4.1. Adjectives:

Adjectives are a class of words which occur as attributes to the nouns. Adjectives when occur in attributive position do not take any marker, but when they occur in predicative position they are marked by personal suffixes. For example,

(i) In the attributive position -

- be do maleh - 'big man'
- be do garid - 'big cart'
- be do purad - 'big belly'

(ii) In the predicative position -

- e:n be do - n - 'I am big'
- ni:n be do - y - 'you are big'
- a:h be do - h - 'he is big'
- a:d be do - d - 'she is big'
- e:m be do - m - 'we (excl.) are big'
- na:m be do - y - 'we (incl.) are big'
- ni:m be do - r - 'you (pl.) are big'
- a:r be do - r - 'they are big'.
Structurally, the adjectives fall into two major classes, simple and complex.

4.2. Simple Adjectives:

Simple adjectives are monomorphemic words.

- *large*
- *smelling*
- *hot*
- *curved*
- *short*

When simple adjectives ending in -e occur in attributive position the -e is dropped.

- *good*
- *bitter fruit*
- *raw mango*
- *heavy box*
- *new cloth*

The adjectives may be reduplicated. The iterative adjectives are of two types, i.e., those which are partially modified when reduplicated and those which are not modified.

- *good good*
- *good good*
- *long long*
- *hot hot*

Apparently, there are no fixed rule of reduplication for the above set of adjectives.
The unmodified iterative adjectives are -

mota - 'fat' - mota mota - 'fat fat'
nekut - 'good' - nekut nekut - 'good good'

The other group of simple stems which function as attributes to nouns are demonstrative and interrogative adjectives:

i: - i: maleh - 'this man'
i: kolme - 'this pen'
a: - a: maleh - 'that man'
a: kolme - 'that pen'

ik - ik maleh - 'which man'
ik ra:jah - 'which king'

indr - indr ja;ti - 'what caste'
indr bora - 'what sack'

4.3. Complex Adjectives:

A complex adjective stem consists of a base and formatives. The following is a list of different adjectival formative morphemes.

(i) -o formative with underlying noun bases.

qe:s - du - 'blood' - qe:s - o - 'red'
qe:p - du - 'village' - qe:p - o - 'village'
marg - du - 'horn' - marg - o - 'possessing horns'
na:d - du - 'god' - na:d - o - 'belonging to god'
qawr - du - 'forest' - qawr - o - 'wild'
balk - 'turmeric' - balk - o - 'yellow'
patra - 'board' - patr - o - 'flat'

-o formative with underlying verb bases.

a:cr - 'to become watery' - a:cr - o - 'watery'
alkr - 'to open' - alkr - o - 'open'
a:qr - 'to mature' - a:qr - o - 'mature'
etgr - 'to break' - etgr - o - 'broken'
circ - 'to strike' - circ - o - 'flint'
añgl - 'to open mouth' - añgl - o - 'open mouthed'
pac - 'to become old' - pac - o - 'old'

A large number of -o ending adjectives, however, cannot be traced to any underlying base.

bando - 'tailless'
bandyo - 'short'
bambro - 'deep toned'
bo:pro - 'open'
picglo - 'slack'
pato - 'sharp'
lagro - 'long legged'
lolro - 'wide'
soppo - 'rotten'
botro - 'dull as instruments'
ca:po - 'low'
oci:qo - 'shrill voiced'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cino</td>
<td>'slender'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cipto</td>
<td>'flat'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuqro</td>
<td>'narrow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qambro</td>
<td>'naked'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dabro</td>
<td>'thick'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obo</td>
<td>'coarse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dordo</td>
<td>'congealed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daabo</td>
<td>'broad'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceero</td>
<td>'dilapidate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toqro</td>
<td>'short'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaindo</td>
<td>'fetid'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busro</td>
<td>'dirty'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pothro</td>
<td>'unsecured'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beido</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiro</td>
<td>'dark'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digro</td>
<td>'far'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciglo</td>
<td>'unkempt'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) -ro formative with underlying non-verbal bases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>'thorn'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acro</td>
<td>'thorny'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadi</td>
<td>'wound'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadro</td>
<td>'person having wounds'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orme</td>
<td>'ash'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ormo</td>
<td>'ash coloured'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embe</td>
<td>'sweet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embro</td>
<td>'sweetish'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a variant -sro which occurs only with following bases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qedw</td>
<td>'ear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qedwo</td>
<td>'large eared'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am</td>
<td>'water'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amo</td>
<td>'watery'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no corresponding base)</td>
<td>gil - sro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) A small class of adjectives which qualify human nouns are differentiated for sex. The rule is, 

final \(-V \rightarrow -1\) when female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bobo</td>
<td>bobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo:ro</td>
<td>bo:ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dumb'</td>
<td>'toothless'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-ro formative with underlying verb bases.

- a:l 'to clear as water' - a:l - ro - transparent'
- nih 'to strike' - nih - ro - 'struck'
- igj 'to bare teeth' - igj - ro - 'wry mouthed'
- calg 'to split' - calg - ro - 'split'
- caq 'to pierce' - caq - ro - 'pierced'
- ceñ 'to smell' - ceñj - ro - 'smelling'
- dol¿ 'to shake' - dolh - ro - 'shaking'
- minq 'to wink' - minq - ro - 'pig eyed'
- gi:ndý 'to cut unevenly' - gi:nde ro - 'uneven'
- jinp 'to shine' - jinp - ro - 'white'
- kit 'to rot' - kit - ro - 'rotten'
- urp 'to bore hole' - urp - ro - 'bored'
- marg 'to become black' - marg - ro - 'black'
- toq 'to finish' - toq - ro - 'finished'
- qa:y 'to dry' - qa:y - ro - 'dried'
- pu:g 'to swell' - pu:g - ro - 'swollen'
- nisg 'to smoothen' - nisg - ro - 'smooth'
In the attributive position, the final vowel is dropped if it is -e, as in bob maleh - 'dumb man'.

With the following set the sex differentiation is realized as,

final -wa → -wi/when female

Some of these have underlying noun bases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laji</td>
<td>'shyness'</td>
<td>lajwa   - lajwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuta</td>
<td>'leprosy'</td>
<td>tutwa   - tutwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(without underlying base) lahwa</td>
<td>lahwi</td>
<td>'lecherous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qo:qe</td>
<td>'back'</td>
<td>qo:qwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qe:l</td>
<td>'drum'</td>
<td>qe:lwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki:re</td>
<td>'hunger'</td>
<td>ki:re:w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paki</td>
<td>'hair'</td>
<td>paki:w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dudo</td>
<td>'gourd'</td>
<td>dudo:w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dole</td>
<td>dolwa</td>
<td>'drummer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka:je</td>
<td>ka:jwa</td>
<td>'worker'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the following group of adjectives the sex differentiation is realized as,

- **ta:we** → **-ta:ni**/when female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pesa</td>
<td>pesata:we</td>
<td>pesata:ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo:le</td>
<td>bo:lta:we</td>
<td>bo:lta:ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba:na</td>
<td>ba:nata:we</td>
<td>ba:nata:ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budi</td>
<td>budita:we</td>
<td>budita:ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akile</td>
<td>akilta:we</td>
<td>akilta:ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few derived adjectives occur with the female suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qes</td>
<td>qe:sta:ni</td>
<td>'bloody'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bise</td>
<td>bista:ni</td>
<td>'poisonous'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba:ri</td>
<td>ba:rita:ni</td>
<td>'not polluted'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not eaten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bacru</td>
<td>bacruta:ni</td>
<td>'a cow having calf'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maqo</td>
<td>maqota:ni</td>
<td>'mother with child, pregnant'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pakra</td>
<td>pakrata:ni</td>
<td>'winged'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
<td>acta:ni</td>
<td>'thorny'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) The following group of bases take the suffix -te, and unlike all other -e ending adjectives, the final -e is
not always dropped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pisi</td>
<td>'low'</td>
<td>piste - piste tebre - 'lower lip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maji</td>
<td>'middle'</td>
<td>majte - majte ahli - 'middle finger'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meca</td>
<td>'up'</td>
<td>mecte - mecte tebre - 'upper lip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qo:q</td>
<td>'back'</td>
<td>qo:qte - qo:qte gari - 'following cart'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oewru</td>
<td>'yesterday'</td>
<td>oewte - oewte sa:jge - 'greens of yesterday'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne:la</td>
<td>'tomorrow'</td>
<td>ne:lte - ne:lte ka:je - 'tomorrow's work'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina</td>
<td>'today'</td>
<td>inte - inte  tadi - 'today's alcohol'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) The following group of bases take the suffix -to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>'man'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pel</td>
<td>'woman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murse</td>
<td>'man'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na:ndu</td>
<td>'winter'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vi) The following group of bases take the suffix -balo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kukdu</td>
<td>'head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa:ldu</td>
<td>'tooth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be:kdu</td>
<td>'salt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beklu</td>
<td>'stalk'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(vii) The following group of bases take the suffix -la:go. When the base is -e ending, the final -e is dropped.
4.4. Nominal Adjectives:

Many noun words function as adjectival in endocentric compounds with noun heads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be:do</td>
<td>'big'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tise</td>
<td>'sour'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embe</td>
<td>'sweet'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qarqe</td>
<td>'bitter'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarwe</td>
<td>'small'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qe:ne</td>
<td>'unripe'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atge</td>
<td>'near'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- be:do - la:go - 'biggish'
- tis - la:go - 'somewhat sour'
- emb - la:go - 'somewhat sweet'
- qarq - la:go - 'somewhat bitter'
- sarw - la:go - 'somewhat small'
- qe:n - la:go - 'somewhat unripe'
- atg - la:go - 'somewhat near'

Other nominals which can occur in the same position are the genitive forms of the pronouns like, eⁿ - 'my', nam - 'our', taⁿ - 'his', ne:k - 'whose', etc.

- eⁿ murse - 'my husband'
- taⁿ ba:yi - 'his sister'
- nam desi - 'our country'
- ne:k taṅgadi - 'whose daughter'

The pronominal adjectives which also occur in this position are,
4.5. Verbal Adjectives:

The four classes of non-finite verbals which function as adjectives are as follows:

(i) The present participle or verb base + u words.
- *tungru maler* - 'people who have gathered'
- *co:yu boda* - 'snake that flies'
- *bika mañyu maleh* - 'the man who begs'

(ii) The past participle or verb base + pe words. The final -e is dropped in the attributive position.
- *bohgp bilpdu* - 'running away moon', i.e., waxing moon
- *kurp cete* - 'baked fish'
- *keyp pacød* - 'dead woman'

(iii) The habitual participle or verb base + po words.
- *mahpo kati* - 'Stick used for striking (drum)'
- *cuypo dari* - 'cloth for weaving'
- *mo:qpo si:jeð* - 'things for eating'

(iv) The gerund or verb base + e words. This is not a
very productive process as most of these constructions are limited only to a few idiomatic expressions. The final -e is dropped in the attributive position.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{erg tilh\text{r}du} & \quad \text{'excreting fly', i.e., 'green bottle fly'} \\
\text{onq maleh} & \quad \text{'drinking man', i.e., 'a drunkard'} \\
\text{elc maleh} & \quad \text{'frightened man', i.e., 'a coward'}
\end{align*}
\]

4.6. Adjective Classes:

Adjectives are grouped into two main classes, qualitative adjectives and quantitative adjectives. The qualitative adjectives do not include the numerals. The quantitative adjectives include numerals in a bound or free form. The qualitative adjectives denote general qualities of objects like, colour, size, taste, etc., and these are dealt extensively in the above sections.

The quantitative adjectives are either a numeral or a numeral classifier. The Malto numeral system is basically a system of 'one score' - ko:ri. All the free numerals are borrowed from Indo-Aryan languages. These are,

\[
\begin{align*}
e:ke & \quad \text{'one'} \\
du:ye & \quad \text{'two'} \\
ti:ne & \quad \text{'three'} \\
ca:re & \quad \text{'four'} \\
pa:ce & \quad \text{'five'} \\
so:ye & \quad \text{'six'}
\end{align*}
\]
sa:te - 'seven'
a:te - 'eight'
noye - 'nine'
da:se - 'ten'
egare - 'eleven'
ba:re - 'twelve'
te:ra - 'thirteen'
caida - 'fourteen'
pandra - 'fifteen'
sola - 'sixteen'
satra - 'seventeen'
atara - 'eighteen'
unes - 'nineteen'
ko:ri - 'twenty'

Higher numerals are counted as
ko:ri + ond e:ke - 'one score one'
ko:ri + ond du: ye - 'one score two'
ti:n ko:ri e:ke - 'three scores and one'
pa:o ko:ri = 'five scores' or 'one hundred'

- and in these numerals is the bound morpheme for 'one'.

Unlike the numerals, the numeral classifier is a construction consisting of a numeral and a classifier which indicate certain qualitative features of the referents of the nouns with which they co-occur. Except for the numbers 'one' and 'two', all other numerals are same for both the classes of quantitative adjectives.
Like all adjectives, the numeral classifiers when occur in predicative position take personal suffixes.

\[\text{e:n ort-}n \quad \text{I am one (alone)}\]
\[\text{ni:n ort-}y \quad \text{you are one (alone)}\] etc.

In the attributive position they are uninflected,

\[\text{ort maleh} \quad \text{one man}\]
\[\text{ort maqo\d} \quad \text{one girl}, \text{etc.}\]

The morpheme structure of the numeral phrase is numeral classifier, when the number is 'three' or above and the number is not a 'group', such as ko:ri - 'a score' or ajare - 'a thousand'. For example,

\[\text{tini jen maler} \quad \text{three - classifier - men}\]
\[\text{tini maq o:ydu} \quad \text{three - classifier - cows}\]
\[\text{tini karsa amdu} \quad \text{three - classifier - water}\]

The other variant structure is morphological, i.e., classifier + number, when the numbers are 'one' and 'two', and the noun is 'non-human'. For example,

\[\text{maq - ond o:ydu} \quad \text{one cow - classifier+numeral - noun}\]
\[\text{maq - s o:ydu} \quad \text{two cows - classifier+numeral - noun}\]
\[\text{top - ond pu:pdu} \quad \text{one bunch of flowers - classifier+numeral - noun}\]
\[\text{top - s pu:pdu} \quad \text{two bunches of flowers - classifier+numeral+noun}\]

When the noun is 'human' portmanteau forms ort - 'one human' and jo:round or irw 'two humans' occur.
Other morphemes which occur with the numeral classifiers are -o, -qadi and -nond. When one of these morphemes occur in a numeral classifier word, they replace the numbers. In other words, these morphemes and the numbers are mutually exclusive.

(i) The classifier +o may be called the 'indefinite classifier' pa:n - o.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a:h pa:no orgik arsyah} & \quad \text{'he reached a certain house'} \\
\text{maq} & \quad \text{o} \\
\text{a:h maqo goro cadyah} & \quad \text{'he selected a certain horse'}
\end{align*}
\]

(ii) The other two morphemes -qadi and -nond occur only after the 'indefinite base'.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{orto} & \quad \text{qadi} \quad \text{'only one (human)'} \\
\text{maqo} & \quad \text{qadi} \quad \text{'only one (non-human animate)'} \\
\text{daro} & \quad \text{qadi} \quad \text{'only one (large long object)'}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{orto} & \quad \text{nond} \quad \text{'one by one (human)'} \\
\text{maqo} & \quad \text{nond} \quad \text{'one by one (non-human animate)'} \\
\text{daro} & \quad \text{nond} \quad \text{'one by one (large long object)'}
\end{align*}
\]

4.7. Numeral Classifiers:

Morphologically and syntactically, numeral classifiers form a finite sub-class of Malto adjectives. The classifiers are predominantly of monosyllabic or disyllabic structure. The classifiers which occur exclusively in a
noun phrase, also occur as natural responses to the questions e:no gur - 'how many?' and e:nond - 'how much?'. The Malto numeral classifiers are obligatory in numeral phrases. In all instances of enumeration of objects, a speaker must make a decision as to which of a number of alternative classifiers to employ in terms of some qualitative feature of the object. Thus, numeral classifiers are linguistic markers which indicate certain physical attributes which a set of objects may manifest.

It has been already mentioned that quantifier adjectives have two kinds of structure.

(i) Number - classifier (noun) when the number is 'three' or above.

(ii) Classifier + number (noun) when the number is 'one' or 'two'.

The bound morphemes which occur in the second structure are -ond - 'one' and -s - 'two'. These numbers may be treated as allomorphs of the free forms e:ke - 'one' and du:ye - 'two' respectively.

A variant of the structure (ii), also occurs when the noun is 'human'. These are fused forms and are non-segmentable.

These classifiers which occur in the structure i. are treated as basic and other forms are treated as variants.
Morphophonemically, all classifiers having phonemic structure CV(C)CV alternate with CV(C)C when followed by the morphemes -ond or -s. For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dara} & \rightarrow \text{dar} \\
\text{para} & \rightarrow \text{par} \\
\text{pula} & \rightarrow \text{pul} \\
\text{kanda} & \rightarrow \text{kand, etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, when the final vowel is -i, it alternates with y when followed by -ond (See, Morphophonemic rule 2.11.iv).

Numeral classifiers are found throughout South-East Asia, in languages of all genitic affiliations - Thai, Mon Khmer, Tibeto-Burmes, Malayo-Polynesian, Chinese and they are even found in a number of Indo-Aryan languages like, Oriya and Bengali (Emeneau, 1956, p.647 ff; Burling, 1965, p.244). These peculiar processes of categorizing the nouns along certain semantic dimensions, revealing highly differentiated perceptual and conceptual referents although do not seem like characteristic of the major Dravidian languages of India, Malto, the northern most Dravidian language of India, is clearly an exception. With regard to the numeral classifiers, Malto enjoys certain special position for having the "most complex" system of all, among languages of this area (Emeneau, 1956, p.649).

Some reference to Malto numeral classifiers are found in various works (Emeneau, 1956; Sengupta, 1974;
Bhattacharya, 1975), but these are all based upon Droese's material which exclusively deals with only Sawria dialect. Moreover, these studies are neither detailed in the specification of the semantic features of individual classifiers nor do they specify the relationships of classifiers to one another. There is also reason to believe that, Droese's inventory of these classifiers, which serves as the source for all sorts of studies, is not complete for that dialect.

Ethno-semantically, the numeral classifiers are of particular interest, for as Berlin says, "they indicate, with a high degree of specificity, certain qualitative features of the referents of the nouns with which they occur" (Berlin, 1968, p.20). There is a possibility that the 'system of meaning' has a direct correlation with the cognitive style - a style characterized by the principles by which people in a culture construe their world. In order to understand this hypothesis, we may ask, from what substantive theoretical position the methodological concern for the system of semantics is actually derived?

4.7.1. Ethno-Semantic Methodology:

Delineating the outlines of this theoretical position, Kay posits the following premises (Kay, 1970).

(1) Culture is essentially a matter of shared cognition.

(2) Human cognition is not in principle unamenable to rational enquiry.
Among the relatively concrete and understandable phenomena at our disposal, language and speech appear to most likely express what we suspect may be the organizing principles of human thought.

According to the first postulate, culture is not at all the totality of mere "material representations" which Goodenough spells out as "things, people behaviour and emotions" (1957). It is imperative to find out the logical nexus of concepts in terms of which the material representations are actually organised in the minds of men. Thus, the object of study is not these material phenomena themselves, but the way they are organised in the minds of men. Cultures then are not material phenomena; they are cognitive organisations of material phenomena. Consequently, cultures are neither described by mere arbitrary lists of anatomical traits and institutions such as house type, family type, economic type, and personality type, nor as they necessarily equated with some overall integrative pattern of these phenomena. Such descriptions may tell us something about the way an anthropologist thinks about a culture, but there is little, if any, reason to believe that they tell us anything of how the people of some culture think about their culture (Tyler, 1969, p. 3). Wallace, stressing the same cognitive aspect of the culture says that, "by culture I mean those sets of equivalent or identical learned meanings by which the members of a society do in fact define a stimuli. Culture, in this usage, thus is not behaviour and products
of behaviour but inferences from the cognitive content maintained by one or more of a group of interdependent organisms. A culturally organised society is accordingly one whose organisation depends heavily upon the patterned relationship of the meanings of stimuli learned by the members of the society". And he goes on to say that "in order for an individual to participate satisfactorily in a culturally sanctioned transaction, he must be able to attend, during the duration of transaction, to the relevant to maintain cognitive representations of a number of predicates simultaneously and continuously (whether consciously or not) .... otherwise his behaviour will appear bizarre, "crazy" to his partner" (Wallace, p.137) (underlined portions are mine).

As regards the second postulate, the enquiry is phrased in two sets, i.e.,

(i) What material phenomena are significant for the people of some culture.

(ii) How do they organise these phenomena.

The questions are based on the evidence that many people do not see things the way we do, because the way we advance information about these things, i.e., the way the defining attributes or the discernible features for these are processed are so different. This is due to the fact that we do not receive information about the things from the things themselves, but rather learn these features which are thought to be significant in defining a thing from
our fellows as part of our cultural equipment. In other-
words, the cognitive features are not the property of
material phenomena at all, but are handed down by the
culture itself in terms of which the material phenomena
are to be conceived.

Now, this brings us to the third phase of the theory,
which in fact followed from the position already taken at
the second. If the culturally significant cognitive features
are to be learned from our fellows, then they must be
communicable. Making this point Frake says that "culturally
significant cognitive features must be communicable between
persons in one of the standard systems of the culture. A
major share of these features will undoubtedly be codable
in a society's most flexible and productive communication
device, its language" (1962). Therefore, the cognitive
anthropology is committed to study the cognitive world of
a community not just by tapping any source, but that source
about which it knows where to begin and how to begin. This
is precisely what Frake means when he says "to the extent
that cognitive coding tends to be linguistic and tends be
efficient, the study of the referential use of standard,
readily elicitable linguistic responses - or terms - should
provide a faithful beginning point for mapping a cognitive
system. And with verbal behaviour we know how to begin".

But this beginning, as far as the methodology of
the ethno- semantics is concerned was made predominantly
in a single lexicon area, i.e., kinship lexicon, and it is yet to free itself from this early preoccupation to gain sufficient applicability to other areas of lexicon. The componential analysis of terms which appeared to be the ultimate aim of all such analyses have lately given way to other forms of possible semantic organisation of the lexicon. However, even if the analysis of the lexicon in terms of distinctive features or components remain essential, there is no good reason to think why the analytical steps adopted for componential analysis of a kinship lexicon should not be equally useful for analysing other areas of the lexicon. Following Wallace and Atkins we may give the major steps to be taken to analyse a lexicon (1960, pp. 58-80).

(1) The recording of a complete set (or a defined subset) of the terms using boundary setting criteria or common inclusion within the extension of a cover term.

(2) The definition of these terms.

(3) The identification in terms of conceptual dimensions each of whose values ("components") is signified by one or more of the terms.

(4) The definition of each term as a specific combination or set of combinations of the components.

(5) A statement of the semantic relationship among the terms and of the structural principles of this terminological system.

The methodological steps suggested by Lounsbury are much more general and these can be applied to the total field of descriptive semantic analysis of lexicon and not
only to the kinship lexicon (1963, p. 574). These are,

(1) the compilation of raw lexicographic data on particular denotations,

(2) the assembling of the denotata of each single linguistic form as a semantic class of objects, or designatum,

(3) the discovery — when possible — of the classificatory dimensions imposed upon the field by native linguistic usage,

(4) the specification of the distinctive features defining each of the constituent semantic classes, and

(5) an ordering of the semantic units of the various hierarchical levels within the total structure of the system.

With this, we can now consider the basic organizational types which characterize different semantic domains. These are generally of three types, taxonomies, paradigms and tree. These are all semantic structures derived from the continuous combination of relations among properties. Properties may be lexemes or semantic features. But these three types do not exhaust all possibilities of semantic structuring. For example, it has been claimed that "folk taxonomies are not necessarily hierarchical; they are better represented by a "spheres of influence" model than by a "family tree" model" (Bright and Bright, 1965, p. 75).

However, taxonomies, paradigms and trees are the three types of semantic structures which are widely dealt by ethnosemantists. The following is a brief description of these structural types.
Taxonomy - In a taxonomy, categories are hierarchically ordered by relations of contrast and inclusion. Categories at the same level contrast with one another while categories at lower levels are included in categories of higher levels. Categories of the same level differ from one another, but when included in the same higher level category are somehow like one another. It is for this reason that a folk taxonomy is but the first step in a semantic analysis, for there must be some reason behind this arbitrary neutralisation of difference at higher levels. In general, this corresponds to our intuition that certain things go together because they share some underlying element. The next step is semantic analysis then is to discover these elements. By discovering the underlying features shared by things which are alike, but not shared by things which are not alike, we complete the second stage of semantic analysis.

Paradigms and Trees - Like a taxonomy, a paradigm arranges its components on the basis of their sameness and difference. But unlike a taxonomy, the multiple components of a paradigm cannot be arranged hierarchically, for they are not ordered by inclusion. Instead, they are ordered by simultaneous intersection.

By contrast, the features in a tree do not intersect one another simultaneously and they contrast on only one dimension at a time. Relationships in a tree are expressed
as dichotomous oppositions of components selected one at a time.

4.7.2. Analysis of Numeral Classifiers:

Now, following the methodological steps for the structural semantic analysis of lexicon, i.e., (1) recording of the complete set of terms belonging to a field, (2) definition of these terms, (3) classificatory dimensions imposed upon the field, (4) specification of distinctive features and (5) ordering of the semantic units within the total structure of the system, an attempt will be made here to give a comprehensive description of the numeral classifiers in ethno-semantic terms. The specific numeral classifier following noun indicates not only the number of items which are counted, but, what we may call, the 'status' of an object, the 'state' of an object or the 'quantity' of an object that is counted. With reference to these three kinds of referents the classifiers fall into three major groups,

(1) Classifiers which specify the status of an object,
(2) Classifiers which specify the state of an object, and
(3) Classifiers which specify the quantity of an object as measured along some dimension.

(1) **Status Classifiers:**

All nouns which co-occur with 'non-unique' and 'unique' classifiers are 'discrete individual entities'.
The domain of 'discrete individual objects' are marked by a set of mutually exclusive morphemes; classifiers with 'live' and 'shaped' referents and classifiers with 'unique' referents. The classifiers are listed in their basic forms and are illustrated with numeral ti:ni - 'three'.

(a) Non-unique Classifiers:

The non-unique classifiers have 'live' and 'shaped' referents.

(i) Classifiers with 'live' referents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jen</th>
<th>'human'</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>'man'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peldu</td>
<td>'woman'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tángade</td>
<td>'brother'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalwe</td>
<td>'thief'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cergni</td>
<td>'witch', etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E.g., ti:ni jen maler - 'three - classifier - men'

| Ti:ni jen qalwer | 'three - classifier - thieves' |
| Ti:ni jen cerg | 'three - classifier - witches' |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maq</th>
<th>'non-human'</th>
<th>Goro</th>
<th>'horse'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mangdu</td>
<td>'buffalo'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pujdu</td>
<td>'bird'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boda</td>
<td>'snake'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lende</td>
<td>'earthworm'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu:te</td>
<td>'ghost', etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) Classifiers with 'shaped' referents.

dara - 'long, large objects':

- ma:sdu - 'bamboo'
- dahri - 'branch'
- bondke - 'gun'
- qeddu - 'leg'
- dimba - 'penis'
- margdu - 'horn'
- nadi - 'river', etc.

- e.g., ti:ni dara ma:sdu - 'three-classifier - bamboos'
- ti:ni dara qeddu - 'three - classifier - legs'
- ti:ni dara nadi - 'three - classifier - rivers'

kati - 'long, small objects':

- te:qri - 'needle'
- kolme - 'pen'
- cai:rdu - 'arrow'
- gasi - 'grass'
- ta:li - 'hair'
- acdu - 'thorn'
- biri - 'biri'
- cabi - 'key', etc.
• three - classifier
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e.g., ti:ni kati te:qri - 'three - classifier - needles'

  ti:ni kati ta:li - 'three - classifier - hair'

  ti:ni kati cabi - 'three - classifier - keys'

panda - 'long, flexible objects':

dawra - 'rope'

  pita - 'ribbon'

  qoli - 'tail'

  pa:wdu - 'road'

  ca:me - 'song'

  ma:ri - 'mantra', etc.

e.g., ti:ni panda dawra - 'three - classifier - ropes'

  ti:ni panda pa:wdu - 'three - classifier - roads'

  ti:ni panda ca:me - 'three - classifier - songs'

para - 'long pods/ruits':

  kaldi - 'banana'

  simbi - 'pod beans'

  qosre - 'string beans'

  sanjori - 'drum sticks', etc.

e.g., ti:ni para kaldi - 'three - classifier - bananas'

  ti:ni para simbi - 'three - classifier - beans'

  ti:ni para ji:nga - 'three - classifier - gourds'
There is another form patra, which freely varies with paṭa.

It is also noted that paṭa occurs as a classifiers with objects which come in pair, as in,

pat - ond jota - 'one shoe'
pat - ond bardī - 'one bullock'

On the basis of this distribution, it would be necessary to treat these as separate homophous classifiers, one which occurs with 'flat, broad objects' and the other with 'paired objects'. The former belongs to the group of status classifiers and the latter to the quantity classifiers.
pata - 'flat, broad, thin objects':
  a:tge - 'leaf'
  kagte - 'paper'
  citi - 'letter'
  lo:te - 'paper money', etc.

  e.g., ti:ni pata a:tge - 'three - classifier - leaves'
  ti:ni pata kagte - 'three - classifier - papers'
  ti:ni pata lo:te - 'three - classifier - notes'

kanda - 'flat, broad, cotton objects':
  pente, sohti - 'pants'
  komle - 'blanket'
  keta, dokri - 'rags'
  cadre - 'chadar'
  moja - 'socks'

  e.g., ti:ni kanda pente - 'three - classifier - pants'
  ti:ni kanda dokri - 'three - classifier - rags'
  ti:ni kanda komle - 'three - classifier - blankets'

got - 'round, heavy objects and miscellaneous objects':
  kukdu - 'head'
  qa:ndu - 'eye'
  patli - 'pet'.
kuwa - 'well'
caka - 'wheel'
orgdu - 'house'
botle - 'bottle'
goga - 'stone'
ti:qldu - 'rice'
qe:r pa:ndu - 'egg'
bi:nke - 'star'
bilpdu - 'moon'
tumgldu - 'dream', etc.

e.g., ti:ni got pa:ndu - 'three - classifier - fruits'
ti:ni got bi:nke - 'three - classifier - stars'
ti:ni got tumgldu - 'three - classifier - dreams'

This morpheme has two allomorphs,
    pa:n - which occurs only before -ond - 'one'
    pand - which occurs only before -s - 'two'

pula - 'round, light objects':
    pu:pdu - 'flower'
o:sdu - 'mushroom'
ja:gu - 'cooked rice'
lawa - 'pop corn'
lahri - 'popped rice', etc.

e.g., ti:ni pula pu:pdu - 'three - classifier - flowers'
(b) Unique Classifiers:-

Unlike the non-unique classifiers, these 'echo' classifiers, as Burling calls them, are applicable only to a narrowly restricted set of nouns, and mostly to a single noun only (1965, p.250). Invariably, the classifier is identical in form to the noun it classifies. The list is exhaustive according to my data, but a few more forms may turn up.

gep — 'village'
  \[ \text{ti:ni gep gepdu} - \text{three - classifier - villages} \]

man — 'tree'
  \[ \text{ti:ni man mandu} - \text{three - classifier - trees} \]

ki:r — 'grass'
  \[ \text{ti:ni ki:r kirdu} - \text{three - classifier - grass} \]

kari — 'hole, den, cave'
  \[ \text{ti:ni kari kari} - \text{three - classifier - holes} \]

kuji — 'shadow, reflection'
  \[ \text{ti:ni kuji kuji} - \text{three - classifier - shadows} \]

Given this paradigm of 'discrete individual objects' as qualified by the unique classifiers, gep, man, ki:r, kuji and the non-unique classifiers, jen, maq, đa:r, kaṭi, panda para, pata, pata, kanda, got, pula, and the rough semantic definitions of the individual classifiers belonging to this
set, it is now possible to identify the dimensions of meaning underlying the field and to map the values or the distinctive features of meaning on these dimensions on to the set of terms (See, cf. Lounsbury, 1964; Berlin, 1968). The aim of this analysis is to isolate in the most economical and non-redundant terms the relevant semantic components constituting each classifier what one must know in order to categorize objects correctly.

Componental definitions of numeral classifiers.

Semantic domain - 'discrete individual object'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 'membership'</td>
<td>unique (a₁), non-unique (a₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 'animateness'</td>
<td>animate (b₁), inanimate (b₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 'shape'</td>
<td>long (c₁), broad (c₂), round (c₃)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 'saliency'</td>
<td>high (d₁), low (d₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 'specification'</td>
<td>specific (e₁), general (e₂)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To this dimensional analysis of the field, and components that constitute it, the following rewriting rules may be introduced to account for the extensional meaning of some of the basic components. This formulation is necessary to explain the variables at realization level, in different contexts. The rules are,

(i) d² 'low saliency' → [non-human' in the context 'animate', 'flexible' in the context 'long', 'thin' in the context 'broad', 'light' in the context 'round']
To sum up, the status classifiers of Malto divide the nouns into two subsets, discrete individual objects and non-discrete objects. The discrete objects are also of two types, unique objects and non-unique objects. The non-unique objects are either live or shaped. The live objects are further sub-divided into two subsets: human (+ jen') and non-human (+ maq). The shaped objects are also
sub-divided into three subsets: one-dimensional or characteristically long objects, two-dimensional or characteristically broad objects and three-dimensional or characteristically round objects. Each of these subsets of shaped nouns are subclassified into two or more classes.

(1) Long  -  large (+ dara)
    -  small (+ kati)
    -  flexible (+ panda)
    -  fruits (+ para)

(2) Broad  -  thick (+ pata)
    -  thin (+ pata)
    -  cotton (+ kanda)

(3) Round  -  heavy (+ got)
    -  light (+ pula)

(2) State Classifiers:

These classifiers are but a few in Malto and these are neutral to the basic discrete/non-discrete opposition of the nouns. They qualify the state or the condition of the nouns irrespective of their status. These are,

baha  -  'area': field, market place, etc.

tada  -  'small area': as is usually occupied by spit, wound, or primary vaccination mark, etc.

dika  -  'puddle': cow-dung, excreta, etc.

del:la  -  'cold': earth, mud, etc.
topa - 'cluster': flower, fruit, crop, etc.
topa - 'drop': water, blood, soup, etc.
ba:gi - 'share, portion'
cawda - 'portion'
po:bi - 'cross section'

e.g., ti:ni baha ti:qldu - 'three areas/mounds of rice'
ti:ni topa ta:tge - 'three bunches of mangoes'
ti:ni dika gobri - 'three puddles of cow-dung'
ti:ni topa amdu - 'three drops of water'

(3) **Classifiers of Quantity:**

These classifiers are also neutral to the discrete/non-discrete opposition of the nouns and are organised under dimensions along which the objects are measured. The examples are given with the numeral -ond - 'one'.

(i) **depth**

- capt - 'foot'
- bagd - 'ankle'
- qosg - 'thigh'
- karm - 'waist'
- buki - 'chest'
- qasr - 'neck'
- toro - 'mouth', etc.

e.g., capt and amdu - 'one foot deep water'
karm and amdu - 'one waist deep water'

(ii) **length**

- bilas - 'span'
- mudr - 'length of the fore-arm from the elbow to the fist'
mukτ - 'cubit', etc.

\[\text{e.g., mukτond suta} \rightarrow \text{'one cubit long thread'}\]

(iii) Volume: mut - 'fist'

\[\text{pohl} \rightarrow \text{'as much as one hand will contain'}\]

\[\text{pasi} \rightarrow \text{'as much as two hands put together will contain', etc.}\]

\[\text{e.g., mutond ti:qldu} \rightarrow \text{'one fistful of rice'}\]

This section also includes various standard containers and measures of volume.

\[\text{kars} \rightarrow \text{'pitcher'}\]

\[\text{gilas} \rightarrow \text{'glass'}\]

\[\text{balti} \rightarrow \text{'bucket'}\]

\[\text{patli} \rightarrow \text{'pot'}\]

\[\text{pa:ye} \rightarrow \text{'a measure for grains', etc.}\]

\[\text{e.g., karsond dudi} \rightarrow \text{'one pitcher full of milk'}\]

\[\text{pa:yond gohme} \rightarrow \text{'one measure of wheat'}\]

(iv) weight: se: ṟ - 'one sher'

\[\text{boj} \rightarrow \text{'one head load', etc.}\]

\[\text{e.g., bojond kankdu} \rightarrow \text{'one head load of wood'}\]

(v) girth: muti - 'circumference around which the index finger and the thumb can reach'

\[\text{e.g., mutyond sa:ge} \rightarrow \text{'one handful of greens'}\]

(vi) time: din - 'day'

\[\text{mehn} \rightarrow \text{'month'}\]

\[\text{bacri} \rightarrow \text{'year', etc.}\]
e.g., mehmo tolope - 'salary for one month'

(vii) groups of number: ko:ri - 'a score'
ajar - 'a thousand', etc.
e.g., ko:ryond ica - 'one score of shrimps'

After this some what detailed analysis of the numeral classifiers, we can now look for the semantic relationship among the terms within the total structure of the system.

From a structural point of view, any further ordering of the state and quantity classifiers seem less promising, but the non-unique status classifiers can genuinely be called a microsystem with high degree of semantic structuring, i.e.,

```
Nouns
  Discrete  Non-discrete
    Non-unique  Unique
      Live  Shaped
        Human  Non-human
          Long  Broad  Round
            Large  Small  Flexible  Fruits  Thick  Thin  Cotton  Heavy  Light
```

The peculiarity of the Malto system is the lack of overt distinction between discreteness and non-discreteness of objects, and it has to be postulated on the basis of contrast and inclusion relationship, operating among lower lever "taxa" (See, Bendix, 1966, p.5).
4.7.3. Development of Malto Classifier System:

For Malto, Emeneau assumes that, it "began borrowing numerals and classifiers from neighbouring Magadhan languages, and subsequently elaborated the system independently, chiefly on the basis of inherited material" (1956, p.649). It is of course doubtful what this "inherited material" is, but it is a necessary prerequisite for keeping the hypothesis from falling into disrepute. Malto, barring the unique classifiers, has a total number of eleven classifiers of which only maq- and pa:n- may be said as truely indegenous. All other forms are generally borrowed from neighbouring languages like hundred of other forms. Furthermore, only three or four of these words, i.e., jen, got, kand and pat might be said to be true classifiers in the Magadhan languages. Others have no such function, and have general meanings like,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malto</th>
<th>Oriya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dara</td>
<td>dhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kati</td>
<td>kathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panda</td>
<td>phando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'net-work of ropes, rope-trap'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para</td>
<td>phoca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'fruit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata</td>
<td>phora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'sliver'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pula</td>
<td>phulca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'flower'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, what is more important to know if the Magadhan languages, considered a probable source for the classifiers...
in Malto, have anything in common with the latter. Regarding the function of the classifiers in Assamese, Goswami says that "the classifiers no longer classify the Assamese nominals into distinct classes; nor is there any evidence that they ever did in earlier periods of the language. They, however, convey some sense and give some idea about the object of which they become an adjunct, whether it is male or female, respectful or general, big or small, round or flat or oblong, in bunches or otherwise etc." (1968, p.iii). Giving a list of important classifiers in Assamese, he says that, "zan is used to signify person, male and respectable only; zani disrespectful, is used for women and females of animals. zana and garaki are used to express respect to both man and woman. to has three forms to, ta, ti. to is a very common classifier used after nominals and pronominals (not respectful for men). It may be called the definite article of Assamese like the English 'the' for men and things in general senses. ta is used in quantifiers to signify men, animals, and things of round, or oblong or of any geometrical sizes. ti is the diminutive form.

pat and khan. These are used for things flat, wide, thin, long or short.
dal is usually used for things round, which may be long or oblong.
sota is used for thin and flat things, while whila is used for thin leaf-like things.
zopa is the classifier for trees or the like.
kosa, mutha and tār are used for things in bunches.
For things, non-discrete, a container or the like may be used as the classifier" (1968, pp.116-17).

No doubt, there are some comparable points between Assamese and Malto classifiers, but these are limited to individual classifiers rather than to systems as such.

In case of Oriya, another language of the Magadhan group, the status classifiers are yet more loosely structured, i.e., (See, Mahapatra, 1973).

```
Nouns
   /\ Discrete  Non-discrete
  /   Human  Non-human
     \   Shaped(?)  Unique
```

The most characteristic feature of this system is the overt markedness of the fundamental distinction between discreteness and non-discreteness (+/- goṭa~ta) of objects. The dichotomy is true for Bengali (+/- သ), Assamese (+/- tooltip) and perhaps for Burmese (+/- khu), in spite of the fact that the latter is genetically unrelated to the Magadhan languages. Although Burling's approach to this Burmese classifier - khu has not been one of exploring its possibilities in terms of total distribution, with or without "varying degrees of awkwardness", some of his findings are very encouraging (1965, p.248). Secondarily, the semantic domain 'discrete objects' is divided along some dimensions - the probable ones seems to be 'life'
and 'shape'. In Oriya, the 'life' dimension is restricted to 'human' nouns and it is clearly marked. But, the dimension of 'shape' of which there is only a mere suggestion in the system is undeveloped and ambiguous.

Analysing the same phenomenon in some of the Amerindian languages, particularly Tarascan, Friedrich isolates the following dimensions (1970).

(i) a dimensionless set lacking both shape and mass,

(ii) a dimensional set of masses, classified by 'container' and of shapes saliently one-dimensional, two-dimensional and three-dimensional,

(iii) a speech-capable and approximately 'human' set.

Besides, Friedrich's interesting review of diverse languages of the world, shows that similar processes for categorizing the nouns along certain semantic dimensions are so widespread that these can neither be restricted to any group of genetically related languages nor to any one area of diffusion. There is also a distinct possibility for assuming certain probable universal concepts which are present in the semantic structure of all languages. While each culture has its own way of viewing reality, there are certain characteristics of the real world for which there is a high likelihood that every culture has linguistic means of expression (See, Mathiot, 1968, p.17).
Finally, the true significance of a numeral classifier lies not in its independent existence as an individual item, but rather in its occupying a particular categoric position within the totality of a classificatory scheme and this is where Malto classifiers differ most from its neighbouring languages. Therefore, linguistic borrowing, no matter how extensive, is too sterile a process to explain the development and diffusion of conceptual systems either within or across genetic boundaries.