GUNTER SENFT (Nijmegen)

A Grammaticalization Hypothesis on the Origin of Kilivila Classificatory Particles*

1. Kilivila, Classifier Languages, and Classifiers

Kilivila (also: Kiriwina, Boyowa) is one of the 40 Austronesian 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; ROSS 1988: 25ff.); 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 on the phenomenon with which this paper deals (see also SENFT 1985, 1989: 143–145, 1991). 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.).

“Classifier languages” show the following three characteristics:
- they have a system of “classifiers”;
- they follow the -almost- 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; but see ADAMS 1989: 12 & 24); and
- they belong to one of the following four language types:
  - numeral classifier languages,
  - concordial classifier languages,
  - predicative classifier languages,
  - intra locative classifier languages (ALLAN 1977: 286ff.).

* This paper is based on 22 months of field research on the Trobriand Islands. I want to thank the German Research Society and the Max-Planck-Society for their support in realizing my field research. This paper owes much to the discussions I had with JOHN BOWDEN and to a talk BERND HEINE presented at our Cognitive Anthropology Research Group in Nijmegen. I want to thank the National and Provincial Governments in Papua New Guinea and the Institute of PNG Studies for their assistance with, and permission for, my research projects. I express my great gratitude to the people of the Trobriand Islands, especially to the inhabitants of Tauwema; I thank them for their hospitality, friendship, and patient cooperation.
JOHN LYONS (1977 (II): 463) mentions another important feature of "classifier languages":

"Languages which grammaticalize the distinction between entity-denoting nouns and mass-denoting nouns tend to draw a sharp syntactic distinction between phrases like ‘three men’, on the one hand, and ‘three glasses of whisky’, on the other. Classifier languages do not: they treat enumerable entities and enumerable quanta in much the same way".

In linguistics, numeral classifier languages are considered to be the paradigmatic type of classifier languages. Kilivila, too, belongs to this paradigmatic type\(^1\).

Languages with numeral classifiers differ from other languages primarily with respect to the following characteristic feature: In counting inanimate as well as animate referents the numerals (obligatorily) concatenate with a certain morpheme, which is the so-called "classifier". This morpheme classifies and quantifies the respective nominal referent according to semantic criteria (see: SERZISKO 1980: 1, 1982: 147; HUNDIUS, KÖLVER 1983: 166). Moreover, in numeral classifier languages we find classifier morphemes in anaphoric (see e.g.: DOWNING 1986) and deictic expressions. Therefore, the term "numeral classification" is somewhat inaccurate (see also ASMAH 1972: 90; BERLIN, ROMNEY 1964: 79; UNTERBECK 1990b: 90). Nevertheless, I adhere to this technical term as it is introduced in the general linguistic literature (see: ALLAN 1977: 286; BECKER 1975: 114f.; GREENBERG 1975: 19; HAAS 1942).

So far classifiers are defined as morphemes that classify and quantify nouns according to semantic criteria. Because of the twofold function of classifiers SERZISKO (1980: 7) – following HLA PE (1965: 166) and BLOOMFIELD (1933: 237) – proposes the generic term "Numerativ" to denote the "obligatorische Konstituente in Quantifizierungskontexten" (see also: HUNDIUS, KÖLVER 1983: 167ff.). The term "numerative" subsumes "classifiers (proper)" as well as "quantifiers".

Classifiers 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 (see also CHOLODOVIC 1954: 49; UNTERBECK 1990b: 43).

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 certain noun which is not inherent to it. Thus, quantifiers are predicative (see SERZISKO 1980: 17, 68ff.; 1982: 152; BERLIN 1968: 175; FRIEDRICH 1970: 397; Denny 1986: 302ff.; with respect to nouns and quantification see also GIL 1991).

Referentially nouns in classifier languages can be characterized as nouns with generic reference (see ROYEN 1929: 775). With their referential function numeratives 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; SERZISKO 1980: 15, 86ff.).

The functions numeratives or "classifiers" fulfill are succinctly summarized by ADAMS, BECKER, and CONKLIN (1975: 2): "Besides their function 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".

\(^1\) This paper deals with the classificatory system of this language; thus, I will not discuss the other three types of classifier languages mentioned above. For a discussion of these types see e.g. ALLAN 1977: 286ff.; CRAIG 1986: 3f.
So far we only differentiated “classifiers” and “quantifiers” (see also Adams 1989: 3ff., 194), or, to use Lyon’s (1977 (II): 463) terms, “sortal classifiers” and “mensural classifiers” (see also Unterbeck 1990b: 40). However, with the definition of “classifiers proper” and “quantifiers” one generally hits upon a third category, the so-called “repeaters”. Hla Pe (1965: 166) defines the concepts “classifier (proper)”, “repeater”, and “quantifier” as follows:

“A classifier is a word for an attribute of a specific object, some of which may have more than one; a repeater is the specific object itself or part of it, used as numeral; 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.”

Moreover, “repeaters” are defined by Burling (1965: 249) as “echo classifiers”, Fischer (1972: 69) calls them “identical classifiers”, and Köver (1982: 178, 183; 1979: 34) characterizes them as “semantischer dummy”; finally, Goral (1978: 33) defines “repeaters” as “autoclassifiers … filling a syntactic slot …” (see also Adams, Conklin 1974: 3f.; Benton 1968: 116; Smith 1979: 88). In connection with this phenomenon, Lehmann (1979: 169) hints at the possibility to study this problem from a different point of view: he notes: “… a classifier can also function as an independent noun…”. Allan (1977) takes up the problem “repeater” with all necessary caution and offers some hypothetical answers to the question why this category develops. Allan (1977: 295) gives the following three “explanations … for their existence: (i) The information may be worth duplicating because of its significance … this strikes me as a possible explanation for the… Kiriwina … examples, because the objects denoted are prized possessions in the … speech communities. (ii) Perhaps the noun and its classifier were originally borrowed from some other language and have maintained their relationship separately from native classes; or, alternatively, the class may once have been larger, but in the course of time all the other nouns have dropped out of use or been reclassified.”

It is the aim of this paper to offer another hypothesis on the function of these “repeaters” and on the origin of classifiers. However, before I do this, I want to note here, that Bronislaw Malinowski (1920) 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.

Kilivila has a system of “Classificatory Particles” that encompasses at least 177 formatives (Lawton 1980; Senft 1983). For the last 8 years this fascinating system of classifi-

---

2 See also Jones (1970: 2): “It is interesting to speculate on the possibility that such usage arises from an inadequate supply of classifiers once their use becomes firmly established”. See also Adams (in print a) and Adams (1989: 1).

3 Royen (1929: iii, 37, 68, 185, 192, 305, 364, 889) emphasizes again and again that an interdisciplinary approach is not only necessary but also inevitable for any research and analysis of nominal classifier systems. See also Berlin et al. 1973: 214. For the sake of completeness I want to mention that Berlin (1968) also speaks of “action classifiers” in Tzeltal, that Harweg (1987) uses the term “Zähleinheitswörter” as a synonym for “Numerativ”, that Hoa (1957: 128) introduces the term “semelfactive classifier” for a “type of classifier which indicates single action”, referring to certain numeratives in Vietnamese, that Adams (1989: 177 & 182) speaks of “the general or cannibalising classifier”, that Hiraburana (1979: 39f.) mentions the terms “reduplicative classifier” and “imitative classifier”, and that Fischer (1972: 69, 77) speaks of “isolierte Klassifikatoren” (i.e.: one classifier classifies only one noun) and that he mentions “metric classifiers” (i.e.: classifiers for numerical and time/temporal units), too. See also Seiler 1986.
cution has been one of my main concerns in learning, studying, describing and analyzing Kilivila (Senft 1985; 1987; 1989; 1990; 1991).

The system of noun classification is an important means of word formation with all but one demonstrative pronouns, with one form of (numerical) interrogative pronouns/adverbs, 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 and syntactic aspects of constituents with CPs in detail elsewhere (Senft 1985: 374–379; 1986). I refer the reader who wants more detailed information about these processes of word formation to my previously published work on this topic (Senft 1985; 1986; 1991); for the purposes pursued here it suffices to finish this brief paragraph with the presentation of two sentences with all the four word classes involved in the system of noun classification (see: Senft 1989; 1991). In the examples the CP (–)ke(–) is underlined:

*Kevila waga lekotasi?*

*ke-vila wa-ga le-kota -si?*

wooden-how many canoe 3 Ps. Past-arrive-Plural

‘How many canoes arrived?’

*Keyu waga makesina kemanahweta (lekotasi).*

*ke-yu wa-ga ma-ke -si na ke-manahweta (le-kota -si).*

wooden-two canoe this-wooden-Plural-this wooden-beautiful (3 Ps. Past-arrive-Plural).

‘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.

To give a few examples of Kilivila noun phrases with repeaters as CPs (repeaters are underlined):

*mbogina boq‘* ‘this night’

*dabvunahweta doba* ‘beautiful grass-skirt’

*makgedana keda* ‘this road’

*kovilima kova* ‘five fireplaces’

*lkuveka liku* ‘big yamshouse’

*megwabogwa megwa* ‘old magic’

*pwaningatala pwanina* ‘one hole’

etc.

Just recently I finished the description and analysis of a sub-system of 88 CPs (see Appendix) with respect to its functions, its acquisition, its realization in actual speech production, its change, and its semantics (see also Senft 1991). These 88 CPs represent the classifier system of the speech community of Tawwema village on Kaula’una Island. my place of residence during 15 months of field research in 1982/83 and during 4 further months of field research in 1989. These classifiers are listed in the Appendix below.

2. Some speculations on the origin of classifiers

Linguists dealing with the phenomenon of classifiers can hardly refrain themselves from speculating on the origin of these formatives. I will not discuss the hypotheses already proposed here: Adams (1989: 193f.) gives an excellent general account on the most
interesting speculations put forward so far (see also ASMAH 1972; DE LEON 1988: 128, 134ff., 141ff., 168ff.; SEILER 1983; UNTERBECK 1990a: 8, 1990b: 86, 90). On the basis of my research on Kilivila I indulge in the following speculations upon the origin of the Kilivila classifiers:

I assume that probably most if not all Kilivila CPs are traceable to nouns. This is a rather obvious speculation, if we remember that quite a number of CPs are "repeaters". As already defined above, a "repeater" is a form that can function as a CP as well as a noun within its own right, or, to say it the other way round, a "repeater" is the noun that functions as its own classifier. Repeaters are found in many classifier languages (see e.g. ASMAH (1972: 88ff.); BARZ, DILLER (1985: 168, 174), and the idea that CPs have evolved from nominals is far from original. Nevertheless, let me develop this speculation briefly.

If we look at the list of the Kilivila CP types in the appendix below and if we compare the CPs there with the lexical entries given in SENFT (1986: 185–430), we note the following:


The CP gudí is a shortened form of the noun gwadi ‘child’; the CP variant iga is a shortened form of the noun vegila ‘name’ (note that I also documented the CP variant vegila’); the CP ke is a shortened form of the noun kai ‘wood, tree’ (note that in highly formal situations the CP variant kai is produced); the CP kumila is a shortened form of the noun kumkumila ‘earth oven’; the CP variants kwoila, kwela, kway, kwaila, kwaikwa are modified forms of the noun kwena ‘clay-pot’ (note that we also documented the CP variant kwena’); the CP na in its connotation ‘person of female sex’ is most probably a shortened and modified form of the noun vivila ‘girl, woman’ (in the “biga galanani”-variety of Kilivila the noun is realized as vivina); the CP variants pwana, pona, ponina, ponu, polu, pwana are shortened or modified forms of the noun pwanana ‘hole’; the CP te’to is a shortened form of the noun tau ‘man’ (note that in highly formal situations the CP variant tau is produced); and the CP viló is a modified form of the noun valu ‘place, area, village’. These 9 cases incorporate 7 more CP types that can be traced back to nouns; these 7 CP types represent another 8% of the 88 CPs described in detail here.

The CP kabu’lua/kabulu in its connotations ‘protuberances’ and ‘cape, point’ can be traced back to the nouns kabulu’a ‘point, ledge’, kahunu ‘point’, and kabulu-PP IV (= possessive pronoun suffix, indicating intimate degree of possession) ‘nose’; the CP

4 See also CARPENTER (1986: 18) and Lee (1987: 404). It goes without saying that classifiers may also originate in other word classes. See e.g. WALTER SEILER (1986: 17) who argues for Ilomnda, a Nonaustronesian language of the Trans-New Guinea Phylum, “…that erstwhile full verbs were semantically depleted and reanalysed as classifiers”. See also SEILER 1983. For the influence of classifier systems upon classifier systems, for the topic of how CP systems are changed by processes of borrowing from other languages see ADAMS (in print b).
kauya can be traced back to the noun kauya ‘woven basket’ – however, the CP has a more specific meaning than the (original) noun; the CP kudu in its connotation ‘tooth’ can be traced back to the noun kudu-PP IV; the CP liku can be traced back to the noun liku ‘big food-house’ – however, the CP has a more specific meaning than the (original) noun; and the CP yuma, yam in its connotation ‘hand’ can be traced back to the noun yama-PP IV. These 5 CPs represent another 6% of the 88 CPs described in detail here.

To summarize this argument: 37 of the 88 CPs described in detail in this monograph can be traced back to nouns without any difficulties at all. Thus, the speculation presented here seems to be highly plausible for 42% of the described CPs!

Discussing this aspect of my research with Malcolm Ross, he proposed to reconstruct the proto forms for the Kilivila CPs to find some more evidence for the proposed hypothesis (Ross 1989, personal communication); this is a very interesting proposal, indeed, and such a research should be done some time.

However, I have some further evidence to support and to develop my speculative hypothesis: In my description and analysis of the processes of language change that affect the Kilivila system of CPs I made the following observations:

I observed that the CP kweya/kwaya/keya ‘limb, yard’ supersedes the CP yam/yuma/yama ‘hand, yard’ and that the CP ka’i ‘tooth’ supersedes the CP kudu ‘tooth’; the repeater peta ‘basket’ is superseded by its shortened variant ta and the repeater yegeya ‘name’ is superseded by its shortened variant iga; the CPs bogi ‘night’, koya ‘mountain, hill’, po’ula ‘plantation, grove’, siva ‘time’, yam ‘day’, and to a certain extent the CP boda ‘group, team, crowd’, too, are superseded by the general CP kwe ‘thing’; the CP liku ‘compartment of a big foodhouse’ and to a certain extent the CP duli ‘cluster, bundle’, too, are superseded by the general CPs ke and kwe; the CP kabula ‘protuberances, sectors, point’ is superseded by the CP ke; the position of the CP gula ‘heap, group’ is afflicted by the CPs tam ‘sprouting yams’ and kwe ‘general CP’; and the CPs bek ‘stone blade’, bwalita ‘sea’, doba ‘grass-skirt’, dumia ‘swamp’, megwa ‘magic’, nigwa ‘hole, nest’, tetu ‘yams’, tuta ‘time’, raya ‘door, window, river, creek’, vakala ‘belt of spondylus shell discs’, vosi ‘song’ and kauya ‘fish trap, creel’ play a marginal role only within the system of Kilivila CPs.

Given these additional observations for 26 of the 37 CPs that could be traced back to nouns without difficulties I will now summarize my speculative line of thought:

I assume that most if not all Kilivila CPs originate in nouns (for a too general formulation of this idea see Lee 1988: 212, 225, 235). Originally, the CP system was constituted by, and consisted of, repeaters only. In the course of the time these repeaters were changed and modified, most often by processes of phonological reduction. Finally, the CPs that can be traced back to nouns rather easily are superseded by the general CPs or by those CPs who underwent so many changes themselves that their nominal origin is difficult, or – because of processes of language change – almost impossible, to trace.

3. Grammaticalization, Repeaters, and the Origin of CPs

At the moment, it seems, we can observe the revival of the classic concept of “grammaticalization” in linguistics (see e.g. Heine et al. 1991; Traugott, Heine 1991). The basic idea for this concept came from the British scientist Horne Took, to whom Wilhelm von Humboldt refers in his discussion of – what we now would call – “grammati-
calization” processes of words referring to “real objects” into prepositions (HUMBOLDT 1822 (= 1963): 51 ff.). The term “grammaticalization” was first coined by MEILLET (1912), but – as JOHN BOWDEN (1991: 13 ff.) rightly emphasizes – it is with KURYLOWICZ (1965) that modern interest in the subject began. MEILLET (1912) already claimed that grammatical forms could be traced back either to processes of analogy (e.g. irregular verbs become regular) or to the development of lexical morphemes into grammatical morphemes. In 1965 KURYLOWICZ defined the concept of “grammaticalisation” as follows: “[Grammaticalisation] … consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status” (KURYLOWICZ 1965: 52).

In his discussion of the “grammaticalisation of locatives in Oceanic languages” BOWDEN (1991: 19) mentions quite generally that nouns “tend to be adopted for different functions: they can be used as, e.g., case markers or classifiers”. This observation corresponds with what I have been discussing so far in connection with the Kilivila CPs. Therefore, I can reformulate my hypothesis on the origin of the CPs in Kilivila on the basis of the concept of “grammaticalization”:

I assume that most if not all Kilivila CPs originate in nouns. Originally, the CP system was constituted by, and consisted of, repeaters only. In the course of the time these repeaters were changed and modified, most often by processes of phonological reduction. These changes, however, are most probably mere consequences of a grammaticalization process that affect the lexical form “noun” and changes it into the grammatical form “classifier” – thus, in Kilivila nouns decategorialized into CPs. In this decategorialization process many repeaters were also changed and modified, especially by processes of phonological reduction. Only with a few CPs this grammaticalization process also resulted in a semantic bleaching, i.e., in a desemanticalisation of the former, now decategorialized, nouns. Among the CPs that are desemanticalized we find the repeater kwena (the noun refers to “clay pot” only, the CP refers to pot-like entities in general) and all the repeaters that are now in the process of being superseded by the two general CPs kwe and ke with which speakers can refer to all inanimate referents. In general we can note that CPs which can be traced back rather easily to the nouns from which they originate are very much likely to be superseded by the general CPs or by those CPs the grammaticalization process of which is much more advanced so that their nominal origin is difficult, or almost impossible, to trace.

I would like to summarize this line of thought as the grammaticalization hypothesis on the origin of Kilivila “Classificatory Particles”.
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Appendix: Kilivila CP types

Abbreviations: # = this connotation of the CP type was not elicited.
+ = this (these) connotation(s) of the CP type are the result of my lexicographic research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP type</th>
<th>gloss(es) and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. beku</td>
<td>stone blade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. bililo</td>
<td>trip; (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bogi</td>
<td>night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. bhubu, bhubu, hobo</td>
<td>cut across, cut transversely, (block) cut off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bubwa</td>
<td>cut across, (part(s)) cut off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. budu, boda, budu</td>
<td>group, team, crows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. bukwa, buko</td>
<td>a) fruit cluster:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. bwa</td>
<td>trees, wooden things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. bwalita</td>
<td>sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. deli</td>
<td>company, group on the move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. diba</td>
<td>skirt made of banana-leaves, “grass”-skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. dili</td>
<td>cluster, bundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. dumiu</td>
<td>swamp, swamp-like; (#)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. duya, duyo, kaduya, kaduyo</td>
<td>roof, entrance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. *gili*  row
16. *giwi*  cut
17. *guba*  bundles of taro
18. *gudi*  a) child;
    b) immature human (#)
19. *gula, guli, gulo, guno*  heap, group
20. *gun*  bit, small piece
21. *iga, vegila*  name
22. *kabissi*  compartment of a foodhouse, section/division in a foodhouse
23. *kabulo, kabulu*  a) protuberances
    b) village sectors; areas of authority (#)
    c) cape, point, peninsula (+)
    d) half of something (+)
24. *kada, keda*  a) road, track
    b) way in which something is done (+)
25. *kai*  stone blade
26. *ka'i*  tooth
27. *kala*  day
28. *kali*  paddle strike (#)
29. *kapwa, kapo*  a) bundles (wrapped up), parcel
    b) nest of birds (+)
30. *kasa*  row, line
31. *kauya*  fish trap, creel (#)
32. *kawi*  tool
33. *ke*  a) wooden things
    b) rigid, long objects
    c) unmarked form for inanimates (general classifier)
    d) fire
34. *kila*  clusters/hands of bananas
35. *kova*  fire, fireplace
36. *kubila, kwabila*  large land plot
37. *kudu*  a) band of fibres (especially the band of fibres at the waist-
    band of a “grass”-skirt
    b) tooth
    c) bundles of lashing creeper (#)
38. *kumila*  earth oven
39. *kwe*  a) thing, anything indefinite or unknown, unmarked form for
    inanimates (general classifier)
    b) shells and clams
40. *kweya, kwuya, keya*  a) limb, severed limb
    b) yard (+)
41. *kwoila, kwela, kway, kwaila, kwetikwa, kwena*  clay pot, pot-like
42. *kwoya, koya*  mountain, hill
43. *liku*  a) compartments of a foodhouse, compartments of a canoe
    b) area of authority (+)
44. *lila*  bough, branch, leaf
45. *lilo, lola, lilo'iu*  a) walk, journey
    b) number of times going somewhere (+)
    c) number of times doing something (+)
46. *lipu*  compartment of a creel, tier (#)
47. *luba*  bundle (of rolls), parcels (of taro pudding)
48. *luva*  a) wooden dishes ("kaboma"-type), full of one’s share of
    food during a food-distribution ceremony/ritual
    b) tried bundle
49. *megwa*  magic, magical formula
50. *meila, mavila*  a) part of a song, part of a magical formula
51. *mmwa, mmo*  
   a) persons of female sex  
   b) animals  
   c) part of a day (+)  
   d) stars, planets, moon (#)  
   e) carvings in human likeness (#)  
   f) spirits, dwarfs (+)  

52. *na*  
   a) hole  
   b) nest (+)  

53. *nigwa, nigo*  
   a) parts of a song  

54. *nina*  
   a) kneaded things, dot, drop  

55. *nutu, notu*  
   a) string  

56. *nunu*  
   a) hole  

57. *oyla*  
   a) basket  

58. *petu, ta*  
   a) fish on strings  

59. *pila, pa*  
   a) contents of a basket (but not basketfuls of yams!) (+)  

60. *po'ula*  
   a) plantation, grove  
   b) heap, group (+)  

61. *pwanina, pona, ponina, ponu, polu, pwana*  
   a) punctured, something with a hole in it, hole  

62. *sa*  
   a) nut-bunch  

63. *sam*  
   a) ginger (in play accompanying verses) (#)  

64. *si*  
   a) small bit  

65. *sipu*  
   a) sheaf  
   (LAWTON (1980) gives also the glosses: tangle, tangled line, rope, net, string)  

66. *sisi*  
   a) bough  

67. *siva*  
   a) time  

68. *siwa*  
   a) number of times doing something (+)  

69. *suya, suye*  
   a) sea portions, ownership division with reference to fishing rights  

70. *tam*  
    a) sprouting, sprouting yams  

71. *tetu*  
    a) persons of male sex  

72. *to/tte*  
    a) human beings  

73. *tuta, tuto*  
    a) time, occasion  

74. *utu*  
    a) scrap, parts (cut off), small particles, fragments  

75. *uva*  
   a) span, measure (the span of two extended arms – from tip to tip)  
   b) items measured in spans (+)  

76. *va, vaya, vayo, vala*  
   a) door, window  
   b) river, creek, sea passage (+)  

77. *vakala*  
   a) belt of spondylus shell discs  

78. *vili*  
   a) untwisted  

79. *vilo*  
   a) place, area, village  

80. *vosi, wosi*  
   a) song, parts of a song  

81. *wela*  
   a) batch of fish, string of fish  

82. *ya*  
   a) flexible things, thin things  

83. *yam*  
   a) day  
   b) number of days (+)
84. yuma, yam, yuma

yama

85. yeni

86. yulai, yule

87. yuva, yuwo

88. o

a) hand
b) length, measure (the span of two extended arms — from the fingertips of one hand to the wrist of the other hand (#)
c) yard (+)
a handful of something (#)
bundle of four things
shoal
a basketful of yams (this "zero-classifier" is only used when basketfuls of yams are counted)

I have to mention here that during my restudy on the Trobriands in 1989 my informants mentioned three additional CPs, namely

num

magic, magical formula
tili

bits of lime clinging at a lime spatula
sebulu

"grass"-skirt for little girls

However, these CPs seem to be either very rarely used or almost obsolete. They are only mentioned here for the sake of completeness.
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