

Part II

**PARTICIPATION AS A UNIVERSAL  
DIMENSION OF LANGUAGE**

## 1. Preliminary remarks

The aim of this paper is not an enumeration of unconnected facts but the inspection of whole factual domains by means of a hypothesis--viz. that they are interconnected and may be ordered accordingly. Upon the basis of such a connection we should understand better both the partial domains and the particular facts.

We have so far considered six partial domains: valency (I,1), orientation (I,2), transitivization (I,3), case marking (I,4), verb serialization (I,5), causativization (I,6). Two other domains, also connected with the dimension of PARTICIPATION, could not be dealt with in detail, viz. predication by means of auxiliaries ("AUX predication" for short) and sentential complexes (or complex clauses).

The technique of AUX predication involves the following periphrastic construction inter alia:

- (1) a. Constructions with the AUX 'be' and a nominalized verb (e.g. English *is going, is eating*, German *ist gegangen*).
- b. Constructions with the AUX 'have' and a nominalized verb (e.g. German *hat gegessen, hat geschlagen*).
- c. Constructions with a modal AUX and the Infinitive (e.g. German *kann/will/darf/soll essen*).

- d. Constructions with the AUX *werden*, *sein* and a nominalized verb (e.g. German *wird geschlagen*, *ist geschlagen*).

Both TAM distinctions (a,b,c) and passivization (d) correlate with a given degree of transitivity (see above I, 3). Such periphrastic constructions are less grammaticalized than the corresponding nonperiphrastic, ones and they show an increase in predicativity--more information about the relation between participle and participants is given.

A further domain appertaining to the dimension of PARTICIPATION is that of complement and subordinate clauses: in so-called subject and object clauses as well as adverbial (viz. final, causal, consecutive, concessive) clauses a participant is represented by a sentence.

Faced with such a diversity we must repeat the question asked at the beginning of the paper (see Introduction): what is the connection, the common denominator of all these phenomena? how do these particular aspects belong together, forming a unity? And again: what is the share that each viewpoint or perspective (conceptual, semantic, syntactic, morphologic, pragmatic) has got in the linguistic phenomena surveyed?

## 2. A sketch of the connexion

In the dimension of participation we have to do (in a first approximation) with the linguistic representation of a *Sachverhalt* (state of