

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Studies in Language* 38:3
© 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/#authors/rightspolicy>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Funcitive phrases in typological and diachronic perspective

Denis Creissels
University of Lyon

This paper is concerned with a particular semantic type of noun phrases in secondary predicate function, illustrated by *as a negotiator* in *He was sent as a negotiator*. It explores the cross-linguistic regularities in the polysemy patterns characteristic of the markers and constructions having the expression of this meaning as one of their possible uses, and discusses the grammaticalization paths in which they are involved.

Keywords: funcitive, essive, grammaticalization, secondary predicate, polysemy

1. Introduction

The combination of a noun phrase or adposition phrase with a verb is not always designed to express a participant in an event encoded by the verb. In addition to participative roles (such as agent, patient, instrument, beneficiary, etc.), noun phrases or adposition phrases may also fulfill circumstantial roles, in which they refer to circumstances of the event (place, time, manner, cause, etc.), and predicative roles, in which they express secondary predications about participants. Nouns may also combine with verbs into complex predicates of the type commonly termed light-verb constructions, in which they contribute to the definition of a type of event.

This article deals with a particular role that noun phrases or adposition phrases may fulfill in the construction of verbs, for which the label *funcitive* is used. *As a negotiator* in *He was sent as a negotiator* is a typical example of a funcitive phrase. Crucially, *a negotiator* does not refer here to an additional participant in the event described by *He was sent*. In this construction, *as a negotiator* expresses a predication about the referent of the subject (*he*), and the semantic contribution of this phrase can be paraphrased as *to fulfill the role of a negotiator*.

The central concern of this paper is the diachronic explanation of the cross-linguistic variation observed in the polysemy of markers or constructions having the expression of the functive as one of their possible uses.

After some preliminary remarks aimed at avoiding possible misunderstandings about the scope of this study and its basic assumptions (Section 2), I present cross-linguistic data on the syncretisms in which functive markers are involved (Sections 3 to 6), and I discuss the grammaticalization paths that may lead to the polysemy patterns observed (Sections 7 to 9).

The obvious difficulty one has to face in such a study is that most grammatical traditions do not include the functive among the notions whose involvement in the structuring of languages must be systematically taken into account. Consequently, gathering data representative of the cross-linguistic diversity in the encoding of this semantic role and its possible connections with other roles cannot be achieved by simply consulting the indexes of reference grammars, and this practically excludes a rigorous typological study on the basis of a representative sample of languages. The sample of languages I have used is certainly biased by my familiarity with a small number of language families, and the generalizations proposed in this article must be viewed as tentative.¹

2. Definition and first observations

2.1 Definition

In this paper, the term ‘functive’ is used with the following definition:

1. A functive phrase is either a noun phrase headed by a noun N normally used to refer to concrete entities (animate beings or concrete things), or the combination of such a noun phrase with an adposition.
2. A functive phrase is syntactically a direct dependent of the verbal head of the clause.
3. A functive phrase does not refer to a participant identifiable as an N and distinct from the participants referred to by the other noun phrases in the construction of the same verb, but predicates the property of fulfilling the role of an N, taking one of the participants as its argument.

The noun phrase about whose referent the functive phrase predicates the property of fulfilling the role of an N can be designated as the *controller* of the functive phrase. For example, in *I am talking to you as your friend*, *I* is the controller of the functive phrase *as your friend*.

Functive phrases are sometimes referred to as role phrases, for example, by Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998), whose definition (“Role phrases express the role or function in which a participant appears”) is equivalent to the definition of the functive formulated above. These authors also use the term of functive (which as far as I know has been used for the first time with reference to role phrases in Haspelmath’s grammar of Lezgian), but they restrict its use to languages in which nouns are inflected for case and one of the case forms of nouns is used to express this notion.

In English, noun phrases in functive role are typically introduced by the preposition *as* — Ex. (1).

- (1) English: *as*-phrases in functive role
- a. *John is working as a teacher.*
 - b. *I got these books as a gift.*
 - c. *I mentioned this as an example.*
 - d. *I am talking to you as your friend.*
 - e. *We were given melon with prosciutto as a first course.*
 - f. *I used my sweater as a pillow.*

The expression of the functive as defined above is however not the only possible use of ‘*as* + NP’ sequences. Ex. (2) illustrates uses of *as* that the adopted definition prevents from being recognized as functive, since they do not really involve the notion of function or role, although their semantic closeness to the functive is obvious.

- (2) English: *as*-phrases in roles distinct from the functive
- a. *She appeared on stage as a man.* (participant-oriented similitive)
 - b. *As a child he was very rebellious.* (temporally-bound equative)²
 - c. *As a woman you should not tell that.* (individual-level equative)

The syncretisms involving markers or constructions that have the expression of the functive role as one of their possible uses show important cross-linguistic variation. For example, in Mandinka, the postposition *tí* marking the functive phrase in (3a) cannot be used to mark nouns expressing temporally-bound identification, which are marked by the suffix *-mâa* also used in the expression of participant-oriented similitive — Ex. (3b–c). *Tí* is not used with secondary predicates expressing individual-level identification either, and Mandinka has a special suffix *-tôo* for this function — Ex. (3d). By contrast, transformative, which cannot be expressed in English by means of *as*, is one of the possible uses of the Mandinka postposition *tí* — Ex. (3e–f), and *tí* also occurs in independent equative clauses — Ex. (3g).³

- (3) Mandinka (p.d.)
- a. *Ŋ́ ná até le lónj [ý faamáa tí].*
 1SG CMP.POS 3SG:EMPH FOC know 1SG father:DEF OBL
 ‘It is him that I knew [as my father].’ (functive)
- b. *Ŋ́ ná í faamáa [dín-dim-mâa] lónj.*
 1SG CMP.POS 2SG father:DEF child-SPR know
 ‘I knew your father [as a child].’ (stage-level equative)
- c. *Íbúliisá [saa-máa] naatá Awá kaŋ.*
 Satan snake-SPR come:CMP.POS Eve on
 ‘Satan came to Eve as a snake.’ (participant-oriented similitive)
- d. *Íte [musu-tôo] mánj ñánna ñinj fôla.*
 2SG woman-SPR CMP.NEG must DEM tell:INF
 ‘[As a woman] you should not tell that.’ (individual level identification)
- e. *Jíyo yelematá [dolóo tí].*
 water:DEF change:CMP.POS wine:DEF OBL
 ‘The water changed [into wine].’ (transformative)
- f. *Kewólu ye yirijúwo lésé [kúlúŋo tí].*
 man:DEF:PL CMP.POS tree_trunk:DEF carve boat:DEF OBL
 ‘The men carved the tree trunk [into a boat].’ (transformative)
- g. *Ŋ́inj yíróo mu [bantáŋo le tí].*
 DEM tree:DEF COP silk_cotton_tree:DEF FOC OBL
 ‘This tree is [a silk-cotton tree].’ (independent clause
 expressing identification)

Moreover, the Mandinka postposition *tí* is not limited to the encoding of predicative roles. It is also fully productive as a marker of the standard of comparison in the construction expressing the comparative of superiority — Ex. (4a), and is marginally found as a marker of phrases in other non-predicative roles: comitative — Ex. (4b) — and substitutive (‘in exchange for’) — Ex. (4c).

- (4) Mandinka (p.d.)
- a. *Sánóo le kúlíyáatá kódóo tí.*
 gold:DEF FOC be_heavy:CMP.POS silver:DEF OBL
 ‘Gold is heavier than silver.’
- b. *Kewó naata kídóo tí.*
 man:DEF come:CMP.POS gun:DEF OBL
 ‘The man brought a gun.’ (lit. ‘came with a gun’)
- c. *I yé jónólu saŋ kídímúnkóo tí.*
 3PL CMP.POS slave:DEF:PL trade gun:powder:DEF OBL
 ‘They traded slaves for gun powder.’

2.2 Functive and equative

The main difficulty in identifying functive phrases is to draw a distinction between phrases predicating the property of fulfilling the role of an N (N a noun) and phrases predicating other semantic types of identification. The view adopted here is that prototypical equative (the term equative being taken in its broad meaning — see footnote 2) can be defined as the expression of individual-level identification, i.e. the identification of an entity with reference to relatively stable properties, whereas the functive can be defined as the expression of functional identification, or role-bound identification, and therefore constitutes one of the non-prototypical varieties of the equative alongside, for example, temporally-bound identification.

A definition of the relationship between functive and equative in terms of relative closeness to prototypes is made necessary by the absence of a clear-cut boundary between prototypical and non-prototypical identification, and between the various non-prototypical subtypes of identification, as evidenced by the cross-linguistic variation in the cut-off points between constructions expressing prototypical identification and constructions more or less specialized in the expression of non-prototypical varieties of identification.

For example, the closeness between role-bound identification (functive) and temporally-bound identification is obvious, as reflected by the use of the same marker for functive phrases and phrases expressing temporally-bound identification in English and other languages. At the same time, however, Ex. (3) above shows that the distinction is relevant at least in some languages.

The sharpness of the distinction between the functive and other varieties of identification crucially depends on the lexical meaning of the noun in functive role. For example, in *I used my sweater as a pillow*, it is clear that the relationship between *sweater* and *pillow* can only be interpreted in terms of functional identification: a sweater is not a pillow, even when used as a pillow. By contrast, in *John is working as a teacher*, the distinction between functive and individual-level equative tends to blur. Working as a teacher is not exactly the same thing as being a teacher, since being a teacher suggests a permanent state requiring a qualification, whereas working as a teacher suggests that the position is temporary, and does not necessarily correspond to the main qualification of the person that occupies it. Speakers are aware of the distinction, and it is not difficult to imagine contexts in which it is relevant, but in most contexts, *John is working as a teacher* and *John is a teacher* can be used interchangeably, since a person who is a teacher (i.e., who has a professional qualification in teaching) is normally expected to work as a teacher, and vice-versa.

Reanalysis processes in such transitional contexts are responsible for the fact that, when a language has several constructions or markers expressing various

types of identification, the markers used in prototypical functive situations do not necessarily extend their use to all types of identification for which a functive interpretation is conceivable, and at the same time may also be used to encode types of identification for which a functive interpretation is clearly ruled out.

2.3 Functive and transformative

The label *transformative* is used here for a comparative concept defined as follows: noun phrases in transformative role refer to the final state of a participant undergoing a transformation, as in *He decided to become a writer*, or *Jesus made water into wine*. Like noun phrases in functive role, noun phrases in transformative role do not refer to participants distinct from those encoded by the other noun phrases included in the same construction, but rather contribute to the expression of a predication about the referent of another noun phrase.

The relationship between equative and transformative is obvious, since transformative phrases can be viewed as equative phrases in the scope of a verb encoding a transformation event, and the transformative can therefore be considered a contextual variant of the equative.

The closeness between transformative and functive is also obvious, since there is no clear-cut distinction between a change that affects the essential properties of an entity, and the acquisition of a more or less temporary role that does not affect the very nature of the entity concerned.

It is therefore not surprising that the constructions or markers found in contexts in which they are unambiguously interpreted as functive are also commonly found in uses that cannot be easily categorized as functive or transformative. We will return to functive-transformative syncretism in Section 3.4.

2.4 Functive phrases in copulative constructions, functive arguments, and functive adjuncts

Finnish illustrates the situation in which functive-marked noun phrases (in Finnish, nouns phrases in the Essive case) can be found in copulative constructions in which they contrast with another form of the noun phrase (in Finnish, the Nominative case) used in the same context to express permanent identification.

- (5) Finnish (Wikipedia: Suomen kieli ulkomaalaisille/Sisältö/Essiivi)
- a. *Hän on opettaja-na.*
 3SG be.PRS.3SG teacher-ESS
 ‘He is teaching (temporarily).’ or ‘He is working as a teacher for the time being.’

- b. *Hän on opettaja.*
 3SG be.PRS.3SG teacher
 'He is a teacher.' (This is his profession and is likely to remain so.)

However, this is not a common situation. In most languages, the functive markers used with noun phrases expressing secondary predications in combination with non-copulative verbs cannot be found in copulative constructions, and the meaning unambiguously expressed in Finnish by the construction illustrated in (9a) can only appear as a contextual interpretation of a copulative construction whose default meaning is plain identification, or be specified by the combination of a functive phrase with a verb such as English *serve* in *serve as a clerk*, *serve as a reminder*.

Some languages have constructions that can be described as involving a copulative-like use of a verb *do* combined with a functive noun phrase. The verbs found in such constructions are bivalent verbs usually found as the equivalent of English *do*, with a second argument denoting an activity (*do the washing*), the entity affected by an activity (*do the garden*), or the result of an activity (*do a lot of damage*). In particular, 'do' verbs with abstract nouns derived from nouns as their second argument constitute in many languages the usual equivalent of English *work / serve as*: Agul (East Caucasian) *dijarkā-r^w el aqʷas* lit. 'do milkmaid-hood' > 'work as a milkmaid', Karata (East-Caucasian) *ušter-ler gāla* lit. 'do teacher-hood' > 'work as a teacher'. Such constructions do not count as functive constructions according to the definition adopted here, since the second argument of 'do' is an abstract noun denoting an activity. But in some languages, such verbs also have the ability to assign the functive role to nouns normally used to refer to concrete entities; the nouns in question may be encoded in the same way as patients of typical transitive verbs — Ex. (6), or as oblique arguments — Ex. (7).

- (6) Japanese (Irène Tamba, p.c.)
Kare wa hoogakkoo no kyooshi o shite iru.
 3SG TOP primary_school GEN teacher ACC do:CVB be
 'He is working as a schoolteacher.' lit. 'He is doing schoolteacher.'
- (7) Spanish (p.k.)
Mi hermana hace de secretaria.
 my sister do:PRS:3SG DE secretary
 'My sister works as a secretary.' lit. 'My sister does of secretary.'

As regards functive phrases combined with non-copulative verbs, the definition formulated in Section 2.1 says nothing about their status with respect to the distinction between arguments and adjuncts. However, unambiguous functive constructions in which the functive phrase is an argument are cross-linguistically uncommon. It is true that in many contexts, the distinction between functive and

other subtypes of equative, or between functive and transformative, is more or less blurred. But once the importance of these distinctions has been acknowledged, a closer look at constructions including predicative arguments whose marking may suggest a functive interpretation leads to the conclusion that the role of the predicative argument is almost always best analyzed as plain equative or transformative. For example, the construction illustrated by *John considers Mary (as) a strong woman* is a raising construction, and the embedded predication in the logical structure of this sentence is plain equative rather than functive, as suggested by the paraphrase *John considers that Mary is a strong woman*. The same applies to *Mary* in *John took Mary for his sister*, paraphrasable as *John got the (false) impression that Mary was his sister*.

Functive phrases arguably analyzable as arguments rather than adjuncts will however be examined in Section 2.10.

2.5 Functive periphrases

From a purely onomasiological perspective, translational equivalents of the functive constructions analyzed in the present paper must exist in all languages, but fully grammaticalized constructions falling under the definition of functive formulated in Section 2.1 do not necessarily exist in all languages. Not all noun phrases that in some way or another express a role fulfilled by the referent of another noun phrase fall within the scope of the present study.

The distinction between grammaticalized functive marking and functive periphrases may however be problematic, since expressions of the types discussed in this section often show evidence of grammaticalization. Diachronically, they are a possible source of fully grammaticalized functive marking, and there is no universal criterion making it possible to decide at what point in the grammaticalization process a functive marker has emerged from a construction initially analyzable as a functive periphrasis.

A first case is that of formulations such as *by way of N*, *in one's capacity/nature/quality of N*, in which the notion of role or function is implied by the lexical meaning of the abstract noun that constitutes the head of the construction. Ex. (8) & (9) illustrate the case of languages in which such constructions constitute the usual equivalent of *as*-constructions in English.

- (8) Hindi (Annie Montaut, p.c.)
Usne do sal maastar ke rûp men kâam kiyâ hai.
 3SG:ERG two year schoolteacher GEN way in work do PFV
 'He worked two years as a schoolteacher.'

- (9) Wallisian (Claire Moyse, p.c.)
'E talaga ia ia i tona 'uhiga 'aliki.
 NPST speak ABS 3SG OBL POSS.3SG nature⁴ chief
 'He is speaking as a chief.'

Similarly, in Persian, the meanings expressed in other languages by constructions that count as functive constructions according to the definition adopted here are expressed by means of formulations like *be envân* 'with the title of', *be semat* 'with the mark of', or *be manzele* 'with the rank of'. See also Šarić (2008) on the use of *u svojstvu / ulozu / funkciji* 'in the quality / role / function' in Croatian.

In some languages, the usual translational equivalent of English 'as N' may also involve the derivation of abstract nouns, lit. *in N-hood* or *doing N-hood*. Such formulations constitute another possible source of functive markers (see Sections 7.1 & 8.2), but are not counted here as functive constructions proper.

Another possibility is the use of bi-verbal constructions implying argument sharing with the following division of labor: the shared argument is expressed as an argument of the verb that assigns it a participant role, whereas the noun phrase in functive role is introduced as an argument of the other verb. As illustrated by Ex. (10), in Japanese, *to shite* taken as a whole expresses a functive or equative meaning similar to that expressed in English by *as*, but grammatically, *to* is a (multifunctional) case particle and *shite* is the converbial form of *suru* 'do', combined with *sumu* 'inhabit' fulfilling the function of main predicate.

- (10) Japanese (Kuwae 1989: 481)
Wakai koro gakusei to shite Tookyoo ni sannnen sunde itta.
 young when student TO do:CVB Tokyo in three_years inhabit:CVB be:PST
 'I lived three years in Tokyo as a student when I was young.'⁵

It can however be argued that this decomposition is no longer relevant to syntax, and that, in present-day Japanese, *to shite* must be considered as a compound marker, in spite of its transparent etymology (Irène Tamba, p.c.). Here again, it is very difficult to decide at what point in its grammaticalization process a periphrasis of this type must be considered as having been converted into a grammaticalized functive construction.

Ex. (11) illustrates a similar construction in Karata (East Caucasian), with a converbial form of *gāṭa* 'do' introducing a functive noun phrase that, semantically, expresses a predication about the Nominative argument of *k'use idja* 'is sitting'.

- (11) Karata (Magomedova & Xalidova 2001)
Hič'u ela qarawul gē χ'aj idja k'use.
 door at guard do:CVB dog COP sit:CVB
 'A dog is sitting at the door as a guard.'

In other languages, similar periphrases are rather of the type commonly designated as serial verb construction. For example, Mandarin Chinese uses serial constructions involving *dāng* ‘act as’ or *zuò* ‘do’ — Ex. (12), and similar constructions are found in other Chinese varieties.

- (12) Chinese (Wu Tong, p.c.)
Ta xuan wo dang hezuo huoban.
 3SG choose 1SG act_as collaboration partner
 ‘He chose me as (his) collaborator.’

Finally, as illustrated by Ex. (13), some languages have functive periphrases in which the functive phrase is introduced by a dependent form of a copula, i.e., a word whose literal meaning can be glossed as ‘being’.⁶

- (13) Turkish (Göksel & Kerslake: 216)
Bun-u san-a avukat ol-arak değil, arkadaş ol-arak söyl-üyor-um.
 DEM-ACC 2SG-DAT lawyer be-CVB NEG friend be-CVB say-PROG-1SG
 ‘I’m saying this to you not as a lawyer but as a friend.’

A similar use of a dependent form of a copula is found in Amharic (Ethiosemitic), Oromo (Cushitic), Sotho-Tswana (Bantu), etc. Not surprisingly, this type of formulation is particularly common with nouns whose lexical meaning blurs the distinction between functive and prototypical equative.

2.6 Functive phrases in the typological literature

From the point of view of a general typology of secondary predicates, functive phrases in non-copulative constructions are a subtype of depictives, both syntactically and semantically: syntactically, depictives as defined by Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004) may not only be noun phrases or adposition phrases, but also adjectives, or phrases headed by non-finite verb forms, and semantically, the definition of depictives does not specify the nature of the predication they express, whereas the definition of the functive posited above limits this notion to noun phrases or adposition phrases paraphrasable as ‘fulfilling the role of an N’.

Since functive phrases in non-copulative constructions are a particular type of secondary predicate, more or less developed discussions about functive phrases in the sense of the definition put forward here can be found in a number of studies devoted to secondary predication, either on particular languages or in a more general perspective — see among others Nichols (1978), Williams (1980), Pinkster (1990, 1991), Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004), Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (eds.) (2005). Schroeder & al. (2008) provides particularly rich material about functive phrases. However, in most of the literature on secondary

predicates, adjectives and non-finite verb forms figure much more prominently than noun phrases, functive noun phrases are not always distinguished clearly from noun phrases in other predicative roles, and even articles that devote a section to the depictive use of nouns do not always provide illustrations of functive phrases.

Given that functive-simulative syncretism (examined here in Section 4.1) is particularly common, functive phrases have also been discussed in studies mainly devoted to simulative constructions — see in particular Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998).

By contrast, in the typologically-oriented discussions about the semantic roles fulfilled by noun phrases or adposition phrases in the construction of verbs and their relationships, the functive has been largely ignored so far, with however the notable exception of Hagège (2010: 320–325). The typological literature on semantic roles focuses on participative and circumstantial roles, neglecting the possibility that noun phrases or adposition phrases directly linked to the verbal head of a clause fulfill predicative functions, and that connections exist between predicative roles and participative or circumstantial roles.

In this paper, the functive is mainly investigated as one of the possible roles noun phrases or adposition phrases may fulfill in the construction of verbs, which implies a special emphasis on the possible connections with other roles that can be fulfilled by noun or adposition phrases. The question of the status of the functive in a typology of secondary predicates cannot be ignored, but this perspective is not central to the discussion.

For example, the Russian Instrumental is used to encode participants with the semantic role of instrument — Ex. (14a) — but also has predicative uses, in which it is used to mark both nouns in functive role, as in (14b), and adjectives in secondary predicate function, as in (14c). This is certainly not fortuitous, but a proper understanding of this coincidence necessitates also considering the use of the instrumental illustrated in (14d).

(14) Russian (p.k.)

- a. *On breet-sja èlektričesk-oj britv-oj.*
 3SG:M shave:PRS:3SG-REFL electric-SG.F.INSTR razor-SG.INSTR
 ‘He shaves with an electric razor.’
- b. *On rabotaet inžener-om.*
 3SG:M work:PRS:3SG engineer-SG.INSTR
 ‘He is working as an engineer.’
- c. *On prišel domoj p’jan-ym.*
 3SG:M come:PFV:PST:3SG home drunk-SG.M.INSTR
 ‘He came home drunk.’

- d. *Vse sčitajut ego durak-om.*
 all:PL COUNT:PRS:3PL 3SG:M:ACC idiot-SG.INSTR
 'Everybody considers him an idiot.'

According to the analytical grid used in this article, the Russian Instrumental has among its possible uses a functive use illustrated by Ex. (14b), and uses in which it expresses other types of identification, illustrated by Ex. (14c–d). In the perspective of this study, this is consequently an instance of a marker whose equative use is not limited to the expression of the functive. The fact that this marker may be found with both nouns and adjectives in the expression of other varieties of identification is just a particular aspect of this polysemy.

2.7 The functive as a comparative concept, and questions of terminology

It must be clear from what precedes that the label *functive* is used here for a comparative concept in the sense of Haspelmath 2010. This implies that no straightforward correspondence must be expected between this notion and the markers used to encode it in individual languages. On the contrary, as illustrated by Ex. (1) to (3) at the beginning of the paper, the general rule is that the markers found with functive phrases also have other uses, sometimes difficult to distinguish from the functive but sometimes very different, and the cross-linguistic variation in the polysemy patterns in which functive markers are involved is amazing at first sight. The only justification for the introduction of the notion of functive is that it may help to discover regularities in the polysemy patterns in which the expression of the functive is involved and to analyze them.

Relatively few descriptive traditions acknowledge the importance of the notion of functive in the organization of case or adposition systems. The main exception is the Uralistic tradition. Most descriptions of Uralic case systems mention an Essive case whose uses include the expression of functional identification.⁷

The functive use of the Essive case of Finnish has already been illustrated in (5). Ex. (15) and (16) illustrate the functive use of the Essive case of Hungarian and Estonian.

- (15) Hungarian (Lelkes 1967: 558)
Öt év-ig [mérnök-ként] dolgoz-ott egy gyár-ban.
 five year-TERM engineer-ESS work-PST[3SG] one factory-INESS
 'He worked five years as an engineer in a factory.'
- (16) Estonian (Lutkat & Hasselblatt 1993: 192)
Minu mees töötab [arsti-na].
 3SG:GEN husband work:PRS:3SG doctor-ESS
 'My husband works as a doctor.'

The fact that Uralic grammars present the functive use as central to the meaning of Essive cases must however not lead one to forget that the expression of functional identification (and possibly other varieties of identification) is not the only use of Uralic Essives, and that the additional uses they may have vary across Uralic languages. For example, the Essive case of Finnish also marks some time adjuncts, whereas the Essive case of Hungarian marked by the suffix *-ként* is also marginally found in similitive function, as in *sas-ként repül* ‘fly like an eagle’ (Balogh 2000: 199). Moreover, even within the Uralic family, the cases regularly used to express the functive and other meanings typically expressed by Uralic Essives are sometimes labeled differently. For example, in Mordvin, the functive is expressed by the so-called Translative case. It may also happen that, in languages in which the Essive case constitutes the most usual expression of the functive, like Hungarian, other cases have functive uses. Ex. (17) illustrates the functive use of the Hungarian Dative.

- (17) Hungarian (Anna Sörös, p.c.)
Kábítószer-nek használják ez-t a növény-t.
 drug-DAT use:PRS:3PL:DEF DEM-ACC DEF plant-ACC
 ‘This plant is used [as a drug.]’

Outside the Uralic family, *essive* is mainly used for cases expressing location, and there is even more variety in the labeling of cases that have the expression of the functive among their possible uses. None of the labels found in descriptive grammars can be viewed as indicative of the existence of a functive use. In Russian, the expression of the functive is one of the possible functions of the Instrumental (see Ex. (14) above), and in Kamaiurá (Tupi-Guarani), it is one of the possible functions of a suffix labeled *attributive case* (*caso atributivo*) by Seki (2000). Basque is probably the most extreme case, since in most Basque grammars, a case specialized in the expression of functive and other types of identification is misleadingly labeled *prolative*.

2.8 The morphosyntactic nature of functive markers

Functive phrases are not always marked by elements straightforwardly identifiable as case markers or adpositions. Functive phrases are often marked by multifunctional grammatical words operating not only at noun phrase level, but also at clause level. This is in particular the case of English *as*. Purépecha — Ex. (18) — provides another example of this kind of situation, with a grammatical word used as a functive preposition, as in (18a), but also as a complementizer, as in (18b).

- (18) Purépecha (Claudine Chamorro, p.c.)
- a. *Ari-sin-ka=kini* *ESKI CHI AMIGUTI.*
 say-HAB-ASRT1/2=2SG *ESKI* 2SG friend
 'I am talking to you as your friend.'
- b. *Wiri, juchiti tapitxu-ni ari* *eski ju-a-ka!*
 run[IMP] 1SG uncle-ACC say[IMP] *ESKI* come-FUT-SUBJ
 'Run and tell my uncle that he should come!'

There is no homogeneity in the categorization and labeling of such multifunctional grammatical words by grammarians. For example, in the French tradition, *comme* 'as, like' is labeled 'conjunction' even in uses in which this word introduces a noun phrase which can hardly be analyzed as the reduced form of a clause, whereas in similar situations, the labels 'relative adverb' or 'preposition' can be found in grammars and dictionaries of other European languages.

Another difficulty in analyzing the morphosyntactic nature of functive markers follows from the fact that functive noun phrases are not referential, and consequently are commonly devoid of the determiners whose presence characterizes fully-fledged noun phrases. Functive noun phrases are often reduced to bare nouns, even in languages in which the general rule is that every noun phrase must include an overt determiner. For example, in French — Ex. (19), noun phrases introduced by *comme* 'as, like' follow the general rule (obligatory presence of an overt determiner) when *comme* marks event-oriented similitive adjuncts, but do not follow the rule when *comme* is used as a functive marker, and this constitutes precisely the formal clue to the choice between the functive and similitive readings of *comme* in French.

- (19) French (p.k.)
- a. *Il parle* *comme un* *médecin.*
 3SGM speak:PRS:3SG like INDEF:SGM doctor
 'He speaks like a doctor.'
 (similitive: the way he speaks is similar to the way doctors speak)
- b. *Il parle* *comme médecin.*
 3SGM speak:PRS:3SG like doctor
 'He speaks as a doctor.'
 (functive: what he says is in conformity with the role of a doctor)

The predicative nature of functive phrases tends therefore to blur the distinction between case markers or adpositions (combining with fully fledged noun phrases) and derivative morphemes (combining with bare lexemes), and this may be the source of discrepancies between grammarians as to the morphosyntactic nature of functive markers.

For example, É. Kiss & al. (2003:202) express reservations about identifying the essive suffixes of Hungarian *-ként* and *-ul/ül* as cases. Examples such as *barát-já-ul* [friend-POSS[3SG]-ESS] ‘as his/her friend’ or *a gyár főmérnök-e-ként* [DEF factory main_engineer-POSS-ESS] ‘as the main engineer of the factory’ show however that these suffixes are compatible with modifications typical of nouns heading noun phrases, and consequently must be analyzed as case suffixes rather than suffixes deriving adverbs from nouns.

2.9 Functive phrases and agreement

One consequence of the predicative nature of functive phrases is that they generally cannot show number variation independently of the number of their controller. They either do not show number variation at all, or follow more or less strict number agreement rules.

The documentation I have gathered includes no instance of case agreement of a functive phrase with its controller. According to Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004), case agreement of noun phrases in depictive function is common in Australian languages, but all the examples they give involve varieties of depictives other than functive.

2.10 Zero-marked functive phrases

Ex. (20) to (23) can be analyzed as including functive noun phrases devoid of any mark of their role in the clause.

- (20) Hindi (Annie Montaut, p.c.)
Usne mujhe sahâyak cunâ
 3SG:ERG 1SG:DAT collaborator choose:PST
 ‘He chose me as (his) collaborator.’
- (21) Arhavi Laz (René Lacroix, p.c.)
Ma xezmek'yari kemzdi!
 1SG servant take:IMP:1SG
 ‘Take me as your servant!’
- (22) Chechen (Zarina Molochieva, p.c.)
Iza imaam xaerzhina.
 3SG imam choose:PRF
 ‘They chose him as (their) imam.’

(23) Basque (a: Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 446, b: Céline Mounole, p.c.)

a. *Jon artzain joan da.*

Jon shepherd go:INCMP PRS.3SG

‘Jon went (to work) as a shepherd.’

b. *Artzainak zakurra izaten du lagun bakarra.*

shepherd:SG:ERG dog:SG have:ICMP PRS:3SG:3SG companion only:SG

‘The shepherd has a dog (as his) only companion.’

Interestingly, all the examples of zero-marked functive phrases I have been able to gather illustrate situations in which the distinction between functive and individual-level identification tends to blur, since the presumed functive phrases in the examples in question are headed by nouns referring to professions or relatively stable interpersonal relationships. Moreover, in the languages in which I came across zero-marked functive phrases, they are possible with very limited sets of verbs. For example, in the documentation I have been able to gather, none of the translational equivalents of *I am talking to you as your friend* includes a zero-marked noun phrase. This can be viewed as evidence that such functive phrases form part of the argument structure of the verbs with which they are found.

2.11 The syntactic role of the controller of functive phrases

Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005: 54–55) discuss the question of the restrictions on the syntactic role of the controller of participant-oriented adjuncts. After noting that “for depictive secondary predicates, it is generally assumed that they can be controlled by subjects or objects or, more precisely, by the single core argument of an intransitive predicate (S), the actor-like core argument (A) of a transitive predicate, and the undergoer-like argument (O) of a transitive predicate,” they observe that “languages differ considerably with regard to which participants are easily accessible to controllers,” and that for a single language “there appear to be considerable differences with regard to acceptability and usage depending on speaker, context, genre, and medium (spoken vs. written usage)”.

In the particular case of functive phrases, the documentation I have gathered confirms that functive phrases are commonly controlled by S, A, or O, and that no clear ergative-like or accusative-like patterning (i.e., exclusion of either A or O from the set of the possible controllers of a functive phrase) emerges in the languages for which I have sufficient data. I am not in a position to put forward any generalizations concerning the control of functive phrases by terms other than A, O, or S.

3. Functive, equative, and transformative

3.1 Introductory remarks

Independent equative clauses may or may not include a copula. Noun phrases in predicate function in independent equative clauses are commonly devoid of any mark of their syntactic role, but in some languages they occur in a marked case form or combined with one of the adpositions used to introduce oblique terms in the construction of verbs.

It is relatively common that the expression of dependent equative predications brings into play special secondary predicate constructions rather than the constructions available for the expression of main predications. As illustrated by Ex. (24), in French, depending on the semantic relationship with the main predication, noun phrases in secondary predicate role may not require the use of the copulative verb *être*, but the presence of a preposition may be necessary.

(24) French (p.k.)

- a. Enfant *il était souvent malade.*
 child he was often ill
 'He was often ill as a child.' (= when he was a child)
- b. En_tant_que Français *il a du mal avec l'accentuation*
 inasmuch_as Frenchman he has some difficulty with the-stress
de l'anglais
 of the-English
 'As a Frenchman he has difficulties with English stress.' (= since he is a Frenchman)
- c. *Il parle bien anglais* pour un Français.
 he speaks well English for a Frenchman
 'He speaks English well for a Frenchman.' (= although he is a Frenchman)

3.2 Markers shared by functive phrases and noun phrases in secondary predicate function expressing other types of identification

It is common that markers used in typical functive situations also occur with noun phrases involved in secondary predications expressing other types of identification. This is in particular the case for English *as* in its use as a preposition. Depending on the context, *as an N*, in addition to its functive reading ('in the role of an N'), may also be interpreted as 'when (s)he was an N' or 'since (s)he is an N'.

Ex. (25) to (27) provide additional illustrations of the use of the same case forms or adpositions (the Estonian *Essive*, the Russian *Instrumental*, and the Spanish preposition *de*) with functive phrases and noun phrases expressing other

types of identification, in particular with a meaning of temporally bound identification.

- (25) Estonian (Lutkat & Hasselblatt 1993: 192)
- a. *Minu mees töötab arsti-na.*
3SG:GEN husband work:PRS:3SG doctor-ESS
'My husband works as a doctor.'
 - b. *Poisi-na mängisin jalgpalli.*
boy-ESS play:PST:1SG soccer:PART
'As a boy I played soccer.'
- (26) Russian (p.k.)
- a. *Ja pomnju ego učitel-em.*
1SG remember:PRS:1SG 3SG:SG:M:ACC teacher-INSTR
'I remember him as a teacher.'
 - b. *Mal'čik-om ja igral v futbol.*
boy-INSTR 1SG play:PST:SG:M in soccer:ACC
'As a boy I played soccer.'
- (27) Spanish (p.k.)
- a. *De postre comimos toronjas.*
DE dessert eat:PST:1PL grapefruit:PL
'We ate grapefruit as dessert.'
 - b. *Juega de centro delantero.*
play:PRS:3SG *DE* center forward
'He plays (as a) center forward.'
 - c. *De niño era muy rebelde.*
DE child be:PST:3SG very rebellious
'As a child (= when he was a child) he was very rebellious.'
 - d. *Yo de ti no lo haría.*
1SG *DE* 1SG NEG 3SG:M do:COND:1SG
'If I were you I would not do that.' lit. 'I as you would not do that.'

3.3 Functive markers and predicate marking in independent equative clauses

In independent clauses in which the main predicate is a noun phrase expressing the identification of an entity (*This is a tree*, *This tree is an oak*), languages may or may not make use of copulas, but in both cases, the use of a marked case form or adposition with noun phrases in predicate function in independent equative clauses is relatively uncommon in the languages of the world. There are however languages in which nouns expressing equative predication in independent clauses may occur in the same marked case form or combined with the same adposition as in functive role — Ex. (28).

(28) Avar (Gimbatov 2006)

a. *Wakil-ɬun w-it'-ana.*

delegate-*ɬUN* M-send-CMP

'He was sent as a delegate.'

b. *Coɬo mast'i b-uk'-ana hesije halmaɁ-ɬun.*

only dog N-be-CMP he:DAT companion-*ɬUN*

'A dog was his only companion.' (lit. 'Only a dog was to him as a companion.')

In most cases, the use of nouns in predicate function in independent equative clauses with the same marking as in functive secondary predicate function competes with the use of zero-marked noun phrases. This is the case in Avar, but also in Finnish (see Ex. (5) above), Russian, etc. In such cases, the use of an overt marker with noun phrases in predicate function in independent equative clauses tends to correlate with non-permanent (or stage-level) identification, whereas zero marking tends to be preferred with reference to permanent (or individual-level) identification — see in particular Erelt & Metslang (2003) on Estonian and Turunen (2011) on Mordvin.

A different pattern is however found in Mandinka and other Mande languages, in which independent equative clauses include a postposition also used as a functive marker in conditions that are entirely determined by syntax and have absolutely no semantic correlate.

The use of the Mandinka postposition *tí* as a functive marker and in independent equative clauses has already been illustrated in Ex. (3a) & (3f), reproduced here as (29a–b). Ex. (29c) illustrates independent equative clauses without *tí*. The rule is that *tí* is obligatory if the entity whose identification is expressed is explicitly designated by means of a noun phrase (*ñiŋ yírôo* 'this tree' in (29b)), whereas it does not occur in identification clauses with no indication of the entity to which an identification is attributed, as in (29c). This example shows that semantics plays no role in this choice: *tí* is obligatory in identification clauses expressing permanent identification too, provided the entity whose identification is expressed is explicitly designated.

(29) Mandinka (p.d.)

a. *Ñ ñá até le lóŋ í faamáa ti.*

1SG CMP.POS 3SG:EMPH FOC know 1SG father:DEF OBL

'It is him that I knew as my father.'

b. *Ñiŋ yírôo mu bantáŋo le ti.*

DEM tree:DEF COP silk_cotton_tree:DEF FOC OBL

'This tree is a silk-cotton tree.'

- c. *Bantáño le mu.*
 silk-cotton_tree:DEF FOC COP
 ‘This is a silk-cotton tree.’

3.4 Functive-transformative syncretism

The use of the Mandinka postposition *tí* not only with functive phrases and in independent equative clauses but also as a transformative marker has already been illustrated in Ex. (3). Similarly, the Avar suffix *-ɬun* illustrated in Ex. (26) above in functive marker function and in independent equative clauses is also used as a transformative marker — Ex. (30).

- (30) Avar (Gimbatov 2006)
Dow rosdal administracijatul bet'er-ɬun kun wugo.
 DEM:M village:GEN administration:GEN head-ɬUN fall:CVB M:COP
 ‘He became (lit. ‘fell’) the head of the village administration.’

Mordvin (Uralic) provides an additional illustration of functive-transformative syncretism. In Finnish, functive and transformative are expressed by two distinct cases, the Essive and the Translative, respectively. In Mordvin, the so-called Translative case, marked by a suffix *-ks* cognate with the Translative case of Finnish, is found both in transformative and functive marker function — Ex. (31).⁸

- (31) Erzya Mordvin (Grünthal 2003: 185)
- a. *Son roboti vračo-ks.*
 (s)he work:3SG doctor-TRANSL
 ‘(S)he works as a doctor.’
 - b. *Ekšés vel'avtś kel'me-ks.*
 weather:DEF change:REFL.PASS:IMPF.3SG cold-TRANSL
 ‘The weather became cold.’

A similar situation is found in the Tupi-Guarani family too, with a suffix labeled *Attributive* in Seki (2000) but more commonly labeled *Translative* in descriptions of Tupi-Guarani languages. This suffix is reconstructed as **(r)amō* in Proto-Tupi-Guarani (Françoise Rose, p.c.). For descriptions of its use in Tupi-Guarani languages, see among others Rose (2011: 235–240), Seki (2000: 110–112).

4. Functive and other non-participative roles

4.1 Functive-similative syncretism

The various types of grammatical elements used as functive markers may have another use, termed *similative* here, in which their combination with a noun phrase N is interpreted as ‘like an N’, ‘in the same way as an N’. Functive-similative syncretism has been systematically investigated by Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998) for the languages of Europe, and is so common, not only in the languages of Europe, but also at the global level, that one might wonder whether functive and similative must be defined as distinct roles rather than being considered as two particular cases of a more general notion. However, it is easy to find languages in which prototypical functive and prototypical similative are not encoded in the same way. This is the case in English with *as* and *like*, and a similar distinction is found among others in Greek — Ex. (32).

(32) Greek (Holton & al. 1997)

- a. *Sou miláo os filósos kai óchi os giatrós.*
 2SG:GEN speak:PRS:1SG as friend and NEG as doctor
 ‘I am speaking to you as a friend and not as a doctor.’
- b. *Miláei san dikigóros.*
 speak:PRS:3SG like lawyer
 ‘He speaks like a lawyer.’

The justification for distinguishing functive and similative relies on the general semantic distinction between secondary predicates and verb modifiers: noun phrases in functive role express a predication about a participant involved in the event denoted by the verb, whereas noun phrases in similative role can usually be analyzed as a particular type of manner adjunct. However, pragmatically, the distinction is not so clear-cut, since ‘*x* does something in the way N’s do’ does not imply ‘*x* fulfills the role of an N’, but does not exclude it either, which leaves the door open to the reanalysis of ‘do something like an N’ as ‘do something as an N’. We will see in Section 8 that this process is attested or can be reconstructed in the history of many languages.

Moreover, a notion that can be labeled *participant-oriented similative*, paraphrasable as ‘having taken on the appearance of’, can be recognized in sentences such as *She appeared on stage as a man*. In this sentence, *as a man* is clearly a participant-oriented adjunct, which does not specify a particular way of appearing on stage but makes explicit the appearance taken on by the woman in question at the moment she appeared on stage. What is relevant here is the contrast with plain (or event-oriented) similative, illustrated by *She appeared on stage like a man*,

which describes a situation in which a woman is clearly recognizable as a woman but does something in a way considered typical for men.

Participant-oriented similative has in common with plain (or event-oriented) similative the notion of similarity, whereas it has in common with functive the orientation towards a participant. It is particularly interesting that English, which uses distinct markers for plain similative (*like*) and functive (*as*) does not mark participant-oriented similative with *like*, but with *as*.

More generally, it is easy to imagine transitional situations that may facilitate the extension of a similative marker to functive marking, or vice-versa, which explains why functive-similative syncretism is so widespread.

Note however that the use of the same marker with functive and similative phrases does not necessarily imply ambiguity at the construction level. In the Zulu example (33), the construction gives no formal clue to decide whether *njenga* must be interpreted as the equivalent of English *as* or *like*. By contrast, in the Spanish Ex. (34), the same marker *como* can be used in both functions, but the distinction manifests itself in the use of determiners (no determiner in (34a), where *como* introduces a functive noun phrase vs. indefinite article in (34b), where *como* introduces a similative noun phrase). A situation similar to that of Spanish has already been illustrated above for French — see Section 2.8, Ex. (17).

(33) Zulu (Online Zulu-English dictionary, <http://isizulu.net>)

- a. *Ngi-sebenza njeng-omshayeli wa-matekisi.*⁹
1SG-work as/like-CL1:driver CL1:GEN-CL6:taxi
'I work as a taxi driver.'
- b. *U-khala njeng-omfazi.*¹⁰
2SG-speak as/like-CL1:woman
'You speak like a woman.'

(34) Spanish (p.k.)

- a. *Te lo digo como médico.*
2SG.DAT 3SGM.ACC tell:PRS:1SG as/like doctor
'I am telling that to you as a doctor.'
- b. *Hablas como un médico.*
speak:PRS:2SG as/like INDEF doctor
'You are speaking like a doctor.'

In addition to languages having a single marker equally productive in functive and similative uses (like Spanish *como* or Zulu *njenga*), many languages have productive functive markers marginally found in similative uses, or productive similative markers marginally found in functive uses. For example, in Russian, the Instrumental case, whose functive use illustrated in (14b) above is relatively productive, also has a more marginal similative use (as in *vyt' volkom* 'howl like a wolf').

Functive-simulative syncretism often involves markers that cannot be straightforwardly identified as cases or adpositions and probably developed from simulative subordination, since they also have uses in which they operate at clause level (see Section 8). In this connection, it may be interesting to compare the use of such multifunctional markers in adverbial subordination with their use as functive markers.

For example, in Spanish, both *Estoy aquí* de *médico* and *Estoy aquí* como *médico* are possible equivalents of English *I am here as a doctor*. However, according to Spanish dictionaries, the construction with *como* ‘like, as’ followed by a bare noun also has an explicative identification reading (‘I am here because I am a doctor’), whereas this reading is not available with *de*, and it is tempting to hypothesize a relationship with the fact that *como* as a conjunction can be used to introduce explicative clauses (as in *como eres médico* ‘since you are a doctor’). Interestingly, de Groot (2008) suggests a similar distinction in Hungarian between the Essive case and the use of *mint* ‘like’.

4.2 Functive and comparative of superiority

Contrary to the languages mentioned in Section 4.1, Mandinka uses different markers in functive and simulative functions, but in the Mandinka construction expressing the comparative of superiority, the standard of comparison is marked by the postposition *tí*, also used as the marker of functive and other non-participative roles, as already illustrated in Section 2, Ex. (4a). The same syncretism is found among others in German — Ex. (35) — and Latvian — Ex. (36).

- (35) German (Ekkehard König, p.c.)
- a. *Das sollte als Beispiel dienen.*
 that should as example serve
 ‘That should serve as an example.’
 - b. *Gold ist schwerer als Silber.*
 gold is heavier than silver
 ‘Gold is heavier than silver.’
- (36) Latvian (Veksler & Jurik 1975: 86, 94)
- a. *Viņš strādā par skolotāju.*
 he works as teacher
 ‘He works as a teacher.’
 - b. *Zēlc ir smagāks par sudrabu.*
 gold is heavier than silver
 ‘Gold is heavier than silver.’

4.3 Functive and location

The Essive case of Finnish, in addition to its particularly productive use as a functive marker, is used with nouns that denote time to express temporal location, and is also found in a few lexicalized expressions of spatial location (which originally constituted the central and most productive function of this case), for example *kotona* ‘at home’, *kaukana* ‘afar’.¹¹

The French preposition *en* ‘in’ (< Latin *in*) has lost much of its productivity as a spatial marker, since in Modern French, interiority is more commonly expressed by means of *dans* < *de intus* ‘from within’, but *en* has developed many non spatial uses. In particular, *en* marks the argument of verbs such as *consister en* ‘take the form of’, *se comporter en* ‘behave as’, *traiter en* ‘treat as’, *changer en* ‘change into’. Although less commonly found than *comme* in this function, *en* is also used to introduce functive adjuncts — Ex. (37).

- (37) French (p.k.)
Je vous parle en ami.
 I to.you speak in friend
 ‘I’m speaking to you as a friend.’

4.4 Functive and manner

In Kartvelian languages (with the exception of Laz), the same suffix (traditionally labeled *Adverbial case*) is found with noun phrases in functive role (38a), in transformative role (38b), or expressing embedded equative predications (38c), and in the derivation of manner adverbs from adjectives (38d). According to Boeder (2005), most of the manner adverbs formed by means of the Adverbial case “seem to have a semantic subject orientation”.

- (38) Georgian (Boeder (2005) and Manana Topadze, p.c.)
- a. *Masc'avlebl-ad mušaobs.*
 teacher-ADV work:PRS:3SG
 ‘He/she works as a teacher.’
 - b. *Yvino 3mr-ad gadaikca.*
 wine vinegar-ADV change:AOR:3SG
 ‘The wine changed into vinegar.’
 - c. *K'arg ekim-ad itvleba.*
 good doctor-ADV be_counted:PRS:3SG
 ‘He/she is considered a good doctor.’
 - d. *Mat'arebeli zant'-ad dai3ra.*
 train lazy-ADV moved
 ‘The train moved lazily.’

Suffixes with the same distribution are also found in North West Caucasian languages — Ex. (39).¹²

- (39) Adyghe (Arkad'ev & al. 2009: 55)
- a. *Sjezdám djeljegat-ew wəqekʷ aʷeš'tən.*
to_the_meeting delegate-ADV you_probably_came
'You probably came to the meeting as a delegate.'
 - b. *Ašʷ əš-ew se səχʷ əʷ.*
his brother-ADV I I_became
'I became his brother.'
 - c. *Dax-ew matxe.*
beautiful-ADV he_writes
'He writes beautifully.'

Note however that, at least in Georgian, the functive use of the Adverbial case is subject to restrictions about which I am unfortunately not able to be more precise. For example, in English, *as* is equally used in *work as a doctor* and *say something as a doctor*, but according to my Georgian consultant, in Georgian, the Adverbial case can be used only with 'work', and *rogorc* 'like, as' must be used with 'say' — Ex. (40).

- (40) Georgian (Manana Topadze, p.c.)
- a. Ekim-ad *mušaobs.*
doctor-ADV work:PRS:3SG
'He/she works as a doctor.'
 - b. *Me amas geubnebi šen ara rogorc ekimi,*
1SG this:DAT say:PRS:1SG:2SG 2SG NEG as doctor
'I am saying this to you not as a doctor
aramed rogorc megobari.
but as friend
but as a friend.'

Dargi (North East Caucasian) has a suffix *-li* which, in addition to the uses typical of South and North West Caucasian Adverbial cases, also marks a converbial form of verbs — compare *qaraul-li* 'as a guardian', *wana-li* 'warmly', *uku-li* 'eating' (Musaev 1987: 70–72).

Among Lezgian languages (another branch of North East Caucasian), Archi has a suffix *-ši* with a similar distribution. This suffix productively marks the functive-transformative form of nouns (as in *dijarka-ši* 'as a milkmaid') and a converbial form of verbs (as in *lap'a-r-ši* 'throwing', where *-r-* is an imperfective marker), and is also found in some adverbs derived from nouns or adjectives (as in *kutak-ši* 'strongly < *kutak* 'strength'). But in addition to that, *-ši* also takes part in another type of

syncretism (the functive-lative syncretism — see Section 5.3), since in the system of spatial cases, *-ši* encodes destination of movement (as in *perma-l-a-ši* ‘into the farm’, where *-l-* is the oblique stem marker, and *-a-* the localization marker ‘in’).

5. Functive and participative roles

5.1 Functive, instrumental, and comitative

The Instrumental case of Russian has not only an instrumental use, but also predicative uses, including functive, as already illustrated by Ex. (14) above. A similar situation is found in Lithuanian, with a case labeled Instrumental, which has instrumental (41a) and perlativ (41b) uses but which is also widely used to mark functive and other predicative uses of nouns (41c–f).

(41) Lithuanian (a–b: Hewson & Bubenik 2006:209, c–f: Nichols 1983)

- a. *Jis rāšo pieštukū.*
he writes pencil:INSTR
‘He writes with a pencil.’
- b. *Jis cīna keliū.*
he walks road:INSTR
‘He walks along the road.’
- c. *Jis dirba mokytoju.*
he works teacher:INSTR
‘He works as a teacher.’
- d. *Karas padarė jį luošu.*
war made him invalid:INSTR
‘The war made him an invalid.’
- e. *Jis grįžo didvyriu.*
he returned hero:INSTR
‘He returned a hero.’
- f. *Aš jį laikau kvailiu.*
I him consider fool:INSTR
‘I consider him a fool.’

Functive-instrumental syncretism is also found in the West Mande language Soso. The Soso postposition *rá* is used in the same way as the Mandinka postposition *tí* (see above) in functive-transformative function and in identificational predication, and is also productively used in instrumental function. In contrast with Mandinka *tí*, Soso *rá* is not used in the construction expressing the comparative of superiority (in this function, Soso uses the benefactive postposition *bé*). *Rá* is also marginally found in spatial and comitative uses.

The Mandinka postposition *tí* is mainly used to encode various non-participative roles (including functive), and is not used at all in instrumental function, but it is marginally found with a comitative meaning, as already illustrated by Ex (4b), Section 2.1.

Among West Mande languages, a postposition *ni* that is probably cognate with Mandinka *tí*, but with a wider range of uses, is found in Bozo. Judging from the examples in Daget et al. (1953), in addition to its functive-transformative use and to its use in equative predication, *ni* has at least some productivity in instrumental, comitative, and spatial uses.

5.2 Functive, benefactive, and substitutive

Ex. (42) illustrates the use of the Bambara postposition *yé*, fully productive in benefactive function (42a) and also used as a functive marker (42b) and in constructions that can be analyzed as involving an embedded equative predication (42c). This postposition is also used to encode the addressee of speech verbs (42d) and the recipient of some transfer verbs, but not purposive adjuncts, for which another postposition (*káma*) is used.

- (42) Bambara (p.d. & Gérard Dumestre, p.c.)
- a. \dot{U} *yé* *báara ké ní yé.*
 3PL CMP.POS work do 1SG *YE*
 ‘They worked for me.’
 - b. \dot{U} *yé* *à cí làsigiden yé.*
 3PL CMP.POS 3SG send ambassador *YE*
 ‘They sent him as an ambassador.’
 - c. \dot{N} *bé* *à jàti nálonma yé.*
 1SG INCMP.POS 3SG consider idiot *YE*
 ‘I consider him an idiot.’
 - d. \dot{U} *yé* *tìnyè fí í yé.*
 3PL CMP.POS truth tell 2SG *YE*
 ‘They have told you the truth.’

Among West Mande languages, a similar situation is found in Bobo, with a postposition *nā* used in functive-transformative function but particularly productive in benefactive function (Le Bris & Prost 1981: 75).

Benefactive-functive syncretism may at first sight seem puzzling, since the closeness between these two notions is not obvious. However, benefactive markers often have a substitutive use (sometimes also called surrogative). In English, *do something for N* can be interpreted as *do something in place of N*, depending on the context, and it is not difficult to conceive of the possibility of a shift from *do*

something in place of *N* to do something in the role of *N*, since the difference is essentially a question of referentiality.

The development of a functive use of the preposition *za* introducing an Accusative noun phrase in Lower Sorbian, described by Bartels (2008), supports the hypothesis of a direct link between substitutive and functive, since among Slavic languages, substitutive is the most common non-spatial use of *za* (whose original meaning is ‘behind’) combined with the Accusative case.

The Latvian preposition *par*, whose use as a functive marker and in the expression of the comparative of superiority has been illustrated in Ex. (36) above, must also be mentioned here, since it is not used as a benefactive marker but is found in contexts in which it can be analyzed as expressing a particular variety of substitutive — Ex. (43).

- (43) Latvian (Veksler & Jurik 1975:94)
- a. *Es jegādājos grāmatu par rubli.*
I got book for ruble
‘I got the book for one ruble.’
 - b. *Viņš maksās par visu.*
he will_pay for everything
‘He will pay for everything.’

In Mandinka too, the postposition *tí*, used as a functive marker, has no benefactive use, but is found marginally with this particular variety of substitutive meaning, as already illustrated by Ex. (4c), Section 2.1.

Interesting data about functive-benefactive syncretism can be found in Basque as well. The Benefactive case of Basque (sometimes called Destinative) is used exclusively to encode beneficiaries; its uses do not overlap with those of the Dative and Causal (or Motivative) cases, and it shows no formal similarity with them either. By contrast, the relationship between the Benefactive case and the misnamed Prolative case (a case used exclusively with nouns in secondary predicate function) is obvious, since the ending of the Benefactive *-(r)entzat* can be decomposed as *-(r)en* (Genitive) + *-tzat* (Prolative). Moreover, as illustrated by Ex. (44), the distinction is partially neutralized for personal pronouns, which can occur in the Benefactive form with meanings that normally require the use of the Prolative form.

- (44) Basque (Lafitte 1962:439)
- a. *Zu-retzat egin dut.*
2SG-BEN do:CMP PRS:3SG:1SG
‘I did it for you (in your interest, or instead of you).’
 - b. *Zu-retzat utzi dut.*
2SG-BEN leave:CMP PRS:3SG:1SG
‘I confused him/her with you.’ lit. ‘I left him/her as you.’

Given that, in the noun inflection of Basque, some case endings include an optional formative identical to the Genitive suffix (as in *Edurne(ren)gan*, locative of the proper name *Edurne*),¹³ it seems reasonable to view this formal similarity and possibility of neutralization as evidence that the Basque cases used to mark benefactive and predicative noun phrases result from the specialization of two suffixes that originally were variants of the same case or postposition.

5.3 Functive and lative (destination of movement)

In some Uralic languages (Mari, Southern Khanty), cases described as primarily encoding the destination of movement (*lative*) are also used in predicative functions, including functive. However, the cases in question also occur in the expression of transformation and location, and consequently do not provide evidence for a direct link between functive and the expression of destination of movement, since lative-locative, lative-transformative, and transformative-functive syncretism are all very common cross-linguistically.

Interestingly, as mentioned above (Section 4.4), Archi (East Caucasian) has a suffix *-ši*, marking the functive-transformative and lative forms of nouns, but also found as the mark of a converbial form of verbs and in the derivation of manner adverbs.

5.4 Functive and separative (source of movement)

In Spanish, some predicative uses of nouns, including functive, can be marked by the preposition *de* — Ex. (27) above and Ex. (45). This preposition has a wide range of possible uses, but it developed from the Latin preposition *de* ‘down from’, and is still fully productive with its original meaning.

(45) Spanish (p.k.)

- a. *Juega de centro delantero.*
 play:PRS:3SG *DE* center forward
 ‘He plays (as a) center forward.’
- b. *De niño era muy rebelde.*
DE child be:PST:3SG very rebellious
 ‘As a child he was very rebellious.’
- c. *Yo de ti no lo haría.*
 1SG *DE* 1SG NEG 3SG:M do:COND:1SG
 ‘If I were you (lit. ‘as you’) I would not do that.’

Given the wide variety of the possible uses of *de* (which among others has instrumental uses, although the instrumental is more commonly expressed by means of

con ‘with’), it is difficult to decide whether a direct link must be posited or not between its original separative meaning and its predicative uses, and I have not been able to find studies dealing with the historical aspect of this question. In particular, it is not clear to what extent the development of the uses of *de* in early Romance may have been influenced by the polysemy pattern of the Ablative case of Latin, which among others included the expression of instrument, manner, comparison, and cause.

The Italian preposition *da* has uses that coincide only partially with those of Spanish *de*. In particular, it may be used to encode location or destination, which is not possible for Spanish *de*. However, Italian *da* also has the encoding of the source of movement as its primary function, and its uses as a functive marker are quite comparable to those of Spanish *de*.

5.5 Others

Nenets has a case labeled Essive which, in addition to functions commonly fulfilled by Uralic Essives (including the expression of the functive), also has uses whose relationship to the other uses of this case form is unclear. According to Irina Nikolaeva (p.c.), it may mark emphatic subjects, “indicating some kind of contrast between the referent and a potential set of other relevant candidates, sometimes with an additional exclamative meaning (admiration)” — Ex. (46).

(46) Nenets (Irina Nikolaeva, p.c.)

Wera-ŋe° əwa=n'uq!

Wera-ESS good-EXCL

‘But Wera is so nice!’

The Nenets Essive may also function as an address (vocative), “again when other people are present and there is contrast” (Irina Nikolaeva, p.c.). It is not clear whether this contrastive use of the Nenets Essive must be viewed as an extension of one of the uses typical for Uralic Essives, or is rather a vestige of the original meaning of the element that has grammaticalized as a functive marker in the history of Nenets.

6. Complex situations and their interpretation

Several of the examples mentioned in the previous sections raise a problem that considerably complexifies the study of the semantic affinities between functive and other semantic roles: most of the time, the functive markers also used to encode some participant roles have very wide ranges of possible uses, among which

it does not seem possible to select a particular role that could safely be considered as having a particularly direct relationship with the functive.

An additional illustration is provided by the Korean ‘directional’ case particle (*u*)*lo*, which according to Sohn (1999:337) marks “direction in the sense of ‘towards, to, for’, instrument in the sense of ‘with, of, by, in’, and function in the sense of ‘as, for, in the capacity of, in terms of.’”

A possible clue to this puzzle could be provided by cross-linguistic observations revealing marked differences in the frequency with which other roles occur in polysemy patterns involving the functive. Unfortunately, the polysemy patterns I have been able to observe so far vary in such a way that the mere frequency with which the various syncretisms occur among languages does not permit the selection of a particular participant role as having more affinities with functive than the others.

The following observations will, however, guide the proposals formulated in Sections 7, 8, and 9:

- Functive markers whose non-functive uses do not go beyond the expression of equative and/or transformative are relatively rare, and all those I came across can be analyzed as resulting from one of the grammaticalization processes presented in Section 7.
- Among the polysemy patterns in which functive markers are involved cross-linguistically, there is a relatively clear-cut distinction between polysemy patterns involving similative but neither locative nor participant roles, and polysemy patterns involving locative or participant roles, which suggests that specific grammaticalization patterns are responsible for the emergence of similative-functive markers.
- The polysemy patterns involving locative and/or participant roles are found, most of the time, with adpositions or cases with a puzzling variety of uses, whose diachronic development is extremely difficult to reconstruct in the absence of historical data; this can be viewed as evidence that functive uses tend to appear at relatively late stages in the evolution of adpositions or cases, since if this were not the case, less intricate polysemy patterns should be more common.
- In all the cases I came across in which the origin of a functive marker with a polysemy pattern involving locative and/or participant roles is known or easily reconstructable, the original meaning is spatial (locative, lative, or separative).

7. Grammaticalization paths directly resulting in the emergence of functive markers

7.1 'In the quality of' > functive marker

In some languages, nouns expressing quality derived from concrete nouns constitute the commonest way to express the meanings expressed in other languages by functive phrases as defined in Section 2.1. For example, in Agul, a language belonging to the Lezgian branch of East Caucasian, nouns derived by means of the abstraction suffix *-s^wel* are widely attested as the Nominative argument of *aq'as* 'do' with the meaning 'work/act as N' — Ex. (47a), in the Dative case with the meaning 'in order to act as N' — Ex. (47b), and in the Locative case or with the adverbial marker *-di* with the meaning 'acting as N' — Ex. (47c).

(47) Agul (Timur Maisak, p.c.)

- a. *Ķandejefij čas müselim-s^wel aq'as.*
want:PST we:DAT teacher-ABSTR do:INF
'We wanted to work as teachers (lit. 'We wanted to do teacherhood').'
- b. *Zun šune dijarka-s^weli-s.*
I go:PFV milkmaid-ABSTR-DAT
'I went to work as a milkmaid (lit. 'I went to milkmaidhood').'
- c. *Čas q̄arawul-s^wel-di hataje Xinebi.*
we:DAT guard-ABSTR-ADV send:IPFV Xinebi
'They send us Xinebi as a guard (lit. 'with guardhood').'

Lezgi has an abstraction suffix *-wal* cognate with Agul *-s^wel* and lending itself to similar uses. According to Haspelmath (1993:105), the inessive form of abstract nouns formed by means of this suffix (i.e., a form that can be glossed as 'in X-hood') is regularly used to express profession or function, as in *reğuxbanwile k'walaxun* 'work as a miller', lit. 'work in millerhood'. Moreover, this author discusses evidence suggesting that the complex ending *-wil-e* [ABSTR-INESS] (where *-wil-* is an allomorph of the abstraction suffix *-wal*) is grammaticalizing into a 'functive' case suffix.

7.2 Dependent form of a copulative verb > functive marker

Dependent forms of copulative verbs used in constructions of the type illustrated in Turkish by Ex. (13) — reproduced here as (48) — may grammaticalize into more or less opaque secondary predicate markers used in particular with noun phrases in functive role.

(48) Turkish (Göksel & Kerslake: 216)

Bun-u san-a avukat ol-arak değil, arkadaş ol-arak söyl-üyor-um.
 dem-ACC 2SG-DAT lawyer be-CVB NEG friend be-CVB say-PROG-1SG
 'I'm saying this to you not as a lawyer but as a friend.'

The languages of the Avar-Andic-Tsezic branch of East Caucasian provide a good illustration of synchronically opaque functive-transformative markers for which a scenario of this type can be reconstructed.

For example, in diachronic perspective, the functive-transformative marker of Avar *-tun* (cf. *wakil-tun* 'as a delegate' < *wakil* 'delegate' in Ex. (28) above) can be decomposed as *-t-un*, with a second formative *-un* cognate with the converbial ending of Avar verbs *-un*. Synchronically, the segmentations **wakil-t-un* or **wakil t-un* are ruled out, since no verb **wakil-t-ize* or **t-ize* is attested. However, in spite of the fact that none of the languages of the Avar-Andic-Tsezic branch of North East Caucasian has a verb whose root could be analyzed as a reflex of **t-*, they provide ample evidence that such a root can be reconstructed with the meaning 'become', and this reconstruction is widely accepted by specialists — see among others Alekseev (1988: 35). In particular, it is supported by the existence of derivative suffixes such as Avar *-t-*, used to convert adjectives (and marginally nouns) into verbs. For a more detailed discussion, including a detailed description of the functive-transformative suffix of Northern Akhvakh (Andic), see Creissels (2014).

Musaev (1987: 70–72) analyzes the functive-transformative form of nouns in Dargi (a language belonging to another branch of North East Caucasian) as having a similar source, without however providing convincing evidence in support of this analysis. As already mentioned in Section 6 above, the Dargi suffix *-li* is used both in noun inflection as a functive-transformative marker (as in *qaraul-li* 'as a guardian'), and in verb inflection as a converbial suffix (as in *uku-li* 'eating'). According to Musaev, a functive form such as *qaraul-li* 'as a guardian' results historically from the reduction of the phrase *qaraul wiubli* [guardian being], where *wiubli* is a converbial form of the copulative verb: the stem *wiub-* was simply deleted, and the suffix *-li* became attached directly to the noun. However, Musaev does not provide any evidence of a historical process of deletion, and his hypothesis remains purely speculative.

The same can be said about the functive-transformative marker *-ši* of Archi (a language belonging to the Lezgi branch of North East Caucasian). In contrast to Avar-Andic-Tsezic languages, in which there is evidence that the functive-transformative marker of nouns is the reflex of a converbial form of an ancient verb 'become', the functive-transformative markers of Dargi and Archi are synchronically transcategorial markers, and there seems to be no clear evidence supporting the reconstruction of a particular historical scenario accounting for their transcategoriality.

8. Grammaticalization paths resulting in the emergence of similative-functive markers or functive markers with marginal similative uses

8.1 Deictic manner adverbs or words expressing similarity in complex constructions > similative markers > functive markers

This grammaticalization path is widely attested among Indo-European languages. Although this is not relevant for the development of such words into functive markers, it can be observed that, in ancient Indo-European languages, words that can be glossed as ‘in this way’ constituted correlative pairs with words glossable as ‘in which way’, as in Latin *ut ... ita* — Ex. (49).¹⁴

- (49) Latin (Ernout & Thomas 1953: 355)
Ut sementem feceris, ita metes.
 in_which_way sowing:ACC do:SUBJ:PRF:2SG in_this_way reap:FUT:2SG
 ‘As you sow, so shall you reap.’

English *as* comes from Old English *alswa* ‘quite so’, a compound form whose second formative is the reflex of Proto-Germanic **swae* ‘in this way’ (cf. English *so*, Dutch *zo*, etc.).

‘In this way’ is also reconstructed as the original meaning of Greek *ως* ‘as’, which in Ancient Greek had a wide range of uses as a conjunction, but has specialized in Modern Greek as a marker of noun phrases in secondary predicate functions (including functive), distinct from the similative marker *σαν* ‘like’.

In Latin, functive was one of the possible uses of *ut* ‘in which way’ illustrated in Ex. (49) above. *Ut* was subsequently replaced by *quomodo*, which expressed the same meaning analytically, and whose reflexes (French *comme*, Spanish *como*, etc.) are used as similative and functive markers in modern Romance languages.

8.2 ‘In the way / state / shape of’ > similative marker > functive marker

8.2.1 The case of Maltese *bħala*

Maltese has a functive marker *bħala* ‘as, in the capacity of’ illustrated by Ex. (50).

- (50) Maltese (Aquilina 1999)
Qed inbħatek dan irrival bħala xhieda ta’ mħabbti.
 PROG send:IPFV:1SG:DAT2SG PROX:SGM present as token GEN love:1SGF
 ‘I am sending you this present as a token of my love.’

According to Martine Vanhove (p.c.), this functive marker derives from *bħal*, glossed in Aquilina’s dictionary as ‘like, similar to, a sort of, a kind of; as’. Cognates of *bħal* are used as equivalents of *like* (and sometimes also as modalizing particles)

in Arabic varieties; their common source is the grammaticalization of *bi* ‘with, by’ + *hāl* ‘state’, ‘way’.

8.2.2 *The case of Hungarian -ként*

According to one of the etymologies that have been proposed for the Hungarian Essive suffix *-ként* (which is mainly used as a functive marker but also has marginal similitive uses), this suffix might result from the grammaticalization of an inflected form of *kép*, a noun borrowed from a Turkic language with the meaning ‘shape’. Interestingly, in Turkic languages, cognates of this noun grammaticalized into similitive markers: Turkish *gibi* ‘like’, Azeri *kimin* ‘like’, etc.¹⁵ Other explanations have been proposed, and there is no consensus among specialists about the etymology of *-ként*, but the hypothesis of an etymological meaning ‘in the shape of’ is supported by the fact that this suffix has functive and similitive as its two possible functions.

8.3 Verb ‘be like’ > similitive marker > functive marker

This grammaticalization path accounts for the development of the Zulu similitive-functive marker *njenga-* ‘like, as’ illustrated in Ex. (33) above. *Njenga-* consists of two formatives, *nje* ‘thus, in this manner’ and *nga*, reflex of the reconstructed Bantu verb **ngà* ‘be like’.

9. Grammaticalization paths resulting in the emergence of functive markers whose polysemy pattern includes locative and/or participant roles

9.1 Locative > functive

A grammaticalization path *locative* > *functive* can be safely reconstructed for Finnish and Estonian. Apart from its use as a functive marker, the Essive case of Finnish is exclusively found in the expression of location, mainly temporal, but also marginally spatial. Moreover, this evolution is part of a more general shift that affected the whole system of Finnish spatial cases, involving the creation of two series of spatial cases (the *in-* and *ad-* series) and a tendency of the former spatial cases towards losing their spatial uses.

Although de Groot (2010) states that the precise semantic motivation for this development is unclear, the hypothesis of an unmarked semantic type shift by which a concrete noun is converted into an abstract quality noun (‘in N’ being interpreted as ‘in the quality of N’) provides an explanation that is both intuitively satisfying and consistent with the general tendencies observed in semantic shifts.

The functive use of French *en* (see Section 4.4 above) constitutes another clear case of a historical development from locative to functive.

In the case of the West Mande language Soso, historical data about the postposition *rá*, used among others with functive and transformative noun phrases and in independent equative clauses, is of course not available, and the diachronic interpretation of the polysemy pattern of this postposition is not immediately obvious (since it includes both instrumental and spatial uses), but comparative data shows that it developed from a noun still attested in various Mande languages with meanings such as ‘place’, ‘side’, ‘opening’, ‘mouth’, and consequently grammaticalized as a spatial postposition before acquiring its other uses.

Interestingly, even in cases of functive markers with a polysemy pattern that, at first sight, seems to have nothing to do with the expression of spatial relationships, it may happen that comparative data support the hypothesis of a locative origin. For example, the Mandinka postposition *tí* is productively used to mark functive and transformative noun phrases, and in the expression of the comparative of superiority; it is also marginally used to encode various participant roles (comitative, surrogative), but is never used to encode spatial relationships. However, comparative data from several other West Mande languages strongly support the hypothesis of a locative origin:

- Bozo has a postposition *ni*, probably cognate with Mandinka *tí*, productively used (among others) in functive-transformative and spatial function;
- Soninke has a postposition *di* exclusively found in spatial uses;
- a noun *tí* glossed as ‘place’ is found in Bobo.

Consequently, the synchronic situation of Bobo, Soninke, Bozo, and Mandinka can be interpreted as representing four successive stages in the following evolution: a noun meaning ‘place’ (a) grammaticalizes as a spatial adposition, (b) acquires non-spatial functions (including functive and transformative), and eventually (probably due to the development of ‘younger’ spatial adpositions) (c) loses its spatial uses.

Of course, this does not solve the problem of establishing how exactly the functive use may appear in this kind of evolution. Nothing ensures that the functive meaning developed directly from the locative meaning. In the particular case of Mandinka *tí*, it is interesting to observe that with one verb (*sǎŋ*), *tí* expresses surrogation: *x y sǎŋ z tí* ‘*x* exchange *y* for *z*’. Given the observations presented in Section 9.3 below, it is tempting to consider this surrogative use of *tí* as the vestige of a formerly productive meaning from which the functive use might have developed (rather than directly from the original spatial meaning). But at the same time, Mandinka has a verb *yelemá* interpreted as ‘pour (a liquid into a recipient)’ in combination with the locative postposition *tó*, but ‘transform (something into

something else)' in combination with *tí*, which might rather suggest a development of the type presented in Section 9.2 below, since Mande spatial postpositions are not specified for the distinction between static location and destination of movement.

9.2 Lative > transformative > functive

A grammaticalization path *lative* > *transformative* > *functive* can be safely reconstructed for Mordvin. The functive marker *-ks* of Mordvin illustrated in Ex. (31) is also used as a transformative marker and is analyzed historically as a reflex of the Finnic-Mordvin Translative **-ksi*. Comparative evidence supports the hypothesis that **-ksi* descends from earlier lative suffixes (Grünthal 2003:186), and this is consistent with the observation that, cross-linguistically, cases primarily encoding the destination of movement are very commonly used as transformative markers (Creissels 2008).

9.3 (Lative >) benefactive > surrogative > functive

The formal similarity between two Basque cases (the so-called Benefactive and Prolative) specialized in benefactive and predicative (including functive) functions respectively, and the possible neutralization of their opposition with personal pronouns have been briefly presented in Section 5.2. This data strongly supports the hypothesis that these two cases have a common origin, and therefore that a case form or adposition expressing plain benefaction first extended its use to the expression of surrogative benefaction, and subsequently acquired predicative uses. This hypothesis is consistent with the possible analysis of the ending *-t* of the *-tzat* formative common to the Benefactive and Prolative endings as cognate with a *-t* formative that can be added to the Lative ending *-ra* in Eastern Basque dialects (Joseba Lacarra, p.c.).

9.4 Separative > functive

As already mentioned in Section 5.4, in some Romance languages, the reflexes of the separative preposition *de* 'down from' have acquired a functive use, but the historical processes that led to the development of this use are unclear, and the data I have been able to gather includes no clear case of a relatively direct development from separative to functive.

10. Conclusion

This paper summarizes the first results of a cross-linguistic investigation of the encoding of a semantic role whose importance and specificity have largely passed unnoticed so far. I only hope I have shown that the recognition of a distinction between participative, circumstantial, and predicative roles and a systematic study of functive and other non-participative roles may reveal interesting connections with the participative roles on which studies of semantic roles have focused so far, and consequently provide interesting insights into the conceptualization of events and its linguistic correlates.

The data I have been able to gather shows that functive markers are commonly used to express other varieties of equative, and confirms that functive-simulative syncretism is particularly widespread cross-linguistically. However, functive markers are also commonly involved in the expression of the following meanings:

- transformative,
- comparative of superiority
- location,
- manner,
- instrumental,
- substitutive,
- lative,
- separative.

As regards the grammaticalization paths resulting in the emergence of functive markers, the situations in which the expression of the functive is one of the possible uses of a case marker or adposition are particularly difficult to interpret, since the functive is typically expressed by ‘old’ case markers or adpositions whose original meaning is not always easy to reconstruct, and for which, even in cases when the original meaning is known or easily reconstructable, the reconstruction of the development of the functive use is problematic. However, in addition to the well-attested grammaticalization path *deictic manner adverbs or words expressing similarity in complex constructions* > *simulative markers* > *functive markers*, the following grammaticalization paths have been identified:

- ‘in the quality of’ > functive marker,
- dependent form of a copulative verb > functive marker,
- ‘in the way / state / shape of’ > functive marker,
- ‘be like’ > simulative marker > functive marker,
- locative marker > functive marker,
- lative marker > transformative marker > functive marker,

- benefactive marker > surrogative marker > functive marker,
- separative marker > functive marker.

Abbreviations

ABS = absolutive / ABSTR = abstract / ACC = accusative / ADV = adverbial / AOR = aorist / ASRT = assertive / AUX = auxiliary / CL = noun class / CMP = completive / COND = conditional / COP = copula / CVB = converb / DAT = dative / DEF = definite / DEM = demonstrative / EMPH = emphatic / ERG = ergative / ESS = essive / EXCL = exclamative / F = feminine / FOC = focalization / FUT = future / GEN = genitive / HAB = habitual / IMP = imperative / IMPF = imperfect / INCMP = incompletive / INDEF = indefinite / INESS = inessive / INSTR = instrumental / IPFV = imperfective / M = masculine / N = neuter / NEG = negation / NPST = non-past / OBL = oblique / PASS = passive / PFV = perfective / PL = plural / POS = positive / POSS = possessive / PRF = perfect / PROG = progressive / PROL = prolativ / PRS = present / PST = past / REFL = reflexive / SG = singular / SUBJ = subjunctive / TERM = terminative / TOP = topic marker / TRANSL = translative

Notes

1. The following persons have contributed to this paper by providing me with data, or helping me to orient myself in questions I am not familiar with: Ayten Babaliyeva (Tabassaran, Lezgi, Azeri), Mehmet-Ali Akıncı (Turkish), Sokhna Ba-Diop (Wolof), Alain-Christian Bassène (Jóola Banjal), Bertrand Boiron (Hungarian), Nthatisi Bulane (Southern Sotho), Jean-François Chaléat (Japanese), Claudine Chamorro (Purépecha), Hilary Chappell (Chinese dialects), Injoo Choi-Jonin (Korean), Michael Daniel (Archi), Danh Thành Do-Hurinville (Vietnamese), Gérard Dumestre (Bambara), Dmitri Ganenkov (Dargi), Csilla Kász (Arabic), Victoria Khurshudian (Eastern Armenian), Jérémie Kouadio (Baule), Joseba Lacarra (Basque), René Lacroix (Laz), Timur Maisak (Agul), Solmaz Merdanova (Agul), Zarina Molochieva (Chechen), Céline Mounole (Basque), Claire Moyses (Xaracuu, Wallisian, Futunan), Irina Nikolaeva (Nenets), Hayat Omar (Amharic, Oromo), Daniel Petit (Indo-European), Françoise Rose (Émérillon, Mojeño Trinitario, and other Amazonian languages), Wu Tong (Mandarin Chinese), Manana Topadze (Georgian), Nicolas Tournadre (Tibetan), Martine Vanhove (Maltese). This version has also benefited from Ekkehard König and Wolfgang Schulze's comments on previous versions, and (last but not least) from the comments of two anonymous reviewers.

2. *Equative* is taken here in its broad meaning, conflating equative stricto sensu with *specificational* and *identificational* — for a recent discussion of these notions within the frame of a typology of copular clauses, see Mikkelsen (2011). Note that this use of equative has nothing to do with the label *equative case* found in the description of the nominal inflection of Sumerian and a few other languages. In the terminology used in the present paper, such case forms would rather be labeled *similative*.

3. In the glosses of the Mandinka examples, the suffixes *-tôo* and *-mâa* are glossed SPR (secondary predicate marker), because they are used exclusively with nouns in secondary predicate function, whereas the postposition *tí* is simply glossed OBL (oblique NP marker), because in

addition to its use with NPs in predicate function, it also occurs with NPs expressing a variety of participative roles — see 5.1.

4. Depending on the context, *uhiga* can variously be translated as ‘reason’, ‘meaning’, ‘nature’, or ‘identity’.
5. The first person subject in the translation of this Japanese sentence is supposed to have been retrieved from the context. The sentence itself provides no clue to identify the person referred to.
6. See Schönig (2008) and Schroeder (2008) for a detailed discussion of this construction in Turkish and other Turkic languages.
7. For general orientation about Uralic Essives, see de Groot (2010).
8. See Riese (1992–1993) for an overview of Translative in Uralic.
9. Vowel merging (a + u > o) occurs at the boundary between *njenga-* and *umshayeli* ‘driver’.
10. Vowel merging (a + u > o) occurs at the boundary between *njenga-* and *umfazi* ‘woman’.
11. For a detailed analysis of the uses of the Finnish Essive, see Onikki-Rantajääskö (2006).
12. See Vydrin (2008) for a detailed presentation of the uses of the suffix *-ew* in Adyghe.
13. A possible explanation of this phenomenon is that the Basque cases including an optional formative identical to the Genitive suffix were originally postpositions governing the Genitive and that either the Genitive marking was not obligatory or the deletion of the Genitive suffix became possible during the process by which postpositions were converted into case suffixes.
14. The glosses ‘in this way’ and ‘in which way’ are given here as pure translational equivalents, and must not be viewed as suggesting that such words necessarily originate from the grammaticalization of expressions involving nouns.
15. Note that a similar grammaticalization path is reconstructed for English *like*.

References

- Alekseev, Mikhail. 1988. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja morfologija avaro-andijskix jazykov* [Comparative-historical morphology of Avar-Andic languages]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Aquilina, Joseph. 1999. *English-Maltese dictionary*, Vol. 1 (A–D). Valletta: Midsea books.
- Arkad'ev, Peter, Jurij Lander, Aleksandr Letučij & Nina Sumbatova. 2009. Vvedenie: Osnovnye svedenija ob adygejskom jazyke [Introduction: Basic information on the Adyghe language]. In Peter Arkad'ev, Aleksandr Letučij, Nina Sumbatova & Jakov Testelec (eds.), *Aspekty polisintetizma: očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysyntheticism: Essays on the grammar of the Adyghe language], 17–120. Moscow: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet.
- Balogh, Judit. 2000. A névszóragozás [Noun inflection]. In Borbála Keszler. (ed.), *Magyar grammatika* [Hungarian grammar], 183–208. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.

- Bartels, Hauke. 2008. Sekundäre Predikation im Niedersorbischen. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 19–39. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Boeder, Winfried. 2005. Depictives in Kartvelian. Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, 201–236. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199272266.003.0006
- Creissels, Denis. 2008. Predicative argument marking: The case of transformation verbs. Conference: Cognitive and functional perspectives on dynamic tendencies in Languages, Tartu. (Electronic version available at <http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-pred.arg.pdf>)
- Creissels, Denis. 2014. Functive-transformative marking in Akhvakh and other Caucasian languages. In Pamjati Alexandra, Evgen'eviča Kibrika, Vladimir Plungian, Michael Daniel, Elena Ljutikova, Sergej Tatevosov and Olga Fedorocva (eds.), *Jazyk, Konstanty, Peremennyye*, 430–449. Saint Petersburg: Aletja.
- Daget, J., M. Konipo & M. Sanankoua. 1953. *La langue Bozo*. Limoges.
- É. Kiss, Katalin, Ferenc Kiefer & Péter Siptár. 2003. *Új Magyar Nyelvtan* [New Hungarian grammar]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Erelt, Mati & Helle Metslang. 2003. Case marking of the predicative in Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 39(3). 166–174.
- Ernout, Alfred & François Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine*, 2nd edn. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Gimbatov, Magomed. 2006. *Avar-surus slovar* [Avar-Russian dictionary]. Makhachkala.
- Groot, Casper de. 2008. Depictive secondary predication in Hungarian. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 69–96. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Groot, Casper de. 2010. Uralic Essive. Workshop 'Uralic case', *14th International Morphology Meeting*. Budapest.
- Grünthal, Riho. 2003. *Finnic adpositions and cases in change*. Helsinki: Société finno-ougrienne.
- Hagège, Claude. 2010. *Adpositions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199575008.001.0001
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. *A grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110884210
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2010.0021
- Haspelmath, Martin & Oda Buchholz. 1998. Equative and similitive constructions. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*, 277–334. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hewson, John & Vit Bubenik. 2006. *From case to adposition: The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.280
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Eva Schultze-Berndt. 2005. Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: An introduction. In Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, 1–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199272266.003.0001

- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.). 2005. *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199272266.001.0001
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1997. *Greek: A comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. London: Routledge.
- Hualde, José Ignacio & Jon Ortiz de Urbina. 2003. *A grammar of Basque*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110895285
- Kuwae, Kunio. 1989. *Manuel de japonais*. Paris: L'Asiathèque.
- Lafitte, Pierre. 1962. *Grammaire basque (navarro-labourdin littéraire)*. Bayonne: Editions des "Amis du musée basque" et "Ikas".
- Le Bris, Pierre & André Prost. 1981. *Dictionnaire bobo-français*. Paris: SELAF.
- Lelkes, István. 1967. *Manuel de hongrois*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Lutkat, Florence-Silvia & Cornelius Hasselblatt. 1993. *Estonisch intensiv: das Lehrbuch der estnischen Sprache*. Hamburg: Baltica.
- Magomedova, Patimat & Rašidat Xalidova. 2001. *Karatinsko-russkij slovar'* [Karata-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2011. Copular clauses. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning, 1805–1829*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Musaev, Magomed-Said. 1987. *Slovoizmenitel'nye kategorii darginskogo jazyka (kategorii grammatičeskix klassov, abstraktnye padeži)* [Inflectional categories in Dargwa (grammatical classes, abstract cases)]. Makhachkala.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1978. 'Secondary predicates'. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4. 114–127.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1983. 'Predicate instrumentals and agreement in Lithuanian: A contrastive analysis'. *Papers in Linguistics* 16(3/4). 1–21. DOI: 10.1080/08351818309370593
- Onikki-Rantajääskö, Tiina. 2006. Metonymy in locatives of state. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo & Lyle Campbell (eds.), *Grammar from the human perspective: Case, space and person in Finnish*, 67–100. Amsterdam: Benjamins DOI: 10.1075/cilt.277.08oni
- Pinkster, Harm. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1991. Praedicativum. In Christian Touratier (ed.), *Compléments prédictifs et attributs du complément d'objet en Latin*, 72–78. Aix-Marseille: Publications de l'Université de Provence.
- Rakhilina, Ekaterina & Elena Tribushinina. 2011. The Russian instrumental-of-comparison: Constructional approach. In Laura Janda & Marcin Grygiel (eds.), *Slavic linguistics in a cognitive framework*, 145–174. Peter Lang.
- Riese, Timothy. 1992. Der Translativ in den uralischen Sprachen 1. *Linguistica Uralica* 28. 251–261.
- Riese, Timothy. 1993. Der Translativ in den uralischen Sprachen 2. *Linguistica Uralica* 29. 1–20.
- Rose, Françoise. 2011. *Grammaire de l'émérillon teko, une langue tupi-guarani de Guyane française*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Schönig, Claus. 2008. Notizen zu türksprachigen Gerundialformen (Konverbialformen) als verbale Kerne von Rollenprädikaten. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 327–338. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2008. Adverbial modification and secondary predicates in Turkish: A typological perspective. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder

- (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 339–358. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Schroeder, Christoph, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.). 2008. *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16). Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2004. Depictive secondary predicates. *Linguistic Typology* 8(1). 59–131. DOI: 10.1515/lity.2004.004
- Seki, Lucy 2000. *Gramática do Kamaiurá, língua Tupi-Guarani do Alto Xingu*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
- Sohn, Ho-Min 1999. *The Korean language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Šarić, Ljiljana. 2008. Secondary predicates in Croatian. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 295–325. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Turunen, Rigina. 2011. Double encoding of nominal and adjectival predicates: A study of the nominative-translative switch in Erzya. *SUSA/JSFOu* 93. 385–415.
- Veksler, Bunim X. & Vladimir A. Jurik. 1975. *Samoučitel' latyšškogo jazyka*. Riga: Zvaigzne.
- Vydrin, Arseniy. 2008. Are there depictives in Adighe? In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 423–445. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12. 203–238.

Author's address

Denis Creissels
 513 route de la Combette
 38410 Saint Martin d'Uriage
 France
 denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr