

## Indeterminate valency and verbal ambivalence in Chitimacha

Daniel W. Hieber  
University of California, Santa Barbara

SSILA 2017, Jan 5–8, Austin, TX

### 1. Valency

- long history, but few crosslinguistic surveys (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000; Kulikov, Malchukov, & de Swart 2006; Malchukov & Comrie 2015; Tsunoda & Kageyama 2006)
- minority but persistent concern: Are valency classes a concept equally applicable to all languages?
- Possible exceptions: Creek (Martin 2000), Mohawk (Mithun 2006), Balinese (Shibatani & Artawa 2015), Sri Lanka Malay (Nordhoff 2015), Abawiri (Yoder 2016).

### 2. Valency in Chitimacha

- Language isolate spoken in Louisiana until 1940
- Texts recorded by Morris Swadesh from speakers Chief Benjamin Paul and Mrs. Delphine Ducloux between 1930 and 1934

How does one determine valency classes in a language where there is no consistent means of deciding the number of arguments that a given verb has?

**Answer:** *Each of the potential morphological valency-adjusting devices in Chitimacha are not valency-adjusting per se, but rather alter the lexical semantics of the verb in ways that license and abet – but do not require – changes in valency.*

### 3. Overview of Chitimacha Grammar

Verbs distinguish between First and Non-First person:

- |     |  |          |
|-----|--|----------|
| (1) | <u>First</u><br>?am- <b>iki</b><br>see- <b>1SG</b><br>‘I saw’                  | A65 4.20 |
| (2) | <u>Non-First</u><br>?am-?iš- <b>i?i</b><br>see-IPFV- <b>NF.SG</b><br>‘you see’ | A5 6.3   |

- |     |  |          |
|-----|--|----------|
| (3) | ?am-?iš- <b>i?i</b><br>see-IPFV- <b>NF.SG</b><br>‘she saw’ | A65 2.13 |
|-----|--|----------|

Verbs show agent-patient alignment in the First person, and nominative-accusative alignment in the Non-First person (only subjects are marked):

- |                                |  |         |
|--------------------------------|--|---------|
| <u>Intransitive with Agent</u> |  |         |
| (4)                            | ?apš    ?e-h- <b>iki</b><br>back    be-LOC- <b>1SG.A</b><br>‘I returned’ | A10 5.4 |

- |                                  |   |         |
|----------------------------------|---|---------|
| <u>Intransitive with Patient</u> |   |         |
| (5)                              | hi        ?e-h- <b>ki</b><br>AND      be-LOC- <b>1SG.P</b><br>‘it happened to me’ | A70 1.6 |

- |                                   |   |         |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------|
| <u>Transitive without Patient</u> |   |         |
| (6)                               | k’et- <b>iki</b><br>hit/kill(SG)- <b>1SG.A</b><br>‘I killed it’ | A80 5.6 |

- |                                |  |         |
|--------------------------------|--|---------|
| <u>Transitive with Patient</u> |  |         |
| (7)                            | k’et- <b>ki</b> -?i<br>hit/kill(SG)- <b>1SG.P-NF.SG</b><br>‘she beat me’ | A60 1.6 |

Verbs do not index their syntactic object, only the subject:

- |     |   |        |
|-----|---|--------|
| (8) | he:čpi-ču-k<br>help-IRR-1SG.A<br>‘I’ll help you’                            | A1 2.7 |
| (9) | siksi    k’e-ču:-š<br>eagle    kill(SG)-IRR-COND<br>‘if one kills an eagle’ | A1 4.2 |

- (10) *hus tep c'ismam ʔuka:ši*  
 hus tep c'ismam ʔuka-ʔiš-i  
 his fire piece count-IPFV-NF.SG  
 'he counted his pieces of fire' A5 1.6

Any argument may be omitted if marked on the verb or understood from context:

- (11) *Wetk kunuk'u we panš hi šam-tk-š t'ut-naʔa.*  
 then QUOT DET people AND go.out-PTCP-SBD go(PL)-NF.PL  
*ʔašinč'at'a* kunšin hani ʔašinč'ata=nki hi tup-t-naʔa.  
 old some house old=LOC DIST find-TR-NF.PL  
*Panš hiš k'et-k ʔo:š hup hi hokšte-pa, ʔo:š*  
 people ERG kill(SG)-PTCP buzzard to AND feed-SBD buzzard  
*hepši=nk kap mesti-k' čiči-ʔuy-i. Tutk*  
 excrement=ABL STAT be.white-PTCP COP(VERT)-IPFV-NF.SG then  
*wey-š* kin ʔapš ne:č'i-mi-naka.  
 DEM=TOP with RECIP speak-PLACT-1PL.A  
 'The people got out and went on. They found an **old man** at an old house.  
 He was all white with buzzard excrement, because some people had killed  
 him and left him to the buzzards. We spoke with **him**.' A3 4.1 – 4.4

The above two facts make it difficult to determine transitivity in Chitimacha based on local context alone (i.e., the clause). However, tracking of discourse referents (as above), combined with a variety of transitivity-adjusting devices, resolve this problem in almost every case:

- (12) *Hi kima-ki k'an [...] ni k'uš-m-puy-na.*  
 DIST believe-1SG.P NEG DTRZR eat-PLACT-IPFV-NF.PL  
 'I do not believe they ate [in that other land].' A4 5.2
- (13) *Kamčin ʔap šam-k'ust-i-nki t'emi-naka. Weyt*  
 deer VEN go.out-sudden-NF.SG=TEMP kill(PL)-1PL.A thus  
*ni k'uš-mi-t'i-nakun.*  
 DTRZR eat-PLACT-IRR(PL)-1PL.A  
 'As the deer came out, we killed them. Thus we shall eat them.' A19 4.4

#### 4. Transitivity-Adjusting Devices

##### 4.1. Preverbs

A set of preverbs form a lexical unit with the verb, and affect the verb's lexical aspect, directionality, reciprocity/reflexivity, and sometimes transitivity:

<i>Preverb</i>	<i>Function(s)</i>	<i>Translational Equivalent</i>
hi	ANDATIVE DISTAL	'(going) to' '(going) there'
his	ANDATIVE REDITIVE (ADREDITIVE) REPETITIVE RESPONSIVE	'(going) back to' 'doing again' 'doing in response'
kap	INCEPTIVE INCHOATIVE PUNCTUAL STATIVE SUPER-LATIVE	'starting' 'becoming' 'suddenly' 'being' '(going) up'
ka:p's	SUPER-LATIVE REDITIVE (SUPERREDITIVE)	'(going) back up'
ka	TRANSLATIVE	'across'
kas	DISLATIVE REVERSIVE TRANSLATIVE REDITIVE (TRANSREDITIVE)	'(going) apart' 'reverse' 'back across'
ni	DETRANSITIVIZER IMPERATIVE NOMINALIZER SUBLATIVE	'thing' 'do it!' 'thing' '(going) down'
ʔap	PROXIMAL VENITIVE	'(coming) here' 'coming'
ʔapš	CIRCUMLATIVE PROXIMAL REDITIVE RECIPROCAL REFLEXIVE SOCIATIVE (VENITIVE/SIMPLE) REDITIVE	'randomly, about' '(coming) here' 'each other' 'oneself' 'together' '(coming) back'

Preverbs can license or delicense arguments to the verb:

- *hi* adds a Goal to the verbal semantics, even when that Goal is not overt or even salient in the discourse.

(14) No Goal  
miš k'ap-t-k, t'ut-naka  
road take-TR-PTCP go(PL)-1PL.A  
'taking to the road, we went' A4 3.1

(15) Overt Goal  
Wetk kunuk'u k'ast'a=nk hi t'ut-na?a.  
then QUOT north.wind=LOC AND go(PL)-NF.PL  
'Then, they say, they went toward the north.' A3 2.1

[...]

(16) Goal Added to Lexical Semantics of Verb  
hi t'ut-na?a hesik'en  
AND go(PL)-NF.PL again  
'they went on (to there) again' A3 2.5

- *ʔapš* 'back, together' often adds a reflexive semantics to the verb, sometimes delicensing an argument.

(17) Reduced Valency (Transitive Verb)  
hus mahči kuh hiš ʔapš neh-pa-puy-na  
his tail feather INSTR REFL cover-CAUS-IPFV-NF.PL  
'they adorn themselves with his tail feathers' A10 11.2

(18) No Valency Change (Intransitive Verb)  
Wetkš we panš pinikank ʔašinč'ata=š ʔapš čuy-i.  
then DET Indian old=TOP back go(SG)-NF.SG  
'Then the old Indian came back.' A9 4.5

(19) No Valency Change (Transitive Verb)  
Huyi waytm ʔapš wok-t-i.  
good more REFL feel-TR-NF.SG  
'He felt (himself) better.' A86 2.21

Reflexive without Reduced Valency (Transitive Verb)

hus nehe ʔapš k'et-i?i.  
his self REFL kill(SG)-NF.SG  
'He killed himself.' A3 6.7

- Without *ʔapš*, arguments like *hus nehe* are interpreted as emphatic rather than reflexive pronouns:

we heki ʔatkank hus nehe=nk hi wit-mi-ču:-š  
DET minister his self=NOM AND shoot-PLACT-IRR(SG)-COND  
'if the minister himself shot it' A67 3.3

- The detransitivizing preverb *ni* derives from a noun originally meaning 'thing'.

(20) Transitive without *ni*  
ʔiš=k ʔiš nu:p k'as-ka-nki-š  
1SG=NOM 1SG potato plant-PL=TEMP=SBD  
'when I planted my potatoes' A59 2.9

(21) Intransitive with *ni*  
hus=k ney =ki ni k'as-t-'iš-i?i  
3sg=NOM ground =LOC DTRZR plant-TR-IPFV-NF.SG  
'he was planting in the ground' A59 1.9

(22) *ni* does not reduce valency  
Tutk namu=š hi čuh-mi-?i. Hani ne  
then town=TOP DIST build-PLACT-NF.SG house just  
  
ni čuh-mi-?i.  
DTRZR build-PLACT-NF.SG  
'Then he built a town. He built houses.' A49 1.11 – 1.12

#### 4.2. Locational Suffixes

- *-n* 'out, on'
- *-h* 'in'
- *-k* 'at' (?)

The locational suffixes add a Ground to the lexical semantics of the verb. These suffixes are no longer productive; they are limited to a small set of verbs.

(23) No Locational Suffix  
Weyt pe-?e-nki [...]   
thus be(HORIZ)-NF.SG-TEMP  
'while he lay thus' A17 5.17

(24) Locational Suffix with Overt Ground  
Wetk napšč'a=nk kiš ʔatin pe-h-k kap tey-i.  
then black=NOM horse be(HORIZ)-on-PTCP STAT stay-NF.SG  
'Now a black person on a horse stopped.' A48 3.5

Ground Added to Lexical Semantics of Verb ('land' already activated)  
(25) We ku:k=š k'amik'i wetk his pe-h-w-i.  
DET water=TOP long then DUR be(HORIZ)-on-moving-NF.SG  
'The water was on (the land) a long time.' A62 2.2

(26) Šuš=up kap pe-h-i?i. Hi pe-h-i-nki  
tree=to up be(HORIZ)-on-NF.SG AND be(HORIZ)-on-NF.SG=TEMP  
'He climbed a tree. When he had climbed it, [...]' A15 2.4 – 2.5

#### 4.3. Transitive Suffix -t

The -t suffix usually increases the transitivity of the verb.

Without -t  
(27) Wetk panš pinikank ?o:nak kap hok-na?a.  
then Indian all STAT leave-NF.PL  
'The Indians all left.' A43 3.7

With -t  
(28) kičant'i ?unk'unk=š hok-t-na?a  
old.woman one=TOP leave-TR-NF.PL  
'they had left only one old woman' A36 2.8

Without -t  
(29) wetk hus hana=nki hi hu-h-ni-na  
then his house=LOC AND enclosure-in-NEUT-NF.PL  
'they entered his house' A86 5.6

With -t  
(30) Wetk we panš ?iš =ki hi kimi-:k'š na  
then DET people me =LOC AND believe-PTCP-SBD COP(NF.PL)  
sa hana=nki hi hu-h-t-iki.  
DIST house=LOC DIST enclosure-in-TR-1SG.A  
'I have put people who believe in me in that house.' A11 1.11

Very often -t merely adds an Undergoer to the verb's lexical semantics:

(31) Weyč'i:k'š hi?niš hi hok-t-na?a.  
therefore alone DIST leave-TR-NF.PL  
'Therefore they left (it) alone.' A9 5.5

(32) Weyt huk'u ?i:-č-t'iš-na?a.  
DEM COP turn-handling-TR-IPFV-NF.PL  
'That is the way they turn-weave.' A73 6.3

#### 4.4. Intransitive Suffix -(t)e

Certain verbs are derived from a noun / adjective + -(t)e INTR (which itself derives historically from *te:t-* 'be like, say').

(33) šuš či:š-e-pa=nki < ci?iš 'leaf'  
tree leaf-INTR-CAUS=TEMP  
'when the leaves bud' A77 1.1

(34) kap nakta:ši?i < nakt 'ice'  
kap nakt-te-?iš-i?i  
STAT ice-INTR-IPFV-NF.SG  
'it (the weather) freezes' A45 4.12

But -te sometimes creates polyvalent verbs:

(35) Wa?a=š ney kin pokti kin kap t'ik-te-mi-?i.  
other=TOP earth with sky with STAT burst-INTR-PLACT-NF.SG  
'The earth and sky crushed the others.' A3 9.4

(36) hak-te-ma-:š-na?a  
drink(?)-INTR-PLACT-IPFV-NF.PL  
'they had him drink it (the medicine)' A3 7.2

In some cases a -te verb shows an unmarked valency alternation:

(37) wetk šušeyi hi mem-ti-:k',  
then fence AND jump(?)-INTR-PTCP  
'then, jumping the fence,' A48 3.13

(38) Wetk we waštik sek'is hi mem-t(e)-i.  
then DET cow among DIST jump(?)-INTR-NF.SG  
'Then he jumped amongst the cattle.' A55 1.13

#### 4.5. Pluractional Suffix -ma

Chitimacha pluractional -ma preferentially indicates plurality of the subject when the verb is intransitive, plurality of the object when the verb is transitive, or plural events generally (i.e., frequentive, distributive, or iterative meanings):

Single Action, Plural Subject (Intransitive)

ka:kwa-ki k'an ʔašt ʔuči:k's panš ne kap nacpik-mi-naʔa  
know-1SG.P NEG how doing person even INCEP begin-PLACT-NF.PL  
'I do not know how people started up' (i.e. how humankind originated) A1 4.4

Single Action, Plural Object (Transitive)

Wetkš hus na:nča:kamank=š hi hok-mi-iʔi.  
then his brothers=TOP AND leave-PLACT-NF.SG  
'He left his brothers.' A1 1.1

Plural Action, Singular Object (Transitive)

wetk ʔapš c'it-mi-ʔi  
then about cut-PLACT-NF.SG  
'then he cut him up (stabbed him in several places)' A48 1.10

- -ma is often the only marker of the syntactic object on the verb:

Overt Object with -ma

(39) Waʔa=š ney kin pokti kin ʔapš neh-t-k  
other=TOP earth with sky with together strike-TR-PTCP  
kap t'ik-te-mi-ʔi.  
STAT burst-INTR-PLACT-NF.SG  
'The earth and the sky crushed the others by striking together.' A3 9.4

Undergoer Added to Lexical Semantics of Verb

(40) we ʔašant'a his nuy-m-i  
DET old response call-PLACT-NF.SG  
'the old man answered' (implied by context: 'them') A4 3.13

**4.6. Manner Suffixes**

- -kint 'dropping, pushing'
- -k'es 'pouring'
- -t'uwa / -ptk'uš 'suddenly'
- -či 'handling'
- -c 'touching'
- -wa 'moving'

Some manner suffixes have no apparent effect on valency:

Without Manner Suffix

(41) Hus waši=nk we kimu pek'is ʔapš ʔi:-m-i.  
his hand=ABS DET branch over CIRC turn-PLACT-NF.SG  
'He moved his hands over the limb.' A9 4.3

With Manner Suffix -t'uwa

(42) Wetkš k'ast'a=nk kas ʔi:-t'uwi-ču:-š,  
then north.wind=LOC back turn-sudden-IRR(SG)-COND  
'Then, if (the wind) turns to the north,' A84 4.7

Other manner suffixes add a Patient to the verbal semantics:

Without Manner Suffix (Intransitive)

(43) č'a: kap ša-n-i-nki  
sun up container-out-NF.SG=TEMP  
'when the sun rises' A64 1.6

With -kint 'dropping, pushing' (Transitive, Overt Object)

(44) Wetkš we nitiya-nk=š ʔiš hi ša-n-kint-ki  
then DET master-NOM=TOP me AND container-out-drop-1SG.P  
'The (boat) master put me off.' A10 10.3

With -kint 'dropping, pushing' (Transitive, No Overt Object)

(45) Tutk ku: =ki hi ni-kint-i.  
then water =LOC AND water-drop-NF.SG  
'He threw (it) into the water.' A9 3.3

**4.7. Other Transitivity-Adjusting Devices**

- Causative -pa
- Benefactive -aʔ
- Patient Suffixes -ki, -kuy (Hieber, under revision)

## 5. Discussion & Conclusions

- Each transitivity-adjusting device often licenses a change in argument structure, but does not necessitate one
- The same set of transitivity-adjusting devices may result in clauses of different valency depending on the preceding discourse context.
- Participants are present in the clause when they are a continuing discourse referent.
- Valency is not strongly expressed in Chitimacha.
- The combination of transitivity-adjusting devices and information tracking resolve potential ambiguities, without the need for clearly-defined valency classes.
- Verbal morphology changes the lexical semantics of the verb, enabling but not requiring changes in valency.
- Chitimacha verbal morphology is fundamentally about event perspective and construal (transitivity) rather than argument structure (valency) *per se*.

## 6. References

- Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). 2000a. *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hieber, Daniel W. under revision. Semantic alignment in Chitimacha.
- Kulikov, Leonid, Andrej Malchukov & Peter de Swart (eds.). 2006. *Case, valency, and transitivity*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 77). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Malchukov, Andrej & Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2015. *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 1: Introducing the framework, and case studies from Africa and Eurasia*. (Comparative Handbooks of Linguistics 1.1). Berlin: Mouton.
- Martin, Jack B. 2000. Creek voice: Beyond valency. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, 375–403. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2006. Voice without subjects, objects, or obliques: Manipulating argument structure in Agent/Patient systems (Mohawk). In Tasaku Tsunoda & Taro Kageyama (eds.), *Voice and grammatical relations: In honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*, 195–216. (Typological Studies in Language 65). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nordhoff, Sebastian. 2015. Case frames in Sri Lanka Malay. In Andrej Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 2: Case studies from Austronesia and the Pacific, the Americas, and Theoretical Outlook*, 987–1014. (Comparative Handbooks of Linguistics 1.2). Berlin: Mouton.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi & Ketut Artawa. 2015. Balinese valency classes. In Andrej L. Malchukov & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, Vol. 2: Case studies from Austronesia and the Pacific, the Americas, and Theoretical Outlook*, 877–940. (Comparative Handbooks in Linguistics 1.2). Berlin: Mouton.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1934a. The phonetics of Chitimacha. *Language* 10(4). 503–521.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1934b. The phonemic principle. *Language* 10(2). 117–129.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1939a. Chitimacha texts. In Morris Swadesh, *Chitimacha grammar, texts and vocabulary*. (American Council of Learned Societies Committee on Native American Languages, Mss.497.3.B63c G6.5). American Philosophical Society Library: Philadelphia, PA.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1939b. Chitimacha grammar (copy 1). In Morris Swadesh, *Chitimacha grammar, texts and vocabulary*. (American Council of Learned Societies Committee on Native American Languages, Mss.497.3.B63c G6.5). American Philosophical Society Library: Philadelphia, PA.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1946. Chitimacha. In Harry Hoijer (ed.), *Linguistic structures of Native America*, 312–336. (Publications in Linguistics 6). New York: Viking Fund.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku & Taro Kageyama (eds.). 2006. *Voice and grammatical relations: In honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*. (Typological Studies in Language 65). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yoder, Brendon. 2016. Valency classes in Abawiri. Manuscript.