

[Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology](#)

## **THE TYPOLOGY OF STATIVE-ACTIVE LANGUAGES**

**Leipzig (Germany), May 20-22, 2005**

### **Organisers:**

**Mark Donohue** (National University of Singapore)  
**Søren Wichmann** (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology)

### **Invited speakers:**

**Johanna Nichols** (U. California, Berkeley)  
**Marianne Mithun** (U. California, Santa Barbara)  
**Marian Klamer** (Leiden University)

[http://email.eva.mpg.de/~wichmann/as\\_gen.html](http://email.eva.mpg.de/~wichmann/as_gen.html)

### **Call for papers**

The aim of the conference is to explore similarities and differences among languages of the 'stative-active' (or 'split intransitive', 'agent-patient', 'agentive', etc.) marking type. In particular we welcome papers that address issues of argument structure and voice (or other valency) related phenomena in such languages, areas where stative-active languages are likely to show common behaviour distinct from languages without stative-active morphology. Other phenomena that are of the interest for the typology of stative-active languages are not excluded, however. Our primary focus is on classic cases of stative-active languages where an agentive S is encoded, through case marking, verbal agreement, or both, in the same way as A and non-agentive S in the same way as P. We do not, however, exclude other cases, as long as the agentive vs. non-agentive distinction is a pervasive feature of the grammar. Papers can be language-specific, reporting on field research on individual stative-active languages, or might directly address typological issues from a broader perspective.

The time allotted for presentation and discussion is 25 + 5 minutes. English is the preferred language at the conference.

## PROGRAMME AND ABSTRACTS

By clicking on the **ABSTRACT** button following the individual titles a pdf file with the corresponding **individual abstract** may be viewed.

For a pdf file containing **all abstracts** ordered alphabetically by authors click [here](#).

<b>Friday 20</b>				
1.00-1.15	The organizers	Welcome & introduction		
<i>Eurasia</i>				
1.15-2.00	Johanna Nichols (University of California, Berkeley)	“Why are stative-active languages uncommon in Eurasia? Typological and geographical considerations”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
2.00-2.30	Gontzal Aldai (University of the Basque Country)	“From (more) ergative case-marking to (more) active case-marking: The case of historical Basque”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
2.30-3.00	Thomas Wier (University of Chicago)	“(Non)antipassivization and Case Marking in Georgian”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
– Coffee/tea break –				
<i>Pacific</i>				
3.30-4.15	Marian Klamer (Leiden University)	“Active Alignment in Indonesia: forms, semantics, geography, possible diffusion”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
4.15-4.45	Gary Holton (Alaska Native Language Center)	“The emergence of stative-active systems in North Halmahera, Indonesia”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
4.45-5.15	Naomi Tsukida (Aichi Prefectural University)	“Split intransitivity in Seediq and in Amis”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
5.15-6.15		General discussion and responses		
<b>Saturday 21</b>				
<i>Americas</i>				
9.30-10.15	Marianne Mithun	“The emergence of agent/patient systems”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	

	(University of California, Santa Barbara)			
10.15-10.45	Pedro Gutierrez & Roberto Zavala (CIESAS-Sureste)	“Three alignment subsystems in Chol, a Mayan language”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
– Coffee/tea break –				
11.15-11.45	Enrique L. Palancar (Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro)	“Otomi Split Intransitivity and other related constructions”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
11.45-12.15	Michael Swanton (Leiden University)	”Semantic motivations of Otlaltepec Popoloca split intransitivity”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
12.15-1.00		General discussion and responses		
– Lunch –				
2.30-3.00	Tania Granadillo (University of Arizona)	“Argument structure in Kuripako: stative-active type”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
3.00-3.30	Swintha Danielsen (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen)	“The active/stative split of verbs in Baure (Arawak)”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">SLIDES-1</a> <a href="#">SLIDES-2</a>
3.30-4.00	Maura Velazquez-Castillo (Colorado State University)	“Voice and Inversion in Paraguayan Guarani”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
– Coffee/tea break –				
4.30-5.00 POSTERS	Olesya Khanina (State University, Moscow)	“Fluid semantic alignment in Tundra Nenets: strange place, strange logic”		<a href="#">POSTER</a>
	Sebastian Nordhoff (University of Amsterdam)	[On Guarani]		<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
	Alejandra Vidal (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas & Universidad Nacional de Formosa)	“Semantic motivations of Pilagá subject-marking system”		
	Loretta O'Connor (University of Hamburg)	[On Oaxaca Chontal]		
5.00-5.30	Johannes Helmbrecht (University of Erfurt)	“Aspects of Hocak (Winnebago) syntax”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	

5.30-6.00	Regina Pustet (University of Munich) & David Rood (University of Colorado)	“Argument suppression in Lakhota”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
6.00-7.00		General discussion and responses		
– Dinner –				
<b>Sunday 22</b>				
<i>General</i>				
9.30-10.00	Edward J. Vajda (Western Washington University)	“Active alignment and morphological transitivity”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	
10.00-10.30	Søren Wichmann (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology)	“Event-orientation in grammar”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
– Coffee/tea break –				
11.00-11.30	Andrej Malchukov (Radboud University Nijmegen)	“Split intransitives, experiencer objects and 'transimpersonal' constructions:(re-)establishing the connection”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">SLIDES</a>
11.30-12.00	Peter Arkadiev (Russian Academy of Sciences)	“Thematic Proto-Properties and Argument Encoding in the Active-Stative Languages“	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
12.00-1.00		General discussion and responses		
– Lunch –				
2.30-3.15	Mark Donohue (University of Singapore)	“Stative-active systems: what's what and what's not”	<a href="#">ABSTRACT</a>	<a href="#">HANDOUT</a>
3.15-3.30	Bernard Comrie (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and UC, Santa Barbara)	Introduction to panel discussion		
3.30-5.00		Panel discussion		
– Farewell reception –				

**From (more) ergative case-marking to (more) active case-marking:  
The case of historical Basque**

Gontzal Aldai, University of the Basque Country

In this work, I present data from historical Basque showing an evolution from a more ergative case-marking system in Old Basque to an active (or agentive) case-marking system in Modern Western Basque. The Eastern dialects have remained more conservative, i.e. more ergative. (Modern Basque data come from a fieldwork study.)

DEFINITIONS

**“Ergative case-marking”**: marks *all* intransitive subjects in the same way as transitive objects.

**“Active case-marking” (split intransitivity)**: marks some intransitive subjects (so-called “unaccusatives”) with transitive objects, whereas another class of intransitive subjects (so-called “unergatives”) has the same marking as transitive subjects. (I will specifically define “unergatives” and “unaccusatives” in semantic terms for the case of Basque.)

Therefore, given a language which marks transitive subjects with an overt marker called ERG and marks transitive objects with ABS, the fundamental distinction between an ergative case-marking system and an active case-marking system can be stated by means of the following criterion relative to the class of “unergative” verbs (e.g. *work*):

**Fundamental Criterion: marking of “unergative” verbs**

TYPE-A MARKING (ERGATIVE SYSTEM):	TYPE-B MARKING (ACTIVE SYSTEM):
(i) Peter-ABS worked yesterday	(i) Peter-ERG worked yesterday

Now, depending on how strictly a given language defines “transitivity”, intransitive sentences can be taken as also comprising “derived” sentences with object omission, incorporation, oblique-objects and even indefinite objects. Thus, we could establish a mini-typology of (more) ergative marking vs. (more) active marking, according to secondary criteria regarding “derived” intransitive sentences. I will propose three secondary criteria, all of them concerning objects:

**2nd Criterion: oblique and indirect objects**

TYPE-A MARKING (MORE ERGATIVE):	TYPE-B MARKING (LESS ERGATIVE, MORE ACTIVE):
(i) Peter-ERG searched John-ABS	(i) Peter-ERG searched John-ABS
(ii) Peter-ABS searched John-OBL	(ii) Peter-ERG searched John-OBL

**3rd Criterion: object deletion (and incorporation)**

TYPE-A MARKING (MORE ERGATIVE):	TYPE-B MARKING (LESS ERGATIVE, MORE ACTIVE):
(i) Peter-ERG ate the-apple-ABS	(i) Peter-ERG ate the-apple-ABS
(ii) Peter-ABS ate	(ii) Peter-ERG ate

**4th Criterion: indefinite, generic or non-referential objects**

TYPE-A MARKING (MORE ERGATIVE):	TYPE-B MARKING (LESS ERGATIVE, MORE ACTIVE):
(i) Peter-ERG ate the-apple-ABS	(i) Peter-ERG ate the-apple-ABS
(ii) Peter-ABS ate fish	(ii) Peter-ERG ate fish

The more criteria rendering a type-A marking, the “more ergative” a given system will be. Thus, we could tentatively propose the following mini-typology of ergative vs. active case-marking systems, along the lines of Harris (1985:125).

- (A) **Pure ergative case-marking:** At least, three criteria render type-A marking; for instance, 1 A-2A-3A-4A/4B.
- (B) **Quasi-ergative case-marking:** Two criteria render type-A marking; for instance, 1A-2A-3B-4B.
- (C) **Restricted ergative case-marking:** 1A-2B-3B-4B. Only basic intransitive verbs trigger absolutive marking of the subject.
- (D) **Active case-marking:** All criteria render type-B marking. Only “unaccusative” verbs trigger absolutive marking of the subject.

## DATA

(I) Old Basque (15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> c.) had practically a quasi-ergative case marking:

- (1a) *[ni k]*            *adituten*        *dot*            *[hori]*  
 [I ERG]            hearing        I have (it)     [that ABS]  
 ‘I understand (it).’  
 (Old Biscayan = Western)
- (1b) *ez*    *nax*    *ni*    *adituten*        *horre*        *lako*    *gauss-etara*  
 no    I-am    I-ABS listening        that-like        thing    ALL,PL  
 ‘I don’t pay attention to those things.’  
 (Old Biscayan = Western)

(II) “Literary” Basque (17<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> c.) had more of a restricted ergative case-marking, as has Modern Eastern Basque:

- (2a) *Ni*    *erhoa, zu*    *iakintsu;*        *beha*    *e-nakidizu*            *[ni*    *zu ri]*  
 I        fool, you    wise;            look    no-INTR.AUX, 1-to-2 [I-ABS you-DAT]  
 ‘I am foolish, you are learned; I cannot understand [to] you’  
 (Old Lower Navarrese = Eastern)
- (2b) *Miserikordia-ren*    *eztitasun-ari*            *behatzen*        *diozu*            *[zu-k]*  
 mercy-GEN            sweetness-DAT        looking        TR.AUX, 2-to-3 [you-ERG]  
 ‘You look at the sweetness of mercy’  
 (Literary Labourdin = Eastern)

(III) Modern Western Basque has basically an active case marking:

- (3a) *Peru*            *afaldu*        *da*  
 Peter-ABS        had-dinner    is (INTR.AUX)  
 ‘Peter has had dinner.’
- (3b) *Peru-k*        *afaldu*        *du*  
 Peter-ERG        had-dinner    has (TR.AUX)  
 ‘Peter has had dinner.’

## **Thematic Proto-Properties and Argument Encoding in the Active-Stative Languages**

Peter Arkadiev, Russian Academy of Sciences

As is now commonly agreed (see e.g. Van Valin 1990, Mithun 1991, Primus 1999), argument encoding in active-stative languages crucially depends on the thematic properties of both predicates and their arguments. For example, Primus (1999) proposes the following generalization in terms of Dowty's (1991) thematic Proto-Properties: the more Proto-Agent (resp. Proto-Patient) properties an intransitive predicate entails with respect to its sole argument, the more likely the latter is to be encoded similarly to the Agent (resp. Patient) of the transitive predicate. Useful as this principle may seem, it turns out that facts exist which it cannot account for, at least in the way it is formulated. As the analysis of some quite well known data (e.g., Georgian, Bats or Central Pomo) shows, in order to correctly predict argument encoding with intransitive verbs in a given language, instead of simply calculating the number and balance of all proto-agentive or proto-patientive properties the predicate entails, it is often necessary to pin down a single 'crucial' proto-property which is able to override all the others. The choice of the relevant proto-property is subject to cross-linguistic variation. Thus, for Georgian (Holisky 1983, Van Valin 1990) the relevant property is [change of state]: if an intransitive predicate entails it for its sole argument, then the latter is encoded as the transitive Patient regardless of how many proto-agentive properties it bears. On the contrary, in Bats (Holisky 1987), as well as in Lhasa Tibetan (DeLancey 1985) the feature [control] seems to override all the proto-patientive properties a predicate may entail. In Central Pomo (Mithun 1991), the crucial proto-property is [causally affected], which reveals itself with stative predicates: only stage-level predicates (such as 'to feel cold' or 'to be sick') take subjects with the [causally affected] proto-patientive property, consequently marking them like Patients, while individual-level predicates (e. g. 'be tall', 'be poor'), which do not entail this feature, usually permit their subjects to be marked only like Agents. These facts show that stative-active languages tend to grammaticalize relatively discreet semantic properties, and not the mere number of proto-properties regardless of their content. The outlined analysis permits also to account for the fact that the classes of 'active' and 'stative' verbs in some such languages are of unequal size and productivity (cf. Merlan 1985): if some proto-property is relevant for argument encoding, then only those verbs which entail this property will take subjects marked as Agents (resp. Patients), whereas subjects of all other verbs will be marked differently, thus forming an 'elsewhere' class.

### REFERENCES

- DeLancey, Scott. 1985. On active typology and the nature of agentivity. In: F. Plank (ed.), *Relational Typology*, pp. 47-60. Berlin: Mouton.
- Dowty, David R. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67.3: 547-619.
- Holisky, Dee A. 1981. *Aspect and Georgian Medial Verbs*. New York: Caravan.
- Holisky, Dee A. The case of the intransitive subject in Tsova-Tush (Batsbi). In: Dixon, R. M. W. (ed.), *Studies in Ergativity*, pp. 103-132. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1985. Split intransitivity: Functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. In: Nichols, Johanna and Anthony Woodbury (eds.), *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause. Approaches to Theory from the Field*, pp. 324-362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67.3: 510-

546.

Primus, Beatrice. 1999. *Cases and Thematic Roles. Ergative, Accusative and Active*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66.2: 221-260.



**The active/stative split of verbs in Baure (Arawak)**  
Swintha Danielsen, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Baure is a seriously endangered South-Arawak language spoken in the Bolivian part of Amazonia. All data presented are result of my own research in the field in 2003 and 2004 and has not been published before. Even though we find a number of publications on Arawak languages in general and on some of them in specific, there has not been any extensive material published on Baure before (with the exception of SIL authors Baptista and Wallin 1967, 1968). Baure is a head-marking, polysynthetic language. The general constituent order is VSO (SVO verb internal cross-reference). There is no grammatical case marking. In general, the system of grammatical relations can be described as nominative/accusative. There is cross-reference of agent and patient on the verbs. However, we are dealing here with a split-S system, in which the subject of a stative verb is cross-referenced in the patient slot. As has been reported for other Arawak languages, e.g., Baré (Aikhenvald 1995), Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003), Warekena (Aikhenvald 1998), and many others in Wise (1986), Baure verbs can be divided into active and stative verbs. Active verbs can be transitive or intransitive, represented by examples (1) and (2); the subject is always prefixed and the object suffixed.

- (1) intransitive: A-V-O  
*ni-šim*  
1SG-arrive  
'I arrive(d)'
- (2) transitive: S<sub>a</sub>-V  
*n-am-er*  
1SG-bring-3SGm  
'I bring/brought it/him'

In general, the split in Arawak languages occurs in the class of intransitive verbs (like example (4) below), and stative verbs are the ones that can be translated into adjectives in English. Surprisingly, in Baure we have some striking exceptions: some states can be expressed in an active verb (3), as well as in a stative verb construction (4).

- (3) *ni-kotive-w*  
1SG-be.sick-COP  
'I am sick'  
(but only temporarily)
- (4) *mavi-wo-ni*  
be.sick-COP-1SG  
'I am sick'  
(and will not recover)

The meaning difference of (3) and (4) may already hint at the function of stative verb constructions. Furthermore, Baure has the highly unusual feature of transitive stative verbs; cf. examples (5) and (6).

(5) *ver*                *eto-ni*                *to*                *ni-vesa-č*  
already                finish-1SG                ART                1SG-read-APPL  
'I finish(ed) reading'

(6) *koehoe-ri*                *pino-nev*  
give.birth-3SGf                twin-PL  
'She gave birth to twins.'

Finally even an active verb like *worapik-* 'come' gets the subject cross-referenced in the object slot (7), indicating that it has stative verb status.

(7) *ni-phiko-pi,*                *ver*                *worapik-ier,*                *moena'*                *ro- niko-pi*  
1SG-hide-2SG                already                come-3SGm                so.that.not                3SGm-eat-2SG  
'I will hide you—he (my son) is already coming—so that he won't eat you.'

In this talk I will discuss examples such as (1) through (7) and give some possible explanations for the type of split system we encounter in Baure.

**Stative-active systems: what's what, and what's not**  
Mark Donohue, Centre for Research on Language Change, ANU  
& National University of Singapore

The distinction between morphological behaviour and syntactic behaviour has long been acknowledged, and has been treated in a great variety of ways by different linguists.

This can mean that we have conflicts between the way information is coded in different parts of a sentence.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps most famously, we find conflicts between the coding of information on dependants and on heads. Often a language that has an ergative case marking system will show nominative-accusative alignment in terms of agreement. In such a case we often describe the language as being morphologically ergative (eg., Li and Lang 1979), but syntactically accusative, simplifying the pivot identities of a possibly wide range of constructions into the label 'syntactic' (the opposite, morphological accusativity and syntactic ergativity, is also, but rarely, attested). We still speak of the language as having an ergative alignment, even though it is not 'fully' ergative in the sense that many accusative languages are consistently accusative in both morphological and syntactic constructions. Any deviance from the accusative norm 'counts' for description (the absence of any articulated theory of morphology helps to license this looseness of terminology among descriptivists).

How do 'stative-active' languages behave syntactically? It is often assumed that, since their morphological coding does not show the collapse of semantic categories that ergative or accusatively aligned languages do that they should be 'less syntactic' and 'more semantic'. Durie (1988) would appear to bear this out, but studies of similar unambiguously 'stative-active' languages are hard to find. Can we identify subject properties in languages with a split S? If we examine a language like Icelandic we find that the S,A arguments do behave as a single privileged grammatical category, regardless of their case marking (NOM, ACC, DAT, GEN). In German, however, non-nominative NPs do not show syntactic privileges. In Muskogean languages case marking firmly marks an S,A category, regardless of the complexities of verbal agreement: how do we evaluate these conflicting data? Does the presence of a 'more syntactic, less purely morphological' switch reference system, that marks an S,A category, help us to decide?

Most relevantly, can we talk about the syntactic 'stative-active'-ness of a language that lacks any morphological indicators of a 'stative-active' alignment, but nevertheless marks that distinction in different Ss in its syntax? I shall address these questions in my talk, though uncontroversial answers are not easy to come by.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> 'Coding' here is used to refer to the presence, form and location of agreement marking by affix or clitic; the presence, location and form of dependant marking by case or adposition; or the relative order of the participants of a clause.

<sup>2</sup> Terminology abounds for this alignment type. Suffice to say that I use the term without any semantic preconceptions, purely to indicate a split in the coding of Ss that matches in some way the coding of As and Ps.

REFERENCES

- Durie, Mark. 1988. Preferred argument structure in an active language. *Lingua* 74: 1-25.  
Li, Charles N. and R. Lang. 1979. The syntactic irrelevance of an ergative case in Enga and other Papuan languages. In: Plank, Frans (ed.), *Ergativity: towards a theory of grammatical relations*, pp. 307-345. London: Academic Press.

## Argument structure in Kuripako: stative-active type

Tania Granadillo, University of Arizona

I will present data on the Ehe-khenim dialect of Kuripako, a Maipurean-Arawak language spoken in the northwest Amazon, which argue for the classification of this language as of the stative-active marking type through verbal agreement. Furthermore, I argue that in this language all of the “adjectives” are non-agentive verbs, as can be seen from their structure and verbal agreement. All the data come from original research carried out in the Amazonas State of Venezuela by the author from 2000-2004.

In the Ehe-khenim dialect of Kuripako agentive S is encoded through verbal agreement as a person marker prefix. This prefix is obligatory and it agrees in person and number with S; in the third person there is a gender distinction (feminine and non-feminine) and there is also a different prefix for nominals as opposed to pronominals. Subject pronouns are only included when emphatic. Example (1) presents an A in first person and nominal P. The most common word-order is VOS.

- (1)     *nukapaka*                    *miitsi*  
      **nu**-kapa-ka                miitsi  
      **1s**- see-continuative    cat  
      **PM-v-T/A**                 n  
      ‘I am seeing the cat’

The same kind of marking is present for agentive S as in example (2).

- (2)     *nudiakawa*                    *pantiriku*  
      **nu**-dia-ka-wa               panti-liku  
      **1s**-return-continuative -intr   house-loc  
      **PM-v.intr-T/A-v.suf**            n-suf  
      ‘I am returning into the house’

In contrast, for stative verbs there is an absence of a person marker prefix and the nonagentive S occupies the same position as P as in example (3).

- (3)     *keepaka*                    *hnua*  
      keepa-ka                    **hnua**  
      be.fat-continuative        **1s**  
      v.st-T/A                    **Pro**  
      ‘I am fat’

One other interesting phenomenon is the transitivizer for stative verbs which highlights the active-stative split as presented in example (4) and contrasting with example (3).

- (4) *nukeepetaka*                      *nokutsin*  
**nu**-keepe-**ta**-ka                      no-kutsi-ni  
**1s**-be.fat-**trans**-continuative    1s-pig-poss  
**PM-v.st-v.suf** -T/A                  PM-n-poss  
'I fatten my pig'

These and other examples will be presented to support the stative-active split in Kurripako Ehe dialect and to argue for the absence of adjectives in this language.

### **Three alignment subsystems in Chol, a Mayan language**

Pedro Gutierrez and Roberto Zavala, CIESAS-Sureste

Languages of the Cholan branch of the Mayan language family have been characterized as ergative languages with nominative/accusative split based on aspect. In addition to this characterization, Chol also exhibits all the major characteristics proper of agentive languages (Gutiérrez 2004 and Vázquez Alvarez 2002). Intransitive predicates are divided in two major groups. Events that include an agent as its only semantic argument are encoded as transitive verbs where the main predicate functions as a complement of a light verb. Agentive predicates mark their subject with an ergative marker. On the other hand, events that include a patient as its only semantic argument are encoded as intransitive verbs marking their subject with the absolutive marker. Each major class of predicate includes several subclasses that can be established on the basis of their morphosyntactic behaviour. Chol, similar to most of the Mayan languages, have voice operations such as passive and antipassive that detransitivize transitive verbs. Chol also exhibits ambivalent verbs whose intransitive subject can be expressed either with an ergative or an absolutive proclitic. The selection of the subject is conditioned by the degree of volition and control of the only participant of the event. In this paper we will present all the major morphosyntactic tests that have been found in Chol that divide the verbs in two major subclasses and we will compare the Chol agentive system with similar alignment systems attested in two other languages of the same branch (Chontal and Chorti).

**Aspects of Hocak (Winnebago) syntax**  
Johannes Helmbrecht, Universität Erfurt

Hocak (Winnebago) is a “classical” active-stative language of the Siouan family still spoken in Wisconsin, USA. There is a basic split between active and inactive intransitive verbs, which is reflected in the person marking of these verbs. Active verbs select person affixes from the actor series; inactive verbs select person affixes from the undergoer paradigm of affixes. Both paradigms of person affixes are also employed in transitive verbs to indicate the person category of the actor and the undergoer. The typological characteristics of Hocak morphosyntax include the following: Nouns do not show any particular word class specific morphology. There are neither morphological cases nor adpositions indicating the semantic/syntactic role of the lexical NP. Verbs, on the other hand, exhibit a rich variety of inflection and derivations. Core participants (except 3 SG actors and undergoers) are marked by two distinct series of pronominal affixes in intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verbal predicates. Up to three arguments of the clause can be indexed pronominally on the verb. In addition, there are morphological operations that increase the valency of the verb such as causativization, instrumental/manner prefixes, two distinct locative applicatives, an instrumental applicative, and the benefactive applicative. There are also operations that tend to reduce the valence of verbs such as reflexivization, the indefinite actor pronoun (impersonal passive) and the indefinite undergoer pronouns. There is no canonical passive in Hocak. There are two other morphological operations that do neither increase nor decrease the valence of the verb, but add a possessive relation between two participants of the verb. These operations are termed external possessor marking. Hence, head marking characteristics are dominant on the clause level of syntax. One of the important properties of Hocak syntax is the treatment of adjuncts. Since Hocak has no adpositions, adjuncts have to be introduced and bound to the core of the clause by other strategies. Three of them are available in Hocak: 1) noun-noun juxtapositions (comparable to genitive constructions in European languages) mainly used for local relations, subordination with coverbs mainly used for comitatives, instruments, and manner expressions, and application, i.e. the centralization of recipients, benefactors, instruments, and local expressions as undergoer arguments. The proposed paper presents a brief sketch of the main features of the syntactic structure of Hocak clauses and sentences focusing on the question how they may be relevant to the active/stative typology. It will be shown that the split found in intransitive verbs is a) one between active versus inactive rather than stative verbs, and b) that the split is not fully motivated by the semantics. In addition, it will be shown that the active/inactive split is only operative for speech act participants (first and second persons). Third person actor and undergoers show an accusative type of participant marking. And thirdly, it will be shown that there is a remarkable split in the syntax of constructions depending on whether they include only lexical NPs or person affixes (representing speech act participants). However, it will be argued that this latter feature is probably independent of the active/inactive split. The data for this presentation are taken from various text sources as well as my own field notes.

## The emergence of stative-active systems in North Halmahera, Indonesia

Gary Holton, Alaska Native Language Center

Among the languages of Eastern Indonesia one commonly finds systems of grammatical relations which exhibit more than one pattern for indexing single arguments of intransitive verbs. Such stative-active systems are clearly not restricted to Eastern Indonesia, however, they are common enough in the region to lead Donohue (2004) to propose stative-active systems as an areal tendency in Eastern Indonesia. This paper examines the ongoing emergence of stative-active systems within one important sub-region of Eastern Indonesia: the North Halmaheran (NH) languages of the West Papuan family. Stative-active systems in NH languages derive ultimately from expletive subject constructions, but this paper will argue that NH languages are semantically pre-disposed to such a development.

While formal realizations vary, grammatical relations in NH languages exhibit sensitivity to semantic properties—including Aktionsart and agency—typically associated with stative-active systems. Two distinct paradigms of pronominal prefixes reference actor (ACT) and undergoer (U) arguments. Modern Galela presents what appears to be a classic stative-active pattern: undergoer arguments of stative intransitive verbs (2) are cross-referenced by the same prefix paradigm used to cross-reference undergoer arguments of transitive verbs (3). A different paradigm cross-references actor arguments of active intransitive verbs (1).

- (1) *to-tagi*  
1SG.ACT-go  
'I am going'
- (2) *ni-kiolo*  
2SG.U-asleep  
'you are asleep'
- (3) *to-ni-doto*  
1SG.ACT-2SG.U-teach  
'I teach you'

Yet, this pattern has emerged only recently. In early sources many Galela stative verbs occur with an expletive actor prefix—a pattern which is still found today in neighboring Tobelo (cf. van Baarda 1891). Here an actor prefix must be formally present in all verb forms, so stative intransitive verbs occur with the third -person non-human actor prefix as in (4).

- (4) *i-ni-kioko*  
3.ACT-2SG.U-asleep  
'you are asleep'

In Tabaru the prefix occurs only with first person (singular and plural) arguments (5) but not with non-first person arguments (6) (data from Fortgens 1928:362).



- (5) *i-na-tootasa*  
3.ACT-1INC.U-angry  
'We are angry'
- (6) *ni-tootasa*  
2PL.U-angry  
'You all are angry'

A careful examination of verbal semantics in the North Halmahera languages reveals that the recent emergence of formally stative-active systems, as in Galela, is due not simply to aphaeresis of the expletive actor prefix, but to an underlying sensitivity to lexical aspect. Thus, while modern Galela, Tobelo, Tabaru, and other North Halmahera languages may differ formally in the expression of grammatical relations via verbal prefixes, all of the North Halmahera languages can be said to exhibit semantic properties consistent with stative active systems. In short the North Halmahera languages are stative-active in spirit, if not always in form.

#### REFERENCES

- van Baarda, M. J. 1891. *Beknopte spraakkunst van de Galillareesche taal*. Utrecht: Kemink.
- Donohue, Mark. 2004. Typology and linguistic areas. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43.1:221-38.
- Fortgens, J. 1928. Grammaticale aantekeningen van het Tabaroesch, Tabaroesch volksverhalen en raadsels. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land en Volkenkunde* 84:300-544.

**Active Alignment in Indonesia: forms, semantics, geography, possible diffusion**  
Marian Klamer, Leiden University

Active alignment (AA) is found in languages where an agentive intransitive argument ( $S_A$ ) is encoded through case marking, verbal agreement, or both, in the same way as a transitive agent (A), while the non-agentive S ( $S_P$ ) is encoded in the same way as the transitive patient (P). In this presentation I present an overview of AA in Indonesia.

Excluding the continent of Borneo and mainland Papua, 385 languages are spoken in Indonesia (source: SIL Ethnologue), as represented in the first row of Table 1. For the survey presented here, I selected a sample of 44 languages, from west and east Indonesia. Apart from areal considerations, genetic considerations determined the selection as well: the sample contains 34 Austronesian languages (of three distinct subgroups (West-Malayo Polyesian (WMP), Central Malayo-Polynesian (CMP), and South-Halmahera-West New Guinea (SH-WNG)), and 10 Non-Austronesian languages (of two families (West-Papuan (WP), and Timor-Alor-Pantar (TAP) group of the Trans New Guinea family).

Table 1 summarises some results. The rightmost column shows that the sample contains 22 languages with AA marking, and 22 languages without it.

No. of lgs in Indonesia excluding Borneo and Papua	West		East		Total	
		72		313		385
Sample languages	7	+AA 2	37	+AA 20	44	+AA 22
		-AA 5		-AA 17		-AA 22

Table 1. Languages of Indonesia and spread of AA in the sample.

In the first part of the paper, I discuss the formal expression of AA, and the semantic parameters involved in AA of the Austronesian languages Nias, Mori Bawah, Kambara, Kedang, Taba, Larike, Dobel and the Non-Austronesian languages Klön, Tobelo, and Saweru. In addition, I discuss some typological correlations of AA found in the sample languages, e.g. the absence of passive constructions and the presence of clear Noun-Verb categorical distinctions.

In the second part of the paper, I address the question of the areal distribution of AA in Indonesia. The second row of Table 1 shows that most of them are located in East Indonesia. Statistically however (using Fisher's Exact Test), the distribution appears not to be significantly different for west and east—more AA languages are found in the east than in the west simply because the absolute number of languages in the east is four times higher than in the west, cf. the first row in Table 1. In other words, the spread of AA in Eastern Indonesia is probably not a ‘highly salient feature that might define an area in Eastern Indonesia’ (Donohue 2004: 230), because in relative numbers it occurs just as frequent in the west of Indonesia. In addition, since an areal feature is usually assumed to have spread through language contact, there must be evidence that contacts have indeed existed between speakers of different AA languages in Eastern Indonesia. For some languages we can show that this is the case, but for others, the evidence is suggestive of the contrary. How does this relate to the geographical spread of AA?

From the sample it appears that AA cross-cuts genetic boundaries in Eastern Indonesia, as shown in Table 2. The paper will end by discussing similarities and differences in AA marking of AN and NAN languages of Eastern Indonesia.

	AN (CMP, SH-WNG)	Non-AN (TAP-TNG, WP)
+ AA	12	8
- AA	13	4

Table 2. AA marking in Austronesian and Non-Austronesian languages of E Indonesia

REFERENCES

Donohue, Mark. 2004. Typology and linguistic areas. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43,1: 221-239.

## **Stative-Active Systems: A Look at 3rd Subjects**

Mary S. Linn, University of Oklahoma

This paper will present data from original fieldwork that confirms Euchee (Yuchi), a genetic isolate originally spoken in the North American Southeast, to be a stative-active language. The data will show how lexicalization of incorporated nouns and a historical applicative prefix obscured the stative-active system until recently. Adding to the problem was the 3rd person in Euchee, which does not show active-stative agreement, and does not appear in the same place as the 1st and 2nd person, and inanimates may not be the grammatical subject for active verbs. Many other American Indian languages treat 1st and 2nd person subjects differently than 3rd person subjects, and animate subjects differently than inanimate subjects. These differences may vary from zero-marking in the 3rd person, different placement from 1/2 in verbal agreement, to different case marking on 3rd noun phrases. It is proposed that active-stative languages organize their arguments around animacy and agentiveness, particularly the animacy of the subject for their ability to initiate events (activities, accomplishments, and achievements vs. states). Active-stative languages with their 3rd person splits show that 3rd is inherently not person (Benveniste 1956) but gender, used to regulate subjecthood. Languages not sensitive to the animacy of subjects do not have cause to show this difference.

**Split intransitives, experiencer objects and ‘transimpersonal’ constructions:  
(re-)establishing the connection**

Andrej Malchukov  
Radboud University Nijmegen

In his review of Uhlenbeck, Sapir (1917) suggested that ‘inactive’ (object inflecting) intransitive verbs in Amerindian languages should be better analysed as transitives: “Thus, forms like ‘I sleep’ or ‘I think’ could be understood as meaning properly ‘it sleeps me’, ‘It seems to me’” (Sapir 1917: 85). In the recent typological literature this insight of Sapir has not been pursued (cf., e.g., Merlan 1985: 327 for a critical assessment), which may be due to an increased awareness of heterogeneity of split intransitive languages. Yet, the semantic similarity between experiencer object constructions and constructions with patientive subject (So) cannot be overlooked. The connection between these two constructions becomes more evident if one takes into account that, on the one hand, object inflecting verbs usually constitute a minor pattern in split intransitive languages, which predominantly have an ‘accusative base’ (Nichols 1992: 103), and, on the other hand, an object experiencer more often than not reveals (some) subject properties and therefore can be alternatively analysed as a non-canonical subject (cf. Aikhenvald, Dixon and Onishi 2001).

In this paper I shall provide further evidence for this connection focusing on the cases when the distinction between experiencer-object construction and a construction with patientive subject is not clear-cut. One instructive case is provided by Koasati (see Kimball 1991), which like other Muskogean languages has been regarded as split intransitive on the basis of its agreement system (cf. Mithun 1999: 237-8). However, Kimball (1991: 251) is reluctant to call Koasati split-intransitive, in particular, because morphologically So verbs look like plain transitives. To account for this similarity Kimball suggests that So intransitives originated from reanalysis of transitive forms with a 3rd p. subject. Earlier a similar analysis has been put forward by Haas for Tunica, where “involuntary action verbs developed from transimpersonals” (Haas 1941: 59). As shown in the paper, a similar account can be suggested for many other split-intransitive Amerindian languages, as long as they use the same agreement for O and So and have a zero agreement marker for the 3rd p. A.

While Amerindian languages show evidence that So verbs developed from ‘transimpersonals’, Papuan languages reveal a gradual reanalysis of experiencer object verbs into transimpersonals and further into So verbs. As is well known (see, e.g. Foley 1986: 123-127) many Papuan languages show a predilection for the experiencer object constructions with the stimulus encoded as subject. While in some languages like Usan the only peculiarity of this construction as compared to a typical transitive clause is that experiencer is invariably found in the clause-initial topic position (Reesink 1987: 139), Amele shows further evidence for reanalysis. According to Roberts (1987: 316), some nouns referring to stimulus do not occur outside this construction, and thus cannot count as subjects. Moreover, the experiencer, while still cross-referenced by the object agreement, shows otherwise properties of the syntactic subject (Roberts 2001: 241). Here then we witness an impersonal construction in the process of being reinterpreted as a patient-subject construction.

Thus, there is considerable evidence that impersonal constructions with object experiencers constitute an important source for the rise of split intransitive languages. The motivation for reanalysis is functional: as in other similar cases (cf., e.g., development of experiencer subject verbs from experiencer object verbs in Germanic, as in the case of English

*like*) it is conditioned by the tendency to ‘upgrade’ the discourse-functionally most prominent (animate/definite etc) argument to the subject position.

#### REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra, R. W. M. Dixon, and Masayuki Onishi (eds.). 2001. *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*. Typological studies in languages, 46. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Foley, William A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Haas, Mary R. 1941. *Tunica*. Handbook of American Indian Languages, 4, pp. 1-143.
- Kimball, Geoffrey D. 1991. *Koasati Grammar*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1985. Split intransitivity: functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. In: Nichols, Johanna and Anthony Woodbury (eds.). *Grammar inside and outside the clause*. London: Cambridge University Press. 324-363.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1999. *The languages of native North America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reesink, Ger P. 1987. *Structures and their functions in Usan*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.#
- Roberts, John. 1987. *Amele*. London: Croom Helm.
- Roberts, John. 2001. Impersonal constructions in Amele. In: Aikhenvald et al. (eds.), pp. 201-251.
- Sapir, Edward. 1917. Review of C.C. Uhlenbeck ‘Het passieve karakter van het verbum transitivum of van het verbum actionis in talen van Noord-America’. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1: 82-86.

## **The Emergence of Agent/Patient Systems**

Marianne Mithun, UC, Santa Barbara

It has been proposed that patterns of core argument categorization, sometimes termed 'alignment', are highly stable over time (Nichols 1992:181). As such they might be good indicators of deep genetic relationships, in some cases more ancient than those identifiable through the comparative method. Such a proposal is certainly appealing, and it coincides with our understanding of the histories of certain language families. Within North America, for example, the Iroquoian, Caddoan, and Siouan families all show agent/patient systems that can be reconstructed for the parent languages, systems that have apparently persisted over thousands of years.

Certain other languages and language families, however, show evidence of more recent shifts between agent/patient or active/stative systems on one side, and nominative/accusative or ergative/absolutive systems on the other. Work on Basque by Aldai, on Georgian by Weir, and on the North Halmaheran languages of the West Papuan family in Eastern Indonesia by Holton among others indicates not only that such shifts can occur, but that they can come about through a variety of processes. The time seems ripe to explore this variety, examining the kinds of situations that can set shifts in motion, the kinds of mechanisms by which they can progress, and the kinds of traces they can leave behind.

The majority of North American languages with agent/patient patterns share a structural feature that points to an obvious point of departure for their development. These languages all contain constructions in which third person arguments need not be identified overtly. Some such constructions can set the stage for reanalysis. Clauses such as '1.SG hurt', for example, could be interpreted ambiguously as transitive in a nominative/accusative system ('(it) hurts me'), or as intransitive in an agent/patient system ('I hurt'). What originated as a first person object pronoun ('me') could thus be reinterpreted as a first person grammatical patient pronoun ('I'), and vice-versa. In a number of cases, a comparison of languages exhibiting agent/patient patterns with their congeners indicates that such reanalysis has indeed taken place. Yuki, spoken in Northern California, has been grouped genetically with nearby Wappo. While Yuki shows agent/patient organization of its independent pronouns and case-marked nouns, Wappo shows pure nominative/accusative organization. Tlingit, spoken in southwestern Alaska, is related to the Eyak-Athabaskan languages. It shows agent/patient patterning in its pronominal prefixes on verbs, while all of its relatives show nominative/accusative patterning in their pronominal prefixes.

The geographical distribution of agent/patient and active/stative systems suggests an additional, potentially significant factor in their emergence. Northern California is well known as a strong linguistic area, characterized by longstanding multilingualism. Traditional Yuki territory is immediately adjacent to that occupied by speakers of the Pomoan languages, all of which also show agent/patient patterns. In fact the Yuki and Pomoan systems are strikingly similar in structure, down to the finest detail, though the actual markers involved are generally different. The Northwest Coast is also a well-known linguistic area. Tlingit territory is adjacent to that occupied by speakers of the language isolate Haida, which also shows an agent/patient system. A third strong linguistic area, the Southeast, is home to a number of genetically unrelated sets of languages with agent/patient patterning: those of the Muskogean, Iroquoian, Caddoan, and Siouan families, as well as the isolates Natchez, Tunica, and Chitimacha. Slight differences in the systems of these groups of languages allow us to trace processes of expansion of such systems.

In the end, core argument categorization may not be as reliable an indicator of deep genetic relationship as we might hope. Agent/patient and active/stative systems, for example, can emerge via a number of pathways of reanalysis, a process which can apparently be stimulated by language contact. As such systems become more widely recognized and described in greater detail, we should come ever closer to understanding the kinds of conditions that can stimulate their emergence and expansion.

#### REFERENCES

Nichols, Johanna 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. University of Chicago.



## **Why are stative-active languages uncommon in Eurasia? Typological and geographical considerations**

Johanna Nichols, UC Berkeley

Is it true that stative-active languages are found chiefly in the Americas and the Pacific? If so, what explains this geography? This paper surveys a fixed list of 20 verb glosses culled in part from Merlan (1985) and Bossong (1998) across a dense Eurasian and thinner worldwide sample of languages, to collect systematic figures on whether subjects are coded the same as A, O, D (indirect or second object; mnemonically, D ‘ Dative), possessor, or other. This abstract reports results from the pilot study. Conventions used here: Sa "active", So "stative"; Sd ‘ S coded the same as D.

An appropriate typological analysis needs to refer not just to semantic parameters but also to several more lexical and/or grammatical properties: deponent transitivity of various kinds (where "deponent" is defined following the Surrey Morphology Group; s.a. Tuite 2003); object-coded S (i.e. So and/or Sd, a broader category than the traditional "stative" which is So); object coding as one type of oblique marking of core arguments; whether object-coded S is So or Sd can be viewed as a matter of direct/indirect vs. primary/secondary object properties.

The more general property of object-coded S yields a much clearer cross-linguistic picture (with a surprisingly neat cline and neat segmentability into ergative, stative-active, and accusative) than traditional Sa/So. A plot of Sa vs. So/Sd gives a quick clear classification.

Object-coded S is not infrequent in Eurasia and is quite frequent in southern Eurasia—but in Eurasia the object-coded S is most often Sd and less often So.

Just as a few languages are fluid Sa~So (e.g. Acehnese, Batsbi), so a few are fluid Sa~Sd (Russian is the clearest case).

While canonical stative-active languages with Sa/So rarely also have an Aa/Ao split, Sd normally cooccurs with an Aa/Ad split (found so far in all Sd languages surveyed). Even in strongly ergative languages, D-like coding of core arguments follows an accusative pattern: Ad and Sd. In a few (e.g. Ingush) there is fluid AS/AdSd marking.

Grammatical factors favoring So over Sd as object-coded intransitivity include head marking; primary/secondary object type (itself a frequent concomitant of head marking); low valence (few three-argument verbs).

The main factor favoring semantically arbitrary split intransitivity is high frequency of denominal (and other derived) verbs, and this is common in Eurasia.

In Eurasia, split intransitivity is found chiefly in the Himalayan and Caucasus enclaves (for enclaves see Bickel and Nichols 2003, in press). This is another respect in which language spreading from interior Eurasia (Indo-European, Uralic, Turkic, etc.) has impoverished the typological profile of the continent.

Stative/active has mostly been viewed as a matter of clause syntax and semantics (agent vs. patient status of subjects) influencing the lexicon (valence frames of verbs) and getting frozen in over time, eventually yielding split subject marking. In contrast, this paper is in the vein of lexical typology and assumes that lexical properties (such as derivational and inflectional morphology of verbs, lexical classes of verbs) also influence clause morphosyntax.

## Otomi Split Intransitivity and other related constructions

Enrique L. Palancar, Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro

All dialects of Otomi (Otopamean, Otomanguean) show a split intransitivity pattern involving a small group of inactive verbs and a large class of stative verbs. Consider (1)<sup>1</sup>:

- 1) a. Intransitive Active Verb (S): *dá* *ʔéhé*  
1.PST come.F  
'I came'.
- b. Transitive Verb (SO): *dá* *tsǝ < ʔ > t'-í*  
1.PST CAUS.burn-F  
'I burned (it)'.
- c. Transitive Verb (SO): *bì* *tsǝ < ʔ > t-kàgí*  
3.PST CAUS.burn-1OBJ  
'S/he burned me'.
- d. Intransitive Inactive Verb (O): *bì* *< z > ǝt-kàgí*  
(3.)PST NPS.burn-1OBJ  
'I got burned'.
- e. Intransitive Stative Verb (O): *šì* *n-tsé-gàgí*  
(3.)PERF STAT-be.cold-1OBJ  
'I'm cold'.

Example (1a) shows the typical case marking pattern of an active intransitive verb. A function word (FW) encodes both TAM and subject (1st person). Example (1b) shows a transitive verb with the same person subject as in (1a). In contrast to (1a) and (1b), the transitive verb in (1c) has object marking for 1st person by means of suffixes. This verb derives from the intransitive verb in (1d). Example (1d) shows what I call an intransitive “inactive verb”. These verbs semantically denote nonvolitional state of affairs whose experiencers are encoded with object marking. The same case marking pattern occurs in the stative verb in (1e). Stative verbs are treated by other authors as adjectives (cf. Lastra 1997, Voigtlander and Echevoyen 1985, etc.) because they express common “adjectival” meanings, but this treatment is not fully adequate (cf. Palancar 2004). The person of whom the state denoted by a stative verb is predicated is grammatically encoded as object, like in (1d). In both (1d) and (1e), the verb is grammatically inflected with a dummy third person subject, whereas the notional subject is encoded as object, just as in the transitive verb in (1c). The pattern shown in (1d) and (1e) reveals a contrast when compared with (1a), and suggests the existence of a split among intransitive verbs.

On the other hand, transitive verbs in the language inflect for an impersonal voice. An illustrative example is given in (2):

- 2) a. Active Voice: *šì* *kǝt-kàgí*  
3.PERF dress.below.waist-1OBJ  
'S/he's dressed me (below the waist)'.
- b. Impersonal Voice: *šì* *k < h > ǝt-kàgí*  
(3.)PERF IMPER.dress.below.waist-1OBJ  
'I'm dressed'. (Lit. 'Somebody's dressed me'.)

Example (2a) has an active reading where the agent of the dressing action is discursively relevant and known. Example (2b) has a resultative state reading, and here the event is portrayed as if the speaker ignored (or thought it irrelevant) who the agent was. Though grammatically distinct, stative verbs in (1e) and impersonal voice in (2b) have a number of constructional features in common (e.g. stative readings; similar TAM morphology; a dummy subject; etc.). Besides impersonal voice, participles (or resultative nouns) also share features with stative verbs. On the other hand, inactive intransitives and stative verbs do share other structural features in common, as seen in (1).

Similarities such as these pose the question of whether these structures are related somehow. I assume here that they are. The phenomenon constitutes an interesting case where voice is formally related to split intransitivity, but in a complex and very intricate way when it comes to details. This paper is fundamentally descriptive in nature. Its first goal is to attain a necessary, adequate description of the structures involved. The second goal of the study is to explore the possible semantic or conceptual links between these different constructs.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations: “.” non-morpheme boundary in source; “◊” internal change morpheme; CAUS causative; F free verbal form; IMPER impersonal; NPS non-present ítem; OBJ object; PERF perfect; PST past; STAT stative.

#### REFERENCES

- Lastra, Yolanda. 1997. *El Otomí de Ixtenco*. México D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Palancar, Enrique L. 2004. Property Concepts in Otomi. Paper presented at the 2003/04 annual meeting of SSILA, Boston 08/01/04.
- Voigtlander, Katherine and Echegoyen, Artemisa. 1985. *Luces contemporáneas del otomí: Gramática del otomí de la sierra*. México, D.F. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. [First printing in 1979 without author names].

## Argument suppression in Lakota

Regina Pustet, University of Munich

David Rood, University of Colorado

Split S languages like Lakota (Siouan language family) have been said to be more or less deficient in morphosyntactic devices by which pragmatic categories such as topic or focus can be shifted from one argument to another within clauses containing more than one argument (e.g. Van Valin 2001). In particular, such languages, by virtue of being role- rather than reference-dominated, can be expected to lack passive and antipassive constructions. This typological characteristic, however, does not preclude split S languages from having structural devices for backgrounding arguments, such as impersonalization strategies. This paper takes a fresh look at the inventory of potentially argument suppressing mechanisms such as passives and impersonals in Lakota. It turns out that in addition to hitherto somewhat under-described backgrounding mechanisms for transitive agents, transitive patients, and intransitive “subjects”, Lakota also has a construction that, although structurally dissimilar to standard English style passives, is functionally equivalent to the latter to the extent that it serves to demote the transitive agent while optionally retaining it in the clause. This construction has, so far, not been dealt with in the literature on Lakota. Example:

- (1) *wicháša ki lé mathó kté-pi*  
man the this bear kill-PASS  
'this man was killed by the/a bear/bears'

Although the passive marker *-pi* is homonymous with the animate plural agent marker it is derived from historically, *-pi* cannot be analyzed as a plural agent marker which is coreferential with the agent *mathó* ‘bear(s)’ in the above example because a singular translation is possible as well.

Lakota narrative structure and coreference phenomena provide further arguments in favor of an interpretation of *-pi* as a genuine passive. Clause initial position of an NP is associated with foregrounded status; since the patient in clauses of the above type is obligatorily fronted, it can be claimed to be as foregrounded as in a standard passive clause in which the agent is retained. Likewise, an interpretation of *-pi* as a plural agent marker is precluded in cases like

- (2) *a-ni-pha-pi s'elé-ni-heca*  
[verb stem]-2SG.PAT-hit-PASS [verb stem]-2SG.PAT-seem  
'you seem to have been hit'

in which complement clause and matrix verb potentially share subject arguments (Rood and Taylor 1996:464).

### REFERENCES

Rood, David and A. Taylor 1996. Sketch of Lakota, a Siouan language. In: Sturtevant, William C. (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 17, pp. 440-482. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

## **Semantic motivations of Otlaltepec Popoloca split intransitivity**

Michael Swanton, Leiden University

In Otlaltepec Popoloca (Otomanguan, Mexico) the single arguments of intransitive verbs appear with two different sets of pronominal suffixes. These same two suffix sets are also used to mark possessors of nouns. After reviewing semantic properties of these two pronoun sets and the use of these suffixes with transitive verbs (where they do not neatly coincide with the syntactic subject and object), a tripartite mapping of prototypical semantic roles (agent, experiencer, patient) is suggested for Otlaltepec Popoloca.

**Split intransivity in Seediq and in Amis**  
Naomi Tsukida, Aichi Prefectural University

In Formosan languages, which have the so-called Focus system of the Philippine type, one can observe split intransitivity. This paper will look at two of those languages, Seediq and Amis, and try to explain the split. My conclusion is that the split is mostly motivated by difference in lexical aspect, control and affectedness of the verb meaning. It must be noted that in these languages, the split is observed not in case marking of the S or in agreement affix/clitic for the S, but in verb conjugation type. In addition, the split in these languages crisscrosses the transitive verbs as well.

Seediq has a three-voice system; it has AV, GV and CV (Tsukida 2004). Amis has a two-voice system: AV and GV (Tsukida 1992). In both languages, it is in AV that the verbs show a split. There are several different conjugations for AV, and verbs are classified according to which conjugation they take. Seediq verbs are classified into five and Amis into four. Since there is already a device to show the semantic role of the subject, that is the voice, the split must convey something else.

Seediq five verb classes are: (I) em/zero class, (II) zero/zero class, (III) me/zero class, (IV) me/ke class, and (V) zero/ke class. An example of each class and their characterization are shown in the table below:

	(I) em/zero	(II) zero/zero	(III) me/zero	(IV) me/ke	(V) zero/ke
example	to run	to perspire	to sleep	to be tired	to be big
AV.Neutral	t-em-alaN	temerin	me-taqi	me-'uray	paru
AV.Perfect	t-em-en-alaN	t-en-emerin	me-ne-taqi	me-ne-'uray	ne-paru
AV.Non-Finite	talaN	temerin	taqi	ke-'uray	ke-paru
AV.Future	mpe-talaN	mpe-temerin	mpe-taqi	mpe-ke-'uray	mpe-ke-paru
Prototypically characterized as:	+event, +P/E/I, +control -affected	+event, +P/E/I, ±control -affected	+event, ±P/E/I, -control +affected	-event, -P/E/I, -control, +affected	-event, -P/E/I, -control, -affected

P/E/I stands for 'performance/effected/instigated (see Mithun 1991 for detail). It is clear from above that the prefix *ke-* signals -event, as Zeitoun and Huang (2000) have claimed.

The four Amis verb classes are (I) mi class, (II) om class, (III) ma class, and (IV) zero class. Examples are shown in (1). (I) and (II) class members are prototypically +event, +P/E/I, +control, class (III) -event, -P/E/I, -control, +affected, and class (IV) -event, -P/E/I, -control, -affected.

Many Amis verbs and several Seediq verbs can conjugate differently and express different meanings as in (2) and (3). Many Amis verb roots have pairs of mi form (ex. 2a) and ma form (ex. 2b-c). In many of such pairs mi forms express causative meaning and ma forms express passive or stative meaning. The affixes *me-* and *ma-* are reflexes of Proto-Malayo Polynesian \*ma (see Evans and Ross 2001, Donohue 2004).

Verbs that exclusively conjugate with *me-* or *ma-* (class III in both languages) include so-called deponent middle verbs (Kemmer 1993, 1994), such as transitive emotion and cognition verbs. Amis class (III) also includes reciprocal verbs. Middle verbs are characterized as +affected ("Initiator/Endpoint identity" in Kemmer 1993, 1994), so it is reasonable that stative verbs and deponent middle verbs should have the same marking.

- (1) Amis  
 (I) *mi dagoy* 'to swim', *mi holol* 'to play'  
 (II) *r-om-akat* 'to walk', *t-om-agic* 'to cry'  
 (III) *ma-lipahak* 'to be happy', *ma talem* 'be sharp'  
 (IV) *ga'ay* 'to be good', *tata'ag* 'to be big'
- (2) Amis  
 a. *mi-patay cira tina tamdaw* (I)  
 MI-kill NOM.3s OBL.this person  
 He killed this person.  
 b. *ma patay kina tamdaw* (III)  
 MA dead NOM.this person  
 This person is dead.  
 c. *ma patay nira kina tamdaw* (III)  
 MA dead GEN.3s NOM.this person  
 This person is dead because of him. He killed this person
- (3) Seediq  
 a. *d-em-eNu lukus ka lawkiN* (I)  
 -AV-dry clothes NOM Lawking  
 Lawking dries clothes.  
 b. *me-deNu ka lukus da*  
 AV-dry NOM clothes NS  
 The clothes are dry now.

#### REFERENCES

- Donohue, Mark. 2004. POC \*ma and the adjectives: Oceanic as seen through possibly productive morphology in *Tukang Besi*. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43 (1). 149-176.
- Evans Bethwyn and Malcolm Ross. 2001. The history of proto Oceanic \*ma. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40 (2). 269-290.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Typological Studies in Language 23. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1994. Middle voice, transitivity and the elaboration of Events. In: Fox, Barbara and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: form and function*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing company, pp. 179-230.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67.3: 510-546.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 1992. Verbal affixes of Fata'an Amis: mi, ma, en. M.A. thesis, University of Tokyo. (In Japanese)
- Tsukida, Naomi. 2004. Seediq subject voice assignment in transitive clauses and causative clauses. Handout at the conference Syntax of the World's Languages, Leipzig 5 8, August 2004. [http://email.eva.mpg.de/~cshmidt/SWL\\_1/handouts/Tsukida.pdf](http://email.eva.mpg.de/~cshmidt/SWL_1/handouts/Tsukida.pdf)
- Zeitoun, Elizabeth and Lillian Huang. 2000. Concerning ka, an overlooked marker of verbal derivation in Formosan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39.2, 391-414.

## **Active alignment and morphological transitivity**

Edward J. Vajda, Western Washington University

The morphological expression of subject/verb coordination divides synthetic languages into nominative/accusative, ergative/absolutive, and active/agentive systems. Active systems are further subdivided between lexically fixed, or split-S systems and the much rarer fluid-S type found in Tsova-Tush and a few other languages (cf. Dee Ann Holisky, “The Case of the Intransitive Subject in Tsova-Tush (Batsbi)”, *Lingua* 71:103-32, 1987). This distinction in typological alignment, in turn, tends to interact with diverse aspects of the grammar and lexicon. For example, the Russian linguist Georgy Klimov (*Tipologija jazykov aktivnogo stroja*, Moscow, 1977) identified a wide variety of lexical and syntactic traits that tend to accompany active morphological alignment. The present paper examines the relationship between active alignment and the obligatory expression of transitivity in verb stem morphology. This typological linkage has not been investigated previously in any systematic way. As is known (cf. R. W. M. Dixon, “Semantic roles and syntactic functions: the semantic basis for a typology”, *Chicago Linguistics Society* 35.2:323-341, 1999), some languages contain labile (also called ambitransitive) verbs, which are defined as verb stems capable of appearing in either transitive or intransitive clauses without morphological modification. English is a prominent example of such a language, with many voice homonyms of the type “I wake up”, and “I wake them up”. Other languages permit little or no voice homonymy; these can be characterized as languages with an obligatory lexical distinction in morphological transitivity. Notable examples include Russian, Maori, and Navaho. A survey of approximately three dozen synthetic languages of diverse genetic and geographic profile demonstrates that active/agentive systems, as well as polypersonal languages in general, are the most likely to be accompanied by a well-defined lexicomorphological distinction between transitive and intransitive stems. Ergative or accusative languages, where transitivity is obligatorily expressed in the morphosyntax—either overtly by nominal case affixes or covertly in context—are more likely to have a significant number of labile verb stems. Although the sample investigated is, as yet, too small to permit any conclusive, precise mathematical ratio, active languages appear to be nearly twice as likely as non-active languages to have few or no labile verb stems. The study preliminarily concludes that obligatory lexico-morphological transitivity represents a strongly defined, though not obligatory, concomitant of active typological alignment. The broader implication of this finding is that all synthetic languages tends to require a significant degree of expression of transitivity in at least some aspect of their structure—if not in the clausal morphosyntax directly, then in the lexicon itself through a pervasive distinction between transitive and intransitive verb stems.



**Voice and Inversion in Paraguayan Guarani**  
Maura Velazquez-Castillo, Colorado State University

Grammatical voice is generally understood as the mapping patterns of semantic roles onto grammatical relations, primarily the traditional relations of subject and object. Within this view, the voice categories of direct active, passive, antipassive, inverse, and middle, are all based on an assumed universally valid two-participant transitive event type, where voice alternations are seen as the result of alternating subject-object prominence asymmetry patterns (e.g., Givon 1994, Shibatani 1988, Kemmer 1993, and Maldonado 1999). My paper argues that, in active languages, this conceptualization of grammatical voice is only marginally relevant. In this sense, my paper continues the line of thought started by Maldonado (1999), which challenges the assumption that the canonical transitive event is the sole conceptual starting point for the understanding of voice phenomena. While Maldonado's challenge is circumscribed to the middle voice, my paper extends it to all voice phenomena in the case of one active language, raising the possibility of its validity for active languages in general.

I base my analysis on data from Paraguayan Guarani, an active-stative language of the South American Tupi-Guarani stock. The Guarani system distinguishes between active and middle situations, and between direct and inverse situations. What I analyze as middle voice, involves the prefix *je-*, traditionally described as a passive and reflexive marker. Inverse phenomena involve a person hierarchy in the pronominal crossreferencing system, such that, 1>2>3. Inverse situations are signaled by the crossreferencing selection of non-Actor participants over Actor participants when the latter are outranked by the former. Thus, a sentence such as 'you hit me' selects the first person non-Actor over the second person Actor for pronominal cross-reference. There is also an intriguing prefix *r-*, traditionally described as a "relational" marker, which was analyzed as an inverse marker in Payne (1994).

My paper argues that the use of the middle marker *je-* is not fundamentally tied to the concept of transitivity. I show that there is a significant number of non-transitive situations that involve the use of *je-*, including some nominalizing constructions. The so-called "reflexive" and "passive" interpretations of this marker, I argue, do not constitute part of its central semantic value, and can be derived from a transitivity-independent construal, that of a centripetal (as opposed to centrifugal) event configuration. This concept is suggested in Klimov (1979) for diathesis systems in active languages, and corresponds to current conceptual characterizations of the middle voice. The paper also argues that the inverse category in this language is a covert one, involving grammatical forms that are not exclusive to the inverse function. I further argue, contra Payne, that the marker *r-* cannot be considered a straight inverse marker, and that its traditional characterization as "relational" is more appropriate, because it encompasses the whole range of this marker's use. The general claim of the paper that voice phenomena in this language are not based on the canonical transitive event type, is in line with Klimov's claim that transitive relations are not directly relevant in the grammatical configuration of active systems in general.

REFERENCES

- Givon, Talmy (ed.) 1994. *Voice and Inversion*. Typological Studies in Language, 28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klimov, G. A. 1979. On the position of the ergative type I typological classification. In: Plank, Frans (ed.), *Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*, pp. 327-32. London:

Academic Press.

Maldonado, Ricardo. 1999. *A media voz: problemas conceptuales del clítico SE en español*. México: Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas, UNAM.

Payne, Doris. 1994. The Tupí-Guaraní Inverse. In Fox, Barbara and Paul Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and Function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) 1998. *Passive and Voice*. Typological Studies in Language, 16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

## Event-orientation in grammar

Søren Wichmann, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

In their fundamental grammatical structures languages are designed to communicate messages about and distinguish two aspects of reality: events and participants. Major grammatical correlates are predicates and arguments. A priori it would seem natural if different languages placed special weight on one of the two aspects in their means of describing reality. If that is indeed the case, we might expect event- vs. participant orientation to be a typologically relevant parameter. It could not be a parameter that made a strict separation of languages into two types, since all languages should have ways to deal with both participants and events, but it is possible that certain features might bundle towards one of the two poles of the parameter.

In this paper I shall focus on a set of typological features whose distribution I believe may relate to such an over-all parameter:

<i>Event-orientation</i>	<i>Participant-orientation</i>
• Semantic alignment	• Syntactic or hierarchical alignment
• Valency-change sensitive to verbal semantics (e.g. resultatives)	• Valency-change involving grammatical relations (e.g. passives)
• Verbiness of property concepts	• Nouniness of property concepts
• Aspect over tense	• Tense over aspect

The languages that I characterize by the term ‘semantic alignment’ (traditionally known as ‘active’, ‘stative-active’, ‘split-S’, etc.) stand out by having alignments of verbal arguments that are sensitive to verbal semantics—whether the semantic features relate to the role of the participant in the event or whether to Aktionsart. In this regard they differ from ergative or accusative languages (bundled here under the label ‘syntactic alignment’) or languages that crucially involve person hierarchies (‘hierarchical alignment’). It has been suggested (Klimov 1974) that one correlate of semantic alignment is the absence of a passive construction. Having carried out an extensive investigation of descriptive sources I can by and large confirm this observation. A well-known hypothesis of Foley and Van Valin (1985) relates the absence of passives and related constructions to ‘role-domination’. I find it problematical, however, that the phenomenon to be explained defines the concept that explains it. Thus, role-domination ‘explains’ and is also defined by the absence of passives and related constructions. A possibly more satisfying explanation is to see the particular manifestations of ‘role-domination’ as instances of a more overarching parameter that not only manifests itself in argument structures. The alternative explanation in terms of event-orientation not only makes sense of the absence of passives, it also predicts the presence of valency-affecting mechanisms more sensitive to verbal semantics, such as resultatives. Moreover, event-orientation seems to be relevant in other areas of grammar as well. Thus, the expression of property concepts is typically ‘verby’ in languages having semantic alignment, and verbiness of property concepts in turn correlates with non-tensedness (Wetzer 1996, Stassen 1997). In sum, the over-all parameter of event-orientation provides a natural explanation for the clustering in a large number of languages of semantic alignment, valency-changing sensitive to verbal semantics, the verby expression of property concepts, and the predominance of aspect over tense.

## **(Non)antipassivization and Case Marking in Georgian**

Thomas Wier, University of Chicago

Grammatical relations and the notion of subjecthood in Georgian has long been a topic of linguistic inquiry (Marr and Brière 1931, Tschenkéli 1958, Chikobava 1968, Aronson 1970, Shanidze 1973, Aronson 1979, Harris 1981). The basic difficulty lies most obviously in case assignment (see table 1). Although frequently described as ‘ergative’, Georgian more closely resembles a Split-S language (Dixon 1994) in that two separate conjugations of intransitive predicates, the second and the third, have distinct properties in terms of case assignment and verbal agreement.

What is more, on top of this, a kind of split-system has verbs from the first through third conjugations mark their notional subjects with nominative case in the present/future series, while in the aorist subjects receive ergative case in the first (transitive) and third (‘unergative’ intransitive) conjugations but nominative case in the second (‘unaccusative’ intransitive) conjugation. This has been analyzed (Palmer 1994: 86) as a kind of obligatory detransitivization in the present series, whereby the transitives of the first conjugation demote their agent to the nominative case and their notional direct object to the dative case. This has some surface plausibility, in that aorist series verbs with the ‘ergative’ construction lack one of the (usually overt) imperfectivizing thematic suffixes extant in the present/future series (see 2). In this conception, these thematic suffixes are thus a kind of antipassive which has the well-known corollary effect of changing the aspectual state of the verb from perfective to imperfective (Tsunoda 1988).

There are, however, a number of difficulties with this analysis. Firstly, if the thematic suffixes really are detransitivizing suffixes, one would expect that the demoted dative-marked patients of transitive verbs of the first conjugation would be optional, given that a true antipassive construction typically has the function of backgrounding the patient, but this is not the case (see 1). Secondly, one would expect that the now demoted dative-marked patient of first conjugation transitive verbs could not be crossreferenced with object markers identical to the object markers in the aorist series (where the ergative construction holds), but rather by the indirect object markers or by nothing at all (i.e., as adjuncts). However, these objects are so cross-referenced, as in (2). Thirdly, if this is truly a valence decreasing affix, why does its effects apply to intransitive verbs of the third conjugation in the present series as well? Perhaps most damagingly, these putatively antipassivized present series verbs can themselves be passivized, as in (3).

Given these facts, reanalysis of the thematic suffixes as aspectual markers is more appropriate. Within the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar, I will argue that the appearance of antipassivization is a diachronic, not a synchronic, fact (Harris 1985, Tuite 1987), and that synchronically thematic suffixes formally contribute aspectual and case agreement features but otherwise do not affect valency. The underlying default case marking expected from Lexical Mapping Theory (Levin 1986, Bresnan 1990) thus only arises when verbal roots are not preempted by other morpholexical processes.

Series / Conj.	1 <sup>st</sup> Conj.	2 <sup>nd</sup> Conj.	3 <sup>rd</sup> Conj.	4 <sup>th</sup> Conj.
<i>Present/Future</i>	Nom <sub>AG</sub> – Dat <sub>PAT</sub> – Dat <sub>GOAL</sub>	Nom <sub>PAT</sub>	Nom <sub>AG</sub>	Dat <sub>EXP</sub> – Nom <sub>PAT</sub>
<i>Aorist</i>	Erg <sub>AG</sub> – Nom <sub>PAT</sub> – Dat <sub>GOAL</sub>	Nom <sub>PAT</sub>	Erg <sub>AG</sub>	Dat <sub>EXP</sub> – Nom <sub>PAT</sub>
<i>Perfect Evidential</i>	Dat <sub>EXP</sub> – Nom <sub>PAT</sub> – -tviS <sub>GOAL</sub>	Nom <sub>EXP</sub>	Dat <sub>EXP</sub>	Dat <sub>EXP</sub> – Nom <sub>PAT</sub>

Table 1. Note: 1<sup>st</sup> conjugation predicates are mostly transitive; 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> conjugations are mostly intransitive; 4<sup>th</sup> conjugation verbs are transitive psych-verbs.

- (1) *Revaz-i xed-av-s*  
 Revaz-NOM see-TH-3SG  
 ‘Revaz sees him/her/them’ (Not: \*Revaz sees.)  
 (That is, even when the argument is pro-dropped, the interpretation of the objects is referential to something earlier in the discourse.)
- (2) a. *m-a-sc’or-eb-s* (with thematic suffix)  
 1.PAT-CAUS-be.correct-TH-3SG  
 ‘He is correcting me.’  
 b. *ga-m-a-sc’or-a* (without thematic suffix)  
 PRVB-1.PAT-CAUS-be.correct-3SG.AOR  
 ‘He corrected me.’
- (3) a. *Revaz-i sit’q’va-s sazJvr-av-s* Active  
 Revaz-NOM1 word-DAT define-TH-3 SG  
 ‘Revaz is defining the word.’  
 b. *Sit’q’va i-sazJvr-eb-a* Passive  
 word.NOM SV-define-TH-3SG.2NDCONJ  
 ‘The word is being defined.’  
 (Here ‘SV’ denotes ‘subjective version’, which is used to derive passive verbs.)

#### REFERENCES

- Aronson, Howard I. 1970. Towards a Semantic Analysis of Case and Subject in Georgian. *Lingua* 25: 291-301.
- Aronson, Howard I. 1979. Grammatical Subject in Old Georgian. *Bedi Kartlisa* 34: 220-31.
- Bresnan, Joan and Annie Zaenen. 1990. Deep unaccusativity in LFG. In: Dziwirek, K., P. Farrell and E. M. Bikandi (eds.), *Grammatical relations: a cross-theoretical perspective*, pp. 45-57. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications/Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Chikobava, A. 1968. Mart’ivi c’inadadebis p’roblema kartulši. [The problem of the simple sentence in Georgian.] Second edition, Tbilisi: Gamomcemloba ‘Mecniereba’.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. 1981. *Georgian Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Alice C. 1985. *Diachronic syntax: the Kartvelian case*. Syntax & semantics, 18. New York: Academic.
- Levin, L. S. 1989. *Operations on Lexical Forms: Unaccusative Rules in Germanic Languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT. Published by Garland, New York.
- Marr, N. and Brière. 1931. *La langue géorgienne*. Paris: Libraire de Paris, Firmin-Didot.
- Palmer, F. R. 1994. *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shanidze, A. 1973. *Kartuli enis grammatik’is sapuZvlebi* [Fundamentals of the grammar of the

- Georgian language*] Second edition, Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universit'et'is Gamomcemloba.
- Tschenkéli, K. 1958. *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*, I-II. Zürich: Amirani.
- Tsunoda, T. 1988. Antipassives in Warrungu and other Australian Languages. In: Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), *Passive and Voice*, pp. 595-649. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Tuite, Kevin. 1987. Indirect transitives in Georgian. *BLS* 13:296-309.