

WPFG

working papers in functional grammar

wpfg no. 33
November 1989

An FG Analysis of Spocanian Passive Constructions
Rolandt Tweehuysen
University of Amsterdam

AN FG ANALYSIS
OF
SPOCANIAN PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

□ □ □

Rolandt Tweehuysen

Department for General Linguistics
University of Amsterdam
Spuistraat 210
1012 VT Amsterdam - Netherlands

November 1989

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.0. Introduction	1
1.1. Passive constructions in FG	1
1.1.1. English example	1
1.1.2. Swedish example	2
1.1.3. Valency reduction in general terms	3
2. Passive constructions in Spocanian	4
2.1. Traditional approach	4
2.2. Spocanian in comparison with Swedish	4
3. Use of the Spocanian passive	7
3.1. Passive construction on syntactic grounds	7
3.1.1. Coreferentiality in relative clauses	7
3.1.1.1. Relative pronouns	7
3.1.1.2. Verbal suffix <i>-lira</i>	9
3.2. Passive construction on pragmatic grounds	11
3.2.1. Focusing	11
3.2.2. Theme (left-dislocated constituents)	11
3.2.3. Ambiguity suppression	12
3.3. Conclusion	13
4. Agentless passives	14
4.1. Properties of the Heart	14
4.2. General properties of "real" passives in Spocanian	16
4.2.1. The suffix <i>-lije</i>	17
4.2.2. The dummy <i>blul</i>	18
4.2.3. Argument shift or not	19
4.2.4. The morphosyntactic form of the Goal	21
4.3. Is there a Heart in a <i>blul</i> -construction?	22
4.3.1. The Heart-test	23
4.3.2. The result of the Heart-test	25
4.3.3. The Functional Pattern	27
4.3.3.1. General	27
4.3.3.2. Traditional approach of the constituent order	28
4.3.3.3. The FG approach	29
4.3.4. From2 assignment in Agentless passives	33

5. Absence of arguments: inexistence and inexpression	36
5.1. Inexistence	36
5.1.1. Type I: no inexistence whatsoever	37
5.1.2. Type II: inexistence of the Recipient	39
5.1.3. Type III: inexistence of the Goal	39
5.1.4. Type IV: inexistence of Goal as well as Recipient	40
5.1.5. Type V: inexistence of the Agent	40
5.2. Inexpression	42
5.2.1. Inexpression of the Recipient	42
5.2.2. Inexpression of the Goal	43
5.2.3. Inexpression of the Agent	45
6. Pseudo-passives and passive pronouns	48
6.1. Pseudo-passives	48
6.1.1. Traditional approach	48
6.1.2. FG approach	49
6.1.2.1. Intransitive verbs	49
6.1.2.2. Transitive verbs	51
6.1.2.3. Predicate frames	52
6.2. Passive pronouns	55
6.2.1. Imperatives	55
6.2.1.1. General description	55
6.2.1.2. Agent-linking	57
6.2.2. Causatives	60
6.2.2.1. General description	60
6.2.2.2. Passive causatives	61
6.2.3. The nature of passive pronouns	63
6.3. Conclusion	65
7. Final Conclusion	67
7.1. Conclusion	67
7.2. A final word	68
Notes	70
References	85

1. INTRODUCTION*

1.0. Introduction

It is a long time since, in 1955, Peoll Quista-Rylle's study was published, in which Spocanian and Swedish passive constructions are compared without fitting these syntactic categories into some existing typological framework. Its title, "Spooksoliy -lije ur sveden -s: eft ýsðos" ('Spocanian -lije and Swedish -s: a comparison'), does not cover the whole story, for Spocanian in fact has two passive suffixes: -lije and -litā. Still, Quista-Rylle deals with both of them. He recounts a number of striking differences between the passives in these languages, at a syntactic level as well as a semantic one, yet he only offers a brief explanation for such distinctions.

As far as I know, Quista-Rylle's paper, which is more than thirty years old, is the only one to put Spocanian passive constructions in a non-Spocanian perspective, and we may wonder to what extent a Spocanian construction, which is regarded as "passive" in its traditional syntax, may be considered so from a semantic perspective too.

During these thirty years linguistics have not been at a standstill, and therefore it seems useful to reconsider the above-mentioned matter of passives, more precisely within a functional framework and in particular within FG.

First of all, I will briefly explain how FG approaches passive constructions. Subsequently, I will give the traditional analysis of the passives in Spocanian, commonly accepted in its grammar, after which I will prove that such an analysis is inadequate and that the instrument of FG is able to solve some of the problems involved.

1.1. Passive constructions in FG

1.1.1. English example

In FG, the distinction between active and passive is described in terms of Subj assignment. The following pair of sentences may serve as an example:

- (1) a. John reads the book
b. The book is read by John

For both constructions, the following (simplified) predicate frame is valid:

* With gratitude to Simon Dik and the editors for their useful comments, and to Joost den Haan who corrected my English.

(2) ready (x_1 : John (x_1))_{Ag} (x_2 : the book (x_2))_{Go}

If the Subject function is assigned to John, the active expression (1a) will be the outcome, while Subj assignment to the book will result in the passive expression (1b). Furthermore, there is the rule that an Agent is marked with the preposition by if no syntactic function (not even that of Subj) has been assigned. This way of passivization is explained in Dik (1978:18f,72f).

1.1.2. Swedish example

Whereas the manner of passivization, described in 1.1.1., is only a matter of Subj assignment, the Swedish constructions in (3) are liable to a more radical process:

- (3) a. Jan läser boken
John reads book-the
'John reads the book'
- b. Boken läses av Jan
book-the read-R by John
'The book is read by John'

(3a) is entirely equivalent to (1a), but (3b) is the result of a different predicate frame than the one that is valid for (3a): it is a frame with a deleted Agent argument:

- (4) a. INPUT: läsav (x_1 : Jan (x_1))_{Ag} (x_2 : boken (x_2))_{Go}
b. OUTPUT: läsav-s (\emptyset) (x_2 : boken (x_2))_Ø (y_1 : Jan (y_1))_{Ag}

The first argument (Agent) in (4a) is deleted, so that now the two-place predicate läsa is changed into the one-place läsas. The original valency =2 is thus reduced to =1. Morphosyntactically, this process of valency reduction is expressed by way of the suffix -s. In the gloss (3b), this suffix is symbolized by R = reduction marker. The deleted argument with the semantic function of Ag returns in (4b) as the satellite (y_1). Again, we should note the way in which the Agent (now a satellite) is marked for this function by a preposition. Swedish uses the preposition av 'by'.

The idea of valency reduction and the introduction of the term "reduction marker" would constitute a meaningless complication if the suffix -s were merely the equivalent of the English auxiliary to be, namely an instrument only for marking the Subj assignment to a non-first argument. As the Swedish suffix -s does not only accomplish a passive interpretation, but also can be interpreted - in other constructions with other verbs - as habitual, detransitivating, impersonal, reflexive, reciprocal (and perhaps there are other interpretations too), it is only natural that we should establish an overall task for this suffix, so that it may express a property inherent in all interpretations summed up here. Such a property entails that there is always one argument less in the predicate frame of a verb extended by this suffix, than there is in the predicate frame of the same, unsuffixed verb.

As far as Swedish is concerned, the idea of valency reduction has been analysed (together with the suffix -s) in Tweehuysen (1987). This phenomenon has also been investigated in other languages; a

more language-independent approach of valency reduction can be found in Dik (1983).

1.1.3. Valency reduction in general terms

Valency reduction is a form of predicate derivation. And because one can fit any predicate into a predicate frame, we may say that an output frame is derived from an input frame, in such a manner that this output frame contains one argument less. There are two ways of showing this schematically: to start with, the first argument can be deleted:¹

- (5) a. INPUT: Pred_V (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: Pred_{V-R} (∅) (x₂)_{Go}

Secondly, the second argument can be deleted:

- (6) a. INPUT: Pred_V (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: Pred_{V-R} (x₁)_{Ag} (∅)

The output frame (5b) results in a construction in which the Agent argument is lacking. As we have seen in 1.1.2., such a construction usually has a passive interpretation, but a pseudo-passive or impersonal interpretation may also be a possibility here.

The output frame (6b) can, for instance, lead to a reciprocal construction (lacking a Goal), like in the Swedish:

- (7) a. Vi kysser henne inte
 we kiss her not
 'We will not kiss her'
 b. Vi kysses inte
 we kiss-R not
 'We will not kiss each other'

In this paper, we are mainly concerned with the deletion of the first argument resulting in a passive interpretation.

□ □ □

2. PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SPOCANIAN

2.1. Traditional approach

Consider the following constructions with the three-place verb *kette* 'to give':²

- (8) a. *Jān kette enn ef mimpit ón Mariy*
 John give GO the book RE Mary
 'John gives the book to Mary'
- b. *Ef mimpit kettelije pai Jān ón Mariy*
 the book give-GSX AG John RE Mary
 'The book is given to Mary by John'
- c. *Mariy kettelitā pai Jān enn ef mimpit*
 Mary give-RSX AG John GO the book
 'Mary is given the book by John'

From the one active construction and the two passive ones in (8), the following may be inferred:

- in principle, the Agent is marked by the determinant *pai*, the Goal by *enn*, and the Recipient by *ón*. *Pai* and *ón* correspond with the English 'by' and 'to';
- one of these three arguments is placed before the verb, where it has the function of something that is called a Clause-heart in Spocanian grammar (in short: a Heart). Thus, we have an Agent-Heart, a Goal-Heart and a Recipient-Heart;
- the Heart is not marked by *pai*, *enn* or *ón*;³
- if the Goal acts as a Heart, the verb is suffixed with *-lije*; the verb receives the suffix *-litā* when the Recipient is the Heart;
- arguments that do not act as a Heart are subject to the following rigid order: Agent - Goal - Recipient.

I shall maintain the traditional term "Heart" for the time being, as it does not entirely overlap the FG notion "Subject". In fact, this lack of overlap is the crux of the problem scrutinized in this paper.

2.2. Spocanian in comparison with Swedish

For the time being, the "Recipient passive" as illustrated in (8c) shall be left out of account, and we will draw a comparison here between the Swedish *s*-passive and the Spocanian *lije*-passive:

- (9) a. Boken läses av Jan
 b. Ef mimpit trempelije pai Jän
 the-book read-SX by John
 'The book is read by John'

In the common gloss, the verbal suffix (-s resp. -lije) has deliberately not been symbolized by the reduction marker "R", but by a neutral "SX" (= suffix). The reason for this will become clear in this section.

It is stated in 1.1.2., that, in Swedish, it is plausible to define the suffix -s as a reduction marker. This implies that, in (9a), the Agent av Jan is a satellite, which may be omitted by definition. Construction (10a) is therefore grammatical, and perhaps even more common than a passive with an Agent satellite:

- (10) a. Boken läses
 book-the read-R
 'The book is being read'

On the other hand, the equivalent Spocanian construction is un-grammatical:

- (10) b. *Ef mimpit trempelije
 the book read-GSX

As the Agent in a Spocanian passive construction cannot be left unexpressed, it can never attain the satellite status in such a construction, and so it must be an argument. Therefore, in (9b) it is a question of the two-place predicate trempelije, whereas in (9a) we find the one-place predicate läsas (infinitive of läses). In consequence, the ungrammaticality of (10b) is explained in the same way as the ungrammaticality of

- (11) *Trempe [enn] ef mimpit
 read GO the book

namely by stating that an Agent argument always must be expressed (unless it is a question of coreferring Agents in subordinate or coordinate clauses); for example, see the constructions in note 25.

Contrary to the Swedish suffix -s, the suffix -lije is not a reduction marker, and therefore the predicate frame of trempelije is not a derived frame. This means that the appearance of -lije is the result of an expression rule, dictating the addition of this suffix when the Goal appears as a Heart. Thus, respectively the following predicate frames are valid for the passives in (9):

- (12) a. läsa_y-s (Ø) (x₂: boken (x₂))_Ø (y₁: Jan (y₁))_{A₀}
 b. trempe_y (x₁: Jän (x₁))_{A₀} (x₂: ef mimpit (x₂))_{Ø₀}

Whereas the Swedish -s appears at the level of predicate formation, and therefore is part of the predicate frame, -lije does not appear until the level at which the expression rules operate. That is why -lije is no more part of the predicate frame than the determinants pai, enn and ön, and so it has the same status as for

instance the English passive marker *to be*, which is not an element within a predicate frame either.

Moreover, the Swedish argument *boken* in (12a) has lost its original semantic *Go* function (apparent from the subscript \emptyset), for *Go* is not a possible semantic function of a one-place predicate like *läsas*. On the other hand, *trempe* in (12b) is a non-derived two-place predicate in which the second argument *ef mimpit* is the regular *Goal*.

These distinctions in semantic function between the Swedish in (12a) and the Spocanian in (12b) require closer scrutiny of the relationship between the "point of departure" from which the *SoA* is described and the second Argument's semantic function. Chapter 3 deals with some conditions for the use of the Spocanian passive. There we shall see that there is often no "passive meaning", in the sense that the *SoA* is approached from a different perspective (see also Dik 1978: 71).

□ □ □

3. USE OF THE SPOCANIAN PASSIVE

If the Spocanian passive construction discussed in chapter 2, is unable to drop the Agent in order to present the SoA from a different perspective, while in addition the semantic functions of Ag and Go are maintained (as appears from schema (12b)), the obvious question arises what the purpose of such a passive may be. Is there any semantic difference between an active and a passive? And what justifies the use of a passive?

Spocanian syntax stipulates a number of cases in which a passive is perhaps unrequired, but nevertheless recommendable. Moreover, there are several pragmatic instances in which the use of a passive is perhaps not compulsory, but nevertheless preferred. As the nature of this paper does not comprise an exhaustive description of Spocanian grammar, I will only explain the syntactic and pragmatic cases below that are relevant for discussing the differences between Agent-containing and Agentless passives (in chapter 4). A comprehensive analysis of the use of the Spocanian passive can be found in Yrmöheide-Jertek (1982: Ch.9).

3.1. Passive construction on syntactic grounds

3.1.1. Coreferentiality in relative clauses

There are two ways of constructing a relative clause:

- (i) by using a relative pronoun
- (ii) by using the verbal suffix *-lira*

Both relative clause types are restricted by a rigid constituent order, which may require modification for several reasons. Heart assignment to a different constituent ("passivization") is an appropriate means of somewhat adjusting this order. Below, (i) and (ii) will be analysed more closely.

3.1.1.1. Relative pronouns

As to relative clauses with a relative pronoun, the following three rules are of interest:

- (i) If the antecedent of a relative pronoun is a non-Heart, it is marked by the determinant *ki*.
- (ii) A relative clause always follows after the matrix clause.
- (iii) A relative pronoun always occupies the original position reserved for the relevant semantic function.

This may be clarified by a few examples:

- (13) a. Ef vlemót byte ef krodūr, tē melde kost ýksaner
 the butcher beat the baker who be my neighbour
 'The butcher who is my neighbour beats the baker'

- b. Ef vlemót byte ki ef krodūr, té melde kost ýksaner
 the butcher beat DET the baker who be my neighbour
 'The butcher beats the baker who is my neighbour'

In (13a), the considerable distance between the matrix Heart ef vlemót and the coreferring relative pronoun té can be reduced by passivization. Thus, compare (13a) with:

- (14) Ef krodūr byteliþe pai ki ef vlemót, té melde kost ýks.
 the baker beat-GSX AG DET the butcher who be my neigh.
 'The baker is beaten by the butcher who is my neighbour'

It is more obvious in (14) that the subordinate clause is related to ef vlemót, than is the case in (13a). Also note that in (14) the passive is not used under the compulsion of syntactic restrictions requiring a certain argument in the Heart function, but, on the contrary, is used to deprive the Heart function of an argument, so that the argument order may be changed.

In (15), the relative pronoun serves as a Recipient:

- (15) Ef 'jan lāzāre eft karé, eup kette ef svāme-doytō ón té
 the boy inhabit a boat she give the life-jacket RE that
 'The boy she gives the life-jacket to, lives on a boat'

The distance between té and the antecedent ef 'jan can be reduced by passivization of the subordinate clause, so that the Recipient becomes the Heart and "moves" to the left:

- (16) Ef 'jan lāzāre eft karé, té kettelitā pai eup
 the boy inhabit a boat that give-RSX AG she
 enn ef svāme-doytō
 GO the life-jacket

'The boy to whom she gives the life-jacket, lives on a boat'

The distance between té and ef 'jan can be further reduced by also turning the matrix clause into a passive:

- (17) Eft karé lāzāreliþe pai ki ef 'jan, té kettelitā pai eup
 a boat inhabit-GSX AG DET the boy that give-RSX AG she
 enn ef svāme-doytō
 GO the life-jacket

('A boat is lived on by the boy who is given the life-jacket by her')

'The boy who is given the life-jacket by her, lives on a boat'

(the somewhat curious literal English translation is given between (3)).

It is outside the scope of this article to expand in detail on the stylistic and other possible distinctions that exist between alternatives like (15), (16) and (17). Still, it may be useful to point out that, in (17), there is no question of any change in perspective, in this sense that here something is primarily said about the boat on which the boy lives; the presence of a relative clause evokes the need to reduce the distance between the relative pronoun and its antecedent, in such a way that passivization only can be interpreted as a means of reducing this distance, and not as a means of actually changing the perspective from which the SoA is approached.

3.1.1.2. Verbal suffix *-lira*

For relative clauses that are formed with the verbal suffix *-lira*, the following rules apply:

- (i) The suffix *-lira* comes in place of the relative pronoun.
- (ii) The relative clause always follows directly after the antecedent.

I would like to emphasize that rule (i) is actually a popular description of the visible tip of a complicated process underlying the *lira*-constructions.

Rule (i) and (ii) may be illustrated by the following example:

- (18) a. Ef vlemót byte ef krodūr, té melde kost ýksaner
 the butcher beat the baker who be my neighbour
 'The butcher who is my neighbour, is beating the baker'
- b. Ef vlemót, meldelira kost ýksaner, byte ef krodūr
 the butcher be-ing my neighbour beat the baker
 'idem'

Rule (i) "changes" té melde kost ýksaner into meldelira kost ýksaner.

Rule (ii) "shifts" meldelira kost ýksaner right behind the antecedent ef vlemót. This "movement" is required, because, in combination with a relative pronoun, the determinant *ki* marking the antecedent cannot be used with *-lira*.⁴

The rule that a relative *lira*-construction must always follow right behind its antecedent, conflicts with the tendency to avoid "fragmentation" as far as possible in a Spocanian clausal structure. In FG terms, fragmentation of a clause is particularly avoided at a nuclear level, or more precisely: there is strong resistance towards inserting any element between the predicate and its related arguments (with the exception of a limited group of adverbials). In (18b), the subordinate clause meldelira kost ýksaner is inserted between the Heart and the verb. As long as a *lira*-clause does not have too much "weight" (is not highly complex), as in (18b), the fragmentation is acceptable, particularly in spoken language. Heavier clauses, however, tend to make the whole construction ungrammatical, for instance:

(19) ?*Ef vlemót, tinkereþira þröchök kost kleter ýksaner
the butcher become-ing probably my new neighbour

fes ef julecýr tradam, byte ef krodúr
in the july-GEN advance beat the baker

'The butcher, who in the course of July is likely to become
my new neighbour, is beating the baker'

The ungrammaticality of (19) can easily be solved by passiviza-
tion, so that the antecedent ef vlemót is moved to the right-hand
periphery of the nuclear cluster:

(20) Ef krodúr bytelije þai ef vlemót, tinkereþira þröchök
kost kleter ýksaner fes ef julecýr tradam

'The baker is being beaten by the butcher who is likely to
become my new neighbour, in the course of July'

The movement of "heavy" constituents to the rear is discussed by
Dik (1978:174f,191f) in his "LIPOC" hypothesis (Language-indepen-
dent preferred order of constituents). Dik illustrates LIPOC by
the following examples, among others:

(21) a. ... dat ze aan me denkt
that she of me thinks

b. ?... dat ze denkt aan me
that she thinks of me

(22) a. ... dat ze aan haar moeder denkt
that she of her mother thinks

b. ... dat ze denkt aan haar moeder
that she thinks of her mother

(23) a. ?... dat ze aan haar moeder die alleen thuis is denkt
that she of her mother who alone at.home is thinks

b. ... dat ze denkt aan haar moeder die alleen thuis is
that she thinks of her mother who alone at.home is

The increasing complexity of the bold constituents runs entirely
parallel to the possibility of moving such constituents to the
right-hand periphery: the scale ranges from "unacceptable" (in
(21b)) to "very desirable" (in (23b)).

Whereas the constituent order in Dutch may be varied without syn-
tactic consequences, it is necessary in Spocanian to use a passiv-
ization process in order to vary it. It is still to be examined
what the precise interaction between LIPOC and such syntactic pro-
cesses is; but this question is less relevant within the scope of
this paper.

3.2. Passive construction on pragmatic grounds

3.2.1. Focusing

Dik (1978:93f) remarks that typical Focus constituents are to be found in question-answer pairs. In (24), the bold constituents have the Focus function:

- (24) a. **What** does John buy?
 b. John buys a **melon**.

In a language like English, the Focus function in a question is marked by placing the relevant constituent (the interrogative pronoun) in the initial position. On the other hand, the answer as such lacks a morphosyntactic Focus marking. From (25), it appears that Spocanian does this exactly the other way round:

- (25) a. Jān lorerde klufft?⁵
 John buy what
 'What does John buy?'
 b. Eft melōne lorerdelije pai Jān
 a melon buy-GSX AG John
 'A melon is bought by John' or 'John is buying a melon'

In (25a) the Focus constituent (interrogative pronoun klufft 'what') takes the Goal position, relevant in all Present tense clauses (this means that, in Spocanian, the distinction between affirmative clauses and interrogative ones is not expressed in the constituent order, but only in intonation and in the presence/absence of an interrogative pronoun or particle). The Focus function of eft melōne in (25b) is morphosyntactically expressed by assigning the Heart function to it: consequently, it is a (Goal) passive.

Note that the active construction

- (26) Jān lorerde eft melōne 'John buys a melon',

which is otherwise correct, cannot serve as an answer to question (25a) (but may be a possible answer to the question Jān paine klufft? 'What is John doing?').

3.2.2. Theme (left-dislocated constituents)

In 3.1.1.2., we have pointed out that a Spocanian nuclear cluster is hardly subject to fragmentation. This property sees to it that a function like Theme is not simply available, and that a certain syntactic condition must be fulfilled first: the Theme has to appear as Heart. That is why a Topic which, according to Dik (1978:92), prefers expression by way of the Theme function, often is found in a passive construction.

Compare the following examples:

- (27) a. Kirro nert invóbe Petriy
 we not invite Peter
 'We will not invite Peter'
- b. Petriy nert invóbelije pai kirro
 Peter not invite-GSX AG we
 'Peter is not invited by us'
- c. Petriy, [ki] do nert invóbelije pai kirro
 Peter DET he not invite-GSX AG we
 'As for Peter, we will not invite him'

In (27b), Petriy functions as the Heart, and as a Theme it may be located on the left-hand side of the matrix-clause. This leads to (27c), in which it may be noted that the Heart position is now occupied by the pronoun do 'he', optionally marked by the coreference marker ki, which we have already seen in combination with relative pronouns (3.1.1.1).

3.2.3. Ambiguity suppression

Consider the following construction:

- (28) Elsa trempe ef quiyrda kaf ef kelbra
 Elsa read the newspaper on the table
 'Elsa is reading the paper on the table'

In Spocanian as well as in English, this sentence is ambiguous because the prepositional phrase kaf ef kelbra 'on the table' may either determine (i) the action as a whole (Elsa is sitting/lying/standing on the table and reads her paper there), or (ii) only ef quiyrda 'the paper' (the paper which is lying on the table is read by Elsa). The Spocanian restriction as to the fragmentation of a nuclear cluster and the fact that the order of Agent, verb and Goal determines the tense⁶, prevent the ambiguity from being suppressed in a smooth way. In fact, it is only possible to place the prepositional phrase kaf ef kelbra in the initial position:

- (29) Kaf ef kelbra Elsa trempe ef quiyrda
 on the table Elsa read the newspaper
 'On the table Elsa is reading the paper'

In (29), ambiguity has indeed been suppressed, as its interpretation can only be that Elsa is also on the table; but the initial position of such a prepositional phrase means that it has a strong Focus function which may be explained in two ways: first, it could be interpreted as a contrast, meaning that Elsa is on the table and not under it, or indicating that Elsa is on the table, and not on the cupboard; and secondly, the Focus function may be required as an answer to the question: 'Where does Elsa read her newspaper?'

The only way to suppress the ambiguity in (28) without creating a strong Focus function (as in (29)), is to use a passive:

- (30) a. Ef quiyrda trempeliije pai Elsa kaf ef kelbra
 the newspaper read-GSX AG Elsa on the table
 'The paper is being read by Elsa on the table'
- b. Ef quiyrda kaf ef kelbra trempeliije pai Elsa
 the newspaper on the table read-GSX AG Elsa
 'The paper on the table is being read by Elsa'
or 'Elsa is reading the paper that is on the table'

Once again, the passive (or more aptly: the Heart function of the Goal) is primarily a means of changing the constituent order, and this overrules the possibility of considering the SoA from a different perspective.

3.3. Conclusion

In many cases a shift from the active to the passive (or the other way round) takes place because the related shift in Heart assignment brings about a change in the constituent order, desirable for certain reasons. In addition to this, an argument acting as a Heart may become subject to several syntactic and pragmatic operations that cannot be carried out on non-Hearts.

The traditional view that the assignment of the Heart function is exclusively related to the passivization operation, is inadequate; for, in order to change the perspective on the SoA, the Heart function often gets assigned for a very different reason than to express a passive. In this connection, it is significant that so-called passive constructions are also possible, and even compulsory, in verbs that can never be interpreted as "passive" semantically, as for instance in the answer in (31b):

- (31) a. Jān ytende beri tinkere klufft?
 John intend INF become what
 'What does John intend to become?'
- b. Eft gekker tinkereliije pai do.
 a teacher become-GSX AG he
 {'A teacher is became by him'}
 'He will become a teacher'

In (31b), a "passive construction" is used in order to meet the rule that the Focus in this answer must appear as a Heart. In this context, I would like to bring to mind that the Agent in (31b) cannot be omitted. But it is possible to reduce (31b) to such a degree that only the Heart (Focus!) remains. Compare the following:

- (32) a. Jān ytende beri tinkere klufft? - *Eft gekker tinkereliije.
 b. Jān ytende beri tinkere klufft? - Eft gekker.

Agent deletion, which justifies a "real" passive interpretation, will be discussed in chapter 4.

4. AGENTLESS PASSIVES

4.1. Properties of the Heart

Along with the syntactic and pragmatic phenomena listed in 3.1. and 3.2., which make Heart-assigning operations recommendable or even necessary, a number of Heart properties that distinguish a Heart from a non-Heart, are implicitly mentioned. Let us consider the summary below:

- (A) **Relative pronouns:**
if a relative pronoun refers to the Heart, there is no special marker. Every non-Heart argument is marked by *ki*, as soon as it appears as an antecedent to a relative pronoun.
- (B) **Focusing:**
in an answer to a question, the Focus can only act as a Heart. A non-Heart argument can never become Focus.⁷
- (C) **Topicalization:**
as such, a Topic is expressed by assigning the Heart function to it; only then, may this constituent be placed outside the matrix clause as a Theme.

A few properties may be added to this list, which indeed do not lead to Heart-assigning operations, but are nevertheless inherent in the Heart function:

- (D) **Reflexivity:**
the reflexive possessive pronoun *sener*⁸ is used when the possessor corefers with the Heart.

Examples:

- (33) a. *Jān trempe sener mimpit*
John read REFL book
'John reads his (own) book'
- b. *Gress trempe sener mimpit*
I read REFL book
'I read my (own) book'
- (34) a. *Lerdu ur Myzo byteliije pai sener sientur*
Lerdu and Myzo beat-*GSX* AG REFL mother
'Lerdu and Myzo are being beaten by their (own) mother'
- b. *Gress byteliije pai hift sientur*
I beat-*GSX* AG their mother
'I am being beaten by their mother'

In (34a), we have a mother with two sons, Lerdu and Myzo, who are both being beaten by her. In (34b), the "normal" possessive pro-

noun *hifit* (3pl.m) is used because this does not refer to the Heart gress 'I'.

- (E) Presence/absence of semantic markers:
the semantic markers *pai*, *enn* and *on* can never be combined with a Heart.

Examples:

- (35) a. **Pai Jān trempe enn ef mimpit*
AG John read GO the book
'John is reading the book'
b. **Enn ef mimpit trempelije pai Jān*
GO the book read-GSX AG John
'The book is read by John'

- (F) Verbal derivations from pronouns:
Every personal pronoun has verbal derivations that can be used in a rather "idiosyntactic" way. One of their possible applications is to express emphasis, or more precisely: they focus the entity to which the Heart refers. Such emphasis cannot be expressed within the domain of a non-Heart.

The verbal derivation from pronouns reminds one very much of the productive verbal derivations from adjectives, such as *glado* 'happy' → *gladoe* 'to be happy'. For instance, *gressere* 'to be me' is derived from the personal pronoun *gress* 'I'. This verb can be used in impersonal constructions like:

- (36) *Ef nert gressere, tē tiffe eup*
it not I.be that know she
{ 'It is not me, who knows her' }
'I don't know her' ("I" is stressed)

In (36), we encounter the - impersonal - matrix clause *ef nert gressere* 'it is not me', followed by a relative clause with the relative pronoun *tē* 'that/who'. The "idiosyntactic" thing about (36) is that the antecedent of the relative pronoun is not a nominal constituent in the matrix clause, but rather the entity the verbalized personal pronoun (1sg) is referring to.⁹

There are some restrictions to this extraordinary reference by way of *tē* in (36), and one of them is that *tē* always must act as a Heart. That is why (37a) is ungrammatical, while (37b) is correct (*eppere* is the verbal derivation from *eup* 'she' 3sg.f):

- (37) a. **Ef nert eppere, gress tiffe tē*
it not she.be I know that
b. *Ef nert eppere, tē tiffelije pai gress*
it not she.be that know-GSX AG I
{ 'She is not the one known by/to me' }
'That one I do not know'
or 'She is not the one I know'

- (G) Determinative pronoun *nem*:
If *nem* takes the Heart function, this requires a personal

pronoun 3rd person or the indefinite pronoun stus 'one' in the subordinate clause belonging to it. If nem is not the Heart, a relative pronoun will appear in the subordinate clause. The following examples may illustrate this:

- (38) a. Do westare nem, té melde nonsens
 he assert that what he nonsense
 'What he is asserting, is nonsense'
 or 'It is nonsense, what he is asserting'
- b. Nem westarelije pai do, ef melde nonsens
 that assert-BSX AG he it he nonsense
 'What is asserted by him, is nonsense'
 or 'It is nonsense what is asserted by him'

In (38a), nem is not a Heart, and therefore it is referred to by the relative pronoun té. In (38b) however, nem is the Heart. Thus, the personal pronoun ef 'it' follows in the relative clause.

The properties (A) - (B) are an excellent means of testing whether a certain constituent has been assigned the Heart function or not. See section 4.3.

4.2. General properties of "real" passives in Spocanian

After all that has been said above about the fact that lije- and litā-constructions do not seem to be real passives, because the present of an Agent is compulsory and the perspective on the SoA is subordinate to syntactic or pragmatic considerations for using a lije- or litā-construction, it is now time to look at those lije- and litā-constructions which do satisfy the classic requirements of a passive construction. These might be the lije- and litā-constructions that lack an Agent, and such constructions certainly exist:

- (39) a. Blul trempelije pert mimpits fes Yslandes
 DUMMY read-BSX many books in Iceland
 'There are many books read in Iceland'
- b. Blul fesreppelitā Peoil enn eft kleter goftróða
 DUMMY promise-RSX Paul GO a new flat
 'Paul is promised a new flat'

By definition, these Agentless constructions can only result from a derived predicate frame, in which the Agent argument has been deleted. So, the following operations have taken place in the respective cases of trempe and fesreppa:

- (40) a. INPUT: trempe_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂: pert mimpits (x₂))_{So}
 b. OUTPUT: trempe_v (Ø) (x₂: pert mimpits (x₂))_{So}

(for the sake of clarity, the satellite fes Yslandes has been omitted here.)

- (41) a. INPUT: *fesreppøy* (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2 : *eft kleter goftróða* (x_2))_{Go}
(x_3 : *Peoll* (x_3))_{Rac}
- b. OUTPUT: *fesreppøy* (\emptyset) (x_2 : *eft kleter goftróða* (x_2))_{Go}
(x_3 : *Peoll* (x_3))_{Rac}

For the present, we will restrict ourselves to Goal passives as in (39a). Once these are clear, there will be no problem with the Recipient passives, as in (39b). Construction (39a) bears an uncanny resemblance to certain equivalents in European languages like English (also in (39a)), Swedish ((42a)) and Dutch ((42b)):

- (42) a. *Det läses många böcker på Island*
DUMMY read-R many books on Iceland
- b. *Er worden veel boeken in IJsland gelezen*
DUMMY are many books in Iceland read

However, the *blul*-constructions differ on three points from their European equivalents:

- (i) the nature of the passive marker *-lije*
- (ii) the restrictions as to the appearance of *blul*
- (iii) the morphosyntactic form of the Goal¹⁰

In the following sections, these three points will be scrutinized.

4.2.1. The suffix *-lije*

In (42), the Swedish suffix *-s* serves as a reduction marker (see 1.1.2.); in (39a), *-lije* can never be such a marker: for, in the preceding sections this suffix has already appeared without any argument deletion. The appearance of *-lije* in (39a) is therefore not a result of Agent deletion, but rather of the fact that somehow there is a Goal-Heart here. That is why the suffix *-lije* cannot be the reduction marker R (see predicate frame (5b)).

Here we encounter a traditional moot point in Spocanian grammar: is there still a Heart present in a *blul*-construction, or is this not the case? If it is, the presence of *-lije* must be attributed to the Goal's Heart function; if not, it should be explained why *-lije* nevertheless appears in a *blul*-construction.

The followers of the traditional grammarian *Lerdu-Sypa Kojen-Pöt* reject the existence of a Heart in *blul*-constructions on formal-syntactic grounds. Only those constituents appearing before the verb and without the determinants *pai*, *enn* or *ön*, are to be called a Heart (for discussion, see *Kalis-Moëlehe* 1983).

The disciples of the transformationalist *Quela Pärdoва* regard every constituent as a Heart in which the addition of *pai*, *enn* or *ön* results in an ungrammatical construction. That is why, according to them, *pert mimpits* in (39a) and *Peoll* in (39b) are Hearts.

By way of the properties inherent in a Heart, mentioned in 4.1., it should be very easy indeed to verify which of the two parties is right, but unfortunately not all above-mentioned properties can be assigned to an argument that might be considered a Heart in a *blul*-construction. It is therefore still an open question

whether all properties listed above are really necessary in order to regard a constituent as a Heart.

In 4.3.2., we will see that FG is able to solve this moot point.

4.2.2. The dummy blul

In the European languages, the dummy (or, in traditional terminology: the provisional Subject) mainly occurs in combination with an indefinite Goal. Next to the dummy construction, there is always still a dummyless variant in which the Goal appears in the position before the verb, as it does in Swedish and English:

(43) a. Det läses många böcker här (Swedish)
 DUMMY read-R many books here
 'There are many books being read here'

b. Många böcker läses här
 many books read-R here
 'Many books are being read here'

Moreover, dummies occur in existential non-passive clauses, like:

(44) Det bor många människor här
 'There are many people living here'

Contrary to this, the Spocanian dummy blul¹¹ occurs exclusively in lije- and litā-constructions and cannot be deleted in favour of the Goal's initial position:

(45) a. Blul trempelije pert mimpits kusami (= (43a))
 b. *Pert mimpits trempelije kusami (cf. (43b) and (10b))

(46) a. Pert veldurs zāre kusami
 many people live here
 'Many people live here'

b. *Blul zāre pert veldurs kusami
 there live many people here (cf. (44))

Under the impression that a Heart is lacking in a blul-construction, Kojen-Pöt and the other traditionalists conclude that the Heart has actually been replaced by blul. Because of their view that the Heart is found after the verb in blul-constructions, Pārdova and other transformationalists believe blul to be a trace of Agent deletion.

Blul's property of only occurring in constructions with a deleted Agent, or, in other words, constructions resulting from a derived predicate frame, justifies the hypothesis that blul is in fact the reduction marker R. That is why the frame derivations in (40) and (41) should be written as:

(47) a. INPUT: tremp_{ey} (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂: pert mimpits (x₂))_{θθ}
 b. OUTPUT: tremp_{ey} blul (θ) (x₂: pert mimpits (x₂))_{θθ}

(48) a. INPUT: fesreppey (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2 : eft kleter goftróða (x_2))_{Go}

(x_3 : Peoll (x_3))_{Rec}

b. OUTPUT: fesreppey blul (\emptyset) (x_2 : eft kleter goftróða

(x_2))_{Go} (x_3 : Peoll (x_3))_{Rec}

From now on I will call blul a "reduction marker" (R), and not a "dummy" any longer. Contrary to a language like Swedish, Spocanian constructions with a reduction marker only have a passive interpretation. And what is more, the Swedish reduction marker is a verbal suffix, whereas its Spocanian counterpart is a lexical morpheme that must accommodate itself to the Functional Pattern like any other constituent. Perhaps one can advance arguments for not accepting blul as a reduction marker in the derived predicate frame, and to regard it instead as a "position filler", which is only added when one of the positions in the Functional Pattern appears to be open because the Agent has been deleted. I will return to this Functional Pattern in 4.3.3., and it will appear from 4.3.4. that there certainly is a valid reason for introducing blul into the predicate frame as a reduction marker.

4.2.3. Argument shift or not

In view of the frames (47) and (48), I would like to mention an operation known as "argument shift", which has been discussed by Dik (1985) and others. In many languages, output frames with an open first-argument position, as in (47b) and (48b), are unacceptable. Such frames conform to the more general model of non-derived predicate frames. This process is known as the "Principle of formal adjustment" (PFA), and Dik (1985) defines it as follows:

(49) "Derived constructions of type X are under pressure to adjust their formal expression to the prototypical expression model provided by non-derived constructions of type X."

Dik offers the following independent definitions for the "prototypical expression model" (PEM). I will restrict myself to zero-, one- and two-place predicates:

- (50) a. "Zero-place predicates have no PEM."
 b. "One-place predicates: the PEM is the expression model for one-place predicates with a specified first argument."
 c. "Two-place predicates: the PEM is the expression model for a two-place predicate with an Agent and a Goal argument."

The effect of the PFA is nicely illustrated by Swedish: from the two-place predicate läsa 'to read', the one-place predicate läsas 'to be read' is derived by Agent deletion:

- (51) a. INPUT: läsa_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: läsa_{v-s} (∅) (x₂)_{Go}

in which -s is the reduction marker R.

The following results from (51):

- (52) a. Han läser en bok 'He is reading a book'
 b. Det läses en bok 'There is a book being read'

The open Agent position marked by (∅) in (51b), is occupied by the dummy *det*, whereas the Goal *en bok* remains in the original Goal position (second argument position). However, the output in (51b) does not comply with the PEM of (50b), which requires that the first argument is specified in the case of a one-place predicate. The output in (51b) can now serve as input for a newly-derived predicate, in which a first argument is specified by means of argument shift:

- (53) a. INPUT: läsa_{v-s} (∅) (x₂)_{Go} (= Output (51b))
 b. OUTPUT: läsa_{v-s} (x₁)_∅

(53b) results in an expression like:

- (54) Boken läses 'The book is being read'

In Tweehuysen (1987), it has been pointed out that in a construction like (52b) the dummy *det* has the character of a first argument in the Subj function, whereas in (54) *boken* must be the first argument to which the Subj function has been assigned.¹²

The form of the argument shift proposed in (53), does not seem to work in the Spocanian predicate frames in (47b) and (48b), for, if the Goal arguments were to shift from their second position to the first, this fails to explain the appearance of the suffix *-lije*, because this suffix indicates that the second argument (Goal) acts as a Heart. The - hypothetical - argument shift in which (47b) and (48b) serve as input, is illustrated in (55) and (56):

- (55) a. INPUT: trempe_v blul (∅) (x₂: pert mimpits (x₂))_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: trempe_v blul (x₁: pert mimpits (x₁))_∅
- (56) a. INPUT: fesreppe_v blul (∅) (x₂: eft kleter goftróda (x₂))_{Go} (x₃: Peoll (x₃))_{Rec}
 b. OUTPUT: fesreppe_v blul (x₁: eft kleter goftróda (x₁))_∅ (x₂: Peoll (x₂))_{Rec}

(55b) and (56b) can only result in the following expressions

(assuming that the constituent order follows from the Functional Pattern defined in (89) without restriction):

- (57) a. *Blul trempe pert mimpits
 R read many books
- b. *Blul fesreppe eft kleter goftróda ón Peoll
 R promise a new flat RE Paul

It follows from the ungrammaticality of (57) that Spocanian derived predicate frames, in which the Agent has been deleted, are not sensitive to the argument shift invited by PFA; the derivations in (55) and (56) are therefore incorrect (see section 6.1.2. for a more detailed analysis of argument shift in Spocanian).

4.2.4. The morphosyntactic form of the Goal

Personal pronouns have a so-called "passive derivation". If an Agent is lacking, such variants should be used for pronominalized Goals in lije- and litā-constructions, instead of the non-derived personal pronouns.¹³ Compare the following constructions, in which the Goal do 'he/him' takes the form dōe in the passive variant:

- (58) a. Gress zerfe do
 I see he
 'I see him'
- b. Do zerfelije pai gress
 he see-GSX AG I
 'He has been seen by me'
- c. Blul zerfelije dōe
 R see-GSX he_{PASS}
 'He has been seen'

The transformationalists have attempted to connect the presence of blul with the appearance of a passive pronoun, while the majority of the traditionalists tend to regard the appearance of a passive pronoun as a result of the "de-hearting" of the original Heart. The problems arising in connection with these two views, can be avoided within an FG framework, as it is now no longer feasible to suppose that there is a relationship between the appearance of a passive pronoun and that of blul.

The rule for using the passive personal pronoun seems to be a semantic one: if the SoA is realized by an unexpressed "force", the Goal appears in the passive form. In this manner, one can at least describe the situation in passive constructions like (58c). However, it is interesting to note that passive personal pronouns also appear in imperatives, causatives, and related constructions. The following two constructions may clarify this:

- (59) a. Tu lukte sener lomkā
 you wash REFL face
 'You are washing your face'

- b. Lukte-tūe sener lomkā!
 wash-you_{PASS} REFL face
 'Wash your face!'

Here also, the passive form *tūe* in (59b) indicates that the SoA is realized by an unexpressed "force", or more precisely: the speaker producing the imperative intends to create a SoA which can be defined in the same way as in (59a). It should also be noted that an imperative arises from a derived predicate frame, viz. a frame in which the Agent has been linked to the predicate in some way or other.¹⁴ In the expression, this is revealed orthographically by the fact that verb and Agent are hyphenated. In section 6.2., I will return in more detail to the use of passive personal pronouns.

4.3. Is there a Heart in a blul-construction?

At a first glance, it seems possible to answer this question in the affirmative, as the verbal suffixes *-lije* and *-litā* also occur in a blul-construction, and are a direct result of Heart assignment to Goal and Recipient respectively. If the question is answered negatively, then this must have consequences for FG, because a blul-construction arises from a derived predicate frame and the presence of *-lije*/*-litā* could therefore indicate that the predicate frame has been derived after Heart assignment. That is why, at the predicate *trempe* 'to read', we should picture something like the following (here, I refer to the derivation procedure in (47)):

(60) a. INPUT: *trempey* (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2 : *pert mimpits* (x_2))_{Go}

Heart assignment to the Goal results in:

b. OUTPUT: *trempey-lije* (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2 : *pert mimpits* (x_2))_{GoHeart}

Now, it follows from b. that:

c. OUTPUT: *trempey-lije blul* (\emptyset) (x_2 : *pert mimpits* (x_2))_{Go}

Here, a kind of "de-Hearting" of the Goal must have occurred while deriving c. from b. (whether related to the loss of the original Go function, or not). The process as proposed in (60) conflicts with FG typology, in which the assignment of a function to an argument should take place at the level where the expression rules operate (Subj assignment cannot precede predicate formation). Moreover, it can hardly be accepted within an FG framework that Heart assignment is overruled by some kind of "de-hearting procedure".

Therefore, let us first carry out a test, which possibly may give us a clear answer to the question whether a blul-construction contains a Heart, or not.

4.3.1. The Heart-test

The 7 properties mentioned in 4.1. are a good basis for our Heart-test (that is why they were mentioned). Now, we will carry out 7 subtests:

(A) Relative pronouns and ki-marking:

Compare the following:

- (61) a. Ef efanty bytelije pai ef gekker, té eft geffy kuntarye¹⁵
 the child beat-GSX AG the teacher that an apple steal
 'The child who has stolen an apple, is beaten by
 the teacher'
- b. Blul bytelije ef efanty, té eft geffy kuntarye
- c. *Blul bytelije ki ef efanty, té eft geffy kuntarye
 R beat-GSX .. the child that an apple steal
 'The child who has stolen an apple, is being beaten'

As the construction with ki in (61c) is ungrammatical, it may be concluded from this subtest that, also in a blul-construction, ef efanty serves as a Heart.

(B) Focusing:

Compare:

- (62) a. Jān lorerde kluff? - Eft snat lorerdelije pai do
 John buy what - a hay-fork buy-GSX AG he
 'What does John buy? - He is buying a hay-fork'
- b. Jān lorerde kluff? - *Blul lorerdelije eft snat
 John buy what - R buy-GSX a hay-fork
 'What does John buy? - There is a hay-fork being bought'

In this answer, the Focus has to appear as a Heart. The blul-construction in (62b) is incorrect as an answer, which means that this subtest shows that it is unlikely that eft melōne is a Heart.

(C) Topicalization:

Compare:

- (63) a. Petriy, [ki] do nert invobelije pai kirro
 Peter DET he not invite-GSX AG we
 'As for Peter, we will not invite him'
- b. *Petriy, blul nert invobelije [ki] dōe
 Peter R not invite-GSX DET hepASS
 'As for Peter, he is not invited'

The ungrammaticality of (63b) could be an indication that Petriy is not a Heart here.

(D) Reflexivity:

Compare the following:

- (64) a. Ef hurt kettelije-týrt pai Jeely ón sener yrge
 the dog give-GSX-back AG Jeely RE REFL master
 'The dog is given back by Jeely to its master'
- b. Blul kettelije-týrt ef hurt ón sener yrge
 R give-GSX-back the dog RE REFL master
 'The dog is given back to its master'

As the reflexive possessive pronoun *sener* can only be coreferential with the Heart, it may be concluded from this subtest that *ef hurt* is also a Heart in (64b).

(E) Presence/absence of semantic markers:

Compare:

- (65) a. *Enn ef mimpit trempelije pai Ján
 GO the book read-GSX AG John
 'The book is being read by John'
- b. *Blul trempelije enn ef mimpit
 R read-GSX GO the book
 'The book is being read'
- (66) a. *Ón Mariy kettelitā pai Ján enn ef mimpit
 RE Mary give-RSX AG John GO the book
 'Mary is being given the book by John'
- b. *Blul kettelitā ón Mariy enn ef mimpit
 R give-RSX RE Mary GO the book
 'Mary is being given the book'

The result of the presence (in bold print) of the semantic markers *enn* and *ón* is ungrammatical in *blul*-constructions.¹⁶ Consequently, the Goal *ef mimpit* in (65b) and the Recipient *Mariy* in (66b) have a clear Heart-function too.¹⁷

(F) Verbal derivations from pronouns:

Compare:

- (67) a. *Ef nert eppere, kirro invóbe té
 it not she.be we invite that
- b. Ef nert eppere, té invóbelije pai kirro
 it not she.be that invite-GSX AG we
 'She is not the one, who is invited by us'
 or 'That one is not invited by us'

In (67a) *té* is not a Heart, and therefore the construction is ungrammatical. Now, look at:

- (68) *Ef nert eppere, blul invòbelije tè
 it not she.be R invite-GSX that
 'She is not invited'

Construction (68) is not grammatical either.¹⁸ Conclusion:
 tè is not a Heart here.

- (G) The determinative pronoun nem:

Compare the following:

- (69) a. Nem westarelije pai do, ef melde nonsens
 that assert-GSX AG he it be nonsense
 'What is being asserted by him, is nonsense'
- b. Do westare nem, tè melde nonsens
 he assert that what be nonsense
 'What he is asserting, is nonsense'
- c. Blul westarelije nem, ef/*tè melde nonsens
 R assert-GSX that it/what be nonsense
 'What is being asserted, is nonsense'

In (69c), the personal pronoun ef is correct in the subordinate clause, while the relative pronoun tè is ungrammatical. This indicates that, also in this blul-construction, nem acts as a Heart, as in (69a).

4.3.2. The result of the Heart-test

From 4.3.1., the following may be inferred:

That there is a Heart in a blul-construction, is confirmed by:

- (A) Relative pronouns and ki-marking
 (D) Reflexivity
 (E) Presence/absence of semantic markers
 (G) Determinative pronoun nem

Counter-examples refuting the claim that a Heart exists in a blul-construction, are:

- (B) Focusing
 (C) Topicalization
 (F) Verbal derivation from pronouns (also considered a form of Focusing, see 4.1.(F))

The sifting above shows that the pragmatic phenomena Focusing and Topicalization indicate that a blul-construction does not contain a Heart, while, on the contrary, the rest of the syntactic phenomena do prove that there is a Heart. This seems to indicate that the notion "Heart" must be split up into a pragmatic and a syntactic component, so that now it is a question of translating these into FG terms. In doing so, Dik's analysis of the Philippine languages offers a good guideline (Dik 1978:89f). In view of the Philippine languages, Dik introduces the notions "Prominence-1" and "Prominence-2", and I quote:

Quotation A:

"(a) the term receiving Prominence-1 is given a special Prominence-1 marker, which 'masks' the semantic function marker. (b) the verb is marked in a way which signals that a term with semantic function S_i has Prominence-1. [...]"

Quotation B:

"(a) the argument receiving Prominence-2 is given a special marker which, however, is usually identical to the Prominence-1 marker. Prominence-2 may be given to a constituent already having Prominence-1. [...] (b) the constituent having Prominence-2 appears in clause-initial position (that is, in these languages, immediately preverbal). [...] (d) Prominence-2 has no consequences for the form of the verb. [...]"

It is striking that all these Philippine properties are almost literally similar to the ones found in Spocanian, if we equate the syntactic component of the Heart with "Prominence-1" (from now on: "Prom1"), and its pragmatic component with "Prominence-2" (from now on: "Prom2"). This may be illustrated by the following example:

- (70) a. Ef mimpit trempeliije pai Jān
 the book read-*GSX* AG John
 'The book is being read by John'
- b. Blul trempeliije ef mimpit
 R read-*GSX* the book
 'The book is being read'

Both (70a) and (70b) meet the definition of Prom1 in all respects (quotation A): the special Prom1 marker (see (Aa)) can, together with the term *ef mimpit*, be regarded as a \emptyset -marker, "masking" the semantic marker *enn*. Furthermore, the suffix *-liije* meets the description in (Ab). In addition to this, (70a) also meets the definition of Prom2 (quotation B): the special marker is identical to the Prom1 marker (namely \emptyset). Prom2 is assigned to *ef mimpit*, while this term also receives Prom1 (see (Ba)). According to (Bb), the Prom2 constituent appears in a clause-initial position, which is actually the case in (70a); and, according to (Bd), Prom2 has no consequences for the verb form: this also holds true.

After a thorough analysis of various Philippine examples, Dik (1978:94) reaches the following conclusion: "The most reasonable interpretation would thus seem to be to regard Prom1 as a matter of Subj assignment." This conclusion is based, among other things, on the findings of Keenan & Comrie (1977), as well as of Keenan (1972), which show that the restrictions on relativization of constituents very often refer to the syntactic functions of Subj and Obj. This is precisely what the subtests (A) and (B) also reveal.

Dik shows that, within the framework of FB, there are no objections towards regarding the Philippine property "Prom1" as a form of Subj assignment. All arguments above also pertain absolutely to Spocanian. What in the Philippine languages is called "Prom1",

is traditionally the "Heart" in Spocanian. Both Prom1 and the Heart are a result of Subj assignment, and from now on I will use "Subject" when "Prom1" is indicated. In 4.3.3., I will analyse the notion "Prom2" in more detail for Spocanian. Subj assignment to a non-Agent does not necessarily lead to a traditional "passive" in every language and in every case.

4.3.3. The Functional Pattern

4.3.3.1. General

The first conclusion to be drawn is that one of the arguments has been assigned a Subj function, in basic predicate frames as well as in derived, Agentless predicate frames (leading to a blul-construction). In doing so, the following expression rules play a part:

(71) expression of syntactic functions:

$$(x_1)_{\text{Subj}} \rightarrow \emptyset (x_1)$$

(72) expression of semantic functions:

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1)_{\text{Ag}} &\rightarrow \text{pai } (x_1) \\ (x_1)_{\text{Go}} &\rightarrow [\text{enn}]_c (x_1) \\ (x_1)_{\text{Rec}} &\rightarrow \text{ón } (x_1) \end{aligned}$$

"[..]_c" indicates that the element between brackets may either be present or absent, depending on a further definition of certain conditions.

(73) verb marking:

<u>condition</u>	<u>operation</u>
AgSubj	\emptyset
GoSubj	$V \rightarrow \langle V\text{-lije} \rangle_V$
RecSubj	$V \rightarrow \langle V\text{-litã} \rangle_V$

Note that "constituent ordering" is not part of the system of expression rules relating to Subj assignment. For, the second conclusion to be drawn is that there is also a second process involved, besides Subj assignment, which may be compared with the notion "Prom2", developed by Dik for the Philippine languages. This second process should explain the distinction between sentence pairs like:

- (74) a. Ef mimpit trempeliije pai Jãn
 the book read-GSX AG John
 'The book is being read by John'
- b. Blul trempeliije ef mimpit
 R read-GSX the book
 'The book is being read'

The difference between the two constructions above is merely one of word order. The presence of blul in (74b) only indicates the

applied process of Agent deletion, but the position of this reduction marker after the process has not yet been fixed.¹⁹

4.3.3.2. Traditional approach of the constituent order

A Functional Pattern must be defined into which all the Spocanian clauses "fit", or more precisely: from which it follows that arguments with Prom2 assignment (as in (74a)) appear before the verb, and arguments without Prom2 assignment appear after the verb, in which case blul takes the position before the verb. Therefore, it might be useful to look at the traditional way in which the constituent order is approached in Spocanian. In doing so, we shall restrict ourselves to the nuclear level, that is to predicates and their arguments.

However, here the traditional view will be explained in FG terms: the following basic order applies to the three arguments Agent, Goal and Recipient: Agent - Goal - Recipient. Still, this order may be disturbed when Subj assignment has taken place, as the Subject always appears before the other, non-Subject arguments. Thus:

- (75)
- | | | | |
|----|---------|------|-------|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| a. | AgSubj | - Go | - Rec |
| b. | GoSubj | - Ag | - Rec |
| c. | RecSubj | - Ag | - Go |

The position of the predicate (V) depends on the tense that is expressed. Here, three tenses are relevant: the Neutral tense, the Definitive tense, and the Future tense. The Definitive tense covers the Past and the Perfect.

In the Neutral tense, the predicate is situated between the first and the second argument, as shown below:²⁰

- (76)
- | | | | |
|----|---------|-----|------------|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| a. | AgSubj | - V | - Go - Rec |
| b. | GoSubj | - V | - Ag - Rec |
| c. | RecSubj | - V | - Ag - Go |

In the Definitive tense, the predicate is situated between the second and the third argument:

- (77)
- | | | | |
|----|---------|------|-----------|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| a. | AgSubj | - Go | - V - Rec |
| b. | GoSubj | - Ag | - V - Rec |
| c. | RecSubj | - Ag | - V - Go |

In the Future tense, the predicate takes the initial position:

- (78)
- | | | | |
|----|----|-----------|------------|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| a. | V | - AgSubj | - Go - Rec |
| b. | V | - GoSubj | - Ag - Rec |
| c. | V | - RecSubj | - Ag - Go |

So much for Agent-containing constructions. In constructions without an Agent (in FG terms: derived predicates), we encounter a process in the Neutral tense, which is traditionally called inversion. This means that Subject and V change place, and that, moreover, blul is added in the initial position in each tense

(except for the Future tense where it takes a second position, after V). The following schemata may illustrate this:

- (79)
- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----|
| | 1. | 2. |
| a. | ∅ | |
| b. | blul - V - GoSubj - Rec | |
| c. | blul - V - RecSubj - Go | |

- (80)
- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----|
| | 1. | 2. |
| a. | ∅ | |
| b. | blul - GoSubj - V - Rec | |
| c. | blul - RecSubj - V - Go | |

- (81)
- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----|
| | 1. | 2. |
| a. | ∅ | |
| b. | V - blul - GoSubj - Rec | |
| c. | V - blul - RecSubj - Go | |

Due to Agent deletion, the a.-paradigms remain open.

4.3.3.3. The FG approach

It will be clear that the traditional way of ordering constituents does not fit into an FG framework. For, in the preceding section we have presented a step-by-step construction by (i) moving the Subject to the left, (ii) adding a predicate either between or before the pattern, and (iii) applying inversion when necessary. Coherence between the different orders stipulated by the tense forms is lacking, and the position of blul seems arbitrary. Within FG, all - unordered - constituents must be arranged at one go in a fixed Functional Pattern, though not every language has just only one Pattern at its disposal. If we confine ourselves to non-derived Spocanian predicates, there are a number of hypotheses possible in order to capture all clauses in a single Functional Pattern. In the following example, we will start with the predicate frame:

- (82) kettey (x₁: Jān (x₁))_{A_g} (x₂: ef mimpit (x₂))_{G_o}
 'give' 'the book'
(x₃: Mariy (x₃))_{R_{ec}}

By way of the expression rules in (71)-(73), and of the frames (76)-(78), we subsequently arrive at the following Spocanian constructions (ef mimpit is abbreviated to ef m., and kette to k- in suffixed forms):

(83)

<u>V-fut</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>Recipient</u>
	Jān	kette		enn ef m.		ón Mariy
	Ef m.	k-lije	pai Jān			ón Mariy
	Mariy	k-litā	pai Jān	enn ef m.		
	Jān			enn ef m.	kette	ón Mariy
	Ef m.		pai Jān		k-lije	ón Mariy
	Mariy		pai Jān		k-litā	<u>enn ef m.</u>
Kette	Jān			enn ef m.		ón Mariy
K-lije	ef m.		pai Jān			ón Mariy
K-litā	Mariy		pai Jān	enn ef m.		

In this schema, one should note three important things:

- (i) Most of the positions (columns) are defined by semantic functions, and not by the usual syntactic functions "S" and "O" (and "IO").
- (ii) For function "V", three positions are available, each of them expressing a different tense.
- (iii) The construction Mariy pai Jān kettelitā enn ef mimpit 'Mary has been given the book by John' does not fit into the Pattern, because the Goal enn ef mimpit turns up erroneously in the Recipient position (underlined in the schema).

ad (i):

Also Okoth Okombo (1983) and De Groot (1981, 1989), have pointed out that, for several languages (such as Hungarian), it may be necessary to accept a Functional Pattern based on semantic functions. In this respect, Spocanian follows a natural tendency.

ad (ii):

As Dik suggests that a language can also have more than one Functional Pattern, there seems nothing against splitting up schema (83) into three schemata, each for its own tense class:

(84) a.	S	V-neut	Agent	Goal	Recipient
b.	S		Agent	Goal	V-def
c.	V-fut	S		Agent	Goal

However, when the splitting up is effected as in (84), this blurs the relationship between the order in the different tense forms. That is why I prefer a single integrated schema in conformity with (83), in which also the 3 positions for V are in fact based on the semantic (?) properties of "neut", "def" and "fut".

ad (iii):

The most elegant way of also fitting construction (iii) into the Pattern, is to base the Pattern not on semantic function, but rather on "semantic function hierarchy" (SFH). For Spocanian, the relevant SFH is:

(85) Agent > Goal > Recipient

As one of the three arguments always acts as a Subject, and thus occupies the S-position, two arguments remain, one of which always outranks the other, according to the SFH in (85). Therefore, I divide the two non-Subject arguments into a "High argument" and a "Low argument". The Functional Pattern may be very much simplified if the three positions for Agent, Goal and Recipient are reduced to the two positions High argument and Low argument, or, in short: the P2 position and the P3 position.²¹ Moreover, in doing so we comply with point (i) for, now the constructions resulting from a predicate frame in which the arguments have other semantic functions than Ag, Go or Rec will fit into the Pattern too (assuming that the other functions are also part of the SFH).²² Now compare (83) with:

(86)

<u>V-fut</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
	Jān	kette	enn ef m.		ón Mariy
	Ef m.	kettelije	pai Jān		ón Mariy
	Mariy	kettelitā	pai Jān		enn ef m.
	Jān		enn ef m.	kette	ón Mariy
	Ef m.		pai Jān	kettelije	ón Mariy
	Mariy		pai Jān	kettelitā	enn ef m.
Kette	Jān		enn ef m.		ón Mariy
Kettelije	ef m.		pai Jān		ón Mariy
Kettelitā	Mariy		pai Jān		enn ef m.

This Functional Pattern based on the SFH, is also relevant for clauses with two- and one-place predicates: in such cases one or two positions remain unused, and the position for the Lowest argument (P3) will be the first one to remain so. This is laid down in the rule:

(A) The P3 position may only be occupied if the P2 position has been occupied already.

Here are some examples using the two-place Goal predicate *trempe* 'to read' and the one-place predicate *farte* 'to walk':

(87)

<u>V-fut</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
	Jān	trempe	enn ef mimpit		
	Ef mimpit	trempe	pai Jān		
	Jān		enn ef mimpit	trempe	
	Ef mimpit		pai Jān	trempe	
Trempe	Jān		enn ef mimpit		
Trempe	ef mimpit		pai Jān		
	Jān	farte			
	Jān			farte	
Farte	Jān				

Note that in the case of the one-place *farte*, the distinction between the Neutral tense and the Definitive tense disappears: both forms are *Jān farte* 'John is/was/has been walking'.²³

Now, after having defined a Functional Pattern into which all constructions resulting from a non-derived predicate frame will fit, we may verify whether the blul-constructions (resulting from a derived predicate frame) are also able to be accommodated by (87). For the sake of clarity, we will first offer all the variants of the basic clause Blul ketteliije ef mimpit ón Mariy 'The book is given to Mary':

- (88) a. Neutral : Blul ketteliije ef mimpit ón Mariy
 b. Definitive: Blul ef mimpit ketteliije ón Mariy
 c. Future : Ketteliije blul ef mimpit ón Mariy
 d. Neutral : Blul kettelitā Mariy enn ef mimpit
 e. Definitive: Blul Mariy kettelitā enn ef mimpit
 f. Future : Kettelitā blul Mariy enn ef mimpit

It is evident that none of these constructions will fit into Pattern (87), because here this leaves no S-position available to the Subjects in bold print, and also a position must remain open for blul. Of course, a new Pattern may be defined for such blul-constructions, apart from the one in (87), but it is more elegant to arrive at a single common Pattern.

This common Pattern can simply be obtained by not reserving the second position for "S", but rather changing it into a general position, analogous to P2 and P3. In that case, we must generalize the S-position into a P1 position, so that the blul-constructions from (88) will fit into the Functional Pattern without further problem:

(89)

<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
	Blul	ketteliije	ef mimpit		ón Mariy
	Blul	kettelitā	Mariy		enn ef mimpit
	Blul		ef mimpit	ketteliije	ón Mariy
	Blul		Mariy	kettelitā	enn ef mimpit
Ketteliije	blul		ef mimpit		ón Mariy
Kettelitā	blul		Mariy		enn ef mimpit

The solution in (89) implies that the notions "High argument" (P2) and "Low argument" (P3) should not only be related to the SFH, but also to the syntactic function of Subj, as the Subject always occupies P2 in a blul-construction, which means that a Subject is always "higher" than a non-Subject, regardless of its semantic function. The SFH in (85) has therefore to be expanded to the SSFH ("Syntactic/semantic Function Hierarchy) in (90):

(90) Subject > Agent > Goal > Recipient

Furthermore, also the function of Prom2 appears to be relevant. The test in 4.3.1. proves that the Prom2 function in blul-constructions has not been assigned, so that, in frame (89), P2 contains a Subject without a Prom2 assignment. As (i) the S-position in (83) has now been replaced by "P1", and (ii) the Subject in Agent-containing (= blul-less) constructions is also Prom2, we may conclude that whenever P1 contains a Subject, it will be a Subject that has Prom2 assigned to it. The absence of the Prom2

function always involves the presence of blul (but... see 4.3.4.), and that is why P1 is always occupied by blul if Prom2 has not been assigned, so that the Subject is located in P2.

In short, we see the following two hierarchies (ranging from "high" to "low"), whereas rule A (see page 31) must lapse:²⁴

- (91) "high" > > "low"
 a. blul/Subject2 > Subject \emptyset > Agent > Goal > Recipient
 b. P1 > P2 > P3

in which Subject2 = Subject with Prom2 assignment

Subject \emptyset = Subject without Prom2 assignment

The interaction between (91a) and (91b) may be interpreted as follows: "if, in (91a), element X outranks element Y, X will occupy the highest possible position in (91b) and Y will occupy the position immediately below it".

Now it appears possible to establish a relationship between the conditions for omitting the Goal marker enn and the position in which the Goal appears in frame (89): only when the Goal is in the P2 position, may enn be omitted. All arguments that are qualified as "Low", and therefore appear in the relevant P3 position, must have a semantic marker.²⁵

Resuming, we may state that:

Traditional "Heart" assignment should be divided into a syntactic and a pragmatic component: Subj assignment plus Prom2 assignment. In constructions resulting from a non-derived predicate frame, Prom2 must also be assigned to the Subject; in constructions with a deleted Agent, and thus containing the reduction marker blul, Prom2 is not assigned. Thus, only if the Subject does not act as Prom2 (see (74b)), will Subj assignment to a non-Agent lead to a real passive construction in Spocanian (a construction in which the SoA is regarded from a different "point of departure"), contrary to what is usual in most other languages.

4.3.4. Prom2 assignment in Agentless passives

On intention, I do not refer to "blul-passives" in the caption above, but to "Agentless passives". Apart from the general reduction marker blul, Spocanian actually still has two other reduction markers: hyg and cÿry. The reduction marker hyg is mainly used in lofty speech and, more generally, in the southern dialects; cÿry has the same register as blul, but contrary to blul, it contains an extra future aspect too. It is outside the scope of this paper to discuss the use of such markers comprehensively, and we will confine ourselves to a closer analysis of the phenomenon that they appear without inversion, traditionally speaking, or, in other words, they are reduction markers appearing in the P2 position. This implies that the constituent, normally appearing in P2, now "moves" to P1. It should be added here that even blul may occur without inversion, though only in some eastern dialects. In the examples discussed below, we will compare standard Spocanian with blul in P1 on the one hand, and the eastern dialects with blul in P2 on the other; in the latter constructions blul can be replaced by hyg or cÿry.

Compare the regular blul-construction in (92a) with the dialectical variant in (92b):

- (92) a. Blul invóbelije Elsa
 b. Elsa invóbelije blul
 'Elsa is invited'

The constructions in (92) fit into the Functional Pattern as follows:

- | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| (93) | <u>V-fut</u> | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
| a. | | Blul | invóbelije | Elsa | | |
| b. | | Elsa | invóbelije | blul | | |

In (93a), Elsa functions as a Subject without having Prom2 assignment (see the preceding section). But in (93b), one expects blul to appear in P2, precisely because Elsa takes the Prom2 function, or, in other words, is Subject2. This supposition is nourished by the hierarchy in (91a), yet it still remains to be proved also. It has been established in 4.3.2., that Focusing and Topicalization are impossible for Hearts in a blul-construction. I will repeat such ungrammatical constructions in a. below, and will add an "inversionless" (dialectical) variant as a b-sentence:

- (94) a. Jān lorerde klufft? - *Blul lorerdelije eft snat (= (62b))
 b. Jān lorerde klufft? - Eft snat lorerdelije blul
 'What does John buy? - A hay-fork'
- (95) a. *Petriy, blul nert invóbelije [ki] dōe (= (63b))
 b. Petriy, [ki] dōe nert invóbelije blul
 'As for Peter, he is not invited'
- (96) a. *Ef nert eppere, blul invóbelije té (= (68))
 b. Ef nert eppere, té invóbelije blul
 'She is not invited'

The grammaticality²⁶ of the b-constructions certainly shows that a Prom2 function has been assigned to the Subjects eft snat, té and dōe respectively.²⁷ Now, it is also necessary to adapt hierarchy (91) in such a way, that, if Subject2 appears in P1, blul appears in P2. And as in this case we may also read hyg or cýry for blul, the more general term "Reduction marker" (R) is appropriate here. Hierarchy (91) now becomes:

- (97) "high" > > "low"
 a. Subject2 > R > SubjectØ > Agent > Goal > Recipient
 b. P1 > P2 > P3

In connection with the frame derivations in (47) and (48) (section 4.2.2.), it has been remarked in passing that one could perhaps find arguments in favour of the fact that blul is not a reduction marker, and therefore is an element in the derived predicate frame, and that, on the contrary, it is an element which only appears after all other elements have taken their position in the Functional Pattern. Dik (1980:153) describes how a P1 position at all times must be occupied in a language like Dutch: if there is

no typical P1 constituent present, then it is possible to place a dummy like *er* or *het* in P1; compare:

- (98) a. *Iemand heeft de ramen gelapt*
 somebody have the windows cleaned
 'Somebody has cleaned the windows'
- b. *Er heeft iemand de ramen gelapt*
 DUMMY have somebody the windows cleaned
 'idem'

In (98a), *iemand* takes P1 (of the Dutch Functional Pattern), whereas in (98b) *iemand* occupies the Dutch Subject position, and as P1 would now remain open, the dummy *er* appears there. An analogous process would have been possible in Spocanian *blul*-constructions like (99b), were it not *blul* can also appear if the P1 position has not remained open (as in (99c)):

- (99) a. *Rast ef miflifs gläntre*
 somebody the windows clean
 'Somebody has cleaned the windows'
- b. *Blul ef miflifs gläntrelije*
 R the windows clean-GSX
 'The windows were/have been cleaned'
- c. *Ef miflifs blul gläntrelije*
 'idem' (dialectical)

The dialectical and lofty variants of the *blul*- and *hyg*-constructions as well as the *cÿry*-constructions, show that such elements must certainly be regarded as a reduction marker which already is an element within the predicate frame, and not as a dummy element, added at the last moment in order to fill P1.²⁸

□ □ □

5. ABSENCE OF ARGUMENTS: INEXISTENCE AND INEXPRESSION

In this chapter, we are mainly interested in the interaction of inexistence and inexpression in passive constructions. However, by way of introduction I cannot avoid dedicating a few words to inexistence and inexpression of arguments in a more general context.²⁹

There are two ways in which an argument may be "absent" in a construction:

- (i) By way of inexistence, if a certain argument position (x_n) either is lacking in the predicate frame, or remains unused.
- (ii) By way of inexpression, if there is an argument position (x_n) in the predicate frame, but this position is not occupied by lexical material.

The following predicate frame may serve as an example:

(100) steal_y (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2)_{Go}

and (101) could be a result of this frame:

(101) Cora steals

In (101) we see inexistence of the Recipient (because its argument position is lacking in frame (100)), and inexpression of the Goal (because this argument has not been expressed in (101)). Note that inexpression of an argument automatically results from its inexistence.

The distinction between inexistence and inexpression will be proved relevant - at least for Spocanian - in the sections below.³⁰

5.1. Inexistence

"Inexistence" may be subdivided into five types:

- I. No inexistence whatsoever: here it is a question of three-place predicates like:

kettey (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2)_{Go} (x_3)_{Rec} 'to give to'

- II. Inexistence of the Recipient: here we find two-place Goal predicates like:

trempey (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2)_{Go} 'to read'

- III. Inexistence of the Goal: this pertains to two-place Recipient predicates for which one may claim two different predicate frames:

(i) pjöley (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Rec} 'to speak to'

(ii) pjöley (x₁)_{Ag} (Ø) (x₃)_{Rec}

Frame (i) has the advantage of being less "marked", in the sense that there is no unused second-argument position, while (ii) has the advantage that the Recipient retains its prototypical property of third argument. In section 6.1.2.3. it will be proved that (ii) has preference.

IV. Inexistence of both Goal and Recipient: referring to one-place predicates like:

farley (x₁)_{Ag} 'to walk'

V. Inexistence of the Agent: here it is a question of derived predicates like:

a. kettey R (Ø) (x₂)_Ø (x₃)_{Rec} 'to give to'

b. trempey R (Ø) (x₂)_Ø 'to read'

c. (i) pjöley R (Ø) (x₂)_{Rec} 'to speak to'

(ii) pjöley R (Ø) (Ø) (x₃)_{Rec}

d. farley R (Ø) 'to walk'

The predicate frames a., b., c. and d. of type V are actually subtypes of respectively I, II, III and IV. They all contain the reduction marker R, and have an unused position as a first argument.

Below, these five types will be discussed in more detail.

5.1.1. Type I: no inexistence whatsoever

Type I, "no inexistence whatsoever" has been added to the inexistence types because three-place predicates can be considered the "most ideal" construction, which means that all rules concerning Prom1 (= Subj) and Prom2 assignment and constituent order are in principle based on such three-place predicates. From this, the rules valid for two- and one-place predicates have been derived.

Moreover, type I forms the basis for type Va.

For the sake of convenience, all possible three-place constructions have again been summed up in (103), where they have been fitted into the Functional Pattern as mentioned in (89). We will start from the construction

(102) Jān kette [enn] ef snat ón Elsa
 John give [GO] the hay-fork RE Elsa
 'John gives Elsa the hay-fork'

The various tenses and voices derived from (102) may be described as follows:

(103)

<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
	Jān	kette	[enn] ef snat		ón Elsa
	Jān		[enn] ef snat	kette	ón Elsa
Kette	Jān		[enn] ef snat		ón Elsa
	Ef snat	kettelije	pai Jān		ón Elsa
	Ef snat		pai Jān	kettelije	ón Elsa
Kettelije	ef snat		pai Jān		ón Elsa
	Elsa	kettelitā	pai Jān		enn ef snat
	Elsa		pai Jān	kettelitā	enn ef snat
Kettelitā	Elsa		pai Jān		enn ef snat

That a three-place construction with an expressed Agent, Goal and Recipient is the "most ideal" construction also follows from the fact that hierarchy rule (97) is valid without exception in all 9 cases summed up in (103). Therefore, the following subrules may be inferred from (103), in which "→" should be read as "is always placed in position ...":

(104) PROTOTYPICAL POSITION-FILLING WITH THREE-PLACE PREDICATES

- (i) Subject2 → P1
- (ii) Agent → P2
- (iii) Recipient → P3

Rule (104) will appear relevant in a number of cases of inexistence and inexpression.

Furthermore, (103) shows that there is a relationship between the absence/presence of the Goal marker *enn* and the position in which the Goal appears. This relationship may be expressed in the following way:

(105) ABSENCE/PRESENCE OF THE GOAL MARKER *enn*

- | | <u>condition</u> | <u>form of the Goal</u> |
|------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (i) | Goal in P2 | [enn] _c (x ₂) |
| (ii) | Goal in P3 | enn (x ₂) |

in which [enn]_c signifies that under certain conditions, the use of *enn* is either obligatory or optional.³¹

It should be emphasized here that, in FG terms, (105) cannot be considered an "expression rule", as such a rule must always operate before the constituents have found their position in the Functional Pattern. Expression rules controlling the way of constituent ordering within the Functional Pattern (like rule (97) or rule (104)) do indeed exist, but as soon as the constituents have occupied their positions, the linguistic expression will be "complete". It is impossible that, by means of rule (97), the Goal is first placed either in P2 or P3, and that subsequently it is decided (by means of (105) for instance) whether *enn* should be added or not.

Therefore, Property (105) must be the result of a rule which as yet remains undefined and which perhaps should be regarded as a kind of Obj assignment to the Goal.

5.1.2. Type II: inexistence of the Recipient

Predicates of type II are the traditional transitive verbs, like:

- (106) Jān trempe [enn] ef mimpit
 John read [GO] the book
 'John is reading the book'

These only have the lije-passive, as the absence of a Recipient and thus the impossibility of Subj and Prom2 assignment to it, prevents the verb from being suffixed with -litā:

- (107) Ef mimpit trempelije pai Jān
 the book read-GSX AG John
 'The book is being read by John'

Two-place constructions with an Agent and a Goal fit into the Functional Pattern without any problem, for the fact that the lowest position P3 remains open (there is no Recipient available) does not conflict with the rules (97) and (104).

5.1.3. Type III: inexistence of the Goal

Predicates of type III are less general than those of type II or IV. As a matter of fact, the lack of a second argument with a Goal function is an anomaly, and this is expressed by a number of deviating properties.

A "pure" example of Goal inexistence is:

- (108) Jān pjōle ɔn Mariy
 John speak RE Mary
 'John speaks to Mary'

Subj and Prom2 assignment to the Recipient results in the litā-passive:

- (109) Mariy pjōlelitā pai Jān
 Mary speak-RSX AG John
 'Mary is spoken to by John'

As a Goal is lacking, of course a lije-passive will be impossible.

That ɔn Mariy in (108) appears in the Functional Pattern's P2-position, is illustrated by the Definitive tense variant:

- (110) Jān ɔn Mariy pjōle
 John RE Mary speak
 'John spoke/has spoken to Mary'

Constructions (108) and (110) fit into the Functional Pattern as follows:³²

- | (111) | <u>V-fut</u> | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
|-------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| a. | | Jān | pjōle | ɔn Mariy | | |
| b. | | Jān | | ɔn Mariy | pjōle | |

In this respect a predicate with Goal inexistence differs in a crucial way from a predicate with Goal inexpression, as will be discussed in section 5.2.2.

Note that rule (104iii) is violated by placing a Recipient in P2, but this is not a problem as we have deliberately restricted the validity of this rule to the domain of three-place predicates.

5.1.4. Type IV: inexistence of Goal as well as Recipient

Predicates of type IV are the traditional intransitive verbs, like:

(112) Jān farte 'John is walking'

An alternative passive construction like

(113) a. *Farteliĵe pai Jān
b. *Fartelitā pai Jān

('Walking is done by John')

is ungrammatical, as is its English equivalent.³³ This ungrammaticality is to be expected, for *liĵe-* or *litā-* marking is always the result of Subj assignment to Goal or Recipient respectively. And, by definition, intransitive predicates lack such arguments.

As the positions P2 and P3 remain open when an intransitive construction is fitted into the Functional Pattern, the distinction between the Neutral and the Definitive tense is erased.³⁴ Compare:

(114)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>	
		Jān	farte				('John is walking')
		Jān		farte			('John [has] walked')
	Farte	Jān					('John will walk')

5.1.5. Type V: inexistence of the Agent

Inexistence of the Agent occurs among derived predicates in which the Agent has been deleted. Consequently, the valency (= number of arguments) has been reduced by value =1. This process is made visible by a reduction marker like *bluĵ*, as we have seen in the preceding chapters.

In short: the predicate frames mentioned under type V result in two types of expressions:

Type A: Subj assignment to Goal or Recipient, but no Prom2 assignment:

(115) a. *Bluĵ kettelĵe ef mimpit ōn Mariy*
'The book is given to Mary'

b. *Bluĵ kettelitā Mariy enn ef mimpit*
'Mary is given the book'

(116) *Bluĵ trempeliĵe ef mimpit*
'The book is being read'

- (117) Blul pjölelitā Mariy
 'Mary is spoken to'

As to Type A, rule (97) is responsible for the appearance of the reduction marker blul in the highest position P1, and of the Subject \emptyset in the penultimate position P2. The constructions (115) - (117) fit into the Functional Pattern as follows:

- | (118) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|
| a. | Blul | ketteliije | ef mimpit | | ón Mariy |
| b. | Blul | kettelitā | Mariy | | enn ef mimpit |
| c. | Blul | trepeliije | ef mimpit | | |
| d. | Blul | pjölelitā | Mariy | | |

Type B: Both Subj assignment and Prom2 assignment to Goal or Recipient:

- (119) a. Ef mimpit ketteliije blul ón Mariy
 'The book is given to Mary'
 b. Mariy kettelitā blul enn ef mimpit
 'Mary is given the book'

- (120) Ef mimpit trepeliije blul
 'The book is being read'

- (121) Mariy pjölelitā blul
 'Mary is spoken to'

In respect of Type B, rule (97) is responsible for the appearance of the reduction marker blul in the penultimate position P2, and of Subject2 in the highest position P1. The constructions (119) - (121) fit into the Functional Pattern as follows:

- | (122) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|
| a. | Ef mimpit | ketteliije | blul | | ón Mariy |
| b. | Mariy | kettelitā | blul | | enn ef mimpit |
| c. | Ef mimpit | trepeliije | blul | | |
| d. | Mariy | pjölelitā | blul | | |

Type A can only be formed with the reduction marker blul. This is the most general variant in Standard Spocanian.

Type B, however, can not only be formed with blul, but also with the markers hyg and cýry. The constructions belonging to Type B are always lofty or dialectical in character. That is why we will mainly discuss constructions of Type A.

The rules formulated in (104) are also valid for constructions resulting from derived predicate frames with a deleted Agent. However, a minor addition is necessary here: as also a Subject \emptyset may occur in such derived predicates, this will always appear in P2 (see (118)). Therefore, the rules in (104) should be replaced by:

(123) PROTOTYPICAL POSITION-FILLING WITH THREE-PLACE PREDICATES AND TWO-PLACE DERIVED PREDICATES WITH AGENT DELETION

- (i) Subject2 → P1
- (ii) Subject \emptyset → P2
- (iii) Agent → P2
- (iv) Recipient → P3

Assuming that a *lije*-construction is always the result of Subj assignment to the Goal, and that a *litā*-construction always follows from Subj assignment to the Recipient, we may expect the following constructions to be ungrammatical:

- (124) a. *Blul trempelitā enn ef mimpit
- b. *Blul fartelitā
- c. ?Blul pjölelije ón Mariy
- d. ?Blul farteliije

However, one should note that (124c) and (124d) are indeed grammatical to a certain extent. This inconsistency may be explained by assuming that here we have two examples of a so-called pseudo-passive construction. This will be discussed in 6.1.

5.2. Inexpression

Not every argument is equally eligible for inexpression. The amount of grammaticality of a construction with one or more inexpressed arguments, seems to depend not only on the kind of argument that remains unexpressed, but also on the number of unexpressed arguments, and on the contrast active vs. passive. Below we will scrutinize all possibilities of inexpression of every argument there is. In doing so, the symbol \emptyset will be used to visualize the position of the non-expressed argument.

5.2.1. Inexpression of the Recipient

The "most easy" way seems to be that a Recipient (third argument) remains unexpressed; compare the a-clauses with the b-clauses:

- (125) a. Jān kette ef mimpit ón Mariy
 'John gives the book to Mary'

- b. Jān kette ef mimpit \emptyset
 'John gives the book'

- (126) a. Ef mimpit ketteliije pai Jān ón Mariy
 'The book is given by John to Mary'

- b. Ef mimpit ketteliije pai Jān \emptyset
 'The book is given by John'

- (127) a. Blul ketteliije ef mimpit ón Mariy³⁵
 'The book is given to Mary'

- b. Blul ketteliije ef mimpit \emptyset
 'The book is given'

As regards its inexpression, a Recipient seems to behave as a satellite and, consequently, it is not surprising that the Recipient marker *ón* 'to' can also act as a preposition, thus forming a prepositional phrase (I get the impression that in the case of Spocanian this is always a satellite). In view of a number of verbal constructions there is even some disagreement whether the *ón*-constituent has to be considered either as an argument with Recipient function, or as a satellite with the function of a prepositional phrase.³⁶

Anyhow, inexpression of the Recipient means that the Functional Pattern's lowest position (P3) always remains open, which, in view of the grammaticality of the examples above, should not meet with any objection. This may also be expected because there is no infringement of the rules in (97) and (123).

Also the predicates of type III (see 5.1.3.) can form constructions in which the Recipient remains unexpressed:

- (128) *Jān pjōle ∅*
'John is speaking/talking'

As far as their syntactic and semantic properties are concerned, such constructions are totally comparable with one-place predicates like: *Jān farte* 'John walks' (Type IV, see 5.1.4.).

5.2.2. Inexpression of the Goal

The "ease" with which a Goal can remain unexpressed, seems to depend on a number of factors. Inexpression of the Goal in an active construction with an expressed Recipient, is highly marked and restricted by context: there is always a habitual or contrastive interpretation involved. Compare (this markedness is symbolized by !):

- (129) a. *Jān kette ef mimpit ón Mariy*
'John gives the book to Mary'

b. *!Jān kette ∅ ón Mariy*³⁷
'!John gives to Mary'

But contrary to (129) itself, the passive variants (*litā*-variants) of (129) do not seem to be marked:

- (130) a. *Mariy kettelitā pai Jān enn ef mimpit*
'Mary is given the book by John'

b. *Mariy kettelitā pai Jān ∅*³⁸
'Mary is given [something] by John'

- (131) a. *Blul kettelitā Mariy enn ef mimpit*
'Mary is given the book'

b. *Blul kettelitā Mariy ∅*
'Mary is given [something]'

The markedness of (129b) may be illustrated by way of the Functional Pattern. (132) contains the b-clauses of (129) - (131):

(132)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
a.		Jān	kette	∅		ón Mariy
b.		Mariy	kettelitā	pai Jān		∅
c.		Blul	kettelitā	Mariy		∅

Here I am referring to the hierarchic rule in (97), and so it will be clear that in the case of (132a) this rule has not been met: the lower position P3 is now occupied while the higher position P2 remains open. This may explain the markedness of (129b). Of course, (129b) might also be fitted into the Functional Pattern in a way which will meet rule (97):

(133)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
		Jān	kette	ón Mariy		

But now the construction conflicts with rule (123iv). Therefore, it will be impossible to fit (129b) into the Functional Pattern, in such a way that both rule (97) and rule (123iv) are complied with. This explains why such a construction is marked. The question which way of filling the Pattern is to be preferred, (132a) or (133), may be answered by means of the behaviour of the Definitive variant of (129b). We immediately understand that ón Mariy belongs in P3, and does not "shift" to P2. The Definitive variants of (129) are:

- (134) a. Jān ef mimpit kette ón Mariy
'John has given the book to Mary'
- b. !Jān ∅ kette ón Mariy
'!John has given to Mary'

The following variant is ungrammatical:

- (134) b'. *Jān ón Mariy kette

The grammaticality of (134b) and the ungrammaticality of (134b'), both indicate that ón Mariy must occupy P3 (see (135a/b)); it may be extrapolated that the Recipient of (129b) must also appear in P3 (see (135c); see also note 32.

(135)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
a.		!Jān		∅	kette	ón Mariy
b.		*Jān		ón Mariy	kette	
c.		!Jān	kette	∅		ón Mariy

The markedness of (134b), and consequently also of (129b), follows from neglecting rule (97), in such a manner that a higher position remains untaken while a lower position is occupied.

The distinction between inexistence of the Goal (as described in 5.1.3.) and inexpression of the Goal is clearly illustrated in (136):

(136)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
		Jān	pjōle	ón Mariy		
		Jān		ón Mariy	pjōle	
<hr/>						
		Jān	kette	∅		ón Mariy
		Jān		∅	kette	ón Mariy

At Goal inexistence, the Recipient appears in P2, according to hierarchy-rule (97).

At Goal inexpression, the Recipient appears in P3, according to rule (123iv), neglecting rule (97) in doing so.

The Goal may be easily omitted if the Recipient is omitted simultaneously:

(137) Jān kette ∅ ∅
'John is giving'

Construction (137) is as scarcely marked as the one-place construction

(138) Jān farte
'John is walking'

which will become clear if we fit (137) into the Functional Pattern:

(139)	<u>V-fut</u>	<u>P1</u>	<u>V-neut</u>	<u>P2</u>	<u>V-def</u>	<u>P3</u>
		Jān	kette	∅		∅

Contrary to (132a), the higher P2 in (139) does not remain open while the lower P3 does contain an element. In other words, the construction in (139) does not infringe upon rule (97).

5.2.3. Inexpression of the Agent

Until now, we have implicitly assumed that all Agentless passives result from a derived predicate frame with a deleted Agent argument. In several cases however, an Agentless passive can also result from inexpression of the Agent in a non-derived frame. This is possible at three-place predicates in which both Goal and Recipient are expressed. If the Recipient acts as a Subject (or more precisely: as Subject2), such Agentless passives are entirely grammatical. Compare:

- (140) a. Mariy kettelitā pai Jān enn ef mimpit
Mary give-RSX AG John GO the book
'Mary is given the book by John'
- b. Mariy kettelitā ∅ enn ef mimpit
'Mary is given the book'

Hypothetically, there are two ways in which construction (140b) fits into the Functional Pattern (due to the lack of space, the "V-fut" position has been omitted here):

- | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| (141) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
| a. | Mariy | kettelitā | ∅ | | enn ef mimpit |
| b. | Mariy | kettelitā | enn ef mimpit | | |

As was the case in (129) and (134), the Definitive tense may tell us once again whether the Goal *enn ef mimpit* really does appear in P2. The Definitive variant of (140b) is not (142a), but rather (142b):

- | | | | | | |
|-------|----|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| (142) | a. | *Mariy | ∅ | kettelitā | enn ef mimpit |
| | b. | Mariy | enn ef mimpit | kettelitā | |
| | | 'Mary has been given the book' | | | |

From the order in the Definitive tense, we are able to extrapolate the Neutral tense's ordering. Compare (142a) with (143a), and (142b) with (143c):

- | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| (143) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
| a. | *Mariy | | ∅ | kettelitā | enn ef mimpit |
| b. | *Mariy | kettelitā | ∅ | | enn ef mimpit |
| | c. | Mariy | enn ef mimpit | kettelitā | |
| | d. | Mariy | kettelitā | enn ef mimpit | |

The order in (143a) is incorrect, so the Neutral variant in (143b) is not correct either. Yet the order in (143c) is correct, which means that the Neutral tense has to be arranged like in (143d). As the ordering in (143d) satisfies rule (97) (whereas (143b) does not), it is hereby proved that inexpression of the Agent as shown in (140b) is entirely grammatical.³⁹

However, if the Goal acts as Subject₂, such Agentless passives are acceptable only in colloquial speech (symbolized by !). Compare:

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----|-------|---------|
| (144) | a. | Ef | mimpit | kettelije | pai | Jān | ón | Mariy |
| | | | | the book | give-BSX | AG | John | RE Mary |
| | | 'The book is given to Mary by John' | | | | | | |
| | b. | !Ef | mimpit | kettelije | ∅ | ón | Mariy | |
| | | 'The book is given to Mary' | | | | | | |

The Definitive variant of (144b) is:

- | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|--------|---|-----------|----|-------|
| (145) | !Ef | mimpit | ∅ | kettelije | ón | Mariy |
| | 'The book has been given to Mary' | | | | | |

Construction (145) fits into the Functional Pattern according to (146a), from which it may be inferred that (144b) has been ordered according to (146b):

- | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| (146) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
| a. | Ef | mimpit | ∅ | kettelije | ón Mariy |
| b. | Ef | mimpit | kettelije | ∅ | ón Mariy |

The fact that neither (146a) nor (146b) satisfy rule (97), explains why these constructions cannot simply be considered gram-

matical. That they nevertheless occur in colloquial speech, seems to be a result of analogy (a construction analogous to the grammatical constructions in (140b) and (142b)) and of the fact that they do meet rule (123iv).

It is interesting to note that both *lije*-passives with inexpression of Agent and Recipient, and *litā*-passives with inexpression of Agent and Goal are not grammatical, this as opposed to (140b) and (144b):

- (147) a. *E \bar{f} mimpit ketteli \bar{j} e
 'The book is given'
 b. *Mariy kettelitā
 'Mary is given to'

For, the constructions from (147) fit as appropriately into the Functional Pattern as (140b) and (144b) do, or, in other words, rules (97) and (123vi) are not infringed upon:

- | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| (148) | <u>P1</u> | <u>V-neut</u> | <u>P2</u> | <u>V-def</u> | <u>P3</u> |
| | a. *E \bar{f} mimpit | ketteli \bar{j} e | | | |
| | b. *Mariy | kettelitā | | | |

The ungrammaticality of (147) may be tentatively explained by a rule like:

- (149) Agent inexpression is only possible if at least two other arguments are expressed.

However, further research will be necessary on this matter. Finally, note that in this chapter the decision whether a construction is grammatical or not, is mainly based on the way in which such a construction fits into the Functional Pattern. As yet I am not quite sure what kind of rules should be defined, in order to meet the FG principle that every construction must be grammatical before it is placed in the Functional Pattern.

□ □ □

6. PSEUDO-PASSIVES AND PASSIVE PRONOUNS

6.1. Pseudo-passives

6.1.1. Traditional approach

In traditional Spocanian grammar, pseudo-passives are usually called fake passives and are prototypically formed with a one-place (= intransitive) verb. By definition, we are thus confronted with inexistence of Goal and Recipient. The verb is always marked by *-lije*, and never by *-litā*. Moreover, the pseudo-passive always appears in a construction with a reduction marker, usually according to Type A (see 5.1.5.), but sometimes according to Type B in dialectical and lofty speech. The absence of a Goal-Subject is compensated by the presence of a "fake" Agent, which here I prefer to call a Pseudo-Agent (semantic function: PsAg). Compare the real passive in (150a) with the pseudo-passive in (150b):

- (150) a. Blul zerfelije ôfe
 R see-GSX it_{GO}
 'It is being seen'
- b. Blul fartelije ôfe
 R walk-GSX it_{PsAg}
 'There is walking going on'

In (150) there seems to be an ergative relationship: the element acting as a Goal with the transitive *zerfe*, takes on the function of a (Pseudo-)Agent with the intransitive *farte*.⁴⁰

The Pseudo-Agent is usually the passive derivation of the personal pronoun 3sg.n *ôfe* (derived from *ef*⁴¹). Non-neutral personal pronouns (like *do* 'he' or *belt* 'they' 3pl.f) can be used if the speaker implicately holds one or more persons responsible for the SoA. For example:

- (151) a. Blul uokkelije dôe pert gy
 R smoke-GSX he_{PASS} much here
 {'A lot is smoked by him'}
 'There is a lot of smoking going on here [by him]'
- b. Kaf ef mārket blul scemrelije biylte riyfain
 on the market R shout-GSX they_{PASS} always
 {'On the market there is always shouted by them'}
 'On the market there is always shouting going on [by them]'

When somebody enters a smoke-filled room, he may utter (151a) if there is just one male smoker there. This smoker may interpret this linguistic expression as a request to stop smoking. The most natural interpretation of (151b) will be that it is a generic utterance, referring to the women offering their merchandise on a (typical Spocanian?) market: the generic aspect is explicitly

expressed by the initial position of the prepositional phrase *kaf ef mārket*, and that there are only women involved appears from the choice of *biylte* (= passive form of *belt* 'they' 3pl.f).

In traditional grammar, it is generally assumed that a pseudo-passive is derived from an active, intransitive construction in which the Agent loses its Heart-function. Thus, here this "de-hearting" is apparently sufficient to have *-lije* appear. The reduction marker *blul* is justified by the assumption that there is no *pai*-marked Agent present. Consequently, the traditional idea starts out from "derivations" like:

(152) *Do mirre pert gy* → *Blul mirrelije dōe pert gy*
 he stroll much here R stroll-GSX he_{PASS} much here

(153) [*Ef mirre pert gy*] → *Blul mirrelije ófe pert gy*
 it stroll much here R stroll-GSX it_{PASS} much here

Note that the active form *Ef mirre pert gy* 'It strolls a lot here' (intended as an impersonal form) in (153) is only an underlying (ungrammatical) structure, formed by analogy to an impersonal construction like

(154) *Ef bidalə pert gy*
 it rain much here
 'It rains a lot here'

Hence the square brackets in (153).⁴²

6.1.2. FG approach

6.1.2.1. Intransitive verbs

The traditional approach of pseudo-passives, as outlined in the preceding section, uses a - hypothetical - active but impersonal construction as a starting point, and from this a pseudo-passive is derived in the same way as "normal" passives are derived from personal actives. However, the FG framework rejects the existence of underlying, hypothetical constructions, only serving as input for the creation of "real" ones. Moreover, the way in which FG generates a passive never results in a pseudo-passive expression, as may be illustrated by the following example:

(155) *Blul mirrelije ófe* 'There is strolling going on'

If a pseudo-passive were to be treated as a normal passive, we would have to assume that (155) results from a zero-place, derived predicate frame in which the Agent is lacking; so, something like:

(156) a. INPUT: *mirrey (x₁)Ag*
 b. OUTPUT: *mirrey blul (∅)*

Without further operations however, (156b) will result in a construction like (157), but not in one as mentioned in (155):

(157) *Blul mirre
R stroll

In principle, the presence of the Pseudo-Agent *ófe* in (155) can be explained by the empirically defined rule:

(158) Subj assignment is always compulsory. If there is no argument present to which the Subj function may be assigned, then a pseudo-argument must be created.

The presence of the suffix *-lije* can be explained by the following tendencies:

- (i) Analogy: a construction like *blul mirrelije ófe* corresponds more with a real passive syntactically (like *blul trempelije ófe*), than a construction like *blul mirre ófe* does.
- (ii) Extrapolation: the presence of the suffix *-lije* always occurs together with the absence of an Agent-Subject; and as an Agent-Subject in *blul mirrelije ófe* is lacking, *mirre* "therefore" is suffixed with *-lije*.

The tendency towards analogy (in (i)) also explains why the Pseudo-Agent appears as a passive pronoun. In 6.2., passive pronouns will be discussed in more detail, and there it will become clear that the use of a passive pronoun in a pseudo-passive can also be predicted without an analogical process (section 6.2.3.).

Within an FG framework, the tendencies (i) and (ii) can be described in terms of predicate derivation, analogous to the notions "Prototypical expression model" (PEM) and "Principle of formal adjustment" (PFA). I am referring here to the quotations (49) and (50).

Consequently, the PFA (quotation (49)) predicts that a construction like (157) will adapt itself to the PEM of a non-derived construction of the same type. If we define the "type" in (157) as a "zero-place predicate", then it follows from (50a) that no PEM exists.

As the occurrence of zero-place predicates in Spocanian is an impossibility and (157) changes into the form of the one-place construction in (155), analogous to *Blul trempelije ófe* 'It is being read', the following Principle (analogous to (49)) may be defined (and will be based on predicate derivation (47)):

(159) Zero-place constructions, derived from one-place constructions by means of Agent deletion, are under pressure to adjust their formal expression to the prototypical expression model provided by one-place constructions derived from two-place constructions by means of Agent deletion.

The "prototypical expression model" as referred to in (159), may be defined as follows (analogous to (50)):

(160) One-place predicates without an Agent: PEM is the expression model for one-place predicates without an Agent, with an open first-argument position and a specified second argument.

The PEM in (160) now provokes adaption, with the result that (156b) conforms to a predicate frame, typical for one-place predicates with a deleted Agent. Consequently, construction (155) results from the derived frame in (161b):

- (161) a. INPUT: mirrey blul (Ø) (= (156b))
 b. OUTPUT: mirrey blul (Ø) (x₂)_{P_sAg}

Note that the open first-argument position (marked by (Ø)) is maintained in (161). As already mentioned in 4.2.3., there is a good reason for assuming that the sole argument in a blul-construction is a second, and not a first argument: for, as we have seen, only Subj assignment to a second argument results in the appearance of -lije.⁴³

The addition of an extra argument in (161a) in the open position would result in the following output:

- (162) *OUTPUT: mirrey blul (x₁)_Ø

(162) results in an expression in which the lije-suffix fails to turn up (apart from the question whether blul really can appear if there is a first argument present), for example:

- (163) *Blul mirre ef
 R stroll it

The ungrammaticality of a lije-less construction like (163) is an indication of the incorrectness of output (162).

6.1.2.2. Transitive verbs

Pseudo-passives are a kind of temporary solution in order to create some kind of passive construction, even with intransitive predicates. One would therefore obviously assume that pseudo-passives are impossible with transitive verbs: the possibility of a real passive would after all obstruct the "temporary solution" which a pseudo-passive is.

Yet, also transitive verbs appear eligible for a pseudo-passive, provided that the Goal remains unexpressed. Compare the one-place predicate in (164a) with the two-place predicate in (164b):

- (164) a. Blul mirrelije ófe pert gy
 R stroll-GSX it much here
 'There is a lot of strolling going on here'
 b. Blul trempeliye ófe pert gy
 R read-GSX it much here
 'There is a lot of reading going on here'

According to predicate frame (161b), ófe in (164a) is a second argument with the semantic function PsAg. As by definition the second argument at a Goal-transitive verb like trempé 'to read' is a Goal, ófe in (164b) would also have to be a Goal. In that case we are dealing with a "normal" passive, in which ófe refers to an inanimate entity (for instance a book). Indeed, this is a possible interpretation of (164b).⁴⁴

Thus, construction (164b) may only be interpreted as a pseudo-passive if *ófe* acts as a Pseudo-Agent. In that case, (164b) must be inferred from the following predicate frame (analogous to (161b)):

(165) *trempey blul (Ø) (x₂)_{PsAg}*

The most logical procedure of arriving at the derived frame in (165) is the following one: in the two-place frame of *trempe* only the first argument is deleted. Now a one-place frame remains, in which the second argument changes its semantic function according to (161b):

(166) a. INPUT: *trempey (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}*

b. OUTPUT1: *trempey blul (Ø) (x₂)_{Go}* (= INPUT in c.)

c. OUTPUT2: *trempey blul (Ø) (x₂)_{PsAg}*

Semantic function shift is not an unfamiliar process within FG. Usually it occurs together with argument position shift, in which, for instance after deletion of the first argument, a second argument with *Go* function becomes first argument itself, thus taking the zero-function (Ø). There seem to be no objections towards also applying the semantic function shift without its argument shift, as is the case in (166c).

Conclusion: pseudo-passives with transitive verbs result from a derived predicate frame in which the Agent has been deleted and the *Go* function has given way to a *PsAg* function.

From (166c), it can be inferred that the addition of a Goal to a pseudo-passive construction like in (164b) always must result in a ungrammatical construction, because (166c) shows that an argument position is no longer available to a Goal:

(167) a. **Blul trempeliye ófe gy enn pert mimpits*
 R read-GSX it_{PsAg} here GO many books

The correct variant of (167a) is always a real passive with the Subj assigned to the Goal, resulting from (166b), for instance:

(167) b. *Blul trempeliye pert mimpits gy*
 'There are many books (being) read here'

6.1.2.3. Predicate frames

Now, as we know the procedures for constructing a pseudo-passive, we have a tool for finding out which predicate frame belongs to a two-place Recipient predicate. Here, I will repeat the frames as proposed in S.1.III with regard to *pjôle* ón 'to speak to':

(168) a. *pjôley (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Rec}*

b. *pjôley (x₁)_{Ag} (Ø) (x₃)_{Rec}*

- (172) a. Blul póbarelije ófe pert
 R sell-GSX it much
 'There is a lot of selling going on'
- b. Blul póbarelije ófe pert ón Petriy
 'There is a lot of selling to Peter going on'

The constructions in (172) show a predicate derivation analogous to the one in (166), with the sole distinction that a third Rec-argument must now be added:

- (173) a. INPUT: póbarey (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go} (x₃)_{Rec}
- b. OUTPUT1: póbarey blul (∅) (x₂)_{Go} (x₃)_{Rec} (= INPUT in c.)
- c. OUTPUT2: póbarey blul (∅) (x₂)_{PsAg} (x₃)_{Rec}

Generally speaking, we may claim that a pseudo-passive will be possible if the original second argument remains unexpressed and acquires the new semantic function PsAg.⁴⁵

Pseudo-passives in which the Pseudo-Agent has been entirely omitted are sometimes heard in (unpolished?) colloquial speech. For example:

- (174) a. Blul mirrelije pert gy (cf. (124d))
 'There is a lot of strolling going on here'
- b. Blul trempelije pert gy
 'There is a lot of reading going on here'
- c. Blul pjólelije [ón Mariy] (see (124c))
 'There is talking [to Mary] going on'
- d. Blul póbarelije pert [ón Petriy]
 'There is a lot of selling [to Peter] going on'

Apparently, in these cases the intermediate output frames in respectively (161a), (166b), (171b) and (173b) are used, in which no Pseudo-Agent is present as yet: here we encounter the Pseudo-Agent's inexistence. Because of the (marginal) grammaticality of the constructions in (174), the output frames belonging to them have a "right to exist", so their presence within predicate derivations does not necessarily contradict the FG principle that "underlying" structures which do not result in lexical expressions must be avoided.

Finally, in the cases of (166b) and (173b) we may note the inexpression of the Goal. Indeed, if the Goal were to be expressed here, then "real" passives would be the result, respectively in the style of (167b) and of

- (174) d*. Blul póbarelije pert mimpits [ón Petriy]
 'There are many books sold [to Peter]'

6.2. Passive pronouns

Passive pronouns do not only appear in blul-constructions, but can be used in a number of other constructions as well. That is why, the term "passive pronouns" is actually far too restricted, but as for the moment I do not have a better suggestion, I will maintain this current term. Moreover, it should be noted that a non-passive pronoun can now be called an "active pronoun".

There is a relationship between passive pronouns and the "absence" of an argument, and this is actually the reason for discussing such pronouns in this chapter.⁴⁶

Here, we will briefly repeat the use of passive pronouns in passive constructions: (175a) is an Agent-containing passive with a Goal as Subject2. (175b) is an Agentless passive with a Goal as Subject0. The Prom2 function remains unassigned here (the Subject is printed in bold type):

- (175) a. Eup tsyneliije pai Petriy
 she_{ACT} tickle-GSX by Peter
 'She is being tickled by Peter'
- b. Blul tsyneliije épe
 R tickle-GSX she_{PASS}
 'She is being tickled'

Also with pseudo-passives (see 6.1.1), a passive pronoun appears:

- (176) Blul mirreliije ófe pert gy
 R stroll-GSX it_{PASS} much here
 'There is a lot of strolling going on here'

In this section, we will trace why such a special pronominal form appears in the constructions above. First of all, note that passive pronouns do not only occur in (pseudo-)passive constructions but also in:

- (i) imperatives
 (ii) causatives

Consideratives and desideratives are syntactically related to imperatives. These constructions will therefore automatically be dealt with under the imperatives. Imperatives and causatives are formed by rather complex rules in Spocanian, and that is the reason why I will confine myself to the constructions in which the passive pronouns' role is shown to best advantage.

6.2.1. Imperatives

6.2.1.1. General description

Passive pronouns 2nd person are used to express an imperative:⁴⁷

- (177) a. Vende-tûe!
 go-thou_{PASS}
 'Go [away]!'
- b. Trempe-görse dena mimpit!
 read-you_{PASS} that book
 'Read that book!'
- c. Kette-tûe ef smurf ón Petriy, missjeffō
 give-thou_{PASS} the money RE Peter please
 'Please, give the money to Peter'

Note that the passive pronoun is linked to the predicate by way of a hyphen. This is done because, together, predicate and pronoun form a single verbal constituent. What kind of a constituent this exactly is, will be discussed in connection with the derived predicate frames in (186) and (187).

The passive pronoun 1st person plural (kiyroe) is used for expressing a considerative:

- (178) a. Vende-kiyroe
 go-we_{PASS}
 'Let us go'
- b. Kette-kiyroe ef mimpit ón Mariy
 give-we_{PASS} the book RE Mary
 'Let us give the book to Mary'

The passive pronoun 1st person singular (gróse) may also express a considerative, or perhaps a desiderative, depending on context, intonation or adverbial phrases:

- (179) Lukte-gróse ef oto
 wash-I_{PASS} the car
 'Let me just wash the car [now]'
 or 'I really want to wash the car [now]'

The constructions in (178) and (179) are entirely identical to those in (177). Once again an Agent argument is lacking, and the passive pronoun has been linked to the verb in one way or another.

Passive pronouns 3rd person form a construction which can be considered either an indirect imperative or an indirect considerative/desiderative (from now on, I will no longer explicitly mention the desideratives):

- (180) a. Vende-dōe
 go-he_{PASS}
 'It must be that he is leaving'
- b. Trempe-ÿpse ef mimpit
 read-they_{PASS} the book
 'It must be that they will be reading the book'

The speaker either expects, as it were, a "real" imperative to be

spoken to the third person, or the third person is addressing him/her self by way of a "real" considerative.⁴⁸

Indirect consideratives and indirect imperatives may also be used in indirect speech. Note the parallelism between the a-example and the corresponding b-example:

- (181) a. Mariy reppe: "Gress luktavy ef oto"⁴⁹
 Mary say I wash-WANT the car
 'Mary says: "I want to wash the car"'
- b. Mariy reppe den eup luktavy ef oto
 Mary say that she wash-WANT the car
 'Mary says that she wants to wash the car'
- (182) a. Mariy empajae: "Lukte-gróse ef oto"
 Mary consider wash-IPASS the car
 'Mary is considering: "Let's go and wash the car now"'
- b. Mariy empajae den lukte-épe ef oto
 Mary consider that wash-shepASS the car
 'Mary is considering to go and wash the car now'

The 1st person gress in (181a) has been replaced by the 3rd person eup in the subordinate den-clause in (181b), which corefers with Mariy.

That the 1st person gróse in (182a) is similarly replaced by épe in the subordinate den-clause in (182b), coreferring with the Agent Mariy, can be inferred from empajae 'consider', which is logically followed by a considerative. If empajae is replaced by quae 'order, command', then the den-clause will be interpreted as an indirect imperative (in (183b)). Now, the 3rd person épe corefers with the Goal Elsa:

- (183) a. Mariy quae Elsa: "Lukte-túe ef oto!"
 Mary order Elsa wash-thoupASS the car
 'Mary orders Elsa: "Go and wash the car!"'
- b. Mariy quae Elsa den lukte-épe ef oto
 Mary order Elsa that wash-shepASS the car
 'Mary orders Elsa to go and wash the car'

From the examples above, it may be inferred that imperatives and consideratives contain an original Agent, linked to the predicate. Imperatives and consideratives are therefore a result of predicate derivation, and this may be illustrated by means of the following expressions:

- (184) a. Tu arfine 'You come'
 b. Arfine-túe! 'Come!'
- (185) a. Gress lukte ef oto 'I am washing the car'
 b. Lukte-gróse ef oto 'Let me wash the car'

6.2.1.2. Agent-linking

Examples (184) and (185) are the result of the following predicate

derivations in which the Agent is linked to the verbal constituent, leaving the first-argument position open:

- (186) a. INPUT: arfinev (x₁: tu (x₁))_{Ag}
 b. OUTPUT: [arfinev-(x₁: tu (x₁))_{Ag}]v (∅)
- (187) a. INPUT: luktev (x₁: gress (x₁))_{Ag} (x₂: ef oto (x₂))_{Bo}
 b. OUTPUT: [luktev-(x₁: gress (x₁))_{Ag}]v (∅)
 (x₂: ef oto (x₂))_{Bo}

This Agent-linking can be seen as a somewhat weaker variant of Agent incorporation. The process of incorporation has been described in Dik (1978:169) as well as in Dik (1980:39f). Dik points out several characteristic properties of such constructions, and I quote:

- (A) "The incorporated nominal is typically an uninflected, unmodified nominal stem;"
 (B) "Incorporation typically reduces the number of arguments of the input predicate;"
 (C) "Constructions with incorporation typically have a more 'generic' or 'habitual' meaning than their non-incorporating counterparts;"
 (D) "The incorporated nominal typically does not refer independently;"
 (E) "Incorporating constructions tend to develop idiomatic meanings;"
 (F) "Incorporated nominals may become insulated in the predicate formation component or in the lexicon, and thus lose their relation with freely occurring nominal predicates."

However, I prefer to call the Spocanian process "linking" instead of "incorporation", and this is based on the following arguments:

- (i) In the Spocanian constructions pronouns are involved, instead of nominal constituents;
 (ii) As opposed to what has been said in (A), the Spocanian elements are certainly inflected: the pronouns have a passive form;
 (iii) The Spocanian constructions lack any "generic" or "habitual" meaning, as suggested in (C);
 (iv) A passive pronoun is very well able to make an independent reference, and therefore (D) is not relevant in Spocanian;
 (v) Contrary to (E), the Spocanian constructions do not tend to develop idiomatic meanings at all;
 (vi) Property (F) is not relevant either.

Of all the properties that are so typical of incorporation, only (B) is relevant in the case of Spocanian. Moreover, there are a number of properties typical for a Subject (and a linked Agent is actually a Subject), which are still valid after the linking-process, like for instance its coreference with a reflexive possessive pronoun. Compare:

- (188) a. Tu lukte sener lomkā
 thou wash REFL face
 'You wash your face'
- b. Lukte-tūe sener lomkā!
 wash-thou_{PASS} REFL face
 'Wash your face!'

If, in (188b), *tūe* would be incorporated in the predicate, its Subject properties would be lost, so that it would be impossible to use the reflexive *sener* here.

In short, there is sufficient reason for considering the Spocanian process a very "weak" variant of incorporation in which all original properties of the element in question are retained. Perhaps the most important modifications are: (i) here we have a derived predicate with one argument position less; (ii) in the Functional Pattern the element no longer occupies a position of its own, but remains linked to the verb. That is why I prefer the term "linking".

Now, I will return to (186) and (187).

Note that, after Agent-linking, the first-argument position remains open, and that there is no argument shift, in the sense that the Goal now appears as a first argument. Indeed, if the Goal would appear as a first argument, we might expect constructions like:

- (189) *Ef oto lukte-grōse
 the car wash-_{IPASS}

in which *ef oto* acts as a Subject₂. Without going into the matter in more detail, I take the view that such constructions certainly are ungrammatical.

In view of the two-place output predicate as in (187), one might expect the Goal to be sensitive to Subj assignment, so that, in other words, a passive construction might follow. This supposition appears to be correct, as can be seen from grammatical constructions like:

- (190) Ef oto lukteliye-grōse⁵⁰
 the car wash-GSX-_{IPASS}
 'Let the car be washed by me'

Besides such passive consideratives, passive imperatives are possible too. Compare:

- (191) a. Lukte-tūe ef oto!
 wash-thou_{PASS} the car
 'Wash the car!'
- b. Ef oto lukteliye-tūe!
 the car wash-GSX-thou_{PASS}
 'See to it that the car is washed [by yourself]!'

The constructions in (191) result from output frame (192b):

- (192) a. INPUT: $luktey (x_1: tu (x_1))_{Ag} (x_2: ef oto (x_2))_{\theta_0}$
 b. OUTPUT: $[luktey-(x_1: tu (x_1))_{Ag}]_V (\emptyset) (x_2: ef oto (x_2))_{\theta_0}$

In (191b), the functions of Subj and Prom2 have been assigned to the Goal *ef oto*, causing the verb to be marked by *-lije* and *ef oto* to appear in P1.

6.2.2. Causatives

6.2.2.1. General description

Causative constructions⁵¹ differ from the constructions discussed in 6.2.1. by the presence of what is still a "real" Agent, the "Causer". Compare:

- (193) a. *Arfine-tūe!*
 'Come!'
 b. *Kirro arfine-tūe*
 we come-thouP_{AGG}
 'We will let you come'
- (194) a. *Lukte-grōse ef oto*
 'Let me wash the car' (= I intend to wash the car)
 b. *Petriy lukte-grōse ef oto*
 Peter wash-Ip_{AGG} the car
 'Peter let me wash the car'

It seems plausible that the constructions (193b) and (194b) result from a predicate frame derived from the output frames in (186b) and (187b), in such a way that the open first position is now occupied by an Agent-Causer:

- (195) a. INPUT: $[arfiney-(x_1: tu (x_1))_{Ag}]_V (\emptyset) (= (186b))$
 b. OUTPUT: $[arfiney-(x_1: tu (x_1))_{Ag}]_V$
 $(x_{1i}: kirro (x_{1i}))_{AgCauser}$
- (196) a. INPUT: $[luktey-(x_1: gress (x_1))_{Ag}]_V (\emptyset)$
 $(x_2: ef oto (x_2))_{\theta_0} (= (187b))$
 b. OUTPUT: $[luktey-(x_1: gress (x_1))_{Ag}]_V$
 $(x_{1i}: Petriy (x_{1i}))_{AgCauser} (x_2: ef oto (x_2))_{\theta_0}$

The addition of a new first argument⁵² with the function of Agent-Causer seems to be the logical result of the "deficiency" that an Agent argument is lacking in (195) and (196). Here, we see the tendency discussed in (49) and called PFA, which is based on the PEMs in (50b) and (50c) referring to (195) and (196) respectively.

6.2.2.2. Passive causatives

Besides passive consideratives and passive imperatives, Spocanian also has a marginal construction which may be best defined as a passive causative:

- (197) Er lelmo tof kiyroe farteliije dalotoje dym kasz
 since this day we_{PASS} walk-GSX outside without coats
 'Since today we are able to go out without a coat'
 (for instance, because summer now really has started)

On semantic grounds, a passive causative is described as follows:

- (a) In a causative the SoA is created by way of an "additional" Agent's (the Causer's) intermediary.
 (b) In a passive, the SoA is described without expressing the Agent.

The combination of (a) and (b) has the following result: in a passive causative the SoA is created through the intermediary of an "additional" Agent, which however remains unspecified.

As for Spocanian, this only seems possible if the unspecified Agent is inanimate, which practically boils down to "an outside force or influence, which makes the SoA possible and has it carried out".⁵³

In a construction like (197) this "outside force" could be the warm weather or the sun that makes it possible, after a cold winter, to go outside without a coat. Also compare:

- (198) Gröse trempeliije ral ef mimpit
 I_{PASS} read-GSX now the book
 'Now I can read the book'

Here too, there has to be "an outside force or situation" which makes the SoA possible and activates it. This "force" may for instance be the light that has been switched on, or the spectacles I put on.

Similar passive causatives always tell us that something initially was impossible, but is possible now. Plus the fact that it is now actually happening, too.⁵⁴

Let us now see how FG is able to deal with such passive causatives. Our example will be (197), in which we will omit the satellites for the sake of convenience:

- (199) Kiyroe farteliije
 we_{PASS} walk-GSX
 'We can walk' (= Something enables us to walk)

Those passives cannot be constructed in the normal way by means of Subj assignment to the Goal, because there is no Goal present, as appears from the derived predicate frame for causatives in (200c):

- (200) a. INPUT: farte_v (x₁: kirro (x₁))_{Ag}
 b. OUTPUT1: [farte_v-(x₁: kirro (x₁))_{Ag}]_v (Ø) (= INPUT in c.)
 c. OUTPUT2: [farte_v-(x₁: kirro (x₁))_{Ag}]_v
 (x₁: do (x₁))_{AgCauser}

Successively, from (200a), (200b) and (200c) result:

- (201) a. Kirro farte 'We are walking'
 b. Farte-kiyroe 'Let us walk' (considerative)
 c. Do farte-kiyroe 'He makes us walk' (causative)

However, there are two reasons why (199) can never result from (200c). The first one is that the linking of the Agent to the verb, as shown in (200c), has been suspended in (199). The second reason is that (200c) contains an Agent (the Causer do), which is lacking in (199), so that (199) would have to result from a derived frame in which the Agent had been deleted. But Agent deletion automatically entails the addition of a reduction marker, for instance *hlul*, and this is also lacking in (199).

With regard to constructions like (199), I therefore claim a frame derivation based on a "first-argument shift to the second-argument position"; the open first-argument position now arising, provides a passive pronoun (see 6.2.3.):

- (202) a. INPUT: farte_v (x₁: kirro (x₁))_{Ag}
 ↓
 b. OUTPUT: farte_v (Ø) (x₂: kirro (x₂))_{ØPASS}

(Obligatory) Subj and Prom2 assignment to the second argument results in a *lije*-marking and in a P1-position for this argument. That is the way expression (199) comes about. Unfortunately, two-place predicates interfere with the procedure as claimed in (202), as the following example may prove:

- (203) Gróse trempelije ef mimpit (cf. (198))
 'I can read the book' (= Something enables me to read it)

Analogous to (202), the following derivation should be correct:

- (204)
 a. INPUT: trempe_v (x₁: gress (x₁))_{Ag} (x₂: ef mimpit (x₂))_{Øg}
 ↓ ↘
 b. OUTPUT: trempe_v (Ø) (x₂: gress (x₂))_{ØPASS} (x_?: ef mimpit (x_?))_{Øg}

The question-marks in (204b) indicate that the status of the original input Goal has become obscure in the output: for, through the process of argument shift, the input Agent now occupies the second-argument position (this explains the passive pronoun *gróse* as well as the suffix *-lije* in (203)).

For methodological reasons, I wish to rule out the possibility of the Goal in (204b) becoming a third argument. For, up to now, it has indeed been managed, in all predicate derivations, to relate an argument's semantic function directly to the argument position. A Goal is by definition a second argument, and it would not be very elegant to make an exception for (204b). That is why I prefer the original second argument to degenerate into a kind of satellite, in order to be able to adapt (204b) in the following way:

(205) OUTPUT: $trempey (\emptyset) (x_2: gress (x_2))_{\emptyset PASS}$
 $(y_1: ef mimpit (y_1))_{\emptyset \emptyset}$

The satellite-character of *ef mimpit* is also affirmed by the following:

- (i) In (203), the verb cannot be placed after *ef mimpit* in order to express a Definitive tense:

*Gröse *ef mimpit* *trepelije* 'I could read the book'

This indicates that *ef mimpit* is not a P2-constituent, as it should be if *ef mimpit* was a Goal-argument.

- (ii) The element *enn*, being a typical marker for a Goal argument, can hardly be added in (203):

??Gröse *trepelije enn ef mimpit*

- (iii) Subj assignment to *ef mimpit*, resulting in a *lije-* or *litā-*passive, is impossible:

**Ef mimpit trepelije/trepelitā [enn/pai] gröse/gress*

6.2.3. The nature of passive pronouns

Compare the following constructions:

- | | | |
|----------|----------------------------|---|
| (206) a. | <i>Blul lukteliije tūe</i> | 'You are being washed' (passive) |
| b. | <i>Blul mirreliije ôfe</i> | 'There is strolling going on'
(pseudo-passive) |
| c. | <i>Lukte-tūe!</i> | 'Go and wash!' (imperative) |
| d. | <i>Gress lukte-tūe</i> | 'I will make you wash' (causative) |
| e. | <i>Tūe lukteliije</i> | 'You can wash' (passive causative) |

What do these constructions have in common that may explain the presence of a passive pronoun? Or, in other words: what is the overall property of a passive pronoun, enabling it to be used in all five constructions?

Traditional grammar provides us with the following answer:

- (207) Passive pronouns appear if a "catalyst" is necessary in order to make the (intended) SoA active.

Instead of "catalyst", one sometimes uses the term "instigator". In view of (206a) and (206b), we have to imagine that the SoA YOU ARE BEING WASHED, respectively THERE IS STROLLING GOING ON is only

possible if there is an Agent present in the real world. Therefore, what we see here is an unspecified force, necessary to activate the SoA.

In (206c), there is the potential SoA YOU WASH. This SoA is initially activated by an order given by an unspecified force. Usually this force refers to the speaker (but also see (182) and (183)).

The causative in (206d) resembles the imperative in (206c), yet in (206c) the open Agent position has been occupied by the instigator in (206d). The SoA YOU WASH is activated by this explicitly specified force.

Finally, the passive causative in (206e) expresses that the SoA YOU WASH is made possible by an external force, and that therefore the SoA will certainly be activated.

In FG, this traditional semantic explanation can be replaced by a syntactic one, which may be directly derived from the predicate frames underlying the constructions in (206). These frames are:

- (208) a. luktey blul (\emptyset) (x_2 : tu (x_2))_{Go}
 b. mirrey blul (\emptyset) (x_2 : ef (x_2))_{PsAg}
 c. [luktey-(x_1 : tu (x_1))_{Ag}]_V (\emptyset)
 d. [luktey-(x_1 : tu (x_1))_{Ag}]_V (x_1 : gress (x_1))_{AgCauser}
 e. luktey (\emptyset) (x_2 : tu (x_2))_g

In all these frames, with the exception of (208d), there seems to be an immediate relationship between the presence of an open first-argument position (indicated by (\emptyset)) and the appearance of a passive pronoun. This relationship is less evident in (208d), but, assuming that (208d) has been derived from (208c) (see 6.2.2.1.), one could imagine that the occurrence of the passive pronoun has already been fixed in some way within the predicate frame of (208c), even before (208d) had been derived from it. In that case, the occurrence of a passive pronoun is not a question of an expression rule applied at the last moment, but rather of a rule already operating at the level of predicate formation. The appearance of a passive pronoun, indicated by the addition of the subscript X_{pAg} , can therefore be compared with the appearance of a reduction marker like blul. In that case, the frames (208a), (208b) and (208c) must have been derived as follows:

- (209) a. INPUT: luktey (x_1)_{Ag} (x_2 : tu (x_2))_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: luktey blul (\emptyset) (x_2 : tu (x_2))_{GoPASS}
- (210) a. INPUT: mirrey (x_1)_{Ag}
 b. OUTPUT: mirrey blul (\emptyset) (x_2 : ef (x_2))_{PsAgPASS}

- (211) a. INPUT: lukte_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂: tu (x₂))_{Go}
 b. OUTPUT: [lukte_v-(x₁: tu (x₁))_{AgPASS}]_v (∅)

Assuming that a causative has been derived from an imperative, (211b) will serve as input for

- (211) c. OUTPUT: [lukte_v-(x₁: tu (x₁))_{AgPASS}]_v
 (x₁: gress (x₁))_{AgCausar}

The occurrence of a passive pronoun in a causative construction can be explained along these lines, but further research may be necessary in order to prove whether the appearance of a passive pronoun is a matter of either an expression rule, or of a rule operating at a lower level.

6.3. Conclusion

I tentatively claim that Spocanian has 6 procedures⁵⁵ in order to derive a new predicate frame:

- (i) Agent deletion
- (ii) Agent linking
- (iii) Agent shift to the second-argument position
- (iv) Agent addition
- (v) Pseudo-Agent addition (see 6.1.2.1.)
- (vi) Semantic function shift Go → PsAg (see 6.1.2.2.)

In the cases (i) - (iii), there remains an open first-argument position in the predicate frame, resulting in the use of a passive pronoun for the other argument with Subj function. In addition to this, Agent deletion is marked by a reduction marker. Case (iv) is only possible if the input predicate has been formed by Agent linking: a new Agent with the Causer function is now added. Cases (v) and (vi) are only possible if the input predicate has been formed by Agent deletion.

The six types of predicate derivation can be expressed in general terms as follows (as this is typical for two-place Recipient predicates and for one-place predicates, I will restrict myself here to two-place Goal predicates, except for type (v)):

(i) Agent deletion:

- INPUT: Pred_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}
 OUTPUT: Pred_v blul (∅) (x₂)_{Go}

(ii) Agent linking:

- INPUT: Pred_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}
 OUTPUT: [Pred_v-(x₁)_{Ag}]_v (∅) (x₂)_{Go}

(iii) Agent shift:

(a possible Goal is also shifted and becomes a satellite):

INPUT: Pred_y (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{Go}

OUTPUT: Pred_y (∅) (x₂)_∅ (y₁)_{Go}

(iv) Agent addition:INPUT: [Pred_y-(x₁)_{Ag}]_y (∅) (x₂)_{Go} (= Output of (ii))OUTPUT: [Pred_y-(x₁)_{Ag}]_y (x₁)_{AgCauser} (x₂)_{Go}(v) Pseudo-Agent addition:INPUT: Pred_y blul (∅) (∅) (x₃)_{Rec} (= Output of (i))OUTPUT: Pred_y blul (∅) (x₂)_{PsAg} (x₃)_{Rec}(vi) Semantic function shift: Go → PsAg:INPUT: Pred_y blul (∅) (x₂)_{Go} (= Output of (i))

OUTPUT: Pred_y blul (∅) (x₂)_{PsAg}

□ □ □

7. FINAL CONCLUSION

7.1. Conclusion

In this paper the following topics have been discussed:

(i)

The elementary FG process of "Subj assignment" by which the distinction active vs. passive can be described, is not equivalent to the traditional Spocanian notion of "Heart-assignment". As far as Spocanian is concerned, "Subj assignment" has to be split into two components: assignment of the syntactic component "Prominence-1" (syntactic function: Prom1) and assignment of the pragmatic component "Prominence-2" (Prom2).⁵⁶ In this respect, Spocanian is in striking agreement with the Philippine languages (also typically insular!).

The element to which Prom1 has been assigned – and not Prom2 – has been defined as Subject \emptyset . The element with both Prom1 and Prom2 assigned to it, has been defined as Subject2. As it seems, Prom2 can never be assigned to an element that does not already have a Prom1 function, unless one can make it seem plausible that even the reduction marker blul is able to take the Prom2 function.

(ii)

Within an FG framework, the elements blul, hyg and cÿry, traditionally called "passive particles", can best be considered "reduction markers". Thus they form an element within a derived predicate frame in which the Agent has been deleted.

(iii)

The Functional Pattern for Spocanian is based on the semantic functions Ag, Go and Rec, and on the tense-parameters Neutral, Definitive and Future. It is not true that every semantic function has its fixed position within this Pattern, but rather that these functions, together with any reduction marker present, form a kind of hierarchy which has some relationship with a certain position-hierarchy (P1...P3), as illustrated below (from "high" to "low"):

- a. Subject2 > R > Subject \emptyset > Ag > Go > Rec
- b. P1 > P2 > P3

(iv)

The occurrence of passive pronouns may be described in terms of predicate formation: an open first-argument position in a derived predicate frame causes the remaining Subject to appear as a passive pronoun. As passive pronouns also occur in expressions resulting from predicates with a taken first-argument position, derived from predicates with an open first-argument position, the property "passive" cannot be ascribed to pronouns by means of an expression rule which operates after the underlying representation has been specified (see also Dik 1980:17). The "passive" property

must therefore be assigned as soon as the underlying representation has been specified.

(v)

Spocanian has an extensive system of predicate formation: my provisional survey contains at least six - and perhaps seven - kinds of derived predicates, but further research will be necessary in this matter.

7.2. A final word

After all this, the following is perhaps most striking: During the late fifties, while attending elementary school, I was doing something which so many children do: I drew maps of an imaginary country, inhabited by ghosts (in Dutch: spoken, plural of spook) speaking an imaginary language. Naturally, I was unaware of grammar, and so this spooky language was mainly a collection of imaginary words, rather than a system of syntactic rules.* When I was 11 years old, I started writing a "real" Spocanian grammar. By then, I already had a sketchy knowledge of Dutch grammar and was learning to read my first sentences in English, German and French, compulsory at that time in Dutch secondary schools. The apparently simple grammatical system of Spocanian, mainly based on intuition, gradually grew more complex as my linguistic knowledge increased and no longer had anything to do with ghosts or magic. On the contrary - for, I intended to create a "natural" language and took care that it should not become too similar to any Indo-European tongue. In doing so, I had to picture a realistic country with regular people, because every natural language "has to be spoken somewhere". Like any natural language, Spocanian also has its irregularities, redundancies, ambiguities and intranslatable, historical and dialectical expressions. And dirty words too, of course. Therefore, I must emphasize that Spocanian is not a kind of Esperanto or Volapuk, intended to bring people closer to one another with the eventual aim of peace. From 1980 onwards, I have been occupied in compiling a "standard grammar" from all that has been described in relation to Spocanian. Up to now, this contains over 350 pages - and that is still less than half of what remains to be done. At the outstart of its develop-

* The country was called Spooksoliy 'Spocania', and its language was Spokānda 'Spocanian'. As nowadays Spocania is considered a "real" nation inhabited by human beings, the root spo[o]k no longer bears any relation to the Dutch word spook 'ghost'. One could say that Spocania has as little to do with ghosts or magic as the American town of Spokane has. I was actually surprised when I encountered this name for the first time, but as so many American placenames were borrowed from European topography, there could easily have been a group of poor Spocanian farmers trying to start a new life in the forests of the north-western part of the USA, founding a town there called after their native soil. The link I was able to establish between Spokane and Spocania is proof, so to speak, of the latter's reality.

ment, this grammar was "tested" by writing in Spocanian and translating into it. A 530 page Spocanian-Dutch dictionary with ca. 24,000 entries, also containing dialectical words and idioms, was more or less completed in 1985, together with its reverse, Dutch-Spocanian, and due to the blessings of the word processor it is still continually being expanded.

After reading linguistics, I am now able to use my knowledge of FG in order to approach the existing Spocanian passive system in a critical manner, and this has resulted in a description which proves it comparable with that of the Philippine "prominence"-languages. If other Spocanian grammatical phenomena are investigated in a similar way, the inner structure of this language will gradually become clearer, and as this structure is based on language-independent universals (for, they are an immediate outcome of an individual's creativity and intuition, and not of an elaborate linguistic theory), we will perhaps understand a little more about how language in general is learnt and used.

Simon Dik has remarked (personal communication) that it is not important in linguistics by how many people a language is spoken. A language spoken by one person is as worthy of being examined as a language used by a 100 million speakers.

So, if someone should wish to attack me for using my own creation as a research object, assuming that this can easily be adapted towards obtaining a desirable research result, then I may frankly oppose him by stating that the development of Spocanian had already begun before I was aware of any linguistic theory. Furthermore, I would like to remind those who suspect my Spocanian material to be limited, that valuable scientific research may even be based on one or two examples from an Indian language recorded by a missionary in 1850, and subsequently becoming extinct in, for instance, 1930. Which language is more of a reality, Spocanian or this extinct Indian language?

□ □ □

NOTES

1. In this article, I will consistently call every first argument an "Agent", every second argument a "Goal", and every third argument a "Recipient", even if the semantic relation between predicate and argument is such that "Agent", "Goal" and "Recipient" are less adequate terms. For instance, together with the three-place Spocanian verb:

mūrše rast ón flaju
 prepare somebody to something
 'to prepare somebody for something'

the argument *ón flaju* can hardly be considered a "Recipient" in a semantic sense, in spite of its Recipient marker *ón*. The function "Goal" does not seem to fit in with *rast* either.

2. In the examples, the following abbreviations will be used:

AG = Agent marker (*pai*)
 GO = Goal marker (*enn*)
 RE = Recipient marker (*ón*)
 GSX = Goal-passive suffix (*-lije*)
 RSX = Recipient-passive suffix (*-litā*)
 R = Reduction marker (*blul, hyg, cÿry*)
 GEN = Genitive suffix (*-ecÿr*)
 DET = Determinant (*ki*)
 REFL = Reflexive pronoun (*sener*)
 INF = Infinitive marker (*beri*)

3. In a number of cases one may drop *enn* (and sometimes this is even obligatory), also when the Goal does not take the Heart function. Thus, the more usual variant of (8a) is:

a. Jān kette ef mimpit ón Mariy
 John gives the book to Mary

Therefore we will also find examples in this paper in which *enn* is missing, in spite of the fact that the Goal does not take the Heart function. However, this apparent anomaly does not effect the matter discussed here. Perhaps it is interesting to investigate whether the possible occurrence of *enn* can be described in FG terms as Obj assignment: thus, in a. ef mimpit could be an Object (in the FG sense), whereas this is not the case in (8a). In passing, I will return to this matter in 4.3.3.3.

4. Here "changes" and "shifts" appear between quotation-marks, for I use these terms only to refer to the changes shown in (18). Thus, it is not a question here of a transformational

notion, which is of course unknown in FG.

5. Instead of the interrogative pronoun *kluft* 'what' in (25a), the use of an interrogative suffix is very common indeed. In that case, the variant in (25a) will be:

Jān lorertatéf?
 John buy-WHAT?
 'What does John buy?'

What is more, it is – intrinsically speaking – even impossible for a suffixed Focus element like *-atéf* to take the initial position!

6. Spocanian is able to express three tenses in its constituent order:

Neutral: Elsa trempe ef quiyrda
 Elsa read the newspaper
 'Elsa reads/is reading the newspaper'

Definitive: Elsa ef quiyrda trempe
 Elsa the newspaper read
 'Elsa has read/has been reading the newspaper'
 or 'Elsa read/was reading the newspaper'

Future: Trempe Elsa ef quiyrda
 read Elsa the newspaper
 'Elsa will read/be reading the newspaper'

See 4.3.3.2.f, for a more detailed discussion of these tenses.

7. Of course this is only valid for arguments. By definition, a satellite cannot be a Heart, but on the other hand it can be placed in a clause-initial position (or: must show up there when it takes the Foc function; see also (29), in which *kaf ef kelbra* is a clause-initial satellite).

8. Originally, the reflexive possessive pronoun *sen* is the genitive of the reflexive personal pronoun *sen* '..self', as in:

Gress sen lukte 'I wash myself'
 Tu sen lukte 'You wash yourself'
 Do sen lukte 'He washes himself'

and so on.

9. Should an attentive reader observe that a relative pronoun which does not refer to a nominal constituent, might possibly refer to an entire clause, so that the antecedent of *té* in

(36) is not gress but ef nert gressere, I would like to point out that the use of *té* is restricted to concrete entities in the singular, and that Spocanian has a special relative pronoun at which the antecedent could be an entire clause. This pronoun is *wān*, and its use is illustrated by the following example:

Tybelt eft flappa kuntarye, wān melde pūl
 Tybelt a fountain.pen steal which be stupid

 āfry gress
 according.to me

'Tybelt has stolen a fountain pen, which I think is stupid'

However, this kind of construction is typical for written language. In colloquial speech, a coordination with the personal pronoun *mittof* 'that' is preferred. *Mittof* refers to the matrix clause as a whole:

Tybelt eft flappa kuntarye, ur mittof melde
 Tybelt a fountain.pen steal and that be

 pūl āfry gress
 stupid according.to me

'idem'

The Past (= Definitive) tense has been expressed by placing the Goal *eft flappa* before the verb *kuntarye* (cf. note 6).

10. In the derived predicate frame (40b), the semantic function "Go" should actually be converted to "Ø". This conversion follows indirectly from Agent deletion, as the original Action in (40a) has now been changed into a State. If a State predication only has a single argument, this is assigned to the "zero semantic function Ø". See Dik (1978:38). As mentioned before, I will consistently use the term "Goal" in this paper.
11. *Blul* is a variant of the Old Spocanian verb *†blueł* 'to point' which was also used as an adverb meaning 'here'. In modern Spocanian, the Old-Spocanian infinitive marker *-el* has been reduced to *-e*. This explains the relationship between *†blueł* and the modern *bløe* 'to show'.
12. As a Goal is not a possible candidate for the first argument position, the argument shift in (53) involves a shift in semantic function: the input Goal becomes an output Ø. This change in semantic function is directly related to a passive construction's different perspective on the SoA.

13. Articles also have passive variants: see note 46.
14. The use of the reflexive possessive pronoun *sener* in (59b) indicates that *tūe* acts as a Heart here. This is one of the reasons that I do not speak of argument incorporation (as was my initial intention), but of argument linking: the original argument still retains some of its properties, which would not be the case after incorporation. See also section 6.2.1.2.
15. In (61) the Past tense has been expressed in the word order: the Goal *ef geffy* is located between Agent and verb.
16. By definition, the Agent marker *pai* is absent in a *blul*-construction, because such a construction exists by virtue of an absent Agent.
17. In this context, it may be useful to note that also in a construction like

Jān trempē ef mimpit
'John is reading the book'

the Goal marker *enn* is lacking, while the Goal *ef mimpit* is not a Heart at all (for this function is fulfilled by the Agent *Jān*). Therefore, neither the presence nor the absence of *enn* is a straightforward indication for the presence/absence of the Heart function. However, the presence/absence of *ōn* is a very good indication indeed.

18. (68) is ungrammatical due to the combination of a verbal derivation from a pronoun followed by a subordinate clause, and not because of the possible ungrammaticality of the clause itself, as may be seen from

Dena mosjeus trune, blul invōbelije tē
this woman crazy.be R invite-GSX that
'This woman, who is invited, is crazy'

in which the *blul*-clause is identical to the one in (68).

19. Thus, here one starts out from the idea that *blul* in (74b) is a reduction marker, already present in the predicate frame. Unless the contrary appears true, I will tentatively claim that this element is not a mere "position filler" which in retrospect takes an open position in the Functional Pattern.
20. By way of the ordinals "first", "second" and "third", I refer to the argument positions as expressed in (75). Thus, there is no relationship whatsoever with (x_1), (x_2) and (x_3) in a

predicate frame.

21. Further on, it will become obvious that the indication "P1" must be reserved for a different purpose; this is the reason why I now use the indications "P2" and "P3".
22. I should point out that a constituent marked with *on* is not necessarily a Recipient. For instance, it may also be a "Comitative", as in:

Elsa kurrtöpe ef ðýny *on* Petriy
 Elsa negotiate the price RE Peter
 'Elsa negotiates with Peter about the price'

Up until now, I have failed to find a term entirely covering the third argument marked by *on*. As has been remarked in Tweehuysen (1987), this problem is also acute in view of the description of Swedish three-place verbs.

23. The Definitive tense is not just expressed in the constituent order, but also through the suffix *-a*:

Jån farta
 'John walked/was walking'
or 'John has walked/has been walking'

In transitive verbs, the Definitive tense can therefore be expressed in three different ways. Compare:

- a. Jån ef mimpit trempe
 b. Jån trempa ef mimpit
 c. Jån ef mimpit trempa

'John read/was reading the book'
or 'John has read/has been reading the book'

In c., inversion has been combined with the suffix *-a*. a., b. and c. are not entirely equivalent; for instance, in c. the Definitiveness is stressed somewhat more and can be used in a contrastive way:

Gress nert trempelira ef mimpit, gress ef trempa pip!
 I not read-PROG the book I it read-DEF already
 'I am not reading the book, I have already read it!'

Here we see a contrast between a Progressive form (expressed by *-lira*) and a Definitive tense (expressed by *-a* as well as by the constituent order, in which the Goal *ef* is placed before the predicate *trempa*).

24. If it would be possible to prove that the Prom2 function is assigned to blul instead of to the Subject, then (91a) could be simplified to:

Prom2 > SubjectØ > Agent > Goal > Recipient.

This means that the P1 position is the typical Prom2 position.

25. This is not entirely complete: the marker *enn* cannot be omitted in a clause containing an initial subordinator, even if the Goal occupies P2. Compare the coordinate construction in a. (preferably without *enn*) with the subordinate one in b. (in which *enn* is compulsory):
- a. Do ?enn/Ø ef mimpit trempe, tûre kurarafanecû ef
he GO /Ø the book read but.not recount-CAN it
'He has read the book, but he is unable to recount it'
- b. Taufen do enn/*Ø ef mimpit trempe, nert kurarafanecû ef
though he GO / Ø the book read not recount-CAN it
'Though he has read the book, he is unable to recount it'

Perhaps the rules for the use of *enn* have yet to be refined further.

26. My claim that the b-sentences in (94), (95) and (96) are entirely grammatical, at least in the eastern dialects, is made with some reservation, for, up to now, the Spocanian dialects have not been described very extensively.
27. As the Prom2 function always seems to be assigned to the Subject in such dialects, there is no longer any reason to distinguish between "Prom1" and "Prom2". Thus, we encounter an elementary way of Subj assignment in these dialects, as is also described by Dik (1978:72) in order to explain passive-constructions.
28. There is no rule dictating that P2 must be occupied too. That is why, in (99c), the presence of *blul* cannot be explained by assuming that we have a dummy here, which only appears in order to fill P2. If *blul* had not been an element in the predicate frame, then (99c) would appear as follows:
- *Ef miflifs glântrelije
- However, this construction is ungrammatical, because it is the result of a non-derived predicate frame in which the Agent erroneously remains unexpressed, and not because *blul* is lacking.
29. The Spocanian phenomena of inexistence and inexpression within a functional framework are to be investigated thoroughly in a paper by Ardeena Drömote-Glümenn (due to appear at the beginning of 1990?).

30. This distinction seems relevant in other languages too. For Swedish this relevance is being investigated at present, see also Tweehuysen (1987).
31. The use of *enn* is obligatory if the clause has an initial subordinator. *Enn* may be added optionally if the clause contains an initial secondary constituent (satellite). In clauses beginning with an Agent-Subject, *enn* is omitted, unless a special contrast or emphasis should be expressed. See also note 3.
32. At least I do not assume that the difference between the Neutral and the Definitive tense, and therefore the different positions of the verb (in V-neut, respectively in V-def), have any effect on the position establish to be chosen for the Recipient. One is able to determine empirically that the ordering of Agent, Goal and Recipient is never influenced by tense.
33. The Dutch equivalent however, is a correct expression:

Door Jan wordt [er] gelopen
by John is [there] walked

34. However, the distinction between the Neutral and the Definitive tense can be made by means of verbal suffixes. See also note 23.
35. In *blul*-constructions we naturally also encounter inexistence of the Agent (first argument), as such constructions result from a derived predicate frame in which the Agent has been deleted. See 5.1.5.
36. Compare the following constructions as an example:
- a. Elsa pjöle ón ef 'jan
Elsa speak RE the boy = 'Elsa speaks to the boy'
- b. Elsa quiste ón ef 'jan
Elsa good-be to the boy = 'Elsa is good to the boy'
- The Recipient status of *ón ef 'jan* in a. explains why c1. is correct and c2. is ungrammatical:
- c1. Ef 'jan pjölelitā pai Elsa
the boy speak-RSX AG Elsa
'The boy is spoken to by Elsa'

- c2. **Ńn ef 'jan Elsa pjŃle*
 RE the boy Elsa speak = 'To the boy Elsa speaks'

The status of the prepositional phrase *Ńn ef 'jan* in b. explains why d1. is ungrammatical, whereas d2. is correct:

- d1. **Ef 'jan quistelitā pai Elsa*
 the boy good-be-RSX AG Elsa
- d2. *Ńn ef 'jan Elsa quiste*
 to the boy Elsa good-be = 'To the boy is Elsa good'

(see also *ŲrmŃheŃe-Jertek* 1982:9.25f)

37. (129b) is correct in a contrastive context like:

Jān nert spāke ef mimpit piti Elsa, tur kette Ńn Mariy
 John not lend the book to Elsa but give RE Mary
 'John does not lend the book to Elsa, but gives it
 to Mary'

By the way, the verb *spāke piti* 'to lend to' is a two-place verb with an Agent-argument and a Goal-argument. A Recipient-argument marked by *Ńn* 'to' is lacking, and the prepositional phrase *piti rast* 'to someone' is used instead (as a satellite!).

38. (130b) is perfect as an answer to the question:

Jān kette ef melŃne Ńn lomp?
 John give the melon RE who
 'Who does John give the melon to?'

in which the Focus in the answer (Mary) must serve as Subject2.

39. Property (105) predicts that (140b) will have

- a. **Mariy kettelitā Ń ef mimpit*

as a variant, for, in (143), it has been proved that the Goal is found in P2. However, variant a. is ungrammatical, which is probably due to the fact that b. (= variant of (140a)) is ungrammatical as well:

- b. **Mariy kettelitā pai Jān ef mimpit*

The ungrammaticality of b. is understandable, as here the Goal *ef mimpit* is in P3, so it must be marked by *enn*. Perhaps *DrŃmote-GlŃmenn's* paper (see note 29) will provide us with an adequate answer.

40. Similar ergative relationships can be found in other construction types as well, such as the ones containing participles:
- a. Do tundare ef vasa → Ef tundaror vasa
'He breaks the vase' → 'The broken vase'
 - b. Ef vasa tasse → Ef tassor vasa
'The vase falls' → 'The fallen vase'
41. The personal pronoun *ef* is considered the pronoun which is marked least. That is why it is also used in impersonal ("Agent-less") constructions like
- a. Ef bidale 'It is raining'
 - b. Ef quiste den tu arfine 'It is good that you are coming'
- or in prepositional phrases like
- Minnepirtiyn éttels lef littit belt-rozas kaf ef
china plates with pink small-roses on it
'China plates with little pink roses on them'
42. The construction
- Ef mirre pert gy
'It/that thing strolls a lot here'
- may indeed be correct if *ef* refers to an inanimate entity which is able to stroll, for instance some kind of a robot. However, in the derived passive construction *Blul mirrelije ôfe pert gy*, the pronoun *ôfe* can never refer to an inanimate entity.
43. In principle, I assume that every semantic argument function has its fixed argument position. An Agent is always a first, a Goal always a second, and a Recipient always a third argument. I consider a Pseudo-Agent a second argument too. With regard to all predicate frames scrutinized in this paper, this principle of a fixed position for every semantic function can be maintained.
44. Below is illustrated in what kind of context *ôfe* may act as a real Goal:
- Ef bibliotekker ef mikar mimpit_i lâplastice, brā
the librarian the valuable book plasticize because
- blul trempelije ôfe_i pert fes ef kusamiss bibliotekke
R read-GSX it_{PAGB} much in the here library
- 'The librarian has plasticized the valuable book, because it is read a lot here in the library'

45. That also transitive predicates do contain a Pseudo-Agent, replacing the original Goal, and have nothing like a Pseudo-Goal, can easily be illustrated by the following constructions:

- a. Blul trempeliije **dōe** pert gy
'There is a lot of reading going on [by him]'
- b. Blul pjōleliije **ŷpse** pert gy
'There is a lot of speaking going on [by them]'
- c. Blul pōbareliije **ēpe** pert gy
'There is a lot of selling going on [by her]'

In all these cases the bold elements indicate the gender and the number of the entity/entities acting as an Agent to the predicate.

46. Below, the complete paradigm of passive pronouns is shown. Perhaps this may help to clarify the examples given in this section.

<u>Singular</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Passive</u>
1	gress	grōse
2 informal	tu	tūe
polite	gŷrs	gōrse
3 masculine	do	dōe
feminine	eup	ēpe
neutral	ef	ōfe
concrete	ef/mittof	ōfe
abstract	ef/kā	ōfe
<u>Plural</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Passive</u>
1	kirro	kīyrōe
2 informal	tu	tūe
polite	gŷrs	gōrse
3 masculine	ōps	ŷpse
feminine	belt	biylte
neutral	ōps	ŷpse
concrete	tem/efs/ef	tiymme
abstract	tem/efs	tiymme

For the sake of completeness, also the archaic passive variants of the articles will be mentioned here:

<u>Articles</u>	<u>Active</u>	<u>Passive</u>
definite	ef	ōfe
indefinite	eft	ōfāt

All that is said in this paper concerning passive pronouns, will generally also hold true for passive articles. But in those cases in which the use of passive pronouns is obligatory, the use of passive articles is optional. Compare:

- a. Blul tsyneliije épe
 'She is being tickled' (= (175b))
- b. Blul tsyneliije ef/ófe 'nin
 R tickle-GSX the_{ACT}/the_{PASS} girl
 'The girl is being tickled'

The opposition active vs. passive cannot be expressed in proper names and so-called article-replacing constructions. Article-replacing constructions contain demonstrative or indefinite pronouns, for instance:

Blul nert tsyneliije lelmos/sest 'nins
 R not tickle-GSX these/such girls
 'These/such girls should not be tickled'

47. In the following examples, the informal pronoun tu 'you' is glossed as 'thou', whereas the polite form gýrs is glossed as 'you'.

Tu is used in addressing persons whose Christian name we are allowed to use, such as close friends, colleagues or children we know. Gýrs is used with people whose Christian name is unknown to us, or should not be used by us, for instance persons we are not acquainted with and also relatives who must be addressed by their "family-title" (follus 'father'; tlokko 'aunt'; sualer 'nephew' &c). Also children whose Christian names we do not know are addressed by using gýrs. The rules for either using somebody's Christian name or his/her family-name or title (either tu or gýrs) are actually even far more complicated.

48. An indirect imperative may be interpreted by the addressee as a direct imperative, in which the addressee is ordered to use a direct imperative himself when addressing a third person. If John has not paid his bill yet, and Peter says to Glenda:

Kafte-dõe ef nota mas!
 pay-he_{PASS} the bill tomorrow
 'Have him pay the bill tomorrow!'

then Glenda will conceive this expression as the incentive: 'Go to John and say to him: "Pay the bill tomorrow!"'. In English this is expressed by the imperative form of a causative.

49. Spocanian has so-called modal suffixes. The - simplified - paradigm is as follows:

<u>sing.</u>	<u>plural</u>	in the examples glossed as	
-avy	-aves	WANT	'wish; want to'
-ecū	-ecos	CAN	'can; be able to'
-og	-ýt	MAY	'may; be allowed to'
-āt	-ūs	MUST	'must; have to'

The distinction between singular Subjects and plural ones is relevant with regard to the choice of a modal suffix:

- a. Ef efanty nert merrog dalotoje
the child not play-MAY outside
'The child is not allowed to play outside'
- b. Ef efantys nert merrýt dalotoje
the children not play-MAY outside
'The children are not allowed to play outside'

This is one of the few instances in which Spocanian makes a numeral distinction in a verbal phrase!

50. Despite the absence of an Agent argument (marked by *pai*), the reduction marker *blul* is lacking in (190). This is because we do not have Agent-deletion here, but Agent-linking. Only a deletion operation can result in a derived predicate frame with *blul*. Therefore the following construction is ungrammatical:

*Blul lukteliye-gröse ef oto (cf. (190))
R wash-GSX-IPASS the car

Still, similar constructions seem to occur in colloquial speech, notably in the capital Hirdo and its surroundings (with gratitude to Maartje Kelderman, personal communication).

51. This is one of the ways of forming a causative. I will confine myself to those causative cases in which a passive pronoun sets the pace. Spocanian clearly distinguishes between causatives and permissives: permissives must be expressed by using the main verb *kirture* 'to let'; compare:

- a. Jān arkette-épe
John cry-shepASS
'John lets her cry' = 'John makes her cry'
- b. Jān kirture den eup arkette
John let that she cry
'John lets her cry'
(= She is crying and John does nothing to console her)

52. In most "less exotic" languages, the Agent-Causer is incorporated in the predicate frame as zero-th argument (Dik 1980:66, 1985), because the first position usually has been occupied already by the Agent-Causee. As the Agent-Causee has been linked to the predicate in Spocanian causatives, and therefore the first position remains unused (see (195) and (196)), I do not think that one could object to regarding the Agent-Causer as a first argument. The apostrophe (') indicates that the original "real" first argument is still present in the frame as well, albeit in a linked form. For regularity's sake, I would like to mention that the Causee has taken over all Subject-properties from the Causer, as appears from the reflexive possessive pronouns, among other things. Compare:

Lukte-tūe; sener; lomkā!
'Wash your face!'

Gress; lukte-tūe sener; lomkā
'I will let you wash my face'

53. In Dik (1978:38), one of the semantic functions is called "Force". Perhaps, we have an unspecified "Force" in the Spocanian constructions discussed here. Further research will be necessary in order to understand the syntactic relationship between the discussed constructions and the constructions with a specified Force.
54. A negation like

*Grōse nert trempeliĵe ef mimpit
IpAGS not read-GSX the book
'I cannot read the book'

is ungrammatical (or rather: semantically nonsensical) because it expresses something which was impossible at first, and remains impossible now also, yet happens nevertheless (?). The following is correct, of course:

Gress nert trempecū ef mimpit
I not read-CAN the book
'I cannot read the book'

This is a regular modal construction, see also note 49.

55. I suspect that a 7th procedure should be added, as Spocanian has another special kind of passive, known as the "reversed passive". As I have not yet thoroughly investigated this remarkable type of construction, I must confine myself to a brief description here. If an active construction satisfies the two conditions below, a reversed passive will become possible:

1. the semantic function of the first argument is rather an "Undergoer", and not an Agent;
2. a satellite is acting as "Instigator" here, expressed by the preposition *pai* 'by; because of'.

The following constructions meet these conditions:

- a. *Ef efanty kinure pai ef nervossi*
the child ill.be by the nervousness
'The child is ill because of nerves'
- b. *Jān blācse pai eft stuke-gelp*
John limp by a sprain-ankle
'John limps because of a sprained ankle'
- c. *Ef togeffyys doeto pai ef vrust*
the apple-trees died by the frost
'The apple trees died because of the frost'

A reversed passive will appear after the following procedures:

1. the Instigator marked with *pai* appears as the new Subject;
2. the former first argument becomes a Recipient;
3. the predicate is suffixed with *-lije*.

Now the following reversed passives can be inferred from a., b. and c.:

- a'. *Ef nervossi kinurelije ōn ef efanty*
'Nerves have made the child ill'
- b'. *Eft stuke-gelp blācselije ōn Jān*
'A sprained ankle makes John limp'
- c'. *Ef vrust doetolije ōn ef togeffyys*
'The frost has killed the apple tree'

Note that a reversed passive often has a causative interpretation.

In order to be able to explain the constructions mentioned in a', b', and c' in FG terms, I tentatively claim a seventh predicate derivation in the form of:

(vii) Agent crossing:

(as the Agent shifts from the 1st to the 3rd position, it "crosses" the 2nd Goal position)

INPUT: $\text{Pred}_y (x_1) \text{Ag} (y_1) \text{Instig}$

[OUTPUT1: $\text{Pred}_y (x_1) \text{Ag} (x_2) \text{Go}$]

OUTPUT2: $\text{Pred}_y (\emptyset) (x_2) \text{Go} (x_3) \text{Rec}$

Note the intermediate stage (output1) in which the satellite (y_1) becomes a second argument (x_2 , with Subj assignment) in order to account for *-like*. In the final stage, the original Undergoer (which is mentioned in the predicate frame as an Agent; see note 1) has become a Recipient, resulting in an open first-argument position. As this open position is not the result of argument deletion, but rather of argument shift, this open position does not lead to a reduction marker like *blul*.

This solution seems adequate for the present, but further investigation will be necessary in order to refine the analysis of reversed passives. Perhaps there will be a way of avoiding the less elegant introduction of the intermediate stage (OUTPUT1).

56. Prominence-1 may be regarded as a matter of Subj assignment (Dik 1978:94)

□ □ □

REFERENCES

- Dik, Simon. 1978. Functional Grammar. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam. 2nd edition.
- Dik, Simon. 1980. Studies in Functional Grammar. Academic Press, London.
- Dik, Simon. 1983. On the status of verbal reflexives. In: Communication and Cognition 16:39-63.
- Dik, Simon. 1985. Formal and semantic adjustment of derived constructions. In: A.M. Bolkestein, C. de Groot, J.L. Mackenzie eds. Predicates and Terms in FG, Dordrecht.
- Dik, Simon. 1989.* The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Groot, Casper de. 1981. The structure of predicates and verb agreement in Hungarian. In: S. Daalder & M. Gerritsen. Linguistics in the Netherlands. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Groot, Casper de. 1989. Predicate Structure in a Functional Grammar of Hungarian. Dissertation. Amsterdam.
- Kalis-Moëlehhe, Berengyna. 1983. Sentences and clauses in Spocanian. Jelafo Books, Amahagge. 1st edition.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1972. Relative clause formation in Malagasy (and some related and not so related languages). In: Peranteau, Paul M. et al. eds. The Chicago Which Hunt; papers from the relative clause festival, April 13, 1972. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. In: Linguistic Inquiry 8:63-99.
- Kelderman, Maartje. 1983. Secondary passivization in primary terms. In: Spocanistics 76:28-57, University of Zest.
- Okombo, Duncan Okoth. 1983. Alpha vs. Non-alpha: some observations on the position of semantic functions on the SFH. In: S.C. Dik ed. Advances in Functional Grammar. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Quista-Rylle, Peoll. 1955. Spooksoliy -lije ur sveden -s: eft ýsšos. In: Zest-týden 4:55-74. Zest.
- Tweehuysen, Rolandt. 1987. Verbale suffigering (s-vorm) in het Zweeds. MA Thesis General Linguistics. University of Amsterdam.
- Ýrmöheđe-Jertek, Qurrde & Rolandt Tweehuysen. 1982. Spokānda-grāmerr furt ef Nelandos (Spocanian grammar written in Dutch). Spokanistiyc-instituša, Stat-Universitiy ber Zest. (chapter I .. IX ready; X .. XXII in preparation.)

□ □ □

* As Dik's latest work on FG appeared after I had finished this paper, I was unable to refer to, and make use of the most recent developments in FG. Perhaps my analysis of Spocanian passives should be adapted on some points, according to the new insights expounded in this new book.