

IJDL

International Journal of
Diachronic Linguistics and
Linguistic Reconstruction

7th Volume
2·2010

|peniope|
München

IJDL - International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction
is edited by Eugen Hill and Stefan Schumacher.

Address of editorial office:
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik)
Universität Wien
Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1
1010 Wien
Austria

Editorial Board:
Olav Hackstein, München
Craig Melchert, Los Angeles
Andreas Willi, Oxford
Daniel Petit, Paris
Peter Schrijver, Utrecht

IJDL is published semi-annually in June and December. Annual subscription rate is 44 Euro including VAT, excluding shipping costs. Please order at your bookseller or at the publisher: Verlag Anja Urbanek, Straubinger Str. 30g, 80687 München, Germany, tel +49-(0)89-88 98 89 01, fax +49-(0)89-88 98 89 02, anja@peniopo.de.

|peniopo| Verlag Anja Urbanek
www.peniopo.de
© 2011 Verlag Anja Urbanek, Straubinger Str. 30g, 80687 München
editors-in-chief: Eugen Hill, Stefan Schumacher (address see above)
printing and binding: Bookstation GmbH, Längerach 4, 78354 Sipplingen
Printed in Germany • ISSN 1614-5291

Contents

Die "Prosodic Change Hypothesis" oder zwei Typen der Lautwandel	97
<i>Eugen Hill</i> (Berlin)	
Armenisch <i>lsem</i> 'hören'	121
<i>Daniel Kölligan</i> (Köln)	
Grammaticalization of Syntactic Patterns	127
<i>Rosemarie Lübr</i> (Jena)	
Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des R̥gveda VII: <i>níṣ</i>	149
<i>Carolin Schneider</i> (Würzburg)	

Grammaticalization of Syntactic Patterns

by Rosemarie Lühr

Abstract

In my paper I will demonstrate the gradual development of grammaticalization of syntactic patterns exemplified by the so-called conjunct participle in ancient Indo-European languages. According to Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 387) since Indo-European times the main role of this participle has been to render “den Ausdruck eines Verbalinhaltes (Zustand, Vorgang, Handlung), der den des regierenden verbum finitum vorbereitete oder begleitete; das Partizip stand dabei [als prädikative Apposition beim] Subjekt”¹. In some languages the participle represents a rather nominal concept, whereas in other languages it can almost be used as a finite verb. The basic attributive nature of the participle implies clearly that it once was a nominal category. So the question arises how the formerly nominal participle was able to change its concept to a verbal one by means of grammaticalization. The exact way of grammaticalization will be exemplified by examples from Sanskrit and Ancient Greek. I will mainly rely upon the ideas of Stefan Engelberg (2000: 10), who was able to substantiate that most verbs show cross-reference of complex and internally structured events.

Preliminary remarks

First we have to deal with the difference between ‘event’ on the one hand and ‘state’ on the other hand. Engelberg² suggests ‘alteration’ as a criterion:

(1) events

¹ ... the expression of a state-of-affairs (state, event, action), which disposed or went along with the state-of-affairs of the verbum finitum in the main clause; the participle being the predicative apposition of the subject.

² (2000: 305).

An event exemplifies an epistemic possible type of alteration P which has an effect on one or more entities $\langle k_1, \dots, k_n \rangle$ in an interval t (applying for n equal or more than 1).

The event argument structure plays an important role according to Davidson³: Whereas states have no event argument because they lack alteration according to Engelberg as mentioned in point (1), action verbs may have an additional position for a singular term expressing the existential binding of the event, rendering the event of the main proposition. Events may be modified by local or temporal phrases, for example number (2):

(2)(a) Jones buttered the toast; he did it at midnight in the bathroom

(2)(b) Jones buttered the toast at midnight in the bathroom

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| i. | → | Jones buttered the toast at midnight |
| ii. | → | Jones buttered the toast in the bathroom |
| iii. | → | Jones buttered the toast |

The appropriate interpretation of (2)(b) is clearly (3)(a), not (3)(b). If (3)(a) is applying then each of its conjuncts apply too. In this case the implications of (2)(b) are ensured. Diagrams as the one in (3)(a) are called Davidson's representations. Compare (3)(a) with the event argument with (3)(b):

(3)(a) $\exists e[\text{BUTTER}(\text{jones}, \text{THE-TOAST}, e) \ \& \ \text{AT-MIDNIGHT}(e) \ \& \ \text{IN-THE-BATHROOM}(e)]$

(3)(b) BUTTER(jones, THE-TOAST, AT-MIDNIGHT, IN-THE-BATHROOM)

A paraphrase including these modifications would be:

(3)(c) There is an event e evoking a buttering of the toast by Jones and e happened at midnight and e happened in the bathroom.

Thus event arguments often appear with adverbial modification. Adverbial phrases of place, time, but also of manner, and instrument are reckoned as predications of events. These modifications may have different shapes, such as subordinate clauses, participles and infinitives, prepositional and nominal phrases, and mere adverbs. Among these explicite structures the participles form an extraordinary kind of modifier because of their dual nature as be-

³ Davidson (1967: 81ff.).

longing both to noun and verb. As already mentioned the crucial point is to find out whether the modification is embodied in the nominal or the verbal nature of the participle.

One can imagine that the verbal nature belongs to the predicate expressions as for example in the *ablativus absolutus* or *genitivus absolutus* of Latin and Ancient Greek.⁴ The nominal nature could prevail when the participle is referring to a noun predicatively as, for example, is the case with the Latin and Greek conjunct participle.

In this connection another important distinction is that between stage-level and individual-level-predicates (the denotation of temporary or permanent features) which has to be observed when the participle is used nominally. According to Carlson (1977: 168) there is a dichotomic difference between predicates like *run*, *eat* on the one hand and *resemble*, *weigh*, *believe* on the other side. Verbs denoting stage-level predicates allow to render an ambiguity of generic and specific interpretation in the preterite and future, whereas this is not possible when individual-level predicates are used. Compare the preterite in (4)

(4)(a) he ate bananas

(ambiguous between 'he ate bananas on a certain occasion' and 'he used to eat bananas')

(4)(b) she resembled Queen Mary

(never ambiguous)

Only stage-level predicates allow the use of the English progressive form, whereas individual-level predicates don't:

(5)(a) he is eating bananas

(5)(b) *she is resembling Queen Mary

Additional phenomena showing the difference between stage-level predicates and individual-level predicates are discussed according to the literature in Kratzer (1989; 1990); compare the following examples containing *available* and *there*-insertion:

(6)(a) there are firemen available

(6)(b) *there are firemen altruistic

⁴ Keydana (1997: 187ff.); Stump (1985).

Stage-level predicates like *umkommen* ‘to perish’ may be modified by local adjuncts, individual-level predicates like *schwarz sein* ‘be black’ are never modified:

- (7)(a) weil fast alle Flüchtlinge in dieser Stadt umgekommen sind
 ‘because almost all refugees in this city perished’
 weil [fast alle Flüchtlinge in dieser Stadt] umgekommen sind
 ‘because [almost all refugees in this city] did perish’
 weil fast alle Flüchtlinge [in dieser Stadt umgekommen sind]
 ‘because almost all refugees [perished in this city]’
- (7)(b) weil fast alle Schwäne in Australien schwarz sind
 ‘because almost all swans in Australia are black’
 weil [fast alle Schwäne in Australien] schwarz sind
 ‘because [almost all swans in Australia] are black’
 *weil fast alle Schwäne [in Australien schwarz sind]
 **because almost all swans [in Australia are black]’ (implying that in other countries they use to be white, which is impossible)

Hence individual-level and stage-level predicates can be recognized by certain linguistic indications. As could be expected the nominal concept represents the individual-level predicate, because it reflects the typical nominal characteristic of ‘time-stability’⁵. Applying these features to the participles one would anticipate that the conjunct participle should appear as an individual-level predicate because it refers to nouns. But active conjunct participles clearly have verbal qualities, too. So we have to scrutinize active conjunct participles and medial conjunct participles used as active ones according to their use as individual-level or stage-level predicates and according to their reference to the matrix clause.

We will hypothesize that in the first step the active conjunct participle comprises the modification of individual-level predicates. These are expressions denoting a state and they don’t have an event argument which could function as an anchor in the matrix clause containing an action verb.

In the next step the active conjunct participle could be used in stage-level predicates thus extending its scope of function; it is containing an event argument which allows the reference to an event in the matrix clause. The participle could now increasingly resemble a finite verb and be grammaticalized in this function. In this grammaticalization process two things

⁵ Givón (1979: 320); Vogel (1996: 110).

play an important role: 1) the temporal relations between conjunct participle and the matrix clause together with the explicit notion of temporality and 2) negativity. Many languages distinguish between a nominal negative referring to a noun and a verbal negative referring to the clause⁶, which could enable us to look for this dichotomy in expressions with the conjunct participle.

We will confine ourselves to taking a look at the most archaic Indo-European languages possessing an active conjunct participle, that is Sanskrit and Greek. Hittite has to be excluded because its participle is only sometimes used in a ‘semi-adverbial sense’ and it cannot shed any light on to our problem:

(8) KUB XVII 10 II (Myth of Telipinu)

33	^D <i>Te-li-pí-nu-uš</i>	<i>li-e-la-ni-ya-an-za</i>	<i>ú-it</i>
	Telipinu	furious	came

‘Telipinu came as a furious one.’⁷

1. Temporal relations

1.1. Sanskrit

Let us begin with the Sanskrit conjunct participle. We can clearly find individual-level predicates. A state is described in:

(9) RV 1,113,7

<i>vīśvasyēśānā</i>	<i>pārthivasya</i>	<i>vásva</i>
all=possessing	terrestrial	goods
<i>úšo</i>	<i>adyéhá</i>	<i>subhage</i>
Ušas	today=here	rich
		dawn

‘O Ye ever possessing all terrestrial goods, dawn here today, rich Ušas’⁸

⁶ Cf. Jespersen’s (1917) term ‘special negative’ (Moorhouse 1959: 1ff.).

⁷ ^DIM-*as* *lēlanīyanza* *wezzi*
Stormgod furious came

‘Furious, the Stormgod came.’

⁸ Delbrück (1888: 372).

According to Vendler's terminology (1957) *to possess* is a state term, while *to dawn* is an accomplishment term. State terms and accomplishment terms can be distinguished by their possible combination with temporal adverbials: with state terms one can use the question 'For how long ...?' with accomplishment terms 'How long does it take ...?'.⁹ Additionally the lexical meaning of the verb *to dawn* implies the achievement of a certain posterior state: *dawning* causes *being light*. *to dawn* is an intransitive verb, a so-called unaccusative, which can be distinguished from another type of intransitive verbs, the unergatives, in the following way as usually demonstrated in German:

(10)	Unergative		Unaccusative
(10)(a)	der Mann hat getanzt the man danced	vs.	das Schiff ist gesunken the ship foundered
(10)(b)	*der getanzte Mann *the danced man	vs.	das gesunkene Schiff the foundered ship
(10)(c)	Tänzer dancer	vs.	*Sinker *founderer
(10)(d)	es wird getanzt there is dancing	vs.	*es wurde gesunken. ¹⁰ *it was foundered

Concerning the temporal relation between the superordinate structure and the conjunct participle in (9) it is necessary that the event of the matrix clause coincides completely with the state expressed by the conjunct participle. An event argument as stated above cannot be detected in expressions with this participle.¹¹

All-expressions like that in (9) can indicate the interpretation as individual-level predicates, compare further:

⁹ Only with accomplishment terms it is possible to use the progressive form.

¹⁰ The important criteria are: Auxiliary with *haben* or *sein*, the possibility to form an attribute in the participle II, *er-*nominalization, formation of an impersonal passive (Engelberg 2000: 56f.).

¹¹ Engelberg (2000: 318f.).

(11) RV 2,10,4

<i>jígbarmy</i>	<i>agním</i>	<i>haviṣā</i>	<i>gḥtēna</i>	<i>pratikṣiyántam</i>	<i>bhúvanāni</i>	<i>vísū</i>
I baste	Agni	offer	butter oil	dwelling/living	being	all

'I baste Agni with the offer, with butter oil, (Agni) who is living with all beings.'

According to Delbrück¹² the conjunct participle in (12) denotes a permanent feature:

(12) RV 1,29,5

<i>sám</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>gardabbám</i>	<i>mṛṇa</i>	<i>nuvántam</i>	<i>pāpáyāmyá</i>
PFX	Indra	donkey	kill	braying	having-evil- announcing-manner

Delbrück (1888: 371) proposes the following translation:

'Indra, kill the donkey, if he is braying in his manner of announcing evil'

that is, if his well-known braying is announcing a portent.

The braying of a donkey is a habitual action, but the semantic of the event structure is more complicated. According to Vendler (1957) *to bray* belongs to the activity terms. It is a punctual verb without a posterior state. But the verb allows to understand the action as iterative, as can be seen by the translation with *every time if*¹³. *to kill* in the superordinate clause is an accomplishment term with a posterior state. In this case it is decisive that although the event *to bray* is coincident with the *killing*, the *braying* is the trigger of the *killing* and therefore antedates the *killing*. One can say: 'each time if the donkey is beginning to bray in an evil manner'¹⁴. The temporal relation between the two events in (12) is 'coincident precedence'¹⁵ on the contrary to the state event in (9), and both conjunct participle and matrix verb have an event argument.

¹² (1888: 371).

¹³ The duration of time can be marked with the question 'For how long ...'. In English the use of the progressive form is possible.

¹⁴ Engelberg (2000: 77).

¹⁵ Engelberg (2000: 327).

Clear stage-level predicates can also be seen in the Sanskrit conjunct participle:

(13) RV 1,105,18

aruṣó mā sakṣ́d vṛ́kaḥ paṭh́á yántam dadárśa hí
 yellowish me suddenly wolf way going has seen for
 ‘because a yellowish wolf has suddenly seen me as I was walking on the way’¹⁶

It is not clear whether the conjunct participle is expressing a spatial-temporal event in this case¹⁷. Surely ‘to go on the way’ is an activity term – the question would be: ‘For how long ...?’. *to see* is an achievement term; the question is ‘At what time ...?’. This punctual event can take place only after the beginning of the activity *to go*. This is another case of coincident precedence.

An explicitly temporal determination can be seen as an indicator of stage-level predication in (14):

(14) RV 1,32,4

át súryam janáyam dyám uśásam tādítmā śátrum
 then sun creating heaven dawn thereupon enemy
ná kílā vivitse
 not really found

‘when you have created sun, heaven and dawn, thereupon you never found an enemy for you’¹⁸

The preterite action of the superordinate clause, the *finding*, approximates up to the present time¹⁹. The verb has a punctual meaning causing a posterior state. The same holds true for the verb *to create*. In both cases one could ask: ‘How long did it take ...?’. The verbs are to be classified as accomplishment terms. But in this example the temporal relation between conjunct participle and the matrix verb is the immediate precedence. After the statement that “sun, heaven and dawn have been created and are existing now” has evolved there is no enemy at all.

¹⁶ Delbrück (1888: 369).

¹⁷ Engelberg (2000: 244ff.).

¹⁸ Delbrück (1888: 369).

¹⁹ Compare Kümmel (2000: 493).

An explicite expression of anteriority can also be seen at constructions with the conjunct participle. Compare the following verse including a perfect participle:

(15) RV 7,7,5

<i>ásādi</i>	<i>vṛtó</i>	<i>váhnir</i>	<i>ājaganván</i>	<i>agnír</i>	<i>brabmá</i>
has sit down	chosen	offerer	having arrived	Agni	priest
<i>nṛṣádane</i>	<i>vidhartá</i>				
meeting of men	distributor				

‘Agni, the chosen offerer, has sit down, after having arrived in the meeting of men, as a distributor.’²⁰

The inherent telic verb *arrive* belongs to the group of punctual verbs evolving a posterior state. The participant of the event is also involved in the immediate preceding event; before having arrived one had to be on the way²¹. *to sit down* is a punctual verb evolving a posterior state, too. So in example (15) five partial events are denoted: *to be on the way*, *to arrive*, *having arrived*, *to sit down*, *to be seated*. The conjunct participle expresses once again the precedence anterior to the matrix clause.

These examples may suffice, since they clearly show the possibility of the Sanskrit conjunct participles to be used as individual-level predicates as well as stage-level predicates. In the mentioned examples the conjunct participle denotes precedence to the event of the matrix clause. The precedence may be absolutely coincident in the cases of individual-level predicates. It is an open question which temporal relation exists between the matrix clause event and the individual-level predicate. In the examples with state level predicates one can observe basic precedence, coinciding precedence and immediate precedence, as Engelberg calls them.

1.2. Greek

Looking at Ancient Greek one also finds clear cases of individual-level predicates expressed by the conjunct participle:

²⁰ Vgl. Kümmel (1996: 121); compare Delbrück (1888: 376).

²¹ Engelberg (2000: 34, 74).

(16) HOM. Od. 1,35ff.

ὡς καὶ	νῦν	Αἰγισθος	ὑπέρ	μόρον	Ἄτρεΐδαο /	γῆμ'	ἄλοχον
so and	now	Aigisthos	through	fortune	son of Atreus	married	wife
μνηστήν,	τὸν	δ'	ἔκτανε	νοστήσαντα, /	εἰδώς	αἰπὺν	ὄλεθρον
wedded	him	but	killed	coming home	knowing	sudden	perdition

'Thus Aigisthos married now – through fortune – the wife of the son of Atreus and killed him when he arrived, knowing his sudden perdition'

Compare further:

(17) HOM. Il. 2,542

τῶδ'	ἅμ'	Ἄβαντες	ἔποντο	θοοί,	ὄπιθεν	κομῶωντες
him	together	Abantans	followed	speedy	after	long-haired

'and the speedy Abantans who have long hair followed after him'

'long hair' is an inalienable possession. So the participle can only be an individual level-predicate.

But the conjunct participle is also able to denote alienable possession in Greek, compare for example the possession of horses:

(18) HOM. Il. 24, 279 f.

ἵππους	δὲ	Πριάμῳ	ὑπαγον	ζυγόν,	οὓς	ὁ	γεραιός /	αὐτὸς
horses	but	Priamos	yoked	yoke	who	the	old man	himself
ἔχων		ἀτίταλλεν	εὐέστη	ἐπὶ	φάτνη.			
possessing		reared	polished	at	cot			

'They were yoking the horses under the yoke of Priamos, whom the old man himself reared as his own possession at the polished cot'

'possessing horses' is behaving just as an individual-level predicate. The event of the matrix clause 'has reared' coincides completely with the state of possession. A posterior state is indicated by the accomplishment term 'to rear'. Nevertheless this example shows how a grammaticalization process can evolve from a formerly nominal pattern to a kind of verbalization. The denotation of an inalienable possession in 'having long hair' with a participle can evoke the denotation of an alienable state 'possessing horses'.

Explicit stage-level predicates can also be found in Greek. Compare for example the following citation, in which a punctual verb without posterior state is expressed by a conjunct participle in (19):

(19) HOM. II. 24, 23

τόν	δ'	ἐλεείρεσκον	μάκαρες	θεοὶ	εἰσαβάντες
him	but	pitied	happy	gods	beholding

'the happy gods were pitying him when they beheld it'

'to behold' is a stage-level-predicate without control by an actor.²²

The example in (20) is a bit more complicated:

(20) HOM. II. 24, 540-542

οὐδέ	νῦ	τόν	γε /	γηράσκοντα	κομίζω,
not	now	him	even	getting old	attend
ἐπεὶ	μάλα	τηλόθι	πάτρης /		
because	very	far	homeland		
ἡμεῖς	ἐνὶ	Τροίῃ			
sit	in	Troja			

'now, that he has grown old, I am not attending to him, because I am sitting in Troja far away from my homeland'

'to grow old' is an accomplishment term ('How long did it take ...?'). It is a telic verb with the posterior state 'to be old'. The temporal adverb *νῦ* 'now' is referring exactly to this posterior state: A translation 'now, when he is growing old' with reference to the pure process doesn't make much sense in this verse.

An example for the alteration from individual-level predicates to stage-level predicates will be shown in the following verse: 'to remember' in (21) is an achievement term evoking a posterior state: 'to be aware of'. From this a transient mental state evolves which is expressed by the perfect²³ - and Greek is a language having aspects, so the perfect is not an expression for anteriority:

²² Engelberg (2000: 74f.).

²³ No event involving an actor or experiencer which could be understood as lexically presupposed precedes. In English the use of the progressive form is not possible (Engelberg 2000: 74f.).

(21) HOM. II. 24,3f.

αὐτὰρ	Ἀχιλλεύς /	κλαῖε	φίλου	ἐτάρου	μειμνημένος,
but	Achilles	complained	beloved	mate	remembering
οὐδέ	μιν ὕπνος	ἦρει	πανδαμάτωρ,	ἀλλ'	ἔστρέφετ'
and not	him sleep	took	all-vanquisher	but	rolled
ἔνθα	καὶ ἔνθα /	Πατρόκλου	ποθέων	ἀνδροτήτᾳ	
to	and fro	Patroclus	desiring	manfulness	
τε	καὶ μένος	ἠΰ			
and	also strength	good			

'but Achilles was complaining when he remembered his beloved mate, and the all-vanquishing sleep didn't take him away, but he was rolling to and fro desiring the manfulness and good strength of Patroclus.'

The act of *remembering* presupposes the matrix event *complaining*, the temporal relation between these events is immediate precedence. The second conjunct participle in (21), 'desiring', expresses only simple precedence; it is a temporary emotional state²⁴.

To summarize so far: In Sanskrit as well as in Greek the conjunct participle can be used to express individual-level predicates and stage-level predicates. The temporal relation of precedence at the stage-level predicate preponderates; sometimes postcedence can occur:

(22) Hom. II. 4,86ff.

ἠ	δ'	ἀνδρὶ	ὡς	Τρώων	κατεδύσεθ'	ὄμιλον /	Λαοδόκῳ
she	but	man	like	Trojans	dived in	troop	Laodocos
Ἀντηνορείδῃ	κραιπερῷ	αἰχμητῇ,		Πάνδαρον		ἀντίθεον	διζημένην
son of Antenor	strong	javelinist		Pandoros		god-like	searching
εἴ	που	ἑφεύροι.					
if	anywhere	may meet					

'She dived into the troop resembling Laodocos, the son of Antenor, a man of the Trojans, searching for the divine Pandoros, if she could find him.'

Only as she was situated in the multitude Athene had the opportunity to look for Pandoros. The event of the matrix clause antecedes the event expressed by the conjunct participle. The relation is final: She went into the multitude for

²⁴ *to desire – like to love, to hate, to praise, to blame, to admire, to demand, to see, to hear – belongs to verbs expressing an action "welche nicht begonnen wird um vollendet zu werden"* (Diez 1844: 185f.); Engelberg (2000: 58 Anm. 50).

the purpose to look for Pandoros. That is: the relation of participle event in comparison with the matrix event achieves a modal future meaning: Finality in Homer is expressed by the future participle, later sometimes clarified by the particle *ὥς* ‘so’, or by *ἵνα* ‘so that’ with subjunctive. Here, the final meaning combined with postcedence ascribes a certain verbal quality to the conjunct participle *διζημένῃ*. So in Homer we can not only find conjunct participles as stage-level predicates, but further transfer to verbal features.

2. Negation

The negation of a conjunct participle may allow to infer that relevant modifications are added to the clause. So propositions like (23) should be excluded:

(23) Eli did not run / laugh / wait

Those sentences presuppose no specific scenario at all, for they tend to denote almost nothing. The “Gricean Maxim of Relevance“ is the only way to concede that a communication purpose is to be supposed²⁵. On the contrary the case is clear with negative counterparts to non-negated descriptions of state-of-affairs:

(24)(a) The child was not awake.	↔	The child was sleeping
(24)(b) The thief did not move.	↔	The thief stayed motionless

Propositions with presuppositions as in (25) are possibly understood from the context as well:

(25)(a) The child did not wake up		
presupposes:		the child was sleeping
implies:		the child remained sleeping
(25)(b) The thief did not flee		
presupposes:		the thief was at the scene
implies:		the thief stayed at the scene

²⁵ Trautwein (2005: 216f.).

(25)(c) Claus did not open the door

presupposes:

the door was shut

implies:

the door remained shut

2.1. Word negation

First of all we have to analyze the possibilities of using a word or clause negation with a conjunct participle. If there is word negation we could argue that such participles represent the nominal concept and thus the individual-level predication. But there are no cognates in Indo-European languages: Examples are Sanskrit *ásasant-* ‘not sleeping’, *áminatī* ‘not diminishing’, *ápaśyant-* ‘not seeing’²⁶, Greek *ἄκέων* ‘to be silent’, *ἄκων* ‘involuntary’ together with an Avestan cognate which undergoes ablaut, *an-usant-* ‘unwilling’²⁷, Latin *insciēns* ‘not knowing’ and Gothic *unagands* ‘not being afraid’, *unkunnandans* ‘not recognizing’²⁸, and only Latin *insciēns* can be defined as

²⁶ For the Avestian negated participles compare Duchesne-Guillemin (1936). For example Avestian *a-xšiiant-* ‘not ruling, not independent’, *a-drujiiant-* ‘not being fallacious, honest’, *a-puiiant-*, *a-friθiiant-* ‘not getting putrid’, *a-fšuiiant-* ‘who is not carrying on cattle breeding’, *a-uui-barant-* ‘not dispelling’, *a-saocant-* ‘not flaming’, *a-sāciiant-* ‘not teaching’, *a-sixšant-* ‘not learning’, *a-zarəšant-* ‘not growing old’, *ə-uuiindant-* ‘not obtaining’.

²⁷ Greek *ἄκων*, Vedic *usant-*, Avestian *usant-*, *an-usant-* (from Indo-European **uek-* ‘to wish’). I owe this parallel to B. Forssman (2009) who considers the genitivus absolutus Greek II 19,273 *ἐμεῦ ἄκωντος* as an inherited construction. The valency gives evidence of this opinion, for Greek *ἄκων*, Vedic *usant-*, Avestian *usant-*, *an-usant-* are only attested without an object (J. L. García-Ramón).

²⁸ Delbück (1978: 125); Delbück (1897: 494); Schwyzler & Debrunner (1950: 385). Compare with a pronominal accusative argument:

(a) Skeir IV, 5f.

nauh un~~kunnandans~~ þo bi nasjand

‘They being still unaware of these things concerning the Saviour’

Adjectival use together with an accusative argument is to be found with a negated participle:

(b) Luke 3,9

all bagme un~~bairandande~~ akran god

‘every tree that does not produce good fruit’ (but for example *unbabands* ‘who does not have’ without complement)

Adjectival valency is documented in:

an individual-level predicate. I will analyze these words according to their kind of predication. Greek $\xi\theta\omega\nu$ in the Ilias I let aside because of its unclear meaning and derivation²⁹. First, compare the Gothic examples;

(26)(a) Phil 1,14

... (<i>managis</i>) <i>tans</i>	<i>broþre</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>fraujin</i>	<i>gatrauandans</i>	<i>bandjom</i>
... many	brethren	in	Lord	relying	imprisonment
<i>meinaim</i>	<i>mais</i>	<i>gadaursan</i>	<u><i>unagandans</i></u>	<i>waurd</i>	<i>gudis</i> <i>rodjan</i> .
my	more	dare	without fear	word	God speak

‘and many brethren in the Lord relied upon my imprisonment and became increasingly daring to announce Gods word without fear.’

(26)(b) Cor I 16,10 (B)

<i>apþan</i>	<i>jabai</i>	<i>qimai</i>	<i>Teimaupaius,</i>	<i>saihvaiþ</i>	<i>ei</i>
but	when	may come	Timotheus	see	if
<u><i>unagands</i></u>	<i>sijai</i>	<i>at</i>	<i>izwis</i>		
without fear	may be	with	you		

‘And if Timotheus will come, have a look to him that he will be without fear.’

(27) Rom 10,3

<u><i>unkunnandans</i></u>	<i>auk</i>	<i>gudis</i>	<i>garaiþtein</i>
ignoring	for	Gods	righteousness

‘for not recognizing the righteousness that comes from God’

In (26)(a) *unagands* is an individual-level predicate, whereas in (26)(b) and (27) *unagands* and *unkunnands* are stage-level predicates. However, *unagands* and *unkunnands* translate Greek adjectives, $\alpha\phi\omicron\beta\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$, or a Greek participle, $\alpha\gamma\nu\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, respectively. So Gothic *unagands* and *unkunnands* are calques on Greek adjectives or participles. A calque can surely be inferred in (28) too:

(c) 2 Tit 1,16

du allamma waurstwe godaize uskusanai (gloss *ungakusanai*)

‘unfit for any good deed’

(d) 2 Cor 2,11

unte ni sijum unwitandans munins is

‘for we are not ignorant of his schemes’

²⁹ $\xi\theta\omega\nu$ is sometimes translated as ‘causing damage or plague’ (II 9,540; 16,260) (vgl. Frisk 1960: 449f.).

(28) Lk 18,2

<i>staua</i>	<i>was</i>	<i>sums</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>sumai</i>	<i>baurg,</i>	<i>gub</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ogands</i>
judge	was	a	in	a	city	God	not	fearing
<i>jab</i>	<i>mannan</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>aistands.</i>					
and	humans	not	dreading					

‘There has been a judge in a city who didn’t either be afraid of God and nor dread any human.’

ni ogands translates Greek *μὴ φοβούμενος*. The Gothic participle negated with *ni* is clearly an individual-level predicate. On the contrary to *unagands ogands* shows the ablaut of the plural perfect of the preterite-present *og* ‘I was afraid of. It is clear, that *unagands* is the more archaic formation, compare the present participle *þaúrbands* from *þarf* ‘I need’. If it was an archaic individual-level predicate with the meaning ‘having no fear’, as could be expected by the meaning, then it must have been lexicalized and used as a stage-level predicate. The same applies to Gothic *unkunnands*.

As for the Greek words, *ἀέκων* ‘involuntary’ and *ἀκέων* ‘to be silent’ and its Avestan cognate *anusant-* are always used in Homer and in Avestian as stage-level predicates. This holds true for its adverbial or predicative use and for its concord with a head noun, compare

(29)(a) HOM. II 1,565

<i>ἀλλ’</i>	<i>ἀκέουσα</i>	<i>κάθησο,</i>	<i>ἐμῶ</i>	<i>δ’</i>	<i>ἐπιτείθεο</i>	<i>μύθῳ</i>
but	being silent	sit down	my	but	listen	word

‘sit down silently and listen to my word!’

(29)(b) HOM. II 1, 327

<i>τῶ</i>	<i>δ’</i>	<i>ἀέκοντε</i>	<i>βάτην</i>
the two	PART	involuntary	went

‘Unwilling went the two.’

(29)(c) Yt 17,19 *mam ... anusantəm* ‘me ... unwilling’

The Greek words *ἀέων* and *ἀέκων* cannot help us to answer the question whether participles with *privative a* can only be used to express individual-level predicates. On the contrary to the clear individual-level predicate Latin *insciēns*, the possible individual-level predicate Gothic *unagands* and the

stage-level predicate Greek ἀέκων, the word formation of Greek ἀέων like that of Greek ἔθων remains obscure³⁰.

Now lets turn to the Sanskrit participles with privative *a-*:

(30) RV 1,143,3

<i>asyá</i>	<i>tveṣá</i>	<i>ajárā</i>	<i>asyá</i>	<i>bhānávaḥ</i> ...
his	sparkling	not aging	his	rays
<i>rejante</i>	<i>ásasanto</i>	<i>ajárāḥ</i>		
tremble	not sleeping	not aging		

'His sparkling, never aging (flames), his rays ... tremble ... not sleeping, never aging.'

ásasantaḥ besides *ajárāḥ* clearly denotes an everlasting feature of Agni's rays and has to be defined as an individual-level predicate.

In (31) the expression 'not diminishing the divine commandments' is a characteristic feature of Uṣas and therefore an individual-level predicate, too:

(31) RV 1,92,12

<i>áminatī</i>	<i>daívyāni</i>	<i>vratāni</i>	<i>súryasya</i>	<i>ceti</i>	<i>raṣmībhir</i>	<i>dṛṣāná</i>
not diminishing	divine	commandments	Sun	appears	rays	gleaming

'She appears gleaming with the rays of the Sungod, never diminishing the divine commandments.'

The same holds true for the feature 'not seeing' of the boy (=Indra as a youth) concerning the chariot:

(32) RV 10,135,3

<i>yám</i>	<i>kumāra</i>	<i>návam</i>	<i>rátham</i>	<i>acakráṃ</i>	<i>mānasákṛnoḥ/</i>	...
which	boy	new	chariot	without wheels	made in mind	
<i>ápaśyann</i>	<i>ádhi</i>	<i>tiṣṭhasi</i>				
not seeing	on which	stand				

'The new chariot without wheels, which thou, boy, hast made in your mind, ... on this (chariot) you are standing as a not-seeing person.'

These few Sanskrit examples of negated present participles can be explained best as stilistically highly marked formations if one compares them to the huge mass of non-negated participles. According to the Sanskrit grammar-

³⁰ Schwyzler & Debrunner (1950: 432); Frisk (1960: 52); Chantraine (1953: 319).

ian Pāṇini negated active participles are not grammatical³¹. But we can state that the use of word negation compels us to understand these formation as individual-level predicates.

2.2. Clause negation

The Old Indian clause negation *nā*³² is never used in Sanskrit participles. Another instance can be seen in Greek: Homer uses the clause negation *οὐ* with the conjunct participle:

(33) HOM. Od 4,534f.

τὸν	δ'	οὐ	εἰδὼτ'	ὄλεθρον	ἀνήγαγε, καὶ	κατέπεφνε
him	but	not	knowing	perdition	led	and killed
ἑσπένισσας,		ὡς	τίς	τε	κατέκτανε βούν	ἐπὶ φάτῃ.
entertaining		as	one		slew cow	at cot

'And he led him, who didn't know, into perdition and killed him during entertainment, as one would slay a cow at the cot.'

The participle expresses an individual-level predicate. We would expect word negation. But if a language has got no appropriate word with such a negation, the language cannot but use the clause negation. The conjunct participle was regularly used in not negated contexts as stage-level predicate; so evolving from contexts as in (34) the clause negation could expand to stage-level predicates firstly in expressions denoting transient states:

(34) HOM. II 5,286

Τὸν	δ'	οὐ	ταρβήσας	προσέφη	κρατερὸς	Διομήδης
him	but	not	shocked	answered	strong	Diomedes

'Then strong Diomedes answered dauntless.'

(35) HOM. II 19,261f.

μὴ	μὲν	ἐγὼ	κούρη	Βρῆσιδι	χεῖρ'	ἐπένευκα,
not	but	I	girl	Briseis	hands	have touched
οὔτ'	εὐνῆς	πρόφασιν	χεχρημένος	οὔτε	τευ	ἄλλου.
neither	bed	pretence	using	nor	any	other

'I never touched the girl Briseis, neither pretending the use of the bed nor any other.'

³¹ Cue of Sabine Ziegler.

³² Delbrück (1888: 543).

(36) Xenophon, Kyropaidie II 4,27

Οὐ ἡγεμόνας ἔχων πλανᾶ ἀνά τὰ ὄρη.
not leader having stray in the mountains

‘You should not stray around in the mountains without a guide.’

Afterwards the participle construction was possible with verbs denoting no state, compare the genitivus absolutus with an activity term:

(37) Xenophon, Anabasis I 2,22

Κυρος δ' οὖν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη
Kyros but so moved forward to the mountains
οὐδένος κωλύοντος
no one impeding

‘So Kyros moved forward to the mountains, without anyone impeding (him).’

In Homer the participle negation is usually οὐ. μή can be used in the Odyssey, too, but only in contexts where a wish is uttered in the optative mood:

(38) HOM. Od. 4,684f.

μή μνηστεύσαντες μηδ' ἄλλοθ' ὀμιλήσαντες
not courting and not elsewhere meeting
ἕστατα καὶ πύματα νῦν ἐνθάδε δειπνήσειαν
for the last time and for the ultimate time now here may banquet

‘o that they would, not courting, not meeting, for the last and ultimate time banquet here and now.’³³

Summary and perspectives

On the contrary to the Sanskrit results the Greek language since Homer is able to use not only the clause negation with the participle but also allows the negation μή in participial constructions, and later the particle ἄν can confer the notion of the potentialis or irrealis to participles. These modal signs as well as the temporal, causal, adversative, final, conditional, and concessive relations marking adverbs with the conjunct participle in later Greek

³³ Chantraine (1953: 336).

(mostly since Herodotus, in Homer *καί* and *περ* with concessive conjunct participles and future participles with final conjunct participles)³⁴ already show that the syntactic pattern of the conjunct participle was grammaticized to a more verbal quality. In the Sanskrit language only the first step of the grammaticalization process of the conjunct participle can be seen: Conjunct participles can be used as individual-level predicates and stage-level predicates, and the negation is constrained to the use of word negation in individual-level predication. The trigger for this development in Sanskrit or in Greek is probably the notion of permanent states as expressed by the conjunct participle, which can in turn be used in transient states. The next step is the expansion to action verbs, that is to achievement, activity, and accomplishment terms. Whereas one example from Greek denotes postcedence of the participial event proportional to the matrix verb, the rest of the Greek citations and all Sanskrit ones denote precedence to express basic, coinciding and immediate precedence. Another important function of the conjunct participle is: In the many cases the conjunct participle belongs to the focus part of the sentence following the finite verb [(11), (12), (15), (16), (17), (19), (21), (22), (30), (32), (35), (37)], but sometimes in preverbal position it functions as the frame of the matrix event [(9), (13), (14), (18), (20), (29), (31), (33), (34), (36), (38)] or, if negated, as immediate preverbal or phrase-initial or phrase-final focus [(27), (29) vs. (26) vs. (28)]. Thus the conjunct participle has also an important function in information structure.³⁵

Rosemarie Lühr

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
 Lehrstuhl für Indogermanistik
 Zwätzengasse 12
 D-07743 Jena
 Deutschland

³⁴ Kühner & Gerth (1904: 82ff.); Schwyzer (1950: 388ff.); Chantraine (1953: 320, 321); Humbert (1960: 361).

³⁵ Cf. Haug (2008).

References

- Carlson, Gegory Norman (1977): *Reference to Kinds*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Chantraine, Pierre (1953): *Grammaire Homérique*. Tome II: *Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck [1986] (Collection de philologie classique 4).
- Forssman, Bernhard (2009): "Zum Genitivus absolutus im Griechischen". Vortrag gehalten auf dem "3. Jenaer Mai-Kolloquium: Berthold Delbrück als Syntaxforscher. 130 Jahre nach Delbrücks Werk 'Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax'", 28. Mai 2009, Lehrstuhl für Indogermanistik, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.
- Davidson, Donald (1967): "The Logical Form of Action Sentences". In: Rescher, Nicholas (ed.): *The Logic of Decision and Action*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburg Press, 81-95 [= Davison, Donald (1980): *Essays on Actions and Events*. Oxford: Clarendon, 105-122].
- Delbück, Bertold (1879): *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses (Syntaktische Forschungen 4).
- Delbrück, Bertold (1888): *Altindische Syntax*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses (Syntaktische Forschungen 5).
- Delbrück, Bertold (1897): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Bd. 2. Straßburg: Trübner (Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen 5).
- Diez, Friedrich (1844): *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*. Bd. 3. Bonn: Weber.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, Jacques (1936): *Les composés de l'Avesta*. Faculté de philosophie et lettres: E. Droz: Liège & Paris.
- Engelberg, Stefan (2000): *Verben, Ereignisse und das Lexikon*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Linguistische Arbeiten 414).
- Frisk, Hjalmar (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. I. Heidelberg: Winter [1973].
- Givón, Talmy (1979): *On understanding grammar*. New York.
- Haug, Dag (2008): "Information structure and the temporal reference of participial XADJs". Vortrag Oslo.
- Humbert, Jean (1960): *Syntax Grecque*. ³Paris: Klincksieck [1986] (Tradition de l'humanisme 8).
- Jespersen, Otto (1917): *Negation in English and other languages*. Copenhagen: Host.
- Keydana, Götz (1997): *Absolute Konstruktionen in altindogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Historische Sprachforschung: Ergänzungsheft 40).
- Kratzer, Angelika (1989): "Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates". In: Bach, Emmon, Kratzer, Angelika & Partee, Barbara (eds.): *Papers on Quantification*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 248-284.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1990): "Stative and Event Predicates. A Study in the Interface of Syntax and Semantics". Paper presented at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

- Kühner, Raphael & Gerth, Bernhard (1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Teil II: *Satzlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft [1963].
- Kümmel, Martin [Joachim] (1996): *Stativ und Passivaorist im Indogermanischen*: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht (Ergänzungshefte zur Historischen Sprachforschung 39).
- Kümmel, Martin Joachim (2000): *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Moorhouse, A.C. (1959): *Studies in the Greek Negatives*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Schwyzler, Eduard & Debrunner, Albert (1950): *Griechische Grammatik*. Bd. 2. München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Stump, Gregory T. (1985): *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*. Dordrecht, Boston & Lancaster: D. Reidel Publishing Company (Synthese Language Library 25).
- Trautwein, Martin (2005): *The Time Window of Language. The Interaction between Linguistic and Non-Linguistic Knowledge in the Temporal Interpretation of German and English Texts*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter (Language, Context, and Cognition 2).
- Vendler, Zeno (1957): "Verbs and Times." In: *The Philosophical Review* 66, 143-160 [= Vendler, Zeno (1967): *Linguistics and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 69-121].
- Vogel, Petra Maria (1996): *Wortarten und Wortartenwechsel. Zu Konversion und verwandten Erscheinungen im Deutschen und in anderen Sprachen*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter (Studia Linguistica Germanica 39).