

Conclusion

The linguistic phenomena (the expressions and their meanings) dealt with in this paper have not been viewed as just a set of things--"abstract objects", as generativists use to say--but as varying solutions of an invariant problem: the linguistic expression or representation of a relation, viz. the participative relation. The crucial insight is that language does something, and that what is immediately accessible to us, i.e. the different structures as the output of a linguistic problem-solving process, permits a retrogressive conclusion to How It is Done.

The fundamentally binary nature of all dimensions thus far studied also shapes the dimension of PARTICIPATION. In other words, there are two options when trying to express or represent linguistically the participative relation:

- A. The relation is assumed as given, and you deictically point to it: "Here is it!" This is possible because there are items in the lexicon which already contain the participative relation--in the same manner as there are items in the lexicon which already contain the relation of possession (such as body-part names or terms of kin). These items then represent the participee and thus

control (govern, backfeed) the appearance and the choice of participants.

- B. The relation is not assumed as given. The kind of relation is not one-sidedly controlled (governed, backfed into) by the participee. Rather, additional information is succesively introduced; and it increasingly appears on the side of the participants. As this happens, the distance between participee and participants also increases. There is no absolute limit here (remember that there are languages with up to 45 cases). Nevertheless, you can say when a limit is reached, viz. where no control (government, feedback) is exerted by the participee--in the form of restrictions.

Now the point is that both "options", A (indicativity) and B (predicativity) do not exclude each other. Rather, they are contemporaneously present in each linguistic structure belonging to PARTICIPATION, albeit with different degrees of predominance. Parti-cipee and participants are mutually related, correlative concepts; the one cannot exist with-out the other. However, as soon as participants become realized in a linguistic form, they must also have some properties--properties, that is, that go beyond what is contained in the participee. And this is also true the other way about: the participants often require something from the participee--or at the very least, the participee must contain, or allow for, something on the side of the participants.

If this is so, all structures belonging to PARTICIPATION must be ordered according to the

specific "blend" of both principles A and B that every structure presents to the analyst.

The question of order and ordering has been the object of long discussions within the UNITYP research group. The sequence I have presented in sections II, 3.1-3.9, could strike some as being a strictly linear, one-dimensional ordering relation. Such an impression would be false; and so I must try to put the record straight.

Both the observation of linguistic facts and their ordering are made possible by three constructs: continuum (see Seiler 1983), paradigm (ibid., pp. 14ff.), and hierarchy (ibid.). Accordingly, if the relations of order we are discussing should be represented geometrically (which is certainly something to be desired), then only a multidimensional space would be adequate.¹ The so-called techniques presented before are hierarchically ordered continua; their grammaticalized poles correspond roughly to the categories treated in traditional grammar as "Morphosyntax of the simple sentence" (valency, active vs. passive, transitivity, cases, causatives, etc.). We have seen that they are not isolated, thing-like forms and meanings but continua or--to use the now fashionable term--parameters, with a number of positions consitituted by the very same two functional principles which order the techniques along the whole dimension. When we thus say that a technique like transitivization is multifactorial, we really and truly mean it. Hopper

¹ Compare Lehmann's proposal to that effect (1984:172f.).

and Thompson (1980) apply the term "parameter" for their "transitivity" (thus in calling individuation of the direct object a parameter), but they do not actually show that we have here an ordered scale.

We thus have continua, subcontinua, sub-subcontinua, ...--*ad infinitum*, at least in principle. However, this infiniteness is constrained by the other two constructs--the paradigm (with grammaticalization as constituting factor) and the hierarchy. How this is possible is both a theoretical and an empirical question. Only a contrastive study of all dimensions of language thus far proposed may come nearer to a solution.

Members of the UNITYP research group have again and again raised the question whether and how far the techniques as here presented are separable in empirical reality, i.e. in a given language. It was time and again pointed out that "everything is connected with everything". Quite so. But if we are to take that dictum seriously, then we must be prepared to show **how** the connections actually look--and we must also be prepared to show **what** exactly is connected with **what**. The **How** and the **What** in such a demonstration are indissolubly correlated with each other. This is exactly what happens in the dimension of PARTICIPATION--and in all other dimensions as well. The recognition of indicativity and predicativity as the dimension-embracing forces and relation centralization and decentralization as their specific mani-

festations within the dimension of PARTICIPATION yields an ordering principle (through their varying "blends"). This ordering principle has been obtained from what we had to order in the first place, viz. the linguistic structures **and** also (who would or could deny it?) from a certain a priori vision of the essence of language, especially of the relation of speaker to hearer. The speaker knows (more or less) what is it he wants to say before he even begins to speak. Thus in case of a participative relation he would be content with a mere indication, a gesture (indicativity). But the hearer does not know: he has to find out what the speaker wants to say, and his only evidence is just what the other says (we ignore the context for the moment). He thus needs explicitness--which means predicativity.

A further question arises--and it has also been abundantly discussed, viz. Will an unbalance, a disequilibrium, in the dimension not appear given that the techniques treated first (the techniques "to the left" in the linear representation) are less complex, involve less morphosyntactic "machinery", while the techniques "to the right" show more "machinery" and more complexity (this must be so because, as we said, they imply the "preceding" techniques). It should be expected, or so the puzzle reads, that the formal means designed to solve **one** task--viz. the linguistic representation of PARTICIPATION--should be, if you wish, several

and diverse but nonetheless apply more or less evenly.

Two remarks are here appropriate. On the one hand, the different "blends" is what makes possible first to isolate the techniques and then to observe their interaction. To illustrate this with an example: valency plays a role in case marking; but case marking presents a whole set of phenomena which have nothing to do with valency. On the other hand, it must be said that increasing complexity and increasing introduction of "machinery" does not have as their unique function to clarify the participative relation--it goes far beyond, e.g. it has to do with tense, aspect, and mood, which certainly cannot be exhausted by PARTICIPATION. The same happens with locality (remember the concrete cases), then with two-verb constructions (from verb serialization to complex sentences). We have begun to see the paths connecting the dimensions with each other.