

THE STORY OF ZERO

T. Givón

CHAPTER 7: CATAPHORIC ZERO: PASSIVE AND ANTIPASSIVE VOICE

1. Introduction

Thus far, our discussion has focused on anaphoric zero, noting its unimpeachable communicative (ch. 1) and cognitive (ch. 2) foundation. Such adaptive motivation may be subsumed under the general principle of **information predictability**. That is:

(1) **Anaphoric zero and information predictability**

- a. **Communicative**: "Predictable information can be left zero-marked".
- b. **Cognitive**: "Information that is already activated under current focal attention requires no re-activation".

In this connection, we have shown that in both nominal and verbal zero anaphora, the context within which zero-marking occurs is, overwhelmingly, one where the antecedent is found in the directly-preceding, thus adjacent clause.

In this chapter we will discuss zero-marking of subjects and objects that is motivated by another communicative principle--the need to signal the **topicality** or **importance** of a referent in the immediately following--cataphoric--discourse. That is, the need to maintain a state of **cognitive alertness** or **anticipation** vis-a-vis incoming information:

(2) **Cataphoric zero and topic importance**:

- a. **Communicative**: "Unimportant information, one that is not expected to persist in the subsequent discourse, can be left zero-marked".
- b. **Cognitive**: "A heightened state of alertness or anticipation needs to be maintained only for important information that is expected to persist".[FN 1]

It is easy to see the fundamental affinity between the cataphoric principles (2a,b) and their anaphoric counterparts (1a,b), respectively. Communicatively, zero-marking signals **informational continuity** either anaphorically (1a) or cataphorically (2a). Cognitively, zero-marking signals

continued attentional activation either anaphorically (1b) or cataphorically (2b). It is thus not an accident that the most common clause-type in natural discourse is the chain-medial clause, with both anaphoric and cataphoric referential continuity and zero-marked referent(s) (DuBois 1987; see also ch. 11, below).

The most conspicuous domain where cataphoric zero manifests itself is that of **grammatical voice**, most commonly in two core de-transitive voice constructions--passive and anti-passive. We will begin the discussion with a brief recapitulation of the functional domain of voice.

2. The functional domain of pragmatic voice

The grammatical domain of voice may be divided into two sub-domains, semantic and pragmatic. Semantic voice constructions, such as reflexive, reciprocal or middle-voice, are defined in terms of relations between the agent and patient within the *same* event-clause. The clause's discourse context is not implicated in these constructions, which will not concern us here.[FN 2]

At its core, pragmatic voice involves the relative **discourse topicality** of the two core participants in the transitive event, agent and patient. The four main pragmatic voice constructions are defined in such terms as (Cooreman 1982,1987, 1988; Givón 1994a):

(3) Relative topicality of agent and patient in the four main voice constructions:

voice	relative topicality
=====	=====
a. Active-transitive:	AGT > PAT
b. Inverse:	PAT > AGT
c. Passive:	PAT >> AGT
d. Antipassive:	AGT >> PAT

The active-transitive ('direct') clause is thus one in which both core participants are topical, but the agent outranks the patient. The inverse clause is one in which both core participants are topical, but the patient outranks the agent. The passive clause is one where the agent is radically de-topicalized (Shibatani 1985). And the antipassive clause is one where the patient is radically de-topicalized (Silverstein 1972; Heath 1976).

The four pragmatic voice constructions have a characteristic frequency distribution in natural discourse, whereby the active-transitive clause is by far the most common, and the three de-transitive-voice clauses are much less frequent. As an illustration, consider the frequency distribution of the four voice constructions in Chamorro narrative:[FN 3]

**(4) Frequency distribution of voice constructions
in Chamorro narrative (Cooreman 1987)**

voice	N	%
active/ergative	601	72.0
inverse	134	16.1
passive	35	4.2
antipassive	64	7.7
total:	834	100.0

One way of assessing the cataphoric topicality/importance of subjects and objects is by counting how many times they persist as event participants in the subsequent 10 clauses (see chs 1,2). While this measure is only a heuristic, it is fairly reliable and replicable in assessing local cataphoric topicality.[FN 4]. As an illustration, consider the differential cataphoric persistence of agents and patients in the four voice constructions in Karao (Philippine; Brainard 1994), expressed in terms of the percent distribution of referents persisting 0-2 times vs. more than 2 times in the subsequent 10 clauses.

**(5) Percent distribution of topic persistence of agent and
patient in Karao voice constructions (Brainard 1994)**

construction	% in gent		% in patient	
	TP 0-2	TP >2	TP 0-2	TP >2
active-transitive	37.8	62.2	63.9	36.1
inverse	76.4	23.6	0.0	100.0
passive	97.6	2.4	54.8	45.2
antipassive	0.0	100.0	92.9	7.1

The agent is most persistent--thus most topical--in the active-direct clause, and even more so in the antipassive clause, where the patient is radically demoted. The patient is most persistent in the inverse or the passive, where the agent is either less topical or radically demoted.

3. Cataphoric zero in passive clauses

3.1. Typology and functional domains

A typology of any grammar-coded domain involves an enumeration of the diverse grammatical structures that can code that **functional domain** cross-linguistically (Givón 1981). Since each one of those structures arises from a different diachronic source and via a distinct diachronic pathway, syntactic typology is fundamentally a **diachronic** enterprise (Greenberg 1978, 1979; Givón 2015a,b). In this section we will survey the diachronic typology of passive clauses, focusing on six major structural types whose diachronic provenance is fairly well established. Of special interest in each case will be the natural source of zero marking of the de-topicalized agent.

As noted above (3), the functional definition of the passive domain is:

(6) **Functional definition of the passive domain:**

"A passive clause is one where the agent of the corresponding active is radically de-topicalized. By default, another argument may then assume the role of main topic".

It is of course not an accident that the most common, natural device for marking the demoted agent-of-passive is plain **zero**. This follows from communicative principles (1) and (2) above. Our diachronic typology of passive clauses is thus, in an obvious way, also a typology of the various diachronic pathways that lead to zero-marking of the demoted agent in the passive clause.

Passive clauses may be divided into two major structural types--promotional and non-promotional. In the **promotional passive**, the remaining default topical argument assumes the subject/nominative grammatical role. In the **non-promotional passive**, the remaining default topical argument retains the same grammatical role it had in the active clause. Two other syntactic properties tend to be associated with non-promotional passives:

- The de-topicalized agent *must* be deleted; it cannot appear overtly.
- Passivization can apply to both transitive and intransitive clauses.

Conversely, in the promotional passives the agent *may* appear overtly, most commonly in an oblique case; and passivization typically applies to only transitive clauses.

3.2. Diachrony of the zeroed-out agents in non-promotional passives

3.2.1. The plain-zero passive

This type is so ubiquitous that it most commonly flies under the linguist's radar; so that the languages in which it is found are often described as 'having no passive'. This unmarked passive is particularly common in languages that zero-mark continuing referents (so-called 'pro-drop' languages, see ch 5). In such languages, the passive clause fully resembles the active clause with a topical anaphoric agent; that is, a clause with a *zero anaphoric* agent. Thus in Sherpa (Koncchok Lama, i.p.c):

(7) a. **Active, non-anaphoric agent:**

ti mi-ti-gi chenyi chaq-sung
 DEF man-DEF-ERG cup/ABS break-PA/EV
 'the man broke the cup'

b. **Zero-marked agent:**

chenyi chaq-sung
 cup/ABS break-PA/EV

(i) **Active anaphoric interpretation:** '(s/he) broke the cup'

(ii) **Passive interpretation:** 'the cup was broken'

The interpretation of the zero-agent clause in (7b) depends on its discourse context. In a typical chain-medial context with a continuing topical agent ('...s/he was serving tea and...'), (7b) is interpreted as an active clause, with a continuing anaphoric agent (7b-i). In a context that de-topicalizes the agent ('...first the saucer fell, then...'), (7b) is interpreted as an agentless passive (7b-ii).

3.2.2. The nominalized-VP passive

In Ute, either a verb or a verb-phrase or an entire clause can be nominalized with the suffix *-ta*, the very same suffix that marks the impersonal passive. Thus compare (Givón 2011, ch. 10):

(8) a. **Active:**

ta'wach̩ t̩kuavi t̩ka-qha
 man/S meat/O eat-ANT
 'the man ate the meat'

b. **Lexical nominalization:**

t̩ka-ta t̩u'at̩
 eat-NOM good/NOM
 'eating is good'

c. **Clause nominalization:**

ta'wachi t̩kuavi t̩ka-ta t̩u'ay-kya
 man/G meat/O eat-NOM good-ANT
 'it was good that the man ate the meat'
 (lit. 'the man's eating (of) the meat was good')

d. **VP nominalization:**

t̩kuavi t̩ka-ta t̩u'at̩
 meat/O eat-NOM good/NOM
 '(the) eating (of) meat is good'

e. **Passive:**

t̩kuavi t̩ka-ta-qha
 meat/O eat-PASS-ANT
 'the meat was eaten'
 (hist.: 'the eating of meat was')

The diachronic logic of the zero-marked agent in the Ute impersonal passive (8e) is simple: its diachronic source, the **nominalized VP** (8d), is also a **zero-subject** construction.[FN 5]

3.2.3. The L-dislocation passive

In Lunda (Bantu), anaphoric arguments must be marked by clitic pronouns on the verb, with subject pronominal agreement being obligatory. The Bantu clitic pronouns have thus fully displaced zero-anaphora, and now occupy its natural functional domain of (see ch. 3). Thus consider (Givón and Kawasha 2001):

(9) a. **Active-transitive:**

aana **a-mono** Nzua
 children **they-saw** John
 'The children saw John'

b. **Anaphoric subject and object:**

a-mu-mono
they-him-saw
 'they saw him'

c. **L-dislocation object (full NP subject):**

Nzua, aana **a-mu-mono**
 John children **they-him-saw**
 'John, the children saw him'

d. **L-dislocation (pronominal impersonal subject):**

Nzua, **a-mu-mono**
 John **they-him-saw**
 'John, they saw him'

But the pronoun 'they' in (9d) may also function as an *impersonal subject* pronoun i.e. having no specific reference. In which case (9d) can be re-interpreted--with a merged intonation contour--as a *passive* clause:[FN 6]

(10) **Passive:**

Nzua **a-mu-mono**
 John **they-him-saw**
 'John was seen'

The Lunda passive in (10) is marked morphologically by two pronouns: First, the semantically-vacuous subject-agreement pronoun *a-* 'they', the closest stand-in for a main-clause zero-subject in a Bantu language (see ch. 1). And second, an obligatory object pronominal agreement controlled by the default topic-of-passive, the erstwhile L-dislocated object of the active clause. Since neither the subject nor the object NP in Lunda is case-marked, the default topic-of-passive appears at the characteristic subject position (SV), unmarked for case and sporting the vacuous 3rd-person-plural subject agreement and a peculiar object agreement. The Lunda passive is a **diachronic hybrid** of two constructions, object L-dislocation and impersonal subject. It bears clear testimony to its complex origin.

3.3. Diachrony of the zeroed-out agents in promotional passives

On the face of it, promotional passives allow the overt mention of the demoted agent, and thus do not involve a zero-marked agent. However, in languages with such passives, the zero-marked agentless passive is still the most frequent option in discourse. Thus, Cooreman (1987) notes that in the Chamorro *ma*-marked passive clause, technically a promotional passive that allows an overt agent, **90.5%** of passive clauses in narrative discourse are agentless. Comparable figures have been shown for the *be*-marked promotional passive of English (Givón 1979, ch. 2) and Spanish (Hidalgo 1994). Indeed, Hidalgo (1994) has shown that the Spanish *ser*-marked passive with an overtly-mentioned agent fits better the functional profile of an *inverse*, rather than a passive.

In the space below we will survey three major types of promotional passive whose diachronic provenance is relatively transparent.

3.3.1. The adjectival-stative passive

In some languages, as in the English *be*-passive, the passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally, a predicate-adjective construction, with the eventual passive emerging gradually through the following diachronic sequence; schematically:

- (11) a. **Predicate-adjective:** It is big
 b. **Adjectival-stative:** It is broken
 c. **Perfect-resultative:** It has been broken
 d. **Agentless passive:** It was broken
 e. **Overt-agent passive:** It was broken by Mary

The oblique agent in English passive clauses is infrequent in natural text, and was no doubt added later on in diachrony (Givón 2015a, ch. 17). What licenced its original zero-agent form (11d) was the fact that the diachronic source of the construction (11a) was agentless to begin with.

3.3.2. The reflexive passive

In some languages, as in the English *get*-passive, a passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally, a reflexive middle-voice construction, as in, schematically (Yang and Givón 1994):

(12) a. **Causative with active V-complement:**

Mary got them to fire John

b. **Causative with passive V-complement:**

Mary got John to be fired

c. **Causative with simplified passive V-complement:**

Mary got John fired

d. **Reflexive-causative with passive V-complement:**

Mary got herself fired

e. **GET-passive:**

Mary got fired

The *get*-passive in English is still, overwhelmingly, agentless in natural discourse. Diachronically, what licenses the zero-marking of its agent is the **subject-object co-reference** in the reflexive clause. In the original reflexive (12d), it is the co-referent *patient* that is replaced by a *reflexive pronoun*. But since that patient is co-referent with the agent, the re-interpretation of the reflexive as a passive (12e) also precipitates a re-interpretation of the zero as marking the *agent*.

3.3.3. **The serial-verb adversive passives**

In some languages, lastly, the passive clause arises diachronically from an adversive **clause-chaining** construction (see ch. 11), which is later compressed into the **serial-verb** passive clause. In the process, an adversive verb such as 'suffer' grammaticalizes as the passive marker. Such constructions are found in Mandarin, Japanese, Thai or Vietnamese, and may often expand their functional scope later on to a generalized passive.[FN 7] Thus, in Mandarin (Li and Thompson 1981; tone marking omitted):

(13) a. **Precursor clause chain:**ta **bei**, gongsi chezi-le [Ø]s/he **suffer** company fire-PERF O

's/he suffered, (when) the company fired her'

b. **Clause chain with zero-marked impersonal agent:**ta **bei**, [Ø] chezi-le [Ø]s/he **suffer** S fire-PERF O

's/he suffered, (when) someone fired her'

c. **Compressed serial clause--adversive passive (older):**

ta **bei** chezi-le
 s/he **PASS** fire-PERF
 'S/he was fired (by the company)'

d. **Compressed serial clause--generalized passive (newer):**

sheng-cheng **bei** jiefang-le
 province-capital **PASS** liberate-PERF
 'the provincial capital was liberated'

Diachronically, what licensed the zeroed-out agent-of-passive in (13c,d) is the zeroed-out agent in the precursor *impersonal-agent* chained clause in (13b). In that clause, two zeros are found--one coding the anaphoric object and abiding by principle (1a), the other coding the unspecified--unimportant--agent and abiding by principle (2a).

4. Cataphoric zero in antipassive clauses

4.1. Functional definition of antipassive voice

The antipassive began its life in linguistics as a vivid demonstration of how absurd the non-functional definition of grammatical constructions can get, and how our long-term addiction to Saussurean structuralism can pervert the natural logic of cross-language typology. Because the antipassive construction, with some of its peculiar morphology, was first described in **ergative languages** (Silverstein 1972; Dixon 1972, 1979, 1994; Fortescue 1996), it had been considered, for years, to be restricted to ergative languages, and then defined by its morphological characteristics in Chinook Jargon, Dyirbal or Inuit. Non-ergative languages then 'didn't have a real antipassive'. The equivalent of this self-defeating approach to grammatical typology would have the promotional *BE*-passive of English define the passive construction universally, relegating languages such as Ute, Mandarin, Sherpa or Kimbundu to the status of 'not having a real passive'.**[FN 8]**

Cogent functional definitions of the antipassive have been around for decades (Heath 1976; Cooreman 1982, 1987, 1988; Klaiman 1991; Givón ed.1994, 2001; Shibatani 2006; *inter alia*) Following our general functional definition of voice constructions in (3) above, the antipassive voice will be defined as:

(14) **Functional definition of the antipassive domain:**

"A antipassive clause is one where the patient of the corresponding active is radically de-topicalized. By default, the surviving agent argument may then become even more topical".

In addition, antipassive clauses often involve some predictable features:

- **Object:** non-referring, indefinite, plural, stereotypical
- **Aspect:** habitual, distributive, repetitive, activity-focused

All these added semantic features are predictable default consequences of the core pragmatic feature of the antipassive--de-topicalization of the patient.[FN 9]

4.2. **Flying under the radar: Plain zero**

As in the case of the passive (sec. 3.2.1. above), the most natural antipassive constructions--zero-marked object and the closely-related object incorporation--have tended to go wholly unrecognized by linguists. Consider first the most humble zero-marked antipassive of English:

- (15) a. **Transitive:** She drank her brandy
 b. **Antipassive:** She drinks like a fish (⇒ object = liquor)
 c. **Transitive:** He hunted the deer
 d. **Antipassive:** He hunts for a living (⇒ object = game animals)
 e. **Transitive:** They farmed 1,000 acres
 f. **Antipassive:** They farmed near Ignacio (⇒ object = land)
 g. **Transitive:** He shot ten people
 h. **Antipassive:** He shot indiscriminately (⇒ object = people)

4.3. **Still under the radar: Incorporated objects**

One of the most natural ways of zeroing a de-topicalized object is incorporating it into the verb. This is the main antipassive construction in Ute (above and beyond zero), applying not only to the direct object but also to instrument and manner. In the process of incorporation, all nominal suffixes, old markers of referentiality, must be shaved off the incorporated noun. In addition, verb-reduplication may be added to signal distributive action. Thus consider (Givón 2011, ch. 10):

(16) **Object incorporation:**a. **Transitive, referring object:**

ta'wa-chi̇ siveetu-**chi** 'uway kukwi-puga
 man-S goat-**O** the/O shoot-REM
 'the man shot the goat'

b. **Antipassive, non-referring object:**

ta'wa-chi̇ **siveetu-kukwi-mi**
 man-S **goat-shoot-HAB**
 'the man shoots goats', 'the man does goat-shooting'

c. **Antipassive with V-reduplication:**

ta'wa-chi̇ siveetu-**ku-gúkwi-na**-puga
 man-S goat-**RED**-shoot-**HAB**-REM
 'the man shot goats here and there', 'the man did some goat-shooting'

(17) **Instrument incorporation:**a. **Referring instrument:**

mama-chi̇ tukua-vi wii-**chi-m** 'uru chaqhavi'na-puga
 woman-S meat-O knife-**O-INSTR** the/O slice-REM
 'the woman sliced the meat with the knife'

b. **Incorporated stereotype instrument:**

mama-chi̇ tukua-vi **wii-chaqhavi'na**-puga
 woman-S meat-O **knife**-slice-REM
 'the woman knife-sliced the meat'

(18) **Manner incorporation:**a. **Referring manner:**

mama-**chi-pani** 'uway paghay-'way
 woman-**O-like** the/O walk-IMM
 '(he) is walking like that woman'

b. **Incorporated stereotype manner:**

mama-paghay-mi
woman-walk-IMM
 '(he) walks like a woman', '(he) woman-walks'

4.4. Zero, incorporation, and the rise of antipassive morphology

Let us consider now another common antipassive construction in English, a syntactic blend of two structural elements--nominalized complement verb and the auxiliary verb 'do' or 'go', as in:[FN 10]

- (19) a. **Active-direct:** We shot the target
 b. **Zero *do*-antipassive:** We did some shooting (behind the barn)
 c. **Zero *go*-antipassive:** We went shooting (out in the desert)
 d. **OBJ-incorp. *do*-antipassive:** We did some target-shooting (out there)
 e. **OBJ-incorp. *go*-antipassive:** We went target-shooting

One should consider the incorporated object stem in (19d,e), the nominalizing verb-suffix *-ing*, and the auxiliary verbs 'do' or 'go' as the nascent **grammatical morphology** that marks these unheralded English antipassives. Given time, all three will become part of the inflectional morphology marking the re-consolidated antipassive verb.

A clearer if diachronically more-advanced case of virtually the same antipassive construction, combining a nominalized verb and the auxiliary 'do'/'act',/'make', has been described recently in Mocovi, a Guaycuruan language from Argentina. Consider first the contrast between the active-transitive clause and the zero-object antipassive (Álvarez-González and Juárez 2015; Juárez and Álvarez-González 2015):

- (20) a. **Active-transitive:**
 so-pyoq i-ta-tak so-yale
 CL-dog 3/TR-sniff-PROG CL-man
 'the dog is sniffing the man'
 b. **Antipassive:**
 so-pyoq re-ta-gan
 CL-dog 3/IN-sniff-AP
 'the dog sniffs'

As Álvarez-González and Juárez (2015) note, the antipassive suffix *-(a)gan* is a composite of two elements--the nominalizing suffix *-(a)ga*, and the now-grammaticalized verb *-(e)n* 'do', 'act', 'make'. In addition, the transitive subject-pronominal agreement in the active-transitive clause (20a) changes to an intransitive (middle-voice) subject agreement in the antipassive (20b).

The object in the Mocovi antipassive need not be zeroed out. It may be retained but lose its reference/specificity marking, and the verb can be marked then with an **oblique (locative) suffix** that tags the object as less affected. In such an object-preserving antipassive, subject agreement may retain its transitive form.[FN 11] Thus consider:

(21) a. **Active-transitive:**

qomawge sa-kon-aga so-qopag
 we 1-take-PL CL-stick
 'We all took the stick'

b. **Antipassive:**

qomawge sa-kon-**agan-aga-gi** so-qopaga-r-ipi
 we 1-take-**AP-PL-LOC** CL-stick-PL-COL
 'We all took sticks'

Demoting a less-affected or non-specific patient by marking it with an oblique case can also be seen in diachronically-mature antipassives of other languages, as in Chamorro and English (Cooreman 1987):

(22) a. **Transitive:**

un-patek i-ga'lago
 ERG/2s-kick the-dog
 'you kicked the dog'

b. **Antipassive:**

ma-matek **hao gi** ga'lago
AP-kick **2s/ABS LOC** dog
 'you kicked **at** the dog'

Álvarez-González and Juárez go on to show that the same suffixal combination *-(a)ga-n* used to mark the antipassive verb in Mocovi is also used in the **causative** construction, as in:

(23) a. **Simple transitive:**

so-piog i-a'ik l-a'at
 CL-dog 3/TR-eat 3/PS-meat
 'the dog eats the meat'

b. **Causative:**

ayim si-ki-**yagan** so-pyog
 I 1s/TR-eat-**CAUSE** CL-dog'
 'I feed the dog', 'I make the dog eat'

This gives rise to a vexing synchronic puzzle:

(24) **Synchronic puzzle of the Moscovi antipassive verb suffix:**

"The very same suffixal combination *-(a)ga-n* used in the antipassive, which **decreases** transitivity by demoting or zeroing out the object, is also used in the causative, which **increases** transitivity by adding an object".[FN 12]

Álvarez-González and Juárez solve this apparent synchronic puzzle by tracking the diachrony of the antipassive and causative suffixal combination: Both combine the **nominalizing** verb-suffix *-(a)ga*, with the grammaticalized old verb *-(e)n* 'do'/'act'/'make'. Thus, with the *-aga* nominalizer alone:

(25) **Nominalizations:**

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| a. | l-qopi- aga
his-wound- NOM | 'his wound' |
| b. | i-awig- aga
my-burn- NOM | 'my burn' |
| c. | i-alola- ga
my-be.sick- NOM | 'my sickness' |
| d. | i-nogo- yaga
my-sweat- NOM | 'my sweat' |
| e. | qasileg- aga
be.brigh- NOM | 'brightness' |
| e. | pal- aga
disappear- NOM | 'darkness' |

The verbal origin of *-(e)n* in Mocovi, Álvarez-González and Juárez then note, is still evident in its use as a **verbalizer** suffix, converting nouns into transitive verbs, as in:

(26) noun	verb
=====	=====
(n)atar 'medicine'	n-atar- en 3-medicine- do 's/he cures' (lit. '... does medicine')
lapo 'a pile'	so-ña:qapioki' Ø-lapo- n-tak na-lawa CL-children 3-pile- do-PROG CL-soil 'children are piling up the soil' (lit. '...making the soil pile')
tawa 'helper'	yo-tawa- n 3-helper- do 's/he helps (him/her)' (lit.: '...acts as helper')

The use of nominalized--non-finite--verb forms in complements of causative verbs is widespread, as in English:[FN 13]

- (27) a. She made him **leave** the house
b. She caused him **to leave** the house

The diachronic logic of combining the auxiliary verb 'do'/'act'/'make' with a nominalized complement to yield an antipassive construction is complex, hinging on the fact that when a verb is nominalized, both its subject and object are **zeroed out**. In using the transitive verb 'do'/'act'/'make' to then innovate a causative construction, one adds to the construction *both* the subject and object of 'make', as in (schematically):

- (28) a. **Intransitive:** The glass fell
b. **Nominalization:** **to-fall**
c. **Causative:** She caused the glass **to-fall**

In contrast, in making an antipassive out of the very same combination of diachronic sources, one adds only the *subject* of 'do' but keeps the object of the nominalized verb as a *zero*, thus winding up with an **activity sense** of a de-transitive clause. That is, schematically:

- (29) a. **Transitive:** She broke the glass
 b. **Nominalization:** break-**ing**
 b. **Antipassive:** She did (some) break-**ing**

4.5. The diachronic accrual of antipassive morphology

In the 'classical' antipassives described first in Ergative languages, the antipassive clause distinguished itself from the transitive-active by three main morphological features:

(30) '**Classical**' antipassive morphology:

locus	active-ergative	antipassive
subject marking:	ERG	ABS
object marking	ABS	OBL (if not zeroed)
verb marking:	-----	AP

Of those, the ergative/absolute nominal morphology is peculiar to ergative languages.

However, antipassive verbal morphology is found in many non-ergative languages (Janic 2015). Thus for example, the nominative Mocovi displays a contrast between transitive and intransitive **subject-pronoun** prefixes,[FN 14] paralleling the ergative-absolute pronominal contrast in many ergative languages (e.g. Mayan; Craig 1977). But the absolute subject pronouns in Mayan, just like the intransitive subject pronouns in Mocovi, also mark the antipassive verb (20b), in effect thus joining the antipassive **verbal morphology**.

In both the ergative Chamorro and the nominative English (22b), the demoted patient can be marked with an **oblique case** (22b). But in the nominative Mocovi, the oblique marker is a verb suffix, thus joining the antipassive **verbal morphology** (21b).

We have also noted above that **incorporated objects** can become part of the verbal morphology of the antipassive, as in Ute (16, 17,18) or English (19d,e). And both English and Mocovi bear testimony to the rise of antipassive verbal morphology that combines a **nominalizer** affix with the **auxiliary verb** 'do'/'act'/'make' or 'go'. The verbal morphology of antipassive verbs is thus assembled over diachronic time from multiple amenable sources.

5. Closure

With whatever attendant morphology, the most natural antipassive clause is still, fundamentally, a **zero-object** construction, whether through flat-out zeroing or by object incorporation. But as in the **zero-agent** passive clause, the functional motivation for the zero in the antipassive is **cataphoric** rather than anaphoric--de-topicalized agent in the passive, de-topicalized patient in the antipassive. Functionally, this de-topicalization means that the zeroed-out (or 'demoted') argument does not persist as an important participant in the subsequent discourse, and therefore does not demand continued attentional activation and anticipation.

The role of nominalization in the diachrony both passive and antipassive constructions is striking. The Ute impersonal passive (sec. 3.2.2.) arose from a VP nominalization that, by definition, zeroes out the **subject**. The English and Mocovi antipassives (sec. 4.4.) arose from a nominalization that zeroed out both the subject and the **object**. The auxiliary verb 'do' or 'go' then restores the subject in the antipassive of both English and Moscovi. But the zeroing-out of the **object** through nominalization remains a key ingredient in making the construction an antipassive.

ABBREVIATIONS OF GRAMMATICAL TERMS

ABS	absolutive	1	1 st person
ANT	anterior	3	3 rd person
AP	antipassive		
CAUS	causative		
CL	classifier		
COL	collective		
DEF	definite		
ERG	ergative		
EV	evidential		
G	genitive		
HAB	habitual		
IMM	immediate		
IN	intransitive		
INSTR	instrument		
LOC	locative		
NOM	nominal(izer)		
PA	past		
PASS	passive		
PERF	perfect		
PL	plural		
POSS	possessive		
PROG	progressive		
O	object		
OBL	oblique		
RED	reduplicate		
REM	remote		
S	subject		
TR	transitive		

Footnotes

1

For an extensive review of the neuro-cognitive literature on default minimal alertness vs. anticipation of change, see Fan *et al.* (2007).

2

In the prototype active-transitive event, the agent acts to change the patient. In the middle-voice, the patient changes by itself without an agent. In the reflexive, the agent acts on itself and is thus co-referential with the patient. In the reciprocal, two different agents act on each other reciprocally. That is:

- (i) *Active-transitive*: She changed him
- (ii) *Middle voice*: He changed
- (iii) *Reflexive*: She changed herself
- (iv) *Reciprocal*: They changed each other

All these variations do not involve the discourse context outside the event-clause. One may argue that an anaphoric zero, or its pronominal replacement, is involved in all three semantic de-transitive voice constructions: a zero agent in (ii) and a zero patient in (iii) and (iv). For an extensive discussion of semantic vs. pragmatic voice, see Givón (2001, vol. 2, ch 13), Shibatani (2006). In addition, the causative and applicative constructions are both associated with increased transitivity, and are sometimes also discussed in the context of voice (Shibatani 2006).

3

Comparable distribution for other languages can be found in the various studies in Givón (ed. 1994).

4

See various papers in Givón (ed. 1994). The relation between the referent's cataphoric persistence in text and its topicality/importance is an asymmetrical one-way conditional: "If persistent in text, then probably important; but not necessarily vice versa". Fundamentally, importance is a psychological property that depends on multiple factors, only one of them being text frequency. And text frequency may be one predictable consequence of importance.

5

A similar nominalized-VP passive was described for Dutch by Kirsner (1976).

21

6

Being a diachronic hybrid construction in the midst of re-analysis, the Lunda passive allows an optional oblique-marked agent, as in:

Nzua **a-mu**-mono (kwa-meme)

John **they-him**-saw by-me

'John was seen (by me)'

7

The English *get*-passive also started as an adversive passive (Yang and Givón 1994).

8

For an extensive discussion of the less-than-salutary effects of lingering Saussurean structuralism on linguistic typology, see Givón (2015c). The lead plenary talk at the ALT 2015 meeting in Albuquerque (Janic 2015), compressed from a recent dissertation, strove hard to demonstrate--largely on structural grounds--that nominative-accusative languages did have antipassive constructions. A simple reference to the functional definition of the antipassive, as in (14) below, would have rendered the entire Rube-Goldberg-like argument moot.

9

Hopper and Thompson (1980) bear considerable responsibility for conflating many secondary, predictable, default features of transitivity with its core features.

10

A similar antipassive construction has been noted in French (Álvarez-González and Juárez 2015).

11

This retention of the transitive subject pronoun in Mocovi is observed in the first person. In the third person, the subject pronoun in the antipassive changes to the intransitive form.

12

While the causative as a synchronic derivation adds an object, in the diachrony of Mocovi antipassive it adds a *subject* to the nominalized verb.

13

For a discussion of the complementation scale, clause-union and the use of non-finite verb forms in the complements of implicative verbs, see Givón (2001, vol. 2, ch. 12).

14

The nominative-accusative distribution of the pronouns in Mocovi is found with SAP subjects. Third person subjects display a more complex tri-partite distribution (Juárez and Álvarez-González 2011).

References

- Álvarez-González, A. and C. Juárez (2015) "The origin of the antipassive/causative syncretism in Mocovi", Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora (ms.)
- Brainard, S. (1994) "Voice and Ergativity in Kawao", in T. Givón (ed. 1994)
- Cooreman, A. (1982) "Topicality, ergativity and transitivity in narrative discourse: Evidence from Chamorro", *Studies in Language*, 6.3
- Cooreman, A. (1987) *Transitivity and Discourse Continuity in Chamorro Narrative*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Cooreman, A. (1988) "Ergativity in Dyirbal discourse", *Linguistics*, 26
- Craig, C. (1977) *The Structure of Jacaltec*, Austin: University of Texas Press
- Dixon, R.M.W (1972) *The Dyirbal Language of Northern Queensland*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1979) "Ergativity", *Language*, 55.1
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DuBois, J. (1987) "The discourse base of ergativity", *Language*, 63.4
- Fan, J., R. Kolster, J. Ghajar, M. Suh, R.T. Knight, R. Sarkar and B.D. McCandliss (2007) "Response anticipation and response conflict: And event-related potential and functional magnetic resonance imaging study", *J. of Neuroscience*, 27.9 (February 28, 2007)
- Fortescue, M. (1996) "West Greenlandic half-transitive affixes in a diachronic perspective", in B. Jacobsen (ed.) *Cultural and Social Research in Greenland 95/96, Essays in Honor of Robert Petersen*, Illisimatuserfik/Atuakiorfik, Nuuk
- Givón, T. (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*, NY: Academic Press
- Givón, T. (1981) "Typology and functional domains", *Studies in Language*, 5.2
- Givón, T. (1994) "The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion", in T. Givón (ed. 1994)
- Givón, T. (ed. 1994) *Voice and Inversion*, TSL #28, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins
- Givón, T. (2001) *Syntax: An Introduction*, 2 vols, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins
- Givón, T. (2011) *Ute Reference Grammar*, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins
- Givón, T. (2015a) *The Diachrony of Grammar*, 2 vols, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins
- Givón, T. (2015c) "Beyond structuralism: Exorcizing Saussure's ghost", paper read at the *Association of Linguistic Typology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico (August 2015; ms.)
- Givón, T. and B. Kawasha (2001) "Indiscrete grammatical relations: The Lunda passive", *TR-01-05*, Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences, Eugene: University of Oregon

- Greenberg, J. (1978) "Diachrony, synchrony and language universals", in J. Greenberg *et al.* (eds 1978)
- Greenberg, J. (1979) "Rethinking linguistic diachrony", *Language*, 55
- Greenberg, J., C. Ferguson and E. Moravcsik (eds 1978) *Universals of Human Language*, Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Heath, J. (1976) "Antipassivization: A functional typology", *BLS* 2, Berkeley: University of California
- Hidalgo, R. (1994) "The pragmatics of de-transitive voice in Spanish: From passive to inverse?", in T. Givón (ed. 1994)
- Hopper, P. and B. Fox (eds 1994) *Voice: Form and Function*, TSL: #27, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins
- Hopper, P. and S. Thompson (1980) "Transitivity in grammar and discourse", *Language*, 56
- Janic, K. (2015) "The antipassive in accusative languages", plenary talk, *Association of Linguistic Typology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico (August 1, 2015)
- Juárez, C. and A. Álvarez-González (2015) "The antipassive marking in Mocovi and its relationship with causativization, aspect and genitive nominal meaning", Hermosillo: Universidad de Sonora (ms.)
- Kirsner, R. (1976) "On the subjectless pseudo-passive in standard Dutch and the problem of background agent", in C. Li (ed. 1976)
- Klaiman, M. (1991) *Grammatical Voice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Li, C.N. (ed. 1976) *Subject and Topic*, NY: Academic Press
- Li, C.N. and S. Thompson (1981) *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Shibatani, M. (1985) "Passive and related constructions: A prototype analysis", *Language*, 61
- Shibatani, M. (2006) "On the conceptual framework for voice phenomena", *Linguistics*, 44.2
- Silverstein, M. (1972) "Chinook Jargon: Language contact and the problem of multi-level generative systems, II", *Language*, 48
- Yang, L. and T. Givón (1994) "the rise of the English GET-passive", in P. Hopper and B. Fox (eds. 1994)