study literature) in 2009, where I learned how to do research and also had a lot of interesting books available at the library.

One of the things people regularly compliment me on is Ayeri's script—note, however, that Tahano Hikamu was not the first one I came up with for Ayeri. Apparently, I had already been fascinated with the look of Javanese/Balinese writing early on;<sup>2</sup> Figure 0.1 shows a draft dated February 9, 2004. However, the letter shapes in this draft looked so confusingly alike that I could never memorize them. About a year later, I came up with the draft in Figure 0.2. What is titled “Another Experimental Script” there is what would later turn into Tahano Hikamu, Ayeri's ‘native’ script. According to the notes in my fictional language ring binder, the script looked much the same as today about a year from then, but things have only been mostly stable since about 2008.

An important date in the history of Ayeri was when I decided to set up an improved website for Ayeri that would include a blog. The idea was that this way, I could more freely write on whatever detail I currently interested me in Ayeri, outside of the constraints of the Grammar. Thus, *Benung. The Ayeri Language Resource* launched on March 1, 2011. Being able to write short articles, however, probably also led to neglecting work on the actual formal reference grammar, which had been lying dormant from January 2011 on. This was always on the premise that I would eventually include the information from blog articles in the grammar. However, juggling such a big document had always felt daunting, so I let laziness take the better part of me eventually as enthusiasm gradually subsided.<sup>3</sup> This renewed attempt at documentation has been started with the intention to right those wrongs.

I hope that by now it should be clear which kind of a fictional language Ayeri is: a personal, artistic language—or *artlang* in community parlance. Thus, my goal in creating Ayeri is not to propose yet another international auxiliary language, like Esperanto. It is also not my goal to make it as logical as possible, like Lojban. Neither is it my goal to engineer it towards certain underlying premises, for example, to reach a maximal amount of information density, like Ithkuil, or to get by on as few different words as possible, like Toki Pona. It is also not a ‘what-if’ language in the sense of “What could the modern language of Old Irish speakers transplanted to Australia look like?” or “Latin piped through Athabascan sound changes.”

Ayeri is rather an attempt to create an artificial language for personal enjoyment and intellectual stimulation by creating a feedback loop between reading up on

<sup>2</sup> Compare, for instance, the charts in Kuipers and McDermott (1996). The Wikipedia articles on either script contain a number of images depicting the scripts in use, both current and historic.

<sup>3</sup> Let me add to my defense, however, that I also worked on my B.A. thesis in 2013 and my M.A. thesis in 2016, which required several months of preparation each and thus left me largely unable to work much on Ayeri.

Figure 0.1: First design for an Ayeri script (February 9, 2004)



linguistics and actively devising rules for a fictional language accordingly, to see how things work within the frame I created, or to try and see whether certain ideas work together at all when combined, and to better understand why they do or do not. Ayeri will only ever be as perfect as miniature models of things can be, since it has not grown organically from millenia of human interaction, and I cannot and will never know about each and every aspect of language myself, in spite of continued curiosity about these matters. Nor will it be possible for me to replicate all the fascinating twists and irregularities that natural languages normally entail. The ultimate goal in my work on Ayeri is, I suppose, to make it emulate natural languages to at least some degree of depth and complexity.

In writing this grammar, I hope that I will find a good balance between applying linguistic theory to already existing materials and ideas, and going forth to create rules for aspects of the language that have so far been neglected, often due to my

[illegible]

not being aware of them. In my opinion, the split between being able to apply methods of linguistics to what has grown over the course of more than a decade on the one hand, and discovering and developing new aspects of the language on the other is what makes Ayer an interesting piece of “informed nonsense,” as a colleague of mine once put it.

Errors are all mine. If my English is not always fully idiomatic, you find that I got my terminology wrong, or not all aspects of the language or its description are equally well worked-out—which are all very likely events—I ask you to bear with me. For one, English is not my native language, and second, I put up the grammar on GitHub in the hope of making it easier to fix and extend things through patches.<sup>4</sup> This also means that you can file an Issue there in case of issues if you feel inclined to do so. Criticism is always welcome as long as it is constructive.

<sup>4</sup> See <https://github.com/carbeck/ayerigrammar/>.



# 1 Phonology

---

This chapter will present charts depicting the phoneme inventory of Ayeri and describe the various commonly encountered allophones of both consonants and vowels. Following this, a detailed statistical analysis of the words found in a number of translated texts from 2008 to 2016 as well as dictionary entries up to July 2016 will produce insights into Ayeri’s phonotactics. Some notes on stress patterns and intonation will close the chapter.

## 1.1 Phoneme inventory

### 1.1.1 Consonants

At 17 consonants, Ayeri has a “moderately small” inventory, according to Maddieson (2013a). Figure 1.1 shows the full chart of consonant phonemes.

Regarding allophony, /tj kj/ and /dj gj/ are usually realized as [tʃ] and [dʒ], respectively, except if a homorganic nasal /n/ or /ŋ/ is preceding: for instance, ႁႏႱ *ankyū* /ʼaŋkju/ ‘really’ is realized as [ʼaŋkju], not as \*[ʼaŋtʃu] or \*[ʼantʃu]. It is important to note, however, that besides this synchronic palatalization process leading to [tʃ] and [dʒ] as *allophones*, there is also a diachronic one in parallel here—or the diachronic process is still ongoing. For example, there is no way to predict whether ႁႏ *cuna* ‘original, initial’, ႏႱ *panca* ‘finally, eventually’, and ႏႱ *vac-* ‘like’, or ႏႱ *jaraṇ* ‘pilgrimage’, ႏႱ *aja-* ‘play’, and ႏႱ *nuy-* ‘pour’ have /tj/ or /kj/, /dj/ or /gj/, respectively, unless we consider the clues given by the conservative native spellings of the respective words.<sup>1</sup> We can rather assume two sound changes, (1) tj, kj → tʃ, and (2) dj, gj → dʒ, leading to the *phonemes* /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ in the present-day language.

<sup>1</sup> Actual scribes would typically err in cases where the merger is complete, so this strategy would, in fact, be of limited use in the real world.

Figure 1.1: Consonant inventory (divergent orthography in pointed brackets)

	Bilabials		Labiodentals		Alveolars		Palatals	Velars		Glottals
Plosives	p	b			t	d		k	g	
Affricates					tʃ <c>	dʒ <j>				
Nasals		m				n		ŋ <ng>		
Fricatives			v		s					h
Taps/Flaps						r				
Approximants						l	j <y>			

The plural marker ၵ -*ye* is commonly contracted to [dʒ] when a case suffix beginning with a vowel follows:<sup>2</sup>

- (1) a. ဘၢၣ်ၣ်ၣ် *nyānyēang* → *nyānjāng* [ˈnjaːndʒaŋ] ‘persons’ (person-PL-A);  
 b. ခၢၣ်ၣ်ၣ် *netuyēas* → *netujas* [neˈtudʒas] ‘brothers’ (brother-PL-P).

The plural marker may also contract before the locative marker ၵ -*ya* and the dative marker ၵ -*yam*, basically for dissimilation:<sup>3</sup>

- (2) a. ခၢၣ်ၣ်ၣ် *nivayēya* → *nivajya* [niˈvadʒja] ‘at the eyes’ (eye-PL-LOC);  
 b. ခၢၣ်ၣ်ၣ် *maviyēyam* → *mavijyam* [maˈvidʒjam] ‘to the sheep’ (sheep-PL-DAT).

Dissimilation of the sequence ၵ -*yaya* is attested in my translation of Kafka’s short story “Eine kaiserliche Botschaft,” where the relative pronoun ၵ *siyaya* appears transcribed as *sijya*:

As far as morphophonology is concerned, the relative pronoun complex *sijya* ‘in/at/on which.LOC’ is interesting in so far as it is a contraction of \**siyaya* ‘REL-LOC-LOC’ that I introduced here [...] Since this feature does not occur in previous texts, let’s assume it’s an acceptable variant. (Becker 2012: 12)

The contraction happens “only if both parts are grammatical suffixes” (12), however, so the environments this contraction may appear in are effectively limited to relative pronouns combining locative and locative, or locative and dative marking.

The word ၵ *lajāy* ‘student’ is special in that it is the only word with ၵ [dʒa] so far. Presumably it is derived from the verb ၵ *laya-* ‘read’ with the agentive suffix ၵ -*maya*, except the shortening of the suffix—with or without compensatory lengthening of the final vowel of the modified word stem—was applied irregularly, possibly via \**ၵ layāya*. The regular form ၵ *layamaya* means ‘reader’.

Lastly, /h/ may assimilate to its phonemic environment and is realized as [ç] before front vowels, and as [x] before back vowels in this case:

- (3) a. ၵ *tabi* [ˈtaçi] ‘favorable’;  
 b. ၵ *babo* [ˈbaxo] ‘loud’.

While vowels become long when two identical vowels come into succession, consonants do not geminate but are treated like a single consonant:

<sup>2</sup> The customary romanization uses ⟨c⟩ and ⟨j⟩ for allophonic cases of [tʃ] and [dʒ] as well.

<sup>3</sup> ၵ -*ea* also occurs as an allomorph, so that ၵ -*ye* + ၵ -*ea* → ၵ -*yēa*.

- (4) a.  $\text{တသ်ဝံၣ်}$  *tavvāng* [ta'va:ŋ] 'you get' (get=2SG.A),  
 b.  $\text{သိၣ်ယၢၣ်}$  *disyyang* [di'sjaŋ] 'I fasten' (fasten=1SG.A).

With diphthongs, the sequence /Vɪ.j/ is treated as though it were /Vj.j/, so the double /j/ simplifies to just a single /j/; however, the vowel remains lax in spite of being phonetically in an open position now:

- (5)  $\text{တိပုၣ်ယၢၣ်}$  *tipuyya* [ti'pu.ja] 'on the grass' (grass-LOC).

### 1.1.2 Vowels

Figure 1.2: Vowel inventory (divergent orthography in pointed brackets)

	Front	Center	Back
High	i, i: ⟨ī⟩		u, u: ⟨ū⟩
Mid	e, e: ⟨ē⟩	ə ⟨ə, e⟩	o, o: ⟨ō⟩
Back		a, a: ⟨ā⟩	

Ayeri's vowel system distinguishes five qualities, as shown in Figure 1.2; Maddieson (2013c) classifies this as “average.” Length, however, is also a factor, and there are five diphthongs as well, as we will see below. At 17 : 5, the consonant–vowel ratio is 4.25, which Maddieson (2013b) again classifies as “average,” although Ayeri finds itself at the upper end of the tier.

The lax vowels [ɪ ɛ ɔ ʊ] occur as allophones of their tense counterparts /i e o u/ in closed syllables, for example:

- (6) a.  $\text{မိၣ်ၣ်}$  *ming* [mɪŋ] 'can, be able',  
 b.  $\text{မၢၣ်ၣ်}$  *enya* ['ɛn.ja] 'everyone',  
 c.  $\text{မၢၣ်ၣ်}$  *agon* ['a.gɔŋ] 'outer, foreign', and  
 d.  $\text{ပၢၣ်ၣ်}$  *pakur* ['pa.kʊr] 'ill, sick'.

/ə/ occurs marginally in the tense prefixes  $\text{န}$ : *kə*- 'NPST',  $\text{မ}$ : *mə*- 'PST',  $\text{ပ}$ : *və*- 'RPST', as well as in the prefix  $\text{မ}$ : *mə*- 'some, whichever'. Otherwise, [ə] acts as an allophone of /e/ in final unstressed position, for instance, in the word  $\text{မိၣ်ၣ်}$  *mine* ['minə] 'affair, matter, issue'.

Ayeri also possesses a number of diphthongs, these are: /ai ei ɔɪ uɪ au/, spelled ⟨ay⟩, ⟨ey⟩, ⟨oy⟩, ⟨uy⟩, and ⟨au⟩. Furthermore, there are long equivalents of the short vowels: /i: e: a: o: u:/; in romanization, long vowels are marked with a macron ⟨̄⟩ over the letter. Long vowels are lexicalized in a few words, for example:



- (7) a.  $\text{ᠨᠢᠰᠠ}$  *nīsa* ‘wanted’,  $\text{ᠫᠤᠰᠢᠰᠠ}$  *pasīsa* ‘interesting’;  
 b.  $\text{ᠠᠷᠡᠨ}$  *arēn* ‘anyway, however’,  $\text{ᠯᠡᠷᠠ}$  *lēra* ‘whore’;  
 c.  $\text{ᠯᠠ}$  *lā* ‘tongue’,  $\text{ᠶᠠᠩ}$  *yāng* ‘he’ (he.A);  
 d.  $\text{ᠨᠣᠨ}$  *nōn* ‘will, intention’; and  
 e.  $\text{ᠪᠠᠪᠤᠠᠨ}$  *babūan* ‘barbarian’.<sup>4</sup>

Otherwise, long vowels result from two same vowels next to each other, for instance:

- (8)  $\text{ᠠᠵᠠ}$  *aja-* ‘play’ +  $\text{ᠠᠨ}$  *-an* ‘NMLZ’  $\rightarrow$   $\text{ᠠᠵᠠᠨ}$  *ajān* ‘game, play’.

Morphophonologically, long vowels also occur in double-marked relative pronouns where the agreement marker for the relative clause’s head has been omitted, for instance,  $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠠ}$  *sinā* ‘of which, about which’, as in the following example:

- (9) *Le turayāng taman sinā ang ningay tamala vās.*  
 Le tura-yāng [taman-Ø]<sub>1</sub> si-Ø<sub>1</sub>-na ang ning=ay.Ø tamala vās  
 PT.INAN send=3SG.M.A letter-TOP REL-PT.INAN-GEN AT tell=1SG.TOP yesterday 2SG.P

‘The letter which I told you about yesterday, he sent it.’

This is to disambiguate it from the plain genitive-marked relative pronoun  $\text{ᠰᠢᠨᠠ}$  *sinā* ‘which.GEN’:<sup>5</sup>

- (10) *tamanreng ledanena nā sina koronvāng*  
 taman-reng [ledan-ena nā]<sub>1</sub> si-na<sub>1</sub> koron=vāng  
 letter-A.INAN friend-GEN 1SG.GEN REL-GEN know=2SG.A

‘the letter of my friend which you know’

As pointed out in (7c), the word  $\text{ᠯᠠ}$  *lā* ‘tongue’ ends in a long vowel, so the question is what happens when a case suffix beginning with a vowel is appended. To avoid a hiat, a glide /j/ may be inserted, so both of the following renditions are possible:

<sup>4</sup> I have gone years without dictionary entries for /u:/, but it has always seemed slightly odd to me to lack a vowel in that position when all other vowels can be long. Therefore,  $\text{ᠪᠠᠪᠤᠠᠨ}$  *babūan* ‘barbarian’ and its adjective  $\text{ᠪᠠᠪᠤ}$  *babū* ‘barbarian (adj.)’ were coined as  $\text{ᠫᠤᠮᠤᠨᠠᠭᠤᠨ}$  *prankayē*—things ‘that you put in specifically to make things fit’, another new coining this decision resulted in. Note, however, that it should have always been possible to form words like  $\text{ᠬᠤᠪᠤ}$  *kūbo* ‘as though bitter’, from  $\text{ᠤᠪᠤ}$  *ubo* ‘bitter’ +  $\text{ᠬᠤ}$  *ku-* ‘like, as though’.

<sup>5</sup> A variant which combines the allomorphs of the relativizer and the genitive case marker in the opposite way also exists:  $\text{ᠰᠢ}$  *s-* +  $\text{ᠠᠨᠠ}$  *-ena*  $\rightarrow$   $\text{ᠰᠠᠨᠠ}$  *sena*.

- (11) a. *Aku*            *lāas!*  
           Aka-u        *lā-as*  
           swallow-IMP tongue-P  
           ‘Shut up!’
- b. *Aku lāyas!*  
           (idem)

With diphthongs—as described above—/ɪ/ coalesces with a following /j/ to /j/, but the initial vowel will not become tense, thus:

- (12) ၵိပုၼ် *tipuyya* [ti'pu.ja] ‘on the grass’ (grass-LOC).

Moreover, /u/ is commonly realized as [w] when followed by a vowel, for example in ၵုၼ် *huākaya* ['wa:kaja] ‘frog’ or ၵိ *rua-* [rwa] ‘have to, must’. [w] may also be an allophone of /uj/, as in ၵိ *adauyi* [a'dawi] ‘then’, ၵိ *edaui* [e'dawi] ‘now’, or ၵိ *nekuyi* ['nekwi] ‘eyebrows’. The negative suffix ၵိ *-oy* is also commonly contracted to [w] before a diphthong:

- (13) ၵိ *mingoyay* → *minguay* [miŋ'wai] ‘I cannot’ (can-NEG=ISG.TOP).

## 1.2 Phonotactics

For the purpose of this statistical analysis, most of the available translations into Ayeri from late 2008 to July 2016 have been used as a text corpus;<sup>6</sup> example sentences from various blog articles have also been added, as well as dictionary entries for all nouns, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, adpositions, conjunctions, and numerals if they were not prefixes or suffixes.<sup>7</sup> Borrowings have been deleted if they could not reasonably be words in Ayeri. Altogether, the corpus comprises 5,500 words, which

<sup>6</sup> These texts are: A Medieval Neighborhood Dispute (2015), A Message from the Emperor (2012), Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (2011), The Beginning of Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* (2014), Conlang Christmas Card Exchange 2008/09 (2009), Conlang Holiday Card Exchange 2010/11 (2011), Conlang Relay 15 (2008), Conlang Relay 17 (2010), Conlang Relay 18 (2011), The First Two Chapters from Saint-Exupéry’s *Le Petit Prince* (2013), The Four Candles (2010), Honey Everlasting (2014), LCC4 Relay (2011), The Lord’s Prayer (2015), The North Wind and the Sun (2016), The Origin of the Wind (2009), Ozymandias (2011), Please Call Stella ... (2008), Psalm 23 (2013), The Scientific Method (2014), The Sheep and the Horses (2012), Sugar Fairies (2011), The Upside-Down Ice Skater (2009). The texts can be accessed from Becker (2016a: Examples).

<sup>7</sup> This section updates and extends a previous analysis of the phonological makeup of dictionary entries (Becker 2010). The previous study had its focus on gathering frequency statistics for word generation, however, we want to know about words generally here.

is a very small figure for such a study, but there are only so many texts available unfortunately. Words may occur more than once.

Among the dictionary entries, verbs have notably been ignored, since verb stems alone do not constitute independent words—they are always inflected in some way, so that they may end in consonants or consonant clusters that independent words cannot end in. This also has repercussions on syllabification and stress, which depend on the inflection of the verb stem:

Figure 1.3: Syllabification of inflected verbs

Suffix	<i>ca-</i> ‘love’	<i>gum-</i> ‘work’	<i>babr-</i> ‘mumble’
- <i>ay</i> (1SG)	cá.y	gu.máy	ba.bráy
- <i>va</i> (2SG)	cá.va	gúm.va	ba.brá.va
- <i>yam</i> (PTCP)	cá.yam	gúm.yam	bá.bryam

For the purpose of gathering statistics on phonemes, the words from translated texts were converted to IPA first. Fortunately, this is rather easy as Ayerí’s romanization is very straightforward. Syllable breaks have also been inserted semi-automatically.

### 1.2.1 Number of syllables per word

First, let us see how many syllables words commonly have (see Table 1.1). The higher the syllable count, the more likely it is for them to be compounds or inflected words.

Table 1.1: Frequency of words with different numbers of syllables (n = 5500)

Segment	Count	Percentage
2 syllables	2277	41.40 %
3 syllables	1393	25.33 %
1 syllable	1201	21.84 %
4 syllables	547	9.95 %
5 syllables	74	1.35 %
6 syllables	8	0.15 %

Two-syllable words make up the bulk of the sample, which is not surprising since 1,072 entries (55.43 %) in the dictionary subsample are disyllabic: most of Ayerí’s roots are disyllabic. Unsurprisingly, most monosyllabic words are function words like the ones cited below. In the following, I will quote a few examples for each number of syllables per word:

- (14) a. ၼာ *ang* (AT),  
 နှ *nay* ‘and’,  
 ရှိ *rua* ‘must’;
- b. ပါဏိ *datau* ‘normal’,  
 နာယ *nasay* ‘near to’;
- c. ၼာဝေၼာ *avanyāng* ‘he sinks’ (sink=3SG.M.A),  
 ၼာၼာ *tovale* ‘a cloak’ (cloak-P.INAN);
- d. ဃုၼာ *binyanveno* (corner.beautiful, a place name),  
 မိတၼာ *mitanena* ‘of the palace’ (palace-GEN);
- e. ဃာယမာ *haruyamanas* ‘a beating’ (beat-PTCP-NMLZ-P),  
 နီၼာ *sungkorankihas* ‘geography’ (science.map);
- f. နီၼာ *kaytomayanena* ‘of righteousness’ (righteous-NMLZ-GEN),  
 နီၼာ *nasimayajang-ben* ‘all followers’ (follow-AGTZ-PL-A=all).

Table 1.2 shows the frequencies of syllable types by position in a word. It is important to note here that phonemes which consist of more than one segment—affricates, diphthongs, and long vowels—have been counted as only one of C (consonant) or V (vowel), respectively. The following subsections will elaborate on which sounds the Cs and Vs correspond to. Moreover, it is important to note that medial syllables have not been further distinguished by position in the word for the sake of this analysis, so anything between the second and the fifth medial syllable is treated the same. It would furthermore be possible to calculate the frequencies of one syllable type following the other, however, no such calculations have been carried out here.

In all positions, CV is the most common syllable type, followed by CVC. With a very big margin, V is the next most common syllable type, which is also most common in initial syllables and least common in monosyllabic words. The cases with only a few attestations are the following:

- (15) a. Initial CVCC:  
 လီၼာ *linktang* /liŋk.'taŋ/ ‘they try’ (try=3PL.M.A),<sup>8</sup>  
 လီၼာ *silvnang* /silv.'naŋ/ ‘we see’ (see=1PL.A);
- b. Final CCCV:  
 မိဂရီ *migr̥yo* /'mi.gr̥jo/ ‘flourishes’ (flourish-3SG.N),  
 မိဂရီ *subr̥yo* /'su.br̥jo/ ‘ceases’ (cease-3SG.N);
- c. Single V:  
 အီ *ay* /aɪ/ ‘I’ (1SG.TOP).

The medial and final VC cases may seem like an oddity, but they are mostly due

<sup>8</sup> The verb stem is found in the dictionary as လီၼာ *linka-*, with a final *-a*, and thus is possibly an entry changed at a later point, or the example from the text (Sugar Fairies) chosen here contains an error.

Table 1.2: Frequency of syllable types per word (n = 5500)

Type	Initial		Medial		Final		Single		Total	
CV	2896	67.36%	1974	72.02%	2109	49.06%	578	48.13%	7557	60.26%
CCV	55	1.28%	24	0.88%	46	1.07%	32	2.66%	157	1.25%
CCCV	—	—	—	—	2	0.05%	—	—	2	0.02%
CVC	761	17.70%	610	22.25%	1902	44.24%	298	24.81%	3571	28.48%
CCVC	29	0.67%	10	0.36%	85	1.98%	9	0.75%	133	1.06%
CVCC	2	0.05%	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.02%
V	488	11.35%	95	3.47%	67	1.56%	2	0.17%	652	5.20%
VC	68	1.58%	28	1.02%	88	2.05%	282	23.48%	466	3.72%
Total	4299	100.00%	2741	100.00%	4299	100.00%	1201	100.00%	12540	100.00%

to the previous syllable ending in /ŋ/, with that syllable also containing a lax vowel, which means that this syllable must be closed. An alternative explanation would be to assume that /ŋ/ is ambisyllabic, or actually /n.g ~ ŋ.g/, but realized as [ŋ]. The high number of single-syllable VC is due to *ᐱᓂ ang* ‘AT’, which alone appears 255 times in the sample (4.63% of all words, 21.23% of monosyllabic words, 90.43% of monosyllabic VC words).

### 1.2.2 Phonemic makeup of initial syllables

The statistics in the following sections have been gathered from the IPA conversions of translated texts and dictionary entries mentioned above. The transcribed words have been split into syllables and then the collected contents of each position group were written into separate plain text files, one each for:

- all initial syllables of polysyllabic words,
- all medial syllables of polysyllabic words,
- all final syllables of polysyllabic words, and
- all monosyllabic words.

Monosyllabic words are both initial and final syllables at the same time; they have been counted separately for the purpose of this analysis. Onsets, nuclei and codas have been matched by regular expressions; the command line tools *grep*, *sort*, and *uniq* were used to aggregate all occurring variants for each syllable segment as well as their absolute frequencies:<sup>9</sup>

```
(16) C = (? : t f | d ʒ | [ptkbgdmnŋvshrɭjw])
      V = (? : [ae] : ? ɪ | əʊ | [ieaou] : ? | [ɪɛʊə])
```

As we have seen above (Table 1.2), CCV syllables only make up 1.28% of initial syllables, insofar it is no surprise that consonant clusters all appear at the bottom of Table 1.3. There also seem to be combination patterns in that initial clusters exist for all plosives plus /r/, and almost all bilabials plus /j/, with the exception of /bj/, however, /nj/ is added to the group instead. Combinations with /w/ only occur for /b/, /r/, and /s/, which do not share an obvious connection. Syllables without a consonant filling the onset position are marked with ‘Ø’; these numbers correspond to the VC and VCC rows in Table 1.2.

Perhaps most striking about the nuclei of initial syllables presented in Table 1.4 is that plain vowels occur most frequently. As mentioned above, lax vowels are counted here as allophones of tense ones as their distribution is complementary and

<sup>9</sup> However, *sort* was unable to handle all IPA characters, so *sed 'γ/εɪʊə:fʒŋ/EIʊ@:SZN/'* had to be used to compensate by transcribing everything into X-SAMPA.

Table 1.3: Frequency of onsets in initial syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	556	12.93 %
s	488	11.35 %
t	432	10.05 %
m	418	9.72 %
k	380	8.84 %
n	375	8.72 %
p	334	7.77 %
b	231	5.37 %
d	172	4.00 %
v	164	3.81 %
l	159	3.70 %
r	134	3.12 %
j	126	2.93 %
g	111	2.58 %
h	99	2.30 %
tʃ	30	0.70 %
pr	27	0.63 %
nj	27	0.63 %
kr	8	0.19 %
br	8	0.19 %
tr	6	0.14 %
dʒ	4	0.09 %
gr	3	0.07 %
w	2	0.05 %
sw	1	0.02 %
rw	1	0.02 %
pj	1	0.02 %
mj	1	0.02 %
bw	1	0.02 %

Table 1.4: Frequency of nuclei in initial syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
a	1847	42.96 %
i	1011	23.52 %
<i>i</i>	802	18.66 %
<i>ɪ</i>	209	4.86 %
e	705	16.40 %
<i>e</i>	523	12.17 %
<i>ɛ</i>	164	3.81 %
<i>ə</i>	18	0.42 %
u	260	6.05 %
<i>u</i>	228	5.30 %
<i>ʊ</i>	32	0.74 %
o	227	5.28 %
<i>o</i>	188	4.37 %
<i>ɔ</i>	39	0.91 %
a:	109	2.54 %
aɪ	88	2.05 %
eɪ	40	0.93 %
e:	4	0.09 %
ɔɪ	3	0.07 %
ʊɪ	1	0.02 %
o:	1	0.02 %
i:	1	0.02 %
e:ɪ	1	0.02 %
aʊ	1	0.02 %



are listed here for the sake of completeness. This is the reason why the plain vowels are presented as grouped with their allophones in this table as well as in subsequent ones. Long vowels and diphthongs find themselves below the 5% threshold, and the words with single occurrences are:

- (17) a.  *kuysān* ‘comparison’,  
 b.  *nōn* ‘will, intention’,  
 c.  *nīsa* ‘wanted’,<sup>10</sup>  
 d.  *sēyraya* ‘will overcome’ (FUT-overcome-3SG.M),  
 e.  *sautan* ‘cork’.

As the diphthong [e:i] only occurs due to allophony, it should not be counted as a phoneme for the purposes of this analysis. On the other hand, the same could be said for a lot of cases of [a:] included here—this caveat applies to all nouns derived from verbs ending in *-a* with the very common nominalizing suffix  *-an*, as exemplified in (8) above. Similarly, the 18 instances of /ə/ reported here are mostly from tense prefixes also mentioned above, for instance,  *məkoronay* ‘I knew’ (PST-know=1SG.TOP).

Table 1.5: Frequency of codas in initial syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	3441	80.04 %
n	298	6.93 %
ŋ	243	5.65 %
r	129	3.00 %
l	88	2.05 %
m	74	1.72 %
s	20	0.47 %
t	2	0.05 %
h	2	0.05 %
tʃ	1	0.02 %
ŋk	1	0.02 %
lv	1	0.02 %
k	1	0.02 %

Initial-syllable codas (Table 1.5) are far less diverse than consonant onsets: there are only 10 attested segments in comparison to 28 for onsets (not counting empty

<sup>10</sup>  *nīsa* and  *nōn* are both related to  *no* ‘want, plan’.

codas of C(C)V syllables, which constitute the majority by a large margin), and the only two cluster attested are /ŋk/ in the word  $\text{linktang}$  ‘they try’ (try=3PL.M.A), and /lv/ in the word  $\text{silvnang}$  ‘I see’ (see=IPL.A). There only being two incidences of a CC cluster is very probably an effect of the small sample size. Furthermore, the only unvoiced single coda consonants attested are /s/, /h/, /t/, /tʃ/ and /k/, the latter two only once, /h/ twice:

- (18) a.  $\text{mehvāng}$  ‘you are supposed to’ (be.supposed.to=2SG.A),<sup>11</sup>  
 $\text{rohtang}$  ‘they bite’ (bite=3SG.M.A);  
 b.  $\text{mutva}$  ‘you rub’ (rub=2SG.TOP),  
 $\text{patlay}$  ‘cousin’;  
 c.  $\text{sik-sik}$  ‘tits’;  
 d.  $\text{vacvāng}$  ‘you like’ (like=2SG.A).

### 1.2.3 Phonemic makeup of medial syllables

The onsets of medial syllables (Table 1.6) show properties very similar to those of initial syllables. The order of most common consonants may different here—for example, the most common onset is /r/, not Ø or /s/—, but there are no restrictions on consonants to appear in this position, with the exception of /ŋ/ for reasons stated above (see section 1.2.1). Regarding initial clusters, there are further attestations for plosive plus /r/ (except for /kr/). As for clusters with /j/, the only one with a bilabial is /bj/, but the set is extended to /sj/ and /kj/. For clusters with /w/, only /sw/ and /kw/ occur here, while attestations for /bw/ and /rw/ as in initial-syllable onsets are lacking. This does not mean that those combinations are not principally possible in this position, however.

As with onset consonants, vowel nuclei of medial syllables (Table 1.7) do not show significant differences compared to those of initial syllables either. /a/ is more common here, and /o/ and /u/ switch places. Instead of /e:i/, there is an attestation of /u:/ (see footnote 4), for which there is more reason to be counted as a phoneme than for /e:i/. The sequences /i:/ and /u:/ also only occur once and twice, respectively, namely in the following words:

- (19) a.  $\text{pasīsa}$  ‘interesting’;  
 b.  $\text{puluyley}$  ‘a mirror’ (mirror-P.INAN),  
 $\text{tipuyya}$  ‘on the grass’ (grass-LOC).

<sup>11</sup> The dictionary entry for the verb is  $\text{mya-}$ , so this may be an instance of my changing a word in the dictionary with the old one staying in the text (The Four Candles).

Table 1.6: Frequency of onsets in medial syllables (n = 2741)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	123	4.49%
r	343	12.51%
n	260	9.49%
j	233	8.50%
t	222	8.10%
d	213	7.77%
k	189	6.90%
s	170	6.20%
m	169	6.17%
l	149	5.44%
v	148	5.40%
h	147	5.36%
p	119	4.34%
g	92	3.36%
b	89	3.25%
tʃ	20	0.73%
dʒ	15	0.55%
tr	11	0.40%
dr	8	0.29%
pr	7	0.26%
w	6	0.22%
sj	2	0.07%
br	2	0.07%
sw	1	0.04%
kw	1	0.04%
kj	1	0.04%
bj	1	0.04%

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
a	1480	53.99%
i	480	17.51%
<i>i</i>	387	14.12%
<i>I</i>	93	3.39%
e	254	9.26%
<i>e</i>	206	7.52%
<i>ε</i>	48	1.75%
o	194	7.08%
<i>o</i>	119	4.34%
<i>ɔ</i>	75	2.74%
u	120	4.38%
<i>u</i>	101	3.68%
<i>ʊ</i>	19	0.69%
a:	110	4.01%
aI	51	1.86%
ɔI	33	1.20%
eI	5	0.18%
e:	5	0.18%
aʊ	5	0.18%
ʊI	2	0.07%
u:	1	0.04%
i:	1	0.04%

With medial-syllable codas (Table 1.8) again, sonorants and /s/ make up the largest number of consonants in this position; /t/ and /g/ only occur once each in

- (20) a.  $\text{ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ}$  *pangitlan* ‘money change’,<sup>12</sup> and  
 b.  $\text{ᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭᑭ}$  *telugtong* ‘they survive’ (survive=3PL.N).

Table 1.8: Frequency of codas in medial syllables (n = 2741)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	2093	76.36 %
n	313	11.42 %
ŋ	193	7.04 %
r	48	1.75 %
m	39	1.42 %
s	32	1.17 %
l	21	0.77 %
t	1	0.04 %
g	1	0.04 %

As documented in Table 1.2 above, Ayeri very strongly favors CV syllables in medial positions, hence the high count of zero segments here.

#### 1.2.4 Phonemic makeup of final syllables

The onsets of final syllables of polysyllabic words (Table 1.9) show the greatest amount of variety, which is due to Ayeri mostly using suffixes for grammatical purposes. Hence it is no surprise that combinations with /j/ and, indeed, /j/ itself as an onset, are especially common, since /j/ is also what a number of very common suffixes start with, for example the plural marker :ṽ -*ye*, the locative marker :ṽ -*ya*, the dative and participle marker :ṽ -*yam*, as well as third-person animate pronoun agreement suffixes, and the various first-person and third-person animate pronominal clitics. Figure 1.3 above shows exemplarily how verbs resyllabify when suffixes are attached. Even though single-segment onsets are strongly preferred, Cr, Cw, and especially C(C)j seem to be generally permissible.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The word for ‘money’ is ṽ pangis, so (20a) is probably a compound, albeit not a fully transparent one. The word for ‘change’ is ṽ tila-, and there seems to be a nominalizing ṽ -an. Ayeri allows noun-verb compounds to have a nominalized verb in the second position in spite of it being the head—noun-noun compounds mostly come in head-initial order. Possibly, what happened at the morpheme borders is that ṽ tilān underwent metathesis to \*ṽ itlān to match the rhyme of ṽ pangis. \*ṽ pangisitlān then underwent irregular haplology (and shortening of the nominalizing suffix) to ṽ pangitlan.

<sup>13</sup> The sequence /sj/ poses difficulty here as there are examples for /Vs.jV/ as well as for /V.sjV/, and I cannot tell for sure if there is a strict rule in operation. It seems that /V.sjV/ is more likely to occur when the second syllable is stressed, whereas /Vs.jV/ is more likely to occur when the first syllable is stressed. Ayeri’s own Tahano Hikamu orthography would not show the difference either, since /sja/ is spelled ṽ either way, and there is no heeding morpheme breaks

Table 1.9: Frequency of onsets in final syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage	Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	155	3.61%	pr	7	0.16%
j	1101	25.61%	kj	6	0.14%
n	528	12.28%	hj	5	0.12%
r	398	9.26%	bj	5	0.12%
t	268	6.23%	tw	4	0.09%
s	244	5.68%	sw	4	0.09%
l	238	5.54%	sj	4	0.09%
k	199	4.63%	kw	3	0.07%
d	184	4.28%	kr	3	0.07%
m	154	3.58%	br	3	0.07%
v	144	3.35%	vr	2	0.05%
h	128	2.98%	rw	2	0.05%
p	115	2.68%	nw	2	0.05%
g	103	2.40%	tʃj	1	0.02%
dʒ	73	1.70%	rj	1	0.02%
b	73	1.70%	nj	1	0.02%
tʃ	52	1.21%	mw	1	0.02%
vj	26	0.60%	grj	1	0.02%
pj	22	0.51%	dv	1	0.02%
dʒj	17	0.40%	dr	1	0.02%
tr	10	0.23%	brj	1	0.02%
w	9	0.21%			

Nuclei of final syllables (Table 1.10) do not bear striking differences to nuclei in other positions. /a:/ comes out second here due to the common nominalizer *-an*, which lengthens the vowel of verb stems ending in /a/, as demonstrated in (8). /aɪ/ is also fairly common here as it is the topic-marked first-person pronoun/pronominal clitic; for the same reason, /a:ɪ/ occurs a number of times—the vowel-lengthening rule applies here as well, so its status as a phoneme is marginal. All instances of /e:/ in the sample are from the word *arēn* ‘anyway, however’; all evidence for /i:/ is from *sirī* ‘due to which’ (see section 1.1.2). The only evidence for /u:/ in the sample is from *babū* ‘barbarian (adj.)’.

The list of coda consonants in final syllables (Table 1.11) is very slightly more restrictive than even that of coda consonants in medial syllables (see Table 1.8), since

in placing the diacritic. /CsjV/ will be /C.sjV/ in any case, since Ayeri avoids final consonant clusters if possible, see Table 1.2.

Table 1.10: Frequency of nuclei in final syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme		Frequency	Percentage
a		2408	56.01%
a:		316	7.35%
o		411	9.56%
	o	298	6.93%
	ɔ	113	2.63%
i		289	6.42%
	ɪ	147	3.42%
	ɨ	142	3.30%
aɪ		254	5.91%
u		207	4.82%
	u	155	3.61%
	ʊ	52	1.21%
e		209	4.85%
	ɛ	127	2.95%
	ə	81	1.88%
	ɐ	1	0.02%
ɐɪ		103	2.40%
ɔɪ		42	0.98%
a:ɪ		23	0.54%
ʊɪ		14	0.33%
aʊ		14	0.33%
e:		5	0.12%
i:		3	0.07%
u:		1	0.02%

Table 1.11: Frequency of codas in final syllables (n = 4299)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	2224	51.73 %
n	899	20.91 %
ŋ	651	15.14 %
s	244	5.68 %
m	225	5.23 %
l	34	0.79 %
r	21	0.49 %
k	1	0.02 %

the only non-sonorant attested is /k/, which only occurs in *ṣik-ṣik* ‘tits’ again, which—besides being a vulgar term, thus maybe slightly more dispositioned to allow for deviating phonotactics—looks quite like onomatopoeia, possibly for the sound of sucking.<sup>14</sup>

### 1.2.5 Phonemic makeup of single syllables

Onsets of single syllables (Table 1.12) appear to be the least varied category. Still, none of the basic set of consonant morphemes (see Figure 1.1) is missing—the frequency order is just completely different from the other onsets surveyed, not merely a mixture of initial and final syllables. Consonant clusters with /j/, /w/ and /r/ exist here as well. Combinations with /j/ are only present for /m/ and /n/, while /r/ again combines with plosives; /w/ combines with /n/ and /r/ at least, which we have already seen in final-syllable onsets (see Table 1.9). Whereas /mj/ has only occurred once in initial-syllable onsets so far (see Table 1.3), it occurs a few more times here, all in the word *ṣmya* ‘be supposed to’, which is very commonly used as an unconjugatable modal particle.

A consonant onset that can only be found in monosyllables is /ŋ/,<sup>15</sup> in *-ngas* ‘almost’, a quantifier suffix that has managed to sneak in due to being marked as an adverb in the dictionary, since it can modify a verb:

<sup>14</sup> Kroonen (2013: 489–490) identifies PGmc *\*sūgan-*, *\*sūkan-* ‘to suck’ as an iterative of PGmc *\*sukkōn-*, *\*sugōn-* ‘to suck’ and reconstructs PIE *\*souk-neh<sub>2</sub>-*. However, he does not say anything about the Germanic word being onomatopoeic in origin.

<sup>15</sup> At least according to the analysis chosen here, see section 1.2.1 for an explanation.



Table 1.12: Frequency of onsets in single syllables (n = 1201)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	284	23.65 %
n	231	19.23 %
s	147	12.24 %
j	144	11.99 %
k	51	4.25 %
v	48	4.00 %
m	46	3.83 %
l	44	3.66 %
t	41	3.41 %
d	33	2.75 %
r	26	2.16 %
h	23	1.92 %
mj	16	1.33 %
p	13	1.08 %
tʃ	9	0.75 %
g	9	0.75 %
nj	8	0.67 %
rw	7	0.58 %
b	7	0.58 %
pr	5	0.42 %
dʒ	3	0.25 %
tr	2	0.17 %
nw	1	0.08 %
ŋ	1	0.08 %
kr	1	0.08 %
br	1	0.08 %

- (21) *Apayeng-ngas.*  
 Apa=yeng=ngas  
 laugh=3SG.F.A=almost  
 ‘She almost laughed.’

Here, ၵာန *-ngas* modifies the verb complex like any other adverb:

- (22) *Apayeng babo.*  
 Apa=yeng babo  
 laugh=3SG.F.A loudly  
 ‘She laughs loudly.’

However, whereas ၵိ *babo* ‘loud’ is treated as a separate unit in terms of intonation, ၵာန *-ngas* is unstressed and binds to what it follows:

- (23) a. ၵာနၵာန ၵာန *Apayeng-ngas.* [apa'jeŋas];  
 b. ၵာနၵာနၵိ ၵာန *Apayeng babo.* [apa'jeŋ 'baxo].

As with onset consonants of monosyllabic words, nuclei of this syllable type are the least diverse group again (Table 1.13). One segment that is notably absent is /au/, and the marginally phonemic /e:/ is not present either. By having /a/, /aɪ/, /a:/ at the top, monosyllabic words behave similar to final syllables of polysyllabic words (see Table 1.10), however, the order of the most common vowels bears more similarities to that of initial and medial syllables (see Tables 1.4 and 1.7). The very uncommon /o:/ features twice in this group, namely in two instances of the word ၵိ *nōn* ‘will, intention’.<sup>16</sup>

Like the other syllable segments of monosyllabic words, coda consonants (Table 1.14) as well show the lowest degree of variety among all the coda consonants of the various syllable classes discussed so far. The order is basically the same as that of final-syllable codas (see Table 1.11), though /ŋ/ supersedes /n/ and there is some attestation of final /h/. As noted above, the prevalence of /ŋ/ is due to the agent-topic marker ၵာ *ang* (see section 1.2.1). /h/ only occurs in the interjections ၵိ *ah!* and ၵိ *āh!*, so its status as an actual phoneme in this position is marginal at best.

### 1.2.6 Cross-syllable consonant clusters

Since a table detailing every combination with its absolute and relative frequency would be too large here, Table 1.15 gives the attested combinations ordered by brack-

<sup>16</sup> Ayeri used to have ၵိ *-on* as a nominalizer beside ၵိ *-an*, however, it was not very productive and has long fallen out of use. ၵိ *nōn* is thus, in fact, originally a nominalization of ၵိ *no-* ‘want, plan’.

Table 1.13: Frequency of nuclei in single syllables (n = 1201)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
a	568	47.29%
aI	171	14.24%
a:	140	11.66%
i	113	9.41%
<i>i</i>	65	5.41%
<i>I</i>	48	4.00%
e	104	8.66%
<i>ε</i>	65	5.41%
<i>e</i>	34	2.83%
<i>ə</i>	5	0.42%
o	45	3.75%
<i>ɔ</i>	30	2.50%
<i>o</i>	15	1.25%
u	20	1.67%
a:I	14	1.17%
ɔI	10	0.83%
i:	6	0.50%
eI	5	0.42%
uI	3	0.25%
o:	2	0.17%

Table 1.14: Frequency of codas in single syllables (n = 1201)

Phoneme	Frequency	Percentage
Ø	612	50.96%
ŋ	377	31.39%
n	105	8.74%
s	58	4.83%
m	36	3.00%
l	6	0.50%
h	4	0.33%
r	3	0.25%

Table 1.15: Frequency of cross-syllable consonant clusters (n = 1270)

Interval [%]	Consonant cluster
0.00 ... 0.09	g.t, h.t, h.v, k.s, l.n, lv.n, m.bj, m.d, m.dʒ, m.l, m.n, m.pr, m.r, n.dv, n.g, n.h, n.w, ŋ.dʒj, ŋ.kw, ŋ.m, ŋ.n, ŋ.rj, ŋ.t, ŋk.t, r.b, r.dʒ, r.g, r.l, r.m, r.sj, r.tʃ, r.v, s.dʒ, s.h, s.l, s.n, s.p, s.v, t.v, tʃ.v (0.08%).
0.10 ... 0.24	l.bj, m.br, m.t, n.s, ŋ.b, ŋ.h, ŋ.p, ŋ.w, r.dʒj, r.pj, s.dʒj, s.m, t.l (0.16%); l.dʒ, l.p, m.k, n.sj, ŋ.dʒ, ŋ.g, ŋ.s, r.pr (0.24%).
0.25 ... 0.49	m.v, r.s, s.r (0.31%); n.r, s.t (0.39%); m.pj, n.dʒj, r.d (0.47%).
0.50 ... 0.74	ŋ.kj, ŋ.v, r.k, r.n (0.55%); l.b, l.t, ŋ.r (0.71%).
0.75 ... 1.00	r.p, r.t (0.87%); l.vj (0.94%).
1.0 ... 2.4	m.j (1.18%); ŋ.l (1.34%); n.tʃ (1.50%); n.dʒ (2.13%); n.v (2.28%); l.j (2.36%).
2.5 ... 4.9	m.p (2.52%); s.j (2.60%); n.l (2.91%); l.v (3.15%); m.b (3.23%); ŋ.k (3.78%).
5 ... 9	n.t (5.28%); n.d (6.85%); ŋ.j (7.32%); r.j (8.98%).
10+	n.j (25.35%).

ets. As can be expected, bilabials cluster mostly with bilabials (83/112 purely bilabial CC combinations = 74.11%), alveolars with alveolars (317/948 = 33.44%), and velars with velars (59/207 = 28.51%). However, at least for alveolars and velars, the score is even higher with /j/: 52.64% and 44.93%, respectively. /j/ is also the most common second consonant overall, at 47.8% of all consonant clusters; /n.j/ is the most common cluster at a total of 25.35%. Alveolars provide the highest variety of both first and second consonants, with 6 different phonemes making up 74.65% of C<sub>1</sub>, and 8 different phonemes making up 28.74% of C<sub>2</sub>.

Labiodentals and glottals occur least frequently, on the other hand: There is only one cluster with /v/ as a first consonant, namely, /lv.n/ (0.08%). For /h/, there are two, which are /h.v/ and /h.t/ (0.16%). Altogether, however, there are 97 combinations in /v/ (7.64%)—most commonly /l.v/ (3.15%) and /n.v/ (2.28%)—while there are only 4 in /h/ (0.31%): /n.h/, /s.h/, and twice /ŋ.h/.

At 924 first consonants (72.76%), the nasals /m/, /n/, and /ŋ/ make up the largest group going by manner of articulation, followed by the tap /r/, which appears 175 times (13.78%) as the first consonant. For second consonants, approximants constitute the largest group at 669 combinations (52.68%), followed by 387 pairs with plosives second (30.47%).

## 1.3 Notes on prosody

### 1.3.1 Stress

Ayeri uses dynamic accent, that is, stress is based on differences in the loudness of syllables, among others.<sup>17</sup> Which syllable is stressed depends on a mixture of which position in a word a syllable occupies and the phonemic shape of it. In fact, English, which also has phonemic stress in pairs such as *record* /'rɛkərd/ (noun) and /rɪ'kɔrd/ (verb) that Ayeri lacks, does a similar thing (examples adapted from Halle 1998: 552):

- (24) *admire* /æd'maɪər/ — *admirable* /'ædmərəbl/ [English]  
*carnivore* /'karnɪvɔr/ — *carnivorous* /kɑr'nɪvərəs/  
*ignore* /ɪg'nɔr/ — *ignorant* /'ɪgnərənt/

Stress does not stay at fixed intervals in these words and they even change their sound structure a little, but there are a number of variables which can nonetheless be formally described and applied here (564–565).<sup>18</sup> To demonstrate how word stress moves around in Ayeri, the complete declension paradigm for  $\text{ḡ}$  *niva* ‘eye’ is presented in Figure 1.4.

Figure 1.4: Declension paradigm for Ayeri  $\text{ḡ}$  *niva* ‘eye’

	Singular		Plural	
TOP	<i>ní.va</i>	‘the eye’	<i>ni.vá.ye</i>	‘the eyes’
A	<i>ni.vǎng</i>	‘eye’	<i>ni.va.jǎng</i>	‘eyes’
P	<i>ni.vǎs</i>	‘eye’	<i>ni.vá.jas</i>	‘eyes’
DAT	<i>ni.vá.yam</i> <sup>19</sup>	‘to the eye’	<i>ni.vá.jyam</i>	‘to the eyes’
GEN	<i>ni.vá.na</i>	‘of the eye’	<i>ni.va.yé.na</i>	‘of the eyes’
LOC	<i>ni.vá.ya</i>	‘at the eye’	<i>ni.vá.jya</i>	‘at the eyes’
CAUS	<i>ni.va.í.sa</i>	‘due to the eye’	<i>ni.va.jí.sa</i>	‘due to the eyes’
INS	<i>ni.vá.ri</i>	‘with the eye’	<i>ni.va.yé.ri</i>	‘with the eyes’

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of terms, see Kager (2007), for instance.

<sup>18</sup> Halle (1998) takes a generativist approach rather than a more modern Optimality-Theory based one like Kager (2007) does, who only deals with fixed-stress systems in this introductory article, though Halle’s article is still informative. Simplifying a lot, English essentially tries to construct trochaic feet from the right edge of the word. If the last syllable’s vowel is not light, it is skipped and stress moves to the antepenultimate syllable; this process is recursive for words with multiple feet, although some suffixes introduce irregularities in rule application.

<sup>19</sup> Final-syllable stress is possible as well, also in the plural.

It may appear that in the table above, stress is always on the penultimate syllable, which is indeed the case for most forms quoted there, but compare the superficially unmarked form  $\tilde{n}$  *niva*, which is disyllabic with stress on the first (= penultimate) syllable, to the agent and patient singular forms,  $\tilde{n}vāng$  and  $\tilde{n}vās$ , respectively. These are also disyllabic, however, they are stressed on the second (= ultimate) syllable. Similarly, compare the agent and patient plural forms to each other: the agent plural form  $\tilde{n}vajang$  is trisyllabic and has its main stress on the third (= ultimate) syllable, while the equally trisyllabic patient plural form  $\tilde{n}vajas$  is stressed on the second (= penultimate) syllable again.

It should have become clear that even though the basic form  $\tilde{n}$  *niva* has first-syllable stress, *ni* will not necessarily carry stress across the whole paradigm. It should also have become clear that the basic algorithm to determine stressed syllables in Ayeri has something to do with counting syllables from the right edge of a word, although some complications need to be factored in. The following sections will try to describe these formally.

#### *Analysis of stress patterns in disyllabic words*

The basic foot in Ayeri is a trochee, and for the most part it does not matter whether the syllable is open or closed, or whether there are complex onsets or codas, or no onsets or codas at all:<sup>20</sup>

- (25) a.  $\acute{x}$        $\times$     ||  
          *ba* - *ri*    'pithy, striking'
- b.  $\acute{x}$        $\times$     ||  
       *sa* - *yan*    'hole, cave'  
       *sem* - *ba*    'comb'
- c.  $\acute{x}$        $\times$     ||  
       *bri* - *ba*    'grace'  
       *ba* - *brya*    '(he) mumbles'  
       *a* - *gu*    'chicken'

It can be deduced from words with more than two syllables that stress assignment is trochaic. Stress assignment furthermore runs from right to left, so that in a word with more than two syllables, the last two syllables form a full foot:

<sup>20</sup> In the following, a syllable will be marked by  $\langle \times \rangle$  and receives an acute accent  $\langle \acute{} \rangle$  when carrying primary stress, a grave accent  $\langle \grave{} \rangle$  when carrying secondary stress, and no accent when unstressed. Feet are marked by horizontal lines  $\langle | \rangle$ ; the end of a word is marked by two horizontal lines  $\langle || \rangle$ .

- (26) a.    ×   |   ×     ×   ||  
           *ba* - *ha* - *lan*    ‘target, goal’  
           *jar* - *ma* - *ya*    ‘pilgrim’
- b.    ×     ×   |   ×     ×   ||  
           *ho* - *ra* - *ma* - *ya*    ‘sinner’  
           *ya* - *ma* - *na* - *ti*    ‘causer’

In the case of (26b), the stressed syllables of the first foot bear secondary stress while those of the second foot bear primary stress. Complications, then, come in the form of syllables ending in /ŋ/, containing a long vowel, or containing a diphthong, or a combination of those features. Ayeri does not have syllables that contain a diphthong and also end in /ŋ/, though, since consonant codas after a diphthong are largely avoided.<sup>21</sup> Since the presence or the absence of a certain element that is suspected to have an effect on stress assignment is a yes–no decision, we can make a matrix of binary features:

Figure 1.5: Types of heavy syllables

	[+ DIPH, – ŋ]	[– DIPH, + ŋ]	[– DIPH, – ŋ]
[+ LONG]	++	++	++
[– LONG]	+	+	–

The feature matrix above (Figure 1.5) shows the various kinds of syllable types that we will now see have a manipulative effect on trochaic stress assignment. These syllable types can be considered ‘heavy’ in that they attract stress and thus modify the regular assignment of stress to every other syllable from the right edge of a word. For the time being, we will only test their effects on disyllabic words as the most common type. As will be shown in the following example, heavy syllables in ultimate positions attract stress while quasi-regular results are produced when they are in penultimate position and the ultimate syllable is not heavy:

- (27) a.    ×        ×        ||  
           *ma* - *tay*        ‘summer, wet season’  
           *pa* - *dang*       ‘mind; heart, mood’  
           *ka* - *nāy*       ‘I marry’ (marry=ISG.TOP)  
           *bras* - *yāng*     ‘he bathes’ (bathe=3SG.M.A)  
           *na* - *rān*        ‘word; speech’
- b.    ×        ×        ||  
           *kār* - *yo*        ‘strong’  
           *key* - *nam*      ‘humans, people’  
           *kan* - *ka*        ‘mind; heart, mood’

<sup>21</sup> It might thus be possible to alternatively analyze diphthongs in /ɪ/ as /Vj/ sequences, essentially.

Unfortunately, there are no disyllabic examples for the feature sets [+LONG, –DIPH, +η] and [+LONG, +DIPH, –η] in the first syllable (syllables of the type /C(C(j))V:η/ or /C(C(j))Vɪη/). If there were, they would group with (27b).

So far, we have only looked at heavy syllables combined with regular/light ones. In the following case, however, another property of heavy syllables will become apparent: long syllables outweigh those containing a diphthong or ending in /η/. They are essentially superheavy, which is why some of the fields in Figure 1.5 are marked with two plus signs. The following examples show what happens when heavy syllables are combined with other heavy syllables. Let us start by examining the various combinations possible between [–LONG, +DIPH, –η] and the elements from the [+LONG] row (28a), and the possible combinations between [–LONG, –DIPH, +η] and the [+LONG] row (28b).

- (28) a.    ×        ×        ||  
           *bay* – *bāy*        ‘I govern’ (govern=1SG.TOP)  
           *say* – *lyāng*    ‘he sails’ (sail=3SG.M.A)  
           *kay* – *vān*        ‘container’
- b.    ×        ×        ||  
           *kong* – *āyn*        ‘we enter’ (enter=IPL.TOP)  
           *keng* – *vāng*        ‘you notice’ (notice=2SG.A)  
           *lang* – *-vā*        ‘in the most tiresome way’ (tiresome=SUPL)

We can see here that these words have primary stress invariably on the last/long syllable in spite of a heavy syllable preceding in the examples in (28b). The question then is, however, what happens if we invert this order. This is more problematic than it sounds, however, as initial [+LONG, +DIPH, –η] and [+LONG, –DIPH, +η], as well as final [–LONG, +DIPH, +η] do not occur, insofar there will only be one possible combination here—the reverse pattern of  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *lang-vā* ‘in the most tiresome way’ from (28b) above, also compare with (27):

- (29)    ×        ×        ||  
           *cā* – *nang*        ‘love’ (love-A)

There is only one pattern possible here, which is very little to make a point, however, other words following this syllable pattern, like  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *nāreng* ‘rather’, for example, behave in the same way. A long syllable has precedence over other kinds of heavy syllables, so  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *-nang* does not take away stress from  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *cā-* as one might expect from the examples in (27a). Another question is what happens if we pit elements from the [±LONG] rows against another feature combination of the same row. As above, we will start with the [–LONG] row:



- (30) a.     $\times$          $\acute{\times}$     ||  
           *bay* - *tang*    'blood'
- b.     $\times$          $\acute{\times}$     ||  
           *pang* - *lay*    'goddess'

In the case of examples for [+LONG] pattern combinations, we need to keep in mind again that initial [+LONG, +DIPH, -η] and [+LONG, -DIPH, +η] are not attested, so again, there will only be one possible combination of two syllables with a long vowel:

- (31)     $\grave{\times}$          $\acute{\times}$     ||  
           *mā* - *sāy*    'I traveled' (PST-travel=ISG.TOP)

Combining two long syllables with each other will result in both being stressed, which is otherwise avoided in Ayeri, as we will see later. Moreover, the following patterns emerge if we combine each pattern with itself; the combinatorial restrictions mentioned above apply again, of course:

- (32) a.     $\times$          $\acute{\times}$     ||  
           *kay* - *vay*    'without'  
           *dang* - *reng*    'bell' (bell-A.INAN)
- b.     $\grave{\times}$          $\acute{\times}$     ||  
           *bā* - *mā*    'parents, mom-and-dad'

As demonstrated in (28), the last heavy syllable will receive primary stress, except if two long syllables collide, in which case the first long syllable will receive secondary stress.

To summarize the above findings:

1. Ayeri assigns trochaic stress from the right edge of a word. A foot thus consists of two syllables, of which the first is stressed.
2. Syllables ending in /η/ or ones containing a diphthong are considered heavy. They attract stress and take it away from a preceding stressed syllable if the following syllable is not stressed already.
3. Syllables containing a long vowel are considered superheavy and override both light and heavy syllables in attracting stress, since long vowels cannot be unstressed.
4. Primary stress is assigned to the last stressable syllable, or otherwise the last heavy syllable. In the rare case of two long/superheavy syllables after another, the first syllable receives secondary stress and reduces in duration.

5. Secondary stress is assigned to syllables that are eligible for word stress but which are not in the final foot.

#### Analysis of stress patterns in trisyllabic words

So far, we have only considered all the possible combinations of two heavy and light syllables. Doing the same for all combinations of three and more syllables would be possible, though the list of examples were to become even longer. Since the feature pair  $[\pm \text{DIPH}, \pm \eta]$  behaves the same way throughout and both features are in complementary distribution, we need not test iterations of them separately, but can subsume them under the label  $[\pm \text{HEAVY}]$ . The parameters that need testing, then, are  $[\pm \text{HEAVY}]$  in combination with  $[\pm \text{LONG}]$ . There are 4 possible outcomes for these two features, which in the case of three syllables leads us to  $(2 \times 2)^3 = 64$  theoretically possible combinations. For this reason, I want to point out just a few cases, since the general rules sketched out above still apply.

First, let us look at  $[+ \text{HEAVY}, - \text{LONG}]$  combined with  $[- \text{HEAVY}, - \text{LONG}]$  in all positions (Figure 1.6). Finding words that fit the respective permutations is not too much of a problem, especially in cases where there is only one heavy syllable.

Figure 1.6: Stress patterns for  $[+ \text{HEAVY}, - \text{LONG}]$  in trisyllabic words

$-H -H +H$	<i>prantanley</i>	$\times   \times \acute{x}   $	‘question’ (question-P.INAN)
$-H +H -H$	<i>sarayya</i>	$\times   \acute{x} \times   $	‘(he) bows’ (bow-3SG.M)
$+H -H -H$	<i>taykondam</i>	$\times   \acute{x} \times   $	‘break (n.)’
$-H +H +H$	<i>ralanghay</i>	$\times   \times \acute{x}   $	‘thumbnail’
$+H -H +H$	<i>kaybunay</i>	$\acute{x}   \times \acute{x}   $	‘by the way’
$+H +H -H$	<i>maykongas</i>	$\times   \acute{x} \times   $	‘harbor’ (harbor-P)
$+H +H +H$	<i>panglay-kay</i>	$\acute{x}   \times \acute{x}   $	‘a few goddesses’ (goddess=few)

It becomes clear from Figure 1.6 that the rules stated at the end of the previous section (p. 35) also hold in the case of trisyllabic words whose syllables alternate short syllables based on the  $[\pm \text{HEAVY}]$  feature: ပြဏတၢ်လၢၤ *prantanley*, ရၢလၢၣ်ဂၢၤ *ralanghay*, ကၢၤပုၤနီၤ *kaybunay*, and ပၢၣ်လၢၣ်ကၢၤ *panglay-kay* receive final-syllable stress since this is their last heavy syllable. The first syllables of တၢ်ယၢၢ် *taykondam* and မၢၤပုၤကၢၤ *maykongas*, on the other hand, lose the secondary stress they would normally be assigned as two stressed syllables after another are normally avoided; the requirement of long syllables to not be unstressed does not come into effect here. တၢ်ယၢၢ် *taykondam* is also an example for the rule that even if a syllable is not heavy, the last syllable that can be assigned stress will receive primary stress.

Carrying out the same analysis as above and moving the feature [+ LONG] through the various positions, we receive the results depicted in Figure 1.7.<sup>22</sup> Since long syllables override stress of both light and heavy syllables as pointed out above (p. 35), the example words in this chart contain both of these syllable types. It was not too hard finding examples for all the slots in this case either, except that words with two long syllables in succession are rather rare. Still, only the case of three long syllables must remain unattested.<sup>23</sup>

Figure 1.7: Stress patterns for [ $\pm$  HEAVY, + LONG] in trisyllabic words

-L -L +L	<i>peraysān</i>	x   x x	‘paste’
-L +L -L	<i>raypānya</i>	x   x x	‘at the stop’ (stop-LOC)
+L -L -L	<i>nōneri</i>	x   x x	‘deliberate, intentional’
-L +L +L	<i>mə-cān-cān</i>	x   x x	‘whatever fling’ (whatever=fling)
+L -L +L	<i>sānisān</i>	x   x x	‘copula; clutch (n.)’
+L +L -L	<i>lēāyon</i>	x   x x	‘manwhore’
+L +L +L	—	—	—

Again, we can see that long syllables attract stress, in that the final syllables of *peraysān* and *sānisān* are stressed even though the penultimate syllable is heavy on the virtue of containing a diphthong. As it is in an unstressed position and there is no requirement for the syllable to be stressed, the first syllable of *raypānya* loses stress adjacent to the stressed long penultimate syllable. *nōneri* and *lēāyon* display a secondary-stressed and a primary-stressed syllable next to each other, in the first case due to the rule that long syllables must not be unstressed and *-eri* forming a valid disyllabic foot that receives regular trochaic stress, and in the second case due to two long syllables next to each other, of which the first—again—must not be unstressed. *mə-cān-cān* is interesting insofar as the long-syllable stress rules operate on the second foot regularly, while the marker *mə-* ‘whatever’ is by default unstressed, so even if it is added to stressed monosyllabic words like *hin* ‘box’, the foot of *mə-hin* ‘which box so ever’ would appear iambic, even though the syllable *hin* itself is not heavy.

<sup>22</sup> For more precision, modifications will be made to the symbols given in footnote 20: let a double acute (ˆˆ) denote superheavy syllables with primary stress, and a double grave (˘˘) denote superheavy syllables with secondary stress.

<sup>23</sup> It would be possible to construct a word with three long syllables if the habitative suffix *-asa* did not delete the vowel at the end of the verb stem if there is one. *māsāy* ‘I traveled’ (PST-travel=ISG.TOP) would then become *\*māsāsāy* ‘I used to travel’ (PST-travel-HAB=ISG.TOP) instead of the actual form *māsasāy*; the verb stem is *asa-* ‘travel’.

A further exception is formed by monosyllabic quantifying clitics like ၵ်း -*ben* ‘all, every’ or ၵ်း -*ngas* ‘almost’. These are unstressed also when following an unstressed syllable of their host if they contain a short vowel.

### Stress in compounds

Ayeri has a number of lexicalized compound nouns that are treated as one word morphologically (33a). This is in contrast to compounds that are not as established terms, or formed ad hoc (33b):

- (33) a. *Ang bengay kardangirayya ya Litareng.*  
 Ang beng=ay.Ø kardang.iray-ya ya Litareng  
 AT attend=1SG.TOP school.high-LOC LOC= Litareng  
 ‘I attend university in Litareng.’
- b. *Ang pasyye Pila sungkoranyam kibas.*  
 Ang pasy-ye Ø Pila sungkoran-yam kahas  
 AT be.interested.in-3SG.F TOP Pila science-DAT map  
 ‘Pila is interested in geography.’

For purposes of surveying stress patterns, we will only deal with the kind in (33a), though it may be noted that when not being overtly inflected, the second kind of compound will be treated as a word as well: ၵ်း ၵ်း ၵ်း *sungkorankihas* ‘geography’. Another kind of indivisible compound as in (33a) is one formed from reduplication, for instance, ၵ်း ၵ်း *kusang-kusang* ‘model’, from ၵ်း *kusang* ‘double’. Figure 1.8 gives several examples along with their stress patterns. As a reference for the various rules in operation, consider the list above (p. 35).

The first word, ၵ်း ၵ်း *apan-apan*, is not very noteworthy but I included it nonetheless as a reference for regular stress assignment to light syllables. The word decomposes into two feet, each of them has trochaic stress, which does not change when reduplicated. Per rule, the first syllable of the word receives secondary stress while the penultimate syllable bears primary stress. ၵ်း ၵ်း *kusang-kusang* is following the normal rules as well in that a heavy syllable takes stress from a light one. This does not change in reduplication.

ၵ်း ၵ်း *depangcāti* is noteworthy since it follows the same stress pattern as ၵ်း ၵ်း *apan-apan* in spite of consisting of one foot with a heavy second syllable (ၵ်း *de-pang*) and another with a superheavy first syllable (ၵ်း *cāti*). To avoid a clash, stress is not shifted to the heavy syllable in ၵ်း *depang*, since it is not strictly necessary for it to be stressed:

- (34)  $(*dépang \rightarrow depáng) + cāti \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} *depàng + cāti \\ dèpang + cāti \end{array} \right\}$

Figure 1.8: Examples of stress patterns in compounds

Word	Pattern	Translation	Constituents					
			Word	Pattern	Translation	Word	Pattern	Translation
<i>apan-apan</i>	˘ x   ˘ x	‘extensive’	<i>apan</i>	˘ x	‘wide’	<i>apan</i>	˘ x	‘wide’
<i>depangcāti</i>	˘ x   ˘˘ x	‘cuckold’	<i>depang</i>	x ˘	‘fool’	<i>cāti</i>	˘˘ x	‘lover’
<i>kusang-kusang</i>	x ˘   x ˘	‘model’	<i>kusang</i>	x ˘	‘double’	<i>kusang</i>	x ˘	‘double’
<i>latunkema</i>	˘ x   ˘ x	‘tiger’	<i>latun</i>	˘ x	‘lion’	<i>kema</i>	˘ x	‘stripe’
<i>malingkaron</i>	˘ x   ˘ x	‘coast, seashore’	<i>maling</i>	x ˘	‘shore’	<i>karon</i>	˘ x	‘water’
<i>māvaganeng</i>	˘˘ x   x ˘	‘mother’s siblings’	<i>māva</i>	˘ x	‘mother’	<i>ganengan</i>	x   ˘ x	‘siblings’
<i>pikunanding</i>	˘ x   x ˘	‘mustache’	<i>piku</i>	˘ x	‘beard’	<i>nanding</i>	x ˘	‘lip’
<i>sapayyila</i>	˘ x   ˘ x	‘limbs’	<i>sapay</i>	x ˘	‘hand’	<i>yila</i>	˘ x	‘foot’

In the case of *မာလ်ကရ်* *malingkaron* again the rule operates that prohibits two stressed non-long syllables after another. Thus, even if the first component *မာလ်* *maling* contains a heavy syllable, stress will not move there. In *လတ်ကဲမာ* *latunkema*, the syllable /tun/ is assimilated to [tʊŋ] before the /k/ onset of the next syllable. For one, however, this does not make it heavy, and second, even if it did, stress would stay on the first syllable of the word for the same reason as in *မာလ်ကရ်* *malingkaron*. The same rule of stress hiatus avoidance operates in *ဆာပယျိလာ* *sapayyila*.

Besides the shortening of the second component of the compound, *မာသင်ဂဲ* *māva-ganeng* retains the stress pattern of its constituents. Since /ma:/ is not in a final foot, it receives secondary stress. Moreover, *မာသင်ဂဲ* *māvaganeng* and *ပိကုနင်* *pikunanding* both show that it is acceptable for two light syllables to follow each other.


### 1.3.2 Intonation

Peterson (2015: 66) writes that if “you’re creating a language on your own and you’re the only speaker, intonation is usually not high on the list of features to focus on, but intonational flavoring is well worth it (read: crucial) when it comes to making an authentic language.” Indeed, this has so far been a rather neglected topic in my work on Ayeri. Even though I made a handful of recordings in the past, I have never considered intonation much. Yet, of course, the spoken words in those recordings do not sound like robot speech either, so there must be intonational patterns that I have been subconsciously applying.<sup>24</sup>

Since intonation contours are notoriously difficult to display in print, I will give very approximate graphs of pitch in the respective examples for each surveyed pattern. Certainly there will be other patterns as well which would require more detailed gradations, but for the time being, I will only try to briefly describe those that are most prominent.

#### *Declarative statements*

Declarative statements have a gradually falling pitch contour based around an average pitch height, not deviating considerably on both ends:

(35) 

<i>Ang</i>	<i>gibayo</i>		<i>Pintemis</i>		<i>minganeri-hen</i>	<i>yona.</i>
Ang	giha-yo	Ø	Pintemis		mingan-eri=hen	yona
AT	blow-3SG.N	TOP	North Wind		ability-INS=all	3SG.N.GEN.

‘The North Wind blew with all of his might.’

<sup>24</sup> Whenever this happens, the fallback is likely to be a mixture of German and English, since those are the languages I am most familiar with.


*Yes-no questions*

Since Ayeri does not use a particle or word order to mark closed questions as such, intonation is used to mark the difference from a declarative statement. To achieve a strong contrast, questions exhibit gradually rising intonation:

- (36)
- 
- |            |               |     |                 |  |                      |              |
|------------|---------------|-----|-----------------|--|----------------------|--------------|
| <i>Ang</i> | <i>gibayo</i> |     | <i>Pintemis</i> |  | <i>minganeri-hen</i> | <i>yona?</i> |
| Ang        | giha-yo       | Ø   | Pintemis        |  | mingan-eri=hen       | yona         |
| AT         | blow-3SG.N    | TOP | North Wind      |  | ability-INS=all      | 3SG.N.GEN.   |
- ‘Did the North Wind blow with all of his might?’

*‘Wh-’ questions*

Unlike English, Ayeri marks open questions with an in-situ question word. Open questions are thus marked by the question word causing a sharp rise and fall in the overall contour of the question. The first half of the clause has the rising contour of a question, the second half has gradually falling pitch.

- (37)
- 
- |            |               |  |             |              |             |             |             |
|------------|---------------|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Ang</i> | <i>engyo</i>  |  | <i>mico</i> | <i>sinya</i> | <i>luga</i> | <i>toya</i> | <i>sam?</i> |
| Ang        | eng-yo        |  | mico        | sinya-Ø      | luga        | toya        | sam         |
| AT         | be.more-3SG.N |  | strong      | who-TOP      | among       | 3PL.N.LOC   | two         |
- ‘Who was the stronger of the two?’

*Lists*

List statements have the general gradual downward slope of declarative statements, but the individual items can nonetheless be marked by a pitch rise on the primary accent of each item.

- (38)
- 
- |           |                |               |              |              |            |               |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| <i>Le</i> | <i>vacyeng</i> | <i>seygo,</i> | <i>disu,</i> | <i>betay</i> | <i>nay</i> | <i>vasra.</i> |
| Le        | vac=yeng       | seygo-Ø,      | disu-Ø,      | betay-Ø      | nay        | vasra-Ø       |
| PT.INAN   | like=3SG.F.A   | apple-TOP,    | banana-Ø,    | berry-Ø      | and        | nut-Ø         |
- ‘She likes apples, bananas, berries and nuts.’

### Complement and relative clauses

Complement clauses are characterized by the short spike at the end of the preceding main clause followed by a short break which together signal the beginning of a new syntactic unit within the context of the current sentence, which is broadly similar to list statements. Otherwise, statements with complement clauses as well bear the overall downward-sloping contour of declarative statements if included in such.

- (39) 
- |            |              |                 |               |             |                 |
|------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <i>Ang</i> | <i>manga</i> | <i>rantong,</i> | <i>engyo</i>  | <i>mico</i> | <i>sinyāng.</i> |
| Ang        | manga        | ran=tong,       | eng-yo        | mico        | sinya-ang       |
| AT         | PROG         | argue=3PL.N.A,  | be.more=3SG.N | strong      | who-A           |
- ‘They were arguing who is stronger.’

Relative clauses, on the other hand, do not receive special prosodic marking, but are treated the same as other basic sentence types. They display a continuous downward slope if part of a declarative statement, or a continuous upward slope if part of a question:

- (40) a. 
- |               |                |           |                          |             |                |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| <i>Lugaya</i> | <i>asāyāng</i> | <i>si</i> | <i>sitang-naykonyāng</i> | <i>kong</i> | <i>tovaya.</i> |
| Luga-ya       | asāya-ang      | si        | sitang=naykon=yāng       | kong        | tova-ya        |
| pass-3SG.M    | traveler-A     | REL       | self=wrap=3SG.M.A        | inside      | cloak-LOC      |
- ‘A traveler passed who had wrapped himself into a cloak.’
- b. 
- |                |               |           |           |                |              |
|----------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| <i>Adareng</i> | <i>asāyās</i> | <i>si</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>ninyāng</i> | <i>tova?</i> |
| Ada-reng       | asāya-as      | si        | le        | nin=yāng       | tova-Ø       |
| that-A.INAN    | traveler-P    | REL       | PT.INAN   | wear=3SG.M.A   | coat-TOP     |
- ‘Is that the traveler who wore the coat?’

### Contrast

Ayeri uses a kind of topic system for highlighting constituents in a clause by morphosyntactic means, but this is still different from emphasis on semantic grounds, for example when the speaker wants to highlight a semantic difference in the same syntactic position, as in the following example, which presents a possible answer to the question posed in (40b):



(41)



*Adareng asāyās si le nin-yāng kegan.*  
 Ada-reng asāya-as si le nin=yāng kegan-Ø  
 that-A.INAN traveler-P REL PT.INAN wear=3SG.M.A hat-TOP

‘It is the traveler who wore the *hat*.’

We can see here a spike towards the end of the utterance where the word *kegan* ‘hat’ is placed. This word receives extra stress for contrast with *tova* ‘coat’, which is what the other person had asked about.



## 2 Writing system

---

In the previous chapter, example words were given in Ayeri's script, *ṭḥano Hikamu*, wherever possible. Thus, it seems advisable to include a description of Ayeri's native writing system here as well. Literally, *ṭḥano Hikamu* means 'Round Script' (script round), which is an old formation based on the word *ṭḥan-* 'write' that stuck. The current word for 'script' is *ṭḥanan* 'writing'. *Tahano Hikamu* was originally named thus because of an earlier draft for a script that never made it very far beyond the drawing board and which was a lot more angular and boxy, see Figure 2.1—*Tahano Hikamu* was a lot more bubbly in comparison, especially early on (Figure 0.2).<sup>1</sup>


As we have seen in the previous chapter, Ayeri's prosody strongly emphasizes the syllable as a unit. Thus, it is not a surprise that Ayeri's native script, *Tahano Hikamu*, is an alphasyllabary similar to the Brāhmī alphabets of India and Southeast Asia (Salomon 1996; Court 1996). Scripts like these are

based on the unit of the graphic "syllable" [...], which by definition always ends with a vowel (type V, CV, CCV, etc.). Syllables consisting of a vowel only (usually at the beginning of a word or sentence) are written with the *full* or *initial vowel signs* [...]. But when, as is much more frequently the case, the syllable consists of a consonant followed by a vowel, the vowel is indicated by a diacritic sign attached to the basic sign for the consonant [...]. (Salomon 1996: 376)


For *Tahano Hikamu* the definition that a syllable consisting only of a vowel is written with an initial vowel sign is only true under certain circumstances, as we will see below. Moreover, Brāhmī scripts are often characterized by conjuncts of clustered consonants which may become quite large and sometimes behave in an idiosyncratic way. Consonant conjuncts like Devanāgarī त्व <tva> from त <ta> + व <va> or idiosyncratic conjuncts like क्ष <kṣa> for क <ka> + ष <ṣa> are not known in *Tahano Hikamu*, however. *Tahano Hikamu* also does not know subscript notation for consonant clusters and special diacritics marking coda consonants like in Javanese (Kuipers and McDermott 1996: 478–479). This does not mean, however,

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, there is no documentation of the Box script surviving that I know of.

Figure 2.1: Box script and Hikamu



(a) Old and aborted draft: Box script



(b) Ayeri's native script: Tahano Hikamu

that final consonants are simply omitted in writing, since closed syllables are reasonably common enough in Ayeri to warrant indicating them. Thus, there is “a special mark to eliminate the vowel of the previous syllable, thereby leaving a consonant in a syllable-final position.” (Kuipers and McDermott 1996: 476) That is, a diacritic exists which marks the absence of an inherent vowel, rendering the syllable consonant-only.

Another difference from Brāhmī-family scripts is that vowel length and diphthongs in [i] are indicated by dedicated diacritics, so the long vowels are not doubled versions of their short counterparts. Like in Kharoṣṭhī—another historically important ancient script of India—initial vowels are not represented by unique graphemes but they are all written like post-consonantal vowel diacritics (Salomon 1996: 377), though in Tahano Hikamu with a character without an inherent sound value. For this reason, the character is indicated in the table below as  $\emptyset$ ; its native name is  $\text{ṛṇṇ}$  *ranyan* ‘nothing’.<sup>2</sup> Similar to a number of Brāhmī scripts, Tahano Hikamu puts diacritics not only below or above consonant bases, but also before them. This, however, is not limited to vowel graphemes as in Devanāgarī ि ⟨i⟩ or Javanese ꦺ ⟨e, é/è⟩ (Kuipers and McDermott 1996: 478).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> I will give the native names of graphemes here, but will refer to them by their English names for clarity in the running text.

<sup>3</sup> Kuipers and McDermott (1996) do not say, but it seems that both might be related, since they are both functionally the only prepended vowel diacritics and both represent a high front sound; this is just a guess, however.

## 2.1 Consonants

Tahano Hikamu is mainly based on consonant bases that are modified by diacritics. Since the vowel /a/ is so highly frequent in Ayeri, it is also the vowel that is *inherent* to every consonant grapheme if not further modified by vowel diacritics. Consonant letters are simply referred to as *pa*, *ta*, *ka*, ... Figure 1.1 displays all the main consonants. The customary collation is—similar to the IPA table—roughly grouping the letters according to their sound value by anteriority (front → back) and sonority (low → high). The script is monocameral, that is, there is no distinction between capital letters and minuscule letters as in the Latin, Greek, Cyrillic, Georgian, and Armenian alphabet. It is also written in lines from left to right.

Figure 2.2: The consonant graphemes

/pa/	/ta/	/ka/	/ba/	/da/	/ga/
ᠠ	ᠲ	ᠬ	ᠪ	ᠳ	ᠭ
/ma/	/na/	/ɲa/	/va/	/sa/	/ha/
ᠮ	ᠨ	ᠨᠠ	ᠪᠠ	ᠰ	ᠬᠠ
/ra/	/la/	/ja/	/Ø/		
ᠷ	ᠯ	ᠵ	ᠯ		

ᠯ, which in Ayeri has no sound value but is used as a base for initial vowels, may also serve as the character for /ʔa/. What is, moreover, interesting about ᠨᠠ ⟨nga⟩ is that even though before, /ɲ/ was treated strictly as a coda consonant in the previous chapter, it is in fact treated as an onset consonant in writing if a vowel is following:

- (1) ᠠ + ᠨᠠᠭᠢᠰ  
 /pa/      /ɲis/  
 ᠠᠨᠠᠭᠢᠰ *pangis* /paŋ.is/ ‘money’

Tahano Hikamu knows a few ligatures. First of all, when two ᠨ ⟨na⟩ are in succession within a word, they will form a ligature ᠨᠠᠨᠠ ⟨nana⟩:

- (2) ᠨ + ᠨ → ᠨᠠᠨᠠ  
 /na/      /na/      /nana/

This is distinct from conjuncts like in Devanāgarī et al., though, since the unmodified sound value will still be /nana/, not \*/nna/, so the inherent vowel of each ᠨ

⟨na⟩ is not deleted, and each  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨na⟩ retains the ability to be modified by diacritics. Tahano Hikamu also has a few ligatures of the kind you would find in Brāhmī scripts, however:

- (3) a.  $\text{ᳵ᳚}$  ⟨kwa⟩ ←  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨ka⟩ +  $\text{᳚}$  ⟨va⟩,  
 b.  $\text{ᳵ᳛}$  ⟨tsa⟩ ←  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨ta⟩ +  $\text{᳛}$  ⟨sa⟩, and  
 c.  $\text{ᳵ᳜}$  ⟨ksa⟩ ←  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨ka⟩ +  $\text{᳜}$  ⟨sa⟩.

These conjunct letters are, however, not normally employed by Ayeri. Figure 2.3 shows all additional consonants, added to write other languages. Individual languages may adapt the sound values slightly to fit their own purposes.

Figure 2.3: Additional consonant graphemes

/fa/	/wa/	/tsa/	/za/	/ja/	/za/
᳚	᳛	᳜	᳝	᳞	᳟
/ṣa/	/ksa/	/kwa/	/xa/	/ya/	
᳠	᳡	᳢	᳣	᳤	

## 2.2 Vowels

As mentioned above, vowels are written as diacritics that are added to consonants. In principle, every consonant has two slots for vowels, a primary one atop it, and a secondary one below it. Vowels added to consonants in the primary slot delete their inherent /a/:

- (4)  $\text{ᳵ} \rightarrow \text{ᳶ}$   
 /pa/      /pe/

Figure 2.4: Primary vowel graphemes

	/i/	/e/	/a/	/o/	/u/	/ə/	/au/
Diacritics	ᳶ	᳷	(᳸)	᳹	ᳺ	᳻	᳼
Independent	᳾	᳿	ᳺ	᳻	᳼	᳽	᳾

Figure 2.4 gives the primary vowel signs. Of the vowel signs given there, only ခ် ⟨ə⟩ is not used in Ayeri. ခ် ⟨au⟩ is the only diphthong for which a dedicated grapheme exists, even though its occurrence is rather limited. The independent vowel graphemes are used at the beginning of words or inside words when there is no other way to spell the vowel, which is occasionally the case for secondary vowels. Secondary vowels are vowels that are not parts of diphthongs (even though another language might use them to spell diphthongs that are not covered by default), but follow the vowel of a syllable directly. They are attached underneath a consonant base, for example:

$$(5) \quad \text{ပ} \rightarrow \text{ပျ} \rightarrow \text{ပျဲ} \\ \quad \quad \quad /ja/ \quad \quad /je/ \quad \quad /jea/$$

In fact, the principle that every consonant base with its diacritics represents one syllable is slightly violated here, which is also the reason why secondary vowels very occasionally need to be spelled as independent vowels, for example when the secondary vowel is long, as in the word ချီရ် *ruān* ‘duty’:

$$(6) \quad \text{ရ်} \rightarrow \text{ရ်ချီ} \quad (\text{ချီ}) \\ \quad \quad \quad /ru/ \quad \quad /rwa:/ \quad \quad /ru:a/$$

Example (6) uses a diacritic, ချီ, to indicate length. If it is put directly under ရ် *ru* (the ချီ diacritic moves down where it is not in the way), the syllable will incorrectly spell /ru:a/ instead of the intended /rua:/. This is because diacritics modify consonants and primary vowels, but there is no way to modify a secondary vowel directly. Figure 2.5 gives a list of secondary vowels corresponding to that of primary vowels above. The vowels as well are just referred to by their sound value; ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’, ‘superscript’ and ‘subscript’ or ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ may be chosen to disambiguate their positions; the native names may use ချီရ် *iray* ‘high’ and ချီရ် *eyra* ‘low’ to disambiguate, so ချီရ် *e iray* denotes the superscript ⟨e⟩ diacritic while ချီရ် *e eyra* denotes its subscript counterpart.

Figure 2.5: Secondary vowel graphemes

/i/	/e/	/a/	/o/	/u/	/ə/	/au/

As a further exception, those consonant bases with an ascender (ခ် ⟨ka⟩, ခ် ⟨da⟩, ခ် ⟨ca⟩) move the primary vowel to the secondary slot below the consonant by default while indicating the vacancy of the primary slot at the top with a dot. This is done to avoid crossing the ascender of the consonant with a vowel diacritic:

$$(7) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} \\ /ka/ & & /ka.i/ & & /ki/ \end{array}$$

If the primary vowel slot were not silenced by the  $\circ$  diacritic, it could reasonably be assumed that the consonant is not losing its inherent /a/ and the vowel below the consonant indicates a secondary vowel, spelling /CaV/. If, however, a secondary vowel is *actually* added, primary and secondary vowels will be assigned the regular primary and secondary slots, respectively, again (8a). This condition also holds true for subscript diacritics (8b).

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{lcl} \text{a.} & \begin{array}{ccc} \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} \\ /ki/ & & /ki.e/ \end{array} \\ \text{b.} & \begin{array}{ccc} \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} \\ /ki/ & & /ki:/ \end{array} \end{array}$$

The order of secondary vowels and subscript diacritics is iconic insofar as it follows the order of sounds in the syllable. Thus, secondary vowels appear below the consonant-doubling diacritic,  $\text{𐌵}$ , while they appear above the syllable-final homorganic nasal diacritic,  $\text{𐌶}$ :

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{lcl} \text{a.} & \begin{array}{ccc} \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} \\ /ppa/ & \rightarrow & /ppea/ \end{array} \\ \text{b.} & \begin{array}{ccc} \text{𐌵} & \rightarrow & \text{𐌵} \\ /peN/ & \rightarrow & /peaN/ \end{array} \end{array}$$

## 2.3 Diacritics

We have already encountered a few diacritics, though Tahano Hikamu comes with a lot more, some of which undergo non-trivial positioning and repositioning rules. As vowels are primarily expressed as superscripts, diacritics are primarily realized as subscripts, so in the following I will first describe subscript diacritics; then prepended diacritics, which Ayeri also has a number of, both as graphemes in their own right and as allographs of other subscript diacritics; and then, lastly, superscript diacritics.

### 2.3.1 Subscript diacritics

Figure 2.6 shows the bottom-attaching diacritics. The ‘large diacritics’ cause the secondary slot of consonants to move down below the diacritic. ‘Small diacritics’



Figure 2.6: Bottom-attaching diacritics

Native name	Function	Example
Large diacritics		
  <i>tupasati</i> ‘long-maker’	Lengthens the primary vowel of the syllable	<i>pa</i> → <i>pā</i>
  <i>eyra</i> ‘low ya’	⟨ya⟩ following another consonant, also across syllables. Marks palatalization of  ⟨ta⟩,  ⟨da⟩,  ⟨ka⟩,  ⟨ga⟩ and  ⟨ya⟩ in Ayeri.	<i>ara</i> → <i>arya</i> ; <i>ta</i> → <i>ca</i>
  <i>ringaya</i> ‘raiser’	Palatalizes a consonant (not used in Ayeri)	<i>ta</i> → <i>tʃa</i> , <i>tʃa</i>
  <i>ulangaya</i> ‘breather’	Aspiration or frication of a consonant (not used in Ayeri)	<i>ta</i> → <i>tʰa</i> , <i>θa</i>
  <i>raypāya eyra</i> ‘low stopper’	Glottal stop coda or glottalization of a consonant (consonant letters with ascenders; not used in Ayeri)	<i>ka</i> → <i>kaʔ</i> ; <i>da</i> → <i>dʰa</i>
Small diacritics		
  <i>gondaya</i> ‘extinguisher’	Deletes the inherent /a/ of a consonant, e.g. in consonant clusters or closed syllables	<i>para</i> → <i>pra</i> , <i>par</i>
  <i>vināti</i> ‘nasalizer’	Indicates a homorganic nasal or nasalizes the vowel, depending on the language	<i>pada</i> → <i>panda</i> /panda/ or /pāda/
  <i>kusangisāti</i> ‘duplicator’	Indicates a geminated or otherwise double consonant	<i>pala</i> → <i>palla</i>

can attach in this place as well as secondary vowels, as does the homorganic nasal diacritic ၂ in this diacritic-fraught example:

- (10)  $\text{တၢ်} + \text{ပုလၢ်} \rightarrow \text{တၢ်ပုလၢ်}$   
 /tʃa:n/      /pu'lɔɪ/      /,tʃa:mpu'lɔɪ/  
 တၢ်ပုလၢ် *cāmpuluy* 'heterosexual'

It also needs to be noted that diacritics like ၂ are applied progressively to words as a whole, not stopping at morpheme and syllable boundaries, so even though *toryeng* 'she sleeps' may be composed of တၢ်: *tor-* 'sleep' + ပုလၢ် *-yeng* (=3SG.F.A) and syllabifies as /tor.'jeŋ/, the spelling is not \*တၢ်ပုလၢ် as one might expect, but တၢ်ပုလၢ်.

Even though the primary position for small diacritics is underneath consonants, the diacritic deleting the inherent vowel, ၂, very commonly also appears after a consonant letter at the end of words:

- (11)  $\text{ပ} \quad \text{နီၤပုၤကၢၤ} \quad \text{ကၢၤ} \quad \text{ၤကၢၤၤၤ}$   
*Ya nimreng pangan narānyena.*  
*Ya nim-reng pangan-Ø narān-ye-na*  
 LOCT appear=3SG.INAN.A end-TOP word-PL-GEN  
 'It appears at the end of words.'

This strategy is advantageous in that Tahano Hikamu leaves very little space between individual words: ပနီၤပုၤကၢၤၤကၢၤၤၤ. With the dot after the consonant, word boundaries are more visible.

### 2.3.2 Prepended diacritics

Example (10) leads us directly to the next class of diacritics—ones that are prepended to the consonant letter, either because they are simply placed there or because of allography. Let us first list those diacritics that appear in front of consonants obligatorily (Figure 2.7).

As Figure 2.7 shows, the only obligatorily prepended diacritic that Ayeri uses is the one that marks diphthongs, ၂. It needs to be noted here that ၂ changes into ပ (ya) proper when a vowel follows, but stays ၂ when a ပ (ya) follows:

- (12) a.  $\text{ယုၤ} \text{ baday}$  'hero'  $\rightarrow$   $\text{ယုၤပုၤ} (*\text{ယုၤပုၤ})$  *badayang* 'the hero' (hero-A);  
 b.  $\text{ယုၤ} \text{ tipuy}$  'grass'  $\rightarrow$   $\text{ယုၤပုၤ} (*\text{ယုၤပုၤ})$  *tipuyya* 'in the grass' (grass-LOC).

<sup>4</sup> In a Tahano Hikamu orthography I devised for English once, ၂ was used for /ə/, as in the NURSE vowel in American English: ၂ nurse.

Figure 2.7: Obligatorily prepended diacritics

Native name	Function	Example
ၢ် ၵုၵ်းလၢ <i>lentankusang</i> 'double-sound'	Marks a diphthong with /l/	ၵ် <i>pe</i> → ၵ် <i>pey</i>
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>tilamaya</i> 'changer'	Marks raised vowels (i.e. umlaut; not used in Ayeri)	ၵ် <i>po</i> → ၵ် <i>pø</i>
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>hiyamaya</i> 'roller'	Marks retroflex consonants (not used in Ayeri) <sup>4</sup>	ၵ် <i>ta</i> → ၵ် <i>ṭa</i>

Figure 2.8: Allographically prepended diacritics

Native name	Function	Example
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>tupasati marin</i> 'anterior long-maker'	Lengthens the primary vowel of the syllable	ၵ် <i>sya</i> → ၵ် <i>syā</i> , ၵ် <i>na</i> → ၵ် <i>nā</i>
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>ya marin</i> 'anterior ya'	⟨ya⟩ following another consonant, also across syllables.	ၵ် <i>na</i> → ၵ် <i>nya</i>
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>ringaya marin</i> 'anterior raiser'	Also used as an allograph for the palatalization proper diacritic.	ၵ် <i>/sʰa/</i> → ၵ် <i>/sʰj/</i>
ၢ် ၵိၵ်းလၢ <i>ulangaya marin</i> 'anterior breather'	(Pre-)Aspiration or frication of a consonant (not used in Ayeri)	ၵ် <i>nga</i> → ၵ် <i>/ŋʰa/</i> ; ၵ် <i>ta</i> → ၵ် <i>/tʰa/</i>

Besides  $\text{ᳵ}$ , there are also a number of diacritics that are also obligatorily prepended to consonants, but do so as context-sensitive allographs (Figure 2.8). The selection of the variant diacritics is not random or up to the aesthetic eye of the writer (even though the device itself is certainly a matter of aesthetics), but it is governed by rules. The prepended forms listed in Figure 2.8 are thus triggered

1. when there is no stem or bowl for the regular subscript diacritic to attach to, which is the case for  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨na⟩,  $\text{ᳶ}$  ⟨nga⟩,  $\text{᳷}$  ⟨va⟩, and  $\text{᳸}$  ⟨wa⟩:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (13) \quad \text{a. } \text{ᳵ} \rightarrow \text{ᳵᳵ} & \text{c. } \text{᳷} \rightarrow \text{᳷᳷} \\
 \quad \quad \quad /na/ & \quad \quad \quad /va/ \\
 \quad \quad \quad /na:/ & \quad \quad \quad /va:/ \\
 \quad \quad \quad \text{b. } \text{ᳶ} \rightarrow \text{ᳶᳶ} & \text{d. } \text{᳸} \rightarrow \text{᳸᳸} \\
 \quad \quad \quad /ŋa/ & \quad \quad \quad /wa/ \\
 \quad \quad \quad /ŋa:/ & \quad \quad \quad /wa:/
 \end{array}$$

2. when a large subscript diacritic would be added after another large subscript diacritic—this position can only be occupied once, so further large subscripts are prepended:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 (14) & & + \text{ᳶ} & & + \text{᳷} & & + \text{᳸} \\
 \text{ᳵ} & \rightarrow & \text{ᳵᳶ} & \rightarrow & 2\text{ᳵᳶ} & \rightarrow & 2\text{ᳵᳶ᳷} \\
 /ta/ & & /tʰa/ & & /tʰja/ & & /tʰji/ \\
 & & & & & & /tʰji:/
 \end{array}$$

The order of diacritics follows the logic of the respective language's phoneme inventory, so if there are, for example, retroflex consonants and both dental and retroflex consonants can be aspirated, retroflexion would be marked first, then aspiration. If there is a palatalization contrast on top of this, the diacritic would be added after aspiration.

When adding large diacritics to stemless consonants, they are prepended from the beginning, as we saw in (13), and just like in (14), this principle continues:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 (15) & & + \text{᳷} & & + \text{᳸} & & + \text{ᳵᳵ} \\
 \text{ᳵ} & \rightarrow & 2\text{ᳵ} & \rightarrow & 22\text{ᳵ} & \rightarrow & 222\text{ᳵ} \\
 /na/ & & /nja/ & & /nja:/ & & /nja:ɿ/
 \end{array}$$

3. with consonants directly following  $\text{ᳵ}$  ⟨na⟩, to avoid a clash with its swash:

$$(16) \quad \underset{/na/}{\text{န}} + \underset{/pa:/}{\text{ပ}} \rightarrow \underset{/napa:/}{\text{နပ}} \quad (*\text{နပ})$$

An exception to this exception occurs, however, when the consonant is not directly following. In this case, no reordering happens, only န ⟨na⟩ *may* reduce its swash in size to accommodate the following prepended diacritic:<sup>5</sup>

$$(17) \quad \underset{/na/}{\text{န}} + \underset{/pai/}{\text{ပိ}} \rightarrow \underset{/napai/}{\text{နပိ}} \quad (? \text{နပိ})$$

4. in other cases where a clash of subscript diacritics needs to be avoided:

$$(18) \quad \underset{/di/}{\text{သိ}} + \underset{/pa:/}{\text{ပ}} \rightarrow \underset{/dipa:/}{\text{သိပ}} \quad (*\text{သိပ})$$

Alternatively, the following solution is permissible:

$$(19) \quad \underset{/di/}{\text{သိ}} + \underset{/pa:/}{\text{ပ}} \rightarrow \underset{/dipa:/}{\text{သိပ}}$$

When two long syllables follow each other, as in *bāmā* ‘mom-and-dad’, one of the length diacritics should definitely be pulled to the front:

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{l} \underset{/ba:/}{\text{မိ}} + \underset{/ma:/}{\text{မ}} \rightarrow \underset{/ba:ma:/}{\text{မိမ}} \quad (? \text{မိမ}) \\ \text{or:} \quad \underset{/ba:/}{\text{မိ}} + \underset{/ma:/}{\text{မ}} \rightarrow \underset{/ba:ma:/}{\text{မိမ}} \end{array}$$

<sup>5</sup> The font I am using here is designed so that the reduced combination looks nicer, but if unreduced, န ⟨na⟩’s swash is not so long as to cross the descender of ပ either in this particular case.

### 2.3.3 Superscript diacritics

Ayeri's standard position for diacritics is below consonants, but sometimes it is nicer to put them on top, especially for the letter  $\text{ၵ}$  ⟨na⟩ due to its swash, as well as for  $\text{ၶ}$  ⟨va⟩ since the space below its flag is empty otherwise, thus not providing much of a visual connection. The only diacritic that is normally attaching to the top of consonants is that for the glottal stop—we have already encountered its subscript allograph earlier. Since Ayeri's phoneme inventory does not possess a phonemic glottal stop or glottalization, this diacritic is not used in Ayeri. The list of superscript diacritics is given in Figure 2.9.

Figure 2.9: Superscript diacritics

	Native name	Function	Example
◌̇	ၵၵၵၵၵၵ <i>godaya</i> <i>ling</i> ‘upper extinguisher’	Deletes inherent /a/ of consonant, e.g. in consonant clusters or closed syllables	$\text{ၶၵ} \textit{vara} \rightarrow \text{ၶၵ} \textit{vra}$
◌̈	ၵၵၵၵၵၵ <i>vināti</i> <i>ling</i> ‘upper nasalizer’	Indicates a homorganic nasal or nasalizes the vowel, depending on language/context	$\text{ၵၵ} \textit{naka} \rightarrow \text{ၵၵ̈} \textit{nanka}$ /naŋka/ or /nāka/
◌̄	ၵၵၵၵၵၵၵၵၵ <i>kusangisāti</i> <i>ling</i> ‘upper duplicator’	Indicates a geminated or otherwise double consonant	$\text{ၵၵ} \textit{pana} \rightarrow \text{ၵၵ̄} \textit{panna}$
◌̣	ၵၵၵၵ <i>raypāya</i> ‘stopper’	Glottal stop coda or glottalization of a consonant (not used in Ayeri)	$\text{ၵ} \textit{ta} \rightarrow \text{ၵ̣} \textit{ta} \text{?};$ $\text{ၶ} \textit{sa} \rightarrow \text{ၶ̣} \textit{sa}$

At times, it may be necessary to attach both a superscript diacritic and a vowel sign above a consonant. In this case, the consonant-modifying diacritic is placed first and the vowel diacritic on top of it—this is exactly equivalent to the rule exemplified for subscript diacritics in (9).

## 2.4 Numerals

Ayeri uses a duodecimal number system, that is, a system based on the powers of 12, which is a typological rarity.<sup>6</sup> There is a digit for zero, so the system is positional, like the Hindu–Arabic digits used by the Latin alphabet. The numerals for the numbers from 1 to 12 are shown in Figure 2.10.

Figure 2.10: The numerals

1 12	2 𐄀	3 12	4 7	5 𐄁	6 0
7 𐄂	8 𐄃	9 𐄄	10 𐄅	11 𐄆	12 𐄇

## 2.5 Punctuation and abbreviations

Tahano Hikamu’s system of manipulating the sound of syllables is very sophisticated, so it comes as no surprise that it is also host of a large number of punctuation marks. Figure 2.11 lists the ones commonly encountered, Figure 2.12 the ones not so commonly encountered.

«*⟨.⟩* does not look very much like a dot or a point, but it is derived from a sign that looks like two circles stacked on top of each other, similar to :*⟨-⟩* (see Figure 0.2). There is no mark for a comma as such, so :*⟨-⟩* or –*⟨-⟩* cannot be used in this way. Instead of a comma, a wide word space is used to separate syntactic units. A long dash –*⟨—⟩* is also sometimes found at the end of paragraphs or texts to mark their end. The strong exclamation mark 𐄈 may appear in its exclamatory function at the end of a line, but does not necessarily indicate strong emphatic force in this case, but just an emphatic statement.

Regarding the less common marks, some of these seem like all to bland copies of modern punctuation, especially the brackets and the decimal point. Still, however, they may serve their purpose sometimes, and the brackets 𐄉𐄊 maybe come with the redeeming notion that they push off the text around the inclusion rather than encapsulating the inclusion within it, so the visual effect is slightly different. The name brackets 𐄋 are interesting and maybe useful insofar as many names in Ayeri are derived from common words, for example, 𐄌𐄍 *Ajān*, a male name, is literally ‘play, game’, relating to a playful character; 𐄎𐄏 *Migoray*, a female name, literally means ‘flower’. The name brackets, then, make it unmistakeably clear that a proper

<sup>6</sup> And one possibly overrepresented by fictional languages due to its rarity in natural languages.

Figure 2.11: Common punctuation marks

	Native name	Function	Example
။	မံး <i>dan</i> ‘dot’	Full stop	ဧကယျာ။ <i>Sarayāng</i> . ‘He left.’
:	မံးမံး <i>dan-dan</i> ‘little dot’	A separator for small things, like clitics and abbreviations; divides the constituents of reduplication	မံး-ဥာ <i>ada-nanga</i> ‘this house’; ဖာမ ၄: <i>pd</i> ‘၄ hrs’; မံးမံး <i>dan-dan</i> ‘dot-dot, little dot’
—	ပုတ် <i>puntān</i> ‘dash’	General sign for a longer pause, equivalent to a dash, colon, semicolon, brackets	ပုတ်-ဧက <i>Yan – saru!</i> ‘Yan – go!’
၊	မံးကံးမံး <i>damprantan</i> ‘question point’	Marks questions	မံးကံး <i>Manisu?</i> ‘Hello?’
၊	မံးဗဟံး <i>dambahān</i> ‘shouting point’	Marks exclamations; strong exclamations may be marked by the ခ variant.	မံးကံး <i>Manisu!</i> ‘Hello!’; ခ ယိ <i>Yi!</i> ‘Urgh!’

Figure 2.12: Less common punctuation marks

	Native name	Function	Example
“ ”	မံးကံး <i>danarān</i> ‘speaking point’	Quotation marks	ဧကယျာ မံးကံး <i>Narayāng</i> “ <i>Manisu!</i> ” ‘He says, “Hello!”’
၊၀	မံးကံး <i>dankayvo</i> ‘beside-point’	Bracketing of text	ဧကယျာ <i>bahis (larau)</i> ‘a (nice) day’
၊	မံးကံး <i>dangaran</i> ‘name-point’	Explicitly marks a name as such. For the closing name parenthesis, ဝါ can be found as well.	မံးကံး <i>Ajān Savati</i> ; ဝါ ကံး <i>Pila Lay Maran</i>
’	မံးကံး <i>dansinday</i> ‘number-point’	Marks (duo)decimal fractions	၁၇.၄၅၈၂ <i>17.45B82</i> ‘19.37482’
။	မံးကံး <i>adrumaya</i> ‘breaker’	Marks line breaks within a phrase	



Two very common abbreviations are symbolic in nature, like the ampersand & in the Latin alphabet, and incidentally, they correspond to it in that the very common small word *nay* ‘and’ may be abbreviated as *η*. Based on this, its reduplicated form *naynay* ‘furthermore, also’ may be abbreviated as *ḡ*.

Over the course of the years since Tahano Hikamu’s inception, I have liked to experiment with different styles of writing, that is, I tried applying a number of different writing styles to the script to change its look and feel while still staying true to the overall character shapes and the system behind the script. The example text I will be using to illustrate the different styles in the following is an Ayeri translation of the first article of the United Nations *Universal declaration of human rights* (Becker 2011):

[All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards each other in a spirit of brotherhood.] (United Nations 1948: Article 1)

Figure 2.13: Tahano Hikamu, ‘book style’

ကံကပိဉ်ဒုဗ္ဗေသနာဝါရီဒုဗ္ဗေသနာဝါရီဒုဗ္ဗေသနာ  
ဝါရီဒုဗ္ဗေသနာဝါရီဒုဗ္ဗေသနာဝါရီဒုဗ္ဗေသနာ

<sup>7</sup> For examples, see Everson (2008), or *Wikipedia*.

it to Tahano Hikamu at some point. As mentioned above as well, there are no subscript letters and in Ayeri, and the number of large swirling diacritics is also rather low, so there is still definitely a difference in appearance. The ‘angular’ style is also the one that is comparable in function to our bold face or italic style letters, since it is used in captions or to highlight special text within running text. This letter style (ဆွဲ၃ *binya* ‘angular’) is displayed in Figure 2.14.

Figure 2.14: Tahano Hikamu, ‘angular style’

The image shows two lines of text in the 'angular style' of Tahano Hikamu. The characters are bold and angular, with straightened strokes and simple descending lines instead of swirls. The text is written in a dark ink on a light background.

The greatest difference to the ‘book’ style is that many of the main strokes double to become a thick and a parallel thin line and the shape of ဃ (na) changes to have its swirl straightened into a simple descending line. The vowel carrier ခ changes to a flattened *O*-like circle, and the bottom curl in ခ (ta) changes to a wedge. While the right side of the န (sa) character in the ‘book style’ consists of two strokes—a flag and a downwards bow, both independently attached to the main stem—they connect here to form an *R*-like shape.

Neatly reproducing the shapes of either the ‘book’ style or the ‘angular’ style by hand goes rather slowly, so I was wondering what daily handwriting could look like. Of course, this presupposes pen and paper again; Salomon (1996: 377) mentions that inscriptions of Brāhmī and related scripts have been found on copper plates and plates made of other metals, besides stone. Metal plates can be inscribed with metal styluses and should allow similar shapes as modern pens. Wax tablets—a staple in European literacy until the use of paper became widespread—should as well allow for relative freedom of stroke direction. Figure 2.15 shows what Tahano Hikamu might look like quickly jotted down by hand.

Figure 2.15: Tahano Hikamu, ‘hand style’

The image shows two lines of text in the 'hand style' of Tahano Hikamu. The characters are simplified and more rounded than in the 'angular style', with some strokes appearing as simple curves or wedges. The text is written in a dark ink on a light background.

Many letter shapes become simplified, specifically ခ (ba), န (ga), န (ka), ဃ (na), န (nga), the vowel carrier ခ, and the vowel ဝ (i). Not shown here is the vowel length diacritic, ခ, which is simplified to a reverse *C* shape. The abbreviation န *na* ‘and’ is used throughout, though in a shape that is more similar to its ‘angular’ form န. ဃ (na) is also taken from the ‘angular’ style န, which opens the possibility that





## 3 Morphological typology

---

The first chapter dealt with the smallest constituent parts of words—speech sounds, which ones there are, and how they assemble into valid words. Consequently, the following two chapters will be about the next step up from this: morphemes, the atoms of meaning. First we will have a more general look at which kinds of morphemes there are, and then look at them more closely by part of speech: what is their distribution, and how are morphemes put together to form inflected words? This chapter on morphological typology will first deal with general questions about Ayeri's degree of synthesis, and then will try to answer questions about the kinds of functions the various morpheme classes carry out in the language.

### 3.1 Typology

For the largest part, Ayeri is an *agglutinative* language. Comrie (1989) says of agglutinating languages that in these, typically,

a word may consist of more than one morpheme, but the boundaries between morphemes in the word are always clear-cut; moreover, a given morpheme has at least a reasonably invariant shape, so that the identification of morphemes in terms of their phonetic shape is also straightforward. [...] As is suggested by the term agglutinating (cf. Latin *gluten* 'glue'), it is as if the various affixes were just glued on one after the other (or one before the other, with prefixes). (43–44)

In Ayeri, root morphemes are modified by affixes for the purposes of inflection and derivation, and these affixes, in the form of suffixes more specifically, can be stacked, especially on verbs. Indeed, they vary little, so that they are always easily recognizable. Suffixation in Ayeri is especially prominent on verbs:

- (1) *Le kondasayāng hemaye pruyya nay napayya kayvay.*  
Le kond-asa=yāng hema-ye-Ø pruy-ya nay napay-ya kayvay  
PT.INAN eat-HAB=3SG.M.A egg-PL-TOP salt-LOC and pepper-LOC without

'He always eats his eggs without salt and pepper.'

The verb root  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *kond-* ‘eat’ is inflected here for a habitual action with the suffix  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *-asa*, and also carries a person-inflection clitic,  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *-yāng*, marking a third person singular masculine agent. With the notable exception of pronouns and related person-inflection clitics, affixes tend to encode a single grammatical function. Verbs are not the only part of speech that can inflect; nouns and the relativizing conjunction can as well:

- (2) a. *Ang mətabanay tamanyeley yeyam.*  
 Ang mə-tahan=ay.Ø taman-ye-ley yeyam.  
 AT PST-write=ISG.TOP letter-PL-P.INAN 3SG.F.DAT  
 ‘I wrote letters to her.’
- b. *Le turayāng taman sinā ang ningay tamala vās.*  
 Le tura=yāng taman-Ø si-Ø-na ang ning=ay.Ø tamala vās  
 PT.INAN send=3SG.M.A letter-TOP REL-PT.INAN-GEN AT tell=ISG.TOP yesterday 2SG.P  
 ‘The letter which I told you about yesterday, he sent it.’

The principle of not conflating several grammatical functions into a single suffix can be observed in (2a) regarding the word  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *tamanyeley* ‘letters’, in which the plural marker  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *-ye* is distinct from the inanimate-patient case marker  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *-ley* (the latter, however, conflates animacy and case). Strictly speaking, the pronoun  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *yeyam* ‘to her’ is also composed, namely of the third person feminine base form  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *ye* and the dative case marker  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *yam*. Example (2b) is one we have already encountered before (p. 11). Here, the relative pronoun,  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *sinā* ‘of/about which’ is inflected for genitive case, and stress on the usually unstressed last syllable suprasegmentally marks that this form is contracted from  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *sileyena* (*si-ley-ena*, REL-P.INAN-GEN).

So far, we have concentrated on suffixes, but there are a number of prefixes as well; (2a) exhibits the past prefix  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *mə-* (which is actually redundant in this case). There are also demonstrative prefixes on nouns, however. In the following example, the prefix  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *eda-* ‘this-’ joins the noun  $\text{ḳḳ}$ : *peham* ‘carpet’ to indicate a specific carpet.

- (3) *Le no intoyyang eda-peham.*  
 Le no int-oy=yang eda=peham-Ø  
 PT.INAN want buy-NEG=ISG.A this=carpet-TOP  
 ‘I do not want to buy this carpet.’

Besides prefixes and suffixes, Ayeri also possesses at least one grammatical morpheme of the kind Zwicky (1977) calls a ‘bound word’. Bound words are cases where morphemes which are

always bound and always unaccented show considerable syntactic freedom, in the sense that they can be associated with words of a variety of morphosyntactic categories. Frequently, such a *bound word* is semantically associated with an entire

consituent while being phonologically attached to one word of this constituent, and ordinarily the bound word is located at the very margins of the word, standing outside even inflectional affixes. (6)

This is the case with the marker  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *manga*, which is treated as an independent word, but can modify verbs and prepositions—heads of verb phrases (VPs) and prepositional phrases (PPs), respectively—is unstressed and appears at the margin of its modification target:

- (4) a. *Ang manga yavaya ayon bariley.*  
 Ang manga yava-ya ayon-Ø bari-ley  
 AT PROG roast-3SG.M man-TOP meat-P.INAN  
 ‘The man is roasting meat.’
- b. *Ya mətapyyāng maritay misley manga luga bari.*  
 Ya mə-tapy=yāng maritay mis-ley manga luga bari-Ø  
 LOCT PST-put=3SG.M.A before spit-P.INAN DYN between meat-TOP  
 ‘The meat, he had put a spit through it before.’

In (4a),  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *manga* modifies the verb  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *yava-* ‘roast’ and indicates that this is a temporarily ongoing action, like the English progressive, except not as strongly grammaticalized.<sup>1</sup> In (4b),  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *manga* modifies the preposition, on the other hand, to indicate that it is dynamic:  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *luga* by itself means ‘among, between’, while its dynamic form  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *manga luga* means ‘through; during, for’.

As we have seen in the examples above, person suffixes on verbs are single morphemes that encode more than one property, for example  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *-yeng* encodes the person features third person, feminine, singular, and agent. Personal pronouns, of which the person clitics on verbs are an instance, are the main case of fusion among agglutination in Ayeri, although some of the forms, like  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *yeyam* ‘to her’ above, can be decomposed into root and suffix without problem.<sup>2</sup>

Perpendicular to the axis isolation–agglutination runs the axis analytic–synthetic. On the latter axis, Ayeri scores mostly as *synthetic*, since it prefers compactness over spreading a construction over several words, though it does not incorporate object noun phrases (NPs) and it is not possible to form ‘sentence-words’

<sup>1</sup> I suppose, a better parallel is the so-called *rheinische Verlaufsform* ‘Riparian progressive’ (*sein* ‘be’ + *am/beim* ‘at the’ + infinitive) in German, a construction common in the colloquial language which parallels the English progressive construction and is not yet fully grammaticalized (Eisenberg et al. 2016: 435). Speakers will thus accept both *Er lernt gerade*, literally ‘He studies right now’, and *Er ist am Lernen* ‘He is studying’.

<sup>2</sup> Originally, Ayeri’s personal pronouns were indeed agglutinative as well, so  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *yeng* ‘she’ used to be  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫ}$  *iyegang* (*iy-e-ang*, 3SG-F-A). This also gives an explanation to Boga et al. (2016)’s observation that Ayeri’s plural pronouns are formed “[v]ielleicht sogar zu regelmäßig” ([15]; ‘possibly in an even too regular way’).

either, so it is not going so far as to be polysynthetic (Comrie 1989: 45–46). It is nonetheless theoretically possible, due to suffixation being a prominent pattern, to form foot-long words like

- (5) *da-mətahasongoyyang-ikan*  
 da=mə-taha-asa-ong-oy=yang=ikan  
 such=PST-have-HAB-IRR-NEG=ISG.A=much  
 ‘I would not much used to have had such’

Cases of analytic morphology are compound prepositions as we have seen with  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *manga luga* ‘through’ in (4b), but verbs as well show analytic structures not only with the progressive marker, but also with modals:

- (6) *Ming sahooyang dabas.*  
 Ming saha-oy=yang dabas  
 can come-NEG=ISG.A today  
 ‘I can’t come today.’

Most of the information the VP contains in this example is marked on the content verb,  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *saha-* ‘come’, except for ability, which is expressed by the particle  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *ming* ‘can’.  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *ming* is an uninflected form of the verb expressing ability and may be counted as an auxiliary verb in that the full semantic content of the VP is spread out over two verb forms, one major, one minor—this probably should not be understood as a serial verb construction, however (Aikhenvald 2006).<sup>3</sup> Consider also the following example in which  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *ming* is inflected like a regular verb:

- (7) *Da-mingya ang Diyan.*  
 Da=ming-ya ang Diyan.  
 so=can-3SG.M A Diyan  
 ‘Diyan can (do it).’

## 3.2 Morphological processes

### 3.2.1 Prefixation

Prefixes in Ayeri apply mainly to verbs, but nouns, pronouns, adjectives and conjunctions as well can appear with them, some of which may be clitics; reasons for their being clitics will be given at the appropriate cases in the sections on the various

<sup>3</sup>  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *manga* has, in fact, a verbal counterpart  $\text{ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆯᆫ}$  *manga-* ‘move; remove’ as well, which presumably served as the origin of both the progressive and the dynamic marker.



parts of speech. With verbs, prefixes that are most certainly ‘true’ prefixes—that is, morphemes that have been semantically bleached by grammaticalization to the point where they only express grammatical functions (Lehmann 2015: 157ff.) and which subcategorize words rather than phrases (Klavans 1985: 117)—are the tense prefixes marking both three degrees of past and future tense, for example:

- (8) *Ang səsarāyn ya Makapetang.*  
 Ang sə-sara=ayn.Ø ya Makapetang  
 AT FUT-go=IPL.TOP LOC Makapetang  
 ‘We will go to Makapetang.’

Here, the prefix 𐀓: *sə-* marks future tense on the verb, 𐀓𐀆: *sara-* ‘go’. The other tense prefixes are 𐀓𐀆: *kə-* (NPST), 𐀓: *mə-* (PST), 𐀓𐀆: *ʋə-* (RPST), and 𐀓: *pa-* (NFUT) and 𐀓𐀆: *ni-* (RFUT). Besides this set of prefixes, there are also a number of proclitics that can appear with verbs, though not exclusively. These are the anaphora 𐀓𐀆: *da-* ‘thus, so, such’ and the reflexive marker 𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆: *sitang-* ‘self’:

- (9) *Da-mingya ang Diyan.*  
 Da=ming-ya ang Diyan.  
 so=can-3SG.M A Diyan  
 ‘Diyan can (do it).’
- (10) *Sitang-kecāng.*  
 Sitang=kə=yāng  
 REFL=Wash=3SG.M.A  
 ‘He washes himself.’

𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆: *sitang-* can also be used as a preverb in situations where the agent is also the instrument, so both of the following two sentences are equivalent in meaning:

- (11) a. *Sa apicāng nanga ikan sitang-yari.*  
 Sa apit=yāng nanga ikan sitang=yari  
 PT clean=3SG.A house complete REFL=3SG.M.INS  
 ‘He cleaned the whole house by himself.’
- b. *Sa sitang-apicāng nanga ikan.*  
 Sa sitang=apit=yāng nanga ikan  
 PT REFL=clean=3SG.A house complete  
 (idem)

Example (11a) shows the more common application of 𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆: *sitang-*, that is, as a reflexive modifier of pronouns. The prefix 𐀓𐀆: *da-* can as well be used with noun phrases and is part of the demonstrative set of prefixes, 𐀓𐀆: *da-* ‘such’, 𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆: *eda-* ‘this’, and 𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆𐀓𐀆: *ada-* ‘that’:

- (12) *eda-ganang*  
 eda=gan-ang  
 this=child-A  
 ‘this child’

The demonstrative prefixes are also used to form the demonstrative pronouns မ်ၤ *edanya* ‘this one’, မ်ၤ *adanya* ‘that one’ and မ်ၤ *danya* ‘such one’. A special case in this regard is the postposition မ်ၤ *da-nārya* ‘in spite of, despite’ where မ်ၤ *da-* combines with the conjunction ခၢၣ် *nārya* ‘but, although, except’. Originally, မ်ၤ *dikapisa* ‘respective’ is derived from မ်ၤ *da-* + မ်ၤ *ikapisa* ‘bound, dependent’, which is an example of a combination with an adjective. There is also a fixed adverbial expression using one of these prefixes, မ်ၤ *eda-tadayyam* ‘for the time being, for now’ (this=time-DAT).

Last but not least, the prefix မ်ၤ *ku-* ‘like, as though’ can be used with both adjectives and nouns (or, more precisely, phrases containing nominals):

- (13) a. *ku-koyaya*  
 ku=koya-ya  
 like=book-LOC  
 ‘like in a book’  
 b. *ku-prasi*  
 ku=prasi  
 like=sour  
 ‘as though (it were) sour’

An example of a set-phrasal adverbial consisting of မ်ၤ *ku-* and a verb is မ်ၤ *ku-nasya* ‘as follows’, ခၢၣ် *nasya-* meaning ‘follow’. What is curious here is that this fossilized form is lacking person marking and is just extended with an epenthetic *-a* since *-sy* is not a permissible coda. The expected form would be \*မ်ၤ *ku-nasyareng* (like=follow=3SG.INAN.A).

Following Klavans (1985), who suggests that clitics best be defined as “affixation at the phrasal level” (117), a very common kind of prefix to the verb *phrase* are the topic markers. They are counted as parts of the VP but do not interact with it regarding stress assignment (they are always unstressed) while always being in an initial position, preceding any other preverbal elements:

- (14) a. *Ang tabanya tamanley.*  
 Ang tahan-ya taman-ley  
 AT write-3SG.M letter-P.INAN  
 ‘He writes a letter.’  
 b. *Ang mətabanya tamanley.* ‘He wrote a letter.’

- c. *Ang manga mətabanya tamanley.* ‘He was writing a letter.’  
 d. *Ang manga no mətabanya tamanley.* ‘He was wanting to write a letter.’

### 3.2.2 Suffixation

As a largely agglutinative language, most grammatical marking in Ayeri is done by means of suffixes. These occur mainly with nouns and verbs, however, quantifiers take the shape of suffixes as well. Quantifiers, then, may modify content words almost regardless of their part of speech—noun, verb, adjective or adverb. The most pervasive examples of suffixation are certainly those of case marking on nouns and of person marking on verbs, for example:

- (15) *Sa pəharuyang va manga miday tangya vana suyareri, vimyon!*  
 Sa pə-haru=yang va.Ø manga miday tang-ya vana suyar-eri, vimyon  
 PT NFUT-beat=ISG.A 2SG.TOP DYN around ears-LOC 2SG.GEN ladle-INS, monkey!  
 ‘I’ll beat you around your ears with a ladle, you monkey!’

This example shows marking of 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *tang* ‘ears’ with the locative case suffix 𐌇𐌆𐌇 -*ya* and the marking of 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *suyar* ‘ladle’ with the instrumental case suffix 𐌆𐌆𐌇 -*eri*; the previous examples already provide instances of the exceedingly common markers for agent and patient case, 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*ang* and 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*as*, respectively. Besides case, nouns can also be marked for plural with the suffix 𐌇𐌆𐌇 -*ye*, and verb roots may be extended by the mood and aspect markers 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*ong* (IRR), 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*asa* (HAB) and 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*oy* (NEG), the last of which is the most frequently occurring one. The mood suffixes can also be stacked, leading to the long word in (5) above. Person marking on verbs is realized as agreement suffixes or of clitic personal pronouns depending on whether an agent NP proper is present or not for the verb to agree with. In (15), a cliticized agent pronoun 𐌂𐌆𐌇 -*yāng* ‘he’ (3SG.M.A) appears.

As mentioned above, quantifiers appear as enclitics on almost any type of content word, like on the adverb 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *para* ‘fast’ in the following example:

- (16) *Tigalyeng para-ma.*  
 Tigal=yeng para=ma  
 swim=3SG.F.A fast=enough  
 ‘She swims fast enough.’

### 3.2.3 Reduplication

There are two patterns of reduplication for verbs, one with complete reduplication of the imperative form to create a hortative statement (17a), and one with partial

reduplication as a way to express that an action takes place again, that is, partial reduplication expresses a iterative, as it were (17b). The imperative iterative, then, has a hortative function as well (17c):

- (17) a. *naru-naru*  
           *naru~nara-u*  
           HORT~speak-IMP  
           ‘let us speak’
- b. *na-narayeng*  
           *na~nara=yeng*  
           ITER~speak=3SG.F.A  
           ‘she speaks again’
- c. *na-naru*  
           *na~nara-u*  
           ITER~speak-IMP  
           ‘let us speak again’

With nouns, full reduplication is used to create a diminutive form (18a), though some reduplications are also lexicalized and may use roots from other parts of speech as well to form nouns, for instance, the words in (18b–d). There are also a number of adjectives for which there exists a lexical reduplication with an intensifying meaning; (19) lists a few examples. This, however, is not a productive derivation strategy.

- (18) a. *veney* ‘dog’ → *veney-veney* ‘little dog, doggie’  
       b. *gan* ‘child’ → *gan-gan* ‘grandchild’  
       c. *kusang* ‘double (adj.)’ → *kusang-kusang* ‘model’  
       d. *veba* ‘build’ → *veba-veba* ‘tinkering’
- (19) a. *apan* ‘wide’ → *apan-apan* ‘extensive’  
       b. *kebay* ‘alone’ → *kebay-kebay* ‘all alone’  
       c. *pisu* ‘tired’ → *pisu-pisu* ‘exhausting’

### 3.2.4 Suprasegmental modification

As written above (section 1.1.2), case agreement on a complex-marked relative pronoun can drop out under certain circumstances and is replaced by compensatory stress on the secondary case marker, which lengthens the syllable’s nucleus vowel:

- (20) ... *tamanley sinā* (\**sina*) *ang ningay tamala vās*  
 ... [taman-ley]<sub>1</sub> si-Ø<sub>1</sub>-na (\*si-na<sub>1</sub>) ang ning=ay.Ø tamala vās  
 ... letter-P.INAN REL-PT.INAN-GEN (\*REL-GEN) AT tell=ISG.TOP yesterday 2SG.P  
 ‘... the letter which (\*whose) I told you about yesterday’

This can be reinterpreted so that vowel length/stress itself is what signifies the agreement of the relativizer with the preceding NP. Which grammatical role the relativizer’s head instantiates as an agreement controller is essentially underspecified, hence I will gloss it as -AGR in the following example instead of as full -P.INAN:

- (21) /si.lei.'ena/ → /si.'na(:)/  
 /si-lei-ena/ → /si-'-na(:)/  
 REL-P.INAN-GEN REL-AGR-GEN

Since  $\text{na}$  as a light syllable cannot be stressed in word-final position under normal circumstances, it has to lengthen to  $\text{nā}$ .

### 3.3 Marking strategies

With regards to the dichotomy head–dependent marking, Ayeri is rather thoroughly dependent marking, albeit with the exception of agreement morphology on the verb. Dependent marking is exhibited, for instance, in the expression of possessive relationships, where the dependent is marked for genitive case:

- (22) a. *dema*  
  
*dema na Tuvo*  
 HEAD DEPENDENT  
*dema na Tuvo*  
 dema na Tuvo  
 aunt GEN Tuvo  
 ‘Tuvo’s aunt’
- b. *kasu*  
  
*kasu bariri nā*  
 HEAD DEPENDENT  
*kasu bariri nā*  
 kasu bari-ri nā  
 basket meat-INS ISG.GEN  
 ‘my basket of meat’

In (22a),  $\text{Tuvo}$  is grammatically in possession of her  $\text{dema}$  ‘aunt’; the possessee forms the head of the phrase while it is modified by the possessor, which receives the marking. In (22b),  $\text{kasu}$  ‘basket’ forms the head and thus also the possessee while  $\text{nā}$  ‘my’ serves as the dependent possessor; the genitive case is, then again, marked on the dependent. A further example of dependent marking is the locative case, which is marked on the prepositional object while the preposition itself, as the head of the PP, does not receive marking:

- (23) *agonan minkayya*  
 agonan minkay-**ya**  
 outside village-**LOC**  
 ‘outside of the village’



The relativizer, likewise, may agree in case with the NP in the matrix clause to which it links the relative clause. This typically happens mainly in formal language and—in terms of linear succession of words at the surface level of the clause—if the relativizer cannot be immediately adjacent to the NP which the relative clause modifies, for example, when an adjective or a possessive pronoun is following the noun:

- (24) *sangalas kivo sas ...*  
 sangal-as kivo s-**as** ...  
 room-P small REL-**P** ...  
 ‘the small room which ...’



The only instance of head-marking there is in Ayeri is person-marking on the verb, which manifests when the NP following the verb (agent or patient) is not pronominal and thus there is no pronoun to cliticize to the verb stem, but the verb still receives a suffix that indicates a relation with, usually, the agent NP:

- (25) *Malya ang Amān.*  
 Mal-**ya** ang Amān  
 sing-3**SG.M** A Amān  
 ‘Amān sings.’



Sentences containing more than one NP also have topic marking on the verb, so that the verb agrees with one of the NPs in topicality. This may be the NP it has person agreement with or any other NP. The topicalized NP as a dependent of the

verb is, in turn, zero-marked, so that the marking relationship for topics is bilateral and thus mixed:

- (26) *Sa manya ang Ajān Pila.*  
*Sa man-ya ang Amān Ø Pila*  
 PT greet-3SG.M A Ajān TOP Pila  
 ‘Pila, Ajān greets her.’



In this example, the verb exhibits canonic agreement with the agent, *ang Ajān*, in person, gender, and number. It is additionally marked for a patient topic, *Pila*, and thus serves as an agreement target for two different controller NPs. The agreement relation is of a different kind for each of the two NPs, however.





## 4 Grammatical categories

While the previous chapter was about general mechanisms of marking in Ayeri, this chapter will dive into the various parts of speech in order to define their morphology with a closer look. I will begin with nouns as the main carriers of meaning, then deal with other parts of speech that regularly feature in or in combination with the noun phrase—pronouns, adjectives, and adpositions. Following this, there will be a discussion of verbs and adverbs before moving on to numerals and conjunctions.

### 4.1 Nouns

Nouns in Ayeri have *gender* and *number* as their inherent grammatical properties. Besides common nouns, there are, of course, also proper nouns (that is, names) and nominalizations. Nouns, as the heads of NPs, are also assigned *case* by the verb, which is a third grammatical property they display. For an illustration of the declension paradigms, compare Figures 4.1–4.4.

Figure 4.1: Declension paradigm for 𐀀𐀃𐀆 *badan* ‘father’ (animate; consonantal root)

		Singular		Plural
TOP	<i>badan</i>	‘the father’	<i>badanye</i>	‘the fathers’
A	<i>badanang</i>	‘father’	<i>badanjang</i>	‘fathers’
P	<i>badanas</i>	‘father’ (obj.)	<i>badanjas</i>	‘fathers’ (obj.)
DAT	<i>badanyam</i>	‘to the father’	<i>badanjyam</i>	‘to the fathers’
GEN	<i>badanena</i>	‘of the father’	<i>badanyena</i>	‘of the fathers’
LOC	<i>badanya</i>	‘at the father’	<i>badanjya</i>	‘at the fathers’
CAUS	<i>badanisa</i>	‘due to the father’	<i>badanjisa</i>	‘due to the fathers’
INS	<i>badaneri</i>	‘with the father’	<i>badanyeri</i>	‘with the fathers’

Figure 4.2: Declension paradigm for ᄅᄇ māva ‘mother’ (animate; vocalic root)

		Singular		Plural
TOP	<i>māva</i>	‘the mother’	<i>māvaye</i>	‘the mothers’
A	<i>māvāng</i>	‘mother’	<i>māvajang</i>	‘mothers’
P	<i>māvās</i>	‘mother’ (obj.)	<i>māvajas</i>	‘mothers’ (obj.)
DAT	<i>māvayam</i>	‘to the mother’	<i>māvajyam</i>	‘to the mothers’
GEN	<i>māvana</i>	‘of the mother’	<i>māvayena</i>	‘of the mothers’
LOC	<i>māvaya</i>	‘at the mother’	<i>māvajya</i>	‘at the mothers’
CAUS	<i>māvaisa</i>	‘due to the mother’	<i>māvajisa</i>	‘due to the mothers’
INS	<i>māvari</i>	‘with the mother’	<i>māvayeri</i>	‘with the mothers’

Figure 4.3: Declension paradigm for ᄅᄇᄇ kirin ‘street’ (inanimate; consonantal root)

		Singular		Plural
TOP	<i>kirin</i>	‘the street’	<i>kirinye</i>	‘the streets’
A	<i>kirinreng</i>	‘street’	<i>kirinyereng</i>	‘streets’
P	<i>kirinley</i>	‘street’ (obj.)	<i>kirinyeley</i>	‘streets’ (obj.)
DAT	<i>kirinyam</i>	‘to the street’	<i>kirinjyam</i>	‘to the streets’
GEN	<i>kirinena</i>	‘of the street’	<i>kirinyena</i>	‘of the streets’
LOC	<i>kirinya</i>	‘at the street’	<i>kirinjya</i>	‘at the streets’
CAUS	<i>kirinisa</i>	‘due to the street’	<i>kirinjisa</i>	‘due to the streets’
INS	<i>kirineri</i>	‘with the street’	<i>kirinyeri</i>	‘with the streets’

#### 4.1.1 Gender

Grammatical gender in Ayeri consists of two tiers which are subdivided into four classes based on a mixture of semantic and ontological properties, see Figure 4.5. The animate gender refers, broadly speaking, to entities that are considered alive or are closely associated with living things, such as events, concepts, or activities executed or connected to them. The ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ subcategories are applied to humans, animals whose sex is known (for example on behalf of breeding them or keeping them as pets), and gods—basically anything that shows sexual dimorphism or is assumed to be an exponent of it as well as nouns referring to such entities in a functional way, for instance, ᄅᄇᄇ *badan* ‘father’ and ᄅᄇ *māva* ‘mother’. The remainder falls into the ‘neuter’ category—plants, for instance, body parts, or

Figure 4.4: Declension paradigm for *pera* ‘measure’ (inanimate; vocalic root)

	Singular		Plural	
TOP	<i>pera</i>	‘the measure’	<i>peraye</i>	‘the measures’
A	<i>perareng</i>	‘measure’	<i>perayereng</i>	‘measures’
P	<i>peraley</i>	‘measure’ (obj.)	<i>perayeley</i>	‘measures’ (obj.)
DAT	<i>perayam</i>	‘to the measure’	<i>perajyam</i>	‘to the measures’
GEN	<i>perana</i>	‘of the measure’	<i>perayena</i>	‘of the measures’
LOC	<i>peraya</i>	‘at the measure’	<i>perajya</i>	‘at the measures’
CAUS	<i>peraisa</i>	‘due to the measure’	<i>perajisa</i>	‘due to the measures’
INS	<i>perari</i>	‘with the measure’	<i>perayeri</i>	‘with the measures’

animals whose sex is unknown. The ‘inanimate’ category typically contains materials and things, such as tools. Furthermore, animals and plants change their category to inanimate as well if they serve as food. There are exceptions to either group, where elements appear in them for no obviously discernable reason. In order to illustrate, here are a few examples for each category:

- (i) a. Animate masculine:  
*badan* ‘father’, *netu* ‘brother’, *aguyan* ‘rooster’, *Ajān*, *Latun*;
- b. Animate feminine:  
*māva* ‘mother’, *kina* ‘sister’, *aguvay* ‘hen’, *Maba*, *Trānay*;
- c. Animate neuter:  
*adang* ‘palm tree’, *mino* ‘color’, *ikam* ‘deer’, *kadān* ‘harvest’, *cān* ‘love’, *nanga* ‘house’, *tampu* ‘luck’, *yila* ‘foot’;
- d. Inanimate:  
*abal* ‘sand’, *bema* ‘egg’, *kahan* ‘spear’, *melung* ‘yogurt’, *nusān* ‘damage’, *payutān* ‘mathematics’.

Figure 4.5: Grammatical genders in Ayeri



There are also a number of doublets like French *le livre* ‘the book’ and *la livre* ‘the pound’, for instance, ႁႃႃ *banan* (an.) ‘kindness, charity’ or ႁႃႃ *binō* (an.) ‘color’ on the one hand, and ႁႃႃ *banan* (inan.) ‘quality’ or ႁႃႃ *binō* (inan.) ‘paint’ on the other. Gender is reified by case marking as well as verb agreement; it is not possible to read the gender of a noun from its phonological makeup. The following example illustrates differences in case marking and agreement (inherent information on grammatical features underneath the NPs):

- (2) a. *Ang konja badan hemale.*  
 Ang kond-ya badan-Ø hema-ley  
 [3SG.M.AN] [3SG.INAN]  
 AT.AN eat-3SG.M.AN father-TOP egg-P.INAN  
 ‘Father eats an egg.’
- b. *Sa tombara kahanreng burang.*  
 Sa tomb-ara kahan-reng burang-Ø  
 [3SG.INAN] [3SG.N.AN]  
 PT.AN kill-3SG.INAN spear-A.INAN animal-TOP  
 ‘The animal, the spear kills it.’

In example (2a), the noun in the agent NP, ႁႃႃ *badan* ‘father’, bears the features [+ ANIMATE, + MASCULINE], which triggers the animate agent topic agreement marker ႁႃႃ *ang* on the verb, since the agent NP is also topicalized. The verb also agrees in person and number with the agent NP by way of the person marker ႁႃႃ *-ya* for third person singular masculine. The object of the sentence, ႁႃႃ *hema* ‘egg’, on the other hand bears the feature [− ANIMATE], so it receives the inanimate patient case marker ႁႃႃ *-ley* rather than its animate counterpart ႁႃႃ *-as*.

In (2b), on the other hand, we see an inanimate agent, ႁႃႃ *kahan* ‘spear’, so the verb receives the marker ႁႃႃ *-ara* for third person singular inanimate rather than its animate neuter counterpart ႁႃႃ *-yo*. The (non-topicalized) NP’s case marking shows that the agent of the clause is inanimate: ႁႃႃ *kahan* carries the marker ႁႃႃ *-reng*, which marks it as an inanimate agent. The object of the sentence, ႁႃႃ *burang* ‘animal’, is also the topic, hence topic agreement on the verb uses the marker ႁႃႃ *sa* according to the NP being animate, rather than its inanimate counterpart ႁႃႃ *le*.

#### 4.1.2 Number

Ayeri only distinguishes singular and plural in nouns, which receive plural marking; verbs, then, agree with agent NPs in number in the canonical case. Ordinarily, nouns in Ayeri are countable, however, there is also a group of uncountable nouns as well as a (small) group of nouns which are always plural. As above, I will list a few words from each group for illustration:

## (3) a. Countable nouns:

- ၼံၼ်း *ajam* ‘toy’ — ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *ajamye* ‘toys’,  
 ပုၼ်း *devo* ‘head’ — ပုၼ်းၼ်း *devoye* ‘heads’,  
 ၼံၼ်း *inun* ‘fish’ — ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *inunye* ‘fish’ (pl.),  
 နဲၼ်း *netu* ‘brother’ — နဲၼ်းၼ်း *netuye* ‘brothers’;

## b. Uncountable nouns:

ၼံၼ်း *abal* ‘sand’, ၼံၼ်း *bakay* ‘stuff’, ၼံၼ်း *gabān* ‘hope’, ၼံၼ်း *mingan* ‘ability’;

## c. Plurale tantum nouns:

ၼံၼ်း *burang* ‘lifestock, cattle’,<sup>1</sup> ၼံၼ်း *ganengan* ‘siblings’, ၼံၼ်း *keynam* ‘people’, ၼံၼ်း *tang* ‘ears’.

Most concrete things that exist as discrete entities are countable, also, for instance, animals and livestock—fish, deer, sheep etc. are thus countable, unlike in English; pants, pliers, scissors, glasses, etc. are by default singular as well. Uncountable, on the other hand, are materials in general or abstract concepts. There are also a number of nouns which are plural by default, most notably entities which often occur in groups, but there is as well the odd word for which there seems to be no reason to be included in this group, for instance, ၼံၼ်း *mino* ‘paint’, and ၼံၼ်း *gimbay* ‘sorrows’. A few body parts are also plurale tantum nouns, especially those which occur in pairs (ၼံၼ်း *niva* ‘eye’ is a notable exception).

As demonstrated in (3a), the noun plural marker is ၼ်း *-ye*, which in native orthography also occurs in the variant ၼ်း or ၼ်း. As described above (section 1.1.1, p. 7), the plural marker may also be reduced to [dʒ] ⟨-j⟩ before case suffixes that begin with /j/ or with a vowel other than /e/, like ၼံၼ်း *-ang* (A) or ၼံၼ်း *-yam* (DAT):

- (4) a. ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *diranang* (uncle-A) + ၼ်း *-ye* (PL) → ၼံၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *diranjang* (uncle-PL-A),  
 b. ၼံၼ်း *diranena* (uncle-GEN) + ၼ်း *-ye* (PL) → ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *diranyena* (uncle-PL-GEN),  
 c. ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *diranyam* (uncle-DAT) + ၼ်း *-ye* (PL) → ၼံၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *diranjyam* (uncle-PL-DAT).

For plurale tantum, to express a singular entity, it is always possible to use a genitive phrase like —ၼံၼ်းၼ်း *...-ena men* ‘one of ...’ (...-GEN one), for instance:

- (5) a. *Nupayon tangang nā.*  
       Nupa-yon tang-ang nā  
       hurt-3PL.N ears-A ISG.GEN  
       ‘My ears hurt.’

<sup>1</sup> Specifically in this meaning; ၼံၼ်း *burang* can also simply mean ‘animal’, in which case there is a plural form ၼံၼ်း *burangye* ‘animals’.

- b. *Na nupareng tang nā men.*  
*Na nupa=reng tang-Ø nā men*  
 GENT hurt=3SG.INAN.A ears-TOP 1SG.GEN one  
 ‘Of my ears, it hurts one.’

Number in nouns can also be manipulated by quantifiers which attach to declined nouns as suffixes. In this case, when plurality is indicated by the quantifier, the noun is not additionally marked for number; the verb, however, keeps agreeing in number:

- (6) a. *Ajayan ganjang kivo.*  
*Aja-yon gan-ye-ang kivo*  
 play-3SG.N child-PL-A small  
 ‘The small children are playing.’  
 b. *Ajayan ganang-ikan kivo.*  
*Aja-yon gan-ang=ikan kivo.*  
 play-3SG.N child-A=many small  
 ‘Many small children are playing.’

Likewise, when nouns are modified by numerals, plurality is not normally marked again on the noun. In example (7a), we see a plural noun, 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *nanga* ‘house’, and in (7b) the same phrase is repeated again with plurality implied by the use of a numeral, 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *sam* ‘two’; the plural noun itself appears unmarked in its singular form in this case.

- (7) a. *Ang no vehya sitang-yām nangajas veno nay hiro.*  
*Ang no veh=ya.Ø sitang=yām nanga-ye-as veno nay hiro*  
 AT want build-3SG.M.TOP self=3SG.M.DAT house-PL-P pretty and new  
 ‘He wants to build himself pretty new houses.’  
 b. *Ang no vehya sitang-yām nangās sam veno nay hiro.*  
*Ang no veh=ya.Ø sitang=yām nanga-as sam veno nay hiro*  
 AT want build-3SG.M.TOP self=3SG.M.DAT house-P two pretty and new  
 ‘He wants to build himself two pretty new houses.’

An exception to this is the use of words for the numeral powers, like 𐌂𐌆𐌇 *lan* ‘dozen’, 𐌂𐌆𐌇𐌆𐌆 *menang* ‘gross’, 𐌂𐌆𐌇𐌆𐌆𐌆 *samang* ‘myriad’, etc. in an unspecified way like ‘dozens of people’. In this case, to convey that the numeral is not to be understood as a precise value, the modified noun will appear in the plural—even if it is a plurale tantum like 𐌂𐌆𐌇𐌆𐌆 *keynam* ‘people’:

- (8) *Bengyon keynamjang menang.*  
 Beng-yon keynam-ye-ang menang  
 attend-3SG.N people-PL-A gross  
 ‘Hundreds of people attended.’

As we have seen in various examples above, proper nouns in Ayeri do not receive inflection for case by suffixes as common nouns do, and for the purpose of number they are treated as uncountable in Ayeri—they resist inflection by suffixation, marking their special status.<sup>2</sup> However, they can still be modified by quantifiers and quantifying suffixes; verb agreement as well can be used to indicate plurality:

- (9) a. *Sabayan cabo ekeng ang Yan.*  
 Saha-yan cabo ekeng ang Yan  
 come-3PL.M late too A Yan  
 ‘The Yans are coming too late.’  
 b. *Ang apatang sa Yan-ikan.*  
 Ang apa=teng sa Yan=ikan  
 AT laugh=3PL.F.A P Yan=all  
 ‘They laughed at (all) the Yans.’

#### 4.1.3 Case

As demonstrated in the declension tables at the beginning of this section (Figures 4.1–4.4), Ayeri’s NPs are marked for case, which is governed by the verb. Since Ayeri uses a split alignment system with some additional complications, it is not very straightforward, in my opinion, to use the classical labels of nominative (S/A) and accusative (O), or of absolutive (S/P) and ergative (O) for the first two core roles. Hence, I will be using the terms ‘agent’ and ‘patient’, which I hope brings about some more clarity, especially when discussing the mentioned complications later on.

##### Agent

What I call ‘agent’ here is, to quote Fillmore (2003 [1968]), “the case of the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb” (46). Fillmore himself qualifies this definition, however, in that the “escape qualification ‘typically’ expresses my awareness that contexts which I will say require agents are sometimes

<sup>2</sup> Many common names in Ayeri are derived from regular words in the language, so the language needs to have a way to distinguish between regular use and use as a name. For instance, the name *uꞤ Yan* also means ‘boy, son’ as a common noun.

occupied by ‘inanimate’ nouns like robot or ‘human institution’ nouns like nation” (Fillmore 2003 [1968]: 46, footnote 31). Payne (1997) summarizes on prototypical agents with regards to their topicality that a “less technical way of expressing this fact is to say that people identify with and like to talk about things that act, move, control events, and have power” (151).

Agents in Ayeri frequently embody the properties quoted by both Fillmore and Payne in this regard, including Fillmore’s caveat. However, importantly, ‘agent’ in Ayeri is a macrorole that may be applied to, for instance, instruments, experiencers, and less typical actors as well, specifically, in absence of more prototypical candidates for agenthood in a sentence. It thus comes very close to a nominative, except that it does not need to be locus of the sentence’s topic—although agents very typically are topics, as Payne (1997: 151) goes on to note.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the first NP after the verb in all of the following examples is treated as an agent; the agent is marked by the suffix 𐄢𐄣𐄤 *-ang* for animate referents and the suffix 𐄢𐄣𐄤𐄥 *-reng* for inanimate referents; names and verbal topic agreement are marked by 𐄢𐄣𐄤 *ang* and 𐄢𐄣𐄤𐄥 *eng*, respectively:

- (10) a. *Ang tinkaya Yan kunangley.*  
 Ang tink-a-ya Ø Yan kunang-ley  
 AT open-3SG.M TOP Yan door-P.INAN  
 ‘Yan opens the door.’
- b. *Le tinkaya ayonang kunang.*  
 Le tink-a-ya ayon-ang kunang-Ø  
 PT open-3SG.M man-A door-TOP  
 ‘The door is opened by a/the man’,  
 or: ‘The door, a/the man opens it.’
- c. *Eng tinkāra tinkay kunangley.*  
 Eng tink-a-ara tinkay-Ø kunang-ley  
 AT.INAN open-3SG.INAN key-TOP door-P.INAN  
 ‘The key opens the door.’
- d. *Tinkāra kunangreng.*  
 Tinka-ara kunang-reng  
 open-3SG.INAN door-A.INAN  
 ‘The door opens.’

<sup>3</sup> This is the main reason I spoke of ‘complications’ above: Ayeri’s notion of ‘subject’ is somewhat problematic due to topicalization, which is why I try to avoid complicating terminology by using ‘nominative’ for agent topics and ‘ergative’ for agent non-topics, and ‘accusative’ for patient non-topics and ‘absolutive’ for patient topics, respectively.



- e. *Sā tinkaya ang Yan kunangley yan.*  
*Sā tinka-ya ang Yan kunang-ley yan.Ø*  
 CAUT open-3SG.M A Yan door-P.INAN 3SG.M.TOP  
 ‘They make Yan open a/the door’,  
 or: ‘Because of them, Yan opens the door.’

In predicative constructions, the constituent which a quality is assigned to or about which a judgement is made is also assigned the agent case:

- (11) a. *Tado tinkayreng.*  
*Tado tinkay-reng*  
 old key-A.INAN  
 ‘The key is old.’  
 b. *Ang Yan nimpayās ban.*  
*Ang Yan nimpaya-as ban*  
 A Yan runner-P good  
 ‘Yan is a good runner.’

With regards to constituents’ roles in ditransitive verb frames, donors are represented by agents in Ayeri as well, since they are the origin of whatever is conceptually passed on to the recipient party:

- (12) *Le ilya ang Yan tinkay yam Cānlay.*  
*Le il-ya ang Yan tinkay-Ø yam Cānlay*  
 PT give-3SG.M A Yan key-TOP DAT Cānlay  
 ‘The key, Yan gives it to Cānlay.’

#### Patient

Patients are less of a definitional problem than agents, since in transitive sentences, they are very typically undergoers, that is, the constituent that is acted on, affected, or produced by the action expressed by the verb. The patient case is thus the one assigned by default to direct objects—but also to predicative nominals. In ditransitive sentences, the theme is represented by the patient. Animate patients are marked by 𑀅𑀲 -as, inanimate ones by 𑀅𑀲 -ley; for names and verbal topic agreement, the markers are 𑀅 sa and 𑀅 le, respectively:

- (13) a. *Ang silvye Briha sa Taryan.*  
*Ang silv-ye Ø Briha sa Taryan*  
 AT see-3SG.F TOP Briha P Taryan  
 ‘Briha sees Taryan.’

- b. *Sa manye ang Briha Taryan.*  
 Sa man-ye ang Briha Ø Taryan  
 PT greet-3SG.F A Briha TOP Taryan  
 ‘Taryan is greeted by Briha’,  
 or: ‘Taryan, Briha greets him.’
- (14) a. *Ang rimaye Briha kunangley.*  
 Ang rima-ye Ø Briha kunang-ley  
 AT close-3SG.F TOP Briha door-P.INAN  
 ‘Briha closes a/the door.’
- b. *Le rimaye ang Briha kunang.*  
 Le rima-ye ang Briha kunang-Ø  
 PT.INAN close-3SG.F A Briha door-TOP  
 ‘The door is closed by Briha’,  
 or: ‘The door, Briha closes it.’
- (15) *Ang ilya Taryan koyaley yam Kandan.*  
 Ang il-ya Ø Taryan koya-ley yam Kandan  
 AT give-3SG.M TOP Taryan book-P.INAN DAT Kandan  
 ‘Taryan gives Kandan a book.’

As the translations of the examples above show, topicalizing the patient can be used to create an effect similar to English’s passive voice, except that the patient will not become marked by the agent case for logical reasons—this is a notable difference from the nominative. Even if the agent NP is omitted, the patient NP will not be changed to the agent case, since that would reverse the direction of action:

- (16) *Manya sa Taryan. ≠ Manya ang Taryan.*  
 Man-ya sa Taryan Man-ya ang Taryan  
 greet-3SG.M P Taryan greet-3SG.M A Taryan  
 ‘Taryan is greeted.’ ≠ ‘Taryan greets.’

This example shows that the case of the NP will not change, however, the verb will: it now agrees with the next argument in line, the patient NP. It will not do so, however, if the order of arguments is just scrambled, as exemplified by (17). This is to say that the verb does not simply agree with whichever NP follows it, even if it can be assumed that verb agreement in Ayeri developed along similar lines in-world, which will become especially apparent in the discussion of pronouns.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Mismatches in agreement in connection to scrambling such as exemplified by (17b) are to be expected, however, since the brain can only handle so much information between the controller and the target of an agreement relationship. Corbett (2006), notes that with regards

- (17) a. *Sa manye Taryan ang Briha.*  
 Sa man-ye Ø Taryan ang Briha  
 PT greet-3SG.F TOP Taryan A Briha  
 ↑  
 person agreement  
 ‘Taryan is greeted by Briha’,  
 or: ‘Taryan, Briha greets him.’
- b. \**Sa manya Taryan ang Briha.*  
 Sa man-ya Ø Taryan ang Briha  
 PT greet-3SG.M TOP Taryan A Briha  
 ↑  
 \*person agreement

Besides being the default case for direct objects, the patient case is also assigned to predicative nominals, by analogy with transitive sentences and in spite of the likening nature of the construction:

- (18) *Ang Yan nimpayās ban.*  
 Ang Yan nimpaya-as ban  
 A Yan runner-P good  
 ‘Yan is a good runner.’

#### Dative

The most typical use of the dative is for the recipient NP in a ditransitive clause; as such, it may be a recipient proper or the entity to whose benefit the action is carried out. A number of transitive verbs also use the dative for their object, for example, when it is the target of address. The dative can furthermore be used to mark movement toward a place. The case suffix for datives is ꠘꠗ -yam for both animate and inanimate entities. Names and verbal topic agreement are marked equally by ꠘꠗ *yam*. Verbs do not exhibit person agreement with dative NPs, since experiencers are treated as agents.

- (19) a. *Ang ilya Taryan koyaley ayonyam.*  
 Ang il-ya Ø Taryan koya-ley ayon-yam  
 AT give-3SG.M TOP Taryan book-P.INAN man-DAT  
 ‘Taryan gives a book to the man.’

to agreement in NP conjuncts, “distant agreement is rare, and that agreement with the nearest noun phrase or agreement with all (resolution) is much more common” (62). If there were an extensive corpus of texts written by Ayeri speakers, it might be interesting to gather statistics on the number of words between target and controller in relation to the prevalence of agreement mismatches.

- b. *Ang ilya                      Taryan koyaley      yam Kandan.*  
 Ang il-ya            Ø    Taryan koya-ley    yam Kandan  
 AT   give-3SG.M TOP   Taryan book-P.INAN DAT   Kandan  
 ‘Taryan gives Kandan a book.’
- c. *Yam ilya            ang Taryan koyaley      ayon.*  
 Yam il-ya            ang Taryan koya-ley    ayon-Ø  
 DATT give-3SG.M A    Taryan book-P.INAN man-TOP  
 ‘The man is given a book by Taryan’,  
 or: ‘The man, Taryan gives him a book.’

The three examples in (19) show the regular use of the dative as the case the recipient of the theme appears in. What distinguishes Ayeri from a pure split-S language is that all constituents can serve as topics, not just agents and patients with regards to their function as syntactic subjects. Thus, it is also possible for dative NPs to appear as topics—person agreement is unaffected by this, though. The following example shows the addressee of a speech act in the dative case; the message is treated as the theme which is passed on:

- (20) *Ang ningye      māva            ninganas      ganyam      yena.*  
 Ang ning-ye      māva-Ø      ningan-as    gan-yam      yena  
 AT   tell-3SG.F mother-TOP story-P    child-DAT    3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘The mother tells her child a story.’

As mentioned above, the dative can also take on an allative meaning insofar as it marks the target of a motion, as displayed in (21a). As an extension of this means, the adpositional object may as well appear in the dative, since Ayeri cannot distinguish, for instance, ‘up’ from ‘to the top of’ with just the preposition, in this case *ling* ‘on top of’. With the adpositional object in the locative case (see below), the phrase in (21b) would imply that the man were literally going to the top of the temple, that is, possibly ending up on its roof.

- (21) a. *Ang nimpye      lay            māvayam      yena.*  
 Ang nimp-ye      lay-Ø      māva-yam      yena  
 AT   run-3SG.F girl-TOP mother-DAT    3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘The girl runs to her mother.’
- b. *Ang saraya      ayon            manga ling      natrangyam.*  
 Ang sara-ya      ayon-Ø      manga ling    natrang-yam  
 AT   go-3SG.M man-TOP DYN    top    temple-DAT  
 ‘The man goes up to the temple.’

## Genitive

The genitive is used to mark possessors; attributive genitives follow the possessee. It can also be used for ablative meanings, that is, to mark the place from which a motion originates, in analogy to the dative's allative use. The genitive is marked on common nouns with the suffix ȳ -*na*. If a noun stem ends in a consonant, the marker becomes ȳ -*ena*, compare Figures 4.1–4.4 above. Names and verbal topic agreement are marked by ȳ *na*. There is no animacy distinction in the genitive case.

- (22) a. *Pakur ledanang netuna nā.*  
 Pakur ledan-ang netu-na nā  
 sick friend-A brother-GEN ISG.GEN  
 'My brother's friend is sick.'
- b. *Kopo dilengyereng ajānena.*  
 Kopo dileng-ye-reng ajān-ena  
 difficult rule-PL-A.INAN game-GEN  
 'The rules of the game are difficult.'
- c. *Ang nakasyo tamo ibangya na Niyas.*  
 Ang nakas-yo tamo-Ø ibang-ya na Niyas  
 AT grow-3SG.N wheat-TOP field-LOC GEN Niyas  
 'There is wheat growing on Niyas's field.'
- d. *Na nakasyo tamoang ibangya Niyas.*  
 Na nakas-yo tamo-ang ibang-ya Ø Niyas  
 GENT grow-3SG.N wheat-A field-LOC TOP Niyas  
 'Regarding Niyas, there is wheat growing on his field.'

Futhermore, Ayeri does not make a distinction between alienable and inalienable possession, so that typically inalienable things such as body parts, relatives and family members, or personal items and tools are all treated as described above. Consider the following example for illustration:

- (23) *Ang puntaye māva nā mitrangas yena sembari yena.*  
 Ang punta-ye māva-Ø nā mitrang-as yena semba-ri yena  
 AT brush-3SG.F mother-TOP ISG.GEN hair-P 3SG.F.GEN comb-INS 3SG.F.GEN  
 'My mother is brushing her hair with her comb.'

The above examples show the regular use of the genitive as a marker of possession. The following examples, on the other hand, show the genitive in its ablative function, first without qualification by a preposition, then with the preposition ȳ *avan* 'at the bottom of', which together with the genitive assumes the meaning 'down from':

- (24) a. *Ang sabaya Vetayan rimanena.*  
 Ang saha-ya Ø Vetayan riman-ena  
 AT come-3SG.M TOP Vetayan city-GEN  
 ‘Vetayan comes from the city.’
- b. *Sabu manga avan mehirena, Niva!*  
 Saha-u manga avan mehir-ena, Niva  
 come-IMP DYN at.bottom tree-GEN, Niva  
 ‘Come down from the tree, Niva!’

### Locative

The locative marks basic locations, often the default that is associated with a verb. It is also the case in which adpositional objects normally appear, besides the special cases using the dative and the genitive mentioned above. Common nouns are marked by *-ya*;<sup>5</sup> names and verbal topic agreement use the marker *u ya*. There is no difference made between animate and inanimate referents in the locative.

- (25) a. *Ang nedraya paray binya.*  
 Ang nedra-ya paray-Ø hin-ya  
 AT sit-3SG.M cat-TOP box-LOC  
 ‘The cat sits in the box.’
- b. *Ang naraya Ajān ya Kaman.*  
 Ang nara-ya Ø Ajān ya Kaman  
 AT speak-3SG.M TOP Ajān LOC Kaman  
 ‘Ajān speaks to Kaman.’
- c. *Ya mica ang Kaman Visamhinang.*  
 Ya mit-ya ang Kaman Ø Visamhinang  
 LOCT live-3SG.M A Kaman TOP Visamhinang  
 ‘Kaman lives in Visamhinang’,  
 or: ‘Visamhinang is where Kaman lives.’

The example sentences in (25) show locative NPs that are not further specified by adpositions so that the correct interpretation may be dependent on context and the experience of the addressee. Example (25a) is an instance of this circumstance, insofar as experience tells that cats like to sit inside boxes, so further specifying the position with the preposition *kong* ‘inside’ would be emphasizing that the cat is not sitting just anywhere, but really *inside* the box as opposed to on top of it, for instance. The following example has the cat sitting on top of the box:

<sup>5</sup> Older texts still exhibit an allomorph *-ea*, used especially in combination with the plural suffix *-ya*, giving *-yēa*. The modern language uses *-jya*.

- (26) *Ang nedraya paray ling binya.*  
 Ang nedra-ya paray-Ø ling hin-ya  
 AT sit-3SG.M cat-TOP on.top box-LOC  
 ‘The cat sits on the box.’

Ayeri also has a number of postpositions, which do not change marking on the adpositional object, however:

- (27) *Ang mican edaya tenyanya tan pesan.*  
 Ang mit-yan edaya tenyan-ya tan pesan  
 AT live-3PL.M here death-LOC 3PL.M.GEN until  
 ‘They lived here until their death.’

### Causative

The causative marks the cause or causer of an action, the instigator or the reason on behalf of which an agent is acting. It is thus similar to the agent case, though it does not replace it in Ayeri; verbs do not exhibit person agreement with causers even though their action logically supersedes or precedes that of the agent in the embedded event. Dixon (2000) writes that a “causer refers to someone or something (which can be an event or state) that initiates or controls the activity. This is the defining property of the syntactic–semantic function A (transitive subject)” (30). According to Comrie (1989: 176), the causee—the agent of the event controlled by the causer—normally takes the highest place in the hierarchy of syntactic constituents that is not already filled, in this case, by the causer. This observation, however, is complicated by Ayeri’s more or less semantics-based case marking as well as topicalization. In the following, I will give examples of nominal marking for cause as before; a discussion of the morphosyntax of Ayeri’s morphological causative constructions will be deferred to the section on valency-increasing operations.

Causers or causes are marked by *isa* for common nouns; names and verbal topic agreement use the marker *sā*. As stated above, verbs do not agree with causers even though they have agent-like semantics. There is no animacy distinction in the marking of causers.

- (28) a. *Ang rua sarāyn seyaranisa.*  
 Ang rua sara=ayn.Ø seyaran-isa  
 AT must leave=IPL.TOP rain-CAUS  
 ‘We had to leave due to the rain.’  
 b. *Ang yomāy edaya sā Apican.*  
 Ang yoma=ay.Ø edaya sā Apican  
 AT be=ISG.TOP here CAUS Apican  
 ‘I am here because of Apican.’

- c. *Sā nimpvāng bakasley yan.*  
*Sā nimp=vāng hakas-ley yan.Ø*  
 CAUT run=2SG.A mile-P.INAN 3PL.M.TOP  
 ‘You run a mile because of them’,  
 or: ‘Due to them, you run a mile’,  
 or: ‘They make you run a mile.’

Regarding the typological oddities mentioned above, example (28c) shows what happens in Ayeri with regards to the marking of causers. Essentially, the causer topic was grammaticalized to express a causation relationship.

### Instrumental

The instrumental marks the means by which an action is carried out by an agent. This can be a tool as well as an animate being by whose help the action is brought about. The instrumental thus, in effect, marks secondary agents; verbs, however, never show person agreement with instrumental NPs. Common nouns are marked by *-ri* when ending in a vowel and with *-eri* when ending in a consonant; names and verbal topic agreement are marked by *ri*. With nouns ending in *-e*, as well as the plural marker *-ye*, there is variation regarding whether *-ri* or *-eri* is used, so that in the case of the plural marker both *-yeri* and *-yēri* occur. In passive-like constructions, it is not grammatical to reintroduce the agent as an instrumental; the agent simply remains in the clause in this case, though as a non-topic constituent.

- (29) a. *Ang visye Pila seygoley tibangeri yena.*  
*Ang vis-ye Ø Pila seygo-ley tihang-eri yena.*  
 AT cut-3SG.F TOP Pila apple-P.INAN knife-INS 3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘Pila cuts an apple with her knife.’
- b. *Ang liboyya-ma badan nibanyeri (nibanyēri).*  
*Ang liha-oy-ya=ma badan-Ø nihan-ye-ri (nihan-ye-eri)*  
 AT earn-NEG-3SG.M=enough father-TOP nihan-PL-INS (nihan-PL-INS)  
 ‘Father did not earn enough with his fruits.’
- c. *Ang lingya Mindan mebiras ri Kadijān.*  
*Ang ling-ya Ø Mindan mehir-as ri Kadijān.*  
 AT climb.up-3SG.M TOP Mindan tree-P INS Kadijān  
 ‘Mindan climbs a tree with Kadijān’s help.’
- d. *Ri tavya gino ang Kan nimpur.*  
*Ri tav-ya gino ang Kan nimpur-Ø*  
 INST become-3SG.M drunk A Kan wine-TOP  
 ‘Kan becomes drunk on the wine’,  
 or: ‘The wine, Kan becomes drunk on it.’



The instrumental may also be used for comitative meanings where the instrumental NP describes an attribute of its antecedent, for example:

- (30) *Ang pegayo sinyā kasuley bariri nā?*  
 Ang pega-yo sinyā-Ø kasu-ley bari-ri nā  
 AT steal-3SG.N who-TOP basket-P.INAN meat-INS 1SG.GEN  
 ‘Who stole my basket of meat?’

In this case, *bari* is marked as an instrumental since it is an attribute of sorts to *kasu*: the instrumental NP describes what its antecedent contains or entails more specifically: it is a basket *with* meat in it. Note, however, that this comitative use of the instrumental is different from mere accompaniment. Thus, it is not possible to say

- (31) \**Ang sabaya Ajān ri Pila.*  
 Ang saha-ya Ø Ajān ri Pila  
 AT come-3SG.M TOP Ajān INS Pila

to express ‘Ajān comes (together) with Pila’. The sentence in (31) would instead imply that Pila helps Ajān to come, for example, because he has a sprained ankle and thus needs support to go places. To express accompaniment, instead, the preposition *kayvo* ‘with, along, beside’ has to be used; the prepositional object appears in the locative case:

- (32) *Ang sabaya Ajān kayvo ya Pila.*  
 Ang saha-ya Ø Ajān kayvo ya Pila  
 AT come-3SG.M TOP Ajān with LOC Pila  
 ‘Ajān comes (together) with Pila.’

Theoretically, it should be possible as well to use the instrumental together with prepositions for some kind of prolativ meaning. The adposition would indicate the place *by way of* a motion is happening:

- (33) *Ang pukay manga luga labaneri.*  
 Ang puk=ay.Ø manga luga lahan-eri  
 AT jump=1SG.TOP DYN top fence-INS  
 ‘I jump over the fence.’

This use of the instrumental is unattested in previous translations into Ayeri, however, but could be considered a stylistic alternative—in the case of the example above, to a construction with the word for ‘over’, *eyrarya*:

- (34) *Ang pukay manga eyrarya labanya.*  
 Ang puk=ay.Ø manga eyrarya lahan-ya  
 AT jump=ISG.TOP DYN over fence-LOC  
 ‘I jump over the fence.’

A more literal translation of ၼၢၢၢၢၢၢၢၢၢ *manga luga labaneri* is ‘by way of the top of the fence’, though without the verbosity of the English translation, as both ways to express the circumstance are about equally long in Ayeri.

#### Case-unmarked nouns

Case endings are applied to nouns in Ayeri only if the word is actually in a syntactic context where case can be applied. Thus, the unmarked form is the citation form, not the one declined for agent. This is the case when addressing people—one might speak of an unmarked vocative:

- (35) a. *Raypu, petāya!*  
 Raypa-u, petāya  
 stop-IMP, idiot  
 ‘Stop it, you idiot!’  
 b. *Sabu edaya, Diras!*  
 Saha-u edaya, Diras  
 come-IMP here, Diras  
 ‘Come here, Diras!’

Imperative forms have underlying second-person agents, so both the ‘idiot’ in (35a) and Diras in (35b) would be the implied agents of their sentences, yet neither the noun nor the name are marked by the agent markers ၼၢၢ -*ang* and ၼၢၢ *ang*, respectively. Another case where nouns are not necessarily marked for case is attested in translations for the prefix ၼၢၢ *ku-* ‘like, as though’ when the phrase acts as an adverb or an object complement:

- (36) a. ... *nay ang mya rankyon sitanyās ku-netu.*  
 ... *nay ang mya rank=yon.Ø sitanya-as ku=netu*  
 ... and AT be.supposed.to treat=3PL.N.TOP each.other-P **like=brother**  
 ‘... and they shall treat each other like brothers.’<sup>6</sup> (Becker 2011)  
 b. ... *ang nunaya ku-vipin ...*  
 ... *ang nuna=ya.Ø ku=vipin ...*  
 ... AT fly=3SG.M.TOP like=bird ...  
 ‘... he (would) fly like a bird ...’ (Becker 2012: 14)

Strikingly, in example (36a),  $\text{ᲛᲗ᲏}$  *netu* ‘brother’ in  $\text{ᲛᲗ᲏Თ᲏}$  *ku-netu* ‘like brothers’ is not even inflected for plural; its placement after the object is likely an effect of translation: adverbs have a strong tendency to appear right after the verb, and a position immediately to the right of the verb is attested for adjectival object predicates as well. In (36b), on the other hand,  $\text{ᲛᲗ᲏Თ᲏Თ᲏}$  *ku-vipin* ‘like a bird’ is feasibly interpretable as an adverb, since it follows the verb and acts as a modifier to it, not as a complement.

Nouns may also be unmarked if they act as modifiers in a compound and the head is marked for the NP’s case and number, for instance:

- (37) *ralanyeri mapang*  
 ralan-ye-ri mapang  
 nail-PL-INS finger  
 ‘with the fingernails’

And lastly and probably most importantly, nouns appear superficially unmarked if topicalized, since the topic marker is  $-\emptyset$ :

- (38) *Saru-nama, ang nupoyya veney aruno vās.*  
 Sar-u=nama, ang nupa-oy-ya veney- $\emptyset$  aruno vās  
 go-IMP=just, AT hurt-NEG-3SG.M dog-TOP brown 2SG.P  
 ‘Just go, the brown dog won’t hurt you.’

#### 4.1.4 Prefixes on nouns

All of the nominal morphology we have so far dealt with in this section was suffixing. As mentioned in the previous section already (p. 67), however, there are also a number of prefixes that can be applied to nouns. I have just given two examples of the prefix  $\text{ᲛᲗ᲏}$  *ku-* ‘like, as though’ above, but  $\text{ᲛᲗ᲏}$  *ku-* applies not only to nouns themselves. In fact, it rather attaches to whole NPs, which makes it a clitic according to Klavans (1985: 117), and a special clitic in Zwicky’s terminology, since no corresponding full form exists in its place, comparable to the English possessive clitic *’s*, for instance (Zwicky 1977: 3, 13; 1985: 295; Zwicky and Pullum 1983: 510). To cite from the Ayeri translation of Kafka’s short story “Eine kaiserliche Botschaft” again:

<sup>6</sup> The original English text this was translated from has “and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” (United Nations 1948: Article 1).

- (39) ... *saylingyāng kovaro naynay, ku-ranyāng palung.*  
 ... sayling=yāng kovaro naynay, ku=ranya-ang palung  
 ... progress=3SG.M.A easy also, like=nobody-A else

‘... he also got on easily, like nobody else.’

(Becker 2012: 12)

In this example, we can see  $\text{ku-}$  attaching to a properly inflected NP adjunct. The NP is case-marked for agent since it can be understood to refer to the verb  $\text{sayling-}$  ‘progress’ in the main clause, insofar  $\text{ranyāng palung}$  ‘nobody else’ can replace  $\text{-yāng}$  ‘he’ in the main clause.

Besides  $\text{ku-}$ , there are also the demonstrative prefixes  $\text{da-}$  ‘such’,  $\text{eda-}$  ‘this’, and  $\text{ada-}$  ‘that’, which have already been mentioned in the previous section as well. The demonstrative prefixes undergo coalescence with nouns beginning with  $a-$ , that is, they form phonological words with their hosts for all means and purposes. The demonstrative prefixes are special clitics as well, since no contemporary free form exists.

- (40) a. *da-nanga kāryo*  
 da=nanga kāryo  
 such=house big  
 ‘such a big house’  
 b. *edāyon nake*  
 eda=ayon nake  
 this=man tall  
 ‘this tall man’  
 c. *ada-envan alingo*  
 ada=envan alingo  
 that=woman clever  
 ‘that clever woman’

Moreover, there is a prefix  $\text{mə-}$  in complementary distribution with the demonstrative prefixes, which adds a meaning along the lines of ‘just any’, ‘whatsoever’, ‘some’ to the noun. Note that this prefix is distinct from the morpheme indicating an inspecific quantity,  $\text{-aril}$  ‘some’.

- (41) a. *Ang lampyo mə-veney kayvo kirinya.*  
 Ang lamp-yo mə=veney-Ø kayvo kirin-ya  
 AT walk-3SG.N some=dog-TOP along street-LOC  
 ‘Some dog is walking along the street.’  
 b. *Ang noyan mēntānley pegamayayam.*  
 Ang no=yan mə=entān-ley pegamaya-yam  
 AT want=3SG.M.TOP some=punishment-P.INAN thief-DAT  
 ‘They demanded some kind of punishment for the thief.’

#### 4.1.5 Compounding

With regards to the classification of compounds, Bauer (2001) gives some helpful typological guidelines. Besides the compound types recognized by Sanskrit grammarians—endocentric (*tatpuruṣa*), coordinative (*dvandva*), adjectival-endocentric (*karmadhāraya*), and exocentric (*bahuvrīhi*)—he also adds synthetic compounds, which Sanskrit did not have (697). Overall, he finds that determinative, or endocentric, compounds are the most common ones in the languages of the world (697), especially if the head refers to a location or source of sorts (702).

Gaeta (2008), then, adds to Bauer’s research, based on a larger sample of grammars surveyed, that compounds for the largest part correlate with the constituent order of the language, both regarding the order of verb and object and that of noun and genitive (129–133). Mismatches in headedness occur, but appear to constitute the minority of cases and may often be explained through historical changes in syntax; he discerns for one that “morphology is not autonomous from syntax” (135), and that secondly, “[s]yntax seems to be the motor of change, which may be then reflected in compounds” (135), and that thirdly, lexical conservatism causes atavisms to linger on, reflecting the syntax of earlier stages of the language (138–139).

For the purpose of gaining at least a little insight into which types of compounds Ayeri allows—besides endocentric compounds—I conducted a small (non-exhaustive) survey based on 130 compounds from the Ayeri dictionary (Becker 2016a: Dictionary); Table 4.1 shows the various compound classes and the number of words for each. ‘Harmonic’ and ‘disharmonic’, respectively, refer to the order of elements; the order is ‘harmonic’ if it is following the normal constituent order of the language and ‘disharmonic’ if it is at odds with it (Gaeta 2008).

Table 4.1: Compounds in the Ayeri dictionary (Becker 2016a) and their classification (n = 130)

Type	Harmonic		Disharmonic		Total	
Endocentric (N + N)	67	51.54%	2	1.54%	69	53.08%
Endocentric (N + Adj)	18	13.85%	4	3.08%	22	16.92%
Synthetic (V + N)	16	12.31%	4	3.08%	20	15.38%
Coordinative (N + N)	9	6.92%	—	—	9	6.92%
Exocentric (N + N)	1	0.77%	3	2.31%	4	3.08%
Unclear	6	4.62%	—	—	6	4.62%
Total	117	90.00%	13	10.00%	130	100%

Unsurprisingly, the largest number of compound nouns in the sample were endocentric compounds of the regular kind, which means that, just like genitive attributes follow nouns, noun compounds are headed left. Especially compounds

with adjectives are interesting insofar as this is also the normal order for free adjectives, so to illustrate, some tests will be necessary to show that these adjectives form a unit with the head noun and are unable to undergo comparison, for instance. Synthetic compounds exist in Ayeri and produce nouns. These are compounds in which “the modifying element in the compound is (usually) interpreted as an argument of the verb from which the head is derived” (Bauer 2001: 701). There are also a number of coordinative compounds; this group, however, is lexicalized and not productive. Exocentric compounds constitute the minority of the sample. In the following I will give examples for each type.

It needs to be noted that unlike Germanic languages, Ayeri does not allow compounds of arbitrary length to be strung together, like in the following ridiculous but no less real example from (former) German legislation (see, for instance, *Süd-deutsche Zeitung* 2013):

- (42) *Rindfleischetikettierungsüberwachungsaufgabenübertragungsgesetz* [German]  
 Rind-fleisch-etikettierung-s-überwachung-s-aufgabe-n-übertragung-s-gesetz  
 cow-meat-labeling-LNK-surveillance-LNK-duty-LNK-delegation-LNK-law  
 ‘Law on the delegation of duties in the surveillance of beef labeling’

In stark contrast, Ayeri allows only two elements in compounds. Furthermore, this section on compounds is located within the section on nouns because Ayeri almost only possesses compounds involving nouns, and the majority of these also results in a noun.

#### *Endocentric compounds*

To start with the largest group, endocentric/*tatpuruṣa* compounds, the bulk of these compounds combines two nouns, one of which is the head which is modified by a dependent noun. As Ayeri exhibits a rather strict head-first word order, it comes as no surprise, according to Gaeta (2008), that most of these compounds follow this order strictly: the second noun modifies the first, which is opposite of how English, for instance, typically operates:

- (43) a. *betaynimpur* ‘grape’ ← *betay* ‘berry’ + *nimpur* ‘wine’  
 b. *karirayan* ‘vertigo’ ← *kar* ‘fear’ + *irayan* ‘height’<sup>7</sup>  
 c. *pikunanding* ‘mustache’ ← *piku* ‘beard’ + *nanding* ‘lips’  
 d. *tapayperin* ‘sunblind’ ← *tapay* ‘screen’ + *perin* ‘sun’

The example words in (43) show that the relationships between the modifier and the head are various: a grape is a berry *used* to make wine from (compare

<sup>7</sup> *irayan*, however, is a transparent nominalization of *iray* ‘high’.

Bauer 2001: 702); vertigo is the fear *of* height; a mustache is a beard *located* over the lips (702); and a sunblind is a screen *against* the sun. Bauer (2001) mentions that “there may be special morphophonemic processes which apply between the elements of compounds”, such as “phonological merger[s] between the elements of the compound” (695). This also occasionally happens in Ayeri, as the next few example words show:

- (44) a. ၼာၼာၼ် *avararan* ‘wetland’  
 ← ၼာၼ် *avan* ‘ground’ + ၼာၼ် *raro* ‘wet’ + ၼ် *-an* (NMLZ)
- b. မဲၼ်မိၼ် *mehimitrang* ‘fiber tree’  
 ← မဲၼ် *mehir* ‘tree’ + မိၼ် *mitrang* ‘hair, fiber’
- c. နီၼ်ဂံၼ် *ningampinam* ‘bedtime story’  
 ← နီၼ် *ningan* ‘story’ + ဂံၼ် *pinam* ‘bed’
- d. ပုၼ်မိၼ် *padilamican* ‘gravitational force’  
 ← ပုၼ် *padilan* ‘attraction’ + မိၼ် *mican* ‘force, power’

There is a modicum of alteration happening in all of the heads of the example words in (44), mostly nasals assimilating to the stop or nasal which the modifier begins with (/n/ + /p/ → /mp/, /n/ + /m/ → /m/), though ၼာၼာၼ် *avararan* and မဲၼ်မိၼ် *mehimitrang* even delete whole coda segments. Bauer (2001: 703) notes that very commonly, genitive and plural markers may form linking elements, though he also gives examples of languages which allow other case markers on the modifying element in languages with head-right order; individual languages may allow even more case inflection. However, this appears not to happen in Ayeri. The only element that comes up time and again in between the two halves of compounds is the nominalizer ၼ် *-an*, which signifies that the head is being formed by a nominalized root, such as in ပုၼ်မိၼ် *padilamican*, where ပုၼ် *padilan* ‘attraction’ is a nominalization of ပုၼ် *padil-* ‘attract’, or in နီၼ်ဂံၼ် *ningampinam*, where နီၼ် *ningan* ‘story’ is derived from the verb နီၼ် *ning-* ‘tell’. However, since Ayeri is head-first and possessive phrases are dependent marking, genitive or other case marking would be expected on the second element, not the first. Case marking on a compound, however, does not inflect just the modifier, but the whole NP:

- (45) *Ang ningya sipikanena koyabahisena.*  
*Ang ning-ya sipik-an-ena koyabahis-ena*  
 AT talk-3SG.M.TOP keep-NMLZ-GEN book.day-GEN  
 ‘He talks about keeping a journal.’

နီၼ်ပုၼ် *koyabahisena* in this example is not to be interpreted as ‘book of day(s)’ but as ‘of a day-book’. Inflection between the parts of a compound can happen nonetheless, though. In compounds which are formed ad hoc or which are otherwise transparent in their composition, inflection often is deferred to the noun head

(46) *Sa trayeng tipin ralanyeri mapang yena.*  
 Sa tra=yeng tipin-Ø ralan-ye-ri mapang yena  
 PT scratch=3SG.F.A itch-TOP nail-PL-INS finger 3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘The itch, she scratches it with her fingernails.’

(47) a. *ကံသင်္ဂရာ* *kardangiray* ‘university’ ← *ကံသင်္ဂ* *kardang* ‘school’ + *အိုင်* *iray* ‘high’  
 b. *မာရသဘိ* *marasbāri* ‘witticism’ ← *မာရ* *maras* ‘phrase’ + *သဘိ* *bāri* ‘pithy’  
 c. *ဆိလ္လကန်* *silvanikan* ‘overview’ ← *ဆိလ္လ* *silvan* ‘view’ + *အိကန်* *ikan* ‘whole’  
 d. *ဝိပိမာကရ* *vipimakārya* ‘crow’ ← *ဝိပိ* *vipin* ‘bird’ + *မာကရ* *makārya* ‘black’

(48) a. \**kardangiray-eng*                      *kardangiray-vā*  
           *kardang-iray=eng*                      *kardang-iray=vā*  
           *school-high=COMP*                      *school-high=SUPL*  
           ‘\*higher-school’    ‘\*highest-school’

b. \**marashari-eng*                              \**marashari-vā*  
       *maras-hari=eng*                              *maras-hari=vā*  
       *phrase-pithy=COMP*                              *phrase-pithy=SUP*  
       ‘\*pithier-phrase’    ‘\*pithiest-phrase’

<sup>8</sup> Bauer also mentions that appositional compounds like *maid-servant*, *woman doctor* and *fighter-bomber* are counted in this category (Bauer 2001: 699). Ayeri, however, does not possess such formations in particular.



In the sample, there were also a few compounds I categorized as noun–noun combinations, which look as though they violate head-first order. All of these involve ṣṭang *sitang* ‘self’ as a modifier:

- (49) a. ṣṭangṭṭan *sitanglentan* ‘vowel’ ← ṣṭang *sitang* ‘self’ + ṭṭan *lentan* ‘sound’  
 b. ṣṭangṭṭan *sitangparonān* ‘self-confidence’ ← ṣṭang *sitang* ‘self’ + ṭṭan *paronān* ‘faith’  
 c. ṣṭangṭṭan *sitangtenyan* ‘suicide’ ← ṣṭang *sitang* ‘self’ + ṭṭan *tenyan* ‘death’

ṣṭang *sitang* does not exist as a noun by itself in Ayeri, the word for ‘self’ is its nominalization ṣṭang *sitangan*. Nonetheless, it looks like it could have plausibly been a noun once. However, this noun may have been grammaticalized into a reflexive morpheme of a more general kind, which in turn birthed the form ṣṭang *sitangan* as a renovation.<sup>9</sup> The reflexive ṣṭang *sitang* is used—as we have seen in the previous chapter—as a prefix, so there are two ways to interpret these formations: first, ṣṭang *sitang* may be the reflexive prefix here and thus the compound follows the normal syntactic order; or second, the order of elements is reversed and thus may reflect an earlier stage of Ayeri where ṣṭang *sitang* was still a noun and modifiers could still appear in front of their heads, at least optionally so (Gaeta 2008: 133–137).

There are a number of genuinely reversed endocentric compounds as well, however, in which the modifier comes first and the head last. Since there are only a few of these, I will give all of them in the following example:

- (50) a. ṣṭangṭṭan *baripata* ‘ground meat’ ← ṣṭang *bari* ‘meat’ + ṭṭan *pata* ‘mash’  
 b. ṣṭangṭṭan *kayvolentan* ‘consonant’ ← ṣṭang *kayvo* ‘with’ + ṭṭan *lentan* ‘sound’  
 c. ṣṭangṭṭan *māvaganeng* ‘mother’s siblings’ ← ṣṭang *māva* ‘mother’ + ṭṭan *ganeng* ‘siblings’  
 d. ṣṭangṭṭan *matinanding* ‘labia’ ← ṣṭangṭṭan *matikan* ‘hot’ + ṭṭan *nanding* ‘lips’  
 e. ṣṭangṭṭan *muyavirang* ‘brass’ ← ṣṭang *muya* ‘false’ + ṭṭan *avirang* ‘gold’  
 f. ṣṭangṭṭan *tonisaytang* ‘self-assured’ ← ṣṭang *tonisa* ‘assured’ + ṭṭan *sitangan* ‘self’

Given the discussion of ṣṭang *sitang* above, one word among the examples above that is not too clear is ṣṭangṭṭan *tonisaytang*, which appears to contain a deviant form

<sup>9</sup> A little bit of language history would certainly simplify things here and lend them credence. Let us simply assume that ṣṭang *sitang* used to be a noun meaning something like ‘self’ at a previous stage of Ayeri and was repurposed as a reflexive prefix. Lehmann (2015) quotes a few examples of what he calls ‘autophoric’ nouns that came to be used as reflexive pronouns in their respective language: “Typical examples are Sanskrit *tan* ‘body, person’ and *ātmán* ‘breath, soul’, Buginese *elena* ‘body’, Okinawan *dūna* ‘body’, !Xu *l’esi* ‘body’, Basque *burua* ‘head’, Abkhaz *a-xə* ‘the head’. In their respective languages, all these nouns are translation equivalents of English *self*” (45–46). Thus, it would not be out of line at all to assume such a grammaticalization path for Ayeri as well.

of either *sitang* or *sitangan*, which is preceded by the adjective *tonisa* ‘assured, ascertained’.

All of the previously mentioned compounds involving nominal elements formed nouns, though, there are also a few denominal compounds in the sample. This process is not productive, however, and interestingly, only noun–adjective combinations appear in this group:

- (51) a. *mirampaluy* ‘otherwise’  
 ← *miran* ‘way’ + *palung* ‘different’  
 b. *padabanya* ‘insane’  
 ← *padang* ‘mind’ + *banaya* ‘sick’  
 c. *tenkarisa-* ‘be frightened to death’  
 ← *ten* ‘life’ + *karisa* ‘frightened’

*mirampaluy* is an adverb, the modifier probably a mangling of *palung*; *padabanya* is an adjective meaning ‘insane’ rather than the expected ‘insanity’ (instead: *padabanyān*); and *tenkarisa-* acts as a verb, possibly from conversion or reinterpretation, since the suffix *-isa* also forms morphological causatives of a number of verbs. Besides these irregularities, there is also at least one noun compound which uses a postposition as an adjectival modifier:

- (52) *silvankayvay* ‘blindness’ ← *silvan* ‘sight’ + *kayvay* ‘without’

This compound must be derived from the phrase *silvanya kayvay* ‘without sight’ (see-NMLZ-LOC without), though here as well, the word roots are simply juxtaposed, as noted above is the common way to form compounds in Ayeri.

#### *Synthetic compounds*

According to Bauer (2001), (semi-)synthetic compounds, or verbal(-nexus) compounds, are compounds that have “been variously defined as being based on word-groups or syntactic constructions (Botha 1984: 2), or as compounds whose head elements are derived from verbs (Lieber 1994: 3607)” (Bauer 2001: 701). Examples of this type in English would include *truck-driver*, *peace-keeping*, and *home-made*. He mentions also that synthetic compounds have been mainly discussed with regards to Germanic languages, but that according to Lieber (1994: 3608), the phenomenon is much more widespread. Ayeri possesses compounds like this as well, and the regular case again follows the constituent order, here that of verbs and nouns: Ayeri is a VO language, and thus the verb as the head of the compound is usually found on the left side with its nominal modifier following it (Gaeta 2008: 129–133):

- (53) a. ၼံၼ်ၼ်ၼ် *anlāgonan* ‘pronunciation’ ← ၼံၼ်ၼ်: *anl-* ‘bring’ + ၼံၼ်ၼ် *agonan* ‘outside’  
 b. ဘုၼ်ၼ် *napakaron* ‘acid’ ← ဘုၼ်: *nap-* ‘burn’ + ၼ်ၼ် *karon* ‘water’  
 c. ဘုၼ်ၼ် *napaperin* ‘sunburn’ ← ဘုၼ်: *nap-* ‘burn’ + ၼ်ၼ် *perin* ‘sun’  
 d. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *telbasasān* ‘waysign’ ← ၼံၼ်ၼ်: *telba-* ‘show’ + ၼ်ၼ် *sasān* ‘way’

The relations between the verb and the noun are various again, that is, the nominal modifier is not simply the direct object of the verb: to pronounce something means to bring it *to* the outside; a sunburn is a burn *caused by* the sun; and a waysign shows the way (ၼ်ၼ် *sasān* is the object here). Even though ၼ်ၼ် *karon* may serve as an agent (or a causer) of the burning effect of acid (similarly for ဘုၼ်ၼ် *napaperin* ‘sunburn’), the verb-first order is justified here as well, since verbs always go first in Ayeri sentences, and any other NPs, whether actor or undergoer, are following.

Just as with endocentric compounds, there are a number of seeming exceptions to the verb-first order of synthetic compounds as well. These are just as far and few between, however, and whether they should all be counted as noun-verb combinations is also questionable as they appear to all be formed with nominalized verbs. The verbal element may thus be only indirectly verbal for the purposes of compounding. If interpreted as noun-noun combinations, the nominal first element would reasonably form the head again for some of the below example words.

- (54) a. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *maripuntayam* ‘spread’  
 ← ၼံၼ် *marin* ‘surface’ + ၼ်ၼ်: *punta-* ‘stroke’ + :ပုၼ် *-yam* (DAT)  
 b. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *sasanlekān* ‘labyrinth’  
 ← ၼ်ၼ် *sasān* ‘way’ + ၼ်ၼ်: *leka-* ‘guess’ + :ၼ် *-an* (NMLZ)  
 c. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *selangnunān* ‘plane’  
 ← ၼံၼ် *selang* ‘machine’ + ၼ်ၼ်: *nuna-* ‘fly’ + :ၼ် *-an* (NMLZ)  
 d. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *sinturān* ‘radio’  
 ← ၼ်ၼ် *sinto* ‘wave’ + ၼ်ၼ်: *tura-* ‘send’ + :ၼ် *-an* (NMLZ)

ၼံၼ်ၼ် *maripuntayam* is special in that it contains the dative suffix :ပုၼ် *-yam* which is lexicalized as part of the word: something made or intended for spreading on a surface. A few more such verbal derivations can be found, though not compounds, among others:

- (55) a. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *grenyam* ‘extremity’ ← ၼံၼ်ၼ်: *gren-* ‘reach out’  
 b. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *lugayam* ‘password’ ← ၼံၼ်ၼ်: *luga-* ‘go through’  
 c. ၼံၼ်ၼ် *sabayam* ‘future’ ← ၼံၼ်ၼ်: *saba-* ‘come’

There is also ၼံၼ်ၼ် *maripunta-* ‘spread over’ as the verb corresponding to ၼံၼ်ၼ် *maripuntayam*, though its meaning is less specific. Here as well, however, the verbal part is last instead of first. For the other example words (54b–d), an interpretation

of the second part as a deverbal noun is possible: a labyrinth as a way or path which requires guessing, a plane a machine for flight, and radio as a sending of waves. In the latter case, *နီတုရ်* *shinturān*, however, the head is still on the wrong side even if one interprets all of the above examples as noun–noun compounds with a deverbal element.

#### Coordinative compounds

Coordinative compounds are a very small group among the sample drawn from the dictionary, and not a very productive one. Bauer (2001) defines this class as having “two or more words in a coordinate relationship, such that the entity denoted is the totality of the entities denoted by each of the elements” (699). He cautions that they are very easy to confuse with appositional (also *karmadhāraya*) compounds in that both types of compound allow inserting an *and* between both elements. The following nominal coordinative compounds are included in the dictionary sample:

- (56) a. *ဘုံမာ* *bāmā* ‘mom-and-dad’ ← *ဘုံ* *bā(bā)* ‘dad’ + *မာ* *mā(mā)* ‘mom’  
 b. *ပုၤနီၤဃုၤ* *pruynapay* ‘seasoning’ ← *ပုၤနီၤ* *pruy* ‘salt’ + *ဃုၤ* *napay* ‘pepper’  
 c. *ဓဃုၤယုၤ* *sapayyila* ‘hands-and-feet’ ← *ဓဃုၤ* *sapay* ‘hand’ + *ယုၤ* *yila* ‘foot’  
 d. *နီၤမိၤလီၤ* *simileno* ‘horizon’ ← *နီၤမိၤ* *simil* ‘country’ + *လီၤ* *leno* ‘sky’  
 e. *နီၤမိၤဃုၤ* *sitemrugon* ‘thunderstorm’ ← *နီၤမိၤ* *sitem* ‘lightning’ + *ဃုၤ* *rugon* ‘thunder’  
 f. *ဃီၤမာၤ* *vekamdekey* ‘dishes’ ← *ဃီၤမာၤ* *vekam* ‘plate’ + *မာၤ* *dekey* ‘fork’

None of the two elements recognizably forms the head in these examples, but both elements are typical exponents of the thing the compound signifies. Bauer (2001: 699) mentions that coordinative adjective compounds are rare, or at least rarely documented in the grammars he surveyed. In the sample I took, only the following compound is included, which forms a noun from the combination of two adjectives, insofar it is relevant to this section even though the component parts are not nouns:

- (57) *မာၤနီၤ* *makagisu* ‘twilight’ ← *မာၤ* *maka* ‘light’ + *နီၤ* *gisu* ‘dark’

The sample also includes the following two words, however, which are neither made up from nouns, nor do they form a noun in combination. Instead, they are technically verbs combining to form directional adverbs and have been exceptionally included here for completeness:

- (58) a. *မာၤနာၤ* *mangasaba* ‘towards’ ← *မာၤ* *manga-* ‘move’ + *နာၤ* *saba-* ‘come’  
 b. *မာၤနာၤ* *mangasara* ‘away’ ← *မာၤ* *manga-* ‘move’ + *နာၤ* *sara-* ‘go’

*Exocentric compounds*

In exocentric compounds, the modifier is not a hyponym of its head (700), which means that the modifier is not describing a property that more closely determines its head. So while a *dog kennel* is a type of kennel made for dogs, the head of an *egghead* is neither for eggs, nor containing eggs, nor made of eggs; instead, it refers to an egg-shaped skull metaphorically. And while a *bluecollar* may wear a blue shirt professionally, the referent it signifies is not a type of collar, but the relationship is metonymical in that the blue collar is part of the guise of the signified entity as a whole. The sample from the Ayeri dictionary contains a few compounds of this kind as well, though again, it is not a very productive group:

- (59) a. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *avanyonang* ‘artery’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *avan* ‘bottom, down’ + ပိၼ်း *yonang* ‘stream’  
 b. ဃုၼ်းၼ်း *baytandevo* ‘headache’ ← ဃုၼ်း *baytang* ‘blood’ + ပိၼ်း *devo* ‘head’  
 c. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *linyongang* ‘vein’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *ling* ‘top, up’ + ပိၼ်း *yonang* ‘steam’  
 d. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *sindaynanga* ‘address’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *sinday* ‘number’ + ၼ်း *nanga* ‘house’

What is striking here is that only one out of four examples shows the expected head-left order: ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *sindaynanga*. The other three examples all have the head component on the right side, preceded by a modifier. However, what all of these have in common, is that they are only metaphorically or metonymically describing the thing they signify: veins and arteries are not literally streams going up or down (they are a kind of stream flowing in different directions, however, so these are probably on the borderline between exocentric and endocentric); a headache is related to the head, but has not directly to do with being made of or containing blood (the rationale behind this being a superstition that you have too much blood in your head, which is said to cause the pain); and a house number may be part of an address, but is in a *pars pro toto* relationship to it.

*A few mysterious cases*

The following words from my sample were either undeterminable as to their composition due to parts of the word not being clear regarding one of their constituent parts, either because I tweaked the constituent so much as to not be readily recognizable anymore, or because I forgot to make an entry in the dictionary, or even deleted or changed that. The words in question are the following:

- (60) a. ဃုၼ်းၼ်း *batangiman* ‘mosquito’ ← ဃုၼ်း *baytang* ‘blood’ + ?  
 b. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *kirinalang* ‘avenue’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *kirin* ‘street’ + ?  
 c. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *ningambakar* ‘telltale’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *ningan* ‘story’ + ?  
 d. ၼ်းၼ်းၼ်း *ragayesuy* ‘grid’ ← ၼ်းၼ်း *ragan* ‘line’ + ?

- e. ၵိးၵိး teraymino ‘melancholic’ ← ? + ၵိး mino ‘happy’  
 f. ၵိးၵိး vetaysano ‘fare’ ← ? + ၵိး sasān (earlier ၵိး sasano) ‘way’

For all of the components represented by a question mark, there is no corresponding dictionary entry. At least in ၵိးၵိး baytangiman, the \*ၵိး \*iman part looks as though it could be a noun due to the ၵိး -an nominalizer suffix. \*ၵိး \*teray in ၵိးၵိး teraymino might also be an adjective supposed to mean ‘sad’ (which would make it an adjectival coordinative compound), although the dictionary entry for that is ၵိး giday. Even though parts of all these words are unclear, they all seem to follow the correct syntactic order, judging by those parts that are identifiable. And even in the case of ၵိးၵိး vetaysano, which is missing the first part, it can be reasonably assumed that the identifiable part, \*ၵိး \*sano, is the modifier, and \*ၵိး vetay may have once been intended to mean ‘money’ or ‘fee’ or something along these lines.

With the exception of ၵိးၵိး ningambakar, all of the mystery words were entered into the dictionary in 2006. Digging through old archives and translations, I could determine at least that \*ၵိး \*bakar was once intended to mean ‘lie’, and \*ၵိး \*teray was indeed meant to mean ‘sad’.

#### 4.1.6 Reduplication

Wiltshire and Marantz (2000) write that it has been suggested that reduplication serves an iconic function, “with the repetition of phonological material indicating a repetition or intensity in the semantics” (561), so with regards to nouns it mainly serves to indicate plurality of various kinds. However, they find that in fact, reduplication serves all kinds of functions, also ones without iconic meanings, and mention Agta, an Austronesian language of the Philippines, which uses reduplication to form diminutives (Healey 1960: 6–9). As we have seen in section 3.2.3 above, so does Ayeri, and it is justified in doing so since there is real-world evidence for this use of reduplication. Examples for diminutive reduplication in Ayeri include:

- (61) a. ၵိး limu ‘shirt’ → ၵိးၵိး limu-limu ‘little shirt’  
 b. ၵိး nanga ‘house’ → ၵိးၵိး nanga-nanga ‘little house’  
 c. ၵိး sapay ‘hand’ → ၵိးၵိး sapay-sapay ‘little hand’  
 d. ၵိး veney ‘dog’ → ၵိးၵိး veney-veney ‘little dog’

Diminutive reduplication involves full stem reduplication in Ayeri. Besides the productive use of reduplication for diminutive marking, there are a number of diminutive formations which have been lexicalized, such as in the following examples:

- (62) a. ၼ်း agu ‘chicken’ → ၼ်း:ၼ်း agu-agu ‘chick’  
 b. ၼ်း gan ‘child’ → ၼ်း:ၼ်း gan-gan ‘grandchild’  
 c. ကံး pasing ‘tube’ → ကံး:ကံး pasing-pasing ‘straw’  
 d. ပိး poyu ‘cheek; bacon’ → ပိး:ပိး poyu-poyu ‘butt’

There are also at least two documented cases where the reduplicated root is not a noun, but the reduplication results in a noun:

- (63) a. ၼ်း kusang ‘double (adj.)’ → ၼ်း:ၼ်း kusang-kusang ‘model’  
 b. ၼ်း veb- ‘build’ → ၼ်း:ၼ်း veba-veba ‘tinkering’

Reduplicated nouns behave like regular nouns with regards to inflection, that is, they receive prefixes and suffixes just like the simplexes from which they are derived:

- (64) *Puco mino veney-veneyang.*  
 Puk-yo mino veney~veney-ang  
 jump-3SG.N happily DIM~dog-A

‘The little dog is jumping happily.’

In this example, the reduplicated noun ၼ်း:ၼ်း *veney-veney* is marked as an agent in that the agent suffix ၼ်း -ang is appended to the noun as a unit *after* reduplicating the noun stem. In other words, the following formation in which the root is reduplicated along with its declension suffix is ungrammatical for the purpose of forming a diminutive:

- (65) \*ၼ်း:ၼ်း:ၼ်း \*veneyang-veneyang

Likewise, the reduplicated form is not treated in the way an endocentric compound would be, so case and plural marking cannot be appended to the first element:

- (66) \*ၼ်း:ၼ်း:ၼ်း \*veneyang veney

While ordinary nouns undergo full reduplication to form a diminutive, in compounds, only the head is reduplicated, unless the compound is strongly lexicalized or has an idiomatic meaning going beyond that of its components. The following example shows the simple case of a transparent endocentric compound:

- (67) *Ya yomayo mehir-mehirang seygo veno kay pang nanga nana.*  
 Ya yoma-yo mehir~mehir-ang seygo veno kay pang nanga-Ø nana  
 LOCT be-3SG.N DIM~tree-A apple pretty three back house-TOP IPL.GEN

‘There are three pretty little apple trees behind our house.’

In this example, being endearing or otherwise small is treated as a property of the head, မဲဃ် *mehir* ‘tree’, not of the whole compound မဲဃ်ဒုန် *mehirseygo* ‘apple tree’, or the dependent, ဒုန် *seygo* ‘apple’—after all, an apple tree which is small is rather a small tree with apples on it than a tree with small apples. The avoidance of the fully reduplicated form မဲဃ်ဒုန်ဒုန် *mehirseygo-mehirseygo* is probably related to the notion of economy of expression.

#### 4.1.7 Nominalization

Some accidental ways of deriving nouns have been mentioned above, for instance, some reduplicated non-nominal roots like နွန် *kusang* ‘double’ or ဖဲဃ် *veha* ‘build’ may form nouns. However, Ayeri also has some dedicated morphology to derive nouns from other parts of speech. The most common and highly productive way to derive a noun, is the suffix -an. The examples in (68) illustrate some derivations from verbs, and (69) shows derivations from adjectives to nouns. As နွန် *kuban* ‘oar’ shows, the nominalization may have an idiomatic meaning.

- (68) a. နာဏ် *balang* ‘search (v.)’ → နာဏ်ဒ် *balangan* ‘search (n.)’  
 b. နွန် *kub* ‘row’ → နွန်ဒ် *kuban* ‘oar’  
 c. ဂိန် *rig* ‘draw’ → ဂိန်ဒ် *rigan* ‘drawing’  
 d. ဖဲဃ် *veh* ‘build’ → ဖဲဃ်ဒ် *vehan* ‘building’
- (69) a. ခါဏ် *apitu* ‘pure’ → ခါဏ်ဒ် *apituan* ‘purity’  
 b. ဂိာ *gira* ‘urgent’ → ဂိာဒ် *girān* ‘hurry’  
 c. ပန် *pakis* ‘serious’ → ပန်ဒ် *pakisan* ‘seriousness’  
 d. ဝာ *vapa* ‘skillful’ → ဝာဒ် *vapan* ‘skill’

Occasionally, it may even happen that a noun is derived from a noun with a related but sometimes more basic meaning using the nominalizer -an. This process, however, is not productive, so compared to deverbalization and deadjectivization, examples of this derivation strategy are few.

- (70) a. ခါဏ် *ajam* ‘toy’ → ခါဏ်ဒ် *ajaman* ‘game’  
 b. နွန် *kelang* ‘chain’ → နွန်ဒ် *kelangan* ‘connection’  
 c. ဂိာ *nanga* ‘house’ → ဂိာဒ် *nangān* ‘household’  
 d. ခါ *ten* ‘life’ → ခါဒ် *tenan* ‘soul’

There are also some apparent nominalizations in -am and -ang, although these are irregular and non-productive:



- (71) a. ၎်ဗျ: *aja*- ‘play’ → ၎်ဗျဗျ *ajam* ‘toy’  
 b. ၎်ဇ်: *gin*- ‘drink’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *ginam* ‘glass’  
 c. ၎်ဇ်: *mik*- ‘poison (v.)’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *mikam* ‘poison (n.), venom’  
 d. ၎်ဇ်: *nuna*- ‘fly’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *nunam* ‘feather’
- (72) a. ၎်ဗျ: *bayha*- ‘rule’ → ၎်ဗျဗျ *bayhang* ‘government’  
 b. ၎်ဗျ *bapa* ‘remaining’ → ၎်ဗျဗျ *bapang* ‘remainder’  
 c. ၎်ဇ်: *kada*- ‘collect’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *kadang* ‘committee; alliance’  
 d. ၎်ဗျ *mima* ‘possible’ → ၎်ဗျဗျ *mimang* ‘access’

Agentive nouns can be formed from regular nouns with the suffix ဗျ *-maya*, compare the examples in (73). An epenthetic /a/ may be introduced to break up consonant clusters that would otherwise be either difficult to pronounce or violating phonotactics. When the stem of the word the agentive suffix is attached to ends in a consonant or /Ca/, it is also often found fused with the root, sometimes with the first /a/ of *-Caya* lengthened, see (74). Specifically feminine agentive nouns can be derived with the related suffix ဗျ *-vaya*; two examples are given in (75).

- (73) a. ၎်ဇ်: *anl*- ‘bring’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *anlamaya* ‘waiter’  
 b. ၎်ဇ် *bora* ‘sin’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *boramaya* ‘sinner’  
 c. ၎်ဇ်: *nasy*- ‘follow’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *nasyamaya* ‘follower’  
 d. ၎်ဇ်: *teba*- ‘bake’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *tebamaya* ‘baker’
- (74) a. ၎်ဇ်: *asa*- ‘travel’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *asāya* ‘traveler’  
 b. ၎်ဇ်: *ibut*- ‘trade’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *ibutaya* ‘trader, merchant’  
 c. ၎်ဇ်: *lant*- ‘lead’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *lantaya* ‘leader; driver’  
 d. ၎်ဇ်: *tang*- ‘listen’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *tangaya* ‘listener’
- (75) a. ၎်ဇ် *gan* ‘child’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *ganvaya* ‘governess’  
 b. ၎်ဇ် *lanya* ‘king’ → ၎်ဇ်ဗျ *lanvaya* ‘queen’

Besides these, there is also a derivative suffix for makers of things, ၎်ဇ် *-ati* (contracting to /atj/ *-ac* before a vowel), though this is not too productive, and sometimes irregular, as ၎်ဇ် *sirtangati* ‘youth’ shows:

- (76) a. ၎်ဇ် *gindi* ‘poem’ → ၎်ဇ် *gindati* ‘poet’  
 b. ၎်ဇ် *sirtang* ‘young’ → ၎်ဇ် *sirtangati* ‘youth’  
 c. ၎်ဇ် *taban*- ‘write’ → ၎်ဇ် *tabanati* ‘scribe’  
 d. ၎်ဇ် *vehim* ‘piece of clothing’ → ၎်ဇ် *vehimati* ‘tailor’

A few instances also exist where a tool of sorts is derived with a suffix  $\text{ᠠᠨᠢᠷᠠᠨ}$  *-(e)ryan*, which is related to the instrumental suffix  $\text{ᠠᠨᠢᠷᠠ}$  *-eri* in combination with the nominalizer  $\text{ᠠᠨ}$  *-an*:

- (77) a.  $\text{ᠭᠣᠷ}$  *gur-* ‘turn’ →  $\text{ᠭᠣᠷᠠᠨ}$  *guryan* ‘coil, cylinder’  
 b.  $\text{ᠮᠢᠰ}$  *mis-* ‘behave’ →  $\text{ᠮᠢᠰᠠᠨᠢᠷᠠᠨ}$  *miseryan* ‘method, strategy’  
 c.  $\text{ᠨᠠᠫ}$  *nap-* ‘burn’ →  $\text{ᠨᠠᠫᠠᠨᠢᠷᠠᠨ}$  *naperyan* ‘tinder’  
 d.  $\text{ᠫᠠᠷ}$  *pra-* ‘glitter, gleam’ →  $\text{ᠫᠠᠷᠠᠨᠢᠷᠠᠨ}$  *praryan* ‘spark’

While  $\text{ᠠᠨ}$  *-an* derives nouns from verbs to produce nouns that act as such in every way, it may sometimes be preferable to refer to the action as such by a noun, compare in English:

- (78) a. Manhattan is famous for its tall **buildings**.  
 b. **Building** a house is an expensive endeavor.

In (78a), *building* is simply a noun derived from the verb *build*. It acts as a noun in every way, for example, it can serve as a subject and object, it can be pluralized, it can take determiners, and can be modified by adjectives. The form of *building* in (78b), however, is a gerund, and as such underlies the restriction that it cannot be pluralized (Payne 1997: 35). As we have seen at the beginning of this section on nominalization, Ayeri can derive  $\text{ᠪᠡᠬᠠᠨ}$  *vehan* ‘building, construction’ from the verb  $\text{ᠪᠡᠬ}$  *veb-* ‘build’, which acts like every other common noun, much like in the English example in (78a):

- (79) a. *Lesāra sirimang vebānreng tado.*  
 Lesa-ara sirimang vebān-reng tado  
 collapse-3SG.INAN about.to building-A.INAN old  
 ‘The old building is about to collapse.’  
 b. *Le vacyang eda-vebān.*  
 Le vac=yang eda=vehān-Ø  
 PT.INAN like=1SG.A this=building-TOP  
 ‘This building, I like it.’  
 c. *Ang latayo bayhang vebānyeley yona.*  
 Ang lata-yo bayhang-Ø vebān-ye-ley yona  
 AT sell-3SG.N government-TOP building-PL-P.INAN 3SG.N.GEN  
 ‘The government is selling its buildings.’  
 d. *Le ming kuysāran vebān-kay dirasyam ran.*  
 Le ming kuysa-aran vebān-Ø=kay diras-yam ran  
 PT.INAN can compare-3PL.INAN building-TOP=few splendor-DAT 3SG.INAN.GEN  
 ‘Few buildings can compare to its splendor.’

The above examples condense several properties into one for illustration. Thus, (79a) shows that ṛṣṣṛ *vehān* can serve as basically a subject of a clause, and that it can as well be modified by an adjective—the choice of adjectives is not subject to any distributional restrictions other than those imposed by the semantic frame of HOUSE. In the next example, (79b), ṛṣṣṛ *vehān* serves as the object of the clause and is being determined by the demonstrative prefix ṣṣṣ *eda-* ‘this’. The third example, (79c), shows ṛṣṣṛ *vehān* both pluralized and modified by a possessive pronoun, ṣṣṣ *yona* ‘of it’. And finally, in (79d) we see ṛṣṣṛ *vehān* quantified by the suffix ṣṣṣ *-kay* ‘few’.

Similar to the English example in (78b), Ayeri can also derive nouns from the participle of a verb describing the action as such—a gerund. For an example, I will again draw on the Ayeri translation of Kafka’s short story “Eine kaiserliche Botschaft” (Becker 2012: 2, 14):

- (80) ... *nay ang pətangongva*                      *ankyū haruyamanas*                      *nanang megayena*  
 ... *nay ang pə-tang-ong=va.Ø*                      *ankyū haru-yam-an-as*                      *nanang mega-ye-na*  
 ... and AT NFUT-hear-IRR=2SG.TOP truly **beat-PTCP-NMLZ-P** great fist-PL-GEN  
*yana kunangya vana.*  
*yana kunang-ya vana*  
 3SG.M.GEN door-LOC 2SG.GEN

‘... and you would indeed hear his magnificent beating at your door very soon.’

The annotations to this translation contain a comment on the grammatical rules which operate in this passage, more specifically also on the gerund derivation ṣṣṣ *haruyaman* ‘beating’:

Furthermore, I wrote *haruyaman* ‘beating’ instead of *haruan* ‘beat(ing)’ because I wanted to emphasize the process of beating as an incomplete action. This is possible here because the word is not topicalized and neither is it marked as a dative, which would also require *haruyamanyam* ‘beat-PTCP-NMLZ-DAT’ to become *haruanyam* ‘beat-NMLZ-DAT’ (the participle marker *-yam* is derived from the dative case ending *-yam*).  
 (14–15)

We can read from this description that the participle marker in Ayeri has possibly been grammaticalized from the dative case marker, or that it is at least synchronically homonymous. In order for case marking to operate, this formation has to be nominalized, which is done the usual way by appending ṣṣṣ *-an*, thus yielding the suffix cluster ṣṣṣ *-yaman* for the derivation of verbs as gerunds. If the gerund is marked for dative case, the suffix cluster \*ṣṣṣ *-yamanyam* basically undergoes haplogy to a simple nominalized form with the suffix cluster ṣṣṣ *-anyam*:

- (81) *haru-*                      *haruyam*                      *haruyaman*                      \**haruyamanyam*                      *haruanyam*  
 haru- → haru-yam → haru-yam-an → haru-yam-an-yam → haru-an-yam  
 beat                      beat-PTCP                      beat-PTCP-NMLZ                      beat-PTCP-NMLZ-DAT                      beat-NMLZ-DAT

The comment on the translation also makes a little note on the gerund being possible because the word is not topicalized. This is based on an old rule that gerunds cannot be topicalized unless nominalized first, however, usage has since changed so that earlier, *ၵၢၢၢၢၢၢ haruyam* would have constituted the gerund form, while even by the time of translating the short story, it had changed to *ၵၢၢၢၢၢၢ haruyaman*. Thus, it is no surprise to see the following example, from the partial translation of Saint-Exupéry's story "Le petit prince" (Becker 2015 [2013]: 3, 13):

- (82) *Sa koronyang palungyaman na Baysānterpeng nay na Bayokivo*  
 Sa koron=yang palung-yam-an-Ø na Baysānterpeng nay na Bayokivo  
 PT knew=1SG.A distinguish-PTCP-NMLZ-TOP GEN Realm.Middle and GEN Spring.Little  
*menaneri nivānyena.*  
 menan-eri nivān-ye-na  
 first-INS glimpse-PL-GEN

'I knew how to distinguish between China and Arizona at first sight.'

A more literal translation of this sentence would be 'The distinguishing of China and Arizona, I knew it at first sight', so the whole passage *ၵၢၢၢၢၢၢ palungyaman ... na Bayokivo* forms the topic of the sentence here, headed by the gerund *ၵၢၢၢၢၢၢ palungyaman* 'distinguishing'. According to the old rule obliquely quoted in the comment to the passage in (80), this should not be possible. As said before, though, usage has changed.

A rule we can gather from the above example from Saint-Exupéry is that gerunds are treated as animate nouns. Since they are impersonal, they trigger neuter agreement on verbs. They can also be the objects of sentences. The passage in (80) furthermore illustrates that gerunds can be modified by The following example shows a gerund used as an agent—basically a subject—as well (Becker 2014):

- (83) *Dilayamanang kalamena babalanas ayonena ...*  
 Dila-yam-an-ang kalam-ena bahalan-as ayon-ena ...  
 find.out-PTCP-NMLZ-A truth-GEN goal-P man-GEN ...

'(If) finding out the truth is the goal of the man ...'

What all the passages on gerunds quoted before show is that gerunds in Ayeri do not behave like transitive verbs as in English. Thus, what would be the object of the former verb appears in the genitive case in Ayeri. As in English, however, gerunds in Ayeri cannot be pluralized:

- (84) \**Noyo vebayamanjang nangayena.*  
 Noyo veba-yam-an-ye-ang nanga-ye-na  
 expensive build-PTCP-NMLZ-PL-A house-PL-GEN

'\*The buildings of houses are expensive.'

It is possible, however, to quantify gerunds insofar as the quantifier does not imply countable quantities of the action. Moreover, it is possible for gerunds to be modified by possessors. The following two sentences exemplify this use:

- (85) *Ang lugayan delacamanas-ikan kayanya pang.*  
 Ang luga=yan.Ø delak-yam-an-as=ikan kayan-ya pang  
 AT go.through=3PL.M.TOP suffer-PTCP-NMLZ-P=much war-LOC after

‘They went through a lot of suffering after the war.’

- (86) *Krico malyamanang muya tan.*  
 Krit-yo maly-yam-an-ang muya tan  
 annoy-3SG.N sing-PTCP-NMLZ-A wrong 3PL.M.GEN

‘Their off singing is annoying.’

## 4.2 Pronouns

Ayeri possesses different kinds of pronouns in the sense that there is a closed class of words which contains anaphora of various types—personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, interrogative pronouns, relative pronouns, as well as reflexive and reciprocal expressions. Each class of pronouns will be discussed in the following.

### 4.2.1 Personal pronouns

As Figure 4.6 shows, Ayeri possesses quite a large number of personal pronouns with little syncretism between the different paradigm slots overall (the second person is a notable exception); there are also no gaps in the paradigm. Ayeri’s personal pronouns reflect the grammatical features also found in nouns, that is, number, gender, and case, and person is added to that. The individual forms range from completely fused to fully transparent even within the same case paradigm, for instance, ꠘꠞ ꠘām ‘(to/for) me’ (1SG.DAT) on the one hand, and ꠘꠞꠞ ꠘayam ‘(to/for) him’ (transparently 3SG.M-DAT) on the other. Originally, all pronouns have been regular formations based on the respective unmarked pronominal element listed in the TOP column of Figure 4.6 declined by adding a case suffix (see section 4.1.3). Use has caused many of these formations to contract and erode as grammaticalization progressed:

- (87) a. *ayang* → *yāng*  
 ay-ang yāng  
 1SG-A 1SG.A
- b. *iyatena* → *tan*  
 iy-a-t-ena tan  
 3SG-M-PL-GEN 3SG.M.GEN<sup>11</sup>

Figure 4.6: Personal pronouns

Person	TOP	A	P	DAT	GEN	LOC	CAUS	INS
1SG	ay	yang	yas	yām	nā	yā	sā	rī
2SG	va	vāng	vās	vayam	vana	vaya	vasa	vari
3SG.M	ya	yāng	yās	yayam	yana	yāy	yasa	yari
3SG.F	ye	yeng	yes	yeyam	yena	yea	yesa	yeri
3SG.N	yo	yong	yos	yoyam	yona	yoa	yosa	yorī
3SG.INAN	ra	reng	rey	rayam	ran	raya	rasa	rari
1PL	ayn	nang	nas	nyam	nana	nyā	nisa	ni
2PL	va	vāng	vās	vayam	vana	vaya	vasa	vari
3PL.M	yan	tang	tas	cam	tan	ca	tis	ti
3PL.F	yen	teng	tes	teyam	ten	teya	tēs	teri
3PL.N	yon	tong	tos	toyam	ton	toya	tōs	tori
3PL.INAN	ran	teng	tey	racam	ten	raca	ratas	ray

The plural series used to be derived by adding 𐌲𐌶 *-n* or, in the third person, 𐌲𐌶𐌴 *-t-* to the pronoun stem, which can still be easily observed in the unmarked pronouns as well as in the alternation between 𐌶𐌴 *y-* and 𐌲𐌶𐌴 *t-* in the third person pronouns. The same goes for the gender-marking thematic vowel in the animate third person pronouns, which has been retained as a distinctive feature even in the non-core pronouns despite sometimes heavy modifications. A further interesting property of Ayeri is that synchronically, singular and plural are distinguished, except for the second person, where the forms are the same, basically like in English. Lehmann (2015) explains, however, that this is not an unusual route for languages to take:

New pronouns, especially for the second person singular, are often obtained by shifting pronouns around in the paradigm, especially by substituting marked forms for unmarked ones. This explains, for instance, the use of [...] English *you* for the second person singular (42)

The second person singular subject pronoun of English used to be *thou*, cognate to German *du*, which can still be found in Shakespeare, for instance. Something along the lines of English *you* as a second person plural pronoun replacing second person singular *thou* by way of a deferential singular use of a plural pronoun (OED 2016: *you*, pron., adj., and n.) may have happened in Ayeri as well.

<sup>11</sup> Strictly speaking, this could as well be glossed as *t<a>n* (3SG.GEN<M>). I chose to gloss the pronoun in the above way, however, in order to not overly complicate things.

The personal pronouns are used in just the same way as their full-NP counterparts would be, also in the non-core cases:

- (88) a. *Sa barya ang Paradan tandās kaleri.*  
 Sa har-ya ang Paradan tanda-as kal-eri  
 AT beat-3SG.M A Paradan fly-P rag-INS  
 ‘Paradan beats the fly with a rag.’
- b. *Sa baryāng tandās kaleri.*  
 Sa har=yāng tanda-as kal-eri  
 AT beat=3SG.M.A fly-P rag-INS  
 ‘He beats the fly with a rag.’
- c. *Sa barya ang Paradan yos kaleri.*  
 Sa har-ya ang Paradan yos kal-eri  
 AT beat-3SG.M A Paradan 3SG.N.P rag-INS  
 ‘Paradan beats it with a rag.’
- d. *Sa barya ang Paradan tandās rari.*  
 Sa har-ya ang Paradan tanda-as rari  
 AT beat-3SG.M A Paradan fly-P 3SG.INAN.INS  
 ‘Paradan beats the fly with it.’

In the above set of examples, (88a) shows a sentence with full NPs, with the agent, *ang Paradan* replaced by the third person singular masculine agent pronoun *yāng* in (88b); in (88c) the patient, *tandās*, is replaced with the third person singular neuter patient pronoun *yos*; in (88d), lastly, the instrument, *kaleri* is replaced with the third person singular inanimate instrumental pronoun *rari*. Furthermore, complex NPs are in complementary distribution, that is, an NP which contains an adjective is wholly replaced by an NP containing a personal pronoun:

- (89) a. *Ang ninye vebimley veno.*  
 Ang nin=ye.Ø vchim-ley veno  
 A wear=3SG.F.TOP dress-P.INAN beautiful  
 ‘She wears a beautiful dress.’
- b. \**Ang ninye adaley veno.*  
 Ang nin=ye.Ø ada-ley veno  
 A wear=3SG.F.TOP that-P.INAN beautiful  
 ‘\*She wears a beautiful it.’
- c. *Ang ninye adaley.*  
 Ang nin=ye.Ø ada-ley  
 A wear=3SG.F.TOP that-P.INAN  
 ‘She wears it.’

Comparing the example sentences in (88) with the TOP column in Figure 4.6 an important property of personal pronouns becomes apparent. That is, the ‘unmarked’ (or rather, zero-marked) pronoun forms are also the ones showing as verb agreement. An important difference in this respect, however, is that the third person singular inanimate verb agreement marker is not  $\text{ra}$ , but  $\text{-ara}$ . The following two examples illustrate the parallel more clearly—observe the person marking on the verb in (90) and the corresponding object pronouns in (91):

- (90) a. *Sa manya ang Ajān Pila.*  
 Sa man-ya ang Ajān Ø Pila  
 PT greet-3SG.M A Ajān TOP Pila  
 ‘Pila, Ajān greets her.’
- b. *Sa manye ang Pila Ajān.*  
 Sa man-ye ang Pila Ø Ajān  
 PT greet-3SG.F A Pila TOP Ajān  
 ‘Ajān, she greets him.’
- (91) a. *Sa manye ang Pila ya.*  
 Sa man-ye ang Pila ya.Ø  
 PT greet-3SG.F A Pila 3SG.M.TOP  
 ‘Pila greets him.’
- b. *Sa manya ang Ajān ye.*  
 Sa man-ya ang Ajān ye.Ø  
 PT greet-3SG.M A Ajān 3SG.F.TOP  
 ‘Ajān greets her.’

Another important property of both pronouns and verbs is that agent pronouns (and patient pronouns under certain circumstances) replace person agreement by cliticizing to the verb stem. As person agreement morphology is a domain of verbs, it will be dealt with in more detail in the chapter on verbs proper. The following example illustrates the mainly relevant process, however:

- (92) a. *Sa manya ang Ajān Pila.*  
 Sa man-ya ang Ajān Ø Pila  
 PT greet-3SG.M A Ajān TOP Pila  
 ‘Pila, Ajān greets her.’
- b. *Sa manyāng Pila.*  
 Sa man=yāng Ø Pila  
 PT greet=3SG.M.A TOP Pila  
 ‘Pila, he greets her.’



Possessive pronouns are special compared to regular personal pronouns in that they can act as both personal pronouns proper and possessive adjectives, depending on context. The main case for the pronouns listed above in the genitive column of Figure 4.6 is that of possessive adjectives, which means that unlike personal pronouns, they are not necessarily in complementary distribution with nominal NPs, compare (89). Instead, they may be used as modifiers like, or alongside, adjectives, as (93) shows.

- (93) *nangaya ledō nā*  
 nanga-ya ledō nā  
 house-LOC blue 1SG.GEN  
 ‘in my blue house’

Yet, however, possessives do not fully share the properties of adjectives, namely, they cannot be compared (\**ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ* \**nā-eng* ‘\*myer’, \**ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ* \**nā-vā* ‘\*myest’). Fronting them in actual pronominal fashion is possible, for instance, in predicative statements like the one in (94a). Alternatively, a phrasal construction with *ᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛᵛ* *vilyang-* ‘belong’ as indicated in (94b) may be used.

- (94) a. *Nā ada-nangāng.*  
 Nā ada=nanga-ang  
 1SG.GEN that=house-A  
 ‘That house is mine.’  
 b. *Ang vilyangyo ada-nanga yas.*  
 Ang vilyang-yo ada=nanga-Ø yas  
 AT belong-3SG.N that=house-TOP 1SG.P  
 ‘That house belongs to me.’

#### 4.2.2 Demonstrative pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns in Ayeri are formed with the demonstrative prefixes: *eda-* ‘this’ (proximal), *ada-* ‘that’ (distal), and *da-* ‘such’ (indefinite). These are combined with a morpheme *nya*, which is related to the word for ‘person’, *nyān*. Figure 4.7 gives the declined forms for all of them. Those forms attested in the corpus gathered from dictionary entries and example texts also used for the syllable structure analyses in section 1.2 appear in upright type, those that should be grammatical as well otherwise are given in italic type. The corpus is very small, but the prevalence of some forms is possibly reflecting varying degrees of grammaticalization at least to some extent. Table 4.2 gives the token frequencies of the various attested forms.

Figure 4.7: Demonstrative pronouns

Case	Proximal	Distal	Indefinite
TOP	<i>edanya</i>	<i>adanya</i>	<i>danya</i>
A	<i>edanyāng</i>	<i>adanyāng</i>	<i>danyāng</i>
A.INAN	<i>edareng</i> , <i>edanyareng</i>	<i>adareng</i> , <i>adanyareng</i>	<i>danyareng</i>
P	<i>edanyās</i>	<i>adanyās</i>	<i>danyās</i>
P.INAN	<i>edaley</i>	<i>adaley</i>	<i>danyaley</i>
DAT	<i>edayam</i>	<i>adayam</i>	<i>danyayam</i>
GEN	<i>edanyana</i>	<i>adanyana</i>	<i>danyana</i>
LOC	<i>edanyaya</i>	<i>adanyaya</i>	<i>danyaya</i>
CAUS	<i>edanyasa</i>	<i>adanyasa</i>	<i>danyasa</i>
INS	<i>edanyari</i>	<i>adanyari</i>	<i>danyari</i>

Table 4.2: Token frequencies of attested demonstrative pronouns

Pronoun	Gloss	Absolute	Relative
<i>edanya</i>	this.TOP	1	1.69%
<i>adanya</i>	that.TOP	9	15.25%
<i>danya</i>	such.TOP	1	1.69%
<i>edanyāng</i>	this.A	4	6.78%
<i>adanyāng</i>	that.A	8	13.56%
<i>edareng</i>	this.A.INAN	3	5.08%
<i>adareng</i>	that.A.INAN	15	25.42%
<i>adanyareng</i>	that.A.INAN	1	1.69%
<i>edanyās</i>	this.P	1	1.69%
<i>adanyās</i>	that.P	2	3.39%
<i>danyās</i>	such.P	2	3.39%
<i>edaley</i>	this.P.INAN	2	3.39%
<i>danyaley</i>	such.P.INAN	2	3.39%
<i>adayam</i>	that.DAT	3	5.08%
<i>edanyana</i>	this.GEN	1	1.69%
<i>adanyana</i>	that.GEN	2	3.39%
<i>danyana</i>	such.GEN	1	1.69%
<i>adanyaya</i>	that.LOC	1	1.69%
Total		59	100%

Of all the cases, the agent demonstratives have the highest token frequency at a combined 52.53%, especially the distal pronouns are very frequent in the sample. Moreover, the distal inanimate agent demonstrative occurs twice as often as its animate counterpart, the shortened form *adareng* ‘that (one)’ being far more current than the full form *adanyareng*. Interestingly, the shortened form *edareng* ‘this one’ is also the only one attested for the inanimate proximate agent; similarly, the only dative demonstrative attested once is shortened as well: *adayam* ‘(to/for) that’. For non-core cases, only ‘long’ demonstratives are attested, albeit sparingly so.

Regarding the variation between ‘long’ and ‘short’ forms, it is not surprising that those demonstratives with a high frequency of use are eroded in some way: it seems that Ayeri prefers them to stay trisyllabic, which is achieved by dropping the *nya* part.<sup>12</sup> A further reason for dropping the *nya* part especially in the inanimate demonstratives may be that it is perceived as a marker of animacy—it has been noted above already that it is related to the word *nyān* ‘person’. Both factors, high frequency and semantic mismatch, may thus promote contraction.

Still, the question for the reason for the high frequency especially of *adareng* remains open. It may be explained by looking at a few typical examples of this word in context, however.

- (95) a. *Nay ang nelyo-ikan sungkorankihas, adareng tono.*  
 Nay ang nel-yo=ikan sungkorankihas, ada-reng tono  
 and AT help-3SG.N=much geography, that-A.INAN certain  
 ‘And geography, that’s for sure, helped me a lot.’ (Becker 2015 [2013]: 13)
- b. *Adareng merambay-ikan, le sundalvāng sasān vana ...*  
 Ada-reng merambay=ikan, le sundal=vāng sasān-Ø vana ...  
 that-A.INAN useful=very, PT.INAN lose=2SG.A way-TOP 2SG.GEN ...  
 ‘It’s very useful if you get lost [...]’ (14)
- c. *Adareng danyaley segasena boa tinka.*  
 Ada-reng danya-ley segas-ena boa tinka  
 that-A.INAN such-P.INAN snake-GEN boa closed  
 ‘The one of the closed boa snake.’<sup>13</sup> (22)

In all of the example sentences in (95), *adareng* ‘that (one)’ serves as a dummy pronoun together with a predicative adjective or NP, which is the main reason why it occurs so frequently. This is to say, Ayeri prefers the demonstrative

<sup>12</sup> According to the so-called Zipf’s law, word length and token frequency correlate in that the most frequently used words in a language also tend to be the shortest (Zipf 1935: 25–27).

<sup>13</sup> More literal translations of this sentence are ‘That is the one of the closed boa snake’ or ‘That is one of a closed boa snake’.

pronoun ᐃᐃᐅᐅ *adareng* as the dummy agent in predicative contexts over the personal pronoun ᐅᐅ *reng* ‘it’. Otherwise, however, demonstrative pronouns work regularly as deictic anaphora: ‘this’, ‘that’, and ‘such (a)’, except that as nominal elements they are declined for case—but not for number or animacy, which is a notable difference between demonstrative pronouns and personal pronouns:

- (96) a. *Ang vehya Ajān nangās.*  
 Ang veh-ya Ø Ajān nanga-as  
 AT build-3SG.M TOP Ajān house-P  
 ‘Ajān builds a house.’
- b. *Nangās? Sa vehyāng may danya.*  
 Nanga-as? Sa veh=yāng may danya-Ø  
 house-P? PT build=3SG.M.A AFF such-TOP  
 ‘A house? He builds one indeed.’
- (97) a. *Sā hasuyeng eda-migorayye.*  
 Sā hasu=yeng eda=migoray-ye-Ø  
 CAUT sneeze=3SG.F.A this=flower-PL-TOP  
 ‘These flowers make her sneeze.’
- b. *Ang tipinyon nivaye yena adanyari naynay.*  
 Ang tipin-yon niva-ye-Ø yena adanya-ri naynay  
 AT itch-3PL.N eye-PL-TOP 3SG.F.GEN that-CAUS as.well  
 ‘Her eyes are itching due to that/them/those [the flowers] as well.’

As mentioned in the previous chapter (p. 67), the prefix ᐃᐃ *da-* ‘such, so’ can combine with a range of syntactic phrase types, but most notably NPs, to serve as an indefinite demonstrative:

- (98) *Adareng da-dipakanas.*  
 Adareng da=dipakan-as  
 that-A.INAN such=pity-P  
 ‘That is such a pity.’

ᐃᐃ *da-* can be used to express English ‘one’ in the sense of a deictic anaphora as well. Thus, to express ‘the X one’, if X is an adjective, it is strictly speaking necessary to use the full demonstrative pronoun, ᐃᐃᐅᐅ *danya*, since adjectives do not decline, and Ayeri largely avoids undeclined NPs:<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See section 4.1.3 above for examples of situations where nouns regularly do not exhibit case marking.

- (99) a. *Silvyo danyāng kivo ku-mino-ing.*  
 Silv-yo danya-ang kivo ku=mino=ing  
 look-3SG.N such-A little like=happy=so  
 ‘The little one looks so happy.’
- b. *Sa noyang danya tuvo.*  
 Sa no=yang danya-Ø tuvo  
 PT want=1SG.A such-TOP red  
 ‘I want the red one.’

Nonetheless, in cases like (99b) where the demonstrative is topicalized, the prefixed form may be used, which is possible since 𐄂 *da-* is a clitic that binds to NPs, rather than nouns. As we have seen before, NPs do not exhibit overt case marking if topicalized, so whether 𐄂 *da-* leans on a superficially unmarked noun or an adjective, which is always unmarked for case, does not matter, since both are NPs. The sentence presented in (99b) is thus rather formal; less formally, the following is acceptable as well:

- (100) *Sa noyang da-tuvo.*  
 Sa no=yang da=tuvo.Ø  
 PT want=1SG.A such=red.TOP  
 ‘I want the red one.’

#### 4.2.3 Interrogative pronouns

The intererrogative pronouns are all formed with 𐄂 *si*, combined with a lexical element or a case marker; 𐄂 *si* is also related to the relativizer 𐄂 *si*. The interrogative pronouns are listed in Figure 4.8.

Figure 4.8: Interrogative pronouns

Pronoun	Literal meaning	Idiomatic meaning
𐄂𐄂 <i>sinya</i>	which one (𐄂𐄂 <i>nyān</i> ‘person’)	‘who’, ‘what’, ‘which’
𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>sikan</i>	how much (𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>ikan</i> ‘much’)	‘how much’, ‘how many’
𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>sikay</i>	with what (𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>kayvo</i> ‘with’)	‘how’ (tool, circumstance)
𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>simin</i>	which way (𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>miran</i> ‘way’)	‘how’ (way, procedure)
𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>sitaday</i>	which time (𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>taday</i> ‘time’)	‘when’
𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>siyan</i>	which place (𐄂𐄂𐄂 <i>yano</i> ‘place’)	‘where’

A property which all interrogative pronouns share is that they are placed *in situ*. That is, they appear in the same position as the phrase they stand in for,

so there will not be movement of the question word to the front as in English. Additionally, impersonal interrogative pronouns cannot be topicalized since they also do not inflect for case, which preempts the difference between zero-marked topicalized and overtly case-marked untropicalized forms.

- (101) a. *Sa petigavāṅ inun sikan?*  
 Sa petiga=vāṅ inun-Ø sikan  
 PT catch=2SG.A fish-TOP how.much  
 ‘How much fish did you catch?’
- b. *Sa-sabavāṅ sitaday?*  
 Sa~saha=vāṅ sitaday  
 ITER~come=2SG.A when  
 ‘When will you return?’

In the table on interrogative pronouns above,  $\text{ḥ}_2\text{ṣ}$  *sinya* ‘who, what, which’ is separated from the other pronouns because it behaves differently. Namely, it can be declined for all cases according to the syntactic or semantic role of the NP it replaces, and it can and will often be topicalized: what you query about will likely constitute the topic of the sentence and the answer.

- (102) a. *Ang yomayo sinya adaya?*<sup>16</sup>  
 Ang yoma-yo sinya-Ø adaya  
 AT exist-3SG.N who-TOP there  
 ‘Who is there?’
- b. *Sa narayeng sinya?*  
 Sa nara=yeng sinya-Ø  
 PT say=3SG.F.A what-TOP  
 ‘What did she say?’

Ayeri does not strictly distinguish animate and inanimate entities in its interrogative pronouns, so there is no distinction between ‘who’ and ‘what’.  $\text{ḥ}_2\text{ṣ}$  *sinya* and/or the verb will simply inflect according to context and to the speaker’s expectations or knowledge (compare Figure 4.9). Thus, there is also no dedicated question word for ‘why’, since in Ayeri one can simply ask ‘due to what/whom’ by inflecting  $\text{ḥ}_2\text{ṣ}$  *sinya*:

<sup>16</sup> This may be shortened to just  $\text{ḥ}_2\text{ṣ}$  *sinyāṅ adaya?* ‘who (is) there?’ (who-A there).

Figure 4.9: Declension paradigm for  $\text{ႬႬႬ}$  *sinya* ‘who, what’

Case	Pronoun	Translation
TOP	$\text{ႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinya</i>	‘who’, ‘what’
A	$\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyāng</i>	‘who’, ‘what’
A.INAN	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyareng</i>	‘who’, ‘what’
P	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyās</i>	‘whom’, ‘what’
P.INAN	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyaley</i>	‘whom’, ‘what’
DAT	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyayam</i>	‘for/to whom’, ‘for/to what’
GEN	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyana</i>	‘whose’, ‘from whom’, ‘from what’
LOC	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyaya</i>	‘in/at/on whom’, ‘in/at/on what’
CAUS	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyisa</i>	‘due to/because of whom’, ‘due to/because of what’
INS	$\text{ႬႬႬႬႬႬႬႬ}$ <i>sinyari</i>	‘by whose help’, ‘with what’

- (103) a. *Le kayāng adanya sinyayam?*  
 Le ka=yāng adanya-Ø sinyayam  
 PT.INAN throw.away=3SG.M.A that-TOP what-DAT  
 ‘Why (= what for) did he throw that away?’
- b. *Ang prantoyva sinyaisa?*  
 Ang prant-oy=va.Ø sinyaisa  
 AT ask-NEG=2SG.TOP what-CAUS  
 ‘Why (= because of what) did you not ask?’

While there is no dedicated ‘why’, Ayeri distinguishes between two kinds of ‘how’:  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *simin* asks about the way by which—or the circumstances under which—an action is carried out, whereas  $\text{ႬႬႬႬႬ}$  *sikay* asks for the means or tools used to carry out an action:

- (104) a. *Le tiyavāng vadisān simin?*  
 Le tiya=vāng vadisān-Ø simin  
 PT.INAN make=2SG.A bread-TOP how  
 ‘How do you make bread?’
- b. *Le peralvāng sagan sikay?*  
 Le peral=vāng sagan-Ø sikay  
 PT.INAN grind=2SG.A flour-TOP how  
 ‘How do you grind flour?’

The correct answer to the question in (104a) needs to treat the process of making bread, since  $\text{ႬႬႬႬ}$  *simin* asks about the way; a correct answer to the question in (104b),

on the other hand, will likely mention grinding utensils, like a mill or a pestle. Even though Ayeri possesses an instrumental case which can be used in a comitative way, note the conflation of that and the preposition of accompaniment,  $\text{ᶑᶞᶞ}$  *kayvo*, in this case (see section 4.1.3).

Comparing Tables 4.8 and 4.9, it may strike the reader's eye that there are two possibilities to express 'where'—lexical  $\text{ᶑᶞᶞ}$  *siyan* and synthetic  $\text{ᶑᶞᶞ}$  *sinyaya*. It is important to note, however, that these are not strictly interchangeable, even though some variation is to be expected. While  $\text{ᶑᶞᶞ}$  *siyan* refers to *places* in general, the  $\text{ᶑᶞᶞ}$  *sinya* series refers to *entities* both animate and inanimate more specifically:

- (105) a. *Saravāṅ siyan?* — *Ya Sikatay.*  
           Sara=vāṅ siyan — Ya Sikatay  
           go=2SG.A where — LOC Sikatay  
           ‘‘Where are you going?’’—‘‘To Sikatay.’’
- b. *Ya divvāṅ sinyā?* — *Ya Haki.*  
       Ya div=vāṅ sinyā-Ø — Ya Haki  
       LOCT stay=2SG.A who-TOP — LOC Haki  
       ‘‘Where are you staying?’’—‘‘At Haki’s’’

#### 4.2.4 Indefinite pronouns

Haspelmath (1997: 56) notes how descriptions of languages often do not document indefinite pronouns—whether they simply do not exist in this language or whether they escaped the author's attention remains unknown in these cases. It may thus be duly noted here that Ayeri does indeed possess indefinite pronouns.<sup>17</sup> In order to classify languages, Haspelmath generalizes the map displayed in Figure 4.10 based on a sample of 100 languages from all continents, although he notes that this sample has a European bias due to the availability of data (2). Languages typically form contiguous areas on the map, even though they may carve it up quite differently, and with overlaps between the different semantic groupings 1–9.

An interesting question that Haspelmath poses towards the end of his book is whether there are any correlations between word order typology and the preference for generic nouns ('person', 'thing', 'place', 'time', 'manner') or, for instance, interrogative-based systems (239–241). While from Haspelmath's concluding statistics it looks as though there is a slight preference of languages with which Ayeri shares basic typological traits—such as verb-initial, verb-object, and noun-genitive word order, also having prepositions—for basing indefinite pronouns on generic

<sup>17</sup> As it is a fictional language, the value of this assertion to linguistic typology remains doubtful, however.



Figure 4.10: The implicational map for indefinite pronoun functions (Haspelmath 1997: 4)




Figure 4.11: Indefinite pronouns

	every	some	none
PERSON	enya	arilinya	ranya
THING	enya	arilinya, arilya	ranya
PLACE	yanen	yāril	yanoy
TIME	tadayen	tajaril; metay	tadoy; jānyam
MANNER	arēn	miranaril	are moy

nouns, Haspelmath concedes that these seeming correlations are skewed by areal effects, “because indefinite pronouns have a strongly areal distribution” (241).<sup>18</sup> He still presumes, however, that word-order typology may have an effect on the formation of indefinites insofar as it correlates with grammaticalization more generally (239).

Haspelmath mentions generic nouns, and these can be combined with the quantifying expressions ‘every’, ‘any’, ‘some’, and ‘none’ into an array like the one presented in Figure 4.11. Ayeri does not distinguish ‘every’ from ‘any’ as English does; there is also no distinction in polarity (affirmative versus negative) the way English has it:

<sup>18</sup> The map in *WALS*, Haspelmath (2013), suggests areal clusters at least for generic-noun based systems in Africa and Southeast Asia. *WALS* classifies 194 out of 326 languages (60%) as possessing interrogative-based indefinite pronouns to date, with evidence for this type quoted for all continents except Africa. The next smaller group, generic-noun based, falls behind at 85 data points (26%). The curious lack of evidence for the interrogative type in Africa despite its being the most frequent one in the set on all other continents may be due to the unavailability of data. Crossreferencing the *WALS* data for constituent-order with the map on indefinite-pronoun systems did not yield a result which obviously suggested a correlation.

- (106) a. \*I don't know something about this.  
 b. I don't know anything about this.

Likewise, Ayeri does not distinguish between animate and inanimate indefinite referents—the same pronouns are used for either, although the shortening of *arilinya*, *arilya*, can only be used for inanimates, similar to the distinction in the demonstrative pronouns between *adanyāng* ‘that one’ (that.one-A) and *adareng* ‘that one’ (that.one-A.INAN; see section 4.2.2). Two further features stand out, however.

Firstly, most of the pronouns in the chart have a lexical part—Ayeri's indefinite pronouns are based on generic nouns. Thus, the pronouns referring to people and things all have the *-nya* element in common, which we also find in the interrogative and demonstrative pronouns, and which also appears in the word *nyān* ‘person’. In the same way, the pronouns related to the notion of place have a *ya-* or *yan-* part, which we also find in *yano* ‘place’.<sup>19</sup> In a regular continuation of this pattern, the indefinite pronouns of time all have an element related to *taday* ‘time’ in common, which is obscured somewhat by palatalization in *tajaril*. The exception to this series, then, is *jānyam*, which is the multiplicative numeral formed from *ja* ‘zero’, thus means ‘zero times’ or ‘not once’ rather than ‘never’, although it can also be used emphatically for the latter. The series of manner pronouns is an absolute exception in that it must be a residue from an older layer of grammaticalization since *are-* is not a recognizable morpheme in the modern language.<sup>20</sup> *miranaril* is a regular formation of *miran* ‘way, manner’ combined with the quantifier (!) for indefinite amounts, *-aril* ‘some’.

This observation leads to the second regular feature, that is, affixes as modifiers to generic nouns. The ‘every’ series regularly features the morpheme *en*, either prefixed or suffixed, which is related to the quantifier *-ben* ‘every, all, each’ and can presumably be found even on *arēn* in spite of its obscure lexical base. In the same manner, the series related to inspecific generic-noun referents is marked by the affix *aril* which, as we have just seen above, is otherwise used to refer to inspecific quantities, for instance, *vadisān-aril* ‘some bread’ (bread=some). In the case of *miranaril*, the suffix seems somewhat of an odd choice, since manner is not a quantifiable variable in the same way people, things, locations or moments are. Possibly, it is chosen rather in analogy with the other pronouns in this series than on semantic grounds. In any event, *metay* has the semantically

<sup>19</sup> *yano* itself is an old nominalization and very likely related as a morpheme to the locative suffix *-ya*.

<sup>20</sup> I probably made this up as I was going, many years ago, and without considering systematic implications, as I was unaware of them at the time.

more ‘proper’  $\text{me-}$  prefix, relating it to absolute inspecificity.<sup>21</sup> This alternation is employed to distinguish between the meaning of ‘sometime’, that is, occurring once an unspecified point in time, and  $\text{tajaril}$  ‘sometimes’, which refers to repeated occurrence at inspecific times. The alternation between  $\text{miranaril}$  and regularly derived  $\text{mā-miran}$  can be leveraged to express a specificity difference as well. While the former suggests that an action is carried out or an event is happening by means of a specific, though unknown procedure, the latter suggests just any possible procedure. Lastly, the negative series is regularly marked by the negative suffix  $\text{-oy}$ , which also occurs with adjectives and verbs (see sections 4.3.2 and 4.5.4). An outlier in this series is the person/thing-related indefinite pronoun,  $\text{ranya}$ . The etymologic connections of the  $\text{ra}$  part are not presently known, perhaps the postposition  $\text{ran}$  ‘against’ is related.

The chart in Figure 4.11 only tells half the truth by not giving any information on use contexts for the individual forms, so how do they fit in with the chart from Haspelmath (1997) quoted at the beginning of this section? Regarding the functions of indefinite pronouns annotated to the numbers on the map, he gives the following examples, which, however, mostly only give one example for either the ‘person’ or ‘thing’ category at a time. It is up to the reader to generalize from this (2–3):<sup>22</sup>

- (107)
1. specific, known to the speaker:  
*Somebody called while you were away: guess who!*
  2. specific, unknown to the speaker:  
*I heard something, but I couldn’t tell what kind of sound it was.*
  3. non-specific, irrealis:  
*Please try somewhere else.*
  4. polar question:  
*Did anybody tell you anything about it?*
  5. conditional protasis:  
*If you see anything, tell me immediately.*
  6. indirect negation:  
*I don’t think that anybody knows the answer.*
  7. direct negation:  
*Nobody knows the answer.*
  8. standard of comparison:  
*In Freiburg the weather is nicer than anywhere in Germany.*

<sup>21</sup> Compare German *irgendjemand* and French *n’importe qui* ‘no matter who’.

<sup>22</sup> These appear here reordered according to numerical order. The book lists them according to their logical order as tracing the map, the enumeration somewhat confusingly tied in with the running enumeration of examples.

Figure 4.12: Map of indefinite pronoun functions in Ayeri



9. free choice:  
Anybody can solve this simple problem.

As we have seen in Figure 4.11 above, Ayeri does not make a difference between ‘every’ and ‘any’, which is why the ‘some’ series can be applied to all of (1)–(5); it can also be used for indirect negation (6). The pronouns from the ‘none’ column, then, are used to express direct negation (7). Since double negation—that is, agreement in negation between verbs and indefinite pronouns for purposes of emphasis rather than double negation in the strictly logical sense—is possible, the ‘none’ series may also be employed for indirect negation (6). Moreover, Ayeri uses the ‘every’ series for both standard of comparison (8) and free choice (9). Besides this, absolute-indefinite *me-* can be used for (3)–(6) in combination with a (generic) noun to attach to. It needs to be noted that only the indefinite pronouns with person or thing reference (those including *nya*) decline; they can also be topicalized. The other indefinites, relating to place, time and manner, are indeclinable and also cannot be topics for this reason. For the ‘specific’ categories (1) and (2) it is furthermore possible to use the plain generic nouns, *nyān* ‘person’, *linya* ‘thing’, *yano* ‘place’, *taday* ‘time’, *miran* ‘way’, however. Figure 4.12 shows the groupings for Ayeri; (108) gives examples of all types.

- (108) 1. specific, known to the speaker:

- a. *Ang sabaya arilinya, leku, sinyāng adaley!*  
 Ang saha-ya arilinya-Ø lek-u sinyāng-ang ada-ley  
 AT come-3SG.M someone-TOP, guess-IMP who-A that-P.INAN

‘Someone came, guess who it is!’

- b. *Le ilta ningyang linya vayam.*  
 Le ilta ning=yang linya-Ø vayam  
 PT.INAN need tell=1SG.A thing-TOP 2SG.DAT

‘I need to tell you something.’

2. specific, unknown to the speaker:

- a. *Ang pegaya arilinya pangisley nā.*  
 Ang pega-ya arilinya-Ø pangis-ley nā  
 AT steal-3SG.M someone-TOP money-P.INAN ISG.GEN

‘Someone stole my money.’

- b. *Ang saratang yano-ya agon.*  
 Ang sara=tang yano-ya agon  
 AT go=3PL.M.A place-LOC foreign

‘They are going somewhere foreign.’

3. non-specific, irrealis:

- a. *Pinyan, prantu yāril palung.*  
 Pinyan prant-u yāril palung  
 Please ask-IMP somewhere different

‘Please ask somewhere else.’

- b. *Le ilta miranang adanya mǝ-miraneri palung.*  
 Le ilta mira=nang adanya-Ø mǝ=miran-eri palung  
 PT.INAN need do=ISG.A that.one-TOP some=way-INS different

‘We need to do that in some other way.’

4. polar question:

- a. *Ang koronva arilinyaley edanyana?*  
 Ang koron=va.Ø arilinya-ley edanya-na  
 AT know=2SG.TOP something-P.INAN this.one-GEN

‘Do you know anything about this?’

- b. *Yomaya mǝ-nyānang si ang vaca mirongya edanyaley?*  
 Yoma-ya mǝ=nyān-ang si ang vaca mira-ong=ya.Ø edanya-ley  
 exist-3SG.M some=person-A REL AT like do-IRR=3SG.M.TOP this-P.INAN

‘Is there *anyone* who would like to do this?’

5. conditional protasis:

- a. *Ang ming pengalayn sitanyās yāril, adareng pray-ven.*  
 Ang ming pengal=ayn.Ø sitanya-as yāril ada-reng pray=ven  
 AT can meet-IPL.TOP each.other-P somewhere that-A.INAN great=pretty

‘If we can meet somewhere that would be pretty great.’

- b. *Sa na-naravāng mǝ-lentan, ang haray vās!*  
 Sa na~nara=vāng mǝ=lentan-Ø ang har=ay.Ø vās  
 PT ITER~say=2SG.A some=sound-TOP AT punch-1SG.TOP 2SG.P

‘You make any more sound, I’m gonna punch you!’

6. indirect negation:

- a. *Paronoyyang, ang no tabaya arilinya adaley.*  
 Paron-oy=yang ang no taha-ya arilinya-Ø ada-ley  
 believe-NEG=ISG.A AT want have-3SG.M anyone-TOP that-P.INAN  
 ‘I don’t think anyone wants to have that.’
- b. *Paronoyyang, le ming sungvāng adanya yanoy.*  
 Paron-oy=yang le ming sung=vāng adanya-Ø yanoy  
 believe-NEG=ISG.A PT.INAN can find=2SG.A that.one=TOP nowhere  
 ‘I don’t think you can find that *anywhere*.’

## 7. direct negation:

- a. *Ang koronya ranya guratanley.*  
 Ang koron-ya ranya-Ø guratan-ley  
 AT know-3SG.M nobody-TOP answer-P.INAN  
 ‘Nobody knows the answer.’
- b. *Le ming sungvāng adanya yanoy.*  
 Le ming sung=vāng adanya-Ø yanoy  
 PT.INAN can find=2SG.A that.one=TOP nowhere  
 ‘You can’t find that anywhere.’

## 8. standard of comparison:

- a. *Sa engyeng larau enya palung.*  
 Sa eng=yeng larau enya-Ø palung  
 PT be.more=3SG.F.A nice anyone different  
 ‘She is nicer than anyone else.’
- b. *Ang engyo ban eda-riman yanen palung.*  
 Ang eng-yo ban eda=riman-Ø yanen palung  
 AT be.more=3SG.N good this=city-TOP anywhere different  
 ‘This city is better than anywhere else.’

## 9. free choice:

- a. *Ang ming guraca enya eda-prantanley.*  
 Ang ming gurat-ya enya-Ø eda=prantan-ley  
 AT can answer-3SG.M anyone-TOP this=question-P.INAN  
 ‘Anyone can answer this question.’
- b. *Epayeng tadayen si sa pinyaya ye ang Tapan.*  
 Epa=yeng tadayen si sa pinya-ya ye ang Tapan  
 refuse=3SG.F.A everytime REL PT ask-3SG.M 3SG.F.TOP A Tapan  
 ‘She refused everytime Tapan asked her.’

Figure 4.13: Relative pronouns

Case	Pronoun	Pronoun with secondary inflection				
		DAT	GEN	LOC	CAUS	INS
Ø	si	siyām	sinā	siyā	sisā	sirī
A	sang	sangyam	sangena	sangya	sangisa	sangeri
A.INAN	sireng	sirengyam	sirengena	sirengya	sirengisa	sirengeri
P	sas	sasyam	sasena	sasya	sasisa	saseri
P.INAN	siley	sileyyam	sileyena	sileyya	sileyisa	sileyeri
DAT	siyam	siyamyam	siyamena	siyamyā	siyamisa	siyameri
GEN	sina/sena	sinayam	sinana	sinaya	sinaisa	sinari
LOC	siya	siyayam	siyana	siyaya	siyaisa	siyari
CAUS	sisā	sisayam	sisana	sisaya	sisaisa	sisari
INS	seri	seriyam	serina	seriya	serīsa	seriri

#### 4.2.5 Relative pronouns

As has been described before, Ayeri connects relative clauses to main clauses with the relativizer *si*. This relativizer can be declined for case in accordance to the relative clause's head in the matrix clause. The respective forms can be gathered from Figure 4.13 (column 'Pronoun').

- (109) a. *Eryyo tarela natrangās si tado.*  
 Ery-yo tarela natranga-as si tado  
 use-3SG.N still temple-P REL old  
 'The temple, which is old, is still being used.'
- b. *Edanyāng ayonas sirtang sas ang sibabaya mondoas nana.*  
 Edanya-ang ayon-as sirtang si-as ang sihaba=ya mondo-as nana  
 this-A man-P young REL-P ang tend=3SG.M.TOP garden-P IPL.GEN  
 'This is the young man who tends our garden.'

As explained in section 3.3, if the relativizer is immediately following its lexical head, only the base form *si* is used, which is illustrated in (109a). Here, the head of the relative clause is *natrangās* 'the temple', which is immediately followed by the relative clause. If word material is intervening, however, which is the case in (109b), the relative pronoun may be inflected to agree in case with its antecedent in more formal language for referential clarity: *sas* agrees in case with *ayonas* two words over to the left. Relative pronouns do not agree in number with their heads, though, and in gender only insofar as it is relevant to nominal case inflection, that is, agents and patients are distinguished for animacy.

Table 4.3: Token frequencies of attested complex relative pronouns

Pronoun	Gloss	Absolute
<i>siyā</i>	REL.Ø.LOC	7
<i>sirī</i>	REL.Ø.INS	3
<i>sinā</i>	REL.Ø.GEN	1
<i>siyām</i>	REL.Ø.DAT	1
Total		12

A special property of the relative pronoun is that it can be declined for its role in the relative clause as well to express more complex relationships between the main clause and the relative clause. The respective forms can be found in the columns titled ‘Pronoun with secondary inflection’ in Figure 4.13. The token frequency of the actually occurring complex relative pronouns in the very small corpus gathered from example texts and dictionary entries (see section 1.2) is given in Table 4.3.

Compared to the unmarked relativizer *si*, which occurs 50 times in the sample (all relative pronouns from Figure 4.13 occur 80 times in total), the complex relative pronouns have a very low frequency. This is not surprising, since ‘for whom’, ‘by which’, etc. are quite specialized expressions. It also seems that those forms unmarked for their antecedent are preferred, since those are the only ones attested—the sample is really much too small to make actually meaningful judgements here, however. Examples of complex relative pronouns are:

- (110) a. *Le vacyang koya yana sileyya ang layāy adanyana.*  
 Le vac=yang koya-Ø yana si-ley-ya ang laya=ay.Ø adanya-na  
 PT.INAN like=1SG.A book-TOP 3SG.M.GEN REL-P.INAN-LOC A read=1SG.TOP that-GEN  
 ‘I like his book in which I read about it.’
- b. *Ya saratang yano siyām saratang.*  
 Ya sara=tang yano-Ø si-Ø-yām sara=asa=tang  
 LOCT go=3PL.M.A place-TOP REL-LOC-DAT go-HAB=3PL.M.A  
 ‘They went to the place to which they always went.’

It needs to be pointed out that a complex relative pronoun cannot form the topic of the relative clause even though it is marked for case according to the relative clause’s syntactic domain. Furthermore, the relative pronoun cannot receive inflection for an agent or a patient of the embedded clause. The following examples illustrate these points:



- (111) \*Mica edaya sobayāng si (ʔsī) na ibayang koyaley.  
 Mit-ya edaya sobaya-ang si-Ø-Ø na iha=yang koya-ley  
 live-3SG.M here teacher-A REL-A-TOP GENT borrow=1SG.A book-P.INAN

‘Here lives the teacher from whom I borrowed a book.’

- (112) \*Mica edaya sobayāng sāng le sobya payutān yām.  
 Mit-ya edaya sobaya-ang si-Ø-ang le sob-ya payutān-Ø yām  
 live-3SG.M here teacher-A REL-A-A PT.INAN teach-3SG.M math-TOP 1SG.DAT

‘Here lives the teacher who taught me math.’

- (113) \*Mica edaya sobayāng sās ya kradasayang kardang.  
 Mit-ya edaya sobaya-ang si-Ø-as ya krad-asa=yang kardang-Ø  
 live-3SG.M here teacher-A REL-A-P LOCT hate-HAB=1SG.A school-TOP

‘Here lives the teacher whom I used to hate in school.’

Example (111) displays a sentence in which the relative pronoun relative clause:  $\text{na}$  as a genitive topic is supposed to refer to ungrammatically forms the controller of topic agreement on the verb in the  $\text{sobayāng}$  in the matrix clause by way of the relativizer  $\text{si}$  which would then necessarily carry a zero-morpheme topic marker. There is no resumptive pronoun in the relative clause, so the relative pronoun itself forms the anaphora in the relative clause referring to the relativized argument of the matrix clause. This is not possible.

In example (112), the relative pronoun  $\text{sāng}$  carries no overt case agreement as it directly follows its antecedent ( $\text{sangang}$  otherwise) but the long vowel shows that it is declined as the agent of the relative clause; the verb agrees using  $\text{-ya}$  accordingly. There is no resumptive agent pronoun, so the relative pronoun would stand in for the agent NP that would be necessary if the relative clause were an independent sentence. The use of the relative pronoun as an agent-NP replacement in this sentence is equally ungrammatical, though, and so is the agreement between verb and declined relative pronoun.

Similarly, in (113), the relative pronoun carries case marking for the patient of the relative clause, since the agent of the matrix clause serves as the patient NP of the embedded clause. This is not grammatical either.

Altogether, it seems that in Ayeri, core arguments of intransitive and transitive clauses—agents and patients—cannot precede the embedded verb of a relative clause; the verb firmly forms the head of the embedded clause in this regard. The relative pronoun also cannot receive secondary marking for agents and patients and stand in directly as the agent and patient NP of the relative clause, respectively. It is interesting in this regard that Ayeri *does* allow this for recipients, however, maybe since by their nature as goals they carry something of a locative connotation

(compare (110b)) and are thus less tightly integrated with verbs, occupying a middle ground between core arguments and adverbials like the locative proper.<sup>23</sup>

#### 4.2.6 Reflexives and reciprocals

As mentioned previously, Ayeri forms its reflexives with the prefix *sitang-* in combination with a personal pronoun, compare (114). If the agent of the action is the same as the reflexive patient—that is, the agent acts on itself—the reflexive prefix can also migrate onto the verb instead, which is demonstrated in (115).

- (114) *Ang silvye sitang=yes puluyya.*  
 Ang silv=ye.Ø sitang=yes puluy-ya  
 AT see=3SG.F.TOP self=3SG.F.P mirror-LOC

‘She sees herself in the mirror.’

- (115) *Ang sitang-silvye puluyya.*  
 Ang sitang=silv=ye.Ø puluy-ya  
 AT self=see=3SG.F.TOP mirror-LOC

‘She sees herself in the mirror.’

Doing the same with a non-patient pronoun does not work, however, so the sentence in (115) with the reflexive *sitang-* marked on the verb is not equivalent to the following one, in which *sitang-* appears together with a personal pronoun in the locative case, even though here as well, the agent and the locative pronoun refer to the same entity:

- (116) *Ang silvye sitang-yea puluyya.*  
 Ang silv=ye.Ø sitang=yea puluy-ya  
 AT look=3SG.F.TOP self=3SG.F.LOC mirror-LOC

‘She looks at herself in the mirror.’

It may be noted furthermore that the genitive/possessive pronoun series conveys the meaning of ‘one’s own’, which is completely regular in meaning (‘of X-self’), however:

<sup>23</sup> This would be interesting to explore in terms of grammaticalization, as it is very possible that this behavior reflects a stage of the language before *ɔɣ* *-yam* had been grammaticalized as the dative marker. In this respect, it would as well be necessary to explore whether the similarity between the dative marker *ɔɣ* *-yam* and the locative marker *ɔ* *-ya* is indeed etymological or merely incidental.

- (117) *Le no erylonyang pakay sitang-nā.*  
 Le no ery-ong=yang pakay-Ø sitang=nā  
 PT.INAN want use-IRR=ISG.A umbrella-TOP self=ISG.GEN  
 ‘I’d like to use my own umbrella.’

Besides reflexive pronouns, Ayeri also has a reciprocal pronoun, *ᱥᱟᱱᱟᱜ sitanya* ‘each other’. This pronoun acts the same as other pronouns and can be inflected according to its function in the clause:

- (118) a. *Ang narayan Ajān nay Pila sitanyaya.*  
 Ang nara-yan Ø Ajān nay Pila sitanya-ya  
 AT talk-3PL.M TOP Ajān and Pila each.other-LOC  
 ‘Ajān and Pila talk to each other.’  
 b. *Sa ming tangtang sitanya.*  
 Sa ming tang=tang sitanya-Ø  
 PT can hear=3PL.M.A each.other-TOP  
 ‘They can hear each other.’

## 4.3 Adjectives

Adjectives are one of the parts of speech in Ayeri which do not inflect for any of the grammatical properties of their heads, that is, there is no agreement relation between adjectives and nominal heads. They do inflect for comparison under certain circumstances, however, and can also take various affixes that modify the meaning of the adjective stem.

### 4.3.1 Comparison

In cases where a comparee is left unexpressed or the patient forms the standard of comparison, Ayeri uses clitic suffixes on adjectives. The suffixes involved are *-eng* (COMP) and *-vā* (SUPL):

- (119) a. *Yeng ganyena men si alingo-eng.*  
 Yeng gan-ye-na men si alingo=eng  
 3SG.F.A child-PL-GEN one REL clever=COMP  
 ‘She is one of the more clever children.’  
 b. *Ang tavya Diyan tingracas ban-eng na Maha.*  
 Ang tav-ya Ø Diyan tingrati-as ban=eng na Maha  
 AT become-3SG.M TOP Diyan musician-P good=COMP GEN Maha  
 ‘Diyan became a better musician than Maha.’

- c. *Garatang, yāng pokamayās para-vā.*  
 Gara=tang, yāng pokamaya-as para=vā  
 name=3PL.M.A, 3SG.M.A shooter-P fast=SUPL

‘They named him the fastest shooter.’

In (119a) the comparee is missing, while in (119b), the quality under comparison, *tingracas ban-eng* ‘a better musician’, is a patient NP; the standard, *Maha*, is expressed by an adverbial genitive NP. The example in (119c) similarly expresses an absolute without giving a group of entities to draw from. In all these cases, it is, however, also possible to use a more complex analytic construction using verbs which will be covered at a later point.

#### 4.3.2 Negation

Adjectives in Ayeri can be negated in two ways: categorially with *-arya*, and pragmatically with *-oy*. These correspond to English *un-*, and *in-, il-, ir-* etc. for categorial negation, and to *not* for pragmatic negation. *-oy* absorbs the vowel of the root it is attached to if said root ends in a vowel.

- (120) *Telbaya miseryanang ku-ardārya.*  
 Telba-ya miseryan-ang ku=arda-arya  
 show-3SG.M method-A like=suitable-NEG

‘The method proved unsuitable.’

- (121) *Pakoy eda-yanoreng.*  
 Paka-oy eda=yano-reng  
 safe-NEG this=place-A.INAN

‘This place is not safe.’

Example (120) displays an adjective which carries the categorial negation marker *-arya*; the adjective in (121) carries the simple, pragmatic negation marker *-oy*. Which one to use is up to the speaker, since both negate the described property. The categorial marker puts an emphasis more on expressing a general opposite, while the pragmatic marker simply negates, so that it is not necessarily implied that the negative state persists. The place that is *pakoy* ‘not safe’ now is not necessarily *pakārya* ‘unsafe’ in general, but simply not safe in the context of the here and now of the utterance.

Besides *ad hoc* derivation of categorial negatives with *-arya*, there are also a few lexicalized instances. These have an idiomatic meaning and the negator or the word itself may be irregularly reduced. Examples are, among others:

- (122) a. *ban* ‘good’ → *banaya* ‘ill, sick’  
 b. *kovaro* ‘easy’ → *kovarya* ‘awkward’  
 c. *sirimang* ‘straight’ → *sirimaya* ‘passive’

#### 4.3.3 Adjectivization

Adjectives in Ayeri are very commonly zero derivations, that is, there is rather free conversion between nouns and adjectives,<sup>24</sup> for instance:

- (123) a. *Ayeri* ‘Ayeri’ ~ *Ayeri* ‘Ayeri’  
 b. *disa* ‘soap, lye’ ~ *disa* ‘soapy, alkaline’  
 c. *gino* ‘drink’ ~ *gino* ‘drunk’  
 d. *pabamay* ‘danger’ ~ *pabamay* ‘dangerous’  
 e. *sempay* ‘peace’ ~ *sempay* ‘peaceful’

Adjectives can also be derived from verbs with the causative suffix *-isa*, which often corresponds to adjectives derived from the past participle form—the meaning is often, but not necessarily, relating to an achieved state. The suffix may change the last vowel to *u* or drop it; a specific pattern to these changes is not recognizable. The derivations may be idiomatic occasionally, as some derivations in the example below show.

- (124) a. *kelang-* ‘connect’ → *kelangisu* ‘connected, related’  
 b. *palung-* ‘distinguish’ → *palungisa* ‘various’  
 c. *sundala-* ‘lose’ → *sundalisu* ‘lost’  
 d. *taban-* ‘write’ → *tabanis* ‘literary’  
 e. *vesa-* ‘give birth’ → *vesisa* ‘native’

There are also at least two words where an *-isa* adjective is derived not from a verb, but a word of a different part of speech—in this case, a noun, and another adjective:

- (125) a. *apin* ‘luck’ → *apinisa* ‘lucky’  
 b. *iray* ‘high’ → *irayisu* ‘exalting’

<sup>24</sup> Adjectives and split-off modifiers in noun–noun compounds are thus similar at least superficially.

#### 4.3.4 Other affixes

As with nouns, other affixes which can be attached to adjectives as clitic hosts, are the prefix  $\text{ku-}$ , expressing semblance, as well as quantifying and grading suffixes, of which the suffixes used to express comparative and superlative are, essentially, a grammaticalized variety, since  $\text{-eng}$  can also be used like ‘rather’.

- (126) *Paray-parayang ku-pikisu*  
 Paray~paray-ang ku=pikisu  
 DIM~cat-A like=scared  
 ‘The kitten is like scared.’

- (127) *Eda-prikanreng napay-eng*  
 Eda=prikan-reng napay=eng  
 this=soup-A.INAN spicy=rather  
 ‘This soup is rather spicy.’

### 4.4 Adpositions

Adpositions are another part of speech in Ayeri whose stem itself does not inflect. Ayeri’s most basic adpositions are derived from relational nouns, which is likely the reason why Ayeri mostly employs prepositions, with postpositions and ambipositions being less important placement patterns (Hagège 2010: 110–111; Lehmann 2015: 81 ff.). Adpositions in their most basic use trigger locative marking on the governed NP, the prepositional object; for allative and ablative meanings, the prepositional object may also appear in the dative and the genitive case, respectively, as described in section 4.1.3.<sup>25</sup> The cognitive metaphor ‘time equals space’ with the future conceptualized as lying ahead and the past behind also holds in Ayeri, so that some of the words describing locations also double to describe temporal relations.

#### 4.4.1 Prepositions

Figure 4.14 gives all the words in Ayeri which may be used as prepositions. As mentioned above, most of these are derived transparently from nouns, so they have probably been grammaticalized relatively recently—their non-preposition meaning is still transparent, they are still phonologically rather complex, and some of them

<sup>25</sup> Even a prolative use together with the instrumental is thinkable.

<sup>26</sup> There is also a preposition  $\text{dayrin}$  ‘side’ listed in the dictionary, however, this has never seen much use. Instead,  $\text{kayvo}$  has come to cover ‘beside, to the side of’ as well.

Figure 4.14: Prepositions (simple)

	Preposition	Etymology (or related to)
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>agonan</i>	outside
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>avan</i>	bottom, ground
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>eyran</i>	under, below
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>eyrarya</i>	over
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>kayvo</i>	with, beside <sup>26</sup>
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>kong</i>	inside, within
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>ling</i>	on
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>luga</i>	among, between
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>mangasaba</i>	towards, in + time
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>mangasara</i>	away
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>marin</i>	front, on (walls etc.)
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>miday</i>	around
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>nasay</i>	near, close
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>nuveng</i>	left
ᐱᐱᐱ	<i>pang</i>	behind, ago
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>patameng</i>	right
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>agonan</i>	‘outside’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>avan</i>	‘ground, bottom; soil’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>eyran</i>	‘sole’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>eyrarya</i>	‘sole’ + ᐱᐱᐱᐱ - <i>arya</i> (NEG)
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>kayv-</i>	‘accompany’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>kong</i>	‘inside’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>ling</i>	‘top’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>luga-</i>	‘pass, penetrate’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>manga saba-</i>	‘coming’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>manga sara-</i>	‘going’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>marin</i>	‘face, surface’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>miday-</i>	‘surround’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>nasay</i>	‘proximity’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>nuho</i>	‘liver’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>pang</i>	‘back’
ᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱᐱ	<i>patam</i>	‘heart’

are even polysyllabic in spite of not being composed and covering rather basic meanings.<sup>27</sup> Since these nouns have ceased to function as common nouns, however, it is not possible to inflect them in the way described in section 4.1. Thus, for example, while it is possible to say (128a), it is not really possible to say (128b):

- (128) a. *Le yomareng kanka lingya rivanena.*  
 Le yoma=reng kanka-Ø ling-ya rivan-ena  
 PT.INAN exist=3SG.INAN.A SNOW-TOP top-LOC mountain-GEN

‘There is snow on the top of the mountain.’<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Unsurprisingly, Hagège (2010: 129) references Zipf regarding speech economy and token frequency. According to Lehmann (2015: 134–141), the phonological integrity of morphemic units reduces as grammaticalization is progressing (with token frequency increasing due to increasing obligatoriness). Bybee and Hopper (2001) see the reason for phonological reduction of highly frequent phonological material “in the automatization of neuro-motor sequences [...]”. Such reductions are systematic across speakers; that is, they do not represent ‘sloppy’ or ‘lazy’ speech” (11). Hence, for example, English’s most basic prepositions are extremely short and simple words, for instance, *of*, *at*, *in*, which derive from the slightly more complex PIE forms *\*h<sub>2</sub>ep-ó*, *\*h<sub>2</sub>ed*, *\*h<sub>1</sub>en(-i)*, respectively (Kroonen 2013: 1, 39, 269). Since adpositions frequently grammaticalize into case markers, it may be assumed that the phonologically much more simple case affixes of Ayeri constitute an older layer of basic adpositions. Their non-suffixed forms may be remnants of this use.

- b. \**Ang nedraye lingya nedrānena.*  
 Ang nedra=ye.Ø ling-ya nedrān-na  
 AT sit=3SG.F.TOP top-LOC chair-GEN  
 ‘She sits on the top of a chair.’

Instead, the grammatical way to express (128b) is the following, using ማገገ *ling* as a preposition with the object in the locative case:

- (129) *Ang nedraye ling nedrānya.*  
 Ang nedra=ye.Ø ling nedrān-ya  
 AT sit=3SG.F.TOP top chair-LOC  
 ‘She sits on a chair.’

In this case, since *on* is the expected position of sitting with regards to chairs, the preposition can even be dropped:

- (130) *Ang nedraye nedrānya.*  
 Ang nedra=ye.Ø nedrān-ya  
 AT sit=3SG.F.TOP chair-LOC  
 ‘She sits on a chair.’

With regards to (128a) it is also necessary to mention what Hagège calls the ‘Proof by Anachrony Principle’ (Hagège 2010: 158–159). According to this principle, when an adposition is very grammaticalized, speakers can use both the adposition and its etymological ancestor side by side without taking offense in the double occurrence. This is notably not the case in Ayeri, where it is not possible to say things like (131a), where ማገገ *pang* is used in both its meanings so that the preposition ማገገ *pang* ‘behind’ governs the original noun ማገገ *pang* ‘back’.

- (131) a. \**Le ranice ang Maha adanya pang pangya yena.*  
 Le ranit-ye ang Maha adanya-Ø pang pang-ya yena  
 PT.INAN hide-3SG.F A Maha that-TOP back back-LOC 3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘\*Maha hides it at the back of her back.’  
 b. *Le ranice ang Maha adanya pangya yena.*  
 Le ranit-ye ang Maha adanya-Ø pang-ya yena  
 PT.INAN hide-3SG.F A Maha that-TOP back-LOC 3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘Maha hides it at her back,’  
 or: ‘Maha hides it behind herself.’

<sup>28</sup> The corresponding sentence with a preposition is ማገገ ማገገ ማገገ ማገገ ማገገ *Le yomareng kanka ling rivanya* ‘There is snow on top of the mountain’ (PT.INAN exist=3SG.INAN.A snow-TOP top mountain-LOC).



Examples like (128b), on the other hand, show that there is nonetheless a tendency towards grammaticalization of originally relational nouns in Ayeri. Grammaticalization is visible in that formerly relational nouns have become restricted in the way they can be used syntactically (Lehmann 2015: 174). This specialization is also apparent in morphology from the fact that prepositions in Ayeri, in spite of their nominal origin, cannot be modified by adjectives and relative clauses like regular nouns. Thus, for instance, while  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{avan}$  as a noun can mean ‘soil’ or ‘ground’ and can be modified by semantically coherent adjectives like  $\text{ṣ-ṣ} \text{ } \text{kabu}$  ‘fertile’, the preposition  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{avan}$  cannot. Again, a grammatical way to express (132b) would have to use  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{avan}$  as a relational noun, that is,  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{ṣ-ṣ} \text{ } \text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{avan} \text{ } \text{kabu} \text{ } \text{similena}$  ‘at the fertile bottom of the country’ (bottom-LOC fertile country-GEN).

- (132) a.  $\text{Sa yomareng} \quad \text{avan} \quad \text{kabu} \quad \text{ibangya} \quad \text{yana}.$   
            $\text{Sa yoma=reng} \quad \text{avan-}\emptyset \quad \text{kabu} \quad \text{ibang-ya} \quad \text{yana}$   
           PT exist=3SG.INAN.A.INAN ground-TOP fertile field-LOC 3SG.M.GEN  
           ‘Fertile ground is on his field.’
- b. \* $\text{Ang mican} \quad \text{avan} \quad \text{kabu} \quad \text{similya}$   
        $\text{Ang mit=yan.}\emptyset \quad \text{avan} \quad \text{kabu} \quad \text{simil-ya}$   
       AT live=3PL.M.TOP bottom fertile country-LOC  
       \*‘They live at the fertile bottom of the country.’

At the beginning of this section it was shown that prepositions in Ayeri cannot receive number and case marking, which are otherwise typical features of nouns. What is possible with regards to affixes, however, is adding degree suffixes to prepositions, since these suffixes are clitics, selecting phrasal heads as their hosts, rather than inflections:

- (133)  $\text{Ang mitasaye} \quad \text{pang-ikan} \quad \text{mandayya} \quad \text{tado}.$   
        $\text{Ang mit-asaye.}\emptyset \quad \text{pang=ikan} \quad \text{manday-ya} \quad \text{tado}$   
       AT live-HAB=3SG.F.TOP back=much forum-LOC old  
       ‘She used to live way behind the old forum.’

As demonstrated before, another quasi-inflection adpositions in Ayeri can carry is the dynamic marker  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{manga}$  (see section 3.1). While most of the prepositions in Figure 4.14 have a static meaning,  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{manga}$  indicates a motion in the direction of the respective location, thus  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{kong}$  ‘inside’ becomes  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{manga} \text{ } \text{kong}$  ‘into’, for instance. Figure 4.15 repeats the table of prepositions above for the most part and gives the respective dynamic meanings. The prepositions  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{mangasaba}$  and  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{mangasara}$  are missing from this list and appear in the previous table instead, even though they express motion rather than position, because they are only used in this base form and cannot be prefixed by  $\text{ṣ-r} \text{ } \text{manga}$ , which they already contain.

Figure 4.15: Prepositions (dynamic)

Preposition	<i>manga</i> + PREP
၁၀၁၁ <i>agonan</i> ‘outside’	out
၁၀၁၂ <i>avan</i> ‘at bottom’	to the bottom; <i>with</i> DAT/GEN: down to/from
၁၀၁၃ <i>eyran</i> ‘under’	under
၁၀၁၄ <i>eyrarya</i> ‘over’	across, over
၁၀၁၅ <i>kayvo</i> ‘with, beside’	along
၁၀၁၆ <i>kong</i> ‘inside’	into
၁၀၁၇ <i>ling</i> ‘on top’	onto, while; <i>with</i> DAT/GEN: up to/from
၁၀၁၈ <i>luga</i> ‘between’	through, during, for + <i>time</i>
၁၀၁၉ <i>marin</i> ‘in front’	to the front
၁၀၂၀ <i>miday</i> ‘around’	circling around
၁၀၂၁ <i>nasay</i> ‘near’	into the near
၁၀၂၂ <i>nuveng</i> ‘left’	to the left
၁၀၂၃ <i>pang</i> ‘behind’	behind, to the back
၁၀၂၄ <i>patameng</i> ‘right’	to the right

Note, however, that မာၣ်မာၣ် *mangasaba* and မာၣ်မာၣ် *mangasara* are not synonymous to an adjunct in the dative and the genitive case, respectively. Rather, the prepositions add a more deliberate or literal meaning:

- (134) a. *Ang nimpay kardangyam.*  
 Ang nimp=ay.Ø kardang-yam  
 AT run=ISG.TOP school-DAT  
 ‘I’m running to (a/the) school.’  
 (e.g. for class, or just up to the building)
- b. *Ang nimpay mangasaba kardangya.*  
 Ang nimp=ay.Ø mangasaha kardang-ya  
 AT run=ISG.TOP towards school-LOC  
 ‘I’m running towards (a/the) school.’  
 (up to the building)

- (135) a. *Ang lampay kardangena.*  
 Ang walk=ay.Ø kardang-ena  
 AT walk=1SG.TOP school-GEN  
 ‘I’m walking from (a/the) school.’  
 (e.g. home, or somewhere else from there)
- b. *Ang lampay mangasara kardangya.*  
 Ang lamp=ay.Ø mangasara kardang-ya  
 AT walk=1SG.TOP away school-LOC  
 ‘I’m walking away from (a/the) school.’  
 (away from the building)

Also note that while Germanic languages like English make frequent use of set expressions which combine a verb with a preposition, such as *run away*, *go by*, *raise up*, *track down*, sometimes with rather idiomatic meanings, this pattern does not occur as frequently in Ayeri. Some exceptions are:

- (136) a. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *il- mangasara* ‘surrender’ (give away),  
 b. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *lant- mangasara* ‘distract’ (lead away),  
 c. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *nimp- mangasara* ‘escape’ (run away),  
 d. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *tapy- dayrin* ‘save (valuable assets)’ (put aside),  
 e. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *tapy- miday* ‘put on’ (put around),  
 f. ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *tura- mangasaba* ‘forward’ (send towards).

These verbs do not govern a prepositional object in the locative case in their idiomatic meaning, as displayed by the next example, in which ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *batangiman* and ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *sa Ajān* do neither serve as arguments of ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *lanco* or ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *mangasara*, but of the phrasal verb ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *lant- mangasara*.<sup>29</sup>

- (137) *Ang lanco mangasara batangiman sa Ajān.*  
 Ang lant-yo mangasara batangiman-Ø sa Ajān  
 AT lead-3SG.N away mosquito-TOP P Ajān  
 ‘The mosquito distracted Ajān.’

Very often, where the verb expression in English contains a preposition, there is a separate verb in Ayeri, or the same verb is used in Ayeri for both the plain English verb and the one extended by a preposition:

<sup>29</sup> Colloquially, ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *mangasaba* and ၵၵၵၵၵၵ *mangasara* may be shortened to just ၵၵၵၵ *saba* and ၵၵၵၵ *sara*, respectively.

- (138) a. ႁႏႏႏ: *apand*- ‘descend, climb down’,  
 b. ႁႏႏ: *dila* ‘figure out, find out’,  
 c. ႏႏႏႏ: *ling*- ‘ascend, mount, climb up’,  
 d. ႏႏႏ: *naga*- ‘watch after’,  
 e. ႏႏႏ: *pah*- ‘remove, take away’,  
 f. ႏႏႏ: *subr*- ‘cease, give up’.
- (139) a. ႁႏ: *ka*- ‘throw (away)’,  
 b. ႁႏႏ: *mat*- ‘warm (up)’,  
 c. ႏႏႏႏ: *sikl*- ‘rip (up)’.

In cases where the preposition does not have a prepositional object otherwise, its double nature as a noun comes to the fore in that the preposition word will be treated like a noun if it is denominal and carries the appropriate case marker itself:

- (140) a. *Ang sabayan manga pang nangaya.*  
 Ang saha=yan.Ø manga pang nanga-ya  
 AT go=3PL.TOP DYN back house-LOC  
 ‘They go behind the house.’
- b. *Ang sabayan pangyam.*  
 Ang saha=yan.Ø pangyam  
 AT go=3PL.TOP back-DAT  
 ‘They go behind (it),’  
 or: ‘They go to the back.’

#### 4.4.2 Postpositions

While Ayeri mainly uses prepositions—which is by far the most common order for VO languages (Dryer 2013)—it also uses a number of postpositions, which are given in Figure 4.16. As can be read from the figure, postpositions do not usually have a nominal origin but are derived either from other prepositions, from adverbial phrases, or even from an adjective in the case of ႏႏ *rayu*. The etymologies of ႏႏ *pesan* and ႏႏ *yamva* are unclear to date.

The postposition ႏႏ *pang* is special in that it also exist as a preposition meaning ‘behind, in the back of’, though as a postposition it acquires the related but slightly different meaning ‘beyond, after, past’. It might thus be better treated as a homonym to the preposition rather than as an ambiposition (Hagège 2010: 115). Example (141a) illustrates a use of ႏႏ *pang* as a preposition, (141b) one of ႏႏ *pang* as a postposition. This is in contrast to typical ambipositions like German *wegen*

Figure 4.16: Postpositions

	Postposition	Etymology (or related to)
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>da-nārya</i>	despite, in spite of
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>kayvay</i>	without
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>masahatay</i>	since
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>nasyam</i>	according to
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>pang</i>	beyond, after, past
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>pesan</i>	until
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>ran</i>	against
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>rayu</i>	diagonally across
𑌕𑌃𑌃𑌃𑌃	<i>yamva</i>	instead of

‘because of, due to’ in (142), which has the same meaning in either position and the position variant is just a matter of style.

- (141) a. *Sa lancāng pel manga pang penungya.*  
 Sa lant=yāng pel-Ø manga pang penung-ya  
 PT lead=3SG.M.A horse-TOP DYN back barn-LOC  
 ‘The horse, he leads it behind the stable.’
- b. *Lesyo pelang si sã nimpjong penungya pang yan.*  
 Les-yo pel-ang si sã nimp=yong penung-ya pang yan.Ø  
 fall-3SG.N horse-A REL CAUT run=3SG.N.A stable-LOC back 3PL.TOP  
 ‘The horse they raced past the barn fell.’

- (142) a. *wegen des schlechten Wetters* [German]  
*wegen des schlecht-en Wetter-s*  
 because.of DEF.GEN.N.SG bad-GEN.N.SG weather-GEN  
 ‘because of the bad weather’
- b. *des schlechten Wetters wegen*  
*des schlecht-en Wetter-s wegen*  
 DEF.GEN.N.SG bad-GEN.N.SG weather-GEN because.of  
 (idem)

Besides the difference in placement, the morphological properties of postpositions are the same as those of prepositions. That is, where postpositions are derived from nouns at all, they do not receive case and number marking and cannot themselves be modified by adjectives or relative clauses. Generally, it is possible for them to be hosts of quantifier clitics where semantics permit it.

Figure 4.17: Adpositions with temporal meaning

Adposition	Spatial meaning	Temporal meaning
<b>Prepositions</b>		
ꠘꠞꠤ <i>kong</i>	inside	within
ꠞꠞꠤ <i>ling</i>	on top of	while
ꠞꠞꠤ <i>marin</i>	in front of	before
ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ <i>manga luga</i>	through	during
ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ <i>mangasaba</i>	towards	in + <i>time</i>
ꠞꠞꠤ <i>pang</i>	behind	ago
<b>Postpositions</b>		
ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ <i>masahatay</i>	—	since
ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ <i>pesan</i>	—	until
ꠞꠞꠤ <i>pang</i>	beyond, after	after, past

#### 4.4.3 Adpositions and time

It has been mentioned above that location also serves as the conceptual metaphor for expressing temporal relationships. Notably the prepositions ꠘꠞꠤ *kong* ‘inside’, ꠞꠞꠤ *ling* ‘on’, ꠞꠞꠤ *marin* ‘in front of’, ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ *manga luga* ‘through’, ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ *mangasaba* ‘towards’, and ꠞꠞꠤ *pang* ‘behind’ come to mind as doubling for ‘within’, ‘while’, ‘before’, ‘during’, ‘in + *time*’, and ‘ago’, respectively (also see Figure 4.17). Since postpositions are not primarily derived from nouns, there are dedicated forms for expressing temporal relationships, namely, ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ *masahatay* ‘since’, ꠞꠞꠤ ꠞꠞꠤ *pesan* ‘until’, and as the only form with a double function, ꠞꠞꠤ *pang* ‘after, past’.

- (143) a. *Miranang kong bihanya sam.*  
 Mira=nang kong bihan-ya sam  
 do=IPL.A inside week-LOC two  
 ‘We will do it within two weeks.’
- b. *Girenjang mangasaba pidimya-kay.*  
 Girend=yang mangasaha pidim-ya=kay  
 arrive=3SG.M.A towards hour-LOC=few  
 ‘He will arrive in a few hours.’
- c. *Layaye-ikan ang Pila ling yeng pakur.*  
 Laya-ye=ikan ang Pila ling yeng pakur  
 read-3SG.F=much A Pila on 3SG.F.A sick  
 ‘Pila read a lot while she was sick.’

Of the examples above, the use of ႁႏႱ *kong* in (143a) is probably still closest to a local preposition in that the time span is conceptualized as a container, or the distance between two points. The use of ႁႏႱႱ *mangasaba* in (143b), on the other hand, is more idiomatic. While the prepositions in these two examples each govern an NP, example (143c) shows that it is also possible for prepositions expressing a temporal relationship to govern a subclause. This ability is even more prominent with temporal postpositions in that all of the words listed above can govern either an NP or a clause, for instance, ႁႏႱႱ *masabatay*:

- (144) a. *Ang manga hangya lakayperinya masabatay.*  
 Ang manga hang=ya.Ø lakayperin-ya masahatay  
 AT PROG stay=3SG.M.TOP solstice-LOC since  
 He has been staying since the solstice.
- b. *Yeng giday sarayāng masabatay.*  
 Yeng giday sara=yāng masahatay  
 3SG.F.A sad leave=3SG.M.A since  
 ‘She has been sad since he left.’

## 4.5 Verbs

Besides nouns, verbs constitute the other main part of speech in Ayeri which carries inflections. Verbs show person and number agreement, but may also inflect for tense, aspect, mood, and modality as grammatical categories of the verb itself. Personal pronouns may furthermore cliticize to the verb stem, and the verb phrase is also often marked with a clitic indicating the topic of the sentence and the topic NP’s role in Ayeri’s case system, which can be interpreted as a second agreement relation. Further clitics may indicate reflexive actions, likeness, logical connection, as well as degree and measure. Verbs are thus probably the most versatile part of speech on the one hand, but also the one with the heaviest workload on the other. The following sections will dissect the morphology of verbs category by category. Since cliticization is a phrase-level process (Klavans 1985), it will only be touched on briefly here. Because verbs inhabit a central position in syntax and exhibit agreement morphology, it will be necessary in this section to merge syntax and morphology on occasion in order to describe morphosyntactic effects.

### 4.5.1 Person–number marking

As described in section 3.3, Ayeri conjugates its main verbs, canonically in agreement with the agent NP, and verb conjugation as such is extremely pervasive. The basic

Figure 4.18: Conjugation paradigm for  $\text{ᲔᲗ}$ : *sob*- ‘learn, teach’ (monoconsonantal root)

Person	Singular		Plural	
1SG	<i>sobay</i>	‘I learn’	<i>sobayn</i>	‘we learn’
2SG	<i>sobva</i>	‘you learn’	<i>sobva</i>	‘you learn’
3SG.M	<i>sobya</i>	‘he learns’	<i>sobyan</i>	‘they learn’
3SG.F	<i>sobye</i>	‘she learns’	<i>sobyen</i>	‘they learn’
3SG.N	<i>sobyō</i>	‘it learns’	<i>sobyon</i>	‘they learn’
3SG.INAN	<i>sobara</i>	‘it learns’	<i>sobaran</i>	‘they learn’
IMP	<i>sobu!</i>	‘learn!’		
HORT	<i>sobu-sobu!</i>	‘let’s learn!’		
ITER	<i>so-sob-</i>	‘learn again, relearn’		
PTCP	<i>sobyam</i>	‘learning’		

Figure 4.19: Conjugation paradigm for  $\text{ᲔᲗᲗ}$ : *anl*- ‘bring’ (biconsonantal root)

Person	Singular		Plural	
1SG	<i>anlay</i>	‘I bring’	<i>anlayn</i>	‘we bring’
2SG	<i>anlava</i>	‘you bring’	<i>anlava</i>	‘you bring’
3SG.M	<i>anlya</i>	‘he brings’	<i>anlyan</i>	‘they bring’
3SG.F	<i>anlye</i>	‘she brings’	<i>anlyen</i>	‘they bring’
3SG.N	<i>anlyō</i>	‘it brings’	<i>anlyon</i>	‘they bring’
3SG.INAN	<i>anlara</i>	‘it brings’	<i>anlaran</i>	‘they bring’
IMP	<i>anlu!</i>	‘bring!’		
HORT	<i>anlu-anlu!</i>	‘let’s bring!’		
ITER	<i>an-anl-</i>	‘bring again, bring back’		
PTCP	<i>anlyam</i>	‘bringing’		

conjugation paradigms are given in Figures 4.18–4.20.<sup>30</sup> Agreement causes verbs to reflect grammatical categories of nominal entities, thus, verbs show agreement in person (1, 2, 3) and number (SG, PL); third persons are again differentiated by gender (M, F, N, INAN; compare section 4.1.1). The conjugation suffixes are basically the same as the topic-marked (thus superficially unmarked) personal pronouns (see section 4.2.1).

Regarding person–number inflection, verbs may be divided into three classes:

<sup>30</sup> Due to the agglutinating structure of Ayeri it makes little sense to list the whole paradigm of verb inflection for all possible affix combinations here, as the table would become unreasonably large. Instead, the various sections below will contain examples of use for all affixes.



Figure 4.20: Conjugation paradigm for 𐌵𐌶: *no-* ‘want’ (vocalic root)

Person		Singular		Plural
1SG	<i>noay</i>	‘I want’	<i>noayn</i>	‘we want’
2SG	<i>nova</i>	‘you want’	<i>nova</i>	‘you want’
3SG.M	<i>noya</i>	‘he wants’	<i>noyan</i>	‘they want’
3SG.F	<i>noye</i>	‘she wants’	<i>noyen</i>	‘they want’
3SG.N	<i>noyo</i>	‘it wants’	<i>noyon</i>	‘they want’
3SG.INAN	<i>noara</i>	‘it wants’	<i>noaran</i>	‘they want’
IMP	<i>nu!</i>	‘want!’		
HORT	<i>nu-nu!</i>	‘let’s want!’		
ITER	<i>no-no-</i>	‘want again’		
PTCP	<i>noyam</i>	‘wanting’		

monoconsonantal, biconsonantal, and vocalic stems. As discussed in section 1.2, Ayeri restricts the number of successive non-glide consonants to two, which has repercussions in the second person, since the conjugation suffix there is 𐌶 *-va*. Monoconsonantal roots are unaffected by this restriction, however, hence the conjugation suffixes can simply be appended as they are; this is illustrated with the verb 𐌵𐌶: *sob-* ‘teach, learn’ in Figure 4.18. Verb stems ending in dental and velar plosives will naturally undergo palatalization in the third person animate, so for instance, the third person singular masculine of the verb 𐌵𐌶𐌵: *gurat-* ‘answer’ is 𐌵𐌶𐌵𐌶 *guraca* ‘(he) answers’, and the third person feminine plural of 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *abag-* ‘roam, wander’ is 𐌵𐌶𐌶𐌶 *abajen* ‘(they) roam, (they) wander’. Verbs whose stem ends in an affricate are treated as monoconsonantal roots as well, since the affricate occupies one consonant phoneme segment. Thus, the second person of 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *ic-* ‘glide, slide’ is not \*𐌵𐌶𐌶𐌶 \**icava*, but 𐌵𐌶𐌶 *icva* ‘you glide, you slide’.

Since /v/ is neither a vowel nor a glide, as present in the non-second person suffixes, an epenthetic *-a-* is inserted between the stem and the second-person suffix for verbs whose stem ends in *-CC*.<sup>31</sup> This is illustrated in Figure 4.19 for the verb 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *anl-* ‘bring’. The second person conjugation of this verb is not \*𐌵𐌶𐌶𐌶 \**anlva*, since the cluster *-nlv-* is illegal, but 𐌵𐌶𐌶𐌶 *anlava*. Since Ayeri treats two successive instances of the same consonant as a single segment—there is no gemination—verbs like 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *silv-* ‘see’ conjugate like monoconsonantal roots with regards to consonant clusters. That is, the second person of 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *silv-* is not \*𐌵𐌶𐌶𐌶 \**silvava*, as one might expect, but 𐌵𐌶𐌶 *silvva*. A further exception to this are verbs ending in *-Cs*, since *-Cs-C-* is commonly resyllabified as *-C-sC-* (see chapter 1, footnote 13). Thus, the

<sup>31</sup> A root is understood here as the uninflected verb morpheme, for instance, 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *anl-*, 𐌵𐌶𐌶: *ic-*, 𐌵𐌶: *no-*, or 𐌵𐌶: *sob-*. A stem may contain inflections and further inflectional affixes attach to it.

second-person form of 𐌂𐌆𐌆𐌆: *kars-* ‘freeze’ is not \*𐌂𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 \**karsava* as expected, but 𐌂𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 *karsva* ‘you freeze’.

Lastly, verb stems may end in a vowel, most commonly *-a*. In these cases as well, the conjugation suffixes may simply be appended to the stem. The conjugation of this class is illustrated in Figure 4.20 with the verb 𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 *no* ‘want’. Verb stems ending in *-a* undergo the regular vowel lengthening process for the first person suffixes, hence, the first person singular conjugation of 𐌂𐌆𐌆𐌆: *apa-* ‘laugh’ is 𐌂𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 *apāy* ‘I laugh’. Verb stems ending in a diphthong in /ɪ/ are essentially treated as a hybrid of monoconsonantal and vocalic stems, since the diphthong’s final /ɪ/ is treated as /j/ before a vowel: 𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 *palayay* ‘I rejoice’, 𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆𐌆 *palayva* ‘you rejoice’.

As mentioned above, the person marking on verbs is essentially the same as the topic-marked personal pronouns. This has further ramifications for person-marking on verbs, however, insofar as—again, canonically—even fully case-marked agent pronouns may act as person marking by means of cliticization. Thus, any person-marking on verbs except third-person agreement is, in fact, a topicalized pronoun clitic not only by diachronic origin. Unlike English, Ayeri does not use agent pronouns in addition to person agreement on verbs. Consider these two example sentences in English:

- (145) a. *John greets Mary.* [English]  
           John greet-s Mary  
           John greet-3SG.PRS Mary
- b. *He greets Mary.*  
           He greet-s Mary  
           3SG.M greet-3SG.PRS Mary

In these examples, the verb has an agreement suffix *-s* which indicates third person singular, present tense, whether the subject of the sentence is a noun (*John*) or a pronoun (*he*), which acts as a free morpheme in English. Now consider the Ayeri equivalents of these two examples, on the other hand:<sup>32</sup>

- (146) a. *Ang manya Ajān sa Pila.*  
           Ang man-ya Ø Ajān sa Pila  
           AT greet-3SG.M TOP Ajān[3SG.M] P Pila[3SG.F]  
           ‘Ajān greets Pila.’

<sup>32</sup> Most of the following account is taken nearly verbatim from a previously published blog article, Becker (2016b). Some of the Ayeri examples used in the following come from a list of samples I provided for a bachelor’s thesis at the University of Kent in March 2016, in private conversation, on request.

- b. *Ang manya sa Pila.*  
 Ang man=*ya.Ø* sa Pila  
 AT greet=<sub>3SG.M.TOP</sub> P Pila[<sub>3SG.F</sub>]  
 ‘He greets Pila.’

It is probably uncontroversial to analyze *sa -ya* in (146a) as person agreement: *ᄇᆞᆫᆫᆞᆫ Ajān* is a male name in Ayeri while *ᄇᆞᆫ Pila* is a feminine one; the verb inflects for a masculine third person, which tells us that it agrees with the one doing the greeting, *Ajān*. *Ajān* is also who this is about, which is shown on the verb by marking for an agent topic. In the second case, there is only anaphoric reference to *Ajān*, so you might say that the agent NP is left out. Very broadly thus, the verb marking here seems to be like in Spanish, where you can drop the subject pronoun:

- (147) a. *Juan saluda a María.* [Spanish]  
 Juan salud-a a María  
 John greet-<sub>3SG ACC</sub> Mary  
 ‘John greets Mary.’  
 b. *Saluda a María.*  
 Salud-a a María  
 greet-<sub>3SG ACC</sub> Mary  
 ‘He greets Mary.’

Example (146b) probably does not seem conspicuous either, except that there is also topic marking for an agent there, the controller of which I have so far assumed to be the person inflection on the verb, in analogy with examples like the following:

- (148) *Lampyāng.*  
 Lamp=*yāng*  
 walk=<sub>3SG.M.A</sub>  
 ‘He walks.’

This raises the question whether in Ayeri, there is dropping of an agent pronoun involved at all, which is why the person suffix in (146b) was glossed as *=ya.Ø* (<sub>3SG.M.TOP</sub>) rather than just as *-ya* (<sub>3SG.M</sub>). In turn, this question leads us to consider another characteristic of Ayeri, namely that the topic morpheme on noun phrases is zero. That is, the absence of overt case marking on a nominal element indicates that it is a topic; the verb in turn marks the case of the topicalized NP with a (case) particle preceding it. Pronouns as well show up in their unmarked

form when topicalized, which is why I am hesitant to analyze the pronoun in (149b) as a clitic on the VP rather than an independent morpheme:<sup>33</sup>

- (149) a. *Sa manya ang Ajān Pila.*  
 Sa man-ya ang Ajān Ø Pila  
 PT greet-3SG.M A Ajān TOP Pila  
 ‘It’s Pila that Ajān greets.’
- b. *Sa manyāng ye.*  
 Sa man=yāng ye.Ø  
 PT greet=3SG.M.A 3SG.F.TOP  
 ‘It’s her that he greets.’

What is remarkable, then, is that *ye* (3SG.F.TOP) is the very same form that appears as an agreement morpheme on the verb, just like *-ya* (3SG.M) in various examples above (also compare the examples in section 4.2.1):

- (150) *Ang purivaye yāy.*  
 Ang puriva=ye.Ø yāy  
 AT smile=3SG.F.TOP 3SG.M.LOC  
 ‘She smiles at him.’

This also holds for all other personal pronouns. Moreover, *yāng* as seen in examples (148) and (149b) may also be used as a free pronoun in equative statements with predicate nominals, as well as other such case-marked personal forms:

- (151) a. *Yeng mino.*  
 Yeng mino  
 3SG.F.A happy  
 ‘She is happy.’
- b. *Yāng naynay.*  
 Yāng naynay.  
 3SG.M.A too  
 ‘He is, too.’

As for case-marked person suffixes on verbs, the assumption so far has been that they are essentially clitics, especially since the following marking strategy is the grammatical one in absence of an agent NP:

<sup>33</sup> Also, perhaps a little untypically, topic NPs in Ayeri are not usually pulled to the front of the phrase (at least not in the written language; see Lehmann 2015: 120–122), so topic-marked pronouns stay in-situ. Which NP constitutes the topic of the phrase is marked on the verb right at the head of the clause. How and whether this can be justified in terms of grammatical weight (see, for instance, Wasow 1997: 95–98) remains to be seen.

- (152) a. *Manye sa Pila.*  
 Man-ye sa Pila  
 greet-3SG.F P Pila  
 ‘Pila is being greeted.’
- b. *Manyes.*  
 Man=yes.  
 greet=3SG.F.P  
 ‘She is being greeted.’

The verb here agrees with the patient—or is it that person agreement suffixes on verbs are generally clitics in Ayeri, even where they do not involve case marking? There seems to be a gradient here between what looks like regular verb agreement with the agent on the one hand, and agent or patient pronouns just stacked onto the verb stem on the other hand. For an overview, compare Figure 4.21. In this figure, especially the middle, transitional category is interesting in that what looks like verb agreement superficially can still govern topicalization marking, which is indicated in column II by an index ‘1’. Note that this behavior only occurs in transitive contexts; there is no topic marking on the verb if the verb only has a single NP dependent. Also consider that for example (b) in the type III transitive cell the question is, whether this should not better be analyzed as AT ...-3SG.M.TOP ...-TOP ...-P, with co-indexing of the topic on the person inflection of the verb, making it structurally closer to type II.

As for personal pronouns fused with the verb stem like in the first column, Corbett points out that

In terms of syntax, pronominal affixes are arguments of the verb; a verb with its pronominal affixes constitutes a full sentence, and additional noun phrases are optional. If pronominal affixes are the primary arguments, then they agree in the way that anaphoric pronouns agree [...] In terms of morphology, pronominal affixes are bound to the verb; typically they are obligatory [...]. (Corbett 2006: 99–100)

This seems to be exactly what is going on for instance in (148) and (152b), where the verb forms a complete sentence. It needs to be pointed out that Corbett includes an example from Tuscarora, a native American polysynthetic language, in relation to the above quotation. Ayeri should not be considered polysynthetic, however, since its verbs generally do not exhibit relations with multiple NPs, at least as far as person and number agreement is involved (Comrie 1989: 45–46).<sup>34</sup>

<sup>34</sup> The topic NP marked on the verb may be a different from the one with which the verb agrees in person and number, so technically, Ayeri verbs *may* agree with more than one NP in a very limited way (compare section 3.3). Still, I would not analyze this as polypersonal agreement, since there is only canonical verb agreement with one constituent, that is, the agent NP. Topic marking should, in my opinion, be viewed as a separate agreement relation, as pointed out in the quoted section above.

Figure 4.21: Verb inflection types in Ayeri

	Type I: Clitic pronouns	Type II: Transitional	Type III: Verb agreement
<b>Inflectional categories</b>	Person Number Case	Person Number Case/Topic	Person Number
<b>Examples (intransitive)</b>	...=yāng ...=3SG.M.A	—	...-ya <sub>1</sub> ...-ang <sub>1</sub> ...-3SG.M ...-A
<b>Examples (transitive)</b>	sa <sub>1</sub> ...=yāng ...-Ø <sub>1</sub> PT ...=3SG.M.A ...-TOP	ang <sub>1</sub> ...=ya.Ø <sub>1</sub> ...-as AT ...=3SG.M.TOP ...-P	a. ang <sub>1</sub> ...-ya <sub>1</sub> ...-Ø <sub>1</sub> ...-as AT ...-3SG.M ...-TOP ...-P  b. a <sub>1</sub> ...-ya <sub>2</sub> ...-ang <sub>2</sub> ...-Ø <sub>1</sub> PT ...-3SG.M ...-A ...-TOP

Taking everything written above so far into account, it looks much as though Ayeri is in the process of grammaticalizing personal pronouns into person agreement (Lehmann 2015: 42–45; Gelderen 2011: 493–497). Corbett (2006: 76–77) illustrates an early stage of such a process:

- (153) a. *Ke móe ke=fue.* (\**Ke móe fue.*) [Skou]  
           3SG.M fish 3SG.M=see.3SG.M  
           ‘He saw a fish.’
- b. *Pe móe pe=fu.* (\**Pe móe fu.*)  
           3SG.F fish 3SG.F=see.3SG.F  
           ‘She saw a fish.’

What Gelderen calls the *subject cycle*, the “oft-noted cline expressing that pronouns can be reanalyzed as clitics and agreement markers” (Gelderen 2011: 493) applies here, and as well in Ayeri. However, while she continues to say that in “many languages, the agreement affix resembles the emphatic pronoun and derives from it” (494), Ayeri does at least in part the opposite and uses the case-unmarked, unstressed form of personal pronouns for what resembles verb agreement most closely. This, however, should not be too controversial either, considering that, for instance, semantic bleaching and phonetic erosion go hand in hand with grammaticalization (Lehmann 2015: 136–137; Gelderen 2011: 497).

As pointed out above in (152), Ayeri usually exhibits verbs as agreeing with agents and occasionally patients, not topics as such. This may be a little counterintuitive since the relation between topics and subjects is close, but is possibly due to the fact that the unmarked word order is VAP. This means that agent NPs usually follow the verb, and it strikes me as not too unnatural to have an agreement relation between the verb and the closest NP also when non-conjoined NPs are involved (Corbett 2006: 180). This conveniently explains why verbs can agree with patients as well if the agent NP is absent. Taking into account that the grammaticalization process is still ongoing so that there is still some relative freedom in how morphemes may be used if a paradigm has not yet fully settled (Lehmann 2015: 148–150) also makes this seem less strange. Verbs simply become agreement targets of the closest semantically plausible nominal constituent. Ayeri seems to be shifting from topics to subjects, and as a consequence the bond between agents and verbs is strengthened due to their usual adjacency; developing verb agreement with agents may be seen as symptomatic of this change.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>35</sup> When translating things in Ayeri, I find myself very often using agent topics, which may be because I am used to subjects proper. Supposing that this is also what Ayeri prefers in-universe, it would make sense to assume the usual grammaticalization path by which topics become subjects, thereby also leading to subject-verb agreement by means of resumptive pronouns

Figure 4.22: The syntax and morphology of pronominal affixes (Corbett 2006: 101)

Syntax:	non-argument	argument	
Linguistic element:	‘pure’ agreement marker	pronominal affix	free pronoun
Morphology:	inflectional form		free form

Signs so far point towards Ayeri’s person agreement in fact being more likely enclitic pronominal affixes, even what I had been thinking of as person agreement before (that is, suffixes on the verb that only encode person and number, but not case). The question is, then, how this might be corroborated. Corbett offers a typology here, see Figure 4.22. According to this typology, a pronominal affix is syntactically an argument of the verb but has the morphology of an inflectional form. If we compare this to the gradient given in table 1 above, it becomes evident that type I definitely fulfills these criteria, and type II does so as well, in fact, in that there is no agent NP that could serve as a controller if the verb inflection in type II were ‘merely’ a agreement target. The inflection in type III, on the other hand, appears to have all hallmarks of agreement in that there is a controller NP that triggers it, with the verb serving as an agreement target. Moreover, the person marking on the verb is not a syntactic argument of the verb. As example (152a) shows, however, marking of type III permits the verb to mark more than one case role, which makes it slightly atypical, although verbs can only carry a single instance of person marking (Corbett 2006: 103). Regarding referentiality, the person suffixes on the verb in table 1, columns I and II are independent means of referring to discourse participants mentioned earlier, whereas the person suffix in III needs support from an NP in the same clause as a source of morphological features to share:

- (154) a. *Ajān ... Ang manya sa Pila.*  
           *Ajān ... Ang man=ya.Ø sa Pila*  
           *Ajān ... AT greet=3SG.M.TOP P Pila*  
           ‘Ajān ... He greets Pila.’

referring back to left-dislocated topics (Lehmann 2015: 121–122; Gelderen 2011: 499–500). Lehmann (2015: 120) gives colloquial French *Jean, je l’ai vu hier* ‘John, I saw him yesterday’ as an example here: the object clitic *l’* (← *le* ‘him’) may well develop into an agreement affix (also see Gelderen (2011: 498) on a dialect of Spanish in which, she argues, this has happened).



- b. *Ajān ... Sa manyāng Pila.*  
*Ajān ... Sa man=yāng Ø Pila*  
*Ajān ... PT greet=3SG.M.A TOP Pila*  
 ‘Ajān ... It’s Pila that he greets.’
- c. \**Ajān ... Manya sa Pila.*  
*Ajān ... Man-ya sa Pila*  
*Ajān ... greet-3SG.M P Pila*

Since person marking of the type I and II is *referential*, as shown in example (154a) and (154b), it can be counted as a cliticized pronoun (103). Pronouns in Ayeri can also refer to non-people—there are both a ‘neuter’ gender for non-people considered living (or being closely associated with living things), and an ‘inanimate’ gender for the whole rest of things (compare section 4.1.1). Since mere agreement as in type III needs support from an NP within the verb’s scope, though, it does not have *descriptive/lexical content* of its own. That is, it *only* serves a grammatical function (104), not strictly as an anaphora. As for Corbett’s *balance of information* criterion, Figure 4.21 also highlights differences in what information is provided by the person marking. Nouns in Ayeri inherently bear information on person, number, and gender, and all three types of person inflection on verbs share these features. However, there are no extra grammatical features indicated by the first two inflection types that are not expressed by noun phrases, although under a very close understanding of Corbett, the following example (155) may still qualify as person-marking on the verb realizing a grammatical feature shared with an NP that is not openly expressed by the NP. He writes that in the world’s languages, this frequently is number (105). This, however, does not apply to Ayeri because the only time verbs display number not expressed overtly by inflection on a noun is in agreement like in type III (a):<sup>36</sup>

- (155) *Ang sabayan ayon kay kong nangginoya.*  
*Ang saha-yan ayon-Ø kay kong nanggino-ya*  
 AT come-3PL.M man-TOP three into tavern-LOC

‘Three men come into a pub.’

As shown above, verb marking of the types I and II is independent as a reference, so there is *unirepresentation* of the marked NP. In contrast, verb marking of type III requires a controlling NP in the same clause to share grammatical features with, so that there is *multirepresentation* typical of canonical agreement (106). Note that unirepresentation as outlined here is probably different from pro-drop, as in this

<sup>36</sup> From a Lexical-Functional Grammar point of view, the number feature of *kay* in (155) coalesces with the semantic features provided by *ayon* in the maximal projection; agreement is thus with the whole agent NP rather than just with *ayon* as the NP’s categorial head.

case I would expect sentences like (154c) to be grammatical (Corbett 2006: 107). A further property that hinges on types I and II being independent pronouns glued to verbs as clitics is that they are not coreferential with another NP of the same grammatical relation, but are in complementary distribution, as commonly assumed with pronominals (108). Hence, either of these two examples is ungrammatical:

- (156) a. \**Lampyāng*      *ang* *Ajān*.  
           Lamp=yāng    *ang* *Ajān*  
           walk=3SG.M.A    A    *Ajān*
- b. \**Ang*    *lampyāng*              *Ajān*.  
           *Ang*    lamp=yāng      Ø    *Ajān*  
           AT    walk=3SG.M.A    TOP    *Ajān*

However, verb agreement with a free pronoun is also not possible even though it might be expected according to (109)—also compare example (145b) above. Instead, the agent pronoun replaces any possible person agreement on the verb:

- (157) a. *Lampyāng*.  
           Lamp-yāng  
           walk=3SG.M  
           ‘He walks.’
- b. \**Lampya*    *yāng*.  
           Lamp-ya    *yāng*  
           walk-3SG.M    3SG.M.A

In conclusion, we may assert that Ayeri appears to be in the process of grammaticalizing pronouns as verb inflections, however, how far this grammaticalization process has progressed is dependent on syntactic context. Ayeri displays a full gamut from personal pronouns (usually agents) glued to verbs as clitics to agreement with coreferential NPs that is transparently derived from these personal pronouns. With the latter, the complication arises that coreferential pronoun NPs are not allowed as agreement controllers as one might expect, but only properly nominal NPs. Slight oddities with regards to Austronesian alignment—Ayeri’s actors bear more similarities to subjects than expected, but still without fully conflating the two notions—can possibly be explained by a strengthening of the verb-agent relationship pointed out as a grammaticalization process in this article as well. Information on agreement with committee nouns and coordinated NPs with incongruent agreement features can be found in the section on VPs.

#### 4.5.2 Tense

Tense in Ayeri is often not explicitly marked, but has to be inferred from context. However, where marked, Ayeri distinguishes past and future as referring to past and

future events, respectively. Both past and future tenses come with three degrees each: near, recent/impending, and remote. Ayeri's distinguishing three degrees of both past and future time is a little unusual with regards to typology according to the survey conducted by Dahl (1985: 127). The decision for which subtier of the past and the future to use is up to pragmatics, that is, there are no definitive and clear-cut lines. The near-time markers are most commonly used for immediate scope, that is, things which have just happened or will happen in a moment. The recent/impending-time markers may then be used for anything else which does not qualify as remote, that is, a long time into the past or the future from the point of view of the speaker.

Dahl (1985: 117) further notes that among the languages in the surveyed sample, past tenses are mostly marked by suffixes, the marking of this category being extremely common in addition. Ayeri may thus be a little unusual crosslinguistically again by exclusively using prefixes for tense marking. This makes sense, however, if we assume that historically, the tense prefixes once were auxiliary verbs. Ayeri applies head-first word order to subordinating verbs, as we will see further below, so these prefixes may just have begun to *procliticize* instead of slipping into a position behind their head (that is, Wackernagel's position).

Of the triad tense-aspect-mood this section will only cover basic uses of the marked tense categories, followed by a discussion of complex tense combinations such as past-in-future. The subsequent section 4.5.3 will provide more insight into the morphological marking of aspectual categories; section 4.5.4 deals with the morphology of mood marking in Ayeri.

#### *Present tense*

Verbs in Ayeri are unmarked for present tense, as it is the normal mode of speaking. Besides being used to comment or report on current events, the present tense is also used to make statements of general truth:

- (158) *Sa arapyo tabanyamanang koyana nogalam-ikan.*  
 Sa arap-yo tahanyaman-ang koya-na nogalam-Ø=ikan  
 PT require-3SG.N writing-A book-GEN patience-TOP=much

'Writing a book requires much patience.'

Moreover, Ayeri does not strictly mark its verbs for past tense in narrative discourses—verbs may thus appear as though with a present-time reference in spite of recounting past events, whether historical or fictional. See the next subsection on the past tense.

- The reference to a past time frame is explicitly given in this example by the adverbial phrase *ṣṣu22ṣṣṣ* *bihanya sarisa* ‘last week’, hence the verb appears here simply as *ṣṣṣṣṣ* *kondayn*, rather than with redundant past-tense marking as *ṣṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *məkondayn*. Since past tense is often underspecified in Ayeri, the language also does not employ epic past forms in narrative contexts like English, among others, commonly does:

- (161) The sky above the port was the color of television, tuned to a dead channel.  
(Gibson 1995 [1984]: 9)

This quote is, of course, the first sentence of Gibson’s novel *Neuromancer*, which never mentions any definite dates, but is clearly set in a future world, maybe somewhere around the middle of the twenty-first century. Yet, however, Gibson recounts events which are logically happening in an imagined future as having already happened in the past: he uses the past tense as a convention of storytelling. What Ayeri, then, does in contrast to English is to basically treat stories as though happening in the present; adverbials referring to past time may, again, set up the correct time frame if required. Ayeri is in good company here, since according to Dahl “[m]ore common than marking narrative contexts [...] is not marking them—quite a considerable number of languages use unmarked verb forms in narrative contexts” (Dahl 1985: 113). This, however, is yet different from a narrative present, that is, the use of present tense within a past context, which languages like English may use in narrative contexts to increase the feeling of immediacy and thus raise suspense. The following example from an Ayeri translation of the well-known Aesopian fable, ‘The North Wind and the Sun’ (compare Aesop 2007), illustrates Ayeri’s non-marking of tense on verbs in narrative contexts:

- (162) *Ang manga ranyon adauyi Pintemis nay Perin, engyo*  
 Ang manga ran-yon adauyi Ø Pintemis nay Ø Perin, eng-yo  
 AT PROG argue-3PL.N then TOP North Wind and TOP Sun, be.more-3SG.N  
*mico sinyāng luga toya, lingya si lugaya asāyāng si*  
 mico sinyā-ang luga toya, ling-ya si luga-ya asāya-ang si  
 strong who-A among 3PL.N.LOC, while-LOC REL pass-3SG.M traveler-A REL  
*sitang-naykonyāng kong tovaya mato.*  
 sitang=naykon=yāng kong tova-ya mato.  
 self=wrap=3SG.M.A inside cloak-LOC warm.

‘The North Wind and the Sun were then arguing which among them is stronger, all the while a traveler passed by who had wrapped himself in a warm cloak.’

#### Future tense

Future tense marks explicit references to future time in Ayeri, that is, “someone’s plans, intentions or obligations” (Dahl 1985: 103), as well as predictions. The future prefixes behave analogously to the ones indicating past tense: *n*: *pə-* indicates immediate/near future (NFUT), *ḥ*: *sə-* indicates impending future (FUT), and *ṣ*: *ni-* indicates remote future (RFUT). Underlying the reduced vowels in *n*: *pə-* and *ḥ*: *sə-* are /a/ and /e/, respectively, so that these prefixes cause adjacent vowels of the same type to lengthen as usual; the same, of course, applies to *ṣ*: *ni-* regarding /i/. The following examples show the future tense markers in context:

- (163) a. *Pəsahayang!*  
 Pə-saha=yang  
 NFUT-come=ISG.A  
 'I'm coming (in a moment)!'
- b. *Ang səkarsayn kankaya.*  
 Ang sə-kars=ayn.Ø kanka-ya  
 AT FUT-freeze=ISG.TOP SNOW-LOC  
 'We will freeze in the snow.'
- c. *Paronatang, nisa-sahaya dibakayāng.*  
 Parona=tang ni-sa~saha-ya dihakaya-ang  
 believe=3PL.M.A RFUT-ITER~come-3SG.M prophet-A  
 'They believe that the prophet will return (one day).'

Like the past tense, the future is often not explicitly marked if the time frame is clear from context or has been clarified with such adverbials as *tasela* 'tomorrow', *mangasaha pericanya* 'in a year', or *metay* 'sometime':

- (164) *Ang raypāy vaya bibanya mararya.*  
 Ang raypa=ay.Ø vaya bihan-ya mararya  
 AT stop=ISG.TOP 2SG.LOC week-LOC next  
 'I'm stopping by you next week.'

It is possible here to explicitly mark the verb for future tense as well, for example, to make a promise, or to otherwise emphasize that the future condition will come to pass:

- (165) *Səsidejang tasela, diran.*  
 Sə-sideg=yang tasela diran  
 FUT-repair=ISG.A tomorrow uncle  
 'I will repair it tomorrow, uncle.'

### Past in past

So far, we have only dealt with tense marking from the point of view of the present. However, it is also possible to refer to an event which precedes another event in the past. Ayeri makes little use of auxiliary verbs, and thus the regular morphological and pragmatic means of tense marking have to cover this relation as well. In order to indicate pre-past events, it is customary to explicitly mark the verb for past time in Ayeri, in difference to the common lack of morphological marking for plain past tense. However, as it is possible for the *ə: mə-* prefix to be used to refer to 'regular' past events from a present point of view as well, context again has to provide the

information that the frame of reference is past in this case, rather than the speaker's present.

(166) CONTEXT: Ajān's past travels

*Ya məsaraya iri maritay ang Ajān Tasankan*  
 Ya ma-sara-ya iri maritay ang Ajān Ø Tasankan  
 LOCT PST-go-3SG.M already before A Ajān TOP Tasankan

'Tasankan, Ajān had already gone there before.'

The above example is essentially ambiguous as to the reference point. The explicit tense marking draws attention to the fact that the event definitely lies in the past and the adverbs underline this fact. Instead of reading the sentence as referring to a pre-past event, it is equally possible to read it from a present-time point of view as 'Ajān has already gone to Tasankan before', although under these circumstances, it would be more common to leave the *ə: mə-* out, as described in section 4.5.2:

(167) CONTEXT: Ajān's current traveling plans

*Ya saraya iri maritay ang Ajān Tasankan*  
 Ya sara-ya iri maritay ang Ajān Ø Tasankan  
 LOCT go-3SG.M already before A Ajān TOP Tasankan

'Tasankan, Ajān already went there before.'

Likewise, it is possible to make plans in the past with the intention of them coming to fruition only later, possibly at a point before the current time or even further in the future. The English idiom to express this time relation is 'was going to'; in Ayeri, the relation cannot be expressed by morphological means, but only by lexical ones. Thus, *ŋ*: *no-* 'want; plan to' must be used, together with explicit past marking. Since *ŋ*: *no-* is a modal particle (see section 4.5.5), inflection is placed on the content verb.

(168) CONTEXT: Ajān's having gone to Tasankan

*Ang no məinca tosangyeley biro yam Pila.*  
 Ang no ma-int=ya tosang-ye-ley hiro yam Pila  
 AT want PST-buy=3SG.M.TOP earring-PL-P.INAN new DAT Pila

'He had planned to buy new earrings for Pila.'

The time relation expressed here is, thus, essentially that of a pre-past event again, since the planning of the action of buying took place before the time of going to Tasankan.

*Past in future*

Of course, it is also possible to refer to future actions or events which will already have happened before a point further in the future. From the point of view of the later event, the closer event will thus already lie in the past, forming its prerequisite. As with future-in-past, there is no way in Ayeri to mark this relation morphologically, but lexical means have to be used, that is, first and foremost the adverb  $\text{ḡḡ}$  *iri* ‘already’, which indicates that an action has been completed in the past. As with other future actions, the time frame must be inferred from context if it is not indicated explicitly by temporal adverbs or future-tense marking (compare section 4.5.2).

(169) CONTEXT: Ajān’s traveling to Tasankan

<i>Ang</i>	<i>girenja</i>	<i>iri</i>	<i>nilay</i>	<i>sirutayya</i>	<i>tamala</i>	<i>pesan.</i>
Ang	girend=ya.Ø	iri	nilay	sirutay-ya	tamala	pesan
AT	arrive=3SG.M.TOP	already	probably	evening-LOC	tomorrow	before

‘He will probably already (have) arrive(d) before tomorrow evening.’

Strictly speaking, the above example does not make it explicit whether Ajān *will arrive* before evening or *will have arrived*. In order to indicate that the action is all but complete, the cessative adverb  $\text{ḡḡ}$  *mayisa* ‘be done; ready’ may be added:

(170) *Girenjāng*      *mayisa* *iri.*  
 Girend=yāng    mayisa    iri  
 arrive=3SG.M.A   be.done   already

‘He already has arrived’, or: ‘He will already have arrived.’

**4.5.3 Aspect**

Aspectually unmarked verb forms indicate general statements, which may be completed or ongoing, depending on the meaning of the verb itself. Ayeri seems not to make strict formal distinctions with regards to either, perfectivity or lexical aspect. It needs to be noted, however, that at least to date, it is not entirely clear how Ayeri fares with regards to conceptualizing perfectivity, which Dahl (1985: 76) in reference to Comrie (1976: 16) characterizes as being based on the conceptualization of actions or events as bounded or otherwise limited wholes, versus a lack of closure. Dahl also notes that “it seems rather to be a typical situation that even in individual languages, we cannot choose one member of the opposition [perfective–imperfective] as being clearly unmarked” (Dahl 1985: 69). He further argues that



The difficulty of deciding which member of the opposition is marked and which is unmarked is connected with the tendency for PFV:IPFV to be realized not by affixation or by periphrastic constructions but rather by less straightforward morphological processes. (73)

In other words: it is a difficult category to assess, in spite of being “often taken to be ‘the’ category of aspect” (69), mostly since languages often do not reify it by straightforward means. In Ayeri, the most tangible way of expressing completeness of an action is to use adverbs like ᄆᄆᄆ *mayisa* ‘ready, done’, ᄆᄆ *iri* ‘already’, ᄆᄆᄆᄆ *ikan* ‘completely, wholly’ (also as an adjective); a quantifier like ᄆᄆᄆ *-hen* ‘all’; verbs like ᄆᄆᄆᄆ *samir-* ‘finish’, ᄆᄆᄆᄆ *panga-* ‘end’, and ᄆᄆᄆ *raypa-* ‘stop’; or an indefinite pronoun like ᄆᄆᄆ *enya* ‘everything, everybody’:

- (171) *Le kondjeng enya.*  
 Le kond=yeng enya-Ø  
 PT.INAN eat=3SG.F.A everything

‘She ate everything.’ or: ‘She ate it all up.’

Apart from the more general dilemma of determining how perfectivity is expressed in detail, Ayeri marks verbs openly by morphological means to indicate progressive, habitual, and iterative actions—by their nature all conceptualizing actions as being composed of a series of two or more related actions of the same kind, though not necessarily implying a strong semantic connection to the past. The following sections will discuss each of these categories.

#### Progressive

In order to indicate an ongoing action explicitly, Ayeri employs the marker ᄆᄆᄆ *manga*, which we have already seen with dynamic prepositions above (section 4.4.1). This marker is a bound morpheme within the verb phrase and precedes the verb word:

- (172) *Ang manga ilye karonas nakajyam.*  
 Ang manga il=ye.Ø karon-as naka-ye-yam  
 AT PROG give=3SG.F.TOP water-P plant-PL-DAT

‘She is giving water to the plants.’

Going by the data presented by Dahl (1985: 91), Ayeri is typologically unremarkable in marking progressive aspect with a periphrastic construction, although it is remarkable in possessing morphological progressive marking at all—it only occurs in 27% of the languages in Dahl’s sample. Typical of progressives, this form of the verb is not limited to present contexts in Ayeri as exemplified in (172) above. Instead, it is possible to also use the progressive in past (173a) and future (173b) contexts, the latter being probably less typical, though:

- ing the constructedness of the above examples, the time adverb is located in the relative clause in both sentences in this case. For illustrative purposes, let us assume that a narrative context with the respective time frames has already been established in (173). As noted above, Ayer prefers to not mark every verb for tense when the context is clear already, insofar the argument that progressive verbs are independent of *tense* needs corroboration; the question being whether constructions like  $\text{ḥm} \text{ m} \text{ ʔ} \text{ ʔ} \text{ ʔ}$ — *manga mə*... (PROG PST-...) are possible. Strictly speaking, there is nothing to prevent this construction, however, we have to wonder if it is *natural* to phrase things this way. What can be said at least is that progressive marking is possible within a context referring to past or future actions and irrespective of their explicit marking on the verb. Furthermore, the examples illustrate a very typical use of the progressive as a structuring means, that ongoing background action may be expressed using a progressive form, while foreground action receives no special marking (compare the past progressive in

Unlike the few instances of habitual marking in Dahl's survey (Dahl 1985: 96), Ayeri possesses a suffix for marking habitual actions on the verb:  $\text{--}\dot{\text{a}}\text{sa}$  *-asa*, where the first *-a* replaces the terminal vowel of a verb stem if present, compare example (174b) below. The habitual aspect in Ayeri stresses that an action is carried out as a habit, that is, not just a few times, but with regular frequency. Essentially, verbs marked with the habitual in Ayeri can be translated by adding the adverb *usually* in English (97). The habitual aspect is not restricted to present actions or absolute statements like the one in (174a), but can also be used in past contexts to express that something *used to* be done in the past as, again, in (174b). While the contexts

are probably very few, there are no restrictions about using the habitual also in contexts relating to future actions which are predicted to be carried out habitually. The following sentences illustrate typical contexts in which the habitual may be used:

- (174) a. *Le kondasayāng hemaye pruyya nay napayya kayvay.*  
 Le kond-asa=yāng hema-ye-Ø pruy-ya nay napay-ya kayvay  
 PT.INAN eat-HAB=3SG.M.A egg-PL-TOP salt-LOC and pepper-LOC without  
 ‘He always eats his eggs without salt and pepper.’
- b. *Ang ajasāyn ranisungas tadayya si yāng ganas.*  
 Ang aja-asa=ayn.Ø ranisung-as taday-ya si yāng gan-as  
 AT play-HAB=IPL.TOP hide.and.seek-P time-LOC REL ISG.A child-P  
 ‘We used to play hide-and-seek when I was a child.’

Importantly, the verb root with habitual marking forms a new verb stem to which affixes may be attached. This is relevant to mood suffixes, which follow aspectual marking.

#### Iterative

The iterative aspect marks actions that are repeated at least once by reduplication. The equivalent in English is to use the adverb *again* or the prefix *re-*. Iterative reduplication in Ayeri is only partial, in that only the initial CV- or VC- of a verb root is repeated—there are no verb roots which consist of only a single consonant or vowel. Complications begin, however, if the verb root starts with a consonant cluster (not unusual), or a diphthong (rare). In the case of an initial consonant cluster, the cluster is simplified to only include the first consonant; for initial diphthongs, there is no necessity to include the first available consonant, since the secondary vowel of a diphthong can by itself act as a semivowel to make up for the vowel hiatus.

- (175) a.  $\text{ḱḱḱḱ}$  *kuta*- ‘thank’ →  $\text{ḱḱḱḱḱḱ}$  *ku-kuta*- ‘thank again’  
 b.  $\text{ḱḱḱḱ}$  *amang*- ‘happen’ →  $\text{ḱḱḱḱḱḱ}$  *am-amang*- ‘happen again’  
 c.  $\text{ḱḱḱḱ}$  *prant*- ‘ask’ →  $\text{ḱḱḱḱḱḱ}$  *pa-prant*- ‘ask again’  
 d.  $\text{ḱḱḱḱ}$  *ayrin*- ‘set’ →  $\text{ḱḱḱḱḱḱ}$  *ay-ayrin*- ‘set again’

The reduplicated stem works as a new stem for other prefixes, that is, no morphological material can go between the reduplicated part and the lexical stem proper; the following example also shows that there is, again, no restriction on the iterative aspect with regards to tense:

- (176) *Məku-kutayāng.* (\**Ku-məkutayāng*)  
 Mə-ku~kuta=yāng  
 PST-ITER~thank=3SG.M.A  
 ‘He thanked again.’

Iterative reduplication is lexicalized at least in one verb, *sa-saba* ‘return’. Besides the meaning of ‘again’, iterative reduplication may also indicate the meaning ‘back’, for instance in the following example:

- (177) *Ta-tapyu adaley!*  
 Ta~tapy-u ada-ley  
 ITER~put-IMP that-P.INAN  
 ‘Put that back!’

In addition to a simple iterative meaning, a frequentative meaning like ‘walk around’, ‘cry all the time’, or ‘keep asking’ can be achieved by combining the iterative and progressive aspects, that is, the verb is both modified by *manga* for progressive aspect and partial initial reduplication for iterative aspect:

- (178) a. *Ang manga la-lampay saba-sara manga luga babisya-hen.*  
 Ang manga la~lamp-ay.Ø saha-sara manga luga bahis-ya=hen  
 AT PROG ITER~walk=1SG.TOP back.and.forth DYN while day-LOC=all  
 ‘I was walking around back and forth all day long.’
- b. *Ang manga si-sipye kimay sirutayya.*  
 Ang manga si~sip-ye kimay.Ø sirutay-ya  
 AT PROG ITER~cry-3SG.F baby.TOP night-LOC  
 ‘The baby, she is crying all the time at night.’
- c. *Manga pa-prantu!*  
 Manga pa~prant-u  
 PROG ITER~ask-IMP  
 ‘Keep asking!’

#### Lexically marked aspectual categories

Besides using morphological means, Ayeri expresses some aspectual categories by way of lexical items, that is, verbs and adverbs. The relevant words in this respect are the adverbs *sirimang* ‘about to’ (prospective) and *mayisa* ‘ready; be done’ (cessative), as well as the verb *cun-* ‘begin, start’ (inchoative):

- (179) *Saratang sirimang.*  
 Sara=tang sirimang  
 leave=3PL.M.A about.to  
 ‘They are about to leave.’

- (180) *Konjang mayisa.*  
 Kond=yang mayisa  
 eat=1SG.A be.done  
 ‘I am done eating.’

- (181) *Pəcunreng seyaryam.*  
 Pə-cun=reng seyar-yam  
 NFUT-begin=3SG.INAN.A rain-PTCP  
 ‘It is going to start raining any moment.’

Prospective *sirimang* (179) and cessative *mayisa* (180) are expressed by adverbs which are regularly following verbs as their heads. They precede other adverbs due to a higher amount of semantic bondedness, by tendency, than other descriptive adverbs. For this reason, as well as for expressing grammatical function rather than lexical meaning with the original meaning still transparent, they appear to be on the verge of grammaticalization. In contrast, inchoative *cun-* (181) is expressed by a periphrastic verb construction, that is, *cun-* requires a content-verb VP as a complement rather than an NP. The content/main verb appears in a non-finite form marked by *-yam*, which will be described below.

#### 4.5.4 Mood

Besides various aspects, Ayeri also marks mood other than realis: irrealis, imperative, hortative, and negative. These are also expressed by suffixes on the verb and typically follow aspectual marking where it is expressed by a suffix, that is, the habitative suffix *-asa*. The following subsections will discuss each of the modal categories expressed by suffixes; modal verbs proper will be discussed in section 4.5.5.

##### *Irrealis*

Irrealis marking in Ayeri is indicated by the suffix *-ong* and marks that an action is thought of as hypothetical by the speaker, whether he or she expects it to be fulfilled or not:

- (182) *Sahongvāng edaya, ming silvongvāng sitang-vāri.*  
 Saha-ong=vāng edaya, ming silv-ong=vāng sitang=vāri  
 come-IRR=2SG.A here, can see-IRR=2SG.A REFL=2SG.INS  
 ‘If you came/had come here, you could see/have seen it yourself.’

As (182) shows, irrealis marking is especially prominent in conditional clauses which express a hypothetical cause and effect. Both condition/protasis and consequence/apodosis are marked with the irrealis suffix in this case. The example sentence also shows that, again, the initial vowel of the suffix replaces the last vowel of the verb stem, if there is one, so that *saba-* becomes *sahong-*, to which further mood suffixes may be added, and finally, person marking.

The same suffix, *-ong*, is also used in other contexts expressing inactual events, for instance, in reported speech, or complement clauses expressing a wish about the actualization of a hypothetical event:

- (183) *Narayeng, ang menongye demās yena.*  
 Nara=yeng ang menu-ong=ye.Ø dema-as yena  
 say=3SG.F.A AT visit-IRR=3SG.F.TOP aunt-P 3SG.F.GEN

‘She said she were visiting her aunt.’

- (184) *Hanuyang, koronongyang maritay.*  
 Hanu=yang koron-ong=yang maritay  
 wish=1SG.A know-IRR=1SG.A before

‘I wish I had known this before.’

Irrealis marking does not, however, appear in contexts that express requirements on or wishes about a third person’s actions, that is, typical subjunctive contexts; the verb in the complement clause rather appears in the indicative in these contexts. To add a sense of expectation of compliance about the action, the modal *mya* ‘be supposed to’ may be added, see section 4.5.5.

- (185) a. \**Arapnang, sa garongyāng hatay.*  
 Arap=nang sa gara-ong=yāng hatay-Ø  
 require=1PL.A PT call-IRR=3SG.M.A police-TOP  
 b. *Arapnang, sa (mya) garayāng hatay.*  
 Arap=nang sa (mya) gara=yāng hatay-Ø  
 require=1PL.A PT (be.supposed.to) call=3SG.M.A police-TOP

‘We require that he call the police.’

### Negative

The negative mood is used to negate verbs, which is separate from irrealis marking: negation of verbs is marked by the suffix *-oy*, which has an allomorph *-u* before diphthongs in romanization and also in pronunciation. The Tahano Hikamu spelling is more conservative here and keeps the spelling *-oyay* for */-uay/* (NEG=1SG.TOP). Like the irrealis suffix, the negative suffix deletes the last vowel of the

verb stem if present, which is exemplified in (186b) besides this example showing the *-u* allomorph. Moreover, example (186c) shows that negative marking usually follows irrealis marking when suffixes are stacked: ၵိၵ်း -ong + ၵိၵ်း -oy → ၵိၵ်း -ongoy.

- (186) a. *Ang silvoyyan nasiyamanas tan.*  
 Ang silv-oy=yan.Ø nasi-yam-an-as tan  
 AT see-NEG=3PL.M.TOP approach-PTCP-NMLZ-P 3PL.M.GEN  
 ‘They did not see them approaching.’
- b. *Ang peguay kalam adaley!*  
 Ang pega-oy=ay.Ø kalam ada-ley  
 AT steal-NEG=1SG.TOP honestly that-P.INAN  
 ‘I didn’t steal it, honestly!’
- c. *Ang tendongoyva sarayam adaya.*  
 Ang tend-ong-oy=va.Ø sara-yam adaya  
 AT dare-IRR-NEG=2SG.TOP go-PTCP there  
 ‘You would not dare to go there.’

### Imperative

The imperative mood is used to mark orders to an unspecified second person, that is, imperative verbs do not require an overt second person agent; if an addressee is included, it is oblique and unmarked for case, see section 4.1.3. Moreover, no distinction is made between singular and plural second-person addressees, so that the marker is ၵိၵ်း -u in either case. Like the other mood suffixes, the vowel of the imperative suffix replaces the vowel of the verb stem if there is one.

- (187) a. *Giru māy!*  
 gira-u māy  
 hurry-IMP INT  
 ‘Hurry up!’
- b. *Tangu yām, Yan!*  
 Tang-u yām Yan  
 listen-IMP 1SG.DAT Yan  
 ‘Listen to me, Yan!’
- c. *Tangu yām, ledanye nā!*  
 Tang-u yām ledan-ye nā  
 listen-IMP 1SG.DAT friend 1SG.GEN  
 ‘Listen to me, my friends!’

It is important to note that the imperative paradigm is defective; imperative verbs behave essentially as infinite forms in that they do not exhibit any agreement in person, number, gender, and topic, and also cannot act as hosts for clitic personal pronouns. Imperative verbs may be marked for negative and hortative, however. Hence, for instance, (188) is grammatical, while the examples in (189) are not.

- (188) *Saroyu yas!*  
 Sara-oy-u yas!  
 leave-NEG-IMP 1SG.P  
 ‘Don’t leave me!’

- (189) a. \**Ya sa-sahu nanga!*  
 Ya sa~saha-u nanga-Ø  
 LOCT ITER~GO-IMP house-TOP  
 ‘Go back to the house!’  
 b. \**Sa sutamuya kohanya tasela!*  
 Sa sutam-u=ya.Ø kohan-ya tasela  
 PT hang-IMP=3SG.M.TOP sunrise-LOC tomorrow  
 ‘May he be hanged tomorrow at sunrise!’

Example (188) simply expresses a negative command, which is unproblematic in terms of logic, since commands may be issued to act in a certain way, or to forgo this action. Example (189a) shows the imperative verb as preceded by a locative topic marker, which is not logically impossible, but unacceptable by convention. Example (189b) takes this one step further in displaying a cliticized object pronoun in the fashion of morphological passives (compare section 4.5.1, page 150).

### Hortative

The hortative is a special kind of imperative which addresses a group including the speaker. Its implied referent is thus first-person plural. Again, it is not necessary to mark the verb for the addressee here. As the hortative is related in meaning to the imperative, the verb also uses the imperative inflection with *-u*, but it is fully reduplicated in addition to mark the difference. As regards agreement morphology, the same restrictions as those of imperatives apply.

- (190) a. *Sabu!*  
 Saha-u  
 go-IMP  
 ‘Go!’



Figure 4.23: Modal verbs and particles

Category	Verb	Particle	Translation
ABILITY	မိာ်: <i>ming-</i>	မိာ် <i>ming</i>	‘be able to, can’
DESIRE, INTENTION	ၵံး: <i>vac-</i> ဝံး: <i>no-</i>	ၵံး <i>vaca</i> ဝံး <i>no</i>	‘like to’ ‘want to’
PERMISSION	ခံး: <i>kila-</i>	ခံး <i>kila</i>	‘be allowed to, may’
REQUIREMENT	မိာ်း: <i>ilta-</i>	မိာ်း <i>ilta</i>	‘need to’
OBLIGATION	မိာ်း: <i>mya-</i> ဝံး: <i>rua-</i>	မိာ်း <i>mya</i> ဝံး <i>rua</i>	‘be supposed to, shall’ ‘have to, must’
CONTINUATION	မိာ်း: <i>div-</i>	မိာ်း <i>diva</i>	‘stay, remain’

- b. *Sabu-sabu umangya!*  
 Sahu~saha-u umang-ya  
 HORT~go-IMP beach-LOC  
 ‘Let’s go to the beach!’

#### 4.5.5 Modal verbs

Modal verbs in Ayeri express the notions of ability, desire, permission, requirement, obligation, and also of continuation, as indicated by Figure 4.23. They can generally act as both fully inflectable intransitive verbs, as well as invariable bound morphemes which occur in combination with fully inflected content verbs:

- (191) a. *Rua babavāng baho, ang bihanoyya mirampaluy nas.*  
*Rua baha=vāng baho, ang bihan-oy=ya.Ø mirampaluy nas*  
 must shout=2SG.A loudly, AT understand-NEG=3SG.M.TOP otherwise IPL.P  
 ‘You have to shout loudly, otherwise he does not understand us.’
- b. *Ruasanang.*  
*Rua-asa=nang*  
 must-HAB=IPL.A  
 ‘We usually have to.’

As (191a) shows, the modal does not inflect in combination with another verb; it rather acts similarly to a prefix, like the progressive marker မိာ် *manga*, which is also presumably deverbal (compare section 3.1, footnote 3). In difference to မိာ် *manga*, which as a preverbal element only serves a grammatical function, the semantic component of the modals is still prevalent, as is shown by (191b), where မိာ် *rua-* appears

in its function as an intransitive verb with the same meaning of strong obligation as in (191a), though it carries regular person and aspect inflection here. Inflecting the modal in the context of cooccurrence with a content verb is, however, considered unacceptable:

- (192) \**Ruavāng      bahayam      baho.*  
          Rua=vāng    baha-yam    baho  
          must=2SG.AT shout-PTCP loudly  
          ‘You have to shout loudly.’

Regarding example (191b) and its ability to inflect, Ayeri also has a verb that generally means ‘do’, namely, *mira-*. However, it is not common to use this as a dummy verb to carry the inflection instead of the modal verb either. While such a construction is not ungrammatical *per se*, it is simply not the preferred way to express intransitive modal verbs:

- (193) ?*Rua      mirasanang.*  
          Rua    mira-asa=nang  
          must do-HAB=IPL.A  
          ‘We usually have to.’

While most of the verbs listed in Figure 4.23 should look reasonable to English speakers, Ayeri uses two verbs for modal particles which may seem odd: *vaca* ‘like to’, to express taking pleasure in doing something, and *diva* ‘stay, remain’, to express that the action is being prolonged.<sup>37</sup> The latter verb thus also has an aspectual component to its meaning.

- (194) a. *Ang vacay              betayley.*  
          Ang vac=ay.Ø      betay-ley  
          AT    like=1SG.TOP    berry-P.INAN  
          ‘I like berries.’  
       b. *Ang vaca konday      betayley.*  
          Ang vaca kond=ay.Ø    betay-ley  
          AT    like    eat=1SG.TOP    berry-P.INAN  
          ‘I like to eat berries.’

<sup>37</sup> The verb stems indeed end in a consonant while the modal particles need an epenthetic *-a* to form permissible words.

- (195) a. *Ang divay rangya nā tasela.*  
 Ang div=ay.Ø rang-ya nā tasela  
 AT stay=1SG.TOP home-LOC 1SG.GEN  
 ‘I will stay home tomorrow.’
- b. *Ang diva bengya ku-danyās kebak.*  
 Ang diva beng=ya.Ø ku=danya-as kebak  
 AT stay stand=3SG.M.TOP like=one-P alone  
 ‘He remained standing as the only one.’

The fact that modal particles in Ayeri retain their verbal semantics in spite of shedding verb morphology is probably even more obvious from the above examples (194) and (195), which show the alternation between full-verb use (a) and modal use (b) for both  $\text{r}_{\text{g}}$  *vac-* and  $\text{r}_{\text{g}}$  *div-*. In comparison to the other modal verbs in Figure 4.23, these two verbs in particular also stand out by virtue of their roots ending in a consonant instead of a vowel like in the other cases. This suggests that they may have been grammaticalized as modal verbs only relatively recently, and there appears to be variation at least for  $\text{r}_{\text{g}}$  *vac-*, for instance:

- (196) ... *yam vacongyang ilisayam eda-koyās gan* ...  
 ... *yam vac-ong-yang ilisa-yam eda=koya-as gan-Ø* ...  
 DAT like-IRR-1SG.A dedicate-PTCP this=book-P child-TOP  
 ‘... I would like to dedicate this book to the child ...’ (Becker 2015 [2013]: 1, 8)

Moreover, as illustrated previously in (185b),  $\text{g}$  *mya* ‘be supposed to, shall’ can be used to express indirect commands where English may use the subjunctive mood; essentially the function of this modal particle is that of the jussive mood. For convenience, the above example will be repeated here:

- (197) *Arapnang, sa (mya) garayāng batay.*  
 Arap=nang sa (mya) gara=yāng hatay-Ø  
 require=1PL.A PT (be.supposed.to) call=3SG.M.A police-TOP  
 ‘We require that he call the police.’

In addition to this use,  $\text{g}$  *mya* is also used in commands to third persons, whether direct or indirect. English may use *shall* here as an equivalent.

- (198) a. *Ningu cam, mya saratang.*  
 Ning-u cam, mya sara=tang  
 tell-IMP 3PL.M.DAT shall leave=3PL.M.A  
 ‘Tell them to leave.’

- b. *Mya vehara nekanley.*  
 Mya veh-ara nekan-ley  
 shall build-3SG.INAN bridge-P.INAN  
 ‘A bridge shall be built.’
- c. *Mya yomāra makangreng.*  
 Mya yoma-ara makang-reng  
 shall exist-3SG.INAN light-A.INAN  
 ‘Let there be light.’

#### 4.5.6 Participle

Besides the imperative—and, by extension, the hortative—Ayeri also possesses another infinite form called the participle. This form is marked by appending *-yam* to the verb root. The participle is generally the form of verbal complements of intransitive subordinating verbs other than modal verbs (compare section 4.5.5). For instance, *ᶤᶤ* *cun-* ‘begin’ or *ᶤᶤᶤ* *manang-* ‘avoid’ both allow complementation with another verb:

- (199) a. *Cunyo makayam perinang.*  
 Cun-yo maka-yam perin-ang  
 begin-3SG.N shine-PTCP sun-A  
 ‘The sun began to shine.’
- b. *Manangyeng pengalyam badanas saba yena.*  
 Manang=yeng pengal-yam badan-as saha yena  
 avoid=3SG.F.A meet-PTCP father-P in.law 3SG.F.GEN  
 ‘She avoids to meet her father-in-law.’

Since subordinated verbs may be transitive like in (199b), the problem of center-embedding arises when the agent NP of the subordinating verb is not simply a cliticized pronoun (see section 4.5.1), since arguments of the subordinating verb follow the embedded clause as in (199a):

- (200) a. <sup>?</sup>*Ang pinyaya [konjam inunas] Yan sa Pila.*  
 Ang pinya-ya kond-yam inun-as Ø Yan sa Pila  
 AT ask-3SG.M eat-PTCP fish-P TOP Yan P Pila  
 ‘Yan asks Pila to eat the fish.’
- b. <sup>??</sup>*Ang pinyaya [ilyam koyaley ledanyam yana] Yan sa Pila.*  
 Ang pinya-ya il-yam koya-ley ledan-yam yana Ø Yan sa Pila  
 AT ask-3SG.M give-PTCP book-P.INAN friend-DAT 3SG.M.GEN TOP Yan P Pila  
 ‘Yan asks Pila to give the book to his friend.’

In order to avoid too much complexity at the expense of ease of composition on the speaker's side, and intelligibility on the listener's, it is much preferable to express the embedded clause as a complement clause instead.<sup>38</sup> The particle 𑀅 *da-* may be added to the formerly subordinating verb in order to signal that a complement clause is following.

- (201) a. *Ang da-pinyaya Yan sa Pila, [le konjeng inun].*  
 Ang da=pinya-ya Ø Yan sa Pila le kond=yeng inun-Ø  
 AT such=ask-3SG.M TOP Yan P Pila PT.INAN eat=3SG.F.A fish-TOP  
 'Yan asks Pila to eat the fish.'
- b. *Ang da-pinyaya Yan sa Pila, [le ilyeng koya ledanyam yana].*  
 Ang da=pinya-ya Ø Yan sa Pila, le il=yeng koya-Ø ledan-yam  
 AT such=ask-3SG.M TOP Yan P Pila, PT.INAN give-3SG.F book-TOP friend-DAT  
 yana  
 3SG.M.GEN  
 'Yan asks Pila to give the book to his friend.'

#### 4.5.7 Other affixes

In the section on noun morphology we have already encountered a number of clitic prefixes that may attach to noun heads (see section 4.1.4), and some of these can also attach to verbs. Furthermore, verbs may also be modified by certain adverbial quantifier clitics. The latter are dealt with in more detail in the section on adverbs; only a few relevant examples will be given here.

##### Prefixes

We have already encountered the prefix 𑀅 *da-* 'so, such' in the previous section, as well as in the section on noun prefixes (see sections 4.1.4 and 4.5.6). With nouns, 𑀅

<sup>38</sup> The German linguist Otto Behaghel (1854–1936) coined a number of laws—albeit with German in focus—three of which are relevant to information flow: "Das oberste Gesetz ist dieses, daß das geistig eng Zusammengehörige auch eng zusammengestellt wird." (Behaghel 1932: 4) ['The supreme law is such that the mentally closely related is also arranged in close proximity.']—"Ein zweites machtvolleres Gesetz verlangt, daß das Wichtigere später steht als das Unwichtige, dasjenige, was zuletzt noch im Ohr klingen soll." (4) ['A second powerful law demands that more important information appear at a later point than what is less important: the which is supposed lastly to resonate in the listener's ear.']—"Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder [...]; es besagt, daß von zwei Gliedern, soweit möglich, das kürzere vorausgeht, das längere nachsteht." (6) ['Law of the growing constituents [...]; it signifies that of two constituents, if possible, the shorter one precedes, the longer one follows.'] Also compare Wasow (1997) on the cooperation between speaker and listener in the face of syntactically complex, 'heavy' constituents.

*da-* ‘such’ patterns as a demonstrative with the deictic prefixes 𑜏𑜤𑜂𑜫 *eda-* ‘this’ and 𑜏𑜤𑜂𑜫 *ada-* ‘that’. Distinguishing between near and far is not possible with verbs,<sup>39</sup> but pointing out that something is happening ‘in this way’, ‘so’ is still possible, hence 𑜏𑜤 *da-* is also applicable to verbs. 𑜏𑜤 *da-* can thus act essentially as a pro-verb. As a clitic, it leans on the verb, preceding all other inflectional prefixes, that is, any tense prefixes that may possibly precede the verb root.

- (202) a. *Da-mingya ang Diyan.*  
           Da=ming-ya ang Diyan.  
           so=can-3SG.M A Diyan  
           ‘Diyan can (do it).’
- b. *Ang da-məpinyaya Yan sa Pila.*  
      Ang da=mə-pinya-ya Ø Yan sa Pila  
      AT such=PST-ask-3SG.M TOP Yan P Pila  
      ‘Yan asked Pila to (do so).’

Another possible use of the prefix 𑜏𑜤 *da-* with verbs is related to the colloquial abbreviation of 𑜏𑜤𑜂𑜫 *danya* ‘such one’ as described in section 4.2.2, where the demonstrative part, 𑜏𑜤 *da-* may be split off the pronoun and attached in front of the adjective directly to express ‘the ADJ one’. This practice has possibly been extended to verbs in analogy to the use just illustrated in (202). Example (100) from the mentioned section is repeated here for the reader’s convenience:

- (203) *Sa noyang da-tuvo.*  
       Sa no=yang da=tuvo.Ø  
       PT want=1SG.A such=red.TOP  
       ‘I want the red one.’

When 𑜏𑜤 *da-* is used as an abbreviation for 𑜏𑜤𑜂𑜫 *danyās* (such.one-P) or 𑜏𑜤𑜂𑜫 *danyaley* (such.one-P.INAN), as in the following example, it may also appear prefixed to the verb:

- (204) *Mya da-vehoyāng.*  
       Mya da=veh-oy=yāng  
       supposed.to one=build-NEG=3SG.M  
       ‘He is not supposed to build one.’

As mentioned above, 𑜏𑜤 *da-* can also be used in an expletive way, to express ‘in this way’ or ‘like that’. It does not encode an anaphoric relation in this case, but merely serves as a discourse particle to highlight the action.

<sup>39</sup> Unless you distinguish between actions performed in the speaker’s proximity versus ones that are performed at a distance. Ayeri, however, does not make such a distinction.

- (205) a. *Da-sabāra seyananeng.*  
 Da=saha-ara seyanan-eng  
 thus=come-3SG.INAN rain-A.INAN  
 ‘Here comes the rain.’
- b. *Le no da-subroyya ang Hasanjan tiga kaytan yana.*  
 Le no da=subr-oy-ya ang Hasanjan tiga kaytan-Ø yana  
 PT want there=give.up-NEG-3SG.M A Hasanjan honorable right-TOP 3SG.M.GEN  
 ‘Mr. Hasanjan did not want to cease his right just there.’

Besides  $\text{da-}$ , verbs may also take the  $\text{ku-}$  ‘like’ prefix, which we have already seen with both nouns and adjectives (compare sections 4.1.4 and 4.3.4). The English translation in context may rather be ‘as though’ than ‘like’ here, but the function is the same: expressing likeness and resemblance.

- (206) *Misyeng, ang ku-tangoyye yās.*  
 Mis=yeng, ang ku=tang-oy=ye.Ø yās  
 act=3SG.F.A AT like=hear-NEG=3SG.F.TOP 3SG.M.P  
 ‘She acts as though she does not hear him.’

As previously described (compare section 4.2.6),  $\text{sitang}$  ‘self’, the reflexive prefix, can appear as a prefix on verbs as well. This may be the case when the patient/undergoer of a transitive sentence signifies the same entity as the actor. Example (115) is repeated here for convenience:

- (207) *Ang sitang-silvye puluyya.*  
 Ang sitang=silv=ye.Ø puluy-ya  
 AT self=see=3SG.F.TOP mirror-LOC  
 ‘She sees herself in the mirror.’

The image of the agent in the mirror is that of the agent herself, so she is seeing her own reflection. Both agent and patient thus reference the same person, which means that instead of using the reflexive object pronoun  $\text{sitang-yes}$  ‘herself’ (self=3SG.F.P), it is possible to drop the pronoun and to place the reflexive prefix on the verb instead.

### Suffixes

Besides taking clitic prefixes, verbs may also take clitic suffixes, namely, adverbial suffixes denoting degree, such as  $\text{-ani}$  ‘not at all’,  $\text{-eng}$  ‘rather’,  $\text{-ikan}$  ‘much’,  $\text{-ikanoy}$  ‘not much’,  $\text{-kay}$  ‘a little’,  $\text{-nama}$  ‘just, only, merely’,  $\text{-ngas}$  ‘almost’, and  $\text{-nyama}$  ‘even’. Some of these overlap with quantifiers applicable to nouns, and all of them are also applicable to adjectives. As enclitics, these suffixes lean on the inflected verb:

- (208) a. *Ang rua apaya-kay Latun adanyaya.*  
 Ang rua apa-ya=kay Ø Latun adanya-ya  
 AT must laugh=3SG.M=a.little TOP Latun that.one-LOC  
 ‘Latun had to laugh a little at that.’
- b. *Ya no narayang-nama va.*  
 Ya no nara=yang=nama va.Ø  
 LOCT want speak=1SG.A=just 2SG.TOP  
 ‘It is you I just want to talk to.’

## 4.6 Adverbs

Adverbs in Ayeri are the counterparts of adjectives with regards to modification of verbs and phrases. Like adjectives, they do not display agreement, though attributive adverbs may take suffixes for comparison (‘run *faster*’, ‘climb *better*’). Adverbs may equally be modified by the usual degree suffixes. Generally, there is no rigid distinction between adverbs and adjectives, so the latter may easily be used as the former. The following subsections will discuss the different kinds of adverbs and their possible uses as modifiers.

### 4.6.1 Attributive adverbs

Attributive adverbs are words expressing the manner in which an action is carried out, or the circumstances of an event. Like adjectives, adverbs follow their heads, that is, verbs:

- (209) a. *Rija ban ang Tapan.*  
 Rig-ya ban ang Tapan  
 draw-3SG.M well A Tapan  
 ‘Tapan draws well.’
- b. *Sahasaya cabo ang Niyas.*  
 Saha-asa-ya cabo ang Niyas  
 come-HAB-3SG.M late A Niyas  
 ‘Niyas always comes late.’

Since actions are usually gradable in the way they are carried out, it is possible to compare adverbs in the same way adjectives can be compared. Here, however, only the particle-based strategy described in section 4.3.1 can be used.



- (210) a. *Ang rije ban-eng Sipra na Tapan.*  
 Ang rig-ye ban=eng Sipra na Tapan  
 AT draw-3SG.F good=COMP Sipra GEN Tapan  
 ‘Sipra draws better than Tapan.’
- b. *Rije ban-vā ang Nava.*  
 Rig-ye ban=vā ang Nava  
 draw-3SG.F good=SUPL A Nava  
 ‘Nava draws best.’

#### 4.6.2 Degree and quantity

...

#### 4.6.3 Sentence adverbs

...



## Bibliography

---

- Aesop. 2007. The North Wind and the Sun. In *Handbook of the international phonetic association: A guide to the use of the international phonetic alphabet*, 9th ed., by International Phonetic Association, 39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, edited by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon, 1–69. Explorations in Linguistic Typology 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001. Compounding. In *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*, edited by Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible, 1:695–707. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 20. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Becker, Carsten. 2010. The syllable structure of Ayerí's stems: A statistical analysis. Draft. April 3. Accessed June 20, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/files/frequency.pdf>.
- . 2011. Article 1 of the United Nations 'Universal declaration of human rights'. November 22. Accessed July 23, 2016. [https://benung.nfshost.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/xmp\\_humanrights.pdf](https://benung.nfshost.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/xmp_humanrights.pdf).
- . 2012. Imperial messages: On translating Franz Kafka's "Eine kaiserliche Botschaft" into Ayerí. August 8. Accessed July 4, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/2012-04-07-imperial-messages.pdf>.
- . 2013. Happy 10th anniversary, Ayerí! *Benung: The Ayerí Language Resource* (December 1). Accessed July 3, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/archives/3817>.

- Becker, Carsten. 2014. Translation challenge: The scientific method. *Benung: The Ayeri Language Resource* (April 25). Accessed August 16, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/archives/4092>.
- . 2015 [2013]. Translation challenge: The first two chapters from saint-exupéry's "Le Petit Prince". Accessed August 16, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2013-05-25-stexupery-petitprince-ayeri.pdf>.
- . 2016a. Benung: The Ayeri language resource. Accessed June 9, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com>.
- . 2016b. Verb agreement in Ayeri: Bound, clitic, or both? *Benung: The Ayeri Language Resource* (June 1). Accessed June 14, 2016. <https://benung.nfshost.com/archives/5909>.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1932. *Wortstellung. Periodenbau*. Vol. 4 of *Deutsche Syntax: Eine geschichtliche Darstellung*. Germanische Bibliothek, I. Abteilung: Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, I. Reihe: Grammatiken 10. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung. Accessed November 15, 2016. <http://digisam.ub.uni-giessen.de/diglit/deutsche-syntax-4>.
- Boga, Bella, Madita Breuninger, Thora Daneyko, and Martina Stama-Kirr. 2016. Ayeri. Universität Tübingen. June 30. Accessed July 4, 2016. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/-abuch/16ss/Referate/Ayeri.pdf>.
- Botha, Rudolf P. 1984. *Morphological mechanisms*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Buch, Armin. 2016. Kunst- und Plansprachen – von Esperanto bis Dothraki. Accessed July 2. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/-abuch/16ss/conlang.html>.
- Bybee, Joan, and Paul Hopper. 2001. Introduction to frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure. In *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, edited by Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper, 1–24. Typological Studies in Language 45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. 2nd ed. London: Blackwell.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics 52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Court, Christopher. 1996. The spread of Brahmi scripts into southeast Asia. In Daniels and Bright 1996, 445–449.

- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Accessed October 5, 2016. [http://www2.ling.su.se/staff/oesten/recycled/Tense & aspectsystems.pdf](http://www2.ling.su.se/staff/oesten/recycled/Tense&aspectsystems.pdf).
- Daniels, Peter T., and William Bright, eds. 1996. *The world's writing systems*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives. In *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, edited by Robert M. W. Dixon and Aleksandra Y. Aikhenvald, 30–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Relationship between the order of object and verb and the order of adposition and noun phrase. In Dryer and Haspelmath 2013.
- Dryer, Matthew S., and Martin Haspelmath, eds. 2013. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Accessed July 12, 2016. <http://wals.info>.
- Eisenberg, Peter, Jörg Peters, Peter Gallmann, Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen, Damaris Nübling, Irmhild Barz, Thomas A. Fritz, Reinhard Fiehler, and Mathilde Hennig. 2016. *Die Grammatik: Unentbehrlich für richtiges Deutsch*. 9th ed. Edited by Angelika Wöllstein. Duden 4. Berlin: Dudenverlag.
- Everson, Michael. 2008. *Proposal for encoding the Javanese script in the UCS*. International Organization for Standardization, January 28. Accessed July 24, 2016. <http://www.evertype.com/standards/iso10646/pdf/n3319r2-javanese.pdf>.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 2003 [1968]. The case for case. Reprint. In *Papers on semantic roles*, vol. 1 of *Form and meaning in language*, edited by Charles J. Fillmore, 21–119. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Accessed August 1, 2016. <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~syntax-circle/syntax-group/spro8/fillmore.pdf>.
- Gaeta, Livio. 2008. Constituent order in compounds and syntax: Typology and diachrony. *Morphology* 18 (2): 117–141. doi:10.1007/s11525-009-9125-x.
- Gelderen, Elly van. 2011. The grammaticalization of agreement. In *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, edited by Heiko Narrog and Bernd Heine, 491–501. Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics 7. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibson, William. 1995 [1984]. *Neuromancer*. Sprawl Trilogy 1. London: Voyager.
- Hagège, Claude. 2010. *Adpositions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halle, Morris. 1998. The stress of English words 1968–1998. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29 (4): 539–568.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2013. Indefinite pronouns. In Dryer and Haspelmath 2013.
- Healey, Phyllis M. 1960. *An Agta grammar*. Manila: Manila Bureau of Printing. Accessed August 12, 2016. [https://archive.org/details/rosettaproject\\_dgc\\_book-1](https://archive.org/details/rosettaproject_dgc_book-1).
- Kager, René. 2007. Feet and metrical stress. In *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*, edited by Paul de Lacy, 195–227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61 (1): 95–120.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 11. Leiden: Brill.
- Kuipers, Joel C., and Ray McDermott. 1996. Insular southeast Asian scripts. In Daniels and Bright 1996, 474–484.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 3rd ed. Classics in Linguistics 1. Berlin: Language Science Press. Accessed July 18, 2016. <http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/88>.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 1994. Root compounds and synthetic compounds. In *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, edited by Ronald E. Asher, 7:3607–3610. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Maddieson, Ian. 2013a. Consonant inventories. In Dryer and Haspelmath 2013.
- . 2013b. Consonant-vowel ratio. In Dryer and Haspelmath 2013.
- . 2013c. Vowel quality inventories. In Dryer and Haspelmath 2013.
- Oxford English dictionary. 2016. Oxford University Press. Accessed August 23, 2016. <http://www.oed.com>.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, David J. 2015. *The art of language invention: From Horse-Lords to Dark Elves, the words behind world building*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Salomon, Richard G. 1996. Brahmi and Kharoshthi. In Daniels and Bright 1996, 373–383.

- Süddeutsche Zeitung. 2013. Abschied vom “RkReÜAÜG”-Ungetüm: Längstes deutsches Wort verschwindet. *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (June 3). Accessed August 10, 2016. <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/laengstes-deutsches-wort-verschwindet-abschied-vom-rkreueaueg-ungetuem-1.1687160>.
- United Nations. 1948. Universal declaration of human rights. United Nations. Accessed July 23, 2016. <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>.
- Wasow, Thomas. 1997. Remarks on grammatical weight. *Language Variation and Change* 9:81–105.
- Wiltshire, Caroline, and Alec Marantz. 2000. Reduplication. In *Morphology: An international handbook on inflection and word-formation*, edited by Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan, 1:557–567. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 17. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Zipf, George K. 1935. *The psycho-biology of language: An introduction to dynamic philology*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. Accessed August 24, 2016. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015008729983>.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. *On clitics*. Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Linguistics Club. Accessed July 22, 2016. [https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/on\\_clitics.pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/on_clitics.pdf).
- . 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61 (2): 283–305. Accessed July 26, 2016. <https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/cliticsparticles.pdf>.
- Zwicky, Arnold M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *N'T*. *Language* 59 (3): 502–513. Accessed July 21, 2016. <https://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/ZPCliticsInfl.pdf>.

# Index

---

- adjectives, 133–136
- adpositions, 136–145
  - of time, 144–145
- adverbs, 178–179
  - attributive, 178–179
  - degree and quantity, 179
  - sentence adverbs, 179
- agglutination, 63
- agreement
  - number, 145–156
  - person, 145–156
- allomorphy, 158, 159, 168
- allophony
  - of consonants, 7–10, 40
  - of vowels, 10–12, 16, 19
- aspect, 162–165
  - habitual, 164–165
  - iterative, 165–166
  - progressive, 163–164
- bound words, 64
- Box script, 45
- Brāhmī scripts, 45
- cases, 81–93
  - agent, 81–83
  - causative, 89–90
  - dative, 9, 85–86
  - genitive, 71, 87–88
  - instrumental, 90–92
  - locative, 88–89
  - patient, 83–85
- clitics, 64, 93
- comparison, 133–134
- complement clause, 42
- compounds, 38–40, 95–104
  - coordinative, 102
  - endocentric, 96–100
  - exocentric, 103
  - synthetic, 100–102
- consonants, 7–10, 16, 19, 20, 22–24, 26, 28, 47–48
  - clusters, 16, 23, 28–30
- dependent marking, 71
- diacritics, 50–56
- diminutive, 70
- diphthongs, 10, 19, 33, 52
- gender, 76–78
- gerund, 108–111
- goals, 3, 4
- marking strategies, 71
- modal verbs, 171
- mood, 167–171
  - hortative, 170–171
  - imperative, 169–170
  - irrealis, 167–168
  - negative, 168–169
- morphophonology



- of relative pronouns, 9, 11, 70
  - of the plural marker, 7, 9, 79
- negation
  - of adjectives, 134–135
  - of verbs, 168–169
- nominalization, 106–111
- nouns, 38, 75–111
- number, 78–81
- numerals, 80
  - digits, 57
- participle, 174–175
- plural, 7, 9, 79
- postpositions, 142
- prefixes, 64, 66–69
  - on nouns, 93–95
- prepositions, 136–142
- pronouns, 111–133
  - demonstrative, 68, 115–119
  - indefinite, 122–128
  - interrogative, 119–122
  - personal, 65, 111–114
  - possessive, 114–115
  - reciprocal, 133
  - reflexive, 67, 132–133
  - relative, 70, 129–132
- punctuation, 57–59
- quantifiers, 37
- questions
  - closed, 41
  - open, 41
- reduplication, 69–70, 104–106
- relative clause, 42
- stress, 31–38
- suffixes, 63, 69
- suprasegmental, 64, 70–71
- syllable
  - final, 23–26
  - heavy, 33–38
  - initial, 16–20
  - medial, 20–23
  - monosyllabic words, 26–28, 37
  - superheavy, 34, 36–38
  - types, 14, 33
- Tahano Hikamu, 3, 45–61
  - angular style (ṣūṣṣ), 59
  - blackletter style, 61
  - hand style (ḥḥḥ), 60
  - regular/book style, 59
- tense, 67, 156–162
  - future, 159–160, 162
  - past, 10, 158–162
  - present, 157
- topic, 42, 82
- typology
  - of compounds, 95
  - of morphemes, 63–73
- verbs, 145–178
- vowels, 10–12, 16, 20, 23, 28, 48–50