Possessors as SR pivots: a grammaticalisation path   A. Bárány & I. Nikolaeva, SOAS

The aim of this paper is to describe the historical development of one particular type of "non-canonical" (de Sousa 2016) or "unexpected" (Stirling 1993, Keine 2013) switch-reference (SR). In this type of SR, same subject (ss) marking is not only licensed by coreference of the subject of the marked clause and the subject of the controlling clause, but also by coreference between a possessor pivot and a subject pivot. We propose a diachronic scenario that can explain how this pattern emerges and argue that two types of processes are involved: first, semantic restrictions on a construction are lost (Harris & Campbell 1995 call this process "extension"), and second, morphosyntactic marking of possessive relations becomes obligatory. The latter is an instance of syntacticisation, i.e. change from a pragmatically and/or semantically licensed construction to a syntactically licensed one (Givón 1979, Comrie 1988, Haspelmath 2004).

Partial coreference In many SR languages, ss-marking can appear even when the subjects of two clauses are not strictly coreferential, but when their referents are in an inclusion relation, such as a part-whole or a subset-superset relation (Stirling 1993, Comrie 1983, Nonato 2014). In these cases, ss-marking is licensed by partial coreference of subjects. For example, in Aranda (Pama-Nyungan), part-whole possessive relations between subjects require ss-marking, and morphosyntactic marking of possession is not necessary, as shown in (1). Here, the possessor of 'nose' is not overtly expressed in the controlling clause, but is implied by the relational semantics of the possessed body-part noun.

(1) *Alhe irrke-ke*   [*ayenge   petye-me-le*   (*-*rlenge*)].   [Aranda]
      nose be itchy-PST.CMPL   1SG.NOM come-NPST-PROG-**ss**   -DS

      'My nose itched as I was coming along.'   (Wilkins 1988: 166)

ss-marking under partial coreference is thus not necessarily based on syntactic factors, but has been analysed as a semantic or pragmatic mechanism. Stirling, for example, represents partial coreference as anaphoric conditions in the lexical entries of ss-markers, e.g. $x \supseteq y$, where y, the matrix subject's referent, is properly included in x, the embedded subject's referent. Such a condition can also license part-whole relations among subjects, as in (1). This forms the starting point for our proposed grammaticalisation path.

Data Other languages also restrict non-canonical ss-marking to part-whole relations, but do require overt morphosyntactic expression of the possessor. (2) illustrates this for Old Turkic, where the suffix *-Vp* indicates a same-subject converb which usually requires strict coreference between its subject and the matrix subject.

(2) [*bo   körünč   kör-üp*   ] *köŋül-üŋ   yazïl-t[ï] mu?*   [Old Turkic]
      this pageant see-**ss.CVB**   heart-2SG.POSS stray-PST Q

      'Did your heart stray seeing this pageant?'   (Erdal 2004: 463)

In (2), the two subjects are in a part-whole relation, which licenses ss-marking (in contrast to other possessive relations, as Erdal 2004 suggests). Unlike Aranda, however, Old Turkic requires the overt coding of possession, the possessive suffix on the matrix subject in (2). In Tuvan (Bergelson & Kibrik 1995), a descendant of Old Turkic, and other modern Turkic languages, e.g. Bashkir (Say 2018), and Turkish (Brendemoen & Csató 1987), which all have cognates of the converb in *-Vp*, the range of possessive relations licensing ss-marking has been extended. This means that possessors in alienable possessive relations, like ownership, can also license ss-marking, see (3) from Tuvan and (4) from Bashkir. Here, coreference is between the possessor of the embedded subject and the matrix subject.

(3) [*aˤd-ïm   **aaraaš**,*] *oon   aŋaj   čoru-p   šida-va-dï-m.*   [Tuvan]
      horse-1SG get sick-**ss**   thence further ride-CVB can-NEG-PST-1SG

      'My horse got sick and I could not ride further.'   (Bergelson & Kibrik 1995: 383)

(4) [*Bolat*ᵢ *tið bar-əp*] ∅ᵢ *mašina-hə hən-də.* [Bashkir]
      Bulat fast go-**SS.CVB**   car-3.POSS break-PST
      'Bulat$_i$ was driving fast and his$_i$ car broke down.' (Say 2018: 15)

We take this to mean that the semantic restriction of non-canonical ss-marking to part-whole relations has been lost in the modern Turkic languages.

Grammaticalisation path We propose that (1)–(4) illustrate diachronic stages in the following grammaticalisation path (we only show one order of part and whole pivots for ease of illustration; other orders are possible):

A. **Partial coreference, no morphosyntactic coding**: Inclusion, subset-superset, and intersection relations license ss-marking; possessive relations can remain unmarked

[**SBJ**[WHOLE]**PIVOT** … V-ss] (Possessor) **Possessum**[PART]**PIVOT** … V

B. **Partial coreference, morphosyntactic coding**: The same relations as in Stage A license ss-marking, but the overt expression of the possessive relation is obligatory

[**SBJ**[WHOLE]**PIVOT** … V-ss] (Possessor) **Possessum**[PART]**PIVOT** … V

C. **Inalienable and alienable relations, morphosyntactic coding**: No semantic restrictions on possessive relations license ss-marking; morphosyntactic expression of the possessive relation is obligatory

[**SBJ**PIVOT** … V-ss] (Possessor) **Possessum**PIVOT** … V

Aranda exemplifies Stage A, in which the part-whole possessive relation can remain implicit, and the whole and part act as SR pivots, respectively. Although we lack diachronic data, we hypothesise that Stage A historically precedes Stage B, as partial coreference is a broader notion than possession. The change between Stages A and B involves a change from a pragmatically or semantically licensed relation to one that must be licensed morphosyntactically (syntacticisation), cf. e.g. the reanalysis of experiencers as agentive subjects in the Russian 'possessive perfect' discussed by Seržant (2012). At Stage B the implicit possessive relation in the part noun's argument structure becomes explicit. The possessor acts as the pivot, but SS-licensing remains restricted to part-whole relations. Old Turkic and Tuvan represent Types B and C, respectively, and provide primary evidence for the diachronic nature of the proposed process. The nature of this change is semantic extension, cf. the extension of case-marking in Laz discussed by Harris & Campbell (1995: 100ff). Stage C involves the extension of possessive relations that license ss-marking, or in other words the loss of a semantic condition, i.e. the restriction to part-whole relations, on ss-marking. It is now the morphosyntactic expression of possession licenses ss-marking, and the type of possessive relation does not matter any more.

Cross-linguistic relevance Other languages at Stage A include Huichol (Uto-Aztecan; Comrie 1983), Washo (Washo; Langdon & Munro 1979); at Stage B, Evenki (Turkic; Nedjalkov 1995), California Uto-Aztecan languages (Hill 2016), Udmurt (Uralic; field notes), and Khanty (Uralic; Nikolaeva 1999); at Stage C, Jamul Tiipay (Hokan; Miller 2001), Tundra Nenets (Uralic; Nikolaeva 2014), and Kolyma Yukaghir (Yukaghir; Maslova 2003). So far, we lack diachronic data from outside Turkic, but the fact that all stages of the proposed path are found cross-linguistically provides an indirect confirmation of the scenario we outlined.

Selected refs. Bergelson, MB & AA **Kibrik**. 1995. The system of switch-reference in Tuva. In M **Haspelmath** & E **König** (eds.). **Brendemoen**, B & ÉÁ **Csató**. 1987. A syntactic analysis of Turkish gerundial clauses with subject control. In *Studies on Modern Turkish*. HE **Boeschoten** & LT **Verhoeven** (eds.). Tilburg University Press. **Comrie**, B. 1988. Topics, grammaticalized topics, and subjects. *BLS* 14. de **Sousa**, H. 2016. Some non-canonical switch reference systems and the fundamental functions of switch reference. In R van **Gijn** & J **Hammond** (eds.). **Erdal**, M. 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Brill. **Givón**, T. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. AP. **Harris**, AC & L **Campbell**. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. CUP. **Haspelmath**, M & E **König** (eds.). 1995. *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. De Gruyter. **Keine**, S. 2013. Deconstructing switch-reference. *NLLT* 31. **Langdon**, M & P **Munro**. 1979. Subject and (switch-)reference in Yuman. *Folia Linguistica* 13. **Nonato**, R. 2014. *Clause chaining, switch reference and coordination*. MIT dissertation. **Say**, S. 2018. *Prominent internal possessors in Bashkir*. Ms., Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences. **Seržant**, IA. 2012. The so-called possessive perfect in North Russian and the Circum-Baltic area. *Lingua* 122. **Stirling**, L. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. CUP. van **Gijn**, R & J **Hammond** (eds.). 2016. *Switch reference 2.0*. JB. **Wilkins**, D. 1988. Switch-reference in Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda). In *Complex sentence constructions in Australian languages*. P **Austin** (ed.). JB.