



**22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics.
Naples, 27-31 July 2015**

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

LOCAL ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Chair: Michela Cennamo (Naples, Federico II).

Members: Amelia Bandini (Naples, Federico II); Giorgio Banti (Naples L'Orientale); Giancarmine Bongo (Naples, Federico II); Paolo Donadio (Naples, Federico II); Francesca Dovetto (Naples, Federico II); Claudia Fabrizio (Università di Chieti-Pescara); Livio Gaeta (Turin); Patrizia Giuliano (Naples, Federico II); Simona Leonardi (Naples, Federico II); Silvia Luraghi (Pavia); Emma Milano (Naples, Federico II); Laura Minervini (Naples, Federico II); Salvatore Musto (Naples, Federico II); Daniela Puolato (Naples, Federico II); Rosanna Sornicola (Naples, Federico II)

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Werner Abraham (Vienna-Munich), Cynthia Allen (ANU), Henning Andersen (UC Los Angeles), Umberto Ansaldo (Honk Hong), Giorgio Banti (Naples, L'Orientale), Jóhanna Barðdal (Ghent), Marina Benedetti (Siena Stranieri), Kersti Börjars (Manchester), Claire Bowers (Yale), Michela Cennamo (Naples, Federico II), James Clackson (Cambridge), Riccardo Contini (Naples, L'Orientale), Denis Creissels (Lyon), Silvio Cruschina (Vienna), Pierluigi Cuzzolin (Bergamo), Hubert Cuyckens (Leuven), Paolo Di Giovine (Rome, La Sapienza), Francesca Dovetto (Naples, Federico II), Þórhallur Eyþórsson (University of Iceland), Ian Terie Faarlund (Oslo), Bjarke Frellesvig (Oxford), Livio Gaeta (Turin), Anna Giacalone Ramat (Pavia), Spike Gildea (University of Oregon), Elly van Gelderen (Arizona State University), Dag Haug (Oslo), Hans Henrich Hock (University of Illinois), Brian Joseph (Ohio State University), Ans van Kemenade (Radboud University Nijmegen), Leonid Kulikov (Ghent), Itziar Laka (University of the Basque Country), Romano Lazzeroni (Pisa), Elisabeth Leiss (Munich), Silvia Luraghi (Pavia), Elisabetta Magni (Bologna), Martin Maiden (Oxford), Giovanna Marotta (Pisa), Laura Minervini (Naples, Federico II), Marianne Mithun (UC Santa Barbara), Piera Molinelli (Bergamo), Elda Morlicchio (Naples, L'Orientale), Heiko Narrog (Tohoku University), Paolo Ramat (Pavia), Nikolaus Ritt (Vienna), Ian Roberts (Cambridge), Suzanne Romaine (Oxford), Malcom Ross (ANU), Joseph Salmons (University of Wisconsin), Lene Schøsler (Copenhagen), John Charles Smith (Oxford), Rosanna Sornicola (Naples, Federico II), Nigel Vincent (Manchester), Søren Wickmann (MPI-EVA), David Willis (Cambridge).

The question is how suppletive stems can be distributed over inflectional paradigms, and a constraint one might want to entertain is to do with whether the distributions have to respect paradigmatic structures. Modelling paradigmatic structures in terms of geometric arrangements, suppletion often patterns as in (1), with each suppletive stem extending over a solid block, as defined by a single inflectional category (with number and case merely used for exemplification). Suppletive stems can also extend to a neighbour outside their block, with the more complex distribution then having to be stated in terms of two categories ((2), stem *x* used for SG and GEN.PL). The most complex distribution conceivable are CROSSOVERS, with no uniform arrangement of the categories and their terms possible where the relevant cells would be horizontal or vertical neighbours ((3), stem *x* used for NOM.SG and GEN.PL).

	(1a)		(1b)		(2)		(3)	
	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
NOM	x	<u>y</u>	<u>x</u>	x	x	y	x	y
ACC	x	y	y	y	x	y	y	y
GEN	x	y	y	y	<u>x</u>	x	y	x

Now, a survey of suppletion across a wide range of languages, in addition to frequent instances of patterns (1) and (2), also unearthes, if comparatively rarely, instances of crossovers (3). Hence, on empirical grounds, there can be no timeless law prohibiting such crossovers.

However, when it is taken into account how suppletion comes about, a diachronic constraint **can** be maintained. When suppletion is created through the COMBINATION of forms of separate lexemes in one paradigm, then paradigm structures **must** be respected and crossovers **are** prohibited. When suppletion develops through phonological DISSIMILATION of allomorphic stems of one lexeme, just about anything goes distributionwise. The impossibility of a timeless constraint on paradigmatic distributions is due to the fact that from the net results of such changes the different modes of origin of suppletion, combination or dissimilation, are indistinguishable. Regardless of their modes of origins, all suppletions are to be dealt with identically in synchronic grammar, however orderly or disorderly their distributions in paradigmatic terms; of their modes of origin, only one, namely combination, is severely constrained through paradigmatic structure.

Negative concord in Slavic: continuity or development?

Vladimir R. Polomac (University of Kragujevac)

Jelena L. Petković (University of Kragujevac)

So far generalizations about the development of Slavic constructions with negative concord have mainly been based on the material from Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian and Old Czech. According to the dominant position in the Slavic linguistics, constructions which

exhibit negative concord, as in (1), developed from constructions which do not have an overt negative operator in the predicate, as in (2). More generally, it is assumed that all the Slavic languages underwent the same type of change: from a language with the non-strict negative concord to a language with the strict negative concord (Haspelmath 1997: 210–213, Brown 2002, Dočekal 2009, Tsurska 2010):

- (1) Nikto nevie.
‘Nobody neg knows.’
- (2) Nikto vie.
‘Nobody neg knows.’

Our empirical research of the Old Serbian data from the 12th to 15th century (Petković and Polomac 2013) attested both types of structure: a) NegQ + NegV (the negated universal quantifier and the negation of the predicate, as in (1)), b) NegQ + NegV (the negated universal quantifier and the absence of the negative operator in the predicate), as in (2)). The second type, however, was attested sporadically (in the parts of the charters written in Serbian Church Slavonic), and is a syntactic borrowing from Greek (via the Old Church Slavonic language). Given that negative concord in the Serbian language may be traced back to the oldest surviving documents, in typological terms, Old Serbian, just like contemporary Serbian, is a language with the strict negative concord.

The aim of this paper is to provide a unitary account of the development of negative concord structures in the Slavic languages. Our working assumptions are as follows: 1) the Proto-Slavic language belongs to the type with the strict negative concord; 2) the Slavic languages, in general, exhibit continuity in negative concord structures rather than development. Our hypotheses have been verified in the data excerpted from Old Slavic, Old Russian and Old Czech.

In support of our proposal, and as a counterargument to the position taken in Willis (2013), we set forth and explain the following findings and assumptions: a) an extremely low frequency of the construction NegQ + NegV in the Old Russian state documents; b) the construction NegQ + NegV in Old Czech may reflect a strong Latin influence (cf. Vachek 1947); c) the construction NegQ + NegV in the contemporary Russian dialects may be an outcome of recent areal developments, and not of the influence of Old Church Slavonic (cf. Haspelmath 1997 regarding the Germanic and Romance languages).

References

- Brown 2002: Brown, Sue. A Minimalist Approach to Negation in Old Church Slavonic: A Look at the Codex Marianus. Wayles Browne, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara H. Partee and Robert A. Rothstein (eds.). *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics XI: The Amherst Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 159–179.
- Dočekal 2009: Dočekal, Mojmir. Negative Concord: From Old Church Slavonic to Contemporary Chech. Björn Hansen, Jasmina Grkovi-Major (eds.). *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax: Gradual Changes in Focus*. Munchen – Berlin – Wien: Verlag Kubon & Sagner, 29–41.

- Haspelmath 1997: Haspelmath, Martin. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Křížková 1968: Kržížkova, Helena. К вопросу о так называемой двойной негации в славянских языках. *Slavia* XXXVII/1 (1968): 21–39.
- Petković–Polomac 2013: Петковић, Јелена и Поломац, Владимир. Слагање негација у старосрпском језику. Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику, LVI/2, 7–22.
- Tsurska 2010: Tsurska, Olena Anatolijivna. *Clausal Architecture and Sentential Negation in Slavic*. Arizona State University.
- Vachek 1947: Vachek, Josef. *Obecný zápor v angličtině a v češtině. Příspěvky k dějinám řeči a literatury anglické VI*. Praha: FF UK, 11–65.
- Willis 2013: Willis, David. Negation in the History of the Slavonic Languages. David Willis, Christopher Lucas, Anne Breitbarth (eds.). *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean. Volume I: Case Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 341–399.

The Indo-Aryan “alignment change” revisited

Uta Reinöhl (University of Cologne)

In this talk, I will revisit a well-known case of alignment change, the shift from a nominative-accusative system to a split ergative-absolutive one in the history of Indo-Aryan. While Old Indo-Aryan is dominated by nominative-accusative alignment, many New Indo-Aryan languages have developed split ergativity along an aspectual axis. While this change is cited as the classical case of alignment change (along with the parallel development in Iranian) (e.g. Harris & Campbell 1995) and has been treated in a fair number of publications, I want to offer a novel analysis of the historical origins of the ergative construction. Rather than arguing for a passive-to-ergative change or for the rival analysis that the construction in question had always been ergative, I propose that it is a change in word class that lies at the heart of the phenomenon.

The *ta*-formation, a “perfective participle” formed from a verb stem with the suffix *-ta* which inflects for case, number and gender is at the origin of the perfective verbal form which triggers ergative case marking and agreement in many modern Indo-Aryan languages. A number of studies have addressed the *ta*-construction in Old Indo-Aryan. The initial claim put forward (e.g. Anderson 1977), that it was a passive at this stage, a proposal also found today (e.g. Verbeke 2013: 76-77), does not hold up to scrutiny. While the *ta*-construction does choose a patientive subject in the case of transitive verbs, it is neither semantically, morphologically, nor syntactically a passive: The subject is not restricted to patientive roles, the verb lacks passive morphology, and the construction does not have an unmarked active counterpart. An alternative