

Transitivity and Valence: Some Lexical Processes in Marwari  
Author(s): David Magier  
*Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1984), pp. 206-219

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

TRANSITIVITY AND VALENCE:  
Some Lexical Processes in Marwari

David Magier  
University of California at Berkeley

In a recent unpublished paper, Shibatani (1984) proposes a prototype analysis of passives, based on a set of pragmatic functions and morphological, semantic and syntactic properties, including change in grammatical relations. Dahlstrom (1985) shows that this feature of grammatical relation change must be taken as a criterial definition of passive, since the pragmatic, semantic and discourse features prototypically associated with passives may also result from inverse-verb structures (such as those in Algonkian and Navaho) which do not change grammatical relations. In light of this, I will examine three different constructions in Marwari (an Indo-Aryan language of western Rajasthan) which share the syntactic property of promoting a patient into subject position, and a pragmatic property of "defocusing" the agent. The three constructions, which I call the anti-transitive, the inflectional passive and the periphrastic passive, are illustrated by the sentences in [1].

- |      |  |                        |
|------|--|------------------------|
| [1a] | cāvaḷ pāk-e<br>rice cooks<br>"The rice is cooking"               | "ANTI-TRANSITIVE"      |
| [1b] | cāvaḷ pakāīj-e<br>is-cooked<br>"The rice is being cooked"        | "INFLECTIONAL PASSIVE" |
| [1c] | cāvaḷ pakāīyo jāv-e<br>cooked goes<br>"The rice is being cooked" | "PERIPHRASTIC PASSIVE" |

To give a rough idea of what these categories mean, the sentences I label as passives are both semantically parallel to English passives, while the anti-transitive is crucially characterized by complete absence of an agent. I will show that an adequate account of the differences between the anti-transitive and the passive requires, in addition to a narrow syntactic definition of passivization as a relation-changing rule, the recognition of a separate parameter of semantic valence. In particular, although valence-changing operations may produce sentence types that seem to mirror the syntax of passives, an examination of the semantics will show that they differ crucially from passives in their treatment of the agent. I will also show that the two Marwari passives are identical relation-changing rules, the only differences between them being attributable to rule ordering and the



[3] VALENCE-CHANGING MORPHOLOGY

<u>univalent</u>	<u>bivalent</u>	<u>trivalent</u>
pāk "cook"	pakāv "cook[tr]"	pakvāv "have-open"
baṅ "be made"	baṅāv "make, build"	baṅvāv "have-build"
baḷ "burn"	baḷāv "burn[tr]"	baḷvāv "have-burn"
mar "die"	mār "kill, strike"	marāv/marvāv "have-kill"
muṛ "turn, bend"	moṛ "turn, bend[tr]"	muṛāv/muṛvāv "have-turn"
khūl "open"	khol "open[tr]"	khulāv/khulvāv "have-open"
pighaḷ "melt"	pighāl "melt[tr]"	pighlāv/pighalvāv "have-melt"

Although the causative trivalent verbs are always suffixed and are clearly derived forms, the determination of the basic form, and the direction of derivation among the univalent and bivalent verbs is somewhat problematic in this system, because the neatest solution for the morphology creates a mess for the semantics and vice versa. Much has been written on the parallel valence system in Hindi, and a non-controversial account has yet to be proposed. For our purposes here, however, direction of derivation is irrelevant, though I will continue to refer to the univalent member of the set as anti-transitive as if it were the derived form.

I call the verb in [2a] univalent because it has only one cognitively obligatory participant role. Rather than speaking of syntactic demotion of an agent (as in the case of true passives), we must consider this an example of elimination of the agent from the frame altogether. That is, although comparison of [2b] with [2a] shows a grammatical relation change with regard to the status of the patient as object versus subject, semantically, [2a] contains no agent at all. While elimination of a participant role may thus be considered a sort of strong pragmatic demotion, it is perhaps to be distinguished from relational change.

The Marwari passives, on the other hand, do imply an agent. They are true relation changing rules, but do not alter the semantic valence of the verb. That is, the ex-object becomes a subject, and the ex-subject, though semantically and syntactically demoted out of the clause nucleus, is still an obligatory participant role in the conceptualization of the event.

Passivization in Marwari is of two kinds. The inflectional passive is derived by addition of the bound morpheme -ī to the active stem, producing a new syntactically intransitive verb. The periphrastic passive is a phrasal construction that is composed of the perfect participle of the verb followed by an inflection-bearing form of the verb jā ("to go"). The process of passivization in Marwari is illustrated in [4].

[4] PASSIVE MORPHOLOGY

active	<u>inflectional</u>		<u>periphrastic</u>	<u>passive</u>
		<u>passive</u>	<u>passive</u>	<u>gloss</u>
kar "do"		kar-īj	kar-iyō jā	"be done"
dekh "see"		dekh-īj	dekh-iyō jā	"be seen"
khā "eat"		khā-īj	khā-iyō jā	"be eaten"
mār "kill"		mār-īj	mār-iyō jā	"be killed"

Marwari passives, as well as anti-transitives, construe the patient in the syntactic role of subject. For a number of reasons that don't concern us here, some of the standard syntactic tests (e.g. control structures, equi, etc.) cannot be applied in this language as evidence for subjecthood. However, other evidence indicates the subject status of the patient in all three sentence types in [1]. These other tests include verbal agreement, conjunction reduction and behavior under nominalization. I will briefly illustrate the latter. As shown in [5] and [6], when a Marwari sentence is nominalized, as with a gerund, its subject appears in the genitive.

[5] NOMINALIZATION OF INTRANSITIVE

rām jodhpur jāv-e  
 Ram Jodhpur goes  
 "Ram goes to Jodhpur" →

NP<sub>S</sub>[rām-ro jodhpur jāv-ṅo]] cokho he  
 Ram-GEN going good is  
 "It is good for Ram to go to Jodhpur"  
 (lit. Ram's going to Jodhpur is good)

[6] NOMINALIZATION OF TRANSITIVE

rām kelo khāv-e  
 Ram banana eats  
 "Ram eats the banana" →

NP<sub>S</sub>[rām-ro kelo khāv-ṅo]] cokho he  
 Ram-GEN eating good is  
 "It is good for Ram to eat the banana"  
 (lit. Ram's eating the banana is good)

\*kelo-ro (rām-sū) khāv-ṅo cokho he  
 -GEN -INST

This is entirely parallel to English, as in John's going to Fiji worried me. This same operation applies to the patient in nominalized anti-transitives (as in [7]), inflectional passives (as in

[8]) and periphrastic passives (as in [9]).

[7] NOMINALIZATION OF ANTI-TRANSITIVE (cf. [1a])

cāvaḷ hoḷe pak-e  
 rice slowly cooks  
 "The rice cooks slowly" →

NP<sub>S</sub>[cāvaḷ-ro hoḷe pāk-ṇo]] cokho he  
           -GEN      cooking  good is  
 "It is good for the rice to cook slowly"  
 (lit. The rice's slowly cooking is good)

[8] NOMINALIZATION OF INFLECTIONAL PASSIVE (cf. [1b])

cāvaḷ hoḷe pakāīj-e  
           is-cooked  
 "The rice is being slowly cooked" →

NP<sub>S</sub>[cāvaḷ-ro hoḷe pakāīj-ṇo]] cokho he  
           -GEN      being-cooked good is  
 "It is good for the rice to be cooked slowly"  
 (lit. The rice's being slowly cooked is good)

[9] NOMINALIZATION OF PERIPHRASTIC PASSIVE (cf. [1c])

cāvaḷ hoḷe pakāīyo jāv-e  
           cooked goes  
 "The rice is being slowly cooked" →

NP<sub>S</sub>[cāvaḷ-ro hoḷe pakāīyo jāv-ṇo]] cokho he  
           -GEN      cooked going  good is  
 "It is good for the rice to be cooked slowly"  
 (lit. The rice's being slowly cooked is good)

These nominalized sentences, which clearly preserve their anti-transitive or passive structure, indicate that the patient is indeed a subject.

Aside from this syntactic parallel, the three constructions under discussion also share the pragmatic effect of defocusing the agent. As Davison (1980) and Shibatani (1984) point out, it is this defocusing of the agent that allows passives in many languages to acquire special potential or capabilitative meanings. In Marwari, anti-transitives as well as passive may take on such implicative meanings, particularly when negated or used in imperfect constructions. Passive sentences generally leave their agent unspecified, but if the agent is specified, the capabilitative reading becomes primary, as shown in [10]. The sentences in [11] are examples of the anti-transitive also being used for implicative potential or capabilitative meanings.

[10] PASSIVES WITH POTENTIAL/CAPABILITATIVE MEANINGS

- a) ero kām aṭhe nī {karīj-e  
such work here not is-done  
"This kind of work is not (cannot be) done here"
- b) mhā-sū ero kām nī {karīj-e  
us-INST such work not is-done  
"We can't do this kind of work"

[11] ANTI-TRANSITIVES WITH POTENTIAL/CAPABILITATIVE MEANINGS

- a) ī bartan mē cāvaḷ nī pāk-elā  
this pot in rice not cook-FUT  
"The rice won't (can't) cook in this pot"
- b) bhījīyoro baḷīto nī baḷ-e  
wet wood not burns  
"Wet wood doesn't (can't) burn"

On the basis of these two features alone, that is syntactic patient-promotion and pragmatic agent-defocusing, one might be tempted to include the anti-transitives in the category of passives. That is, the anti-transitive produces a pragmatic effect (agent defocusing) which Shibatani considers a primary element of the passive prototype. It also exhibits a syntactic property (patient-promotion) which would satisfy a proposed minimal syntactic requirement that passives be "relation-changing". However, I think we would not wish to call the anti-transitive a kind of passive. Although both processes "demote" the agent, anti-transitives do so by eliminating the agent from the cognitive frame, an operation which I think should be excluded from the purview of passivization.

English sentence pairs like those in [12] illustrate the kind of semantic difference which I am attributing to semantic valence.

- |                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| [12] THE DOOR CLOSED      | THE DOOR WAS CLOSED          |
| THE CLOTHES ARE WASHING   | THE CLOTHES ARE BEING WASHED |
| THE RICE DIDN'T COOK WELL | THE RICE WASN'T COOKED WELL  |

That the agent is still cognitively present in passives but absent in anti-transitives can be seen by constructing sentence frames that explicitly negate the presence of an agent. As Pandharipande (1981) shows for Hindi, univalent anti-transitive verbs (as in [13]) are possible in such agentless frames, but passives (as in [14]) are not.

[13] ANTI-TRANSITIVES IN EXPLICITLY AGENTLESS FRAMES

- a)  $\tilde{i}\dot{o}$  pāk-iyō paṅ koī nī pakā-iyō  
egg cooked but no-one cooked  
"The egg cooked, but no one cooked it"
- b) kivār khūl-iyō paṅ koī nī ho  
door opened but no-one was  
"The door opened but no one was there"

[14] PASSIVES IN EXPLICITLY AGENTLESS FRAMES (ungrammatical)

- a) \* $\tilde{i}\dot{o}$  { pakāīj-iyō } paṅ koī nī pakā-iyō  
egg was-cooked but no-one cooked  
(\*The egg was cooked but no one cooked it)
- b) ??kivār { kholiīj-iyō } paṅ koī nī ho  
door was-opened but no-one was  
(??The door was opened but no one was there)

This semantic difference explains a further contrast between passives and anti-transitives that shows up in the syntax. Marwari has a discourse marker (ne) which is functionally parallel to the Hindi so-called dative/accusative marker ko. This ne marker functions in discourse to mark highly salient affected patients when they appear in direct object position. In particular, this marker indicates specificity and definiteness of the patient (as in [15]), though it is sensitive to other parameters of salience such as animacy and humanness. (See Junghare [1983] and Masica [1981]).

[15] -ne AS SPECIFIED OBJECT MARKER

- a) mhē ek pothī bhaṅī a') mhē āp-rī pothī-ne bhaṅī  
I a book read I you-of book-NE read  
"I read a book" "I read your book"
- b) mhē ek dhobī dekhiyo b') mhē ũ dhobī-ne dekhiyo  
I a washerman saw I that washerman-NE saw  
"I saw a washerman" "I saw that washerman"

In Marwari passives, patients in subject position also exhibit variable ne marking. Informants report that marking a passive subject with ne connotes that the action was intentionally carried out by the agent, while this connotation is absent if the ne is absent. Thus, although neither sentence in [16] specifies an agent, [16a] could be used where Ram is struck in a car accident, while [16b] connotes intentional homicide.

[16] -ne MARKING ON PASSIVE SUBJECTS

- |                  |                            |                  |                            |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| a) rām           | { mārīj-iyō<br>māriyo giyo | b) rām-ne        | { mārīj-iyō<br>māriyo giyo |
| Ram              | was-killed                 | Ram-NE           | was-killed                 |
| "Ram was killed" |                            | "Ram was killed" | (i.e. murdered)"           |

A significant difference between the anti-transitive and the passive is that while the passive allows this use of the dative/accusative marking to reinforce the "agentivity" of the demoted agent, anti-transitives do not allow ne-marking at all, regardless of saliency, specificity, etc., as shown in [17].

[17] -ne MARKING ON ANTI-TRANSITIVE SUBJECTS (ungrammatical)

- a) cāvaḷ (\*-ne) pāk-iyō  
rice (\*-NE) cooked  
"The rice cooked"
- b) rām (\*-ne) mar-iyō  
Ram (\*-NE) died  
"Ram died"
- c) mhāro ghar (\*-ne) baḷ-iyō  
my house (\*-NE) burned  
"My house burned"

This evidence indicates that a connotation of intentional agency is incompatible with anti-transitives, a fact which is explained naturally if anti-transitives have no agent at all.

A final difference between passives and anti-transitives is the fact that Marwari freely allows the passive morphology to be applied to intransitive verbs as well as transitives, while there is no analogous application of anti-transitive (i.e. valence reduction) operations to intransitives. As the subjectless sentences in [18] show, passivization of intransitives performs its usual function of defocussing the agent, and in this case again provides the sort of potential or prescriptive readings that Shibani discusses cross-linguistically.

[18] PASSIVES FROM INTRANSITIVES

- |              |         |                        |                             |
|--------------|---------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a) <u>so</u> | "sleep" | aṭhe nī                | { soīj-elā<br>soiyo jāv-elā |
|              |         | here not               | be-slept-FUT                |
|              |         | "One can't sleep here" |                             |



- c) vo kāgad bhej-iyō -----> vo kāgad bhej diyo  
 he letter sent he letter send-gave  
 "He sent the letter" "He sent off the letter"

Nearly all verbs may be found as V1 main verbs in such compound verb constructions. From this, we would expect that all passive verbs (as well as anti-transitives) would function just like any other intransitives and be able to undergo compounding with the V2 jā. As shown in [20] and [21], anti-transitives and inflectional passives do indeed appear as V1 main verbs in such compound constructions. However, this process of compound verb formation cannot be applied to periphrastic passives, as shown in [22].

[20] COMPOUND VERBS FROM ANTI-TRANSITIVES

- a) mukām baḷ-iyō -----> mukām baḷ giyo  
 house burned house burn-went  
 "The house burned" "The house burned up/down"
- b) cāvaḷ pāk-iyō -----> cāvaḷ pāk giyo  
 rice cooked rice cook-went  
 "The rice cooked" "The rice cooked up"

[21] COMPOUND VERBS FROM INFLECTIONAL PASSIVES

- a) khāṇo khāīj-iyō -----> khāṇo khāīj giyo  
 food was-eaten food be-eaten went  
 "The food was eaten" "The food was eaten up"
- b) kām karīj-iyō -----> kām karīj giyo  
 work was-done work be-done went  
 "The work was done" "The work was (all) done"

[22] COMPOUND VERBS FROM PERIPHRASTIC PASSIVES (ungrammatical)

- a) khāṇo khāīyo giyo - - - -> \*khāṇo khāīyo jā giyo  
 food eaten went food eaten-go went  
 "The food was eaten"
- b) kām kariyo giyo - - - -> \*kām kariyo jā giyo  
 work done went work done-go went  
 "The work was done"

The two kinds of passives thus exhibit differential behavior with regard to the application of compound verb formation. The explanation that suggests itself is that compound verb formation only applies to lexical main verbs, and that anti-transitives and inflectional passives meet this condition while periphrastic

passives do not. However, another piece of evidence argues for a possible rule-ordering explanation of these facts. Recall that compounding may apply to transitives or intransitives. Since transitive compound verbs (e.g. those with le or de as in [19b] and [19c]) function like transitive verbs in other respects, we would expect them to be able to undergo passivization themselves. In [23a] and [23b] we show that such transitive compound verbs can indeed be passivized with periphrastic passivization, but may not undergo inflectional passivization.

[23a] PERIPHR. PASSIVIZATION OF COMPOUND VERBS

vo khāṇo khāy liyo	----->	khāṇo khāy liyo giyo
he food eat-took		food eat-taken went
"He ate up the food"		"The food was eaten up"

[23b] INFL. PASSIVIZATION OF COMPOUND VERBS (ungrammatical)

vo khāṇo khāy liyo	- - - ->	*khāṇo khāy lirīj-iyō
he food eat-took		food eat - was-taken
"He ate up the food"		

This differential behavior of the passives proves that inflectional passivization must be ordered before compound verb formation, and that periphrastic passivization must follow compound verb formation. In other words, the facts described above can be explained by positing an ordered set of rules in which the process of compound verb formation intervenes between the two kinds of passivization.

What then is the ordering of the valence-changing rules relative to these other processes? We have already shown (in [20]) that compound verb formation can apply to anti-transitives. Since the same valence-changing operations also produce causative verbs as described above, the additional fact that these causatives may undergo either kind of passivization indicates that valence changes must take place before any of the other rules apply. This is shown in [24a,b]. In other words, the output of the valence-changing rules can undergo any of the other three operations. Since the outputs of none of the other rules can undergo subsequent valence change (as shown in [25a,b]), an ordered set of rules must place valence change before the others.

[24] PASSIVIZATION OF CAUSATIVES

a) inflectional passivization

vo cāvaḷ pakvā-iyō	----->	cāvaḷ pakvāīj-iyō
he rice had-cooked		rice was had-cooked
"He had the rice cooked (i.e. by someone)"		"The rice was had-cooked"

b) periphrastic passivization

vo cāvaḷ pakvā-iyō	----->	cāvaḷ pakvāiyō giyō
he rice had-cooked		rice had-cooked went
"He had the rice cooked		"The rice was had-cooked"
(i.e. by someone)"		

[25a] VALENCE-CHANGE (e.g. CAUSATIVIZATION) APPLIED TO PASSIVES

khā-īj } khāiyō jā } "be eaten"	- - - - ->	{*khāīj-vāv {*khāiyō jā-vāv (* cause-to-[be-eaten])
---------------------------------------	------------	---

[25b] VALENCE-CHANGE (CAUSATIVIZATION) APPLIED TO COMPOUNDS

khāy le	- - - - ->	*khāy lirāv
eat-take		eat cause-to-take
"eat up"		(* cause-to-[eat-up])
vo khāṅo khāy liyō	- - - - ->	*vo rām-su khāṅo khāy lirā-iyō
he food eat-took		he Ram-by food eat caused-to-take
"He ate up the food"		(*He had Ram eat-up the food)

To summarize, the interactions of the rules of valence-change, inflectional passivization, compound verb formation and periphrastic passivization indicate that they are strictly ordered as shown in [26].

[26] POSITED RULE ORDERING:

- A) VALENCE-CHANGE
- B) INFLECTIONAL PASSIVIZATION
- C) COMPOUND VERB FORMATION
- D) PERIPHRASTIC PASSIVIZATION

The output of any of these rules may be subjected to any of the later rules, with the following pragmatic restrictions: (1) anti-transitives, because they have no agent anyway, cannot undergo either kind of passivization (since passivization is pragmatically an agent-defocusing rule), and (2) passives themselves may not be passivized (since the agent is already defocused). Given these pragmatic limitations, any combination of these optional processes may be applied, as shown in [27].

[27] COMBINATIONS OF RULE APPLICATIONS

A+B (causative + inflectional passivization) -- see [24a]

A+C (anti-transitive + compound formation) -- see [20]  
causative + compound formation:

vā rām-sū cāvaḷ pakvāy liyo  
 she Ram-INST rice have-cook took  
 "She had Ram cook up the rice"

A+D (causative + periphrastic passive) -- see [24b]

B+C (inflectional passive + compound formation) -- see [21]

B+D pragmatically ruled out

A+B+C causative + inflectional passivization + compounding:

cāvaḷ pakvāīj giyo  
 rice be[had-cooked] went  
 "The rice was had-cooked-up"

A+C+D (causative + compounding + periphrastic passive)

cāvaḷ pakvāy diyo giyo  
 rice [have-cook]-given went  
 "The rice was had-cooked-up"

I have shown that the passives in Marwari, as distinct from the anti-transitives, are relation-changing rules. I have further shown that the two kinds of passives, though they appear to be identical in semantic and syntactic function, must be ordered separately in the grammar. Space limitations do not allow me to discuss all the consequences of the rule ordering proposed in [26]. But I will briefly point out that while rules A and B appear to be lexical rules, the status of C and D is problematic. In both of these constructions certain emphatic particles may intervene between the constituent elements, that is, between the V1 and V2 in compound verb structures, and between the participle and the verb jā in the periphrastic passives. In the latter case, the construction is even more clearly phrasal in nature, since the participle itself will exhibit concord with the passive subject, and must therefore be accessible to the syntax. Such internal boundaries are totally lacking in the output of the valence-changing and inflectional passive rules, which are based on bound morphology with no syntactically accessible internal structure. If the line between lexicon and syntax is to be drawn between rules B and C, this means that Marwari has bona-fide relation changing rules with apparently identical semantics (i.e. the two passives), both in the lexicon and in the syntax, a fact which must be taken note of in any level-order account of language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dahlstrom, A. 1983 "Distinguishing Inverse-Verbs from Passives," paper read at the 58th Annual Meeting of the LSA, Minneapolis.
- Davison, A. 1980 "Peculiar Passives," Language 56.1: 42-66.
- Givon, T. 1979 On Understanding Grammar, NY: Academic Press.
- Hook, P. 1978 "The Hindi Compound Verb: What it is and What it Does," in K.S. Singh (ed.) Readings in Hindi-Urdu Linguistics, New Delhi: National Publishers. Pp. 130-157.
- Jain, J. 1981 "The Hindi Passive," Papers in Linguistics 14:217-232.
- Junghare, I. 1983 "Markers of Definiteness in Indo-Aryan," BLS 9.
- Kachru, Y. 1981 "Transitivity and Volitionality in Hindi-Urdu," Studies in the Linguistics Sciences 11.2:181-93.
- Koul, O.N. (ed.) 1981 Topics in Hindi Linguistics, Vol.2, New Delhi: Bahri Publications.
- Masica, C. 1981 "Identified Object Marking in Hindi and Other Languages," in Koul (ed.) 1981: 16-50.
- Nichols, J. 1980 "Ingush Transitivity and Detransitivization," BLS 8: 445-62.
- Pandharipande, R. 1981 "Exceptions and Rule Government: The Case of Passive Rule in Hindi," in Koul (ed.) 1981: 93-121.
- Porizka, V. 1977 "Perfective Verbal Expressions in Hindi (A New Line of Approach)," Archiv Orientalni 45: 65-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1981 "On the Aspectual Contrast in Hindi," in Koul (ed.) 1981: 122-134.
- Saksena, A. 1978 "A Reanalysis of the Passives in Hindi," Lingua 46: 339-353.
- Shibatani, M. 1984 "Passives and Related Constructions: A Prototype Analysis," unpublished manuscript.