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Space in Diachrony workshop

I. Asymmetries between goals and sources

II. Differential marking of landmarks

III. Asymmetries in the encoding of path
Our talk

I. How do changes in the type of marking used for spatial relations affect
   a) polysemic patterns (Source =/= Place =/= Goal)
   b) degrees of markedness

II. Case-in-point: the loss of se in the Modern Greek dialects of inner Asia Minor
Inner Asia Minor Greek
Inner Asia Minor Greek
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Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

I. Conservative varieties

II. Intermediate varieties

III. Innovative variety
Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

I. Conservative varieties
   – All Cappadocian varieties (except Phloïtá and Ulaghátsh) and Pharasiot
   – Overt marking for all three relations:
     • Source is marked by *apo/as*
     • Place and Goal are marked by *se*
   – Both markers occur in
     • PrepPs $[\text{PREP} + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{PrepP}}$
     • CircumPs $[\text{PREP} + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} + \text{POSTP}]_{\text{CircumP}}$
   – POSTPs in CircumPs encode Region
I. Conservative varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>ALLATIVE, LOCATIVE</td>
<td>‘to, at’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apo</td>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja</td>
<td>PURPOSEIVE</td>
<td>‘for’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me(ta)</td>
<td>COMITATIVE, INSTRUMENTIVE</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xoris</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE</td>
<td>‘without’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>os</td>
<td>TERMINATIVE</td>
<td>‘up to, until’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal > Source
# Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

## I. Conservative varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postposition</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a/e)pano</td>
<td>SUPERIOR</td>
<td>‘on top of, above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(apo)kato</td>
<td>INFERIOR</td>
<td>‘under’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e/o)mbros</td>
<td>ANTERIOR</td>
<td>‘in front of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o)piso</td>
<td>POSTERIOR</td>
<td>‘behind’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apeso, mesa</td>
<td>INTERIOR</td>
<td>‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okso</td>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konda</td>
<td>PROXIMATE</td>
<td>‘near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anamesa</td>
<td>MEDIAL</td>
<td>‘between’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

I. Conservative varieties

(1) Source

\[\text{katévasen} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{mílo} \quad [\text{ásó} \quad \text{raf}]\]

took down the apple from the shelf

‘[the woman] took down the apple from the shelf’

(Delmesó; Dawkins 1916: 306)
Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

I. Conservative varieties

(2) Place

\[\text{so} \quad \text{spitʃ}] \quad \text{inde} \quad \text{ðóðeka} \quad \text{peðjá}\]

at the house are twelve young men

‘in the house there are twelve young men’

(Delmesó; Dawkins 1916: 306)
I. Conservative varieties

(3) Goal

\[ p\text{\textit{i\text{\textj\textn\texten}}} [sa \text{\textv\textn\textp\textn\texta}] \]

he went to the mountains

‘he went to the mountains’

(Delmesó; Dawkins 1916: 304)
II. Intermediate varieties
   – Phloïtá Cappadocian and Sílliot
   – Overt marking for Source
   – Variation between overt marking (se) and zero for Place and Goal.
     • \([se + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{PrepP}} \sim [\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{NP}}\)
     • \([se + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} + \text{POSTP}]_{\text{CircumP}} \sim [\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} + \text{POSTP}]_{\text{PostP}}\)
II. Intermediate varieties

(4) Source

\[\text{ta ffáxa írtane [ásó skó̂lo]}\]

the children came from the school
‘the children returned from school’
(Phloïtá; Dawkins 1916: 410)
II. Intermediate varieties

(5) Place

a. overt

\[\text{cimíθane} \quad \text{[so \ skóλo]}\]

they slept at the school

‘they slept at the school’

(Phloïtá; Dawkins 1916: 306)
II. Intermediate varieties

(5) Place

b. zero

[écí to xorjo] íxan tría θírja
that the village had three gates
‘in that village there were three gates’
(Phloïtá; Dawkins 1916: 434)
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II. Intermediate varieties

(6) Goal
  a. overt
    \(p\text{i}a\text{n}e \quad [s\text{o} \quad s\text{k}\text{\'l}\text{o}]\)

they went to the school

‘they went to the school’

(Phloïtá; Dawkins 1916: 410)
II. Intermediate varieties

(6) Goal

b. zero

\[
\text{ben [devrefú to spit]}
\]

enters dervish.
\text{GEN the house}

‘he goes into the dervish’s house’

(Phloïtá; Dawkins 1916: 416)
II. Intermediate varieties

  • In Phloïtá Cappadocian, zero is preferred in utterances in which the head noun of the Ground-encoding NP is modified by an adnominal genitive
  • In Sílliot, zero is preferred in utterances in which Region is encoded by a POSTP
  • se is omitted in cases where the Ground-encoding expressions display high degrees of informativity and redundancy.
**Source, Place and Goal in AMGr**

II. Intermediate varieties


‘in(to) the house’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMGr</th>
<th>s(e)</th>
<th>to spit</th>
<th>mésa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>POSTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turkish

| evin | iç-in-{e/de} |
| NP   | POSTP       |

AMGr

| to spit | mésa |
| NP       | POSTP |
Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

III. Innovative variety

– Ulaghátsh Cappadocian
– Overt marking only for Source (*apo*)
– Zero marking for Place and Goal

  • NPs $[\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{NP}}$
  • PostPs $[\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} + \text{POSTP}]_{\text{PostP}}$
III. Innovative variety

(7) Source

to peǰí īrte [ap d’ iskóλon]
the boy came from the school
‘the boy returned from school’
(Ulaghátsh; Dawkins 1916: 356)
III. Innovative variety

(8) Place

*tránse ci [to *meidán] en ávja*

saw that the yard is game

‘she saw that in the yard there is some game’

(Ulaghátsh; Dawkins 1916: 348)
III. Innovative variety

(9) Goal

*píje [éna xorjó]*

went a village

‘he went to a village’

(Ulaghátsh; Dawkins 1916: 352)
### Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

#### III. Innovative variety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ap, as</em></td>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>me</em></td>
<td>COMITATIVE, INSTRUMENTITIVE</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>os</em></td>
<td>TERMINATIVE</td>
<td>‘up to, until’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>ALLATIVE, LOCATIVE</td>
<td>‘to, at’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal > Source
Source, Place and Goal in AMGr

I. Conservative varieties
   Source $\Rightarrow$ \textit{apo}
   Place = Goal $\Rightarrow$ \textit{se}

II. Intermediate varieties
   Source $\Rightarrow$ \textit{apo}
   Place = Goal $\Rightarrow$ \textit{se} $\sim$ $\emptyset$

III. Innovative varieties
   Source $\Rightarrow$ \textit{apo}
   Place = Goal $\Rightarrow$ $\emptyset$
Impact of the loss of *se*

- The expression of Goal becomes morphologically less complex (zero marking) than the expression of Source (overt marking, *apo/as*)
  - Goal is considered to be the unmarked member of the contrasting pair Source–Goal (Dixon 1980; Ikegami 1987; Fillmore 1997; Stolz 1992; Stolz et al. 2014)

- The case of Ulaghátsh Cappadocian shows:
  - Directionality of change can have a clear vector, which is determined by the markedness hierarchy Goal < Source.
Impact of the loss of se

• The diachrony of markedness relations in inner Asia Minor Greek (notation follows Stolz et al. 2014):

I. Conservative   II. Intermediate   III. Innovative
Goal–Place vs Source

• The reorganisation of the system has a local effect:
  
  – the loss of $se$ and its replacement by zero

• The original global picture remains intact:
  
  – Place = Goal ≠ Source
Conclusions

• More grammatical means for the expression of Goal than for Source in all varieties.
• The expression of Goal becomes diachronically less complex:
  – \( se > se \sim \emptyset > \emptyset \)
• Source remains equally complex in time.
• Despite the loss of \( se \), the inherited polysemic pattern remains intact.
Conclusions

• In all stages, Goal expressions occur more frequently than Source expressions:
Conclusions

• The findings are in line with general asymmetries found in language:
  – Zero (or, short) encoding of present vs future tense forms (Haspelmath 2006)
Thank you for your attention!
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Method: how to find zeroes

• When the semantic role of the Ground is not assigned by the verb ⇒ ∅

(10) Ulaghátsh Cappadocian

a. to pejí írten ap d’ iskóλon
the boy came from the school
‘the boy returned from school’

b. írte ∅ do spít=it
came the house=his
‘he came to his house’
The variable use of *se* and ∅

- Sources of data: three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Size (words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phloïtá</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8 stories, Dawkins 1916: 410–441)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sílli (D)</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 stories, Dawkins 1916: 284–304)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sílli (K)</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 stories, Kostakis 1968: 116–130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* and ∅

- Phloïtá Cappadocian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>– adnominal genitive</th>
<th>+ adnominal genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>se</em></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (1) = 91.3, p < .001$

The odds of dropping *se* are 76.92 times higher in the presence of an adnominal genitive.
The variable use of *se* and Ø

- Phloïtá Cappadocian:

\[(11)\quad ce\quad ben\quad [\text{devrefú to spit}],\]
and enters dervish.GEN the house
\[[\text{so tecé}]\]
to the convent
‘And he goes into the dervish’s house, into the convent.’
(Dawkins 1916: 416)
The variable use of *se* and ∅

• Silliot:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>– postposition</th>
<th>+ postposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>se</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (1) = 6.37, p < .05 \)

The odds of dropping *se* are 10.25 times higher in the presence of a postposition.
The variable use of *se* and ∅

- Silliot:

  (12) a. \( \text{vémbi}=ta \quad [\text{st’ } \text{ambéλa}] \)
      sends=them  to the  vineyards
      ‘She sends them to the vineyards.’
      (Dawkins 1916: 286)

  b. \( \text{kónis}=ta \quad [\text{tfiŋ } \text{kúpa apēsu}] \)
      pour=OBJ the cup  inside
      ‘Pour it into the cup.’
      (Dawkins 1916: 300)
The variable use of *se* and ∅

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-incorporation</th>
<th>Omission of <em>se</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Only locations, not parts of locations</td>
<td>Both locations and parts of locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only prepositional complements</td>
<td>Both complements and adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does not introduce discourse referents</td>
<td>Introduces discourse referents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No regular modifiers</td>
<td>Regular modifiers are fine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ioannidou & den Dikken 2009; Terzi 2010; Gehrke & Lekakou 2013)