And for the dual:

\[ \text{devā} \text{ [N, stem, Dual]} \]

\[ \text{devān} \text{ [ ]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Nom, Voc, Acc} \]

\[ \text{devāyoh} \text{ [periph/local]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Gen, Loc} \]

\[ \text{devāhyān} \text{ [periph/rel]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Dat, Abl, Instr} \]

In these inheritance trees the learner must identify affix templates. Every time he investigates a set of more complex word forms, he has to readjust the position class of all the affixes already identified (Wunderlich 1996: 276). The paradigms are built up only from the positively marked instances, and they define the dimensions in which the other elements may receive minus values by entering the unmarked cells. These elements, for instance the nominative singular or the nominative dual, obtain their syntactic potential from their place in a paradigm.

Taking into account the features that have morphological representations, we get the following results for the three numbers:

\[ \text{Sg.: } -, \text{ outside, hr, periph/hr, nom, with, place, dir, wh} \]
\[ \text{Pl.: } -, \text{ hr, concern, nom, with, place} \]
\[ \text{Du.: } -, \text{ rel, local} \]

Now for the unpredictable affixes: in the singular these include all but the nominative and accusative:

\[ [+] \text{ outside} \rightarrow e \text{ (with accent shift to the root) } \rightarrow \text{ vocative} \]
\[ [+] \text{ periph} \rightarrow [+] \text{ nom} \rightarrow \text{ genitive} \]
Luhr

[+ periph] [+ adv] [+ with] -éna → instrumental
[+ periph] [+ adv] [+ place] -ë → locative
[+ periph] [+ hr] -éyé → dative
[+ periph] [+ adv] [+ direct] [+ wh-direct] -ď → ablative

When we compare the plural with the inflection of further paradigms, only the affix of the instrumental is absolutely unpredictable:

[+ periph] [+ adv] [+ with] -áih → instrumental

For the locative and dative/ablative the stem vowel has to be kept in mind:

[+ periph] [+ adv] [+ place] -éšu → locative
[+ periph] [+ concern] -ébhyař → dative/ablative

On the contrary, the accusative and genitive show -ď:

[+ periph] [+ nom] -áñám → genitive
[ ] [+ hr] -ďt → accusative

And for the dual:

[ ] -au → nominative/accusative/vocative
[+ periph] [+ rel] -ébhyař → dative/ablative/instrumental
[+ periph] [+ local] -áyoih → genitive/locative

We must also consider the neuter yugâ: 'yoke':

(9)(a)

yugâ [N. stem, Sg]

yugâm [ ]

[→ Nom, Voc, Acc]

yugâyâ [periph/hr] yugâ [periph]

[→ Dat]

yugâyâ [periph/nom] yugé [periph/adv], etc.
(9)(b)

\[ \text{yugā [N, stem, Pl]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Nom, Voc, Acc} \]
\[ \text{yugé [periph]} \]
\[ \text{yugāni [ ]} \]
\[ \text{yugē [periph]} \]
\[ \text{yugēbhyaḥ [periph/concern]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Dat, Abl, etc.} \]
\[ \text{yuginām [periph/nom]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Gen, etc.} \]

And for the dual:

(9)(c)

\[ \text{yugā [N, stem, Dual]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Nom, Voc, Acc} \]
\[ \text{yugē [ ]} \]
\[ \text{yugā [periph]} \]
\[ \text{yugāyoh [periph/local]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Gen, Loc} \]
\[ \text{yugāhyām [periph/rel]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{Dat, Abl, Instr} \]

Now let us consider the inheritance tree of the feminine ā-stems (sēnā- ‘army’). For the coincidence of genitive and ablative we need a common feature [ ] vs. [− source].
The plural:

(10)(b)  
\[ \text{senā [N, stem, Pl]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senāmāy [periph/secom]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

And for the dual:

(10)(c)  
\[ \text{senā [N, stem, Dual]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]

\[ \text{senā [periph]} \]
Which features do have morphological representations?

\( \tilde{a} \)-stems:

(10)(d)

Sg.: -outside, hr, periph/hr, source, with, place
Pl.: -concern, nom, with, place
Du.: -rel, local

And the unpredictable affixes are:

\( \tilde{a} \)-stems:

Sg.

\[ \begin{array}{l}
[\text{+[outside]} -e \rightarrow \text{vocative}] \\
[\text{+[periph]} [\text{+[adv]} [\text{with}]] -ayh \rightarrow \text{instrumental}] \\
\end{array} \]

Dual:

\[ \begin{array}{l}
[\text{-e} \rightarrow \text{nominative, accusative, vocative}] \\
[\text{+[periph]} [\text{+[local]}] -ayh \rightarrow \text{genitive, locative}] \\
\end{array} \]

If one generalizes the \( \tilde{a} \) in the other cases those forms are regular.

Let us now compare the data with respect to the features we considered to be subnodes. For the following we will confine ourselves to the dichotomy feminine vs. masculine:

\( \tilde{a} \)-stems

Sg.: -outside, hr, periph/hr, source, with, place
Pl.: -concern, nom, with, place
Du.: -rel, local

\( \alpha \)-stems:

Sg.: -outside, hr, periph/hr, nom, with, place, dir, wh
Pl.: -hr, concern, nom, with, place
Du.: -rel, local

With respect to underspecification, the following has to be kept in mind: in the singular masculine, the \( \alpha \)-stems do not show
syncretism. The neuter has the same form for the nominative, accusative and vocative. In the feminine singular, there is syncretism in the genitive and ablative. In the dual, all the three genders behave in the same way: there is syncretism among the nominative, accusative and vocative; among the instrumental, dative and ablative; and between the genitive and locative. In the plural there are differences again: in the feminine ā-stems the nominative/vocative and accusative are identical, whereas the masculine differs in these cases.

1.c. Number

Let us briefly consider number with regard to underspecification. In every paradigm no single singular form is identical with a plural form. Only in the dual of the ā-stems does one find the nominative, accusative, vocative identical with the vocative singular. However, we should remember that the vocative occurs outside the sentence. Inside the sentence in the mentioned nouns there is no instance of underspecification concerning number.

1.d. Gender

Now let us turn to the question: why do the given paradigms appear the way they do? Why are there apparently pronominal endings in some cases? Why does the syncretism in the singular diverge from that in the plural? Why is syncretism in the feminine different from that in the masculine?

I think the answer to all these questions is that, as in other languages, in Old Indian it is the importance of the conception of gender that lies behind nearly all the kinds of syncretism mentioned above. Following Corbett (1991: 44), the defining
property of gender is agreement. Compare the following generalization:

“If a language distinguishes gender, there is always agreement with respect to gender.

Second, gender is the most idiosyncratic of the functional categories of the noun,” since it is “either specified by virtue of inherent ... properties (natural kinds, of 'sorts'), or it is arbitrarily specified and hence must be learnt for the noun in question.” Gender is more important than number, since gender “is inherently fixed for a noun, whereas [number] is usually instantiated and gives rise to different word forms in the paradigm of a noun.” In Old Indian for a core of the noun inventory, gender is assigned according to semantic criteria. On the other hand gender is assigned to nouns in an arbitrary manner. However, the gender specification of a given noun is invariant (Ortmann 1998: 62).

As Ortmann points out (1998: 76f.) there are languages with special inflectional allomorphs to distinguish the dichotomy [+/- animate]. In German for instance the weak declensional class is increasingly confined to nouns denoting persons, as seen with suffixes such as -at, -ist in Demokrat, Sozialist (accusative den Demokraten, den Sozialisten, also consider den Typen vs. den Typ). Therefore, [+ animate] clearly defines an inflectional noun class in German.

However, it is important for the following that the same trend as in noun inflection is observed for pronominal systems. For example in Swedish, which has maintained the tripartite sex-based gender in a reduced fashion, there is an innovative distinction [- neuter]. For nouns which denote non-human entities, and which were formerly masculine or feminine, the pronominal form den is used
for nouns such as *hunden* 'a dog' or *katten* 'a cat' as opposed to [+human], which are pronominally referred to as *han* and *hun*, respectively.

(11) *han* (male) *hun* (female) *den* (common) *det* (neut) 

[+hum, -ntr, -fem] [+hum, -ntr, +fem] [-hum, -ntr] [-hum, +ntr]

Persian is also an example of a language without gender that nevertheless has established a [+/-human] differentiation for third person pronouns. The same holds for Finnish, viz. *hän* vs. *se*.

From this point of view one can understand why languages which do not have articles, but demonstrative pronouns, take over endings from the pronominal system.

Turning now to Old Indian, we assume that the pronominal distinction between the genders was as relevant as in the just mentioned examples. The pattern is the demonstrative pronoun *tā-.* The nominal a- and ā-stems took affixes from this pronominal system and not from other classes of masculine and feminine nouns, because the gender dichotomy is the clearest in the pronominal system. And having not only natural but also grammatical gender the relevant affixes apply to nouns with grammatical gender, too.

Since the instrumental plays the same prominent role among the peripheral cases as the nominative among the full cases, it must be specified. In the singular an *-ā* from the masculine affix *-eh/oh₁* and the feminine affix *-ah₂oh₁* provided no distinction between the two genders. Therefore, the same affixes as in the pronominal system are found here: *tēna* vs. *tāyā*. In the instrumental of the masculine plural, the old affix *-ah₂* could be kept because it differs from that of the feminine *-ābhīḥ*. But in the dative/ablative plural
and in the locative plural, the thematic vowel -e- vs. -ā-
corresponds to that of the pronoun: tēbhyaḥ vs. tēbhyaḥ, tēṣaḥ vs. tāṣa. Thus the two genders are distinguishable. Like the
instrumental singular, the dative singular is a case which would be
assumed to have the same ending for the masculine and the
feminine: *-āi from *-ājī vs. *-ājī. In both genders the form is
remodeled (-āya vs. -āyai). The corresponding forms of the
pronoun (tāsmāi vs. tāseyai) do not fit, because the ending -āi in
both genders does not distinguish between masculine and
feminine while the stem -sm- vs. -sy- does. Thus the dative
singular of the masculine gets a second dative ending -ay form
*-ejj of which the second -j may be dissimilated; *-āja from *-ājaj
from *-ējj + -ej (G.Klingenschmitt 1992: 105). Another device
would have been the assumption of the whole pronominal affix
-smāi in the masculine and -syāi in the feminine, but the elements
-sm- and -sy- do not occur elsewhere in the inflection of the
masculine and feminine nouns respectively. -sy- occurs only in the
genitive singular masculine. Since no other remodeling after the
-sy-element in the noun inflection is to be found one can assume
that -āya in the genitive singular masculine of the noun is of the
same age as the predecessor of -oiσ in Greek Homeric ἵππος.

As to the element -āy- in the singular of the ā-stems, I assumed
some time ago that the ā-inflection in Old Indian started from the
locative singular *-aj + vowel from *-ahjī + vowel (Lühr 1991).
Whereas the short a was kept in the instrumental since -ayā is, as
mentioned, identical with the instrumental singular feminine of
the pronoun, ā was elsewhere generalized before -j-. The reason
for the remodeling surely lies in the locative singular: the outcome
of *aj would have become identical with the -e in the locative
singular of the masculine. Thus *aj was remodeled after the
locative singular of the feminine pronoun to *-āyam and then
lengthened to *-āyām since -ā- is the stem vowel otherwise. In
analogy to that the remodeling of the ablative/genitive after the feminine pronoun tâyâh took place, thus resulting in -âyâh in the paradigm of the feminine noun. A possible ablative *-ât in the feminine singular, compare Latin sententâd, would not be possible because this form would coincide with that of the masculine. Also the ending -e in the vocative singular is due to the trend of distinguishing masculine from feminine. A possible vocative *sēnā with shortened *-ah to *-a as in Old Church Slavonic ženo ‘woman’ or Greek νῆμα (compare also Old Indian dévi) would have become identical with the masculine déva. Therefore, on the basis of a nominative -ā which could be interpreted as an outcome of -āy within a paradigm with āy-forms a new vocative *-aj resulting in Old Indian -e was created. In the plural of the feminine the expected form -āh for the nominative and the accusative was maintained as it corresponds with that of the feminine pronoun: nom., acc. pl. tāh (: sēnāh). The instrumental and dative/ablative of the masculine and feminine are distinguishable because of the pronominal -e in the masculine: devēbhīh vs. sēnābhīh, devēbhyāh vs. sēnābhyaḥ. Only the ending of the genitive plural is identical: devēnām = sēnānām. The alternative would have been the ending of pronominal tēgām vs. tāgām: the question would be: why did the Old Indians not follow this analogy? I suggest the following explanation: in the plural there is only one affix beginning with s, i.e. the affix -su, which can easily be recognized as the ending of the locative plural; compare the locative singular masculine devē with the locative plural devēgū. On the contrary, a genitive plural *-sām does not have any connection to the singular. In addition, the regular form *sēnām of the genitive plural would have been identical with the full case accusative singular sēnām. One can assume that to maintain the distinction between the numbers singular and plural, the expected type *sēnām was first enlarged with the result of *-
ān. That means the original ending *-ān was doubled. In a next step the genitive plural *devān was remodeled after the genitive plural feminine, because the dative/ablative and the locative feminine and masculine also have the same endings.

With respect to the neuter plural and the dual of all genders and cases, the endings are identical with those of the pronoun: neuter tānī, dual tānī masculine, tē neuter, tē feminine, instrumental, dative, ablative tābhyām, genitive and locative tāvoh respectively. Therefore, with regard to the genitive plural of the masculine and feminine, one can state the generalization:

If the pronoun distinguishes gender, the noun also does. Thus one can say that the inflection of the ā- and ō-stems in Old Indian is really determined by gender. Forms are specified regarding gender whenever it is possible.

In the treated stems the phenomenon of underspecification is only to be found in the case system. Number does not demonstrate underspecification. In general the expected forms are to be found with the exception of the just mentioned genitive plural masculine and the pronominal thematic vowel -ē- in some plural forms of the masculine and neuter. Quite the contrary, in order to provide a clear distinction between the three genders, especially between masculine and feminine, many forms are remodeled by analogy. The pattern is that of the demonstrative pronoun.

2. Greek and Hittite

With regard to pronominal endings within nominal inflection let us take a look at two further Old Indo-European languages, Greek and Hittite.
In Greek o- and á-stems correspond to the Old Indian a- and á-stems. The o-stems show the pronominal ending of the article in the nominative plural masculine:

(12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. ῥίπτος</td>
<td>ῥίπτοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. ῥίπτος</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. ῥίπτος</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. ῥίπτος</td>
<td>τοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. ῥίπτος</td>
<td>τοῦ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The á-stems behave in the same way, but pronominal αὐ is not original, it is remodelled after the nominative plural masculine αὐ.

(13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. τιμή</td>
<td>τίμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. τιμῆς</td>
<td>τίμων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. τιμή</td>
<td>τίμως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. τιμήν</td>
<td>τίμας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Greek, like Old Indian, is a language which maintains the distinction between singular and plural. Thus the singular and the plural of the o- and á-stems always have different endings. If a singular form and a plural form threaten to become identical, another analogy occurs as in the case of the nominative plural feminine. The expected ending *-ἡς from Indo-European *-āh₂es would have become identical with the genitive singular feminine. To distinguish singular and, first the pronominal -αι was taken over for the feminine nouns, and then pronominal -α for the masculine nouns. The result of this remodeling is not only a clear dichotomy between singular vs. plural in the o- and á-stems. The

---

feature singular vs. plural is also connected with an ending, which shows a distinction between masculine and feminine. There is one other exception: as in Old Indian, the genitive plural feminine and masculine/neuter is only specified regarding number and not gender; compare τημὸν and τημῶν with pronominal τῶν. But the predecessor of the genitive plural feminine ending, Proto-Greek *-ān (hom. myk. -ān, lesb. ἄν, ion. -αν, att. -ān), is from the pronoun; compare hom. τῶν. Thus, the development to -ān in the genitive plural feminine occurred later, but the underspecification concerning gender was not abandoned.

The reason for this must be further investigated. We must remember, however, that the main function of the genitive is its adnominal use. A gender specification is possibly more necessary in the full cases than in the other cases. The distinction between the genders outside the full cases, however, may vary; consider the peripheral dative/ablative plural in Latin dominis, feminis and genitive plural dominorum vs. feminorum.

Now let us further consider the Greek inflection of the pronoun. It is widely assumed that the dative singular masculine, neuter att. τῷ (ai. τάσματι), the genitive plural masculine, neuter att. τῶν (ai. τάσγματος), the genitive singular feminine att. της (ai. τάσγας) and the dative singular feminine att. τῇ (ai. τάσγατι) are remodeled after the endings of the noun (Rix 1992: 183). But since feminine *τέσσαρες, *τέσσαρι and masculine *τοίσιον would hardly have resulted in other forms than της, τῇ and τῶν\(^\text{10}\), one can state that the correspondence between nominal της, τῇ, τῶν and pronominal της, τῇ and τῶν caused the assumption of nominal dative singular masculine -όν by the pronoun — *m resulting from *τέσμον would

have been maintained.

Considering underspecification in the Greek o- and ā-stems, we should now keep in mind that this phenomenon does not occur in the case and number system. The only form *-ης in the nominative plural feminine, being identical with the genitive singular feminine, was remodeled after pronominal -oι. -oι in the nominative plural masculine of the noun is also a pronominal ending. With respect to gender, the identity of the former distinguished forms of the genitive plural masculine and feminine was maintained. This is possibly because gender specification is not so necessary in other than full cases. Except the dative singular masculine of the pronoun τῶν, which was adapted to the corresponding form of the noun, the pronoun influenced the noun system for distinguishing gender:

Gen.Pl.f. hom. myk. -āon, lesb. -āw, ion. -ēōn, att. -ō from *-āsōn
   : hom. τῶν
Nom.Pl.f. -oι : αι
Nom.Pl.m. -oι : οι

As in Old Indian, the remodeling of the feminine noun has prevailed over that of the masculine noun.

Now, let us take a look at Hittite. This language has only two genders, commune and neuter. Pronominal -e from Indoeuropean *-oι does not enter the noun inflection:

Compare nom.pl.m. antuḫješ ‘men’ : apē ‘they’

Since Hittite does not distinguish between masculine and feminine, pronominal endings are not found in the noun inflection. Therefore, we can now define the function of the analogy to the pronoun in the oldest Indoeuropean languages. This

---

11 In the nominative plural of the noun and pronoun the ending -oι is also
analogy has helped to maintain the distinction of the two genders masculine and feminine, i.e., in general, where the pronoun had a clearer distinction between masculine and feminine, the endings of the pronoun are taken on.

3. The Hittite neuter

Let us now take a more detailed look at the relationship between nouns and pronouns in Hittite. In Hittite the pronouns have another function rather than just to distinguish gender. In this connection the neuter is the relevant category. It has the feature [-animate]. You find neutrals among the a-stems. Two have correspondences in other Indoeuropean languages:

(14)


memal 'grits', paršulli- 'breadcrumb', šakkar 'excrement',

found which goes back to the accusative plural.


If pronouns refer to communia and neuters you find:

(15)

Sg.

nominative c. kās ‘this’ apās ‘that’ vs. (akk.) n. kē, apāt

Pl.

nominative c. kē apē vs. (akk.) n. kē, apē

In the plural of the communia the expected ending -ē from Indo-
European pronominal *-o/j appears. But why does this ending also occur in the neuter? In the neuter plural of the deictic pronoun there is no specific pronominal ending. The adjectives and the possessive pronoun behave in the same way. The corresponding singular forms occur most often in the adjective, and are compulsory in the possessive pronoun:

(16) ud-da-a-ar-mit ‘my words’
ša-ku-ga-ša-še-it ‘his eyes’

Often the singular of a noun and the plural of a verb are combined:

Compare the following data:

(17) KBo V 6 (CTH 40, yhitt.) II 5 f.:
(5) na-an ŠÁ [L] KUR KUR-e-]a-an-xa a-uš-ta
(6) na-at na-ah-far-ri-ja-an-da-ri
‘And the hostile country saw him and they were afraid’

A conception like ‘population’ may be interpreted in the same sentence both as a collective singular and a group of individuals; compare also tazzzi- ‘army’, which is mostly singular, but if the word occurs as an ideogram, it is written with the plural determinative ĒRIN. In traditional terms this construction is called constructio ad sensum, but in reality it concerns the phenomenon of underspecification. Only the context, the kind of agreement, permits the right interpretation.

This means that the neuter must be underspecified for [+/- collective]. tazzzi- ‘army’ for instance is a so-called “genus

---

collective. Words like *tuzzi- or army, cattle* in the singular refer not only to a group of individuals, but also to the whole kind. If the conception refers to individuals, then the plural pronouns *kē, apē* often occur together with the plural ending of the verb. If the conception is considered collective, the pronoun *apāt* appears and possibly the verb has the singular ending. With regard to the possessive pronoun only the conception as collective is developed, therefore the possessive pronoun occurs only in the singular. On the contrary, if *kē* refers to a neuter the individuals of the group are meant. The conclusion is: whereas the genus commune is specified for singular and plural, the gender neuter is underspecified. The pronoun neuter singular *apāt* ‘that’, plural *kē, apē* refer either to the collective as a whole or to a group of individuals.

III.

To sum up: our consideration of the inflection of the oldest Indo-European languages has shown different kinds of underspecification. With regard to the *a- and ā-stems in Old Indian*, the most frequent stems in this language, the case system shows the most instances of underspecification. Our representation, which follows the principles of Minimalist morphology, has shown this. Number is not underspecified in the singular and plural, but only in the dual; and gender, except that the genitive plural, does not display underspecification. In recognizing the important role of gender-based inflection for the pronoun, a lot of remodeling after the pattern of the pronoun becomes clear. The distinction between masculine and feminine defines the gender paradigm. When a form threatens to become

---

identical with one of the opposite gender, a form analogous to the
pronoun usually occurs. Since pronouns are those parts of speech
which copy natural gender the best, endings of the pronoun can be
taken on within the noun system, and this may occur not only in
the nouns with natural gender, but with grammatical gender, too.
In Greek, remodeling analogous to the pronoun is also to be found
in the o- and ã-stems, which is motivated by the distinction
between the genders masculine and feminine. The feminine is
always more frequently remodeled than the masculine. This is
quite the contrary for Hittite, which has only the two genders,
commune and neuter, and does not demonstrate such analogies.
Hittite does, however, have a remarkable kind of
underspecification, a constructio ad sensum, for which pronouns
are also relevant. The neuter which has the feature [- animate] is
underspecified with respect to the features [±/- collective]. The
decitic pronouns kâs ‘this’ and apâs ‘that’ occur in the nominative
(accusative) neuter as apâr vs. apê, kê; their use is dependent on
the conception of neuter. If the neuter is imagined as a whole, the
singular of the pronoun occurs, whereas the plurals apê and kê
refer to a neuter, when a group of individuals is the underlying
conception. Thus, in the oldest Indo-European languages
pronouns play an important role for the inflection and conception
of categories of the noun.

Gender and collectivity are undoubtedly decisive functional
categories. In a language like the Indo-European languages which
marks gender, the one category depends on the other: individual
nouns are typical of these languages and determine the “primary”
lexicon, whereas collectives or mass nouns belong to the
“secondary” lexicon and are often generated from individual
nouns. Therefore, we can say that gender influences division of
nouns on the basis of the mass/count distinction\textsuperscript{16}.
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