

Tim Zingler

University of Innsbruck

Tim.Zingler@uibk.ac.at

3RD INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF MORPHOLOGY

09/23/2021

A DIACHRONIC APPROACH TO THE FORMAL ANOMALIES OF INDEXES

INDEXES

- ▶ Pronouns
- ▶ Agreement markers
- ▶ Everything in between
- ▶ Here: no possessives

MOTIVATION

- ▶ Zingler (2020) investigates “wordhood issues” (mismatches between criteria of phonological and morphological wordhood)
- ▶ Exponents of (a) definiteness, (b) case, (c) indexation, and (d) tense in 60 unrelated languages from five macro-areas
- ▶ One finding: indexes constitute particularly strong challenge to wordhood, both phonological and morphological

MOTIVATION

- ▶ Tallies with idea that indexes are most diverse/heterogeneous grammatical class (e.g., Julien 2002: ch. 5; Fuß 2005: 62-67)
- ▶ Wordhood not only complicated by specific constructions (e.g., MWEs) or languages (e.g., Munda) but also by entire grammatical categories cross-linguistically
- ▶ Warning: small sample size

OUTLINE

- ▶ “Extrametricality”
- ▶ “Mobility”/Free variation
 - ▶ Word-internal
 - ▶ Word-external
- ▶ “Duality”

“EXTRAMETRICALITY”

- ▶ Fwe (Atlantic-Congo; fwe; Gunnink 2018: 272)

(1) ndi-a-**endí**-end-i=ko

1SG-PST-**RDP**-go-PST=LOC₁₇

‘I kept going there.’

- ▶ Locative indexes (classes 16-18) exempt from RDP, unlike all suffixes

“EXTRAMETRICITY”

- ▶ Similar pattern in Jarawara (Arawan; jaa) for 1SG and 2SG, differs from all (other) prefixes – cf. Dixon (2004: ch. 9)
- ▶ No such reduplication effects found for markers of the other three categories
- ▶ Fwe markers fully integrated into morphological word but not into phonological word – anti-clitics (Zúñiga 2014)?

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ Ability to occur in different slots of otherwise identical morphological or syntactic constructions, **without** impact on resulting semantics
- ▶ Word-internal ~ “free placement” (Crysmann & Bonami 2016)
- ▶ In my sample: two indexes, only one marker from the other three categories combined

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ San Francisco del Mar Huave (Huavean; hue; Kim 2008: 347)

(2)	(a)	m- e -chutu-r	(b)	chutu-m- ia -r
		SB- 2 -sit-2.INTR		sit-SB- 2 -2.INTR
		‘that you (SG) sit’		‘that you (SG) sit’

- ▶ Similarly: 3PL object marker in Yeri (Nuclear Torricelli; yev; Wilson 2017: 360) – alternates between suffix and infix variant with some stems

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ Previous examples illustrate the same word because the relevant forms have the same meaning (cf. also Dixon & Aikhenvald 2003); also Kim (2008: 346)
- ▶ Violates idea that word-internal constituents follow rigid order (e.g., Dixon & Aikhenvald 2003; Haspelmath 2011)

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ Word-external = index can appear on one of several members of the predicate
- ▶ Again: no semantic differences between the alternatives
- ▶ No perfectly analogous examples among the definiteness, case, and tense data

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ Lillooet (Salishan; lil; van Eijk 1997: 153)

(3) waʔ-**wit**-ás=maɬ=ʔuʔ ʔíʔəm

AUX-**3PL**-SBJV=HORT=well sing

‘Let them sing/they might as well sing.’

(4) waʔ-as=máɬ=ʔuʔ ʔíʔəm-**wit**

AUX-SBJV=HORT=well sing-**3PL**

‘Let them sing/they might as well sing.’

“MOBILITY”

- ▶ Similarly for Kharia (Austroasiatic; khr; Peterson 2011: 59) – 2SG on verb or on preceding NEG
- ▶ Unclear what form class such indexes belong to:
 - ▶ Not affixes because hosts from different word classes
 - ▶ Not second-position/phrasal/simple clitics, etc.
 - ▶ Not words because phonologically integrated with adjacent lexical elements

“DUALITY”

- ▶ Index is apparently free phonological and morphological word in one context, but apparently affix in another context
- ▶ Not the same as English GEN “clitic” ‘s, which shows same phonological and morphological behavior across all contexts, i.e.:
 - ▶ NP-final
 - ▶ voicing feature copied from immediately preceding segment

“DUALITY”

- ▶ Krongo (Kadugli-Krongo; kgo; Reh 1985: 59)

(5)

n-ɯllà	à'àng	kòtú
--------	-------	------

 1/2SG-love.IPFV **1SG** 2SG.LOC

(supra)segmental sandhi when in unmarked postverbal position

'I love you.'

(6)

à'àng	n-ɯllà	kòtú
-------	--------	------

1SG 1/2SG-love.IPFV 2SG.LOC

no phonological processes when in marked preverbal position

'I love you.'

- ▶ Cf. also 3SG in Hup (Naduhup; jup; Epps 2008)

INTERIM SUMMARY

- ▶ Indexes present major challenge to definitions of phonological and morphological wordhood
- ▶ Problem is considerable but perhaps not caused by other types of grammatical markers to the same extent
- ▶ So, why might indexes be different?

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS

- ▶ “Extrametricity” possibly due to probabilistic/diachronic interaction
- ▶ Indexes often at margins (Bybee 1985), only place where extrametricity can manifest itself
- ▶ Indexes don’t support suffixing preference (Siewierska 2004: 165), and preposed material less integrated (e.g., Himmelmann 2014)
- ▶ Higher probability to “delay” full fusion with word domain

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS

- ▶ “Duality:” pronouns often divide into emphatic and reduced variants, unlike case/tense markers
- ▶ Emphatic variants are preferably prosodically heavy, which prevents fusion over time
- ▶ Reduced variants are probably more token-frequent, which contributes to fusion over time

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS

- ▶ Word-internal “mobility:” perhaps reanalysis of “exuberant agreement,” as in Batsbi (Nakh-Daghestanian; bbl; Harris 2008: 265)?

(7) **v**-ux-**v**-erc'-**v**-ie

AGR-back-**AGR**-return-**AGR**-PST

'turn him back'

presumably gets externalized
(Haspelmath 1993), if vacuously

possible result: free variation between
prefix and suffix

*(v)-ux-erc'-(v)-ie

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS

- ▶ Word-external “mobility:” perhaps because agreement is ultimately with mental entity (referent), not with formal element (Kibrik 2019)
- ▶ Indexation compatible with every member of the predicate because all of them mentally tied to the referent in some way (iconic marking)
- ▶ How many indexes are actually found? Competition between economy and iconicity (Croft 2003: ch. 4)
- ▶ Diachronic path from iconic to economical? Cf. Haiman (1985)

CONCLUSION

- ▶ Indexes present a major challenge to wordhood, perhaps more so than exponents of other categories
- ▶ Causes seem to be their potential for emphasis and multiple marking – suggests interplay between diachrony and usage/communicative patterns
- ▶ More data, and from more categories, needed
- ▶ More nuanced and consistent terminology required

REFERENCES

- Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and universals*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crysmann, Berthold & Olivier Bonami. 2016. Variable morphotactics in Information-Based Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 52, 311-374.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2004. *The Jarawara language of southern Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W., & Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2003. Word: A typological framework. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), *Word*, 1-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Epps, Patience. 2008. *A grammar of Hup*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Fuß, Eric. 2005. *The rise of agreement*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gunnink, Hilde. 2018. *A grammar of Fwe*. PhD dissertation, University of Gent.
- Haiman, John. 1985. *Natural syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Alice. 2008. Explaining exuberant agreement. In Porhállur Eythórsson (ed.), *Grammatical change and linguistic theory*, 265-283. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. The diachronic externalization of inflection. *Linguistics* 31, 279-309.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax. *Folia Linguistica* 45, 31-80.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 2014. Asymmetries in the prosodic phrasing of function words: Another look at the suffixing preference. *Language* 90, 927-960.
- Julien, Marit. 2002. *Syntactic heads and word formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kibrik, Andrej. 2019. Rethinking agreement: Cognition-to-form mapping. *Cognitive Linguistics* 30, 37-83.
- Kim, Yuni. 2008. *Topics in the phonology and morphology of San Francisco del Mar Huave*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Peterson, John. 2011. *A grammar of Kharia*. Leiden: Brill.
- Reh, Mechthild. 1985. *Die Krongo-Sprache (Niinò Mó-di)*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Eijk, Jan. 1997. *The Lillooet language*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Wilson, Jennifer. 2017. *A grammar of Yeri*. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Zingler, Tim. 2020. *Wordhood issues: Typology and grammaticalization*. PhD dissertation, University of New Mexico.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2014. (Anti)-cliticization in Mapudungun. *Morphology* 24, 161-175.