Maud Devos,
Jenneke van der Wal (Eds.)

'COME' AND 'GO' OFF THE BEATEN GRAMMATICALI- ZATION PATH

COME and GO
off the Beaten
Grammaticalization Path

Edited by
Maud Devos and Jenneke van der Wal

DE GRUYTER
MOUTON

MIX
Papier aus verantwor-
tungsvollen Quellen
FSC
www.fsc.org   FSC® C003147

Trends in Linguistics
Studies and Monographs

Volume 272

Foreword

From 2007–2011, the Belgian Science Policy funded an inter-university cooperation on Grammaticalization and (Inter)subjectification (GRAMIS), between the Universities of Ghent, Antwerp, Leuven, Louvain-la-Neuve, Hannover and the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Tervuren. We, the editors, were both involved in this project at the RMCA, where we studied the processes of grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification in the Bantu languages, spoken in sub-Saharan Africa.

Maud Devos drew on her earlier profound studies of the language Shangaci when she discovered a rather unexpected grammaticalized use of the verb 'go'. Inspired by this new and fascinating grammaticalization path (see the Introduction to this volume, as well as Devos and Van der Wal 2010), Maud developed a more general interest in the grammaticalization of motion verbs. It appeared to her that verbs of 'come' and 'go' are often taken as 'most basic', 'in deictic opposition' and known to develop into tense/aspect markers, whereas this is certainly not exceptionless – a conclusion also drawn by Wilkins and Hill (1995). We hence examined data on the semantics and grammaticalized uses of verbs of 'come' and 'go' in a number of Bantu languages, presenting the results at the International Conference of Historical Linguistics in Osaka (July 2011). More importantly, we organized a workshop to bring to light the less well known paths of grammaticalization of these verbs crosslinguistically, within the 44th meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, held in Logroño (Spain) in September 2011. This workshop attracted much international interest and was a great success in bringing scholars together working on the lexical semantics and grammaticalization of 'come' and 'go'.

With the interest of these researchers and the quality of the papers presented, we felt that the results should be published together, the outcome of which is the current book. We would like to thank the authors for their efforts, their cooperation and their patience. Furthermore, we are grateful to the external reviewers of the papers: Daniel van Olmen, Johan van der Auwera, María José Rodríguez Espiñeira, Matthew Juge, Amina Mettouchi, Iren Hartmann, Jacques Bres, Mario Squartini, and Claus Pusch.

Maud Devos   Brussels and Cambridge
Jenneke van der Wal   February 2014

Contributors

Philippe Bourdin
York University, Toronto
pbourdin@yorku.ca

Ana Bravo
University of Murcia
ana.bravo@um.es

Robert Carlson
Africa International University
robert_carlson@sil.org

Kelsey Daniels
Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics
klsydnls@gmail.com

Maud Devos
Royal Museum for Central Africa
maud.devos@africamuseum.be

Adina Dragomirescu
University of Bucharest and
"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti"
Institute of Linguistics
adina_drag@yahoo.com

Anna Giacalone Ramat
University of Pavia
annaram@unipv.it

Caterina Mauri
University of Pavia
caterina.mauri@unipv.it

Egle Mocciaro
University of Palermo
egle.mocciaro@gmail.com

Alexandru Nicolae
University of Bucharest and
"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti"
Institute of Linguistics
nicolae_bibi@yahoo.com

Andrea Sansò
University of Insubria
andrea.sanso@uninsubria.it

Jenneke van der Wal
University of Cambridge
jennekevanderwal@gmail.com

Contents

Maud Devos and Jenneke van der Wal
Introduction

1 Motivation

Verbs glossed as 'come' and 'go' are known to evolve into grammatical markers of tense and aspect (see e.g. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994), Bybee and Dahl (1989), Heine and Kuteva (2002)). Examples (1) to (4), taken from different Bantu languages, illustrate this. In (1) and (2), verbs expressing 'come' are used in constructions marking immediate past and remote future. The utterances in (3) and (4) illustrate the use of 'go' to express the habitual and a 'tomorrow' future.

(1)   Sesotho (Doke and Mofokeng 1957: 204, gloss added)

   u-tswa-rɛk-a
   SBJ$_{2SG}$-COME.FROM-buy-FV
   'I have just bought.'

(2)   Mwera (Harries 1950: 98 cited in Botne 2006: 161)

   many'any'i ci-ga-jie-w-a
   NP$_6$.grass   FUT-PP$_6$-RFUT(<come)-die-FV
   'The grass will die.'

(3)   Zulu (van Eeden 1956: 567, gloss added)

   u-ye   a-vuk-e   ekuseni   kakhulu
   SBJ$_1$-GO.SBJV SBJ$_1$-wake-SBJV in.the.morning   very
   'He usually gets up very early in the morning.'

(4)   Hunde (Mateene 1992: 25, cited in Botne 2006: 174)

   tw-eéndé-birangir-a   mu-kátsi
   SBJ$_{1PL}$-FUT(<go)-call-FV   NP$_1$-woman
   'We will call a woman tomorrow.'

However, 'come' and 'go' verbs are also known to travel down less common grammaticalization paths. The verb *entta* 'go' (cf. (5a)) in Shangaci, a Bantu language from Mozambique, is a case in point. It has evolved into a marker of verb focus, as in (5b): *entta* does not function as an autonomous lexical verb here

but has the effect of focussing the immediately following verb *rezula* 'sweep', contrasting it with other activities like 'pulling out the weed'.

(5) Shangaci (Niger-Congo, Bantu)

    a. lexical use of -*entta* (Devos and Van der Wal 2010: 46):

       mwaw-éntt-é   *vaaí*   *taána?*
       SBJ$_{1PL}$.PST-go-PFV where yesterday
       'Where did you (pl) go yesterday?'

    b. grammatical use of -*entta* (Devos and Van der Wal 2010: 53):

       miíyó *koów-áampel-e*   *o-khuruúp-a*
       I   SBJ$_{1SG}$.PST.OBJ$_{2SG}$-tell-PFV NP$_{15}$-pull.weed-FV
       'I told you to pull out the weed

       weéyo *w-entt'*   *o-rézuúl-a*   *mi-yaní* *z-áawe*
       you   SBJ$_{2SG}$-GO-PFV NP$_{15}$-sweep-FV NP$_4$-weed PP$_4$-POSS$_1$
       but you just swept it.'

The uncommonness and the apparent loss of motion semantics in the above grammaticalization path prompted us, first, to reconsider the lexical semantics of motion verbs in Shangaci and other Bantu languages and, next, to look for other less common grammaticalization paths starting from Bantu 'come' and 'go' (Devos and Van der Wal 2011). In order to broaden our perspective and to add insights from people working on languages for which historical sources exist we decided to organize a workshop (held at the 44th meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea in Logroño) on lesser known grammaticalization paths travelled by 'come' and 'go' in familiar and less familiar languages. The papers presented at that workshop are gathered in the present volume. Grammatical targets different from tense and aspect have been mentioned in the literature (see e.g. Nicolle 2002, Ebert 2003, Bourdin 2008, Devos and Van der Wal 2010 and Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1993 and Heine and Kuteva 2002 for an overview) but, as far as we know, no single book volume has been dedicated to the topic. Bringing the less usual targets together is, of course, typologically interesting and it will broaden our understanding of the possible grammaticalization paths of a particular set of source items (cf. also Maisak 2005). More importantly, however, we believe that a study of more unusual targets of 'come' and 'go' verbs will increase our insight in grammaticalization processes in general as they force us to rethink certain aspects of grammaticalization. The present volume focuses on four such aspects. It should be clear from the start that not all papers discuss all four aspects to the same extent. However, the authors certainly had the focal

points enumerated below at the back of their mind when developing their papers and the conclusion at the end of this book will serve to bring them to the fore again.

2 The broader questions addressed in this volume

2.1 Lexical semantics and persistence

It is generally accepted that the lexical meaning of a source item "persists" to a greater or lesser degree in the newly developed grammatical function. Hopper and Traugott (2003: 95), for example, claim that "it is unlikely that any instance of grammaticalization will involve a sudden loss of meaning" and that it is therefore "incumbent on the researcher to seek a plausible set of inferences that enable changes to occur". They also make clear that bleaching or loss of lexical meaning is characteristic of the later stages of grammaticalization only. This "persistence" (Hopper 1991: 22) of the original lexical semantics is the reason why Lichtenberk (1991: 505) in his study of the development of movement verbs in Oceanic languages consistently asks himself "what there was in the meaning of the source element that enabled the new function to develop." It should be clear that to be able to appreciate the role of persistence in grammaticalization the lexical semantics of source items need to be well understood. However, we find, on the one hand, that source elements are typically described as general in meaning, which appears to downplay persistence effects, and, on the other hand, that their lexical semantics are often presupposed or taken for granted.

Lexical meanings that enter into grammaticalization processes are typically referred to as basic, universal, general and frequent. Semantically, source items tend to be described as *basic*. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994: 9), for example, claim that "lexical units that enter into grammaticization [...] usually represent [...] the basic semantic features of their domains. Thus 'come' and 'go' are the motion verbs chosen most often for grammaticization." Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer (1991: 33), also stress the basicness or prototypical nature of source concepts. In addition, they indicate that source items are similar to what is known as "basic vocabulary" in that they are less prone to replacement than other lexemes and represent universal notions, which also makes them good candidates for a universal set of semantic primitives.[1]

---

1 Neither 'come' nor 'go' are included in Wierzbicka's (1996) semantic primes, whereas 'move' is.

On a more pragmatic level, source items are said to be *general* and *frequent* in use, the latter characteristic plausibly being a concomitant feature of their basic and general nature (cf. also Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991: 38). Both Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994 (1994: 9–10) and Hopper and Traugott (2003: 100) take it that lexical items that enter into processes of grammaticalization must first be semantically general(ized). This implies that they are already fairly abstract in content and have gained a wider distribution. Maisak (2005) basically refers to the same thing when suggesting that source items have a 'meta-linguistic' potential, i.e. the possibility of metaphorically referring to notions different from their core meaning. As an example of generalization of meaning, Hopper and Traugott (2003: 102) refer to the Latin verb *ambulare* 'walk' which grammaticalized as a future marker only after it was generalized in its French cognate *aller* 'go'.

One of the questions that this study of lesser known grammaticalization paths starting from 'come' and 'go' wishes to address is whether these motion verbs reflect the basic, universal and general nature typically associated with source items. Part of the question is instigated by Wilkins and Hill (1995), who show that 'come' is not a lexical universal and in doing so pave the way for more research on the basicness of 'come' and 'go'. Next, just as Wilkins and Hill (1995) question the basicness of 'come' and 'go', the present volume aims to take a closer look at their supposed generalness and whether it leaves room for persistence. As an illustration, Swahili has a grammaticalized construction consisting of the habitual of the verb *enda* 'go (to)' followed by a consecutively marked semantic main verb and expressing epistemic possibility (cf. (3a)). Surprisingly, the same meaning can be expressed by substituting *enda* 'go (to)' by *ja* 'come' (cf. (3b)), even though the latter construction occurs less frequently.

(3) Swahili (Niger-Congo, Bantu) (Zawawi 1988: 130)

   a. *yeye hu-end-a a-ka-fik-a leo*
      he HAB-go-FV SBJ₁-SUBS-arrive-FV today
      'He might arrive today.'

   b. *yeye hu-j-a a-ka-fik-a leo*
      he HAB-come-FV SBJ₁-SUBS-arrive-FV today
      'He might arrive today.'

This variability could be explained by referring to the generalization of the concerned motion verbs prior to grammaticalization. However, an important question still is whether the original lexical meanings of 'come' and 'go' restrict the usage range of the grammaticalized constructions.

Studies dedicated to grammaticalized uses of 'come' and 'go' often assume that it is the deictic nature of the verbs that is responsible for their grammaticalization. Sweetser (1988), for example, when discussing the grammaticalization of English *going to* into a marker of future tense claims that "lexicalization of motion away from the deictic centre makes 'go' the perfect choice for movement away from the present in time". However, Wilkins and Hill (1995) convincingly show that, contrary to what is commonly assumed, 1) 'go' is not universally deictic (see also Langacker 1990: 155) and 2) 'come' and 'go' are not in a universal deictic opposition. Botne's (2005) study of motion verbs in the Bantu language Chindali fully supports these findings. Whereas Chindali has a deictic motion verb encoding motion towards the location of the speaker (i.e. *iisa* 'come'), it has no motion verb dedicated to the expression of motion towards a location different from the deictic centre. Instead, there are up to four (i.e. *tiila* 'GO from source, *fuma* 'go from SOURCE', *buuka* 'GO to goal' and *ya* 'go to GOAL') non-deictic motion verbs that can, in appropriate contexts, fulfill the role of deictic 'go'.

Seeing that deixis cannot be presupposed for 'come' and 'go' verbs, an important question will be whether the motion verbs that take part in the grammaticalization paths discussed in the present edition, are really deictic. Next, if deixis can be established, we still need to find out whether deixis is crucial in the grammaticalization process in question or whether other semantic features come into play. Motion verbs, in general, and 'come' and 'go' in particular, typically involve a Source, a Path and a Goal (Fillmore 1997, Talmy 1985). Deixis, i.e., whether or not the Goal of the motion can be identified with the deictic centre, is an important variable in motion schemes pertaining to 'come' and 'go' verbs. However, other variables may be equally important. First, motion schemes typically involve a "spatial reference point" (Fillmore 1997: 81, based on his 1965 & 1966 papers). This becomes more clear when comparing the examples in (4) and (5), taken from Fillmore (1997: 80).

(4)   *He went home around midnight.*

(5)   *He came home around midnight.*

In (4) the use of *go* implies that the motion starts at midnight and the spatial reference point coincides with the Source. In (5), on the other hand, *come* indicates that the motion ends at midnight and the spatial reference point coincides with the Goal. In the same vein, Taylor (1988: 506–507) describes *go* as having Source focus and *come* as having Goal focus. This is different from a third feature, which Botne (2005: 45) refers to as Salience. According to him Chindali 'come' and 'go' verbs can differ solely in whether or not they mark the Goal, the Path

or the Source as the most prominent and relevant part of the motion scheme. To illustrate, Chindali has two verbs expressing motion towards a specified Goal: *buuka* and *ya*, the crucial difference between the two being that in the case of *buuka* the motion is salient (cf. GO to Goal), whereas in the case of *ya* the Goal is salient (cf. go to GOAL). Interestingly, it is the verb with Salience of Goal (*ya*) which grammaticalizes as a future marker (Botne 2005: 74).

2.2 The role of the co-text

So far, we have only considered discrete lexical items as inputs to grammaticalization processes. However, it is well-known that whole constructions rather than individual lexemes grammaticalize. As Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994: 11) put it, "in tracing the origin of grammatical meaning, we must attend to the syntax and morphology of the source construction and not simply to the referential meaning of its lexical items". In the present volume special attention is paid to the syntactic contexts in which 'come' and 'go' verbs grammaticalize.

As suggested by Bourdin (2008: 42), who notes that auxiliation and serialization are especially favored structures in the grammaticalization of 'come' and 'go' verbs to textual connectives, it will be interesting to see whether semantically similar targets involve similar source structures. Moreover, some papers address the question how influential the distributional context is to the grammatical meaning. Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994: 11) suggest that the distributional context is crucial. Rather than stating that a single source concept can give rise to different grammatical targets (as do, for example Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer (1991: 38)), they prefer to say that each target derives from a specific source construction involving the same lexeme. Alternatively, different targets can actually be seen as distinct steps on the same grammaticalization cline, a situation we turn to in Section 2.3. A quick glance at grammaticalization paths followed by cognates of the Proto-Bantu verb *gènd* 'walk, travel, go' supports this. The verb is known to develop into a future tense marker, as in (6), as well as into a progressive aspect marker, as in (7) and (8). However, the constructions leading to future and progressive are crucially different with *gènd* being followed by an infinite and a finite verb form, respectively.

(6)　Kikae (Niger-Congo, Bantu) (Racine-Issa 2002: 127)
　　　kw-end-a-tend-a　　*u-shez-a*
　　　SBJ$_{2SG}$-go-PRS-do-FV　NP$_{11}$-play
　　　'Are you going to play?'

(7) Ruwund (Niger-Congo, Bantu) (Nash 1993: 859)
tal   âap,   m-êm   m-ènd   m-ìicik
look.IMP PP$_{16}$.DEM$_B$ NP$_6$-water PP$_6$-go.FV PP$_6$-spill.out.FV
'Look here, the water is spilling out!'

(8) Kagulu (Niger-Congo, Bantu) (Petzell 2008: 144)
ni-gend-ag-e   ny-ambik-a
SBJ$_{1SG}$-go-IPFV-FV SBJ$_{1SG}$-cook-FV
'I was cooking.'

2.3 Direct and indirect paths

A distinction is made between unusual targets of 'come' and 'go' involving direct paths versus indirect paths. The latter are of two types. First, the unusual targets can be derived from more usual targets of grammaticalization processes and thus involve changes pertaining to the second part of the definition of grammaticalization as formulated by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 231) in which it is said that lexical items, once they have developed a certain grammatical function, can "continue to develop new grammatical functions" (cf. 'expansion' in Haspelmath 2004: 33). A difficult issue with respect to such indirect paths is when to identify a given grammatical meaning as a new one (i.e. how to define discrete events of grammaticalization).

Second, the path can be indirect because of a change in the lexical semantics of the motion verb in question. As was mentioned in (1) it is generally assumed that lexical items that are subject to grammaticalization have undergone generalization and can, thus, be used in many contexts. In the present edition we apply the term 'indirect path' to those cases where the lexical meaning that enters the grammaticalization path no longer pertains to Motion. It might not always be easy to distinguish between indirect paths of the first and of the second type since there is arguably no easy way to distinguish between lexical meaning change and grammatical meaning change (cf. also Hopper and Traugott 2003: 102). We turn to the latter in Section 2.4.

2.4 Meaning changes

What kind of meaning changes are involved in the grammaticalization of 'come' and 'go' verbs? Recent grammaticalization studies tend to agree that, rather than involving loss of semantic content or 'semantic bleaching', the early stages of

grammaticalization involve a change in meaning often referred to as 'pragmatic strengthening' (e.g. Hopper and Traugott 2003: 76). Pragmatic strengthening occurs when a source construction used in a specific context invites an inference, most typically through metonymy or metaphor. If this inference occurs often enough it can become routinized and then conventionalized (i.e., semanticized). In sum, in the early stages of grammaticalization meaning change is instantiated by mechanisms of pragmatic strengthening and generalization. The overall change in meaning from (lexical) source to (grammatical) target has been said to typically involve 'subjectification', or in Traugott's terms an increasing tendency to express the speaker's subjective perspective on the situation (see the overview in Traugott 2010).

The papers in this volume address several issues relating to meaning changes in the early stages of grammaticalization. First, it considers the role of metaphor and/or metonymy. Metaphorical processes are often seen as crucial in grammaticalization processes starting from source items with spatial properties (via the SPACE = TIME metaphor). Emanatian (1992: 3), for example, argues that "Chagga verbs for coming and going may imply a future interpretation [...] by expressing present 'motion' of the actors on a path of action through time, directed toward the future." And she adds that "this, of course, is spatio-temporal metaphor." However, together with an increasing interest in the co-texts (cf. syntactic contiguity) of lexical source items, metonymy (cf. semantic contiguity) has gained importance in grammaticalization studies. Another question is whether the unusual targets of 'come' and 'go' involve subjectification and whether intersubjectification (Traugott and Dasher 2002, Traugott 2003), i.e. an evolution towards meanings that are increasingly concerned with the interaction between speaker and hearer, is ever attested in the early stages of grammaticalization starting from 'come' and 'go' verbs. And if such is the case, does it necessarily follow subjectification?

Until now, we have only considered meaning changes pertaining to the early stages of grammaticalization. Of course, the second part of the definition of grammaticalization relating to 'expansion' or the development of new grammatical functions out of older ones also involves changes in meaning and these have received much less attention in the grammaticalization literature (see Kranich 2010). In cases where unusual targets of 'come' and 'go' verbs develop out of more usual targets, do we see the same mechanisms of pragmatic inferencing and generalization at work and do we find cases of generalization leading to desemanticization? Or, do we find evidence for Kranich's (2010: 103) claim that secondary grammaticalization typically involves a loss of subjective meaning, an evolution she refers to as 'objectification'? Also, can we adhere to Hopper and Traugott's (2003: 102) claim that a difference between grammatical meaning

changes and lexical meaning changes is that the former do not show narrowing in meaning? Complicated grammaticalization networks might bring about near-synonymous grams leading to specialization and narrowing of meaning (cf. also Haspelmath 2004: 33 on 'retraction' rather than 'expansion').

3 The contributions to this volume

The papers are organized following the grammatical targets of 'come' and 'go' source items: the first three papers involve grammaticalization paths leading to passives. The next two papers discuss targets pertaining to the domain of mood and modality, whereas the remaining four discuss 'come' and 'go' verbs evolving into discourse markers. In terms of methodology, the grammaticalization paths in question are addressed 'in depth', 'in width' or by a combination of both approaches. An in-depth approach leans on a historical corpus when such is available or on synchronic variation in the absence of historical data. In-width approaches are more typologically oriented and concern representative samples of the world's languages. Below we give summaries of all nine papers.

3.1 Passive

In Italian the verb *venire* 'come' has undergone a grammaticalization process to passive auxiliary in the periphrastic construction with a past participle. Giacalone Ramat and Sansò address two questions about this process and provide answers on the basis of a historical corpus study as well as crosslinguistic data.

The first question they address is which among the various constructions in Old Italian is the most plausible forerunner of the modern passive construction. Two candidate constructions are discussed: 1) the action in the verb happens to an encoded involuntary experiencer ('to him came left open his room' = 'he happened to leave his room open'), and 2) the entity encoded by the subject undergoes a change of state ('they came thin' = 'they had become thin'). The authors argue that the second candidate is the forerunner of the passive construction, because the dynamic interpretation of the passive, representing both the process and the final state, is more compatible with the dynamic character of the change-of-state function. This also explains the restriction of the passive to non-compound tenses, that is, tenses that favor a dynamic rather than stative interpretation.

The second question is to what extent this path is determined by the original lexical semantics of *venire* 'come'. Although there is persistence of the dynamic