Giorgio Arcodia (Milano), Chiara Melloni (Verona) and Bianca Basciano (Venice): \textit{Total reduplication of verbs in the East and Southeast Asian Area}

This paper aims at identifying and analysing the correlations between form and function in reduplicating constructions in a sample of twenty Chinese dialects, representing eight branches of Sinitic, comparing them to a set of fourteen non-Sinitic languages of the East- and Southeast Asian area.

The study of TR in other Sinitic and non Sinitic languages has been carried out with the aid of descriptive grammars and data collected from the literature. Original sources together with the list of online-corpora we consulted will be given in detail in the presentation. When possible, native speakers have been consulted for interpretive and grammaticality judgements, especially in the case of dubious data in Mandarin.

The main findings of our survey are:

1. Reduplicated monosyllabic verbs express more variation in meaning than disyllabic ones (as different as delimitative aspect, tentativeness, rapid completion, suddenness, greater intensity, etc.);
2. These various semantic nuances could be argued to derive from the core (iconic) meaning of verbal reduplication as iteration of an event over an undefined time-span;
3. TR mostly expresses iconic/increasing semantics;
4. On the structural level, a pervasive feature of reduplication lies in its compliance to strict requirements on the morphological makeup of the base. This holds especially in the case of reduplication of disyllabic and bimorphemic verbs with increasing semantics, a consistent pattern across the languages we considered.
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This cross-linguistic study investigates morphological overlaps in voice and person markers and their historical connections in order to answer the following questions: a) how frequent such developments are, b) whether there are areal patterns and c) whether passives are indeed primarily associated with third person plural markers and antipassives with first person plural markers.

The study is based on a sample of 59 languages out of 28 stocks. The languages were chosen to cover all macro-areas (based on the proposal by Hammarström & Donohue 2014) and, if possible, two languages of the same family were selected for better internal comparison. From each language, personal pronouns, verbal agreement and voice markers were collected in a data base and then evaluated as to whether any of the forms morphologically overlap or not. In a second step, all the overlaps were analyzed in detail as to whether a historical connection between the markers is possible or not.

The data in Examples (1-a) and (1-b) from Itelmen (Eastern Russia; Chukotko-Kamchatic) illustrate an overlap of a third person plural marker and a passive marker: in Example (1-a) the prefix n- (in bold) refers to a third person plural agent, while the same prefix has a passive meaning in Example (1-b). In Examples (2-a) and (2-b) from Puma (Nepal; Sino-Tibetan, Kiranti) an overlap of a person marker and an antipassive is presented. The prefix kha- marks an antipassive in Example (2-a), but refers to a first person plural patient in Example (2-b).

Previous research has either taken into consideration passives (cf. Haspelmath 1990, Givón 2006, Siewierska 2010) or antipassives (cf. Janic 2013), but not both together. Other works have focused on single languages or language families, e.g. Bresnan et al. (2001) on English and Lummi (Canada; Salishan), Fleck (2006) on Matses (Peru; Panoan), Ajanki (2010) on Finnish, Guillaume (2011) on the Tacanan languages (Bolivia) and Bickel & Gaenszle (2015) on the Southern Kiranti languages (Nepal; Sino-Tibetan). Their observations indicate that passives regularly develop from third person plural forms via an impersonal stage, while antipassives develop into first person plural forms through the notion of genericity. The predictions are thus that a) passives and antipassives are not associated with the same person features, i.e. passive markers with third and antipassive markers with first plural, respectively b) the direction of the developments is opposite, i.e. from person to voice marker in case of the passive and from voice to person marker in case of the antipassive and c) passives are more frequently associated with person than antipassives.

The results are in many points not consistent with the predictions. First of all, person-voice overlaps are not as frequent as earlier theories (e.g. DeLancey 1981) would lead one to expect: out of the 70 markers that were analyzed, only 20 have a possible historical connection with a person marker. Interestingly, antipassives have a closer association with person markers than passives: in case of the former, 10 out 20 markers in the sample could be diachronically connected with person marker, while in case of the latter, this is only so for 7 out of 39 markers (see Table 1). The person markers involved also do not correspond entirely to the prediction: first and third person plural are indeed most frequently involved, but there is a notable – and so far unexplained – absence of second person plural forms.

Australia is the only macro-area that has no possible connection between a voice and a person marker. This absence might be explained by the close contact these languages had with each other for a long time, which led to close parallelism in form and function of voice markers in that area.

While many uncertainties concerning the detailed histories of such diachronic connections remain, the study shows that there are trends in this domain, but not necessarily in the expected directions.
Table 1: Number of markers, overlaps and connections per voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>overlapping</th>
<th>VM with a conn.</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAUS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of markers, overlaps and connections per voice

(1) a. Xiwne-ʔn min’l, n-ŋnkw-nen.
   wolf-PL hare 3PL-catch-3SG
   The wolves caught the hare.’
   b. Min’l, n-ŋnkw-kiçen xiwne-nk.
   hare PASS-catch-3SG wolf-LOC
   ‘The hare was caught by the wolf.’ (Georg & Volodin 1999:64)

(2) a. (kho-ci) som-kha-ma-tuk.
   3-NSG[NOM] love-AP-3PL.S-love.NPST
   ‘They love people.’
   b. (kho-ci-a) som-kha-ma-tuk.
   3-NSG-ERG love-1NSG.I-3PL.S-love.NPST
   ‘They love us.’       (Bickel & Gaenszle 2015:69)

Abbreviations

ACAUS=anticausative, AP=antipassive, DETR=detransitive, ERG=ergative, I=inclusive, LOC=locative, NOM=nominative, NPST=non-past, NSG=non-singular, PASS=passive, PL=plural, S=singular argument of a one-place predicate, SG=singular, VM=voice marker
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My presentation aims at discussing a possible framework for a typology of argument coding systems, a question commonly dealt with in a rather superficial and sometimes confused way under the heading of morphological accusativity / ergativity.

Within the framework I am trying to elaborate, the distinction between core-like and oblique-like coding characteristics plays a crucial role, and systems of argument coding are characterized in terms of coincidence with or deviation from two prototypes for which the terms of \textit{A-unmarked} and \textit{P-unmarked systems of argument coding} are proposed. The definition of each prototype involves features characterizing two phenomena that are logically independent but tend to correlate cross-linguistically: the formal characteristics of transitive coding, and the alignment of the other possible types of coding frames with transitive coding.

In my presentation, after some terminological clarifications, the following points will be addressed:

– the typology of transitive coding;
– the typological parameter of Obligatory Coding (a reformulation of the traditional distinction between morphologically accusative and morphologically ergative languages which allows a better understanding of the cross-linguistic variation in argument coding systems);
– the correlation between types of transitive coding and types of alignment between transitive coding and other coding frames;
– types of argument coding that show only partial coincidences with the coding of either A or P.

* * *

*
Implicational universals and explanations thereof usually refer to a combination of synchronic patterns, not how they actually develop cross-linguistically. Yet, these patterns arise from several different processes.

This is illustrated in the paper through cross-linguistic diachronic evidence about various patterns predicted by number marking, alignment, possession, and word order universals.

This evidence shows, for example, that the same phenomena (e.g. overt marking, particular alignment systems) originate differently when they are restricted to particular contexts and when they are not so restricted.

Co-occurring constructions (e.g. overt markers in different contexts, different word order dyads) may originate independently or as subtypes of the same source construction. Not all of the processes leading to particular patterns always conform to the relevant universals (for example, among different processes leading to zero marking for singular and overt marking for plural, some also lead to the opposite pattern, prohibited by the relevant universal).

In line with previous work in phonology (Blevins 2004, Bybee 2006), these facts suggest that implicational universals emerge from many particularized diachronic processes, not amenable to a unified explanation. Explaining implicational universals requires qualitative and quantitative data on these processes, rather than on the resulting patterns in themselves.
In the Tanimuka language (East Tucanoan), spoken by about 500 people of the Tanimuka (u’pairã) and the Letuama (retuarã) groups in the department of Amazonas in Colombia, two systems of nominal categorization co-occur together and intersect: gender and numeral classifiers.

Nouns in this language are divided first into human and non-human entities. This grammatical categorization is associated with a semantic categorization that includes three gender values. Nouns with the +human feature take masculine, feminine and plural gender suffixes, and nouns with the –human feature (whether animate or inanimate) take neuter gender. Nouns obligatorily agree in gender and number with their determiners (1).

The system of numeral classifiers is obligatorily suffixed on numerals or any word denoting quantity. There are two types of numeral classifiers: a closed system of sortal classifiers (2a,b) and an open system of classifying elements of lexical origin (2c).

-sortal classifiers form a group of four monosyllabic marks, completely grammaticalized, that make reference to the figure shape and configuration: long (1 D), flat (2 D), round (3 D), and flexible (1 D), /string-like.

-classifiers of lexical origin form an open system of disyllabic marks, partially grammaticalized, which can refer to measure terms, essence, function or simply are repeaters or semi - repeaters of the words they classify.

These lexical elements also play a role in nominal composition and are closer to the type of ‘class markers’ that are found in neighboring Amazonian languages, since they function as some sort of agreement to the extent that they appear on both the numeral and the determined noun (2c). Both types have an anaphoric function and serve as reference tracking devices. These classifiers are also suffixed to demonstratives in deictic function (3b), adjectives, where they acquire anaphoric and referential functions (4b), and they also serve as elements of nominalization (4c).

(1)   iʔ-ká  parú-á  hóʔba-ká  
      DEM-N  plantain-N  big-N  
      ‘this big plantain.’

(2) a. ~ípa-bí  óá-ka  b. ~ípo-ó  óá-ka  c. ~ípa—tatá  óá—tatá  
    2-CLSlong  corn-N  2-CLSround  corn-N  2-CLSmonoculture  corn-CLSmonocult.  
    ‘two corn cobs’  ‘two grains of corn’  ‘two cornfields’

(3) a. iʔ-ká  parú-á  béʔ  erá-bé  b. i-bí  béʔ  erá-bé  
    DEM-N  plantain-N  2ps-bring-IMP  DEM-CLSlong  2ps-bring-IMP  
    ‘Bring this plantain.’  ‘Bring this [one].’

(4) a. hóʔba-ká  biá  b. hóʔba-ó-ká  biá  c. hóʔba-ó  jí-ré  ~bi—ihi-be  
    big-N  pepper  big-CLSround-N  pepper  big-CLSround-N  1s-DAT  2-give-IMP  
    ‘big pepper’  ‘big round pepper’  ‘give me the big (round) [one]’

*   *
Antoine Guillaume (Lyon): Reconstructing the history of ergative marking and alignment change in core argument pronouns and NPs in Takanan languages (Amazonian Bolivia & Peru)

The languages of the small Takanan family from the Amazonian lowlands of Bolivia and Peru (Cavineña, Ese Ejja, Araona, Tacana and Reyesano) manifest three distinct case-marking systems, from strictly ergative, to optionally ergative, and strictly neutral. The Tacana language is particularly interesting in manifesting the three systems at the same time, each system being characteristic of a different category of referents, as indicated in Figure 1, where the referents are ranked according to Silvestein’s (1976) animacy hierarchy. Tacana case-marking is even more remarkable in that the distribution of ergative marking among the different types of referents does not follow Silvestein’s predictions: strict marking should be at the right hand side, optional ergative marking in the middle, and lack of ergative marking at the left hand side.

Figure 1. Case marking in Tacana and Silverstein’s (1976) animacy hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent pronouns</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg, 2sg</td>
<td>1dl, 1pl, 2dl, 2pl, 3dl, 3pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG obligatory</td>
<td>ERG absent (neutral forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>kinship &gt; humans &gt; animates &gt; inanimates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explain how this counter-universal pattern came about, I reconstruct the history of ergative marking in NPs and pronouns in Tacana and in the rest of the Takanan languages. I present comparative evidence that the peculiarities of the Tacana case-marking system manifest the progressive loss of an ergative system that used to be rigid originally (reconstructible to proto-Takana). This original ergative system has been strictly retained in Cavineña and Ese Ejja, partly retained in Araona and Tacana, and completely lost in Reyesano. In Araona, one observes a phenomenon of renewal of ergative marking in some pronouns which had lost the ergative-absolutive distinction.

Finally, I explore different factors that might have contributed to the loss of ergative properties in Araona, Tacana and Reyesano, such as phonological loss and language obsolescence in contact with Spanish.
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*  *
Caroline Imbert (Grenoble): *Path coding and morpheme ordering in complex predicates*

This paper explores the semantic constraints underlying the relative ordering of Path-coding morphemes, more specifically in monoclusal complex predicate constructions.

The data was collected during the Trajectory Project (CNRS / TUL) and through subsequent working sessions with native speakers. It includes Burmese and Arakanese (Vittrant 2012, to appear), Chinese (see Imbert to appear), Japanese and Thai.

Following the lead of studies on affix ordering (from Greenberg 1963, Baker 1985 and Bybee 1985, to Rice 2000, Mithun 2000 and Manova 2015), and more specifically on the ordering of Pathcoding affixes in multi-affixed verbs (Craig 1993, Imbert 2010, to appear), this paper examines strikingly similar constraints in complex predicates. Such constraints include: (a) the tendency of Manner-coding elements to appear in the V1 slot or closer to the V1 slot, as opposed to Deixis-coding elements which tend to appear in the farthest slot from V1; (b) recurring tendencies in the relative ordering of Verticality vs. Telicity coding elements.

This paper constitutes a preliminary study about Path-coding morpheme ordering and complex predicates. Although multi-affixed verbs and complex predicates have formally little in common, they seem to share similar semantic constraints on the relative order of elements with respect to the verb stem in the former, a.k.a V1 in the latter.
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Katarzyna Janic (Lyon): Is antipassive truly asymmetrical to passive?

Dixon (1994) defines the notions of prototypical passive and antipassive, providing the following criteria: (anti)passive applies to an underlying transitive clause and forms a derived intransitive; there is some explicit formal marking of (anti)passive construction; the underlying OBJECT (passive)/the underlying AGENT (antipassive) → becomes SUBJECT; the underlying AGENT (passive)/the underlying OBJECT (antipassive) → goes into a peripheral function; this argument can be omitted, although there is always the option of including it.

The antipassive is argued to constitute a mirror image of the passive (Polinsky 2005). This means that these two operations are in a relationship of symmetrical opposition. The notion of symmetry is recognized in terms of the syntactic status of the semantic arguments of verbs and refers to a core vs peripheral distinction. The major assumption is that while passive demotes the AGENT to the peripheral status, the PATIENT in antipassive has an equivalent status. As a result, the PATIENT of passive and the AGENT of antipassive are core arguments.

This study investigates passive and antipassive in the domains of syntax and semantics to determine whether they are truly asymmetrical operations. The claim is that even if the core/peripheral distinction supports a symmetrical approach to prototypical passive and antipassive, the underlying syntactic and semantic forces hold against this observation.

In my analysis, I will adopt first Creissels’ (2006) definition of promotion to argue that the canonical passive involves both the demotion of the AGENT and the promotion of the PATIENT, whereas antipassive does not imply any mechanism of promotion. Then, following Dixon and Aikhenvald’s (2007) classification of transitivity classes of verbs, I will show that the syntactic parallelism between passive and antipassive is misleading for languages with multiple transitivity classes of verbs. Unlike the antipassive, the passive may extend to prototypical intransitive clauses, (1). On the other hand, in Circassian languages, the antipassive applies to two-argument intransitive predicates, (2b). Ultimately, I will build on the parameters of transitivity by Hopper and Thompson (1980) to show that only antipassive can change the semantic transitivity of the clause. This may involve a change in the properties of predicate, the properties of AGENT (agency, 3b); and/or the properties of PATIENT (affectedness, 3b).

The analysis raises theoretical question about the syntactic and semantic effects valency-decreasing operations produce on a derived clause. It also explains why from a typological perspective the term antipassive is often questionable. This results from the fact that it suggests a parallelism with passive that in reality does not exist.

(1) Turkish (Keenan and Dryer 2007: 346)
   ankara-ya gid-il-di
   Ankara-to go-PASS-PST
   ‘It was gone to Ankara’

(2) Besleney (Letuchiy and Arkadiev 2012)
   a. çәxʷ xe-r z-we-benә-r.
      man-PL-ABS REC.IO-DYN-fight-ACL
      ‘The men are fighting with each other.’
b. *Aslan* desʷ-wə me-bane.
   Aslan well-ADV DYN-fight.AP
   ‘Aslan fights well.’

(3) Kabardian (Foley 2007: 434)

a. fi-e-m qʷ-ᕑṝ-e-r jedzaq’e
dog-ERG bone-ABS bite
   ‘The dog bites the bone’

b. fi-e-r qʷ-ᕑṝ-e-m je-w-dsaq’e
dog-ABS bone-INS AP-bite
   ‘The dog gnaws at the bone’

**Abreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>‘actual’ present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYN</td>
<td>dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From a cross-linguistic perspective, egophoric marking is prototypically associated with certain arguments, most commonly with volitional agents. In fact, some languages restrict egophoric marking to clauses in which such arguments occur (cf. Creissels 2008, Hargreaves 2005). However, certain languages are more liberal in that egophoric marking may also apply in clauses in which the individual in question cannot be construed as an argument of the verb, yet is involved in the event as a 'peripheral participant'. While the discussion often focuses on the more prototypical contexts, egophoric marking with 'peripheral participants' is commonly considered secondary.

In this talk, I present the results of a cross-linguistic study of these less prototypical instances, which are attested in at least four different language families, i.e. Barbacoan, Tibeto-Burman, Mongolic and Trans New Guinea. While these constructions show structural similarities in that the participant is not overtly expressed as an argument, their meanings vary across the investigated languages. The findings show that this 'peripheral participant' can assume different roles including possessor (e.g. 'This is my book', cf. Fried 2010), deictic center (e.g. 'He came [to where I was]', cf. DeLancey 1990) or affected entity (e.g. 'It rained [on me]', cf. Curnow 2001). Moreover, it is evident that the use of an egophoric marker may indicate that the occurrence of an event is desired by the participant in question (e.g. '[I want that] you will go', cf. San Roque 2008).
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Kristina Kotcheva (Freiburg): *Agglutination in North Germanic*

Danish, Norwegian and Swedish constitute the Mainland Scandinavian branch of North Germanic. These languages share a number of morphological characteristics which set them apart from the Insular Nordic languages Faroese and Icelandic. One important difference between the two branches of North Germanic is based on morphological typology: whereas Insular Nordic exhibits rich inflectional morphology with several different categories marked in nominals and verbs, these features are lacking in Danish, Norwegian or Swedish.

Among the Mainland Scandinavian languages, Swedish is often characterized as displaying conspicuously agglutinative features (e. g. Askedal (2002); Braunmüller (2007)). This claim is usually backed by citing examples of inflected nominal forms such as *bänk-er-na-s* (stem–number–definiteness–case) 'of the banks' or verbal forms like *köp-te-s* (stem–tense–voice) 'was/were bought'. In the examples above the morphemes bearing the relevant grammatical categories can easily be separated which is strongly reminiscent of separability in Turkish or Finnish, cf. Turkish *köy-lerim-in* (stem–number–possessive–case), Finnish *talo-i-ssa-ni* (root–house–number–case–possessive) 'in my houses'. The typological distinction between agglutinative vs. fusional morphology has been investigated since the beginning of comparative linguistics, recently also by e. g. Plank (1999), Haspelmath (2009) or Bickel & Nichols (2013).

The aim of the talk is to present a comparative survey of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish nominal and verbal inflection based on criteria proposed by Haspelmath (2009). Haspelmath's survey is based on 30 languages, none of which is North Germanic. The criteria employed are based on differentiating between a) cumulation vs. separation of morphological categories coded in a given morpheme; b) stem alternation vs. invariance; c) affix alternation vs. invariant affixes; and d) affix suppletion vs. uniformity. The data comprise borrowed and inherited nouns and verbs in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. I will show that with regard to the criteria cited above, agglutinative morphology is especially noticeable in recently borrowed or recently formed Swedish verbs while inherited verbs are less agglutinative. Both inherited and recently borrowed or recently formed nouns occupy a position between these two poles.

**References**


In my paper, I survey the origin and the development of partitive case markers, particles or adpositions. Items discussed include partitive cases, as in Balto-Finnic (1) and Basque (2), 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) (see Luraghi & Huumo 2014).

(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)

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

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

(4) pácanti te vrṣabhām ātsi téšām
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 ḫaka-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).

As discussed in Luraghi & Kittilä (2014), diachronic developments attest to partly different origins of partitive case markers. Partitive cases of Basque and of the Finnic languages originated from ablatives. In Basque, the partitive is an allomorph of the present ablative: the two case forms became differentiated at a pre-literary stage, when the features of number and definiteness in spatial cases had not yet emerged. At a later stage, the partitive remained indefinite, while the ablative acquired definiteness and singular number. The Finnic partitive originates from the Finnic-Mordvinian separative (‘away from’) case, which was used as a rudimentary partial object, but also as a kind of partitive attribute. Another interesting development, partly similar to Basque, is found in Russian. In this language, a number of second declension nouns feature the so-called second genitive, which is partly used in partitive contexts. The morpheme involved was in origin the genitive ending of the -u declension, which later merged with consonant stems (second declension). Some of the former -u stems preserved the older genitive, while also acquiring the new one; in addition, the second genitive ending spread to some other nouns that were not older -u stems. In most ancient and some modern Indo-European languages, it is the genitive, rather than the ablative, which develops a partitive meaning: such development is
most clear in languages such as Sanskrit or Latin, in which the ablative and the genitive are distinct. However, there is a major difference between the developments of the Basque and Finnic ablative cases and of the IE genitive: the Finnic and Basque partitives historically derive from an ablative, but no longer function as an ablative (apart from some lexicalized uses); these languages also have a genitive, which is formally and functionally distinct from the partitive. Indo-European languages, for their part, have a genitive which also functions as a partitive, and moreover some of these languages have an independent ablative distinct from the partitive genitive. Also interesting is the relation between partitive cases and partitive constructions on the one hand, and partitive cases and pseudo-partitives on the other hand. In general, partitive case markers originate within partitive construction: evidence for such development comes from the Romance languages, in which the Latin preposition *de* eventually developed into a partitive and later an indefinite article. However, partitive case markers are no longer used within partitive constructions possibly after losing their separative meaning, as shown in Finnic, in which partitive constructions feature the elative case.

Setting partitive items in a cross-linguistic perspective, I show that 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) - [Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.](1). 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. 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. In this framework, it is interesting to notice that Oceanic languages feature partitive particles, which are not connected with genitive cases, do not occur inside partitive constructions, and whose possible relation with an earlier ablative is unclear. When reconstructable, their origin seems to connect them with the numeral ‘one’: if this is the case, one could envisage an opposite development, by which an indefinite determiner turned into a partitive.
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*
This talk will show the preliminary data of a typological study on the phenomenon of Pluractionality, that marks the plurality of the events directly on the verb. These preliminary data show that languages of the world are really heterogeneous and present a lot of differences, both from a morpho-syntactic and semantic point of view. For example, cross-linguistically we can recognize some main ways of marking (affixation, reduplication, stem alternation and auxiliary constructions) and several other “minor” strategies; but the interesting aspect is that these strategies can coexist in languages that are strictly related and even in the same language.

In addition, also the semantics of pluractionality is heterogeneous; these forms can encode, besides the prototypical meaning of multiplicity of actions, an action that is distributed over different participants or over different locations, but even quite different phenomena, for example intensity, durative/continuative and habitual meanings, reciprocity, different goals, etc.

Finally, these constructions show even a big difference from a diachronic point of view. This is particularly evident for the paths of pluractional affixes (that can have as source: demonstratives, different verbs like “love”, “hate”, locative verbs, etc.).

From a theoretical point of view, this great diversity is difficult to explain using a theory that presupposes categories as universally valid and homogeneous set of constructions; cross-linguistically, Pluractionality is not a valid category, but we have to consider this phenomenon only as a classificatory label that group together different constructions that at the same time share a specific semantic value. This analysis is recently adopted in the functional-typological approach that consider categories valid only in a language-specific and construction-specific perspective and cross-linguistically we can consider categories only as a linguists’ theorization (cf. Dryer 1997, Croft 2001, Haspelmath 2007 and Cristofaro 2009).
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There is massive crosslinguistic evidence for this typological generalisation about the (most natural) ordering of attributive adjectives relative to their head noun, if languages permit such stacking:

(i) The relative distance (position class) of semantic classes of adjectives from the noun is the same, whether the adjectives come before or after the noun. (That is, the permissible orderings of stacked adjectives in AN and NA languages are mirror images of each other.)

Semantic classes of adjectives relevant for ordering include VALUE, SIZE, COLOUR (but others such as MATERIAL or PROVENANCE could be added); hence this mirror image pattern, accommodating the great majority of relevant languages:

a. English et al.:  *a beautiful big red ball*  VALUE SIZE COLOUR N  
b. Bahasa Indonesia et al.:  *bola merah besar tjantik*  N COLOUR SIZE VALUE

Generalisation (i) can be restated in more general terms, invoking more general principles such as nouniness (ii) and/or semantic scope (iii):

(ii) The nounier an attribute, the closer it is to the noun.
(iii) The reference of an NP is delimited gradually, with the most general distinctive concept (applicable to the widest range of other nominal concepts) taking widest scope and with the least general distinctive concept taking narrowest scope; linear closeness/distance of the respective A’s to/from the N mirrors this scoping hierarchy.

In other words, we are faced with an instance of iconicity, a kind of explanation dear to typologists: linear order in the NP is determined by semantic-conceptual relationships between NP constituents.

Alas, there are also languages like Italian, which somewhat complicate the typologist’s life:

c. Italian et al.:  *una bella grande palla Rossa*  VALUE SIZE N COLOUR

In light of Italian and its kind (Romance, Celtic, Semitic languages in particular), the iconicity generalisation can only be maintained at the cost of countenancing abstract representations, with structural order differing from surface order: Italian et al. must be analysed as being, abstractly, AN – like English et al., where the adjectives come in the relative order that is dictated by nouniness- or scoping-based iconicity, VALUE SIZE COLOUR – and with a syntactic rule of partial N-fronting. Cinque, Longobardi and many others in one generative framework or another have offered independent support for some such abstract analysis of Italian and relevant other languages. There are typologists who are suspicious of abstract analyses of all kinds: but here abstract representations should be
welcomed, since, independently motivated, they permit us to maintain iconicity in the strongest, categorical form (without random “exceptions”) – though with the proviso that certain typological constraints have to be conceived of as holding for abstract structural rather than surface linear orderings of constituents.

A language like Maltese (and I have not seen many others, even among its Semitic relatives) complicates matters further:

d. Maltese:  
\[\text{ballun sabi} \text{@kbir a@mar} \text{N VALUE SIZE COLOUR}\]

On the face of it, Maltese looks like Italian et al., only with N fronted completely, from an abstract ordering like in English et al. (a), complying with the nouniness- or scoping-based iconic ordering constraint. (And we would still be able to rule out a further ordering possibility, (e), nowhere attested, as violating iconicity and as an impossible surface version of (b) because universally only N-fronting is permitted, but not N-backing.

e.  
\[\text{*redd bigg beautifull ball} \text{*COLOUR SIZE VALUE N}\]

The problem with Maltese is how the abstract ordering, A... N, underlying concrete N A... is learnable. It is only by virtue of such a structural order that stacked adjectives in Maltese comply with our cherished iconicity universal; but there is very little evidence for learners of Maltese to assume any order other than NA. A few adjectives can precede nouns in marked contexts: e.g., \text{il-kbir Alla} DEF-big god ‘God Almighty’; \text{Ghażiż Pawlu/hija} ‘Dear Paul/brother’, the address formula in letters; \text{l-gharef hu-k} DEF wise brother-2SG ‘your clever brother’ (only ironic: ‘your supposedly wise brother’); and there are cases where a prenominal adjective and its noun have been analysed as sharing a definite article: \text{Il-kbir miraclu kien sar} DEF.SG.M miracle PAST become ‘The big miracle happened’. Still, it is almost as if it is only the sequences of stacked adjectives themselves that point iconically-minded learners to AN.

This is the problem I would like to state and discuss, reporting on ongoing joint work with Albert Borg (U Malta).
Françoise Rose (Lyon): When grammatical gender and genderlects interact

Grammatical gender is a well-known common category (Corbett 1999). A much rarer and less studied phenomenon is that of indexical gender, whereby the gender of the speaker and/or the hearer is indexed in utterances that do not necessarily refer to the speech act participants (Bodine 1975, Fleming 2012, Dunn 2014). Gender can be indexicalized at several levels in the genderlects: phonological (1), morphological (2), lexical (3). [The gender of the speaker is represented in the glosses and translations with ♂ and ♀, not to be confused with M and F for grammatical gender.]

1. *otso / oso* Guarayo (Höller 1932: 2)
   ‘(s)he went away ♂ / (s)he went away ♀’

2. *-o?re / -o?s* Mandan (Mithun 1999)
   ‘indicative (hearer ♂ ) / indicative (hearer ♀ )’

   ‘yesterday ♀ / yesterday ♀’

Gender indexicality at the morphological level most often occurs within the domain of (pro)nominal reference (Rose 2013a, 2015). Gender indexicality may interact with grammatical gender in complex ways. This paper aims at presenting the four types of interactions attested in our cross-linguistic survey of gender indexicality (Rose and Bakker 2015), based on first- and second-hand data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction 1</th>
<th>Interaction 2</th>
<th>Interaction 3</th>
<th>Interaction 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♀ ♂</td>
<td>♀ ♂</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>♀ ♂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first situation, each genderlect (male/female speech) has different markers for masculine and feminine. This can be illustrated with a selection of Kayabí pronouns (Dobson 1997): *kîà 3SG.M♀, *gà 3SG.M♂, kyna 3SG.F♀, èè 3SG.F♂.

In the second situation, grammatical gender is restricted to the speech of only one gender of speaker. This is the case in bésiro/chiquitano (Sans, fieldnotes), where only male speakers have a special marker =tí for masculine agreement (feminine is unmarked and corresponds to the gender-neutral form always used by female speakers).

In the third situation, only one grammatical gender is distinct for male and female speakers. This is the case in Mojeño (Rose 2013b), where only the masculine (in pronouns, articles, possessive prefixes, agreement prefixes) is distinct for males and females: *nî 3SG.M♀, ma 3SG.M♂, su 3SG.F♀/.♂.

The fourth situation is the most unexpected: in the same context, male and female speakers use a different gender. For instance, Garifuna males use feminine agreement with abstract nouns, where females use male agreement (dePury 2003, Munro 2013).
The paper ends on a discussion of the cross-linguistic distribution of these four (rare) types of interaction of genderlects with grammatical gender, and some generalizations that can be made regarding the (as)symmetry of the systems, the identity of the marked form and the issue of innovation in general.
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The issue. The grammars of several languages, such as French and Turkish, treat subordinates expressing spatial relationships as relative clauses. In German grammars they are classified with adverbial clauses, while in Hungarian grammars some of them are considered adverbials while others are considered relatives. In general linguistic works clauses expressing location are grouped with adverbials which can be substituted by a single word and, at the same time, can be paraphrased by a relative clause with a generic and relatively semantically empty head noun, \( \text{where} / \text{at the place at which} \).

The paper, based on data from 11 languages belonging to 6 language families, suggests that the classification as relative or as adverbial clauses is not a grammar writing issue but reflects an interesting typological variation going beyond a simple opposition.

The hypothesis, based on Hungarian (see ex. 1) is that in some languages there are two subtypes of spatial subordinates: one of adverbial nature and another of adjectival nature.

The analysis. First, a questionnaire was given to linguists and native speakers, including examples (a) with a verb like \textit{to go}, and (b) with a nominal head. Then, in order to distinguish among the three generally acknowledged subordinates, i.e. complement, relative and adverbial clauses, the following properties have been observed: a) the category and the syntactic role of the constituent developed in the subordinate clause, studied by means of tests like interrogation and commutation; and b) the nature of the subordinating marker.

Results. It has been demonstrated that the languages included in the corpus use different strategies: some languages use the same adverbial-like subordinator and the same strategy in all examples (Occitan, ex 2); others use the same relativizing device (Finnish, ex 3); still others use two different strategies (English, see translations, Mandarin, ex 4, Tagalog, ex 5), while certain languages (French, Hungarian) can use two subordinators to introduce a spatial relative.

Conclusions and perspectives. In several languages there are headed or headless relative clauses expressing spatial relationships, according to the specific strategies available. As relatives, they express a property. However, the data presented here make possible the identification of another type of subordinate which cannot be labeled as adverbial if adverbials should be facultative and mobile. The subordinates concerned are obligatory, complete motion verbs or verbs/copulas, they commute with an adverb, answer to questions expressing direction and are introduced by an item which is difficult to categorize (labeled as a \textit{relative pro-adverb}).

My proposition is illustrated by selected data from a much larger corpus, allowing for a more fine-grained analysis of spatial subordinators and subtypes of spatial subordinate clauses cross-linguistically.

---


2. Hungarian, Finnish; French, Occitan, Francoprovençal; German; Polish; Turkish; Korean; Tagalog; Mandarin.
(1) Hungarian
   a. *Elmegyünk, ahová akarod*
      away_go.1PL where to want-2SG
      ‘We’ll go where you would like’
   b. *Elmegyünk (abba) az étterembe, ahová / amelyikbe János meghívott*
      away_go.1PL DEM.ILL DEF restaurant to_where/ which-ILL J. invite-PA3SG
      ‘We’ll go to the restaurant to which John invited us’

(2) Occitan
   a. *Anarem ont voles.*
      go.fut1pl where want.2sg
      ‘We’ll go where you would like’
   b. *Anarem au restaurant ont Joan nos a invitats*
      go.fut1pl intoMSG restaurant where J. 1PL.ACC AUX invite-PTC
      ‘We’ll go to the restaurant to which John invited us’

(3) Finnish
   a. *Mennään minne haluat*
      go.PSF1PL REL.ILL want2SG
   b. *Menemme ravintolaan jossa/etta Jean kutsui medät.*
      go.1PL restaurant-ILL REL.INESS/COMPL J. invite.pa3sg 1sgacc

(4) Mandarin
   a. *ni xiang qu na women jiu qu na*
      2SG want go where 1PL then go where
      ‘id.’
   b. *women qu rang qing women chifan de canting*
      1pl go John invite 1pl eat COMP restaurant
      ‘id.’

(5) Tagalog
   a. *Pupunta tayo kung saan mo gusto.*
      go1PL 1PL INCL CONN where 2SG.GEN want
      ‘We’ll go where you would like’
   b. *malaki ang bahay na tinitira-han namin.*
      big NOM house LIG liveptc-LOC 1PL.EXCL
      ‘the house (in which) we live is big’

   *  *
   *  *
Languages are traditionally thought to vary in terms of their relative position on an index of synthesis (Sapir 1921; Greenberg 1960; Comrie 1981). This typological parameter refers to the amount of morphemes per word. The higher the language is on the index of synthesis the more morphemes the language can put or tends to put in a word. Most linguists now recognize a number of different types of word (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987; Russell 1999). Most prominently linguists distinguish between morphosyntactic and prosodic words and it is widely recognized that for a given language, these two constructs do not always align (Woodbury 1996; Hall 1999; Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000). On analogy with the split between morphological and phonological words, I argue that the index of synthesis should likewise be split into morphological and phonological parameters. This study considers the relationship between phonological and morphological synthesis in 16 languages of the Americas (Matses, Chácobo, Cavineña, Slave, Chipewyan, Ojibwe, Arapaho, Tariana, Baure, Choctaw, Quechua, Yagua, Tiriyo, Alaskan Yupik, Hup, and Ute).

First, I introduce a new method of quantifying the synthetic profile of a language based on ranking the functional morphemes in terms of distributional promiscuity. Then I use these rankings to analyze the correlation between morphological and phonological dependence across the languages. I show that languages can be distinguished not just in terms of morphological and phonological synthesis, but also in terms of the correlation between these two indexes across functional morphemes. I consider languages broadly spread across the Americas because Amerindian languages are generally thought to be highly synthetic, and will thus be interesting for this study, while at the same time displaying a high degree of typological variation.
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Hanna Thiele, Niko Partanen & Michael Rießler (Freiburg): Exploring constituent order variation in selected languages of the Barents Sea area

Saamic and Permic branches of Uralic, all spoken in the Barents region. All four are endangered, although to very different degrees, from the moribund Ter Saami (10 speakers) to Komi (300,000 speakers). Flexible constituent order, found in the languages under investigation, has so far been a minor topic in typology, cf. e.g. (Dryer 2007, 113–14). We have carried out a comparative study on variation in constituent order patterns within verb phrases in Kildin Saami, Ter Saami, standard Komi-Zyrian and Izhva Komi. The texts are comparable in length and genre and our framework is similar to (Haig and Thiele 2014), who studied languages of Anatolia. The evaluation of our data provides preliminary evidence for phrase weight being an important factor in the positioning of arguments. Despite studying genealogically related and geographically neighboring languages, we do not take a strong historical or areal perspective. Instead, we explore factors that could explain the variation synchronically. Our aim is to show the potential of quantitative corpus-based research using documentary linguistic datasets. Data for future research includes Tundra Nenets, Karelian and the Pomor dialect of Russian. Whereas the Uralic languages of the area seem to follow roughly the same models, one source of atypical structures might be contact with Russian. Identifying examples using a corpus search – as is common in most descriptions of Uralic languages – does not make the analysis or description “corpus-based” per se, as this does not involve empirically verifying the significance of a finding. To ensure reproducibility, our data are stored at The Language Archive (TLA); all R code used will be stored in GitHub.
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Manuel Widmer (Zürich): *Towards a diachronic typology of egophoricity*

Research on the diachronic origins of egophoricity has revealed that there are two widely attested sources for egophoric markers. First, they may be grammaticalized from copulas (cf. DeLancey 1992). Second, they may develop from markers that index the identity of participants, that is to say, person markers (cf. Widmer & Zemp in preparation) or coreference markers (cf. Genetti 1994: 134–136). In this talk, I will put the findings of historical linguistics into cross-linguistic perspective and develop a preliminary diachronic typology of egophoric systems.

In a first part, I will demonstrate that egophoric markers display considerable cross-linguistic variability in terms of their scope (cf. Bickel 2008) and that it is sensible to distinguish contexts in which egophoric markers take scope over entire events and propositions from contexts in which they take scope over specific arguments. In a second part, I put forward the hypothesis that the synchronic scope of an egophoric marker may allow us to draw inferences about its historical development. Based on egophoric systems whose history has been reconstructed in detail, I will argue that the scope of an egophoric marker tends to reflect its diachronic origin, which in turn allows us to draw interesting inferences about universal diachronic tendencies that shape egophoric systems over time.
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Utterance-final weakening (UFW) refers to a prosodic feature of some clauses in a number of genealogically diverse languages of far northern Europe. The phonetic-acoustic correlates are typically a complete devoicing of the final syllables of the affected clause, although creaky-voice is also possible. Anywhere from one to five syllables can be weakened, and these sound as if they were being whispered. Pragmatically, UFW appears to have a discourse-level function which indicates the end of a thought or smaller unit of text, and possibly indicates an acceptable location for turn-taking.

I have encountered this phenomenon in Uralic languages and Indo-European languages spoken across northern Sweden. Specifically, this includes western Saamic languages (particularly Pite Saami) and the Finnic language Meänkieli, as well as North Germanic dialects (especially the Swedish dialect from Arjeplog). To my knowledge, no descriptions of UFW exist, with the exception of a few lines in Wilbur (2014: 36) on Pite Saami.

In this presentation, I will compare and contrast the phonetic realizations and pragmatic functions of UFW in these languages and possibly others from the area. Furthermore, I will propose an isogloss for UFW, and consider the role of language contact in attempting to explain the distribution and origin of UFW.
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