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Identity of form: lexemes

1. ina gerun-an these expensive+3pl.
   "These are expensive."

2. sima ina farsa mi-y-an Sima these tomorrow CONT+come+3pl.
   "Sima and family will come tomorrow."

3. ketab-o majale-o ina xund-im these book+CONJ magazine+CONJ these read.PAST+1pl.
   "We read books and magazines and stuff."

4. goft ke mi-r-e said.PST.3SG COMP CONT+go+3SG
   "She/he said that she/he will go."

5. bayed ke be-r-e must PRT SUB+go+3SG
   "She/he must go."

6. sima ke mi-r-e Sima PRT CONT+go+3SG
   "Sima will go."

Identity of form: morphemes

7. ketab-e gerun book+ez expensive 
   "expensive book"

8. ketab-e sima book+ez Sima
   "Sima’s expensive book"

9. ketab-e xund æm book+DEF.5SG the book
   "the book"

10. æz in xof-am amead from this good+1SG.CLCCome.PST.3SG.SBI
    "I liked this."

11. ketab-æm-o xund æm book+ISO.PASS+OM read.PAST+1SG.SBI
    "I read my book."

12. ketab-æm æm xund æm book+ADD read.PAST+1SG.SBI
    "I read books/the book as well."

Identity of form: morphemes

Grammaticalization

One well-established grammaticalization cline is from independent content word to bound morpheme.
(Heptner & Traugott 1993:7)

Under the Minimalist version a principle of Feature Economy strips away semantic and interpretable features.
(van Gelderen 2011:14.17)

---

see Ghomeshi (to appear)
see Ghomeshi (2013)
**Grammaticalization**

**Last Merge Principle**
Merge as late as possible.
(van Gelderen 2011:14.17)

This is consistent with Chomsky’s (1995, 2001) ‘merge-over-move’ principle according to which it is preferable to merge an element in a higher position than to merge it lower in a syntactic structure and then move it higher. This principle has been invoked to explain the change from main verb to auxiliary.

**Grammaticalization: ke in Persian**

13. introducing a purpose clause  

un mansel-o foron-een [ke] be-r-er amrika ]
that house →om sold+3n. that sub+go+3n. America
“They sold that house [in order/so that] to go to America.”

14. introducing a clause with a temporal reading [term and example from Perry 2007:996]

hamuz vared-ra-shode bud-am [ke mara did ]
yet enter=3sg=become.PTCP was+3sg.
“We had not yet entered when he saw us.”

15. introducing a clause with a causal reading [term and example from Perry 2007:996]

bo-ra birun [ke sobh shod ]
imp+go outside that morning became=3sg
‘Go out, for it is morning.’

be’rd az in ke ‘after’ (lit. after that which); chun ke ‘because’; bær-ye in ke, ‘for, because’ (lit. for that which); to ke ‘so that’; argar ke ‘although’; bæral ‘but’

**Head Preference Principle (HPP)**
Be a head, rather than a phrase.

This principle explains, for example, the tendency for relative or demonstrative pronouns (merged as specifiers within CP) to be reanalyzed as complementizers (merged as C-heads).

**Grammaticalization: ke in Persian**

16. introducing direct discourse (Perry 2007)
goft (ke) man ne-mi-y-am)
said.3sg that I neg+cont+come+3sg
“He said ‘I’m not coming.’”

17. introducing direct discourse (Perry 2007)
goft (ke) ne-mi-y-ad)
said.3sg that neg+cont+come+3sg
“He said he’s not coming.”

18. introducing an indicative complement clause

mi-dun-æm (ke) aftab daq-e ]
cont+know+1sg that sun hot+3sg
‘I know (that) the sun is hot.’

Estaji (2011) traces the sources of some of these uses of ke to relative pronouns and some to other connectives. See also Stífla (2004) for pronominal sources of ke.
The modal particle *ke*

19. *I am word-i ke?*  
   dinner eat.PST+2SG PRT  
   ‘You have eaten, haven’t you?’

20. *hai ke ne-mi-r-in emIta?*  
   place PRT NEG=CONT+GO+2SG tonight  
   ‘You’re not going anywhere tonight, are you?’  
   (presumed answer is ‘no’)

21. *eke in ka-a ke asun nist*  
   because this work+PRT easy NEG=be+3SG  
   ‘Because these things aren’t easy to do.’ (in response to  
   a question about why something didn’t get done)

22. *qahve ke mi-xor-e*  
   coffee PRT CONT+consume+3SG  
   ‘S/he drinks coffee.’ (…but not other things)

Some of the functions of the modal particle *ke*

- requesting confirmation
- underlining the obvious (in exclamations)
- adversative (marks assertion in the context of counter-expectations)
- identifying most likely alternative from a list  
  (scalar reading)

See Bateni (2010), Lazard (1957, 1992), Droj & Rezazl (2013)

---

Modal particles across languages

Properties (see Traugott 2007)

- lack connective properties at the discourse level (do not sequence units of talk)
- occur in dialogic contexts and are often ‘adversative’
- may not appear in one fixed position (e.g. in German they occur in the “Middle-field” but can  
  also appear in other clause-internal positions)
- are phonologically unstressed and semantically have inferential, epistemic meanings
- are often untranslatable from one language to another
- are often deletable in translation

**German** (Diewald 2013:21.3)

23. *ja, und dann kommt ja der große Balken, ja?*  
   *ja, and then comes ja the large beam, ja?*
   ‘Okay, and then – we know that – comes the large beam, right’

---

The functions of *ke*

- **Layering**: where original and emergent functions coexist.  
  (Hopper & Traugott 2003:124-6)
- **(Grammatical) Polyseney**
- **Polyfunctionality**
- **Heterosemey**: where a word belongs to two different categories, e.g. non-finite to  
  and preposition to (Lichtenberk 1991, Diewald 2013)

---

Pragmaticalization

(y’know) cars are (y’know) expensive (y’know)

(y’know) cars are (y’know) expensive (y’know)

(y’know) cars are (y’know) expensive (y’know)
Detachment Principle
[head complement] \rightarrow [\dddot{k} \rightarrow head complement]
Ghoseishi (2013)

\[ TP [\dddot{k} \rightarrow head complement] \rightarrow \] [XP] ke

where XP receives adverbase focus, exclamatory force, scalar reading of being most likely, etc.

Schema:
[XP] ke

Pragmaticalization & the Detachment Principle

Coordination: hæm in Persian (Stilo 2004)

Simple coordinate conjunction
24. hæm sib berenj xærid-arm / sib xærid-arm/no berenj
   apple=CONJ rice buy/PST-1SG apple buy/PST-1SG=CONJ rice
   ‘I bought apples and rice.’

Bisynthetic Coordination
25. hæm sib berenj xærid-arm
   ALSO apple=CONJ ALSO rice buy/PST-1SG
   ‘I bought (both) apples and rice.

26. hæm sib xærid-arm=no berenj
   ALSO apple buy/PST-1SG CONJ ALSO rice  CONJ ALSO fish
   ‘I bought (both) apples and rice.

hæm vætan hæm-homeland ‘compatriot,’ hæm kekask-i hæm-class(-ite) ‘classmate,’ hæm saye hæm-shade ‘neighbours,’ hæm dige hæm-other ‘each other,’ ba hæm with hæm ‘together,’ hæm ir hæm-this ‘this very one’ (emphatic deictic), hæmishe ‘always’

Coordination: hæm in Persian

27. hæm sib xærid-arm=no hæm berenj
   ALSO apple buy/PST-1SG CONJ ALSO rice
   ‘I bought (both) apples and rice.’

28. sib xærid-arm, berenj-arm * ( xærid-arm) apple buy/PST-1SG
   ‘I bought apples and rice too.’

29. væ æz un bardarx, xæsise\(2\)
   and from that worse stingy-is
   ‘And what’s worse, he’s stingy!’

30. æz un-arm bardarx, xæsise\(2\)
   from that also worse stingy-is
   ‘And what’s worse, he’s stingy!’

While appearing to be a reduced form of hæm, this marker differs in numerous ways.

The particle -æm

Stilo (2004) identifies at least four functions for -æm:

31. Inclusive focus particle
   mæn jayd\(æm\) did\(æm\)
   I Javad/also saw/PST-1SG
   ‘I saw Javad too.’

32. Coordinating conjunction meaning ‘and’
   diruz xeyli xærid bud, yesterday very cold be.PST-3SG
   ‘Yesterday was very cold, and it was raining also.’

33. Coordinating conjunction meaning ‘even’
   daer omn\(æm\) xætæng\(æm\) mi-\(æm\)-and
   in America crab\(æm\) CONT-eat-3Pl
   ‘In America, they even eat crabs.

34. As an adverbase conjunction meaning ‘but, and’
   bar\(æm\)-\(æm\) mi-vast ke ped\(æm\)-\(æm\) e bar\(æm\)-\(æm\)-\(æm\)
   only CONT\=want.PST-3SG that father\=3SG.POSS PED\=turn=3SG
   ‘He only wanted his father to return. But his father had no thought of returning.’
The particle -æm: test for additive marker

Its core function is best characterized as additive:

Ishkashimi                      Persian

35. . . . The mother goes away and leaves the child an apple and an apricot. When she returns, she asks if the child ate the apple.  
Q: Did you eat the apple?  
A: Az-ǝm čwǝnḍ-ǝm xůl 1SG-1SG apricot+PRT eat.  

36. . . . The mother goes away and leaves the child an apple and an apricot. When she returns, she asks if the child ate the apple.  
Q: sib-o xord-i? apple+OM eat.PST+2SG  
A: zærdalu-r=æm xord-æm apricot+OM+ADD eat.PST+1SG  

"I ate the apricot as well." (meaning: I ate both)

Forker (2016) notes that additives are frequently called 'focus particles' or 'focus-sensitive particles'. They are commonly seen as presupposition triggers: there is an alternate proposition in which the associate is replaced by a contextually relevant alternative.

Presupposition: I ate the apple.

The additive: typology of ...

Forker (2016) identifies seven core semantics domains of additives, of which Persian has at least four:

- Concessive
- Scalar additive
- Additive
- Conjunctional adverb
- Indefinites
- Coordination

37. Inclusive focus particle  
man-æm javāx-æm did-æm  
i saw Javad too.

38. Coordinating conjunction meaning ‘and’  
diruz xeyi xand bud, yesterday very cold be.PST.3SG  
barun-æm miy-æmed rain=also CONT=come.PST.3SG  
"Yesterday was very cold, and it was raining also."

39. Coordinating conjunction meaning ‘even’  
dær amrika xarang=æm mi-vor-ænd  
in America crab=also CONT-eat-3PlPST,  
ke peder-æ barγ=ænd-e eat.  
"In America, they even eat crabs."

40. As an adversative conjunction meaning ‘but, and’  
fəxqet mi-vast only CONT=want.PST.3SG  
peder-e harm fæk-e barγ=ænd-æm na-dalt  
father also thought+3PST+turn.PST+3SG  
"He only wanted his father to return. But his father had no thought of returning."

The polysemy of -æm

Fig. 1. A categorical semantic map for additives.  
Forker (2016:18)
The distribution of -æm

- can occur more than once in a clause
41. ha ba'd-e æm be xale minu-æm ye zangi=æd æm/ do daqiqa/
PRT after+3SG.CLCL+ADD to aunt Minoo+ADD one phone+HDEF=HIT.PST+1SG two minutes
‘Oh and then I called Aunt Minoo, two minutes.’ [Canavan & Zipperlen 1996, CALLFRIEND FARSI FA_4046]
- can co-occur with ke
42. chi-eæm bud æm ke be mān hichi æm=goft/i/
think+HDEF neg+say.PST+3SG be.PST.3SG Saeed you+ADD PRT to me nothing neg+say.PST+3SG
‘Saeed hadn’t said anything and you didn’t say anything to me either.’ [Canavan & Zipperlen 1996, CALLFRIEND FARSI FA_4099]

Schema for -æm

[XP] ke — where XP receives adversive focus, exclamative force, scalar reading of being most likely, etc.

[...{XP} æm ... V] — where XP receives additive interpretation, scalar reading of being least likely, contrastive topic, or whole clause is conjoined with another via ‘and then’

Note that both ke and -æm tend to be follow the first constituent in the clause but this is not absolute.

Forker (2016:4) notes that there are few languages that allow an additive to occur on a finite verb, and even in those languages, the associate is not the verb itself but one of its arguments.

Note: xodæm-æm is okay, therefore constraint is not about sequence of two identical affixes but rather a categorical one.

The distribution of -æm

- can occur with non-nominal associates
43. ... in discussion about status in the US...
  goft mam-æm hāmāntorī bud-æm/ ino-m be-æm/ goft-æmb/ ke/
say.PST.3SG the same be.PST+1SG they+ADD two minutes
  say.PST HDEF be.PST+3PI that

44. ... in discussion about a mutual friend...
  ‘Ph.D. dar-e xeyli-æm sat-eš-e ešun tu in department man-e ma
  PhD has+3SG very+ADD 3SG.PST high be.3SG in this department+2 1pl
  ‘He, has a Ph.D. and has high status in our department.’ [Canavan & Zipperlen 1996, CALLFRIEND FARSI FA_4621]

Homophony & Inflectional Spread

45. bæra ye mān-æm sib xariid-æm apple xariid-æm
  for+e2 mother+3SGL.PST apple be.PST+1SGL
  ‘I bought apples and rice too for my mother.’

subject agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-æm -im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-i -id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-e -et</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pronominal enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-æm -ešun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-et -etun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-ei -esun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: æm-æm is okay, therefore constraint is not about sequence of two identical affixes but rather a categorical one.
Inflectional spread in Korean: EPM

46. ai-tul-i kongwon-yeo-tul chinkwu-lang(-tul) culkepley(-tul)
   child+PL+NOM park+LOC(+PL) friend+COMP(+PL) cheerfully(+PL)
   'The children wanted to sing a song cheerfully with their friends in the park.'

47. ai-tul-i puwul-ko(-tul) siph-e(-tul) ha-ess-ta
   song+PL+ACC sing+COMP(+PL) like+COMP(+PL) do+PST+IND
   'The children drank water.

48. ai-tul-i cal(-tul) nol-ass-ta
   child+PL+NOM water(+PL)+ACC drink+PST+IND
   'The children played well.'

Song (1997) suggests that EPM of the kind in X above may mark focus. Jin Ho Yeum (p.c.) suggests that in addition to focus, EPM may mark utterances by a higher status speaker towards a lower status one.

Inflectional spread in Guaraní: la

49. ha o-japo jey ará chupe hina la
   and A3xb again should-to-him PROG LA
   estudio-kuéra study-PL

We have seen three types of “inflectional spread”:

- pragmaticalization via detachment
- homophony by analogy
- derivation

Hypothesis: the form of a frequently occurring grammatical morpheme (e.g. an inflectional affix) is available for the expression of functions in other domains, namely the domain of word formation or the domain of pragmatics.

From which it follows that:

- There is a domain of pragmatics, perhaps best represented with constructional schema, where marker is somewhat mobile (“no fixed address”), polysemous, and where their meaning often involves “focus”, information structure, and subjectivity.
- That in our study of the relationship between sound and meaning, we must find a way to model the fact that the same form can have vastly different functions depending on the domain.
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