РОССИЙСКАЯ АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК
ИНСТИТУТ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ГРАММАТИКИ И ТИПОЛОГИИ

Сборник статей памяти
Владимира Петровича Недялкова
(1928—2009)

ЗНАК
Москва
2010
Problemy grammatiki i tipologii:

Sbornik statej pamjati

Vladimira Petroviča Nedjalkova

(1928-2009)

[Issues in grammar and typology: A memorial volume for Vladimir Nedjalkov]

Edited by
V.F. Vydrin, S.Ju. Dmitrenko,
N.M. Zaika, S.S. Saj, N.R. Sumbatova,
V.S. Xrakovskij

Moscow: Znak
2010
Издание осуществлено при финансовой поддержке
Российского гуманитарного научного фонда
(РГНФ)
проект № 08-04-16095

РЕДКОЛЛЕГИЯ:
В. Ф. Выдрин, С. Ю. Дмитренко,
Н. М. Заика, С. С. Сай, Н. Р. Сумбатова,
В. С. Храковский

Утверждено к печати
Ученым советом Института лингвистических исследований РАН

П 78 Проблемы грамматики и типологии: Сб. статей памяти


ББК 81.2

© Знак, оригинал-макет, 2010
BRIDGING TYPOLOGY AND DIACHRONY: 
A PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR A DIACHRONIC TYPOLOGICAL STUDY
OF VOICE AND VALENcy-CHANGING CATEGORIES*

Leonid Kulikov
(Leiden / Moscow)

1. Typology of valency-changing categories:
Imbalance of synchronic and diachronic studies

The last decades of the 20th century were marked with considerable progress in the typological study of valency-changing categories, such as passive, causative, reflexive and reciprocal. Linguistic typology has contributed a lot to our understanding of the structure and functioning of these categories. The research of V. P. Nedjalkov as well as other members of the Leningrad/St. Petersburg Typology Group, such as E. Š. Geniušienė and V. S. Xrakovskij, occupies an outstanding place among these studies. By now, we have at our disposal rich catalogues of possible systems of valency-changing derivations attested in the languages of the world. More specifically, we know a lot about the morphological, syntactic and semantic synchronic properties of these categories. On the other hand, a systematic treatment of these categories in a diachronic perspective is lacking. Their rise, development and decline mostly remain on the periphery of typological research.

One of the main reasons of such an imbalance of the synchronic and diachronic typology (which is not limited to the valency-changing derivations) amounts to the following. While synchronic linguistics has at its disposal the material of hundreds of languages of various genetic affiliations and different structural types, the material for historically oriented typological generalizations is much more limited. There are relatively few languages for which we dispose of textual evidence for the period sufficient to observe essential changes in morphological systems and syntactic types (for

* I am much indebted to Robert Kerr and Nina Sumbatova for valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper.
instance, 1000 years or more). Most of these languages belong to the major genetic groups located in the mainstream of the development of the «Eurocentrically-oriented» human culture, foremost to Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic families. This unavoidably limits the typological diversity of the data.

2. Diachronic typology and grammaticalization theory

There is at least one branch of linguistics that appears to concentrate on some aspects and issues of diachronic typology. It encompasses the studies carried out under the general heading of grammaticalization theory. The grammaticalization theory claims to explore and uncover the main mechanisms of the rise and evolution of grammatical morphemes. It might thus be supposed to bring diachronic evidence, accumulated by historical linguistics, under typological horizons. The results of the research within this framework are conveniently summarized in the World lexicon of grammaticalization by [Heine, Kuteva 2002] (which can also be taken as an instructive example of a study within the context of the grammaticalization theory). Judging from the title, this encyclopaedic edition might be conceived as a catalogue of the main historically attested paths of the developments of grammatical categories. However, a reader who will open this lexicon may be disappointed. One might expect that a good deal of evidence for evolution of morphemes will be extracted from grammars and dictionaries which focus on the history of languages — that is, from historical grammars and etymological dictionaries. Quite surprisingly, however, the list of references includes just one (!) historical grammar (A Welsh grammar, historical and comparative by J. Morris-Jones (Oxford, 1913)) and two etymological dictionaries (Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache by F. Gamillscheg (Heidelberg 1928) and Dizionario etimologico sardo by M. L. Wagner (Heidelberg 1962)). This lack of interest towards the literature on the history of individual languages — unfortunately, quite typical of many studies within the framework of the grammaticalization theory — may be responsible for some quite annoying mistakes and lacunae which the reader will encounter in this book. I will confine myself to two examples.

The reader interested in diachronic sources of the reciprocal morphemes will find on p. 92 the following erroneous statement: «Russian drug (comrade / friend:M:SG:NOM) + druga (comrade / friend:M:SG:ACC) > reciprocal marker (Martin Haspelmath, personal communication)». The authors could easily avoid this blunder by taking a look into the standard etymological dictionary of Russian [Vasmer 1953: I, 373], where the rec-
Bridging typology and diachrony... 141

ciproral pronoun in question is explained within the lemma *DRUGOJ ‘(an)other’ (~ Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian *drougъ), not under *DRUG ‘friend’. It is common knowledge in Indo-European comparative and historical grammar that the structure of the Russian (and Old Church Slavonic: *drougъ *drouga ‘other:NOM.SG.M other:ACC.SG.M’){1} reciprocal pronoun is parallel to similar polyptotic expressions in several other (ancient) Indo-European languages, all meaning ‘(an)other-(an)other’, such as Greek ἀλλήλονες, Latin alius alium, Vedic (Sanskrit) anyó-(a)nyá-(anyáḥ ... anyám, anyá ... anyám), Avestan ańiīō ańiīm, Old Persian ańiya ańiyam{2}.

Heine & Kuteva’s book presents a rich collection of grammaticalization paths which can be found in synchronic descriptions of the languages of the world. This catalogue might be, however, much more complete and useful if the authors would have paid more attention to the evidence available from historical grammars. Thus, the list of possible sources of past tense morphemes (which can easily be compiled by using the index ‘From Target to Source’), includes the following:

(i) **NEAR PAST ← ABLATIVE** (p. 33), cf. French passé immediat (recent past) ← venir de;
(ii) **NEAR PAST ← ‘come’** (p. 72f.), cf. Malagasy near past ← avy ‘come’;
(iii) **PAST ← ‘get’** (p. 147), cf. Khmer PAST ← baan ‘get’;

---

1. Note that in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian we still find examples where both parts of the pronoun appear in the feminine form, agreeing in gender with the antecedent, as in:

(Old Church Slavonic) (Codex Suprasl. 59:14)

> Две:DAT.F exist:PART.PRES:DAT.DU.F thing:DAT.DU
> ἡ κοτοραβίσσειμα θα ημά and contradict:PART.PRES:DAT.DU.F REFL it:DAT.DU.F
> дрογτα κ’ дрογτή κανό Ꜵδολάντε •
> other:NOM.SG.F to other:DAT.SG.F one:NOM.SG.N choose:PRES:2PL
> [ναν ὀτκάρβασιτθ θα χ[ῥήστ]α η σ’ ημάιι ηςεδλάντε θα • η αί νε ποκοράλλει
> θα μεθελμ θανες θ’κόνγιατθ θα]

> ‘When two things are present (before you), and they contradict to each other, you choose one. [Either you renounce Christ and rejoice with us, or you do not submit and will now be killed with sword.]’ (from a hagiographic text).

2. The Greek, Latin and Indo-Iranian forms may point to the hypothetical Proto-Indo-European collocation *ali(os ... ali(om) (masculine), *ali(a) ... ali(ām) (feminine).
(iv) PAST ← ‘yesterday’ (p. 315), cf. Baka -ngi PAST ← ngili ‘yesterday’;
(iv) COMPLETIVE, TERMINATIVE ← ‘put’ (p. 248); cf. Imonda TERMINATIVE ← pada ‘put’.

The above list shows a number of annoying lacunae that could be filled in on the basis of the standard historical grammars of some Indo-European languages. In particular, two important sources of the PAST tense which can be added to Heine & Kuteva’s list are:

(v) IMPERFECT ← ‘become’, and
(vi) IMPERFECT ← ‘be’.

The former is safely reconstructed for the Latin imperfect suffix -bā- (1SG -bam etc., cf. e.g. amabam ‘I loved’), which goes back to the Proto-Indo-European verbal root *bheyh₂ ‘become’ (see e.g. [Leumann et al. 1977: 579 f.; Baldi 1976]). The latter is well-known from Slavic historical grammar: the marker of the Slavic (Old Church Slavonic) imperfect in -aax'b (1SG), -aasë (2,3sG) etc. is traced back to the Proto-Indo-European perfect form *ĕse of the verb *hjes- ‘be’ (see e.g. [Vaillant 1966: 66 ff.]).

To this list we may probably add the Germanic ‘dental’ preterit (cf. Eng. past tense in -(e)d, German preterite in -t, etc.). Its marker is likely to go back, at least in some of its forms, to the Proto-Indo-European verbal root *d'eh₁ ‘put; do’ (cf. Eng. do; German tun); thus:

(vii) PAST ← ‘put’.

Cf., e.g., Gothic -de- (for instance, in (nasi)dēs ‘you (save)d’) < PIE *(nosi)-dēs (lit. ‘(save)-put’); for details, see, in particular, [Ball 1968; Tops 1974; Kortlandt 1981: 128; 1989].

Although these three paths are not attested within the documented history of Latin, Old Church Slavonic, Gothic, etc., they can be reconstructed for the dialects of the proto-language which immediately preceded the corresponding Italic, Slavic and Germanic languages and thus represent a linguistic reality.

To sum up, the book by Heine & Kuteva, albeit a useful summary of synchronically observable changes within the system of grammatical meanings, fails to unite the evidence available from historical linguistics with the methods and ambitions of linguistic typology. Quite unfortunately, the same holds true for many other studies written in the framework of the grammaticalization theory. A systematic research on the diachronic typology of tense, voice and other verbal (and nominal) categories still remains a desideratum.
This being the state of affairs, it seems advisable to initiate a dia-
chronic typological research with collecting evidence from languages
(language groups) with a history well-documented in texts for a suffi-
ciently long period of time (around 1000 years or more). When approach-
ing the history of a particular valency-changing category, such as passive
or causative, it might be useful to outline some kind of group
(family) portrait of the relevant category, tracing it from the earli-
est attested texts in an ancient language (L₀) onwards up to its reflexes in
the daughter languages (L₁, L₂ etc.). Of particular interest would also be — if available — evidence from the sister languages of L₀ (L', L'' etc.), which can serve as a basis for a tentative reconstruction of the hypo-
thetical history and possible sources of the category under study in the
proto-language *L, as shown in Fig. 1:

The most challenging objects for such a diachronic typological study
include such languages or language groups as Greek, Indo-Aryan or He-
brew, which are attested in texts for the period of many centuries or even
millennia. Thus, in the case of Indo-Aryan, we dispose of an uninter-
rupted documented history for a period of more than 3,000 years, starting
with the Old Indo-Aryan (OIA), which can be roughly identified with
(Vedic) Sanskrit. Already by the middle Vedic period (i.e. by the middle

---

3 The most ancient Vedic text, the Rgveda, dates to the 2nd half of the
second millennium B.C. Vedic can be divided into at least two main periods,
of the first millennium B.C.), Sanskrit was no longer a spoken language, but co-existed, as a sacral language, with Middle Indo-Aryan vernaculars. The Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA), attested from the 2nd half of the first millennium B.C. onwards, includes Pāli, Prakrits and Apabhraṃśa (for details, see [Hinüber 1986]). The New Indo-Aryan (NIA), which covers second millennium A.D., is represented by the modern Indic languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Bengali, Marathi, Sinhalese, etc.).

This means that, in the case of Indo-Aryan, we dispose of rich material for a diachronic analysis of the valency-changing categories. On the one hand, the rich evidence collected by the Indo-European comparative linguistics creates a good basis for hypotheses about the origin and possible sources of the morphological and syntactic categories attested in OIA and thus provides important material for a retrospective diachronic typological research. On the other hand, evidence from late Vedic and Middle Indo-Aryan texts, as well as from New Indo-Aryan languages, allows for a prospective diachronic study (how the OIA categories develop into their reflexes in Middle and New Indo-Aryan).

To mention just a few basic tendencies related to the development of a valency-changing category, causative. On the one hand, the importance and productivity of the morphological causative in Indo-Aryan (starting with the Vedic -āya-causative) constantly increases from the earliest texts onwards. By the end of the Old Indo-Aryan period this category reaches its absolute productivity, which is accompanied by the decline of other causative oppositions and of the labile syntactic type. Middle Indo-Aryan witnesses the rise of double causatives, and in some New Indo-Aryan languages the system of causatives may include as many as three members.

On the other hand, one productive causative formation ousts all other competing causatives. While in the early Old Indo-Aryan period (early Vedic), the causatives with the suffix -āya- co-exist with other causative formations, such as presents with nasal affixes or thematic class VI presents, by the end of the Old Indo-Aryan the -āya- type remains virtually the only causative formation within the present system.4

the mantra language (= the language of the hymns of the Rgveda, Atharvaveda and the mantras of the Yajurveda) and the language of the Vedic prose, which includes Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas as well as the earliest Upaniṣads and Sūtras. For the chronology of Vedic texts, see [Witzel 1995: 96 ff.].

4 Cf. the opposite tendency, from single to multiple causatives (which, most likely, betrays a different evolutionary type, in terms of a diachronic ty-
4. Methodology: diachronic typological questionnaires

A typologist approaching a (typologically much less cultivated) diachronic ground will immediately be confronted with methodological problems. How to capture typologically relevant features within the history of a given language or language group/family? Which kinds of tool(s) can be used for that purpose?

It seems that in this field we can apply the same powerful tool which has been developed and successfully employed during the last 3-4 decades in synchronic typology, a typological questionnaire. Typological questionnaires are widely used in the framework of the Leningrad/St. Petersburg Typological Group, in particular, for a synchronic study of valency-changing categories, such as causative, passive, reflexive, reciprocal etc. (which have always been and remain in the spotlight of the research of this group). The reader can be referred to a series of detailed and very useful questionnaires developed, foremost, by such eminent representatives of this school as V. P. Nedjalkov (e.g. [1988; 2000; 2007]), E. Š. Geniušienė [1987] and V. S. Xrakovskij [1996; 2001; 2005].

The questionnaire outlined in the present paper is diachronically-oriented. How can such an orientation be achieved? At first glance, transposing a synchronic questionnaire into its diachronic version may appear an almost trivial operation: we simply have to reformulate each synchronic question in the form: «What happens to the given synchronic feature in the history?». Of course, every synchronic phenomenon has its history, past and future. Yet, a mechanical transposition would probably result in a mere conglomeration of facts extracted from historical grammars. It will be in place to concentrate on some features and to disregard some others. Apparently, we have to focus on the most important features which determine the basic trends in the evolution of the linguistic system. In what follows I will present a tentative questionnaire concentrating on a rather homogenous group of verbal categories (voice and valency-changing). In this questionnaire, I attempted to pick up the issues which seem to be most relevant for the typologization of historical linguistic evidence.

\[\text{polological classification}, \text{ attested for the evolution of the Egyptian verb, from Old Egyptian to Coptic (see [Reintges 2004: 207 ff.]).}\]

\[\text{5 I am much indebted to V. P. Nedjalkov for his remarks and comments on an earlier version of the questionnaire.}\]
5. A preliminary questionnaire for a diachronic typological study of voice and valency-changing categories

The majority of questions include (i) a synchronic part, which addresses the feature under study in the attested languages (usually, starting with the most ancient language $L_0$ which opens the documented history of a genetic group) and (ii) a diachronic part (I mark it with «D»). In some cases, it is appropriate (iii) to ask questions about the hypothetical (reconstructable) origin of the linguistic phenomenon under study (e.g. etymology of a marker); this part of the question is marked with «R». Most questions are supplied with illustrative material taken from historical linguistic studies, particularly from (Old-)Indo-Aryan. X is used as a cover term for individual voices and valency-changing categories (causative, passive, reflexive, reciprocal, etc.). Examples are given after ♦.

1. The system of markers of the valency-changing categories (Xs)

1.1. How are the main valency-changing categories expressed?

1) voices properly speaking (sensu stricto)
   • passive
   • antipassive
2) voices sensu latoire
   • reflexive
   • reciprocal
   • causative
   • anticausative (decausative)
   • applicative
   • benefactive (object version)
3) voice-related categories
   • affective (subject version)

Competing markers of X and their relationships, synchronically and diachronically

♦ functional and chronological relationships between formal types of passives in the history of Scandinavian languages (Old Norse, Old Swedish, Swedish, etc.) ([Haugen 1982: 134, 159—161; Holm 1952]; etc.):
   • morphological (medio-)passive in -$s$ ($\leftarrow$ -$st$ $\leftarrow$ *-sk);
   • periphrastic (analytic) vera-passive (until early modern Scandinavian);
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- periphrastic (analytic) *verda*-passive (mainly between 10th and 13th cent.);
- periphrastic (analytic) *bliva*-passive (since c. 13th cent.)

- two competing forms of periphrastic passive in Old — Middle — Modern High German ([Kotin 1995]; cf. also the relationships between morphological and periphrastic passives in Gothic, see [van der Wal 1981])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>dynamic passive</strong></th>
<th><strong>statal passive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early OHG (until 12th cent.)</td>
<td><em>tuerdan-pass.</em></td>
<td><em>uuesan-pass.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. High German</td>
<td><em>werden-pass.</em></td>
<td><em>sein-pass.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.1D.** How does the set of markers change diachronically? The rise of new markers

- the emergence of the syntactic causative construction in Middle Korean and the increase of its productivity in Late Middle Korean (i.e. from the late 15th century onwards) (see [Song, Kwon, forthc.])

**1.2.** The status of the markers: free or bound morpheme; grammaticalized / non-grammaticalized / not completely grammaticalized

**1.2D.** How does this status change in the history? Is the transition «free morpheme → bound morpheme» attested? Details of this transition (chronology; in which constructions / with which verbs is this binding first attested? etc.). Grammaticalization phenomena and their details

- Slavic: development of reflexive pronoun ( → clitic → bound morpheme);
  cf. Common Slavic *sę* → Polish clitic *się* / Russ. suffix *-sja*
- Germanic: development of reflexive pronoun ( → clitic → bound morpheme);
  cf. Proto-Germ. *sīk* → Old Norse *-sk* (→ Swed. -s)
- early Vedic → middle Vedic → late (post-Vedic) Sanskrit: grammaticalization of the reciprocal pronoun *anyō ... anyā- (anyō’nyā-)* ‘another ... another’ (see sub 9D)
Degrammaticalization of valency markers

- loss of the intransitivizing functions of the middle inflexion (‘middle diathesis’) in Vedic [Kulikov 2006; Kulikov 2009]

1.3. Productivity of (morphological) markers of X (Which verbs can take the marker in question: nearly all verbs? verbs of several major classes? only a few (minor) classes? …)

1.3D. How does the productivity change in the history? (increasing / decreasing / remaining constant)

- increase of productivity of the aya-causatives in Sanskrit / Old Indo-Aryan [Thieme 1929; Jamison 1983]
- decrease of productivity of the i-causatives in Slavic [Gołb 1968]
- decrease of productivity of the jan-causatives in Germanic [García García 2005: 48 ff.]
- loss of several intransitive (reflexive with prefixed or infixed -t-, etc.) formations in Classical Hebrew [Gzella, forthc.]

Are there any correlations between the increase / decrease in productivity of different markers?

- parallel expansion of causatives and passives in Old Indo-Aryan; see sub 9D

2. Functions and polysemy of the marker(s) of X

2.1D/R. How does the basic meaning of marker(s) change in the history?

- passive-to-inverse voice development reconstructed for Cariban languages (see [Gildea 1998: 218 ff.])
- reanalysis of the Old Egyptian passive morpheme -tw in Late Egyptian (only in First Present and Conjunctive conjugation [Reintges, forthc.])
- separation of the passive proper, impersonal passive, and subject impersonal usages of the no/to-participle in Polish (see [Wiemer, forthc.])

2.2D. Documented examples of lexicalizations and their chronology.

The main types of lexicalizations
Examples of lexicalization:

♦ Russ reciprocal -sja:
  \( drat' \) ‘tear’ + -sja = \( drat'\)-sja ‘tear each other’ → ‘hit each other, fight’

♦ Ved middle diathesis (middle inflexion):
  \( šap \) ‘curse’ + middle = \( šápate \) ‘curses oneself’ → ‘swears’

♦ Nogai (Turkic) causative:
  \( ojna- \) ‘to play’: \( ojna-t- \) ‘make play’ → ‘amuse (a child)’;
  second causative: \( ojna-t-tyr- \) ‘to let/allow to play’ (permissive)
  [Kulikov 1993: 134; 1999a]

2.3R. The rise and etymology of the markers of X

♦ passive and middle morphemes often go back to reflexive pronouns (see [Haspelmath 1990; Heine, Kuteva 2002: 252 f.]), as in many Indo-European languages (cf. Russian -sja, Swedish -s etc. ← forms of the Proto-Indo-European pronominal lexeme \( *s(u)\)e- ‘own, -self’)

♦ the development of the passive function of the reflexive morpheme may go through the stage of the causative reflexive usages (see [Janke 1960: 24] for the possibility of such a scenario of the semantic evolution of -sja in Russian)

♦ passive morphemes may go back to the verbs ‘be’ (cf. in Mapudungun: passive suffix -nge ← copula verb ngen ‘be’; see [Zúñiga, forthc.]), ‘get’ (see [Haspelmath 1990: 41; Heine, Kuteva 2002: 145 ff.]) and some others

♦ Dutch reflexive pronoun zich (instead of the expected **zik / zij; cf. Middle Dutch sik) is borrowed from German (sich)

♦ typical sources of causative morphemes include verbs meaning ‘make’, ‘let’, ‘give’, as well as directional and benefactive affixes [Song 1990; 1996: 80—106; Heine, Kuteva 2002: 117 f., 152]

♦ reciprocal markers may go back to reflexive morphemes (see [Nedjalkov 2007; Heine, Kuteva 2002: 254]; cf. Russian -sja)

♦ Vedic reciprocal prefix vi (cf. dviṣ ‘hate’ — vi-dviṣ-āte ‘(they) hate each other’) and Ancient Greek prefix δια- (cf. διά-λογος ‘dialogue, conversation’, δια-επιθέω ‘talk to each other’, δια-κυνέω ‘kiss each other’) ← Proto-Indo-European adverb *dvis ‘in two’ (*dvi- in compounds), derived from the numeral ‘two’ (see [Lubotsky 1994: 202 ff.; Kulikov 2002])

♦ Turkish reciprocal suffix -ş- may be etymologically related to the Proto-Turkic marker of plurality -ş/-l [Juldašev 1980]
2.4. Which other meanings/functions (not related to valency-changing) are expressed by the marker(s) of X? (e.g.: causative/iterative; causative/intensive; anticausative/inchoative; reflexive/emphatic). Is there any historical evidence for the secondary character of some of these functions?

- causative/intensive polysemy in Arabic (cf. *darasa* ‘learn’—*darrasa* ‘teach’ (causative); *qatala* ‘kill’—*qattala* ‘massacre’ (intensive)), Boumaa Fijian (cf. *mate* ‘die’—*va’a-mate-a* ‘kill’ (causative); *taro-ga* ‘ask’—*va’a-taro-ga* ‘ask many times’ (intensive)) and some other languages (see [Li 1991; Kulikov 1999b; 2001a: 894])

2.4D. Is this polysemy preserved in L1, L2 ..? Which new types of polysemy appear in L1, L2 ..?

2.5. Are there examples of the loss of the original (valency-changing) function(s) of the marker of X? examples of the replacement of the original function(s) by other functions, not related to valency-changing?

Examples of the ‘passive-to-ergative’ development:
- Old Indo-Aryan (Vedic) → Middle Indo-Aryan → New Indo-Aryan: the Old Indo-Aryan construction with passive perfect participles in -*ta/-na-* gives rise to the New Indo-Aryan ergative construction (see [Bubenik 1993; 1998; Butt 2001; Peterson 1998])
- development of ergativity (from passive constructions) in Cariban languages (see [Gildea 1998: 218 ff.])

3. Which types of syncretism are attested for valency markers?

- “Middle voice” (as reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European; see e.g. [Neu 1968a; 1968b; Jankuhn 1969; Flobert 1975; Gonda 1979])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-benefactive (subject version)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3D. How do these types of syncretism change diachronically?

✧ «Middle voice»: the development of the functions of the middle inflection from PIE to Vedic. The functions expressed with the middle inflection are enclosed with a dotted line:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Vedic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive:</td>
<td>Passive -yá-present + MED, i-aorist, stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive:</td>
<td>Reflexive tanũ-, ātmán-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal:</td>
<td>Reciprocal vi + MED., mithás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative:</td>
<td>Anticausative MED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-benefactive:</td>
<td>Auto-benefactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✧ The development of the middle function of se: from Latin to Romance/French [Kemmer 1993: 151—182; Cennamo 1993; 1998; Heidinger, forthc.]. The functions expressed with the middle se and its reflexes are enclosed with a dotted line:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>mod. Romance (French etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td>Anticausative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple intransitive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✧ Causative/passive polysemy in some modern Turkic (e.g. Tuvan; exceptional in Old Turkic), Tungusic and Mongolic languages and its emergence (e.g. from permissive causatives: 'the boy let the dog bite' → 'the boy let himself be bitten by the dog' → 'the boy was bitten by the dog' (see [Nedyalkov I. 1991])

4. Are there labile (ambitransitive) verbs / verbal forms, i.e. verbs / forms that show a valency alternation with no formal change in the verb (as in John opened the door (transitive-causative) / The door opened (intransitive))?
4D. How does this feature change in the history of language? In the case of the expansion of the labile type (cf. the history of Germanic languages and especially English), what are the sources of the labile patterning?

♦ some mechanisms of the rise of the labile patterning in English:
(i) due to some phonological developments (cf. the merger of Old English intransitive *meltan* and transitive-causative *mieltan, myltan* in modern English *melt*) [Visser 1970: 131 ff.];
(ii) due to some syntactic processes; e.g. a number of basically transitive verbs can be employed intransitively both with and without a reflexive pronoun (cf. *hide/hide himself*) in Old English, but in later periods the tendency to suppress the reflexive marker becomes stronger [Hermodsson 1952: 65 f.; Visser 1970: 145 ff.]

♦ the rise of lability in Germanic languages as a result of the emergence of intransitive usages of some -i- (-jan-) causatives (cf. Old English *iernan* ‘run’, Old High German *rinnan* ‘flow, run’ [< Proto-Germ. *reinna- ‘run’] ~ Old English *xernan* ‘run’ (intr.), ‘arrange running’ (tr.), Old High German *rennen* ‘run together, run around’ (intr.), ‘coagulate’ (tr.) [< Proto-Germ. *rannija- ‘make run’] as opposed to the Gothic pair *rinnan* ‘run’, also *ur-rinnan* ‘rise’ ~ *ur-ranjjan* ‘make rise (of the sun)’, where the -jan-causative cannot yet be employed intransitively; see [García García 2005: 49 f., 80 f.])

♦ some mechanisms of the rise of the labile patterning in Greek (Lavidas, forthc.):
‘causative extension’ = the rise of the causative-transitive usages of the originally intransitive verbs; cf. *leukaino*: ‘whiten; make white’: intransitive active and intransitive non-active in Classical Greek → intransitive non-active and labile active in Hellenistic-Roman; *pleo*: ‘float, sail; make sail’: intransitive active in Homeric Greek → labile active in Classical Greek.

♦ some mechanisms of the rise of the labile patterning in East Lezgic [Ganenkov, forthc.]:
transitive verbs denoting deformation start to express spontaneous deformation not instigated by an agent, cf. Tabasaran *at’ub* ‘hit, strike’ (tr.) ~ Lezgian *at’un* ‘cut, be cut’.
Which verbal classes participate in labile patterning? For which verb classes is the labile patterning attested earlier / later? How do closely related languages \((L_1, L_2, \ldots)\) differ as far as the system of verbal classes involved into labile patterning is concerned? Which language(s) is / are closer to the original system reconstructed for the proto-language \((L_0)\)?

- differences between classes of labile verbs in Germanic languages (see [Abraham 1997])
- the (semantic) classes of labile verbs in the history of English (see [Kitazume 1996])

Possible scenarios of the decay of the labile type.

- early Vedic \(\rightarrow\) middle Vedic (the loss of labile perfects in Vedic by the end of the early Vedic period); see [Kulikov 2003]

Which combinations of valency-changing categories are possible?

(e.g.: Are passives of causatives possible / attested? Are reflexives of causatives possible / attested? Are passives of reciprocals possible / attested?)

Is the emergence of such combined categories documented within the historical period?

- from early to middle Vedic: passives of causatives
  — in early Vedic, present passives with the suffix -\(\text{\-y\-}\) are only derived from simple transitives
  — in middle Vedic (young mantras, Yajurveda, Brähmanas) first examples of -\(\text{\-y\-}\)-passives derived from desideratives and causatives of intransitive verbs are attested: \(\tilde{\alpha}-\text{pyāyāmāna-} \quad \text{‘being made swell’ (pyā ‘swell’)} \quad \text{VS+}, \quad \text{pra-vartyāmāna-} \quad \text{‘being rolled forward’ (vṛt ‘turn’)} \quad \text{MS}^\text{m}, \quad \text{sādyāte} \quad \text{‘is (being) seated, set’ (sād ‘sit’) YV}^\text{m+}; \quad \text{etc.}
  — at the end of the Vedic period (from the Śrāuta-Sūtras onwards) and in post-Vedic, passives derived from causatives of transitives are attested: caus. \(\text{dhāpāyati} \quad \text{‘makes put’} \quad \text{― ni-dhāpyamāna- VaitS}, \quad \text{caus. pāyāyati} \quad \text{‘makes drink’} \quad \text{―pāyamāna- ĀpŚS+}; \quad \text{etc.}\)

Double categories (double causatives, passives, etc.)

Are double Xs possible? (X = causative, passive, reflexive, etc.) How are they employed / what is their meaning?
6.1D. How do double Xs arise? How does their usage change in the history?

- the emergence of double causatives in Middle Indo-Aryan from hypercharacterized Old Indo-Aryan -(ā)paya- causatives

6.2. Pseudo-double, or sesqui-, categories: two morphemes = one meaning

- pseudo-double causatives ('sesqui-causatives') in Turkic
cf. Turkish kon- ‘settle’- kon-dur- / kon-dur-t- ‘make settle’;
Azerbaijani ič- ‘drink’ — (ič-ir-) / ič-ir-t- ‘give to drink’;
Double causatives may often oust (more archaic / unproductive) simple causatives (see [Kulikov 1993: 126—127; 1999a: 55—56])

- the rise of ‘sesqui-causatives’ in Hittite (the types harnink-mi and reduplicated causative ašēš-bbi); see [Daues, forthc.]

- double passives in Balkar (Turkic) can render volitional (deliberate) activity, as opposed to accidental events (expressed by simple passives): bil-in-il-gen-di ‘[the truth] was discovered [as a result of somebody’s inquiry]’ ~ bil-in-Men-di ‘[the truth] was discovered [accidentally]’ [Lyutikova, Bonch-Osmolovskaya 2006]

7. Paradigmatic features of morphological Xs

7.1. Do Xs form complete paradigms?

7.1D. How do the paradigmatic features of X change within the documented history?

- Vedic present passives with the suffix -yā-: from early to middle Vedic [Kulikov 2001b; 2006]
  Early Vedic passives: almost exclusively 3sg., 3pl. and participles.
  Cf. the inventory of the present passive forms attested in the Rgveda: next to present forms proper, participles and rare imperatives, only exceptional attestations of other tense-moods are found (one occurrence of imperfect, one occurrence of injunctive, one occurrence of subjunctive, and no attestations of optative). The complete paradigm develops within the middle Vedic period.

7.2. Which non-finite formations are possible for Xs (converbs, infinitives, participles, nominalizations)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2D. Which non-finite formations based on Xs emerge within the documented history?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Old Indo-Aryan: causatives of converbs only appear from late Sanskrit onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Slavic: reflexive verbs (with the suffix / clitic (s\hat{e}, \text{-}\text{sja}) etc.) typically do not form nominalizations, but Polish has developed (s\hat{e})-nominalizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Does the marker of X combine with non-verbal bases? (nouns, adjectives, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8D. How do such derivatives emerge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Vedic: the reciprocal marker (RM) (\text{anyonyam}) (lit. ‘another-another’) is completely grammaticalized as a pronoun within the middle Vedic period, but it is applied to nouns (as a first member of compounds = reciprocal prefix) only from the post-Vedic period onwards (see \textit{sub} 9.1.D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Syntax: the main features of X constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1. • syntax of passive constructions (Can the passive agent be expressed? How is it encoded? Which objects can be promoted to the passive subject? …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• syntax of causative constructions (Can the causee ([-\text{object of causation}] be expressed? How is it encoded? How the initial object(s) is/are encoded? …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• syntax of reflexive constructions (Agreement of the reflexive pronoun with its antecedent; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• syntax of reciprocal constructions (Agreement of the reciprocal pronoun with the antecedent; How are the participants of the reciprocal situation encoded? E.g.: Nom. + Nom.; Nom. + Instr./Comit.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 9.1D How do these syntactic features change in the history? |

**Syntax of passives:**

♦ Turkish passives: agentless passive \(\rightarrow\) passive with overtly expressed agent nouns, cf. mod. Turkish passive agent with the postposition \(\text{tarafından}\) (probably introduced under the influence of European languages)
encoding of the passive agent in (South) Slavic:
Old Slovene, Old Serbo-Croatian: Instrumental case → modern Slovene, Serbo-Croatian: prepositional phrase with the ablative preposition od (probably due to case syncretisms, esp. in the plural; see [Gvozdanović 1996])

encoding of the passive agent in (Old) Russian:
The instrumental case-marking of the passive agent has probably been borrowed by the Old Russian literary language from Old Church Slavonic and co-existed in Old Russian with the two other types of encoding of the passive agent (ots + Genitive and u + Genitive), later ousting them entirely; see [Janke 1960: 63 ff.]

Polish impersonal passive constructions: disappearance of the overtly expressed passive agent (which could be used in Old Polish) (see [Wiemer, forthc.])

Syntax of causatives:
encoding of the pronominal causee (3sg.) in Spanish:
Old Spanish: Dat. (le/les) → modern Spanish: Acc. (lo/la/los/las) [Davies 1995]
encoding of the causee in Old Korean and Early Middle Korean (most often in the accusative) is not semantically motivated, the rise of the semantic motivation of the encoding of the cause (dative/accusative) in Contemporary Korean [Song, Kwon, forthc.]

Syntax of reciprocal constructions:
early Vedic → middle Vedic → late (post-Vedic) Sanskrit: changes in constructions with the reciprocal pronoun anyá- ... anyá- / anyonyá- ‘other-other’ (see [Kulikov 2007])

• Stage I (early Vedic):
RM1: NOM S: GEN. non-SG RM2: ACC V: SG
The two components (RM1, RM2) of the (future) reciprocal pronoun anyá- anyá- behave as autonomous lexical units (separable by other word(s), with independent accents), agreeing in number and gender with the antecedent noun; the verbal form can agree in number with the first (singular) constituent of the reciprocal phrase and thus normally is singular.

• Stage II (end of the early Vedic period):
The components of the reciprocal pronoun are still rather autonomous, but the verbal form agrees with the whole reciprocal com-
plex (denoting the set of participants which are in reciprocal relations to each other) and thus is non-singular.

- **Stage III** (middle — late Vedic):
  S:NOM.non-SG RM1:NOM.SG.M/(F)-RM2:ACC.SG.M/F V:non-SG
  The components of the reciprocal pronoun cannot be separated; the singular form is generalized; the reciprocal pronoun does not always agree with the antecedent noun in gender (masculine/neuter/feminine).

  IIIa (in the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa): both parts of the reciprocal pronoun agree in gender with the antecedent noun (anya-[M/N/F] anya-[M/N/F])

  IIIb (in most other middle and late Vedic texts): only the second part of the reciprocal pronoun agrees in gender with the antecedent noun (anyó-(M) anyá-[M/N/F])

- **Stage IV** (late Vedic — post-Vedic Sanskrit):
  S:NOM.PL RM1:NOM.SG.M-RM2:ACC.SG.M
  anyonya- is fossilized as a single lexical unit and does not agree with the antecedent noun; it can also appear as the first member of a compound (cf. anyonya-sakta- ‘connected with each other’)

9.2. Which types of constructions (resp. syntactic types of verbs) can serve as base constructions (base verbs) for X? i.e. which types of constructions/verbs can be passivized, causativized, reciprocalized, etc.?

9.2D. How does the scope of application of the X derivation change in the history?

- scope of application of causatives and passives in early/ middle Vedic:
  In early Vedic, -āya-causatives are only made from intransitives, as well as a few verbs of perception and consumption (dṛś ‘see’, vid ‘know’, pā ‘drink’), which can be constructed either with the accusative or with some other oblique cases (locative, genitive, etc.) — ‘intransitive/transitives’, in Jamison’s [1983] terminology (see also [Nedjalkov, Sil’nickij 1969] for typological generalizations). Causatives of transitives first appear in middle Vedic (Brāhmaṇas): kṛ ‘make’ — kārāyati ‘cause to make’, vak ‘speak’ — vācāyati ‘make speak’, kṛ ‘take, carry’ — ħārāyati ‘make take, make carry’ (see [Thieme 1929; Jamison 1983: 186 f.; Hock 1981: 15 ff.]).
In early Vedic, -ṇá-passives are only derived from simple transitives; middle Vedic texts attest first examples of -ṇá-passives made from derived transitives, viz. causatives (see sub 5D). Both developments are chronologically parallel (see [Kulikov 2006]).

* * * *

The questionnaire outlined above by no means claims to be exhaustive and can easily be supplemented with new questions and illustrative material. All suggestions, criticisms and comments on this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.
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