ON THE SEMANTICS OF AFFECTEDNESS IN THE KA'APOR LANGUAGE

Fábio Bonfim Duarte

Federal University of Minas Gerais

The purpose of this paper is to examine the grammatical status of the particle [ke] in order to examine its syntactic and semantic scope within the clauses in the Ka'apor language.[1] The empirical data collected thus far indicates that [ke] can semantically mark internal arguments of transitive verbs, in particular those that are affected by the events expressed by verbs of activity, such as "peel" and "eat", as follows:

(1) *ihẽ*   *narãj ke*[2]   *a-pirok*
     I   orange AFET   1SG -peel
     "I peeled the orange."

(2) *a'e   tatu*   *ke   u-'u*   *ta*
     he   armadillo   AFET 3-eat   VOL
     "He will eat armadillo."

Moreover, this particle is also found in contexts where it becomes enclitic to subjects of stative and unaccusative verbs, thereby giving rise to an absolutive system, as is illustrated by the following examples:

---

[1] Ka'apor is spoken by about 1000 people who live in the state of Maranhão, in the northern region of Brazil. This language belongs to the Tupí-Guaraní family, Tupí Stock.

[2] The following are abbreviations used in glosses: ACC: accusative Case; AFET: affected argument; AUX: auxiliary; CAUS: causative prefix; CT: a relational prefix that signals the adjacency of the internal argument in relation to its head; DAT: dative Case; ERG: ergative Case; IMIN: a particle that conveys the future tense; INF: Infinitive; G generic; GEN: genitive Case; LOC: locative Case; NCT: a relational prefix that signals that the there is no adjacency of the internal argument in relation to its head; NOM: nominative Case; PERF: perfective aspect; PL: plural marker; PRES: present tense; PROSP: prospective suffix; REFLX: reflexive prefix; REP: particle in final sentence position that indicates repetition of the action performed by the subject; VOL: volition.

(3) *Ana*   *ke*ᵢ   *h*ᵢ-e ʔõ   *ʔɨ*

     Ana   AFET   3SG-be tired   PERF

     "Ana got tired."

(4) *ihẽ* *ke*   *a-'ar*

     I   AFET   1SG-fall

     "I have fallen."

Based on the examples above, I will be assuming henceforth that one of the roles of the particle [ke] is to convey the semantics of affectedness. For this reason, this particle will constitute one of our most direct tools for diagnosing when an argument is semantically affected or not. A natural assumption is then to propose that the semantic denotation for [ke] is one of affectedness, such that this is the meaning that [ke] contributes to the D/NP that it marks. Additionally, the morphosyntactic distribution of [ke] in the examples above suggests that Ka'apor exhibits an absolutive alignment in such a way that the object and the intransitive subjects can be both marked with [ke], whereas the prototypical agents remain unmarked. According to Dixon (1979, 1994)[3], in many languages, the absolutive tends to be the unmarked Case, whereas the ergative is the marked one. In this sense, the Ka'apor data above contradict Dixon's prediction due to the fact that only the absolutive arguments, that is, the affected internal arguments, are the marked ones, whereas the external agent remains unmarked. This observation is reinforced by the fact that the external argument, as in example (1) above and in example (5) below, is not normally marked with [ke], particularly in those contexts wherein this argument does exert control over the action.

(5) *arauxu*   *ø-ahem*   *uhu*

     Araújo   3SG-shout   a lot

     "Araújo shouted a lot."

In sum, keeping in mind the semantic denotation of [ke] and its grammatical distribution in the sentences examined thus far, this paper aims to find a unified answer for the following questions:

---

[3] Dixon (1994:62) states that "in many ergative languages, the absolutive NP must obligatorily be included in each sentence, but an ergative NP may be omitted (…)". According to him, this provides further support for one to assume the following:

     (i) that absolutive is the unmarked Case;
     (ii) the ergative is the marked one.

In sum, according to Dixon's assumption, in every ergative language known to him, "the absolutive is the sole citation form."

(6)

    (a)   Is it possible for this particle to mark other core arguments of the predicate, such as the agent subject of transitives and unergatives?

    (b)   Does [ke] correspond to a Case marker? If so, which Case?

The article is divided into five sections. Sections 1 and 2 outline the theoretical assumption on which the analysis will be based. Section 3 presents the relevant data that will serve to advance the theoretical proposal. Section 4 demonstrates that [ke] can in fact be interpreted as being a morphological instantiation of an inherent dative Case. The final section concludes the paper.

1.   On the notion of structural and nonstructural Case

In this paper, I will be following the essential of Woolford's (2006) proposal that Case theory is composed of two types of abstract Case: the structural and the nonstructural. The main difference between the two types is that structural Case is dissociated from theta role and is thus licensed in a purely structural way. This proposal entails that a given structural Case can be, in principle, associated with various theta roles, whereas nonstructural Case is associated with particular θ-positions. In recent literature [Ura (2000); Woolford (1997, 2006); Legate (2006); Laka (2006)], it has been assumed that nonstructural Case comprises two distinct Cases: the lexical Case and the inherent Case. The former is idiosyncratic and cannot be predicted, whereas the latter is much more regular and predictable. According this proposal, inherent Case is usually connected to fixed theta-roles, such as the agent and the goal/experiencers. It is also assumed that ergative is the inherent Case associated with the arguments that exhibit the agent theta role, whereas the dative is the inherent Case associated with the arguments that bear the goal/experience theta role, as the examples below illustrate:

(7)   *Gizona-k*   *kurritu*   *du*
        man-ERG   run   AUX
        "The man ran."

                                       (Levin 1989 (33))

(8)   *Miren-ek*   *atea*   *ireki*   *du*
        Miren-ERG   door-NOM   open   AUX
        "Miren opened the door."

                                       (Levin 1989 (20))

(9)   *Taroo-ni*   *eigo-ga*   *hanaseru.*
        Taro-DAT   English-NOM   speak-can
        "Taro can speak English."

                                     (Shibatani 1977:806)

(10) *Dann hat   Hans   der Erna   einen Kuß   gegeben*
      then   has   Hans   the Erna-DAT a   kiss-ACC   given
      "Then Hans gave Erna a kiss."

<div align="right">(Czepluch 1988:92)</div>

On the other hand, Icelandic is a good example of a language that instantiates idiosyncratic lexical Case. Within Case theory, it has been assumed that the dative in (11) and the accusative in (12) are both determined by the lexical entries of the verbs "capsize" and "drift".

(11) *Bátnum*   *hvolfdi*
      boat-DAT   capsized
      "The boat capsized."

<div align="right">(Levin and Simpson 1981:(1b))</div>

(12) *Bátinn*   *rak á   land.*
      boat-ACC   drifted to   shore.
      "The boat drifted to the shore."

<div align="right">(Jónsson 2003:(66a))</div>

Under Woolford's (2006) approach, inherent Case cannot appear in themes/internal arguments, but only in agent/experiencer arguments. The immediate consequence of this proposal is that themes/internal arguments will not get inherent Case, nor will goals/experiencers and agents get idiosyncratic lexical Case. In sum, this generalization predicts that agents and goals/experiencers typically take ergative and dative Case, respectively. [4] Therefore, one may conclude that internal arguments with inherent accusative Case and external arguments with lexical Case will not be found cross-linguistically.

2**.**   **On different Case marking theory**

Butt and King (1991) and Butt (2003, 2006) develop the Differential Case Marking Theory, henceforth DCMT. The core of this proposal is that semantic factors do seem to be at the root of most Case alternations among languages. For this reason, DCMT entails that the semantic contribution of Case cannot be relegated to the realm of lexical stipulation and cannot be seen as being mere spell-outs of feature bundles. Butt (2006) then assumes that Case systems are better understood if one takes semantic parameters into account. One piece of

---

[4] Woolford (2006) states this correlation by means of a complementary distribution of lexical and inherent Case, as follows:

(i)   Lexical Case may occur on themes/internal arguments, but not on external arguments or on (shifted) DP goal arguments.

(ii)   Inherent Case may occur on external arguments and on (shifted) DP goal arguments but not on themes/internal arguments

evidence in favor of this analysis is the fact that there is a tendency among the languages to use Case alternations, both in subjects and in internal arguments, in order to express semantic contrasts. This happens in the Urdu examples below, wherein dative alternates with ergative to encode contrasts such as volition/purpose versus necessity/desire.

(13) *nadya=ko*   *zu*   *ja-na*   *hɛ*
      Nadya.F.SG=DAT   zoo.M.SG.LOC   go-INF.M.SG   be.PRES.3.SG
      Nadya has/wants to go to the zoo."

(14) *nadya=ne*   *zu*   *ja-na*   *hɛ*
      Nadya.F.SG=ERG   zoo.M.SG.LOC   go-INF.M.SG   be.PRES.3.SG
      "Nadya has/wants to go to the zoo."

                                                         Urdu (Butt, 2006:71)

In the examples above, the ergative serves to indicate a greater control over the action, whereas the dative denotes that the subject has no control. Notice that the meaning of *volition/wanting* is directly obtained when the subject is marked with the ergative Case, whereas the meaning of *necessity/desire* is achieved by marking the subject with dative. These examples point out that the ergative is associated with control over an action, whereas the dative is typically associated with goals and experiencers. Furthermore, Butt (2006:20) proposes a two-dimensional view of Case markers. Under this proposal, the spatial and the control/agency dimensions are crucial for one to understand the semantics encoded by Case systems. For instance, the spatial dimension refers to the level where the arguments of an event are usually placed in a spatial relationship to one another. The control/agency dimension, on the other hand, captures the fact that Case marker choice is sensitive to whether the argument exerts more or less control. For example, if a language follows an ergative pattern, the ergative Case tends to be used to mark agents. Moreover, Butt proposes that the spatial dimension is more basic than the control/agency dimension. The immediate consequence of this theory is that the control/agency dimension is viewed as being a derivative of the spatial dimension. Then, Butt contends that arguments of an event, besides being placed in a spatial relationship to one another, also act upon each other. In short, the essential of Butt's proposal is that Case markers must be semantically interpreted with respect to the spatial and control/agency dimensions. In line with the theoretical proposals assumed here, the objective of the following sections is to show that Ka'apor exhibits an alternating Case system similar to Hindi, Bengali and Urdu. The purpose is to show that the particle [ke] is a dative Case marker that is triggered whenever the external arguments of unergative and transitive verbs exert low control over the action. Before presenting the details of this analysis, the next section aims to provide the reader with some descriptive facts that will be crucial for the discussions in section 4.

3.   The relevant data

To facilitate the understanding of the agreement pattern, Table 1 shows the complete set of the personal pronouns and the agreement prefixes. It is important to mention that both intransitive and transitive verbs may trigger these prefixes, whose role is to cross-reference those nominals that appear in the syntactic position of subject. However, as Ka'apor does not exhibit object agreement, there is no set of agreement affixes for cross-referencing objects.

Personal Markers	
Personal Pronouns	Subject Agreement Prefixes
ihẽ "I" ne "you$_{singular}$" jane "we" pehẽ "you$_{plural}$" a'e "he/she"	a- "I" ere- "you$_{singular}$" ja- "we" pe- "you$_{plural}$" o-/u- "he/she"– used in monosyllabic stems ø- "he/she"– used in stems with more than one syllable.
Table 1	

The subject agreement prefixes encode both the intransitive subject and the transitive subject, regardless of whether the verb s-selects a theme/affected argument or an agent. Thus, the verbal agreement pattern shown below clearly indicates that Ka'apor agreement system is not dependent on the morphosyntactic distribution of the particle [ke].

UNERGATIVE
(15)   ihẽ   a-por   "I jumped"
       ne   ere-por   "You$_{singular}$ jumped"
       jane   ja-por   "We jumped"
       pehẽ   pe-por   "You$_{plural}$ jumped"
       a'e   u-por   "He jumped"

UNACCUSATIVE
(16)   ihẽ   ke   a-'ar   "I fell"
       ne   ke   ere-'ar   "You$_{singular}$ fell"
       jane   ke   ja-'ar   "We fell"
       pehẽ   ke   pe-'ar   "You$_{plural}$ fell"
       a'e   ke   u-'ar   "He fell"

TRANSITIVE
(17a) *ihẽ   ta'yn   ke   a-mu-'e*
       I   child   AFET 1SG-CAUS-learn
       "I taught the child." [lit: caused her to learn]

(17b) ne   *ta'yn*   *ke*   *ere-mu-'e*
       you   child   AFET   2SG -CAUS-learn
       "You taught the child." [lit: caused her to learn]

In typological literature, active-stative languages usually mark intransitive subjects differently. Thus, in such languages, the affected intransitive subjects and objects usually receive the same Case marker, whereas agentive intransitive subjects and transitive subjects exhibit a different Case marker. This grammatical pattern is usually called split-intransitive system. Even though not all split-intransitive systems are necessarily ergative, it is possible to imagine a situation in which split-intransitive languages activate two Cases for intransitive subjects. This seems to be the situation of Ka'apor, as agent subjects remain unmarked, whereas the non-agentive and affected agent subjects are usually marked with [ke][5]. Based on this typological viewpoint and on the semantic denotation of [ke] shown thus far, I will hypothesize that Ka'apor presents a split-S intransitive system. In such a system, the intransitive verbs are divided, at least, into two different subclasses: the class of the unaccusative/statives and the class of the unergatives. Observe that this division is based on the fact that the unaccusative verbs s-select a patient/affected subject, usually marked with [ke], whereas the unergatives s-select an agent subject. The Table 2 below is a detailed inventory of some verbs that comprise the two subclasses of intransitive verbs.

Intransitive verbs whose subjects are marked with the enclitic particle [ke]		Intransitive verbs whose non-affected agent subjects are not marked with the enclitic particle [ke]
Statives	**Unaccusatives**	**Unergatives**
-e'õ: be tired -yaj: be sweaty -pahar: be in a hurry -ky'a: be dirty -pya'i: be sad, miss -aku: be hot -juhar: be ticklish -pu'i: be thin -katu: be good -ahy: to have pain -akym: be humid -axer: be bad -taj: be energetic -nge: be hungry -risan: be cold -ka'u: be dizzy -membek: be soft	-kajum: go away, be lost -pen: be broken -karuk: urinate -manõ: die -mano:ÿano: struggle -pak: awake -pyhyj: to snooze -jixi'u: cry -hyk: arrive -siryk: slide -'ar: fall -pyrii: stumble -'e: blow out	-xe: come in -jahuk: have a bath -pikũj: row -por: jump -hem: exit, leave -wata: walk -je'en: speak -wapik: sit down, sink -ninõ: lay down -pu'ãm: stand up -ker: sleep -jengar: sing -wa:wak: spin -jan: run -purahaj: dance -hendu: listen

---

[5] See section 3.2 for a detailed analysis of contexts wherein the unergative and transitive subjects can be marked with [ke].

		-hem: shout
		-jawir: make a mistake
Table 2: subclasses of intransitive verbs		

The next section aims to examine other contexts of occurrences of the particle [ke] in order to demonstrate that it is in fact possible for [ke] to mark other core arguments of the verb, in particular affected subjects of unergative and transitive subjects. In such contexts, there is a subject-marking alternation in that [ke] encodes an agent with a reduced control, whereas the default marker may signal the existence of a prototypical agent.

3.1   The occurrence of ke to mark affected agents and goals

In addition to marking unaccusative subjects and objects, it is also possible to find contexts in which [ke] marks the subject of agentive verbs (in principle, a situation the reader might have thought to be impossible). Interestingly, in the examples (a) below, the particle [ke] can become enclitic to the subject of unergative verbs. In such contexts, the subject does not correspond to a prototypical agent, but to an argument whose θ-role is hybrid in nature. In other words, although it is an argument of a verb of activity, it does display some degree of affectedness. As such, this external argument corresponds to what Saksena (1980) describes as being the affected-agent in languages such as Hindi[6]. Notice that the presence or absence of [ke] in the examples below serves to encode contrasts such as volition/purpose versus necessity/obligation.

(18a) *Purutu   ke   ∅-ahem*
       Purutu   AFET   3SG-shout
       "Purutu shouted." [with some affectedness]

(18b) *Purutu   ∅-ahem*
       Purutu   3SG-shout
       "Purutu shouted." [on purpose]

(19a) *Maíra ke   ∅-wata*
       Maíra   AFET   3-walk
       "Maíra walked." [with some effort]

(19b) *Maíra   ∅-wata*
       Maíra   3-walk
       "Maíra walked." [voluntarily]

---

[6]Saksena (1980:821) assumes that affected agents "undergo a change of state physically (as in the activity expressed by running) or psychologically (as in the activity of studying). In other words, these agents have some of the properties that one typically expects of patients. These agents are not only doers (performers of their activities) but also doees (recipients of these same activities)."

Thus, in the (a) examples above, the meaning is that the subject performed the action with some affectedness. In (18a), for example, there is an entailment that something (a stone, a knife, a chair, etc.) might have fallen on Purutu's foot, so that he did not have a chance to avoid it. The same interpretation holds for (19a). In this sentence, the subject performed the action of walking with affectedness. The reason is that he might have done it either because he was forced or because he needed it. However, the agentive meaning is obtained when the subject does not co-occur with the particle [ke], as in the examples in (b). In such contexts, since [ke] is omitted, the meaning of affectedness cannot be inferred. Owing in particular to the semantic scope of [ke] within the intransitive clauses, as shown above, one can conclude that Ka'apor grammar exhibits a fluid-S system.[7] This means that any subject of unergative verbs can be in principle marked with [ke]. This then allows us to conclude that action intransitive verbs (=unergatives) can select either an affected agent or a prototypical agent. Either choice will depend, of course, on whether or not the unergative subject can control the activity denoted by the predicate. According to Dixon (1994:81), "fluid-S characteristics have been reported for at least one language from South America – Baniwa do Içana (.....Arawak family)." Hence, in addition to Baniwa do Içana, one can conclude that Ka'apor can be added to the typological inventory of the world languages as being another language from South America with a fluid-S system. Another context in which the unergative verbs may select an affected agent is in the causative constructions. Notice that the agent of the former occupies a causee position in the related causative construction due to the adding of the causative morpheme {mu-}. Consequently, the subject of the unergative verb becomes the internal argument of the causativized construction. Since this argument corresponds to the affected agent, it must then be marked with [ke], as shown in (20b).

(20a) *a'e   ta   a-jengar*
      he   PL   1SG-sing
      "They sang."

(20b) *ihẽ   a'e   ta   ke   a-mu-jengar*
      I   he   PL   AFET   1SG-CAUS-sing
      "I made them sing."

Here, the causative morpheme {mu-} encodes what Sakesena (1980:819) defines as the contactive causation. The semantics of contactive causation implies that the causativized unergative verb selects an affected agent in the slot of the internal argument. According to Sakesena's proposal, the selection of an affected

---

[7] Dixon (1994:71) proposes that Fluid-S system employs semantically based marking just for unergative verbs so as that an unergative subject can be marked as S_a, that is, like the agent subject of transitive verbs A, or as S_o, that is, like the transitive object O, depending on the semantics of a particular instance of use.

agent (=causee) forms a necessary condition for the occurrence of contactive causation. Furthermore, the fact that the affected agent is marked with [ke] is clear evidence that the causative constructions of Ka'apor really correspond to the Hindi contactive causatives described by Sakesena.[8] Similar semantic alternation is also found in transitive constructions. For example, the verb -ʔu "eat" can select an affected agent or an agent. Then, in (21a) below, the subject has control over the action of eating; and, as a consequence, [ke] need not appear. Thus, the action of eating armadillo suggests that the agent does it gladly and without being forced. In (21b), on the other hand, the subject is an affected participant. The reason is that, in the Ka'apor culture, to eat owl always involves being affected. The examples below illustrate this semantic contrast.

(21a) *a'e*   *tatu*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*
        he   armadillo   AFET   3-eat   VOL
        "He will eat armadillo."

(21b) *a'e*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*   *pypyhu*   *ke*   *tĩ*
        he   AFET   3SG-eat   VOL   owl   AFET   REP
        "He is going to eat the owl."

Because of these data, one can arrive at the conclusion that the affected agents share a common semantics: they are all the recipient of some causing event and constitute the goal toward which the action is directed. More precisely, these agents have some of the properties that one typically expects of patients and goals, as they are not only agents but also recipients of the event represented by verbs such as "shout", "walk", "sing", "eat", among others. More importantly, in addition to marking unaccusative subjects, transitive objects and affected agents, it is also possible to find [ke] marking goals in ditransitive verbs, as follows:

(22) *a'e*   *ta*   *Ø-ma'e*   *Ø-jukwa-há*   *ihẽ*   *ke*   *pe*   *Ø-me'ẽ*
       3   PL   G-thing   CT-kill-NOML   I   AFT   to   3-give
       "They gave poison to me."

(23) *ihẽ*   *kamanai*   *a-panu*   *ne*   *ke*   *pe*
       I   bean   1SG-ask   you   AFT   to
       "I asked (some) bean to you".

---

[8] Sakesena (1980:819) argues that the semantics of direct causation has an important prerequisite: "the verb must license an affected agent." Because of this, he posits that contactive causation must be directly associated with verbs that project an affected agent. To illustrate such a situation, Saksena (1980:819) provides us with the following example:

(i)   *mar-nee*   *larkee-koo*   *parh-aa-yaa*
        I-AGT   boy-OBL-D/A   study-DC-PAST(m.)
        "I taught the boy."

Notice that the occurrence of [ke] to mark goals brings further evidence for Butt's (2006:20-21) localist theory according to which the spatial dimension is more basic than the control/agency dimension. Based on this view, one may be tempted to postulate that [ke] originates from a spatial relation, marking goal arguments, and then extends further to mark theme/patient arguments as well as agents with low control. This proposal, in turn, helps us to understand the syntactic distribution of [ke] within the transitive clauses, as it can even mark both the subject and the object simultaneously in the same clause, as follows:

(24) *a'e*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*   *pypyhu*   *ke*   *tĩ*
      he   AFET   3SG-eat   IMIN   owl   AFET   REP
      ''He will eat owl.''

(25) *ne*   *ke*   *u'i*   *ke*   *re-karãj*   *ta*
      2SG   AFET   farinha   AFET   2SG-torrar   IMIN
      "You will eat manioc."

(26) *a'e*   *ta*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*   *moj*   *ke*   *tĩ*
      he   ASS   AFET   3SG-eat   IMIN   snake   AFET   REP
      "They will eat snake."

(27) *a'e*   *ke*   *i-py*   *ke*   *Ø-tukwa*
      he   AFET   NCT-foot   AFET   3-hit
      "He has hurt his own foot."

(28) *a'e*   *ke*   *Ø-eha*   *ke*   *Ø-tukwa*   *tĩ*
      he   AFET   CT-eye   AFET   3-hit   REP
      "He has hurt his own eye."

In sum, based on the data examined thus far, one can conclude that the main role of [ke] is to cover both spatial concepts and notions of control. In turn, this explains the reason why [ke] can mark patients, affected agents and goals, grouping them together as natural class of core arguments. This view conforms to Butt's (2006:20-21) localist theory that the arguments of an event can establish either a spatial relationship to one another or act upon each other.[9]

The objective of the next section is to demonstrate that [ke] is an instantiation of a semantic/inherent Case. As it will be shown, this Case is semantically predicted due to the fact that it is always associated with arguments that bear the affected theta role.

---

[9]Butt (2006:84) proposes that "genitives tend to express possession, which is basically a notion of place: x be at y. Ergatives are also sometimes observed in conjunction with possession (....) Instrumentals can express both place and path because 'with x' can be interpreted both as 'x be at y' and as 'x go along with y.' Comitative uses are therefore also included in this use."

4. Does [ke] correspond to a Case marker?

Taking into consideration the fact that external arguments (affected agents), internal arguments (affected patients) and indirect object arguments (goals/recipients) can all be marked with [ke], I will assume henceforth that this particle is a morphological spell-out of an abstract Case that is used to mark patients, agents with reduced control and goals. Let's further admit that it corresponds to a dative Case in the sense of Woolford (1997, 2006) in that it is not exactly a structural Case, but a semantically oriented Case.[10] Strong evidence in favor of this proposal comes from the fact that the occurrence of [ke] is highly predictable, inasmuch as it cannot be associated with various theta roles, but only with a fixed semantic interpretation, usually the one related to the semantics of affectedness.

Another piece of evidence is that there is a tendency among languages to use Case alternations, both with subjects and with internal arguments, in order to express semantic contrasts. This is, for instance, the situation in Urdu, where the dative alternates with the ergative, and in Bengali, where the genitive alternates with the nominative.[11] For instance, since there is no dative available in Bengali grammar, the genitive is used to cover the meaning of affectedness. Butt (2006:74) calls our attention to the fact that Bengali uses the genitive Case where other languages tend to employ the dative. Thus, in Bengali, the nominative acts as the default marker for agents, whereas the genitive is used to express an argument that has reduced control over the action, as follows:

(29a) *ami*   *tomake*   *cai*
      I.NOM   you.ACC   wants
      "I want you."

(Klaiman 1980:279)

(29b) *amar* *tomake*   *cai*
      I.GEN   you.ACC   wants
      "I need you."

---

[10] Ura (2000:336) argues that, while structural Case is dissociated from theta role and assigned in a purely structural way, inherent Case is linked closely with theta-role. Hence, various theta roles may, in principle, be assigned to an element with a given structural Case. This captures a well-known fact concerning a difference between structural Case and inherent Case. In accusative languages such as English, Latin and Japanese, nominative marked arguments may usually have various kinds of theta-role. Inherent marked arguments, on the other hand, can only have a fixed theta-role.

[11] Butt (2006:84) proposes that the dative may be interpreted both "as a goal (place) and, in contrast to another case marker, as an agent with reduced control over the action. (….). In Urdu, the dative contrasts with the ergative. In Bengali, the genitive contrasts with the nominative. Given that Bengali has no ergative case, the nominative acts as the default marker for agents; and the genitive in contrast with the nominative indicates reduced control over the action."

(Klaiman 1980:279)

Interestingly, the same Case alternation also seems to hold in Ka'apor, since the dative Case, instantiated by [ke], alternates with the unmarked nominative subject, both in unergative and transitive sentences, as repeated below:

(30a) *Purutu*   *ke*   *∅-ahem*
       Purutu   DAT   3SG-shout
       "Purutu shouted."

(30b) *Purutu*   *∅*   *∅-ahem*
       Purutu   NOM   3SG-shout
       "Purutu shouted."

(31a) *a'e*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*   *pypyhu* *ke*   *tĩ*
       he   DAT   3SG-eat   VOL   owl   AFET   REP
       "He is going to eat the owl."

(31b) *a'e*   *∅*   *tatu*   *ke*   *u-'u*   *ta*
       he   NOM   armadillo   AFET   3-eat   VOL
       "He will eat armadillo."

Based on data like these, it thus seems quite plausible to postulate that Ka'apor exhibits the same Case alternation as Hindi, Urdu and Bengali. However, as Ka'apor is not exactly an ergative language like Urdu, it will be the unmarked nominative that alternates with the dative to indicate prototypical agents with high control over the action. Based on these lines of reasoning, I will assume hereafter that the inherent dative Case, which is expressed by the enclitic particle [ke] in Ka'apor, bears the following semantic interpretations:

(32)
        (a) It marks arguments that are goals (spatial dimension relation);

        (b) In the subject Case alternation contexts, the dative will be used to encode an agent with a reduced control, whereas the nominative will indicate a prototypical agent;

        (c) It can mark affected objects (internal affected causee) to contrast it with the non-affected object.

Before closing this section, it is important to recall that, in many languages, distinct syntactic functions are usually expressed by form-identical Case markers. This occurs, for example, in Urdu where the Case marker *ko* is

used for marking both the dative and the accusative.[12] In other languages, the markers of instrumentals and ergatives, or instrumental and genitives, also tend to be form-identical. A similar situation also holds in Ka'apor, as [ke] covers different syntactic slots, thereby resulting in homophony of the Case markers of subject and direct/indirect object. A clear piece of evidence in favor of this is the fact that [ke] can occur even twice in the same sentence, marking both the subject and the object, as follows:

(33) *a'e*   *ke*   *Ø-eha*   *ke*   *Ø-tukwa*   *tĩ*
      he   DAT   CT-eye   DAT   3-hit   REP
      "He has hurt his own eye."

Therefore, based on the empirical data examined thus far, one is led to conclude that [ke] is a dative Case marker that spreads over several cells, occurring in the slots of subjects, direct objects and indirect objects.[13] In sum, it seems quite reasonable to assume that [ke] is in fact an instantiation of the inherent dative Case that engages in competition with the unmarked nominative Case in order to encode a system of semantic contrasts, a situation that is quite pervasive in languages such as Hindi, Urdu and Bengali, among others.

5.   Final remarks

This paper shows that one of the main roles of the particle [ke] is to convey the semantics of affectedness. Furthermore, the analysis presents evidence that [ke] can mark affected agents, patients and goals. Another conclusion is that [ke] can be formally interpreted as an inherent dative Case marker that engages in competition with the unmarked nominative Case in order to encode a system of semantic contrasts, such as control versus low control. It is also assumed that the appearance of [ke] to mark goals is evidence in favor of a proposal that there is a Case homophony in that the dative Case may mark subject, objects and goals. This fact allows us to posit that [ke] originates as a spatial relation marker to encode goal arguments so that its usage is extended to mark theme/patient arguments, as well as agents with low control. This proposal provides us with new evidence in favor of Butt's (2006:20-21) localist theory that the arguments of an event can establish either a spatial relationship to one another or act upon each other.

---

[12] See Butt (2006) for a detailed analysis on Urdu Case system.

[13] Notice that, under Butt's (2006) proposal, this is expected as part of language change, when new case markers enter the language or engage in competition in a system of semantic contrasts. According to Butt's theory, "if a Case marker can express both low control (affectedness) and the dimension of place and path, then this Case marker can take over the semantic space of the accusative as well as the dative, thus resulting in homophony of the accusative and dative."

References

Butt, M. & King, T. H. 1991. Semantic case in Urdu. In Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, eds. Dobrin, L., L. Nichols, and R.M. Rodriguez, 31–45. Chicago: CLS

Butt, M. 2003. Case systems: Beyond structural distinctions. In New Perspectives on Case Theory, eds. Brandner, Ellen and Heike Zinsmeister, 53-87. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Butt, M. 2006. The Dative-Ergative Connection. In Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics, eds. P. Cabredo-Hofherr and O. Bonami. The Hague. Thesus.

Czepluch, H. 1988. Case patterns in German: Some implications for the theory of abstract Case. In McGill Working Papers in Linguistics, Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax, 79-122. Montreal, Canada: Department of Linguistics, McGill University.

Dixon, R. 1979. Ergativity. Language 55:55-138.

_____ 1994.Ergativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jónsson, J. G. 2003. Not so quirky: On subject Case in Icelandic. In New Perspectives on Case Theory, eds. Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister, 127-163. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Klaiman, M. H. 1978. Arguments against a passive origin of the ergative. In Papers from the 14th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 204-216. Chicago Linguistics Society, University of Chicago, Chicago.

——— 1980. Bengali dative subjects. *Lingua* 51:275–295.

Laka, I. 2006. On the nature of Case in Basque: structural or inherent? In organizing grammar, eds. Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz & Jan Koster, 374-382. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Legate, J. A. 2006. Split Absolutive. In: Ergativity, eds. Alana Johns, Diane Massam and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 143–171. London: Springer.

Levin, B. 1989. The Basque verbal inventory and configurationality. In Configurationality: The typology of asymmetries, eds. László Marácz and Pieter Muysken, 39-62. Dordrecht: Foris.

Levin, L. and J. S. Simpson. 1981. Quirky Case and lexical representations of Icelandic verbs. *Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society*, 185-196. Chicago Linguistics Society, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Saksena, A. 1980. The affected agent. Language 56(4):812-826.

Shibatani, M. 1977. Grammatical relations and surface Cases. *Language* 53:789-807.

Ura, H. 2001. Case. In The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory, eds. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), 334-373. Oxford: Blackwell.

Woolford, E. 1997. Four-way Case Systems: Ergative, Nominative, Objective, and Accusative. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15:181-227.

Woolford, E. 2006. Lexical Case, Inherent Case, and Argument Structure. Linguistic Inquiry 37.1: 111-130.

Fábio Bonfim Duarte

Department of Linguistics and Portuguese Language
Federal University of Minas Gerais/Brazil
Av. Antônio Carlos, 6627 Pampulha - Zip Code: 31270-901
Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais - Brazil
www.letras.ufmg.br/fbonfim

fbonfim@terra.com.br