Referential hierarchies and three-participant constructions

EuroBABEL final conference
Leiden
August 24-26, 2012

Eva van Lier & Katharina Haude

Idea of IP04: "Hierarchical ranking and argument encoding in three participant clauses" (Anna Siewierska)

Do referential hierarchies only influence the marking of A and P in monotransitive clauses, or also that of R(ecipient) and T(heme) in ditransitive clauses?

From an e-mail on 09/05/2008, when planning the project:

"… Another possibility that I have considered is whether the phenomenon of hierarchical alignment systems can be extended meaningfully to hold for ditransitive clauses. Recently there has been quite a bit of discussion on the alignment patterns of ditransitive clauses. From the purely formal perspective one could imagine the R and T also being hierarchically ranked relative to each other, though of course, Ts do not tend to be first or second person. Nonetheless, there is still the difference between Rs being higher than Ts or being equal to Ts and how that tends to be encoded. Again we have choice of T or R marking, or both may be marked in some order or they may be linearized in some way... Maybe I can think a little more tonight. …"

Prototypical three-participant constructions

- Referentially: 'low' T and 'high' R

Theme (T)	Recipient/Goal (R)
inanimate	animate/human
indefinite	definite
full NP	pronoun
3rd person	1st/2nd person

- Lexically: GIVE

Our questions

- What happens when a language encodes a **non-prototypical** three-participant event?

- Non-prototypical in terms of
  - Referential properties of T/R
  - Event other than "give"

- How does this relate to the (alignment) typology of three-participant constructions?

More specifically

- What happens when T and R are **both human**?
  - How (in-)frequent are '(non-)prototypical' scenarios?
  - How are T/R arguments encoded?
  - Which lexical verbs are involved?
  - To what degree does T/R coding depend on the lexical verb?
  - How can we compare coding variation across languages?
  - How can we explain coding strategies?

Data collection

- Languages that are highly sensitive to referential factors → **our project:** Chintang (Kiranti), Blackfoot (Algonquian), Yakima Sahaptin (Sahaptian), Movima (isolate)

- Collaboration with other CRPs (Ob-Ugric, Alor Pantar) and fieldworkers

  (workshop Lancaster May 2011, Van Lier 2012)

- Limited availability of corpus-based and experimental data → European languages

- Published descriptive sources

Some results

- (In)frequency and coding (European corpora)
- T/R coding sensitive to referential factors (BABEL languages a.o.)
- Interaction with lexical factors

(In)frequency

- British National Corpus (100 million words)

verb	total	T & R human
give	1004	0% (N=0)
show	1089	2% (N=18)
introduce	682	40% (N=275)

- Polish corpus (14 million words)

verb	total	T & R human
dać 'give'	416	1% (N=5)
pokazać 'show'	196	6% (N=11)
poznać 'acquaint'	9	100% (N=9)

(Siewierska & Van Lier 2012a,b)

Infrequency and coding

- British National Corpus (100 million words)

  280 instances with T and R human (and pronominal), 278 prepositional and 2 'double object':

  It was I who first introduced him to her.

  I'll show you her anyway.

Infrequency and coding

- Polish corpus (250 million words)

  336 instances, 150 prepositional and 186 ACC-DAT
  (cf. Kittilä 2006)

  Przysyłają **do** *nas posłów.*

  send:3PL **to** us:ACC representatives:ACC

  'They are sending representatives to us.'

  Mnie mu polecił.

  me:ACC **him**:DAT recommend

  'He recommended me to him.'

Referentially sensitive languages

Variables:

- Which referential factors/values?

- Properties of which argument(s) count? (differential vs. co-argument conditioned)

- Formal effects: case vs. agreement marking?

- Lexical factors: verb classes (including derived constructions)?

- Monotransitive vs. ditransitive constructions?

Araki

- Monotransitive class I:
  differential P indexation:
  [non-human] or [human and pronominal] → index
  [human and nominal] → no index

Naivou-ku	mo=poi-**a**	hija-m
wife-my	3REAL=like-**3SG.OBJ**	name-your

  'My wife likes your name.'

Naivou-ku	mo=poi	naivou-m
wife-my	3REAL=like	wife-your

  'My wife likes your wife.'   (François 2012)

Araki

- Monotransitive class II: P= LOC (no indexation)

  Nam=vavēre   ***lo***   *v̄ere*

  1SG:REAL=sing   LOC   song

  'I sang a song.'

- Monotransitive class III: P=DAT (no indexation)

  Nra   *mo=re*   *ha=v̈alum*   ***isa**-m̈am*

  3PL   3:REAL=say   3PL:IRR=fight   DAT-1EX.PL

  'They want to fight with us.'

  (François 2012)

Araki

- Ditransitive class I:
  co-argument conditioned T/R indexation
  (factors: person and humanness)
  non-indexed T=LOC; non-indexed R=DAT:

    T=3, R=1

    o=vsei-á   ***lo***   *pla-m*   *to*

    2SG:IRR=show-**1SG.OBJ**   **LOC**   farming-your   chicken
    'Show me your chickens!'

    T=1, R=3

    o=kan   *slei-á*   ***sa**-na*

    2SG.IRR=PROH   give-**1SG.OBJ**   **DAT**-3SG

    'Don't give me to him!'   (François 2012:26)

14

Araki

- Ditransitive class II: no alternation of indexation; differential indexation of T; R=DAT:

T=3 (non-human), R=2

*na=a=sohani-**a***		*lleta*	*mo=hese*	***isa=m***
1SG:IRR=FUT=send-**3SG.OBJ**		letter	3SG:REAL=one	**DAT=2SG**

'I'll send you a letter.'

T=3 (human, nominal), R=2

nam=ṝusan	*venaṝu-ku*	***isa-m***
1SG:REAL=release	daughter-my	**DAT-2SG**

'I give my daughter away to you.'

T=2, R=3

*Na=pa=sohani-**ko***	***sa**-n*	*ṝaṁa-ku*
1SG:IRR=FUT=send-**2SG.OBJ**	**DAT**-CSTR	father-my

'I'll send you to my father.' (François 2012)

Upper Necaxa Totonac

- Underived ditransitives: always R-indexation

  Wix, tzumaját,   *na-ik-maxkí-ya:-n*   *wamá: hawácha'*
  you   girl   FUT-1SG.SBJ-give-IPFV-**2OBJ**   this   boy
  'You, daughter, I'm going to give this boy to you.'

- Derived: applied participant is indexed only if it is SAP with 3rd person; animate with inanimate; or inanimate and topical with (in-)animate non-topical:

  Ásta hen-tú: kuchílu *cha:-tín chixkú ka:-li:-lhtukú-lh*   *ho'tni'*
  even CL-two knife   CL-one man   **PL.OBJ-INSTR.APPL**-stab-PFV drunk
  'With ***two knives*** the drunk stabbed a man.'

  (Beck 2006)

Issues raised (i): alignment typology

- T/R=P???
  - Depends on referential properties of P/T/R
    (cf. Witzlack et al. 2011)
  - Referential factors (humanness/animacy, anaphoricity, person, topicality) and application (1/2 arguments) differ for
    - Monotransitive /ditransitive constructions
    - Individual verb classes and derivational processes
      (cf. Peterson 2007, Malchukov et al. 2010, Bickel et al. 2010)
  - Formal effects differ for case and agreement
    (cf. Siewierska 2003, 2004; Van Lier et al. 2011)

Issues raised (ii): separating referential and lexical factors?

- Coding caused by lexical verb or the referential argument(s) it (typically) occurs with?

- Experimental data: De Swart, Van Bergen & Van Lier 2011: Dutch production experiment controlling referential T/R arguments and corpus-based constructional preferences (Colleman 2009): **Independent factors**

Summary

- There's (much) more to three-participant constructions than 'give low T to high R':
  - Referential effects in three-participant constructions are frequent and formally diverse
  - Referential factors interact closely with lexical (including derivational) factors

- This holds for 'referentially sensitive' as well as for European languages

References

- Beck, David 2006. Control of person agreement in multi-object constructions in Upper Necaxa Totonac. In Atsushi Fujimoro and Maria Amalia Reis Silva (eds.), *Proceedings of the 11th workshop on structure and constituency in the languages of the Americas*. 29-38. Vancouver: UBC Working papers in Linguistics.

- Bickel Balthasar, Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, and Taras Zakharako. 2010. Alignment across the lexicon. Paper presented at Syntax of the World's Languages IV, Lyon, 23-26 September 2010.

- Colleman, Timothy. 2009. Verb disposition in argument structure alternations: a corpus study of the dative alternation in Dutch. *Language Sciences* 31.593-611.

- François, Alexandre 2012. Ditransitive alignment and referential hierarchies in Araki. *Linguistic Discovery.*

- Kittilä, Seppo. 2006. The woman showed the baby to her sister. On humanness-driven ambiguity in ditransitives. *Case, valency and transitivity,* ed. by Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov and Peter de Swart, 291-308. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Lier, Eva van (ed.) 2012: Referential hierarchies in three-participant constructions. Special issue of Linguistic Discovery.

- Lier, Eva van, Anna Siewierska & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich 2011: Alignment splits in ditransitives – effects on case versus agreement marking. Presentation at ALT9, July 2011, Hong Kong.

References

- Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: a typological overview. *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook,* ed. by Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie, 1-64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Siewierska, Anna 2003. Person agreement and the determination of alignment. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101/2.339-370.

- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Siewierska, Anna and Eva van Lier. 2012a. Ditransitive constructions with two human non-agentive arguments. *Faits de Langues* 39 [Special issue on salience], ed. by Katharina Haude and Annie Montaut, 140-156.

- Siewierska, Anna and Eva van Lier. 2012b. INTRODUCE: encoding a non-prototypical three-participant event across Europe. To appear in *Argument Structure in Flux: The Naples/Capri Papers,* ed. by Elly van Gelderen, Michaela Cennamo and Johanna Barðdal. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Swart, Peter de, Geertje van Bergen and Eva van Lier. 2011. Lexical preferences in Dutch ditransitives. Poster presented at AMLAP 2011, Paris, 1-3 September 2011.

- Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena, Taras Zakarkho, Lennart Bierkandt, and Balthasar Bickel. 2011. Decomposing hierarchical alignment: participant scenarios as conditions on alignment. Paper presented at SLE44, Logroño, 8-11 September 2011.