Degrees of Central Coincidence Across Categories*

P5

Sylvia L.R. Schreiner, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign slrs@illinois.edu

OVERVIEW

- Scottish Gaelic (SG) has two markers of central coincidence between Figure and Ground (after Hale 1986) that exist outside the spatial realm: one that marks imperfective aspect and one that creates a particular kind of nominal predicate
- Imperfective aspect is marked with a(g), historically the preposition 'at' (now aig)
- The nominal predicates in question are marked with ann, historically 'in' (now ann (an))

QUESTION: Why should the language employ prepositions of central coincidence in these instances?

QUESTION: Why is the distribution of prepositions as it is?

PROPOSAL

- Imperfective aspect states that temporal Figure and Ground overlap and is expected to be marked by such a grammatical element (after Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria)
- The type of nominal predication under consideration is marked with a similar element due to the nature of the argument-predicate relation (after Talmy and Hale)

PROPOSAL: SG employs different prepositions of central coincidence for these meanings because they involve different types of centrality

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Figure and Groun

- Talmy (1978/2003) defines Figure & Ground and gives defining characterizations for them
 - Figure—"Has unknown spatial (or temporal) properties to be determined";
 - Ground—"Acts as a reference entity, having known properties that can characterize the Figure's unknowns" (2003:316)
- Talmy demonstrates different instances of Figure/Ground in sentences—the relationships between two nominals in a single clause, and main and subordinate clauses of multiclausal sentences.

Central Coincidence (Figure in Ground)

- Hale (1986) argues that an important theme in Figure-Ground relations is that of central vs. non-central coincidence
 - Hale's discussion of Warlpiri case shows that distinctions of central coincidence can involve additional dimensions (e.g., the trajectory inherent in along)
 - He does not discuss distinctions between different types of central coincidence, as I do here
- Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria (1997 and forward; "D&UE") extend this theme to temporal aspects of the grammar
 - Tense, Aspect, Mood, and temporal adverbials are spatiotemporal predicates (WITH)IN, BEFORE, AFTER that relate temporal Figure to Ground
 - Central coincidence ((WITH)IN) results in present tense (assertion time in utterance time) and progressive/ imperfective aspect (assertion time in event time)
 - [Ev-T [Ast-T]]

 D&UE note that languages mark distinctions of central coincidence with prepositions such as *in*, *at*, etc.

- These are prepositions of containment ('in') or coincidence ('at') (e.g. Kemmerer 2005, Zwarts & Winter 2000, Coventry et al. 1994)
- When lexical items are appropriated to instantiate grammatical functions, the lexical items involved are often "appropriate" in a way that seems to reflect something about the cognitive architecture—e.g., "go" motion constructions marking future tense (see e.g. Bybee et al. 1994).
- An outstanding question is to what extent the "choice" of lexical item can be seen to reflect details of the grammatical function
- Trying to compare across languages in this case is particularly difficult: the meanings and domains of prepositions rarely overlap exactly between languages
- Interestingly, SG uses (derivatives of) both 'in' and 'at' to instantiate different non-spatial meanings
- This gives us the opportunity to investigate these related prepositional meanings within one language

DATA

- Scottish Gaelic (SG) employs what are historically prepositions in several non-spatial domains
- E.g.: Morphologically realized aspects other than the perfective are marked by material that is homophonous (or nearly so) with prepositions (see Ramchand 1993, Reed 2012).
- In each case, I have argued (after D&UE; Reed 2012, Schreiner ms.) that the particle in question spells out the relation between ASSERTION TIME and EVENT TIME (e.g., as dèidh 'after' = perfect)
- As D&UE's account predicts, progressive/imperfective aspect is marked with (a particle deriving from) a preposition of central coincidence, a' (aa before yowels: from aja 'at'):
 - (1a) Tha mi ag ithe.
 be.present I a' eat.participle
 'I am eating.'
 - (1b) Tha e a' tuigsinn.
 be.PRESENT he A' understand.PTCPL
 'He understands.'
- In its prepositional uses, it indicates coincidence between spatial or temporal Figure and Ground, as English 'at':
- (2a) Bha mise 'nam stad <u>aig an t-solas</u> be.PAST I.EMPH ANN.AGR stop.PTCPL at the light 'I was stopped <u>at the stoplight.</u>' (Reed 2012:250)
- 2b) Bha e air fhàgail <u>aig meadhan-latha.</u> be.PAST he PERF leave.PTCPL at mid-day 'He had left <u>at noon</u>.'
- SG also employs another preposition of central coincidence for a non-spatial meaning: the particle ann (from the preposition ann (an) 'in'). Prepositionally, it indicates containment between spatial or temporal Figure and Ground, as English 'in':
- (3a) Cuir <u>ann an gloinne uisg'</u> e put in glass water it 'Put it <u>in a glass of water</u>.'
- (3b) Tha mi gu mìle a ruith <u>ann an còig mionaidean.</u>
 be.PRES I PROSP mìle AGRO run.PTCPL in five minutes.
 'I'm about to run a mile <u>in five minutes</u> [a 5-minute mile].'

- Outside of these uses, ann also appears with stage-level-like nominal predicator;
- (4a) Tha Lachy 'na dhotair be.pres Lachy ANN.AGR doctor 'Lachy is [works as] a doctor.'
- (4b) Tha i 'na boireannach #(a-nisde).
 be.PRES she ANN.AGR woman now
 'She is a woman #(now).' (Schreiner 2015:115)
- (4c) Tha an tir 'na fhàsach #(a-ni be.PRES the land ANN.AGR wilderness now 'The land is a wilderness #(now).' (Schreiner 2015:124; Based on Masson 1882:77)
- This construction contrasts with individual-level-like nominals, formed with a different 'be' verb (and no ann):
- (5) Is dotair Calum. (Ramchand 1996:177; my gloss) COPULA.PRES doctorCalum 'Lachy is [at his core/definitionally] a doctor.'
- In Schreiner (2015) I argue that in all cases ann creates "situation-descriptive", but not "definitional" (Roy's 2006/2013 terms) nominal predicates; these require functional structure unavailable in the nominal domain, and so must merge with prepositional structure.

PROPOSAL

- With prepositions, we know that we need to distinguish between more than just central vs. non-central coincidence between Figure and Ground, even just in the spatial realm
- E.g., 'at' the store vs. 'in' the store vs. 'on' the store—all centrally coincident relations
- The SG data indicate that we also need to distinguish between (or among) levels or types of central coincidence in other areas
- These distinctions in prepositional meaning are reflected in how they are grammaticalized

(A): Why are these non-spatiotemporal relations realized by former prepositions? What (if anything) does the prepositional meaning relate (i.e., what are the Figure and Ground?)

- Progressive Aspect—D&UE: Aspect is a spatiotemporal relation between the Assertion Time (Figure) and Event Time (Ground)
- · Progressive aspect is the spatiotemporal relation (WITH)IN
- In SG, a' heads an Aspect phrase (Ramchand 1993, Reed 2012)
- Nominal Predication—We can generalize from Talmy's (1978/2003) discussion that in cases of simple predication, the subject is the Figure while the predicate is the Ground

(B): Why are two different prepositions employed? What informs the "choice" between 'at' and 'in'?

- Just as the prepositions aig and ann an convey different kinds of centrally coincident relations between Figure and Ground, so do progressive aspect and predication
- · Necessary for the progressive is the overlap of two times
- The type of nominal predication under discussion here ("situation-descriptive") corresponds to the figure being contained by the ground—a person is (currently) in the "doctorhood" realm, e.g.

- This is in opposition to "definitional" (following Roy 2006/2013 for Irish) predicates, which are formed with a different 'be' verb and no preposition (see ex. 5)
- Instead of the Figure being in the Ground, Figure and Ground are related by anaphora, yielding covaluation between the two
- This corresponds to the more fundamental, definitional relationship between subject and predicate in these
- Overall, the system in SG demonstrates an instance in which a language co-opts details of a lexical item, not just its overall meaning, when it borrows it to express a grammatical function

CONCLUSIONS & IMPLICATIONS

- We have seen an example of a language that has adopted two prepositions of central coincidence for non-spatial purposes
 - While the preposition of coincidence ('at') was co-opted to express aspectual central coincidence, that of containment was borrowed as the functional material required to create some nominal predicates
- Hale's theme of central vs. non-central coincidence between figure and ground is an important one
- However, as we can see from the SG data, a further distinction needs to be made.
- Just as we need to distinguish between different centrally coincident prepositional meanings, we must differentiate between these relations when they are utilized elsewhere in a language in order to account for the data we see
- When investigating languages that employ spatiotemporal notions outside the usual domains, we need to keep an eye out for the same kinds of distinctions we see within the prepositional sphere
- This also has language-specific implications for SG: we should look more closely at constructions with ann elsewhere in the language; for instance, clefts with ann

SELECTED REFERENCES

In Parks 1, Perkins, 8, & Pagilacu, W. 1994. The evaluation of grammus: Traces, aspect, and monotify in the language of the world in Wheren't of Chicago Prices, Coveriny, 14, Cormichael, R., & Garrod, S. C. 1994. Spatial prepositions, object-specific function, and task requirements. Journal of Semontics 11(4), 2893-11. Demindache, N., & Ubrice-techerain, M. 1977. The syntax of temporal relations: a uniform approach to tense and aspect. In Proceedings of the WCCF1. 16, 1945-199, Garrod, 5, Ferrier, G., & Campbell, 5, 1999. In and in-vestigating the functional geometry of spatial prepositions. Cognition, 72(2), 167-180. Halle, K. 1996. Notes on world as semantic categories: some Warspier samples. Ferrier and projections, 233-234. Remmerer and semantic categories: some Warspier samples. Ferrier and projections, 233-234. Remmerer impaired. Neuropsychologia, 43(5), 797-808. Ramchand, G. 1993. Nos extends in Modern Scottish Godie: Stanford, G. 4865-1809. See Campbell Scottish Gadie: The Syntax-semantic interface. Natural Language Semantics, 4.156-191. Reed, 1001. 1001. Scottish Godie: User and Categories and Categories

*I am previously published as Sylvia L. Reed. Special thanks to Muriel Fisher for always enthusiastically sharing her knowledge of Scottish Gaelic. All mistakes herein are my own. Research undertaken at the University of Arizona and Wheaton College, Mrk, the former funded in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF), RBCS0602768A, and in part by a pre-doctoral grant from the University of Arizona Social and Behavioral Sciences Research