

Grammar Writing and Diachronic Typology: Friends or Foes?

GOALS & OUTLINE

Goals: argue that it is crucial that grammar writers investigate, and include in their grammars, the evolution of features and constructions of the language under study

- case study on case marking in Jodì-Sáliban

Outline:

1. Introduction
 - Diachronic Typology
 - Grammar writing
 - The role of diachrony in grammars
2. Case Study
 - DOM in Sáliban
 - Instrumental and locative cases in Piaroa and Sáliba
 - Adding Jodì to the mix
 - Implications for the description of Mako
3. Final thoughts

INTRODUCTION: DIACHRONIC TYPOLOGY

Typology:

- synchronic distribution of particular features or patterns
- synchronic explanations for observed distributions

Diachronic typology:

- Typology of grammaticalization paths (Croft (1991) on negation, Heine & Kuteva (2007))
- Recent work (e.g. Cristofaro 2013, 2017; Hendery 2012; *inter alia*) shows the importance of considering diachrony as explanation
 - Observed distributions may be the result of common grammaticalization paths

INTRODUCTION: GRAMMAR WRITING

Grammar writing or grammaticography:

- Increasing number of works dedicated to its theorization
 - Payne & Weber 2006
 - Ameka, Dench & Evans 2006
 - Nakayama & Rice 2014
 - Nikolaeva 2016
 - Aikhenvald 2015
 - Camp et al. 2018
- Propose best practices regarding (primarily):
 - Coverage
 - Organization

INTRODUCTION: ROLE OF DIACHRONY (part 1)

- However, role of diachrony in grammar writing still relatively undertheorized
 - Sometimes completely left out of work discussing the methodology of grammar writing (e.g. Nikolaeva 2016) or only marginally mentioned:
 - “Though not commonly included in **synchronic grammars**, some grammars mention the historical linguistic facts behind some constructions and lexical items where known. For example, the source of loanwords is often indicated, as are instances of grammaticalization (see Rice 2006, 402).” (Camp et al, 2018; emphasis added)
 - Sometimes mentioned but sending mixed messages:
 - “An academic reference grammar is a complex study which can be enriched by incorporating diachronic, ethnographic, and theoretical dimensions. [...] For example, inclusion of **excessive diachronic discussion can obscure the synchronic details** and produce a study that is primarily historical; this is clearly a worthy endeavor, but one with a different function and goals than a descriptive reference grammar.” (Genetti 2014:121; emphasis added)

INTRODUCTION: ROLE OF DIACHRONY (part 1)

- Two notable exceptions are:
 - Rankin 2006
 - Post 2013
- Perhaps also Aikhenvald (2015)
 - “A reference grammar is primarily synchronic—the language is analysed as it is at a given point in time.” (p. 210)
 - “Adding a historical diachronic facet to a synchronic description may shed some light on the reasons why a form, or a construction, has come about, and how this may have happened. The processes of grammaticalization and reanalysis take place gradually over some time. Incomplete grammaticalization may create additional issues, both for the analysis, and for its presentation in a grammar.” (p. 211)
- But why is this?
 - As Rankin (2006:527) mentions, it is likely that this stems from the “Saussurian prohibition against mixing synchrony and diachrony”.

Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- DOM in Sáliban
- Instrumental and locative cases
- Adding Jodi to the mix
- Implications for the description of Mako

3. Final thoughts

TODAY IN A NUTSHELL

- I will use my personal experience writing a grammar of Mako (see Rosés Labrada, 2015) to show how paying close attention to comparative data and diachrony can improve an analysis
 - In other words, a story of WHAT NOT TO DO
- Story goes:
 - *-ni* marker proposed as *non-subject marker* occurring on O, R, locative, goal, instrumental, and adjunct arguments
 - Comparative data from Sáliba, Piaroa and Jodi suggest that there were two proto-Jodi-Sáliban case markers
 - a better analysis of the Mako data might be to posit two homophonous case markers

JODĪ-SÁLIBAN: BACKGROUND

- Jodī-Sáliban is a small language family (see Rosés Labrada, 2016, forthcoming)
 - Sáliban: Sáliba (slc), Piaroa (pid), Mako (wpc)
 - Jodī (yau)
- spoken in Venezuela and Colombia
- Mako, Piaroa and Jodī are relatively vital; Sáliba is critically endangered
- Different degrees of description: Mako > Sáliba > Piaroa > Jodī



Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- **DOM in Sáliban**
- Instrumental and locative cases
- Adding Jodi to the mix
- Implications for the description of Mako

3. Final thoughts

DOM: MAKO *-ni* (part 1)

- Suffix *-ni* can mark O and R but it is highly correlated with animacy → **DOM**

Mako

- (1) $k^{w\tilde{a}^?d\tilde{o}-ni}$ $\text{d}\check{z}i-b-aw-ah-i$
2SG–grandmother–NON.SUBJ call–B–MID–MOT–IMP
‘go call your grandmother!’
- (2) $its-uhu-ni$ $l\check{e}r\tilde{o}$ $ts-i?i$
DUM–CL.FEM–NON.SUBJ watch DUM–CL
- $\emptyset-id\check{z}-in-obe$
3SG.MASC–give–PST–TAM2
‘he was giving the watch to the woman’

(Rosés Labrada 2015:344)

DOM: MAKO *-ni* (part 1)

- But it can also mark locative (3) and goal arguments (4)

(3) hōba–ma tebo–**ni** h–ō–∅
that.one–TOP? woods–NON.SUBJ stand–CL.MASC–3COP
‘he lives in the woods’ (lit. ‘he always stands in the woods’)

(4) ã–hĩb–emi–ma tahi–da wãt^h–ō–da
3SG.MASC–hide–ADV2–TOP? [filler] hollow.trunk–CONTR?

lahu–**ni**–ma

tsi–b–ib–iki

hole–NON.SUBJ–TOP?

go_into–B–?–NEG

‘where it (the agouti) hides is inside hollow trunks; it does not go into holes’

(Rosés Labrada 2015:347)

DOM: MAKO *-ni* (part 3)

- Finally, it can also mark an instrumental argument (5)

(5) *martillo-ni* [?]do-b-i Ø-ik^w-in-obe
hammer-NON.SUBJ hit-B-NON.FIN 3SG.MASC-AUX-PST-TAM2
'he was hitting [the carrot] with a hammer'

(Rosés Labrada 2015:345)

- This led me to describe *-ni* as a non-subject marker
 - It is important to note that some speakers marginally have this marker as *-li* but all attested cases are on O or R
 - Likely also related to the dialectal difference between *-al* and *-an* forms of the durative marker

DOM: PIAROA *-ri*

- In Piaroa, there is also marker that occurs on O (6) and R (7) arguments, also dependent on animacy → **DOM**

Piaroa

(6) uku ^ht^hi-**ri** ^htʁ-p-u-hæ
2SG.PRO 1SG.PRO-OBJ see-P-NON.FIN-2
'You look at me/you see me.' (Mosonyi 2000:662)

(7) dæhe k^w-ij-æk^w-aʔati ^ht^hi-**ri**-mæ
WHAT 2SG-give-FUT-PERMANENTLY 1SG.PRO-OBJ-TOP
'What are you going to give me?' (Krute 1989:147)

DOM: SÁLIBA *-ri*

- Sáliba has a suffix *-ri* with a similar function and similar form → DOM
 - In some dialects is *-di*

Sáliba

(8) h́isi da-d-ǎ-ʔri ɖ́áma-**ri** h́idanóhoʔo rãpó-ho
I kill-1SG-IND-3MASC.COMP deer-COMP there woods-LOC
'I killed the deer there in the woods'

(9) h́isi tʃ-itʃ-ǎ-xa k^weluta-ʔa tʃ-átʃu-**ri**
I 1SG-give-IND-3FEM.COMP paper-CL 1SG-older.sister-COMP
'I gave the notebook to my older sister.'

(10) h́isi tʃ-óxu-**ri** tʃ-itʃ-ǎ-xa óli-**ri**
I 1SG-mother-COMP 1SG-give-IND-3FEM.COMP dog-COMP
'I gave the dog to my mother' (Morse and Frank 1997:46, 51)

INTERIM SUMMARY

So far,

- Mako *-ni* used with O, R, goal, locative and instrumental arguments and also some adjuncts
 - Only in O and R does it appear as *-li*
 - On O or R, it appears on animates over inanimates (DOM)
- Piaroa has *-ri* used with O or R, it appears on animates
- Sáliba has *-ri* used with O or R, it appears on animates

- A system like this could perhaps taken to be similar Spanish DOM (see for a summary García García 2018)
 - *ad* ‘to’ → ‘a’ DO (primarily before animate O arguments)

Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- DOM in Sáliban
- **Instrumental and locative cases**
- Adding Jodi to the mix
- Implications for the description of Mako

3. Final thoughts

SÁLIBA *-na*

- Locative (11) and instrumental (12) arguments are marked with a *-na* suffix, which Estrada Ramírez (1996) calls an ‘inesive’

Sáliba

(11) hũã suk^wa-**na** Ø-íx-a
Juan town-INES 3SG.M-be-REAL

‘Juan is in town’

(12) jo-ho ukũ-di nũgu-**na** po-Ø-ã-gi
DIST-CN.1b 2SG.PRO-DAT stick-INES hit-3SG.M-REAL-2SG

‘He hit you with a stick.’

(Estrada Ramírez 1996:47-48)

PIAROA *-næ*

- Although not really described, Piaroa has a *-næ* suffix for instrumental (13) and locative (14) arguments.

Piaroa

(13) *dæhæ-næ* *i^h-k^wæk-æhi* *ow^ho-ba-ri*
what-INST 3SG.MASC-kill-PST tapir-CL:ROUND-OBJ
‘How/with what did he kill the fat tapir?’ (Krute 1989:147)

(14) *penenä* *kötta* *pä’ö*
p-ene-næ *k^hĩ-t^h-a* *pæ-ʔ-i*
PROX-ADV1-LOC cut-3PL-FUT say-CLS2-NON.FIN
‘...so that they cut here’ (Babel033:181)

Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- DOM in Sáliban
- Instrumental and locative cases
- **Adding Jodī to the mix**
- Implications for the description of Mako

3. Final thoughts

JODĪ =*nī* (part 1)

- Jodī has a suffix whose form is =*nī* for animate O (15) and *likë* for animate R (16) arguments
 - The second one could be thought of as *li+kë*, where *kë* is a directional suffix (translated as ‘a’—i.e. ‘to’—by Quatra 2008:172)

Jodī

(15) ama = **nī** abe di!
mother = POST.POS 1 call ACT:IMP
‘call your mother!’

(16) jkë ama **likë** jkajtī di
2SG.PRO mother INDIR.OBJ give ACT:IMP
‘Give (it) to your mother!’

(Quatra 2008a:233)

JODĪ =*nī* (part 2)

- This =*nī* can also mark instrumental arguments (17)

Jodĭ

(17) A: jkwëjæ = **nĭ**
what.thing = POST.POS₁
‘with what?’

B: jela = **nĭ**
machete = POST.POS₁
‘with the machete’

(Quatra 2008a:200)

JODĪ =nī (part 3)

- The language also uses =nī with locative (18) and (temporal) adjunct arguments (19)
 - According to Quatra (2008), only in the locative does it have variants =në and =na

Jodĭ

(18) jye nuwe = **nī**
1SG house = POST.POS₁
‘in my house’

(19) baede jtuwö = **nī**
before year = POST.POS₁
‘many years ago’

(Quatra 2008a:200)

SUMMARY

TABLE 1 Summary of the different markers

	Sáliba	Piaroa	Mako	Jodï
O	<i>-rĩ~ -di</i>	<i>-rĩ</i>	<i>-nĩ~ lĩ</i>	<i>= nĩ</i>
R	<i>-rĩ~ -di</i>	<i>-rĩ</i>	<i>-nĩ~ lĩ</i>	<i>= likë</i>
GOAL			<i>-nĩ</i>	
LOCATIVE	<i>-na</i>	<i>-næ</i>	<i>-nĩ</i>	<i>= nĩ/ = në/ = na</i>
INSTRUMENTAL	<i>-na</i>	<i>-næ</i>	<i>-nĩ</i>	<i>= nĩ</i>
ADJUNCT			<i>-nĩ</i>	<i>= nĩ</i>

Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- DOM in Sáliban
- Instrumental and locative cases
- Adding Jodi to the mix
- **Implications for the description of Mako**

3. Final thoughts

RECONSTRUCTING TWO MARKERS?

- Based on regular sound correspondences, we can also perhaps do the same grouping we did based on function and distribution
 - **-li* for O and R, with DOM
 - **-na* for instrument and locative arguments

n	n	n	n	120 (nas), 172 x2, 215	98 (nas), 154, 160 (nas), 186, 204	102, 185
s	r	l/r	l	207, 210	24, 35 (nas), 39, 48, 201, 203, 209, 214 (nas), 215 x2	7, 26, 30, 77, 103, 152, 160, 190
a	æ	a	a	38, 99, 120 x 2, 139, 215 x2	69, 103, 131, 160, 202 x2, 205, 207, 214	12, 43, 64, 70, 158, 166, 169 :
i	i	i	i	13	37, 204, 207	23, 54, 73, 90, 13: 166, 178, 185

	Sáliba	Piaroa	Mako	Quatra (2008a,b)
PROX/DIST	<i>-ene/-eno</i>	<i>-ena/-ene</i>	<i>-ena</i>	<i>-öna/-öni</i>

Outline:

1. Introduction

- Diachronic Typology
- Grammar writing
- The role of diachrony in grammars

2. Case Study

- DOM in Sáliban
- Instrumental and locative cases
- Adding Jodi to the mix
- Implications for the description of Mako

3. Final thoughts

FINAL THOUGHTS

- I have shown that Mako *-ni*, which I analyzed before as a non-subject marker, is probably better analyzed as two different homophonous suffixes:
 - one that occurs on (mostly) animate O and R and
 - one that occurs on instrument and locative arguments
- In other words, the comparative data can result in a better analysis for the language under study
- At the same time, this also makes it clear that the locative/directional > DOM path from Spanish is probably not applicable here
 - Hence contributing to (or at least not muddying the waters for) diachronic typology—as well as to synchronic typology

FINAL THOUGHTS

- Rankin (2006:527)'s advice:
 - “So the field worker and synchronic grammar writer must be familiar not only with typology but with the comparative method and all that is available in the way of historical and comparative phonology and grammar within the language family he or she is studying.”
- How to add this info to my grammar?
 - You can have “historical notes” and “comparative notes” as in Epps (2008)

Historical note

It is likely that the Possessive marker *nih* in Hup is of relatively recent origin. Yuhup has what appears to be a cognate possessive suffix *-nəh*, which likewise associates with the possessor (Ospina 2002: 243), but Dâw has instead an optional genitive marker *-ēj* (Martins 1994: 34), and Nadëb is reported to have no specific morphological marker of possession at all (Weir 1984: 86).

Comparative note

The verb *ni-* is an areal feature. It exists in Tukano with essentially identical form, meaning, and many of the same functions as it has in Hup (particularly as a copula and in existence clauses; cf. Ramirez 1997a: 140), as well as in the East Tukanoan languages Wanano (Stenzel 2004: 327) and Desano (Miller 1999: 67) (although with somewhat varying functions and forms). It also occurs – again with virtually the same form and meaning – in several other Nadahup languages, including Yuhup (Ospina 2002: 138, etc.) and Dâw (V. Martins 1994: 154). A similar form *ni-* ‘do’ in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003a: 606–608) may also be related.

Thank you! Questions?

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Ameka, F. K., Dench, A., Evans, N. (eds). 2006. *Catching Language. The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*. Trends in Linguistics 167. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2015. *The Art of Grammar: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: OUP
- Cristofaro, S. 2013. The referential hierarchy: Reviewing the evidence in diachronic perspective. In *Languages Across Boundaries: Studies in Memory of Anna Siewierska*, eds. Dik Bakker & Martin Haspelmath, 69-93. Berlin: dGM
- Epps, Patience. 2008. *A grammar of Hup*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Genetti, Carol. 2014. Walking the Line: Balancing Description, Argumentation and Theory in Academic Grammar Writing. In *The Art and Practice of Grammar Writing*, eds. Toshhide Nakayama and Keren Rice, 121-134. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press
- Nikolaeva, I. 2015. Reference Grammars. In *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (HSK)*, eds. G. Ungeheuer & H. Wiegand, Volume 3, 2036-2063. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Post, Mark. 2013. Diachrony in description: Making sense of the grammar of X. Presentation at *BernerZirkel für Sprachwissenschaft*. May 2013.
- Quatra, Miguel Marcelo. 2008a. *Bajkewa jkwikädëwa-jya : jodi ine-dodo ine = Diccionario básico : castellano-jodi*. Caracas: Ediciones IVIC.
- Rankin, Robert. 2006. The interplay of synchronic and diachronic discovery in Siouan grammar-writing. In *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*, eds. Felix Ameka, Alan Dench, and Nicholas Evans, 527-547. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Rosés Labrada, Jorge Emilio. (forthcoming). Jodi-Sáliban: A new linguistic family of the Pacific Northwest. *IJAL*
- Rosés Labrada, Jorge Emilio. 2016. Proto-Sáliban verb classes. *IJAL* 82(2): 181-210.
- Rosés Labrada, Jorge Emilio. 2015. *The Mako Language: Vitality, Grammar and Classification*. The University of Western Ontario & Université Lumière-Lyon 2