

Vuillermet, Marine. 2017. *Questionnaire on the apprehensional domain*. Laboratoire Dynamique Du Langage, Lyon, ms.

!!! Work in progress !!!

Please do not cite without permission

& contact me if you are interested in using it

marine.vuillermet@cns.fr

Questionnaire on the apprehensional domain

The apprehensional domain (Vuillermet 2018) covers the grammatical morphemes expressing fear, i.e. “a judgement of undesirable possibility” (cf. Verstraete’s (2005) definition of the apprehensive mood marker). Apprehensional morphology has been little described so far (see however Green 1989; Lichtenberk 1995; François 2003:300–311; Angelo & Schultze-Berndt 2016; Vuillermet 2018), and the goal of this questionnaire is to help fieldworkers to investigate the semantic details of the morphemes attested in their language of study.

The introduction below overviews the existing typology based on the scarce litterature, presents the structure of the questionnaire, and gives guidelines to use the questionnaire in the most efficient way.

Introduction: the apprehensional domain & the questionnaire

The following questionnaire is a work in progress document that aims to take into account the fine-grained variation in the apprehensional morphology, as it is so far described in individual languages. According to **my current understanding of the domain**, I suggest that the apprehensional morphology subsumes three main functions (sometimes divided into subfunctions), plus a minor one (associated to a *lexeme* of fear).

- 1) The APPREHENSIVE, that is instantiated in some languages by a mood marker and that has no straightforward equivalent in English. It is best translated with the attention getter particle *watch out* (undesirability) and the auxiliary *might* (high possibility);
- 2) The PRECAUTIONING, that is instantiated in some languages by a subordinate marker or coordinator that links 1) a (main) clause that expresses a precaution taken (the ‘precautionary situation’ as coined by Lichtenberk (1995:298), aka the preemptive situation (Evans 1995)) to 2) a clause encoding an expected undesirable situation (the ‘apprehension-causing situation’ as coined by Lichtenberk (1995:298)). This function subdivides into the IN CASE and the AVERTIVE (sub)functions, and is best translated with the somewhat archaic subordinator *lest* (which subsumes the two (sub)functions) or *so that not* (only the AVERTIVE (sub)function);
- 3) The TIMITIVE, that is instantiated in some languages by an NP marker, and best translated with *for fear of*. It marks an entity that is feared and that triggered the situation encoded by the main verb.
- 4) The FEAR FUNCTION, that is instantiated in some languages by a complementizer that links the lexical expression of fear with the feared situation (cf. *I fear lest X happen*).

While Ese Eja (Takanan; Bolivia & Peru) displays one dedicated marker for the first three functions (Vuillermet 2018), other languages do not: Marrithiyel (Daly River; Australia) has a single morpheme for all three functions (Green 1989). Lichtenberk also suggests the following grammaticalization chain: precautioning > fear (complementation) > apprehensive ('apprehensional epistemics' in this terms). However, he acknowledges that too little data are available so far to support a strong claim, and that the fear function may not be a necessary step (Lichtenberk 1995: 320).

The questionnaire aims at investigating the variations so far observed crosslinguistically in all four functions, and it is structured accordingly: the four sections correspond to the four functions as listed above: the APPREHENSIVE, the PRECAUTIONING, the TIMITIVE, and the FEAR FUNCTION.

Each section further divides into subsections that question in turn the compatibility of different semantic classes with the apprehensional morphemes – e.g. the positively valenced lexemes that should still trigger a negatively valenced reading –, the influence of distinct grammatical persons, the possibility to negate the morpheme, etc. Given the very different nature of the four functions (e.g. scope over a situation vs. an entity), the subsections across sections diverge greatly.

The questionnaire consists of sentences in English, to be translated into the language of study by the researcher. The aim of each 'question' is briefly discussed and then illustrated with examples. The researcher might first look for similar examples in her/his corpus, and if no example are found, s/he should adapt the questions to the speaker and/or the situation. Ideally, the researcher should suggest the form in the vernacular language, and ask the speaker to:

- Give a context when the sentence could be uttered – contexts should be suggested if the speaker cannot find any;
- Translate it back into the working language.

Ideally again, the sentences should be checked with different speakers.

1. Apprehensive

1.1. Is the reading with positive verbs like 'smile, laugh, help, find a 100 dollar bill' necessarily negative?

Watch out he might smile (ex of context: while he should stay serious, e.g. at the mass or any other official event)

Watch out he might help (ex of context: but we all know he is so clumsy)

1.2. Is the reading with neutral verbs like 'walk, talk, sleep, come, cook' necessarily negative?

Watch out they might sleep (ex of context: you don't want to wake them up)

Watch out she might come (ex of context: the speakers don't like her)

Watch out she might cook (ex of context: she is a bad cooker)

1.3. Are [-agentive] verbs compatible with the apprehensive function? [The idea behind that question and the next one is that some languages seem to restrict the apprehensional morphology to situations where one can have a direct impact on the event: one cannot prevent to rain or to

thunder, one can only protect oneself in case of such an undesirable situation (= indirect control). Cf. Mwotlap (Austronesian; Vanuatu), where ‘watch out there will be an earthquake’ is not possible (pc A. François April 2015)]

1.3.1. impersonal verbs like ‘rain, snow, wind-blow, thunder, be.an.earthquake’

Watch out it might rain!

Watch out it might thunder!

1.3.2. [- agentive] verbs (!!! possible influence of the grammatical person, see next 1.4.)

Watch out you might fall asleep / fall / cough / vomit!

Watch out he might fall asleep / fall / cough / vomit!

1.4. Change in the illocutionary force: warning or threat equally available with 1st person?

1.4.1. what is the reading of [+agentive] verbs with 1st person? (necessarily threat?)

Watch out I might hit you!

Watch out I might follow you!

1.4.2. what is the reading of [-agentive] verbs with 1st person? (necessarily warning?)

Watch out I might fall (over you)

Watch out I might cough/sneeze (on you)

1.5. Are all the grammatical persons available? I.e. check for 1S/A/O, 2S/A/O, 3S/A/O. See Matsés (Fleck 2003) for highly constrained distribution.

1.6. Compatibility with negation?

Watch out he might not come! (although he said so)

Watch out it might not rain! (when the addressee wants the rain to water his plants)

Watch out the dog might not bark at the thieves! (and so not advise when there are thieves)

1.7. Is the apprehensive function also available in a question? If so, whose fear is it, that of the speaker or of the addressee?

Might he leave/laugh (and I don't want that)?

1.8. Temporality of the apprehension causing event:

1.8.1. Can the event have happened already (but one will never know if it really did or not)? Cf. the following example in Toqabaqita (Lichtenberk 1995), which can be translated in 3 ways, depending on the context:

be.sick+APPR = 1. 'you may have been sick'

2. 'you may be sick'

3. 'you may get sick'

1.8.2. Test the grammaticality with temporal adverbs like today / tomorrow / yesterday

1.8.3. Must the event be about to happen or can it happen some time in the future? In other words, are the apprehensive sentences necessarily uttered with respect to an imminent undesirable situation, or can they be also uttered with respect to less imminent situations? Cf. the apprehensive in Hup (Epps 2008) where it is possible to add a future tense marker.

1.9. If there is a dedicated negative optative in the language, how do the speakers explain the difference between the two forms? (→ expectation for the addressee to act vs no expectation?)

Watch out he might die! vs. *may he not die*

Watch out you might die vs. *may you not die*

1.10. Does the apprehensive marker necessarily attach to a verb or can it also attach to an NP? [primarily only depends on the morphosyntactic nature of the morpheme] (cf. in Urarina (Olawsky 2006)?)

Watch out you'll fall!

Watch out for the crocodile!

1.11. Can the apprehensive marker be used as an endophoric evidential? Cf. Jing-Schmidt & Kapatsinski (2012).

I fear you have to leave

I fear I don't understand (what you mean)

I fear I will never come back again.

1.12. Can the apprehensive marker be used as a politeness marker? Cf. In Standard and Boumaa Fijian, the "lest" morpheme has further developed into a neutral downtoner (politeness marker), where the "necessarily apprehensional connotation" is lost (Lichtenberk 1995: 318).

Ex given in Standard Fijian: *Perhaps we could work together*

in Boumaa Fijian: *'I feel that the motion should be changed (lit. I felt that the motion might possibly be changed)'* (Dixon 1988:270)

1.13. Apprehensive and evidentiality: if the language has grammatical evidentials, are they compatible with the apprehensive?

In Hup (Epps 2008:632), only OK with REPortative (no other evidential specifications).

2. Precautioning

2.1. Is the reading with positive verbs like ‘smile, laugh, help, find a 100 dollar bill’ necessarily negative?

She put her hand on his mouth lest he laugh (ex of context: they are hiding and making fun of someone)

They took him away lest he help (ex of context: he is so clumsy).

2.2. Is the reading with neutral verbs like ‘walk, talk, sleep, come, cook’ necessarily negative?:

I kept pinching him lest he fall asleep (ex of context: you don’t want him to sleep)

I hurried up to leave lest he come with us (ex of context: the speakers doesn’t like him)

2.3. Does the precautioning appear in indirect speech, or in direct speech only?

The man kept pinching her lest she fall asleep.

2.4. Are [-agentive] verbs compatible with the precautioning function? does the language distinguish between [-agentive] and [+agentive] verbs? [Lichtenberk (1995:298) distinguishes between the PREVENTIVE and the IN CASE subfunctions, and argues that Marthutunira does distinguish morphosyntactically between the two subfunctions.]

2.4.1. Impersonal verbs like ‘rain, snow, wind-blow, thunder, be.an.earthquake, EXISTENTIALS’

*Take your coat lest it rain (*take your coat so that it does not rain).*

[vs. *Take your coat lest you get wet (= so as not to get wet).*]

*Check your shoes (before you put them on) lest there be a scorpion inside. (*so that there will be no scorpion inside.)*

2.4.2. non agentive verbs like ‘fall, get ill, cough, sneeze’

He tied her shoes lest you fall.

He turned the light on lest he fall.

*Put your coat on lest you get ill (*take your coat so that it does not rain).*

2.5. Compatibility with negation?

Keep the door open, otherwise the children will not go out / ?lest the children should not go out.

They turned the radio off, lest they should not hear the thieves.

2.6. Is the apprehension-causing situation necessarily avoided?

They hid the bottle from him lest he finish it off, but he found it, and finished it off completely.

3. Timitive

3.1. Is the reading with a positive activity like ‘cook’ necessarily negative?

I cooked for fear of my husband/mother (ex of context: s/he will bit me if I have not cooked food for her/him.)

He went home for fear of his friend. (ex of context: the friend is drunk)

3.2. Is the reading with positive entities like ‘friend, mother, father, sibling’ necessarily negative (check the family background of the speaker first!)?

I ran away for fear of my mother (ex of context: they had been naughty)

He grabbed his stick for fear of his friend. (ex of context: he is drunk)

3.3. Is the reading with neutral entities like ‘teacher, pet’ necessarily negative? (!!check the personal experience of the speaker with the named entities first!)

I ran away for fear of my teacher (ex of context: the teacher has become mad.)

He grabbed his stick for fear of his own cat. (ex of context: the cat has become aggressive)

3.4 are [+/-control] verbs equally available with the ‘timitive’? [-> precautionary action vs. physiological reaction: the timitive may require avoidance like (apparently) in Marrithiyel or not (like in Ese Eja)]

3.4.1. [+agentive] verbs

He ran away for fear of the bees / to avoid the bees.

He hid for fear of the bear / to avoid the bear.

3.4.2. [-agentive] verbs

*He burst into tears for fear of the bees / *to avoid the bees.*

*He fainted / screamed for fear of the bear / *to avoid the bear.*

3.5. Possible entities (may also indicate if the timitive entails avoidance or not)

3.5.1. Are non-human entities OK?

He stayed in for fear of the rain / thunder/ snow / cold.

3.5.2. Are inanimate entities OK?

he crossed the bridge ?for fear of / to avoid the plants (e.g. nettle)

I went this way ?for fear of / to avoid the table / the excrements.

3.6. Is the timitive indifferently available in the past or present?

I will cook for fear of my husband/mother (ex of context: s/he will bit me if I have not cooked food for her/him.)

He will come back quickly for fear of the night.

3.7. Also available for disgust?

I went away for disgust of the vomit.

*I vomited *for fear/*disgust/because of the bad rice (→ only ‘negative causal marker’)*

3.8. Is the timitive available in direct speech only (with imperatives only) or in narratives too (with any main sentence type)?

?run away for fear of the crocodile (→ speaker’s fear)

he ran away for fear of the crocodile (→ agent’s fear)

for fear of what did you run away?

3.9. Does the timitive necessary attach to an NP or can it also attach to a verb?

He screamed for fear of falling.

He ran away for fear of being eaten / attacked / harmed.

3.10. Can the timitive stand on it own? (cf. in Manambu (Aikhenvald 2008:153–154))

be aware of the tiger / the excrements!

NB: is it comparable to **Gare au tigre!** In French? Note that this so called ‘interjection’ may have the danger as a complement, or the potential victim.

3.11. Does the timitive (always or occasionally) introduce the feared argument in the fear predicates? (Cf. the morpheme *-walitya* in Ganggalida described by Keen (Keen 1983:207–208); note however that I have not considered it as bona fide timitive for lack of convincing data).

He is afraid of/TIM dogs.

4. Fear-function

4.1. Is the reading with positive verbs like ‘smile, laugh, help, find a 100 dollar bill’ necessarily negative?

I fear lest he smile (ex of context: they is making fun of the speaker)

I fear lest he help (ex of context: he is so clumsy or so old and weak)

4.2. Are other main verbs available in complementation?

4.2.1. negatively valenced verbs like ‘forbid, impede’, (cf. Mwotlap (François 2003:305–306)) or ‘be shy’ (cf. Alyawarra (Yallop 1977:75; 112))

I forbid you to go there (~I forbid you LEST you go there)

He was shy lest they see him.

4.2.2. positively valenced verbs like ‘pay attention, make sure, check’

Be careful LEST he kill you

Make sure LEST there be a scorpion in your shoe.

4.3. Are all person available?

Acknowledgements:

Anetta Kopecka, Clément Voirin, Magdalena Lemus