

- g. * Malt mit Kreide.
'Paints with chalk'

The first complement (the Subject) is obligatory and therefore has the greatest bondedness with respect to the verb *malen*. All other participants, i.e. DO/PAT, INSTR and DIR, are optional and thus nearly equally bound to *malt*. In (3a-c) the IO appears not to be as strongly bound to the verb as the DO, since (3b) is more marked than (3a) and again (3c) more marked than (3b).

Valency concerns the minimal and most economic expression of PARTICIPATION, i.e. it embraces all phenomena that one can observe if an expected item does not occur.

2. Orientation

2.1 Voice

By 'voice' (*genus verbi*, Diathese) we understand the difference between active, medial, medio-passive, reflexive, reciprocal and passive. A study of voice must take into account the separation of the levels of morphology, syntax, semantics (including the lexico-semantic representation of the participant) and pragmatics. That means, for instance, that the claim that a language does not have a passive must be examined at all levels and, if need be, restricted and made more precise.

As a matter of method, not of principle, the following argument is limited to participes

with one or two participants, in other words to one-place or two-place predicates. We shall adopt the symbols proposed by Comrie (1981a):

- S = the only argument of a one-place predicate
A,P = the two arguments of a two-place predicate

We shall sometimes follow Hopper/Thompson (1980) and use O instead of P, the former being more neutral with respect to case roles. The item denoted by S is not identical with SUBJ, although identity is not to be excluded. The division of participants into A and P correspond in most, but not all cases, to the classification of the semantic roles AG and PAT. Compare:

- (4) a. Hans sah Maria 'Jack saw Mary'
b. Hans tötete Maria 'Jack killed Mary'

Hans/Jack is certainly the AG in (4b) but not so in (4a), nevertheless it is A in both sentences.

In a first approximation the basic feature of a SUBJ is that it is the NP which has a preferred position or which is preferentially handled. This preference shows up at different levels through certain regularities, e.gr. first position in the sentence and agreement of the verb with the SUBJ. Verbal agreement with the SUBJ occurs with significantly greater frequency than verbal agreement with objects. If the DO agrees with the verb, though, then so does the

SUBJ, which is again evidence for the said preference.

Although there is no universal correspondence between single levels it is typical for the SUBJ to be the TOPIC or to be the AG. In the case of one-place predicates the S is the SUBJ of the sentence. An exception, however, would be Latin *curritur* with the meaning of 'someone is running' or even 'running occurs'

In the case of one-place predicates S is predominantly AGENS or predominantly PATIENS. In the case of two-place predicates, both participants, A and P, are involved. If A is characterized by the abovesaid subject features, there is A-orientation (typically in the active or in the antipassive voice). If P is SUBJ, there is P-orientation (typically in the passive voice and in ergative constructions).

How can the opposition between active and passive become more precise? Let us try an answer à la Keenan (1981, cf. his example (1)):

- (5)
- a. Mary slapped John
 - b. John was slapped
 - c. John was slapped by Mary

The prototypical passive properties (what Keenan calls 'basic passive') are:

- (6)
- a. No AG-phrase is there.
 - b. The main verb in its non-passive form is transitive.
 - c. The main verb in the active denotes an activity with an AG as SUBJ and a PAT as OBJ.

These properties are not always supposed to occur if there is a passive, but they are supposed to be the most widespread in the languages of the world. More exactly, we can state the following generalizations (Keenan 1981:4 ff.):

- (7)
- G-1: Some languages have no passives.
 - G-2: If a language has any passives, it has basic passives as characterized above, the converse fails.
 - G-2.1: If a language has passives with agent-phrases, it has them without agent-phrases.
 - G-2.2: If a language has passives of stative verbs (e.g. *lack, have, etc.*), then it has passives of active verbs.
 - G-2.3: If a language has passives of intransitive verbs, then it has passives of transitive verbs.

Further, the morphosyntactic form of the passive concentrates on the VP (as implied in the title of Keenan 1980: "Passive is Phrasal, not Sentential or Lexical"), i.e. what formally distinguishes a passive is located in the Predicate or Verb Phrase - expressed by a verb form with a certain ending or in a periphrastic way.

There are further linguistic operations which might appear to be other techniques of orientation alongside with voice. Although there are reasons to exclude them from participation, only the theory to be sketched in the second part of this paper will be able to make them clear. Until then, we must try to review them briefly.

2.2 Topicalization and Left-Dislocation

From a functional viewpoint topicalization, left-dislocation and voice have to be considered as means for expressing the paradigmatic functions of *foregrounding* and *backgrounding*, i.e. it is claimed that certain NPs are essential for the sequential portion of an event which is on the fore. There is topicalization in (8) and left-dislocation in (9), both taken from Keenan:

- (8) a. I like beans.
b. Beans I like.
- (9) a. Congressmen don't respect the President any more.
b. As for the President, Congressmen don't respect him any more.

Functional differences of these two manners of orientation are:

- (a) In the passive the AG-NP can be eliminated.
(b) In (9b) *President* is more strongly topicalized than *Congressmen* in (9a); by contrast *John* or *Mary* are in (5a) and (5b) equally TOPIC.
(c) Passivization, in contrast to topicalization and left-dislocation, is an integral part of the grammar, i.e. the following syntactic operations may be applied to the passive:

- (10) **Nominalization**
I was dismayed at John's being fired.
(From *John was fired.*)
- (11) **Relative sentence formation**
The garden in which John was attacked.
(From *John was attacked.*)
- (12) **Yes/No Questions**
Was John attacked in the garden?

Grammaticalized procedures involve smaller constituents than nongrammaticalized ones. Thus, the passive only involves the VP whereas topicalization and left-dislocation involve the syntax of the whole sentence.

2.3 Further possibilities

Some languages of the Algonquian family (cf. I, 4.23) show an opposition between proximative and obviative which mark the relative nearness of the participant to the speaker. That which is nearer to the speaker is preferentially handled with respect with what is further away. To inverse this relativity the language affords a special means, the so-called **inverse verb flexion**.

Voice—as the most frequent grammaticalized means for 'grounding'—belongs to the wider context of orientation, i.e. the marking of relations of the participants to the participle in the most general sense.

Givón 1981 is instructive in this respect. His considerations have three central aspects:

- (a) passive constructions present in a particular language, viz. Ute (Uto-Aztec);
- (b) cross-linguistic typology of passive constructions;
- (c) the general methodology of typology.

We want to consider here first (a) and then (b). The latter is justified by a principle which governs the study of the interaction of form and function in a domain like that of the passive: The consideration of **one** particular language is insufficient (this excludes the procedure of TG which is exclusively based on English).

Givón's starting-point is the assumption that passivization is a multi-factorial concept. That means that a good number of functional components and correspondingly also a good number of possibilities of expression are involved in passivization. Passivization participates of three 'functional domains':

(a) **TOPIC-assignment in the sentence:**

The SUBJ/AG of the active sentence is not the TOPIC any more; instead, a non-AG participant of the active sentence is given the function of TOPIC.

(b) **Impersonalization:**

The identity/presence of SUBJ/AG of the active sentence is suppressed.

(c) **Detransitivization:**

A sentence in the passive becomes semantically less 'active', less transitive, more static.

These 'domains' frequently show co-variation in languages and thus constitute what is commonly called passive. But each one of the three domains may occur alone, e.g. in topicalization. Givón's main interest is to establish how can we give a morphosyntactic characterization of those passive constructions which we identify by means of a combination of the three 'domains'; and his claim is that such morphosyntactic characterizations belong to a scale. As a result of the interaction of each 'domain' with the other two a certain "marge" of possibilities emerge. Let us anticipate Givón's examples to make his claims clearer. Compare the Ute sentences:

(13) ta'wá-ci 'u siváatu-ci 'uwáy paḡá-qa
man-SUBJ the-SUBJ goat-OBJ the-OBJ kill-ANT

'The man killed the goat' [= Givón (11)]

(14) siváatu-ci 'uwáy paḡá-ta-ḡa
goat-OBJ the-OBJ kill-PASS-ANT

'The goat was killed' [= Givón (12)]

We want to emphasize two of the morphosyntactic facts of the passive sentence: that the AG is necessarily deleted and that all other participants (including the new TOPIC) keep

their original status (here that of an OBJ). The Passive itself is marked by a verb suffix.

Now compare:

- (14) siváatu-ci 'uwáy pa^áxá-ta-^áxa
goat-OBJ the-OBJ kill-PASS-ANT

'Someone (SG) killed the goat', 'The goat was killed (by a SG SUBJ/AG)' [= Givón (46)]

- (15) siváatu-ci 'uwáy pa^áxá-^áxa-ta-^áxa
goat-OBJ the-OBJ kill-PL-PASS-ANT

'Some people (PL) killed the goat', 'The goat was killed (by a PL SUBJ/AG)' [= Givón (47)]

In the verb of the passive sentence the mark of number - relating to a non-expressed participant, viz. the AG - is kept. In other words, the SUBJ/AG keeps control upon the category of number and does not yield it to the participant topicalized in a passive sentence.

Even more significant is the following:

- (16) tuá-ci 'u tyká'na-py-vwa-n 'aví-kya
child-SUBJ the-SUBJ table-OBJ-on-LOC lie-ANT

'The child lay on the table' [= Givón (13)]

- (17) tyká'na-py-vwa-n 'aví-ta-^áxa
table-OBJ-on-LOC lie-PASS-ANT

'Someone lay on the table' [= Givón (14)]

Any participant of a Ute active sentence may be thus topicalized through passivization, as is shown in the case of the LOC.

Languages like English or German show a completely opposed behaviour with respect to those Ute features: the non-SUBJ non-AG participant does not keep its original case-marking, the AG must not be deleted, the number category is controlled by the new TOPIC and not every participant of an active sentence can assume the function of TOPIC through passivization. Thus, according to Givón, English and Ute are the poles of a continuum.

Now, what are the parameters on whose basis such a scale may be constructed? The scale is a matter of categorizations and generalizations (cf. Givón 1981:168) of the morphosyntactic features involved in the realization of the 'functional domains' in which passivization takes part, viz.

- (a) The degree in which the case-marking properties present in the SUBJ/AG of the active are transposed to the non-agentive TOPIC of the passive (low in Ute, as seen in the conservation of case-marking; high in English where the TOPIC/SUBJ becomes the NOM-NP).
- (b) The degree in which the identity of the SUBJ/AG of the active is suppressed in the passive (complete suppression in Ute as opposed to English).
- (c) The degree in which the passive sentence conserves the semantic and syntactic properties of activity and transitivity (low in English, high in Ute where case-marking is conserved, the deleted AG keeps control of grammatical number and - semantically - the actional character of the event is maintained).
- (d) The degree in which the different non-SUBJ non-AG participants of the active may become TOPIC/SUBJ

(high in Ute in that no restrictions occur, whereas in English only the OBJ and in German occasionally also the LOC is affected: *Auf dem Tisch wurde getanzt*; but cf. *Es wurde auf dem Tisch getanzt*, where *es* assumes the SUBJ position and thus the heavy transposition of LOC into TOPIC is avoided).¹

Now, these scalar typological dimensions interact on the basis of interdependencies in such a way that one big continuum results which represents the dimension of passivization. The parameter correlations are based upon the relation of the first parameter (viz. TOPIC assignment) to the two others (cf. Givón 1981:169):

The less a language assigns SUBJ/AG marking to the TOPIC in the passive, the more its passive sentences

- (a) will tend to delete the AG of the active (a-b),
- (b) will keep transitive and active features (a-c),
- (c) will accept non-SUBJ non-AG participants as their TOPICS (a-d).

3. Transitivity

The original meaning of the word 'transitive' is 'going through, going over'. We are focussing on the participle as an event or action represented

¹ The German sentences mean something like 'there was (someone) dancing on the table', 'dancing was carried out on the table', and not 'it was danced on the table', because here 'it' would refer to a kind of dance, say, 'tap' or 'fox trot'. [T]

by a predicator which, in its turn, is represented by a verb. The abovesaid 'going over', as specified by the verb, takes place from one participant to another. More generally, transitivity is the construction of a relation which relates a starting-point via the participle to an endpoint. The following hypothesis looks likely:

Hypothesis. The participle must be of such a kind (the verb must have such semantic and morpho-syntactic features) that a 'going over' is plausible. Starting-point and endpoint are quite close to the action/event. Once the participants are established as starting-point and endpoint, it is both their distance from the participle and their mutual relations which decide both the degree and the nature of transitivity.

Tradition has it that transitive verbs are those which require a DO. This view is maintained by Transformational Grammar. According to Chomsky (1965), the strict subcategorization of verbs belongs to the base and is found in the lexicon; it is there that verbs divide into transitives and intransitives. V_{tr} are those which occur with an OBJ-NP and V_{itr} are those which do not. The following example illustrates Chomsky's idea: