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Aims of today’s talk

• To give an overview of an ongoing project on the typology of adposition borrowing.

• To illustrate the usefulness of a cross-linguistic sample for the evaluation of proposed universals of contact-induced change, taking as a case study the Linear Order Preservation universal proposed by Moravcsik (1978).
A proposed universal of borrowing

“a grammatical word cannot be borrowed unless the linear order with respect to its head is also ‘borrowed’ […] This statement excludes a language which borrows the form and the meaning of a preposition and uses it postposed, or which borrows the form and meaning of a postposition and uses it preposed,” (Moravcsik 1978:112).
• “Surprisingly, however, counterexamples are not as readily available as one might expect” (Campbell 1993; Harris & Campbell 1995: 136)

• “[t]his is probably the universal which has stood up best to the test of time and counterexamples” (Curnow 2001: 431)
• It is possible to built theories on small, areally-, genealogically-, and sociolinguistically-restricted cases.

• Another approach is to examine a broad cross-linguistic sample.
Looking for empirically-based cross-linguistic generalizations about constraints on borrowing, based on a broad cross-linguistic sample.

Projected scope:
• borrowability of adpositions vis-à-vis other categories,
• ‘hierarchies’ of adpositions borrowed according to meaning;
• morphosyntactic integration of adpositions into recipient language structures (e.g., person indexing, case government, linear order);
• role of frequency and discourse considerations;
• correlations with geography and sociohistorical events and situations
Today’s talk

• Background
• The sample
• Evaluating the proposed universal
• Results and discussion
Background: lexical borrowing

• The literature on language contact has repeatedly noted that, with respect to lexical borrowing, it is more likely for content items ("words") to be borrowed than function items ("words").
• That is, there seem to be constraints on borrowing.
• Such constraints have often been interpreted as implicational universals.
Borrowability scales as implicational universals

– content item > **function word** > agglutinating affix > fusional affix (Field 2002)

– nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, **adpositions** > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > **inflectional affixes** (Matras 2007)

Different interpretations (Haspelmath 2009):

– Quantitative, temporal, implicational, frequency
Borrowability scales

• Such scales predict that borrowing of function words is less frequent and more constrained than borrowing of content items.

• Much of the research on borrowing has concentrated on the borrowing of content words (see Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009, Wohlgemuth 2009, Matras 2011, among others), on the one hand, or on the borrowing of grammatical patterns, on the other.
While there is a lot of interesting work on particular languages, language families, and linguistic areas, the borrowing of adpositions has not received systematic cross-linguistic attention in the literature yet.

Note: Frank Seifart’s AfBO, *A Worldwide Survey of Affix Borrowing*, now online. Smaller in scale than the current project, with a little overlap.
What goes into the database?
What is an adposition?

Adpositions: roughly, grammatical elements marking the relationship between two parts of a clause

“An adposition (Adp) is an unanalyzable or analyzable grammatical word constituting an adpositional phrase (Adp-phrase) with a term that it puts in relationship, like case affixes, with another linguistic unit, by marking the grammatical and semantic links between them” (Hagège 2010: 8)
Problems with most definitions

• They assume “word” as a cross-linguistically definable concept, which has been argued to be untenable.
• Moreover, descriptive terminology is often inconsistent and even controversial.
• What one linguist describes as an adposition might be described by another as a case marker, a relational noun, a relator, or using terms from an orthogonal parameter, as a clitic or affix. Cf. the nightmare of tagmemic descriptions.
Problems with most definitions

As such, “adposition” is used here as a broad net, encompassing the following language-specific descriptive categories:

– Adposition
– Relational noun
– Case marker
– Relator
– Locative body part

“Adposition” here is broadly equivalent to the notions “case marker,” “flag” or “dependent marker,” which mark dependent noun phrases for the type of relationship they bear to their heads.
Adpositions, in practice

This is common enough in typologists’ practice anyway, e.g., Bakker on Quechua postpositions:

“some authors analyze them as case markers (cf. Cerrón-Palomino 1987). Given enough time, this is likely what at least some of them might develop into anyway” (2012: 14).
Adpositions, in practice

Bottom line:

• Difficulties in synchronic categorization often reflect diachronic pathways of change, both in terms of boundedness and in terms of the lexicon/grammar continuum.

• Descriptive linguists propose language-specific categories necessary for description, while typologists might have to live with broader comparative concepts (Haspelmath 2010).

• This is important, since we want to generalize across language structures, not linguists’ descriptive practices.
A way out?

Multivariate Analysis (Bickel 2010, 2011)

• Don’t typologize over categories
• Do typologize over matrices of fine-grained properties
Adposition borrowing: matter vs. pattern
(Matras 2009, Sakel 2007)

Matter replication:
Incorporation of sounds and sound shapes of words and morphs alongside their grammatical meaning and function.

Pattern replication:
Replication of the organization, distribution and mapping of grammatical patterns using native linguistic material (without borrowing actual forms).
Adposition borrowing: matter vs. pattern (Matras 2009, Sakel 2007)

Interestingly, among the most detailed descriptions of individual cases of adposition borrowing are those involving pattern replication (e.g., Ross 1996, Heine & Kuteva 2006).

Jenny 2013: Mon developed double preposition constructions under the influence of Burmese

```
(1) a. ပြက်ချောင်း  
   ဒါဖျောင်  ဟောင်
   LOC  OBL  house
   ‘in the house’

   b. ပြင်ချောင်း
   ထဖျောင်  ဟောင်
   house in LOC

(2) a. နောက်ချောင်း
   နောက်ဖျောင်  ဟောင်
   SRC  OBL  house
   ‘out of the house’

   b. ပြင်ချောင်း
   ထဖျောင်  ကက်
   house in SRC
```
Matter replication can occur in a few different ways, e.g.,

a. Adposition > adposition

Sinti Romani < German (Matras & Elšik 2006)

\textit{tu hal kowa kai weh von o}

\textit{you you.are that who you.come from DEF.NOM}

dewles-ter

God-ABL

“You are the one who comes from God”
b. borrowed lexeme grammaticalized as an adposition in a recipient language:

- Indonesian (Austronesian) *antara* ‘between’, in which a noun was borrowed from Sanskrit, and later developed into an adposition (Tadmor 2009);
- Basque (isolate) *kanpo* “outside” from Spanish (Indo-European) *campo* “field”
- Taba (Austronesian) *ada* ‘COM/INSTR’ < North Moluccan Malay (Austronesian) *ada* ‘exist’ (Bowden 2001)
c. Collocation of a borrowed lexeme with an inherited basic adposition/case-marker, e.g.,

Maltese *flok* “instead of” which is the result of univerbation of the inherited basic adposition *f(i)-* “in” and the borrowed lexical item *lok* (< Sicilian *loku*, “place”).
Pattern replication

Pattern replication can be involved in the development of adpositions in a number of ways, including triggering or catalyzing the emergence of an adposition category in a language that did not have one pre-contact.

Brahui (Dravidian) acquires prepositions as the result of contact with Indo-Aryan languages.
In borrowing hierarchies, adpositions are generally located somewhere in the middle

- nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, ADPOSITIONS > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes (Matras 2007, see also Muyskens 2008)

The location of adposition in the middle of the hierarchy predicts that they will be rather resistant to borrowing compared to other types of lexical and grammatical items.
Which adpositions are borrowed?

Often observed that borrowed adpositions usually express peripheral local meanings (“between, around”) as opposed to core local meanings, such as “in, at” (Matras 2007: 42)

- Non-temporal/non-spatial > peripheral temporal > core temporal > peripheral spatial > core spatial (> core grammatical relations)

Counterexamples:

- Latvian iga “at, to” into Livonian (Grünthal 2003)
- Dative markers from Nepali in Kham (Watters 2004)
- and many more.
Livonian (Uralic) < Latvian (IE)
Se izā um tie-nd tānda
it father is make-PTCP.PST him/her

pa rišt īngō-ks teg īž.
PREP man-TRANSLCOM back
‘The father has made him a human being again’ (Grünthall 2003: 178)

Kham (Tibeto-Burman) < Nepali (IE)
ŋa-lai nǝ-mǝya lagi-zya.
me-DAT 2SG-love feels-CONT
‘I feel love for you.’ (Watters 2004: 225)
Another addition from yesterday!

Motion events in Russian Sign Language
Kirill Aksenov, Elena Pasalskaya, Valeria Vinogradova, Daria Lapenkova

“GOAL BIAS”

There is a verb in RSL that can be combined with both Goal and Source. While Goal is not marked, Source should be marked with a sign which is a fingerspelled borrowing from spoken Russian (Н-3 = F-R-O-M)*.

P-E-T-Y-A LEAVE F-R-O-M SAINT-PETERSBURG
‘Petya left Saint-Petersburg’

I SAINT-PETERSBURG PAST LEAVE
‘I left for Saint-Petersburg’

*This sign is the only borrowed Russian spatial preposition.
Why is adposition borrowing interesting?

- Adpositions lie at the border between grammar and lexicon.
- Not necessarily homogeneous categories in this respect.
- Can be closed classes, open classes, or non-existent in particular languages.
- Often involved in complex syntactic relationships (encoding of arguments, government of case-marked nouns, etc.).
- Not extremely common
Why is adposition borrowing interesting?

In general, understanding constraints on what can be borrowed is crucial for typology (Nichols 1992, Bickel 2012), since the diffusion of features creates cross-linguistic similarities.
Constraints on adposition borrowing

**Structural** constraints: e.g., what influence does linear order of the contact languages have on the borrowability of adposition?

**Sociolinguistic** constraints: can we operationalize proposed notions like “intensity and length of contact”, “type of contact situation” etc.?

**Semantic** constraints: to what extent does the inherent meaning of adpositions determine borrowability?

**Discourse** constraints: to what extent do different speech styles/modes influence adposition borrowing?

Does **frequency** play a role, and if so, how?
Adposition borrowing and morphosyntax

- Person indexing
- Case marking
- Word class
Person indexation (‘agreement’)

Kurdish (IE) \textit{gal} “with” $>$ Arbel Neo-Aramaic (Afroasiatic)
gal/gall- (Khan 1999)

\textit{gall-eu}

with-3SGM

“with him”
Closely related languages

Tlalolcula Valley Zapotec (Oto-Manguean)

\[pu’unt\] \[me’es\] \[pu’unt=nil’i\]
\[at\_tip\_of\] \[table\] \[at\_tip\_of=3PR\]
“at the end of the table” “at the end of it”

San Bartolome Zoogocho Zapotec (Oto-Manguean)

\[trasde\] \[neto\] \[*trasde=to*\]
\[behind\] \[I\ PL. EXCL\] \[behind=I\ PL. EXCL\]
“behind us”
Case

Borrowed adpositions can co-occur with inherited adpositions or other case markers, as in some Quechua varieties (< Spanish).

Lamas Kechwa (Quechuan; Sanchez 2012)

*Kawa-yka-n a ese niñitu-ta.*
look-PROG-3SG ACC that boy-ACC

“(S/he) is looking at that boy”
Supyire (Senufo) fó ‘till, as far as’ < Bambara fɔ (Niger-Congo) ‘till, except for’ (Carlson 1994)

*u à kàrè fó Sukwole e*
s/he PERF go as.far.as Sukwole to
‘S/he went as far as Sukwole.’

*u à bárāŋi pyi fó yàkɔŋkè*
s/he PERF work.DEF do till afternoon.DEF
‘S/he worked until the afternoon.’
Are adpositions always borrowed as adpositions?

Linguists often express doubts about whether a given adposition is borrowed “as an adposition” or rather as a noun, adverb, or something else:

Basque
etsaien kontra
enemies.PL.GEN against
“against the enemies”
Are adpositions always borrowed as adpositions?

• Borrowed adpositions are often integrated into the same case patterns as inherited ones.
• The fact that an adposition is linked by a possessive/genitive marker is relatively unremarkable, since such constructions are often sources for language-internal grammaticalization.
• In some cases, there is no evidence whatsoever for basic adpositions being borrowed as nouns, e.g., Azeri Turkic qabax ‘front side’ > Neo-Aramaic qabax ‘in front of’, but no lexical use.
We should keep in mind that

- Morphosyntactic coding is not the only evidence for categorial assignment.
- The fact that many borrowed adpositions are integrated into pre-existing adnominal (“genitive”) constructions does not necessarily mean that the adposition was borrowed as a noun.
- Meaning and broader distributional facts have to be taken into account.
Most importantly

We still know very little about the cross-linguistic variation of integration of borrowed adpositions into inherited case systems.
Meaning

• Are adpositions borrowed with their entire polysemy network?

• If not, do they confirm or disconfirm the semantic contiguity hypothesis that underlies semantic maps?

• Is there any implicational relationship between lexical vs. grammatical meanings when ‘axial parts’ are borrowed
What kind of cross-linguistic sample?

• Are balanced or stratified samples desirable – or possible – in the typology of borrowing?

• Such samples might be useful for studying borrowability per se, i.e., whether adpositions or borrowed or not, but they are less useful for studying other questions, e.g., linear order, morphosyntactactic integration, and semantics.

• Methodological limitations and difficulties of work on the typology of borrowing.
Cross-linguistic samples

• We know rather a lot about some families/areas (Meso- and South America, the Araxes area, Europe), but next to nothing about others (e.g., Africa, northern North America).

• We even have some “universals of contact situations” e.g., Stolz’ universal for Spanish-Mesoamerica/Pacific contact (if a language borrows an adposition, it also borrows the conjunction pero “but”).
• Some proposed universals might turn out to be specific to particular areas or contact situations

• Casting a wide net is crucial for the typology of borrowing, especially since some allegedly robust universals might turn out to show areality.
Our research questions
Some still unasked…

• What is the validity of proposed borrowing hierarchies?
• What are the synchronic constraints – whether structural, sociolinguistic, or discourse-based – on adposition borrowing?
• What do we know about the actual diachrony of adposition borrowing?
• What are the cross-linguistic patterns of morphosyntactic integration of adpositions?
• In what situations does contact lead to the emergence of a new “adposition” category?
• What conditions encourage or inhibit adposition borrowing?
In order to ask these questions we need

• Detailed descriptions of adposition borrowing in individual languages, families, and areas
• Integration of discourse and sociolinguistic factors
• Integration of extra-linguistic factors, i.e., social, cultural, historical features, including actual attested diachronies.
• Cross-linguistic research!
Next

• A cross-linguistic sample of adposition borrowing

• Evaluating a proposed universal of language contact: Linear Order Preservation

• Conclusions
THE SAMPLE
The pilot sample

A convenience sample of
100 language pairs
89 recipient languages (RL)
ca. 30 donor languages (DL)

• Just a pilot sample
• Currently building a much more detailed and comprehensive database.
• Also, many pairs need to be looked at more closely.
Where does the data come from?

- Grammars and dictionaries.
- Secondary literature.
- Corpora.

Basically, anything I can get my hands on – a voracious convenience sample.
The database under construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>around</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Southern Persian-Azeri Jewish)</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>atrâf</td>
<td>around</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Southern Persian-Azeri Jewish)</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Kurdish (Central)</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>betâ\ heta\ihatâ</td>
<td>until, up to</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Northern Persian-Azeri Jewish)</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>ðar atrâf</td>
<td>four sides</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Guaroní</td>
<td>Tupian</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#attat "matêwa g-do olka, #darwazit olka dviqâlu "by the time he arrived in that city, they had shut the city gate", mar peši galox #atta ezan adjan "let them stay with you until I go and come back" (more exx. in Garbell 1965b: 60-62, 98, 298

May not take personal pronouns. In relation to nouns, numerals and demonstrative pronouns (or clauses apparently), may connect directly or, in archaic style and deliberate speech, through the relational suffixes -t-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garbell 1965b: 60-62, 98, 298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A cautionary excursus

• This project was my first cross-linguistic study.
• I knew I had to make a database.
• I hired an IT guy to do it, and housed the database on the university website.
• Long story short, the database is inaccessible today.
• Lesson for IT dummies (like me): keep it simple and flexible. Don’t be afraid to ask for advice and help from experienced typologists.
## Areal distribution (in the pilot sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Language Pairs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areal bias might result from

- A genuine lack or paucity of adposition borrowing.
- This seems to be the case in northern North America and in Australia.
- Biases in description
Or bias with respect to presence/absence of adpositions

World Atlas of Language Structures Feature 85A (Dryer 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postpositions</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpositions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dominant order</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adpositions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

< 3% of languages in the sample are reported to have no adpositions.
Bias wrt presence/absence of adpositions
Bias wrt presence/absence of adpositions

World Atlas of Language Structures Feature 48 (Bakker 2011)

No adpositions 63
No person marking 209
Pronouns only 83
Pronouns and nouns 23

6% of languages in sample reported to have no adpositions.
Bias wrt presence/absence of adpositions
Doesn’t look very significant, but Australia and North America figure prominently in the ‘no adposition category (more than half, taken together).
EVALUATING LINEAR ORDER PRESERVATION
A proposed universal of borrowing

“a grammatical word cannot be borrowed unless the linear order with respect to its head is also ‘borrowed’ [...] This statement excludes a language which borrows the form and the meaning of a preposition and uses it postposed, or which borrows the form and meaning of a postposition and uses it preposed,” (Moravcsik 1978:112).
Evaluating the universal

First of all, what are the logical possibilities, if

(a) we take only prepositions and postpositions, leaving aside ambipositions, circumpositions, and other less frequent construction types (Hagège 2010)?

(b) we take only languages that have a dominant PrN or NPos order?
We need to take into account

1. The basic linear order of adposition vis-à-vis complement in the donor language (DL);

2. The basic linear order of adposition vis-à-vis complement in the recipient language (RL); and

3. The linear order of borrowed adposition vis-à-vis-complement in the recipient language.
A quick typology of situations

**Harmonic order**: when the donor language linear order matches recipient language linear order:

a. Prepositional DL/Prepositional RL
b. Postpositional DL/Postpositional RL

**Disharmonic order**: when donor language linear order $\neq$ recipient language linear order.

a. Prepositional DL/Postpositional RL
b. Postpositional DL/Prepositional RL
8 logically possible borrowing outcomes and their predictability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DL adposition</th>
<th>Borrowed as X</th>
<th>in X-positional RL</th>
<th>Harmonic?</th>
<th>Predicted by LOP universal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>Yes, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>Yes, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>No, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>No, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only situations with which we can test the proposed universal are *disharmonic* situations. *Not really. Languages that allow both Pr and Pos are also interesting, but we won’t be dealing with them here.
The only situations with which we can test the proposed universal are *disharmonic* situations.*

*Not really. Languages that allow both Pr and Pos are also interesting for evaluating the universal, but we won’t be dealing with them here.
4 situations for evaluating LOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DL adposition</th>
<th>Borrowed as X</th>
<th>in X-positional RL</th>
<th>Harmonic?</th>
<th>Predicted by LOP universal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>Yes, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>Yes, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>No, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>No, trivially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>Yes, LOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>Yes, LOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Postpositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>no: counter-example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposition</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>Prepositional</td>
<td>disharmonic</td>
<td>no: counter-example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disharmonic pairs in the sample

40 disharmonic pairs from
Eurasia, Pacific, North and South America
Disharmonic situations are somewhat less frequent than harmonic ones

• Probably in part due to the fact that linear order is not distributed evenly across languages.

• Linear order also tends to pattern areally.
SOME RESULTS
Harmonic (I): $Pr > Pr$ in $Pr$

Coptic (Afroasiatic) $<$ Greek (IE)

$kata$-$pek$-$šače$

according.to-your-word

‘According to your word.’

$kata$ $tēn$ $praksin$ $autou$

according.to $ART$.ACC $work$.ACC $DEM$.GEN

‘According to his work.’
Harmonic (2): Pos as Pos in Pos

Kolami (Dravidian; India; Subrahmanyan 1998)

bōtal  (< Marathi (IE) bhovtālā)
ūr   bōtal
village.NOM around
‘around the village’

lōpal  (< Telugu (Drav.) lōpala)
ella lōpal
house.NOM inside
‘inside the house’
Unattested harmonic situations

• Harmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pr
  Not attested to date.

• Harmonic (4): Pos as Pr in Pos
  Not attested to date.
Interim summary

• Harmonic situations always comply with Linear Order Preservation, but in two different ways.
  – When two languages have the same adposition order, the result is always trivially identical to the order of both.
  – Which means that it never results in the other order, trivially and entirely unsurprisingly.

• What happens in disharmonic situations?
  – Keep in mind that LOP predicts that disharmonic situations will always be resolved in favor of the linear order of the donor language.
Disharmonic (I): Pr as Pr in Pos

Karaim (Turkic) kolo < Polish (IE) kolo

I uzhe bu fotograf
and already this photographer

tur-at kolo Bas’ya-niin.
stand-A.NONPST-3PS by Bas’ya-GEN
‘And this photographer is already standing near Basia.’ (Csató 2000: 269)

LOP: √
Disharmonic (I): Pr as Pr in Pos

Brahui (Dravidian; Pakistan; Bray 1909)

• All native adpositions are postpositions
• All prepositions are borrowed from ‘Perso-Arabic’

bayaire  nēān  bē(ḍē)  nēān
without  you.ABL  without  you.ABL
‘without you’  ‘without you’

LOP: √
Disharmonic (I): Pr as Pr in Pos

Khorasan Turkic (Turkic) < Persian (IE)

\textit{ta} axîrâ äçän
\textit{to} end.DAT to
‘to the end’

\text{LOP: √}
Disharmonic (I): Pr as Pr in Pos

Khalaj Turkic < Persian (IE)

\( b \ddot{i} \quad s\ddot{a}n \)

without\hspace{1cm}2SG

‘without you’

\text{LOP: } \checkmark
Disharmonic (I): Pr as Pr in Pos

Cavineña (Tacanan; Bolivia) < Spanish

`amen aje-etibe-chine hasta re-keja`

BM walk-COME.PERM.DISTR-REC.PST until here-LOC.GNL

‘I came back walking slowly until here.’

“As in Spanish, this morpheme is preposed to its argument in Cavineña [...] Note that except for this borrowed morpheme, Cavineña does not have any preposition” (Guillaume 2008: 77)

LOP: √
Disharmonic (2): Pos as Pos in Pr

Romani (Gadžikano, Kaspičan, IE) < Turkish (Elšík & Matras 2006)

Varšava-dan
Warsaw-ABL
‘from Warsaw’

Polša-dan
Poland-ABL
‘from Poland’

Rusija-da
Russia-LOC
‘in Russia’
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Basque (Isolate, France/Spain) < Spanish (Indo-European, Spain; exx. from A. Antonov, p.c.)

(a)
polizieko gobernuaren kontra
police.DEF.PL government.DEF.GEN against

protesta egin dute
protest DO.PTCP AUX.PRES.3PL>3SG
The police protested against the government

(b)
i-rekin zaude edo ni-re kontra
1SG-WITH be.PRS-2SG or 1SG-GEN against
Either you are with me or you are against me.
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Basque (cont.)

\textit{hormaren} \textit{kontra} \text{wall.\textsc{def.\textsc{gen}}} \textit{against} \\
against the wall

\textit{hormari} \textit{kontra} \text{wall.\textsc{def.\textsc{dat}}} \textit{against} \\
against the wall

\text{LOP: X}
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Sri Lanka Malay (Austronesian) < Javanese (Austronesian) Nordhoff

\[ \text{kithang } \text{lorang=} \text{nang } \text{baaye } \text{mliiga athi-kaasi} \]
1 PL 2 PL = DAT good palace IRR-give

“We will give you beautiful palaces”

Javanese [Ngoko] (Austronesian)
\[ \text{nang } \text{ngomah} \]
at home
‘at home’

LOP: X
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Manambu (Sepik, PNG) < Tok Pisin (Eng. based creole)

\[ m\text{ǝn}-a \quad \text{wantaim} \quad yi-k-na-bran \]
\[ \text{you.M-LK with go-FUT-ACT.FOC- I duBAS.VT} \]

We will go together with you; you and I will go together‘

Replaces the postposition \( wuk\text{ǝn} \) ‘together, with.’ The postposition \( \text{wantaim} \) is used by younger speakers, and considered highly substandard” (Aikhenvald 2001: 611).

LOP: X
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Khalaj Turkic < Persian

tā čāštga tā
to noon.DAT to
‘until noon’

äkgi künkä tā
two day.DAT to
‘up to two days’

LOP: X
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Brahui (Dravidian, Pakistan)

Borrowed adpositions can pattern like native ones:

*nēān savā*

you.ABL without

‘without you’

LOP: X
Disharmonic (3): Pr as Pos in Pos

Russian (IE) < Erzya (Uralic) (Grünthal fc)

a. t’ejt’er jaki čuvto-n’ krugom
   girl walk.3SG tree-GEN around
   ‘a girl walks around a tree’

b. t’ejt’er jaki čuvto-n’ peřka
   girl walk.3SG tree-GEN around
   ‘a girl walks around a tree’
Disharmonic (4): Pos as Pr in Pr

Azerbaijanian Neo-Aramaic (Afroasiatic) < Azerbaijanian (Turkic), (Garbell 1965)

$qaba\gamma\ kalo\ <\ Azerbaijanian\ qabax$
before the.bride (Householder 1965)

$qaba\gamma-an$
before- I PL

$\text{LOP: X}$
Disharmonic (4): Pos as Pr in Pr

Anatolian Kurdish (Indo-European; Haig 2001)

Turkish  Kurdish
X-DAT göre  (li) gora X
‘according to X’

X-DAT ait  aitê X
‘belonging to X’

LOP: X
# Interim Summary: Disharmonic situations and their outcomes

## Table of Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Eurasia</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>South America</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trivial LOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr &gt; Pr in Pr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos &gt; Pos in Pos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-trivial LOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr &gt; Pr in Pos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos &gt; Pos in Pr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counterexamples</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr &gt; Pos in Pos</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos &gt; Pr in Pr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Harmonic vs. disharmonic situations: 60% vs. 40%

Disharmonic situations found most often in Eurasia, South America, and North America (in the ‘Iberosphere’).

- Linear order preservation: 67.5%
- Counterexamples to LOP: 32.5%

Unexpected:
- Prepositions are much more frequently borrowed than postpositions in disharmonic situations.
- Eurasia shows the full range of outcomes; no other area does.
Interim summary

• Linear Order Preservation is the most common outcome when adpositions are borrowed, but:

• Real opportunities to evaluate this empirically are relatively rare, because:

• Many instances of adposition borrowing are between languages with the same linear order, in part due to areal patterning of linear order and perhaps to genealogical considerations.
Some examples

a. The South Asian ‘Indosphere’ is a hotbed of adposition borrowing, but all of the languages in the sample have postpositions.

b. Same goes for the ‘Middle Volga’ region, with Turkic and Uralic languages (Mari, Chuvash, Tatar, Udmurt).

c. Interestingly, North and South America in the ‘Iberosphere’ have lots of disharmonic situations, but LOP is invariably observed (in the sample).

d. Prepositional Romani, Yiddish and Neo-Aramaic languages frequently borrow adpositions, but most of the contact languages have prepositions.
Areality of AdpNP order
Nonetheless

In some cases the above are in contact with languages with another linear order, so we have a nice laboratory to evaluate the universal:

- Brahui (Pos) and Indo-Aryan languages (Pr)
- Romani (Pr) and Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish (all Pos)
- Neo-Aramaic (Pr) and Azerbaijanian (Pos).

Similarly, donor languages in contact with multiple recipient languages (usually across large areas) are interesting:

- Arabic (Pr) in contact with Bantu, Turkic, Indo-European, Nilo-Saharan, and more.
- Spanish (Pr) in contact with Otomanguean, Quechuan, Tupi, Austronesian, Basque, and more.
- Persian (Pr) in contact with Turkic, other Indo-Aryan, and others.
Bottom line:

Linear Order Preservation is not an absolute universal, but rather a tendency.

Both kinds of counterexamples are found:

• Prepositions borrowed as postpositions (Basque, Turkish, Sri Lanka Malay, Khalaj Turkic, Manambu)
• Postpositions borrowed as prepositions (Central Anatolian Kurdish, Azerbaijanian Neo-Aramaic)

Actually, in the sample, when the situation is disharmonic, 1/3 of the outcomes are counterexamples to LOP.
So what?

• Purely structural accounts don’t make the right predictions,
• Because given the same disharmonic structural situation, both outcomes are possible.
• Purely structural accounts are especially weak, because a single language pair can have multiple results, e.g.,

  – Khalaj Turkic < Persian (Pr, Pos < Pr)
  – Brahui < ‘Perso-Arabic’ (Pr, Pos < Pr)
Some things to consider

• DL adpositions often occur in ‘bilingual mode’ or code-switching before they diffuse to monolingual RL speech (Karaim < Russian/Polish).

• DL adpositions are often limited to DL lexical complements (e.g., Chamorro kon < Spanish con ‘with’; Topping 1973).

• There are also borrowed adpositions that occur with RL lexemes, but the converse is not found (e.g., Chamorro sin < Spanish sin ‘without’).
Some things to consider

• There are cases in which borrowed adpositions can occur in both orders in disharmonic situations, i.e., according to DL patterns (LOP) and according to RL patterns (no LOP).

• In some contact situations, it seems there is an implicational relationship between examples of LOP and counterexamples, e.g., Khorasan, Tabriz, and Khalaj Turkic, which all borrowed Persian prepositions (Pr > Pr).

• But counterexamples (Pr > Pos) are only found where LOP-conforming examples are also found. The converse is not true.
This may suggest

That at least in some cases, speakers of donor languages do initially follow Linear Order Preservation, but afterwards treat borrowed adpositions like native ones.
Some things to consider

• Taken together, these observations indicate that there might be a constraint against altering donor language linear order, at least in the speech of bilinguals.

• The donor language is also part of the bilingual repertoire (Matras 2009).

• Such a constraint would probably lead to a statistical preponderance of LOP-conforming outcomes.

• And also allows us to propose a prediction, which can be evaluated empirically:
Counterexamples to LOP are likeliest to occur in situations that facilitate ‘disloyalty’ to donor language patterns, e.g., in which, e.g.,

- Bilingualism is community-wide, which would favor convergence within the bilingual repertoire, at least in some speech registers, or
- Speakers are no longer bilingual, and the donor language patterns are no longer part of their repertoire > recipient language-internal change,
- Bilingualism is symmetrical and stable, rather than asymmetrical and imposed.

So we need to look at sociolinguistic typology, too.
Moravcsik’s proposed universal has generated a lot of useful research, and more cross-linguistic research remains to be done, e.g.:

– Linear order and morphosyntactic integration, especially with respect to compatibility with inherited case markers.

– Direct vs. indirect borrowing (Seifart 2013+).

– Typologizing sociolinguistic and discourse situations in which adpositions are borrowed.
Thank you!
References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sub-Family</th>
<th>Pr</th>
<th>Pr?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arabic (Jewish Tripolitanian) (yud)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arabic (Jewish Tripolitanian) (yud)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coptic (cop)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hausa (hau)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siwi (siz)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Swahili (swh)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Croatian [Molise Slavic] (hrv)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Domari (rmr)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maltese (mt)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Amidiya) [lsd]</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Iraqi Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Amidiya) [lsd]</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Betanure) [lsd]</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (C. Qaraqosh)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (C. Qaraqosh)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (C.Barwar) [aii]</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Iraqi Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Subfamily</td>
<td>Genus</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (C.Barwar) (aii)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Challa)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Iraqui Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (Challa)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Neo-Aramaic (J. Arbel)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Romani (Abruzzian; Slovene/Apennine dialects)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Vietnamese (vie)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Sino-Tibetan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Yiddish (ydd)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Primary Language</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixtec (Chalcatongo) (mig)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Otomanguean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Otomi</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Otomanguean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pipil (ppl)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr (previously Pos)</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tehepua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chamorro (cha)</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hiligaynon</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tetun Dili (tdt)</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Austronesian (creole)</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos &gt; Pos in Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dongolawi-Kenuz (xnz)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Nilo-Saharan</td>
<td>Nobiin</td>
<td>Nilo-Saharan</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos (Heine 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bantawa</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mari</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Uralic (Finno-Ugric)</td>
<td>Chuvash</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos (Bereczki 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chuvash (chv)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Udmurt</td>
<td>Uralic (Permic)</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos (Bereczki 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kolami (nit)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos (Subrahmanyam 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Language Family</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mordvinian (Erzya) (myv)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Uralic</td>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mundari</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Munda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rongpo (rnp)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Sino-Tibetan</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sunwar (suz)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Sino-Tibetan</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cavineña (cav) (?)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quechua/Aymara?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Subfamily</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Brahui (brh)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Dravidian</td>
<td>Indo-Iranian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Karaim (kdr)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Karaim (kdr)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ket (ket)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Yeniseian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Turkish (Khalaj) (klj)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Turkish (Khorasan) (kmz)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Turkish (Tebriz Azerbaijani) (azb)</td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mexicano (Malinche)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Language Family</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Popoloca</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yaqui (yaq)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Uto-Aztecan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zapotec (zap)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Otomanguean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zapotec (zap)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Otomanguean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baniwa (bwi)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bolivian Quechua (qul)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Quechuan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cavineña (cay)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guarani (gm)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Tupi-Guarani</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quechua (Imbabura) (qvi)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Quechuan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moseten (cas)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Isolate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Piapoco (pio)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Arawakan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Purepecha (tsz)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Tarascan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Quechua (Ulcumayo) (qvm)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>Quechuan</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos &gt; Pr in Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Kurdish (Central Anatolian) (kmr)</strong></td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>(Haig 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Neo-Aramaic (Northern Persian-Azeri)</strong></td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Afroasiatic</td>
<td>Azeri Turkish</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pos?</td>
<td>(Garbell 1965a), (Garbell 1965b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Romani (Ajia Varvara; South Vlax)</strong></td>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Turkic</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>(Matras 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pos in Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brahui (brh)</td>
<td>Eurasia Dravidian Indo-Iranian Indo-European Pos Pr (Bray 1909)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hindi-Urdu</td>
<td>Eurasia Indo-European Perso-Arabic ? Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sri Lanka Malay (sci)</td>
<td>Eurasia Austronesian Javanese Austronesian Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tatar</td>
<td>Eurasia Turkic Arabic Afroasiatic Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Turkish</td>
<td>Eurasia Turkic Arabic Afroasiatic Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Turkish (Khalaj) (klj)</td>
<td>Eurasia Turkic Persian Indo-European Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Uyghur</td>
<td>Eurasia Turkic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uzbek</td>
<td>Eurasia Turkic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Manambu</td>
<td>Pacific Sepik Tok Pisin ? Pos Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>