Verbs of throwing and categorization of completive events: Evidence from Hill Mari

Egor Kashkin

(V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of RAS, Moscow)

Keywords: Uralic languages, Hill Mari, semantics, grammaticalization, verbs of throwing.

<u>Schedule: Thu 14.30 Room 14</u>

This paper focuses on the grammaticalization undergone by two verbs of throwing (*šuaš* and *kǝškäš*) in Hill Mari (< Uralic). I will discuss what semantic and collocational restrictions they have when used as completive markers and how these properties can be predicted from their basic semantics. The data were collected in fieldwork in the village of Kuznetsovo and its surroundings (Mari El Republic, Russia) by elicitation and by using the corpus of transcribed oral narratives (ca. 63.500 tokens).

The lexical typology of throwing verbs is discussed in Ivtushok (2015, 2016), but no information on their grammaticalization is provided. Maisak (2005) leaves this domain outside his research on grammaticalization patterns adopted by motion verbs. Heine and Kuteva (2004: 297–298) formulate a general pattern of their development into perfect or completive markers. Some sources contain short pieces of information on individual languages or language families, e.g. Baranova (2013: 19–21) on Kalmyk, Grashchenkov (2015: 73–74) on Turkic. Still, the patterns of such shifts remain underdescribed; neither is it studied in detail what semantic components are preserved by verbs of throwing after grammaticalization (see Sweetser (1988) and Eckardt (2006) for the theoretical discussion).

The verb *šuaš* describes one action of throwing in its primary meaning, while the verb *kǝškäš* asserts that several actions of throwing took place. Both predicates can be used as light verbs in complex predicates, i.e. morphosyntactically bound combinations of a lexical verb in the form of a converb and a finite light verb, see (1)–(2). Such constructions were discussed by Serebrennikov (1960: 190–199), Pengitov et al. (1961: 202–216), Bradley (2010), among others, but without much detail about semantic restrictions on their slots.

(1) *mǟn'* *toštǝ̂* *pört-ǝ̂m* **p*ǝ̂d*ǝ̂rt-en* *šu-en-äm.***
     I old house-ACC break-CVB throw-PRET-1SG
     'I destroyed the old house'.

(2) *tǝ̈n'* *cilä* **port'-en** *kǝškǝ-š-ǝ̂c!*
     you all spoil-CVB throw-AOR-2SG
     'You have spoiled everything!'

According to my data, *šuaš* and *kǝškäš* usually collocate with verbs referring to destruction or removal of the patient, e.g. *kǝškedäš* 'to tear', *puštaš* 'to kill', *jǝ̂lataš* 'to burn sth. down', *jästäräš* 'to pour out, to empty', *pačkaltaš* 'to shake out', see also (1)–(3). This semantic shift follows from the categorization of throwing events as situations in which an object is removed from some location. In some cases the two verbs under consideration can collocate with predicates introducing an object less close to a prototypical patient (in terms of Dowty (1991), Malchukov (2005)), e.g. some verbs of physical impact (*mǝ̂škaš* 'to wash', *ut'užaš* 'to iron') or of possessor change (*vǝ̂žalaš* 'to sell').

Having similar collocational properties, constructions with *šuaš* and *kǝškäš* differ in quantificational features of the object and in compatibility with uncontrollable situations. The former parameter is illustrated in (3), where *šuaš* co-occurs with either a singular or a plural object, while

kǝškäš requires a plural object. This can be predicted from their difference in the primary uses, namely by the fact that *kǝškäš* describes a pluractional event.

(3) a. *mǝn'*   *pükšem-ǝm*   **šüt-en**   **šu-š-ǝm**   **/*šüt-en**   **kǝškǝ-š-ǝm.**
    I   knot-ACC   untie-CVB   throw-AOR-1SG untie-CVB   throw-AOR-1SG
    'I untied the knot'.

b.   *mǝn'*   *pükšem-vlä-m*   **šüt-en šu-š-ǝm**   **/**   **šüt-en**   **kǝškǝ-š-ǝm.**
    I   knot-PL-ACC   untie-CVB   throw-AOR-1SG untie-CVB   throw-AOR-1SG
    'I untied the knots'.

    I will also discuss the place of throwing verbs in the system of light verbs in Hill Mari, in particular comparing their semantics and compatibility with those of the telicizers *šǝndäš* 'to seat' and *šoaš* 'to reach' used in similar morphosyntactic patterns.

Abbreviations

1, 2 — 1st , 2nd person; ACC — accusative; AOR — aorist; CVB — converb; PL — plural; PRET — preterite; SG — singular.

References

Baranova, Vlada (2013), Grammaticalization and semantics of complex predicates in Kalmyk, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 94, 9–35.

Bradley, Jeremy (2010), *Mari converb constructions: interpretation and translation*, MA Thesis, Vienna: University of Vienna.

Dowty, David (1991), *Thematic proto-roles and argument selection*, Language 67 (3), 547–619.

Eckardt, Regine (2006), *Meaning change in grammaticalization. An enquiry into semantic analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grashchenkov, Pavel (2015), *T'urkskie konverby i serializacija: sintaksis, semantika, grammatikalizacija* [Turkic converbs and serialization: syntax, semantics, grammaticalization], Moscow: Jazyki slav'anskoj kul'tury.

Heine, Bernd, and Kuteva, Tania (2004), *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ivtushok, Elizaveta (2015), Glagoly tipa «brosat'» v leksiko-tipologicheskom osveshchenii [Verbs of throwing in a lexical-typological view], in E. Lyutikova, A. Tsimmerling, and M. Konoshenko (eds), (2015), *Typology of morphosyntactic parameters. Proceedings of the international conference «Typology of morphosyntactic parameters 2015»*, Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical University, 114–122.

Ivtushok, Elizaveta (2016), K tipologii glagolov so znacheniem «brosat'» [On the typology of verbs of throwing], in A. Kretov (ed), (2016), *Problems of lexical-semantical typology*, vol. 3. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 72–77.

Maisak, Timur (2005), *Tipologiya grammatikalizacii konstrukcij s glagolami dvizheniya i glagolami pozicii* [Typology of grammaticalization of the constructions with motion verbs and posture verbs], Moscow: Jazyki slav'anskih kul'tur.

Malchukov, Andrej (2005), Case pattern splits, verb types and construction competition, in M. Amberber, H. de Hoop (eds), (2005), *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages*, London, New York: Elsevier, 73–117.

Pengitov, Nikolaj, Galkin, Ivan, and Isanbaev, Nikolaj (eds), (1961), *Sovremennyj marijskij yazyk. Morfologiya* [The Modern Mari language. Morphology], Yoshkar-Ola: Marijskoje knizhnoje izdatel'stvo.

Serebrennikov, Boris (1960), *Kategorii vremeni i vida v finno-ugorskih jazykah permskoj i volzhskoj grupp* [Categories of tense and aspect in the Finno-Ugric languages of Permic and Volgaic groups], Moscow: Nauka.

Sweetser, Eve (1988), Grammaticalization and semantic bleaching, in A. Shelley, A. Jaisser, and H. Singmaster (eds), (1988), *Berkeley Linguistic Society: Proceedings of the Fourteenth annual meeting. General session and parasession on grammaticalization*, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 389–405.

✄

Investigating lexical changes in the Russian language of Estonia

Éva Katona

(ELTE Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest)

Keywords: Russian, Estonian, loanword, language contact, code copying

Schedule: Sat 12.30 Room 8

In a language contact situation the "most common specific type of influence is the borrowing of words" (Thomason 2001: 10). In accordance to this, in the Russian language of Estonia lexical changes are also common. In the past thirty years, after Estonia regained its independence and Estonian became the only official language of the state, the new state language became a part of the everyday lives of those with Russian as their first language as well. This everyday contact situation impacts the local variety of Russian. One of the outcomes is change in the lexicon, which is the most visible in the domains of education, government administration and culture. A good number of lexical changes have already been described, see further: Verschik (2005) and Адамсон (2009) about government administration, and Zabrodskaja (2007) for words regarding university life. Especially since the change is still happening, the list is far from complete, and there are many lexical elements awaiting documentation, and several of the documented words have not yet been tested from the point of usage or preference.

In my study I test whether the Russian Estonian speakers actually prefer those lexical elements in "fill the gap" tests that are believed to be characteristic only for the speakers in Estonia. The words in question are retrieved from my own questionnaires, interviews, some from the existing literature (Кюльмоя, 2009) and a comment section of an online magazine about this topic.

From my own corpus I chose words that are not included in Russian monolingual dictionaries, but also words people perceived as results of language contact were chosen. For my lexical test I paired up each "Estonian Russian" variant with its corresponding monolingual variant, and created sentences where the context would elicit one or the other. When both variants start with the same letter, I provided the first letter to exclude any other possibilities, otherwise the alternatives were not given. I asked my informants (N=30) to fill the gap in the sentences with the missing words. I then compared the tests with the tests of my control group who were all born and living in Russia (N=22).

Several of the word choices showed a remarkable difference between the two groups. The Estonian Russians chose hybrid words that were formed on the basis of an Estonian word, for example choosing *inventura* (12) instead of the monolingual *inventarizacija* (18) (based on the Estonian word *inventuur* for *stock-taking*), while each member of the control group wrote *inventarizacija*. There was also a remarkable presence of the Estonian borrowing *rebarbar* (4) along with *reven'* (22) and other (4) in the Estonian group, as opposed to *reven'* (13), *rebarbar* (0) and other (9) in the monolingual group (the plant is less known in Russia).