

Polygrammaticalization in the history of a motion verb: evidence from the verb *πα* in the 15th century and Cretan Renaissance*

Aglaia G. Trigka

University of Patras, Sorbonne Université

aglaiatrigka@gmail.com

Περίληψη

Είναι ευρέως γνωστό ότι τα ρήματα κίνησης (*motion verbs*) δε φέρουν μόνο την πρωτοτυπική σημασιολογική ιδιότητα της κίνησης από/προς ένα στόχο, αλλά μπορούν επίσης να χρησιμεύσουν και ως γραμματικοί δείκτες μελλοντικής αναφοράς. Όσον αφορά την Ελληνική, η διαχρονία του ρήματος κίνησης ‘πηγαίνω’ δεν έχει μελετηθεί ενδελεχώς. Σε αυτό το άρθρο, εστιάζουμε στις συντακτικές και σημασιολογικές ιδιότητες αυτού του ρήματος που αποτελεί τυπικό παράδειγμα Γραμματικοποίησης. Για την επίτευξη του στόχου, χρησιμοποιούμε ένα σώμα κειμένων που προέρχεται από την Κρητική Αναγέννηση και δύο κείμενα του 15^{ου} αιώνα (*Ιστορία και όνειρο*, Ρίμα παρηγορητική) όπου, πρώτη φορά, επισημαίνονται μερικές ενδιαφέρουσες δομές και σημασίες.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: γραμματικοποίηση, ρήματα κίνησης, Κρητική Αναγέννηση, πάω - πα

1 Introduction

The study of the diachronic evolution of motion verbs has long been one of the most popular research objects in the field of morphosyntactic change. This is firstly due to the typological study of languages, which has made it clear that many motion verbs, coming from languages of different linguistic families, are the source of grammatical constructions with common semantic content, like future reference (Talmy 1975, Bybee, Pagliuca and Perkins 1991); and secondly, to the study of the phenomenon of grammaticalization, in which specific verbs (or constructions) acquire grammatical content in combination with the necessary changes at all linguistic levels (phonological, morphological, semantic, syntactic) (Heine and Kuteva 2002).

It is also known that the English language, on which the above studies were largely based, has a well-known future reference construction derived from ‘be going to’¹, which is the main object of a variety of studies (Bourdin (2008), Fernand (1938), Fischer et al. (2000), Danchev and Kytö (1994), Traugott and Dasher (2001) and Budts and Petré (2016)). However, there is a lack of systematic research of Greek motion verbs and especially of the verb *πηγαίνω* ‘go’, which has developed some very interesting syntactic and semantic properties in Modern Greek, apart from the

* This work was supported by K. Karatheodoris 2017 research program, funded by the K. Karatheodoris Foundation under Grant No 80638. I am immensely grateful to the audience for their helpful comments and questions during the Conference, although any errors are my own.

¹ Many linguists have often debated why motion verbs participate in the grammaticalization of tense. Heine (2003: 594) has already argued that “*future tenses are primarily derived from motion schemas (X goes to / comes to Y) and volition schemas (X wants to Y)*”. Thus, motion verbs, and especially ‘go’, in certain constructions, evolve in many languages to an exponent of futurity. As Sweetser has observed (1988: 392) “*The suggested reason is that ‘go’, which expresses movement from proximal to distal in space, can easily shift to indicate ‘movement away from the present time’*”.

established meaning of motion from or towards a goal, as shown in the following examples²:

(1) Η κατάσταση πάει να ξεφύγει, πρέπει να παρέμβεις
 The situation go-3rd prt leave-3rd subj must- prt intervene-2nd
 sg imper. subj

‘The situation is almost out of control, you should intervene.’ (‘proximate future’)

(2) Δεν πα να λες, εγώ θα κάνω αυτό που θέλω
 Neg. go- prt say- I will do- this which want-
 3rd 2nd 1st sg 1st sg
 sg. sg

‘No matter what you are saying, I will do what I want.’ (‘concessive’)

(3) Πήγε να χάσει το παιχνίδι μέσα από τα χέρια του
 Went- prt lose- the game inside from the hands him
 3rd sg 3rd subj.

‘He almost lost a game that was practically his.’ (‘avertive future’)

Although, generally, my overall research starts from the 11th century and the Late Medieval Greek, in this paper we will focus on some texts of a very specific period, the Cretan Renaissance, where various and interesting constructions with *πηγαίνω* ‘go’ appear. More precisely, we will focus only on the form *πα*, a short form of *πάω* that derives from the verb *πηγαίνω*. The reason for this specific interest is the fact that the form *πα* offers some special syntactic and semantic constructions that we will examine in the following sections.

The data for this study come from a literary corpus between the 15th and 17th century³, drawn from Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG)⁴. These texts belong to different literary genres, in order to examine whether genre plays any role in the various morphosyntactic constructions. However, in some examples, the ambiguity of the meaning was very high, thus it was quite difficult to categorize the meaning. On the whole, ten (10) literary texts⁵ were examined, which provided 135 tokens of the verb.

In this paper, section 2 consists of a brief theoretical presentation of the phenomenon of grammaticalization and review of existing analyses on *πηγαίνω* ‘go’. So, we will present the evolution of the verb over the centuries, from a morpho-

² In this section, the examples (1), (2) and (3) are my own.

³ According to Holton (1991), the artistic and literary period of the Cretan Renaissance mainly covers the period from the 16th to the 17th century. But, in this paper, we also examine two texts (*Ρίμα παρηγορητική* and *Ιστορία και Όνειρο*) from the early medieval texts from Crete (15th century) because of their interesting constructions with the verb *πηγαίνω* ‘go’.

⁴ The literary texts are the following (in brackets are shown the tokens of overall *πα*-constructions in the text):

three tragedies: *Ζήνων* (6 tokens), *Βασιλεύς ο Ροδολίνος* (4 tokens), *Ερωφίλη* (7 tokens)

two comedies: *Κατζούρμπος* (27 tokens), *Στάθης* (13 tokens)

one religious drama: *Η θυσία του Αβραάμ* (18 tokens)

one religious poem: *Ρίμα παρηγορητική* (1 token)

one erotic poem: *Ιστορία και Όνειρο* (2 tokens)

one pastoral drama: *Πανώρια* (10 tokens)

one narrative poem: *Κρητικός πόλεμος* (47 tokens)

⁵ Although one of the most famous literary texts of the Cretan Renaissance is *Ερωτόκριτος*, here it is not examined as it is excluded from TLG.

phonological point. In section 3, our particular goal is to highlight the relation between syntax and semantics. Thus, we examine a collection of data from our corpus, in order to present the main syntactic constructions and the different meanings of the verb *πηγαίνω* ‘go’ in Cretan Renaissance. A number of unknown semantic and syntactic properties of the different constructions from the texts of the Cretan Renaissance will be shown. Finally, some conclusions are drawn in the last section.

2 Previous analyses

Generally, grammaticalization is the process by which a lexical element is converted to a grammatical one⁶. An interesting but not extensively yet studied example from the history of Greek is the evolution of the verb *πηγαίνω* ‘go’, from a typical motion verb to a marker of various grammatical meanings. Despite its high frequency of use, its semantic and syntactic properties diachronically have not been studied.

From a morphological point of view, we would like to note that the verb *πηγαίνω* is a variant form of *παγαίνω*, which derives from the ancient verb *ὑπάγω*. Moreover, *πηγαίνω/παγαίνω* was shortened into the form *πάω*, in which the form *πα* originates. Jannaris (1897) presents a rather etymological account, noting only that *[ὑ]πά(γ)ω* derives from *ὑπαγάγω*. This form produces the new present *παγαίνω*. On the other hand, Hatzidakis (1905) focuses on the morpho-phonetic change, explaining that *πηγαίνω* is used instead of *ὑπάγω*, after the loss of the aorist *ἤγαγον*. A more elaborated description is found in Horrocks (2010). According to him (2010: 237), originally, “*the aorist of this verb was ὑπ-ἤγαγ-ον, but the clumsy root reduplication was dropped in popular speech to give (ὑ)π-ἦγ-α (πήγα in modern greek), with subjunctive (ὑ)π-ά(γ)-ω (modern πάω). Since this last was homophonous with the present indicative, a new present (ὑ)π-αγ-αίνω was built to the stem ὑπάγ- and subsequently this was remodeled on the basis of the aorist indicative ἐπήγα, to give modern πηγαίνω.*” As far as the remaining literature is concerned, Grammenidis (1993) develops a rather sociolinguistic account of the verb *πάω να* and Konta (2002) examines the origin and the use of the Modern Greek construction *πάω να* as future marker, employing a great variety of examples. Thus, both of them employ solely synchronic and not diachronic data, as shown. The first systematic attempt to study the semantic and syntactic properties of constructions with the verb *πηγαίνω* ‘go’ diachronically is found in Tsakali (2003). She takes as the starting point the Ancient Greek language and reaches to the Cretan Renaissance in order to carry out a diachronic presentation of the verb in relation to the grammatical constructions it formed. But she does not go into any detail, hence the need for the analysis presented below.

3 The main constructions and the different meanings

As is already argued in section 1, we will focus on the form *πα* and we will make some remarks on its syntactic and semantic properties. So, as the data indicate, two basic syntactic constructions exist:

1. Πά (clitic / pronominal element) + subjunctive

⁶A classic definition comes from Kuryłowicz: “Grammaticalization consists in the increase of the range of a morpheme advancing from a lexical to a grammatical or from a less grammatical to a more grammatical status, e.g. from a derivative formant to an inflectional one.” (Kuryłowicz 1975[1965]: 52)

Except for the basic meaning of motion towards a goal, another typical meaning exists, this one of proximate future. The tendency to denote an act in the near future by using the verb ‘go’, is observed not only in Greek, but also in other languages such as English, as indicated above, in the introduction.

- (9) Σύμβουλε με τα καλά σου πα να παρηγορήσω
 consultant with the good your go-3rd prt. console
 sg
 Καλά και στρέφω με πολύ φόβο μου και περ
 well and return- with much fear mine and and
 1st sg
 ο
 rest

‘Consultant, I am going to console with your words.
 And I return back with so much fear.’

(*Ερωφίλη, 97*)

- (10)⁷ Φεύγω και πού να πα χωστώ
 Leave- and where prt go-3rd hide-1st subj.
 1st sg sg
 γη πού να πα να δώσω
 land where prt go-3rd sg prt find-1st subj
 δεν ξέρω η κακορίζικη σήμερα,
 neg. know-1st the hapless today
 sg
 ανέ γλυτώσω
 if get
 away-1st
 sg

‘I am leaving and where should I hide, where am I going to find someplace?
 I am hapless and don’t know if I will get away with it today.’

(*Ερωφίλη, 3*)

- (11) μεγάλα πλούτη και χαρές πα να κληρονομήσεις,
 great wealth and joy go-3rd sg prt. inherit-2nd sg.
 subj.
 σα σώσεις εις τους ουρανούς ν’ ανοίξουσιν τη θύρα
 when reach-2nd sg to the heavens prt. open-3rdpl.subj. the door

‘You will inherit great wealth and joy,
 when you reach the heavens so that they open the door.’

(*Η θυσία του Αβραάμ, 852*)

In these three examples, the meaning that something ‘is going to happen in the near future’ is developed, although example (9) still maintains some semantic element of motion. In the examples (10) and (11), the verb *πα* has nothing to add in the meaning

⁷ In this example, we consider as future marker only the second construction with *πα*: *πα να δώσω*.

of motion, thus it emphasizes the meaning of proximate future. In addition, especially in the example (11), the verb *πα* serves as a future marker. In this case, the short form *πα* constitutes a grammatical element (and not a traditionally lexical one, this one of the typical motion verb *πάω* – *πα*) that emphasizes the meaning of proximate future.

Finally, an interesting observation can be made, as far as the form *πα* is concerned. More precisely, the data illustrate that the short form *πα* of the verb *πάω* is always in the third singular person. Also, although it is difficult to know how the degree of grammaticalization is actually measured, it is argued that in these examples, an almost full procedure of grammaticalization takes place. The lexical element *πα* has lost many of its grammatical properties (tense, person etc.) and follows a ‘path’ towards a particle-like status. It is undoubtedly a grammatical element that cannot be considered as a verb, like the future marker *θα* in Modern Greek which is not a verb anymore (Markopoulos, 2006). This extension of the full category ‘verb’ into a secondary category such as ‘particle’ constitutes exactly the case of de-categorialization, one of the principles of grammaticalization, as defined by Traugott and Heine (1991). This assumption is also strengthened by the other meanings of *πα*, discussed below.

c. Possibility

(12)	Κι	όντα	γυρίζης	προς	εμέ,	χώνομαι		
	And	when	turn-2 nd	to	me	hide-1 st		
			sg			sg		
	μην	πα	λάχη					
	lest	go-3 rd	happen-					
			3 rd sg					
	και	δούσι	με	τα	μάτια	σου	και	
	and	see-3 rd pl	me	the	eyes	your	and	
	πιάσουσί	μου	μάχη					
	get-3 rd pl	me	battle					

‘And when you return to me, I hide lest your eyes see me and confront me.’

(Πανόρια, 568)

(13)	κι	αν	πα	το	μάθη	η	κερά	τι	έχομε	καμ
										ωμέ
										να
	and	if	go-3 rd	it	learn-	the	lady	what	have-	don
			sg		3 rd sg				1 st pl	e-
										ptcp
	όλες	οι	πρίκες	πέφτουσι	εις	το	λαιμ	μου	εμένα	
							ό			
	all	the	bittern	fall-3 rd -	to	the	neck	my	me	
			ess	pl						

‘and if the lady should learn what we did I will get all the bitterness.’

(Κατζούρμπος, Α’ 349)

(14) Μην πα μισέψεις από πα και τα
 Neg. go-3rd leave-2nd from here and the
 sg sg
 πλευρά σου σπάσω!
 sides your break-1st
 sg

‘Don’t you leave me here or I’ll break your ribs!’

(Κατζούρμπος, E’ 296)

In the examples above, the prototypical meaning of motion is undoubtedly submerged and we have probably the evolution of *πα* into a particle with the meaning of ‘maybe’ and ‘by chance’. This meaning of possibility may be also found in negative context, as shown in the example (12). Also, as far as the example (13) is concerned, it is observed that the hypothetical particle *αν* is used. Denizot and Vasilaki (2017) have argued that the prototypical meaning of the “presumptive”, the “possibility” starts from the hypothetical system, as it is used in the example (13).

But the most interesting fact in this construction is that it shows evidence of a particle and not of a verbal element, because of the loss of all the prototypical elements of a verb (conjugation, verbal morphology etc.).

As presented in the examples above, there are two meanings -except for the traditional one of motion-, found in two different syntactic constructions. But it is questioned now whether these meanings occur in both constructions. Thus, the following tables present the relation between the two syntactic constructions and the meanings:

Construct ion: Πα να+ subjunctiv e	Ιστορί α και όνειρο	Ρίμα παρηγορητικ ή	Κα τζ.	Ερω φ.	Παν.	Ζήνων	Θυσί α του Α.	Στά θης	Ροδ ολ.	Κ. Π.	
motion	2	-	2	5	3	2	12	5	1	25	57
proximate future	-	-	2	-	2	1	5	-	-	-	10
possibility	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	5
	2	-	5	5	5	3	18	7	1	26	

Table 1 | The relation between *πα να+* subjunctive and the meanings.

Construct ion: Πα + subjunctiv e	Ιστορί α και όνειρο	Ρίμα παρηγορητικ ή	Κατζ.	Ερω φ.	Πα ν.	Ζήνων	Θυσία του Α.	Στάθ ης	Ροδ ολ.	Κ. Π.	
motion	-	1	8	-	1	3	-	2	3	17	35
proximate future	-	-	10	2	3	-	-	-	-	4	19
possibility	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	9
		1	22	2	5	3	-	6	3	21	

Table 2 | The relation between *πα +* subjunctive and the meanings.

As far as the different meanings are concerned, it is observed that in most cases they are not used in the same syntactic constructions. For instance, the meaning of proximate future is expressed, in totally nineteen (19) examples, through the construction of *πα* + subjunctive, while this meaning is found in ten (10) examples in construction of *πα να* + subjunctive. As for the meaning of possibility, it is found in both syntactic constructions too, but it is more common in the construction of *πα* + subjunctive: It is found in totally nine (9) examples, while the construction of *πα να* + subjunctive is used for five (5) examples. Another interesting point is that these semantic properties are not illustrated in *Κρητικός Πόλεμος*. In the latest text of Cretan Renaissance⁸, the verb *πα* exhibits almost exclusively the traditional meaning of motion and there are only a few examples with the meaning of proximate future and possibility, in both syntactic constructions, emphasizing the use of the construction *πα* + subjunctive. This maybe has a strong relation with the genre of the text, as it constitutes the less ‘sophisticated’ in comparison with the others (Markopoulos, 2006). Thus, literal meanings, such as the prototypical one of motion, are preferred. Finally, it is argued that the different semantic properties of *πα* in both syntactic constructions are not found in texts of the 15th century. Thus, it is argued that Cretan Renaissance constitutes a focal point for the appearance of different constructions with *πα*. Finally, in the table below, is shown the frequency of use of the meanings of proximate future and possibility in the texts and as it is concluded, the verb *πα* expresses more often the meaning of proximate future:

Meaning	Ιστορία και όνειρο	Ρίμα παρηγορητική	Κατζ.	Ερωφ.	Παν.	Ζήνων	Θυσία του Α.	Στάθης	Ροδολ.	Κ. Π.	
motion	3	1	10	5	4	5	12	7	4	42	93
proximate future	-	-	12	2	5	1	5	-	-	4	29
Possibility	-	-	5		1		1	6	-	1	14
	3	1	27	7	10	6	18	13	4	47	

Table 3 | The frequency of use of meanings

4 Conclusion

This paper has shown that the short form *πα* of the motion verb *πάω*, derived from *πηγαίνω*, participates in two syntactic constructions (one with the particle *να* and another without it) and expresses other grammatical meanings, apart from the prototypical one, the meaning of motion. These are the meanings of proximate future and possibility. Also, it is argued that the short form *πα* is undergoing its own development, as it is a grammatical element and not a lexical one, with its verbal morphology already lost. More precisely, the data drawn from the Cretan Renaissance illustrate that this form in the third singular person has a particle-like status. Finally, it is argued that both semantic properties participate in both syntactic constructions, but with different frequencies of use.

⁸ As noted in Alexiou and Aposkiti (1995), *Κρητικός Πόλεμος* was written between 1669/1670 and 1677.

References

- Αλεξίου, Στυλιανός, και Μάρθα Αποσκήτη. 1995. *Μαρίνου Τζάνε Μπουνιαλή του Ρεθυμναίου: Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος (1645-1669)*, Αθήνα: Στιγμή.
- Bourdin, Philippe. 2008. "On the Grammaticalization of come and go". In *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*, edited by Maria José Lopez – Couso and Elena Seoane, 37-59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Budts, Sara, and Peter Petré. 2016. "Reading the intentions of be going to. On the subjectification of future markers". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 37: 1-32.
- Bybee, Joan, William Pagliuca, and Revere Perkins. 1991. "Back to the future". In *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, edited by Elisabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-58. Vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Danchev, Andrey, and Merja Kytö. 1994. "The construction be going to + infinitive in Early Modern English". In *Studies in early Modern English*, edited by Dieter Kastovsky, 59-77. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Denizot, Camille, and Sophie Vassilaki. 2017. "La fabrique de l'éventuel en grec : les fortunes de τυχόν". In *The Greek Future and its History. Le futur grec et son histoire*, edited by Frédéric Lambert, Rutger J. Allan and Theodoros Markopoulos, 253-283. Leuven : Peeters.
- Fernand, Mossé. 1938. *Histoire de la forme périphrastique être + participe présent en germanique*. Paris : Klincksieck (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, XLII et XLIII).
- Fischer, Olga, Ans van Kemenade, Willem Koopman, and Wim van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grammenidis, Simos. 1994. "The verbs 'πηγαίνω' and 'έρχομαι' in Modern Greek". In *Themes in Greek in Linguistics. Papers from the 1st International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, (Reading, 9/1993), edited by Irene Philippaki-Warbuton, Katerina Nicolaidis and Maria Sifianou, 193-200. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Heine, Bernd. 2003. "Grammaticalization". In *The handbook of historical linguistics*, edited by Joseph D. Brian and Richard D. Janda, 575-601. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, David. 1991. *Literature and society in Renaissance Crete*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, J. Paul. 1991. "On some principles of grammaticalization". In *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, edited by Elisabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-36. Vol I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. Second edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jannaris, Antonius Nicholas. 1899. *An historical greek grammar, chiefly of the Attic dialect*. London : Macmillan.
- Κόντα, Ειρήνη. 2002. "Η δομή 'πάω να' ως δείκτης μελλοντικής αναφοράς." Στο: *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 22: 353-364.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. (1975[1965]). The evolution of grammatical categories, *Esquisseslinguistiques* 2: 38–54. (Diogenes 1965: 55–71.).

- Μαρκόπουλος, Θεόδωρος. 2006. “Γραμματικοποίηση και γλωσσική ποικιλία: ο μέλλοντας στην εποχή της Κρητικής Αναγέννησης” (16ος-17ος αι.)” *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 27: 251-263.
- Nicolle, Steve. 2012. “Diachrony and grammaticalization”. In *The oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, edited by Robert. I. Binnick, 370-397. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve Eliot. 1988. “Grammaticalization and Semantic Bleaching”. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, edited by Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaisser, and Helen Singmaster, 389-405. Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1975. “Semantics and syntax of motion”. In *Syntax and Semantics*, edited by John P. Kimball, Vol. IV, 181-238. New York: Academic Press.
- Traugott, Elisabeth Closs, and Bernd Heine. 1991. *Approaches to grammaticalization, Vol I*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Traugott, Elisabeth Closs, and Richard. B. Dasher. 2001. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsakali, Vassiliki. 2003. “On the Greek verbs erhome ‘come’ and pijeno ‘go’”. Unpublished MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Χατζιδάκις, Γεώργιος. 1905. *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά Α’*. Αθήνα: Πελεκάνος.