26th International Conference on Historical Linguistics – ICHL26

Selected workshops

In order to be considered as a contributor please send a one-page abstract to the corresponding author by January 1st, 2023.

(If not accepted, consider applying to the general session.)

W1: Climate change and language change (Martine Robbeets)
robbeets@shh.mpg.de

W2: Macro-level social motivations for language change: Contact, migration, and globalization (Bridget Drinka, Gijsbert Rutten and Terttu Nevalainen)
bridget.drinka@utsa.edu

W3: Computational models of diachronic language change (Stefania Degaetano-Ortlieb, Lauren Fonteyn, Marie-Pauline Krielke and Elke Teich)
s.degaetano@mx.uni-saarland.de

W4: Ambiguity (avoidance) as a factor in language change (Eva Zehentner and Ilaria De Cesare) eva.zehentner@es.uzh.ch

W5: Conceptual metaphors in a comparative and diachronic perspective (Daniel Kölligan) daniel.koelligan@uni-wuerzburg.de

W6: Categorizers in diachrony (Laura Grestenberger)
laura.grestenberger@oeaw.ac.at

W7: Interactions at the dawn of history: Methods and results in prehistoric contact linguistics (Marwan Kilani and Rasmus Bjørn)
marwan.kilani@unibas.ch

W8: Filling in the diachronic gaps: The view of Old Iranian from the present (Shuan Karim and Saloumeh Gholami) karim.56@osu.edu

W9: "Your birch-bark bag has something" – Grammaticalization and diachrony of locative, existential and possessive predications (Chris Lasse Däbritz)
chris.lasse.daebritz@uni-hamburg.de

W10: The (pre)history of the languages of Japan – Current issues and prospects (Étienne Baudel, Aleksandra Jarosz and Georg Orlandi) etienne.baudel@gmail.com

W11: The diachrony of tone – Connecting the field (Sandra Auderset, Rikker Dockum and Ryan Gehrmann) sandra_auderset@eva.mpg.de

W12: From and towards demonstratives: Grammaticalization processes and beyond (Veronica Orqueda and Berta González Saavedra) vorqueda@uc.cl

W13: New methods for old languages: The comparability of data (Alessia Cassarà, Lena Kaltenbach, Mariapaola Piccione and Tara Struik) alessia.cassara@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

W14: Exploiting standardized cross-linguistic data in historical linguistics (Johann-Mattis List) mattis.list@lingpy.org

W15: Using secondary dialect data for reconstruction: Methodological considerations for Arabic (Maris Camilleri and Uri Horesh) URIH@live.achva.ac.il

Workshop descriptions in the order presented above

W1

From climate change to language change

Martine Robbeets robbeets@shh.mpg.edu

Over the last decades, our Earth has experienced an alarming number of extreme events, such as heatwaves, heavy rainfall, flooding, melt events, drought, forest fires, cyclones, etc. With progressing climate change, such extreme events can be expected to occur more frequently and potentially become more severe (Martin et al. 2021). A new field of study has risen from the ashes of these events: Geoanthropology studies present and past interactions between humans and the Earth system, integrating fields such as Climate science, Earth system science, Ecology, Environmental history, Archaeology, Economics, Law, Anthropology and Political sciences. In our panel, we wish to add linguistics to this list and explore the relevance of Historical Linguistics for the field of Geoanthropology.

How do climate and language connect? The link between the two lies in humans and how they respond to changing conditions and extreme events. Simply put, climate change can affect speaker populations in the following three ways.

(1) *The speaker population declines to extinction*

Disrupting subsistence industries of speakers of endangered languages, climate change is forcing these speakers to assimilate to the language and subsistence strategies of more dominant linguistic groups or to scatter around the globe, thus threatening linguistic survival. For example, as reindeer populations are threatened by climate change, reindeer herders speaking Evenki, a Tungusic language in Northeastern Siberia, are shifting not only to jobs in industry but also to the Russian language.

(2) *The speaker population migrates to a new environment*

By contrast, climate change can also increase linguistic diversity. During the Little Ice Age these Tungusic speakers expanded their territory because colder weather appears to increase reindeer populations (Hudson 2020, Robbeets & Oskolskaya 2022). Moreover, climate change can force populations to move, along with their crops and languages to search for a more viable environment. In such cases, we expect language split between the part of the speech community that stays and the part that leaves, leading to the development of separate daughter languages. The daughter language on the move can either be maintained and interact with contact languages at its new destination, or, alternatively, it can be abandoned, with speakers shifting to a new target language, spoken by a more dominant speech community in the new environment. For example, a large group of Maldivian climate refugees has moved to India or Sri Lanka. Even if the immigrants' language has received substantial influence from Tamil, Hindustani and English, they maintain Dhivehi, spoken in the Maldives, as their native language.

(3) *The speaker population adapts to the changing environment*

Even if certain speech communities manage to stay in place and maintain their native language, they will need to adapt it to the changing local environment (Frainer et al. 2020). This may involve coining new words, losing specific cultural vocabulary, lexical recycling, borrowing from better adapted speakers, etc. Ongoing climate change in Alaska, for instance, created new opportunities for agriculture. In Aleut, the agricultural verbs 'to plant' and 'to sow' are recycled from original hunter-gatherer terminology meaning 'to drop a fishing line' and 'to distribute sea-catch' (Berge 2017).

How can we extrapolate, projecting observable cases of climate-driven language change to reconstruct linguistic prehistory? Geoanthropologists use the designation "Anthropocene" as a unit of geologic time, used to describe the period when human activity started to have a significant impact on our planet's climate and ecosystems. Other suggestions for the starting date being the Industrial Revolution and the invention of the atomic bomb, some researchers argue that the Anthropocene began approximately 8 000 years ago with the development of farming and sedentary cultures (Foley et al. 2013; Smith and Zeder 2013, Renn 2020). This falls within the time frame that can be investigated by applying the traditional historical-comparative linguistic method, the practical cut-off point for this method lying around 10 000 years ago (Comrie 2000; Campbell 2000). It is no coincidence that many of the world's major language families started to disperse around the Neolithic Revolution. For instance, language families such as Bantu (Philipson 2002) , Semitic (Diakonoff 1998), Austronesian (Blust 1995, 2013; Pawley 2002; Bellwood & Dizon 2008), Transeurasian (Robbeets et al. 2021), Sino-Tibetan (Sagart et al. 2019, Zhang et al. 2020), Tai-Kadai (Ostapirat 2005), Austroasiatic (Higham 2002, Diffloth 2005, Sidwell and Blench 2011, Sagart 2011, van Driem 2017), Dravidian (Fuller 2002) Arawakan (Aikhenvald 1999), Otomanguean (Kaufman 1990, Brown et al. 2013a/b, 2014a/b) are argued to owe their primary dispersal to the adoption of agriculture by their early speakers. The link between postglacial warming and farming/language dispersals is generally accepted (Richerson et al. 2001, Bellwood 2022: 150) but it remains to be investigated how climate versatility and extreme events in specific regions may have influenced language loss, change and dispersal.

Our panel proposes a wide range of questions stressing the need of case studies that illustrate in what ways climate reshaped individual languages and language families across the world.

Is climate change threatening certain languages and accelerating language loss of already endangered languages? Can climate change also have a positive effect on linguistic diversity, leading to the birth of new daughter languages? What is the relation between the reduction of biological, cultural and linguistic diversity through climate change? What is the reason for/ mechanism behind the correlations? Can the conservation of species be expected to lead to the conservation of languages? Can regions that have high biodiversity be linked to the development of linguistic diversity? Can we correlate established periods of climate change in a certain region in prehistory with periods of linguistic dispersal and language loss? Do dated trees of individual language families support such a correlation? Can we extrapolate our understanding of climate-driven language change not only to reconstruct the past but also to predict the future? In what way and to which extent did the emergence of the Anthropocene impact language loss, dispersal and change? What is the influence of extreme events on language diversification? Can the impact of extreme events be modeled, for instance by Dixon's (1997) equilibrium/punctuation model or by Hudson's (2017) adaptive cycle model? Are there case studies that illustrate the impact of extreme events on language change? What is the impact of time on climate-driven language change? Is it reasonable to expect that linguistic diversity will restore at a higher speed than biological diversity? What is the role of climate in proposals like "the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis" (Bellwood & Renfrew 2002), which posits that many of the world's major language families owe their dispersal to the adoption of agriculture by their early speakers?

Convenor

Martine Robbeets
Max Planck Institute for Geoanthropology, Jena
robbeets@shh.mpg.de

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 1999. The Arawak language family. In Amazonian Languages, Alexandra Aikhenvald & Robert Dixon (eds), 65–106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bellwood, Peter 2022. *The Five-Million-Year Odyssey. The human journey from ape to agriculture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bellwood, Peter & Dizon, Eusebio. 2008. Austronesian cultural origins: Out of Taiwan, via the Batanes Islands, onwards to Western Polynesia. In *Past Human Migrations in East Asia, Matching Archaeology, Linguistics and Genetics*, Alicia Sanchez-Mazas, Roger Blench, Malcolm Ross, Ilia Peiros & Marie Lin (eds), 23–39. London: Routledge.

Bellwood, Peter & Renfrew, Colin (eds). 2002. *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Berge, Anna. 2017. Subsistence terms in Unangam Tunuu (Aleut). In *Language Dispersal Beyond Farming*, Robbeets, Martine & Alexander Savelyev (eds.), 47-74. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Blust, Robert. 1995. The prehistory of the Austronesian-speaking peoples: a view from language. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9: 453–510.

Blust, Robert. 2013. *The Austronesian Languages* [Asia-Pacific Linguistics. Open access monographs]. Canberra: Australian National University.

Brown, Cecil et al. 2013a. The paleobiolinguistics of domesticated chili pepper (*Capsicum* spp.). *Ethnobiology Letters* 4: 1–11.

Brown, Cecil et al. 2013b. The paleobiolinguistics of domesticated manioc (*Manihot esculenta*). *Ethnobiology Letters* 4: 61–70.

Brown, Cecil et al. 2014a. The paleobiolinguistics of domesticated maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Ethnobiology Letters* 5: 52–64.

Brown, Cecil et al. 2014b. The paleobiolinguistics of the common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). *Ethnobiology Letters* 5: 104–115.

Campbell, Lyle. 2000. Time perspective in linguistics. In Time depth in historical linguistics, Renfrew, Colin and McMahon, Alice (eds), 3-31. Cambridge : McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research

Comrie, Bernard 2000 Is there a single time depth cut-off point in historical linguistics? In Time depth in historical linguistics, Renfrew, Colin and McMahon, Alice (eds), 34-60. Cambridge : McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research

de Boer, Elisabeth. 2010. *The Historical Development of Japanese Tone: From Proto-Japanese to the Modern Dialects [and] the Introduction and Adaptation of the Middle Chinese Tones in Japan.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

de Boer, Elisabeth M. 2020. The Classification of the Japonic Languages. *Transeurasian Languages*, ed. M. Robbeets & A. Savelyev, 40–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diakonoff, Igor. 1998. The earliest Semitic society. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (2): 209–219.

Diffloth, Gérard. 2005. The contribution of linguistic palaeontology to the homeland of Austroasiatic. In *The Peopling of East Asia: Putting Together the Archaeology, Linguistics and Genetics*, Laurent Sagart, Roger Blench & Alicia Sanchez-Mazas (eds), 77–80. London: Routledge Curzon.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1997. The rise and fall of languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diakonoff, Igor. 1998. The earliest Semitic society. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43 (2): 209–219.

Foley, Stephen F. et al. 2013 The Palaeoanthropocene: the beginnings of anthropogenic environmental change. *Anthropocene* 3:83–88

Fortescue, Michael & Edward Vajda. 2022. *Mid-Holocene language connections between Asia and North America*. BSILA 17. Leiden/ Boston: Brill.

Fuller, Dorian. 2002. An agricultural perspective on Dravidian historical linguistics: Archaeological crop packages, livestock and Dravidian crop vocabulary. In *Examining the Language/Farming Dispersal Hypothesis*, Peter Bellwood & Colin Renfrew (eds), 191–214. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Frainer, André et al. 2020. Cultural and linguistic diversities are underappreciated pillars of biodiversity PNAS 117(43): 26539–26543 www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.2019469117

Francis-Ratté, Alexander T. 2016. Proto-Korean-Japanese: A New Reconstruction of the Common Origin of the Japanese and Korean Languages. Ph.D. dissertation, the Ohio State University.

Francis-Ratté, Alexander T., and J. Marshall Unger. 2020. Contact between Genetically Related Languages: the Case of Old Korean and Old Japanese. In Robbeets & Savelyev 2020, 705–14.

Gorenflo, L. J. et al. 2012 Co-occurrence of linguistic and biological diversity in biodiversity hotspots and high biodiversity wilderness areas PNAS 109: 8032-8037

Higham, Charles. 2002. Languages and farming dispersal: Austroasiatic languages and rice cultivation. In *Examining the Language/Farming Dispersal Hypothesis*, Peter Bellwood & Colin Renfrew (eds), 223–232. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Hudson, Mark J. 2017. Socio-ecological resilience and language dynamics: An adaptive cycle model of long-term language change. Journal of Language Evolution, 2018, 1–9. doi: 10.1093/jole/lzy008

Hudson, Mark J. 2020. Language dispersals and the "Secondary Peoples' Revolution": A historical anthropology of the Transeurasian unity. In: The Oxford guide to the Transeurasian languages, Robbeets, Martine & Savelyev, Alexander (eds.), 806–813. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hudson, Mark J. et al. 2012. Prospects and challenges for an archaeology of global climate change. WIREs Clim Change 3:313–328. doi: 10.1002/wcc.174

Kaufman, Terence. 1990. Early Otomanguean homelands and cultures: some premature hypotheses. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 91–136.

Martin M.A. et al. 2021. Ten new insights in climate science 2021: a horizon scan. Global Sustainability 4: e25, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2021.25

Ostapirat, Weera. 2005. Kra-dai and Austronesians. In *The Peopling of East Asia: Putting Together the Archaeology, Linguistics and Genetics*, Laurent Sagart, Roger Blench & Alicia Sanchez-Mazas (eds), 107–131. London: Routledge Curzon.

Pawley, Andrew. 2002. The Austronesian dispersal: languages, technologies and people. In *Examining the Language/Farming Dispersal Hypothesis*, Peter Bellwood & Colin Renfrew (eds), 251–274. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Philipson, David. 2002. Language and farming dispersals in sub-Saharan Africa, with particular reference to the Bantu-speaking peoples. In *Examining the Language/Farming Dispersal Hypothesis*, Peter Bellwood & Colin Renfrew (eds), 177–190. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Renn, Jürgen 2020. The evolution of knowledge: Rethinking science for the Anthropocene. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Richerson, P. J., Boyd, R., & Bettinger, R. L. 2001. Was agriculture impossible during the Pleistocene but mandatory during the Holocene? A climate change hypothesis. *American Antiquity*, *66*(3): 387-411.

Robbeets, Martine et al. 2021. Triangulation supports agricultural spread of the Transeurasian languages. *Nature* 599: 616-621. DOI 10.1038/s41586-021-04108-8 https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-04108-8

Robbeets, Martine, and Alexander Savelyeve (ed.) 2020. *The Oxford Guide to Transeurasian Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robbeets, Martine & Oskolskaya, Sofia 2022. Proto-Tungusic in Time and Space. In Tungusic languages: Past and present, Hölzl, Andreas & Payne, Thomas E. (eds), 263–294. Berlin: Language Sciences Press.

Romaine, Suzanne & Gorenflo, L. J. 2017. Linguistic diversity of natural UNESCO world heritage sites: bridging the gap between nature and culture. Biodivers Conserv (2017) 26:1973–1988. DOI 10.1007/s10531-017-1340-x

Sagart, Laurent et al. Dated language phylogenies shed light on the ancestry of Sino-Tibetan. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci*. **116**, 10317–10322 (2019).

Sagart, Laurent. 2011. How many independent rice vocabularies in East Asia? *Rice* 4 (3): 121–133.

Sidwell, Paul & Blench, Roger. 2011. The Austroasiatic Urheimat: the Southeastern Riverine Hypothesis. In *Dynamics of Human Diversity: the Case of Mainland Southeast Asia*, Nick Enfield (ed.), 315–343. Canberra:

Pacific Linguistics.

Smith, Bruce D. & Zeder Melinda A. 2013 The onset of the Anthropocene. *Anthropocene* 4:8–13.

Unger, J. Marshall. 2001. Layers of Words and Volcanic Ash in Japan and Korea. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol. 27 no. 1 pp. 81–111.

Unger, J. Marshall. 2009. *The Role of Contact in the Origins of the Japanese and Korean Languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

van Driem, George 2017 The domestications and the domesticators of Asian rice In *Language Dispersal Beyond Farming*, Robbeets, Martine & Alexander Savelyev (eds.), 183-214. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zhang, H. et al. 2020 Dated phylogeny suggests early Neolithic origin of Sino-Tibetan languages. *Nature Scientific Reports* 10: 20792.

W2

WORKSHOP
MACRO-LEVEL SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS FOR LANGUAGE CHANGE:
CONTACT, MIGRATION, AND GLOBALIZATION

Bridget Drinka (bridget.drinka@utsa.edu)
Terttu Nevalainen (terttu.nevalainen@helsinki.fi)
Gijsbert Rutten (g.j.rutten@hum.leidenuniv.nl)

In her 1989 article on the role of socio-political forces as motivators of linguistic change, Susan Gal noted that the examination of speakers' micro-level responses to "macrohistorical processes" could provide new insights into the operation of contact as a motivator of change (Gal 1989: 357). In the years since the publication of this work, historical linguists, sociolinguists, and socio-historical linguists have grown increasingly aware of the interface between macro-historical processes and micro-level responses, as witnessed by paths of inquiry such as the following:

- The recognition of the role of ecology in establishing the trajectory of early varieties of African American English (Mufwene's 2001, 2008)
- The identification of population size as a determining factor in the linguistic outcome of contact and the level of complexity of contact varieties (Trudgill 2011), with smaller populations maintaining more complexity (Sinnemäki 2020) but also at times showing large-scale areal distributions of complexity (Tallman and Epps 2018)
- The investigation of the role of koineization (Tuten 2003, 2021) and of socio-demographic factors (Sessarego 2019, 2021) under conditions of colonization and contact
- The development of new tools for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the role of the individual in large-scale language change (Petré and Van de Velde 2018) and the mapping of large-scale and genealogical and geographical trends across time and space (Nichols 2016, 2020; Bickel 2020)
- The analysis of the interactive role of migration and urbanization in Africa and Europe (Mesthrie 2022; Kerswill & Wiese 2022; Wiese 2022; Mufwene 2022)

In this workshop, we propose to bring together scholars whose work focuses on macro-level motivations for linguistic change to explore how socio-political forces—invasion and migration, religious conversion and exclusion, colonization and globalization—have brought populations into contact, and what the micro-level effect on the languages of these speakers has been.

We regard this topic as critical at this moment in history, especially in light of several noteworthy trends:

- Approximately 4% of the world's population are global migrants: in 2020, there were about 281 million migrants in the world. [Migration Policy Institute]; in 2022, those fleeing

conflict, violence, and other threats numbered more than 100 million (UNHCR, The UN Refugee Agency). Language contact is a constant among migrating populations.

- In 1945, about one third of the world's population (approximately 750 million people) lived under colonial rule (United Nations). While this number has diminished greatly in recent years, linguistic effects of colonial rule persist.
- Closely tied to colonization is globalization, defined by Vignouroux and Mufwene (2008: 4) as "the worldwide network of economic interconnectedness and interdependencies." English and other European languages continue to exert influence in the realm of commerce, academics, and popular culture.

Such macrohistorical pressures continue to leave their mark on the languages of the world today, and on the linguistic choices that each individual speaker makes.

What we hope to accomplish in this workshop is an in-depth examination of the mechanisms through which these and other macro-level processes have influenced the language of speakers.

In order to achieve this goal, we invite submissions focusing on the following research questions or other related issues:

- To what extent are macro-level motivations responsible for the creation of linguistic areas?
- What new methodologies can be employed to map the effects of past macro-level influences? What kinds of remnants of past influence persist, and how can we analyze and interpret these most effectively?
- Do some demographic features turn out to be more influential in contact situations than others? Are some of these features intersectional in their influence?
- What role does contact play in determining the level of complexity in larger or smaller speech communities?
- Is koineization to be found in languages around the world, or only in those which have experienced particular macrohistorical pressures?
- To what extent do changing social hierarchies and political and religious ideologies impact patterns of change?
- What role does prestige play in setting up superstratal influence and roofing effects? How do such factors influence the actual language of speakers? That is, to what extent do these factors illustrate micro-level responses to macro-level processes?
- Are some traditional examples of language change better explained as having been motivated by macrohistorical processes or, more generally, by contact?

REFERENCES
Arkadiev, Peter, and Francesco Gardani (eds.) 2020. *The complexities of morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
Baechler, Raffaela and Guido Seiler (eds.). 2016. *Complexity, isolation, and variation*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter.
Bickel, Balthasar. 2020. Large and ancient linguistic areas. In Crevels and Muysken (eds.). 78–101.
Chappell, Whitney and Bridget Drinka (eds.). 2021. *Spanish socio-historical linguistics: Isolation and contact*. Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
Crevels, Mily and Pieter Muysken (eds.) 2020. *Language dispersal, diversification, and contact: A global perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gal, Susan. 1989. Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 345-67.
Kerswill, Paul, and Heike Wiese (eds.). 2022. *Urban contact cialects and language change: Insights from the Global North and South*. New York: Routledge.
Mesthrie, Rajend. 2022. Migrants and urban contact sociolinguistics in Africa and Europe. In: Kerswill and Wiese (eds.). 337-343.
Migration Policy Institute. (https://www.migrationpolicy.org/)
Mufwene, Salikoko. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 2008. *Language evolution: Contact, competition, and change*. London: Continuum.

Mufwene, Salikoko. 2022. Multilingualism and super-diversity: Some historical and contrastive perspectives. In: Mufwene and Escobar (eds.) 144-171.

Mufwene, Salikoko, and Anna María Escobar (eds.). 2022. *The Cambridge handbook of language contact. Vol. 2: Multilingualism in population structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, Johanna. 2016. Complex edges, transparent frontiers: Grammatical complexity and language spreads. In: Baechler and Seiler (eds.). 116-137.

Nichols, Johanna. 2020. Dispersal patterns shape areal typology. In: Crevels and Muysken (eds.) 25-43.

Petré, Peter, and Freek Van de Velde. 2018. The real-time dynamics of the individual and the community in grammaticalization. *Language* 94.4: 867-901.

Sessarego, Sandro. 2019. *Language contact and the making of an Afro-hispanic vernacular: variation and change in the Colombian Chocó*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sessarego, Sandro. 2021. A socio-historical perspective on the origin and evolution of two Afro-Andean vernaculars. In: Chappell and Drinka (eds.). 163-184.

Sinnemäki, Kaius. 2020. Linguistic system and sociolinguistic environment as competing factors in linguistic variation: A typological approach. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 6 (2): 1-39.

Tallman, Adam, and Patience Epps. 2020. Morphological complexity, autonomy, and areality in western Amazonia. In: Arkadiev and Gardani (eds.). 230-263.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuten, Donald. 2003. *Koineization in medieval Spanish*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tuten, Donald. 2021. Complexification of the early modern Spanish address system: A role for koineization? In: Chappell and Drinka (eds.) 17-47.

United Nations: The United Nations and Decolonization (www.un.org/dppa/decolonization/)

UNHCR: The UN Refugee Agency (www.unhcr.org/)

Vigouroux, Cécile, and Salikoko Mufwene (eds.). 2008. *Globalization and language vitality: Perspectives from Africa*. London / New York: Continuum.

Wiese, Heike. 2022. Urban contact dialects. In: Mufwene and Escobar (eds.) 115-144.

W3

Workshop: Computational models of diachronic language change

Authors:
Stefania Degaetano-Ortlieb*, s.degaetano@mx.uni-saarland.de (corresponding author)
Lauren Fonteyn[+],
Marie-Pauline Krielke*,
Elke Teich*

*Saarland University, [+]Leiden University

While the study of diachronic language change has long been firmly grounded in corpus data analysis, it seems fair to state that the field has been subject of a 'computational turn' over the last decade or so, computational models being increasingly adopted across several research communities, including corpus and computational linguistics, computational social science, digital humanities, and historical linguistics.

The core technique for the investigation of diachronic change are distributional models (DMs). DMs rely on the fact that related meanings occur in similar contexts and allow us to study lexical-semantic change in a data-driven way (e.g. as argued by Sagi et al. 2011), and on a larger scale (e.g. as shown on the Google NGram corpus by Gulordava & Baroni 2011). Besides count-based models (e.g. Hilpert & Saavedra 2017), contextualized word embeddings are increasingly employed for diachronic modeling, as such models are able to encode rich, context-sensitive information on word usage (see Lenci 2018 or Fonteyn et al., 2022 for discussion).

In previous work, DMs have been used to determine laws of semantic change (e.g. Hamilton et al. 2016b, Dubossarsky et al. 2017) as well as develop statistical measures that help detect different types of change (e.g. specification vs. broadening; cultural change vs. linguistic change; Hamilton et al. 2016a, Del Tredici et al. 2019). DMs have also been used to map change in specific (groups of) concepts (e.g. 'racism', 'knowledge'; see Sommerauer & Fokkens 2019 for a discussion). Further studies have suggested ways of improving the models that generate (diachronic) word embeddings to attain these goals (e.g. Rudolph & Blei 2018).

Existing studies and projects focus on capturing and quantifying aspects of *semantic change*. Yet, over the past decade, DMs have also been shown to be useful to investigate other types of change in language use, including *grammatical change*. Within the computational and corpus linguistic communities, for example, Bizzoni et al. (2019, 2020) have shown an interdependency between lexical and grammatical changes and Teich et al. (2021) use embeddings to detect (lexico-) grammatical conventionalization (which may lead to grammaticalization). Within diachronic linguistics, the use of distributional models is focused on examining the underlying functions of grammatical structures across time (e.g. Perek 2016, Hilpert and Perek 2015, Gries and Hilpert 2008, Fonteyn 2020, Budts 2020). Specifically targeting historical linguistic questions, Rodda et al. (2019) and Sprugnoli et al. (2020) have shown that computational models are promising for analyzing ancient languages, and McGillivray et al. (2022) highlight the advantages of word embeddings (vs. count-based methods) while also pointing to the challenges and the limitations of these models.

A common concern across these different communities is to better understand the general principles or "laws" of language change and the underlying mechanisms (analogy, priming, processing efficiency, contextual predictability as measured by surprisal, etc.). In the proposed workshop, we will bring together researchers from relevant communities to talk about the unique promises that computational models hold when applied to diachronic data as well as the specific challenges they involve. In doing so, we will identify common ground and explore the most pressing problems and possible solutions. The program of the workshop will include talks by both invited speakers and open call for paper presentations.

Specific questions will concern:

Model utility: How can we capture change in language use beyond lexical-semantic change, e.g. change in grammatical constructions, collocations, phraseology?

Model quality: How can we evaluate computational models of historical language stages in absence of native-speaker 'gold standards'? To what extent does the quality of historical and diachronic corpora affect the performance of models?

Model analytics: How do we transition from testing the reliability of models to employing them to address previously unanswered research questions on language change? How can we detect and "measure" change? What are suitable analytic procedures to interpret the output of models?

References:

Bizzoni, Y., Degaetano-Ortlieb, S., Menzel, K., Krielke, P., and Teich, E. (2019). "Grammar and meaning: analysing the topology of diachronic word embeddings". In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Computational Approaches to Historical Language Change*, ACL, Florence, Italy, pp. 175–185.

Bizzoni, Y., Degaetano-Ortlieb, S., Fankhauser, P., and Teich, E. (2020). "Linguistic variation and change in 250 years of English scientific writing: a data-driven approach". *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence,* 3.

Budts, S. (2020). "A connectionist approach to analogy. On the modal meaning of periphrastic do in Early Modern English". *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 18(2), pp. 337–364.

Del Tredici, M., Fernández, R., and Boleda, G. (2019). "Short-term meaning shift: A distributional exploration." In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL): Human Language Technologies*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, pp. 2069–2075.

Dubossarsky, H., Weinshall, D., and Grossman, E. (2017). "Outta control: laws of semantic change and inherent biases in word representation models". In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Copenhagen, Denmark, pp. 1136–1145.

Fonteyn, L. (2020). "What about grammar? Using BERT embeddings to explore functional-semantic shifts of semi-lexical and grammatical constructions." *Computational Humanities Research CEUR-WS*, pp. 257–268.

Fonteyn, L., Manjavacas, E., and Budts, S. (2022). "Exploring Morphosyntactic Variation & Change with Distributional Semantic Models". *Journal of Historical Syntax,* 7(12), pp. 1–41.

Gries, S. T., and Hilpert, M. (2008). "The identification of stages in diachronic data: variability-based Neighbor Clustering". *Corpora*, 3(1), pp. 59–81.

Gulordava, K., and Baroni, M. (2011). "A distributional similarity approach to the detection of semantic change in the Google Books Ngram corpus". In *Proceedings of Geometrical Models for Natural Language Semantics (GEMS)*, EMNLP, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, pp. 67–71.

Hamilton, W. L., Leskovec, J., and Jurafsky, D. (2016a). "Cultural shift or linguistic drift? comparing two computational models of semantic change". In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing,* EMNLP, Austin, Texas, USA, pp. 2116–2121.

Hamilton, W. L., Leskovec J., and Jurafsky, D. (2016b). "Diachronic word embeddings reveal statistical laws of semantic change". In *Proceedings of Morphosyntactic Variation & Change with DSMs*, 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL, Berlin, Germany, pp. 1489–1501.

Hilpert, M., and Saavedra, D.C. (2020). "Using token-based semantic vector spaces for corpus-linguistic analyses: From practical applications to tests of theoretical claims". *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 16(2), pp. 393–424.

Hilpert, M. and Perek, F. (2015). "Meaning change in a petri dish: constructions, semantic vector spaces, and motion charts". *Linguistics Vanguard*, 1(1), pp. 339–350.

Lenci, A. (2018). "Distributional Models of Word Meaning". *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 4, pp. 151–171.

Perek, F. (2016). "Using distributional semantics to study syntactic productivity in diachrony: a case study". *Linguistics*, 54(1), pp. 149–188.

Rodda, M.A., Probert, P., and McGillivray, B. (2019). "Vector space models of Ancient Greek word meaning, and a case study on Homer". *TAL Traitement Automatique des Langues*, 60(3), pp. 63–87.

Rudolph, M., and Blei, D. (2018). "Dynamic embeddings for language evolution". In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference* (WWW '18), Lyon, France, pp. 1003–1011.

Sagi, E., Kaufmann, S., and Clark, B. (2011). "Tracing semantic change with Latent Semantic Analysis". *Current Methods in Historical Semantics*, 73, pp. 161–183.

Sommerauer, P., and Fokkens, A. (2019). "Conceptual Change and Distributional Semantic Models: An Exploratory Study on Pitfalls and Possibilities". In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Computational Approaches to Historical Language Change*, Florence, Italy, pp. 223–233.

Sprugnoli, R., Moretti, G., and Passarotti, M. (2020). "Building and Comparing Lemma Embeddings for Latin. Classical Latin versus Thomas Aquinas". *IJCoL. Italian Journal of Computational Linguistics,* 6(6-1), pp. 29–45.

Teich, E., Fankhauser P., Degaetano-Ortlieb, S., and Bizzoni, Y. (2021). "Less is More/More Diverse: On the Communicative Utility of Linguistic Conventionalization". *Frontiers in Communication,* 5.

Workshop 'Ambiguity (avoidance) as a factor in language change'

Eva Zehentner (University of Zurich), eva.zehentner@es.uzh.ch

Ilaria De Cesare (Universität Potsdam), decesare@uni-potsdam.de

There is general agreement on the fact that ambiguity is abundant in language, and is present in all linguistic domains. That is, as Felser (2017: 271) points out, "strings of human speech sounds (or strings of graphemes) may be compatible – at least, temporarily – with more than one possible phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic or pragmatic representation". In the linguistic literature, most attention so far has been paid to lexical and structural ambiguities, such as e.g. garden path sentences or PP-attachment. The role of ambiguity in language change has been extensively discussed in the literature, specifically its role as a crucial factor in both syntactic and semantic reanalysis (e.g. Evans & Wilkins 2000; Traugott 2012; Traugott & Trousdale 2013; Denison 2017; Felser 2017). Ambiguous instances are here often considered as 'bridging contexts', triggering new analyses of a structure or word if ambiguity is prevalent enough (cf. Winter-Froemel 2021: 12-14, positing a threshold of 50% of ambiguous contexts needed to instigate reanalysis). However, these assumptions have been criticised as 'logically flawed' (De Smet 2009: 1728), as ambiguity is the result rather than the motivation of reanalysis – in order for ambiguities to arise, the target interpretation must already be given (De Smet 2009: 1729). Despite calling for caution in attributing causal force to ambiguity and viewing it as the 'spark' of change, De Smet & Markey (2021: 21) nevertheless show that ambiguity can act as 'fuel' in the diffusion of innovations, as they may "spread more easily to contexts where the innovation is less conspicuous".

A related, yet slightly different question is the role of ambiguity avoidance as a cognitive pressure in language use and change (e.g. Stefanowitsch 2021): Studies into syntactic phenomena such as differential object marking (Fedzechinka et al. 2012; Iemmolo 2013; Levshina 2020; Tal et al. 2022), argument structure (e.g. Flack 2007; De Swart et al. 2008; Lamers & de Swart 2012 or MacWhinney et al. 2014; Kittilä et al. 2011; Kulikov et al. 2006), as well as e.g. Temperley (2003) on relative clauses suggest that there is a cross-linguistic tendency for ambiguity to be resolved, with 'trade-offs' between disambiguation strategies

being frequently observed. A well-known example for such trade-offs is the history of English argument structure, where the decreasing disambiguation power of case marking appears to correlate with an increasing reliance on constituent order for identifying 'who did what to whom'. Explorations of the role of ambiguity avoidance in morphonotactic histories of languages (e.g. Baumann et al. 2019) as well as lexical and morphological homophony avoidance (e.g. Baermann 2011; Munteanu 2021) suggest that similar tendencies could be given in other domains.

Although such explanations are intuitively appealing and seem to hold in specific cases, they have not been extensively tested against empirical data, and existing results are somewhat inconclusive (cf. e.g. Fedzechinka et al. 2012; Levshina 2021; Zehentner 2021; De Cesar & Demske 2022). Furthermore, the cross-linguistic commonness of ambiguity as discussed by Wasow (2015) or Piantadosi et al. (2012) as well as the synchronic evidence (e.g. Ferreira 2006, 2008; Ferreira & Dell 2000; Ferreira et al. 2005; Roland et al. 2006, among others) call into question whether ambiguity avoidance can be considered a general, strong, potentially universal and stable cognitive mechanism in the first place, or whether it may only come into play in relatively restricted areas and under specific circumstances. The present workshop aims to provide a platform for discussing both the role of ambiguity in language change as well as the role of ambiguity avoidance as a cognitive pressure triggering and/or shaping diachronic change. In particular, the workshop addresses the following questions (among potential other issues):

- Do ambiguous (bridging) contexts serve as (a) triggers of change, (b) the fuel for change, facilitating or accelerating change once an innovation has emerged, or (c) instead as the result of change (cf. De Smet 2009; De Smet & Markey 2021)?
- Does ambiguity (avoidance) affect different linguistic levels in similar ways, or are there differences between e.g. ambiguity effects in phonology versus syntax, or between the role of structural versus semantic/ lexical ambiguity (e.g. Winter-Froemel 2021)?
- Which changes are particularly prone to be affected by ambiguity (avoidance)? Is there a difference between linguistic phenomena at the same linguistic level?
- How does ambiguity affect comprehension and (how) are comprehension effects reflected in production?
- What is the role of the (individual) speaker or hearer regarding language change and ambiguity and how conscious/ unconscious are these processes?
- Are both ambiguity and ambiguity avoidance stable and quasi-universal factors in language change or does their effect interact with other factors impacting language change, both social and cognitive ones? For example, how does mode interact with ambiguity?
- How does ambiguity relate to vagueness and/or fuzziness, and where does this

distinction come into play in regard to language change (cf. e.g. Denison 2017)?

While we welcome more theoretically-focused contributions of such issues to the workshop, one main goal for the workshop is to discuss the role of ambiguity (avoidance) on the basis

of empirical data, as well as possible methodological challenges. That is, we particularly invite empirical (corpus-linguistic or other) contributions on the impact of ambiguity in change, aiming to also address questions such as:

- How can we operationalise ambiguity (avoidance) in historical data? Which methodological problems may arise in data extraction and analysis in diachronic studies of ambiguity?
- What are possible options to assess the impact of ambiguity(avoidance) on specific changes, and how can we empirically address the question of causality in particular instances of change (cf. Winter-Froemel 2021; Zehentner 2021)?

Finally, the workshop intends to cover an as broad as possible range of languages and time-depths beyond Germanic/ Indo-European languages, and is neither restricted in terms of

linguistic level of analysis nor regarding theoretical framework.

References

Baerman, Matthew. 2011. Defectiveness and homophony avoidance. *Journal of Linguistics* 47(1). 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226710000022.

Baumann, Andreas, Christina Prömer & Nikolaus Ritt 2019. Word form shapes are selected to be morphotactically indicative. *Folia Linguistica* 53(40, 1): 129-151. https://doi.org/10.1515/flih-2019-0007.

De Cesare, Ilaria & Ulrike Demske. 2022. Ambiguity avoidance as an efficiency strategy driving word order change. *The 25th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Oxford*.

Denison, David. 2017. Ambiguity and vagueness in historical change. In Marianne Hundt, Sandra Mollin & Simone Pfenninger (eds.), *The changing English language: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, 292-318. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316091746.013.

De Smet, Hendrik. 2009. Analysing reanalysis. *Lingua* 119: 1728-1755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2009.03.001.

De Smet, Hendrik & Marie-Anne Markey. 2021. The spark or the fuel? On the role of ambiguity in language change. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 5: 1-24 (Special Issue: Whither reanalysis?). https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2021.v5i32-39.144.

De Swart, Peter, Monique Lamers & Sander Lestrade. 2008. Animacy, argument structure, and argument encoding. *Lingua* 118(2): 131-140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.02.009.

Evans, Nicholas & David Wilkins. 2000. In the mind's ear: The semantic extensions of perception verbs in Australian languages. *Language* 76(3): 546-592.

Fedzechkina, Maryia, Florian Jaeger & Elissa Newport. 2012. Language learners restructure their input to facilitate efficient communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(44): 17897-17902. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.121577610.

Felser, Claudia. 2017. Syntactic ambiguity in real-time language processing and diachronic change. In Marianne Hundt, Sandra Mollin & Simone Pfenninger (eds.), *The changing English language: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, 271-291. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316091746.012.

Ferreira, Victor. 2006. Avoid ambiguity! (If you can). *CRL Technical Reports* 18: 3-13.

Ferreira, Victor. 2008. Ambiguity, accessibility, and a division of labor for communicative success. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation: Advances in Research and Theory* 49: 209-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(08)00006-6.

Ferreira, Victor & Gary Dell. 2000. The effect of ambiguity and lexical availability on syntactic and lexical production. *Cognitive Psychology* 40: 296-340. https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0730.

Ferreira, Victor, Robert Slevc & Erin Rogers. 2005. How do speakers avoid ambiguous linguistic expressions? *Cognition* 96: 263-284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.09.002.

Flack, Kathryn. 2007. Ambiguity avoidance as contrast preservation: Case and word order freezing in Japanese. In Leah Bateman, Adam Werle, Michael O'Keefe & Ehren Reilly (eds.), *UMass Occasional Papers in Linguistics 32: Papers in Optimality Theory III*. Amherst: GLSA, 57-88. https://doi.org/doi:10.7282/T3HQ42T3.

Iemmolo, Giorgio. 2013. Symmetric and asymmetric alternations in direct object encoding. *STUF Language Typology and Universals* 66(4): 378-403. https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.2013.0019.

Kittilä, Seppo, Katja Västi & Jussi Ylikoski (eds.). 2011. *Case, animacy and semantic roles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.99.

Kulikov, Leonid, Andrej Malchukov & Peter de Swart (eds.). 2006. *Case, valency and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.77.

Lamers, Monique & Peter de Swart (eds.). 2012. *Case, word order and prominence.* Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1463-2.

Levshina, Natalia. 2020. Communicative efficiency and differential case marking: A reverse engineering approach. *Linguistics Vanguard* 7(s3): 20190087. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan- 2019-0087.

Levshina, Natalia. 2021. Cross-linguistic trade-offs and causal relationships between cues to grammatical subject and object, and the problem of efficiency-related explanations. *Front. Psychol*. 12: 648200. https://10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648200.

MacWhinney, Brian, Andrej Malchukov & Edith Moravcsik (eds.). 2014. *Competing motivations in grammar and usage*. Oxford: OUP. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198709848.001.0001.

Munteanu, Andrei. 2021. Homophony avoidance in the grammar: Russian nominal allomorphy. *Phonology* 38(3): 401-435. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952675721000257.

Piantadosi, Steven, Harry Tily & Edward Gibson. 2012. The communicative function of ambiguity in language. *Cognition* 122: 280-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.10.004.

Roland, Douglas, Jeffrey Elman & Victor Ferreira. 2006. Why is that? Structural prediction and ambiguity resolution in a very large corpus of English sentences. *Cognition* 98: 245-272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.11.008.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol (ed.). 2021. Ambiguity (non-)avoidance in English. Special Issue: Z*eitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 69(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/zaa-2021.

Tal, Shira, Kenny Smith, Jennifer Culbertson, Eitan Grossman & Inbal Arnon. 2022. The impact of information structure on the emergence of differential object marking: An experimental study. *Cognitive Science* 46(3): e13119. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13119.

Temperley, David. 2003. Ambiguity avoidance in English relative clauses. *Language* 79(3): 464-484.

Traugott, Elizabeth. 2012. On the persistence of ambiguous linguistic contexts over time: Implications for corpus research on micro-changes. *Language and Computers* 75: 231-246. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401207713_019.

Traugott, Elizabeth & Graeme Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199679898.001.0001.

Wasow, Thomas. 2015. Ambiguity avoidance is overrated. In Susanne Winkler (ed.). *Ambiguity: Language and communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 29-48. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110403589-003.

Winter-Froemel, Esme. 2021. Reinvestigating ambiguity and frequency in reanalysis: A two-step methodology for corpus-linguistic analyses based on bridging use exposure. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 5: 1-24 (Special Issue: Whither reanalysis?). https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2021.v5i32-39.143.

Zehentner, Eva. 2021. Ambiguity avoidance as a factor in the rise of the English dative alternation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 33(1): 3-33. https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-216295

W5

Workshop: Conceptual metaphors in a comparative and diachronic perspective

convenors:

Daniel Kölligan, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Institut für Altertumswissenschaften, Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, Oswald-Külpe-Weg 84, D-97074 Würzburg, email: daniel.koelligan@uni-wuerzburg.de (corresponding author)

Lucien van Beek, University of Leiden, Faculty of Humanities, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, Reuvensplaats 3-4, 2311 BE Leiden, The Netherlands, email: l.c.van.beek@hum.leidenuniv.nl

keywords:

cognitivism, conceptual metaphor, diachrony, etymology

Abstract

In cognitive linguistics, the term "conceptual metaphor", or "cognitive metaphor", refers to the understanding of one idea, or conceptual domain, in terms of another. The source domain is usually more concrete, relating to basic human experience and perception, the target domain is usually more abstract, e.g. time conceptualized in terms of space ("the days ahead of us" like "the road ahead of us"). The research paradigm took off with Lakoff & Johnson 1980, who investigated the persistent use of metaphorical language in all areas of human experience, such as love conceptualized as a journey.

Among the cases studied most in cognitive linguistics literature is the concept of anger conceptualized as a hot fluid in a container, e.g., "You make my blood boil", "He's just letting off steam" (cf. e.g. Lakoff 1987: 380ff., Kövecses 1986, Kövecses 1998, Stefanowitsch 2006:92, etc.). This specific metaphor has been claimed not to be a universal based on the general physiology of humans, but rather a historically contingent feature of languages and cultures influenced by the Ancient Greek Hippocratic theory of humors that was further developed in early modern Europe (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995). While the basic point that the history of ideas must be taken into account in cognitive studies is well made (as e.g. in studies like Brock 2013 on Greek political imagery), Geeraerts and Grondelaers did not discuss similar metaphors in non-European languages such as Sanskrit and in pre-Hippocratic European traditions, e.g. Classical Greek and Latin. Indeed, early evidence for anger as a pressurized fluid may be found, for instance in the etymology of Latin furor 'anger' (Kölligan 2020).

Conceptual metaphors have now been applied to (and described for) most languages spoken today, and also to some for the ancient and medieval languages (e.g., Cairns 2016; Forte 2018; Horn 2016; Zanker 2019 for Greek; Short 2013 for Latin; Izdebska 2016 on Old English). At the same time, attempts are being made to compare metaphors from different Indo-European languages, and to reconstruct specific metaphors for Proto-Indo-European (e.g., van Beek 2017 on metaphors for 'law' and 'justice', Bartolotta 2018 on the deixis of past and future events based either on absolute positioning or one relative to ego, Johnson 2019 et al. on metaphors for 'succeed, be successful' based on the notion of a motion forward as in Lat. *mihi succedit* etc.). The analysis of conceptual metaphors may also support or undermine specific etymological reconstructions (Kölligan 2022).

The workshop invites papers discussing the applicability of conceptual metaphor theory to historical language data, asking what is universal and what is historically contingent, whether and how conceptual metaphors may help us in judging etymologies, and inviting cross-linguistic and diachronic comparisons.

References

Bartolotta, Annamaria (2018). Spatio-temporal deixis and cognitive models in early Indo-European. Cognitive Linguistics 29, 1–44.

Beek, Lucien van (2017). Die Bildersprache des Rechts im Indogermanischen: Griechisch ἰθεῖα δίκη und δίκην βλάπτειν. In H. Bichlmeier and A. Opfermann (eds), Das Menschenbild bei den Indogermanen. Akten der

Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Halle (31. März – 2. April 2011), 129–150. Hamburg: Baar.

Brock, Roger (2013). Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle. London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Cairns, Douglas (2016). Clothed in Shamelessness, Shrouded in Grief: The Role of "Garment" Metaphors in Ancient Greek Concepts of Emotion. In Fanfani, G., M. Harlow, M.-L. Nosch (eds), Spinning Fates and the Song of the Loom: The Use of Textiles, Clothing and Cloth Production as Metaphor, Symbol and Narrative Device in Greek and Latin Literature, 25–41. Oxford: Oxbow.

Forte, Alexander (2018). The Cognitive Linguistics of Homeric Surprise. In: P. Meineck et al. (eds), The Routledge Handbook of Classics and Cognitive Theory, 39–58. London/New York.

Geeraerts, Dirk & Stefan Grondelaers (1995). Looking back at anger: Cultural traditions and metaphorical patterns. In John R. Taylor & Robert E. MacLaury (eds.), Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World, 153-179. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Horn, Fabian (2016). 'Building in the Deep': Notes on a Metaphor for Mental Activity and the Metaphorical Concept of Mind in Early Greek Epic. Greece and Rome 63, 163–174.

Izdebska, Daria (2016). Metaphors of weapons and armour through time. In: Anderson, W. et al. (eds.), Mapping English Metaphor Through Time, 221-242. Oxford: OUP.

Johnson, Cynthia A., Peter Alexander Kerkhof, Leonid Kulikov, Esther Le Mair, und Jóhanna Barðdal. „Argument Structure, Conceptual Metaphor and Semantic Change: How to Succeed in Indo-European without Really Trying". Diachronica 36, Nr. 4 (2019): 463–508. https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.00014.bar.

Kölligan, Daniel (2020). „Seething anger: Latin furor". In: L. Repanšek, H. Bichlmeier, and V. Sadovski (eds.), vácāmsi miśrá kṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019, 397–412. Hamburg: Baar.

Kölligan, Daniel (2022). "Conceptual metaphors and historical linguistics – some case studies". Talk at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan. March 22, 2022.

Kövecses, Zoltán (1986). Metaphors of anger, pride and love: a lexical approach to the structure of concepts. Pragmatics & beyond, 7,8. Amsterdam. Benjamins.

Kövecses, Zoltán. „Are there any emotion-specific metaphors?" In Speaking of Emotions. Conceptualization and Expression, ed. by Angeliki Athanasiadou & Elzbieta Tabaskowska, 127–51. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980). Metaphors we Live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George (1987). Woman, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marcinkowska-Rosół, Maria and Sellmer, Sven (2021). The Mind as Container: A Study of a Metaphor in Homer and Hesiod with a Parallel Analysis of the Sanskrit Epics. Mnemosyne pre-publication, https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525X-bja10076 (last visited 2022-09-19).

Short, William (2013). 'Transmission' Accomplished? Latin's Alimentary Metaphors of Communication. American Journal of Philology 134, 247–275.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol (2006). "Words and their metaphors: A corpus-based approach". In Anatol Stefanowitsch and S. T. Gries (eds.), Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy, 61–105. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zanker, Andreas T. (2019). Metaphor in Homer: Time, Speech and Thought. Cambridge: CUP.

W6

Categorizers in diachrony

ICHL 26 workshop call for papers

Laura Grestenberger, Austrian Academy of Sciences (laura.grestenberger@oeaw.ac.at)

Iris Kamil, University of Edinburgh (iris.kamil@ed.ac.uk)

Viktoria Reiter, University of Vienna (viktoria.reiter@univie.ac.at)

Although the form, meaning, and ontological status of "categorizing" ("stem-forming") morphology have received some attention in the typological and theoretical literature on word classes (e.g., Vogel & Comrie 2000, Baker 2003, Knobloch & Schaeder 2005, Panagiotidis 2011), its diachrony remains understudied: It is unclear how and why new categorizers arise historically and what "mechanisms" of change are responsible for the rise of new categorization devices. Do new categorizers arise due to semantic bleaching/grammaticalization (e.g., nominal diminutives > nominalizers), reanalysis of functional heads in the context of decategorial ("secondary") derivation (nominalizers > verbalizers, e.g., Grestenberger forthcoming), the need for "compensation of phonological reduction" (Haspelmath 1995), or is there no uniform diachronic path that gives rise to these grammatical categories?

The goal of this workshop is to discuss the diachrony of categorizing morphology with the aim of establishing cross-linguistic regularities and generalizations concerning the rise, function, and development of nominal, verbal, and adjectival stem-forming morphology. Examples include the reanalysis of nominalizers as verbalizers, (1), of adjectivizers as verbalizers, (2), or of adjectivizers as participial affixes, (3), but also a variety of phenomena usually classified as "grammaticalization" (e.g., the reanalysis of nominal second compound members as nominal or adjectival suffixes).

1) $n \rightarrow v$: Ancient Greek [*basil-eú*]$_n$-*s* 'king': [[**basil-eú*]$_n$-*j*]$_v$-*ō* 'am/act as king' → Modern Greek *stóx-os* 'target' [[*stox*]$_n$-*év*]$_v$-*o* 'to aim at'; Pre-Proto-Algonquian *[*api*]$_v$-**hm**]$_n$ 'sitting place, seat', **net*-[[*api*]$_v$ -**hm**]$_n$-*ena·n* 'where we sit; our sitting place' → Proto-Algonquian **net*-[[*api*]$_v$-**hm**]$_{v?}$-*ena·n* (*ma·hi*) 'we sit over there' (Oxford 2014: 14-15)

2) $a \rightarrow v$: Gm. *Kraft* 'strength': [[*kräft*]$_n$-*ig*]$_a$ 'with strength, strong'; [[[*kräft*]$_n$-*ig*]$_a$-*en*]$_{v/T[-fin]}$ 'to strengthen' → *Pein* 'pain' : [[[*pein*]$_n$-*ig*]$_v$-*en*]$_{T[-fin]}$ 'to torture' (**pein-ig* 'painful')

3) $a \rightarrow v/ptcp$: Sanskrit *áśva*- 'horse': [[*aśv*]$_n$-*ín*]$_a$- 'possessing horses' → √*yaj* 'sacrifice': [*yāj-ín*]$_{ptcp}$- 'sacrificing'

We especially welcome papers that bring specific predictions from theoretical approaches to bear on these issues and/or that adduce novel empirical arguments to the debate. Contributions could address (but are not limited to) the following issues:

- What role do morphological reanalysis and resegmentation, especially mechanisms such as **"affix telescoping"** (Haspelmath 1995) play in the establishment of new categorizers, and what is the role of "phonological erosion" or loss of phonological material in these processes?
- How does categorization interact with morphosyntactic features such as number or classifier morphology and gender (on *n*) or Aktionsart on *v*? Which diachronic generalizations as to these interactions are possible? For example, in Distributed Morphology, roots only receive their categorization in the course of the syntactic derivation by combining with the categorizing heads *v* (verbalizers), *n* (nominalizers), and *a* (adjectivizers or "stativizers"). Categorization is thus fundamentally syntactic, and the extent to which categorizers are also associated with syntactico-semantic "content" such as definiteness (in the nominal domain) or Aktionsart (in the verbal domain) is debated (Panagiotidis et al. 2017). In (broadly) lexicalist approaches, on the other hand, "stem classes" or "conjugational classes" are treated as properties of words and hence, the lexicon. These approaches also differ in how conjugational class elements such as "theme vowels" are treated both from a synchronic and from a diachronic perspective (cf., e.g., Calabrese 2019, Bertocci & Pinzin 2020), and with respect to the analysis of change in classifier systems and their connection to (noun class) categorization (e.g., Craig 1986).
- Are there unambiguous diagnostics for distinguishing between categorizing morphology and derivational morphology in the more technical sense, that is, category-changing morphology with specific (argument- and event-structure changing) functions, e.g., agent noun- and verbal abstract-forming morphology in the nominal domain or causativizing and applicativizing morphology in the verbal domain? Empirical arguments in favor of separating "low"

categorizing morphology from "higher" functional, category-changing projections come from a variety of different theoretical and typological perspectives (e.g., Himmelmann 2005, Marantz 1997, Borer 2015; Panagiotidis et al. 2017), but these have not yet been connected to the diachrony of these entities in a systematic way.

- What role does language acquisition play in the diachronic development of categorizing morphology? For example, syntactic change has been argued to proceed via **"upwards reanalysis"** (Roberts & Roussou 2003) of lexical projections as higher functional projections, and this is compatible with L1 acquisition evidence of how children acquire, for example, epistemic modal verbs by overextending their functional domain "upwards" (Cournane 2014). However, it has not been tested with regard to how children acquire categorizing morphology. Do they overextend the uses of categorizers, and does this overextension parallel the changes we see in the historical record? That is, is categorizer change inherently directional?

References

Baker, M. C. 2003. *Lexical categories: Verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bertocci, D. & Pinzin, F. 2020. Two kinds of verbal roots in Latin: Evidence from thematic vowels and word-formation processes. *Lingue antiche e moderne* 9. 23–56.

Borer, H. 2015. The category of roots. In *The syntax of roots and the roots of syntax*, 112–148. Oxford: OUP.

Calabrese, A. 2019. Morpho-phonological investigations: A theory of PF. From syntax to phonology in Sanskrit and Italian verbal systems. Ms., University of Connecticut.

Cournane, A. 2014. In search of L1 evidence for diachronic reanalysis: Mapping modal verbs. *Language Acquisition*, 21(1): 103–117.

Craig, C. G. 1986. Jacaltec noun classifiers: A study in grammaticalization. *Lingua* 70: 241–284.

Grestenberger, L. Forthcoming. The diachrony of verbalizers in Indo-European: Where does *v* come from? *Journal of Historical Syntax*.

Haspelmath, M. 1995. The growth of affixes in morphological reanalysis. *Yearbook of Morphology* 1994, 1–29. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Himmelmann, N. 2005. Gram, construction, and class formation. In Knobloch & Schaeder 2005, 79–94.

Knobloch, C. & B. Schaeder (eds.). 2005. *Wortarten und Grammatikalisierung. Perspektiven in System und Erwerb*, 79–94. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Marantz, A. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2), 201–225.

Oxford, W. 2014. Microparameters of agreement: A diachronic perspective on Algonquian verb inflection. University of Toronto PhD thesis.

Panagiotidis, P. 2011. *Categorial features: A generative theory of word class categories*. Cambridge: CUP.

Panagiotidis, P., V. Spyropoulos & A. Revithiadou. 2017. Little v as a categorizing verbal head: Evidence from Greek. In *The verbal domain*, 29–48. Oxford: OUP.

Roberts, I. & A. Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.

Vogel, P. & B. Comrie (eds.). 2000. *Approaches to the Typology of Word Classes*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

W7

Interactions at the dawn of history: Methods and results in prehistoric contact linguistics

Marwan Kilani (University of Basel - Swiss National Science Foundation)
Marwan.Kilani@unibas.ch

Rasmus G. Bjørn (Max Planck Institute of Geoanthropology, Jena)

It is well known that the elements of a language acquired through contact preserve traces of the past socio-cultural interactions of the communities that used it. This observation is particularly interesting when dealing with pre- and proto-historic realities, because it implies that these elements can be used to build bridges between languages and between language families, which in turn can be extremely useful in contextualizing such languages and family, in highlighting their positions in cross-linguistic networks, and in better locating them in relation with other languages, and thus both in space and time.

These linguistic concepts have been known for decades. However, recent developments in ancient genetics have introduced completely novel frameworks for investigating contacts between human populations in the past (Haak et al. 2015, Allentoft et al. 2015), which in turn have stimulated new, fresh debates about the possibility to combine ancient genetics, archaeology, and historical linguistics for the study of pre- and proto-historic realities.

As a result, new increasingly robust and sophisticated reconstructions of the social ecology of whole language families are being formulated (Sagart et al. 2019, Robbeets et al. 2021, Narasimhan et al. 2019, Rocha & Fehn 2016), and historical linguistics has witnessed a renewed interest in issues of contacts between pre- and proto-historic speech communities (and proto-languages). This new trend is well represented by various research projects on these topics that have been launched in the past few years, such as the recent ERC project by Guus Kroonen and his team, based in Leiden, which focuses on language contacts in prehistoric Europe in the context of Indo-European linguistics. It is also worth noting that this renewed interest is not limited to Europe and the Indo-European language family, but extends beyond it: good examples touching on different regions are the ongoing project of Wolfgang Behr based at the university of Zurich on pre- and proto-historic Wanderwörter in Central and East Asia, the recently concluded project by Federico Giusfredi on language contacts in pre-/proto-historic Anatolia, the recently (2022) launched project by Koen Bostoen at Ghent University on prehistoric contacts between Bantu and Khoisan languages, or the also recently (2022) launched project by Marwan Kilani at the university of Basel on linguistic interactions and Wanderwörter in Bronze Age Egypt and the Levant, just to name but a few.

These projects (and the work of several other scholars) are opening new avenues of research, are making new data available, and are suggesting new methodological approaches. Nevertheless, the work is far from over. On the contrary, the research developed in recent years has already yielded fruitful linguistic and historical insights, but it has also raised new questions and new methodological needs. First and foremost, there are theoretical questions that need to be discussed. While research on language contacts in modern languages has a long and established tradition, the systematic study of linguistic contacts in ancient languages is still in its infancy, especially outside the Indo-European reality. Moreover, while the analytical frameworks developed to explore contacts in modern languages are undoubtedly valuable, the nature of the available evidence for ancient and proto-languages raises unique questions that require specific theoretical and methodological approaches to be answered satisfactorily. The fact that the data attesting prehistoric contact situations is usually limited and often difficult to substantiate by the comparative method alone, makes the need for solid, commonly agreed means to assess the veracity of hypotheses even more pressing. Moreover, the question of if and how linguistic data can be correlated with archeological and genetic evidence is becoming increasingly relevant, and sound discipline-specific methodologies (in our case, on the linguistic side) are a crucial basis for a constructive interdisciplinary dialogue.

It is thus clear that the question of language contacts and language interactions in pre- and proto-historic societies can be approached in multiple different ways, which we believe makes it an ideal topic for a conference such as this one.

First and foremost, we are aiming at gathering contributions that address methodological issues and offer new approaches to tackle them. We aim to have a good representation of research that focuses on non-European regions and/or deals with non-Indo-European languages, as we believe that a broader scope is essential to identify patterns and specificities. Discussions of specific case studies (whether based on single language-to-language interactions, or involving large geographical areas or *longue durée* approaches) is also welcomed and encouraged: good theory can only be developed on the basis of a careful and systematic investigation of real cases.

As mentioned above, several projects have emerged in recent years that aim to explore contact phenomena from different angles, often using interdisciplinary approaches that combine linguistic data with archeological and genetic evidence. Papers arising from such projects or presenting interim or final results are also welcome.

We welcome discussions of contact phenomena touching on any linguistic level (phonology, morphology, lexicon, etc.), and we are especially interested in realities involving multiple languages. In this respect, we are particularly interested in contributions dealing with Wanderwörter that permeate several languages and distinct language families. Recent scholarship (Boutkan & Kossmann 2001, de Vaan 2008, Antonov & Jacques 2011, Haynie et al. 2014, Piispanen 2020, Peyrot 2016, Bjørn 2020, 2022, etc.) has focused on the specificities of Wanderwörter, highlighting how Wanderwörter are like breadcrumbs attesting ancient (and often pre- and proto-historic) networks of interlinguistic and intercultural interactions. Furthermore, Wanderwörter are characterized by two features that make them particularly interesting for the study of pre- and proto-historic contacts, namely their datability and their multiple interfaces. These two features can provide crucial insights into the historical and cultural contexts in which the words were transferred, thus making Wanderwörter a valuable tool for the investigation and contextualization of ancient interactions, of the participating speech communities, and of the history of the items they denote. Therefore, we believe that the analysis of Wanderwörter provides a very attractive topic for this conference.

Finally, we believe that there are several other types of language contact phenomena that deserve renewed scrutiny in light of recent and emerging research on prehistory, including but not limited to calques (e.g. Puhvel 1993), areal phenomena (e.g. Peyrot 2019), and extinct substrate languages (e.g. Lubotsky 2001). Papers focusing on these topics are also welcome.

Bibliography:

Allentoft, M., Sikora, M., Sjögren, K.G., et al. (2015). Population genomics of Bronze Age Eurasia. Nature, 522, 167–172.

Antonov, Anton & Guillaume Jacques (2011). 'Turkic *kümüš* 'silver' and the labdacism vs sigmatism debate', *Turkic languages* 15 (2), 151-170.

Bjørn, Rasmus G. (2020). 'Nouns and foreign numerals. Anatolian 'four' and the development of the PIE decimal system', in M. Serangeli & T. Olander (eds.) *Dispersals and diversification. Linguistic and archaeological perspectives on the early stages of Indo-European*, 54-76. Leiden: Brill.

Bjørn, Rasmus G. (2022). 'Indo-European loanwords and exchange in Bronze Age Central and East Asia', *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 4, E23.

de Vaan, Michiel (2008). 'On Wanderwörter and substrate words in etymological research', in *Yesterday's Words,* 199-207.

Dirk Boutkan and Maarten Kossmann (2001), "On The Etymology of 'Silver'", North-Western European Language Evolution 38, 3-15.

Haak, W., Lazaridis, I., Patterson, N., Rohland, N., Mallick, S., Llamas, B. … Reich, D. et al. (2015). Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe. *Nature* 522, 207–211.

Haynie, Hannah, Claire Bowern, Patience Epps, Jane Hill, and Patrick McConvell. (2014). 'Wanderwörter in Languages of the Americas and Australia'. *Ampersand* 1: 1–18.

Lubotsky, A. (2001). 'The Indo-Iranian Substratum', in Carpelan, C., Parpola, A., & Koskikallio, P. (Eds.), *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and archaeological considerations. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 242, 301–317. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seura.

Narasimhan, V. M., Patterson, N., Moorjani, P., Bernardos, R., Mallick, S., Lazaridis, I., …, Reich, D. (2019). The formation human populations in South and Central Asia. Science, 365(6457), eaat7487.

Peyrot, Michaël (2016). 'Language contact in Central Asia: on the etymology of Tocharian B *yolo* "bad"', in Sandgaard Hansen et al. (eds.), *Etymology and the European Lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17-22 September 2021, Copenhagen*, 327-335. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Peyrot, Michaël (2019). 'The deviant typological profile of the Tocharian branch of Indo-European may be due to Uralic substrate influence', *Indo-European Linguistics* 7, 72–121.

Piispanen, Peter S. (2020). 'An ancient East Asian Wanderwort', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 73(4), 567-584.

Jaan Puhvel, Jaan (1993). 'A Hittite Calque in the Iliad', *Historische Sprachforschung* 106(1), 36-38.

Robbeets, M., Bouckaert, R., & Conte, M. et al. (2021). 'Triangulation supports agricultural spread of the Transeurasian languages'. *Nature* 599, 616–621.

Rocha, J. and A.M. Fehn. (2016). 'Genetics and Demographic History of the Bantu'. *eLS* [doi: 10.1002/9780470015902.a0022892]:

Sagart, L., Jacques, G., Lai, Y., Ryder, R. J., Thouzeau, V., Greenhill, S. J., & List, J.-M. (2019). 'Dated language phylogenies shed light on the ancestry of Sino-Tibetan', *PNAS*, 116(21), 10317–10322.

W8

"Filling in the diachronic gaps: the view of Old Iranian from the present"

Convenors:

Shuan Osman Karim, Goethe University of Frankfurt

Saloumeh Gholami, Goethe University of Frankfurt

Corresponding Author:

Shuan Osman Karim (karim.56@osu.edu)

Research into the prehistory of Iranian languages is a field doubly blessed: (1) there is a fairly large corpus of Old Avestan dating back between the 1st and 2nd millennia BCE and a small corpus of Old Persian dating back as far as the 6th century BCE (Skjærvø, 2017, 471). Because of the corpora, much is known about Old Iranian, and Old Iranian has played an important role in the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European (PIE). (2) The modern languages of the greater Iranian world are diverse and numerous, preserving features of PIE already lost in the extant Old Iranian texts (e.g., the retention of PIE laryngeals in New Iranian languages following Kümmel, 2014). Despite these archaisms, many of these languages have changed radically and independently along what Stilo (2008) has deemed the reduction and innovation axes. They have lost case and innovated it anew. They have lost gender in all but a few facets of the grammar and renovated it anew (Karim, 2021, ch2 and ch4). These radical transformations lead to the inevitable question: what would our picture of Old Iranian be without the extant Old Iranian texts, and to what extent does our reliance on Old Iranian bias our analysis of New Iranian languages? None of the New Iranian languages is the direct descendant of any of the Middle or Old Iranian languages except for New Persian (< Middle Persian < Old Persian following Korn, 2017, 609).

Additional issues affecting the historical analysis of Iranian languages are that Iranian populations were largely nomadic in their early history, and there has been massive borrowing between genetically related languages (Korn, 2017, 611). This situation invokes the analogy of the Rubik's cube: As each group migrates to a new region, its contact languages change, and those languages

undergo sprachbund-like shared changes, "mirror[ing] the multilingual situation of the vast majority of speakers of Ir. languages in past and present times" (Korn, 2017, 611). The existence of many phonological convergences due to borrowing suggests that Iranian historical linguists should prefer morphological innovation over regular sound change. Korn (2019, 268) uses morphological isoglosses to develop the current best understanding of the genealogy of Iranian, following Clackson's (2007) assertion that "It is now generally agreed among linguists that the most certain sub-groups are constructed on the basis of unique shared morphological innovations." This runs contrary to the typical methods of historical linguists that begin with sound change because of Neo-Grammarian regularity; "[s]ound change I, in so far as it takes place mechanically, takes place according to laws that admit no exception" (zosthoff and Brugmann, 1878, apud Hock & Joseph, 1996). Recently work by Gholami has suggested that phonological changes cannot be dismissed a priori despite the difficulty in establishing cognacy. Additionally, it is hard to compare constructions across the Iranian languages because the pioneering work on many varieties was conducted by scholars with little to no linguistic training. The ultimate result is inconsistent and innovative terminology being used to refer to well-understood linguistic concepts. For instance, there are at least four terms for definite articles: "definite" (Mackenzie, 1961; MacKenzie, 1966; Mahmoudveysi & Bailey, 2013; Mahmoudveysi, Bailey, Paul, & Haig, 2012; Opengîn, 2016, etc.), "demarcative" (McKinnon, 2011), "determinative" (Windfuhr, 2012), and "deictic" (Windfuhr, 1991) appear in the literature (Karim, 2021, 217); three terms for applicatives: "applicatives" (Karim & Salehi, 2022), "placeholder constructions" (Jügel, 2016), and "absolute prepositions" (Mackenzie, 1961); and there is idiosyncratic terminology for adjectives, possessives, etc.

These issues, migration and borrowing, combined with a lack of documentation and inconsistent terminology, make the study of the genealogical relationships between the New Iranian languages opaque. Originally, the Iranian languages were divided into four geographical distinctions Northwestern, Southwestern, Northeastern, and Southeastern (Schmitt, 1989). These designations were fraught from the beginning, with Northwestern languages like Balochi spoken in the far southeast of the greater Iranian world and Ossetian (NE) spoken in the far northwest. The geographic designation, long-recognized as inadequate, was most recently challenged by Korn, who proposes a Central Iranian core with Bactrian, Sogdian, and Parthian (traditionally NE, NE, and NW) along with the entire Northwestern group (Korn, 2016, 2019). The rest of the Iranian languages form peripheral groups that resist further subcategorization.

In this workshop, we do not make any prescriptions as to historical approaches. Comparative, socio-historical, and computational approaches are to be given equal consideration, as well as multidimensional analyses that combine multiple approaches. The goal of this workshop is to reexamine the validity of previous approaches and established methods as applied to the diachronic study of Iranian languages and, when necessary, to develop new approaches that address the difficulties presented by the unique socio-linguistic situation in the greater Iranian world.

Papers presented in this workshop will focus on:

--- Establishing cognacy despite massive borrowing from genetically related languages

--- The significance of isoglosses (phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic)

--- Relation models within the Iranian family

--- Waves of contact and migration across time and space in the Iranian world

--- The reciprocal influence between Iranian and non-Iranian minority languages

--- Innovative methods in historical reconstruction.

Languages represented:

This workshop favors submissions that feature data from and analyses of endangered, minoritized, and understudied languages or those spoken by displaced peoples. Submissions are welcome from all languages with a presence in the greater Iranian world regardless of their genealogy, i.e., papers on Iranian, Neo-Aramaic, Dravidian, Armenian, Turkic, etc. are welcome as long as the paper's aims match the goals of the workshop.

Anonby, C. van der W. (2019). Kumzari. In G. Khan & G. Haig (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 625–658). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Anonby, E., & Taheri-Ardali, M. (2019). Bakhtiari. In G. Khan & G. Haig (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 445–480). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Borjian, H. (2015). Judeo-Iranian Languages. In L. Khan & A. D. Rubin (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish Languages* (pp. 234–297). Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Bulut, C. (2019). Iraqi-Turkic. In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 354–384). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Clackson, J. (2007). *Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doron, E., & Khan, G. (2012). The typology of morphological ergativity in Neo-Aramaic. *Lingua*, *122*(3), 225–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2011.11.008

Gholami, S. (2011). Definite Articles in Bactrian. In A. Korn, G. Haig, S. Karimi, & P. Samvelian (Eds.), *Topics in Iranian Linguistics (Beiträge zur iranistik 34)* (pp. 11–22). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Gholami, S. (2014). Selected features of Bactrian grammar.

Gholami, S. (2018a). *Endangered Iranian Languages*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

Gholami, S. (2018b). Pronominal clitics in Zoroastrian Dari (Behdīnī) of Kerman. In S. Gholami (Ed.), *Endangered Iranian Languages* (pp. 111–122). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Haig, G. (2019a). Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji). In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 106–158). Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Haig, G. (2019b). The Iranian languages of northern Iraq. In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspectiveanguag* (pp. 267–304). Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Hock, H. H., & Joseph, B. D. (1996). *Language history, language change, and language relationship : an introduction to historical and comparative linguistics*. *Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs*. Berlin ; SE - xv, 602 pages : illustrations ; 24 cm: Mouton de Gruyter. Retrieved from http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=007302059&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Jügel, T. (2016). Enclitic Pronouns in Middle Persian and the Placeholder Construction. In M. J. Dehaghi (Ed.), *Quaterly Journal of Language and Inscription 1/1 [1396 h.š.], dedicated to Professor Mansour Shaki* (pp. 41–63). Tehran.

Karim, S. O. (2021). *The synchrony and diachrony of New Western Iranian nominal morphosyntax*. the Ohio State University.

Karim, S. O. (2022). The Ezafe and the Article. In S. Karimi (Ed.), *Advances in Iranian Linguistics II*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Karim, S. O., & Salehi, A. (2022). An applicative analysis of Soranî "absolute prepositions." In S. Pacchiarotti & F. Zúñiga (Eds.), *Applicative Morphology: Neglected Syntactic and Non-syntactic Functions [TiLSM 373]* (pp. 263–298). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Key, G. (2008). Differential object marking in a Medieval Persian text. In D. L. Stilo, S. Karimi, & V. Samiian (Eds.), *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics* (pp. 227–248). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Khan, G. (2007). The north-eastern neo-aramaic dialects. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, *52*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/fgl034

Khan, G. (2019). the Neo-Aramaic Dialects and their Historical Background. *The Syriac World*, 266–289. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315708195-17

Korn, A. (2003). Balochi and the Concept of North-Western Iranian. In C. Jahani & A. Korn (Eds.), *The Baloch and their Neighbours: Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times* (pp. 49–60). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Korn, A. (2008). A New Locative Case in Turkmenistan Balochi*. *Iran and the Caucasus*, *12*, 83–100.

Korn, A. (2011). Pronouns as Verbs, Verbs as Pronouns: Demonstratives and the Copula in Iranian. In A. Korn, G. Haig, S. Karimi, & P. Samvelian (Eds.), *Topics in Iranian Linguistics (Beiträge zur iranistik 34)* (pp. 53–70). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Korn, A. (2016). A partial tree of Central Iranian. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, *121*(1), 401–434. https://doi.org/10.1515/if-2016-0021

Korn, A. (2017). The evolution of Iranian. In J. S. Klein, B. D. Joseph, & M. Fritz (Eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics Band 1* (pp. 608–624). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Korn, A. (2019). Isoglosses and subdivisions of Iranian. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, *9*(2), 239–281.

Korn, A., & Olsen, B. A. (2012). On Armenian -agin: additional evidence for a third West Middle Iranian dialect? *Munchener Studien Zur Sprachwissenschaft*, *66*(2), 201–220.

Kümmel, M. J. (2014). The development of laryngeals in Indo-Iranian. In *The Sound of Indo-European*. Opava.

Mackenzie, D. N. (1961). *Kurdish dialect, studies 1-2. studies 1-2.* London; New York: Oxford University Press.

MacKenzie, D. N. (1966). *The dialect of Awroman (Hawraman-i Luhon): Grammatical sketch, texts, and vocabulary*. Kobenhavn: Kommissionaer : Munksgaard.

MacKenzie, D. N. (1999a). Bājalānī (1956). In Daniel Nathan Mackenzie, C. G. Cereti, & L. Paul (Eds.), *Iranica Diversa I* (pp. 409–426). Roma: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente. https://doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1003 LK - https://osu.on.worldcat.org/oclc/5862823479

MacKenzie, D. N. (1999b). Pseudoprotokurtica (1963). In C. G. Cereti & L. Paul (Eds.), *Iranica Diversa II* (pp. 402–402). Roma: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.

Mahmoudveysi, P., & Bailey, D. (2013). *The Gorani language of Zarda, a village of West Iran*.

Mahmoudveysi, P., & Bailey, D. (2019). Hawrāmī of western Iran. In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 533–568). Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Mahmoudveysi, P., Bailey, D., Paul, L., & Haig, G. (2012). *The Gorani Language of Gawraju, a village of West Iran: texts, grammar, and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

McKinnon, C. (2011). LORI LANGUAGE i. LORI DIALECTS. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Retrieved from https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/lori-dialects

Noorlander, P. M., & Stilo, D. (2015). On the Covergence of Verbal Systems of Aramaic and its Neighbours. Part I: Present-Based Paradigms. In G. Khan & L. Napiorkowska (Eds.), *Neo-Aramaic in its linguistic context*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

Opengîn, E. (2016). *The Mukri variety of Central Kurdish : grammar, texts, and lexicon*. Reichert Verlag.

Öpengin, E. (2019). Accounting for the combinations of clitic and person markers in Central Kurdish. In S. Gündoğdu, E. Öpengin, G. Haig, & E. Anonby (Eds.), *Current Issuses in Kurdish Linguistics*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press.

Paul, L. (1998). The position of Zazaki among West Iranian languages. *Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies: Held in Cambridge, 11th to 15th, 1995: Part 1 Old and Middle Iranian Studies (Beiträge Zur Iranistik 17)*, 163–177.

Paul, L. (2003). The Position of Balochi Among the Western Iranian Languages: The Verbal System. In C. Jahani, A. Korn, & P. Titus (Eds.), *The Baloch and Their Neighbors: Ethnic and Linguistic Contact in Balochistan in Historical and Modern Times* (pp. 61–71). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Paul, L. (2019). Persian. In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 569–624). Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmitt, R. (1989). *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Sims-Williams, N. (2011). Differential Object Marking in Bactrian. In A. Korn, G. Haig, S. Karimi, & P. Samvelian (Eds.), *Topics in Iranian Linguistics (Beiträge zur iranistik 34)* (pp. 23–38). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Skjærvø, P. O. (2017). The documentation of Iranian. In J. S. Klein, B. Joseph, & M. Fritz (Eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics Band 1* (pp. 471–480). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Stilo, D. (2008). Case In Iranian: From Reduction and Loss to Innovation and Renewal. In A. Spencer & A. L. Malchukov (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case* (pp. 700–715). Oxford; New York: Oxford University

Press.

Stilo, D. (2018a). Dikin Marāqei Tati of Alamut: an undocumented conservative Tati lanuguage. In S. Gholami (Ed.), *Endangered Iranian Languages* (pp. 41–70). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Stilo, D. (2018b). The Caspian region and South Azerbaijan: Caspian and Tatic. In G. Haig & G. Khan (Eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western Asia: An areal perspective* (pp. 659–829). Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Stilo, D., & Noorlander, P. M. (2015). On the Convergence of Verbal Systems or Aramaic and its Neighbors. Part II: Past Paradigms Derived from Present Equivalents. In G. Khan & L. Napiorkowska (Eds.), *Neo-Aramaic in its linguistic context*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

Wendtland, A. (2011). The Emergence and Development of the Sogdian Perfect. In A. Korn, G. Haig, S. Karimi, & P. Samvelian (Eds.), *Topics in Iranian Linguistics (Beiträge zur iranistik 34)* (pp. 39–52). Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Werner, B. (2018). Forms and Meanings of the Ezafe in Zazaki. In S. Gholami (Ed.), *Endangered Iranian Languages* (pp. 71–91). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

Windfuhr, G. (1991). CENTRAL DIALECTS. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (pp. V, 3, 242–252). Retrieved from https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/central-dialects

Windfuhr, G. L. (2012). FĀRS viii. Dialects. In *Encyclopædia Iranica* (p. Vol. IX, Fasc. 4, 362-373). Retrieved from https://iranicaonline.org/articles/fars-viii

W9

"Your birch-bark bag has something" –
Grammaticalization and diachrony of locative, existential and possessive predication

Chris Lasse Däbritz (University of Hamburg)
chris.lasse.daebritz@uni-hamburg.de

It is widely known that locative, existential and possessive predications are closely related in many languages of the world (see Lyons 1967, Clark 1978, Freeze 1992, Hengeveld 1992, Koch 2012). In what follows, I conceive locative and existential predications as expressing the temporary presence or absence of a figure (a.k.a. theme, pivot) in a ground (a.k.a. location, coda), their difference lying in perspectivization (Hengeveld 1992: 94–100; Creissels 2019: 37). The prototypical instances of locative and existential predications are clauses like (1a) and (1b), respectively. In turn, predications which either express the permanent presence/absence of a certain referent (1c) or lack a specified location (1d) represent a different, though often formally similar, type of predication. Following Koch (2012), I call the former *bounded existentials* and the latter *generic existentials*. Possessive predication expresses an asymmetric and usually unidirectional relation of two entities, the possessor and the possessee, whereby the possessee belongs to the possessor (1e).

(1a) *The book is on the table.*   (LOCATIVE)

(1b) *There is a book on the table.*   (EXISTENTIAL)

(1c) *There are many lions in Africa.*   (BOUNDED EXISTENTIAL)

(1d) *There are many unhappy people.*   (GENERIC EXISTENTIAL)

(1e) *Bill has a book.*   (POSSESSIVE)

Given the overlap of the functional domains expressed, it is not surprising that many languages use similar or even the same linguistic structures to express the predications of type (1a) to (1e) (Hengeveld 1992: Ch. 5.1.3; Heine 1997: Ch. 2). Whereas this can be described on a synchronic

level from various perspectives, it has also diachronic implications given that languages evolve during time and linguistic structures may spread from one functional domain to another.

Within the realm of possessive predication, the grammaticalization of so-called *habeo*-verbs is a classical instance. They often have their lexical source in verbs like *get*, *grab*, *take*, *obtain*, *hold*, *carry* or alike, as e.g. the Dullay (< Eastern Cushitic < Afro-Asiatic) verbal root *-sheeg-* 'have; carry on one's head or shoulder' or the Khanty (< Uralic) verb *taj-* 'have; hold; carry' (Heine 1997: 47–48; Honti 2008: 172). Additionally, as shown by Koch (2012: 572–575) and Creissels (2019: 70–76), *habeo*-verbs can appear in existential clauses, like in Greek (< Indo-European) (2); the distinguishing criterion of a possessive (2a) and existential (2b) reading is the locative coding of the "possessor" in (2b). The Mansi (< Uralic) example (3) shows a sentence, structurally ambiguous between the two readings, but the semantics of the "possessor" rather favour an existential reading.

(2a) *Ta   chōriá   den   échoun   dáskalous.*
      the   villages NEG   have.PRS.3PL teachers.ACC
      'The villages don't have teachers.'

(2b) *Den   eíche   dáskalous   sta   chōriá.*
      NEG   have.PST.3SG teachers.ACC in.the   villages
      'There were no teachers in the villages.'
      (Greek (< Indo-European); Creissels 2019: 71)

(3)   *Pajp-ən   matər   oːnsʲ-i.*
      birchbark.bag-POSS.2SG   something   have-PRS.3SG
      'There is something in your birch-bark bag.' ~
      ?'Your birch-bark bag has something.'
      (Mansi (< Uralic); Kannisto & Liimola 1956. OUDB Northern Mansi Corpus. Text ID 1235, 211)

Besides that, existential predications of the type (1b) show a wide variation of potential source structures, as shown by Creissels (2019). E.g., Icelandic (< Indo-European) shows a construction, which formally resembles identificational clauses (4a). In Nganasan (< Uralic), a similar construction seems to have developed further on the grammaticalization pathway: Existential clauses are formed with the existential verb *təisʲa*, lexicalized from the combination of the demonstrative stem *tə-* and the copula verb *isʲa* (Wagner-Nagy 2019: 354; example 4b).

(4a) *Það   eru   mys   í   baðkerinu.*
      that   are   mice   in   bathtub
      'There are mice in the bathtub.' (lit. 'That are mice in the bathtub.')
      (Icelandic (< Indo-European); Creissels 2019: 79)

(4b) *tahari͡abə   təndə   sʲiti   bəŋgüʔtüə   təi-ču.*
      now   there   two   burrow   EX-AOR.3SG
      'Now, there are two burrows.' (< lit. 'Now, that is two burrows there.')
      (Nganasan (< Uralic); Wagner-Nagy 2019: 355)

Finally, Hengeveld (1992: 238–240), Newman (2002) and Ameka & Levinson (2007), among others, account for the grammaticalization of posture verbs like *stand*, *sit*, *lie* as copula elements

in locative and existential predication. As a case in point, Mbay (< Nilo-Saharan) uses, among others, the posture verb *tèn* 'lie' in existential clauses (5).

(5)   *mbētē*   *lì-í*   *lā*   *tèn.*
       book   POSS-you   LOC   lying
       'Here is your book.'
       (Mbay (< Nilo-Saharan); Newman 2002: 10, cit. from Keegan 1997: 76)

This non-exhaustive sketch already shows that many synchronically observed overlaps in the realm of locative, existential and possessive predication are connected to diachronic developments. Having in mind the similar, if not identical, underlying semantic structure of the discussed predication types, this does not surprise.

The aim of this workshop is to bring together researchers working on various aspects of the named functional domain and to discuss the role of diachrony and grammaticalization processes within it. Therefore, contributions may take any theoretical perspective and deal with single languages or work cross-linguistically, granted that they somehow acknowledge the diachronic perspective of the conference. Additionally, it is desirable that the presented work relates to the theoretical understanding of locative, existential and possessive predication. Finally, contributions to this workshop should not interfere with eventual contributions to the SLE workshop on core and periphery in locative and existential predication.

For indicating your interest in participating in the workshop, please send a one-page (+ references) abstract by **January 1st, 2023**, to chris.lasse.daebritz@uni-hamburg.de.

References:

Ameka, Felix K. & Levinson, Stephen C. 2007. Introduction: The typology and semantics of locative predicates: posturals, positionals, and other beasts. *Linguistics* 45(5/6), 847–871.

Clark, Eve 1978. Locationals: Existential, locative and possessive constructions. In: Clark, Eve & Greenberg, Joseph (eds.). *Universals of human language. Vol. 4. Syntax*, 85–126. Stanford [Ca.]: Stanford University Press.

Creissels, Denis 2019. Inverse-locational predication in typological perspective. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 31(2), 37–106.

Freeze, Ray 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68(3), 553–595.

Heine, Bernd 1997. *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces and grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hengeveld, Kees 1992. *Non-verbal predication: Theory, typology, diachrony.* (Functional Grammar Series 15). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Honti, László 2008. Habere 'po-uralski' [Habere 'in Uralic']. *Linguistic Uralica* 44(3), 161–177.

Kannisto, Artturi & Liimola, Matti 1956. *OUDB Northern Mansi Corpus*. Text ID 1239. Ed. by Janda, Gwen Eva. http://www.oudb.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/?cit=1239. (Accessed on 2022-10-01).

Keegan, John M. 1997. *A reference grammar of Mbay.* Munich & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Koch, Peter 2012. Location, existence and possession: A constructional-typological exploration. *Linguistics* 50(3), 533–603.

Lyons, John 1967. A note on possessive, existential and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3(4), 390–396.

Newman, John 2002. A cross-linguistic overview of the posture verbs 'sit', 'stand', and 'lie'. In: Newman, John (ed.) 2002. *The linguistics of sitting, standing, and lying.* (Typological Studies in Language 51), 1–24. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019. *A Grammar of Nganasan.* Leiden: Brill.

The (Pre)History of the Languages of Japan – Current issues and prospects

Étienne Baudel – École des hautes études en sciences sociales (Paris) – etienne.baudel@gmail.com

Aleksandra Jarosz – Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń – aljarosz@umk.pl

Georg Orlandi – Osaka University – georg.orlandi@gmail.com

In spite of its tenacious reputation of being a monolingual country, Japan is actually home to a variety of languages that reflects a rich and complex linguistic history. Although this diversity is now finally starting to be acknowledged and protected, most of the minority languages of Japan are now severely endangered (Moseley, 2009).

Thus, this workshop aims at embracing this diversity and at fostering multiple and interdisciplinary approaches to the questions regarding the linguistic (pre)history of Japan.

In this perspective, we will try to bring together researchers of diverse backgrounds and expertise, and to stimulate a discussion about the interactions of various approaches and scales of consideration.

Context

Over the past decades, a lot of research has been conducted on the history of the languages of Japan, and substantial advances have been made on the interaction between archaeological, genetic and linguistic data (for instance, Lee and Hasegawa, 2011; Jarosz et al. 2022).

However, the hypothesis of a possible relatedness of the Japonic language family with any other neighbouring language families (and most notably with Koreanic) remains controversial (see for instance Vovin, 2010 vs Robbeets, 2005).

On an inner Japonic level, since the seminal works of Kindaichi Haruhiko and Hattori Shirō, the past decades have seen a spectacular surge of dialectology, which allowed new discoveries regarding the inner classification of Japonic (Kibe et al. 2021; Igarashi, 2021), even though the classification of some famous "language islands" such as Hachijō are still a matter of debate (see Kupchik, 2011: 7; vs Pellard, 2015: 15 or 2018: 2).

In the meantime, Japan also saw important development in sociolinguistics (Heinrich and Ōhara, 2019; Asahi et al. 2022), which allowed to observe a lot of recent and ongoing language shifts, and especially the importance of new language contacts (ex: Long, 2018).

On a philological scale, the numerous studies conducted recently on Eastern Old Japanese (Kupchik, 2011; Vovin, 2021), on Old Okinawan (Tawata, 2010; Lin, 2015; Serafim and Shinzato, 2021), and the publication of the Oxford-NINJAL corpus of Old Japanese (NINJAL, 2020) have dramatically transformed the access to ancient language data.

Similarly, a lot of progress has been made on the reconstructions of proto-languages, following the works of Martin (1987) and Thorpe (1983), and their revisions by Miyake (2003), Shimabukuro (2007) and Frellesvig and Whitman (2008). Intermediary proto-languages have also started to be reconstructed, for instance Proto-North-Ryukyuan (Lawrence, 2009) and Proto-South-Ryukyuan (Jarosz, 2019). However, in this perspective, one can but lament the lack of a proper etymological dictionary of the Japonic languages, since, sadly, Alexander Vovin could not complete his ambitious project during his lifetime.

On another note, a lot has also been uncovered on the (pre)history of Ainu languages since Vovin's seminal work (1993), but a lot of questions still remain. Most notably, there is still no consensus regarding the origin of the Ainus, and Ainu can still not be classified as anything but an isolate. In parallel, however, the question of the contact and loans between Ainu and Japonic varieties has become a very active field of research (e.g.: Vovin, 2009; Kupchik, 2021).

Finally, based on Supalla's works on the linguistic history of the American Sign Language, Japanese Sign Language also has recently become an object of historical and comparative research (Nakamura, 2006; Sasaki, 2007; Kanda and Osugi, 2011). Since that research, the critically endangered indigenous sign languages of Japan such as Amami Sign Language and Miyakubo Sign Language are also gaining rising attention (Kanda and Kimura, 2016). However, there is still a lot to be discovered on the origin and evolutions of sign languages in Japan.

Research questions and goals:
Our workshop aims at studying the history and prehistory of **_all indigenous_** languages of Japan. Those include discussions on the proto-languages, as well as the ancient and modern forms of all the following:

- mainland Japanese varieties
- Hachijō language
- Ryukyuan languages
- Ainu languages
- 'contact languages', such as Bonin English and Ogasawara Japanese
- sign languages: Japanese Sign Language, Amami Sign Language, Miyakubo Sign Language

Furthermore, we wish to study those languages from several perspectives. Thus, we welcome contribution propositions that may discuss (but need not be limited to):

- the prehistory of the languages of Japan and of their speakers
- the history of those languages
- the changes in the "linguistic ecology" of Japan
- the ongoing changes in the synchrony of the languages of Japan
- the languages of Japan outside of Japan, as heritage or migrant languages (for instance, in Hawai'i, in South America, etc.)
- the implementation of recent concepts and of new technologies to the historical linguistics of those languages

References:

Alonso de la Fuente, José Andrés. 2012. *The Ainu languages: traditional reconstruction, Eurasian areal linguistics, and diachronic (holistic) typology*. PhD dissertation, Universidad del País Vasco – Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.

Asahi Yoshiyuki, Usami Mayumi and Inoue Fumio. 2022. *Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bugaeva, Anna (ed.). 2022. *Handbook of the Ainu language*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

de Boer, Elisabeth. 2020. The classification of the Japonic languages. In: Robbeets, Martine and Savelyev Alexander (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Transeurasian languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 40-58.

Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frellesvig, Bjarke and Whitman John. 2008. *Proto-Japanese: Issues and Prospects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Frellesvig, Bjarke; Shibatani Masayoshi and Smith, John Clark (eds.). 2007. *Current issues in the History and Structure of Japanese*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Frellesvig, Bjarke; Kinsui Satoshi and Whitman, John. 2017. *Handbook of Historical Japanese Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heinrich, Patrick and Ōhara Yumiko. *Routledge Handbook of Japanese Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

Igarashi, Yōsuke. 2021. Bunki-gaku-teki shuhō ni motodzuita nichiryū shogo no keitō bunrui no kokoromi [An Attempt to Systematic Classify Japanese and Ryukyu Languages Based on Cladding Techniques]. In: Hayashi Yuka; Kinuhata Tomohida; Kibe Nobuko (eds). *Fīrudo to bunken kara miru nichiryū shogo no keitō to rekishi* [Lineage and History of Japanese and Ryukyu Languages Seen from Fields and Documents]. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Miyake, Marc. 2003. *Old Japanese: A phonetic reconstruction*. London: Routledge Curzon.

Jarosz, Aleksandra. 2019. Fine details of a larger picture: Proto-Sakishima *au and *ao diphthongs. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 40 (2), 401-437.

Jarosz, Aleksandra et al. 2022. Demography, trade and state power: a tripartite model of medieval farming/language dispersals in the Ryukyu Islands. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kanda Kazuyuki and Osugi Yutaka. 2011. Database of historical changes in Japanese signs from 1901–2011. Paper presented at the International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Osaka, Japan.

Kanda Kazuyuki and Kimura Tsutomu. 2016. Ritō ni okeru rōsha hōmusain no dēta shūshū ni kansuru chōsa hōkoku [Survey Report on Data Collection of Deaf People's Home Signs on Remote Islands]. *Hyūman'intāfēsu gakkai kenkyūkai hōkoku-shū*. 18. 1. 45-48.

Kibe Nobuko; Hayashi Yuka; Kinuhata Tomohide. 2021. *Fīrudo to bunken kara miru Nichiryū shogo no keitō to rekishi* [The phylogeny and history of the Japonic languages seen from the field and from philological records]. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Kubozono Haruo. 2016. Language contact and accent changes in Japanese. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* 140 (4). 3050-3051.

Kupchik, John. 2011. *A Grammar of the Eastern Old Japanese dialects*. PhD dissertation, Mānoa: University of Hawai'i.

Kupchik, John. 2021. Ainu Loanwords in Hachijō. In; Kupchik, John; Alonso de la Fuente, José Andrés and Miyake, Marc Hideo. *Studies in Asian Historical Linguistics, Philology and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill.

Lawrence, Wayne. 2009. Kita Ryūkyū sogo no meishi onchō – Shiron [The tone system of Proto-Northern-Ryukyuan nouns – A proposal]. In: *Okinawa bunka*, 43, 2, 106. 102-186.

Lee, Sean & Hasegawa Toshikazu. 2011. Bayesian phylogenetic analysis supports an agricultural origin of Japonic languages. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 278.3662-69.

Lin Chihkai. 2015. *A Reconstruction of Old Okinawan: a Corpus-Based Approach*. PhD dissertation, Mānoa: University of Hawai'i.

Long, Daniel. 2018. *Ogasawara Shotō no kongō gengo no rekishi to kōzō : Nihon ganrai no tabunka kyōsei shakai de okita gengo sesshoku* [History and structure of mixed languages in the Ogasawara Islands: Language contact that occurred in Japan's original multicultural society]. Tokyo: Hitsuji shobō.

Martin, Samuel Elmo. 1987. *The Japanese Language through Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Matsuoka Kazumi; Yano Haiko. 2017. Ehime-ken Oshima Miyakubo-cho no shuwa: airand sign [Island Signs: The Sign Language of Miyakubo in Ehime Prefecture]. *Kagaku,* 87 (5). 415–417.

Matsuoka Kazumi; Taira Eiji; Yano Haiko. 2014. Ehime ken ōshima ni okeru birejjisain (shuwa hōgen) no hozon oyobi gengo-gaku-teki bunseki no tame no dētabēsu no kōchiku [Construction of a database for the preservation and linguistic analysis of village signs (sign language dialects) in Ōshima, Ehime prefecture]. *Fukutake zaidan*.

Moseley, Christopher (ed.) and Nicolas, Alexander (cartographer). 2009. *Atlas of the world's languages in danger*, 3rd edition. Paris: Unesco.

Nakamura, Karen. 2006. Deaf in Japan: signing and the politics of identity. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (2020) "Oxford-NINJAL Corpus of Old Japanese" http://oncoj.ninjal.ac.jp/

Osada Toshiki (ed.). 2020. *Nihongo "kigen" ron no rekishi to tenbō: Nihongo no kigen wa dono yō ni ronjirarete kita ka* [Debating the origins of the Japanese language: history and outlook]. Tokyo: Sanseidō.

Osada Toshiki and Vovin, Alexander (eds.). 2003. *Nihongo Keitōron no genzai Perspectives on the Origins of the Japanese Language*. Tokyo: International Research Center for Japanese Studies.

Osterkamp, Sven. Foreign Sources on the History of the Japanese Language: Problems and Prospects. In: *Acta Asiatica: Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture,* 111 (Recent Trends in Japanese Language Studies).75–93.

Osugi Yutaka; Supalla, Ted; Webb, Rebecca. 1999. The use of word elicitation to identify distinctive gestural systems on Amami Island. *Sign Language & Linguistics*, 2, 1. 87-112.

Pellard, Thomas. 2015. The linguistic archaeology of the Ryukyu Islands. In: Heinrich, Patrick; Miyara Shinshō; Shimoji Michinori. *Handbook of the Ryukyuan languages: History, structure, and use*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 13−37.

Pellard, Thomas. 2018. The comparative study of the Japonic languages. Presentation given in *Approaches to endangered languages in Japan and Northeast Asia: Description, documentation and revitalization.* Tachikawa: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics.

Robbeets, Martine. 2005. *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sasaki Daisuke. 2007. "The lexicons of Japanese Sign Language and Taiwan Sign Language: A preliminary comparative study of handshape differences. In: Quinto-Pozos, David. *Sign Languages in Contact.* Washington DC: Gallaudet. 123-150.

Serafim, Leon and Shinzato Rumiko. 2021. *The Language of the Old-Okinawan Omoro Sōshi*. Leiden: Brill.

Shibatani Masayoshi. 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shimabukuro Moriyo. 2007. *The Accentual History of the Japanese and Ryukyuan Languages: a Reconstruction*. London: Global Oriental.

Takubo Yukinori; Whitman, John; Hirako Tatsuya. *Ryūkyū shogo to Kodai Nihongo: Nichiryū sogo no saiken ni mukete* [Ryukyuan and premodern Japanese: Toward the reconstruction of proto-Japanese-Ryukyuan]. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Tawata Shin'ichirō. 2010. *Okinawa-go on'in no rekishi-teki kenkyū* [A Historical Study of Okinawan Phonology]. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.

Thorpe, Maner Lawton. 1983. *Ryukyuan Language History*. University of Southern California: PhD dissertation.

Unger, James Marshall. *The Role of Contact in the Origins of the Japanese and Korean Languages*. 2009. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Vovin, Alexander. 1993. *A Reconstruction of Proto-Ainu*. Leiden: Brill.

Vovin, Alexander. 2009. Man'yōshū to fudoki ni mi rareru fushigina kotoba to jōdai nipponrettō ni okeru ainukotoba no bunpu [Strange Words in the Man'yōshū and the Fudoki and the Distribution of the Ainu Language in the Japanese Islands in Prehistory]. Kyoto: International Research Center for the Japanese Studies.

Vovin, Alexander. 2010. *Koreo-Japonica: A re-evaluation of a common genetic origin*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Vovin, Alexander. 2021a. 'Names of Large Exotic Animals and the Urheimat of Japonic'. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 2.1.

Vovin, Alexander. 2021b. *The Eastern Old Japanese Corpus and Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.

Whitman, John B. 2012. *The relationship between Japanese and Korean*. In: Tranter, David N (ed.). *The Languages of Japan and Kore*a. London: Routledge, 24-38

ICHL 2023 Workshop
The diachrony of tone: connecting the field

Sandra Auderset (MPI for Evolutionary Anthropology),[1] Rikker Dockum (Swarthmore College), Ryan Gehrmann (Payap University)

Context and background

Tone, that is the use of pitch to distinguish lexical and/or grammatical forms, is an integral feature of many—possibly a majority of—languages across the world (Yip 2002). Despite this, tonal phenomena are conspicuously absent from most studies on language change, so that interest and progress in the understanding of the origins and evolution of suprasegmental contrasts lags behind that of segmental contrasts (Janda & Joseph 2003, Dockum 2019, Campbell 2021).

Nevertheless, starting in the latter half of the 20th century, steady progress has been made in the investigation of tonogenesis, i.e. in the emergence of tonal contrasts. This research has identified various pathways for a language to acquire tonal contrasts from segments. Haudricourt's (1954) model of tonogenesis in the so-called *Sinospheric Tonbund* (Matisoff 2001) connects the emergence of tonal contrasts with originally segmental material and processes of simplification of syllable structure. Similar progressions, from segmental contrast to tonal, can be observed in other languages and language families, such as Athabaskan (Kingston 2005), Mayan (see discussion in Bennett 2016, 497-499), Uto-Aztecan (Manaster-Ramer 1986; Guion et al. 2010), Punjabi/Northwest Indo-Aryan (Baart 2014; Evans et al. 2018), Malagasy (Howe 2017), and Afrikaans (Coetzee et al. 2018), among others. Prosodic contrasts can also give rise to tones, as in Cushitic (Kießling 2004). Formerly predictable stress patterns, for which pitch has become salient, became unpredictable in conjunction with syllable or word structure reduction. Tonal contrasts can also be acquired through contact and bilingualism of a non-tonal language with a tonal one. Such developments have been observed in languages such as Southern Qiang (Evans 2001) and Mal (L-Thongkum & Intajamornrak 2008), for example.

There are, however, language families in which tonality has such a long history that its origins might not ever be discoverable. This is the case in Otomanguean, where all the daughter families are reconstructed as tonal, e.g. proto-Mixtecan (Longacre 1957) and proto-Mixtec (Dürr 1990), proto-Chinantec (Rensch 1968), proto-Oto-Pamean (Bartholomew 1965), proto-Mazatec (Gudschinsky 1958; Kirk 1966), proto-Popolocan (Gudschinsky 1959), proto-Zapotec (Benton 2001), and proto-Chatino (Campbell 2013). It is thus assumed that proto-Otomanguean also had tonal contrasts (Rensch 1976, Kaufman forthcoming). Proto-Niger-Congo has also been reconstructed with tonal contrasts (Hyman 2016). Tone change *per se* is much less well studied than tonogenesis, and often not addressed even in language families with old tone systems. This can be at least partially attributed to impressionistic statements on the volatility of tones (Ratliff 2015; Cahill 2011; Beam de Azcona 2007; Morey 2005; Dürr 1990, among

---

[1]Questions on abstract submissions may be directed to sandra_auderset@eva.mpg.de.

others), leading to the assumption that tones play at best a minor role in unraveling the history of a language family.

There is thus a considerable gap in the field of historical linguistics when it comes to the diachronic study of tones. A welcome exception to this is the recent collected volume on tone neutralization and phonetic tone change, Kubozono and Giriko 2018, and see also the overview by Yang & Xu (2019) of existing tone change work in Asia. This gap also applies to computer-assisted methods, such as automatic alignment and cognate detection (List et al. 2018), and quantitative methods, such as Bayesian phylogenetics (Greenhill et al. 2020), which have gained traction in the field over the past two decades. Studies using such methodologies have been applied to few language families with tonal contrasts (e.g. Sagart et al. 2019 and Zhang et al. 2019, both on Sino-Tibetan) and none have addressed tone, despite evidence of historical tone categories having significant phylogenetic signal (Dockum 2019).

Workshop content and goals

As a result of the issues mentioned above, comparatively few linguists focus on the diachronic study of tone. Individual specialists tend to sort themselves into regional and language family niches, leaving the field fragmented with little dialogue or cross-pollination between interested scholars. Given that the diachronic study of tone is in need of intensified research, the absence of exchange between scholars creates a further impediment to progress in this area.

Our workshop aims to address this by bringing together linguists from different regions and language families who work on tone diachrony and initiating an ongoing dialogue. Our goal is to form and strengthen collaborations between participants and attendants to advance this research area in the future. Another outcome of this workshop would be a new collected volume of work on tone diachrony, focusing on representation of each area of the world with a high concentration of tonal languages. We have received an expression of interest from *Diachronica* for a special issue on the topic, for which the workshop presentations would form the basis.

Presentations for this workshop should address topics in the diachronic study of tone, either in a language (sub-)family, a geographical region, or cross-linguistically. Topics include but are not limited to:

- phonological environments that condition the emergence of tone contrasts or tone changes in existing tones;
- morphosyntactic patterns involving the innovation of new tone contrasts or changes to existing tone contrasts;
- underlying articulatory, acoustic, and perceptual mechanisms of tonogenesis and/or tone change;
- methodological considerations in the study of tone diachrony, e.g. the comparability of tonal systems in the absence of detailed phonetic studies, and the creation of reusable datasets and databases;
- addressing similarities and differences, both theoretically and empirically, in the study of tonal and segmental change;
- the contribution of tone to our understanding of the linguistic past, including subgrouping and classification in a language family, explaining historical contact phenomena between languages and language families, etc.;

- the relationship of historical tone studies with language documentation and description of tonal languages and language families;
- descriptions of tone change in under-described languages

Abstracts for this workshop should be one page, plus references, and clearly state the topic and how it is related to the workshop content, the language(s) involved in the study, the source of data, and (preliminary) results.

References

Baart, Joan. 2014. Tone and stress in north-west Indo-Aryan: A survey. In Caspers et al. (eds.), *Above and Beyond the Segments: Experimental Linguistics and Phonetics,* 1-13. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Beam de Azcona, Rosemary G. 2007. Problems in Zapotec tone reconstruction. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 3–15.

Bennett, Ryan. 2016. Mayan phonology. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 10(10), 469–514.

Benton, Joe. 2001. *A reconstruction of the tone system of Proto Zapotec*. Unpublished manuscript.

Cahill, Michael. 2011. *Tonal diversity in languages of Papua New Guinea*. SIL Electronic Working Papers.

Campbell, Eric W. 2013. The internal diversification and subgrouping of Chatino. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 79(3), 395–420.

Campbell, Eric W. 2021. Why is tone change still poorly understood, and how might documentation of less-studied tone languages help? In Patience Epps, Danny Law & Na'ama Pat-El (eds.), *Historical Linguistics and Endangered Languages: Exploring Diversity in Language Change*. New York & London: Routledge.

Coetzee, Andries W., Patrice Speeter Beddor, Kerby Shedden, Will Styler & Daan Wissing. 2018. Plosive voicing in Afrikaans: Differential cue weighting and tonogenesis. *Journal of Phonetics* 66, 185-216.

Dockum, Rikker. 2019. *The Tonal Comparative Method: Tai tone in diachronic perspective.* New Haven: Yale University PhD thesis.

Dürr, Michael. 1990. A preliminary reconstruction of the Proto-Mixtec tonal system. *Indiana* 11: 19-61.

Evans, Jonathan. 2001. Contact-induced tonogenesis in Southern Qiang. *Language and Linguistics* 2(2), 63-110.

Evans, Jonathan, Wen-Chi Yeh & Rukmini Kulkarni. 2018. Acoustics of tone in Indian Punjabi. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116(3), 509-528.

Greenhill, Simon, Paul Heggarty, Russell D. Gray. 2020. Bayesian phylolinguistics. In Janda, Richard, Brian D. Joseph & Barbara S. Vance (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Vol. 2. pp. 226-253. Wiley Blackwell

Gudschinsky, Sarah C. 1958. Mazatec dialect history: a study in miniature. *Language* 34(4), 469–481.

Gudschinsky, Sarah C. 1959. *Proto-Popotecan: a comparative study of Popolocan and Mixtecan*. Baltimore: Waverly Press.

Guion, Susan G., Jonathan D. Amith, Christopher S. Doty & Irina A. Shport. 2010. Word-level prosody in Balsas Nahuatl: The origin, development, and acoustic correlates of tone in a stress accent language. *Journal of Phonetics* 38(2), 137-166.

Haudricourt, André-Georges. 1954. De l'origine des tons en Viêtnamien. [On the origin of tones in Vietnamese]. *Journal Asiatique* 242, 69-82.

Howe, Penelope Jane. 2017. *Tonogenesis in Central Dialects of Malagasy: Acoustic and Perceptual Evidence with Implications for Synchronic Mechanisms of Sound Change*. Houston: Rice University PhD thesis.

Hyman, Larry. 2016. On Reconstructing Tone in Proto-Niger-Congo. *UC Berkeley PhonLab Annual Report,* 12.

Janda, Richard D. & Brian D. Joseph. 2003. On language, change, and language change – or, of history, linguistics, and historical linguistics. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, pp. 3-180. Blackwell.

Kaufman, Terrence. forthcoming. Comparative Oto-Mangean grammar research: Phonology, aspect-mood marking, valency changers, nominalizers on verbs, numerals, pronouns, deictics, interrogatives, adpositionoids, noun classifiers, noun inflexion, compounds, word order, and diversification model. In Wichmann, Søren (ed.), *Languages and linguistics of Mexico and Northern Central America: a comprehensive guide*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Kießling, Roland. 2004. Tonogenesis in Southern Cushitic (Common West Rift). In Rose-Juliet Anyanwu (ed.), *Stress and Tone – the African Experience*, 141-163. (Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter 15). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Kingston, John. 2005. The phonetics of Athabaskan tonogenesis. In Hargus, Sharon & Karen Rice (eds.), *Athabaskan Prosody*, 137-184. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 269). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kirk, Paul L.. 1966. Proto-Mazatec phonology. PhD dissertation, University of Washington.

Kubozono, Haruo & Mikio Giriko. 2018. *Tonal change and neutralization*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

L-Thongkum, Theraphan & Chommanad Intajamornrak. 2008. Tonal evolution induced by language contact: A case study of the T'in (Lua') language of Nan province, northern Thailand. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 38, 57-68.

List, Johann-Mattis, Mary Walworth, Simon J. Greenhill, Tiago Tresoldi, & Robert Forkel. 2018. Sequence comparison in computational historical linguistics. *Journal of Language Evolution* 3(2), 130–144.

Longacre, Robert E. 1957. *Proto-Mixtecan*. Indiana University.

Manaster-Ramer, Alexis. 1986. Genesis of Hopi tones. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52(2), 154-160.

Matisoff, James. 2001. Genetic versus contact relationship: Prosodic diffusibility in South-East Asian languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*, 291–327. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morey, Stephen. 2005. Tonal change in the Tai languages of Northeast India. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 28(2), 139–202.

Ratliff, Martha. 2015. Tonoexodus, tonogenesis, and tone change. In Honeybone, Patrick & Joseph Salmons (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Phonology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 245-261.

Rensch, Calvin R. 1968. *Proto Chinantec phonology*. Papeles de la Chinantla 6. México, D.F: Museo Nacional de Antropología.

Rensch, Calvin R. 1976. *Comparative Otomanguean Phonology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Sagart, Laurent, Guillaume Jacques, Yunfan Lai, Robin J. Ryder, Valentin Thouzeau, Simon J. Greenhill, & Johann-Mattis List. Dated language phylogenies shed light on the ancestry of Sino-Tibetan. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 116(21), 10317-10322.

Yang, Cathryn and Yi Xu. 2019 Crosslinguistic trends in tone change: A review of tone change studies in East and Southeast Asia. *Diachronica* 36(3), 417-459.

Yip, Moira. 2002. Tone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, Menghan, Shi Yan, Wuyun Pan & Li Jin. Phylogenetic evidence for Sino-Tibetan origin in northern China in the Late Neolithic. *Nature* 569, 112–115.

W12

From and Towards Demonstratives: Grammaticalization Processes and Beyond

Verónica Orqueda (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

Berta González Saavedra (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Demonstratives are generally seen as deictic elements, which are primarily used to point to a referent, focusing the hearer's attention on an entity (Diessel 1999). However, their nature, their inner possible classifications, and their grammaticalization processes from and towards such a category have long been topics of debate. With respect to the sources of demonstratives, there is a well-known discussion regarding whether demonstratives can or cannot develop from lexical sources. Thus, Heine et al. (2020: 421) claim that "there are at least three main lexical sources that may lead to the emergence of demonstrative categories.

But these sources do not seem to exhaust the range of pathways", contra Diessel (2006: 481), who believes that "demonstratives are so old that their roots are not etymologically analyzable".

As for the grammaticalization processes that start with demonstratives, it has been noted that demonstratives can develop into complementizers, conjunctions, copulas, definite articles, focus, third person pronouns, relatives and subordinators, among others. As Diessel (1999) shows, the targets may vary according to the syntactic classification of the source demonstratives. As well, demonstratives are not restricted to one single path of grammaticalization. Among examples of different targets that stem from the same source, there is the case of Latin *ille*, which develops both as a definite article (*el*) and as a third person personal pronoun (*él*) in Spanish (see e.g., Giusti 2001, Roca 2009, and van Gelderen 2011), probably depending on the different contexts.

Particularly, the connection between demonstratives and personal pronouns through grammaticalization processes is still a field of fruitful discussions, and one may wonder whether demonstratives may develop as 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person pronouns: there is plenty of evidence of 3rd person pronouns derived from demonstratives, (see e.g., Heine and Kuteva 2002), while there is no evidence of 1st person pronouns, and scarce evidence of 2nd person pronouns, as is the case of *anata* in Japanese (distal demonstrative > 2nd sg. person pronoun, see Ishiyama 2012 and Ishiyama 2019).

Regarding grammaticalization processes within the category of demonstratives, there is also an ongoing debate on whether exophoric uses (this is, in speech act situations) necessarily precede or not anaphoric or discursive uses. This debate has a direct implication to the question of unidirectionality of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Stavinschi 2012).

Lastly, recent cognitive investigations on the selection and use of demonstratives can shed light of possible explanations for the development of demonstratives. Thus, for instance, Peeters et al. (2021), among others, show that the selection of specific demonstratives may be determined by the communicational situation and the perception of the speaker-addressee relationship, and not only by the proximity or distance of the object. Such synchronic observations may lead one to wonder what cognitive factors are behind the grammaticalization of demonstratives towards new functions.

The purpose of this workshop is to invite scholars working on different aspects of the grammaticalization of demonstratives and from diverse theoretical frameworks, in order to

jointly elaborate a more complete map of possible developments of demonstratives and their related aspects that have taken place or are still taking place in languages of the world. As suggestions, some topics that will be welcomed are:

- New proposals for the origin of demonstratives
- New proposals of grammaticalization processes from demonstratives
- Processes with more than one result, e.g. Lat. *ille* > Sp. *él* and *el*.
- Cognitive processes involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives from cross-linguistic perspectives.
- New approaches from diverse linguistic areas (sociolinguistics, pragmatics, among others) that help us understand the processes involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives.

References:

Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diessel, H. (2006). "Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar". *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4). 463–489.

van Gelderen, E. (2011). *The linguistic cycle: Language change and the language faculty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giusti, G. (2001). "The birth of a functional category: From Latin ILLE to the Romance article and personal pronouns". In G. Cinque & G. Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 157–171. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, CUP

Heine, B., T. Kuteva, H. Long, H. Narrog and F. Wu. (2020). "Where do demonstratives come from?" *STUF* 73(3). 403-434.

Ishiyama, O. (2019). *Diachrony of personal pronouns in Japanese*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ishiyama, O. (2012). "The diachronic relationship between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 13(1). 50–71.

Peeters, D., E. Krahmer, and A. Maes. (2021). "A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Demonstrative Reference". *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 28. 409–433.

Roca, F. (2009). "The Left Periphery of Nominal Constructions and the Evolution of Definite Determiners in Romance". In J. Rafel (ed.) *Diachronic Linguistics*, 497–553. Girona: Documenta Universitaria.

Stavinschi, A. (2012). "On the development of the Romance demonstrative systems: Historical remarks and theoretical conclusions". *Diachronica* 29(1). 72-97.

W13

New methods for old languages: the comparability of data

Workshop proposal for ICHL26, Heidelberg.

Alessia Cassarà (Universität Stuttgart); Lena Kaltenbach (Universität Mannheim); Mariapaola Piccione (Universität Stuttgart); Tara Struik (Universität Mannheim).

Author's email: tara.struik@uni-mannheim.de

While historical linguistics is traditionally known to suffer from a "bad data problem" (Labov 1994: 11), the field has seen a surge in the development of (annotated) data collections and computational tools to trace quantitative changes throughout the history of languages, allowing researchers to get more out of the (often sparse) data than ever before. This availability of data opens up many new avenues for research, in particular in explaining the cognitive mechanisms behind language change. In this workshop we want to bring together researchers working in different disciplines to discuss novel empirical methods that allow us to investigate the relation between the structural changes we observe in historical texts and the factors which arguably led to these changes. We aim to do this by focusing on a) how historical corpus data can be related to **models of language learning**, b) **contemporary psycholinguistic models** and c) how we can deal with the **heterogeneity of historical data** in relation to these models.

Historical linguists have discussed the link between historical change and changes in the input and have proposed models that make use of psycholinguistic explanations, especially in terms of language acquisition (e.g. Lightfoot 1999, 2017). However, a challenge for the study of the role of language acquisition in language change is that there is no direct access to the input for past stages of languages. Approximating the input by using corpora of child-directed speech (e.g. CHILDES) for contemporary languages has resulted in the development of learning models, which may also be informative for the historical stages. For instance, Yang's (2016) Tolerance Principle has been shown to work effectively with small amounts of data, making it very attractive for historical work (Kodner 2020, 2022; Dresher and Lahiri 2022, Ringe and Yang 2022, Trips and Rainsford 2022). However, the application of such models on corpus data requires careful consideration of how the data obtained from corpora can be compared to the input a child received (cf. Trips and Rainsford 2022 for discussion). One potential solution is to compare the frequencies of the most common verbs in a corpus to the most common verbs in a sample of child-directed speech, as Kodner (2019) demonstrates that there is a substantial overlap.

From both a psycholinguistic and historical linguistic perspective the relationship between language change and mechanisms of language processing has only rarely been explicitly addressed (for exceptions, see Jäger & Rosenbach 2008; de Smet & de Velde 2017; see also the contributions in Hundt et al. 2017 and the ongoing work by the the DFG Research Unit SILPAC (FOR 5157)). Notably, some authors have recently pointed to the importance of cross-linguistic and within-language structural priming and syntactic adaptation for studies of (contact-induced) language change (e.g. Pickering & Garrod 2017; Kaan & Chun 2018; Kootstra & Şahin 2018; Kootstra & Muysken 2019). Effects of priming may be observable in historical corpora in the form of persistence of linguistic forms (see Ecay and Tamminga 2017; also Gries 2005; Szmrecsanyi 2006). From a Uniformitarian perspective (see Bergs 2012, Walkden 2019 for discussion), it follows that psycholinguistic processes active in language change should not differ fundamentally across languages or language stages. Methodologically, changes

observed in diachrony could in principle also be elicited in psycholinguistic experiments and the results and methods of psycholinguistic experiments could inform historical corpus analyses.

Applying psycholinguistic methods and learning models to historical data also requires us to think critically about the nature of our data and how informative they are about the actual linguistic environment in which language acquisition and change takes place. Historical corpora may be heterogeneous in nature, consisting of many different genres (e.g. legal prose, narrative verse, etc.), which may not all be equally representative of a language user's input. Some types of text, e.g. theatrical texts, conversation manuals, direct speech in verse narratives, etc. have been argued to be particularly close to spoken language in the past (Ernst 1980, Ayres-Bennett 2000); also, it has been shown that language change does not proceed at the same rate in all text genres (Whitt 2018). However, it is not clear whether a restrictive approach to selecting corpus texts is preferable to one which instead draws on as much data as possible, using statistical techniques to evaluate the effect of genre. A further open question is the extent to which the writers of historical texts are themselves influenced by mechanisms such as priming, whether it is self-priming within a single text, between the two writers in private correspondence or even between two languages in translations. Similarly, it is not always clear what the impact of the linguistic background of individual authors is on the output – are they, for instance, monolinguals, early bilinguals, or possibly late bilinguals writing in their first language or late bilinguals writing in their second language?

In this workshop, we aim to compare different types of historical corpus data not only with each other, but also with the input to language acquirers and with data elicited in psycholinguistic experiments in order to develop novel methodologies bringing the fields of historical linguistics, psycholinguistics and language acquisition closer together. We invite contributions which answer or relate to the following research questions and topics:

- How can models of learnability be applied to historical data?
- What are the psycholinguistic processes behind historical language change?
- Which insights does historical linguistics provide for the study of these psycholinguistic processes?
- Which methods and resources are the best to use if we want to relate historical data to language learner input and which are best for researching the relationship between experimental data and historical data?
- Which additional data types/methodologies can contribute to bridging the gap between the disciplines of historical linguistics, acquisition studies and psycholinguistics, e.g. artificial language studies, longitudinal studies, computational models of language change, etc.?
- How can insights from historical sociolinguistics and philology contribute to a better understanding of the heterogeneity of historical corpus data and the linguistic background of individual authors?
- To what extent are the writers of historical texts themselves influenced by mechanisms of language processing, such as intra- and interindividual priming in monolingual and bilingual situations? How can we use notions such as persistence in historical corpora to tap into the cognitive processes behind the text production of medieval authors?

References

Ayres-Bennett, W. 2000. Voices from the past: Sources of seventeenth-century spoken French. *Romanische Forschungen*, *112*, 323–348.

Bergs, A. 2012. The Uniformitarian Principle and the risk of anachronisms in language and social history. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics* (1st ed., pp. 83–101). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118257227.ch5

De Smet, H., & Van de Velde, F. 2017. Experimenting on the past: A case study on changing analysability in English ly-adverbs. *English Language & Linguistics*, *21*(2), 317–340. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674317000168

Dresher, B. E., & Lahiri, A. 2022. The foot in the history of English: Challenges to metrical coherence. In B. Los, C. Cowie, P. Honeybone, & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *English historical linguistics: Change in structure and meaning: Papers from the XXth ICEHL* (pp. 42–59). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ecay, A., & Tamminga, M. 2017. Persistence as a diagnostic of grammatical status: The case of Middle English negation. In E. Mathieu & Truswell, B. (Eds.). *Micro-change and Macro-change in diachronic syntax* (pp. 202-215). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198747840.003.0013

Ernst, G. 1980. Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte des gesprochenen Französisch. In H. Stimm (Ed.), *Zur Geschichte des gesprochenen Französisch und zur Sprachlenkung im Gegenwartsfranzösischen* (pp. 1–14). Steiner.

Gries, S. 2005. Syntactic priming: A corpus-based approach. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *34*(4), 365–399.

Hundt, M., Mollin, S., & Pfenninger, S. (Eds.). 2017. *The changing English language: Psycholinguistic perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Jäger, G., & Rosenbach, A. 2008. Priming as a testing ground for historical linguists? - A reply to Chang, Eckardt, and Traugott. *Theoretical Linguistics*, *34*(2), 143–156.

Kaan, E., & Chun, E. 2018. Priming and adaptation in native speakers and second-language learners. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *21*(2), 228–242. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728916001231

Kodner, J. 2019. Estimating child linguistic experience from historical corpora. *Glossa. A Journal of General Linguistics*, *4*(1), 122.

Kodner, J. 2020. *Language acquisition in the past* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Pennsylvania.

Kodner, J. (2022). What learning Latin verbal morphology tells us about morphological theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-022-09553-2

Kootstra, G. J., & Muysken, P. 2019. Structural priming, levels of awareness, and agency in contact-induced language change. *Languages*, *4*(3), 65. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages4030065

Kootstra, G. J., & Şahin, H. 2018. Crosslinguistic structural priming as a mechanism of contact-induced language change: Evidence from Papiamento-Dutch bilinguals in Aruba and the Netherlands. *Language*, *94*(4), 902–930.

Labov, W. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change, Volume 1: Internal factors*. Blackwell.

Lightfoot, D. 1999. *The development of language: Acquisition, change, and evolution*. Blackwell.

Lightfoot, D. 2017. Acquisition and learnability. In A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of historical syntax* (pp. 381–400). Cambridge University Press.

Pickering, M., & Garrod, S. 2017. Priming and language change. In M. Hundt, S. Mollin, & S. Pfenninger (Eds.), *The changing English language: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 173–190). Cambridge University Press.

Ringe, D., & Yang, C. 2022. The threshold of productivity and the 'irregularization' of verbs in Early Modern English. In B. Los, C. Cowie, P. Honeybone, & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *English historical linguistics: Change in structure and meaning: Papers from the XXth ICEHL* (pp. 91–112). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Szmrecsanyi, B. 2006. *Morphosyntactic persistence in spoken English: A corpus study at the intersection of variationist sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and discourse analysis*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Trips, C., & Rainsford, T. 2022. Tolerating subject-Experiencers? Yang's Tolerance Principle applied to psych verbs under contact in Middle English. *Journal of Historical Syntax*, *6*(12), 1-43.

Walkden, G. 2019. The many faces of uniformitarianism in linguistics. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, *4*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.888

Whitt, R. J. (Ed.). 2018. *Diachronic corpora, genre, and language change*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yang, C. 2016. *The price of linguistic productivity: How children learn to break the rules of language*. MIT Press.

#

W14

Exploiting Standardized Cross-Linguistic Data in Historical Linguistics

Robert Forkel (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, robert_forkel@eva.mpg.de)

Gerhard Jäger (Eberhard-Karls University Tübingen, gerhard_jaeger@uni-tuebingen.de)

Johann-Mattis List (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, mattis_list@eva.mpg.de)

Introduction

Computational approaches play an increasingly important role in mainstream historical linguistics. Along with these contributions, we note an increased need for standards which drive the curation and sharing of data in historical linguistics (annotated texts, wordlists, collections of structural data, information on phylogenies, etc.). While there have been attempts towards standardization in the past, most prominently reflected in the Cross-Linguistic Data Formats initiative (Forkel et al. 2018), which has been adopted by several teams working on computational and quantitative approaches in the field of historical linguistics, there are still many types of data for which no standards and examples of best practice exist, although they serve frequently as input or output of studies in historical linguistics (e.g. language phylogenies as collected in Greenhill's (2022) "Phlorest collection"). Considering in addition that many new data collections have been published lately (Dellert et al. 2020, List et al. 2022, Kaiping and Klamer 2018), it seems about time to consolidate and discuss which methods we have at our disposal in order to explore highly standardized collections of cross-linguistic data.

The workshop intends to bring together scholars from three different backgrounds: those who work actively on the development of new standards for cross-linguistic data in historical linguistics in particular and comparative linguistics in general, those who design new methods and workflows to explore and exploit standardized data, and those who conduct full-scale analyses of standardized data in order to address concrete scientific problems.

Expected Topics

We expect a wider range of contributions on diverse topics. The following three key topics highlight directions we envision, but we explicitly encourage colleagues to submit their work on topics related to the general theme of exploiting standardized data in historical linguistics which may not be covered here.

1 Standards for Cross-Linguistic Data in Historical Linguistics

Contributions related to this key topic will present existing standards for linguistic data that have not yet been introduced in historical linguistics, propose new standards for those cases in which standards are lacking, and discuss the role that standards could or should play in historical linguistics (their use, their limits).

2 Methods and Analyses for the Exploitation of Standardized Cross-Linguistic Data

This key topic will invite contributions that present new methods by which standardized cross-linguistic data can be explored as well as new full-fledged analyses in which specific research questions are addressed by means of workflows that involve standardized cross-linguistic datasets.

3 Research Questions Requiring New/Better Data

In this key topic, we expect broader discussions on particular research questions that cannot yet be solved but might be solved in the future if sufficiently standardized cross-linguistic data would be available.

References

Greenhill, Simon J. (2022): Phlorest. https://github.com/phlorest

Dellert, Johannes, Thora Daneyko, Alla Münch, Alina Ladygina, Armin Buch, Natalie Clarius, Ilja Grigorjew, et al. 2020. "NorthEuraLex: A Wide-Coverage Lexical Database of Northern Eurasia." *Language Resources & Evaluation* 54: 273–301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-019-09480-6.

Forkel, Robert, Johann-Mattis List, Simon J. Greenhill, Christoph Rzymski, Sebastian Bank, Michael Cysouw, Harald Hammarström, Martin Haspelmath, Gereon A. Kaiping, and Russell D. Gray. 2018. "Cross-Linguistic Data Formats, Advancing Data Sharing and Re-Use in Comparative Linguistics." *Scientific Data* 5 (180205): 1–10.

Kaiping, Gereon A., and Marian Klamer. 2018. "LexiRumah: An Online Lexical Database of the Lesser Sunda Islands." *PLOS ONE* 13 (10): 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0205250.

List, Johann-Mattis, Robert Forkel, Simon J. Greenhill, Christoph Rzymski, Johannes Englisch, and Russell D. Gray. 2022. "Lexibank, a Public Repository of Standardized Wordlists with Computed Phonological and Lexical Features." *Scientific Data* 9 (316): 1–31.

W15

Workshop proposal:

Using secondary dialect data for reconstruction: Methodological considerations for Arabic

Contact: Maris Camilleri mcamil@essex.ac.uk

Uri Horesh urih@live.achva.ac.il

The intent is to bring scholars together to discuss or argue how, in the absence of corpora, the following constitute apt methodologies (along with the questions they raise) through which to reconstruct change, whether it be straightforward grammatical change, or change resulting from (socio)linguistic variation. Our focus will be on the applicability of these methodologies vis-à-vis Arabic, with evidence from additional Afroasiatic languages in the Middle East and North Africa.

1. Relying on previous older descriptions (even if snippets) of a particular dialect or speech community and then generalising for a wider area while making use of synchronic data from a other varieties of the language.
2. Can we consider recent discoveries of Arabic texts (e.g., North Arabian/Safaitic inscriptions, Old Christian Palestinian Arabic manuscripts) reliably indicative of generalised older phases of Arabic, or should they be viewed as representative precursors solely of their own respective dialectal groups?
3. How much do we necessarily need to rely on what we may know from neighbouring languages outside of Arabic (e.g., Aramaic, Amazigh languages) to be able to reconstruct change (e.g., reference to zero-marking of definiteness)?
4. Alternatively, in the absence of cues from diachrony, what limitations associate with comparative dialectal observations to try to have access to some diachronic information of what could have been, given factors that pertain to sociolinguistic variables and varied contact scenarios. E.g., if feature X is present in the grammar of a particular dialect, how can it be used as a means to tap into a generalised past, if it so happens that that particular dialect's sociolinguistic characteristics cannot be deemed generalisable for the whole system?
5. What is the utility of old dialect atlases and other cartographic compilations (e.g., Bergsträßer 1915, Cantineau 1940)?

Two examples that illustrate the issue at hand from: (1) lexical and (2) lexical-grammatical diachronic perspectives, yet both tapped into from synchronic grammaticalised end-points:

1. *zey* lit. 'as, like' in Djidjelli Algerian is reported by Marçais (1954) as an 'appear, seem'-type predicate. *zey* as a preposition is not synchronically used in the area, where *kīf* is commonly used instead. Yet to try to account for the diachronic development of a predicate meaning 'seem' out of something that meant 'like, as', which is something not unheard of crosslinguistically, requires us first to have some sort of diachronic evidence that *zey* existed as an erstwhile preposition in the grammar of the area. The attested use of the lexical function of *zey* as a preposition comes from, e.g., Marçais's (1908) descriptive texts of Saida Algerian bedouins. The closest synchronic attestations also come from synchronic Egyptian grammaticalised forms such as: *izzaayyik* 'how are you?', etc. –which in turn also requires some grammatical decoding to be done. Yet the relation between 'as' and 'how' is much closer. The question we would be asking, therefore, is whether such a mix of synchronic and diachronic evidence, even from varied linguistic communities which may not have a direct import on the target dialect and the data therein, constitutes proper evidence on the basis of which to work one's way backwards to try to reconstruct the change and how it may have taken place.
2. In a similar vein, while *zey* and *mitil* (and variants thereof) are the more widespread prepositions meaning 'as, like' in Egyptian and the Gulf, for example, it may well be the case that something akin to **ka* 'like', otherwise attested in Classical Arabic, could have been available in dialectal speech, at some point. The way one may want to go about testing this hypothesis is by looking at reflexes of this in certain grammatical(ised) forms, such as the

complementiser *kaʾinn* 'as though'. On a view that this complementiser must have come about as a result of the univerbation of the complementiser *ʾinn* 'that' with the erstwhile preposition **ka* 'as, like' (very much in parallel to, e.g., *killi* in Algerian in its composition, but not so in terms of meaning), the questions to ask include: Is this a good enough piece of evidence on the basis of which one could then argue that some sort of *ka* lexical item meaning 'as, like' existed in the dialect data, before its supplanting by other lexical items? What would be the relation between *ka* and *kīf*; would they have shared a source? Or not? Alternatively, could it be the case that *ka* never existed in the dialects and what may have been borrowed from another system is just the function word, such that the function word within the dialectal system would wrongly lead us to assume that some preposition *ka* once existed in the dialects too?

References

Bergsträßer, Gotthelf. 1915. *Sprachatlas von Syrien und Palästina*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
Cantineau, Jean. 1940. *Les parlers arabes du Ḥōrân: Atlas*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
Marçais, Philippe. 1954. *Le parler arabe de Djidjelli*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
Marçais, William. 1908. *Le dialecte arabe des Ulâd Brāhîm de Saïda (Département d'Oran)*. Paris: Honoré Champion.