Differential time stability in categorial change

Family names from nouns and adjectives, illustrated from German*

Frans Plank
Universität Konstanz

Change affects different parts of the lexicon and grammar differently, and in particular some parts are more time-stable than others. The creation of family names from words of other types is an example, and many such examples need to be examined before credible generalizations can be made about differential time stability in historical linguistics. In German, the language used here for illustration, family names typically derive from common nouns or adjectives designating the origin, place of residence, occupation, or salient personal characteristics of the families or their heads originally given those names. Despite such origins in nouns or adjectives, and despite retaining the phonology and partly also the syntax of their origins, family names in contemporary German have subtly, but comprehensively, severed ties with their ancestral word classes in their morphology upon attaining name status. This is shown for inflection as well as derivation, and this result renders the traditional word class categorization of family names as a type of noun in languages such as German untenable. Diachronic conclusions are drawn on this basis as to the transience of semantics-pragmatics and morphology on the one hand and the pertinacity of syntax and phonology on the other in category-changing developments of this kind, with other kinds of developments apparently showing different kinds of developmental dynamics.

Keywords: category change, German, nouns, proper names, surnames, time stability, word classes

1. Pertinacity and transience

Languages are the way they are because this is what they have become over time, as members of each new generation acquire a mental lexicon and grammar on the basis of speech acts performed by the preceding generation, subject to timeless

constraints on linguistic structures and processes. Within the limits of what is permissible at any and all times, the possibilities for re-analyses from one generation to the next are further reined in by laws of change, proscribing or prescribing transitions from particular starting points to particular end points via particular pathways. An important but little understood aspect of developmental dynamics is how different parts of lexicons and grammars differ in TIME STABILITY across generations: some parts are more pertinacious, changing slowly or resisting change altogether and thereby preserving unity among the descendants of an ancestral proto-language, while others are more transient, changing rapidly and frequently, thereby boosting crosslinguistic diversity. In recent years, this aspect of developmental dynamics has sometimes been studied inferentially, with patterns of crosslinguistic diversity interpreted as revealing something about differential time stabilities (see Plank 2010 for a survey of the state of this inferential art). By contrast, the approach taken here is more straightforward: time stability is investigated by examining change and non-change directly.

What follows is a case study that makes a case for the transience of semantics-pragmatics and morphology relative to syntax and phonology in particular kinds of developments, namely categorial re-analyses. The categories re-analyzed in this example are common nouns and adjectives, which are re-analyzed as proper names, in particular family names. This is the story to be told in Sections 2–3. In Section 4, the diachronic dynamics of this kind of development will be profiled and compared with those of other kinds of developments (including grammaticalization and relational re-analysis).

2.   Nouns/adjectives and surnames

Morphologically speaking, nouns in contemporary German distinguish themselves as a word class through inflecting for (i) CASE, with nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive as the terms of this category, much affected by syncretism (with determiners generally more distinctive), and (ii) for NUMBER, with only two terms, singular and plural, less given to syncretism than cases. It is primarily only count nouns which participate in number inflection, but mass nouns often have plurals as well, interpreted sortally or quantally, 'kinds/quanta of N'. Also part of inflection, though in a different way, nouns are inherently specified for two categories: (i) GENDER, if only in the singular, with masculine, neuter, feminine as the terms of this category, which almost exclusively only matters for syntax, insofar as gender, in association with case and number, determines the agreement of eligible determiner and modifier words; (ii) INFLECTION CLASS, which, in occasional interaction with gender, regulates the choice of exponents when more than one is

available for a given case-number. Besides inflection, nouns also distinguish themselves derivationally, insofar as certain derivational patterns, including diminutive and motional suffixation (*Bäch-lein* 'brook-DIM', *Gräf-in* 'earl-FEMALE') and adjectivalization with *-lich* (*männ-lich* 'man-ADJCT'), are limited to nouns as bases.

Adjectives in German are nouny. Nonetheless, they differ inflectionally from nouns in agreeing in GENDER rather than being inherently specified for this category, and also in varying in, rather than being inherently specified for, INFLECTION CLASS, with "strong" vs. "weak" declension essentially a matter of indefiniteness vs. definiteness of the matrix noun phrase. CASE and NUMBER, as well, are assigned to adjectives through noun-phrase-internal agreement rather than by virtue of their own external grammatical relations and their quantified reference. These inflectional differences only become manifest when adjectives are attributive; predicative adjectives in the contemporary standard language differ from nouns more radically because they do not inflect at all and remain invariable.

Among proper names, which are traditionally categorized as a kind of noun, at least in the Indo-European languages, it is family names (or surnames) which show the closest affinity to common nouns or adjectives. Historically, they are often transparently derived from designations of origin, place of residence, occupation, or salient personal characteristics of the families concerned or their heads: e.g., *Bach* 'brook', *Graf* 'earl, count', *Müller* 'miller', *Mann* 'man', *Lang(e)* 'long (one)'. In German, unlike elsewhere in Germanic and in other languages, patronymics, matronymics, other ancestral given names or also names of patrons were less frequently adopted as family names, except in the north (e.g., *Jens Peter-sen* 'Jens son of Peter'), with elliptic patronymics (*Jens Peter(-s)* 'Jens [son of] Peter', with the genitive marking on the father's given name omissible) comparatively the most widespread representative of this type. And an even less common source of family names are verbs, or rather verbally-headed imperative clauses (e.g., *Bleibtreu* lit. 'remain faithful!'). Of rarely equalled comprehensiveness, Pott (1853) is the classic study of these types of origins (and a few others) of family and other personal names in a wide range of languages, prominently including German.

The use of any such epithet nouns or adjectives as rigidly-designating family names in Germany, like elsewhere in Europe (though not everywhere — Iceland is a notable exception), has only spread slowly since the tenth century and was not legally prescribed before the seventeenth century. Synchronically, they still do not seem to differ a great deal from their ancestral nouns or adjectives, allowing for such occasional minor formal differences as in *Schmidt/Schmitt/Schmi(e)d*, of variable vowel length, whereas the stem vowel of the corresponding occupational noun is long and does not vary (*Schmied* 'smith'), or *Burger* vs. *Bürger* 'burgher, citizen', without (name) and with (noun) umlaut. On the face of it, nothing here would seem to seriously call into question the age-old categorization of the proper

names of families as a subclass of nouns, whatever views (Kripkean/causal or Russellian/descriptivist) one may hold about the semantics and pragmatics of names.

Actually, when one takes a closer look, everything does call that categorization into question, most conspicuously in the morphology.

3.   Surname morphology

3.1 Case

First, do family names inflect for case? When the corresponding common noun has an accusative distinct from the nominative, as singulars do in the weak declension, family names, in contemporary German, can clearly be seen to differ:

(1) a.   Hol den Graf-en   / den Lange-n   / den Mann-Ø!
          get the earl-ACC.SG / the long.one-ACC.SG.MASC / the man-ACC.SG
          'Get the earl / the long one / the man!'
     b.   Hol (den) Graf / (den) Lange / (den) Mann!
          get (the) Graf / (the) Lange / (the) Mann
          'Get Graf / Lange / Mann!'

As indicated in (1b), family names, and other names, can take a definite article in many regional and stylistic varieties of German. With the requirement of and the resistance to articles considered a major difference between common nouns and proper names, this is one more reason, it would seem, to lump family names together with common nouns, at least in these varieties of German.

In (1a), *Graf* optionally has zero ACC.SG; *Lange* is a nominalized adjective, inflecting according to the weak/definite adjectival declension, with the suffix *-e* in NOM.SG.MASC; *Mann* belongs to an inflection class in which ACC.SG is zero. In (1b), *Graf-en and *Lange-n, with the same overt suffix as the nouns in (1a), would be wholly ungrammatical as names. This difference between the accusative markings shown in (1a–b) could be interpreted in two ways: either family names do not inflect for the accusative at all, or ACC.SG has an allomorph, specially selected by family names (along with a few other noun classes, like that of the noun *Mann*), which is zero.

This is also what one has to conclude for the dative:

(2) a.   Hilf dem Graf(-en)   / dem Lange-n   / dem Mann(-e)!
          help the earl-DAT.SG / the long.one-DAT.SG.MASC / the man-DAT.SG
          'Help the earl / the long one / the man!'
     b.   Hilf (dem) Graf / (dem) Lange / (dem) Mann!
          help (the)   Graf / (the) Lange / (the)   Mann
          'Help Graf / Lange / Mann!'

In (2a), *Graf* and *Mann* can optionally have zero DAT.SG (strongly preferred in the case of *Mann*), like all members of these inflection classes; in (2b), any of the non-zero-inflected DAT.SG forms of the respective inflection classes (*Graf-en, *Lange-n, *Mann-e) are categorically out.

After the accusative, the dative is now the second case for which a special zero allomorph would have to be assumed; such duplicity inclines one to favor the other, more radical interpretation, namely that family names simply do not inflect for dative and accusative. This would thus be an instance of the absence of something (namely accusative and dative case marking) as opposed to the presence of nothing (zero exponents for these cases).

But then, family names do inflect for genitive, or so it would seem, as exemplified here for adnominal dependents, but verb-, adjective-, and adposition-governed genitives take the same form (e.g., *Heute gedenken wir des Graf-en/Graf-s* 'today we commemorate the earl/Graf', *gedenken* being a verb governing the genitive):

(3) a. der Tod   des Graf-en   / des Lange-n   /des Mann-(e)s
         the death the earl-GEN.SG / the long.one-GEN.SG.MASC /the man-GEN.SG
         'the earl's / the long one's / the man's death'

     b. der Tod   des Graf(-s)   / des Lange(-s)   / des Mann(-s)
         the death the Graf-GEN.SG / the Lange-GEN.SG.MASC / the Mann-GEN.SG
         'Graf's / Lange's / Mann's death'

     c. der Tod   Graf-s   / Lange-s   / Mann-s
         the death Graf-GEN.SG / Lange-GEN.SG.MASC / Mann-GEN.SG
         'Graf's / Lange's / Mann's death'

When a family name is accompanied by the definite article, *-s* is optional, with zero allomorph (once more!) or no inflection as the other option (3b). Without a definite article, *-s* is obligatory (3c). What the comparison with (3a) shows is that GEN.SG takes a different form depending on whether its host is a common noun or the corresponding family name. As common nouns, *Graf* and (the nominalized adjective) *Lange* are both weak, hence marked with GEN.SG *-(e)n*. For family names, GEN.SG is invariably *-s*. When they end in a sibilant, there is also the more archaic-sounding option, shared with other personal names and place names, of the suffixal entension *-ens*, which avoids having two sibilants adjacent, as would otherwise be inevitable since names do not permit the syllabic variant of the suffix, *-es*; this *-ens* is shared with masculine and neuter weak common nouns (such as *Ochse* 'ox'), though here it would seem bimorphemic, with the *-s* or also the stem-formative *-en* being optional:

(4) a. der Tod   des Frosch-(e)s / des Ochs-en-s
       the death the frog-GEN.SG / the OX-OBL-GEN.SG
       'the frog's / the ox's death'
    b. der Tod   Frosch-(*e)s/-ens / Ochs-ens
       the death Frosch-GEN.SG   / Ochs-GEN.SG
       'Frosch's / Ochs's death'

To anticipate part of the story of the chronology of change events that will be the topic of Section 4, the dissociation from common nouns in this respect occurred relatively recently: all family names in *-e*, and likewise given names, used to have GEN.SG in *-ns* (e.g., *Lange* NOM.SG, *Lange-ns* GEN.SG; *Goethe* NOM.SG, *Goethe-ns* GEN.SG) until the nineteenth century or even later; earlier, purely weak GEN.SG in *-en* had been the norm until the seventeenth century (Paul 1917: 155).

  That GEN.SG is invariably *-s* is also true for family names applied to female referents, even though feminine nouns in German categorically resist GEN.SG *-(e)s*, which represents one of the most salient connections between gender and inflection class (if feminine, then GEN.SG cannot be *-(e)s*, and if GEN.SG is *-(e)s*, then the gender cannot be feminine). It is only terms of address for females, obligatorily unaccompanied by the definite article, which also take, or indeed require, *-s*:

(5) der Tod   Oma-s   und Opa-s   / Onkel-s   und Tante-s
    the death grandma-GEN.SG and grandpa-GEN.SG / uncle-GEN.SG and auntie-
    GEN.SG
    'grandma's and grandpa's death' / 'uncle's and auntie's death'

With inflection intricately bound to word-order syntax, it should be noted that such adnominal dependents marked with *-s* can also precede their heads in a determiner position (hence precluding a further determiner), which would be stylistically highly marked for nouns in the regular genitive (see Demske 2001: Chapter 4 for a historical perspective):

(6) a. Graf-s   / Lange-s   / Mann-s   Tod   (= 3c)
       Graf-GEN.SG / Lange-GEN.SG.MASC / Mann-GEN.SG death
       'Graf's / Lange's / Mann's death'
    b. Oma-s   und Opa-s   Tod   (= 5)
       grandma-GEN.SG and grandpa-GEN.SG death
       'grandma's and grandpa's death'

Such peculiarities of the *-s* genitive with terms of address and proper names have occasioned serious doubt among theoretical grammarians whether this is indeed a regular, morphologically bound inflectional ending; in some ways it is reminiscent of *-s* "genitives" in English or Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian, where an analysis as an enclitic or a phrasal affix has been suggested (diachronically speaking an

instance of degrammaticalization, with a tight morphemic bond having become looser). Thus, =*s* can be omitted from first conjuncts especially in close coordination, while regular genitive -*(e)s* normally cannot:[1]

(7) a. Graf=s/Graf   und Mann=s   Briefwechsel
         Graf=GEN.SG/Graf and Mann=GEN.SG correspondence
         'Graf and Mann's correspondence'
     b. der Verlust ihr-es   Mann-es/*Mann   und Freund-es
         the loss   her-GEN.SG.MASC husband-GEN.SG/husband and friend-GEN.SG
         'her husband('s) and friend's loss'

Further evidence that this marker of names and terms of address is different from the regular GEN.SG suffix of nouns is more subtle. Even when both a family name and the corresponding noun would seem to share the masculine, strong-declension exponent of GEN.SG, what is not shared is its allomorphy. For nouns, syllabic and non-syllabic forms of the suffix alternate relatively freely, with the schwa-less form more informal in some phonological environments (e.g., *Mann-es/Mann-s*) and preferred in others in all styles (e.g., *Bach-es/Bach-s*); but with family names and terms of address, no schwa ever occurs.[2] (In *Lange-s*, the schwa is part of the nominalisation, with bare *lang* as the adjective's stem.)

Although there is an overt marker, the conclusion for the genitive, thus, is either that family names inflect for this case, but its exponent takes a different (allomorphic) form than with common nouns, or that family names do not inflect for this case but have some other kind of less tightly-bound relational marking when occurring as adnominal dependents. Since this second interpretation is more plausible, especially in conjunction with the evidence for other cases, the overall balance would be that family names do not inflect for case at all.

There are theoretical analyses of Modern German (in particular Gallmann 1996) which deprive nouns on their own of the property of case inflectability in general, and require case-inflecting determiners and modifiers to enable co-occurring nouns to also inflect for case. This unification of nouns and names, however, entails morphological complications, insofar as names must be uniquely allowed to be of variable inflection class membership in non-attributive and attributive uses. Considering the difference between nouns and names as one of case-inflectability and non-inflectability, as suggested here, would seem to be the simpler analysis.

When family names derive directly from adjectives, with no sign of nominalization, i.e., in cases such as *Lang* 'long' rather than *Lang-e* 'long one', their inflectional properties are the same as just described. The dissociation from the case inflection of weak attributive adjectives (showing much syncretism: *lang-e* NOM.SG.MASC/FEM/NEUT, *lang-en* ACC.SG.MASC, *lang-e* ACC.SG.FEM/NEUT, *lang-en* DAT.

SG.MASC/FEM/NEUT, *lang-en* GEN.SG.MASC/FEM/NEUT) is as obvious as is that from uninflecting predicative adjectives. Thus, when adjectives were appropriated for the new role of family names, either gradually with attributive (or appositive) uses as the point of departure or straight from their uninflected basic lexical forms, something changed that governs inflection, and that something is word class.[3]

The ending *-er* of family names derived from adjectives, as in *Lieber* or *Liebermann*, points to vocative expressions as the actual source (as noted by Pott 1853:613–620), with adjectives inflecting according to the strong declension when used as vocatives and with VOC=NOM morphologically:

(8) Lieb-er!   Lieb-er   Mann!
     dear-VOC.SG.MASC   dear-VOC.SG.MASC man
     'Dear!'   'Dear man!'

As names, such forms in *-er* have become invariable, like all other denominal and de-adjectival family names: they are equally applicable to females (where the VOC=NOM exponence would be *-e*) and males, groups (with VOC=NOM also *-e* in the plural) and individuals; they do not inflect for case (e.g., *Ich kenne kein-en Lieber/*Lieb-en* 'I know no-ACC.SG.MASC Lieber/*Lieber-ACC.SG.MASC') and add "genitive" *=s* after the ending *-er* (*Lieber=s/*Lieb-es*).

3.2 Number

Since proper names are often credited with the property of unique reference, one wonders whether they should be expected to take part in an opposition of number to begin with. Still, in the case of family names, reference to sets is easy to conceive of — they can be used to refer to one member as well as to several members of the same family. And again, instructive differences emerge when such non-singular uses of family names are compared to the plural of corresponding nouns:

(9) a. Hilf den Graf-en   / den Lange-n   / den Männ-er-n   /
         help the earl-DAT.PL / the long.one-DAT.PL / the man-PL-DAT.PL /
         den Müller-n   / den Vögel-n   / den Bäch-e-n!
         the miller.PL-DAT.PL / the bird.PL-DAT.PL / the brook-PL-DAT.PL
         'Help the earls / the long ones / the men / the millers / the birds / the brooks!'
     b. Hilf den Graf-s   / den Lange-s   / den Mann-s   / den Müller-s   /
         help the Graf-PL / the Lange-PL / the Mann-PL / the Müller-PL /
         den Vogel-s   / den Bach-s!
         the Vogel-PL / the Bach-PL
         'Help the Grafs / the Langes / the Manns / the Müllers / the Vogels / the Bachs!'

These are examples of DAT.PL, the most complex inflection for regular nouns insofar as it is sometimes transparently bimorphemic, with a DAT.PL exponent proper, *-(e)n*, invariable across all declensions, following upon whatever is added to the stem to make it plural (when a general plural suffix, this is sometimes analyzed as a stem formative rather than an inflection proper).[4] At any rate, family names, and they must be accompanied by the definite article when non-singular in most varieties of contemporary German (where they are not, like in the far north, this would seem a recent innovation), take a marker of their own, regardless of the declension of the corresponding noun, which is invariably *-s*. Again, as with the adnominal dependent marker, there is no syllabic alternative: *die Mann-s/*Mann-es*, but this is less significant here insofar as nouns taking plural *-s*, seen below in (10), do not have a syllabic variant either, even where this would be phonologically unobjectionable (e.g., **Park-es* park-PL). Not only do all family names agree in this choice, but this *-s* is also invariable for all cases: in nominatival, accusatival, or genitival contexts, no other forms appear than those given for dative in (9b), as opposed to rich inflectional class variety for these other (syncretic) cases with common nouns (cf. *Graf-en*, *Männ-er*, *Müller-Ø*, *Vögel-Ø*, *Bäch-e* NOM/ACC/GEN. PL). Since this quirk was mentioned above, those names ending in a sibilant also have the more archaic option of *-ens*: *die Frosch-ens* 'the Frosches', vs. the common noun plural *Frösch-e* 'frog-PL'; like regular *-s*, this is the same marker as that for singular "genitives".

Now, is this *-s* as in *die Manns* 'the Manns' to be interpreted as an allomorph of plural, specifically selected by family names, along with an array of nouns which are phonologically unusual in ending in a full vowel (10a) or whose credentials as native German and/or indeed as nouns are dubious (10b–g)?

(10)   a.   *Uhu-s* 'owl-PL', *Oma-s* 'grandma-PL', *Auto-s* 'car-PL', *Sozi-s* 'socialist-PL', etc.

     b.   borrowings: *Park-s* 'park-PL', *Job-s* 'job-PL', *e-mail-s* 'e-mail-PL', *Scheich-s* 'sheik-PL', *Labor-s* 'laboratory-PL' (also *Labor-e*), *Cousin-s* (pronounced in the French manner) 'cousin-PL', *Balkon-s* [bal.ˈkɔŋs] 'balcony-PL' (but [bal.ˈko.nə]), etc.

     c.   abbreviations, often also in (8a): *Trafo-s* (vs. unabbreviated *Transformator-en*) 'transformator-PL', *Schiri-s* (vs. unabbreviated *Schiedsrichter-Ø*) 'referee-PL', *Moped-s* (vs. unblended *Motoräd-er* + *Pedal-e*) 'motorbike-PL + pedal-PL', etc.; *Hoch-s*, *Tief-s* (not straightforward nominalisations of adjectives, but abbreviated from *Hoch-/Tief-druckgebiet-e*) 'high/low pressure area-PL'

     d.   acronyms: *WM-s* [ve.ˈɛms] (vs. unabbreviated *Weltmeisterschaft-en* 'world-championship-PL', etc.)

     e.   names of letters: *a-s*, *be-s*, … *ef-s*, … *zet-s*

    f.   place names: *Deutschland-s* 'Germany-PL' (vs. regular PL of head noun *Länd-er*), *Hamburg-s* 'Hamburg-PL' (vs. regular *Burg-en*), *Berlin-s*, etc.

    g.   words mentioned rather than used, including non-nouns: *deine "Müller"-s kann ich überhaupt nicht lesen* 'your "Müller"-s I can't read at all', *die vielen "wenn"-s und "aber"-s* 'the many if's and but's', etc.

Phonologically, German family names do not differ from ordinary nouns, being often identical to them, as in the examples used here, and they are native, unabbreviated, and also otherwise impeccable: thus, this should not be such a potent motive for selecting this particular, rather special, allomorph.[5] In fact, not all varieties of German have this -*s* to begin with and use the zero plural instead in *Uhu*, *e-mail*, etc., for all the subcategories in (10).[6] But, confirming that the two are not the same, Bavarian and other such Southern varieties do have -*s* with family names.

    More plausibly, this -*s* is not an exponent of plural at all (with all cases syncretised), but of a different category, one which has come to be called ASSOCIATIVE (cf. Moravcsik 2003 and much subsequent work in typology). It is quantificational in nature as well, but it is also similar to the collective: its basic meaning is 'and others, to be naturally associated in the given context with the referent named, the representative of the group', and its preferred domains are 1st and 2nd person pronouns, kinship terms, and proper names. In the strictest sense, associatives associate unlike rather than like: brother-ASSOC meaning 'brother(s) and sister(s)', father-ASSOC meaning 'father and mother' or 'father and son(s)/daughter(s)', the John Smith-ASSOC meaning 'John Smith and his family' (who will not all be called John). Nonetheless, perhaps the reason why "plurals" of family names have this associative flavor despite not strictly fitting this definition of unlike associates is that they are associative in terms of full names, family plus given. For example, if I am asking, after a church service in Thomaskirche, *Wo waren denn heute (die) Bachs?* (**(die) Bäche*), I mean to ask 'Where were the Bach family today, that is Johann Sebastian, Anna Magdalena, Gottfried Heinrich, Elisabeth Juliana Friederica, Johann Christoph Friedrich, Johann Christian, Johanna Carolina, Regina Susanna, and perhaps others belonging to the Bach household?', or some subset of those who would usually be seen in church on Sunday. I do not mean to ask where the additively defined set of people were who happen to share the family name 'Bach', related to one another or not. Further, as with associatives in the strict sense, there is typically one dominant member of such groups, namely the *pater familias* (or the *mater familias* in matriarchal/matrilineal societies) who determines the family name, or the most famous individual member. For example, *Am Sonntag war Bach krank*, in most contexts, means 'Mr. Bach' or 'Johann Sebastian Bach was ill'. (Famous women, unlike famous men, usually and in all dialects and formal varieties

take a definite article in addition to their family name — *die Callas*, *die Gandhi*, *die Merkel* — in German and other languages, not including English.)

Sometimes associatives are identical or similar in form to regular plurals, or also duals, and have therefore tended to be miscategorized as being on par with such non-singular numbers. But there are also languages where associatives are expressed quite differently from ordinary plurals, among them Swiss German:

(11)   s   Mann-s
       the-GEN.SG.MASC Mann-GEN.SG
       '(Mr.) Mann and those associated with him' (i.e., his family)

In Swiss German, the marker on the noun itself as well as on the preceding definite article (*[de]s*) is, at least historically, a genitive singular (masculine), and the head of this (once-) genitival construction, a plural demonstrative, is elided, '[those] of the Mann'. The German German associative construction can be made sense of quite similarly as involving an (erstwhile) genitive singular, with the family name not accompanied by a definite article (unlike in Swiss German), but with the plural demonstrative (identical to the definite article) as an overtly present head rather than elided (as in Swiss German): 'those/the ones of Mann'.[7] The construction is no longer conceived of as consisting of (i) a demonstrative as head, in the plural as per cardinality of the intended referent (greater than one) and in whatever case is dictated by the external grammatical relation of the whole expression, and (ii) a family name in the genitive singular as its dependent, but rather as consisting of (i) a definite article in the plural functioning as determiner and (ii) a family name in a quantificational form *sui generis* (with associative or additive-plural meaning) and invariant with respect to case. Therefore, a drastic morphological-syntactic re-analysis has occurred, camouflaged by the surface-identity of the two constructions (perhaps differing subtly in prosody, with the definite article typically more subdued and less autonomous than the demonstrative). Assuming such a re-analysis would account for the strongly favored presence of the definite article (erstwhile demonstrative) in such constructions, with the definite article otherwise an optional and regionally limited companion of family names. As to the relative chronology of events, the re-analyzability of the genitive singular as an allomorphically invariant associative marker presupposes that such an invariant genitive singular had already come into existence, superseding the variable genitive singular markings that family names had originally shared with common nouns.

One might object to the exclusive validity of an associative interpretation of *-s* with family names, because it is undeniable that, e.g., *die Bach-s* (as in *Die Bach-s waren alle Komponisten* 'the Bachs were all composers') can additively refer to several individuals called Bach rather than to the family, wife, children, etc. of one Bach, given name to be supplied. However, this is probably a different kind of

construction from the associative one: in the associative construction the definite article, if strongly favored, is omissible, but with the individual-plural reading it cannot be omitted at all (**Bach-s waren alle Komponisten*). Arguably, the individual-plural reading involves the recategorization of a name as a common noun (*Bach* 'Bach' > *ein Bach* 'a person named Bach'), and it is this derived common noun that is pluralized with *-s* like the other unusual words in (10), while with real names the homonymous suffix is the associative one.

As to number inflection, the most plausible interpretation, then, is that family names do not, or not exclusively, inflect for plural like count nouns do (and also mass nouns, where plurals are sortal or quantal), but inflect for associative, which is something rather different, and formally most closely related to the genitive singular. There are other associative forms in German, in particular the 1st and 2nd person personal pronouns *wir* and *ihr*, 'speaker and others associated with the speaker' and 'addressee and others associated with the addressee' (rather than 'more than one speaker', 'more than one addressee'); but here the associative is expressed differently, namely through stem suppletion, so that family names are therefore unique among the words inflecting for this category in taking the exponent *-s*.

As to number, de-adjectival family names bear no resemblance to their word class of origin: *die Lang-s* 'the Langs' vs. *lang-en* 'long-NOM/ACC/DAT.GEN.PL' when attributive and weak, uninflected *lang* when predicative; adjectival number is due to agreement, not reference, as is plural with nouns and associative with names. On inflectional evidence, therefore, using adjectives as family names must have entailed a complete categorial break.

3.3 Inflection class

Given that family names today all inflect the same, if they are to be analyzed as inflecting at all, rather than as taking adnominal-dependent/possessive and associative enclitics or loosely bound phrasal suffixes, there is no basis for distinguishing inflection classes, unlike with common nouns and attributive adjectives. They could be said (and in the Germanist literature sometimes have been said) to be in the same inflection class as those nouns which take *-(e)s* in GEN.SG and *-s* in PL, but given the problematic nature of the allomorphy and number interpretations highlighted above, it is probably wiser here to split than to lump, and to wholly dissociate family names from those words which show inflection class distinctions (i.e., nouns). Such dissociation, given that it is historically real, cannot have occurred very long ago — up until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, traces of a weak and strong distinction were still observed with family names (and also given names), along the lines of common nouns (e.g., Paul 1917: 153–158).

3.4 Gender

A family name can today be used to refer to female as well as to male members of a family. The agreeing or coreferential forms that it co-occurs with will vary accordingly, with the sex of the referent rather than any grammatical categorizations as the determinant (*der/die Graf … er/sie* 'Graf … he/she'). (Perhaps small children will get special treatment through neuter agreement, but this seems marginal*: das kleine Graf … es* 'little Graf … it'.) There are no grounds, therefore, to credit family names with any inherent specification for gender, assigned however idiosyncratically or by whatever general principles. Even in the case of complex common nouns assigned gender by their suffixes (with, e.g., diminutive suffixes turning nouns neuter: *der Schmied* 'the smith MASC' vs. *das Schmied-chen* 'the little smith NEUT'), such genders do not carry over to the corresponding family names (*Schmiedchen … er/sie* 'Schmiedchen … he/she'). Family names do not have gender, although they can be used to refer to male and female people, and perhaps small children, without formal difference; that is, no motional suffix is required in present-day German, as it used to be: *Luise Miller-in* 'Luise Miller-FEMALE', current in the eighteenth century, or without female given name, *die Bach-sche* 'Mrs. Bach' (lit. 'the one belonging to [Mr.] Bach'), *die Müller-n* 'Mrs. Müller', continuing into the twentieth century.

In a sense, gender variability is something family names share with adjectives, although — and this is a big difference — with adjectives, gender is due to agreement rather than reference.

3.5 Derivation

There are a couple of derivational suffixes in German, both deriving adjectives, which uniquely select for family names as bases, to the exclusion of nouns and adjectives.

The first is *-esk*, meaning 'in the manner of': *Kafka-esk*, *Mann-esk*, *Chaplin-esk* etc., or *kafka-esk* etc., with non-capital initial, with the vacillation in spelling suggesting uncertainty as to whether the proper name status is to be inherited by the derived adjective; nouns, spelled with capital initial, always lose capitalization when derived to adjectives. This suffix (*-esque* in English) originates from Romance borrowings, such as *grotesk*, *burlesk*, *pittoresk*, and there may be the occasional instance where a base is also attested independently as a common noun, such as *ballad-esk* 'ballad-esque', *Ballade* 'ballad'. However, to the extent that *-esk* is productive, it only combines with the family names of famous people.

The second is *-sch*, already alluded to above as an archaic motional-associative suffix, *die Bach-sche* 'the wife belonging to [Mr.] Bach'. The contemporarily

predominant meaning is authorial-possessive, as is sometimes seen in contrast to the rather similar suffix or suffix combination *(-ian)-isch*: *die Humboldt-sch-e Theorie* 'the theory propounded/held by Humboldt' vs. *die humboldt(-ian)-isch-e Theorie von Sapir* 'Sapir's theory in the manner of Humboldt'. However, semantic distinctions are not always clear cut here, and phonological factors also play a role in choosing between non-syllabic and syllabic suffix variants. Nonetheless, the non-syllabic form *-sch* itself is very choosy, and only chooses family names as bases.

But then, since the syllabic and extended variants *-isch* and *-ian-isch/-ist-isch/-ies-isch* in a more general qualifying sense are also available for family names (as well as for other kinds of proper names), we do find some shared ground in derivational morphology with common nouns. On the other hand, *-isch* or its extensions are not confined to names and nouns, but also derive adjectives from verbal and adjectival bases: e.g., *mürr-isch* 'sulky', *trüg-er-isch* 'deceptive', *link-isch* 'clumsy', *re-al-ist-isch* 'realistic'. The ground, therefore, is so common that it practically accommodates bases of all kinds. And the same is true for adjective-deriving, semantically rather general suffixes such as *-mäßig* and *-haft* 'in the manner of, in relation to', which permit family names as bases, but all other major word classes as well.

Of the derivational suffixes which uniquely select for nouns as bases, diminutives are perhaps those which could most naturally be expected to also admit family names, but they do not. *Bäch-lein* 'Bach-DIM', for example, can only be used facetiously to refer to a child from the Bach family or to a Bach especially dear to the speaker.

German can convert nouns to verbs without the aid of affixes, if less productively than English, and the meaning of such verbs is generally predictable from the culturally most salient traits of the nouns (or rather, their referents). One semantic pattern here is 'to behave or do something in the typical manner of the referent of the base': e.g., *hecht-en* 'to jump headlong like a pike', *reiher-n* 'to throw up like a heron'. If some typical behavior is associated with particular well-known individuals, their family names may get a foot in this derivational pattern as well: *müller-n* 'to do as a well-known person by the name of Müller used to do' (e.g., a footballer with a rare knack for scoring goals). It is a question here, however, whether such family names permitting conversion to verbs are not on the verge of becoming common nouns in any case, as is also suggested by their easy compatibility with indefinite article and modifiers: *Er ist ein zweiter Müller* 'he is a second Müller'. In some cases, the onymic status has been lost completely; with verbs such as *(ein-)weck-en* 'to preserve, bottle' or *röntg-en* 'to X-ray', the awareness is at best dim that these processes owe their designations to inventive people with the family names *Weck* and *Röntgen*.

3.6 Word-class conclusion

In conclusion, morphologically speaking, and with respect to both inflection and derivation, family names in contemporary German share nothing with common nouns or adjectives and only with common nouns or adjectives. Naturally, therefore, they should not be categorized synchronically as a subclass of nouns, on a morphological understanding of lexical classes.[8] The simplest and most plausible analysis is to consider family names, and to some extent others, as a category *sui generis*, rather than to seek to accommodate them under some other categorial rubric, such as determiner (à la Longobardi 1994, 2005) or determinative (à la Anderson 2006).

4. Pertinacity and transience assessed

4.1 Time stability

It is instructive to see how this synchronic state of affairs has come about diachronically, because in the case of structures not comprehensively determined by timeless universal laws of language, it is the past and the potentials of change which account for the present. The important lesson is that as categorizations change, from common noun to family name, the temporal dynamics are different for different members of the categories concerned. And arguably a very similar lesson about what is changing faster and what is changing slower or not at all could be learned by examining the genesis of family or similar names from descriptive epithets in languages other than German as well, perhaps everywhere where some such category of cognomen has been innovated.

4.2 Tempo of change

In the history of German, it took little more than a few centuries (some three or four, which is some 12 to 16 generations or cycles of acquisition) for family names to completely dissociate themselves from common nouns or adjectives with respect to their MORPHOLOGY after the initial, somewhat drawn out, change that brought them into existence — the semantic-pragmatic transition from the status of descriptive epithets in the grammatical form of nouns and adjectives to that of rigid designators (*vulgo* proper names).

This rapid morphological estrangement, only reaching completion in the nineteenth century, was a story of redeploying existing morphology and allomorphic variants in novel ways, rather than of loss vs. retention. Where morphology was

lost, with family names arguably ceasing to inflect for accusative and dative, this was not the result of erosive phonology. So, perhaps, when morphology is brought into disarray by phonology and ultimately obliterated, the time scale should be expected to be a different one than it was here, requiring more generations than here to fully wear out the morphology (of L1 learners at any rate — untutored L2 learners would undo morphologies faster).

4.3 Meaning and form

Meanings have sometimes been assumed to be more time-stable than forms, in particular in those developments which fall under the rubric of grammmaticalization (e.g., Hopper 1991:22). But the reverse claim has also been made for grammaticalization developments: "conceptual/semantic shift precedes morphosyntactic and phonological shift" (Heine et al. 1991:213). In opposition to the idea of special semantic inertia, forms have sometimes been assumed to be superstable, with obsolescent morphology able to survive almost indefinitely, especially when new meanings or functions can be found for them; this is the idea of "exaptation" (Lass 1990). In the case at hand, which is not one of grammaticalization, but does not involve morphological obsolescence either, it was clearly meaning that changed first, when descriptive epithets acquired the status of rigid designators.

4.4 Syntax and morphology

On the formal side, the SYNTAX of family names has been more pertinacious than their morphology.

The ancestral nouns and nominalized adjectives were used in referring functions clause-internally, as well as in addressing functions clause-externally, before they became rigid designators. Perhaps the latter function, addressing, is more prominent now, associating family names more strongly with other terms of address (such as hypocoristic kin terms) functionally as well as formally, but family names certainly continue to be used as arguments of verbs and adpositions. The relevant ancestral uses of adjectives were attributive and appositional, shading into one another; when family names derived from adjectives as well as from nouns are now in construction with given names or titles (*Hans Müller*, *Herr/Frau/Bäcker Müller* 'Mr./Mrs./Baker Miller'), the relation between them is still one of apposition. Among these appositional constructions, that of given name and family name is of course novel, only coming about through the introduction of such bipartite personal names; the construction with a title as the partner of a family name is only an innovation of sorts, generalizing the old Title–Name construction from given to family names (*Herr Siegfried > Herr Müller*).

In relation to given names, denominal family names continue to occupy the positions they occupied before they became family names: they usually follow the given name, like appositional epithets (12a), although in some varieties, such as Bavarian, they can also precede the given name, like patronymic genitives or possessive datives (12b).

(12) a. Hans, der Müller 'Hans, the miller' > Hans Müller
    b. des Müller-s Hans 'the miller's Hans', dem Müller sein Hans 'the miller his Hans' > (der) Müller Hans

With de-adjectival family names, the question is whether the source construction was appositional (13a) or tightly appositive (13b):

(13) a. Hans der lange 'Hans, the long one' > $\text{Hans}_{\text{given}}$ $\text{Lang}_{\text{family}}$
    b. der lange Hans 'the long Hans' > $\text{Lang}_{\text{family}}$ $\text{Hans}_{\text{given}}$

Only on the former assumption, which seems the more plausible one, would syntactic ordering have been pertinacious; on the latter assumption, only those varieties such as Bavarian which have Surname–Given Name as the normal order would have been order-preserving, while Given–Family Name would involve a reversal.

Family names themselves are not as liberally modified by attributive adjectives as they once were when they were common nouns (and as the corresponding common nouns still are), and determiners now are not obligatory everywhere with family names in the singular, although they are in the case when a family name is accompanied by an adjective (*der alte Bach/*alter Bach* '(the) old Bach'. Still, family names continue to allow determiners and modifiers under certain conditions.

Like other names and terms of address, that is, like all adnominal dependents marked with genitive look-alike *-s*, family names continue to occur before their heads, as before, as well as after them (*Müller-s Tor* 'Müller's goal', *das Tor Müller-s* 'the goal of Müller'), while common nouns as adnominal dependents are postnominal and only retain pre-posing as a stylistically highly marked option.

There was a syntactic change insofar as a living syntactic construction became frozen; when descriptive epithets were in the form of prepositional phrases, they lost their phrasal character through univerbation upon becoming family names, ending up inflectionally largely invariable (only permitting "genitives" in =s and associatives in *-s*, e.g., *Zurlinden=s Tante* 'Zurlinden's aunt', *die Imhof-s* 'the Imhofs') and with the same syntactic potential as family names of structurally simpler provenance:

(14) a. Hans im   Hof   > Hans   Imhof
    Hans [in.the.DAT.SG.MASC yard]$_{\text{PP}}$ $\text{Hans}_{\text{given}}$ $\text{Imhof}_{\text{family}}$

b. Fritz zu-r   Linde-n   > Fritz   Zurlinden
    Fritz [at-the.DAT.SG.FEM lime.tree-DAT.SG]$_{PP}$ Fritz$_{given}$ Zurlinden$_{family}$

Notwithstanding such freezing of internal phrasal syntax, perhaps there is a time-less universal at work after all, superintending the developmental sequence of states in the transition of nouns and adjectives from being descriptive epithets to being rigid designators. It seems that wherever and whenever rigid designators are recognized as grammatically distinct from nouns and adjectives, the difference is primarily a matter of morphology rather than of syntax. Needless to add at this stage, thorough validation is as yet lacking for a putative implicational universal "If proper names differ from other words in syntax, they will also differ in morphol-ogy, but not vice versa" (see further evidence in Plank 2007).

Overall, although syntax did not remain totally unaltered, this sequence of change events and non-events in the creation of family names from nouns and adjectives, instigated by the semantic-pragmatic development of these nouns and adjectives from descriptive epithets to rigid designators, does fit in with what has been proposed as a universal constraint, a law of diachronic nature, pertaining to differential time stabilities. The theory of syntactic inertia (Keenan 2002, Lon-gobardi 2001) holds that syntax is the most conservative part of the grammar and really does not change at all, or at any rate not on its own account, but only if driv-en by changes elsewhere in the grammar or lexicon. Although not widely tested either, there are indications that inertial theory is perhaps somewhat too general — it seems that the type of development matters for the question of whether syn-tax is more pertinacious than morphology or whether it is the other way around.

One other kind of development that has been examined from this perspec-tive are RELATIONAL re-analyses of objects as subjects and vice versa, as illustrated schematically in (15):

(15)   the king-OBJ like-AGREE$_{Sbj}$ the presents-SBJ >
       the king-SBJ like-AGREE$_{Sbj}$ the presents-OBJ

Such relational re-analyses have occurred in Germanic and in a wide range of other languages; it always seems to be the syntax of the relations (as in ellipsis and other processes requiring relational identity in complex clauses) that is reversed first, with the original morphological marking (case, agreement) persisting longer, resulting in "quirky" markings of the relations involved (such as non-nominative cases for subjects).[9]

Under the rubric of relational re-analyses also come revaluations of non-ba-sic diatheses as basic. Thus, when passives or other non-basic constructions in languages with nominative–accusative alignment are revalued as basic, or anal-ogously when antipassives or other non-basic constructions in languages with

ergative–absolutive alignment are revalued as basic, grammatical relations may eventually become reversed: the oblique agent of a passive construction may become the transitive subject upon revaluation of the passive as the basic diathesis (shown schematically in 16a); the intransitive subject of an antipassive construction may become the transitive subject upon revaluation of the antipassive as the basic diathesis (16b).

(16)   a.   by-hunter$_{Oblique}$ kill-PASS bear$_{Sbj}$ > by-hunter$_{Sbj}$ kill bear$_{Obj}$
       b.   hunter$_{intransSbj}$ shoot.at-ANTIPASS bear$_{Oblique}$ > hunter$_{transSbj}$ shoot bear$_{Obj}$

What changes last in such revaluations, after the relational syntax has been restyled, are the morphological markings of the relations involved, which often accounts for the identity of subject and object case markers in languages where such relational re-analyses have occurred (as surveyed in Plank 1995b, especially Sections 2.2.3 and 3.2.3).

In yet another type of development, relational re-analysis is combined with categorial re-analysis. Somewhat against the spirit of grammaticalization unidirectionality, a number of languages are on record as having created transitive verbs out of having/possession from locative ('at') and/or comitative ('with') prepositions (Comrie 1982, Plank 2001, Stassen 2009, Haspelmath 2010). To exemplify, among the Semitic languages, Maltese seems to have gone furthest in converting an old locative preposition 'at' (as in 17a) into a (morphologically somewhat irregular) verb, via the intermediate stage of left-displacement topicalization of the complement of the preposition (17b), then re-analyzed as basic (17c).

(17)   a.   Il-baqra ġand iz-ziju   / ġand=u   (Subject: Possessor,
            the-cow at   the-uncle / at=3SG.MASC   Object: Possessum)
            'The cow is at the uncle's / at his place'
       b.   Iz-ziju,   ġand=u   baqra
            the-uncle, at=3SG.MASC$_{Topic}$ cow
            'The uncle, at his (place) is a cow'
       c.   Iz-ziju   ġand=u   baqra   (Subject: Possessor,
            the-uncle have=3SG.MASC$_{Sbj}$ cow   Object: Possessum)
            'The uncle has a cow'

Syntactically, the relational re-analysis has been completed, but again, inflectional morphology is lagging behind, insofar as the new possessive verb retains the enclitic person-number-gender marking from the stage when it was a preposition. Further morphological idiosyncrasies distinguishing this preposition-re-ananlysed-as-verb from old verbs in Maltese include the manner of negation and suppletion for tense and aspect.

In cases such as these, then, syntax is less inert than has sometimes been assumed. On such comparative evidence, it seems to be only in particular circumstances, namely in purely CATEGORIAL re-analyses such as those of nouns or adjectives as names, that morphological change goes ahead without any conspicuous syntactic change having set the stage; here, semantic-pragmatic change seems to suffice to get things going.

4.5 Phonology

Even more inert than syntax in the particular kind of category-changing development examined here is PHONOLOGY: family names still sound just like the common nouns or adjectives they once were. Perhaps it is this phonological immutability which has been misleading grammarians to imagine that family names are still the nouns (or adjectives) they used to be.

In the few cases where family names and their ancestral words have come to differ phonologically, these differences are epiphenomenal. In prepositional phrases, as in (14), phrasal accent is on the noun (*im HOF*), but upon univerbation as a name, word accent takes over and falls on the initial syllable, provided by the old preposition (*IMhof*) (as noted by Paul 1920: 253). Still, this retraction of word stress does not seem an automatic concomitant of univerbation, but may lag behind, on the evidence of some family names derived from prepositional phrases still showing variation between phrasal and word stress (*zur LINden > zurLINden*/ *ZURlinden*).

In the case of *Schmidt/Schmitt/Schmi(e)d*, where the stem vowel can be short or long (as reflected by spelling variants) when this is a name, as opposed to *Schmied* 'smith', where the stem vowel can only be long when a noun, this difference is due to open syllable lengthening being analogically extended to the closed-syllable nominative from bisyllabic CV.CV(C) case- and number-inflected forms such as *Schmi.d-e* and *Schmi.d-es*; these are typically missing with names, where there is therefore no basis for analogical extension. Similarly, as a name, *Burger* remains without umlaut because it is not felt to contain a suffix that would trigger umlaut, while the noun *Bürger* 'burgher' has umlaut triggered by living morphology, namely the suffix *-er*, added to the base *Burg* 'borough'.

Seen from a wider typological angle, it is actually rather surprising that phonology has remained so inert in this particular domain, while semantics-pragmatics and subsequently morphology could not have been more active. The proper names of people, being among those expressions which are predestined for extra-clausal usage as terms of address, calling forms, or vocatives, have been observed to be phonologically peculiar in many a language (Plank 2007), often taking a distinctive sound shape appropriate for performing these particular functions.

Sometimes, as in the Australian language Jingulu (Pensalfini 2003), names are phonologically, and indeed syntactically, as deviant as interjections, and hence are appropriately categorized as interjections rather than as a subclass of nouns. Even in Germanic, there are indications of family and other names diverging from nouns prosodically; in Swedish, for example, they permit or even favor final over initial stress (*Nobel*, *Lindén*, etc., owing to the latinizing ending *-ius*, now omitted) and accent 1 over accent 2 (e.g., *[1]Hjalmar*, a given name, vs. *[2]sommar* 'summer', the more common accent with bisyllabic nouns; Nübling 2005: 29–30), and there are the occasional phonotactically illicit onset clusters in German (as mentioned above in fn. 5: /gm/ *Gmeiner*, /tʃ/ *Zschokke*).

Still, a diachronic scenario like that of family names in German, typically deriving from designations of origin, place of residence, occupation, or salient personal characteristics — that is, from native common nouns or adjectives — is unlikely to encourage phonology to take the lead in distinguishing names from other word classes. It is in other diachronic scenarios, with massive non-native admixtures to the naming lexicon or with names derived from entirely different sources along entirely different lines, that phonology would seem likelier to play an *avant garde* role.

The moral here is that the grammar of naming is diverse, diachronically no less than synchronically. And, to at least some extent, synchronic diversity is accounted for by diachronic diversity: the grammars of names, in phonology, morphology, and syntax, differ depending on the origins of names.

4.6 Lesson

To draw a general diachronic lesson for module interaction, a lot of morphological change, and a little syntactic change, can occur in this sort of re-categorizing development without being driven by phonological change. But morphological and syntactic change do need some driving, and in the case at hand, common nouns and adjectives turned into names, it has come directly from semantic-pragmatic change.

Notes

JHL helped me to get some things here even righter. Among non-Germanists, thanks are due to Edith Moravcsik and Misha Daniel, pertinacious discussants of associatives, and to Aditi Lahiri, among other friends of pertinacity at Konstanz and Oxford. It is only the general idea of looking at the name–noun issue in terms of differential diachronic time stability and a few little points, such as the highlighting of the distinctive "allomorphy" subtleties and of the associative–genitive link, that I thought I might claim personal credit for. But then, a recent re-reading of Hermann Paul's *Deutsche Grammatik* robbed me of another illusion of grandeur, at least concerning the genitival origin of the "anscheinender Plural" (although I do not agree with Paul at all that what happened to family names in general happened because they were assimilated to given names). So, perhaps all I can pride myself on is to have drawn attention (i) to the issue of time stability, which should be investigated directly rather than inferentially, and (ii) to the great grammatical interest of proper names and their histories, which should not be left entirely to onomasticians, genealogists, and philosophers.

1. Although the conditions on the use or omission of =*s* are subtle, there is ample evidence for omissibility. Even for the very example of an anonymous doubting reviewer (involving two German politicians from the two current coalition parties), *Westerwelle(-s) und Merkel-s Zusammenarbeit* 'W and M's cooperation', Google does return quite a number of *s*-less first conjuncts, even without the conjunction being an especially close one, such as *Westerwelle und Merkels Parteien* 'W and M's [respective] parties'. For my own take on this kind of suspended affixation in German see Plank 1995a.

2. For those nouns which have -*s* as the exponent of plural (see 10 below), -*es* is often an alternative to -*s* in the genitive singular where phonologically appropriate (e.g., *Scheich-s/Scheich-es* 'sheik'). If used as a family name, the schwa would not be an option (*Scheich-s/*Scheich-es Tod* 'Scheich's death').

3. There appears to be room here for crosslinguistic variation: as an anonymous reviewer points out, de-adjectival surnames partly retain adjectival inflection in Slavonic.

4. Such distinctive -*s* forms were only gaining ground during the nineteenth century, supplanting regular nominal number inflections, or halfway regular, allowing for allomorphic idiosyncrasies: where -*e* plurals of common nouns had umlaut, the family names derived from them did not, e.g., *Bäch-e* 'brooks' vs. *Bach-e* 'Bachs' (Nübling 2005: 36, with further references).

5. Or at any rate, family names do not greatly differ from ordinary nouns — with names there is a somewhat greater tolerance for onset clusters violating phonotactic constraints, e.g., *Gmeiner*, *Zschokke* (Nübling 2005: 30–31).

6. This is another reason why it is odd to consider -*s* the default plural in German, as is common in psycholinguistic circles.

7. This is essentially the diachronic (or perhaps even the synchronic) analysis of such "anscheinende Plurale … eigentlich Genitive Sg." suggested by Paul (1917: 158). See more recently also Nübling & Schmuck 2010. Language contact does not seem to have played a role here; French influence, as might be expected for Swiss German, is unlikely because the associative of family names in French precisely consists in the absence of regular -*s* from names (*les Petit* vs. *s Klein-s*).

8. Differences like those surveyed above are interpreted by Nübling (2005: 37–41) as revealing an inclination of names towards only a "Sparflexion", an inflectional impoverishment, relative to common nouns. For contemporary German, where gradual morphological differentiation has turned into categorical (and categorial) difference, this interpretation is not radical enough.

9. Cole et al. (1980) were the first to propose this generalization, and it has by and large been confirmed in subsequent work (e.g., Haspelmath & Caruana 2000). In a more inertial vein, Eythórsson & Barðdal (2005) question the evidence for any syntactic changes in such developments and suggest that, syntactically, experiencers in constructions such as (15) have always been (quirky) subjects in Germanic and elsewhere; but this leaves many questions open, in particular concerning the original relational status of the stimulus.

References

Anderson, John M. 2006. *The Grammar of Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cole, Peter, Wayne Harbert, Gabriella Hermon & Shikaripur N. Sridhar. 1980. The Acquisition of Subjecthood. *Language* 56.719–743.

Comrie, Bernard. 1982. Syntactic-Morphological Discrepancies in Maltese Sentence Structure. *Communication & Cognition* 15.281–306.

Demske, Ulrike. 2001. *Merkmale und Relationen: Diachrone Studie zur Nominalphrase im Deutschen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur & Jóhanna Barðdal. 2005. Oblique Subjects: A Common Germanic Inheritance. *Language* 81.824–881.

Gallmann, Peter. 1996. Die Steuerung der Flexion in der DP. *Linguistische Berichte* 164.283–314.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. The Behaviour-Before-Coding Principle in Syntactic Change. *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale: Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissels* ed. by Franck Floricic. Lyon: ENS Éditions.

Haspelmath, Martin & Sandro Caruana. 2000. Subject Diffuseness in Maltese: On Some Subject Properties of Experiential Verbs. *Folia Linguistica* 34.245–265.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi & Friederike Hünnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On Some Principles of Grammaticalization. *Approaches to Grammaticalization* ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine, 17–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Keenan, Edward L. 2002. Explaining the Creation of Reflexive Pronouns in English. *Studies in the History of English: A Millennial Perspective* ed. by Donka Minkova & Robert P. Stockwell, 325–355. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lass, Roger. 1990. How to Do Things with Junk: Exaptation in Language Evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* 26.79–102.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and Proper Names. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.609–665.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2001. Formal Syntax, Diachronic Minimalism and Etymology: The History of French 'chez'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.275–302.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2005. Toward a Unified Grammar of Reference. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 24.5–44.

Moravcsik, Edith A. 2003. A Semantic Analysis of Associative Plurals. *Studies in Language* 3.469–503.

Nübling, Damaris. 2005. Zwischen Syntagmatik und Paradigmatik: Grammatische Eigennamenmarker und ihre Typologie. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 33.25–56.

Nübling, Damaris & Mirjam Schmuck. 2010. Die Entstehung des *s*-Plurals bei Eigennamen als Reanalyse vom Kasus- zum Numerusmarker: Evidenzen aus der deutschen und niederländischen Dialektologie. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 77.145–182.

Paul, Hermann. 1917. *Deutsche Grammatik, Band 2, Teil 3: Flexionslehre*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Paul, Hermann. 1920. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. 5th ed. Halle: Niemeyer.

Pensalfini, Rob. 2003. Part of Speech Mismatches in Modular Grammar: New Evidence from Jingulu. http://eprint.uq.edu.au/archive/00000445/01/rpmism.pdf.

Plank, Frans. 1995a. Entgrammatisierung — Spiegelbild der Grammatisierung? *Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel* ed. by Norbert Boretzky, Wolfgang U. Dressler, Janez Orešnik, Karmen Teržan & Wolfgang U. Wurzel, 199–219. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Plank, Frans. 1995b. Syntactic Change: Ergativity. *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 2nd vol. ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann, 1184–1199. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Plank, Frans. 2001. Becoming a Verb, from Adpositions and Such: The Easy Way and the Harder Ways. Paper at the 15th International Conference of Historical Linguistics, Melbourne. http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/plank/fp_presentations.html.

Plank, Frans. 2007. How Crosslinguistically Variable is the Lexicon and Grammar of Naming? Paper presented at the conference *Nouns Cross-Linguistically*, Campobasso, Molise, Italy, 22–23 June 2007. Forthcoming in *Italian Journal of Linguistics*.

Plank, Frans. 2010. Time-Stability in Historical Linguistics. *Temporal Dynamics of Language: Transience and Pertinacity* ed. by Frans Plank, 14–22. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz. http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/plank/fp_unpublished.html.

Pott, August Friedrich. 1853. *Die Personennamen, insbesondere die Familiennamen und ihre Entstehungsarten; auch unter Berücksichtigung der Ortsnamen: Eine sprachliche Untersuchung*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative Possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author's address

Frans Plank
Universität Konstanz
Sprachwissenschaft
D-78457 KonstanzS
Germany

frans.plank@uni-konstanz.de