

Decreasing derivations in an increasing language: the case of Adyghe

0. Introduction

In Nichols et al. 2004 languages are classified as “transitivizing” or “detransitivizing”:

- Transitivity: Caucasian, Amerindian
- Detransitivizing: European

However, this distinction is drawn on the data of inchoative/causative alternations: therefore, it is very similar to the distinction between causativizing and anticausativizing.

I want to analyze data of Adyghe (West Caucasian), addressing the following issue:

- **If a language is “transitivizing” (as Adyghe), does it mean that it doesn’t have any decreasing derivations? If it has, which derivations are they? Are they different from similar derivations in detransitivizing languages?**

We will analyze two types of phenomena:

- Transitivity decrease: a transitive verb becomes intransitive (the number of participants does not obligatorily change);
- Valency decrease: the verb loses one of syntactic arguments (transitivity does not obligatorily change).

Adyghe valency

- Ergative (oblique) arguments and one absolutive argument are cross-referenced in the verb form;
- Ergative (oblique) case marks the agent of transitive verbs and all types of indirect objects – both inherent and introduced by derivations;
- Many increasing derivations: causative, benefactive, malefactive, comitative, locatives.

1. Resultative

Resultative derivation leads to omission of the agentive slot (although not of the semantic agentive participant):

- (1) se qebaske z-ʁe-ʒ_wa-ʁ
I cabbadge 1SG.A-CAUS-cook-PST
‘I cooked cabbadge’;
- (2) qebaske ʁe-ʒ_wa-ʁe
cabbadge CAUS-cook-PST
‘The cabbadge is cooked’.

Not surprisingly, this derivation is restricted by the past tense: in this sense we can regard -ʁe here as a part of “resultative stem”, cf. impossible:

- (3) qebaske ʁa-ʒ_we
cabbadge CAUS-cook
‘The cabbadge is being cooked’,

Therefore, in (2) we see the resultative and **not** the passive construction.

All verbs except transitives are impossible in this construction.

There are also “resultativa tantum”, which present separate verb meanings, but are morphological resultatives: see, e.g., *pələʁen* ‘hang (intr)’

- (4) portret-ər depqə-m pə-ʁa-ʁ
portrait-ABS wall-OBL LOC-lie-PST
‘The portrait hangs on the wall’ (lit. ‘The portrait is hung on the wall’, present interpretation).

In fact, this meaning is not canonically “derivational”: it only emphasizes the result phase of the situation. However, we must regard it as a decreasing derivation, because it decreases the number of arguments of the verb.

(!) Another important problem is marking of resultative. Two possible distinctions:

- no marker (but the resultative meaning is applicable to the past tense only);
- resultative is marked with the past tense marker *-ɬe*.

The second decision is supported by the fact that the derivatives in (2) and (4) do not have past proper meaning.

In fact, Adyghe resultative is rather typologically usual, but unusual is the fact that the verb loses its agent valency slot.

2. Anticausative (see Letuchiy in press)

Anticausative meaning is expressed by the reflexive marker *zə/ze-* for only a couple of verbs:

- (5) a. se čəxə-r (∅)-sə-wəfa-ɬ
I tree-ABS (3SG.SO)-1SG.A-bend-PST
‘I bent a tree.’
- b. čəxə-m z-jə-wəfa-ɬ
tree-OBL REFL-3SG.A-bend-PST
‘The tree bent.’
- (6) a. se šhan_wəpčə-r (∅)-fe-s-šə-ɬ
I window-ABS (3SG.SO)-REFL-DIR-LOC-BEN-3SG.A-make-PAST
‘I closed the window’
- b. šhan_wəpčə-m zə-q(ə)-ze-f-jə-šə-ɬ
window-OBL REFL-DIR-LOC-BEN-3SG.A-make-PAST
‘The window closed’.

In Shapsug dialect, the number of anticausative derivatives increases:

- (7) a. waje-m psə nah š_wab_wə (∅)-ə-šə-ɬ
rain-OBL river more broad (3SG.SO)-3SG.A-make-PST
‘Rains made the river broader’
- b. čəjəm nah š_wab_wə z-jə-šə-ɬ
more broad REFL-3SG.A-make-PST
‘The road became more narrow (lit. make itself more narrow)’ (maybe the Russian influence).
- (8) a. mə č’ale-m ɬ_weg_wə (∅)-je-(ɬe)-wəš_web_wə-ɬ
this boy-OBL road 3SG.SO-3SG.A-(CAUS)-broaden-PST
‘This guy made the road broader.’
- b. psə-m z-jə-(ɬe)-wəš_web_wə-ɬ
river-OBL REFL-3SG.A-(CAUS)-broaden-PST
‘The river became broader.’

Non-prototypical anticausative:

- no destruction anticausative verbs (see Kulikov 1998 on destruction anticausatives in Vedic, which are in fact the most prototypical type of anticausatives);
- strange pattern for polysynthetic ergative language (the anticausative verb is apparently transitive with an ergative/oblique agent). In (a) variants, the patient is in the absolutive, in (b) variants in the oblique (ergative) case, i.e. anticausativization does not lead to valency/transitivity decrease.

Most of similar meanings are expressed by labile verbs (like *q_wəten* ‘break’, *zəpəč’an* ‘break’, *zəbərətəq_wən* ‘spill’) or by basic intransitive verbs (like *k_wedən* ‘die out’). In this sense Adyghe is a problem for typology proposed in Haspelmath 1993, since anticausative and causative are asymmetric in the language system.

Note the interesting situation with the verb in (8): the transitive meaning can be expressed by a base verb or by a causativized verb. Correspondingly, in the first case reflexive is built from the base and in the second case from the derived causative verb.

3. Antipassive (see in detail Arkadiev, Letuchiy in press)

Antipassive is marked with change of the last vowel of the stem from *ə* to *e*.

- (9) a. se pjəs'me-r (Ø)-se-txə
I letter-ABS (3SG.SO)-1SG.A-write
'I write a letter.';
- b. se se-txe
I 1SG.S-write.AP
'I write.'

Note that neither of the verbs is more marked than the other one, cf. Dyirbal:

- (10) a. tə-laʔu-n əpapa.
1SG.A-see-3SG.P father.ABS
'I saw my father.'
- b. ənɲin ənpəŋav qiwwaŋ ina-ləʔu-tkən.
this old_woman.ABS bad (3SG.S)AP-see-IPF
'This old woman sees badly.'

The vowel change in fact marks different derivations. However, all of them are related to transitivity decrease:

- omission of the patient, which is not an argument, i.e., not cross-referenced in the verb form (9), and cannot be expressed in the sentence;
- the patient is not an argument, but can be expressed by a peripheral NP (instrumental case):

- (11) a. se lə-r (Ø)-se-šxə
I meat-ABS (3SG.SO)-1SG.A-eat
'I eat meat.'
- b. se lə-če se-šxe
I meat-INS 1SG.SO-eat.AP
'I feed on meat.' (i.e. in the context 'I feed only by meat, because I haven't anything else to eat').

In fact, the difference between (9) and (11) may be only in the verb class: the verb 'eat' admits reinterpretation of the patient as a **means/instrument**. The verb 'write' does not admit such reinterpretation.

- antipassive proper: the patient remains an argument, but it is now an indirect object and the verb is intransitive:

- (12) a. se txələ-r (Ø)-s-žə-ke
I book-ABS (3SG.SO)-1SG.A-read-PAST
'I read the book over.'
- b. se txələ-m s-je-ža-κ
I book-OBL 1SG.SO-3SG.IO-read.AP-PAST
'I read a book (for some time).'

- minor type without syntactic transitivity change, but with valency change: the antipassive verb is monovalent, as opposed to the bivalent base verb:

- (13) a. č'ale-r se (Ø)-s-je-plə
boy-ABS I (3SG.SO)-1SG.IO-DYN-look
'The boy looks at me.'
- b. č'ale-r č'əž'-ew ma-plə
boy-ABS far-ADV DYN-look.AP
'The boy looks into the distance.'

In (13), (b) is lower than (a) in semantic transitivity (since in (a), but not in (b) the verb has a referent goal). However, both in (a) and in (b) the verb is intransitive. The fact that in (b) it is monovalent is apparent from presence of dynamic prefix *ma-* on the verb.

This is the only derivation which marks **valency change without any transitivity change**. Usually such changes remain unmarked or are marked by locative prefixes:

(14) ha-r ɕəf-xe-m je-caqe
 dog-ABS person-PL-OBL 3SG.A-bite
 ‘The dog bites people.’

(15) ha-r ɕəf-xe-m me-caqe
 dog-ABS person-PL-OBL DYN-bite
 ‘The dog bites.’

- “locative applicatives”: the transitive variant has an object argument with the meaning of path: e.g. *ɕen* ‘run’/*ɕən* ‘run, cover some distance’
- “applicatives” like *ležen* ‘work’/*ležən* ‘process, work up’. Difference from canonical antipassives:

Antipassives presuppose existence of the second semantic argument in the intransitive use (i.e. if ‘X reads’ then ‘there exists an Y such that X reads Y’).

Applicatives do not obligatorily presuppose the second argument (if ‘X works’ it is not obligatorily true that ‘there exists an Y such that X works Y up’) (see Peterson 2007 on semantic and syntactic properties of applicatives).

Historically, according to Yakovlev, Ašhamaf 1941, these stem alternations were related to **directionality** (locative uses are also present today for some stems).

4. Decreasing uses of increasing derivations

In (Rogava, Kerasheva 1966), a number of decreasing uses of derivational markers is listed. We cite them in Table 1, both from (Rogava, Kerasheva 1966) and from our field data:

Derivational marker	“Increasing” meaning	“Decreasing” meaning
<i>fe-</i>	Benefactive	Possibilitive
<i>š_we-</i>	Malefactive	‘accidentally’
<i>ʔeɕ’e-</i>	‘unexpectedly’	‘accidentally’

4.1. Increasing uses

Below we illustrate the increasing use of the benefactive marker *fe-*

(16) a. se txəλ-xe-r (we-šʔ paje) qə-s-šʔefə-ke-x
 I book-PL-ABS you-OBL for DIR-1SG.A-buy-PST-PL
 ‘I bought books (for you)’.

b. se we¹ txəλ-xe-r qə-p-fe-s-šʔefə-ke-x
 I you(OBL) book-PL-ABS DIR-2SG.IO-BEN-1SG.A-buy-PST-PL
 ‘I bought books for you’.

In (16a), the verb is bivalent, the benefactive participant is coded by a peripheral noun phrase and can be omitted. In (16b), the verb is trivalent, the benefactive participant is coded by an ergative NP and cross-referenced by an indirect object prefix.

Several benefactive-like derivations can combine in the verb form; the only restriction is that the same marker cannot repeat in the increasing use: forms like *qə-p-f-a-fe-šʔefə-ke-x* (‘I bought it for them and (make it) for you’) with two benefactive markers are impossible. It can result from the prohibition for doubling semantic roles.

4.2. Decreasing uses

(17) exemplifies the decreasing use of the benefactive marker:

(17) a. ɕʔale-xe-m bukva-xe-r a-λeɕ_wə-re-p
 boy-PL-OBL letter-PL-ABS 3SG.A-see-DYN-NEG
 ‘The boys do not see letters’

b. ɕale-xe-m bukva-xe-r a-fe-λeɕ_wə-re-p
 boy-PL-OBL letter-PL-ABS 3SG.IO-BEN-see-DYN-NEG
 ‘The boy cannot see letters’.

¹ Personal pronouns have different ergative forms in postpositional phrases (-šʔ) vs. in all other cases (unmarked form). This fact is outside the scope of our paper.

In (17b) a new argument do not introduced: the verb still has two arguments, the agent and the patient. Moreover, the verb ceases to be transitive. For example, the initial verb *λεβ_wαν* ‘see’, which is transitive, takes the “transitive” reciprocal prefix *zere-*, whereas the potential derivatives can only take the “intransitive” variant *ze/zə*:

- (18) a-xe-r **zere-**λεβ_wα-xe-r-ep
 he-PL-ABS REC-see-PL-DYN-NEG
 ‘They don’t see each other’.
- (19) a-xe-r **ze-**fe-λεβ_wα-xe-r-ep
 he-PL-ABS REC-BEN-see-PL-DYN-NEG
 ‘They cannot see each other’.

Note that the situation with the inadvertitive derivatives is somewhat more complex: they can both take *zere-* and *ze-*:

- (20) aməşaxew ?eç’e-**zere-**wəça-ke-x
 accidentally INADV-REC-kill.AP-PST-PL
 ‘They killed each other accidentally’.
- (21) ç’ale-xe-m **z(e)**-a-?eç’e-wə?e-ž’ə-κ
 boy-PL-OBL REC-3SG(IO)-INADV-wound-RFC-PST
 ‘The boys wounded each other accidentally’;

However, the number of arguments do not change. The same is true for decreasing uses of other derivations:

- (22) šofjorə-m c’əfə-r Ø-**š_we-**wəç-əκ
 driver-OBL person-ABS 3SG.IO-MAL-kill-PST
 ‘The car driver killed a man accidentally’.
- (23) se səməşaxew s-jə-š’ewεβ_wα-xe-r s-**?eç’e-**wə?a-ke-x
 I accidentally 1SG-POSS-friend-ABS 1SG.IO-INADV-wound-PST-PL
 ‘I wounded my friend accidentally’.

As we can see, in (23) the verb form contains the plural absolutive marker *-x*, and the indirect object marker *s-*, which show that it has two arguments, just as the base verb ‘wound’.

Another intriguing fact is that the inadvertitive marker *?eç’e-* with some verbs uses the intransitive (antipassive) verb stem, like *-wəç’e-* in (20) which does not exist independently for verbs like ‘kill’. Another variant is the verbal stem with the directional suffix *-ha*:

- (24) aməşaxew ?eç’e-**zere-**wəçə-ha-ke-x
 accidentally INADV-REC-kill.AP-DIR-PST-PL
 ‘They killed each other accidentally’.

A strange property of decreasing uses: **compatible only with transitive verbs**:

- (25) *a-š’ Ø-fe-κwe-re-p
 HE-OBL 3SG.IO-BEN-GO-DYN-NEG
 ‘He cannot go’;
- (26) *se we wə-s-**?eç’e-**wənča-κ
 I(OBL) you 2SG.S-1SG.IO-INADV-push-PST
 ‘You pushed me (unexpectedly for me)’.

In fact, potential is **the main test for distinguishing between transitive and intransitive verbs** (which is rather unusual for modal categories). However, nothing in semantics of potential or inadvertitive prevents them from modifying intransitive verbs (cf. (25) and (26), which are semantically perfect).

On the other hand, potential is compatible with non-agentive subjects:

- (27) čəxə-r maš_we-m Ø-fe-ke-stə-š’t-ep
 tree-ABS fire-OBL 3SG.IO-BEN-CAUS-burn-FUT-NEG
 ‘The fire will not be able to burn this tree’.

The situation with inadvertitive is not the same: inadvertitives are incompatible with patientive events because of semantic restrictions.

Does the transitivity restriction result from properties of the increasing uses?

(Shibatani 1996), (Peterson 2007): applicatives and benefactives modify primarily transitive verbs (whereas causatives modify primarily intransitive verbs): in some languages these two meanings are expressed by the same marker, but with different groups of verbs.

In Adyghe, benefactives, malefactives and inadvertitives in their increasing uses can modify both transitive and intransitive verbs:

- (28) se lə-r fe-s-š'əḅwə-ḅ → se a-š' lə-r Ø-fe-s-š'əḅwə-ḅ
 I(OBL) meat-ABS BEN-1SG.A-salt-PST I(OBL) he-OBL meat-ABS 3SG.IO-BEN-1SG.A-salt-PST
 'I salted meat' 'I salted meat for him'.
- (29) se s-e-k_we → se a-š' s-Ø-fa-k_we
 I(ABS) 1SG.S-DYN-go I(ABS) he-OBL 1SG.S-3SG.IO-BEN-go
 'I go' 'I go for him/instead of him/to him'

The sole explanation can be given in syntactic terms: valency derivations in Adyghe can make only a limited set of operations:

Possible operations:

- absolutive argument of two-place verb is eliminated; the base agent is marked with absolutive (antipassive; A-lability)
- oblique argument is eliminated (resultative; P-lability)
- oblique agent turns into oblique indirect object (decreasing derivations)
- new ergative argument is added (benefactive-like derivations)

Impossible operations:

- *new absolutive argument is added (no canonical applicative in Adyghe)
- *absolutive argument turns into an ergative argument; the ergative argument turns into an absolutive argument (no decreasing derivations from bivalent intransitive verbs)
- *absolutive argument is eliminated, the verb has no absolutive argument (no decreasing derivations from monovalent verbs)

If potential modified monovalent intransitive verbs, the derived verb would not have an absolutive argument.

- (30) *č'ale-m Ø-fa-k_we
 boy-OBL 3SG.IO-BEN-go
 'The boy can go'.

The situation with intransitive bivalent verbs like *bewən* 'kiss' and *wənč'en* 'push' is more complex:

- (31) č'ale-r pšaše-m j-e-wənč'a-ḅ
 boy-ABS girl-OBL 3SG.IO-DYN-push-PST
 'The boy pushed the girl'.

- (32) (=26) *se we wə-s-ʔeč'e-wənč'a-ḅ
 I(OBL) you 2SG.S-1SG.IO-BEN-push-PST
 'You pushed me (unexpectedly for me)'.

In fact if this group of verbs took the potential marker, this wouldn't be prohibited by Adyghe grammar, cf. antipassives.

4.3. Possible sources of decreasing uses

Increasing uses of **benefactive** marker:

- goal (29)
- addressee
- benefactive (28)
- external possessor
- stimulus
- "instead" (29)

- “dativus ethicus”²:

(33) se s-fe-čəje-re-p

I 1SG.IO-BEN-sleep-DYN-NEG

‘He does not sleep’ (although I am trying to make him sleep);

(34) s.jane x’ədədem pče qə-wə-s-jə-ɸe-xə, aw se qə-fe-wə-s-xə-re-p

1SG.mother now door DIR-LOC-1SG-3SG-CAUS-open but I DIR-BEN-LOC-1SG.AG-open-DYN-NEG

‘My mother causes/asks me to open the door, but I do not open it’ (literally: ‘for her’).

The possible sources for the potential use can be benefactive proper or “dativus ethicus”:

(i) Benefactive/“dativus ethicus” → decreasing of the status of agent ‘for me I do not write’ → potential.

The situation with malefactive and inadvertitive is much simpler:

Meanings of the **malefactive** marker:

- locative (synchronically very far from malefactive)
- malefactive
- experiencer

(35) se a-š’ j-ə-š’aj s-jə-ŕwe-ŕwa-ɸ

I (s)he-OBL 3SG-POSS-tea 1SG.SO-3SG.IO-MAL-drink-PST

‘I drink his tea (to his spite)’ (malefactive).

(36) a-š’ ŕwe-kən sumkə-r hən-ew

(s)he-OBL MAL-heavy bag-ABS carry-CONV

‘This bag is too heavy for him’ (lit. ‘To carry the bag is heavy for him’, experiencer).

The rare meaning ‘accidentally’ can result from the malefactive meaning:

(ii) Malefactive → “reflexive malefactive”: in spite of the agent → unvolitionally

Inadvertitive has only the meaning ‘unexpectedly’:

(37) s-jə-kompjuter Ø-s-ʔeç’e-kwesa-ɸ

1SG-POSS-computer 3SG.S-1SG(IO)-INADV-die.out-PST

‘My computer switched off unexpectedly for me’.

This meaning is in fact much more rare than the inadvertitive one. The decreasing use comes just from “reflexivization” of the increasing one:

(iii) ‘my computer switched off unexpectedly for me’ → ‘I wounded my friend unexpectedly for me (i.e. ‘accidentally’).

Cf. the common property of three semantic paths:

decreasing uses are “unmarked reflexives” from increasing ones.

In fact this explains occurrence of this type of decreasing derivations in an (almost) exclusively increasing languages: they do not in fact increase the valency or transitivity of the verb.

4.4. Adyghe and typology of accessive/decessive polysemy

In (Nedjalkov 2001), (Galiamina 2001) the notion of accessive/decessive polysemy applies primarily to passive/causative polysemy, see Khakas (my field data):

(38) ajdo xaryndaz-y-na porčo-ny sap-t(ə)r-š’a

Ajdo brother-3SG-DAT Porcho-ACC beat-CAUS-PRS

‘Ajdo lets his brother beat Porcho’;

(39) ol sap-t(ə)r-š’a

(s)he beat-CAUS-PRS

‘He is being beaten’.

In Adyghe, other types of polysemy are attested. Note, however, that the same mechanism of re-analysis of markers is used:

² This list is rather similar to the list of meanings of Svan version, cited in Bergelson 1998.

- 1) increasing derivation ('I made Ajdo beat Porcho'; 'They eat all my apples **unexpectedly for me**');
- 2) "reflexive" increasing derivation: the new argument is co-referent to one of the base arguments ('I_i made/let Ajdo beat me_i'; 'I_i eat all apples unexpectedly for me_i');
- 3) transitivity decrease: one of the co-referent arguments is eliminated ('I was beaten by Ajdo'; 'I eat all apples unvolitionally').

On the other hand, the nature of decreasing derivations is different:

- in Turkic languages the last stage (3) is purely syntactic derivation (passive);
- in Adyghe, the last stage is semantically-relevant processes (modal meanings; features of the participant), which do not necessarily affect syntactic transitivity.

Another parallel is polysemy of indirect object markers:

Russian: **dative case** marks benefactive and "decreased subjects":

(40) *Ja otkry-l starik-u dver'-Ø.*
 I.NOM open-PST.M old.man-DAT door-ACC
 'I opened the door for/to the old man';

(41) *Mne ne spi-t-sja.*
 I.DAT not sleep-3SG-REFL

'I cannot sleep' (literally 'It does not sleep to me') (← the base verb *spat* 'sleep' with a nominative subject).

(Some) Turkic languages: **dative case** marks benefactive, addressee etc. and the agent in passive constructions.

Possible explanation: dative case is the form of the argument, which is neither the prototypical patient, nor the prototypical agent.

5. Fasilitive and difasilitive

Finally, in Adyghe there are two complex markers of fasilitive (-*ɤ_wə-š_wə*) and difasilitive (-*ɤ_wa-jə*), attached to the right of the stem:

(42) *mə çale-r ɤe-š'əne-ɤ_weš_wə*
 this boy-ABS CAUS-fear-FSL

'It is simple to frighten this boy' (lit. 'This boy is simple to frighten').

(43) *mə çale-m je-wəŋç'ə-ɤ_weš_wə*
 this boy-OBL 3SG(IO)-push-FSL

'It is simple to push this boy.'

(44) *mə çale-r zexe-xə-ɤ_waje*
 this boy-ABS LOC-hear-FSL

'It is difficult to hear this boy.'

(45) *ɤ_we-ɤ_weš_wə*
 go-FSL

'It is easy to go.' (impersonal construction).

According to Rogava, Kerasheva 1966 and our field data, this derivation is compatible with all types of dynamic verbs (see transitive verb in (42), bivalent intransitive in (43), bivalent inverse in (44) and monovalent in (45)).

Unusual feature:

The derivation is oriented to the syntactic role of subject and not the ergative/absolutive marking of arguments.

In (42) and (44) the subject oblique slot is omitted, whereas in (43) and (45) the subject absolutive slot is omitted. See also the following pair of examples:

(46) *aslan-əm š'ə-š'tə-ɤ_weš_wə*
 lion-OBL LOC-fear-FSL

'It is easy to fear a lion' ('Smb is easy to fear a lion').

- (47) *aslan-əm ə-ke-š'əne-κ_weš_wə
 lion-OBL 3SG.A-CAUS-fear-FSL
 'It is easy to fear a lion.' ('The lion is easy to frighten smb').

In (46), with experiencer subject and stimulus indirect object the stimulus can be expressed. This is impossible in (47), where stimulus is a subject (causer of a causative verb). The case marking and semantic role is identical in both examples.

- **The only Adyghe construction, which admits absence of an absolutive argument** (although it is difficult to prove, since 3SG absolutive argument are cross-referenced by the zero marker).

According to Rogava, Kerasheva 1966, the omitted argument cannot be expressed. In fact the situation is somewhat more complex:

5.1. Direct expression of the argument

Some native speakers admit (though not in all contexts) expression of the omitted argument of the type (47):

- (48) psə-fač'e-m zə-rə-p-thač'ə-κ_we-š_wə
 water-hot-OBL RFL.ABS-INS-2SG(A)-INS-wash-ADJ-FSL
 'It is easy for you to wash in hot water.'

Strict rules of expression of the agent are not clear. However, the least expressible is the subject of an agentive transitive verb:

- (49) se mə wəne-r s-λeκ_wə-κ_waj
 I this house-ABS 1SG.A-see-DFSL
 'It is difficult for me to see this house.';

- (50) *se wəne-r se-šə-κ_waj
 I house-ABS 1SG.A-build-DFSL
 'It is difficult for me to build a house.'

5.2. Expression of the argument by means of version

More widespread are constructions where the omitted argument is expressed as a version argument (indirect object):

- (51) se mə čəκ_wə-r s-š_we-ž_we-κ_weš_wə
 I this field-ABS 1SG(IO)-MAL-plough-FSL
 'It is easy for me to plough this field'.

- **In fact the restriction on expression of the subject may be not strictly syntactic but rather semantic/pragmatic.**
- **Another striking property: expression of NPs are also relevant (contrary to pronominal argument theory, see Jelinek 1995, Baker 1986):**

- (52) mə čale-m š_wefə-r je-ke-ž_we-κ_weš_wə
 this boy-OBL field-ABS 3SG.IO-CAUS-plough-FSL
 'It is easy to make this boy plough the field.';

- (53) mə š_wefə-r je-ke-ž_we-κ_weš_wə
 this field-ABS 3SG.IO-CAUS-plough-FSL
 'It is easy for him to plough the field if anyone makes him.';

- (54) ?/*mə čale-m je-ke-ž_we-κ_weš_wə
 this boy-OBL 3SG.IO-CAUS-plough-FSL
 'It is easy to make this boy plough (smth).'

If the causee and the DO are expressed (52), the facilitative meaning applies to the causation.

If only the DO is expressed (53), the facilitative meaning applies to the caused situation.

If only the causee is expressed (54), the sentence is regarded as incomplete.

5.3. Reflexivization/reciprocalization “finds” the omitted argument

The omitted argument can bind reflexive and reciprocal markers:

- (55) zere-λeκ_wə-κ_weš_wə
 REC-see-FSL
 'It is easy to love each other.'

(56) ze-λeκ_wə-β_weš_wə

REFL-see-FSL

‘It is easy to love oneself.’

Therefore, we can hardly speak about elimination of syntactic argument, although the valency slot is empty. Possible solutions:

- reflexive marker is controlled from the empty slot
- reflexivization takes place before “fasilitivization”; the marker is controlled by the agent marker

In any case, reflexivization of this type would be impossible for canonical decreasing derivation.

6. Summary: properties of decreasing derivations

In the table we list the following properties of derivations: (1) productiveness; (2) main/secondary use of the marker; (3) transitivity change; (4) valency change; (5) meanings cumulated with the derivation.

Derivation	Productiveness	Main/secondary	TC	VC	Cumulated meanings
Antipassive	+/-	Main	+, rarely -	+ or -	
Anticausative	-	Secondary	-	-	
Fasilitive	+	Main	+/-	+/-	Modal
Potential	+	Equal	+	-	Modal
Malefactive	-	Secondary	+	-	
Inadvertitive	+/-	Main	+	-	
Resultative	+	Secondary?	-	+	Aspectual

Therefore, none of the derivations is a prototypical case of decreasing derivation, cf. Russian marker *-sja*: (1) productive (2) anticausative is the main meaning (3) transitivity change (4) valency change (5) often no cumulated meanings.

This results from the fact that the system of valency slots in Adyghe hardly admits omission of arguments. Valency slots (as opposed to NPs) are obligatory: for example, discursively-motivated omission of slots are impossible (whereas NPs often remain unexpressed). This leaves for the language the following variants:

- ❖ system of “unmarked reflexives” – secondary uses of increasing derivations;
 - ❖ derivations outside the valency slots domain – i.e., antipassive and fasilitive, which take place in the suffixal zone;
 - ❖ rearranging variants of decreasing derivations – anticausative;
 - ❖ (rarely) really decreasing derivations, motivated by modal or aspectual meanings – fasilitive and resultative.
- Note that the most productive are derivations which are cumulated with other meanings (potential, resultative, fasilitive). Transitivity changes are secondary in these cases.
- On the other hand, “derivations proper” (anticausative, antipassive) are peripheral and restricted by rather small groups of verbs.

Therefore, these types of decreasing derivations can really be replaced by lability and/or increasing derivations: in this sense Adyghe is a really increasing language.

Conclusions

Adyghe is really an increasing language, since it lacks purely grammatical markers of decreasing derivations. Meanings that are often expressed by means of decreasing markers in Adyghe are often expressed with unmarked derivation and other types of derivations (rearranging, increasing). However, decreasing derivations occur in other zones: aspectual and modal.

In these cases transitivity decrease is motivated not by semantics of derivation (fasilitive or potential do not require transitivity decrease), but because of **lack of semantic transitivity**.

- **Fasilitive, potential etc. make the verb intransitive, because the situation is not semantically transitive: stative in the case of potential and fasilitive, not controlled in the case of inadvertitive.**

This motivation is normal for Caucasian languages which were proved (see Klimov, Alexeev 1980, Testelec 1998) to have strongly semantically motivated transitivity.

Bibliography

Arkadijev, P.M., and Letuchiy, A.B. In press. Derivacii antipassivnoj zony v adygejskom jazyke. In: V.A. Plungian, S.G. Tatevosov (eds). *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki. Otglagol'naja derivacija*.

Baker, M.C. 1986. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford University Press.

Bergelson, M.B. 1999. Versija v svanskom jazyke. In: E.V. Rakhilina and Ya.G. Testelecs (eds). *Tipologija i teorija jazyka: ot opisanija k objasneniju*.

Galiamina, Ju.E. 2001. Akcessivno-recessivnaja polisemija pokazatelej zaloga i aktantnoj derivacii. In: V.A. Plungian (ed.). *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki*. Vol 1. *Glagol'nyje kategorii*. Moscow. P. 178-197.

Haspelmath M. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In: Comrie B. and M. Polinsky (eds). *Causatives and Transitivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1993. 87-120.

Jelinek, E. 1995. Quantification in Straits Salish. In: E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratzer and B. Partee (eds). *Quantification in natural languages*. Kluwer.

Kulikov L.I. Passive, anticausative and classification of verbs. The case of Vedic. In: Kulikov L.I., Vater H. (eds). *Typology of verbal categories*. Papers presented to V.P. Nedjalkov on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Tübingen, 1998.

Kumakhov, M.A. 1964. *Morfologija adygskich jazykov*. Moscow/Nalchik.

Letuchiy, A.B. In press. *Sredstva markirovanija protivopostavlenija "dekauzativ/kauzativ" v adygejskom jazyke*.

Nedjalkov, I. V. 1991. Recessive-Accessive Polysemy of Verbal Suffixes. In: *Languages of the World*. Vol. 1. P. 4-31.

Nichols, J., Peterson, D.A., and Barnes, J. 2004. Transitivity and detransitivizing languages. In: *Linguistic Typology*, 8, 2004. 149-211.

Peterson, D.A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford University Press.

Rogava, G.V., Kerasheva, Z.I. 1966. *Grammatika adygejskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Krasnodar/Majkop.

Shibatani, M. 1996. Applicatives and Benefactive: A Cognitive Account. In: Shibatani M., Thompson S.A. (eds). *Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yakovlev, N.F., and Ašhamaf, D.A. 1941. *Grammatika adygejskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.