Towards a Typology of Version: Formal and Functional Perspectives[1]

Gregory Anderson and Olga Gurevich
U Oregon / MPI-EVA, Leipzig and UC Berkeley

1 Introduction

In this report, we examine the category of *version*, a discourse-based notion of 'primary affectedness.' We look at its status in grammar and grammatical theory and offer a preliminary typology of its formal and functional realizations using data from languages of Eurasia. Version is generally realized in the morphosyntax of a language, particularly in constructions whose participants perform 'subject' or 'object' functions; it has often been considered a kind of voice manipulation. Formally, version often uses the apparatus of voice manipulation or a serial / auxiliary verb construction, and/or the expression of TAM categories. It is often expressed constructionally and crucially depends on the rest of the morphosyntax of a language.

1.1 Definition and functional types of version

What we describe here as 'version' can fulfill several related discourse/pragmatic functions in the languages under consideration. In this introductory and cursory overview, we discuss 'primary affectedness' and orientation. Primary affectedness is a discourse-based notion that singles out the event participant or discourse referent seen as most salient in the conversation. 'Orientation' includes deictic spatial orientation and its various metaphorical extensions, which are well represented in grammaticalization phenomena from a number of languages.

Version differs from voice in several important ways. Voice either adds, deletes, or equates actor and undergoer participants, and thus belongs to a layer of lexical event structure. Version, on the other hand, encodes discourse-based properties (primary affectedness, orientation, or salience) of those participants already present in the event structure.

The role of the participant that is highlighted as salient, and encoded formally through the version construction, varies from language to language but generally includes subject, object, and oblique-like roles. The first two are often labeled "subject[ive]" and "object[ive]" version, respectively, while one manifestation of the latter is known as 'locative' version in the Kartvelianist literature (see the discussion of Georgian below).

Consider the English variants *I shot me/myself a bear*. This is an unusual construction in the grammar of English: the objective pronoun *me* (in this case a dative-moved recipient or beneficiary, i.e. a semi-reflexive self-benefactive) and the reflexive *myself* are generally not interchangeable in their non-version uses. The pronominal element *me/myself* 'parasitically' uses the morphosyntactic machinery available in English to

[1]Funding for this paper was in part provided by the following organizations: Volkswagen Stiftung, IREX, Wenner-Gren Foundation, HRELP, MPI-EVA. Thanks to Marc Ettlinger, Nick Fleisher, Anne Pycha, Ilya Yakubovich and several audience members at CLS 41 for helpful discussion. All errors of course remain our own.

encode a primarily affected referent, but does not add an argument to the subcategorization frame of the verb as a typical benefactive would; nor does it exhibit the canonical argument identity characteristics of a 'true' reflexive. We would like to suggest that this syntactic anomaly is due to the version-like function of the construction.

Version constructions occur in a wide range of languages, but for the sake of brevity, we survey only four languages and language groups with formal version systems: Georgian [Kartvelian], Turkic languages of Siberia, Burushaski [isolate], and South Munda Gorum of India [Austroasiatic].[2] These show not only the range of formal means of encoding version, but also the functional subtypes of the formation, and importantly how categories of version can become tied to and interconnected with grammatical subsystems that also serve to encode voice, valence, argument properties, tense, mood, and aspect categories. Indeed, in certain languages and in certain grammatical environments, the actual semantics of version formations can only be understood in a broader constructional context.

The origins of version constructions in these Eurasian languages suggest that they derive from either voice manipulation categories involving formal markers of referent properties, or from serialized verb constructions with deictic verbs like 'come' and 'take',[3] sometimes having passed through a stage of 'serialization' to one of 'auxiliation'. Another possible source includes adverbial (adnominal) elements, which may themselves come from a 'nominal periphrasis' development of serial verb constructions as well.[4]

Version constructions tend to be interpreted as sub-functions of various other grammatical subsystems that otherwise serve to mark argument relations, e.g. various kinds of voice, valence, tense, mood, or (viewpoint based) aspect.

2 Version in Georgian

The term "version" originates from the Georgian grammatical tradition; it is a translation of *kceva* (lit. 'change'). In Georgian (Tschenkeli 1958, Boeder 1969, Hewitt 1995), the category of version interacts with voice and TAM properties. The Kartvelianist grammatical literature describes version as one of the inflectional categories of a verb, along with TAM, person, number, and others.

Formally, it is marked by a set of pre-stem vowels, the historical origins of which

[2]Not discussed here but also relevant to a macro-typology of version are certain 'focus' constructions in various Austronesian languages, as well as the system of 'viewpoint aspect' in Oksapmin (an isolate within the putative Trans-New Guinea Phylum of 'Papuan' languages).

[3]Note in this regard the Russian formation *vzjal i umer* 'took and died (i.e. intentionally)' that is formally quasi-serialized and is functionally related to version formations. Thanks to I. Yakubovich for drawing our attention to this structure.

[4]Thai provides an example of such a development:

(1) THAI

a. *thân cá bin cáak krungthêep*
he FUT fly leave Bangkok
'he will fly to Bangkok'
(Blake 1994: 164)

b. *thân cá bin maa krungthêep*
he FUT fly come Bangkok
'he will fly from Bangkok'
(Blake 1994: 163)

are unclear. These so-called *version vowels* or *character vowels* mark a variety of distinctions in different morphosyntactic contexts. The precise function of version vowels can only be identified in conjunction with the TAM, agreement, and voice properties of the verb form.

2.1 Structure of the Georgian Verb

A simplified Georgian verb template is in (1); cf. (Hewitt 1995).

(1) (Preverb$_1$)-(Pron1$_2$)-(**Version**$_3$)-root$_4$-(Thematic Suffix$_5$)-(TAM$_6$)-(Pron2$_7$)[5]

Version vowels appear between the prefixal pronominal markers and the root. They do not co-occur with each other and appear in the same slot before the verbal stem. Possible version vowels are *i-*, *u-*, *e-*, *a-*.

Version vowels comprise a distributional / form class but have a variety of synchronically and diachronically distinct functions. The synchronic functions of version vowels include: 'objective,' 'subjective,' and 'locative' version (with transitive verbs); passive (with unaccusative verbs); perfect and pluperfect tense (in inversion constructions); future tense (with unergative verbs); causative; and an indication of lexical class.

Some functions of version vowels are historically related. In other cases, different version vowels may have become morphologized in the same slot, but were never part of a single functional category. That is, there may have been two separate grammaticalizations of the same phenomenon, or a secondary conflation of two originally distinct forms.

2.2 Prototypical Uses of Version: Active Constructions

The most prototypical uses of version vowels occur in active constructions (transitive and medio-active intransitive verb classes). Here, version vowels can express the primary affectedness of a subject ("subjective version") or an indirect object ("objective version"). The expression of version is optional and discourse (or pragmatically) motivated.

2.2.1 Objective version

With objective version, the primarily affected participant of an action is the indirect object [IO]. The version vowel depends on the person of the IO: for 1st and 2nd person IO, the vowel is *-i-* (transitive verbs in (2b), unergative in (4b)). For 3rd person IO, the vowel is *-u-* (3). In the first case, the pre-stem agreement slot is occupied by object markers referring to the indirect object. In the second case, the pre-stem agreement slot is empty or contains a subject marker.

[5] Abbreviations Used:
1 = 1st person; 2 = 2nd person; 3 = 3rd person; ACC = accusative; AOR = aorist; AUX = auxiliary; CLOC = cislocative; CV = converb; DAT = dative; ERG = ergative; FOC = focus; GEN = genitive; INF = infinitive; INTR=intransitive; LOC = locative; MOD = modal; NEG = negative; NOM = nominative; NPAST = non-past; PL = plural; OBJ= object; PL = plural; PERF = perfect; PLUPERF = pluperfect; PRES = present; PROG = progressive; PRON = pronominal; PST = past; PV = preverb; SG = singular; SUBJ = subject; TAM = tense/aspect/mood; TNS = tense; TS = thematic suffix; VER = version.

(2) a. *meri-m* *a-gho* ***chem-tvis*** *c'ign-i*
Mary-ERG PV-take.AOR **1SG-for** book-NOM
'Mary took a book for me.' (field notes[6])

b. *meri-m* *a-**m-i**-gho* ***(me)*** *c'ign-i*
Mary-ERG PV-**1SGOBJ-VER**-take.AOR **(1SG)** book-NOM
'Mary took a book **for me**.'

(3) *meri-m* *a-**u**-gho* *p'avle-s* *c'ign-i*
Mary-ERG PV-**VER**-take.AOR Paul-DAT book-NOM
'Mary took a book **for Paul**.'

(4) a. *shen **m-i**-cek'v-eb* *(me)*
you 1SGOBJ-**VER**-DANCE-TS (I)
'You will dance **for me**.'

b. *shen **u**-cek'v-eb* *(mas)*
you **VER**-DANCE-TS (he.DAT)
'You will dance **for him**.'

In the above examples, the use of a version vowel appears to allow the addition of another core argument (the indirect object). However, we would like to suggest that the addition of the argument is due to discourse / constructional factors, and version merely serves to specify the affectedness of that argument, as (5) demonstrates more clearly.

(5) a. *man* *mo-**m**-p'ara* *(me)* *vashl-i*
he.ERG PV-**1SGOBJ**-steal.AOR (1SG) apple-NOM
'He stole an apple **from me**.'

b. *man* *mo-**m-i**-p'ara* *(me)* *vashl-i*
he.ERG PV-**1SGOBJ-VER**-steal.AOR (1SG) apple-NOM
'He stole an apple **for me**.' (Boeder 1969)

2.2.2 Subjective version

Subjective version is indicated by the version vowel *-i-* and means that the primary participant affected by the action is the subject. In most cases, the subject is animate and the preverbal agreement slot contains a subject agreement marker. Subjective version is only possible with transitive verbs (6), and the object is most commonly 3rd person[7].

(6) a. *(me) saxl-s* ***v-i**-shen-eb* **mas*
(I) house.DAT **1SUBJ-VER**-build-TS *he.DAT
'I build a house **for myself**.'

b. *meri* *saxl-s* ***i**-shen-eb-s* **mas*
Mary.NOM house.DAT **VER**-build-TS-3SGSUBJ *he.DAT
'Mary builds a house **for herself**.'

[6]Unless otherwise specified, all Georgian data is from consultant work by one of the authors

[7]In rare, lexicalized instances, it is possible to have a 1st or 2nd person indirect object, so that the pre-stem agreement slot contains an object marker. In this case, the agreement marker and the version vowel refer to different action participants, and make the verb form ambiguous with objective version. However, such instances are rare, and are usually disambiguated by context.

For some Georgian verbs, the version vowel *-i-* is required (7). Some of these verbs have semantics compatible with a subjective / reflexive meaning.

(7) *me lekcia* *da-**v-i**-c'q'-e* */*da-v-c'q'-e*
I lecture.NOM PV-**1SUBJ-VER**-start-AOR /*PV-1SUBJ-start-AOR
'I have started the lecture.' (frozen form)

Objective and subjective version can be indicated by the same vowel, but their functions are clearly distinct. However, the only way to distinguish them formally is by looking at the agreement system and at the arguments cross-referenced on the verb. In other words, it is the particular formal constructional combinations that yield the appropriate semantic interpretation.

2.2.3 Locative version

Active constructions in Georgian permit one more type of version, the so-called 'locative' ('superessive') version expressed by the vowel *-a-*. This again indicates primary affectedness of an indirect object, but further specifies that the action is done in some spatial relation to the indirect object (usually 'onto'). It can often be paraphrased by a postpositional phrase with *-ze* 'on' (8).

(8) a. *me **v-a**-t'ex-av* *j'ox-s* *mis **tav-s***
I **1SUBJ-VER**-break-TS stick-DAT his **head-DAT**
'I break a stick **over** his head.'

b. *me v-t'ex-av* *j'ox-s* *mis tav-**ze***
I 1SUBJ-break-TS stick-DAT his head-**on**
'I break a stick **over** his head.'

Similarly with unergative verbs:

(9) a. *t'ot-s* *a-zis*
branch-DAT **VER**-sit.PRES
'He sits **on** a tree branch.'

b. *t'ot-**ze*** *zis*
branch-**on** sit.PRES
'He sits **on** a tree branch.'

2.3 Further Grammaticalized Uses of Version Vowels in Georgian

Version vowels in Georgian are used in other constructions to serve functions that are quite different from their prototypical uses.

2.3.1 Unaccusative / Passive

In the passive constructions, version vowels in the Georgian verbal template express the *presence* of an affected participant (*-e-*, as in (10b)) vs. its *absence* (*-i-*, as in (10a)). In these constructions, a version marker is required.

(10) a. ***i**-c'ereba*
VER-write.INTR.PRES
'It is being written.'

b. ***e**-c'ereba* *(mas)*
VER-write.INTR.PRES (he.DAT)
'It is being written **for/in front of/on him**.'

As with the active constructions, version markers express the general notion of primary affectedness. However, their specific function is determined by the larger construction. This difference cannot be ascribed to independent meanings of the version markers, but rather must be described in terms of the differences between active and passive formations.

2.3.2 Inverse Construction

In so-called 'inversion' paradigms (perfect / evidential; cf. Harris 1981), the version vowels are required and serve to distinguish TAM and person of the subject. In the Perfect, the vowel *-i-* is used with 1st and 2nd person subject (11a), and *-u-* is used with 3rd person subject (11b).

(11) a. *(t'urme) saxl-i a-**m-i**-sheneb-ia.*
(apparently) house.NOM PV-**1SGOBJ-VER**-build-PERF
'I have (apparently) built a house.'

b. *mas (t'urme) saxl-i a-**u**-sheneb-ia.*
3SG.DAT (apparently) house.NOM PV-**VER**-build-PERF
'(S)he has (apparently) built a house.'

In the Pluperfect, *-e-* is used in all forms(12).

(12) a. *saxl-i unda a-**m-e**-sheneb-ina.*
house.NOM must PV-**1SGOBJ-VER**-build-PLUPERF
'I was supposed to have built a house.'

b. *mas saxl-i unda a-**e**-sheneb-ina.*
3SG.DAT house.NOM must PV-**VER**-build-PLUPERF
'(S)he was supposed to have built a house.'

Again, the function of the version vowels may be historically related to active constructions, but synchronically it is quite different and can only be described with reference to TAM distinctions.

2.3.3 Other uses of version vowels

The version vowel *-i-* can be used in forming the future for a certain class of verbs (13), in contrast to the usual method of adding a preverb (14).

(13) a. *pren*
fly
'You are flying'

b. ***i**-pren*
VER-fly
'You will fly'

(14) a. *xat'av*
draw
'You are drawing'

b. ***da**-xat'av*
PV-draw
'You will draw'

The vowel *-a-* can be used in the formation of causatives (15).

(15) a. *v-q'ep*
1SUBJ-bark
'I bark.'

b. *v-**a**-q'ep-**eb***
1SUBJ-**VER**-bark-**TS**
'I make him bark.'

The same version vowel *-a-* and thematic suffix *-eb* also appear in verbs formed from nouns and adjectives. In this case, *-a-* is required even when there is no indirect object. Historically, the use of *-a-* may signal a verbalizing function (increase in valency as compared to a noun), but synchronically it is simply part of the verb form. *-a-* can be replaced by other vowels to express objective or subjective version (16c).

(16) a. *saxl-s* ***a**-shen-**eb***
house-DAT **VER**-build-**TS**
'You build a house (beneficiary not specified).'

b. *saxl-s* ***a**-shen-eb* *mis-tvis* */ *mas*
house-DAT **VER**-build-TS he.GEN-for / *he.DAT
'You build a house for him.'

c. *saxl-s* ***u**-shen-eb* **mis-tvis* */ mas*
house-DAT **VER**-build-TS *he.GEN-for / he.DAT
'You build a house for him.'

This latter use provides a paradigmatic contrast with objective-version uses of *-i-*, and has been analyzed as indicating 'neutral version' (cf. Boeder 1969). However, as can be seen, the use of *-a-* in these contexts is not related to 'real' version expressing primary affectedness, and calling it 'neutral' is misleading, particularly since it only required in one lexical class of verbs (cf. (17) for another class).

(17) *surat-s* *xat'-av*
picture-DAT draw-TS
'You paint a picture.'

To summarize, the function of version vowels in Georgian is mainly determined by larger morphosyntactic constructions. In the case of active verbs, the version vowels express discourse-based primary affectedness of event participants and can indicate a large number of distinctions. In other constructions (e.g. passive or inverse), the morphological tools by which version can normally be expressed are used to mark other contrasts. The function of version vowels in these contexts is often related to, but more restricted than, the prototypical uses, and may reflect (perhaps most likely) separate or secondary developments. Overall, version in Georgian is sensitive to both discourse factors and the morphosyntactic and lexical properties of the verbal system. Indeed, most elements in the Georgian verbal morphology seem to get their function from larger constructions (Gurevich 2003), but version is the only one that also requires reference to discourse.

The historical origins of version vowels in Georgian are unclear, and the version systems are virtually identical in its sister languages. That is, the Georgian version system is the result of a historically opaque system inherited from Proto-Kartvelian, and its ultimate origins remain for the most part a mystery.

3 Towards an Informal Typology: Eurasia

Given that the origin of the version system in Kartvelian is unclear, we turn to functionally similar constructions in a range of unrelated languages of Eurasia. Our intent is to see if the somewhat less opaque origins of these formal systems may help shed some light on the history of version formations in Kartvelian, and further to serve as the foundation for an ongoing large-scale cross-linguistic formal and functional typology of version. We briefly present here preliminary information on version formations in Turkic, Burushaski, and Munda as an initial step in this comparative process.

3.1 Turkic

Members of the Turkic language family, particularly those of the Altai-Sayan region of Siberia, are perhaps 'best' known among languages of Eurasia for their system of grammaticalized version (Anderson 2001, 2004), albeit it is encoded in a system formally quite different from that of Georgian.

In Turkic (see Table 1), there are a number of different formal constructions used to mark subject version, all involving a functional specialization of a verb meaning 'take' (**al*). Such formations, depending on the theoretical persuasion of the investigator, may be variously labeled 'auxiliary,' 'serial,' or 'light verb' constructions.

Language	**LV form**	**AV stem**	**Citation**	**Gloss**
Tuvan[i]	-Ip	al	*biž-**ip al**-di-m*	'I wrote (down) for myself'
Tofa	-GAʃ	al	*tùt-kaʃ al-ɣan*	'caught for himself'
Yakut (Sakha)	-An	ɨl	*taay-an ɨl-la*	'he guessed for himself'
Chuvash	-sA	il	*kălarsa il*	'steal for self'
Xakas	-(p)	-il	*tab-il-za-m*	'if I find myself'
Uyghur	-iw-	-al-	*yez-iw-al-di-m*	'wrote down for self'
Xalaj	-Ø-	-al-	*tut:-ā́l-du-m*	'I seized it (for myself)'
Orkhon Turkic	α	al-α	*ölür-tü-müz al-tɨ-miz*	'we killed for ourselves'

(Sources: Anderson and Harrison 1999; Rassadin 1994: 198; Korkina 1982: 289; Skvorcov 1999: 111; Field Notes; Hahn 1991: 612; Doerfer 1988: 169; von Gabain 1974: 279 l.3)

i. so too Tofa, Tuvan, Xakas, etc. LV = lexical verb; AV = auxiliary verb

Table 1: **Subject version AVCs in selected Turkic languages**

The range of formal subtypes of constructions attested across the Turkic languages shows variation with respect to the inflectional pattern and the historical morphosyntactic relation between the two verbs in the version construction. Thus, lexical verbs in these version 'auxiliary' constructions include converb (dependent, subordinate) forms of various types (*-Ip*, *-An*, *-sA*, depending on the language); same subject (dependent,

conjunctive) form (one Tofa variant); or doubled inflection, the latter speaking to the likely origin of the construction in a 'core serialized' formation in Old Turkic (Crowley 2002, Bril 2004).

Note that the version constructions in the Turkic languages are usually synchronically bipartite, consisting of the lexical verb and the functional verb marking version, but may show complete (Uyghur) or lexically restricted tendencies to univerbation (Xakas). The Xalaj form might be an archaic fusing of a nuclear rather than a core serialized formation, or it may represent a fairly shallow innovation of loss of an original converb element in the fused complex.

The clines and continua of phenomena attested in Turkic constructions of this type may be represented as in Table 2.

Doubled < Core SVC	**Converb > AH (Dep/Sub)**	**SS > AH (Dep/Conj)**	**Bound**
Old Turkic	Tuvan, Yakut, Chuvash, Xakas, Tofa	Tofa	Uyghur (all+CV) Xalaj (all?+Ø) Xakas (1)
SVC = Serial Verb Construction; AH = Auxiliary-Headed; SS = Same Subject; Dep = Dependent; Sub = Subordinate			

Table 2: **Formal subtypes of subject version constructions in Turkic**

The developments of version in the Turkic language family suggest the following grammaticalization paths (18-19).

(18) Syntactic: Core Serial Verb Construction
> AUX-Headed Auxiliary Verb Construction
> Suffix

(19) Functional: (Self-)Benefactive > Version

A full example of subject version may be seen in (20) from Xakas:

(20) XAKAS [AVC > AFX]
*pu kniga-nɨ tab-**ɨl**-za-m min xayda örɯn-e-m*
this book-ACC find-**SUBJ.VERS**-CON-1 I oh.boy be.happy-FUT-1
'If I find myself this book, boy will I be happy.'
(field notes)

Object version forms are also found throughout the Turkic language family. Object version forms a paradigmatic set with the subject version construction and derives from a similar complex predicate involving a functional specialization of the verb originally meaning 'give'. An example of this formation may be seen in Tofa (21).

(21) TOFA

onu *sooda-p* *beer* *be*
s/he.ACC say-GER **OBJ.VERS**.P/F Q
'Should I say it (again for you)?'
(ASLEP Field Notes [PVB])

3.2 Burushaski

The so-called D-prefix in Burushaski (Anderson in press) is a lexicalized part of certain stems. It occupies position –3 in the Burushaski verb template, often appearing with a following copy vowel (from the following syllable) or with a following *-i-*.

The prefix represents an advanced stage in a now lost system of grammaticalized version. Its semantics range from a clear cislocative meaning, to subject version or actor/subject focus (Bashir 1985), to vaguely (de-)transitivizing functions and various idiosyncratic, sometimes opaque semantic nuances.

Verbs with the D-prefix can be both transitive and intransitive. This should come as no surprise given that version relates to action that primarily affects the deictic center, not valence like voice categories do. [8]

(22)

di-yaray *d-yuray*
'be hot' 'make hot, heat'
(Berger 1998: 107)

d-:s-karay *-r > d-r* *su ∼ dusu-*
'send' 'send here' 'bring'

di-s-íl (∼ di-íl) *du-s-úlǰa (∼ d-úlǰa)*
'become wet' 'satisfy, sate'
(Berger 1998: 109)

The verb 'come' in Burushaski consists of a fusing of the D-prefix and an 'auxiliary' (or 'light' verb) stem fused into a single complex. This yields a curiously double-marked subject inflection of the pattern (D-subj+AUX-subj)[9].

(23) 'come' in Burushaski

	PAST		**NEG.PAST**	
	SG	**PL**	**SG**	**PL**
1	*dáayam*	*diméeman*	*atáayam*	*atímiman*
2	*dukóoma*	*damáaman*	*atúkuma*	*atúmaman*
II	*dumóomo*	*dúuman*	*atúmumo*	*atúuman*

(Berger 1998: 148)

[8] Note, however, that subjective version in Georgian can only appear on transitive verbs (6). The reason for this oddity is unclear to us.

[9] Note that the D-prefix triggers devoicing of a following obstruent.
du-kóo-n
D-2-D
'you having come'
(Berger 1998: 133).

Note that in forms showing the lexicalized version formation, we also find this doubled inflectional pattern; it is common with auxiliary verb constructions derived from core serialized constructions (Anderson forthcoming).

(24) *dasin radyo du-**mo**-yel-**umo***
girl radio *D*-**II**-hear-**II**
'the girl heard the radio'
(Willson 1990: 5)

Thus, version formations in Burushaski seem to historically derive from a serialized construction with the deictic serial verb 'come'.

3.3 Gorum

This insight into the origin of the Burushaski version construction (i.e. in a deictic serialized formation using the verb 'come') is an invaluable resource when considering the functional overlap in two elements that express version functions in Gorum (Parengi), a South Munda language spoken in southern Orissa, India. In Gorum, the two functionally overlapping elements are described as marking 'orientation' or 'affectedness,' i.e. the very discourse functions that grammaticalized version categories seem to encode cross-linguistically. These two Gorum elements are formally quite distinct, despite their considerable functional overlap, viz. a suffix *-ay* and a suprasegmental creaky voice feature.

Unfortunately comparative evidence sheds little light on this issue: the origin of the suprasegmental creaky voice feature encoding affectedness remains entirely opaque, although it probably originated in some kind of 'affective' discourse register. On the other hand, the 'cislocative' or speaker-orientation form *-ay* appears to derive from a serialized construction involving the historical verb 'come,' preserved in various individual archaic pockets throughout the languages of the Austroasiatic family and supported by similar changes in the functional semantics of such structures in other language families (e.g. Turkic [Anderson 2004] and the origin of the Burushaski version prefix.)

3.3.1 Creaky Voice Feature

One function of the creaky voice feature is to encode an affected subject, i.e. subject[ive] version (25).

(25) $\Longrightarrow$ Subject affecting
GORUM

a. *b. gọ̰saŋ ga?a-ru-ni*
B rice eat-PAST-DESIA.ORIYA.PROG
'B is eating the rice'

b. *gǫ̣saŋ gaʔa-ru̱--ni*
rice eat-PAST-**VER**-DESIA.ORIYA.PROG
'B is eating himself the rice'[10]

Besides so-called 'subject version' functions, such formations in Gorum may likewise mark action primarily affecting a (deictic/speech-act participant) non-subject, and a range of functions generally subsumed under the grammatical heading of 'voice', e.g. 'passive potential', 'antipassive' and 'semi-reflexive'. Thus, unlike Turkic and Georgian, a single version construction in Gorum may mark all types of participant affectedness (sometimes grammaticalized in combination with particular lexemes as part of a construction encoding various modal, aspectual, and/or voice categories [as in Kartvelian]).

(26) ⟹ Object affecting
GORUM
a. *boʔy amon e-niŋ bam-(m)-i̱ŋ duk-i̱ŋ*
one arrow OBJ-1 hit-1OBJ.**VER** AUX-1OBJ.**VER**
'(an arrow) has hit me'
(Aze 1973: 298)
b. *tileʔy-di neʔ zel-om tay-om-t-o̱m dom*
old.man-FOC it tell-2 AUX-2-NPAST-2.**VER** MOD
'it's the old man, let him tell you'
(Aze 1973: 278)

(27) ⟹ Passive Potential
GORUM
a. *aɽi ʈableʈ luʔm-tu̱*
that tablet swallow-NPAST.**VER**
'that tablet will/can be swallowed'
(Aze 1973: 286)
b. *aɽi ʈableʈ lor-luʔm-nu̱*
that tablet NEG-swallow-INTR.**VER**
'...will/can not...'

(28) ⟹ Antipassive
GORUM
noʔn turyaʔ-n-u̱ luʔru
he kick-INTR-INF.**VER** AUX
'he is kicking (in general)'
(Aze 1973: 284)

(29) ⟹ 'semi-reflexive' or 'auto-affective'
GORUM
a. *miŋ siʔ-doy ne-poʔ-tu*
I arm-3 1-stab-NPAST
'I will stab his arm'
(Aze 1973: 281)
b. *miŋ siʔ-niŋ ne-poʔ-tu̱*
I arm-1 1-stab-NPAST.**VER**
'I will stab my arm'
(Aze 1973: 281)

[10]Note that what is glossed here as 'past' is a kind of default combining and non-finite verbal form in Gorum, often used in non-past contexts, as well as being the past tense marker.

3.3.2 Suffix *-ay*

The cislocative/speaker-orientation suffix *-ay* (from 'come') in Gorum, on the other hand, marks, depending on the verb stem involved and the particular discourse context, motion towards the speaker, orientation toward the speaker, and by extension, motion/orientation toward the 'locus of discourse focus' or deictic center. In some instances, it seems also to have taken on a meaning of a first person singular referent; the same is true of a cognate element in certain conjugations in its only close sister language Sora.

(30) GORUM

a. *le-ɖon-tu*
1PL-take-NPAST
'we will take'
(Aze 1973: 275)

b. *le-ɖon-t-**ay***
1PL-take-NPAST-**CLOC**
'we will bring'
(Aze 1973: 275)

c. *ara-di liga?n-t-**a͡y** ua?-t-ay*
tree-FOC break-NPST-**CLOC.VER** AUX-NPST-CLOC
'the tree will break (towards me)'
(Aze 1973: 279)

In some uses, the 'orientation' seems to act more like the discourse-based notion of salience or primary affectedness, and thus akin to the function of the suprasegmental creaky voice feature.

(31) GORUM

a. *guro?y do?-r-iŋ*
shy.AFF feel-PAST-1
'I felt shy'
(Aze 1973: 275)

b. *guro?y do?-r-iŋ-**ay***
shy.AFF feel-PAST-1-**CLOC**
'I felt (myself) shy'
(Aze 1973: 275)

c. *saybu-di zel-iŋ*
master-FOC tell-1
'the master told me'
(Aze 1973: 275)

d. *saybu-di zel-iŋ-**ay***
master-FOC tell-1-**CLOC**
'the master told me (and I was affected by that)'
(Aze 1973: 275)

A likely explanation for this situation in present-day Gorum is as follows: The version/affectedness marker (creaky voice phonation) is older than the cislocative marker (*-ay*), even though the former is lacking in Gorum's sister language Sora while the latter has clear cognates (although now mainly in entirely different functions). Subsequently the cislocative marker has begun to take on the functional space formerly occupied by the increasingly opaque creaky voice feature in Gorum.

(32) Proto-Sora-Gorum cislocative > Version (Gorum)
> 1st person subject (Sora)
> cislocative (Gorum and Sora)

4 Conclusions and Future Work

Version is a robust discourse category that employs various morphosyntactic means for its expression and can only be described in terms of the larger constructions of a given language. It is often mistaken for, or formally overlaps with, systems of voice manipulation or, less commonly, means of TAM encoding, but it nevertheless deserves separate consideration in linguistic theory.

Once the construction types are identified in a sufficient number of languages and their range of formal and functional expression is categorized, a full historical and synchronic typology of version can be attempted. This paper is the first step in that process.

Based on our limited sample, we suggest the following possible paths for the grammaticalization of version and version-related phenomena:

(33) Grammaticalization paths of version
'come'/'take' deixis → (subject) version
'give' (?/'go') deixis → (object) version
version → voice; voice → version
version → modal, aspectual categories

Thus, to conclude, version is discourse-based in origin but uses the formal machinery of voice/aspect/mood manipulation in a language. More generally, grammatical phenomena can have formal constructional realization, but not consist of a rote combination of the functional and lexical semantics of the elements involved. Grammaticalized version structures demonstrate that syntactic/formal and discourse-pragmatic/functional planes co-exist and can be interdependent in the architecture of grammatical constructions, providing support for construction-based theories of grammar (cf. Fillmore 1988, Goldberg 1995).

References

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2001. Subject Version and Object Version in Tofa Auxiliary Verb Constructions. *Turkic Languages* 5(1):240–269.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2004. *Auxiliary Verb Constructions in Altai-Sayan Turkic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. Forthcoming. *Auxiliary Verb Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. In press. Burushaski morphology. In A. Kaye (Ed.), *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Anderson, Gregory D. S., and K. David Harrison. 1999. Tyvan. *Languages of the World Materials* 257.

Aze, (F.) Richard. 1973. Clause Patterns in Parengi-Gorum. In R. L. Trail (Ed.), *Patterns in clause, sentence, discourse in selected languages of India and Nepal*, Vol. 1, 235–312. Norman, OK: SIL.

Bashir, E. 1985. Towards a semantics of the Burushaski verb. In A. Zide et al. (Eds.), *Proceeedings of the conference on participant roles: South Asia and adjacent areas*, 1–32. Bloomington: IULC.

Berger, H. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager. 3 vols.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Blake, Barry. 1994. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boeder, Winfried. 1969. Über die Versionen des georgischen Verbs. *Folia Linguistica, 2:* 82-152.

Bril, Isabelle. 2004. Complex nuclei in oceanic languages: contribution to an areal typology. In I. Bril and F. Ozanne-Rivierre (Eds.), *Complex Predicates in Oceanic Languages*, 1–48. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crowley, Terry. 2002. *Serial Verbs in Oceanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doerfer, G. 1988. *Das Chorasantürkische*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The Mechanisms of "Construction Grammar". *BLS* 14:35–55.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions : a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gurevich, Olga. 2003. On the Status of the Morpheme in Georgian Verbal Morphology. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 29:161–172.

Hahn, R. [w/ Ablahat Ibrahim]. 1991. *Spoken Uyghur*. Seattle/London: University of Washington Press.

Harris, Alice C. 1981. *Georgian syntax: a study in relational grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hewitt, B. G. 1995. *Georgian: a structural reference grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Korkina, E. I. et al. 1982. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka [Grammar of modern literary Yakut]*. Moscow: Nauka.

Rassadin, V. I. 1994. *Törœœn soot [Native word]*. Irkutsk: Vostochno-sibirskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.

Skvorcov, M. I. 1999. *Chavashla-vyrasla tata vyrasla-chavashla slovar' [Chuvash-Russian and Russian-Chuvash Dictionary]*. Cheboksary: Chuvknigizdat.

Tschenkeli, Kita. 1958. *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*. Zurich: Amirami Verlag.

von Gabain, A. 1974. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Willson, S. 1990. *Verb agreement and case marking in Burushaski*. Master's thesis, University of North Dakota.

Gregory Anderson
Department of Linguistics
1290 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1290
gdsa@darkwing.uoregon.edu

Olga Gurevich
Linguistics Department, 1203 Dwinelle Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-2650
olya@berkeley.edu