

## Grammaticalization of completive in Tupí-Guaraní revisited

Dmitry Gerasimov

(Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences)

Many Tupí-Guaraní (TG) languages have a verbal suffix of ‘completive’ historically connected to the Proto-TG verb *-\*paβ* ‘to finish’. Cognate suffixes are found in all branches of the subfamily, except Subgroup II, where TAME systems have been completely rebuilt under contact influence. A cross-linguistically common path of grammaticalization from ‘finish’ to completion [Heine & Kuteva 2002: 134-137] is generally assumed for the protolanguage.

The completive expresses universal quantification over absolutive argument (1-2) or over a semantic scale inherent to the predicate (3); in some, but not all, languages in question it can also be used in terminative meaning reminiscent of the source verb (4). Cf. [Thomas 2007] for the most detailed language-specific account.

Some TG languages, however, lack aforementioned suffix, instead employing a lexical universal quantifier which diachronically is a fossilized 3<sup>rd</sup> person form of the same phasal verb *-\*paβ* (5). [Jensen 1990: 148, 1998: 537] assumes that such languages have lost the original completive suffix and substituted it with a lexical item, effectively suggesting a kind of grammaticalization reversal.

Based on the observed variation within the subfamily, we propose a revisited, somewhat more complex scenario for the emergence of completive suffix in TG languages. In particular, we argue that:

- (i) Despite its pervasiveness, the suffixal completive is not a proto-TG phenomenon, but represents a parallel development;
- (ii) Those languages that lack a dedicated completive suffix haven’t lost it: rather, they have never developed it in the first place and are thus closer to the proto-TG situation;
- (iii) Most importantly, quantificational and terminative readings of completive markers result from two different grammaticalization processes: while the latter have evolved directly from the phasal verb, grammaticalization of the former involved universal quantifier like the one in (5) as an intermediate stage.
- (iv) The first part of the above postulated diachronic evolution, from phasal verb to (nominal) universal quantifier is naturally expected given that quantificational expressions in TG languages have generally shifted in character from predicative to nominal [Vieira 1995; Queixalós 2006].

As an aside, we demonstrate how reconstruction of the diachrony of TG tense and aspect systems, shaped by an interaction of numerous relatively recent grammaticalization processes, could benefit from better understanding of affix ordering and combinatorial properties of verbal suffixes in modern languages — the topic that, in part due to a certain Eurocentric bias, is largely overlooked even in latest grammatical descriptions.

### Examples:

KAMAIURÁ

- (1a) *o-mano-pap*  
3A-die-COMPL  
‘They all died’.

- (1b) *o-juka-pap*  
3A-kill-COMPL  
‘He killed everyone’.

ASURINI DO TOCANTINS

- (2) *o-∅-eraa-pam maʔesiroa toria.*

3A-3-take-COMPL thing civilized  
'The Brazilians took all the things'.

ARAWETE

(3) *te-kutfaha-pa didi he Ø-ha*  
1SG-study-COMPL after I REL-go  
'When I am finished with my studies, I will go'.

PARAGUAYAN GUARANÍ

(4a) *O-ky-pa.*  
3A-rain-COMPL  
'It stopped raining'. (can be uttered even if the rain can be expected to resume any minute now)

MBYÁ GUARANÍ

(4b) *\*o-ky-pa*  
3A-rain-COMPL  
Intended: 'It stopped raining'.

URUBU-KAAPOR

(5) *kaʔa ke upa ŋã Ø-wirɔk ʔi*  
forest OBL UQ people 3-clear PERF  
'People have cleared the forest entirely'.

**Abbreviations:**

1, 3 – person; A – cross-reference marker of the active series; COMPL – completive; OBL – oblique; PERF – perfect; REL – relational; SG – singular; UQ – universal quantifier.

**References:**

Heine & Kuteva 2002 — B. Heine, T. Kuteva. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Jensen 1990 — Ch. Jensen. Cross-referencing changes in some Tupí-Guaraní languages // D. L. Payne (eds.). *Amazonian linguistics: Studies in the Lowland South American Languages*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1990. Pp. 117–158.

Jensen 1988 — Ch. Jensen. Comparative Tupí-Guaraní morphosyntax // D. Derbyshire, G. Pullum (eds.). *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Vol. IV. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. Pp. 487–618.

Queixalós 2006 — F. Queixalós. The primacy and fate of predicativity in Tupi-Guarani // X. Lois, V. Vapnarsky (eds.). *Lexical categories and root classes in Amerindian languages*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006. Pp. 249–287.

Thomas 2007 — G. Thomas. Quantification, completive aspect and degree modification in Mbyá // A. Deal (ed.). *Proceedings of Semantics of Understudied Languages of the Americas 4*. Amherst: UMass, 2007. Pp. 291–310.

Vieira 1995 — M. D. Vieira. The expression of quantificational notions in Asurini do Trocará: Evidence against the universality of determiner quantification // E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer, B. H. Partee (eds.). *Quantification in natural languages*. 1995. Pp. 67–85.