IP 04, Lancaster University
"Hierarchical ranking and argument encoding in three participant clauses"

Team
Anna Siewierska (Principal Investigator)
Eva van Lier (Post-doc)

Aims and objectives
This IP seeks to examine the role played by referential hierarchies in the encoding of the non-agentive arguments (NAAs) in three participant clauses. The investigations of three participant clauses carried out to date, suggest that the encoding of their NAAs is less often affected by the referential properties of the arguments than in the case of dual argument clauses (see. e.g. Haspelmath 2005; Malchukov et al 2007; Siewierska & Bakker 2007; Haspelmath 2007, Bickel et al 2008). In the case of clauses involving the verb „give", for example, most languages extend the treatment of the transitive patient argument (P) either to that of the recipient (R), i.e. exhibit secundative alignment, or to that of the theme (T), i.e. manifest indirective alignment, and less often treat both the T and R in the same way as the P (see e.g. Siewierska & Bakker 2007). Nonetheless, we do come across languages in which some aspect of the encoding of the T and R, be it order, case marking or agreement marking, are sensitive to the hierarchical status of the two. For example, in the Yuman language Jamul Tiipay whether agreement in ditransitive clauses is with the T or the R depends on which is higher on the person hierarchy of 1 > 2 > 3. Thus, in (1a) since the R outranks the T the person prefix marks the R, while in (1b) the T outranks the R, and consequently it is the T that is marked.

(1) Jamul Tiipay

a. xikay ny-iny-ma
some 1:2-*give*-PROM
`I'll give you some.'

b. nyaach maap Goodwill ny-iny-x
I:SUB *you* *Goodwill* 1:2-*give*-IRR
`I'm going to give you to Goodwill.'

In French it is the order of the R and T proclitics relative to the verb which is hierarchically determined. When the R is first or second person, the R precedes the T but with third person Rs the T precedes the R. Compare (2a) with (2b).

(22) French

a. *IL* *me=le=donne.*
he 1SG(R)=3SG(T)=give
'He gives it to me.'

b. *IL* *le=lui=donne.*
he 3SG(T)=3SG(R)=gives
'He gives it to him.'

And in Araki, an Oceanic language, the patterns of agreement and case marking depend on the animacy of the T. If the T is inanimate, as is generally the case, the R is bound to the verb while the T occurs as the object of the instrumental/oblique preposition *ni/ini* or *lo*. But if the T is human it may take priority over the R with respect to attachment to the verb. In such a case the R is marked by a different preposition, namely *sa/isa.* Compare (3a) with (3b).

(3) Araki

a. *Na* *sile-ko* *ne-re* *presin.*
I give-2SG OBL-some present
'I feel like giving you a present.'

b. *Na* *pa* *sle-ko* *sa-n* *ramare*
I SEQ give-2SG to-CST devil
'I will give you to a devil.'

Furthermore, as argued by Haspelmath (2007), ditransitive clauses also manifest effects completely parallel to inverse patterns in mono-transitive clauses be it via a different form of marking. Whereas in languages with a direct/inverse distinction in mono-transitive clauses, the inverse, i.e. the situation where the P is referentially higher or equal to the A, is typically expressed via verbal marking (see the examples given in the other IPs associated with this project), the ditransitive inverse, where the T is higher or equal to the R, is expressed via the form of the personal pronouns used for the T and R; in direct marking both the T and R may be reduced forms, while in inverse marking the R occurs in its less reduced form. Note the ungrammaticality of the inverse (4b) in Shambala in which the clitic forms are used for both the T and R as compared to (4c) in which the R is an independent pronoun.

(4) Shambala

a. (1>3) *A-za-m-ni-et-ea.*
3sg.sbj-pst-3sg.thm-1sg.rec-bring-appl
'S/he has brought him/her to me.'

b. (3>1) * *A-za-ni-mw-et-ea.*
3sg.sbj-pst-1sg.thm-3sg.rec-bring-appl
'S/he has brought me to him/her.'

c. *A-za-ni-eta kwa yeye.*
3sg.sbj-pst-1sg.thm-bring to him/her
'S/he has brought me to him/her.'

An alternative solution adopted by some languages, again parallel to what happens in mono-transitive clauses, is to prohibit altogether the expression of some inverse constellations, such as those involving a 1st person T and a 2nd person R, as is the case, for example in Modern Greek.

The above typological observations on the hierarchical effects in ditransitive clauses are based in the main on constructions involving the verb *give.* This is due to the fact that typically constructions with give are the only ditransitive constructions considered in descriptive grammars. However, if, as argued by Borg & Comrie (1984) and Kittilä (2006), constructions with the verb give are by no means necessarily representative of the ditransitive constructions of a language, let alone of the three participant clauses that it may display, we may well expect to find more or even other hierarchical effects on the encoding of NAAs once we extend our range of enquiry to constructions with predicates which allow for arguments with a different constellation of semantic and referential features.

The present project will concentrate on three participant constructions which, given examples such as those in (1) –(4) above, may be assumed to be most likely to exhibit hierarchical effects of some type, namely constructions in which the two NAAs are human or animate. While two human or animate NAAs are highly atypical of the predicate *give*, they are considerably more common with predicates such as those in the English examples in (5).

(5) a. He introduced me to his wife/*his wife me.
b. I will present your friend to the panel/*the panel your friend.
c. He recommended me to the jury/* the jury me.
d. You promised the child to me/ me the child.
e. She offered me to him/ him me.
f. They showed him to me/me him

As these examples suggest, in English there is some variation in relation to the encoding possibilities of the T and R with human NAAs (see e.g. Bresnan and Nikitina 2007) most of which conform to the generalizations advanced by Haspelmath (2007; see below). However, it remains to be seen whether his generalizations hold on a cross-linguistic basis and in particular what type of reflections of

hierarchical ranking are to be found in ditransitive clauses with human NAAs in languages manifesting mono-transitive inverse systems such as those investigated in the other IPs of this larger project, namely, namely Algonquian, Sahaptian, Caribian, Tupian, Movima. Mapudungun and Kiranti. To the best of my knowledge, there is no study of ditransitive constructions with a special focus on such languages.

This IP will therefore rely in the first place on the language data stemming from the other IP projects in combination with data collected from additional grammar based research. On the basis of a cross-linguistic sample of 200 of the world's languages, the project will establish (i) which languages have basic or even derived predicates which allow for two NAAs participants, (ii) to what extent the encoding and syntactic behaviour of the relevant arguments is subject to hierarchical factors, (iii) whether and if so how the patterns of marking displayed differ from those found in *give*-based constructions and (iv) in the case of languages with hierarchically based mono-transitive systems whether and how the patterns of marking found differ from those obtaining in mono-transitive constructions. We will be particularly concerned with determining the validity of the three universals proposed by Haspelmath (2007) presented below:

> Universal 1: Special ('indirective' or 'dative') R-marking is the more likely, the lower the R is on the animacy, definiteness, and person scales.
>
> Universal 2: Special ('secundative') T-marking is the more likely, the higher the T is on the animacy, definiteness, and person scales.
>
> Universal 3: If a language shows any ditransitive inverse patterns, on the scale of decreasing harmony of person-role association the upper end is expressed by a simpler construction, and the lower end is expressed by a more complex construction.

We will also seek to determine whether:

a. there is any evidence from ditransitive clauses for more than one person hierarchy, i.e. if the 2nd person is ever ranked higher than the 1st, as sometimes suggested, for example, in Algonquian mono-transitive clauses;
b. there are any interactions between person and number and potential distinctions of honorificity in hierarchical rankings
c. ditransitive alignment is primarily predicate as opposed to argument based.

While the IP does not provide new data on an additional endangered language, it poses questions which would not otherwise be addressed by the PIs of the other IPs and thus necessitates the elicitation of data and scrutiny of corpora which would not otherwise be sought for. Partcular close collaboration is planned with the IPs of Zuniga and especially Bickel with whom a joint RA appointment is envisaged. . It is precisely the availability of expertise on these languages within the extended project that has given rise to the possibility of embarking on an investigation of ditransitive constructions with two NAAs.