Case, Valency and Transitivity

Edited by

Leonid Kulikov

Leiden University

Andrej Malchukov

Peter de Swart

Radboud University Nijmegen

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Case, Valency and Transitivity / edited by Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov and Peter de Swart.
p. cm. (Studies in Language Companion Series, ISSN 0165–7763 ; v. 77)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
1. Grammar, Comparative and general--Case. 2. Grammar, Comparative and general--Transitivity. 3. Dependency grammar. 4. Semantics. I. Kulikov, L.I. II. Mal'chukov, A.L. (Andrei L'vovich). III. Swart, Peter de. IV. Series.

P240.6.C37 2006
415'.5--dc22 2006040572
ISBN 90 272 3087 0 (Hb; alk. paper)

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Introduction

1. Case, valency and transitivity

The present selection of papers dealing with case, valency, and transitivity, originated from a conference on the similar topic held at the University of Nijmegen in June 2003. Thematically it belongs to a row of recent publications indicating a new upsurge of interest in that field.[1] The contributions to the present volume discuss issues related to case, valency, and transitivity in a wide range of languages from different theoretical perspectives. Before turning to the presentation of individual chapters, a brief discussion of the central concepts addressed in this volume is in order. The notions of case, valency and transitivity, which are in the center of the present publication, are distinct, albeit related phenomena. As most of the concepts coming from traditional grammar 'case' is multiply ambiguous (see Blake 2001; see also Spencer, this volume, for discussion). In a narrow sense it pertains to morphological case, but the term 'case marking' is frequently used to cover also alternative means of encoding grammatical relations such as agreement, and even syntactic position. The term 'valency' is also ambiguous. On the one hand, it pertains to a valency pattern, i.e., specification of the number of verbal arguments and their encoding, but is also used to refer to a verbal category marking valency change, such as causatives, applicatives, etc. Many authors, like Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000), also include voices into the valency changing categories. One could expect that transitivity is the most specific notion, as at least on the traditional interpretation it is referring to a specific valency pattern involving a direct object in addition to the subject, or more precisely, transitive verbs are those verbs which take an agent and a patient argument and any other verb with the same valency (Blake 2001). However, in the last two decades (as in Hopper and Thompson's work, see below) transitivity has been elevated into a central overarching category interacting with many functional factors, which manifest themselves in a range of 'transitivity alternations', pertaining to a change of case and valency. On this broad view transitivity is the central phenomenon addressed in this volume.

The contributions in the present volume belong to different research traditions. Many of them, in particular those which have a cross-linguistic scope, follow a functional-typological approach trying to uncover functional motivations behind cross-linguistically recurrent case-marking patterns. A different line of research dealing with the issues of case marking can be found within the generative tradition. This tradition focuses on syntactic effects of morphological case, on relations between morphological case, abstract case and grammatical relations, and tries to give a structural syntactic implementation for many notions discussed above (for example, through associating valency and case with special functional projections; the contributions by Abraham and Trommer can give an idea of the research agenda within this tradition). There are

a number of other theoretical approaches, as represented, for instance, by Sahoo's contribution. A special mention should be made of Optimality Theory (OT) which seeks to integrate a variety of formal and functional approaches to grammar and where case marking has been one of the favourite topics (see contributions by de Hoop and Lamers and de Swart for discussion of OT approaches to case marking). Malchukov's contribution, for example, tries to integrate OT with functional typology, whereas Trommer's OT approach is grounded in the generative tradition.

As is clear from the above, different contributions align to different traditions, although many of them, in particularly those representing case studies of individual languages, can be considered as theory neutral. Equally diverse are the issues addressed in the respective contributions. Some contributors (Abraham, Johanson, Spencer, Barðdal and Eythórsson, Sahoo, de Swart, and Trommer) focus on theoretical issues, other contributions are more typologically oriented (Naess, Malchukov, and Kittilä), while still others take a diachronic (Kulikov, Vydrine, and Peterson), or a psycholinguistic perspective (de Hoop and Lamers). The majority of papers represent case studies of individual languages, often based on original field work. The languages addressed in individual contributions include Amerindian languages (Broadwell, Lehmann and Verhoeven on Mayan, Peterson on Tsimshian, Trommer on Algonquian), African (Vydrine on Mande and Galiamina on Songhay), Turkic languages (Johanson, Lyutikova and Bonch-Osmolovskaya, and Letuchiy), Finno-Ugric (Kalinina et al.), Caucasian (Ganenkov on Nakh-Daghestanian), Indo-Aryan (Sahoo), as well as better studied European languages (as in the contributions by Abraham, Barðdal and Eythórsson, de Hoop and Lamers).

Still another way to classify the contributions, which is again orthogonal to the previous classification, concerns the empirical focus of the contributions. Above we have noted that the notions of case, valency and transitivity are interrelated but distinct. The current order of presentation in the volume roughly follows the following outline: the volume starts with contributions examining case as a morphological phenomenon, after which it continues with contributions dealing with case marking on a syntactic level and interaction between case marking and transitivity, and finally, the volume concludes with the contributions related to verbal valency and valency changing. It goes without saying that a neat classification into classes is impossible, as many authors address several interrelated topics, as is evident from the chapter summaries.

2. Overview of the individual contributions

Part I: Morphological case

The contributions to this part primarily focus on morphological case. **Andrew Spencer**'s contribution **Syntactic vs. morphological case: implications for morphosyntax** is well-fit to open the volume as it discusses the relation between morphological and

syntactic case setting the scene for discussion in the subsequent parts. In his contribution Spencer draws attention to the dual character of the category of case in case-marking languages. On the one hand, case is expressed as a morphological form of a noun; on the other hand, it is manifested as a property of a phrasal node, thus fulfilling its syntactic function. The author focuses on examples of mismatch between the two, arguing that for some case relations defined in syntax there is no straightforward morphological correspondent. His claim is illustrated by three examples: the realization of syntactic ergative case distributed across two other morphological cases in Chukchee; the realization of certain classes of dative marked nouns in certain positions in the NP as a special morphological subtype of dative in Czech (which has no other reflex in the syntax of the language); and the very complex morphological realization of nouns in genitive marked syntactic contexts in German (which cannot be understood unless we decouple syntactic and morphological case labels).

A broad diachronic perspective on morphological case is provided by **Leonid Kulikov**. His contribution **Case systems in a diachronic perspective: A typological sketch** is a typological overview of the main types of changes in case systems. It deals with the main mechanisms of the rise of new cases and expansion of case systems (case-increasing), types of decaying case systems (case-reducing), as well as with some processes within case systems which help to resist phonetic erosion and case syncretism (stable case systems). On the basis of this cross-linguistic diachronic survey of case systems, the author offers a tentative classification of the evolutionary types of languages.

This diachronic perspective on morphological case is also adopted by **Valentin Vydrine** in his contribution **Emergence of morphological cases in South Mande languages**. The author shows that pervasive phonetic processes have resulted in the emergence of contracted forms of pronouns, and he further argues that contrary to the established view, their forms can be interpreted in terms of morphological cases. The author further demonstrates that in some languages of the group, such as Guro, elements of an ergative system have emerged in the personal pronouns. Interestingly, in these languages ergative case is found on pronouns, rather than nouns, which contradicts one of the typological universals, established by Silverstein (1976) and Kozinskij (1980) among others. In the second part of the chapter, the author addresses the rise of locative cases in two other Mande languages, Tura and Dan.

While Vydrine's contribution examines the emergence of a case system, **Tyler Peterson**'s contribution **Issues of Morphological Ergativity in the Tsimshian Languages** focuses on the vestiges of a case system in the Tsimshian languages (Canada, province of British Columbia), which he detects in the class of clitic morphemes called 'connectives'. He argues that they arose from rearrangement of several types of morphemes which include agreement markers, determiners and the remnants of a morphological case system. The author further provides an in-depth discussion of the interaction of the (new) ergative agreement with the remnants of the (old) nominative–accusative case patterning. In general, Tsimshian languages are shown to display some typologically remarkable mechanisms of case reduction and case reanalysis.

Staying in North America **Jochen Trommer** discusses **Direction marking and case in Menominee**, an Algonquian language. In this language a different verbal marker is used depending on the relative animacy of the subject and object. When the object is higher in animacy than the subject, the inverse marker is used but when the subject is higher the direct form is used. Whereas recent generative approaches have argued that direction marking does not emerge from a prominence hierarchy but rather is the expression of case at a more abstract level, Trommer argues that prominence hierarchies do play a role. He proposes that direction marking expresses abstract Case features, and that the realization of these features is mediated by constraints on prominence hierarchies. He provides an Optimality Theoretic analysis in which direction marking is the outcome of the interaction between different types of violable constraints.

Part II: Case marking and transitivity

The second part of this volume, which includes the majority of papers, addresses the role of case on a syntactic level and the relation between case marking and transitivity. It starts with a discussion of general issues in the syntax of case and case variation, after which it moves on to the distinguishing function of case, followed by discussions of case and the typology of transitivity.

A. *Syntax of case*

One of the hotly discussed topics in the recent literature is the phenomenon of *non-canonical* marking of subjects and objects (see the papers in Aikhenvald, Dixon and Onishi (2001), Bhaskarao and Subbarao (2004)). The phenomenon of non-canonical marking, or more generally of *differential case marking* of subjects and objects was first discussed in the typological literature in relation to split-ergativity. A well-known generalization, originally due to Silverstein, states that accusative marking will most likely be found on 'prominent' Os (e.g., pronominal or animate and definite), while ergative marking will most likely be found on non-prominent As (e.g., on nouns rather than pronouns). Silverstein (1976), Comrie (1989) and others provide an explanation for this pattern in terms of markedness: the typical (most natural, functionally unmarked) Os are indefinite/non-specific and inanimate, and deviation from this prototype needs overt marking. Best studied in the typological literature is the phenomenon of Differential Object Marking (DOM), discussed in typological perspective by Bossong (1985), and in an optimality-theoretic perspective by Aissen (2003), who derives DOM patterns via the interaction of markedness hierarchies and economy constraints. Differential subject marking, on the other hand, remains less studied, which may be due to the fact that few uncontroversial cases of non-canonical subjects have been found in better studied European languages (Icelandic is rather exceptional in this respect). The issues of differential case marking and non-canonical marking of subjects and objects are addressed in a number of contributions to the volume.

Werner Abraham's contribution **Bare and prepositional differential case marking: the exotic case of German (and Icelandic) among all of Germanic** integrates a formal syntactic analysis of (differential) case-marking patterns with some insights from the functional and historical traditions. In particular, certain generalizations and predictions about 'differential object marking' (DOM) formulated by Aissen (2003) are taken issue with both empirically and theoretically. The author examines the possible case-marking patterns in Germanic languages, in particular, in German and Icelandic, and proposes a number of general structural constraints which account for the attested patterns. In the second part the author compares the encoding of arguments of three-place predicates in German to Dutch and Norwegian, which use either bare NPs or PPs instead of German dative. He further discusses the relation between case marking on objects and scrambling, and addresses the question of verb-incorporated prepositions. Thus he shows how the issues of differential case marking are related to word order variation, as well as to other seemingly independent syntactic parameters.

The chapter by **Jóhanna Barðdal** and **Þórhallur Eythórsson** is similar to Abraham's in language material and in its interest for non-canonical subjects, but differs radically on a theoretical stance, and also in conclusions. Their contribution **Control infinitives and case in Germanic: 'Performance error' or marginally acceptable constructions?** discusses control constructions in Germanic involving impersonal predicates, in which subject-like obliques are the unexpressed subjects of controlled infinitives. The relevance of this construction lies in the fact that it has been considered in the literature as an important diagnostics for subjecthood. It has also been used as evidence that subject-like obliques in Icelandic, which can be embedded under control verbs, are true subjects, while their counterparts in German are not. The authors present attested examples of control infinitives, obtained from different sources including the World Wide Web, from Modern Icelandic and Modern German, as well as Modern Faroese. They argue that the difference assumed in the literature between Modern Icelandic and Faroese, on the one hand, and Modern German, on the other, should not be considered categorical but gradient. Finally, the authors make an important methodological point that marginally acceptable constructions should be taken more seriously by linguists, rather than being dismissed as 'performance errors'.

Dmitry Ganenkov examines in his contribution **Experiencer coding in Nakh-Daghestanian** non-canonical marking of overt subjects. Ganenkov proposes a three-way classification of experiencer arguments, on the basis of their encoding in 18 Nakh-Daghestanian languages: (1) core experiencers appearing with perception verbs; (2) recipient-like experiencers; and (3) 'involuntary agent'-like experiencers. He then constructs a semantic map which brings to the fore two diachronic tendencies in the semantic evolution of experiencer markers. He argues that experiencer markers tend to arise from spatial sources and then gradually develop into dative markers. Furthermore, over time non-canonical experiencer arguments often turn into canonically marked transitive subjects, expressed with ergative case in Nakh-Daghestanian.

Moving from simple to complex predicates, **Kalyanamalini Sahoo** investigates '**Argument-sharing' in Oriya serial verb constructions**. Such constructions consist of several co-ranking nuclei, which refer to sequential actions conceptualized as one event or various phases of a single event. The author provides an analysis of serial verb constructions in the LFG framework, paying special attention to the patterns of object sharing in these constructions. She argues that the Case of the shared argument is determined by the verb with which this argument co-occurs, while the Case imposed by other verbs is suppressed.

B. *Case interpretation*

The papers in this section have a shared interest in the issues of case interpretation and case markedness. As mentioned above, markedness has been invoked as an explanation for differential case-marking patterns. This explanation is in line with the discriminating approach to case marking which takes the main function of case marking to be to distinguish subjects from objects. On this view those objects which are less typical as objects (e.g., animate, pronominal, etc) are most likely to be marked, as otherwise they can be mistaken for subjects. This connection between case-markedness and distinguishability is further persued in contributions by de Hoop and Lamers and de Swart.

Lars Johanson's approach to markedness, rooted in the structuralist tradition, is somewhat different and considers markedness in a paradigmatic perspective. His chapter **Two approaches to specificity** deals with differential object marking in Turkish, where one finds accusative case only on specific objects. The author shows how the interpretation of cases is affected by the markedness relation within language-specific oppositions. For example, he demonstrates that accusative case signals specificity only when it is competing with unmarked objects in the immediate preverbal position, while in other positions the distinctions in specificity are not overtly marked by case. The author further offers a comparison of his structural approach to specificity, to a functional account as advocated, for instance, by Dik (1989). Focusing on disagreement between these two types of accounts, he demonstrates that the two approaches are complementary to each other.

Peter de Swart in his contribution **Case markedness** also deals with differential object marking, but focuses exclusively on the distinguishing function of case. He argues that in the languages under discussion object marking has a pure pragmatic function and is only used when a potential ambiguity of grammatical relations is at stake. He proposes a principle of *minimal semantic distinctness* which states that lack of contrast between two arguments of a transitive verb at the semantic level should be compensated for by means of contrast at the morphological level, i.e., the use of overt case on the object. Grounded in two markedness scales, one of semantic and one of formal transitivity, he formalizes his account in Bidirectional Optimality Theory, a recent formal framework which gives a natural account of the relation between markedness in meaning and markedness in form.

Helen de Hoop and **Monique Lamers**'s **Incremental distinguishability of subject and object** takes the distinguishing function of case into the psycholinguistic domain by looking at the distinguishability of subjects and objects from an incremental (time-sensitive) perspective. Focusing on subject and object functions in German and Dutch they examine five cues on which subject and object can be distinguished: (1) case; (2) agreement; (3) selectional restrictions of the verb; (4) precedence; (5) prominence. Re-interpreting these cues as violable optimality-theoretic constraints, the authors apply them to the interpretation of transitive sentences on a word-by-word basis. De Hoop and Lamers show that their model of incremental optimization of interpretation and the violation patterns that come about by checking the proposed distinguishability constraints incrementally can account for the differences in processing found in several psycholinguistic studies.

C. *Case and the typology of transitivity*

The chapters in this section continue the discussion of cross-linguistic variation in case marking and its motivations initiated by the previous contributions. In particular, they discuss how the discriminating approach to case marking, as outlined above, is related to the function of identifying or 'indexing' semantic roles. The indexing approach can be naturally extended beyond role-properties to clausal properties contributing to high transitivity, as demonstrated by Moravcsik, Hopper and Thompson, and Tsunoda. In a well-known paper Hopper and Thompson (1980) featured out certain functional factors which contribute to high transitivity (such as affectedness and definiteness/individuation of O, perfectivity and punctuality of the verb, volitionality of A, etc). They showed that lack of these features can lead to a decrease in formal transitivity, i.e., a transitivity alternation. Note that on this approach, case alternations on objects are not interpreted in terms of markedness but rather as a transitivity decrease, reflecting the lack of one of the functional parameters contributing to high transitivity, such as animacy and specificity related to O individuation. Although Hopper and Thompson's approach is not without problems (see, for instance, Lazard (2003) for a recent critical discussion), their approach has been highly influential, and a number of contributions to this volume take up or elaborate on their analysis.

The next three chapters, by Kittilä, Næss and Malchukov are similar, as they are typological in nature, and all address the issue of cross-linguistic motivations for case-marking patterns, and their motivations. The analyses, however, are different as the authors differ in the importance they attribute to the distinguishing and indexing function of case marking. **Seppo Kittilä**'s contribution **The woman showed the baby to her sister: on resolving animacy-driven ambiguity in ditransitives** is in line with the contributions by de Swart and de Hoop and Lamers in that it focuses on the disambiguating function of case marking. The author examines the strategies languages use for resolving ambiguity in ditransitives in which both objects (Recipient and Theme) have a human referent. The author suggests a distinction between languages depending on what factor determines the encoding of objects in a ditransitive construction:

semantic role, grammatical function, or animacy information. The latter languages are of particular interest, as these languages must take special measures to disambiguate arguments in constructions where the Theme is animate as well. The author provides a comprehensive survey of ditransitive constructions in animacy prominent languages, showing that languages differ both in terms of disambiguation mechanism involved (case, agreement, etc), but also with respect to which object changes its encoding when compared to the canonical ditransitive construction.

The chapter by **Åshild Næss** on **Case semantics and the agent-patient opposition** addresses the question how the distinguishing and indexing functions of case can be related to each other as parts of a single integrated system. The chapter presents a set of case-marking data which does not seem to be readily explainable from either a purely discriminatory or a purely indexing point of view. In a number of languages (such as Chepang and Marwari), case marking on one core argument appears to depend on semantic properties of the *other* argument of the clause. The author argues that an adequate analysis of these case-marking patterns must recognize that case marking has *both* discriminatory and semantic aspects. She further argues that the notion of prototypical transitivity must be defined in terms of a *maximal semantic distinction* between the arguments involved, and that core case marking in the prototypical instance makes reference to this distinction: only when the arguments of a bivalent clause are maximally distinct with respect to the properties of volitionality, instigation and affectedness does core case marking (in the sense of overt ergative or accusative case) necessarily apply.

Andrej Malchukov's contribution **Transitivity parameters and transitivity alternations: constraining co-variation** addresses the relation between transitivity parameters, as formulated by Hopper and Thompson (1980), and transitivity alternations. The author proposes to represent the list of transitivity parameters in the form of a scale, stretching from subject-related (e.g., agentivity) via verb-related (e.g., aspect) to object-related parameters (e.g., affectedness). This semantic scale can be used to predict which syntactic argument changes its case marking in the course of an alternation, on the assumption that a transitivity parameter should be preferably encoded on the 'relevant' constituent, that is, the constituent to which it pertains. This, basically iconic 'Relevance principle' interacts with a structural principle, which prohibits the manipulation on case marking of the 'primary' argument exclusively (i.e., without a diathetic shift). The author then shows how interaction of these two principles can predict cross-linguistically preferred patterns of transitivity alternations, as well as constrain co-variation between transitivity alternations and transitivity parameters.

The last chapter in this part presents a case study of **Transitivity in Songhay**. In this chapter **Julia Galiamina** discusses the correlation between semantic and syntactic transitivity in this West-African language. In the first part of her paper she argues that the morpheme *na* should be analyzed as a marker designating clauses with a high degree of transitivity. She argues that four of the parameters proposed by Hopper and Thompson (1980) are exclusively involved in determining the degree of clausal transitivity. Two

other of Hopper and Thompson's parameters may influence the lexical transitivity (i.e., valency patterns) of verbal lexemes as discussed in the second part of her contribution. On the basis of a comprehensive examination of Songhay verbal vocabulary Galiamina proposes a classification into six basic syntactic verb types. She presents a detailed discussion of the semantics of these verb types with particular attention granted to the different types of labile verbs and their alternations.

Part III: Transitivity and valency changing

Typological approaches to valency-changing categories have a somewhat different research tradition, in this connection the pioneering work by the Leningrad/St. Petersburg Typology Group should be mentioned (see, for example, Nedjalkov and Sil′nickij (1969) on the typology of causative constructions, and Xrakovskij (1981) on the typology of passive constructions). In the subsequent years rich literature has been published on this topic, yet some phenomena in this domain attracted more attention than others. Thus, among the voice categories passive is arguably best studied both within particular languages as well as across languages, while among the valency changing derivational morphology the causatives have received most attention. However, in spite of the extensive literature on this topic, a number of issues remain controversial, including the basic question, whether voices should be treated on a par with other valency changing categories such as causatives. It should be noted that a strict distinction between the two classes could be hardly maintained in view of a wide-spread polysemy of voice morphology, which may have syntactic repercussions. This is also demonstrated in a number of contributions to the volume which deal with structurally ambiguous categories, which may perform both a valency-decreasing and a valency-increasing function, e.g., when the same marker can be used both in a passive and a causative function. The order of presentation in this section starts from valency decreasing categories, which indisputably fall into the domain of voices, to valency ambiguous categories, and further on to valency increasing categories (causatives and applicatives).

George Aaron Broadwell's chapter on **Syntactic valence, information structure, and passive constructions in Kaqchikel** opens the discussion of voice and valency changing categories. His contribution deals with two passives in the Mayan language Kaqchikel, the *ki*-passive and the standard passive. The author shows that the two derivations share many syntactic features, but differ at the informational level: the former type is only employed in cases where the arguments are topical noun phrases. This chapter contributes to the typological study of passives and to grammatical theory, in general. It draws attention to the relatively neglected aspects of passive constructions, in particular, the relation between their syntactic features and informational effects of valence changing.

Ekaterina Lyutikova and **Anastasia Bonch-Osmolovskaya** in their contribution **A very active passive: Functional similarities between passive and causative in Balkar** address the range of uses of the Balkar passive. They note that the passive marker in

Balkar has developed uses which are not attested in most Turkic languages. The authors present an extensive discussion of the different uses of the passive morpheme of which the 'causal passive' use is very uncommon from a typological perspective. Furthermore, a special feature of Balkar is the proliferation of 'double passive' forms, in which we find more than one application of passive morphology on transitive verbs. The double passive is shown to have a wide variety of functions, including a causal one. This detailed discussion of the Balkar passive provides us with new evidence for a functional contiguity of the passive and causative domains.

Staying within the same language family, **Alexander Letuchiy** discusses **Case marking in causative constructions in Khakas in comparison to some other Turkic languages**. The author shows that the marking of the causees in causative constructions can depend on different factors, including discourse-pragmatic, semantic and syntactic ones. The latter refers in particular, to the hierarchy of grammatical relations which, according to Comrie, determines the encoding of causees as direct, indirect or oblique objects. The author shows how deviations from the 'paradigm case' predicted by Comrie's hierarchy can be accounted for in terms of other factors, pertaining to the marking of the underlying object, the type of the causee, and to discourse properties of the arguments in the causative construction. It is further shown that other Turkic languages (e.g. Tuvinian, Altai and Balkar) differ from Khakas with respect to what weight they attribute to the different factors. The author also discusses polysemy of the causative marker, in particular, he notes its use in the passive function.

The next chapter, **Transitivity increase markers interacting with verbs semantics: evidence from Finno-Ugric languages**, by **Elena Kalinina**, **Dmitriy Kolomatskiy**, and **Alexandra Sudobina**, also deals with a valency ambiguous category, this time in the Finno-Ugric languages Mari and Komi. At first sight the Mari suffix *-alt* seems to be a polysemous marker with two mutually exclusive functions. On the one hand, it derives transitive verbs from intransitive ones and on the other hand it also actively participates in agent-demotion constructions. The authors argue, though, that this polysemy is apparent as it is dependent on an alternation in agreement pattern. A similar polysemy pattern is revealed by the causative marker *-əd* in Komi. The authors show that, depending on the verb semantics, the derived causative form may be interpreted as causative proper (marking the presence of an animate counteragent) or as one of the secondary derivatives, pertaining to total affectedness of the object, intensity, or volitionality.

The final chapter addresses applicative-like derivations, which have figured less prominently in the typological literature, as compared to causatives. **Christian Lehmann** and **Elisabeth Verhoeven**'s contribution **Extraversive transitivization in Yucatec Maya and the nature of the applicative** investigates a transitivity increasing operation in Yucatec Maya, expressed by the suffix *-t*. This derivation, termed by the authors 'extraversive', applies to intransitive verbs, making them transitive by adding a direct object (an undergoer-focused transitivization). The authors note the similarities this category has to applicatives, but emphasize that it differs from the latter, being an es-

sentially lexical operation with limited syntactic regularity. The authors provide an in-depth analysis of the 'extraversive' transitivization with the aim of refining the concept of the applicative. Special attention is given to a possible functional transition between plain undergoer-focused transitivization (i.e., 'extraversion') and applicative formation. It is argued that such a transition is conceivable given the kind of thematic roles typically involved in the two constructions.

The last chapter demonstrates how a fine-grained analysis may lead to the discovery of a new category. More generally, many other contributions to the volume, providing in-depth analyses of case and valency in individual languages, are in line with an increased concern found in the literature in capturing specific functions of grammatical categories, as well as an increased interest in polysemy patterns. This bottom-up approach to the study of case marking is intended to feed and complement general approaches seeking to uncover typological generalizations or provide an articulated theory of case and valency in different theoretical frameworks.

As can be seen from the above, the present volume collects papers dealing with case, valency, and transitivity from a variety of theoretical perspectives and in a wide range of languages. As the editors we hope it will be interesting to linguists of different persuasions and that the challenging data will promote further research in the field.

3. Acknowledgements

The preparation of this volume started immediately after the PIONIER Workshop 'Case, Valency, and Transitivity' organized at the University of Nijmegen in June 2003. As with any other book, the realization of this book would not have become reality without the help of many people and we would like to take the opportunity to thank them.

First and foremost we would like to thank the contributors for their cooperation and patience without which this volume would not have been possible. Our warm thanks and deep appreciation go to the anonymous reviewers whose constructive and helpful critical remarks helped us and the authors to improve this volume.

We thank Werner Abraham, who, as one of the series editors, suggested to us the possibility of publishing the papers presented at the workshop and who assisted us throughout the preparation of this volume. Kees Vaes, Patricia Leplae, and the staff at John Benjamins provided us with all the necessary help during the production process.

The workshop and this volume were organized and prepared within the scope of the PIONIER project 'Case Cross-linguistically' at the Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. We would like to express our gratitude to our fellow research team members Helen de Hoop, Monique Lamers, Sander Lestrade, Yang Ning, and Joost Zwarts for their support and we acknowledge the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) for financial support [PIONIER Project 'Case Cross-linguistically' grant 220-70-003]. Special thanks are due to Sander Lestrade who provided us with last-minute assistance in preparing the final manuscript for publication.

During the preparation of this volume the deeply sad news reached us about the untimely death of Helma van den Berg. In June 2003 Helma actively participated in the workshop and presented her research on experiencer constructions in Daghestanian languages. She intended to write a contribution to the present volume but matters turned out differently. On 11 November 2003 she suffered a heart attack while working on a dictionary of the Dargi language in Derbent (Daghestan, Russia). Helma will be dearly missed.

Notes

1. We refer the reader to such (edited) volumes as Reuland (2000), de Hoop et al. (2001), Brandner and Zinsmeister (2003), Amberber and de Hoop (2005), dealing with case and case marking, Aikhenvald, Dixon and Onishi (2001), Bhaskararao and Subbarao (2004), specifically addressing issues of non-canonical case marking, Kulikov and Vater (1998), Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000b); Shibatani (2001), dealing with transitivity and valency-changing operations.

References

Aikhenvald, A., Dixon, R. and Onishi, M. (eds). 2001. *Non-canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects* [Typological studies in languages, 46]. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aissen, J. 2003. "Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 435–83.

Amberber, M. and de Hoop, H. (eds). 2005. *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages: the Case for Case*. London and New York: Elsevier.

Bhaskararao, P. and Subbarao, K.V. (eds). 2004. *Non-nominative Subjects. Volume* 1–2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Blake, B. J. 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bossong, G. 1985. *Differentielle Objectmarkierung in den Neuiranischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Brandner, E. and Zinsmeister, H. (eds). 2003. *New Perspectives on Case Theory*. Stanford: CSLI.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dixon, R. and Aikhenvald, A. 2000. "Introduction". In *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, R. Dixon and A. Aikhenvald (eds), 1–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. and Aikhenvald, A. (eds). 2000b. *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dik, S. C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar,* 1. *The Structure of the Clause* [Functional Grammar Series 9]. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

de Hoop, H., Koeneman, O., Mulders, I. and Weerman, F. (eds). 2001. *Effects of Morphological Case* [*Lingua* 111, Special issue].

Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A. 1980. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". *Language* 56: 251–99.

Kulikov, L. and Vater, H. (eds). 1998. *Typology of Verbal Categories. Papers Presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* [Linguistische Arbeiten 382]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kozinskij, I. Š. 1980. "Nekotorye universal'nye osobennosti sistem sklonenija ličnyx mestoimenij" [Some universals in the declension of personal pronouns]. In *Teorija i Tipologija Mestoimenij* [*Theory and Typology of Pronouns*], I.F. Vardul' (ed.), 50–62. Moscow: Nauka.

Lazard, G. 2003. "Transitivity revisited as an example of a more strict approach to typological research". *Folia Linguistica* XXXVI (3–4): 141–90.

Nedjalkov, V. P. and Sil'nickij, G. G. 1969. "Tipologija morfologičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativov" [A typology of morphological and lexical causatives]. In *Tipologija Kauzativnyx Konstrukcij: Morfologičeskij Kauzativ* [A Typology of Causative Constructions. The Morphological Causative], A. A. Xolodovič (ed.), 20–50. Leningrad: Nauka. (Engl. transl. in: F. Kiefer (ed.). 1973. *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1–32).

Reuland, E. (ed.). 2000. *Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Shibatani, M. (ed.). 2001. *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Silverstein, M. 1976. "Hierarchy of features and ergativity". In *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), 112–71. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Xrakovskij, V. S. 1981. "Diateza i referentnost'. Passivnye konstrukcii" [Diathesis and referentiality. Passive constructions]. In *Zalogovye Konstrukcii v Raznostrukturnyx Jazykax* [Voice constructions in the languages of different structural types], V. S. Xrakovskij (ed.). Leningrad: Nauka.