VALENCE, ALIGNMENT SYSTEM AND AGREEMENT IN MARORI: WHAT DO WE LEARN?

This paper examines patterns of (alternative) argument realisations or valency classes in Marori from a typological and theoretical point of view. While the findings support the widely known fact that valency classes have a semantic basis, the nature of how surface grammatical valence and its underlying semantics are structured and encoded in the grammar of Marori raises interesting functional and theoretical issues regarding grammatical relations and agreement. Functionally I will show that differences in the valence marking in Marori are best explained in terms of the need to encode aspectually relevant force-dynamics (e.g., static, nonstatic) involved in the event conception (Vendler 1967, Talmy 2000). This is intertwined with the need to differentiate varying degrees of affectedness. Theoretically the complex interplay between morphosyntax and semantics involved in valence marking posses a challenge in the conception and modeling of linguistic levels involved and their inter-level interface.

The significance of aspectually related force-dynamics in the valence structure in Marori comes from the fact that it is central to the principle of argument indexing and auxiliary selection in this language. Table 1 summarizes the basic event/valency types (VT) involved, the associated verbal shapes (i.e. the verb root and the indexing morphology), and flagging (argument marking). The argument indexing is indicated by ✔ and ★ for subject and (first) object respectively.

EVENT & VALENCY TYPES (VT)		HEAD MARKING		DEPENDENT MARKING
		Prefixing	Suffixing	clitic =i
STATIC	VT-1 'static.states': **S✔ V✔**		*tombo*-**du** ✔ 'BE-1s.PRES' ['be a teacher, be dead']	S
DYNAMIC	VT-2 'Patientive, non.motion': **Sp✔ ✔V**	✔ **yu**-*nggo* 1s-AUX.FUT ['become dead, big, a teacher', 'sink/drown']		Sp:=*i*
	VT-3 'motion': **S(p)✔ V✔**		*soron*-**du**✔ fall-1sPRES ['fall', 'come', 'go(home)', 'walk', 'run', 'jump'	S Sp:=*i*
	VT-4 'Agentive': **Sa✔ V✔**		*nambana*-**du**✔ speak-1sPRES 'speak', 'shout', 'stand.up', 'sleep', 'bathe'	S
	VT-5 'intr.Middle': **S✔ ✔V✔**	✔ **yu**-ngg-ra-**du** ✔ 1s-AUX-PL-1sPRES ['afraid', 'happy', 'angry', 'forget', 'work', 'squat', 'unite.ourselves', 'dance']		S Sp:=*i*
	VT-6 'trans.middle' **S✔ O★ ✔V✔**	✔ **yu**-ngg-ra-**du** ✔ 1s-AUX-PL-1sPRES ['x afraid.of y', …]		S(exp.) O=*i*
	VT-7 'trans.active' **S✔ O★ ★V✔**	★∅-*panda*-**du**✔ 3-make-1sPRES ['make', 'push', 'see',…]		S O=*i*
	VT-8 'ditrans.active' **S✔ O★ O ★V✔**	★**k**-imo-**ru**✔ 2-give-1sFUT ['x fill.in y withy', 'x show y to z', …]		S O(go/rec)=*i* O(th)

The following important features should be noted. *Firstly*, the system does not fit easily with the known grammatical alignments (nominative vs. ergative vs. split (S) systems). While showing split-S properties, a closer investigation reveals that the alignment in Marori is not a clear split-S system because intransitive motion verbs and static states receive the same suffixing marking strategy (i.e., an A-like pattern), irrespective of whether they are patientive or agentive. *Secondly*, while valency structures in Marori are mainly semantically driven, there is evidence of grammaticalisation of the undergoer marker =*i* as an object marker. That is, =*i* can mark object that is thematically nonpatientive in a transitive structure. Of particular interest is the valence

structure of a psychological predicate such as *sira* 'x afraid.of y'. It can have different configurations with different auxiliary verbs and argument markings, which correlate with different meanings, as shown in (1).

(1). a. *woro   nuaryaifi   mbeki Thomas   sira   nggu-fi*   [Intrans.middle VT-5]
     rat   come.out-RmPST   so.that Thomas   fear   BE.NDU-RPST
     'a rat came out, and Thomas was scared.' (FSP.040: 00:02:58.860-00:03:01.910)

   b. *Na   sira   yu-ngg-ra-du*   [Intrans. middle VT-5]
     1s   fear   1s-AUX-DUR-1s.PRES
     'I am afraid/scared.'

   c. *Na   sira   yu-ngg-ra-du*   *koro=i*   [Trans.middle VT-6]
     1SG   fear   1SG-AUX-DUR-1SG.PRES   dog-OBJ
     'I am afraid of the dog.'

   d. *Na   hos   sira-won   tombo-du*   [Intrans.Static VT-1]
     1SG   ghost   scared-SG   BE-1SG.PRES
     'I am a person often scared of ghosts.'

(1a-c) show that the middle structure with the auxiliary root *ngg* is used for specific instances of being scared (i.e. in a given time; hence understood as dynamic states). In these structures the indexing makes use the combination of prefixing and suffixing, both agreeing with the subject *na*. In (1d), in contrast, a different verb (i.e, the copula *tombo* 'BE') is used with suffixing to express a static state expressing a constant property of being scared. Furthermore, the intransitive structure (1b) can be transitivised by making the stumulus, e.g. 'dog', explicit and marked by *=i*. Hence, the verbal morphology shows intransitive middle indexing whereas the syntax shows transitive flagging. The flagging with *=i* marks the presence of syntactic object. The clitic *=i* does not mark an undergoer role in this instance because the 'dog' is not in any sense being affected. Other evidence for the grammaticalisation of *=i* as an object marker comes from three-place valence structures with double *=i* marking (a version of VT-8; not exemplified here, to be discussed in the full paper).

   Valence structures and agreement marking of the type shown in (1c) raise important questions about the devision of labour, the tension or competition between morphology and syntax in grammar (Bresnan 1998). On the basis of this pattern, and other intriguing agreement facts such as constructed number in Marori (Arka 2011) and other Papuan languages such as Nen (Evans 2009, 2011), I argue that there is compelling evidence that valence properties are not only morpholexically determined, but also syntactically constructed. This provides good supports for a construction-based theory of grammar. From agreement patterns in Marori, however, we also learn that the traditional separation of morphology and syntax should be maintained. This is because not all morphological contrasts/features are relevant to syntactic agreement. For example, dedicated dual morphology on the verb in Marori can be thought of as argument indexing but in syntax it appears only with non-singular pronouns because there is no dual pronoun or dual nominal marking at all in Marori. Hence, theoretically there is in fact no syntactic dual agreement eventhough verbal dual morphology is involved.

References

Arka, I Wayan. 2011. "Constructive number systems in Marori and beyond." In *The proceedings of the International Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG2011) conference*, edited by Miriam Butt and T. Holloway King, 5-25. The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, 19 July 2011: CSLI, http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/LFG/16/lfg11-toc.html.

Bresnan, Joan. 1998. "Morphology competes with syntax: explaining typological variation in weak crossover effects." In *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and competition in Syntax*, edited by P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis and D. Pesetsky, 59-62. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press and MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Evans, Nicholas. 2009. Complementarity, unification, and non-monotonicity: bound pronominals, free NPs and argument status in a double-marking language (Nen). Canberra, a handout at the workshop on Complexities in Grammar, ANU 18 December 2009.

Evans, Nicholas. 2011. "Valence in Nen. Presented at Valence Workshop, Leipzig MPI-EVA, April 2011 " In *Valency Patterns*, edited by A. Malchukov, A. Hartman and M. Haspelmath. http://chl.anu.edu.au/linguistics/projects/sng_project/publications.php.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Volume 1: Concept structuring events*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Vendler, Z. 1967. "Verbs and Times." In *Linguistics in Philosophy*, 97–121. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.