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The apprehensional domain

• 2 key features: high probability & undesirability
• 4 functions to encode an apprehension-causing situation / entity
  (Lichtenberk 1995; Vuillermet 2018)

Table 1. Four functions identified for the apprehensional domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>English equivalent</th>
<th>Marrithiyel Green 1989</th>
<th>Toqabaqita Lichtenberk 1995</th>
<th>Ese Eja Vuillermet 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive (APPR.-EPISTEMICS)</td>
<td>(I am afraid) he might fall</td>
<td>fang</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>-chana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautioning</td>
<td>He grabbed him lest he fall</td>
<td>fang</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>e-V kwanijje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear complementation</td>
<td>He was afraid, lest he fall</td>
<td></td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>non.finite V=Loc mistaken belief contrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timitive</td>
<td>He ran away for fear of her</td>
<td>fang</td>
<td></td>
<td>=yajjajo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ese Ejja (Pano-Takanan, Bolivia; Vuillermet 2018)

(1) **APPREHENSIVE**

*Kekwa-ka-chana* miya!
pierce-3A-APPR 2SG.ABS
‘Watch out (this bee) might sting you!’

(2) **PRECAUTIONING**

*E-’bakwa kawi-mee-ka-ani jjanijji=jo*
NPF-child sleep-CAUS-3A-PRS mosquito_net=LOC

['di=a o=e-kekwa-ka pwanijje].
mosquito=ERG 3ABS-PREC-pierce-3A PREC
‘She has her child sleep under a mosquito net lest mosquitoes sting him.’ [NTM MS]
Toqabaqita (Austronesian, Solomon Islands; Lichtenberk 1995)

(3) **APPREHENSIVE**

Ada wane ka 'arungi kulu.

‘(I fear) that the man might see me.’

(4) **PRECAUTIONING**

Nau ku agwa 'i buira fau

I IFACT hide at behind rock

ada wane ka 'arungi kulu.

‘I hid behind a rock so that lest the man see me.’
Marrithiyel (Western Daly, Australia; Green 1989:80; 170)

(5) **APPREHENSIVE**

\[\text{gu-n-ning-pirr-Ø-fang}\]

3s.real-go-1sgo.nsg.nirr.s-leave-3pl-APPR

‘(I’m afraid) they might leave me.’

(6) **PRECAUTIONING:**

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tharr} & \text{guwa-mirrmirr} & \text{garri} & \text{mitik-a} / \\
\text{thing} & 3\text{sg}.\text{subj.real.stand-thunder} & 3\text{sg}.\text{subj.nfem.rri} & \text{extinguish-pst} \\
\text{watjan} & \text{ambi} & \text{gu-iwinj-sjang-Ø-fang} & \\
\text{dog} & \text{neg} & 3\text{nsg}.\text{subj.real-3nsg.hear-3pl-APPR} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He turned off the “thundering thing” (the generator), lest they not hear the dogs.’
Apprehensives & preemptive actions

Ese Ejja (Vuillermet 2018)

(7) \textit{Piajja=koma! Shiwi-’io-\textit{chana}=mi! Jama=owe}
\textbf{bad=DISC} \quad \textbf{slim-TEL-APPR=2ABS}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{a-kwe} \quad \textbf{’ba’a!}
  \item \textbf{do-IMP} \quad \textbf{SEE}
\end{itemize}
‘But this is unhealthy! Watch out you’ll slim down! Look, do it that way!’

(8) \textit{A’a María wowi-jji, poki-\textit{chana}!}
\textbf{PROH} \quad \textbf{M.} \quad \textbf{tell-PROH} \quad \textbf{go-APPR}
\begin{itemize}
  \item ‘don’t tell her, (beware of that) she may come along!’ [volunt]
Lichtenberk’s (1995) account

• Apprehensional-epistemics as a mixed-modality marker (p.295)

• the Precautioning function “connect[s] a clause encoding an apprehension-causing situation to a preceding clause encoding a [preemptive] situation” (p. 298)

→ Nature of the link?
Apprehensives & preemptive actions

(7) Piajja=koma! Shiwi-’io-chana=mi! Jama=owe
    bad=DISC slim-TEL-APPR=2ABS this.way=DISC
    a-kwe ’ba’a!
do-IMP SEE

‘But this is unhealthy! Watch out you’ll slim down! Look, do it that way!’

(8) A’a María wowi-jji, poki-chana!
PROH M. tell-PROH go-APPR

‘don’t tell her, (beware of that) she may come along!’ [volunt]
Very strong pragmatic link


Figure 1. Adapted from François’ (2003:307) “carré logique de l’Evitatif”

- You tell Maria
- You don’t tell her
- Maria comes
- Maria does not come
Wardaman (Yangmanic)

Merlan (2003:102)

“Evitative (...) is usually preceded by a clause expressing what ought to be done to avoid those results: ‘do X, lest Y (evitative’). But the evitative is also used more broadly, that is, not preceded by a clause saying what ought to be done; so that, by itself, the evitative simply expresses some possible events which is deemed undesirable.”
Wardaman (Merlan 1994:295)

(9) Precautioning (dependent) use

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yirrb-a} & \quad \text{me} & \quad \text{yiwarln} & \quad \text{wiya-warang} & \quad \text{wu-boban} \\
\text{remove-PS} & \quad \text{AUX} & \quad \text{clothes-ABS} & \quad \text{water-having-ABS} & \quad \text{WU-dry-ABS} \\
\text{guwe} & \quad \text{yi-ni-ngegbi} & \quad \text{bujun} & \quad \text{warlad} \\
\text{don} & \quad \text{IRR-2SG-AUX} & \quad \text{lest} & \quad \text{sick}
\end{align*}
\]

'Take off your clothes, they're wet, put on dry ones, \textit{lest} you \textit{get} sick'.

(10) Apprehensive (independent) use

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bujun} & \quad \text{nunu-jologbi} & \quad \text{lagla-ya} & \quad \text{warlgin-(n)ya} \\
\text{lest} & \quad \text{IRR2NSG-urinate.FUT} & \quad \text{camp-LOC} & \quad \text{bed-LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

'You \textit{might} pee in your bed!'
Austin (1981:232; my emphasis):

“There are a number of examples (...) where a verb is inflected for ‘lest’ and yet there appears to be no main clause to which it is dependent. That is, -yathi appears to function as a main clause verb suffix. Nevertheless, in all the examples (...) it is clear from the context that an ‘understood’ imperative, warning or suggestion is implicit; the ‘lest’ clause simply expresses an unhappy or harmful consequence and the cause of it or precautions necessary to avoid it are clear and need not be expressed.”

• Other cues:
  • -yathi ‘lest’ being morphologically closer to the mood markers
  • only subordinate with no SR marking
Dyirbal (Pama-Nyungan)

• Dixon (1972): no mention of the independent use

• Verstraete (2006:201-202)
  • APPR similar to the other TAM in terms of verb marking
  • Almost all other languages in Verstraete’s sample have an independent use
    → a ‘dependent mood’
Marrithiyel: speaker vs. MC subject

- Green (1989:168), contrasting the independent and dependent uses
  - “In subordinate /fang/ the speaker simply reports the apprehension of the main clause subject without himself endorsing or otherwise commenting on the feeling.”
  - “In independent clauses, /fang/ expresses the speaker’s view that the event is undesirable.”
Marrithiyel (Western Daly, Australia; Green 1989:80; 170)

(11) **APPREHENSIVE:** *Speaker’s Fear*

\[\text{gu-n-ning-pirr-Ø-fang}\]

\[3\text{S-REAL-} \text{GO-1SGO.NSG.NIRR.S-LEAVE-3PL-APPRE}\]

*I’m afraid* they **might** leave me.

(12) **PRECAUTIONING:** *MC Subject’s Fear*

\[\text{tharr guwa-mirrmirr garri mitik-a /}\]

\[\text{thing 3SG.SUBJ.REAL.STAND-THUNDER 3SG.SUBJ.NFEM.RRI extinguish-PST}\]

\[\text{watjan amb } \text{gu-iwinj-sjang-Ø-fang}\]

\[\text{dog NEG 3NSG.SUBJ.REAL-3NSG-HEAR-3PL-APPRE}\]

*He turned off the the generator, lest they not hear the dogs.*
Intra-clausal markers and...

• If no relational markers, then how is the interclausal relation notified? (Verstraete 2006:217)
  • Pragmatic effect
  • Intonation
    “Turn off the generator $\text{APPRL}_{\text{SBD}}$ they might not hear the dogs!”
  $<$ “Turn off the generator! $\text{APPRL}_{\text{MC}}$ they might not hear the dogs!”
  ? He turned off the generator; “watch out they might not hear the dogs!”

• Strategies to repair for perspective mismatch: agent binding relator
  • “linguistic evidential” in Ngiyambaa (Pama-Nyungan; Donaldson 1980:285)
Reported speech construction in Matsés (Pano-Takanan)

(13) ́uesnid chimadēsh pe-en-quo ic-e-c
     curassow gizzard eat-Neg-Aug Aux-Npast-Indic
     [shēta nēn-mane que-shun]
     [tooth hurt-APPR say-after:S/A> A]

‘(Matses) do not eat curassow gizzards lest their tooth hurt.’

< Matses do not eat curassow gizzards, after saying: “I might tooth-hurt”

(Fleck 2003:439)

• Similar strategies reported in Tariana (Arawakan; Aikhenvald 2003:386;453ff.), in Mehweb (Nakh-Daghestanian; Dobrushina & Daniel 2018 SLE), in Thulung Rai (Lahaussois 2018 SWL), in Japhug (Jacques 2018 SWL)
Criteria suggestion

• An apprehensional marker displays a precautioning (*lest*) function
  1. if the judgement of the undesirable possibility of the apprehension causing-situation is bound to the subject of the main clause.

  ‘*He* turned off the generator, lest they not hear the dogs.’
  = judge of undesirable possibility

  2. if the main clause has a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subject and does not convey the speaker assessment.

  △ *I* turned off the generator
  △ *Turn* off the generator
  △ *He should* turn off the generator
  △ *Don’t* be loud

  lest they not hear the dogs.
Apprehensives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOUTH AMERICA (50 families)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIA (8 families)</th>
<th>TOTAL 121 lg, 58 families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPR</td>
<td>28 / 102</td>
<td>18 / 19</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREC</td>
<td>17 / 102</td>
<td>8 / 19</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Precautioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South America (50 families)</th>
<th>Australia (8 families)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPR</td>
<td>28 / 102</td>
<td>18 / 19</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREC</td>
<td>17 / 102</td>
<td>8 / 19</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

121 lg, 58 families
Preliminary observations

Table 2. Apprehensive & Precautioning marking in South America and Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH AMERICA (50 families)</th>
<th>AUSTRALIA (8 families)</th>
<th>TOTAL 121 lg, 58 families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPR 28 / 102</td>
<td>18 / 19</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREC 17 / 102</td>
<td>8 / 19</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=P 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A±P 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A≠P 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P only 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General conclusion

• Subtle differences between the APPREHENSIVE and PRECAUTIONING functions
  → no dedicated marker in (many?) languages
    △ intonation
    △ clause type of the preemptive clause

• Some unsolved issues
  • PREC > APPR... ongoing insubordination?
  • Restricted data available in grammars
    (but apprehensional questionnaire (Vuillermet 2017 ms!) online -- TULQUEST!
  • *Bambai*-like markers (Schultze-Berndt & Angelo 2018 SWL)
Thank you for your attention!


