CHAPTER 4

CAUSATIVITY AND ERGATIVITY

4.0 Introduction

All simple verbs, with a very few exceptions, are inherently either transitive or intransitive. However, an intransitive verb can be changed into a transitive by the process of causativity. When a causative marker is suffixed to an intransitive verb root, it becomes a transitive verb stem. Simple, compound and conjunct verbs can be causativized. Distinguishing a transitive from an intransitive verb is important because of the split ergative system found in Chodri.

Chodri, a split ergative language, shows the first three of the morpho-syntactic signals of high transitivity listed below by Hopper and Thompson (1980:257) in at least some situations.

a. Ergative case-marking on A

b. Absolutive case-marking on O

c. Independence of V and O as separate words

d. Transitive marking on V

The subject of a transitive clause is marked with ergative case only in past and perfect tenses. The object of a transitive clause is marked with absolutive case. Verbs and objects are separate words. Ergative case and causative marker are grammatical markers of transitivity in Chodri. The first section in this chapter discusses the causativity and the second discusses the ergativity.

4.1 Causativity

Some languages use syntactic features to express causativity while other languages use morphological features. Chodri uses both, specifically analytical, morphological and lexical features to make a verb causative. A causativized verb becomes a transitive verb regardless of the transitivity of the verb root. Such causativized verbs in past and perfect tenses are marked for the gender-number of the object. Thus it is important in understanding the verb phrase to discuss causativity.

A causativized verb requires an agent or initiator who causes the situation. Agency, punctuality, volitionality, and affectedness of the object are few of the components of transitivity described by Hopper and Thompson (1980). Comrie (1981) states that, causative constructions in a language show a high degree of control. The activity is initiated or controlled by a participant. Hook in his discussion on Indo-Aryan languages says,

> The causative in Indo-Aryan is a lexically conditioned morphological process whose input is an intransitive or a transitive stem and whose output is a stem which is higher in transitivity by one degree (1991:76).

In a clause containing a predicate slot filled by a non-causative verb, the number of possible arguments the verb requires is important. An intransitive verb takes one argument while a transitive verb requires two arguments and a bitransitive verb three. When an intransitive verb root takes the derivational suffix *-aɾ* or *-av* 'causative marker' it becomes a transitive verb and so takes two arguments. Causative derivation yields transitive forms irrespective of the transitivity of the original form. This is illustrated by the following examples.

(98) "Story of a pretender" (058)

amba-haj *akse* ***pəɽ-t-e*** *məjɳ-ɖ-e*
mangoes-of ripe **fall**-prog-pn begin-pt-pn

'The ripe mangoes began to fall.'

(99) "Story of a pretender" (059)

ʧoʈʈe *av-i-n* *bədə* ***paɽ-i-n*** *ne-i*
robbers come-cp-cnj all **fall(caus)**-cp-cnj take-cp

naha-jat
move away-non1,p,pre

'Having come and plucked (lit: cause to fall) all (the mangoes), the robbers take them and flee away.'

In example 98, *ambahaj aksə* 'ripe mangoes' is the only argument of the intransitive verb *pəɽ* 'fall' and the verb agrees with the number and gender of the subject argument. But in example 99, the verb base form *pəɽ* 'fell' has been changed into a transitive (thus, 'cause to fall') by the derivational process of causativization and it requires two arguments: *ʧoʈʈe* 'robbers' subject and *bədə* 'all (mango)' object.

Two kinds of causatives are identified in Chodri: direct and indirect (or double) causatives. Direct causatives talk about somebody directly causing someone or something to perform or undergo some action. Indirect causatives describe someone or somebody causing someone or something to perform or undergo some action by means of a third person.

4.1.1 Direct causatives

The direct causative in Chodri may be expressed in three ways as Comrie (1985) states: analytic (or syntactic), morphological (or synthetic) and lexical. These are discussed in the following sections.

4.1.1.1 Analytic causatives

Comrie states that,

> An analytic causative construction is that which uses syntactic devices of the language for forming complex sentences out of simplex sentences without fusing together the predicates of those simple sentences;...this means that the predicate expressing the idea of causation will be separate from the predicate of the non causative sentence (1985:331).

Analytic causatives at surface level, necessitate two verbs as found in English. E.g., 'John *made* Peter *run*', or 'John *got* Peter *to bring* a cup of water'. Chodri marks the analytic causative in two ways:

Firstly, an analytic causative can be marked by compounding the main verb with the verb *mag* 'ask', which is not one of those regular vectors used in compound verbs. Secondly, an analytic causative can be marked by compounding the main verb in present participial form with the verb *kər* 'do' or 'make'. These are illustrated through the following examples.

(100) "Elicited Data" (S 016)

məjẽ	*məhes*	***pahẽ***	*kukɽə*	***vaɽ-i***	***mag-dʒ-ə***
I(ERG)	Mahes	**near**	chicken	**cut-cp**	**ask-pt-sn**

'I got Mahes to cut the chicken.'

In example 100, the locative *pahẽ* 'near' is used with the causee to mean the argument through whom the action was done. The verb *mag* 'ask' is compounded with the main verb *vaɽ* 'cut' to indicate the causative derivation. The verb 'ask' here has nothing to do with the action of 'asking', but it is merely a causative verb used to derive the analytic causative.

(101) "Story of Bilawanti queen" (S 015)

pəlj-eɳe *tʃʰaɽv-a* *təle* ***behe-t-i*** ***kər-i*** ***de-d-i***

she-Obj tree-Loc under **sit-prog-sf** **do-cp** **give-pt-sf**

'(He) made her to sit under the tree.'

In example 101, the main verb *behe* 'sit', an intransitive verb, is causativized by the occurrence of causative verb *kər* 'do' or 'make' following it. When a verb is causativized analytically by compounding the verb *kər* with the main verb, the main verb root is suffixed with the participial suffixes *-t* and *-i* which mark progressive tense and the gender-number of the object respectively. The verb 'do' here functions as the causative verb to derive the analytic causative. This analytic causative is further compounded with *de* 'give'.

4.1.1.2 Morphological causatives

According to Comrie (1985), when a verb undergoes some derivational process in order to express the idea of causativity, it can be called a morphological causative. The derivational process to causativize a verb in Chodri is expressed by adding causative marker *-av* to the base form of a non- causative verb. The allomorphic variants of the causative marker are given below.

{*-av*} → *-av* ~ *-aɽ* ~ *-uv* 'direct causative marker'

The occurrences of these allomorphic variants with non-causative verb roots are partially morphemically conditioned in Chodri. While there is some morphophonemic conditioning present (vowel-final roots always take *-aɽ*; consonant-final roots usually take *-av*), there is also morphemic conditioning in that some consonant-final roots take *-uv* and some take *-aɽ*.

Causatives with *-uv* :

A relatively small number of Chodri non-causative verbs, regardless of their transitivity, take the causative suffix *-uv*. The following examples show how they are used in clauses.

(102) "Story of Bilawanti queen" (S 063)

ambə ***pak-i*** *gə*
mango **ripe**-cp go(pt,sn)

'Mango ripened.'

(103) "Story of Bilawanti queen" (S 060)

hãj *kʰər* ***pak-uv-i-n-udʒ*** *kʰa-hĩ*
I house **ripe-caus**-cp-cnj-Emp eat-1,s,fu

'I will cause it to ripen at home and eat it.'

In example 102, the non-causative verb root *pak* 'ripe' is an intransitive verb root and *ambə* 'mango' is the only argument of that clause. In example 103, when the causative marker *-uv* is suffixed to the verb root, it becomes a transitive verb root and requires two arguments. *hãj* 'I' is the subject and 'mango' is the implied object of that transitive clause.

A few examples of the non-causative and causativized verb roots with *-uv* are given below. A more exhaustive listing of non-causative verb roots and their causativized forms is given in Appendix 3.

Non-causative	**meaning**	**causativized**	**meaning**
hikʰ	'learn'	*hikʰ-**uv***	'cause to learn'
pʰir	'turn'	*pʰir-**uv***	'cause to turn'
pak	'ripe'	*pak-**uv***	'cause to ripen'

Causatives with *-aɽ* :

A relatively large number of non-causative verb roots take the causative suffix *-aɽ*. The following examples show how a non-causative verb root becomes a causativized verb root when *-aɽ* is suffixed to the non-causative verb root.

(104) "Story of a tiger killer" (S 031)

tũ	*həve*	*ogodʒ*	***huv-i***	*dʒa*
you	now	quietly	**sleep**-cp	go

'Now you sleep quietly!'

(105) "Elicited Data" (S 017)

tujẽ	*nitʃak-aj*	***huv-aɽ-i***	*de-d-o*
you(ERG)	boy-ABS	**sleep-caus**-cp	give-pt-sm

'You caused the boy to sleep.'

In example 104, *tũ* 'you' is the only argument of the non-causative intransitive verb root *huv* 'sleep.' But in example 105, when the same verb root is causativized with the causative marker *-aɽ* it becomes a transitive verb root *huvaɽ* 'cause to sleep' and it requires two arguments, the subject and object. The subject is filled by *tujẽ* 'you' (ERG) and the object by *nitʃak* 'boy.'

A sample list of non-causative consonant final verb roots which take *-aɽ* causative suffix is listed below with their causativized forms and their meaning (more in Appendix 2).

Non-causative	**meaning**	**causativized**	**meaning**
rak^h	'wait'	*rak^h**aɽ***	'cause to wait'
huv	'sleep'	*huv**aɽ***	'cause to sleep'
dʒit	'win'	*dʒit**aɽ***	'cause to win'
ũg	'sprout'	*ũg**aɽ***	'cause to sprout'

An intensive compound verb can also be causativized by adding *-aɽ* or *-av* 'causative marker'. In such cases, only one member of the compound verb is marked with the

causative marker. Generally, when a compound verb is causativized, the causative suffix is added to the main verb root. However, occasionally a causative is derived by adding the causative suffix to the vector verb. It has been observed that the vector verbs *muk, de, kaɽ* and *nak^h* can be causativized. Two examples are cited here to illustrate how an intensive compound verb is causativized.

(106) "Story of five brothers" (S 093)

ɖaɳɖa mũa mã ***k^{h}en-av-i*** ***de-d-a***
stalk mouth in **push-caus-cp give-pt-pm**

'He caused some stalk to be pushed into the mouth (of the horse).'

(107) "Story of a Bhil's wife" (S 100)

tijeɳe maʈəɽa-ɳe mat^{h}ə ***dəp-aɽ-i*** ***de-d-ə***
her man-of head **hide-caus-cp give-pt-sn**

'She hid the head of her husband.'

In example 106, the main verb root *k^{h}en* 'push' is causativized by adding the suffix *-av*. In example 107, the main verb root *dəp* 'hide' is causativized by adding the suffix *-aɽ*. In both cases, the vector verb *de* is not causativized.

When the causative suffix *-aɽ* is suffixed to a verb root ending in a vowel, the consonant *v* is inserted as shown in the further examples below.

Non-causative	**meaning**	**causativized**	**meaning**
pi	'drink'	*pivaɽ*	'cause to drink'
ne	'take'	*nevaɽ*	'cause to take'
kə	'say'	*kəvaɽ*	'cause to say'
k^{h}a	'eat'	*k^{h}avaɽ*	'cause to eat'
du	'milk'	*duvaɽ*	'cause to milk'
t^{h}o	'wash'	*t^{h}ovaɽ*	'cause to wash'

Causatives with *-av* :

The most widely occurring causative marker is *-av* and it occurs only with verb roots ending in consonants. The examples below illustrate how a non-causative verb root with a final consonant is causativized with the causative marker *-av*.

(108) "Story of five brothers" (S 009)

hara mã harə ho-t-nə tijẽ ***ʧəɽ-i*** *go*
good in good be(pt)-prog-sn there **climb**-cp go(pt,sm)

'He climbed on the best tree.'

(109) "Story of five brothers" (S 089)

ʧal mane kʰoɽo ***ʧəɽ-av-i*** *de*
come to me horse **climb-caus**-cp give

'Come, lift the horse (lit: cause the horse to climb) on me!'

In example 108, the non-causative verb root *ʧəɽ* 'climb' is an intransitive verb root and 'he' is the subject of that verb. In example 109, the verb *ʧəɽ* 'climb' takes the causative marker *-av* and is changed into a transitive verb root. So one more argument, 'horse', functioning as the object is added.

A sample list of non-causative verb roots which take *-av* causative suffix is listed below with their causativized forms and their meaning.

Non-causative	**meaning**	**causativized**	**meaning**
ap	'give'	*apav*	'cause to give'
vaɽ	'cut'	*vaɽav*	'cause to cut'
ʈãg	'hang'	*ʈãgav*	'cause to hang'
vaʈ	'grind'	*vaʈav*	'cause to grind'
dəɽ	'run'	*dəɽav*	'cause to run'

When a disyllabic non-causative verb root ending in a consonant takes the causative marker *-av*, the vowel in the final syllable of the non-causative verb root is deleted. A

sample list of words is given in Table 16 below to illustrate this morphophonemic change.

Non-causative verb	Meaning	Causativized verb	Meaning
mukun	'send'	**mukn-av**	'cause to send'
uk^{h}ul	'skin'	**uk^{h}l-av**	'cause to skin'
ũgul	'bathe'	**ũgl-av**	'cause to bathe'
tʃopuɽ	'apply'	**tʃopɽ-av**	'cause to apply'
tʃ^{h}etur	'cheat'	**tʃ^{h}etr-av**	'cause to cheat'
babar	'yawn'	**babr-av**	'cause to yawn'
kek^{h}ir	'shake off'	**kek^{h}r-av**	'cause to shake off'

Table 16. Morphophonemic changes when disyllabic verbs are causativized

4.1.1.3 Lexical causatives

A set of non-causative verb roots in Chodri become causative by stem modification. They do not take any of the above causative markers. Instead, when they are causativized the stem is modified and they become a different lexical item which has a close morphological resemblance with the non-causative verb roots. As Comrie (1985) states, it is difficult to draw the distinction between the morphological and lexical causatives. However, since these causativized items are treated as separate lexical entries in Chodri, they are considered lexical.

There are three (basic) types of lexical causatives found in Chodri. There are those monosyllabic roots where *ə* is replaced by *a* in the causative. There are also those where the vowel *u* is replaced by *o* in the causative. And finally, there are those where the *u* of the final syllable of disyllabic roots is replaced by ***a*** in the causative form. The following examples illustrate the first sort:

non-causative	meaning	causativized	meaning
mər	'die'	***mar***	'kill or 'cause to die'
bəl	'burn'	***bal***	'cause to burn'
pəɽ	'fall'	***paɽ***	'cause to fall'
vəl	'turn'	***val***	'cause to turn'
gəl	'leak'	***gal***	'cause to leak'

The second sort of lexical causative is illustrated in the examples below:

k^hul	'open'	*k^hol*	'cause to open'
p^huɽ	'break'	*p^hoɽ*	'cause to break'
$tʃ^h$uɽ	'release'	*$tʃ^h$oɽ*	'cause to release'

As can be seen in the last two forms of the examples above, final *ɽ* is replaced by *r* as part of the stem modification in these types of causatives.

Finally the third sort of lexical causatives are illustrated below:

utur	'get down'	*utar*	'cause to get down'
nikul	'emerge'	*nikal*	'cause to emerge'

As seen in the sets of examples above, some causative forms in Chodri are lexical causatives. That is, they are made by stem modification rather than affixation.

4.1.2 Indirect causatives

The verbs which undergo a derivational process more than once to become a causative and which express the involvement of more than two arguments are called indirect or double causatives. Indirect causatives are used to describe two causations: A causes B to cause C to perform or undergo some action. All indirect causatives are morphological causatives (as opposed to analytic or lexical). As has been stated, any intransitive verbs which undergo the derivational process of causativity become transitive verbs in Chodri. Some of these verbs which are causativized and become transitive may undergo another causativization by an additional causativizing

derivational process. An indirect causative in Chodri is derived by adding the causative marker *-av, -aɽ* to the direct causative. The examples below will illustrate this.

(110) "Elicited Data" (S 018)

hãj tune ***kʰa-vaɽ****-i-n* ***pi-vaɽ****-i-n*
I you **eat-caus**-cp-cnj **drink-caus**-cp-cnj

huv-aɽ*-ihĩ*
sleep-caus-1,s,fu

'I will cause you to eat, drink and sleep.'

(111) "Story of a snake god's daughter" (S 035)

hãj tumahaj ***kʰa-vɽ-av****-i-n*
I you-pl **eat-caus-caus**-cp-cnj

pi-vɽ-av*-i-n* ***huv-ɽ-av****-ihĩ*
drink-caus-caus-cp-cnj **sleep-caus-caus**-1,s,fu

'I will cause (someone) to cause you to eat, drink and sleep.'

In example 110, the use of causative suffix *-aɽ* with the verb roots *kʰa* 'eat', *pi* 'drink' and *huv* 'sleep' implies the direct action of an initiator upon the patient. In example 111, the once causativized verb stems become double causatives by adding the causative marker *-av*. This implies the requirement of an additional argument in the clause. The subject person will cause the patient to do something by means of a third person.

An intensive compound verb can also be double causativized. In such cases, only the vector verb which follows the main verb is causativized and this is illustrated by the example 112 below.

(112) "Story of a rabbit and a fox" (S 056)

bərap^h mã puhuɳɖo nak^h-i ***de-vɽ-av-in-o***

ice in tail put-cp **give-caus-caus-pt,pft-sm**

'(You) had caused me to bury my tail in the ice.'

In example 112, the vector *de* is double causativized to show that the agent in the clause gets the patient to do the action by some indirect means. The non-causative compound verb root *nak^{h}i de* 'put' becomes a direct causative by the addition of *-aɽ* to the vector *de* and when the indirect causative *-av* is added to the causativized verb the vowel *a* in *-aɽ* is deleted thus becoming an indirect causative verb stem *devɽav* 'get someone to do something.'

When a verb undergoes the derivational process of double causativity, a morphophonemic change occurs. The vowel *a* in the first causative marker *-aɽ* is deleted when second causative marker *-av* is attached. However, not all verbs that are once causativized can be causativized for the second time. A few of the verbs that undergo double causative process are listed below.

Non-causative	**meaning**	**Direct causative**	**Indirect causative**
ʤa	'go'	*ʤavaɽ*	*ʤavɽav*
huv	'sleep'	*huvaɽ*	*huvɽav*
behe	'sit'	*behevaɽ*	*beheɽav*
t^{h}o	'wash'	*t^{h}ovaɽ*	*t^{h}ovɽav*
pi	'drink'	*pivaɽ*	*pivɽav*
k^{h}a	'eat'	*k^{h}avaɽ*	*k^{h}avɽav*

Two kinds of causatives, direct and indirect, have been discussed here. The direct causative may be expressed analytically, morphologically or in some cases lexically. Analytic causatives are expressed in two ways. The first way to derive a causative is to compound the verb *mag* 'ask', which acts as a causative, with a main verb. The second way is to compound the verb *kər* 'do', which acts as a causative, with the main verb in its present participial form. A verb can be changed into a causative

morphologically by adding one of the partially morphemically conditioned allomorphs (*-av, -aɽ, -uv*) of the causative marker. Some monosyllabic and disyllabic verbs become causative by stem modification and they are treated as separate lexical entries. Some verbs, which are already once causativized can be causativized a second time by adding the causative marker *-av* to them and they are called indirect or double causatives.

4.2 Ergativity

Typologically, languages may be classified into two major types according to case marking of grammatical relations and they are: nominative/accusative and ergative/absolutive. In a nominative/accusative language, the subject of an intransitive clause is marked identically to the subject of a transitive clause but differently from the object of a transitive clause. In an ergative/absolutive language, the subject of an intransitive clause is marked differently from the subject of a transitive clause but marked in the same way as the object of the transitive clause. Dixon states,

> the term ergativity is, in its most generally accepted sense, used to describe a grammatical pattern in which the subject of an intransitive clause is treated in the same way as the object of a transitive clause, and differently from transitive subject (1994:1).

The ergative system in Chodri can be seen to be related to concepts of transitivity. It is relevant to discuss ergativity under 'verb phrase' since the verbs of Chodri agree in certain features with either subject or object of a clause and this affects their structure. Dixon (1994) states that languages can be characterized as ergative in terms of pronominal type affixes attached to the verb which agree in certain features with subject or object noun phrases.

Every simple verb in Chodri, in its finite form, is marked for gender-number by verbal suffixes which agree either with the gender-number of the subject or object. The verbal

suffixes agree with the gender-number of the subject of intransitive clauses in all tenses and of transitive clauses in tenses other than past or perfect. They agree with the gender-number of the object of transitive clauses in past and perfect tenses. Dixon states, "the patterning of bound pronominal affixes in the verbal word can be taken as evidence of intra-clausal ergativity just like the patterning of case inflections" (1994:42). The presence or absence of ergative case with the noun phrase subject helps one to identify whether the gender-number of the subject or object is in agreement. The subject of a transitive clause in past and perfect tenses is marked with ergative case and the verbal suffixes agree with the gender-number of the object. In Chodri, 'an ergative patterning' has developed in past tense/perfective aspect (Dixon 1994:6).

It has been found by linguists that many languages in the world mix nominative/ accusative and ergative/absolutive systems. Dixon lists four kinds of factors that condition these splits: "semantic nature of the verb, semantic nature of the core NP, tense or aspect or mood of the clause and the grammatical status of a clause, whether it is main or subordinate" (1994:70). He has also noted that while some languages show just one conditioning factor others combine two or more of these factors.

An examination of these conditioning factors shows why Chodri has a split ergative system. The split is conditioned by the semantics of the verb and the tense of the clause. The verb must be transitive and the tense must be past or perfect for the ergative case to be marked on the subject. This factor agrees with what Delancy states about the split ergative pattern found in northern Indo-Aryan languages. He says,

> Gujarati is atypical of the aspectual split ergative pattern formed in northern Indo-Aryan languages. Past tense verbs in Gujarati agree in gender with an NP. Imperfective agrees according to the accusative pattern, perfectives according to the ergative (1989:174).

Chodri is closely related to Gujarati and the subject of a transitive clause has no case marking in imperfect tenses and so the verb is marked for agreement with the gender-number of the subject. The subject of an intransitive clause is nominative in tenses other than past and perfect and absolutive in past and perfect tenses.

Examples 113 and 114 below show how the subject of a transitive or intransitive clause in present tense is nominative and the gender-number of the subject is marked on the verb.

(113) " Story of a king's daughter" (S 011)

manɳehẽ ∅	*te*	*mane*	***vəkʰaɳ-t-e-t***
people-NOM	ptl	me(ACC)	**admire-prog-pn-non1,pre**

'People are admiring me.'

(114) "Story of a king's daughter" (S 011)

hãj ∅	*te*	*bəhũ-dʒ*	*pʰain*	***dekʰa-t-i-m***
I-NOM	ptl	very-Emp	fine	**look-prog-sf-1,pre**

'I am looking very beautiful.'

In example 113, we see the nominative/accusative system. The gender-number of the subject noun *manɳehẽ* 'people', is marked on the verb *vəkʰaɳ-t-e-t* 'admiring'. Although it is a transitive clause, the verb agrees with the subject because the nominative/accusative system is used in present tense which is indicated by the present tense suffix *-t*. In example 114, the first person singular feminine *hãj* 'I' is marked on the verb *dekʰa-t-i-m* 'looking'. In both examples the subject is nominative which is unmarked and indicated by ∅.

The pronouns in Chodri are incorporated for nominative, ergative, dative/accusative/ absolutive cases in Chodri. Table 17 below shows this.

Person	Gender	Number	NOM	Ergative	Dative/ACC/ABS
1st	m/f	singular	hãj	məjẽ	mane
exclusive	m/f	plural	ame	amehẽ	amahaj
inclusive	m/f	plural	apɽe	apɽe	apɽahaj
2nd	m/f	singular	tũ	tujẽ	tune
	m/f	plural	tume	tumehẽ	tumahaj
3rd	m	singular	o	ije	ijaj /ijaɳe
	f	singular	e	ijje	ijej /ijeɳe
	n	singular	ĩ	ije	ijaj /ijaɳe
	m	plural	e	iɳehẽ	iɳahaj /iɳahaɳe
	f	plural	e	ijɳehẽ	ijɳehej/ijɳeheɳe
	n	plural	ĩ	iɳehẽ	iɳahaj /iɳahaɳe

Table 17. Pronouns incorporated for cases

As shown in Table 17, dative, accusative and absolutive cases in Chodri are marked the same and the nominative case is unmarked. Ergative case is indicated by inseparable morpheme in the pronominal forms given under third person ergative.

Dixon, when talking about split ergativity systems, states: "Ergative marking is most likely to be found in clauses that describe some definite result in past tense or perfective aspect" (1994:101). Longacre (in Thomas 1990:60) states, "Chodri like Indo-Aryan in general, is morphologically a split ergative system, with nominative-accusative structure in some tenses and ergative-absolutive in others". Nouns functioning as subjects in transitive clauses are marked with ergative case *-e* in past and perfect tenses.

Examples 115 and 116 show that when an ergative case is marked on the subject of a transitive clause in past tense, the object is marked for absolutive and the gender-number of the object is marked on the verb.

(115) " Story of a lost sister" (S 041)

*mari ben-**ne*** *hurdʒi* *p^{h}un-**e*** ***taɳ-i*** ***ne-d-i***
my sister-**ABS** sun flower-**ERG** **pull-cp** **take-pt-sf**

'The sun flower pulled away my sister.'

(116) " Story of a Brahmin" (S 032)

*həve bamən-**e*** *bar* *gam-ɳe* *maɳah-**aj***
now Brahmin-**ERG** twelve village-of people-**ABS**

ʈole ***kə-d-e***
crowd **do-pt-pn**

'Now the Brahmin gathered people from twelve villages.'

In example 115 and 116, the subject nouns *p^{h}un-e* 'flower' and *bamən-e* 'Brahmin', are marked with the ergative case marker *-e*. The objects in these examples are humans and they are marked with *-ne* and *-aj* for absolutive. The singular feminine of the object *ben-ne* 'sister' in example 115, is marked on the vector verb *ne-d-i* 'took'. The projection of the object preceding the subject in example shows the emphasis. The plural neuter of the noun *maɳah-aj* 'people' in example 116, is marked on the verb *kə-d-e* 'did' which acts as the verbalizer in this conjunct verb.

The following examples show that a subject of a transitive clause in tenses other than past and perfect is not marked with ergative case.

(117) " Story of a speaking and laughing flower" (S 043)

ame Ø *paɲi* Ø ***reʈ-ʧe-m***
we-NOM water-ACC **pour-prog,pf-1,pre**

'We are pouring water.'

(118) " Story of a head man" (S 086)

puʈ^{h}i *ɖoho* Ø *ɖohonj-**ej*** ***kə-t-o*** ***a***
then man-NOM woman-**ACC** **say-prog-sm** **be(pre,non1,s)**

'Then the man says to the woman.'

(119) " Story of a pumpkin" (S 093)

te ∅	*mane*	***utar-t-in-i***
she(NOM)	me(ACC)	**bring down-prog-pt-sf**

'She was bringing me down.'

The transitive clause in example 117 is in present progressive tense. The subject *ame* 'we' is marked as nominative by ∅ and the object *paɳi* 'water' is unmarked accusative. Indefinite inanimate objects are not marked as accusative in Chodri. An unmarked object is indefinite and more generic. The verb agrees with the first person plural feminine of the subject which is indicated by the suffix *-tʃem* on the verb root. The transitive clause in example 118 is in present progressive tense. The subject *ɖoho* 'man' is marked as nominative by ∅ and the object *ɖohonj-ej* 'woman' is marked as accusative. Animate and human objects are marked as accusative. The verb agrees with the singular masculine of the subject which is indicated by the suffix *-o* on the verb root. The transitive clause in example 119 is in past progressive tense. The subject *te* 'she' is marked as nominative by ∅ and the object *mane* 'me' is first person singular masculine which is inherently accusative. The verb agrees with the singular feminine of the subject which is indicated by the suffix *-tini* on the verb root. These examples show that the subject of a transitive clause in progressive tenses is in nominative case (and is always unmarked) and the object is accusative case (and may be marked or unmarked).

According to Dixon, a noun in plain form, with no suffix when it is in S function (subject of intransitive), and also in O function (object of transitive) is said to be absolutive case (1994:10).

In Chodri, objects in ergative constructions are not always overtly marked as absolutive. Human objects and definite (specific) objects (whether human, non-human, animate or inanimate) are always marked for absolutive. Indefinite and non-specific

(non-human and inanimate) objects are always unmarked[8]. The absolutive in Chodri can be divided into marked and unmarked. In the following sections each of these cases is exemplified and discussed in turn.

4.2.1 Unmarked absolutive

When the subject of a transitive clause in past or perfect tense is marked as ergative, the indefinite and non-specific inanimate object noun of that clause is unmarked absolutive. This is illustrated by examples 120 and 121.

(120) "Story of a rabbit and a fox" (S 040)

tije	*te*	*ek*	*moʈo*	*lilo*	*ɖepʰɳoØ*	***pʰãg-dʒ-o***
he **(ERG)**	ptl	one	big	green	stick-**ABS**	**break-pt-sm**

'He broke a big green stick.'

(121) "Story of a tiger killer" (S 012)

radʒ-e	*ɖəɳɖirə Ø*	***ʈip-av-j-ə***
king-**ERG**	drum-**ABS**	**beat-caus-pt-sn**

'The king caused a drum to beat.'

The transitive clause in example 120 is in past tense. The subject *tije* 'he' is inherently ergative and the object *ɖepʰɳo* 'stick' is unmarked as absolutive which is indicated by *Ø*. The verb agrees with the singular masculine object, which is indicated by *-o*. The transitive clause in example 121 is also in past tense. The subject *radʒ-e* 'king' is marked as ergative and the object *ɖəɳɖirə* 'drum' is unmarked as absolutive which is indicated by *Ø*.

[8] Direct object noun phrases in bitransitive clauses are also always unmarked absolutive, regardless of their humanness, definiteness or specificity.

In bitransitive clauses, the direct object is unmarked for absolutive regardless of its humanness, definiteness or specificity while the indirect object is of course marked with dative case marking as shown in example 122 below.

(122) "Story of a Myna" (S 004)

tijaj	*pʰava-**he***	*ʈarpi* ∅	*bənav-i*	***ap-ʧ-i***
he **(DAT)**	brothers-**ERG**	flute-**ABS**	make-cp	**give-pt-sf**

'His brothers made a flute and gave it to him.'

In example 122, the subject *pʰavahe* 'brothers' of this bitransitive clause is marked as ergative. The direct object *ʈarpi* is unmarked absolutive and the indirect object *tijaj* is marked as dative.

4.2.2 Marked absolutive

As stated above, when the subject of a transitive clause is ergative, the indefinite and non-specific animate or inanimate object is in unmarked absolutive case. However, if the object refers to a human or definite non-human (inanimate or animate) noun it is in marked absolutive case. Examples 123 and 124 illustrate this.

(123) " Story of a crocodile" (S 024)

tujẽ	*umbra-**ɳe***	*mula-**ɳe***	***tʰəj-r-ə***
you **(ERG)**	fig-of	root-**ABS**	**catch-pt-sn**

'You caught the root of the fig tree.'

(124) " Story of a Brahmin" (S 032)

*həve bamən-**e***	*bar*	*gam-ɳe*	*maɳah-**aj***
now Brahmin-**ERG**	twelve	village-of	people-**ABS**

ʈole	***kə-d-e***
crowd	**do-pt-pn**

'Now the Brahmin gathered people from twelve villages.'

In example 123, the subject *tujẽ* 'you' is ergative and the object *mula-ɳe* 'root' is marked as absolutive. Here 'root' is definite, specifically referring to the root of the fig tree, so it is overtly marked as absolutive. Again we see the gender-number of the object is marked on the verb. In example 124, the subject *bamən-e* 'Brahmin' is marked as ergative and the object *maɳahaj* 'people' refers to humans so the absolutive is overtly marked. As expected, The gender-number of the object is marked on the verb.

A few nouns in subject and object function referring to humans and a few definite and specific non-human and inanimate nouns in subject and object function are listed in Table 18 below. The corresponding free variant suffix *-aj* for the absolutive marking on the objects is not given.

Human			**Definite Non-Human and Inanimate**		
Subject	**Object**	**Meaning**	**Subject**	**Object**	**Meaning**
nitʃak	nitʃak-**aɳe**	'boy'	bəldʒə	bəldʒ-**aɳe**	'ox'
nitʃki	nitʃki-**jeɳe**	'girl'	hat^{h}i	hat^{h}i-**ɳe**	'elephant'
nitʃkə	nitʃk-**aɳe**	'child'	ʋag	ʋag-**aɳe**	'tiger'
goʋal	goʋal-**aɳe**	'shepherd'	muhulə	muhul-**aɳe**	'pestle'
bahal	bahal-**jeɳe**	'young girl'	tʃ^{h}aɽə	tʃ^{h}aɽ-**aɳe**	'tree'

Table 18. Absolutive markings on object nouns

4.3 Summary

Chodri verbs may be causativized analytically, morphologically or lexically. Analytical causatives are indicated by the compounding of the verb *mag* 'ask' with a main verb in the verb phrase or by the compounding of the verb *kər* 'do' with a main verb in the present participial form. Morphological causatives are derived by adding a causative suffix *-av* to the verb stem. Lexical causativization is found to occur among a limited set of verbs wherein the causative form is derived by stem modification of the verb, (resulting in different lexical items). Some verbs may be causativized twice by

morphological causativization and become double causatives. Such causativization is derived by adding the causative suffix *-av* to the causativized verb stem.

To know whether a verb in Chodri is transitive is very important because of the split ergative system conditioned by the semantics of the verb and tense. The subject is marked for ergative case only if the following two requirements are fulfilled: 1) the verb should be transitive and 2) the tense should be past or perfect tense. Verbs of transitive clauses in past or perfect tenses agree with the gender-number of the object and the subject is marked for ergative. The human and definite (animate and inanimate) objects are marked absolutive. Indefinite animate or inanimate object and direct object in the ergative construction are unmarked absolutive.