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Overview

• Some background: doing cross-linguistic research of grammatical relations: what are we talking about and what are the challenges?

• An alternative framework with a place for lexical effects

• Lexical effects on grammatical relations

• Lexical effects on some diathetical operations

• Note: “effects” and not “restrictions” for reasons to be outlined during the talk
Grammatical relations

- **Traditional** grammatical relations
  - e.g. subject and objects
  - understood as relations between a clause or a predicate and its arguments
  - fundamental to many grammatical models and central in language description
  - often regarded as universal categories, also in typologically-oriented sources (cf. Dixon 1994)

Grammatical Relations

- Subject and object (the traditional grammatical relations) are suitable for the description of some languages of the world.
- But they are not always suitable for the description of other languages (e.g. the ones with ergative traits).
- Not at all suitable for the comparison of grammatical relations across languages, as grammatical relations are fundamentally both language-specific and construction-specific (Dryer 1997, Croft 2001)

Identifying grammatical relations (1)

- A lot of the earlier studies (and many recent ones) start with an assumption that there is one true subject and object out there.
- The task is to find proper tools (or tests) to identify them.

- Traditionally, grammatical relations used to be identified on the basis of morphological marking:
  - nominative flagging & indexing on the verb > subject
  - accusative flagging & no indexing on the verb > (direct) object
Identifying grammatical relations (2)

German

- nominative flagging & indexing on the verb > subject
- accusative flagging & no indexing on the verb > (direct) object

one-argument clause

(1a) *Ein Mann ist gestorben.*
    INDEF.NOM man AUX died
    ‘A man died’

two-argument clause

(1b) *Der Hund hat den Mann gebissen.*
    DEF.NOM dog AUX DEF.ACC man bitten
    ‘The dog bit the man.’

How do these tests fare in other languages?
Identifying grammatical relations (2)

- The morphological tests do not quite work for every language e.g. Kâte (Trans New Guinea; PNG; Pilhofer 1933)
  
  (2a) \[ \eta ic \quad moc \quad hâmo-\text{jec}. \]
  \[ \text{man.ABS} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{die-PST.3sg} \]
  ‘A man died.’

  (2b) \[ qâto-zi \quad \eta ic/\text{no} \quad ki-\text{jec}. \]
  \[ \text{dog-ERG} \quad \text{man.ABS/1sg.ABS} \quad \text{bite-PST.3sg} \]
  ‘The dog has bitten the man.’

- In comparison to the German examples:
  the two categories established by the Kâte flagging do not correspond to the two categories in German

- Moreover, argument indexing in Kâte does not match the categories established by Kâte flagging
Identifying grammatical relations (3)

- In search of the one and only true subject (or object)
  - a discussion of a larger set of tests or identifiers of GRs
  - interim results: in some cases they provide conflicting evidence or seem to contradict the researcher’s intuition about the true grammatical relations
    “MISMATCH in distribution patterns for the same criterion or construction across languages” (Croft 2001: 35)
  - a popular response to such conflicts: pick one criterion or a small selection of criteria from a range of possible phenomena and argue that they providing the only correct diagnostic for “real” or “deep” grammatical relations.
Identifying grammatical relations (4)

- In search of the one and only true subject (or object)
  - a discussion of a larger set of tests or identifiers of GRs
  - a popular response to such conflicts: pick one criterion or a small selection of criteria from a range of possible phenomena and argue that they providing the only correct diagnostic for “real” or “deep” grammatical relations
  - E.g. Anderson (1976) on Kâte: the language has a subject after all but the morphology won’t help to identify it the syntactic test which provides the necessary evidence is switch-reference marking → the subject is the same NP as the one translated as subject into English or German

Construction-specific grammatical relations

• morpho-syntactic properties as subject and object tests or criteria – a common praxis in the research on grammatical relations

Problem 1:

(i) different morpho-syntactic criteria > different kinds of “subjects” and “objects”

• Which criterion to chose?
• Should different criteria be weighted? How? And why?
Language-specific grammatical relations

• **Problem 2:**

(ii) other languages $>$ other criteria

switch-reference marking absent in many languages; but other constructions can be used there, which in turn are absent in Kâte (e.g. relativization site in Dyirbal, infinitive control in German, etc.)

switch-reference in Kâte $\approx$ infinitive control in German
Language-specific grammatical relations

• **Problem 2:**

(ii) **other languages > other criteria**

switch-reference marking absent in many languages; but other constructions can be used there, which in turn are absent in Kâte (e.g. relativization site in Dyirbal, infinitive control in German, etc.)
‘Methodological opportunism’ = use “language-specific criteria when the general criteria do not exist in the language, or when they give the “wrong” results according to one’s theory” (Croft 2001:30) (two subtypes: language-internal and cross-linguistic methodological opportunism)

- **inconsistent** and **ad hoc:**
  an unaccepted method of language comparison

- **Alternatives?**
Construction-specific grammatical relations

- **Alternatives** to the methodological opportunism
  - consider all morpho-syntactic properties of GRs in individual languages (our “argument selectors”, Witzlack-Makarevich & Bickel 2019)
  - compare languages only with respect to common morpho-syntactic properties
- **Subject-/Object Alignment** of individual morpho-syntactic properties, i.e. the grouping of the three argument roles S, A, and P (and T and G, as well as adjunct)
  by flagging, indexing, switch reference marking, interpretation under conjunction reduction, etc…

Argument selectors

• Needed: a comprehensive framework that would allow typological investigations of grammatical relations against the background of their construction-specific and language-specific nature and language-internal variation (i.e. splits)

• Our proposal:
  Grammatical relations as equivalence sets of arguments which are treated the same way (i.e. “aligned”) by an argument selector (any morphosyntactic construction or pattern of marking or rule) under certain conditions (cf. Bickel 2011, Witzlack-Makarevich 2019)

Argument selectors

• How can one typologize such a complex phenomenon? Decomposition of GRs into a range of fine-grained variables
  (cf. Bickel 2010 on multivariate typology)

• Three types of variables:
  a) argument selectors (e.g. flagging and indexing, but also promotion and demotion via passivization and antipassivization)
  b) selected arguments
  c) conditions on argument selection

Argument selectors

- How can one typologize such a complex phenomenon? Decomposition of GRs into a range of fine-grained variables

- Three types of variables
  a) argument selectors (e.g. promotion and demotion via passivization and antipassivization)
  b) selected arguments (S, A, P, T, G as generalized argument roles of one-, two- and three-participant predicates, defined exclusively by semantic criteria, independent of morphological marking or syntactic behavior → “Bickelian” approach is different from Dixon’s or Comrie’s/Lazard’s/Creissels’ view of S, A, P (cf. Haspelmath 2011, Creissels 2018)
Argument selectors

- How can one typologize such a complex phenomenon?
  Decomposition of GRs into a range of fine-grained variables

- Three types of variables
  a) argument selectors (e.g. promotion and demotion via passivization and antipassivization)
  b) selected arguments (S, A, P, T, G as generalized argument roles of one-, two- and three-participant predicates)

So far we get a familiar alignment for various selectors, but there is a range of phenomena we haven’t covered...


Language-internal variation and all sorts of splits

differential recipient marking

prominence hierarchy

differential theme marking

prepositional accusative

two-dimensional DAM systems

DOM

global/local DAM

animacy hierarchy

empathy hierarchy

DAM

differential argument indexing

referential scale

active/stative languages

fluid-S

split alignment

differential agent marking

split ergativity

bi-absolutive construction

split

optional ergative marking

differential subject marking

hierarchical agreement

scenario
Argument selectors

• How can one typologize such a complex phenomenon?
  Decomposition of GRs into a range of fine-grained variables

• Three types of variables
  a) argument selectors (e.g. promotion and demotion
     via passivization and antipassivization)
  b) selected arguments ... as generalized argument roles
     + referential properties (e.g. animacy, topicality, etc.)
Argument selectors

• How can one typologize such a complex phenomenon? Decomposition of GRs into a range of fine-grained variables

• Three types of variables
  a) argument selectors
  b) selected arguments: S, A, P, ... as generalized argument roles + referential properties (e.g. animacy, topicality, etc.)
  c) conditions on argument selections:
    - TAM, polarity
    - scenario (configuration of arguments, e.g. 1>2, 1>3)
    - clause type (main vs. various types of dependent clauses)
    - predicate classes (or valency classes) → our lexical restrictions
    - ...

Lexical restrictions

- How is it different from other approaches?
  - S, A, and P can only be defined with reference to a specific predicate class, exclusively on the basis of semantic criteria:
    e.g. case in Chechen (Nakh-Daghestanian, Molochieva, p.c.)

\[<A_{\text{ERG}} P_{\text{NOM}}> \quad \text{As} \quad niaw \quad kagjina.\]
\[\text{I.ERG} \quad \text{door}(j).\text{NOM} \quad \text{break.PR} \quad \text{‘I’ve broken the door.’}\]

\[<A_{\text{DAT}} P_{\text{NOM}}> \quad Suuna \quad Zaara \quad j-iez-a.\]
\[\text{I.DAT} \quad Zara(j).\text{NOM} \quad j\text{-love-PRS} \quad \text{‘I love Zara.’}\]

also \[<A_{\text{GEN}} P_{\text{NOM}}>, <A_{\text{NOM}} P_{\text{ALL}}>, <A_{\text{NOM}} P_{\text{LAT}}>, <A_{\text{ERG}} P_{\text{DAT}}>, \ldots\]
Lexical restrictions

• How is it different from other approaches?

- S, A, and P can only be defined with reference to a specific predicate class, exclusively on the basis of semantic criteria:
  e.g. case in Chechen
  \(<A_{\text{ERG}} P_{\text{NOM}}>, <A_{\text{DAT}} P_{\text{NOM}}>, <A_{\text{GEN}} P_{\text{NOM}}>, <A_{\text{NOM}} P_{\text{ALL}}>, <A_{\text{NOM}} P_{\text{LAT}}>,
  <A_{\text{ERG}} P_{\text{DAT}}>, ...\)

- for some research questions, only one class is of interest,
  e.g. the largest and/or most productive (“the default predicate classes”) or whatever one believes to be the most prototypical (exemplar)

- for many other, all classes are of interest, e.g. Bickel et al. (2014)
How is it different from other approaches?

- How is it different from other approaches?
  - S, A, and P can only be defined with reference to a specific predicate class, exclusively on the basis of semantic criteria: e.g. Chechen
    
    \[
    \langle A_{ERG} \ P_{NOM} \rangle \ <A_{DAT} \ P_{NOM} \rangle, \ <A_{GEN} \ P_{NOM} \rangle, \ <A_{NOM} \ P_{ALL} \rangle, \ <A_{NOM} \ P_{LAT} \rangle, \ <A_{ERG} \ P_{DAT} \rangle, \ldots
    \]
  
  - other approaches: focus only on some verbs and their arguments
  - e.g. A and P are only “arguments that [...] are coded exactly like typical agents and patients of core transitive verbs” (Creissels 2018: 62),
    (but see also Creissels 2019:318–319 on suggestions how to study other predicate classes)
  - see Arkadiev & Letuchiy (2021) for a recent critique of this limitation

Lexical effects on grammatical relations

• Lexical effects are well-studied with respect to flagging:
  many studies on “non-canonical” case marking (e.g. Tsunoda 1985, Aikhenvald et al. 2001, Bhaskararao & Subbarao 2004, Bickel et al. 2014, Malchukov & Comrie 2015)

• And, more recently, some studies on indexation (Fedden et al. 2014)

• From the workshop call: “such constraints have also been reported for grammatical relations defining other types of constructions, including

• a range of voice- and valency-related constructions ...”

→ An overview of the evidence of lexical effects on some of these voice- and valency-related constructions (or diathetical operations)
Diathetical operations

• Diathesis is any specific mapping of semantic argument roles onto traditional GRs (subject or direct object) (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019:4) e.g. the active diathesis: A mapped onto the subject, P onto the object

• This mapping can be modified via various diathetical operations

• One often can distinguish the basic “active” diathesis (e.g. Mel’čuk 2006:182–191)

• (Grammatical) voice is the grammatical category whose values correspond to the particular diathesis marked in the form of predicates

• Thus, e.g. an unmarked antipassive is not a grammatical voice, but is still a diathetical operation (see also the recent discussion [Lingtyp] Double-marked passive)

Diathetical operations

- Several types of diathetical operations (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019: 4):
  - argument *installment* or *removal* are operations that modify *valency* (number of arguments in the *semantic* argument structure)
  - promotion and demotion (including suppression) are operations that change the *morpho-syntactic properties* of the arguments

Diathetical operations

- Several types of diathetical operations (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019: 4):
  - promotion and demotion (including suppression) are operations that change the **morpho-syntactic properties** of the arguments

- In the approach to grammatical relations adopted here
  - promotion and demotion by various diathetical operations are argument selectors
  - e.g. a passive selects P by **promoting** it, i.e. it acquires the properties which are otherwise attributed to some other arguments (e.g. \{S, A\})
  - a passive can also select A by **demoting** it, i.e. A of passive “looses” some of the properties which A has in an active clause
  - note that promotion and demotion can be limited to certain morpho-syntactic properties (e.g. promotion wrt to flagging only)

Lexical effects on antipassives
Antipassive

- Note that in the past decades, the antipassive has been identified in a large number of languages without any ergative traits
- E.g. in Nahuatl (Nouguier Voisin 2005), Soninke (Creissels 2012), Sereer (Renaudier 2012), Mandinka (Creissels 2015), some Bantu languages (Bostoen et al. 2015), Slavic languages (Janic 2013), see also the discussion in Janic (2016).

and in range of up-to-date studies in Janic & Witzlack-Makarevich (2021)

Lexical restrictions on antipassives

• The issue of lexical restrictions on the antipassive construction is mentioned in many accounts of individual languages, some examples on the next slides

• It is also addressed in several comparative studies, e.g. Polinsky (2005/2013) and recently Say (2021)

• However, dedicated language-specific studies of productivity are not numerous, some notable exceptions:
  - Say (2005) on Russian
  - Arkadiev & Letuchiy (2008) on Adyghe
  - several contributions in Janic & Witzlack-Makarevich (eds, 2021)
Lexical restrictions on antipassives: Some examples

- Restricted but seemingly quite productive examples:
  - **Mandinka** (Mande): the antipassive suffix `-ri` “used exclusively with verbs that select the two-core-term predicative construction as their basic coding frame”
  - “I am aware of only two verbs meeting this definition that cannot take the antipassive suffix: *sèné* ‘cultivate’ and *fiiri* ‘sell’. These two verbs behave in all other respects like the other verbs having the two-core-term construction as their basic coding frame, [...]. I am aware of no possible explanation of this oddity in the behavior of these two verbs.” (Creissels 2019: 328)
Lexical restrictions on antipassives: Some examples

- Restricted but seemingly quite productive examples:
  - **Chamorro** antipassive: “considerably more lexical idiosyncrasy than does passive” (Chung 1998:39).
  - Transitive verbs that lack the antipassive form include *nisisita* ‘need’, *malagu’i* ‘desire’, and *fattoigui* ‘come for (esp. of spirits)’
  - Complex set of restrictions governing the argument structure of antipassives formed from verbs of transfer

Lexical restrictions on antipassives: Some examples

• More restricted cases

• Mithun (2021) on antipassive in the four families on North America: Siouan, Haida, Pomoan, and Iroquoian (languages with “agent/patient patterning”)
  - in the discussed languages Central Pomo, Lakota, Mohawk, and Haida “antipassives are derivational and, accordingly, differ in their productivity and pervasiveness” (Mithun 2021: 62)

  - note that Central Pomo and Lakota, as well as Seneca (N. Iroquoian) are classified as having no antipassive in Polinsky (2005/2013)
Lexical restrictions on antipassives: Some examples

- “Moving further away from the prototype, we can distinguish LEXICALLY CONSTRAINED ANTIPASSIVES” (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019: 107)

  - **Basque**: antipassive possible only with “a dozen heterogeneous verbs” (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019: 107)

  - **Diyari**: only eight verbs can take the antipassive suffix (Austin 2005)

  - Romance, e.g. **Spanish**: the antipassive alternation “available only with a reduced number of verbs”, impossible even with the semantically related verb *recordar* ‘remember’ (Zúñiga & Kittilä 2019: 107)

    a) *Olvidó los libros.*  
    
    forgot.3sgSBJ DEF book

    b) *Se olvidó de los libros.*  
    
    ANTIP forgot.3sgSBJ of DEF books

    Both: ‘S/he forgot the books.’
Lexical restrictions on antipassives: Some examples

- On the other hand, a better database can change the understanding of the limitations of the antipassive construction
- **Cariban:** Sapién et al. (2021) on the properties of an underspecified construction with a “detransitivizer” morpheme in six Cariban languages
  - the construction was previously analyzed as having other idiosyncratic readings, including the antipassive reading limited to just a few verbs per language
  - a corpus-based study shows that many more verbs per language allow the antipassive reading and that this reading is much more frequent in naturalistic discourse than previously assumed

A recurrent theme in the discussion of the antipassive construction in individual languages is its productivity.

Various definitions, various suggestions as to how to operationalize the concept of morphological productivity (textbook examples Lieber 2009, Haspelmath & Sims 2010)

- e.g. the applicability of a morphological rule or pattern (e.g. the antipassive formation) to new bases

- e.g. transparency of form and of meaning (compositional vs. lexicalized), frequency of base type (the number of different bases to which a specific morphological rule or pattern applies), etc.

- all of them not without challenges. (e.g. Bauer 2001, Lieber 2009, Haspelmath & Sims 2010)
Antipassive: inflection or derivation?

- Productivity is related to the analysis of the antipassive as either a derivational process or an inflectional category (for one of the most articulated discussions, see Say 2005).
- Linguists are in consensus about what constitutes the core verbal inflectional categories (e.g. Booij 2007: 133–138), but the status of various diathetical operations varies.
- Haspelmath & Sims (2010: 234–245) consider passives and antipassive to be function-changing morphological operations and thus inflectional.
- In contrast to event-changing ones, (e.g. the causative), which are derivational categories.
- However, Haspelmath & Sims (2010: 234–245) note that in concrete languages the distinction might be problematic.

Antipassive: lexicalist vs. syntactic approaches

- The issue of productivity is related to how the antipassive is treated by various theoretical approaches, specifically, to the dichotomy between lexicalist (or lexical) approaches vs. syntactic approaches.
  - Lexicalist approaches: the antipassive modifies the argument structure of the input lexeme (for references, see Polinsky 2017)
  - Syntactic approaches: the antipassive is a result of a syntactic derivation
- Polinsky’s (2017: 316–322) overview of the debate emphasis language-internal evidence in adopting one of the approaches
- Also Say (2008:82) argues for a continuum view: from productive and semantically unmodified antipassives with primarily pragmatic functions and syntactic effects to less productive antipassives

Antipassive: productivity

- The only(?) large-scale typological study of the productivity of the antipassive is Polinsky (2005/2013), the criteria applied are not discussed.

- E.g. both Basque and Chamorro as partially productive.

- Some languages later reported to have an antipassive, classified as “no antipassive” (e.g. C. Pomo and Lakota, as well as Seneca (N. Iroquoian)).
Antipassive in Russian

- A language can have both types of antipassive, e.g. Russian has lexical *sja*-antipassives and grammatical *sja*-antipassives (Say 2005)

Lexical *sja*-antipassives in Russian (Say 2005)

- **Lexical *sja*-antipassives** vs. grammatical *sja*-antipassives
  a) Active
  b) Antipassive

  *Ja zažmурil glaza.* vs. *Ja zažmурil-*

  I squeezed.shut eyes.**ACC**

  I squeezed.shut-*sja*

  both: ‘I squeezed my eyes shut.’

  - only certain patients: body parts, ‘spiritual parts’ (thoughts and attention),
    products of one’s creativity, certain objects of personal use (Kretov 1978)

  - each verb of this type presupposes a particular type of patient
    that is idiosyncratic for that *sja*-verb: (a **lexically restricted** process,
    even for those transitive verbs whose expected objects are inalienably
    possessed

---


Kretov, Aleksey A. 1978. Osobennosti semantiki vozratnyx glagolov vključennogo neoduševlennogo ob"jekta v
Grammatical sja-antiappassives in Russian (Say 2005)

- Lexical sja-antipassives vs. grammatical sja-antipassives particularly common in but not limited to informal registers “a regular, even if innovative phenomenon” (Say 2005:265)

a) Active
   
   Sejčas ona budet perezarjažat’ vintovku.
   now she will reload rifle.ACC
   ‘Now, she will reload the rifle.’

b) Antipassive
   
   Sejčas Ekaterina Ivanova budet perezarjažat-sja.
   now PN will reload-sja
   ‘Now, Ekaterina Ivanova will reload.’ (Say 2005: 265)
   (her rifle in a biathlon competition)

Antipassive in Russian (Say 2005)

• Lexical *sja*-antipassives vs. **grammatical *sja*-antipassives**

• Difference:
  - no tight connection between the verbal lexeme and the type of implied patient, as well as the contextual nature of the semantic interpretation of grammatical antipassives
  - no idiosyncratic, arbitrary lexical restrictions on the applicability of the grammatical *sja*-antipassive use

• Conclusion: it is a diathetical permutation, that is, a ‘function-changing’ operation (as opposed to ‘event-changing’, Haspelmath 2002:218)

---

Grammatical *sj*a-antipassives in Russian (Say 2005)

- No idiosyncratic, arbitrary lexical restrictions on the applicability
- What about systematic restrictions?
  - *sj*a-antipassives are almost never used when the patient is animate (matches the functional motivation to eliminate unimportant patients), thus uncommon with such verbs as *ubit’* ‘to kill’ or *kormit’* ‘to feed’
  - not about predicate classes, but a kind of “differential argument behavior” (DOB)
  - possible only with **verbs of action** (also true for *sj*a-passives), but not with non-action transitive verbs, e.g. *stoit’* ‘to cost’, *znat’* ‘to know’, *prevosxodit’* ‘to surpass’, etc.
Passives
Passive

• Multiple definitions, cf. a recent discussion on Double-marked passive [Lingtyp]
• Traditionally, patterns of diathesis alternation are described with reference to the grammatical relations of subject and objects.
• For instance, one way to characterize the passive diathesis is by stating that the active subject corresponds either to an optional oblique phrase or to nothing, whereas the active direct object corresponds to the subject of the passive

Some definitions mention lexical restrictions:

“A construction is called passive if:
(i) the active subject corresponds either to a non-obligatory oblique phrase or to nothing; and
(ii) the active direct object (if any) corresponds to the subject of the passive; and
(iii) the construction is somehow restricted vis-a-vis another unrestricted construction (the active), e.g. less frequent, functionally specialized, not fully productive.

(Haspelmath 1990: 27)
Passive in English

• Lexical restrictions on passivization are found in familiar languages: “A passive sentence in English is not an automatic transformation of an active one.” (Dixon 2005: 353)

• Verbs “open to passivization” are “those whose object is likely to be human, or else something with specific reference that is being particularly focused on” (Dixon 2005: 353)

• “There are some transitive verbs which—for semantic or other reasons—never occur in the passive [...] and, for many verbs, ability to passivise depends on the nature of the object.” (Dixon 2005: 353)
Transitive verbs which do not allow a passive (Dixon 2005:360–367):

- symmetric verbs (*She is resembled by their daughter.)*
- verbs that refer to a static relationship (contain, cost, last, etc.)
  + have (but be owned is ok, some explanations provided)
- verbs that inherently focus on the subject:
  join (*The Catholic Church was joined by John.)*
  possess (in the sense of own)
  infrequently in passive
Passive in Russian (Say 2005)

- Systematic restrictions: *sja*-passive can only be formed from verbs that are transitive, imperfective (analytic construction with perfective verbs) and **verbs of action**, no passive with non-action transitive verbs (e.g. with *stoit* ‘to cost’, *znat* ‘to know’, *prevosxodit* ‘to surpass’)

- What about further restrictions?
Passive in Russian (Say 2005)

- Systematic restrictions: *sja*-passive can only be formed from verbs that are transitive, imperfective (analytic construction with perfective verbs) and **verbs of action**, no passive with non-action transitive verbs (e.g. with *stoit’* ‘to cost’, *znat’* ‘to know’, *prevosxodit’* ‘to surpass’)

- What about further restrictions? Say (2005) reports Korolev’s study (1968) who added further subtler constraints and examined 4500 verbs that could theoretically form *sja*-passives. At least 4300 verbs do allow formation of *sja*-passive. But also apparently hundreds of verbs that do not!

- Also Xrakovskij (1991: 149) claims that almost 90% of imperfective transitive verbs are able to form *sja*-passives

---

The extent of passives

• Similarly to antipassives, the question of extent of passives is infrequently addressed, i.e. its applicability to other than transitive verbs (often with further language-specific restrictions)

• Some exceptions:
  Dixon (2005:369–374) discusses the promotion of prepositional NPs of bivalent intransitive verbs via passivization

The extent of passives

• Similarly to antipassives, the question of extent of passives is infrequently addressed, i.e. its applicability to other than transitive verbs (often with further language-specific restrictions)
• Another exception: Keenan & Dryer’s (2007) overview of several studies that “make remarks” on languages with passives of intransitives
• They tentatively have the following properties:
  - such passives exist
  - they have a reasonable distribution across language areas and genetic families
  - they use the same verbal morphology as basic passives
  - they typically take their agent phrases marked in the same way as in basic passives, if they accept agent phrases at all

A pilot study of passives of intransitive (Neshcheret & Witzlack-Makaevich 2016)

• Pilot study
  - Convenience sample: languages reported to have passive
  - 80 languages with confirmed passive construction
    (out of 200 languages considered)
  - only monovalent verbs (intransitive bivalent and avalent verbs ignore, noted that there are passivizable weather verbs in quite a few languages)
  - also considered whether a languages provides support for Permutter’s (1978) hypothesis that only unergative intransitive verbs can be passivized (see also Blevins 2003)


A pilot study of passives of intransitive verbs (Neshcheret & Witzlack-Makarevich 2016)

- Intransitive passive found in 19 families throughout the world
- “yes” to Keenan & Dryer's (2007) tentative “reasonable distribution across language areas and genetic families”

Conclusions

• Lexical restrictions on grammatical relations are pervasive, though our evidence is so far based mainly on flagging and indexing
• Diathetical operations are no exception
• Much more frequently reported for antipassives
• Range from a few exceptions of “eligible” predicates to systematic exclusion of whole classes
to languages where having an antipassive is an exception
• On a continuum between inflection and derivation
• Corpus-based studies provide more realistic accounts of the productivity of diathetical operations and can lead to revision of earlier analyses (Sapién et al. 2021 on six Cariban languages)
Conclusions

• Though more and more studies discuss lexical restrictions, few studies consider the extent of the application of a diathetical operation beyond lexical classes it is expected to apply to as in the pilot study on passives of intransitives: “a neglect of the properties characteristic of non-monovalent intransitive verbs” (Arkadiev & Letuchiy 2021: 483), i.e. predicate classes with non-canonically marked arguments

• Other diathetical operations are similarly if not more restricted as passives and antipassives e.g. Arkadiev & Letuchiy’s (2021) discussion of some studies of applicatives
Thank you!