

Ingush Transitivity and Detransitivization

Author(s): Johanna Nichols

Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1982), pp. 445-462

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.

Ingush Transitivity and Detransitivization

Johanna Nichols
University of California, Berkeley

This paper has three goals: to shed some light on Caucasian linguistic prehistory; to advance a new typological metric applicable to syntactic reconstruction; and to identify and emulate some recurrent trends in Yakov Malkiel's teaching and writing. One such trend is attention to what I will call language-specific typology (and what the interwar Prague school called characterology: see Mathesius 1928), the attempt to capture the 'genius' and fundamental characteristics of a single language. Another such trend is the use of generalizations about systems and types in historical argumentation. A third is preservation of tradition through reassessment and updating of classic statements. Specifically, this paper presents a detailed grammar of causatives and other verbal derivations in one North Caucasian language; proposes a new typological metric based on generalizations over that grammar; and uses the grammar and the generalizations to reexamine a universal of passivization proposed by Kuryłowicz. 1)

The Caucasian language is Ingush, spoken by some 150,000 people in the north-central Caucasus. Standard typological parameters classify it as OV, ergative, and straddling the boundary between agglutinative and inflectional. Together with closely related Chechen and less closely related Batsbi it comprises the Nakh, or North-Central Caucasian, linguistic family (which may or may not be a branch of Northeast Caucasian, and may or may not be related to Northwest Caucasian).

Henceforth subject refers to S/A in the terms of Dixon 1979, and also includes the dative experiencer with inverse verbs; i.e. it corresponds to the English subject in translations. Criteria for subjecthood in Ingush include word order, control of reflexivization, control of cross-clause coreferential deletion, thematization, translations, and explicit statements of speakers. (Actually, the isomorphy between semantic roles and morphological cases is so nearly complete that it is difficult to construct arguments for the independent status of syntactic relations.) Object is Dixon's O, i.e. the nominative noun with a transitive verb. (I use nominative rather than absolute on the grounds that this case, zero-marked, is indeed the citation form.) There are also oblique objects. Valence is the surface array of arguments governed by the verb, viewed as either syntactic relations or morphological cases.

Ingush utterly lacks syntactic rules which change or create syntactic relations. Put differently, it has no inflectional categories like voice that change or create syntactic relations. It has no voice oppositions whatsoever. It does, however, have two other kinds of rules which do affect valence: lexical rules for the formation of transitivizing and detransitivizing verbal derivations; and morphological rules determining the form of certain compound tense-

aspect forms. These rules accomplish conversion of arguments, just as syntactic rules of voice do in other languages. Therefore they can provisionally be regarded as functional analogs to voice, and universal claims about voice categories can also be applied to them.

Valence patterns. That Ingush can be called an ergative language does not entail that every two-place verb has an ergative subject and a nominative object. Ingush displays some half-dozen well-defined morphological valence patterns, more or less predictable from the lexical semantics of the verb and the semantic roles of argument. These valence patterns are the input to the lexical and morphological rules to be examined here, so they must be completely accounted for at the outset. A valence pattern is intransitive if it has a nominative subject, inverse if it has a dative subject, and transitive if it has an ergative subject.

One-place intransitives: NOM.²⁾ These include verbs denoting states (laza 'hurt'), change of state (talxa 'spoil'), motion, and position.

- (1) talxa 'spoil': sixa talx yz
 fast spoils it-NOM
 'It spoils (is spoiling) fast'
- (2) laza 'hurt': sy kuo:rtā laz
 my head-NOM hurts
 'My head aches'

Two-place intransitives: NOM OBL. A small, miscellaneous group of verbs. ³⁾

- (3) b"arh"āža 'look at': suo:na b"arh"ež yz
 me-DAT looks he-NOM
 'He looks at me'
- (4) qie:ra 'fear': suo qie:r cunax
 I-NOM fear him-COM
 'I'm afraid of him'

Inverse verbs: DAT NOM. Verbs of emotion, judgment, modality.

- (5) vie:za 'like, love' suo:na yz vie:z
 I-DAT him-NOM like
 'I like him'
- (6) xie:ta 'think' suo:na xie:t, [S]
 I-DAT think
 'I think (that S)'

Oblique transitives: ERG OBL. A rare valence type.

- (7) laduo:ȷa 'listen': cuo: suo:ga ladie:ȷar
 he-ERG me-ALL listened
 'He listened to me'

Two-place transitives: ERG NOM. A large, productive group. Typically, subjects are agents.

(8) die:ša 'read': cuo: yz kinaška die:š
 he-ERG this book reads
 'He reads this book'

(9) vie: 'kill': cuo: yz vu:
 he-ERG him-NOM kills
 'He kills him'

Three-place transitive: ERG DAT/ALL NOM. There are two subtypes: the verbs 'give', 'say', etc., which variously take an allative or dative indirect object:

(10) dala 'give': da:s wo"a: kita:b d"a-lu
 Fa-ERG So-DAT book-NOM preverb-gives
 'Father gives son a book'

and verbs of contact, which take a nominative object where Indo-European would have an instrument and a dative corresponding to the Indo-European direct object:

(11) tuo:xa 'hit': cuo: cunna urs tuo:x
 he-ERG him-DAT knife-NOM hits
 'He stabs him'

(12) t'aju:xa 'dress,
 put on' na:nas biera: kuoč t'aju:x
 Mo-ERG kid-DAT shirt-NOM dress
 'Mother puts shirt on child', 'Mother
 dresses child in shirt'

Crosscutting this series of valence types is the distinction of what is labeled labile vs. non-labile (or stable) in Caucasian grammar. Labile verbs can be used either as intransitives (with nominative subjects) or as transitive or inverse verbs (where the ergative or dative is the subject and the nominative is the object), with no formal marking of derived transitivity or intransitivity. In other words, these are verbs like English open, cover, fill, surround. The verb of (12) is labile: in (12) it is used transitively, with ergative subject, while in (13) it is intransitive:

(13) kuoč t'aju:x bie:ra:
 shirt-NOM dress child-DAT
 'The child is wearing a shirt', 'The shirt is on the child'

Labile verbs will not be considered separately here.

Derivation types. The verbal derivations described here are shown, with their case frames and case changes, in Table 1. Included at the bottom of Table 1 are two selected Indo-European derivations, for comparison. 4) Notice that the entries in the last two columns of the table -- those showing added and removed arguments -- are in complementary distribution: Ingush has entries in the Added argument column, Indo-European in the Removed argument column. The Indo-European entries are chosen to schematically illustrate a basic tendency in that family's verbal derivations: although Proto-Indo-European may have had productive transitivity derivations, these are in the minority; most Indo-European derivations detransitivize, removing the input subject. These last two columns show at a glance

Derivation	Suffix	Restrictions	Resultant valence	Case change	Added argument	Removed argument
Inceptive	'go/emerge'		intransitive	ERG ⇒ NOM	---	---
Potential	'give'	some lexical restrictions	inverse ⁵ (from transitive); intransitive (others)	ERG ⇒ DAT/ALL	---	---
Causative	'let' (?)		transitive ⁵	ERG ⇒ ALL	+ ERG	---
Transitive	'make'	intransitive input	transitive	ERG ⇒ DAT	+ ERG	---
Transitive	'take'	intransitive input; rare	transitive	---	+ ERG	---
Double causative	'make' + 'let'		transitive	ERG ⇒ DAT	+ ERG + ALL	---
Double causative	'take' + 'let' rare		transitive	(?)	+ ERG (+ ?)	---
<u>Two Indo-European forms, for contrast:</u> ⁴						
archaic passive			intransitive	ACC ⇒ NOM	---	- NOM
one Russian reflexive			intransitive	ACC ⇒ NOM	---	- NOM

Table 1. Ingush derivation types

Legend:

ERG ⇒ NOM Ergative subject of input verb is replaced by nominative in the derived valence.
+ ERG Ergative subject is added to the valence of the input verb to produce the derived verb.

two principal conclusions of this paper: Ingush has no derivations which remove arguments, while Indo-European does have such derivations; and this contrast is typologically significant.

Examples of each derivation follow, by input valence type.

Inceptive. The suffix is a verb meaning 'go (in, out)', 'emerge', 'cross threshold'. The basic meaning is inception of action, with variants determined by the tense and aspect of root and suffix. In the present tense, with an imperfective stem, it means 'begin', 'wants to', 'is about to'; in the past with a perfective stem, 'began', 'finished'; in the past with an imperfective stem, once-and-for-all change of state with lasting result. Multiple action is a possible reading where context and verbal meaning permit it. An oblique subject becomes nominative in the potential. Such nominatives are underlined in the examples.

From one-place intransitive:

- (14) sy kuo:rta laza-bĥ:lar
 my head-NOM hurt-INC-past
 'My head started to ache' (U menja zaboleta golova)
- (15) sy kuo:rta laza-boal
 INC-pres
 '(Every time) my head starts aching'

From two-place intransitive:

- (16) t'aqq yz qie:ra-vĥ:lar
 then he-NOM fear INC-past
 'Ever since then he's been afraid'

From inverse verb:

- (17) t'aqq suo dika xie:ta-jĥ:lar yz
 then me-NOM well seem INC-past she-NOM
 'Then she started to like me'

From oblique transitive:

- (18) yz suo:ga laduqya-vĥ:lar
 he-NOM me-ALL listen INC-past
 '(He used to be spoiled and not pay attention, then he got smart and) he began to listen to me (and still does)'

From two-place transitive:

- (19) t'aqq yz xabar du:ca-vĥ:lar yz
 then this talk-NOM tell INC-past he-NOM
 '(He hadn't talked before, but something happened and) then he began to relate this conversation'

From three-place transitive:

- (20) yz txow t'aq'ejla:-vĥ:lar
 he-NOM roof-NOM cover-perf INC-past
 'He's already finished putting on the roof'

Potential. The suffix is a verb meaning 'give'. The present tense means ability or tendency, and can often be translated with an

English patient-subject construction. 6) The perfective past is usually 'manage to', with a presupposition that there was some obstacle or difficulty. An ergative subject becomes dative or allative in the potential. Such datives and allatives are underlined in the examples.

From one-place intransitive:

- (21) sixa talxa-lu yz
fast spoil POT-pres it-NOM
'It spoils (tends to spoil) fast'

From two-place intransitive:

- (22) yz sixa qie:ra-lu
he-NOM fast fear POT-pres
'He scares easily'

- (23) suo:na b"arh"aža-valor yz
me-DAT look POT-past he-NOM
'(There was something in the way, but) he managed to look at me'

From inverse verb:

- (24) yz massanie:na vie:za-lu
him-NOM all-DAT like POT-pres
'He's one of those people that everyone likes right off'
(Srazu že ego ljubjat) 7)

- (25) suo:na vie:za-valor [yz]
me-DAT like POT-past he-NOM
'I fell in love [with him]'

From oblique transitive:

- (26) cunna suo:ga laduo:ya-dalar
him-DAT me-ALL listen POT-past
'He managed to listen to me', 'He managed to hear me out'

From two-place transitive:

- (27) suo:na yz kinaška dika die:ša-lu
me-DAT this book-NOM well read POT-pres
'I can read this book well', 'This book is easy for me to read'

- (28) suo:ga yz kinaška dika die:ša-lu
me-ALL
id.

- (29) yz kinaška dika die:ša-lu
this book-NOM well read POT-pres
'This book reads well/easily'

From three-place transitive:

- (30) yz urs dika tuo:xa-lu ni"arax
this knife-NOM well hit POT-pres door-COM
'This knife throws at/sticks in the door well'

- (31) suo:ga yz tuo:xa-lu
 me-ALL it-NOM hit POT-pres
 'I can fire it (stab with it, etc.)'

Causative. The suffix -i:t, -Vjt may be cognate to d-ita 'leave'. This is a typical causative: X lets, makes, or has Y do V. X causes the entire situation, and does not act directly on Y; in particular, there is no physical contact of X with Y. When the ergative subject is absent (see again note 5), the meaning is usually 'let Y do V'. A former ergative subject becomes allative and a new ergative subject is added. These cases are underlined in the examples.

From one-place intransitive:

- (32) sy kuo:rta laz-i:t, ...
 my head-NOM ache-CAUS
 'So let my head ache (I'm going out anyway)'
- (33) a:z cun kuo:rta laz-i:t
 I-ERG his head-NOM hurt-CAUS
 'I'm making his head ache' (I'm doing something to make his head ache -- making noise, annoying him, etc.) (cf. (38))

From two-place intransitive:

- (34) a:z yz qie:r-i:t
 I-ERG him-NOM fear CAUS
 'I make him be afraid' (cf. (39))

From inverse verb:

- (35) cuo: šie: cunna duqa vie:z-i:t
 he-ERG self-NOM her-DAT lots like CAUS
 'He can make her like him', 'He can please her'

From two-place transitive:

- (36) cuo: cunga nižaḡa kinaška die:š-i:t
 he-ERG her-ALL by force book-NOM read CAUS
 'He forces her to read the book'

From three-place transitive:

- (37) a:z h"ama tuo:x-i:t cunga?
 I-ERG thing-NOM hit CAUS him-ALL
 'Shall I have him hit (him)?' 'Shall I tell him to hit (him)?'

Transitive in 'make'. This is a prototypical transitive: there is direct physical action of the (added, ergative) agent on the (input subject, nominative) patient. This form could also be called a causative; but while the true causative (above) has to do with causation of an entire situation, this form indicates that the agent acts directly on an argument in order to cause a change. With few exceptions, this transitive is formed from intransitives only. An ergative is added; this ergative is underlined in the examples.

From one-place intransitive:

- (38) cuo: sy kuo:rta loza-bu
 he-ERG my head-NOM hurt-MAKE
 'He's hurting my head (hitting it, etc.)' (cf. (33))

(38) forms a near-minimal pair with (33) above: in (33) there is no physical contact; in (38), however, there is: the agent acts directly on the speaker's head.

From two-place intransitive:

- (39) a:z yz qie:ra-vu
 I-ERG him-NOM fear- MAKE
 'I scare him' (cf. (34))

(39) forms a minimal pair with (34), showing that in the transitive (39) but not in the causative (34) the agent acts directly on the patient to produce a change, rather than simply causing a situation.

The exceptional transitives which can take this transitive derivation include 'eat' and 'drink' (Jakovlev 1940:83 also lists 'bite' and 'inflate bellows' for Chechen). (40)-(41) show that the ergative subject of an input transitive becomes dative in the transitive.

- (40) (underived) a:z q'araq' muol
 I-ERG vodka-NOM drink
 'I drink vodka'

- (41) (derived) cuo: cunna q'araq' muola-du
 he-ERG him-DAT vodka-NOM drink MAKE
 'He buys his drinks' (On poit ego [vodkoj])

Transitive in 'take'. This form is so infrequent that it is difficult to establish its valence and case changes with certainty. It seems to apply only to intransitives. It seems not to denote direct physical action of the agent on the patient. The meaning seems to include reference to inception or multiple action (for imperfectives) or completed action (for perfectives); a tentative generalization is that, in contrast to either causative or 'make' transitive, the 'take' transitive implies discreteness of action(s). An ergative subject is added, and has been underlined in the examples.

- (42) cuo: sy kuo:rta laza-boaqq
 he-ERG my head-NOM hurt TAKE
 'He always does things to make my head hurt'

- (43) a:z cun kuo:rta laza-boaqq
 I-ERG his head-NOM hurt-TAKE
 'His head is starting to ache because of me', 'He's getting a headache from me' (U nego načinaet bolet' golova ot menja)

- (44) a:z cun kuo:rta laza-b^hqqar
 TAKE-past
 'His head already aches [because of me]'

The 'take' suffix has a separate form for plural S/O and/or multiple actions:

- (45) cuo: sy kuo:rta laza-boax
 he-ERG my head-NOM hurt TAKE
 [Same as (42), with more emphasis on 'always']

In summary, this form seems to impose an aspectual distinction on a valence-changing operation.

Double causatives. Either of the two transitive derivations may add the causative ending to form a double causative. Double causatives appear to be unrestricted: any derived transitive may become a double causative. The meaning is 'X makes Y make Z do V'. The double causatives will not be completely illustrated here. They add an ergative subject and a dative or allative causee, underlined in the examples.

'Make' double causative from one-place intransitive:

- (46) cuo: sy kuo:rta luoza-bejt
 he-ERG my head-NOM hurt MAKE-CAUS
 'He makes (someone) hurt my head'

From two-place intransitive:

- (47) a:z cunga qie:ra-vejt-ar yz
 I-ERG her-ALL fear MAKE-CAUS-past him-NOM
 'I made her scare him'

The transitives 'eat' and 'drink' can form the 'make' causative and can thus form the double causative. They show us that the ergative subject of the 'make' causative verb becomes allative in the double causative, and the subject of the original verb -- the person who does the eating or drinking -- appears in the dative:

- (48) da:s wo"a:g š'i: doattaŷačua: q'araq' muola-de-jt
 Fa-ERG son-ALL refl neighbor-DAT vodka-NOM drink-MAKE-CAUS
 'The father has his son serve his (=father's) neighbor drinks'

There are some transitive verbs which appear to be formally derived transitives but which lack corresponding underived forms. An example is ja:z-die: 'write', whose root *ja:z is never used as an intransitive. For such verbs the formal double causative has the meaning of a plain causative of the input transitive.

- (49) (underived) [cuo: yz kinaška ja:z-du] 8
 he-ERG this book-NOM write-MAKE
 'He writes this book'
- (50) (double causative) yz kinaška ja:z-dejt cuo:
 this book-NOM write-MAKE-CAUS he-ERG
 'He allows this book to be written', lit. 'He allows \emptyset unspecified to write this book'

The potential, however, is derived directly from the root: ja:z-lu 'can write', not *ja:z-die:lu or *ja:z-du-lu.

- (51) (potential) joazanuočuna š'ij kinaška a:tta ja:z-dalar
 author-DAT refl book-NOM successfully write-POT
 'The author wrote his book successfully', 'To the author, his own book was easy to write'

Compound tenses. The compound tense forms are composed of a participial form of the main verb, plus 'be' as an auxiliary. (52)-(53) illustrate two forms of the simple tense of 'go out', and (54)-(55) show the compound tense. (52)-(53) are given in two variants to illustrate gender agreement in Ingush, which will be important to subsequent examples. As (52)-(53) show, gender is not overtly marked on nouns or pronouns. It causes agreement in the verb, which takes the form of substitution of root-initial consonants, the masculine marker being v- and the feminine marker j-.

- (52) yz a:ra-voal
 he-NOM out goes-M
 'He goes out'
- (53) yz a:ra-joal
 she goes-F
 'She goes out'
- (54) yz a:ra-voalaž wa
 he out going is-M
 'He goes out' (habitual), 'He is going out'
- (55) yz a:ra-joalaž ja
 she out going is-F
 'She goes out' (habitual), 'She is going out'

((16)-(17) above also illustrate gender agreement.) These examples show that, with intransitives, the verb and the auxiliary both agree in gender with the subject. Inverse and transitive verbs, however, have two compound tense forms: a plain compound tense, in which the subject is in its usual ergative or dative case and both the verb and the auxiliary agree in gender with the nominative object, as in (57) and (60); and an antipassive tense, in which the subject is nominative, the auxiliary agrees in gender with that subject, and the verb agrees in gender with the (still-nominative) object, as in (58) and (61).

From inverse verb (agreement markers are underlined):

- (56) simple: suo:na yz vie:z
 I-DAT him-NOM like
 'I like him'
- (57) plain compound: suo:na yz vie:zaž va
 liking-M is-M
 id.
- (58) antipassive: suo yz vie:zaž ja
 I-NOM liking-M is-F
 id., specifically: 'I (fem.) like him'

From transitive:

- (59) simple: cuo: cunna bij biett
 he-ERG him-DAT fist-NOM hits-N
 'He hits him'

- (60) plain compound: cuo: cunna bij biettaž ba -q
 he-ERG him-DAT fist-NOM hitting-N is-N ptc
 'He hits him'
- (61) antipassive: yz cunna bij biettaž va
 he-NOM id. is-M

To account for the plain-antipassive opposition is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to note that the tense-aspect meaning appears to be identical, but the subject of the antipassive is more thematic than that of the plain tense, and consequently the antipassive is favored in chain-final or paragraph-final position or as an independent utterance, while the plain compound tense is favored where another clause follows it. The simple tense appears to be marked, restricted to narrative.

Conclusions. The examples above bear the following generalizations.

(1) Ingush verbal derivations affect only subjects. The detransitivizing derivations and the antipassive change non-nominative subjects into nominatives. The transitive ones add ergative subjects. The potential adds a dative or nominative subject. Those derivations adding ergative subjects also change the ergative subject of an input transitive verb into the allative or dative. But no derivation, and no syntactic rule, of Ingush adds or converts objects. This is in contrast to Indo-European languages, which abound in pairs like load hay onto the truck : load the truck with hay, possessor promotion (hit his head : hit him on the head), etc.

(2) Ingush verbal derivations either add arguments or change the cases of existing arguments. There are no processes that remove arguments. We have seen that the inceptive and the antipassive tense change oblique subject cases to nominative; but the full array of arguments can remain in the sentence, as is shown by (17)-(20) and (56)-(61). We may call the inceptive and the antipassive detransitivized, since the subject is now nominative, which means (by the definition given above) that the verb form is intransitive. But detransitivization does not remove arguments. In addition, it affects only cases and does not affect subject properties such as control and word order: the newly nominative noun remains subject. This is in sharp contrast to Indo-European, where detransitivization refers primarily to removal of subjects and consequent promotion of a non-subject to subject.

(Indo-European languages also exhibit detransitivizing derivations where the subject is unaffected and an object is removed, e.g. Russian:

- (62) sobaka kusaet menja
 dog-NOM bites me-ACC
 'The dog bites (is biting) me'
- (63) sobaka kusaetsja
 dog-NOM bites-REFL
 'The dog bites', 'The dog is biting'

Ingush has no such derivations, which further illustrates generalization (1) above, to the effect that Ingush derivations affect subjects, not objects.)

(3) There are two places in Ingush grammar where we find regular pairings that might be seen as valence-decreasing processes. One of them concerns the labile verbs, those which can be either transitive or intransitive without formal change. Labile verbs cannot be regarded as representing a valence-lowering derivation, for two reasons. First, there is no way to decide which form -- transitive or intransitive -- of a labile verb is basic and which derived. Second, there is no formal marker. There is no reason to describe the intransitive as a zero derivation: zero derivations can be posited only when there is a regular paradigmatic relationship to other, overtly marked, forms; and there are no verbs in Ingush which are just like labile verbs except that the intransitive member of the pair is formally marked.

The second such place in the grammar concerns zero objects. Now, zero objects in Ingush do not automatically trigger antipassivization: any tense form, simple or compound, plain or antipassive, may be used with an anaphoric zero object. Unspecified zero objects favor the antipassive tense: a request to translate 'he writes' or 'he's writing' will almost invariably produce (64):

(64) yz ja:z-diež va
 he-NOM write-MAKEing is
 'He's writing', 'He writes'

But the simple tense can also be objectless, the most plausible situation for such a construction being stage directions:

(65) cuo: ja:z-du
 he-ERG write-MAKE
 'He writes'

I could not elicit the plain compound tense with a zero object, although I suspect its unacceptability is semantic and pragmatic rather than morphological or syntactic: the antipassive is associated with thematization of the subject, and in 'He's writing' the subject is highly thematized, hence the antipassive is appropriate, hence the simple compound tense sounds less good. All three tenses may have overt objects. These facts show that the antipassive, despite its frequent association with zero objects, is not a device for signaling object removal and hence not a valence-lowering device.

Typological implications. Kuryłowicz 1946 offers an implicational universal of voice: if a language has a passive or an antipassive that demotes the agent or patient respectively, then it also has one that deletes it. That is, agentless passives and patientless antipassives head an implicational hierarchy. If a language has any voice oppositions at all, it will have a valence-reducing voice. 9)

If we take this principle in its more abstract form -- voice oppositions imply valence-reducing processes -- and approach the Ingush derivations as a functional equivalent to voice oppositions, we see that Ingush presents a counterexample to Kuryłowicz's claim: Ingush has valence-increasing processes and case-changing processes, but no valence-reducing processes. The rest of this paper will argue

that the Ingush phenomena only superficially contradict Kuryłowicz's claim, and that on a more abstract view they actually support it.

First, however, we need some background on the general question of morphosyntactic typology in and adjacent to the Caucasus. Three language stocks come into play: Indo-European, North Caucasian, and South Caucasian. (South Caucasian, which includes most prominently Georgian, is more often known as Kartvelian; I use South Caucasian to remind non-specialists of the geographical distribution.) On the standard view of the proto-homelands, Indo-European was spoken north of, and probably adjacent to, some North Caucasian, and was separated from South Caucasian by North Caucasian. Schematically, the distribution relative to the mountains was:

Proto-Indo-European

North Caucasian

(Caucasus mountains)

South Caucasian

Standard criteria for morphosyntactic typology lump all three stocks under the same headings: all are OV, all are ergative (or, in the case of Indo-European, have been ergative), and all have similar blends of inflection (especially ablaut) and agglutination. I suggest that the morphology of valence-changing processes reflects a typological distinction that will allow us to split these OV, ergative, agglutinating-inflecting languages into two types. That typological distinction, incidentally, formalizes the intuitive conviction of some specialists that Indo-European and South Caucasian are at least impressionistically similar, while North Caucasian is somehow a very different kind of language.

Recall from Table 1 that Ingush has no valence-decreasing processes, while Indo-European does. South Caucasian, like Indo-European, has lexical and inflectional valence-decreasing processes. These are not isolated facts but point to a fundamental typological distinction in the status of transitivity or intransitivity in the verbal lexicon of a language. I will speak of the fundamental transitivity or intransitivity of whole languages, with the advance caution that this is an abstraction which does not make specific claims about the formal or semantic markedness either of any individual verb in the lexicon of a given language or of the entire set of intransitive or transitive verbs of any language.

Ingush is a fundamentally intransitive language. It lacks valence-decreasing processes (as we have seen); predictably, then, its intransitives are mostly ancient, etymologically simple verbs, and they are morphosyntactically regular. I call the entire language fundamentally intransitive because, impressionistically speaking, the verbal morphosyntax appears to be geared for accepting intransitives as input rather than for producing them as output. (As a corollary of this impressionistic generalization, recall that Ingush has derivations -- the two transitives -- which can apply only to

intransitives. It does not, however, have derivations which apply only to transitives. This is another respect in which transitives look more like output than like input.) 10) Put differently, transitivity in Ingush is, again impressionistically speaking, a derived state of affairs. This is consistent with the fact that we have what may be called 'stranded' transitives, in the form of words like ja:z-du 'write' ((49)-(51) above), formally a derived transitive but lacking an undervived intransitive counterpart *ja:z. However, there are no 'stranded' intransitives. Finally, even the undervived transitives of Ingush include many -- the labile verbs -- which can also function as intransitives.

Indo-European and South Caucasian, on the other hand, are fundamentally transitive languages. They have valence-decreasing processes of voice and derived intransitivity. Consequently, their intransitives include many derived verbs and (especially in South Caucasian) many irregular verbs. The lexicon of basic agent-patient verbal notions in these languages includes many simple root transitives. There are stranded intransitives: e.g. Russian bojat'sja 'be afraid' is reflexive, thus formally a derived intransitive, and it fits into a regular detransitivizing process -- but there is no corresponding transitive *bojat'. In other words, Indo-European and South Caucasian give the impression of on the whole being prepared to accept transitives as input and intransitives as output.

I repeat that fundamentally intransitive does not mean that every verbal lexeme in the language is ultimately -- etymologically or underlyingly -- intransitive; fundamentally transitive does not entail that every verbal lexeme is ultimately transitive. These terms are simply generalizations about the preferred direction of valence-changing processes, and about the prototypical input and output verbs for such processes. Languages of both types have in their lexicons etymologically opaque, monomorphemic intransitive roots and etymologically opaque, monomorphemic transitive roots.

Kuryłowicz's claim applies to fundamentally transitive languages. If a fundamentally transitive language has any valence-affecting processes, it will have valence-reducing ones. It may, but need not, also exhibit valence-permuting and valence-increasing processes (Indo-European and South Caucasian do happen to have both of these additional process types).

The Ingush patterns suggest that the converse of Kuryłowicz's claim is true for fundamentally intransitive languages: they will have at least valence-increasing processes, and may have valence-permuting processes. (Ingush has both.) Presumably they may also have valence-decreasing processes, although -- as shown by the absence of such devices in Ingush -- those will stand at the very end of the implicational hierarchy, implying the presence of valence-increasing and valence-permuting devices in the given language.

Presumably orthogonal to this distinction is the question of whether valence in such formulations applies to syntactic relations or to morphological marking. Georgian and Indo-European happen to have relation-changing syntactic processes; valence for them refers to syntactic relations, so that e.g. passives in the languages affect subjecthood and objecthood. Ingush happens to lack relation-changing

rules; valence for Ingush refers only to morphological cases, so that e.g. the antipassive changes cases but does not alter subjecthood.

Above I claimed that Ingush derivations are functionally analogous, thus typologically comparable, to Indo-European voice inflection. The notion of fundamental transitivity and intransitivity of languages allows us to motivate this difference of inflection vs. derivation. Adding arguments is inherently the domain of the lexicon: while an argument can be removed from a sentence -- under non-referentiality, unspecificity, non-prominence, etc. -- without altering lexical content, an argument cannot simply be added to a sentence without adding lexical content and endangering the original choice of verb. In other words, valence-increasing processes should naturally be lexical, not inflectional. Therefore fundamentally intransitive languages -- in which we expect to find valence-increasing devices -- should have lexical, rather than inflectional or syntactic, valence-changing processes. But since fundamentally transitive languages are likely to display valence-decreasing devices, they may well have inflectional voice oppositions. In summary, then, the question of inflectional vs. derivational, or syntactic vs. lexical, processes is immaterial to the typological status of valence-changing processes. (In fact, the entire question may be misdirected, since the inflectional or syntactic status of even the canonical Indo-European passive can be questioned. For instance, Babby and Brecht (1975) argue that the Russian passive -- traditionally regarded as inflectional -- is not transformational but lexical.)

Conclusions. Kurylowicz's claim is still valid. Fundamental transitivity or intransitivity provides a new typological metric which crosscuts existing classifications. Generalizations about systems and types -- buttressed by detailed language-specific inquiry -- were an important part of this paper's argumentation. We are left with the question of whether that argumentation is (as promised in the first paragraph) specifically historical, and whether transitivity as a typological metric has value for charting language history. I suggest (as an empirical hypothesis) that fundamental transitivity or intransitivity of languages is a conservative, thus deep-seated trait, one potentially diagnostic of ancient genetic and/or areal affinity. There are two arguments that it is conservative and thus deep-seated: first, Indo-European appears to have remained fundamentally transitive for thousands of years (at least if we restrict our survey to the languages which retain inflection, like Russian), despite radical typological changes of other sorts; second, North and South Caucasian differ on this point, despite considerable areal interaction. There is one argument for the diagnostic value of fundamental (in)transitivity in establishing areal affinity: the North Caucasus displays intensive areal convergence, and all North Caucasian stocks are fundamentally intransitive; the convergence between the North and South Caucasus is less intensive and does not affect fundamental (in)transitivity. These three arguments suggest that languages abide by their fundamental (in)transitivity with great tenacity, yielding it only in the most extreme instances of convergence.

If these arguments hold, we may have a criterion which will allow us to go further back in time than the comparative method does,

and which will allow us to separate genetic underpinnings from later overlays of borrowing in languages without attested history. And -- arguing from affinity to areal connection to physical adjacency -- it mandates reconsideration of the relation of the Proto-Indo-European homeland to the Caucasus, since it suggests ancient, close links between Indo-European and South Caucasian while placing North Caucasian distinctly apart.

Footnotes

1 This paper is based on field work done in Tbilisi, Georgia, USSR in late 1981, supported by the International Research and Exchanges Board and a Fulbright-Hays Research Abroad grant from the U.S. Department of Education. For hospitality and assistance I am grateful to Tbilisi State University, particularly the Division for Scientific Relations Abroad; to the staff of the Institute of Linguistics, Georgian Academy of Sciences; and especially to Thomas Gamkrelidze. Preparation of copy was facilitated by a grant from the Committee on Research, University of California, Berkeley. Deepest thanks go to my Ingush consultants, students of the Rustaveli Theater Institute in Tbilisi, for their time, their patience, their insights. This paper is dedicated to Yakov Malkiel and bears his intellectual imprint. It was undertaken out of respect for the ancestors of the Chechen-Ingush nation, the men and women who created this language.

2 Transcription symbols include y, a high nonfront unrounded vowel; ie:, uo:, long diphthongs ([i:e], [u:ø]); ", pharyngeal stop or pharyngealization of the preceding consonant (so that e.g. h" is the voiceless pharyngeal fricative); ', glottal stop or glottalization of the preceding consonant. Case abbreviations: NOMinative, ERGative, DATive, ALLative, COMpletive; OBLique is a cover term for non-nominative cases. Abbreviations for verbal derivations should be straightforward, and are always identified by the section heading.

I have called Ingush an OV language on the evidence of word order in non-main clauses (rigidly SOV) and overall left-branching syntax. Word order in main clauses, however, is fairly free; sentence-final position is associated with thematization, thus subjects are often final. The word order in the example sentences, all of which represent main clauses, reflects pragmatics, thematization, and preferred sentence rhythm. Translations given are context-specific. The translations, contexts, and word order are due to my elicitation procedure, which was to make up verb forms and ask whether they existed and how they might be used. Translations are occasionally given in the original Russian, where English loses information.

Readers may observe that many of the derivational suffixes, and the roots for 'like', 'read', 'kill', and 'give', show gender agreement in the form of substitution of the initial consonant: masculine v-, feminine j-, neuters b-, d-. Agreement is always with a nominative. It is discussed further in connection with (52)ff.

3 It is difficult to generalize over the semantics of two-place intransitives. This formal class is also found throughout Northeast Caucasian, where it comprises some of the same verb meanings as in Ingush (Klimov and Alekseev 1980:81). In general, the valence types and the verbs they include are all more or less pan-Caucasian. For some remarks on the semantics of two-place intransitives vs. transitives see Catford 1975.

4 The archaic passive is the agentless passive of e.g. older Latin, where, instead of being demoted, the original subject was deleted. The Russian reflexive in question is the derived intransitive of verbs such as 'close', 'open', 'cover', 'fill', 'surround':

transitive	Mat' otkryla dver'
	Mother opened door-ACC
	'Mother opened the door'

derived intransitive	Dver' otkrylas'
	door-NOM opened-REFL
	'The door opened'

5 These two derivations may well be labile. (29) below shows the potential from a transitive verb, with no dative; cf. (27)-(28) with dative. (32) shows an agentless causative; (33) has the agent.

6 This is the term proposed by Van Oosten 1977 for English constructions like this book reads easily and he scares fast.

7 Also translated on srazu vljubljaetsja 'he falls in love right away'. This supports Jakovlev's observation (1940:76, for Chechen) that roots in the potential can be interpreted either transitively or intransitively: the root in this form can mean either '(fall in) love' or 'please', i.e. 'get (people) to love'.

8 This example is my own.

9 These claims were made independently, with less emphasis on history, in Jacobsen 1969.

10 At first glance the double causatives may appear to be counter-examples: they are causatives of transitives, so we might speak of a special causative derivation applying only to transitives. But on that analysis they would have to be regarded as just special instances of the plain causative derivation, which applies to any type of verb. In reality, I think the double causatives are best regarded as unit derivations, adding the double-causative marker to all kinds of input verbs; that they contain the transitive morpheme followed by the causative morpheme is a statement of etymology, not of synchronic derivation.

References

- Babby, L. H., and R. D. Brecht. 1975. The syntax of voice in Russian. Language 51:2.342-67.
- Catford, J. C. 1975. Ergativity in Caucasian languages. NELS 6. 37-48.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1979. Ergativity. Language 55:1.59-138.

- Jacobsen, William. 1969. The analog of the passive transformation in ergative-type languages. Read at winter LSA meeting, San Francisco. To appear in J. Nichols and A. C. Woodbury, eds., *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*.
- Jakovlev, N. F. 1940. *Sintaksis čečenskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow-Leningrad: AN.
- Klimov, G. A., and M. E. Alekseev. 1980. *Tipologija kavkazskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. (1946) 1960. Èrgativnost' i stadial'nost' v jazyke. Reprinted in his *Esquisses linguistiques*, 95-103. (PAN, Komitet językoznawczy, *Prace językoznawcze*, 19.) Wrocław-Krakow: PAN.
- Mathesius, Vilém. (1928) 1964. On linguistic characterology with illustrations from modern English. In J. Váček, ed., *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*, 59-67.
- Van Oosten, Jeanne. 1977. Subjects and agenthood in English. CLS 13.459-71.