

Rara in the desiderative domain: hints for the theory

By desiderative domain I understand here a language system of means for expressing wanting. It can consist of desiderative lexemes (verbs (ex. 1) and nouns (ex. 2)), and/or desiderative affixes (ex. 3) and particles (ex. 4).

In a search for typological generalizations in the desiderative domain, I have encountered a number of quite unusual rare facts. They have been too few to cancel the universal tendencies, but too salient to be neglected. This talk will be devoted to their presentation and the description of their impact on the theory of desideratives I have built.

It is necessary to make the difference between two types of rare facts:

- (a) so called “great that they exist (no matter rarely or not)” facts, i.e. the facts proving the logic of the theory predicating that the combination of the parameters in question must be possible;
- (b) so called “great that they are rare” facts, i.e. the facts whose rarity proves unnaturalness of the combination of the parameters in question.

Among the first type could be named

- ❖ existence of desiderative constructions (in particular, when they are the only means a language has to express wanting);
- ❖ existence of subject-to-object raising for complement clauses of desiderative verbs;
- ❖ existence of desiderative means with more than two other meanings except ‘to want’ (e.g. ‘to intent’ and ‘to love’)

Among the second type could be named some combinations of the semantic type and the morphosyntactic type of a desiderative (e.g. desiderative affixes with emotive meaning).

At the same time, some facts belong to both types: their existence follows the logic of the system, but contradicts the logic of communication. Cf.

- ❖ possibility of marking of wanter-NP and wanted-NP as ‘non-core’ arguments of a desiderative verb
- ❖ inability of a desiderative verb to have a wanted-NP (only a wanted-clause).

Examples:

(1) Imbabura Quechua, [Cole 1982:38]

ñuka	muna-ni	kan	miku-chun.
I	want-1	[you	eat-SUBJ.DS]

I want that you eat; I want you to eat.

(2) Tukang Besi, [Donohue 1999:398]

te	hempo-no	te	wila-‘a.
CORE	desire-3POSS	[CORE	go-NMN]

They want to go.

(3) Shipibo-Konibo, [Valenzuela 2003: 576]

e-a-ra	wame	rete-kas-ai.
I-NOM-EV	paiche:NOM	kill-DESID-INC

I want to kill paiche.

(4) Mapuche, [Smeets 1989: 301]

küpa	amu-fu-y-iñ	welu	elu-ñma-nge-la-y-iñ.
desire	go-IPD-IND-1NON_SG-PL	but	give-IO-PASS-NEG-IND-1NON_SG-PL

We(pl) wanted to go but were not allowed to.

References:

Cole P. 1982. *Imbabura Quechua*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Donohue M. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Smeets C.J. 1989. *A Mapuche Grammar*. Leiden University Dissertation.

Valenzuela P.M. 2003. *Transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo grammar*. University of Oregon Dissertation. (Ann Arbor: UMI).