

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

Tsige Yohannes Zeleke *
(Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia)

Abstract: The present paper focuses on a descriptive method of valency-increasing devices in five South Ethio-Semitic languages (Amharic, Harari, Kistane, Məsqan, and Endəgəñ). The five languages were selected for two reasons. The first reason is that conducting a valency study on all South Ethio-Semitic languages would have been impossible. With limited resources and time, it will prove difficult to cover all languages. The second reason is that, except for Amharic, these languages are known for being the least studied. Most of them even lack sufficient recording and description. So this research needs to choose the representative language in each branch. As a result, no explicit theoretical framework is followed; data analysis is guided solely by a descriptive perspective. The study's data was gathered by consulting native speakers via elicitation. Valency has been considered as both a semantic and syntactic notion. As a semantic notion, it is used to refer to the participants in an event; as a syntactic notion, it is used to indicate the number of arguments in a construction. There are different types of transitivity classes of verbs in the South Ethio-Semitic Language, which is spoken in Ethiopia: intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive. Apart from these, there are verbs that can be used both intransitively and transitively. The facts that provide clear evidence for grammatical relations in South Ethio-Semitic languages are crucial to the study of the concept of valency-increasing devices. As is the case in many languages, South Ethio-Semitic languages possess morphosyntactic means through which the valency of verbs can be adjusted. The application of these morphosyntactic processes decreases or increases the valency of verbs. This article looks at valency-increasing devices in Causative and Applicative South Ethio-Semitic languages.

Keywords: applicative, causative, intransitive, SESL, transitive, valency

1. Introduction

1.1 Some basic background

Ethiopia is a country with more than 80 languages. All of these languages are

* Tsige Yohannes Zeleke: Department of Linguistics and Philology, College of Humanities, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. E-mail: tsigashu@gmail.com.

categorized under the Semitic, Cushitic, Omotic, and Nilo-Saharan language families. Semitic, Cushitic and Omotic are subgroups of the super family known as Afro-Asiatic (Eberhard, Simons & Fennig, 2022). The Semitic languages that are spoken in Ethiopia are referred to as the Ethio-Semitic languages, and they are spoken in most parts of Northern Ethiopia (Fleming, 1976; Bender & Eteffa, 1976). Leslau (1951) and Hetzron (1972) classify these languages into two groups: North Ethio-Semitic and South Ethio-Semitic. The North Ethio-Semitic group includes Tigrinya, Tigre, and Ge'ez which is preserved as a liturgical language. South Ethio-Semitic is further divided into the Outer South Ethio-Semitic and the Transversal South Ethio-Semitic.

South Ethio-Semitic Languages (SESL hereafter) are syntactically head final and morphologically complex. Tense, Aspect and Mood marking mainly employ particles. The constituent order is Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) in the unmarked form. Subject agreement suffixes occur on perfective verbs while the combination of prefix and suffix occurs on the imperfective and jussive ones. In addition, SESL are pro-drop languages possible for all arguments (object pro-drop is more frequent than subject pro-drop). Hence, the verb indexing addresses the subject in its physical absence. SESL are Nominative-Accusative languages where Nominative is unmarked and Accusative is affixed.

There are various general works on South Ethio-Semitic languages that are of theoretical and typological nature, as well as works on grammar in individual languages. Review those studies which deal with verb morphology across languages and those concerned wholly or in a limited way with valency in the five targeted languages of this study, Amharic, Harari, Kistane, Engəgaṅ, and Məsqaṅ, the following facts can be found.

Even though valency is a major topic in linguistics, comprehensive study on the topic is not available in South Ethio-Semitic languages. This does not mean that there is no work related to the valency systems of the languages. It is true that there are works on the full grammatical description of Amharic, Harari, Məsqaṅ, and Endəgaṅ (cf. Baye, 1987; Leslau, 1995; Beniam, 2013; Ousman, 2015; Adigeh, 2015). However, the comparative studies as well as the valency and typological framework, which are the focuses of this study, are yet to be done. To my knowledge, no research has been conducted on verb valency in the target languages. The present work is meant to fill in this gap.

1.2 Goal and methodology

The main goal of this paper is to give a detailed description of the valency-increasing devices of the five representative languages: Amharic, Harari, Kistane, Endəgaṅ, and Məsqaṅ.

Depending on their semantics, South Ethio-Semitic Language verbs can be categorized into event and stative verbs (Leslau, 1995; Mengistu, 2002; Beniam, 2013; Ousman, 2015; Adigeh, 2015). On the other hand, Huddleston & Pullum (2005:78) state that verbs can be

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

categorized into monovalent, divalent, and trivalent depending on the number of arguments they require. In this study, the focus will be on the second type of classification. This particular paper deals with the valency increasing devices in the South Ethio-Semitic language from a purely descriptive point of view. A verb's valency is defined by the number of arguments it possesses and the semantic roles of these arguments in the prediction. Valency-changing devices hence change either the number of syntactic arguments of a verb or the semantic status of its arguments, or both. The valency-increasing devices consist of the causative derivation and the morphosyntactic marking of adjuncts by applicative suffixes on the verb.

Since the primary purpose of this study is to investigate valency-increasing devices, it is designed as a descriptive study utilizing a qualitative approach based on Allerton's (1982) model. Data collection included three periods of fieldwork trips and three rounds to the target areas (Addis Ababa, Harar, Butajira, and Welkite). The total duration of time estimated to cover the above trips was three and a half months. All the informants were selected based on the information obtained from the people themselves, the Zonal/Regional offices, and friends' contacts. The informants were chosen (purposeful sampling) to give importance to the following factors:

- Locally based, i.e., born, raised, and presently living in the area of the target languages (geographical area: location).

- Stability: the informants have not lived away from their hometown for a long period of time (to elicit more authentic and natural language use).

To achieve the objectives set out by this study, a descriptive research method was adopted. Therefore, to have an adequate database for this study, the methods for data collection were involved, such as elicitation and written texts (published and unpublished theses). Throughout the fieldwork, Amharic was used as the working language. The information was organized and analyzed using a comparative and descriptive approach. The majority of the data was presented in an interlinear morpheme by morpheme format with four lines: the first was the informant's actual utterance, and the second was an underlying hypothetical morpheme that glossed the third line and provided an English literal translation.

2. Valency types

Valency is simply the number and kind of arguments a particular predicate can take (Comrie, 1989:57). It is the characteristics of all major word classes and of certain types of functional words (in particular adpositions and auxiliary verbs)(Velupillai, 2012:257). The term "valency" is used to refer to various types of relations: lexical, syntactic, and semantic valency. Lexical valency is wrapped up in the lexical meaning of the verb with or without

change in its form (kill-die). Syntactic valency refers to the number of arguments that a verb takes. Semantic valency has more to do with the thematic roles of those arguments. For example, a putting event involves three entities: one carrying out the putting, the entity that is put somewhere, and the place where the thing is put. So, the verb *put*, semantically speaking, implies AGT, PAT & LOC.

We differentiate four valency kinds for verbs, which will be discussed more below.

2.1 Avalent

Avalent verbs are verbs which have no valency, i.e., they have no logical arguments, such as subject or object. Common examples of such verbs in many languages are verbs describing weather. It rains. It snows. It is freezing. It is snowing (Tesnière, 2015[1959]: 101, 240). Consider examples (1) and (2):

(Kistane)

(1) *zənnəbo.*

zənnəb-o

rain:PFV-3MS.Sub

'It rained.'

(Debela, 2010:205)

(Amharic)

(2) *k'əzəkək'əzə.*

k'əzəkək'əz-ə

cold:PFV-3MS

'It cold.'

The valency pattern in (1) and (2) above can be described as: $\emptyset+V$. Hence, the verb is avalent. The symbol \emptyset (empty) is used to show that no true argument is present.

2.2 Monovalent (Intransitive)

In South Ethio-Semitic language monovalent or intransitive verb is with one argument, such as, subject only. Consider the following examples:

(Məsqan)

(3) *təgəddərə.*

təgəddər-ə

sleep:PFV-3MS

'He slept.'

(Amharic)

(4) *sak'ə.*

sak'-ə

laugh:PFV-3M

'He laughed.'

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

(Kistane)

(5) *bəffo*.

bəff-o

cry:PFV-3MS

‘He cried.’

Monovalent verbs, like *təgəddərə* ‘slept’; *sakk’ə* ‘laughed’ and *bəffo* ‘cried’, in sentence (3)-(7), require only one participant to perform the action and do not have any effects on any other participant(s). Monovalent verbs thus take only one argument and are intransitive verbs. The single argument of a monovalent verb serves as the subject in the sentence and, as opposed to avalent verbs, the subject is referential.

2.3 Bivalent verbs (Transitive)

Bivalent verbs are monotransitive (having one object) verbs that require subject and object. Different SESL have many bivalent verbs, such as *səbbərəw* ‘he broke’, *siyəhu* ‘I sold’, *aʒʒətti* ‘she saw’ and *ʔəttərə* ‘he killed’. These verbs have subject (AGENT) and direct object (PATIENT) as their participants. Consider the following examples headed by bivalent verbs (6)-(9).

(Harari)

(6) *abdi mənəzəru səbərəw*.

abdi

mənəzər-u

səbər-e-w

Abdi eyeglass-ACC

break:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3MS.OBJ

‘Abdi broke the eyeglasses.’

(Beniam, 2013)

(Məsqaṅ)

(7) *iyya fek’i siyəhu*.

iyya

fek’

siyə-h^w

I

goat

sell:PFV-1S

‘I sold the goat.’

(Kistane)

(8) *almaz əfur aʒʒətti*.

almaz

əfur

aʒʒ-ətt-i

Almaz

rat

see:PFV-3FSF.OBJ

‘Almaz saw a rat.’

(Endəgaṅ)

(9) *abraham gijə ʔəttərə*.

abraham

gijə

ʔəttər-ə

Abraham

dog

kill:PFV-3MS

‘Abraham killed a dog.’

(Adigeh, 2015:89)

The verbs in the above examples only combine with the agent-subject and the patient-object. With reference to the basic verbs, there are monotransitive and ditransitive. Using these verbs, bivalent and trivalent valency structures were identified.

2.4 Trivalent verbs (Ditransitive)

Trivalent or ditransitive is a verb with three arguments, such as with a subject, a direct object, and an indirect object. The examples in (10)-(12) exemplify trivalent constructions.

(Kistane)

(10) *kasa yəaster waga abənnat.*

<i>kasa</i>	<i>yə-aster</i>	<i>waga</i>	<i>ab-ə-nnat</i>
Kasa	to-Aster	money	give:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3FS.OBJ

‘Kasa gave money to Aster.’

SUBJ	DO	IDO	
------	----	-----	--

(Amharic)

(11) *lidḡu gənzəb ləinat-u lakə.*

<i>lidḡ-u</i>	<i>gənzəb</i>	<i>lə-inat-u</i>	<i>lak-ə</i>
boy-DEF	money	to-mother-POSS	send:PFV-3MS

‘The boy sent money to his mother.’

SUBJ	DO	IDO	
------	----	-----	--

(Harari)

(12) *abdi səmiru inf’əbe məḥat’ew.*

<i>abdi</i>	<i>səmir-u</i>	<i>inf’ə-be</i>	<i>məḥat’-e-w</i>
Abdi	Semir-ACC	stick-INS	hit:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3MS.OBJ

‘Abdi hit Semir with a stick.’ (Beniam, 2013:545)

SUBJ	DO	IDO	
------	----	-----	--

For instance, the verb *ab-* ‘gave’ (10) has a semantic valency of three since a situation of giving requires a giver, a given and a givee. However, the same verb has a syntactic valency of either two or three as shown in Məsqaṅ examples below.

(Məsqaṅ)

(13) a. *abraham birri aḡə.*

<i>abraham</i>	<i>birr-i</i>	<i>ab-ə</i>
Abraham	money-DEF	give:PFV-3MS

‘Abraham gave the money.’

SUBJ	DO	
------	----	--

b. *abraham yəsara birri aḡənnə.*

<i>abraham</i>	<i>yə-sara</i>	<i>birr-i</i>	<i>ab-ə-nna</i>
Abraham	DAT-Sara	money-DEF	give:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3FS.OBJ

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

'Abraham gave money to Sara.'

SUBJ DO IDO

As can be seen in example (13a), the verb 'give' has two participants 'Abraham' and *birr* 'money'. In (13b) the same verb 'give' has three participants 'Abraham', *Sara* and *birr* 'money'.

3. Valency increasing devices

In this section, we are going to give major parameters of valency-increasing devices in the South Ethio-Semitic language. As mentioned in the previous sections, verb valency is the number of arguments a verb possesses and the semantic roles of these arguments in the prediction. Valency-changing devices hence refer to either the number of syntactic arguments of a verb or the semantic status of its arguments or both. Valency increasing devices consist of the causative derivation and the morphosyntactic marking of adjuncts by applicative suffixes on the verb. Applicatives are realized as morphemes of a new participant included in the valency frame of a predicate corresponding to a non-subject argument role while causatives occur both as morphemes and as a lexical item, a new participant is included in the valency frame of a predicate corresponding to the argument role. Possessor raising is also a valency changing device in which a possessor NP inside an object NP raises to become a direct object (Katamba, 1993:273; Radford, 1997:525). In the present work, we will concentrate only on the previous two valency-increasing devices (causative and applicative).

3.1 Causative constructions

A causative is a valency-increasing device that indicates that a subject either causes someone or something else to do or be something or causes a change in state of a non-volitional event. Normally, it brings in a new argument (the causer), A, into a transitive clause, with the original subject S becoming the object O (Payne, 1997:173-186).

Causative construction typology can be studied using two general parameters. These are formal and semantic parameters. According to the formal parameters, causative construction can be divided into lexical, morphological, and periphrastic. Most SESL use all these three types to express the notion of causation. Whereas the semantic parameters can be direct and indirect causative.

3.1.1 Lexical causatives

For lexical causatives, the subject of an intransitive caused event is treated as the object of the causative construction (e.g., 16b), and the subject of a transitive caused event is treated as the indirect object of the causative construction.

It is a kind of causative that involves neither a morphological process nor separate causative verbs (Dixon, 2012:247). These are two kinds: (a) when a single lexeme can be

used in either a causative or a non-causative function; and (b) when there are two unrelated forms, that appear to be in causative relation. Most South Ethio-Semitic Language do not have productive lexical causatives in which the causative form is morpho-phonologically unrelated to its non-causative variant (Mengistu, 2000:22; Beniam, 2013:112). Consider the Amharic and Harari examples below:

(Amharic)

(14) <i>mot-ə</i>	vs	<i>gəddəl-ə</i>
die:PFV-3MS		kill: PFV-3MS
'He died.'		'He killed.'

(Harari)

(15) <i>səfə</i> . (int.)	vs	<i>səfə</i> . (tra.)
drink:PFV-3MS		drink:PFV-3MS
'He drank.'		'He drank.'

The lexical causative is illustrated with suppletive verbs in causative relations as in Amharic example (14), and with an ambitransitive verb that can occur both in none derived and derived forms, i.e., the verbs have the same meaning but differ only in transitivity as in Harari example (15).

Some transitive causative verbs have non-causative counterparts. These are considered lexical causatives since they always contain a subject which causes someone or something to do or become something. Consider the following examples:

(Amharic)

(16) a. <i>zafu wəddək'ə</i> .		
<i>zaf-u</i>	<i>wəddək'-ə</i>	
tree-DEF	fall:PFV-3MS	
'The tree fell.'		
b. <i>nifasu zafun t'aləw</i> .		
<i>nifas-u</i>	<i>zaf-u-n</i>	<i>t'al-ə-w</i>
wind-DEF	tree-DEF-ACC	drop:PFV-3MS.SUBJ.-3MS.OBJ
'The wind dropped the tree.'		

For verbs like *wəddək'*- 'fall' and *t'al*- 'drop', a different verb enters into sentences of causative and non-causative types without modification of the one verb. For pairs of verbs such as *gəddəl*- 'kill' and *motə*- 'die', Lyons (1968) notes that they are pairs of different verbs between which the same syntactic (and semantic) relationship of causative is lexically existing in corresponding intransitive and transitive sentences. The implication of this relationship is that *kill* is the lexical causative version of the non-causative *die* and this is part of the lexical structure of Amharic. Thus, the class of verbs in Amharic to which *gəddəl*- 'kill' belongs is also referred to as the class of lexical causative.

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

3.1.2 Morphological causatives

Dixon (2012:242) explains, causative construction may be marked by a morphological process applied to the verb of the clause. In South Ethio-Semitic language, morphological causative verb undergoes some derivational processes in order to express the notion of causation. In these languages both transitive and intransitive verbs can be causativized. There are two basic productive causative marker morphemes *a-* and *as-* in Amharic, *a-* and *at-* in the rest of the targeted languages that affect the argument structure of a verb by increasing its valency.

The morpheme *a-* is one of the targeted South Ethio-Semitic language causative markers that are prefixed to the stem of a verb. All linguists who worked on South Ethio-Semitic language causatives recognize *a-* as a causative morpheme or as a transitivizer morpheme (see Baye, 1987; Leslau, 1995; Mengistu, 2000; Debela, 2010; Adigeh, 2015; Ousman, 2015; Beniam, 2013). The causative marking *a-* is prefixed to stems of intransitives and only some transitives. Most transitives require the *as-* causative for direct causative and do not allow *a-* derivation.

As mentioned earlier, in South Ethio-Semitic language mostly the prefix *a-* attaches to intransitive verbs and introduces a new argument that has a core grammatical relation to the derived verb. The following illustration shows that the morpheme *a-* derives a causative verb from an intransitive verb:

(Amharic)

(17)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
a.	<i>bokka</i>	'fermented'	<i>a-bokka</i>	'he fermented'
b.	<i>fälla</i>	'boiled'	<i>a-fälla</i>	'he boiled'

(Harari)

(18)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
a.	<i>qorəra</i>	'became near'	<i>a-qorəra</i>	'brought near'
b.	<i>godəra</i>	'became long'	<i>a-godəra</i>	'lengthen'

(Məsqaṅ)

(19)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
a.	<i>dak'ə</i>	'laugh'	<i>a-dak'ə</i>	'made laugh'
b.	<i>bakkyə</i>	'cry'	<i>a-bakkyə</i>	'made cry'

As we have seen in the above examples, in the case of causatives derived from intransitive verbs, the base verb controls only one argument (expressed by the subject) in an intransitive construction; since causative derivation is a valency-increasing device, the derived form is transitive, and controls two syntactic arguments (subject and direct object). This modification changes the intransitive base verb into transitive (causative) by adding a new subject (corresponding to the role of the causer), which demotes the original subject

(Causee) to the DO position. Further, we can distinguish between two subtypes of intransitive verbs as follows.

(a) (Agentive) Unergative verbs

Agentive (or action) verbs are verbs that take an agent as a lexical subject, such as verbs *mətt'a* ‘come’, *hedə* ‘go’, and so on. Below is the intransitive/transitive (causative) pair from Amharic and Kistane:

(Amharic)

(20) a. *liḏgu mətt'a*.

<i>liḏgu</i>	<i>mətt'a</i>
boy-DEF	come:PFV-3MS
‘The boy came.’	

b. *kasa liḏgun amətt'aw*.

<i>kasa</i>	<i>liḏgu-n</i>	<i>a-mətt'-ə-w</i>
Kasa	boy-DEF ACC	Caus-come:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3MS.OBJ
‘Kasa brought the child.’		

(Kistane)

(21) a. *k'ibi k'allət'o*.

<i>k'ib-i</i>	<i>k'allət'-o</i>
butter-DEF	melt:PFV-3MS
‘The butter melted.’	

b. *aster yək'ibi ak'allət'ətut*.

<i>aster</i>	<i>yə-k'ib-i</i>	<i>a-k'allət'-ət-ut</i>
Aster	ACC-butter-DEF	CAUS-melt:PFV-3FS.SUBJ-3MS.OBJ
‘Aster melted the butter.’		

In example (20a) and (21a), the intransitive verbs *mətt'a* ‘come’ and *k'allət'o* ‘melt’ have only one argument, *liḏg* ‘child’ and *k'ib* ‘butter’ as the agentive subject; however, in example (20b) and (21b), the verb is transitivized and now has two arguments, *Kasa* and *liḏg* ‘child’; *Aster* and *k'ib* ‘butter’ with the role of AGT (Subject) and PAT (Object) respectively.

In (20a) and (21a), the verb agrees with the subject *liḏg* ‘child’ and *k'ib* ‘butter’, while in (20b) and (21b), it agrees with the new agent (subject) argument *Kasa* and *Aster*. The intransitive verb *mətt'a* ‘come’ and *k'allət'o* ‘melt’ thus achieves transitive status in the process of causativization and its valency is increased by one.

According to Leslau (1969), only a small percentage of agentive verbs allow a causative derivation in SESL. On the other hand, *a-* prefix attached to patientive verbs is encountered more frequently.

(b) Patientive verbs (Unaccusative verbs)

Patientive verbs take the Patient or Recipient (and not the Agent) as their lexical subject. Here are examples from Məsqan: *seffʿə* ‘he drank’, and Harari *fələħa* ‘boiled’. These verbs are always intransitive, and hence they need a causative prefix in a transitive counterpart. Compare the Məsqan and Harari examples:

(Məsqan)

(22) a. *seffʿə*.

seffʿə-ə

drink:PFV-3MS.SUBJ

‘He drank.’

b. *aseffʿə*.

a-seffʿə-ə

CAUS-drink:PFV-3MS.SUBJ

‘He made someone drink.’

The subject of intransitive verb, shifting its role, occurs as an object argument to the direct causative verb as illustrated below:

(Harari)

(23) a. *hay fələħa*.

hay *fələħ-a*

milk boil:PFV-3MS

‘The milk boiled.’

b. *zebura haya fələħa*.

zebura *haya-a* *fələħ-a*

Zebura milk CAUS-boil:PFV-3MS

‘Zebura boiled milk.’

As can be seen in example (23b), the new agent NP occurs as *Zebura* and the object NP as *hay* ‘milk’, the latter being the previous non-agentive subject of the intransitive verb. In the above example, Harari intransitive verbs are causativized and a new agent (causer) argument is introduced and the subject of the intransitive verb is moved from its subject status becoming the new direct object (patient) of the causative verb. In this way two place predicate is derived from the original one place predicate. The valency patterns in (22a) and (23a) can be represented as: SUBJ+V, while (22b) and (23b) can be represented as: SUBJ+DO+V. The causative derived verbs are bivalent.

In South Ethio-Semitic language, the prefix *a-* expresses direct causation whereas, *as-* (in Amharic) and *at-* in the rest of the targeted languages (Harari, Kistane, Məsqan, and Endəqan) express indirect causation from both intransitive and transitive verbs. Consider the following examples:

Tsige Yohannes Zeleke

(Amharic)

(24)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
	a. <i>wässədə</i>	‘he took’	<i>as-wässədə</i>	‘he caused to take’
	b. <i>t’əbbək’ə</i>	‘he guarded’	<i>as-t’əbbək’ə</i>	‘he caused to guard’

(Məsqaṅ)

(25)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
	a. <i>fəjjna</i>	‘sat’	<i>at-fəjjna</i>	‘cause to sit’
	b. <i>bettənə</i>	‘dispersed’	<i>at-bettənə</i>	‘cause to disperse’

(Kistane)

(26)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
	a. <i>wadɣdɣo</i>	‘he bought’	<i>at-wadɣdɣo</i>	‘he caused to buy’
	b. <i>sabbəro</i>	‘he broke’	<i>at-sibbəro</i>	‘he caused to break’

(Endəgaṅ)

(27)	Non-derived	Gloss	Derived	Gloss
	a. <i>k’r</i>	‘killed’	<i>at-k’et’əra</i>	‘cause to kill’
	b. <i>k’-n-w</i>	‘insulted’	<i>atk’ənəwə/ak’-k’ənəwə</i>	‘cause someone to insult’

The derivation of indirect causatives introduces a new agent subject. The new agent argument here, unlike the new agent (causer) of the direct causative in (24)-(27), does not directly perform the action nevertheless only indirectly causes an event without being directly engaged. When it comes to Endəgaṅ example (27b) *-t* of the causative marker *at-* totally assimilates to the first radical of the stem leaving its trace in the gemination of the first radical. Consider the following Harari and Amharic examples respectively:

(Harari)

(28) a.	<i>sara fahi afələhti.</i>			
	<i>sara</i>	<i>fahi</i>	<i>a-fələh-ti</i>	
	Sara	tea	Caus-boil:PFV-3FS.Sub	
	‘Sara made tea.’			
b.	<i>abraham saraw fahi atfeləhe.</i>			
	<i>abraham</i>	<i>sara-u</i>	<i>fahi</i>	<i>at-fələh-e</i>
	Abraham	Sara-ACC	tea	Caus-boil:PFV-3MS
	‘Abraham caused Sara to boil/make tea.’			

Harari employs the prefix *at-* for constructing the causative of transitive verb, when this morpheme is prefixed to transitive/intransitive verbs a new subject is added to the causative construction and the original subject becomes a secondary object (causee). The valency patterns in (28a) can be represented as: SUBJ+DO+V. The derived causative verbs are bivalent. However, (28b) can be represented as: SUBJ+IDO+DO+V. The causative derived verbs are trivalent.

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

(Amharic)

(29) a. *betu fərrəsə.*

bet-u *fərrs-ə*
house-DEF collapse:PFV-3MS
'The house collapsed.'

b. *lidzu betun afərrəsəw.*

lidz-u *bet-u-n* *a-fərrs-ə-u*
boy-DEF house-DEF-ACC CAUS-collapse:PFV-3MS-3MS.OBJ
'The boy collapsed the house.'

c. *səwijjəw bəlidzu betun asfərrəsəw.*

səw-iyyə-u *bə-lidz-u* *bet-u-n* *as-fərrəs-ə-u*
man-S-DEF INST-boy-DEF house-DEF-ACC CAUS-collapse:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-3MS.OBJ
'The man made the boy collapse the house.'

In (29a), the verb *fərrəs-* 'collapse' (intransitive) is the basic verb, whereas (29b) is a direct causative of *fərrəs-*. Indirect causative counterparts of such single causatives are formed by the prefixation of the morpheme *as-* as shown in (29c), where the number of arguments is increased by one as compared to the direct derived causative and by two as compared to the un-derived stem. The valency patterns in (29b) can be represented as: SUBJ+DO+V. The causative derived verbs are bivalent. (29c) is represented as: SUBJ+IDO+DO+V. The causative derived verbs are trivalent.

In Amharic, the morpheme *as-* is productively prefixed to bases of transitive verbs to derive direct causatives and not indirect causatives since these transitive verbs cannot take the derivation with *a-* as in *mətt-* 'beat', *as-mətt-* 'make beat'; *k'orrət-* 'cut', *as-k'orrət-* 'make cut'; *ləmmən-* 'beg', *as-ləmmən-* 'make beg', etc.

3.1.3 Periphrastic causatives

Periphrastic causatives describe a situation involving two events: (1) the causing event, in which the causer does or initiates something; and (2) the caused event, in which the causee carries out an action, or undergoes a change of condition or state as a result of the causer's action (Song, 2013). Periphrastic causatives are the addition of a distinct causative predicate. They are also known as analytic types as they involve separate causative verb forms other than the main verbs of the clauses.

In South Ethio-Semitic Languages, the notion of causation can also be expressed syntactically or periphrastically by using the independent verb *adərrəg-* and the causation morpheme *a-* and *as-* (in Amharic); *āf-*, *a-* and *at-* (in Harari) and the like (Mengistu, 2002; Beniam, 2013). The verb *-dərrəg-* 'make' takes a complement clause introduced by the complementizer *indi-* as shown below.

(Amharic)

(30) a. *məkinaw mətt'a.*

məkina-w mətt'a-ə
 car-DEF come:PFV-3MS
 'The car came.'

b. *abraham məkinaw ind(y)imətt'a adərrəgə.*

abraham məkina-w ind-(y)i-mətt'a-ə adərrəg-ə
 Abraham car-DEF COMP-3MS- come:IMPF-3MS make:PFV-3MS
 'Abraham made the car come.'

As we can see from the data, (30a) is a patientive intransitive and in (30b) the complement clause of the causative verb is (30a). The complementizer that introduces the embedded clause precedes the verb of the embedded clause; and the verb of the embedded clause has an imperfective form. So, here the causative has two predicates. *Abraham* is the predicate with the causing event whereas the second predicate, *məkinaw* 'the car' is the predicate of effect or result of the causation. Many languages have two or more causative constructions. SESL, the subject of this study, have the periphrastic and the morphological causatives, with the morphological being more productive.

Similar to Amharic, Harari has periphrastic causative expressions but these expressions are found only with ambitransitive verbs (Beniam, 2013:111). Consider the following example:

(Harari)

(31) a. *diḏḡa.*

diḏḡ-a
 come:PFV-3MS
 'He came.'

b. *yidiḏḡkut āfxu.*

yi-diḏḡ-kut āf-xu
 3MS-come:IPFV-as make:PFV-1S
 'I made him come.'

(Beniam, 2013:112)

The valency pattern in (31b) above can be described as: SUBJ+OBJ+Verb. The causative derived verb is bivalent.

As we have seen in the above examples, this verb is used to express indirect causation. Comrie (1981:165) suggests that the continuum from periphrastic via morphological to lexical causative correlates with the continuum from less direct to more direct causation. Though South Ethio-Semitic Languages have a productive morphological causative, the same causative notion(s) can be conveyed periphrastically by using separate verbs. Comparing morphological and periphrastic causatives, we can say that only morphological

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

causatives are valency increasing since they add a new participant to the clause, while periphrastic causatives consist of two predicates with their respective arguments. Therefore, the verbs that can be used both transitively and intransitively are monovalent, divalent or trivalent and sometimes tetravalent.

3.2 Applicative construction

3.2.1 Applicative morphemes

Prototypically, applicative morphemes are a valency-increasing device which adds a new object and thematic role to the argument structure of a given verb (see Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000) and Peterson (2007) for a typological overview of valency-changing morphology cross-linguistically).

In South Ethio-Semitic Languages, the morphemes (-*ll-*, -*bb-*) in Amharic, (-*le-*, -*be-*) in Harari, (-*n-*, -*b-*) in Məsqan, (-*n-*, -*b-*) in Endəgaŋ, and (-*l-*, -*b-*) in Kistane demonstrate two different morphological realizations (Benefactive and Malefactive respectively) that apply to the action described in the verb to someone or something. Applicative has an effect of changing the syntactic properties of the verb, where an applied object is introduced. In most situations, the new object has different semantic realizations. Below we have to see Amharic applicative examples:

(32) a. *sara wuha k'əddaɸɸ*.

<i>sara</i>	<i>wuha</i>	<i>k'ədda-ɸɸ</i>
Sara	water	fetch:PFV-3FS
'Sara fetched water.'		

Valency Pattern

Agent	Patient
SUBJ	OBJ

b. *sara wuha k'əddaɸɸillat*.

<i>sara</i>	<i>wuha</i>	<i>k'ədda-ɸɸ-ill-at</i>
Sara	water	fetch:PFV-3FS-APPL-3FS.OBJ
'Sara fetched water for her.' (in favour of her)		

Derived Valency Pattern

Agent	Patient	Benefactive
SUBJ	(OBJ)	OBJ

As can be seen in the above examples, we create a completely new object in the function structure of the verb.

Applicative in South Ethio-Semitic Languages includes benefactive, malefactive, source, instrument (Leslau, 1969; Baye, 2008; Leslau, 1995; Mengistu, 2002; Beniam, 2013; Ousman, 2015; Adigeh, 2015). Below demonstrate these terminologies/definitions in different SESL: Benefactive and malefactive in Amharic as mentioned earlier are

expressed using *-ll-* and *-bb-* morphemes, respectively.

(Amharic)

(33) *sara lidɔ motəbbat.*

<i>sara</i>	<i>lidɔ</i>	<i>mot-ə-bb-at</i>
Sara	child	die:PFV-3MS-MAL-3FS.Sub

‘A child is dead against to Sara.’

(34) *hizbu k’an wətt’allat.*

<i>hizb-u</i>	<i>k’an</i>	<i>wətt’-a-ll-at</i>
people-DEF	day	come:PFV-3MS-BEN-3FS.Sub

‘A day came in favour of the people.’

According to scholars the applicative morphemes *-ll-*, and *-bb-* are the most common in Amharic, Harari and Kistane, and *-n(n)*, *-b(β)* are the types of applicative morphemes in Məsqaṅ and Endəgaṅ expressing malefactive and benefactive respectively. These morphemes can be attached to avalent, monovalent, bivalent and trivalent verbs.

(Amharic)

(35) a. *sara bunna afəllaɣɣif.*

<i>sara</i>	<i>bunna</i>	<i>a-fəll-əɣɣif</i>
Sara	coffee	Caus-boil:PFV-3FS

‘Sara boiled coffee.’

b. *sara bəɖɖəbənə buna afəllaɣɣifibbat.*

<i>sara</i>	<i>bə-ɖɖəbənə</i>	<i>buna</i>	<i>a-fəll-əɣɣif-ll-ət</i>
Sara	INS-pot	coffee	Caus-boil:PFV-3FS-APPL-3FS

‘Sara boiled coffee by pot.’

c. *sara bəɖɖəbənaw labraham buna afəllaɣɣifillət*

<i>sara</i>	<i>bə-ɖɖəbənə-w</i>	<i>lə-abraham</i>	<i>buna</i>	<i>a-fəllaɣɣifi-ll-ət.</i>
Sara	INS-pot-DEF	DAT-Abraham	coffee	Caus-boil-APPL-3FS

‘Sara boiled coffee to Abraham by pot.’

3.2.2 Applicatives and transitivity

In this section, we discuss how the applicative morpheme attached on a verb is able to change the valency of a verb.

3.2.2.1 Applicatives derived from avalent verbs

With illustrations, we shall show that the applicative morpheme leads to valency-increasing in different SESL. First we consider the intransitive verbs: a valent verb such as *zənəb-* ‘to rain’ in Amharic only patterns with two applied morphemes as exemplified in (36b-c) below.

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

(Amharic)

(36) a. *zənəbə*.

zənəb-ə

rain-3MS

‘It rained.’

b. *sit’ota zənəbəllat*.

sit’ota zənəb-ə-ll-at

gift rain:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-APPL-3FS.OBJ

‘Gift has rained for her.’

c. *irgiman zənəbəbbət*.

irgiman zənəb-ə-bb-ət

Curse rain:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-APPL-3MS.OBJ

‘Curse has rained for him.’

The valency pattern in example (36b-c) is SUBJ+OBJ+V. The applicative derived verb is monovalent.

3.2.2.2 Applicatives derived from monovalent verbs

When the applicative morphemes *-ll-* and *-bb-*, *-n(n)* and *-b(β)* are added to an intransitive verb, this process endows the verb with a new object. Monovalent verbs such as *alək’əsə* ‘cry’ have their valency increased by one when used with the applied morpheme. The new argument introduced by the applied morpheme is raised as in example below.

(Amharic)

(37) a. *aster alək’əsəff*.

(Monovalent verb)

aster alək’əs-əff

Aster cry:PFV-3FS

‘Aster cried.’

b. *aster alək’əsəffillət*.

aster alək’əs-əff-ill-ət

Aster cry:PFV-3FS.SUBJ-APPL-3MS.OBJ

‘Aster cried for him.’

(Bivalent)

The valency pattern in example (37b) is SUBJ+OBJ+V. The applicative derived verb is bivalent.

3.2.2.3 Applicatives derived from bivalent verbs

A bivalent verb can appear with a second object when the applicative morpheme is added to it. This means that the applicative construction turns a bivalent verb into a trivalent verb either semantically or syntactically. The examples in (38) and (39) exemplify bivalent applicative constructions.

(Amharic)

(38) a. *kasa finkurt tækkälä.*

kasa finkurt tækkäl-ä
Kasa onion plant:PFV-3MS

‘Kasa planted an onion.’ (Bivalent)

b. *kasa länatu finkurt tækkälallät.*

kasa länat-u finkurt tækkäl-ä-ll-ät
Kasa for-mother-DEF onion plant:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-APPL-3FS.OBJ

‘Kasa planted onion for his mother.’ (Trivalent applied structure)

(Məsqan)

(39) a. *abraham bämädwəfa sahn säbbärəbhä.*

abraham bämädwəfa sahn säbbär-ä
Abraham INS-hammer dish break:PFV-SMS

‘Abraham broke a dish with a hammer.’

b. *abraham bämädwəfa sahn-i säbbär-ä-b-hä.*

abraham bämädwəfa sahn-i säbbär-ä-b-hä
Abraham INS-hammer dish-DEF break:PFV-3MS.SUBJ-APPL-2MS.OBJ

‘Abraham broke the dish with a hammer to your disadvantage.’

The valency pattern in (39b) can be described as: SUBJ+INS+IDO+DO+V. The applied derived verb in above is trivalent.

3.2.2.4 Applicatives derived from trivalent verbs

Trivalent (ditransitive) verbs such as *lakä* ‘send’ which are basically trivalent, take the applied morpheme. When this happens, one more argument, which is either a beneficiary NP, a locative NP or a motive NP, is added to the clause as shown in (40b-d) below respectively.

(Amharic)

(40) a. *abraham läsara gänzäb lakä.*

abraham läsara gänzäb lak-ä
Abraham to-Sara money send:PFV-3MS

‘Abraham sent money for Sara.’

b. *abraham läwändim-sil länatu gänzäb lakällät.*

abraham läwändim-u-sil länat-u gänzäb lak-ä-ll-ät
Abraham DAT-brother-POSS-BEC DAT-mother-POSS money send:PFV-3MS-APPL-3MS.OBJ

‘Abraham has sent money for his mother for the benefit of his brother.’

c. *sara lälidḡwa timhirtbet misa lakäffillät.*

sara lä-lidḡ-wa timhirtbet misa lak-äff-ill-ät
Sara BEN-child-POSS school lunch send:PFV-3FS-APPL-3FS.OBJ

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

‘Sara has sent lunch for her child at school.’

d. *abraham gənzəb siləfəgərarəŋ lakəllij.*

<i>abraham</i>	<i>gənzəb</i>	<i>silə-fəgərr-ə-ŋ</i>	<i>lak-ə-ll-ij</i>
Abraham	money	BEC-trouble-3MS-1.OBJ	send:PFV-3MS-APPL-1S.OBJ

‘Abraham has sent me money because I was in need of money.’

The beneficiary argument *ləinatəsil* ‘because of his mother’ occurs immediately after the subject while the locative argument *timhərtbet* ‘school’ and motive *fīgir* ‘poverty’ occur after the other objects in the clause. The valency pattern in (40b) can be described as: SUBJ+IDO+Motive+OBJ+V. The valency pattern in (40c) can be described as: SUBJ+IDO+OBJ+OBJ+V, and (40d) SUBJ+OBJ+Motive+V. The applicative derived verb in (40c) is tetravalent the rest are trivalent.

3.2.2.5 Applicative Derived from Ambitransitive verbs

The verbs that are used both intransitively and transitively also pattern with the applied morpheme as shown in (41c) below:

(Amharic)

(41) a. *lidzəoffju zəməru.*

<i>lidzə-offj-u</i>	<i>zəmə-r-u</i>
child-PL-DEF	sing:PFV-3PL

‘The children have sung.’

b. *lidzəoffju məzmur zəməru.*

<i>lidzə-offj-u</i>	<i>məzmur</i>	<i>zəmə-r-u</i>
child-PL-DEF	song	sing:PFV-3PL

‘The children have sung a song.’

c. *lidzəoffju lənatəffəw məzmur zəməru llət.*

<i>lidzə-offj-u</i>	<i>lə-inat-əffəw</i>	<i>məzmur</i>	<i>zəmə-r-u-ll-at</i>
Child-PL-DEF	DAT-mother-POSS	song	sing:PFV-3PL-APPL-3FS.OBJ

‘The children have sung a song for the benefit of their mother.’

In (41a) the verb has been used intransitively but (41b) and the valency pattern can be described as: SUBJ+OBJ+V. The applied derived verb is bivalent. In (41c) the verb has been used transitively and just like in (41b) the argument introduced by the applied marker *inat* ‘mother’ is a beneficiary NP and occurs closer to the verb. This structural pattern can be described as: SUBJ+IDO+OBJ+V. The applicative derived verb is trivalent.

As we have seen in the above examples, the applicative markers increase the valency of the basic verb by one.

4. Conclusion

This article has described the valency increasing in SESL. It has shown that SESL has

two devices. These devices are applicative and causative. The causative and applicative affixes differ with respect to the semantic roles associated with the NPs they introduce to the clause. The causative affix introduces NPs with the semantic role of agent, while the applied affix introduces NPs with the semantic roles of locative, motive, and beneficiary/maleficiary. The applicative morphemes (-*ll-*, -*bb-*) in Amharic; (-*le-*, -*be-*) in Harari; (-*n-*, -*b-*) in Məsqan; (-*n-*, -*b-*) in Endəgag; and (-*l-*, -*b-*) in Kistane demonstrate two different morphological realizations (benefactive and malefactive respectively) that apply to the action described in the verb to someone or something. It has the effect of changing the syntactic properties of the verb whenever an applied object is introduced. Causative introduces a cause element in both the *a-* and *as-/at-* stems, expressing both factitive and causative notions. The former takes a cause more directly involved in the action, while the latter takes a cause that is more often indirectly involved in the action. They are valency-increasing devices that differ in the kind of argument that is added to the clause: a non-patient object in the former case and a causer subject in the latter. Change of valency is predominantly a morphologically signaled operation in SESL, where the valency-changing devices are expressed as prefixes to the verb root. The valency-changing prefixes do not affect the shape of the verb root.

Abbreviations and symbols

1	First Person	INS	Instrumental
2	Second Person	INTR	Intransitive
3	Third Person	IPFV	Imperfective
ACC	Accusative	JUS	Jussive
ADJ	Adjective	LOC	Locative
AGT	Agent	M	Masculine
APPL	Applicative	MALF	Malefactive
AUX	Auxiliary	NOM	Nominative
BEC	Because	NP	Noun Phrase
BEN	Benefactive	OBJ	Object
CAUS	Causative	OBL	Oblique
Comp	Complementizer	PAT	Patient
COPU	Copular	PFV	Perfective
DAT	Dative	PL	Plural
DEF	Definite	POSS	Possessive/Possession
DET	Determiner	PP	Adposition Phrase
DO	Direct Object	PST	Past
F	Feminine	S	Singular/Singulative
GEN	Genitive	SESL	South Ethio-Semitic Language
GR	Grammatical Relation	SUBJ	Subject
IDO	Indirect Object	V	Verb

Reference

Adigeh, Y. 2015. *Descriptive Grammar of Endegagn* [D]. Doctoral Dissertation. Addis Ababa: Addis

Valency Increasing in South Ethio-Semitic

- Ababa University.
- Allerton, D. J. 1982. *Valency and the English Verb* [M]. London : Academic Press.
- Baye, Y. 1987. *Amharic Grammar* [M]. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- Baye, Y. 2008. *Amharic Grammar* (2nd Edition) [M]. Addis Ababa: Eleni Printing Press.
- Beniam, M. 2013. *Harari: A descriptive grammar* [D]. Doctoral Dissertation. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Bender, M. L. & M. Eteffa. 1976. Two Cushitic Languages [A]. In M. L. Bender, J. D. Bowen, R. L. Cooper & C. A. Ferguson (eds.). *Language in Ethiopia* [C]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 130-154.
- Comrie, B. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistics Typology* [M]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Comrie, B. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and morphology* (2nd Edition) [M]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Debela, B. W. 2010. *Morphology and Verb Construction Types of Kistaniniya* [D]. Doctoral Dissertation. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Dixon, R. M. W. & A. Y. Aikhenvald. 2000. *Changing Valency: Case studies in transitivity* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. 2012. *Basic Linguistic Theory, Volume 3: Further grammatical topics* [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eberhard, D. M., G. F. Simons & C. D. Fennig (eds.). 2022. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (25th Edition) [OL]. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Fleming, H. C. 1976. Kefa (Gonga) Languages [A]. In M. L. Bender (ed.). *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia* [C]. East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, 351-376.
- Hetzron, R. 1972. *Ethiopian Semitic Studies in Classification* [M]. Cambridge: Manchester University Press.
- Huddleston, R. & G. K. Pullum. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Katamba, F. 1993. *Morphology* [M]. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leslau, W. 1951. Archaic Features in South Ethiopic [J]. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 71(4):212-230.
- Leslau, W. 1969. Towards the Classification of Gurage Dialects [J]. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 14:96-109.
- Leslau, W. 1995. *Reference Grammar of Amharic* [M]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mengistu, A. 2000. Valency-changing and Valency-encoding Devices in Amharic [A]. In R. M. W. Dixon & A. Y. Arkhenvald (eds.). *Changing Valency: Case studies in transitivity* [C]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 312-332.
- Mengistu, A. 2002. *Verb Classes and Transitivity in Amharic* [M]. Munich: Lincom.
- Ousman, S. A. 2015. *Descriptive Grammar of Mesqan* [D]. Doctoral Dissertation. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Payne, T. E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 173-186.
- Peterson, D. A. 2007. *Applicative Constructions* [M]. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Radford, A. 1997. *Syntax: A minimalist introduction* [M]. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Song, J. J. 2013. Periphrastic Causative Constructions [OL]. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (eds). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/110>.
- Tesnière, L. 2015[1959]. *Elements of Structural Syntax* [M]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Velupillai, V. 2012. *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology* [M]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Yimam, B. 1987. *Amharic Grammar* [M]. Addis Ababa: Educational Materials Production and Distribution Agency.
- Yimam, B. 2008. *Amharic Grammar* (2nd Edition) [M]. Addis Ababa: Eleni Printing Press.