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This article aimed at uncovering the interaction between verbal extension and valence in Gumer, an Ethiosemitic language, in a general typological framework. Data were collected with the help of key informants living in the Gumer district of Gurage. Four categories of verbal extensions that either increase or decrease valence were found. The valence-increasing operations are causative and applicative. There are two causative forms, direct and indirect, that are expressed with \{a-\} and \{at-\}, respectively. The benefactive applicative and malefactive applicative are shown with \{-nv\}~\{-lv\} and \{-bv\}~\{-wv\}, respectively. Valence reducing verbal extensions include passive, reflexive, middle, and reciprocal, all shown with the prefix \{tə-\}. Some verbal extensions, such as frequentative and intensive, do not change valence at all. There are also a few verbal extensions that encode valence but do not change the number of arguments.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background. Gurage is an area inhabited by South Ethiosemitic speaking people of the Gurage Zone of the Southern Nation Nationalities and Peoples’ Regional State of Ethiopia. The land of Gurage is surrounded by Cushitic speakers of Oromo in the east, north, and west, and Hadiyya speakers in the south. Fellman (1993:673) describes Gurage as “a tiny Semitic island floating in a vast Cushitic sea”. Omotic speakers, the Yem, border Gurage in a relatively small area in the southwest. The South Ethiosemitic Silte language speakers, who were part of the Gurage until they claimed and obtained independence from Gurage in 2001, border Gurage in the south. There are also two Cushitic speaking groups (Qabena and Mareko with auto-ethnonym of Libido) within the Gurage land.

The term Gurage designates the people. When it refers to the language, the suffix \{-ina\} is attached, hence, Guragina. Guragina has fifteen dialect clusters (Hetzron, 1972:7-8; Faber, 1997:6) that vary in their degree of intelligibility (Fekede, 2015:196). These varieties are classified into three main groups: West Gurage (Cheha, Gura, Gumer, Ezha, Muher, Mesqan, Geto, Inor, Ener, and Endegegn), North Gurage (Dobbi also called Gogot, and Kistane with the alternative name Soddo), and East Gurage (Wolane, Silte, and Zay). Zay is spoken outside the Gurage land on the island of Lake Zway in the Oromia Regional State. Linguists still include Silte as one of the East Gurage languages, despite the speakers are no longer administratively considered Gurage. Extinct Gurage languages include the Mesmes and Galila (see Huehnergard and Pat-El, 2019:4). The present study is based on the Gumer variety of the West Gurage sub-group. This variety was chosen because it is still relatively less studied. What is more, gathering data from key informants...
was convenient, and, as I am a native speaker of this variety, I could apply the introspective method.

Verb morphology of Gurage, like most Ethiopic languages, is characterized by internal modification or non-linearity, as in bannør- 'demolish' and bunnir something that has been demolished', and affixation as in to-bannør- 'be demolished'. The addition of affixes to a verb root is considered a verbal extension. Internal modification in Gurage has grammatical functions, such as marking tense and aspect, and word formation roles - derive new words. The internal modification encompasses vocalic change (šək’k’ar to -šək’k’ir ‘hang’, in the perfective and imperfective forms, respectively) and consonant cluster and vowel changes (ji-səbr ‘he breaks’ and jə-səbir ‘let him break’). Verbal extension to a large extent plays a role in the derivation and expression of syntactic properties. For instance, it can influence the argument structure of a verb by increasing or decreasing its valence. It also encodes semantic roles. So far, the syntactic properties of verbal extension and the resulting valence changes are not well studied in Gurage in general and the Gumer variety in particular. This article is an attempt to fill this gap.

1.2 Literature review. Valence refers to the "expression of arguments in verbs and adverbial formations" (Haspelmath, 2002:209). According to Kreidler (1998:67), valence is "the semantic potential of predicates in terms of the number and types of arguments which may co-occur with them".

An argument structure is "the relationship between a verb and its noun participants" (Riemer, 2010:335). Verbs play a major role in the interaction of meaning and syntax as they are accompanied by nouns or pronouns referring to participants in the action, event, or state expressed by the predicate. The "participants receive a range of morphosyntactic markers - case suffixes, subject or object markers, etc. – specifying which participant is the ‘actor’ or instigator of the action, which the undergoer of the action, as well as other possible roles" (Riemer, 2010: 336). The verbal extension described in this study is an instance of morphosyntax in which verbs extend their roots into larger stems thereby showing the roles of nouns functioning as the arguments of the verbs.

Cross-linguistically, verbs often have zero, one, or two arguments (Kittilä, 2011:240). The nature of a verb, whether it is transitive or intransitive, determines the categorization of an argument. Some verbs such as break are labile. They can categorize one or two arguments as in A glass broke and Kasa broke a glass; where the former has one argument and the latter two arguments. Some verbs can have two objects such as Kasa bought Bekele a laptop; such verbs are called ditransitive or double transitive. The arguments have semantic roles, such as agent (initiator of action), patient/theme (an entity that undergoes an action or motion), experiencer (an entity that feels or perceives something), source (entity from which motion takes place), goal (entity towards which motion takes place), recipient (involving a change of possession), location (a place where the action occurs), instrument (an object with which an action is performed), and beneficiary (one for whose benefit an action or event takes place) (Riemer, 2010:338).

The arguments have syntactic functions, such as subject, object, or oblique. Certain constructions change the number of arguments by promoting or demoting the existing argument or by introducing a new one. This in turn changes the valence number. The common valence changing operations are passive, reflexive, causative, and applicative. Before we present the
argument structure of verbs with a different valence number, it is worth discussing the typology of verbs in Gumer Gurage.

Verbs in Gumer Gurage can be as short as one radical or as long as four radicals. Baye (1999), however, argues that all verbs in Ethiosemitic have three radicals. He showed that mono- and biradical verbs have reduced their roots, and the quadri-radical verbs have extended their roots. In Gurage as well as in Amharic, there are, however, basic quadri-radical roots, hence, they are not extended. An example of a basic quadri-radical root in Gurum is the verb $k'irat'om$ ‘cut into two parts,’ with the root $\sqrt{k'rt'm}$, and in Amharic the verb $sanat't'ak'a$ ‘split’ with the root $\sqrt{sn't'k'}$.

The verbs in Ethiosemitic in general, including Gumer Gurage, have been grouped into Type-A, Type-B, and Type-C (Hetzron, 1972:10; Rose, 2007:405), mainly based on the occurrence of the vowels /ə/, /e/ and /a/ in the first syllable of a perfective verb. Rose (1997) and Degif (1993) consider another criterion for the typology of the verb types, that is, whether the penultimate consonant of a verb is geminated or not in the perfective and imperfective. However, this criterion is less helpful to draw generalizations across Gurage varieties including Gumer. Degif (1993) also distinguishes Type-D verbs whose first root consonants are labialized. Examples of Type-D verbs include $b'anaa$ (actually a Type-A verb) ‘one not felt at home’ and $m'anaah$ (actually a Type-C verb, see below) ‘confiscate’. Völlmin (2017:55) also considers verbs with initial labialization Type-D, similar to Degif (1993), however, Type D verbs fit well into the non-labialized verb patterns of Type A and Type C. So, it seems that this fourth type based on labialization is redundant. This argument is important as we have also palatalized consonants, such as $k'apaa$ ‘replied’ or ‘answered’ and $k'anas$ ‘spoke mockingly’, which also fit into the Type A and Type C patterns, respectively. Völlmin (2017:55) adds Type-E verbs with forms such as $dirakkar$ ‘throw away’ and $firat$- ‘mess’. Such forms, however, are patterns that most quadri-radical verbs follow, but not the basic triradical verbs. Leslau (2004:24-25) disregards the Type-D of Degif (1993) and suggests another Type-D verb with the vowel /o/ in the first syllable of the perfective form, for which he only provides a single example: $somma$- ‘fast (v)’. Völlmin (2017) on the other hand provides more verbs with /o/ in their initial syllable, but he groups them into either Type-A, B, or C as in not ‘run’ considered Type-A (page 58), $3or$ ‘go round’ considered Type-B (page 59) and $zobb$ ‘have a mouthful of Chat’ considered Type-D (page 54). There is no consistency in grouping the verb types among the scholars working on Gurage languages; this specific issue requires further study.

1.3 Methodology. A general typological-descriptive framework, as outlined in the several contributions in Shopen (2007), has been used for data collection, analysis, and presentation. The data were obtained from six key informants in the Arekit town of the Gumer district of the Gurage Zone. All participants spoke Gumer as their mother tongue and lived in the district for more than 20 years. Two of the participants were women whereas four of them were men. Their age range was between 25 and 45 years. A linguistic questionnaire was used to elicit part of the linguistic data. Short stories and other oral expressions were also audio-recorded, transcribed, glossed, and translated into English. The data are transcribed in IPA. The transcribed sentences are glossed following Leipzig’s morpheme-by-morpheme glossing rule.
2. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Nearly all verbs in Gumer can be extended by affixes to derive other lexical categories including verbs and/or for inflection. A distinction is made between VERBAL EXTENSION, the derivation of a new verb from verbs of a similar lexeme, such as sappǝrɔ-a-m (break.PFV-3SGM-PST) ‘he broke’ and at-sappǝrǝ-a-m (ICAU-break.PFV-3SGM-PST) ‘He caused someone to break something’, and VERBALIZATION which refers to the derivation of verbs from verbs as well as from other lexical categories such as adjectives nǝt’a-a-m [white.PFV.3SGM-PST ‘It became white’] from nǝf’a ‘white’. The focus of this article is on verbal extension, not on verbalization.

The verbal extensions have the role of introducing, maintaining, or reducing core arguments, which can have different syntactic roles and peripheral arguments that have various semantic roles, to the verb hosting the affixes. The core arguments are mirrored in the complex morphology of verbs and sentence constructions when the number of arguments is increased in Gumer. The verbal extensions in Gumer Gurage can be classified into three groups concerning the valence of the verb:

i. Valence increasing verbal extensions
ii. Valence decreasing verbal extensions
iii. Valence maintaining verbal extensions

Valence is a semantic and syntactic concept. Semantically, it refers to the number of participants expressed by a verb, and syntactically it refers to the number of arguments a verb has in a clause. The semantics of a verb determines the valence of a language. A verb that takes a grammatical object is transitive hence bivalent. If a verb takes a direct and an indirect object, it is ditransitive, i.e. trivalent. If a verb does not take an object, it is intransitive and monovalent. In some languages, there is a case that a verb may have just a pleonastic subject, not an argument, such as English it in It rains; such verbs said to be avalent. It is important to note that valence is

---

1 The morpheme [-m] in Gurage is used to mark past tense (PST) (see Tsehay 2019:237, Fekede 2016:56; Rose 2007: 413-414), a main verb marker (Tsehay 2019:236, Völlmin, 2017:121,177), converb marker (Rose 2007:416; Völlmin, 2007:85) and focus marker (Tsehay, 2019:252). In a simple declarative sentence such as Kasa sin sappǝrǝ-m (Kasa cup break.PFV.3SGM-PST ‘Kasa broke a cup’), it marks past tense. In complex structures involving two verbs whereby one functioning as a converb and the other used a main verb as in Kasa sin sappǝrǝ-a-m wǝt’a-m (Kasa cup break.PFV.3SGM-CNVT go out.PFV.3SGM-PST ‘Having broken a cup, Kasa went out’, the first [-m] attached to sappǝrǝ (break.PFV-3SGM ‘he broke’ marks the converb, but the second [-m] attached to wǝt’a (go out.PFV.3SGM-PST ‘he went out’ marks past tense. In pronouns such as aw-o-m nehe (2SGM-FOC come.IMP.2SGM ‘you too come’) and in demonstratives as in bo-hi-m bet isatnǝr(LOC-that-FOC house fire exist.IMFV.3SM ‘There is a fire in that house, too’), it marks focus. Regarding the use of [-m] as a main verb marker, we should be careful that the main verb is contrasted with auxiliary verb. The [-m] as past tense marker also contrasts with [-te] as in kasǝfnǝn-a-m (Kasa come.PFV-3SGM-PST ‘Kasa came’) where the [-m] marks past tense as opposed to kasǝfnǝn-te [3SGM-come.IPFV-FUT ‘Kasa will come’) in which [-te] shows future tense. The homophonous morpheme should, therefore, be understood based on the semantic context in which it is used.

2 Verbalization can be contrasted with nominalization in which nouns are derived from nouns and other lexical categories such as sibrot ‘breaking’ from sǝbar ‘break’; gefnǝt ‘tallness’ from gef ‘tall’.
associated mainly with the core arguments, not with the peripheral arguments (see Dixon and Aikhenvald, 2000:4).

The semantics of verbs, however, is not always a reliable means to know the valence number as there are labile verbs with a varying number of arguments. For instance, Kasa broke the window has two arguments, but The window broke has just one argument.

2.1 Valence Increasing Verbal Extensions. Valence-adding operations include causative (direct and indirect) and applicative (dative, benefactive, malefactive). Applicative constructions with ablative, locative, and instrumental functions, which often belong to peripheral cases, also increase the peripheral argument without extension of the verb.

Causative

Two types of causatives, direct causative and indirect or a double causative, increase valence. In Gumer, the direct causative is derived with {a-} and the indirect causative with {at-} (Völlmin, 2017:99-107). The direct causative increases the valence of mainly intransitive verbs by one. Indirect causative can add one core argument to transitive or intransitive verbs, and one peripheral argument to intransitive verbs. There are a few causeless causatives that are considered stem-formatives, discussed in (24), such as a-skʷ‘at’-ơ-m ‘DCAUS-cry.PFV-3SGM-PST ‘He cried with pity.’

The examples in Table 1 show the derivation of causatives (direct and indirect) in perfective and imperfective aspects, and the jussive mood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Jussive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) bōna</td>
<td>‘eat’</td>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>bōna-m</td>
<td>ji-bōra</td>
<td>ji-bōra-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCAUS</td>
<td>a-bōna-m</td>
<td>j-a-bōra</td>
<td>j-a-bōra-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICAUS</td>
<td>at-bōna-m</td>
<td>j-at-bōna</td>
<td>j-at-bōna-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) səʧʻə</td>
<td>‘drink’</td>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>səʧʻə-ơ-m</td>
<td>ji-səʧʻ</td>
<td>ji-səʧʻ-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCAUS</td>
<td>a-səʧʻə-ơ-m</td>
<td>j-a-səʧʻ</td>
<td>j-a-səʧʻ-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICAUS</td>
<td>at-səʧʻə-ơ-m</td>
<td>j-at-səʧʻ</td>
<td>j-at-səʧʻ-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) stja</td>
<td>‘buy’</td>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>stja-m</td>
<td>ji-stja</td>
<td>ji-stja-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCAUS</td>
<td>a-stja-m</td>
<td>j-a-stja</td>
<td>j-a-stja-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICAUS</td>
<td>at-stja-m</td>
<td>j-at-stja</td>
<td>j-at-stja-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) kōna</td>
<td>‘climb’</td>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>kōna-m</td>
<td>ji-kōra</td>
<td>ji-kōra-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCAUS</td>
<td>a-kōna-m</td>
<td>j-a-kōra</td>
<td>j-a-kōra-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICAUS</td>
<td>at-kōna-m</td>
<td>j-at-kōra</td>
<td>j-at-kōna-te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Causative derivation

The person markers in Ethiosemitic are suffixed to the verb in the perfective but prefixed in the imperfective and jussive. In the Gumer examples in Table 1, the third person masculine marker in the perfective, which comes after the verb but before the past tense marker [-m], is {-ə}, which can be deleted to avoid impermissible vowel sequences. In verbs like ˑskr ‘intoxicate’ it surfaces: səkkər-ơ-m [intoxicate.PFV-3SGM-PST ‘He got intoxicated’. Similarly, the third person marker in the imperfective and jussive is {ji-} and {jə-}, respectively, but the vowels of the third person masculine marker are deleted when added to a stem that begins with a vowel, as in the
causative forms in Table-1 for the same phonological adjustment reason, that is, to avoid vowel sequences.

There are various other changes such as sonorant alternation (n→r) as in Table-1(a) and (d), and depalatalization, as in (ʧ’→t’) in Table-1 (b). The sonorant alternation occurs due to several idiosyncratic and historical factors (Fekede and Meyer, 2015:531-551). The palatalization seems phonological as the basic form for √st’j ‘drink’ but the palatal glide /j/ of the verb root is deleted palatalizing the preceding alveolar voiceless ejective /t’/.

The causative derivations in Table-1 show us only the morphological processes. We will show how the causative derivation affects the argument structure and valence with the perfective verbs fǝka- ‘escape’ and bǝna- ‘eat’, in (1) and (2).

(1) a)ʤǝmǝl  fǝka-ǝ-m [fǝkǝm]
    Jemǝl  escape.PFV-3SGM-PST
   ‘Jemǝl escaped’

b)ʤǝmǝl ǝrʧǝta  a-fǝka-ǝ-m
    Jemǝl  son-POSS.3SGM  DCAU-escape.PFV-3SGM-PST
   ‘Jemǝl made his son escape’.

c)ʤǝmǝl ǝrʧǝta (bǝ-mahmud)  at-fǝka-m
    Jemǝl  son-POSS.3SGM (by-Mahmud)  ICAUS-escape.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Jemǝl made his son escape with the help of Mahmud’.

(2) a)zǝbǝrgǝ fǝrǝt  bǝna-m
    Zeberga  food  eat.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Zeberga ate (food)’.

b)zǝbǝrgǝ fǝrǝt  jǝ3-abarǝs-ǝta  a-bǝna-m
    Zeberga  food  GAD-family-POSS.3SGM  DCAUS-eat.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Zeberga fed food to his family’.

c)zǝbǝrgǝ fǝrǝt  jǝ-gǝn-sǝb  bǝ-zǝrǝma  at-bǝna-m
    Zeberga  food  GAD-country-people  by-youngsters 3SGM.  ICAUS-eat.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Zeberga made the villagers eat food by youngsters’.

The verb fǝka ‘escape’ in 1a is intransitive as it has no object noun. The addition of the causative {a-} in 1b introduces a core argument ǝrʧǝta ‘his son’ hence transitivizing the verb. In 1c, the addition of {at-} has the same number of core arguments ʤǝmǝl, the subject of the verb, and ǝrʧǝta the direct object of the verb. However, it also adds a peripheral argument bǝmahmud

---

3 The morpheme {jǝ-} in Gumer Gurage marks genitive as in jǝ-kasa ǝmat’af ɡǝdǝr-u (GEN-Kasa book new-COP.3SGM ‘Kasa’s book is new; direct object (accusative) as in Sara jǝ-kasa tıtǝrmǝd-n (Sara ACC-Kasa3SGF-love.IPV-3SGO’Sara loves Kasa’), and indirect object (dative) as in 2b above. Because there is no way to distinguish the three forms despite their functional difference, I will use the abbreviation GAD (Genitive, Accusative, and Dative) as a gloss for all the three functions.
‘by Mahmud’ which is optional because it can be understood from the context as *atfǝkam* presupposes ‘made escape by someone’.

The verb *bǝna*-‘eat,’ in example 2a, is a transitive verb and hence has two arguments, the subject *Zeberga* that performs the act of eating and the direct object *ʃərət* ‘food’. In 2b, *Zeberga* causes his family to eat food (direct causative), and in 2c *Zeberga* makes the youngsters feed food to the villagers (indirect causative). The direct causative marker *{a}-* introduces an extra argument, the indirect object *ja-aba-rus-əta* ‘to his family,’ and the indirect causative prefix *{at}-* adds a core argument *jagənsəb* ‘villagers’ and an adjunct *ba-zərma* ‘through youngsters’. Semantically, the direct causative in 2b involves an agent (*zəbərga*), a patient (*ʃərət*), and a theme argument (*jabərusəta*). In 2c, the indirect causative has two agents in which the first agent, *Zeberga*, makes the second agent, *zərma*, perform the act of feeding the theme *jagənsəb*.

**Applicative**

Applicative refers to “either the applicative construction or the verb in that construction” (Polinsky, 2005: 442). It is often limited to the “cases where the addition of an object is overtly marked on the predicate” (Polinsky, 2005: 442). A distinction is made between objects in the applicative construction. “The object added in the applicative construction is referred to as the *applied object*; if a verb without an applicative suffix takes an object, this latter object is referred to as a *basic object*. The verb from which the applicative is formed is called the base” (Polinsky, 2005:442). An applicative has a transitivity role by adding an argument (Peterson, 2007:2). It "creates a completely new object in the structure of the verb, or shifts a non-object to the object function" (Haspelmath, 2002:216).

Polinsky (2005:442) makes a distinction between an applicative construction and a double object construction as follows:

an applicative construction is a particular instance of double object construction. Both constructions share the property that the two objects do not have to be distinguished by agreement morphology or case marking. However, the primary use of the double object construction is for the encoding of the event of a transfer. The presence of an applicative construction per se often entails that a non-derived double object construction is also present. But the opposite is not the case; for example, Dutch and English have the double object construction but not the applicative construction.

In Gumer, there are two types of applicative verb extensions, the benefactive marked by *{-n-}* with the allomorph *{-l-}* and the malefactive expressed with *{-b-}* with the allomorph *{-w-}*.

The paradigm in (3) demonstrates the alternation between *{-n-}* ~ *{-l-}* and *{-b-}* ~ *{-w-}* with the verb *sijə*-‘buy’:
The benefactive {-n-} changes to {-l-} in the third person. The use of {-n-} in this person bears different meanings, as {-n/ also serves as base for direct object marking, for instance, \textit{sija-\textalpha n-\textalpha m} (buy.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-1PL.OBJ-PST) ‘We bought something’ instead of \textit{sija-\textalpha l-\textalpha m} (buy.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-1PL.OBJ-PST) ‘He bought something for him’; \textit{sija-\textalpha n-a-m} (buy.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-OBJ-3SGF-PST) ‘He bought something from her’, but \textit{sija-\textalpha l-a-m} (buy.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-OBJ-3SGF-PST) ‘He bought something for her’, etc. The change of malefactive morpheme {-b-} to {-w-} in the third person singular masculine does not change the meaning. The change seems to be phonologically conditioned; when {-b-} occurs between vowels, it is weakened to {-w-}.

As shown in (4) below, benefactive applicative forms change the argument of intransitive verbs by making them transitive; hence, they add an object NP (4b). With a transitive verb, they introduce an additional second object (4d).

(4) a. kasa m\textsuperscript{w}at-\textalpha m
   Kasa die.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Kasa died’

b. kasa ja-sara m\textsuperscript{w}at-\textalpha l-a-m
   Kasa GAD-Sara die.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-BA.OBJ-3SGF-PST
   ‘Kasa died to the benefit of Sara’.

c. kasa j\textalpha ma si\textalpha m
   Kasa shoes buy.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Kasa bought shoes’.
In 4a, the sentence has one argument Kasa, the subject of the sentence. In 4b, the benefactive verbal extension introduces the object, Sara. The sentence in 3c has two arguments, the subject Kasa and the basic object g'ama ‘shoes’. In 4d, the benefactive applicative verb extension introduces the applied object jəgərədəta ‘his daughter’.4

Malefactive applicative also introduces an object with intransitive verbs and a second object with transitive verbs, as in (5).

(5) a. kasa onə-ɑ-м
   Kasa shout.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Kasa shouted’.

   b. sara ja-zərməʃ’it ɑnə-ʃ-b-ɑ-m
   Sara GAD-Zermechit shout.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-MA.OBJ-3SGF-PST
   ‘Sara shouted against (on) Zermechit’.

c. kasa ədja-ta əna-m
   Kasa lunch-POSS.3SGM eat.PFV.3SGM-PST
   ‘Kasa ate his lunch’.

d. kasa ja-kəbədə ədja-ta əna-w-ə-m
   Kasa GAD-Kebede lunch-POSS.3SGM eat.PFV.3SGM.SBJ-MA.OBJ-3SGM-PST
   ‘Kasa ate the lunch of Kebede (against Kebede’s will)’.

In 5a, the intransitive verb onə ‘shout’ has the subject Kasa; the addition of malefactive applicative suffix {-b-} in 4b introduced the object jəzərməʃ’it; hence, transitivizing the verb. The verb əna- ‘eat,’ in (5c), has two arguments Kasa and ədja-ta. In 5d, the same verb adds the malefactive applicative suffix {-w-}, which introduced an additional argument jəkəbədə. Thus, the verb in 5d has three arguments Kasa, jəkəbədə, and ədja-ta.

Applicative construction can have additional peripheral arguments in addition to the applied object as in the examples in (6):

(6) a. deng’a-hino wər-o-m
     boys-DEF.3PL go.PFV-3PLM.SBJ-PST
     ‘The boys went.’

   b. deng’a-hino (jə-ijja) tə-ʃəwa amarikan
     boys-DEF.3PL (GAD-1SG) LOC-Shewa America

---

4Note that the morphological shape of the possessive agreement affixes may change based on the person, gender, and number of the possessor. For instance, garəd-əta (girl-POSS.3SGM ‘his daughter’) can be garəd-əbəta (girl-POSS.3SGF ‘her daughter’), garəd-ənda (girl-POSS.1PL ‘our daughter’), etc.
Verbal Extension and Valence in Gumer Variety of Gurage

The predicate \( w\-o\-m \) in (6a) has a single core argument, \( deng\'ahino \) 'the boys', but in (6b) the number of arguments increases from one to two core arguments, \( deng\'ahino \) 'the boys' - a core argument \( j\-i\-i\)ja 'for me' - an optional applied object added due to the benefactive applicative {\-n\-}, and three peripheral arguments, \( ta\-f\o\-\)ha 'from Addis Ababa,' note that Shewa refers to Addis Ababa, \( amerikan \) 'to (to) America' and \( ba\-eropl\-an \) 'with an airplane.'

The verb \( f\-o\-n\- \) 'come' has one argument, \( baz\-\)ra 'guest', in 6c; it adds the peripheral locative argument \( ta\-f\o\-\)ha 'from Chaha’ in 6d, and the applied object \( j\-sara \) 'to Sara’ in 6e at the same times maintaining the locative argument of 6d.

The malefactive applicative also increases an external argument with an instrumental role as shown in (7):

(7) a kasəf basər katəf-o-m
Kasech meat chop.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-PST
'Kasech chopped meat'.

b kasəf ba-sənda-hut basər katəf-o-w-ə-m
Kasech INST-knife-DEF.3SGM meat chop.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-MA.OBJ-3SGM-PST
'Kasech chopped meat with the knife'.

The malefactive applicative extension {\-w\-} raises the external argument \( bə\-\)sənda\-hut 'with the knife’ which has an instrumental role.

Since valence is increased or decreased based on core arguments, we can conclude that only the applicative constructions in Gumer, but not the peripheral arguments, increase valence.

2.2 Valence decreasing verbal extensions. The valence decreasing operations include passive, reflexive, reciprocal, and middle (see Palmer 1994:155; Dixon and Aikhenvald, 2000:7). The impersonal passive (Palmer 1994:127-131) also reduces valence. Each of the valence-reducing verbal extensions in Gumer is discussed below.

\(^5\)The peripheral argument \( ba\-eropl\-an \) ‘by airplane’ can also follow the subject noun \( deng\'a-hino \) ‘the boys’ in 6b; see also 7b.
Three derivational processes decrease valence in Gumer, namely (a) passive, reflexive and middle, (b) reciprocal, and (c) impersonal. The passive, reflexive, and middle are all derived with the prefix {tə-} whereas the reciprocal changes its root pattern in addition to prefixing {tə-}. Passive, reflexive, and middle are glossed PRM since they have the same morphological form.

(a) Passive, reflexive, and middle

Passive
Passive is a syntactic operation in which a clause is semantically transitive, and it has two participants of which one, the Agent, is either demoted to an oblique role or altogether omitted and the other, the patient, is the subject.

The passive in Gumer Gurage is derived from transitive verbs with the prefix {tə-} and a specific vocalization of the template as shown in (8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Gloss</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Jussive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'hit'</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>dənəg</td>
<td>ji -dərɡ</td>
<td>jə-dirɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>tə-dənəɡ-</td>
<td>ji -t-dənəɡ</td>
<td>jə-t-dərɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'choose'</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>met’t’ər-</td>
<td>ji -met’iər</td>
<td>jə-mət’iər</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>tə-met’t’or-</td>
<td>ji -t-met’ər</td>
<td>jə-t-met’ər</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'confiscate'</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>m”anəh-</td>
<td>ji -m”anih</td>
<td>jə-marḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>tə-m”anəh-</td>
<td>ji -t-m”anəh</td>
<td>jə-t-marəh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tie'</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>agəd-</td>
<td>ji-agid</td>
<td>jə-gid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>t-agəd-</td>
<td>ji -t-agəd</td>
<td>jə-t-agəd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the initial consonant /m/ of m”anəh ‘confiscate’ is delabialized in the jussive form. Furthermore, the consonant /n/ alternates with /t/, reflecting the distinction between geminated /nt/ and simple /t/ consonant. Vowel sequences are not allowed and yield deletion or assimilation of one of the vowels. However, it is not clear why the first vowel in *ji-agid > jagid (3SGM-tie.IP¥V ‘He ties’) is deleted, but the second vowel in *jə-igid > jəgíd (3SGM-tie.JUS ‘Let him tie’).

The {tə-} changes to {t-} when preceded by the person marking prefixes, e.g. the 3SGM prefix {ji-} in the imperfective and {jə-} in the jussive in (8). The root patterns are also readjusted in the perfective, imperfective, and jussive forms.

The example sentences in (9) demonstrate how the passive verbal extension reduces the argument:

(9) a. kasa səb dənəɡ-ə-m
   Kasa person hit.PF¥V-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   'Kasa hit a person'.

   b. kasa  tə-dənəɡ-ə-m
   Kasa PRM-hit.PF¥V-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   'Kasa was hit'.

Reflexive

In reflexive constructions, the subject and the object of the verb have the same referent (cf. Lyons, 1969:361). Concerning the middle constructions, Payne (1997:218) states that they express a
situation as a process, whereas reflexives and passives express the situation as an action. As to Lyons (1969:373), in the middle construction, the action or state expressed by the verb affects the subject. This is also the case with reflexives. Therefore, Lyons (1969:373) adds that the middle can be used transitively unlike the reflexive. For instance, *I am washing myself* is reflexive, but *I am washing* or *I am washing (my) shirt* are considered middle as the action is performed by the subject for its benefit. As the semantics of the two are ambiguous, the notion of subject and object co-reference is taken as a criterion for reflexives.

In Gumer, the reflexive is expressed with the prefix {tə-} that also derives the passive:

(10)  
  a. kasəʧ t-at'əb-əʧ-m  
      Kasech  PRM-wash.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-PST  
      'Kasech washed (herself)'.
  
  b. kasa  tə-hətər-ə-m  
      Kasa   PRM-dress.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST  
      ‘Kasa dressed (himself)’.

Some reflexives, such as Amharic: *lomma to-latʧ/’a* ‘Lemma shaved himself’ (Mengistu 2000:325), have an ambiguous reading in Gumer. The Amharic example would be rendered into Gumer by *lomma to-k’əbəb-ə-m* [Lemma PRM-shave.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST] which can be glossed as ‘Lemma shaved himself’ (a reflexive reading) or ‘Lemma was shaved by someone’ (a passive reading). The two readings can be disambiguated by adding the expression *gəgməta* ‘himself’ to the reflexive, as in (11):

(11)  
      lemma  gəg-m-əta       tə-k’əbəb-ə-m  
      Lemma self-FOC-3SGM.POSS        PRM-shave.PFV-3SGMS-PST  
      ‘Lemma shaved himself’.

**Middle**

The concept of middle or mediopassive (Siewierska, 2005: 435) is understood quite differently in the literature and its definition is elusive (see Dixon and Aikhenvald, 2000: 11-12). According to Mengistu (2000:315), in Amharic, “[i]f an event encoded by a transitive predicate can be conceptualized as taking place without the intervention of an external causer, the event can be cast in the anticausative” or middle.

In Gumer, the external causer of the middle does not intervene in the action and the action happens by itself, which sometimes is true for passive constructions. The middle, differs from the impersonal, discussed below, in that the impersonal has a generic subject.

The middle reduces the argument of a transitive verb. Structures in (12) show the derivation of the middle:

(12)  
  a. kasa  wədərə-hut  t’iwanər-ə-n-m  
      Kasa  rope-DEF  roll.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-3SGM.OBJ-PST  
      ‘Kasa rolled the rope’.
b. wǝdǝrǝ - hut tǝ- t'ibanǝr-ǝ-m
   rope-DEF PRM-roll.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘The rope rolled’.

c. sara əʧ'ir bannǝr-əʧ-m
   Sara fence demolish.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-PST
   ‘Sara demolished a fence’.

d. əʧ'ir tǝ-bannǝr-ǝ-m
   fence PRM-demolish.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘A fence was demolished’.

In 12a and 12c, Kasa and Sara are agents that are demoted in 12b and 12d, respectively. Both 12b and 12d have patient subjects, the rope, and the fence, respectively. The structure in 12b is typically middle as ‘it rolled’ by itself and ‘was not rolled’ by someone. However, the structure in 12d can be interpreted either as a passive ‘a fence was demolished (by Sara)’ or as a middle ‘the fence get demolished by itself’.

(b) Reciprocal

In reciprocal constructions, two arguments of a predicate act upon one another. Thus, each participant is subject and object at the same time. In Gumer, a verb expressing reciprocity is derived with {tə-}, homophonous to the passive and reflexive marker. However, verb root patterns with reciprocal meanings, change their root patterns from Type-A C₁aC₂(C₂)ǝC₃ to Type-C C₁aC₂(C₂)ǝC₃ (as in 13a and 13b) and Type-B C₁eC₂(C₂)ǝC₃ to Type-C C₁aC₂(C₂)ǝC₃ (as in 13c)⁶ in the manner shown in (13):

(13) Verb stem  Gloss  Reciprocal verb  Gloss
  a) dǝnǝg-  ‘hit’  tǝ-dǝnǝg-  ‘hit one another’
  b) k'atǝr-  ‘kill’  tǝ-k'atǝr-  ‘killed one another’
  c) metǝr-  ‘chose’  tǝ-metǝr-  ‘chose one other’

The sentences in (14) show the arguments of verbs in reciprocal constructions.

(14) a. dǝng'i-a-hino ǝsǝb k'at'tǝr-ǝ-o-m
    boys-DEF.PL.M person kill.PFV-3PLM.SBJ-PST
    ‘The boys killed a person.’

b. dǝng'i-a-hino tǝ-k'at'tǝr-ǝ-o-m
    boys-DEF.PL.M PRM-kill.REC.PFV-3PLM.SBJ-PST
    ‘The boys killed each other.’

c. gired-hinǝma əʧt dǝnǝg-ǝma-m
    girl.PL-DEF.PL.F woman hit.PFV-3PLF.SBJ-PST
    ‘The girls hit a woman.’

⁶C stands for any consonant, the consonants with an identical number subscript indicates gemination; the parenthesis shows optionality; the vowel /ə/ before the third root consonants shows perfective.
d. gired-hinəma  tə-danəg-əma-m
giri.PL-DEF.PL.F PRM-hit.REC.PFV-3PLF.SBJ-PST
‘The girls hit one another.’

The examples in (14a and c) are non-reciprocal forms while those in (14b and d) are reciprocal. The verbs in the former have two arguments; in the latter, the arguments are reduced to one.

It is possible to add an optional reciprocal pronoun ‘each other’ which consists of two duplicated personal pronouns (according to the person of the referents) connected by the focus marker { -m} and the prefix {tə-} that marks the comitative, as in (15):

(15) a. deng'ā-hino hino-m tə-hino tə-k'atər-o-m
boys-DEF.3PL 3PLM-FOC COM-3PLM PRM-kill.REC.PFV-3PLM.SBJ-PST
‘The boys killed each other’.

b. gired-hinəma hinəma-m tə-hinəma tə- danəg-əma-m
giri.PL-DEF.PL 3PLF-FOC COM-3PLFPRM-hit.REC.PFV-3PLF.SBJ-PST
‘The girls hit each other’.

Thus, Gumer can mark reciprocity by a dedicated verb derivation and optionally by the reciprocal pronoun.

**Impersonal**

In Gumer Gurage, there is also another means of demoting an agent of a transitive verb; hence, giving it a sense of passive, that is, making it impersonal. A derivational morpheme { -u} is attached to a verb which is followed by other agreement affixes (see Degif, 2000:207). The morpheme often disappears at the surface by labializing the right-most non-alveolar consonant (see Rose, 1994a:117-118 for details). Moreover, the suffix { -u} triggers the palatalization of the immediately preceding consonant. Sonorants such as n and r may change to j in the process (see Rose 1994a:113-120). The examples in (16) show the derivation process of impersonal verbs:

16) (a) səppər-
Active səppər-ə-m
break.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
‘He broke’.

Impersonal səppər-U-i-m > [səppʰər-i-m]
break.PFV-IPM-3SGM.OBJ-PST
‘It was broken’.

(b) səkkər-
Active səkkər-ə-m
intoxicate.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
‘He got intoxicated’.

Impersonal səkkər-U-i-m > [səkkʰərim]
intoxicate.PFV-IMP-3SGM.OBJ-PST
‘Someone was intoxicated’.

(c) fət-
Active fət-ə-m
till.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
‘He tilled’.

Impersonal fət-U-i-m > [fəfim]
till.PFV-IMP-3SGM.OBJ-PST
‘It was tilled’.
(d) bettor- Active bettor-ə-m separate.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST ‘He separated’.

Impersonal bettor-U-i-m > [b*ettərim]
separate.PFV-IPM-3SGM.OBJ-PST ‘It was separated’.

The impersonal marker {-U} disappears in surface forms labializing the nearest labializable consonants (as in pʷ in 16a, kʷ in 16b, and bʷ in 16d of impersonal forms). As there is no labializable consonant in 16c, the suffix {-U} cannot surface as labialization, but still triggers the palatalization of the root-final consonant /t/ to [ʧ], yielding ꙉʧim (see Rose, 1994b:115; 1997:185-190).

Both labialization and palatalization may apply to a single verb root, such as ꙉkft as in ꙉkəf'ət'rim (open.PFV-IMP-3SGMO-PST ‘It was opened’, which is realized as ꙉkəf'əʧim in which /f/, the right-most non-alveolar consonant, is labialized and the root-final /t/ is palatalized. There is, therefore, rule ordering in that labialization is applied first and then palatalization.

The impersonal in Gumer can be used with imperfective verbs of the present and future tense as well as the jussive, as shown with the verb ꙉk’t’r ‘kill’ in (17):

(17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Jussive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ji-k’at’r-U-i</td>
<td>ji-k’at’r-U-i-te</td>
<td>jə-k’it’r-U-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGM.BJS-kill.PFV-IMP-3SGMO</td>
<td>3SGM.SBJ-kill.IPFV-IMP-3SGM.OBJ-FUT</td>
<td>3SGM.SBJ-kill.JUS-IMP-3SGM.OBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘It is killed’. | ‘It will be killed’. | ‘Let it be killed’.

In (17), the agent is impersonalized to ‘it’, and the verb functions as a passive construction. The demotion of the agent as well as the deletion of the subject marker with imperfective verbs in 17 demonstrates that the impersonal semantically reduces the number of arguments in Gumer Gurage. Consider the examples in (18) and (19):

18 a. kasa jə-sara dənəg-ə-na-m
Kasa GAD-Sara hit.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-3SGF.OBJ-PST
‘Kasa hit Sara’.

b. sara dənəg-U-ja-m > [dənəgʷ]jam
Sara hit.PFV-IMP-3SGF.OBJ-PST
‘Sara was hit’.

19 a. deng’a-hino jə-sara k’ənəm-o-ja-m
boys-3PL.DEF GAD-Sara insult.PFV-3PLM.SBJ-3SGF.OBJ-PST
‘The boys insulted Sara’.

< [jikʷ’ət’rɪ], [jikʷ’ət’rɪte] and [jəkʷ’t’ıɾɪ] for the present, future and jussive forms, respectively.
The active sentences in 18a and 19a have two arguments (subject and direct object). In 18b and 19b, the agents are semantically bleached out and the object noun Sara appears as if it were the logical subject, but syntactically it is still referred to by the 3SGF object marker on the verb. It is important to note that the accusative marker { jo- } is deleted in the impersonal construction.

The impersonal constructions in Gumer are typically followed by a default third-person singular object marker cross-referencing the logical subject. However, depending on the number and gender of the patient, the object marker may change, as for the 3SGF in 18b and 19b, or the 3PLM in 20b, where the 3PLM object agreement is maintained.

The difference in the form of the 3PLM object marker is due to the complex allomorphic distribution of two basic object marker sets in Gunnän Gurage (for which see Hetzron 1977: 62–65).

The impersonal passive can also be derived from intransitive verbs (see Lyons, 1969:379), which also applies to Gumer. These impersonal intransitive verbs, have a dummy generic subject ‘it, one or people.’ The examples in (21) show the impersonal derivation from intransitive verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Active</td>
<td>daƙ’-o-m laugh.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST</td>
<td>ji-daƙ’ 3SGM.SBJ-laugh.IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daƙ’-u-i-m &gt;[daƙ’im] laugh.PFV-3SGM.OBJ-PST</td>
<td>ji-daƙ’-u-i&gt;[jidak’im] 3SGM.SBJ-laugh.IPFV-IMP-3SGM.OBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Impersonal</td>
<td>k’oƙ’u-o-m be_tired.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST</td>
<td>ji-k’oƙ’ 3SGM.SBJ-be_tired.IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k’oƙ’u-i-m’&gt;[k’oƙ’im] be_tired.PFV-3SGM.OBJ-PST</td>
<td>ji-k’oƙ’-u-i&gt;[jik’oƙ’im] 3SGM.SBJ-be_tired.IPFV-IMP-3SGM.OBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the perfective in (21), the active forms of the verbs have a 3SGM subject (which can be replaced by a proper noun like John) and the subject suffix {-o}. In the impersonal forms, the subject suffix is replaced by the impersonal marker referring to a dummy agent. However, the
morphosyntax of the impersonal requires an object suffix, thus the 3SGM is attached by default. In the imperfective (and jussive), subject marking is obligatory, thus the prefix j- is applied here as the default subject marker. In addition, the default 3SGM object marker has to be attached.

Verbs with pleonastic subjects, such as *zirab żənəb-u-im [rain rain.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST ‘the rain rained’ or ‘it rained’] cannot add the impersonal suffix {-U}. So, *zirabżənəb-u-i-m [*zirab żənəb’im] is not acceptable.

2.3 Valence maintaining verbal extension. Valence maintaining verbal extensions in Gumer include the frequentative, the intensive, and the iterative. Transitive verbs that express an action performed frequently and/or intensively are derived by reduplicating the penultimate radical of verbs. The meaning of the reduplicated frequentative or intensive verb is distinguished only by the inherent semantics of the verb. The examples in (22) show the forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Frequentative/intensive</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>səppər-</td>
<td>'break'</td>
<td>sibəppər-</td>
<td>'break into pieces' (INT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met’tər-</td>
<td>'choose'</td>
<td>mit’et’tər-</td>
<td>'choose repeatedly' (FREQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kətəf-</td>
<td>'chop'</td>
<td>kitətəf-</td>
<td>'chop into pieces' (INT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nəppə-</td>
<td>‘smear’</td>
<td>niβəppə-</td>
<td>‘smear into pieces’ (INT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>məaf-</td>
<td>‘cut’</td>
<td>məifəf-</td>
<td>‘cut into several parts’ (INT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kərat’təm-</td>
<td>‘attach’</td>
<td>kiβat’təm-</td>
<td>‘attach one after the another’ (ITER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kətər-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The triradical verbs in (22) with the root pattern \(C_1VC_2(C_2)VC_3\) change to \(C_1C_2VC_3(C_2)VC_3\) in the frequentative/intensive. The gemination of \(C_2\) depends on the verb root. Note that /p/ (< geminated *bb) is reduplicated as single /b/ in sibəppər-‘break’ and niβəppa-‘split’. In biradical verbs, \(C_1VC_2\) becomes \(C_1C_2VC_2(C_2)\)V. In quadric-radical verbs, \(C_1VC_2VC_3(C_3)VC_4\) becomes \(C_1C_2C_3VC_3VC_4\). Intransitive verbs following these patterns were not attested.

The examples in (23) show that the number of arguments of frequentative/intensive derived verbs are the same as the related simple (not derived) verbs.

(23) a.  žərga sin səppər-a-m  
Zerga cup break.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST  
‘Zerga broke a cup’.

b.  žərga sin sibəppər-a-m  
Zerga cup break.FREQ.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST  
‘Zerga broke a cup repeatedly’. 
c. zeru wədəra-hut kət’ər-əf-n-m
   Zeru rope-3SGM.DEF attach.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-3SGM.OBJ-PST
   Zeru attached the rope’.

d. zeru wədəra-hino kət’ər-əf-no-m
   Zeru rope-3PLM.DEF attach.FREQ.PFV-3SGF.SBJ-3PLM.OBJ-PST
   ‘Zeru attached the ropes one after the other’.

2.4 Stem forming verbal extensions. In Gumer, some verbs are differently derived from the verb patterns discussed in sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 above. These verbs do not have a simplex stem but obligatorily appear either with the causative marker {a-} or the passive marker {tə-}. Structurally, the assumed simplex stems of these derived verbs are bound, hence they cannot stand by themselves. Degif (1994:1222) calls such verbs in Chaha “prefix necessitating verbs”, while Mengistu (2000:327) refers to related verbs in Amharic as “valence encoding devices”. Mengistu makes a distinction between valence changing and valence encoding devices. The former is directional in that either a transitive verb is derived from a basic intransitive verb or an intransitive verb is derived from a basic transitive verb. The valence encoding devices are not directional and are similar to what Haspelmath (1993:91) calls EQUIPOLLENT ALTERNATION “in which both the intransitive and transitive forms of a verb are derived from a common stem by employing different affixes or auxiliary verbs”. Some examples of bound verbs with the causative prefix {a-} and the passive prefix {tə-} are given in (24):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(24) Gloss</th>
<th>Bound stem</th>
<th>CAUS stem</th>
<th>PASS stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ‘entreat’</td>
<td>*-slamət’</td>
<td>a-slamət’-</td>
<td>tə-slamət’-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ‘be inattentive’</td>
<td>*-zbazəb</td>
<td>a-zbazəb-</td>
<td>tə-zbazəb-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) ‘organize’</td>
<td>*k’mamət’</td>
<td>a-k’mamət’-</td>
<td>tə-k’mamət’-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) ‘feel pity’</td>
<td>*mat’ət’-</td>
<td>a-mat’ət</td>
<td>tə-mat’ət-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) ‘trouble’</td>
<td>*-dyəgar-</td>
<td>a- dyəgar-</td>
<td>tə-dyəgar-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) ‘cheat’</td>
<td>*-dbapər-</td>
<td>a-dbapər-</td>
<td>tə-dbapər-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) ‘feel pity’</td>
<td>*-sk”at’ət’</td>
<td>a-sk”at’ət’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) ‘disgust’</td>
<td>*-transə</td>
<td>a-transə</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the bound stems in (24), namely a–f, can derive both causative and passive, while only a few verbs, g–h, derive only the causative. The problem, however, is that the derived verbs with the causative and passive encoding are not necessarily causative or passive. For instance, ask”at’ət’- ‘feel pity’ is always intransitive with a single argument. Some verbs with causative and passive encoding can have an equal number of arguments as in (25):

| (25)         | zarga jə-zərməfi      | a-slamət’-ə-na-m
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| a.           | Zerga GAD-Zermeci      | CAUS-entreat.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-3SGF.OBJ-PST
|              | ‘Zerga entertained Zermeci’ |

| (25)         | zarga jə-zərməfi      | tə-slamət’-ə-la-m
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| b.           | Zerga GAD-Zermeci      | PRM-entreat.PFV-3SGM.SJB-3SGF.OBJ-PST
|              | ‘Zerga became entertained for Zermeci’s benefit’ |
In 25a and 25b, the verbs a-slamət'- and tə-slamət'- have causative and passive encoding prefixes which are supposed basically to increase and decrease arguments. However, the examples have an equal number of arguments, that is, the subject and the basic object in 25a and the subject and the applied object in 25b. The examples in (26) also substantiate that the derivational prefixes {tə-} and {a-} may not change the number of arguments.

(26) a. kasa frank a-dbapər-ə-m
   Kasa money DCAUS-deceive.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Kasa deceived money (from somebody)’.

   b. kasa frank tə-dbapər-ə-m
   Kasa money PRM-deceive.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Kasa was deceived (of) money’.

The forms in (26) neither increase nor decrease the arguments of the verb. Some other verbs marked by the derivational prefixes, however, change their number of arguments, as shown in (27):

(27) a. zarga tə-dʒəgar-ə-m
   Zerga person DCAUS-trouble.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Zerga caused trouble to a person’.

   b. zarga səb a-dʒəgar-ə-m
   Zerga person DCAUS-trouble.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-PST
   ‘Zerga caused trouble to a person’.

   c. zərga jə-mʷena-ta ⱦama at-dʒəmʷəd³-ə-l-ə-m
   Zerga GAD-uncle-POSS.3SGM shoes ICAUS-send.PFV-3SGM.SBJ-BA.BOJ-3SGM-PST
   ‘Zerga sent shoes to his uncle via someone’.

In (27a), tədʒəgarəm is reflexive and hence has a single argument, Zerga. In (27b), adʒəgarəm ‘caused trouble’, the prefix {a-} functions as direct causative and increases the argument of the verb by one. In addition to the subject Zerga, it has now the object səb. In (27c), the verb atdʒəmʷəd³əm ‘sent him’ functions as double causative; hence, it increases the argument structure of the verb by two arguments: Zerga (subject), jəmʷenata (indirect object), and ⱦama ‘shoes’ (direct object).

In short, we can say that the verbs with valence encoding devices discussed above are mainly derived from the same stem and have equipollent alternations. There is, however, a tendency that a few of the constructions (as in 27) are being lexicalized independent of the valence changing prefixes. This indicates that there is no strict division between equipollent alternation and valence changing operations.

---

8 The verb -dʒəmədl- ‘send via someone’ is bound that exists with only double causative marker {at-} and not with the causative {a-} and the passive {tə-}. 
3. Summary

In this article, an attempt was made to describe and analyze the interaction between verbal extension and valence. Verbs in Gumer were grouped into transitive, intransitive, double transitive, and equipollent based on the number of arguments the verbs assign.

Regarding verb extension and valence, verbs in Gumer can increase, decrease, and maintain valence. It was found that there are verbs with equipollent alternations which are derived with prefixes from bound stems. The valence increasing operations are direct causatives and indirect causatives marked by \{a-\} and \{at-\}, respectively. Applicative construction with a benefactive and a malefactive meaning also increases the number of arguments of verbs. The benefactive applicative is derived with \{-nv-\} which alternates with \{-lv\} when the subject of a verb is a third person. The malefactive applicative is formed with \{-bv-\} that alternates with \{-wv-\}. Valence reducing verbal extensions include (i) passive, reflexive, and middle – all marked by \{tə-\}, (ii) reciprocal is marked by the prefix \{tə\} plus the insertion of vowel /a/, and (iii) the impersonal is formed with \{-U\}. The valence maintaining verbal extension includes frequentative and intensive, which are characterized by reduplication of parts of verbs. A few bound verb roots to which derivational prefixes are attached do not change valence.
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Symbols and Abbreviations Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Morpheme boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Benefactive applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>Benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNV</td>
<td>Converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAUS</td>
<td>Direct causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>Frequentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAD</td>
<td>Genitive, accusative, dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAUS</td>
<td>Indirect causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>Iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>Jussive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Malefactive applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>Malefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVM</td>
<td>Main verb marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRM</td>
<td>Passive, reflexive, middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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