

Complex adpositions in Romance Languages

Benjamin Fagard, Dejan Stosic, José Pinto de Lima

In this talk, we describe the systems of complex adpositions in modern Romance languages. One obvious question with respect to complex adpositions is that of their status: are they simply a morphosyntactically complex variant of simple adpositions? How do we define them? There have been a few studies on complex adpositions in individual Romance languages (for instance Spanish, Cifuentes Honrubia 2003, or Portuguese, Pinto de Lima 2014), and a few papers on complex adpositions in Romance languages in general (for instance Fagard & Mardale 2007), there is still much to say. With a corpus-based analysis focusing on three Romance languages, French, Portuguese and Romanian, we show that some features of complex adpositions are common to most if not all varieties, while some seem to be specificities of one or more Romance language(s). One case in point is the way such constructions can be tested (see Adler 2001, 2008), for instance with possessives – a test which does not seem to affect French and Portuguese (Catalan, etc.) CAs in the same way. The clear contrast which appears in French between non-lexicalized constructions and CAs on account of their intolerance to the possessive (*à la place de Jean* → *à sa place* ‘in John’s seat’ ; *au lieu de Jean* → **à son lieu* ‘in John’s stead’) is not found in Portuguese, as in this language CAs do not exhibit this particularity, or at least to a lesser extent (*por causa do João* / *por sua causa* ‘because of John/of him’, *em seu lugar* ‘in his stead’, etc.). We go on to formulate a hypothesis as to the development of CAs in various Romance languages, suggesting it may not have been parallel.

References

- Adler, Silvia. 2001. « Les locutions prépositives : questions de méthodologie et de définition », *Travaux de linguistique* 42-43(1), 157-170.
- Adler, Silvia (2008). French compound prepositions, prepositional locutions and prepositional phrases in the scope of the absolute use. In: Kurzon & Adler (eds.), *Adpositions: Pragmatic, semantic and syntactic perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17-35.
- Cifuentes Honrubia, José Luís. 2003. *Locuciones prepositivas – sobre la gramaticalización preposicional en español*. Alicante : Universidad de Alicante.
- Fagard, B. & A. Mardale. 2007. Systèmes prépositionnels des langues romanes : la notion de partie du discours en diachronie. *Actes du XXIVe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, D. Trotter (ed), Tübingen : Niemeyer.
- Pinto de Lima, José. 2014. Grammaticalization of complex prepositions in European Portuguese. In José Pinto de Lima, *Studies on Grammaticalization and Lexicalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa, 163-183.

Complex prepositions in Dutch

Matthias Hüning

In my contribution to the workshop, I will show that the class of prepositions is not a closed class in Dutch. I will provide a short overview of the possibilities to extend this class. The focus of my talk will be on structural and historical aspects of constructions like *aan de hand van* ‘by means of; on the basis of’ or *met betrekking tot* ‘with regard to’, constructions that function as complex prepositions in modern Dutch.

Dutch will be compared with other West Germanic languages with respect to the emergence and the use of such complex prepositions and I will provide a tentative explanation for the striking parallels that can be found.

References

Horst, Joop van der. 2010. *Met (het) oog op morgen: Opstellen over taal, taalverandering en standaardtaal. (UPL in context)*. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.

Hüning, Matthias. 2014. Over complexe preposities en convergentie. In Freek Van de Velde, Hans Smessaert, Frank Van Eynde & Sara Verbrugge (eds.), *Patroon en argument. Een dubbelfeestbundel bij het emeritaat van William Van Belle en Joop van der Horst*, 433–445. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.

Wouden, Ton van der. 2006. Nederlandse voorzetsels tussen Duitse en Engelse. In Matthias Hüning, Ulrike Vogl, Ton van der Wouden & Arie Verhagen (eds.), *Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels*, 183–206. (SNL-reeks 15). Leiden: SNL.

Variation in word order of German complex prepositions during grammaticalization

Christian Ebert

German complex prepositions originate from several sources, like prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases and subordinated sentences, with prepositional phrases consisting of a primary preposition and a noun with a genitive complement being particularly productive. While in present-day German, where the unmarked position of the adnominal genitive is postnominal except for proper nouns, these complex structures are always prepositional (1a). In Early New High German and early modern German, with the position of adnominal genitive attributes being more variable, there are also circumpositional variants co-existing (1b).

- (1) a. *anstatt* [*eines Sohns*]_{GEN}
b. *an* [*eines Sohns*]_{GEN} *Statt*
'instead of a son'

In the case of the complex preposition *anstatt* 'instead of', the loss of a productive circumpositional usage might be due to a general tendency of complex prepositions to show the same word order like primary prepositions, as claimed by Lindqvist (1994) and Di Meola (2000), or to the decline of prenominal genitive attributes in Early New High German.

This study aims to determine, if the complex preposition *anstatt* is affected by the decline of prenominal genitives in the source construction, by comparing the frequency of its word order variants with pre- and postnominal genitive attributes of non-grammaticalized nouns in the extended corpus of the DTA in the time from 1500 to 1800.

Using a fitted generalized linear mixed model which included the fixed effects time, animacy and semantic type of the genitive noun, significant differences were found between the frequency of prenominal genitives in productive noun phrases for several lexemes and the *anstatt* constructions. Since there were also significant differences between all nominal head noun lexemes considered for the productive genitive pattern, it is not possible to establish a general word order pattern for genitive attributes to compare with the complex preposition. Nevertheless, the data can yield some insights in the rise and decline of the word order variants of *anstatt* during the process of grammaticalization.

Lindqvist, Christer (1994): *Zur Entstehung von Präpositionen im Deutschen und Schwedischen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Di Meola, Claudio (2000): *Die Grammatikalisierung deutscher Präpositionen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Recycling grammar – development of (complex) adpositions in Estonian

Anni Jürine

University of Tartu

In this talk I give an overview of complex adpositions (CAs) in Estonian with a special focus on complex *postpositions* (CPs). The development of CPs is here viewed as an instance of recycling grammar – a phenomenon where new complex grammatical items develop as lexical and grammatical components merge (see Jürine & Habicht 2013, 2017).

Most Estonian postpositions are simple postpositions. The development of CPs in Estonian is a process still in its early stages and has (thus) so far received very little attention. Until quite recently (Veismann & Erelt 2017) the (sub)category was not found in grammars.

CPs in Estonian include two components – a noun and a simple postposition. According to Jürine (2016), who investigated body part related complex postpositions, CPs in Estonian have the following characteristics: unit interpretation, desemanticization, decategorialization, and extension to new contexts. These features, which are listed also in many other accounts of CAs (e.g. Hoffmann 2005, Lehmann 2002, Moirón Bouma 2003, Adler 2008), may be used as criteria to distinguish Estonian CPs from their source form. Most CPs have both readings in contemporary Estonian:

Ex. *Poiss istus tüdruku selja taga* > *otsus tehakse rahva seljataga*
Boy sat girl.GEN back.GEN behind decision is made people.GEN back+behind
'The boy sat behind the girl's back' 'The decision is made behind people's back'
SIMPLE POSTPOSITIONAL PHRASE COMPLEX POSTPOSITION

As such, the development of CPs is part of a developmental cycle of function words in Estonian where new grammatical items are formed by simple grams merging with lexical items:

NOUN + LOC. CASE SUFFIX > SIMPLE POSTPOSITION

NOUN + SIMPLE POSTPOSITION > COMPLEX POSTPOSITION

As there are many parallels in the development of complex and simple postpositions, I observe the development of CPs against the backdrop of functional and formal properties of simple postpositions in Estonian. The investigation is carried out synchronically as well as diachronically. Synchronic analysis relies on data from the etTenTen corpus (270 million words), the diachronic development of the CPs is investigated based on data from COLE (Corpus of Old Literary Estonian; 2 million words) and CELL (Corpus of Estonian Literary Language; 4.5 million words).

References

Adler, Silvia. 2008. French compound prepositions, prepositional locutions and prepositional phrases in the scope of the absolute use. In Dennis Kurzon, Silvia Adler, (eds.) *Adpositions: Pragmatic, semantic and syntactic perspectives*. Typological Studies in Language 74. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 17–36.

Hoffmann, Sebastian 2005. *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions: a corpus-based study*. Routledge Advances in Corpus Linguistics. London: Routledge.

Jürine, Anni. 2016. *The development of complex postpositions in Estonian: a case of grammaticalization via lexicalization.* *Dissertationes Philologiae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis* vol. 38.

Jürine, Anni & Külli Habicht. 2013. Kaassõnade tsükiline areng. [The cycle of postpositions] *Keel ja Kirjandus* vol. 12, 736–749.

Jürine, Anni & Külli Habicht. (in press). Grammaticalization of complex items: Estonian *nii et* ‘so that’, ‘so’. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics*, 8 (2).

Lehmann, Christian 2002. New Reflections on Grammaticalization and Lexicalization. In Ilse Wischer, Gabriele Diewald (eds.) *New Reflections on Grammaticalization.* *Typological Studies in Language* 49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1–18.

Moirón, Begoña Villada, Gosse Bouma 2003. A corpus-based approach to the acquisition of collocational prepositional phrases. In *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002: Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13–17, 2002.* 2003, 153–158.

Veismann, Ann & Mati Ereht 2017. Kaassõnafraas [The Adpositional Phrase]. In Mati Ereht, Helle Metslang (eds.) *Eesti keele süntaks.* *Eesti Keele Varamu* vol. 3. Tartu University Press, 446–462.

Prepositions in Brythonic Celtic: Stability and Contact-Induced Change

Kevin Rottet

Prepositions represent a significant part of what is distinctive about the Celtic languages. Many prepositions trigger initial consonant mutations (Breizh ‘Brittany’ but da Vreizh ‘to Brittany’); simple prepositions are ‘conjugated’ for pronominal complements (evit ma breur ‘for my brother’ but evitañ ‘for him’). There are several patterns of complex prepositions including one in which pronominal complements take the form of possessive infixes (a-raok ‘before’ but en ho raok ‘before you’, cf. ho ‘your’). Additionally, language contact, with English (in the case of Welsh) and French (where Breton is concerned) has played a role in recent times. For instance, Breton expressions for ‘up’ and ‘down’ (d’al laez ‘to the top’, d’an traoñ ‘to the base’) are only weakly grammaticalized whereas in Welsh, i fyny ‘to a mountain’ and i lawr ‘to a floor’ are highly grammaticalized and have undergone nearly total interlingual identification with the English words up and down, becoming full-fledged prepositions (and not just adverbs), and even competing with the traditional pattern of phrases of bodily posture, e.g. the contact-induced eistedd i lawr ‘to sit down’ versus the traditional mynd ar ei eistedd lit. ‘to go on his sitting’.

Greek complex adpositions as a key to Greek adpositional development

Pietro Bortone

University of Oxford

Greek is the Indo-European language with the longest and best-attested history: over three thousand years with relatively small gaps. This makes Greek a uniquely valuable terrain for studying, among other things, language change. In Greek, a whole system of adpositions – appearing, initially, both before and after nouns – can be observed coming into existence (in combination with an older case system), then fading and being renewed. The use of multiple adposition+case combinations (P1+case1, P1+case2, etc.) was slowly abandoned, but new combinations of adverbs with old adpositions (ADV1+P1, ADV1+P2) enabled the system to express lost semantic nuances. The strikingly rich Ancient Greek adpositional inventory was thus gradually replaced and diversified largely thanks to the use of compounds – which have become the norm in Modern Greek. Furthermore, in Modern Greek, a number of phrases distributionally comparable to prototypical adpositions are also in use. These can express meanings that Greek previously expressed with simple adpositions. One may therefore ask whether such Greek phrases, which are an open class, could be considered fully-fledged adpositions and, ultimately, where the boundaries of the ‘adposition’ category should be drawn. Those Greek phrases, after all, match constructions that are found in other modern European languages, and which some linguists want to classify as adpositions (e.g. ‘according to’, ‘at the time of’, ‘at the presence of’, ‘on the theme of’, ‘for the benefit of’, ‘under the power of’). This fact highlights also the elusive possibility that their use in Greek might be, in part, a contact-induced change.

Complex adpositions in Permic languages

Timofey Arkhangelskiy
Maria Usacheva

Just as other Uralic languages, Permic languages have postpositions and no prepositions. Complex postpositions are very rare in Permic languages. The probable reason for this is that usually the postpositions are quickly agglutinated into complex case markers instead of existing as postpositional clusters. Besides, Permic spatial systems are quite complex: they include spatial cases (up to 8 in Udmurt, up to 9 in Komi, depending on the variety), postpositions with adverbial-like properties, and relational nouns (inflected postpositions) with noun-like properties. Yazva Komi also has a very developed system of deictic units which are often used instead of spatial PPs. However, some complex postpositions do exist. They consist of elements denoting ‘front’, ‘back’, ‘bottom’, ‘top’, ‘side’ in Udmurt; ‘front’, ‘top’, ‘edge’, ‘upper part’ in Komi. Most of complex postpositions arise from PPs with the head with the meaning ‘side’ (Udmurt) or ‘edge’ (Komi). In Yazva Komi there are relational nouns derived from complex postpositions which consisted of two stems: $\nu\lambda r d \acute{a}l$ ‘upper part’ ($\leftarrow \nu\lambda l$ ‘top’ + $d\lambda r$ ‘edge’) and $u r d \acute{o}l$ ‘lower part’ ($\leftarrow u l$ ‘bottom’ + $d\lambda r$ ‘edge’).

Permic complex postpositions are similar to simple spatial relational nouns in many respects. In Udmurt, they attach nominal dependents in the nominative or in the genitive, like both full-fledged and relational nouns. Unlike full-fledged nouns and like relational nouns, they allow for nominative dependents with definite referential status. However, they only accept pronominal dependents in the genitive, which puts them one step lower on the grammaticalization path than ‘true’ relational nouns. In Komi, complex postpositions attach dependents only in the nominative.

Up in the mountains: Spatial categories in East Caucasian revisited

Michael Daniel (HSE/MSU)

The hallmark of the East Caucasian languages is the bimorphemic structure of their spatial forms (Kibrik 1970, 2001; Comrie & Polinsky 1998). With very few exceptions, all languages of the family share the same makeup of spatial nominal forms, with one category (traditionally called localization) designating the spatial area defined with respect to the landmark, and the other (traditionally called orientation) expressing the motion of the trajector. The static location (essive) is usually zero-marked, while the Goal (lative, but sometimes identical to the essive) and Source (elative) are expressed by special morphemes following the suffix of the localization. This encoding is apparently similar to the English *from under the table*; what makes East Caucasian structures special is that, apparently, they employ suffixes rather than complex prepositions. In my talk, I will show that at least in some of the languages of the family the orientation marker does not have exactly the same morphological status as the localization marker, making these forms less exotic typologically but at the same time more interesting from the morphosyntactic point of view. My data comes primarily from Mehweb, a lect of Dargwa branch; but I also show that the relevant constructions are observed in languages of other branches of the family in northern Daghestan, including Tsez (Tsezic), some Andic languages, Archi (Lezgian) and, to some extent, also in Rutul, a Lezgian language of southern Daghestan. This data suggests that the morphosyntax of these forms in East Caucasian shows a range of variation that has not been previously observed and has non-trivial theoretical implications.

