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0 SUMMARY

This paper deals with the system of "Classificatory Parti-
cles (CPs)" in Kilivila language. After a definition of
the concepts "classifier language" and "classifier", and after a description of the structure of CP systems and the usage of CPs, the Kilivila system with its inventory, its grammatical/morphological relevance, and its functions is presented in more detail. It is claimed that a complete description of such a system must also result in the simulation of the strategies a speaker may follow in the actual speech production process. A preliminary sketch proposes how this simulation may look. The paper ends with some speculations on the relationship between CPs as a part of Kilivila and Kilivila language as a whole that also incorporates the cultural and cognitive structures encoded in this language.

1 KILIVILA - A CLASSIFIER LANGUAGE+

Kilivila (also: Kiríwina, Boyowa) is one of the 40 Austro-nesian languages spoken in the area of Milne Bay Province in Papua New Guinea. Typologically it is classified as belonging to the "Papuan-Tip-Cluster"-group (CAPELL 1976: 6& 9); moreover, it is classified as one of the languages with VOS-word order (SENFT 1986: 107-112). The Kilivila language family encompasses the languages Budibud (or: Nada), Muyuw (or: Murua), and Kilivila. Kilivila is spoken by about 17 500 speakers; the majority of these speakers lives on the Trobriand Islands.

Bronislaw MALINOWSKI's ethnographic work on these islands and on the culture of their inhabitants has made them rather well known even outside of anthropology. It was Bronislaw MALINOWSKI, who published the first study of the phenomenon with which this paper deals. Ever since MALINOWSKI's classic paper "Classificatory Particles in the Language of Kiriwina" (MALINOWSKI 1920) Kilivila has been known in linguistics to be a so-called "classifier language" (ALLAN 1977, 286ff.)
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1.1 WHAT IS A CLASSIFIER LANGUAGE?

Classifier languages show the following four characteristic features:

- they do not "draw a sharp syntactic distinction between phrases like 'three men' on the one hand, and 'three glasses of whiskey' on the other..." but "...treat enumerable entities and enumerable quantities in much the same way" (LYONS 1977 (II): 463);

- they dispose of a system of classifiers;

- they follow the universal principle which runs:
  "A CLASSIFIER CONCATENATES WITH A QUANTIFIER, LOCATIVE, DEMONSTRATIVE OR PREDICATE TO FORM A NEXUS THAT CANNOT BE INTERRUPTED BY THE NOUN WHICH IT CLASSIFIES" (ALLAN 1977: 288);

and

- they belong to one of the following four language types:
  numeral classifier languages
  concordial classifier languages
  predicative classifier languages
  intra locative classifier languages (see: ALLAN 1977: 286f.).

Classifier languages are distributed all around the world; they are found as members of a broad variety of different language families².

In linguistics, numeral classifier languages are considered to be the paradigmatic type of classifier languages. Kilivila is such a numeral classifier language. Having briefly described and characterized classifier languages, we must now define the term "classifier".

1.2 WHAT IS A CLASSIFIER?

Classifiers are 'morphemes' that classify and quantify nouns according to certain semantic criteria, most often according to specific perceptual properties, the majority of which has to do with form, function, arrangement, or
number, and some of which have to do with time or activities and events.

With classifiers we can distinguish between classifiers proper, quantifiers, and repeaters.

Classifiers proper classify a noun inherently, i.e., they designate and specify semantic features inherent to the nominal denotatum and divide the set of nouns of a certain language into disjunct classes.

Quantifiers classify a noun temporarily, i.e., they can be combined with different nouns in a rather free way and designate a specific characteristic feature of a noun which is not inherent to it. Thus quantifiers are predicative (see: BERLIN 1968: 175; DENNY 1986: 302ff.; FRIEDRICH 1970: 397; SERZISKO 1980: 17, 68f.).

Classifiers proper and quantifiers are mutually exclusive.

Repeaters are "echo classifiers" (BURLING 1965: 249), "identical classifiers" (FISCHER 1972: 69), or "auto-classifiers...filling a syntactic slot..." (GORAL 1978: 33).

Moreover, most if not all classifier languages have at least one "semantically neutral classifier, which may be employed to all sorts of entities...In many languages the semantically neutral classifier is restricted to nonpersonal, or even inanimate, entities..." (LYONS 1977 (II): 461).

Bronislaw MALINOWSKI does not differentiate between classifiers (proper), quantifiers, and repeaters, but refers to these formatives as "Classificatory Particles". I will use this general term (from here onwards abbreviated as: "CP") MALINOWSKI coined for these formatives to pay tribute to the master of Trobriand ethnography.

Before we look at the system of CPs in Kilivila a bit more in detail, we have to finish these introductory remarks by briefly discussing the structure of classifier systems and the usage of CPs.
1.3 STRUCTURE OF CLASSIFIER SYSTEMS AND USAGE OF CPs

We have stated above that nouns in classifier languages are classified and categorized according to their respective characteristics. This kind of classification is based on semantic principles and results in the ordering of objects, living beings, concepts, actions, and events. In other words, this classification leads to a categorization of all the nominal denotata coded in such a language. We can refer to the units of this classification as "semantic systems" (DENNY 1979: 97) or as "semantic domains" (BERLIN 1968: 34). Thus, CPs can be regarded as indices or as "Exponenten von nach inhaltlichen Merkmalen geschiedenen Nominalklassen" (KÖLVER 1979: 1); they represent the semantic (sub-) structures of a (classifier) language (see: FRIEDRICH 1970: 379).

The critical questions to be answered now are: "What are the semantic criteria and principles this kind of classification is based on?" and, moreover, "Is the respective classification in different languages culturally determined or not?"

Before we attempt to answer these questions we must emphasize that the classificatory systems of the various numeral classifier systems are not comparable to 'folk-taxonomies', but must more often than not be regarded as 'paradigms' (see: BECKER 1975: 111; BERLIN 1968; BURLING 1965; HAAS 1942; HUNDIUS, KÖLVER 1983: 204; MIRAM 1983; SAUL 1965; SENFT 1987 in press; TYLER 1969: 7ff.). In taxonomies the respective nominal referents are classified on the basis of objectively perceptible and verifiable features. In paradigms the single nominal referents are categorized in contrastive relation to other nominal referents. Mixed forms of taxonomic and paradigmatic classification do also exist, but they are exceptional; moreover, such mixed forms of classification depend on the inventory of CPs these languages display. The inventory of CPs classifier languages dispose of varies between 2 and
Descriptions of the criteria that structure classifying systems generally give the following features:

"± Human; ± Animate; Sex; Shape/Dimension; Size; Consistency; Function; Arrangement; Habitat; Number/Amount/Mass/Group; Measure; Weight; Time; Action; ± Visible" (see: ADAMS, CONKLIN 1973; ALLAN 1977; BECKER 1975; BENTON 1968; BURLING 1965; DENNY 1979; FRIEDRICH 1970; HAAS 1942; HOA 1957; KADEN 1964; MIRAM 1983). Classificatory systems are usually described by feature-lists that list the respective features in a relatively free order; however, there are a few attempts to order these features hierarchically (e.g.: GORAL 1978: 194). What must be emphasized here is the fact that most if not all of these features represent semantic categories that are fundamental in, and for, all languages.

At first sight, these principles of classification seem to be universal, indeed (see: LYONS 1977 (II): 466); however, a look at the respective CPs that constitute the semantic domains for the individual languages on the basis of these features elucidates that these general and probably universal categories are defined in a culture specific way (see: BERLIN 1968: 35).

Moreover, it is evident that the boundaries between the individual semantic domains are rather fluid. Thus CRAIG (1986: 1) - on the basis of prototype theory - claims rightly that "...categories...should be described as having fuzzy edges and graded membership..." (see also: POSNER 1986; GIVON 1986).

Therefore, the description of semantic domains within any numeral classifier language asks for a sound analysis of how these domains are constituted, i.e., which features are relevant for the definition of the respective semantic domain. This ethno-semantic descriptive and analytical research is rather complex, indeed, and presupposes the linguist's thorough and deep delving into the language he wants to describe.
Now what about the speaker's actual usage of the CPs that constitute such complex systems? This question is only relevant for languages that display a certain number of CPs, of course. With respect to these languages it must be emphasized that a variety of CPs can refer to any nominal denotatum, i.e., that even with inherent classification CPs can be used to specify special aspects of relatively general nominal concepts. In other words: these complex systems of CPs allow to refer to a noun within its semantic domain either by the general, characteristic, or 'unmarked' CP or by a more specifying CP. The choice of the adequate CP occurs on the semantic level; it can be independent of the speech act intended, and thus attains stylistic denotation, meaning, and significance (see: Becker 1975: 113; Burling 1965: 259; Goral 1978: 26).

Individual speakers use these options in their choice of CPs in one way or the other. Some linguists even claim that the actual "use of classifiers...is in part an art" (Becker 1975: 113). Thus we can conclude that all CPs "do have meaning" (Allan 1977: 290).

This basic information about classifier languages and CPs given, we can now look at Kilivila and its system of CPs.

2 THE KILIVILA SYSTEM OF CPs

This section of the paper deals with the Kilivila CP inventory, the morphological relevance of CPs with respect to Kilivila inflectional morphology, and with the functions that are assigned to the CPs. The exposition given here is based on the one hand on the research done by Malinowski (1920) and Lawton (1980), and on the other hand and especially on my own research (Senft 1985; 1987 in press)—which is still in progress. This research will result towards a monograph that presents studies on the acquisition of the system of CPs in Kilivila, studies on its CP inventory realized in actual speech production, and
studies on its change. This status of the exposition to come explains why I can finish this section only with a preliminary sketch to illustrate possible CP production strategies that may be employed by Kilivila native speakers.

2.1 CP INVENTORY AND MORPHOLOGICAL RELEVANCE

Kilivila disposes of a system of CPs that encompasses at least 178 formatives. The data I collected during my 15 months of field research on the Trobriands document 94 CPs produced by Kilivila native speakers in actual speech production; the other 84 CPs are described by LAWTON (1980). The appendix lists these CPs with annotations on rules of reference/usage. I assume that with all the subtle and very specific differentiations possible, there are probably more than 200 CPs in Kilivila. I will not deal with the Kilivila CP inventory here in more detail, but I will proceed with a few remarks on the morphological relevance of CPs in Kilivila.

The system of noun classification is an important means of word formation with all but one demonstrative pronouns, with one form of interrogative pronouns, with two classes of adjectives, and with numerals. These word classes require concord with the class of the noun they refer to. This concord is secured by the CPs that are infixed or prefixed to the respective word frame or word stem. I have described these processes of word formation in detail elsewhere (SENFT 1985a: 374-379; 1986); for the purposes pursued here it suffices to give two sentences with all the four word classes involved in the system of noun classification. In the examples the CP "(-)ke(-)" is underlined:

(1) Kevila waga lekutasi?
  ke-vila waga le-kota -si
  wooden-how many canoe 3Ps.-arrive-Plural Past
How many canoes arrived?

(2) Keyu waga makesina kemanabweta (lekotasi).

kek-yu waga ma-ke -si -na
wooden-two canoe this-wooden-Plural-this
kemanabweta (le-kota -si ).
wooden-beautiful (3Ps.-arrive-Plural).

Past

These two beautiful canoes (arrived).

Here the speakers of these sentences refer to "canoes"; they have to indicate the noun class of "canoe" with the CP for "wooden things" - "(-)ke(-)" - in the interrogative pronoun, in the numeral, in the demonstrative pronoun, and in the adjective.

With these few remarks on the morphological relevance of CPs we already mentioned one function these formatives take over, namely to secure concord between the noun and the four word classes involved in these word formation processes. The next subsection will deal with the functions of CPs in Kilivila a bit more in detail.

2.2 FUNCTIONS

Contrary to GREENBERG's (1975: 25) language universal postulate, not all but only the majority of nouns in numeral classifier languages lack a marking with respect to the category "number" (- in these languages "number" is usually marked with nouns denoting persons - (see: GORAL 1978: 15; MIRAM 1983: 36f.; SENFT 1986: 45f.)). CPs can take over the syntactic function of marking "number" in the nouns they refer to.

Referentially, nouns in classifier languages can be characterized as nouns with generic reference. With their referential function CPs individualize nominal concepts; they can mark that a noun they refer to must be understood as having non-generic reference (see: SEILER 1982: 6&8).

The functions CPs fulfill are succinctly summarized by ADAMS, BECKER, and CONKLIN (1975: 2): "Besides their func-
tion in numeral noun phrases classifiers in various languages function as nominal substitutes, nominalizers of words in other form classes, markers of definiteness, relativizers, markers of possession, and as vocatives, serve to disambiguate sentences, establish coherence in discourse and regularly mark registers and styles within a language".

In the following subsections we will describe the functions of CPs in Kilivila exemplarily.

2.2.1 REFERENTIAL FUNCTION / CONCORD

In 2.1 above we already emphasized the referential function of CPs that secure concord between the nouns and the word classes that use CPs as a means of their word formation. This concord implies redundancy in the information transported by a sentence, of course. This is illustrated in sentences (1) and (2) above. The reference of the respective word classes is unequivocal, the redundancy in the information given is obvious: Trobriand canoes are made of timber, they are "wooden things" (we will discuss this aspect of redundant information in 2.2.3).

The complex inventory of CPs allows the speaker to classify a noun "temporarily" (BERLIN 1968: 175); i.e., to emphasize certain characteristics of the noun he refers to. This is illustrated by the following examples (see: SENFT 1985a, 38ff.):

(3) natala yena
    na-tala yena
    animal-one fish
    one fish

(4) kevalalima yenə
    kevala-lima yena
    batch drying-five fish
    five batches of smoked fish

(5) aylalima yenə
These examples first present the CP "(-)na(-)" for "animals" and then illustrate a part of the noun modifying group of CPs that specify the noun with respect to its quantity, its order, its arrangement, and its condition or state.

Sentence (8) presents the two sex-specifying CPs "(-)to/te(-)" and "(-)na(-)" together with the age-subclassifying CP "(-)gudi(-)".

(8) Bibodi tetala natala guditala.
    bi-bodi te-tala na-tala gudi-tala
    3Ps.-benefit male-one female-one child-one
    Future .
    It will benefit each man, woman, and child.

The following noun phrase (9) (see: LAWTON 1980: 49) nicely illustrates the semantic power of the CPs used:

(9) kai mabubosina kwelatolu
    kai ma-bubo -si -na kwela-tolu
    wood this-cut across-Plural-this pot like-three these three pot-like sawn-off sections of timber

Sentence (10) shows that CPs can also be used metaphorically:

(10) Kugisi magudina waga kekekita okopo'ula waga
dimdimi
In sentence (8) the numerals "tetala, natala, guditala" are translated as nominal expressions. This is legitimate, indeed, especially when we assume that the respective nouns of the three noun phrases given ("tetala tau" - "one man", "natala vivila" - "one woman", "guditala gwadi" - "one child") were deleted. This analysis - which is possible because of the information redundancy transported by CPs - assigns to the numerals proper nominal status. We find this kind of nominalization with demonstrative pronouns and adjectives, too (see: SENFT 1985a: 384).

The phrases (11) and (12) as well as the phrases (4-6) illustrate the plural marking function of CPs:

(11) makaña nuya keveaka

\[ ma\text{-}ke\ -na\ nuya\ ke\text{-}veaka \]
\[ \text{this-wooden-this coconut tree wooden-big} \]
\[ \text{this big coconut tree} \]

(12) mapo'ulana nuya keveaka

\[ ma\text{-}po'ula\ -na\ nuya\ ke\text{-}veaka \]
\[ \text{this-plantation-this coconut tree wooden-big} \]
\[ \text{this plantation of big coconut trees} \]

Besides this function of plural marking we also find some CPs that fulfill the function of quantifying numeral-
ization, a function independent of that of numerals proper. The noun phrase (6) quoted above illustrates this function exemplarily.

With the examples (4, 5, 7) and (9) it also becomes quite evident that some CPs also take over the function of verb-like expressions within a noun phrase. This is especially true for CPs that specify certain activities or refer to such activities (see: SENFT 1985a: 385).

So far we dealt with CPs on sentence or phrase level, only. In the next subsection we will look at the CPs realized in actual discourse.

2.2.3 REDUNDANCY - DELETION/ELLIPSIS - DISCOURSE COHERENCE

With sentence (8) above we demonstrated that noun phrases may be constituted by numerals (without the respective nouns these numerals refer to). We explained this principle of noun phrase construction by positing that the respective nouns are deleted and that the other word classes (in our example: the numerals) that constitute the noun phrases acquire nominal status (see: 2.2.2).

It was already MALINOWSKI (1922: 59f.) who hinted at such an interpretation of Kilivila sentences as in sentence (8) above. He compared these sentences with elliptic utterances in English. Sentences that are constructed like our example (8) are indeed quite frequently produced in Trobriand discourse. A Trobriand Islander introduces a certain nominal denotatum explicitly. If he wants to refer to this noun in the course of his discourse by the means of numerals, demonstrative pronouns, and adjectives, he usually does no longer realize this noun - the noun is deleted.

This noun deletion is only possible because the CPs represent the deleted nouns in a quasi-fragmentary way, and because the anaphoric reference of CPs secures semantic concord beyond sentence boundaries. Now we can explain why
we sometimes find redundant information within the noun phrase: It is only the information redundancy given by the CPs within a Kilivila noun phrase that enables the deletion processes described without any loss of information — even beyond sentence boundaries. Thus CPs fulfill the important function to secure coherence in discourse. As a general rule, a noun can be deleted as long as it is not reclassified, e.g. for stylistic reasons, by another CP. Then the noun must be realized again as a constituent of the noun phrase to secure unequivocal and unambiguous reference.

The following examples (13)-(15) illustrate these functions of CPs:

(13) Atatai tataba. Tauwau Tabalu mtosina makena si koni.

a-tatai tataba tauwau Tabalu
1Ps.-carve "tataba"-board men "Tabalu"-clan
m-to -si -na ma-ke . -na si
this-male-Plural-this this-wooden-this their koni
sign of honor
I carve a "tataba"-board. These men belonging to the "Tabalu"-clan, this is their sign of honor.

Here the speaker refers to a certain board with carving patterns that marks houses, food houses, and canoes as the personal property of men belonging to the "Tabalu"-clan. The reference of the two demonstrative pronouns produced is unequivocal.

(14) Tauwau pela emesi bilebusi. Ekokwa' usi kebila mabudanaga ekugwasi emesi.

tauwau pela e-me -si bi-lebu-si
men for 3Ps.-come-Plural 3Ps.Fut.-take-Plural
e-kokwa'u-si kebila
3Ps.-weave -Plural stretcher
The men have come to take him with them. They have woven a stretcher, the men belonging to this group who were the first to arrive.

Here the speaker used the CPs "(-)buda(-)" with the demonstrative pronoun in the second sentence to refer unequivocally to the noun ("tauwau") produced in the first sentence (see: SENFT 1985b: 481).

(15) O davalusi esisusi tommota topaisewa. Vivila nasalau, tauwau tobugubagula. Tommota gala todubakasala, kena kumwedona enukwali-si bubunesi bwena. o da-valu -si e-sisu-si
in our-village-Plural 3Ps.-live-Plural tommota to-paisewa vivila
people human beings-work woman
na-salau tauwau to-bugubagula female-busy men male-work in the garden
tommota gala to-dubakasala people not human beings-rude
kena kumwedona e-nukwali-si but all 3Ps.-know -Plural
bubune-si bwena manners-their good

In our village live people taking pleasure in their work. The women are busy, the men are good gardeners. The people are not rude, but all have good manners.

This example illustrates that, in general, reclassification does not allow the deletion of the then more specified noun. To emphasize the different characterization of men and women on the one hand and all villagers on the
other hand, the nouns can hardly be deleted. The speaker uses the CP "(-)to(-)" to refer to "human beings" and to "persons of male sex". If the speaker would not realize the noun "tomgota" ("people") in the last sentence again, then this sentence would refer to "persons of male sex" only (see: SENFT 1985b: 387f.).

So far we have described the morphological role and the different functions of CPs in Kilivila. Now it seems to be quite logical to attempt to answer the questions already raised in subsection 1.3, namely:

"What about the speaker's actual usage of this rather complex system of CPs?",

and,

"How can we describe the semantic domains that are constituted by CPs?"

The next subsection presents a fragmentary example to illustrate my attempt to answer these two crucial questions. The status of the following remarks is indeed preliminary, and the example represents initial ideas and hypotheses proposed by research in progress.

2.3 A PRELIMINARY SKETCH OF POSSIBLE CP PRODUCTION STRATEGIES

A description of a classifier system that claims to be complete must explain, why a speaker produces a certain CP to refer to a certain noun. Thus, the linguist must try to reach at a description that can at least simulate the decision processes or strategies a speaker follows in producing a certain CP. "The prerequisite for these psycholinguistic explanations is the sound definition of the semantic domains constituted by the CPs. As stated above, this is not feasible at the present stage of research. However, the following hypothetical example should illustrate how I will attempt to simulate possible CP production strategies that Kilivila speakers may use in their language production."
Let us assume a Kilivila native speaker wants to refer with a demonstrative pronoun, a numeral, and an adjective, or with the respective interrogative pronoun to "human beings". To do this, he has a number of CPs at his command: The CP "(-)to/te(-)" refers quite generally to the two nominal concepts "human beings" and "man/men/person(s) of male sex". Both concepts include living and historic persons, only.

To refer to women or girls, Kilivila speakers use the - sex-specifying - CP "(-)na(-)". This CP also refers only to living and historic persons.

To refer to children, i.e., to refer in an age-specifying way to a certain group of humans, Kilivila speakers use the CP "(-)gudi(-)".

The CP "(-)buda(-)" is used to refer to a group of persons; to refer to a group of persons on the move, Kilivila speakers use the CP "(-)deli(-)".

The CP "(-)na(-)" does not only refer to the concept "woman/women/girl(s)/person(s) of female sex", but also to the following nominal concepts that may be present to a speaker intending to refer to human beings:
- corpses
- carvings in human likeness
- spirits/dwarfs
- stars/planet/moon
- animals (but not clams and snails).

With these concepts we have to keep the following facts in mind: "carvings in human likeness" are "wooden things", too. The CPs "(-)ke(-)" and "(-)bwa(-)" refer to this concept.

To refer to the concept "animal", the Trobriand Islander can use a number of CPs: The CP "(-)kwe(-)" is used to refer to "clams and snails".

The CP "(-)kalo(-)" refers to a "two-bundle crustacean". The CP "(-)buluwo(-)" refers to a "group of 10 animals". The CP "(-)yuva(-)" refers to a "shoal of dolphins".

To specify fish with respect to number, arrangement, or
A speaker wants to refer to a nominal concept

Referent

human

alive

unmarked with respect to gender (sex);

unmarked with respect to gender (sex);

marked with respect to gender (sex);

adults & children

- group -

adults children general group on the move

"te/to" "gudi" "buda" "deli" "te/to" "na" "na"

dead; corpses

represented in artistic work

"na"

see:

"ke"; "bwa"
Figure 2: A PRELIMINARY SKETCH OF POSSIBLE CP PRODUCTION STRATEGIES

A speaker wants to refer to a nominal concept

| Referent |
| non-human |

- spirits
- dwarfs
- stars
- planets
- moon
- in general but not clams & snails - for clams & snails see:
- "na" "na" "na" "kwe" "kalo" "buluwo" "yuva" "suya" "kaulo" "givi"
food, the CP "(-)kauko(-)" refers to a "10-group (strings of fish)", the CP "(-)suya(-)" refers to a "batch of fish on strings", and the CP "(-)givi(-)" refers to a "serve of fish".

Thus, the system of CPs that may be present to a speaker intending to refer either generally or specifically to "human beings" can be illustrated as in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

This attempt of simulating a speaker's decision processes and strategies in selecting and producing a certain CP illustrates at least two things:

On the one hand it shows the principles of perception and of ordering the speaker uses as guidelines in the process of CP production.

On the other hand it shows how interwoven, but also how closed or open or fuzzy, the semantic domains involved are.

Moreover, I assume that the attempt of simulating a speaker's decision processes with respect to his CP production presented above shows that the relationship between Kilivila language as a whole and its morphologically and semantically relevant parts - here presented by the CPs - is rather intricate and quite sophisticated. I will conclude this paper with some speculative ideas elaborating on this topic.

3 THE WHOLE AND ITS PARTS - SOME SPECULATIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CPs, LANGUAGE, AND THOUGHT

Throughout this paper I emphasized that my argumentation is based on the first results of research in progress. This research does not only aim at a sound description of the Kilivila CP system - including studies of its acquisition, its realization in actual speech production, and its change -, but also at a discussion of the relationship between CPs, Kilivila language, and Trobriand thought. This discussion must be based on the sound linguistic and psycholinguistic description of the CP system, of course.
Thus, this final section of the paper can only hint at possible directions the discussion may take. Nevertheless, let us set out on the uncertain terrain of speculations.

In a recent paper, Johannes BECHERT (1988: 1) argues that "...a "word" is a piece of language or speech that corresponds to a piece of the world (the world including the speaker's own mind)". With respect to CPs, ALLAN (1977: 308) emphasizes even more pointedly that "...classifiers are linguistic correlates to perception...", and BECKER (1975: 118) claims that "...linguistic classifiers relate people to the world...".

Statements like these together with theses and theories advanced in BERRY and DASEN (1974), BRUNER, GOODNOW, and AUSTIN (1962), COLE, GAY, GLICK, and SHARP (1971), COLE and SCRIBNER (1974), CRAIG (1986 (especially: 285ff.), HALLPIKE (1979), LAKOFF (1986), and ROSCH and LLOYD (1976) will form the basis for our attempts to answer the question of how the parts relate to the whole with respect to the Kilivila CP system.

It may be that CPs are - at least in part - "simple forms" representing "mnemonic tricks" in the sense proposed by KOCH (1986: 49ff., 55).

It may also be that the CPs that constitute the semantic domains or the "semantic networks" (KOCH 1986: 23) of Kilivila and thus frame Trobriand thought - at least to a certain extent - are linguistic manifestations of human perception.

These linguistic manifestations of human perception may thus either completely or in part represent universals of human thought, or they may completely or in part represent language- or culture-specific characteristics of Trobriand thought.

Be that as it may, one hopes that the CPs as a linguistic datum may allow the linguist to infer from it answers to questions considering cultural and cognitive structures that are reflected in this system of classification.

If we keep in mind that in Kilivila all nominal denota-
ta must fit into a system of classification that is constituted by about 200 formatives, this hope seems to be legitimate in certain respects. The fact that even loan-words Kilivila speakers borrow from English (see: SENFT 1987) are classified by the same means within the same system of CPs, the fact that these nominal lexical innovations do not trigger innovation in the CP system, and the fact that no loan-word has been incorporated completely or in part into the inventory of Kilivila CPs seem to underline that this system is of great importance for the language, indeed.

Thus, research on the Kilivila CP system means research on a system that is at the core of this language. I assume that the closer we scrutinize linguistic data at the core of a language, the better are the chances to gain some insight into cultural and cognitive structures encoded in that language. At present I would hope that the results of such research will help to prove this hypothesis to be true, as it follows the classic Platonic "Weg zum Ganzen durch die Elemente" ("way to the whole through the elements" (G.S.) PLATON 366/367 B.C. (1979):146) in its craving for knowledge.

NOTES

+ I want to thank the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" (German Research Society) for financing the project "Ritual Communication on the Trobriand Islands" (Ei-24/10-1). I am also very much indebted to the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, to I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt and to the Forschungsstelle für Humanethologie in der MPG (Research Unit for Human Ethology within the Max-Planck-Society) for the support in realizing this project. I wish to thank the National and Provincial Governments in Papua New Guinea and the IPNGS for their assistance with, and permission for, our research project. I express my great gratitude to the people of the Trobriand Islands, espe-
cially to the inhabitants of Tauwema; I thank them for their hospitality, friendship, and patient cooperation. This paper is the elaborated version of a paper I presented during the "International and Interdisciplinary Symposium 'The Whole and Its Parts'", Ruhr Universität Bochum, 17.-19. December 1987, organized by Walter A. KOCH. I would like to thank him for inviting me to participate in this symposium. I owe Kerry Pataki-Schweizer thanks for having corrected what the author supposed to be English.

As to the discussion of the Kilivila system of classifiers see: BALDWIN (n.d.); CAPELL (1969: 61; 1971: 273); LAWTON (1980); LITHGOW (1976: 461, 465ff., 480, 488ff.); SENFT (1985a; 1986; 1987 in press). Kilivila classifiers were first mentioned in FELLOWS (1901) and in RAY (1907).

Moreover, we find classifiers in the "American Sign Language" and graphemic classifiers in Egyptian hieroglyphics and Mesopotamian cuneiform (see: KLIMA, BELLUGI (1977: 13-15, 191f.), SUPPALLA (1986), RUDE (1986)).

HLA PE (1965: 166) gives the following definition:
"A classifier is a word for an attribute of a specific object, some of which may have more than one; a repeater is the object itself or part of it, used as numerative; whilst a quantifier concerns itself with the estimating of things by some sort of measure - size, extension, weight, amount or number especially of ten or multiples of ten".

As to the functions CPs can take over in Kilivila see 2.2.

For a more detailed description I refer the reader to the Kilivila dictionary in SENFT (1986); SENFT (1986) does not list the CPs "(-)dumía(-)" and "(-)kali(-)".

164
I found these CPs only recently by checking and counter-checking all my Kilivila data again. The two CPs were only realized once by one informant each.

6 The detailed description of the morphological relevance of CPs is given in SENFT (1986; see also: SENFT (1985a)).

7 The CP "(-)na(-)" refers to: 1. animals; 2. stars/moon/planets; 3. corpses; 4. carvings in human likeness; 5. spirits/dwarfs; 6. person(s) of female sex (SENFT (1986: 334)).
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APPENDIX: CPS IN KILIVILA LANGUAGE

(SEE: LAWTON (1980); SENFT (1985a; 1986))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
<th>USAGE/REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bek u</td>
<td>1. stone blades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. floating submerged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big a</td>
<td>word, message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biko</td>
<td>coconut bunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bili</td>
<td>roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bililo</td>
<td>trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo</td>
<td>cut across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bobo, bubo,</td>
<td>1. cut across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubu</td>
<td>2. block cut off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bogi, bugi</td>
<td>night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubulo</td>
<td>something made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubwa</td>
<td>cut across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buda boda,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budu, budo</td>
<td>group, team, crowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buko, buku</td>
<td>buried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukwa, buko</td>
<td>fruit cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buliga</td>
<td>storey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulu</td>
<td>half submerged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buluwo</td>
<td>ten-group (animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bwa</td>
<td>trees, wooden things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bwallita</td>
<td>sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dala, dila</td>
<td>family line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deli</td>
<td>company, group on the move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doba</td>
<td>skirt made of banana leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dodiya</td>
<td>load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duli</td>
<td>cluster, bundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumia</td>
<td>swamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duyo, duyo</td>
<td>door, entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gabu, gubu</td>
<td>burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gibu</td>
<td>sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gili</td>
<td>row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gini</td>
<td>mouthful of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>givi</td>
<td>serve of fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giwi</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guba</td>
<td>bundles of taro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gubu, gubu</td>
<td>garden division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gubwa</td>
<td>group of four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gudi</td>
<td>child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gugulo</td>
<td>gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gula, guli</td>
<td>heap, group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gulo, guno</td>
<td>bit, small piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gum</td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iga</td>
<td>wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igi</td>
<td>tens of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabila</td>
<td>large cut of meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabilikova</td>
<td>fireplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabisi</td>
<td>compartment of a food house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabulo, kabulu</td>
<td>protuberances, village sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keda, kada</td>
<td>road, track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadida</td>
<td>very small garden division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka'i, ke'i</td>
<td>tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>stone blades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiga, kaigi</td>
<td>voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaliliku</td>
<td>part of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiyuvai, yuvai</td>
<td>layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kala</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kali</td>
<td>paddle strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalipo</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalivisi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaluvisi</td>
<td>large garden division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalo</td>
<td>two-bundle (crustacean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaluwo</td>
<td>ten days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapo, kapwa</td>
<td>bundles (wrapped up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapu, kapo</td>
<td>mouthful of drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapuli</td>
<td>group of parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapupu</td>
<td>grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasa</td>
<td>row, line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasila</td>
<td>ten-group (wealth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katukuni</td>
<td>reel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katuluwo</td>
<td>large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katupo</td>
<td>village sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaulo</td>
<td>ten-group (strings of fish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kauya</td>
<td>creel, fish trap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kavi</td>
<td>tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaya</td>
<td>half piece of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke, kai</td>
<td>wooden things, rigid long objects, unmarked form for inanimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kevala,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaivala</td>
<td>batch drying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kila, kili</td>
<td>clusters (hands) of bananas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kipu</td>
<td>cut of meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kova</td>
<td>fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kovi</td>
<td>pot-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koya, kwoya</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kubila, kwabila</td>
<td>large land plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudu</td>
<td>1. band of fibres, bundles of lashing creeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumila</td>
<td>clan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumila, kumlo</td>
<td>earth oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuna, kuno</td>
<td>rain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kununu  serve of greens, number of fibres laid together
kupa, kupu  loose coil
kupro  two string
kuwo  crumb
kwai, kwela,  
kwena, kwela,  
kwaila, kweikwa  clay pot
kwailuwo,  
kweluwo  tens of things
kwe, kwai  things, unmarked form for inanimates
kweya, kwaya,  
kwe'i  limb, severed limb
kweya  yard
lada  small fishing spot
lapou  a third of
ligila, ligili  group action
liku  1. compartments of a canoe, of a food-house
       2. area of authority
lila  bough, branch, leaf
lilivi  forked stick
lilo, lola,  
lilo'u  walk, journey
lipu  1. compartment of a creel
       2. tier
livisi  shelf
luba  bundles (of rolls)
lukuva  growing bundle
lupo  smaller garden division
luva  1. wooden dishes
       2. tied bundle
mavila, meila  part of a song, of a magic formula
megwa  magic formula
miga, migi  appearance, face
mmwa, mmo  conical bundle
moya  limb
mweli 1. practices
2. bundle of leaves

na 1. animals
2. stars, moon, planets
3. spirits, dwarfs
4. carvings in human likeness
5. person(s) of female sex

nigo, nigwa nest, hole
nina parts of a song, idea
no blow
notu, nutu kneaded, dot, drop
nunu corner(s) of a garden
oya string
peta basket
pila part, piece
pona, ponu, polu hole
ponina, pwanina punctured hole
po'ula, po'ulo plantation, grove
puli bunch
pulu garden mound
pupai layer of filth
pwa excrement
pwasa rotten
sa nut-bunch
sam ginger
sega branching
seluva bundle being tied
seuyo lagoon
si small bit
sipu 1. sheaf
2. tangle
sisi bough
sisili cut of meat
siva times
siwa sea portions, ownership divisions with reference to fishing rights
<p>| sobulo   | growing                  |
| soulo    | fishing spot             |
| suya, suye | batch of fish on strings |
| suyo     | things strung through hole |
| ta       | basket                   |
| tabili   | roll                     |
| tabudo   | room                     |
| tam      | sprouting, sprouting yams|
| tavi     | loose coil               |
| te/to, tau | 1. human being(s)       |
|          | 2. person(s) of male sex |
| teni     | tight coil               |
| tetu     | yams                     |
| tubo     | generation               |
| tupila   | fleet                    |
| tuta, tuto | time                   |
| udila    | land tract               |
| umila    | grove (one species)      |
| utu      | scrap, parts cut off, small particles |
| uva      | span measure, the span of two extended arms - from tip to tip |
| uwo      | two-bundle               |
| vala     | small garden division    |
| va, vala, vaya | 1. rivers, creeks, sea passages |
|          | 2. doors, windows        |
| vakala   | belt of spondylus-shell discs |
| vili     | untwisted                |
| vilo     | place, village           |
| vosi     | songs, parts of songs    |
| wela     | batch of fish, string of fish |
| wouyo    | newnes                  |
| ya       | flexible, thin           |
| yam      | 1. day                   |
|          | 2. hand                  |
| yama     | yard                     |
| yeni     | a handful of             |
| yegila   | name                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yivi</td>
<td>serve of food pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yulai, yule</td>
<td>bundles of four things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuma</td>
<td>length, fingertips of one hand to wrist of the other hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuva</td>
<td>shoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yuwo</td>
<td>group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø (= zero-morpheme)</td>
<td>a basketful of yams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>