

Semantic Motivations for Split Intransitivity in Haida

HIROFUMI HORI

Shizuoka University

Abstract: Haida has been claimed to be a language of the active-stative type in terms of linguistic typology, in which the subjects of intransitive clauses are marked in two different ways: as transitive subjects and as transitive objects. This phenomenon is termed “split intransitivity,” and it crosslinguistically underlies active type languages. The motivations for split intransitivity have been pursued mostly in semantic terms such as “lexical aspect,” “agency,” and “volition,” among others. The split intransitivity in Haida is manifested only when the first (singular and plural) and second (singular) personal pronouns occur as intransitive subjects. Furthermore, intransitive verbs in Haida can roughly be classified into four groups based on the cases and persons of pronouns that occur as their subjects. The present study argues that the two semantic features of [AGENCY] and [CONTROL] can be postulated to explain this phenomenon. [AGENCY] describes the situation wherein a verb requires a participant as its subject that performs an activity or instigates a situation. [CONTROL] is concerned with one’s ability to control the activity or situation. This study also points out inconsistencies in case marking on personal pronouns for certain verbs, as well as for speakers, which may be due to the fact that these two features interact with split intransitivity in a fairly complicated manner. Such inconsistencies may be inevitable since the motivation for the split intransitivity is semantically-conditioned, which in turn leads to difficulties in characterizing active type languages in general.*

Key words: Haida, active typology, agency, control

1. Introduction

Languages can roughly be classified into the nominative-accusative type, the ergative-absolutive type, and the active-stative type on the basis of the markings on core arguments in transitive and intransitive clauses. In the literature of linguistic typology, the first two systems are well-established, and in particular, the second type has been discussed adequately in such important works as Plank (1979), Dixon (1979, 1994), and others. However, the third type, i.e., the active-stative type, has not been treated suitably enough, and in fact, the languages that are

* I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my Haida teachers, Diane Brown, Gordon Cross, Beatrice Harley, Watson Pryce, Eleanor Russ, Ernie Wilson, and Ada Yovanovich (in alphabetical order), who have patiently and kindly shared their linguistic knowledge with me. Similar thanks go to the members of the Skidegate Haida Immersion Program (SHIP) for allowing me to draw some data from stories recorded by them. I am also grateful to

argued to belong to this type have been variously classified as active-inactive (Sapir 1917), active-stative (Klimov 1974, 1977 [1999], 1979), split-S systems (Dixon 1979, 1994), and agent-patient systems (Dahlstrom 1983), among other ways (see Mithun 1991). This variation in terminology might indicate that this type of language, although found extensively among languages of the world, has not been well-documented in typological theory.

In Klimov (1974, 1977 [1999], 1979) and others that deal with active-stative languages, it is commonly observed that the subjects of intransitive clauses are not marked in a single way, i.e., intransitive subjects have two (or three) possibilities in terms of case-marking, which are mainly decided based on the semantic features of the intransitive verbs. Merlan (1985) proposes the term “split intransitivity” to capture this phenomenon, which is a more neutral term than active-stative or some other terms, since it is difficult to define “active” verbs and “stative” verbs precisely across languages. Moreover, the term “active” can refer not only to a certain semantic class of verbs, but also designate a language type as such, whereas split intransitivity can simply refer to the phenomenon itself.

The problem of split intransitivity has been approached both syntactically and semantically. The Unaccusative Hypothesis proposed by Perlmutter (1978) is one of the most influential approaches to split intransitivity. It classifies intransitive verbs into two types: “unaccusative” verbs deriving a surface subject from an underlying object and “unergative” verbs deriving a surface subject from an underlying subject. This hypothesis attempts to explain the phenomenon in syntactic terms, mainly on the basis of accusative languages; however, it fails to contribute to the creation of theoretical grounds for active typology in general.

Split intransitivity has also been pursued in semantic terms. For example, Van Valin (1990), refuting the syntactic approaches of Perlmutter (1978) and others, identifies the inherent lexical aspect (Aktionsart) and agentivity as the primary semantic parameters of split intransitivity by analyzing different types of languages, including Italian, Georgian, and Achenese. DeLancey (1985a) observes that control works effectively as a factor for the nominal case marking pattern, and volition, as one for auxiliary choice in Lhasa Tibetan. It should be pointed out that the semantic motivations do not seem to be consistent crosslinguistically, and in fact, the same semantic features that are relevant to split intransitivity in one language do not always characterize another language (see Mithun 1991 for a similar discussion and section 4 of the present study). In addition, it is not certain if the semantic motivation for split intransitivity can correlate with some other morpho-syntactic features of the language (cf. Klimov 1974, 1977 [1999] for “structural correlates” at lexical and morphosyntactic levels).

Megumi Kurebito, Kan Sasaki, and two anonymous referees for valuable and constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for all errors and misinterpretations that might be contained in this paper. The present study was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) #19520337 (headed by Hirofumi Hori) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Haida¹ is a language that shows split intransitivity, and Klimov (1977 [1999]), perhaps the most extensive work that focuses on the active–stative type, frequently cites Haida as one of the representative languages. The present study argues that split intransitivity in Haida can be explained on semantic grounds by postulating two semantic features [AGENCY] and [CONTROL] (both of which will be defined explicitly in the course of this discussion), rather than by Aktionsart. It also points out some difficulties of grouping verbs solely on the basis of semantics, which in turn leads to difficulties of characterizing an active typology in general.

2. Personal Pronouns in Haida

Typologically, Haida is an isolating language in that core arguments in transitive clauses (i.e., subjects and objects) and intransitive clauses (i.e., subjects) bear no case markings. Thus, the syntactic relationship between a verb and its core arguments is basically indicated by the word order. See the examples in (1).²

- (1) a. *dəwjay* *χaagay* *xidxiidən*³
 cat[DEF] dog[DEF] chase[PAST]
 ‘The cat chased the dog.’
- b. *χaagay* *dəwjay* *xidxiidən*
 dog[DEF] cat[DEF] chase[PAST]
 ‘The dog chased the cat.’

dəwjay in (1a) and *χaagay* in (1b) bear no case markings; however, these NPs are

¹ Haida is spoken on the Queen Charlotte Islands off the northwest coast of British Columbia in Canada and the southeastern part of Alaska in the United States. The dialects can be classified into two major groups, i.e., the northern dialect group and the southern dialect group. The former is subdivided into the Alaskan dialect and the Massett dialect (Canada), and the latter, into the Skidegate dialect (Canada) and the Ninstints dialect (Canada). Except for the Ninstints dialect, all of these dialects are still spoken. The number of speakers of each dialect is provided by Krauss (1997, 2007): for Northern Haida (including the Alaskan dialect and the Massett dialect), it is 10 (Krauss 2007), and for Canadian Haida (including the Massett dialect and the Skidegate dialect), it is 30 (Krauss 1997). Enrico (2003: 1) asserts that the number of knowledgeable and fluent speakers of each dialect is very small. By “knowledgeable and fluent speakers,” he refers to those who speak the language in the manner it was spoken in the nineteenth century (cf. Enrico 2005: viii). However, it would be inappropriate to place too much emphasis on the small number of such speakers because this type of estimation might lead to the impression that many of the present speakers are not “knowledgeable and fluent,” and even discourage them from taking pride in their ability to speak Haida. Of course, I do not deny the critical condition of the language and the possibility that drastic changes have been exerted by the constant exposure to English for many years. However, I still believe that there are a few more speakers than Enrico estimated who possess valuable expertise in the language.

² The Haida examples are from the Skidegate dialect (one of the southern group, spoken in Skidegate on the Queen Charlotte Islands in Canada), all (except for the ones noted as such) of which were obtained by the author.

³ In each Haida example, the Haida forms are provided in the first line, followed by glosses

regarded as the subjects of transitive clauses (henceforth designated as As, following Dixon 1979, 1994), which is due to the fact that these NPs are followed by other NPs, i.e., *χaagay* in (1a) and *dəwjay* in (1b).⁴ These NPs serve as the objects of transitive clauses (henceforth designated as Os) with no case markings. It should be observed that the verb *xidxid*, realized as *xidxiidən* with the addition of the past tense suffix *-gən*, bears no marking to indicate the syntactic relations between A and O. Typical transitive verbs in Haida require two arguments (A and O) that have no postpositions. See 4.3 for the other types of two-argument verbs in Haida.

On the other hand, personal pronouns have two case distinctions that are designated as the α case and β case here.⁵ See the examples in (2).

- (2) a. *dəwjay* **ʔə**=*xidxiidən*
 cat[DEF] 1SG. α =chase[PAST]
 ‘I chased the cat.’
 b. *χaagay* **dii** *xidxiidən*
 dog[DEF] 1SG. β chase[PAST]
 ‘The dog chased me.’

In (2), distinct cases are used for the first person singular pronouns, depending on whether the pronoun serves as an A or O. The α case is used for A and the β case is used for O.

Table 1 summarizes personal pronouns in Haida, although it is not an exhaustive list.

and (rough) English translations. The symbols used to represent the Haida forms basically follow the IPA usage conventions, except for the following (the IPA equivalents are represented in []): *c* [ʃ], *j* [dʒ], *y* [j]; voiced stop consonant symbols represent voiceless unaspirates and voiceless stop consonant symbols represent voiceless aspirates. The Haida forms marked by hyphens are affixes; those marked by = are clitics; and the ones marked by + are compounds. Square brackets in glosses indicate that the affixes render morphophonological adjustments; consequently, the boundaries between the affixes and roots (or stems) are unclear. I consulted Enrico (2005) to provide the meanings of some morphemes in glosses. For abbreviations used in glosses, see the end of this study.

⁴ Note that this statement does not imply that Haida is an SOV language. Word order in Haida correlates with the animacy and potency of the referents of NPs, the presence of the focus marker =*ʔuu*, and other factors. See Enrico (2003: 74ff.) for more details.

⁵ These cases are labeled variously in the literature of Haida linguistics, for instance, “subjective” and “objective” (Swanton 1911), “active” and “neutral” (Levine 1977), “subject” and “object” (for the Alaskan dialect, see Leer 1977), and “agentive” and “objective” (Enrico 2003). In this study, I adopt the more neutral terms “ α case” and “ β case” merely to avoid the implications that these other terms might have.

Table 1. Personal pronouns in Haida

		free forms		bound forms	
		α	β	α	β
1	SG	<i>ʔaa</i>	<i>dii</i>	<i>ʔə=</i>	
	PL	<i>t'alaay</i> ⁶	<i>ʔiitl'ə</i> ⁷		
2	SG	<i>daa</i>	<i>dəŋ</i>		
	PL		<i>dalaay</i>		
3		<i>'laa</i> ⁸		<i>'lə=</i>	

For 1SG and the third person, there are free forms, i.e., *ʔaa* for 1SG and *'laa* for the third person, and bound (or proclitic) forms, i.e., *ʔə=* for 1SG and *'lə=* for the third person. It should be noted that Haida lacks pronominal markers that are coreferential with other arguments in a clause. Thus, only one pronoun, free or bound, for the same referent occurs within the same clause. Note that no pronominal markers occur in (1).

The choice of free or bound pronouns depends on their position within a clause and whether they are followed by a focus marker, which has a pragmatic function to move a constituent in a sentence to the initial position, and some other factors (for more details, see Enrico 2003: 21). For example, when 1SG and the third person pronouns co-occur in the same clause, it is the pronoun nearest to the verb that tends to occur as a bound form. Thus, the two sentences in (3) can convey the general meaning “I lent him money,” although there is a slight difference in meaning between them, due to the presence of the focus marker *=ʔuu* in (3b).

- (3) a. *daal 'laa ʔə=səlda-da-gən*
 money 3 1SG.α=borrow-CAUS-PAST
- b. *ʔaa=ʔuu daal 'lə=səlda-da-gən*
 1SG.α=FOC money 3=borrow-CAUS-PAST
 ‘I lent him money.’

As shown in (3), the pronoun nearest to the verb occurs as a bound form, regardless of its syntactic function or semantic role. However, this is not such a rigid rule as to be applicable in all cases: there are some cases in which a free form is used before a verb (see (4b), (7a), (7b), and (8a), among others).

⁶ The form *t'a'aaŋ* (where the apostrophe represents the gradual beginning of a syllable) can also be used. It should be regarded as a reduced form of *t'alaay*, which occurs in rapid speech.

⁷ The form *ʔiid* is also used as the 1PL β case by some of my consultants but not by others. I have not yet clarified the existence of a functional difference between *ʔiid* and *ʔiitl'ə*. Those who use *ʔiid* reject *ʔiitl'ə* in environments where other consultants use *ʔiitl'ə*, and in some cases, the judgments do not seem to be consistent.

⁸ The plurality of the third person pronoun, regardless of its syntactic function in a clause, can be indicated by the verbal suffix *-gu* (see (7b, d), and (10b, d), among others), although the third person pronoun has a plural form, i.e., *'laagaaya*, which consists of *'laa* and the suffix *-gaaya*, denoting “a group of N” (Enrico 2003: 472, 2005: 1379f).

There is a distinction between the α case and β case only in 1SG/1PL and 2SG, and not in 2PL and the third person. The examples in (4) below show that the third person has the same form whether in α case or β case. However, Enrico (2005: 841f.) observes that the case distinction is also made in the third person: the α case (or agentive case in his terms) can be *'laa* or also *'lə=* (or *'ll* in his orthography), while the β case (or objective case) must be *'lə=*.⁹ This means that the bound form is used as the α case and β case, but the free form is used only as the α case. However, it seems that the free form *'laa* can also be used for the object of a transitive verb which is referred to by the β case when the first person or the second person occurs in that position. See the examples in (4).

- (4) a. Uncle Rolo=*han=ʔuu* **'laa** *t'alaay* *kiGa-da-gəŋ-giin-'i*
 Uncle Rolo=PP=FOC 3 1PL.AG name-CAUS-HABIT-PAST-INFO
 'We used to call him Uncle Rolo.'
- b. **'laa** **'laa** *tyaah-gən*
 3 3 kill-PAST
 'He/she caught him/her.'
- c. **'laa** *lə=kil-q'əw-ʔu-gən*
 3 1SG.AG=INSTR-sit-SG-PAST
 'I told him/her to sit down.'

The pronoun *'laa* in (4a, c) and the second one in (4b) tend to be pronounced with a short vowel bearing a high tone, which may be due to the utterance speed, and in fact, the form *'laa* is pronounced with a long vowel occurs in slow utterances.

Considering these facts, it would be appropriate to assume that there is no distinction between the α case and β case in the third person. An explanation of the 2PL can be seen in the next section.

3. Split Intransitivity in Haida

In this section we observe examples in which the personal pronouns shown in Table 1 occur as transitive subjects (A), transitive objects (O), and intransitive subjects (S) in (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3), respectively.

3.1. Transitive subjects (A)

The subject of a transitive clause takes the α case in 1SG/1PL pronouns, as shown in (5), and in 2SG pronouns, as shown in (6a). (6b) is an example with the 2PL pronoun, and (7) is an example of the third person pronoun.

- (5) The first person (a: SG (free), b: SG (bound), c: PL)
 a. **'laa=ʔuu** *tləway* *tləGutGa-gən*
 1SG.α=FOC boat[DEF] build-PAST
 'I built the boat.'

⁹ Enrico (2003: 92) lists the form *'l@* for non-clitics (or free forms in the present study) and clitics (or bound forms), but later in Enrico (2005) he abolishes the use of *@* for the third person pronoun, commenting that this notation was incorrect (Enrico 2005: 1831).

- b. *gina* *ʔwaadhluʔan=ʔuu* *dii* *ʔawGa=ʔad* *naanGa=sda*
 thing all=FOC 1SG.β mother=PP grandmother=PP
ʔə=sqʼadGa-gəy-giin-ʼi
 1SG.α=learn-HABIT-PAST-INFO
 ‘I used to learn everything from my mother and grandmother.’
- c. *ciina* *tʼalaay* *dlən-gən*
 fish 1PL.α wash-PAST
 ‘We cleaned fish.’
- (6) The second person (a: SG, b: PL)
- a. *daa=gwaa* *dəwjay* *qyaaya*
 2SG.α=INTER cat[DEF] see[EVD]
 ‘Did you see the cat?’
- b. *daGalayGa=gwaa* *dalaay* *ʔaxada-ʔyaana*
 the.next.day=INTER 2PL seine-outward[EVD]
 ‘Did you (PL) go seining the next day?’
- (7) The third person (a, b: free, c, d: bound)
- a. *kʼaay* *dii* *ʼlaa* *dəw-ʔalgən*
 apple 1SG.β 3 get-tell[PAST]
 ‘He/she told me to get an apple.’
- b. *kʼiway=Ga* *ʔiitʼə* *ʼlaa* *xisGaləy-Gu-gən*
 street[DEF]=PP 1PL.β 3 wave-PL-PAST
 ‘They waved us to the street.’
- c. *dəy=ʔuu* *ʼlə=qiy-gən*
 2SG.β=FOC 3=see-PAST
 ‘He/she saw you.’
- d. *dəy=ʔuu* *ʼlə=qiy-Gu-gən*
 2SG.β=FOC 3=see-PL-PAST
 ‘They saw you.’

It should be noted that the plurality of the third person pronoun is marked by the verbal suffix *-Gu*, and not on the pronoun itself, as shown in (7b, d).

3.2. Transitive objects (O)

The object of transitive verbs takes the β case in 1SG/1PL pronouns, as shown in (8), and 2SG pronouns, as shown in (9a). (9b) is an example with the 2PL pronoun, and (10) is an example of the third person pronoun. In both (9b) and (10), the pronouns for the transitive objects (Os) are the same as the ones used for the transitive subjects (As).

- (8) The first person (a: SG, b: PL)
- a. *dii* *ʼlaa* *qiy-gən*
 1SG.β 3 see-PAST
 ‘He/she saw me.’

- b. *ʔiit'ə nəŋ kun-gən*
 1_{PL,β} somebody hit-PAST
 'Somebody hit us (on vehicle).'
- (9) The second person (a: SG, b: PL)
 a. *dəŋ xaagay xidxiidən*
 2_{SG,β} dog[DEF] chase[PAST]
 'The dog chased you.'
 b. *xaagay=ʔuu dalaay xidxiidən*
 dog[DEF]=FOC 2_{PL} chase[PAST]
 'The dog chased you (PL).'
- (10) The third person (a, b: free, c, d: bound)
 a. *gə=ʔad=χan=ʔuu 'laa 'laa qiy-ʔin-gən*
 one.time=FOC 3 3 see-outward-PAST
 'One time he/she went to see him/her.'
 b. *'laa=ʔuu tə=xidxid-gu-gən*
 3=FOC 1_{SG,α}=chase-PL-PAST
 'I chased them.'
 c. *təa=ʔuu 'lə=xidxiidən*
 1_{SG,α}=FOC 3=chase[PAST]
 'I chased him/her.'
 d. *daa=gwaa 'lə=qiy-gaawa*
 2_{SG,α}=INTER 3=see-PL[EVD]
 'Did you see them?'

Note in (10b, d) that the suffix *-gu* indicates the plurality of the third person which, in these examples, occurs as the object.

3.3. Intransitive subjects (S)

The subject of intransitive clauses takes either of the α case or the β case in 1_{SG}/1_{PL}, as shown in (11) and (14), and in 2_{SG}, as shown in (12a) and (15a), while 2_{PL} and the third person consistently occur as the same forms (i.e., *dalaay* for 2_{PL} and *'laa* for the third person), as shown in (12b) and (15b) for 2_{PL}, and (13) and (16) for the third person. (11) – (12) are examples where the 1_{SG}/1_{PL} and 2_{SG} take the α case.

- (11) The first person (a: SG (free), b: SG (bound), c: PL)
 a. *təa=ʔuu χaw-gəŋ-giin- 'i*
 1_{SG,α}=FOC fish-HABIT-PAST-INFO
 'I used to fish.'
 b. *χaayda kil=ʔad tə=qiʔətGalaay-xidi-ga*
 Haida voice=PP 1_{SG,α}=tell.stories-INCEP-NONPAST
 'I am going to tell some stories in Haida.'
 c. *Vancouver=gu 'alaay tGangulχa-gən*
 Vancouver=PP 1_{PL,α} work-PAST
 'We worked in Vancouver.'

- (12) The second person (a: SG, b: PL)
- a. *daGaɬ=gwaa daa xyaala*
 yesterday=INTER 2SG.α dance[EVD]
 ‘Did you dance yesterday?’
- b. *daGaɬ=gwaa dalaay xyaala*
 yesterday=INTER 2PL dance[EVD]
 ‘Did you (PL) dance yesterday?’
- (13) The third person (a, b: free, c, d: bound)
- a. *'laa=ʔuu k'ajuu-di-ga*
 3=FOC sing-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘He/she is singing.’
- b. *'laa=ʔuu xyaat-di-gu-ga*
 3=FOC dance-DUR-PL-NONPAST
 ‘They are dancing.’
- c. *yaan=ʔuu 'lǝ=xudsk'aju+ʔiwʔan-di-gən*
 truly=FOC 3=whistle+big-DUR-PAST
 ‘He/she was whistling really loud.’
- d. *'lǝ=q'əw-sdlə-gu-gən*
 3=sit-completely-PL-PAST
 ‘They sat down.’

Some verbs require β case pronouns as their Ss in 1SG/1PL and 2SG, as shown in (14) and (15a):

- (14) The first person (a: SG, b: PL)
- a. *gəm dii q'ud-gəŋ-gən*
 NEG 1SG.β hungry-NEG-PAST
 ‘I was not hungry.’
- b. *ʔiitl'ə hit'agan ʔina-gən*
 1PL.β a.little.while.ago grow-PAST
 ‘We were young.’
- (15) The second person (a: SG, b: PL)
- a. *dəŋ=gwaa Giitgi*
 2SG.β=INTER be.ready
 ‘Are you ready?’
- b. *dalaan=gwaa Giitgi*
 2PL=INTER be.ready
 ‘Are you (PL) ready?’
- (16) The third person (a, b: free, c, d: bound)
- a. *'laa=gwaa Giitgi*
 3=INTER be.ready
 ‘Is he/she ready?’
- b. *'laa=ʔuu 'laa-gu-ga*
 3=FOC good-PL-NONPAST
 ‘They are fine.’

- c. *gəm 'lə= 'laa-gəŋ-ga*
 NEG 3=good-NEG-NONPAST
 'He/she is not fine.'
- d. *'lə=χaldəŋaa-gu-ga*
 3=be.slave-PL-NONPAST
 'They are slaves.'

The following table summarizes the occurrences of these personal pronouns given above. S_a means S marked like A, while S_o means S marked like O, following Dixon (1979, 1994). The α case pronouns are in bold.

Table 2. Occurrences of personal pronouns

Free forms					
	1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3
A	<i>tʰaa</i> (α) (5a)	<i>tʰalaŋ</i> (α) (5c)	<i>daa</i> (α) (6a)	<i>dalaŋ</i> (6b)	<i>'laa</i> (7a, b)
S_a	<i>tʰaa</i> (α) (11a)	<i>tʰalaŋ</i> (α) (11c)	<i>daa</i> (α) (12a)	<i>dalaŋ</i> (12b)	<i>'laa</i> (13a, b)
S_o	<i>dii</i> (β) (14a)	<i>?iitl'ə</i> (β) (14b)	<i>dəŋ</i> (β) (15a)	<i>dalaŋ</i> (15b)	<i>'laa</i> (16a, b)
O	<i>dii</i> (β) (8a)	<i>?iitl'ə</i> (β) (8b)	<i>dəŋ</i> (β) (9a)	<i>dalaŋ</i> (9b)	<i>'laa</i> (10a, b)

Bound forms

	1SG	3
A	<i>tʰə</i> (5b)	<i>'lə</i> (7c, d)
S_a	<i>tʰə</i> (11b)	<i>'lə</i> (13c, d)
S_o	—	<i>'lə</i> (16c, d)
O	—	<i>'lə</i> (10c, d)

This table shows that S is not consistently marked by the same case in 1SG/1PL and 2SG: some verbs require the α case while other verbs require the β case pronouns as their Ss. In contrast, notice that in the 2PL and the third person, there is no distinction between α case and β case, and consequently the same form is used for A, S, and O. In this sense, Haida can be characterized as having split intransitivity,¹⁰

¹⁰ As will be shown later, the term would not be appropriate since not only the S of some

although its manifestation is confined to the first and second persons.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that the split intransitivity in Haida is only relevant to verbs that denote something applicable to human activities or states, such as “to fish,” “to dance,” “to work,” “to be ready,” “to be jealous,” etc., since the split intransitivity in Haida is only apparent in personal pronouns, although some of these verbs, such as “to sneeze,” “to look good,” “to jump,” “to walk,” and others, can also be used with other animate entities. On the other hand, verbs that denote something that cannot be considered to be human activities or states, such as “to shine,” “to thunder,” “to wind,” or “to be partial,” are not associated with personal pronouns. Thus, they are not pertinent to split intransitivity in Haida. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that animacy is a covert category in Haida, in that it is not overtly marked in nouns or verbs but implicitly works as an effective factor for verb classification (see also Merlan 1985: 331 and Klimov 1977 [1999: 68] for the relation between animacy and verb classes) and word order (see Enrico 2003: 74–8 for the relation between word order and potency).

4. Semantic Features for Split Intransitivity

The previous section reveals that intransitive verbs can roughly be classified into those that take the α case and those that take the β case as their Ss. Hereafter, the former will be termed “ α case verbs,” while the latter will be termed as “ β case verbs.”

As shown in (17), roughly speaking, typical α case verbs refer to activities, motions, or events. Many of them coincide with active verbs (as termed in the literature of active type languages), and consistently require α case personal pronouns as their Ss.

(17) α case verbs

<i>dləgiydaal</i>	‘swim’	<i>xudsk’aju</i>	‘whistle’
<i>skinxa</i>	‘wake up’	<i>xyaat</i>	‘dance’
<i>skyaana</i>	‘stay awake’	<i>gad</i>	‘run’
<i>sGaytə</i>	‘cry’	<i>gaaday</i>	‘bathe’
<i>tGangulxa</i>	‘work’	<i>gadkaadas</i>	‘jump’
<i>na</i>	‘live’	<i>Guyʔutda</i>	‘blink’
<i>naay</i>	‘play’	<i>qaa</i>	‘walk’
<i>giinəy</i>	‘paddle’	<i>qayd</i>	‘leave’
<i>gyaaxa</i>	‘stand’	<i>q’adii</i>	‘sleep’
<i>kitgul</i>	‘talk’	<i>q’aathu</i>	‘get up’
<i>k’ajuu</i>	‘sing’	<i>q’əw</i>	‘sit’
<i>k’ah</i>	‘laugh’	<i>χaw</i>	‘fish’

On the other hand, typical β case verbs, as seen in (18), roughly speaking, denote states, qualities, the inherent or temporary nature of the participant, and

intransitives, but also the A of a few transitives can take both the α and β cases of personal pronouns (see also Enrico 2005: 1845).

adjectival notions (note that Haida lacks adjectives as a word class). Many of these β case verbs coincide with stative verbs in active type languages and consistently require β case personal pronouns as their Ss.

(18) β case verbs

<i>daguya</i>	‘be strong’	<i>xuy</i>	‘be cold’
<i>dayat</i>	‘sweat’	<i>gaxa</i>	‘be weak’
<i>st’i</i>	‘be sick’	<i>giidxa</i>	‘be embarrassed’
<i>sgidaɬda</i>	‘blush’	<i>giitgi</i>	‘be ready’
<i>sq’adaga</i>	‘be smart’	<i>qat’uu</i>	‘be thirsty’
<i>sq’iila</i>	‘be dirty’	<i>q’aya</i>	‘be sleepy’
<i>səlgəŋ</i>	‘feel ticklish’	<i>q’aya</i>	‘be old’
<i>ɬq’unxida</i>	‘be nervous’	<i>q’ud</i>	‘be hungry’
<i>ɬgaxida</i>	‘shiver’	<i>χaynaya</i>	‘be alive’
<i>’laa</i>	‘be good’	<i>haana</i>	‘be pretty’
<i>k’udʔut</i>	‘die’	<i>ʔiitəŋa</i>	‘be a man’

It should be pointed out that these two verb classes in Haida are not mutually exclusive, and in fact, some of the verbs, as seen in (19), can take either the α case or the β case personal pronoun as their S. These are called “intermediate verbs.”

(19) Intermediate verbs¹¹

<i>tləgəŋ</i>	‘vomit’	<i>sdaɬə</i>	‘want, need’
<i>qayga</i>	‘dream’	<i>st’ixəgəŋ</i>	‘be angry’
<i>gadləguy</i>	‘fall down’	<i>ɬgwaaga</i>	‘be afraid’
<i>gadləxunəŋ</i>	‘stagger’	<i>k’uuga</i>	‘love’
<i>gadləsɟid</i>	‘bump into’ ¹²		

Even when intransitive verbs are divided into two (or more) groups on semantic grounds, it is difficult to define one group by some semantic feature that the other group entirely lacks. What is formed by these verbs is not a dichotomy but a continuum. Thus, in the extremes of a continuum, verbs of one group show striking differences from those of the other. However, in the middle of the continuum, there are some intermediate verbs that can have characteristics of verbs at both ends of the continuum (see 4.3 for the details). We will now demonstrate how, in active type languages, verbs are characterized by their semantic nature.

In languages showing split intransitivity (or active type languages), including Haida, it is often observed that some type of semantic feature(s) plays a key role in motivating the phenomenon (see Dixon 1979, 1994, and Mithun 1991). Thus, active verbs, roughly corresponding to α case verbs in the present study, have often been semantically characterized as denoting activities or motions, and stative verbs,

¹¹ Note that these intermediate verbs can be further classified into two groups (see 4.3).

¹² The last three verbs, i.e., *gadləguy* ‘fall down,’ *gadləxunəŋ* ‘stagger,’ and *gadləsɟid* ‘bump into,’ all share the instrumental prefix *ga-* ‘moving’ and the classifier *dlə-* for a single animate object.

as denoting states or qualities.

However, it seems highly unlikely that the same semantic feature(s) can be applied to all languages in order to explain split intransitivity. In the literature on active type languages, it has been shown that various semantic features of verbs, such as “lexical aspect,” “agency,” “control,” and “volition,” are relevant features for split intransitivity (for further details, see Van Valin 1990, and Mithun 1991). For example, the lexical aspect (or Aktionsart) can be suitably used to describe split intransitivity in Colloquial Guaraní (see Mithun 1991: 512–4). In this language, whereas intransitive verbs denoting events such as activities, accomplishments, and achievements in Vendler’s (1967) classification take A markers as their Ss (see also Foley and Van Valin 1984), the ones denoting states take O markers. It is true that many of the latter verbs listed in Mithun (1991: 513) coincide with β case verbs in Haida; however, some verbs under the former category (e.g., “die” and “get lost”) belong to β case verbs in Haida. The following examples illustrate that the β case pronouns are used as the subjects of the verbs of dynamicity (as opposed to statives) even when the verbs take the inceptive suffix *-xidi* (a tense/aspect ending):

- (20) a. *dii* *ɲaysdlə-xidi-ga*
 1SG. β be.cured-INCEP-NONPAST
 ‘I am getting better.’
 b. *dii* *Giitgi-xidi-ga*
 1SG. β be.ready-INCEP-NONPAST
 ‘I am getting ready.’

The following pairs of examples also verify that lexical aspect does not play a crucial role in explaining split intransitivity in Haida.

- (21) a. *dii* *q’aya-ga*
 1SG. β old-NONPAST
 ‘I am old.’
 b. *dii* *q’aya-Giit-di-ga*
 1SG. β old-become-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘I am getting old.’
 (22) a. *dii* *sq’iila-ga*
 1SG. β dirty-NONPAST
 ‘I am dirty.’
 b. *dii* *sq’iila-Gilgən*
 1SG. β dirty-become[PAST]
 ‘I got dirty.’

It should be noted in (21b) and (22b) that the β case pronouns are still used even when the suffix *-Giit* (~ *-Gil*), which denotes change of state, is added to the β case verbs.

In addition, some of the “stative verbs” in Vendler’s 1967 classification do not require β case pronouns, but α case pronouns. The following examples show that the stative verbs “to sit” (23a), “to stand” (24a), and “to live” (25) take α case pro-

nouns as their Ss.

- (23) a. *ʔaa=ʔuu q'əw-ʔu-di-ga*
 1SG.α=FOC sit-SG-DUR-NONPAST
 'I am sitting.'
- b. *ʔaa=ʔuu q'əw-ʔu-gən*
 1SG.α=FOC sit-SG-PAST
 'I sat down.'
- (24) a. *qayday=q'utGa ʔə=gyaaGəy-gən*
 tree[DEF]=PP 1SG.α=stand-PAST
 'I was standing near the tree.'
- b. *ʔə=gyaaχa-gən*
 1SG.α=stand-PAST
 'I stood up.'
- (25) *ʔaan=ʔuu ʔə=na-ʔu-ga*
 here=FOC 1SG.α=live-SG-NONPAST
 'I live here.'

From these facts, it is obvious that some other semantic feature than lexical aspect should be pursued to explain the phenomenon in Haida. In the following subsections, I explore the semantic features shared by α case verbs, β case verbs, and intermediate verbs, in (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3), respectively.

4.1. α case verbs

As mentioned above, α case verbs such as “run,” “cry,” “dance,” and “walk,” correspond to the so-called active verbs, while β case verbs such as “be sick,” “die,” and “be sleepy,” are stative verbs. The notion of agency (or agentivity)¹³ has been proposed as a crucial or predominant feature for characterizing active verbs in languages such as Acehnese (Van Valin 1990), Lakhota (Mithun 1991), and Mopan Maya (Danziger 1996), among others, and I assume that agency can also serve to distinguish α case verbs from β case verbs in Haida. However, the definition of agency differs slightly among the studies that propose it. For example, Merlan (1985) defines agency as characterizing either one that performs an activity or one who is engaged as an effector. Dixon (1979, 1994) characterizes the agent as an initiator or controller of the activity. Finally, Bakker (1994: 25) regards an agent as one that produces an effect (typically physical) on a patient (usually human) in causative events.

The slight difference among these studies might be due to the fact that, as pointed out by DeLancey (1984, 1985b), several semantic categories that are considered to be relevant to agency, such as control, volition, and animacy, are intertwined with each other on the one hand, and can vary independently

¹³ Agency and agentivity are treated as synonyms here. The former is used by Dixon (1979, 1994), Hopper and Thompson (1980), while the latter is used by DeLancey (1985a), Merlan (1985).

of one another on the other. Thus, the notion of agency cannot be defined straightforwardly.

The definition of agency provided by Mithun (1991) seems to reflect a common view among the studies presented thus far. She assumes that agency consists of performance, effect, instigation, and control, based on the notion of “actor” advocated by Foley and Van Valin (1984). According to them (1984: 29), an actor is “the participant which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate,” as opposed to the “undergoer,” i.e., “the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it in some way.”

However, when characterizing the α case verbs given in (17), the four components considered by Mithun (1991) to constitute the feature [AGENCY], i.e., <performance>, <effect>, <instigate>, and <control>,¹⁴ are not always relevant to verb classification in Haida. For example, the verbs in (17) can take only one core argument, which means that it would be difficult to assume the presence of another participant that is affected by the actor. Thus, <effect> can be excluded from the feature [AGENCY] in Haida.

Moreover, the notion of control should be considered as a separate semantic feature, rather than a component of [AGENCY]. In fact, Mithun (1991: 516) states that performance/effect/instigation and control do not themselves coincide in Lakhota, particularly in the case of verbs such as “sneeze,” “smile,” and “vomit,” which are interpreted to be out of one’s control. In Haida, it is apparent that we need the feature [CONTROL] in addition to [AGENCY] to distinguish intermediate verbs from the other two classes (see 4.3 for the discussion).

I assume that a verb has the feature [AGENCY] if it requires a participant that performs the activity or instigates the situation denoted by the verb. Let us consider some verbs from (17) as examples: *Gad* “run” denotes the activity of running performed by the participant, while the participant of *skaak’aday* “get hiccups” can instigate the situation of hiccupping, or can be regarded as the source of the event (cf. DeLancey 1985b), although he/she cannot have any control over the situation (see below for controllability).

The following three tests are considered to be valid for checking if a verb bears [AGENCY], i.e., it denotes performance and instigation (cf. Vendler 1967, Brennenstuhl 1976, and Enrico 2003: 96–8 on “tests for planning”¹⁵).

¹⁴ The semantic feature is represented in [] and its components are in < >.

¹⁵ Enrico assumes the following six tests: (a) ability to occur with “know how to V, good at V-ing” (see (32)); (b) ability to occur with “of own will, on own, on purpose”; (c) ability of the verb to occur in an imperative; (d) ability of the verb to occur with “try to V”; (e) ability of the verb to occur with an adjunct purpose clause, which appears to be equivalent to (c); and (f) ability of the verb to occur with manner adverbs such as “carefully,” “in a hurry,” etc. Among these tests, (b), (c), (d), and (e) (which is almost equivalent to (c)) overlap with the tests proposed in the present study; however, it is not certain how the other tests are relevant to volitionality. Further, it should be pointed out that, for example, the verb “to give birth” requires the α case (or agentive case in his terms) pronoun in spite of failing the three

A-1. The verb can be used as a predicate in replying to the question “What was/is/will be S doing?,” or “What did S do?,” as illustrated in (26).

- (26) a. *guus=ʔuu daa ʔisda-dyaŋ*
 what=FOC 2SG.α do-DUR[PR]
 ‘What are you doing?’
- b1. *ʔə=Gad-di-ga*
 1SG.α=run-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘I am running.’
- b2. *ʔə=k’ajuu-di-ga*
 1SG.α=sing-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘I am singing.’
- b3. *ʔə=ʔGangulχa-di-ga*
 1SG.α=work-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘I am working.’

A-2. The verb can be used as a predicate in an imperative, as a request.

- (27) a. *q’aathuu ʔa*
 get.up IMP
 ‘Get up!’
- b. *skyaana ʔa*
 stay.awake IMP
 ‘Stay awake!’

A-3. The verb can be used as a predicate in replying to the question “What is going on?,” or “What happened?”.

- (28) a1. *gasəŋ=ʔuu gina giiday*
 how=FOC thing be[PR]
 ‘What is going on?’
- b1. *ʔə=SGayʔə-di-ga*
 3=cry-DUR-NONPAST
 ‘He/she is crying.’
- a2. *gasəŋ=ʔuu gina ʔaʔjuu-gaŋ*
 how=FOC thing happen-PR
 ‘What happened?’
- b2. *ʔə=q’aathuu-gəŋ*
 3=get.up-PAST
 ‘He/she got up.’

Although [AGENCY] consists of the two components <performance> and <instigation>, tests A-1 and A-2 are roughly concerned with the component <performance>, while test A-3 is assumed to be mainly valid for checking if a verb includes the meaning <instigation>. Most of the verbs in (17) pass these three

tests (b, c, d): the relationship between the test results and the volitionality is unclear to me (although I do not deny the validity of his statement, for I have not checked the intransitive “to give birth” which is to be distinguished from the transitive “to give birth to NP”).

tests, but some α verbs seem to fail one of them. For instance, the verb *qayd* “leave” passes A-2 and A-3, but it seems to be inappropriate as a reply to the question in A-1; the verb *naay* “play” passes A-1 and A-2, but would not pass A-3 because it may not be possible to think of a context that fits into A-3. I assume that if a verb passes at least test A-1 or A-2, the verb has the feature [AGENCY]. All the verbs in (17) meet this criterion, and thus they denote the activity performed or the situation instigated by a participant which is the subject.

Another feature that is relevant to verb classification in Haida is [CONTROL]. The following two tests can be postulated to check if a verb has the feature [CONTROL].

B-1. The verb can take the suffix *-t'ajəŋ* “to try to V,” as illustrated in (29).

- (29) a. *ʔaa=ʔuu k'ajuu-t'ajəŋ-gəŋ*
 1SG.α=FOC sing-try-PAST
 ‘I tried to sing.’
 b. *ʔaa=ʔuu q'aahuu-t'ajəŋ-gəŋ*
 1SG.α=FOC get.up-try-PAST
 ‘I tried to get up.’

B-2. The sentence in which the verb is used as a predicate can be modified by a manner adverb *k'udχan* “on purpose.”

- (30) a. *ʔaa k'udχan=ʔuu k'ah-gəŋ*
 1SG.α on.purpose=FOC laugh-PAST
 ‘I laughed on purpose.’
 b. *ʔaa k'udχan=ʔuu sɣayʔə-gəŋ*
 1SG.α on.purpose=FOC cry-PAST
 ‘I cried on purpose.’

Most of the verbs in (17) pass both tests. However, the verb *ʔgangulχa* “to work” would not be modified by the adverb “on purpose” in normal context, though the verb can take the suffix “to try to V,” thus passing test B-1. A verb can be regarded as having the feature [CONTROL], if it passes at least either test B-1 or B-2.

However, the notion of control is difficult to define straightforwardly. One can exercise control over instigating or stopping an activity, or extend control during a process in order to achieve a goal that one has in mind (for the notion of control, see also Thompson 1979, 1985, and Anderson and Wade 1988). Thus, considering *xyaʔ* “to dance” as an example of an α case verb, one can begin to dance and stop, and one can also perform the dance, while following a particular form of dance. In this case, one intends to perform a dance and can carry out his intention, totally exercising control over his movements. Likewise, other activities, such as walking and singing, are also totally controllable in that one can instigate the activity of walking without any special effort and can freely stop it; these activities also imply one’s will or volition, so volitionality and controllability often coincide. In fact, Enrico (2003) argues for split intransitivity in Haida on the basis of volitionality, by which he means that the verb denotes an eventuality brought about through the

execution of positive plans (see footnote 15).

However, it does not follow that all activities involve one's volition. For example, the activity of blinking (*Guy?utda* "to blink") can be performed without one's will or volition but can still be a controllable activity, thus passing tests B-1 and B-2. The same is true of other verbs such as *sgaytə* "cry" or *qagənjuu* "breathe." It should also be pointed out that even if one is going to do some kind of activity voluntarily, there is no guarantee that he or she will succeed. In this respect, it may be possible to discriminate between controllability and volitionality, although there are still many cases in which the two notions are closely intertwined (see also Brennenstuhl 1976 and Mithun 1991).

In general one does not know whether the other person performs an activity with or without volition because the volitionality of the act is only accessible to the actor, while the other person can only perceive the ongoing process and/or the result of an event that is caused by the actor.¹⁶ However, one can judge whether the activity is controllable or not from his/her own experience; thus, it is a little easier to encode controllability in some manner or other in the grammatical system of a language (see also DeLancey 1985a and 1985b). The notion of control will be taken up again when we look at intermediate verbs in 4.3.

In summary, α case verbs can be described as having the features [AGENCY] and [CONTROL], thus designated as [+AGENCY, +CONTROL].

4.2. β case verbs

β case verbs, on the other hand, fail most of the tests on [AGENCY] and [CONTROL]. For example, the following sentences are not appropriate as a reply to the question "What are you doing?," thus failing test A-1.

- (31) a. *dii st'i-ga*
 1SG. β sick-NONPAST
 'I am sick.'
- b. *dii xuy-ga*
 1SG. β cold-NONPAST
 'I am cold.'
- c. *dii xaynaŋa-ga*
 1SG. β alive-NONPAST
 'I am alive.'

¹⁶ See also DeLancey (1985a: 56) for the difference between "control" and "volition." Enrico (2003: 100, 105) remarks that some of the intransitive verbs in English, such as "to slide," and "to roll," are both [+VOLITIONAL] and [-VOLITIONAL] since they "can be used to describe either intentional or unintentional happenings" (p. 100). It may be true that these actions have to be described as having dual values in terms of volitionality, for one does not know whether these actions are performed with or without volition; however, these actions are described as being performed by the actor, thus can be unambiguously specified as [+AGENCY] without taking the actor's volition into consideration.

Among the verbs given in (18), *k'udʔut* “die” may be used as a reply to “What happened?,” thus passing test A-3, but would not be appropriate in the context of A-1, and cannot be used as an imperative to pass test A-2. The same is true of *dayat* “sweat,” *səlgəy* “feel ticklish,” and *ʔgaxida* “shake.” Thus β case verbs can be regarded as lacking the feature [AGENCY].

As for tests B-1 and B-2, which are used to check if a verb has the feature [CONTROL], these β case verbs fail both of these tests too. For example, *q'aya* “old” cannot take the suffix *-t'ajəy* “to try to V” and also cannot occur with the adverb *k'udʔan* “on purpose,” which is true of the other verbs in (18) as well.¹⁷ Thus β case verbs can be regarded as lacking the feature [CONTROL] as well.

Considering these facts, it can be observed that β case verbs do not require a participant that can perform, instigate, or control the situation as their subjects; rather, they require a participant that experiences or is affected by the situation. For example, one cannot instigate and control the situation of being sick; rather, one is affected by this situation. Consequently, β case verbs can be designated as [-AGENCY, -CONTROL].

The same line of argument also applies to compound verbs that consist of α case and β case verbs, where the meaning of the whole compound decides the required case of personal pronouns. See the examples in (32) and (33) below.

(32) *xyaat+Gaaya* “good at dancing, know how to dance”

a. *dii=ʔuu xyaat+Gaaya-ga*
1SG. β =FOC dance+good.at-NONPAST
'I am good at dancing/know how to dance.'

b. *dəy=ʔuu xyaat+Gaaya-ga*
2SG. β =FOC dance+good.at-NONPAST
'You are good at dancing/know how to dance.'

(33) *st'i+naay* “play sick”

a. *ʔaa=ʔuu st'i+naay-gən*
1SG. α =FOC sick+play-PAST
'I played sick.'

b. *daa=ʔuu st'i+naay-gən*
2SG. α =FOC sick+play-PAST
'You played sick.'

(32) and (33) are different in that (32), with the compound verb *xyaat+Gaaya* “good at dancing” consisting of the α case verb *xyaat* “dance” and the β case verb *Gaaya* (originally) meaning “be fat,” requires a β case pronoun as its S. On the other hand, in (33), *st'i+naay* “play sick,” consisting of the β case verb *st'i* “be sick” and the α case verb *naay* “play,” requires an α case pronoun as its S. (32) requires a β case pronoun because the compound verb denotes the participant’s ability to perform a dance which is designated as [-AGENCY, -CONTROL], while (33) requires

¹⁷ One might think that the verb *k'udʔut* “die” could occur with the suffix “try to V” or the adverb “on purpose,” but the speakers whom I consulted with rejected such expressions.

an α case pronoun because the compound verb denotes the activity of playing sick which can be controlled by the participant, thus designated as [+AGENCY, +CONTROL].

As we have observed, although the distinction between the two verb classes is chiefly based on semantic features, it is also apparently reflected in the choice of pro-verbs. Among the pro-verbs in Haida,¹⁸ *ʔwaa* tends to be used as a pro-verb for α case verbs, while *Gid* is used as a pro-verb for β case verbs. See the examples in (34).

- (34) a. *dii=χaygu daa q'anda-gən gəm yaan ʔəsəy hak'waan*
 1SG.β=PP 2SG.α belch-PAST NEG really again that.way
ʔwaa(/**Gid*)-*Gəy*
 PV-NEG
 'You burped in front of me. Never do that again!'
- b. *'laa=ʔuu 'laa-ga dəy=gwaa ʔəsəy gid* (/**ʔwaa*)
 3=FOC good-NONPAST 2SG.β=INTER too PV
 'He/she is fine. Are you too?'

Note the association of the β case pronoun with the pro-verb *Gid* in (34b) (see also Enrico 2003: 224).

However, the choice of pro-verbs does not always guarantee a consistent result. The example in (35), taken from Swanton (1905), illustrates a case in which the pro-verb *Gid* is used for the α case verb *skyaana* 'stay awake' and co-occurs with the α case pronoun (1PL) *t'alaay*:

- (35) "*dalaay=gwaa tləway=guga skyaana-giy*" "*t'alaay giiday*"
 2PL=INTER boat[DEF]=PP stay.awake-on.the.boat 1PL.α PV[PR]
 "Are you awake in the canoe?" "We are."
 (Swanton 1905: 101)

One of my language consultants reluctantly accepted the β case pronoun *ʔiitl'ə* in place of the α case pronoun in the second sentence, but completely rejected the other pro-verb *ʔwaa* in this context. (35) reveals that the semantic differences based on [AGENCY] and [CONTROL] do not always ensure the selection of the pro-verbs.¹⁹

4.3. Intermediate verbs

Thus far, we have observed typical α case and β case verbs. By "typical" I mean verbs that consistently require personal pronouns which are Ss to be either α case or β case. However, there are some verbs, called "intermediate verbs," that can take either the α case pronoun or the β case pronoun as their S. See examples in (36)

¹⁸ See Enrico (2003: 505–6) for a list of pro-verbs in Haida.

¹⁹ Enrico (2005: 1853) comments that the occurrence of the pro-verb *Gid* is relevant to a situation, not to a verb, which points to the fact that *Gid* is not consistently used as the pro-verb for a specific verb.

and (37).

- (36) a. *tə= / dii tləgəŋ-gəŋ*
 1SG.α/1SG.β vomit-PAST
 ‘I vomited.’
- b. *tə= / dii skaak’aday-gəŋ*
 1SG.α/1SG.β get.hiccups-PAST
 ‘I got hiccups.’
- c. *tə= / dii t’abnənəŋ-gəŋ*
 1SG.α/1SG.β slip-PAST
 ‘I slipped.’
- (37) a. *daa / dəŋ=ʔuu ’laa=ʔad st’iigəŋ-ga*
 2SG.α/2SG.β=FOC 3=PP be.jealous-NONPAST
 ‘You are jealous of him/her.’
- b. *daa / dəŋ=ʔuu ’lə=kiGəŋ=gi q’aysgüidən*
 2SG.α/2SG.β=FOC 3=name=PP forget[PAST]
 ‘You forgot his/her name.’
- c. *daa / dəŋ=gwaa ’laa=Gan ʔunsəd*
 2SG.α/2SG.β=INTER 3=PP know
 ‘Do you know him/her?’

The verbs that display this pattern are found in (19), and repeated in (38) below.

- (38) Intermediate verbs
- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|
| <i>tləgəŋ</i> | ‘vomit’ (see (36)) | <i>sdatə</i> | ‘want, need,’ |
| <i>qəŋga</i> | ‘dream’ | <i>st’ixəgəŋ</i> | ‘be angry’ |
| <i>gadləguy</i> | ‘fall down’ | <i>t’Gwaaga</i> | ‘be afraid’ |
| <i>gadləxunəŋ</i> | ‘stagger’ | <i>k’uuga</i> | ‘love’ |
| <i>gadləsgid</i> | ‘bump into’ | | |

In Table 3, we see the results of applying the above tests A-1, A-2, and A-3 to these verbs.

Table 3. Intermediate verbs and [AGENCY]

	A-1	A-2	A-3
(a) vomit, bump into	+	+	+
(b) fall down, stagger	+	?	+
(c) get hiccups, slip	+	-	+
(d) dream, have diarrhea	-	-	+?
(e) be angry, forget	-	-	+
(f) want, be afraid, be jealous	-	-	-

A-1: A reply to “What is/are/was S doing,” “What did S do?”

A-2: Imperative

A-3: A reply to “What is going on?,” “What happened?”

[+: yes, -: no, ?: questionable]

The verbs in (a), (b), and (c) can be considered to retain the feature [AGENCY], although the degree of it is rather lower than in typical α case verbs in that some of these verbs fail test A-2. One can instigate the event of hiccups or vomiting, which is perceptible to other persons. On the other hand, the verbs in (d), (e), and (f) are relatively closer to typical β case verbs, in that all of the verbs fail tests A-1 and A-2. In fact, the subjects of these verbs are not considered to perform an activity or instigate a situation; rather, they are affected by it in some manner.

The verbs in (38) are slightly different from typical α case and β case verbs in terms of the feature [CONTROL] too: most of the verbs cannot take the suffix “to try to V” (e.g., “*try to dream,” “*try to stagger,” “*try to get hiccups,” “*try to be jealous,” but “try to vomit” would be acceptable). They also cannot be modified by the adverb “on purpose” (e.g., “*dream on purpose,” “*have diarrhea on purpose”). Table 4 summarizes the results of applying the control-tests to the verbs in (38):

Table 4. Intermediate verbs and [CONTROL]

	B-1	B-2
(a) vomit, bump into	+	+
(b) fall down, stagger	-	₂₀
(c) get hiccups, slip	-	-
(d) dream, have diarrhea	-	-
(e) angry, forget	-	-
(f) want, be afraid, be jealous	-	-

B-1: Possibility of taking the suffix “to try to V”

B-2: Possibility of being modified by the adverb “on purpose”

[+: yes, -: no]

The results given in Table 4 show that most of these verbs lack the feature [CONTROL] except for (a), but the results do not explain all cases in which the verb in question is used. For example, the verb “to vomit” can pass test B-1 (although it might be impossible to say “to vomit on purpose”), but the verb essentially indicates an uncontrollable activity: one vomits but does not have any control over instigating the action and needs to make some special effort in order to stop or avoid it, although there is no guarantee that he or she always can succeed. Another verb in (a), “to bump into,” seems to be the same as typical α case verbs in that it passes both the [CONTROL] tests. However, the actual event of bumping into somebody/something usually occurs accidentally, not under one’s control. Thus, the verbs in (a) have a lower degree of [CONTROL] than typical α case verbs.

The rest of the verbs in Table 4 are apparently close to typical β case verbs in terms of [CONTROL] in that they fail both tests, but still seem to be different from

²⁰ It might be possible to say “to fall down on purpose,” but this means “to simulate or pretend to fall down,” and thus is significantly different from its original meaning, i.e., having an accidental nature (see Brennenstuhl 1976: 60). The same is true of other verbs such as “to stagger,” “to slip.”

them regarding the degree of control. Particularly the verbs in (e) and (f) denote emotional or mental processes that are controllable in some manner and uncontrollable in another. For example, one can easily forget something but avoid doing so by trying to keep the thing in mind.²¹ For such mental or emotional processes, one does not need to make any effort to be involved in the situation; rather, one needs to make some type of effort in order to avoid the situation (cf. Brennenstuhl and Wachowicz 1976). These verbs do not have the same degree of control with typical α case verbs; rather, they have a lower degree of control than typical α case verbs, but have a slightly higher degree of control than typical β case verbs, which denote totally uncontrollable situations. Thus, these verbs can be represented as [\pm CONTROL] (where [\pm] means that the feature falls between [+] and [-]).

From what we have observed so far, the verbs in (38) can be further classified into two groups, designated as A and B here:

(39) Intermediate verbs

A: [+AGENCY, \pm CONTROL]: 'vomit,' 'fall down,' 'stagger,' 'get hiccups,' etc.

B: [-AGENCY, \pm CONTROL]: 'be angry,' 'forget,' 'want,' 'be jealous of,' etc.

Group A roughly corresponds to the verbs in (a), (b), (c) in Tables 3 and 4, while group B corresponds to the verbs in (e) and (f).²² Many of the group B verbs are two-argument verbs requiring an S, and another argument referring to the other participant in the clause, such as a patient or a psychological target, which is introduced by postpositional phrases (e.g., 'laa=*ʔad*, literally meaning "with him/her" in (37a), which serves as the psychological target of the verb *st'iigəŋ* "be jealous"). The presence of the postpositional phrase is a difference between these verbs and typical transitive verbs in that typical transitive verbs can take two bare arguments (for examples of typical transitive verbs, see (1), (4b), (5a), and (5c), among others).²³ Moreover, they also differ from typical β case verbs, which cannot take a

²¹ If the verb *q'aysgid* occurs with the habitual suffix *-gəŋ* in order to express the propensity of the S for being forgetful, the β case pronoun is consistently used for both the first and second persons, exactly like a typical β case verb.

²² The verbs "dream" and "have diarrhea" must be represented as [-AGENCY, -CONTROL], which is the same specification as typical β case verbs, although "have diarrhea" implies some kind of instigation inside the body. Thus these two verbs should be treated as exceptions until further explanation is given.

²³ The verb "like" can require β case personal pronouns for both A and O (some speakers prefer the α case for the second person in A):

i) *dəŋ dii gud-'laa-ga*
 2SG. β 1SG. β INSTR-good-NONPAST
 'I like you.'

ii) Bill Mary *gud-'laa-ga* 'Bill likes Mary.'

ii) shows that the verb can take two bare arguments. Although β case personal pronouns are used for A and O, their syntactic status can be inferred from the word order (note that the order of A and O is reversed depending on whether both A and O or either of them are/is a personal pronoun or a noun). The verb *gud-'laa* "like" is derived from the β case verb '*laa*

second argument.²⁴

Among intermediate verbs, the difference between groups A and B can be pointed out in their syntactic behavior: verbs of group A tend to have two possibilities in terms of case marking when the first person is involved; however, for the second person, the α case is allowed, while the β case is less preferred or not allowed (although the degree of preference for the β case seems to vary among speakers). The following are some more examples.

- (40) *gadləsgid* ‘bump into NP’
- a. *'laa=gii tə=/dii Ga-dlə-sgiidən*
 3=PP 1SG. α =/1SG. β INSTR-CL-‘CONTACT’[PAST]
 ‘I bumped into him/her.’
- b. *daa/dəŋ=ʔuu 'laa=gii Ga-dlə-sgiidən*
 2SG. α /2SG. β =FOC 3=PP INSTR-CL-‘CONTACT’[PAST]
 ‘You bumped into him/her.’
- (41) *gadləGuy* ‘fall down’
- a. *təa/dii=ʔuu Ga-dlə-Guy-gən*
 1SG. α /1SG. β =FOC INSTR-CL-‘FALL’-PAST
 ‘I fell down.’
- b. *daa/*dəŋ=ʔuu Ga-dlə-Guy-gən*
 2SG. α /2SG. β =FOC INSTR-CL-‘FALL’-PAST
 ‘You fell down.’

It seems difficult to elucidate the difference in meaning between the sentences with α case and β case pronouns. However, it might be possible to point out that the use of an α case pronoun implies that the activity is done under some kind of control, while a β case pronoun implies that it is done accidentally, at least with regard to the first person (see also the next section). If this is accurate, the variation in the choice of the case of the first person pronoun reflects some differences

“be good” by the addition of an instrumental prefix *gud-* “by heart,” which often increases the valency of a verb. The same prefix is used to derive *gud-haana* “think O pretty” from a β case verb *haana* “be pretty,” which can also require β case personal pronouns for both A and O. Since As are marked in two ways, α case and β case, the term split intransitivity would be inappropriate for covering such transitive verbs in Haida. Dixon (1994: 122) points out that “LIKING verbs” are low on the transitivity scale and thus bear variant case markings.

²⁴ There are some typical α case verbs that can take another argument that is also followed by a postposition. For example, *halχa* “get, harvest” can take another argument serving as the patient, which is followed by the postposition =*gi* “to”:

k'aaw=gi tə=halχa-gən
 herring.roe=PP 1SG. α =get-PAST
 ‘I got herring roes.’

The following are some of the verbs having the same syntactic pattern:

NP=*gi qiixə* “find NP,” NP=*gi tləGəd* “help NP,” NP=*gi kyaagəŋ* “call NP,”
 NP=*Gan k'ah* “laugh at NP,” NP=*Gii q'idnənəŋ* “cut NP”

among speakers' perceptions of controllability over the action.²⁵

The verbs "to dream" and "to have diarrhea," though represented as [-AGENCY, -CONTROL], follow a similar pattern to group A, as shown below in (42) and (43).

(42) *qayga* 'dream'

a. *tə=/dii* *qayga-gən*
1SG.α=/1SG.β dream-PAST
'I dreamed.'²⁶

b. *daa/*dəy* *qayga-gən*
2SG.α/2SG.β dream-PAST
'You dreamed.'

(43) *sk'alxaw-ga* 'diarrhea'

a. *tə=/dii* *sk'alxaw-ga*
1SG.α=/1SG.β have.diarrhea-NONPAST
'I have diarrhea.'

b. *daa/dəy* *sk'alxaw-ga*
2SG.α/2SG.β have.diarrhea-NONPAST
'You have diarrhea.'

On the other hand, the other intermediate verbs, designated as group B, can only take the β case (or rarely, both cases) for the first person. However, they seem to be able to take either the α case or the β case for the second person (although the α case is not allowed by some speakers). See (37) above and the following examples in (44) – (46).

(44) *k'uuga* 'love'

a. *χaagay=ga* **tə=/dii* *k'uuga-ga*
dog[DEF]=PP 1SG.α=/1SG.β love-NONPAST
'I love the dog.'

b. *χaagay=ga* *daa/dəy* *k'uuga-ga*
dog[DEF]=PP 2SG.α/2SG.β love-NONPAST
'You love the dog.'

(45) *st'ixəgəy* 'be angry'

a. *'laa=gan* **tə=/dii* *st'ixəgəy-gən*
3=PP 1SG.α=/1SG.β angry-PAST
'I was mad at him/her.'

b. *'laa=gan* *daa/dəy* *st'ixəgəy-gən*
3=PP 2SG.α/2SG.β angry-PAST
'You were mad at him/her.'

²⁵ It might be more appropriate to remark that the variation depends on the speaker's perception of protagonist control, following McLendon (1978), who describes agent/patient markings in Eastern Pomo.

²⁶ Some speakers do not allow the β case for the first person.

(46) *sdatə* ‘want, need’

- a. *tləw=gi* **ʔə=/dii* *sdatə-ga*
 boat=PP 1SG.α/1SG.β want-NONPAST
 ‘I want a boat.’
- b. *tləw=gi* *daa/ dəŋ* *sdatə-ga*
 boat=PP 2SG.α/2SG.β want-NONPAST
 ‘You want a boat.’

It should be noted that the case of the first person pronoun is relatively consistent, while that of the second person pronoun varies between the α and β cases. This might have something to do with the notion of “empathy,”²⁷ which is introduced by Kuno (1976) to characterize the speaker’s identification with a participant in an event: it is easiest for the speaker to empathize with himself and next, to empathize with the hearer (Kuno 1976: 433). The fact that the same case is consistently used for the first person pronoun may be construed as another reflection of empathy: the speaker can state the type of effect that is exercised over him/her as the experiencer of a situation denoted by the predicate; however, he/she does not know about the hearer. Thus, it is likely that the consistency and variation in the cases of the first and second persons may suggest the degree of empathy, although the implication of the use of the α case for the second person pronoun has not yet been clarified.²⁸

4.4. Summary

Table 5 summarizes the relations between verb classes and personal pronouns. I and IV indicate typical α case and β case verbs, respectively, while II and III, both of which are intermediate verb groups, correspond to group A and group B verbs in the above discussion. Furthermore, (+) indicates that some of these verbs are judged to be unable to take that case for the second person pronoun by some speakers.

²⁷ The possibility of empathy is also noted by Mithun (1991: 521–3) in Central Pomo and by Enrico (2003: 106–7) in Haida. One of the reviewers of this journal proposed the notion of “introspection” by which he meant accessibility to the thoughts of the person being talked about. Anyway, the notion of empathy may play some role in the case variations of personal pronouns associated with verbs of [-AGENCY] denoting states which are not perceptible to others. This needs more consideration.

²⁸ It is important to note that I suggest the validity of empathy to explain the consistency of case marking for the first person pronoun. The fact that the first person outranks the second person is also claimed by Dixon (1994: 85), who proposes “the nominal hierarchy” (or “potentiality of agency” scale in Dixon 1979: 85), in which the first person pronoun is more likely to function as an A than any other NP constituent, such as the second person pronoun and others. It seems that Dixon’s hierarchy is also based on an observation similar to Kuno’s empathy, in that they regard the first person (or the speaker) as the center of the event denoted by a predicate. It is interesting to note that the notion of empathy is employed to explain the agenthood of an NP constituent on the one hand, and the consistency of case marking for the first person pronoun on the other.

Table 5. Verb classes and personal pronouns

	1sg.α	1sg.β	2sg.α	2sg.β
I [+AGENCY, +CONTROL]	+	–	+	–
II [+AGENCY, ±CONTROL]	+	+	+	(+)
III [–AGENCY, ±CONTROL]	–	+	(+)	+
IV [–AGENCY, –CONTROL]	–	+	–	+

It is observed that these four verb classes are not mutually exclusive, and overlap with each other in some cases. In particular, the intermediate verbs, i.e., II and III, are fairly difficult to distinguish from each other as compared with I and IV, which are more rigidly defined. It is II and III that show inconsistency with regard to the choice of personal pronouns among the speakers I consulted. This fact may reveal that semantic features cannot be specified simply by the binary oppositions of [+/-]. For example, the minus status of one feature does not always imply that the feature is lacking entirely; rather, it implies that that feature can still be retained to some degree. The verbs from class I to class IV form a continuum ranging from verb class I to the other extreme, namely, verb class IV, with II and III falling between them. This sort of difficulty in obtaining an exact and exclusive semantic basis for explaining split intransitivity may be demonstrated for many languages, thus leading to the difficulty of characterizing an active type language in typological theory (see also Dixon 1979: 108).

5. Haida and Active Typology: [AGENCY] and [CONTROL]

From what we have observed thus far, we can posit two semantic features, [AGENCY] and [CONTROL], to capture split intransitivity in Haida, which manifests itself when the first (singular and plural) and second (singular) person pronouns are used as Ss. In other words, the split is only salient in the leftmost position in Dixon's (1994) Nominal Hierarchy. However, it is sometimes difficult to define these features unambiguously, which in turn produces inconsistencies and discrepancies in case markings among verbs or among speakers. In this section, we discuss some of these inconsistencies and related phenomena observed in Haida.

We have proposed two semantic features, [AGENCY] and [CONTROL], to explain split intransitivity in Haida. The former consists of <perform> and <instigate>, while the latter mainly concerns one's ability to control the action or situation. As discussed by Mithun (1991), although these two features are difficult to separate from each other, the present study argues that [AGENCY] and [CONTROL] should be treated as independent features to capture the split intransitivity in Haida.

Then, which of these two semantic features plays a more crucial role in the occurrence of α case and β case personal pronouns? If we take a closer look at Table 5 again, it seems that the feature [AGENCY] is more relevant to occurrences of α case personal pronouns, since α case pronouns tend to occur with verbs designated as [+AGENCY]. However, there are some cases where [CONTROL] plays a more

effective role in determining the case of personal pronouns. For example, see (47).

- (47) a. *dii* *t'iił-Ga-gən*
 1SG.β wet-become-PAST
 'I got wet.'
 b. *taa* *k'udχan=ʔuu* *t'iił-Ga-gən*
 1SG.α on.purpose=FOC wet-become-PAST
 'I got wet on purpose.'

As illustrated in (47a), the verb *t'iił* "be wet" takes the β case personal pronoun *dii*; however, when co-occurring with the adverb *k'udχan* "on purpose," the α case is used instead, as in (47b). The contrast between these two sentences may indicate that the choice of the case of the personal pronoun is determined by the context rather than a semantic feature of the verb itself. In this regard, Haida might be considered as a "fluid-S type" language (Dixon 1979, 1994) that shows variable case markings for an intransitive subject, depending on the controllability of its NP referent. (48), taken from a story narrated by a Haida speaker, is another example illustrating the fluid-S nature of Haida.

- (48) [...] *ʔə=xal-xab-xyay-daal* *hawiidχan=ʔuu* *xal-xab-xyay-daal*
 1SG.α=CL-INSTR-'GO'-along rapidly=FOC CL-INSTR-'GO'-along
 [...] *huu* *hayiy=ʔuu* *dii* *xal-xab-xyay-daal* [...]
 then merely=FOC 1SG.β CL-INSTR-'LEAP'-along
 '[All of sudden the wind blew hard, so] I went fast (on the sailing board). [I wanted to stop] and yet I just went fast.' [SHIP CD #5B-28 "Sail boarding" (Diane Brown)]

It should be noted that the same predicate *xal-xab-xyay-daal* can take either the α case or the β case, depending on the context. It is possible that the alternation of the α case with the β case implies total uncontrollability over the action on the part of the actor (= the speaker).²⁹

These examples may be regarded as evidence for the fluid-S nature of Haida; however, they also illustrate some difficulties in defining the feature [CONTROL]. It is defined ad hoc as it were, i.e., by the context in which the verb is used, and cannot be defined absolutely. It should also be noted that, as claimed by Dixon (1994: 53), it is difficult to designate each verb as controllable or uncontrollable solely on a semantic basis, because there might be some verbs that have to be treated as exceptions due to some lexical idiosyncrasy; thus, the feature [CONTROL] might not be

²⁹ However, such an interpretation was rejected by Mrs. Brown, which might suggest that another interpretation is possible: it is likely that the predicate, derived by the addition of the instrumental prefix *xal-* "with power" (Enrico 2005: 1166), can take two arguments, i.e., an omitted A (such as "wind") and *dii* as O. However, this interpretation also seems to be untenable because the candidate for A is not expressed in the foregoing sentences and, according to Enrico (ibid.), the instrument prefix does not trigger causativization. If causativization is observed, it would be possible to regard *dii* as O (= the causee).

inherent in each verb. On the other hand, [AGENCY] might be inherently relevant to each verb, since it seems that it is not as affected by the context as [CONTROL] is. However, it is difficult to give a definite answer to the question of which of the two features plays a more crucial role in determining the case marking of personal pronouns in Haida.

The problem is made more complicated by the inconsistencies in case choice observed among speakers, particularly for verbs of II and III. For example, one speaker accepts the α case pronoun, rejecting the β case for *dləguy* “fall down” (a verb belonging to group II), while another speaker accepts the β case pronoun. There are other examples of verbs where the choice of pronoun is inconsistent as well, such as *skaak’adəy* “get hiccups” (II) and *st’iigəy* “be jealous of NP” (III). Sometimes, the same speaker also provides the opposite response with regard to the use of personal pronouns for the same sentence. These discrepancies in response to the choice of case marking on personal pronouns among speakers may be caused by the fact that the distinction is solely based on the semantic features of verbs. Moreover, these discrepancies may be due to the fact, although speculative, that Haida has not been used as a daily language over a long period of time, in which case such a subtle difference cannot be easily maintained, thereby leading to different judgments among speakers.

6. Conclusion: Split Intransitivity and Active Typology

One of the features shared by the languages classified under the rubric of active type is split intransitivity, by which we mean that the S of an intransitive verb has two possibilities in terms of case marking: one is the same as the subject, A, while the other is the same as the object, O, of a transitive verb. This fact is easily perceived when we take a look at case markings on intransitive subjects, but the principle behind split intransitivity essentially belongs to the domain of semantics, and consequently, it is often observed that the principle does not work consistently even within one language, which leads to inconsistencies of case markings for intransitive subjects. It should also be pointed out that semantic features which play a crucial role in the phenomenon vary from one language to another. In some languages, lexical aspect is decisive, while in other languages, agency is more crucial than lexical aspect, or some other feature such as “affectedness” interacts with agency and lexical aspect.

Thus, A-marking verbs or O-marking verbs in one language do not necessarily coincide with those in another language; for example, verbs of inherent states, such as “tall,” “strong,” and “big,” among others, belong to β case verbs in Haida, but they are marked with A markers in Caddo and Mohawk. This is because, in these languages, the feature “affectedness” distinguishes A-marking verbs (lacking this feature) from O-marking verbs (having it) (Mithun 1991). The intermediate verbs in Haida are also variously marked among active type languages; thus, for example, the subject of “vomit” is marked with A in Lakhota, Mohawk, and Mopan Maya, but with O in Central Pomo; that of “stagger” is marked with A in Guaraní, but with O in Lakhota, Central Pomo, and Caddo; and that of “dream” is marked with

A in Lakshota, but with O in Eastern Pomo, and others.³⁰ It naturally follows that there is a wide diversity among active type languages, which makes it difficult to pursue an underlying principle that can apply to active type languages in general. Compared with formally-conditioned motivation (such as in the domain of morphosyntax), semantically-conditioned motivation is rather indiscernible, and frequently induces variation in assigning the surface case to the core arguments of verbs (cf. Klimov 1977 [1999: 73]).

The present study has clarified that [AGENCY] and [CONTROL] are relevant to split intransitivity in Haida, which manifests itself only when the S is either the first person or the second person. In other words, split intransitivity in Haida can only be perceived in verbs denoting human activities or states. Even in cases where the verb in question lacks these two features (e.g., “be good,” “be sleepy,” etc.), it is still related to some human propensity or state. Thus, animacy, although not overtly marked in nouns nor at any level of morphosyntax, also plays a significant role in Haida and perhaps in many active type languages (see Klimov 1977 [1999: 68] for a discussion on the correlation of animacy with active type languages).

In this context, it would be interesting to point out that Lyons (1968: 356–7) constructs “a theoretically ‘ideal’ system” in which the distinction between an “agentive” S and “non-agentive” S is clarified, as in *He moved* and *Him moved*. If this type of system is assumed to be ideal, then the distinction between them (agentive and objective, or active or stative/inactive, and others) would not be confined to so-called active type languages. In fact, such a dichotomy can be observed not only in active type languages, where it is evident in the form of a case marking system, but also in other domains of various languages, which are apparently not of the active type in view of morphological marking. For example, in Nivkh, split intransitivity is observed in the Ss of embedded clauses (Kaneko 2006); in Mapudungun, the patterning of the causativization of intransitive verbs reveals the split between inactive intransitives and active intransitives (Golluscio 2007); and in Slave, the split is observed in noun incorporation, causativization, and passivization, among other aspects (Rice 1991). These facts would serve as plausible evidence for assuming that split intransitivity is a prevailing feature in various levels of morphosyntax among many languages. I believe that a thorough and comprehensive theorization of active typology may be possible by pursuing and characterizing the structural correlations between split intransitivity and morphosyntax among diverse types of languages.

³⁰ Guaraní (Tupian), Lakshota (Siouan), Central Pomo (Pomoan), Caddo (Caddoan), and Mohawk (Iroquoian) are from Mithun (1991); Eastern Pomo (Pomoan) is from McLendon (1978); and Mopan Maya (Mayan) is from Danziger (1996).

Abbreviations

CAUS	causative	INSTR	instrumental
CL	classifier	INTER	interrogative
DEF	definite	NEG	negative
DUR	durative	PL	plural
EVD	evidential	PP	postposition
FOC	focus	PR	present
HABIT	habitual	PV	pro-verb
IMP	imperative	REF	reflexive
INCEP	inceptive	SG	singular
INFO	information		

References

- Anderson, Neil and Martha Wade (1988) Ergativity and control in Folopa. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 19: 1–16.
- Bakker, Egbert (1994) Voice, aspect and Aktionsart: Middle and passive in Ancient Greek. In: Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.) *Voice: Form and function*, 23–47. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brenenstuhl, Waltraud (1976) What we can't do. In: Salikoko S. Mufwene, Carol A. Walker and Sanford B. Steever (eds.) *Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society*: 59–71. Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Brenenstuhl, Waltraud and Krystyna Wachowicz (1976) On the pragmatics of control. *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 2: 396–405. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Dahlstrom, Amy (1983) Agent-patient languages and split case marking systems. *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 9: 37–46. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Danziger, Eve (1996) Split intransitivity and active-inactive patterning in Mopan Maya. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 62: 379–414.
- DeLancey, Scott (1984) Notes on agentivity and causation. *Studies in Language* 8(2): 181–213.
- DeLancey, Scott (1985a) On active typology and the nature of agentivity. In: Frans Plank (ed.), 47–60.
- DeLancey, Scott (1985b) Categories of non-volitional actor in Lhasa Tibetan. In: Arlene R. K. Zide, David Magier and Eric Shiller (eds.) *Proceedings of the Conference on Participant Roles: South Asia and Adjacent Areas: An Ancillary Meeting to the Chicago Linguistic Society Regional Meeting, April 25, 1984, University of Chicago*: 59–70. Bloomington: Indiana University Club.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1979) Ergativity. *Language* 55: 59–138.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Enrico, John (2003) *Haida syntax*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Enrico, John (2005) *Haida dictionary: Skidegate, Masset, and Alaskan dialects*. Fairbanks/Juneau: Alaska Native Language Center and Sealaska Heritage Institute.
- Foley, William and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (1984) *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Golluscio, Lucía A. (2007) Morphological causatives and split intransitivity in Mapudungun. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 73: 209–238.

- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
- Kaneko, Tohru (2006) Note on CAUSE in Nivkh. *Journal of Chiba University Eurasian Society* 9: 1–30. Chiba: Chiba University.
- Klimov, Georgij A. (1974) On the character of languages of active typology. *Linguistics* 131: 11–25.
- Klimov, Georgij A. (1977) *Tipologija jazykov aktivnogo stroja*. Moscow: Nauka. Japanese translation by Shuichi Ishida (1999) *Atarashii gengo ruikeigaku: Katsukaku kôzô gengo to wa nani ka*. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Klimov, Georgij A. (1979) On the position of the ergative type in typological classification. In: Frans Plank (ed.), 327–332.
- Krauss, Michael E. (1997) The indigenous languages of the North: A report on their present state. In: Hiroshi Shoji and Juha Janhunen (eds.) *Northern minority languages: Problems of survival*, 1–34. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Krauss, Michael E. (2007) Native languages of Alaska. In: Osahito Miyaoka, Osamu Sakiyama and Michael E. Krauss (eds.) *The vanishing languages of the Pacific Rim*, 406–417. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kuno, Susumu (1976) Subject, theme, and the speaker's empathy: A re-examination of relativization phenomena. In: Charles N. Li (ed.) *Subject and topic*, 417–444. New York: Academic Press.
- Leer, Jeff (1977) Introduction. In: Erma Lawrence (comp.) *Haida dictionary*, 12–153. Fairbanks: The Society for the Preservation of Haida Language and Literature and the Alaska Native Language Center.
- Levine, Robert D. (1977) The Skidegate dialect of Haida. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Lyons, John (1968) *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McLendon, Sally (1978) Ergativity, case, and transitivity in Eastern Pomo. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44: 1–9.
- Merlan, Francesca (1985) Split intransitivity: Functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. In: Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury (eds.) *Grammar inside and outside the clause: Some approaches to theory from the field*, 324–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne (1991) Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67: 510–546.
- Perlmutter, David (1978) Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 157–189. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Plank, Frans (1979) *Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*. London/New York: Academic Press.
- Plank, Frans (ed.) (1985) *Relational typology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rice, Keren (1991) Intransitives in Slave (Northern Athapaskan): Arguments for unaccusatives. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 57: 51–69.
- Sapir, Edward (1917) Review of C.C. Uhlenbeck: Het passive karakter van het verum transitivum of van het verum actionis in talen van Noord-Amerika. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1: 82–86.
- Swanton, John R. (1905) *Haida texts and myths: Skidegate dialect*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 29. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

- Swanton, John R. (1911) Haida. In: Franz Boas (ed.) *Handbook of American Indian languages*, Part 1, 205–282. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Thomson, Laurence (1979) The control system: A major category in the grammar of Salishan languages. In: Barbara S. Efrat (ed.) *The Victoria Conference on Northwestern Languages* (British Columbia Provincial Museum Heritage Record No. 4), 156–176. Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum.
- Thomson, Laurence (1985) Control in Salish grammar. In: Frans Plank (ed.), 391–428.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. (1990) Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66: 221–260.
- Vendler, Zeno (1967) *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Author's contact information:
 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
 Shizuoka University
 836 Oya, Suruga-ku, Shizuoka
 422-8529, Japan
 e-mail: jjhori@ipc.shizuoka.ac.jp

[Received 30 January 2008;
 Accepted 29 July 2008]

【要 旨】

ハイダ語における分裂自動詞性とその意味的動機付けについて

堀 博文
 静岡大学

北米北西海岸地域で話されるハイダ語は、自動詞節の主語として現われる人称代名詞が他動詞節の主語と同じ格の場合と目的語と同じ格の場合の二通りがある（但し、1人称単数と複数、2人称単数に限られる）。従って、ハイダ語は、「分裂自動詞性」（Merlan 1985）を有するといえ、活格型言語の典型的な例の1つと見做され得る。

分裂自動詞性を有する様々な言語において、それを決定付けるのは動詞の意味特徴であるが、どのような意味特徴が関与するかは言語によって異なる。

本稿では、「動作性」と「制御性」がハイダ語における分裂自動詞性に関与すると捉える。これらの意味特徴と更に人称代名詞の人称や格によって、ハイダ語の自動詞は4つに分類することができるが、意味特徴が主たる分類基準であるために、自動詞の分類は、厳密になされるものではない。更に、このことは、活格型言語を一般的に特徴付けることの難しさを示すものと考えられる。