Chapter 7
Voice and valence changing

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents valence alternations and voice changes in Eastern Lawa. It discusses how argument structure changes through passive, causative, and applicative constructions. First, it discusses typical valence-decreasing constructions such as passives in section (7.2). Adversative passives, where no agent is required, are examined first. Next passives where the patient is forced to do something are examined. Then non-referential passives are investigated where an undefined "agent" is used and finally zero agent passives in the form of resultative constructions are examined. Most of these "passives" do not strictly result in fewer arguments as might be expected say for English, but semantic changes like the English passive do occur and are worth investigating. Secondly, this chapter discusses reflexives and reciprocals in (7.3). Next valence-increasing constructions such as causatives in (7.4), and applicatives in (7.5) are investigated.

7.2 Passives

O'Grady (2001), defines passive voice as, "Passive voice is a grammatical voice common in many of the world's languages. In a clause with passive voice, the grammatical subject expresses the theme or patient of the main verb – that is, the person or thing that undergoes the action or has its state changed. This contrasts with active voice, in which the subject has the agent role."

Eastern Lawa has various forms of passive and passive like constructions: adversative passives, passive constructions with *klaɁ*, passive constructions that use *pui* as a dummy subject and zero passives.

7.2.1 Adversative passives

Kroger describes adversatives as a special type of passive construction (Kroger 2005: 279). Eastern Lawa has an adversative passive construction using *lɔk*. In this kind of sentence, the patient is the subject of the clause, and the 'patient' suffers the effect of

an action. There is a special emphasis on the affectedness of the patient, and the effect is almost always negative. The adversative passive construction is schematized as below.

$$S_{\text{PASSIVE.ADVERSATIVE}}: [[\text{NP}_{-i \text{ SUB.PATIENT}} \; \text{lɔk} \; [\text{V (NP}_{\text{AGENT}}) \; \text{---} \; (X_i)]_S]$$

Examples (161) and (162) illustrate adversative passive constructions. In example (161) no agent is expressed

(161)

pɛː	tʰɔ	lɔk	kok
mango	DEM	**ADVERS**	eat

The mango was eaten.

In example (162), the speaker suffers the result of a beating. The agent is expressed using a non specific subject in an oblique prepositional phrase *taʔ puj ʔuː maic*.

(162)

ʔaj	lɔk	ᵐbein	taʔ	puj	ʔuː	maic
1SG	**ADVERS**	beat	by	person	NEG	good

I was beaten by a bad person/people.

7.2.2 *klaː* passive like constructions

Eastern Lawa has another passive like construction that is formed by using the verb *klaː* 'forced.to'. The expressed subject (patient) does not have volitional freedom and suffers the action of the verb. The passive construction with *klaː* is schematized as below.

$$S_{\text{PASSIVE}}: [klaː \; \text{NP}_{\text{SUB.PATIENT}} \; \text{V} \; \text{---}]$$

In example (163), the patient *puj* 'he' is in the subject position but is forced to do something non volitional.

(163)

klaː	puj	ʔəŋ	ʔɔk	pʰaʔ	(ʔəŋ)	ŋan
forced.to	3SG	DEM	out	from	his	work

He was fired.

Lit: forced he was to leave from his work.

7.2.3 *puj* - non-referential passive like constructions

Another passive-like construction uses *puj* 'people' as a non-referential subject. Non-referential subjects are formed using *puj* without a demonstrative. Therefore the gloss 'person' could just as easily be translated 'someone'.

For instance, in a sentence like (164) *puj* appears as a non-referential subject and refers to non-specfic people. This sentence seems syntactically more like an active voice, as there is a syntactic subject who has built a house, but the clause is semantically passive due to the non-referential subject.

(164)

ʔiː	hɔit	poh	puj	ɲia?	niŋ	ka?rej
finished	COMPL	build	person	house	LOC	here

The house has been built here.

Lit: Finished building someone did the house here.

7.2.4 Zero agent resultative

Zero agent resultative constructions focus on the result of the event. The agent of the event is not expressed as an argument. Lawa has some different 'cause' and 'result' forms for some action verbs as in Table 43 but there are other verbs that can be used as either cause or result. The verbs listed in the first column take two arguments: agent as a subject and a patient as an object. They are more agentive. The verbs listed in the second column take only one argument; the patient as a subject. If the agent is expressed, it is as an oblique.

Table 43 Lexical causatives and resultatives

Cause		Result	
wiak	'to break'	*bewp*	'broken'
pʰluj	'to burn'	*ha?*	'burnt'
pʰra?	'to frighten'	*lat*	'frightened'

The schematic construction for zero agent passives that indicate the result of an event is as below.

$$S_{PASSIVE.RESULT}: [NP_{SUB.PATIENT} \ V_{RESULT} \ (NP_{OBL.AGENT})]$$

Example (165) is a causative construction and example (166) is a resultative construction. Note example (166) has no agent (passive construction) whereas example (165) does (active construction).

(165)

    ka?ⁿdɒw?   tʰɔ   wiak   kak   kʰɒ?

    child   DEM   break   branch   tree

    The child broke the branch.

(166)

    kak   kʰɒ?   bewp

    branch   tree   broken

    The branch (is) broken.

If the agent is to be stated it appears in an oblique NP as in example (167).

(167)

    kak   kʰɒ?   bewp   ta?   ka?ⁿdɒw?   tʰɔ

    branch   tree   broken   by   child   DEM

    The branch was broken by the child

7.3 Reflexives and reciprocals

Reflexives are used to denote doing something to or for oneself. Reciprocals are used to denote people doing something to or for each other. *te?* is used in both reciprocal and reflexive clauses to refer to the subject.

Example (168) is a simple reflexive sentence with the subject accidentally hitting himself.

(168)

    kʰɒ?   ᵐbein   te?

    accidently   hit   PRO.SUBJ

    (He) accidently hit himself

7.3.1 Reflexive emphatics

In Eastern Lawa ˀnɔŋ is used to express doing something alone and poʔ is used to express doing something with others.

ˀnɔŋ teʔ - to/for oneself

poʔ teʔ - to/with each other

In example (169) ˀnɔŋ and teʔ are used to express that the subject ate alone. If ˀnɔŋ was taken out, the subject would then be referring to themselves eating, but we would be (fairly) sure that they ate with others.

(169)

ʔaj	sɒm	ˀnɔŋ	teʔ
I	eat.rice	**do.alone**	**PRO.SUBJ**

I ate by myself.

In example (170) the subject puj tʰɔ 'he' is the one who feeds himself. This conveys the meaning that he is young and only just able to do this by himself.

(170)

puj tʰɔ	sɒm	ˀnɔŋ	ʔiah
3SG	eat.rice	**do.alone**	**able**

He was able to eat by himself.

The word ˀnɔŋ semantically includes meanings like - seperately, oneself, not relying on others, alone. In example (171), puj tʰɔ 'he' dressed himself without getting any help from others. The object noun phrase 'clothes' comes between ˀnɔŋ and teʔ.

(171)

puj tʰɔ	ʔiah[25]	ˀnɔŋ	kʰua	teʔ
3SG	put.on	**do.alone**	**clothes**	**PRO.SUBJ**

He put on his clothes alone

---

[25] Here we have ʔiah –turning up before ˀnɔŋ, but it doesn't have the meaning 'only just able'. It means 'to put on (clothes)'. A change in position denotes a change of meaning.

7.3.2 Reciprocals

The reciprocal relationship is expressed using the reciprocal *po?* with the reflexive *te?*.

In example (172), the three (boy, dog and frog), become friends together – expressed with the reciprocal *po?* and the reflexive *te?*.

(172)   BDF.27

> *la?ɔj*   *pen*   *piɲew*   **po?**   **te?**
> three   is.are (TH)   friends   **RECIP**   **PRO.SUBJ**
> All three were friends together

7.4 Causatives

Causatives indicate that a subject causes someone or something else to do or be something, or causes a change in state of a non-volitional event.

Causatives are formed using the causative verbs *kʰe* 'force', *kiah?* 'cause' or *cʊ?* 'command'. They add a new participant in a clause (Kroger 2005:277). The schematic construction for causatives is as below.

$$S_{CAUSATIVE}: [NP_{CAUSER} \ V_{CAUSATIVE} \ S]$$

The relative clause in (173) includes a simple causative; *kiah* indicates that *kaⁿdʊw?* 'child' is the causer of the event of smashing.

(173)

> *?dɔ*   *la? kaⁿdʊw? pi*   **kiah**   *kracok tʰɔ*   **?bɨa?**
> command   to child   **REL CAUS**   glass   DEM   **smash**
> Command the child who caused that glass to break

> *kiah*   *hew*   *ka? hej*
> CAUS   come   here
> make them come here.

kʰe 'force' in example (174) also contains a causative meaning. The embedded part of the clause is intransitive with a verb *liak* 'enter' and an agent *mu tʰɔ* 'them'. But when a causative verb *kʰe* 'force' is added to the clause, the agent of *liak* 'enter' which is *mu tʰɔ* '3PL' also becomes a patient. The meaning of (174) is 'he forced them to enter the forest'.

91

(174)

puj tʰɔ	kʰe	mu tʰɔ	liak	taʔ	pʰɛʔ
3SG	force	3PL	enter	in	forest

He forced them to enter the forest.

Eastern Lawa causatives can also be formed by using *cɒʔ* 'command'. The result is not entailed in this kind of causative. Example (175) is a simple transitive clause consisting of an NP$_{SUB}$ - *kaⁿdɒwʔ* 'child', a verb *ʔaːn* 'read' and an NP$_{OBJ}$ *naŋsiː* 'book'. In example (176), the causer *kʰru* 'teacher' is added with the command *cɒʔ* to form a causative construction applied to sentence (175). The agent *kaⁿdɒwʔ* 'child' of *ʔaːn* 'read' in (175), becomes the patient for the verb *cɒʔ* 'command' in (176). The same pattern is also found in example (177).

(175)

kaⁿdɒwʔ	ʔaːn	naŋsiː
child	read	book

The children (are) read(ing) the book.

(or the children are studying).

(176)

kʰru	**cɒʔ**	kaⁿdɒwʔ	ʔan	naŋsiː
teacher	**command**	child	read	book

Lit: The teacher commanded the child to read the book.

The teacher made the children study.

(177)

maʔ	**cɒʔ**	ʔiak raʔ	ʔaj	kiah	kaⁿdɒwʔ	sɔm
mother	**command**	elder sibling	1SG	give	child	eat rice

Mother commanded my sister to feed the child.

7.5 Summary

This chapter presented valence alternations and voice changes in Eastern Lawa. It discussed how argument structure changes through passive constructions and reflexives and reciprocals and also how valence is increased with causative constructions.