Against a metaphoristic approach to grammaticalisation

Nick Nicholas (n.nicholas@linguistics.unimelb.edu.au)

Linguistics & Applied Linguistics Seminar Series,
University of Melbourne; 1998–10–28

1. Grammaticalisation

Grammaticalisation: tracing development of grammatical forms;
Persistence: e.g. will, shall, going to
Meaning Retention:

- ab > b Bleaching
- ab > bc Loss-and-gain
- ab > bc > cd Implicature

Metaphor: Isomorphic transfer from one semantic domain to another
“The essence of metaphor is understanding one thing in terms of another”
(Lakoff & Johnson)

Grammaticalisation chain (Heine):
PERSON > OBJECT > PROCESS > SPACE > TIME > QUALITY

Metonymy: Context-Induced Reinterpretation
E.g. I am going to get married > I intend to marry > I will marry

Counterexample: Moving-World vs. Moving-Ego tenses:
French: I come from marrying = I have just married
Chagga: I come to marry = I will marry

2. pu

Relativiser (includes cleft, pseudo-relativiser)
Realis Adjuncts: causal, temporal, circumstance, resultative, contrastive, concessive

Nominaliser: mexri pu ‘until that’, para pu ‘than that’, mono pu ‘it’s just that’
Complementary distribution with irrealis marker na: mexri pu ~ mexri na
Irrealis versions of pu-functions covered by pu na: intensional relativisations, irrealis results, unrealisable concessives, optatives

Complementiser: pu oti/pos na
Na irrealis (cf. English infinitive); e.g. arxizo ‘start’, òelo ‘want’, anagazo ‘force’
Oti/pos unmarked realis (cf. English that); e.g. leo ‘say’, elpizo ‘hope’, nomizo ‘think’, ksero ‘know’
Pu factive (cf. English participle); e.g. metaniono ‘regret’, vlepo ‘see’, ksero ‘know’
Factivity: presuppose truth of complements
Classical test—preserves truth under negation: I do not regret telling you +> I told you
True factives (emotives) preserve truth under negation: Do you regret telling him? +> You told him
Semi-factives (cognitive, perception) do not: Did you know that he arrived? Did you see him arrive?

Standard Modern Greek: *pu* obligatory with true factives:

\[\text{metaniono pu su to pa} \, \text{‘I regret telling you’}\]

Encodes direct vs. indirect perception:

\[\text{ton ida pu erxotan ‘I saw him coming’}\]
\[\text{ida oti erxotan ‘I saw that he was coming’}\]

Marked for givenness with semi-factives:

\[\text{dimame pu epine ka\thetae vra\deltai ‘I recall how he used to drink every night’}\]
\[\text{dimame oti epine ka\thetae vra\deltai ‘I remember the fact that he drank every night’}\]
\[\text{ksexase pu epine ka\thetae vra\deltai ‘he’s (conveniently) forgotten that he used to drink every night’}\]

*pu* is factive in Greek.

Christidis: *pu*<\land<\hbox{h\text{	extdegree}a} ‘where’; *na*<\hbox{h\text{	extdegree}a} ‘whither’

so conceptual metaphor:

- stationary in space > ‘static’, given in discourse
- directional in space > ‘dynamic’, hypothetical in discourse

*pu* and *na* conscripted as a SPACE > DISCOURSE conceptual metaphor

3. Counterevidence

I. MACEDONIAN SLAVONIC COMPLEMENTATION

\[\text{fio deka, oti da}\]

*deka* is locative; *fio* is relativiser

\[\therefore\text{. Relativisers, not locatives, become factive complementisers}\]

II. *h\text{	extdegree}a*

Already in Homeric Greek, *h\text{	extdegree}a* is purposive

Purposive is itself adequate to account for subsequent development:

I tell you in order for you to go +> I tell you to go +> I want you to go

\[\therefore\text{. Not ultimate etymon, but first salient function steers development}\]

Homeric *h\text{	extdegree}a* stationary (16:1)

Attic *h\text{	extdegree}a* directional, but obsolescent (literary); purposive *h\text{	extdegree}a* colloquial

\[\therefore\text{. Directionality irrelevant to development of *h\text{	extdegree}a*}\]

Closest cognate to *h\text{	extdegree}a* is Sanskrit instrumental yéna ‘by which’

Instrumental as plausible an origin of a purposive as an allative (English *so*; *to*)
3. HEBREWS

‘athar ‘place’ > ‘asher/she: relativiser, causal connective, complementiser

General complementiser: appears in non-factive and even irrealis contexts

Grammaticalisation with same starting point as pu can have different endpoint

4. DIALECTAL COMPLEMENTATION

Dialects in which pu independently introduces non-factive realis complements (e.g. hope, think, say that...): Tsakonian, Corfiot, Thracian, Livisiot, Italiot, Macedonian Greek (latter under Macedonian Slavonic influence)

Italiot: also introduces event complements: èftasa pu ‘in essiànosa/ ti xítari tto Teù ‘I managed to bring together God’s grace’ (Palumbo)

RELATIVISER > FACTIVE COMPLEMENTISER > GENERAL COMPLEMENTISER

Relativiser the salient function, and factivity not inevitable

5. TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL

Infrequent counterexamples to factivity within Greek.

One strand: TEMPORAL > FUTURE TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL

opo rði tu stavru thá teliose ikosi xrono. ‘When the Feast of the Holy Cross comes, it will have been twenty years.’ (Apiranthos, Naxos)

”opo pjaso tuto apu kiniyo ki ala enã ka kano ðeka ‘When I catch this one that I’m hunting and with another nine, and that makes ten.’ (Cythera)

opo to vris inda xo mesa sti fuxta mu ‘If you find it what I have in my fist = guess if you can what I am hiding in my palm’ (Çesme)

Cross-linguistically common path (cf. German wenn); prevented in Greek by persistence of factivity of relativiser

6. ANTI-FACTIVES

Semantically pragmatic implicatures:

sopa pu pires medalio ‘Be silent that you have won a medal = Be silent! You have not won a medal!’

Accretion onto factive-<i>pu</i>. Yet why is factive-<i>pu</i> any less of an accretion?

Distribution of <i>pu</i> a result of contingent developments, kept in some order by persistence and subsequent analogical levelling, but not intrinsic

Distribution of <i>pu</i> cannot be the result of deliberate problem-solving
7. GRADUALISM

Different functions of *pu* permeate language to differing extents

e.g. Temporal: Main exponent in Ulagaç, one of two main exponents in Tsakonian (1.8‰); cf. 0.2‰ for Makriyannis’ Memoirs (1828–1850), 0.02‰ for Taktsis’ The Third Wedding (1963)—2 instances; cf. 386 instances of *otan*.

e.g. Concessive: 2 instances of *ke pu* ‘even given that’ in ca. 8 million words of text (Hellas-L mailing list, Nov. 1995–Jan. 1998)—cf. 812 for *an ke* ‘even though’.

.: Distribution of *pu* cannot be the result of a single deliberate metaphorist move; all semantic fields encompassed by the metaphor should be served equally

8. DISCOURSE CONNECTIVE

No evidence, phonological or semantic, of LOCATIVE > COMPLEMENTISER

Complementisers have good pedigree in *pu* (cf. Givón on ‘asher):

CAUSAL > EMOTIVE ‘I regret, because I saw’ > ‘I regret that I saw’ (*metaniono pu iḍa*)

RELATIVE > PERCEPTION ‘I saw the student that wrote’ > ‘I saw the student writing’ (*iḍa ton maḥṭī pu eṣrāfe*)

temporal > cognitive ‘I remember (the time) when you came’ > ‘I recall you coming’ (*θimane pu iḍes*)

Much evidence of locative > discourse connective, including phonological (’*opu*); cf. English whereupon

exaṣa ti ēnēka mu; opios ti vri θa tu ḏoṣo moyalo riyalo. ’*opu* tote lipo treksane oli... ‘I have lost my wife; whoever finds her, I will give him a great reward. So then they all ran...’ (Kythnos)

This conceptual metaphor is obvious; the putative metaphor for discourse givenness in complementisers is not

.: Metaphoricist effects in the lexeme are distinct from most of what happened to *pu*

4. Conclusion

*pu* is non-prototypical grammaticalisation: ABSTRACT > MORE ABSTRACT, not CONCRETE > ABSTRACT

Metaphoricism does not apply; more profitably viewed as series of contingent, metonymic (contextual) reanalyses, smoothed over analogically.