

## What is left after passivization? On the syntactic status of derived arguments oral *or* poster

In the discussion of syntactic derivation, Dixon (1994) provides the following criteria of passive: (a) passive applies to an underlying transitive clause and forms a derived intransitive; (b) the underlying O (transitive object) NP becomes S (intransitive subject) of the passive; (c) the underlying A (transitive subject) NP goes into a peripheral function. An analogous set of criteria is suggested for antipassives. Similar syntactic characteristics are proposed by Shibatani (1985) and Keenan & Dryer (2007).

Such approaches to passive and other diathesis alternations run into a number of problems once one considers the syntactic behavior of the arguments of derived clauses. On the one hand, contrary to the prediction, derived subjects do not always behave as underived ones, i.e., they do not necessarily become intransitive subjects in all respects. Compare, for instance, the switch reference marking in the active and passive sentences in Seri (Farrell et al. 1991). In 1c-d, the subjects of the passive sentences are unable to control switch reference marking in contrast to the subjects of the active sentences in 1a-b. Another range of problems emerges once the analysis is extended to ditransitive verbs, which are analyzed as a subtype of transitive verbs by Dixon (1994). For instance, if a ditransitive clause in Puma (Bickel et al. 2007) is passivized the resulting, supposedly intransitive clause has, however, two arguments (as in 2b). If *ya* (1sABS) is the intransitive subject, what is the status of *cheikuma* (clan.sister.ABS) then? The transitivity characterization of Keenan & Dryer (2007) is as well problematic, as according to them passives derive *n*-place predicates from *n+1*-place predicates. Thus, we would expect a transitive clause after passivization or antipassivization of a ditransitive one. However, if one considers the agreement and case marking in Puma, the subject of an antipassivized ditransitive clause (as 2b) has the same properties as the subject of an intransitive clause (S) and not as expected subject of transitive clauses (A).

One possibility to overcome these and similar problems in the analysis of diathesis alternations is to consider such deviating passives and antipassives to be non-basic (as in Keenan & Dryer 2007), or even not to consider them as passives or antipassives at all (cf. Dixon 1994). Another possibility is to claim that the 'misbehaving' processes are not genuine subject properties (see the discussion in Moore & Perlmutter (2000)). Neither of these solutions is satisfactory if one strives for a unified account of the phenomena.

This paper presents an alternative approach to diathesis alternations based on the multivariate approach to grammatical relations (in the spirit of Bickel (in press)). In this approach, the attention is shifted from such generalized notions as subject and object towards argument alignment of single syntactic process, rule or restriction (called 'argument selectors' here). The syntactic promotion and demotion taking place in the process of diathesis alternations affects not subjects and objects *per se* but rather argument alignment on certain, but not necessarily all, argument selectors (cf. Van Valin 1980). Thus, in the case of Seri, we observe promotion and demotion of a set of arguments with respect to agreement, but not with respect to switch reference marking. The question of syntactic transitivity of a derived clause becomes redundant, as a derived clause can simultaneously show alignment patterns common to underived clauses of different transitivity depending on what selector one looks at. Thus, Puma antipassive clause with a semantically ditransitive verb behaves as an intransitive clause with respect to case and agreement, but as a transitive one with respect to the number of possible overt arguments. This approach allows for an integrated account of within-language variation in its full range and enabling for an adequate cross-linguistic comparison of diathesis alternations.

### References:

- Bickel, B. In press. Grammatical relations typology. In J. J. Song (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Typology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bickel, B., M. Gaenszle, A. Rai, P. D. Rai, S. K. Rai, V. S. Rai and N. P. Sharma (Gautam). 2007. Two ways of suspending object agreement in Puma: between incorporation, antipassivization, and optional agreement. *Himalayan linguistics* 7: 1-18.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Farrell P., S. A. Marlett and D. M. Perlmutter. 1991. Notions of subjecthood and switch reference: evidence from Seri. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22:431-456.
- Keenan, E. L. and M. S. Dryer. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume I*. [2<sup>nd</sup> edition], 325-361.
- Marlett, S. A. 1984. Personal and impersonal passives in Seri. In D. M. Perlmutter and C. G. Rosen, (eds.), *Studies in Relational Grammar 2*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Moore J. and D. M. Perlmutter. 2000. What does it take to be a dative subject? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 18:373-416.
- Shibatani, M. 1985. Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis. *Language*, 61(4): 821-848.
- Van Valin, R. D. 1980. On the distribution of passive and antipassive constructions in universal grammar. *Lingua*, 50: 303-327.

**Examples:**(1) **Seri** (Hockan, Mexico; Marlett 1984)

a. mi-n† kiʔ po-šatX ta-Xt-oXi,  
 2POSS-finger the MOOD-have.thorn DS-UT

im-s-o:ʔa ʔa-ʔa.  
 2sSUBJ-MOOD-cry AUX-DECL  
 ‘If your finger gets thorn in them, you will cry.’

b. mi-nai† kom m-po-ki:ɣk x,  
 2POSS-skin the 2sSUBJ-IRR-wet AUX

ʔata:ɣp ko-mi-si-a: ʔa-ʔa.  
 mucus 3OBL-2sSUBJ-IRR-be AUX=DECL  
 ‘If you wet your skin, you will be with mucus.’ (i.e. get a cold).’

c. m-yo-a:ʔ-kašni, kokašni šo m-t-ʔo ma.  
 2sSUBJ-DIST-PASS-bite snake a 2sSUBJ-REAL-see DS  
 ‘You were bitten, after you had seen a snake.’

d. ʔa:†t kiʔ p-a:ʔ-ka: x,  
 torote the IRR-PASS-seek AUX

ʔe:po† kiʔ mos si-a:ʔ-ka: ʔa=ʔa.  
 ratany the also IRR-PASS-seek AUX=DECL  
 ‘If torote is looked for, white ratany should be looked for also.’

(2) **Puma** (Kiranti, Bickel et al . 2007)

a. ŋa-a yoŋni-lai chetkuma itd-u-ŋ.  
 1s-ERG friend-DAT clan.sister.ABS give-3sP-1sA  
 ‘I gave a/my celi to a/my friend (in marriage).’

b. ŋa chetkuma kha-itd-oŋ.  
 1sABS clan.sister.ABS ANTIP-give-1sS.PST  
 ‘I gave away my celi (to someone/people).’