

Symposium “Areal patterns of grammaticalization and cross-linguistic variation in grammaticalization scenarios”

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 12-14 March, 2015

Organizers: Walter Bisang, Andrej Malchukov

Abstracts (authors in alphabetical order)

Grammaticalization processes in Andean languages

Willem F.H. Adelaar (Leiden University)

In spite of their rich and complex morphology, the Aymaran and Quechuan languages (spoken in the Central Andes and adjacent areas) are characterized by a lack of transparency in the grammaticalization history of their numerous affixes. For instance, in the Quechuan languages personal reference affixes, both nominal possessive and verbal, lack any significant formal similarity with the corresponding free pronouns. Nevertheless, relatively clear cases of grammaticalization can be found in Quechuan languages as verbal compound tense constructions were transformed into simple tense forms, mainly by deletion or reduction of the auxiliary verb ka- ‘to be’ and the subsequent attachment of its affixes to an accompanying nominalized verb. Similar processes may have occurred in Aymaran, although the developments underlying them remain obscure. The verb ka- ‘to be’ probably also played a role in the formation of Quechuan progressive aspect markers (*-yka-, *-ĉka-), although the exact history of these affixes is difficult to determine.

Grammaticalization processes that take another grammatical form, rather than a free form, as their point of departure are illustrated by the development of (perfective) aspect markers from derivational markers indicating direction in the Quechuan verb. There is some evidence that connects the directional marker -yku- denoting ‘inward motion’ to the noun uku ‘inside’, ‘hollow’, ‘deep’. Similarly, *-rqu-, glossed as ‘outward motion’ and the source of a perfective aspect marker in several modern Quechuan varieties, may eventually be derived from urqu ‘mountain(s)’, although this assumption remains highly speculative. In the Aymaran languages it appears to be impossible to relate directional markers to lexical elements outside the verb.

Grammaticalization of free lexical elements is also found in Andean nominal case systems as some nominal roots or nominalized verbs have acquired the status of postpositions or case affixes in present-day language varieties. Notwithstanding these incidental cases it remains very difficult to link affixes in Andean languages to any lexical elements outside the word form in which they occur.

In my presentation I will explore some of the more eloquent cases of grammaticalization in the Aymaran and Quechuan languages, bearing in mind the admonition that overt grammaticalization processes are not typical for these languages.

Grammaticalization in East and mainland Southeast Asian languages

Walter Bisang (University of Mainz)

Processes of grammaticalization are assumed to have the same properties across the world's languages. This assumption will be critically analyzed from the perspective of East and mainland Southeast Asian languages, consisting of Sinitic, Tai-Kadai, Mon-Khmer, Hmong-Mien and Chamic (Austronesian). As will be shown, grammatical markers differ from standard assumptions on products of grammaticalization in the following way (Bisang 2011, 2015):

- Limited co-evolution of meaning and form: There is some cross-linguistic variation in the extent to which more abstract grammatical meaning is paralleled in linguistic form. This will be checked for Lehmann's (1995) six parameters for measuring the autonomy of the linguistic sign.
- Pragmatic inference is more relevant even in markers that express abstract grammatical concepts. This manifests itself in at least two ways: (i) The information provided by these markers is not obligatory (e.g. radical pro-drop, non-obligatory expression of tense-aspect, number, (in)definiteness, etc.). (ii) The meaning of one and the same marker stands for more than one grammatical category. In both cases, the concrete meaning of the marker needs to be pragmatically inferred from context.
- There are paths of grammaticalization which seem to be area specific (e.g. 'come to have'-verbs; Enfield 2003).

Observations like these support the conclusion that there is a certain cross-linguistic variation in processes of grammaticalization. From the perspective of complexity, many products of grammaticalization in EMSEA languages are characterized by a particularly high degree of hidden complexity which seems to be a characteristic of this area (Bisang 2009, forth).

References:

Bisang, Walter. 2009. On the evolution of complexity — sometimes less is more in East and mainland Southeast Asia, in: Sampson, Geoffrey, David Gil and Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Language complexity as an evolving variable*, 34 – 49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 2011. Grammaticalization and linguistic typology. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (eds), 105–117.

___ 2015. Problems with primary vs. secondary grammaticalization: the case of East and mainland Southeast Asian languages. *Language Sciences* 47, 132-147.

___ forth. Hidden complexity—the neglected side of complexity and its consequences. *Linguistic Vanguard*. Accepted.

Enfield, Nicholas James. 2003. *Linguistic Epidemiology. Semantics and Grammar of Language Contact in Mainland Southeast Asia*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Lehmann, Christian 1995[1982] *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Munich:Lincom Europa.

Paths of grammaticalization in Romance voice systems

Michela Cennamo (University of Naples)

In this talk I will discuss some aspects of the grammaticalization of lexical verbs as passive auxiliaries in Romance and the reanalysis of reflexives as voice markers, focusing on the diachronic relationship between auxiliatation and serialization, and the direction of the changes, trying to detect general and areal features of the grammaticalization patterns investigated (Bisang 2008; Heine & Kuteva 2011, among others).

More specifically, I will consider the grammaticalization of some motion (COME), activity (DO/MAKE) and change of state (BECOME) verbs in the transition from Latin to (Italo-)Romance, in relation to the status of serial/light verbs — whether intermediate stages in the auxiliarization process (Rosen 1977, Giacalone Ramat 2000, among others) or a different syntactic category (Butt 2003) — and to the linearity of the relationship between serial verb and auxiliary (following the path verbal lexeme > serial > auxiliary) (Heine 2003, Hopper & Traugott 2003 and recent discussion in Bisang 2011, Börjars & Vincent 2011, among others).

I will argue that, although characterized by maximal desemanticization on a par with auxiliaries, the serial uses of the verbs under investigation in (Italo-)Romance seem to exhibit a different type rather than a reduced degree of decategorialization. I will also show that the relationship serial verb-auxiliary is non-linear: the same lexeme, in fact, can have simultaneously auxiliary and serial uses, the latter developing, for some verbs, after their auxiliary uses (Cennamo 2006, 2007).

Other types of grammaticalization instead, appear to follow a linear path, like the reanalysis of the reflexive morpheme as a voice marker, proceeding from anticausative to passive and optionally to an impersonal/indefinite reinterpretation, the latter attested to a different degree in Romance (Cennamo 1993, 2014, forthc.). Evidence for this claim is also given by changes currently taking place in Brazilian Portuguese, involving the loss of the reflexive as a passive marker, whilst its impersonal/indefinite function is retained and widely used (Cyrino 2007, 2013).

References

- Bisang, W. 2008. Grammaticalization and the areal factor- the perspective of East and mainland Southeast Asian languages. In M.J. López & E. Seoane (eds), *Rethinking Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 55–88.
- ___ 2011. Grammaticalization and linguistic typology. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (eds), 105–117.
- Börjars, K. & Vincent, N. 2011. Grammaticalization and directionality. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (eds), 163–176.
- Butt, M. 2003. The light verb jungle. *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 1–49.
- Cennamo, M. 1993. *The Reanalysis of Reflexives: a Diachronic Perspective*. Naples: Liguori.
- ___ 2006. The rise and grammaticalization paths of Latin *feri* and *facere* as passive auxiliaries. In
W. Abraham & L. Leisiö (eds), *Passivization and Typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 311–36.
- ___ 2007. Auxiliaries and serials between late Latin and early Romance. In D. Bentley & A. Ledgeway (eds), *Sui Dialetti Italo-Romanzi. Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent. The Italianist*, Special Supplement 1, 63–87.
- ___ 2014. Passive and impersonal reflexives in the Italian dialects: synchronic and diachronic aspects,. In P. Benincà, A. Ledgeway & N. Vincent (eds), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–95.
- ___ forthcoming. Voice. In M. Maiden & A. Ledgeway (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Syntax of the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cyrino, S. 2007. Construções com *se* e promoção de argumento no Português Brasileiro: uma investigação diacrônica. *Revista de Abralín* 6.2: 85–116.
- ___ 2013. Argument promotion and *se*-constructions in *Brazilia Portuguese*, in E. van Gelderen, M. Cennamo & J. Barðdal (eds), *Argument Structure in Flux. The Naples-Capri papers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 284–306.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. 2000. Some grammaticalization patterns for auxiliaries. In J.C. Smith & D. Bentley (eds), *Historical Linguistics 1995*, vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 125–38.
- Heine, B. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ___ 2003. Grammaticalization. In B. Joseph & R. Janda (eds), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 576–601.

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. 2011. The areal dimension of grammaticalization. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (eds), 291–301.

Hopper, P. & Traugott, Elisabeth C. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, A. 2011. Grammaticalization from Latin to Romance. In H. Narrog & B. Heine (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 717–726.

Narrog, H. & Heine, B. (eds) 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosen, C. 1997. Auxiliation and serialization: on discerning the difference. In A. Altsina, J. Bresnan & P. Sells (eds), *Complex Predicates*. Stanford: CSLI.

The grammaticalization of ‘see’ verbs as copulas in Mande languages

Denis Creissels (University of Lyon)

The grammaticalization path SEE > OSTENSIVE MARKER > COPULA (> TAM MARKER) does not appear in the inventory of grammaticalization processes provided by Heine & Kuteva (2002), and ‘see’ verbs are not mentioned as a possible source of copulas by Pustet (2003) either. However, as already observed by Creissels (1981) and Tröbs (2003), Mande languages widely attest the possibility that ‘see’ verbs grammaticalize into copulas that may further grammaticalize as TAM markers. The routinization of an ostensive use of the imperative of ‘see’ verbs (i.e., of the use of *see N!* to express the equivalent of English *Here is N*) is a crucial aspect of this grammaticalization path.

For example, among Manding varieties,¹ Sédhiou Mandinka has no grammaticalized use of *jé* ‘see’, whereas other varieties attest a greater or lesser range of grammaticalized uses of the cognates of this Mandinka verb:

	Sédhiou Mandinka	Bamako Bambara	Kita Maninka
‘see’	<i>jé</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>yé</i>
ostensive marker	<i>félé</i>	<i>flé / yé</i>	<i>yé</i>
equative copula	<i>mú</i>	<i>dòn / yé</i>	<i>yé</i>
locational copula	<i>bé</i>	<i>bé</i>	<i>yé</i>
incompletive auxiliary	<i>bé</i>	<i>bé</i>	<i>yé</i>

¹ Manding is a dialect cluster included in the Central sub-branch of the Western branch of the Mande family.

In my presentation at the symposium on areal patterns of grammaticalization and cross-linguistic variation in grammaticalization scenarios, I will present and discuss data from various Mande languages illustrating this grammaticalization path, concentrating on the transition from ostensive marker to copula.

References

- Creissels, Denis. 'L'étymologie des prédicatifs d'identification des parlers bambara et jula : *yé* et *dòn~dò~lò*'. *Mandenkan* 1. 3-10
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pustet, Regina. 2003. *Copulas*. Oxford University Press.
- Tröbs, Holger. 2003. 'On the origin of some predicative markers in imperfective constructions in Manding'. *Mandenkan* 38. 1-14.

Grammaticalization pathways in Uto-Aztecan languages spoken at the highlands of northwestern Mexico: A diachronic view of how intragenetic variation evolves

Zarina Estrada Fernández (University of Sonora)

In this presentation, I will discuss several patterns of grammaticalization that have been observed in a group of Uto-Aztecan languages from Northwestern Mexico. Languages under study belong to two distinct branches: the Taracahitan branch, which includes Yaqui, Guarijio and Tarahumara, and the Tepiman branch, with Tohono O'odham, Pima Bajo, Northern Tepehuan and Southern Tepehuan as the representative languages.

The analysis identifies three different types of grammaticalization processes: (i) the inherent grammaticalization, where linguistic changes of some forms that can be clearly traced to the protolanguage (cf., for instance, the PUA *puku for animal possession of domestic animals, Miller 1980), can be explained considering the historical evolution of languages within the linguistic family; (ii) the contact-induced grammaticalization, i.e., processes of change that are explained by considering language contact resulting from an abrupt socio-politically complex event, such as colonization (cf., the Spanish influence in the grammaticalization of a non-subject pronoun encoding a middle voice construction, Estrada 2005), and finally, (iii) the universal principles of language change, where changes have been characterized cross-linguistically as the result of internal processes of language change. The last type of processes of linguistic change differ from the inherent processes in that the former can be attested in several languages of the same family while the latter are not necessarily attested among other languages of the same family (cf. the relativizer *-kig* in Pima Bajo, Estrada, 2012).

The presentation pays attention to the parameters of grammaticalization proposed by Heine and Kuteva (2007): extension, desemanticization, decategorialization and erosion, to consider the diachronic differences observed from an intragenetic perspective.

References

- Estrada Fernández, Zarina. 2005. The pronominal form *a-* in Pima Bajo as a middle marker.” *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Vol. 71, no. 3: 277-302.
- Miller, Wick R. 1980. “The Possession of pets, dogs, and other beasts (both animal and human) in Southern California, and surrounding areas.” *AAA Annual Meeting*, Washington, D.C.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2007. *The genesis of language. A reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grammaticalization patterns in the Cariban family

Spike Gildea, University of Oregon & Collegium de Lyon

This talk will characterize major innovations in the grammar of languages of the Cariban family, which is composed of around 25 languages still spoken in northern South America plus three extinct languages for which more extensive colonial records exist. While there is solid evidence to reconstruct many historical changes in the morphosyntax of the family, the most widespread changes in main clause structure do not obviously qualify as cases of grammaticalization in that they do not create any new morphology from older lexical items, but are rather reanalyses of different constructions that contained old derivational morphology, sometimes fusing old two or more older morphemes into a single innovative inflection.

In the main body of this talk, I will describe reanalyses in which productive nominalizations (of verbs) and nominalizations plus adpositions (sometimes also plus a copular auxiliary) have become tense-aspect-mood markers. As a part of these same reanalyses, the morphosyntax of nominal possession has become the morphosyntax of one argument (usually the absolutive, but sometimes the accusative or the nominative). Sometimes the dative postposition marks an oblique agent relation in the source construction; this use of the dative marks the ergative argument of several reanalyzed constructions. I will list the source nominalizations (plus an additional postposition, where relevant), along with the new semantics that accompanies the reanalysis: from referring to the action or to a participant in the scene described by the verb to providing a TAM interpretation for the state/event described by the verb. Alongside the semantic shifts, I also characterize the innovative argument structures that arise via these reanalyses: ergative-absolutive, nominative-absolutive, and nominative-accusative, with each pattern realized by some combination of case-marking, verbal and/or auxiliary indexation, and constituency (inside versus outside the VP).

In addition, I will quickly list a number of other developments scattered across the family that are more typical cases of grammaticalization: third person verbal number from the noun meaning ‘people’, elaboration of tense-aspect suffixes by adding various postverbal particles to the inflected verb, derivational aspect markers from complement-taking verbs, the development of genitive classifiers from generic nouns, determiners from demonstrative pronouns, and conversion of the essive postposition to a derivational suffix that derives adverbs from nouns.

On the grammaticalization of some determiners in Hoocąk and other Siouan languages.

Johannes Helmbrecht (University of Regensburg)

It is common knowledge in grammaticalization theory that demonstrative pronouns are the source of two different grammaticalization paths. Free demonstratives (as heads of a NP) develop frequently into anaphoric pronouns and third person pronouns. Dependent demonstratives (as determiners of a nominal head) frequently become definite articles, markers of specificity, gender markers, noun markers, relative clause markers, and subordinators in general (see Greenberg 1978, Lehmann 1995, Hopper and Traugott 2008, Heine and Kuteva 2002, and others). The topic of the proposed paper are grammaticalization processes that are associated with demonstratives and the definite articles in Hoocąk and some other Siouan languages. It will be shown that some of these grammaticalizations nicely fit in the already attested ones in other languages that were mentioned above. However, there are also grammaticalizations that are different and that might broaden the traditional picture of the grammaticalization of determiners. In particular, the grammaticalization of demonstratives from auxiliaries has – to the best of my knowledge – never been described.

Hoocąk (also known as Winnebago) is a Siouan language still spoken in Wisconsin. Hoocąk has two paradigms of demonstrative pronouns. The first paradigm of demonstratives goes back to Proto-Siouan. The second paradigm is an innovation in Hoocąk (and similarly in other Siouan languages; cf. Rankin 2004). Two bound deictic forms *-re* and *-ga* are combined with the three positional verbs *nqk* 'sit', *qk* 'lie' and *jee* 'stand' in order to form a new paradigm of demonstrative pronouns. These new demonstratives are quite different from the first and old paradigm grammatically and semantically. First, they are always dependent demonstratives determining the head noun, while the old paradigm can be used as dependent as well as free demonstratives. Secondly, they appear only post-nominally, while the first paradigm is more variable occurring pre- and post-nominally. Thirdly, the new demonstratives classify the head noun according to proximate and distal and according to its spatial position (neutral, horizontal, vertical), while the old demonstratives distinguish only proximal and distal and are used anaphorically to distinguish between topical (aforementioned) and new referents (this however, has still to be shown!). Fourthly, the new paradigm of demonstratives can be used as

relativizer and subordinator, which is not possible with the old paradigm of demonstratives. The positional verbs themselves, on the other hand, go back to Proto-Siouan. They are grammaticalized in Hooçak (and other Siouan languages) as auxiliaries of being 'be.sitting/be.lying/be.standing' and in combination with other verbs as continuative/progressive markers. Besides these two paradigms of demonstrative pronouns, Hooçak has two bound deictic elements already mentioned, *-re* and *-ga*. They are used as dependent demonstratives too. In addition there is a definite article *=ra*, used as nominalizer and general subordinator, but cannot be traced back to one of the common Siouan demonstratives. The source of this definite article is still a miracle. I will try to come up with some hypotheses of its origin.

The goal of the proposed paper is to sketch the historical developments of the various determiners mentioned above according to the structural and semantic/ pragmatic properties of these forms and with regard to grammaticalization theory. Special attention will be laid on the division of labor or functions between these different determiners that emerged with the advent of new determining forms. The grammaticalization processes that are observed in Hooçak will then be compared to corresponding ones in some other Siouan languages of other sub-branches of

Siouan, except the languages of the Dhegiha sub-branch. For the languages of this sub-branch, there are already very informative studies available that show a further development of the positional verbs to definite articles with a classifying function; cf. Barron & Serzisko 1982 and Rankin 2004. These grammaticalizations are unique to this sub-branch and cannot be found in the rest of Siouan.

The data for Hooçak come from my own fieldnotes and the DOBES corpus of Hooçak texts. This corpus is stored in "The Language Archive" of the Max-Planck-Institute for Psycholinguistics. Data from the other Siouan language are taken from grammatical descriptions.

References:

Barron, Roger and Serzisko, Fritz 1982. Noun classifiers in the Siouan languages. In: Seiler, Hansjakob and Stachowiak, Franz Joseph (eds.) *Apprehension. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen, III: Die Techniken und ihr Zusammenhang in Einzelsprachen*. Tübingen: Narr, 85-105.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In: Greenberg et al. (eds.) *Universals of Human Language*. Vol. 3. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 47-82.

Heine, Bernd and Kuteva, Tanja 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, Paul J. and Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2008[1993] *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, Christian 1995[1982] *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Munich:Lincom Europa.

Rankin, Robert L. 2004. The history and development of Siouan positionals with special attention to polygrammaticalization in Dhegiha. In: *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* STUF 57:202-227.

Grammaticalization in Khoisan

Bernd Heine, Universität zu Köln

In the history of modern studies in grammaticalization of the 1980s and 1990s, African languages have played quite some role. The present paper will look at a kind of "garden variety"-type of process that may be of interest from a more theoretical perspective, namely the grammaticalization of future tense categories. Discussion will focus on !Xun, traditionally known as Northern Khoisan, and its various dialects spoken in southern Angola, northern Namibia and western Botswana.

Grammaticalisation processes and reanalyses in Sulawesi languages

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, Universität zu Köln

The Indonesian island of Sulawesi is home to more than 100 languages belonging to 10 different low-level subgroups of the Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) branch of Austronesian, three of which have been argued to belong to the Philippine subgroup of WMP. Grammatically, the languages are highly diverse (in their Austronesian context) and provide evidence for major restructuring processes found also in other branches of the family. Of necessity, reference will also be made to Formosan and Philippine languages as well as to the languages spoken in the Malaysian part of Borneo and in western Indonesia (Sumatra, Kalimantan, islands up to Lombok), but the main focus of the presentation will be on Sulawesi languages.

Three grammatical areas will be of central concern:

1. Articles or more generally noun phrase markers Many western Austronesian languages include grammatical markers, usually proclitics, which derive from demonstratives and have article-like functions. When compared to the well-known articles of European languages, two features of these markers are particularly remarkable. First, these markers always mark something like specificity or referentiality, never definiteness. Second, their use is always also grammatically constrained in that their use is prohibited in certain types of constructions, regardless of function and meaning. A major aspect of this second feature is the fact that they often are in complementary distribution with locative markers, leading to paradigms consisting of 'articles' and 'prepositions'.

2. **Person marking** Sulawesi languages show a bewildering diversity of person marking systems at what appear to be different stages in closely related grammaticisation processes. When seen in an areal perspective, it is clear that these systems basically derive from very similar source constructions. However, the outcome of the processes are superficially very different alignment types, i.e. nominative-accusative, ergative, and (Philippine-type) symmetrical voice systems. Importantly, these different outcomes appear to be triggered by relatively minor differences in the overall development.

3. **Pluractionals** Many Sulawesi languages show reflexes of an inherited prefix *si-* with meanings related to event plurality, both in the sense of events involving multiple (agentive) participants (sociatives/collectives, reciprocals) as well as multiplicities of (identical) events (iteratives, duratives, intensives). Unlike the well-known voice marking morphology, this part of the verbal morphology is little-known outside the specialist circles and also much more variable and changeable, providing evidence for different possible paths of development. In general, the presentation will highlight the variation in, and the variability of, grammaticisation processes. Apart from discussing possible historical developments, which of necessity will be speculative in that there is no historical record that would allow one to trace the trajectory of changes, it will also include the discussion of what appear to be ongoing changes evident in current spontaneous speech.

Areal patterns of multiple argument marking in Bantoid: from Syntheticity to Analyticity

Larry M. Hyman, University of California, Berkeley

Given the typological similarities between the geographically and genetically distant Atlantic, Kordofanian and (Narrow) Bantu languages, it is generally assumed that early Niger-Congo had a synthetic structure with extensive noun class marking and derivational verb extensions (causative, applicative, etc.). However, other Niger-Congo languages show varying degrees of analyticity, some coming close to the endpoint of one morpheme per word. Much of the variation is quite clearly areal. In this paper I am concerned both with the mechanisms of change that lead from syntheticity to analyticity in the Nigeria-Cameroon borderland area, as well as the different strategies that are adopted as these languages lose their verbal extensions. The Bantoid languages I report on are typologically quite diverse. I am particularly concerned with what has replaced dative (recipient, benefactive) and instrumental applicative marking on verbs which historically allowed multiple object noun phrases (*send-APPL chief letter, cook-APPL child rice, cut-APPL knife meat*). The languages of this area show a remarkable variation: (i) Some languages allow multiple objects (typically with restrictions), while others do not (including some which have relic verb extensions); (ii) some have replaced verb extensions with serial verbs (*take knife cut meat give child*), others use adpositions (*cut meat with knife for child*). Still others have adopted multiple strategies for marking such arguments. In this study I sort out these strategies and attempt a micro-mapping of who has developed what where—and grammaticalizing from what (from nouns? verbs?)? I will show that even

adpositional languages have extensive verb serialization which they exploit for other functions (aspectual, directional, comparatives etc.), thereby raising the question of why only some Bantoid languages use serial verbs for argument marking. Although information is lacking for many languages, there does appear to be a southerly band of languages which mark datives and instruments with serial verbs. Information from Nigeria suggests that a similar distinction separates much of Lower Cross-River from Upper Cross River languages as well.

From ergative to index of comparison: multiple reanalyses and polyfunctionality

Guillaume Jacques (CNRS)

The talk describes the uses of the marker *ku* in Japhug, which presents many distinct functions, including ergative, instrumental, distributive, causal linker, manner linker, emphatic adversative, interrogative sentence final particle and index of the comparee in the comparative construction. A series of grammaticalization pathways, some of which have never been documented before, are proposed to account for the polyfunctionality of this marker.

On the grammaticalization of the parts of speech in Uralic in a general Eurasian context

Juha Janhunen (University of Helsinki)

The Uralic languages, like all languages of the Ural-Altai type, exhibit a basically strict distinction between the nominal and verbal classes of speech. Each class is characterized by a distinct set of inflectional categories, marked with class-specific sets of suffixes. In addition to the basic dichotomy of nouns vs. verbs, the Uralic languages typically also possess a small class of invariables, which take neither nominal nor verbal markers. From a diachronic perspective, the invariables are secondary, and even synchronically they are often transparent cases of lexicalized and/or grammaticalized nominal and/or verbal forms. Most Uralic languages also show some diversification within, especially, the nominal class of words, which are typically divided into nouns proper, adjectives, spatial, and pronouns. The differences between these subclasses are both morphological and morphosyntactic.

There are, however, phenomena suggesting that the synchronically observable basic distinction between nouns and verbs is ultimately secondary. These phenomena include: (1) the presence of ambivalent nominal-verbal roots (*nomen-verba*) in several Uralic languages, (2) the possibility of using certain markers of the verbal conjugation on nouns (*nominal conjugation*) in some Uralic languages, (3) the possibility of using certain markers of the nominal declension on verbs (*verbal declension*) in some Uralic languages, and (4) the presence of static verbs (*verbal adjectives*) in some Uralic languages. The further back towards Proto-Uralic we go, the more prominent these phenomena seem to become,

suggesting that at some time in Pre-Proto-Uralic the distinction between verbs and nouns was not yet fully grammaticalized. This possibility opens up insights into the typological prehistory of Uralic as well as perspectives for areal comparisons in the Eurasian realm.

Areal patterns in the grammaticalization of Turkic postverbal constructions as markers of actionality and viewpoint aspect

Lars Johanson (Uni Mainz)

The paper deals with Turkic postverbal constructions, i.e. analytic constructions consisting of a lexical verb in converbial form and a following auxiliary verb. The label 'postverb' is used in analogy to Indo-European preverbs used as actional operators. Two types of converbs are involved: type ⟨A⟩, ending in a vowel, type ⟨B⟩, ending in a labial consonant. One and the same auxiliary verb may occur with both converb types.

Postverbal constructions typically function as actional operators, serving the expression of actionality (Aktionsart). They operate on various types of actional phrases, creating more specific actional contents.

The constructions are based on a limited number of auxiliary verbs with strongly generalized grammaticalized meaning. They go back to lexical verbs of various kinds, e.g. motion verbs meaning 'to go', 'to come', 'to go away', 'to go out', 'to proceed', postural verbs meaning 'to stand', 'to remain', 'to sit', 'to lie', etc., and transfer verbs meaning 'to put', 'to seize', 'to place', 'to cast', 'to send', etc. The constructions allow the expression of highly differentiated shades of meaning.

The use of postverbal constructions varies considerably across languages. The systems are well developed in the Northwestern, Northeastern and Southeastern branches of Turkic. Languages of the Northeastern branch make extensive use of them. The best developed systems are found in South Siberia, where the constructions are highly conventionalized and mostly preferred to simple verb forms. The Southwestern branch exhibits relatively poor systems. Varieties spoken in Iran and Azerbaijan employ restricted sets of constructions. Considerable differences between standard and non-standard dialects are often found. Standard Turkish is surprisingly poor in postverbal constructions, whereas some Anatolian dialects display rich systems. Gagauz and Karaim, which are both strongly influenced by Slavic, only possess rudimentary systems of postverbal constructions.

The semantic notions grammaticalized vary across languages and are not fully predictable from the original lexical meanings of the auxiliaries. Different languages employ different auxiliaries to grammaticalize similar notions, and the same constructions may have different meanings in different languages. The types of semantic notions are nevertheless mostly similar. Certain constructions follow identical patterns in many Northwestern, Southeastern and South Siberian languages.

Turkic postverbal constructions are typically used for phase specification, highlighting an inherent phase of the actional phrase. Some mark transformativity, others non-transformativity.

Transformativizers operate on actionally ambiguous actional phrases, highlighting a dynamic initial or final phase of the action and blocking non-transformative readings. They mean 'to write down' rather than 'to write', 'to sit down' rather than 'to sit', 'to catch sight' rather than 'to look', 'to catch fire' or 'to burn down' rather than 'to burn'. The corresponding auxiliary verbs have developed from source verbs with lexical meanings such as 'to send', 'to move', 'to put', 'to throw', 'to go away', 'to come', 'to go out', 'to take', 'to reach', 'to enter', 'to strike', 'to fall'. They mostly combine with ⟨B⟩ converbs.

Non-transformativizers operate on transformative and actionally ambiguous actional phrases, specifying a nondynamic phase of the action and blocking limit-oriented readings. They mean 'to be ill' rather than 'to fall ill', 'to look' rather than 'to catch sight', 'to eat' rather than 'to eat up', and 'to read' rather than 'to read and finish reading'. The auxiliary verbs have developed from postural or locomotive verbs meaning 'to stand', 'to sit', 'to lie', 'to proceed', 'to move', 'to run'. Their choice may thus give additional information on the physical position in which the action is performed.

Postverbal constructions based on motion verbs meaning 'to come' and 'to go away' may express spatial orientation, specifying whether an action is directed towards or away from a deictic center. Cislocative orientation, direction towards a deictic center ('to this place') is expressed by constructions based on verbs meaning 'to come'. Translocative orientation, direction from a deictic center ('from this place') is expressed by constructions based on verbs meaning 'to go (away)'.

Postverbal constructions based on verbs meaning 'to give' and 'to take' express so-called version, indicating whether a given action is performed to the benefit or affliction (advantage or disadvantage) of the performer or of some other entity.

The patterns of the typical postverbal actional constructions have spread through contacts into other languages spoken in Turkic-dominated areas. The semantic and combinatory patterns have proven attractive for copying as long as they have preserved their initial analytic structure.

Postverbal constructions are found in several older Iranian languages, particularly in Khwarezmian as written until the 13th or 14th century. This is a result of the strong Turkic influence to which Khwarezm was exposed from the 8th century on.

The Central Asian Iranian language Tajik, a variety of Persian, has developed auxiliary constructions with functions similar to the Uzbek ones. The patterns of postverbal constructions are strongly represented in Northern Tajik, where they display clearly Turkic features. Here, participial forms based on the preterite stem + *-ā* are combined with a limited number of auxiliary verbs fulfilling various actional functions. The constructions are heavily represented in dialects spoken close to Turkic-speaking areas, whereas they occur less frequently or not at all in more distant dialects.

Mongolic languages exhibit similar patterns. Examples of contact-induced copying of postverbal constructions from Chuvash and Tatar are found in the Finno-Ugric language Mari (Cheremis), spoken in the Volga region in the eastern part of Russia proper. Anatolian Greek varieties have copied functions of Turkish postverbal constructions with <dur-> 'to stand' and <yat-> 'to lie' onto corresponding Greek verbs. Anatolian Kurmanji shows cases of Turkish influence.

In contrast, postverbal techniques have declined or vanished in Turkic varieties dominated by Persian. As a result of the loss of converbs, the use of the typically Turkic postverbal constructions has eroded in favor of paratactic constructions. This is true of Khalaj, Kashkay and several other Turkic varieties of Iran.

Turkic languages make use of a number of grammaticalized viewpoint aspect markers expressing perspectives on events, i.e. different ways of envisaging events with respect to their limits.

Intraterminality envisages an event from an internal point of view, within its outer limits. This viewpoint aspect yields imperfective and progressive meanings, typical of present/imperfect categories. Postterminality envisages an event at a point where its relevant limit is already transcended, yielding meanings typical of resultative and perfect categories.

Intraterminals and postterminals display higher or lower focality degrees depending on the relative narrowness/broadness of the range of vision applied to the event at a given vantage point.

Intra- and postterminal items originally expressed high degrees of focality and later turned into items of lower focality, i.e. simple presents, imperfects, perfects, constatives. This led to renewals of the expression of high focality by periphrastic means.

Several Turkic postverbal constructions have served as the basis for grammaticalization of viewpoint aspect operators renewing the expression of focal intraterminality and postterminality. Originally actional properties have been reinterpreted in aspectual terms. The markers have generalized to occur with actional phrases of all semantic types.

Constructions with the verb *tur-* 'to stand', <A> *tur-* and *tur-*, have played a major role. In most languages, <A> *tur-ur* came to renew focal intraterminality, e.g. *Yaz-a tur-ur* 'X stands writing' > 'X is writing', whereas *tur-ur* renewed focal postterminality, e.g. *Yaz-ïp tur-ur* 'X stands having written' > 'X has written'. The forms underwent formal erosion, first univerbation, i.e. fusion of the converb marker with the auxiliary, and then partial or total loss of *tur-ur*, e.g. *Yaz-a tur-ur* >> *Yaz-a*, *Yaz-ïp tur-ur* >> *Yaz-ïp*. After the defocalization of items of these types, further similar grammaticalization processes have taken place, leading to new periphrastic exponents of high focality, e.g. with other postural verbs such as *yat-* 'to lie'. Most Turkic languages have undergone at least one renewal of this kind during their known history, Yakut being a remarkable exception.

The construction <A> *är-ür* ← *är-* 'to be' was once spread over wide areas in the western parts of the Turkic-speaking world, serving to renew focal intraterminality in numerous Oghuz and Kipchak varieties. The marker is preserved in various more or less contracted

shapes in the Ponto-Caspian area, the Balkans, East Anatolia, the Azeri area, the South Oghuz area, Iraq, etc. Kipchak varieties of Southern Russia and the Volga region preserve clear traces of it.

This type was abandoned in many languages and replaced by ⟨A⟩ *tur-ur* ← *tur-* ‘to stand’, which came to renew intraterminality at an early stage in the Northwestern, Southeastern and Northeastern branches. Its source was the continuative postverbal construction ⟨A⟩ *tur-* rather than ⟨B⟩ *tur-*. As mentioned, the combination underwent univertation and partial or total loss of *tur-ur*. This focal intraterminal type may have been influenced by Persian constructions based on ‘to stand’.

A construction ⟨A⟩ *yorı-r* ← *yorı-* ‘to move’ led to a late Ottoman innovation that was not firmly established until the 18th century. The marker {-(Ø)Iyor} is today the most frequent Turkish intraterminal marker. Cypriot Turkish originally lacked {-(Ø)Iyor} since this form became established after the Turkish immigration to Cyprus. The Turkish-speaking groups settled here by the Ottoman government in the 16th century mostly came from the Konya-Adana-Antalya area and spoke dialects that lacked the marker in question.

There are further items renewing focal intraterminality, products of relatively recent developments. In the Southeastern branch of Turkic they are similar to Persian constructions.

Turkic postterminals are mostly evidential, signaling that the event is not stated directly, but in an indirect way, by reference to its reception by a conscious subject. They imply that the utterance is based on a source of information such as hearsay, inference and perception (‘evidently’, ‘obviously’, ‘as it turns out’, etc.). The expression varies across languages. Postterminals in {-mİŝ}, {-GAN} and {-(V)p-tI(r)} tend to get indirective interpretations, e.g. Turkish ⟨*Yaz-mıŝ*⟩, Bashkir *Yaz-yan*, Uzbek *Yâz-ip-ti* ‘X has reportedly/apparently/obviously written’.

The oldest known postterminal marker is {-mİŝ}. It is still used as a finite item in modern West Oghuz, South Oghuz, Khorasan Oghuz varieties, Khalaj, Salar and North Siberian. Lexicalized forms with {-mİŝ} have survived in some Kipchak languages. The Azeri finite item in {-mİŝ} differs from its Turkish counterpart by displaying more perfect-like functions without evidential connotations. This usage is clearly influenced by the Persian perfect. The Yakut marker {-BIt}, an archaic feature etymologically corresponding to {-mİŝ}, forms a postterminal with evidential connotations.

The finite type {-GAN} came to be used as a postterminal marker in most Turkic languages, replacing the old suffix {-mİŝ}. It is now used in the Northwestern and Southeastern branches as well as in the West and South Siberian languages. In West Kipchak, {-GAN} expresses past events of current relevance, often on the basis of results or indirect evidence. The {-GAN} perfects of Tatar and Bashkir have evidential connotations. In many languages, e.g. Kirghiz, Kazakh, Uzbek, Uyghur, {-GAN} has perfect, resultative, experiential and constative (summarizing) functions,

The expression of postterminality has also been renewed with constructions of the type ⟨B⟩ *tur-ur* ← *tur-* ‘to stand’. This has led to the formation of postterminals in a variety of Turkic

languages. The Persian perfect has certainly corroborated this type as the usual perfect among the Turks of Iran. Turkmen possesses the indirective postterminal marker {-Ib-dIr} // {-:b-dIr} < ⟨B⟩ *dur-ur*. Its functions are similar to those of the finite Turkish item {-mIş}, e.g. ⟨Gel-miş⟩ ‘X has obviously come’. Many Kipchak items going back to ⟨B⟩ *tur-ur* have been strongly defocalized. Several languages possess low-focal indirective postterminal markers of the type {- (I)p-tI(r)}, e.g. Uyghur {- (I)p-ti}.

The paper will sketch some basic areal patterns in the grammaticalization of Turkic postverbal constructions as markers of both actionality and viewpoint aspect.

Grammaticalisation in the verb system in Iranian

Agnes Korn (Uni Frankfurt) & Carina Jahani (Uni Uppsala)

This paper studies some grammaticalisation phenomena in the verb system in Iranian. It will specifically look at those categories where grammaticalisation features prominently: while not all categories of the verb system show grammaticalisation processes, some do so in a large number of Iranian languages, and using the same morphological elements.

Transitivity is a category of high grammaticalisation activity in Iranian. It is marked by analogical extension of inherited verbal stem formation as well as by the introduction of a number of double paradigms in the PAST domain (which arise as the inherited aorist and perfect stems are lost in late Old Iranian): the “inchoative suffix” -s- is used for the formation of secondary intransitives in several Middle Iranian languages [1a], and new suffixes arise for the formation of causatives [1b]).

While the intransitive perfect / past is expressed by the perfect participle / past stem with the copula in most of Middle Iranian and later on, the transitive paradigm shows a different pattern: Khotanese employs an enlarged form of the perfect participle [2], some languages form ergative constructions [3] and others use a transitive auxiliary. As is common for auxiliaries in grammaticalisation processes, phonological reduction occurs; so the verb ‘hold/have’ that forms the transitive perfect in Sogdian (in a pattern entirely parallel to Germanic and Romance *have* vs. *be* perfects) merges with the past stem (thus *xwrd’r-* from PT *xwrt-* + AUX *δ’r-* in [4]) and the origin of the transitive formation in Ossetic [5] is not transparent any more (probably Ir. **dā-* < PIE **d^heh₁* ‘put’,² thus parallel to Latin formations of the type *rube-facio* ‘make red’).

Secondly, the categories of particularly high grammaticalisation activity themselves appear to form clusters. A small number of verbs are used as auxiliaries in various patterns [6]: ‘do’, ‘hold’ and ‘put’ on the transitive / active side and ‘be’ as well as verbs of movement on the

² CHRISTOL (1990:44), Lubotsky apud CHEUNG (2002:140)

intransitive / passive side (perfect / past domain, passive voice, intransitive / passive pairs of the potential construction [7]). The same verbs are also the most prominent light verbs, suggesting that the rise of complex predicates is a process parallel to the grammaticalisation of auxiliaries.³ Both periphrastic verbal patterns and complex predicates come in pairs of a transitive / active and a intransitive / passive counterpart; it thus seems that categories of transitivity, control and actionality forms one cluster of particularly high grammaticalisational activity in Iranian.

Another cluster is the field of aspect, durativity and mood. Progressives (often becoming present tense formations) may be grammaticalised by particles or locational constructions ('I am [in the position of] going'). Auxiliaries are also found, among which, again, is 'hold/have' and the verb 'stand', recalling the use of verbs of movement in intransitive / patterns just mentioned.

A third field of particular interest is animacy and person marking. Differential marking of direct and indirect objects as well as of agents in the ergative domain is common throughout Iranian and is expressed by case suffixes and adpositions. A possibly related phenomenon is the conversion of demonstratives to copula forms, by which process gendered copula forms of the 3SG arise in languages as diverse as Pashto and Zazaki. Conversely, verbal endings assume pronominal function following a loss of case distinctions and changes in ergativity patterns [8].

Examples

1a) <u>Sogdian</u> (GERSHEVITCH 1954: §826)	ITR	<i>yγwsty</i>		TR	<i>ywc-</i>	
		'is taught, learns'			'teach'	
1b) <u>Balochi</u>	ITR	<i>ras-</i>		CAUS	<i>ras-ēn-</i>	
		'arrive'			'transport'	
2) <u>Khotanese</u> (EMMERICK 2009:395f.)	ITR	<i>parrātā</i>	<i>mā</i>	TR	<i>parrete</i>	<i>mā</i>
		deliver.PF.M.SG	COP1SG		deliver.PF.TR.M.SG	COP1SG
		'I have been delivered'			'I have delivered'	
3) <u>Parthian</u>	ITR	(<i>az</i>)	<i>āγad</i>	<i>hēm</i>		
		I.DIR	come.PT	COP.1SG		
		"I have come"				
	TR	<i>u</i>	<i>≡t</i>	<i>az</i>	<i>hišt</i>	<i>hēm</i> <i>sēwag</i>
		and you.SG.PC(OBL)	I.DIR	leave.PT	COP.1SG	orphan
		'...and you have left <i>mē</i> as an orphan' ⁴				
4) <u>Sogdian</u> (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985:194f.)	TR	<i>xwrd'r-y</i>		ITR	<i>m't</i>	<i>=ym</i>
		eat.PP.hold-2SG			become.PP	=COP.1SG
		"you have eaten"			"I have become"	

³ Cf. KORN 2013.

⁴ M 42 R i, 15f., KORN (2008:268)

5)	<i>kal-in</i>	ITR <i>kaldisti</i>	TR <i>kald-ton</i>
Ossetic	pour.PR-INF	pour.PT.COP.3PL	pour.PT-TR.1SG
(ABAEV 1964:53f.)	‘to pour (TR/ITR)’	‘they are poured’	‘I poured’

6) Auxiliaries in Iranian (selection)

	transitive / active		intransitive / passive		
* <i>kar</i> ‘do’	transitive potential	(many Ir. languages)	* <i>baw-</i> ‘be, become’ / copula	middle & passive potential	Khotanese, Sogdian, Balochi, Pashto
* <i>dār-</i> ‘hold, have’	transitive past	Sogdian, Xwarezmian		intransitive past	Sogdian, Ossetic
				compound tenses (perfect, perfect) past	(general)
* <i>dā-</i> ‘put; give’		Ossetic		passive	(many Ir. languages)
			* <i>čyaw-</i> ‘move forward’	passive	Khotanese, Pashto, Ossetic, New Persian, etc.
			* <i>ā-gam-</i> ‘come’		Kurmanji

7a) TR *βyzy* L’ *βrt* *wn-’y=k’m*
 Sogdian⁵ bad NEG carry.PP.POT do.PRS-2SG=FUT
 ‘you will not be able to bear the hardship’

7b) ITR *’xw* L’ *np’st’* *βw-t*
 DEM.NOM.SG.M NEG lie down.PP.POT become.PRS-3SG
 ‘he cannot lie down’

7c) PASS *wyt’* *w’-t*
 say.PP.POT become.PRS.SBJ-3SG
 ‘[it] could be said’

8) *lawē taqrār=yān wār-girt-im*
 Sorani there report=PC3PL receive-1SG
 (JÜGEL 2009:153) ‘There they took my report.’

Sources

- ABAEV, Vasilij I. 1964: *A Grammatical Sketch of Ossetic*. The Hague: Mouton
 CHEUNG, Johnny 2002: *Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism*. Reichert, Wiesbaden
 CHRISTOL, Alain 1990: *Introduction à l’ossète : éléments de grammaire comparée*. LALIES (Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature) 8, 7-50
 EMMERICK, Ronald 2009: "Khotanese and Tumshuqese" // WINDFUHR, pp. 377-425

⁵ (a) + (b) SIMS-WILLIAMS (2007:378, Buddhist), (c) GERSHEVITCH (1954:131, Manichean)

- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: University Press
- JAHANI, Carina & Agnes KORN 2009: "Balochi" // WINDFUHR, pp. 634-692
- JEREMIÁS, Éva 1993: "On the Genesis of the Periphrastic Progressive in Iranian Languages" // Wojciech SKALMOWSKI, Alois VAN TONGERLOO (eds.): *Medioiranica. Proceedings of the International Colloquium organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 21st to the 23rd of May 1990*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 99-116
- JÜGEL, Thomas 2009: "Ergative Remnants in Sorani Kurdish?" // *Orientalia Suecana* 58, pp. 142-158
- KARIMI, Simin, Vida SAMIAN, Donald STILO (eds.): *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- KORN, Agnes 2008: "Marking of arguments in Balochi ergative and mixed constructions" // KARIMI et al., pp. 249-276
- _____ 2011: "Pronouns as Verbs, Verbs as Pronouns: Demonstratives and the Copula in Iranian" // KORN et al., pp. 53-70
- _____ 2013: "Looking for the Middle Way: Voice and Transitivity in Complex Predicates in Iranian" // *Lingua* 135, pp. 30-55
- _____ (fthc.): "Evolution of Iranian" // Matthias FRITZ, Jared KLEIN (eds.): *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft]*. Berlin: de Gruyter
- KORN, Agnes, Geoffrey HAIG, Simin KARIMI, Pollet SAMVELIAN (eds.): *Topics in Iranian Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Reichert
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C2*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag
- _____ 2007: The Sogdian potentialis // Maria MACUCH, Mauro MAGGI, Werner SUNDERMANN (eds.), *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turfan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 377-386
- _____ 2011: "Differential object marking in Bactrian" // KORN et al., pp. 23-38
- WINDFUHR, Gernot (ed.) 2009: *The Iranian Languages [Routledge Language Family Series]*. London, New York: Routledge

Grammaticalization in Yucatec Maya

Christian Lehmann (University of Erfurt)

The documented history of Yucatec Maya begins with colonial documents of the 16th century. Its prehistory is indirectly represented in Mayan hieroglyphic writing and may be accessed by internal reconstruction and historical comparison with cognate languages. The closest relative of Yucatec is (Southern) Lacandón. It is a dialect that split off the main variety in the 18th cent. and preserves some archaic traits, lending thus additional support to reconstructions. Including such reconstruction, responsible diachronic analysis may reach back approx. 1,000 years.

Grammaticalization has been going on at all times and at all levels of grammar. The most visible among the changes analyzable as cases of grammaticalization include the following:

1. Prehistoric changes, leading to Colonial Yucatec:

- Erstwhile free set A personal pronouns become enclitic in Yucatecan and Ch'olan.

Set B enclitic personal pronouns, which originally were more mobile, become suffixes of the full verb in Yucatecan and Ch'olan.

Relational nouns become prepositions.

2. Changes leading from Colonial to Modern Yucatec:

Tense/aspect/mood were primarily coded by suffixal conjugation in Colonial Yucatec. In Modern Yucatec, the TAM system is continually being renewed by a paradigm of auxiliaries.

3. Ongoing changes:

The basic order of main clause constituents was VOS in Colonial Yucatec; it is becoming SVO in Modern Yucatec.

Colonial Yucatec had no article; the modern language is acquiring a definite and an indefinite article.

The paradigm of numeral classifiers is being reduced to a mere prop for the (prefixal) numerals.

A subset of the changes in groups 2 and 3 may be motivated, guided or reinforced by Spanish contact. Others like the renewal of the TAM system follow strictly language-internal patterns.

References

Lehmann, Christian 1993, "The genesis of auxiliaries in Yucatec Maya". *Proceedings of the International Congress of Linguists* 15(1992), vol. 2:313-316.

Grammaticalization in Lezgian languages (East Caucasian), with special reference to Agul

Timur Maisak (*Institute of Linguistics, Moscow*)

The Lezgian languages spoken in the southern part of Dagestan (Russia) and northern part of Azerbaijan constitute the southern branch of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Dagestani) family. Like other languages of the family, they are predominantly ergative in syntax and predominantly agglutinative in morphology, and are well-known for their elaborate consonant inventories, extraordinarily rich case systems, nominal gender agreement (an archaic feature, lost in a few languages) or personal agreement (an innovative feature). There are nine languages in this group, namely Lezgian and Tabassaran (the two major languages with the developed literary standard), Agul, Tsakhur and Rutul (the three languages which became

written only in 1990s), and the smaller languages Kryz, Budugh, Archi and Udi. It has been proved that Udi is the closest living relative to the (now extinct) Caucasian Albanian language, which is the only East Caucasian language with ancient written tradition. Apart from this (the available written records of Caucasian Albanian are very few), not much is known about the history of the Lezgetic languages before the 19th century, when the first grammatical sketches and recorded texts were published. This is why the grammaticalization sources and the evolution scenarios of such old and prominent phenomena of the Lezgetic languages as locative cases or gender agreement markers are not clear, although the attempts to discover their origins have been undertaken in works on comparative reconstruction (esp. by the late Mikhail Alekseev). Still, there are plenty of examples of more recent grammaticalization phenomena, not necessarily common to all languages of the group, and there are both typologically well-established cases and *rara/rarissima* among them.

In the present talk, I will give examples of some grammaticalization paths that are typical of the Lezgetic languages and are also widely known from the cross-linguistic research, cf. ‘do’ > causative, ‘say’ > quotative, ‘one’ > indefinite article-like marker, or conditional/concessive affix > indefinite pronoun series marker. I will also mention some cross-linguistically uncommon paths which are nevertheless typically Lezgetic, e.g. ‘say’ > ordinal numeral marker.

I will then survey in more detail the structure of the basic tense and aspect forms, which are mainly periphrastic, consisting of participles, converbs, or infinitives and postpositional auxiliary verbs. It is interesting that although similar source patterns are used in different Lezgetic languages (e.g. Equation Schema “X is a Y”, the Manner Schema “X stays in a Y manner”, or the Purpose Schema “X acts in order to Y”, in Bernd Heine’s terms), the individual markers are not necessarily cognate, and hence probably do not go back to the Proto-Lezgetic. The variation between languages is also manifested in that structurally similar forms cover different ranges of uses along the paths like ‘present > old present/habitual > future’ or ‘resultative > perfect > non-witnessed past’.

Finally, I will present the data on a (probable) typological *rarissimum*, attested in two languages of the Lezgetic group, namely Agul and Archi. This is the rise of the morphologically bound form – or, strictly speaking, series of forms – meaning ‘to find out the truth value (or the unknown variable) of the proposition’. As I will argue, these “verificative” forms, available for lexical verbs, have probably originated in the construction with the embedded interrogative clause (indirect question) immediately preceded the once autonomous matrix verb ‘see’. The difference between the plausible source patterns of the Agul and the Archi verificatives, and even the dialectal variation in Agul alone, clearly show what this form is not of a very old origin; it is thus a bit mysterious why it appeared exactly in these two (not very closely related and not geographically adjacent) languages. At the same time, some other Lezgetic languages seem to possess syntactic constructions which might represent the “pre-grammaticalization” stage of the morphologized verificatives.

Verbalization and insubordination in Tungusic languages in an areal perspective

Andrej Malchukov (University of Mainz)

The talk deals with insubordination phenomena in Siberian languages, focusing on Tungusic and Paleosiberian languages. It shows that Siberian languages share a tendency to renew the finite verb forms through forms of nonfinite origin. This tendency can manifest itself either in the reanalysis of a nominal (participial) predicate as a verbal predicate (verbalization), or in the reanalysis of the erstwhile subordinate clause as a main clause (insubordination). Although the tendency for renewal of finite verb forms constitutes a general areal feature of Siberian languages, the outcome of these processes would be somewhat different, reflecting the difference in scenarios involved (insubordination proper vs. verbalization), as well as differences in the input structures.

References

- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2013. Verbalization and insubordination in Siberian languages. In Robbeets, Martine & Hubert Cuyckens (Eds.), *Shared grammaticalization: With special focus on Transeurasian languages*, 177-208. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Grammaticalization in Hindi and its dialects. Verb, adpositions.

Annie Montaut (Inalco; Paris)

Modern Indo-Aryan can be considered to have evolved from a flexional system to a highly analytical system (Chatterji 1926, Bubenik 2006), whether in the same process shifting from non-configurational to configurational syntax as suggested by Bubenik or retaining certain non-configurational properties as suggested by Butt, Dayal, Mohanan). This change has involved the grammaticalization of lexical words (less often of grammatical words) as new case markers, resulting in the new category of adpositions in the nominal group, and in the verbal domain, resulting in the renewal of inherited categories such as present, past or future tenses, passive voice, ability and deontic modalities, and also in new (mainly Aktionsart) categories such as progressive, continuative, frequentative, terminative, inchoative, perfective, evidential, not all of these categories being grammaticalized in all IA languages nor even in all the dialects of Hindi, and not all of them being grammaticalized to the same degree in a given language.

Whereas the role re-analysis in the process seems relatively weak, and attested with relative certitude only in the case of passive (example 1) and possibly ergative/de-ergativized alignments, contact has undoubtedly played an important role, yet not always easy to disentangle from internal evolution and convergence : Chatterji, who accounts for the general remodelling of the verbal IA paradigm by the Dravidian influence, is generally not followed

on this point. Yet the appearance of quotatives with evidential functions in Garhwali and Kumaoni (northern dialects of Hindi) seems more uncontroversially to be contact-induced (example 2), as well as the agreement pattern of Maithili and Magahi (Eastern dialects of Hindi), with possibly borrowed forms as well as functions (cf. Matras 2011) (example 3). My contribution, focused on Hindi and its ‘dialects’ will first deal with the verbal category and case in the nominal category, leaving aside for further study the emergence of classifiers, number (from class markers in dialects which lost inflexional markers), pronouns (grammaticalization of a three-fold honorific distinction for 2nd and 3rd person) and subordination.

Within the verb, markers for tense and aspect mainly originate from auxiliarized verbs (be, stay, do, go, touch/stick and other motion verbs). The degree of obligatorification and paradigmaticization (Lamiroy & Mulder 2011) varies in the various dialects of Hindi and for some categories such as perfectivity (the so called ‘vector’ constructions) is low in all. In addition, different markers may grammaticalize in the same function, ie progressive in those Hindi dialects which have grammaticalized the distinction habitual/progressive: ‘be’ (*cha/h-*) marks the progressive in those languages which maintained a synthetic present, whereas the semantically more specific ‘stay’ marks it in those languages which developed a complex form for present (V be). Reversely the same original form may evolve into different functional markers: *rah* “stay” in modern Hindi < *rakshati* “preserve, keep” marks the past in Bhojpuri (eastern dialect of Hindi) and the progressive in Standard Hindi, as well as the continuous, in different constructions: V *rahā* (past participle) *hai* (be-present) is progressive, V-*tā* (imperfective participle) *rah*+TA endings is continuous (‘keep V-ing’) in Standard Hindi and the function of *rah* as a past tense marker (Eastern dialects) corresponds to a still different construction (V + inflected *rah-*). Constructions, as well as the semantic map of the concerned domain at the relevant time, are to be taken into account in order to understand how the form itself came to grammaticalize in a given function – future in this respect is problematic since it grammaticalize ‘go’ as a tense marker in Western Hindi dialects but in a non-usual construction (V-irrealis + go-past participle).

This is all the more obvious when the whole sentence construction is at stake (Lehmann 2002:7; Delancey 2011: 376-7): the rise of ergative patterns in past transitive clauses is both the result of the grammaticalization of a passive participle as TA marker and of the reinterpretation of a nominal sentence with instrumental agent (by A P done) as a tense marked finite active sentence. The fact that a parallel construction evolved from modal nominal statements (by A P to be done) to future in Eastern Hindi dialects argues against the isolated rise of ergative alignments in IA and in favour of a common development path for non-processual TA, oriented towards result or aim (Kurylowicz 1965, 1931 ; Benveniste 1965, 1952, 1960). The fact that these futures (developed from modal passive participles) and the transitive past (developed from past passive participles) in Eastern languages further shifted back into nominative alignments with new personal endings emphasizes (at least in Bengali and related languages) the grammaticalization of person pronouns in the renewal of person endings.

Within the nominal domain, the most striking facts are the development of genitive markers evolved from a past participle of ‘do’, resulting in a postposition which agrees with

the head noun, and the semantic content of other markers as well as the diversity of functions which they grammaticize into in various dialects, and sometimes in the same language (example 4), blurring the usual relation with sources (Heine & Kuteva 2002).

The genitive so-called postposition is in fact an adjectivizer (origin: participle of verb kar“do”, *krita*, or *kerā* by analogy with other modern past participles), with various degrees of phonetic erosion (*ker* in Eastern dialects, *kā* in standard Hindi, *ko*, in old Hindi, *ro* in Western dialects), but always agreeing with the head noun and governing the oblique form of the complement noun. It occurs in the same construction as the derivative *-vālā* “related to” (bound or unbound) < Sk *pāla* “protector”, not (yet) fully grammaticalized.

Other case markers come partly from locational nouns: this is true for dative (originally allative) secondarily used for marked accusative and experiencer: modern hindi *ko*, old Hindi *kau* (*kaū*, *kū*, *kū*), which comes from the Sanskrit *kakṣa* “side, place”, with alternate forms in Northern dialects *kakh*, *kākh*, *kakhā*. Dative other forms include *khuṇī* (Garhwali/Kumaoni) from the Sk noun ‘ear’ (*karṇa* in the locative: **karnasmin* <*karṇe*) “at the hear”, “aside, close to”, with alternate forms *nai/ne* (<*kanhai/kannai* in old Rajasthani), giving the ergative markers in almost all IA languages. But the locative seme may stem from the case only of the unit grammaticalized, as in *tai/tāi* (Garhwali) < *tāvati*, a locative form of the resumptive indefinite *tāvat* (*tāvahī*, *tāmhī* **taaī*, **tannī*, *tāi*) “so long, so far, up to, till”. Other sources are the verb “touch, stick” *lag* (>*lai*, *lagi*, *lag*) for allative, beneficiary and dative, also at the origin of future tense in Eastern languages. Less usual is the grammaticalization of comitative nouns in the function of dative/accusative, like *saṇī* (*haṇī*) in northern dialects, from the Sk noun *sanga* “society, company”, then “with”.

Ablative instrumental (Modern Hindi *se*) is now traced from *sama* “equal, even” (Tiwari 1955, Chatak 1966) in the instrumental *sam.ena* (*saē* > *saī* > *sē*), but has long been derived from a verb (Hoernle), *sunto* “being”. Other ablative markers also derived from existential verbs include *te/tī* (northern dialects) < *hunti* < *hontai* < *hontako*, present participle, “being, staying”, *thai* from the past participle of *stha* “stand, stay”, or *bāṭi*, *baī*, in Garhwali/Kumaoni from the verbal noun *vartamana* (< *vṛt* “turn, expand”).

Questions: does the extension in functional range, eventually resulting in new categories (dative, then marked accusative, and experiencer, or instrumental then incapacitated or inhibited agent, inadvertent agent) pertain to grammaticalization? Can the experiential alignment be considered a case of grammaticalization (obligatorification of a given argument structure, parallel to the ergative alignment but with no reanalyse of the nominal predicate as a finite verb, since lexical semantics of the predicate only is responsible)

(1) *kī.j.ai* *kī.ja.ai* (Old Hindi)
do.passive.3s do.go.3s ‘is done’

inherited passive : -ya- > iy/i/ ijja > ja > j, vs modern analytical passive : V.past-participle go

(2)a *mantrī-jī* *tumrā gaūmā* *ayā* *bal* (Garhwali)
minister-HON POSS.2 village.OBL come.PFV bal[speak.cv]
[I heard /it’s said that] the minister came to your village

(2)b *baṛī sundar dikhtī hai bal* (Kumaoni Hindi)
 great beautiful seem.FSG PRES bal[speak.CV]
 ‘It is said / I heard that she looks very beautiful’

2)c *baṛī sundar dikhtī hai kahā* (Kumaoni Hindi)
 great beautiful seem.FSG PRES kahā[say.ms]
 ‘I say/believe me, she really looks very beautiful’

(3) *u dekh-al-k-ain* (Magahi, Eastern Hindi)
 3 see.past-3-3Honorific ‘he saw him[Honor]’

2 participants indexed in the verb, replicating the Mundari (Austro-Asiatic language) pattern, may-be form: -k-

(4)a *rupay tī us-tī le lo* (Bangru Western Hindi/Panjabi)
 money ACC 3S.ABL take take.IMPER
 ‘take the money from him’ (from Tiwari 1956: 177)

b. *kutte nae dande nae mārya* (Central Bangaru, Singh 1970)
 dog.ACC stick.INSTR beat.IMPER

(1) ‘Strike the dog with a stick’

c. *balkā nae toriya hongē*
 children.ERG break.MP PRESuMPTive
 give.IMPER

(2) ‘The children have probably broken (it)’

d. *ghoṛ nae paṇi pyā de*
 horse.DAT water drink.CAUS

‘Give water to the horse’

References (general)

Benveniste, Emile. 1952. La Construction passive du parfait transitif. BLS XLVIII, re-ed in *Problèmes de linguistique générale* 1, Gallimard (pp. 176-86)

Benveniste, Emile. 1960. Avoir et être dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. BSL LV, re-ed. in PLG 1 (pp. 187-207)

Benveniste, Emile. 1965. Les transformations des catégories grammaticales. re-ed in *Problèmes de Linguistique générale*, 2, Gallimard (pp. 127-136)

Cohen, Marcel. 1996. *L’Aspect*. Paris: PUF.

Delancey, Scott. 1997. Grammaticalization and the gradience of categories : relator nouns and postpositions in Tibeto-Burmese. In Bybee Joan, Haiman J & Thompson Sandra A (eds.), *Essays on Language function and language type*, 51-69. Amsterdam : Benjamins.

DeLancey, Scott. 2011. Grammaticalization and syntax : A Functional view. In Heine & Narog, 365-77.

Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Univ. Press

- Heine, Bernd & Narrog, Heiko. 2011. *A Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford
- Hewson, John & Bubenik, Vit. 2006. *From case to adposition : the development of configurational syntax in Indo-European Languages*. Amsterdam : Benjamins.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1965. The evolution of grammatical categories. *Diogenes* 51 : 51-71.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1931. Les Temps composés du roman. re-ed. in *Esquisses linguistiques*, 1960, Wrocław-Kraków, Polska Akademia Nauka (pp. 104-8)
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1953. Aspect et temps dans l'histoire du persan. (réed) in *Esquisses linguistiques* (pp. 109-118)
- Lamiroy, Béatrice & Walter de Mulder. 2011. Degrees of Grammaticalization across Languages. In Heine & Narrog, 302-17.
- Lehmann, 1995/2002. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*.
- Matras, Yaron. 2011. Grammaticalization and language contact. In Heine & Narrog (eds), *Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 279-90.
- Noonan, Michael. 2008. Case compounding in the Bodic languages. In Corbett, Greville & Noonan Michael (eds.) *Case and grammatical relations*, 127-48. Amsterdam : Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elisabeth & Trousdale, Graeme (eds.). 2007. *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam : Benjamins.

Grammaticalisation patterns in Nyulnyulan languages

William B. McGregor (University of Aarhus)

The Nyulnyulan languages of the Dampier Land peninsula and western Kimberley region of Western Australia form a small genetic family of about a dozen languages that are both genetically and typologically quite similar. A number of grammaticalisation tendencies are shared among the modern languages. Some of these appear to have begun in pre-proto-Nyulnyulan times, although they have developed in somewhat different ways, and have reached different end points. They include, among others: development of pronominal forms into case markers, developments within the compound verb constructions, and development of case markers into verbal markers of subordination and applicatives. There are also some instances of lexical items beginning on the road to grammaticalisation. For instance, the nominal *buru* 'place' seems to be developing into a derivational morpheme in some languages, and into a relational marker in a few of them. Some of these grammaticalisations appear to be peculiar to Nyulnyulan languages, distinguishing them from neighbouring languages and language families. Others are shared with nearby languages; overwhelmingly these are really shared grammaticalizations enter via Eastern Nyulnyulan languages, which are in contact with languages of three different families (Bunuban, Worroran, Pama-Nyungan).

Grammaticalization in creole languages

Susanne Maria Michaelis & Martin Haspelmath (MPI EVA, Leipzig)

Creoles are well-known for having lost inflectional distinctions of Indo-European languages such as nominal number, gender on articles and adjectives, tense on verbs, and person-number on verbs; in addition, short grammatical markers such as definite articles, genitive prepositions, dative and locative prepositions, tense auxiliaries and passive auxiliaries are also often lost.

But this does not mean that these notions all remain unexpressed in creoles; in a large number of cases, creoles do have grammatical forms to express notions such as plural, past tense, future tense, imperfective aspect, definiteness, indefiniteness, adnominal possession, locative, and even passive – but typically, these forms do not continue the lexifier forms.

Instead, what we usually find is that the grammatical forms are new forms for which an earlier lexical (or less grammaticalized) source can be identified, e.g.

Mauritian Creole plural marker *bann* < French *bande* ‘group’
Sranan definite article *a* < English *that*
Haitian Creole definite article *la* < French *là*
Saramaccan possessive marker *u* < English *for*
Papiamentu possessive marker *su* < possessive pronoun *su* ‘his, her’
Kriol possessive marker *blanga* < English *belong*
Tayo dative preposition *pu* < French *pour* ‘for’
Seychelles Creole coordinator *avek* ‘and’ < French *avec* ‘with’
Tok Pisin future marker *bai* < English *by and by*
Papiamentu future marker *lo* < Spanish *luego* ‘afterwards’
Haitian Creole imperfective marker *pe* < French *après* ‘after, close to’
Seychelles Creole passive marker *ganny* < French *gagne* ‘gain, get’

These grammaticalizations sometimes have parallels in other varieties of the lexifiers, but it is difficult to deny that they are far more common in creoles, so much so that one can say that accelerated grammaticalization is a characteristic property of the rise of creoles (creolization).

Bruyn (1996, 2009) has argued that some apparent cases of grammaticalization are not grammaticalization, but rather a kind of substrate effect (polysemy copying); we will discuss this claim but will conclude that even if we subtract these cases, many cases of accelerated grammaticalization remain.

Finally, we will propose a tentative explanation for why creolization is characterized by accelerated grammaticalization.

Grammaticalization and Polysynthesis: Iroquoian

Marianne Mithun (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Like many other languages in North America, those in the Iroquoian family are highly head-marking and polysynthetic. Nominal morphology is generally quite simple, but verbal morphology is elaborate, serving many functions expressed syntactically in other languages. Because there is documentation of a good set of Iroquoian languages, it is possible to reconstruct the basic grammatical structure of the common parent and certain stages of subsequent development. Most of the verb morphology was already in place in Proto-Iroquoian, spoken thousands of years ago, a structure which has remained remarkably stable over time. The situation raises interesting questions about processes of grammaticalization in languages which already show extensive, tightly grammaticalized structures.

For the most part, Iroquoian communities have long been sufficiently large that there was not the regular, longstanding, extensive exogamy and resulting multilingualism characteristic of some other parts of the continent. There have, however, been several types of contact. The family consists of two main branches: Southern Iroquoian, represented only by Cherokee; and Northern Iroquoian, comprising all of the other languages. Within Northern Iroquoian, the first group to separate became the Tuscarora. The next became the Wendat and Wyandot. The remaining group became known as the Five Nations, comprising Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, and Mohawk. (There is documentation of some additional languages, but little beyond vocabulary.) The Cherokee were first encountered by Europeans in the Southeast, a notorious linguistic area; we know there was some contact there with speakers of unrelated languages, but they do not appear to have left a strong structural mark. The Tuscarora were also living in the Southeast, but early in the 18th century they migrated northward to join their relatives in New York State. This migration resulted in contact with speakers of related languages with very similar morphological structure; it resulted in some replica grammaticalization as well as lexical borrowing. In the mid 17th century, the Wendat, living in what is now Ontario, were decimated and took refuge in the various Five Nations communities; the resulting contact with even closer relatives affected primarily allomorphy and some vocabulary. Finally, in the 19th and 20th centuries, bilingualism in English or French began to spread in all communities, where it has begun to have some syntactic effects.

Many of the same kinds of processes commonly associated with grammaticalization elsewhere in the world can be seen in Iroquoian. Some new affixes were added to the various languages at the outer edges of words. Jespersen negative cycles can be seen in each of the languages, whereby negative constructions, grammaticalized early, have been reinforced and replaced in slightly different ways in the various languages. There are the usual kinds of semantic extensions, such as space > time, with directional markers, already grammaticalized as affixes, taking on tense functions. The morphological structures were also enriched in other ways, however. All verbs contain pronominal prefixes identifying their core arguments, for example. In Proto-Iroquoian, there were prefixes for first, second, and third persons, a situation which has remained unchanged in Southern Iroquoian (Cherokee). In Northern Iroquoian, we can see the progressive enrichment of the third person categories, first with the addition of a masculine gender, then the extension of a generic category to some female persons, and, in some languages, to all, resulting in a dedicated feminine category. In Proto-

Iroquoian, dual number was distinguished only in first and second persons, again as in modern Cherokee. In the Northern languages, the distinction has been extended into third persons, but by exploiting different sources. Finally, modern contact with European languages affected the languages primarily in the area of complex syntactic constructions. Overt markers of syntactic relations previously less differentiated or expressed primarily prosodically are rapidly becoming grammaticalized. The same kinds of pathways observed for many European languages can be seen here as well, such as the development of complementizers from demonstratives and from content question words.

Grammaticalization in Germanic Languages: The future tense

Damaris Nübling, University of Mainz

Originally, Germanic did not possess an inflectional expression for future tense. However, each of the twelve contemporary Germanic languages developed a more or less grammaticalized construction for indicating future time. The usage of these constructions ranges from more mandatory (e.g. English) to rather optional (e.g. Luxembourgish). Furthermore, the Germanic languages developed fairly diverse types of constructions which range from periphrastic expressions to rather fused techniques such as *gonna* or clitic *'ll* in English (*it'll be better*) and Yiddish (*du'st < du west loyfn* 'you will walk'). Some of these languages also differentiate between classes of future incidents, depending on whether they can be controlled by the agent (actions) or not (events). Some languages even show three different future expression types (e.g. Swedish). Sometimes, a further distinction is made between close and distant future events. With regard to the sources, most languages grammaticalized modal and/or movement verbs. Only German and Luxembourgish used 'become' as their source. In my talk, I will present a detailed overview of Germanic languages and classify them with respect to their future systems, their source, the 'purity' of future meaning (with auxiliaries deriving from modals), their degree of (formal) grammaticalization as well as the semantic differences which can be expressed.

Areal features in Yeniseian grammaticalization

Edward Vajda (Western Washington University)

Pastoral nomads speaking suffixal-agglutinating Uralic, Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic languages occupied most of Siberia when the Russians arrived in the late 16th century. There were also remnant Yeniseian hunter-gatherer groups, whose languages contrast structurally with the other families in having a complex prefixing verb, pronominal possessive prefixes, and phonemic distinctions in prosody. The surrounding languages are non-tonal and consistently suffixing in nominal and verbal inflectional morphology. While pastoralists borrowed no prototypical Yeniseian typological traits, they exerted significant areal influence on Yeniseian grammatical structures. The Yeniseian languages that survived long enough to be documented acquired a suffixal-agglutinating case system through grammaticalization of

native postpositions. The Yeniseian verb, particularly in Ket, shifted from prefixing to suffixing through semantic reanalysis of inherited arrangement of morpheme position classes. Specific types of contact-induced language change arise from specific types of human interactions, not from the mere fact of geographic propinquity. The exogamous, patriarchal nature of traditional Ket society, together with the diversity of Ket mitochondrial DNA haplogroups, passed down by the mother, indicates that wives were taken from adjacent tribes. The Ket Y-chromosome, passed down from father to son, is overwhelmingly haplotype Q and shared by most Native American males. This suggests a contact scenario whereby Ket gradually underwent areally induced grammatical change as female outsiders inducted into the tribe as young brides acquired it as a second language, while outright borrowing of lexemes and morphemes was culturally disfavored. Yeniseian-internal comparisons show what structural traits were originally characteristic of the family. External comparison with Na-Dene (Athabaskan-Eyak-Tlingit) in North America – with which Yeniseian shares a genealogical link – is also useful in helping determine the original typological profile of Proto-Yeniseian.

The evolution of Japanese and Korean adnominal forms in areal context

John Whitman (Cornell/NINJAL, Tokyo)

This paper would look at the superficial similarities in the areal pattern where "participial" nominalizations are used as noun modifiers (and complements) throughout NE Asia. This pattern is of course not rare globally, but in NEA it is the only relativization strategy, extending even to earlier Chinese, as well as Korean (where it has recently been shown that the "adnominal" inflection was used for clausal and participant nominalizations, as recently as the 12th century), and Japanese (where it has long been known that the historical adnominal form, the source of modern main clause forms), was originally a nominalizing inflection. I will look at differences such as whether possessor agreement on the RC subject is marked on the participial or relative head, whether the RC subject is marked with genitive case, whether the participial modifier itself attaches to the head with a genitive particle, and what parameters may determine whether the Japanese "loose" style of semantic relation between RC and head is permitted.

Slavic aspect: Its rise and inner-Slavic clines as a result of macro-areal diffusion?

Björn Wiemer, University of Mainz

The perfective:imperfective opposition of verbs in Slavic languages is probably the most salient feature of the whole language group. Simultaneously, it is an atypical example of an aspect system, at least against a European background (Dahl 2000). Concomitantly, the criteria which can describe the rise of this opposition can only be captured by Lehmann-like parameters (Lehmann 1995) to a very limited extent. The typologically outstanding feature of

the opposition is (i) stem derivation, which conditions the fact that (ii) the pfv.:ipfv. distinction works independently of inflectional categories, although (iii) it shows tight interaction with other categorial distinctions marked by verb forms or verb complexes on all levels of the utterance. The complex layering of different types of interaction leads to heterogeneity of aspect systems among Slavic languages (Wiemer 2008) that can, in part, be presented as inner-Slavic clines (Dickey 2000, Lehmann 2009).

This said, we have to be aware of a basic morphological precondition of the evolution of a derivational pfv.:ipfv. opposition: the productivity of both prefixation and suffixation of verb stems. However, the fulfilment of this precondition had to be accompanied and followed by functional development: an opposition between pfv.:ipfv. verb stems began to be strengthened by an increasingly strict association between the choice of morphologically related stems and different function sets tending toward complementary distribution (Wiemer 2011: 743f.).

Certain questions relevant to the symposium arise from these basic considerations; First, are there any (macro-)areal patterns in the affixation of verb stems that are likely to have supported the “survival” of productive prefixation and, even more importantly, of suffixation in early Slavic (in contrast to other ancient IE. languages)? Second, which role in the rise of the basic Slavic aspect system was played by the fact that Proto-Slavic lacked dedicated markers of future tense? Does the basic split we notice in future marking between South and North (= East+West) Slavic correlate with larger areal clines? Third, to what extent can more salient differences in the functional layering of aspect choice, observed among contemporary Slavic languages, be explained as an effect of areal contiguity (i.e. contact) with non-Slavic languages? Among salient phenomena, modal auxiliaries and different types of complex predicates must be accounted for.

References

- Dahl, Östen (2000): The tense-aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective. In:
Dahl, Ö. (ed.): *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York:
Mouton de Gruyter, 3-25.
- Dickey, Stephen M. (2000): *Parameters of Slavic Aspect (A Cognitive Approach)*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publ.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995): *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. München, Newca stle: Lincom.
- Lehmann, Volkmar (2009): Aspekt und Tempus im Slavischen. In: Kempgen, S., P. Kosta, T. Berger & K. Gutschmidt (eds.): *Die slavischen Sprachen (Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihre Struktur , ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung)*, Bd. 1. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 526-556.

Wiemer, Björn (2008): Zur innerslavischen Variation bei der Aspektwahl und der Gewichtung ihrer

Faktoren. In: Gutschmidt, K., Jekutsch, U., Kempgen, S., Udolph, L. (eds.): *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavistenkongreß, Ohrid 2008*. München: Sagner, 383-409.

Wiemer, Björn (2011): *Grammaticalization in Slavic languages*. In: Heine, B., Narrog, H. (eds.):

Handbook of Grammaticalization. Oxford etc.: Oxford U.P., 740-753.