

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object

Kittilä, Seppo

2007

Kittilä, S 2007, ' On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object ',
Functions of Language , vol. 14 , no. 1 , pp. 147-164 . <https://doi.org/10.1075/fo1.14.1.09kit>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/250884>
<https://doi.org/10.1075/fo1.14.1.09kit>

unspecified
acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object¹

Please cite this paper as: Kittilä, Seppo. (2007) On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object. *Functions of Language (Ditransitivity, special issue dedicated to ditransitive constructions)* 14: 149–164.

Seppo Kittilä

University of Helsinki

The proposed (short) title: The encoding of transitivity on the indirect object

Address:

Seppo Kittilä

Department of Linguistics

P.O. Box 9

00014 University of Helsinki

Finland

kittila@mappi.helsinki.fi

Tel. +358-9-191 29328 (office), +358-44-537 4942 (private)

Fax. +358 (09) 191 29307

Abstract

The present article examines the effects of transitivity on the encoding of indirect object. The examined features comprise affectedness, aspect and animacy. In addition, differences between what will be labelled as neutral vs. purposeful transfer will be discussed. The article shows that effects of transitivity are not confined to direct objects only, but transitivity has consequences for indirect object coding too. In addition, the article also shows that there are good reasons for coding the examined features on the indirect object. The most important of these reasons is represented by the fact that features of the referents of the indirect object are responsible for coding the relevant features. For example, an event of transfer is conceived of as completed, when the Recipient has received the transferred entity.

1. Introduction

As is received wisdom in linguistics, features of semantic transitivity – most notably the affectedness of the patient – influence the form of the direct object (defined simply as the non-subject argument of a monotransitive clause). An illustrative example is found in (1):

Finnish (Finno-Ugric, Uralic)

(1a) *puutarhuri rikko-i maljako-n*
gardener.NOM break-3SG.PAST vase-ACC
‘A gardener broke a vase’

(1b) *puutarhuri ajattel-i kukka-a*
gardener.NOM think-3SG.PAST flower-PART
‘A gardener was thinking about the flower’

(1c) *muurari rakens-i talo-n*
bricklayer.NOM build-3SG.PAST house-ACC
‘A brick layer built a house’

(1d) *muurari rakens-i talo-a*
bricklayer.NOM build-3SG.PAST house-PART
‘A brick layer was building a house (not finishing it)’ (personal knowledge)

The direct object occurs in the accusative in (1a) and (1c), while in (1b) and (1d) the direct object bears partitive coding. This variation has a clear semantic basis. (1a) and

(1c) denote highly transitive events instigated by a volitionally acting agent and resulting in a dramatic and a salient change-of-state in the patient (in (1c) the event creates the referent of the direct object). (1b), in turn, denotes an experiencer event, while in (1d) the described event is not successfully completed. In other words, the events in (1b) and (1d) do not involve an affected patient, for which reason the direct object occurs in the partitive instead of the accusative.

Variation in object marking, as in (1), constitutes the topic of dozens of articles and books in linguistics (see e.g. Hopper & Thompson 1980, Tsunoda 1985, Rice 1987, Comrie & Polinsky (eds.) 1993, Rousseau 1998, Kittilä 2002, and Naess 2003 among others). Perhaps the most seminal of these studies is represented by Hopper and Thompson (1980), where it is shown that transitivity (including different aspects of object marking) is best regarded as a multilayered notion comprising such facets as affectedness, agency, aspect and individuation (see Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252). These facets of transitivity are relevant to the examples in (1), as discussed above. This article is also concerned with the expression of transitivity, however, in contrast to the studies noted above (and also numerous others), it focuses on the expression of (semantic) transitivity on the indirect object.² Semantic transitivity is here understood similarly to Hopper and Thompson as a bundle of (semantically defined) features which may have formal consequences for the coding of events. The sole difference with respect to typical studies of transitivity is thus found in the fact that the present article only considers the effects of transitivity on the encoding of indirect objects. Two examples of the phenomenon under scrutiny are provided in (2) and (3):

Wolaitta (Omotic, Afro-Asiatic)

(2a) *ʔastamareé mat'aápaá mat'aáfa keettá*

teacher.M.NOM book.M.ACC book house.ABS

yedd-iisi

send-3M.SG.PERF

'The teacher sent the book to a library'

(2b) *ʔastamareé mat'aápaá ba biir-úwa*

teacher.M.NOM book.M.ACC 3LOG office-M.ACC

yedd-iisi

send-3M.SG.PERF

'The teacher sent the book to his office' (Examples courtesy of Azeb Amha)

Tsez (Tsezic, Daghestanian)

(3a) *ʕal-ā kidb-er surat tel-si*

Ali-ERG girl-LAT picture give-PAST.WIT

'Ali gave a picture to the girl (for good)'

(3b) *ʕal-ā kidb-eqo-r surat tel-si*

Ali-ERG girl-POSS-LAT picture give-PAST.WIT

'Ali gave a picture to the girl (as a loan)' (Comrie 2000: 363)

In Wolaitta, as shown in (2), indefinite inanimate Goals occur in the zero-marked absolutive case, while definite inanimate Goals (other than place names) bear accusative marking. This variation is thus conditioned by individuation (feature J of Hopper and

Thompson). In Tsez, the encoding of the Recipient varies depending on whether the denoted transfer is permanent or temporary. The lative encodes permanent transfer, while the possessive-lative case implies that the Theme enters the Recipient's sphere of control only temporarily. This is very close to the differences between successfully and less than successfully completed events and hence aspect (feature C of Hopper and Thompson). The event in (3a) can also be said to be more resultative in nature, since the transfer is conceived of as irrevocable.

This article pursues two goals. First, by studying the expression of transitivity from a different perspective, I hope to be able to show that semantic transitivity affects the argument marking in a more thorough fashion than can be assumed from studies of traditional transitivity. Second, the article will show that it is only natural that the features of transitivity under examination are expressed by modifying the form of the indirect object. The most important reason for this lies in the features shared by canonical patients and (animate) goals of transfer. The article thus hopefully contributes to our understanding of transitivity, since, as far as I know, similar cases have not been studied from a cross-linguistic perspective to date. It is rather the case that the occurrence of such cases has been excluded in the previous studies, as indicated below (see Blansitt 1988: 181):

No language suspends overt marking of dative or spatial functions
because the referent is non-specific or indefinite.

No language signals completive or incompletive aspect by the form of its

dative, allative or locative marking.

Both of these proposed universals are falsified by the data in (2) and (3), and, as will be shown, similar cases are attested in other languages too.

A few methodological notes are in order before we proceed to the investigation itself. First, this article discusses cases in which the changes in the form of the indirect object can be explained by a transitivity feature. The exact formal nature of the change is not relevant. As a result, both (2) and (3) are relevant, even though only in (2) is the connection to formal transitivity evident. Second, only those cases are considered in which the semantic role borne by the indirect object is maintained. This is the case in both (2) and (3), in which the indirect object consistently bears the role of Recipient/Goal irrespective of the animacy of its referent, or the aspect of the clause. On the other hand, the generally recognized, crosslinguistically frequent differences between the encoding of Recipients and Beneficiaries are not relevant to this article, because the attested formal differences can be explained by the semantic roles borne by the arguments. Third, changes which follow from the lexical semantics of verbs are also disregarded. This is to avoid the effects of idiosyncratic features of verbs on the research. For example, the verbs ‘give’ and ‘send’ both have a Recipient as a part of their lexical semantics, but the encoding of these verbs may vary. The formal treatment given to ‘give’ is especially anomalous crosslinguistically (see Kittilä 2006). Put together, this means that the features of semantic transitivity under scrutiny are responsible for the changes attested in the examined cases.

The organization of the article is as follows. Section 2 examines the coding of

certain transitivity features (affectedness, aspect, animacy and neutral vs. purposeful transfer) on the indirect object from a rather formal point-of-view. The motivation for the marking is discussed in Section 3. Section 4 summarizes the most important findings of the article.

2. The encoding of transitivity on the indirect object

2.1. Preliminaries

In this section, the coding of transitivity features on the indirect object will be examined. The relevant features comprise affectedness, aspect, animacy and the differences between what will be labelled neutral vs. purposeful transfer. This section is primarily formal in nature, the underlying motivation of the coding constituting the topic of Section 3.

2.2 Affectedness

Affectedness is without a doubt one of the central features of transitivity (see e.g. Tsunoda 1985: 393) This is reflected, for example, in the fact that the basic transitive construction of any language is defined with respect to events involving highly affected patients rather than clauses denoting experiences (see also [1]). The impact of affectedness is not confined to direct objects only, but the form of the indirect object may also be determined by the degree of affectedness of the referent of the indirect

object. Consider:

Alamblak (Sepik-Ramu)

- (4a) *yima-r kahpa-m nanho met-t-n*
person-3SG.M oil-3PL my woman-3SG.F-S.SET
hëta-më-r-m
put.REC.PAST-3SG.M-3PL

‘A man put oil on my wife’ (implication: the oil did not affect her)

- (4b) *yima-r nanho met-t kahpa-m hëta-më-r-t*
person-3SG.M my woman-3SG.F oil-3PL put-REC.PAST-3SG.M-3SG.F

‘A man put oil on my wife’ (implication: the oil did affect her) (Bruce 1984: 238)

Macedonian (Slavic, Indo-European)

- (5a) *ani pes by od něho kŕku*
not even dog.NOM would from him.GEN crust.ACC
chleba nezval
bread not took

‘Not even a dog would take a crust of bread from him’

- (5b) *ani pes by mu kŕku chleba nezval*
not even dog.NOM would him.DAT crust.ACC bread not took

‘Not even a dog would take away his crust of bread’ (Janda 1998: 258)

In Alambalak, the Goal surfaces as an adjunct whenever its referent is not affected by the profiled event in any dramatic fashion, as in (4a). On the other hand, the Goal takes the form of a direct object if the event has a more significant effect on the Goal, as in (4b). The examples in (5) demonstrate how the form of the Source varies according to affectedness. The examples denote the same (hypothetical) transfer of bread from man to dog, but the conveyed messages are radically different (see Janda 1998: 258). (5a) describes the transfer in neutral terms. In (5b), on the other hand, the Source is regarded as being dramatically affected by the event in question. The source directly experiences the loss, and it has a salient effect on him. The variation in (4) and (5) is very close to the typical spray/load alternation, such as *the farmer loaded the cart with hay* vs. *the farmer loaded hay onto the cart*, where the former implies a higher degree of affectedness of the cart. Cases similar to (4) and (5) have been reported for a number of other languages including Afrikaans (de Stadler 1996: 265ff), Yankunyjtjara (Goddard 1983: 32), Kayardild (Evans 1995: 334, 339), Yimas (Foley 1991: 309f), Dutch (Janssen 1998: 281), and Zulu (Taylor 1998: 76f).

2.3 *Aspect (completedness of events)*

Aspect constitutes another central facet of linguistic transitivity. Completed events rank higher for transitivity than non-completed ones, for example, in having a salient result. This section is concerned with languages which encode aspect (understood as different degrees of event completedness) by modifying the form of the indirect object. In so doing, it provides clear counterexamples to Blansitt's universal (Blansitt 1988: 181, see

above). The notion of aspect comprises two facets in this subsection. First, I will consider canonical instances of aspect, in which (non)completedness of events determines the marking of indirect objects. In addition, I will also examine the effects of permanence of transfer on indirect objects. In these cases, the event has been successfully completed (i.e. it is not imperfective), but the two instances of the same event differ according to the degree of resultativity. Permanent transfer is conceived of as more resultative in nature than temporary transfer, such as lending.

Examples of languages in which the completedness of events (i.e. whether the Goal has been reached or not) determines the marking of indirect objects are given in (6) and (7):

Wolaitta (Omotic, Afro-Asiatic)

(6a) *ʔastamareé mat'aápaá mišireé-yyo*

teacher.M.NOM book.DEF.M.ACC woman.DEF.F-DAT

yedd-iisi

send-3M.SG.PERF

'The teacher sent the book to the woman'

(6b) *ʔastamareé mat'aápaá mišireé-kko yedd-iisi*

teacher.M.NOM book.DEF.M.ACC woman.DEF.F-DIR send-3.MSG:PERF

'The teacher sent the book in the direction of the woman' (examples courtesy of

Azeb Amha)

Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, Australian)

(7a) *ya-nu-rna-rla* *walypali-ki*
 go-PAST-1SS-3DAT European-DAT
 ‘I went to the European’ (destination reached)

(7b) *ya-ru-rna* *walypali-kirra*
 go-PAST-1SS European-ALL
 ‘I went towards the European’ (destination not reached) (Simpson 1991: 325)

In Wolaitta, the use of the dative implies that the transferred entity has reached its destination, i.e. the denoted transfer has been successfully completed. The directive case, in turn, is used when the event is still ongoing, i.e. not completed. In Warlpiri, the variation is between reached and non-reached Goals of (intransitive) motion. The dative codes reached Goals (completed events), while the allative is used for non-reached Goals (non-completed events). Similar variation is also attested e.g. in Warao (Romero-Figeroa 1997: 46), Aranda (Wilkins 1989: 192) and Paamese (Crowley 1982: 197). A similar principle is at work also in English, as the free translations of (6) and (7) show.

The other facet of aspect, as the label is used in this article, is represented by the permanence of transfer (semantically these differences are close to the ‘give’ vs. ‘loan’ distinction of, for instance, English). Examples are found in (8) and (9):

Sochiapan Chinantec (Oto-Manguean)

(8a) *cuéh³²* *tsú²* *pé¹* *quie³* *tša³háu²*
 give.FUT.3 3 Peter money tomorrow
 ‘S/he will give Peter money tomorrow’

- (8b) *cué³² tsú² quie³ ñi^lcon²pé^l tsa³háu²*
 give.FUT.3 3 money to Peter tomorrow
 ‘S/he will give money to Peter tomorrow’ (Foris 1998: 212)

Harar Oromo (Cushitic, Afro-Asiatic)

- (9a) *xennáa náa-f xanne*
 gift me-DAT gave
 ‘He gave me a gift’

- (9b) *xennáa ná-tt xanne*
 gift me-LOC gave
 ‘He gave me a gift’ (Owens 1985: 111, 113)

In (8a) and (9a), the denoted transfer is seen as irrevocable, while (8b) and (9b) describe temporary transfer. In contrast to (6b) and (7b), the transfer is successfully completed in (8b) and (9b) as well, which means that the transfer has reached its destination. However, (8b) and (9b) lack a permanent result, since the possession of the Theme does not change. (8a) and (9a), on the other hand, denote events with a definite result, because the Theme is transferred to the Recipient’s domain of possession. The events denoted by (8a) and (9a) are thus more resultative in nature. Variation similar to that in (8) and (9) has been reported also for Wolaitta (Azeb Amha, p.c.), Indonesian (I Wayan Arka, p.c.), Chipewayan (Rice 1998: 97) and Afrikaans (de Stadler 1996: 276).

2.4 Animacy (*individuation*)

Animacy is another important facet of transitivity in that in many languages only animate (human) direct objects may occur, for example, in the accusative. Affected objects also bear this coding (see Naess 2003b). Animacy affects the coding of Goals in a variety of ways, too, as shown in (10)-(12) (a more detailed examination of this is found in Kittilä: submitted):

Korku (Munda, Austro-Asiatic)

(10a) *raja* *ra:ma-ke* *sita-ke* *ji-khe-nec*
king.NOM Ram-OBJ Sita-OBJ give-PAST-PERS
‘The king gave Sita to Ram’

(10b) *iñj* *ini-koro-ken* *mya* *kama:y-Ten* *Di-ga:w-en*
I this-man-OBJ one work-ABL that-village-DAT/LOC
kul-khe-nej
send-PAST-PERS
‘I sent this man for work to that village’ (Nagaraja 1999: 46, 97)

Finnish (Finno-Ugric, Uralic)

(11a) *lähetti* *lähett-i* *lähettime-n* *poja-lle*
messenger.NOM send-3SG.PAST transmitter-ACC boy-ALL
‘The messenger sent a/the transmitter to the boy’

(11b) *lähetti* *lähett-i* *lähettime-n* *lähetystö-ön*
messenger.NOM send-3SG.PAST transmitter-ACC embassy-ILL

‘The messenger sent a/the transmitter to the embassy’ (personal knowledge)

Fongbe (Gbe, Niger-Congo)

(12a) *kɔkú sɔ àsɔn ɔ ná Àsibá*

Koku take crab DEF give Asiba

‘Koku gave the crab to Asiba’

(12b) *kɔku sɔ àkwe ná kùtɔnú*

Koku take money give Cotonou

‘Koku gave money to Cotonou (a place name)’

(12c) *kɔkú ná Àsibá àsɔn*

Koku give Asiba crab

‘Koku gave Asiba crab’

(12d) **kɔku ná kùtɔnú àkwe*

Koku give Cotonou money

(Koku gave Cotonou money) (Lefebvre & Brousseau 2002: 445f, 448f, 422)

In Korku, animate (human) Goals take the dative case, while inanimate Goals appear in the locative. In Finnish, the variation is between allative (animate Goals) and illative (inanimate Goals) cases. In contrast to Korku, Goals can never surface as direct objects (in the accusative) in Finnish. Fongbe differs from Korku and Finnish in that the variation between animate and inanimate Goals is only optional. Both animate and inanimate Goals may be accommodated as a part of a serial verb construction, as in

(12a) and (12b). On the other hand, only animate Goals permit dative shift (the omission of *ná*), which promotes the Goal to direct object status.

2.5 *Neutral transfer vs. purposeful transfer*

The transfer in events like ‘the performance artist gave a book to the phonetician’ can be either neutral or it may have a specific purpose. In this article, the transfer is regarded as neutral if the agent merely transfers an entity to the Recipient’s sphere of control with no indication of what happens after that. The focus lies on the physical transfer of that entity from agent to Recipient. On the other hand, the transfer may also serve a specific purpose. As for the event noted above, this can, for example, mean that a book has been transferred to the phonetician for educational purposes such as acquiring a new language. The transfer itself may be exactly the same, but the two readings can be distinguished based on what happens after the transfer has occurred and whether this is deemed relevant (see also LaPolla & Huang 2003: 87 for a similar note on Qiang). Examples of languages in which this difference is relevant formally are found in (13) and (14):

Kayardild (Pama-Nyungan, Australian)

(13a) *dathin-a makurrarr-a bukabarnji-n-d wuu-ja*
that-NOM wallaby-NOM stink-n-NOM give-IMP
jardarrka-y
crow-LOC

‘That wallaby is stinking, give it to the crows’

- (13b) *maku* *dun-maru-tha* *wuu-ja nguku-wuru*
woman.NOM spouse-VD-ACT give-ACT water-PROP

‘A woman gives water to her spouse’ (Evans 1995: 335f)

Khmer (Mon-Khmer)

- (14a) *ʔo:pùk tɛ̀n* *siə̀vphɽu* *ʔaoy khnom*
father buy book ‘give’ 1SG

‘Father bought a book for me’

- (14b) *khnom tɛ̀n* *siə̀vphɽu* *nih səmrapko:n-pros*
1SG buy book DEM ‘use’ son

‘I buy this book for my son (in order that he will use it)’ (Bisang 1992: 418, 424ff)

(13a) and (14a) denote neutral transfer, while (13b) and (14b) describe events of transfer with a specific purpose. In other words, the Recipient is expected to do something with the transferred entity in (13a) and (14a), while this feature is backgrounded in (13b) and (14b). Formally, this difference is mirrored differently in Kayardild and Khmer. In Kayardild, it is the case marking of the Recipient that mirrors this difference: the (general) locative case is used for neutral transfer, while purposeful transfer is coded by the dative (Evans 1995: 334 labels the latter as ‘giving with an immediate benefit for the recipient’). In Khmer, it is the serial verbs used for accommodating indirect objects that encode this difference. The verb changes from ‘give’ to ‘use’, which very nicely

captures the semantic nature of the variation; the former verb is used for neutral transfer, while the latter verb is used for purposeful transfer.

Some readers may object to my discussing the difference between neutral and purposeful transfer in connection with the expression of *transitivity* on the indirect object. This can, however, be regarded as justified, because the differences examined in (13) and (14) are rather directly related to affectedness, and they also have features in common with definiteness. First, Recipients that use the transferred entity for a specific purpose are more affected by an event of transfer than Recipients that simply accept the transfer without any further consequences. For example, the change in the Recipient's state is more dramatic in (14b), in which the Recipient may educate himself by reading the transferred book. In (14a), in turn, the only change in the state of the Recipient is the entering of an entry into his/her sphere of control. Second, the differences between neutral and purposeful transfer are also rather closely related to individuation. The Theme of purposeful transfer is probably more definite than the Theme of a neutral transfer. This is also manifest in (14), as the free translations of the examples imply. What is relevant to the purposes of this article is that this difference is realized by modifying the coding of the indirect object.

3. The rationale

3.1. Preliminaries

In the previous section, it was shown that such features of semantic transitivity as affectedness, aspect and individuation (animacy) have formal consequences for the coding of indirect objects in a number of structurally and genetically diverse languages. The purpose of the present section is to discuss the motivation behind these cases. I will demonstrate that there are good reasons for expressing these features on the indirect object rather than the direct object (Theme) of clauses which denote events of transfer. The features are discussed below in the order in which they were examined in Section 2.

3.2. *Affectedness*

As shown in (4) and (5), the degree of affectedness associated with the Recipient determines the marking of indirect objects in a number of languages. For example, in Alambalak the indirect object surfaces as a direct object or as an adjunct depending on whether its referent is seen as being directly affected by the denoted event. The formal variation is thus very close to that attested for highly vs. less affected direct objects. The question that we need to answer is why these changes are manifested on the indirect object and not on the direct object.

The marking of affectedness on the indirect object is understandable in light of the features shared by patients and Recipients (animate Goals). First, animate Goals and Patients can be regarded as the primary targets of events. In other words, the intention of the agent is to modify the state of the patient in transitive events and the state of the Recipient in transfer events. From this it follows that they also register the effects of events in the most salient way, which makes animate Goals the most affected

participants of transfer events. Second, events of transfer affect the Theme in a rather consistent manner: only the location of the Theme changes. On the other hand, the Goal of a transfer event may be affected in a variety of ways depending on whether the denoted transfer has a direct effect on the Goal or whether the Recipient is going to use the transferred entity for a specific purpose. Third, animate Goals are, similarly to patients also the participant most responsible for the overall nature and affectedness of transfer events. Consequently, cases such as (4) and (5) also conform to the universal tendency to code the most affected participant of an event as a direct object (see e.g. Dixon 1994: 8). Given these facts the coding of affectedness on the indirect object of clauses denoting transfer events appears very natural.

3.3 *Aspect*

The expression of aspect on the indirect object can be explained very much in the same way as the coding of affectedness. The Recipient/Goal constitutes the endpoint of a transfer event. The event ceases to proceed when the transferred entity reaches the Goal. In other words, an event of transfer is regarded as being successfully completed when the Theme has reached the Goal. The Goal is thus the participant most relevant to the completedness of transfer events. In a similar vein, a transitive event has been successfully completed when the patient has been affected in the expected way. As a consequence, it is easy to see why the aspect of transfer events is expressed on the indirect object.

In Section 2.3, I also examined cases in which the permanence of transfer is expressed by modifying the form of the indirect object. Because aspect and permanence of transfer are closely related it does not come as a surprise that permanence is also coded on the indirect object in a number of languages (in Wolaitta both are coded by the same means, Azeb Amha, p.c.). As with aspect, the Goal is primarily responsible for the permanent vs. temporary nature of a transfer event. In other words, an event of transfer is conceived of as permanent whenever the Recipient does not return the bestowed entity. The contribution of the Theme to this is minimal. Moreover, the differences between permanent and temporary transfer correspond to the differences between instances of transfer which modify the possessive relations (permanent transfer) and those in which no changes in the possession relations are implied (temporary transfer). This is a feature characteristic of the transfer of entities, so that it is only natural that differences in permanence are coded on the indirect object. The relation to the transitivity of two-participant events is also manifest, because the effects are more drastic in nature, if an event affects the patient in a permanent fashion.

3.4 *Animacy (individuation)*

As shown in Section 2.4., animacy (or rather humanness vs. non-humanness) makes a contribution to the formal coding of Goals in a number of languages. Animacy differs from the two features discussed thus far in this section in that it is not a general feature of the denoted event, but rather a feature of the participants of the denoted events. In other words, the (in)animacy of the Goal does not depend on other features of the

overall event in any way. As a result, we should expect the (in)animacy of the Goal to be expressed on the indirect object, because this constitutes the most iconic way of expressing this difference.

The question that remains to be answered is why animacy should influence the coding of indirect objects to begin with. One of the central factors in this regard is probably represented by the intimate relation obtaining between animacy and affectedness. As was noted in Section 3.2, animate Goals (Recipients) are usually more affected by events of transfer than inanimate Goals. This follows largely from the fact that only animate Goals can use the transferred thing for a specific purpose, which is closely related to affectedness in the case of Goals. Animate Goals also have other features in common with patients, which makes it natural that animate Goals should receive the formal treatment of direct objects (which encode highly affected patients), while inanimate Goals are treated differently. This results in differential formal treatment accorded to Goals depending on the animacy of their referents.

3.5 *Neutral vs. purposeful transfer*

Neutral and purposeful instances of transfer are distinguished primarily on the basis of what happens after the denoted transfer has been successfully completed. An instance of transfer is regarded as neutral if the focus lies on the transfer itself without any implications about what happens after the transfer has occurred. On the other hand, the transfer is in the background and the focus lies on the resulting state whenever the transfer event serves a specific purpose. As such, the denoted transfer may be the same,

but it is viewed from different perspectives, which has formal consequences for the coding of the event in question.

As noted above, neutral and purposeful transfer are distinguished on the basis of which aspect of the transfer is focused on. Another difference, closely related to the difference in focus, concerns whether the denoted transfer implies active participation of the Recipient or not. Neutral transfer does not imply any active involvement in the denoted event by a Recipient (apart from accepting the transfer), while an event of transfer usually has a specific purpose only if the Recipient uses the transferred entity for the intended purpose. In other words, features related to the Recipient primarily determine whether an instance of transfer is regarded as purposeful or not. As a result, the most natural way of coding this difference is to modify the marking of the Recipient. Moreover, as was noted in Section 2.5, neutrality vs. purposefulness of transfer is closely related to affectedness, which makes it understandable that the difference is coded by modifying the case marking of arguments, i.e. in the same way as many transitivity alternations are marked. What is also noteworthy here is that examples such as (13) and (14) show that being an animate Recipient does not suffice for an indirect object to be coded in a certain way: the purpose of transfer also needs to be considered in some languages.

4. Final words

The present article has shown that a number of canonical transitivity features, such as affectedness, aspect and animacy, determine the marking of indirect objects in a number of languages. In so doing, the article has falsified the two universals proposed by Blansitt (1988: 181, repeated here for convenience):

No language suspends overt marking of dative or spatial functions because the referent is non-specific or indefinite.

No language signals completive or incompletive aspect by the form of its dative, allative or locative marking.

The first universal is falsified by languages such as Wolaitta (see (2)), while Tsez (see ex. (3)) and Warlpiri (see (7)) contradict the second proposed universal. To summarize, the present article has shown that transitivity affects the marking of arguments in a more thorough fashion than assumed thus far.

In Section 3, I discussed the underlying reasons for coding the transitivity features under scrutiny by modifying the form of the indirect object rather than the direct object, as would be usual for transitivity. I hope that the discussion in Section 3 has shown that the expression of transitivity on the indirect object follows primarily from the fact that the referents of the indirect object constitute the participant most relevant to the coded feature. For example, an event of transfer is seen as successfully completed when the transferred entity reaches the Recipient's sphere of control (or domain of possession). As a result, it is only natural that this feature is coded by

modifying the form of the indirect object. In a similar vein, affectedness is expressed on the direct object in many languages. What is also noteworthy here are the features shared by especially Recipients (animate Goals) and patients. Recipients and patients can both be regarded as the primary targets of events which register the effects of events in the most direct fashion. Consequently, it is not unduly surprising that they are accorded a similar formal treatment in a number of languages.

Abbreviations

ABL	Ablative	LAT	Lative
ABS	Absolutive	LOC	Locative
ACC	Accusative	LOG	Logophoric pronoun
ACT	Active	M	Masculine
ALL	Allative	NOM	Nominative
DAT	Dative	OBJ	Object
DEF	Definite	PART	Partitive
DEM	Demonstrative	PAST	Past tense
ERG	Ergative case	PAST.WIT	Witnessed past
F	Feminine	PERF	Perfective aspect
FUT	Future tense	PERS	Person marker
GEN	Genitive	PL	Plural
ILL	Illative	POSS-LAT	Possessive-lative
IMP	Imperative	PROP	Proprietary

REC.PAST	Recent past	SS	Same subject
SG	Singular	VD	Verbal dative
S.SET	Subject set		

References

- Bisang, W. (1992) *Das Verb im Chinesischen, Hmong, Vietnamesischen, Thai und Khmer*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Blansitt, E. L. Jr. (1988) Datives and allatives. In M. Hammond, E. Moravcsik, and J. Wirth (eds.) *Studies in syntactic typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 173–191.
- Bruce, L. (1984) *The Alamlak language of Papua New Guinea (East Sepik)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics
- Comrie, B. (2000) Valency-changing derivations in Tsez. In R.M.W. Dixon & A.Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 360–374.
- Comrie, B. & M. Polinsky (eds.) (1993) *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Crowley, T. (1982) *The Paamese language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, N. (1995). *Kayardild*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Foley, W. (1991) *The Yimas language of New Guinea*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Foris, D. (1998) Sochiapan Chinantec GIVE: A window into clause structure. In Newman (ed.) 1998: 209–248.
- Goddard, Cliff (1983). A grammar of Yankunytjatjara. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Linguistics: Australian National University.
- Hopper, P. J. & S. A. Thompson (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
- Janda, L. (1998) GIVE, HAVE and TAKE in Slavic. In Newman (ed.) 1998: 249–265.
- Janssen, T.A.J.M. (1998). Giving in Dutch: An intra-lexematical and inter-lexematical description. In Newman (ed.) 1998: 267–306.
- Kittilä, S. (2002) *Transitivity: Towards a comprehensive typology* (Publications in General Linguistics) Turku: Åbo Akademi Tryckeri.
- Kittilä, S. (2006) Anomaly of the verb ‘give’ explained by its high (formal and semantic) transitivity. *Linguistics* 44:3: 569–612.
- Kittilä, S. (submitted) Differential Object Marking revisited: Concerning the animacy effects on the encoding of Goals. *Linguistic Typology*.
- LaPolla, R. & Huang, C. (2003). *A grammar of Qiang*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lefebvre, C. & A. Brousseau (2002) *A grammar of Fongbe*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Naess, Å. (2003) Transitivity: from semantics to structure. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Nijmegen: Department of Linguistics, University of Nijmegen.

- Naess, Å. (2003b) What markedness marks: the markedness problem with direct objects. *Lingua* 114: 1186–1212.
- Nagaraja, K.S. (1999) *Korku language: grammar, texts, and vocabulary*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Newman, J. (ed.) (1998) *The linguistics of giving*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Owens, J. (1985). *A grammar of Harar Oromo (Northeastern Ethiopia)*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Rice, S. (1987) Towards a cognitive model of transitivity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Linguistics: University of California, San Diego.
- Rice, S. (1998) Giving and taking in Chipewyan: The semantics of THING-marking classificatory verbs. In Newman (ed.): 97–134.
- Romero-Figueroa, A. *A reference grammar of Warao*. Munich/Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Rousseau, A. (ed.) (1998) *La transitivité*. Paris: Septentrion.
- Simpson, J. (1991) *Warlpiri morpho-syntax: A lexicalist approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- de Stadler, L. (1996) The indirect object in Afrikaans. In W. van Langendonck & W. van Belle (eds.) *The Dative. Volume 1: Descriptive Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. 251–288.
- Taylor, J. R. (1998) Double object constructions in Zulu. In Newman (ed.) 1998: 67–96.
- Tsunoda, T. (1985) Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21: 385–396.
- Wilkins, D. P. (1989) Mparntwe Arrente (Aranda): Studies in the structure and semantics of grammar. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Linguistics, Australian National University.

1. The Academy of Finland (grant number 105771) has provided financial support for the present study. I would also like to express my gratitude to an anonymous referee for his/her comments on an earlier version of the present article.

2. The notion of indirect object is understood in a broad sense in this article. The label comprises all other arguments than the subject and the direct object. Semantically, the indirect object can thus denote goals, recipients, sources, beneficiaries, and maleficiaries (but not agents or patients of typical transitive events). Formally it may take the form of an adjunct or it may surface as a core argument and bear accusative/dative or absolutive (zero) marking.