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Wolof verbal predication

- Based on phrasal patterns
  Predicative constructions

- Predicative Constructions ≈ Conjugations
tense, aspect, mood, information structure

- Complex predicates

  Verb + Predicative Marker
  - Verb
    lexical meaning
  - Predicative Marker
    grammatical information + subject affix
Predicative constructions

- **Subject Focus**
  - ma-\text{-a} \ liggéey
    - 1SG-PM \ work

- **Presentative**
  - ma-\text{-angi} \ liggéey
    - 1SG-PM \ work

- **Complement Focus**
  - fii \ \text{la-a} \ liggéey
    - here \ PM-1SG \ work

- **Verb Focus**
  - da-\text{-ma} \ liggéey
    - PM-1SG \ work

- **Perfect**
  - liggéey \ na-a
    - work \ PM-1SG

- **Future**
  - dina-\text{-a} \ liggéey
    - PM-1SG \ work

- **Optative**
  - na-\text{-a} \ liggéey
    - PM-1SG \ work
Other grammatical categories

- **Suffix on lexical verb or auxiliary verb**

  **Past**
  
  \[
  \text{da-ma} \quad \text{liggéey-oon} \\
  \text{PM-1SG} \quad \text{work-PST} \\
  'I had worked'
  \]

  **Negation**
  
  \[
  \text{da-ma} \quad \text{liggéey-ul} \\
  \text{PM-1SG} \quad \text{work-NEG} \\
  'I haven't worked'
  \]

  **Imperfective**
  
  \[
  \text{da-ma} \quad \text{di} \quad \text{liggéey} \\
  \text{PM-1SG} \quad \text{IPFV} \quad \text{work} \\
  'I had worked'
  \]
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Morphosyntactic status

- Predicative Constructions
  Lexical or syntactic status?

- Predicative markers
  Syntactic or morphological elements?
  § PM are words (or clitics)

- Criteria
  A. Accent position
  B. Direction of phonological attachment
  C. Verbal affixation
  D. Syntactic separability
  E. Copula functions of some PMs
A. Accent position

- Accent position
  First syllable of the word or prosodic unit

- dafa & dina
  Bear their own accent
  'dafa'  'dofadi'
  PM.3SG   be.a.bit.crazy
  'he is a bit crazy'

⇒ dafa & dina would be words
B. Phonological attachment

- a & angi
  Weak forms

- Direction of phonological attachment
  Always to the left
  \[ \text{kóllëre} = a \quad \text{baax} \quad [\text{kóllëre} = a \to \text{kóllëree}] \]
  \[
  \text{fidelity} = \text{PM} \quad \text{be.good} \\
  \text{'it is fidelity which is good'}
  \]

⇒ a & angi would be clitics (no affixes)
C. Verbal affixation

- Verbal affixation (inflection & derivation)
  Only suffixes / no prefixes
  - dund-\textit{aat} ; dund-\textit{al} ; dund-\textit{ul}
  - live-\textit{ITER}  live-\textit{CAUS}  live-\textit{NEG}
  - 'come alive again ; feed ; do not live'

- All PMs are before the verb
  Except perfect 'na'

\(\Rightarrow\text{ PMs would not be verbal affixes}\)
D. Syntactic separability

- Between PM and lexical verb
  
  Most often: personal pronouns
  
  \[ \text{dina-}nu \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{jaay} \]
  \[ \text{FUT-1PL} \quad \text{3SG} \quad \text{sell} \]
  
  'we will sell it'

- In Optative and Complement Focus

  Lexical subject between PM and lexical verb
  
  \[ \text{na} \quad \text{ndongo yi} \quad \text{dem} \quad \text{Cees} \]
  \[ \text{OPT} \quad \text{pupil} \quad \text{the.PL} \quad \text{go} \quad \text{Thiès} \]
  
  'let the pupils go to Thiès'

  \[ \text{Cees la} \quad \text{ndongo yi} \quad \text{dem} \quad \text{Thiès CFOC pupil the.PL} \quad \text{go} \]
  
  'it is to Thiès that the pupils gone'

\[ \Rightarrow \text{na (OPT) & la would not be affixes (lexical integrity principle)} \]
E. PM as copula

- **la & angi**
  
  Used as Copula

  \[
  \text{doktoor \quad la} \\
  \text{doctor \quad CFOC.3SG} \\
  \text{'he is a doctor'}
  \]

  \[
  \text{ma-angi \quad ci \quad tool \quad bi} \\
  \text{1SG-PRES \quad in \quad field \quad the} \\
  \text{'I am in the field'}
  \]

  ⇒ **la & angi would not be affixes**
The case of 'na' (PRF)

- **Difficulties in the analysis**
  - V + na = prosodic unit
    - Affix or clitic
  - No word between V and 'na'
    - Affix
  - 'na' impossible without verb
    - Affix
  - 'na' just after Verb, as verbal affixes but all affixes always before 'na'
    - Affix or clitic
  - 'na' disappears in negative clause same position as negation affix
    - Affix
  - No suffixes begin with [n] problem with phonological constraints
    - Clitic or word
The case of 'na' (PRF)

- Zwicky & Pullum's criteria
  - Degree of selection with respect to its host
    - High ⇒ Affix
  - Arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations
    - None ⇒ Clitic
  - Morphophonological idiosyncrasies
    - None ⇒ Clitic
  - Semantic idiosyncrasies
    - None ⇒ Clitic
  - Syntactic rules
    - No ⇒ Clitic
  - Attachment to material with clitics
    - No ⇒ Affix

⇒ 'na' would be a clitic undergoing grammaticalization process
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Verb Focus
V1 na-S V2

Future
dina-S V1

Perfect
V1 na-S V2

Optative
na-S V1
Origin of Perfect

Process

Verb Focus

V na-S

bleaching process

(loss of focus features)

Perfect

V na-S
Origin of Perfect

Arguments

- Frequency effect
  - "The mechanism behind bleaching is habituation: a stimulus loses its impact if it occurs very frequently" (Bybee, 2007)
  - [V na-S] highly frequent in Wolof

- Verb in Focus position

- PM-Subject paradigm
## Origin of Perfect Arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Foc</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>-a</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>liggéey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compl. Foc</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>-S</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>fii</em></td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td><em>-a</em></td>
<td><em>liggéey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfect</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
<td>-S</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>liggéey</em></td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
<td><em>-a</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Origin of Perfect Arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complement Focus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG 1</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>-nga</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>-nga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-nu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>-ngeen</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>-ngeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>-ñu</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-ñu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Origin of Future

Verb Focus
V1 na-S V2

impression

Imperfective Focus
di na-S V2

morphologization

Future
dina-S V1
Origin of Future

Arguments

- Imperfective as Future
  - Imperfective used to express Future
  - \textit{dina} (FUT) = \textit{di} (IPFV) + \textit{na} (VFOC)
    Future = Focus on imperfective auxiliary

- Negative Future as Verb Focus
  - Negative Future used to express Negative Focus

  \textit{d-u-ma} \textit{naan}
  FUT-NEG-1SG drink
  'I (never) drink'

  \textit{dina-a} \textit{naan}
  FUT-1SG drink
  'I will drink'
'yell' triggered a semantic change of 'na' by inference

Frozen form
yell $na$ S V2

Focus on verb 'yell'
yell $na$ S V2

instantiation

Verb Focus
V1 $na$ S V2

Optative
$na$ S V1

'yell' was progressively dropped
Origin of Optative

Arguments

- Evidence from oldest grammars
  - No Optative [na-S V]
  - But equivalent construction (same meaning)
  - Describe as frozen construction
  - Involves the verb 'yell' and the PM 'na'

\[
\begin{align*}
yell & \quad na & \quad Omar & \quad dem \\
\text{be.suitable} & \quad PM & \quad Omar & \quad go
\end{align*}
\]

'it is suitable to let Omar go'

- Explains why the lexical subject is between the PM and the verb in Optative

\[
\begin{align*}
a & \quad Omar & \quad dem \\
\text{OPT} & \quad Omar & \quad go
\end{align*}
\]

'let Omar go'
Overview

- Verb Focus
  V1 na-S V2

- Future
  dina-S V1

- Perfect
  V1 na-S V2

- Optative
  na-S V1

- Imperfective Focus
  di na-S V2

- Verb
  yell

Focus on verb 'yell'
yell na-S V2
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Morphosyntactic status of PMs is not clear
  - But they are not affixes

Predicative constructions are syntactic constructions
  - They are not morphological units

Diachony can explain the morphosyntactic heterogeneity of these constructions

Polygrammaticalization process accounts for characteristics of these constructions
  - Neutral value of Perfect
  - Actual focus meaning of *dina* negative form
  - Syntactic position of the lexical subject in Optative

Provides new perspectives to analyze the relations between such constructions
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