

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bybee, Joan L. and William Pagliuca. 1985. Cross-linguistic Comparison and the Development of Grammatical Meaning. *Historical Semantics: Historical Word Formation*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak. 59-83.
- Givón, Talmy. 1980. The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements. *Studies in Language*. 4.333-377.
- Kim, N. 1974. *Studies in the Syntax of Korean Complementization*. University of Washington Dissertation.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic Variation and Diachronic Change. *Lingua e Stile* 20:303-318.
- Lord, Carol. 1976. Evidence for Syntactic Reanalysis: From Verb to Complementizer in Kwa. *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementization. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Constructions*, ed. by Timothy Shopen.
- Martin, Samuel and Young-Sook C. Lee. 1989. *Beginning Korean*. Yale University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ransom, Evelyn. 1986. *Complementization: Its Meanings and Forms*. Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From Propositional to Textual and Expressive Meanings: Some Semantic-Pragmatic Aspects of Grammaticalization. *Perspectives on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel. Benjamins. 245-271.

1988. BLS 14:375-388

On Syntactic Convergence: The Case of the Verb 'say'
in Tibeto-Burman¹
Anju Saxena
University of Oregon

Introduction

In a number of languages around the world, some form of the verb 'say' is used as a quotative marker². In South Asian languages too the quotative is a form of the verb 'say'. In these languages the verb 'say' has been further reanalyzed and is used to convey a wide range of functions, such as causal and conditional conjunction.

The grammaticalized functions of the verb 'say' in South Asian languages are: quotative, causal, purpose and conditional conjunction; it occurs with embedded questions, with onomatopoeic expressions, as a question word complementizer, as an evidential particle, as an expletive and as a naming-labelling device. In Saxena (1987) I have argued for a historical sequence of the development of these functions such that at stage I the verb 'say' functions as a linker between the tightly bound complement and the main verb (quotative), at stage II the verb 'say' also functions as a linker between adverbial clauses and the main verb (purpose, causal and conditional conjunction) and at stage III it functions as a linker between two NPs (comparative marker).

Though the quotative has been used as a feature to define India as a linguistic area, most of the studies done so far (such as Kuiper (1974), Klaiman (1977), and Southworth (1982)) focussed their attention on the quotative function in Indic and Dravidian languages ignoring Tibeto-Burman languages almost completely³.

The aim of this paper is to show that the presence of the grammaticalized functions of the verb 'say' ("quotative complex", henceforth) in Tibeto-Burman languages is due to Indic influence. The comparative Tibeto-Burman evidence indicates that areal influence was probably the stimulus for the development of the quotative complex in these languages.

In order to prove this contention, I will first briefly discuss the quotative complex in Indic and Dravidian languages. Such a description will help in establishing a normal pattern in the South Asian subcontinent. After showing the normal pattern in this area, we will examine the nature of the quotative complex in Tibeto-Burman languages. This description, we hope, will show that Tibeto-Burman languages of the

South Asian subcontinent are more similar to the neighboring Indic languages regarding the quotative complex than they are to other Tibeto-Burman languages with which they are genetically related. I will take into consideration representative languages of several branches of the Sino-Tibetan language family⁴:

- (i) Newari, Magar, Ladakhi, Sherpa, Jirel and Lhasa Tibetan (Bodish);
- (ii) Tangkhul Naga (Naga);
- (iii) Lushai (Kuki-Chin);
- (iv) Adi (Bodo-Garo?);
- (v) Meithei (Mikir-Meithei);
- (vi) Lahu and Lisu (Lolo-Burmese); and
- (vii) Jinghpaw.

Six of these languages - Newari, Magar, Sherpa, Jirel, Meithei and Adi - have been in close contact with Indic languages (Nepali, Bengali and Assamese), whereas Tangkhul Naga, Lhasa Tibetan, Lahu, Lisu and Jinghpaw have not been in contact with any Indic language; and Lushai and Ladakhi only marginally.

Quotative complex in South Asian languages

Two important characteristics of the quotative complex in Indic and Dravidian languages are: (i) The quotative is a form of the verb 'say'; and (ii) this form of the verb 'say' is used to convey a wide range of functions. I'm illustrating a few of these grammaticalized functions here (for details see Saxena (1987)).

Quotative:

Nepali: rām-le saroj calāk cha bhanera bhay-o⁵
 Ram-ERG Saroj intelligent is say-PART say-PD
 'Ram said that Saroj is intelligent.'

Causal conjunction:

Nepali: timiharu madh-e ek jana murkh ho
 you PL among-LOC one CL fool is

kinabhane yo dhorohoro hoina
 why-say-PART this tower be NEG
 'One of you is a fool because this is not a tower.'

Onomatopoeic expressions:

Nepali: saroja dh@mm@ bhanera pacchaanhy-o
 Saroja Onp say-PART fell down-PD
 'Saroja fell down with a thud.'

Quotative complex in Tibeto-Burman languages of South East Asia

In Lahu (Matisoff, 1973) the quotative markers are: qhe

~ qô?, tE ~ tE? 'thus'. The following sentence is illustrative.

Lahu: te mâ phê? qhe qô? pîve yo
 'He said "He cannot do it"'

["Cannot do it" - thus he said]

In Lahu the embedded sentence can be "doubly set off" from the rest of the sentence by having qô? in the initial and also in the final position. For example,

Lahu: yô qô? ve: šó-pō mû-yé mâ là qo vên qhə qay
 ve qhe qô? ve

'He said he would go to town if it didn't rain tomorrow.'

[What he said was "if it didn't rain tomorrow, he would go to town" - thus he said.]

Normally the first qô? is deleted but never the second one. (As will be pointed out later in the paper, this condition in Lahu is very similar to a Lhasa Tibetan restriction on the occurrence of the quotative).⁶

In Lisu bē 'say' seems to occur as the quotative, as a purpose conjunction and it "has the specialized meaning 'speaking of'" (Roop, 1979:208). The following sentences are illustrative.

Purpose: gyia bēkyāngū
 (go-nom say=remain-nom-is=so)
 'I intend to go'

Speaking of: mahā bé, āzù māvā há bé; āzù zānō
 (reputation have-nom say-nom, our together reputation is)
 'If (our daughter) has a good reputation, (it's also) our joint reputation.'

In Jinghpaw da is used as a quotative and as an evidential particle. The following sentence is illustrative.

Evidential: anhtē gǎloi n jaw ga ai, nga ma da
 'They say, we will never give it.'

It is important to point out that da does not seem to be a form of the verb 'say' in Jinghpaw. The forms of the verb 'say' in Jinghpaw are: sun ai or ngu ai.

Quotative complex in Tibeto-Burman languages of South Asian subcontinent

Newari, Sherpa, Magar, Jirel, Meithei and Adi have the following functions of the verb 'say': quotative,

causal, purpose and conditional conjunction, as an evidential particle, as a naming-labelling device and as an expletive. It also occurs with question words, with embedded questions, with onomatopoeic expressions and it conveys the sense of "deliberateness". dha-k-a-a dha-i-gu in Newari, am-la in Adi, si-N si-ni in Sherpa, si-ni in Jirel, de-mx in Magar and hāi-nā in Methei have the maximum number of grammaticalized functions, the most basic of these functions being the quotative. (In order to avoid repetition, examples of Newari, Sherpa, Jirel, Magar, Methei and Adi will be given simultaneously). I don't have enough data to say whether Adi does or does not have functions such as causal, purpose and conditional conjunction and whether it can occur with question words and with onomatopoeic expressions.

Quotative: The following sentences illustrate the use of the verb 'say' as quotative.

Newari: rām-ɔ saroj calāk dha-k-a-a
Ram-ERG Saroj intelligent say-CAUSE-PART-NF

dhal-ɔ
say-PD

'Ram said that Saroj is intelligent.'

Sherpa: cipcang 'ti-ki "di kalak woru 'ti yangq
jackal he-AG this crow voice that em

kangyaapq dzop-te lyemu-yi 'nok" si-N
surprisingly make-may beautiful-em be sayPART

sikyaa -nok
say-PD

'The jackal said: "The voice of the crow may sound extremely beautiful."'

Methei: rām-na kamala laka-ni hāi-nā khaq-i
Ram-ERG Kamala come-FUT say-PART know-PRES
'Ram knows that Kamala would come.'

Jirel: the-me 'the 'thom-gi "abii 'woi kho-tniq'
then-T2 that bear-Ag Ex Ex you-Lg-E

'cyiq kha-in gyaamu gal-ka" si-n 'the
what do-vd2 fat go-Q say-vd2 that

kipcyang-laq 'Thijini
jackal-G ask-vd1

'That bear asked the jackal in amazement, "How fat are you."'

Magar: ho-tik-ing a-lak ta-ha-rx "oho nga-i-cx
Dsl-x-Dr Ds2-place arrive-P-Cj1 oh I-AgB2

hi ale puci-a ? ciso le gilo le" de-a
what Ds2 step on-P cold be soft be say-P

rx nga-ke de-a
r-G I-G say-P

'Having gotten away (he said), "Oh, what is it that I stepped on? It was cold and soft."'

Causal conjunction: In all these languages, the verb 'say' is used as part of a construction conveying a sense of reason or causation.

Newari: chi-pi cho-mho murkho kho chae-dha-e-sa⁷
you-Pl one-CL fools are why-say-INF-if

tho dhorohora mo-khu
this tower NEG-is

'One of you is a fool because this is not a tower.'

Sherpa: 'ti-'mi 'ti-ki nangje 'si-ne 'kho-re
that man that-AG pity say-PART he-GEN

khangbaa 'khurq 'gaal-nok
house carry go-PD

'The man felt pity for it and took it to his house.'

Jirel: 'the phujyung-te sacyi-rangq phemme 'chol-apq
that boy-that really-E wife searchvil3

si-ni ngaaroq 'cyok-teq khamba-du-kiq gal-duklo
say-vd1 tomorrow like-F house-L-from go-vi6RI
'The next day he left home to search for a wife'

Magar: nga-cx hxjur-ke usha pa-ke de-mx
I- B2 sir-G medicine search-Inf say-Cj2

Dheray bon pahar pxrbxt charhya-mx hwa-a
much jungle hill mountain wander-Cj2 moveP

'"For you, Sir, I have wondered through much jungle and over many hills and mountains in search of a medicine."'

Methei: ima na aibo thabak-tu tou-de hāi-ba-gi
mother my I work - CL do-NEG say-PART

šao-rammi

angry-PST

'My mother was angry because I didn't do the work.'

Embedded questions: The verb 'say' occurs in embedded question constructions as a complementizer in Methei.

Methei: rām khadāida thadoino hāi-ba khaḡ-dre
 Ram where send Q say-PART knows-NEG
 'It is not clear where to send Ram.'

Purpose conjunction:

Newari: ji kamala yato napal-e dha-k-a-a woy-a
 I Kamala DAT meet NPC say-CAUSE-PART-NFcomePD
 'I came to meet Kamala.'

Sherpa: 'tamaa yangq longq 'kho-re rhyicangq 'ti
 then em again he-GEN shadow that

thong-simaa 'ti-laa 'phat-upq 'si-ni
 see con that-to bite-1ms say-PART

tsangb-i nang-laa 'chongbal 'gep-nok
 stream-LOC in -to big jump hit-PD
 'Seeing his shadow again and trying to bite it,
 he jumped into the stream.'

Methei: ai thabak-tu tou-ge hāi-nā lakpani
 I work-CL do-FUT say-PART have come
 'I have come to do the work.'

Naming-labelling: Another function of the verb 'say' is to introduce participants or other NPs by name. The following sentences are illustrative.

Newari: cho-gu des-e cho-mho sinho-pota-moyju
 one-CL country-LOC one-CL Red Thika Cake

dha- i- mho⁸ misa-du
 say- REL woman have
 'In a country there lived a woman called Sinho-
 Poto Moyju.'

Sherpa: 'lamaaq namaaq cikq 'gelukpaa 'sir-u-wi 'tangq
 Lama kind one Gelukpa say-1ms-Fds come
 'One Lama Gelukpa came.'

Jirel: theme-ni saanuq sir-a-te phiija-la-ng
 then-E Sanu say-1ms-RPron child-G-too

mur-duk-logq
 bite-1ms-RI
 'That time Sanu had been attacked by the
 bear.'

Magar: kan-ung dungngaDi de-cx ngar-ang cho
 we-Po a place say-1ms terrace field-L rice

so-khe de-mx boy rx nga nung-ani-ang
 weed by hand say-Cj2 father Cj1 I go-Pf-P
 'Father and I had gone to our terrace in
 Dungadi, intending to weed the rice by hand.'

Methei: sumitra hāi -ba -du nupi-du
 Sumitra say-PART CL girl-CL
 'A girl called Sumitra.'

Adi: indirā am-nām mimakko ḡo kenduḡ
 Indira say-PART girl I know
 'I know a girl called Indira.'

Evidential: As an evidential particle, the verb 'say' occurs at the end of a sentence. It generally indicates that the speaker is conveying what he heard from a source which he does not identify.

Sherpa: ta 'tuk kyaa-N 'ti-ki 'ti yeti 'ti seq
 now that do that-AG that Yeti that kill

namaajuN taasam belaa yeti 'alaaq 'm si-ni
 from nowadays time Yeti many is say-PART
 'Since he did so and killed the Yeti, there
 aren't many Yetis nowadays.'

Jirel: the-me i-ne khaeu-kiq 'Tha 'se-iduk si-ni
 then-T2 up-L4 rabbit-Ag wheat eat-1ms say-1ms
 'A rabbit was nearby eating wheat.'

Magar: gorak-rx ma-si-ke na-bi-lang rx
 morning-Cj1 Neg-die-Inf CL-night-place Cj1

ma-si-ke de-mx
 Neg-die-Inf say-Cj2

'He was to pass away neither during the morning
 nor during the night.'

Methei: indira širi hāi-bani
 Indira died say-PART
 'It seems Indira died.'

"Deliberately": Newari, Methei and Adi use the verb 'say' to convey the interpretation of doing something intentionally or deliberately. The following sentences are illustrative.

Newari: rām-š gilās kurke dha-k-a-a⁹ kurk-lo
 RamERG glass breakNPC say-CAUSE-PART-NF breakPD
 'Ram broke the glass deliberately.'

Methei: rām-na gilās-tu thugai-ge hāi-nā thugai-bani
 Ram-ERG glass-CL break-FUT say-PART break-PD
 'Ram broke the glass deliberately.'

Adi: rām-a gilās ipat-pa am-la impat-to
 Ram ERG glass-CL break-FUT say-PART break-PD
 'Ram broke the glass deliberately.'

With Onomatopoeic expressions: The verb 'say' is frequently attached to onomatopoeic expressions in

Sherpa, Newari, Jirel and Magar. The following sentences are illustrative.

Sherpa: 'ti gur gur si-N kyaa 'gep -u -yi nok
that exclamation say-PART do cry-Ims-Cont-PD
'He began to snore "Gur Gur." '

Newari: hɔp hɔp dha -k -a -a wɔl-a
hot hot say-CAUSE-PART-NF come-PART
'Very very steaming (water) came...'

Jirel: 'thangq si-ni lakp-e-ki 'gyap-tuk-lo
Onp say-VD2 hand-cm-Ins hit-vi6-RI

Damp-e 'lak-pa
cheek-cm on-L2
'He hit (the child) with his hand on the
cheek.'

Magar: ho-tik-ing kat cuti swaŋk de-cx
Dsl-x-Dr one at once Onp say-B1

se-mi-ang-ta
hear-Pf-P-RI
'Suddenly there was a loud sound of slurping.'

Question word complementizer: In Newari, Sherpa and Mehei, the verb 'say' is used with question words in sentences where the verb can potentially take a sentential complement. For example,

Mehei: rām-na kari hāi-nā i
Ram-ERG what say-PART writes
'What does Ram write?'

Conditional: The verb 'say' is also used in conditional conjunction in Newari and Sherpa.

Newari: chɔ ji-tɔ kapi byu-sa dha-k-a-a ji
you I-DAT copy give-COND say-CAUS-PART-NF I

ch -tɔ kalam by-i
you-DAT pen give-PD
'If you will give me a copy then I will give
you a pen.'

Sherpa: nup-laa 'dakpu wwo-sung 'si-si phig na
night-at we come-PD say-if outside of

sur 'gothe-laa 'me gek-up
from cowshed-at fire set-Ims
'If we come at night, they would set fire to
the cowshed from outside.'

Expletive:

Sherpa: tshowang 'kang ki 'si- 'si¹⁰ tye
ceremonial rice what do say-if there

'tsharii nang-gu-wiq
blessing of main Lama give-AUX-Fdj
'Then the blessing will be given to them.'

Lushai, Ladakhi, Tangkhul Naga and Lhasa Tibetan, though spoken in the South Asian subcontinent, have at the most only been marginally influenced by the Indic languages. The following description will show that these languages behave differently from the other Tibeto-Burman languages of this region regarding the quotative complex.

Lushai has two verbs of saying, namely, *ti* and *swai*. *ti* is used as a complementizer. The following sentence is illustrative.

Lushai: rāma-cuan sarojini-cu a-fin ti
Rama Saroj he-intelligent COMP

a-swai
he said
'Rama said that Saroj is intelligent.'

Ladakhi has two grammaticalized functions of *zere*, the participial form of the verb 'say'. These are:

Complementizer:

Ladakhi: khyang Musulman in zere , ŋga-la krtakphayod
'It is known to me that you are a Moslem.'

Purpose:

Ladakhi: kho la lam la chang kish-kish mi go zere
ŋga si ŋgi bizbo yambo tangs
'In order that he might have no trouble on the
road, I sent my servant (with him).'

Tangkhul Naga doesn't have any grammaticalized functions of the verb 'say' - not even as a quotative.

Lhasa Tibetan marks the verb of the embedded sentence with a verbal suffix -s (which is apparently a reduced form of the verb *se* 'say') (Scott DeLancey, p.c.) besides using the quotative (which is a form of the verb 'say') to mark off direct discourse. For example,

Quotative:

Lhasa: mɔɔ -qE sɛ na mɔɔ -qi (rə tɪ)
old woman-ERG say-COMP old woman-ERG goat this

thiî .qi-yîi-s lâp-pa-reê
 take FUT/CONJ-QUOTE say- PERF
 'The old woman said she should take (the goat).'

In Lhasa, the quotative marker can be deleted but not the quotative suffix. Notice that Lhasa and Lahu are similar regarding the quotative construction and the restrictions on the occurrence of the quotative. It is plausible that this may be the original Tibeto-Burman pattern.

In short, the above description points out that of the Tibeto-Burman languages considered, we find a range of grammaticalized functions of the verb 'say' in Newari, Sherpa, Jirel, Magar, Mehei and Adi (which are under Indic influence) whereas Tibeto-Burman languages of the South East subcontinent and Lhasa Tibetan, Ladakhi and Tangkhul (which are not under Indic influence) do not show similar development.

Discussion

The question which arises now is: Is the quotative complex in the aforementioned Tibeto-Burman languages due to independent development devoid of the influence of the neighboring languages? The answer seems to be: No. A comparison of the grammaticalized functions in Tibeto-Burman languages and in Indic and Dravidian languages reveals the extent of similarity in these languages. If the development of the process of the grammaticalized functions in Tibeto-Burman languages is due to independent innovations, then why does no other Tibeto-Burman language show development of this construction comparable to these Tibeto-Burman languages? And, further, why is such a development restricted only to those languages which are geographically contiguous to Indic languages?

The case of Sherpa and Jirel is worth mentioning here. Sherpa and Jirel are two varieties of Tibetan spoken in Nepal where the dominant language is Nepali. Regarding the quotative complex, Sherpa and Jirel are more similar to Nepali than they are to Tibetan with which they are genetically very closely related. Sherpa and Jirel differ from Tibetan regarding three points which are the main characteristics of the verb 'say' in South Asian languages. These are: (i) Sherpa and Jirel use the verb 'say' as a quotative and not the concatenation of the verb 'say' + the verbal suffix -s which is the case in Tibetan; (ii) in these languages the quotative occurs in the postsentential position whereas in Tibetan it occurs in the presentential position; and (iii) in these languages, the verb 'say' is used to convey a wide range of functions which is

not the case in Tibetan.

A frequency count of the occurrences of the verb 'say' with non-literal meanings in 83 sentences of text in Sherpa and Tibetan shows that in Tibetan, there were 8 occurrences of the verb 'say' (all of them being the quotative) whereas in Sherpa there were 24. It is important to point out that I did not choose a particular Sherpa text to show this discrepancy—rather I took the first 83 sentences from a Sherpa text from Hale (1973) and 83 sentences of a Lhasa Tibetan text.

A comparative study of Newari, Sherpa, Magar and Lhasa shows that Newari has only the postsentential complement construction (when the complementizer is a form of the verb 'say') which is the case in Indic and Dravidian languages also. And in Lhasa we only find the 'nesting' type of construction (see the examples under quotative) whereas Sherpa and Magar have the postsentential construction as well as the 'nesting' type of construction; the latter seems to be the typical Tibeto-Burman construction. The following sentences from Magar are illustrative.

Magar: raja-i "pihin sikhar ge-s-ke
 king-Ag tomorrow wild game play-Ref1-Inf

nung-ke ma-xr-le" de-mx hukum ya-lhe-sa
 go-Inf Ne-need-be say-Cj2 command give-be-Op
 'The king said "It will be necessary to go for
 wild game." '

Magar: sila-i de-a "xho TiTra naku rx nga miT
 jackal-Ag say-Ag aho quail you Cj1 I friend

lxy-di-ing" de-mx TiTra-ke de-la-sa
 apply-LM-let's say-Cj2 quail-G say-be-Op
 'The jackal said "Oh quail, you and I should
 become friends." '

It is important to point out that Newari has been heavily under Indic influence (cf. Bendix 1974). The influence of Indic on Magar and Sherpa is not so much and on Lhasa it has presumably been minimal.

Conclusion

Thus, without denying the fact that Tibeto-Burman languages have a quotative in their system, it seems that the areal influence was probably the stimulus for the development of the quotative complex in Tibeto-Burman languages. The above description suggests that the quotative complex is an areal rather than a native

Tibeto-Burman feature.

Footnotes

1. This work was partly supported by National Science Foundation grant BNS - 8313502. I would like to thank Professor Scott DeLancey for encouraging me to work on this project. I would also like to thank him for giving me access to his Lhasa Tibetan text which proved very useful to me. I'm thankful to Professor Subbarao, Professor Hans.H. Hock, Professor Peter E. Hook for their comments. I am also thankful to Carol Genetti for giving me access to her Newari text. I alone am responsible for all the errors and inconsistencies in the analysis.

2. I define quotative as a morpheme used to mark off direct discourse.

3. Emeneau (1956) while dealing with the notion "India as a linguistic area" omits Tibeto-Burman languages completely. He states: 'The Indian subcontinent is inhabited by a very large population who speak languages belonging to three major families [emphasis added], Indo-Aryan (a subfamily of Indo-European), Dravidian and Munda.. This does not take account of all the languages that are included geographically in this area. There are Burushaski in Gilikit, Khasi in the hills of Assam, Nicobarese, Andamanese, and many languages of the Tibeto-Burman group in the Himalayas and Assam. Our attention will be focussed primarily on Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and Munda' (1956:5).

4. Lhasa Tibetan data is based on a text of a story entitled; 'A hungry dried-up goat tail'; Sherpa data is from Schottelndreyer and Hieiderose, Schottelndreyer (1973); Magar data is from Shepherd and Shepherd (1973), Jirel data is from Maibaum and Strahm (1973), Lisu data is from Roop (1970), Jinghpaw data is from Hanson (1917), Ladakhi data is from Francke (1979) and Koshal (1979); Balti data is from Read (1934); Adi, Methyl and Lushai data was collected when I was working in the University Grants Commission project on 'A Study in the Linguistic Typology, Contact and Areal Universals in the Indian Subcontinent', Delhi University. The information regarding the Indic and Dravidian languages is based on Subbarao et al (1983).

5. The abbreviations used in this study stand for: ERG = ergative, AG = Agent, DAT = Dative, PART = Participle, NF = Non Finite, CL = Classifier, NEG = Negative, FUT = Future, PRES = Present, PL = Plural, NEG = Negative, POSS = Possessive, PPS = Perfect Participial form of the verb say, PST = Past, PNG =

Person, Number and Gender, GEN = Genitive, AUX = Auxiliary, COMP = Complementizer, em = emphasis, Q = Question marker, NPC = Non Past Conjunct, Ims = Impersonal, PD = Past Disjunct, REL = Relative Clause marker, Fdj = Future disjunctive marker, Ex = Exclamation, Lg = Ligature, E = Emphatic word and suffix, vd2 = Consecutive action, Q = Interrogative marker, G = Goal, vdl = Simultaneous action, vil3 = mood:intent, F = Focus affix (attributive marker), L = Location, vi6 = Past disjunct, RI = Reported information marker, vd5 = base formative, dependent, RPron = Relative pronoun, L4 = Location and direction;at/to (up), vi2 = habitual disjunct, Onp = Onomotopoeic.

6. In Lahu there is a form *qo* 'if, when'. It is plausible that this is related to *qô?* 'to say'. I'd like to thank Professor Matisoff for providing me this information.

7. *chae-dha-e-sa* always occurs as a unit, conveying the meaning of 'because'. Such a construction is found in Shina (Gilgit) too (Peter Hook, p.c.).

8. Notice that the verb 'say' occurs with a relative clause marker. In the verb *dha-in-mho*, *mho* marks the relative clause.

9. This cannot be regarded as the literal meaning because 'will break' is not spoken. Rather, such usage conveys the interpretation of deliberateness. It is plausible that originally *dha-k-a-a* in such sentences must have been a real verb but now such sentences convey the expression of deliberateness.

10. In the speech of one of the informants, there were 13 occurrences of *kang ki 'si 'si* (as an expletive) in the total number of sentences (68).

References

- Bendix, E.H. 1974. Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman contact as seen through Nepali and Newari verb tenses. *International journal of Dravidian linguistics* 3.1:42-59.
- Emeneau, M.B. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language* 3.6:3-16
- Francke, A.H. 1979. *Ladakhi and Tibetan grammar*. Delhi: Seema Publications.
- Hale, Austin (ed.). 1973. *Clause, sentence and discourse patterns in selected languages of Nepal*. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Klaiman, M.H. 1977. Bengali syntax: Possible Dravidian influence. *International journal of Dravidian linguistics* 4.2.
- Koshal, Sanyukta. 1979. *Ladakhi grammar*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidas.

- Kuiper, F.B.J. 1974. The genesis of a linguistic area. *International journal of Dravidian linguistics* 3.4:135-153.
- Maibaum, Anita and Esther Strahm. 1973. *Jirel texts*, in Hale (ed.).
- Matisoff, J.A. 1973. *The grammar of Lahu*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- O. Hanson, Rev. L.D. 1917. *A handbook on the Kachin or Jinghpaw language*. Rangoon: The American Baptist Mission Press.
- Read, A.F.C. 1934. *Balti grammar*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Roop, D.Haigh. 1970. *A grammar of the Lisu language*. Ph.D dissertation. Yale University.
- Saxena, Anju. 1987. On the grammaticalization of the verb 'say'/'thus': A typological study. Paper presented at the Third Pacific Linguistics Conference, Eugene.
- Schottelndreyer, B. and Hieiderose, S. 1973. *Sherpa texts*, in Hale (ed.).
- Shephard, G. and Barbara Shepherd. 1973. *Magar texts*, in Hale (ed.).
- Southworth, F.C. 1982. Substratum influence on early Indo-Aryan. (Ms.).
- Subbarao, K.V., C.Viswanath Rao, Anju Saxena & Nalini Rau. 1983. Verb 'say' in South Asian languages: A study of linguistic convergence. Paper presented at the Seminar on language change and language maintenance, Osmania University, Hyderabad.

Grammaticalization and Semantic Bleaching

Eve E. Sweetser

University of California at Berkeley

This paper is an attempt to unify our understanding of semantic change, and in particular to treat the semantic changes attendant on grammaticalization as describable and explicable in the terms of the same theoretical constructs necessary to describe and explain lexical semantic change in general. I will argue that the semantic phenomenon known as "bleaching" may well fall out of ordinary trends in semantic change, taken together with an independently motivated understanding of lexical and grammatical meaning domains.

In 1912, Antoine Meillet wrote an essay called "L'Evolution des Formes Grammaticales." In it he stated:

The development of grammatical forms by progressive deterioration of previously autonomous words is made possible by...a weakening of the pronunciation, of the concrete sense of the words, and of the expressive value of words and groupings of words. The ancillary word can end up as an element lacking independent meaning as such, linked to a principal word to mark its grammatical role.

Meillet, tackling a subject so new that he used his innovative word "grammaticalization" in quotes, thought that weakening or loss of meaning was a way of describing the meaning-changes we often see accompanying the process of grammaticalizing a lexical item. He also thought that there was little *semantic* connection between prior lexical and later grammatical senses of a morpheme, although he himself quite insightfully discussed some of the semantic origins of negation-reinforcers in French.

The two questions raised by Meillet are still with us. First, are senses lost, or weakened, in grammaticalization, or what in fact happens to them? Second, to what extent are the directions (if not the occurrences) of such semantic developments regular or predictable? The second question has received attention from numerous scholars recently. Givon (1971 and elsewhere), Fleischman (1982, 1983), Bybee (1985), Anderson (1982), Genetti (1986), Bybee and Pagliuca (1985), Shepherd (1981), Sweetser (1984), DeLancey (1986) and others have all mapped directions of frequent semantic developments in grammaticalization. Traugott (1982, 1988, and elsewhere) has, in particular, argued that these shifts, like other meaning-shifts, follow a trend from propositional to textual to expressive, or (more recently) towards greater *situatedness* in the speaker's context.

The primary focus of this paper will be the first question: I shall attempt to define which aspects of meaning are lost in grammaticalization, and which are preserved. My claim is that an analysis of meaning-transfer as metaphorically structured will, for the range of cases I examine, allow us to predict which inferences are preserved across transfer of senses.