

# Having come to be a copula in Sri Lanka Malay – an unusual grammaticalization path

Sebastian Nordhoff

April 14, 2010

## Abstract

Sri Lanka Malay has innovated a prominent and productive copula, which sets it apart from other descendents of colloquial Malay varieties. This copula has developed from the verb *dhaathang* ‘to come’, which is a grammaticalization path not attested in the literature so far. This paper describes the forms and functions of this copula and shows that it cannot be traced to any of the main input languages of Sri Lanka Malay (Trade Malay, Tamil, Sinhala). Comparing the Sri Lanka Malay case to attested grammaticalization paths, the paper concludes that the grammaticalization of COME to a copula is less surprising when assuming intermediate stages of ‘resultative’ and ‘stative’. These subpaths are illustrated by a variety of Creole and non-Creole languages.

## 1 Introduction

I would like to thank Eva van Lier and Benard Comrie for comments on earlier version of this paper. The usual disclaimers apply. Languages with copulas are widely known in Europe and beyond, but languages without a copula are also frequently encountered. If languages without a copula develop one over time, the source is normally either a former locational verb or a deictic (Stassen 1997:91). In this paper, I want to highlight yet another source for a copula, namely the participle of the verb COME, which has grammaticalized into a copula in Sri Lanka Malay.

I will first give some information on Sri Lanka Malay (Section 2) and the types of copula sentences we find in that language (Section 3). I will then show that neither other varieties of Malay nor the contact languages Sinhala and Tamil provide models for the development of this particular copula in Sri Lanka Malay

(Section 4). I then discuss common sources for the grammaticalization of copulas in Section 5 and common targets of grammaticalization for the verb COME in Section 6, showing that the particular combination COME→copula is not attested. However, three subpaths, namely COME→resultative, resultative→stative and stative→copula are attested, which, when chained, can explain the Sri Lanka Malay facts.

## 2 Sri Lanka Malay

Sri Lanka Malay is the language of the descendants of soldiers, exiles, convicts and slaves who were brought to the island by the colonial powers of the Dutch and the British between roughly 1650 and 1850 (Hussainmiya 1990). The grammar of the language has changed dramatically ever since (Adelaar 1991, Smith et al. 2004, Ansaldo 2008, Nordhoff 2009) and has shed most of its Austronesian origins to align with the Sri Lankan sprachbund (Bakker 2006), although some traces of Malay grammar still remain (Slomanson 2006). For instance, the language has changed from SVO to SOV and from prepositional to postpositional. The language has developed more than 20 new bound morphemes, mainly for the marking of TAM and case, which is virtually unheard of in other parts of the Malay world. Most of the changes the language has undergone since its arrival on the island 350 years ago were triggered by language contact. The copula, however, does not seem to have a clear origin in any contact language or any historical variety of Malay.

## 3 The copula in Sri Lanka Malay

The copula in Sri Lanka Malay is homophonous to the conjunctive participle of the verb *dhaathang* ‘come’. The Sri Lanka Malay verb can take a number of prefixes, one of them being the conjunctive participle. This form is used to indicate that the event depicted in the clause thus marked is prior to the event in the main clause. In this sense, it is similar to an English construction like *Having done X, having done Y, finally Z happened*. An illustration of this form is given in (1).

- (1) a. *Oorang pada asà-pìrrang*,  
 man PL CP-wage.war  
 ‘After having waged war’  
 b. *derang=nang asà-banthu*,  
 3PL=DAT CP-help  
 ‘and after having helped them’  
 c. *siini=jo su-ciiñgal*.  
 here=EMPH PAST-settle  
 ‘the people settled down right here.’ (K051222nar03)

Alternatives to the form with *asà-* shown in (1) are the form with *=apa* shown in (2) and the form with both *asà-* and *=apa*, shown in (3). These three forms seem to be functionally equivalent.

- (2) a. *Oorang pada thiikam=apa*  
 man PL=DAT shoot=CP  
 ‘People having been stabbed./People were stabbed and’  
 b. *oorang pada=nang theembak=apa*  
 man PL stab=CP  
 ‘people having been shot./people were shot and’  
 c. *se=dang bannyak creeveth pada su-aada*.  
 1S=DAT much trouble PL PAST-exist  
 ‘I had a lot of problems.’ (K051213nar01)
- (3) a. *Siithu asà-blaajar=apa*,  
 there CP-learn=after  
 ‘After having learned there,’  
 b. *thaaun nnamblas=ka se skuul asà-luppas=apa*,  
 year sixteen=LOC 1s school CP-leave=after  
 ‘after having left the school at 16,’  
 c. *pukuran asà-caari anà-pii*.  
 work CP-find PAST-go  
 ‘I looked for work and went (away).’ (K060108nar01)

The Sri Lanka Malay copula is built around the lexical verb *dhaathang* ‘come’ in its conjunctive participle form. All three forms mentioned above are possible for the copular use. The following three examples illustrate this.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Note that the word order in copula sentences is NP Cop NP, while in verbal sentences, it is

- (4) *Se=ppe naama asàdhaathang Cintha Sinthani.*  
 1s=POSS name COPULA Chintha Sinthani.  
 ‘My name is Chintha Sinthani.’ (B060115prs04)
- (5) *Se=ppe baapa dhaathangapa Jinaan Samath.*  
 1s=POSS father COPULA Jinaan Samath.  
 ‘My father was Jinaan Samath.’ (N060113nar03)
- (6) *Estate=pe field officer asàdhaathangapa kithang=pe kaake*  
 estate=POSS field officer COPULA 1PL=POSS grandfather.  
 ‘The estate field officer was our grandfather.’ (N060113nar03)

The three examples above illustrate the use of *(asà)dhaathang(apa)* as a copula. Any of the three forms mentioned could also be used as a conjunctive participle proper when combined with *dhaathang* ‘come’, as shown in the following three examples.

- (7) a. *Moonyeth pada=le asà-dhaathang*  
 monkey PL=ADDIT CP-COME  
 ‘The monkeys would go and’
- b. *creeveth athi-kaasi.*  
 trouble IRR-give  
 ‘cause (some other) trouble.’ (K070000wrt01)
- (8) a. *oorang mlaayu siithu=dering dhaathang=apa*  
 man malay there=ABL come=CP  
 ‘The Malay men came from there and’
- b. *cinggala raaja=nang=le anà-banthu*  
 Sinhala king=DAT=ADDIT past-help  
 ‘helped the Sinhalese king.’ (K051206nar04)

---

typically NP NP V.

- (9) a. *incayang islaam=nang asà-dhaathang=apa*  
 3s.POLITE Islam=DAT CP-come=CP  
 ‘He came to Islam’
- b. *inni siigith=nang asà-dhaathang*  
 PROX mosque=DAT CP-come  
 ‘and came to the mosque’
- c. *giini girja*  
 like.this make  
 ‘and does like this (=observes Islamic rites).’ (K051220nar01)

The interpretation as involving an event of coming is mandatory in examples (7)-(9), but impossible in examples (4)-(6). We are thus dealing with polysemy of the form (*asà*)*dhaathang*(*apa*).

In the languages of the world which have a copula, it is normally used for one or more types of non-verbal predicates (Stassen 1997). The predication types which are often found to require support by a copula are property assignment (*John is tall*), class inclusion (*John is a doctor*), existence (*There is a solution*) and location (*John is in Dubai*). Additionally, identification (*The murderer was the butler; I am John*) and specification (*The president is Obama*) also often require the use of a copula (Hengeveld 1992). This is actually exactly what we find in English, where the copula *to be* is present in all these cases.

In Sri Lanka Malay, the copula is mainly used for naming people and for indications of group membership. Property assignment or location are not areas which trigger the use of the copula. Among these uses, naming is the most common one and has been illustrated in (4) and (5) above. Apart from naming, the copula is most frequently used for indicating membership in ethnic, professional or gender classes or groups. These three uses are given in (10)-(12). The three forms with *asà*-, =*apa* and *asà*-...=*apa* appear to be used indiscriminately for these functions.

- (10) a. *Se=ppe* daughter-in-law=*pe* mother *asàdhaathang*  
 1s=POSS daughter-in-law=POSS mother COPULA  
*bìnggaali*<sub>ethnicgroup</sub>  
 Bengali  
 ‘My daughter-in-law’s mother is Bengali.’
- b. *Ithukapang* daughter-in-law=*pe* father *asàdhaathang*  
 then daughter-in-law=POSS father COPULA  
*m̥laayu*<sub>ethnicgroup</sub>  
 Malay  
 ‘Then my daughter-in-law’s father is Malay.’ (K051206nar08)
- (11) [*Seelong=nang duppang duppang anà-dhaathang m̥laayu*]  
 Ceylon=DAT before before PAST-come Malay]  
*asàdhaathang oorang ikkang*<sub>profession</sub>  
 COPULA man fish  
 ‘The Malays who came to Ceylon very early were fishermen.’  
 (K060108nar02)
- (12) *Kàthama aanak dhaathangapa klaaki*<sub>gender</sub>  
 first child COPULA male  
 ‘My oldest child is a boy.’ (G051222nar01)

Another use frequently found use is the indication of kinship relations, another type of class membership. Example (13) illustrates this.

- (13) *Baapa=pe umma asàdhaathang kaake=pe aade*<sub>kin</sub>  
 father=POSS mother COPULA grandfather=POSS younger.sibling.  
 ‘My paternal grandmother was my grandfather’s younger sister.’  
 (K051205nar05)

All the functions mentioned above, with the exception of naming, have in common that they indicate group membership. Another function is the use of the copula in identificational or specificational sentences. The following two examples show the use of the copula to further specify or identify the nature of a problem.

- (14) *[Itthu vakthu kithang=nang nya-aada] asàdhaathang ini JVP katha*  
 DIST time 1PL=DAT PAST-EXIST COPULA PROX JVP QUOT  
*hathu problem.*  
 INDEF problem.  
 ‘What we had at that time was the so-called JVP-problem.’  
 (K051206nar10)

- (15) *suda karang [kithang=nang aada problem] dhaathangapa kithang=pe*  
 thus now 1PL=DAT exist problem COPULA 1PL=POSS  
*aanak pada mlaayu thama-oomong*  
 child PL Malay NEG.NONPAST-speak  
 ‘So, the problem we are having now is that our children do not speak  
 Malay.’ (G051222nar01)

To sum up, of the functions commonly associated with the copula, ‘class membership’ seems to be central for the Sri Lanka Malay case, while identification is another use. Identificational uses of the copula are very common as far as naming is concerned, but far less common for the types of identification and specification illustrated with examples (14)-(15).

The domains of property assignment and location do not seem to trigger the use of the copula in Sri Lanka Malay, as illustrated in (16) and (17).

- (16) *Theem̃bok (\*asàdhaathang) puuthi*  
 wall COPULA white  
 (intended reading ‘The wall is white.’)
- (17) *Tony (\*asàdhaathang) Kluuṃbu=ka*  
 Tony COPULA Colombo=LOC  
 (intended reading ‘\*Tony is in Colombo.’, possible reading ‘Tony has arrived in Colombo.’)

While class inclusion as described above often does show the copula, it is by no means obligatory. The copula can be left out in all the sentences above without affecting truth conditions. This means that together with the sentence in (11), (18) is also grammatical.

- (18) [*Seelong=nang duppang duppang anà-dhaathang mlaayu*] Ø *oorang*  
 Ceylon=DAT before before PAST-come Malay] man  
*ikkang*.  
 fish  
 ‘The Malays who came to Ceylon very early were fishermen.’

It appears that the use of the copula is conditioned more by considerations of information structure than by syntax or semantics. Especially topic-comment structures seem to favour the use of the copula (cf. Li & Thompson 1977:420). The stretch preceding the (*asà*)*dhaathang(apa)* is the topic, while the following portion is the comment. In that sense, (18) without the copula is less felicitous than (11), where the topic-comment-structure is overtly indicated by (*asà*)*dhaathang(apa)*.

It is not necessary for the topic to be nominal. In (19), we see an adverbial topic *dovulu* ‘in former times’, the comment on which is preceded by *abbisdhaathang*, an idiolectal variant of *asàdhaathang*. In (20), we have a spatial topic *siini* ‘here’ instead of a temporal topic.

- (19) *dovulu abbisdhaathang muuka thama-thuuthup*  
 earlier COPULA face NEG.IRR-close  
 ‘Earlier, the women would not cover their faces.’ (K061026prs01)
- (20) *siini dhaathangapa mixed, mixed community*  
 here copula mixed mixed community  
 ‘What we get here is a mixed, a mixed community.’ (G051222nar04)

Occasionally, the comment can be quite elaborate as in the following two examples.

- (21) *Itthu abbisdhaathang custard powder=dering=jo arà-kirja*.  
 DIST COPULA custard powder=ABL=EMPH NON.PAST-make  
 ‘As for this one, it is such that it is made with custard powder.’  
 (K061026rcp02, K081105eli02)



- (22) a. *Sepakthakrowpe* rules *dhaathangapa*  
 sepaktakrow=poss rules copula  
 ‘The Sepaktakrow rules are as follows:’
- b. *inni hathu* badminton court=*ka arà-maayeng*  
 PROX INDEF badminton court=LOC NON.PAST-play  
 ‘You play it on a badminton court;’
- c. game *hatthu itthe* same measurement *ambel=apa*; height=*le*  
 game INDEF DIST same measurement take=after height=ADDIT  
 same=*jo*  
 same=EMPH  
 ‘(For) a game, you take the same measurements, and then the height  
 (of the net) is also the same.’ (N060113nar05)

Furthermore, use of the copula seems to be strengthened by the presence of loanwords in the sentence, as is already evident from the preceding example. Most of the Malays have an above average command of English for the Sri Lankan context, and it cannot be excluded that the use of lexical material from English (loanwords) activates grammatical structures of English as well, in this case the requirement for a copula in predications of class membership.

## 4 Where does the copula come from?

The copula is both synchronically and diachronically analyzable as conjunctive participle of the lexical verb *dhaathang* ‘come’. The first Malays who arrived in Ceylon in the 17<sup>th</sup> century communicated in Vehicular Malay, a trade language used in and around the Indonesian archipelago (Smith 2003, Smith et al. 2004). The language has changed considerably in the last three centuries and has typologically converged towards the local languages Tamil and Sinhala (Smith et al. 2004, Smith & Paauw 2006, Ansaldo 2005, 2008, Nordhoff 2009). Given these historical facts, three possible origins for the copula can be suggested: Indonesian varieties of Malay, and Sinhala or Tamil. In this section, I will discuss the copula-like structures we find in these languages and the possibility of their influence on the development of Sri Lanka Malay.

### 4.1 Copulas in Indonesian varieties

In Indonesian there exist two copulas, *adalah* and *ialah*, which are restricted to very formal varieties Sneddon (2006:98f) informs us that

[t]he copulas *adalah* and *ialah* optionally occur in F[ormal ]I[ndonesian] to link a subject and nominal predicate, and sometimes an adjectival predicate [...] with *adalah* being considerably more common than *ialah*.

*Adalah* also occurs in C[olloquial ]J[akarta ]I[ndonesian], although it is very rare; in about half the texts it did not occur. In most of the others it occurred with very limited frequency. It was only in the meetings and in the two most formal interviews [...] that it occurred frequently. [...] It can be said that *adalah* is marked for formality while *ialah*, being entirely absent from CJI, is very highly marked for formality.

The immigrants to Sri Lanka were mostly soldiers temporarily garrisoned in Batavia/Jakarta and spoke a very colloquial variety of Malay, remote from any formal standard (Adelaar 1991, Smith et al. 2004, Nordhoff 2009). It is unlikely that Formal Indonesian (or the equivalent historical variety) has had a significant impact on their speech. The sociolinguistic profile of Colloquial Jakarta Indonesian is closer to what would have been appropriate for the immigrants, although the relations between the colloquial varieties of the 17th century and the contemporary varieties are not exactly straightforward (Grijns 1991, Adelaar & Prentice 1996). The copula *adalah* can be found in CJI although it is extremely rare. The following is an example of the copula in informal speech.

- (23) *Yang pasti bakal ngebikin gua terpesona banget adalah cewek*  
 which certain will make me enchanted very COPULA girl  
*dengan rambut panjang yang tergerai, terus anggun CJI*  
 with hair long which flowing then elegant  
 ‘What would certainly very much enchant me is an elegant girl with long flowing hair.’ (Sneddon 2006:79)

This specificational use of the copula in (23) is similar to example (14), repeated as (24) for convenience.

- (24) *[Itthu vakthu kithang=nang nya-aada] asàdhaathang ini JVP katha*  
 DIST time 1PL=DAT PAST-exist COPULA PROX JVP QUOT  
*hathu* problem.  
 INDEF problem.  
 ‘What we had at that time was the so-called JVP-problem.’  
 (K051206nar10)

While the functional properties of the copulas in CJI and SLM are similar, they are morphologically very different. The Indonesian form is composed of the existential plus the imperative/emphatic clitic, but the Sri Lankan form is composed of the verb ‘to come’ and the conjunctive participle prefix *asà-*. It cannot be excluded that a construction involving a copula crossed the Bay of Bengal with the immigrants, but given the formal register with which this construction occurs in Indonesia, this is not very likely. An additional argument against a historical relatedness of the SLM and CJI constructions is the use of *dhaathang* ‘come’ in SLM. *Dhaathang* would have had to replace the existential *ada* without any particular motivation. One reason for the replacement of the morphological composition of the copula could be influence from the adstrates. This will be discussed in the following section.

## 4.2 Copulas in Sinhala and Tamil

Colloquial Sinhala has no copula as such, but uses a predicative suffix *-yi* on adjectives ending with a vowel (25). Adjectives which end in a consonant (26), and other word classes ending in any sound do not take this suffix (27)(28).

- (25) *mee amu miris hari særa-yi* COLLOQUIAL SINHALA  
 prox raw chillis really strong-YI  
 ‘These green chillies are really strong.’ (Gair 2003:794)

- (26) *mee dawaswələ haal bohoma ganaŋ(\*-yi)* COLLOQUIAL SINHALA  
 prox days rice very expensive(-YI)  
 ‘These days (uncooked) rice is very expensive.’ (Gair 2003:795)

- (27) *mamə govi-yek(\*-yi)* COLLOQUIAL SINHALA  
 1s farmer-INDEF.ANIM(-YI)  
 ‘I am a farmer.’ (Gair 1998:241)

- (28) *ma-tə niwaadu\*(-yi)* COLLOQUIAL SINHALA  
 1s-DAT vacation(-YI)  
 ‘I’m on vacation.’ (Gair 2003:794)

In Literary Sinhala, a similar suffix *-mi* is also used for nominal predications, as in (29).

- (29) *mama goviyekmi* LITERARY SINHALA  
 1s-NOM farmer.NOM.1SG  
 ‘I am a farmer.’ (Gair 1998:242)

There is some discussion of whether *mi* in should indeed be analyzed as a copula, or rather as an agreement suffix (Gair 1998:242). Whatever the right analysis of *-mi* and similar forms, it is clear that the variety of Sinhala the Malays were exposed to did not feature this form. The most copula-like element they are likely to have encountered is *-yi*, which does not suggest itself as possible model for the Sri Lanka Malay copula. Its form as a suffix is very different from the verbal form employed by Sri Lanka Malay, and its use for adjectival predications is precisely one where the use of the Sri Lanka Malay copula is not found.

In Tamil, the existential *iru* is sometimes analyzed as a copula. This verb is used for predications of existence as in (30) but also for locational predications as in (31).

- (30) *kumaar-ukku oru paiyan iru-kkir-aan* TAMIL  
 Kumar-DAT one boy IRU-PRES-3SM  
 ‘Kumar has one boy/There exists one boy to Kumar.’ (Lehmann 1989:188)

- (31) *inta-k<sup>2</sup> kiraama-tt-il muunru koovil (iru-kkir-atu)* TAMIL  
 this village-OBL-LOC three temple IRU-PRES-3SN  
 ‘There are three temples in this village.’ (Lehmann 1989:173)

Uses for property word predications (32) and nominal predications (33) are ungrammatical.

- (32) *paṭippu mukkiyam (\*irukkiratu)* TAMIL  
 education importance (IRU.3SN)  
 ‘Education is important.’ (Lehmann 1989:172)

---

<sup>2</sup>The dot · separates the grammatical word from the first part of a long consonant which is the result of certain morphosyntactic environments. The words in isolation would be *inta* and *kiraama*. One could also choose to write *inta kkiraama* to correctly represent pronunciation and orthography, but Lehmann chooses to leave the first part of the long consonant as the coda of the preceding syllable, although he separates it with a dot to indicate the special status.

- (33) *kumaar vakkiil (\*irukk<sub>i</sub>ratu/\*irukk<sub>i</sub>raa<sub>n</sub>)* TAMIL  
 Kumar lawyer (IRU.3SN/IRU.3SM)  
 ‘Kumar is a lawyer.’ (Lehmann 1989:171)

While in (32) and (33) the English translational equivalent has a copula, it does not seem pertinent to grant the same status to the Tamil form. An analysis as an existential can cover both the meanings given in (30) and (31), namely ‘A boy exists (for Kumar)’ and ‘Temple exist in this village’, while excluding the readings ‘Education exists importance’ and ‘Kumar exists a lawyer’. This is precisely what we find in (32) and (33). It is true that *iru* is sometimes found in nominal predications as in (34), but in that case, the noun is adverbialized by *aakalaay*, and the construction can actually be shown to have a locational reading as well (cf. Lehmann 1989:174).

- (34) *kumaar vakkiil-aakalaay iru-nt-aa<sub>n</sub>* TAMIL  
 Kumar lawyer-ADV IRU-PAST-3SM  
 ‘Kumar was a lawyer.’ (Lehmann 1989:174)

Whatever analysis one prefers for *iru*, this Tamil form seems to be closer related to the Sri Lanka Malay existential *aada*, which would be used for translations of (30) and (31), given in (35) and (36).<sup>3</sup>

- (35) *Ini nigiri=ka thiiga koovil aada* SLM  
 PROX village=LOC three temple exist  
 ‘There are three (Hindu) temples in this village.’
- (36) *Kumaar=nang hatthu aanak klaaki aada* SLM  
 Kumar=DAT one child male exist  
 ‘Kumar has one boy.’

While *iru* and *aada* are quite similar, the parallels between *iru* and (*asà*)*dhaathang(apa)* are less striking, and it seems unlikely that Sri Lanka Malay emulated the Tamil form *iru* with (*asà*)*dhaathang(apa)*.

Sinhala and Tamil both have conjunctive participles, too. The conjunctive participle forms of the verb meaning ‘to come’ in Sinhala (*ævillaa*) and Tamil (*vantu*) are not used in a copular sense in these languages; they can only be used

<sup>3</sup>Note that *aada* in SLM is only an existential, whereas the historically related form in Colloquial Jakarta Indonesian *adalah* (Section 4.1) is a copula which can also be used for non-existential predications, e.g. as in (23).

in the original reading of temporal anteriority.

- (37) a. *lamayaa pantiya=ta ævillaa*,  
 child class=DAT come.CP  
 ‘The child came to the class and/The child having come to class,’  
 b. *liyuma livvaa* SINHALA  
 letter write  
 ‘(he) wrote the letter.’ (Karunatilake 2004:161)
- (38) a. *naalai kumaar va-ntu*,  
 tomorrow Kumar come-CP  
 ‘Tomorrow Kumar will come and/Kumar having come tomorrow,’  
 b. *enkaḷ-ai-c canti-pp-aaṇ* TAMIL  
 1PL-ACC meet-FUT-3SM  
 ‘(he) will meet us.’ (Lehmann 1989:267)

To sum up, while the Malay ancestor language, Sinhala, and Tamil all have structures which come at least close to a copula, none of these structures is similar enough to the SLM structure as to suggest itself as the driving force behind the development of the copula in Sri Lanka Malay. It thus seems likely that the copula in Sri Lanka Malay is an independent development.

## 5 The emergence of copulas

The most common etymological source for copulas is an existential (Munro 1977) or a positional verb (Stassen 1997:94). Stassen illustrates this with data from Kiowa gathered by Watkins, which are repeated here.<sup>4</sup> In (39) we see the last reflexes of the original positional/locational use of *do:*. This locational use has given way to the general use of *do:* as a copula, which can be seen in (40). In return, most of the original uses of *do:* for locational purposes are now expressed by other morphemes, e.g. *-cél* in (41). *Do:* has thus nearly fully completed the grammaticalization from locational verb to copula.

- (39) *p'ó· hé· gyà-dó·* KIOWA  
 moon gone PL-be  
 ‘There is (temporarily) no moon.’ (Watkins 1984:216)

---

<sup>4</sup>Stassen uses the 1980 PhD-thesis; in this article, I use the newer version (Watkins 1984) and add stripped diacritics back in place.

- (40) *té· kóygú bà-dó·* KIOWA  
all Kiowa 2PL-be  
'You are all Kiowas.' (Watkins 1984:227)

- (41) *é·gò yí· ól è-cél kí·còy-kyà* KIOWA  
here two hair 3DUAL-be.in soup-in  
'There are two pieces of hair in the soup.' (Watkins 1984:211)

The other common source for copulas are pronouns. This can be seen in the famous example from Chinese (Li & Thompson 1977).

- (42) *jì yù qí shēng yòu yù qí sǐ, shì huò yě* ARCHAIC CHINESE  
already wish 3SG live also wish 3SG die this indecision DCL  
'Wishing him to live and wishing him to die, this is indecision.' (Li & Thompson 1977:424)

The demonstrative *shì* in this construction type was reanalyzed as a copula *shì* (Li & Thompson 1977:424).

- (43) *nèi-ge rén shì xuéshēng* MODERN MANDARIN  
that-CLF man COP student  
'That man is a student' (Li & Thompson 1977:422)

Next to Chinese, this pattern is for instance found in Hebrew, Arabic and furthermore in a number of North American and African languages (Stassen (1997:77–91)).

With regard to Sri Lanka Malay, we can say that the existential *aada* is different from *asàdhaathangapa* and does not seem to be very much grammaticalized towards a copula. The deictics *ini* and *itthu* are not recruited for copular purposes either. Changes from lexical meanings like 'coming' to more grammatical meanings like 'COPULA' have been investigated under the umbrella of grammaticalization. The verb 'come' is a frequent source of a number of grammatical functions, so that an investigation of the directions of development of this verb might shed light on what we find in Sri Lanka Malay. Stassen (1997:92) notes that a minor class of sources for the grammaticalization of copulas includes motion verbs like 'go' and 'come', but unfortunately he does not cite languages illustrating the 'come' case, so that it is not possible to compare the Sri Lanka Malay case to other purported instances of this path.

## 6 Grammaticalization paths of COME

In the languages of the world, verbs meaning ‘to come’ often undergo grammaticalization and can be used for a variety of grammatical functions. In French, *venir de* is used to express immediate past, but the venitive meaning is bleached: it is possible to say *Jean vient de partir*, literally ‘John comes from leaving’, meaning that John has just left (and not that he has just come back). Heine & Kuteva (2002:68–78) list a number of grammaticalization targets for COME: consecutive, continuous, hortative, venitive, ablative, near past, benefactive, change-of-state, future, proximative, purpose. The copula is not found among them. The closest example to a copular use of COME I am aware of is the use as an auxiliary in passive constructions, as found in Italian. In Italian, the verb *venire* can be used to form passives as in (44). Those passives always have a dynamic interpretation.<sup>5</sup>

- (44) *Era chiaro che i ragazzi veni-vano maltratta-t-i* ITALIAN  
 was clear that the children come-3PL.IMPFT illtreat-PPL-PL  
 ‘It was obvious [that] the children were being ill-treated.’ (Maiden & Robustelli 2000:282)

As in the Sri Lanka Malay case, the verb meaning ‘to come’ has lost its original venitive meaning. There is no motion towards the deictic center involved in (44). In Italian as in Sri Lanka Malay, the verb meaning ‘to come’ is completely bleached and serves a purely grammatical function, which would in both cases be fulfilled in English by the copula ‘to be’. However, the similarities end here. In Italian, *venire* is used as an auxiliary for diathesis, which is part of a larger construction involving a past participle. Both the auxiliary and the participle agree in number with the subject of the sentence. In the Sri Lanka Malay case, the absence of other verbs in the sentence suggests that *asàdhaathang* is not an auxiliary. There is no participle either, let alone agreement. Furthermore, the Sri Lanka Malay copula typically surfaces in intransitive, non-verbal predications, while the Italian passive construction with *venire* requires at least a bivalent verb. The Italian construction has a dynamic reading, while in the Sri Lanka Malay cases, a stative reading is the norm. For naming uses for instance, a dynamic reading is completely excluded. This all suggests that the grammaticalization path of Sri Lanka Malay *dhaathang* ‘come’ is not comparable to Italian *venire*, nor to any other of the cases discussed in Heine & Kuteva (2002). With the knowledge we have today, it seems that this grammaticalization from COME to a copula is unique to Sri Lanka Malay.

<sup>5</sup>For some diachronic information on this development, see Michaelis (1997) and Giacalone Ramat (2000)



## 7 Possible grammaticalization paths

In the preceding sections, I have ruled out inheritance of the copula construction, or emergence through language contact. I have also shown that the existing literature on grammaticalization paths does not cover the phenomenon encountered in Sri Lanka Malay. Given this paucity of literature to hook on to, some speculation as to the possible development may be warranted. One possible path from COME to the copula would lead over an intermediate resultative stage. This resultative reading of come is found for instance in English constructions like (45).

(45) A dream come true

In this case, the original motion meaning of *to come* has been lost. There is no spatial motion involved. What remains is the change of state from A to A', which is also what we observe in motion events like *John came home from work*. In (45), the state of the dream changes from unrealized to realized/true.<sup>6</sup> While in English, this resultative reading is restricted to a small set of words (*\*A man come tall*, *\*A T-shirt come grey*), in other languages, it has a wider application. In To'aba'ita, the verb *mai* 'come' has an ingressive/resultative meaning when used with a property concept as in (46).

(46) *fanua-'e rodo na-mai* To'ABA'ITA  
place-it:PFV be.dark PERF-COME  
'It has become dark.' (Lichtenberk 1991:487)

Heine & Kuteva (2002:74) note that "[t]his grammaticalization appears to be particularly common in pidgin and creole languages." While it is not entirely clear whether Sri Lanka Malay should be seen as a Creole (Smith & Paauw 2006) or not (Ansaldi 2008, Nordhoff 2009) it is clear that the immigrants to Sri Lanka spoke Vehicular Malay, a trade language for inter-ethnic communication which has been likened to a pidgin (Adelaar & Prentice 1996). As such, it is interesting to note that Fa d'Ambu Creole Portuguese (47), Guyanese Creole French (48), and Seychelles Creole French (49) show the resultative reading of the verb meaning 'to come' as well.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Note also that the string *come* is present in English *become*, and *venir* 'come' is found in French *devenir* 'become' and several Romance cognates.

<sup>7</sup>Furthermore, this is also found in Ghanaian Pidgin English (Huber 1996) and Chinook Jargon (Grant 1996:236).

- (47) *tyipa bi sxa dual eli kumu pasa* FA D'AMBU  
 stomach come PART hurt 3s east surpass  
 'His stomach hurt; he had eaten to much.' (Post 1992:159)
- (48) *i vini malad* GUAYANESE CREOLE FRENCH  
 3s come sick  
 'He has become sick.' (Corne 1971:90)
- (49) *i n vin larpâter* SEYCHELLES CREOLE FRENCH  
 he CPL come surveyor  
 'He became a surveyor.' (Corne 1977:80)

The grammaticalization from 'to come' to a resultative marker is the first step in a grammaticalization chain I want to propose. The second case involves the change from resultative to stative. For this case, especially the Seychelles Creole French example in (49) is interesting. It shows a great resemblance to one of the main uses of the SLM copula, namely membership in a (professional class) as in (11) or also in (50) below.

- (50) *Umma=pe baapa dhaathangapa hathu* inspector of police. SLM  
 mother=POSS father COPULA INDEF inspector of police.  
 'My mother's father was an inspector of police.' (N060113nar03)

The difference between the Seychelles Creole French example in (49) and the Sri Lanka Malay example in (50) is the change from resultative to stative. The Seychellois sentence is necessarily resultative, while the SLM sentence is necessarily stative. In the Sri Lanka Malay sentence, the information is not about the grandfather having passed an exam, thereby becoming an inspector of police (unlike the Seychellois surveyor). Rather, it is the first mentioning of the grandfather in this text, indicating his profession as a stative predicate without forcing a resultative interpretation.

However, it is logically necessary that the grandfather must have made the step from prospective inspector of police to certified inspector of police at one point in time since it is unlikely that he was born inspector. With many predicates there is a reciprocal entailment between the stative reading and a prior ingressive/resultative one. This is especially true for predicates of profession: If you become a professor, you are then a professor; if you are a priest, you must have

become a priest before.<sup>8</sup> The second step of the grammaticalization chain is then the change from a resultative reading entailing stative to a pure stative reading. This is likely to have been pioneered by predicates of profession, which are still one of the most frequent predicates found with the copula in Sri Lanka Malay. Only later would other predicates where a resultative meaning is impossible (e.g. sex) have followed suit. The proposed development can then be summarized as follows:

- (51) come>resultative>resultative entailing stative>copula (professions)>copula (other predicates)

## 8 Conclusion

Sri Lanka Malay has a copula, which is mainly used for naming and predications of class membership, although some information structure use especially with regard to topic and comment is also found. This copula is derived from the conjunctive participle form of the verb *dhaathang* ‘come’. Neither the formal properties of the copula, nor its functional uses show parallels to any of the possible languages of origin, i.e. Indonesian varieties, Sinhala, or Tamil. This suggests an independent development. This independent development, however, is not of a type attested in the literature on grammaticalization and seems to be a new grammaticalization path not found up to now. While further research is needed, a promising hypothesis is the development through an intermediate stage of a resultative marker, as found in other contact languages like Seychelles Creole French. This marker would then lose its resultative reading for predicates of profession and become a semantically void copula, which then spreads to other types of intransitive predication.

## References

- ADELAAR, K. A. (1991). “Some notes on the origin of Sri Lankan Malay”. Canberra: The Australian National University. pp. 23–37.
- ADELAAR, K. A. & D. J. PRENTICE (1996). “Malay: its history, role and spread”. Walter de Gruyter. pp. 673–693.
- ANSALDO, U. (2005). “Typological admixture in Sri Lanka Malay. The case of Kirinda Java.” Unpublished manuscript, available at <http://home.medewerker.uva.nl/u.ansaldo/index.html>.

---

<sup>8</sup>A similar case of resultative entailing a subsequent stative reading is Latin *cognovi* in the perfect, literally ‘I have learnt’, which very often means ‘I know now’ with a present reading.

- ANSALDO, U. (2008). "Sri Lanka Malay revisited: Genesis and classification". In DWYER, A., D. HARRISON & D. ROOD (eds.) "A world of many voices: Lessons from documented endangered languages", Studies in Language, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 13–42.
- BAKER, P. & A. SYEA (eds.) (1996). *Changing meaning , changing functions: Papers relating to grammaticalization in contact languages*. London: University of Westminster Press.
- BAKKER, P. (2006). "The Sri Lanka *Sprachbund*: The newcomers Portuguese and Malay". In MATRAS, Y., A. McMAHON & N. VINCENT (eds.) "Linguistic Areas – Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective", Houndmills, New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 135–159.
- CORNE, C. (1971). "Le patois créole français de la Guyane (St. Laurent de Maroni): Esquisse de grammaire". *Te Reo*, 14:81–103.
- CORNE, C. (1977). *Seychelles Creole grammar: Elements for Indian Ocean Proto-Creole reconstruction*. Tübingen: Narr.
- DEUMERT, A. & S. DURLEMAN (eds.) (2006). *Structure and Variation in Language Contact*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- GAIR, J. W. (1998). *Sinhala and Other South East Asian Languages*. New York, Oxford: OUP.
- GAIR, J. W. (2003). "Sinhala". In CARDONA, G. & D. JAIN (eds.) "The Indo-Aryan Languages", London: Routledge. pp. 766–818.
- GIACALONE RAMAT, A. (2000). "On some grammaticalization patterns for auxiliaries". In J.C.SMITH & D. BENTLEY (eds.) "Historical Linguistics 1995. Vol.I: General issues and non-Germanic languages", Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 125–154.
- GRANT, A. P. (1996). "The evolution of functional categories in Grand Ronde Chinook Jargon: Ethnolinguistic and grammatical considerations". In Baker & Syea (1996), pp. 225–242.
- GRIJNS, C. D. (1991). *Jakarta Malay*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Leiden.
- HEINE, B. & T. KUTEVA (2002). *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HENGVELD, K. (1992). *Non-verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- HUBER, M. (1996). "The Grammaticalization of aspect markers in Ghanaian Pidgin English". In Baker & Syea (1996), pp. 53–70.
- HUSSAINMIYA, B. A. (1990). *Orang Rejimen: The Malays of the Ceylon Rifle Regiment*. Universiti Kebangsaan.
- KARUNATILLAKE, W. S. (2004). *An Introduction to Spoken Sinhala*. Colombo: Gunasena, 3rd edn.

- LEHMANN, T. (1989). *A Grammar of Modern Tamil*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- LI, C. N. (1977). *Mechanisms of syntactic change*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- LI, C. N. & S. THOMPSON (1977). "A mechanism for the development of copular morphemes". In Li (1977), pp. 419–444.
- LICHTENBERK, F. (1991). "Semantic change and heterosemy in grammaticalization". *Language*, 67(3):475–509.
- MAIDEN, M. & C. ROBUSTELLI (2000). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*. Lincolnwood: NTC.
- MICHAELIS, S. (1997). "Antikausativ als Brücke zum Passiv: fieri, venire und se im Vulgärlateinischen und Altitalienischen". In DAHMEN, W., G. HOLTUS, J. KRAMER, M. METZELTIN, W. SCHWEICKARD & O. WINKELMANN (eds.) "Neuere Beschreibungsmethoden der romanischen Syntax", Tübingen: Narr.
- MUNRO, P. (1977). "From existential to copula: The history of Yuman *be*". In Li (1977).
- NORDHOFF, S. (2009). *A Grammar of Upcountry Sri Lanka Malay*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- POST, M. (1992). "The serial verb construction in Fa d'Ambu". In "Actas do Colóquio Sobre Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa", Lisbon: Edicoes Colibri. pp. 153–169.
- SLOMANSON, P. (2006). "Sri Lankan Malay morphosyntax: Lankan or Malay?" In Deumert & Durlleman (2006), pp. 135–158.
- SMITH, I. R. (2003). "The provenance and timing of substrate influence in Sri Lankan Malay; Definiteness, animacy and accusative case marking." Paper presented at the South Asian Language Analysis Roundtable XXIII, Austin, Texas.
- SMITH, I. R. & S. PAAUW (2006). "Sri Lanka Malay: Creole or convert". In Deumert & Durlleman (2006), pp. 159–182.
- SMITH, I. R., S. PAAUW & B. A. HUSSAINMIYA (2004). "Sri Lanka Malay: the state of the art." *Yearbook of South Asian Languages*, 2004:197–215.
- SNEDDON, J. N. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian, Pacific Linguistics*, vol. 581. Canberra: Australian National University.
- STASSEN, L. (1997). *Intransitive Predication*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- WATKINS, L. J. (1984). *A grammar of Kiowa*. Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press.