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Atlantic Languages

*Locative, Presentative and Progressive Constructions*

- **Atlantic languages**
  - Very distant (genetically) from each others
- **In world's languages**
  - Generally, verbal morphology renews itself quickly
    (Creissels 2006)

- Verbal morphology displays a lot of differences within Atlantic languages

- **However, in most Atlantic languages:**
  - Locative construction
  - May be used as Presentative or Progressive construction
  - Structure of the constructions & Form of the markers
    Specific to Atlantic languages
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Structure of the Construction(s)

- **Locative Construction:**
  
  Subject (NP or disjunctive pronoun) + Marker + Locative Phrase

- **Presentative/Progressive Construction:**
  
  Subject (NP or disjunctive pronoun) + Marker + Verb Phrase
Structure of the Construction(s)

Laalaa (Cangin)

- **Locative construction**
  \[Mi \quad yuu \quad ga \quad kaan.\]
  PRO1SG  LOC  PREP  home
  'I am at home.'

- **Presentative construction**
  \[Mi \quad yuu \quad tík \quad cëen.\]
  PRO1SG  PRST  cook  dinner
  'I am cooking the dinner.'
Structure of the Construction(s)

**Joola Banjal**

- **Locative construction**
  \[ \text{Atejo umu búsol yan yayu.} \]
  Atejo COP behind house the
  'Atejo is behind the house.'

- **Presentative construction**
  \[ \text{Atejo umu ni bu-rokk.} \]
  Atejo COP PREP INF-work
  'Atejo is working.'
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Marker of the Construction(s)

- **General form:**

```
  Amalgam
   /     \
  /       \
Subject  Marker
   |       |
  |       |
  S     DEIC1
   |       |
   |       |
DEIC2  CL
```

Marker of the Construction(s)

- The marker may fuse with the subject pronoun (S)

- The marker is constituted by:
  - a deictic marker (DEIC1)
    (which may be a link with the subject pronoun)
  - a base, constituted by:
    - a noun class marker (CL)
    - another deictic marker (DEIC2)

- CL usually agrees with the subject
- DEIC1 usually agrees with DEIC2
Marker of the Construction(s)

- **Sereer**
  
  *Me-x-e* ñaan-aa.
  
  PRO1SG-CL.HUM;SG-PX eat-IPFV
  
  'I am eating.'

- **Laalaa**
  
  *Mi (i) y-uu tik cëen.*
  
  PRO1SG (PX) CL.HUM;SG-PX cook dinner
  
  'I am cooking the dinner.'

- **Joola Banjal**
  
  *Atejo u-m-u ni bu-rokk.*
  
  Atejo DEIC-CL-PX PREP INF-work
  
  'Atejo is working.'
# Marker of the Construction(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Amalgam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>DEIC 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>isolate</td>
<td>Wolof</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyun-Buy</td>
<td>Buy</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niamone</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
<td>DEM.PX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djifanghor</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>DEM.PX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenda-Jaad</td>
<td>Bedik</td>
<td>no marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badiaranke</td>
<td>marker displaying a different form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fula-Sereer</td>
<td>Pulaar</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sereer</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cangin</td>
<td>Laalaa</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>(DEIC 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palor</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ndut</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Manjaku</td>
<td>Mankanya</td>
<td>marker displaying a different form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pepel</td>
<td>marker displaying a different form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joola</td>
<td>Banjal</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>DEM.DT ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwatay</td>
<td>PRO-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balant</td>
<td>Kentohe</td>
<td>marker displaying a different form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isolate</td>
<td>Bijogo</td>
<td>marker displaying a different form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most Atlantic languages display a locative-presentative construction.

Structure of these constructions and marker's form are similar in most languages.

Coherent with the actual classification:
- All languages without specific marker belong to some groups (Tenda-Jaad, Manjaku, Balant, Bijogo).
- In languages of the same group, markers have similar forms.

Attested in the two main branches (North and Centre) come from Proto-Atlantic.
In languages in contact with Atlantic languages:

- Soninke & Mandinka (Mande)
  - markers derive from perception verbs (*see, look*)
- Jalonke (Mande)
- Casamancian (Portuguese-based Creole)
- Zenaga (Berber)
- Mel languages
  - construction and marker formally different
  - no link between Locative and Presentative

One exception: Temne (Mel)
  - Language contact?
A genetic inheritance?

- **Mandinka (Mande)**
  
  *Yír-óó be boy-óó la.*
  
  tree-DET COP fall-DET POSTP
  
  'The tree is falling.'

- **Casamancian (Portuguese-based Creole)**
  
  *I na kumé karna di purku.*
  
  S3SG IPFV eat meat of pork
  
  'He is eating some pork.'

- **Temne (Mel)**
  
  *Ká-gbɛŋbɛ kə fúmpɔ k-aj.*
  
  CLk.DF-chili PRO.CLk fall CLk-DT
  
  'The chili is falling.'
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In several Atlantic languages, the marker is similar to demonstrative determiner.

Hypotheses:

- Demonstrative grammaticalized into Locative Copula.
- In some languages (Cangin, Sereer), Demonstrative first grammaticalized into Definite Determiner.
- In some languages (Palor-Ndut, Buy, Wolof), the Determiner has frozen (human class).
- Locative Copula has been used as Presentative Marker, and/or grammaticalized into Progressive Marker.
Grammaticalisation path(s):

- Demonstrative determiner
- Definite determiner
- Locative copula
- Presentative marker
- Progressive marker
In Proto-Atlantic: *DEIC1-CL-DEIC2

Hypotheses:

- **DEIC2** = deictic marker of demonstrative or definite 
  *attested in all languages*

- **DEIC1** = agrees with **DEIC2**
  *attested in some languages belonging to North (Wolof, Nyun, Cangin) and Centre (Joola) branches*

- **CL** = agrees (in noun class) with the subject
  *attested in all languages*
  *[has frozen in default (human) class in some languages (Palor-Ndut, Buy)]*
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In most Atlantic languages:

- Locative construction, may be used as Presentative or Progressive construction
  Link between Locative, Presentative and Progressive not peculiar to Atlantic languages, but attested in a lot of languages (various families) (Heine & Kuteva 2002)

- Structure of the construction & Form of the marker
  - Specific to Atlantic languages
  - Not attested in languages in contact with Atlantic languages
A genetic inheritance

- No typological convergence
- No language contact

Locative-Presentative Construction from Proto-Atlantic

- Reconstruction: *DEIC1-CL-DEIC2
- Marker grammaticalized from a demonstrative determiner
- Marker has frozen in some languages
Thank you

for your attention
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