# Grammaticalization in Russian-Lexifier Pidgins

Dieter Stern

## Grammaticalization and Pidgins

In recent years, Heine & Kuteva have focused on language contact as a possible trigger for language internal development.[1] Grammaticalization paths in these instances seem to be much the same as in non-contact-induced grammaticalization. But there is an apparent difference between ordinary language change, whether it be contact-induced or not, and pidginization. Whereas the starting point for the regular type of grammaticalization is an already existing fully-fledged grammatical system that, being under no particular pressure to do so, gradually evolves new grammatical patterns, pidgins and creoles are generally assumed

---

1 Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, "Contact-Induced Grammaticalization," *Studies in Language* 27 (2003), pp. 529–572; Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, "Constraints on Contact-induced Linguistic Change," *Journal of Language Contact – Thema* 2 (2008), pp. 57–90; Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, "Contact and Grammaticalization," in Raymond Hickey, ed., *The Handbook of Language Contact* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), pp. 86–105. Contact-induced grammaticalization as proposed by Heine and Kuteva may, by the way, offer a good explanatory model for the Balkan linguistic area with its seeming contradiction between shared structures across languages and the evident internal development of these same structures for each individual language.

to start from scratch, with a presumably high pressure to create grammatical forms right on the spot. The difference would thus be between grammatical change and grammar creation.[2] While grammaticalization requires its input to already have a lexical or even grammatical function, available linguistic forms (mostly lexical) within a pidginization process would appear to have to be functionally redefined from almost nil in an ongoing process of negotiation of linguistic means. Accordingly, instead of a proper starting point for grammaticalization, there seems to be a functional void at the beginning, with only the most basic and general meanings of lexical items percolating through the filter created by the presumed radical break in transmission. Thus, what from a synchronic perspective might look like a typical outcome of grammaticalization in the sense outlined by Hopper & Traugott[3] could in fact have quite a different history. Adrienne Bruyn[4] suggests that the past tense marker *ben/bin* in many creoles, which derives from the English past participle *been*, though suggestive of a prior history of gradual grammaticalization, must have instead assumed its new function right away without any intervening stages. She argues that in early Sranan records from the eighteenth century, the form is neither used as a participle nor as a lexical verb. The argument, however, is moot on two counts. For one, historical evidence can be found from the early stages of other creoles whose grammaticalized *ben/bin* is missing, and the second point is that these early Sranan records may not necessarily represent the very formative stages of this language. Due, not so much to the often-cited communicative pressure, but rather to the lack of binding norms for verbal behavior, new lan-

---

2 Jacques Arends and Adrienne Bruyn, "Gradualist and Developmental Hypotheses," in J. Arends, P. Muysken, and N. Smith, eds., *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995), pp. 111–120, here, p. 118.

3 Paul J. Hopper and Elizabeth Closs Traugott, *Grammaticalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

4 Adrienne Bruyn, "On Identifying Instances of Grammaticalization in Creole Languages," in Philip Baker and Anand Syea, eds., *Changing Meanings, Changing Functions* (London: University of Westminster Press, 1996), pp. 29–46, here, pp. 30–31.

guages like Sranan may be expected to run through grammaticalization processes at a much faster rate, possibly here and there skipping steps that would be considered necessary in ordinary grammaticalization. The principal difference suggested by Bruyn would boil down to a mere quantitative difference. The difference with regard to grammaticalization for elements like *been* with a prior grammatical rather than lexical function would be that they probably were interpreted right from the beginning in a vague fashion as some kind of element that has to do with past events rather than being recognized for its genuine original function as a constituent element of a periphrastic perfect construction. So there may indeed be an initial overall dilution of functions, short-circuiting the mechanism of generalization in the sense of a gradual metaphorical extension as proposed by Bybee & Pagliuca.[5] But *been* still had to go its way from an occasional variable marker of past events to an invariant tense marker. Besides, the idea of the radical break in transmission underlying Bruyn's argument should not be taken too strictly. More recent work by Bakker[6] and Roberts & Bresnan[7] on functional lexifier inflexions in pidgins proves that morphosyntactic features of the lexifier may not always be reduced to nil, but do occasionally seep through the filter of wholesale reduction of grammatical structures in pidginization.

A more serious challenge to the tenets of general theories of grammaticalization, which try to include contact-related phenomena, seems to be presented by apparent results of grammaticalization in pidgins/creoles, which can be traced back to substrate influence. Although these cases would qualify as obvious instances of contact-induced change as outlined by Heine & Kuteva, they may in fact be no more than direct rel-

---

5 Joan Bybee and William Pagliuca "Cross-linguistic Comparison and the Development of Grammatical Meaning," in Jacek Fisiak, ed., *Historical Semantics, Historical Word-Formation* (Berlin-New York-Amsterdam: Mouton, 1985), pp. 59–83, here, p. 72.

6 Peter Bakker, "Pidgin Inflectional Morphology and Its Implications for Creole Morphology," in Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, eds., *Yearbook of Morphology 2002* (Boston, MA: Kluwer, 2003), pp. 3–33.

7 Sarah Julia Roberts and Joan Bresnan, "Retained Inflectional Morphology in Pidgins: A Typological Study," *Linguistic Typology* 12:2 (2008), pp. 269–302.

exifications of substrate structures instead of a stimulus triggering a se-ries of internal developments. This becomes particularly evident where the results run counter to expectations, as in the case of the neo-Melane-sian *fastaem*, deriving from the temporal expression *first time* and cov-ering the temporal meaning "before" as well as the spatial meaning "in front of," which clearly violates the unidirectionality of the metaphorical extension from spatial to temporal.[8] Substrate transfers often may bear a striking similarity to grammaticalization with even the supposedly inter-vening stages still being available in the later stages of the language, as in the case of the preposition *baka* "behind" in Sranan. Bruyn convincingly demonstrates that historical evidence does not bear out the presumed development over time.[9] Instead, the stages of the apparent grammati-calization process can be shown to derive directly from various West African substrates. This is of course not meant to deny the possibility of regular grammaticalization processes in pidgins and creoles altogether, but it supplements an alternative model of the emergence of grammatical categories, at least for the early formative stages of pidgins and creoles.

A common feature of pidginization is the emergence of general all-purpose forms for basic form classes (verbs, prepositions, nouns, and pronouns). This process is known as generalization in creolistics, and though it involves generalization as it is understood within grammati-calization theory,[10] it should not be confused with it. Generalization in pidgins describes a competitive process through which one morpholog-ical form within a form class is singled out to replace all other forms. The competition between forms is set in motion by the complete loss of func-tional distinctions within a form class caused by the specific conditions of transmission in first-contact scenarios. This leaves an unspecified ar-ray of functionally fuzzy, free variants or *junk*,[11] which will usually be reduced to just one surviving form with a global function and an accord-ingly minimal feature specification. Although this process brings about

---

8 Bruyn, "On Identifying Instances," p. 31.

9 Ibid., pp. 32–39.

10 Bybee and Pagliuca "Cross-linguistic Comparison."

11 Roger Lass, "How to Do Things with Junk: Exaptation in Language Evolu-tion," *Journal of Linguistics* 26 (1990), pp. 79–102.

grammatical change, it does not lead to a principle change of status for the surviving element, that is, it does not undergo a categorial transformation, as from lexical to grammatical, or from one grammatical category to another. Besides, treating the type of generalization outlined here as grammaticalization would necessarily entail focusing completely on the trajectory of the winning form, which would miss the more global effect of the systemic restructuring of whole form classes. Generalization of this kind has more to do with Sapir's *drift*, that is, the regularization of construction types within a language, rather than the changes affecting individual constructions.[12] It is therefore distinct from grammaticalization and is accordingly beyond the scope of the present paper.

In what follows, an attempt will be made to clarify the probable history of those features found in Russian pidgins that at first glance look like typical outcomes of grammaticalization processes. Since we are dealing with pidgins, every single case must be tested against the competing explanations outlined above. Arguments will have to be found in favor of or against either grammaticalization or direct relexification from the substrate. A third option, which is in fact rather a reverse variant of the substrate hypothesis, is a more or less accurate adoption of a superstrate model. The basic criteria for deciding against grammaticalization are i. violations against established grammaticalization paths or ii. the simultaneity of occurrence of the purportedly successive steps of a presumed grammaticalization trajectory. Hard evidence for both criteria, but especially for the second one, is best provided by a continuous documentation of all stages of the respective contact language from its inception up to its most completely evolved state. Unfortunately, none of the Russian pidgins meets this requirement. All three Russian-lexifier pidgins, Taimyr Pidgin Russian (TPR), Chinese Pidgin Russian (CPR), and Russenorsk (RN), significantly predate their earliest written records,[13]

---

12 Hopper and Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, p. 96.

13 Iurii B. Simchenko, *Зимняя дорога* (Moscow, 1985), p. 20, dates TPR back to the very first encounters between Russians and Nganasans on the Taimyr Peninsula in the year 1610, but Dieter Stern, *Das Taimyr-Pidgin-Russische im Kontext der Landnahme Sibiriens* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 2011), pp. 205–208, is skeptical about Simchenko's self-assured guess and opts for a later date, pos-

and the likely candidates for a grammaticalization history found in these earliest records already display their final, fully evolved stage. As with most pidgins, the formative critical period went by unnoticed. The following argument will therefore have to rely on indirect reasoning and speculation, and possibly not all cases can be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

## Case Marking in TPR

The most obvious and prominent case for the rise of a lexical element to the status of a grammatical category is certainly the Russian noun *mesto* "place," which in TPR is used as an overall marker of peripheral

sibly even not earlier than the second half of the eighteenth century. In both cases does the rise of the pidgin clearly predate its first documentation in Father Suslov's missionary diary from 1880 (David G. Anderson and Nataliia A. Orekhova, "The Suslov Legacy: The Story of One Family's Struggle with Shamanism," *Sibirica* 2:2 (2002), pp. 88–112). The earliest possible date for the emergence of CPR is 1727, when the Treaty of Kyakhta was signed. In view of the fact that well into the 1780s Mongolian seems to have been the major means of communication at the trading post where CPR came into being (Dieter Stern, "Myths and Facts about the Kyakhta Trade Pidgin," *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 20:1 (2005), pp. 175–187), here again, a later date of emergence seems to be likely. But according to Evgenii Timkovskii, *Путешествие в Китай чрез Монголию в 1820 и 1821 г.* (St. Peterburg, 1824), CPR must already have been there by the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The first written record, which is S. I. Cherepanov's "Кяхтинское китайское наречие русского языка," *Известия Императорской Академии наук по отделению языка и словесности* 2 (1853), pp. 370–377, is once again dated some time later. RN seems to date back to the second half of the eighteenth century (Ingvild Broch and Ernst Håkon Jahr, "Russenorsk: A New Look at the Russo-Norwegian Pidgin in Northern Norway," in Per Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, eds., *Scandinavian Language Contacts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 21–65), but it was only recorded in some detail in the 1890s by Professor Quigstad. His materials were published by Olaf Broch, "Russenorsk tekstmateriale," *Maal og Minne* (1930), pp. 113–140.

case relations.[14] The maximal inclusiveness of this case marker already seems to indicate that more than a simple story of relexification may be implicated here. Two independent successive processes seem to offer themselves right away: i. the grammaticalization from a lexical entity to a marker of a specific case relation, and ii. the spread and generalization of this specific case domain to encompass all remaining peripheral case domains. A direct shortcut from the lexical entity *mesto* with its fairly specific locative meaning to an all-purpose peripheral case marker seems counterintuitive. Although a relexification approach seems to be support-ed by the fact that the sum total of domains using *mesto* can be mapped quite neatly on the sum total of domains of peripheral case marking in the major substrate languages Dolgan and Nganasan (see below), this assumption would beg the question of why a noun with a locative mean-ing should have been chosen as a marker for almost any conceivable case relation. A graded process that, though it may have been speeded up and aided by substrate models, would nevertheless bear clear signs of an internal grammaticalization process seems the only possible op-tion. The most likely first step of this process would be from "place" > locative. This grammaticalization path is in fact attested in regular, that is, (probably) non-contact-induced language change, namely, in Kpelle (Mande, West Africa) and Finnish.[15] The second step would then lead on from locative to other peripheral case domains, and here it would again be assumed that this process took place in a gradual manner from case domain to case domain rather than through an abrupt event of spontane-ous generalization. This preference is justified by a lack of motivation for an abrupt overall change. If in the process of pidginization a general communicative pressure should have forced the instantaneous creation

---

14 Evgenij Khelimskii, "«Говорка»: таймырский пиджин на русской лек-сической основе," in Evgenij Khelimskii, *Компаративистика, Уралистика. Лекции и статьи* (Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 2000), pp. 378–395, here, pp. 388–389; Dieter Stern, "Taimyr Pidgin Russian (Govorka)," *Russian Lin-guistics* 29 (2005), pp. 289–318, here, pp. 301–303; Stern, *Das Taimyr-Pidgin-Russische*, pp. 275–289.

15 Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002), p. 240.

of a simple, but functionally complete case system, this would have not allowed for the first step to have occurred in the first place. We will deal with the two steps presumed separately.

The noun *mesto* stands directly behind the noun or noun phrase it specifies for case. It forms a fundamental opposition with bare nouns or noun phrases. Core relations are marked with bare NPs against peripheral relations with NPs followed by *mesto* whereby a basic contrast is achieved. Note, however, that the *mesto* construction is not strictly obligatory. A bare NP can always take the position of a peripheral constituent, whereas NPs modified by *mesto* can never be used to mark core relations. This distribution may be interpreted as an indication of a still-ongoing grammaticalization process, with the overall use of bare nouns possibly representing a stage predating the grammaticalization and spread of the *mesto* construction. Although the structure of the overt case system may in principle be reduced to a binary contrast of default bare nouns and marked *mesto*, there are other nouns competing with *mesto* for some of its functions, albeit with little success. These will be dealt with later.

The first step of the presumed grammaticalization process from lexical *mesto* "place" > locative has to be checked against the possibility of a direct transfer from one of the source languages. We will start with the most obvious model, which however is also a more unlikely one. The Russian lexifier offers a preposition *vmesto* meaning "instead," which would due to the regular simplification of onset clusters in TPR even qualify as a direct formal model for the *mesto* construction. The only remaining difference would be the word order pattern, which could easily be accounted for by the wholesale adoption of strict SOV patterns from the substrate languages in TPR. The narrow specificity of its meaning, which is paralleled by a comparatively low frequency in actual speech, would however make this superstrate model too marginal to provide sufficient input in a pidginization setting. The major substrate languages Dolgan and Nganasan offer similar models for the use of *mesto* as a case marker. The respective nouns for "place," that is, the Dolgan *onnu* and the Nganasan *bəbə*, are used in postpositional constructions with the meaning "instead," that is, the same meaning as the Russian preposition *vmesto*. The argument against these direct models is accordingly the same.

The role of the substrates seems to be restricted to providing a structural model of using postpositions. The formal parallel can even be taken further. Postpositions in Nganasan and Dolgan are basically nouns that are inflected for case when serving as postpositions, which is to say that they remain recognizable as nouns. Using a lexical item like *mesto* as a case marker thus seems to be neatly patterned on the model provided by postpositions in the substrate languages. But *mesto* in Nganasan is not just a postposition but a true case marker, too, as may be seen from the fact that it also specifies genuine postpositional expressions for case in TPR: [16]

(1) *Тут лед середина место* тахариавы два дыра.
  "*In the middle of that ice* there were two holes."

(2) *Дверь край место* кто-то идет.
  "Someone is moving *close to the door*."

The position occupied by *mesto* in (1)–(2) as a case specifier for the postpositional *seredina* and *kraj* is clearly that of the ablative case in the parallel Nganasan construction in (3) rather than that of the postpositional noun *bəbə* "place":

(3) *Kojgumə kaj          ngjantum     čüo"           bəbəətə*
  *leave-behind*.caus.1sg *boy*.acc.sg  *feather*.nom.pl  *place*.abl.sg
  "I will leave behind the boy instead of the feathers."[17]

This further corroborates the finding that the *mesto* construction is not modeled on postpositional constructions using lexical items with the

16 The examples are given in Cyrillic transcription representing the Standard Russian form of the lexical items. This will facilitate reading the examples for those who are already acquainted with Russian. A phonetic transcription would divert attention from the morphosyntactic issues to be discussed here. Unless indicated otherwise, all examples are taken from my own field records.

17 Example taken from Michael Katzschmann, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica. Texte – Übersetzung – Glossar – Grammatik* (Norderstedt: Books on Demand GmbH, 2008), p. 156.

meaning "place" in Dolgan and Nganasan. If there is indeed a substrate source for *mesto* as a case marker, it is rather the oblique case endings of Dolgan and Nganasan, whose case domains are neatly mirrored by *mesto*. But these, being genuine inflectional endings, may hardly be supposed to have served as a direct model for the relexification of *mesto*.

The rise of *mesto* as a case marker is thus best treated as a case of grammaticalization.[18] The hypothetical trajectory for this development could have started with co-compounds,[19] that is, simple juxtapositions of two bare nominals forming either a compound word or an adnominal (mostly possessive) construction. This type of construction is to be found in most pidgins and it also abounds in TPR. Some co-compounds containing the lexical *mesto* as a second element in TPR are, for example, *čim mesto* "camp-site" or *olen' mesto* "reindeer pasture."[20] As

---

18 We assume this grammaticalization to have taken place within the process of the formation of TPR, but Elena Perekhval'skaia, *Русские пиджины* (St. Petersburg: Aletejja, 2008), p. 168, insinuates the possibility of a much earlier emergence in an unattested Russian protopidgin she calls Siberian pidgin. In favor of her argument, she cites a parallel from Chinese Pidgin Russian (CPR) taken from Cherepanov, "Кяхтинское китайское наречие русского языка": *За моя подумай, како ваша закона хорошаньки: женушеки месяза поживу еса* "I think that your laws are good: [they allow] you to live together with your wives." In this example, *месяза* is identified by Perekhval'skaia as the noun *mesto* functioning as a postnominal modifier qua case marker. Striking as the evidence may seem, however, a different interpretation is possible. The obvious comitative meaning indicates that *месяза* is *meste* (< Russian *vmeste*) rather than *mesto*. It would thus derive from a direct superstrate model, the Russian comitative expression *vmeste s* + instrumental, which has nothing to do with *mesto*. For further details, refer to the discussion on the relation between *mesto* and *meste* in TPR below.

19 Bernhard Wälchli, *Co-Compounds and Natural Coordination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

20 Interestingly, observers who were not linguistically trained tended to interpret the case construction with *mesto* as a co-compound. This is indicated by hyphenizations such as *Turuchan-mesto* in Mikhail Nikitin's *Путь на Север. Очерки туруханского края* (Moscow: Federacija, 1929), pp. 27 and 28, *čim-mesto* in Amalija Khazanovič's *Друзья мои – нганасаны. Из таймыр-*

nouns denoting a location, these are naturally more likely than other nouns to occur in locative contexts. This offers rich opportunities for a reinterpretation of *mesto* compounds, as in (4):

(4) Тебя олень место мотри.

The regular interpretation would be "Take a look around the reindeer pasture [for an appropriate reindeer]." The syntactic interpretation would accordingly be $_{NP}[_N[_N[олень] _N место] _{LOC}[Ø]]$, with a zero morpheme for the locative, or rather the locative meaning being provided by the context of the utterance. Note that bare nominals in locative contexts are still common in TPR. The same sentence may, however, be given a different interpretation: "Take a look among the reindeers [for an appropriate reindeer]." This kind of alternative reading is not an exceptional case, but seems to be a general property of the more common *mesto* compounds. In most contexts, mesto compounds do not stand in sharp contrast to the simple nouns that specify them, but may instead be taken as synonyms of these. Going to a camp-site is in almost all cases of occurrence synonymous with entering a tent, and looking around a reindeer pasture is almost always identical to looking at reindeers. It is this implicit second reading that offers the opportunity of transferring the contextual locative meaning to the second element of the co-compound by way of hypoanalysis. The resulting syntactic interpretation would be $_{NP}[_N[олень] _{LOC}[место]]$. This process runs parallel with and may in fact be triggered by a shift in the relative semantic weight of the elements of the co-compound. If we apply Halliday's opposition of logical structure versus experiential structure[21] to co-compounds, it would be required that the head of the logical structure (that is, the second or specified element of the formal co-compound) also be the prominent theme—or "Thing" in Halliday's terminology—of the experiential structure; that is, in using

*ских дневников* (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1986), pp. 67 and 107, and the improper use of *čum-mesto* in the sense of "tent" instead of "camp-site" as a nominative by Khazanovič (see Stern, "Taimyr Pidgin Russian (Govorka)," p. 316, ann. 12).

21 M. A. K. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (London, 1985).

a co-compound like *olen' mesto*, the emphasis or the "aboutness" of the expression should rest on *mesto* rather than on *olen'*. The alternative readings outlined above indicate, however, that the experiential structure stands in conflict with the logical structure. Demoting *mesto* from the position of a specified lexical entity to the position of a grammatical specifier would realign both structural levels.

Before we enter a discussion of the second step, that is to say, the spread from locative to other thematic roles, it is appropriate to give a short survey of the case domains that have been recorded for the *mesto* construction:

LOCATIVE
(5) *Тут озеро место* сетку тяни, рыбачить будешь там.
   "*On that lake,* you shall cast your net; there you will fish."

ABLATIVE
(6) Я *царь место* падерка принёс.
   "I have brought a letter *from the Czar*."

ELATIVE
(7) *Чум место* хозяин выйдет, кричит тут волк место.
   "When your master comes *out of his tent*, he will start shouting at that wolf."

PROLATIVE
(8) Тут дверь *дыра место* таперя тут на улице выскочил это голова.
   "*Through that hole in the* door, this head jumped out on the street."

PERLATIVE
(9) Так олень край место *след место* так вокруг, стадо обошли вокруг.
   "Thus, they went once around on the outer fringe of the reindeer herd *along the tracks*."

ILLATIVE
(10) Таперя меня *печки место* толкай.
   "Now, shove me into the oven."

Directional

(11) Иди *тут сосед место*.
"Go *to our neighbor*."

Recipient

(12) *Тарик место* такан налил.
"He poured a glass [of tea] *for the old man*."[22]

(13) Утром нганасан *тут баба место* говорит.
"In the morning, the Nganasan spoke *to his wife*."

Instrumental

(14) Теперь *лук место* тырыляй, меня *урусе место* тырыляй буду.
"Now, shoot *with that bow*; I will shoot *with a rifle*."

Comitative

(15) Какой-то другой *мужик место* спит.
"She is sleeping *with another man*."

Essive

(16) Меня *царь место* работал.
"I worked *as czar*," i.e., "I used to be *a czar* (temporarily)."[23]

Comparative Marker

(17) Так короче    красивой    *тебя    место* девушка был.
     QUAL         STD      *MKR*
"To make things short, this girl was more beautiful *than you*."

(18) Тебя    талант-то    *меня    место* больше.
                 STD   *MKR*   QUAL
"Your talent is bigger *than mine*."

---

22 Khelimskii, "«Говорка»: таймырский пиджин," p. 389.
23 Ibid.

Temporal extensions

(19) *Третий год место* тахариа мать-то говорит, "Оу, сына, меня голова болит."

"Then, *in the third year*, mother says, 'Oh, my son, my head aches.'"

(20) Тахариа *тут время место* тахариа мальчик голова-то совсем красной стал.

"Then, *during that time*, the head of the boy turned completely red."

Thematic Locative

( 21) Один олень место спор делали.

"They quarreled *about one single reindeer*."

To these domains, the possessive usage may be added, which is, however, found only twice in one of the historical sources of TPR:

Possessive

(22) Тебя *меня место* рожа знаешь? [A-possessive]

"Do you recognize *my* face?"[24]

(23) *Тебе место* какой начальник? [H-possessive]

"Who is *your* boss?"

Otherwise, possessivity in TPR is expressed by placing the generalized pronoun in front of the specified NP. Although one might be tempted to discard examples (22)–(23) because the reliability of the source is doubtful, we will treat them as facts that show that *mesto* was indeed about to extend its sphere of usage even beyond the scope of what is provided for by peripheral case marking in the substrate languages. This overextension beyond the limits set by at least one of the substrates, namely Nganasan, may be a possible reason for the final failure of the possessive usage, the more so that the competing strategy pointed out above had the advantage of being not only functionally sufficient, but also simpler than the *mesto* expression.

---

24 Examples (22) and (23) are from Nikitin, *Путь на Север*, p. 139.

Above, the spread from locative domains to other peripheral case domains was postulated as a second step in the rise of the lexical *mesto* to a general case marker and it was implied that this spread ought to be gradual. First would come the extension from the locative proper to other spatially defined cases as exemplified by (6) through (11). This would be achieved by a simple process of hyperanalysis, that is, by relegating the implied movement (from, through, etc. a place) to the context of the utterance. This generalizing reinterpretation would in some instances be supported by additional indicators of movement, such as the prefix *vy-* on the verb *vyjdet* "he comes out of X" in (7). But it may be doubted whether any process of gradual extension took place at all. The conflation of expressions of state and expressions of movement is a common feature of pidgins, which seem never to adopt this differentiation from their respective input. In the case of TPR, it may therefore be assumed that the conceptual differentiation of state and movement was never there in the beginning, so that the locative meaning of *mesto* was from the start conceived very broadly as covering all spatial expressions including those of movement through space. Besides, the fine-grained differentiation into six types of directed movement reaches far beyond the differentiations made in the substrate languages, with the most detailed set of oppositions found in Nganasan, which has only three morphological cases (dative, prolative, and ablative) to express movement through space.

Although the extension of locatives to mark the standard in comparative constructions is in fact a common and well-attested process in the world's languages,[25] thus offering a straightforward trajectory for the comparative usage in TPR, a substrate explanation may be more likely in this particular case. Nganasan employs the ablative case to mark the standard of a comparative construction, whereas Dolgan also uses a marker of its own alongside the ablative for this particular function, but the syntactic properties are the same. Both substrate languages represent

---

25 Leon Stassen, *Comparison and Conjunction* (Ph. D. thesis, University of Nijmegen, Netherlands, 1984); Leon Stassen, *Comparison and Universal Grammar* (Oxford-New York: Blackwell, 1985); Bernd Heine, *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 114–115; Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 201.

the same type of comparative construction classified by Leon Stassen as separative comparative, which is common to the most part of Northern Asia:[26]

(24) Nganasan
   boloukə-"        ma-**kətə**          hekuti"
   *Balok*-PL        *tent*-**ABL**.SG          *grow-warm*.IAOR.SK.VX3SG
   "Baloks are warmer than tents inside."[27]

(25) Dolgan
   Нолкот-тон      нукна            берт.
   *silk*-**ABL**        *cloth*            *excellent*
   "Cloth is better than silk."[28]

(26) Dolgan
   Эн ырыа-гы-**наагар**  мин олонгк-ам      ырыа-та берт.
   2SG *song*-2SG-**COMP**        1SG *Olonkho*-1SG  *song*-3SG *excellent*
   "My Olonkho song is better than your song."[29]

Although extant reference works on grammaticalization do not mention the fact, there is some typological evidence for a common grammaticalization path from locative to instrumental.[30] But once again, a strong

---

26 Stassen, *Comparison and Conjunction*, lists Eskimo, Nenets, Khalkha-Mongolian, and Even in his sample as representatives of the separative comparative in Northern Asia. The only North Asian language deviating from this type is Chukchee with a locative comparative. To the separative type, Dolgan/Yakut and Nganasan may be added.

27 The example is from Katzschmann, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica*, p. 366.

28 The example is from E. I. Ubriatova, *Язык норильских долган* (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1985), p. 121.

29 The example is from Ubrjatova, *Язык норильских долган*, p. 124.

30 Thomas Stolz, "To Be with X is to Have X: Comitatives, Instrumentals, Locatives, and Predicative Possession," *Linguistics* 39:2 (2001), pp. 321–350; Tuomas Huumo, "Domain Shifts and the Grammaticalization of Case: A Case Study of the Finnish Adessive," *Folia linguistica historica* 17:1/2 (1996), pp. 73–95, here, pp. 83–87.

case for substrate influence may be made here. Both Nganasan and Dolgan conflate the thematic roles of the instrumental and the locative into one morphological case. While Dolgan fuses the dominant instrumental meaning of *–nan* with the more marginal meaning of prolative, elative, and perlative, Nganasan offers a more direct model for the conflation of both basic functions in the case form labeled the locative (*–tənu*), which also serves as the instrumental.

Unlike the thematic roles discussed so far, essive marking as exemplified by (16) falls outside the sphere of case domains, which may be provided using a straightforward substrate model. In Dolgan, temporary states seem not to be expressed by an oblique case construction, and Nganasan offers a model that may be applied only with reservation. In Nganasan, object constituents marked for grammatical case may be specified by an additional suffix called the predestinative or desiderative to indicate a change of state intended by a person different from the person for whom the change of state is intended:[31]

(27) kobtuat'ü”                 ńeṃibt̪iṇia-δini”        tətuŋuru”
     *daughter*-NomPl.2Pl     *wife*-**Pred.**GenPl.1Pl   *give*-IntAor.2Pl.
     nanu”
     *together with*-LatSg.1Pl
     "Give your daughter **as wives** to both of us."

Evidently, this marginal construction with its narrow restrictions would not qualify as ideal input to feed into a pidginization process, the more so because it is not backed by the other major substrate, Dolgan. Besides, the Nganasan construction would not formally qualify as a case construction. The Russian superstrate, on the other hand, seems to provide a more direct match, which is much more widely used into the bargain, that is, the instrumental is used to denote temporary states of any kind. The Standard Russian equivalent of (16) would be:

(16') Я           работа-л       *цар-ём*.
     1SG.NOM    *work*.PST     *czar*-INSTR.SG
     "I worked *as czar*," i.e. "I used to be *a czar* (temporarily)."

31 Katzschmann, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica*, pp. 368–369.

The appropriation of the superstrate model would, however, imply its translation into TPR. This would require the form and function of morphological case endings of native Russian to have been fully and properly understood by non-native speakers in the formative stages of TPR. This would again beg the question of why the *mesto* construction was ever introduced, if it were not for the functional void with respect to the original Russian case relations presumably left by the pidginization process. The essive construction may therefore count as an example of a more or less independent, possibly later, internal development. But if there was development at all, it went never very far. The essive use of *mesto* is only attested by three examples throughout the whole extant TPR corpus. The more usual way of indicating temporary states would be the use of a bare noun phrase as in (28):

(28) Он тахариа *начальника милиция* работает.
    "He is working *as the head of the police* now."

In the end, there may be a functional reason for blocking the overall spread of the essive *mesto* in TPR. The most common context would be provided by statements like the context provided in (16). With a uniform general case marker like *mesto*, this context is, however, liable to ambiguity. Expressions meaning "I work *as a doctor*" and "I was *a doctor* (temporarily)" become formally indistinguishable from expressions meaning "I work *for a doctor*" and "I was *at the doctor*," which is highly likely to create a lot of confusion, since both types of expression share the same types of context of utterance.

The only functional domain that unambiguously points to an internal gradual extension from the locative to other case domains is the possessive function illustrated by (22)–(23). Here, neither a straightforward superstrate nor a substrate model for either attributive or A-possessives or predicative or H-possessives is available, whereas typological parallels for the grammaticalization of locatives into either A-possessives or H-possessives abound.[32] While Russian and Dolgan indeed have H-possessives based on locative expressions (an adessive prepositional phrase in

---

32 Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, pp. 204–205.

Russian and the locative-dative in Dolgan), Nganasan offers no corresponding model.[33] A gradual extension also seems the more plausible explanation in view of the fact that there already exists a firmly established simpler strategy for indicating possessive relations in TPR, which is juxtaposition.

The comitative usage of *mesto* is derived from a competing construction modeled independently and directly on the superstrate with only minor adjustments made to the emerging syntactic properties of TPR. This more or less direct loan was, however, confused and accordingly merged with *mesto* for reasons of phonetic similarity.

The metaphorical extensions from spatial to temporal and thematic locative, though substrate and superstrate models are available, may best be treated as cases of internal grammaticalization. The relatively low number of examples within the corpus may be taken as an indication that grammaticalization has only just begun.

It has become apparent that most functions of *mesto* can be explained in terms of substrate models. In fact, the overall spectra of the usage of *mesto* may be mapped quite neatly onto the respective spectra for peripheral case domains in both substrate languages, as the following template indicates:

| *место*-domains | Nganasan peripheral case | Dolgan peripheral case |
|---|---|---|
| Dative/Benefactive/Adessive | DATIVE –*tə* | DATIVE –*ga/–ka* |
| Directional (Allative) | | |
| Lative/Illative | | |
| Locative | LOCATIVE –*tənu* | |
| Instrumental | | INSTRUMENTAL –*nan* |
| Perlative | PROLATIVE –*mənu* | |
| Prolative/Elative | | |
| Ablative | ABLATIVE –*gətə* | ABLATIVE –*tan* |
| Comparative | | |
| Comitative | COMITATIVE –*na* | COMITATIVE –*lyyn* |
| Essive | PREDESTINATIVE –*tə/–δə* (restricted to objects and non-coreferentiality of intention) | – |
| Possessive | – | DATIVE (only H-possessive) |

33 Stern, "Taimyr Pidgin Russian (Govorka)," pp. 312–313.

Although through the grammaticalization of *mesto* a clear-cut formal division between core and peripheral case marking emerged, *mesto* does not go completely unchallenged as a case marker in TPR. First, there is *storona*[34] "side" that competes with mesto for the locative proper, but also for other functions (directional, adessive). The concept "side" ranges among the more typical inputs for the locative role. Interestingly, it seems to be found mostly in creoles.[35] The alternative case marker *storona* is fairly pervasive in TPR usage, but it certainly stands no chance against the ubiquitous *mesto*.

There is also a certain amount of competition between *meste* and *mesto*, which, however, shows a clear bias for the comitative with *meste*. It may safely be assumed that *meste* in fact started as a comitative. It derives directly from the Russian adverb *vmeste* "together," which figures prominently in colloquial Russian to reinforce the Russian comitative construction, which is expressed by the prepositional phrase *s* "with" + instrumental case. Obviously, by way of metanalysis, the comitative meaning had been transferred from the much less salient prepositional construction to the reinforcing adverbial *vmeste*. The initial #*v*- in *vmeste* had to be deleted according to the rules for initial cluster deletion operative in TPR, and so would the preposition *s* preceding the noun, if it were noticed at all. The only further step needed was to fix the position for *meste* behind the noun it specifies, whereas the Russian *vmeste* would in most cases, but not of necessity, directly precede the prepositional phrase. Although the formal difference between *meste* and *mesto* seems negligible at first glance, it has to be assumed that both forms arose independently. The partial merger of both forms must surely have started

---

34 The attested forms are *storona, torona*, and *toroba*. The first corresponds to Standard Russian and is certainly due to more recent standard influences on TPR. In TPR proper, initial clusters are reduced. The second form, *torona*, reflects this regular phonetic development. The third form has not yet received a satisfying explanation. Most likely, it is the result of contamination with the Nganasan adverb *tabə* "thither." There is, in any case, a certain functional overlap between *toroba* and *tabə* due to the highly frequent TPR adverbial expression *tut toroba* "thither," literally "here side" or rather, "that side."

35 Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 272.

at an early stage due to their phonetic similarity, but it is doubtless secondary to the rise of both case markers. In the extant TPR corpus, *meste* occasionally takes the place of *mesto* in a variety of functions (locative, instrumental, directional, adessive, ablative, prolative), but it still shows a clear bias towards the comitative, which is only rarely infringed upon by the more dominant *mesto*. In view of these facts, a three-case system might be postulated for TPR, consisting of bare nouns for core relations, *mesto* for peripheral case relations, and the highly specialized *meste* for the comitative. It is, however, apparent that this system is highly unstable and could be expected to finally give way to a fusion of *mesto* and *meste* in the hypothetical course of future development.

## Postpositions in TPR and CPR

Basic case marking in TPR is further supplemented by a range of postpositions to indicate more specific local relations. These are *rjadom* "beside," *nizu* "below," *berkhu* "on top of," *zadi* "behind," *perjod* "in front of," *dalej* "beyond," *blizko* "close to," *seredina* "in the middle of," and *kraj* "beside, along." Although these nominal postmodifiers clearly fall within the range of the peripheral case marker *mesto*, the peripheral case will not be overtly marked on them by *mesto* most of the time, as examples (29)–(31) illustrate:

(29) Тут *девка рядом* положит.
 "He is lying *beside the girl*."

(30) *Тут сопка низу* там озеро есть.
 "*Below that hill*, there is a lake."

(31) *Тут гора вверху* чугунный дом, большой да большой.
 "*On top of that mountain*, there is a cast-iron building, quite tremendous."

This may lead to the wrong impression that postpositions operate on the same level as *mesto*, which is clearly not the case as has been argued at the outset of this article (see examples (1)–(2)). Instead, postpositions form a separate class of modifiers.

Most TPR postpositions may be tracked down directly to counterpart forms of the lexifier, where they serve the same purpose as secondary prepositions: TPR *rjadom* < Russian *rjadom s* + instrumental "beside"; *nizu* < adv. *vnizu* + genetive "below"; *zadi* < Russian *szadi* + genitive "behind"; *blizko* < *blizko ot* + genetive "close to." Grammaticalization in these cases involves hardly anything more than deleting the native morphological case—which in TPR had never been adopted anyway—and aligning the specifying elements with the SOV word order pattern of the substrate language. On a categorial level, there is however still more to it. As the optional case marking pattern in (1)–(2) demonstrates, the postpositions in question are treated as nouns in TPR. It should also be noted that all of the secondary prepositions also figure as locative adverbials in Russian. Two TPR postpositions derive from locative adverbials that do not usually figure in prepositional constructions: *berkhu* < adv. *vverkhu* "above"; *perjod* < adv. *vperjod* "forward." Although *vverkhu* is not registered as a regular part of an established secondary preposition in Russian, it occurs quite often in specifying and reinforcing statements like *vverxu, na gore* "on the mountain, right at the top," which clearly qualify as the direct if less formalized equivalent of the genuine secondary prepositions. The selection of the latter element, *vperjod*, poses something of a riddle, because the Russian *vperedi* "in front of" + genetive would have offered a more obvious and direct model in this case. It may however be assumed that the grammaticalization of *vperjod* was helped by the closely related preposition *vperedi*. A less straightforward case seems to be *dalej* "beyond" < Russian adv. *dalej, dalee* "further," but this comparative adverb may also be encountered quite often in constructions that parallel the structure of the secondary prepositions. Thus, (33) would be a possible Russian equivalent of the TPR sentence in (32):

(32) *Речка далей* найдешь еще озеро.
  "*Beyond the small river*, you will find yet another lake."

(33) *Далее от речки* найдешь еще озеро.
  "*Farther away from the small river ...*"

More promising from a grammaticalization point of view appear the remaining postpositions that derive directly from full lexical nouns, that is to say, *seredina* "in the middle of" < noun *seredina* "middle" and *kraj* "beside, along" < noun *kraj* "border, borderland, land, fringe."[36] Since, however, postpositions in TPR are rather nouns forming part of juxtapositional constructions, there is less grammaticalization to them than one might suspect. Moving a noun like *seredina* "middle" behind another noun in order to specify it will cause *seredina* to lose neither its noun status nor its more specific lexical semantic features. The basically nominal character of postpositions in TPR might also explain why the noun *seredina* was selected over the seemingly ready-made secondary Russian preposition *vseredine* "in the middle of" to provide the model for the postposition.

A somewhat different case is manifest in the postposition *kraj* "beside, along," which derives from a noun with a less abstract, non-relational spatial meaning. If you take into account that in TPR, the yet more concrete meaning "riverbank, lake-shore" has been added to the semantic spectrum of *kraj* from the Nganasan equivalent *bərə*, there may indeed a case to be made for a gradual development from a rather concrete meaning to a more abstract and general meaning, and thus from the lexical to the grammatical. The presumed developmental trajectory is represented by four stages exemplified by (34)–(37):

    I
(34) Совсем сухой край-то.
     "The lake shore is very dry."


    II
(35) *Лайда край-то идет.*
     "He moves on to the fringe of the marshland."

---

  36 An approximate parallel would be *edge* (relational noun) > locative (Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 122).

III

(36) *Белой озеро край место* тут упал.

"He came down by the shore of a white lake."

or

"He came down right *beside a white lake*."

IV

(37) Потом тут девка *его тут сестра край место* тахариа тихоньку так положил.

"Then this girl lay quietly down beside his sister."

The first stage is exemplified by (34), which shows *kraj* in its lexical function. In stage II, *kraj* is still lexical, though the syntactic environment (second element of a co-compound + directional thematic role) would principally allow for an interpretation as a postposition. But *kraj* is highlighted by the topic prominence marker –*to*. In fact, this is a statement about the fringe of the marshland, and not about the marshland: *kraj* is singled out and individuated as the topic of the utterance, and is thus still fully lexical. In stage III, topic prominence is no longer a given feature of the utterance. Although *kraj* may still be given its lexical reading, it is clear that its contextual meaning is relational rather than independent. The "shore" in this case is reduced to specify the spatial relation between the subject of the sentence and the "white lake." Finally, stage IV no longer even allows for a lexical reading of *kraj*, since human beings and persons do not belong to the class of objects that may be defined in terms of having a fringe or a shore. There is of course no way of knowing whether these four stages correspond to an actual chronology of grammaticalization, but it may at least be said that stage IV is not covered by Nganasan usage.

Much like TPR, CPR makes use of postpositions to specify a relative position in space. Perekhval'skaja cites two examples that bear a striking resemblance to TPR usage:[37]

---

37 Perekhval'skaia, *Русские пиджины*, pp. 167–168.

(38) *Сиди трава рядом.*
　　"Он сидел в траве." / "He was sitting in the grass."


(39) *Собука низу живи.*
　　"Я живу под сопкой." / "I live at the foot of the hill."


Despite the seemingly aberrant semantics of *rjadom* in (38), the manner of construction as well as the origin of these postpositions may be assumed to be the same as in TPR. The superstrate origin will render a monogenetic explanation superfluous. The postpositional order seems to conform to the general SOV patterns of CPR, which can be traced back to neither Russian nor Chinese. Stern lists this particular feature among the Mongolian characteristics of CPR along with more straight-forward items like the Mongolian verbal suffix *–xu* found on CPR verbs (for example, *кушаху* "eat") or the conjunction *adali* "like" < Buriat *adli* "like, as" (Modern Mongolian has the slightly different *adil* "like, as").[38] The Mongolian share in the emergence of CPR has been further corrobo-rated on sociohistorical grounds.[39] The use of postpositions to express spatial relations is a common strategy in Modern Mongolian, which has genuine, uninflected postpositions alongside postpositions derived from nouns. In the latter case, the postposition will be inflected for case,[40] much like the type of postposition found in Nganasan and Dolgan on the Taimyr. However, Chinese may in fact also have had a share in the word order of spatial modifiers.[41] Although Chinese is an SVO language, spatial specifications will make use of a specific kind of compounding in-volving so-called locative particles, which bear a superficial resemblance to postpositional constructions, though they are more like prepositional constructions:

---

38 Dieter Stern, "Russische Pidgins," *Die Welt der Slaven* 47 (2002), pp. 1–30, here, p. 19.

39 Stern, "Myths and Facts about the Kyakhta Trade Pidgin," pp. 175–187.

40 James E. Bosson, *Modern Mongolian: A Primer and Reader* (Bloomington-The Hague: Indiana University Press, Mouton, 1964), pp. 58–59.

41 Roman Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 25:1 (2010), pp. 5–62, here, p. 39.

(40) *zài*     *huāyuan -*     *pángbian*
     at     garden -     side of/beside "beside the garden"[42]

After all, postpositions occupy however a rather marginal position in CPR usage, while they belong to the common stock of grammatical strategies in TPR.

Finally, there remain two cases of postpositions that involve a change of grammatical status, while little or no semantic change is involved. The first case is the TPR *mera* < Russian noun *mera* "measure,"[43] which marks expressions of spatial as well as temporal measurement:

(41) *Тут два карыгали меря* там еще бригада чум стоят.
"*In the distance of two days' travel*, there are standing more tents of the brigade."

(42) Потом *год или половина год меря* тебя место тоже гостевать буду.
"Then, *after a year's or one and a half year's time*, I will come to visit you again."

Example (42) also indicates a further reaching aspect of the *mera* construction, in that it seems to imply the estimated character of the measurement. Using *mera* or not would thus mark the difference between an estimated measurement (43) and an exact count (43'):

(43) Тут какой-то десять *мера* чум нашел.
"He discovered *about* ten tents there."

(43') Тут десять чум нашел.
"He discovered (exactly) ten tents there."

---

42 Charles Li and Sandra A. Thompson, *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 1981), p. 391.

43 There is the phonetic variant *merʲa*, with a palatal /rʲ/. No recognizable pattern of distribution seems to apply. The origin of this variant has not yet been clarified, either.

Estimating implies approximating a given reference point, possibly but not necessarily without reaching it. Thus, the estimativity of (42) and (43) is associated with approximative movements in space and time as exemplified by (44)–(45):

(44) Тахариавы *середина мера* под земля рука-то так толкал.
"Now, it [the horse] pushed his leg *up to the middle* into the ground."

(45) Старуха все время лежит так *до обед меря*.
"The old woman is lying that way *until noon*."[44]

Thus, there may in fact be a semantic change under way from the general "measure" > approximative, but in all examples that allow for an approximative interpretation, the original lexical meaning is still present. As for the syntactic path from full noun to postposition, what is remarkable about *mera* is that it is attested exclusively in postpositional constructions. There is no trace of it being used as a true lexical item. Whether *mera* ought to be classified as a marker of case alongside *mesto* or as a postposition instead remains open to debate. The fact that *mera* is never marked for case by *mesto* may point to its being a case marker, but on the other hand, the basic function of *mera* seems to fall beyond the general range of thematic roles typical for case marking.

The second case is the TPR *takuvasa*, which has a functionally exact though etymologically different parallel in the CPR *odinaka*. Both are used as postpositions to mark references of comparisons stating the likeness of the things being compared:

---

44 If the approximative interpretation of *mera* is correct, the addition of the approximative Russian preposition *до* "up to, until" would be pleonastic. Although the presence of *до* may not rightaway confirm our interpretation, at least it does not contradict it. In general, TPR does not make use of Russian prepositions. Occasional occurrences of Russian prepositions like the one in question may count as influenced by more recent contacts with Standard Russian.

TPR

(46) Там мох-то совсем прямо *как вата такуваса*.
"There, the moss is exactly *like cotton wool*."

(47) Цепь-то брал-да теперя *ремень такуваса* делал.
"He took the chain and used it *like a girth*."

CPR

(48) *сахала адинака* "sweet as sugar"[45]

(49) *трава адиннакэ* "like grass"

The CPR *odinaka* derives from the colloquial Russian *odinakij/ odinako* "alike," while the TPR *takuvasa* can be traced back to the correlative pronominal adjective *takov-takova-takovo* "such, the same as" extended by the emphatic *že*. The selection of both items for the function of a comparative conjunction would imply some kind of grammaticalization process despite the availability of substrate models, for neither of them occurs originally in comparative constructions. It may therefore be supposed that the grammaticalization involved some kind of reinterpretation of prevalent lexifier structures.

The Russian model for the TPR *takuvasa* typically occurs in comparisons of the following structure: *Каковы пастыри, таково и стадо* "The way the herders are, such is the herd." It may also be expected in independent utterances following descriptive or evaluative statements as a predicate: *Пастырь злой. Стадо таково же*! "The herder is vicious. The herd is just the same!" Grammaticalization would in this case hardly involve anything more than fusing both independent statements. It could then be easily extended to comparative statements without an evaluative component. As a comparative conjunction, *takuvasa* competes with the native Russian comparative conjunction *kak*, and it may be safely assumed that this competition is not due to the recent introduction of *kak* into TPR due to the influence of the standard language. Possibly

---

45 Examples (48) and (49) are from Perekhval'skaia, *Русские пиджины*, p. 169.

*takuvasa* or *takova že* was initially employed to reinforce a comparative statement. The reference of comparison would regularly be introduced by the preceding *kak* and would then be followed by *takova že* to stress the point. Thus, (46) could be given a slightly different reading as (46'):

(46') Там мох-то совсем прямо *как вата* такуваса.
  "There, the moss is exactly *like cotton wool*, exactly like that."

In fact, in quite a lot of the attested cases, the postpositional *takuvasa* is accompanied by the seemingly pleonastic *kak*. It may therefore be assumed that this common type of construction provided the basis for a metanalysis by shifting the comparative coordinative function from *kak* to *takuvasa*, making *kak* ultimately redundant.[46]

A similar type of isolated predication would also be typical of *odinakij*, which takes the short forms *odinak-odinaka-odinako* in predicative positions. The CPR *Трава одинакэ* could in fact directly reflect the predicative usage of the native Russian *трава одинака* "The grass is quite similar [to X]." The latter usage bears an especially striking resemblance to the way *takuvasa* and *adinaka* are used in TPR and CPR. In both cases, only a change of syntactic status from predicative adjective to comparative conjunction is involved, which would mean a simple process of embedding this kind of predication into a larger syntactic frame. Semantic development plays no part in this, anyway. Available substrate models may have suppported and favored the grammaticalization of a postpositional comparative conjunction, but it is doubtful whether they replaced or short-circuited the processes outlined above. For TPR, the substrate models are modal postpositions expressing comparisons in both major substrate languages, that is, the Nganasan *mantə* as in *syrə mantə* "like ice"[47] and the Dolgan *kördük* as in *möčük kördük* "like a

---

46 This process is reminiscent of the shift from *ne > pas* as a negator via *ne ... pas* in French (Hans Henrich Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991), p. 194; Hopper and Traugott, *Grammaticalization*, pp. 58–59).

47 The Nganasan example is from Katzschmann, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica*, p. 395.

ball."[48]  Models for the CPR *odinaka* may be found in both Mongolian and Chinese.[49]

## The Rise of Demonstratives in TPR

Although having adopted the Russian demonstrative *ėto*, TPR has evolved a new competing demonstrative based on the locative adverbial *tut* "here," besides.  Thus, the argument of a short-circuited genesis due to the pressure of communicative necessity caused by impoverished input clearly does not apply here.  There is also neither a superstrate nor a substrate model available, so this may indeed be considered a clear case of grammaticalization in a Russian pidgin, the more so in that it represents one of the most common cases of grammaticalization with parallels all over the world, among them two of the most prominent creole languages, Tok Pisin and Papiamentu.[50]  The common concrete deictic usage of the locative adverbial may safely be assumed to have served as the starting point for the grammaticalization process, as illustrated in (50).  Further development would include extension to contexts where no immediate spatial deixis is at hand, as in (51):

(50) Зачем тебя это правда *тут ружьé* все время таскаешь?
     "Why do you carry *that rifle (here)* about all the time?"

(51) Ну, тебя вот прямо так пойдешь, а найдешь маленький *лайда*.
     *Тут лайда* край найдешь речка.
     "Now, you shall go straight ahead; there you will find a small marsh.
     At the edge of *that marsh*, you will find a rivulet."

---

48 The Dolgan example is from Marek Stachowski, *Dolganischer Wortschatz* (Cracow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1993), p. 157.

49 For examples, see Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," pp. 39–40.

50 Compare the Tok Pisin *Pukpuk hia* (< Engl. "here") *i gat bigpela tis* "This crocodile has large teeth" and the Papiamentu *E karta aki* (< Span. "aquí") *ta pa mi tata* "That letter is for my father." For more examples, see Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 173.

In (50), *tut* refers to the immediate situation with the rifle being present. It could therefore still be interpreted as an indicator of immediate deixis, typically accompanied by a pointing gesture, rather than a marker that identifies discourse elements. In this usage, it is still an appendage to instead of a true modifier of the noun. In example (51), *tut* is used in a dislocated context. Although the local meaning is still prevalent, *tut* may not be interpreted as an additional pointing device because the character of the utterance (instruction) implies that the locale being talked about is not immediately present. *Tut* has aquired an obvious discourse function in this context, which means that it is clearly a demonstrative. Finally, (52) shows *tut* in an exclusively discourse-oriented function without any spatial implications:

(52) Тахариа начальника милиция работает это сын$_i$. Ох, таперя
    *тут парень$_i$* ушел.
    "His son is working now as head of the police. Well, now, that boy
    (i.e., his son) has also left."

The expression *tut paren'* is a recategorization of the coreferent *syn* in the preceding sentence. Recategorization clearly belongs to the typical functions of demonstratives.

The grammaticalization of *tut* did not stop at that, but went still further from the demonstrative > third-person pronoun as exemplified by (55)–(56):

(55) Парень-то тут-то, почему вино место поили *тут*? Не надо был
    поить *тут*.
    "That boy here, why did you make *him* drunk with wine? You
    should not have made *him* drunk."

(56) Тогда бинтiси все кушал. *Тут-то* живот полный стал тахариа.
    "Then, the wolverine ate them all. *His* stomach became full, finally."

For (55), an interpretation as a demonstrative is ruled out due to the antecedent of *tut* immediately preceding the sentence proper. Obviously, the independent use of the demonstrative with its often ambiguous status

between deixis and pronominal reference, as exemplified by (57), has informed this further development into a genuine personal pronoun:

(57) Меня-то *тут-то* не замечал.
  "I didn't notice *that / it*."

Once again, the grammaticalization of third-person pronouns out of demonstratives counts among the most commonly attested grammatical changes.[51] An immediate path from the adverbial "here" > third-person pronoun also seems possible.[52] But, as Heine and Kuteva point out,[53] this process is not yet well understood and needs further clarification.

## From Coordinative Conjunction to Converb

There are clear indications that TPR has morphologized the collo-quial Russian coordinative conjunction *da* "and" as a marker of cosubor-dination and even subordination on verbs. In colloquial Russian, *da* will join syntactically independent clauses, sometimes assuming an adversa-tive meaning. This original lexifier usage is still attested in TPR, though examples that may only be interpreted in terms of coordination to the exclusion of other types of juncture, especially subordination, are rare:

( 57) Этих санки место грудил-да тахариа пошёл домой.
  "He (had) loaded them onto the sleigh, and now he went home."

Most commonly, *da* will occur with verbs in the preterite singular form, which it immediately follows, never allowing for intervening ele-ments. The apparent fusion of *da* and the preceding verb as well as the verb's uniformity is already indicative of the high degree of morpholo-gization of *da* and of the ambiguity of (57), which would also allow of

---

51 Ibid., pp. 112–113.

52 Claude Hagège, *The Language Builder: An Essay on the Human Signature in Linguistic Morphogenesis* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993), pp. 216–217.

53 Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 174.

a subordinative reading: "Then, as soon as he had loaded them onto the sleigh, he went home" seems to further support the assumption that *da* in TPR has been grammaticalized as a verbal marker of juncture. This is further corroborated by cases (58) and (59), which would seem incongruent if the past singular form were to be taken at face value:

(58) Тут место ушел-да озеро большой найдем.
     *"He left the place, and we will find a big lake."
     "We will leave this place and find a big lake."
     "Leaving this place, we will find a big lake."

(59) Тебя олень место мотри. Мотрел-да выбранный олень бери.
     *"Take a look at that reindeer! He looked and took his chosen reindeer!"
     "Take a look at the reindeer. Look around and take your chosen reindeer."
     "Take a look at the reindeer. Looking around, take a reindeer of your choice."

The first of the clauses conjoined by *da* in (58) and (59) does not contain the full grammatical information required for it to be an independent clause. This qualifies the first clause as a medial clause that is dependent on the following final clause. But there is no subordination involved since the first clause means neither a modification of the second clause nor does it form its complement. It is a dependence of a different kind that applies to the junctures at hand. The medial clause of both (58) and (59) is dependent on the operator specifications of the final clause. The scope of the future tense in (58) as well as of the imperative in (59) extends to the left to necessarily include *ušel-da* and *motrel-da* respectively. This qualifies the given examples as clear cases of cosubordination as explicated by Van Valin & LaPolla.[54] Example (60), however, provides a clear case of subordination with the *da* clause functioning as a relative clause modifying the final clause:

---

54 Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. and Randy J. LaPolla, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

(60) *Меня место тут* ножик *давал-да* худо будет?
   "Is the knife *you gave to me* bad?"

The *da* construction also allows for switch reference indicated by the use of an explicit pronoun form, which in the case of same pivot will usually be absent:

(61) Это коробка-то двери открыл-да *тут-то* упал.
   "When he opened the cover of that box, *it* fell on the floor."

The principal functional polysemy of the *da* construction encompassing both cosubordination and subordination quite neatly matches the use of Nganasan converbs.[55] In particular, the Nganasan conditional gerund of the aorist *–hü"* offers striking parallels. The occurrence of *da* in these two types of juncture to the near complete exclusion of the coordinative juncture proper seems to point to an immediate relexification of the substrate structure. This could, however, also be the effect of a later functional redistribution of the initially synonymous Russian *da* and *i*, with *i* being restricted to coordination[56] while cosubordination and subordination have come to be served by *da* following the pattern of the Nganasan *–hü"*. Unfortunately, this matter cannot be decided on the basis of extant historical records of TPR. It would be safe to state, though, that *da* in TPR underwent a functional shift from coordinative to cosubordinative + subordinative, which shift went hand in hand with the morphologization of the initially unbound element *da*. The principal ambiguity of many utterances, which like (57) cannot be unanimously as-

---

55 N. M. Tereshchenko, *Нганасанский язык* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979), pp. 273ff; Evgenii A. Khelimskii, "Nganasan," in D. Abondolo, ed., *The Uralic Languages* (London-New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 480–515, here, pp. 507–508; Katzschmann, *Chrestomathia Nganasanica*, pp. 443–445.

56 Besides conjoining NPs, *i* will normally come to stand between independent clauses. A few examples are superficially reminiscent of cosubordination, but most are quite unambiguous examples of coordination, where neither the dependency criteria for subordination nor those for cosubordination will hold, like the following: *Руки даст и подымать не мог* "He reached out his hands, but could not lift it." Both clauses employ different modal operators and there is no indication of subordination.

cribed to either coordination or subordinated adverbial modification, will certainly have favored the grammaticalization of the original conjunction.

As a matter of fact, identification of the original coordinative conjunction *da* as a marker of a generalized adverbial clause marker in TPR rests primarily on contextual inference, which makes our conclusion doubtful up to a certain point, because a sense of adverbial modification can be read into many if not most coordinated clauses in any language. It may, however, be pointed out in support of our argument that there are in fact no cases of *da* usage that would forbid an interpretation as an adverbial clause, allowing only for a coordinative reading, such as would be the case in, for instance, adversative statements. This point is further corroborated by a few hybrid cases, where under the renewed influence of the lexifier, the *da* construction will be additionally headed by a Russian subordinative conjunction:

(62) *Когда* месте так встречал-*да* надо целовать надо.
    "*When* we meet in that manner, we are supposed to kiss each other."

Usually, the more acrolectal usage of *kogda* will conform to the native Russian usage of having a finite verb and no additional marker of juncture, as in (63):

(63) А когда пришли, даже колхоз не было.
    "And when we arrived, even the Kolkhoz did not yet exist."

The exceptional construction in (62) may therefore safely be considered to be a hybrid, with *kogda* and *da* being used synonymously. This clearly shows that *da* indeed serves the function of a subordinative conjunction.

## Tense Marking in CPR

CPR has evolved a set of tense markers for future, present, and past tenses.[57] Tense marking of this kind, though widely used, is nonetheless

---

57 Perekhval'skaia, *Русские пиджины*, pp. 158–162; Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," pp. 24–30.

optional, which may be taken as a sign of grammaticalization being still incomplete. The tense markers are derived from corresponding tense forms of the Russian auxiliary *byt'* "to be": *budu/budi* < Russian *budu* "I will" for the future tense; *esi/esa* < Russian *est'* "he/she/it is/exists" for the present tense; and *byla* < Russian *bylo* "it was" for the past tense.[58] None of these tense markers will be inflected for number or person, and they will always immediately follow the invariant lexical verb they modify.[59] So there is a clear change of functional status involved from auxiliary verb to tense particle or possibly even suffix. One possible model for this construction may be found in the future imperfective marking of the Russian lexifier, which makes use of a periphrastic construction consisting of the future auxiliary *budu* and the lexical verb in the infinitive. But *est'* and *bylo* are never used in periphrastic tense constructions, and *est'* is, moreover, restricted to existential statements. On the basis of the more lexical meaning of *est'* "to exist," T. O. Rozanova suggests a history of grammaticalization for this particular element, which is still reflected in its threefold usage in CPR to mark habitual, progressive, and

---

58 Except for *budu*, the actual appearance of these tense markers needs some commentary with regard to their particular form. The variant of *budi* for the future tense does not derive from any inflected Russian form, but is instead due to alignment to the generalized pattern of verb marking in CPR. Verbs in CPR all end in –*i*, a form probably modeled on the Russian imperative. Although the same explanation would seem to hold for *esi*, the –*i* in this form may rather be an effect of the palatalized cluster -*sť'* in the Russian *est'*. The final vowel –*i* would in this case be a variant of the euphonic vowel –*a*, which is found in *esa*. The variant form *esa* shows a common strategy of dealing with word-final consonants in CPR by adding the euphonic –*a*. Once again, the same would seem to hold for *byla*, which could in fact be derived from the Russian masculine *byl*, but the neuter *bylo*, which is usually pronounced /ˈbylə/, and of course also the feminine form *byla* (with a final accent) offer more direct models for the CPR *byla*. Like the euphonic final vowels, the simplification of consonant clusters in both *esi* and *esa* is conditioned by Chinese phonotactics.

59 The same tense markers may also modify nouns and adjectives in the predicate position.

resultative meanings.[60] She identifies habitual usage as the initial stage.[61] Typological evidence is, however, rather suggestive of a different order: "exist" > continuous (progressive) > habitual.[62] But in view of the following, a grammaticalization account may ultimately prove unnecessary. Shapiro identifies a substrate model[63] that appears to fit more neatly with the facts provided by CPR and would only require the Russian auxiliary verb forms to be identified as equivalent to the substrate tense markers. As Shapiro points out, in Mongolian, tensed forms of the verbs "be" and "exist" are used as tense as well as aspect markers following a lexical verb. The structural equivalence may be seen from a comparison of both CPR and Mongolian examples:

(64) Vasha     des'a     zhivi     budu
     2pl       here      live      be.fut
     "You are going to live here."[64]

(65) Za   evo  malen'ki kurema pode-bol'shana kurema ponosi esa.
     topic 3   small    jacket  under-big      jacket  waer   be.prs
     "They wear a small jacket under a big jacket."

(66) Ter       güjž      bajna
     he        run       be.nonpast
     "He is running."

(67) Včera       khodi        byla
     yesterday   go           pst
     "I went yesterday."[65]

60 T. O. Rozanova, *Некоторые особенности соотношения словаря и грамматики в пиджинах на русской основе* (unpublished thesis, St. Petersburg State University, 1998), pp. 75–78.

61 Ibid., p. 78.

62 Heine and Kuteva, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, p. 127.

63 Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," p. 24.

64 Examples (64)–(66) and (68) are from Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," pp. 24–27.

65 The example is from Perekhval'skaia, *Русские пиджины*, p. 161.

(68) Sühbaatar ...     barsan     bilee
     Sühbaatar ...     deceased     be.pst
     "Sühbaatar died on ..."

In the case of *byla* against the Russian *bylo* and the Mongolian *bilee*, a double etymology even seems to be at hand, though it ought to be noted that *bilee* is rather marginal in Mongolian, regularly marking past tense by means of the suffix –*v*.[66] But the marginality of *bilee* in Mongolian may be assumed to have been effectively counteracted by its identification with the ubiquitous Russian *byl/bylo/byla*. Taking into account the share of both the Russian lexifier and the Mongolian substrate, not much seems to have been going on in terms of grammaticalization. The identical semantics as well as the similar functions that hold between both lexifier and substrate forms offered a direct path for immediate relexification of the Mongolian auxiliary-like tense markers, which came to be replaced by the Russian auxiliaries. In the case of *byla* with its double etymology in both the substrate and the lexifier, not even relexification need be invoked, but a direct loan of form and function from Mongolian, which was additionally helped by Russian, may be assumed.[67]

## Conclusion

In our account, TPR figures more prominently than the two remaining Russian pidgins, CPR and RN, the latter of which made no actual appearance at all. As a matter of fact, there is little by way of grammaticalization that can be pointed to in CPR and nothing in the case of RN.[68] Both pidgins rely for their emergent grammatical structures

---

66 Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," p. 29.

67 The effect of double etymology also had its share in the direct adoption of the Chinese perfective particle *le*, which was helped to enter CPR by Russian preterite forms ending in –*la* (Shapiro, "Chinese Pidgin Russian," pp. 28–29).

68 It is not quite clear whether this principal difference between TPR on the one hand and CPR and RN on the other hand reflects a sociolinguistic difference. While RN remained a vehicular language until its final demise, functioning mostly as a seasonal short-term means of communication for particular purposes, TPR seems to have acquired a more communal quality, serving a wide

primarily if not exclusively on processes of generalization in the specific sense outlined in the introduction. Thus, case relations are organized in CPR as well as in RN around a basic dichotomy of bare nouns for core relations against NPs preceded by a generalized preposition for peripheral relations. The respective prepositions are *za* in CPR and *på* in RN. Personal/possessive pronouns in TPR, CPR, and RN and verbs in CPR underwent the same procedure of generalization. Finally, in RN, the generic verb marker *–om* has been troubling scholars for quite some time. Various etymologies have been proposed that are suggestive of a story of generalization. Olaf Broch opts for the Swedish adhortative *–om* in *sjungom* "Let us sing!"[69] while James Fox prefers the Russian first plural ending *–om*, as it is found in *pojdëm* "we go" (also "Let us go!"),[70] as the ultimate source. Both forms are used comparatively infrequently in the lexifiers, which makes them unlikely candidates for generalization from a statistical point of view. There is also little on the functional-semantic side that would qualify them as preferred objects of generalization. More recently, Johanna Laakso pleaded for the verbal nouns ending in *–mA* found in most Fennec languages as a possible source of *–om*.[71] Provided

---

spectrum of communicative needs among neighboring groups. CPR seems to occupy an intermediate position, having started like RN as a makeshift language for trade, to finally serve as a communication means between Russian and Chinese settlers, as well as indigenous tribes following the Russian annexation of the Far Eastern territories in 1858. The idea would be that grammaticalization would require a higher exchange rate than is provided by makeshift languages that are used only by a comparatively small set of people on narrowly defined specific occasions. The context dependence of communication may also be assumed to come into play. Trade languages like RN rely more on the immediate context than do polyvalent communal languages, which means that they are less dependent on the availability of elaborated morphosyntactic structures.

69 Olaf Broch, "Russenorsk," *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 41 (1927), pp. 209–262, here, p. 249.

70 James A. Fox, *Russenorsk: A Study in Language Adaptivity* (unpublished thesis, University of Chicago, 1973).

71 Johanna Laakso, "Reflexions on the Verb Suffix –om in Russenorsk and Some Preliminary Remarks on 'Docking' in Language Contact," *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 8 (2001), p. 315–324.

that Saami speakers indeed had a significant share in Russo-Norwegian trade contacts, this would be a plausible substrate source. But unfortunately, the suffix in Saami is, as in most other Fennec languages, subject to complex morphophonemic alternations, thus lacking the salience required of a linguistic element for it to be selected in pidginization. Stern has advanced a completely different proposal.[72] He suggests that *–om* is in fact a loan from Cape Dutch Pidgin, with Solombala English[73] possibly forming an intermediate link. Both pidgins do indeed use the same marker *–om* as a generic verb marker. Thus, it is possible that neither generalization nor grammaticalization is involved in the rise of the RN *–om*.

The relatively neat match between Russian pidgins and their substrates where grammaticalization comes into play, especially in the case of the *mesto* construction in TPR, and the according lack of truly innovative structures may be suggestive of grammaticalization in pidginization being basically governed and restricted by substrate licensing. This is not the same as stating that there is no grammaticalization at work in these cases. Some kind of incipient grammaticalization process may in fact always be involved, which is, however, speeded up and directed by substrate models. Grammaticalization and relexification must thus not necessarily be seen as alternative options exclusive of each other, but should instead be conceived of as interacting components of grammar creation in pidgins. For even where grammaticalization due to the violation of a unidirectional path seems to be out of the question, some kind of gradual development ought still to be assumed. Substrate patterns may win out over universals of grammaticalization as the case of *fastaem* cited by Bruyn illustrates, but supposedly they do so only on condition that a preceding cycle of grammaticalization from lexical to grammati-

---

72 Dieter Stern, "'Matraas altsamma skaffum': Anmerkungen zu einem Seemannswort im Russenorsk," in Wolfgang Gladrow and Dieter Stern, eds., *Beiträge zur slawischen Philologie. Festschrift für Fred Otten* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007), pp. 177–191.

73 Ingvild Broch, "Solombala-English in Archangel," in Ernst Håkon Jahr and Ingvild Broch, eds., *Language Contact in the Arctic: Northern Pidgins and Contact Languages* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 93–98.

cal has been completed. Thus, *fastaem* may have been extended from temporal to local according to the substrate pattern only after the association with the original lexical meaning of "first time" had generally been loosened. The idea behind this is that extensions that run counter to semantically conditioned trajectories of development would be blocked by still-prevalent concrete meanings, whereas the bleached semantics of an already fully grammaticalized item, though still determining the direction of further developments in ordinary language change, would pose no barrier to substrate-induced deviant developments, as the case of *fastaem* ultimately proves. The same principle also may apply to cases where the grammatical path is essentially undisputed, such as extension from locative to instrumental in the case of the TPR *mesto*. Although the Nganasan substrate model has certainly offered the possibility of directly mapping instrumental usage onto the *mesto* construction without any intervening developmental stages, this extension of grammatical-semantic functions possibly did not take place, as long as the association between the lexical meaning and the grammatical uses of *mesto* was still strong. The same holds for other uses such as the comparative, which, though ultimately deriving from a spatial expression (ablative), certainly offers no immediate semantic link to the notion of "place." Structural transfer or relexification may be considered to be a process of translation. It requires equivalence of structural status between the model structure and the affected structure. For any element to assume the properties of another element by way of translation, it has to belong to the same class of elements. Grammatical homonymy or polysemy may possibly only be transferred on elements that are already fully grammatical, that is, no longer lexical.

## List of Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| ACC | accusative |
| ABL | ablative |
| CAUS | causative |
| COMP | comparative |
| FUT | future |
| GEN | genetive |
| INSTR | instrumental |
| INTAOR | interrogative aorist |
| LAT | lative |
| MKR | marker |
| NOM | nominative |
| PL | plural |
| PRED | predestinative |
| PRS | present |
| PST | past |
| QUAL | quality |
| SG | singular |
| STD | standard |