JEZIKOSLOVLJE
22.2 (2021): 251-268



UDC 81'366.573=111
Original scientific article
Accepted for publication on 06.12. 2021
https://doi.org/10.29162/jez.2021.7

**Bernard Comrie**
University of California, Santa Barbara

# The afterlife of the antipassive: Alignment shift and transitivity

Three examples are presented of reanalyses of antipassives as or in the direction of ordinary transitive constructions, from Tsez, Chukchi, and Mayan languages. In all cases, an antipassive construction remains in the language or language family concerned, thus presenting empirical evidence of reanalysis to parallel earlier hypothesized reconstructions of antipassives to explain synchronic idiosyncrasies.

**Key words:** antipassive; alignment; alignment shift; Tsez; Chukchi; Mayan languages.

## 1. Introduction

Earlier work has suggested reconstructing antipassive constructions to explain syntactic anomalies in the structure of transitive clauses, for instance in the masterly reconstruction of alignment in Common Kartvelian by Harris (1985: 151–263). The aim of the present article is to present three examples where an antipassive construction survives alongside a construction at least partially reinterpreted as an ordinary transitive clause. The aim is not to present new data, but rather to reinterpret data from the general perspective of reanalysis of the antipassive. It will become clear that this broader treatment of the antipassive goes well beyond changes in grammatical relations, much as was argued for the passive by Kučanda (1999).

Use will be made of the S–A–P notation in order to identify the core arguments of intransitive and transitive clauses. In an intransitive clause like (1), the single core argument is labeled S.

(1) English
*the horse* *jumped*
S Vi

In a transitive clause, the labels A and P are used to identify the more agent-like and the more patient-like core arguments respectively, as in (2).

(2) English

| *the farmer* | *killed* | *the duckling* |
|---|---|---|
| A | Vt | P |

The basic characterization of the antipassive construction, in relation to the corresponding transitive construction, can be given as in (3), following Janic & Witzlack-Makarevich (2021: 2).

(3) Characterization of the antipassive

(i) The antipassive is an intransitive construction.

(ii) The same verb with the same lexical meaning can also be found in a transitive construction.

(iii) The A of the transitive construction is encoded as the S of the corresponding antipassive construction.

(iv) The P of the transitive construction is either encoded as an oblique or left unexpressed in the corresponding antipassive construction.

Examples (4–5) from Dyirbal (Dixon 1972: 65–66, though with a more current orthography) illustrate the relation between transitive and antipassive constructions where the P is retained in the antipassive as an oblique.

(4) Dyirbal

| *bayi* | *barrgan* | *banggul* | *yara-nggu* | *jurrga-nyu* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CLFI.ABS | wallaby(ABS) | CLFI.ERG | man-ERG | spear-NFUT |
| P | | A | | Vt |

'the man is spearing the wallaby'

(5) Dyirbal

| *bayi* | *yara* | *bagul* | *barrgan-gu* | *jurrga-na-nyu* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CLFI.ABS | man(ABS) | CLFI.DAT | wallaby-DAT | spear-ANTIP-NFUT |
| S | | OBL | | Vi |
| A > S | | P > OBL | | Vt > Vi |

'the man is spearing the wallaby'

The notation in the fourth line of (5) is a useful way of illustrating the correspondences between the transitive and the antipassive constructions; while it can be given a ready "transformational" interpretation, this is not necessary. "X > Y" means that

the participant that is an X in the lexical representation of the verb (and in the ordinary transitive construction) is encoded as Y in the antipassive.

Across the languages of the world that have antipassives, there are two main functions of the construction, with some languages giving preference (even exclusive preference) to the one or the other, while other languages regularly have both uses, as will be seen in the examples in the rest of this article.

First, the antipassive can serve to lower the transitivity of a clause in the more general sense of transitivity espoused by Hopper & Thompson (1980). This includes examples where detransitivization literally involves omission of the P, as in Dyirbal example (6) (Dixon 1972: 70).

(6) Dyirbal

| *bayi* | *yara* | *balgal-nga-nyu* |
|---|---|---|
| CLFI.ABS | man(ABS) | hit-ANTIP-NFUT |
| S | | Vi |
| A > S | | Vt > Vi |

'the man is hitting'

But it also includes examples where there is departure from the typical aktionsart value of a transitive construction, for instance in the direction of durativity, as illustrated in Section 2 for Tsezic languages.

Second, in languages where the A argument of a transitive clause is not accessible to certain syntactic processes, while the S is, the antipassive can be used to "present" the A as an S and thus render it accessible. Thus, in Dyirbal example (7), it would not be possible to have coreference between the P of the first clause and the A of the second clause with omission of that A; to circumvent this constraint recourse must be had to the antipassive; note that the intended sense is that the woman will scrape beans.

(7) Dyirbal

| *balan* | *jugumbil* | *banggul* | *yara-nggu* | *munda-n* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CLFII.ABS | woman(ABS) | CLFI.ERG | man-ERG | take-NFUT |
| P | | A | | Vt |

| *Ø* | *bagum* | *mirrany-gu* | *babil-nga-nyu* |
|---|---|---|---|
| (ABS) | CLFIII.DAT | bean-DAT | scrape-ANTIP-NFUT |
| S | OBL | | Vi |
| A > S | P > OBL | | Vt > vi |

'the man took the woman to scrape beans'

This second function is, of course, only available to the few languages of the world in which there is a constraint rendering A (but not S) inaccessible to certain syntactic processes.

In Sections 2–4, three cases of reanalyses of antipassive constructions giving rise to an "afterlife" of the original antipassive construction are presented. Direct historical evidence is rarely available, only for Chukchi can one track the demise of the semantic-pragmatic function of the antipassive (attested in traditional texts gathered prior to the mid-twentieth century) to its loss in the language as documented in the 1990s. Although the decipherment of Classic Maya has added a direct historical dimension to the study of Mayan languages, the issues discussed in Section 4 find little resolution in this earlier material. For the Tsezic languages, there is no relevant direct historical attestation. It is therefore necessary to have recourse to other methods from historical linguistics in order to reconstruct earlier stages of the languages in question and provide accounts of the changes that have led to the attested languages. One of these methods is the comparative method, which allows us, other things being equal, to project back to the common ancestor features that are found across a sufficient range of the descendant languages. The other is the more general methodology of trying to make sense of a synchronic anomaly by postulating a plausible scenario under which the anomaly did not exist at an earlier stage but arose as a result of the interaction of this earlier stage and changes separating it from the present situation; "internal reconstruction" is the classic instance of this second method, explaining morphophonological alternations through the application of regular sound changes to an earlier stage lacking those alternations.

## 2. Tsez

Tsez belongs to the Tsezic group of languages, one of the components of the Nakh-Daghestanian (East Caucasian) language family. The group is composed of two sub-groups, West Tsezic (Khwarshi, Tsez, Hinuq) and East Tsezic (Bezhta, Hunzib). The construction to be described in this section is found in all Tsezic languages except Khwarshi. For more information on the antipassive in Tsezic, and more generally Nakh-Daghestanian languages, see Comrie et al. (2021).

Tsezic languages have ergative-absolutive alignment of flagging (case marking), with some verbs also indexing the absolutive argument, as in (8–9) from Tsez (own fieldwork in cooperation with Maria Polinsky, Arsen Abdulaev, and Ramazan Radžabov). Given the minor role played in these examples by verb indexing, which

always follows the flagging of noun phrases, noun gender is only indicated in the glossing where verb indexing occurs, and is not commented on separately.

(8) Tsez

| | |
|---|---|
| *is* | *b-exu-s* |
| bull(III)(ABS) | III-die-PSTWIT |
| S | Vi |

'the bull died'

(9) Tsez

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *žek'-ā* | *gulu* | *žek'-si* |
| man-ERG | horse(ABS) | hit-PSTWIT |
| A | P | Vt |

'the man hit the horse'

It should be noted that the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs in Tsezic languages is very strict, with few or no ambitransitive (labile) verbs, i.e. verbs that can be used both transitively and intransitively. In Tsez itself, there seem to be no instance of ambitransitive verbs other than in the pattern with durative verbs illustrated in (17–18) below.

Each of the four Tsezic languages under consideration has a suffix (with allomorphic variants) expressing durative aspect; the choice of allomorph, and even the possibility of forming the durative, is highly lexicalized.[1] When used with an intransitive verb, there is no change in valence, as in Bezhta examples (10–11) (Comrie et al. 2021: 526).

(10) Bezhta

| | |
|---|---|
| *öž-dä* | *b-ogi<ba>c'-iyo* |
| boy-PL.ABS | HPL-jump<PL>-PST |
| S | Vi |

'the boys jumped once'

[1] There are no really detailed studies that would enable a precise statement at this point, but the following gives partial information. Komri & Xalilov (2007) present many examples of Tsezic duratives, but do not discuss the limitations of the construction. For Bezhta, Comrie et al. (2015) note that out of a selection of 36 transitive verbs from the basic lexicon, 32 allow the antipassive, while 4 do not. The latter are 'get', 'seek', 'request', and 'say', which does not suggest any obvious unifying semantic factor. Van den Berg (2003: 10–11) finds that of 153 Bezhta durative verbs derived from transitive verbs, 85 require the patient in the instrumental (cf. (15)), 43 do not allow specification of the patient (cf. (13)), and 6 allow both possibilities, while the remainder have assorted idiosyncrasies.

(11) Bezhta

| | |
|---|---|
| *öž-dä* | *b-ogi<ya-ba>c-ca* |
| boy-PL.ABS | HPL-jump<DUR-PL>-PRS |
| S | Vi |

'the boys jump many times'

With transitive verbs, however, the durative suffix also involves antipassivization, giving an intransitive sentence as in Bezhta example (13) in relation to transitive (12) (van den Berg 2003: 12).

(12) Bezhta

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *öž-di* | *koo* | *xosλo-yo* |
| boy-ERG | hand(ABS) | scratch-PST |
| A | P | Vt |

'the boy scratched his hand'

(13) Bezhta

| | |
|---|---|
| *öžö* | *xos-dā-yo* |
| boy(I)(ABS) | scratch-DUR-PST |
| S | Vi |
| A > S | Vt > Vi |

'the boy was scratching'

The suffix will continue to be glossed as durative, to maintain a uniform glossing across all instances, although it should be borne in mind that examples like (13) also involve antipassivization.

Note that (13) lacks expression of the P of the corresponding transitive. This object-less antipassive is possible across all four languages, and is the only possibility in Hinuq and Hunzib, so it can be reconstructed to the proto-language using the comparative method. In Bezhta, however, with some verbs it is possible to include the object in the instrumental, as in (15) in relation to (14) (Comrie et al. 2021: 526–527).

(14) Bezhta

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *öž-di* | *xo* | *y-ü$^{n}$q-čä* |
| boy-ERG | meat(IV)(ABS) | IV-eat-PRS |
| A | P | Vt |

'the boy eats the meat'

(15) Bezhta

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *öžö* | *xo-lo-d* | *Ø-üⁿq-dä-čä* |
| boy(I)(ABS) | meat-OBL-INS | I-eat-DUR-PRS |
| S | OBL | Vi |
| A > S | P > OBL | Vt > Vi |

'the boy is busy eating the meat'

So far, everything in the behavior of lexically transitive verbs is in keeping with the general characterization of the antipassive given in (3). Tsez, however, presents an anomaly (Comrie et al. 2021: 527–528). Starting from a transitive sentence like (16), it is possible to derive an objectless antipassive, as in the other four languages, as in (17).

(16) Tsez

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *xex-z-ā* | *gamač'* | *kur-xo* |
| child-PL.OBL-ERG | stone(ABS) | throw-PRS |
| A | P | Vt |

'the children throw stones'

(17) Tsez

| | |
|---|---|
| *xex-bi* | *kur-noy-xo* |
| child-PL.ABS | throw-DUR-PRS |
| S | Vi |
| A > S | Vt > Vi |

'the children are engaged in throwing'

However, Tsez also allows inclusion of the P with the durative verb form, but in this case alignment of flagging reverts to the ergative system seen in the ordinary transitive clause (16), as in (18).

(18) Tsez

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *xex-z-ā* | *gamač'* | *kur-noy-xo* |
| child-PL.OBL-ERG | stone(ABS) | throw-DUR-PRS |
| A | P | Vt |

'the children are engaged in throwing stones'

In Tsez, then, we see an unusual development of the durative in transitive clauses in relation to the antipassive. If the object is unexpressed, then the construction is (and must be) antipassive, as in (17). But if the object is expressed, then antipassive syntax is (and must be) abandoned in favor of the ordinary transitive construction, i.e. the syntax of (18) mirrors that of (16), not of (17). This transitive durative construction, surely an innovation of Tsez by comparison with the other Tsezic

languages, thus provides a clear instance of the "afterlife" of an antipassive construction, in this case reverting completely to usual transitive clause syntax.

## 3. Chukchi

Chukchi, which in relevant respects is very similar to the other Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages, has ergative alignment of flagging, as illustrated in (19–20) (Kozinsky et al. 1988: 670, 652).

(19) Chukchi
*qlawəl* *raɣt-əɣʔe-Ø*
man(SG.ABS) return.home-TH-3SGS
S Vi
'the man returned home'

(20) Chukchi
*ətləɣ-e* *qora-ŋə* *Ø-qərir-nin*
father-ERG deer-ABS 3A-seek-3SGA.3SGP
A P Vt
'the father looked for the deer'

Transitive verbs index person-number of both A and P, while intransitive verbs index the person-number of S. The verb morphology is rather complex; Dunn (1999: 177–191) may be consulted for a detailed analysis, Moll & Inènlikèj (1957: 173–186) for complete paradigms. The indexing is by means of prefixes and suffixes, some of which are zero (though in paradigmatic contrast with a set of overt affixes); Chukchi has vowel harmony, so many morphemes have allomorphs determined by vowel harmony, with alternations *i~e, u~o, e~a*. The prefixal slot indexes S or A, with the same morphemes for both, i.e. nominative-accusative alignment. However, for some combinations of an A lower on the person-number scale 1 > 2 > 3SG > 3PL and a P higher on this scale, the inverse prefix *ne-* is used, as in (24) below, where A is 3PL and P 3SG. With intransitive verbs, the suffixal slot indexes S. With transitive verbs, the suffixal slot typically indexes P, though with a partially different set of suffixes than is used for indexing S; for some combinations of A and P, however, the suffixal slot is a portmanteau form indexing both, such as the suffix *-nin* in (20). Some combinations with overt prefix and suffix are illustrated in (21–22) (Moll & Inènlikèj 1957: 174, 182).

(21) Chukchi

| | |
|---|---|
| *ətlon* | *nə-wiri-ɣʔe-n* |
| s/he(ABS) | IMP.3S-descend-TH-3SGS |
| S | Vi |

'may s/he descend!'

(22) Chukchi

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *ɣəm-nan* | *ɣət* | *mə-pela-ɣət* |
| I-ERG | you(ABS) | IMP.1SGA-leave-2SGP |
| A | P | Vt |

'may I leave you!'

Chukchi has an antipassive with the prefix *ine-*. The antipassive occurs with both omission of the P of the corresponding transitive and expression of this participant in an oblique case (instrumental or allative), as in (23) in relation to (20), and (25) in relation to (24) (Kozinsky et al. 1988: 652).

(23) Chukchi

| | |
|---|---|
| *ətləɣ-ən* | *ena-rer-ɣʔe-Ø* |
| father-SG.ABS | ANTIP-seek-TH-3SGS |
| S | Vi |
| A > S | Vt > Vi; A > S; P > Ø |

'the father did some searching'

(24) Chukchi

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *ʔaacek-a* | *kimitʔ-ən* | *ne-nlʔetet-ən* |
| young.man-ERG | load-ABS | INV-carry.away-(PST)3SGP |
| A | P | Vt |

'the young men carried away the load'

(25) Chukchi

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *ʔaacek-ət* | *ine-nlʔetet-ɣʔe-t* | *kimitʔ-e* |
| young.man-PL.ABS | ANTIP-carry.away-TH-3PL | load-INS |
| S | Vi | OBL |
| A > S | Vt > Vi; A > S; P > Ø | P > OBL |

'the young men carried away a load'

Antipassive constructions like (23) and especially (25), which involve the broader Hopper-Thompson concept of transitivity and in Chukchi have aktionsart implications, are not unusual in traditional texts from the earlier twentieth century, but Dunn (1999: 216–217) notes that they are unusual with the speakers he worked

with in the 1990s, almost absent from spontaneous speech, and elicitable from some but not other speakers. However, Dunn (1999: 217) notes that there are some constructions where A arguments are at least usually treated as inaccessible, and here the antipassive is productive in the use of the speakers with whom he worked. One such construction is the prohibitive. With an intransitive verb, the S is accessible to the position of the addressee (the person to whom the command or request is addressed), as in (26) (Dunn 1999: 328–329).

(26) Chukchi
*e-quli-ke*
NEG-make.noise-NEG
'don't make a noise!'

With transitive verbs, use of the antipassive is usual, though not categorical for the speakers he worked with, as in (27) (Dunn 1999: 217).

(27) Chukchi

| *wetəqun* | *ənŋe* | *ŋaw-tomɣ-etə* | *ena-tw-əka* |
|---|---|---|---|
| EMPH | PROH | woman-friend-ALL | ANTIP-tell-NEG |
| | | OBL | Vi |
| | | P > OBL | Vt > Vi |

'don't tell your wife!'

Note that the prohibitive particle *ənŋe* is optional, and that the prefixal part of the negative circumfix *e-...-ke* drops before the initial vowel of the antipassive prefix. The prohibitive lacks argument indexing. In such constructions, the antipassive is licensed syntactically, and has no semantic effect.

In transitive verbs, some combinations involving first person Ps require the use of an antipassive affix, and the verb form indexes only the person-number of the lexical A of the verb, thus exactly matching morphologically the structure of an antipassive verb form, as in (21); in (28) the verb form on its own would suggest something like intransitive 's/he is leave-taking'. However, A and P are expressed in the ergative and the absolutive respectively, as in a regular transitive construction. In (28) (Moll & Inènlikèj 1957: 182), the verb form is intransitive, more specifically antipassive, but the overall syntax of the clause is transitive, with ergative A and absolutive P.

(28) Chukchi

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *ə-nan* | *yəm* | *n-ena-pela-ɣʔa-n* |
| s/he-ERG | I(ABS) | IMP.3S-ANTIP-leave-TH-3SG.S |
| A | P | Vi |
| | | Vt > Vi; A > S; P > Ø |

'may s/he leave me!'

Chukchi example (28) is thus morphologically intransitive but syntactically transitive, an anomaly that can be explained by assuming an alignment shift, with the verb morphology reflecting an earlier antipassive, the syntax the regular transitive configuration.

## 4. Mayan languages

Issues surrounding the antipassive in Mayan languages are fraught with controversy, not to mention at times significant differences alongside striking similarities across the languages in the family. My previous often unguided peeks into Mayan languages have been substantially systematized by the presentation in Heaton (2021), though interpretations are often my own and should not be imputed to any of the cited sources. In what follows, I attempt an interpretation of the Mayan agent focus construction in terms of the "antipassive afterlife", as an illustration of one possible historical scenario, one that is probably not at the forefront of Mayanists' current thinking on the agent focus construction, but one that I nonetheless want to throw into the arena of competing hypotheses.

In Mayan languages core arguments (S, A, P) have no flagging (case marking), but are indexed in the verb, according to an ergative-absolutive system, with one set of markers for S and P, another for A, as indicated in Popti' (Jacaltec) examples (29–32) (Craig 1977: 102, 109, 111), where 1SG S and P are expressed as *-in*, 1SG A as *w-*, while 2SG S and P are *-ach* and A is *ha-*.

(29) Popti'

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *ch-in* | *to* | *boj* | *hach* |
| INCOMPL-1SGS | go | with | you |
| S | | | |

'I go with you'

(30) Popti'
*xc-ach* *toyi*
COMPL-2SGS go
S
'you went'

(31) Popti'
*ch-in* *ha-maka*
INCOMPL-1SGP 2SGA-hit
P A
'you hit me'

(32) Popti'
*xc-ach* *w-abe*
COMPL-2SGP 1SGA-hear
P A
'I heard you'

Many Mayan languages have an antipassive structure matching the characterization in (3), as in Ixil example (34) (Ayres 1983: 27). In the corresponding transitive clause (33), the A is 2SG and the P is 1SG; in the antipassive, marked by an overt antipassive suffix, the 2SG participant appears as S, while the 1SG participant either is omitted or is encoded as an oblique; in Mayan languages generally, obliques require a preposition and are not indexed in the verb (cf. the comitative phrase in (29)).

(33) Ixil
*kat* *a-q'os* *in*
COMPL 2SGA-hit 1SGP
A P
'you hit me'

(34) Ixil
*kat* *q'os-on* *axh* *(s* *wi7)*
COMPL hit-ANTIP 2SGS OBL 1SG
Vi S OBL
Vt > Vi A > S P > OBL/Ø
'you hit (me)'

Mam is unusual in that, under certain circumstances (basically, where ambiguity does not result), the oblique preposition can be omitted as in (35) (England 1983: 212–213).

(35) Mam

| *ma* | *Ø-tzyuu-n* | *Cheep* | *(t-i7j)* | *xiinaq* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RECPST | 3SGS-grab-ANTIP | José | 3SG-OBL | man |
| | Vi | | OBL | |
| | Vt > Vi; A > S | | P > OBL | |

'José grabbed the man'

The glossing presented here for (35) assumes that even in the absence of the preposition, the constituent corresponding to the P of the ordinary transitive clause is an oblique, i.e. an exceptionally unflagged oblique. An alternative analysis might assume that it remains a P, in which case the major constituents of (35) would be those of an ordinary transitive clause, but the morphological structure of the verb would be antipassive (and therefore intransitive indexing an S argument), somewhat paralleling Chukchi example (28).

Many Mayan languages also have certain syntactic processes to which A is inaccessible, typically focus ('it was you who opened the door'), including constituent questions ('who opened the door?'), and relativization ('the child who opened the door'). In some languages, including Mam, the ordinary antipassive is used in order to circumvent this restriction, as in (36) (England 1983: 214).

(36) Mam

| *alkyee* | *Ø-Ø-tzyuu-n* | *ky-e* | *xiinaq* |
|---|---|---|---|
| who | DEPPST-3SGS-grab-ANTIP | 3PL-OBL | man |
| | Vi | OBL | |
| | Vt > Vi; A > S | P > OBL | |

'who grabbed the men?'

In Mam, both the verb form and the clausal syntax in (36) are exactly the same as in (35) (version with the preposition). However, in many Mayan languages the construction used in order to circumvent the inaccessibility of A differs to a greater or lesser extent from the ordinary antipassive, and in current Mayanist linguistics the construction used to make A accessible is usually called the "agent focus" construction. In (36), one might therefore replace the gloss ANTIP with AF, although the two would be identical in form. In the following examples, where there are differences between agent focus and the regular antipassive, e.g. the participant corresponding to the P of the transitive clause always lacks the oblique preposition, the gloss AF will be used consistently. This should not, however, blind us to the obser-

vation that there are also striking similarities, in particular that the antipassive and agent focus suffixes usually both go back to one or other of the same two etyma *-(V)n or *-(V)w (Heaton 2021: 565); in addition, the agent focus verb form can only index one argument, exactly paralleling an intransitive verb, including an antipassive. In what follows, two instances of increasing departure from the ordinary antipassive construction will be illustrated.

First, in some Mayan languages, while the agent focus indexes only one argument, this is not necessarily the one corresponding to the A of the corresponding transitive clause (as is found with the antipassive), but is determined rather by hierarchical alignment of indexing. Thus, in Tz'utujil examples (37) and (38) (Dayley 1985: 349), the agent focus verb indexes the first person participant as opposed to the third person participant, whether the first person participant corresponds to the A or to the P of the corresponding transitive.

(37) Tz'utujil

| *inin* | *x-in-ch'ey-ow-i* | *jar* | *aachi* |
|---|---|---|---|
| I | COMPL-1SGS-hit-AF-INTR | the | man |
| | Vi | P | |
| | Vt > Vi; A > S | | |

'it was I who hit the man'

(38) Tz'utujil

| *jar* | *aachi* | *x-in-ch'ey-ow-i* |
|---|---|---|
| the | man | COMPL-1SGS-hit-AF-INTR |
| | | Vi |
| | | Vt > Vi; P > S |

'it was the man who hit me'

This means that while the verb indexing of (37) looks more like an ordinary antipassive, that of (38) is more akin to a passive. Second, in some Mayan languages, such as Akatek, indexing is always of the participant corresponding to the P of the transitive clause, as illustrated in (39) (Zavala 1997: 452), with third person singular indexing in the verb, and (40) with first person singular indexing (Zavala 1992: 279, with modification of the orthography to match that of (39)); the verb indexing in the Akatek agent focus construction thus looks even more like a passive.

(39) Akatek

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *ja'-in* | *Ø-ij-on-toj* | *naj* | *unin* |
| FOC-1SG | 3SGS-carry-AF-DIR | CLF | boy |
| | Vi | P | |
| | Vt > Vi; P > S | | |

'it was I who carried the boy'

(40) Akatek

| | |
|---|---|
| *maj-Ø* | *x-in-ma'-on-i* |
| who-3SG | COMPL-1SGS-hit-AF-INTR |
| | Vi |
| | Vt > Vi; P > S |

'who hit me?'

It should be emphasized that the agent focus construction in particular languages can have various other idiosyncratic properties, as set out in Heaton (2021: 565–569) and the references cited there. What is crucial for present purposes is the scale of departure from the antipassive construction, with loss of crucial features of the antipassive (oblique flagging of the participant corresponding to the P or the transitive clause; loss of consistent indexing of the participant corresponding to the A of the transitive clause as S), showing once again an afterlife of the antipassive in constructions that still retain some of its features while others are realigned.

## 5. Conclusions

This article has tried to show that an erstwhile antipassive construction, while losing some of its properties as an antipassive, can none the less have some of those properties live on, thus providing an afterlife for the antipassive. In each of the three cases treated, the original antipassive continues elsewhere in the language, so the examination of the afterlife of the antipassive is not based solely on reconstruction, but also on direct comparison with synchronically coexisting constructions.

## References

Ayres, Glenn. 1983. The antipassive "voice" in Ixil. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49. 20–45. https://doi.org/10.1086/465763

Comrie, Bernard & Forker, Diana & Khalilova, Zaira & van den Berg, Helma. 2021. Antipassives in Nakh-Daghestanian languages: Exploring the margins of a construction. In Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena (eds.), *Antipassive: typology, dia-*

*chrony, and related constructions*, 515–548. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.16com

Comrie, Bernard & Khalilov, Madzhid & Khalilova, Zaira. 2015. Valency and valency classes in Bezhta. In Malchukov, Andrej & Comrie, Bernard (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages*, 541–570. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110338812-019

Craig, Colette Grinevald. 1977. *The structure of Jacaltec*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Dayley, Jon P. 1985. *Tzutujil grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of north Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139084987

Dunn, Michael John. 1999. *A grammar of Chukchi*. Doctoral dissertation, Canberra: Australian National University. DOI:10.25911/5D77842288837

England, Nora C. 1983. *A grammar of Mam, a Mayan language*. Austin: University of Texas Press. https://doi.org/10.7560/727267

Harris, Alice C. 1985. *Diachronic syntax: the Kartvelian case*. Orlando: Academic Press.
DOI:10.1163/9789004373143

Heaton, Raina. 2021. Antipassive and antipassive-like constructions in Mayan languages. In Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena (eds.), *Antipassive: typology, diachrony, and related constructions*, 549–578. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.17hea

Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56. 251–299. https://doi.org/10.2307/413757

Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena. 2021. The multifaceted nature of the antipassive construction. In Janic, Katarzyna & Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena (eds.), *Antipassive: typology, diachrony, and related constructions*, 1–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.01jan

Komri [Comrie], B.; Xalilov, M. Š. 2007. Durativnye i iterativnye glagoly v cezskix jazykax. In Abduraxmanov, A. M. & Alieva, Z. M. & Magomedov, A. D. (compilers), Nasledie kak sistema cennostej: jazyk, kul´tura, istorija, 531–541. Makhachkala: Institut jazyka, literatury i iskusstva im. Gamzata Cadasy DNC RAN.

Kozinsky, Isaac Š. & Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Polinskaja, Maria S. 1988. Antipassive in Chukchee: oblique object, object incorporation, zero object. In Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), *Passive and voice*, 651–706. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.16.21koz

Kučanda, Dubravko. 1999. Pasivizacija kao strategija subjektivizacije/topikalizacije. *Jezikoslovlje* 2(2–3). 17–33.

Moll, T. A. & Inènlikèj, P. I. 1957. *Čukotsko-russkij slovar´*. Leningrad: Učpedgiz.

van den Berg, Helma. 2003. *Antipassive constructions in Nakh-Daghestanian languages*. Ms, Leipzig.

Zavala, Roberto. 1992. *El kanjobal de San Miguel Acatán*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Zavala, Roberto. 1997. Functional analysis of Akatek voice constructions. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 63. 439–474. https://doi.org/10.1086/466340.

## Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ABS | absolutive |
| AF | agent focus |
| ALL | allative |
| ANTIP | antipassive |
| CLF | classifier |
| COMPL | completive |
| DAT | dative |
| DEPPST | dependent past |
| DIR | directional |
| DUR | durative |
| ERG | ergative |
| HPL | human plural |
| IMP | imperative |
| INCOMPL | incompletive |
| INV | inverse |
| NEG | negative |
| NFUT | non-future |
| OBL | oblique |
| PL | plural |
| PROG | progressive |
| PROH | prohibitive |
| PRS | present |
| PST | past |
| PSTWIT | past witnessed |
| RECPST | recent past |
| SG | singular |
| TH | thematic suffix |
| Vi | intransitive verb |
| Vt | transitive verb |

## Author's address:

University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
E-mail: comrie@ucsb.edu

### DAS NACHLEBEN DES ANTIPASSIVS: ALIGNMENT-VERSCHIEBUNG UND TRANSITIVITÄT

Die folgende Untersuchung erörtert drei Beispiele einer Reanalyse von Antipassiven als oder in Richtung einer üblichen transitiven Konstruktion, und zwar in der tsesischen, der tschuktschischen und den mayanischen Sprachen. In allen Beispielen bleibt das Antipassiv in der jeweiligen Sprache bzw. der jeweiligen Sprachfamilie erhalten, was einen empirischen Beweis für die Reanalyse neben früher hypothetisch aufgestellten Rekonstruktionen des Antipassivs als Erklärung von synchronischen Eigenarten bietet.

**Schlüsselwörter**: Antipassiv; Alignment-Verschiebung; tsesische Sprache; tschuktschische Sprache; mayanische Sprachen.