

PACOH PRONOUNS AND GRAMMATICALIZATION CLINES

Mark J. Alves

Montgomery College

<Mark.Alves@montgomerycollege.edu>

1 Introduction

The Pacoh pronoun system is exceptional among the Mon-Khmer languages in Southeast Asia for having morphologically distinct case-marked sets, including subjects/direct objects, indirect objects, and possessive pronouns (Watson 1964, Alves 2000). Moreover, these pronoun sets have gone further along the path of a grammatical cline, serving a number of semantico-syntactic functions beyond their capacity as pronouns. It is the purpose of this study to show these paths of grammaticalization and how they represent a number of linguistic processes in the syntactic evolution of lexical material. In particular, while semantic changes are present, the changes more often follow step by step along parameters of both semantic fields and syntactic features.

The sections of this study include (1) general discussion of grammaticalization with additional information on relevant aspects of Southeast Asian lexical subcategories, (2) a summary of the basic Pacoh pronoun system with overt case-marking affixes, (3) a section on Pacoh pronouns grammaticalized as general possessive or dative relator nouns, (4) discussion of the Pacoh pronoun grammaticalized as a marker of plurality, (5) discussion of Pacoh pronouns grammaticalized as conjunctions, and (6) a brief look at related derivational patterns in other Mon-Khmer languages. In each section, both the semantic and syntactic aspects of each derivational relationship are discussed where those aspects are seen as distinct. A constant issue among all the grammatical vocabulary derived from Pacoh pronouns is whether or not there are semantic restrictions on co-occurring nouns, namely whether or not those nouns must be human. In addition, some of the aspects of the cognitive characteristics of the changes are shown in relation to the types of universal changes seen in other languages.

2 Grammaticalization and Syntactic Issues

The term ‘grammaticalization’ refers ultimately to a subcategory of (a more general process of) semantic shift in which words or word parts become increasingly abstract and serve grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Heine and Kuteva 2002). In fact, the term ‘grammatical’ itself does not have a clear breaking point in the literature on the topic, and this definition thus becomes circular (i.e., Grammaticalization is the process of becoming grammatical. Grammatical words undergo grammaticalization). Still, intuitively, identifying function words/grammatical vocabulary appears to be a less controversial matter.

In the end, perhaps the best way to deal with this issue is to acknowledge that the definition is somewhat imperfect and deal with the rough edges later. However, to attempt to clarify this issue somewhat, distinctive features (both semantic and syntactic) can be used to bring the issue of ‘grammatical’ and hence ‘grammaticalization’ into a sharper fo-

cus. The purpose of the following subsections is to clarify the kinds of features used in this paper, the kinds of clines seen among Pacoh pronouns, and the key concepts of relator nouns, a class of words into which the pronouns have grammaticalized.

2.1 *Degree of Grammaticality and the Use of Syntactic Features*

While the differences between the extremes of function and content words seem clear, there does appear to be a degree of grammaticality in which there must be areas of uncertainty. While the word ‘dog’ (referring to the animal) intuitively serves non-grammatical content word, and words or word parts expressing ‘past tense’ are intuitively grammatical in nature, some words and concepts appear to be somewhere in between. Examples are time words (such as ‘today,’ which is a true time noun with specialized distribution, as opposed to ‘day,’ which is a common countable noun that requires prepositions to mark their function in time clauses, such as ‘on that day’ or ‘during those days’) and causative words (such as ‘make’ which differs from ‘force’ as the latter requires a ‘to’ infinitive while the former requires only a bare non-finite verb). No specific line has been drawn between grammatical and non-grammatical elements, and this is perhaps due to the semantic definitions typically given for grammaticalization. Typically, in the literature on grammaticalization, semantico-syntactic categories are used, with somewhat more emphasis on the cognitive and semantic side. However, using semantic fields is not the only way to identify grammaticality and hence grammaticalization. A concrete partial solution lies in the use of syntactically-grounded lexico-syntactic features, features that manifest themselves in freedom or restriction in syntactic distribution.

Parts of speech represent distinct grammatical categories and can be rated according to degree of grammaticalization to identify chains of grammaticalization and account for the direction of the shifts (though not necessarily the cause(s) of the shifts). Consider the differences between common nouns, pronouns, and classifier nouns. Common nouns in Pacoh (and other Southeast Asian languages) have the fewest grammatical restrictions, occurring as subjects, objects of verbs, objects of prepositions, possessive attributes, or semantic heads of quantified noun phrases. Pacoh pronouns have roughly the same functions, though they have anaphoric reference and special morphological attributes which limit restrict their distributions and semantico-syntactic functions. Classifiers in Pacoh, which have even more specialized distributional properties, are a subcategory of nouns that are often derived from nouns and can take demonstrative complements, a characteristic common to nouns.

Table 1: *Properties of Noun Subtypes*

Common Nouns	Pronouns	Classifier Nouns
nouns	nouns	nouns
fewest restrictions	some restrictions	most restrictions
open set	closed set	closed set

Still, within these primary lexical categories, there are additional degrees of grammaticality. Increasing restrictions and specialization can be rated with polar features, as in Table 1. We can see on the one end common nouns as the least marked and least ‘gram-

matical’ and the classifier nouns¹ as the most marked and thus most ‘grammatical’. The features themselves correspond well to concepts of markedness.

Parts of speech themselves can be roughly graded, verbs, nouns, and adjectives being less grammatical than prepositions, conjunctions, articles, and sentence particles. Indeed, in many cases, words from the former group are the derivational source for those in the latter. Thus, we can get a general sense of what constitutes grammatical vocabulary. Markedness in terms of semantic features, syntactic constraints, as well as the number of items belonging to a lexical class or subclass all give us some idea of what words are more grammatical than others.

While acknowledging some circularity in the logic, the fact that grammatical functions (indicating specific kinds of relationships between words, phrases, or even larger units of speech) can be clearly identified and explicitly referred to demonstrate that these linguistic changes can also be differentiated from non-grammatical semantic changes, say for example, the relationship between ‘dog’ as a noun and as a verb, an example of general semantic extension.²

2.2 Summary of Clines in Pacoh

Four kinds of grammaticalization of Pacoh pronouns are considered in this study, as summarized in Table 2, which contains categories and formalism used in Heine and Kuteva’s (2002) catalogue of grammaticalization chains. With the exception of Table 2, this article does not employ the same categories and directions of grammaticalization used by the work of Heine and Kuteva, in which all capital letters and arrow symbols indicate the direction of change. Instead, syntactic properties are indicated loosely with commonly used grammatical terms, such as ‘noun’ and ‘preposition’, ‘possessive’ and ‘dative’, and ‘human’ and ‘plural’.

Table 2: *List of Grammaticalization Clines of Pacoh Pronouns*

1	<i>?a.dɔ̌₂</i>	PRONOUN, 3 rd DATIVE > DATIVE
2	<i>?n.dɔ̌₂</i>	PRONOUN, 3 rd POSSESSIVE > POSSESSIVE
3	<i>?a.pɛ̌₂</i>	PRONOUN, 3 rd PLURAL > PLURAL
4	various	PRONOUN > CONJUNCTION

While Heine and Kuteva provide an extensive list of types of grammaticalization among languages of the world, Pacoh (and other Southeast Asian languages, as discussed in § 4) show a few clines not mentioned by those authors, though the Pacoh clines discussed here use basic categories seen as common sources for grammaticalized forms, mostly 3rd person personal pronouns. Of the four categories discussed in this paper, only category 3 (PLURAL) is listed in Heine and Kuteva, although category 4 is similar to their category DEMONSTRATIVE > CONJUNCTION since 3rd person pronouns are semantic correlates of

¹ This author considers what are commonly called classifiers, measure words, and the like to be a subclass of nouns. Justification for this is in Sak-Humphrey 1996 and Alves 2000.

² Though a type of grammatical change nonetheless that is paralleled in other parts of English in which nouns are derived as verbs, a kind of N → V rule.

distal demonstratives. Category 1 has some justification as an areal or possibly genetically unmarked type of change within the Mon-Khmer language group as it is seen in another language in another branch of Mon-Khmer, namely, Palaung/Bulang, which is spoken in areas of northern Burma and bordering areas of Yunnan province in China and thus could not have had language contact (see § 4).

What Heine and Kuteva's formalism, which uses very general semantico-syntactic categories, does not show is that the first three categories preserve the primary part of speech (i.e., noun) and that the last category, while changing part of speech, does preserve features related to the human pronouns, namely that human nouns co-occur with those derived conjunctions, in some cases even requiring a kind of agreement in plurality (see § 3.3). In each case, some properties change, while others are kept. When a more distinct change has occurred, typically, there are intervening steps, changes of single syntactic features which lead to subsequent changes further from source meanings. While these changes can be seen in terms of semantic extension due to implied semantic relationships and reanalysis, the changes in each case follow pre-established syntactic categories and features.

2.3 *Relator Nouns in Mon-Khmer Languages and Homophony*

Relator nouns,³ like adpositions, indicate spatial, directional, or possessive relationships between nouns, or they may indicate directions or locations of verbs. Thus, they tend to have semantic properties similar to prepositions in English, but with somewhat different distributional properties. Relator nouns are inalienably possessed (Indrambarya 1984, Sak-Humphrey 1996) and so cannot be connected to morphemes that already carry possessive semantic features (such as Pacoh *ʔən* mentioned in §3.1.1), though they are, as nouns, able to take following demonstratives. Furthermore, they are entirely uncountable and cannot be the semantic heads in quantified noun phrases. Hence, such words serve very specific grammatical purposes and thus have specialized syntactic features and relatively abstract semantic properties.

Pacoh, like most Mon-Khmer languages and other Southeast Asian languages, has a set of locational relator nouns⁴ to indicate various substantive locations, such as 'front' (as opposed to 'before'), 'back' (as opposed to 'behind'), and the like. Such words themselves have often down the path of grammaticalization from the semantically concrete to the more abstract (e.g., 'face' to 'front' to 'before (time)'), from a specific, concrete part of something to a general area.

The question then is how the source and target meanings in a grammaticalization chain are related. I take the view that the mental lexicon distinguishes between homophonous forms through syntactic and/or semantic distinctions, rather than an approach involving polysemy. Viewing words variously as polysemous or homophonous (e.g., 'to' as a movement direction is a different word than 'to' in an infinitive but polysemous with 'to' as a dative goal) results in ad hoc explanations that cannot be decisively proven or refuted.

³ The term 'relator noun' has been used largely in literature using the Lexicase dependency theory. Justification for these words as nouns is their ability to take following demonstrative noun dependents and for their functions as locative objects of verbs and prepositions.

⁴ Pacoh does have a limited set of prepositions. See Alves 2000 for examples.

In the perspective of this paper, grammaticalization is, in the case of words, the creation of new words in the mental lexicon rather than simply multiple uses of a word.⁵

3 The Pacoh Pronouns

Pacoh pronouns were first described in Watson 1964, though Table 3 (and the transcriptions) below comes from Alves 2000. The basic set of Pacoh pronouns is divided into nine categories by three dimensions of person (1st, 2nd, and 3rd) and three dimensions of plurality (singular, dual (two persons), and plural (three or more persons)). The forms in the basic set (under the column ‘General’) are used as subjects, direct objects, and possessives in the postnominal position. The dative pronouns are used as direct objects of ditransitive verbs and as complements of a special class of Pacoh verbs.⁶ Finally, the possessive pronouns are used after nouns, generally just marking possession but sometimes acting as possessive predicates.

Table 3: *Pacoh pronominal nouns*⁷

NUMBER	PERS.	GENERAL	DATIVE	POSSESSIVE
Singular	1st	ki:	?a.ki:	?ŋ.ki:
	2nd	maj	?a.maj	?m.maj
	3rd	dɔ:	?a.dɔ:	?n.dɔ:
Dual-Plur.	1st	ɲaŋ	?a.ɲaŋ	?ɲ.ɲaŋ
	2nd	?i.ɲa:	?a.dɔ:-?i.ɲa:	?n.dɔ:-?i.ɲa:
	3rd	?a.ɲa:	?a.dɔ:-?a.ɲa:	?n.dɔ:-?a.ɲa:
Plural	1st	he:	?a.he:	?ŋ.he:
	2nd	?i.pe:	?a.dɔ:-?i.pe:	?n.dɔ:-?i.pe:
	3rd	?a.pe: / ŋa:j	?a.dɔ:-?a.pe: / ŋa:j	?n.dɔ:-?a.pe: / ŋa:j

The affixes appear only on monosyllabic base forms. The means of marking those bisyllabic forms is by adding the dative or possessive 3rd pronoun before them. This solution to the pronoun case-marking paradigm may have led to the further grammaticalization of those particles; this rule may have been generalized to include ordinary non-pronominal nouns, though they could as well be the result of the grammaticalization. It is important to realize that grammaticalization involves semantic shift that leads to the native speaker’s lack of awareness of the original forms. That is, there is no conscious effort on the native speaker’s part to add these pronouns as pronouns, but as grammatically-significant and phonologically-bound material, essentially bound morphemes.

⁵ Taking the definition of ‘word’ as a unit distinguished by sound, meaning, and distribution precludes the idea of a word having more than one meaning.

⁶ See Alves 2000 for additional discussion and examples.

⁷ The morphology is generally transparent. The affix /?a-/ marks the dative pronouns, while the /?n-/ prefix marks possession. Watson 1964 claims that /?a-/ was originally a preposition, but no form exists in Pacoh currently to support this claim. The /?n-/ prefix is clearly related to the relational particle /?ən/, which is used to at the heads of relative clauses. Additional prefixes are used to distinguish 2nd and 3rd person (/?i-/ and /?a-/ respectively) in the dual and plural categories.

3.1 *Pacoh Pronouns and Relator Nouns*

From both the dative and possessive 3rd singular pronouns in Pacoh, relator nouns have developed. This section describes (1) locational and possessive relator nouns and (2) directional prepositions in Pacoh and shows how the Pacoh pronouns have overlapped in semantico-syntactic fields with other grammatical vocabulary and syntactic patterns.

3.1.1 The Possessive Relator Noun

The possessive 3rd person singular pronoun, *ʔn.dɔː₁*, is the historical source of the possessive relator noun, *ʔn.dɔː₂*. While this relator noun can take both human and non-human complements, it most often takes human noun complements, as in S1.

S 1: Possessive pronoun and relator noun

(a) ‘His/her house’	(b) ‘The house of that fellow’
duŋ ʔn.dɔː ₁	duŋ ʔn.dɔː ₂ ʔa.caːj
house of-3s	house of brother/that fellow

For non-human nouns, possession is indicated by immediate juxtaposition of the nouns, though the form *ʔən*, which heads modifying clauses, may be used between the two nouns, as in S2.

S 2: Universal possessive marker

‘The teacher’s house’ ⁸
duŋ ʔən t ^h əj
house of teacher

The result of language contact with Vietnamese may have resulted in a calque that fits the function of the Vietnamese possessive relator noun *của* ‘possession of’ (see Thompson 1985:340), which has no semantic restrictions on noun types. S3 is a translation of Vietnamese by a Pacoh speaker (on the topic of administrative divisions in Vietnam), which may be precisely the starting point for the Vietnamese usage.

S 3: Possessive relator noun with non-human complement

‘Three provinces of Vietnam’
pɛː tɪŋ ʔn.dɔː ₂ viət.naːm
three province of Vietnam

In brief, both forms are possessive nouns, the semantico-syntactic common denominator. The change is from pronoun to relator noun, a change in lexical subcategory, as shown in Table 4. The human feature of the relator noun appears to be in the process of expanding its usage to non-human nouns as well. However, the possessive marker *ʔən* is at this point the universal marker of possession in Pacoh (and it modifies relative clauses in general) and thus has the upper hand in competition for dominant usage.

⁸ Sentence samples, when not given specific sources, are from my personal field notes taken in Vietnam in 1997 and 1998.

Table 4: *Feature changes from possessive to relator noun*

ʔn.dɔː_1	ʔn.dɔː_2 (current)	ʔn.dɔː_2 (in development)
noun possessive pronoun human	noun possessive relator human	noun possessive relator any

3.1.2 The Dative Relator Noun

The 3rd person dative pronoun ʔa.dɔː_1 , as shown in S4, has a corresponding dative relator noun ʔa.dɔː_2 , as in S5. This relator noun has similar semantic and syntactic functions to that of the English dative prepositions ‘to’ and ‘for’.

S 4: Dative pronoun

‘What did you give to him?’

ʔa.məh maj ʔɔːn ʔa.dɔː_1
 what you give to 3s

S 5: Dative relator noun

‘They give gifts to the girls.’

ŋaːj ʔɔːn pi.neːʔ ʔa.dɔː_2 ku.mɔːr
 3s give gift to girl

The relator noun has lost its semantic association with humans; it can take either human noun complements as in S5 or non-human nouns as in S6. In S6, no linking verb is needed since, in Pacoh, a noun alone can be the head of a predication phrase.

S 6: Dative relator noun with non-human

‘The *kup* trap is for mice.’

kip ʔa.dɔː_2 ʔa.bil
kup trap for mouse

In sum, the grammaticalization path in this instance is from a 3rd person singular dative pronoun to a general dative relator noun that can co-occur with any kind of noun, human or non-human. Whether or not there was an intermediate step in which only human nouns could be the complements of these cannot be answered without more data. Table 5 summarizes both the feature constants and changes.

Table 5: *Feature changes from dative pronoun to relator noun*

ʔa.do:_2		ʔa.do:_2
noun		noun
dative		dative
pronoun	→	relator
human	→	any object

3.2 The 3rd Person Plural Pronoun and the Quantifier

The 3rd person plural pronoun ʔa.pɛ_1 ‘a few (persons)’ is the source of an indefinite numeral, ʔa.pɛ_2 , that can only mark plurality on human nouns, as in S7. This change from 3rd person pronoun to a plural marker is a notable entry in Heine and Kuteva (Ibid: 237-238), reoccurring in numerous languages.

S 7: Person and non-person numerals

‘A few guys’

ʔa.pɛ_2 ʔa.ca:j
a few brothers/guys

The grammaticalization could be a reanalysis of the use of a noun phrase consisting of the pronoun plus a modifying complement (the relativizer ʔən plus a noun), as in S8. There, the form is still a pronoun that takes a noun predicate adjective clause meaning roughly ‘those few there who are women.’

S 8: ʔa.pɛ as a pronoun with a modifier

‘Those few women’

ʔa.pɛ ʔən kan
3rd plur. rel. woman

The complete change in semantic status is demonstrated by the fact that the noun complement may have other than 3rd person reference. In S9, the noun has 2nd person reference.

S 9: ʔa.pɛ_2 as an indefinite numeral

‘Do **you** three young ones understand?’

ʔa.pɛ ʔa.ʔɛ:m cɔ:m $\text{ləj}^?$
a few youngster know yes-no?

Thus, the change has gone from 3rd person plural pronoun to a plural numeral noun. While retaining the status of noun, the subcategorizing properties have shifted from pronominal to numeral and from 3rd person to any reference (more semantic features), while the features ‘plural’ and ‘human’ remain. Table 6 shows the constant and changed features.

Table 6: *Feature changes from pronoun to quantifier*

ʔa.pɛ:₁	ʔa.pɛ:₂
Bnoun	noun
pronoun \longrightarrow	numeral
3rd person \longrightarrow	any
human	human
plural	plural

3.3 Pacoh Pronouns as Conjunctions

While in Pacoh the general coordinative conjunction *ʔa.lɨŋ* ‘and’⁹ has no semantic restrictions on co-occurring nouns, there is a set of ‘human’ conjunctions that are related to plural personal pronouns. These conjunctions require their complements to be human, second or third person, and consist of either two or more than two nouns. Table 7 lists the forms and the type of complements they take, as discussed in S. Watson 1964. The table shows the conjunction forms, the required number of co-occurring nouns, and the noun reference that is expected for each.

Table 7: *Noun complements of ‘human’ conjunctions*

FORM	NO.	PERSON
ʔi.ɲa:₂	2	2 nd dual
ʔa.ɲa:₂	2	3 rd dual
ʔi.pɛ:₂	3+	2 nd plural
ʔa.pɛ:₂	3+	3 rd plural

Watson (*ibid.*) also notes that the forms *ʔa.ɲa:₂* and *ʔa.pɛ:₂* can take a combination of a singular noun and a semantically plural noun. There is semantic agreement between the factors of number and person. In each case, the required features of the complements of the conjunctions match the features of the homophonous pronoun forms. In S10a, the conjunction takes two 3rd person nouns, while in S10b, the conjunction takes a 2nd person noun.

S 10: Person conjunctions

(a) ‘mother and father’	(b) ‘you and Cubuat’
ʔa.ʔi: ʔa.ɲa:₂ ʔa.ʔam	maj ʔi.ɲa:₂ ku.buət
mother and father	2s and (name)

In data I collected in 1997 from Pacoh speakers who were 16 to 20 years old, *ʔa.ɲa:* ‘and’ is used without regard either to the quality of the noun (human or non-human) or the number of complements involved, as in S11. Apparently, the reduced semantic restrictions have increased the syntactic utility. Unless this turns out to be a regional vari-

⁹ This form also represents the preposition ‘with’. The distributional differences of these two concepts warrant the differentiation of them as two distinct words in the mental lexicon. This is in line with my view of homophony over polysemy.

ant,¹⁰ the conjunction paradigm described by Watson may be in the process of being lost, and a third word, the conjunction *ʔa.pa:3*, is becoming dominant.

S 11: *ʔa.pa:* with non-human noun dependents

‘Two knives and a hoe.’

ba:r lam ʔa.ci:w ʔa.pa:3 mɔ:j lam kuək
two (unit) knife and one (unit) hoe

The grammatical cline, thus, goes from personal pronouns, to conjunctions that take only persons with matching numbers, to a general single pronoun becoming the default pronoun. In terms of semantico-syntactic categories, the change is from pronoun to conjunction (syntactic category), agreement of number to any number (semantico-syntactic), and from human to general (semantic field). While the change of part of speech seems drastic, the other two syntactic features, number and type agreement, remained constant to the second form, reducing the apparent severity of the change.

Table 8: *Feature changes from pronoun to conjunction*

<i>ʔa.pa:1</i>	<i>ʔa.pa:2</i>	<i>ʔa.pa:3</i>
Noun →	conjunction	conjunction
Agreement	agreement →	any
Human	human →	any

4 Comparison with Other Mon-Khmer Languages

Were these cases of grammaticalization restricted only to Pacoh, they might be considered as mere linguistic quirks, not approaching the level of universality. However, these changes do indeed appear in other Mon-Khmer languages. The connection between the 3rd person plural pronoun and a general marker of plurality is seen in a language closely related to Pacoh, Katu, having the 3rd person plural pronoun *ʔa.pe:* which is related to the plural marker (Nguyen V. L. and Nguyen H. H. 1998:192, 211). Furthermore, in Katu, Bru, and Taoih (and presumably other Katuic languages), there are additional remnants of the dative forms that have some similar functions. Similarly, in the Vietic language Rục (spoken somewhat north of the Katuic languages), the 3rd person singular pronoun *ʔa.pa:1* is related to a plural marker, very similar to that in Pacoh (Nguyen V. L.: 97, 106).

In a language spoken farther away, Palaung (in Myanmar and bordering areas in Yunnan, China) shares a few surprising similarities of grammaticalization clines. Specifically, the 3rd person singular pronoun *ga:r* is the apparent source of the conjunction ‘and’ (Milne: 18, footnote). Two other 3rd person singular pronouns *de:* and *ʔə:n* (which is very similar to Pacoh *ʔən*, as well as the same word in other Katuic languages) is related to a

¹⁰ Most of the speakers I sampled were from A-Lưới district, Thừa-Thiên/Huế Province, Central Vietnam. However, as that is a major district and maintains somewhat higher social status than in other areas of Pacoh speakers, this could indeed represent a general change in progress.

possessive relator noun (Milne: 18 and 19). Finally, the same Palaung form ʔə:n is a general relative pronoun (Milne: 32), used in the same way as the nearly homophonous form in Katuic languages. Finally, in an admittedly less interesting example, Khasi has a set of clause-linking words that all contain a suffix [-ta] which is derived from the demonstrative ta ‘that’ (Nagaraja 1985:100).

There is both the possibility of close linguistic affiliation and language contact, though in the case of Palaung, the distance makes the contact factor unlikely if not impossible. Then the matter becomes one of a reconstructable innovation or typological similarity based on shared linguo-cultural cognitive organization.

5 Summary

Grammaticalization is a place to explore the way human cognition organizes reality within linguistic categories. While it appears to shift primarily along semantic lines, lexical categories as syntactically defined also play a part. Syntactic constraints as part of a contemporary state of the grammar of a language are the guidelines along which semantic forces move. While features are ultimately an analytical tool, they may actually be closer to the means by which the linguistic faculty changes, at least in a somewhat abstract manner.

The actual impetus for these changes may be multifold. The three most notable factors appear to be connecting of phonological material, reanalysis of juxtaposed elements, and language contact. The dative and possessive pronouns themselves are the result of the fusion of syllables with words resulting in prefixes. Reanalysis, ultimately a kind of unpredictable change, is seen in the cases of change from noun to noun (following noun dependents/complements) and from noun to conjunction (existing conjunction). Moreover, as Pacoh is a language that utilizes reduplication, topicalization, but few overt grammatical-marking elements, these instances are clearly places where reanalysis leading to grammaticalization may occur. Add to that language contact with Vietnamese (the possessive marking *của*, and the pluralizing Sino-Vietnamese word *các*), and it would be a surprise if reanalysis and grammaticalization didn’t occur.

References

- Alves, Mark. 2000. *A Pacoh Analytic Grammar*. Ph.D. University of Hawai‘i.
- Clark, Marybeth. 1979. Coverbs: Evidence for the derivation of prepositions from verbs, New evidence from Hmong. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11.2:1-12. Honolulu, HI: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.
- , 1989. Hmong and areal Southeast Asia. In David Bradley, *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics, Southeast Asian Syntax* 11:175-230.
- Clark, Marybeth and Amara Prasithrathsint. 1985. Synchronic lexical derivation in Southeast Asian languages. *Southeast Asian Linguistics Presented to Andre-G. Haudricourt*, ed. S. Ratankul, D. Thomas and S. Premrirat, 34-81.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Indrambarya, Kitima. 1994. *Subcategorization of verbs in Thai: A Lexicase dependency*. Dissertation. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. In Traugott and Heine (ed.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Vol. 1:383-453. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nagaraja, K. S. 1985. *Khasi: A descriptive analysis*. Pune: Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute.
- Milne, Leslie. 1921. *An elementary Palaung grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Nguyễn, Hữu Hoàn, and Nguyễn Văn Lợi. 1998. *Tiếng Katu* (The Katu language). Hà Nội, Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.
- Nguyễn Văn Lợi. 1995. *Tiếng Rục* (The Ruc language). Hà Nội, Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.
- Sak-Humphry, Chhany. 1996. *Khmer nouns and noun phrases: A dependency grammar analysis*. Dissertation. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Watson, Sandra. 1964. Personal pronouns in Pacoh. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 1:81-97.
- , 1976. The Pacoh noun phrase. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 5:85-95.

