

TRANSITIVITY IN GRAMMAR AND DISCOURSE

Hopper & Thompson
1980

—

ЧТО ТАКОЕ ПЕРЕХОДНОСТЬ?

простой ответ: наличие прямого объекта

ЧТО ТАКОЕ ПЕРЕХОДНОСТЬ?

сложный ответ: комплекс нескольких параметров, одним из которых является наличие прямого объекта

ЧТО ТАКОЕ ПЕРЕХОДНОСТЬ?

- СВОЙСТВО КЛАУЗЫ
- имеющая результат деятельность совершается агенсом над пациенсом
(effective activity transferred from an agent to a patient)

ПАРАМЕТРЫ ПЕРЕХОДНОСТИ

	HIGH	LOW
(1) A. PARTICIPANTS	2 or more participants, A and O. ¹	1 participant
B. KINESIS	action	non-action
C. ASPECT	telic	atelic
D. PUNCTUALITY	punctual	non-punctual
E. VOLITIONALITY	volitional	non-volitional
F. AFFIRMATION	affirmative	negative
G. MODE	realis	irrealis
H. AGENCY	A high in potency	A low in potency
I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O	O totally affected	O not affected
J. INDIVIDUATION OF O	O highly individuated	O non-individuated

INDIVIDUATION (индивидуация)

насколько мы можем отличить один предмет от всех остальных

INDIVIDUATION (индивидуация)

INDIVIDUATED

proper

human, animate

concrete

singular

count

referential, definite

NON-INDIVIDUATED

common

inanimate

abstract

plural

mass

non-referential

HIGHER vs LOWER TRANSITIVITY

Jerry likes beer.

Jerry knocked Sam down.

There were no stars in the sky.

CARDINAL vs REDUCED TRANSITIVITY

Susan left.

Jerry likes beer.

TRANSITIVITY HYPOTHESIS

If two clauses (a) and (b) differ in that (a) is higher in Transitivity according to any of the features, then, if a concomitant grammatical or semantic difference appears elsewhere in the clause, that difference will also show (a) to be higher in hierarchy.

Представим язык, в котором по-разному морфологически маркируются предельные и непредельные предикаты.

Референтный маркер x на O появляется только при предельных предикатах.

x [$+$ referentiality]

y [$-$ referentiality]

A V_{telic} O_x

A V_{atelic} O_y

A V_{telic} O_y

A V_{atelic} O_x

DOM. DEFINITNESS

Modern Hebrew (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic)

a. *David natan matana lərina.*

gave present to Rina

‘David gave a present to Rina.’

b. *David natan ET ha-matana lərina.*

gave OBJ DEF-present to Rina

‘David gave the present to Rina.’

DOM. ASPECT

Finnish (Uralic, Finnic)

- a. *Liikemies kirjoitti kirjeen valiokunnalle.*
businessman wrote letter (ACC) committee-to
'The businessman wrote a letter to the committee.'
- b. *Liikemies kirjoitti kirjettä valiokunnalle.*
businessman wrote letter (PART) committee-to
'The businessman was writing a letter to the committee.'

DOM. REFERENTIALITY

Chukchee (Chukotko-Kamchatkan)

- a. *Tumg-e na-ntəwat-ən kupre-n.*
friends-ERG set-TRANS net-ABS
‘The friends set the net.’
- b. *Tumg-ət KOPRA-ntəwat-GPAT.*
friends-NOM net-set-INTR
‘The friends set nets.’

DATIVE MOVEMENT

Clara wrote a letter **to Santa Claus**.

Clara wrote **Santa Claus** a letter.

ANTIPASSIVE & PARTITIVE

Tongan (Austronesian, Oceanic, Polynesian, Tongic)

a. *Na'e kai-i 'a e ika 'e he tamasi'i.*

PAST eat-TRANS ABS DEF fish ERG the boy

'The boy ate the fish.'

b. *Na'e kai 'a e tamasi'i 'i he ika.*

PAST eat ABS DEF boy OBL the fish

'The boy ate some of the fish.'

ERGATIVE vs. ANTIPASSIVE

ERGATIVE

Verb codes two participants

Perfective Aspect

Total involvement of O

Definite O

Kinetic/volitional V

Active participation of A

ANTIPASSIVE

Verb codes only one participant

Imperfective Aspect

Partitive O

Indefinite O

Stative/involuntary V

Passive participation of A

CAUSATIVE & INTENSITY

Chichewa (Niger-Congo, Bantu)

- a. *Mw-ana'yu w-a-dy-a.*
child this he-TENSE-eat-INDIC
'The child has eaten.'
- b. *M-ai a-ku-dy-ETS-a mw-ana.*
woman she-TENSE-eat-cause-INDIC child
'The woman is feeding the child.'
- c. *Mw-ana'yu w-a-dy-ETS-a.*
child-this he-TENSE-eat-cause-INDIC
'The child has eaten too much.'
- d. *Gwir-a-ni chi-ngwe!*
hold-IMPER-2pl. string
'Hold the string!'
- e. *Gwir-ITS-a-ni chi-ngwe!*
hold-cause-IMPER-2pl. string
'Hold the string firmly!'

LOW TRANSITIVITY

Yidin (Australian, Pama-Nyungan)

Thus *-:ḍi-n* is used:

- a. In an ANTIPASSIVE clause, where A is marked as absolutive instead of ergative, and O is oblique.
- b. In a reflexive construction in which ONLY ONE NP appears.
- c. If the A refers to something INANIMATE, which could then not exercise voluntary control over the action.
- d. If the action is ACCIDENTAL rather than purposeful.
- e. If the action is CONTINUOUS.

ВЫВОДЫ

- переходность — это континуум
- переходность присутствует на разных уровнях языка
- переходность — комплекс связанных параметров, которые ведут себя последовательно
- переходность позволяет объяснять некоторые явления (логический круг)

ПОЧЕМУ
ПЕРЕХОДНОСТЬ
ТАК ВАЖНА
ДЛЯ ЯЗЫКА?

ДИСКУРС: GROUNDING

FOREGROUND основная информация

скелет текста (в т.ч. временная последовательность → нельзя передвигать)

BACKGROUND вспомогательная информация

плоть текста (можно двигать относительно друг друга и основной информации)

GROUNDING

Swahili (Niger-Congo)

Hata wa-LI-kuwa wa-KI-rejea kuja zao kambini, wa-KA-shuka
until they-li-were they-ki-return come their to camp they-ka-descend
kilima-ni magharibi, mara wa-KA-kuta kondoo, bwana
hill-LOC west suddenly they-ka-come upon sheep master
wangu KA-m-piga kondoo mkubwa sana na pembe zake nzito
my ka-him-shoot sheep big very and horns its heavy
sana.
very

‘When they were making their way back to camp, they came down a hill on the western side, and at once came upon some wild sheep, and my master shot an enormous sheep, and its horns were very heavy’.

GROUNDING

параметры **FOREGROUND** = параметры переходности

GROUNDING

- 3 текста
 - посчитать количество значений HIGH TRANSITIVITY для каждой из клауз
 - классифицировать клаузы на FOREGROUND и BACKGROUND
- FOREGROUND 8/10, BACKGROUND 4.1/10

GROUNDING

	FOREGROUND	BACKGROUND
(A) Participants	76%	18%
(B) Kinesis	88%	49%
(C) Aspect	88%	27%
(D) Punctuality	55%	10%
(E) Volitionality	76%	36%
(F) Affirmation	100%	92%
(G) Mode	100%	66%
(H) Agency	—	—
(I) O-Affectedness	39%	12%
(J) O-Individuation	—	—
Average for all features	78%	39%

REFERENCES

Hopper, P., & Thompson, S. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language*, 56(2), 251-299.

Simons, Gary F. and Charles D. Fennig (eds.). (2018). Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Twenty-first edition. Dallas, Texas: *SIL International*. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>