



## 1 David Felipe Guerrero-Beltran (LLF, CNRS & Université Paris-Cité)

### Avertive constructions in Gu-jingaliya

Gurr-goni (GG) and Gu-jingaliya (GJ) are two non-Pama-Nyungan languages from the Maningrida family spoken by about 30 and 900 people in the Arnhem Land (Northern Territory, Australia). Following previous descriptions of GG and GJ (Carew, n.d.; Caudal, 2021; Green, 1995, *inter alia*), we will present an analysis of the avertive constructions in these languages.

Like many non-Pama-Nyungan languages (Caudal, 2021), GG and GJ avertive meanings are expressed through a polyfunctional past irrealis inflexion. GG/GJ's past irrealis suffixes can refer to past modalities, negative past events, and avertive/counterfactual events, as in example (1):

- (1) a-wu-che+rna            gu-ba-nge+rna            wurra gu-n-nyagara (GJ)  
I.O-give-C+PST.IRR    IV.O-eat-NFUT+PST.IRR            but    IV-DC-nothing  
'She should have given it to him and he would have drunk it, but nothing.'  
(England et al., 2014, p. 23-Margaret Garranyita)

Due to the polyfunctional semantics of past irrealis markers, avertive constructions often require additional elements specifying: negation, discourse contrast, or failed expectations/suppositions, as in example (1) above and (2-3) below.

- (2) mundjarra    gabi    police station            mu-yo-rri+rni            (GG)  
supposedly    MED    police station            III-lie-C+PST.IRR  
'It was supposed to lie at the police station (but wasn't).'  
(Green, 1995, p. 315)
- (3) gala    wupa    birripa            gu-bu-na-che+rna            gu-n-nyagara (GJ)  
NEG    inside    3.AUG.CARD    IV.O-AUG.A-see-C+PST.IRR    IV-DC-nothing  
'(They walked around and) they couldn't go inside to see, nothing.'  
(England et al., 2014, p. 13-England Banggala)

Examples (1-3) shows that avertivity is not part of the *at-issue* content of GJ/GG past irrealis markers. Instead, it is one of many possible interpretations of the irrealis markers which can be inferred at their expressive (*non-at-issue*) dimension. Whether past irrealis is inferred as a past modal, a past negative event, or as an avertive event, will thus depend on presuppositional information triggered by other elements in the construction, such as *mundjarra* 'supposedly' in (2). Nevertheless, avertitive readings can also be inferred without additional elements, as in example (4):

- (4) maka    dji-na-djeka-nga+rni,            nguwurr-bogi-ya+rni.            (GG)  
FAMO    3IIS-TWDS-go\_back-NFUT+PST.IRR    1+2.AUG.S-go-C+PST.IRR  
'Your grandma could have come back, (so) we could all have gone.'  
(= if your grandma had come back, we would all have gone) (Green, 1995, p. 196)

In cases like (4), it remains unclear whether aspectual/rhetorical specification or switch reference through multiverb constructions may restrict or affect the interpretation of irrealis markers, as suggested by Green (1987, p. 53), or if it relies on extralinguistic factors.

### Abbreviations

I-IV: 3rd person noun classes; A: Subject of transitive clause; AUG: augmented number; C: contemporary tense; CARD: cardinal pronoun; DC: direct case; FaMo: Father's mother; MED: medial demonstrative; NEG: negation; NFUT: non-future tense; O: object; PST.IRR: past irrealis; TWDS: towards.

### References

- Carew, M. (n.d.). *The grammar of Gun-nartpa (unpublished)*.  
Caudal, P. (2021). *Avertive/frustrative markers in Australian languages: blurring the boundaries between aspectuo-temporal and modal meanings*.  
England, C. B., Litchfield, P. M., England, R. W., & Carew, M. (2014). *Gun-ngaypa Rrawa 'My Country.'* Batchelor Institute Press.  
Green, R. (1987). *A sketch grammar of Burarra*. Australian National University.  
Green, R. (1995). *A grammar of Gurr-goni (North Central Arnhem Land)*. Australian National University.

## 2 Nicholas EVANS (Australian National University)

### Beyond fear: the grammar of negative emotions in Australian languages

Nicholas Evans. (ANU/CoEDL).

Abstract for FEMIDAL workshop, Fontainebleau, Oct 2022

It has been known for some time (Dixon 1980, Zester 2010) that Australian languages frequently possess grammatical mechanisms encoding fear (typically by the speaker, or by the agent) that some action might occur, and outline redressive action to avoid it. Constructions in this broad domain have been variously termed 'lest constructions' (Dixon 1972), apprehensives (Evans 1995), aversives (Dixon 1977, 1980, 2002:171), evitatives (Hale 1997). The site of encoding may be verbal TAM-inflections (Kayardild), specialised types of subordinate construction (Dyirbal), case marking on NPs (Yidiny, Kayardild), 'modal case' (Kayardild), or special series of pronominal prefixes/proclitics (Dalabon).

In this talk I will discuss three interrelated questions, drawing especially on fine-grained analyses of the relevant categories in Kayardild (Tangkic) and Dalabon (Gunwinyguan)

(a) how accurate is it to subsume all these under the 'grammar of fear'? Among the related meanings, in addition to the prototypically-invoked meanings of apprehension and redressive action, these constructions express (i) threats (ii) undesirable actions which are already happening, (iii) flight or avoidance (from unpleasant things or events) (iv) other types of modal uncertainty that are neutral with respect to desirability

(b) how far do these semantic nuances reflect differences in the site at which these categories are encoded? Where there is more than one site, how do these work together to produce specific meanings in this domain (e.g. Kayardild has three: verbal inflections, modal case, and a special evitative case, each with different semantic conditions).

(c) what can a detailed study of grammaticalisation pathways tell us about the ways in which this cluster of meanings and their interrelationships are conceptualised? In many

languages, for example, aversive case suffixes are built from other cases, and apprehensive verb inflections are typically formed by adding a case (e.g. comitative in Dyrbal) to nominalised verbs (Blake 1993:45-7). In other languages, insubordination (Evans 2007, Evans & Watanabe 2016) leads to erstwhile subordinate ‘lest’ clauses allowing main-clause use – what semantic changes accompany insubordination?

### 3 Maïa Ponsonnet (DDL, CNRS / Lyon 2)

#### **My belly is angry and my throat is in love – A typology of body-based emotion metaphors in Australian languages**

Many Australian Indigenous languages use collocations featuring body parts to describe emotions. For instance, in Dalabon (Gunwinyguan, NPN), *kangu-yowyow(mu)*, lit. ‘belly flows’, means ‘feel good, be nice’; in Arrernte (PN, Arandic), *ahentye ampeme*, lit. ‘throat is burning’ means ‘feel angry’; in Kaurua (PN, Yura) *tangka mampinhi*, lit. ‘liver staggering’ means ‘to mourn, to be cast down about a deceased person’ (Turpin 2002; Gaby 2008; Ponsonnet 2014; Ponsonnet, Hoffmann, and O’Keeffe 2020).

The first part of this presentation, based on first-hand data collected with speakers of Dalabon (Gunwinyguan, NPN, Arnhem Land), focuses on figurative expressions featuring the word for ‘belly’ in this language. A relatively large set of such expressions enables us to unveil the underlying figurative logic of these expressions (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Kövecses 2000; Sharifian, Dirven, et al. 2008). I will discuss their conceptual anchorage into somatic metonymies, and subsequent figurative ramifications such as metaphors of destruction, resistance, and accessibility.

In the second part of the talk, I will present a typology of body-based emotion tropes in Australia, across a balanced sample of 67 languages (Ponsonnet and Laginha 2020). In this sample, at least 30 distinct body parts occurred in emotional expressions. The belly is by far the most frequent; the heart, abdomen, eyes, nose, head, face, ears, throat, forehead, and liver, are also prevalent. These prevalent body parts divide into four groups based on the types of tropes that link them with emotions. I will present these four profiles of body parts, which emotions they preferentially map onto, and via which figurative processes. I will also discuss plausible historical scenarios to explain how body parts become linguistically associated with emotions, and what these scenarios suggest regarding the cultural status of these linguistic associations.

#### **References**

- Gaby, Alice R. 2008. “Guts Feelings: Locating Emotion, Life Force and Intellect in the Thaayorre Body.” In *Body, Culture and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages.*, edited by Farzad Sharifian, René Dirven, Yu Ning, and Susanne Niemeier, 27–44. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Ponsonnet, Maïa. 2014. *The Language of Emotions: The Case of Dalabon (Australia).* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Ponsonnet, Maïa, Dorothea Hoffmann, and Isabel O’Keeffe. 2020. *Emotion, Body and Mind across a Continent: Figurative Representations of Emotions in Australian Aboriginal Languages - Special Issue of Pragmatics & Cognition 27(1)*.
- Ponsonnet, Maïa, and Kitty Laginha. 2020. “The Role of the Body in Descriptions of Emotions. A Typology of the Australian Continent.” *Pragmatics and Cognition 27 (1)*: 20–83.
- Sharifian, Farzad, René Dirven, Ning Yu, and Susanne Niemeier. 2008. *Culture, Body and Language. Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Turpin, Myfany. 2002. “Body Part Terms in Kaytetye Feeling Expressions .” In *The Body in Description of Emotion, Pragmatics and Cognition*, edited by Nick J Enfield and Anna Wierzbicka, 10:271–303. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

#### 4 Patrick Caudal & Beatrice Pahontu (LLF, CNRS & Université Paris-Cité)

##### On the development of Australian vs. Romance s: modal bases and aspectual meanings

This talk will give further substance to the claim made in (Caudal 2018) that demodality encompasses both positive and negative meanings, respectively associated with ‘actuality entailment’ (1)/(3) postmodal constructions vs. what we will refer to as ‘inactuality entailment’ postmodal constructions (2)/(4), sometimes realized by separately conventionalized constructions or complex morphological markings (‘postmodal’ being here meant in (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998)’s sense).

- (1) Dieu a voulu qu’il survive à la guerre.  
 God have.3sg.PR want.PP that.he survive-3sg.SUBJ.PR to the war  
 ‘God willed it that he should survive the war (= God willed it, and he survived).
- (2) Il a voulu ouvrir la porte.  
 He have.3sg.PR want.PP open-INF the door  
 ‘He (vainly) tried to open the door.’
- (3) Il a pu ouvrir la porte.  
 He have.3sg.PR be.able-PP open-INF the door  
 ‘He managed to open the door.’
- (4) Il n’a pas pu ouvrir la porte.  
 He NEG.have.3sg.PR NEG be.able-PP open-INF the door  
 ‘He (tried and) failed to open the door’.

A brief areal comparative account of demodality across Europe vs. Australia based on a sample of 40 languages (capitalizing on the results of (Caudal 2022a) for its Australian part), will reveal that while SAE languages seem to offer both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ demodal meanings, with a predominance of the former over the latter, Australian languages exclusively grammaticalize or constructionalize negative postmodal meanings – especially so-called avertives (Kuteva et al. 2019), cf. (5)-(6).

- (5) ayana-wu-ni (Iwaidja)  
 1sg>3pl.FRUST-hit-FRUST (TAIM20181114DY@00:04:11) (Author’s filedwork)  
 ‘I was going to hit them but didn’t/nearly hit them’.
- (6) na-buk yimarnek ki-buddu-karlkkangkila. (Kunbarlang)

i-person CTFCT 3sg.neg-3pl.obj-stalk.irr.pst conj  
 kadda-rnay la kadda-bum.  
 3pl.nf-see.pst conj 3pl.nf-hit.pst

‘He was going to sneak up on them, but they saw him & beat him’ (Kapitonov 2019:291)

The core research question addressed in this paper will be – what is the reason behind this typological asymmetry? After identifying distinct, sometimes overlapping development paths for the various categories at stake in both SAE and Australian languages (with averitivity primarily deriving from volitional/proximative aspectuo-modal meanings in Australia), we will hypothesize that the observable differences between Europe and Australia mostly originate in deep differences in the respective types of aspectual systems found in ‘Standard Average European’ (Haspelmath 1998) (especially Romance and Germanic) vs. Australian languages. In particular, following (Caudal 2022b), we will argue that Australian languages frequently lack combinations of ‘strong’ perfective aspectual operators with modal operators in their morphology and lexicon, as they tend to only possess aspectually underspecified and/or ‘weak’ perfective tenses the sense of (Martin 2019) – i.e., past tenses, which even when endowed with perfective meanings, can disregard culminating interpretations, cf. (7), which is an instance of a so-called ‘non-culminating accomplishment’ (Bar-El, Davis & Matthewson 2006).

- (7) n-alyubaru-nu=ma y-akina yinumaninga akena nara (Anindilyakwa)  
 REAL.3M-eat-PST=CTYP MASC-that MASC.food but NEG  
 kin-alyubari-na  
 IRR.3M>MASC-eat-PST  
 ‘He began to eat the wild apple, but didn’t finish it’ (Bednall 2019: 206)  
 (weak perfective; partitive culmination – event began but failed to culminate)

We will conclude by arguing for the centrality of an aspectual-coercion based origin of demodal meanings in Germanic & Romance (although it is not exclusive – Romanian thus offers an Australian-like, imperfective avertive (Pahonțu forthcoming)) – and will suggest that such instances of aspectual coercion should not be regarded as a matter of mere type-shifting operator à la (de Swart 1998), but as a richer, multi-dimensional type of meaning à la (Gutzmann 2015), combining a non-at-issue modal meaning (formerly at-issue), with an innovative ‘actuality entailment’, at issue meaning. Of course, such developments are entirely lacking in Australian languages, for want of proper ‘strong’ perfective grams combining with modal markers.

## References

- Auwers, Johan van der & Vladimir Plungian. 1998. Modality’s semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2(1). 79–124.
- Bar-El, Leora, Henry Davis & Lisa Matthewson. 2006. On Non-Culminating Accomplishments. In Leah Bateman & Cherlon Ussery (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 35)*, vol. 1, 87–102. Amherst, MA.: GLSA (Graduate Linguistic Student Association), Department of Linguistics, University of Massachusetts.
- Bednall, James. 2019. *Temporal, aspectual and modal expression in Anindilyakwa, the language of the Groote Eylandt archipelago, Australia*. Canberra / Paris: ANU & Université de Paris-Diderot PhD Thesis.
- Caudal, Patrick. 2018. Demodality: profiling a novel category at the tense/aspect – modality divide. Presented at the 13th International Conference on Tense, Aspect, Modality and Evidentiality (Chronos 13), Université de Neuchâtel.
- Caudal, Patrick. 2022a. Avertive/frustrative markers in Australian languages: blurring the boundaries between aspectuo-temporal and modal meanings. In Kasia M. Jaszczolt (ed.), *Understanding Human Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caudal, Patrick. 2022b. Culmination/telicity and event delineation in Australian Languages: phonology, morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics. In Nora Boneh, Daniel Harbour, Ora Matushansky & Isabelle Roy (eds.), *Building on Babel’s Rubble*. Saint Denis: Presses

- Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-Conditional Meaning: Studies in Multidimensional Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. How young is standard average european? *Language Sciences* 20(3)(3). 271–287.
- Kapitonov, Ivan. 2019. *A grammar of Kunbarlang*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne. <http://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/225743> (1 November, 2020).
- Kuteva, Tania, Bas Aarts, Gergana Popova & Anvita Abbi. 2019. The grammar of ‘non-realization.’ *Studies in Language* 43(4). 850–895. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.18044.kut>.
- Martin, Fabienne. 2019. Non-culminating accomplishments. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 13(8). 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12346>.
- Pahonțu, Beatrice. forthcoming. *Périphrases progressives/proximatives et avertivité en roumain*. Université de Paris / Universitatea din București PhD Thesis.
- Swart, Henriëtte de. 1998. Aspect Shift and Coercion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(2). 347–385.

## 5 James Gray (Australian National University)

### The position of non-finite modality in a typology of variable force modality: Some thoughts on Pintupi-Luritja

Variable force modality, where particular modal expressions can express both possibility and necessity readings, has been increasingly described and theorised about across languages of the world (Rullmann et al 2008, Peterson 2010, Deal 2011, Yanovich 2016, a.o.). Gray (2021) described the modality that arises in some uses of purposive clauses in Pintupi-Luritja (Western Desert, Pama-Nyungan), and showed that these constructions also exhibit variable force. The Pintupi-Luritja data is interesting in light of previous analyses of the phenomenon. Deal (2011) for example analyses some modal expression in Nez Perce as an underlying possibility modal, with subsequent strengthening to a necessity modal in ways analogous to scalar implicatures. A scalar implicature account of force variability makes predictions about possible readings in non-upward-entailing environments; these predictions are however not carried through in Pintupi-Luritja; variability endures in grammatical environments that are predicted to have uniform readings. I suggest that the variable modality that arises in non-finite environments like the Pintupi-Luritja purposives has a different nature to those described elsewhere; the typology of variable force modality as a phenomenon may then not be reducible to a single analysis.

#### References:

- Deal, Amy Rose. 2011. Modals without scales. *Language* 87: 559-85.
- Gray James. 2021. Variable Modality in Pintupi-Luritja Purposive Clauses. *Languages* 6(1):52.
- Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson, and Henry Davis. 2008. Modals as distributive indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 16: 317-57.
- Peterson, Tyler. 2010. Epistemic Modality and Evidentiality in Gitksan at the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface. Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Yanovich, Igor. 2016. Old English \*motan, variable-force modality, and the presupposition of inevitable actualization. *Language* 92: 489-521.

## 6 Rob Mailhammer (Western Sydney University)

### Reconstructing verb prefixes in the Iwaidjan languages

The topic of this talk is the development of the future tense prefixes in the Iwaidjan languages. The paper argues that Proto-Iwaidjan possessed preverbal clitics that formed a preverbal clitic complex. These clitics expressed pronominal information about the subject and object as well as TAM information. As in other Non-Pama-Nyungan languages (Harvey & Mailhammer Ms.), these clitics developed into prefixes in the Iwaidjan daughter languages. This paper argues that the forms of the future prefixes found in modern Amurdak, Iwaidja and Mawng go back to one paradigm. They are best explained as parts of the preverbal clitic complex that Proto-Iwaidjan appears to have inherited from Proto-Australian.

The data for this reconstruction come from published descriptions of the three languages in question (Capell & Hinch 1970; Pym & Larrimore 1979; Singer 2006; Mailhammer 2009; Mailhammer 2014; Mailhammer 2017; Mailhammer & Harvey 2018) as well as field work. The future prefix paradigms for intransitive verbs are set out in Table 1.

*Table 1: Intransitive future prefix in Amurdak (Class 3), Iwaidja and Mawng*  
Table 1: Intransitive future prefix in Amurdak (Class 3), Iwaidja and Mawng

Person/number	Amurdak	Iwaidja	Mawng
1sg	<i>an-</i>	<i>ŋ-ana-</i>	<i>ŋana-</i>
1nsg/pl.incl	<i>aban-</i>	<i>adbana-</i>	<i>argbana-/adbana-</i>
1nsg/pl.excl	<i>aran-</i>	<i>ŋadbana-</i>	<i>ŋadbana-</i>
2sg	<i>wan-</i>	<i>aŋmana-</i>	<i>aŋbana-</i>
2nsg/pl	<i>uran-</i>	<i>gudbana-</i>	<i>gudbana-</i>
3sg	<i>wan-</i>	∅	<i>iwa(na)-(M)/iŋbana-(F), aŋbana-(LL)/mana-(VE)/aba(na)-(ED)/</i>
3nsg/pl	<i>iran-/waran-</i>	<i>ana-</i>	<i>awa(na)-</i>

The Iwaidja and Mawng forms are reconstructable as coming from one ancestral paradigm if one assumes that Iwaidja has lost gender marking on intransitive verbs. The 2sg in Iwaidja is reconcilable with such an interpretation, if the occurrence of /m/ is explained by progressive assimilation, which happens elsewhere in Iwaidja. This and similar cases make it clear that the underlying morpheme that expresses the future tense is really *ba(na)-* which can be abstracted for Mawng allowing for standard morphophonemic variants (Pym & Larrimore 1979: 116–120; Singer 2006: 57). Amurdak also has forms with *m-* in transitive verbs, e.g. *a-man-* 1sg.fut in *aman-ma-ju* ‘I’ll get it’, which can be explained in analogy to the relevant Iwaidja forms. The Proto-Iwaidjan I reconstruct is *\*ba(na)-*, which can be compared with a Proto-Australian root modal clitic *\*ba*, with future tense readings in many daughter languages (Harvey & Mailhammer Ms.). I propose that Proto-Iwaidjan inherited this clitic. In Mawng, this form essentially remains unchanged, except for standard lenition. However, Iwaidja and Amurdak developed additional *m-*initial forms through progressive assimilation, which is attested elsewhere in the language. In all three languages, the meaning is that of a future tense, though there is some overlap with other purely modal categories (Caudal & Mailhammer 2019). The talk will also explore whether the “irrealis” prefix series in Iwaidja, (Caudal & Mailhammer 2019), e.g. *ga-na-ja-nyij* ‘look! vs. *ga-bana-ja-n* ‘you will see’ is also connected to this modal clitic.

This reconstruction sheds new light on how the prefixes in the Iwaidjan languages can be reconstructed, which may be a pathway to explaining other unexplained forms in those languages, especially in Amurdak (see Mailhammer 2017 for further details), and possibly for other Australian languages.

## References

- Capell, Arthur & Heather E. Hinch. 1970. *Maung Grammar, Texts and Vocabulary*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Caudal, Patrick & Robert Mailhammer. 2019. Tense-Aspect-Mood System of Iwaidja. CoEDL Fest, Sydney 4-8 February 2019.
- Harvey, Mark & Robert Mailhammer. Ms. Proto-Australian. University of Newcastle/Western Sydney University, ms.
- Mailhammer, Robert. 2009. Towards an aspect-based analysis of the verb categories of Amurdak. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 29(3). 349–391.
- Mailhammer, Robert. 2014. Some answers and more puzzles: Newly discovered modal categories and the history of the Iwaidjan verb system. In Aicha Belkadi, Kakia Chatsiou & Kirsty Rowan (eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory 4*, 1–16. London: SOAS.
- Mailhammer, Robert. 2017. Zur Rekonstruktion der Verbalpräfixe im Amurdak. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 1–30.
- Mailhammer, Robert & Mark Harvey. 2018. A reconstruction of the Proto-Iwaidjan phoneme system. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 38. 329–359.
- Pym, Noreen & Bonnie Larrimore. 1979. *Papers on Iwaidja Phonology and Grammar*. Darwin: SIL.
- Singer, Ruth. 2006. *Agreement in Mawng: Productive and lexicalised uses of agreement in an Australian language*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.