**Q Plurative (and singulative) languages?**

When looking at number marking systems in languages, it is tempting consider four distinct inflectional classes (at least): (a) singular, (b) plural, (c) singulative, and (d) plurative or ‘collectivizer’. This classification (living greater plurals, plurals of plurals, or other plurals aside; Ojeda 1992, Corbett 2000) can be established on both formal and semantic grounds, when natural Number is viewed as reflecting ways in which (exact or approximate) numerosity, meorological relations among sets, as well as singularities or pluralities are conceived or classified (Grimm 2012, Acquaviva 2017). In general, only (a) is unmarked (morphologically), and the other three classes are marked. We should add (e) the ‘collective’, which is also generally unmarked, providing the base for the singulative derivation. If the ‘plurative’ is not (roughly) just ‘another’ plural (as in Dimmendaal 2000), or more generally ‘any’ plural (as in Haspelmath & Karjus 2017), but rather designates (in a restricted sense) only a *‘collective’ derived form* (interpreted as a group; Fassi Fehri 2015, 2018), then it makes sense to ask questions about how the singulative-plurative phenomenology is articulated in natural languages, and what relevant types of languages are to be found.

The relevant number variation can be instantiated by Arabic as follows:

*Sound number*

(1) a. *kaatib* “= 1 writer”; b. *kaatib-****uu*** (na) ‘writer-pl’; “writers; >1writers”

*Broken number*

(2) *k****u****tt****aa****b* “writers; >1 writers”

*Plurative number*

(3) *katab-****at*** ‘writer-plv’; “writers as (professional) group”

The morphology of the plurative (= plv), forming a group or a unity, is identical to that of the *singulative* individuater or atomizer (= sgv), found in (4), which is derived from (the unmarked) ‘collective’:

*Singulative*

(4) a. *samak* ‘fish’; “one or more fish”; b. *samak*-**at** ‘fish-sgv’; “one unit of fish”

The plurative and the plural exhibit distinct behaviours in terms of morphology, syntax and semantics. One essential syntactic difference between the two is the nature of agreement involved (feminine vs. sound):

(7) *l-qatal-at-u xtabaʔ-at*

 The-killer-plv-nom hided-plv

 The killers (as group) hided.

(8) *l-qaatil-uu-na xtabaʔ-uu*

 The-killer-pl.nom hided- pl

 The killers hided.

I know that a list of ‘collectivizers’ are found in Italian, French, etc. But I am not aware of any clear pluratives of this type in other languages than Semitic varieties. The closest instantiation I could find is the collective numeral in Slavic (Ojeda 2005; Arsenevic 2018). Some substantial work has been done on singulative languages (though not enough), but there is not much about the relevant pluratives, nor about the potential correlation of singulativity and plurativity in a language type. Are there languages (a) that have both singulative and plurative (like Arabic, Semitic, Serbo-Croatian), or (b) only singulatives (Celtic?), or (c) only pluratives (Italian?)? I will appreciate discussion of any characterization of the phenomenology.
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