Seventeenth Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS November 21, 2020

Launch of BivalTyp

Typological database of bivalent verbs and their encoding frames (www.bivaltyp.info)

Sergey Say Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS serjozhka@yahoo.com Dmitry Nikolaev Stockholm University mail@dnikolaev.com

Prominent role of valency for linguistic typology

- transitivity
- alignment
- voice and related phenomena: passive, reflexive, ...

Typology is mainly focused on major clause types

- monovalent: 'sleep', 'run', ...
- transitive: 'kill', 'break', ...
- ditransitive: 'give', ...

 All (?) languages have minor (a.k.a. non-canonical) valency patterns

 (Until recently) underrepresented in typological research

Goal: to fill this gap for bivalent verbs

- Why bivalent verbs?
 - they are especially prone to show deviant valency behaviour [Bickel et al. 2014]
- (1) The boy looked *at the clouds*(2) *Мне* нравится эта рубашка
 - they often form relatively large classes, unlike noncanonical trivalent verbs

Project: goals

- Which factors determine valency class assignment in individual languages?
- To what extent are valency classes similar across languages?
- What is the role of genealogical and areal factors?

- First-hand data
 - St. Petersburg-style typology

- Questionnaire with 130 verbs given in context
 - Wordlist-based approach: Nedjalkov 1969, Bossong 1998, Nichols et al. 2004, Nichols 2008, Malchukov & Comrie (eds.) 2015, etc.

#21 (Peter was crossing the river in a boat) 'Peter reached the bank' X

#22 (The wall was covered with fresh paint) 'Peter touched the wall' (and got dirty) X Y

=> Two pre-defined arguments (X, Y) for each predicate

• The valency of a verb = "the list of its arguments with their coding properties"

- Coding properties
 - flagging (cases & adpositions)
 - indexing (agreement, cross-referencing)
 - word order (rarely)

• Problem: coding devices (e.g. 'Instrumental case', 'post-verbal agreement slot', etc.) are language specific

• How to typologize behavior of verbs like 'be afraid', 'follow', 'listen', 'touch', etc.?

• Solution: use the lexical lists as a *tertium* comparation is = set partition variable

Eastern Armenian

#	Predicate	Translation				Valency Class
 21	reach	Petros-ə	hasav	ap'-i-n		
		Petros[NOM]-DEF reach:AOR:3SG bank-DAT-DEF				NOM_DAT
		'P. reached the bar				
22	touch	Petros- <i>ə</i>	dipav	pat-i-n		
		Petros[NOM]-DE	[NOM]-DEF touch:AOR: 3SG wall- DAT -DEF			NOM_DAT
		'Petros touched the wall'				
53	attack	Arĵ-ə	harjakvec'	jknors-i	vra	
	bear[NOM]-DEF attack:AOR:3SG fisherman-DAT on					NOM_DATvra
		'A bear attacked a	fisherman'			

=> Eastern Armenian equivalents of 'reach' and 'touch' belong to the same class; the equivalent of 'attack' is different

- 2010: first version of the questionnaire
- Laboratory for the typological study of languages, Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS
- Team members

Sergey Dmitrenko Dmitry Gerasimov Maria Kholodilova Viktor Khrakovskij Elena Kordi Olga Kuznecova Daria Mischenko Arseniy Vydrin Natalia Zaika

 2009-2013: two consecutive grants from the Russian Foundation for Humanities

 2010-present: collection and annotation of data contributed by a large group of supportive language experts without whose help the project would have never got of the ground

Further contributions are very welcome!

A big big THANK YOU to language experts

Anna Alexandrova, Ekaterina Aplonova, Peter Arkadiev, David Avellan-Hultman, Aleksandra Azargaeva, Mislav Benić, Sandra Birzer, Alena Blinova, Nadezhda Bulatova, Denis Creissels, Michael Daniel, Varvara Diveeva, Sergey Dmitrenko, Vladimir Fedorov, Timothy Feist, Dmitry Gerasimov, Elena Gorbova, Olga Gorickaja, Ingunn Hreinberg Indriðadóttir, Ildar Ibragimov, Emil Ingelsten, Vasilisa Kagirova, Maria Khazhomia, Maria Kholodilova, Mikhail Knyazev, Elena Kolpachkova, Daria (Suetina) Konior, Yukari Konuma, Elena Kordi, Richard Kowalik, Kirill Kozhanov, Irina Külmoja, Olga Kuznecova, Timur Maisak, Anastasia (Borisovna) Makarova, Anastasia (Leonidovna) Makarova, Ramazan Mamedshaxov, Solmaz Merdanova, Stepan Mikhajlov, Daria Mischenko, Zarina Molochieva, George Moroz, Rasul Mutalov, Galina Nekrasova, Johanna Nichols, Dmitry Nikolaev, Ajtalina Nogovitsyna, Sofia Oskolskaya, Maria Ovsjannikova, Elena Perekhvalskaja, Natalia Perkova, Krasimira Petrova, Inna Popova, Maria Pupynina, Neige Rochant, Alexander Rostovtsev-Popiel, Sergey Say, Ekaterina Sergeeva, Ksenia Shagal, Mayya Shlyakhter, Ksenia Studenikina, Evgenija Teplukhina, Mladen Uhlik, Anastasia Vasilisina, Arseniy Vydrin, Natalia Zaika, Andreja Zele, Ekaterina Zheltova, Vasilisa Zhigulskaja, Anastasia Zhuk



Year

2018: edited volume (in Russian)



Валентностные классы двухместных предикатов в разноструктурных языках

2020: Building the web-site

https://www.bivaltyp.info/

 All credit for this phase goes to Dmitry Nikolaev

Intermission

a virtual tour of BivalTyp [www.bivaltyp.info]

Potential applications

- transitivity ratio of verbs
- (dis)similarity distances between verbs
- typologically informed analysis of language-specific valency class systems
- transitivity profiles for languages
- (dis)similarity distances between languages
- comparison with genealogical and areal data
- comparison with structural data: case, WO, etc.
- predictability of valency patterns
- and many more

Transitivity ratio of verbs

Tsunoda's implicational transitivity hierarchy

1a) direct effect (kill, break subtype) >

1b) direct effect (*hit, shoot* subtype) >

2a) perception (see subtype) >

2b) perception (*look* subtype) >

3) pursuit (search, wait) >

4) knowledge (know, understand, remember, forget) >

5) feeling (love, like, want, need) >

6) possession (have) [Tsunoda 1981, modified in 1985].

 Only partially supported by the data from BivalTyp, see next slide

Transitivity ratio of verbs

1a) direct effect	break	1,00
1b) direct effect	hit	0,77
	shoot	0,25
2a) perception	see	0,88
	hear	0,86
2b) perception	look	0,30
	listen	0,67
3) pursuit	search	0,81
	wait	0,65
4) knowledge	know	0,88
	understand	0,84
	remember	0,71
	forget	0,41
5) feeling	love	0,76
	like	0,22
	need	0,25
6) possession	have	0,40

(Dis)similarity distances between verbs

Which verbs tend to pattern together?

 Distance metric D (V1, V2) = the ratio of languages where the two verbs V1 and V2 belong to different classes

 NeighborNet visualization of the distance matrix



Typologically informed analysis of language-specific valency class systems

 E.g., build a distance matrix of verbs based on their typological behaviour

 And explore the ways in which individual language's valency classes carve out sections of that space

Basic valency classes in North Eastern Neo-Aramaic against a typological background (MDS-visualization)



25

The ratio of intransitive verbs



(Dis)similarity distances between languages

 DistValPat: a dissimilarity metric based on Mutual Information

 Captures dissimilarities between the ways in which the verbal lexicon is partitioned into valency classes

Neighbornet visualization based on DistValPat



Comparison with genealogical and areal data

- Similarities in valency class organization, including minor classes
 - no family-level genetic effects
 - strong areal effects
- Similarities in transitivity profiles:
 - family-deep genealogical effects
 - no large-scale areal effects

DistValPat = Entropy-based distance between valency class systems



DistTrProf = Hamming distance between transitivity profiles



THANK YOU!

References

- Bickel, Balthasar, Taras Zakharko, Lennart Bierkandt & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, 2014. Semantic role clustering: An empirical assessment of semantic role types in non-default case assignment. Studies in language, 38 (3). Advances in research in semantic roles. 485-511.
- Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage de l'expérient dans les langues d'Europe'. In: Feuillet (ed.). Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 259–94.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative / causative verb alternations. In: Comrie, Bernard & Maria Polinsky (eds.) Causatives and Transitivity. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 87– 120.
- Nedjalkov, V.P. 1969. Nekotorye verojatnostnye universalii v glagolnom slovoobrazovanii. In: F. Vardul' (ed.). Jazykovye universalii i lingvisticheskaja tipologija. Moscow: Nauka. 106-114.
- Nichols, Johanna. 2008. Why are stative-active languages rare in Eurasia? Typological perspective on split subject marking. In Mark Donohue and Søren Wichmann (eds). The Typology of Semantic Alignment Systems, 121-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nichols, Johanna, David A. Peterson & Jonathan Barnes. 2004. Transitivizing and detransitivizing languages. *Linguistic Typology* 8: 149–211.
- Tsunoda, T. 1981. Split case-marking patterns in verb-types and tense / aspect / mood // Linguistics. Vol. 19. P. 389–438.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 21. 385–396.