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Introducing the avertive

• Kuteva (1998, 2001: Ch. 4):
Avertive is a cross-linguistic gram type expressing an event that was “potentially imminent but did not get realized”.

Introducing the avertive

• Kuteva (1998, 2001: Ch. 4):
  Avertive is a cross-linguistic gram type expressing an event that was “potentially imminent but did not get realized”.

• French: *J’ai failli tomber.*
  ‘I almost fell.’
Introducing the avertive

• Kuteva (2009):
  Avertive is a “semantically elaborate” gram combining meanings from three different domains:
Introducing the avertive

- Kuteva (2009): Avertive is a “semantically elaborate” gram combining meanings from three different domains:
  - temporal (pastness),
  - aspectual (imminence),
  - modal (counterfactuality).
Introducing the avertive

- Kuteva et al. (2019):
  Avertive belongs to a broader domain of “non-realisation” including such meanings as *apprehensional, frustrated initiation, frustrated completion*, and *incosequential*. 
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• Kuteva et al (2019: 852):
  – *apprehensional*: non-realisation of an undesirable situation;
  – *frustrated initiation*: non-realisation of initial stage of past situation;
  – *frustrated completion*: non-realisation of the final stage of past situation;
  – *inconsequential*: non-realisation of expected result of past situation.
Introducing the avertive

• Kuteva et al (2019: 852):
  – *avertive*: non-realisation of once imminent past situation *viewed as a whole*. 
Introducing the avertive

• Avertive vs. frustrated initiation:
  – seem to imply each other:
    • non-realisation of the initial phase > non-realisation of the event;
    • non-realisation of the complete event > non-realisation of the initial phase
Introducing the avertive

• Avertive vs. frustrated initiation:
  – seem to imply each other:
    • non-realisation of the initial phase > non-realisation of the event;
    • non-realisation of the complete event > non-realisation of the initial phase
  – seem to primarily differ in event types they apply to:
    • avertive ~ punctual events without internal phases;
    • frustrated initiation ~ durative events
Introducing the avertive

• For my purposes, the distinction between “avertive proper” and “frustrated initiation” does not appear relevant, and so I will speak of the avertive as combining with both punctual and durative events and expressing their imminence and non-occurrence.
Introducing the avertive

- Kabardian, Kuban dialect (own fieldwork data):

(1) zurjet tje-xʷe pe-t-a
Zurjet PVB-fall PVB-stand-PST
‘Zurjet almost fell.’ (punctual, avertive)

ERG - ergative
OBL - oblique case
PST - past tense
PVB - preverb
Introducing the avertive

- Kabardian, Kuban dialect (own fieldwork data):

  1. zurjet tje-xʷe pe-t-a
     Zurjet PVB-fall PVB-stand-PST
     ‘Zurjet almost fell.’ (punctual, avertive)

  2. zurjet haž’əbe-kʷeda-m haləbʷ x-jə-șə-č’ pe-t-a
     Zurjet flour-rotten-OBL bread PVB-3SG.ERG-make-out PVB-stand-PST
     ‘Zurjet almost started making bread from rotten flour.’ (durative, frustrated initiation)
Avertive vs. proximative

  - avertive should be distinguished from proximative.
Avertive vs. proximative

  – avertive should be distinguished from proximative.

• Heine (1994: 36):
  – proximative expresses “a temporal phase located close to the initial boundary of the situation described by the main verb”, i.e. mere imminence of a situation.
Avertive vs. proximative

- Kuteva et al. (2019: 860):
  - the semantics of the avertive subsumes the semantics of the proximative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>avertive</th>
<th>proximative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>imminence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counterfactuality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avertive vs. proximative

• Koasati (Muskogean, Louisiana, USA)

(3) ca-támm-á:pi-t avertive
1SG.P-fall-AVR-PST
‘I almost fell.’ (Kimball 1991: 196)
Avertive vs. proximative

- Koasati (Muskogean, Louisiana, USA)

(3) \textit{ca-támm-á:pi-t} avertive
\begin{align*}
&1\text{SG.P-fall-AVR-PST} \\
&‘I \textbf{almost fell.’} \quad \text{(Kimball 1991: 196)}
\end{align*}

(4) \textit{falank-á:hi-má:m} proximative
\begin{align*}
&\text{awaken(SG)-INTENT-DUBIT} \\
&‘\textbf{He is ready to awaken.’} \quad \text{(Kimball 1991: 183)}
\end{align*}

AVR - avertive \quad P - patient
DUBIT - dubitative \quad PST - past tense
INTENT - intentional \quad SG - singular
Avertive vs. proximative

• Proximative is not restricted to the past: Gyeli (Bantu A.80, Cameroun; Grimm 2015: 317):

(5)  mè  múà  wè  nà  nzà
    1SG  PROX  die  COM  hunger

‘I’m about to die from hunger.’

COM - comitative
PROX - proximative
SG - singular
Avertive vs. proximative

• Proximative does not imply non-realisation of the event:

   English (BNC)

   (6) I looked at the paper, and realised that a new comedy show was about to start on Channel 4.
Avertive vs. proximative

• However, in past tense contexts proximatives often give rise to an avertive interpretation implying that the event did not occur:

• English (BNC):

(7) *For a whole month my parents were convinced I was about to die.*

[the author obviously did not die]
Grammaticalisation of avertives

• Kuteva (1998: 138-145) identifies the following grammaticalisation path leading to avertive, which she calls “the Past Volition chain”:

I
PAST
VOLITION /
INTENTION
(Kuteva 1998: 142)
Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Kuteva (1998: 138-145) identifies the following grammaticalisation path leading to avertive, which she calls “the Past Volition chain”:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{I} & \text{II} \\
\text{PAST} & \text{COUNTERFACTUAL} \\
\text{VOLITION} / & > \text{and/or} \\
\text{INTENTION} & \text{HYPOTHETICAL}
\end{array}
\]

(Kuteva 1998: 142)
Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Kuteva (1998: 138-145) identifies the following grammaticalisation path leading to avertive, which she calls "the Past Volition chain":

I  II  III
PAST  COUNTERFACTUAL
VOLITION /  >  and/or  >  AVERTIVE
INTENTION  HYPOTHETICAL

(Kuteva 1998: 142)
Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Bulgarian (Maslov 1981: 260)

(8) štjax da padna

AUX.PST.1SG SBJ.PTCL fall.PRS.1SG

‘I almost fell.’

AUX - auxiliary      SBJ.PTCL - subjunctive particle
PRS - present tense      SG - singular
PST - past tense
Grammaticalisation of avertives

• The Modern Bulgarian avertive construction štjax da V goes back to the construction with the verb xotěti ‘want’ with the infinitive whose primary meaning in Old Bulgarian (Old Church Slavonic) was volition and intention (see, however, Kozlov 2014 and the Appendix).
Grammaticalisation of avertives

• In fact, the Modern Bulgarian construction has all three main meanings distinguished by Kuteva:
  – past volition (9);
  – counterfactual (10);
  – avertive (8).
Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Bulgarian (Kuteva 1998: 144): past volition

(9) \( T\!a \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{šteše} \quad \text{da} \)

\begin{align*}
\text{she} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{want.IPF.3SG} & \quad \text{SBJ.PTCL} \\
\text{izleze} & \quad s & \quad \text{nego} & \\
\text{go.out.PRS.3SG} & \quad \text{with} & \quad \text{him} & \\
\end{align*}

‘She \textbf{did not want} to go out with him.’

IPF - past imperfective  SBJ.PCTRL - subjunctive particle
NEG - negation  SG - singular
PRS - present
Grammaticalisation of avertives

• Bulgarian (Kuteva 1998: 144): counterfactual

(10) Šteše da se izplašiš.
want.IPF.2SG SBJ.PTCL REFL
frighten.PRS.2SG
‘You would have been frightened.’
Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Semantic changes along the Past Volition chain (Kuteva 1998: 139):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Type of event schema</th>
<th>Contextual attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Past Volition/Intention</td>
<td>Person X wanted to do Y</td>
<td>Y refers to a dynamic situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Counterfactual</td>
<td>X was going to undergo Y but Y does not take place</td>
<td>Y is a potential but unrealised event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Avertive</td>
<td>X was about to undergo Y but Y does not take place</td>
<td>X was close to entering situation Y but Y does not take place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Grammaticalisation of avertives

- Semantic changes along the Past Volition chain (Kuteva 1998: 139):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Type of event schema</th>
<th>Contextual attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Past Volition/Intention</td>
<td>Person X wanted to do Y</td>
<td>Y refers to a dynamic situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Counterfactual</td>
<td>X was going to undergo Y but Y does not take place</td>
<td>Y is a potential but unrealised event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Avertive</td>
<td>X was about to undergo Y but Y does not take place</td>
<td>X was close to entering situation Y but Y does not take place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From avertive to proximative?

• Kuteva (1998: 145-148) suggests that avertive may further develop into proximative by semantic bleaching, losing the meaning components of pastness and counterfactuality.
From avertive to proximative?

• Kuteva (1998: 46):

  Avertive
  imminence
  pastness
  counterfactuality
From avertive to proximative?


  \[
  \begin{array}{ll}
  \text{Avertive} & \text{Proximative} \\
  \text{imminence} & \text{imminence} \\
  \text{pastness} & \emptyset \\
  \text{counterfactuality} & \emptyset \\
  \end{array}
  \]
From avertive to proximative?

- Direct empirical evidence for the development from avertive to proximative as outlined by Kuteva is rather scarce.
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From avertive to proximative?

- Direct empirical evidence for the development from avertive to proximative as outlined by Kuteva is rather scarce.
- The Modern Bulgarian štjax da V construction admittedly has some proximative uses like (11).
- However, their exact chronological relation to the avertive use is unclear (see Kozlov 2014).
From avertive to proximative?

• Modern Bulgarian (Kuteva 1998: 147):
  proximative

(11) *Kogato Milena šteše da ulovi druga ulica, tja vidja...*

*when Milena want.IPF.3SG SBJ.PTCL catch.PRS.3SG other street she see.AOR.3SG*

‘When Milena was just *about to turn* into another street, she saw...’

NB from Kuteva’s exposition it remains unclear whether the event of turning to another street actually took place or not.
From avertive to proximative?

• In this talk I shall argue that avertive and proximative can be linked in the way opposite to Kuteva’s hypothesis:
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• In this talk I shall argue that avertive and proximative can be linked in the way opposite to Kuteva’s hypothesis:
  – avertive can develop from past proximative via conventionalisation of the counterfactual implicature;
From avertive to proximative?

• In this talk I shall argue that avertive and proximative can be linked in the way opposite to Kuteva’s hypothesis:
  – avertive can develop from past proximative via conventionalisation of the counterfactual implicature;
Introducing the Lithuanian avertive

• Auxiliary ‘be’ in the past tense
  – agrees with the subject in person and number

• Present active participle of the lexical verb with the continuative prefix be-
  – agrees with the subject in gender and number (and nominative case)
Introducing the Lithuanian avertive

(12) *Buv-au  be-nu-krent-a-nt-i*

be-PST.1SG  CNT-PVB-fall-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F

‘I almost fell.’

CNT - continuative  PRS - present tense
F - feminine  PST - past tense
NOM - nominative  PVB - preverb
PA - active participle  SG - singular
Introducing the Lithuanian avertive

(12) \textit{Buv-au} \textit{be-nu-krent-a-nt-i}

\textit{be-PST.1SG CNT-PVB-fall-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F}

‘I almost fell.’

CNT - continuative \hspace{1cm} PRS - present tense
F - feminine \hspace{1cm} PST - past tense
NOM - nominative \hspace{1cm} PVB - preverb
PA - active participle \hspace{1cm} SG - singular
Introducing the Lithuanian avertive

• The so-called “inceptive” or “continuative” “compound tense” of traditional grammar (Sližienė 1961, 1995; Ambrazas ed. 2006: 250-251, 321-323).

• In my previous work (Arkadiev 2011), I argued that the construction is an instance of avertive. In fact, this was not entirely correct (Alexandrova 2016, Arkadiev 2019).
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• In my previous work (Arkadiev 2011), I argued that the construction is an instance of avertive.
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• The so-called “inceptive” or “continuative” “compound tense” of traditional grammar (Sližienė 1961, 1995; Ambrazas ed. 2006: 250-251, 321-323).

• In my previous work (Arkadiev 2011), I argued that the construction is an instance of avertive.

• In fact, this was not entirely correct (Alexandrova 2016, Arkadiev 2019).
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• The construction has the following meanings:
  – avertive (incl. frustrated initiation) (12), (13);
  – frustrated completion (14);
  – past proximative (15);
  – past progressive (16).
Semantics

- Frustrated initiation (LtTenTen14):

\[(13) \quad Jau \quad \textit{buv-o-me be-pa-tik-į},\]
\[
\quad \text{already be-PST-1PL} \quad \text{CNT-PVB-believe-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M}
\]
\[
\quad \textit{kad daugiau neturėsim tokių vyriausybių...}\
\]
‘We already \textbf{started believing} that we would no longer have such governments...’
Semantics

• Frustrated completion (LtTenTen14):

(14) *Jau* **buv-o** **be-lip-ąs**

already be-PST.3 CNT-climb-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M

*ant žemės, bet užkliuvo už akmens ir pliumptelėjo į ledinį vandenį.*

‘He **was** already **climbing** ashore, but stumbled over a stone and plopped back into ice-cold water.’

CNT - continuative  PA - active participle  SG - singular
M - masculine  PRS - present tense
NOM - nominative  PST - past tense
Semantics

- Past proximative (LtTenTen14):

(15) *Jis įsimylėjo merginą, kur-į buv-o be-iš-vyk-sta-nt-i į Ameriką, vedė ir išvažiavo.*

‘He fell in love with a girl who **was about to leave** for America, married her and left [with her for America].’

- CNT - continuative
- PRS - present tense
- F - feminine
- PST - past tense
- NOM - nominative
- PVB - preverb
- PA - active participle
- SG - singular
Semantics

- Past progressive (LtTenTen14):

(16)  O saulė jau

\[ \text{buv-o be-kyl-a-nt-i...} \]

be-PST.3 CNT-rise-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F

‘And the sun was already rising...’

CNT - continuative
F - feminine
NOM - nominative
PA - active participle

PRS - present tense
PST - past tense
SG - singular
Semantics

• The interpretation of the construction is partly determined by the type of the event described by the predicate and partly depends on broader context.
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• The meaning of *frustrated completion* is mainly attested with durative telic (accomplishment) predicates.
Semantics

• The meaning of *frustrated completion* is mainly attested with durative telic (accomplishment) predicates.

• The *avertive* meaning, by contrast, favours punctual and atelic (stative and activity) predicates.
Semantics

• The meaning of *frustrated completion* is mainly attested with durative telic (accomplishment) predicates.

• The *avertive* meaning, by contrast, favours punctual and atelic (stative and activity) predicates.
  – However, the distribution is not categorical, some verbs being compatible with both meanings (Arkadiev 2019: 91-92).
Role of context

• The choice between the counterfactual and the non-counterfactual (proximative and progressive) interpretations largely depends on the context.
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Role of context

• The counterfactual reading of the construction is more often than not triggered by explicit contextual cues:
  – concessive/adversative clauses (17);
  – temporal clauses expressing events interrupting the situation (18);
  – occurrence in a temporal clause describing background to an interrupting event (19).
Role of context

• Concessive clause (LtTenTen14):

(17) \( J-i \quad buv-o \quad be-atsigau-na-nt-i, \)
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{she-NOM} & \quad \text{be-PST.3} & \quad \text{CNT-recover-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F} \\
\text{tačiau,} & \quad \text{su-žinoj-us-i} & \\
\text{however} & \quad \text{PVB-know-PST.PA-NOM.SG.F} \\
\end{align*} \]
\[ \text{apie galutinį sukilimo pralaimėjimą, atkrito ir mirė.} \]

‘She was recovering, however when she learned about the final defeat of the uprising, she relapsed and died.’
Role of context

• Interruption by a temporal clause (LtTenTen14):

(18) jau buv-o be-baigi-ąs
already be-PST.3 CNT-finish-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
neakivaizdin-ę pedagogin-ę mokykl-ą,
extramural-ACC.SG.F pedagogical-ACC.SG.F school-ACC.SG
kai gav-o šaukim-ą
when get-PST.3 call-ACC.SG
per dvi dienas išvažiuoti.

‘He was already finishing a correspondence pedagogical school when he got a call to leave in two days.’
Role of context

• Interruption by a main clause (LtTenTen14):

(19)  Kai  jau  buv-o  be-kiš-ąs  
   when  already  be-PST.3  CNT-poke-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M
   laišką i voką,

   kažk-as  pa-beld-ė  į  dur-is...  
   someone-NOM  PVB-knock-PST.3  in  door-ACC.PL

‘When he was already putting the letter into an envelope, someone knocked at the door...’
Role of context

• In the absence of contextual cues unequivocally signalling that the situation did not occur, the construction can be interpreted as non-counterfactual.
Role of context

• In the absence of contextual cues unequivocally signalling that the situation did not occur, the construction can be interpreted as non-counterfactual.

• “Minimal pairs” with the same lexical verb are frequently found, see (20) vs. (21).
Role of context

• Avertive (LtTenTen14):

(20) *Parduotuvės savininkas jau*

\[\text{buv-o be-duod-ąs}\]

\[\text{be-PST.3 CNT-give-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M}\]

\[\text{jam grąžos, kai staiga pastebėjo...}\]

‘The shop owner was already going to give him change when he suddenly noticed [that something was wrong with the banknotes].’
Role of context

• Progressive (LtTenTen14):

(21) Mane surado žemesniajame aukšte, kur aš *jau* *buv-au* *be-duod-a-nt-i*

> already be-PST.1SG CNT-give-PRS-PA-NOM.SG.F

interviu vietinės televizijos žinioms...

‘They found me on the ground floor, where I was already *giving* an interview to the local TV news...’
Avertive by implicature?

• All this suggests that the avertive interpretation of the Lithuanian construction arises via a counterfactual implicature rather than is part of the encoded meaning.
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• Past proximatives naturally give rise to counterfactual implicatures (see Ziegeler 2000):

(22) a. *I was about to fall.*
    b. *I fell.*
Avertive by implicature?

• Past proximatives naturally give rise to counterfactual implicatures (see Ziegeler 2000):

  (22) a.  *I was about to fall.*
  
  b.  *I fell.*

• Hearing (22a) instead of (22b), the addressee infers that (22b) is not true, since otherwise the speaker would have used the stronger statement.
Avertive by implicature?

• The counterfactual implicature associated with the Lithuanian construction is on the way to conventionalisation:
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Avertive by implicature?

• The counterfactual implicature associated with the Lithuanian construction is on the way to conventionalisation:
  – when elicited in isolation, the construction is interpreted as avertive by default (Arkadiev 2011);
Avertive by implicature?

• The counterfactual implicature associated with the Lithuanian construction is on the way to conventionalisation:
  – when elicited in isolation, the construction is interpreted as avertive by default (Arkadiev 2011);
  – the avertive accounts for ca. 75% of the corpus examples of the construction, while the proximative is clearly marginal with less than 5% (Arkadiev 2019).
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• In Old Lithuanian the construction was primarily used as progressive and mainly occurred with stative (23) and activity (24) verbs.
Progressive > proximative > avertive

- Old Lithuanian (Wolfenbüttel Postil, 1573, 42r:12):

(23) *Bua* tew-as *ir* matin-a *ia*

be.PST.3 father-NOM.SG and mother-NOM.SG he.GEN

*be-fsi-fteb-i*

CNT-REFL-look-PRS.PA.NOM.PL.M on this.GEN

ant ta.

‘His father and mother were looking on this.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>REFL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>continuative</td>
<td>active participle</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>present tense</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progressive > proximative > avertive

- Old Lithuanian (Bretke’s Bible, 1590, 1Chr 21:20):

(24) Nefa Arnan buw-a
    because Ornan(NOM.SG) be-PST.3
    be-kull-ens Kwiezi-us.
    CNT-thresh-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M wheat-ACC.PL

‘Now Ornan was threshing wheat.’
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• The construction was not restricted to the past tense and could be used with a present tense auxiliary (25).
Progressive > proximative > avertive

- Old Lithuanian (Bretke’s Sacred songs, 1589, 81:6):

\[(25) \quad \text{Iog} \quad \text{eft} \quad \text{be-gul-is}\]

\[\text{that} \quad \text{be.PRS.3} \quad \text{CNT-lie-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M}\]

\[\text{edzi-ofu} \quad \text{Kudik-is}\]

\[\text{crib-LOC.PL} \quad \text{child-NOM.SG}\]

‘That the Child is lying in the crib.’
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• The first uses of the construction with the semantics of imminence are attested in the 17th century:
  – in (26) it is plain proximative;
  – (27) is already an avertive, since the context clearly implies that the imminent situation was not realised.
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• Old Lithuanian (Chylinski’s Bible, 1660, Gen 40:10):

(26) Ó and ano wina medies buwo tris ṣzakos,

ó buw-o kaypo be-fprog-qs.

And be-PST.3 as CNT-burst-PRS.PA.NOM.SG.M

‘And in the vine were three branches; it was as though it budded.’

CNT - continuative  PA - active participle  SG - singular
M - masculine  PRS - present tense
NOM - nominative  PST - past tense
Progressive > proximative > avertive

- Old Lithuanian (Klein’s *New Books of Songs*, 1666, 248:14):

(27) **Pékl-on'**  **buw-au**  **be-grimšt-qs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL - allative</th>
<th>PA - active participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNT - continuative</td>
<td>PRS - present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - masculine</td>
<td>PST - past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM - nominative</td>
<td>SG - singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I nearly fell into Hell [but God saved me].’
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• Unfortunately, since there is no comprehensive and searchable corpus of Old Lithuanian texts, tracing the semantic development of the construction is very hard, given its low textual frequency.
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- Unfortunately, since there is no comprehensive and searchable corpus of Old Lithuanian texts, tracing the semantic development of the construction is very hard, given its low textual frequency.
- E.g. I could not find a single token of the construction in the available texts from the 18th century.
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• The development of proximative uses by a progressive construction is quite expected, especially in the context of punctual (achievement) predicates with which progressives naturally denote preliminary stages of the event (Smith 1997: 76-77; Johanson 2000: 153-154; Vafaeian 2018: 109-113).
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• The development of proximative uses by a progressive construction is quite expected, especially in the context of punctual (achievement) predicates with which progressives naturally denote preliminary stages of the event (Smith 1997: 76-77; Johanson 2000: 153-154; Vafaeian 2018: 109-113).

• The rise of the avertive interpretation in past contexts is pragmatically conditioned and comes “for free”.
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• Persian (Vafaeian 2018: 104): progressive

(28)  \textit{dār-e} \hspace{1cm} \textit{mi-r-e}

have.PRS-3SG \hspace{1cm} IPFV-go.PRS-3SG

\textit{be} \hspace{1cm} \textit{samt=e} \hspace{1cm} \textit{daryā}

to \hspace{1cm} direction=EZ \hspace{1cm} sea

‘She \textit{is walking} towards the sea.’

EZ - ezafe \hspace{1cm} PRS - present tense
IPFV - imperfective \hspace{1cm} SG - singular
Progressive > proximative > avertive

- Persian (Vafaeian 2018: 110): proximative

(29) ġatār dār-e  mi-r-e
    train   have.PRS-3SG   IPFV-leave.PRS-3SG

    ‘The train is about to leave.’
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• Persian (Vafaeian 2018: 110): proximative

(29) ğiţâr dār-e  mi-r-e
      train  have.PRS-3SG IPFV-leave.PRS-3SG
     ‘The train is about to leave.’

• avertive in the past tense (Vafaeian 2018: 111)

(30)  dâşt-am  siāh  mi-šod-am
      have.PST-1SG black  IPFV-become.PST-1SG
     ‘I was about to get burned [but I didn’t]’
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• I propose the following tentative scenario of the development of the Lithuanian construction ‘was’ + be-Present Active Participle:
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- I propose the following tentative scenario of the development of the Lithuanian construction ‘was’ + *be-Present Active Participle*:
  - restriction to the past tense due to low frequency and competition with simple present;
  - development of the (past) proximative meaning in the context of punctual and telic verbs;
  - conservation of the past progressive uses in limited contexts due to competition with simple past;
  - spread of avertive uses due to pragmatic naturalness and conventionalisation of implicature.
Progressive > proximative > avertive

• The grammaticalisation scenario just outlined involves “semantic enrichment” rather than “semantic bleaching.”
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• Note also that the Lithuanian construction underwent a reduction, rather than expansion, of its paradigmatic freedom in the domain of tense.
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- The grammaticalisation scenario just outlined involves “semantic enrichment” rather than “semantic bleaching”.
- Note also that the Lithuanian construction underwent a reduction, rather than expansion, of its paradigmatic freedom in the domain of tense.
- Cf. the “loss and gain” model of grammaticalisation (e.g. Brems 2011).
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• Stage I (progressive): intraterminality
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- Stage I (progressive): intraterminality
- Stage II (proximative): imminence
- Stage III (past proximative): imminence + pastness
- Stage IV (avertive): imminence + pastness + counterfactuality
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Conclusions

• The construction ‘was’ + *be-Present Active Participle* in Lithuanian shows a path of development of the avertive which is simultaneously expected and non-trivial:
  – from an incipient progressive to past proximative via lexical extension (durative verbs > punctual verbs) and grammatical narrowing (all tenses > past tense);
  – from past proximative to avertive via conventionalisation of the counterfactual implicature;
  – involves gain, rather than loss, of semantic content.
Appendix

• Back to the history of the Bulgarian avertive construction.

• Kozlov (2014): in Old Church Slavonic (OCS) the xotĕti + infinitive construction had the following meanings:
  – volition and intention with agentive animate subjects (31);
  – proximative with inanimate as well as animate subjects (32);
  – predestinative (33);
  – counterfactual (34).
Appendix

• OCS (Codex Marianus, Lk 18:13, Kozlov 2014: 129):
  volition

(30) *myтарь iz deleče stoję*
  
  *ne xotěaše ni očiju*
  
  NEG want(IPF.3SG) even eye(GEN.DU)

  *възвести na nebo*
  
  lift.up(INF) on sky(ACC.SG)

‘And the publican, standing afar off, *would* not so much as lift up his eyes unto heaven.’

ACC - accusative
IPF - past imperfective
DU - dual
NEG - negation
GEN - genitive
SG - singular
INF - infinitive
Appendix

• OCS (Codex Marianus, Mk 4:37, Kozlov 2014: 130): proximative

(31) \(\text{vlъny \grave{\varepsilon}e vəlīvaxǫ \text{ sę və ladijо ěko }}\)
\(\text{juže \quad pogręznǫtį \ xotěaše}\)
already sink.INF want.IPF.3SG

‘And the waves beat into the ship, so that it was now full [lit. \text{was about to sink}].’
Appendix


(32) čko xotěaše is[jus]
that want(IPF.3SG Jesus.NOM.SG
umrěti za ljudi
die.INF for people.ACC.PL

‘[he prophesied] that Jesus should die for that nation’

ACC - accusative     IPF - past imperfective     PL - plural
INF - infinitive       NOM - nominative       SG - singular
Appendix

- OCS (Codex Suprasliensis 442:17-18, Kozlov 2014: 133): counterfactual

(33) ašti bo ne vъstalъ to ni

ta   xotěaxǫ    imъ
that.NOM.PL.N  want.IPF.3PL  they.DAT

věrъna   byti
true.NOM.PL.N  be.INF

‘If He [Christ] had not arisen, then those [promises] would have turned out untrue as well.’
Appendix

• Kozlov (2014: 140) criticises Kuteva’s (1998) diachronic scenario and proposes the following paths of development of the xotěti + Infinitive:
  (i) volition > intention > proximative
  (ii) past proximative > avertive > counterfactual

• Kozlov (2014: 141): the transition from past proximative to avertive is due to conventionalisation of implicature.
Appendix

• If Kozlov’s (2014: 140-141) empirically firmly grounded conclusions are correct, then Bulgarian exemplifies the same mechanism of development of avertive out of past proximative as I have argued for on the basis of Lithuanian.

• NB different grammaticalisation paths converge.
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