

Combined marking of reflexivity

Typology and grammaticalization

Riccardo Giomi & An Van linden

(University of Amsterdam & University of Liège)

SLE 2023 – University of Athens



1. Introduction

Topic: Combination of two or more separate grammatical markers to express reflexivity (CMRs)

(1) Dyirbal (Pama-Nyungan)

bayin-ɟilu

DET-SELF

ɟaŋgay-mari-nu

eat-INTR-NFUT

‘He is eating himself.’ (Dik 1983: 244; glosses adapted)

Lit. “he himself is eating”

Aims:

- Typological overview of the construction-types
- Pathway of grammaticalization
- Significance: Diachrony of some CMRs seems to defy unidirectionality hypotheses

Outline

~~1. Introduction~~

2. Data

3. Typology of CMRs

4. Grammaticalization

5. (Uni)directionality?

6. Conclusions

2. Data

- Convenience sample: 47 typologically and areally diverse languages from 23 families; in total, 78 CMRs (62 double marking + 16 triple marking)
 - Only languages for which we have proof of existence of CMRs (impossible to exclude existence thereof when not reported in grammars) → Some families overrepresented (3 to 8 languages > different genera)

Table 1: Overview of the languages in the sample

Macro-area	Lngs	Families	CMRs	Names of families
Eurasia	13	5	23	Abkhaz-Adyghe; Dravidian; Indo-European; Nakh-Daghestanian; Sino-Tibetan
South-America	11	8	14	Guaicuruan; Mosestenan; Naduhup; Pano-Tacanan; Quechuan; Tupian; Yahgan; Yurakaré
North-America	9	5	11	Athabaskan-Eyak-Tlingit; Iroquoian; Ktunaxa; Mayan; Otomanguean
Papunesia	8	1	18	Austronesian
Australia	3	2	8	Nyulnyulan; Pama-Nyungan
Africa	3	2	4	Afro-Asiatic; Atlantic-Congo
TOTAL	47	23	78	

3. Typology of combined marking

- Combined-marking reflexives may involve four types of grammatical elements:
 - i) personal, logophoric or reflexive (pro)noun;
 - ii) a middle(-like) marker, usually with valency-reducing functions (e.g. reflexive/reciprocal, passive, antipassive, etc.);
 - iii) an intensifier (adnominal vs. adverbial, actor- vs. non-actor oriented)
 - iv) a refractive marker (< ‘again’, ‘return’, ‘back(wards)’)

3. Typology of combined marking

- 6 out of 10 logically possible two-marker combinations attested:

Markers of different classes:

(pro)noun + intensifier

(pro)noun + middle(-like) marker

middle(-like) marker + intensifier

(pro)noun + reflexive

~~middle(-like) marker + reflexive~~

~~intensifier + reflexive~~

Markers of the same class:

~~(pro)noun + (pro)noun~~

middle(-like) marker + middle(-like) marker

intensifier + intensifier

~~reflexive + reflexive~~

- 6 out of 20 logically possible three-marker combinations also attested

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, different class (1): (pro)noun + intensifier

- logophoric pronoun + intensifier (adnominal)

(2) a. Khwarshi (Nakh-Daghestanian)

Ražab-i_i žuč_{i/j} ∅-uwox-i.

Razhab-ERG LOG.ABS I-kill-PST

‘Razhab_i killed him_j / himself_i.’ (Khalilova 2009: 427; glossed adapted)

b. *Ražab-i_i žu-žuč_{i/*j} ∅-uwox-i.*

Razhab-ERG INTS-LOG.ABS I-kill-PST

‘Razhab_i killed himself_i.’ (Khalilova 2009: 427; glossed adapted)

Lit. “Razhab killed [**him himself**]”

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, different class (2): (pro)noun + middle(-like) marker

- middle(-like) marker (antipassive) + reflexive noun

(3) Mam (Mayan)

ma *kub'* *t-b'iyoo-n* *t-iib'* *xiinaq*

REC.PST DIR 3.SG.ERG-kill-ANTP 3.SG-REFL man

'The man killed himself.' (England 1983: 74; glosses adapted)

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, different class (3): middle(-like) marker + intensifier

- middle(-like) marker (anticausative, facilitative, grooming) + intensifier (adverbial)

(4) Sinhala (Indo-European)

Mamə ibeemə sedhaa/naa gatta.

1.SG **by_SELF** wash/bathe.PTCP.PERF **INTR.PST**

'I washed/bathed by myself.' (Beavers & Zubair 2016: 98; glosses adapted)

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, different class (4): (pro)noun + reflexive

- reflexive pronoun + reflexive

(5) Adyghe (Abkhaz-Adyghe)

s-jə-ʋ^wəneʋ^wə-m z-jə-wəç'ə-ž'ə-ʋ

1.SG-POSS-neighbour-OBL REFL.ABS-3.SG.A-kill-REFACT-PST

'My neighbour killed himself' (Arkadiev & Letuchiy 2014: 505)

Lit. "my neighbour killed **himself** again"

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, same class (1): middle(-like) general + middle(-like) specific

- middle(-like) general (various functions) + middle(-like) specific (reflexive/reciprocal)

(6) Caoden rGyalrong (Sino-Tibetan)

ogjiʔ-kə *ogjiʔ* *to-gje-nə-səsmet-kjə*

3.SG-A 3.SG PFV.INV-REFL-MID(NVOL)-wound-EVID

‘He hurt **himself** ([**inadvertently**,] through his own fault).’

(LaPolla 1996: 1950; glosses adapted)

3. Typology of combined marking

Double marking, same class (2): intensifier + intensifier

- intensifier (actor-oriented adnominal) + intensifier (actor-oriented adverbial)

(7) Mezquital Otomí (Otomanguean)

Da hyan-sëhë-?ä.

3.FUT see-SELF-**3.EMPH**

‘He **himself** will see **himself**.’ (Spanish: *Se verá a si mismo él*)

(Priego-Montfort 1989: 121)

3. Typology of combined marking

Triple marking (1): (pro)noun + intensifier + middle(-like) marker

- personal pronoun + intensifier (emphatic particle) + middle(-like) marker (several functions)

(8) Mizo (Sino-Tibetan)

kéy-maʔ leʔ *kéy-maʔ kâ-in-bia*

1-EMPH and 1-EMPH 1.s-MID-speak_to

‘I’m talking to myself.’

(LaPolla 1996: 1950)

Lit. “I myself and I myself talk.INTR”

3. Typology of combined marking

Triple marking (2): (pro)noun + intensifier + reflexive

- personal pronoun + intensifier (emphatic particle) + reflexive ('again/back')

(9) Nengone (Austronesian)

<i>buhnij</i>	<i>ci</i>	<i>amani</i>	<i>buhnij</i>	<i>yawe</i>	<i>ko</i>
2.PL	IMPF	pride	2.PL	again	INTS

'You pride yourselves.'

(Moyse-Faurie 2008: 142)

Lit. "you pride **you** **again** **by yourselves**"

3. Typology of combined marking

Triple marking (3): (pro)noun + middle(-like) marker + reflexive

- personal pronoun + middle marker (several functions) + reflexive ('again/return', 'backwards')

(10) Ajië (Austronesian)

gèrré vi-méari rré yâi

1PL.INCL INTR-like **1.PL.INCL.OBJ** **backwards**

'We like ourselves/*each other.'

(Moyse-Faurie 2008: 148)

Lit. "we like.**INTR** us **back**"

3. Typology of combined marking

Table 2: Double-marking reflexive strategies by macro-area

Strategies	Eurasia	South America	North America	Papunesia	Australia	Africa	TOTAL
mid+(pro)n	3	3	4	3	2	2	17
mid+ints	5	8	1		1	1	16
(pro)n+ints	10			6			16
mid+mid	1	2	3		1	1	8
pron+refact	1			3			4
ints+ints			1				1
TOTAL (45 lgs)	20	13	9	12	4	4	62

3. Typology of combined marking

Table 3: Triple-marking reflexive strategies by macro-area

Strategies	Eurasia	South America	North America	Papunesia	Australia	Africa	TOTAL
mid+pron+ints	1			1	2		4
pron+ints+ints	2		1	1			4
mid+mid+ints		1			2		3
pron+mid+refact				2			2
pron+ints+refact				2			2
mid+mid+mid			1				1
Total (12 lgs)	3	1	2	6	4	0	16

4. Grammaticalization

Table 4: Diachronic hypothesis: combined-marking reflexives arise in grammaticalization
→ 4 stages

Stage 1	Each marker performs its original function: semantics of construction is always compositional, either exceeding reflexivity or not reflexive at all
Stage 2	Combination of markers starts conventionalizing as a reflexive construction, but compositional interpretation is still possible in context
Stage 3	Compositional interpretation is no longer possible: combination has grammaticalized as full-fledged reflexive construction, but is not strictly obligatory
Stage 4	Combination has become obligatory for the expression of reflexivity

4. Grammaticalization

Stage 1: Each marker performs its original function: semantics of construction is always compositional, exceeding mere reflexivity or not reflexive at all

(11) Huallaga Quechua (Quechuan)

(Kiki-n) wañu-chi-ku-ra-n

SELF-3POSS die-CAUS-REFL-PST-3.SBJ

‘He (**himself**) killed **himself**.’ (Weber 1989: 167, ex. (591); glossed adapted)

(12) Amharic (Afro-Asiatic)

ləmma ras-u-n tə-la-čč'-ə

Lemma head-3M.POSS-ACC MID-shave-PERF-3.M

‘Lemma shaved his head’ (‘*Lemma shaved himself’) (Amberber 2000: 326)

4. Grammaticalization

Stage 2: Combination of markers starts conventionalizing as a reflexive construction, but compositional interpretation is still possible in context

(13) Mezquital Otomí (Otomanguean)

Da *hyan-sähë-?ä.*

3.FUT see-SELF-3.EMPH

‘He **himself** will see **himself**.’ (Priego-Montfort 1989: 121)

(14) *Di ne ge rä Xuwa da hyan-sähë-?ä ha rä hñe*
1.PRS want COMPL DET Juan 3.FUT see-SELF-3.EMPH in DET mirror

‘I want Juan to see himself in the mirror.’ (Priego-Montfort 1989: 121)

4. Grammaticalization

Stage 3: Compositional interpretation is no longer possible: combination has grammaticalized as full-fledged reflexive construction, but is not strictly obligatory

(15) Kambaata (Afro-Asiatic)

ís *gag-á-s sa~~axx~~-án* *biir-óochch* *biir-úta zahh-áyyoo'u*
3M.NOM SELF-M.ACC-3M.POSS praise.MID-3.M.IPFV.CVB office-F.ABL office-F.ACC
walk-3.M.PROG

‘he walked from office to office praising himself’ (Treis 2023: 158)

(16) *Gag-á-s ba'-íshsh-o*

SELF-M.ACC-3M.POSS be_destroyed-CAUS-3.M.PFV

‘He killed himself.’ (Treis 2023: 158)

4. Grammaticalization

Stage 4: Combination has become obligatory for the expression of reflexivity

(17) Ktunaxa (isolate)

hu-n ?iktu-qu-?-m-ik

1.SG-PRED COP.VERTICAL-in_water-APPL-MID(ASSOC)-REFL

'I washed myself'. (Morgan 1992: 165; glosses adapted)

4. Grammaticalization

- Double-marking strategies

Table 5: Range of grammaticalization stages attested per strategy

Grammaticalization stage	mid+(pro)n	mid+ints	(pro)n+ints	mid+mid	pron+refact	ints+ints
1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	X
4	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X

4. Grammaticalization

- Double-marking strategies

Table 6a: Most advanced grammaticalization stage per strategy

Most advanced grzn stage	mid+(pro)n	mid+ints	(pro)n+ints	mid+mid	pron+refact	ints+ints	TOTAL
1	1	11	1	1	2		16
2	5	3	2		1	1	12
3	8	1	7	2	1		19
4	3	1	6	5			15
Total (45 lgs)	17	16	16	8	4	1	62

- 1/3 of Stage 4 CMRs are of the otherwise rare type mid+mid; probably due to one of the two middle markers having grammaticalized from a pronoun (explicitly claimed by Thompson 1996 for AET)

4. Grammaticalization

- Triple-marking strategies

Table 7a: Most advanced grammaticalization stage per strategy

Most advanced grzn stage	mid+(pro)n +refact	mid+(pro)n +ints	(pro)n+ints +refact	(pro)n+ints +ints	mid+mid +ints	mid+mid +mid	TOTAL
1				1	2		3
2		2		1	1		4
3	2	2	1	2			7
4			1			1	2
Total (12 lgs)	2	4	2	4	3	1	16

5. (Uni)directionality?

- Of “our” 6 double-marking strategies, 3 involve **intensifiers** (expression of emphasis/focus/contrast); 2 of these have reached full grammaticalization (Stage 3/4)

Table 6b: Potential counterexamples to unidirectionality hypothesis in red (15/62; 24%)

Most advanced grzn stage	mid+(pro)n	mid+ints	(pro)n+ints	mid+mid	pron+refact	ints+ints	TOTAL
1	1	11	1	1	2		16
2	5	3	2		1	1	12
3	8	1	7	2	1		19
4	3	1	6	5			15
Total (45 lgs)	17	16	16	8	4	1	62

5. (Uni)directionality?

- As for triple-marking strategies, 4 out of 6 involve **intensifiers**; 3 of these have reached full grammaticalization (Stage 3/4)

Table 7b: Potential counterexamples to unidirectionality hypothesis in red (4/16; 25%)

Most advanced grzn stage	mid+(pro)n +refact	mid+(pro)n +ints	(pro)n+ints +refact	(pro)n+ints +ints	mid+mid +ints	mid+mid +mid	TOTAL
1				1	2		3
2		2		1	1		4
3	2	2	1	2			7
4			1			1	2
Total (12 lgs)	2	4	2	4	3	1	16

5. (Uni)directionality?

- It has been claimed that the change from emphatic to “plain” reflexive conforms to the diachronic paths identified by (i.a.) Meillet (1912) and Lehmann (1982) (“loss of expressivity”), Traugott & König (1991) and Heine (2002) (“semanticization of pragmatic inferences”), Givón (1979) (“syntacticization of discourse patterns”): *from discourse pragmatics to grammar*

“Since it is commonly assumed in grammaticalization research that (pragmatic) emphasis often gives rise to the development of grammatical formatives, we seem to have a first clue as to why [...] intensifiers and reflexives are formally related in many languages.”

(Gast & Siemund 2006: 361)

→ Intensifiers regarded as a **discourse phenomenon** (*extragrammatical*), later grammaticalized as **“grammatical formatives”** (reflexives)

- In our opinion, intensifiers are **grammaticalized, intersubjective** expressions of pragmatic (*interpersonal*) meaning: emphasis, (contrastive) focus, unexpectedness

5. (Uni)directionality?

- Intensifiers regarded as *grammaticalized, intersubjective expressions of pragmatic (interpersonal) meaning*
- Therefore, a change from emphatic to plain reflexive *is* potentially problematic, as it seems to **defy directionality constraints** in functional grammaticalization:
 - **(inter)subjectification** (Traugott 1982, i.a.): propositional > textual, expressive
 - increase in **discourse orientation** (Hengeveld 1989, Narrog 2012, i.a.)

i.e. from *semantic* (propositional/representational) to *pragmatic* meaning (interpersonal/interactional) (*within the grammar*)

not to be confused with “loss of expressivity”, semanticization of pragmatic inferences, syntacticization of discourse patterns (*from discourse to grammar*)

5. (Uni)directionality?

- Intensifiers regarded as *grammaticalized, intersubjective expressions of pragmatic (interpersonal) meaning*
- Therefore, a change from emphatic to plain reflexive *is* potentially problematic, as it seems to **defy directionality constraints** in functional grammaticalization:
 - **(inter)subjectification** (Traugott 1982, i.a.): propositional > textual, expressive
 - increase in **discourse orientation** (Hengeveld 1989, Narrog 2012, i.a.)
- Explanation: it is *not the intensifier* that loses its pragmatic meaning to turn into a reflexive marker; it is *the whole combination* that loses its compositional interpretation as it grammaticalizes as a plain reflexive marker: **constructionalization**

(18) Tsakhur (Nakh-Daghestanian: Lyutikova 2000: 229)

Rasul-e: **wuž-e:** **wuž** get-u.

rasul-ERG **INTS-ERG** LOG.ABS beat-PFV

Lit. “Rasul **himself** beat **him(self)**” → ‘Rasul beat himself.’

6. Conclusions

- While the grammaticalization of plain reflexives from more complex constructions is a well-known phenomenon, this study has shed further light on
 - its different subtypes and their respective frequencies:
 - double-marking strategies: combinations of **different types of markers (53)** much more frequent than combinations of **same type of marker (9)**;
 - **triple-marking strategies** less common than double-marking ones, but **not exceptionally rare**: 16/78 total cxns (from 12/47 languages), 9 of which grammaticalized (8 languages);
 - its areal distribution: **+Eurasia, +Americas, +Papunesia; –Africa, –Australia**;
 - its diachronic workings: 4 stages, characterized by increasing **constructionalization** (Traugott & Trousdale 2013), **context expansion** (Heine 2002) and **specialization** (Hopper 1991)
- Despite the loss of pragmatic/interpersonal meaning, the grammaticalization of CMRs involving intensifiers **does not display a decrease in intersubjectivity or discourse orientation** but merely a **loss of compositionality** (constructionalization): **the whole combination grammaticalizes** as a reflexive marker.

thank you!

Table 8: Overview of the languages in the sample

N°	Language	Family	Genus	Macro-area
1	Amharic	Afro-Asiatic	Semitic	Africa
2	Kambaata	Afro-Asiatic	Cushitic	Africa
3	Joola Keeraak	Atlantic-Congo	North-Central Atlantic	Africa
4	Yawuru	Nyulnyulan	Yawuric	Australia
5	Dyirbal	Pama-Nyungan	Dyirbal	Australia
6	Kuuk Thaayorre	Pama-Nyungan	Paman	Australia
7	Adyghe	Abkhaz-Adyghe	Circassian	Eurasia
8	Kannada	Dravidian	South Dravidian	Eurasia
9	Dutch	Indo-European	Germanic	Eurasia
10	Sinhala	Indo-European	Indo-Iranian	Eurasia
11	Avar	Nakh-Daghestanian	Avar-Andic-Tsezic; Avar	Eurasia
12	Khwarshi	Nakh-Daghestanian	Avar-Andic-Tsezic; Tsezic	Eurasia
13	Tsakhur	Nakh-Daghestanian	Lezgic	Eurasia
14	Tsez	Nakh-Daghestanian	Avar-Andic-Tsezic; Tsezic	Eurasia
15	Caoden rGyalrong	Sino-Tibetan	Burmo-Qiangic	Eurasia
16	Dulon-Rawang	Sino-Tibetan	Nungish	Eurasia
17	Galo	Sino-Tibetan	Macro-Tani	Eurasia
18	Khaling	Sino-Tibetan	Himalayish	Eurasia

Table 8 (continued): Overview of the languages in the sample

N°	Language	Family	Genus	Macro-area
25	Kaqchikel	Mayan	Quichean	North America
26	K'iche'	Mayan	Quichean	North America
27	Mam	Mayan	Mamean	North America
28	Mezquital Otomí	Otomanguean	Western Otomanguean	North America
29	Ajië	Austronesian	Oceanic; South New Caledonian	Papunesia
30	Bwatoö	Austronesian	Oceanic; North New Caledonia	Papunesia
31	East Futunan	Austronesian	Oceanic; Nuclear Polynesian	Papunesia
32	Iaai	Austronesian	Oceanic; New Caled.; Loyalty Islands	Papunesia
33	Mwotlap	Austronesian	Oceanic; Vanuatu	Papunesia
34	Nengone	Austronesian	Oceanic; New Caled.; Loyalty Islands	Papunesia
35	Sri Lanka Malay	Austronesian	Malayo-Sumbawan	Papunesia
36	Taba	Austronesian	Southern Halmahera	Papunesia
37	Toba	Guaicuruan	Guaicuru del Sur	South America
38	Hup	isolate	isolate	South America
39	Yahgan	isolate	isolate	South America
40	Yurakaré	isolate	isolate	South America
41	Chimane	Mosetenan	Chimane	South America
42	Moseten	Mosetenan	Moseten	South America

2. Data

Figure 1: Areal distribution of the languages in the sample

