



**EUROCORES Programme**

**EuroBABEL Final Conference**  
23-26 August 2012, Leiden, the Netherlands

**PROGRAMME BOOKLET**



## WELCOMING WORDS

The diversity of the world's languages is on the verge of becoming dramatically reduced in the decades to come. Partly due to the attention that has been drawn to this problem, the field of linguistics has been moving towards taking the diversity of languages more fully into account. The dramatic change in the amount and the nature of primary data that is being collected and analyzed has proven to have, and will continue to have, a profound influence on our insights into the human language faculty.

In 2009, the EUROCORES programme "Better Analyses Based on Endangered Languages (EuroBABEL)" was launched with the aim of solidifying this development. The EuroBABEL programme has been - and continues to be - crucially different from, and complements, existing documentation initiatives in that our emphasis lies on bringing the newly gathered data to bear on the development of linguistic theory and all areas concerned with the study of language. The programme covers a number of projects that work on primary data, both newly collected and archival material, in order to concentrate on the analysis and the use of the results to expand and correct our insights into the structure and nature of human language.

The EuroBABEL programme – with a research budget of ca. 5 Million Euros – brings together 22 research teams from 9 countries across Europe and the US. The EuroBABEL Final Conference brings all programme members together for the final time, after three years of research collaborations and presents the achievements that have been made.

Throughout the running time of the programme, the EuroBABEL members have been actively engaged in creating synergy among the various EuroBABEL Collaborative Research Projects (CRP)s. An important outcome of the EuroBABEL programme is indeed that the programme as a whole has proven to be more than the sum of its parts. To present this added value, the EuroBABEL Final Conference will entail three thematic sessions – one each day- which address an issue that lies on the interface of various EuroBABEL CRPs and that have emerged during the running time of the programme as holding particular promise. In each session speakers from at least three different CRPs will present their views. Apart from presenting the outcome of the programme, this structure also allows the conference to point towards new directions of research.

In addition to these cross-CRPs sessions, all CRPs will be given the floor to present themselves. Rather than providing an overview of all the work that they have carried out in the past three years (which will be available in the Final report to be produced), the CRP presentations will focus on a particular result or research line that they wish to highlight. The conference will end with a session that will be of interest to all CRPs on the "Methodology and best practices for community engagement and reciprocity of research".

Overall, the EuroBABEL Final Conference will not only be looking back but also forward. The conference will offer ample opportunities to (in)formally discuss the future challenges of this research field and explore the possibilities for the continued development of collaborative research and research networking in this area.

The outcome and impact of this meeting rely on your contribution. We therefore encourage you to make the most of these three days.

*The organising team*

## PROGRAMME

### Thursday, 23 August

- 13.00-14.00  
17.00-19.30      *Registration*
- 14.00-17.30      Internal CRP meetings
- 17.30-18.30      Scientific Committee meeting
- 19.30              *Welcome dinner at the Golden Tulip and Tulip Inn Leiden Centre hotel*

### Friday, 24 August

- 08.30-09.00      *Registration for late arrivals*
- 09.00-09.30      **Inge Drijfhout**, The Netherlands Organisation for scientific research (NWO), NL
- Eva Hoogland and Eléonore Piémont**, European Science Foundation (ESF), FR  
*Welcome and opening words*
- 09.30-11.00      **Session 1 / Intra-CRP 1 – RHIM**
- 09.30-10.00      **Spike Gildea**, University of Oregon, US  
                          **Fernando Zúñiga**, University of Zurich, CH  
*Referential Hierarchies: A new look at some typological and historical patterns*
- 10.00-10.30      **Giorgio Iemmolo and Robert Schikowski**, University of Zurich, CH  
*Differential argument marking and differential agreement*
- 10.30-11.00      **Eva van Lier**, University of Amsterdam, NL  
                          **Katharina Haude**, CNRS Villejuif, FR  
*Referential hierarchies in three-participant events*
- 11.00-11.30      *Coffee break*

- 11.30-13.00 **Session 2 / Intra-CRP 2 – Ob-Ugric**
- 11.30-11.40 **Elena Skribnik**, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, DE  
*Introduction to the project*
- 11.40-12.30 **Marianne Báкро-Nagy** and **Katalin Sipősz**, University of Szeged, HU  
**Ulla-Maija Forsberg**, University of Helsinki, FI  
*Ob-Ugric text sources from the 19th to the 21th c. linguistically and metalinguistically*
- 12.30-13.00 **Elena Skribnik** and **Gwen Janda**, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, DE  
*Northern Mansi miratives*
- 13.00-14.30 *Lunch*
- 14.30-17.40 **Session 3 / Inter-CRP 1 - Numerals in areal and genetic perspectives**  
Chair: **Keren Rice**, University of Toronto, CA (Chair of the Review Panel)
- 14.30-15.00 **Zhofia Schön**, LMU Munich, DE (Ob-Ugric)  
*Numeric systems in Ob-Ugric*
- 15.00-15.20 **William McGregor**, Aarhus University, DK (KBA)  
*Number words and number symbols in Shua*
- 15.20-15.40 **Tom Güldemann**, Humboldt Universität, DE (KBA)  
*Structural and semantic aspects of Tuu numerals*
- 15.40-16.10 *Coffee break*
- 16.10-16.40 **Harald Hammarström**, Nijmegen, NL (Alor-Pantar)  
*Numeral bases in the language of the world*
- 16.40-17.10 **Antoinette Schapper** and **Marian Klamer**, Leiden University, NL (Alor-Pantar)  
*A reality of complex numerals in Eastern Indonesia*
- 17.10-17.40 **Hasan Dikyuva**, **Cesar Ernesto Escobedo Delgado**, **Sibaji Panda** and **Ulrike Zeshan**, University of Central Lancashire, UK (VillageSign)  
*Typological variation in numeral systems among village sign languages*
- 19.30 *Conference Dinner ([Restaurant van der Werff](#))*

## Saturday, 25 August

- 09.00-10.30      **Session 4 / Intra-CRP 3 - Alor Pantar**
- 09.00-09.30      **Gary Holton**, University of Alaska Fairbanks, US  
**Marian Klammer**, University of Leiden, NL  
*Introduction to the Alor-Pantar languages*
- 09.30-10.00      **Laura Robinson**, University of Alaska Fairbanks, US  
*Internal and wider relations of the (Timor)Alor-Pantar family*
- 10.00-10.30      **Sebastian Fedden**, University of Surrey, UK  
*Lexical stipulation vs. referential hierarchies: variation in pronominal indexing in Alor-Pantar languages*
- 10.30-11.00      *Coffee break*
- 11.00-12.30      **Session 5 / Intra-CRP 4 - KBA**
- 11.00-11.40      **Brigitte Pakendorf**, University of Lyon, FR  
*Genetic perspectives on 'Khoisan' prehistory*
- 11.40-12.00      **Linda Gerlach** and **Falko Berthold**, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, DE  
*Contact influences on †Hoan*
- 12.00-12.20      **Hiroshi Nakagawa**, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, JP  
*Cross-Khoisan comparative phonology*
- 12.30-14.00      *Lunch*
- 14.00-15.30      **Session 6 / Intra-CRP 5 - VillageSign**
- 14.00-14.25      **Victoria Nyst**, **Moustapha Magassouba** and **Kara Sylla**, Leiden University, NL  
*The Dogon Sign Languages Corpus*
- 14.25-14.50      **Irit Meir** and **Sara Lanesman**, Haifa University, IL; **Dany Adone**, University of Cologne, DE; **Keren Cumberbatch**, University of the West Indies, JM  
*Sociolinguistic factors in the endangerment and vitality of Algerian Jewish Sign Language*
- 14.50-15.15      **Angela Nonaka** and **Tony Wright**, University of Texas, US  
*Talk beautiful: Linguistic Anthropological Observations about Politeness in Ban Khor Sign Language*

- 15.15-15.30 **Anahit Minasyan**, UNESCO, FR and **Ulrike Zeshan**,  
University of Central Lancashire, UK  
*Endangered sign languages in the UNESCO Atlas of the  
World's Languages in Danger*
- 15.30-16.00 *Coffee break*
- 16.00-18.00 **Session 7 / Inter-CRP2 - Kinterms in areal and genetic  
perspectives**  
Chair: **Alexander King**, University of Aberdeen, UK (Review  
Panel member)
- 16.00-16.30 **Hitomi Ono**, Reitaku University, Kashiwa-Shi, JP (KBA)  
*Reconsidering the avoidance/joking dichotomy among G|ui*
- 16.30-17.00 **Gertrud Boden**, University of Edinburgh, UK (KBA)  
*'Khoisan' kinship classifications: Geographical distribution and  
historical interpretation*
- 17.00-17.30 **Joana Jansen**, University of Oregon, US (RHIM)  
*Kinterms and kinship grammar in the Sahaptian Family*
- 17.30-18.00 **Connie De Vos**, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, NL;  
**Angela Nonaka**, University of Texas, US; **Elaine Maypilama**,  
University of Cologne, DE (VillageSign)  
*Cross-Modal Contact in Shared-Signing Communities: Kinship*
- 18.00 *Free evening ([list of suggested restaurants](#))*

## Sunday, 26 August

- 09.00-11.00 **Session 8 / Inter-CRP 3 - Spatial language and its relation to the conceptualisation of space**  
Chair: **Angela Terrill**, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, NL (Review Panel member)
- 09.00-09.30 **Zsófia Schön**, LMU Munich, DE (Ob-Ugric)  
*Spatial relations in Ob-Ugric*
- 09.30-10.00 **William McGregor**, Aarhus University, DK (KBA)  
*Shua spatial language and cognition*
- 10.00-10.30 **Antoinette Schapper**, Leiden University, NL (Alor-Pantar)  
*Elevation and scale in two Papuan languages of Timor-Alor-Pantar family*
- 10.30-11.00 **Connie De Vos**, Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, NL; **Angela Nonaka**, University of Texas, US; **Victoria Nyst**, Leiden University, NL; (VillageSign)  
*Cross-linguistic diversity in spatial timelines: evidence from sign language isolates*
- 11.00-11.30 *Coffee break*
- 11.30-13.00 **Panel discussion moderated by Robert van Valin**, Buffalo University, US (Review Panel member)  
**Bill McGregor**: KBA representative  
**Gary Holton**: Alor-Pantar representative  
**Joana Jansen**: RHIM representative  
**Elena Skribnic**: Ob-Ugric representative  
**Hasan Dikyuva**: VillageSign representative  
*Methodology and best practices for community engagement and reciprocity of research*
- 13.00-13.30 Final words / Closing session  
**Joan Malin**, National Science Foundation, US (Management Committee member)  
**Maarten Mous**, Leiden University, NL (Theme proposer)
- 13.30 *Lunch and departure*

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Adone	Marie Carla (Dany)	University of Cologne	Germany
Asamer	Beatrix	Austrian Science Fund (FWF)	Austria
Bakró-Nagy	Marianne	University of Szeged	Hungary
Barnard	Alan	University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom
Bauer	Anastasia	University of Cologne	Germany
Berthold	Falko	Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology	Germany
Boden	Gertrud	University of Edinburgh	United Kingdom
Borinstein	Helsa	Overseas Interpreting	United Kingdom
Corbett	Greville	University of Surrey	United Kingdom
Cumberbatch	Keren	The University of the West Indies	Jamaica
De Vos	Connie	Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics	Netherlands
Dikyuva	Hasan	University of Central Lancashire	United Kingdom
Drijfhout	Inge	NWO, The Hague	Netherlands
Escobedo Delgado	Cesar Ernesto	University of Central Lancashire	United Kingdom
Fedden	Sebastian	University of Surrey	United Kingdom
Forsberg	Ulla-Maija	University of Helsinki	Finland
Gerlach	Linda	Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology	Germany
Gildea	Spike	University of Oregon	United States
Güldemann	Tom	Humboldt Universität zu Berlin	Germany
Hammarström	Harald	Nijmegen	Netherlands
Haude	Katharina	CNRS	France
Heikkonen	Petri-Tapio	Helsinki University	Finland
Herdeg	Alexandra	University of Zurich	Switzerland

Holton	Gary	University of Alaska Fairbanks	United States
Hoogland	Eva	European Science Foundation	France
Iemmolo	Giorgio	University of Zurich	Switzerland
Janda	Gwen	LMU Munich	Germany
Jansen	Joana	University of Oregon	United States
Keller	Robert	Universität zu Köln	Germany
King	Alexander	University of Aberdeen	United Kingdom
Klamer	Marian	Leiden University	Netherlands
Koptjevskaja-Tamm	Maria	University of Stockholm	Sweden
Laakso	Johanna	University of Vienna	Austria
Lanesman	Sara	University of Haifa	Israel
Magassouba	Moustapha	Leiden University	Netherlands
Maling	Joan	National Science Foundation (NSF)	United States
Marten	Lutz	SOAS	United Kingdom
Maypilama	Elaine	University of Cologne	Germany
McGregor	William	Aarhus University	Denmark
Minasyan	Anahit	Unesco	France
Moriarty	Eddie	International Sign Language Interpreter	United Kingdom
Mous	Maarten	University of Leiden	Netherlands
Nakagawa	Hiroshi	Tokyo University of Foreign Studies	Japan
Nonaka	Angela	University of Texas at Austin	United States
Nyst	Victoria	Leiden University Centre for Linguistics	Netherlands
Ono	Hitomi	Reitaku University	Japan
Pakendorf	Brigitte	CNRS & Université Lumière Lyon 2	France
Panda	Sibaji	University of Central Lancashire	United Kingdom
Piémont	Eléonore	European Science Foundation	France

Rapold	Christian	Leiden University	Netherlands
Rice	Keren	University of Toronto	Canada
Robinson	Laura	University of Alaska Fairbanks	United States
Schapper	Antoinette	University of Leiden	Netherlands
Schikowski	Robert	Universität Zürich	Switzerland
Schön	Zsofia	LMU Munich	Germany
Sipösz	Katalin	University of Szeged	Hungary
Skribnik	Elena	Ludwig-Maximilians- Universität München	Germany
Sylla	Dieydi (Kara)	Leiden University	Netherlands
Terrill	Angela	Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics	Netherlands
Tosco	Mauro	University of Turin	Italy
Van Lier	Eva	University of Amsterdam	Netherlands
Van Valin	Robert	Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf	Germany
Witzlack- Makarevich	Alena	University of Zurich	Switzerland
Zavala	Roberto	CIESAS-Sureste	Mexico
Zeshan	Ulrike	University of Central Lancashire	United Kingdom
Zeviar	Lissa	International Sign Language Interpreter	Netherlands
Zúñiga	Fernando	University of Zurich	Switzerland

## ABSTRACTS

### Session 1: Intra-CRP 1 – RHIM

#### Referential Hierarchies: A new look at some typological and historical patterns

##### **Spike Gildea**

University of Oregon, Department of Linguistics, Eugene, US

##### **Fernando Zúñiga**

University of Zürich, Department of Linguistics, Zürich, Switzerland

In this talk, we briefly review the starting point of the CRP *Referential Hierarchies in Morphosyntax* (RHIM), then highlight some of our findings. We departed from the widely accepted typological notion that multiple grammatical patterns (case, indexing, order) in multiple languages reflect a single hierarchy, something like:

1>2>3Pro>Proper Name>human>animate>inanimate.

We sought to collect large typological samples and to understand the diachronic processes by which this hierarchy effects grammar. Our group has concluded that “the hierarchy” is epiphenomenal, derived primarily by human desire to extract a single pattern from a heterogeneous set of phenomena with multiple and unrelated diachronic sources.

This talk focuses on the combination of case (ERGATIVE, OBLIVATIVE), indexing, and direction marking (DIRECT, INVERSE) that has been characterized as HIERARCHICAL ALIGNMENT or INVERSE ALIGNMENT. Hierarchical grammar prototypically occurs in the DIRECT (1/2A3P) and INVERSE (3A1/2P) scenarios, showing that 1/2>3. In the LOCAL domain (1A2P, 2A1P), no universal ranking occurs: 1>2, 2>1, or 1=2. In the NONLOCAL (3A3P) domain, the typical claim is that human>animate>inanimate and/or pronoun>proper N>common N. However, these rankings of argument features are inconsistent across languages, across different grammatical systems within individual languages, and in some languages, within the same construction.

This heterogeneity is reinforced when we seek to identify the sources found so far for each pattern, along with the mechanisms that allow these sources to manifest themselves in the different grammatical subsystems of main clause alignment. We have identified three sources for hierarchical person indexation, two for obviative case-marking, and two for direction marking, each of which produces somewhat different synchronic patterns. We see no conclusive evidence that the evolution of these grammatical patterns is driven by the sorts of functions put forward to motivate the hierarchy: salience, likeliness to be an agent, generic topicality, deixis, etc.

#### Differential argument marking and differential agreement

##### **Giorgio Iemmolo, Robert Schikowski**

University of Zurich, Department of General Linguistics, Zurich, Switzerland

Differential object coding is a cover term for differential object marking (DOM) and differential object indexing (DOI). Our talk will give an overview of how these phenomena interact with referential hierarchies. We will show that

- Formally, DOM and DOI work in similar ways.

- Functionally, they are quite different: DOM is associated with high topicality and grammaticalised spinoffs thereof, whereas DOI is as a reference-tracking device connected to specificity.
- These facts become plausible in the light of the diachrony of the involved markers.

The mentioned similarities and differences will be summarised based on typological findings and illustrated with examples from two languages, Chintang and Nepali.

## Referential hierarchies in three-participant constructions

**Eva van Lier**

University of Amsterdam, NL

**Anna Siewierska (posthum.)**

**Katharina Haude**

CNRS Paris, France

**Joana Jansen**

University of Oregon, Department of Linguistics, Eugene, US

**Robert Schikowski, Alena Witzlack, Fernando Zúniga**

University of Zürich, CH

We will give an overview of our findings concerning the manifestation of referential hierarchies in the cross-linguistic expression of three-participant events. We will discuss general typological patterns as well as language-specific patterns from Sahaptin, Blackfoot, Movima, and Chintang. Special attention will be devoted to the expression of non-prototypical three-participant events - specifically those involving three humans.

## Session 2: Intra-CRP 2 – Ob-Ugric

### Ob-Ugric text sources from the 19th to the 21st century linguistically and metalinguistically

**Marianne Bakró-Nagy and Katalin Sipőcz**

University of Szeged, Hungary

**Ulla-Maija Forsberg**

University of Helsinki, Finland

Text sources of the EuroBABEL OUL corpus represent different historical stages and sociolinguistic aspects of Ob-Ugric languages deserving special comments. In this talk three topics will be discussed.

1. The first talk investigates the methodology of late 19th/early 20th century descriptive fieldworks in Uralic studies in comparison with the present day linguistic fieldwork methodology requirements. It aims to systematically overview how the linguistic material was obtained by the early fieldworkers and in doing so to discuss the reliability of data collected by them. As a case study one geographical variant of the Mansi language will be presented, a highly endangered dialect even at that time when one Hungarian and one Finnish scholar collected narratives and linguistic material in Western Siberia, along the Tavda river. Their collections are the only sources of our knowledge about this variant. It will be argued that the traditional labelling „Southern Mansi dialect“ or „Tavda Mansi dialect“ is based on the competency of a

very small number of consultants (with significant Tatar and Russian interference phenomena), i.e. it is rather a loose set of idiolects.

2. “The tale of two hunters” (Panteley Yevrin, 1940) is the first example of literary fiction written in Mansi by a Mansi native speaker. The idiolect represented here is especially interesting, while it can be analysed as a mixture of the native dialect of the author (Eastern dialect, EM) and the newly introduced literary conventions based on the Northern Mansi (NM) and thus as the result of influence of education on the speech production. The text is written basically in the literary language, but some features, phonological, morphological and lexical, show characteristics of the EM (Konda dialect). Several EM forms are used systematically: e.g. the homonymous absolute dual and basic translative suffixes in the EM form *-ij* (NM *-g*), or the infinitive *-yx* [-x<sup>o</sup>] (NM *-uŋkwe*). The infinitive suffix seems also to trigger a lexical EM feature, the use of the auxiliary verb *pūmt-* (NM *pat-*) ‘to begin’. The accusative suffix used with definite objects in EM (absent in NM) appears in the text, but whether systematically is yet to be decided.

3. The Mansi biweekly periodical, *Luima Seripos* (The Northern Sunrise), published since 1989, demonstrates permanently increasing diversity of topics and linguistic competency of the journalists. A contradiction can be deduced, however, between the growing number of ethnic Mansi people (reflected by the censuses of 1989, 2002 and 2010) and the declining number of Mansi native speakers with good competency. This tendency is unreflected by the growing number of publications written either in Mansi or in Russian on Mansi culture, ethnology, history, mythology, etc., especially recently. The phenomenon can be explained by the activity of the Mansi intellectuals, mostly living and working in larger cities, especially in Khanti-Mansiysk: while Mansi language and culture has been associated traditionally with rural lifestyle, its revitalization is increasing in urban environment. This “language boom”, manifested in written language and represented by the urban Mansi intelligentsia, will be analysed as an indicator of recent processes in language use.

## Northern Mansi Miratives

### Elena Skribnik and Gwen Janda

LMU Munich, Department of Finno-Ugric Studies, Germany

Participial forms in Ob-Ugric languages Khanty and Mansi can also function as finite predicates (described as “evidential”, “absentive”, “narrative”, “неочевидное наклонение”). In many languages of Northern Eurasia this strategy is used to convey evidential meanings with mirative extension. The specifics of Mansi present participle in *-n*, past participle in *-m* and passive participle in *-ima* is that the mirative became their primary meaning, with evidential meaning only as a background:

- (1) *s'a:n<sup>i</sup>-e*                      *wo:rut*                      *o:jka*    *o:s<sup>i</sup>-ne-te*  
 mother-POSS.SG<3SG forest monster man    have-MIR.PRS-3SG  
 ‘His mother is married to a forest monster’ (seeing this person entering the house);
- (2) *sort*    *χuri-l*                      *taw*    *ti*                      *χuliylaxt-am*  
 pike    form-INST                      he    PTCL    swim-MIR.PST.3SG  
 ‘He swam away in the guise of a pike (surprisingly)’;
- (3) *Ta*    *ma:χum-n*                      *a:s<sup>i</sup>-anəl*                      *ta*                      *al-ima*  
 That    people-DAT                      father-SG<3PL PTCL    kill- MIR.PASS.3SG  
 ‘Their father was killed by those people, as it turned out.’

The personal marking of these forms is different: finite personal paradigm by *-m* and *-ima* (3sg ∅), and the nominal possessive paradigm by *-n* (3sg *-te*), which can be explained by the

recent grammaticalization on the base of a participial subject clause with omitted perception predicate. For *-ima* a different grammaticalization path could be suggested: resultative – evidential – mirative (non-mirative resultatives are built with auxiliaries ‘be’ and ‘have’).

These forms present some difficulties for the grammatical description of Mansi: the opposition between finite and non-finite forms and between the three personal paradigms (verbal predicative and nominal possessive, plus the verbal paradigm for object agreement) gets blurred, the structuring of the verbal system is controversial. I argue that for the Northern Mansi two subsystems can be differentiated: Realis (+ tense, Indicative and Mirative) and Irrealis (- tense, Imperative and Conjunctive-Optative). For predominance of mirativity areal explanations must be looked for.

### Session 3: Inter-CRP 1 – Numerals in areal and genetic perspectives

#### Numeric systems in Ob-Ugric

##### Zsófia Schön

LMU Munich, Germany

This talk will give a general overview of the numeric systems in the Ob-Ugric (< Ugric < Finno-Ugric) languages, i.e. Khanty and Mansi and their dialects: Northern Mansi (last existing dialect) and two dialectal groups of Khanty (Northern group: Middle-Ob, Kazym, Shuryshkary, Priural'skiy dialects, Eastern group: Vakh, Vasyugan and Surgut dialects).

In Khanty and Mansi, the cardinal numerals have different formal structures.

The first two numerals have full forms and short forms used attributively: e.g. Mansi *ak<sup>w</sup>a* vs. *ak<sup>w</sup>*, *kitiγ* vs. *kit*, Kazym *it* vs. *ī*, *kätən* vs. *kät*.

The numerals 1-7 are primary in all dialects. In Mansi, 8 (*nololow*) and 9 (*ontolow*) are built in relation to 10 (*low*), but in all Khanty dialects 8 (Surgut *nitəy*) is also primary, and only 9 (*irjen*) is built in relation to 10 (Middle-Ob *jan*).

In Mansi, the numerals 11-19 are built according to the scheme „numeral + *χujp* + 10 (*low*)“ (*xuj-* ‘to lie’ + old participle in *-p*): *ak<sup>w</sup>χujplow* ‘11’. In Eastern Khanty the numerals 11-19 follow the scheme “10 (*jen*) + *urəkkə* ‘besides’ + numeral”. In Northern Khanty, however, only the numerals 11-17 use the scheme “numeral + *χös* ‘to’ + 10”, while 18 and 19 are related to 20 (numeral + 20: Kazym: ‘18’ *nivət χös*).

In Mansi, some tens are primary (e.g. *χos* ‘20’, *wät* ‘30’), others are complex with no regular scheme, though 80 (*nolsāt*) and 90 (*ontərsāt*) are related to 100 (*sāt*), similarly to 8 and 9. In contrast, all Khanty dialects have a regular scheme for 30-70: “numeral +10” (Kazym: *nät-jan* ‘40’), but 20 is primary (*χös*).

In Mansi, the numerals based on tens (21-89, but not 91-99) have the scheme “the next tens – *nupəl* ‘towards’ - numeral”: 21 = *wät nupəl ak<sup>w</sup>* ‘thirty-towards one’. The same scheme was employed in Old Turkic. For 91-99, the additive scheme is used: *ontərsāt ak<sup>w</sup>* ‘91’.

For the numerals 21-29 in Eastern Khanty, a scheme similar to 11-19 is used: “20 (*kos*) + *urəkkə* ‘besides’ + cardinal”: ‘24’ = *kos urəkkə nətə*, but for 31-99 we find the additive scheme “tens + numeral” (*tapət jen tapət* ‘77’). Northern Khanty, however, uses additivity in all numerals 21-99.

Both Mansi and Khanty express hundreds and thousands using the multiplicative scheme: Northern Mansi *kitsāt* ‘200’, *kitsötər* ‘2000’, Kazym *kätsət* ‘200’, *wetsöras* ‘5000’.

## Number words and number symbols in Shua

**William B. McGregor**

Linguistics, Department of Aesthetics and Communication, Aarhus University, Jens Chr. Skous Vej, Office 1485-617, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

This paper is concerned with numerals and other expressions of arithmetical concepts in Shua, an endangered Khoe-Kwadi language spoken in north-eastern Botswana, near the Makgadikgadi Pans. My main purposes are to provide a descriptive overview of the numeral systems available to speakers of the language, including the traditional “restricted” system, which is basically a ‘1, 2, 3, 4, (5), many’ system, and modern elaborations and extensions, which are based primarily on borrowings from English, but also on extensions of terms for monetary units. The range of morphological modifications of the lexemes of the traditional “restricted” system is overviewed, which include a small number of derivational morphemes (permitting, among other things, derivation of frequency adverbials), and reduplication (deriving distributive numerals). I present evidence that the lexical items in question are indeed numerals, and provide some remarks on their wider uses and senses. In addition to these descriptive concerns, I also situate the Shua system in a wider context by making some comparative comments on its relation to systems and lexical forms in other Khoe-Kwadi languages, as well as languages of former hunter-gatherers, drawing on recent research by myself on “restricted” numeral systems in Australian Aboriginal languages.

## Structural and semantic aspects of Tuu ‘numerals’

**Tom Güldemann**

Humboldt University Berlin and MPI for Evolutionary Anthropology Leipzig, Germany

The paper will start with presenting new data on quantifier expressions in the Taa language complex of the Tuu family. On this basis structural and semantic aspects of basic lexical items used for quantification will be discussed for the Tuu family (formerly called “Southern Khoisan”) as a whole. This will shed new light on the profile and history of a widely recognized part-of-speech class “numerals” in this language group.

## Numeral bases in the languages of the world

**Harald Hammarström**

Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands & Max Planck Institute of Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany

Expressions for exact numbers in the languages of the world has been a research topic for at least 200 years. There have been numerous surveys throughout this time, but only recently has the coverage exhausted every known spoken language. About 1/7 of the languages of the world have no conventionalized expressions for exact numbers beyond 3. The remaining languages that do express numbers beyond 3, all have some systematicity in the formation of the number expressions, in that higher numerals are formed by combinations of lower ones. In particular, natural language number expressions appoint number bases around which higher numerals are formed. Nearly all languages are either 5-10-20, 10-20, 10-100. However, also 4-16, 6-36, 8-64, and 12-144 are bona fide attested. Other possible systems, e.g., 5-25, 7-49, 20-50, do not occur. We will discuss explanations for why conventionalized number expressions in spoken human languages have such a narrow range of number base organisations.

## **Areality of complex numerals in Eastern Indonesia**

**Antoinette Schapper and Marian Klamer**

Leiden University, NL

In this talk we seek to draw attention to the composition of numerals in Austronesian languages in Eastern Indonesia. Contrary to what is commonly believed, a significant number of them have innovative numeral bases. We present an overview of languages with numerals containing a base-5, or base-20, as well as complex numerals involving various additive, subtractive and multiplicative procedures. We observe that the concentration of complex numeral innovations in the region of eastern Indonesia suggests a clear Papuan influence, either through contact or substrate.

## **Typological variation in numeral systems among village sign languages**

**Hasan Dikyuva, Cesar Ernesto Escobedo Delgado, Sibaji Panda and Ulrike Zeshan**

University of Central Lancashire, UK

This paper presents data on cardinal numerals in three sign languages from small-scale communities with hereditary deafness: a Yucatec Mayan village, a Muslim Shia enclave in South India, and an extended family from Mardin in South-Eastern Turkey. The unusual features found in these data considerably extend the known range of typological variety across sign languages. Some of these features, such as non-decimal numeral bases, are unattested in sign language research, but familiar from spoken languages, while others, like subtractive sub-systems, are rare in sign and speech. Due to the signed modality, some constructions such as spatial modification of numeral signs are available to signers but not to speakers. We conclude that for a complete typological appraisal of a domain, an approach to cross-modal typology, which includes a typologically diverse range of sign languages in addition to spoken languages, is instructive and feasible.

## **Session 4: Intra-CRP 3 – Alor Pantar**

### **Introduction to the Alor-Pantar languages**

**Gary Holton**

University of Fairbanks, US

**Marian Klamer**

Leiden University, NL

The Alor Pantar family is unique as the westernmost outlier of non-Austronesian (Papuan) languages in Island Southeast Asia, west of mainland New Guinea. In this presentation we introduce the family. We present some recent findings about their internal affiliation and history, and describe typological patterns that are characteristic of the Alor-Pantar language group.

## Internal and wider relations of the (Timor) Alor Pantar family

**Laura C. Robinson**

University of Alaska, Linguistics, Fairbanks, Alaska, USA

The historical relations of the non-Austronesian languages of Alor archipelago and nearby East Timor in eastern Indonesia have remained largely conjectural. This paper will demonstrate that the languages of Alor and Pantar form a single genealogical group by applying the comparative method to primary lexical data from twelve languages sampled across the islands of the Alor-Pantar archipelago. We identify sound correspondences and reconstruct lexical items to the level of proto-Alor-Pantar. Unfortunately, the sound correspondences identified by the comparative method do not delineate neat subgroups, so we attempt a tentative internal subgrouping of the Alor-Pantar languages by applying computational techniques to the lexicon. The lexical data are coded for cognacy based on phonological innovations identified by the comparative method, and subgroups are proposed on the basis of lexical cognacy.

Temporarily leaving aside the question of the position of the Timor languages within the family, the second part of this paper will examine the wider affiliations of the Timor-Alor-Pantar (TAP) family. Drawing on typological data, pronominal paradigms, and especially lexical reconstructions, we examine four proposed genealogical affiliations of the TAP languages: first, that they are part of the Trans-New Guinea family; second, that they are part of the West Papuan family; third, that they are related to the West Bomberai family; and fourth, that they are unrelated to any other languages. Of the hypotheses evaluated here, we find the most striking similarities between TAP and both Trans New Guinea and West Bomberai. However, we conclude that the evidence currently available is insufficient to confirm a genealogical relationship with either Trans New Guinea or West Bomberai, and hence, TAP must be considered a family-level isolate.

## Lexical stipulation vs. referential hierarchies: variation in pronominal indexing in Alor-Pantar languages

**Sebastian Fedden and Dunstan Brown**

University of Surrey, Surrey Morphology Group, Guildford, United Kingdom

Referential hierarchies (associated with ‘animacy’, ‘person’, as well as other scales) play an important role in determining whether, or how, particular inflectional distinctions are realized (Bickel 2008). An important, and particularly challenging, question is where the role of referential hierarchies ends and that of lexical stipulation begins. The Papuan languages of the Alor and Pantar islands in eastern Indonesia, which constitute a recognizable family, are a fertile ground for investigating this question. We use published and recent fieldwork data, elicited using new video stimuli, to show that while referential properties may figure largely in pronominal indexing in some of the languages we analyse, in others lexical stipulation has a much greater role. These languages have verb prefixes which typically index person and number of object arguments, but they exhibit a wide range of variation, with semantic conditions differing in prominence across the languages, and some degree of lexical stipulation of the verbs involved.

Properties of the arguments (animacy, volitionality) and properties of the predicate (telicity and active-stative), based on Arkadiev’s (2008) typology of semantic alignment systems, are systematically manipulated. Teiwa (Klamer 2010), a member of the Pantar subgroup (Holton et al. forthcoming), has a single set of prefixes indexing objects only, a typologically rare phenomenon (Siewierska 2011). Teiwa has syntactic alignment and shows a strong correlation between animacy of the object and the presence of a prefix. In the Alor language

Abui prefixes are sensitive to semantic properties which express a relationship between participants and events, mainly volitionality and affectedness.

We show that there is an interesting contrast between Abui and Teiwa. In Teiwa the prefix form is determined by the verb, and the correlation of prefix choice or prefix presence/absence with object animacy is an indirect consequence of the typical object choice of the verb. This is then the result of lexical stipulation, and synchronically the distinction is a matter of different verbs showing different inflectional morphology. We can contrast this with Abui where the semantics of the event plays an important role in the prefix choice, which is in principle not constrained by verb class. This provides a demonstration of how much variation there can be in the relative roles of referential hierarchies and lexical stipulation within a small and well defined group of closely related languages.

## Session 5: Intra-CRP 4 – KBA

### Genetic perspectives on ‘Khoisan’ prehistory

#### Brigitte Pakendorf

CNRS & Université Lumière Lyon 2, UMR 5596 Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, Lyon, France

The genealogical relationship of the languages of southern Africa spoken by hunter-gatherers and non-Bantu pastoralists that make use of click phonemes (often called ‘Khoisan’) has been taken for granted by numerous linguists since it was postulated by Greenberg (1963). However, this relationship has been increasingly doubted by specialists, and three independent language families have now been defined: Tuu (Güldemann 2005), Khoe-Kwadi (Güldemann 2004, Güldemann & Elderkin 2010), and Kx’a (Heine & Honken 2010); whether these are all ultimately genealogically related remains to be investigated. An alternative view to the hypothesis of genealogical unity postulates that the similarities among the ‘Khoisan’ languages may be the result of areal diffusion rather than shared inheritance (Güldemann 1998, 2006; Güldemann & Vossen 2000; Traill 1986). However, the nature of such areal processes is difficult to elucidate in the absence of historical documentation.

Molecular anthropological analyses provide a different perspective on prehistorical processes that can complement linguistic investigations. Genetic data can provide information on demographic events such as population size changes, admixture, and, crucially, language shift, and thus help shed light on the areal relations among the peoples of southern Africa. In this paper, the results of ongoing molecular anthropological analyses that are being conducted in the framework of the ‘Kalahari Basin Area’ project will be presented. The study involves over 20 populations from Namibia, Botswana, and Zambia, covering the linguistic, cultural, and phenotypic diversity of indigenous southern African peoples.

### Contact influences on #Hoan

#### Falko Berthold and Linda Gerlach

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Department of Linguistics, Leipzig, Germany

#Hoan is a severely endangered Khoisan language (Kx’a family) nowadays spoken at the fringe of the Kalahari in Botswana. It has been in long-term contact with at least two Khoisan languages belonging to different language families: Glui (Khoe-Kwadi family) and Taa (Tuu family). Contact with speakers of Kgalagadi (Bantu family) is presumably more recent. Today, speakers of all four languages live in mixed settlements. All #Hoan speakers are trilingual in

ǀHoan, Glui, and Kgalagadi, while only one ǀHoan speaker has some knowledge of Taa. Notwithstanding the current lack of knowledge of Taa among ǀHoan speakers, lexical data show, that ǀHoan and Taa have exchanged linguistic material. Lexical comparison between ǀHoan, Glui, and Taa reveals that lexemes are shared between any two languages (i.e. Glui-Taa, Glui-ǀHoan (Traill & Nakagawa 2000), and ǀHoan-Taa (Güldemann & Loughnane 2011) as well as between all three languages (Güldemann & Loughnane 2011). Phonological investigations have shown that ǀHoan shares significant phenomena especially with one of the three dialects of Glui, the Khute dialect (Nakagawa 2006). The most prominent features are palatalization of stops and diphthongization of rounded vowels. On the other hand, the inventory of click accompaniments recently discovered in the recordings of one consultant corresponds considerably to the click inventory of Taa (particularly the East !Xoon dialect of Taa).

Structural investigations of contact induced changes reveal that some grammatical morphemes are shared between all three contact languages and even across other Khoisan languages. This can be shown, for example, for the forms of an adverbializing morpheme, which are shared between a number of Khoe languages, dialects of the Kx'a family, and Tuu languages.

In our presentation, we will introduce some examples of lexical, phonological, and grammatical features that are shared between some languages of the Kalahari Basin which potentially represent instances of contact induced changes.

## Cross-Khoisan comparative phonology

### Hiroshi Nakagawa

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Institute of Global Studies, Tokyo, Japan

This paper proposes a framework for description and comparison of all Khoisan phonological segments. The framework consists of two devices, i.e. (i) a cross-Khoisan consonant chart and (ii) a template for vowel feature distribution in the canonical form of lexical morphemes in Khoisan lexicons. It aims to adequately capture synchronically recurrent sound patterns and their variation in observed in Khoisan segmental phonology.

Device (i) facilitates identification and classification of all phonetically distinct and potentially contrastive consonantal units and complexes found across Khoisan languages, cross-classifying clicks and non-clicks within a single chart with a set of descriptive labels (features). Its earlier version was proposed by Güldemann (2001), revised by Nakagawa (2006), and is extended and revised by this paper.

The template in (ii) is an analytical device for Khoisan vowels and their asymmetric distribution in terms of phonological features within the CVCV form, which is predominant in lexical morphemes. A comparison by using this template reveals typologically uncommon asymmetry of feature distribution attested across Khoisan languages, which can be accounted for by the distribution of clicks in CVCV (Nakagawa 2010).

The proposed framework is illustrated by selected Khoisan phonologies, including those in the process of investigation by the KBA project, such as East Taa (by C. Naumann), ǀHoan (by L. Gerlach), and ǀHaba (by H. Nakagawa), as well as better-documented phonologies of Khoekhoe, Juǀ'hoan, Naro, Gǀui etc.

## Session 6: Intra-CRP 5 – VillageSign

### The Dogon Sign Languages Corpus

**Victoria Nyst, Moustapha Magassouba, Kara Sylla**

Leiden University, NL

The Dogon Sign Languages Corpus contains 32 hours of video data, recorded in the Dogon area in Mali between 2010 and 2012. As a rural area, with limited access to medical care and no access to deaf education, the incidence of deafness in this area is likely to be representative of areas in similar conditions. A deaf-led team visited the Dogon area twice, recording spontaneous and semi-spontaneous signing of 68 deaf and hearing signers. During the initial visit, focus was on the identification of deaf signers. During the second visit, a selected number of communities with deaf signers was revisited to get a more in-depth understanding of their signing and social setting. This presentations reports on methodologies in the collection and annotation of the data, including the pros and cons of collaboration on distance. Also, we will discuss the vitality of the sign languages documented and the possible applications of the corpus.

### Sociolinguistic factors in the endangerment and vitality of Algerian Jewish Sign Language

**Irit Meir and Sara Lanesman**

Haifa University, Israel

**Dany Adone**

University of Cologne, Germany

**Keren Cumberbatch**

University of the West Indies, Jamaica

Algerian Jewish Sign Language (AJSL) is a language that developed in a Jewish community in the town of Ghradaia, in the sub-Saharan M'zab region of Algeria. The members of this community left Algeria by 1962, to France or to Israel, and brought with them the sign language that developed there. The language, Algerian Jewish Sign Language (AJSL), is therefore a case of an immigrant sign language, which managed to survived in Israel alongside the dominant sign language, Israeli Sign Language (ISL). As far as we know, AJSL is the only immigrant sign language that persisted in Israel for more than 50 years. In the talk we examine the factors which contributed to its survival, using the theoretical construct of Ethno-linguistic Vitality as a framework for the study. Our findings indicate that two factors contributed significantly to the survival of AJSL in Israel. The first is that the language served as the main means for communication within the family unit, between deaf and hearing family members. The fact that hearing members of the family used AJSL is an important factor in its vitality. The second factor is the role that the language played served as a characteristic of a group. Although this characteristic was not perceived as positive or prestigious at all, it nonetheless strengthened the feelings of group identity among its members. The influence of these two factors has diminished in the past two decades, and therefore AJSL today is an endangered language. Language endangerment in AJSL is compared to language endangerment in two other village sign languages - Konchri Sain (KS) and Yolgnu Sign Language (YSL). In the future, AJSL may be as critically endangered as KS is now with families using the urban sign language to communicate and no attachment to KS outside of its being the language of the elderly. The use of YSL by the young deaf generation is also under threat and is heading in the direction that AJSL has taken but group identity of the Yolgnu people is still inseparable from the language.

## **Talk beautiful: Linguistic Anthropological Observations about Politeness in Ban Khor Sign Language**

**Angela Nonaka and Tony Wright**  
University of Texas, US

Politeness is a language universal, one that is realized in linguistically and culturally distinct ways. While (im)politeness has been studied extensively in spoken languages, comparatively little is known about the phenomenon in manual-visual languages, especially in lesser-known varieties like village sign languages. This gap in our collective knowledge of pragmatics is unfortunate, especially given widespread negative stereotypes about sign(ed) language—i.e., that it is more blunt, less polite, or even rude. This presentation has three interwoven objectives. One is to provide preliminary description of (im)politeness in Ban Khor Sign Language, a village sign language isolate in Thailand. Second, the Ban Khor case study will serve as a springboard for developing hypotheses about (im)politeness in other manual-visual languages. Finally, it is hoped that the linguistic anthropological insights gleaned from this study will contribute to better scholarly and by extension social understandings of sign languages and the individuals and communities that use them.

## **Endangered sign languages in the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger**

**Anahit Minasyan**  
UNESCO, France

**Ulrike Zeshan**  
University of Central Lancashire, UK

This short presentation summarises work on endangered sign languages undertaken with the aim of contributing to the UNESCO endangered languages atlas project. The UNESCO's questionnaire on language endangerment was adapted for collecting data from endangered sign languages, for which many additions and modifications have been necessary. We discuss initial results, as well as challenging issues in developing this line of work.

## **Session 7: Inter-CRP 2 – Kinterms in areal and genetic perspectives**

### **Reconsidering the avoidance/joking dichotomy among G|ui**

**Hitomi ONO**  
Reitaku University, Faculty of Foreign Studies, Chiba, Japan

Practicing avoidance/joking relationships has been reported to be a common feature found among Khoisan kinship systems (Barnard 1992). G|ui (and G||ana) peoples, a subgroup of the Khoe (aka Central Khoisan) family, also make use of the dichotomy in their universal kin categorization system. Their shared system, however, differs from the other Khoe avoidance/joking dichotomy, including that of G|ui described in the literature by preceding researchers such as Silberbauer and Tanaka, in how to deal with classificatory siblings. The Khoe dichotomy sorts opposite sex siblings into avoidance whereas same sex siblings into joking, but in this talk I will argue that siblings, both opposite sex and same sex, are all avoidance among G|ui. A number of relevant contrastive behaviours which support this interpretation will be given, such as restrictions on practicing multiple sexual relationships, practicing “damaged” gift exchanges, use of honorific plurals, and differences in speech styles.

This talk will then deal with another feature found among G|ui (and G||ana) that avoidance kin categories are found only within three adjacent generations for the ego, namely G+1, G0, and G-1; and the affine category, which is a converted avoidance from original joking relationship caused by a marital or extra-marital relationship of the ego or of the ego's avoidance kin. As a concluding remark, this talk will show what is actually prohibited among G|ui by practicing the avoidance and joking dichotomy.

### 'Khoisan' kinship classifications: Geographical distribution and historical interpretation

**Gertrud Boden**

University of Edinburgh, Social Anthropology, Edinburgh, UK

The way how people group their relatives terminologically into kin classes differs across languages and cultures. The paper displays the geographical distribution of selected features of kinship classification in relation to the proposed three language families of South African 'Khoisan': Kx'a, Khoe-Kwadi and Tuu. The features to be examined are sibling classifications, cousin classifications, classifications of parents' siblings, grandparent/grandchild equivalence and parent-in-law/child-in-law equivalence. The paper will show that some of these features trace language family boundaries quite neatly whereas others reveal a more complex pattern. The paper goes on to discuss, how the geographical distribution can be interpreted from a historical perspective.

### Kinterms and kinship grammar in the Sahaptian Family

**Joana Jansen**

University of Oregon, Department of Linguistics, Eugene, US

The languages of the Sahaptian family (Plateau Penutian; Sahaptian includes Sahaptin and Nez Perce) have an extensive set of kin terms. Approximately 40 relations are named; some with reference, vocative, and two possessed forms. This paper describes the kinship terms and the cultural practices reflected by the terms. It discusses the unique grammar associated with kinterms (including possessed forms, case marking suffixes and ergative prefixes), and presents a comparison of Nez Perce and Sahaptin ergative forms that contributes to the analysis of the development of ergative markers in the languages. The paper also discusses the effect of language endangerment and culture shift on kinship terms.

The complexity of the system can be seen in part in the extensive number of terms. 'Man's younger sister' in the Northwest dialects has four forms: *ats* (reference), *lʌsa* (vocative), *intsats* (1<sup>st</sup> person possessive) and *tsnits* (2<sup>nd</sup> person possessive). Some terms depend on the sex of the relation; this is the only place in the language that is sensitive to this. Some allomorphs are specific to kinship terms. The standard object case marker is *-nan*; object forms of kinship terms include *na'ʌas-aan* 'my.mother-OBJ'; *púsha-pa* 'man's.son's.child- OBJ' and *tútap* 'your.father.OBJ'.

Cultural practices are reflected in kinship terms. The intermarriage system is both levirate and sororate, based on the practice of marriage to a spouse's sibling after the death of a spouse. Terms for siblings and cousins are the same (*pat* 'older sister, older female cousin'), and terms for aunts, uncles, nieces and nephews assume that an aunt or uncle could become step-parent. Finally, terms for a spouse's same-sex siblings change after the death of a spouse, as that sibling is now an *awít* 'potential spouse'.

The language and cultural shift of the last 150 years has brought about changes in the number and set of kin terms used. Traditional marriages are no longer practiced and the shift to English has diminished the set of relations referred to and the terms used for relations.

### **Cross-Modal Contact in Shared-Signing Communities: Kinship**

#### **Connie de Vos**

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, NL

#### **Angela Nonaka**

University of Texas, Austin, US

#### **Elaine Maypilama**

University of Cologne, DE

Due to the particular dynamics of shared-signing communities, village sign languages are in intense contact with the spoken languages that surround them from the moment that they emerge. The vast majority of sign language users in these communities are hearing individuals who often speak multiple spoken languages. Most of these bimodal bilinguals are in fact semi-fluent signers. Because of these sociolinguistic factors, one may expect considerable overlap between the signed and spoken language within a single shared-signing community. This might have been particularly true for lexicalisation in core semantic domains that represent culturally-salient information such as kinship terminology. Comparative data from shared signing communities in Indonesia, Thailand, and Australia show, however, that there are considerable differences between the signed and spoken languages of these communities in the degree and types of lexicalisation despite shared cultural practices. Such discrepancies had not previously been attested between urban sign languages and the spoken languages of the wider hearing communities that surround them, suggesting that the social context in which sign languages are used may be crucial in the formation of signed lexica. Initial observations also suggest that rather than wholesale concepts, conventionalised gestures are more readily adopted within village sign kinship systems. While the outcomes of the interaction between village sign languages and the surrounding hearing communities in which they emerge may vary, these cross-modal contact situations provide a unique insight in our understanding of the coevolution and the calibration of cultural and communicative practices.

### **Session 8: Inter-CRP 3 – Spatial language and its relation to the conceptualisation of space**

#### **Spatial relations in Ob-Ugric**

#### **Zsófia Schön**

LMU Munich, Germany

The two highly endangered Ob-Ugric languages Khanty and Mansi (the Ugric branch of the Finno-Ugric language family) are spoken as minority languages in North-West Siberia (Russia).

Nowadays, only one Mansi dialect, Northern Mansi, is still spoken, but in Khanty there are two large dialectal groups: the Northern group with four dialects (Middle-Ob, Kazym, Shuryshkary, Priuralskiy) and the Eastern group with three (Vakh, Vasyugan, and Surgut). There are significant grammatical and lexical differences between Northern and Eastern Khanty: e.g. there are three cases in the North vs. ten and more cases in the East.

Spatial relations in Ob-Ugric languages can be grammatically coded in different ways: local cases and postpositions on the one hand, verbal prefixes on the other.

The number of local cases varies from dialect to dialect: the common Uralic triad ablative (SOURCE) – locative (PLACE) – dative-lative (GOAL) is reduced in Northern Khanty to the locative and the dative-lative, but in Northern Mansi and Eastern Khanty it is complemented by a translative (PATH), in Eastern Khanty also by an approximative (NEAR IN DIRECTION TO). Examples: Kazym-Khanty *χɔt-ən* house-LOC 'in the house', *χɔt-a* house-DLAT 'to the house', but *χɔt ewəkt* 'from the house' (with a postposition); Surgut-Khanty *ḱāt-yə* house-TRANS 'to the house', *ḱāt-nam* house-APP 'towards the house'.

More complex topological relations are expressed by postpositions; independent of the number of case suffixes, the system of postpositions is quite large. Many newly grammaticalized postpositions contain different case affixes, building series: Surgut-Khanty *owtiji – owtijən – owtija* 'from – on – to (the surface)'.

Spatial relations are also coded on verbs of location and movement by verbal prefixes such as Middle-Ob *īt* 'down' – *nōχ* 'up'. Reference points in this system are HOUSE (Surgut-Khanty *jăḱə tǎŋ-* /into the house step/ 'step in', *kem tiwut-* /out of the house/ go 'go out'), RIVER/FIREPLACE (*nik mən-* /to the river go/ 'go down to the river', *nōḱ mən-* /from the river go/ 'go from the river (upwards to the house)'). The opposition includes movement towards or from the reference point, but never around, as the place behind the house and the fireplace is considered sacred.

Some prefixes give also FIGURE or EGO as reference points: Surgut-Khanty *təyə jɯ-* /here (to me) come/ 'come here', *tōwə mən-* /there (to them) go/ 'go there'.

## Shua spatial language and cognition

**William B. McGregor**

Linguistics, Department of Aesthetics and Communication, Aarhus University, Denmark

This paper is concerned with one aspect of the linguistic representation of spatial relations in Shua, an endangered Khoe-Kwadi language spoken in north-eastern Botswana, near the Makgadikgadi Pans: frames of reference (FORs), that is, the coordinate systems used for providing angular specifications of figures with respect to grounds, as in *the tree is to the north of the hill*. These include: absolute (a restricted system contrasting east with west), intrinsic (primarily body-related), relative, and landmark systems. The paper has two main aims: (a) to describe the range of FORs available in the language; and (b) to present some information concerning their usages. In regard to (b), an interesting (though not unique) feature of Shua is the range of different FORs in use within the same “sized” spatial domains (such as small geographic spaces, table-top space). It is shown that in general speakers deploy whatever linguistic resources are available within the language, regardless of the relevant spatial domain within which they are working: thus for instance in describing arrangements of objects in table-top space each of the FORs is likely to be used, and there is no apparent motivation for choice amongst the systems. I overview the usages of the FORs in a range of contexts, including arrangements of objects (toy animals) on tables, route descriptions, and directional descriptions in geographical space. As might be predicted, speakers show a range of variation in the way that they replicate table-top arrangements under conditions of rotation. However, these do not correlate well with the way speakers themselves talk about the arrangements, and I comment on the implications of these findings to the recent debate on the Whorfian attributes of spatial language.

## Elevation and scale in two Papuan languages of Timor-Alor-Pantar family

**Antoinette Schapper**

Leiden University, NL

Papuan languages are frequently cited as having an elevation component incorporated into their deictic systems. Typically, however, grammars give only basic glosses such as HIGH, LOW and LEVEL or similar. There has been little discussion in the Papuanist or typological literature as to how such elevation terms are applied to being in and talking about the landscape at different scales. In this talk, I examine the systems of elevation deixis in two Papuan languages of the Papuan Timor-Alor-Pantar family. The first language, Bunaq has a simple three-term system, while the second, Kamang, has a more complex seven term system. I show that elevation terms are often used in ways that do not accord with a strict geographical measure of elevation. Instead I argue that elevation terms are often recalibrated to apply to spaces in different ways depending on the scale of reference, for instance, within a house versus within a village, or between villages versus between islands.

## Cross-linguistic diversity in spatial timelines: evidence from sign language isolates

**Connie de Vos**

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, NL

**Angela Nonaka**

University of Texas, Austin, US

**Victoria Nyst**

Leiden University, NL

This paper discusses the expression of time through spatial means in village sign languages of Indonesia, Ghana, Thailand, and Mexico. In the urban signing varieties reported thus far, the typical timeline runs along the signer's sagittal axis, and is split at the signer's centre, such that the area behind the signer represents the past, and the front of the signer represents the future. This paper shows that the front-back timeline may be the typologically prevalent structure, but it is not the only option, and time can be projected onto space in a number of different ways. The main timeline in Chican Village Sign Language (Mexico) projects the past onto the signing space in front of the signer, and the future is conceptualised above the signer's head. Both Adamorobe Sign Language (Ghana) and Ban Khor Sign Language (Thailand) have adopted a vertically oriented timeline, but representing time from bottom to top and top to bottom respectively. Kata Kolok signers (Bali) do not make use of any of the body-anchored timelines, and have adopted a celestial timeline, running from East to West instead. These findings indicate that the impact of the visual modality is limited in the conceptualisation of temporal relations in sign languages, and that sign languages may utilise each of the dimensions of signing space to express temporal relations. These preliminary reports suggest that village sign languages – being language isolates – may continue to make unique contributions to our understanding of the typological variation among sign languages.

## **Panel discussion: Methodology and best practices for community engagement and reciprocity of research**

### **William B. McGregor (KBA representative)**

Linguistics, Department of Aesthetics and Communication, Aarhus University, Jens Chr. Skous Vej, Office 1485-617, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

This short presentation reports on community involvement and engagement in subprojects of the *Kalahari Basin area: a “Sprachbund” on the verge of extinction* project. I outline some of the initial strategies and processes of engagement with the communities, their expectations, and actual outcomes in the form of literacy workshops, products (orthographies, text recordings and transcriptions, dictionaries, documentations, etc.), and on-site and international linguistic training. I comment on what has already been completed, what remains in the pipeline, and some of the difficulties encountered – including what constitutes the/a community, and differences amongst community members – and how these difficulties were addressed by members of the teams.

### **Gary Holton (Alor-Pantar representative)**

University of Alaska Fairbanks, USA

### **Marian Klammer**

Leiden University, Netherlands

It is increasingly recognized that community engagement is not just a good thing to do; it also produces better results. By breaking down the barriers between community members and researchers, community-based research leads to outcomes in which the goals of all parties are more closely aligned (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009). Researchers gain greater insights into the language, as well as increased quantity and quality of data. Community members receive training and materials such as dictionaries which help to create and sustain minority language programs. Like other EuroBABEL projects, the Alor-Pantar CRP has benefited greatly from a community-based approach. Numerous speakers have been trained in linguistic research methods and have made valuable contributions to data collection and analysis, and several volumes of community-oriented pedagogical materials have been produced. Nonetheless, as the project funding comes to an end, it is natural to ask how this community engagement can be sustained. Without an on-going research program, local language efforts may be endangered.

In this presentation we suggest that the most important step we can take to avoid ‘hit-and-run’ linguistic research is to provide unfettered access to research results. The Alor-Pantar project has collected and analysed a huge amount data, including recordings, wordlists, photos, and field notes. Embedded within these data is a wealth of information not only about language but also about cultural heritage, including oral histories, traditional ecological knowledge, and customs such as marriage practices. Through digital repatriation these data can be made readily accessible to communities in Alor-Pantar, and these communities will in turn transform those materials in ways never envisioned by the original research team.

### **Joana Jansen (RHIM representative)**

University of Oregon, US

In situations where language revitalization is a priority, linguists and speech community members must ensure the current and future usefulness of the data collected. Materials enhancing revitalization are collected via documentation projects as well as projects addressing theoretical or typological goals; revitalization may not be the primary purpose of the work. Recordings and analyses are necessarily put to multiple uses: as resources for

learning and teaching language and culture, as sources of historical and cultural information, and as data for linguistic research.

This paper discusses the overlap of linguistic analysis and language revitalization in several communities whose languages are included in EuroBABEL's (Better Analyses Based on Endangered Languages) Referential Hierarchies in Morphosyntax (RHIM) Project. RHIM investigates morphosyntactic systems that are influenced by a hierarchy of referents, such as first and second person ranking over third, humans over non-humans, topical referents over less topical ones. For example, the Sahaptin system is sensitive to the full hierarchy, with SAP > 3Prox > 3Obv, however, different grammatical systems interact to indicate different subsets of the inverse clause type, where a lower-ranked participant acts on a higher-ranked participant. A combination of SAP clitics, case marking and verb prefixes is used depending on whether the scenario is local, mixed, or non-local.

The data gathered and resulting analyses support revitalization, even though the RHIM project is typological and descriptive in nature and investigates complex linguistic structures. Research at this level of complexity has traditionally been divorced from revitalization efforts. However, RHIM's findings strengthen revitalization. Without adequate description and analysis of a given structure, accurate teaching materials cannot be prepared. Languages discussed include Sahaptin, Movima (isolate, Amazonian Bolivia) and Blackfoot (Plains Algonquian). The paper also includes a more in-depth look at the Sahaptin inverse system and pedagogical strategies used to teach it.

**Elena Skribnik (Ob-Ugric representative)**

LMU Munich, Department of Finno-Ugric Studies, Germany

I will support the opinion that the best way for researchers working with indigenous languages and cultures to ensure community engagement and reciprocity of research is through the educational activities of the researchers themselves and their institutions; and the best perspectives on documentation and preservation/revitalization of endangered languages and cultures open up when representatives of minority groups, especially their native speakers, obtain access to higher education as philologists or ethnologists dealing with their own native language and culture. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas argues that most indigenous education has been and still is organised without regard for solid research evidence of how it should be conducted, and that it represents linguistic and cultural genocide in educational, sociological and psychological terms (2010). It should be one of our tasks to provide stimuli, opportunities, and educational materials; in my talk I will discuss three cases of educational engagement of Ob-Ugrists with Ob-Ugrians (Dr. Eva Schmidt and Ob-Ugrian folklore studies; Prof. Lukina and Ob-Ugrian ethnography; Prof. Cheremisina and Ob-Ugrian linguistics).

**Hasan Dikyuva (VillageSign representative)**

University of Central Lancashire, International Institute for Sign Languages and Deaf Studies, Preston, UK

The villagesign project within EuroBabel has been working with sign language users in small-scale rural communities with a high incidence of hereditary deafness. Our field sites are distributed over a number of (mostly developing) countries, including Thailand, Mali, India, Mexico, Israel, and others. Working with these communities, and in particular the deaf people from each community, poses a number of particular challenges for research ethics, community engagement, and reciprocity in research. The aim of our panel contribution is to bring these issues to the attention of researchers who work on spoken languages and may have very limited experience of sign language using communities.

