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Innovative 1PL Subject Constructions in Finnish and Consequences to Object Marking

Rigina Ajanki, University of Helsinki

As most of the Uralic languages, Finnish makes use of suffixal person marking in conjugation and declination. The phenomenon is not an example of canonical agreement, but as Haspelmath (2013) suggests, best described in terms of two kinds of person marking, morphological and syntactic, not necessarily dependent of each other. In Colloquial Finnish, the 1PL person suffix in verbal conjugation is hardly ever employed but instead, Impersonal Construction (Finnish Passive) is applied with free 1PL subject pronoun to encode 1PL subject. Due to the replacement of 1PL conjugational construction by Impersonal construction, another previously unexisting pattern has become general in Colloquial Finnish: occurrence of a Nominative Object in a construction with a Nominative Subject, not taken into account in (Sands&Campbell 2001), see Examples 1 and 2. Encoding of Finnish Object varies to the extent that Objects are either in Genitive-Accusative or in Partitive, and when there is no Nominative Subject, Object is in Nominative instead of Genitive-Accusative. The novel construction makes an exception: it is morphosyntactically unexpected as in these constructions both, Subject and Object are encoded in Nominative. The asymmetry found in novel 1PL Construction with non-canonical object marking has neither a semantic ground.

The present study claims that with the emergence of the new 1PL Subject Transitive Constructions Finnish grammar has gone through a profound innovation. The data is drawn from vernacular, compared with data from dialects and from the data base of Mikael Agricola’s works from 16th century. The study is innovative in the sense that it combines variable data to be described with modern theoretical tools of typological-functional and diachronical linguistics. The data from vernacular offers also with evidence as far as the development of the new pattern is concerned. The data of spoken language reflects the ambiguity of Impersonal Construction: depending on the context, constructions in which Impersonal conjugation is applied, can be interpreted as 1PL or Impersonal, discussed in (Helasvuo 2006). Thus the study makes also a reference to dialectal typology demonstrating how vernacular can and should be employed in diachronical typology (De Vogelaer & Guido 2012). The diachronical process is sketched also the basis of data from other Finnic languages. Namely, in other Finnic languages, Karelian and Veps, the third person pronoun ‘they’ is added to their corresponding Impersonal Constructions, resulting to the replacement of the old 3PL suffixal person forms by Impersonal Construction. In the sister languages the rules for object marking vary, and non-canonical constructions with nominative encoded subjects and objects are found as well. Interestingly, typologically similar phenomenon is found in French: Finnish Impersonal Construction is in contemporary language employed as 1PL Construction exactly as in French (Coveney 2000). The change is though not (yet) reflected in Standard Finnish. It is, however, attested in the language of Internet (chats, blogs etc.) representing a genre characterised as written colloquial Finnish.
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Conservative pattern, Standard Finnish, 1PL Construction

1) (Me-Ø) osta-mme auto-n.
    (we-NOM) buy-1PL car-GEN-ACC

‘We will buy a car.’

Innovative pattern, Colloquial Finnish, 1PL’ Construction

2) Me-Ø oste-taan auto-Ø.
    We-NOM buy-IMPERS car-NOM

‘We will buy a car.’
COMING and GOING: Passive voices in the Alps

Marco Angster, Livio Gaeta - Università di Torino

Language contact, which has gained a central role in the research on grammaticalization over the last years thanks to Heine & Kuteva (2005)’s contributions, lies in the background of this paper on the passive voice in some heavily endangered language varieties found in the Walser communities of Piedmont and Aosta Valley. The peculiar character of these dialects, which might also be taken as a prototypical example of an Alpine Sprachbund (cf. Seiler 2004), can be seen in the highly complex voice system, only partially understandable in terms of contact with Italian or other Romance varieties. In these dialects, the passive construction containing the venitive auxiliary typical of the rest of the Upper Alemannic dialects (1) (cf. Russ 1990: 388) stands in competition with the construction containing the andative auxiliary (2)-(3) (cf. Angster 2004-05):

(1) \(\text{wia chun das ggmachut-s?} \)

how comes this[N] make:PSTPTCP-N:SG:NOM

‘How is this made?’

(2) \(\text{z \ ròt chappe éscht en der letscht kanget errettent-s vòm} \)

the red cap[N] is in the last gone save:PSTPTCP-N:SG:NOM by-SG:DAT hunter

‘Little Red Ridinghood is lastly saved by the hunter’.

[Cappuccetto Rosso è infine salvata dal cacciatore]

(3) \(\text{e chatzò éscht kchéem-e \quad én vòn der fänschtrò} \)

a cat[F] is come:PSTPTCP-F:SG:NOM in from the window

\(\text{woa \ ésch ni kanget gschlossen-é} \)

where is not gone close:PSTPTCP-F:SG:NOM

‘A cat has entered from the window which has not been closed’.

[Un gatto era entrato da una finestra che non aveva chiuso]

The sentences correspond only partially to the Italian input sentences which had to be translated by the speakers as shown by (3). Notice that the andative construction forces a different form of the past participle (strong, inflected) of the main verb (4) from that required by the perfect construction (weak, uninflected) (5):

(4) \(\text{de naf \ ésch kanget brochn-e vò Johannes} \)

the bowl[F] is gone broken-F:SG:NOM by Johannes

‘The bowl has been broken by John’.

[La scodella è stata rotta da Giovanni]

(5) \(\text{Johannes hät brochet de naf} \)

Johannes has broken the bowl

‘John has broken the bowl’.

[Giovanni ha rotto la scodella]

At any rate, the andative construction only occurs in the perfect form, in which it competes with
the BE-passive, while in the present only the venitive construction is found besides that containing BE (6-7):

(6) *z bant *éscht khakkót-s *vóm sendék*
the ribbon[N] is cut:PSTPTCP-N:SG:NOM by:DEF mayor
‘The ribbon is cut by the mayor’.
[Il nastro è / viene tagliato dal sindaco]

(7) *z fleisch chént kchouft-s *vó Johannes
the meat[N] comes buy:PSTPTCP-N:SG:NOM by Johannes
‘The meat is bought by John’.
[La carne viene comprata da Giovanni]

(8) *z bant geit khakkót-s *vóm sendék*
the ribbon goes cut:PSTPTCP-N:SG:NOM by:DEF mayor
‘The ribbon has to be cut by the mayor’.
[Il nastro va tagliato dal sindaco]

The andative construction in the present (8) basically displays a modal interpretation directly corresponding to the Italian input sentence. However, this modal meaning is completely absent in the perfect forms mentioned above in (2-4). This highly complex picture comes from a peculiar elaboration of the different passive constructions that the speakers had at their disposal in such a multilingual speech context, in which language contact did not simply lead to calquing.
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Semi-direct speech in Rtau

Anton Antonov & Guillaume Jacques (CNRS-INALCO-EHESS, CRLAO)

This paper deals with ‘semi-direct’ speech (Aikhenvald, 2008), also called ‘hybrid’ in the context of Tibetan languages (Tournadre, 2008), in Rtau (locally known as rsonsgske). Rtau is a poorly documented Rgyalrongic language (Sino-Tibetan) spoken in Rtau county, Sichuan province, China. The data presented here is based on ongoing fieldwork by the authors.

In Rtau, there are two main ways of reporting what someone else has said, direct speech (DS) and semi-direct speech (SDS). The authors have been unable to ascertain the existence of any other type of reported speech, such as indirect speech (IS) which is reported to be unattested in Tibetan languages as well (Tournadre, 2008). Unlike direct speech, semi-direct speech is framed by a converbal form and an appropriately conjugated form of the reporting verb jo ‘say’ (cf. 1a through 1e). Furthermore, SDS is used not only with verbs of reporting, but also with some verbs denoting cognitive activities such as nts’h ‘think’ (cf. 2a through 3b).

SDS in Rtau is of type II in Aikhenvald (2008)’s terms, i.e. the current speaker (CS) reports an original speaker (OS)’s words (or thoughts) by partly adjusting them to their (CS) perspective. This is materialized by a shift in personal deixis: coreference between the OS as subject of the reporting (or cognitive) verb and (one of) the participant(s) in the reported speech is signalled by the (logophoric) use of the reflexive pronoun daq ‘oneself’ instead of the first person pronoun na (cf.1c); absence of coreference in case of a third person OS is signalled by the use of the ordinary third person pronoun la (cf. 1b); third and second person pronouns referring to the CS are shifted to first person pronouns (cf. 1d); and finally, third person pronouns referring to the CS’s addressee are shifted to second person pronouns (cf. 1e). Crucially, however, the verb does not shift to the CS’s perspective but retains the OS’s one (cf. 1c through 1e).

The most striking feature of SDS in Rtau is that it is the only construction in the language in which the first person singular pronoun is ergative case marked when the agent of a transitive verb (cf. 1d against 2c). It is important to note that contrary to what happens in some other Sino-Tibetan languages (esp. in Tibetan languages and some other members of the Rgyalrongic branch) ergative marking is normally blocked on SAP, with SDS being the only exception as far as the first person singular is concerned (the second person singular pronoun remains unmarked as usual as in 1e).

Finally, SDS seems to be of the obligatory subtype in Aikhenvald (2008)’s terms whenever the CS is the first person and the addressee or the object within the speech report is coreferent either with them (i.e., the CS) or with their (i.e., the CS’s) addressee. It is not a stylistic device and seems reasonably frequent in the appropriate speech or thought reporting contexts.
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Examples

(1) a. tsaci-w na-gi jo-ra-ge [stendzi-w dzema de
Bkrashis-ERG 1SG-DAT say-CONST-CVB Bstandzin-ERG Zgrolma DEM
nə-f-se-sə] $jo^{-rə}$
PFV-INV-kill-EVID say-CONST
Bkrashis told me that Bstandzin had killed Zgrolma.

b. $tšaei^{-w}_i$ $ŋa$-gi $jo^{-rə}$-ge
[tə-wi, dzəma de nə-f-se-sə]
Bkrashis-ERG 1SG-DAT say-CONST-CVB 3SG-ERG Zgrolma DEM PFV-INV-kill-EVID
$jo^{-rə}$ say-CONST
Bkrashis told me (that) he, (≠ Bkrashis) had killed Zgrolma.

c. $tšaei^{-w}_i$ $ŋa$-gi $jo^{-rə}$-ge
[ədə, dzəma de nə-se-w]
Bkrashis-ERG 1SG-DAT say-CONST-CVB REFL Zgrolma DEM PFV-kill-1SG>3 $jo^{-rə}$ say-CONST
Bkrashisi told me that he had killed Zgrolma.

d. $tšaei^{-w}_i$ $jo^{-rə}$-ge
[ŋa-w dzəma de nə-f-se-sə]
Bkrashis-ERG say-CONST-CVB 1SG-ERG Zgrolma DEM PFV-INV-kill-EVID
$jo^{-rə}$ say-CONST
Bkrashis said that I had killed Zgrolma.

e. $tšaei^{-w}_i$ $jo^{-rə}$-ge
[ŋa-tə-se]
Bkrashis-ERG say-CONST-CVB 2SG Zgrolma DEM PFV-kill-2SG>3-EVID say-CONST
Bkrashis said that you had killed Zgrolma.

(2) a. $ŋa$ $tə$-se-ā / tə $tə$-se
1SG PFV-die-1 / 3SG PFV-die
I am dead. / He is dead.

b. $ŋa$ [tšaei $tə$-se] $nts^{kə-w-rö}$
1SG Bkrashis PFV-die think-1SG>3-CONST
I think Bkrashis is dead.

c. $tšaei^{-w}_i$ [ŋa $tə$-se] $nts^{kə-rö}$
Bkrashis-ERG 1SG PFV-die think-CONST
Bkrashis thinks I am dead.

(3) a. $ŋa$ [tə-w $je$ $tə$-spə] $nts^{kə-w-rö}$
1SG 3SG-ERG house PFV-move think-1SG>3-CONST
I think he has moved.

b. $tə$-w [ŋa-w $je$ $tə$-spə] $nts^{kə-rö}$
3SG-ERG 1SG-ERG house PFV-move think-CONST
He thinks I have moved.
Hybridisation in Macanese multi-verb constructions

Giorgio Francesco Arcodia, University of Milan-Bicocca

Macanese, or Maquista, the near-extinct Portuguese creole of Macao, is an understudied contact language with strong Malayo-Portuguese features, closely related to Malaccan Kristang (Baxter 1996, Ansaldo 2009). It is also characterised by Sinitic influence, mostly in syntax (Batalha 1953), which however has sometimes been downplayed in the literature (see Ansaldo & Matthews 2004). In this paper, I shall show that Macanese makes use of multi-verb constructions showing Sinitic influence, focussing on the chomá [call] - NP - VP pattern:

Macanese
(1) Vôs chomá iou tomá amuichái vêm casa?
   2PL call 1SG take maidservant come home
   ‘And you (call >) want me to bring a maidservant home?’ (Ferreira 1967, Má-lingu co má-língu)

(2) Fred chomá iou falá
   Fred call 1SG talk
   ‘Fred (call >) asked/(made) me to talk’ (Ferreira 1973, Padrinho)

This use of a verb meaning ‘to call’ as a marker of indirect causation (arguably, curative causation; Kulikov 2001) is found as such in many Sinitic languages, including Cantonese and Hokkien, two important adstrates of Macanese:

Hong Kong Cantonese
(3) kéuih bīk ngóh giu néih syún kéuih jouh bàan-jéung
   3SG force 1SG call 2SG choose 3SG do class-monitor
   ‘S/he forced me to ask/(make) you to choose her/him as class monitor’ (Cheung 2007: 89)

Taiwanese Hokkien
(4) Hāu-tiúnn kiò i khi hâu-tiúnn-sik
   school-head call 3SG go school-head-room
   ‘the headmaster ordered/(made) her/him to go to his office’ (Taiwanese Hokkien, web example)

Note that his use of kiò ‘to call’ in Hokkien (Southern Min) is attested since the 16th century (Chappell & Peyraube 2006); hence, it should not be a recent innovation, and may well have been present in the varieties spoken by Fujian traders who had the first contacts with Macanese speakers. The verb chamar ‘to call’ is also used in Modern Portuguese with a similar meaning (e.g. quando chamei ele para falar com meu pai (…) ‘when I asked him to talk to my father (…)’, Brazilian web example), and a construction based on chamar is attested at least since the 17th century:

Portuguese
(5) Cham-ou para escrever-seu testamento a Dom Agostinho Manuel
   call-3SG.PRET to write-INF his will OBJ Dom Agostinho Manuel
   ‘He summoned/asked Dom Agostinho Manuel to write his will’ (Francisco Manuel de Melo, Tácito Portugues, 1650)
There are also parallel constructions in other Asian Portuguese (and Spanish) creoles, using e.g. *mandá* ‘to send’, but these constructions typically involve adjacent verbs and case-marking of the (human) patient:

**Sri Lanka Creole Portuguese**

(6)  
\[ \text{Per sinhor grande mandá fallá (...) DAT man big send say} \]

‘Have the squire informed that (...)’ (Baxter 2009:80)

Note that Macanese *chomá* in its core lexical meaning often involves patient marking (e.g. *quim ta chomá pa iou?* ‘who’s calling me?’). We argue that the difference between Macanese and other Asian Portuguese creole lies in their ‘typological matrix’ (Ansaldo 2009). Whereas in the latter the syntax of indirect causatives appears to be modelled mainly on (Vehicular) Malay or on Indian substrate languages, basing on a semantic and structural precedent in the superstrate (Baxter 2009), in Macanese the syntactic model is clearly Sinitic, pointing towards a more important role of Chinese languages in the typological matrix of *Maquista*, arguably a distinctive feature of this variety vis-à-vis other Asian Portuguese creoles (cf. Ansaldo & Matthews 2004 on reduplication).

The main data for this research come from three sources: (a) the *Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo*, a XIXth century Portuguese magazine on the Far East, containing texts in (a form of) Macanese; (b) the prose works by José dos Santos Ferreira (Adé); and (c) excerpts of contemporary Macanese collected by Pinharanda Nunes (2010).
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The Syntax of Hungarian Preverbs: the “Existential Construction”

Laura Becker (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz)

Being expressions somewhat between unbound morphemes and bound prefixes, preverbs in Hungarian gained much attention of the linguistic community due to their syntactic separability from the verb. By default, preverbs attach to the verb in the way “canonical” prefixes do. Under certain syntactic circumstances, they do not merge with but rather follow the verb. Traditionally, four triggers are cited to condition the inversion of the verb and the preverb:

- formal – (i) negation marker; (ii) imperative use of the subjunctive;
- semantic – (iii) progressive interpretation of the event;
- pragmatic – (iv) focalized constituent (including WH-words) in the preverbal slot.

Still, none of these factors being available, the inverted order of verb and preverb is attested in specific constructions, which have only scarcely been discussed in previous research. Labelled the “existential construction”, this inversion has been addressed as pertaining either to the aspectual or temporal functions of the preverb (É. Kiss 1987 and Piñón 2009, respectively), viz. within the semantic domain.

The functions attributed to this construction in previous studies can be summarized as follows:

- it implies (i) that the event has taken place at least once before (Kiefer 1994) or (ii) will take place at least once in the future (Piñón 2009);
- it (iii) simply states the occurrence of an event as a fact (Balogh 2000);
- the event must be (v) repeatable (Piñón 2009).

However, the application of these properties to examples seems problematic in many cases, as the examples often lack a context necessary in order to become – according to my informants – acceptable.

Two adjustments to the previous approaches could be made leading to a better understanding of this syntactic property of Hungarian preverbs. On the one hand, a corpus-based approach could provide us with more information about the contexts featuring this specific construction; which, on the other hand, leads us to a better understanding of its meaning. A quick glance at the features listed above and the low degree of acceptable constructions in solitary elicitations and/or standalone sentences suggests that the functions of the existential construction should not only be localized within the semantic domain, as was sought for before. Instead, possible pragmatic functions and their interaction with the semantic properties of this syntactic inversion could be expected.

And indeed, examples from the Hungarian National Corpus show that the traditionally neglected inversion of the preverb and the verb in Hungarian does not only follow semantic, but also pragmatic factors, which can in addition interact with each other.

The following three examples serve to illustrate a few instances out of several semantic and pragmatic factors under the cover label “existential construction”.

Example (1b) illustrates the implications of temporal remoteness (the meaning of immediate past being excluded) and repetition of the event by inversion and syntactic independence of the preverb; while (1a) shows a neutral direct construction with no such reading available.

In example (2), the “existential construction” serves a pragmatic function. The speaker uses the inversion to introduce a piece of entirely unexpected information, which supposedly goes beyond the addressee’s knowledge.

In previous research, the occurrence of either még ‘still/again’ or már ‘already’ (here: free adverbs) in “existential constructions” was judged as optional. Yet, no acceptable example could illustrate this construction without either of these two adverbs. Example (3) features a context, in which the remote repetition of the event is expressed first by inversion (“existential

consideration”) and lexical emphasis, and in a second proposition only marked by the inversion. Considering these exemplary instances of the “existential construction”, we can say that the inversion is not only caused by some semantic factors, but also proves to involve complex interactions of semantic and pragmatic factors, which have to be examined in more detail. It is therefore necessary to examine them in more detail than was done before.

Examples (from the HNC)

(1) a Ismert, hogy a honvédelmi miniszter már alá-ír-t
known the Minister of Defense already PRV:under-write-PST.3SG

egy szándéknilyelatkozat-ót egy német-orosz konzorcium-mal
a declaration of intent-ACC a German-Russian consortium-COM

a meglévő MiG-29-esek korszerűsítés-é-ről, […].
the available MiG-29-PL modernisation-POS:3SG-DELAT

‘It is known that the Minister of Defense already signed a declaration of intent with a German-Russian consortium about the modernization of the available MiG-29 (fighters) […]’

b2 Mindenki ír-t már alá a feleség-e nev-é-ben.
Everybody write-PST.3SG already PRV:under the wife-POS:3SG name-POS:3SG-INESS

‘Everybody has already signed in the name of one’s wife.’

(2) A nép-pel így érintkez-ni – tud-t-am még meg
the people-COM this.way contact-INF know-PST-1SG yet PRV:PFV

az út-on –, az öreg gróf ezt némiképp katonás dolog-nak tart-ott-a, […].
the way-SPRESS the old count this fairly knightly thing-DAT consider-PST-S3SG.ODEF

‘To contact the people this way – I got to know this unexpectedly on the way –, the old count considered this fairly a knightly deed.’

(3) Ez szerint-em 20-30-szor men-t már le
This according.to-POS:1SG 20-30-times go-PST.3SG already PRV:down

a Rádió különböző kivánság-műsor-at-ban.
the radio various wish-program-POS:3PL-INESS

Székhelyi József ad-t-a elő zseniálisan, de […].
Székhelyi József give-PST-S3SG.ODEF PRV:into.sight ingeniously but

‘This, in my opinion, has been broadcasted already 20-30 times on the radio’s program of choice. József Székhelyi was performing it ingeniously, but […]’
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Infinitive constructions in Norwegian, in a comparative perspective

Dorothee Beermann and Lars Hellan, NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

The *infinitive* is instantiated pervasively throughout the European Indo-European languages, as a *verb form* counting among the ‘de-ranked’ ones, and together with gerunds and participles belonging under the notion *non-finite* forms. As a *construction type*, the infinitive is an embedded clause-like structure with an infinitive verb form acting as head. In this paper we present an overview of infinitival constructions in Norwegian. Anecdotal observations suggest that Norwegian has a fairly rich array of such construction types, thus providing an interesting basis for further cross-linguistic comparison of infinitival constructions. In the WALS Online, 7 of the 144 typological features relate to complex clauses, and while the WALS lists complex clause features for some of the Scandinavian languages (viz., Swedish and Icelandic), little is recorded about Norwegian in this respect. The paper will thus potentially contribute to an increased coverage, and allow a better insight into regularities genuine to this construction type.

Although being a national language of a West-European country, Norwegian ranks low on existing lists of European ‘language density’. This means that is has only a limited supply of digital resources and easily accessible and operable linguistic information (see for instance the META-NET ‘whitebook’ of European language resources), Valency lexicons, richly annotated corpora and electronic inventories of construction types are between the resources still lacking.

As our empirical point of departure we use a ‘handmade’ construction inventory of Norwegian verbal constructions hosted at TypeCraft ([http://typecraft.org](http://typecraft.org)), which at [http://typecraft.org/tc2wiki/Valence_Profile_Norwegian](http://typecraft.org/tc2wiki/Valence_Profile_Norwegian) in a succinct form lists examples of 263 distinct construction types whereof 48 have a constituent part headed by an infinitival form, and thus are *infinitival constructions* by our terminology. Our paper will describe salient properties of these 48 construction types (henceforth referred to as *infinitives*), according to the parameters:

- Whether the infinitives are ‘bare’ infinitives or preceded by the infinitive marker å;
- What is their *grammatical function*, either subject, object, second object, secondary predicate in a ‘small clause’ constellation, extraposed, or ‘oblique’, that is, governed by a preposition;
- Whether the infinitive is controlled or not, that is, having its logical subject interpreted as identical to an NP in the matrix clause, or not.

In terms of numbers relative to our construction type corpus, 8 out of the 48 infinitives are ‘bare’, the others preceded by å. 29 of the types are controlled infinitives, 19 are ‘absolute’. A particularly salient feature of Norwegian infinitives is that they can be governed by a preposition, there are 9 types instantiating this, all with a non-bare infinitive, and 7 of them controlled.

The paper will give examples of each type, with some further subclassifications, and end with suggestions about the Norwegian profile in a comparative perspective, on the one hand to closely related languages, and on the other hand to some types of languages remote from the EIE type.

Our choice of languages is restricted when looking for deranked equivalents of the EIE infinitive allowing a comparison with data from Ga (ISO_639-3 gaa), a Kwa language, and Kistaninya (ISO 639-3 gru), an Ethio-Semitic language. All our data relating to these languages and to Norwegian are accessible online at [www.typecraft.org](http://www.typecraft.org), where aside from
constructional properties one in most cases finds a detailed morphological and POS annotation for a selected sentence of each type.

The main focus of this paper remains the Norwegian infinitive types. On the next page we show examples of the ‘oblique’ infinitive, being perhaps the type most specific to Norwegian, and a template for describing the 48 infinitive constructions, which can be used cross-linguistically.

Example in TC editor with standard IGT and annotation for phrasal properties, head verb in boldface:

han håper på å komme
Free translation: he hopes to be able to come
Construction parameters: NP+PP[INF:equiSBJ]-propositionalAttitude------
Word: Han håper på å komme
Morph: Han håpe på å komme e
Baseform: Han håper på å komme e
Meaning: He e to come
Gloss tags: SBJ.3.SG.NOM PRES OBL INF INF
POS: PN Vitr PREP COMP Vitr

The same sentence represented in the typological template for infinitives and gerunds (with reduced morphological glossing, ‘hope-PRES’ indicating that the form håper has segmentable morphology, and ‘beg.PAST’ in the example lower down that the relevant composition is not segmentable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v-intrObl</th>
<th>GF: P-gov, Control +, Controlled_by: Subj, Control-type: Equi, Bareinf -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>han håper på å komme</td>
<td>he hope-PRES on INF come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'he hopes (to be able to) to come'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of terms in the right column, signifying properties of the infinitive:
GF: Extrapos-subj The infinitive is in extraposed position, linked to subject position
GF: Extrapos-obj The infinitive is in extraposed position, linked to object position
GF: P-gov The infinitive is governed by preposition
GF: Vcomp The infinitive is a complement of the matrix verb
GF: Subj The infinitive is subject of the matrix verb
GF: Obj The infinitive is object of the matrix verb
GF: SecPred The infinitive is secondary predicate of the matrix verb
Control + The infinitive is controlled
Control - The infinitive is not controlled

More template examples, illustrating contrasting properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v-intrPrtcObl</th>
<th>GF: P-gov, Control +, Controlled_by: Subj, Control-type: Equi, Bareinf -, Aspect: Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ola driver på med å skrive</td>
<td>Ola keep-PRES on with INF write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ola is engaged in writing'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v-trObl</th>
<th>GF: P-gov, Control +, Controlled_by: Subj, Control-type: Equi, Bareinf -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>han bønnfalt meg om å fá komme</td>
<td>he beg.PAST me about INF be-allowed come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'he begged me to be allowed to come'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v-ditr</th>
<th>GF: Vcomp, Control +, Controlled_by: Subj, Control-type: Equi, Bareinf +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kari ber ham komme</td>
<td>K. ask-PRES him come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Kari asks him to come'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntax and pragmatics of motion constructions: The status of PATH revisited

Valeria A. Belloro, FLL-Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro
Lilián Guerrero, IIFL-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

The study of motion event descriptions has been a fruitful area of research in languages of the world, especially from the semantic side. This paper explores the syntax-pragmatics interface of ‘intransitive’ motion constructions in Yaqui, Nahuatl and Guarijio, three Uto-Aztecan languages of Mexico. The study focuses on the expression of semantic arguments of motion events, both subjects and place, goal and source (lumped together under the label ‘PATH’ following Jackendoff 1990 and Pantcheva 2009).

In the analysis, we adopt a pragmatically-based view, following the predictions put forth by Du Bois and associates under the label of “Preferred Argument Structure” (PAS; Du Bois 1987; Du Bois et al. 2003). PAS points out specific tendencies regarding the realization of core arguments of verbs in natural discourse, showing that languages with very different morphosyntactic configurations follow a discourse-ergative pattern: while A’s are typically coded as pronouns or anaphoric zeros (i.e., weak-coding), and denote ‘given’ participants, both S’s and O’s can freely express lexical content such as full NPs (i.e., strong-coding), and introduce ‘new’ referents. Crucially, the model is predicted to apply only to direct core arguments. Obliques and adjuncts are predicted to function alike, as “safety valves” for introducing new information, and therefore insensitive to the type of co-occurrence effects found between A and O arguments.

However, a previous study from Yaqui has shown that intransitive motion events exhibit an unexpected “discourse-transitive” pattern. In this study, additional evidence from Nahuatl and Guarijio is advanced, which further questions the validity of limiting the preferred argument structure effects to direct core arguments in structurally different languages. Specifically, based on the evidence provided by oral narratives in the three languages under study, we found that clauses with both new/lexical S’s and new/lexical PATH’s as in (1), are disfavored, whereas clauses with a pronominal S and strongly coded PATH (2) are the most frequent in the corpus. The preference for expressing spatial relations with strong-coding devices and the fact that this coding correlates with weak subjects supports the idea that PATH behaves in discourse as a core argument of ‘intransitive’ motion verbs (Beavers, Levin and Tham 2010) and gives rise to the same co-occurrence effects found in transitive clauses. However, Nahuatl exhibits an unexpected difference from Yaqui and Guarijio: the expression of PATH in motion constructions is very low, and this is true for ‘intransitive’ (e.g. walk, run, arrive) as well as ‘transitive’ events (e.g. bring, put, send).

Discourse evidences for the grammatical status of PATH expressions may suggest that head-marking languages, like Nahuatl, treat direct core arguments differently from spatial complements. However, an in-deep analysis of oral texts reveals that the absence of spatial phrases actually reflects a general tendency in the language to avoid lexical coding of discourse-participants.

Strong S and strong PATH
(1)
   a. Yaqui
   \[ a = \text{achai-wa} \quad \text{siuda-u} \quad \text{siika} \]
   \( 3\text{SG} = \text{father-GEN} \quad \text{city-DIR} \quad \text{go.SG.PFV} \)
   ‘His father went to the city.’ (Johnson; Little bear: 44)

   b. Guarijio
   \[ \text{poe-chi} \quad \text{simi-re} \quad \text{ichikuame} \quad \text{o’owitiame} \]
   \( \text{road-LOC} \quad \text{go.SG.PFV} \quad \text{thief} \quad \text{woman} \)
   ‘The woman’s thief went along the road.’ (Félix; HVA: 250)
c. Nahuatl
Ø-yohui-yaya wajka [Ø-ki-on-kui naka-tl] nopa mono
3SG.NOM-go-IMPFV far.away 3SG.NOM-3SG.ACC-DIR-bring meat-ABS DET monkey
‘The monkey went far away in order to bring the meat.’ (Sandstrom; monkey:43)

Weak S and strong PATH
(2) a. Yaqui
wana bo’o-t= ne bea weama-n
there road-LOC =1SG.NOM MD walk.SG-PASC
‘I was walking over there on the road.’ (Johnson; donkey & coyote: 46)

b. Guarijio
weikaoba wa’a-tepa ena=teme undisioni
then here-up come =1PL.NOM foundry
‘Then, we came up here, to the foundry.’ (Félix, HVA: 19)

c. Nahuatl
Ø-ki-huika nopa i-iste cuaj-tli pa i-morral
3SG.NOM-2SG.ACC-bring DET 3SG.GEN-nail sparrow hawk-ABS LOC 3SG.GEN-bag
‘He brought the sparrow hawk’s nail in his bag.’ (Sandstrom; Wizard: 34)
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A constructional approach to the expressions of possession in IE

Maria Carmela Benvenuto & Flavia Pompeo, Sapienza University of Rome

Many ancient IE languages show a variety of expressions of predicative possession. Of these, some are constructions involving a verb form meaning ‘to be’ or ‘to exist’ in combination with an accompanying oblique case denoting the Possessor, while the Possessee NP is constructed as the grammatical subject in the nominative case controlling a verb agreement.

This paper analyses possessive constructions from IE languages (Latin, Italic, Celtic, Ancient Greek, Baltic and Indo-Iranian) within the framework of Construction Grammar, in which the basic unit of language is the construction, i.e., a form-meaning pair larger than a word. Indeed, even though the literature on possession in IE languages is vast, recent studies show that a constructional approach is particularly suited to successful syntactic reconstruction (Bergs and Diewald 2008, Barðdal et al. 2013).

On the basis of the results of the comparison between the languages investigated, the aim of the analysis is twofold:
1) to identify the constructions which are instantiated by the various expressions of predicative possession;
2) to verify the extent to which it is possible to establish the archaicty of the constructions identified and infer their prior existence in Proto-Indo-European.
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The crosslinguistic inconsistency of Comparative Correlatives

Gabriela Bîlbîie, LLF & Université Paris Diderot – Paris 7

Coordination and subordination are not always very clear-cut phenomena. There are many intermediate occurrences which seem to behave as coordinate structures in syntax and as subordinate structures in semantics. Such an intermediate case is the Comparative Correlative construction (henceforth, CC), illustrated for English (1), French (2) and Romanian (3).

English
(1) **The more** I read, **the more** I understand.

French
(2) **Plus** je lis, *(et) plus* je comprends.
more I read, *(and) more* I understand
‘The more I read, the more I understand.’

Romanian
(3) **Cu cât** citeşc *(mai mult), cu atât* înţeleg *(mai bine).*
with how-much I-read *(more), with that-much* I-understand *(better)*
‘The more I read, the more I understand.’

Two kinds of analyses have been proposed to account for CC: (i) the first appealing to a mismatch between syntax and semantics (a symmetric syntax and an asymmetric semantics), cf. Culicover & Jackendoff 1999 and 2005, where CC constructions involve a coordination relation in syntax but a subordination relation in semantics; (ii) the second appealing to an asymmetric relation both in syntax and semantics, cf. Den Dikken 2005, where CC constructions involve a subordination relation at both levels; moreover, Den Dikken 2005 stipulates a universal syntactic analysis, the cross-linguistic variation occurring only at the lexical level (i.e. the choice of different introductors).

In this paper, we show that the Den Dikken 2005’s generalization is not valid cross-linguistically: if we compare data from English, French and Romanian, there is not only a lexical variation, but also a syntactic one, i.e. the variation observed cross-linguistically with CC appeals not only in the lexical choice of the introductor, but also in the kind of syntactic structure (asymmetric vs. symmetric). In order to account for these differences, we build on the analysis proposed by Borsley 2011 for English, in terms of constructions; this allows us to account not only for the specific properties of the CC across languages, but also for the common properties shared by CC and related constructions (coordinations for French or head-adjunct structures for English and Romanian), as illustrated by the hierarchy in (4).

(4) **Hierarchical classification of CC constructions**
Interestingly, Romanian CC, unlike other Romance languages such as French\(^3\), don’t involve a coordination relation, but rather a subordination one, coming closer to English CC\(^4\). The empirical evidence thus shows that in Romanian the clause introduced by the correlative PP *cu atât* ‘with that much’ behaves as a root clause whereas the clause introduced by the correlative PP *cu cât* ‘with how much’ behaves as a regular adjunct subordinate clause. Some of the main distributional properties of Romanian CC are listed below: the order of CC clauses is relatively free, no insertion of a coordinating conjunction between the CC clauses, availability of cataphoric relations, the fronted PP *cu atât* ‘with that much’ may be optional or occur in a non-initial position, etc. Thus, CC in Romanian clearly show a subordination relation both in syntax and semantics, distinguishing Romanian from Romance languages, such as French, Spanish or Italian. All these comparative data will be discussed at the conference.

**References**
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\(^3\) See Abeillé & Borsley 2006, Abeillé, Borsley & Espinal 2006.

\(^4\) See Borsley 2011.
What differentiates what? Differential Subject and Object Marking in the Tibeto-Burman languages of Manang, Nepal

Oliver Bond (University of Surrey), Kristine Hildebrandt (SIUE) and Dubi Nanda Dhakal (Tribhuvan University)

In many dependent-marking languages of the Tibeto-Burman area, Differential Subject Marking (DSM) (de Hoop & de Swart 2008, Malchukov 2008) and Differential Object Marking (DOM) (Bossong 1985, Aissen 2003) are manifested through case-marking of core arguments that is conditional (in the sense of Corbett 2012) rather than invariably governed. In languages exhibiting the possibility of both DSM and DOM within the same transitive clause, the formal manifestation of argument NPs opens up the logical possibility of four different permutations of case-marked arguments [+SUBJ, -OBJ; +SUBJ, +OBJ; -SUBJ, -OBJ; -SUBJ, +OBJ] with the number of case-combinations realised determined on a language specific basis. In this paper we examine the distribution of Differential Argument Marking (DAM) strategies in Gyalsumdo (Tibetic) and nearby Tamangic languages (Gurung, Manange and Nar-Phu), spoken in Manang District, Nepal, to determine the ways in which DSM and DOM intersect in a system exhibiting both possibilities.

Using fieldwork data from discourse, semi-spontaneous speech and elicitation, we argue that the combination of case-marking realised on both arguments in a clause with DSM-DOM potential is influenced by differences in the referential density and case-inventory in each language, but that the overall distribution of case is determined by the interplay between the animacy hierarchy and the information-structure of the clause. For instance, in an information question in Gyalsumdo in which the predicate head of a transitive clause is in focus, inanimate objects receive Dative case (1), while in a subject focus question (2) and the corresponding declarative answer, a Dative marked object is ungrammatical (3). In an object focus question (4) or the corresponding answer (5), Dative marking of the object is not possible.

Discourse data from Gyalsumdo demonstrates that while overt transitive subject NPs are typically case marked (with ERG, DAT or ABL case), animate transitive objects may be differentially marked (even with the same verb and object). In contrast, discourse data from neighbouring Tamangic languages suggests that ERG marking of transitive subjects is much more variable, with DSM determined primarily by topicality, except when case is lexically governed by the verb as with Manang Gurung se ‘know (someone)’ (6-7) and tha ‘know (a place)’ (8-9).

Evidence of this kind points to an analysis of DSM-DOM clauses in which information-structural features related to focus or topicality are more important factors for case marking than structural relations. Since the influence of other conditions such as animacy, definiteness and tense-aspect are also relevant – at least in where only on argument may be differentially marked – the evidence examined points to an analysis of DAM in which a multitude of conditions contribute to a meaningful contrast. We propose that while the ways in which these factors influence DSM-DOM clauses are not identical across members of the same genetic group, analysis of the clauses’ information structure appears to be the best determinate of its case-marking potential.

Examples

Gyalsumdo

(1) di pomo-ki/*pomo di tshoe-la/*tshoe tshi tshe-bare?
   ‘What did the girl do to the book?’
(2) di tshoe-ko/*tshoe-la su-ki/*su To-kere?
   ‘Who read the book?’

(3) di pomo-ki/*pomo tshoe-ko/*tshoe-la To-bare
   ‘The girl read the book.’

(4) pema(-ki) tshi/*tshi-la thong-sum?
    Pema(-ERG) what/what-DAT see-PST
    ‘What did Pema see?’

(5) pema(-ki) kjubu/*kjubu-la thong-sum
    Pema(-ERG) dog/dog-DAT see-PST
    ‘Pema saw a dog.’

Manang Gurung

(6) kjo-i/*kjo pema-ni/*pema se-mu?
    2SG-ERG/*2SG Pema-DAT/Pema know-NPST
    ‘Do you know Pema?’

(7) nga-i/*nga pema-ni/pema se-mu
    1SG-ERG/1SG Pema-DAT/Pema know-NPST
    ‘I know Pema.’

(8) kjo-ni/*kjo kaThmanDu(*-ri) tha-mu?
    2SG-DAT/2SG Kathmandu(*-LOC) know-NPST
    ‘Do you know Kathmandu?’

(9) nga-ni/*nga kaThmanDu(*-ri) tha-mu?
    1SG-DAT/1SG Kathmandu(*-LOC) know-NPST
    ‘I know Kathmandu.’
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Synthetic causativization strategies in Latin

Luisa Brucale and Egle Mocciaro, University of Palermo

Latin has diverse verbal strategies of causativization, which have been described in Lehmann (forth.) as ranking along an increasing degree of formal reduction: 1) complex sentences, in which a verb meaning “to cause” (e.g. *facio* “to do, make”, *iubeo* “to give an order” etc.) governs a subordinate finite clause (e.g. *ut* + subjunctive); 2) analytic constructions, which include a non-finite subordinate clause (e.g. accusative + infinitive). This type is the forerunner of the Romance type (cf. Simone and Cerbasi 2001; Chamberlain 1986); 3) derivational (synthetic) constructions, i.e. causative verbs including *-facio* and *-fico* compounds and -ē-derivatives < PIE *-éye/o/-, e.g. *moneo* “to admonish”, *torreo* “to parch; to roast”; 4) lexical alternations, e.g. *fio/facio* “to become/to make”, i.e. verbal pairs involved in a causative relation, but not in a derivational one.

In general terms, Lehmann’s description is consistent with the Dixon’s (2000) scale of compactness (see also Comrie 1985), summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MECHANISM</th>
<th>COMPACTNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constructions with two verbs (causative + lexical)</td>
<td>morphological (e.g. internal, reduplication, affixation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two verbs in one predicate (serial verbs, e.g. <em>faire</em> in French; compounding)</td>
<td>lexical (e.g. <em>walk, melt</em> in English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaving aside the poles of the continuum (i.e. complex sentences and lexical alternations), this paper will focus on the synthetic strategies. These strategies manifest different degrees of compactness, as well as different degrees of productivity: 1) Causative *-ē* verbs: ancient causative forms, whose causative meaning is no more accessible. They may be re-causativized by means of *-facio* (e.g. *perterrefacio* “to frighten thoroughly”).

2) *-fico* compounds: factitive verbs based on adjectives. They are more compact than *-facio* compounds (reduction of the formative *-fic*-, linking vowel *i* between the two members of the compound, e.g. *amplifico* “to widen”). This strategy seems to be quite productive, as suggested by the persistence in Romance languages.

3) *-facio* compounds: factitive verbs which can be further described depending on the nature of the first constituent. In particular, the *calefacio* type (Hahn 1947), based on stative intransitive -eo verbs (e.g. *caleo* “to be hot”), represents the most ancient nucleus of the *-facio* type and shows high productivity throughout the history of Latin, although it does not persist in Romance languages.

In quantitative terms, compounding strategies mainly involve states. Causativization determines an increase of valency, so that the intransitive subject (S) of the base is reinterpreted as an object (O), and an additional agent (A) is included in the representation of the event. On the other hand, non-stative intransitive bases as well as transitive bases are sporadic. In the latter case the functional value of compounding is not fully clear, as causativization does not modify the argumental structure of the base and both the base and the compound seem to convey the same meaning.

On the basis of this description, this paper will focus on the following points: 1) *-facio* and *-fico* compounds seem to express the same meaning “to make something –ed”. The seemingly functional equivalence of the two types needs to be explained in the light of Dixon’s observation that if a language has several causative strategies they express different causative values; 2) both *-facio* and *-fico* form factitive verbs, based on stative verbs and adjectives respectively. We are dealing with a radical constraint on the selection of the bases which
suggests to verify to what extent active intransitive and transitive bases play a role in other causativization strategies. This will also allows to verify Simone and Cerbasi’s (2001:454) claim, according to which “Latin was not a strongly causative-oriented language”; 3) the –facio type seems to be closer to the Romance compounding mechanism, in that it mainly involves full lexical forms lacking relational information, in contrast to the –fico type which conforms to the typical PIE mechanism in that it shows a general “shrinkage” of the constituents (cf. Rassmussen 2002:333). Interestingly, the –facio type does not survive in Romance languages whereas the –fico type persists and undergoes a reanalysis as a verbalizing suffix (e.g. It. identificare, Fr. identifier, Sp. identificar, Rom. a identifica).
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Clause fusion as a process of forming complex predicates in Ainu and Japanese

Anna Bugaeva, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics

In this paper, I discuss the synchronic behavior of ‘Verb1+conjunction+Verb2’ construction in Ainu in terms of diachronic change. I also try to contrast it with the equivalent -te converbal complex predicate construction in Japanese, which is similar to in terms of meanings brought in by V2 (Aktionsart, social, spatial aspects), e.g. stative/perfect resultative wa an/oka (EXIST (sg/pl); J -e aru, -te iru), perfective wa isam (DISAPPEAR; J -te shimau), benefactive wa kor-e (GIVE; J -te kureru), preparatory wa anu/ari (PUT (sg/pl); J -te oku), tentative wa inkar (SEE; J -te miru), directional (to the speaker) /inchoative wa ek/arki (COME (sg/pl); J -te kuru), and directional (from the speaker) /completive wa arpa/paye (GO (sg/pl); J -te iku). Unlike in Japanese, both V1 and V2 in Ainu are finite (non-converbal), thus marked for the person and number of the subject and object (1), (2). The most commonly used conjunction connecting V1 and V2 is wa ‘and’, which is also employed to mark coordination and subordination (temporal/ causal). However, I argue that synchronically ‘V1+conj.+V2’ cannot be regarded as coordination/subordination any longer. To show this, I test ‘V1+conj.+V2’ for mono/bi-clausal with regard to the expression of arguments, negation, TAM and evidentiality etc. The overall result is that ‘V1+conj.+V2’ behaves more like a monoclausal construction than bi-clausal and that there is a split within particular V2 types, just like in Japanese (Matsumoto 1996). However, ‘V1+conj. wa+V2’ construction is much less grammaticalized than its -te converbal equivalent in Japanese, which becomes clear from a corpus-based analysis of the V2 token frequency and V1 variation. I suggest that the -te converbal construction in Japanese is older than its Ainu equivalent. Although Ainu had independently had ‘V1+conj.+V2’ or, at least, the preceding coordinating construction, the process of grammaticalization has been reinforced through its contact with Japanese. As a result, the respective V2s have diffused from Japanese to Ainu (calquing). Moreover, in the course of Ainu-Jap. language contact, only those V2 which had parallels in Japanese proved to be viable within ‘V1+conj.+V2’, while those which had no parallels have gone out of use.

I present a case of two genetically unrelated neighboring languages which have inevitably been developing in the same general direction of clause fusion as the process was activated by language contact. Japanese as a language at a more advanced stage of grammaticalization of the construction in question has influenced Ainu where the pace of grammaticalization had originally been slower.

Examples

Ainu

(1) ku=ye wa k=ānu (Tamura 2000: 184)
1SG.A=say and 1SG.A=PUT.SG
‘I told (him something).’ (speaker is giving listener information to be used in the future)

(2) ku=mi-pi usa toto hok wa en=kor-e
1SG.A=wear-thing-POSS various mother buy and 1SG.O=have-CAUS(=GIVE)
‘My mother bought me clothes etc.’ lit. ‘bought and made me have (it).’
(Sunazawa 1983: 65)
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Nonfinite complements in K’iche’: The transitive status of a passive verbal noun

Telma Can Pixabaj, The University of Texas at Austin

The purpose of this paper is to propose a transitive analysis of a verbal noun (nonfinite verb form) that bears a passive marker, based on the control relation that it displays. This proposal departs from any analysis that the passive forms are intransitive verbs. In K’iche’ and in other Mayan languages the passive is an intransitivized verb that promotes the patient and demotes the agent. In K’iche’ it is marked by the suffix -x or root vowel lengthening.

One context where passive verbal nouns occur is in nonfinite complement clauses (Larsen 1988). Other forms of verbal nouns can occur in this context, but I am focusing only on the passive ones. The passive verbal noun can occur in two forms, one has a bare form, (1), and the other bears an ergative marker or Set A in the Mayan literature, (2).

On the one hand, the passive verbal noun in (1) is interpreted as passive. Regarding control relations, there is structural object control (Stiebels 2007), the controller is the object of the matrix and the controllee is the patient of the passive verbal noun, which is not overtly marked, and should not be by definition.

On the other hand, the verbal noun in (2) with the set A marker presents a different configuration. (i) The patient is overtly marked by the set A marker which it should not be if this were the controlled argument. (ii) The controlled argument is the agent that is not overtly marked and it cannot be the patient in spite of the passive morphology. Thus, the analysis of (1) cannot be extended to (2). I argue that (2) should be analyzed as a transitive nonfinite complement in this context. In addition to the control pattern in (2), another argument for this analysis is the occurrence of the reflexive in the complement clause as in (3), which occurs with transitive or ditransitive verbs, but is ungrammatical with passive verbs and passive verbal nouns.

In summary, the verbal noun with a passive base inflected with a set A marker in complement clauses in K’iche’ is being re-analyzed as transitive rather than passive as has been assumed. Syntactic tests and the pattern of control relations support the transitive verb analysis.

Examples

(1) x-oj-u-ya’ [pa [kuna-x-ik]k]
   COM-B1P-A3S-give COMP cure-PASS-VN
   ’S/he allowed us to be cured.’

(2) x-ø-qaJ-choma-j [r-eta-x-ik] le uleew[k]
   COM-B3S-A3P-think-ACT A3S-measure-PASS-VN DET land
   ‘We thought to measure the land.’

(3) x-ø-inw-eta’ma-j [r-iil-ik] w-iib’
   COM-B3S-A1S-learn-ACT A3S-see.PASS-VN A1S-REF
   ’I learned to take care of myself.’
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Adjectival secondary predicates in Supyire

Robert Carlson, SIL and Africa International University

Supyire (Senufo, Niger-Congo) has two very different constructions for nominal and adjectival secondary predicates. Nominal secondary predicates have a (nearly) dedicated, and typologically unexceptionable, construction. Basic word order in Supyire is S AUX O V X, where X includes all arguments and adjuncts other than the subject and direct object. Secondary predicate nouns occur postverbally in position X. They may be controlled by the subject or the object, and may be resultatives, complementatives (term used by van der Auwera and Malchukov (2005)) or depictives (according to the criteria given in Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004)). Example (1) shows a depictive controlled by the direct object.

This predicate nominal construction only rarely admits adjectives, a fact undoubtedly related to the rare occurrence of adjectives as primary predicates, and in fact the overall rarity of adjectives. Secondary predicate adjectives must use a different construction, the typological interest of which stems from its apparent violation of Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann’s (2004) fifth criterion for identifying depictive secondary predicates: “The depictive does not form a low-level constituent with the controller, i.e. it does not function as a modifier of the controller”. In fact, in Supyire secondary predicate adjectives are indistinguishable from ordinary epithetic adjectives by their position. They seem, that is, to form a constituent with their controller/head. They can often be formally distinguished from ordinary epithetic adjectives in that they do not agree in definiteness with their controller/head, whereas epithetic adjectives do. Both types of adjective normally agree in gender (noun class) and number with their controller noun. Compare the depictive in example (2), which is indefinite while the controller/head is definite, with the epithetic in (3), where both adjective and head are definite.

Secondary predicate adjectives can further be identified as predicative by the criterion proposed by Güldemann (2005) and others, viz. they form part of the assertive focus of the clause, as shown by their interpretation under negation and in questions. Examples (4) and (5) are the negative counterparts of (2) and (3). The adjective in (4) attracts the negation while that in (5) does not.

While the difficulty of distinguishing secondary predicates from other types of participant-oriented adjuncts has been much discussed in the literature, Supyire presents a much different and evidently much rarer problem of distinguishing secondary predicate adjectives from epithetic adjectives when constituent order is of no help. This paper examines a large range of textual and elicited data and pays particular attention to “bridging” examples where both epithetic and a secondary predicate interpretation are possible.

Examples

(1)  Û a kù lyj žàngèj. s/he PERF it eat lunch
     ‘She/he ate it for/as lunch.’

(2)  Sôlashi-i-bú ṇéh-kanh-i’ ṇó aní.  DEPICTIVE
     soldier-CL2-DEF ADJ-be.tired-CL2 PERF arrive there
     ‘The soldiers arrived there tired.’

(3)  Sôlashi-i-bú ṇéh-kanh-i-bú’ á ṇó aní.  EPITHETIC
     soldier-CL2-DEF ADJ-be.tired-CL2-DEF PERF arrive there
     ‘The tired soldiers arrived there.’

(4)  Sôlashi-i-bú ṇéh-kanh-ié pye ṇó aní me.  NEG PERF arrive there NEG
‘The soldiers didn’t arrived there tired.’ (They arrived, but they were not tired.)

(5)  Sòlashí-i-bíí  pin-kanh-i-bíí  pye  ã  no  aní  me.
soldier-CL2-DEF ADJ-be.tired-CL2-DEF NEG PERF arrive there NEG

‘The tired soldiers didn’t arrive there.’ (The ones who were not tired did arrive.)
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Cooperation strategies and coreferential deletion in Middle Indo-Aryan

Alessandra Caviglia – University of Pavia

Jain Māhārāṣṭrī (henceforth JM) is a Middle Indo-Aryan language (henceforth MIA) and the main language of the non-canonical literature of the Śvetambara group of Jainism. In JM the past construction expressed by the inherited past passive participle becomes the only available means of expressing past actions and thus functionally active, since there no longer exists a contrasting voice. The syntactic status of A in this past participle construction has yet to be proven. In literature the ‘transfer to subject properties’ proposals (Comrie 1978, Cole et al. 1980, Marantz 1984, Estival and Myhill 1988) indicate topicalization of A as the starting point of the ergative reanalysis in Indo-Aryan (IA) languages.

In my talk I will argue against these proposals and I will focus on phenomena connected with grammatical relations that are not yet completely accounted for MIA, taking a closer look at coordination strategies and coreferential deletion in JM. The data presented are based on the commentary to the Jain canon written by Devendra in the 11th century AD.


Coordinate constructions will be divided into:

a. cross-clause standard coreference, where two clauses are conjoined.

b. cross-clause coreference inside a thematic paragraph, where two or more sentences are combined by a full stop.

According to Peterson (1998) in MIA there are no cases of an S/O pivot in conjunction reduction: even if he finds evidence for pragmatic pivot controlling coreferential deletion, this is actually restricted to an A/S syntactic pivot. On the contrary, I will show that in JM coreference is quite free in terms of syntactic constraints and I will demonstrate that coreferential deletion is governed by a combination of syntactic and pragmatic features and depends on the verb employed.

In conjunction reduction constructions, when the first clause is intransitive and the second is transitive both S/A and S/O pivot are acceptable. Since there is no active/passive opposition, constituent order appears to be the mechanism used for disambiguation: when the shared argument is O, A is placed in focus post-verbal position at the end of the second clause, as in (1). When the pivot is S/A, as in (2), O is in final focus position. When the first clause is transitive and the second is intransitive, only O/S pivot is admitted, as in (3). I will show that the reason why we do not find S deleted by a coreferential A is that coordination between intransitive and transitive clauses with S/A in strictly restricted to the gerund construction, as in (4). Therefore, only in the gerund construction there is a syntactic S/A pivot.

Inside the JM thematic paragraph there can be two or more sentences. The link among these sentences is the topic and there are no syntactic constraints. In JM S, A and O can be topicalized and thus deletion along S/A and S/O but also A/O and O/A core arguments is possible if the NPs are maintained in topic function, as S/O in (5). Bubenik (1998) proposes that a double argument past participle should be interpreted as passive when O is topicalized and active when the argument topicalized is A. Compared to Bubenik I will suggest that topicalization, instead of being a strategy for differentiating passive and active interpretation of the past participle constructions, is a strategy employed by the language because there is no active/passive opposition.

The possible existence of an S/O pivot has been attested in Early New Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages and even in some contemporary NIA languages (Strońska 2010, Bickel&Yādava 2000). As a result, I will reconsider the transfer to subject properties theories and reassess the concurrence of a S/A and S/O pivots as a mechanism of a transitional phase in
the morpho-syntactic development of MIA towards NIA.

**Examples**
Jain Māhārāṣṭrī

(1) S/O
so ya puva·bhava·vereṇa keṇa‘i vasanta·māse
3SG:M.NOM and old-existence·hostility:INS some:INS spring·month:LOC
ujjānaṃ gao
park:ACC go:PP.SG.M.NOM
āhao asinā khandharae niya·bhāunā Maṇirahaṇa.
strike:PP.SG.M.NOM sword:INS neck:LOC own·brother maniraha:INS
‘And he by some hostilities dating from a previous existence, he went to the park in the month of spring and his own brother Maniraha struck (him) in the neck with a sword.’

(2) S/A
paviṭṭho taṇṇmi, diṭṭhā nava·jovva·rūva·lāyaṇṇā juvaī.
enter this:LOC see:PP.SG.F.NOM fresh·youth·shape·beauty girl:SG.F.NOM
‘He entered there and saw a girl, endowed with the fresh bloom of youth, beauty, and grace.’

(3) O/S
so Maniraho tīe ceva rayaṇīe phaṇinā daṭṭho
3SG.M.NOM maniraha:SG.M.NOM that ENF night snake:INS bite:PP.SG.NOM
kālagao cautthī pudhavīe neraio uvavanno tti.
die:PP.SG.M.NOM fourth·hell.land dweller be.reborn:PP.SG.M.NOM
‘That night a snake bit Maniraha, (he) died and was reborned as a dweller of the fourth hell land.’

(4) Gerund A/S
pakkhāliūṇa ambarāiṃ avaiṇṇā majjaṇṇa’thāṃ.
wash:GRD clothes:PL.N.ACC go.down:PP.SG.F.NOM bathing in.order.to
‘she washed her clothes and stepped down in order to bathe.’

(5) Topic continuity
(a) tao pahuviṃ ādhatto Jugabāhū.
then start.out:INF begin:PP.SG.M.NOM jugabahu:SG.M.NOM
(b) etth’ antare aviyāriṇa kajjā’kajjā,
meanwhile not.consider:GRD allowed not.allowed:ACC
(c) aganiṇṇa jaṇā’vavāyam,
disregard:GRD people censure:ACC
(d) ujjhiūṇa ca paraloya·bhayaṃ vīsattha hiyao
abandon:GRD and next.world·fear:ACC confident·heart
(e) āhao dadham nisīya·khaggena kandharāe Maṇirahaṇa,
hit:PP.SG.M.NOM violently sharp·sword:INS neck:LOC maniraha:SG.M.INS
(f) guru·pahāra·viyaṇo nimīliya’ccho nivaḍio dharaṇi·vaṭṭhe.
heavy·wound·pain closed eyes fall:PP.SG.M.NOM ground:LOC
‘Then Jugabahu prepared to start out. In the meanwhile Maniraha, without considering what is allowed to be done and what is not allowed to be done, disregarding the censure of the people, abandoning fear of world beyond, with a confident heart, hit (him) violently in the neck with his sharp sword; with agony for the deep wound with his eyes closed, (Jugabahu) fell to the ground.’
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Placement patterns of the enclitics by and b in Modern Russian: A corpus-based study

Tommaso Claudi, University of Pavia

Modern Russian forms the conditional mood by means of the enclitic by and its variant b, which only occurs after vowels. The syntactic behaviour of such clitics is of particular interest for a number of reasons. Firstly, they do not always select the same kind of host, nor do they occur consistently in a fixed position. In fact, they mainly appear either in second position in the sentence or immediately after the verb. Secondly, it is not uncommon for them to be expressed more than once in a single sentence (cf. Franks and Holloway King 2000). According to Zaliznjak (2008), at some stage in Old Russian by conformed to Wackernagel’s Law, being later attracted to the verb. In spite of this varied syntactic behaviour, to my knowledge previous analyses fail to provide any kind of quantitative, corpus-based description of the different placement patterns of the enclitics. Moreover, the possibility of the two variants exhibiting differences in placement preferences is completely disregarded.

In my paper I investigate possible patterns in the placement of by and b against data from the Russian National Corpus. The analysis is conducted on a representative sample of the subcorpus pertaining to the spoken language, as data from written texts would yield a sample skewed towards the more standard, and more widely studied, patterns. The results of the corpus query show that even though second and post-verbal positions do indeed make up for most of the occurrences of by, in a significant number of cases (10%, tagged as Pn in Tab. 1) pre-verbal placement other than second position is observed. In addition, the data for b show a remarkable preference for second position, other pre-verbal positions being marginal and b selecting post-verbal position much less frequently than by.

I explain these findings in two main ways. On the one hand, I provide a unified view of the competing motivations at play in the different placement patterns of modal clitics from a functional perspective, especially expanding on the interplay between semantic and prosodic factors. On the other hand, I draw on the theory of the information structure of the clause (cf. Arnold et al. 2000) and reasons of phonological weight. In particular, I argue that pre-verbal placement should be regarded as a focusing structure giving particular prosodic saliency to usually phonologically weak elements, most often personal pronouns. The resulting cluster consisting of the host and the clitic acquires then a particularly prominent prosodic status, often signaled by contrastive intonation. If this assumption is true, than one can easily explain why pre-verbal position other than the second is dispreferred: as such focused, prosodically salient elements typically occur at the beginning of the clause, the further this construction moves towards the right, the less effective it is. Moreover, differences in placement between the two variants are also accounted for, in that b, being phonologically lighter, preferably appears in a position that may make it prosodically relevant, namely second position. In the analysis I also touch upon other issues related to this topic, such as the problems that arise in determining what counts as second position, and the factors that may trigger by-doubling in specific syntactic and prosodic environments.
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Russian National Corpus: http://www.ruscorpora.ru
Data

Tab.1: Relative frequency rates of *by* and *b* in the sample according to different placement patterns and the type of host that is selected. (P2=second position, Pn=second position other than P2, n=noun, adv=adverb, pron=pronoun, *esli*=conjunction *esli*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>by+V</th>
<th>V+by</th>
<th>b+V</th>
<th>V+b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pron</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>esli</em></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adv</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pron</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development and renewal of perfects in Eastern Aramaic

Eleanor Coghill, University of Konstanz

Aramaic, having a three thousand year documented history rich in dialectal variation, provides an ideal case for long-term diachronic study. A particularly fruitful area is the emergence of new perfects: perfects of various types have developed several times in Aramaic’s history, and new ones have emerged recently in the Neo-Aramaic languages. This paper will give an overview of the cycles of renewal of perfects in Aramaic, looking at both their origins and their functional evolution. Comrie’s (1976) typology of perfects, as well as Bybee et al. (1994)’s analysis of their synchronic and diachronic relationship to resultatives, completives, perfectives and pasts, will inform the discussion.

The Suffix Conjugation of early Aramaic (and other West Semitic languages) expressed a (past) perfective synchronically, but has been reconstructed as developing from a stative construction (Hetzron 1987: 166–167) presumably via a perfect. By the time of Imperial Aramaic (c. 600–200BC) there was no longer a grammaticalized way to explicitly express perfect aspect. In eastern Late Aramaic dialects, such as Syriac, we see the emergence of new resultatives and perfects. At this stage, however, these are all restricted in their lexical distribution.

Firstly, the passive participle in the predicative Absolute State, with gender/number inflection, could be used to express a resultative/perfect, but normally only in the passive:

Syriac
(1) ḥšil-in \(=(h)\text{waw}\)
get_ready.PASS_PTCP-MPL =PST.COP.3MPL
‘they had been got ready’ (The achievements of Mar Rabbūlā, Nöldeke 1904: 219)

However, an agent phrase could be added using the dative preposition \(-l\)-, in the ‘Qṭil li’ construction:

Syriac
(2) qrē-n \(l-āk\ \ kṭāhē\ \ d-kaldāyē\)
read. PASS_PTCP-MPL -MPL -2MS books(m.) of-Chaldeans
‘Have you read the books of the Chaldeans?’
(Book of the Laws of Countries, ed. Drijvers 1965: 3825)

A corpus study (in Coghill, forthcoming) shows that this construction was disproportionately common with experiencer verbs, such as ‘hear’ and ‘think’. Given also the cross-linguistic connection between dative case and experiencer arguments, it seems likely that the construction first emerged among experiencer verbs, and was only later extended to other verbs.

Constructions involving the passive participle were almost entirely restricted to transitive verbs. For some intransitive verbs there was a special intransitive verbal adjective, with stative or resultative function:

Syriac
(3) w-saggiʾě \(\text{men}\) y(h)uḥāyē \'attiʾ-in \(=(h)\text{waw}\)
and-many from Jews come.VRB_ADJ-MPL =PST.COP.3MPL
‘and many of the Jews had come’ (Peshitta, John 11:19)

For the same set of intransitive verbs, a further construction existed, which focused on the entry into the state (see Joosten 1989, 1996: 140–142). This involved a verb with a coreferential
dative pronominal phrase (known misleadingly as the ‘ethic dative’). When the verb was in the past perfective Suffix Conjugation, the construction could be understood as a perfect. It may be that this developed via an affectedness (beneficiary/maleficiary) function of the dative phrase: the affectedness of the intransitive subject could have been reanalysed as a resultant state, or present relevance.

Syriac

(4) mit-əṭ l-āh bart-āk die.PST_PFV-3FS l-3FS daughter-POS.2MS
‘Your daughter has died.’ (Peshitta, Luke 8:49)

Already by the earliest records of North-eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA), in the 16th century, the Qṭil li construction (now Qṭollī) had become a general past perfective and displaced the Suffix Conjugation. Contemporary NENA dialects exhibit a multiplicity of perfect constructions. Some use a reflex of the old passive participle construction (without loggedin). Many possess a perfect built on the NENA resultative participle plus copula. With transitive verbs this can be interpreted as passive or active:

North-eastern Neo-Aramaic (Telkepe dialect)

(5) ʾilə šqils PRES.COP.3MS take.RES_PTCP.MS
‘he has been taken’, ‘he has taken’ (author’s fieldwork)

Others use a present copula before the past perfective Qṭollī construction. In some dialects this copula has lost inflection and become a particle. Where different constructions co-exist in one dialect, in some cases they are in complementary lexical distribution (e.g. transitive/intransitive) and in others they express different types of perfects. In some dialects, such as Jilu (Fox 1997: 88) and Barwar (Khan 2008a: 669), the resultative participle + copula construction is losing the present relevance component of meaning and becoming a general past perfective, completing yet another cycle of perfect development.
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Indirect representation of questions in Old Babylonian Akkadian

Eran Cohen, The Hebrew University

Indirect questions constitute a syntactic issue that is occasionally given attention in grammars of particular languages. However, this phenomenon has hardly been addressed from a cross-linguistic perspective, perhaps as a result of the difficulty of characterizing the phenomenon from a typological perspective.

In addition, it is impossible to arrive at such general characterization by combining general insights gleaned from better-investigated, adjacent phenomena such as question and indirect discourse: after all, indirect questions often do not perform interrogative speech acts (i.e., asking for information), nor are they always deictically indirect (as expected from indirect discourse).

Conducting a comparison among the ancient Semitic languages yields mixed results—whereas Ancient Hebrew and Classical Arabic are said not to manifest indirect questions at all, other languages, e.g., Syriac Aramaic and Ancient Ethiopic (both of which were in contact with Greek), do express this category.

The proposed paper examines whether and to what extent a category of ‘indirect question’ can be identified for Old Babylonian Akkadian. The language is the oldest abundantly attested Semitic language. Its classical stage, which is amply attested in various genres (epistolary, legal, scientific and literary) is examined here. In order to do this, some fundamental questions need to be asked about the very phenomenon of ‘indirect question’.

Several strategies are considered and analyzed. In addition to direct questions, which can occur in the object slot (e.g., ex. [1]), it is concluded that a substantial, diverse group of indirect questions exists in Old Babylonian and occurs in two major patterns: They either 1. stand juxtaposed to some nominal anchor (most notably annītam lā annītam ‘this or that’), which formally takes the object slot of the question introducing expression (ex. [2]), or 2. take the object slot directly (ex. [3]). In addition to indirect yes-no questions, two more kinds of constituent questions, namely manner and locative indirect questions (e.g., ex. [4]). This description goes on to differentiate indirect yes-no questions from conditional structures, as well as the other types of indirect questions from similar expressions. Deictic shift, which is generally regarded as the basic feature of indirect discourse, is shown here to not be crucial for defining indirect question constructions.

Examples

Old Babylonian Akkadian

(1) awāt-am šātu bīr-ši OBJ=awātum
    matter-ACC DEM.CS.OBL IMP-verify-2MS-ACC.3FS OBJ=direct-question
    u eql-am mann-um ana PN iddin
    CONN field-ACC who-NOM to PN 3CS-give-PST
    bīr–ma
    IMP-verify-2MS-CONN
    ‘Verify this matter and also verify: who gave the field to PN? …’ (letters)

(2) inanna šumma ... amaḫḫar–ma
    now if 1CS-accept-NPST-CONN
    avīl-am šātu ṣevaššar (1)CS-release-NPST
    man-ACC DEM.CS.OBL (1)CS-release-NPST
    annī-t-am lā annī-t-am bēl-ī l-išpur-am
    DEM-FS-ACC NEG DEM-FS-ACC lord-GEN.1CS JUSS-3CS-write-DAT.1CS
‘Now, let my lord write me this or that, whether I should accept ... and release this man’

(letters)

(3) šumma  adi  uṭṭ-ēt-i-ka  akammis-u
IF  till.NUC  grain-FP-OBL-GEN.2MS  1CS-collect-NPST-SUBJ
wašb-āku  šupr-am-ma (letters)
STV-dwell-1CS  IMP-write-2MS-DAT.1CS-CONN
‘Write to me whether I (should) stay until I collect your (wheat) grain...’ (letters)

(4) īṭū-ma  ūm-u
3CS-grow_dark-PST-CONN day-NOM
ēmi  allak-u  ul  īde
where.NUC  1CS-walk-NPST-SUBJ  NEG  (1)CS-know
‘the day grew dark and I did not know where I was going’ (lit)

[NUC=nucleus; PN=personal name; STV=stative]
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Analyticity and internal borrowing in Afrikaans syntax

Jac Conradie, University of Johannesburg

Afrikaans derives from colloquial varieties of 17th century Dutch, in an intense contact situation in the multilingual Cape of Good Hope. After a brief outline of the syntax of the language with special reference to analytical developments, the focus will be on a factor of change which may be described as borrowing syntactic structures from the same language and employing them in contexts where they do not necessarily “fit”, often with pragmatic effect.

The general word order of Afrikaans is similar to that of Dutch, viz. verbs in V1 (yes/no questions, imperatives) or V2 (main and some subordinate clauses), with clause-final stranding of the rest of the verbal group, followed in Afrikaans by a copied negative nie (see (1) below). The sentential subject is adjacent to V2 and replaceable through topicalisation. [+ human] direct objects may form part of prepositional phrases with vir ‘for’ (2). In certain other syntactic relations prepositions are required where they are optional or absent in Dutch. Possession, etc. is generally expressed as a pre-genitive with the particle se, a virtual equivalent of the Eng. ’s-genitive, though post-genitives with van ‘of’ are also utilised (3). Compared to Dutch, the verb has undergone thoroughgoing deflection with the exception of the perfect participle, which is still morphologically marked and able to scramble to the left (4). Verbal strings have developed a more rigid ordering than they have in Dutch. When stranded in clause-final position, the verbal group may consist of (i) modal verbs (of which several may co-occur), (ii) lexical verbs (which co-occur through verb raising) and (iii) auxiliaries, in this order. Developments such as the optional combination of more than one lexical verb in V1 and V2 (5), and the replacement of is ‘is’ by het ‘have’ as auxiliary with mutative verbs (6) may be noted. The increased use of prepositions and the greater rigidity of verbal order, among others, would suggest diachronic development in an analytical direction.

A number of exceptions to this general tendency may, however, be pointed out. For instance, some relics of inflection, such as the imperfect modals verbs after the demise of the imperfect tense category, are involved in constructional innovation, e.g. the forming of more economical past infinitives (7) and a kind of “sequence of tenses” enhancing verbal cohesion (8). These are examples of what Lass refers to as exaptation. While Lass has in mind the employment “of material that is already there, but either serving some other purpose, or serving no purpose at all” (Lass, 1997: 316), there is evidence of a more inclusive diachronic process at work in Afrikaans (and other languages) which may be referred to as internal borrowing: extant constructions are borrowed in contexts with which they at first seem syntactically incongruent, for example met ek en sy, lit. ‘with I and she’, instead of met my en haar, ‘with me and her’, where conjunction reduction takes precedence over case marking. Verb-final subordinate clauses are routinely reformed to main clause structure, for instance with a verb in V2 (9) or the direct appropriation of a main clause (10). Several instances of internal borrowing appear to have pragmatic corollaries, e.g. special emphasis (11) – in this case through superimposing a clause with verb topicalisation on its un-topicalised variant. The syntactic “clash” characterising and in fact identifying internal borrowing, such as the “contamination” in (11), is an indication that analogy, inter alia, is not an appropriate explanation.

The following examples illustrate phenomena referred to above.

Afrikaans

1) Sy gaan nie die mas opkom nie.
   she go does not the mast up.come not
   ‘She is not going to succeed.’
2) Ek sien vir jou!
I see for you
‘I can see you!’

3) *Dit is die boeke wat gister gekom het se rak.*
   this is the books that yesterday come.PP have ‘s shelf
   ‘This is the shelf for the books that arrived yesterday.’

4) *Dit is duidelik dat die aanslag afgestaan sal moet word.*
   it is clear that the attack repel.PP shall must become
   ‘It is clear that the attack will have to be repelled.’

5) *Vanjaar bly werk sy nog in die stad.*
   this.year remain work she still in the city
   ‘This year she is still continuing to work in the city.’

6) *Die oorlog het pas begin.* Dutch *De oorlog is pas begonnen.*
   the war have just begin.PP the war is just begin.PP
   ‘The war has just begun.’

7) *Hy was verheug om die werk te kon kry.*
   he was delighted by the job to can.IMPF get
   ‘He was delighted to have been able to get the job.’

8) *Jou plan sou moes kon uitgewerk het.*
   your plan shall.IMPF must.IMPF can.IMPF work.out.PP have
   ‘Your plan should have been able to succeed.’

9) *Ek sê jou wat moet jy doen.* < *Ek sê jou wat jy moet doen.*
   I tell you what must you do I tell you what you must do
   ‘Let me tell you what you must do.’
   Question: *Wat moet jy doen?*

10) *Ons wil hê julle moet die oorhandiging doen.*
   we will have you must the presentation do
   ‘We want you to do the presentation.’
   Directive: *Julle moet die oorhandiging doen.*

11) *Sing sal sy nou sing.* < *Sing sal sy nou.* + *Sy sal nou sing.*
    sing shall she now sing sing shall she now she shall now sing
    ‘She will definitely sing now.’

Nominal categorization and syntax

Greville G. Corbett and Sebastian Fedden, University of Surrey

Despite a long research tradition, the definition and description of nominal categorization systems is still difficult. We need to make progress here, if we aim for a typology based on valid comparisons. Familiar systems, like French or German, often show peculiar combinations of elements, which do not necessarily co-occur cross-linguistically, nor should they be definitional of a certain type of noun categorization system. Many languages systematically categorize their nominal vocabulary, in ways that have a larger or smaller effect on syntax. Categorization may involve a gender system, as in Italian, where nouns are assigned to the masculine or the feminine gender. Another possibility is a system of classifiers, as in the Austronesian language Kilivila, which distinguishes at least 177 categories (Senft 1996), based on semantic properties, for example long and flexible objects or pots. In the main a language has only one system or the other. However, there are languages which combine two systems. We aim to present new data on a language with two categorization systems, and to use that material to refine the typology of such systems.

1. DATA: the data come from Mian, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea (Fedden 2011). Mian has a gender system with four values: masculine, feminine, neuter 1 and neuter 2. In (1), the subject ē ‘3SG.M’ triggers agreement in gender and number on the verb (-e); the object unáng ‘woman’ triggers agreement in gender and number on the verb (wa-) and the clitic article (=o). Moreover, free pronouns in the third person agree with their antecedents (2). So Mian gender is evidenced within a range of syntactic domains. In addition there are six prefixal classifiers: the M-classifier (for male referents and some inanimates), the F-classifier (for female referents and many inanimates), the bundle classifier, the classifier for objects which serve as covers, and a residue classifier. The use of the classifier tob- ‘long object (SG)’ with fút ‘tobacco’ is illustrated in (3). The classifiers make a singular-plural distinction as well but are more restricted in their distribution. They occur only on verbs of object handling or movement, such as ‘give’, ‘take’, throw’ and ‘fall’. There is no separate set of free pronouns which distinguish the same categories as the classifiers.

2. TYPOLOGY: languages like Mian require us to extend the typology of categorization systems. Earlier work often treated gender systems and classifier systems as opposed to each other. Dixon (1982; 1986) gives helpful criteria for contrasting the two, followed by Aikhenvald (2000) and Grinevald (2000). Since then, interesting instances of intermediary systems have been found, for instance, Miraña (Seifart 2005). These suggest that factors which are grouped together in familiar languages can vary independently, and that we need to look at these variables individually. It is therefore appropriate to take a Canonical Typological approach (Brown, Chumakina & Corbett 2013). This involves examining the variability within and across languages, to establish the parameters of variation which enable us to set up a theoretical space of possibilities. We then examine how real examples are distributed in the space. We find a clear point of convergence in this space, which points us to defining a canonical gender system. Like other canonical morphosyntactic features (Corbett 2013), a canonical gender system (and its gender values) is clearly distinguished by formal means, its use is determined by simple syntactic rules and it is realized by canonical inflectional morphology. Where gender differs from the other morphosyntactic features is in the availability of values: in the canonical system, controllers have one gender value, while targets have all values.

This idealized picture provided by the canon proves its usefulness when we calibrate the facts of Mian against it. The Mian gender system is close to canonical in most respects. Conversely, the classifier-like elements have some properties close to a canonical gender system (they are realized as verbal prefixes reminiscent of the agreement affixes of gender systems) and other properties which are distant from the canonical ideal (they are highly
restricted in the lexical items involved). The gender system is fully integrated into the syntax, evidenced by a range of domains, while the classifier system is more peripheral, essentially restricted to a subset of verbs.

We conclude that adopting Canonical Typology allows us to integrate into our typology the systems close to canonical (Italian) as well as the intermediate cases we find both in single systems and in combined systems (as in Mian).

**Examples**

**Mian**

(1) ē unáng=o wa-tèm’-Ø-e=be
3SG.M woman(F)=ART.SG.F 3SG.F.OBJ-see.PFV-REAL-3SG.M.SBJ=DECL
‘He sees the woman.’ (SF, field notes)

(2) Futaman mín=e baa-n-e=le
Fu.valley son=ART.SG.M say.PFV-SEQ-3SG.M.SBJ=N2=TOP
ībo wan-ībt=e [intervening material]
say.PFV say.PFV-DS.SEO-3SG.M.SBJ=and [...] ‘The man from the Fu river valley said, “Who are you?” and …’
ē as=o hā’-n-e=le=TOP […]
3SG.M firewood=ART.N2 break.PFV-REAL-3SG.M.SBJ=N2=TOP […] ‘when he [i.e. the man from the Fu river valley] cut the firewood …’ (Fedden 2011: 530)

(3) nē fút=e tob-ò-n-i=a
1SG tobacco=ART.SG.N1 3SG.LONG.OBJ-take-SEQ-1SG.SBJ=and
‘I take the long tobacco leaf and then I …’ (Fedden 2011: 541)

[Abbreviations: 1 - first person, 2 - second person, 3 - third person, AN - animate, ART - article, CQ - content question, DECL - declarative, DS - different subject, EMPH - emphatic, F - feminine, M - masculine, N1 - neuter 1, N2 - neuter 2, OBJ - object, PFV - perfective, PL - plural, REAL - realis, SBJ - subject, SEQ - sequential, SG - singular, TOP - topic]
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Valency, transitivity and voice in Jóola Banjal (a.k.a Gújjolaay Eegimaa)

Denis Creissels (University of Lyon), Alain-Christian Bassène (University of Dakar), Serge Sagna (Surrey Morphology Group)

Jóola Banjal (a.k.a Gújjolaay Eegimaa) is an Atlantic language spoken by approximately 7000 speakers in Casamance (Sénégal). The main reference works on this language are Bassène (2007) and Sagna (2008). In our presentation, after providing the necessary information about the organization of verbal predication, we would like to discuss the following questions: the coding frames available for bivalent verbs and their relative frequency, valency alternations, lability, the status of Jóola Banjal according to the distinction between transitivizing and detransitivizing languages (Nichols & al. 2004), and mismatches between the morphological structure of verbs and their valency properties.

In the transitive predication of Jóola-Banjal, there is no flagging of either A or P, but in addition to the rigid constituent order AVPX, there is a clear contrast between A and P in indexation. As regards the relationship between transitive and intransitive predication, Jóola Banjal is an accusative language in which the traditional notion of subject is not problematic, since every coding frame must include a term with coding properties identical to those of the A term in transitive predication, and most syntactic operations treat the term showing these coding properties in a uniform way.

Jóola Banjal has five valency-changing suffixes: causative -en, passive -t, reflexive -ɔɔɛ, middle -ɔ, and middle -ɔr.

Our analysis of valency, transitivity and voice in Jóola Banjal deals with the following points:

(a) Jóola Banjal shows a particularly strong tendency to generalize transitive coding to nearly all semantic types of bivalent verbs; exceptions to this tendency are only found among movement verbs and verbs encoding naturally reciprocal events.

(b) Jóola Banjal has no particular restriction on the intransitive use of transitive verbs with a non-specific reading of the P argument; by contrast, the intransitive use of transitive verbs with a subject corresponding to the object of the transitive construction is limited to a small set of verbs.

(c) As regards the orientation of the relationship between transitive verbs and monovalent verbs assigning a role similar to that assigned to the P argument of a transitive verb, when this relationship is formally marked, both reduction (transitive > intransitive) and augmentation (intransitive > transitive) are widely used, with however a slight predominance of reduction.

(d) The verbal lexicon of Jóola Banjal includes an extremely high proportion of verbs with endings that could represent valency-changing operators, but for which, either no possible source of the derivation can be identified, or a possible source can be identified, but the semantic relationship between the two verbs is not in accordance with the general meaning of the suffix in question.
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Class agreement in Atlantic languages

Denis Creissels (University of Lyon)

This presentation aims at giving a typological overview of class agreement in two major groups of Atlantic languages that constitute genetic units within the Atlantic family: a group consisting of Wolof, Buy, Nyun, Cangin, Fula-Sereer, Tenda, and Jaad-Biafada, and a group consisting of Jóola-Bayot, Manjaku-Mankanya, Balant, and Bijogo.

All the languages included in these two groups of Atlantic languages have gender systems of the type commonly designated as ‘noun class systems’ in the Africanist tradition, with the only exception of two of the five Cangin languages (Palor and Ndut) and Jaad.

Typical Niger-Congo noun class systems show the following three characteristics:

(a) Noun include an obligatory class membership marker (CMM) correlated to their behavior as controllers of agreement, and the number of possible CMMs attached to nouns and of possible agreement patterns is generally comprised between 10 and 20.

(b) Number is not expressed independently from gender: the number value of noun forms is expressed by their CMM, and it is impossible to isolate morphemes whose sole function would be the expression of number.

(c) One of the singular-plural class pairing (human singular and human plural classes) has the following three properties: all of the nouns that fall into this pair of classes denote human beings, most nouns denoting humans are found in this pair of classes, and personal names as agreement controllers belong to this pair of classes, although they do not show the corresponding CMMs.

The languages dealt with in this study show variations with respect to various aspects of this prototype. In this presentation, I analyze those concerning class agreement. The range of noun modifiers involved in class agreement is not identical across Atlantic languages. The adjectives, the demonstratives, the numeral ‘one’, and the interrogative determiner (‘which?’) are the only types of noun modifiers that invariably show class agreement. In typical Niger-Congo noun class systems, argument indexation on verbs is sensitive to class distinction, but in some Atlantic languages, the subject and object indexes vary in person and number only, and do not express the class distinctions expressed at noun phrase level.

Semantic agreement triggered by humaneness/animacy is found in a number of Niger-Congo languages that have otherwise prototypical noun class systems, including some of the languages dealt with in this study. However, the most interesting contribution of Atlantic languages to a typology of class agreement is a phenomenon found in Jóola languages that does not seem to have been signaled in other language families: semantic agreement triggered by generic reference. In the languages that have this kind of semantic agreement, when singular nouns that do not denote humans are used in subject function and do not carry generic reference, they can only be indexed on the verb by means of the index corresponding to their CMM, but when they carry generic reference (i.e., in sentences such as Lions are dangerous), it is also possible to cross-reference them by the human singular index, and this deviation from morphological agreement can only be interpreted as indicating that the subject noun does not refer to an individual, but to a kind.
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On expletive subject pronoun in Vietnamese: syntax or pragmatics, or both?

Huy Linh DAO (Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3 & LACITO UMR 7107)

The present study deals with the expletive subject pronoun nó (henceforth nó_{EXPL}) in modern Vietnamese, a phenomenon which, to the best of our knowledge, has received scant attention in the linguistic literature until recently (cf. Nguyen V. H. & Hoang T. T. 2011, Dao 2013). These rare proposals, albeit insightful, have primarily focused on the internal properties of nó_{EXPL}. For instance, Nguyen V. H. & Hoang T. T. (2011, henceforth N&H), while highlighting its semantic “emptiness” and its non-referential status, argue that this morpheme, whose usage seems to be confined to spoken language and informal styles (ex. 2), must be syntactically and semantically distinguished from its homonymous form - the third singular personal pronoun nó (ex. 1):

(1) a. Nó mớ ig M at hôm qua. 3SG just see/meet NPROP yesterday ‘(S)he just saw Mai yesterday’
   b. Mai không muốn nói chuyện với nó. NPROP NEG want talk with 3SG ‘Mai doesn’t want to talk to him/her’

(2) Mùa hè rõ! Mặc quần sok c cho nó mát! Summer ASP wear shorts so that EXPL be-cool/fresh ‘It’s summer already! (We/you) should wear shorts, so that (we/you) will feel fresh’ or ‘it will freshen up your body’

On the basis of this type of examples, N&H further claim that the notion of (grammatical) subject should be maintained in the description of Vietnamese, despite the fact that this language has often been considered a topic-prominent language, as is proposed in Li & Thompson’s (1976, 1981) typology (see also Cao X. H. 2004). Taking another angle of attack, Dao (2013) points out that although compatible with unaccusative (but not unergative or transitive) verbs, nó_{EXPL} is nonetheless limited to irrealis-resultative contexts (involving change-of-state predicates):

(3) Mày làm thế, nó vỡ cái bình bày giờ! 2SG do so EXPL break_{INTRANS} CL vase now ‘If you do that, the (flower) vase will definitely break!’

(4) a. Mày làm thế, nó thằng bé khóc bày giờ! 2SG do so EXPL boy-child cry now ‘If you do that, the boy will definitely cry!’
   b. *Mày làm thế, nó thằng bé khóc bày giờ! 2SG do so EXPL boy-child cry now
   c. *Mày làm thế, nó khóc thằng bé bày giờ! 2SG do so EXPL cry boy-child now

(5) Mày làm thế, (*nó) mẹ (*nó) sẽ mắng mấy đây! 2SG do so EXPL mother EXPL FUT scold 2SG PART ‘If you do so, Mom will scold you for sure!’

However, Dao does not give any explanation for this contextual restriction. Moreover, neither N&H (2011) nor Dao (2013) attempt to address issues such as:

(i) Why nó_{EXPL} is only licensed in spoken speech;
(ii) Why nó_{EXPL} cannot freely co-occur with weather-verbs (ex. 6);
(iii) Why nó_EXPL requires overt realization of some linguistic elements (cf. the ungrammaticality of (7) and the ill-formedness of (8) due to the absence of the sequence in parentheses);

(iv) Why nó_EXPL is perfectly acceptable in realis contexts (as shown in (8)).

(6) Hôm qua (*nó) mưa rất to.

Yesterday EXPL rain very big

‘It rained heavily yesterday’

(7) (*Nó) cháy ngôi nhà rồi.

EXPL burn down house ASP

‘The house has burnt down’

(8) *(Mày ăn nhiều đồ béo nên) nó béo bụng!

2SG eat much stuff greasy so EXPL fatten belly

‘You ate so much greasy food, so your belly got fat!’

All the distributional facts stated above seem to indicate that, in contrast to the referential nó (cf. ex. 1), nó_EXPL does not behave like a full-fledged pronoun and appears to be deficient. They also suggest that nó_EXPL tends to exhibit peculiar properties: while it functions like a syntactic subject, its licensing appears to be strongly sensitive to contextual (i.e. pragmatic) considerations. In this regard, it is not entirely true that nó_EXPL is semantically vacuous. Rather, its behavior reminds us of that of a variable which needs to be bound by an Operator. Based on novel empirical evidence, we argue that nó_EXPL occupies the syntactic subject position of the clause and is base-generated in [Spec, TP]. It is further assumed to be D(iscourse)-linked. More precisely, we suggest that nó_EXPL marks the Point of View (PoV) of discourse participants, namely the 1st and 2nd persons (or indexicals), the 3rd person being analyzed as “non-person” (non-personne), according to Benveniste (1966 [1946]). In this sense, nó_EXPL is endowed with the features [+d] (“Discourse Participant”-Feature) and [p: __] (“person”-Feature), the latter being unvalued. Following Guéron & Haegeman (2012), we propose that PoV heads a functional projection located in the left periphery of the clause. PoV and nó_EXPL are said to be engaged in an AGREE relation, whereby the feature [p: 1st/2nd] carried by PoV values that of nó_EXPL. We briefly discuss the differences and similarities between nó_EXPL and logophoric expressions (cf. Sells 1987). In our account, nó_EXPL is not treated as the explicit realization of a stage topic as defined in Erteschik-Shir (1997) and extended in Lahousse (2003, 2007).
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The typology of subjects: phonological overtness and referential dependence

Maia Duguine (University of Cambridge & University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)

We propose a novel characterization of the typology of subject NPs, on the basis of a detailed study of overt and non-overt subjects in the Navarro-Labourdin variety of Basque (henceforth NLB), cross-checked with independently observed facts in other non-related languages.

1. The traditional analysis assumes that finite contexts allow overt NP subjects as well as pronominal null subjects ('pro', found in so-called pro-drop languages), while non-finite contexts allow non-overt subjects of a different type (PRO, but also DP-trace), which are interpreted as being 'controlled' by a NP in the matrix clause, i.e., which are referentially dependent, unlike pro.

Furthermore, it is assumed that referential dependence on a higher NP is limited to the subjects of the type of PRO.

2. This characterization has clear counter-examples: (i) in many languages, overt subject NPs are allowed in non-finite contexts, in alternation with PRO (see (2)) (Sundareshan & McFadden 2009), (ii) in languages such as Hungarian, Italian or Spanish, there exist overt subject NPs which are referentially dependent, just like PRO (see (3)) (Szabolcsi 2009), and (iii) we show that in Basque, besides finite contexts, non-finite contexts also allow subjects of the pro-type (see (4)). To this, it must be added that the notion of 'finiteness' is itself a complex one, since certain clauses with tense or agreement morphology behave like control structures (see a.o. Terzi (1997) on Greek, Raposo (1987) on Portuguese, Fujii (2006) on Japanese).

Nonetheless, the literature on the syntax of subjects has generally chosen not to focus on all these issues, and to maintain the typology presented above as an idealization.

3. We develop a detailed study of the so-called 'nominalized' non-finite constructions in NLB (see (5)), which split into five different types (Artiagoitia 2003, Euskaltzaindia 2011). We have checked systematically the availability of overt and null subjects in each type of nominalized clause, verifying further whether they are referentially free or dependent. This has led us to the following typology of nominalized clauses:

(1) Typology of nominalized clauses in NLB
Type 1: licenses referentially free overt and non-overt subjects.
Type 2: licenses referentially free overt subjects & referentially dependent non-overt subjects
Type 3: licenses referentially dependent overt and non-overt subjects.
Type 4: only licenses referentially dependent non-overt subjects.

NLB thus displays a wide variety of constructions, which reflect the richness and the non-uniformity of the syntax of subjects. An crucial aspect of (1) is that it gathers together constructions that are part of the idealized typology standardly assumed and constructions that correspond to the exceptions discussed in section 2. In this sense, we argue that the paradigm (1) represents a more adequate characterization of the behavior of subjects cross-linguistically, and that it paves the way for a better understanding of the syntax of overt and non-overt subjects.

4. The final part of the talk discusses the consequences of our results, and some of their theoretical implications.

An important consequence of (1) is that, contrary to what is often assumed, finiteness and referential (in)dependence are independent phenomena, since we find in non-finite contexts both referentially free and referentially dependent subjects. Control-type phenomena cannot thus be directly related to non-finiteness.

There is no relation between referential dependence and phonological (non-)overtness
either, since we find both overt and non-overt referentially dependent subjects. Consequently, those approaches that account for Control phenomena on the basis of the null phonological matrix of an element such as 'PRO' are on the wrong track.

Tamil
   Raman,NOM puuri,ACC fry-INF flour,ACC buy-PST-M.3sg
   'Raman bought flour to fry puuris.' (purposive) / 'Raman bought flour while frying puuris.' (temporal) (Sundaresan & McFadden 2009)

   Raman,NOM Vasu,NOM puuri,ACC fry-INF flour,ACC buy-PST-M.3sg
   'Raman bought flour for Vasu to fry puuris.' (purposive) / 'Raman bought flour while Vasu fried puuris.' (temporal) (Sundaresan & McFadden 2009)

Italian
(3) Gianni, [odierebbe [andare PRO/solo lui/*j a Milano].
   Gianni, would.hate.3sg go-INF only he to Milan
   'Gianni would hate it if (only he) went to Milan.' (adapted from Szabolcsi 2009)

Basque
(4) Nik/[e] [zu/[e] etor-tze-a] nahi dut.
   I,ERG you,ABS come-NMLZ-D.ABS want AUX.1sgERG.3sgABS
   'I want you to come.'

Basque
(5) [[Haurr-ek liburuak irakur-tze]-a-k] pozten gaitu.
   children-ERG books.ABS read-NMLZ-D-ERG delight AUX.1plABS.3sgERG
   Lit. [The children reading books] delights us.
   'That the children read books delights us.'
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Several apparently unconnected properties of participial periphrastic constructions in Basque systematically distinguish central and eastern varieties. Those properties can be summarized as follows: (i) eastern varieties possess optional dative agreement (1); (ii) only eastern varieties allow wh- and focal operators to immediately precede the auxiliary; central varieties always have the lexical verb in between the auxiliary and the focus/wh-phrase (2,a,b); (iii) eastern varieties naturally allow, but central ones don’t, orders of the type modal+participial complement (3). The participial complement can in those cases be richer in structure than in the orders participial complement+modal, universally available in Basque (see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2009); (iv) only eastern varieties allow orders in which the participial complement and the auxiliary are separated by something else, typically an additive marker of the even/also sort, or evidential adverbs (4); (v) only central dialects accept dummy egin “do” (Haddican, 2007) in verb-focus constructions (5); (vi) only eastern varieties have distinct non-finite transitive and intransitive auxiliaries, unlike central ones, in which only a general purpose one exists (izan “be/have”) (6); (vii) Eastern dialects allow for post-auxiliary, participle internal negation (not an instance of constituent negation, see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2009) (7). Finally, Eastern dialects require simple unergative verb be, instead of have, unlike in central/western dialects (8). Outside the domain of periphrastic constructions proper, only eastern varieties have participial relatives (9). I will claim that those differences can be reduced to a single morphosyntactic parameter, consisting in the fact that eastern copulas must be “synthetic verbs” (De Rijk, 2008) not auxiliaries, the latter being the only option in central dialects. Synthetic verbs are finite verbs which, unlike auxiliaries, possess a lexical root. The class of synthetic verbs in Basque is composed of a handful of very common verbs, including the equivalents of the romance locative copulas (cf. Spanish estar). In eastern dialects, this class would include the transitive and intransitive copulas. As a first step in the argument, let me note that the immediate adjacency of focus/wh-phrase and finite forms is generally possible in Basque in the case of synthetic verbs (10), and in identificational predications (11), for which it has been claimed that the copula may be a contentful verb (Zaring, 1996, on Welsh). It is also well known that synthetic verbs do not accept dummy do in Basque. The reason is simple: synthetic verbs are characterized by the fact that the verbal root raises to T; and as shown by Haddican (2007) dummy do is inserted as a way to save stray aspectual morphology, when the lexical verb cannot raise to Aspect and beyond. If eastern auxiliaries are synthetic verbs we easily explain this otherwise intriguing lexical gap in the Basque dialectal continuum. This hypothesis complies well with the fact that only eastern dialects have distinct lexical forms for intransitive (izan) and transitive (ukan) non-finite auxiliaries. We can capitalize on the lexical status of eastern copulas to account for the rest of the distinguishing properties of those varieties: on the one hand, lexical copulas do not trigger ordinary predicate fronting (Haddican, 2004), the syntactic process whereby verbal predicates in Basque periphrases raise to a higher polarity phrase immediately preceding the auxiliary in unmarked affirmative sentences, yielding the rigid order OVAux. Other things, such as focus particles or evidential adverbs, may intervene (see 4). Then, the lexical status of the copula in eastern varieties also has an effect in the type of complement it can take: lexical verbs, unlike auxiliaries, can take complements of different complexity (Wurmbrandt, 2004). Those complements will be able to host at least some clausal functional structure, such as negation, and allow for wh-operator movement, which accounts for the existence of participial relatives. Pairs such as (2a,b), nevertheless, available in all dialects, raise the following question: if auxiliaries in eastern varieties are synthetic verbs, why do they seem to optionally allow predicate fronting? The existence of participial relatives provides us with a clue for a parsimonious analysis of this alternation: the structure of the
eastern interrogative/focal cases resembling western configurations is actually the output of clausal pied-piping (12a), an independently attested phenomenon in Basque. The optionality is thus related to the syntactic complexity of the participial: if it contains a C-layer, it allows pied-piping; if it doesn’t, the wh-p./focus directly raises to the higher clause (12b). The same option can also account for apparent optional dative agreement: the presence of C, a Phase, will block Agree from the auxiliary probe; its absence potentially allows Agree to apply. The auxiliary alternation in (8a,b), on the other hand, is reminiscent of Laka’s (2006) discussion of ergative splits in the context of progressive periphrases (biclausal constructions). I will argue that Eastern participials project a case licensing head F. F licenses one of the arguments of a transitive verb, typically the object. In the case of transitive predicates, this will force the subject to raise outside the participial clause, ending up in a local relation with the higher T (see Rezac et al., 2014 for T as the locus for ergative case/agreement). An exception arises in the context of unergatives if incorporation of the bare noun (dantza) to V allows it to dispense with case (Baker, 1988). In that case, the case feature in the participial is available for the second argument (the subject), which does not raise and surfaces as absolutive (13a,b). Concentrating on perfect periphrases, I show that the microparameter distinguishing E and C varieties can be viewed as the transition point in a diachronic process whereby biclausal periphrases became monoclausal in Basque (Mounole, 2011). This process was accomplished in western/central areas, but did not fully affect eastern varieties.

(1)  Liburu bat eman dut/dakot gizon horri (E/*C) [E=Eastern ; C=Central]
Book one-abs given aux(tr)/(dirt) man that-dat
“I gave a book to that man”

(2)  a. Nor/XABIER etorri da (E/C)
who/Xabier come is
“Who came?/XABIER came”
b. Nor/XABIER da etorri (?) (E/*C)
who/Xabier is come
“Who came?/XABIER came”

(3)  Behar du garai zer etorri (E/*C)
must aux on-time come
“She must come on time”

(4)  Errabia batek hartu ere/bezala du (E/*C)
rage one-erg taken also/like has
“She has also/apparently been overcome by rage”

(5)  Erori egin da (C/*E)  (6)  Erosi nahi ukhan du (E/*C)
Fall done is
“She FELL”
buy-partc want had has
“He wanted to buy it”

(7)  JON da [ez etorri] (E/*C)
Jon is not come
“It is JON who did not come”

(9)  Jon-erg bought book-D
“The book that Jon bought”

(10) Nor dator? (General)
Who comes

(12)  a. [CP [CP nor etorri], C^0 [TP da t_i]]?
b. [CP Nor, C^0 [TP da [AspP t_i etorri]]]

(13)  a. [TP DP T_AUX… [vp(DP) v V+N]]
(Ergative Case/Agreement)
b. \[TP \ldots V_{BE} [\text{PartP} \text{DP} F^0 [\text{vP} (\text{DP}) v V+N]]
\]
\[
\underline{\text{(Absolutive agreement)}}
\]

References


The Ordering of Attributive ‘Adjectives’ in Poly-adjectival Nominal Phrases in Cross-linguistic Perspective

Paul Flanagan, Edge Hill University, UK

This paper reports the findings of a study on the ordering of attributive adjectives in 5 different languages. Cinque (2010) compares the position of adjectives in Germanic and Romance languages, while Sadler (2000) and Willis (2006) argue against the same author’s N-raising analysis of Welsh noun phrases. In this paper, I provide data which suggest that the examination of the order of adjectives in any language must consider the semantic and functional properties of all elements in the phrase both independently and as part of the modification string as a constructional grammatical unit.

The many studies of adjective order in English (Dixon 1982, Scott 2002 among others) have usually focussed on the semantics of each adjective within a string in isolation, with orders such as SIZE-SHAPE-AGE-COLOUR-NATIONALITY often being proposed. Some authors (most notably Bache 1978, Feist 2012) have focussed more on ordering systems based upon whether an adjective specifies, describes, or classifies a noun, with the order within each functional subclass then considered further (see Warren 1984 for a study of the ordering of classifying adjectives). Sproat & Shih’s (1991) comparative work on adjective ordering restrictions is an inspiration for this project.

The data presented were obtained through corpus studies and field-based methods, and shed some light the ordering of adjectives in Welsh, Polish, Chinese, Tagalog and Northern Sotho. The final three in this list are languages which have often been considered not to have an independent word class ‘adjective’ (see Dixon & Aikhenvald 2004, Gil 1992 & 2000, Van Wyk 1967, Haspelmath 2007 & 2012). While Polish and Mandarin Chinese are predominantly ADJ-N languages and Northern Sotho and Welsh are N-ADJ, Tagalog has both patterns. Northern Sotho adjectives are separated from the modified head by a qualificative particle, while adjectives in Chinese and Tagalog also take ligatures/particles in attributive function, giving the study a nice, representative typological range.

By comparing the structure of complex modification strings in these five languages with mutually distinctive morphosyntactic properties, it is possible to identify trends and patterns which support and modify the suggestion that attributive adjective order can be considered, to some extent, as universal across a range of languages.
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Insubordination in the Caucasus

Diana Forker, University of Bamberg & Cairns Institute

Languages in the Caucasus, as many other languages in Eurasia, have a rich inventory of what are normally classified as non-finite verb forms: infinitives, masdars, participles and converbs. Nakh-Daghestanian languages fit well into this picture. They make use of non-finite verb forms in subordinate clauses (1) and as part of periphrastic verb forms in main clauses (2). Some of these verb forms can also be used to head an independent main clause (3), which is at first sight unexpected given the widespread assumption of a correlation between finiteness and clause type (independent main clause headed by a finite verb vs. dependent subordinate clause headed by a finite or a non-finite verb). Such phenomena have been discussed from a typological point of view by Kalinina (2001) and Evans (2007) who has coined the term insubordination for ‘the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses’. Another term repeatedly used in the literature is desubordination (e.g. Jendrascheck 2009). In this talk I will focus on Avar, Dargi, and the Tsezic languages Hinuq and Bezhta. I will analyze various kinds of non-finite verb forms thereby applying Evan’s characterization of insubordination and test whether it matches the Daghestanian data. I will pay special attention to the semantic side of insubordination and show how the use of non-finite verb forms in main clauses can be functionally explained. In addition, I will embed the analysis into the wider discussion of finiteness by discussing whether the respective verb forms justify the claim of Kalinina & Sumbatova (2007) that Daghestanian languages instantiate a special type of finiteness that is crucially different from finite/non-finite distinction in European languages.

Examples

Avar

(1) [dur wac-al č’w-ara-j] pačahasul jas=gi
2sg.GEN brother-PL kill-PTCP.PST-F king.GEN girl=PTCL
‘the king’s daughter who has killed your brothers’ (Bokarev 1949: 71)

(2) hesda-san luh-ara-w w-ugo mun
3sg.M.LOC-TRANS happen-PTCP.PST-M M-COP 2sg
‘You were born from him.’ (Akhlakov & Khalilov 1976: 12)

(3) ‘arac-mesed-gun ššw-ara-j jas insul roq’o-je
money-gold-CUM return-PTCP.PST-F girl father.GEN house.IN-DAT
‘With wealth the girl turned to her father’s house.’ (unwitnessed evidentiality)
(Charachidzé 1981: 172)
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Person syncretism and impersonal reference in Vanikoro languages

Alexandre François, CNRS–LACITO, A.N.U.

The island of Vanikoro, in the eastern Solomon Islands (Melanesia), is home to three Oceanic languages: Teanu (800 sp.), Lovono (4 sp.), Tanema (1 sp.). Their systems of personal pronouns share the same structural properties (François 2009), which are not found anywhere else in the surrounding languages.

First, their paradigms of subject prefixes show systematic syncretism in non-singular numbers, between 1st exclusive and 2nd person, as well as between (1st) inclusive and 3rd person – see ex.(1)-(2). This syncretism is found for both dual and plural, and both realis and irrealis: thus Tanema has ba- ‘1ex/2:Du’, la- ‘incl/3:Du:R’, ti- ‘1ex/2:Pl:R’, ja- ‘incl/3:Du:Ir’ etc. (Table 1). Individual cases of similar pronoun syncretism are scattered around the world (Cysouw 2005), but nowhere else does one find such a regular and complete system. I will illustrate the patterns of syncretism found in Vanikoro, and propose a contrast between Dislocutive [‘1ex’=‘2’] and Collocutive [‘incl’=‘3’] person indexing, a subtype of the clusivity contrast.

A second feature shared by the three Vanikoro languages is the existence of an extra category of person, referring to generic, non-specific referents (Teanu idi ‘people/one’, =French on) – see ex. (3)-(5). While its form is distinct from other pronouns for most syntactic functions, this pronominal category triggers subject agreement using the Collocutive prefixes ‘incl/3:Pl’ – see (5). The semantics of this impersonal pronoun will be illustrated, based on naturalistic examples taken from my corpus. I will review some syntactic clues which can tell apart impersonal from personal reference; but also some bridging contexts where the ambiguity is genuine. These observations will help us decide whether the impersonal should be analysed as pertaining to 1st inclusive, to 3rd plural, or to a person category in its own right – one of the three subtypes of the macro-category Collocutive developed by these languages.

Examples

Teanu (Oceanic)

(1) Kape ba-vongo ne lema.
FUT 1EX/2:DU-eat LOC inside
‘The two of usEXCL ~ the two of you will eat inside.’

(2) Kape la-vongo ne lema.
FUT INC/3:DU-eat LOC inside
‘The two of usINCL ~ the two of them will eat inside.’

(3) nuduko peini mata idi tamwaleko
glass for eye IMPSL bad
‘prescription glasses’

(4) Li-ovei pe li-e idi.
INC/3:PL:R-know SUB INC/3:PL:R-eat IMPSL
‘They are cannibals.’ (lit. they can eat people)

(5) Li-romo dapa wako ia idi li-madau.
INC/3:PL:R-see 3pl good but IMPSL INC/3:PL:R-fear [sacred masks] ‘They look beautiful, but they are scary.’
(lit. One sees them beautiful, but one is afraid.)
Table 1 – Patterns of pronoun syncretism in the subject pronouns of Vanikoro languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tanema</th>
<th>Lovono</th>
<th>Teanu</th>
<th>Tanema</th>
<th>Lovono</th>
<th>Teanu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>ne-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 2</td>
<td>gi-</td>
<td>nu-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>go-</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>u-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>ki-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du 1EX</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>nuba-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
<td>ba-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC 3</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td>la-</td>
<td>ja-</td>
<td>sa-</td>
<td>la-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl 1EX</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td>nupe-</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>tu-</td>
<td>pe-</td>
<td>pe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC 3</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>lepe-</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>li-</td>
<td>kape-</td>
<td>le-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>se(pe)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The antipassive uses of the Georgian detransitive voice

Hélène Gérardin, INALCO (National Institute of Oriental Studies) – UMR 7192 (Paris)

The aim of this presentation is to demonstrate the existence of an antipassive pattern in modern Georgian and to describe it from both formal and functional points of view. Georgian (a partially ergative language of the South Caucasian family) is usually not considered as having the so-called antipassive derivation (see, for instance, the WALS, where it is placed among the languages without the antipassive). A number of sources mention isolated verbs or constructions [Tuite (2002); Karkashadze & Soselia (2012)], but this phenomenon lacks a thorough analysis. Following a general presentation of the antipassive pattern across languages of the world we intend to discuss in detail the characteristics of the antipassive uses of the Georgian detransitive voice on the basis of first-hand data carried from our fieldworks.

The antipassive is generally defined as a derived detransitivized construction with a two-place predicate in which an indefinite, generic or obvious patient-like argument (P) is either suppressed (left implicit) or realized as an oblique complement (prototypical antipassive) [Polinsky: 2005; see also Say: 2008]. This transformation most often involves a special marker on the verb form. The agent-like argument (A) is often focalized (the derived clause is to be understood in this case as its virtual property) and can either behave in the same manner as in the transitive clause or more often be treated as the single argument of intransitive verbs (S).

This is particularly relevant in ergative systems, where S=P≠A. (1) illustrates this derivation. Even though the antipassive occurs primarily in ergative systems, it is not restricted to them. All typical features of the antipassive in Georgian are found in (2), where the transitive verb čičənna ‘to dig’ appears in the detransitive voice (derivable by means of the circumfix i-eb from almost all transitive verbs). According to our corpus, P can be expressed only with verbs of vision and verbs meaning ‘to dig’ and ‘to snoop’ whereas in most cases, it is not overtly expressed and receives a generic interpretation.

As shown in (3), the detransitive voice has several functions one of which is clearly antipassive. Because of the lack of a dedicated marker, this structure did not come to be productive and is restricted to some verbs: verbs of vision (‘to look’), verbs of aggression (‘to bite’, ‘to curse’), and verbs of searching (‘to dig, to snoop’). This is certainly the reason for linguists not to consider these uses as real cases of the antipassive. In fact, interesting parallels to the Georgian construction are found in some other languages. For example, there are obvious typological parallels with Russian desobjective verbs like kusat’-sja ‘to bite’ or kopat’-sja ‘to dig’, where -sja is a suffix with reflexive or passive uses. Finally we will present how some uses have been reanalyzed, particularly with the say-like verbs. In such sentences as (4), the antipassive loses its initial transitivity-decreasing function and takes a specific semantic value. As shown by Say (2008), one of the ways in which the antipassive pattern may disappear is through lexicalization. Thus we can hypothesize that the Georgian antipassive has initiated a process of deterioration by lexicalization.

Examples

Chukchi

(1)

| a. ʔaaček-a | kimit?-øn | ne-nl?etet-øn |
| youth-ERG | load-ABS | 3PL.SUBJ-carry-AOR.3SG.OBJ |

‘The young men carried away the/a load.’ (transitive)

| b. ʔaaček-øt | ine-nl?etet-gø-e-t | kimit?-ø |
| youth-ERG | 3PL.SUBJ-carry-AOR.3SG.OBJ |
youth-ABS  ANTIP-carry-AOR-3SG.SUBJ-PL  load-INST

‘The young men carried away the/a load.’ (antipassive) (Kozinsky & al. 1988: 652), see the WALS

Georgian (first hand data)

(2) a. glex-i  mic’a-s  čičkn-i-s
    peasant-NOM  ground-DAT  dig-TRANS-3SG

‘The peasant is digging the ground’ (transitive)

b. glex-i  mic’a-ši  i-čičkn-eb-a
    peasant-NOM  ground-IN  DETR-dig-DETR-3SG

‘The peasant is digging in the ground.’ (antipassive)

(3) a. k’ac-i  pul-s  xarž-av-s
    man-NOM  money-DAT  spend-TRANS-3SG

‘The man spends money.’ (transitive)

b. i-xarž-eb-a
    DETR-spend-  DETR-3SG

‘[The money] is spent.’ (passive/decausative)

‘[The man] is ruining himself (by spending too much money).’ (antipassive)

(4) a. zog-i  mecnier-i  amt’k’ic-eb-s,  rom...
    some-NOM  scientist-NOM  affirm-TRANS-3SG  COMPL

‘Some scientists affirm that… [and I do not express my personal opinion about the said fact.]’ (transitive)

b. zog-i  mecnier-i  i-mt’k’ic-eb-a,  rom...
    some-NOM  scientist-NOM  DETR-affirm-DETR-3SG  COMPL

‘Some scientists affirm that… [and I do not agree with them].’ (antipassive)
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Allative-future syncretism and beyond in Malayic

David Gil (MPI Leipzig) & Eitan Grossman (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

An allative future, as a comparative concept intended for cross-linguistic comparison, is defined as any future tense that is grammaticalized from an allative source construction, and in which the element that marks the future also synchronically marks at least some typical allative meanings, especially spatial destination or purpose (Grossman & Polis 2014+). Especially interesting are languages in which the allative future does not involve a verb of motion, but rather a verbless allative construction or marker, e.g., Ancient Egyptian, Mauritian Creole, and Tigré.

Such allative futures are especially prominent in some Malayic languages, including Padang Minangkabau, Tapus Minangkabau, Tapan, Besemah (all spoken in Western Sumatra), as well as in Standard Indonesian. Examples from Padang Minangkabau are provided in (1-3). Other Malayic languages that do not have this construction include Kuala Lumpur Malay, Riau Indonesian, Jakarta Indonesian, and Papuan Malay (koinés), Muara Sipongi, Bangkinang, Siak Malay, Jambi Malay, and Pulau Tengah Kerinci (local dialects of Sumatra), and Balai Berkuak Malay (a local dialect of Borneo).

For the most part, in the languages with allative futures, the future tenses are fully grammaticalized, according to most diagnostics: they occur with all persons, as well as with inanimate and immobile subjects; they also occur with predicates whose semantics entail movement, static location, stativity, or which preclude agentive subjects. They occur in subordinate clauses, in negative contexts, and in passive clauses.

Even more interesting than the allative/future syncretism is the polyfunctionality of the allative/future marker. In each of the Malayic languages with future/allative syncretism, the marker in question has additional and arguably related functions; however the pattern formed by these additional syncretisms are different in each of the respective languages. These are summarized in Table 1.

This paper will provide a description of the range of functions associated with the allative/future markers in these Malayic varieties, based on original fieldwork by Gil, focusing on the relationship between the allative/future marker and the causative/applicative function.

Examples

Minangkabau (Malayic)

(1) *bisuak datanglah ka rumah den*  
    tomorrow come:IMP to house 1SG  
    “Tomorrow, come to my house” (Crouch 2009)

(2) *aden ka jadi marapulai*  
    1SG to become bridegroom  
    “I’m going to be a bridegroom” (Crouch 2009)

(3) *awak ka diberangan dek anak akak*  
    1SG to PASS-angry-APP CAUSE mum  
    “I’m going to be scolded by mum” (Crouch 2009)
Table 1: Patterns of Polyfunctionality of the Allative/Future Marker

(Key: ORD=ordinal numeral, PASS=passive, CAUS=causative, APPL=applicative, (proximate) DEM=(proximate) demonstrative, ALL=allative, FUT=future.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>ORD</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>CAUS</th>
<th>APPL</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>FUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Padang Minangkabau</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapan</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besemah</td>
<td>kə</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besemah</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapus Minangkabau</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapus Minangkabau</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapus Minangkabau</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indonesian</td>
<td>(a)ka</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References

Crouch, Sophie Elizabeth. 2009. Voice and verb morphology in Minangkabau, a language of West Sumatra, Indonesia, unpublished MA, University of Western Australia.

Nivkh (Paleosiberian) is a polysynthetic verb-final language that makes extensive use of clause combining. Clausal nominalization is the only Nivkh complementation strategy, in terms of (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2006). Nominalization scopes over the entire clause and allows it to function as an (object) argument of a matrix predicate. As a result, the complement clause is reanalyzed as a nominal constituent of a matrix clause, cf. (1) and (2).

A nominalized verb form that continues to function as a head of a complement clause is not fully deverbalized and maintains some verbal categories, including tense-aspect marking. It synthesizes with the matrix predicate, triggering the consonant alternation, which serves in Nivkh as a marker of morphosyntactic units (Mattissen 2003).

On the basis of Nivkh data, the paper examines the patterns of lexical and clausal nominalizations, cf. (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, Beck 2000, Comrie & Thompson 2007, Genetti 2011), together with morphological and syntactic aspects of deverbalization and substantivization, cf. (Malchukov 2004), the polyfunctionality of the nominalization marker and the semantic features of complement-taking predicates, cf. (Cristofaro 2003, Noonan 2007). Furthermore, the paper compares the structural similarities and differences both between nominalized and matrix clauses and between same-subject, cf. (1), and different-subject, cf. (2), complement constructions, cf. (Nedjalkov & Otaina 2013).

**Examples**

Nivkh

(1) Ñi k‘e+aj-d+ajm-d.
   I fishnet+{make-IND}:NML+know-IND
   ‘I know [how] to make a fishnet.’

(2) Jaŋ urguř p‘-ət k mu+aj-d+ñř-d.
   s/he well REFL-father boat+{make-IND}:NML+look.at-IND
   ‘He looks attentively [how] his father makes a boat.’
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When the trees cut the man: Verb agreement in Cuwabo relative clauses (Bantu, P34)

Rozenn Guérois, Dynamique du Langage, Université Lyon 2

This paper gives an overview of the morphology and syntax of relative clause constructions in Cuwabo, an understudied P34 Bantu language spoken in north-eastern Mozambique. While most Bantu languages make use of relative markers, usually derived from demonstrative or possessive pronouns, first-hand data collected over 10 months fieldwork show that Cuwabo does not have any morphological marker to indicate relativity. Rather, the language uses specific verb forms which formally correspond to the conjoint tenses forms, i.e. a set of “basic conjugations” (van der Wal 2010) which, with the disjoint tenses, are often associated with focal information (Creissels 1996).

Another feature of Cuwabo (non-subject) relatives, which is even more peculiar among Bantu languages (Nsuka Nkutsi 1982, Henderson 2007), is that, while the logical subject only appears post-verbally, the subject marker on the relativized verb always agrees with the antecedent element, i.e. the head noun. This results in constructions such as ‘the trees are cutting the man’ to express the object relative ‘the trees that the man is cutting’, as illustrated in (1).

After presenting the formal connection between relativization and the conjoint/disjoint system in Cuwabo, I examine in detail the question of agreement in the relative constructions and try to put them in perspective with other Bantu languages. We will pay particular attention to the non-subject relatives whose logical subject can, in a pronominal form, be cliticized to the verb, forming a particular paradigm. In this respect, it will be interesting to confront this morphosyntactic construction with Makhuwa’s (P31), a neighbouring language spoken in northern Mozambique, which also makes use of enclitics in such a context, whose derivation from possessive pronouns is clearly established (van der Wal 2010).

Example

Cuwabo
(1) mírí [dhingwádda múlóbwana]REL
    mírí dhi-Ø-ni-gwádda múlóbwana
    4.tree SM4-PRS-IPFV.CJ-cut 1.man
‘the trees that the man is cutting’ (author’s first-hand data)
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Clause-linking strategies expressing cause, reason and adversative relations in Yaqui

Lilián Guerrero, IIFL-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Valeria A. Belloro, FLL-Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro

Since sentential adjuncts do not fill an obligatory slot of a superordinate clause, there is no strong evidence to argue that adverbial sentences are syntactically dependent. As a result, the study of adverbial subordination used to focus on the semantic properties of the adverbial unit, and the form and function of the subordinators (Thompson & Longacre 1985; Thompson et al 2007). Yet, some recent studies have included syntactic features into the analysis (Cristofaro 2003). Semantically, purpose, reason and causal relations are grouped together since they portray the same semantic association between the events: one event provides the intention, explanation, motivation or result of what is described by the other event (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2009). It is not surprising then to find structural overlaps between purpose, reason and/or cause across-languages (Givón 2001; Cristofaro 2003; Schmidtke-Bode 2009).

A previous study on Yaqui (Uto-Aztecan, Mexico) showed that causal and reason adverbial clauses (1) differ in a number of structural features with respect to purpose clauses (2), e.g., the position of the adverbial unit, the selection of the clause linkage marker, (non-)dependency on TAM, negation and illocutionary force, argument coding and argument sharing. It was claimed, then, that cause/reason and purpose clauses represent two different clause-linkages: whereas purpose makes use of the tightest structures for adverbials (i.e. subordinated), causal and reason relations are expressed by a single and less tight structure (i.e., non-subordinated).

As one step further, the present study compares the syntax and pragmatic features of causal and reason clauses with respect to adversative clauses, a type of coordinated construction (Hauselmann 2007). Based on first-hand data and oral narratives, it is shown that causal and reason construction show the same degree of syntactic and pragmatic autonomy than adversative clauses in (3). Syntactically, the two construction types show a variable order between the main and linked units, initial connectors and nominative subjects, i.e., the two units are syntactically independent of each other. Pragmatically, the two linkages avoid argument sharing and, instead, prefer to express asserted information by introducing new referents and new/unexpected events into discourse, i.e., they are pragmatically autonomous (Chafe 1984; Lambrecht 1994).

Yaqui
(1) a. Inepo enchi ubba-k [kiali’ikan empo aa yeu=siime]
   1SG.NOM 2SG.ACC bath-PFV CLM 2SG.NOM able out=go.SG.PRS
   ‘I bathed you, so you are able to leave.’
   b. ¡Ttampareo-ta yaati-tua-’e! [bwe’ituk kompae-Ø a’abo weye-k]
   drummer-ACC play-cause-IMP CLM compadre-NOM here walk.SG-PFV
   ‘Stop the drummer because my compadre is coming.’ (Buitimea; dream: 155)

(2) Ne in chiva-mi batwe-po to’osiika [am, ji-bwa e-betchi’ibo]
   1SG.NOM 1SG.GEN goat-PL river-LOC leave.SG.PFV 2PL.ACC something-eat-CLM
   ‘I left my goats close to the river in order for them to eat something.’ (Buitimea; Kamam:145)

(3) Kea ba’am jiba itepo ili je’e-n
   just water always 1PL.NOM little drink-PASTC
   bweta inepo jaibu che’a yantela-n
   CLM 1SG.NOM already more be.calm-PSTC
   ‘We drank just a little bit of water but I was calm.’ (Guerrero; Lalo 368-9)
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The decay of ergativity in Tacana (Tacanan family, Amazonian Bolivia)

Antoine Guillaume, Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, CNRS & Université Lyon 2

Tacana is a very endangered and poorly studied language of the small Tacanan family (together with Araona, Cavineña, Ese Ejjja and Reyesano) spoken in the Amazonian lowlands of northern Bolivia, at the foot of the Andes.

Like Araona, Cavineña and Ese Ejja, Tacana has an ergative case-marking system. NPs in A function are (normally) marked by a special enclitic postposition =ja [ha], as in (1a), as opposed to NPs in S/O functions which are left unmarked, as (1b) and (1a), respectively. Pronominalized arguments are marked by two distinct series of ergative versus default pronouns.

However, unlike what happens in Araona, Cavineña and Ese Ejja, the ergative case-marking system of Tacana is ‘defective’ in several respects. First, for (at least) certain speakers, the ergative enclitic postposition is not always obligatory on A NPs, as in (1a’). Secondly, for all speakers, ergative pronouns are only available in the singular (not in the dual and in the plural). And thirdly, for all speakers, singular arguments in A function are not always pronominalized with ergative pronouns.

In this paper, I will present comparative evidence that the peculiarities of the Tacana case-marking system illustrate the progressive loss of an ergative system that used to be more rigid originally, as is still the case in Araona (Emkow 2006), Cavineña (Guillaume 2010) and Ese Ejja (Vuillermet 2012). And I will argue that it is on its way to be completely lost, as has already happened in Reyesano (Guillaume 2009), the Tacanan language that is the closest to Tacana, in terms of geographic and genetic proximity (Girard 1971) and vitality status.

Secondly, I will explore different factors, contexts and forces that might have contributed to the present loss of ergative properties in Tacana (and Reyesano). In doing so, I will suggest that this phenomenon is the result of the combination of different types of motivations, both language internal (morpho-phonology and grammaticalization) and language external (language obsolescence and contact with strictly head-marking languages).

The data used in this study comes from my own fieldwork conducted in the village of Tumupasa since 2009. It consists of a corpus of oral texts supplemented by sentences elicited in more controlled settings.

Examples

Tacana

(1) A O V
a. Tataedhi=ja pa bakwa tidhi-ta-itia.
   grandfather=ERG REP viper step_on-A3-PAST
   'Grandfather stepped on the viper.'

   S OBL V
b. Tataedhi da kwadhata=su sewita-itia.
   grandfather TOP river_cliff=LOC slip-PAST
   'Grandfather slipped on the river cliff.'

(1a’) A O V
Tataedhi pa bakwa tidhi-ta-itia.
   grandfather REP viper step_on-A3-PAST
   'Grandfather stepped on the viper.'
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The syntax-phonology interface is illustrated by some languages, in which syntactic structures are directly accessible to phonological phenomena, including tones. Thus, in the noun-phrases of several dialects of Dogon (Heath & McPherson 2013), inherent lexical tones are overridden by syntactically conditioned replacive tones. The inherent tonal contours H(igh)L(ow) of kúrú "stone" and LHL of rsê: "village" remain unchanged with an "all" quantifier, as in examples (1)a and (1)b. But when the noun is followed by an adjective, as in (1)a', or preceded by a possessor, as in (1)b', these contours are overridden, respectively, by an LL and a HLH overlays, whose type depends on the position of the controller, before or after the controlled element. On the other hand, in Dogon languages, such elements as topic markers meaning “only” and “even”, as well as nonsingular numerals and the independent plural particle, just like “all” quantifiers, do not impose any replacive tone to the adjacent element in the sentence. Since these four unit types do not restrict reference, unlike adjectives and possessors, whose behavior is shared by demonstratives and internally headed relative clauses, we may conclude that the latter’s effect on the adjacent words’ tonal contour is the phonological manifestation of their status of reference restrictors. Thus, Dogon stresses the syntactic-semantic status of reference restrictors by a dedicated (tonal) mark.

Kpelle (Mande, Manessy 1964) exhibits a (fairly rare) alternation between two consonant sets, one of which has a preceding low tone. There are, among others, five alternation types: p ~ b , B (= preglottalized voiced bilabial consonant) ~ \`m, s~ \`z, k~ \`g and f~ \`v . In (2)a.2, we see that the second type L(ow) T(one) C(onsonant) is used as a mark of the definite article (a deictic particle -i being also suffixed to the noun); the first type LTC has the same usage (cf. (2)a.1), but it also appears as a mark of a predicative adjective (cf. (2)c); the third type LTC, when affecting a quantity word, refers to the totality from which this quantity is extracted (cf. (2)b); the fourth and fifth types LTCs mark, in the 3SG, the subject of the well-known four predicative auxiliaries of the Mande languages, two of which appear here, i.e. positive progressive ká in (2)d and negative perfective fé in (2)d’. Thus, in Kpelle, interestingly, the same phonological process applies to two distinct syntactic structures. The fact that at least one language presents, through this phonology-syntax interface, an identical tonal contour is the phonological manifestation of their status of reference restrictors. Thus verbs and nouns are morphologically treated in the same way (here by tones) in terms of dependency, i.e. when both function as centers and when both function as dependents. This means that phonology can reflect and stress essential syntactic homologies.

However, besides these cases of strict tonology-syntax correspondence, there is another case in which phonological phenomena are totally independent of syntax, namely clitics. In Mukri (Central Kurdish, Öpengin 2013), (4) shows that clitic placement does not take into account at all the link between agent pronoun and verb (cf. a.) (even less so when the same
clitic, in addition to the agent, also marks, by syncretism, the possessor, as in d.), nor the link between a preposition and its complement (cf. b.-c.).

In conclusion, the correspondence between phonology and syntax (itself semantics-driven) is illustrated by striking tonal phenomena such as those exhibited by certain African languages. But such phenomena are relatively rare among languages. Moreover, clitics constitute a remarkable counterexample to this correspondence. This suggests that meaning in languages tends to be dominated by form. Human languages transmit meanings, but when there is a conflict with form, it is the latter which overrides the former.

Examples

(1) Ben Tey (Dogon (Niger-Congo), Mali, Heath & McPherson 2013: 269-275)

a. kúrù dàwòy (stone all) “all (the) stones”

a’. kùrù `g ú (s tone. PROX.INAN) “this stone”

b. rsê: dàwòy (village all) “all (the) villages”

b’. yâ-m ìsê: (woman-AN.SG village) “a woman’s village”.

(2) Kpelle (Mande (Niger-Congo), Liberia, Manessy 1964 : 120-121)

a.1. pæ`Ñr æ « house » ~`bæ Ñrai “the house”; 2. Bála « sheep » ~ `m ´álai “the sheep”

b. nũu sàa B a (man three) « three men » ~ `zàaB a “three of them”

c. nũu pO´lO (O = open mid-back vowel) (man old) “an old man” ~ `b O´l Oi “(s)he is old”

d. dì ká pár (3PL POS.PRG come) “they are coming” ~ `gá pár (3SG.SBJ.POS.PRG come) “(s)he is coming”

d’. dì fë páni (3PL.NEG.PRF come) “they didn’t come” ~ `vé páni (3SG.SUBJ.NEG.PRF come)“(s)he didn’t come”.

(3) Kiyaka (Bantoid (Niger-Congo), Congo Democratic Republic, Van den Eynde & Kyota 1984: 68-70)

a. bà-tàtată bà-na bà-vuumbuk-íd (1.CL.PL-father 1.CL.PL-DEM 1.CL.PL-stand.up-REC.PST) “these fathers stood up”

a’. tù-à-vùúmbùk-rdr ha-tháángi (1PL-NON.REC-stand.up-PST 16.CL-bed) “we stood up from bed”

b. biímá byá-bá-táata (DEM(1.CL.PL) of(1CL.PL)-1.CL.PL-father) “these are properties of fathers”

b’. betu tu-a-vúúmbük-íd (1PL 1PL.-NON.REC-stand.up.REL-PST 16.CL-bed leave-PAST “we who stood up from bed, we left”.
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a. xezīne-ī pādšā=yān tālān kird-bū (treasure-CONNECT king=3PL.AGT plundering do.PST-PFCT.COP) “they had plundered the king’s treasure”

b. bo=m gērā-ī-y-yewe (to-1SG.AGT narrate.PST-LIG-2SG.ATTR-PFCT) “I narrated (it) to you”

c. birā-le sē pirsyār=t lē de-ke-m (brother-VOC three question-2SG from INDIC-do.PRST-1SG)

“brother, I’ll ask you three questions”

d. ser-yān we der de-hēnā (head-3PL.A~POSS towards out INDIC-bring.PST) “they took their heads out”.
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Two AND-conjunctions in Mauritian Creole

Shrita Hassamal

Languages of the world divide into two categories: AND-languages and WITH-languages (Stassen 2000). The first category of languages uses different markers for nominal coordination and comitative coordination. For example, English and French use ‘and’ and ‘et’ respectively for nominal coordination and they use ‘with’ and ‘avec’ for comitative coordination. WITH-languages on the other hand, use the same prepositional marker for both types of coordination.

According to some studies done on coordination in creole languages, creoles are often presented as being WITH-languages unlike their superstrata. Kihm (1994) shows that Kriyol, a Portuguese-based creole is not an AND-language like Portuguese. Also, Kriegel and Michaelis (2007), in a diachronic study of Mauritian Creole, show that it started as a WITH-language, unlike French.

Mauritian creole has in fact two forms for the AND-conjunction – e and ek. The first one comes from the French et ‘and’ while ek comes from the French preposition avec ‘with’. I shall show that ek has been reanalysed and has become a true conjunction in Mauritian Creole and that it is similar to e in its syntactic distribution. However, this conjunction has a semantic specialization, which distinguishes it from e.

E in Mauritian Creole is a conjunction which can coordinate all types of phrases – nominal (1), verbal, adjectival, prepositional as well as clauses (2). This conjunction also appears in correlative coordination constructions (3).

Adding to its prepositional use, ek can also be a proper coordinating conjunction. As a preposition, ek can only introduce a nominal phrase and can be replaced by avec ‘with’. However, ek as a conjunction can coordinate all the other categories, including prepositional phrases and cannot be replaced by the preposition avec. Following the reanalysis of ek, the conjunction has preserved a group meaning (MacNally 1993) due to its prepositional origin (6). Thus, constructions like (7) with a distributive meaning are awkward with ek. The use of the conjunction e is thus preferred, as it is more general: it is compatible with propositional readings as well as non-propositional readings.

This semantic specialization is sometimes thwarted with an opposite sociolinguistic tendency to use ek instead of e to distinguish creole from French and has extended to the coordination of other categories as well, particularly to clauses and adjectival phrases. The use of ek infers a simultaneity interpretation – thus with this conjunction, the coordinated events happen at the same time (8). Thus in (8), the two events – the barking of the dogs and the children playing, happen at the same time, in (9), there is a follow up of the two events, which makes the sentence sounds odd with ek. E is preferred. For adjectives, the meaning can also be different. While we tend to interpret that each flag is two-coloured in (10), e can be used in cases where there are red flags and blue flags (11). This semantic specialization also accounts for the impossibility of correlative coordination with ek (12), since this construction imposes a distributive reading (Mouret 2007). It can also explain the impossibility of elliptical coordination: gapping (13) or stripping (14), since they involve two propositions.

There are thus two and-conjunctions in Mauritian Creole – e and ek. E can be boolean (\(\wedge\)) or not, while ek only has non boolean interpretations (\(\oplus\)). This evolution from a preposition to a coordinating conjunction with a group reading, has rarely been seen, to the best of our knowledge. For example, in Reunion Creole, ek is limited to noun phrases and has thus remained a preposition.
References

Benjamins. KRIEGEL, Sybille and MICHAELIS, Susanne (2007). “Conjunction and
ditransitives: Some functional domains covered by avec, et and ensemble.” The making of
Mauritian Creole - Analyses diachroniques à partir des textes anciens. Baker, P et Fon Sing,
G (ed.) Battlebridge Publications, p.113-132
MCNALLY, Louise. 1993. Comitative Coordination: A Case Study in Group Formation. NLLT,
11, 347-379. MOURET, François (2007) Grammaire des constructions coordonnées,
PhD, Université Paris 7

Examples:

(1) Jean e Marie ena lizie ble
   ‘John and Mary have blue eyes’
(2) Seo inn tombe e dilô inn fann partou
   ‘The bucket fell and water was spilt everywhere’
(3) Paul pou aprann e angle e franse
   ‘Paul will study both English and French’
(4) Mo pe manz ek / avek enn fourset
   ‘I am eating with a fork’
(5) Mo pe al lamer ar Paul ek / *avek ar Marie
   ‘I am going to the beach with Paul and with Mary’
(6) Jean e/ ek Marie form enn zoli coup.
   ‘John and Mary are a nice couple’
(7) Jean e/ # ek Marie ena lizie ble.
   ‘John and Mary have blue eyes’
(8) Bann lisien inn zape ek bann zenfan inn zve
   ‘The dogs were barking and the children were playing’
(9) # Seo inn tombe ek dilô inn fann partou
   ‘The bucket fell and water was spilt everywhere’
(10) Sa bann drapo la rouz ek ble
    ‘These flags are red and blue’ (two-coloured) (11)
    Sa bann drapo la rouz e ble
    ‘These flag are red and blue’ (there can be both red flags and blue flags) (12)
    *Paul pou aprann ek angle ek franse
    ‘Paul will study both English and French’
(13) Marie manz pom e/ *ek Paul banann
    ‘Marie eats apples and Paul bananas’
(14) Zan inn e al lekol. e / *ek Marie ozi.
    ‘Jean has gone to school and Mary too’
Inverse and antipassive in Movima relative clauses

Katharina Haude, CNRS (SeDyL/CELIA)

In transitive clauses in Movima (isolate, lowland Bolivia), the formal distinction between the two core arguments is not based on semantic roles, but on the relative hierarchical status of the referents with respect to person and, arguably, animacy and topicality. The first postverbal argument, called “proximate” by Haude (2009), refers to the higher-ranking, the second, so-called “obviative” argument to the lower-ranking event participant. Semantic roles are indicated through direct (1) and inverse (2) marking on the predicate.

The “obviative” argument is syntactically privileged, having the same formal and behavioural properties as the single argument of an intransitive clause. In particular, only this argument can be relativized, and direct (3) or inverse (4) marking on the predicate indicate its semantic role as either patient or agent, respectively.

In this way, inverse marking clearly has a voice function (as indicated by the passive paraphrase): it is chosen so that the obviative argument can always be the head of the relative clause, independently of its semantic role.

However, there is also an additional, derived antipassive voice, based on the direct construction. Here, a valency-decreasing particle (kwey) is inserted, and the direct-marked verb becomes intransitive – it takes no cliticized (proximate) argument, and the former obviative argument is optional and marked as oblique (5). When comparing (5) with (4), it appears that both have largely the same propositional content; although the antipassive allows the omission of the patient, the patient is often expressed. Therefore, the question is why the kwey-construction is needed, and to what extent it competes with the inverse.

The existence of the valency-decreasing construction shows that animacy, in particular the opposition between humans and inanimate entities, does indeed play a central role in the choice of the direct and inverse construction in Movima. While the direct construction is applied quite flexibly, the inverse is never used when the patient is inanimate: here, invariably the antipassive is chosen. Therefore, the existence of the antipassive is due to the importance of animacy in Movima grammar, and from this basis, the antipassive has spread to areas where this factor is less obvious.

With examples from a DOBES corpus of spoken Movima discourse, this talk will show how intimately an inverse system can be linked with grammatical relations and how, in turn, structural patterns can be influenced by the factor animacy.

Examples

Movima direct main clause
(1) vel-na=us
look.after-DIRECT=3M.AB
‘He looked after the ox.’

Movima inverse main clause
(2) vel-kaya=i
look.after-INVERSE=3PL
‘The authority looked after them (i.e. “They [the people] were looked after by the authority.”)’

Movima direct relative clause
(3) is we:ye di’ vel-na=us
ART.PL ox REL look.after-DIRECT=3M.AB
‘the ox that he looked after’
Movima inverse relative clause
(4) \textit{us eno:na di’ vel-kaya=i}
\begin{align*}
\text{ART.M} & \quad \text{authority} & \quad \text{REL} & \quad \text{look.after-}\text{INVERSE}=\text{3PL} \\
\text{‘the authority who looked after them (i.e. “the authority by whom they were looked after”)’}
\end{align*}

Movima antipassive
(5) \textit{us eno:na di’ kwey vel-na (n-isko)}
\begin{align*}
\text{ART.M} & \quad \text{authority} & \quad \text{REL} & \quad \text{VALDECR} & \quad \text{look.after-}\text{DIRECT} & \quad \text{OBL-}\text{PRO.3PL} \\
\text{‘the authority who looked after (them)’}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Abbreviations}
\begin{itemize}
\item 3=\text{3rd} person; AB=absential; ART=article; M=masculine; PL=plural; REL=relativizer; OBL=oblique; PRO=free pronoun; VALDECR=valency decrease
\end{itemize}

\textbf{References}
Referential continuity in Hoocąk (Siouan) discourse – a corpus study

Johannes Helmbrecht (University of Regensburg, Germany)

Referential continuity (or topic continuity; cf. Givón 1983) is a functional domain that contributes among others to the cohesion of natural language texts. The basic task of speakers/ hearers associated with this domain is the introduction, maintenance, and resumption of referents (discourse topics) in texts. To this end, different languages grammaticalized different so-called “reference-tracking devices” such as gender agreement, voice distinctions (active-passive/antipassive), switch-reference, and fourth person/obviation systems (cf. Comrie 1998; Van Valin & LaPolla 1997 among others). Pragmatically controlled ways of topic continuity can be found in so-called “topic prominent” languages, or simply “pragmatic languages” (cf. e.g. Huang 2000) such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean and others. From a typological point of view the question arises how speakers guarantee referential continuity in a language that has neither one of the above mentioned grammatical devices, nor is a Chinese-style topic prominent language.

Hoocąk is such a language. Hoocąk is a Siouan language of Wisconsin still spoken by less than 200 tribal members. Hoocąk is a head-marking language of the active/inactive type obligatorily indexing actor (A) and undergoer (U) (if present) pronominally on the verb. Much of the semantic information of a clause is coded in the complex morphology of the verb. It is the goal of the proposed paper to show how speakers of Hoocąk create referential cohesion in texts, i.e. how new referents are introduced into discourse, how they are maintained, if they are salient enough, and how they are resumed, if there is a break in the topic chain. The major grammatical device to maintain referential continuity is the person indexing system of the A and the U in the Hoocąk clause. However, in order to introduce new salient or less salient referents, other types of referential expressions such as emphatic pronouns, demonstratives + NP, definite NPs, referential/nominalized clauses, and proper names as well as specific syntactic constructions are used. These are selected according to the degrees of accessibility (cf. Ariel 1990) the speaker presumes that the discourse referents have in a specific context or at a specific point of discourse. In addition, it will be shown that the choice of these referential expression types interacts with other parameters such as the degree of animacy of the referents, the degree of individuation, as well as the semantics of the verbal predicate. The study is preliminary. It is based on textual data that were collected within the DOBES project “Documentation of the Hoocąk Language” (2003-2008) and that are accessible digitally in The Language Archive (TLA) at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen.
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Welsh “syntactic mutation” and Arabic “faulty accusative”: case or configuration?

Steve Hewitt, UNESCO

Both Welsh and Arabic have special marking for indefinite objects, soft mutation (lenition) of, for instance, t to d in Welsh, and indefinite accusative case-marking –an in Arabic (1). Welsh syntactic mutation (direct-object mutation) has been the object of considerable debate among theoretical linguists over the past 30 years, Lieber, Zwicky and Roberts having adopted a case-based approach, but Harlow, King, Borsley, and Talerman preferring a configurational approach (XP Trigger Hypothesis). When an active subject is suppressed/retired ($), there is no marking of the entity that was the direct object in the active sentence (2) (no mutation in Welsh, nominative instead of accusative in Arabic). When an adverbial phrase is added after the subject of the passive, there is no change (3a), but when it is inserted in between the verb and the subject of the passive, that NP has “syntactic mutation” in Welsh, and sometimes, if erroneously, “faulty accusative” in Arabic (3b):

Welsh “syntactic mutation” (ex. t > d)   Arabic (indefinite) accusative (-an)

1. gwelodd Mair dŷ saw® Mary house (tŷ) ra’at miryam bait.an saw’f Mary house.ACC.IDF

   ‘Mary saw a house.’

2. gwelwyd tŷ was.seen®$ house ru’iya bait.un was.seen®M$ house.NOM.IDF(M)

   ‘A house was seen.’

3a. gwelwyd tŷ ar y bryn was.seen®$ house on the hill ru’iya bait.un ‘alâ t-tall was.seen®M$ house.NOM on the-hill

3b. gwelwyd ar y bryn dŷ was.seen®$ on the hill house ru’iya ‘alâ t-tall bait.an (faulty acc.) was.seen®M$ on the-hill house.ACC!IDF

   ‘A house was seen on the hill.’

It thus looks as if a single configurational HEAD-[TRIGGER]-DEPENDENT rule would account for both syntactic mutation in Welsh and indefinite accusative in Arabic (both for correct and for “faulty” accusative): whenever some XP – NP, AdvP etc. – is inserted between a verbal head and its bare (without definite article) dependent, the dependent is marked with lenition in Welsh and accusative indefinite in Arabic. Every single example of faulty accusative in Arabic would have syntactic mutation (lenition) in Welsh.

Yishai Peled, who is unaware of the Welsh evidence and debates, in his 2004 article ―Accusatival subjects in Arabic non-transitive constructions and the unaccusative hypothesis‖ gives numerous examples of “faulty accusative” in both Middle Arabic and Modern Arabic analysed as being the result of unaccusative effects (intransitive unaccusative subjects having object-like properties). For most of his examples, a configurational HEAD-[TRIGGER]-DEPENDENT rule would work just as well, but for a number of them, especially from Middle Arabic and Biblical Hebrew, there is no element inserted between head and dependent, so an unaccusative explanation is more plausible. This prompts the speculation that “faulty accusative” in Arabic may have evolved from a semantic (case-based) rule to a simpler, configurational HEAD-[TRIGGER]-DEPENDENT rule.

If such an evolution was possible for Arabic, it could provide a clue to the genesis and evolution of “syntactic mutation” in Welsh, which begins to appear, at first sporadically and then increasingly consistently, in the Middle Welsh period, To begin with, any immediately post-verbal NP may show lenition, whether subject or object. With the introduction of the T-2 (tense-second) constraint (Willis 1998), the most likely candidates for fronting are subjects of transitive verbs and
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unergative intransitives, leaving direct objects and subjects of unaccusative intransitives as the most common post-verbal NPs. Lenition would then become associated with direct objects or subject NPs having object-like properties (unaccusative subjects). The association with objects or pseudo-objects might then have been reanalysed into a configurational HEAD-[TRIGGER]-DEPENDENT rule, on the analogy of V-S-O, giving the rule that best accounts for all instance of “syntactic mutation” in Modern Welsh.
Varieties of unagreement and the impact of contact

Georg Höhn (University of Cambridge)

Unagreement There is a proper subset of null subject languages (NSLs) in which a definite plural subject and certain quantified phrases can be combined with all three (plural) person forms of the verb. This phenomenon, sometimes referred to as unagreement (Hurtado 1985, Ackema & Neeleman 2013), is attested, e.g., in Spanish, Greek and Bulgarian, cf. (1), while other NSLs, such as Italian and European Portuguese, only allow third person agreement in the corresponding cases, cf. (2).

(1) Oi mathites ex-oume/-ete/-oun poli diavasma.
    the pupil.NOM.PL have-1/2/3PL much study
    'We/you/the pupils have to study a lot.' [Greek]

(2) Gli studenti lavor-*iamo/*ate/-ano molto.
    DET.PL students work.1/2/3PL much
    only: 'The students work much.' [Italian]

This talk presents a further distinction within the class of unagreement languages in terms of the scope of the person feature and a related contact phenomenon.

Low scope interpretation of person In Greek and Spanish it is possible, in an appropriate context, to find structures like (3). The sets of participants in the events described in the two clauses are conceived of as mutually exclusive due to the use of an indefinite quantified phrase as one subject and the others as the second one. Nevertheless, both verbs may carry first plural marking. Under the assumption that first person presupposes that the author of the utterance is a member of the denotation of the subject (cf. eg. Heim 2008), one might expect that this configuration should be infelicitous because it would impose the impossible requirement that the author simultaneously be among the pupils going to the theatre as well as among those going to the cinema. The fact that these structures are nevertheless possible suggests that in Greek-type languages the presupposition introduced by first person can have low scope over the restrictor of the quantifiers only, to the exclusion of the scope domain of the quantifier. In other words, the author has to be a pupil, but there is no commitment as to which activity she will participate in (notice the crucial role future tense plays in licensing this reading).

(3) Tha pa-me pente mathites sto theatro kai oi ypoloipoi tha pa-me sto sinema.
    FUT go-1PL five pupils in.the theatre and DET others FUT go-1PL to.the cinema
    'Five of us pupils will go to the theatre and the others of us will go to the movies.' [Greek]

Only high scope interpretation of person In Bulgarian, on the other hand, the person clash in these constructions is fatal, i.e. (4) is indeed infelicitous, reportedly because it would require that the author be a student going to the theatre and the cinema simultaneously. Hence, it seems that the first person condition necessarily applies to the scope domain of the quantifier as well, i.e. the low scope reading saving the structure in Greek is missing in Bulgarian.

(4) # Pet studenti shte otid-em na teatar i drugi-te shte otid-em na kino.
    five students FUT go-1PL to theatre and others- DET FUT go-1PL to cinema
    int.: 'Five of us students will go to the theatre and the others of us will go to the movies.' [Bulgarian]
**Language contact** Pomak as spoken in Western Thrace is a South Slavic language (or a set of varieties) and part of the Bulgarian dialectal continuum with influences from Greek and Turkish. In spite of its close genetic relationship to standard Bulgarian, however, it contrasts minimally with it in the availability of (5). This is quite plausibly a result of language contact with either Greek or Turkish. Greek shows the same pattern as Pomak wrt. unagreement and hence may be the more likely source at first sight. Although Turkish lacks the basic unagreement construction in (1), however, it cannot be ruled out as a possible source either, since it nevertheless seems to allow structures similar to (3). The fact that Turkish historically has a stronger standing in the (Muslim) Pomak communities, leading to a potentially greater significance of Pomak-Turkish as opposed to Pomak-Greek bilingualism, may provide reasons to consider Turkish as the possible source of this "deviation" of Pomak unagreement from the Bulgarian one after all. To the extent that Greek influence on Pomak seems to have started gaining significance only more recently, consultations of older speakers might provide further insights, as would more fine-grained comparisons of the relevant structures in the relevant languages.

(5) Besh örendji-eve sa varv-ime na sinema i drugi-se sa varv-ime na metshit-ene.
    five student-PL FUT go-1PL to cinema and others-DET.1PL FUT go-1PL to school- DET
    'Five of us students will go to the cinema and we others will go to the school.'
    [Satres Pomak]
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On the typology of answers to yes-no questions

Anders Holmberg, Newcastle University/University of Cambridge

The paper will report research on the syntax of yes-no questions and answers to them in a cross-linguistic perspective. One of the parameters investigated is

(1) Does the answer use an affirmative particle (like yes) or does it echo the finite verb of the question for affirmation?

Finnish is an example of a language in which echoing the finite verb is a standard form of answer.

(2) Question: *Juo-ko Marja kahvia?*  Answer: *Juo. / Ei juo.*

‗Does Marja drink coffee?’ ‘Yes.’ / ‘No.’

Data has been gathered from descriptive grammars and by using the SSWL database and a questionnaire. Data search has been hampered by the fact that most grammars don’t mention the form of answers. Concerning (1), I have data presently from 56 languages (46 genera) employing verb echo-answers, 64 languages (48 genera) not employing such answers, with all continents represented. There are few robust geographic or genealogical generalisations visible in the data; consider the fact that Portuguese employs verb-echo answers but Spanish doesn’t. The main issue for me is the syntactic structure of verb-echo answers. There are good reasons to think that there are some widely different subtypes.

A hypothesis guiding the research and the discussion is that the syntax of the question in part determines the syntax of the answer. A yes-no questions asks the interlocutor to say which of two alternatives, a proposition $p$ or its negation $\neg p$, is true. A question can always be answered by uttering $p$ or $\neg p$, possibly in reduced form. If it is reduced by subject pro-drop and so called verb-stranding VP-ellipsis, what is left is a finite verb or auxiliary. This is one type among the verb-echo answers. A yes-no question does not, typically, explicitly list the two alternatives, though, but instead is a sentence with a free variable for polarity: ‘Marja x drinks coffee’ in the case of (1), where $x$ is $+$ or $-$Polarity. What the answer then typically does is assign a value to the variable, thereby picking one of the two alternative propositions as the true one. This is what answer particles like yes and no do. For many of the languages employing verb-echo answers, this is what they do, too. This is done by moving/copying the finite verb, or a larger remnant clausal constituent headed by the finite verb, to a C-domain focus position with ellipsis of the rest of the clausal content. The finite verb or verb-headed remnant constituent functions as the host of positive polarity or, in construction with the sentential negation, negative polarity, which, being focused, assigns a value to the question variable.

One issue is to determine which of the two structures a verb-echo answer has, in a given language. A test to distinguish them is proposed and tested, based on whether the verb-echo answer can be used to answer a question with an existential indefinite subject like (3).

(3) Question: *Asuu-ko täällä ketään?*  Answer: *Asuu.*

‗Does anybody live here?’ ‘Yes.’

If it can be, as is the case in Finnish, it can’t be derived by subject pro-drop as existential indefinite pronouns can’t be pro-dropped (as will be argued), leaving V (or remnant clause) movement with IP-ellipsis as the only viable derivation. For the limited set of relevant languages that I have data from (about 30), about half do allow a verb-echo answer to a question like (3). Some pros and cons with this test will be discussed. Some variation within the two types, the pro-drop-and-VP-ellipsis one and the movement-with-IP-ellipsis one will also be discussed.
Accusativity in Mingrelian

Jan Henrik Holst, Universität Hamburg, Asien-Afrika-Institut

1. Mingrelian

2. On morphosyntactic alignment
Core NPs can be marked in various ways cross-linguistically, cf. classic discussions on ergativity, active languages etc. S, A and O used here following Dixon (1994). Diagrams can be used for various purposes. Examples with Greenlandic. Top line: Argument of an intransitive clause. Bottom line: Arguments of transitive clause.

1. General arrangement of S, A and O
2. Case labels (basic allomorphs)
3. Case suffixes (also “rel.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>abs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>erg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some languages: split-system, often conditioned by TAM (tense / aspect / mood), “split-ergative”. Some languages: “marked nominative”, i.e. nom. has suffix, acc. has none (Yuman, Cushitic, partly Kartvelian, others).

3. Alignment in Mingrelian: synchrony
Mingrelian has a TAM-conditioned split-system. Marking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>present tense</th>
<th>aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case labels often used by Kartvelologists: -Ø nom., -s dat.acc., -k “narrative”. The main typological point: a split-system, but none of the two subsystems is ergative; both are accusative. Additional complications with perfect tense, unclear data. To my knowledge the only language in the world known with this system. (Visitors of the congress or fieldworkers with news are allowed to prove me wrong, of course.)

4. Alignment in Mingrelian: diachrony
Origin of the system: can be reconstructed. Georgian and Svan have typologically similar split-ergative systems (with some extra features) and historically identical morphemes, although they are at very different places in the family tree. Reconstruction like them. Laz and Mingrelian innovated (each in a different way); I will demonstrate how. The talk may have an impact also on reconstructing alignment in other language families.
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Subject agreement suspension in main and relative clauses: is it really a unified phenomenon?

Giorgio Iemmolo, University of Zurich

This paper discusses the phenomenon of subject agreement suspension (henceforth, SAS), defined as the suspension of agreement with forms that in other morphosyntactic environments show agreement. Subject agreement suspension is known under the label of “Anti-agreement” in the generative literature (cf. Baker 2008, Brandi and Cordin 1989, Ouhalla 1993, among others), where it has been analysed as the suspension of subject agreement in contexts of local subject extraction, namely:

1. wh-words in subject function
2. subject relative clauses and clefts
3. inverted subjects

A typical example of SAS comes from Florentine (Indo-European, Romance), where subject agreement is suspended with postverbal subjects and in subject relative clauses introduced by the invariable relativiser che, as in (1) and (2), where there should be plural agreement on the verb.

The aim of this paper is to provide a comparative analysis, based on sample of 57 languages, of subject agreement suspension and evaluate current theoretical proposals against the data presented in this paper. I first illustrate the various syntactic environments in which subject agreement suspension appears. I then argue that subject agreement suspension is not a unitary phenomenon due to local subject extraction, but rather the manifestation of different formal and functional principles which only superficially show synchronic structural similarities. Two main morphosyntactic environments are identified.

On the one hand, there is a first group of constructions where SAS is triggered by the information structural properties of the subject NP, usually focus or introduction of a new participant. In these cases, SAS appears when the subject is in a position generally exploited for focal or newly-introduced subjects, such as the postverbal position in Florentine.

The second group of construction comprises subject relative clauses and clefts. In this case, two different groups are identified. In the first group, SAS is triggered by the fact that the verb either agrees with the invariable relativiser, which bears third person singular (masculine) default features, as in the Florentine example in (1b). In the second subgroup of languages, I show that we are not dealing with SAS, since relative clauses and clefts employ a dedicated deranked verb form is used which cannot occur in independent declarative clauses, and cannot occur with person, gender, and number markers. An example of this pattern comes from Jamsay (Dogon). The verb shows SAS with focal subjects, as in (3), as well as with subject relative clauses, where a participial verb form is used, as in (4). SAS with focal subjects is realised via the omission of the person marker on the verb and the use of low tones. In subject relative clauses, the verb takes a special participial form to which suffixes indicating humanness and number, also used on nouns and adjectives, are attached.

An apparent counterexample to the analysis proposed in this paper is constituted by languages where SAS occurs both in main clauses and relative clauses with the same morphological makeup. An example of such a language is Breton, where SAS is found with sentence-initial focused constituents, as well as with wh-subjects, subject relative clauses, and clefts (Borsley and Stephens 1989). In these cases, I argue that SAS in main clauses is due to the origin of the construction rather than to extraction. In fact, these focus constructions historically derive from former clefts, which were in turn built on relative clauses, following the well-known grammaticalisation path REL > CLEFT > FOCUS (Heine and Reh 1984: 177). Subject relative clauses in Breton showed agreement with an invariable relativiser a, which bore third person singular features (Fleuriot 1964), as in the Florentine case discussed above. When cleft
constructions became grammaticalised as focus constructions, the original agreement pattern was retained, thus explaining the synchronic similarity between SAS in main and relative clauses attested in some languages (cf. also Harris and Campbell 1995: 152–162 for similar considerations).

Examples

Florentine (IE, Romance)

(1) Arriva / *arrivano tante persone dal Marocco
arrive.PRS.3SG arrive.PRS.3PL many people from_the Morocco
‘Many people are arriving from Morocco.’

(2) Le ragazze che gli è venuto / *enno venuto / *enno
the girls REL subj3sg.m-be.prs.3sg come.ptpc.m.sg be.prs.3pl
venuto ieri so’ qui
come.ptp.f.pl yesterday be.prs.3pl here
‘The girls who came yesterday are here.’

Jamsay (Dogon)

(3) yà: ù ê:-sá-m
yesterday 2sg.obj see-RES-1SG
‘Yesterday I saw you.’ (Heath 2008: 17)

(4) à-n íjè dègé béré-n
man-sg-l stand spend.day be.able.ipfv-tpcp.sg
‘A man who can stand up the whole day.’ (Heath 2008: 525)
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Syntax of the non-eventive semantic relations in four Otomanguean languages: Amuzgo, Mazahua, Mazatec and Zapotec

Alejandra Itzel Ortiz Villegas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México  
Antonio García Zúñiga, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Yucatán  
Armando Mora-Bustos, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa  
Francisco Arellanes Arellanes, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

A difference between the semantic relations of possession and part-whole is not always recognized in the literature. For instance, when a syntactic phenomenon like external possession is described - see the Mazahua example in (1) - the examples used are often that of a whole-part relation rather than a possession relation, see (2-4).

(1) Mazahua (Mora-Bustos, 2012: 7)
   e-pegro na-ʃʃot-pi [o-paŋa e-ʃʃa]
   NP-pedro 3PROG-fold-3DAT 3POSS-shirt NP-juan
   ‘Pedro folds Juan’s shirt’

(2) Spanish (Velázquez-Castillo in Payne & Barshi, 1999: 77)
   Julio le atravesó [el corazón con el arma]
   ‘Julio cut him through the heart with the weapon’

(3) French (Deal, 2013: 2)
   Je lui ai pris [la main]
   I 3SG.DAT. have taken the hand
   ‘I took his hand’

(4) Japanese (Ura, 1996: 100 in Deal, 2013: 2)
   [Mary-ga kami-ga] naga-i
   Mary-NOM hair-NOM long-be
   ‘Mary’s hair is long’

This lack of distinction seems to be justified by the existence of languages where both types of semantic relations share the same syntactic codification, as is the case of Spanish (5). Other mechanisms for codifying possession are the so-called “genitive forms”. In English, for instance, the “possessive marker” (6a) contrast with “periphrastic genitive” (6b) which, in turn, is very similar to Spanish construction in (5).

(5) Spanish
   a. [Los zapatos de la señora] están nuevos
      ‘The shoes of the lady are new’
   b. [Los brazos de ese niño] están muy largos
      ‘The arms of that boy are very long’

(6) English
   b. [The mother of the child] (Allen, 2008: 1)

On the other hand, for some languages the syntactic codification of the possession relation is different from that of the part-whole relation, see the examples of Mazatec (7) and those of Zapotec (8):
(7) Mazatec (data from Ortiz Villegas’s corpus)

a. [he najo=le ŋʰõ] njo? ŋʰa kʰi
   ART clothes=3POSS women INTS old be.PRES
   ‘The clothes of the women are very old’

b. [he ʰdzoa ni joki] njo? ʰba kʰi
   ART belly.3SG man DEM INTS big be.PRES
   ‘The belly of that man is very big’

(8) Zapotec (data from Arellanes’s corpus)

a. b-ro’ ya’z (nâ) [gìky dâd]
   C-grow INTS COP head man
   ‘The head of the man is very big’

b. b-ro’ ya’z (nâ) [x-pèkw dâd]
   C-grow INTS COP POS-dog man
   ‘The dog of the man is very big’

Taking into account this second type of languages, we propose the following typology of codification patterns of the different types of non-eventive relations in a N(ominal) P(hrase): A) no syntactic or morphological marking (juxtaposition), (8a); B1) morphological marking of the nucleus, but no syntactic marking (8b); B2) morphological marking of the complement, but no syntactic marking (6a); and, C) syntactic marking, (5a), (5b), (6b).

The objective of this work is to analyze the distribution of the different codification patterns that a language has at it’s disposal to express several non-eventive semantic relations in an NP. Possession and whole-part relations are but two types of these semantic relations, and the following are also included: a) secretion/excretion-body (John’s urine), b) object-matter (the wood table), c) location (the village church), d) entity-origin (french wines), e) kinship (Mary’s sister), f) container-content (the mezcal bottle), g) affiliation or hierarchy (John’s boss), and so on. The analyzed languages in this work belong to four different linguistic families that share the same trunk, the Otomanguean language family: Amuzgo (Amuzgo), Mazahua (Oto-pamean), Mazatec (Popolocan) y Zapotec (Zapotecan).
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Complex predicates (CPs) are very common in many Iranian languages. However, the source of transitivity of CPs in these languages is, according to previous studies, somewhat uncertain. In some cases the transitivity of the light verb (LV) is found to determine the transitivity of the CP, whereas in other cases it depends on the semantic transitivity of the whole CP. In Southern Balochi (SB), as well as in several other Iranian languages, where ergative alignment is found with transitive (tr.) predicates formed with the past stem, and accusative alignment with intransitive (itr.) predicates formed with the past stem, as well as with all predicates formed with the non-past (present–future) stem, the transitivity of a CP is evident from the alignment.

Haig (2008: 11–12) discusses the transitivity of CPs and notes that not only in Balochi, but also in Northern Kurdish and Vafsi, semantically itr. CPs can trigger ergative case marking. He also makes two additional remarks for Iranian languages, namely that “there are examples of etymologically tr. verbs shifting class under semantic pressure” and that “there are interesting interactions between main verbs and auxiliaries”.

The purpose of this presentation is to investigate the impact of the transitivity of the LV in determining the transitivity of a CP. The investigation is based on a corpus consisting of six texts and on interviews with three speakers of SB. The study shows that the transitivity of CPs is generally determined by the syntactic transitivity of the LV rather than the semantic transitivity of the whole CP. There is, however, one exception to this rule, namely the LV girag ‘to get’, which occurs with accusative alignment in semantically itr. CPs.

Farrell (2003: 199) proposes that the unexpected accusative alignment in the past temporal domain for a CP with a tr. LV in SB could reflect the alignment of this CP in Urdu (i.e. when Urdu forms the corresponding CP with an itr. LV). However, there is only one verb, at least in the present corpus, that breaks the alignment rule, and it does so not only in dialects of SB spoken in Pakistan, e.g. Karachi Balochi, the dialect described by Farrell, but also in dialects spoken in Iran, which are hardly influenced by Urdu syntax at all. Two of the persons I interviewed are from Iran, and they both rule out ergative alignment for semantically itr. CPs involving the LV girag ‘to get’.

A more reasonable explanation of the fact that girag ‘to get’ appears at first sight to break the alignment rule, is that it is an ambitransitive verb. Assuming it is, we can conclude that syntactic transitivity always takes supremacy over semantic transitivity in SB, a rule that applies both to CPs and to periphrastic verb constructions.

At the end, I compare alignment of CPs
a) in SB and Kurdish (a closely related Iranian language)
b) in SB and Urdu (a language that SB is in close contact with, particularly in Pakistan).

Examples

Southern Balochi

(1) dādū-ā pas-Ø pōst jat-Ø
PN-OBL sheep-NOM.SG skin hit.PT-3SG
‘Dadu skinned the sheep.’

(2) hawr-ā ēr dāt-Ø
rain-OBL down give.PT-3SG

---

6 For descriptions of the ergative system in Balochi, see e.g. Farrell (1995) and Korn (2009).
‘The rain poured down.’

(3) āp-ay tōkā bukk=iš wārt-Ø
water-GEN in diving=PC.3PL eat.PT-3SG
‘They dived into the water.’

(4) har-ā yakbarā trās kut-Ø
donkey-OBL suddenly movement do.PT-3SG
‘The donkey made a sudden move (out of fear).’

(5) ahmad-Ø sar gipt-Ø be-raw-t sapar-ā
PN-NOM.SG head get.PT-3SG SUBJ-go.PR-3SG journey-OBL
‘Ahmad set out to go on a journey.’

(6) wāǰa panč-kuš-Ø ča ham=ē sitāh-ān
mister five-kill.PR-NOM.SG from EMPH=DEM.PROX praise-PL.OBL
garm gipt-Ø warm get.PT-3SG
‘Mr. “Five-slayer” got excited by these expressions of admiration.’

(7) andiga yakk=ē-Ø pa bandīxāna-yā sar būt-Ø
that.other one=IND-NOM.SG to prison-OBL head become.PT-3SG
‘That other one ended up in prison.’
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Semantic roles between verb and context

Elisabetta Jezek, Università di Pavia

Although it is often assumed that semantic roles are assigned solely by the lexical properties of the predicate, it appears that contextual factors also play a role in this process (Wechsler 2005). A case in point involves verbs that allow optional agency in their subjects, that is, verbs that may be construed as agentive or non-agentive in the syntax. The following is an example:

(1) a. John hit the ball.
   b. John hit a lamp-post.

In the a) sentence, the default interpretation of the subject is agentive, whereas in the b) sentence the default interpretation is non-agentive. This is determined by contextual factors, in particular by the nature of the argument filler in object position.

The goal of the paper is to examine the interplay between lexical and compositional factors in the determination of whether the subject argument of a predicate will be interpreted as an Agent. I will propose a classification of predicates into three broad groupings, which are cross-linguistically valid: verbs with lexical agents, verbs with lexical non-agents, and verbs which are lexically unmarked with respect to Agency (unmarked verbs). This classification provides the basis for several typological observations; for examples, languages seem to vary strikingly with respect to how extensively agency is lexicalized in verbs. English appears to have few verbs which have obligatory agentive arguments (verbs with lexical agents), whereas many Japanese verbs whose English counterparts are unmarked for Agency do indeed require an Agent argument (van Valin and LaPolla 1997, 120).

In the paper, I will examine the semantic and syntactic properties (such as, for example, inchoativization) of verbs belonging to the three classes. I will classify verbs based on empirical evidence obtained from corpora for following contextual cues: argument filling, adverbial modification (including agent- and patient-oriented adverbs) and modification by purpose clauses (“Christ died in order to save us from our sins”, cf. Cruse 1973). I will discuss the difficulties that arise in modeling the role that adverbials play in semantic composition, due to the fact that they may be analyzed as either confirming or coercing the information provided by the predicate.

I wil conclude by claiming that Agency is better interpreted as a derivative notion, resulting from the interplay between the semantics of the clause (the semantics of both the NPs and the predicate), the grammatical construction in which the verb and the NPs co-occur, and general pragmatic principles (Holinsky 1987, van Valin and Wilkins 1996).
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Concessive participles and epitactic constructions in Ancient Greek

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado, Universidad de Sevilla (Spain)

The purpose of this paper is to explain the construction of concessive participles introduced by kai taûta as a result of epitaxis, an especial case of coordination. This construction is to be distinguished by its syntactic configuration and pragmatics from the concessive participles introduced by scalar kai. The data are drawn from the works by Xenophon of Athens.

Epitaxis is a form of coordination with a clear pragmatic function of enhancing the introduced information. It has been defined by Rosén (2009) as “the presentation of an additional rheme, thus bringing into focus an element that did not figure in the preceding - syntactically and informationally saturated - sentence, provided this element is a secondary component”. This is a very common construction in a number of IE and non-IE languages, including Latin (Rosén 2008). Nevertheless, it has not been thoroughly studied in Ancient Greek, and it is only mentioned in the specific bibliography. This lack of attention is remarkable, given that a careful examination of the texts reveals a surprising vitality: even if the examination is limited to the Xenophontean corpus, a considerable number of examples can still be quoted (examples 1, 2).

The sequence kai taûta is one of the most typical in Greek epitactic constructions (examples 3, 4). Besides, its use introducing concessive participles has already been described (LSJ s. u. οὕτος). The function of kai as a concessive marker, both alone and in specific combinations (Wakker 1994), is related to the general trend of additive particles to evolve into this kind of markers (König 1991). That trend is mostly exhibited by scalar additive particles, which denote that the event expressed in the subordinate clause is highly unexpected by implying the existence of less extreme alternatives (examples 5, 6). In the case of kai taûta the adverbial interpretation of kai is excluded: taûta is an anaphoric pronoun resuming the main clause, with which the participle construction is coordinated by kai. Accordingly, the construction normally follows its main clause (examples 7, 8). The concessive effect brought about by invoking less extreme alternatives (scalar particle path) is obtained with kai taûta (the epitactic construction path) by coordinating the hindering circumstance as an independent clause. In such a way, no alternatives are invoked, but the realisation of the main event is highlighted by enhancing the hindrance. For a similar concessive marker compare Span. y eso que (Flamenco 1999).

From a pragmatic point of view, a circumstance affecting the main event is added, yet it is not presented as a frame in which that event takes place, but as a restriction forcing to reconsider what has been said (Fuentes 2012). This reinterpretation is part of the assertion (Lambrecht 1994), so we can consider the construction with kai taûta as a focusing one. This is another difference with the concessive participles introduced by scalar kai, which usually precede their main verb establishing a setting for its state of affairs.

Examples

(1) Seúthēs... apaitēsei me kai apaitēsei méntoi dikaïōs. Seuthes will demand back from me and (idem) Particle with justice “Seuthes, he will demand it back from me, and, moreover, he will demand it back with justice”. (An. 7.6.17)

(2) skholē tois polemiôn lēzesthai, kai dikaïōs hēmîn epibouleûousin. leisure to the enemies plundering and properly to us plotting against “Our enemies have leisure for plundering and quite properly are they plotting against us”. (An. 5.1.9)
(3) oîmai se dunatòn ónta okneîn epimeleîsthai, kài taûta
I fancy you able being to shrink from taking care of and that
hôn anigkê soi metêkheîn politê ge ónti.
of which obligation to you to take part citizen Particle being
“I fancy that you shrink from work that is within your powers, work in which it is your
duty as a citizen to take a hand”. (Mem. 3.7.2)

(4) hoi gâr mnân protelêsantes eggûs duoin mnân prósodon héxousi, kài taûta en pólei
those for mina advancing nearly of two minae income will draw and that in State
“For those who advance one mina will draw an income of nearly two minae, guaranteed by
the state”. (Vect. 3.10)

(5) sùn mèn soì hómōs kài en tê polemiâ ontes tharroûmen.
with Particle you however in the enemy’s land being we are confident
“[…] with you we are not afraid even in the enemy’s land”. (Cyr. 5.1.26)

(6) ho d’ Agêsilâos kài mála boulómenos apágeîn tô stráteuma,…
the and Agesilaus even quite desirous lead back the army
hômös ekeî katêmeîne treis hêmérâs…
nevertheless there remained three days
“And Agesilaus, even though he was exceedingly desirous of leading back his army,
nevertheless remained there for three days”. (HG 6.5.20)

(7) bárbaron mèn pólin oudemân êthel samen kataskhe n, kài taûta kratoûntes.
barbarian PTC city none we wanted seize and that conquerors being
“[…] we refrained from the seizure of any barbarian city, conquerors though we were”.
(An. 7.1.29)

(8) … phâskôn … ou prépon andri kalô kagathô tôn erômenon … prosaîteîn
saying unbecoming to a gentleman the beloved to importune
hôper tois ptôkhôiîs … deômenon prosdônai, kài taûta médenôs agathôû.
like the beggars asking to give and that nothing good
“[…] saying that it was unbecoming in a gentleman to sue like a beggar to the object of his
affection … stooping to ask a favour, even if it was wrong to grant”. (Mem. 1.2.29)
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Net-VP-ellipsis and across-the-board scrambling in Russian

Ivan Kapitonov

This paper investigates the interplay between coordinate ellipsis, prosody and word order in Russian. I show that there is a requirement on information structure parallelism that becomes manifest in word order restrictions. The particular ellipsis construction that I am focussing on is *net*-VP-ellipsis (*net*-VPE). It is ellipsis that involves coordination at the level of vP or above (in our examples, clausal coordination), where the verb phrase in the second conjunct is substituted with a predicative negative word *net* ‘not’.

Russian has moderately free word order. Scrambling, which is rather pervasive, is motivated by information structure (IS) demands, like topicalisation and focalisation (e.g., Dyakonova 2009). Topics normally appear clause-initially, while foci are clause-final. In addition to word order, focus is encoded by intonation — focal stress (pitch accent), which overrides the clause-final focus rule.

In general, a simple transitive sentence consisting of a subject, a verb and an object (e.g. *Vanja čital knigu*) allows all 18 logically possible permutations (six word orders by three pitch accent placements). However, in a *net*-VPE sentence the freedom in the first clause is suddenly reduced: only seven variations seem perfectly acceptable; five variations are out; the remaining six vary in their acceptability (and show greater variation between speakers).

I argue that the key to this problem lies in parallelism. The second conjunct in *net*-VPE has a rigid order (1): COORDINATOR - SUBJECT - PREDICATE, which in IS terms means that the subject is always the topic and the negative element is the focus. On the other hand, there is variation in the interpretation of the negative element: new information focus (2) vs. contrastive focus (3) (which suggests that contrastive foci in Russian do not obligatorily front, contra Neeleman et al. (2009)).

The semantics of *net*-VPE is essentially that of contrast, viz. two individuals are contrasted w.r.t. having a certain property. Parallel information structure facilitates drawing that contrast, while radically different IS bleeds it. I show that topicalisation of the subject in the first conjunct is preferred, topicalisation of the verb is dispreferred. At the same time, there are factors, such as contrastive (i.e., exhaustive; Kiss 1998) focus marking of the subject, that improve otherwise dispreferred orders. This move allows establishing a contrast pair with the second clause subject. I conclude that CONTRAST should be a distinct feature (pace the typology in Neeleman et al. 2009), since contrastive foci can pair with topics.

Moreover, certain configurations with the direct object fronted require a rather specific reading, whereby the object becomes a shared topic for the both conjoined clauses. I introduce the notion of across-the-board scrambling for this type of constructions. The object in this case must be specific. Indefinite-marked DPs, which normally are ambiguous between specific and non-specific readings, are unambiguously specific in such constructions (4). This might be an instance of surface representation of the object’s scope.

Examples

(1) Vanja čital knigu, a Maša — net.
    Vanya read book, but Masha not
    ‘Vanya read the book, and Masha didn’t.’

(2) Knigu čital VANJA, a Maša — [net]F.
    book read Vanya, but Masha not
    ‘Vanya read the book, Masha didn’t read it.’

(3) Vanja čITAL knigu, a Maša — [net]F.
    Vanya read book, but Masha not
‘Vanya read the book, and Masha didn’t.’

(4) [Context: A: Masha always reads more of the extra readings than Vanya does.]

B: Kakije-to knigu VANYA čital, a Maša — [net]F.

which-INDEF book read Vanya, but Masha not

‘As for a certain books, Vanya read them, but Masha didn’t.’
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Subordination features in Graeco-Coptic from a historical and typological perspective

Christina Katsikadeli – University of Salzburg

Coptic (Afro-Asiatic), the last stage of the Egyptian language (roughly 200 AD-1300 AD) consists of two components, the “Egyptian-Coptic” and “Graeco-Coptic”, which are traditionally described separately. Most Coptic items expressing general grammatical categories are Egyptian in origin, nevertheless a great deal of the non-inflected word stock comes from Greek (cf. Layton 2011). As far as the interclausal relations are concerned, the Coptic language presents a picture of great diversity of patterns, in which the Coptic “conjunctive”, a “conjugation” which has no temporal, aspectual or modal value apart from its clause linking function, plays a central role. According to the overview provided by Reintges (2010), the use and distribution of the Coptic conjunctive can be summarized as follows: “The distinction between the coordinative and subordinative behavior of conjunctive clause chains is not an “all-or-nothing property”. Instead, asyndetically linked conjunctive clauses can often be interpreted either way. In other instances, the purposive reading of conjunctive clauses becomes available when a coordinative interpretation is excluded by the temporal or aspectual specification of the controlling verb. To specify or disambiguate a particular interclausal relation, conjunctive clauses may be modified by a broad range of native and borrowed [scil. Greek] connectives and subordinating conjunctions. The resulting hybrid pattern has features of both a co-ranking and a chaining structure.” (Reintges 2010: 260). The paper will focus on these aforementioned “hybridic patterns” (esp. Copt. hina ~ gr., Copt. hōs ~ gr., Copt. hōtì ~ Gr., as well as hybridic “stacked complementizers” with Copt. xe) in contrast with their “original” Egyptian and Greek counterparts (esp. from the Hellenistic and Early Byzantine Greek of that period) and will examine the stages and features of their development. The focus will be on constructions expressing finality and direct vs. indirect speech features. The diachronic overview encompasses Coptic material from various texts from the 3rd c. AD until the Arabic conquest (7th c. AD), from different registers (translation vs. original) and Coptic dialects (Sahidic, Bohairic, Achmimic, Fayyumic), aiming at tracing implications for contact-induced phenomena, going beyond the syntactic observations based only on the Christian Coptic translations.
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Postpositional phrases in Mano, South Mande: up and down from IP to VP-level

Maria Khachaturyan (LLACAN, Paris)

This paper deals with the syntax of postpositional arguments in South Mande and accounts for a reanalysis of the verb phrase structure.

Mande languages, including South Mande, are characterized by a typologically unusual rigid S-O-V-X word order. It was argued in (Nikitina 2007, 2011) that oblique arguments (X) in Wan, one of the South Mande languages, are not verb-phrase internal but rather attach to the clause like adjuncts. This interpretation was supported by the fact that adjacent placement of verb embedded in a postpositional phrase and its oblique argument is not allowed.

In Mano, both types of constructions are allowed: the embedded verb and its oblique argument can be juxtaposed (2b) as well as separated by a postposition (2a). In (2a), the postpositional phrase gulu yi ‘from (lit: in) the pit’ should be interpreted as verb-phrase external and in (2b), as verb phrase-internal. Therefore, postpositional phrase in (2) shows quite unusual syntactic flexibility. Such syntactic flexibility is constrained and depends on the type of the postpositional phrase and on the type of the construction. In some cases, a postpositional phrase can or should be separated from the verb; in other cases the postpositional phrase is obligatorily adjacent to the verb. For example, in a finite construction the postpositional argument can follow the verb as well as be separated from it by a locative noun, as in (3), while in (4) the order is strict. In the topic construction (5) topic marker follows the whole nominalized verb phrase and cannot separate the verb from the postpositional argument, the two are therefore obligatoriness adjacent. In the construction of cleft (6), on the contrary, postpositional phrase is obligatorily extraposed. We can conclude that, as opposed to Wan where postpositional phrases behave like adjuncts and attach to the clause-level, in Mano in some cases they should be interpreted the same way as in Wan, in some cases they are clearly a part of the verb phrase. Since the same postpositional argument of the same verb can be interpreted in both ways depending on the type of the construction, a special operation of movement from VP to IP level and back should be postulated.

As it is claimed in (Nikitina 2011, MS), clause-level adjunction of postpositional phrases in Mande languages took place at the Proto-Mande level already. In Mano we can observe the inverse process: grammaticalization of postpositional phrases as part of the verb-phrase.

S V [PP ] [PP ] Neg
1a lâ pâ-ŋ wîâ lê kû ê wâ ñ yî you can-NEG enter POST house DEF under NEG ‘You cannot enter the house’.

S V [PP [PP ] ] Neg
1b *lâ pâ-ŋ wîâ kû é wâ lê ñ you can-NEG enter house DEF under POST NEG ‘You shouldn’t be afraid to pump water from the pit’.

S V [PP ] [PP ] Neg
2a yékê i túó yîí bô-ô lêë gulu yî better.not.to 2SG.CONJ frighten water take.off-GER for hole in

S V [PP [PP ] ]
2b yékê i túó yîí bô gulu yî lêë better.not.to 2SG.CONJ frighten water take.off.NMZ hole in for

S V [PP [PP ] ] Nom.LOC
3a ë gbînîlà gî gë à lêkê kâ lûû 3SG.PRET hiding fight 3SG.NSBJ younger.sibling with bushes
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‘He hided from his younger brother in the bushes’.

‘He hided money from his younger brother at home’.

‘As John Baptist was caught near the Jordan river, the work stopped’.

‘The fact that he hided money from him is not good’.

Abbreviations
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Passive in Enets: interaction of a valency-changing marker and split intransitivity

Olesya Khanina, Moscow
Andrey Shluinsky, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of sciences

This paper is a case study of passive in Enets (Samoyedic, Uralic). The study is based on a corpus of natural texts of ca. 32 hours; we use the data of both Enets dialects, Forest Enets and Tundra Enets (in the abstract we used Forest Enets examples only). In addition to Enets passive per se we discuss in detail two other morphosyntactic phenomena related to it, valency-changing (causative) marking and split intransitivity.

Enets passive is formed with the help of a combination of two structures: the causative marker -ra- and the middle construction, consisting of the middle marker -e- (used only in some morphological contexts) and a specific middle cross-reference series. In the passive construction the agent-like argument, expressed by the subject of the active construction, can be optionally expressed by a dative case noun phrase, see (1a) vs. (1b) and (2a) vs. (2b). As expected, the main function of the passive construction is foregrounding the patient-like argument. Even when not expressed, like in numerous impersonal uses (2b), the agent-like argument is semantically almost always present in the passive construction. Anticausative uses of Enets passive like (3) are very few. Enets passive is completely regular and can be used with any transitive verb stem.

The causative marker -ra- is, in contrast, not truly regular, but is rather lexicalized; there are several causative markers in Enets none of which seem to be fully productive. The -ra- marker is used with intransitive verbs only and most of its corpora uses are with a close set of verbs, cf. (4a) vs. (4b).

The middle marking is an option that is chosen lexically for intransitive verbs. Some intransitive verbs use no middle marking, i.e. they use a standard ‘subjective’ cross-reference series, as in (5), and other intransitive verbs use the middle marking, as in (6). Some intransitive verbs may be used both without and with the middle marking, cf. (7a) vs. (7b), usually with a difference in telicity. Most Enets intransitive verbs used with the middle marking refer to middle type situations in the sense of (Kemmer 1993). Underived transitive verbs use the middle marking only occasionally, resulting in an anticausative.

Both causatives and middle markers are attested cross-linguistically as possible diachronic sources for a passive, cf. (Haspelmath 1990, Robbeets 2007) for causatives, (Kemmer 1993, Abraham 2006) for middles. However Enets provides a non-standard case because both models are involved simultaneously.

Note also that the formation of the Enets passive is not synchronically compositional. Indeed, on the one hand, the involved causative marker is not very productive, and on the other hand, the middle marking is seldom used with underived transitive verbs, and if used at all, it has anticausative meaning almost non-existent for the Enets passive. Therefore, one cannot analyze the Enets passive as a regular formation of the middle form from a regular causative derivate. The non-compositionalism is also observed in syntax: the passive construction involves the agent-like argument in the dative case not expected either from the causative or middle syntax in Enets. So -ra- causative derivates have only two arguments: the Subject-causer and the Object-causee, cf. (4b), and verbs with the middle marking have the only Subject argument, cf. (6) and (7b). Thus unlike its diachronic sources, the Enets passive is a regular construction, which has also developed its own syntax.

Examples

(1) a. oo-da ɔburi-nʔ tfuktʃi nizu-pi-zuʔ
eat(pfv)-PTCP.SIM thing-PL.1SG all tear(pfv)-PRF-3PL.SOnsg
‘They tore all our food.’
b. bɔli-za?  <...> bɔgul¹a-d nizu-la-bi-z?  
bolok-NOM.PL.2PL bear-DAT.SG tear(pfv)-CAUS-PRF-3PL.M  
‘Your boloks are torn by a bear.’

(2) a. a♭u-uʃ  bɔgul¹a-ʔ tɔza-d  
what-TRANSL bear-PL bring(pfv)-2SG.S  
‘Why did you bring bears?’

b. tʃike sɔja-ta-go-j ne me-ko-da  
this be_born(pfv)-CAUS2-DUR-PTCP.ANT woman tent-DAT.SG-OBL.SG.3SG  
tɔ-za-r-e-z?  
bring(pfv)-CAUS-M-3SG.M  
‘The woman who gave birth was brought home.’

(3) bedu-kon kada-ra-d-e-z?  
stream-LOC.SG take_away(pfv)-CAUS-FUT-M-3SG.M  
‘It will be taken with the stream.’

(4) a. pi♭-nʔ  noda-?  
trousers-PL.1SG get_wet(pfv)-3PL.S  
‘My trousers got wet.’

b. peee-zaʔ  tʃukʧi noda-r-e-zaʔ  
shoe-NOM.PL.2PL all get_wet(pfv)-CAUS-SOPl-2PL.SOnsg  
‘You have made wet all your shoes.’

(5) tʃike mense an¹ toni kan¹є-Ø  
this old_woman and there(dir) leave(pfv)-3SG.S  
‘That woman also went there.’

(6) ne ad-e-z?  
woman sit_down(pfv)-M-3SG.M  
‘The woman sat down.’

(7) a. palatka-nʔ  no fe nee-Ø  
tent-OBL.SG.1DU door hole be_open(ipfv)-3SG.S  
‘The door of our tent is open.’

b. a tʃike no-r ne-bi-z?  
and this door-NOM.SG.2SG open(pfv)-PRF-3SG.M  
‘And that door opened.’
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The following abbreviations are used: 1, 2, 3 – 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; DAT – dative; DU – dual; DUR – durative; FUT – future; ipfv – imperfective; LOC – locative; M – middle marker or middle cross-reference series; NOM – nominative; pfv – perfective; PL – plural; PRF – perfect; PTCP.ANT – anterior participle; PTCP.SIM – simultaneous participle; S – subjective cross-reference series; SG – singular; SOnsg – subjective-objective cross-reference series for non-singular object; SOPl – plural object marker.
Unexpected similarities and contrasts in Oceanic and European languages: The distribution of semantic components in compound verbs.

Ekkehard Koenig (Freie Universität Berlin) & Claire Moyse-Faurie (University of New Caledonia)

After a period of deep disillusionment, componential analysis and generative semantics has had a spectacular revival in recent years, especially in the analysis of verb classes in individual languages and in comparative studies. Instead of trying to provide an exhaustive analysis of individual verbs, current componential analyses tend to isolate general components that are easily identifiable across languages, typically correspond to thematic relations (Patient, Instrument, Result, Location, Time, Path, Manner, etc.) and are thus located at the interface between semantics and syntax (cf. Talmy, 1985, 2000; Levin & Rappaport-Hovav, 2013, etc.). One of the interesting issues in comparative analyses of certain verb classes in different languages is the question where exactly these components are expressed: in the verb stem or in affixes and other satellites attached to the verb. In a seminal study L. Talmy (1985) has shown that in Germanic languages it is primarily the MANNER of motion which is encoded in motion verbs, whereas it is the direction or PATH which tends to be encoded in Romance languages or in Japanese. English occupies a middle position between these two types, manifesting both patterns of lexicalization.

Building on these studies, on earlier work by Ozanne-Rivierre & Rivierre (2004) and our own contributions to semantic typology (Gast, Koenig & Moyse-Faurie, 2014), this paper will take a comparative look on the lexical structuring of certain notional domains in selected Oceanic (Xârâcùù) and Germanic languages (CUTTING, KILLING, CARRYING) and show that there are surprising similarities between Xârâcùù and Germanic languages as well as surprising contrasts between genealogically related languages within Europe (Romance + English vs. Germanic). The languages selected for comparison are several Oceanic languages and English, German and French from Europe.

In the semantic domain of CUTTING (separating s.th. by a sharp instrument) French disposes of the non-specific all-purpose verb couper, which provides the basis of the resultative verb découper (‘cut in accordance with a certain purpose’), which is derived from this basis by adding the prefix dé-. All the other verbs in this domain are basic verbs, incorporating instrumental or resultative components in addition to the basic action of cutting, which are not signaled overtly by affixes or other satellites (cf. (1)).

The lexical differentiations in German are semantically similar, but the additional components of RESULT or INSTRUMENT are separately encoded by a separable or inseparable prefix, a pattern of differentiating hyponyms and specific subclasses of verbs typical of Germanic languages. True to its history, English manifests a middle position between Romance and Germanic, disposing of both derived verbs which signal specific semantic components by separable particles and simplex verbs which incorporate the relevant components (cf. (2)).

Some Oceanic languages, Xârâcùù in particular, manifest exactly the same pattern as the one found in Germanic: A basic verb for ‘cutting’ combines with various satellites which encode more specific semantic components like INSTRUMENT, RESULT and nature of PATIENT. Examples of the relevant lexical inventories are given in (3) and (4).

The aim of our talk is (a) to provide new information on Oceanic languages and (b) to show that in the morphological structure of action verbs two basic types can be distinguished, which may be distributed over languages independently of genealogical affiliation. Moreover, our talk will give us the opportunity to discuss a general claim - made inter alia in various articles by Levin & Rapoport-Hovav – that MANNER/INSTRUMENT and RESULT components are never both lexicalized in simple verbs (cf. Beavers & Koontz-Garboden, 2012).
Examples

(1) French: verbs of CUTTING

Basic verb: couper

Morphologically derived: dé-couper (RESULT)

Non-complex verbs and their additional semantic components:

RESULT: percer, entamer, fendre, tailler, émonder, amputer (OBJECT)

INSTRUMENT: scier, sarcler, hacher, etc.

(2) German and English verbs of CUTTING

German English

schneiden (ab-, an-, durch-, auf-, zer-, be-, über-, ein-, aus-, ver-, zu-, zurück-, mit-, etc.) cut (across, in, off, out, up, through, etc.)

mähen RESULT clip, carve, trim, slit, slice, chop

RESULT+ specific object mow, hew, prune

(3) Separate encoding of RESULT (suffix) and of INSTRUMENT (prefix)

Xârâcùù (Oceanic)

cha- ‘cut with an axe or a saber held in the fist’
a. cha-cöö ‘cut the bark vertically’ (cöö ‘break into fibers’) b. cha-chëe ‘miss a cut, cut across’ (-chëe ‘miss’)
c. cha-gwéré ‘succeed in cutting with an axe’ (-gwéré ‘succeed’) d. cha-körō ‘cut into pieces’ (-körō-görō ‘break into pieces’) e. cha-nyûû ‘pierce’ (-nyûû ‘pierce’) f. cha-pèrè ‘cut efficiently’ (-pèrè-bèrè ‘efficiently’) g. cha-pöru ‘cut the bark from every part of the stem’ (pöru-böru ‘peel’)

-puru/-buru ‘cut in two vertically’
a. ca-puru ‘cut in two with the hand’ b. cha-puru ‘cut in two with an axe’ c. ji-puru ‘cut in two with a knife to make shorter’ d. kè-puru ‘cut in two with the teeth’ e. kè-buru ‘cut in two with the fingers’ f. kwì-puru ‘cut in two with a saber’ g. sò-puru ‘cut in two with a circular movement of the arm’
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Subordinates and their equivalents in Balochi

Agnes Korn (Universität Frankfurt a.M., Germany), with Maryam Noorzaei (Uppsala Universitet, Sweden)

A. The few works that have treated subordination in Balochi at all have presented the topic from a morphosyntactic point of view, listing conjunctions and noting which verbal morphology is used with them.8

With this approach, Balochi subordination appears to be closely parallel to Persian: *ki* is the default subordinator; it also introduces quoted speech and relative clause.9 Most other subordinating conjunctions are combinations with *ke*, e.g. *waxt-ē ki* “when (lit. the time REL)”. Essentially, then, adverbial subordinates are relative clauses in a way quite parallel to what CREISSELS (2006: 192f.) notes for French subordinates such as *par-ce que* “because (= lit. by-this REL)” [Ex. 1-2].

B. In our speech data recorded among Black Baloch in Southern Balochistan, overt subordination of the type just mentioned does occur, chiefly with the subordinator *ki*, which here covers a broad range of meanings (including temporal, causal ones, etc.) [Ex. 3]. However, such patterns are strikingly infrequent in our data. Even relative clauses are very rare. Conversely, passages that one would be tempted to translate by subordinates are mostly without overt marker of subordination.

We argue that intonation [Ex. 4], repetition and the use of sequentials are ways of marking subordination. Concerning intonation, CREISSELS (2006:185) notes its use as a marker of subordination for spoken French.10 Quite frequently and perhaps even regularly, intonation is combined with repetition, particularly to convey temporal subordination. Another strategy used in combination with intonation, and sometimes in combination with repetition, is the use of sequentials, viz. *o* “and” and *nī* “now” [Ex. 6], which introduces either the subordinate or the matrix clause [Ex. 5, 6].

C. We argue that several factors may play a role in the different systems of subordination observed. Clearly, there are differences in register and style: the speech of the Black Baloch is the spoken style of a particularly marginalised group of society, while previous descriptions of Balochi grammar have more relied on written material as well as on grammatical descriptions of recordings effected among less marginalised groups.

This receives confirmation from the fact that most overt markers of subordination are clearly borrowed from (or via) Persian.11 We argue that *ki* is likely to be a borrowing, too, since its development implies sound changes regular for Persian, but not for Balochi.12

This suggests the hypothesis that the entire pattern of conjunctural subordination could be copied from Persian, thus particularly prominent in written styles and less so in others. Intonation, repetition and the use of sequentials may then be the inherited means to express subordination.

Examples

French (CREISSELS 2006 : 193)

1) *Je suis venu pour [que tu me donnes des explications]*

“I have come { in order that (lit. for [ that you give me explanations ] ).”

---

8 See JAHANI / KORN (2009: 678ff.) for a summary.
10 “Il faut notamment tenir compte du fait que la construction d’une phrase complexe peut reposer uniquement sur l’intonation. Par exemple, en français oral, une intonation particulière suffit pour indiquer qu’on enchaînement tel que *Tu as faim, je te donne à manger* doit être reconnu comme une phrase complexe avec une relation de type conditionnel entre les deux unités phrastiques (‘si tu as faim, je te donne à manger’) et à l’oral, il est impossible de confondre une telle phrase complexe avec une séquence de deux phrases assertives indépendantes”.
12 Indeed, JAHANI (2008: 163) discusses the possibility that the structure of relative clauses may be copied from Persian.
Western Balochi, Pakistan (traditional tale)\textsuperscript{13}

2) \textit{bē-śakk taī nām panč-kuš int} 
undoubtedly your.SG name five-slay COP3SG
\{ \textit{par-čē kī ā pančē muśk taī janōkē ant} 
for-what SUB DEM five mouse your.SG slaying COP3PL
“Undoubtedly your name is Mr. Five-slayer 
\{ because you have slain those five mice (lit. those five mice are your slain). \} \}

Black Coastal Balochi data:

3) \{ \textit{ēšīya, ēšīya ke warag dātag-an } gepta 
DEM.OBL DEM.OBL SUB food give.PT- take.PRF 
3PL.
\{ He (that one), \textbf{when} he gave them to eat, \} \-[they] took [him].

4) \{ \textit{taw mana barē } man bannām bō 
your.S I.obl take.PT2SG I bad reputation become.PR1SG 
G
\{ \textbf{If} you take me \textbf{away}, \} \ I will be of bad reputation.

5) \textit{pēr kota.} \{ \textit{pēr kota } nī bōč, bōč bīta, 
top do.PRF top do.PRF now white cheese white cheese become.PRF 
One put it onto the fire. \{ \textbf{When} one \textbf{had} put it onto the fire, \} 
then it became white cheese, white cheese, it became white cheese.

6) \textit{koṭetag-ant-e o koṭetag-ant-e } \{ o dāng-o-dāz bīta 
beat.PRF-3PL-PC3PL and beat.PRF-3PL-PC3PL and SMALL become.PRF 
PIECE 
One beat them and beat them \{ \textbf{and} (until) they became small pieces. \} \}
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The diachrony of the Basque subordination marker bait-

Dorota Krajewska, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)

The present paper is concerned with the diachrony of the Basque verbal prefix bait-. It is one of very few prefixes found in Basque, a predominantly suffixing language. Characterized by Lafon (1966: 667) as ‘un des éléments morphologiques et syntaxiques les plus curieux que le basque possède’, apart from being a prefix, it is also found as suffix in indefinite pronouns and in some dialects as temporal postposition.

The prefix is attested in all Basque dialects, but it was not retained in western-most varieties. Its primary function is to mark subordination. First, it is employed together with several clause-initial conjunctions (in manner, reason (1) and explanation clauses) or with a pronoun in relative clauses. Secondly, it can be used on its own (i.e. without any conjunction), in a way similar to the adjoined relative clause construction found in Australian languages (Hale 1976). Thus, it is found in: adverbial clauses (circumstance, reason, modal), relative clauses (2) and in complement clauses of a rather limited group of verbs: factives and verbs like ‘happen, occur’ (3). The semantic relation between the two clauses is frequently ambiguous (especially between the relative and adverbial interpretation). Apart from the subordinative uses, it can also appear in independent clauses in contexts which are rather poorly defined, but typically involve: exlamatives, topicalization, coordination with another clause with an imperative or to emphasize contrast between the clauses (4).

Previous research (most importantly Lafon 1966, Lafitte 1962, Oyharçabal 1987 and Etxepare 2001) focused on the range of contexts in which the prefix appears, the problem of whether the prefix, suffix and postposition historically derive from one source and, finally, if this source can be related to bai ‘yes’. The diachronic changes in the use of the prefix, though, have not been studied in detail and establishing what were its most important functions in the oldest texts might shed some light on its grammaticalization.

Thus, this paper analyzes the developments that bait- underwent (on a corpus of 16th to 19th century Basque texts): loss of functions, appearance of new ones and changes in frequency. The goal is to examine the diachronic relations between the various functions of the morpheme, and especially (1) between the subordinate and non-subordinate uses and (2) between different types of subordinate clauses. As for the main clauses, Lafon (1966) suggested that bait- initially emphasized affirmation and then extended to subordinate clauses. He did not explain, however, the exact mechanism of that change. Alternatively, rather than relics of an older function, the fact that bait- appears in independent clauses could also be analyzed as ‘insubordination’ (a subordinate morpheme come to be used in main clauses, Evans 2007). What is also unclear is in what kind of clauses the prefix was used first: adverbial, relative or complement. According to Heine & Kuteva (2007:252) relative or complement marker can extend to adverbial clauses, but not the other way round. Their claim, however, is based to markers developed from demonstratives and ‘say’ verbs and the question is whether the Basque subordinator followed the same path.

Examples

Basque

(1) zeren ez-pai-tira giristino fin-ak
    because NEG-bait-BE.3PL Christian fine-PL
    ‘(...) because they are not fine Christians’

(2) gizon bat ikusi dut, ez bait-zuen ilhe ondo-rik ere
    man a see AUX.1SG>3SG NEG bait-AUX.PST.3SG>3SG hair-PART even
    ‘I saw a man who didn’t have a single hair.’ (Lafitte 1962: 406)
‘So it happened that the poor died.’

‘Why do we fast often and your disciples do not?’
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Syntactic peculiarities at the borders of language families: Sorbian and South Saami

Martin Joachim Kümmel, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

The dominant basic word order in modern Europe is certainly VO, with variants V2 in the Northwest and the peculiar V2/OV pattern in continental West Germanic. Aside from the typologically outlier Basque, only two language areas clearly show basic OV order even in main clauses: Sorbian (Stone 1993: 653) and South Saami (Sammallahti 1998: 84). Within their respective families, this word order system is very unusual, since both Slavic and Saamic (together with Balto-Finnic) normally belong to the VO type (though Feist 2010 has argued for OV in Skolt Saami, too). Since both areas are situated at the borders of their families and have had strong contact to Germanic languages for a long time, it might be suspected that their peculiarity is due to contact. However, the Germanic varieties in question do not have the same word order system as Sorbian and South Saami: German has V2 in main clauses, and North Germanic is V2 in general. Therefore an explanation based on direct pattern borrowing is not possible. Direct contact influence should have resulted in even more clear V2 patterning in the case of Saami, and it should have supported VO in Sorbian main clauses, if it had been there before. From a historical perspective it is possible that VO order is an innovation in both families. For Uralic languages in general, the rather strict head-final order in other parts of the grammar speaks for original OV which is preserved in many Eastern branches. It is therefore probable that the Northwestern branches have innovated in accordance with the Northern European areas they are spoken in. The case of Slavic is less clear: While OV is most probable for Proto-Indo-European, already the oldest Slavic sources seem to show basic VO order, and they do not exhibit consistent head-final order elsewhere. On the other hand, Baltic as the next relative of Slavic clearly has more head-final structures, and in Old Lithuanian, OV order is rather frequent (e.g., in roughly % of transitive finite verb forms in the first 400 verses of Donelaitis’ „Metai”); it is therefore possible that Proto-Balto-Slavic and earlier Slavic originally had OV. The predominant OV order in Sorbian as well as in South Saami may thus be due to retention rather than innovation, and the effect of the marginal geographical position may just have been that an innovation from within the language family did not spread to the peripheral language while possible influences from the contact languages did not really cross the family borders or had other indirect effects. In my paper, this question shall be investigated more thoroughly, considering details in the patterning of different predicate types, especially the fact that auxiliaries tend to be V2 in both Sorbian an South Saami. The problem is relevant for the understanding of syntactic change and/or stability and diachronic typology as well as for the interpretation of areal distribution.
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Choice factors in the case marking for underlying object in the Koryak S=A alternation

Megumi Kurebito, University of Toyama, Japan

This presentation aims to identify determining factors in the choice of a case frame out of the several possible options in the S=A alternation in Koryak (Chukchi-Kamchatkan), an ergative language.

The Koryak A is marked with either -nan (1), the ergative suffix exclusively used for personal pronouns; the locative -k (2); or the instrumental -(t)je/-t)aj (3). For its part, P is marked with a single case marker, the absolutive -Ø. As a result of S=A alternation including antipassivization, however, A is promoted to an S marked with the absolutive, while P is either omitted (4a)(cf. the transitive [4b]) or demoted to a non-core oblique case, that is, the instrumental (5a)(cf. the transitive [5b]), locative (6a)(cf. the transitive [6b]), allative (7a)(cf. the transitive [7b]), or dative (8a)(cf. the transitive [8b]). The main concern of this presentation is what kind of factors determine the omission or case marking of these four cases.

It has already been pointed out by Comrie (1979) and Kurebito (2001) that choice of case marker for A is determined by the animacy hierarchy. Meanwhile, however, there is no accepted view about the determining factor in the choice of the case marker for P in the S=A alternation. This presentation tries to determine the main case-choice factor for P, and finds the following.

A. The different strategies for coding P in the S=A alternation, that is, omission and different case marking, reflect the two-argument hierarchy proposed by Tsunoda (1981, 1985).
B. Omission or occurrence of various cases is hierarchically interconnected as a function of Affectedness, one of the most essential factors in determining transitivity: omission >the instrumental>the locative>the allative>the dative.
C. This hierarchy approximately corresponds to the hierarchy of verb types that predicts distribution of intransitive and transitive patterns in individual languages (Tsunoda 1985).

Effective action>Perception>Pursuit>Knowledge>Feeling>Relation.

Examples

Koryak (The Chukchi-Kamchatkan)
(1)  En’pic-Ø  mocy-ə-nan  tata-no  mat-co-lŋ-ə-la-ŋ-ə-n.
father-ABS.SG 1PL-E-ERG  daddy-ESS 1PL.A-IPFV-regard-E-PL-IPFV-E-3SG.P
‘We call Father ‘Tata’.

(2)  L’age-na-k  tejk-ə-ni-n-Ø  ic’-ə-n  qəlavol-ə-ŋ.
L’age-AN.SG-LOC(ERG) make-E-3SG.A-3SG.P-PFV  fur.coat-E-ABS.SG  husband-E-DAT
‘L’age made a fur coat for her husband.’

(3)  Qajuju-pill’aq-a  ko-tənəp-ŋ-ə-ne-n  en’pic-Ø.
newborn.reindeer-DIM-INS(ERG) IPFV-gore-IPFV-E-3SG.A-3SG.P  father-ABS.SG
‘The newborn reindeer is going Father.’

(4a)  Kawi-Ø  ɣ-ena-nm-al-len  [P]
Kawi-ABS.SG  RES-ANTIP-kill-ET-3SG.S
‘Kawi killed (something).’

(4b)  Kawi-na-k  təm-ne-n-Ø  qajuju-Ø.
Kawi-AN.SG-LOC(ERG) kill-3SG.A-3SG.P-PFV  newborn.reindeer-ABS.SG
‘Kawi killed a newborn reindeer.’
(5a) Appapo-Ø ɣ-ine-nŋivel-lin picye village-all
grandfather-ABS.SG RES-ANTIP-send-3SG.S food-INS
‘Grandfather sent food to the village.’

(5b) Apappo-na-k ɣe-nŋiv-ə-lin-Ø wojv-etən
grandfather-AN.SG-LOC(ERG) RES-send-E-3SG.P-3SG.A village-ALL
picY-ə-n.
food-E-ABS.SG
‘Grandfather sent food to the village.’

(6a) Kawi-Ø maleta t-ə-k-ine-nni-ŋ
Kawi-ABS.SG slowly 1SG.S-IPFV-ANTIP-touch-IPF freeze-E-meat-LOC
‘Kawi is slowly touching the frozen meat.’

(6b) Qit-ə-kinuŋi-Ø maleta ku-nni-ŋ-ni-n
freeze-E-meat-ABS.SG slowly IPFV-touch-IPFV-3SG.A-3SG.P Kawi-AN.SG-LOC(ERG)
‘Kawi is slowly touching the frozen meat.’

(7a) Vava-Ø ɣ-enə-jŋo-len kenuŋya-jtəŋ.
grandmother-ABS.SG RES-ANTIP-smell-3SG.S meat-ALL
‘Grandmother smelled meat.’

(7b) Vava-na-k ɣ-ŋo-len-Ø kinuŋi-Ø,
grandfather-AN.SG-LOC(ERG) RES-smell-3SG.S-3SG.A meat-ABS.SG
‘Grandmother smelled meat.’

(8a) En’pic-Ø ɣ-u’čel-lin-Ø kalicitl’-ə-ŋ.
father-ABS.SG RES-wait-3SG.S student-DAT
‘Father waited the student.’

(8b) Kalicitl’-ə-n en’pici-te ɣ-u’čel-lin-Ø.
student-E-ABS.SG father-INS(ERG) RES-wait-3SG.P-3SG.A
‘Father waited for the student.’
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**Reflexive derivations in Thulung Rai**

*Aimée Lahaussois, Histoire des théories linguistiques (CNRS/Univ. Paris Diderot)*

Thulung Rai, an endangered Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Eastern Nepal, presents two derivational suffixes associated with reflexivization: -\textit{si} and -\textit{s}.

The first, -\textit{si}, is quite productive, found in complete paradigms, and derives reflexives, reciprocals, antipassives and anticausatives from transitive verbs (and occasionally from intransitive verbs). The derived verb is exemplified in (1), which is contrasted with the base verb in (2).

The second marker, -\textit{s}, is more difficult to analyze: it has a limited distribution in verb paradigms, only appearing with 1PI and 3SG forms, and appears in a number of different contexts: it is found with the same types of derivations as -\textit{si} ((3) and (4)) but also--in some cases obligatorily, in others optionally--with verbs that do not have reflexive (or related) functions (5). It is even found with some transitive verbs (6).

In this presentation, I will propose an analysis of the phenomena above based on elicited and narrative data I have collected in the field. The -\textit{s} in fact has multiple, albeit related, origins: it is a phonological reduction of -\textit{si} in certain circumstances, while in others it appears to be an older reflexivizing suffix which has been integrated, to different degrees, into the verb morphology. With transitives, it appears to be a trace reflecting the complex derivational history of verbs which are derived from intransitives.

**Examples**

(1) go khu-ŋ-\textit{si}ŋu
   1SG bend-1SG-REFL-1SG.NPST
   'I am bending over.'

(2) go bephuŋ khu-ʈ
   1SG bamboo bend-1SG\textgreater 3SG.PST
   'I bent the bamboo.'

(3) pakhanu je-\textit{s}-ɖa
   outside call-REFL-3SG.NPST
   'There was calling outside.'

(4) gu-ka təo-lai jet-\textit{dy}
   3SG-ERG child-OBJ call-3SG\textgreater 3SG.PST
   'He called the child.'

(5) meram-ka wo phəl-mu nəs-ta/nə-ɖɖa
   that-ERG also cut-INF be.afraid-3SG.PST
   'He was afraid to cut [during sacrifice].'

(6) ko-le khlea-lai thyrs-ty/thyr-ry retsha ?e
   one-CL dog-OBJ send-3SG\textgreater 3SG.PST it.seems HS
   'One day, he sent a dog outside.'
Serial verb constructions (SVCs) or verb serializations are a classical topic in the grammar of many West African languages. These constructions are defined as combinations of two or more verbs sharing their arguments, which form complex predicates; verbs in a SVC are not separated by any overt dependency marker and the construction is interpreted as a single event. One particular type of SVCs is called *comitative*, and expresses the meaning “together with”. It is an asymmetrical construction in which one of the verb typically means “to be with”, “to accompany” or “to follow”, and is used to introduce a comitative participant. Comitative SVCs are found in Fon, a Kwa language mainly spoken in Benin by almost 2 millions speakers. In (1), the verb xá ‘to turn’ is the second of a series, and introduces a comitative participant. This comitative construction coexists with another construction expressing co-participation via an adpositional phrase, illustrated in (2). The preposition kpó(ɖò) is followed by a noun and a postposition kpó/kpán. Both elements are obligatory, and glossed identically as ‘with’.

The two comitative constructions in Fon have quite different syntactic and semantic properties. The aim of this presentation is to investigate their similarities and differences in forms and functions from a functional-typological point of view. One striking difference between the two constructions is that the complement of the adposition kpó(ɖò)...kpó/kpán can be comitative, but can also be instrument and manner. As such, the NP introduced by the adposition is not restricted to agentive participants. Conversely, the complement of the verb xá in a comitative SVC has to be an agent, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (3). The same sentence with kpó(ɖò)...kpó/kpán would be grammatical.

As noted by Stolz (2001:172) “the pattern of comitatives [...] is characterized by a symmetrical relation between two participants.” Consequently, the comitative NP is a co-participant that shares the same semantic role as another participant in the clause, either the subject or the object. Therefore, the notions of comitative and agent are closely linked, as it is noted by Plungian (2000) (cited in Archipov 2007): “[C]omitative expresses the role of a secondary agent accompanying the actions of the primary one, and/or of an object which the main participant has with him”.

In this talk, I demonstrate that the distinction between the two comitative constructions in Fon lies in which argument is the primary agent, and which one is the secondary one. In the adpositional construction, the comitative is the secondary agent and its co-participant is the primary one, while in the SVC, it is the comitative that is the primary participant. This analysis finds a remarkable parallel in the typological study by Stolz et al. (2006) who concluded for languages like Latvian that a construction may be described as having the semantics of *accompanyee-orientation*—the description of situations from the point of view of the participant who has more control over the action—, and of *companion-orientation*—the description of situations from the point of view of the participant who has less control over the action. This division of labour between the two comitative constructions explains on the one hand why the adpositional construction serves a variety of functions, among which comitative, and on the other hand why a comitative construction developed from a SVC.
Examples

Fon

(1) *nyà ɔ gbò sú xá ɛ
def cut bet turn 3sgo
‘The man bet with him.’

(2) é yì əxí mè kpó nò tòn kpó
3sgs go market in with mother gen with
‘He went to the market with his mother.’

(3) *vǐ ɔ yì wèmàxòmè xá wèmà tòn lè
child def go school turn book gen pl
‘The child went to school with his books.’
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Relative clause incorporation: evidence from the North Caucasus

Yury Lander (National Research University Higher School of Economics)

Many theories and descriptive traditions assume that parts of the word cannot be taken as separate syntactic nodes. In this talk, I discuss a phenomenon that presumably challenges this view, namely the incorporation of the predicate of the relative clause into the head noun as observed in some languages of the Caucasus.

In many dialects of Dargwa (Northeast Caucasian), the predicate of the prenominal relative clause may appear either in the long form (marked with a dedicated “attributive” suffix, which can also mark the number) or in the short form (unmarked for subordination). Long forms can themselves function as nominals taking case morphology, which is why they are sometimes considered nominalizations derived from short forms (cf. Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003). However, there is evidence that short forms constitute a single unit with head nouns: (i) a short form cannot be separated from the head noun, (ii) some short forms display the shift of accent, presumably motivated by their combining with nouns, (iii) unlike long forms, in coordinate constructions short forms can only modify the conjunct they combine with but not the whole set of conjuncts (1). Thus short forms appear to be syntactically and phonologically but also morphologically (due to the absence of the number category) deficient, which suggests they lost their autonomy and are incorporated in the head noun. Importantly, these forms still may have dependants of their own, hence participating in syntactic relations (2), and do not differ from long forms in this respect.

In the Circassian languages (i.e. West Circassian, alias Adyghe, and Kabardian, Northwest Caucasian), the predicates of prenominal relative clauses may either appear as independent words or form single words with the head nominal, as is indicated by certain morphophonological changes and the constraints on the morphological constituents observed in such patterns. As in Dargwa, the incorporated predicate may retain its own dependants (3).

The Circassian languages also show another interesting pattern, where a verb modifying a noun may behave similarly to adjectives and appear postnominally within a “nominal complex”, which grammatically shows properties of a single word. In West Circassian and in some Kabardian dialects such an incorporated verb may not have dependants (cf. Applebaum & Berez 2009), but in Standard Kabardian and some other Kabardian dialects the constituents of the relative clause can appear before the nominal complex (4). As it seems, the latter situation is an innovation and results from the fact the incorporated verb got access to syntactic rules in such constructions.

The first two cases may be considered violations of the No Phrase Constraint (originally proposed in Botha 1983), which prohibits morphology operating with complex syntactic phrases. The last construction cannot be described this way, though, but it seems to demonstrate a kind of demorphologization (in the course of which parts of complex morphological units become “syntactically active” interacting with other elements of the syntactic structure). In all of these cases some part of a unit that shows properties of a single word behaves as if it is a separate syntactic node projecting some structure (i.e. the relative clause).

There are further three issues to be discussed in relation to the relative clause incorporation. First, it is not clear that the incorporated predicates are all syntactically active to the same degree. Second, an issue remains of how widespread the construction is and what are typological constraints on it (for example, we are aware of a similar construction based on prenominal relatives in some Cushitic languages). Finally, it may be that morphology and syntax in such constructions may simply be not as precisely demarcated as in some other patterns.
Examples

Tanti Dargwa

(1) a. ĉe-t:i-w-ič-ib—durhaˁ=ra rurs-be=ra gap b-arq’-a
ON-BEHIND-M-win:PF-PRET—boy=ADD girl-PL=ADD praise HPL-do:PF-IMP
‘Compliment [the boy that won] and the girls’.

b. *ĉe-t:i-b-ič-ib—durhaˁ=ra rurs-be=ra gap b-arq’-a
ON-BEHIND-HPL-win:PF-PRET—boy=ADD girl-PL=ADD praise HPL-do:PF-IMP
(Expected: ‘Compliment [the boy and the girls] which won’.)

Tanti Dargwa

(2) [du sːa sun-ne-he gu-r-r-isː-un]—q’atːa r-aˁq’-en
I yesterday RFL-OBL-IN <hide>UNDER-EL-F-LV:PF-PRET—ravine F-go:PF-IMP
‘Go to the ravine where I was hiding yesterday’.

West Circassian

(3) [se z-e-z-kә-ʃe-ʔa]—bze-r
I RFL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-CAUS-know-PST—language-ABS
‘the language that I learned’

Ulap Kabardian

(4) mə psɔ-m ʃə-r ʃeʔe—ʃə-z-ke. psk’-a-r
this water-OBL horse-ABS horse.herd—LOC-REL.A-bathe-PST-ABS
‘the horse-herd that bathed the horse in this river’
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Transitivity alternations in Northern Samoyedic languages

Larisa Leisiö, Kone Foundation / University of Tampere, Finland

The Northern Samoyedic languages (< Samoyedic < Uralic) are basically agglutinative accusative SOV languages with complex morphophonology. They include Tundra Nenets, Forest Nenets, Forest Enets, Tundra Enets and Nganasan. Tundra Nenets is the largest language group with 20,000 native speakers. The area where Tundra Nenets is spoken stretches from the eastern parts of the Kola Peninsula (Murmansk Region) in the west to the Taimyr Peninsula in the east. Forest Nenets is a small group of around 2,000 people living to the south of Tundra Nenets territory, between the northern and central basin of the Ob River in the west and the basin of the Pur River in the east. There are several hundred Forest Nenets speakers including children. Both Enets languages and Nganasan are moribund languages of the Taimyr Peninsula, with some 100 speakers of Nganasan, a dozen speakers of Forest Enets and several speakers of Tundra Enets.

The Northern Samoyedic languages (NSMs) are a result of gradual divergence in the first millennium A.D. of the protolanguage via a dialect continuum, so that the edges of linguistic territories always were in contact. As could be anticipated in this situation, NSMs have numerous structural similarities.

A transitive event involves two participants, one of them being the instigator of the situation and the other the patient affected or effected in the course of the situation. Næss (2007, 30) suggests that in a prototypical transitive clause the two arguments are maximally semantically distinct. I will discuss the implementations of this prototype and deviation from the prototype in NSMs, and show that Tundra Nenets and Nganasan differ concerning transitivity while the other NSMs are in-between.

NSMs’ verbal characteristics, in particular aspect and transitivity, are mostly determined at the level of lexeme. Nevertheless, some transitive verbs (e.g. ‘write’, ‘read’, ‘sew’, ‘study’) allow indefinite object deletion in Nganasan (ex. 1 & 2), but not, e.g., in Tundra Nenets, in which a special suffix is needed to authorize an intransitive use (ex. 4, cf. ex. 3). There are three conjugation types; in subjective conjugation V[erb] agrees with S[ubject] in person and number, in objective conjugation V agrees with S in person and number and with the 3rd person O[bject] in number, and in reflexive conjugation agreement markers differ from those of subjective conjugation and indicate that a direct object is impossible. In all NSMs, there is a group of transitive-reflexive verbs (e.g. ‘wash’, ‘dress’ ex. 5), which permit a transitive use (ex. 6) with distinct S and O, and a reflexive use (S=O) (ex. 7). In transitive use these verbs conjugate objectively or subjectively while in reflexive use they conjugate reflexively. There are also a few S/O ambitransitive verbs (Nganasan, e.g. ‘close’).

Another kind of transitivity alternation is connected to the information structure. Direct objects are marked with Genitive, Accusative, Nominative, or Partitive. Conditions for each marking will be discussed. Individuation of the object is considered to be a factor of high transitivity (Hopper & Thompson 1980). One of the object’s characteristics in favour of high individuation is topicality (Timberlake 1975: 134). In the NSMs, only topical object can be cross-referenced on the verb.

Only in Tundra Nenets a partitive marker of direct object is possible. The Partitive indicates that an unspecified part of the object is affected (ex. 8, cf. ex. 9), or that the object entity is affected temporarily (ex. 10). Interestingly enough, it is Tundra Nenets speakers who have had contacts with the Northern Russian dialects in which the genitive marking of the object is used in the same sense.
Examples
Nyangansan
(1) səmu sot´ũrəndu-m
    hat   sew.IPF-1SG
    ‘I sew a hat.’

(2) d´ali-məni sot´ũrəndu-m
    day-PROL sew.IPF-1SG
    ‘I sew all day long.’ (T79: 206)

Tundra Nenets
(3) xasawa-nta maλ°c´a-d° sæd°b i
    husband-GEN.3SG overcoat-DEST sew.DUR.3SG
    ‘She sews an overcoat for her husband.’ (T65, 582)

(4) n´abako-m i sædor°
    older.sister-1SG sew.INTR.3SG
    ‘My older sister sews’. (T65, 582)

(5) yemp°q- ‘to dress.PF’: xibyaxəwa-m 1SG.SUBJ

(6) ñac´eke-m i yemp°qŋa-d°m / yemp°qŋa-w°
    child-[ACC=NOM]1SG dress-1SG.SUBJ / dress-1SG.OBJ>SG
    ‘I have dressed my child.’ (TS)

(7) yemp°qŋa-w°q
    dress-1.SG.REFL
    ‘I have got dressed.’ (TS)

(8) n´an°-xəq ta°
    bread-PAR give.3SG
    He has brought some bread (T73, 185)

(9) n´an°-m ta°
    bread-ACC give.3.SG
    ‘He has brought the bread.’ (T73, 185)

(10) n´a°ka-m° ñoba-x°q lsk°mpoy°h m´i°-q
    older.brother-GEN.2SG mitten-PAR for.a.while give-IMP
    ‘Give your brother mittens for a short time.’ (T73, 186)

Abbreviations: IMP imperative, IPF imperfective aspect, OBJ objective conjugation, PROL prolative, PAR partitive, PF perfective aspect, REFL reflexive conjugation, SUBJ subjective conjugation.
The referenceless data come from the author’s fieldwork.
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Russian sentential arguments: do they have properties of canonical subjects / objects?

Alexander Letuchiy, National Research University Higher School of Economics

Russian, as many other languages, has different ways of expressing sentential arguments. I consider mainly examples where sentential arguments are introduced by the complementizer čto and infinitive constructions.

The focus of my paper is to test sentential arguments (mainly those marked by the complementizers čto and the infinitive form) for subject and object behavior. I show that for many criteria, sentential arguments do not behave as canonical subjects or objects (see Postal 2011 and Fabrizio 2011 with some tests for English and Latin).

Below I show only several examples of these syntactic criteria.

1. ‘Stability’ of expression

In some constructions where the sentential argument is doubled by an emphatic marker, like odno in (1), the expression of sentential argument can differ from that possible without odno. For instance, in (1), the verb volnovat‘ ‘worry’ is used with infinitive which is impossible in the standard construction without odno in (2). This type of change is impossible for NPs which do not change their marking in constructions like those with odno (cf. (3) where the object NP is marked with the instrumental case both with and without odno).

2. Nominalization

Sentential arguments behave differently from NPs in nominalization. For instance, not all verbs can retain their sentential arguments when nominalized: znat‘ ‘know’ has a deverbal noun znanije, able to host a sentential argument, while vyjasnit‘ ‘find out’ in (4), forming a noun vyjasnenie, as in (5) which has no sentential argument.

Most nominal direct objects can be retained under nominalization, though this rule knows some exceptions. For instance, vyjasnenie can retain the object argument of the base verb, now marked with genitive, as in vyjasnen-e obstojatel’stv [find.out-NOMIN-NOM circumstance.GEN.PL] ‘clarification of circumstances’.

3. Passive constructions

The difference between passive constructions with nominal vs. with sentential arguments is that in the latter the agent (base subject) is expressed much more rarely than in the former (though in general, in Russian agents of passive often remain unexpressed). For instance, for the verb (soobščit‘ ‘report’) when used in passive with a subject NP, the agent is expressed in 26.92 per cent of cases. In contrast, with sentential subject (cf. example (6), the agent is expressed only in 1.6 per cent of examples. Though the presence of instrumentally-marked agent cannot be regarded as an obligatory feature of passive constructions, we can see that constructions with sentential arguments differ in this respect from those with nominal arguments.

Conclusions

Sentential arguments behave differently from corresponding nominal arguments (subjects and objects) in different respects: valency change and voice formation; nominalization; expression of the argument in emphatic construction and so on. All of these differences show that sentential arguments are not canonical subjects, objects and so on. However, the precise explanation will be different for different tests. For instance, differences in passivization can result from the fact that sentential direct objects lack direct object status. On the contrary, restrictedness of nominalization can result from the lack of case marking on sentential arguments (since under nominalization, the case-marking of nominal objects is changed to genitive, and for sentential arguments this is impossible). Finally, the variance in constructions with odno can result from the fact that the connection between sentential arguments and the predicate is looser than that between nominal arguments and the predicate. These non-canonical properties of different nature match together, making sentential arguments non-canonical subjects and objects.
Examples

All examples are from Russian.

(1) *Ego volnova-l-o odn-o: by-t’ ne xuže drug-ix.
   he.ACC worry-PST-SG.N one-SG.NOM be-INF not bad.COMPAR other-PL.GEN
   ‘Only one thing worried him: not to be worse than others.’

(2) *Ego volnova-l-o by-t’ ne xuže drug-ix.
   he.ACC worry-PST-SG.N be-INF not bad.COMPAR other-PL.GEN
   Intended: ‘It worried him not to be worse than others.’

(3) Mam-a nedovol’n-a (odn-im): besporjad-om.
   mother-SG.NOM unhappy.SHORT-F.SG one-SG.INS disorder-SG.INS
   ‘My mother is unhappy with (only one thing): the disorder.’

(4) On pomog-Ø starik-u vsta-t’.
   he.NOM help.PST-SG.M old.man-SG.DAT stand.up-INF
   ‘He helped the old man to stand up.’

(5) *Vyjasn-eni-e čto ubij-c-a - Petrov.
   find.out-NOMIN-NOM that killer-SG.NOM Petrov-SG.
   Intended: ‘Finding out / clarification that Petrov was the killer / that it was Petrov who
   killed.’

(6) Nam by-l-o soobšč-en-o čto proizoš-l-a ošibk-a.
   we.DAT be-PST-SG.N report-PARTCP.PST.PASS-N that happen-PST-SG.F mistake-
   SG.NOM
   ‘It was explained to us that a mistake took place.’
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The Cartography of Adverbials in Kavalan

Dong-yi Lin, Ghent University

Chang (2006) and Holmer (2010) have argued convincingly that some adverbial expressions in the Austronesian languages in Taiwan, or Formosan languages, are syntactically realized as verbs. The present study explores this syntactic phenomenon in Kavalan, an East Formosan language, and offers a syntactic analysis within the cartography framework of adverbials proposed by Cinque (1999, 2006).

Kavalan adverbials can be classified into three broad types based on their morphosyntactic behaviors. First of all, manner (1a), frequency (1b), aspect (1c), and modal-volition (1d) expressions exhibit the same morphosyntactic distributions as verbs: They occur in the clause-initial position, take voice markers, are affixed with ergative agreement suffixes, and attract pronominal and tense/aspect clitics. Secondly, evaluative and deontic adverbials must occur in the clause-initial position and can host clitics, but are not allowed to take voice markers, as shown in (2). The third type of adverbials must occur in the clause-initial position, but cannot take voice markers nor host clitics, as illustrated in (3).

Based on Cinque’s (1999, 2006) cartography syntax of adverbials, the present study argues that Kavalan adverbials occupy the heads of adverbial phrases in the split-IP/CP domain. Kavalan adverbials that are syntactically realized as verbs are merged between VP and vP, i.e., [AdvP₁] in (i) below, with v heading the so-called voice markers in Formosan languages. The second type of adverbials is merged right above vP within the IP domain, i.e., [AdvP₂] in (i), whereas the third type of adverbials, which cannot host clitics, is merged in Rizzi’s (2004) ModifierP in the CP domain, i.e., [ModP] in (i).


Only the adverbial heads situated between vP and VP can move to v to take voice affixes and thus show typical properties of verbs, whereas the adverbial heads in AdvP₂ cannot take voice markers, which would be affixed to the head that moves upward to v. Just like other functional elements in CP that cannot host clitics in Kavalan, e.g., the complementizer tu and the subordinator anu ‘if’, adverbials in ModP in the CP domain cannot attract clitics either.

The analysis of Kavalan adverbial verbs as heads of adverbial phrases between vP and VP predicts that the structure of the adverbial verb construction (AVC) like (1) is monoclausal even though there are two verbs in the construction. This prediction is borne out. First of all, the adverbial verb and the lexical verb in an AVC cannot host separate tense or aspect markers (4). Secondly, nominal arguments can only occur once (5). Moreover, their case-marking pattern is determined by the voice marker on the adverbial verb, not the lexical verb. In (1b), the agent is in ergative case and the theme takes the absolutive case marker; this is the case-marking pattern of a patient voice construction with -an. Thirdly, the lexical verb cannot be preceded by tu, which introduces a finite complement clause (6). Finally, as the adverbial verb intervenes between v and V, it is expected that the lexical verb cannot move to v due to the Head Movement Constraint. The contrast between (1) and (7) shows that the lexical verb cannot take the patient voice marker, but must occur in the agent voice form, which is the default non-finite form of a verb in Kavalan. In contrast, adverbials merged in AdvP₂ and ModP do not impose this voice restriction on the lexical verb, which can occur in the patient voice form (8).

The cartographic approach to Kavalan adverbials thus successfully accounts for not only the different morphosyntactic properties of the three types of adverbials but also the monoclausal structure of the AVC.
Examples

Kavalan

(1) a. paqanas-an-ku=ti s<m>inap
do.slowly-PV-1SG.ERG=PFV <AV>sweep
‘I swept (the floor) slowly.’

b. pataz-an-ku q<m>an ya ’may
do.often-PV-1SG.ERG <AV>eat ABS rice
‘I often eat rice.’

c. tuRin-an-na ni buya m-nubi ya kelisiw
do.immediately-PV-3ERG ERG Buya AV-hide ABS money
‘Buya hides the money immediately.’

d. sapazeng-an-na=iku ni buya p<m>ukun
do.on.purpose-PV-3ERG=1SG.ABS ERG Buya <AV>hit.with.a.stick
‘Buya hits me with a stick on purpose.’

(2) a. peliya=iku q<m>an tu iyu
luckily.not=1SG.ABS <AV>eat OBL medicine
‘Luckily, I didn’t take medicine.’

b. *m-peliya/#peliya-an-ku q<m>an tu iyu
AV-luckily.not/luckily.not-PV-1SG.ERG <AV>eat OBL medicine

(3) *pasi=pa/#m-pasi/#pasi-an Rasa tu lepaw ta-banqiao-an
probably=FUT/AV-probably/probably-PV buy OBL house LOC-Banqiao-LOC

(4) *paqanas-an-ku=ti s<m>inap=ti
do.slowly-PV-1SG.ERG=PFV <AV>sweep

(5) *pataz-an-ku q<m>an aiku ya ’may
do.often-PV-1SG.ERG <AV>eat 1SG.ABS ABS rice

(6) *paqanas-an-ku=ti tu s<m>inap
do.slowly-PV-1SG.ERG=PFV COMP <AV>sweep

(7) *sapazeng-an-na ni buya pukun-an aiku
do.on.purpose-PV-3ERG ERG PN hit.with.a.stick-PV 1SG.ABS

(8) pasi Rasa-an-na=ti ni buya ya lepaw ta-banqiao-an
probably buy-PV-3ERG=PFV ERG PN ABS house LOC-Banqiao-LOC
‘Buya has probably bought the house in Banqiao.’
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Non-canonical subjects in Classical Armenian

Federica Lini, Sapienza University of Rome

In Classical Armenian, within a nominative-accusative system, the perfect, the pluperfect and the future perfect show a construction with a genitive-marked subject. These compound forms, featuring a past participle and present/imperfect/present subjunctive tenses of the copula, take genitive subjects and accusative direct objects as in 1). According to grammarians, only transitive clauses take genitive subjects and a default third person singular form of the copula. The same distribution regarding subject is found with participles used as main verbs in a narrative mood without the copula.

Recent studies (Comrie 1981b: 181; Dixon, 1994: 100, 110; Haig, 2008: 318; Schulze, 2010), explain this feature as a split in the alignment system, whereby Classical Armenian shows tense-conditioned split ergativity.

Refining previous research by Bubenik (1997: 73-79) on the relation between alignment and definiteness, Scala (2009) suggests that Classical Armenian has a tripartite system: a rare kind of alignment in which each of the morpho-syntactic primitives has a proper case-marking, in Armenian nominative for S, genitive for A and accusative for O.

My paper aims to show the inadequacy of these descriptions. A survey focused on a broader and more reliable corpus than the only translation literature casts doubts on the ergative hypothesis. An in-depth analysis of the distribution of genitive and nominative subjects in the historical prose of the 5th and 6th centuries indicates that both subject-marking strategies occur with intransitive verbs (unaccusative and unergative alike). In particular, intransitive forms (with/without copula) may take the genitive-subject as in 2).

In my paper I suggest that this construction is better explained as originating from a possessive construction, as Benveniste (1952) already pointed out. Nevertheless the Benveniste possessive-resultative hypothesis implies a non-attested armenian construction with a nominative subject agreeing with the participle, comparable with the latin compound perfect "eius facta" (NP) est (VP) "eius factum est" (VP) operam.

The armenian feature could be instead intended as a nominalization; precisely the occurrence of genitive subjects even with intransitives, which Benveniste denied (1952: 57), supports the explanation of the genitive as the Possessor of the nominalized verb form, as shown in 3).

(1) oroy bazowm yawžarow ʿiwn i vardapetowtʿenē ēr
    who.GEN much inclination from teaching.ABL be.IMPF.3SG
    show.PST.PTCP
    “who showed much inclination to teaching” Koriwn XVII. 63, 38-39

(2) orpēs ʿtacʿeal ʿAstowcowoy ʿaycʿ ʿarar Hayocʿ
    like have mercy.PST.PTCP God.GEN visit do.AOR.3SG Armenian.GEN
    aḵxarhi-s
    land.GEN-DET
    “As God, having mercy, visited this Armenian land” Agathangelos, 13, 18-19

(3) z-ʿcʿayg ew z-ʿcʿerek nsteal vardapetacʿ-n
    night and day sit.PST.PTCP teachers.GEN-DET
    z- vardapetowtʿiwn-n i veray hosoēn
    ACC-doctrine-DET on pour.IMPF.3PL
“the teachers, sitting day and night, (…) poured on (them) the doctrine” P’awstos
Buzandac’i, III. 13, 33-36
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The nature of NP constituency in Australian languages: a sample-based study

Dana Louagie & Jean-Christophe Verstraete, University of Leuven

This paper examines the nature of NP constituency in Australian languages, using data from a sample of 75 languages. The existence of 'classic' NP structures has often been questioned for Australian languages, typically embedded in theoretical debates about non-configurationality (e.g. Hale 1983). In this paper, we isolate the question of NP constituency from the broader theoretical issue of non-configurationality (see also Nordlinger 1998), and investigate NP structure in its own right. We use data from a sample of 75 Australian languages, covering most subgroups of Pama-Nyungan as well as most non-Pama-Nyungan families, and we argue that there are in fact very few Australian languages that show strong evidence against NP constituency.

In order to examine NP constituency in its own right, we break down the notion of constituency into a number of concrete parameters that can be checked throughout the sample. Specifically, we investigate six parameters that are relevant to NP constituency: (i) the order of the nominal head and various modifiers, (ii) the location of case marking, (iii) patterns of number and gender agreement, (iv) the availability and functions of 'discontinuous' patterns, and, where information is available, (v) the prosody of nominal patterns, and (vi) their behaviour with respect to 'diagnostic slots' like second-position clitics. We tabulate this information for each of the 75 languages in the sample.

Most of the languages examined have evidence for basic NP constituency, as reflected in a combination of (i) clear ordering tendencies of the nominal head and its modifiers, (ii) various boundary phenomena like phrasal case marking, diagnostic syntactic slots (both usually defining the right edge of a phrase) and/or determiners (defining either edge of the phrase), and (iii) in the few descriptions investigating prosody in detail, prosodic integrity. That is, when a nominal and its modifiers co-occur in these languages, there is little reason not to assume they form a phrase with the nominal as its head.

Given the strong predominance of such patterns in the sample, the existence of 'discontinuous' patterns in some languages need not be interpreted as evidence against NP constituency. Instead, they can often be interpreted as splitting of nominal material over several coreferential NPs for functional considerations (McGregor 1997, Schultze-Berndt & Simard 2012). Even where such an analysis is not available, there is no clear reason to regard 'discontinuous' patterns as variants of the contiguous pattern, and thus as evidence that the contiguous pattern does not form a genuine NP. The few detailed studies that exist show that the two types of patterns are separate constructions, with very different functions (again, as shown in Schultze-Berndt & Simard 2012). What this paper adds to such arguments is robust evidence pointing to a core of NP constituency across a representative sample of languages.
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Partitives, differential object marking and the development of indefiniteness markers: a cross-linguistic survey

Silvia Luraghi, University of Pavia

My paper aims at a unified treatment of a number of morphologically different items, including partitive cases, as in Balto-Finnic (1) and Basque (2a), partitive genitives/ablative, as in various ancient and modern Indo-European languages, (3)- (4), partitive articles, as in some Romance languages (5), and particles in Oceanic languages (6). I start by considering the fact that in recent studies (e.g. De Hoop & Malchukov 2007, De Swart & De Hoop 2007), the Finnish partitive case is described as instantiating a special type of differential object marking (symmetrical DOM; see Iemmolo 2013 for a different view). Typically, such studies disregard the fact that the partitive can also mark subjects, as in (7), something which is not true for other DOM marking devices. Far from being a peculiarity of the Finnish partitive, this holds for other partitive items cross-linguistically, cf. e.g. (8) from Ancient Greek. In fact, it has been argued e.g. for Basque (Laka 1993) and Finnish (Asbury 2006) that partitive cases should better be regarded as belonging to the class of determiners (note the complementary distribution of the partitive case and the definite determiner in (2a) vs. (2b) from Basque). Setting various partitive items in a cross-linguistic perspective, I show that the properties that set apart partitive items from other markers of core arguments are explained diachronically. One can trace a diachronic cline, which moves away from partitive nominal construction, as in English ‘A piece of that cake’ (cf. Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2006), and leads to indefiniteness marker, as in examples (1)-(8). Indeed, all items considered share the common characteristic of indicating indefiniteness to various extents. Language-specific partitives can also convey other meanings, such as various aspectual meanings in Balto-Finnic languages (Huumo 2010, see also Kiparsky 1998), or be associated with negation as in Basque. However, these meanings are not uniformly displayed by all partitive items, while indefiniteness is. This diachronic development explains the extension of partitives from direct object to existential subjects first, and then to all types of subject and other syntactic functions (e.g. complement of adpositions, as in Finnish). Based on the evidence surveyed in the paper, I conclude that the extension of partitive markers to direct objects and subjects, rather than as an instantiation of DOM (or DSM), should better be regarded as the development of markers of indefiniteness, variously related to determiners. Of the languages discussed, only the Romance varieties (French and to some extent Italian) display the end stage of grammaticalization (cf. Carlier 2007), at which items that started out from partitive constructions acquire the only function of indefinite determiners, possibly on account of the peculiar interaction of the partitive marker with the definite article.
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Examples

(1.) *Elmeri loysi mansikoita.*
Elmer find:3SG.PAST strawberry:PL.PAR
‘Elmer found some (i.e. and indefinite quantity of not previously identified) strawberries.’ (Finnish)

(2a) *Amaiak ez du goxokirik jan*
Amaia:ERG NEG AUX candy:PAR eat
‘Amaia has not eaten any candy.’ (Basque)

(2b) *Amaiak ez ditu goxoiak jan*
Amaia:ERG NEG AUX candy:DEF.PL eat
‘Amaia has not eaten the candies’ (Basque)

(3.) *Ja vypil vody*
1SG drink:PST.PFV.M.SG water:GEN
‘I drank (some) water.’ (Russian)

(4.) *pácanti te vṛṣabhānī átsi tēsām*
cook:PRS.3PL 2SG.DAT bulls:ACC eat:PRS.3SG 3PL.M.GEN
‘They cook bulls for you, you eat (some) of them.’ (Vedic Sanskrit, Rigveda X 28.3)

(5.) *J’ai accheté des livres.*
I have bought PAR books
‘I bought some books’ (French)

(6.) *No-ku ta, o vodo re paka-ku, re vina-ku.*
POSS-1S dad 2S:I make PAR bow-1S, PAR arrow-1S
‘Dad, could you make me a bow, make me some arrows?’ (Araki, François 2002: 53-54).

(7.) *Use-i-ṭa ihmis-i-ā odott-i satee-ssa bussi-a.*
Many-PAR-PL person-PAR-PL wait-PST.3SG rain-INE bus-PAR
‘Many people were waiting for the bus in the rain.’ (Finnish)

(8.) *he ḍe khelōnē hótan ēkheōs phāgēi epēsthiei orīganon*
ART.NOM PTC turtle when snake:GEN eat:SBJV.PRS.3SG eat:PRS.3SG oregano:ACC
‘In case they eat snake, turtles take oregano (as an antidote).’ Ancient Greek (Arist. *HA* 612a24)
Subject agreement is often viewed as one of the most important criteria for finiteness, which seems to make the finite/non-finite distinction in Udi (< Lezgic < East Caucasian) rather straightforward. Subject person marking, an innovative Udi feature, is obligatory in (most of) the independent clauses (ex. 1, the perfect *bake=zu*), whereas it is absent in dependent clauses, e.g. those headed by converbs, participles or the infinitive (ex. 1, the perfective participle čováki). However, there are exceptions in both directions. First, some independent clauses – e.g. the 2SG imperative and the hortative ones (ex. 2) – do not have subject agreement (their person/number value is unambiguous, though). Next, there is obligatory person marking in some types of dependent (complement or adverbal) clauses, e.g. on the conditional (ex. 3, *bašaji=jan*) and the subjunctive forms of the verb (ex. 4, *ba=ne*). Thus, on the basis of just two criteria, agreement and clause dependency, we see the ‘cline of finiteness’ ranging from non-agreeing dependent to agreeing independent clauses.

The behaviour of person clitics can say much more about the distinction between the types of clauses. Apart from agreement, person markers in Udi are the main means of the morphosyntactic expression of information structure, as they are placed on the focused constituent. Thus, the clauses also differ in their possibilities of information structuring: while in “non-agreeing” clauses this mechanism cannot apply, some of the “agreeing” clauses allow the person enclitic to mark various types of focused constituents (ex. 5), though in some of them the position of the marker is restricted to the verb (ex. 4). Moreover, it is not only the verb form as a whole [V] that can host the person enclitic (ex. 3, the future *tašal=e*; ex. 4, the subjunctive *ba=ne*), but also the first, or “lexical” part [V\_LEX] of the verb, be it a historically complex, but now lexicalized combination (ex. 6), or a simplex stem (ex. 7); it is exactly this property of Udi person markers that earned them the status of ‘endoclitics’ (Harris 2002). One peculiarity of the “agreeing” verb forms is the preference of person marker placement: e.g. while the aorist or the present always have the enclitic on V\_LEX (exx. 6, 7, 8), the perfect or the future place it on V (exx. 1, the perfect *bake=zu*; 3, the future *tašal=e*).

On the whole, the latter group of forms is more restricted with respect to the information structuring, which makes these forms less ‘canonically’ finite (in the sense of Nikolaeva 2013). The talk will present the ‘cline’ of the finite/non-finite clauses in Udi, paying most attention to the intermediate stages and suggesting possible historical scenarios. In particular, the functions of forms with reduced finiteness will be discussed in more detail. One hypothesis to be presented is that “agreeing” dependent forms (e.g. subjunctive) are former finite forms, now ousted to dependent contexts. On the other hand, finite TAM-forms with restricted possibilities of information structuring (e.g. perfect, future, debitive) seem to be comparatively recent grammaticalizations, that still retain some of their original structure, based on copular clauses with participles. A piece of evidence supporting the latter path is a special negation strategy available to these forms, as will be discussed in the paper.

Given that endoclisis is a very rare phenomenon typologically, it is also worth asking why it has become a primary strategy of person markers placement on the most frequent finite verb forms (aorist and present). A plausible answer is that the position of person markers on V\_LEX reflects the preference of placing a focused constituent in the immediately preverbal position (like in ex. 5). Thus, in the absence of a focused non-verbal constituent, person clitics are found on the “less verbal” part of the verb (or verbstem), to the left of the locus of inflectional marking ([L[ight]V[erb] / ST[em]]).
Examples
[clitics are separated with = ; person markers are bolded]

(1) zu=al č:ovak-i šamat: mija bak-e=zu
    l=ADD [pass-AOR,PTCP] week PROX.LOC be-PERF=1SG
‘Last week (lit. week that passed) I have been here as well.’

(2) uk-a! uk-en!
    eat-IMP eat-HORT
‘eat!’ (2SG) ‘let’s eat!’ (1PL)

(3) tūk  bau-aji=jan, χe-n-en jay taš-al=e
    [alone enter-COND=1PL] water-O-ERG we:DAT take.away-FUT=3SG
‘If we step into (the river) separately, water will take us away.’

(4) te=ne ava-bak-i hik:ä b-a=ne
    NEG=3SG know-LV-AOR [what:NA do-SUBJ=3SG]
‘He didn’t know what to do.’

(5) šo šähär-e=ne tac-i
    DIST:NA [city-LOC]=3SG go.away-AOR
‘He went TO THE CITY.’

(6) cam=e=p-i
    [write]=3SG=LV-AOR
‘s/he wrote’
(< cam ‘writing’ + p- ‘say’)

(7) ta=ne=c-i a=ne=kː-i
    [go.away]=3SG=ST-AOR [see]=3SG=ST-AOR
‘s/he went away’ (the stem is tac-) ‘s/he saw’ (the stem is akː-)

(8) āš=e=b-sa a=ne=kː-sa
    [work]=3SG=LV-PRS [see]=3SG=ST-PRS
‘s/he works’ ‘s/he sees’
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Word order, animacy and topic in Kabardian

Ranko Matasović, University of Zagreb

East Circassian (Kabardian) is a polysynthetic language with dominant SOV word order. Polinsky (1989) claimed that the dominant word order in Kabardian is OVS in sentences with inanimate Subjects (1). This claim is likewise found in a number of Russian reference works on Kabardian (e.g. Kumaxov (ed.) 2006: 491, Kumaxov & Vamling 2006: 87-8, adding that this word order also depends on the semantic class of the verb, without specifying any details). However, Colarusso (1992: 184-5) disputes this, stating that there is no such general rule involving inanimate subjects. When confronted with examples such as (1), native speakers have different intuitions, and the acceptability of such examples apparently depends on the pragmatic context of the utterance. Moreover, in Kabardian texts we find examples with inanimate subjects and SOV order, such as (2).

The matter is further complicated by the fact that Kabardian, like its close relative Adyghe (Sumbatova 2009), has two strategies of argument focalization: (I) by word order change (putting the focalized argument in the preverbal position) in sentences with finite verbs and case-marked nouns (3), and (II) by predicativizing focalized arguments and relativizing the predicate (4a). The latter construction, called ‘marked’ by Sumbatova, is characterized by remarkably free word order and does not show O-initial preference for inanimate Actors (4b). Thus, the relative argument position in Kabardian is certainly affected by information structure, and the question arises how information structure interferes with animacy in determining word order.

This paper will present the results of a corpus-based study of word order in Kabardian. The corpus consists of narrative folklore prose texts dealing with the Nart legends (Nārtxar). It will be shown that the OSV and OVS orders are regularly found only if the following conditions are met: (a) the Subject (Actor) is clearly topical (i.e. it is found in a topic chain in a narrative discourse); (b) the Subject (Actor) is inanimate, and (c) the sentence is not pragmatically marked (in the sense of Sumbatova 2009).

Examples

Kabardian

(1) γāva-r dǝγa-m 0-ya-sǝž-ǝ-ś
   crops-ABS sun-ERG 3U-3A-burn-PRET-AFF
   “The sun burned the crops”

(2) zǝ dap l’ǝ c’ǝk”ǝ-m yǝ džāna-r 0-px-ya-sǝč’-ǝ-ś
    a flame man little-OBL his shirt-ABS 3U-DIR-3A-burn-PRET-AFF
    “A flame burned through the shirt of the little man” (Nārtxar, 288)

(3) l’ǝ-m 0-ya-sǝž-ǝ-ś γāva-r
    man-ERG 3U-3A-burn-PRET-AFF crops-ABS
    “The man burned the crops”

(4a) γāva-r 0-ya-sǝž-ǝ-r dǝγ-ǝ-ś
    “The sun burned the crops” (“It was the sun that burned the crops”)

(4b) dǝγ-ǝ-ś γāva-r 0-ya-sǝž-ǝ-r
“The sun burned the crops” (“It was the sun that burned the crops”)
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Languages with adnominal agreement without verbal agreement

Ranko Matasović, Tena Gnjatović, University of Zagreb

Recent research (Matasović 2014) has suggested that languages with adnominal agreement (i.e. agreement in the domain of the NP) almost always have verbal agreement (where the clause is the domain of agreement) as well. Languages with the former agreement pattern, but without the latter (languages of the [+NA & -VA] type), are very rare cross-linguistically. It has been argued that this is because agreement first arises on verbs, as person/gender/number argument indexes (Haspelmath 2013) lose their referential status and become pure agreement markers, while adnominal agreement arises only if a language already has verbal agreement, by extension of an already present syntactic rule. This means that languages with adnominal agreement, but without verbal agreement, must have had verbal agreement at an earlier stage, but lost it (without also losing adnominal agreement).

This paper will take a comparative look at the languages that belong to this type and show that the hypothesis sketched above is basically correct. Languages of the [+NA & -VA] type belong to two sub-types; the first one has possessive agreement in the NP, where possessed nouns obligatorily have possessive markers agreeing with pronominal and/or nominal possessors. Boumaa Fijian (Austronesian) is such a language (see example (1)).

The other sub-type has gender/number (occasionally also case) agreement in the NP, but no agreement on verbs, e.g. Grebo (Niger-Kordofanian, Gur), as in (2). There appear to be no languages with both person and gender/number adnominal agreement without verbal agreement.

With very few exceptions, languages of the [+NA & -VA] type are found in Australia (in the Pama-Nyungan family), parts of Austronesia, and in West Africa (in the Niger-Kordofanian family and in the Chadic branch of the Afro-Asian family). We will show for nearly all of the documented languages of this type that the current situation is the result of the loss of verbal agreement. In some of them, e.g. Guugu Yimidhirr, affixes expressing verbal agreement were lost by erosion, or became indistinguishable by phonological mergers not affecting adnominal agreement markers. In others, e.g. in Gur languages such as Supyire (Marchese 1986), the original verbs were reduced to auxiliaries, while new verbal forms arose out of nominalizations. The auxiliaries became petrified in only one form (usually the original 3rd person sg.), while the new lexical verbs (from old verbal nouns) never developed person marking.

Examples

Boumaa Fijian (Austronesian)

(1) a liga-na a gone.yalewa yai
   ART hand-3SG.POSS ART young.girl this
   ‘The hand of this young girl’ (Dixon 1988: 121)

Grebo (Niger-Kordofanian, Gur)

(2) Ká u ú fyāngi niŋyëng tùgò mii fyè
   and he NAR son.DEF(GENDER1SG) old.DEF(GENDER1SG.) send my footsteps
   e
   in
   ‘And he sent his oldest son after me.’ (Carlson 1994: 24)
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Exemplar-driven category building: A basic communicative function and its coding across languages

Caterina Mauri (University of Pavia), Andrea Sansò (Insubria University)

The act of building shared categories revolving around a given exemplar is crucial in everyday interaction. Speakers frequently make reference to a discourse-relevant set of entities/situations, without the need to name all its members explicitly, but simply evoking them by naming one or more exemplars. To see this interactional move in action, consider example (1) from Japanese. In (1), the speaker uses -ya to refer to a more or less abstract category ‘alcoholic drinks’, inviting the addressee to build it starting from the two mentioned exemplars ‘beer’ and ‘sake’. If the speaker wanted to refer only to ‘beer and sake’, she should have used -to instead of -ya. Similar cases are (2a) and (2b), from Kuuk Thayorre, where the suffix =yuk (glossed as ‘STUFF’ in (2a-b)) attached to a noun extends its reference to include items more or less occasionally associated with the referent of that noun (Gaby 2006: 209-210). In (2b), for instance, the speaker/narrator wants the hearer to build an occasional discourse-relevant category that can be labeled “Objects I was bearing” by marking two of them (a shovel and an axe) by means of =yuk.

We propose to call exemplar-driven category building (henceforth EDCB) the process by which the speaker invites the addressee to take one (or more) given item(s)/situation(s) as a starting point to build – through contextually-based similarity reasoning – a ‘higher-level category’ (Ariel & Mauri, submitted), which is in itself more discourse-relevant than the individual exemplar(s), as in (1)-(2). We argue that such a process represents a basic communicative function in human communication and that there are recognizable linguistic strategies through which speakers perform such an operation.

Based on a 150-language sample, this paper aims to provide a cross-linguistic typology of the linguistic constructions encoding the process of EDCB. Languages employ a great variety of constructions to reach this goal, ranging from inflectional to discourse-level strategies, but no cross-linguistic survey is available accounting for variation in how this crucial communicative operation is performed.

From the structural point of view, the survey shows that constructions encoding EDCB range from more transparent discourse-level constructions such as English ‘and stuff like that’ (usually called “general extenders” in the literature; Overstreet 1999), to synthetic, less transparent means such as the Modern Japanese non-exhaustive connective -ya in (1), the affix =yuk in (2), or the so-called representative plural suffix -nado in Classical Japanese (cf. (3)), paradigmatically opposed to -domo, the simple additive plural. Other well-represented strategies are echo-word formation (cf. (4)) and other types of reduplication, which are particularly widespread in Asia, as well as special (e.g. non-exhaustive) connectives (cf. (5)). Table 1 synoptically illustrates the continuum from morphologically highly integrated strategies to more syntactic strategies encoding EDCB. From the functional point of view, the picture emerging from the typological survey shows that EDCB constructions are frequently synchronically associated with (or diachronically derived from) strategies encoding the notions of genericity (e.g. generic nouns such as “thing”, general classifiers, indefinite pronouns, universal quantifiers, etc.), and similarity (e.g. “like”-adjectives and adverbs). Moreover, there is a very widespread multi-functionality pattern by which many of these strategies (e.g. plurals, connectives, echo-word) are also exploited in various functional domains having to do with the process of building heterogeneous sets (e.g. reference to groups, to types, non-exhaustive enumeration, etc.).
Examples and tables

(1) Japanese (isolate; Kuno 1973: 115)

[Biru-ya sake-σ] drinks takusan nomimashita.
beer-and sake-ACC lots drank
‘I drank lots of beer and sake and stuff like that.’

(2) Kuuk Thayorre (Pama-Nyungan; Gaby 2006: 210, 642)
a. *pormpyr=yuk koop thiik-nhan*
house(ACC)=STUFF all break-GO&:NPST
‘all the houses and things will be broken [in a cyclone]’
OK then 1sg(ERG) shovel(ACC)=STUFF leave-P.PFV axe(ACC)=STUFF
‘okay, so I put down the shovel thingy, and the axe’

(3) Classical Japanese (isolate; Vovin 2003: 40)

tani-no soko-nado-ni fa
valley-GEN bottom-REPR-LOC TOP
‘at the bottom of valleys and other places like that’

(4) Lao (Kam-Tai; Enfield 2007: 306)

man2 pajo sùù4 song5 sùù4 sùa4
3.B DIR.ABL buy trousers buy shirt
‘He (went and) bought clothes (lit. trousers and shirt).’

(5) Koasati (Muskogean; Kimball 1991: 413)

be.so-CONN LOC-dwell.PL-PROG river-in-LIST swamp-in-LIST be.so-in
‘So they live in rivers and in swamps and in suchlike places.’

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High morphological integration</th>
<th>Low morphological integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Inflection</td>
<td>Derivational Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E.G. Special Plurals)</td>
<td>Echo-word formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glosses: ABL = ablative; ACC = accusative; B = bare; CONN = connective suffix; DIR = directional; ERG = ergative; GEN = genitive; GO& = associated motion morpheme; LIST = connective nominal suffix;
LOC = locative; NPST = non-past; PL = plural; P.PFV = perfective past; PROG = progressive; REPR = representative; TOP = topic.
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Grammatical description in terms of symmetry and asymmetry with particular reference to negation in Skolt Saami

Matti Miestamo, University of Helsinki

This paper will discuss how the notion of symmetry and asymmetry introduced by Miestamo (2005) can be used in grammatical description. The distinction between symmetric and asymmetric structures was originally used to typologize standard negation, i.e. the negation of declarative verbal main clauses. Symmetric negatives do not differ from affirmatives in any other way than by the presence of negative markers whereas asymmetric negatives show structural differences as compared to the corresponding affirmatives. Symmetry can be observed in constructions and paradigms. In asymmetric constructions the negative differs structurally from the corresponding affirmative in other ways than the mere presence of the negative marker, cf. the asymmetric construction in Skolt Saami (2) to the symmetric one in Taba (1). In asymmetric paradigms, the correspondence between the members of the paradigms used in negatives and affirmatives is not one to one and often paradigmatic distinctions made in the affirmative are lost in the negative, cf. the asymmetric paradigm in Burmese (4) to the symmetric one in Romanian in (3); in Burmese the affirmative paradigm makes a distinction between actual, potential and perfect, but in the negative there is only one form corresponding to all three. Asymmetric negation can be further divided into subtypes according to the nature of the asymmetry and the different subtypes can be seen as motivated by different functional properties of negation (see Miestamo 2005 for discussion). Miestamo (2007) discusses how other functional domains, beyond standard negation, can be typologized in terms of symmetry and asymmetry, exemplifying this with the typological classification of polar interrogatives and their relation ship to the corresponding unmarked category of declaratives. In this paper the focus is not on typological classification, but on how these principles of typological classification can be applied to the analysis and description of particular languages. The discussion will be illustrated mostly by examples from the domain of negation in Skolt Saami. We have observed that standard negation is expressed by an asymmetric construction in Skolt Saami (2a-b): the negative auxiliary takes the finite inflections and the lexical verb is in the nonfinite connegative form. We may also look at negative imperatives (5a-b), and observe the same kind of asymmetry with a negative auxiliary and a nonfinite lexical verb; since this is a combination of two marked categories: negation and imperative, we will also want to observe whether the relation between imperatives and declaratives is symmetric or asymmetric here. Similarly, in the domain of non-verbal predication (5c-e), we examine the relationship between affirmative and negative copula clauses paying attention to any structural differences we can observe between them. This study will take a comprehensive and systematic look at the domain of negation in Skolt Saami, and for every negative construction identified, it is systematically asked what the structural differences are with respect any identifiable positive counterparts, both in terms of the formation of the construction and its paradigmatic combinability with other categories. In addition to providing a description of the domain of negation in Skolt Saami and a discussion of how the notion of asymmetry can be useful in grammatical description in the domain of negation and beyond, the presentation also aims to contribute to our understanding of the relationship between typological research and language description.

Examples

Taba (Austronesian, South Halmahera – West New Guinea)
(1) a. n-han ak-la  
    3SG-go ALL-sea  
  ‘She’s going seawards.’
 b. n-han ak-la te  
    3SG-go ALL-sea NEG  
  ‘She’s not going seawards.’ (Bowden 1997: 388)

Skolt Saami (Uralic, Saami)
(2) a. poor-am eat-1SG  
  ‘I eat.’
 b. jiõm poor eat  
  ‘I do not eat.’ (constructed examples)

Romanian (Indo-European, Romance)
(3) a. (a) cânta ‘to sing’ PRES  
    AFF NEG 1SG cânt  
    nu cânt cântam nu cântam
 b. (a) cânta ‘to sing’ IMPF  
    AFF NEG 1SG cânt  
    nu cânt cântam nu cântam
 2SG cânti nu cânti cântai nu cântai
 3SG cântă nu cântă cânta nu cânta
 1PL cântăm nu cântăm cântam nu cântam
 2PL cântaţi nu cântaţi cântaţi nu cântaţi
 3PL cântă nu cântă cântau nu cântau
 (constructed examples)

Burmese (Sino-Tibetan, Burmese-Lolo)
(4) a. θwâ-dé  
    go-ACT ‘goes, went’
 b. θwâ-mé  
    go-POT ‘will go’
 c. θwâ-bí  
    go-PERF ‘has gone’
 d. ma-θwâ-bû  
    NEG-go-NEG ‘does/did/will not go, has not gone’
 (Cornyn 1944: 12–13)

Skolt Saami (Uralic, Saami)
(5) a. poorrâp  
    eat.IMP.1PL ‘Let’s eat!’
 b. jeäl’lap porru  
    NEG.IMP.1PL eat.IMP.CNG ‘Let’s not eat!’
 c. lij  
    be.3SG ‘he/she is’
 d. i  
    be.NEG.3SG ‘he/she is not’
 e. i’lla  
    be.CNG ‘he/she is’
 f. leäk’ku  
    be.NEG.CNG ‘he/she is not’
 (constructed examples)

Abbreviations: 1/2/3 = 1st/2nd/3rd person, ACT = actual, AFF = affirmative, ALL = allative, CNG = connegative, IMP = imperative, IMPF = imperfect, NEG = negative, PERF = perfect, PL = plural, POT = potential, PRES = present, SG = singular.
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The Position of Piedmontese on the Romance Grammaticalisation Cline

Emanuele Miola (University of Milano-Bicocca)

The proposal of a Romance grammaticalisation cline (RGC, also called pace or rhythm or gradualness of grammaticalisation) has given rise to a vast strain of research since Lamiryo’s (1999) pioneering work, recently summarised in Carlier/De Mulder/Lamiroy (2012) and in De Mulder/Lamiroy (2012).

The RGC hypothesis suggests that languages belonging to the same linguistic family, such as for instance Romance languages, grammaticalise at different speed. For the majority of grammaticalisation phenomena Romance languages can be situated on a scale, on which French is ahead of Italian. The latter, in turn, is ahead of Spanish. Until now, less attention has been paid to non-national, i.e. to regional, Romance languages, although they are numerous and vital, or even highly vital, within the Romance territory.

This paper focuses on the pace of grammaticalisation in (a number of varieties of) Piedmontese, a north-western Italo-Romance language (including a regional koine and several peripheral local varieties). Piedmontese is compared to the geographically nearest languages usually discussed in the literature about the RGC: French and Italian. The speed of grammaticalisation in Piedmontese is tested with respect to four (morpho-)syntactic domains already covered in the literature on RGC for national languages, namely demonstratives, negation, partitives and perfective auxiliaries for intransitive verbs (see 1 to 4 below). The analysis is carried out relying on data coming from the author’s fieldwork, from previous studies on Piedmontese (Berruto 1990, Bonato 2004, Parry 2005, Villata 1997, a.o.), and from a selected corpus of Piedmontese texts ranging from 1321 to our days.

Data show that the Piedmontese koine is positioned in between French and Italian on the RGC, while peripheral Piedmontese varieties apparently are on par with, or even slightly ahead of, French. While helping to answer the question as to why some languages appear to be more grammaticalised than others within the same genealogical family, these findings challenge De Mulder/Lamiroy’s (2012: 219-221) view about the role of language-external factors on the grammaticalisation processes: the amount of contact with other languages and the strength of social ties between speakers seem to be more important in favouring grammaticalisation than early urbanization and the size of the speaker community.

Examples

(1) Demonstrative adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM. / LANG.</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Pied. koine</th>
<th>Southern Pied.</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st-person oriented</td>
<td>questo</td>
<td>sto/(cost)</td>
<td>[(e)s]</td>
<td>ce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far from the speaker</td>
<td>quello</td>
<td>col</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-person oriented</td>
<td>(codesto)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Negation

Italian

non posso
NEG can-1SG
‘I cannot.’

French
je  (ne) peux  pas
I  NEG can-1SG  NEG
‘I cannot.’

Piedmontese koine
i peuss  nen
SBJ.CL-1SG can-1SG  NEG
‘I cannot.’

(3) Perfective auxiliaries for intransitive verbs (E = ESSE; H = HABERE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANG. / VERB CLASS</th>
<th>definite change of location/state</th>
<th>indefinite change of location</th>
<th>continuation of a state</th>
<th>existence of a state</th>
<th>uncontr. process</th>
<th>controlled process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piedmontese koine</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallanzenghese/Cigliese</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NE / S Piedmont)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coggiolese/Niellese</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NE / S Piedmont)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Partitives

French
Je mange  des [/** Ø] pommes
I  eat-1SG  PART  apples
‘I eat apples.’

Piedmontese koine (19th cent.)
a  j’ è d’ [/** Ø] aqua e  ’d[ /** Ø] pan  mufì
SBJ.CL-3SG  there  is PART  water and  PART  bread  molded
‘there is some water and moldy bread.’

Italian
abbiamo trovato dei / Ø funghi nel bosco
have-1PL found PART / Ø mushrooms in the wood
‘we found some mushrooms in the woods.’
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Corpus Study of Information Structure in Hittite (on the basis of the Middle Hittite letters)

Maria Molina, Centre of Comparative Studies, Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies, Russian State University for the Humanities

This report is a corpus study of information structure of Middle Hittite. The Hittite letter corpus of (Hoffner 2009) offers a good representative raw data for the analysis. As a dead language, Hittite provides scarce data about its information structure. Letters are one good source to understand the way how people might have communicated. As to the theory of the information structure, we used Krifka's (Krifka 2007) and Lambrecht’s (Lambrecht 1994) understanding of Focus and Topic. The corpus approach helps us to catalogize all non-canonical word order cases, subsequently calculate their frequency and discuss their function. Although there exist descriptions of information structure of the Hittite language (Luraghi 1990; Goedegebuure 2003; 2009; 2014 among others), there has never been undertaken a quantitative information structure research of a homogenous corpus. The study of (Widmer 2009), although carried out on the same data, is not properly statistical and narrowly focuses on the information structure of sentence connective nu. My paper focuses on the problems which are often ignored: does word order always directly correlate with marked information structure status? What is the frequency of non-canonical word order (non-final verbs, OSV, negation/preverb/DP fronting) in relation to the canonical word order in a corpus that comes from a limited period of time and a group of people in close contact?

The main focus of the research is made on verbs, their position and their communicative role in a clause. Canonical word order in Hittite, rigidly limited to SOV word order, implies that the verb is clause-final/rightmost and carries informational focus. Still, there is a certain amount of cases when the verb is non-final. Our study focuses both on the cases when the verb goes first in the clause as well as on the cases when it is clause internal. The frequency of such cases is very low — 0,46% in case of the verbs in the first position (see Ex. (1)) and about 1,69% in case of the clause internal verbs.

Still, the non-canonical verb position appears to be a regular phenomenon in Hittite. Extreme rarity of a syntactic phenomenon is paralleled by right dislocations in a great number of languages as well as the rarity of verb fronting in, e.g., Georgian (Skopeteas, Fanselow 2010). The same situation in Hittite can be observed for OSV word order, which is attested in our corpus only 7 times (0.6%, see Ex. (5)). Such a low ratio has been quite unexpected, because OSV involves preverbal focus on subject. Generally preverbal focusing is a perfectly regular information strategy in Hittite, as shown in (Goedegebuure 2014:566), in case of contrastive preverbal focus: «Contrastive or counter-expectant focus constituents occur in preverbal position». But corpus approach to our material gave virtually none of that kind. Probably preverbal focusing is a regular information strategy, but more research is obviously needed here. My paper offers some new statistics concerning this point.

A related problem is topical verbs. It has been suggested that they raise (Bauer 2011). However, our study shows no topical verbs at all in the left periphery in the whole corpus of Middle Hittite letters published by Hoffner. The only case when topical verbs appear clause internal is in case of a ‘list’, i.e. right dislocation of a syntactically heavy constituent (Sideltsev 2010), see Ex. (2).

Thus the topical verb is also in situ in such cases – it is the heavy DP that is right-adjoined to the clause. The same holds good for the vast majority of topical verbs in the study: they are either omitted (see Ex. (3)) or placed in situ (see Ex. (4)), with focus in the preverbal position.
Examples

Hittite

(1) /da-ṭen=ma=šši=kan/ /lē/
take-2PL.IMP=ENCL.CONJ=him.LOC.SG=LOC.PART NEG.IMP.
‘Then don’t take anything from him!’ (HKM 17 l.e.4)

(2) n[u=šš]an /kiššan tiy-anzi/ /šš/50 PA.ŠE 6 ME NINDA.ÉRIN.ME[Š...]
CONN=LOC.PART thus place-3PL.PRS 50 PARIŠU 600 soldier-rations
‘Thus (they) will place 50-PARISHU 600 soldier-rations.’ (KUB 31.79 obv. 14)

(3) mān /UL=ma/
if NEG=ENCL.CONJ
‘But if not.’ (HKM 14 obv. 10)

(4) n=ašta apatta /šš/3-ŞU dā
CONN=LOC.PART DEICTIC.ADV 3 times take.2SG.IMP
‘Therefore, take thrice.’ (HKM 30 l.e.1-l.e.2)

(5) [1 ant]uhša-nn=a=šmaš /UL ammuk /[per]an huimun-un
1 man-ACC.SG.C=ENCL.CONJ=you.PL.DAT NEG I.SG.NOM PRV put.under.command-1SG.PST
‘It wasn’t I who put the one person in your charge.’ (HKM 89 obv. 9)
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Interrogative Verbs in Chickasaw

Pamela Munro, UCLA

A Google Scholar search for "interrogative verbs" brings up mostly references to verbs of asking, verbs with interrogative affixes, or verbs used in questions, but various languages of the world have verbs that include a wh element (Hagège (2008) and Idiatov and van der Auwera (2004) and present useful typological surveys, with Hagège (2003) suggesting such verbs are more common than most linguists realize). In this paper I describe the extensive system of interrogative verbs in the Muskogean language Chickasaw (ISO code cic) of south-central Oklahoma, USA.

Chickasaw has only three arguably nonverbal wh words, kata 'who', nanta 'what', and katiya 'where'. In addition, Chickasaw has six basic and numerous derived interrogative verbs. The most frequently used of these, expressing (pro-)verbal notions (often along with nanta 'what'), are katihmi 'to do (what) / to happen / to be doing how' and its causative katihchi 'to do (what) to / to do what to', as in examples (1)-(4).\(^{14}\) Crucially, the non-interrogative verb yahmi 'to do' cannot be substituted in these questions, even those that contain nanta 'what', as shown in (5).

Other interrogative verbs, such as katimpi 'to be which' or káttohmi 'to be how many', are used to ask questions that in other languages would be expressed with interrogative quantifiers within noun phrases, as illustrated in (6)-(8).

All these verbs take nominative subjects or non-third-person agreement (e.g., the three different second-person singular markers in (1), (3), and (8)), normal tense-aspect-modality marking (e.g., -tok in (6), -a'chi in (7)), and additional verbal affixes, such as the dative prefix included in (8). Like other verbs, they are typically clause-final.

Derivatives of these interrogative verbs express every non-argument wh word ('when', 'how', 'why'...). Like other stative verbs, interrogative verbs like káttohmi 'how many' can be used as nominal modifiers, as in (9).

Both nominal and verbal Chickasaw interrogatives have paired indefinite forms (generally formed by substitution of indefinite -n- for interrogative -t-): kana 'who', nanna 'what', kanihmi 'to do (something) / to happen (of what)...', kanimpi 'to be a certain', etc.

In this paper, then, I will describe the morphology and syntax of Chickasaw questions containing interrogative verbs and their relationship to the corresponding indefinites. This paper thus is a new contribution to our understanding to the typology of such verbs.

Examples

(1) Nanta-hta\(^{\text{ish-katihmi?}}\)
   what-acc.int 2sl-do.what/happen/be.what
   'What are you doing?'

(2) Nanta-haat\(^{\text{katih-taa?}}\)
   what-nom.int do.what/happen/be.what-Q
   'What happened?'

---

\(^{14}\) Abbreviations used include acc : accusative, cs : causative, int : interrogative, nom : nominative, pt : past/perfective, Q : question. A period separates elements of a complex gloss. Chickasaw agreement series are indicated as I, II, III, with agreement shown as 1, 2, s, p.
Chi-katĩh-taa?
2sII-do.what/happen/be.what-Q
'How are you doing?'

Ish-katĩh-sh-taa?
2sI-do.what-cs-Q
'What are you doing to him?'

*Nanta-htà ish-yahmi?
what-acc.int 2sI-do
(for 'What are you doing?')

Chahta’ yamm-at katimpi-tok?
Choctaw that-nom be.which-pt
'Which of those Choctaws was it?'

Hash-katimp-a’chi?
2pI-be.which-inc
'Which of you guys will it be?'

Ihoo-at chin-katimpi?
woman-nom 2sIII.dat-be.which
'Which woman is for you?'

Ofi’ káttohmi-haat chi-kisili-m?
dog be.how.many-int.nom 2sI-bite-past
'How many dogs bit you?'
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The multifunctionality of desiderative constructions: a typological study

Elena Musi, Università della Svizzera italiana, Lugano

This contribution is concerned with the multifunctionality patterns shown by desiderative constructions cross-linguistically, in a sample of 40 languages. Differently from previous works on desideratives (Khanina 2008), I will consider only the desiderative constructions in which desire is directed towards the realization of an event and not to the acquisition of a simple object. From a morphosyntactic point of view, desiderative constructions can consist of very different formal items (e.g. lexical verbs, auxiliaries, affixes, complementizers) and can be expressed either in a simple or a complex clause. Previous literature on desideratives has mainly tackled their status in the realm of modality (e.g. Hengeveld 2004, Palmer 2001) due to the fact that every type of desiderative involves "an element of will or an interest in the realization of the dependent SoA on the part of a participant of the main SoA" (Cristofaro 2003: 234). However, little attention has been devoted to the explanation of the polysemy shown by desiderative items with other domains. As data analysis has clarified, in fact, items used to encode desire, frequently also convey other functions such as future (13 languages) and purpose (11 languages). The attested processes of semantic change at the basis of the multifunctionality of desiderative constructions are instances of co-optation, grammaticalization and constructionalisation (Mauri and Sansò 2011). This study, being aimed at identifying patterns of form-function reanalysis at the basis of recurrent cases of multifunctionality, addresses grammaticalization phenomena where a lexical item used to express desire evolves into more grammatical material conveying future/purpose. At a semantic level, these processes can be conceived as cases of "intraference from a form with a closely related function in the same language" (Croft 2006: 85). The functional similarity between the domains of desire and future or purpose is accessible in specific contexts of use: the contexts in which a desiderative item is used to express future always show coreference between the subject of the desire, which tends to be at the first/third person, and that of the desired state of affairs. As far as the multifunctionality between desire and purpose is concerned, a central role is that played by the position of the desired state of affairs on the time axis: the desired SoA, when projected into the future with respect to the moment of utterance, can be reanalyzed as the purpose of the action of desire. These semantic shifts mainly correspond, at a formal level, to the following grammaticalization paths: -full verb > auxiliary > tense-aspect-mood affix (e.g. 1.) -full verb> auxiliary (e.g. 2) -full verb > affix (e.g.3).

Examples

Rama: Chibchan, Nicaragua

(1)

(a)   airi i-bating-i soup
   3-wants-TNS
   ‘He wants soup’ (Grinevald 1988: 168)

(b)   airi i-kwus-bating-i soup
   3-eat-MOD-TNS
   ‘He wants to eat soup/he is going to eat soup’ (Grinevald 1988: 168)
(c) sumuu y-angtik-bating-i banana
    3-cut-want-TNS
    ‘He is going to cut bananas’ (Grinevald 1988: 231)

Awa Pit: Barbacoan, Colombia and Ecuador

(2)
(a) an izh-shi-mtu-s more see
    DESID-IMPF-LOCUT
    ‘I want to see more’ (Curnow 1997: 166)
(b) alu ki-shi-mtu
    rain(1) rain(2)-DESID_IMPFPART
    ‘It is about to rain’ (Curnow 1997: 166)

Korana: Khoisan, South Africa

(3)
(a) haka kwezaigu kie kie !hami ha
    ‘four men came in order to hunt’, lit: ‘came and hunted’ (Maingard 1962: 30)
(b) a-kie-kuidaopho
    ‘let us take the road’ (or ‘we want to take the road’) (Maingard 1962: 30)
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The syntax of excess

Maria Napoli, Università del Piemonte Orientale

In a paper by Egbert Fortuin appeared in the last number of Linguistic Typology (Fortuin 2013), the cross-linguistic expression of the degree concept of excess is focused on. This concept corresponds to the idea of exceeding a maximum or passing a crucial boundary with possible negative consequences related to it, such as the impossibility of doing something. From a cross-linguistic point of view, excess is conceptualized on the basis of two main patterns (Fortuin 2013: 38):

i) It may be overtly expressed by means of a dedicated form (like English too);
ii) It may be implied by the context, in particular through forms denoting a high degree or a large quantity (like English very), or through other linguistic or pragmatic strategies.

However, a third pattern also exists:
(iii) Excess may be encoded by lexically restricted means (like the English prefix over-, used with adjectives and verbs).

When the excessive degree of a given entity or state of affairs leads to negative consequences, in the majority of languages these consequences are expressed indirectly by means of a purposive non-negative strategy (Fortuin 2013: 60-62), i.e. a clause introduced by a non-negative marker or form which may also occur to denote the goal implied by a given action. This is illustrated by example (1.a), where the main clause with too is followed by an infinitival clause expressing the potential consequences of the excess (from Fortuin 2013: 32). Two more examples from different languages are (2) and (3).

As pointed out above, in English, all the three patterns expressing excess are attested. However, according to Fortuin (2013: 32), a difference exists between type (i) and type (iii) in syntactic terms: forms with over- cannot be followed by a to-clause differing from the too-construction (example 1.b).

Data at my disposal from the Italian language (obtained through a corpus-based analysis: see References) show that adjectives formed with intensifying prefixes which may denote excess, like iper- and stra-, are not usually followed by a purposive non-negative clause, differing from the corresponding forms used with troppo ‘too (much)’ (cf. example 4.a). With these prefixed adjectives the negative consequences of excess are preferentially not expressed or expressed by means of a negative independent clause (example 4.b).

In this paper, I will address the following questions: (i) whether the syntactic restrictions noted for English and Italian prefixed forms denoting excess, derived by means of evaluative morphology (Bauer 1997), are documented also for other languages; (ii) whether a relationship exists between the morpho-semantic properties of strategies used to express an excessive degree and the type of clause (finite or non-finite, subordinate or not) used to express the consequences of excess.

A purposive non-negative strategy like that in example (1.a) “adds the information IN WHAT RESPECT, or ACCORDING TO WHICH NORM, one can speak of a maximum. In the case of the concept of excess, this norm is closely associated with the idea of a specific goal” (Fortuin 2013: 62). Moreover, such a goal is represented as hypothetical and not as embedded in reality. As is well-known, intensifiers – as English and Italian evaluative prefixes are (cf. Cacchiani 2011) – may be defined as subjective in nature: they are “particular markers of subjectivity, the prime function of which is to index a speaker’s perspective/viewpoint/attitude” (Athanasiadou 2007: 554). It could be argued that the intensifying and subjective nature of evaluative prefixes expressing excess, which primarily occur to denote a very high degree, may prevent – at least in English and Italian – the use of a non-finite clause, which corresponds to the highest extent of integration into the immediate clausal
environment (Givón 1990: 853). As pointed out by Nikolaeva (2007: 7), “the stronger the semantic bond between the two events, the more extensive will be the syntactic integration of the two clauses into a single clause”. What is focused on by means of evaluative prefixes is the speaker’s viewpoint on something subjectively judged as reaching a very high degree and consequently, in some cases, as being excessive, rather than on the “norm” according to which this state of affairs is objectively determined. This could explain why, when the negative consequences related to it are to be expressed, a type of clause is preferentially selected which does not show the maximum degree of syntactic integration with the ‘degree-clause’ and allows to encode overtly negation as well as tense/aspect morphology and person/number morphology (i.e., a finite verb and its subject, as in 4.b).

In investigating whether these supposed generalizations are correct, I will further try to explain how the parameter of subjectivity as linked to intensification correlates with the syntax of excess.

EXAMPLES

English

(1)

a. He is too old to go to school (Fortuin 2013: 32)
b. *He is oversensitive to get a girlfriend (Fortuin 2013: 48)

Indonesian

(2)

Keputusan itu terlalu risan untuk di-laksanakan
decision that too risky for di-implement
‘The decision is too risky to implement’ (Fortuin 2013: 62)

Basque

(3)

Inori entzu-te-ko nekatu-egi dago
anybody-DAT listen-NMLZ-DST tired-too is
‘S/he is too tired to listen to anybody’ (Fortuin 2013: 62)

Italian

(4)

a. La sala al primo piano del Beverly è già piena, stracolma,
the hall at.the first floor of.the Beverly is already full stra-full
troppo piccola per tener dentro quattro, cinquecento persone
too small to contain four five.hundred people
‘The hall at the first floor of the Beverly is already crowded, overcrowded, it is too small to contain four-five hundred people’

(b) (Corpus La Repubblica)

b. La piazza è stracolma, gli ultimi arrivati non riescono a entrare
the square is stra-full the last arrived not are able to go in
‘The square is overcrowded, people who arrived last of all are not able to go in’

(Corpus La Repubblica)
Abbreviations
DAT = dative; DST = distative; NMLZ= nominalization

References
Fortuin E. 2013, “The construction of excess and sufficiency from a cross-linguistic perspective”. In Linguistic Typology 17: 31-88.
Corpora
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The “body part” construction as a source of new spatial postpositions in Wan (Mande)

Tatiana Nikitina, CNRS (France)

Cross-linguistically, spatial adpositions are commonly derived from nouns describing part-whole relations, such as body part nouns and nouns referring to parts of inanimate objects (Svorou 1993, Heine & Kuteva 2002, inter alia). In Mande languages, this development is responsible for the close affinity of many spatial postpositions to nouns (Nikitina 2008); such affinity is especially common in the case of newly innovated postpositions, which have no cognates in the related languages and therefore cannot be reconstructed to an inherited form. Since the languages have no case marking, one would expect new postpositions to emerge from combinations of nouns with an old postposition, possibly later fused into a single word (as in English *in steede > instead). Yet in some Mande languages, a large number of postpositions are homophonous with their corresponding noun and bear no trace of an old postpositional element, suggesting that such postpositions were derived directly from nouns. In spite of the pattern’s general prominence, no mechanism of change has been identified that could create new postpositions from nouns without support from an old postposition.

This study explores the systematic noun-to-postposition development in Wan, a Southeastern Mande language, and argues that it is made possible by the use of a special construction in which the distinction between noun phrases and postpositional phrases is neutralized. The construction, however unusual from the syntactic point of view, provides a unique opportunity for nouns describing part-whole relations (such as body part terms) to become reanalyzed as spatial postpositions.

In Wan, spatial postpositions derive from two types of noun describing part-whole relations: (i) nouns characterizing parts based on their shape or function (such as pēŋ ‘head’), and (ii) nouns characterizing parts based on their geometric relationship to the rest of the object (such as tā ‘upper surface, top’). The nouns are extremely common in discourse, and often appear in contexts where speakers of a European language would not expect to find them. The nouns specify the exact part of the object to which the statement applies (ex. 1a-c).

Spatial postpositions differ from nouns both in their syntactic distribution and in their interpretation. Syntactically, postpositional phrases always appear after the verb, while bare noun phrases are restricted to the pre-verbal positions of subject and object (cf. the SOV-PP word order in ex. 2; Nikitina 2009). Semantically, postpositions describe spatial relations without regard to the shape-based distinctions imposed by the corresponding nouns, i.e. without reference to the shape of the Ground or its parts (cf. the difference between the noun and the postposition in 3a-b). These differences, along with some lexical irregularities in the development of postpositions from body part terms, suggest that the process involves lexical recategorization of individual nouns as postpositions. Such recategorization, however, could only take place in an ambiguous context that would allow an original noun to become reinterpreted as a postposition – a situation made unlikely in Mande by the restricted distribution of postpositional phrases. Yet precisely such context is provided in Wan by a special “body part” construction, which allows a restricted class of verbs (primarily verbs associated with motion) to combine with a description of the Ground’s part in the post-verbal position (4a). Surprisingly, the part’s description appears – in this particular construction – in the position that is usually restricted to postpositional phrases, even in cases where the description features unambiguous nouns, from which no postposition has been derived (ex. 4b-c).

The unusual “body part” construction presents a unique context in which a noun phrase and a postpositional phrase may appear in the same position in Wan and in which one can become reanalyzed as the other. It offers a possible explanation for the fact that many spatial postpositions are homophonous with their corresponding nouns, and do not seem to go back to combinations of nouns
with postpositions.

Examples

Wan

(1) a. à mɛ̃ kæŋ é tā glɔ̃gɔ maña
   3SG head hair DEF upper.surface smooth PRED
   ‘Her hair is smooth.’

b. té gbɛ̃nĩ é gbɔ̃ é mĩ̊ tilá maña
   fire smoke DEF pot DEF external.surface make.black HABIT
   ‘The smoke renders the pot black.’

c. ë̃ gà bë̃ lā plë̃tĩ mũ̊ é gò gò
   IMPER go then 2SG plate PL DEF inside clean
   ‘Go clean the plates.’

(2) mĩ̊ é kpó tā tābāli tā
   man DEF fish put table upper surface
   ‘The man put a fish on the table.’

(3) a. yi̊ é tā / pëŋ̊ glɔ̃gɔ maña
   water DEF upper.surface head smooth PRED
   (shape-based restrictions)
   ‘The water’s surface is smooth.’

b. kpó mū á glũŋ lé yi̊ é tā / pëŋ̊
   fish PL COP jump PROG water DEF upper.surface head
   (no shape-based restrictions)

   ‘Fish is jumping above the water.’

(4) a. è kpāgë̃ dō̃ yā é pëŋ̊
   3SG head.ring one put REFL head
   ‘She put a carrier’s ring on her head.’

b. lē̃ é bĩ māŋ̊ wiá lé né̃ lāgā
   woman DEF PAST rice enter PROG child mouth
   ‘The woman is feeding the child by putting rice in its mouth’

c. kpó kəŋglɔ̃ é gbɔ̃̃ ñ̃ lɔ̃ŋà
   fish bone DEF got.stuck 3SG throat
   ‘A fish bone got stuck in his throat.’
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Prominent possessors

Irina Nikolaeva, SOAS, University of London

The paper explores how NP-internal possessors participate in NP-external syntax. I present a collection of data from a Uralic language, Tundra Nenets, in which the possessor can behave as a clausal argument in some respects while remaining NP-internal. The theoretical importance of these data is that they contribute to the question of how NPs are internally structured.

In Tundra Nenets the lexical possessor triggers optional 3rd person agreement on the head: Wera-h tī (Wera-GEN reindeer) and Wera-h te-da (Wera-GEN reindeer-3SG) both mean ‘Wera’s reindeer’. The syntactic properties of such constructions have not been studied in detail before, but I show that the agreeing lexical possessor affects the syntax of the whole clause, whereas there is no evidence that it is extracted out of the host NP.

First, only the agreeing possessor of the subject is able to control same-subject non-finite forms in dependent clauses. Example (1) shows that the agreeing possessor of the main subject can be coreferential with the non-overt dependent subject, but a non-agreeing possessor is ungrammatical in such sentences. Examples (2) demonstrate the same point for the purpose clause: (2a) is ambiguous and it can be interpreted either as same-subject or as different-subject, whereas (2b) cannot. Second, agreeing possessors antecedent a non-reflexive pronoun in an argument position, while non-agreeing possessors cannot. See the contrast between (3a) and (3b): only in (3a) can the pronoun s’ita refer to the possessor of the subject. In this it behaves just like other non-subject clause-level constituents which can antecedent non-reflexive pronouns within the same clause (3c). Finally, agreeing possessors and non-agreeing possessors play a different role in cross-clause anaphora. Clause-level constituents can control a zero subject in action nominal clauses (4a), while non-agreeing possessors cannot. The possessor can only control a dependent null subject if it triggers 3rd person agreement on its own head (4b). Crucially, such possessors remain NP-internal, as shown in (4c): they cannot be separated from the possessed noun by clause-level elements.

Taken together, these data indicate that agreeing internal possessors in Tundra Nenets exhibit certain syntactic properties of verbal arguments without assuming a proper argument status, and raise the question of how they should be analysed. I propose that there is a positional difference between agreeing and non-agreeing possessors within the NP: an agreeing possessor precedes the determiner (5a), while a non-agreeing possessor must follow it (5b). This suggests that the agreeing possessor is accorded some level of syntactic prominence: it is located in a phrase-peripheral position which is structurally higher than the position of the regular possessor. The paper further argues that this prominent position bears a similarity to the peripheral topic position at the clausal level, which creates an appropriate syntactic configuration for the phenomena outlined above, and that syntactic prominence is mirrored by functional prominence: the agreeing possessor typically functions as a kind of ‘local’ topic. I then briefly address similar phenomena from other languages where the NP-internal possessor has an effect on clausal syntax, mostly in terms of agreement on the main verb (e.g. Maithili, Tabassaran, Jarawara, Aleut) or control of same-subject switch-reference (e.g. Yukaghir), but it does not participate in other clausal phenomena. We do seem to have evidence that such internal possessors are functionally marked, although the exact conditions differ from language to language. The answer to the question of how this is to be analyzed in terms of syntax presumably also depends on the language, and it remains to see whether the type of analysis outlined above for Tundra Nenets is applicable to other cases. The paper introduces several typological possibilities of how the behavioral properties of prominent possessors can be analyzed, based on the idea that relevant
phomena can target different levels of the representation of the clause.

**Examples**

Tundra Nenets

(1) \[Ô_i \text{ tolº-h t'axº-na ŋamºd'o} \] Wera-\(h_i \) ŋèwa*º(-da) jeº

Table-GEN at sit.SS Wera-GEN head-3SG hurt.3SG

‘Wera’s head hurts when he sits at the table’.

(2) a. Wera-\(h_i \) n'eºka-da \[Ô_ij \text{ ŋono-m xanº-e-wanº}º] s'ertaº

Wera-GEN elder.brother-3SG boat-ACC hunt-PURP do

‘Wera’s brother made a boat to hunt with / Wera’s brother made a boat for Wera to hunt with.’

b. Wera-\(h_i \) n'eºka j \[Ô_i*j_i \text{ ŋono-m xanº-e-wanº}º] s'ertaº

Wera-GEN elder.brother boat-ACC hunt-PURP do

‘Wera’s brother made a boat to hunt with / *Wera’s brother made a boat for Wera to hunt with.’

(3) a. Wera-\(h_i \) n'a-da \[s'ita\(k_i\)ºj] ladoº

Wera-GEN companion-3SG 3SG.ACC hit

‘Wera’s friend hit him.’

b. Wera-\(h_i \) n'a \[s'ita\(k_i\)ºj] ladoº

Wera-GEN companion 3SG.ACC hit

‘Wera’s friend hit him.’

(3) a. Wera-\(h_i \) n'a-da \[s'ita\(k_i\)ºj] ladoº

Wera-GEN companion-3SG 3SG.ACC hit

‘Wera’s friend hit him.’

b. Wera-\(h_i \) n'a \[s'ita\(k_i\)ºj] ladoº

Wera-GEN companion 3SG.ACC hit

‘Wera’s friend hit him.’

c. Wera \(i\) Maša-nºhj \[s'ita\(k_i\)ºj] meneq-lapº

Wera Masha-DAT 3SG.ACC see-CAUS

‘Wera showed her to Masha.’

(4) a. temta \[Ô_i \text{ nulº-ma-xaºdºnta} \] Wera laºda-da

reindeer.ACC.3SG stop-PERF.AN-ABL.3SG Wera hit-3SG>SG.OBJ

‘When the reindeer stopped, Wera hit it.’

b. Wera-\(h_i \) sëwºººº(-da) \[Ô_i to-qma-xaºdºnta] yesººººmºa-cºººº

Wera-GEN eye-PL.3SG come-PERF.AN-ABL.3SG hurt.INCH-3PL.PAST

‘When Wera arrived, his eyes started hurting.’

c. (t'en'ana) Wera-\(h_i \) (*t'en'ana) sewºººº-da (t'en'ana)

yesterday Wera-GEN yesterday eye-PL.3SG yesterday

[Ô_i to-qma-xaºdºnta] yesººººmºa-cºººº

come-PERF.AN-ABL.3SG hurt.INCH-3PL.PAST

‘When Wera arrived yesterday, his eyes started hurting.’

(5) a. Wera-h \[t'ukuº te-da / *ti] Wera-GEN this reindeer-3SG/reindeer

‘this reindeer of Wera’s’

b. t'ukuº Wera-h \[ti / *te-da] this Wera-GEN reindeer/reindeer-3SG

‘this reindeer of Wera’s’
Ablative landmark construction in Bashkir: projection of motion or comparative construction?

Maria Ovsjannikova, Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

In Bashkir (<Turkic<Altaic) there exist two major ways of landmark encoding in constructions with denominal spatial expressions. The syntactic basis of the first construction (1) is clearly the possessive construction. The landmark can bear the genitive marker or remain unmarked, the spatial expression (postposition) usually bears a possessive maker (1). This construction will be referred to as the basic postpositional construction. In the second construction the landmark is marked with the ablative case and the spatial expression never has a possessive marker (2). This construction will be referred to as the ablative landmark construction.

The study focuses on the ablative landmark construction analysing its semantic properties against the background of the basic postpositional construction, which was found to have wider range of the two. The study is based on field data gathered in 2013 in Bashkortostan, Russia, and on the Bashkir data found on the Internet.

1) The ablative landmark construction can only be used with the spatial expressions which denote the position in or movement into or from the following regions: ‘front’, ‘top’, ‘bottom’, and, to a lesser extent, ‘back. When used with spatial expressions for ‘inside’ or ‘near’ this construction is considered ungrammatical. These spatial regions are crucial for the spatial orientation based on asymmetrically oriented objects, most importantly — humans, cf. [Mühlhäusler 2001: 569].

2) The ablative landmark construction imposes restrictions on the semantic relation between the landmark and the trajector. It is generally used when both are asymmetrically oriented objects with their relevant asymmetric parts oriented in the same way: people in a queue, bathhouse standing behind the dwelling house, etc., cf. (2)–(3) vs. (4).

3) There is a strong tendency for the ablative landmark construction to be used with human or animate landmarks. This finding based on the native speakers’ judgments is supported by the frequency counts of the manually sorted examples from Bashkir texts available on the Internet.

When trying to find a semantic basis for the ablative landmark construction, one might be tempted to regard this construction as an instance of the comparative construction. Indeed, in the comparative construction the standard of comparison is marked by the ablative and the predicate (e.g., an adjective or an adverb) can remain unmarked, cf. (5). This analysis has several drawbacks. Firstly, for Bashkir the notion of the comparative construction will appear to be much wider (i.e. including some basic spatial relations) than the typologically oriented definition traditionally assumes, cf. [Stassen 1985; 2013]. Moreover, the semantic idea of comparison has been regarded as cognitively less basic and construed upon the spatial and temporal relations rather than *vice versa*, cf. [Stassen 1985: 105]. At the same time, this analysis does not account for the preference for animate landmarks over inanimate and for ‘front’ over ‘back’ region expressions.

The analysis proposed here is based on the idea of fictive motion, cf. [Talmy 2000: 99], or dynamic projection, cf. [Nikitina, in press]. Under this analysis the trajectory is conceived of as removed from the landmark along the spatial axis specified by one of the asymmetrical parts of the landmark. The preference for animate landmarks and ‘front’ region is thus regarded as a consequence of the fact that animate entities are capable of movement and facial perception, which makes them natural reference points for the projection. This analysis is also more plausible in a diachronic perspective with the ablative landmark possibly originating as a combination of two adjacent spatial modifiers of the same verb syntactically independent of each other, cf. the proposal made for prepositions in several Indo-European languages in [Luraghi 2009].
Examples

(1) *Haraj-ðəŋ / haraj art-ə-nda säskä-lär üθ-ä.*
  shed-GEN  shed  back-P.3-LOC  flower-PL  grow-PRS
  ‘Flowers are growing behind the shed’.

(2) *Aðəq-tülek mayazin-ə-nda sirat-ta minän al-da*
  food  shop-P.3-LOC  queue-LOC  I.ABL  front-LOC
  ike  üθmer  qəð  tor-a  ine.
  two  teenager  girl  stand-CV.IPFV  be.PST
  ‘In the food store two teenage girls were standing in a queue in front of me’.

(3) *Šuɣa kür-ä beð-ðəŋ jeget-tär*
  because_of_this  see-CV.IPFV  we-GEN  lad-PL
  mašina-nan al-da bar-ap,
  car-ABL  front-LOC  go-CV
  jul-da taðart-ta-lar.
  way-ACC  clean-PST-PL
  ‘That’s why our lads were walking in front of the car cleaning the road’.
  [http://www.bashforum.net/index.php?/topic/7513-7513/page__st__80, 15.10.2013]

(4) *Uqətəwsə-nan al-da bötä*
  teacher-ABL  front-LOC  all
  uqə-yän-əm-da onot-a-m.
  read-PC.PST-PL.1SG-ACC  forget-PRS-1SG
  ‘When I am facing the teacher, I forget all I have learnt’.

(5) *Mineŋ ayaj-əm minän oðon.*
  I.GEN  elder.brother-P.1SG  I.ABL  long
  ‘My elder brother is taller than me’.
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Deponent verb constructions with two overt arguments in Bribri (Chibchan)

Sara Pacchiarotti, University of Oregon

Bribri, a member of the Chibchan family, is spoken in Costa Rica by approximately 10,000 people. Bribri displays ergative-absolutive alignment, rigid preverbal position of the absolutive argument and free position of the ergative argument either before or after the absolutive-verb sequence. The data presented in this paper comes from a collection of oral tradition texts and elicitation. Bribri has a large class of deponent verbs, that is, verbs with a morphologically marked middle voice form (–r for imperfective and –ê for perfective) and no active counterpart (Baerman 2007). This talk is concerned with atypical argument structures of a subgroup of deponent verbs which can take two overtly expressed arguments. Alongside the unmarked absolutive, these verbs allow the following argument structures: a) idiosyncratic marking (lexically determined) of the non-absolutive argument as a locative, by means of a postposition able to control co-referentiality under coordination (1, 2 and 3); b) canonical ergative marking of the non-absolutive argument by means of the ergative postpositions tô or di (4 and 5); c) differential ergative marking of the non-absolutive argument by means of the postposition wä (6 and 7), which is found in several other constructions within the language as a differential, non allomorphic, ergative marker co-existing with the canonical ergative marker tô; and d) no marking of the non-absolutive argument (ex. 8). These argument structures are not systemic but rather lexically idiosyncratic, a fact that posits interesting diachronic questions concerning the evolution of the class of deponent verbs in this language. Semantically, the domains expressed by deponent verbs in Bribri include those typologically common in other languages with middle and reflexive voice: physiological and emotional reactions, uncontrollable physiological events, emission of non-linguistic sounds, translational motion, spontaneous events, natural phenomena and cognitive states. Some verbs within these domains can take the different argument structures discussed above. In such cases, they usually display a change in their original meaning (i.e. ‘be born’ becomes ‘create’, ex. 4). Within the functionalist perspective, I discuss Bribri’s data according to the theoretical considerations on middle voice proposed by Kemmer (1993), Klaiman (1991) and Croft (1994). Then, I propose a possible diachronic scenario that might have led to the presence of a copious number of deponent verbs which, conceivably because of their meaning, started to be used again as active transitive verbs in the language.

Examples (all Bribri)

a) Idiosyncratically marked non-absolutive argument

1) Ye’ kí kâpi kiàn-ê
   1SG over coffee want-PRF.MIDV
   ‘I want coffee’ (over me coffee is wanted) (Elicitation)

2) Ie’ kí alâköl kiàn-ê-kâ ie’ kipô å
   3SG over woman want-PRF.MIDV- DIR 3SG hammock on
   ‘He wants the woman on his hammock’ (Elicitation)

3) Be’ én å 1  ôn-ê?
   2SG liver in it fall-PRF.MIDV
   ‘Do you understand?’ (literal: Did it fall into your liver?)
(Elicitation)

b) Canonical ergative marking of the non-absolutive argument by means of the ergative postpositions tö or di15:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
| \text{P} & \text{V_{DEP}} & \text{A} |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| e'             | skè tsakin-è    | i di e'          |
| that.DIST      | be.born-3SG     | that.DIST tcho’dawe |
| others         | PRF.MIDV ERG    | COP |
\end{array}
\]

‘He (Sibò = god) created others of those, they were the Tchô’dawe (a kind of demons) (Historias Bribris)

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
| \text{P} & \text{V_{DEP}} & \text{A} |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| e'             | tsô kôn-à cha   | pè kēkēla tö |
| that.DIST      | first take.care-PRF.MIDV | perso elder ERG |
\end{array}
\]

‘The elder (= Armadillo) first took care of it (= the seed) (Historias Bribris)

c) Differential ergative marking of the non-absolutive argument by means of the postposition wā:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
| \text{P} & \text{V_{DEP}} & \text{A} |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Ye’ wâ i chê-r  |                      |                |
| 1SG ERG it know-IMPF.MIDV |                  | |
\end{array}
\]

‘I know it’ (Elicitation)

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
| \text{P} & \text{V_{DEP}} & \text{A} |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| se’ wâ i dalê-r | tâi-è           |                |
| 1PL.INCL ERG 3SG suffer-IMPF.MIDV much.INT | |
\end{array}
\]

‘We respect him a lot’ (Historias Bribris)

d) No marking of the non-absolutive argument:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
| \text{P} & \text{V_{DEP}} |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| ie’ i kûn-è, kûn-è-nê | find-PRF.MIDV-IT |
| 3SG it find-PRF.MIDV-IT | |
\end{array}
\]

and he found it, he found it again (he got it back) (Historias Bribris)
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Alternating experiencer constructions in Lamunkhin Ėven: a matter of perspective

Brigitte Pakendorf, Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, UMR5596, CNRS & Université Lyon Lumière 2
Ija V. Krivoshapkina, Sebjan-Küöl National Ėven Middle School P.A. Lamutskij"

Non-canonical marking of experiencer subjects is well-known from South Asia (Masica 1976: 164; Verma & Mohanan 1990) as well as from the languages of the European periphery (Bossong 1998: 286-289) including the Caucasus (Ganenkov 2006). In the languages of Europe or the Caucasus, this non-canonical case marking is lexically determined, occurring to various extents with different verbs of emotion, sensation, perception, or cognition. In South Asia, on the other hand, fluid systems prevail, in which different case frames express a larger or smaller degree of volition, control, or agentivity on the part of the experiencer (Davison 1990: 356-358; Onishi 2001: 35-39; Hagège 2006: 106-109).

The Lamunkhin dialect of Ėven, a North Tungusic language spoken in eastern Siberia, also manifests a fluid system of experiencer marking which occurs with a subset of emotion and a few sensation verbs. The verbs concerned exist in pairs that differ in conjugation class, with the majority of these verb pairs showing a formal alternation between root-final alveolar and palatal nasal, e.g. hebđzen- 'be amused' vs hebđeñ- 'amuse', or herken- 'be ashamed' vs. herken- 'be shameful'. This verb alternation results in a change in case frame between nominative experiencer and dative experiencer, respectively, but does not formally involve a change in valency, since both experiencer and stimulus can be expressed with either of the verbs (ex. 1a-c). Nevertheless, it is pragmatically infelicitous for the palatal verb roots to occur with both an overt experiencer and an overt stimulus, and in spontaneous speech constructions with overt stimulus are lacking.

In this paper we will discuss the different constructions in Lamunkhin Ėven and show that these alternations do not involve a difference in control or volition, but rather a change in perspective of the clause, with fore- or backgrounding of different aspects of the proposition. Thus, the construction with the alveolar verb rootforegrounds the experiencer (ex. 1a, 2a), while the construction with the palatal verb root backgrounds the experiencer and foregrounds the emotion. Depending on whether the experiencer or the stimulus is overtly expressed in these palatal verb root constructions, the focus can further be on the stimulus (ex. 1b) or the experiencer (ex. 1c, 2b). Most commonly, however, these constructions focus on the emotion or sensation as such, with the verb occurring in an impersonal 'exclamative' form (ex. 2c).

Examples

(1) Lamunkhin Ėven: hebđzen- 'find amusing, be amused' vs. hebđeñ- 'amuse' (all three examples are constructed)
(a) alveolar verb root, nominative experiencer

EXP  STIM  
(bi:)  kine-w  hebđzen-e-m
(1sg)  movie-acc  be.amused-nfut-1sg
'I find the movie amusing'
(b) palatal verb root, only stimulus expressed

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{STIM} & \quad \text{erek kuna} & \quad \text{hebdgeh-n} & \quad \text{//} & \quad \text{erek kuna} & \quad \text{hebdgeh-n} \\
\text{this child} & \quad \text{amuse-NFUT-3SG} & \quad \text{//} & \quad \text{this child} & \quad \text{amuse-IMPF.PTCP}
\end{align*}
\]

'this child is amusing/funny'

(c) palatal verb root, only dative experiencer expressed

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EXP} & \quad \text{min-du} & \quad \text{hebdgeh-n} \\
\text{1SG.OBL-DAT} & \quad \text{amuse-NFUT-3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

'I am amused'

(2) Lamunkhin Even: herken - 'be ashamed' vs. herkeń - 'be shameful' (narrative examples)

(a) foregroundering of experiencer, alveolar verb root, nominative experiencer:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EXP} & \quad \text{tarit bi herken-e-m,} & \quad \text{jamman tut-un-dji-m} & \quad \text{tar} \\
\text{then 1SG[NOM] be.ashamed-NFUT-1SG} & \quad \text{to.what.extent run-MULT-FUT-1SG that} \\
\text{kontora-la,} & \quad \text{office.R-LOC} \\
\text{'Then I felt ashamed, how often will I run to that office...'}
\end{align*}
\]

(AAK_headmistress_075)

(b) foregroundering of emotion, additional focus on experiencer, palatal verb root, dative experiencer:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EXP} & \quad \text{ottomon kamera-du omneken do:oreken tore-cê} & \quad \text{bej-du} & \quad \text{ho herkehni-mdes,} \\
\text{DPY camera-DAT once twice speak-PF.PTCP person-DAT very shame.IMPF.PTCP-SML} \\
\text{'Well, a person who has spoken in front of a camera (only) once or twice is very shy,'}
\end{align*}
\]

(AAS_den_olenovoda_11)

(c) foregrounding only of emotion, palatal verb root in 'exclamative' form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bi: istorik bi-he-m go:n-e-m,} & \quad \text{direktor bi-he-m} \\
\text{1SG historian.R 1SG-NFUT-1SG say-NFUT-1SG director.R be-NFUT-1SG} \\
\text{e-he-m go:n-e,} & \quad \text{herke je bi-hi-n} \\
\text{NEG-NFUT-1SG say-NEG.CVB shame-EXCL be-PST-3SG} \\
\text{''I'm a history teacher", I said, I didn't say that I'm the headmaster, it was too shameful.'}
\end{align*}
\]

(AAK_headmistress_021)

References


Information Structure and Syntactic Order in Maa Ditransitives

Doris L. Payne, University of Oregon & SIL International

Maa (Maasai) clausal constituent order is typically said to be verb-subject-object (VSO) (Tucker & Mpaayei 1955:7, Koopmans 2005). However, Eastern Nilotic specialists have often noted that order of nominal arguments can vary, so that SVO, OVS, and VOS also occur. Published studies on Maa have not observed that in ditransitives, both V-THEME-GOAL and V-GOAL-THEME are also possible. Grounded in a corpus study, this paper argues that a single information structure principle of “more topical before less topical” accounts for variation in order of both postverbal THEME and GOAL and of postverbal S and O. “Topical” as defined in this study centers on the notion of a participant already established, more familiar, or “closer to Ego” in the interlocutors’ cognitive discourse world.

In past studies, claims about what motivates order variation in Maa have failed to reach consensus. Allan (1990) and Payne (1995) describe preverbal NPs as focused, while Koopman (2005:291) says VOS occurs when the object is focused or prominent. Payne et al. (1994), in contrast, argue that VOS corresponds to a “pragmatic inverse” in which the O is more topical than the S. The varied claims have usually not distinguished among various types of contrastive or marked focus (Dik et al. 1981), non-contrastive focus of assertion (Lambrecht 1994), information which is cognitively salient (e.g. having human or animate reference or being in the cognitive focus of attention; Tomlin 1995), topical in the sense of being familiar (given or evoked) (Prince 1981), communicatively presupposed (Lambrecht 1994), or cognitively established (Givon 1983). Nor have past order claims for Maa typically addressed how such information statuses might relate to syntactic roles.

This quantitative text-based study demonstrates that VOS is used when the O is more topical than the S, and VSO when the S is more topical than the O. One consequence of the Maa information structure principle is that VOS invariably occurs if the O is pronominal; though VOS order is not limited to pronominal O’s. Regarding ditransitive objects, the same information structure principle accounts for relative order of THEME and GOAL O’s with basic ditransitive verbs, as well as with derived ditransitives that involve Instrumental or Dative applicatives.

The Maa general information structure principle subsumes a number of specific subcases. For example, (1-3) demonstrate GOAL-THEME order with the basic ditransitive verbs ‘give’ and ‘put’. In (1), the GOAL is human and discourse-established, while the THEME is non-referential. In (2) with ‘give’ and in (3) with ‘put’, the GOAL is a first-person pronominal while the THEME is nominal. In (2), both GOAL and THEME are human and discourse-established, but the THEME is a possessed NP while the GOAL is ‘us’ – a quintessentially familiar core participant. In (3) the THEME is the abstract concept of ‘name’ and is not a previously discourse-established concept in the relevant text. Examples (4-5) demonstrate THEME-GOAL order with ‘put’. In (4) both THEME and GOAL are non-referential but the THEME is human. In (5) both THEME and GOAL are referential and previously mentioned in the text; but the THEME ‘bull’ is animate and is a central character in the story. What unites all of these cases is that the first postverbal referent is more topical, cognitively established or familiar, or “closer to Ego” than the second.

Overall, the higher frequency of VSO and V-GOAL-THEME orders, compared to VOS and V-THEME-GOAL, results from how linguistic principles map “established/familiar” to the syntactic role of Subject and the thematic role of GOAL, but order does not correspond to grammatical relations or thematic roles directly. The most fundamental order generalization is simply: VERB-MORETOPICAL-LESTTOPICAL. Indeed, there is reason to consider this to be a basic construction of the language, as postverbal order regularly and predictably corresponds – thus codes – this specific information structure arrangement. This study adds African data to that already available from Native American
and Australian languages regarding how information structure and linear order can have a constructional relationship.

Examples

Maa (Maasai)

(1) \(\begin{array}{lllll}
& \text{VERB} & \text{GOAL} & \text{THEME} \\
\text{n-ëítò} & \text{e-lot-ú} & \text{a-tshó} & \text{m=këra} & \text{en=dáa} \\
\text{CN-NEG.PF} & \text{3-go.SG-TOWARDS INF.SG-give} & \text{F.PL=children F.SG=food} \\
\end{array}\)

‘She did not come and give the children food.’ (from a story about a negligent mother)

(2) \(\begin{array}{lll}
\text{VERB} & \text{GOAL} & \text{THEME} \\
\text{n-i-nchò} & \text{iyóók} & \text{en=kéráí inó} \\
\text{CN-2-give us F.SG=child your} \\
\end{array}\)

‘You give us your child.’ (from a prayer)

(3) \(\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{VERB} & \text{GOAL} & \text{THEME} \\
\text{ê-nyaák} & \text{-tà} & \text{áa-pk} & \text{iyóók} & \text{nk=ái árná} \\
\text{3-do.again.PF-PL.PF INF.PL-put us F.SG=other name} \\
\end{array}\)

‘the Tugen have given us another name’ (text about interactions among ethnic groups)

(4) \(\begin{array}{lll}
\text{VERB} & \text{THEME} & \text{GOAL} \\
\text{m-á-ti-pk} & \text{in=tóyie sukúul} \\
\text{JUSS-1SG-SUBJN-put F.PL=girls school} \\
\end{array}\)

‘Let’s send girls to school’ (description about old and new traditions in raising children)

(5) \(\begin{array}{llll}
\text{VERB} & \text{THEME} & \text{GOAL} \\
\text{n-é-pk-í} & \text{ɔl=kitég ɔl=monánda} \\
\text{CN-3-put-PASS M.SG=cow M.SG=marketplace} \\
\end{array}\)

‘The bullock was put into the marketplace.’ (report of conflict between British and Maasai)
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Grammatical evidentiality in Estonian dialects as an indicator of areal morphosyntactic variation

Maarja-Liisa Pilvik, Kristel Uiboaed - University of Tartu

Estonian has a rich and multiform system for expressing reported evidentiality as classified by e.g. Aikhenvald (2004). In addition to specialized grammatical form – the oblique (or quotative) mood (1) – Estonian also makes use of other grammatical means for marking reported information, e.g. the 1st infinitive (2) or the modal verb *pidama* + the 2nd infinitive (3) (Erelt et al. 1993: 36-37).

Estonian

(1) Anna-l ole-vat armuke.  
Anna.ADE be.QUOT lover.NOM

(2) Anna-l oll-a armuke.  
Anna.ADE be.INF1 lover.NOM

(3) Anna-l pid-i armuke ole-ma.  
Anna.ADE have.to.PST.SG3 lover.NOM be.INF2

‘Anna (reportedly) has a lover.’

Even though the abundance and variation of these different morphological and syntactic constructions is particularly evident in colloquial Estonian and dialects, the observed category has mostly been described for Estonian standard language (e.g. Kehayov 2008) and less attention has been paid to the nonstandard varieties (with one exception by Kask 1984). The latter is the focus of the present study. The aims of our study are to map potential grammatical means for expressing reported evidentiality in Estonian dialects, to examine, how the functional load of these formal alternatives relate to the frequency of use of specific evidential constructions, and to observe the geographical variation. We take different quotative constructions as one example of parallel usage of both analytical and synthetical structures and set our focus on that perspective. To observe the spread and variation of selected constructions, we conduct a quantitative corpus study based on the data from the Corpus of Estonian Dialects (EMK 2011). We apply classification methods (correspondence analysis) to detect dialect groupings based on the constructions under examination.

The current study is a part of a larger study of analyticity and syntheticity in Estonian dialects. We hypothesize that western dialects tend to use more analytic quotative constructions as opposed to eastern dialects that prefer inflectional structures. Such areal distribution would differ from traditional Estonian dialect classification, which contrasts northern and southern dialects.
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Syntax of self-repairs in Russian and elsewhere

Vera I. Podlesskaya, Russian State University for the Humanities

The paper focuses on syntactic organization of self-repairs in spontaneous spoken discourse, basing on first-hand corpus data of spoken Russian, Armenian, Japanese and Italian as well as on earlier reported data (on English [3],[8], Swedish [1], Chinese [9], Hungarian [6]), Japanese [5], English/German/Hebrew [2], inter alia)*. Two main strategies of self-repairing are identified and described: (i) the on-line strategy used to signal the trouble and redress it as soon as the trouble is apparent; (ii) the off-line strategy used if the speaker decides to proceed with the ongoing (potentially) troublesome segment allowing the addressee “to register” it as received; and only after that, sends an explicit notification of the trouble, often accompanied by negations and excuses ‘oh no, sorry, it was a mistake’. On-line repairs are associated with speech disfluencies, i.e. with breaking syntactic and prosodic integrity and coherence, cf. (1); while off-line repairs are integrated into fluent planned speech production, cf. (2), (3). In both on-line repairs and off-line repairs, the segment under repair (reparandum) and its corrected counterpart (reparans) tend to show systematic formal and functional isomorphism which is crucial for overcoming speech-production difficulties associated with the repair, [4]. E.g., in the on-line isomorphic repair (1), the reparandum vsjakie ‘various’ – as far as it can be reconstructed from its truncated form – and the reparans različnye ‘different’ are almost synonyms, both are adjectives and both are modifiers occupying the same slot in the syntactic structure. In the off-line isomorphic repair (3), the first line is a full-fledged rhetoric / exclamatory wh-question and it doesn’t project any continuation. Neither grammatical, nor prosodic integrity of the unit is broken; the repair is added post factum, in a separate unit. The most interesting thing about this repair is that although reparans korobku ‘box’ appears in a separate unit, outside the initial clause structure, its form, i.e. its accusative case, is licensed by the transitive verb voz’mu ‘get’ in the first line – in the very same way as the accusative case of the reparandum posylku ‘parcel’ inside the initial clause structure.

The repair usually targets at switching one feature in otherwise remaining formally and functionally isomorphic reparandum and reparans. I distinguish several classes of repairs depending on the type of the targeted feature. In lexical repairs, like (1), (3), the target of the repair is a subtle semantic shift (‘various’ > ‘different’; ‘parcel’>‘box’). Repairs can affect morphological shaping of the reparandum. These normally entail the recycling of the lexical stem, cf. (4) where the incorrect verbal masculine ending is changed to feminine. However, in rare cases, morphological repairs can be made within the word even in a highly fusional language like Russian (cf. [2], [10] for a discussion of morpho-syntactic and phonological factors that restrict possible types of repairs). E.g. in (5), the speaker initially produces an allomorph of the Actionsart prefix podo= which suggests that the intended stem was other than actually produced bežala (bežala would have required another allomorph, pod=), but then ends up producing correct bežala without revising incorrect prefix. Repairs can also affect the phonetic shell of the reparandum, cf. a mispronunciation in (6), as well as its prosodic shaping, cf. (7), where the speaker, having initially planned to further continue the illocutionary chain, signalled this by the rising pitch in the phrasal accent of the second line, but then decided to redress this line as a final and repeated it with a falling pitch. Repairs may also result in syntactic restructuring, e.g. reparandum may get reintroduced through explicit negation, as in (2).

A preliminary quantitative analysis of more than 800 repairs registered in PrACS-Russ (Prosodically Annotated Corpus of Spoken Russian, [7]) shows that self-repairs appear with an overall rate 2.7 per 100 words. On-line repairs vastly outnumber off-line repairs with the ratio 85:15,
isomorphic repairs vastly outnumber non-isomorphic repairs with the similar ratio 83:17. Lexical repairs are most frequent, comprising 55% of all isomorphic repairs, next frequent are syntactic and segmental phonologic repairs – 19% each, morphologic repairs comprise 4%, and the least frequent are prosodic repairs which comprise 3% of isomorphic repairs. The observed overall rates of repairs and the distribution of their main patterns appeared to be consistent with results reported previously for other languages, which allows suggesting that these may depend more on general speech mechanisms than on language-specific factors, but a more accurate quantitative comparison is yet to be done on bigger and better balanced samples. However, already at this stage of research, introducing first-hand corpus data contributes to an enhanced understanding of universal tendencies in repair formatting and the range of their cross-linguistic variation.

**Examples** (from Prosodically Annotated Corpus of Spoken Russian [7] in its original transcript format)

1. "vsjak= || .. različnye /–zme-ei,,.. vari= different snakes

   ‘[There were] various…different snakes.’

2. /Potom on odin raz vyšel na /balkon,
   then he once went.out to balcony
   .. i /ego /–pristreli-ili,,
   and him shot.dead
   /a-a /\ßer\vza= =\vrezali.
   but stabbed.to.death

   Sablej.
   saber.INSTR
   ‘Then he once appeared on the balcony, and [they] shot him dead; or no, not shot, [they] stabbed him to death. With a saber.’

3. Gde ja vam voz’mu /posyłku?!
   where I for.youget.1.SG.PRES parcel.ACC
   Vot eto .. –k-korgbk,
   whatchamacallit box.ACC

   ‘Where [do you think can] I get you a parcel [if at all]?! Whatchamacallit… a box’

4. na-a .. pravom beregu/reki … naxodilsja || naxodilas’ malen’kaja /stancija.
   on right bank of.river situate.PAST.M situate.PAST.F small station.F

   ‘On the right bank of the river, there was(M.)… there was(F.) a small station(F.).’

5. podo= || .. =/bežala ko mne rozovaja myška,
   PREF ran.up to me pink mouse

   ‘A [small] pink mouse ran=[up] to me.’

6. nu eto byl ne mjukis= || ne /mjuzikl,
   OK it was not mjukis= not musical

   ‘OK, this [performance] was not a mjukis= … was not a musical.’

7. /nogorživali,,
   build.fence.PAST.PL

164
‘[We] were building a fence, [we] were fixing pegs [and] … [well] … fixing pegs [that’s it].’

**Notes**

*Supported by the RFFR grant 13-06-00179*
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Relative clauses in Munda languages: a preliminary survey

Jurica Polančec, University of Zagreb

The Munda branch of the Austroasiatic family is surely the least well-known of the four major families of mainland South Asia. Papers dealing with the syntax of Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, both modern and ancient are numerous. The recent time has also seen an increasing interest for Tibeto-Burman languages of the area. On the other hand, the Munda languages have remained largely underdescribed in the field of syntax, with the notable exception of Kharia (South Munda), described by Peterson (2011). The talk aims at filling this gap by presenting, at least in a preliminary way, the relative clause formation in Munda languages, with the special concern for its areal and especially typological features. Sources for such an attempt were mostly drawn from Anderson (2008). This preliminary sketch will show that Munda languages feature two major strategies, the correlative one and the prenominal one. Both are attested in virtually all Munda languages. The correlative strategy is almost surely borrowed from the neighbouring Indo-Aryan languages (Sadri, Oriya) in two phases. In the first one, more ancient, only the structure was copied, and the relativizer (or the relative pronoun) was recruited among native interrogative (rarely indefinite) pronouns, while in the more recent stage, the Indo-Aryan relativizer was borrowed (so-called j-series forms). The prenominal strategy is probably original in Munda (Donegan and Stampe 2004: 12–13). Roughly, three subtypes are attested: 1) in the Northern Munda languages of the Kherwarian group the prenominal verbal form differs from the finite one only in that it lacks the finite marker -a; 2) in South Munda languages, the prenominal form is marked by the general attributive or genitive marker or by a suffix derived from it (e.g. in GtaɁ); 3) Korku uses the full finite form in prenominal constructions. With respect to the prenominal construction, Munda languages can be shown to feature so-called augmented gap (W. Tong 2011: 587–591), which is also found in Dravidian, e.g. in Tamil (Comrie 1998a). In addition, so-called generalized noun modifying clause constructions (Comrie and Khalilova 2013, Comrie 1998b) have been found in two languages: Gorum and Kharia. Furthermore, Kharia gives us some clues that the picture presented above is rather superficial, since Kharia features all of the mentioned strategies and some other. This suggests that a more detailed analysis of relative constructions in individual languages is urgently needed before a more clear picture could be established.
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A Germanic language island in Brazil: generalized T-to-C and absence of V-to-T in Brazilian Pomeranian

Gertjan Postma (Meertens Institute Amsterdam) & Andrew Nevins (University College London)

Pomeranian is the coastal dialect of Continental Germanic between the Oder river and the Vistula river, an area which is called Hinter-Pommern. Until 1945 it was part of Germany, but lays in present-day Poland. While Pomeranian is not used anymore in cohesive communities in Europe since 1945, it is still in full use in various parts of Brazil. These communities derive from immigration as early as 1850, and were rather isolated until recently.

In this talk we report on new fieldwork on Brazilian Pomeranian spoken in the state of Espirito Santo (ES). We study some morphosyntactic innovations found in these 19th century settlements. We focus on the merger of the verbal prefix tau 'to' (German zu), with the complementizer um 'for', giving rise to the complex complementizer taum, as shown in (1) and (2). We argue that the form taum, which used to be a preposition tau + a Dative case marker (-m), was reanalyzed in Brazilian Pomeranian as a complex complementizer um + zu (for+to), which we also encounter in Middle English (3).

We analyze this complex complementizer as a realization of (C+T). As V remains clause final, it implies that V and T are split, similar to what happens in the history of English (split infinitives). We discuss two other instances of absence of V-to-T: daua-support, and the complete absence of suffixal past tenses in Brazilian Pomeranian: *walked. Only irregular past tenses survive (4).

Examples

European Pomeranian (19th century)

(1) du bust nog nich grot naug um an Flasch Wiin ut-tau-drink-en
   'you are not big enough to drink out a bottle of wine' (Wenker Atlas, 16, loc Schloenwitz)

Brazilian Pomeranian (2006)

(2) Dai lüür häwa kair gild taum sich ai ruus ø buug-en.
   'The people have no money to build themselves a house' (Tressmann 2006: 78)

Middle English (15th century)

(3) A modir is not bounde forto alwey and for euere ø fede her children
   'A mother is not bound always and for ever feed her children' (Peacock, Repressor 219, apud Visser 1963: 1044)

Brazilian Pomeranian (2006)

(4) Dun kaim ain im an un staik em. Dun hät hai upstampt.
   'Then came a bee PRT and stung him. Then he stamped on it'.
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Thetic clefts in Nama-Damara

Christian J. Rapold, University of Regensburg

This paper investigates formal, semantic and pragmatic aspects of a cleft construction used to express theticity in Nama-Damara, a Khoe (a.k.a. Central Khoisan) language spoken by over 250,000 people in mainly Namibia.

Thetic constructions (Kuroda 1972, Sasse 1987, 2006), a.k.a. all-new, presentational, or sentence-focus constructions, are characterised by the absence of a topic-comment structure and are typically “uttered at those points of the discourse when compact information is required” (Sasse 1987:558). As such they are frequently found in ‘out of the blue’ utterances, where the logical subject is not a topic as in example (1) on the data sheet. Another common use of thetic constructions is in answers to questions like ‘What happened?’ (2) or more generally in explainative utterances (3).

Cleft sentences as in (1)-(3) are a widespread cross-linguistic strategy for the expression of theticity (Sasse 1987, 1996, 2006, Lambrecht 2000) that is also attested in the areally related Tuu languages (Güldemann 2010).

After a morphological and syntactic description of the Nama-Damara construction in question, I explore semantic features of the clefted element (such as animacy and definiteness), and chart the semantic fields expressed by the verbs in the relative clauses of these clefts. The discourse-pragmatic functions are investigated mainly based on a corpus of published texts and the results are compared to domains of theticity found in the literature (Sasse 1987, 1996, 2006, Matić 2003 i.a.). The data comes from participant observation, published texts and elicitation.

It is not uncommon for languages to have several strategies for various parts of the domain of theticity (cf. Sasse 1996:16). In Nama-Damara two other constructions have been identified as expressing theticity, both of which are also used for predicate-focus sentences (Haacke 2006:120, Witzlack-Makarevich 2006:77-78). They likely developed from cleft constructions, too (cf. Güldemann 2006, 2010 for a similar situation in Tuu languages), but the erstwhile relative clause is no longer recognisable as such. This means that the clefts investigated here may represent a younger development, shedding light on the semantics and pragmatics of a “young” thetic construction.

Examples

(1) Out-of-the-blue utterance
Context: Waiting staff at a restaurant carry Santa Claus hats during Christmas season. Having served some patrons, the waitress walks away, brushing a beam with her hat. As a result, the hat falls down unnoticed by her. One of her patrons says to her:

A: [relative clause] [matrix clause]

Inā go gapa-s ge.
fall.down REC.PAST hat-3sf DECL
‘THE HAT FELL DOWN!’ (lit. #‘It is the hat which fell down.’)

(data from participant observation)

(2) Answer to questions like ‘What happened?’
Context: Two sisters are in the living room, the mother in the kitchen next door. The baby sister falls to the ground with a thud. A moment later, screaming is heard from the living room. (Mo = mother; Es = elder sister)
Mo: **tai-ʔe?**
what-3sc.OBL
‘What’s up?’

Es: [lna go] khoe-s ge.
fall.down REC.PAST person-3sf DECL
‘THE LADY FELL DOWN!’
(data from participant observation)

(3) Explanative utterance

A: ‘Oh, oh, my heart..., my heart...’
[stage direction]: ‘She is falling down.’

B: !khō re! !khō re, khoe-s-a ![khaea.ʔai ra] khoe-s
catch OPT catch OPT person-3sf-OBL have.blackout PROG person-3sf
ge.
DECL
‘Catch! Catch, the lady, THE LADY’S FAINTING!’
(data from a drama text)

Glosses

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>common gender</td>
<td>PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECL</td>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>prog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Rise of Accusative Alignment in Tāti

Mohammad RasekhMahand, Bu-Ali Sina University, Iran
Raheleh IzadiFar, Bu-Ali Sina University, Iran

Tāti belongs to the Tātic family of Northwest Iranian branch of Indo-Iranian languages and is spoken in north-west of Iran. Although Tāti dialects are threatened or highly endangered, most of them are undocumented or poorly described and the diachronic changes in alignment of Tāti dialects remain unstudied. Our intention here is to elaborate upon the structures of Tāti in more detail as a contribution to the understanding of the typology of changes in alignment types and to the exploration of diachronic changes in Iranian languages. The material for this study was collected from fieldwork on Tāti dialects in 2013 and 2014. The fieldwork consisted of elicitation of data from native speakers of these dialects.

The morphosyntax associated with past transitive verbs in most Iranian languages including Tāti language group differs from that associated with others. This difference can be traced back to previous stages of these languages. Old Iranian had a unified accusative alignment in all tenses of finite verb forms. In the transition from Old to Middle Iranian period, the verbal system was reduced to a two-way distinction between forms based on the present tense stem of the verb, and those based on the past stem. All modern Iranian languages must have passed through the tense-sensitive alignment in Middle Iranian period in which the alignment in clauses comprised of past stem verbs was ergative-absolutive, while it was nominative-accusative in clauses including present stem verbs (cf. Haig 2008a,b).

Most Tāti dialects show tense-sensitive alignment in varying degrees. In present stem verb sentences, all Tāti dialects follow the nominative-accusative case marking which marks subject of intransitive clauses (S) and subject of transitive clauses (A) with a morphologically unmarked case, generally termed the Direct case marker, and both determine agreement on the verb; in present stem clauses, there happens differential object marking (DOM) according to the definiteness hierarchy and the cut-off point is between definite and indefinite nouns; So objects of transitive verbs (P) are marked with an Oblique case marker if they are definite and are left unmarked if they are indefinite (for a detailed discussion of DOM in Tāti dialects cf. Bossong 1985:22-3,Yar-shater 1969). The cut-off point can be seen in (1).

1. DOM based on definiteness hierarchy in Tāti dialects:

| marked: | Personal Pronoun > Proper noun > Definite NP |
| unmarked: | Indefinite specific NP > Non-specific NP |

In clauses headed by verb forms built with the past stem of transitive verbs, the situation differs. There is considerable variety in these clauses among Tāti dialects. The most conservative dialects like Eshtehārdi have retained the ergative-absolutive alignment system of the Middle Iranian. In these dialects, A is marked with a distinct oblique marker, while S and P are marked with the direct case marker and both determine agreement on the verb based on gender and number (Yar-shater 1969, Payne 1998). Other dialects have dropped the ergative alignment system and show considerable changes toward the nominative-accusative alignment system. Tākestāni and Esfarvarini are among these dialects and they belong to the southern dialects of Tāti in Yar-shater’s (1969) grouping. These dialects are spoken in Qazvin province which is in vicinity of the capital city of Iran and have had much communication with the Persian speakers in past decades. As this area is an industrial area receiving a lot of Persian or Turkic immigrants in recent years, it has been influenced heavily by these
languages. Almost all Tāts are bilingual since the language of education and media in Iran is Persian. Some Tāts are trilingual as the lingua franca in most areas in North-West of Iran is a language of the Turkic family.

The aim of this study is to show that some Tāti dialects such as Tākestāni and Esfarvarini have diverted from the ergative alignment in past stem clauses and have gone one step forward toward the nominative-accusative alignment. This change of alignment system can be attributed to the contact with Persian and Turkic which both follow nominative-accusative alignment in all tenses and also as a result of system pressure to use the same alignment in all tenses. In this transition, the ergative marker on A has been lost and verb agreement with P is lost too. As none of verb arguments, i.e. neither A nor P had any case marking, these dialects have used two strategies to mark the arguments in transitive past sentences: first, the A-referring person agreement marking clitics which can attach to different words in other dialects and in some dialects follow wackernagel's law, just attach to P in Tākestāni and Esfarvarini, so they do two jobs simultaneously: referring to A and marking P. Second, P is marked with oblique case in transitive past sentences too. This oblique marking is hard to distinguish, as both case marking and the enclitics are attached to the end of P, but the oblique case can be distinguished in pronouns which have irregular forms and in kinship terms which have irregular forms and also in plural nouns because the plural case endings are different in Esfarvarini, as in example 1.

In Tākestāni, the oblique case can be distinguished in noun phrases which have deictic adjectives before P. This is shown in example 2 below. So it can be seen that these dialects are harmonizing the alignment system in clauses including past stem with transitive present clauses. The case marking of the objects in past clauses follows the DOM in present clauses based on the definiteness hierarchy in (1) above.

Examples:
Esfarvaini dialect of Tāti:
(1) a. āpāra ahmad čemen=eš bind.
   last year PN¹⁶:Dir.Ms 1sg:Obl=Clt:3Sg see:Past
   "Last year, Ahmad saw me."

   b. hasan ā gandom-un=eš undā ahmad-e.
   PN:Dir.Ms those wheat-Pl:Obl=Clt:3Sg give:Past PN:Obl.Ms
   "Hasan gave the wheat (Pl) to Ahmad."

Tākestāni dialect of Tāti:
(2) a. (a) jā ketāb=em bo.
   1sg:Dir that:Obl book=1Sg buy:Past
   "I bought that book."

   b. hasan inne sang=eš partā čā mun.
   PN one stone=3Sg throw:Pst well in
   "Hasan threw a stone in the well."

References


¹⁶Abbreviations: Ms: masculine - Sg: singular - Dir: direct - Obl: oblique - Pl: plural - PN: proper name – Clt: clitic


Exploring configurationality as a historical phenomenon

Uta Reinöhl, University of Cologne

Languages differ regarding the configurationality of their syntax, i.e. the degree to which their clause structure is organized hierarchically. I will address the question of how a language may change from largely non-configurational to (part-)configurational through the development of phrasal syntax. I propose that there are two logical possibilities, both of which are attested in different branches of Indo-European. This insight hinges on the inclusion of data from Indo-Aryan, which shows an alternative pathway to adpositional phrases unrelated to the developments in other branches. The commonplace that the shift from synthesis to analysis developed in a uniform fashion across Indo-European (e.g. Hewson & Bubenik 2006) must accordingly be revised.

Some languages dubbed “non-configurational” hardly show hierarchical syntactic organization, e.g. Warlpiri (Hale 1983) or Homeric Greek (Taylor 1990). In these languages, word order is syntactically mostly unconstrained and there are hardly any compulsory requirements that elements be overtly expressed. By contrast, a strongly configurational language like English has phrasal categories consisting of function words (e.g. articles or prepositions) with slots for content words that must be filled. Now, in some cases, historical documents attest to an increase in configurationality over time as for example in Indo-European. This poses the challenge of how to account for the development of phrasal categories in languages that lack syntactic constraints on order or on obligatory expression.

Vincent (1999), Hewson & Bubenik (2006), Luraghi (2010) and others have proposed that phrases emerge in different branches of Indo-European through the reanalysis of syntactically independent elements as phrasal units. While order is free in principle, semantically connected elements frequently stand in juxtaposition. For example, strings of Indo-European spatial adverbs in juxtaposition with local case forms were reanalyzed as prepositional phrases in many branches of the family, e.g. Pre-Latin *[sub] [ponte] ‘below, at the bridge’ > Latin *[sub ponte] ‘below the bridge’ (see Luraghi 2010 for an analysis of analogical changes in other branches, both on the level of the prepositional phrase and on higher clausal levels). It has been claimed that all branches of Indo-European developed adpositional phrases through precisely this reanalysis of spatial adverbs. However, while this scenario indeed adequately describes the development in most branches of the family, it does not hold for Indo-Aryan. In this branch, postpositional phrases did not emerge from symmetrical groups of syntactically independent elements, but from asymmetrical groups of nominal, adverbial or participial heads with nominal dependents. Here, we do not deal with a rebracketing as in the Latin example above, but with the syntactization of dependency relations. For example, the Old Indic construction *(Ngen +) madhye (middle.LOC.SG.N) ‘in the middle of x’ where the genitive is optional and word order free yielded the Hindi postpositional phrase *Nobl= mē ‘in x’ with the (now oblique-marked) noun obligatorily overt and positions fixed.

In conclusion, the issue of configurationality has taken center stage in grammatical theory since the 1980s when Ken Hale pointed out that Warlpiri defies classical generative-transformational theory, but its historical dynamics have rarely been explored. In this talk, I do not only show that configurationality is a gradual phenomenon, but also, that there is more than one way in which a non-configurational language may become more hierarchical.
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The role of TAM and focus markers in paratactic clause-linkage

Stéphane Robert, CNRS-LLACAN Paris

Wolof (Atlantic, Senegal) has a complex and interesting verbal system expressing, among others, distinctions related to information structure (focus). These are merged in the inflectional verbal morphemes with specifications for person, number, tense, aspect, mood and polarity. Another characteristic of this language, which is probably related to this particular verbal system, is the tendency in Wolof to express complex sentences paratactically, i.e. by juxtaposing clauses in a single sentence without any coordinating or subordinating morphemes. Subordinating morphemes do exist in the language (cf. Sall 2005) but the specific properties of its conjugations (Tense-Aspect-Mood-Focus markers) naturally allow certain types of interclausal relations to be expressed by simple parataxis and conjugation chaining. The study of clause combining shows that, with some restrictions on possible combinations, the various combinations of conjugations produce different but regular interclausal meanings, such as succession (1), causality (2), consecution (3) or opposition (4):

Wolof
(1) Ágg na, taw bi door na.
   arrive PRF.3SG, rain the begin PRF.3SG
   ‘He arrived, (then) it started to rain.’

(2) Sama câmmiñ waxal mboog, man dama yàkkamtì.
   My brother speak:IMP PTCL me VBFOC.1SG be.rushed
   ‘Come my friend, make up your mind (because) I am in a rush.’ [XCL]

(3) Dafa ko fétal, mu dée.
   VBFOC.3SG him shoot, NULL.3SG die
   ‘He shot him (therefore) he is dead.’

(4) Paaka bi mu ngi ñaw be, nga koy foye!
   knife the PREST.3SG be.sharp so NULL.2SG OPR:IPFV play:INS
   ‘The knife is so sharp and (yet) you are playing with it!’

In this paper, I will first, present an overview of the morphosyntactic and semantic patterns observed in paratactic clause chaining and then show how, due to the nature of the different conjugations, paratactic clause chaining in Wolof yields different types of interclausal dependency, defining a gradient of syntactic integration, along with the semantic integration of the two events (Cristofaro 2003): from simple assertive juxtaposition to more integrated syntactic dependency, through lesser known types of dependency, defined here as ‘situational dependency’ and ‘pragmatic dependency’ (Robert 2010). Eventually, the observed semantic pattern will be paralleled with those produced by different morphosyntactic means for encoding interclausal relations with markers from outside the domain of clause linkage in an Australian language, Umpithamu (Verstraete 2010).
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Negative Concord in Övdalian and Estonian Swedish – a Vernacular Universal in Scandinavian?

Henrik Rosenkvist, Gothenburg University

Two of the most interesting varieties of Swedish are Övdalian and Estonian Swedish. Both of these language varieties have developed in relative isolation since the Middle Ages, Övdalian in the northwestern part of Dalecarlia and Estonian Swedish in the Estonian archipelago. Both are incomprehensible for speakers of Swedish, and they both display a number of syntactic features that are unattested in Swedish as well as in more recently developed dialects of Swedish – but while Övdalian has been the topic of some contemporary syntactic studies (cf. for instance Garbacz 2010 and Rosenkvist 2010, 2011), the syntax of Estonian Swedish has not yet been properly documented. In an ongoing project funded by the Swedish Research Council (ESST: Estonian Swedish Language Structure) 2013–2016, more data from Estonian Swedish will be collected and published during the coming years.

One of the syntactic aspects that will be studied closer is negative concord (NC). In both Övdalian and Estonian Swedish, it is possible to combine two negative expressions that yield one semantic negation – see examples below.

Övdalian:
(1) Tjyöpum int inger so kringgt.
   BUY.1PL NOT NO SO OFTEN
   ’We do not buy any [of them] so often.’ (Levander 1909:111)

Estonian Swedish:
(2) Väliaken had änt heldor inga fail.
   WEATHER-THE HAD NOT EITHER NO FAULTS
   ’There were no problems with the weather.’ (Nyman 1990:9)

The fact that both Övdalian and Estonian Swedish allow NC is intriguing, considering that this phenomenon did not occur in Old Swedish, and that Övdalian and Estonian Swedish have developed without contact – in fact, they are located in the western and eastern fringes of the Swedish language area, respectively. Neither are there any intermediate language forms where NC is found. The conclusion must be that NC has developed independently but in parallel in Övdalian and Estonian Swedish. Applying a wider perspective, we find that NC can only be attested in non-standardized varieties of Germanic (cf. Chambers 2001, 2004): it is found in southern German vernaculars, in Yiddish, in Afrikaans and in traditional English dialects. It is furthermore also found in urban American sociolects. Unlike the situation in Swedish, however, Old English and Old High German allowed NC (cf. Trudgill 2009 and Langer 2001:150ff, respectively), so the construction seems to have disappeared from these languages due to standardization. Thus, NC in traditional English dialects and in for instance Bavarian must be seen as syntactic archaisms, while the lack of NC in Old Swedish leads to the conclusion that NC in Övdalian and Estonian Swedish are innovations.

After having presented relevant data from Övdalian and Estonian Swedish, I will briefly discuss the possible typological consequences of the observation that NC is only found in non-standardized Germanic language varieties, and not in the traditional standard languages (which is the object of investigation in for instance WALS Online (Dryer & Haspelmath 2013)), with a focus on the concept of Standard Average European (Whorf 1941, Haspelmath 2001).
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Today’s morphology in Mako is both yesterday’s and today’s syntax: Grammaticalization of the Mako copulas and its implications for marking animate subjects in the verb

Jorge Emilio Rosés Labrada, University of Western Ontario & Université Lumière-Lyon 2

Only animate subjects in Mako [ISO 639-3: wpc]—a Sáliban language spoken in Venezuela by approximately 1,200 people—are cross-referenced on the verb (cf. exx. 1-4 with exx. 5-8). In some instances, the cross-referencing is achieved via a set of suffixes (see exx. 5-6) and in others, via a set of prefixes (see exx. 7-8). The use of these two distinct sets of affixes is phonologically—rather than semantically—motivated: verb roots ending in a consonant take a prefix (See paradigm in (9)); verb roots ending in a vowel, a suffix (See paradigm in (10)). In this paper, I argue that these two (apparently) different sets of affixes are in fact one and the same and that their position vis à vis the root is the result of a process of lexicalization; the suffixes being former prefixes that ended up “trapped” in the middle of an old verb + copula construction. The evidence for this claim comes primarily from the investigation of the sources of the present-day TAM and polarity verbal morphology.

Mako, like most Amazonian languages, is highly synthetic and agglutinative so it is no surprise that there would be a large number of TAM verbal markers in the language (See Table 1 below for a selection of first person forms with the verb edi ‘to see’). The historical source for these suffixes becomes evident if we examine the language’s non-verbal predicate constructions in (11) through (14). For example, the negative copula in (11) and the future copula in (14) are clearly related to the negative suffix and the future suffix in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 Partial Paradigm for the Verb edi ‘to see’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>PRES.NEG</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>PAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s G</td>
<td>if-ed-a</td>
<td>if-ed-iki</td>
<td>if-ed-in-a</td>
<td>if-ed-atɔ</td>
<td>if-ed-ih-atɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>PRES.NEG</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td>FUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s G</td>
<td>if-ed-o be</td>
<td>if-ed-ok-o be</td>
<td>if-ed-in-o be</td>
<td></td>
<td>if-ed-akʷ-o be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the implications of the grammaticalization of the Mako copulas for the cross-referencing of animate subjects in the verb? When the copulas fused onto the main verb of the clause, they brought with them their subject prefixes (For a copula marked for person, see ex. (11), exx. (12-14) have no subject markers because their subjects are inanimate) which then ended up being “trapped” between the two (See Givón (1976:183-184) for a similar scenario in the formation of the Semitic perfect conjugation). This hypothesis is further confirmed by examples like (15a) and (15b) uttered by the same speaker in a continuous stretch of discourse. In (15a) the speaker uses a non-finite form of the verb yōbanō [ji-b-an-i]—where the -i is the marker for non-finiteness and the -b is a “placeholder” morpheme that is only used in non-finite forms of Class II verbs—in conjunction with a copula that is inflected for third person plural (marker ʈʰ- represented orthographically as tj). In (15b), however, the speaker chooses to mark person inside the verb and not in the copula, which is now not an independent phonological word but part of the main verb.
The question remains of why only some verbs have suffixes while others have prefixes. The explanation for this, I argue, lies in the syllable structure of the language—strictly (C)V—and a constraint against sequences of two or more consonants. I posit that, when the fusion of the copulas occurred, the prefix had to be moved to the beginning of the main verb to avoid creating a C-C sequence.

This study not only describes nonverbal predication in Mako and shows how copulas have served to create polarity and TAM distinctions in verbal clauses but also illustrates how this process has affected the marking of animate subjects on the verb creating two seemingly different sets of affixes—and arguably two verb classes. It thus contributes both to the description of Mako—thus far undescribed—and to our understanding of the role of syntax in the creation of polarity and TAM verbal morphology and of complex systems of person marking.

**Examples**

(1) $bak^{w}$-apo  pelota-po  me-obe  
one-CL  ball-CL  fall-TAM  
‘one ball falls’

(2) $d$-opo-latahi  pelota-po  me-obe  
two-CL-two  ball-CL  fall-TAM  
‘two balls fall’

(3) $bak^{w}$-apo  pelota-po  bamat-obe  
one-CL  ball-CL  stop-TAM  
‘one ball stops’

(4) $d$-opo-latahi  pelota-po  bamat-obe  
two-CL-two  ball-CL  stop-TAM  
‘two balls stop’

(5) Rosalba  me-$h$-obe  
PN  fall-$3SG.FEM$-TAM  
‘Rosalba falls’

(6) $duhutaha$  isuhu  me-$t^{h}$-obe  
two.$ANIM$  woman  fall-$3PL$-TAM  
‘two women fall’

(7) Rosalba  $hi$-bamat-obe  
PN  $3SG.FEM$-stop-TAM  
‘Rosalba stops’

(8) $duhutaha$  isuhu  $t^{h}$-bamat-obe  
two.$ANIM$  woman  $3PL$-stop-TAM  
‘two women stop’

$ed^{i}$ ‘to see’ (Class I)  
$m eb i$ ‘to fall’ (Class II)  

(9) $t^{f}$-ed-obe  
$me$-t-obe  
1SG

$k^{w}$-ed-obe  
$me$-kib-obe  
2SG

$\emptyset$-ed-obe  
$me$-$\emptyset$-obe  
$3SG.MASC$

$h$-ed-obe  
$me$-$h$-obe  
$3SG.FEM$

$d$-ed-obe  
$me$-$d$-obe  
1PL

$k^{w}$-adu-obe  
$me$-kib-adu-obe  
2PL

$t^{h}$-ed-obe  
$me$-$t^{h}$-obe  
$3PL$
(11) *íthi-ma* siete año (siete año) *tf’obe*
1SG.PRO-FOC seven years (repetition) 1SG-COP
‘I have been [in school X] for seven years’

(12) *bi-ka-ma* (*it’h*) *tf’úk’w-a-ka* iká
DEM.PROX-CL.HARD-TOP (1SG.PRO) 1SG-POSS’D.INAN-CL.HARD NEG.COP-CL.HARD
‘This (cassava) is not mine’

(13) *bi-ka-ma* (*it’h*) *tf’úk’w-a*
DEM.PROX-CL.HARD-TOP (1SG.PRO) 1SG-POSS’D.INAN
*ile-ka*
PST.COP-CL.HARD
*ina-ka*
manioc-CL.HARD
‘This cassava was mine’

(14) (*it’h*) *tf’úk’w-a* *akw’-ka*
(1SG.PRO) 1SG-POSS’D.INANIM FUT.COP-CL.HARD
‘This (cassava) will be mine’

(15) a. *waayatjö // kwatjö yóbanö tjiłatö’ // ti edanäbi?*
I don’t know. That is what they said. Who would be looking?
b. *chedökö // dąpjonöda yótjanijatö’:
I did not see it. They talked about it a lot time ago.
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Modality and evaluative adverbs and focus sensitivity in ancient Greek

Emilia Ruiz-Yamuza. University of Seville

The description of the syntax of modality and evaluative adverbs in ancient Greek can be improved taking into consideration the idea of focus sensitivity. They are well known facts that modality adverbs, also in ancient Greek, are able to produce harmonic and no-harmonic combinations with verbal moods, to be the answer to a question, and to be out of the scope of negation. Their syntactic classification as adjuncts or disjuncts is probably less clear cut in ancient Greek than in other old or modern languages, as Latin or English. Some of the adverbs appear in different positions in the sentences: initial position, pre-verbal position, post-verbal position, and have different scopes: broad scope on the sentence or narrow scope on an element, a noun phrase e.g. if we consider that modality adverbs have focus sensibility we can explain the different positions in the sentences and the different scope of the adverbs. The notion of focus sensibility explains the instances where the focus is bound by an operator. The standard example for focus sensitive expressions are focus particles, such as only, even or also in English (König 1991), or μόνον (Martínez Vázquez 2014) in ancient Greek. Generally speaking, although sentence adverbs have been mentioned (Koktova 1986, Partee 1992, Filipenko 2000, Nuyts 2001, Sudhoff 2010) with respect to focus sensitivity in some papers, and some of them have been recently considered (Döring 2012), however, a systematic analysis seems to be still missing and this applies in a higher degree to ancient Greek. As focus-sensitive expressions are a heterogeneous set, it seems plausible to assume different mechanisms for the association with focus. Three ways of association with focus have been established (Beaver & Clark 2008): quasi association, free association, and conventional association with focus. The present communication, from a corpus-based study of three modality adverbs (isōs, tácha, schedón) and two evaluative adverbs (eikótōs, alógōs,) in the works by Xenophon and Polybius, clarifies the role of each one of them as focus-sensitive expressions, and their positions in the scale between conventional association and quasi association.
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Digital databases for the study of verb argument realization in diachrony

Eleonora Sausa, Università di Pavia, Alberto Pardal Padín, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

The aim of our study is to show how two new and complementary digital databases for Ancient Greek syntax work. In order to do so, we run a case study on the change in second argument realization (see Levin 1993; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005) of three Ancient Greek verbs in diachrony. The first database is focused on Homeric verbs based on the Homeric texts lemmatized and morpho-syntactically annotated within the Perseus Project, which includes all argument realizations attested in Homer for each verb. The second one is the REGLA (Rección y complementación del griego antiguo y del latín) Ancient Greek and Latin database (Torrego et al. 2007), a work in progress based on a selection of Classical authors which contains the argument realizations and the semantic classification of some of the most frequent Ancient Greek and Latin verbs.

The two databases are the product of two different methodologies. The Homeric database is the result of the semi-automatic extraction of argument realizations; it explores and exploits the information present at the morpho-syntactic layer of annotation, and contains a list of all verbs attested in Homer with the correspondent list of arguments and their realization. The Classical authors database, differently, is not based on a morpho-syntactically pre-annotated corpus; it collects all occurrences of some of the most frequent verbs of the Greek classical literature in a selection of some classical authors. For each verb all attested argument realizations are given and an attempt for a semantic classification is provided. In addition, in this database one can find semantic information about the arguments and a final argument structure template will be available for each verb when the work will be completed.

Our paper aims to show how, in spite of the differences, it is possible to use these two databases in a complementary way in order to study the verb argument structure and realization in Ancient Greek in diachrony. We will focus, in particular, on second argument case marking in Homer and its change in diachrony: we will analyze three semantically different verbs (ágamai ‘admire, be jealous’, antibolēō ‘meet, be present’ and methiēmi ‘dismiss, let go’) which in Homer show case alternation for the second argument, respectively Acc(usative)/Dat(ive) (see (1), (2)), Gen(itive)/Dat(ive) (see (3), (4)) and Acc(usative)/Gen(itive) (see (5), (6)). Starting from these case alternations attested in Homer, we study the syntactic behavior of these verbs in the post-Homeric Greek (6th, 5th and 4th century BC) using the second database. Thus, we explore the syntactic productivity in diachrony (Barddal 2008).
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Examples:

Ancient Greek

(1) ἡδὸν ὁ γῆρον ἐγάσσατο φωνεσέν τε
3SG:ACC PTC DEF.NOM.SG old.man:NOM.SG admire:AOR.3SG speak:AOR.3SG PTC
‘The old man admired him and spoke.’ (Il. 3.181)

(2) ἥσος ἐφάσκε Poseidῶν ἀγάσασθαι ἡμῖν
REL.NOM.SG say:IMPF.3SG Poseidon:NOM.SG be.angry:INF.AOR 1PL.DAT
‘He said that Poseidon would be angry with us.’ (Od. 13.173)

(3) ἐνθὰ μοι Ἡρμῆσας [...] ἀντεβολέσαν
then 1SG.DAT Hermes:NOM.SG meet:AOR.3SG
‘Then Hermes came to meet me.’ (Od. 10.277)

(4) σὺ δὲ κεκατάφου ἀντεβολέσαις
2SG.NOM PTC NEG funeral:GEN.SG be.present:FUT.2SG
‘You will not be present at the funeral.’ (Od. 4.547)

(5) Poseidῶν δὲ μεθέσει ἡνὸν κόλον
Poseidon:NOM.SG PTC let.go:FUT.3SG POSS.2SG.ACC anger:ACC.SG
‘Poseidon will let go his anger.’ (Od. 1.77)

(6) Αὐλ’ οὖ δ’ [...] σεῖο μεθέσο
but NEG PTC 2SG.GEN leave:FUT.3SG
‘But I will not leave you.’ (Il. 11.841)
Pseudo-partitive constructions and other NPs involving containers in Bashkir

Sergey Say, Institute for linguistic studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

Pseudo-partitive constructions (PPCs) are constructions that consist of two nominals, one of which denotes a kind of entity (such as ‘tea’ or ‘books’, henceforth referred to as “substance”), and the other quantifies over this kind of entity, cf. *a pile of books* [Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 527].

In Bashkir (< Turkic < Altaic), as in many other languages, PPCs may involve names of containers. When used in PPCs, containers are syntactically expressed as unmarked modifiers to the head noun (substance), (1). This kind of juxtapositional PPCs has been reported for other languages, including some Turkic languages [Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2009: 334].

This study is based on the field data gathered in Bashkortostan (2012–2013) and, to a lesser extent, on the Internet. The study has two goals: i) to analyze the syntactic properties of PPCs in Bashkir in a typological perspective; ii) to identify the semantic niche which is occupied by the PPC in Bashkir, as opposed to several other types of NPs with the same components.

i) When used in the Bashkir PPC, words that denote containers are stripped of most properties associated with nouns; e.g., they are never marked for case, number and possession. They almost cannot have syntactic dependents (such as demonstratives, possessors, or adjectives), with one notable exception: they are obligatorily preceded by numerals. If the relevant quantity is equal to the capacity of one container, the numeral *ber* ‘one’ is obligatorily used (2), whereas in other types of constructions it is optional (3). The loss of noun-like properties is iconic: the names of containers in PPCs are used non-referentially, they do not refer to actual physical objects (such as ‘cups’, ‘pockets’, etc.).

PPCs are syntactically different from all Bashkir constructions in which nouns serve as adnominal modifiers; e.g., containers linearly precede adjectival modifiers, whereas regular unmarked noun-like modifiers follow adjectives, cf. (1). Syntactically, names of containers in the PPC are similar to dedicated quantifiers (numerals and words like ‘some’ or ‘many’). Once we acknowledge that these words lose properties associated with a major part of speech (nouns) and acquire properties associated with quantifiers, which are closer to the grammatical pole of the lexicon-to-grammar continuum, it is tempting to interpret this process in terms of decategorialisation / grammaticalisation. Importantly, however, what is grammaticalised here is not a closed set of individual nouns, but the very mechanism (cf. “implicit type-shifting” [Michaelis 2004]), which can turn the name of any object that is viewed as a container into a quantifier-like expression: ‘hand(ful)’, ‘lap(ful)’, ‘car’ (4), etc.

ii) The domain of the relations between substance and a container is exquisitely elaborated in the syntax of the Bashkir language. The PPC coexists with at least four other types of NPs which involve the words denoting containers and substance. Constructions with locative adjectives (5) and comitative constructions (6) are similar to the PPC in that the substance nominal functions as the syntactic head. It is also possible to use the name of the container as the syntactic head, so that the name of the substance is syntactically expressed as either an unmarked (7) or an explicitly marked (8) possessor. The uses of all these “alternative” constructions are not confined to the domain of the relations between containers and substances. The choice between the five constructions shows an intricate pattern. On the one hand, each of them corresponds to a particular type of “image schema”, and the choice largely depends on definiteness and referentiality of the two nominals and the semantic type of the predicate. For example, both the PPCs and the construction with locative adjective are predominantly used if the predicate is semantically compatible with the name of the substance (e.g. ‘boil’ or ‘drink’), but the latter construction is used not for quantification, but for reference to a particular portion of the substance which is identified through its position relative to a definite container (5). On the other hand, there are some contexts (such as, e.g., existential sentences like ‘there is … on the table’) where several constructions are equally possible and semantic contrasts between them are largely bleached (see
[Vos 1999] for typological parallels).

In my talk, I am going to discuss syntactic properties of PPCs and similar constructions in Bashkir within a broader hypothesis, according to which grammatical properties of individual words in Bashkir are weakly specified lexically, and are mostly determined by those syntactic constructions (“configurations”) they are used in, whereas the possibility to be used in a particular construction is primarily driven by semantic compatibility.

Examples

Bashkir

(1) Bolat ike stakan eθe kâzâ höt-ö-n es-te.
Bolat two glass hot goat milk-p.3-ACC drink-PST
‘Bolat drank two glasses of hot goat’s milk’.

(2) Bolat *((ber) keθä kânfît al-əp kil-gân.
Bolat one pocket candy take-CV come-PC.PST
‘Bolat brought along a (lit ‘one’) pocketful of candies’.

(3) Bolat (ber) xat jað-ðə
Bolat (one) letter write-PST
‘Bolat wrote a letter / one letter’

(4) Awol-ə-na ike mašina urəθ-tar kil-gân.
village-P.3-DAT two car Russian-PL come-PC.PST
‘Two “carfuls” of Russians arrived to the village’.

(5) Sənajaq-ta-əs Säj həwan-nə.
cup-LOC-ADJ tea get.cold-PST
‘The tea in the cup got cold’.

(6) Bolat qala-nan [biðrä menän alma] al-əp kil-de
Bolat town-ABL bucket with apple take-CV come-PST
‘Bolat brought a bucket of apples from the town’ (he actually brought apples in this bucket).

(7) Min piva hawət-ə-n jar-ðə-m.
I beer vessel-P.3-ACC split-PST-1SG
‘I broke a bottle of beer’.

(8) Alma-lar-ðə biðrä-he tul-əp jet-mä-gân.
apple-PL-GEN bucket-P.3 fill-CV reach-NEG-PC.PST
‘The bucket with apples has not filled up’.
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Constraining Emai’s Linker Morpheme in Nominal Modifier Phrases

Ronald P. Schaefer, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Francis O. Egbokhare, University of Ibadan

Nominal modifier order relative to head noun has attracted a great deal of attention in recent decades (Greenberg 1966, Dryer 2007), as has harmonic ordering between modifiers and other grammatical categories (Dryer 1992, Hawkins 1983, 1994). Less intensively investigated has been nominal modifier marking, Foley’s (1980) analysis of Austronesian languages being a notable exception. Their ligature or linker morpheme and its variable distribution led Foley to posit a bondedness hierarchy, a claim about the variable semantic and pragmatic intimacy between modifier type and head noun (Croft 1990).

A distinct line of investigation concerned with nominal modifiers involves African languages, where two patterns have drawn recent attention. Postnominal modifiers either occur with a linker morpheme or trigger a construct form of their head noun. Creissels, Dimmendaal, Frajzyngier and Konig (2008) claim that while linkers for most nominal modifiers are uncommon in Africa, they are prevalent for relative clauses. CDF&K also note that construct forms, while frequent among Semitic languages of North Africa, are rarely mentioned in descriptions of Africa’s sub-Saharan languages. An intriguing exemplar they cite in this regard is Southeastern Bantu’s Tswana, which for select modifiers manifests both a morphosyntactic linker (tsé) and a construct condition consisting of head noun with high tone. These different lines of investigation ground our exploration of nominal modifiers in Emai, an Edoid language of West Benue Congo stock spoken in south-central Nigeria. Emai is relatively rigid SVO, manifesting lexical and grammatical tone, little inflectional morphology and few prepositions. Over a number of years, we developed a grammar and dictionary for Emai as well as a substantial collection of spoken oral tradition texts in orthographic and translated form.

Emai’s relator (R) morpheme li links head noun (éwé) to relative clause (éwé li ŋnwímé shén’-i [goats R farmer PAP.sell-F] ‘goats that the farmer sold’) or adjective phrase (éwé li óbín’ [goats R dark] ‘dark goats’). Wherever li occurs, the head noun displays construct tone, high tone spreading from right to left. Relative to other postnominal modifiers, li never codes demonstrative (éwé dín ‘those goats’), quantifier (éwé ërèmé ‘all goats’) or kindred (éwé ëlìyò ‘goat of that kind’). It also never marks definite article (éli éwé ‘the goats’), which precedes rather than follows its head noun. In contrast to these stable patterns, numeral modifier types attract li less consistently, doing so along what initially appears to be a collective/distributive parameter. Neither inducing construct tone nor attracting linker li are cardinal numerals (èvá in éwè èvá [goats two] ‘two goats’), whereas collective phrases derived with cardinals induce construct tone on head noun and require li (éwé li èvá [goat R two] ‘twosome of goats’). In contrast, emphatic collectives (éwé êvèvá [goats all two] ‘both goats’) and emphatic distributives (éwé êvèvá [goats two two] ‘two goats each’) require construct tone but reject li. Ordinals meanwhile take li optionally but induce construct tone (éwé (li) ëzèvà [goat R second] ‘second goat’). Thus a collective/distributive interpretation may be too narrow. Linker-distinguished meaning contrasts with some adjectives (éwé li kéré [goat R small size] ‘small sized goat’) vs (éwé kéré [goats small quantity] ‘small quantity of goats’), indeed, suggest a broader qualitative/quantitative parameter is constraining Emai’s linker morpheme distribution. We conclude with discussion of how contrasting parameters relate to the range of Emai’s nominal modifiers, bondedness and relationships among sub-Saharan Africa’s Niger-Congo languages.
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The syntax and semantics of clause chaining in Toposa

Helga Schröder, University of Nairobi, SIL International

Some languages make extensive use of clause chaining. According to Payne (1997: 312), clause chaining has been documented for languages in the highlands of New Guinea, Australia and the Americas. In Africa it is found in Ethiopia (Völlmin et al. 2007), in Kiswahili, a Bantu language (Hopper 1979: 213-215) and in Anuak, a Western Nilotic language (Longacre 1990: 88-90 and 2007: 418). Clause chaining has been considered a typical phenomenon of SOV languages, but it is also reported in a few SVO languages (Dooley 2010: 8). I have recently demonstrated that it also occurs in Toposa, an Eastern Nilotic language spoken in South Sudan that is VSO (Schröder 2011).

Clause chaining is characterised by the long combination of non-finite clauses that have operator dependency on a finite clause, and it usually signals foreground information in discourse (see also Dooley 2010: 3). Besides its discourse function, it has important morpho-syntactic and semantic properties.

This paper will explore the morpho-syntactic, semantic and discourse properties of clause chaining in Toposa, an Eastern Nilotic language. The paper will claim that the main syntactic function of clause chaining is to organize discourse in terms of foreground and background information, and that it does so irrespective of whether the discourse is narrative, procedural or expository.

The paper will also demonstrate that one of the syntactic properties of Toposa clause chaining is that it does not only occur in coordinative constructions (as for example suggested by Myhill & Hibiya 1988: 363), but that it is also prevalent in subordinative sentence constructions which express either purpose or means-result. In coordinative sentence constructions clause chaining expresses the semantic properties of either logical-causal sequence or simultaneity.

Finally, the paper will show that, contrary to typological expectations (Huang 2000, 2003, Payne 1997, Stirling 1993: 14-18), clause chaining in Toposa does not employ switch reference, but operates on a mixed S/A–S/O pivot.
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Reconstructing morphosyntactic changes: the independent partitive genitive

Ilja A. Seržant (University of Konstanz)

1. Introduction
The aim of the paper is twofold: first, the main focus is on reconstructing the changes that have occurred to the independent partitive genitive from ancient Indo-European languages to some modern Indo-European languages that have inherited this category; second, some methodological issues on reconstructing syntactic properties of a category will be briefly touched upon.

The paper examines the diachronic development of the morphosyntactic properties of the independent (or bare) partitive genitive (henceforth: IPg) from Proto-Indo-European to Baltic and East Slavic. The evidence on the state-of-affairs in Proto-Indo-European is mainly based on morphosyntactic correspondences across such ancient Indo-European languages as Vedic Sanskrit and Ancient Greek.

As regards methodology, in order to start examining the historical development of a particular grammatical category, first, the typologically idiosyncratic profile thereof must be established in the course of the synchronic analysis. Such a profile should encompass the morphology involved, since the phonological make-up of the morphological devices generally represents the typologically most idiosyncratic facet of a category. It should furthermore contain the lexical profile (based on the lexical input restrictions for that category). The syntactic profile (i.e. the list of the syntactic properties) and the functional profile (the list of the functional properties) are, finally, least conducive of the typological idiosyncracy. Hence, an important prerequisite for the reconstruction of a syntactic category is that its morphological profile can be reconstructed into the proto-language (using the Historical-Comparative Method). Furthermore, the lexical profile, at least partly, should be reconstructable into the proto-language. If both prerequisites are found only then the development of that category’s functional and syntactic profile can be scrutinized. Indeed, both prerequisites are fulfilled with the independent partitive genitive in the ancient Indo-European languages and Modern Lithuanian and East Slavic.

2. Subject properties in the subject position
As stated in, inter alia, Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 101), Luraghi (2003: 60) or Bauer (2007: 133-4), there has been no restriction for the IPg as to which syntactic position in the surface structure it may occupy. Thus, the IPg does not only override structural case in the ancient Indo-European languages but also datives (Conti and Luraghi 2010) or non-argumental accusatives (accusativus graecus); it also overrides the accusative case of the controlled subjects in the accusativus cum infinitivo construction (Seržant 2012). Furthermore, the IPg, while being in the subject position, triggers semantically-based verbal agreement and can be coordinated with nominatives. With this agreement, the verb copies the logical singular vs. plural number of the subset (not the formal number of the superset NP – plural in both (1) and (2)).

None of the aforementioned syntactic properties is attested with the IPg of Baltic and East Slavic. In these languages, the IPg may override structural cases only. Moreover, there is no agreement between the IPg-marked subject and the verb except for North Russian. In some subdialects of North Russian, examples are found that exhibit verbal agreement with the IPg-marked subjects, cf. (3). Yet, this agreement is crucially different from the semantic agreement in the ancient IE languages in that here the verb copies the number of the NP in the IPg with no regard to semantics (Markova 2008, Seržant, to appear).

3. Discussion

17 Exactly the same type of agreement with partitive subjects is found in Garifuna (Awakan, South-American), cf. Barchas-Lichtenstein (2012: 189).
To account for these facts, it has been suggested that the IPg in Classical Greek is governed by an implicit syntactic position filled by an indefinite pronoun, which assumes case and number but provides no or an arbitrary reference (Seržant 2012). The ability of this implicit pronoun to assume case explains the morphosyntactic behaviour of the IPg in the subject position: this pronoun – being case-marked with nominative and marked for number - triggers verbal agreement along its number (singular vs. plural) values and is capable to coordinate with other nominative-marked NPs in the sentence. Since it can assume any other case its occurrence is not restricted structurally.

As regards Baltic and East Slavic, the main changes that distinguish the IPg of Baltic and East Slavic from the IPg in the ancient IE languages concern the properties of this implicit pronoun. I will claim that this pronoun has lost the ability to assume case and number from Proto-Indo-European to Baltic and East Slavic. Consequently, it has lost the ability to control verbal agreement and to occur in non-structural positions. At the final stage of the development, this implicit pronoun has been lost completely. This is evidenced by those North Russian subdialects that allow regular verbal agreement with the IPg-marked subject. Here, no implicit head can be assumed, because it is the number of the IPg-marked NP that is directly copied by the verb.

**Examples**

1. **phōlousi d’ ouden diaektekrimenōs kai tôn** (Ancient Greek)
   - phōlousi: PRS.3PL.PRT
   - d’: ADV
   - ouden: GEN.PL
   - diaektekrimenōs: ADV
   - kai tôn: GEN.PL
   [About birds in the winter time] ‘Those with the crooked and those with straight talons, indistinguishably, hide.’ (and not fly away) (Arist. Hist. Anim. VIII.16)

2. **ën dè toútōn tôn stathmōn** (Ancient Greek)
   - en: IMPF.3SG
   - dè: GEN.PL
   - toútōn: GEN.PL
   - tôn: GEN.PL
   - stathmōn: GEN.PL
   ‘And there was [one] of these stages …’ (X. Anab. 1.5.7)

3. **Snov budut** (North Russian, Onežskij r.)
   - Snov: GEN.PL
   - budut: FUT.3PL
   'There will be (night) dreams.'
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Towards cross-linguistic types of contextually oriented participles

Ksenia Shagal, University of Helsinki

Most languages in which relative clauses are prenominal and do not contain a subordinator are usually claimed to employ the participial relativization strategy, cf. *Relativpartizip* in Lehmann (1984). The relative verb forms in such languages are contextually oriented, which means that one and the same form can be used to relativize various syntactic positions, commonly both arguments and adjuncts. The forms in question are considered participles due to the fact that they almost always demonstrate at least some degree of desententialization/nominalization, for example by imposing restrictions on the verbal categories they encode or by converting verbal into nominal government, cf. Lehmann (1988).

However, these participles differ greatly in their manifestations of desententialization. Thus, participles in Lezgian (North Caucasian), cf. (1), have a restricted set of available TAM meanings (if compared to finite verb forms) and combine with a special ‘non-finite’ negative marker. Nevertheless, they behave exactly like independent verbs with respect to subject encoding and do not employ any nominal morphology to agree with the modified noun. Quite on the contrary, in Makhuwa (Bantu), cf. (2), the subject of a relative clause (if it is pronominal) is expressed by a possessive suffix instead of a regular pronominal prefix, and the relative verb form agrees in the noun class with the head of the relative construction. At the same time the TAM paradigm of Makhuwa participles is very close to that of finite verbs, and they employ the ‘finite’ negative marker. A specialized negative relative verb form in Kambaata (Cushitic), cf. (3), shares some properties with both Lezgian and Makhuwa participles. Similarly to the former, it does not require special marking of the relative clause subject, and like the latter it agrees with the modified noun, hence acquiring some nominal morphology.

An important observation that can be made is that various combinations of such nominalization signs appear to be possible, but no contextually oriented participles that would demonstrate all the possible signs were attested in the language sample under investigation. Yet the high degree of nominalization is very common among inherently oriented participles, e.g. passive participles in many European languages. Thus, in Finnish (Uralic), cf. (4), the -ma-participial form cannot be negated, does not show any TAM distinctions and agrees in case and number with the modified noun, and the subject of the participial relative clause is encoded as a possessor.

In the current paper I aim to establish cross-linguistic types of contextually oriented participles based on the possible combinations of nominalization signs attested in a genetically and geographically balanced sample of 30 languages and to discuss possible explanations for the observed fact that contextually oriented participles avoid being highly nominalized, while for inherently oriented participles it appears to be totally acceptable.

Examples

Lezgian
(1) [ruš-a čar kši-zwa-j] stol
girl-ERG letter.ABS write-IMPERF-PTCP table
‘the table on which the girl is writing a letter’ (Hasepmlath 1994: 154)

Makhuwa
(2) ehópá [tsi-low-aly-áaka]
10.fish 10-fish-PERF.REL-POSS.1SG
‘the fish that I caught’ (van der Wal 2010: 226)
Kambaata
(3) [cíil-at it-tumb-úta] ichch-áta
baby.girl-F.NOM eat-3F.NREL-F.ACC food-F.ACC
‘the food that the baby girl does not eat’ (Treis 2008: 171)

Finnish
(4) [eilen luke-ma-ssa-ni] kirja-ssa
read-PTCP.PASS.SG-INE-POSS.1SG book.SG-INE
‘in the book read by me yesterday’
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A diachronic source for mention type frequency.

Shahar Shirtz, Linguistics Department, University of Oregon.

Many linguists have offered synchronic principles explaining the distribution of lexical NPs, pronouns and referential zeros (henceforth “mention types”) in core argument roles. Most of these principles deal with information packaging and structural features of argument flagging. Du Bois (1987, 2003) and Genetti & Crain (2003) argue for constraints on the distribution of new information in discourse, e.g., the “avoid lexical A” and “avoid two lexical NPs” constraints (Du Bois 1987). Bickel (2003) argues that a language with many “case-sensitive” Privileged Syntactic Arguments will have frequent activation of case frames, which in turn “habituates speakers into using overt NPs” (Bickel 2003:718).

This talk argues that the diachrony of argument structure constructions can also play a role in the relative frequency of mention types. Specifically, the Middle Persian (West Iranian, henceforth MP) Predicative Possession and Need constructions were old “dative subject” constructions, with the Possessor and Needer coded by a dative NP. By MP, these arguments are coded using the same forms found coding core arguments, but differ from these in the frequency of mention types, especially pronominal mentions. This different frequency can be explained by the “dative subject” source of need and predicative possession constructions.

Old Persian (6-3 cent. BCE) had six morphological cases which almost completely disappeared by MP (3-9 cent. CE). The dative-genitive clitic pronouns of Old Persian survived into MP, thus maintaining some case distinction in pronouns, while most lexical nouns lost such distinctions. Some argument roles can be coded by 3 different forms: clitic pronouns, lexical NPs (unmarked for case), and referential zeroes. These are A arguments in the past (1a clitic pronoun underlined, 1b lexical argument underlined), P arguments in the present (ex 2a-b), Possessors in the predicative possession construction (ex 3a-b) and Needers in need constructions (ex 4a-b). In other argument roles, e.g., S arguments, clitic pronouns are almost completely absent.

The resulting situation is one where a form marked for (historically a dative-genitive) case (the clitic pronoun), is paradigmatic with a form unmarked for case (a lexical NP), in four different argument roles. These argument roles differ, however, in the relative frequency of the different mention types. Confirming Du Bois’ principles and Genetti & Crain’s results (2003), A-past arguments are more frequently expressed by zeroes and pronouns, while P arguments are expressed mostly by lexical NPs. In contrast, Possessors and Needers are mostly coded by clitic pronouns. Lexical NPs are found in old “dative subject” roles under specific pragmatic conditions, and referential zeroes are very rare. Thus, the former “dative subject” constructions show a preference for the cognate of the old dative form, no longer dative in MP as it also codes A and P arguments. This form is available only as a pronoun, which leads to a relatively high frequency of pronominal mentions in these constructions. Altogether, this paper offers an explanation for mention type frequency that relies on information packaging principles and the diachronic source of the construction.

Examples (all Middle Persian):

(1a) u-šōy ērān dahibed ēzad
   and-3SG DEM Iran lord kill.PST
   'and he killed that Iranian lord' (AWN)

(1b) did purs-ēd kū tu zad mar ī tūr ī frangrasiyāb
   other ask.PRS-3SG COMP 2SG hit.PST.3SG scoundrel LNK PN LNK PN
   'Again he asked: “did you smite the scoundrel Tur of Frangrasiyab?” (PRDD)
(2a) $u\text{-}m$ paz-ē
   and-1SG cook.PRS-2SG
   'and you cook me' (PRDD)

(2b) ka pazūg ī gird-ēw be ōzan-ēd
   When worm LNK round-INDEF PRV kill.PRS-3SG
   'if he kills a round worm' (PRDD)

(3a) $u\text{-}š$ frazand būd
   and-3SG child be.PST.3SG
   'and he has a child' (PRDD)

(3b) harw kas ox-ē ast
   every person mind-INDEF be.PRS.3SG
   'every person has a mind' (DK6)

(4a) ku-mān xwar-išn ud wastarag kam abāy-ēd
   REL-1PL eat-NMZ and cloths less need.PRS-3SG
   'So we need less food and clothes' (DK7)

(4b) harw kas gyāg-ē widārd-an abāy-ēd
   every person place-INDEF pass-INF need.PRS-3SG
   'every person needs to pass through a place (of discomfort)' (DK6)
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Morphosyntax of serial verb constructions in Kwa

Andrey Shluinsky, Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of sciences

The morphosyntactic features of the so-called serial verb constructions (SVCs) in Kwa are discussed in the paper. Kwa is a language family in West Africa that consists of ca. 80 languages; ca. 20 of them are described, and the data of those descriptions are used in the paper (for Abe, Akan, Akebu, Anufo, Anyin, Attie, Avatime, Baule, Chumburung, Dangme, Ewe, Fon, Ga, Gen, Gonja, Igo, Ikposo, Lelemi, Logba, Nawuri, Tuwuli). The notion of a SVC was introduced in linguistics exactly based on the data of Kwa languages (namely, the most well-known ones, Akan and Ewe). There is lot of literature on this issue, where SVCs are defined based on their languages-specific morphosyntactic features, cf. a definition that is based on Ewe data: “A serial verb construction is a succession of verbs and their complements (if any) with one subject and one tense value that are not separated by any overt marker of coordination or subordination” (Collins 1993: 91).

An intragenetic typology of SVCs shows that, on the one hand, in Kwa this is a more or less homogenous class of constructions that have a relatively stable number of functions. On the other hand, their morphosyntax differs even in the structural properties that are claimed to be deciding for SVCs. In the paper, the following parameters of SVCs are discussed: (a) unity of syntactic subject, (b) unity of tense, aspect and modality (TAM), (c) unity of negation, (d) absence of an overt marker of a syntactic relation.

1. **Unity of subject.** Though Kwa SVCs are claimed to have one subject, in fact there are three type of Kwa languages:
   (i) languages where the subject is always expressed once in a SVC (1),
   (ii) languages where the subject is always expressed with every verb in an SVC (2),
   (iii) languages where SVCs with both single and multiple expression of the subject are attested – optionally (3) or depending on TAM (4).

2. **Unity of TAM.** Kwa SVCs are claimed to have a common TAM value. This is the most typical case, but there are three morphosyntactic options of expressing the common TAM value:
   (i) agreement of TAM marking of the verbs in a SVC (5),
   (ii) TAM marking of the first verb and using unmarked verbal stems of other verbs (6),
   (iii) TAM marking of the first verb and using a special TAM form for other verbs (7).

Less typically, there are SVCs where verbs have different TAM meanings (8).

3. **Unity of negation.** Kwa SVCs are claimed and really do have a common semantic negation. There are three morphosyntactic options of expressing it:
   (i) agreement of negation marking of the verbs in a SVC (9),
   (ii) negation marking of the first verb in a SVC (10),
   (iii) negation marking of the whole SVC (11).

4. **Absence of an overt marker of a syntactic relation.** It is claimed that verbs in a Kwa SVC are not separated by any overt marker of coordination or subordination. For most of Kwa languages, this is true, but Gonja SVCs contain a syntactic marker between the verbs (12).

**Examples**

Ikposo
(1) á mì àwɔ kó nɔ̃ɔ
    3SG.PFV sew dress give 1SG
    ‘She has sewn a dress for me’. (Eklo 1987: 125)
Avatime
(2) a-kɔ liggbole e-du nikloɛ
3SG-take stool 3SG-place there
‘He placed the stool there’. (Funke 1909: 333)

Baule
(3) a. ŋ fā-li tannî ŋ mān-ni kuąjō
3SG give-PST cloth 3SG give-PST Kuadio
‘He has given cloth to Kuadio’. (Creissels & Kouadio N’Guessan 1977: 419) {a=b}
b. ŋ fā-li tannî mān-ni kuąjō
3SG give-PST cloth give-PST Kuadio (Creissels & Kouadio N’Guessan 1977: 421)

Chumburung
(4) a. bàko so bàˈ yòwɛ mò
3PL.IPV get_up 3PL.IPV leave 3SG.O
‘They are getting up and leaving him’.
b. bàá sèrɛ yòwɛ mò
3PL.PFV run leave 3SG.O
‘They ran and left him’. (Hansford 1990: 385)

Ewe
(5) wo le agba-wɔ tsɔ-m le yiyi-m
3PL COP load-PL take-PROG COP go.REP-PROG
‘They are carrying their loads along’. (Westermann 1907: 95)

Logba
(6) a-bobi-e o-to-kle fiɛ a-tawalibi-wɔ
CL-moon-DEF SG-HAB-shine exceed CL-star-CL
‘The moon shines brighter than stars’. (Dorvlo 2008: 196)

Ga
(7) hòó mó nii á há wɔ
cook IMP thing.PL SBJV give 1PL
‘Cook for us!’ (Kropp Dakubu et al. 2007)

Attie
(8) àdú nù lātɔ̀ dzê
Adu take.PFV book.IPV go
‘Adu is carrying away a book’. (Kouadio N’Guessan 1996: 574)

Akan
(9) kofi a-m-tɔ bukuu a-m-ma ama
Kofi PST-NEG-buy book PST-NEG-give Ama
‘Kofi did not buy a book for Ama’. (own data)

Logba
(10) o-dzu mo-o-kpali nu le u-kpo
CL-river NEG-SG-flow NEG climb CL-mountain
‘A river does not flow up a hill’. (Dorvlo 2008: 197)
Ewe
(11) wo me ñɔ̀ ngu vɔ haɗe o
3PL NEG write thing finish yet NEG
‘They have not finish writing yet’. (Westermann 1907: 98)

Gonja
(12) m fiŋ kúmû ǹ sá mó
1SG look_for 3SG.O.INAN CONJ give 3SG.O.AN
‘I have looked for it for him’. (Painter 1970: 441)
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Subject clitics in Piedmontese: data from a local variety

M.Cristina Sifletto and Lunella Mereu, Università RomaTre

This work deals with the status of subject clitics in a local variety of Piedmontese, a Gallo-Italic dialect spoken in the north-west of Italy.

Piedmontese is generally agreed to be the regional common variety that may be identified with the one spoken in Turin, the main socio-political urban centre of the Piedmont region, located in the north west of Italy. This regional variety often referred to as koiné, has gained importance in the years over a kaleidoscopic pattern of local varieties. The latter has happened for a complex set of socio-dialectological reasons (ranging from once being the political capital to having been in the XXth century a strong industrial centre) that helped in establishing a prestige status for the Turinese variety. The differences between the many varieties are not structural nor fundamental, they mostly concern lexical and morpho-phonological aspects. It must be underlined that under the pressure of Italian, the national language, on one side and the koinè on the other, this heterogenic linguistic landscape is gradually going to disappear.

The variety which is considered here is the one spoken in Monasterolo Torinese, a small centre at the foots of the Pre-Alps north of Turin. In this variety subject clitics are present for all the six persons and are always used when a finite verb occurs. Along with this they show all the morpho-phonological characteristics of clitics (i.e. they cannot stand alone, cannot be coordinated, etc.). The aim of the work is to analyse what is the current nature of these elements (hence called Subject Markers), whether they belong to the argument structure of the verb or if they are agreement markers, or if they have an ambiguous nature between the previous two. This is in line with what has been discussed in the literature for a while, cf. Bresnan and Mchombo (1987), Spencer (1991), Parry (1993, 1997), Siewierska (2004), Corbett (2006). The ultimate goal of this analysis is to show whether the Piedmontese variety considered is a null subject language or a language with pronominal incorporation. A comparison with other Northern Italian dialects previously analysed in (mainly generative) studies (Brandi e Cordin 1981, 1989, Renzi e Vanelli 1983, Rizzi 1986) is constantly carried on considering various aspects such as the use of SMs as expletives in impersonal, existential and weather sentences.

Diagnostics consisting of three different tests are applied in order to face this issue (Mereu 1994, 1995). First the extension of the occurrence of the SMs is measured, then co-occurrence of SMs and full NPs/free pronouns in broad-focus sentences is tested and thirdly the use of SMs as resumptive pronouns in long distance relative clauses is analysed. The response to these three tests gives as an outcome that the SMs in the variety of Piedmontese under scrutiny behave as agreement markers. Therefore this language is, like Italian, a null subject language, where an independent subject can be omitted and there is no pronominal incorporation of arguments in the form of clitics or SMs.

Examples

The data on which the work is based are first hand as the study has been conducted by a native speaker of the variety. The utterances that have been used for the second slot of tests are all-new (or broad focus) sentences, in order to avoid having constituents which could lead to the interpretation of dislocation/topicalisation.

As for the first test, aiming at showing the range of forms, here in table 1 we include the paradigm of the SMs associated with the verb ‘to speak’ at the indicative present.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>FREE PRONOUN</th>
<th>CLITIC/SM</th>
<th>VERB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I SG</td>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Parlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II SG</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>It</td>
<td>Parli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III SG</td>
<td>chial/chila</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Parla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I PL</td>
<td>Nui</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Parlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II PL</td>
<td>Vojait</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Parli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III PL</td>
<td>Lor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Parlan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the second test, examples 2 (b-c) below show the co-occurrence of full NPs/free pronouns and SMs:

Piedmontese (Monasterolo T.se)

(2)

a. Co ch’a l’è suceduji?
   What has happened?

b. La cita a l’ha dësblà la ca’
   The little girl SM3SG has taken down the house

   The little girl has taken down the house

c. Chila a l’ha dësblà la ca’
   She SM3SG has taken down the house

   She has taken down the house

Finally, as for the third test, we illustrate the realisation of the long distance relative clause, after showing the relativisation of different arguments. These examples have been formulated on a comparative basis with examples of Fiorentino and Trentino available in the literature in order to illustrate the difference between these other Northern Italian dialects and Piedmontese.

Piedmontese (Monasterolo T.se)

(3) Li fiji ch’a sun ëmnjuvi ier
   The girls that SM3PL came yesterday

   The girls that came yesterday

(4) La përsuna ch’ i l’hai vist
   The person that SM1SG have seen

   The person that I have seen

(5) L’òm ch’ it l’as da-ji la mia ròba
   The man that SM2SG have given=him(DAT) the my stuff

   The man you have given my stuff to

(6) Li fiji [che la gent a dis [ch’a sun ruva’ ier]].
   The girls that the people SM3SG says that SM3PL are arrived yesterday

   The girls that people say that have arrived yesterday
References
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Constructions of the type ‘X becomes Y’ in Finnish and Erzya

Mari Siiroinen & Rigina Ajanki, University of Helsinki, Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian languages and literatures

Typically for the Uralic languages, Erzya and Finnish do not display an inflectional category to express future tense. Instead, the remote sister languages employ the present tense to refer to future, and when necessary, several constructions that make use of lexical and morphological device. In our presentation we compare especially the expressions referring to future that have a nonverbal predicate. We concentrate both on the verbal elements, copulas, as well as on the morphological encoding of the nominal constituents. We aim to show that variation observed in Finnish can be better understood and analyzed with the assistance of the Erzya counterparts of the Finnish ‘X becomes Y’ constructions. The data is drawn from Erzya folklore and the journal Syatko, and from Standard Finnish as well as Finnish dialects. In our study, we employ dialectal data and we believe that vernacular should be studied a priori in the sense of (De Vogelaer & Guido 2012). The dialectal data offers new insights into Finnish grammar also because the dialectal variation of Finnish is huge. Erzya is still lacking a general typological description, and offers with plenty of unpublished data. Combining dialectogy and comparative linguistics our study aims to contribute to discussion on the methodological issues in diachronic typology.

In Standard Finnish there are three slightly different constructions expressing the meaning ‘X becomes Y’. The verb used in these constructions is *tulla* (also meaning ‘to come’). All the sentences 1—3 have the same meaning. The difference between these constructions is in the cases of the nominal constituents. The first constituent, whose change is at issue, is either in Nominative (1 and 3) or Elative case (2), and the predicative complement, which expresses the new state or property, in either in Partitive (1 and 2) or Translative (3). All these constructions are also found in Finnish dialects. Of these three constructions, type 1 is special because it is very infrequent in modern standard Finnish and often regarded by native speakers as odd and ungrammatical. Still it has been one of the standard examples mentioned in the traditional reference grammars, and in old dialectal data this construction is actually quite frequent. The corresponding semantic content is expressed in Erzya by the constructions 4–7. The auxiliary employed is either the copula *ul’ems* ‘be’, not employed in nonverbal predication to refer to the present tense but as a special future tense marker, or the verb *karmams* originally ‘begin’, employed in Erzya generally as a syntactic device to refer to future, independently of the lexical class of the predicate. The subject is always in Nominative, and the predicative element is either in Nominative (4 and 6) or in Translative (5 and 7). In the light of Erzya construction type presented in Example 4, which consists of a subject referent in Nominative, a copula and a predicative element in Nominative, the Finnish type 1 seems the most logical counterpart. In today’s standard language, the Finnish type 1 seems, however, to have virtually vanished. We try to find out what might have caused its demise: has its conceptualization changed, and if so, for what reason. We will also discuss the subtle differences in meaning between the constructions in the gist of the so-called Principle of Contrast (Croft 2001: 111).

Examples

**Finnish**

‘The porridge became thick’

   porridge-NOM become-1PST.3SG thick-PART

   porridge-ELA become-1PST.3SG thick-PART
   porridge-NOM become-1PST.3SG thick-TRA

**Erzya**
‘The boy becomes big.’

4. Ćoriñe-ś ul’-i pokš.
   boy-DEF be-PRS.3SG big-NOM

5. Ćoriñe-ś ul’-i pokšo-ks.
   boy-DEF be-PRS.3SG big-TRA

6. Ćoriñe-ś karm-i pokš.
   boy-DEF become-PRS.3SG big-NOM

7. Ćoriñe-ś karm-i pokšo-ks.
   boy-DEF become-PRS.3SG big-TRA
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Non-core argument case markers in the convergence of Amdo-Tibetan and Salar

Camille Simon, Université Sorbonne nouvelle - Paris 3 / LACITO

Being both members of the *Amdo Sprachbund*, a language union comprising ca. 10-15 languages spoken in eastern Qinghai and southern Gansu provinces of Northwest China (Janhunen 2007), Salar and Amdo-Tibetan belong respectively to the Turkic and Tibetic language families. The two languages share a history of intense contact, since approximately to the 14th century when the Salar people settled in Amdo (Dwyer 2007: 3-4) and intermarried with Tibetan women. Tight economical relationships where established and the Salar-Tibetan bilingualism was generalized among men – Only in the last decades, it started to decrease and change to a Salar-Chinese bilingualism. (Dwyer 2007: 13-14).

Turkic and Tibetic languages are typologically different at a syntactic level: the former follows an accusative alignment pattern whereas the later are known for having a predominant ergative alignment pattern. At the same time, this opposition is not absolute, since other alignment types are regularly attested in various Tibetic languages (see e.g. Tournadre 1996: 214-215, Zeisler 2007), and Turkic languages are known for their differential object marking (e.g. Bossong 1997: 247). The morphological similarity of the case markers (nominal phrase enclitics in both language families) allows a certain amount of syntactic convergence between Salar and Amdo-Tibetan.

With this respect, the role of the non-core argument case markers is crucial, insofar as they constitute a common basis between the two language systems. The presentation will deal with the dative and, secondarily, with the associative/comitative case markers. Thus, under the influence of Amdo-Tibetan, the syntactic functions of the dative case in Salar have extended to the Possessor of predicative possession (ex.1) and to the second argument of (some) controlled perception verbs (ex.2).

Regarding the valency changing processes, dative also appears involved in the convergence process while the voice derivation processes involving the core argument markers are marginalized. In fact, we observe the loss of the regular Turkic passive voice in Salar, which is not productive anymore. At the same time, we observe the emergence of an applicative voice derivation process, unknown in Turkic: the dative marker is again involved as the standard marker of the newly introduced Beneficiary. The contributive/reciprocal voice is preserved in Salar and seems more frequent in Amdo-Tibetan than in standard Tibetan. The participants involved in such events cumulate the semantic roles of Agent and Patient or Beneficiary and thereby concern the use of the dative and the associative/comitative marker.

Thus, this presentation aims to offer a comparative analysis of the different functions of the non-core case markers dative and associative/comitative in Salar and Amdo-Tibetan, as elements of evidence of the convergence of their respective valency systems, despite the primary opposition in the core-arguments marking.

**Examples**

**Abbreviations**:

1 : first person ; 3 : third person ; ABS : absolutive ; CONN : connective particle ; DAT : dative ; IMPF : imperfective ; MOD : modal particle ; NLZ : nominalizer ; NOM : nominative ; PL : plural ; SG : singular ; TEST : testimonial

Salar

(1a). \text{men} \ yemen \ bol-sa \ \text{maga} \ \text{jakci} \ \text{var} \ \text{ja}

1SG[NOM] bad to.be-if 1SG.DAT good to.exist MOD

‘Even though I am bad, I [also] have virtues!’
Amdo-Tibetan
(1)b. ngu-cho-'a  'dishes  bshad-tshul  yodnired  ya
1-PL-DAT such  to.say-NLZ.ABS  to.exist  MOD
‘We have such sayings’

Salar
(2)a. asmən-a  yēr-bə-r-a
sky-DAT  look-IMPF-TEST
‘[He] is looking at the sky.’

Amdo-Tibetan
(2)b. ama-s  khu-'a  bltas-yas
mother-ERG  3SG-DAT  look-CONN
‘The mother looks at him, and…’
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Trade-offs between head and dependent marking: A typological study

Kaius Sinnemäki, University of Helsinki

Research of interactions among typological variables is one of the main goals of linguistic typology (Bickel 2007). One type of interaction among typological variables is that of a trade-off, a (roughly) complementary distribution among the variables. Recently such relationships have been studied in the research on language complexity, for instance, between different phonological variables (Moran and Blasi, forthcoming), between phonological and morphological variables (Shosted 2006), and between different morphosyntactic variables, such as case marking and agreement (Miestamo 2009). Based on these studies, it seems that especially trade-offs are more likely between linguistic patterns that are alternative strategies for marking in a functional domain: otherwise the variables do not interact or the interactions are a byproduct of aggregating data from language families that behave differently from one another (Moran and Blasi, forthcoming). In this paper I propose that there are trade-offs between head and dependent marking in two functional domains.

Head and dependent marking are well-known alternative patterns for marking syntactic relations in a particular functional domain, such as in core argument marking or in possessive noun phrases (Nichols 1986, 1992). In head marking, the syntactic relation is marked on the head via some morphological marking, as in possessive noun phrase in Maricopa (1), whereas in dependent marking the syntactic relation is indicated on the dependent by virtue of some morphological marking as in English (2).

I studied the interaction between head marking and dependent marking in two domains, the possessive noun phrase and in the clause, but focusing on lexical and pronominal arguments (1st and 2nd person) separately in the clause. The data for the possessive noun phrase comes from Nichols & Bickel (2005), that for the pronominal arguments in the clause from Comrie (2005) and Siewierska (2005), and that for the lexical arguments (more specifically the P argument) in the clause from Nichols & Bickel (2005). The relationship between the variables was estimated by using multiple logistic regression (counting genera), coding dependent marking as the dependent and head marking as well as an area factor (Nichols’ 1992 three-way areal breakdown into the Old World, the Pacific and the New World) as predictors. Estimation was done using penalized maximum likelihood ratio.

Based on the results there is a strong trade-off relationship between head and dependent marking in the possessive noun phrase and in the marking of pronominal arguments in the clause (p < 0.01) but not in the marking of lexical arguments in the clause (p = 0.1). In each test the area factor was also significant (p < 0.05) but its effect was independent of the interactions between the linguistic variables (p > 0.2). This result suggests that the relationships between the linguistic variables were similar across areas.

I propose that the results can be explained via recourse to the interplay between economy and distinctness, so that languages prefer to use only one strategy overall. In addition, in some double-marking languages the marking patterns are dedicated to different constructions. The reason why there was no trade-off between the marking patterns for lexical arguments may owe to the limited functionality of head marking as a reliable indicator of syntactic roles.

Examples

Maricopa
(1) Bonnie ø-avhay
Bonnie 3-dress
‘Bonnie’s dress.’ (Gordon 1986: 31)
English

(2) John’s knife
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Converbs as Depictives and Circumstantials in the History of Lithuanian

Florian Sommer (Universität Zürich)

One of the peculiarities of the system of non-finite verb forms in Lithuanian is what is known as the half-participle (lith. pusdalyvis, called “gerund” by Mathiassen 1996). In terms of morphology, the half-participles are derived from the infinitive-stem by adding a suffix -dam-, which then inflects for gender and number. These constructions are generally taken to serve as a means of adverbial subordination and can thus be labeled a converb as defined by Haspelmath 1995. In addition to the formation of full-fledged adverbial clauses, they encode secondary predications. This is illustrated by (1):

Lithuanian
(1) Mergaitės dainuo-dam-os ėjo namo.
GIRL:F.PL.NOM SING-CONV-F.PL.NOM WENT:3 HOME
‘The girls went home singing.’

A central feature of these constructions is that their use is restricted to the nominative case, in other words, they show inherent subject-orientation, additionally indicated by agreement in number and gender with the subject of the main clause. As the half-participle usually also encodes a secondary predication showing temporal overlap with the main predication, they qualify as “depictive” (in the broader sense of Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005, which includes “circumstantials” as well). The construction, which is fully alive in present-day Lithuanian, is already attested in the oldest documents of the language. The present investigation will focus on these earlier stages, called Old Lithuanian.

The aim of the paper is twofold. In addition to a general delimitation of the functional range of the half-participles as circumstantials and depictives proper, I will use a diachronic approach, aiming at an elucidation of the conditions that led to changes in the syntax of the construction. Since the half-participle took over several functions of the present participle within the history of Old Lithuanian (see Ambrazas 2006), this will have affected the use of the half-participles in the constructions to be investigated here as well. Special attention will be paid to crucial questions like modal and negation scope, which have not been the topic of earlier studies like Ambrazas 1979. The analysis will be corpus-based, drawing on material ranging from Mažvydas’ Catechismus (1547) to Donelaitis’ Metai (2nd half of the 18th century).
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Case alternation of derived objects of Estonian achievement verbs

Anne Tamm, KRE and Johns Hopkins University

Various accounts of aspectual composition try to integrate the contribution of verbs and their arguments (Verkuyl 1993, Krifka 1992, Kiparsky 1998), calculating the aspectual value of the clause on the basis of the features of its constituents. Several accounts operate with a feature that is referred to as “boundedness”. Achievement and accomplishment verbs are considered “bounded” (+B), and quantized NPs (e.g., count nouns) are also regarded as “bounded” (+B). Since the term “boundedness” covers nominal as well as verbal quantification, it is found useful in explaining the Finnish aspectual accusative-partitive object case alternation (Kiparsky 1998). As a general rule, the accusative corresponds to clausal boundedness feature (+B) and the partitive to clausal unboundedness feature (-B). If either the verb or the object—or both—are unbounded, then the clause is unbounded, and the object case partitive.

However, Finnish and other Finnic achievement verbs are different. Despite the non-boundedness of their objects, they can appear in bounded clauses and with partitive objects (Kiparsky 1998, Tamm 2012). Example (1) illustrates a bounded sentence (+B) composed of an achievement verb tekita ‘create (suddenly)’ (+B) and a mass noun, valgus ‘light’ (-B), which is partitive-marked. The boundedness features are indicated under the glosses of the respective verbs and nouns. The example is from Estonian.

Moreover, some Finnic data as in (2) demonstrate that not all deadjectival and deverbal NPs behave similarly to other mass nouns. As opposed to the deadjectival (-B) noun ‘light’ in (1), the deadjectival (-B) noun ‘darkness’ cannot combine with an achievement verb, be marked with the partitive case, and yield a +B, bounded sentence (Tamm 2014). Instead, the deadjectival mass noun ‘darkness’ can only have an accusative object in a bounded sentence with an achievement verb, as in (3). In this respect, some mass nouns, such as ‘darkness’ behave like quantized expressions and count nouns, since quantized noun phrases also have only an accusative object in a bounded sentence with an achievement verb, as exemplified in (4).

The observation is that not all mass nouns are equal in aspectual composition with achievement verbs, because some derived ones resemble count nouns instead.

I will explore three avenues in explaining the Estonian and Finnic data that, because of the explicit link to overt case marking, can be of help for understanding the semantics of achievement verbs in other languages as well:

1) achievement verbs are insensitive to the boundedness features of the object nouns (I will argue against this option)
2) derived nouns preserve their original boundedness features (I will discuss the nature of these features in morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics)
3) achievement verbs form two subclasses according their behavior in the environments defined above (I will demonstrate how the distinction that is clearly visible in a morphologically rich language such as Estonian emerges in other languages).

Examples

Estonian

(1) Mari tekita-s (hetkega) saali-s valgus-t.
    M[NOM] create-PST3S in-a-moment hall-INESSIVE light-PARTV
    +B -B
‘Mary created light in the room (in a moment).’ (+B sentence)
‘Mary created darkness in the room’ (cannot have an achievement reading)

‘Mary created darkness in the room’ (cannot have an achievement reading)

‘The magician created a rabbit in the hat’ (+B achievement reading with the accusative only)
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Differential nominal marking: The pervasive case alternation in Circassian

Yakov Testelets, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow
Peter Arkadiev, Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences / Russian State University for the Humanities / Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities, Moscow

The regular case alternation in direct objects/patients, most often between a marked and an unmarked form, a phenomenon called Differential Object Marking (DOM), has been extensively studied in many languages and cross-linguistically, cf. (Bossong 1985; Aissen 2003; de Hoop, Malchukov 2007, Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011 and others). DOM is determined by non-relational characteristics such as person, animacy, specificity, topicality, partitivity, aspect, negation etc. If an object nominal takes a marked case form, all nominals that outrank it on the person, definiteness or animacy hierarchies, take the marked form too. Similar kinds of alternation with subjects/agents are but very rarely attested (Fauconnier 2012).

In Adyghe and Kabardian, two closely related polysynthetic languages that constitute the Circassian branch of the West Caucasian family, we find a remarkable alternation between the marked absolutive (-r) and oblique, or ergative, (-m with some allomorphs) case forms and the unmarked form (-Ø) which, being functionally typical for DOM, extends to transitive and intransitive subjects, indirect objects with transitive and intransitive verbs, and even to most adjunct nominals; therefore it can be called Differential Nominal Marking (DNM). There is no restriction as to how many nominals may be unmarked in a single clause. With common nouns, case-marked forms are normally interpreted as specific, while the unmarked forms are non-specific.

Some characteristics of the Circassian unmarked form are typical for Pseudo Incorporation, a phenomenon which often accompanies DOM but sometimes extends to subjects too (Massam 2001; Kamali 2008; Dayal 2011 and others): non-specificity, non-pronominality, number neutrality, scope inertness, inability to take determiners. However, DNM in Circassian is distinct from some better-known instances of Pseudo Incorporation (e.g. Turkish) in that the case-unmarked nominals need not be verb-adjacent. We hypothesize that 1) the DNM in Circassian is an instance of Pseudo Incorporation whereby the unmarked form represents a bare NP which is grammatically deficient; 2) both marked forms (absolutive and oblique) represent full nominal constructions (DPs).

Examples

Adyghe, transitive subject and direct object, marked forms:
(1) ğ’elıčaŋŋ-a-r  pšešęğaje-r  j-e-ħə
boy-OBL  girl-ABS  3SG.A-DYN-carry
‘The boy is carrying the girl.’

Adyghe, intransitive subject and indirect object, marked forms:
(2) ğ’elıčaŋŋ-a-r  pšešęğaje-m  j-e-że
boy-ABS  girl-OBL  DAT-DYN-wait
‘The boy is waiting a girl.’

Adyghe, adjunct, marked form:
(3) meza-r  ma-k’e
forest-OBL  DYN-go
‘S/he is going to the forest.’

Adyghe, transitive object, unmarked:
(4) se  pjəsme  s-e-txə
I  letter  1SG.A-DYN-write
‘I am writing a letter (non-specific).’
Adyghe, adjunct, unmarked:

(5) mez ma-kʷe
forest DYN-go
‗He is going to a forest (non-specific).’

Adyghe, transitive subject, unmarked:

(6) ʔaze derʷə w-ja-ke-χʷəzʷə-s’t
doctor good 2SG.ABS-3SG.A-CAUS-recover-FUT
‗A good doctor will cure you‘

Besleney Kabardian, direct and indirect ditransitive objects, unmarked:

(7) pšeše ʁesa xʷəje
girl well-mannered flower 3SG.IO-DAT-3SG.A-give-POT-ADV want
‗He wants to offer flowers to (some) well-mannered girl.’

Kabardian, number neutrality with unmarked forms:

(8) txəλ qu-sşexʷa-s
book DIR-1SG.A-purchase-PRED
‗I purchased a book/books.’

Adyghe, scope inertness with unmarked forms:

(9) tjetrad peɗwə s-jə-tʷ de-tə-k
notebook each poem-LNK-two LOC-stand-PST
‗In each notebook, there were two poems’ (maybe different in each notebook)
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Destinative construction in Q’anjob’al (Maya): A complex predicate analysis

Eladio Mateo Toledo (B’alam), Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (CIESAS), Mexico

Purpose constructions are complex clauses with two situations linked by a PURPOSIVE RELATION where the matrix predicate is performed with the intention/goal of obtaining the realization of a situation, the purpose clause (Schmidtke-Bode 2009:20, and others). This means that they involve intentionality on the part of an argument of the main clause, the purpose clause has an intrinsic future orientation, and the outcome is intended/desired or hypothetical, like in (1).

Q’anjob’al (a Mayan language spoken in Guatemala) has finite purpose clauses and motion-cum purpose clauses, example (2), whose properties are no different from those of the English purpose clause. However, Polian, Mateo and Can (2013), following Simonin’s (2011) analysis of weak purpose clauses in English, show that Q’anjob’al and Tseltal (Mayan) have a DESTINATIVE CONSTRUCTION defined as ‘the construction denotes a situation where the matrix verb makes available an entity that is earmarked for a particular use, specified by the second verb’. The destinative is shown in (3); it resembles purpose clauses, but differs from them in structure and semantics, and has been unrecognized in the typology of purpose clauses (Schmidtke-Bode 2009). One difference is that intentionality is not necessary, (3). Polian, Mateo and Can suggest that destinative constructions are complex clauses that differ from infinitival and nonfinite purpose clauses, which I follow here.

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, it provides a detailed description of the features the destinative construction, which is not yet available, the data come from my own corpus of natural texts. Second, it shows that destinative constructions share the properties of nonfinite clauses and complex predicates in Q’anjob’al. In particular, it shows that the destinative construction with transitive verbs patterns like ditransitive and causative complex predicates in that they all involve argument structure fusion (Butt 1995, Mateo 2012, among others). The ditransitive complex predicate in (4) and the destinative in (3) have argument fusion; their second verbs lack inflection of their ABS2SG logical objects (vs. the nonfinite clause in (2)) and this cannot be explained under control. However, destinative constructions with intransitive verbs are syntactically similar to infinitives whose features can be explained under control, though they undergo integration that resembles resultative serial verbs.

English
(1) A: A monkey picked leaves or fruit to eat them.
   B: So did it eat them?
   A: I have no idea, but that was certainly its intention. {based on Simonin 2011:2}

Q’anjob’al (Maya)
(2) Kax max-ach b’et hin ha-kol-on-i
then COM-ABS2SG go_return ABS1SG ERG2SG-help-DEP-FF
‘Then, you went [to help me].’
(3) chot-an hach ek’ j-il-a’
sitting-POS ABS2SG DIR ERG1PL-see-TV
‘You are sitting for us to see you.’
(4) Ch-ach ul hin-say w-il-a’
INC-ABS2SG come ERG1SG-look.for ERG1SG-see-TV
‘I come to look for you (for myself).’ {txt062}
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There will always be number!

Seid Tvica, University of Amsterdam

The goal: It is a well-attested fact that natural languages show a great deal of variation with respect to the properties of pronominal inventories. While the morphological properties of pronominal features (i.e. person, number) have been explored to a great extent (cf. Greenberg 1963; Cysouw 2003; Harley and Ritter 2002, among others), and while the full range of possibilities for person and number has been sketched out providing insights as to the maximum set of features that a natural language could employ, (cf. Harley and Ritter 2002), the questions remain (i) is there a set of pronominal features that all languages must incorporate? and (ii) what kind of features would such a set contain? This naturally leads to the central goal of this inquiry which is to determine the most minimal pronominal system possible on the basis of the hitherto documented facts. Ultimately the outcome of this inquiry provides the necessary empirical basis for the development of a coherent theory of the nature of linguistic knowledge underlying the wide range of morphological realizations of pronominal features that we find in natural languages.

Previous claims: The outcome of this inquiry has consequences on a range of other issues. For example, in the literature the questions pertaining to the most minimal pronominal system have been raised on several different occasions in which they are framed within the issue of whether or not the number feature is universally present in the systems of free pronouns. For instance, Everett (2005) claims that the pronominal inventory of Pirahã does not make number distinctions, challenging Greenberg’s universal 42: ‘All languages have pronominal categories involving at least three persons and two numbers’ (Greenberg 1963:96). In contrast, the most minimal pronominal system has also been claimed to make the number distinctions only in the first person (Ingram 1978; Cysouw 2003; Nevins, Pesetsky, and Rodrigues 2009), whereas Harley and Ritter’s feature-geometric system predicts a pronominal system which lacks the number feature altogether (2002:501–2). The outcome of this debate is of importance for those theories where ‘richness’ of subject-verb agreement is supposed to play a role for the properties of other grammatical phenomena. One example among others is Koeneman and Zeijlstra’s to appear who relate the presence of the most minimal set of pronominal features in the verbal agreement morphology to verb placement. Specifically, the orderings of finite verbs and the middle field adverbs depend on whether or not the agreement morphology on the verb reflects the most minimal set of features found in all pronominal systems of the world’s languages. Consequently, if the agreement morphology is rich, the verb will precede the adverb, whereas if the agreement morphology is poor the verb will follow the adverb.

Data and analysis: In this paper I provide the results of a crosslinguistic survey which sought to determine the most minimal set of features that all languages must incorporate in their pronominal systems. The data are mostly drawn from ‘Free Personal Pronoun System database’ (Smith 2013), an online database documenting free pronouns in 456 languages. The survey reveals two important observations. First, languages which lack person or number features in their paradigms of free pronouns systematically compensate for this by realizing the missing features in the agreement morphology, suggesting that the grammar does encode the pronominal features that appear absent at first sight. For example, in Winnebago in (1) the distinction between the first and the second person as well as plurality are only marked on the verb, while in Wâmbule in (2) only verbs mark plurality whereas free pronouns do not discriminate between singular and plural referents. Second, languages which have been reported to lack morphological number features in both free pronouns and agreement paradigms, such as Classical Chinese (cf. Norman 1988:120):120, implicitly specify the number feature by constraining particular pronouns to referents which have specified number. For instance, Classical Chinese has a set of singular pronouns which must be linked to singular referents. First person pronouns yù, yū, yì, zhēn and the second person pronoun rù cannot be linked to plural referents (Meisterernst 2012). This suggests
that the singular-plural distinction must be present in the system, even though the language altogether lacks plural pronouns.

The summary of these two observations provides us with the typology given in Table 1 below. The main conclusion is that in those languages which show fewer distinctions in the paradigm of free pronouns, the distinguishing features are provided in the subject-verb agreement morphology. Consequently, every language has a pronominal system which includes (at least) three-way person distinctions and two-way number distinctions, confirming Greenberg’s intuitions condensed in his Universal 42.

In light of these findings there are two ways of analyzing the apparent typological divide. One way is to assume that the pronominal features are spread out over multiple syntactic positions, e.g. some of the pronominal features surfacing only in the set of free pronouns, while others surfacing only in the set of agreement affixes on the verb. The other way is to assume that the set of pronouns in any given language underliningly includes the specifications for all three pronominal features but that some feature(s) on the pronoun are unpronounced as a consequence of agreement with the verb, yielding homophonous pronouns for different specifications of person and number. The predictions of each of these two analyses will be evaluated.

Examples

Winnebago

(1)  
a. nee he- šgáč  
1/2 1.SG- PLAY  
‗I play.’ (Helmbrecht and Lehmann 2010:11, adapted; Johannes Helmbrecht, p.c.)
b. nee ra- šgáč  
1/2 2.SG- PLAY  
‗We play.’ (Helmbrecht and Lehmann 2010:11, adapted; Johannes Helmbrecht, p.c.)

Wāmbule

(2)  
a. uńgu hep I bi -l jā: -ø -me  
1 COOKED GRAIN YOUR SOC -LOC EAT -1.SG -RES  
‗I eat rice at your place.’ (Opgenort 2002:169)
b. Un im bǐ -l camdo pā -sī cāb -du -m  
2 THAT SOC -LOC GAME DO -INF CAN -2.SG -RES  
‗You.sg can play with that [boy].’ (Opgenort 2002:169)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuman</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Chinese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāmbule</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwa (Northern)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaqaru</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Presence of number and person features
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The meaning and usage of openly used person forms

Milla Uusitupa, University of Eastern Finland

In world’s languages, there are various means to refer not to a specific individual or a set of individuals but to a loosely specified collective. Quite commonly also person forms, or some of them, are used for this purpose. (I. a. Siewierska 2004: 210–213, Bhat 2004: 41–42.) Such person forms are referred in literature with various terms, including generic and impersonal. Yet in Finnish linguistics, also the term open reference is used (e.g. Laitinen 2006, Helasvu–Laitinen 2006). Contrary to impersonal, open reference emphasises the role of interpretation more precisely: the reference is constructed only in the interplay. In Finnish both pronouns and verb forms denote person. This paper seeks to illustrate the open uses of the 2nd (example 1) and the 3rd (example 2) person singular in Border Karelian dialects. Border Karelia refers to the area situated in the borderline of Finland and Russia where both the Eastern Finnish dialects and their closest cognates, Karelian languages, were originally spoken.

Border Karelian
(1) midä enämmär ruavo-i-t. se-n ol-i parempi
what more work-PRET-2SG it-GEN be-PRET better-NOM
‘The harder you worked the better.’
(2) sii-tä [kuivatusta kalasta] šoa-pi oikei hyvä-ŋ
it-ELA [dried-ELA fish-ELA] can make-3SG real good-ACC
keito-ŋ ku šii-h pano-o kerma-a ja voi-ta
soup-ACC when it-ILL put-3SG cream-PAR and butter-PAR
‘You can make a real good soup from dried fish when you use cream and butter.’

In Standard Finnish, the most common and by far the most examined means of open reference are the 3rd person singular and the passive. Yet in spoken language also other singular and plural forms may be used openly (e.g. Helasvu–Laitinen 2006). In many other Finnic languages, in Karelian and Estonian for instance, the openly used 2nd person singular is the most frequent means of open reference. Interestingly, it has originally belonged to the Eastern Finnish dialects as well. However, until recently, little attention has been paid to syntactic issues concerned with Karelian or borderland dialects containing ingredients from both Finnish and Karelian (however, see Sarhima 1999). The data consists of dialect interviews recorded in the 1960s. A preliminary analysis clearly indicates that the openly used 2nd and 3rd person singular are not interchangeable but they have distinct distributions and difference in meaning. Furthermore, the paper will strive to demonstrate the feasibility of the concept open reference. The reference is, indeed, constructed in the interplay between the interviewer and the interviewee.
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A typology of Bantu subject inversion

Jenneke van der Wal (University of Cambridge) and Lutz Marten (SOAS, University of London)

Contemporary research in comparative Bantu has highlighted the high degree of morphosyntactic microvariation among different Bantu languages. A specific area of variation are locative inversion constructions (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989 and following work) (1), where different languages (e.g., Chichewa, Herero, Ndebele, or Sotho) show different morphosyntactic and thematic restrictions.

Herero

(1) m-òn-djúwó mw-á hití é-rùngà
    18-9-house SM18-Past enter 5-thief
‘Into the house entered a/the thief’ (Marten 2006)

However, on the basis of grammatical descriptions and new comparative data, we show that locative inversion constructions are just one type of inversion in Bantu: there is a **wider micro-typology of subject inversion** in Bantu which includes formal locative inversion (LI), semantic locative inversion (SLI), instrument inversion (II), patient inversion (PI), default agreement inversion (DAI) and agreeing inversion (AI). The talk will develop such a typology and propose

1. a set of **descriptive variables** which describe the similarities and differences between the construction types in detail (Table 1),
2. a **comparison of 46 Bantu languages** which differ with respect to one or more of these parameters (cf. the subset of languages presented in Table 2), and
3. a set of **underlying structural properties** which account for (some of) the variation observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LI</th>
<th>SLI</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>DAI</th>
<th>AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 Verb-logical subject order</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Logical subject cannot be omitted</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 No object marker</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Post-verbal/thetic focus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 Prosodic marking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 Locative grammatical subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Locative subject agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 Referential subject agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Thematic restrictions on topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Variable properties P1 to P9 for Bantu inversion constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LI</th>
<th>SLI</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>DAI</th>
<th>AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dzamba (C32)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagulu (G11)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili (G42)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirundi (JD62)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichewa (N31)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimatuumbi (P13)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herero (R31)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana (S40)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu (S42)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Inversion constructions in nine Bantu languages
The results from the comparison show the complex and detailed variation between different Bantu languages, but also highlight the problem that for many languages, complete data are not easily available (cf. ‘?’ in Table 2). However, based on our research so far, we propose that the variation encountered results from three underlying domains of differences related to nominal morphosyntax, verbal-functional morphosyntax, and verbal-thematic restrictions: 1) The status of locative phrases as nominal or prepositional, 2) restrictions on the verbal licensing of arguments related to agreement and case, and 3) thematic restrictions on the predicates available in the inversion constructions. We will show that P1 to P5 characterise the constructions as inversion constructions (in distinction to, for example, passives), P6 reflects the status of locative phrases, P7-8 are related to different properties of subject licensing, and P9 reflects thematic restrictions. Overall, the talk shows how the interaction of underlying structural differences results in complex surface variation and in a fine-grained typology of different Bantu languages.
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Argument marking in Harakmbut: The avoidance of transparent 1 ↔ 2 combinations

An Van linden, University of Leuven & Research Foundation Flanders – FWO

Native American languages show interesting features in the domain of argument marking, especially in 1 ↔ 2 pronominal combinations. These combinations often show fused, opaque, or unusually complex marking, which has been explained in terms of “pragmatic skewing” by Heath (1998), who draws a parallel with cross-linguistically recurrent pragmatic restrictions on the use of transparent 2SG pronomininals (thou, tu, etc.), which may become “bluntly familiar”, and tend to be replaced by impersonal, third-person, or morphological 2PL forms in polite discourse (1998: 84).

This paper focuses on the morphosyntactic patterns of argument marking in the underdescribed language Harakmbut (more specifically the Amarakaeri dialect spoken in the Madre de Dios district of Peru), and it concentrates on effects of pragmatic skewing in 1 ↔ 2 combinations. Harakmbut is still considered as an unclassified (Amazonian) language (cf. Wise 1999: 307; WALS), although Adelaar (2000) has argued for a genetic link with the Brazilian Katukina family, which may be further linked to Macro-Jê.

The data available in the literature (Tripp 1995; Helberg 1984, 1990) and my own fieldnotes suggest that Harakmbut formally distinguishes between three mood types, each of which has a distinct set of argument markers, cross-referenced on the (finite) verb. It has a primary object system, with transitive contexts showing cross-referencing of (applied or direct) O-arguments, while in ditransitive contexts it is the Goal-argument that is cross-referenced, in addition to the A-argument. The system shows person hierarchy effects ({1, 2} > 3) and accusative alignment in mixed and non-local configurations (A(>3)-markers = S-markers). In addition, Harakmbut shows considerable pragmatic skewing in 1<2 pronominal combinations, as shown in examples (1)-(4).

(1) o-ning-to-chak-me-ne purak
1<>2SG/1.PL.INCL(>3)-BEN-SOC-come-REC.DIR.EVD-IND cacique
‘We brought you (SG) a cacique (type of passerine bird).’ OR ‘I brought you (SG) a cacique.’ OR ‘You (SG) brought me a cacique.’ OR ‘You (SG) brought us a cacique.’ OR ‘We (INCL) brought him/her a cacique.’

(2) on-ta-mba-to-chak-me-ne e-mamboya
1<>2PL-POSS-hand;leaf,CLF-SOC-come-REC.DIR.EDV-IND NMLZ-photograph
‘We brought your (PL) pictures.’ OR ‘I brought your (PL) pictures.’ OR ‘You (PL) brought my pictures.’ OR ‘You (PL) brought our pictures.’

As can be seen in (1)-(2), the 1 ↔ 2 pronominal prefixes show a number of strategies to avoid referential transparency, which have been noted by Heath (1998: 85-86) for other native American languages as well, such as the use of unanalysable portmanteaus, neutralization of the number distinction for 1st person, and syncretism of the 1<>2SG and 1PL.INCL(>3) forms. Within the imperative paradigm, this last strategy is not used, but instead the prefixes show neutralization of the person distinction for 2nd and 3rd person, as shown in (3)-(4).

(3) Mbe-chaway-∅!
2/3SG>1SG-see-2.IMP
‘Look at me!’

(4) Mbe’e-yok-e’ tare!
2/3SG>1SG-give-3.IMP manioc
‘He/she should give me manioc!’
While in the imperative forms, the ambiguity of the A-argument is resolved by the markers in the suffix slot (see (3)-(4)), the indicative (and dubitative) forms can only take recourse to case-marked free pronouns to disambiguate examples like (1)-(2). This paper also aims to investigate the factors determining the distribution of these optional free pronouns in spontaneous discourse.
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Past imperatives

Daniël Van Olmen (Lancaster University)

Of the Indo-European languages in Europe, only Spanish and Dutch appear to possess what might be called past imperatives (see Rothstein & Thieroff 2010). The former has the retrospective construction in (1). The past imperatives in the latter include a past perfect construction similar to (1) and a simple past construction, as in (2) and (3) respectively.

The focus here is on the type in (1) and (2). It argues against ‘reductive’ analyses of these constructions as, for instance, optatives or hidden conditionals (see Bennis 2007: 124 and Biezma 2010). They fail, inter alia, to acknowledge the constructions’ inherent directive communicative function (e.g. as a critical appeal to own up to a fault and its consequences) and to explain – for Dutch – the occurrence of non-optative particles such as toch and the absence of an overt second person subject. But it is argued that analyses of (1) and (2) as ‘straightforward’ imperatives (see Proeme 1984 and Vicente subm.) run into problems too. They are forced to expand the semantics of the imperative (e.g. by introducing tense) to such an extent that, inter alia, various other types of (past) imperatives should – in principle – be acceptable as well, the prototypicality of the retrospective meaning in (1) and (2) remains to be explained and the past imperative’s cross-linguistic scarcity (see Aikhenvald 2010: 132-133) is actually puzzling.

This paper offers a middle ground between these analyses. The past perfect imperative in Dutch, for instance, is said to be the typologically plausible outcome of the interaction of various constructions. The starting point is the counterfactual conditional inversion construction in (4) (see Duinhoven 1995 too). It is argued: 1. to have conventionalized with its potential function of reprimand, which involves some kind of encouragement (though to no avail); 2. to have been insubordinated – a process often producing new directive strategies in the world’s languages (see Evans 2007: 387); and 3. to have lost its subject – also cross-linguistically common among directive strategies (see Nikolaeva 2007: 139 and Aikhenvald 2010: 343) – by functional and formal analogy with the imperative construction and, more specifically, the variation between the conditional imperative construction and the conditional inversion construction in (5).

A similar account is proposed for Spanish, in which the infinitive ‘just’ happens to be a very frequent alternative to the imperative (see Bosque 1980: 416). Finally, Dutch is compared to English and German – the Austrian variety of which seems to have an insubordinated counterfactual conditional inversion construction serving as a reprimand (see Vicente subm. 48-49). The lack of a construction like (2) in these languages is attributed to morphological differences between the imperative verb form and the inverted auxiliary blocking analogy, different degrees of specialization of the conditional inversion construction (see Van den Nest 2010) and, relatedly, the absence of the variation in (5). More generally, the paper shows that there is no need to postulate some abstract schema for the imperative in which directivity is omitted or backgrounded (Dancygier & Sweetser 2005, Takahashi 2012) to account for its atypical uses. They can be explained in terms of constructional networks (see Fortuin & Boogaart 2009 on the conditional imperative too). Such a schema is inevitably too broad and unlikely from the perspective of exemplar theory.

Examples

Spanish
(1) Haber venido ayer!
    have.INF come.PST.PTCP yesterday
    ‘You should have come yesterday.’ (Bosque 1980: 415)

Dutch
(2) Had toch gebeld!
    have.PST.SG yet call.PST.PTCP
‘You should have called.’ (after Duinhoven 1995: 346)

(3) Man, werd maar eens boos!
‘Man, you should get angry for once.’ (Boogaart & Janssen 2010: 125)

(4) Had je gebeld, dan zou je gered zijn.
‘If you had called, you would have been saved.’

(5) a Bel en je wordt gered.
‘Call and you’ll be saved.’

b Bel je, dan word je gered.
‘If you call, you’ll be saved.’
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Quotative constructions and prosody in Beja

Martine Vanhove (LLACAN – CNRS –INALCO)

This presentation investigates, in a cross-linguistic perspective, the relationship between prosodic contours and direct reported speech, i.e. without a deictic shift to the perspective of the narrator, a highly frequent rhetorical strategy in Beja (Cushitic), an SOV language where indirect speech report is unknown.

The syntactic properties of direct quotes are first investigated. Direct speech reports are syntactically quotative complements, objects of the quotative verb: they take up the same syntactic slot as a nominal object, which may also be the object argument of the quotative verb. Similarly to relative clauses, the quoted speech is embedded within the quotative frame (i.e. the matrix clause). Both the subject and the recipient, i.e. the addressee precede the quoted speech in this order. In actual discourse, the quotative frame is most often reduced to the quotative verb which follows, and the subject and the addressee rarely co-occur when one of them is lexically encoded (ex. 1). The quoted speech may even be used without the quotative verb (typically in a series of dialogues) and only be signalled by the absence of deictic shift and by prosodic cues.

The descriptive tools and analysis of Genetti (2011) for direct speech report in Dolakha Newar (Tibeto-Burman) are used as a starting point and adapted to the annotation system of the CorpAfroAs project from which the first hand data is taken (freely accessible online at http://corpafroas.tge-adonis.fr/Archives/), in order to investigate the prosodic integration cline of quotes within the syntactic frame, i.e. the quotative frame and the right and left syntactic contexts. It is shown that the direct speech reports are most often prosodically marked with respect to the quotative frame, but that there is a radical asymmetry between the onset of the quote and its end which integrates the quotative verb in the same Intonation Unit as the (end of) the speech report in roughly 90% of the examples; exceptions are linked to a strong correlation between exclamative contexts and the absence of a prosodic integration. Conversely, there is almost always (98%) a prosodic boundary at the onset of the direct speech report which is a clear prosodic cue of the beginning of a quote. The working hypothesis is that such a pervasive prosodic pattern may be linked to the syntactic properties of the language and to physical constraints, i.e. the SOV word order, the embedding of the quote within the quotative frame whose initial part is most often missing, the absence of a complementizer, and the fact that the short quotative verb most often occurs at the end of the speech declination.

In the concluding section, these findings are compared to the existing literature on widely studied languages such as English, and the scantier one on lesser studied languages (Coulmas 1986, Couper-Kuhlen 1999; Klewitz & Couper-Kuhlen 1999; Jansen et al. 2001; Genetti 2011; Malibert and Vanhove forth; Zuckermann 2006). Beyond the variety there are clear cross-linguistic tendencies, and a preliminary typology of the interface between prosody and speech reporting is discussed, including a possible candidate for a universal prosodic cue of speech reports which would indicate that quoted speech is treated as independent of the narrative in which it is embedded.

Examples
Beja

(1) oː=jaːs-i=d hus ak-a eːjadna
\[DEF.SG.M.ACC\=dog\=GEN.SG=DIR\] voice \[be\=IMP.SG.M\ \say\=IPFV.3PL\]
‘they tell the dog: Shut up!’ (BEJ_MV_NARR_18_Adam_devil_221)
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Degrees of lexical flexibility in and across Oceanic languages

Eva van Lier, University of Amsterdam

Some Oceanic languages have been claimed to lack a distinction between major word classes of verbs, nouns, and adjectives (see e.g. Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992 on Samoan; Jones 1998 on Mekeo). These claims are based on the observation that lexemes denoting actions, objects, and properties can all be used, without any formal adaptations, as predicing, referring, and modifying expressions. While the language-specific nature of lexical categories is widely recognized among functional typologists (see e.g. Cristofaro 2009, Haspelmath 2007), the complete lack of major word class distinctions, especially between nouns and verbs, remains a controversial issue (Evans & Levinson 2009). This paper reports a detailed investigation of lexical flexibility in 14 Oceanic languages; one for each first and second order sub-group (with a few exceptions due to unavailability of data). Specifically, it assesses the distributional possibilities of a fine-grained set of semantic groups of words, including various types of semantically ‘noun’-like words (persons, kin terms, body parts, artefacts, locations, etc.), ‘verb’-like words (intransitive actions, intransitive states, emotions, transitive actions, etc.), and adjective-like words (dimensions, values, physical properties, etc.). For each of these semantic classes, in each of the languages, I documented not only whether these can be used, with or without formal adaptation (such as the use of a nominalizer or copula) for predication, reference and/or modification, but also to what extent these uses allow for the expression of typically ‘nominal’, ‘verbal’, or ‘adjectival’ categories, such as articles, case/adpositions, possessive attributes, person, TAM, and reduplication, respectively. Analysis of this data set shows a spectrum of variation in the degree of lexical flexibility displayed by (i) languages, (ii) semantic word groups, and (iii) additional categories of the types just mentioned above. In some languages no word groups may be used without formal adaptation in functions that do not prototypically match their semantic meaning; in others only specific combinations of semantic word groups and functions are flexible, while again in others all words have ‘free’ access to all functions, but there are subtle restrictions on the expression of additional categories. In particular, both the semantic word groups and the additional category types can be ordered along hierarchies of flexibility; the latter confirming ‘nominal’ and ‘verbal’ feature hierarchies proposed earlier (by e.g. Bybee 1985; Malchukov 2004) on the basis of languages with clear noun-verb distinctions. Thus, the paper shows that while lexical flexibility is a pervasive phenomenon in Oceanic languages, it is also a variable and gradable phenomenon, which is subject to functionally motivated restrictions.
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Postpositions, relational preverbs and topological prefixes in Meseño Cora (Uto-Aztecan)

Verónica Vázquez Soto, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Meseño Cora is a southern Uto-Aztecan language spoken in northwest Mexico by around 5,000 people. In this language, the locative predicates in declarative sentences are expressed by a small set of posture verbs always co-occurring with a topological prefix and a grammaticalized postposition. The set of grammaticalized pospositions are known in the typological literature as relational preverbs (Craig and Hale 1988). (1) is an example of a declarative locative description in Meseño Cora.

In (1), the posture verb bee ‘to be standing.SG’ is a locative predicate which occurs both with the preverb hapwán ‘on’ and with the topological prefix húh-. The source of the relational preverb hapwán ‘on’ is a stranded postposition which is no longer adjacent to its dependent, the nominal méesa ‘table’. Thus, the grammaticalized form of the posposition hapwán has moved to a pre-verbal position. In this paper, I will argue that the both free morphemes and bound morphemes occurring in declarative locative descriptions in Meseño Cora are different manifestations of grammaticalized relational preverbs coming from pospositions. Both relational elements, the stranded postposition and the prefix, encode the topological notion of SUPERPOSITION. Example (1) illustrates both the stage of procliticization of postpositions, and the stage of affixation of the postposition (Craig y Hale 1988:321-323). In contrast, example (2) is analysed as a bona fide postposition governing an adjacent NP.

This paper explores the morphosyntactic features that distinguish the different stages in the process of grammaticalization from adposition to relational preverb to topological affixes. This study also explores the topological notions encoded by postpositions, and preverbs, such as CONTAINMENT, SUPERPOSITION, PROXIMITY and ATTACHMENT, among others (Levinson et al. 2003). A list of the lexical items to be studied for proving the grammaticalization cline of postpositions into preverbs is given in Table 1.

Examples

Meseño Cora (Uto-Aztecan)

(1) méesa =pu hapwán húh-bee báaso
table =S3 PV:on SUPER:on-standing.SG cup
‘The cup is on the table.’ (literally “the cup is standing on the table”)

(2) kiyéh hapwá =pu húh-pii hí káunari
trunk POSP:on =S3 SUPER:on-lying.SG TOP rope
‘The rope is on the trunk.’

The abbreviations used in glosses are the following: 3=THIRD PERSON; POSP=POSTPOSITION; PV=PREVERB; S=SUBJECT; SG=SINGULAR; SUPER=SUPERPOSITION; TOP=TÓPICO
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Table 1. *Markers of topological relations (MTR) in Meseño Cora*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topological Relation</th>
<th>Affixation of the postposition</th>
<th>Procliticization of postpositions</th>
<th>Lexical prefixes</th>
<th>Postpositions</th>
<th>Locative Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ATTACHMENT</td>
<td>hu-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SUPPORT</td>
<td>tá-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EXTENTION</td>
<td>wa-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UNDER</td>
<td>be’e-ráh-</td>
<td>heté</td>
<td>hetén</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be’e-ráh-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be’e-ráh-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba’a-ráh-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUPERPOSITION</td>
<td>húh-</td>
<td>hapwá</td>
<td>hapwán</td>
<td>han</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hé’e-hou-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BEHIND</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>heih-</td>
<td>wári-ta’a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GENERAL LOCATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>hetsé</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hetsé</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CONTAINMENT</td>
<td>a-ráh-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>téete’e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-ráh-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi-ráh-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wi-ráa-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PROXIMITY</td>
<td>hái-háh-téé-teh-hai-téh-hah-téh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>bèhli’i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discovering effects of ergativity in corpus data: the case of Cabécar

Elisabeth Verhoeven, Humboldt-University Berlin

A subset of the Chibchan languages, among them Cabécar, have been analyzed as ergative on the basis of the morphological properties of the verbal arguments (cf. Quesada 1999, Margery Peña 2003). This presentation provides a detailed account of the syntactic properties of ergativity in Cabécar. First, it establishes the syntactic facts with elicited data presenting the crucial constructions that provide evidence for subject/object asymmetries in this language. Second, it examines the properties of ergative marking in a large corpus of narratives (96 narratives produced by 24 native speakers). All data were collected in Ujarrás, Province of Puntarenas, Costa Rica, a traditional settlement of Cabécar people, in which the language is still used in everyday life. The Cabécar facts are particularly challenging because they show the full-range of properties that are expected for a language with syntactic ergativity (see Dixon 1994). In particular, ergative case is assigned to the agents of transitive verbs (and only these) with a postpositional element whose form depends on polarity (tëlte in affirmative and wà in negative contexts; see Margery Peña 2003:xii). Ergativity is reflected in word order: the object of transitives and the single argument of intransitives must be left adjacent to the verb, while the agent of transitives can either precede or follow the Absolutive-V complex, a property that is otherwise typical for adjuncts. Furthermore, quantified absolutes are preferably discontinuous with the quantifier appearing in the postverbal domain; this syntactic property is not possible for ergatives. The account is corroborated by evidence from tests of syntactic ergativity (among them raising facts and asymmetries in argument dropping).

The second part of this talk will present the corpus facts. This empirical study is relevant, in particular because the ergative marker is optional and the sources of variation determining its occurrence in discourse cannot be estimated with elicited data. We will present a quantitative corpus study in a set of 96 narratives showing that:
- The ergative particle is optional in the canonical order (SOV) but obligatory if the subject does not occur in its canonical position but postverbally (OVS order): the source of this asymmetry is functional: morphological marking is superfluous if the linearization offers a cue for disambiguating the thematic roles.
- A further asymmetry relates to tense: ergative marking is obligatory with imperfective/habitual/future but optional in the perfective past.
- Finally, optionality in the preverbal position interacts with givenness: a decoding of the text data shows that the non-case marked agents most frequently present new information.
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He cried when he left: Intertwined systems of person reference in Tupian languages

Ana Vilacy Galucio, MCTI-Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi

This paper focuses on the interaction between cross-referencing, argument marking, coreferential distinction and complex clause reference tracking in languages of the Tupian family, one of the largest and most widespread linguistic families in lowland South America. Tupian languages show two typical features with regard to person indexation: the occurrence of two sets of person indexes (free and bound person morphemes), and a distinction between coreferential and non-coreferential person indexes. Even though in some languages, coreferent and non-coreferent indexes are distinguished in both sets (free and bound person morphemes), this paper addresses only the use of coreferential indexes in the set of bound person morphemes, since that is where the distinction is relevant for intraclausal argument encoding and for reference tracking at discourse level. The distinction between referential and coreferential indexes is generally employed with possessive nouns and verbs, but the structure of the system of coreferential indexation varies from language to language. In at least one branch of the family, the Tupi-Guaranian branch, some languages apply the coreferential/non-coreferential distinction to all six discourse persons (Jensen 1998). Examples in (1) illustrate this extensive use of coreferential markers for Assurini do Tocantins. In most Tupian languages, however, the referential/coreferential distinction is restricted to third persons, where the two forms are contrastively employed to indicate coreferent or non-coreferent relations with a third person controlling subject. This is the system found is languages such as Mekens, Karo, and Gavião. An important feature of these languages is the use of the coreferential/non-coreferential distinction as one of the major strategies for reference tracking across clauses. This is shown in (2) for Karo (Ramarama branch). The use of coreferentiality markers has been described for the Tupi-Guarani branch (Jensen 1998). In this talk, I will analyze and compare the system of cross-referencing and coreference indexes in languages belonging to distinct branches of the Tupian family, trying to arrive at an unified description of the system in the light of other reference tracking mechanisms found in the world’s languages. Understanding the interaction between coreferential markers, intraclausal argument encoding and reference tracking at the discourse level is highly relevant for our understanding of Tupian syntax, especially in relation to its indexing system.

Examples

Assurini do Tocantins (Tupi-Guarani branch)

(1) ere-ha-pota s-aga pype
    2s-go-FUT 3s-house to
    ‘You will go to his house.’ (Jensen 1997:06)

(2) a-ha-pota w-aga pype
    3s-go-FUT 3C-house to
    ‘He will go to his own house.’ (Jensen 1997:06)

(3) we-tyroa a-kotog
    1s.C-clothes 1s-sew
    ‘I sew my own clothes.’ (Jensen 1997:06)

(4) a-se’eg we-se-ope
    1s-sing 1s.C-REFL-to
    ‘I sang to myself.’ (Jensen 1997:06)
Karo (Ramarama branch)

(1) $o=ja\hat{\text{w}}t-t \ a?=ket-a \ \text{kanâp}$

1S=leave-IND 13S=sleep-GER time

‘I left when he slept.’ (Gabas Jr. 1999: 200-201)

(2) $pëg \ yâ\hat{\text{w}}t-t \ to=\hat{\text{w}}-\text{é}-a \ \text{kanâp}$

white.man leave-IND 3C=cry-GER time

‘The white man, left when he, cried.’ (Gabas Jr. 1999: 200-201)
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Switching on and off gender in Nalca and the syntax of a non-mature gender system

Bernhard Wälchli (Stockholm University) & Erik Svärd (Stockholm University)

Nalca, a Mek language of Irian Jaya, (Svärd 2013) has a highly unusual gender system with six agreement target classes (masculine be-, feminine ge-, neuter ne-, default noun e-; non-noun a-, and coordination da-) only four of which function as noun classes. Gender in Nalca is also highly unusual from a diachronic point of view since it is very young. The closely related languages Una, Eipo, and Yale, which all happen to be well described for the standards of New Guinea and with which Nalca shares a very large part of vocabulary, lack gender. Gender in Nalca cannot be said to be non-canonical in terms of Corbett (2006), because it is very simple, also from the point of view of the lexicon. All three non-default noun class genders are inquorate in terms of sheer number of nouns (very few nouns per class). Yet they follow semantic and phonological gender assignment principles as they are common in gender systems. Nalca gender has the following properties:

- There are only noun phrase markers as agreement targets (but these come in many forms).
- All non-default noun genders are inquorate in terms of sheer number of nouns.
- With innumerable exceptions the gender controller is immediately linearly adjacent to the agreement target (always preceding), but the syntax of gender is very different from other cases of gender adjacency phenomena as in Taa languages (Güldemann 2004).
- There is a majority of recessive gender controller nouns which exhibit an alternation between the gender they control and non-noun gender depending on whether or not the controller has an “ally” attribute (often a nominalization) in its immediate environment which supports it in imposing gender onto the target. We call this “switching on and off of gender in syntax” and we do not know of any other language that exhibits the same phenomenon.
- Pronominal agreement is limited to demonstratives (no agreement in personal pronouns) and does not extend to all noun classes.
- Person names play an important role as gender controllers, which makes Nalca gender typologically similar to personal noun markers as they occur in some Austronesian languages such as Tagalog.
- Nominalizations, more precisely generalized noun-modifying clause constructions (Comrie et al. 2013), play an important role as gender controllers.
- There is a specific coordination gender which is not gender resolution since it is the coordination marker that is the agreement trigger, not the coordinated nouns.

This talk focuses on the syntactic peculiarities of gender in Nalca including the alternation between the four noun genders and non-noun gender, linear adjacency phenomena, the interaction of gender with nominalizations, and the interaction of gender and coordination. We argue that some of the peculiarities of the syntax of gender in Nalca can be explained by its being a non-mature gender system while it at the same time follows an unusual diachronic path of gender emergence (no noun classifiers) where grammaticalization only plays a minor role. Methodologically, the talk considers to what extent new phenomena in the syntax of the world’s languages can be discovered in languages where the major available source is a parallel text and where diachronic reconstruction is possible due to available material from closely related languages.
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Yeri predicate morphemes: straddling the affix-clitic boundary

Jennifer Wilson, University at Buffalo; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

Yeri is an endangered Torrocelli language spoken in Sandaun Province, Papua New Guinea. It has two morphemes which can occur on most word classes operating predicatively, an imperfective morpheme often translated as ‘now’ and an additive morpheme often translated as ‘also’. These morphemes display a diversity of positions, shown in Table 1. Examples demonstrating the use of these morphemes on each word class are presented in (1)-(10) on the following page. All data comes from my own fieldwork.

Table 3: Yeri imperfective and additive morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>imperfective ‘now’</th>
<th>additive ‘also’</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>hebi</td>
<td>‘we’</td>
<td>w-ma-hebi</td>
<td>w-ba-hebi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>nabe</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
<td>ma-nabe</td>
<td>ba-nabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>altob</td>
<td>‘force’</td>
<td>al&lt;me&gt;tobi</td>
<td>al&lt;pe&gt;tobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>osia</td>
<td>‘swell’</td>
<td>o&lt;ma&gt;sia</td>
<td>o&lt;pa&gt;sia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideophones</td>
<td>gɨlglei</td>
<td>‘bounce’</td>
<td>gɨlglei-ma</td>
<td>gɨlglei-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>wodehɨl</td>
<td>‘elder’</td>
<td>wodehɨl-ma</td>
<td>wodehɨl-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hwora</td>
<td>‘wife’</td>
<td>hwora-mɨ</td>
<td>hwora-pɨ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For many linguists, a fundamental distinction is made between affixes which are positioned with respect to a word root in the morphology and clitics which are positioned with respect to a phrase in the syntax (Anderson 2005; Spencer & Luis 2012a,b). However, analyzing Yeri predicate morphemes as either affixes or clitics is misleading since the morphemes display characteristics commonly associated with both affixes and clitics (e.g. morphophonological idiosyncrasy, promiscuous attachment to a variety of hosts, arbitrary gaps, narrow scope). Furthermore, a complete description of the placement of these morphemes must make reference to (i) word root, (ii) word class, and (iii) the head of the syntactic phrase.

In this paper, I provide an overview of the behavior and positioning of Yeri predicate morphemes in both simple and complex predicates. I consider the theoretical implications this has for the distinction between ‘affixes’ and ‘clitics’ maintained in the literature and the syntactic implications this has for Yeri predicates.

Examples

Yeri

(1) Yem y-atar-e-Ø, w-ma-yem.
    2PL 2PL-take.care.REAL-AUG-F REL-IPFV-2P
    ‘You all take care of her, she is yours now.’

(2) Nebo-i yot-u-i w-ei-ba-hem.
    dog-PL DEM-DIST-PL REL-PL-ADD-1SG.
    ‘Those dogs are also mine.’

(3) Yot-a-Ø helol hiro w-ei-ma-nab-i.
    DEM-PROX-F work NEG REL-PL-IPFV-good-PL
    ‘Here, the work is not good now.’
(4) Ten yot-u-n, ba-nabe-n.
3SG.M DEM-ADDR.PROX-M REL-ADD-good-M
‘That guy, he is also good.’

(5) Hiro, w-gei-ka-Ø w-da<me>wil.
NEG 3SG.F-put-REAL-AUG-F 3SG.F-hang.REAL<IPFV>
‘No, she put it and it’s hanging now.’

(6) M-ia<be>wua moi yot-u-Ø w-d-a<be>wil.
1SG-tie.REAL<ADD vine DEM-ADDR.PROX-F 3SG.F-hang.REAL<ADD>
‘I tied the rope and it hangs too.’

(7) Nigongo-n w-den yot-u-n palpal-ma.
child-M REL-3SG.M DEM-ADDR.PROX-M fly-IPFV
‘His son there is flying now.’

(8) Lahabi yot-u-Ø, wan halhal-pa yot-u-Ø
yesterday DEM-ADDR.PROX-F heart mad-ADD DEM-ADDR.PROX-F
w-di<pe>ba.
3PL-fight.IRR<ADD>
‘Yesterday there, they were also angry then and they also almost fought.’

(9) Te hwora-mi.
3SG.F wife-IPFV
‘She is a wife now.’

(10) Te hwora-pi.
3SG.F wife-ADD
‘She is a wife also.’

Abbreviations: 1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, ADD additive, ADDR addressee, AUG augment, DEM demonstrative, DIST distal, F feminine, IPFV imperfective, IRR irrealis, M masculine, NEG negation, PL plural, PROX proximal, REAL realis, REL relational, SG singular
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Grammatical relations, case marking and switch-reference in Kakataibo (Panoan)

Roberto Zariquiey, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Over the last three decades, linguists have conducted intense research on grammatical relations (GR) from different approaches (formal, typological, descriptive and so on). This is not surprising if we consider that the associations between A, S and P (and other more marginal grammatical functions) have been proved extremely valuable for the understanding of how languages work (Bickel 2011).

Typologists have found that GR are not only implicated in constituent order, subject/object cross-reference and case marking, but also in a large list of properties and constructions. This observation, based on a large sample of languages, has led to the discovery that GR are construction-specific and that there is no such a thing as a nominative-accusative or an ergative-absolutive language (Comrie 1978, 1979; Fillmore 1988, among many others). This is particularly transparent regarding ergative languages, which are by definition not exclusively ergative. The notion of split, based on a person hierarchy proposed by Silverstein (1976), has been used to describe the conflation of two or more GR alignments in the case marking of a language. In this talk I will first explore the different GR alignment types exhibited by the case marking system of Kakataibo and we will see that case marking in this language combines tripartite, ergative, neutral and horizontal alignment types. This produces a system that cannot be accounted for by means of the standard version of Silverstein’s hierarchy and thus posits interesting theoretical issues.

This talk also describes how different GR alignments manifest and interact with each other in other domains of Kakataibo grammar, paying particular attention to the switch-reference markers, which revolve around accusative, neutral and tripartite alignment types in how they treat the coreferential arguments in both the dependent and the matrix clause. The unusual diversity of GR alignments found in Kakataibo constitutes a radical example of their construction-specific nature and opens interesting questions about how and why such complex systems of GR may emerge.
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