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1. Introduction
This study examines the semantic structures of Sidaama (Sidamo), a Cushitic language of Ethiopia, to see how this language fits in Ikegami’s (1981, 1991) typology of DO- and BECOME-language types (correspondingly, the English and Japanese types). Although it has many state-change verbs where an entity’s change of state is lexicalized, Sidaama exhibits no pattern of expressing events in discourse that is characteristic of the BECOME-language type in Ikegami’s sense at all, and appears to be a DO-language. However, as far as features of the two types of languages with which Ikegami characterizes them are concerned, Sidaama has some features of one type as well as some features of the other. Thus, it is not clear whether this language is really a DO language, or should be regarded as a language that cannot be handled by Ikegami’s typology. However, if Sidaama is a DO language, what Ikegami claims about the features of the two types of languages does not seem to apply to this language. The validity of this typology, which is founded solely on two languages, as a general framework for semantic typology is addressed.

2. Ikegami’s (1981, 1991) Typology of DO- vs. BECOME-Languages
Ikegami hypothesizes that there are two contrastive types of languages, DO- and BECOME-language types, that differ in their dominant pattern of expressing events in discourse. The former usually expresses an event as ‘someone DOing something’, whereas the latter prevailingly expresses an event as ‘the whole scene changing into another state (BECOMing changed in its state)’ with individual event participants backgrounded or submerged in the scene. (Note that Ikegami (1991:318-319) states that the Japanese verb *naru* would be more appropriately used than the English verb *become* to characterize a BECOME-language, “because it can leave implicit who or what becomes something”.) Ikegami illustrates the peculiar expression pattern found in discourse in Japanese with examples from literary works (e.g. no mention of subject in the first sentence of Yukinari Kawabata’s *Yukiguni*), where the event participant is not prominently mentioned, and the whole scene in which the event participant is submerged is described as being changed, and with some idiomatic expressions (e.g. *haru-meku* [spring-become] ‘it becomes spring’; *yu-sare-ba* [evening-come-when] ‘when the evening comes’), where subtle implications involving a change of state of the whole scene are expressed, but no event participant is mentioned. Ikegami also argues that unlike English, which expresses a motion event as a change in locus of a moving entity (an individuum), Japanese treats one as a change in state of the whole scene where the moving entity, which assumes successively different forms and postures but as a whole remains stationary, is submerged though its parts undergo a change in locus, as, according to Ikegami, corroborated by the use of motion verbs for state-change events in English (e.g. *go crazy*) and the use of *naru* ‘to become’ for motion in old Japanese.

Ikegami argues that the contrast between the two types of languages in the way of expressing events in discourse is due to the difference in the treatment of an individuum, as in (1a), especially in the treatment of a human being, the most focusable instance of an individuum, as in (1b).

1. a. A DO-language singles out and focuses on an individuum, whereas a BECOME-language focuses on the event as a whole, with the individua submerged in it.
b. A DO-language focuses on a human being (especially, as an agent), and tends to give linguistic prominence to this notion (by thematizing/subjectivizing or obligatorily selecting a linguistic item for a human referent), whereas a BECOME-language tends to suppress the notion of the human being.

According to Ikegami, these differences between the two types of languages reflect contrasting features (of course, not meant to be binary features in generative grammar) of the two types of languages (specifically, different characteristic patterns of expressing meanings and the existence or non-existence of grammatical categories).\(^1\) They are summarized in Table 1.

There are a couple of ways in which the two types of languages differ in expressing an individuum, as shown in (I) in Table 1. First, English can make discreetness distinctions of referents by means of the number and/or definiteness markings, whereas Japanese is generally ambiguous about the discreetness of referents, and can even use vague expressions for specific referents (e.g. ‘about two’ for ‘two’). Second, English favors *mono* (a concrete object) type expressions (e.g. subject raising, tough construction), but Japanese prefers *koto* (circumstances) type expressions (e.g. internally-headed relative clauses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>feature</th>
<th>language type</th>
<th>DO-language (English)</th>
<th>BECOME-language (Japanese)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) individuum vs. event</td>
<td>discreteness</td>
<td>discreteness distinction with number and/or definiteness markings</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vague expressions for specific referents</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preference for <em>mono</em> (a concrete object) type or <em>koto</em> (circumstances) type expressions</td>
<td><em>mono</em> type</td>
<td><em>koto</em> type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II-i) human being</td>
<td>possession</td>
<td>HAVE-language</td>
<td>BE-language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitness in expressing a human referent in some expressions</td>
<td>direct reference to a human referent</td>
<td>no mention of a human referent; backgrounding a human referent; use of <em>koto</em> ‘thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II-ii) agent</td>
<td>transitivity of verbs that are primary</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree of agentivity in causative expressions</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different complementation patterns</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>event realization: the implication of the achievement of the goal</td>
<td>more likely</td>
<td>less likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation of causer in some grooming/body-care expressions</td>
<td>direct causer</td>
<td>direct or indirect causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rhetorical figure of personification</td>
<td>can be used</td>
<td>avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>various means of suppressing the notion of an agent</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Expression patterns characteristic of DO- and BECOME-languages

The two types of languages also differ as to whether they tend to focus on or suppress the notion of a human being, as summarized in (II-i) in Table 1. First, in expressing possession, English follows the HAVE-language pattern, which uses a verb of possession (e.g. *John has two children./The room has two windows.*), whereas Japanese follows the BE-language pattern, which uses a construction with the existential verb (e.g. *lit. ‘At/To John are two children./In the room are two windows.’*) (in addition to that with a verb of possession, in the case of an animate possessor and an inanimate possessum). Second, in many cases where English directly expresses a human referent (e.g. *I have a temperature./John ran out of money./I don’t understand you.*), Japanese may leave it unexpressed or background it (e.g. *lit. ‘(As for me,) (there) is a temperature./(As for John,) money became null.’*), or use a *koto* type expression (e.g. *lit. ‘I don’t understand what you say.’*).

There are also several respects in which the two types of languages differ in their expression of an agent, as listed in (II-ii) in Table 1. Generally, English verbs often convey a higher degree of agentivity than Japanese counterparts, and English tends to or prefers to focus on the notion of an agent, unlike Japanese, which tends to or prefers to suppress it. First, it is transitive verbs that are primary in English, but it is intransitive verbs that are primary in Japanese. Second, the causative constructions that, in their basic usage, express the most peremptory type of causation (with the causer’s
strongest control over the causee and a lack of the causee’s independence from the causer) in English and Japanese are used for somewhat different ranges of causation types. The English causative construction with *make* is restricted to agentive causation, whereas the Japanese causative construction with *sase* can be used not only for agentive causation but for permissive causation as well, and sometimes even in place of the adversative passive (e.g. *sin-ase-ru* [die-CAUS-DEC] instead of *sin-are-ru* [die-PASS-DEC]); thus, the causative meaning can be very much weakened in the Japanese causative. A third point in which the two types of languages differ with respect to agentivity is that, unlike Japanese, English has developed different complementation patterns with which agentivity can be highlighted (e.g. *ask/report + object + infinitive*) or backgrounded (e.g. *ask/report + that-clause*). Fourth, there are many cases where the successful achievement of a goal is implied in English expressions, but is not necessarily in (colloquial) Japanese counterparts (e.g. lit. ‘I burned/thawed/boiled it, but it did not burn/thaw/boil.’). Fifth, there are cases where an English grooming/body-care expression (e.g. *I cut my hair*) has only the direct causer interpretation, while its Japanese counterpart allows either the direct or indirect causer interpretation. Sixth, English can use expressions containing the rhetorical figure of personification because of its favoring the ‘actor-action’ construction, but Japanese avoids such expressions.

Furthermore, unlike English, Japanese has various ways of suppressing or effacing the notion of an agent. First, in its enormously honorific usage, Japanese can express the honored person as a location where the event takes place, rather than as an agent, and the event as that where the whole scene BECOMES changed, rather than as that where the agent DOes something (e.g. lit. ‘At emperor, became to eating.’: Ikegami 1981:199). Second, in addition to the subject-predicate constructions, Japanese has the topic-comment constructions, where the topic phrase could be interpreted as expressing a location where the event takes place. Third, Japanese can reduce agentivity with the inchoative morpheme *reru/rareru*, which generally suppresses the notion of an agent, and, among other things, can change the verb for ‘to think’ into that for ‘to seem’. Fourth, Japanese has a construction like (2) whose main verb is *naru* ‘to become’ (but presumably has no subject), and where a nominalized clause expresses the event.  

(2) Watakushitachi wa konotabi kekkonsuru koto ni nari mashita.  
we TOP now marry NML to become polite-PAST  
‘(It) has become (that is, come to pass) that we are now getting married.’ (Ikegami 1991:316) (or more correctly: ‘It has been determined/decided that …’)

Finally, Japanese sometimes uses the intransitive construction for cases where English uses the passive construction (e.g. *John was born in 1950*).  

Ikegami’s hypothesis sounds appealing, especially because the contrast in linguistic conceptualization seems to parallel differences in other non-linguistic behavioral patterns between speakers of the two languages. However, there are a number of respects in which Ikegami’s hypothesis is not convincing or seems to be too vague to evaluate. First, this typology is based only on two languages, English and Japanese, and it does not seem to have been tested against any other genetically and geographically distant language. It is questionable how it is possible to claim convincingly that two languages are of two extreme typological types by listing their contrastive characteristics. If other languages are taken into account, this hypothesis might not work. To take one example, Ikegami seems to suggest at least implicitly that Indo-European languages other than English also belong to the DO-language type, but there are those Indo-European languages that follow the BE-language pattern in expressing possession, including Classical Greek (Smyth 1956[1920]: 341-342) and Russian (Haspelmath 1999: 126-128). Second, some of the arguments that Ikegami makes need evidence. For example, it is far from clear whether motion events are really treated as a change in locus in English but as a change in state in Japanese. Also, his argument for a change in state of the whole scene as the event description pattern characteristic of discourse in the BECOME language relies mainly on literary works. It may not
apply very well to colloquial Japanese. Third, it is often not clear how the specific examples that he uses for his argument about an individuum vs. an event actually show what he intends to show. For example, he claims that the lack of the discreteness distinction in Japanese implies its focus on the whole situation, but the lack of the distinction in a language does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that that language focuses on an event rather than a referent of a noun phrase; in other words, an entity treated as being irrelevant to the discreteness distinction does not have to be an event. Fourth, although examples concerning the contrast between an individuum and an event as a whole are given, there do not seem to be sufficient examples provided for the contrast between DO and BECOME (actions and changes) in discourse. The focus on an individuum, on a human being, and on an agent in a language does not necessarily mean that that language treats any type of event as one involving 'DOing', nor does the focus on the event as a whole and the suppression of the notion of a human being or an agent in a language necessarily mean that that language treats any type of event as one involving 'BECOMing' (in other words, neither (1a) nor (1b) says anything conclusive about DO vs. BECOME). Finally, Ikegami claims that there are many cases where English expresses an event as 'someone DOing something', and Japanese expresses the same event as 'the whole scene changing into another state', but does not show how common such cases are to the extent that they form contrastive patterns. It is questionable whether Japanese predominantly expresses any type of event as 'the whole scene changing into another state'. One language might show different patterns for different types of events. Furthermore, most of the BECOME-language type expressions dealt with in Ikegami's arguments are syntactically constructed rather than expressed or lexicalized in morphemes, and are optional rather than obligatory. How pervasive a given expression is can differ depending on this factor. In fact, for English, obligatory expressions are provided as examples of the DO-language pattern, but for Japanese, many of the examples do not necessarily have to be selected, and could be replaced by expressions of the DO-language pattern, often depending on the context (see note 2).

The next section examines whether Sidaama follows the DO- or BECOME-language pattern, disregarding the problems discussed above, some of which are returned to in section 4.

3. IS Sidaama a DO- or BECOME-Language?

Sidaama is a Highland East Cushitic language spoken in South Central Ethiopia (Kawachi 2007a, b, c, d, 2008a, b, c, 2009, in press a, b, Kawachi & Tekleselassie in press). The case system of this language is accusative. It is a verb-final language whose word order is predominantly SOV, and uses suffixation (and also suprafication for marking some grammatical cases). This language has two classes of verbs, action verbs and state-change verbs, which differ in their aspectual behavior. The progressive form of an action verb expresses an ongoing action, whereas that of a state-change verb expresses a gradual state change in process. The perfect form of an action verb expresses a completed action, whereas that of a state-change verb expresses a completed state change, and also implies a current, temporary or non-inherent state as a result of the state change.

Sidaama does not have the BECOME-language pattern often found in Japanese literary works, where the whole scene in which the event participant is submerged is described as undergoing a change. Although, like Japanese and unlike English (e.g. go crazy), Sidaama usually does not use motion verbs (except da- ‘to come’ in some contexts) for a change in state involving no motion, there is no evidence that Sidaama motion verbs express a change in state in the sense that a person assumes successively different forms and postures, as Ikegami (1991:321) claims Japanese ones do (also, unlike old Japanese and like English, Sidaama cannot use the verb for ‘to become’ to express a change in locus). Thus, Sidaama does not seem to show the BECOME-language pattern in Ikegami’s sense.4

It is shown below that despite this, Sidaama exhibits some features of the DO-language and some features of the BECOME-language as well, but apparently not consistent characteristics of either type (nor those of an inbetween type).
(I) Expressions of an individuum vs. the whole event

With respect to the notion of an individuum as opposed to the whole event, a DO-language prefers a referent to be discrete, and a BECOME-language tends to blur a referent. Sidaama can be analyzed as similar to English in some respects, but also as similar to Japanese in other respects. Like English, Sidaama uses morphological number markings on most common nouns. Some common noun forms are morphologically marked with number suffixes, either singular or plural suffixes, whereas others are morphologically unmarked for number. Some common nouns have all three forms (e.g. UNMARKED: sina, SG: sin-čo, PL: sin-na ‘branch’), and some have two forms (singular and plural forms, unmarked and plural forms, or unmarked and singular forms), though the rest have only one (the unmarked one only).

On the other hand, although the definite suffix -nni occurs in limited contexts (see (9)), Sidaama common nouns, like Japanese ones, basically do not make a definiteness distinction. Also, like Japanese speakers, Sidaama speakers often choose to use vague expressions like (3) and (4), especially if they want to sound modest or polite in their request or offer, even when they have a specific referent in mind.

(3) lamé burtukaané geešša ad-a dand-ee-mm-o ?
two(GEN.F) orange(GEN.F) degree(ACC) take-INF can-IM PERF.1-1SG-MASC
‘Can I (MASC) take about two oranges?’ (lit. ‘Can I (MASC) take the degree of two oranges?’)

(4) bun-ú-ğede re ad-a hasí’r-a-tt-a ?
coffee-GEN.M-like things(ACC) take-INF come.to.want- IMPERF.2SG-2SG-F
‘Do you (SG.FEM) want to drink things like coffee?’

It is not clear whether Sidaama follows the DO- or BECOME-language pattern with respect to the other point that Ikegami makes, either. He states that the DO-language and the BECOME-language prefer mono-type and koto-type expressions, respectively, but it is difficult to decide which type of expression Sidaama prefers. For example, it has neither a “raising” construction nor an internally-headed relative clause construction.

(II-i) Expressions of a human being

According to Ikegami, for the notion of a human being, a DO-language and a BECOME-language show contrasts with each other in the way of expressing possession and in the explicitness in expressing a human referent. For possession, Sidaama uses the verb of possession (afiɗ-: the middle voice form of af- ‘to get to know, find’) like English, as in (5), but uses a construction with the existential verb as well like Japanese, as in (5’). In this respect, Sidaama exhibits the BECOME-language pattern.

(5) ise miné afiɗ-ɗ-ino.
3SG.FEM house(ACC) get-3SG.F-PERF.3
‘She has a house.’ (lit. ‘She got a house.’)

(5’) ise-ra min-u no.
3SG.FEM-DAT house-NOM.M come.to.exist.PERF.3
‘She has a house.’ (lit. ‘To her, a house came to exist.’)

However, it is not clear which pattern Sidaama follows with respect to the explicitness in expressing a human referent. As English does, Sidaama can sometimes express a human referent directly in cases where Japanese does not, as in (6) and (6’) (in either of these sentences, the subject pronoun can be omitted, though the subject always has to be indicated with the subject person suffix).

(6) ani iibbillé afi’r-oo-mm-o.
1SG.NOM fever(ACC) get-PERF.1-1SG-M
‘I (MASC) have a fever.’ (lit. ‘I (MASC) got a fever.’)

(6’) ani iibbabb-oo-mm-o.
1SG.NOM become.feverish-PERF.1-1SG-M
‘I (MASC) became feverish.’ (lit. ‘I (MASC) became feverish.’)

On the other hand, there are cases where Sidaama, like Japanese, cannot express a human referent directly, as in (7) (instead of *lit. ‘She is right.’), (8) (instead of *lit. ‘I don’t understand you.’), and (9) (instead of *lit. ‘She went to
him/the rock.

(7) ise  y-i-t-ino  ri  halaale=ho.
3SGF.NOM say-EP-3SGF-PERF.3 things.NOM.M truth=NPC.PRED.M
'The things that she said are the truth.'

(8) ati  y-oo-t-t-o  ri  di=leell-a-ino-’e.
2SGNOM say-PERF.2SG-2SG-M things.NOM.M NEG=become.visible-3SGM-PERF.3-1SG
'I don’t understand the things that you (SGMASC) said.' (lit. 'The things that you (SGMASC) said did not become visible to me.

(9) ise  isi=wa/kenē-ū-nni=wa  had-d-ino.
3SGF.NOM 3SGM.GEN=place/rock-GEN.M-DEF=place go-3SGF-PERF.3
'She went to him/the rock.' (lit. 'She went to his location/the rock’s location.')

However, in some cases, Sidaama can use either type of expression, as in (10) and (10’).

(10) ninke  mat’ineé-nke  gu-n-d-oo-mmo.
1PL.NOM salt(ACC)-1PL.POSS finish-1PL-finish-PERF.1-1PL salt(NOM.F) end-3SGF-PERF.3
'We are/ran out of salt.' (lit. 'We finished our salt.')

(10’) mat’inee  goof-f-ino.
'The salt ran out.'

(II-ii) Expressions of an agent

Ikegami hypothesizes that the two types of languages differ in their treatment of an agent in various respects. Which pattern Sidaama follows with respect to each criterion is described below.

(A) Transitivity of verbs that are primary

According to Ikegami, transitive and intransitive verbs are primary in English and Japanese, respectively, but in the case of Sidaama, it is difficult to decide which verb class is primary. Although many transitive verbs are derived from intransitive verbs with the causative suffix -s (e.g. ra’- ‘to become cooked’ – ra’-i-s- ‘to cook’), some intransitive verbs (mostly, state-change verbs) are derived from transitive verbs with the passive suffix -am (e.g. giir-am- ‘to become burned/offended’ – giir- ‘to burn/offend’), and there are also pairs of compound verbs with y- ‘to say’ (intransitive) and ass- ‘to do’ (transitive) (e.g. tašši y- ‘to become satisfied’ – tašši ass- ‘to satisfy’), which contrast in transitivity.

(B) Degree of agentivity in causative expressions

In the causative construction in Sidaama, which is formed with the causative suffix as in Japanese, the causer’s control of the causee is strong as in the English construction with make. It expresses agentive causation, but not additionally permissive causation nor adversity, unlike the Japanese construction with sase.

(C) Different types of complements

Sidaama verbs can take various types of complements. For example, most manipulative verbs (Noonan 1985) in this language can follow the supplementation patterns in (11a)-(11d): (11a) takes a verb with the infinitive suffix, the person suffix, the gender suffix, and the dative suffix, (11b) and (11c) each use the connective form of the verb of saying, and (11d) takes a clause with the complementizer suffix similar to the that-complementizer in English.

(11)  

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{a} & \quad \text{ha’r-a-mm-o-ra} & \quad \text{go-INF-1SG-M-DAT} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{ha’r-a} & \quad \text{basis-o-amno-’e} & \quad \text{y-i-t-e} & \quad \text{giddies-s-ino-’e.} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{ha’r-i} & \quad \text{y-i-t-e} & \quad \text{try.to.force-3SGF-PERF.3} \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{ani} & \quad \text{ha’r-ee-mm-o-ɡede} & \quad \text{1SGNOM go-IMPERF.1-1SG-M-so.that} & \quad \text{1SG}
\end{aligned}
\]

3SGF.NOM

'She tried to force me (MASC in (a) and (d)) to go.' (lit. (b) ‘saying, “You must go (Your going is necessary)”’/ (c) ‘saying,
Because, in (11a), the referent of the first-person is highly likely to have gone, unlike in (11b)-(11d), where the person might not have gone, one could say that agentivity is more foregrounded in the infinitive construction in (11a) than in any of the other constructions.

(D) Event realization  According to Ikegami, there is a type of goal-directed action that implies the achievement of the goal both in English and Japanese (e.g. ‘kill’), and one that implies the achievement of the goal neither in English nor in Japanese (e.g. ‘invite’), and there is still another type that implies the achievement of the goal in English, but not in Japanese (e.g. ‘drown’, ‘persuade’) (but not vice versa). Ikegami claims that this is because English verbs generally express a higher degree of agentivity than Japanese counterparts.

Sidaama is consistent with English and Japanese regarding the ‘kill’-type verb and the ‘invite’-type verb, and seems to be close to Japanese with respect to the event realization of the ‘drown’/‘persuade’-type verb; there are many cases in Sidaama where a goal-directed action does not imply the achievement of the goal, as in Japanese. For example, the Sidaama translation of ‘I drowned him.’ does not necessarily imply his death. Other examples of this type are manipulative verbs (e.g. huučč’iɗ- ‘to persuade’, giddees- ‘to force’, gubbis- ‘to bribe’, awaawur- ‘to cajole’); unlike many of those in English and like those in Japanese, they do not necessarily imply the achievement of the goal.

(E) Interpretation of a causer in some grooming/body-care expressions  For cases where English grooming/body-care expressions have only the direct causer interpretation and their Japanese counterparts allow either the direct or indirect causer interpretation, Sidaama follows the Japanese pattern, as in (12), where the middle construction highlights the subject’s experience of the event, backgrounding who the agent is.

(F) Rhetorical figure of personification  Sidaama does not use the rhetorical figure of personification as much as in English, but like English, it commonly uses noun phrases for inanimate entities (e.g. ‘The wind broke the glass.’) and those for abstract concepts including ma ‘what’ as the subject of a transitive or causative verb, as in (13), which is a question asked less directly than (13’).

(G) Various means of suppressing the notion of an agent  Though not exactly in the same ways as Japanese, Sidaama has some means of suppressing or backgrounding the notion of agentivity. First, in addition to those in (6) and (6’), Sidaama has a construction with an impersonal third-person masculine subject (only expressed with the suffix on the verb) and a transitive state-change verb or the causative form of a state-change verb where the real participant is indicated with the object suffix on the verb or an NP in the accusative, or both, as in (6’). Second, Sidaama has the adversative middle construction, which is used for an adversative event that befalls the referent of the subject NP, and is neutral about the existence of an agent. An example is given in (14), where there may
or may not be an agent, and if there is one, the agent may or may not be the subject of the subject NP, unlike in (14).

(14) ise midaanó hiikk’-i-d-d-ino.
3SGF.NOM clay.pot(ACC) break-EP-3SGF-PERF3

‘Her clay pot got broken to her detriment.’

(14’) ise midaanó hiikk’-i-t-ino.
3SGF.NOM clay.pot(ACC) break-EP-3SGF-PERF3

‘She broke the clay pot.’

4. Discussion

As shown in section 3, even though Sidaama seems like a DO-language because of its lack of the expression pattern of the BECOME-language in discourse, it has some features of one type and some features of the other type, and does not consistently show features of either type of language. This can be interpreted in different ways. First, Sidaama might be a language of a third type that is very different from and cannot be classified into either of the (other) two types, and cannot be placed anywhere between the two extremes. However, this does not go beyond speculation before many other languages are also investigated. Unless this possibility is correct, Sidaama seems to be a DO-language. Thus, it seems that the features used to characterize DO- and BECOME-languages are not all relevant to the difference between the two types of languages emergent in discourse – it may be that only some of them are valid typological parameters but others have nothing to do with the difference. If all the features in Table 1 are relevant to the DO- vs. BECOME-language typology, it is likely to be the case that a BECOME-language has to strictly possess all or almost all of the features, while a DO-language could have some of them but not all of them.

One thing that Ikegami’s typology does not consider is that a language does not necessarily have to conceptualize an event in a single way, but can often conceptualize an event in different ways. Ikegami discusses only two event conceptualization patterns, DO and BECOME, which are shown in (A) and (D), respectively, in Table 2 below. However, it is not the case that the two types of languages each always conceptualize events only in one of the ways. English and Japanese can express events in one of the three ways, (A), (B), and (D). (The other combination (C) (‘an action where the whole scene is foregrounded’) seems to be impossible.) For example, English can express an event as the change of an event participant or that of the whole scene, and Japanese can express an event as an event participant’s action. Also, even English has BECOME-language type expressions like it turns out that ... and it comes about that ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>event type conceptualized as</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foregrounded entity</td>
<td>(A): DO</td>
<td>(B): ‘become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event participant (often, individuated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the whole scene</td>
<td>(C): *</td>
<td>(D): BECOME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Patterns of event conceptualization

The arguments of such verbs are noun phrases that usually refer to an event participant in (A) or (B) in most cases.

Given that the major conceptualization patterns are (A) and (B), and that the prevailing use of the BECOME-language pattern (D) has not been reported to be attested in any other language than Japanese in literature (to the author’s best knowledge), even though this pattern is sporadically found even in the DO-language English (see note 2), it is likely that the conceptualization of the whole scene as undergoing a change shown in (D) is a crosslinguistically unusual pattern that deviates from the common patterns (A) and (B), and cannot be the most predominant pattern in any language. The unusualness of (D) is also corroborated by the optionality of expressions that follow the BECOME-language pattern, which could be replaced by some other expression of either the (A) pattern or (B) pattern in Japanese, and also by the peculiarities of Japanese such as the omissability of the subject and the existence of BECOME-type idiomatic expressions.

Another point that Ikegami’s typology fails to take into account is what type of grammatical category expresses a particular conceptual component (Bybee 1985, Talmy 1985, 2000). Expressions that follow the BECOME-language
pattern are syntactically constructed, and are often idiomatic. This also contributes to the unusualness of (D). In modern Japanese, the concept of *naru* ‘to become’, in which the event participant undergoing the change is implicit, is usually expressed by a syntactic construction rather than being lexicalized in a verb root. It is not clear how the use of such a syntactic expression can be regarded as a prevalent way of conceptualizing an event in Japanese.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, even though Sidaama seems to be a DO-language, it bears some features of a DO-language that Ikegami claims focus on an individuum rather than the whole scene, particularly the notion of a human being (especially as an agent), and some features of a BECOME-language that Ikegami claims focus on the whole scene rather than an individuum, or suppress the notion of a human being (especially as an agent). Thus, the difference in the expression pattern in discourse between the two types of languages is not attributable to the set of features. If the conceptualization of events in terms of BECOME is scarcely found in any other language, Japanese may be typologically unique in this respect. Nevertheless, it would be necessary to show that the BECOME-pattern is more pervasive than the DO- and ‘become’-patterns even in Japanese to support Ikegami’s hypothesis. Not to mention, in order to test Ikegami’s typology as a general framework for semantic typology, research on many additional languages needs to be conducted.

Notes

1. Ikegami (1991) is extremely vague about the relation between characteristic expression patterns of the two types of languages in discourse and their features listed in Table 1. Ikegami (1981) seems to mix these when he characterizes the two types of languages. Note, however, that the unlike the use of constructions without *naru*, the use of this construction implies that the occurrence of the event is beyond the control of the agent(s), and makes the speaker sound modest when the agent/agents is/are the speaker/speakers (or the agents include the speaker). On the other hand, the English construction *it turns out that* ... does not convey any modesty.


According to Dr. Kazuko Maeda (p. c.), her dissertation (1998), which looked at how Ikegami’s hypothesis is applicable to Portuguese (Romance), found that this language is in between the two types of languages – it has both DO-language type expressions as well as BECOME-language type expressions, and also has some features of the DO-language type and some features of the BECOME-language type. This appears to support Ikegami’s hypothesis in the sense that a language between the two types has expressions of both types as well as features of both types. However, it does not support Ikegami’s assumption that Indo-European languages belong to the DO-language type.

3. As a verb-framed language (Talmy 1985, 2000), Sidaama expresses motion events (and a few other types of events) similarly to Japanese (Kawachi 2007a, in press b). Also, aspectually, Sidaama path of motion verbs belong to the class of state-change verbs, and in this sense, Sidaama expresses a motion event as a change in state.

4. Also like Japanese, Sidaama can use an expression like (i), which could mean ‘She loves Dangura.’ (in place of *ise dangurá bat-t’-anno*, where *dangurá* is in the accusative), though it can be used in a wider range of contexts than its Japanese counterpart.

5. Nevertheless, a goal-directed action sometimes implies the achievement of the goal in Sidaama like in English and unlike in (colloquial) Japanese, and sentences like ‘I burned/thawed/boiled it, but it did not burn/thaw/boil.’ are unacceptable.

6. Though uncommon, it is possible to use the active construction with the possessor obligatorily expressed on the object noun (*ise danančó-se mur-t-ino*) instead of the middle construction, but the active construction allows only the direct causer interpretation, in which the action is incomplete (e.g. She cut one piece of her hair).

7. There are a few cases like (ii) where the impersonal third-person singular masculine subject can be used for an action verb.

8. Contrary to this type of construction, where the subject is not an event participant, Sidaama also has a construction with a verb of feeling like (iii) where the object of the feeling is used as the subject (thus, it could be analyzed as being “raised” from the object NP in (iii) to the subject NP).
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(iii) hakku rīči-ı bat’-ı-s-o-anño-’e.
that.M.NOM thing-NOM.M come.to.like-EP-CAUS-3SGM-IMPERF.3-1SG
I like that thing (MASC).’

(iii) ani hakkó rīčō bat’-ee-mm-o.
1SGNOM that.M.ACC thing(ACC) come.to.like-IMPERF.1-1SG-M
I (MASC) like that thing (MASC).’

Abbreviations
CNN Connective (Converb) EP Epenthetic vowel NPC Noun-phrase clitic

Acknowledgments
I would like to convey my hearty thanks to Dr. Abbeayehu Aemero Tekleselassie (K’eweena dialect; currently a professor of education at George Washington University) for consultation sessions and discussions on various aspects of Sidaama over the years, and to Silesii Workeneh (Alatta dialect), Solomon Shaamanna (Alatta dialect), and Yehualaesheh Aschenaki (K’eweena dialect) for being my consultants during my fieldwork in the Sidaama zone in 2008 and 2009. I consider myself under a debt of deep gratitude to the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies for funding my field trip in 2009. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the audience at my presentation at the 9th Japanese Cognitive Linguistics Association Conference, especially Dr. Yoshihiko Ikegami, for comments and discussions. I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Leonard Talmy, Dr. Matthew S. Dryer, and Dr. Jürgen Bohnemeyer for their advice and comments on a study on which portions of the present paper are based (Kawachi 2007a). Many thanks also go to Justin Boffemmyer for his valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. All errors are mine.

References
Kawachi, Kazuhiro (2007c) Shidaama-go (Shidamo-go) no kakun no shisutemu (The case system of Sidaama (Sidamo)). 135th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan, 190-195. (シダーマ（シダモ）語の格のシステム. 『日本言語学会第135回大会予稿集』, 190-195.)
Kawachi, Kazuhiro (2007d) Shidaama-go (Shidamo-go) no kanku kogenretsukusuo no keisei no pataan (Patterns of relative clause formation in Sidaama (Sidamo)). 135th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan, 362-367. (シダーマ（シダモ）語の関係節の形成のパターン. 『日本言語学会第135回大会予稿集』, 362-367.)
＜要旨＞

池上の「する」と「なる」の類型論

日英対照言語学を超えて意味類型論の一般的枠組みになり得るか？

Sidaama (Sidamo) 語（エチオピアのクシ語族の言語）の意味構造の研究

河內一博
防衛大学校

kawachi@nda.ac.jp, kazuhirokawachi@gmail.com

Sidaama 語（エチオピア中南部のクシ語族の言語）の意味構造・文法構造のパターンを調べ、この言語が英語と日本語をもとに構築された池上 (1981, Ikegami 1991) の「する」と「なる」の類型論にどのように当てはまるかを記述する。Sidaama 語は意味の表現のし方と文法構造上の特徴に関してはどちらの言語の特徴もいくらかずつ持っているのだが、ディスコースにおいては「なる」型の表現は見られないことを示し、この類型論の問題点を指摘する。

池上は、言語には「する」型の言語（英語）と「なる」型の言語（日本語）の二つのタイプの言語があるという仮説を提示している。ディスコースにおいて、「する」型の言語は個々のイヴェントの参加者が行為を「する」ととらえるのに対し、「なる」型の言語は個々のイヴェントの参加者ではなく状況全体が別の状況に変化する（「なる」）ととらえる。これらの違いは (i) 個を選び出してそれに焦点を当てる（「する」型）か、あるいは個が埋もれている状況全体に焦点を与える（「なる」型）かという違い、および (ii) 人間（特に動作主）に焦点を当てる（「する」型）か、あるいは表現をしないようにする（「なる」型）かという違いによるものであり、(i) と (ii) を示すような意味の表し方の特徴と文法構造の特徴が二つのタイプの言語に存在する。しかし、この類型論は日本語と英語の二言語のみに基づいていて、他の言語を使ってテストされた例がほとんどないということを始めとしていくつかの問題がある。

Sidaama 語のディスコースには日本語のような「なる」型の表現は見られないので、この言語は「する」型であるように思われる。しかし「する」型の言語と「なる」型の言語の意味の表し方の特徴と文法構造の特徴に関しては、ある面では「する」型の特徴を、別の面では「なる」型の特徴をそなえている。この言語は、池上が個と人間（特に動作主）に焦点を当てると主張している表現や文法形式（例：数の区別、動作主の働きかけの度合いによって違う補文のパターン）も、状況全体に焦点を与えると主張している表現や文法形式（例：指示対象を曖昧に表す表現、所有者を与格で表す文法、目的の達成を必ずしも示さない動詞）も持っている。

Sidaama 語が池上の類型論によってとらえられない類稀な言語であるということのない限り、この言語は「する」型であるはずである。そうなると、池上が「する」型と「なる」型の意味の表し方の特徴と文法構造の特徴として挙げているものはすべてが彼の類型論に関係しているわけではない、または「なる」型の言語は池上が挙げる意味の表し方の特徴と文法構造の特徴をすべて持っていないわけではないか、あるいは「なる」型の言語には他にも特徴があるということになる。

この論文では、ディスコースにおけるイヴェントをとらえる方法として「なる」型というのは、日本語を含むどの言語においても特殊であるという可能性を指摘する。言語がイヴェントをとらえる方法として、個々のイヴェントの参加者に焦点を当てて、その参加者が行為を行う、または変化をすると主張するもののが最も普通であるというのは、どの言語であってもイヴェントの参加者に焦点を当てるという傾向を持つ行為が変化を表す動詞を持ち、行為が変化を表す動詞を持つということと対応する。それに対して「なる」型の表現は統語的に組み立てられることが多く、ディスコースにおける「なる」型のイヴェントのとらえ方は主語の省略の可能性や「なる」型の慣用表現の存在といった日本語の特異性によるものである可能性がある。