

Solveiga Armoskaite (Carleton University)

Animacy and gender as derivational devices

In Blackfoot (Alogonquian) roots that inherently encode animacy are of category noun; in Lithuanian (Baltic), roots that inherently encode gender are nouns (Armoskaite 2011; cf Lowenstamm 2008, Kramer 2009, among others). What is the role of animacy and gender in the process of nominalization? In Lithuanian, for example, most nominalizers are either of masculine or feminine gender only. Yet nominalizer *-um-* can be of either gender. In Blackfoot, for example, some nominalizers are either animate or inanimate. Yet nominalizers like *-a'tsis* can be of either animacy, as plural agreement indicates. Moreover, any intransitive verb may be used as a noun (first observed by Uhlenbeck 1938). We see a verb with its aspectual and transitive morphology intact used as a noun, i.e., becoming nominal due to animacy.

Working hypothesis: Animacy and gender (i) are features; (ii) can be used to derive nouns. The question is: what is the syntax of these features?