Vlada Baranova (Saint Petersburg)

Grammaticalization and Semantics of Complex Predicates in Kalmyk

The paper describes Kalmyk complex predicates, based on the empirical data of linguistic fieldwork. The focus of this investigation is on the semantics and morphosyntactic properties of the complex predicates in Kalmyk. In Kalmyk, several auxiliaries (*bää-* 'to be', *jov-* 'to go', *kevt-* 'to lie' and *suu-* 'to sit') belong to the imperfective domain. Perfective semantics is the basis for complex predicates with the primary verbs *ork-* 'to put' and *od-* 'to go away', whereas the verbs *av-* 'to take' and *ög-* 'to give' express reflexive benefactive and benefactive meanings. The verb *xaj-* 'to throw' expresses intensivity and pluractionality. The study shows that the Kalmyk aspectual system arose as a result of grammaticalization.

1. Introduction

The paper describes Kalmyk complex predicates based on the empirical data of linguistic fieldwork. I will analyze the semantics and degree of grammaticalization of auxiliary verbs in Kalmyk and some peculiar morphosyntactic features of complex predicates. Kalmyk is one of the Mongolic languages spoken in the steppe regions adjacent to the northwest shore of the Caspian Sea (Republic of Kalmykia, Russian Federation; there are also small Kalmyk minorities in Kyrgyzstan and in the Xinjiang autonomous region of China). The article is based on the material obtained from the village of Yergeninsky in 2007 and from the village of Tugtun in the Ketchenerovsky region, Republic of Kalmykia from 2007 to 2008[1]. The data was collected from oral narratives (some of the data was published in IPGKYA (2009)) and by means of elicitation tasks: the native speakers were asked to translate a set of sentences from Russian into Kalmyk and from Kalmyk into Russian. Through this text, I will apply a transcription system and interlinear glosses used for all the material collected during the expedition.

The paper is structured as follows. In the introduction, I will briefly outline the theoretical and methodological preliminaries of this study, focusing on the theory of grammaticalization and the two-component model of aspectuality. Section 2 will present the data on the complex predicates and affix expressing perfective aspect, Section 3 will discuss auxiliaries which have been considered perfective, but are not.

Section 4 will present the data on the interaction and the distribution of Kalmyk auxiliaries belonging to the imperfective domain. In Section 5, further data on the degree of grammaticalization will be discussed. In the conclusion, I will summarize the semantics and morphosyntactic properties of some complex predicates in Kalmyk and I will discuss the aspectual system in Kalmyk in general.

Kalmyk, like other Mongolic languages, has a system of non-finite verb form that serves to express adverbial subordination. Bläsing (2003: 243) divides Kalmyk converbs as modal, imperfective, perfective, conditional, concessive, terminative, abtemporal, final, and successive. Complex predicates in Kalmyk are formed by a combination of the imperfective converb ending in -ǯə (in some grammar descriptions it is called a conjunctive converb) and the anterior (also called a disjunctive or perfective) converb formed by adding the affix -ad and an auxiliary verb that carries grammatical markers indicating grammatical meaning for the whole construction[2]. Descriptive converbs ending in -ǯə and ending in -ad as imperfective and perfective assume the distribution of these forms in different aspectual zones, however, in some contexts, the two converbs are interchangeable. As Bläsing (2003: 243) notes, "the imperfective (or copulative) converb puts the predicates in a more concrete or special relation towards each other, […] while the perfective (or disjunctive) converb in -(gh)-Ad involves no such relationship" and "often implies a chronological sequence". This tendency works at least for converbs used as part of complex predicates, although the semantics of converbial forms in Kalmyk is not entirely clear.

From the semantic point of view, complex predicates represent one event. Types of complex predicates differ, depending on the semantic impact made by the lexical verb and the auxiliary verb on the general meaning. In most cases, it is the syntactically dependent verb that carries general lexical meaning.

An auxiliary verb as a component of a complex predicate is more or less grammaticalized. Grammaticalization is usually understood as a process when lexical units gradually change into grammatical units, which, as a general rule, is accompanied by a partial loss of lexical meaning (semantic bleaching) and strengthening syntactic boundedness. Desemantization, the loss of some syntactic properties and phonetic changes take place simultaneously (for these definitions, see Hopper, Traugott (2003), Heine, Kuteva (2002)).

There are two characteristics of grammaticalization processes that are important for further description. First, grammaticalization affects whole constructions rather than single lexemes, thus we should consider the impact made by each one of the grammatical and lexical units. Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca state that "[….] in tracing the origin of a grammatical meaning, we must attend to the syntax and morphology of the source construction rather than the referential meaning of its lexical items" (1994: 11). Secondly, it is probably the similarity of human perception that conditions

---

2.   Here, I will not discuss complex predicates with converbs ending in -n and auxiliaries gi- 'say' and ald- 'lost'.

the fact that the ways of grammaticalization for lexemes with the same meaning in various languages of the world have very much in common.

Synchronically, an auxiliary can have various interpretations. According to Heine (1993: 48 ff.), as the verb is changing its status from a full lexical item to a grammaticalized functor element, there is a period of ambiguity associated with the use of the not-yet semantically bleached auxiliary element. For example, on a synchronous level, (semi)loose combinations of movement verbs and grammaticalized aspectual constructions based on the latter coexist in the Kalmyk language. Although there are extreme cases when these constructions diverge in semantics and morphosyntactic properties, sometimes it is impossible to classify a particular construction (for details, see Section 5).

General characteristics for all complex predicates in Kalmyk are 1) unified marking of a compound verb; 2) fixed word order that prohibits rearrangements of the complex predicate components; 3) unified argument structure.

Depending on the degree of grammaticalization, complex predicates differ in behavior 1) in negative constructions and 2) when they carry markers of causative, passive, sociative and other voices (these cases will be considered in detail in the corresponding sections).

Through the formal properties listed above, it is possible to divide Kalmyk complex predicates into groups. Other optional features such as desemantization (semantic bleaching) or (partial) retaining of the original lexical semantics, morphologization or semi-clitic status or retaining of fully stressed forms, regularity of combination with any possible predicates or limited combination with verbs of a particular class (for example, only with other verbs of movement) should be regarded as extreme points, between which there lies a continuum of forms.

Most of the auxiliaries in Kalmyk refer to aspectual meanings. Henceforth, aspect will be examined within the framework of the two-component model. This theory implies that the two components of the aspectual system interact with each other. There are different (with different nominations for this opposition: grammatical or verbal aspect "proper" (as "a sub-system belonging to the grammar of a particular language") and "a lexical aspect, or actionality, or Aktionsart", Binnick (2011a: 32); viewpoint aspects and aspectual situation type by Smith (1997). Smith 1997: 3) distinguishes three main viewpoint types, perfective, imperfective, and neutral (the last one is irrelevant for my data), stating that "Perfective viewpoints focus a situation in its entirety, including both initial and final endpoints. Imperfective viewpoints focus part of a situation, including neither initial nor final endpoints".

Lexical aspect, in other words aspectual situation type, is considered in Vendler's (1967) perspective. The types of predicates concern the presupposition of a natural endpoint in the event. For my discussion here, we find it convenient to divide Vendler's four types of events into stative or non-dynamic and non-stative or dynamic events. States are stative and activities, accomplishments and achievements are dynamic. Smith (1997: 3) distinguishes three main viewpoint types: perfective, imperfective, and neutral (the last one is irrelevant for my data). "Perfective viewpoints focus a

situation in its entirety, including both initial and final endpoints. Imperfective view-points focus part of a situation, including neither initial nor final endpoints" (Smith 1997: 3).

It will also be an important typological semantic interpretation of perfective and imperfective aspects and a grammaticalization approach to aspectual and other grammatical markers. Following Bybee et al. (1994), I will discuss progressive, durative and habitual aspects in the imperfective domain. In the perfective domain, the semantic properties should be divided into having a completive and inchoative or inceptive interpretation.

2.   Perfective auxiliaries

The affix -*čkə* (see below) and a set of analytical forms with auxiliaries are included in conveying perfectiveness in Kalmyk. M. D. Ondzhanova (1969) identifies several verbs that form the *completive aspect*: *ork-* 'to put', *od-* 'to go away', *xaj-* 'to throw', *av-* 'to take', *ög-* 'to give', *ir-* 'to come', *xuur* 'to exhaust', *duus-* 'to finish'. My field materials indicate that the verb *ir-* 'to come' cannot be used as an auxiliary, the verbs *xuur* 'to exhaust' and *duus-* 'to finish' are sentential arguments and do not form complex predicates (and therefore they are not considered below), and the verbs *xaj-* 'to throw', *ög-* 'to give' and partly *av-* 'to take' express other semantic properties (see Section 3).

2.1. The affix -*čkə* and the verb *ork-* 'to put'[3]

G. D. Sanzheev notes that the completive aspect can be equally expressed both by using the affix -*čkə*, which can be traced back to a combination of the verb *ork-* 'to put' with a conjunctive (imperfective in my glosses) converb ending in -*ǯə*, or by means of the verb *ork-* with a disjunctive (or anterior in my glosses) converb formed by adding the affix -*ad* (GKYa 1983: 190–191), i.e. the affix as the result of grammaticalization is understood as the development of grammatical morphemes from free lexical items and synchronically as the affix and analytical form co-exist in Kalmyk. I follow this treatment for Kalmyk, although it is not generally accepted (for example, I. Gruntov has a different view of the etymology in this case). This affix is incomprehensible in other Mongolian languages; Svantesson (1991: 198) lists -*čx-* (-*čiqa-/čike-*) as an intensive aspect suffix (in Khalkha). Robert Binnick (2011b: XVIII) notes that the affix -*čix-* "likely has no counterpart or adequate gloss in English, but in any case no completely satisfactory, definitive statement of its meaning".

---

3.   Henceforth I translate and transcribe in glosses *ork-* as 'to put' like it is accepted in modern Kalmyk dictionaries, but it also has (or had in the past) the meaning 'to throw away'; for example, Ramstedt (1935: 289) translated the verb *orkxə* (*orkkə*, *okko*) 'werfen, weggeben, verlassen, hinterlassen'.

The general meaning for forms with the affix *-čkə* can be defined as completive, as long as this form emphasizes the resulting phase of a situation.

(1a) *noxa   Badm-igə   zuu-čkə-v*
      dog   Badma-ACC   bite-COMPL-PST
      'A dog has bitten Badma.'

The affix *-čkə* is relatively frequent. The meaning of the final form is affected by the lexical aspect (or actionality properties) of the dependent verb and whether this verb is transitive or intransitive. The affix *-čkə* is used for transitive verbs, and, as a rule, also incompatible with intransitive verbs (in cases like this, the verb *od-* 'to go away' is used, see below), but there are a few exceptions with metaphoric or occasional meanings.

In colloquial Kalmyk[4], only contracted forms with *-čkə* are present, whereas the full form of the verb *ork-* 'to put' is almost never used, although the speakers admit to the possibility of its existence (1b):

(1b) *noxa   Badm-igə   zuu-ʒə   orkə-v*
      dog   Badma-ACC   bite-CV.IPFV   put-PST
       'A dog has bitten Badma.'

The perception of native speakers can be an additional argument for viewing the affix *-čkə* as a result of grammaticalization of the verb *orkə* 'to put' and the creation of a new morpheme in the construction of an imperfective converb (a conjunctive converb, in Sanzheev's terminology) with *-ʒə* and therefore, the full complex predicate is almost out of use.

2.2. The verb *od-* 'to go away'

The verb *od-* 'to go away, to depart from a deictic center' can be found in my materials both used on its own and as a part of a complex predicate (with imperfective converbs ending in *-ʒə*). Used on its own, *od-* denotes a start of a vectored motion from an observer.

(2) *a   в   42   году   äärm-də   od-ad*
     but in   42   year   army-DAT   go.away-CV.ANT
     'In 1942, (father) joined the army.'[5]

---

4. G. D. Sanzheev based on the the data Standart / Literature Kalmyk considers the complex predicate with auxiliary *ork-* 'to put' as a synonym of the affix *-čkə*, but for modern colloquial Kalmyk it's wrong.
5. The oral narratives have a great deal of cases of code-switching.

As an auxiliary verb, *od-* combines with different modality and tense markers, but more frequently with the evidential affix *-čə* and in everyday speech becomes the contracted form *odəč* or *oč*:

(3) *tiig-äd   kel-in   cacu   amə-ny*
     do.so-CV.ANT   language-GEN   just   mouth-P.3
     kooči-ǯə   oč
     become.deformed-CV.IPFV   go.away.EVD
     'As soon as she uttered this, her mouth curved.'

Used as an auxiliary verb in a complex predicate, *od-* behaves in the same way as other verbs of movement. The resulting complex predicates have spatial meaning. In a spatial meaning, the verb *od-* is predominantly combined with verbs that signify a manner of motion (*nis-* 'to fly', *güü-* 'to run', *mölkə-* 'creep, crawl' etc.) and have no telic semantics. The complex predicate has a meaning of the start of a direct motion (examples 4, 5).

(4) *bičkən   shovu-n   ürg-äd   nis-ǯə   odə-v*
     little   bird-EXT   flush-CV.ANT   fly-CV.IPFV   go.away-PST
     'A little bird flew up, started to fly.'

(5) *... ödməg-mödməg⁶   ög-xlä   güü-ǯə   od-ad ...*
     bread bread   give-CV.SUCC   run-CV.IPFV   go.away-CV.ANT
     'When they gave (us) bread, (we) ran up.'

Cases when the *od-* is used with verbs of movement that have their own direction (*ʁar-* 'to go out', *or-* 'to enter') are much less frequent. In the small corpora of texts available there are only few examples (3 cases out of 45 complex predicates with *od-*). All of them have a metaphoric meaning:

(6) *... ämə-ny   ʁar-čə   od-na*
     life-P.3   go.out-CV.IPFV   go.away-PRS
     '(S/he) passed away'

Combinations of the *od-* with verbs of movement are a source of grammaticalization for this verb as an aspectual marker. Grammars classify *od-* as one of the verbs that transmit a complete aspect, "completeness of manifestation of an action" Pyurbeev (1977: 113). Depending on telicity or atelicity of a dependent verb, *od-* signifies the reaching of a certain limit, completeness (see example 6 above). With atelic predicates (as a rule with activities), the complex predicate introduces an initial boundary taken as a starting point of a situation, i.e., it carries an inchoative meaning (example 7).

---

6.   There is an example of reduplication with phonetic transformation which is found very often in oral speech.

(7) *Baatr   asx-n-a   arvə-n   neg-n   čas-la*
     Batyr   evening-EXT-GEN   ten-EXT   one-EXT hour-COM
     unt-ǯ   od-la
     sleep-CV.IPFV   go.away-REM
     'Batyr fell asleep at 11 o'clock in the evening.'

It seems that the process of desemantization of *od-* first involved constructions with verbs of movement and verbs that have the possible meaning 'to go to do something'. Later, its influence spread to all other intransitive verbs, though for the usage of this construction, spatial context is no longer necessary and the biclausal interpretation of 'to go to do P' is prohibited. For example, example 7 cannot be literally translated as 'went to sleep'.

   In combination with verbs that do not contain a component of movement or reorientation in space, the verb *od-* is strongly desemanticized. The original semantics of moving away can be can be traced back to its tendency of being combined with verbs that describe various situations when something disappears, stops in its existence or undergoes deformation, which can be metaphorically understood as "going away":

(8) *terə   ükrə-ny   tuqəl-ta-ʁan   ük-č   oč*
     that   cow-P.3   calf-ASSOC-P.REFL   die-CV.IPFV   go.away.EVD
     'This cow and its calf died.'

In many cases, this construction demonstrates lexical selectivity. For instance, almost all speakers of Kalmyk refuse to use *od-* with the verb *tör-* 'to be born' and instead suggest using a complex predicate with the auxiliary verb *ʁar-* 'to come out'.

   The verb *od-* versus the affix *-čkə* (and the verb *ork-* when it is used) displays a tendency for complementary distribution. Constructions with *od-* cannot be used for transitive verbs, while *-čkə* is usually affixed to transitive verbs. The distribution of constructions with *od-* and verb *ork* or affix *-čkə* provides a means to differentiate between the verbs with final consonants *-r* and *-l* that form an equipollent causative opposition. Verbs with final consonant *-r* are intransitive. There are several pairs of verbs that represent this opposition in Kalmyk: for example, *tasər-* 'to come off' and *tasəl-* 'to tear (something) off', *shuur-* 'to burst (itr.)' and *shuul-* 'to tear (something)', *xamxər-* 'to break (intr.)' and *xamxəl-* 'to break (something)'. To express a completive meaning, *od-* is regularly used in constructions with intransitive verbs, while with transitive verbs with final *-l*, only constructions with *-čkə* or *ork-* are possible (examples 9a-b and 10a-b).

(9a) *suulʁə   xamxər-ǯə   odə-v*
      bucket   break(intr.)-CV.ANT go.away-PST
      'The bucket broke.'

(9b) *suulʁə xamxər-čk-əv
      bucket   break(intr.)-COMPL-PST
      'The bucket broke.'

(10a) *Badma köl-än   xamxəl-čkə-v
      Badma   leg-P.REFL break(tr.)-COMPL-PST
(10b) *Badma köl-än   xamxəl-ǯ   odə-v
      Badma leg-P.REFL   break (tr.)-CV.IPFV go.away-PST
      'Badma broke his leg.'

On the synchronic level, there are both combinations of the verb *od-* with other verbs of movement and complex predicates present in Kalmyk in which *od-* is responsible for an aspectual rather than a spatial component of meaning (i.e. completive semantics). These combinations differ in their semantic and morphosyntactic properties.

2.3. Complex predicates with *av-* 'take' with inanimate subjects

Grammars and Ondzhanova (1969) affirm that completive meaning can be expressed by complex predicates with the auxiliaries *ög-* 'to give' and *av-* 'to take' but my data demonstrate that perfectiveness is characteristic only of combinations of *av-* with inanimate subjects (and in other cases, complex predicates have a benefactive and reflexive-benefactive meaning, see Section 3).

(11) čejnik-tə usə-n   busəl-ǯə   avu-v
      kettle-DAT water-EXT boil-CV.IPFV take-PST
      'The water in the kettle has boiled (already).'

The analysis of the texts indicates that this complex predicate with the auxiliary *av-* with inanimate subjects does not occur in Kalmyk very often.

2.4. Summary

There are some actual ways of expressing perfectiveness in Kalmyk: the affix *-čkə* (and sometimes complex predicates with auxiliary *ork-* 'to put'), complex predicates with auxiliary *od-* and peripheral constructions with the auxiliary *av-* with inanimate subjects. The most grammaticalized way is by using the affix *-čkə* which arises (according to GKYA (1983)) from the merging converb *-ǯə* and *ork-* 'to put'. The complex predicate with auxiliary *od-* also has a tendency to morphologization, especially in oral speech, with the evidential affix *-čə* (see the form fused with *oč* 'go.away.EVD' above).

As Bybee et al. (1994) show, a completive (= perfective) marker in many languages develops from a verb meaning FINISH and also from words with directional and motional semantics. The auxiliary *od-* is a motion verb, and the auxiliary *ork-* with the diachronical meaning 'to throw away, to cast off' has the semantic properties of movement, causation of motion.

The verb *od-* versus the affix *-čkə* (and verb *ork-* when it is used) displays a tendency for complementary distribution. Constructions with *od-* cannot be used for transitive verbs, while *-čkə* is usually affixed to transitive verbs. The distribution of verbs that have similar semantics depending on whether they are transitive or intransitive can also be observed in other languages of the world. It is both possible to use a pair of verbs that differ only in transitivity (as in many Turkic languages where the verbs meaning FINISH and LEAVE are combined with transitive verbs while those meaning COME TO AN END and STAY are combined with intransitive ones (Nasilov 1989)) or apply various grammaticalized verbs (as in the Indo-Arian languages where the verbs GIVE and TAKE art combined with transitive verbs and the verbs GO and GO AWAY are associated with intransitive verbs; such a distribution is sometimes referred to as *transitivity harmony* (see Maisak 2005: 324)).

In Kalmyk, the completive meaning is more common, that expresses reaching of a natural limit. It is typical for telic verbs expressing dynamic events (accomplishments and achievements as coined by Vendler (1967)). For the atelic process (Vendler's activities) and state the perfectivizing function consists in the implementation of an initial border and achieves an inchoative interpretation.

3. Auxiliaries *av-* 'to take' with animate subjects, *ög-* 'to give' and *xaj-* 'to throw'

In this section, I will briefly discuss complex predicates with the auxiliaries which have been considered perfective in previous works (primarily, Ondzhanovas 1969), but according to my data are not.

3.1. The verbs *av-* 'to take' with animate subjects and *ög-* 'to give'

The verbs *av-* 'to take' and *ög-* 'to give' in a complex predicate go together with the imperfective converb *-ʒə*. M. D. Ondzhanova (1969) defines *av-* and *ög-* as markers of the **completive aspect** with the additional meaning of "an action in somebody else's favor" or "for oneself" respectively. My field materials demonstrate that the main meaning of a complex predicate with *ög-* is benefactive (without a completive meaning), whereas complex predicate with *av-* has the meaning of reflexive benefactive with animate subjects and the meaning of completiveness with inanimate subjects.

Complex predicates with *ög-* signify that the situation includes a benefactive participant that does not coincide with the agent ('subject does P in favor of X) (examples 12a and 12b), while in reflexive benefactive constructions the subject coincides with the recipient (examples 13a and 13b).

(12a) *Badma   maxə   šar-ǯ   ögə-v*
      Badma   meat   fry-CV.IPFV   give-PST
      'Badma fried the meat (for somebody else).'

(12b) *Badma   nan-də   maxə   šar-ǯ   ögə-v*
      Badma   I-DAT   meat   fry-CV.IPFV   give-PST
      'Badma fried the meat for me.'

(13a) *Ajsa   maxə   šar-ǯ   avə-v*
      Ajsa   meat   fry-CV.IPFV   take-PST
      'Ajsa fried the meat (to eat it on her own).'

(13b) *Ajsa   bij-d-än   maxə   šar-ǯ   avə-v*
      Ajsa   body-DAT-P.REFL   meat   fry-CV.IPFV   take-PST
      'Ajsa fried the meat for herself.'

Constructions with *av-* and *ög-* introduce a new participant, although its presence is necessary only from the semantic point of view. Syntactic manifestation of the beneficiary is optional (as in examples 12a and 13a). Nevertheless, the benefactive participant in complex predicates with *ög-* usually has material representation (unless it is evident from the context). In cases such as example 13b, the reflexive pronoun *bijdän* 'oneself' is used as a means of emphasis. When the benefactive participant is unexpressed, the chosen complex predicate form identifies whether the beneficiary and the subject coincide or not.

Both *av-* and *ög-* partially retain their initial semantics of transmission. Constructions like this can be referred to as complex predicates only based on word order and a unified argument structure. The best semantic verbs to enter into such a construction are those that imply physical or metaphoric transmission (example 14).

(14) *enə tuuly-igə   bi   eeǯ-äsə*
     this fairytale-ACC   I.NOM   grandmother-ABL.P.REFL
     med-ǯə   av-u-v
     recognaze-CV.IPFV   take-PST-1SG
     'I learned this fairytale from my grandmother.'

Both of these verbs cannot be noted as fully desemanticized, as long as they still cannot form constructions with malefactive meanings and cannot group with verbs that imply loss (as, for instance, the verb *gee-* 'to lose').

In the languages of the world, the development of benefactive meanings is perhaps the most widespread grammaticalization route for the verb TO GIVE (see Heine & Kuteva 2002: 149), whereas the development of constructions with the verb TO TAKE into reflexive benefactives cannot be listed among frequent grammaticalization routes. The verb TO TAKE is more likely to transform into a completive marker accordingly (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 286–287). In the Mongolic languages, there are several varieties of grammaticalization for the verbs TO GIVE and TO TAKE with a resulting benefactive or completive meaning. For example, both benefactive and reflexive benefactive constructions exist in Khalkha Mongolian (see Kuzmenkov 1984).

The relationship between the Kalmyk benefactive constructions with *ög-* and reflexive benefactive constructions with *av-* is not symmetrical. Kalmyk speakers do not use combinations of *ög-* with an inanimate subject but permit their usage with the verb *av-*. In this case, the whole construction has a completive interpretation, whereas a reflexive-benefactive interpretation is not possible when the subject is inanimate (15):

(15) *čejnik-tə   usə-n   busəl-ǯə   avu-v*
      kettle-DAT   water-EXT   boil-CV.IPFV   take-PST
      'The water in the kettle has boiled (already).' / *'Boiled for itself"

3.2. Complex predicates with *xaj-* 'to throw'

The verb *xaj-* 'to throw' as a part of a complex predicate is combined with transitive verbs. Constructions with *xaj-* are not mentioned in the traditional grammars of Kalmyk (Pyurbeev 1977, GKYA 1983). Here, I suggest a preliminary observation of the auxiliary *xaj-* but its uses are quite rare and sometimes its semantics is not clear.

As it has already been stated, M. D. Ondzhanova (1969) lists *xaj-* alongside other auxiliary verbs used to form the *complete aspect*. However, my field materials show that complex predicates with *xaj-* do not express a perfective meaning as such. Complex predicates with *xaj-* are not included in the paradigm of perfective markers and frequently go together with the completive affix *-čkə*.

There are only a few cases with the auxiliary *xaj-* in texts. For example, in tales, this complex predicate has a meaning of intensive action or total involvement of the object in the process (and in example 16, the result of it is a total destruction and absence of the boots):

(16) *övgə-n   bos-ad   evr-änn^j   ʁos-an*
old.man-EXT   get.up-CV.ANT   oneself-GEN.P.3   boot-P.REFL
tƛär-äd   xaj-ad   *örü-n-d-än*
cut-CV.ANT   throw-CV.ANT   morning-EXT-DAT-P.REFL
bos-xlagə   ter ʁosə-n^j uga
get.up-CV.SUCC2 that boot-P.3   NEG.COP
'The old man was up (at night) and cut the boots. When (the
family) woke up in the morning, there weren't any boots'.

The phrase in example 17 has two interpretations, and one has a meaning of total
involvement of the object in the process and the other close to the continuative aspect:

(17) *carcaxa urʁcə id-äd   xaj-ǯa-na*
locust   crop   eat-CV.ANT   throw-PROG-PRS
a)'Locusts are eating (all) the crop.'; b) 'Locusts are still in the course
of eating, even though they are close to finishing.' (i.e., they have eaten
(for some time) and are now throwing it away → finishing it off)

The examples above show that a complex predicate with *xaj-* does not have a com-
pletive meaning and, furthermore, (with a progressive affix) it can express a mean-
ing associated with the imperfective domain. The intensity is close to more the gen-
eral category of *pluractionality*, or *event plurality*. In Bertinetto and Lenci (2011),
pluractionality is considered within the context of the categories of habituality and
imperfectivity.

Complex predicates with *xaj-* used for quantum objects can express both inten-
sity and the meaning of distributional object plurality:

(18) *bi   cug aaʁə-savə xamxl-ad   xaj-čkə-v*
I.NOM   all dishes   break-CV.ANT   throw-COMPL-PST
'I have broken all the cups (lit.: teabowl dishes).'

Constructions with *xaj-* that involve multiplicative verbs describe an action as an
iteration, a sequence of punctual events when one situation is repeated several times
with the same set of participants ('to beat', 'to kiss'). In such constructions, there are
frequently used reduplicated forms of the converb with the affix *-ǯə* (example 19).
Reduplication as such is one of the widespread means of transmitting multiplicative
meanings and, in general, of expressing verbal plurality.

(19) *Bajrta küük-än üms-č-üms-čə   xaj-čkə-v*
Bajrta girl-EXT   kiss-CV.IPFV kiss-CV.IPFV   throw-COMPL-PST
'Bajrta covered her daughter with kisses.'

The verb *xaj-* as a part of a complex predicate has not completely lost its initial semantics: in some contexts, the informants realize that it bears a connection with throwing or tossing. For instance, complex predicates containing *xaj-* are frequently used to describe some destructive actions, especially when they imply throwing as it happens in example 19. However, there are lexical compatibility limitations. As a general rule, complex predicates with *xaj-* have an additional pejorative shade of meaning and denote a negative appraisal of a situation. This construction is not present in literary texts, as speakers of Kalmyk consider it a colloquial or even rude expression.

The examples listed above demonstrate that complex predicates with *xaj-* cannot be attributed to the perfective domain. Depending on the lexical semantics and actional properties of the dependent verb, complex predicates of this class have one or several related meanings, such as intensity, affectedness, distributive object plurality or multiplicative semantics.

3.3. Summary

Although Ondzanova considers the verbs *av-*, *ög-* 'and *xaj-* to be completive / perfective auxiliaries, they express different meanings. The benefactive and reflexive benefactive are core for complex predicates with the affix *av-* with animate subjects and *ög-*. The auxiliary *xaj-* forms constructions with the meanings of intensity and pluractionality.

4.   Imperfective domain

4.1. The general characteristics of the imperfective in Kalmyk

The main way of expressing imperfective meanings in Kalmyk is with the progressive marker *-ǯa* which apparently originated from the combination of the imperfective converb ending in *-ǯə* with the verb *bää-* 'to be', according to Bläsing (2003: 244). Moreover, Kalmyk also has complex predicates with imperfective meanings formed from *bää-* as well as other auxiliary verbs *jov-* 'to walk', *kevt-* 'to lie' and *suu-* 'to sit'. The verbs *bää-* and *jov-* are used both with the converb ending in *-ǯə* and the converb ending in *-ad*, whereas the verbs of position (*kevt-* and *suu-*) can only be combined with the anterior converb ending in *-ad*. All the above mentioned verbs are intransitive and can be combined with both transitive and intransitive verbs, although combinations with intransitive verbs are used more often.

Complex predicates belonging to the imperfective domain have been summarily described in Ebert (1999) and Bertinetto et al. (2000). They contrast *focalized progressive* constructions, i.e. those expressing the notion of an event viewed as going

on at a single point of time vs. *durative progressive*, i.e those that describe a large interval of time (see Bertinetto et al. 2000: 527)[7].

Combinations of converbs ending in -*ǯə* with the verbs *jov-* and *bää-* form *focused progressive* forms, the form ending in -*ǯana* is a durative progressive form Ebert (1999: 334). Combinations with the converb ending in -*ad* and auxiliaries *bää-/jov-/suu-* form *durative*, in Ebert (1999: 334), or "various types of durative situations, like continuativity, iterativity, graduality" (Bertinetto et al. 2000: 544).

My data are mainly in agreement with these works (see below for a few differences), so I will only specify a few characteristics of the semantic properties concerning the complex predicates consisting of anterior converb -*ad* and auxiliary verbs *bää-/jov-/suu-* that are treated as synonyms by Ebert (1999: 334). Although these complex predicates are indeed weakly specified, different auxiliary verbs introduce different semantic properties.

Also, I am not going to use the tripartite division (the durative, the durative progressive and the focused progressive); by the **durative**, I understand the various types of nonactual-progressive views of the situation (at moment T, situation P is in progress which means that P was in progress before T and is going to be in progress after T). The **progressive** aspect means that the situation has an actual interpretation (at moment T, progressive dynamic situation P is actually in progress).

4.2. Progressive. Complex predicate with the converb ending in -*ǯə* and the verbs *bää-* 'to be' and *jov-* 'to walk'

According to Bertinetto et al. (2000: 533), complex predicates in Kalmyk with the copula *bää-* 'to be' and converb ending in -*ǯə* are almost completely substituted by present progressive forms ending in -*ǯa-na* PROG-PRS. My data show that -*ǯə bää-* is in fact a rare form (for example, it is not found in texts, the elicited examples below are taken from questionnaires) and it is used with those predicates whose actional characteristics make it difficult for them to have progressive forms: with verbs of state (example 20) or punctive verbs (example 21) which, in this case, usually have a figurative meaning, and the compound verb has an additional resultative meaning (example 21).

(20) *Badma   Baatr   xojr   xörn   ǯil-də   üürl-ǯə   bää-nä*
     Badma   Batyr   two   20   year-DAT   be friends-CV.IPFV   be-PRS
     'Badma and Batyr have been friends for 20 years.'

---

7.   There is a third type, "'absentive' constructions, i.e., those conveying the meaning of an event occurring in a place displaced from the deictic centre", in Bertinetto et al. (2000: 527), but this is irrelevant to Kalmyk data.

(21) *Badm-in   Manǯə   toxm-an   gee-ǯə   bää-nä*
     Badma-GEN   Mandzhi   breed-REFL   loose-CV.IPFV   be-PRS
     'Badmaev Mandzhi's family line is broken (only girls have been
     born).' (literally 'Badmaev Mandzhi is losing his family line')

K. Ebert (1999) interprets combinations of the verb *bää-* with converbs ending in
-ǯə as "focused" progressive forms as compared to the neutral syntactic expression
of progressive forms by those ending in *-ǯana*. However, strictly speaking, complex
predicates V-*ǯə bää-* are not progressive due to the fact that they are combined with
stative verbs, whereas the progressive is used with dynamic predicates and cannot be
combined with stative verbs (Bybee et al. 1994: 126).
     Another analytical form, a converb ending in *-ǯə* in combination with the verb
jov- form the progressive from verbs of movement (example 22), verbs that have the
semantic property of spatial motion (such as 'to dance', 'to whirl' in example 23) or
that contain a motion component, such as the verb 'to put' which describes causation
of movement (24).

(22) *xälä-Ø,   xälä-Ø   moʁa   ger-ür*
     look-IMP   look-IMP   snake   house-DIR
     or-ǯə   jov-na!
     enter-CV.IPFV   walk-PRS
     'Look, look, a snake is crawling towards the house!'

(23) *küükə-n   biil-ǯə   jov-na*
     girl-EXT   dance-CV.IPFV   walk-PRS
     'A girl is dancing.'

(24) *Nina   širä   deer   aaʁə   täv-ǯə   jov-na*
     Nina   table   surface   cup   put-CV.IPFV   walk-PRS
     'Nina is putting the plates on the table.'

The progressive construction of verbs of movement is formed both by forms ending
in *-ǯa-na*/*-ǯa-la*, and the combination of a converb ending in *-ǯə* with the verb *jov-*.
Many verbs of movement in Kalmyk (for example, *güü-* 'to run', *nis-* 'to fly', *mölk-* 'to
crawl', *öömə-* 'to swim') have the meaning of non-directional chaotic motion and can-
not be combined with denominations of a starting and/or finishing point of movement:

(25) *xälä-Ø!   šovu-n   nis-ǯä-nä*
     look-IMP   bird-EXT   fly-PROG-PRS
     'Look! The bird is flying (to and fro).'

(26) *ter   samolet   Moskva-ʁasə   Aʁš-ur*
      that plane   Moscow-ABL   Volgograd-DIR
      nis-ʒ́ə   jov-na   /   *nis-ʒ́ä-nä
      fly-CV.IPFV   walk-PRS   fly-PROG-PRS
      'This plane is flying from Moscow to Volgograd.'

Complex predicates with the imperfective converb *-ʒ́ə* and auxiliary *jov-* express a directional motion in combination with verbs signifying ways of movement and lacking any indication of direction.

4.3. Durative. Complex predicates with anterior converbs ending in -ad and the copula bää-, postural verbs and the verb jov-

The copula *bää-* is combined with anterior converbs ending in *-ad*, and compound verbs V-*ad bää-* express a rather wide range of durative meanings and other meanings close to the durative.

The *durative* implies a nonfactual-durative view of the situation (i.e. the situation was happening before a certain point and may continue after it):

(27) *Očir   av-xə   degtr-igə   Saglər šuluʁar*
      Ochir take-PC.FUT book-ACC   Saglar fast
      umš-ad   bää-nä
      read-CV.ANT   be-PRS
      'Saglar is reading a book very fast which Ochir is going to take from him soon.'

Complex predicates can sometimes have an iterative or habitual interpretation ('every day'):

(28) (...) *durə-n-də-nʲ   xotə-nʲ   ög-äd*
            wish-EXT-DAT-P.3   food-P.3   give-CV.ANT
      bord-ad   bää-nä
      feed up-CV.ANT be-PRS
       '(...)gives food at will, feeds up'.

The durative with *bää-* may express a certain property, a permanent characteristic of an object:

(29) *terü-n-äsə   ikär   seʒ́-äd   bää-nä*
      that-EXT-ABL very   be.suspicious-CV.ANT be-PRS
      'Because of this, he is constantly very frightened.'

With strong telic verbs in the form of converbs ending in *-ad* the complex predicate with the copula *bää-* 'to be' has a resultative meaning:

(30) (...) *öŋgr-äd   bää-ǯə   mini   eckə*
        die-CV.ANT   be-EVD   I.GEN   father
      '(...) and died, my father.'

Another way of expressing the durative is by using complex predicates with the verbs 'to sit' and 'to lie'. Ebert (1999: 338) notes that combinations with postural verbs are very rarely used and always retain something of their literal meaning i.e. they are used in contexts such as *umš-ad suu-* / *kevt-* (read-CV.ANT sit / lie) 'sit / lie and read'.
     However, my data show a much greater degree of desemantization of *suu-* 'to sit' and *kevt-* 'to lie' as part of complex predicates: they are combined with dynamic verbs that do not have the semantic properties of spatial position (sitting or lying) (example 31), including verbs of movement (example 32) and verbs of position as part of a compound verb cannot be understood literally, i.e. it does not describe the spatial position of an object but has an aspectual meaning (example 33).

(31) *daŋgin   xö   al-ad   kevt-nä*
      always   sheep   slaughter-CV.ANT   lie-PRS
      '(Badma likes to receive guests and) constantly slaughters sheep.'

(32) *Manǯə   gerə   erg-äd   güü-ʁäd   suu-na*
      Manzhi   house   whirl-CV.ANT   run-CV.ANT   sit-PRS
      'Mandzhi is running around the house'.

(33) *enə   zurəg   daŋgin   un-ad   kevt-nä*
      this   drawing   always   fall-CV.ANT   lie-PRS
      'This picture keeps falling down' / *'Picture, having fallen, is lying.'

Complex predicates with the verbs *suu-* and *kevt-* are synonymous and weakly distributed. Forms with *kevt-* have an additional connotation: the informants describe complex predicates with *kevt-* as **coarse and informal** forms (example 34).

(34) *caadkə   zalu-čən   gergə-n-d-än*
      remote   man-PCL.CONC   wife-EXT-DAT-REFL
      naa-ld-ad   kevt-nä
      glue-RECP-CV.ANT   lie-PRS
      '(My neighbor keeps complaining about her son like
      this:) "This man so stick to his wife".'

It is typologically characteristic of these forms to have a negative connotation: Newman (2002: 3) draws our attention to the important associations the verb TO LIE has with rest, sleep, illness and death, which may account for the grammaticalization of appraisive meanings.

The verb *jov-* is combined with the verbal adverb ending in *-ad* from verbs of movement and has a durative or a habitual interpretation:

(35) *xortə-n   cug xöö-d   al-ad   jov-na*
      enemy-EXT   all sheep-PL   kill-CV.IPFV   walk-PRS
      a) 'The enemy is killing all the sheep (right now)';
      b) 'The enemy kills all the sheep (usually does this)'.

Verbs of movement can also be combined with complex predicate verbs with the auxiliaries *jov-* and *bää-*; in the case of the latter auxiliary, it is not the semantic properties of motion that is emphasized any longer but the denotation of the location in a space (compare examples 36a and 36b):

(36a) *ʁärd šovu-n   xö-d   deegür   nis-äd   jov-na*
      eagle bird-EXT sheep-PL above   fly-CV.ANT   walk-PRS
      'An eagle is flying over the sheep.'

(36b) *ʁärd šovu-n   xö-d   deegür   nis-äd   bää-nä*
      eagle bird-EXT sheep-PL above   fly-CV.ANT be-PRS
      'An eagle is flying over the sheep (soaring over the flock, motionless).'

4.4. Summary. Complex predicate distribution in the imperfective

In Kalmyk, several complex predicates belong to the imperfective domain (along with the progressive affix *-ǯa* that appears as the result of morphologization of the compound verb with the imperfective converb ending in *-ǯə* and the auxiliary *bää-*). The progressive is usually expressed by the affix *-ǯa*, and the analytical form is used with predicates for which it is difficult to have an actual-durative interpretation (punctive, stative) and to form the progressive of the verbs of movement.

Kalmyk has several weakly distributed forms of the durative with the verb 'to be', verbs of position and the verb 'to walk'. Compound verbs with the copula *bää-* and with the form of the disjunctive participle ending in *-ad* are neutral ways of expressing a durative state.

Complex predicates based on the verbs of position 'to sit' and 'to lie', which have an intensive durative meaning (P is taking [too/very] long), are used less often. The complex predicate with verb *kevt-* has negative connotation in Kalmyk.

5.   Degree of Grammaticalization of Complex Predicates

5.1. Semantic bleaching

Kalmyk complex predicates emerge on the basis of lexemes with a generalized meaning that reflect some basic situations and concepts of human perception, such as verbs of movement (*jov-* 'to walk', *od-* 'to go away'), verbs of position (*kevt-* 'to lie', *suu-* 'to sit') and verbs of causation of movement (*ork-* 'to put', *xaj-* 'to throw', *ög-* 'to give', *av-* 'to take').

The degree of grammaticalization for different complex predicates differs. For the majority of verbs, their semantic motivation is partly retained alongside the combinatory limitations for dependent verbs (these limitations are usually semantic and sometimes are conditioned by the actional properties of the semantic verb). The verbs with the highest degree of grammaticalization (*ork-*, *bää-*) almost never have their own semantic limitations.

In combination with verbs that do not contain a component of movement or reorientation in space, the verb *od-* is substantially desemanticized, but the original semantics of moving away can be traced back to its tendency to be combined with verbs that describe disappearance or deformation (see Section 2.2).

Two constructions are created with the auxiliary *av-*. First, it has a reflexive benefactive meaning with an animate subject, partly keeping the literal meaning 'to take' in complex predicates. There are very frequently constructions such as *sur-ǯə avə* (ask-CV.IPFV take = 'ask for myself') and lexicalizations such as *xul-ǯə avə-* (trade-CV.IPFV take = 'to buy'). The second meaning has semantic bleaching with inanimate subjects, which referred to perfective domain, and does not have the primary semantic properties of taking.

As previously mentioned in Section 3.1, both complex predicates with the auxiliary *av-* with an animate subject and *ög-* cannot be called fully desemanticized, as long as they still cannot form constructions with malefactive meanings and cannot group with verbs that imply loss (such as the verb *gee-* 'to lose'). The verb *xaj-* composed of a complex predicate also partially retains its initial semantics of transmission.

Complex predicates with the imperfective converb *-ǯə* and auxiliary *jov-* express directional motion in combination with verbs referring to ways of movement and lacking any indication of direction; in combination with non-movement verbs, it loses its primary meaning and only indicates aspectual semantic properties. The auxiliary s*uu-* and *kevt-* as part of complex predicates undergo desemantization (see Section 4.3).

5.2. Morphosyntactic features (negation, passivization, etc.)

Two verbs with a perfective meaning (*ork-* and *od-*) are both strongly grammaticalized. The verb *ork-* is almost never used independently (in the sense the verb *täv-* 'to put, to place' is frequently used) and is relatively rare as a part of a complex predicate. A complex predicate with the main verb *ork-* has a range of limitations, i.e. morphosyntactic changes, for example, it cannot occur in a negative construction (example 37) or be causativized or passivized.

(37) **eckə-m   nan-də   bičəg   bič-čə*
     father-P.1SG   I.DAT   letter   write-CV.IPFV
     ork-sən   uga
     put-PC.PST   NEG.COP
     (intended meaning: 'Father didn't write me a letter.')

The morphosyntactic limitations on this construction as well as the fact that *ork-* is never used in colloquial Kalmyk seem to correspond with the deduction that the affix *-čkə* had been a result of morphologization (when a lexical item loses its independency). In literary Kalmyk, which is by definition more conservative, this process is taking place more slowly. In Kalmyk literature, the full form of *ork-* is used.

These Kalmyk verbs have undergone a grammaticalization process into perfective markers. In case of the verb *ork-*, we can note almost full morphologization (according to B. Heine (1993: 62–64). The verb *od-* has also advanced on the grammaticalization path. However, on the synchronic level, in Kalmyk there are less grammaticalized spatial verbs (stage 3 according to Heine) as well as more grammaticalized complex predicates with aspectual semantic properties (stage 4).

Complex predicates with *od-* as the auxiliary verb in the construction coexisting on a synchronic level display different morphosyntactic properties in spatial and completive meanings. As regards the aspectual (perfective) meaning, there are several morphosyntactic limitations, such as prohibition against the negation of a complex predicate with *od-* (example 38), whereas complex predicates with a spatial meaning accept negation, providing that the biverbial structure is retained (negation is part of the complex predicate as a whole), (example 39).

(38) **Badma   kögšər-ž   od-sən   uga*
     Badma   grow.old-CV.IPFV   go away-PC.PST   NEG.COP
     'Badma did not grow old.'

(39) *küükə-d   kičäl-äsən   güü-žə   od-sən   uga*
     girl-PL   lesson-ABL.P.REFL   run-CV.IPFV   go.away-PC.PST   NEG.COP
     'The children did not skip the lesson.'

The passive marker -gdə can be affixed to complex predicates with spatial semantic properties (in the sense of necessity). Complex predicates with completive semantic properties do not accept passivization.

(40) *nandə ödər bolʁə-n Elstə or-ǯə   od-gd-na*
     I.DAT   day   every-EXT Elista enter-CV.IPFV go.away-PASS-PRS
     'I have to go to Elista every day.'

Similarly, the morphosyntactic properties of complex predicates with the imperfective converb ending -*ǯə* and the anterior converb -*ad*, both with with the auxiliary *jov-*, differ in terms of spatial semantics (auxiliaries show the direction of movement) and in an aspectual meaning. It is possible to have negation in the first case (as in example 41) and it is not when the auxiliary *jov-* expresses the aspect.

(41) *noxa ez-än   ard-asə dax-ǯə*
     dog   owner-REFL back-ABL follow-CV.IPFV
     jov-sən   uga
     walk-PC.PST NEG.COP
     'The dog doesn't follow its master.'

Complex predicates with *av-*, *ög-* and *xaj-* have not undergone morphosyntactic changes, for example, they can occur in a negative construction (with a wide scope of negation) or be causativized or passivized:

(42) *Nina (nan-də) duul-ǯə   ög-sən   uga*
     Nina (I.DAT)   sing-CV.IPFV give-PC.PST NEG.COP
     'Nina doesn't sing (for me) (she doesn't want to sing).'

(43) *Badma gerg-än   cok-ad   xaj-sən   uga*
     Badma wife-REFL beat-CV.ANT throw-PC.PST NEG.COP
     'Badma didn't beat his wife black and blue.'

Durative constructions, i.e. complex predicates with anterior converb -*ad* and auxiliary *bää-/jov-/suu-/kevt-*, are not usually used in a negative construction. There are no examples of the negation of durative complex predicates in the texts, nevertheless some informants use it (example 44):

(44) *Ajsa-n   mal-mud   üvl-är   ük-äd*
     Aisa-GEN cattle-PL winter-INS die-CV.ANT
     kevt-sən   uga
     lie-PC.PST NEG.COP
     'Aisa's cattle didn't die this winter.'

5.3. Phonetic transformation

The last stage of grammaticalization is the disappearance of a lexical item, but synchronically, there are a continuum of forms from lexeme to clitic. Part of the complex predicates in Kalmyk creates a fused form.

The most grammaticalized form in the imperfective domain is the complex predicate with the imperfective converb -*ǯə* and the auxiliary *bää-*. It has the fusion form -*ǯa-na* (glossed as two morphemes -PROG-PRS). The construction -*ǯə bää-* is almost never used independently and cannot occur in a negative construction or be causativized or passivized.

The most grammaticalized auxiliary in the perfective domain, *ork-* 'to put', undergoes the transformation in the completive affix -*čkə* in colloquial speech. The verb *od-* is also strongly grammaticalized. Besides the semantic changes considered above, the frequent form in spoken Kalmyk for the evidential past derived from the combination of *od-* and the marker of inferential evidentiality -*čə* (*od-čə*, 'go away-EVD') is subject to contraction and displays a tendency to merge with a form of converb from the phonetic point of view (for instance, vowel harmony is a factor). All these features can be considered a sign of on-going morphologization (compare the completive -*čkə* and progressive affix -*ǯa* which originates from an imperfective affix and copula *bää-*).

In oral speech there are fused forms -*ǯa-və* derived from the affix of imperfective converb with combinations of the verb *av-*.

(45) *bičk-düd   muzej-də   ir-äd*
      child-PL   museum-DAT   come-CV.ANT
      olən   son^jn   jumə
      different   interest   thing
      xälä-ǯä-və = (*xälä-ǯ avə-v*)
      see-CV.IPFV-take.PST
      'The children came to museum and saw a lot of interesting things.'

5.4. Summary and Table

The properties of Kalmyk complex predicates previously discussed can be summarized by a few parameters:

Phonetic transformations: 1) reduction of the material 2) adaptation (leading to the development of synharmonic allomorphs).

Desemantization: a) the loss of the lexeme's original meaning in the function of the top-node of a compound verb; b) the regularity of combinations with predicates of any class; c) stylistic neutrality vs. markedness.

Morphosyntactic changes (*decategorization* according to B. Heine (1993)): a) the location of the **makers of actant derivation** at the top-node or in the lexical verb; b) the loss of ability to form negation.

The characteristics of Kalmyk complex predicates are summarized in Table 1. The complex predicates that possess each characteristic is marked by +. Those that only possess one or two of the characteristics are marked by + / −. The shading reflects the degree of grammaticalization: the dark gray areas show the most grammaticalised forms and the white area signifies the least grammaticalized.

Verb	Phonetic transformation / morphologization	Desemanticization	Morphosyntactic changes
-ǯǝ ork- '-CV.IPFV put'	+	+	+
-ǯǝ od- '-CV.IPFV go away'(aspectual)	+/−	+	+
-ǯǝ bää- '-CV.IPFV be'	+	+	+
-ad bää- '-CV.ANT be-'	−	+	+/−
-ǯǝ jov- '-CV.IPFV walk-' (aspectual)	−	+/−	+/−
-ad jov- '-CV.ANT walk-' (aspectual)	−	+/−	+/−
-ad kevt '-CV.ANT lie-'	−	+/−	+/−
-ad suu- '-CV.ANT sit-'	−	+/−	+/−
av- 'to take' with inanimate subject	+/−	+	−
av- 'to take' (with an animate subject)	+/−	+/−	−
ög- 'to give'	−	+/−	−
xaj- 'to throw'	−	+/−	−
spatial construction (with auxiliary *jov-* 'to walk-' *od-* 'to go away')	−	−	−

Table 1. Degree of grammaticalization of complex predicates in Kalmyk.

As Table 1 shows, the different levels of grammaticalization (semantic bleaching, phonetic transformation and morphosyntactic changes) are interrelated but the speed of each process may vary. Also, we can see that that one verb gives a set of constructions under grammaticalization with a different place on the grammaticalization chain. As we already noted, grammaticalization affects whole constructions rather than single lexemes, thus we should consider the impact made by each one of the grammatical and lexical units. In Kalmyk, the most grammaticalized constructions are those with imperfective converbs ending in *-ǯǝ*.

These data may further clarify the understanding of the grammaticalization path. B. Heine (1993: 54–60) unites the semantic (*desemantization*), morphosyntactic (*decategorization*), morphophonological (*clitization*) and phonetic (*erosion*) levels into stages. This approach allows us to determine the position of a linguistic unit on the scale of grammaticalization. In B. Heine's classification, desemantization is completely finished on stage C, and although the verb may be on several neighboring stages according to different parameters, it is assumed that the discussion of semantics is redundant on stages D to G. However, Kalmyk data show that some "traces" of the semantics of the top-node verb may persist even on the last levels of grammaticalization. Earlier in this paper, I discussed the special characteristics of the strongly grammaticalized verb *od-* that has lost its semantic properties of physical movement in space but still partly preserves the semantic properties of **going away** (this compound verb is often combined with verbs of physical destruction or disappearance of objects such as 'to break', 'come to pieces' 'to die', 'to rot', but is not combined with predicates denoting **emergence** such as 'to be born')

6.   Conclusions

Perfective semantics is the core for complex predicates with auxiliary verbs *ork-* 'to put' and *od-* 'to go away' and peripheral for *av-* 'to take' with an inanimate subject (perhaps, the further grammaticalization will cause expansion of the perfective to other cases of using complex predicates with *av-*). The affix *-čkə /* the verb *ork-* predominantly combined with transitive verbs are in complementary distribution with *od-* used for intransitive verbs.

For telic situations, a completive interpretation signifies the moment of reaching the endpoint, whereas in atelic contexts, the limit coincides with the starting point and the perfectivizing of atelic predicates achieves an inchoative interpretation. It is especially typical for auxiliary *od-* to have different interpretations with different aspectual verb classes: inchoative/ingressive with activity and state verbs, but completive with accomplishment and achievement verbs. Complex predicates with *od-* have grammaticalized on the basis of complex predicates with a spatial meaning. In modern Kalmyk, both less grammaticalized spatial combinations and complex predicates with *od-* 'with completive semantic properties can be used.

The verbs *av-*, with an animate subject, and *ög-* 'to give' express benefactive and reflexive benefactive properties, i.e. they transform the argument structure but not aspect. The auxiliary *xaj-* 'to throw' expresses different meanings connected with pluractionality (intensity, total involvement of object, iteration).

The most grammaticalized way of expressing imperfective meanings in Kalmyk is using the progressive marker *-ǯa* which originates from the combination of an imperfective converb ending in *-ǯə* with the verb *bää-* 'to be'. There are also complex predicates with imperfective semantic properties. A complex predicate with

imperfective converb -ǯə and verb *jov-* 'to walk' make up the progressive with motion verbs. There are a different ways to express the durative with a set of complex predicates with anterior converb -*ad* and auxiliary *bää-/jov-/suu-* 'to sit'/ *kevt-* 'to lie'. These forms have approximate semantic properties and a weak distribution. This is typical for the process of grammaticalization when, on the synchronic level, similar constructions co-exist, interact and compete with each other (Hopper (1991) calls such a phenomenon *layering*).

The majority of auxiliary verbs in Kalmyk express aspectual meanings and their analysis allows us to arrive at certain conclusions not just regarding complex predicates but also regarding the structure of the aspectual system in Kalmyk. Diachronically, Kalmyk has no synthetic means of expressing aspectual semantics. There are complex predicates with aspectual meanings and affixes which emerge as a result of grammaticalization.

In other words, the aspectual system of Kalmyk arose as the result of grammaticalization; the most grammaticalized verbs developed synthetic forms (the completive affix -*čkə* and the progressive affix -*ǯa*, going back to the combinations of converbs with the verbs *ork-* and *bää-* respectively). Other means of expressing aspectual meanings represent a continuum of grammaticalized complex predicates. This unites Kalmyk with other languages that have analytical aspectual systems (see the typological review of the systems of *analytical perfectivation* in Maysak 2005: 293).

The most grammaticalised forms express the central meanings for the Kalmyk aspectual system (the frequency of use is what leads to the greater degree of grammaticalization). For the **imperfective** domain, the core meaning is progressive (the morphologicized progressive affix -*ǯa*). The less grammaticalized complex predicates express the durative semantic properties, and the peripheral meanings represent a diversity of complex predicates, for example, in their specially "detailed" character of durative meanings (with anterior converb -*ad* and auxiliary *bää-/jov-/suu-/kevt-*). The **perfective** domain also has a strong grammaticalized way of expressing perfective/completive semantic (the completive affix -*čkə* and complex predicates with auxiliaries *ork-* and *od-*) and peripheral propeties (*av-* with inanimate subjects).

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative		IPFV	imperfective
ACC	accusative		NEG	negation
ANT	anterior		P	possessive
ASSOC	associative		PASS	passive
COP	copula		PC	participle
CV	converb		PL	plural
DAT	dative		PROG	progressive
DIR	directive		PRS	present
EVD	evidential		PST	past
EXT	extension		RECP	reciprocal
FUT	future		REFL	reflexive
GEN	genitive		REM	remote past
IMP	imperative		SG	singular
INS	instrumental		SUCC	successive

References

Bertinetto, Pier M. & Karen H. Ebert & Casper de Groot 2000: The progressive in Europe. – Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 517–558.

Bertinetto, Pier M. & Alessanro Lenci 2011: Habituality, Pluractionality, and Imperfectivity – Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 852–880.

Binnick, Robert I. 2011a: Introduction. – Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 3–58.

Binnick, Robert I. 2011b: *The Past Tenses of the Mongolian Verb: Meaning and Use*. Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 1. Leiden: Brill.

Bläsing, Uwe 2003: Kalmuck. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge. 229–248.

Bybee, Joan & Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca 1994: *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ebert, Karen H. 1999: Degrees of focality in Kalmyk imperfectives. – Werner Abraham & Leonid I. Kulikov (eds), *Tense-aspect, transitivity and causativity: Essays in honour of Vladimir P. Nedjalkov*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 323–339.

Heine, Bernhard 1993: *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine Bernhard & Tania Kuteva 2002: *Word lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991: On some principles of grammaticization. – Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vol. I. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 17–36.

Hopper Paul & Elizabeth C. Traugott 2003: *Grammaticalization*. Sec. edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IPGKYA = С. С. Сай & В. В. Баранова & Н. В. Сердобольская (eds) 2009: *Исследования по грамматике калмыцкого языка*. Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды ИЛИ РАН. Т. V, ч. 2. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.

GKYA = Г. Д. Санжеев (ed.) 1983: *Грамматика калмыцкого языка. Фонетика и морфология*. Элиста: Калмыцкое книжное издательство.

Kuzmenkov = Е. А. Кузьменков 1984: *Глагол в монгольском языке*. Ленинград: Издательство ЛГУ.

Maisak = Т. А. Майсак 2005. *Типология грамматикализации конструкций с глаголами движения и позиции*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Nasilov = Д. М. Насилов 1989: *Проблемы тюркской аспектологии. Акциональность*. Ленинград: Наука.

Newman, John 2002: A cross-linguistic overview of the posture verbs 'sit', 'stand' and 'lie'. – John Newman (ed.), *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing and Lying*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1–24.

Ondzhanova = М. Д. Онджанова 1969: *Аналитические глагольные формы в калмыцком языке*. Автореф. дисс. к. филол. н. Ленинград.

Pyurbeev = Г. Ц. Пюрбеев 1977: *Грамматика калмыцкого языка. Синтаксис простого предложения*. Элиста: Калмыцкое книжное издательство.

Ramstedt, Gustaf J. 1935: *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Smith, Carlota S. 1997: *The Parameter of Aspect*. (Second edition.) Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Svantesson, Jan-Olof 1991: Tense, mood and aspect in Mongolian. – *Working Papers* (Department of Linguistics, Lund University) 38: 189–204

Vendler, Zeno 1967: Verbs and times. – Zeno Vendler (ed.), *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. 97–121.