

Fábio Bonfim Duarte
 Federal University of Minas Gerais
fbonfim@terra.com.br

Ka'apor is a language spoken by around 1000 people who live in the state of Maranhão, in the northern region of Brazil. The purpose of this paper is to examine the grammatical status of the particle [ke] in the Ka'apor language. The empirical data collected thus far indicates that this particle marks internal arguments of transitive verbs, as follows:

- (1) *ihē narāj ke a-pirok*
 I orange AFET 1SG -peel
 "I peeled the orange".

This particle is also found in contexts where it comes enclitic to subjects of stative and unaccusative verbs, thereby giving rise to an absolutive alignment system, as is illustrated by the following examples.

- (2) *Ana ke_i h_i-e ʔō ʔi*
 Ana AFET 3SG-be tired PERF
 "Ana is tired".

- (3) *ihē ke a-'ar*
 I AFET 1SG-fall
 "I fell".

Based on the above examples, I will be assuming henceforth that the particle [ke] has the role of conveying the semantics of affectedness. For this reason, this particle will constitute one of our most direct tools for diagnosing when an argument is semantically affected or not. A natural assumption is then to assume that the semantic denotation for [ke] is one of affectedness, such that this is the meaning that [ke] contributes to the D/NP that it marks. Additionally, the morphosyntactic distribution of [ke] in the above examples suggests that Ka'apor exhibits an absolutive alignment. In this system, the object and the intransitive subjects are both marked with [ke], whereas the agent subject remains unmarked. This hypothesis is reinforced by the fact that prototypical agents, as in the example (1), above, and as in the example (4), below, are not normally marked with [ke].

- (4) *araxu ø-ahem uhu*
 Araújo 3SG-shout a lot
 "Araújo shouted a lot".

In addition to the contexts examined thus far, there exists a possibility that the enclitic particle [**ke**] marks the subject of agentive verbs. Then, in the contexts below, although the subject has some control over the action and receives the θ -role of AGENT, the particle [**ke**] can come enclitic both to the unergative subjects and to the transitive subjects of agentive verbs. In such a situation, the subject does not correspond to a prototypical agent, but to an argument whose θ -role is hybrid in nature. In sum, the subjects below correspond to what Saksena (1980) describes as being the affected-agent in languages such as Hindi.

- (5a) *Purutu ke ø-ahem*
 Purutu AFET 3SG-shout
 "Purutu shouted

- (6a) *Maíra ke ø-wata*
 Maíra AFET 3-andar
 "Maíra walked [with suffering]".

Here, the subject does not have control over the action performed. Then, in (5a), something (a stone, a knife, a chair, etc) might have fallen on Purutu's foot and he did not have a chance to avoid it. The same interpretation holds for the subject in (6a), as the subject performed the action of walking with affectedness. However, the non-affected meaning is obtained if the subject does not co-occur with the particle [ke]. Then, when we omit the particle [ke], the meaning of affectedness cannot be inferred, but only the meaning that the subject performed the action on purpose and with control, as follows:

UNERGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

- (5b) *Purutu* *Ø-ahem*
Purutu 3SG-shout
“Purutu shouted”.
[=Purutu was an agent of the shouting, probably he did it on purpose”.]
- (6b) *Maíra* *Ø-wata*
Maíra 3-andar
“Maíra walked [with suffering]”.
[=Maíra was an agent of the event of walking, he performed it on purpose.]

Similar contrast is also found in transitive constructions. For example, the verb -*ʔu* “eat” can select an affected agent, which is marked by the particle [**ke**], as in the example (7a). In such context, the subject is the agent of a causing event of eating, which is performed with some affectedness. The reason is related to the fact that, in the ka’apor culture, to eat owl always involves being affected. The affected agent of such a verb can also be viewed as the recipient of the verb activity, and, therefore, constitutes the goal toward which this activity is directed. Thus, the action represented by ‘eat’ is not only directed at their objects, but also toward their agents.

- (7a) *a’e* *ke* *u-’u* *ta* *pypyhu* *ke* *tĩ*
he AFET 3SG-eat VOL owl AFET REP
“He is going to eat the owl”.

On the other hand, this verb can also select an agent, as in the example (7b), a situation in which the subject has control over the action of eating and, as a consequence, the particle [**ke**] need not appear.

- (7b) *a’e* *tatu* *ke* *u-’u* *ta*
he armadillo AFET 3-eat VOL
“He will eat armadillo”.

Based on these data, the hypothesis I will be exploring in this paper is that the particle [**ke**] is triggered whenever subjects and objects are pragmatically affected by the event/action denoted by the predicate. Hence, this analysis entails that the subject of unergative and transitive verbs presents a hybrid semantic status, inasmuch as it is at the same time the agent and the affected argument. For this reason, I will be referring to this subject, hereafter, by the descriptive label ‘affected agent’. This, in turn, permits us to explain the distribution of the particle [**ke**] in Ka’apor: its main role is mark the affected arguments regardless whether they are in subject, direct objects or indirect objects positions. Based upon this distribution, I will hypothesize that the particle *ke* primarily signals two semantic Cases: the dative and the accusative. In sum, the dative marks the core arguments that usually occur in the slots of goals and affected agents, whereas the accusative mark the patients.

REFERENCES

- CALDAS, Raimunda Benedita. *Aspecto, modo de ação e modalidade na língua Ka’apor*. 86p. Dissertação, (Mestrado em Linguística) _ UFPA, Belém, 2001.
- DIXON, R. Ergativity. *Language*, volume 55, p.59-138, 1979.
- _____. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- DUARTE, Fábio Bonfim, GARCIA, Mário Alexandre. Ergatividade cindida, papel temático e causativização na língua Ka’apor. Faculdade de Letras: UFMG, Relin, 2006.
- HALE, Ken & KEYSER, Jay. *Aspect and the syntax of argument structure*, MIT, 1993, ms.
- _____. *The basic elements of argument structure*. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, Curso de Estrutura das Línguas Indígenas Brasileiras, março 2000, ms.
- KAKUMASU, James. Urubu-Ka’apor. In: DERBYSHIRE, D. C. & PULLUM, G.K. (orgs.). *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Vol. 1, p.326-403. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.
- KAKUMASU, James Y.& KAKUMASU, Kiyoto. *Outros textos urubu-kaapor*. Brasília: SIL, 1990. 228 p. (Arquivo Lingüístico do Museu Nacional)
- Saksena, Anuradha. The affected agent. *Language*:1980.
- SILVA, Tabita Fernandes. *Classes verbais e algumas questões pragmáticas em Ka’apor*. 79 p. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) _ UFPA, Belém, 2001.
- WHALEY, Lindsay. *Introduction to Typology – the unity and diversity of language*. London: Sage, 1997.