

## Valence in Sidaama Reflexive and Reciprocal Constructions

Aynalem Girma<sup>1</sup>,

### Abstract

This study focuses on Sidaama reflexive and reciprocal constructions in relation to verbal valence adjustment. It aims at describing and analyzing how reflexive and reciprocal constructions are marked in the language. It also examines how these constructions affect the syntactic and semantic valence of verbs. To attain the objectives, exhaustive primary and secondary data were collected from primary and secondary data sources, respectively. To collect the secondary data, published and written materials were consulted first, since they can serve as sources of linguistic data and insight. Exhaustive primary data were collected from the native speakers of the language via elicitation. To gather the primary data, the informants were asked to translate the Amharic sentences and word lists into Sidaama. Then, the collected data were organized, phonemically transcribed (morphophonemic processes are taken into account) and glossed. Finally, the data were translated and analyzed. Based on the data analysis, the study yielded the following findings. Sidaama marks reflexive and reciprocal constructions morphologically, syntactically, lexically or both morphologically and syntactically. Morphological reflexive constructions decrease the syntactic valence of the verbs, whereas syntactic reflexive constructions do not affect the syntactic valence of the verb since the object slot is occupied by a reflexive pronoun. However, both morphological and syntactic reflexive constructions decrease the semantic valence of a verb. Because the action stated by the verb is not transmitted from one entity to another, the verb semantically remains intransitive. As already stated, Sidaama marks reciprocal constructions lexically, morphologically or syntactically or morphologically and syntactically. Syntactic reciprocal constructions do not affect the valence of a verb since the verb remains transitive both syntactically and semantically. However, the syntactic valence is affected when reciprocation is encoded lexically and morphologically since the object slot is left empty.

**Keywords:** valence, valence increasing devices, valence decreasing devices, reflexive and reciprocal constructions

### Introduction

The term valence was primarily introduced by the French linguist Tesnière (1893-1954) to cover the various numbers of core arguments in

---

<sup>1</sup> Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia; Email: [aynalemgirma@yahoo.com](mailto:aynalemgirma@yahoo.com)

sentences. The basic items of valence theory are valence carriers, core and non-core arguments. The theory considers a verb as the prime element of a sentence. The verb is the central valence carrier and the arguments depend on this valence carrying element. The verb governs its core arguments (i.e., subject and object). Modern valence theory is based on the idea that verbs structure sentences by binding specific arguments. However, except core arguments, other freely added oblique arguments or adjuncts are not determined by the verb. These are freely omitted optional non-core arguments. Verbs have a fixed relation between core arguments and their semantic roles.

In valence theory, the number of core arguments that depend on the verb constitutes its valence. Commonly, there are aivalent verbs (e.g., rain, sleep), monovalent/univalent verbs (e.g., die, cry), bivalent verbs (e.g., eat, kick) and trivalent verbs (e.g., borrow, lend). A verb with one, two and three core argument(s) are called intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verb, respectively (Payne, 2006, p.237). Verbs vary in the number of core or obligatory arguments that they require based on the communicative context. For example, the verb *give* in the sentence *Kasa gives the book in the bookstore to Aster* is a ditransitive or trivalent verb. It involves three obligatory participants one doing the giving and the one being given and the receiver. The NPs *Kasa*, *book* and the PP *to Aster* are valence governed core arguments; the PP *in the book store* is not governed since it is a non-core argument. In this clause, the verb *give* has a semantic valence of three. However, it may appear with a syntactic valence of 2 or 3 based on the communication context. The direct or indirect object of a verb can be omitted if it is construable from the situational context.

Valence is a syntactic notion, a semantic notion or both. Semantic valence (i.e., semantic role structure) refers to the number of necessary participants that must be on the stage in the scene expressed by the verb, while syntactic or grammatical valence is the number of verbal arguments grammatically present in any given structure (Payne, 2006, p.237). Thus, a verb can have various valences in different contexts (Payne, 1997. p.170).

A particular valence bearing element may have different core arguments based on the contexts in which it occurs (Crystal, 1997). Verbs increase or decrease the number of their core arguments via valence increasing and decreasing devices, respectively. Valence increasing and decreasing devices are structures that change the semantic and/or grammatical/syntactic valence of a verb. Payne (2006, p.24) states that:

Valence-related constructions can be categorized in terms of how they affect the idealized scene evoked by particular verbs. The communicative effect of increasing syntactic valence can be characterized most generally as bringing a participant that is normally not part of a scene, or on the margin of a scene, onto “center stage.” The effect of decreasing syntactic valence, on the other hand, is to downplay a normally center-stage participant to marginal status, or eliminate it from the scene altogether.

According to Payne’s (1997, p.172) and Payne’s (2006, p.240) functional typology of valence adjusting operators: valence increasing operators subsume causative, possessor rising, dative shift, dative of interest and applicative constructions. Payne also includes middle, reflexive, reciprocal, subject omission, object omission, object demotion, object incorporation, passive, inverse and antipassive as a valence decreasing devices. Among the enumerated valence decreasing operators, this study focuses only on reflexive and reciprocal constructions in Sidaama.

### **Reflexive and Reciprocal Constructions**

The term reflexive is used in the process of grammatical description to stand for a verb or structure where the subject and the object relate to the same entity (Crystal, 1997, p.408). Reflexive subsumes within the scope of the middle voice (Lyons, 1968, p.373). It is considered as a part of the middle voice because the subject is affected by the action which he/she herself/himself performs. The subject is both the agent and the patient of the action stated by the verb: a singular entity fulfills two thematic roles. Reflexive construction is a structure in which the subject and object (direct or indirect) of a sentence refer to the same entity. Reflexive verbs are formed from the non-reflexive ones and show situations where the subject and object are co-referential. According to Haspelmath (2002, p.13) reflexive construction is a function changing operation where the doer and the receiver of the action/ the indirect object expressed by the verb are co-referential. Comrie (1985, p.327) says that in some languages, in reflexive structures only the subject is expressed overtly, while a morphological reflexive marker affix (or other derivational marker) shows that the subject NP functions equally as a direct object NP. In languages that mark the reflexive construction syntactically, the co-referential object NP is expressed overtly. Thus, in reflexive constructions the object is shown as being referentially identical with the subject either by means of a reflexive pronoun (syntactically) or via an affix (morphologically), via reflexivization reflexive pronouns are introduced into a sentence.

Another construction which is structurally closely similar to reflexive is reciprocal construction.

The term reciprocal stands for classes (i.e., reciprocal verbs and reciprocal pronouns), which express the meaning of mutual relationship (Crystal, 1997, p.405). In reciprocal and reflexive constructions, the subject is both the agent and the patient of the action expressed by the verb. Hence the two constructions are conceptually very alike. In reciprocal, two different entities each acting upon the other are linked in a pair of reciprocal relations, while the reflexive involves a relation in which the agent and the patient are the same. Reciprocal constructions require plural subject, but the reflexive ones can have singular or plural subject.

Kemmer (1993, p.96) categorizes reciprocal construction into direct and indirect. In direct reciprocal constructions, the plural subject is the plural patient of the reciprocal action denoted by the verb. Thus, the same plural participant is the subject/agent and the direct object/patient of the action stated by the verb. Hence there is a double linking of participants to thematic roles. On the contrary, in indirect reciprocals the plural subject is not the patient of the action but the plural recipient. The agent and patient entities are completely distinct in indirect reciprocal actions.

Reciprocal constructions can also be divided into simultaneous or sequential based on temporal properties. As cited in Kemmer (1993, p.109), Lichtenberk (1985) identifies two possible temporal properties of reciprocal constructions: simultaneity vs. sequentially of reciprocal actions. Sequential reciprocal actions happen one after another, while simultaneous reciprocal actions co-occur together or simultaneously.

Some reciprocal actions are inherently reciprocals. In so-called "naturally reciprocal" events (e.g., meet, join, etc.) the object participant need not be overtly stated. For example, in English the reciprocal marker (the anaphoric pronoun 'each other') need not appear on such verbs; it appears chiefly if the speaker wants to emphasize the reciprocity of the action. Otherwise, these verbs are expressed as unmarked intransitives (Kemmer, 1993, p.102). When the verb is used without the reciprocal marker as a marked intransitive verb, the reciprocal construction can be considered as a syntactically valence-decreasing operation, since the valence of the normally transitive verb is reduced from transitive to intransitive. The semantic valence does not change; the originally transitive verb remains the transitive.

### **The Sidaama Language**

Sidaama belongs to the Afro-Asiatic Superfamily. It is one of the five Highland East Cushitic languages of Ethiopia. Highland East Cushitic subsumes Burji, Derasa, Hadiyaa, Kambaata and Sidaama. The term “Sidaama Language” is sometimes used as a group name or collective term for all highland East Cushitic languages of Ethiopia except Burji. In this sense, the term includes Derasa, Hadiyya, Kambaata and the Sidaama language itself. Bender (1976, p.13) says that Sidaama is also an old and misleading designation for “West Cushitic” (Omotic) languages. It is an Oromo word meaning “non-Oromo”.

Until 1991 the language was known by the name Sidamo. But since the name Sidamo is too general and misleading, the name of the language was changed to Sidaama (Anbessa 1994, p.1101). The self-designation for the Sidaama language is Sidamo K’ale (lit.Sidaama word) or Sidaamo Afo (lit. mouth of Sidaama). The term Sidaama is also the name of an awraja/district and province where the language is spoken (Bender 1976, p.13). Throughout this study, I will use the term Sidaama rather than Sidaamo.

Hudson (1976, p.233) explains that Sidaama is the most widespread language of the Highland East Cushitic group. It is nevertheless little differentiated into dialects. According to him, speakers of different centers and Sidaama clans are distinguishable by their speech but the variations are minimal. Anbessa (1987, p.2) also states that dialect variation between the Sidaama dialects is minimal and mutual intelligibility is complete. According to him Sidaama has two mutually intelligible dialects: the Alichu dialect and Gammojje dialect. The dialects have very little lexical difference. My informants were from each of the two dialects: they communicated with one another without any difficulty.

### **Review of Related Literature**

As compared to other Highland East Cushitic languages, considerable linguistic research has been conducted on the documentation and description of Sidaama. These are: senior essay papers, MA and PhD theses and various descriptive works written by various scholars. Many studies have been carried out on various linguistic aspects (i.e., phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax) of Sidaama. However, only those having direct relevance with the current study are briefly reviewed as follows.

Anbessa (1984) wrote his senior essay on “Sidaama verb Morphology”. In this work, he provides a description of some inflectional and

derivational morphemes of Sidaama verbs. However, he does not focus on how reflective and reciprocal constructions influence the argument structure of verbs. Another work is Anbessa's PhD dissertation (2000) entitled "A Grammar of Sidaama". In this study, he studies the grammar of Sidaama at all linguistic levels. However, only the section that focuses on verbal derivation is reviewed here based on its relevance. In this section, Anbessa deals with Sidaama verbal derivational morphemes and distinguishes */-am/*, */-s//siis/* and */-d/* as a passive, simple causative, double causative and auto-benefactive markers, respectively. However, he mentions nothing about reflexive and reciprocal constructions. He also does not discuss the effect of these constructions on the grammatical status of arguments and number of arguments of verbs (i.e., valence change).

Kawanchi (2007) also wrote his PHD dissertation on "the grammar of Sidaama". He deals with the documentation and description of Sidaama at all linguistic levels: phonology, morphology and syntax. In a nutshell, he covers the entire grammar of the language. I have reviewed only the morphology part of the work, since it is relevant to the current study. In this part, the verbal derivational morphemes are very briefly dealt with. He identifies */-am/* as a passive and a reciprocal morpheme, and */-s/*, */-siis/* and */-d/* as simple causative, double causative and middle voice markers, respectively. However, he does not deal with the influence of the aforementioned morphemes on the valence or argument structure of verbs.

His work also seems to have a number of problems. Kawanchi identifies */-d/* as a middle voice marker. According to him this suffix has the following allomorphs: */d, ʔr, ʔ, p', t'/*. However, of these 'allomorphs' none of them are middle markers except */-d/* and */-ʔr/*. The rest are neither allomorphs nor the result of assimilatory processes. In order to consider */p'/* and */t'/* as the result of assimilation they should have to be geminated, since a root-final consonant is glottalized when the middle morpheme */-d/* is suffixed to it and changes to a geminated ejective.

He has also apparently interpreted some of the data wrongly. According to him the following verbs have only middle forms and lack an active counterpart (i.e., they are deponents).

Verbs	Gloss
<i>/ʔosoʔla/</i>	'to laugh'
<i>/godoʔla/</i>	'to play'

*/kaʔla/* ‘to help’

*/gongoʔma/* ‘to role’

However, these verbs are not middle but rather are active verbs. The glottal stop found in these verbs is not a middle/ reflexive marker but is part of the verb root, since it is also found in the noun form of these verbs.

### **Statement of the problem**

As reviewed above, various linguistics works have been written on different linguistic aspects of Sidaama. However, none of them specifically deals with reflexive and reciprocal constructions. To my knowledge and on the basis of personal communication, no research has been conducted on this topic in Siadaama. The present study is meant to fill this gap.

### **Objective**

The central objective of the study is describing and analyzing the reflexive and reciprocal constructions of Sidaama. The study mainly confines itself on the following key points.

- Describing how Sidaama marks reflexive and reciprocal constructions.
- Analyzing how reflexivization and reciprocation influence the syntactic and semantic valence of verbs in Sidaama.

### **Significance**

This study has the following significance.

- It contributes to our knowledge of the grammar of the language.
- It may also serve as a cornerstone for researchers who are interested in studying reflexive and reciprocal constructions in other Cushitic languages, especially Highland East Cushitic languages.

### **Research Methodology and Procedures**

The following research methodology was followed. This study uses qualitative description since the data is not quantitative and cannot be quantified. The study relies on two types of data sources: elicitation and written texts and published materials. To collect the data, first, published and written materials were consulted since they can help as sources of linguistic data and insight. Second, appropriate sentence and word lists

were prepared in Amharic. Third, exhaustive primary data was collected from the native speakers of the language through elicitation. The informants were asked to translate the Amharic sentence and word lists into Sidaama orally, and the data was then phonemically transcribed (morphophonemic processes are taken into account) and glossed. Finally, the data was organized, transcribed and analyzed.

### **Data Analysis**

This subsection deals with how reflexive and reciprocal constructions are encoded via valence adjusting operators to adjust verbal valence in Sidaama.

### **Sidaama Reflexive Constructions**

Reflexive constructions can be expressed either morphologically or syntactically/analytically. Sidaama encodes the notion of reflexivization in both ways. Kemmer (1993, p.480) states that concerning the marking of reflexive situations, languages are categorized into two main types based on person. As cited in Kemmer (1993), Faltz (1985) refers to the two major types of reflexive marking systems as “strategically streamed” (reflexive marks all 3 persons distinctively) and “functionally streamed” (reflexive does not distinguish person, i.e., marks third person only). Kemmer states that the third person is given special status since it is the only person for which the referent is not inherently specified by deixis. This author considers the two kinds of reflexive marking systems as expressively motivated and functionally motivated, respectively. The expressive motivation is responsible for the explicit linguistic expression of information without taking into consideration whether the information is predictable or redundant. The economic motivation, on the other hand, is the opposing tendency which leads to the absence of explicit coding for semantic information when such information is expected, predictable or inherently present in a situation. With reflexive, the relevant semantic information (the person) is indeed recoverable without looking at the reflexive pronoun, since the same person is explicitly coded in the subject.

In Sidaama the expressive motivation wins. Like English, Sidaama marks all three persons in reflexives. In Sidaama morphological reflexivization is realized by using the derivational morpheme /-d/ i.e. the middle marker. While syntactic reflexivization involves a reflexive pronoun which is expressed in two ways: it can be expressed by combining the word /*ʔumo*/ (literally ‘self’ or ‘head’) and the possessive pronouns, or it



can be indicated by combining the independent accusative pronoun plus */-neente/*.

### **Morphologically Marked Reflexive Constructions**

Sidaama encodes Reflexivization morphologically by using the derivational morpheme */-d/*. In morphologically marked reflexive, only the subject is expressed overtly, but the reflexive affix (i.e. the middle marker) indicates that the subject nominal serves equally as direct object. Examples:

- |    |             |              |           |              |              |
|----|-------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| 1. | <i>ʔise</i> | <i>wonk'</i> | <i>-i</i> | <i>- d d</i> | <i>-anno</i> |
|    | she         | shield       | EP        | MID          | 3FS. IMP     |
- ‘She shields herself.’

Sidaama has some reflexive verbs that admit a reflexive interpretation. In these morphologically marked reflexives, the inherently divalent verbs become syntactically univalent, since the direct object is not overtly stated. Thus, the suffixation of the reflexive marker results in the reduction of the syntactic valence of the verb. The semantic valence of the verb is also decreased; since there is no transmission of the action stated by the verb from one entity to another (i.e. a single entity plays two /double thematic roles). As Comrie (1985, p.12) and Brown (1980, p.52) state, in order to talk about transitivity two different entities are required; the action denoted by the verb is considered to pass over from the agent /subject to the patient /direct object. Most inherently transitive Sidaama verbs are used in morphological reflexive structures, without an object (patient) NP: the direct object is construable from the reflexive (middle) suffix.

### **Syntactically Marked Reflexive Constructions**

Sidaama marks reflexive constructions syntactically by using two kinds of reflexive pronouns (i.e., the reflexive pronouns based on */-neente/* and */ʔumo/*). Van Valin (2001, p.42) states that in some languages there is more than one type of reflexive pronoun. In Sidaama, the syntactic reflexive construction is of this type, as there are two kinds of reflexive pronouns. First, the reflexive pronoun can be expressed by using the bound morpheme */-neente/* preceded by accusative pronouns, as in the following paradigm.

2.	1SG	/ʔaneneente/	‘myself’
	1PL	/ninkeneente/	‘ourselves’
	2SG	/ʔateneente/	‘yourself’
	2PL	/kiʔneneente/	‘yourselves’
	3MSG	/ʔisoneente/	‘himself’
	3FSG	/ʔiseneente/	‘herself’
	3PL	/ʔinsoneneente/	‘themselves’

These reflexive pronouns are used to encode reflexive constructions syntactically. To construct a grammatically well-formed reflexive construction the feature matching condition must be satisfied between the antecedent and the reflexive pronoun: if two NPs are assigned the same index (i.e. if they are co-referential), they must match in features like gender, number, person, etc. (Radford, 1987, p.14). Examples:

3. a. *ʔinsa ʔinsoneneente gawajj -i -t -u*  
 they themselves hurt EP 3PL PF

‘They hurt themselves.’

b. *ʔisi ʔisoneente gawajj -i*  
 he himself hurt 3MSG.PF

‘He hurt himself.’

In these clauses, the subject personal pronouns /ʔinsa/ ‘they’ and /ʔisi/ ‘he’ are the antecedents of the reflexive pronouns /ʔinsoneneente/ ‘themselves’ and /ʔisoneente/ ‘himself’, respectively. The feature matching condition is satisfied: the antecedent matches the reflexive anaphora in person, number and gender and hence the above constructions are well-formed. In the above reflexive constructions, there is no transmission of action from one entity to another (i.e., no transitivity) since the subject and object positions are occupied by the same entity.

Reflexive pronouns are anaphors since they have no independent reference. Anaphoric expressions are context dependent pro-forms or kinds of deictic expressions since they take their reference from their c-commanding arguments. As anaphors, they also can never occupy the subject position, since anaphors must be bound within the sentence. For instance, a structure like the following is not acceptable or ungrammatical.

4. \**ʔisoneente ʔisi gawajj -i*  
 himself he hurt 3MSG.PF  
 ‘He hurt himself.’

This sentence is ungrammatical since the subject position is occupied by the reflexive pronoun */ʔisoneente/* ‘himself’. Reflexive pronouns do not occupy the subject slot since they are anaphors and must be bound within the sentence. In the above example, the reflexive pronoun */ʔisoneente/* ‘himself’ has no independent reference and needs a c-commanding argument.

In addition to the reflexive pronouns formed based on */-neente/*, Sidaama also expresses reflexivization syntactically in a different way by combining the noun */ʔumo/* (‘head’ or ‘self’) with the possessive (accusative or object) suffixes. The full paradigm of Sidaama reflexive pronouns built on */ʔumo/* is presented as follows:

5. 1SG	<i>/ʔumoʔja/</i>	‘myself’
1PL	<i>/ʔumonke/</i>	‘ourselves’
2SG	<i>/ʔumokki/</i>	‘yourself’
2PL	<i>/ʔumoʔne/</i>	‘yourselves’
3MSG	<i>/ʔumosi/</i>	‘himself’
33FSG	<i>/ʔumose/</i>	‘herself’
3PL	<i>/ʔumonsa/</i>	‘themselves’

Like the reflexive pronouns based on */-neente/*, this reflexive pronoun paradigm is also used to mark reflexive constructions syntactically. The following clauses show how Sidaama reflexive pronouns based on the word */ʔumo/* (‘head or self’) can be used in clauses to mark reflexivization syntactically.

6. a. *Dantʃile ʔumo -se t'on -t -u*  
 Danchile self her insult 3FSG PF  
 ‘Danchile insulted herself.’
- b. \**ʔisi ʔumo-se laʔ -i*  
 he self her see 3MSG.PF  
 \* ‘He saw herself.’

In sentence (6a) the structure is grammatical because the third person feminine singular anaphora /ʔumose/ ‘herself’ is bound by a suitable third person singular feminine antecedent, so that the feature matching condition is satisfied. By contrast, sentence (6b) is ungrammatical, since the feature matching condition is not satisfied between the antecedent and the reflexive anaphora. If reflexive markers are used in a sentence where they have no antecedent, the sentences become uninterpretable or syntactically ill-formed. However, the reflexive pronoun can be employed with a covert antecedent in a reflexive imperative construction.

As with reflexive pronouns of the /ʔisoneente/ series, reflexive pronouns built on /ʔumo/ can never occupy the subject position since (as anaphors) they have no independent reference and are thus uninterpretable as subjects. A structure like the following is ungrammatical because the antecedent ‘he’ does not occupy the right structural position. Example:

7. \*ʔumo -si ʔisi taʔ -i  
 self him he snap 3MSG-PF

‘He snapped himself.’

The reflexive pronoun /ʔumosil/ ‘*himself*’ must be bound, so its antecedent nominal must occupy the subject structural position; thus, the reflexive pronoun cannot itself be a subject. In the syntactic reflexive constructions represented above, a single entity plays two semantic roles, but it overtly occupies two syntactic positions. Thus, unlike morphological reflexivization syntactic reflexivization does not affect syntactic valence hence is not treated as a valence-decreasing operation. The verbs appear with two explicit arguments and thus remain transitive. On the other hand, the semantic valence of the verb is affected: the sentences are semantically intransitive, and the two arguments do not refer to two distinct entities in the discourse. The semantic valence of the verb is affected by reflexivization, since the action expressed by the verb is not performed on another entity distinct from the subject (i.e. there is no transmission of action from one entity to another). Rather, a single entity fulfills two semantic roles and/or grammatical relations at once (Payne, 1997, p.198).

### **Sidaama Emphatic Reflexive**

Unlike reciprocal pronouns, Sidaama reflexive pronouns are used to express emphasis. Emphatic or intensive reflexive pronouns are used simultaneously with their antecedent to give special emphasis for it (e.g., I myself will come). Like in English, in Sidaama, an extended use of the

reflexive pronouns built on /ʔumo/ is expressing emphasis. When the word /ʔumo/ is combined with a possessive pronoun to strengthen a noun or pronoun which occupies the subject slot, its ending vowel is altered into the nominative ending /i/. The reflexive pronouns formed on /-neente/ are not used to emphasize a noun or pronoun that occupies the subject slot. Examples:

8. a. ʔani ʔumiʔja daj -ee -mm -o  
 I self my come IMP 1SG M  
 ‘I myself (will) come.’

b. \*ʔani ʔaneneete daj -ee -mm -o  
 I myself come IMP 1SG M  
 ‘I myself (will) come.’

The first example is grammatical while the second one is not since the reflexive pronouns based on /-neente/ are not used to express emphasis of the subject argument. The emphatic reflexive pronouns built on /ʔumo/ can also be used to strengthen a noun or an accusative pronoun that occupies the object slot. In this case, it is the absolutive form of the reflexive pronoun that is used, as would be expected for an object nominal. There are different object reflexive pronouns for the three persons (for more information see syntactically marked reflexive)

Beside subject, to emphasize a noun or accusative pronoun that fills the object slot, the reflexive pronoun built on /-neente/ may also be used. However, such pronouns cannot be employed to focus on a noun or pronoun that occupies the subject position. Examples:

9. a. ati ane umo -ʔja t'on -i -tt -o-ʔe  
 you me self my insult-PF-2SG-M-1SG.OBJ.SUFF  
 ‘You insulted me myself’.

b. \*ati ane aneneente t'on -i -tt -o-ʔe  
 you me myself insult-PF-2SG-M-1SG.OBJ.SUFF  
 ‘You insulted me myself’.

In these examples, the reflexive pronoun built on /ʔumo/ and /-neente/ is used to emphasize the direct object of the verb. The syntactic valence of the verbs is not affected since the subject and object slots are occupied.

The semantic valence of the verbs is also not affected since the subject and object slots are occupied by two different non co-referring arguments. Hence, there is transmission of action from the agent to patient (i.e., two different entities are involved in the action expressed by the verbs). The reflexive pronoun built on /ʔumo/ can be used to emphasize both subject and object nouns or pronouns. However, the reflexive pronoun based on /-neente/ is not used to encode emphasis.

### Sidaama Reciprocal Constructions

Reciprocal construction is a structure in which each of the participants plays the role of agent and patient with respect to the other. Arce-Arenales et.al (1994, p.4) say the reciprocal construction is another subtype of middle voice in which the plural subject is both affected by the action and instigates the action. A prototypical reciprocal construction is a structure in which two participants equally act upon each other, i.e. both are equally agent and patient. As cited in Kemmer (1993, p.97), Lichtenberk (1985) explains that in the primary reciprocal constructions exactly two participants A and B are involved and the relation in which A stands to B is identical to that of in which B stands to A (i.e., the same relation is realized twice). Kemmer (1993) states that more than two entities can participate in reciprocal events. When multiple entities are involved in the possibility for distributive or reciprocal relations between individual pairs of participants arises in contrast to the strict reciprocity of a primary or prototypical reciprocal event that involves only two participants, the process of reciprocation essentially conflates two independent sentences. Example:

10. a. *dantjile dangiso -ra daftara moor -t -u*  
 Danchile Dangiso -DAT exercise\_book steal-3FSG.PF  
 ‘Danchile stole Dangiso’s exercise book.’
- b. *dangiso dantjile-ra daftara moor-i*  
 Dangiso Danchile-DAT exercise\_book steal-3MSG.PF  
 ‘Dangiso stole Danchile’s exercise book.’
- c. *dangiso–nna dantjile mimmitinsa daftara moor -t -u*  
 Dangiso and Danchile each other (3PL) exercise\_book steal -3PL-PF  
 ‘Dangiso and Danchile stole each other’s exercise book.’

The simple clause in (10a) and (10b) convey a single proposition: each participant plays a single role in the event, whereas the reciprocal

construction in (10c) is a combination of these two simple clauses. Unlike the simple clauses in (10a) and (10b), the reciprocal clause in (10c) conveys two different propositions (i.e., Danchile stole Dangiso's exercise book.' and Dangiso stole Danchile's exercise book.) In the reciprocal clause, each participant plays a single role since the patient of the action is not the conjoined nouns but a distinct entity /*daftara*/ 'exercise book'. This is an indirect not a direct reciprocal construction. In indirect reciprocal constructions the agent and patient entities are entirely distinct. In the reciprocal construction in (10c) reciprocity is marked syntactically. Sidaama marks reciprocal actions morphologically, syntactically or lexically. The next sections will be devoted to reciprocal marking in Sidaama.

### Lexically Marked Reciprocal Constructions

In Sidaama, reciprocity can be expressed lexically in the case of inherently or naturally reciprocal verbs. Naturally reciprocal events are actions or states in which the relationship among the participants is typically or necessarily mutual or reciprocal (verbs like 'meet', 'fight' and 'kiss'). In naturally reciprocal events, there is low degree of distinguishability between the two events that constitute the relations between the participants. Verbs of naturally reciprocal actions are either necessarily (e.g., /*t'aad-*/ 'meet') or else very frequently (e.g., /*heewis-*/ 'fight') semantically reciprocal. Naturally reciprocal verbs (e.g., /*t'aad-*/ 'meet') express the mutual relationships realized between entities by themselves without involving any grammatical marking. These are semantically restricted set of verbs that encode naturally reciprocal actions and relations. Sidaama naturally reciprocal verbs can be used without any reciprocal marker and with no object participant (i.e., no reciprocal object). When no object participant is expressed the syntactic valence of the verb is affected since the inherently basic transitive verb becomes intransitive. Instead of A performing the (transitive) action on B, A and B mutually perform the (intransitive) action together. The reciprocal marker can optionally be used with such verbs. In this case the reciprocity of the action is emphasized. Example:

11. a. *ʔise -nna ʔisi summuu ji -t -u*  
 she and he agree say-3PL-PF  
 'She and he agreed.'

- b. *ʔise -nna ʔisi mimmitinsawa summuu ji-t-u*  
 she and he each other (3PL) agree say-3PL-PF

‘She and he agreed with each other.’

These clauses express a reciprocal event. In the first clause, the reciprocal event is expressed only by the inherently reciprocal verb. In the second clause, the reciprocal event is emphasized since it is encoded by the inherently reciprocal verb and reciprocal pronoun. In the first clause, the syntactic valence of the verb is reduced, whereas in the second one it remains the same since the object slot is occupied by the reciprocal pronoun. On the other hand, the semantic valence of the reciprocal verb remains transitive in both clauses since the action stated by the verb is transmitted from one entity to another (i.e., the verb is transitive). Inherently reciprocal verbs like /*t'aad-*/ ‘meet’ mark reciprocity lexically. Example:

12. a. *ʔisi ʔise ledo doogote t'aad -i*  
 he she with road meet 3MSG.PF

‘He met with her on the road.’ (Naturally reciprocal)

- b. *ʔisi dangiso -nna ʔisi ledo doogote t'aad -i*  
 he Dangiso and her with road meet 3MS.PF

‘He met with Dagiso and her on the road. (Naturally reciprocal)

- c. *dantjile -nna daraaro doogote mimmitinsa -nni t'aad -d -u*  
 Danchile and Daraaro road each other (3PL) with meet 3PL PF

‘Danchile and Daraaro met each other on the road’.

These are reciprocal constructions. In clause (12a) and (12b), reciprocity is encoded only by the inherently reciprocal verb /*t'aad-*/, whereas in clause (12c), it is marked by the inherently reciprocal verb /*t'aad-*/ and the reciprocal pronoun/*mimmitinsawa*/. The reciprocal action is emphasized in (12c) due to the presence of the reciprocal pronoun. The number of the reciprocal action is increased as the number of the participants of the event is increased as clause (12b) illustrates. The next section dwells on morphological reciprocal.

### Morphologically Marked Reciprocal Constructions

Besides lexical reciprocal constructions, morphological reciprocal constructions are common in Sidaama. It has specialized reciprocal constructions encoded morphologically by the derivational morpheme /-



*am/*. This is the same as the passive morpheme. When it is suffixed to verbs having a plural subject, the structure can thus have two readings: Passive and reciprocal. Example:

13. a. *ʔinsa kaaʔl -an -t -u*  
 they help PASS/RECIP 3PL PF  
 1. ‘They helped each other.’  
 2. ‘They were helped.’
- b. *kiʔne kaaʔl -an -tin -i*  
 you (PL) help PASS/RECIP 2PL PF  
 1. You helped each other.’  
 2. You were helped.’

In clause (13a) and (13b) the object arguments are reciprocalized, which means that it is not explicitly stated. However, the verbal reciprocal marker indicates the object reciprocalized arguments. In these morphologically marked reciprocal constructions the conjoined subject co-refers with the covert object. Though the object position is not overtly occupied in these morphologically marked reciprocal constructions, it is possible to predict that underlyingly there is a co-referential object.

As already noted, in Sidaama different valence-changing operations are marked by the same suffix. Middle and reflexive are marked by the same derivational morpheme */-d/*. Passive and reciprocal constructions are also marked by the same derivational morpheme */-am/*. In the above clauses, reciprocity is marked morphologically by the derivational morpheme */-am/*. The syntactic valence of the verb is reduced in morphologically marked reciprocal since the object slot is left empty and the verb has only one syntactic argument. The verb in the above reciprocal constructions is semantically bivalent though it is syntactically monovalent since the direct object slot is empty. Both reciprocants occupy only the subject position. There is no object marker on the verbs and no NP in the object position.

As the above examples show, the construction with */-am/* is ambiguous in Sidaama. To avoid the ambiguity the syntactic reciprocal marker/reciprocal pronouns can be used. When */-am/* is suffixed to verb having a plural subject, and if there is the postposition */ledo/* ‘with’ or the

syntactic reciprocal marker or both, the structure cannot have a passive reading. Examples:

14. a. *dangiso -nna dantjile ?insa insawa kaaʔl -an -t -u*  
 Dangiso and Danchile each other (PL) help RECIP 3PL PF  
 ‘Dangiso and Danchile helped each other.’

b. *dantjile dangiso ledo sunk’ -am -i*  
 Danchile Dangiso with kiss RECIP 3FSG.PF

‘Danchile and Dangiso kissed each other.’ (lit. Danchile kissed each other with Dangiso).

Clause (14a) has no passive reading due to the reciprocal pronoun */?insa insawa/* ‘each other’. The syntactic valence of the verb is also not affected due to the presence of the reciprocal pronoun. Clause (14b) has also no passive reading due to the postposition */ledo/* ‘with’. The topic (i.e. a matter dealt with in a text, usually a subject) of sentence (14b) is Danchile since it focuses on Danchile not on Dangiso. Apparently, Danchile is the instigator of the reciprocal action performed by the reciprocants. However, in (14b) the syntactic valence of the verb is affected since the object position is empty.

In general, in morphologically marked reciprocal construction, the conjoined subject co-refers with the covert object though the object slot is not overtly occupied. Hence, it is possible to predict the presence of an underlying co-referential object. In morphological reciprocal constructions with no reciprocal pronoun, the verb acts syntactically more like intransitive than transitive and the co-referential object nominal is not explicitly stated. Morphologically marked reflexive constructions can be taken as a valence-decreasing operation. This is in agreement with the valence behavior of */-am/* as a passive marker, where the valence is again decreased. The purely morphologically marked reciprocal constructions decrease the semantic and the syntactic valence of the verb. The semantic valence of the verb is affected, since the plural agent and the plural patient entities are the same or identical set. However, there is still transmission of action from one entity to another, since the individual participants do not act on themselves reflexively. Similarly, in a purely morphological reciprocal construction, the syntactic valence of the verb is also affected since object position is not overtly occupied. The verb acts more like intransitive than transitive.

### Syntactically Marked Reciprocal Constructions

Besides morphological reciprocal, reciprocity is expressed syntactically by an independent reciprocal pronoun that can be formed in two ways. It can be formed by combining the reciprocal word */mimmito/* ‘each other’, the accusative or possessive suffixes (the two types of suffixes have the same phonological form in the plural) and the form */-wa/*. Example:

15. a. */mimmitinkewa/* ‘each other’ (1PL) /‘we each other’  
 b. */mimmiti?newa/* ‘each other’ (2PL) /‘you one another’  
 c. */mimmitinsawa/* ‘each other’ (3PL) /‘they each other’

This is the paradigm of reciprocal pronouns built on the reciprocal word */mimmito/* in Sidaama. It denotes a mutual relationship between two subjects or objects via the aforementioned reciprocal pronouns. It encodes reciprocity analytically or syntactically by combining the reciprocal word */mimmito/* ‘each other’ plus plural accusative/possessive suffixes and the particle */-wa/*. Examples:

16. a. *danboowe -nna dangiso mimmitinsa ledo kaa?l -t -u*  
 Danbowe and Dangiso each other (3PL) with help 3PL PF  
 ‘Danbowe and Dangiso helped each other.’  
 b. *danboowe -nna dangiso mimmitonsa sunk’i -t -u*  
 Danbowe and Dangiso each other (3PL) kiss 3PL PF  
 ‘Danbowe and Dangiso kissed each other.’

The reciprocal relation is encoded syntactically by a reciprocal pronoun */mimmitonsa/* in the above examples. The reciprocal marking word */mimmito/* ‘each other’ may be used without a person marking suffix without a major meaning difference except focus. Example:

17. *danboowe -nna bule mimmito gan -t -u*  
 Danbowe and Bule each other hit 3PL PF  
 ‘Danbowe and Bule hit each other.’

Besides the reciprocal pronouns based on */mimmito/* ‘each other’ alternatively, Sidaama forms reciprocal pronouns by combining the reduplicated form of the nominative or accusative pronouns (which have

the same phonological form in the plural) with the same particle /-wa/. Examples:

18. a. /*ninke ninkewa*/ 'each other' (1PL)  
 b. /*kine ki?newa*/ 'each other' (2PL)  
 c. /*insa ?insawa*/ 'each other' (3PL)

These reciprocal pronouns can also be used to convey a mutual feeling or action among the referents of a plural subject. Because, in reciprocal constructions there is more than one subject involved in the reciprocal action, that is, there are more people doing an action to each other. Sidaama encodes reciprocity analytically or syntactically through the reduplicated accusative/nominative pronouns plus the particle /-wa/. The language also encodes a reciprocal relationship morphologically and syntactically at once/, by using the reciprocal morpheme /-am/ and one of the analytic reciprocal pronouns simultaneously. In this case, the reciprocity of the verbal action is not ambiguous since the construction doesn't have a passive reading due to the presence of the reciprocal pronoun. Example:

19. *dantʃile -nna dangiso mimmitinsawa hank'af -an -t -u*  
 Dachile and Dangiso each other (PL) embrace RECIP 3PL PF  
 'Danchile and Dangiso embraced each other.'

Reciprocal actions usually involve plural entities (i.e., agents/subjects) whether the reciprocal constructions are encoded lexically, morphologically or syntactically. Cross-linguistically, syntactic reciprocal pronouns require a plural antecedent that c-commands them, since reciprocal actions must involve more than one entity. The reciprocal anaphors (like reflexive anaphors) are bound and have no independent reference (i.e., they are anaphors). They take their reference from their c-commanding antecedent. In the preceding reciprocal construction, the plural subject c-commands or governs the analytic reciprocal pronoun. When reciprocity is explicitly encoded syntactically (with or without the morphological reciprocal marker) the reciprocal construction cannot be considered as a valence-decreasing operation. The syntactic valence of the verb remains the same since the subject and object positions are overtly occupied. However, the semantic valence of the verb is affected, just as with the morphological reciprocal.

## Temporal Properties of Reciprocal Constructions

Reciprocal constructions can be simultaneous or sequential based on temporal properties. Sequential reciprocal actions happen one after another, while simultaneous reciprocal actions co-occur together. Sidaama has reciprocal constructions of both kinds. Examples:

20. a. *dantfile dangiso ledo ada -an -t -u*  
 Danchile Dangiso with marry RECIP 3FSG PF  
 ‘Danchile and Dangiso married each other.’
- b. *ɖise ɖisi ledo doogote t'aad -d -u*  
 she he with road meet 3FSG PF  
 ‘She and he met on the road.’

These prototypical reciprocal constructions denote situations where both participants involve, simultaneously, in symmetric actions. The reciprocal actions in these clauses are simultaneous because in example (20a) the action of marrying each other and in clause (20b) the action of meeting each other, inevitably happen at a single moment simultaneously. On the other hand, reciprocal actions can happen sequentially. Sequential reciprocal actions happen one after another. Example:

21. *ɖise ɖisi ledo t'on -an -t -u*  
 she he ledo insult RECIP 3FSG PF  
 ‘She and he insulted each other.’

By contrast, in this clause the reciprocal action (i.e., the action of insulting) can easily be sequential. In this sequential reciprocal action, the two participants are involved in the reciprocal action of insulting each other one after another in a continuing series. In the example, the plural subject is identical with the plural patient of the reciprocal action denoted by the verb, thus, it is a direct reciprocal construction. Thus, the same plural participant is the subject/agent and the direct object/patient of the action stated by the verb. There is a double linking of participants to thematic roles thus; each participant is linked to both thematic roles.

### Direct and Indirect Reciprocal

The plural subject is the plural patient of the reciprocal action in direct reciprocal constructions, whereas in indirect reciprocals, the plural subject is not the patient of the action but the plural recipient. Except

example (10c), all the examples given above are direct reciprocals since the agent and patient entities are the same. The next sentences are indirect reciprocal constructions.

22. a. *dantjile -nna dangiso buna kojs -an -t -u*

Danchile and Dangiso coffee offer RECIP -3PL -PF

‘Danchile and Dangiso offered coffee to each other.’

b. *dantjile -nna dawak’o mimmitinsa -ra ba?raa?ra ?uji -t -u*

Danchile and Dawakm each other (3PL) to gift give 3PL PF

‘Danchile and Dangiso gave a gift to each other.’

In sentence (22a) the reciprocity is encoded morphologically by the reciprocal suffix */-am/*, whereas in (22b) it is marked syntactically by the reciprocal pronoun */mimmitinsara/* ‘to each other’. These examples are indirect reciprocal constructions because the agent and patient entities are totally different. In both clauses, the patient entity is not the plural subject but a different entity, */buna/* ‘coffee’ and */ba?raa?ra/* ‘gift’, respectively. Unlike in direct reciprocal constructions, the reciprocity here concerns the agent and the recipient, not the agent and the patient. Thus, it is an indirect reciprocal construction. In these indirect reciprocal constructions, the plural subject is not the patient of the action but the plural recipient; there is a different entity that functions as the patient. The agent and patient entities are completely different. Thus, there is no double linking of participants to thematic roles.

As the examples given in this section show, the postposition */ledo/* ‘with’ can be either present or absent in the morphological and the syntactic reciprocal constructions. In reciprocal construction, if the subject of the sentence with two nominals are not combined with the bound coordinating conjunction */-nna/* ‘and’, then */ledo/* must be used. If the subject of the sentence contains more than two nominals both */ledo/* and */-nna/* must be used. Example:

23. a. *?isi dantjile dangiso -nna daraaro ledo t’aad -i*

He Danchile Dangiso and Dararo with meet 3MSG.PF

‘He met with Danchile, Dangiso and Dararo.’

When */ledo/* appears after the reciprocal word */mimmito/* ‘each other’ plus accusative suffix the bound form */-wa/* which is otherwise added to the accusative suffix is not used. In the above reciprocal construction, the singular subject ‘he’ may meet with *Danchile*, *Dangiso* and *Dararo*

simultaneously or sequentially. The above clauses emphasize on the singular subject ‘he’.

### Summary and Conclusion

The topic of this study is valence in Sidaama reflexive and reciprocal constructions in relation to verbal valence adjustment. The main objective of the study is describing and analyzing the reflexive and reciprocal constructions. The study followed a descriptive approach. To attain the objective of the study, exhaustive primary and secondary data were gathered from primary and secondary data sources. The primary data were collected from the native speakers of the language via elicitation. While the secondary data were collected through consulting published and written materials. The collected data were transcribed, glossed, translated and analyzed. Based on the analyzed data the following results were yielded.

Sidaama reflexive and reciprocal constructions are very similar though they have a structural difference. In reflexive constructions, a reflexive pronoun can be a direct or indirect object of the verb. Hence, the subject and object of the verb refer to the same entity. Unlike reflexive constructions, reciprocal constructions always require a plural subject that performs the reciprocal action, which is, there are more people doing an action to each other. They also involve a reciprocal pronoun that refers back to the subject or object of the verb. Sidaama encodes reflexive and reciprocal constructions morphologically, syntactically or lexically. It marks reflexive and reciprocal constructions morphologically by the middle and passive voice marking derivational suffix */-d/* and */-am/*, respectively. Thus, the reflexive and middle voice morpheme is identical. Likewise, the reciprocal and passive morpheme is the same. Reflexivization can also be marked syntactically by the reflexive pronouns built on */-neente/* or

*/-ʔumo/*. Similarly, reciprocal constructions are also encoded syntactically by the reciprocal pronouns formed in two ways. Besides, reflexive and reciprocal constructions can be marked both morphologically and syntactically. Reciprocal structures can be encoded lexically by using inherently reciprocal verbs.

Unlike morphological reflexivization, syntactic reflexivization does not affect the syntactic valence of a verb since the object slot is occupied by a reflexive pronoun. Hence, morphological reflexivization is not a valence decreasing device. However, syntactic reflexivization affects the semantic valence of a verb and the verb becomes semantically

intransitive since the reflexive action is not transmitted from one entity to another.

Sidaama naturally reciprocal verbs can be used without any reciprocal marker and object argument. The syntactic valence of the verb is affected in lexically marked reciprocal constructions and the inherently basic transitive verb becomes intransitive. With the morphological reciprocal, the Sidaama verb acts syntactically more like intransitive than transitive, since the co-referential object nominal is not explicitly stated. Hence morphological reciprocal constructions are a valence-decreasing operation. However, the semantic valence of the verb remains the same since the reciprocal action can be transmitted from one entity to another entity.

Sidaama reflexive and reciprocal constructions influence the argument structure of verbs. Morphologically and syntactically marked reflexivization decreases the semantic valence of the verb due to the absence of action transmission from one entity to another. Syntactically marked reciprocal constructions do not reduce the semantic valence of verbs since the reciprocal action is transmitted from one entity to another. The syntactic valence of the verb also remains the same since the object slot is occupied by reciprocal pronouns. Sidaama reflexive and reciprocal constructions either keep or decrease the number of core arguments of verbs.

### References

- Anbessa Teferra.(1984). Sidaama verb morphology: Some inflections and derivations (Unpublished senior essay). Addis Ababa University.
- Anbessa Teferra. (1987). Complement clause in Sidaama (Unpublished master's thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Anbessa Teferra. (1994). Phonological government in Sidaama. In *New trends in Ethiopian studies, I*, 1085-1101. Lawrenceville, N.J: Red Sea Press.
- Arce-Arenales, Manuel, Melissa Axelrod and Barbara A. Fox. (1994). Active voice and middle diathesis: A cross-linguistics perspective. In B. Fox & P. J. Hopper (Eds.), *Voice: Form and Function*, pp.1-21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bender, M.L. (1976). *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*. East LAansing: MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.



- Brown, E.K and J.E. Miller.(1980). *Syntax: A Linguistic Introduction to Sentence Structure* .London: Anchor Brend.
- Comrie, B. (1983). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haspelmath, M. (2002). *Understanding Morphology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, G.(1976). Highland East Cushitic. In M.L. Bender (ed), *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, pp. 232-277. East Lansing, MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.
- Kawanchi, K.(2007). A Grammar of Sidaama (Sidamo), A Cushitic Language of Ethiopia. University of Buffalo (PhD dissertation).
- Kemmer S. (1993). *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Payne, T.E. (1997). *Describing Morphosyntax*. A guide for Field Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Payne, T. E. (2006). *Exploring Language Structure a Student Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Radford, A. (1997). *Transformational Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr.(2001). *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.