Pluractional posing as Progressive

A construction between lexical and grammatical aspect

Eva Schultze-Berndt

University of Manchester, UK

To appear in: *Australian Journal of Linguistics* (accepted Nov 2011)

Abstract

This paper proposes an analysis of an aspectual construction in Jaminjung, a non-Pama-Nyungan Australian language of the Mirndi family. At first sight, this looks like construction conveying grammatical aspect, specifically progressive, since it bears both formal and functional resemblances to typical progressive constructions. At closer investigation, however, the two morphemes crucially involved in the construction, a grammatical morpheme =*mayan* and a “semantically light” inflecting verb, in their combination can be shown to convey lexical rather than grammatical aspect: =*mayan*, which occurs in a wider range of contexts, can be analyzed as a marker of iterativity, and the inflecting verbs -*yu* ‘be’ and -*ijga* ‘go’ signal atelicity of different flavours, and are selected as classificatory verbs in analogy to other closed-class verbs in complex predicates in Jaminjung. The findings support a distinction made in the literature between event-internal and event-external pluractionality. Of all pluractionals, only event-internal iterative expressions (which include not only complex predicates but also iterated direct speech) are overtly marked as atelic in Jaminjung, and only those exhibit the functional overlap with a progressive. The study of this construction thus provides an insight into the pathway of grammaticalization between lexical and grammatical aspect.

Keywords: lexical aspect, progressive, atelicity, iterative, pluractionality, complex predication, grammaticalization, Australian languages

1. Introduction

This paper proposes an analysis of a construction in Jaminjung which at first sight looks like an analytic construction conveying progressive meaning. It will be argued, however, that it is better analyzed as a subtype of complex predicate construction which conveys lexical rather than grammatical aspect, while exhibiting properties of a typical progressive construction to some extent. This construction will be referred to as a “Pseudo-Progressive” (P-PROG) in the discussion.

Jaminjung is a highly endangered language belonging to the Mirndi family and spoken in the Victoria River District in Northern Australia. This language name is used here for two named varieties, Jaminjung and Ngaliwurru, which are mutually intelligible and exhibit mainly lexical differences. As will be evident in some of the examples below, code-switching and borrowing from Kriol, an English-lexified creole which is now the lingua franca of a large area in Northern Australia and the first language of many younger people, are common (Schultze-Berndt 2007).

The main grammatical characteristics of Jaminjung include a great degree of flexibility in word order depending on considerations of information packaging in discourse. Jaminjung also exhibits “double-marking” (in the sense of Nichols 1986) in that core arguments are both cross-referenced by pronominal prefixes on Inflecting Verbs and expressed as full NPs with case marking (following an ergative-absolutive pattern) indicating grammatical relations, although omission of argument NPs is highly frequent.

Most importantly for the purposes of the discussion to follow, Jaminjung has two distinct predicative parts of speech: a closed class of Inflecting Verbs (IVs) with approximately 30 members (depending on the variety and speaker), and an open class of Uninflecting Verbs (UVs), also termed “coverbs” or “preverbs” in the literature. IVs, as the name suggests, take the above-mentioned prefixes for person and number as well as a range of tense, aspect and mood markers which will be discussed briefly in Section 2; marking of these categories is obligatory. UVs, on the other hand, are unmarked, with the curious exception of the marker =*mayan* which appears in the P-PROG. This particular part of speech distinction is an areal phenomenon found in a number of unrelated languages in Northern Australia (for overview discussions see e.g. Capell 1979; Dixon 2001; McGregor 2002; Schultze-Berndt 2003). Not surprisingly considering the closed-class nature of IVs, the majority of predicates in finite clauses are complex predicates, composed of a UV and an IV.

The Pseudo-Progressive (P-PROG) is illustrated in the following pairs of examples, which also show an apparently productive relationship between the P-PROG and non-progressive expressions. Formally, the latter (in the b examples) are “canonical” complex predicates consisting of a UV and an IV which is selected on the basis of semantic compatibility with the UV (see further Section 3.1). In the P-PROG (the a examples), the same UV is followed by the bound grammatical morpheme =*mayan*, and the IV is -*yu* ‘be’. The reasons for representing =*mayan* as a clitic will become apparent in Section 4.

In (1), the IV -*yu* ‘be’ contrasts with the general action verb -*junggu* ‘say/do’ used in the canonical complex predicate (see also Section 4.2 below), both with the action interrogative *warndug* ‘do what?’ in the UV slot.

- (1) a. *Warndug=mayan burru-yu?*¹
 UV.do.what=ASP 3PL-IV.be.PRS
 ‘What are they doing?’
- b. *Warndug=biya yurru-wu-yu,*²
 UV.do.what=SEQ 12PL>3SG-POT-IV.say/do
dij=ja yurru-w-iyaj?
 UV.stay.overnight=QU 12PL-POT-IV.be
 ‘What are we going to do now, are we going to camp out?’

In (2), the IV selected by the UV *burlug* ‘drink’ is -*mind*i ‘eat’ when not in the P-PROG. Note that the agent of the drinking is in the (unmarked) absolutive case in the (a) example and in the ergative in (b); while ergative marking is optional in Jaminjung and thus could be omitted from (b), it is not possible to add the ergative marker to the agent in (a), in other words, transitive clauses involving a UV marked with =*mayan* and an intransitive IV obligatorily involve a double absolutive frame. We will return to this observation in Section 5.

- (2) a. *Janyungbari buliki burlug=mayan ga-yu gugu.*
 another cow UV.drink=ASP 3SG-IV.be.PRS water
 ‘The other cow is drinking water.’

- b. *Majani gugu burlug gani-bida ngayin-ni thanthu-ni.*
 maybe water UV.drink 3SG>3SG-POT:eat animal-ERG DEM-ERG
 ‘Maybe it wants to drink water, that animal.’

Example (3) shows the UV *yirr* ‘move out’ in the P-PROG and in a canonical complex predicate where it combines with an IV of manipulation (glossed as ‘get/handle’) in a causative reading (the same UV may also combine with verbs of locomotion).

- (3) a. *Yirr-yirr=mayan ga-yu=nu ngathalany.*
 RDP-move.out=ASP 3SG-be.PRS=3SG.OBL tongue
 ‘She is sticking her tongue out at her.’ (describing action performed for the purpose of elicitation)
- b. *Wirra yirr-yirr ganiny-ngangga-m nganthanug?*
 hair RDP-move.out 3SG>2SG-get/handle-PRS why
 ‘She pulls your hair, why?’

Finally, example (4) illustrates the contrasting IVs *-ma* ‘hit’ and *-yu* ‘be’ with the UV *wiyu* ‘twist hair into a string’, in the canonical complex predicate and in the P-PROG construction, respectively, in immediate contiguity in the same text.

- (4) *Wiyu=biyang burra-ma-nyi::,*
 twist=SEQ 3PL>3SG-hit-IMPF
 “*nganthan-gu wiyu=mayan na-yu, mugurla?*”
 what-DAT twist=ASP 2SG-be.PRS FaSi
nga-yina=nu.
 1SG>3SG-say/do.IMPF=3SG.OBL
 ‘They used to twist (hairstings), “what are you twisting for, auntie?” I used to say to her.’

At first sight, and considering only its syntagmatic properties and form-meaning correspondences, the expressions just illustrated appear to have the properties of a typical

progressive construction (i.e. one which is frequently attested cross-linguistically; cf. Bybee & Dahl (1989: 80-81)). First, they denote an event that is ongoing at reference time. Second, they feature dynamic predicates. Third, they are formed by the combination of a grammatical formative (= *mayan*, for the time being glossed as ASPECTUAL marker) on the lexical component of an analytically formed predicate in combination with an (apparently) grammaticalized use of a locative verb (-*yu* ‘be’), a cross-linguistically well attested ingredient in progressive constructions (see Section 3.2 for further discussion and references). Fourth, the “lexical” rather than the “grammatical” verb determines the valency (at least as far as the number of arguments is concerned) of the resulting expression, as shown in the transitive clause in (2), that is, unlike most other expressions featuring the intransitive IV -*yu* ‘be’, expressions in the P-PROG can have an absolutive object. Thus, the construction as a whole looks like a periphrastic progressive, again in line with cross-linguistic tendencies (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 77), in the sense that this category is expressed not synthetically, but by a combination of a lexical and a grammatical verb plus possibly other markers, in many languages of the world.

At the same time, the P-PROG also looks remarkably like any other type of complex predicate in Jaminjung, i.e. it consists of a lexically specific Uninflecting Verb and a semantically generic Inflecting Verb. Basically, the P-PROG involves substituting the IV -*yu* ‘be’ (or, alternatively, as we will see in Section 3.2, -*ijga* ‘go’) for the IV selected on the basis of semantic compatibility. To make things even more complicated, the marker =*mayan* is also not uniquely associated with the P-PROG, but is used in a number of other, though related, functions (see Section 4).

In the remainder of this paper, I will attempt to disentangle the contribution of the two main components of the P-PROG, i.e. the specific Inflecting Verb(s) used, and the marker =*mayan*. As a background to the discussion, the Jaminjung tense and aspect system will be sketched briefly in Section 2. Section 3 offers a characterization of Jaminjung complex predicates in general (3.1), before turning to the semantic contribution of the Inflecting Verbs used in the P-PROG (3.2). Section 4 explores the range of functions of the marker =*mayan* which allows us to narrow down its semantic in the P-PROG. The concluding Section 5 brings together the various strands of argumentation. The P-PROG will ultimately be analyzed as a subtype of atelic complex predicate, but the semantics of both =*mayan* and Inflecting Verbs used in the P-PROG will allow us to understand better why the P-PROG has properties of a typical progressive, albeit to a limited extent. Implications for the typology of Pluractionality will also be discussed at this point.

2 A sketch of the Jaminjung tense/aspect system

Formally, as already mentioned above, all tense/aspect/modal categories (except for the P-PROG) are marked on the Inflecting Verb (IV) in Jaminjung; the paradigm is summarized in Table 1. Modal categories are marked by means of prefixes (distinguishing imperative, irrealis, and potential, while the indicative is formally unmarked). Tense/aspect categories are marked by suffixes and/or complete or partial stem suppletion. There is a basic distinction between present and past tense, and within past tense, between perfective and imperfective forms. The potential modal prefix, which combined with the bare stem often has a future interpretation, can also be combined with the imperfective suffix, in an interpretation of potential or intention holding in the past (Verstraete 2006). The potential prefix is not compatible with any other tense/aspect marking, and will be disregarded in the following discussion. Up to four distinct stem forms (suppletive for some verbs) are attested for IVs: the bare stem for all exclusively mood-marked categories (imperative, irrealis, potential), the imperfective stem for past and potential imperfective, the past perfective stem, and the present tense stem. The structure of the Inflecting Verb is schematically presented in (5).

(5) Structure of the Inflecting Verb

(Mood1-)PronA-(Mood2-)(Pron.U-)**IV.Stem**(-REFL)(-Tense/Aspect)

MOOD	TENSE/ASPECT/(Modality)			
Imperative		Potential	Past	Present
<i>ba-manggu</i> IMP-hit ‘hit him/her/it!’	PFV	<i>gadi-ba</i> 3SG>3SG-POT:hit ‘he will/wants to hit him’	<i>gani-mangu</i> 3SG>3SG-hit.PST ‘he hit him’	<i>gani-ma-m</i> 3SG>3SG-hit-PRS ‘he hits him’
Irrealis				
<i>yani-ma</i> IRR:3SG>3SG-hit ‘he might hit him’	IPFV	<i>gana-ba-nyi</i> 3SG>3SG-POT:hit-IMPF ‘he would have hit him / wanted to hit him’	<i>gana-ma-nyi</i> 3SG>3SG-hit-IMPF ‘he was hitting / used to hit him’	

Table 1. TAM Paradigm of inflecting verb *-ma* ‘hit’ (3SG>3SG forms; Imperative: 2SG>3SG)

Table 1 shows clearly that the P-PROG is not part, in any sense, of the TAM paradigm of Inflecting Verbs. Since IVs do not have non-finite forms, and do not combine to form serial verb constructions, it is impossible for an IV to function as the host for the marker =*mayan* and in addition to combine with the IV -*yu* ‘be’ in the way that the UV does in the P-PROG (although we will see in 4.3 that a combination with =*mayan* is rare but possible). Thus, as a first major restriction on the applicability of the P-PROG, one can state that it can only be formed with Uninflecting Verbs (UVs), lending support to the hypothesis that the P-PROG may in fact be just a special case of complex predication.

Turning now to the functions of the tense/aspect forms, as one would expect, past perfective forms typically appear when in a sequence of events each is completed before another begins. In the terminology of Segmented Discourse Representation Theory (SDRT), we are dealing with a discourse relation of narration (Asher and Lascarides 2003). A text example is (6).

- (6) *Cave Spring-bina* *yurr-ijga-ny=mulu* \
 place.name-ALL 13PL-go-PST=COLL
bilij *garrb=mayan* \
 ashes hold.multiple.entities=ASP
en .. buru *yirru-ruma-ny* \
 and return 13PL-come-PST
malajagu=biya birdij gana *Nangari-ni* \
 goanna=SEQ find 3SG>3SG-chop.PST subsection.name-ERG
 ‘We all went to Cave Spring, gathering ashes, and we came back, (and) then
 Nangari found a goanna.’

Past imperfective forms have two major functions. They, too, can appear in clauses in a relation of narration to each other, but the interpretation in this case is invariably habitual; this is in fact the most frequent function of the past imperfective. A typical example is the text fragment in (7).

- (7) *Buliki=biya* *du* *burr-ijja-na* *ngayin*,
 cow=SEQ shoot 3PL>3SG-poke-IMPF meat/animal

juld-um *burra-ma-nyi* *gurra* \

salt-TR 3PL>3SG-hit-IMPF TAG

juld-um=*biyang* *burra-ma-nyi:::*,

salt-TR=SEQ 3PL>3SG-hit-IMPF

jala-jalalang *yirr-arra-nyi*,

RDP-hang 13PL>3SG-put-IMPF

larrman *gan-ina* \

dry 3SG>3SG-say/do.IMPF

‘They used to shoot cattle, salt it (the meat), right; they used to salt it, (and) we used to hang it up, (and) it used to become dry.’

The difference between the perfective illustrated in (6) and the imperfective shown in (7) is that the perfective indicates that the sequence of events took place only once while the imperfective signals that each of the events in sequence was repeated on multiple occasions – hence the habitual reading.

The second function of the past imperfective is the one that more clearly meets a Reichenbachian definition of imperfective aspect expressing a situation where the utterance’s event time (the temporal extension of the situation that is being talked about) is properly included in the reference time (the time being talked about) (cf. e.g. Klein 1994). In terms of SDRT’s discourse relations, imperfectives typically provide a background – an event that is not presented as bounded – for a bounded event. Example (8) comes from a description of videos designed by J. Bohnemeyer for the elicitation of temporal relations and depicting a number of overlapping or sequential actions involving two participants (Bohnemeyer 1998).

(8) *Janyung* *larriny* *gan-ijja-na* \

another paperbark 3SG>3SG-poke-IMPF

... *en* *banana* *durd* *gan-angu*,

and banana hold.single.entity 3SG>3SG-get/handle.PST

thawaya *ga-gba* \

eat 3SG-be.PST

‘The other one was writing a letter ... and she picked up a banana, and ate it (while writing the letter).’

The next example of a similar type comes from a well-known mythical narrative about a fight, in Dreamtime, between two large birds, Emu and Brolga, before they took on the form of birds and their present-day characteristics, which are explained by the events in the story. The text preceding the example establishes the multiple locations where the fight took place and already mentions the fighting. In the (a) part of example (9), the fighting is again mentioned, in the imperfective, as a background statement to the immediately contiguous account of the individual events in (9b) which are presented in the perfective.

- (9) a. *Buny-mama-ji-na* *jiya* \ *bala-ni* \
 3DU-hit-REFL-IMPF there plain-LOC
bala=ma *ga-yu* *gujugu*, *minygi=na*, *Gulugulu* \
 plain=SUBORD 3SG-be.PRS big what's.it=SEQ place.name
 ‘They were fighting there, on the plain, where the big plain is, at what’s it called, Gulugulu.’ (Imperfective)

- b. *Buny-ma-ja*, *gurdurru-ni* *gani-ma* *bag-bag* \
 3DU-hit-REFL.PST fighting.stick-INST 3SG>3SG-hit.PST RDP-break
wing \ *marrabarra* *bag* *gani-ma* \
 wing feather/wing break 3SG>3SG-hit.PST
minyga-rni =malang \ *gurdarrg-di* \ *gumurrinyji* \
 what's.it-ERG=GIVEN brolga-ERG emu
jarlaj *gani-yu=nu* \
 jealous 3SG>3SG-say/do.PST=3SG.OBL
 ‘The two fought, and she hit her with a fighting stick such that she broke her wings; she broke her wings, what’s it called, the brolga did, (to the) emu; she was jealous of her.’ (Perfective)

Finally, present tense forms are underspecified for perfectivity. They can encode generic statements as in (10), which is also from the Emu and Brolga narrative and states the characteristics of emus in general which are seen as resulting from the mythical Emu having its wings broken by Brolga.

- (10) *Gurrany=biya diwu ga-ngga,*
 NEG=SEQ fly/throw 3SG-go.PRS
*jarlig=biya bardawurru gani-ma-ya *
 child=SEQ many 3SG>3SG-have-PRS
*gumurrinyji-ni=mulang *
 emu-ERG=GIVEN

‘It does not fly now, (but) it has many children, the emu.’

Present tense forms can also describe an unbounded (11) or bounded (12) state of affairs that holds at speech time.

- (11) *Det janyungbari gurrany jinij ng-antha.*
 that other NEG name 1SG>3SG-take.PRS

‘That other one I don’t remember the name.’ (discussing named places)

- (12) *Malara=biya dibard ganuny-ngunga-m, ba-ngawu!*
 frog=SEQ jump 3SG>3DU-leave-PRS IMP-see

‘The frog now is jumping away leaving the two, look!’ (describing a picture in the Frog Story picture book where the frog is just leaving the jar that it has been kept in)

In its “ongoing event” function, the simple present tense overlaps with the use of present tense P-PROG forms, present tense being the tense/aspect value most frequently attested in the corpus for the P-PROG. For example, in an ongoing description of a video (at the time of watching it), both the P-PROG and the simple present descriptions in (13) were used, immediately following each other.

- (13) a. *Burlug=mayan ga-yu=mindi.*
 drink=ASP 3SG-be.PRS=12DU

- b. *Burlug gan-unggu-m=mindi.*
 drink 3SG>3SG-say/do-PRS=12DU

Both: ‘She is drinking (you and me watching).’

Other examples where the P-PROG is used to describe (or enquire about) an event that is ongoing at the time of speaking (a function expected for a progressive) are (1) to (4) above, and (14) below. The latter, in addition, shows that the reference time for the ongoing event can be shifted to the future.

- (14) *Gad-gad=mayan burru-yu=nu (...)*
 RDP-cut=ASP 3PL-be.PRS=3SG.OBL
gad-gad=mayan burru-w-iyaj dina-wu-ngunyi
 RDP-cut=ASP 3PL-POT-be dinner-DAT-ABL

‘They are cutting it (grass) for her; (...) they will be cutting (it) until dinnertime.’

Curiously, both past perfective and past imperfective forms of the P-PROG are vanishingly rare in the corpus. The available examples suggest, though, that, like the past imperfective, the past P-PROG – whether in the perfective as in (15) and (16) or in the imperfective as in (17) and (34) – functions to provide a background for another event. In (15), again from the Emu and Brolga story, the “going back and forth” includes the specific instance of returning in the following intonation unit. In (16), from a description of events in an elicitation video, the actor was picking up books and then depositing them, one by one, on top of a pile on a chair, eventually leading to the collapse of the pile; thus the depositing is plausibly the foreground of the description, not the picking up. In (17), the events of the crocodiles eating cattle and the woman cooking overlap (she is watching them), but the former is presented as backgrounded by the use of the P-PROG. A further example of the equivalence of the past P-PROG with the past imperfective is (61).

- (15) *Gurdarrg=biya ga-jga-ny yinyjungiya *
 brolga=SEQ 3SG-go.PST PROX
*buru=mayan ga-gba *
 return=ASP 3SG-be.PST
*gurdarrg .. buru ga-jga-ny, minygi=na ga-gba *
 brolga return 3SG-go-PST what's.it:LOC=now 3SG-be.PST
*gayu=ni yina *
 3SG-be.PRS=FOC DIST

‘The Brolga now, she went over here; she kept coming back. The brolga went back, and stayed at what’s it called; she is now there.’

- (16) *Tharran marlayi,*
 DEM woman
jurrb=mayan=mang gan-arra-ny=ngunggu buk,
 place.on.pile=ASP=SUBORD 3SG>3SG-put-PST=2SG.OBL book
garrb=mayan ga-gba,
 hold.multiple.entities=ASP 3SG-be.PST
*jarr gan-arra-ny jiya-bina *
 put.down(sg) 3SG>3SG-put-PST chair-ALL
jamang burrurrug ga-rdba-ny=ni
 finished scattered 3SG-fall-PST=FOC

‘That woman that repeatedly placed the books on a heap for you, she was picking them up, put one down on the chair, then they fell over (and) scattered.’

- (17) *Th.=biya ngiya ga-gba waga, wirrigaja, mangarra *
 [name]=SEQ PROX 3SG-be.PST sit cook plant.food
*ning-mayan burr-anyi *
 break.off=ITER3PL-be.IMPF

‘Th. was sitting here, cooking bread; they (crocodiles) were biting off (flesh from the cows)’

The most plausible explanation for the scarcity of past P-PROG expressions and their discourse function when they do occur is that the existence of the past imperfective synthetic forms pre-empts (“blocks”) the use of the P-PROG. This could be taken as evidence for a grammatical aspectual function, i.e. a progressive function proper, of the P-PROG. However, as we will see in the following section, there is also considerable evidence for an analysis of the P-PROG as a complex predicate and a lexical aspect marking function of =*mayan*.

3 The Pseudo-Progressive as a type of complex predicate

3.1 Complex predicates in Jaminjung

Before discussing the potential complex predicate status of the P-PROG in more detail, some background information on the general properties of complex predicates in Jaminjung is provided in this subsection. As already indicated, Jaminjung has two distinct parts of speech in predicative function. In finite clauses, Inflecting Verbs (IVs) – the class of predicates taking obligatory prefixes and suffixes for person/number and for temporal, aspectual and modal categories – occur either as simple predicates, or they form complex predicates with an Uninflecting Verb (UV). In some types of subordinate clause, Uninflecting Verbs function as the main predicate. The main features distinguishing Inflecting Verbs, Uninflecting Verbs and nominals are summarized in Table 2.

	Inflecting Verbs (IVs)	Uninflecting Verbs (UVs)	Nominals
Affixation for Person, TAM	obligatory	impossible	impossible
Predicative use	in independent and dependent (subord) clauses	in dependent clauses and complex predicates	in independent (e.g. ascriptive) verbless clauses
Determination	impossible	impossible	possible
Nominalisation	impossible	partially possible (only agentive nouns)	n.a.

Table 2. Morphosyntactic differences between Inflecting Verbs (IVs), Uninflecting Verbs (UVs), and Nominals in Jaminjung

Since IVs form a closed class, the majority of predicates in Jaminjung are complex predicates, consisting of an IV and a UV (rarely two UVs; in this case each of them has to be semantically compatible with the same IV). They meet the widely accepted definition (see e.g. Butt 1997: 108; 2010) of complex predicates as monoclausal constructions, confined to a single intonation unit, where two or more predicative constituents jointly contribute to the argument structure of the clause, share at least one argument, and share values for tense, aspect, modality and polarity; for details on these points, see Schultze-Berndt (2000: Ch. 3). While IV and UV are clearly distinct phonological words, they constitute a close-knit formal unit: they are usually immediately contiguous, with the UV preceding the IV, although the reverse order is also possible. In terms of both their lexical semantics and their argument structure they form

nuclear junctures (or “merger” constructions, in the terminology of Baker and Harvey (2010)). While IV and UV can have different argument structures, there is a requirement for all available arguments of the two components to be merged, in other words, neither of the components can introduce an additional participant that would duplicate a grammatical function already contributed by the other, as would be the case for two bivalent predicates each taking different objects. Usually, the valency of the IV includes or equals that of the UV; the reverse case will be discussed below (see Schultze-Berndt 2000: Ch. 4 for details).

As is to be expected in the case of a closed class, IVs tend to have generic, schematic meanings. The important point for the purpose of the analysis of the P-PROG is that IVs can be regarded as classificatory (Silverstein 1986; Schultze-Berndt 2000; McGregor 2002): they specify the general type of event that the complex predicate encodes, irrespective of the more specific semantic relationship between UV and IV, which is variable. To give just a few examples: in combination with a UV encoding a specific position as in (18), the IV of general location *-yu* ‘be’ categorizes the entire event as one of locative relation, and the IV *-irdba* ‘fall’ functions as a classificatory verb of change of location. Apart from categorising general intransitive motion events, the IV *-ijga* ‘go’ categorizes certain combinations as expressions of change of state as in (19). The transitive IV *-angu* ‘get/handle’ regularly occurs in expressions encoding manipulation and contact without impact. The actual semantic relationship with the UV can be one of cause–result as in (19), or one of semantic inclusion (washing being a subtype of manipulation), as in (21). All complex predicates involving the IV *-ruma* ‘come’ encode motion towards the deictic centre; in addition, a UV can specify the manner or path, as in (20). This type of classification analysis can be extended to all IVs in Jaminjung (for details see Schultze-Berndt 2000: Ch. 5).

- (18) a. *Lalamag* *mun* *ga-yu*.
 saltwater.crocodile belly.down 3SG-be.PRS
 ‘The saltwater crocodile is (lying) belly down.’
- b. *Mun* *ga-rdba-ny=mindi=biyang*.
 belly.down 3SG-fall-PST=12DU=SEQ
 ‘She bent down (i.e. assumed a belly down position) then.’

- (19) a. *Marring-marring, lag-lag ga-jga-ny.*
 RDP-bad RDP-split 3SG-go-PST
 ‘(They are) bad, they have cracked.’ (boab nuts)
- b. *Lag ba-wurra-ngu=ni jurruny!*
 split IMP-2PL>3SG-get/handle=FOC lower.arm/hand
 ‘Split his hands apart!’
- (20) a. *Yugung ga-ram ngarlu-bina.*
 run 3SG-come:PRS shade-ALL
 ‘She comes running to the shade (tree).’
- b. *Ngayug=biya burduj nga-wu-rum.*
 1SG=SEQ go.up 1SG-POT-come
 ‘I will then come up.’
- (21) *Mali gurrany gulyu nganth-angga-m=ngarrgu.*
 thing NEG rinse 2SG>3SG-get/handle-PRS=1SG.OBL
 ‘You don’t wash clothes for me!’ (uttered as a (mock) complaint)

As the examples above also show, often more than one IV can combine with the same UV, resulting in different readings. The pattern of co-occurrence with IVs and the resulting interpretation is a diagnostic tool for both argument structure and lexical aspect (*aktionsart*, actionality) of UVs. For example, the co-occurrence with both the intransitive stative locative verb *-yu* ‘be’ and the change of location verb *-irdba* ‘fall’, as in (18), is diagnostic of monovalent stative UVs such as *mun* ‘belly down’. Intransitive change of state (achievement) UVs, for example *lag* ‘split’ in (19), combine with *-ijga* ‘go’ in an inchoative reading, as well as with a number of transitive IVs specifying a type of contact or trajectory in a causative reading. Non-stative atelic UVs (activities) combine with intransitive or transitive locomotion verbs if they encode a manner of motion (e.g. *yugung* ‘run’ in (20)); others combine with the

IV *-yu* ‘be’ in an atelic reading (see Section 3.2 below). A number of bivalent activity UVs exclusively combine with a transitive IV of manipulation and contact; this is the case for *gulyu* ‘wash, rinse’ in (21). This is by no means an exhaustive list of UV classes; for details, see Schultze-Berndt (2000: Ch. 6).

A final observation to be made in this context is that a number of IVs are systematically employed, sometimes in secondary readings, to express distinctions in lexical aspect. For example, with UVs encoding a type of boundary crossing such as *malang* ‘go across’, IVs of locomotion convey an accomplishment reading (locomotion across) while the IV *-irdba* ‘fall’ conveys an achievement reading (the punctual event of crossing the boundary); despite what the crude gloss suggests this IV is not restricted to downward motion (see Schultze-Berndt 2000: 230-236).

- (22) a. *Malang yirri-w-ijga, buya yirri-w-ijga.*
 cross 13PL-POT-go downstream 13PL-POT-go
 ‘Let’s go across (the river), and then downstream.’

- b. *Ivanhoe-ngunyi=biya mala-malang yirri-rdirdba=ngarndi,*
 place.name-ABL=SEQ RDP-cross 13PL-fall.IMPF=SFOC
buru yirr-inyji yina-wurla na,
 return 13PL-go.IMPF DIST-DIR then
 ‘From Ivanhoe station then we used to cross (the river) and we used to go back over there.’

A similar contrast between locomotion and boundary crossing is achieved for UVs denoting emerging or appearance by the IV *-ma* ‘hit’ in a secondary, intransitive reading, as shown in (23).

- (23) a. *bul ga-ruma-ny* ‘to come out’
 b. *bul gani-mangu* ‘to appear’

Similarly, a subset of UVs of contact and manipulation, usually combined with *-angu* ‘get/handle’ in an atelic reading, can also be combined with *-ma* ‘hit’ in a (transitive) telic reading of complete affectedness; consider the following two pairs of complex predicates:

(24) a. *yurr gan-angu* ‘to rub (surface)’

b. *yurr gani-mangu* ‘to completely cover (surface, with substance) by rubbing’

(25) a. *wunyu gan-angu* ‘to wipe (surface)’

b. *wunyu gani-mangu* ‘to clean surface by wiping’

Keeping in mind the classificatory nature of IVs and their potential of signalling distinctions in lexical aspect (as well as transitivity) with the same UV, I will now look in more detail at the semantic contribution of the Inflecting Verb *-yu* ‘be’ in the P-PROG, as well as that of a second IV, *-ijga* ‘go’, which is also used in this construction.

3.2 *The contribution of the Inflecting Verb to the Pseudo-Progressive*

The Inflecting Verb *-yu* ‘be’ is the only intransitive stative verb in Jaminjung. Its primary meaning is that of a locative verb, that is, it predicates of a figure that it is at rest, and implies that it is also located (Schultze-Berndt 2000: 222-224). It is also used to predicate existence. As a locative verb, *-yu* ‘be’ regularly combines with stative UVs encoding a posture, position, or configuration, which form a large class in Jaminjung; an example is *mun* ‘belly down’ in (18) above. It also combines with a smaller set of other stage-level stative UVs, e.g. *guyawud* ‘hungry’ and *yarrajgu* ‘be afraid’.³

(26) *Yarrajgu=biya ga-yu* *nindu, ba-ngawu!*
afraid 3SG-be.PRS horse IMP-SEE

‘The horse is frightened, look!’

The relevant sense of the IV *-yu* ‘be’ in the context of the P-PROG is, however, a secondary sense in which it classifies atelic dynamic events, i.e. activities. While, as we have seen in Section 3.1, activity UVs (e.g. of manner of motion, or manipulation) can select other IVs too, many UVs encoding activities are regularly, and usually exclusively, combined with *-yu* ‘be’ in

this function. Examples are *thawaya* ‘eat, be eating’ in (27) and *garlagarla* ‘play’ in (28); several other UVs of the same type are listed in (29).⁴ Note that with bivalent UVs these expressions, like the P-PROG, can be transitive in the sense that they can take an absolutive object, but their subject NP cannot take the ergative case.

- (27) *Guruwuny thawaya ga-yu jalig wuju.*
 boob eat 1SG-be.PRS child small
 ‘The small child is eating boob nuts.’

- (28) *Thanthiya=ba butbol garlagarla ga-yu=di ba-ngawu!*
 DEM=SEQ ball play 3SG-be.PRS=FOC IMP-see
 ‘That one now is playing (with a) ball, look!’

- (29) a. *wirrigaja ga-yu* ‘to cook/be cooking’ (generic)
 b. *wajama ga-yu* ‘to be fishing’
 c. *jirrngayib ga-yu* ‘to sneeze / be sneezing’
 d. *gurrija ga-yu* ‘to be digging’
 e. *garrwaja ga-yu* ‘to be swearing’

As (30) and (31) show, an activity can also be expressed metonymically, for example by a noun phrase marked with the purposive *-ngulung* or the ‘motivative’ case *-garni ~ -warni* (the latter indicates that an event is motivated by, or centered around, the referent of the noun phrase). Thus, the activity sense of this IV does not depend on the presence of a UV.

- (30) *Leta-ngulung=na ga-yu.*
 letter-PURP=now 3SG-be.PRS
 ‘She is busy with a letter now.’

- (31) *Junba-warni burr-agba.*
 dance.style-MOTIV 3PL-be.PST
 ‘They were busy with the Junba.’, ‘They were at (doing) Junba.’

The use of a stative locative verb to signal atelicity more generally is not surprising: this phenomenon is widely attested cross-linguistically, and has often been explained by a metaphorical replacement of a ‘location’ with a ‘state’ or ‘activity’ (e.g. Lehmann 1995: 30). Thus the use of *-yu* ‘be’ in the P-PROG could be characterized as the choice of a classificatory verb, just as in other complex predicates. However, the use of this verb is also consistent with an analysis of the P-PROG as progressive proper, since the most common source for the grammaticalization of progressives are locative expressions, including locative verbs (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 77-78; Bybee et al. 1994: 129-137; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 97-99).

Both analyses are also conceivable for the second IV which can occur in the P-PROG, the motion verb *-ijga* ‘go’. Like *-yu* ‘be’, it can take on a metaphorical sense and merely encode atelicity, and in this sense is used with both stative UVs and UVs of activity; compare (32) with (26) above and (33) with (27). Its use in the P-PROG is illustrated in (34) and (35).

- (32) *Gurrany yarrajgu yina mayi ga-ngga.*
 NEG afraid DIST man 3SG-go.PRS
 ‘That man is (generally) not frightened.’

- (33) ... *yangarra=ma thawaya ga-ngga.*
 kangaroo=SUBORD eat 3SG-go.PRS
 ‘... the one the kangaroo eats’ (generic, in the context of the description of a plant species)

- (34) *Wirib du=mayan ga-yinyji ...*
 dog shoot=ASP 3SG-go.IMPF
wirib burrurr-ajji-na.
 dog 3PL>3PL-poke-IMPF
 ‘He was (going around) shooting dogs ... they were shooting the dogs.’

- (35) *Ngabulu =ja burlug=mayan guny-angga?*
 milk=QU drink=ASP 2DU-go.PRS
 ‘Do you two drink it with milk?’

Motion verbs, too, are cross-linguistically common as sources of atelic or progressive meaning (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 79; Bybee et al. 1994: 133; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 157-159). The semantic difference between *-yu* ‘be’ and *-ijga* ‘go’ in all of these expressions is that the motion verb conveys a sense of extended duration, genericity or habituality of the state or activity in question. The P-PROG formed with *-ijga* ‘go’ thus corresponds to a specialized progressive attested in other languages and analyzed by Bertinetto et al. (2000: 523, 527) as presenting the action as ongoing, not relative to a single point in time, but relative to a larger time interval.

Thus, the use of both of these IVs in the P-PROG appears entirely consistent with the analysis of this construction as a progressive proper, encoded by the combination of either a locative or a motion verb in a secondary sense conveying atelicity, and a “progressive” marker *=mayan*. According to the alternative analysis, hinted at in Section 3.1 above, the two IVs *-yu* ‘be’ and *-ijga* ‘go’ are, however, classificatory IVs in a canonical complex predicate construction, which are chosen to reflect the lexical aspect (in this case, atelicity) at the expense of any other semantic feature of the event. If the second analysis is correct, the atelicity must be the result of the combination of *=mayan* with a UV.

The fact that *=mayan* is not restricted to an occurrence in the P-PROG (although this is its most frequent function) allows us to determine its semantic contribution separately from that of the IVs discussed above. In the next section, the distribution and function(s) of this marker will be examined more closely.

4 Uses of *=mayan* as a grammatical marker of iterativity

From the preceding discussion two potential analyses of the grammatical marker *=mayan* have emerged. The first is as an aspectual affix marking the progressive category which is responsible for the use of the locative Inflecting Verb (IV) *-yu* ‘be’ (or its alternant *-ijga* ‘go’) because of the general propensity for locative verbs to be employed in a progressive construction. The second is as a marker of lexical aspect which applies to Uninflecting Verbs (UVs) to yield atelic UVs, which then trigger the use of the IVs *-yu* ‘be’ or *-ijga* ‘go’ in their classificatory use, as the most general atelic verbs.

The two hypotheses make different predictions for restrictions on the occurrence of *=mayan*. For a progressive marker, we would expect a general applicability of the marker across verb classes, except for restrictions with stative predicates and possibly with

achievement (punctual) predicates observed for progressives cross-linguistically. In particular, one would expect a general progressive marker to co-occur with activity predicates, as in English *Dina is running right now*. Furthermore, while progressive verb forms can double as simultaneous converb forms (as in the case of English), one would not expect to find the progressive marker outside the verbal domain.

For a derivational marker of atelic lexical aspect, we would expect restrictions (or else semantic coercion effects) in the co-occurrence with lexical UV classes, in particular – and depending on its precise semantics – concerning UVs which are inherently atelic, such as activity predicates.

It will turn out that neither of the two hypotheses will allow us to fully account for the distribution of *=mayan*. Rather, I will present evidence that we are dealing, throughout all contexts, with general a marker of iterativity. Iterativity, i.e. temporally iterated action (also termed frequentative), is one of the subtypes of pluractionality or “verbal plurality” recognized in cross-linguistic studies of this phenomenon (Dressler 1968; Cusic 1981; Lasnik 1995: 238; Xrakovskij 1997; Wood 2007: 52-55), alongside participant plurality (action by or on more than one individual) and distributivity (action distributed spatially or separately over individuals). Of these, only iterativity is encoded by the marker *=mayan*. The term iterative, more precisely, applies to multiple repetitions of an event, where the exact number of occurrences is not specified. It is moreover distinguished from the continuative by involving a hiatus, i.e., a clear separation, between any two of the repeated subevents (Van Geenhoven 2004: 141). In line with semantic studies of pluractionality, I assume that pluractionality operators can apply at the lexical level as well as at hierarchically higher levels of semantic representation (see Section 5 for further discussion and references). In other words, the same (or different) markers of pluractionality can have semantic scope over different expression types (cf. Van Geenhoven 2004: 160), with the scope difference often, but not necessarily, reflected in their position. This notion will turn out to be crucial for explaining the distribution of *=mayan*, which can occur on adverbial noun phrases (4.1), with quotations (4.2), with scope over the entire predicate in independent (4.3) as well as dependent clauses (4.4), as well as in the P-PROG, where it turns out to have scope over the lexical item (UV) only, and to be lexically restricted (Section 4.5).

At the formal level, *=mayan* is analyzed here as an enclitic grammatical morpheme for the following reasons: It is not a suffix (contrary to what the preceding discussion may have suggested) because it is not restricted in its occurrence to a single part of speech (UVs) and

because it can attach to phrase-level as well as word-level constituents. It is not an independent word because it is never stressed, and unlike particles (such as *majani* ‘maybe’ in (2)), which are likewise unstressed in Jaminjung, it cannot occur in initial position in a constituent but only enclitic to a host. Because of the specific prosodic properties of quotations and mimetic expressions (Section 4.2), however, it can actually be separated from these constituents by a short pause. Along with Bermúdez-Otero and Payne (2011) I assume that clitics have no special status in the architecture of grammar. In other words, labelling a grammatical formative as “clitic” only reflects their intermediate status of grammaticalization (the relative freedom of positioning compared with affixes, but restrictions compared with independent words) rather than the nature of its grammatical contribution. In the case under investigation, this means, as we will see in Section 4.5, that the clitic can have a function equivalent to a derivational marker on UVs. In terms of text frequency the distribution of =*mayan* is quite clearly skewed towards UVs: in a search on a subset of the text corpus, out of 166 occurrences only 11 (less than 7%) were on constituents other than UVs. It is therefore plausible that this form, in a diachronic perspective, is actually positioned closer to the affix end of the scale in an ongoing process of morphologization (cf. Hopper and Traugott 1993: 135).⁵

4.1 *Iterative adverbials*

The marker =*mayan* is found, albeit very rarely, on noun phrases. In combination with a noun phrase denoting cyclically recurring periods of time, it yields iterative adverbials, as in (36) (‘one month at a time’) and (37) (‘every year’, ‘year in year out’). In other words, the use of the clitic indicates that an event occurs at several of the time periods denoted by the noun phrase.

- (36) *Yuramingulung=biyang [jungulug barangan]=mayan*
 place.name=SEQ one moon=ITER
*yirr-agba dij *
 1PL.EXCL-be.PST stay.overnight

‘At Y. we stayed for a month at a time.’ (from a text describing alternating periods of time working on stations and living in the bush)

- (37) *Ngiya=binji nga-gba, mayul=mayan.*
 PROX=only 1SG-be.PST wet.season/year=ITER

‘I’ve been only here, year in year out.’ (English prompt: ‘I’ve lived here all the time, I never went away.’)

With numerals, =*mayan* yields an iterative distributive adverbial reading, e.g. ‘one by one, one after the other’ in (38).

- (38) *Ga-rda-m jungulug=mayan.*
 3SG-fall-PRS one=ITER

‘They (fruit) fall down one after the other.’ (speaker’s Kriol translation: *Im godan wan-wan.*)

This use of =*mayan* with NPs supports its analysis as a marker of iterativity which contributes the meaning of recurrence of a period of time as in (36) and (37), or the repeated participation of a particular quantity of individuals in the same event, as in (38). Because of the scarcity of relevant examples, the full range of possibilities of the interpretation of =*mayan* with a noun phrase will have to be left for further research. What the available examples do show is that =*mayan* itself does not specify the interval within which the repetition takes place. For example, (36) can refer (and did in context) to a situation where within each interval of several months or a year, one month was spent at a particular place.

4.2 Iterative quotations and mimetic representations

The iterative marker =*mayan* can also have scope over a quotation, as illustrated in examples (40) to (43) below. Without =*mayan*, the general speech framing verb in Jaminjung is *-junggu* ‘say/do’, illustrated in (39); this verb thus indicates a single instance of the utterance represented (and marked prosodically, see Simard (2010)) as direct speech.

- (39) “*Ngayug=malang nga-w-ijga=ngarndi yinawurla*” \
1SG=GIVEN	1SG-POT-go=SFOC	DIST:DIR
- gani-yu=nu* \
- 3SG>3SG-say/do.PST=3SG.OBL

“‘As for me, I’m going to go over there’, she said to her.”

If the quotation is followed by =*mayan*, however, it is either combined with the verb -*yu* ‘be’ just like the UV in the P-PROG, as in (41), or with a motion verb in a reading of associated motion (i.e. of repeatedly uttering S while going along), as in (42) and (43). The resulting reading is one of iteration (i.e. multiple repetitions) of the utterance represented as direct speech.

- (40) “*Gabardag burduj ba-rum!*”=mayan=biya burr-agba=nu \
quickly go.up IMP-come=ITER=SEQ 3SG-be.PST=3SG.OBL

“‘Come up quickly!’” they were going (like that) to him.’

- (41) *Jalig=biyang waya ga-gba=rnu, malara-wu *
child=SEQ call 3SG-be.PST=3SG.OBL frog-DAT
“*wanaja na-jga-ny=ngardi::*”=mayan ga-gba=rnu waya.
where 2SG-go-PST=SFOC=ITER 3SG-be.PST=3SG.OBL call

‘The child was calling out for the frog, calling out for him going “where did you go?”’ (from a Frog Story narrative)

- (42) “*Wayi! wayi! wayi!*”=mayan ga-ruma-ny=gun!
INTERJ INTERJ INTERJ=ITER 3SG-come-PST=CONTR

‘Indeed she came, going “wayi, wayi, wayi!”’

- (43) *Ya, yugung=biya nga-ruma-ny ngayug,*
yes run=SEQ 1SG-come-PST 1SG

“*nanggayin ngiya motika*” \

who PROX car

“*nanggayin ngiya motika*”=mayan=biyang \

who PROX car=ITER=SEQ

‘Yes, I came running, “who(se) is this car?”, (going) “who(se) is this car?”’

The quotation use of *=mayan*, at least when *-yu* ‘be’ is used as a framing verb, is thus closely related to the P-PROG use, since in a sense the quotation occurs in the slot of the UV, combining with the same IV.

A further, related use of *=mayan* is with mimetic representation of events. Jaminjung speakers occasionally use UVs not just as parts of complex predicates or as predicates of dependent clauses (see Section 4.4), but without an accompanying IV to mimetically represent an event. The UV in this case is usually separated prosodically from the following predicate, and often accompanied by a gesture; this was also the case for the example in (44).

- (44) *[[Gundangarra ning . diwu], [daman . ning . diwu .]]*
 pubic.tassle off throw armband off throw
=mayan=biyang ga-jga-ny, thet gurang na
=ITER=SEQ 3SG-go-PST DEM old.man now

‘He was (going along) taking off and throwing away his pubic tassle and arm band, that old man.’ (Lit. He was going ‘pubic tassle off!, throw!; armband off!, throw!’)

Unlike with noun phrases, the interpretation of the iterative marker with quotations / mimetic representations is always one of immediate repetition; in other words, the interval within which the repetition takes place cannot be extended beyond the smallest interval required to execute the represented utterance or action.

4.3 *Iterativity with wide semantic scope: repetition on different occasions*

Very rarely, the marker *=mayan* follows an Inflecting Verb (IV) rather than a UV. The IV can either be a simple predicate, as in (45) and (46), or part of a complex predicate, as in (47) and (48). As with noun phrases and quotations, the semantic contribution of *=mayan* with IVs is iterativity, i.e. repeated occurrences of an event with a hiatus separating each instance.

- (45) *Ani jirrama=gun jarlig ganiny-garra-m=mayan \ buluwwuj *
 only two=CONTR child 3SG>3DU-put-PRS=ITER egg

‘[The Brolga can fly, but] she gives birth to only two children, eggs.’ (describing generic properties of the bird, based on its Dreamtime personification)

- (46) *Bun-mangu=mayan burrb-ni=wung.*
 3PL>1SG-hit.PST=ITER all-ERG=RESTR
 ‘I always got hit by everyone.’ (elicited)
- (47) *Jaj yirri-yu=nu=mayan=biyang *
 say.in.vain 3PL>3SG-say/do.PST=3SG.OBL=ITER=SEQ
 ‘We told him again and again then (but) to no avail.’ (warning a man of an approaching crocodile)
- (48) *Birrg gani-yungga-ya=mayan*
 take.away 3SG>3SG-take.away-PRS=ITER
 ‘She takes things away from her again and again.’

The examples above show again that *=mayan* itself does not specify the size of the interval within which the event recurs. For example, in (45), the interval is the reproductive cycle of the Brolga, while in (47), judging from the context of the narrative, all repeated warnings were issued within a relatively short time period, probably less than half an hour.

The position of *=mayan* on an IV rather than a UV indicates a difference in its semantic scope: the scope is over the entire predicate as opposed to the lexical item (the UV), resulting in the interpretation of repetition of the same type of event on different occasions, rather than repetition in immediate succession as part of the same occasion. We will return to this distinction in Section 5.

To make matters more complicated, instances where the iterative marker has this wider semantic scope are not restricted to those where *=mayan* follows an IV. The same interpretation can be achieved when the marker is hosted by a UV, but in combination not with *-yu* ‘be’ (or *-ijga* ‘go’) but with one of the same IVs that this UV would select without *=mayan*. Contrasting examples with and without *=mayan* are provided in (49) (describing repeated events vs. a single event of throwing), in (50) (describing repeated events vs. a single event of missing a target when trying to pierce it), and in (51), which provides a three-way contrast between repeated showing (teaching) to the same participants on multiple occasions (a), a single instance of showing (b), and repetitive showing on a single occasion encoded by the P-PROG (c).

(49) a. *Diwu=mayan ganurr-ardgiya-m.*

fly/throw=ITER 3SG>3PL-throw-PRS

‘It throws them off (separately).’ (referring to a bull throwing off several men in a row in a video of a rodeo)

b. *Diwu gan-ardgiya-ny ninunggurru-ni, dirl-dirl-ngarna*

fly/throw 3SG>3SG-throw-PST hand-INST RDP-draw-NMLZ

‘He threw it with his hand, the pencil.’

(50) a. *Ngabulja ga-ngga, ngab=mayan gan-ijja-m *

bathe/dive 3SG-go.PRS miss=ITER 3SG>3SG-poke-PRS

‘It keeps diving, and keeps missing (when trying to pierce its prey, on multiple occasions).’ (referring to a kingfisher bird)

b. *Yangarra ngab nga-yijja-ny!*

kangaroo miss 1SG>3SG-poke-PST

‘I missed the kangaroo (when trying to spear it).’ (on one occasion)

(51) a. *Yurrg=mayan bun-garra-nyi=yinyag yuno, mangarra-nguji.*

show=ITER 3PL>1-put-IMP=13DU.O you.know plant.food-ASS.PL

‘They used to show us two, you know, about food and other things.’ (on separate occasions)

b. *Jarlig yurrg ganurru-rra-ny mulurru-ni.*

child show 3SG>3PL-put-PST old.woman-ERG

‘The older woman taught the children (about basket weaving).’ (on one occasion)

c. *M.-gi yurrg=mayan yirr-agba.*

place.name-LOC show=ITER 13PL-be.PST

‘We were showing/teaching (things to someone) in M.’

A particularly clear example of *=mayan* with wide semantic scope is (52). With certain UVs such as *dibird* ‘be tied around’ or *walig* ‘go around, move on a circle-shaped path’, the IV *-mangu*, otherwise meaning ‘hit; impact with a blunt instrument’ takes on a secondary sense of ‘do to completion’ (see Section 3.1 above, and for details, Schultze-Berndt (2000: 314-317)). It is clearly this reading which is invoked in (52); the entire clause, in context, refers to repetitions of a completion of a full circle. If *waligmayan* was instead interpreted as an activity predicate, it would not be compatible with *-ma* ‘hit’ in this telic reading.

(52) *Walig=mayan gani-ma-m*

round=ITER 3SG>3SG-hit-PRS

‘He goes around him in a full circle again and again’ (elicited by means of a toy man with a dog moving around it in several circles)

It is not entirely clear why *=mayan* is hosted by the IV in (45) to (48) but by the UV in (49) to (52) when arguably its scope properties are the same. As already pointed out at the beginning of this section, a UV is by far the most frequent host of the clitic, which is not only due to the frequency of the P-PROG, but also consistent with the observation that the UV tends to attract other markers with phrasal or predicate scope, such as the sequential / temporal shift marker *=biyang* illustrated in (4), or the restrictive clitic *=Cung*. The first two examples above of *=mayan* on an IV involve a simple verb (where there is no UV available as the host); the other two examples ((47) and (48)) involve very strongly lexicalized combinations of a UV and an IV.

To make things even more complicated, a combination of UV and *=mayan* can have yet another interpretation, that of an inclusion relation between two events sharing at least one participant, i.e. a “coindexing” (Baker and Harvey 2010) or clause-chaining interpretation. This case will be discussed in the next subsection.

4.4 *Iterative marking in simultaneous dependent clauses*

Relatively frequently, UVs occur as the sole predicate (without IV) in a dependent clause which may or may not be prosodically separated from the main clause. The interpretation of the dependent clause can be as sequential to the main clause (i.e. in a discourse relation of

narration) as illustrated in (53), or as simultaneous (i.e. in a discourse relation of background or elaboration), as illustrated by *wirrigaja* ‘(while) cooking’ in (17) above.

- (53) *nenigot=biyang yirrunra-wardagarra-nyi=ngardi, garrb*
 goat=SEQ 13PL>3PL-follow-IMPF=SFOC hold.multiple.entities
mangarra thawaya burr-inyji buj
 plant.food eat 3PL-go.IMPF bush
 ‘We used to follow goats around, and pick them all up, (since) they used to eat plants in the bush.’

UVs followed by *=mayan*, when functioning as the main predicate of a dependent clause, always encode an event which is interpreted as ongoing at the reference time of the event encoded by the predicate of the main clause. They thus have the function of simultaneous converbs in languages which have such verb forms (Haspelmath 1995). Prosodically detached dependent clauses of this type are illustrated in (54) and (55). In neither case would the unmarked UV in the dependent clause normally select the IV in the main clause as classificatory verb. The UV *garrb* ‘hold multiple items, gather’ in (54) selects either *-muwa* ‘have’ or *-angu* ‘get/handle’ as classificatory IV, but not a motion verb like *-ijga* ‘go’ in its motion sense (or *-wardagarra* ‘follow’ in (53)).

- (54) *Mindubala I. walnginy yiny-inyji buyi,*
 1DU.EXCL proper.name walk 13DU-go.IMPF keep.going
*mangarra buj-mawu garrb=mayan *
 plant.food bush-DWELLER hold.multiple.entities=ITER
 ‘The two of us, I. [name] and me, kept on walking, picking up bush food.’

The UV *yurrg* ‘show’ in (55) would not normally co-occur with *-uga* ‘take’, but rather exclusively takes *-arra* ‘put, transfer’ as its classificatory IV (as in (51) above).

- (55) a. *Bun-nga-nyi=yirrag=biyang *
 3PL>1-take-IMPF=13PL.O=SEQ
*yurrg-yurrg=mayan *
 RDP-show=ITER
 ‘They used to take us, showing us (the country, while going along).’

The same analysis, as dependent clause, can be applied to UVs followed by *=mayan* which are not prosodically separated from an IV, but which co-occur, in a simultaneous interpretation, with an IV which is neither *-yu* ‘be’ (or *-ijga* ‘go’ in its atelic reading) nor the IV that they would usually select as classificatory IV. For example, *jurrb* ‘be placed on top of a pile’ selects *-arra* ‘put’ as the only transitive classificatory IV, but in (56) co-occurs with *-ijja* ‘poke, spear, pierce, sew’. The interpretation is not ‘place on a pile by poking/sewing’ but ‘sew/weave things while putting them on a pile’, i.e. that of an adverbial rather than part of a complex predicate.

- (56) *Dilibeg majaja yina jurrb=mayan yirri-w-ijja.*
 dillybag like.that DIST place.on.pile=ITER 13PL>3SG-POT-poke
 ‘We will weave bags like this over there producing a heap.’

Similarly, the combination of a UV of sound emission (normally selecting *-junggu* ‘say/do’, as shown in (63)) with a motion verb like *-ruma* ‘come’ (predicted not to occur in a complex predicate of the Jaminjung type by Baker and Harvey (2010)) is only possible if the former is interpreted as forming a simultaneous dependent clause.

- (57) *Winy=mayan ga-ram burdaj.*
 whistle=ITER 3SG-come:PRS wind
 ‘The wind comes whistling.’

The only possible interpretation for the UVs followed by *=mayan* in the above examples is thus as predicates in a dependent clause marked as dependent by the absence of a classificatory IV. The effect of *=mayan* in these cases, however, is exactly the same as that in all other contexts reviewed so far: it encodes iterativity. In the case of *=mayan* on predicates of dependent clauses the interval of repetition is set at its smallest possible size, and the event is presented as ongoing at reference time, which is the time of the event encoded by the main clause – hence the equivalence to a simultaneous converb. In the next subsection, I will show that the interval size property is also relevant for the function of *=mayan* in the P-PROG.

4.5 Lexical restrictions on the P-PROG

In this subsection, we return to the function of *=mayan* in the Pseudo-Progressive construction (P-PROG). The findings will turn out to be compatible with an analysis of *=mayan* as a general iterative marker. In fact, this analysis explains some of the observed restrictions on the occurrence of *=mayan* with UVs in this construction.

On the basis of a typological study of pluractional markers, Wood (2007: 82) observes that iterative markers are only found on activity predicates if they have a more general function, i.e. if they can express continuity as well. This is because activities have no inherent boundaries and therefore the hiatus required in the definition of iteratives cannot be present. One would therefore predict a similar lexical restriction on the applicability of *=mayan* if the analysis of this clitic as an iterative marker is correct.

It turns out that the P-PROG is indeed restricted in its applicability in a way that supports this analysis. The clitic *=mayan* does not, as a general rule, appear with UVs of activity, neither with those discussed in Section 3.2 above which select *-yu* ‘be’ as a classificatory IV, nor with activity UVs selecting other IVs. The latter include UVs of manner of motion such as *warrng* ‘walk’, *mingib* ‘crawl’, *yugung* ‘run’, *yawal* ‘run, of a group of individuals’, and *jawud* ‘sneak around’, which normally collocate with IVs of locomotion. Activity UVs which do not occur in the P-PROG also include transitive UVs such as *gulyu* ‘wash, rinse’ and *wunyu* ‘wipe’ which usually co-occur with the transitive IV *-angu* ‘get/handle, manipulate’ (this IV itself is neutral as to telicity and can occur with both atelic and telic UVs).

The P-PROG is, however, compatible with some UVs of manner of motion. These encode motor patterns which are not conceived of as continuous, like the ones mentioned above, but rather as consisting of repeated single actions, such as individual strokes in swimming (*liwu*), individual impacts of a foot on the ground in stomping (*thunthun*), individual swaying motions in staggering (*ngarrangarrang*) and individual jumps in jumping (*dibard*). Thus the difference between (12) above and (58) is due to the fact that in the Frog Story scene in (12) a single jump is sufficient for the frog to escape from the jar, while in (58), repeated jumping is presented, with *-yu* ‘be’, as motion on the spot (a) or, with *-ijga* ‘go’, as manner of locomotion (b).

(58) a. *Dibard=mayan ga-yu.*

jump=ITER 3SG-be.PRS

‘He is jumping around’ (description of a child throwing a tantrum)

b. *Gururrunggu* *dibard=mayan ga-ngga.*
left-handed.wallaby jump=ITER 3SG-go.PRS

‘The left-handed wallaby is jumping along.’

The compatibility of a UV like *burlug* ‘drink’ (which might be taken to be an activity predicate based on its English translation equivalent) with the P-PROG (see example (2) above) can be explained in a similar way: the UV itself only encodes a single, bounded event of taking in liquid and swallowing it, while the activity of drinking is encoded by the combination of *burlug* and *=mayan* (which is far more frequent in texts than the unmarked UV).

UVs encoding a path or direction can occur in the P-PROG if the path is at least potentially bounded and a motion event can be described as repeatedly covering the same path or comparable paths, e.g. *malangmayan gayu* ‘to cross (a river, or road) repeatedly’ (compare *malang* in (22) above), *waligmayan gayu* ‘to go round in circles again and again’ (*walig* ‘move in a circle-shaped path’), *burumayan gayu* ‘to go back and forth’ (*buru* ‘return’), or *yirrbagmayan gayu* ‘to move along in small steps’ (*yirrbag* ‘move over, shift’).

Further evidence for an analysis of *=mayan* as a marker of iterativity (rather than a progressive marker) comes from statives. While progressives, as a general rule, are not expected to occur with stative predicates (Bybee et al. 1994: 126), it has been observed that in languages such as English, progressives are allowed with some stative predicates, e.g. positional verbs, as long as the resulting interpretation is one of contingent (stage-level) state, as in *Dina is now sitting on the balcony* (see e.g. Dowty 1979; Deo 2009). In Jaminjung, some stative UVs, in particular positionals, are compatible with the P-PROG, but the resulting interpretation is never one of contingent state/position, but rather one of repeatedly assuming (or causing something to assume, depending on the interpretation pragmatically compatible with world knowledge) the position in question. Compare the examples in (59) and (60a) below with the stative versions in (18) above and (60b). The same observation holds for transitive configurational UVs like *dud* ‘hold a single item’ and *garrb* ‘hold multiple entities or mass’ (with the iterative interpretation ‘gather’, illustrated in (6) and (16)).

(59) *Mun=mayan ga-yu.*
belly.down=ITER 3SG-be.PRS

‘She keeps bending down’ (elicited by demonstration)

- (60) a. *Langiny=biya dirrg-dirrg=mayan ga-yu=ni*
 tree/wood=SEQ RDP-tied=ITER 3SG-be.PRS=FOC
 nawurlu-ngguluwa.
 daughter-KIN2

‘She is tying up a tree stem in different places (building a house), your daughter.’

- b. *Langiny-gi dirrg ga-yu.*
 tree-LOC tied 3SG-be.PRS

‘It is tied to a tree.’

Turning now to UVs of achievement, not surprisingly, they have a semelfactive reading without =*mayan* (ignoring the effect of reduplication here, which will be discussed briefly in Section 5), but in the P-PROG they invariably have an iterative reading. This holds for monovalent UVs of change of state like *bag* ‘break’, *ning* ‘break in halves’, or *lag* ‘split’; compare the uses of *lag* in (19) above and in (61).

- (61) *Warrany nga-mamila.;*
 remove.from.cover 1SG>3SG-get/handle.IMPF
 lag-lag=mayan ga-gba=ni, jungurniny-ni ngarrgina-ni.
 RDP-split=ITER 3SG-be.PST=FOC husband-ERG 1SG:POSS-ERG

‘I used to take out (the echidna from the ground oven), and he was splitting (dividing) it up, my husband’ (from a text about hunting and cooking echidna)

Similarly, the iterative/semelfactive distinction holds for bivalent achievement UVs encoding both a specific type of impact and a result, like *gad* ‘cut’ (illustrated in (14) above), *lurr* ‘pierce’, *thaburr* ‘smash up’ and *jibug* ‘make a hole (to remove guts)’, and UVs of transfer to a location and removal from a location such as *jarr* ‘put down single item’, *jurrb* ‘place on a pile’, *jab* ‘remove flexible item attached at end point, e.g. hair, grass’, and *gub* ‘take out/off’.

In a single example found the corpus so far (62), the combination of =*mayan* and an achievement UV in the P-PROG resulted in a pre-state change interpretation of the type also well-known as a coercion effect for a progressive in a language like English. The paraphrase

provided by the speaker is revealing here: an iterative component is postulated even for a pre-state change reading.

- (62) *Digirrij=mayan ga-yu.*
die=ITER 3SG-be.PRS

‘It is dying.’ (English translation of speaker’s Kriol paraphrase: ‘its chest is moving up and down, it is nearly going to die.’)

With UVs of internal motion (e.g. *mangan* ‘wave’, *duwaj* ‘nod’, *wujag* ‘shake’, *num* ‘breathe’) or sound emission (e.g. *bawa* ‘shout’, *winy* ‘whistle’, *ngarl* ‘bark’, *dang* ‘click one’s tongue’, *dum* ‘beat of heart’, *luwi* ‘thunder’), the semelfactive reading, contrasting with the iterative reading, is expressed with the punctual general action verb *-junggu* ‘say/do’, as illustrated in (63) (compare the equivalent contrast with direct speech, discussed in Section 4.2). Thus, the UV roots in these cases are achievements, but in the P-PROG they have an activity interpretation.

- (63) a. *Dirrng=mayan ga-yu.*
fart=ITER 3SG-be.PRS

‘He is farting.’

- b. *Dirrng gani-yu, dum gani-minda-ny mangarra.*
fart 3SG>3SG-say/do.PST full 3SG>3SG-eat-PST plant.food

‘She farted, (since) she ate food so she is full up.’

These findings point to an application of the clitic at the lexical level, i.e. with scope over the lexical item (the UV) only, in an equivalent function to a derivational marker. A UV followed by *=mayan* with narrow scope (unlike in the cases discussed in Section 4.3) is atelic due to the iterative component, and this is indicated by the choice of the atelic classificatory IVs.

Interestingly, the restriction against *=mayan* with UVs of activity can be lifted if the resulting expression can be interpreted as habitual, as shown for *garlagarla* in (64) (compare this with (28) above).

- (64) *Garlagarla=mayan myusik burru-yu.*
 playing=ITER music 3PL-be.PRS

‘They are (regularly) playing music.’ (referring to schoolchildren)

I suggest that this means that the iterative marker has in fact ‘wide’ semantic scope in this case, i.e. that the repetition holds on the level of occasion. The surface similarity with the P-PROG is due to the fact that for a UV like *garlagarla* ‘play’ the usual classificatory IV is *-yu* ‘be’ and therefore, unlike in the other cases discussed in Section 4.3, the scope difference cannot be reflected in the choice of *-yu* ‘be’ vs. the “canonical” classificatory IV.

Finally, a noun phrase can occur in the UV slot as part of a collocation of an event-denoting noun phrase plus IV, such as ‘be out of breath’ in (65). Here, the iterative marker in fact coerces an activity interpretation of the noun phrase.

- (65) [*Ngayimaj judbung*]=*mayan nga-gba=ni,*
 breath short=ITER 1SG-be.PST=FOC
warranya-giyag.
 remove.from.ground-ABL

‘I was out of breath from digging.’

As a final remark, it is important to remember that whether a certain meaning – especially in the case of an event which is likely to be repeated in the real world, such as scraping or shouting – is encoded as a primarily punctual (telic) predicate or an activity (atelic) predicate is to some extent down to language-specific matters of conventionalization, as some of the above examples have already demonstrated (for a more elaborate argument concerning this issue, see Tatevosov 2002). A good example of this aspect of conventionalization is the pair of dialectal equivalents *waya* (Jaminjung) and *bawa* (Ngaliwurru), both glossed as ‘call, shout’, which were explicitly recognized as equivalent by speakers. The pair of examples in (66) was provided by the same speaker, contrasting the two dialects. While *waya* is lexicalized as an activity predicate, *bawa* is an achievement predicate which, in order to occur in the same frame, has to be turned into an activity predicate using *=mayan*. As outlined in Section 3.1, I have used formal criteria (collocational possibilities of UVs with IVs) rather than semantic intuition for determining the lexical aspect of Jaminjung UVs, although more work on the classification of the lexical predicates is certainly needed.

(66) a. *Nganthan-nyunga* *waya* *nga-yu=ngunggu::,*
 what-ORIG call 1SG-be.PRS=2SG.OBL
 gurrany *malangayij na-yu!*
 NEG listen 2SG-be.PRS

‘Why am I calling out for you!?, you are not listening!’

b. *Nganthan-nyunga* *bawa=mayan* *nga-yu=ngunggu::?*
 what-ORIG call=ITER 1SG-be.PRS=2SG.OBL

‘Why am I calling out for you!?’

In this section, *=mayan* was established as a specific grammatical marker of iterativity, rather than a more general marker of atelicity or progressive marker. In the next section, I will review the semantic differences between the different constructions in which *=mayan* occurs, consider again the combined effect of this marker and the use of the specific IV *-yu* ‘be’ or *-ijga* ‘go’ in the P-PROG, and attempt to account for the similarities of the P-PROG with a “real” progressive construction. In the process, I will outline some of the implications of the Jaminjung findings for models of pluractionality.

5 A pluractional analysis of the Pseudo-Progressive

The preceding sections have arrived at a precise characterization of the components of the construction initially termed “Pseudo-Progressive” (P-PROG) because of its uncanny formal and functional resemblance to canonical progressive constructions.

One of the components of the P-PROG is the grammatical marker *=mayan* which in the P-PROG is invariably cliticized to a member of the open verb class in Jaminjung, i.e. an Uninflecting Verb (UV). As shown in Section 4, this marker can be analyzed as a marker of iterativity (frequentativity), a subtype of pluractionality defined as a repetition of (sub)events with a hiatus separating each instantiation of the (sub)event. This explains the general absence of *=mayan* on UVs of activity in the P-PROG, and is consistent with its interpretation on UVs of other classes (Section 4.5). Iterativity is also the common denominator of the occurrences of *=mayan* on noun phrases functioning as iterative adverbials (Section 4.1), on quotations (Section 4.2), on Inflecting Verbs (Section 4.3), and on UVs serving as the main predicate in

dependent clauses (Section 4.4). The survey of constructions involving *=mayan* showed that the marker itself expresses repetition of an event for an unspecified number of times, but does not require the interval for the repetition to be set at a fixed length, although the grammatical context may impose restrictions on the length of this interval. These different resulting interpretations support the notion that pluractional operators can apply at different hierarchical levels in semantic structure, as recognized in previous studies of pluractionality: Ignoring, for the purpose at hand, the possibility of event-internal phases (inherently “repetitive” lexical items, as in English *nibble*), repetition can apply event-internally (an event is repeated multiple times on a single occasion, resulting in the interpretation of repeated subevents within a single coherent event) and event-externally (an event is repeated on different occasions). The terms “event-internal” and “event-external” as used here roughly correspond to Cusic’s occasion-internal vs. occasion-external (Cusic 1981) and to “multiplicative” vs. “iterative” (Xrakovskij 1997; Tatevosov 2002). In Jaminjung, this distinction is formally reflected in the choice of IV: the two atelic IVs *-yu* ‘be’ and *-ijga* ‘go’ require an event-internal interpretation of *=mayan* in most cases.⁶ This can also be described as a requirement that in the context the IVs *-yu* ‘be’ and *-ijga* ‘go’, the interval for the repetition becomes fixed at the smallest possible length. This is because these IVs – which in Jaminjung are members of a closed class – serve as classificatory verbs of atelicity, in the sense that atelicity here overrides any other semantic components otherwise responsible for the event classification. As shown in Section 3.2, this function of the two IVs is independent of the grammatical marker *=mayan*. The combination of a UV plus *=mayan* and the IVs *-yu* ‘be’ or *-ijga* ‘go’ conveys an event which despite its internal complexity (due to the iterative component) is a single coherent event, unbounded due to its iterativity, and thus atelic.

On the other hand, if the usual classificatory IVs selected by this particular UV are employed (Section 4.3), the event is interpreted as being repeated on multiple occasions, and atelicity no longer applies. In other words, syntactically identical combinations of UV plus *=mayan* and an Inflecting Verb can have different interpretations (single vs. multiple occasions) depending on the IV employed. An event-external (multiple-occasion) interpretation also holds for frequentative adverbials formed with *=mayan*.

The findings for Jaminjung are interesting for the theory of pluractionality in that the existence of classificatory IVs lends a formal correlate to the distinction between event-internal and event-external iterativity, and at the same time supports the analysis of iterativity (frequentative) as closely linked to atelicity as proposed by Van Geenhoven (2004; 2005) – but

only in the case of event-internal iterativity. A further interesting observation is that the event-internal interpretation not only holds for UVs marked with *=mayan*, but also for quotations (Section 4.2), which take the UV slot, as it were, and likewise select the atelic IV *-yu* ‘be’. It was moreover suggested in Section 4.4 that in the absence of a IV, i.e. in the case of *=mayan* on UVs as predicates in dependent clauses, the event-internal interpretation also holds, resulting in an interpretation equivalent to that of a simultaneous converb, i.e. as an event which temporally includes the event encoded by the main clause. Elaboration and testing of this proposal requires further research.

A further finding based on this overt marking of atelicity is that of the subtypes of pluractionality, only (event-internal) iterativity has the effect of atelicity. Both participant plurality (action by or on more than one individual) and distributivity (action distributed spatially or separately over individuals) in Jaminjung are expressed by reduplication, which, while compatible with iteration as marked by *=mayan* (see e.g. examples (14), (60) and (61)), never by itself leads to a change in the choice of classificatory IV, as can be seen in (3), (7), (19), and (22). A full investigation of the subtypes of pluractionality in Jaminjung will have to be left for further research.

One consequence of the above analysis is that the P-PROG is just a specific subtype of complex predicate, since complex predicates in Jaminjung are all formed by combining a lexically specific UV with a semantically generic classificatory IV. The one distinctive property of the P-PROG, which it does not share with any other complex predicates except those consisting of UVs inherently encoding an activity and one of the verbs *-yu* ‘be’ and *-ijga* ‘go’ (see Section 3.2), is that the valency of the UV can to some extent override the specification provided of the (intransitive) IV: bivalent UVs can take an absolutive object (their subject, however, is also in the absolutive rather than ergative case). This was one of the features that made the P-PROG look like a progressive proper, with an auxiliary verb, in the first instance (see Section 1).

There are other properties of the P-PROG which place it in the neighbourhood of Progressive constructions proper. As shown in Section 2, in terms of discourse functions the P-PROG partly fills the gap left by the absence of inflectional imperfective marking in the present tense. This explains the near-absence (and in cases where it does occur, interchangeability with the past imperfective) of the P-PROG in the past tense. Considering its semantics, the functional overlap of the P-PROG with progressives proper is not accidental. According to Deo (2009), progressives differ from general imperfectives precisely in that the

latter require for an event to be true at intervals of context-dependent (equal) length, while progressives require the interval to be of infinitesimally small length (resulting in the “ongoing at reference time” interpretation). As shown above, setting an interval at infinitesimally small length is precisely what is achieved by the combination of *=mayan* and the inflecting verb *-yu* ‘be’. The difference from a progressive proper is merely that the P-PROG carries the additional semantic feature of iterativity.

This places the P-PROG in Jaminjung in the vicinity of some periphrastic constructions in Romance languages which likewise formally resemble progressives but which have been argued by Laca (2004; 2006) to operate not at the level of grammatical aspect, but at the level of “eventuality modification” (lexical aspect), i.e. to be equivalent with derivational markers of lexical aspect. Laca (2004: 436) further claims that combinations of *estar* ‘be’ and gerund in Ibero-Romance can also “oscillate between a time-relational (progressive) and an eventuality modification status (with activities or temporary states as output) according to the tense involved”. A diachronic pathway from iteratives to progressives in European languages is also discussed by Johanson (2000: 94-95). More generally, the grammaticalization of lexical aspect to grammatical aspect is well attested in the case of the development from telicity markers to perfective markers, the best-known case being perfectivity in Slavic languages, where perfective forms retain many derivational characteristics (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 86-87). As shown for Jaminjung (Section 2), the discourse distribution of such constructions can help one to understand this development, since in many contexts, the lexical aspect (here: iterativity) and grammatical aspect (progressive) construction have the same discourse function, in this case that of expressing temporal overlap required by discourse relations such as background or elaboration. The Jaminjung P-PROG would only have to be extended to activity predicates to be indistinguishable from a true progressive. While event-external iterativity can be shown to overlap in its distribution with habitual aspect (Bertinetto and Lenci 2010), the findings for Jaminjung suggest that event-internal iterativity overlaps with progressive aspect.

Thus, the P-PROG, rather than just being a Pseudo-Progressive, is a Pluractional Progressive, a hybrid located at the boundary between lexical and grammatical aspect. The findings presented here point to a special role of event-internal iterativity as the type of pluractional expression with the closest affinity to atelicity, and therefore the most likely to be involved in such a development.

References

- Asher, N & A Lascarides 2003 *Logics of Conversation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, B & M Harvey 2010 'Complex predicate formation' in M Amberber, B Baker & M Harvey (eds.) *Complex predicates. Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 13–47.
- Bermúdez-Otero, R & J Payne 2011 'There are no special clitics' in A Galani, G Hicks & G Tsoulas (eds.) *Morphology and its Interfaces* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 57–96.
- Bertinetto, PM & A Lenci 2010 'Iterativity vs. habituality (and gnomic imperfectivity)' *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica* 9, 1.
<http://linguistica.sns.it/QLL/QLL10/Bertinetto-Lenci.pdf>.
- Bertinetto, PM, KH Ebert & C de Groot 2000 'The progressive in Europe' in Ö Dahl (ed.) *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 517–558.
- Bohnemeyer, J 1998 'Time relations in discourse. Evidence from a comparative approach to Yukatek Maya' PhD Dissertation, Tilburg: Katholieke Universiteit Brabant.
- Butt, M 1997 'Complex predicates in Urdu' in A Alsina, J Bresnan & P Sells (eds.) *Complex Predicates* Stanford CA: CSLI Publications: 107–149.
- Butt, M 2010 'The light verb jungle - still hacking away' in M Amberber, B Baker & M Harvey (eds.) *Complex predicates. Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 48–78.
- Bybee, J, R Perkins & W Pagliuca 1994 *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bybee, JL & Ö Dahl 1989 'The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world' *Studies in Language* 13: 51–103.
- Capell, A 1979 'Classification of verbs in Australian languages' in SA Wurm (ed.) *Australian Linguistic Studies* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics: 229–322.
- Cusic, DB 1981 'Verbal Plurality and Aspect' PhD Dissertation, Stanford: Stanford University.
- Deo, A 2009 'Unifying the imperfective and the progressive: partitions as quantificational domains' *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32: 475–521.
- Dixon, RMW 2001 'The Australian linguistic area' in AY Aikhenvald & RMW Dixon (eds.) *Areal Diffusion and Genetic inheritance. Problems in comparative linguistics* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 64–104.

- Dowty, DR 1979 *Word meaning and Montague grammar. The semantics of verbs and times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ* Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company.
- Dressler, WU 1968 *Studien zur verbalen Pluralität: Iterativum, Distributivum, Durativum, Intensivum in der allgemeinen Grammatik, im Lateinischen und Hethitischen* Wien: Böhlau Nachfolger.
- Haspelmath, M 1995 'The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category' in Haspelmath & König (eds.) *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms* Berlin: de Gruyter: 1–56.
- Heine, B & T Kuteva 2002 *World lexicon of grammaticalization* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, PJ & EC Traugott 1993 *Grammaticalization* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johanson, L 2000 'Viewpoint operators in European languages' in Ö Dahl (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 27–187.
- Klein, W 1994 *Time in language* London/New York: Routledge.
- Laca, B 2004 'Romance 'aspectual' periphrases: eventuality modification versus 'syntactic' aspect' in J Lecarme & J Guéron (eds.) *The Syntax of Time* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press: 425–440.
- Laca, B 2006 'Indefinites, quantifiers, and pluractionals. What scope effects tell us about event pluralities' in Vogeleer, S & L Tasmowski (eds.) *Non-definiteness and Plurality* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 191–217.
- Lasersohn, P 1995 *Plurality, Conjunction and Events* Dordrecht Kluwer.
- Lehmann, C 1995 *Thoughts on grammaticalization* München/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- McGregor, WB 2002 *Verb classification in Australian languages* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nichols, J 1986 'Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar' *Language* 62: 56–119.
- Schultze-Berndt, E 2000 'Simple and complex verbs in Jaminjung: A study of event categorisation in an Australian language' PhD Dissertation, Nijmegen: University of Nijmegen.
- Schultze-Berndt, E 2003 'Preverbs as an open word class in Northern Australian languages: synchronic and diachronic correlates' in G Booij & J v Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology 2003* Dordrecht: Kluwer: 145–177.
- Schultze-Berndt, E 2007 'Recent grammatical borrowing into an Australian Aboriginal language: The case of Jaminjung and Kriol.' in Y Matras & J Sakel (eds.) *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 363–386.

- Silverstein, M 1986 'Classifiers, verb classifiers, and verbal categories' *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 12: 497–514.
- Simard, C 2010 'The Prosodic Contours of Jaminjung, a language of Northern Australia' PhD Dissertation, Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Tatevosov, S 2002 'The parameter of actionality' *Linguistic Typology* 6: 317–401.
- Van Geenhoven, V 2004 'For-adverbials, frequentative aspect, and pluractionality' *Natural Language Semantics* 12: 135–190.
- Van Geenhoven, V 2005 'Atelicity, Pluractionality, and Adverbial Quantification' in H Verkuyl, H de Swart & A van Hout (eds.) *Perspectives on Aspect* Dordrecht: Springer: 107–124.
- Verstraete, J-C 2006 'The nature of irrealis in the past domain: Evidence from past intentional constructions in Australian languages' *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 26: 59–79.
- Wilson, S 1999 *Coverbs and complex predicates in Wagiman* Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Wood, E 2007 'The semantic typology of Pluractionality' PhD Dissertation, Berkeley, CA: University of Berkeley.
- Xrakovskij, VS 1997 'Semantic types of the plurality of situations and their natural classification' in VS Xrakovskij (ed.) *Typology of iterative constructions* München: LINCOM Europa: 3–68.

Endnotes

- ¹ In these introductory examples, Inflecting Verbs (IVs) and Uninflecting Verbs (UV) are marked as such in the glosses. Part of speech membership will not be shown in later examples. The unmarked absolutive will not be glossed.

The following conventions and abbreviations are used in examples throughout:

Word and clause level boundary symbols: - : word-internal morpheme boundary; = : clitic

boundary; \ (backslash): final (falling) boundary intonation; , (comma): nonfinal boundary intonation; ., ..., ... (medially): pauses of varying length.

Abbreviations in interlinear glosses: 1, 2, 3: First, second, third person; LOC: Locative case; 12:

First person inclusive; MOTIV: Motivative case ('preoccupied with'); 13: First person exclusive;

ABL: Ablative case; ALL: Allative case; ASP: Marker of (lexical) aspect (=mayan); ASS.PL:

Associative plural; CONTR: Contrastive focus marker; DAT: Dative case; DEM: Demonstrative

(distance-neutral / recognitional); DIST: Distal demonstrative; DU: Dual; ERG: Ergative case; EXCL:

Exclusive pronoun (Kriol); FOC: Predicate focus marker; IMP: Imperative; IMPF: Past Imperfective;

INCL: Inclusive pronoun (Kriol); INST: Instrumental case (same as ergative); INTERJ: Interjection;

IRR: Irrealis; ITER: Iterative marker; NEG: Negative particle; NMLZ: Nominalizer; O: Oblique

pronominal clitic in object function; OBL: Oblique pronominal clitic; PL: Plural; POT:

Potential/Future modal prefix; POSS: Possessor; PROX: Proximal demonstrative; PRS: Present; PST:

Past perfective; PURP: Purposive case; RDP: Reduplication; REFL: Reflexive/reciprocal; RESTR:

Restrictive clitic ('right there/then'); SEQ: Sequential clitic ('now', 'then', 'on the other hand');

SFOC: Sentence focus marker; SG: Singular; SUBORD: General subordinator; TR: Transitivity marker (Kriol).

Other conventions: underline marks Kriol words in Jaminjung examples; :::: following vowels mark a lengthened syllable.

- ² The Inflecting Verbs *-yu* 'be' and *-junggu* 'say/do', both irregular verbs, each have an allomorph */yu/*, functioning as the present tense stem and as the past perfective stem, respectively. The

inflected verb forms can still be distinguished in principle by the use of the intransitive (with *-yu* ‘be’) vs. transitive paradigm (with *-junggu* ‘say/do’) of pronominal prefixes; however, some verb forms are homophonous due to the zero exponence of the 3rd person singular object in most cases. While an etymological relationship between these stems is not entirely implausible, they are synchronically distinct.

- ³ This IV does not function as a copula, i.e. does not occur with individual-level ascriptive (nominal) predicates, which can form predicates of verbless clauses on their own.
- ⁴ Those UVs of activity which usually or exclusively co-occur with *-yu* ‘be’ (or *-ijga* ‘go’) often bear one of a number of endings including *-mib*, *-b*, *-ya* or *-ja*. These are non-productive or at most semi-productive forms.
- ⁵ The form *=mayan* corresponds to a combination of a suffix *-ma* (with allomorphs) and a bound morpheme *-yan* in the neighbouring language Wagiman, and may have been borrowed from Wagiman. In Wagiman, the suffix *-ma*, only found on UVs, is neutral in terms of lexical aspect (Wilson 1999: 50), but plausibly used to derive atelic UVs at some stage, since UVs without it are telic (“perfective” in Wilson’s analysis). The marker *-yan* occurs both on UVs and IVs and is glossed as Imperfective, but all examples provided by Wilson (1999: 34-35, 54-55), are compatible with an analysis as marker of atelicity, and in fact iterativity.
- ⁶ The exception is the case, discussed briefly in the context of example (64), where the “normal” classificatory IV itself is *-yu* ‘be’, and therefore the distinction cannot be made.