

SALOS lectures

1

SEPPÖ KITTILÄ
SALOS SUMMER SCHOOL,
1.-7.8.2016

The outline of the lectures

2

1. Introduction to valency change: Differential argument marking
2. Introduction to valency change: decreasing and increasing valency
3. Causatives: Introduction and formal aspects
4. Causatives: Semantics
5. Causatives that are not $n+1$

Changing valency

3

Introduction

- ❧ Changes in valency (argument structure) comprise cases, in which the verb is (typically) marked somehow, which has consequences for the number of obligatory arguments either increasing it (e.g., causative) or decreasing it (e.g., passive).
- ❧ In English, this corresponds largely to what is understood under 'Voice'.
- ❧ In addition, there are cases, where only the argument marking changes (Differential Argument marking).

Differential Marking of Arguments

5

- ⌘ Differential Subject Marking (DSM)
- ⌘ Differential Object Marking (DOM)
- ⌘ Differential R (Goal) Marking (DRM)
- ⌘ Differential Adjunct Marking

In all of these cases, arguments are marked differently without any changes in their number (the number of core arguments may change), and the changes are not explicitly marked on the verb.

Differential Subject Marking

6

- ⌘ The coding of A/subject/Agent varies according to its semantic features
- ⌘ The most important of these features are illustrated by animacy and volitionality
- ⌘ Many instances include also changes in verb morphology (but the number of (core) arguments is not necessarily affected)

Example

7

Tsakhur (Schulze 1997: 58)

(1a) *adam-e* *jizr^z* *alebt'e*
man-ERG bridge.III.ABS III.destroy.PAST

‘The man destroyed the bridge’

(1b) *dama-n* *jizr^z* *alebt'e*
river-ERG bridge.III.ABS III.destroy.PAST

‘The river destroyed the bridge’

Example 2 (optional changes)

8

Archi (Schulze 1997: 58)

(2a) **q'u^zt'i-li** lo e^zwq'ni
thunder-ERG boy(III).ABS III.frighten.AOR
'The thunder frightened the boy'

(2b) **q'u^zt'i-li-t_t:'iR** lo e^zwq'ni
thunder-SAF-SUB.ABL boy(III)ABS III.frighten.AOR
'The boy was afraid of the thunder'

Cf. English: *The cancer/hunter killed the cat* → *The cat died of cancer/*of the hunter*

Example (changes in verb morphology)

9

Sinhala (Gair 1990: 16)

(3a) *lameya* *wælikandak* *hæduwa*
child.NOM sand-hill.INDEF make.PAST

‘The child makes a sandpile’

(3b) *hulangen* *wælikandak* *hæduna*
wind.INSTR sand-hill.INDEF make.P.PAST

‘A sandpile formed (because of the wind)’

Example (different roles)

10

Hindi (Mohanan 1994: 75)

(4a) *havaa-ne patte bik^her dyie*
wind-ERG leaves.NOM scatter give.PERF

the

be.PAST

‘The wind had scattered the leaves’

(4b) *?patt^har-ne šiišaa tod diyaa*
stone-ERG glass.NOM break give.PERF

‘?The stone/rock broke the glass’

Example (IAC)

11

Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 292)

(5a) *zamira.di get'e xa-na*

Zamira.ERG pot break-AOR

'Zamira broke the pot'

(5b) *zamira.di-waj get'e xa-na*

Zamira-ADEL pot break-AOR

'Zamira broke the pot accidentally'

DSM

12

- ❧ The two types (animacy and volitionality –determined) differ according to their motivation
- ❧ The first is determined directly by the semantic role (Force vs. Agent), and it does not need to be marked necessarily
- ❧ The second is motivated contextually (both IA's and Agents are potential Agents), and this needs to be highlighted somehow.

DOM

13

- ❧ DOM means basically that animate (and/or) definite objects are marked differently from inanimate/indefinite ones, and usually the marking of the former is more elaborate.
- ❧ The number of studies dealing with DOM is higher than the number of studies on DSM, probably at least to some extent, because the phenomenon was discovered/made publically known earlier.

Examples (animacy-determined)

14

Badaga (Lazard 1998: 189)

(6a) *ama ondu manusa-na nooDida*

he a man-ACC see.PAST.3SG

‘He saw a man.’

(6b) *ama ondu kaTTE baNDi(-ya) nooDida*

he a wood vehicle(-ACC) see.PAST.3

‘He saw a waggon’

Example 2 (animacy-determined)

15

Camling (Ebert 1997: 46)

(7a) *khu-wa lungto-wa pucho(*-lai) set-yu*

he-ERG stone-INSTR snake(*-DAT) kill-3

‘He killed a snake with a stone’

(7b) *khana khut(-lai) ta-set-yu*

I he(-DAT) 2-kill-3

‘You killed him’

Example (definiteness-determined)

16

Amharic (Gasser 1983: 110)

(8a) *girma bet gäzza-ø*

PN house buy.PAST-3SG.I

‘Girma bought a house’

(8b) *Girma bet-u-n gäzza-ø(-w)*

PN house-DEF-ACC buy.PAST-3SG.I(-3SG.II)

‘Girma bought the house’

Example (definiteness-determined)

17

Finnish

(9a) *henkilö näk-i lapse-t*

person see-3SG.PST child-ACC.PL

'A person saw the children'

(9b) *henkilö näk-i laps-i-a*

person see-3SG.PST child-PL-PRT

'A person saw some children'

- In Finnish both instances are marked

DOM (rationale)

18

1. The marking of prominent, subject-like objects
2. The markedness of animate (and definite) patients
3. Disambiguation of clauses
4. The marking of affectedness
5. The marking of primary targets/most affected participants

DOM

19

The marking of prominent, subject-like objects

- ✎ E.g. Comrie 1989: 129 and Aissen 2003: subjects are definite and human/animate and objects indefinite and non-human/inanimate
- ✎ This function naturally explains the occurrence of DOM, since explicit marking appears whenever the objects are definite and animate, i.e. more subject-like.
- ✎ But see, however, Næss 2003 (discussed later)

DOM

20

The markedness of animate patients

- ❧ Since patients are typically indefinite and inanimate, marking appears to highlight their marked nature in the more elaborately coded cases. But this is not necessarily the whole truth (as has been argued by Næss).

Disambiguation of clauses

✎ Since clauses with animate objects usually involve two animate participants, it is naturally evident that disambiguation makes a contribution to DOM. There are even languages that resort to explicit coding only if other cues do not suffice for assuring the intended reading.

DOM

22

The marking of affectedness

On this basis we may re-cast the DOM phenomena as follows: The tendency to case-mark objects that are high in definiteness and animacy is in fact a relation of the accusative case as marking objects which are construed as being *highly affected*. (Naess 2003: 1203)

Marking of affectedness

23

- ✎ Animate patients are obviously more affected by events in some cases, such as 'the hero hit the rock/the bully', where the animate patient is unarguably more affected by the hitting event than the inanimate rock. Animate patients can, e.g., feel pain and they can be affected in various ways also after the event has occurred.
- ✎ What is also noteworthy in this context is that in some languages less affected and/or inanimate/indefinite patients are formally not direct objects at all.

DOM

24

The marking of primary targets/most affected participants

One of the obvious functions of explicit object marking (also in languages without DOM) is to mark the most affected participant of the denoted event. In case both participants are animate (and/or definite), the marking is needed to highlight which of the two participants is more affected (a transitive event may also affect the agent, even though the agent is not targeted by the event).

DRM

25

- ❧ The differential coding of R arguments (comprising both Goals and Recipients) according to the animacy of their referents.
- ❧ DRM seems to be conditioned solely by animacy, I have not come across a language where DRM is determined by definiteness.
- ❧ Kittilä (2008) distinguishes between three types (core vs. oblique; extended DOM and oblique type)
- ❧ In addition, Goals and vicinal Goals (Kittilä & Ylikoski 2011) are coded differently.

Examples (core vs. oblique type)

26

Korku

(10a) *raja* *ra:ma-ke* ***sita-ke*** *ji-khe-nec*
king.NOM Ram-OBJ Sita-OBJ give-PAST-PERS

‘The king gave Sita to Ram.’

(10b) *iñj ini-koro-ken* *mya* *kama:y-Ten*
I this-man-OBJ one work-ABL

Di-ga:w-en *kul-khe-nej*

that-village-DAT/LOC send-PAST-PERS

‘I sent that man to work in that village’

Example (extended DOM)

27

Retuarã (Strom 1992:118f, 114)

(11a) *ernesto-te* *alvaro-te* *heyobaa-rape*

Ernesto-TERM Alvaro-TERM help-PAST

‘Ernest helped Alvaro.’

(11b) *dõʔõka* *waʔia* *yiha-baʔa-rape*

yesterday fish 1PL-eat-PAST

‘Yesterday we ate fish.’

Example (extended DOM)

28

(11c) *waʔia pisaṛãka ki-hiʔa-koʔo*

fish cat 3M.SG-feed-PAST

‘He fed the fish to the cat.’

(11d) *ko-re ki-re yi-bea-yu*

3F.SG-TERM 3M.SG-TERM 1SG-show-PRES

‘I show her to him. ☒ (*I show him to her)’

(11e) *anita-re baʔarika ñhĩ-koʔo betania-re*

Anita-TERM food give-PAST Bethanie-TERM

‘Anita gave the food to Bethanie.’

Example (oblique type)

29

Balinese (I Wayan Arka, p.c.)

(12a) *Guru-ne* *nto* *ngirim* *buku* ***sig/*ke***

teacher-DEF that AV.send book to

anak-e *nto*

person-DEF that

‘The teacher sent a book to the person.’

(12b) *Guru-ne* *nto* *ngirim* *buku* ***ke/*sig*** *Indonesia*

teacher-DEF that AV.send book to Indonesia

‘The teacher sent a book to Indonesia.’

Example (Goal vs. Vicinal goal)

30

Finnish

(13a) *henkilö heitti-i pallo-n yksilö-lle*
person throw-3SG.PST ball-ACC individual-ALL

'A person threw the ball to the individual' (recipient)

(13b) *henkilö heitti-i pallo-n yksilö-n*
person throw-3SG.PST ball-ACC individual-GEN

luo/viereen

to/beside

'A person threw the ball to the vicinity of the individual'
(vicinal goal)

Example (goal vs. vicinal goal)

31

Finnish

(13c) *henkilö* *heitti-i* *pallo-n* *talo-lle*
person throw-3SG.PST ball-ACC house-ALL

'A person threw the ball to the house' (goal)

The roles:

Goal (G) [+direction] [-possession] [**+coincidence**]

Recipient (R) [+direction] [**+possession**] [-coincidence]

Vicinal Goal (VG) [+direction] [-possession] [-coincidence]

Transitivity-determined marking

32

Tsez (Comrie 2000: 363)

- (13d) *ʕal-ā* *kidb-er* *surat* *teλ-si*
Ali-ERG girl-LAT picture give-PAST.WIT
'Ali gave a picture to the girl (for good)'
- (13e) *ʕal-ā* *kidb-eqo-r* *surat* *teλ-si*
Ali-ERG girl-POSS-LAT picture give-PAST.WIT
'Ali gave a picture to the girl (as a loan)'

Rationale

33

∞ DRM can be explained by four factors:

1. Differences in semantic roles
2. Affectedness
3. Markedness (or lower frequency) of animate goals
4. Transitivity (the last type)

Differential Adjunct Marking

34

- ⌘ The differential coding of peripheral participants
- ⌘ This may be motivated by the inherent properties of the arguments (14-15), or contextually (16)
- ⌘ Either the marking changes (14 and 16), or the reading changes (15).

Example 1

35

Yidiñ

(14a) *mandi-m*

hand-ABL

‘from the hand’

(14b) *bunja:-ni-m*

woman-MARKING-ABL

‘Because of the woman’

Example 2

36

Finnish

(15a) *Kirja on pöydä-llä /pöydä-n päällä*

book COP table-ADESS table-GEN on

'The book is on the table'

(15b) *Kirja on lapsel-lla /lapse-n päällä*

book COP child-ADESS child-GEN on

'The child has the book/the book is on top of the child'

Rationale

38

- ✧ Also in this case, the marking is determined by deviations from the expected patterns; animate entities are not typical representatives of peripheral roles and whenever they have this role, this needs to be highlighted.
- ✧ Examples in (16) are accounted for by differences in semantic roles.