CHAPTER 15

Indirect antipassive in Circassian

Peter Arkadiev[1,2] and Alexander Letuchiy[3,4]
[1]Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences / [2]Russian State University for the Humanities / [3]Higher School of Economics / [4]Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences

The article focuses on antipassive formation in Adyghe and Kabardian (Circassian < West Caucasian), polysynthetic languages with ergative alignment of basic morphosyntax. The Circassian antipassive is typologically unusual in several respects. First, it is derived not only from transitive, but also from intransitive verbs: in these cases, it eliminates the indirect object. Thus, antipassive in Circassian targets an object argument, but not necessarily the direct object, contradicting the general ergative patterning. Second, the Circassian antipassive is expressed by the change of the root-final vowel, which complicates the determination of the direction of the valency change. Third, although the Circassian antipassive mainly fulfils the semantic functions typologically associated with antipassives, sometimes the syntactic type of the argument (i.e. nominal vs. clause) is relevant for the choice of the valency frame as well.

Keywords: Circassian languages, polysynthesis, intransitive verbs, lability, applicatives

1. Introduction

While the range of syntactic functions of valency-changing operations has been given attention in many linguistic works, the issue of the possible relations between valency change and transitivity seems to be underrepresented in the current linguistic theory and typology. In many typological studies of valency-changing operations (cf. e.g. such overview works as Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000; Kittilä 2010; Kulikov 2010; Janic & Nau (eds) 2016) it is assumed without much discussion that (at least prototypically) valency change correlates with change in morphosyntactic transitivity, cf. e.g. Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000: 6): "Passive and antipassive prototypically apply to transitive verbs and derive intransitives …. Causative and applicative prototypically apply to intransitive verbs and derive transitives". This leads to a neglect of the properties characteristic of non-monovalent intransitive verbs

https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.15ark

(the so-called "extended intransitives", Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000: 3), which are attested in many languages of the world and are not exempt from valency-changing operations, both as their input and as their output.

For instance, the typology of applicatives is addressed using a large sample of languages in Peterson (2007). However, the syntactic status of the new argument introduced by the applicative derivation is only mentioned in passing. It seems that the question of "direct object applicatives" as opposed to "indirect object applicatives" (those which introduce a new indirect object, not a direct one, as, for instance, the category of "version" in Caucasian languages, such as Kartvelian and Northwest West Caucasian) has never been subject of systematic typological research, moreover, the latter type of applicatives is often not recognized at all (as e.g. in Polinsky 2005a).

Polinsky (2005a) and Peterson (2007) claim that applicativization is more characteristic of transitive than of intransitive verbs and give examples of languages (e.g. Tzotzil) where applicativization of intransitive verbs is not possible. Besides that, Peterson (2007: 64–66) lists some languages (e.g. Hualapai) where a polysemous causative-applicative marker expresses applicative when applied to transitive verbs and causative when applied to intransitive verbs. However, in many languages (e.g. Hakha Lai), applicative markers are compatible with both types of basic verbs.

On the other hand, applicatives can either change transitivity of the base verb or leave it intact. Peterson (2007) analyzes thoroughly the status of the new argument in some particular applicative constructions and concludes that the applicative argument can either have or lack direct object properties. However, he misses examples where the new argument is definitely an indirect object, as is the case in the already mentioned Kartvelian and West Caucasian languages. In the following examples from Laz, the applicative prefix *u-* introduces an indirect object marked by the dative case, distinctly from the direct object in the nominative. This applicative is compatible with transitive (1a) as well as intransitive (1b) verbs.

(1) Laz (Kartvelian, Lacroix 2009: 484, 486)[1]

a. *hemu-k Xasani-s oxoi* ***u****-ḳod-um-s*
DEM-ERG Hasan-DAT house(NOM) APPL.3.IO-build-TH-PRS.3SG.SBJ
'He is building a house for Hasan.'

b. *žuma-čkimi bee-pe-s* ***u****-ṭḳob-u-n*
brother-1SG.PR(NOM) child-PL-DAT APPL.3.IO-hide-TH-PRS.3SG.SBJ
'My brother is hiding from the children.'

From some studies (Shibatani (ed.) 1976, 2001), we can judge that transitivity is not strictly correlated with valency change. The causative always increases the

1. Transcription and glossing adapted.

number of verbal arguments (in particular, it adds a causer to the subject position). Causativization of intransitive verbs usually makes them transitive, but it is not always the case. For instance, in Hungarian, with causatives derived from intransitive verbs the base subject (causee) can be marked either by the accusative or by the instrumental case, the difference being in the type of causation:

(2) Hungarian (Uralic > Ugric; Comrie 1989: 174)
a. *Én* *köhög-tet-t-em* *a* ***gyerek-et***.
1SG.NOM cough-CAUS-PST-1SG.DEF.OBJ DEF boy-ACC
'I made the boy cough (by slapping him on the back).'
b. *Én* *köhög-tet-t-em* *a* ***gyerek-kel***.
1SG.NOM cough-CAUS-PST-1SG.DEF.OBJ DEF boy-INS
'I had the boy cough (by asking him to do so).'

Likewise, although prototypically passives apply to transitive verbs and render the construction intransitive, there exists a large literature on passives based on intransitive verbs (see e.g. Shibatani 1998) as well as on instances of passivization that do not result in unambiguously intransitive constructions, e.g. the "impersonal passive" in Ute described by Givón (1988).

Thus, we find no universally valid restrictions on the transitivity of the base and derived verbs in valency changing operations. The real restrictions on the use of valency change markers seem to be related to the number and properties of arguments, rather than to transitivity.

One of the few exceptions to this conclusion seems to be the antipassive, which we understand as an operation demoting the non-agentive argument of a bi- or polyvalent verb. In the literature on antipassives in the world's languages (including such cross-linguistic studies as Polinsky 2005b, 2017; Say 2008; and Heaton 2017), we find no examples of antipassivization without a transitivity change, and antipassives seem to be always restricted to transitive base verbs affecting their P-argument (direct object).[2] However, in our paper, we will show that the antipassive derivation found in Adyghe (West Circassian) and Kabardian (the two Circassian languages belonging to the Northwest Caucasian family; see Hewitt 1981 for an overview of the antipassive constructions in the languages of the North Caucasus) is applied to transitive and bivalent intransitive verbs alike, thus being sensitive to numerical valency and semantic properties of verbs and their arguments rather than to morphosyntactic transitivity. Another exception to the general pattern is found in Atlantic languages, mentioned below in Section 6 (see a typological account in Janic 2013: 96).

2. Sometimes this is certainly due to the fact that transitivity of the base verb is built into the definition of "antipassive" as a comparative concept used by a particular scholar, cf. Polinsky (2005b: 438) or Heaton (2017: 63).

This paper is based on the fieldwork data collected by both authors for three Circassian varieties spoken in the Republic of Adygheya (Russian Federation) in 2004–2016, i.e. Temirgoy dialect of Adyghe, which is very close to standard Adyghe, and Besleney and Kuban dialects of Kabardian, which are both quite distinct from standard Kabardian. The three varieties discussed, however, do not show any significant differences in the features under investigation, i.e. verbal valency and antipassive constructions. Both elicited and textual examples are used; some of the latter come from published texts in Standard Adyghe.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the major relevant morphological and syntactic features of Circassian languages. In Sections 3–5 we discuss various features of the Circassian antipassive, i.e. its morphology, types of verbs allowing it, its syntactic and semantic properties, and pragmatic conditions that favor the use of antipassive constructions. Section 6 offers a typologically oriented discussion and conclusions.

2. Typologically relevant features of Circassian languages

In this section, we briefly present the features of Circassian languages relevant for the discussion of antipassives, namely, polysynthesis, ergativity, valency classes and general properties of the system of valency changing operations.

The most notable and pervasive property of the grammar of Circassian, and, more broadly, Northwest Caucasian languages, is polysynthesis, which we understand broadly as the tendency to express most syntactic and semantic information by means of productively formed morphologically complex words, primarily verbs (see Lander & Testelets 2017; Arkadiev & Lander 2021). Examples (3) from Temirgoy Adyghe and (4) from Besleney Kabardian show that the verb form includes the expression of as much as four participants by means of pronominal prefixes, as well as affixes marking valency-change, spatial meanings, negation, modality, tense-aspect and subordination (see Smeets 1992; Korotkova & Lander 2010; Lander & Letuchiy 2010; Arkadiev & Letuchiy 2011).

(3) Temirgoy Adyghe (textual example)
zə-qə-Ø-r-a-r-jə-ʁe-xə-ʁ-ep
REFL.ABS-DIR-3SG.IO-LOC-3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-CAUS-carry-PST-NEG
'He did not ask them to carry him (lit. himself) from there.'

(4) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
sə-q̇ə-zer-a-xʷə-č̣'erə-mə-ṭetə-č̣'ə-ž'-a-r
1SG.ABS-DIR-REL.FCT-3PL.IO-BEN-LOC-NEG-tie-ELAT-RE-PST-ABS
'that they could not untie me'

Figure 1 presents the schematic template of the Circassian verbal complex, glossing over some minor points of cross-dialectal variation.

prefixes										root	suffixes			
argument structure zone						pre-stem elements			stem				endings	
−10	−9	−8	−7	−6	−5	−4	−3	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
absolutive	directional	subordinators	applicatives	dative	ergative	jussive	dynamicity	negation	causative	root	directionals, transitivity	propositional operators	absolutive plural	subordinators, force

Figure 1. The Circassian verbal complex

Not surprisingly, given that all participants of the event, including locationals, are indicated in the predicate by means of overt pronominal prefixes (only third person absolutive and third person singular indirect object prefixes are zero), the corresponding noun phrases are optional and can be omitted if sufficiently activated in the previous discourse. In clauses with overt noun phrases, word order is generally flexible with a preference for SOV.

Circassian languages exhibit ergativity in both head- and dependent marking (see Smeets 1992; Kumakhov & Vamling 2009; Letuchiy 2012). In head marking, ergativity is manifested in the difference between the absolutive (slot −10) and ergative (slot −5) series of verbal pronominal prefixes; notably, the ergative series contains the only overt marker of 3rd person singular, viz. *(j)ə-*. In dependent marking, Circassian languages possess a "poor" case system comprising just two grammatical case markers, i.e. the absolutive (*-r*), marking the intransitive S (5a) and the transitive P (5b), and the oblique (several allomorphs, the most common of which is *-m*, attested across all dialects), which, besides marking the transitive A (5b), also flags various indirect objects, e.g. the recipient in (5b), as well as nominal possessors (5c) and even certain adjuncts not cross-referenced in the predicate. It has to be noted that personal pronouns, possessed nominals and proper names, as well as non-referential common nouns normally do not admit case marking (see Arkadiev & Testelets 2019).

(5) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *ç'ale-r Ø[3]-me-čəje.*
boy-ABS 3SG.ABS-DYN-sleep
'The boy is sleeping.'
b. *ç'ale-m pŝaŝe-m txələ-r Ø-Ø-r-j-e-tə.*
boy-OBL girl-OBL book-ABS 3SG.ABS-3SG.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
'The boy is giving the book to the girl.'
c. *ẹəfə-m Ø-jə-wəne*
man-OBL 3SG.PR-POSS-house
'the man's house'

Circassian languages possess a rich system of valency increasing operations, including causative and a large set of applicatives comprising benefactive, malefactive, comitative and many locatives (Paris 1995; Letuchiy 2009a,b), some of which are shown in examples (3) and (4). In the context of this study, the most important applicative is the one we call "dative"; it does not have a specialized meaning and is used to formally introduce indirect objects selected by the verbal stem, as e.g. the recipient argument of the verb 'give' in (5b) above. The dative applicative has several contextually distributed allomorphs: *je-/jə-*, *e-* and *r-*. See Letuchiy (2009a,b, 2012) for detailed descriptions of the system.

In our paper, valency is understood as the number of arguments a verb requires and expresses by means of pronominal and/or applicative prefixes. All participants which are not cross-referenced in the verb form are regarded as adjuncts, which are not related to valency. Thus, in (6a) the locative phrase in the oblique case is marked in the verb by means of a locative prefix and hence is an argument; by contrast, in (6b) the same locative phrase does not have any corresponding affix in the verb and hence is treated as an adjunct.

(6) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
a. *wəne-m s-Ø-**jə**-h-a*
house-OBL 1SG.ABS-3SG.IO-LOC-go.in-PST
'I entered the house.'
b. *wəne-m sə-ḳ^{w}-a*
house-OBL 1SG.ABS-go-PST
'I went towards the house.'

Transitivity is a formal morphosyntactic feature of verbs in Circassian languages reflected in the kind of cross-referencing prefixes they take and is as such independent

3. In the subsequent sections we will not mark and gloss zero morphemes.

of valency: while monovalent verbs are all intransitive, polyvalent verbs can be both transitive and intransitive, and, as we will show, both can form antipassives. It is also necessary to keep in mind that, apart from a few lexicalized exceptions, all Circassian verbs have an obligatory absolutive argument cross-referenced in the leftmost slot (−10). With monovalent verbs the absolutive is the only argument, i.e. the S, see (5a) and (6b) above.

Bivalent verbs fall into two large classes: transitive and (extended) intransitive. Transitive verbs have an A(gent) and a P(atient) arguments. The A is case-marked by the oblique case and is cross-referenced with a special class of prefixes occupying the slot (−5) close to the verbal stem; no other pronominal prefixes can occur to the right of the A. The P is encoded as the absolutive and is cross-referenced in the leftmost position of the verb form (if the absolutive is the third person, no overt prefix occurs), see (5b) above and (7).

(7) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
a. ***wə-s***-*λeʁʷ-a*
2SG.ABS-1SG.ERG-see-PST
'I saw you.'
b. ***w-jə***-*λeʁʷ-a*
2SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-see-PST
'S/he saw you.'
c. *pŝaŝe-**m*** *ç'ale-**r*** *Ø-**jə***-*λeʁʷ-a*
girl-OBL boy-ABS 3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-see-PST
'The girl saw the boy.'

The class of transitive verbs in Circassian includes predicates corresponding to the cross-linguistic prototype of transitivity, i.e. verbs denoting telic events leading to a significant change of state in the patient and performed by a controlling animate agent (see Hopper & Thompson 1980; Tsunoda 1981; Næss 2007), such as 'kill', 'write', 'tear', 'build', as well as certain verbs from other semantic domains, notably 'eat', 'see' and 'know'.

Extended intransitive verbs have an absolutive S which is cross-referenced in the leftmost position of the verb with the set of prefixes identical to the set cross-referencing the P of transitive verbs, and an oblique indirect object (IO). The IO is introduced either by one of the numerous specific applicative prefixes or by the semantically underspecified "dative" applicative prefix *(j)e-*. All applicative prefixes together with the pronominal prefixes immediately preceding them occur in slots intermediate between those of the absolutive and the ergative arguments, see examples in (8).

(8) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. ***sə-qə-w-e-ža-ʁ***
1SG.ABS-DIR-2SG.IO-DAT-wait-PST
'I waited for you.'
b. *ç'ale-**r*** *pŝaŝe-**m*** Ø-Ø-***je***-ža-ʁ
boy-ABS girl-OBL 3SG.ABS-3SG.IO-DAT-wait-PST
'The boy waited for the girl.'

Circassian languages possess a large and heterogeneous class of two-argument intransitive verbs. These can denote both physical activity ('hit', 'bite', 'drink', 'kiss', etc.) and mental activity, speech, or perception ('read/learn', 'look at', 'scold', 'talk to', 'smell', 'think about', etc.). Many of these predicates are translated by transitive verbs into European languages. With most indirect intransitive verbs, the absolutive S argument is more agentive than the oblique IO.

There is also a class of trivalent transitive (ditransitive) verbs which have an A and an IO marked with the oblique case and an absolutive P, as in (5b) above. All ditransitive and bivalent intransitive verbs contain applicative prefixes, usually the dative applicative mentioned above, and thus technically are "derived", although in the next section we will show that things are not so simple as they look on the surface.

3. The morphology of the Circassian antipassive

We distinguish between two formal types of the antipassive in Circassian languages, which we call "marked" and "unmarked". The lexical groups which are compatible with antipassivization will be described in Section 4; here, we will only say that both marked and unmarked antipassives have restricted productivity mostly applying to verbs denoting specific activities with a strong manner component, e.g. verbs of professional activity ('weed', 'plough', and so on).

3.1 Marked antipassive

The marked antipassive is formed from verbs whose stem ends in /ə/ (in some positions this vowel is elided) by substituting it with /e/ (in some positions /e/ changes to /a/), see e.g. Dzuganova (2005) and Gishev (2008: 231–234) for overviews of this phenomenon. The antipassive verbs are predominantly monovalent. When the base verb is transitive, its P argument is eliminated and its A becomes the S of the antipassive verb, as shown in Figure 2 and in examples (9) and (10), where the a-examples show the transitive, and the b-examples the antipassive variants of the

encoding mechanism	transitive		→	antipassive	
	I	II		I	(II)
	A	P		S	(IO)
cross-reference	ergative	absolutive		absolutive	(IO)
case-marking	oblique	absolutive		absolutive	(oblique)

Figure 2. The canonical antipassive

same verb. We call the marked antipassive based on transitive verbs "canonical", with no particular theoretical implications.

(9) Standard Adyghe (textual examples)
a. *njewəš' š'jeʁež'aʁew cʷəmpe-r qə-č̣'-a-č'ə-ze*
tomorrow beginning.with strawberry-ABS DIR-LOC-3PL.ERG-pick-CVB
*a-**šxə**-š't…*
3PL.ERG-eat-FUT
'From tomorrow on they'll eat strawberries right after having picked them…'
b. *žə-dede-m ŝʷə-z-ʁe-**šxe**-š't.*
NOW-INTF-OBL 2PL.ABS-1SG.ERG-CAUS-eat.ANTIP-FUT
'And now I'll give you something to eat.', lit. 'I will make you eat.'

(10) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *se ǯ'ane-r z-**də**-ne*
1SG dress-ABS 1SG.ERG-sew-FUT
'I will sew a dress.'
b. *zə-z-ʁe-psexʷ-me jə-ṭane sə-**de**-ne*
REFL.ABS-1SG.ERG-CAUS-relax-COND POSS-then 1SG.ABS-sew.ANTIP-FUT
'I will take a rest and then will do my sewing.'

However, there is also a small group of bivalent antipassive verbs like Adyghe/Kabardian *je**ǯ'e*** 'read' and Adyghe *je**ŝʷe***, Kabardian *je**fe*** 'drink', which retain the original patient argument of the transitive base verb and encode it as an indirect object, as in (11).

(11) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *s-jə-q̇ʷeš'ə-m s-jə-txələ-r jə-**ǯ'ə**-ne.*
1SG.PR-POSS-brother-OBL 1SG.PR-POSS-book-ABS 3SG.ERG-read-FUT
'My brother will read my book through.'
b. *s-jə-q̇ʷeš'ə-r s-jə-txələ-m j-ew-**ǯ'e**.*
1SG.PR-POSS-brother-ABS 1SG.PR-POSS-book-OBL DAT-DYN-read.ANTIP
'My brother is reading my book.'

The semantic differences between transitive and antipassive verbs of the type shown in (11) will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.

The antipassive derivation just outlined can be applied not only to transitive, but to bivalent intransitive verbs as well. In this case, the base indirect object marked with the oblique case is eliminated together with the dative applicative, while the base absolutive subject remains intact, cf. Figure 3 and examples in (12)–(14). We call this type of the antipassive "indirect".

encoding mechanism	bivalent intransitive		→	antipassive	
	I	II		I	(II)
	S	IO		S	–
cross-reference	absolutive	IO		absolutive	–
case-marking	absolutive	oblique		absolutive	–

Figure 3. The indirect antipassive

(12) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *pŝaŝe-r ç'ale-m **je-bewə-ʁ**.*
girl-ABS boy-OBL DAT-kiss-PST
'The girl kissed the boy.'
b. ***bewe**-nə-r jə-ç'as.*
kiss.ANTIP-MSD-ABS POSS-love
'S/he loves kissing.' (lit. 'To kiss is his/her love.')

(13) Besleney Kabardian (textual example)
*ʁʷeg**ʷ**ə-m **je-pλ**-te-q̇əm a-r jə-ŝha məd̦ç'e **pλe**-w*
road-OBL DAT-look-IPF-NEG DEM-ABS POSS-head there look.ANTIP-ADV
*məd̦ç'e **pλe**-w že-t g**ʷ**əš'əʔe-r-əw.*
there look.ANTIP-ADV run-IPF talk-CVB-ADV
'He didn't look at the road, he would drive talking and looking here and there.'

(14) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *se ŝale-m s-**je-ʔʷənŝə**-ne.*
1SG boy-OBL 1SG.ABS-DAT-push-FUT
'I will shove that guy.'
b. *sabəj-xe-r me-**ʔʷənŝe**.*
child-PL-ABS DYN-push.ANTIP
'The children are jostling.'

As can be seen, the "indirect" antipassive based on extended intransitive verbs behaves in exactly parallel way to the antipassive formed from transitive verbs: it employs the same formal marking (vowel alternation) and affects the argument structure in the same way, i.e. eliminates the less agentive participant. Formal

differences between the two versions of the Circassian antipassive result from the morphosyntactic differences between transitive and intransitive bivalent verbs in terms of case marking and cross-referencing.

3.2 Unmarked antipassive

Now we turn to the unmarked antipassive. While with the verbal stems ending in /ə/, the opposition of bivalent vs. antipassive patterns is marked by the change of the stem-final vowel to /e/, those verbs whose stems already end in /e/ do not make any formal difference between the bivalent and the antipassive diatheses. Examples (15)–(16) show the unmarked antipassive based on a transitive verb (the change of /e/ to /a/ in (15b) is purely morphophonological).

(15) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *ʁʷənеʁʷə-m xate-r j-e-**pčʼe**.*
neighbour-OBL garden-ABS 3SG.ERG-DYN-weed
'The neighbour is weeding the garden.'
b. *a-r mafe rjenə-m **pčʼa**-ʁe.*
DEM-ABS day whole-OBL weed(ANTIP)-PST
'He was busy weeding all day long.'

(16) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
a. *ɬə-xe-m ʁʷefə-r ja-**ve**-n xʷej.*
man-PL-OBL field-ABS 3PL.ERG-plough-POT must
'The men must plough the field.'
b. *ɬə-xe-r ma-**ve**-xe.*
man-PL-ABS DYN-plough(ANTIP)-PL.ABS
'The men are busy ploughing.'

The same situation is observed with bivalent intransitive verbs. In (17) and (18), the verbs 'think' and 'bite' can be used with or without an indirect object, and this difference is left unmarked.

(17) Standard Adyghe (newspaper "Adyge maq" ('Adyghe Voice')[4])
a. *čʼele-jeʒʼaqʷe-r… sportə-m nemәčʼ-xe-m-jə*
boy-pupil-ABS sports-OBL other-PL-OBL-ADD
*ja-**gʷəpšəse**-šʼt.*
3PL.IO+DAT-think-FUT
'The pupil … won't think about anything but sports.'

4. <http://www.adygvoice.ru>

b. *ç'ale-r mə-dej-ew adəya-bze-ç'e me-gʷəšʼəʔe*,
boy-ABS NEG-bad-ADV Adyghe-tongue-INS DYN-speak
*me-**gʷəpšəse***, *wered q-j-e-ʔʷe*.
DYN-think(ANTIP) song DIR-3SG.ERG-DYN-say
'The boy speaks, thinks and sings in Adyghe fairly well.'

(18) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
a. *ha-r ġə-šʼə-w-e-**ʒaġe**-ç'e vračə-m=dej ḳʷe*.
dog-ABS DIR-TEMP-2SG.IO-DAT-bite-INS doctor-OBL=to go(IMP)
'If a dog bites you, go to the doctor.'
b. *ha-r me-**ʒaġe***.
dog-ABS DYN-bite(ANTIP)
'The dog bites.'

This type of correspondence between a bivalent and a monovalent verb is called Agent-preserving lability or A-lability by Haspelmath (1993), Dixon (1994), Kazenin (1994a) and others: the agent is the same in both uses, and the more patientive argument, which can also be a stimulus or goal, is expressed only in the bivalent (transitive or intransitive) use. This type of lability is contrasted to the Patient-preserving lability (cf. English *The cup broke / I broke the cup*), where it is the P-argument that is retained in both uses, while the A is only expressed in the transitive use (P-lability is also amply attested in the Circassian languages, see Kumakhov 1971: 201, 206–207; Smeets 1992; Letuchiy 2009b, 2013).

In many languages, labile verbs constitute a special class, and lability is strongly motivated by the verbal meaning (see e.g. Letuchiy 2009c, 2013). However, distribution of A-labile verbs vs. antipassives is rarely considered in detail. For instance, Kazenin (1994a) argues that agent-preserving operations (both A-lability and antipassives) are compatible with situations where the agent is focused and the patient is non-specific (e.g. verbs of professional activity, such as 'plough', 'weed', 'cook', 'drive', etc.), but gives no hints as to how formally marked and unmarked correlations between the diatheses can be distributed across lexemes.

In Circassian languages, the distribution of A-labile verbs versus marked antipassives is purely formal for both transitive and extended intransitive verbs: in the bivalent use, all A-labile verbs have /e/ as the final vowel of the stem, which means that changing it into /e/ in the antipassive would result in a phonologically vacuous operation. This form-based analysis is supported by the fact that no A-labile verbs with a stem ending in /ə/ have been found.

Thus, the general rule says that all antipassives in Circassian have stems ending in /e/. Note that this rule cannot be generalized to cover all intransitive verbs. For instance, there are P-labile verbs, such as Adyghe *teqʷə* 'spill' or *wəŝʲʷejə* 'soil' that end in /ə/ in both uses, as well as monovalent *ə*-final verbs like Adyghe/Kabardian *bəbə* 'fly'. Thus the rule relating valency and stem-final vowels is only valid for verbs involved into antipassive alternations.

3.3 The issue of directionality and formal marking

As said above, the distribution of marked antipassives and A-labile verbs in Circassian languages is formal and linked to the final vowel of the stem. We consider this fact to be a strong argument for regarding the objectless pattern (both in the canonical and in the indirect antipassive) as derived, and the bivalent pattern as basic. If the objectless pattern were basic, we would expect the verbal stems ending with /e/ to substitute this /e/ by /ə/ in the bivalent version. In fact, the issue of directionality of derivation is particularly complicated for Circassian (see Kumakhov 1974, 1981: 229–256 on the historical-comparative interpretation of the "ablaut" in Circassian languages). In many languages, the antipassive verb is obviously derived from the transitive one, e.g. by means of a clearly segmentable affix added to the verbal stem. This is not the case in Circassian: since antipassive is marked with the vowel change, and only for a subset of verbs participating in this valency change, it is theoretically possible that transitive verbs like *də* 'sew smth.' are derived from intransitive ones like *de* 'sew' by an "extraversive" derivation (Lehmann & Verhoeven 2006), rather than vice versa.

Moreover, if untenable on formal grounds for canonical antipassives, an analysis in terms of transitivization seems well founded for motion verbs like *ḳʷe* 'go', which also show a distinction between an intransitive monovalent stem in /e/ and a transitive bivalent stem in /ə/. In the intransitive variant, such verbs appear in a pattern typical for motion verbs, taking only an absolutive S, as in example (6b) above and (19a). By contrast, in the transitive variant the verb of motion denotes the situation of covering a certain distance and takes the expression of such distance as its absolutive P argument, with the agent of motion expressed as the transitive A, as in (19b).

(19) Standard Adyghe (textual examples)

a. *χʷəλfəʁe-xe-r zanč'-ew qexaλe-m* ***ḳʷa****-ʁe-x.*
male-PL-ABS direct-ADV cemetery-OBL go-PST-PL.ABS
'The men went directly to the cemetery.'

b. *kilomjetre ṭʷeč'-jə-ṭʷ fed-jə-z-jə* *ə-****ḳʷə****-ʁ.*
kilometer twenty-LNK-two like-LNK-one-ADD 3SG.ERG-go.TR-PST
'He walked approximately forty kilometers.'[5]

For indirect antipassives, the bivalent and the monovalent variants correspond to each other in a complicated way. On the one hand, the bivalent variant contains an antipassive marker. On the other hand, as mentioned before, all IO arguments in Circassian must be introduced by an overt applicative prefix, in this case by the default dative applicative *(j)e-*, as in (20):

5. <http://book.cherkesincil.net/AD/StanleyTrudnosti%20adyg.pdf> (29 June 2017).

(20) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. ***je**-bewə*
DAT-kiss
'kiss someone'
b. *bewe*
kiss.ANTIP
'kiss'

In other words, both variants are formally marked in indirect antipassive pairs: the monovalent verb contains the antipassive vowel grade /e/, while its bivalent counterpart bears the applicative marker *je-*. To account for this situation, we propose to distinguish between **markers** of a particular argument structure change and **indicators** of argument structure.

While the antipassive vowel alternation marks the change from the bivalent to the monovalent diathesis, the default applicative prefix is automatically used to introduce an indirect object and to mark its presence in the argument structure – basically in the same way as the ergative set of pronominal prefixes is obligatorily employed to express the A with transitive verbs. The difference between the antipassive marker and the dative applicative is apparent from the fact that the indirect antipassive cannot be used if the base verb lacks the applicative, but not vice versa. The default applicative is used in many verbs which do not have an antipassive correlate and are only used with an indirect object (e.g. *je-že* 'wait'). Therefore, we consider the monovalent antipassive verbs derived with respect to their bivalent intransitive counterparts.

A special case is represented by Adyghe/Kabardian *šʼə-gʷəʁə* 'hope, trust (in smb./smth.)' vs. *gʷəʁe* 'hope (monovalent)'. The vowel alternation /ə/ ~ /e/ is correlated here with the presence resp. absence of the locative applicative marker *šʼə-*, which is sometimes used to mark the stimulus of emotional states, see (21).

(21) Standard Adyghe (textual examples)
a. *nə-r pa-pλe, nə-r me-**gʷəʁe**.*
mother-ABS LOC-watch.ANTIP mother-ABS DYN-hope.ANTIP
'Mother waits, mother hopes.'
b. *w-jate we qə-**p-šʼə-gʷəʁə**-šʼtə-ʁe*
2SG.PR-POSS-father 2SG DIR-2SG.IO-LOC-hope-IPF-PST
'Your father trusted in you.'

However, contrary to the default applicative *je-*, the locative *šʼə-* cannot be regarded as a default 'indicator' of the indirect object. Normally, this locative marker is added to verbal stems without inducing any change in the latter. For example, when *šʼəne* 'be afraid' attaches the same locative prefix introducing the cause of fear, no change of the stem occurs, see (22).

(22) Standard Adyghe (textual examples)
a. ***šʼəna***-ʁe-t-jə, *xase-m* *q-a-fe-ḳʷa-ʁ-ep*
fear-PST-CS-ADD meeting-OBL DIR-3PL.IO-BEN-go-PST-NEG
'He got afraid, that's why he didn't come to the meeting.'
b. *pšesenə-m ʔaj-ew* *sə-**šʼ**-e-**šʼəne***
nettle-OBL terrible-ADV 1SG.ABS-LOC-DYN-fear[6]
'I am terribly afraid of nettle.'

The case of 'hope' is formally and semantically similar to the indirect antipassive but for the use of the locative applicative *šʼə-* instead of the dative applicative *(j)e-* in the bivalent verb. However, the question remains whether this difference is purely formal or has consequences for the analysis of this verbal pair. Previously we argued that the default dative applicative prefix *(j)e-* can be regarded as a pure indicator of the presence of an IO argument, hence the fact that the verb contains the dative applicative does not prevent us from considering the *e*-variant as derived and the *ə*-variant as basic. For 'hope' this kind of analysis is less plausible, since there is not much evidence across the verbal lexicon of Circassian languages that the locative *šʼə-* can serve to express an indirect object required by the semantics of the root. On the other hand, neither do we know of any other case when the vowel alternation /e/~/ə/ would co-occur with the addition of an applicative. Hence, the exact status of the bivalent and monovalent versions of 'hope' in Circassian remains undecided and serves as a good illustration of analytical challenges presented by the kind of marking employed by the antipassive in these languages.

4. Antipassive and the verbal lexicon

The range of transitive verbs to which the antipassive applies in Circassian mostly includes verbs denoting specific activities with a strong manner component ("manner verbs" in terms of Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1998; see also Say this volume), e.g. 'eat', 'wash', 'sew', 'knit', 'dig', 'sow', 'cut', 'wipe', 'write', 'steal', etc., and is used when no particular P argument is implied and the speaker's focus is on the activity itself. Verbs of non-physical activity such as 'read' or 'condemn' are clearly a minority. The semantic classes of bivalent intransitive verbs admitting the antipassive derivation is more heterogeneous and include verbs denoting physical contact such as 'touch' and 'kiss', directed perception such as 'watch' and 'listen', addressee-directed verbal behavior such as 'scold' or 'ask' and mental activities such as 'think'. In Table 1 we list all the verbs for which antipassive correlates were found in Kuban Kabardian; for all

6. *šʼ-* is a morphophonemic variant of the locative prefix *šʼə-* derived by regular hiatus resolution.

Table 1. Antipassive-forming verbs in Kuban Kabardian

	Transitive	**Intransitive**
marked antipassive	*ṭə* 'dig'	*ṗestχə* 'scratch'
	pχə 'sow'	*ʔʷənṣ̂ə* 'push'
	xə 'mow'	*bewə* 'kiss'
	χə 'knit'	*benə* 'wrestle'
	də 'sew'	*ṗesḳʷə* 'pinch'
	š'eč'ə 'measure weight'	*ʔebə* 'touch'
	pŝə 'knead'	*gʷəš'əpsə* 'think'
	pχenṣ̂ə 'sweep'	*deʔʷə* 'hear'
	λeṣ̂ə 'wipe'	*pλə* 'look'
	gəṣ̂ə 'wash (clothes)'	*pemə* 'smell'
	theṣ̂ə 'wash (hands, dishes)'	*λeʔʷə* 'ask (of a favour)'
	txə 'write'	*wəpṣ̂ə* 'ask (a question)'
	bzə 'cut'	*gəjə* 'scold'
	jəfə 'drink'	*χʷenə* 'curse'
	šxə 'eat'	
	bzejə 'lick'	
	tə 'give'	
	dəʁʷə 'steal'	
	ǯ'ə 'read'	
	wəbə 'condemn'	
unmarked antipassive	*ve* 'plough'	*ʒaq̇e* 'bite'
	ʔʷe 'reap'	*psaλe* 'speak'
	ŝe 'sell'	
	ǯ'e 'call'	

what we know, the other two dialects surveyed here present largely the same set of verbs with antipassives, sometimes with minor variation (e.g. in Temirgoy Adyghe, as example (17) above suggests, the verb 'think' forms an unmarked antipassive).

Even inside the manner verb class, one can observe a formal restriction on antipassive formation: morphologically causative verbs cannot be antipassivized to become intransitive (cf. a discussion of this issue in Letuchiy 2009b and Arkadiev & Letuchiy 2011). Thus, the Adyghe verb *ʁe-ŝe* 'bake, roast', a morphological causative of the intransitive *ŝe* 'undergo baking', is a manner verb semantically very close to 'plough', 'sew', etc. However, it is impossible to use this verb in an intransitive argument frame, see (23).[7] It seems that the restriction is purely formal and is related to the fact that causatives in Circassian languages are necessarily morphosyntactically transitive.

7. Note that only the antipassivization of a morphological causative is impossible. The inverse ordering of derivations (causativization of the antipassive) is possible and represented in (9b), where the antipassive version of the verb 'eat' is causativized.

(23) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *haləʁʷəʁaʑe-m njepe rjen-ew haləʁʷə **j-e-ʁa-ʑe**.*
baker-OBL day whole-ADV bread 3SG.ERG-DYN-CAUS-be.baked
'The baker bakes bread the whole day.'
b. **haləʁʷəʁaʑe-r njepe rjen-ew **me-ʁa-ʑe**.*
baker-ABS day whole-ADV DYN-CAUS-be.baked(AP)
Intended: 'The baker bakes the whole day.'

The problem with this explanation is that other detransitivizing operations are compatible with causatives in Circassian. For instance, causatives can take the benefactive prefix Adyghe *fe-* / Kabardian *xʷe-* in the meaning of dynamic possibility, which eliminates the A prefix from its ergative position thus rendering the verb apparently intransitive (see Letuchiy 2015 for discussion), cf. (24).

(24) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *pŝaŝe-m čəgə-r ə-ʁe-stə-š'ɨt-ep*
girl-OBL tree-ABS 3SG.ERG-CAUS-burn-FUT-NEG
'The girl won't burn the tree.'
b. *čəgə-r pŝaŝe-m **fe**-ʁe-stə-š'ɨt-ep.*
tree-ABS girl-OBL BEN-CAUS-burn-FUT-NEG
'The girl won't be able to burn the tree.

There is, however, a crucial difference between the antipassive and the intransitivizing benefactive-potential shown in (24b): the latter does not affect the absolutive argument of the verb, while the former, when applied to transitive verbs, does precisely this, i.e. removes the original absolutive and assigns this morphosyntactic function to the original Agent. In fact, the antipassive is the only valency changing operation in Circassian languages that affects the absolutive argument, and it is perhaps this exceptionality of the antipassive that requires it to only apply before all other valency changing derivations.

5. Syntax, semantics and pragmatics of antipassivization in Circassian

As we have seen, the antipassive in Circassian languages applies to both transitive and intransitive verbs and eliminates (or, rarely, demotes) the P argument of the former and the IO argument of the latter, reassigning the A argument of the former to the grammatical function of the absolutive S and leaving the S of the latter intact. This behavior is clearly at odds with the overall ergative morphosyntax of Circassian languages and gives *prima facie* evidence that not only antipassive derivations are attested in non-ergative languages (an observation going back at least to Heath 1976, but not really paid attention to until recently), but also that they can have nominative-accusative features even in predominantly ergative languages.

This behavior of the Circassian antipassive can perhaps be also accounted for in semantic terms (cf. Letuchiy 2012). What is eliminated in the antipassive is the least agentive argument of a polyvalent verb. This is supported by the fact that the vowel change in the ditransitive verb *tə* 'give' is associated with the elimination of the absolutive theme (P), rather than of the recipient (IO), see (25b) with the unmarked omission of the recipient vs. (25c) with the marked omission of the theme and concomitant change in transitivity.

(25) Besleney Kabardian
a. *jə-de-q̇əm mašine-r q̇ə-r-jə-**tə**-n-əw.*
3SG.ERG-agree-NEG car-ABS DIR-DAT-3SG.ERG-give-MSD-ADV
'[He] does not agree to give him the car.' (textual example)
b. *sedaq̇e p-**tə**-nə-r deʁʷe.*
alms 2SG.ERG-give-MSD-ABS good
'It is good to give alms.' (elicited)
c. *a ɬ̣ə-r ma-**te**=zepət.*
DEM man-ABS DYN-give.ANTIP=always
'That man is always charitable', lit. "always gives". (elicited)

An important question concerns the referential status of the omitted argument and the function of the Circassian antipassive in general. Cross-linguistically, several possibilities are available (cf. Heath 1976 and subsequent work, most notably Cooreman 1994 and, more recently, Vigus 2018): first, the antipassive may be used when the P-argument is unknown, indefinite or non-specific; second, the antipassive may be used when the P is specific, but the speaker does not want to mention it due to its irrelevance or other reasons; third, antipassivization may be triggered syntactically, i.e. by the need to assign the A argument to the function of the pivot (e.g. the language does not have A relativization and therefore the A must become S by antipassivization in order to be relativized).

In Circassian, the antipassive with an omitted object (P or IO) is almost exclusively used when the object is non-specific. For instance, in (26) the use of the antipassive is impossible because the object is specific, even though it has not been overtly mentioned.

(26) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *mədej ḟəje-dəde-t-jə s-jə-q̇ʷe-m **jə-ɬeṣ̂-a**.*
here dirty-INTF-IPF-ADD 1SG.PR-POSS-son-OBL 3SG.ERG-wipe-PST
'It was very dirty here, but my son wiped it.'
b. **mədej ḟəje-dəde-t-jə s-jə-q̇ʷe-r **ɬeṣ̂-a**.*
here dirty-INTF-IPF-ADD 1SG.PR-POSS-son-ABS wipe.ANTIP-PST
Intended: 'It was very dirty here, but my son wiped.'

By contrast, example (27) is a good context for the antipassive, because the focus is on the activities customarily not performed on a specific day, while the exact objects of these activities are unknown and irrelevant.

(27) Besleney Kabardian (textual example)
ja-nəse-xe-r *mejrem-max^{w}e-m*
3PL.PR+POSS-daughter.in.law-PL-ABS Friday-day-OBL
pχanč'e-xe-q̇əm, ***de-xe-q̇əm***
wipe.ANTIP-PL-NEG sew.ANTIP-PL-NEG
'Their daughters-in-law don't wipe and don't sew on Fridays.'

Likewise, with the verbs of asking, the bivalent pattern is used only when the addressee is expressed, as in (28a). If only the sentential complement is present as in (28b), it is not eligible for morphosyntactic argumenthood and hence the monovalent antipassive verb is used (see more on these verbs below).

(28) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *pŝaŝe-r* *ṣ̂ale-m* ***je-λeʔ^{w}ə-ne*** *məʔerəse*
girl-ABS boy-OBL DAT-ask-FUT apple
q̇ə-x^{w}-jə-hə-n-əw
DIR-BEN-3PL.ERG-bring-MSD-ADV
'The girl will ask the boy to bring her an apple.'
b. *pŝaŝe-r* ***me-λaʔ^{w}e*** *kencertə-m* *də-q̇e-k̟^{w}e-n-əw*
girl-ABS DYN-ask.ANTIP concert-OBL 1PL.ABS-DIR-go-MSD-ADV
'The girl is asking that we go to the concert.'

However, there are some exceptions to this, where the antipassive form does not require the second argument of the base verb to be irrelevant, unknown or non-specific, moreover, when this second argument is overtly expressed. This can happen when the object is not a canonical argument, i.e. not a noun phrase. Thus, in (29a), the second participant, i.e. the goal of 'look', is expressed with an adjunct locative phrase. Although this expression can be regarded as filling the semantic valency of the verb, it has no chance to be morphosyntactically encoded as the second argument,[8] because phrases marked with the adverbial suffix *-ew* never trigger verbal agreement, in contrast to NPs marked by the absolutive or oblique cases or unmarked personal pronouns, as in (29b) with a pronominal goal.

8. As an anonymous reviewer notes, there is another way of analyzing the structure in (29a), i.e. as involving a manner adverb. However, this point of view does not seem to be plausible, since the very possibility to have a directional adverbial is directly connected with the semantics of the situation 'look'.

(29) Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited)
a. *ç'ale-r č'əž'-ew* ***ma-pλe***.
boy-ABS far-ADV DYN-look.ANTIP
'The boy is looking far away.'
b. *ç'ale-r se* ***s-e-pλə***.
boy-ABS 1SG 1SG.IO-DAT-look
'The boy is looking at me.'

The antipassive may be used with perception or speech verbs when their second argument is a clause rather than an NP. Thus, in (30) the bivalent structure is used with the verb *deʔʷə* 'listen' because its second argument is the noun *wered* 'song', while in (31) the second argument is a complement clause and the monovalent structure with the antipassive *deʔʷe* is used (in both examples, the final vowel is elided before the vowel of the suffix, however, the argument structure is clearly visible from the cross-referencing prefixes).

(30) Besleney Kabardian (textual example)
zeč'e-r-jə weredə-m ***je-deʔʷ-əw*** *… š'ə-s-a-xe*.
all-ABS-ADD song-OBL DAT-listen-ADV LOC-sit-PST-PL.ABS
'All the people were sitting listening to songs.'

(31) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
nebgər-jə-ṭə-r z-e-χʷen-t-jə
person-LNK-two-ABS RECP.IO-DAT-quarrel-IPF-ADD
s-ḟe-ʁeŝeʁʷen-əw ***sə-deʔʷ-a***
1SG.IO-BEN-interesting-ADV 1SG.ABS-listen.ANTIP-PST
'I listened with interest how the two men were quarreling.' (lit. 'The two men were quarreling, and I listened with interest.')

While in (29a) 'far away' can be said to be indefinite, this is not the case in (31), where the subordinate clause encodes a definite specific situation.

Thus we see that while with activity-denoting verbs the main function of the antipassive is to background the object when it is non-specific or irrelevant, with verbs of speech and perception the use of the bivalent vs. the antipassive variant is sensitive to the syntactic status of the object participant.

In fact, there are several other cases in Circassian when the second argument of the base verb is retained in the antipassive construction. Notably, all such cases are lexically restricted. The first case concerns the genuine bivalent antipassives, i.e. antipassive verbs that encode the original P as their own indirect object argument. We have found only three such verbs: 'read', 'drink' and 'lick'; for all of them, the opposition between the transitive and the antipassive variants is related to telicity: the transitive version emphasizes the completion of the event, while the antipassive

focuses on the activity phase. The verb 'read' has been already exemplified above; the verb 'drink' is special in that its transitive variant contains an obligatory locative prefix *jə-*/*r-* 'inside a container', which does not seem to have a transparent synchronic function (although it could be argued that it refers to the vessel with liquid, such an interpretation is by no means possible for all examples) and is absent from the antipassive variant, as in (32).

(32) Standard Adyghe (textual examples)
a. *mwe ç'ale-m sena-bźe-r ə-št-jə … sane-r*
that boy-OBL wine-horn-ABS 3SG.ERG-take-ADD wine-ABS
r-jə-ŝʷə-ʁ
LOC-3SG.ERG-drink-PST
'That guy took the horn and … drank the wine.'
b. *sane-m* ***w-je-ŝʷe-ze***,
wine-OBL 2SG.ABS-DAT-drink.ANTIP-CVB.SIM
qə-zə-w-a-we-xe-ç'e…
DIR-REL.TEMP-2SG.IO-DAT-hit-PL.ABS-INS
'When they [the snakes] bit you while you were drinking wine…'

It is worth noting that the bivalent antipassives can be also used without an indirect object, if the latter is unknown to the speaker or irrelevant. However, even in such cases the dative applicative prefix cannot be omitted, as in (33).

(33) Temirgoy Adyghe (textual example)
*ç'ele-ʔʷəšə-ʁ, aw thaməç'e-t-jə, ***(je-)ǯ'e-ŝʷə-ʁ-ep**.*
boy-clever-PST but poor-CS-ADD *(DAT-)read-HBL-PST-NEG
'He was a clever boy, but poor and hence illiterate (lit. could not read).'

This can be regarded as the indication of the ban on the recursive application of the antipassive: the transitive verb *ǯə* 'read smth. (through)' corresponds to the antipassive *jeǯe* 'read smth.', and the antipassive of the latter cannot be formed.

With a number of antipassive verbs the second argument can be expressed as a locative object introduced by a locative applicative; this is possible only if the P itself is a location, as in (34).

(34) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *w-jə-wəne-r* ***pχenç'!***
2SG.PR-POSS-room-ABS sweep(IMP)
'Sweep your room!'
b. *w-jə-wəne-m* ***ŝə-pχanç'e!***
2SG.PR-POSS-room-OBL LOC-sweep.ANTIP(IMP)
'Sweep in your room!'

Obviously, the semantic relations between the object and the verb in (34a) and (34b) are not identical: while (34a) suggests that the whole room has to be cleaned and the event is construed as a telic accomplishment, in (34b) no such implication is necessary, and the sentence rather denotes an atelic activity. Other verbs whose antipassives can take locative arguments of this type are 'wash', 'plough', 'dig' and 'sow'.

The antipassives with locative indirect objects can be contrasted with the case of the intransitive verb 'ask (a question)', which in its bivalent use with the dative applicative takes as its object the person to whom the question is addressed, see (35a). Its antipassive can occur in a monovalent frame not implying any particular addressee (35b), but more frequently it occurs with a locative applicative Adyghe *ç̣'e-* / Kabardian *ŝe-* 'under', which in this case introduces the topic of the question, as in (35c).

(35) Temirgoy Adyghe (textual examples)

a. *jəλes-jə-x zə-nəbž' ŝewêžəje-m* ***je-wəpç̣ə-ʁ***
year-LNK-six REL.PR-age male.child-OBL DAT-ask-PST
'He asked a boy of the age of six.'

b. *ade səd s-ŝe-n faje-r?* ***qe-wəpç̣a-ʁ*** *sawəsərəqʷe*
PTC what 1SG.ERG-do-POT must-ABS DIR-ask.ANTIP-PST Sosruko
'Sosruko asked: What should I do?'

c. *jə-ç̆'eleješ'aḳʷe-xe-r pesere λeχanə-m adəge-xe-m*
POSS-pupil-PL-ABS ancient epoch-OBL Adyghe-PL-OBL
qʷešən-xe-r zer-a-ŝə-š'tə-ʁe-xe-m
vessel-PL-ABS REL.MNR-3PL.ERG-do-IPF-PST-PL.ABS-OBL
ç̣'e-wəpç̣a-ʁe-x
LOC-ask.ANTIP-PST-PL.ABS
'The pupils asked about the way Adygheans made pottery in ancient times.'

Another possibility to express the original P of the transitive verb in the antipassive is by means of an adjunct in the instrumental case (suffix *-ç̣'e*). This case marker is extremely polyfunctional (see e.g. Serdobolskaya 2011), and besides instrument and means also express certain spatial and more abstract meanings. In the antipassive construction, the instrumental may encode the original P of the base verb if its semantic relation to the verb can be construed as falling within one of the functions of the instrumental, e.g. means with such verbs as 'sow' and 'eat', as in (36), or direction or goal with verbs of perception, as in (37). Note that in (36) the transitive pattern is used with the definite object and the event is telic, while the antipassive is employed when the object is non-specific and the whole sentence is generic. This is not the case in (37), where both the object of the transitive use and the instrumental-marked noun in the antipassive construction are definite. Here, factors other than telicity and definiteness seem to be relevant for the distribution

of variants. Perhaps, the key factor is the class of object: in (37a), the indirect object position is filled by the stimulus of perception 'song', while in (37b), the peripheral argument 'radio' has a role close to an instrument. However, other parameters can also be relevant.

(36) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *lə-r* ***jə-š'x-a***
meat-ABS 3SG.ERG-eat-PST
'S/he ate the meat.'
b. *ɕəxʷ-xe-r* *lə-č'e* ***ma-š'xe***
man-PL-ABS meat-INS DYN-eat.ANTIP
'Humans eat meat.'

(37) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *fatime* *wered=daxe-m* ***je-deʔʷə-ne***
Fatima song=beautiful-OBL DAT-listen-FUT
'Fatima will listen to a beautiful song.'
b. *zerine* *haləve* *j-e-ɕ* *jəč'jə* *radio-m-č'e*
Zarine pancake 3SG.ERG-DYN-do and radio-OBL-INS
me-daʔʷe
DYN-listen.ANTIP
'Zarina is making pancakes and listening to the radio.'

Finally, at least one antipassive can attach the dative applicative, which, however, corresponds not to the P of the transitive base verb, but to a different participant. This is the case of the verb 'steal', which in its transitive version takes the stolen object as the absolutive P and usually denotes a specific act of stealing (38a), whereas its monovalent antipassive is rather used to describe a habit of stealing with no specific object (38b).[9]

(38) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
a. *ɕale-m* *aχše-r* ***jə-dəʁʷə-ne***
boy-OBL money-ABS 3SG.ERG-steal-FUT
'The guy will steal the money.'
b. *mew* *ɕale-r* *ʔej-we* ***me-dəʁʷe-rjə*** *xʷe-saq̇*
that boy-ABS bad-ADV DYN-steal.ANTIP-ADD BEN-careful(IMP)
'Take care, that guy often steals.'

9. Recall that the habitual reading (as well as other readings related to plurality of situations) is widely attested in antipassive constructions and their analogues, e.g. in Slavic and Oceanic languages. For instance, the Russian verb *kusat'sja* 'bite (antipassive)' can only be used in the imperfective aspect and usually has a habitual or iterative reading.

However, the antipassive variant of 'steal' can also be used with the dative applicative, which in this case introduces the source or maleficiary of the act of stealing; this bivalent antipassive can be used in episodic contexts like (39).

(39) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
jəλes jəčʼa-m de ***q̇ə-d-e-dəʁʷ-a-xe***
year past-PST 1PL DIR-1PL.IO-DAT-steal.ANTIP-PST-PL.ABS
'We were robbed last year.' (lit. they stole on us)

The maleficiary of an act of stealing can be expressed with the transitive verb as well, but only as an indirect object introduced by the dedicated malefactive applicative, as in (40).

(40) Kuban Kabardian (elicited)
ʂ̣ale-m aχše-r ***s-f̈-jə-dəʁʷə-ne***
boy-OBL money-ABS 1SG.IO-MAL-3SG.ERG-steal-FUT
'The guy will steal money from me.'

If we take arguments introduced by the dative applicative to be more core-like than those added by the dedicated applicatives, the verb 'steal' seems to behave similarly to 'drink' and 'read'. Both verbs have a transitive pattern with two core arguments (if we assume that in examples like (40), the maleficiary is not a core argument) and an intransitive pattern, also with two core arguments. While the semantic difference between the two patterns is greater in the case of 'steal' (there the objects of the transitive and the intransitive variants have different roles: Theme with the transitive variant and Maleficiary in the intransitive one) than in the case of 'drink' or 'read', syntactically, the situation is much the same.

6. Typological outlook and conclusions

The types of antipassive attested in the Circassian languages are listed in Table 2. As follows from the table, some theoretically possible types are not found: unmarked antipassives never express their objects (with marked antipassives, the initial object can sometimes be retained), likewise, with indirect antipassives, the object is never overtly expressed.

As we have shown in this paper, Circassian languages possess an unusual type of antipassive we call indirect antipassive. This operation is similar to the canonical antipassive in that it eliminates the object (= non-agent) argument of the verb. However, the difference is that the indirect antipassive eliminates an indirect object of a bivalent intransitive verb in the same way as the canonical antipassive removes or demotes the direct object (P) of a transitive verb. The indirect antipassive does

Table 2. Types of antipassive in Circassian

Morphology	Transitivity of the base verb	Object expression	Adyghe example
marked	transitive	unexpressed	*txe* 'write'
marked	transitive	expressed (bivalent antipassive)	*jeŝʷe* 'drink'
unmarked	transitive	unexpressed	*ŝe* 'sell'
unmarked	transitive	expressed (bivalent antipassive)	not found
marked	intransitive (indirect antipassive)	unexpressed	*bewe* 'kiss'
marked	intransitive (indirect antipassive)	expressed (bivalent antipassive)	not found
unmarked	intransitive (indirect antipassive)	unexpressed	*ceqe* 'bite'
unmarked	intransitive (indirect antipassive)	expressed	not found

not affect the transitivity of the verb, which remains intransitive, and its subject retains its absolutive marking.

The Circassian antipassive is especially interesting, provided that Adyghe and Kabardian are uncontroversially ergative in their morphology and to a certain extent in their syntax as well (see e.g. Lander 2012; Letuchiy 2012). In a language displaying ergative features in its morphosyntax, we would expect the antipassive to pattern ergatively, i.e. to affect only transitive verbs, target their P argument and advance the A argument to the S position. However, as it turns out, the Circassian antipassive is insensitive to transitivity and affects the P of transitive verbs and the IO of intransitive verbs alike, and thus can be considered as organized accusatively, rather than ergatively. Indeed, in the Circassian antipassive construction any object argument (but that introduced by a dedicated applicative) is eliminated, and any subject argument (be it S of intransitive verbs or A of transitive ones) is retained.

Antipassive is primarily taken to be characteristic of ergative languages, and even though it has been argued (Heath 1976; Polinsky 2005b; Say 2008; Janic 2013) that purely nominative-accusative languages may well have antipassive derivations, Heaton (2017: 116–117) has convincingly shown on the basis of a huge cross-linguistic sample that for ergative languages to have an antipassive is much more common than for languages without (morphological) ergativity. This link between antipassives and alignment usually gets a functional explanation. Since antipassivization affects the P argument of a transitive verb, which in morphologically and especially in syntactically ergative languages shows some degree of grammatical prominence, the antipassive is a means to manipulate the mapping between semantic participants and core syntactic functions. In ergative languages, when the absolutive argument is eliminated or demoted to an oblique, the base A of the transitive verb is assigned the status of S of an intransitive verb and absolutive encoding, thus becoming eligible for certain syntactic operations, e.g. relativization or infinitival control (see e.g. Kazenin 1994b for an overview).

The existence of indirect antipassives in Circassian shows that the traditional analysis of antipassive as an operation demoting the P argument of transitive verbs is inappropriate for these languages and that even in morphologically clearly ergative languages antipassive may behave in a nominative-accusative way. If antipassive can be used to eliminate the indirect objects of bivalent intransitive verbs, then its function can be neither the suppression of the privileged absolutive (since the indirect antipassive does not target the absolutive) nor the promotion of the original A to the privileged absolutive function (since, again, with intransitive verbs the S is absolutive to begin with and remains intact under antipassivization).

However, the "indirect antipassive" found in the Circassian languages is a cross-linguistically very infrequent phenomenon, in fact, a clear case of typological *rarum* in terms of Plank (no date) and Cysouw & Wohlgemuth (2010). To date, we are not aware of any other language where the antipassive derivation would affect both transitive and extended intransitive verbs in a similar fashion. Nevertheless, we suspect that this may be at least partly due to the *a priori* restriction to transitive verbs built into the definitions of antipassives, rather than only to extreme rarity of Circassian-like structures in the real empirical data. The only comparable phenomenon we know of is the antipassive in the Atlantic languages Wolof and Sereer, that preferably targets the recipient of ditransitive verbs like 'give' (see Nouguier-Voisin 2002: 308–315; Creissels & Nouguier-Voisin 2008: 297–298 on Wolof and Renaudier 2011 on Sereer); however, no data is available on the application of this derivation to bivalent intransitive verbs, and neither is it clear whether the recipient argument in the Atlantic languages is syntactically an indirect object (and not a primary object).

In general, in the domain of object-affecting operations an asymmetry seems to exist between valency increase and valency decrease in their relations to transitivity. Two features: "valency increase" vs. "valency decrease" and "change in transitivity" vs. "no change of transitivity" yield four possible values shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Valency change and transitivity

	+transitivity change	−transitivity change
valency increase	applicative adding a DO	applicative adding an IO
valency decrease	antipassive	??

According to the received view in typology, one of the four cells, i.e. valency decrease without a change in transitivity, remains empty. Indeed, while applicatives can add either a direct object (admittedly the cross-linguistically most common case, see Peterson 2007) or an indirect object (at least Kartvelian and North-West Caucasian languages), antipassives only eliminate a direct object, not an indirect

object. Most languages, when they need to remove an indirect object from the valency frame of the verb, do not employ any special marking (such option, as we have seen, exists in Circassian as well, but is a minor pattern). As we have shown, Circassian languages fill this empty cell with their indirect antipassive.

The aforementioned asymmetry between the demotion or elimination of a direct object and that of an indirect object can be explained semantically: languages usually do not employ any special marking for the elimination of indirect objects because these are low in prominence to begin with and are not always clearly distinguishable from optional adjuncts. By contrast, the addition of an IO is nevertheless often specially marked, because the exact semantic role of the new IO (recipient, benefactive, malefactive, instrument, etc.) is not always obvious, especially in languages, which, like Circassian, do not distinguish between these semantic roles by means of flagging, and because its addition can change the semantics of the whole predicate. What makes the Circassian case special and can probably serve as a hypothetical explanation of the cross-linguistically exceptional behavior of its antipassive is the existence of a large class of extended intransitive verbs encoding many basic two-participant situations, a number of which are expressed by morphosyntactically transitive verbs in other languages. The second argument of these verbs (e.g. the person who is kissed or asked or the stimulus of looking or listening) is an integral participant of the situation that can be assigned no less discourse prominence than the P of genuinely transitive verbs, and hence its removal from the argument structure requires special morphological marking.

The antipassive in Circassian languages can be regarded as a "lexical" or "derivational" rather than an "inflectional" or "syntactic" operation (we use scare quotes since the divide between inflection and derivation, or lexicon and morphosyntax, in Circassian languages, as in polysynthetic languages in general, is fairly problematic, see e.g. Lander 2016; Lander & Testelets 2017). Although antipassive applies to many verbs of the relevant semantically defined classes (e.g. transitive verbs denoting specialized types of activities with a strong manner component), it can hardly be called really productive. Moreover, there are restrictions on the formation of the antipassive, e.g. the ban on the antipassivization of morphologically causative verbs.

Generally speaking, the Circassian antipassive falls into the class of antipassives primarily sensitive to the discourse-pragmatic properties of the object, such as relevance or specificity. However, interestingly, the Circassian antipassive, especially when it applies to extended intransitive verbs of speech and perception, is also sensitive to the syntactic type of the object argument: the antipassive can be used when the object is expressed syntactically not as an NP but as an adverbial or a complement clause and, thus, cannot trigger verbal agreement and be formally encoded as an argument. Therefore, the antipassive in Circassian languages has

both functional semantic and formal motivation, the latter being related to the general way argument structure is encoded in the polysynthetic morphology of these languages. The same reasoning applies to the often non-trivial interactions between the antipassive and the applicative system in these languages. Thus, on the one hand, verbs with the "dative" applicative can serve as both a valid input to, and a possible output of, the antipassive, albeit in different cases. On the other hand, the dedicated applicatives, being in general unaffected by antipassivization (with a possible peculiar exception of 'hope'), can attach to the antipassive adding to it an extra argument, sometimes related to the demoted object of the original verb.

Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to all our Adyghe and Kabardian consultants as well as to the editors of the volume and an anonymous reviewer for their help and comments. This paper is based on our presentations from the conference "Syntax of the World's Languages V", Dubrovnik, October 2012, and the workshop "The crosslinguistic diversity of antipassives: function, meaning and structure" at the 49th Annual meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Naples, September 2016. We are grateful to the audiences of these events for their useful feedback. All errors and shortcomings remain ours.

The division of labor between the authors was as follows. The data from Temirgoy Adyghe has been collected by both authors jointly in 2004–2005. The data from Besleney and Kuban Kabardian was mainly collected by Peter Arkadiev in 2012–2016, with substantial additions made by Alexander Letuchiy. Both authors equally participated in the analysis and typological interpretation of the data and writing of the text. The order of authors is alphabetical.

Funding

Alexander Letuchiy acknowledges the financial support of the Russian Scientific Fund grant #18-78-10128.

Abbreviations

Interlinear glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules, additional abbreviations are as follows:

ADD	additive	LOC	locative preverb
CS	causal	MAL	malefactive
DAT	dative applicative	MNR	manner
DIR	directional preverb	MSD	masdar
DYN	dynamic	POT	potential
ELAT	elative	PR	possessor

FCT	factive	PTC	particle
HBL	habilitive	RE	refactive
INTF	intensifier	SIM	simultaneous
IO	indirect object	TEMP	temporal
IPF	imperfect	TH	thematic suffix
LNK	linking morpheme		

References

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Lander, Yury A. 2021. The North-West Caucasian languages. In *The Oxford Handbook of the Languages of the Caucasus*, Maria Polinsky (ed.), 369–446. Oxford: OUP.

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2011. Prefixes and suffixes in the Adyghe polysynthetic wordform: Types of interaction. In *Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus*, Vittorio S. Tomelleri, Manana Topadze & Anna Lukianowicz (eds), 495–514. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Testelets, Yakov G. 2019. Differential nominal marking in Circassian. *Studies in Language* 43(3): 715–751. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.18063.ark

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cooreman, Ann. 1994. A functional typology of antipassives. In *Voice: Form and Function* [Typological Studies in Language 27], Barbara Fox & Paul J. Hopper (eds), 49–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.27.05coo

Creissels, Denis & Nouguier-Voisin, Sylvie. 2008. Valency-changing operations in Wolof and the notion of "co-participation". In *Reciprocals and Reflexives, Theoretical and Typological Explanations*, Ekkehard König & Volker Gast (eds), 289–305. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cysouw, Michael & Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2010. The other end of universals: Theory and typology of *rara*. In *Rethinking Universals. How Rarities Affect Linguistic Theories*, Jan Wohlgemuth & Michael Cysouw (eds), 1–10. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220933.1

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: CUP. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611896

Dixon, R. M. W. & Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2000. Introduction. In *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds), 1–29. Cambridge: CUP. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627750.002

Dzuganova, Rita X. 2005. Ablautnye čeredovanija i ix funkcii v kabardino-čerkesskom jazyke (Ablaut alternations and their functions in Kabardian). PhD dissertation, Naľčik.

Gishev, Nux T. 2008. *Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju* (Selected Writings in Linguistics). Majkop: Kačestvo.

Givón, Talmy. 1988. The tale of two passives in Ute. In *Passive and Voice* [Typological Studies in Language 16], Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), 417–440. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.16.14giv

Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In *Causatives and Transitivity* [Studies in Language Companion Series 23], Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky (eds), 86–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.23.05has

Heath, Jeffrey. 1976. Antipassivization: A functional typology. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Henry Thompson, Kenneth Whistler, Vicki Edge, Jeri J. Jaeger, Ronya Javkin, Miriam Petruck, Christopher Smeall & Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (eds), 202–211. Berkeley CA: BLS.

Heaton, Raina. 2017. A Typology of Antipassives, with Special Reference to Mayan. PhD dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Hewitt, B. George. 1981. 'Anti-passive' and 'labile' constructions in North Caucasian. *General Linguistics* 22(3): 158–171.

Hopper, Paul J. & Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2): 251–299. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1980.0017

Janic, Katarzyna. 2013. L'antipassif dans les langues accusatifs. PhD dissertation, Lumière University Lyon 2.

Janic, Katarzyna & Nau, Nicole (eds). 2016 [2017]. *Valency-changing Operations within and across Languages. Special issue of Lingua Posnaniensis* 58(2).

Kazenin, Konstantin I. 1994a. On the lexical distribution of agent-preserving and object-preserving transitivity alternations. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17(1): 141–154. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586500002985

Kazenin, Konstantin I. 1994b. Split syntactic ergativity: Toward an implicational hierarchy. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 47(2): 78–98.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2010. Transitivity typology. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, Jae-Jung Song (ed.), 346–367. Oxford: OUP.

Korotkova, Natalia A. & Lander, Yury A. 2010. Deriving suffix ordering in polysynthesis: Evidence from Adyghe. *Morphology* 20: 299–319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-010-9185-y

Kulikov, Leonid I. 2010. Voice typology. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, Jae-Jung Song (ed.), 368–398. Oxford: OUP.

Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. 1971. *Slovoizmenenie adygskix jazykov* (Inflection in the Circassian languages). Moscow: Nauka.

Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. 1974. K probleme ablauta v abxazo-adygskix jazykax (On the problem of ablaut in West Caucasian). *Ežegodnik iberijsko-kavkazskogo jazykoznanija* (Annual of Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics) 1: 80–90.

Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. 1981. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika adygskix (čerkesskix) jazykov* (Historical-comparative Phonetics of the Circassian Languages). Moscow: Nauka.

Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. & Vamling, Karina. 2009. *Circassian Clause Structure*. Malmö: Malmö University.

Lacroix, René. 2009. Description du dialecte laze d'Arhavi (caucasique du sud, Turquie). Grammaire et textes. PhD dissertation, Lumière University Lyon 2.

Lander, Yury A. 2012. *Subject properties of the Adyghe absolutive: Evidence from relatives*. Ms.

Lander, Yury A. 2016. Word formation in Adyghe. In *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Vol. 5, Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (eds), 3508–3526. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lander, Yury A. & Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2010. Kinds of recursion in Adyghe morphology. In *Recursion and Human Language*, Harry van der Hulst (ed.), 263–284. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219258.263

Lander, Yury A. & Testelets, Yakov G. 2017. Adyghe. In *The Oxford Handbook of Polysynthesis*, Michael Fortescue, Marianne Mithun & Nicholas Evans (eds), 948–970. Oxford: OUP.

Lehmann, Christian & Verhoeven, Elisabeth. 2006. Extraversive transitivization in Yucatec Maya and the nature of the applicative. In *Case, Valency and Transitivity: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, [Studies in Language Companion Series 77], Leonid I. Kulikov, Andrey L. Malchukov & Peter de Swart (eds), 465–493. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.77.28leh

Letuchiy (Letučij), Aleksander B. 2009a. Affiksy benefaktiva i malefaktiva: Sintaksičeskie osobennosti i krug upotreblenij (Benefactive and malefactive markers: Syntactic peculiarities and range of uses). In *Aspekty polisintetizma: Očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* (Aspects of Polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe Grammar), Yakov Testelets (ed.), 329–371. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Letuchiy (Letučij), Aleksander B. 2009b. Kauzativ, dekauzativ i labil'nost' (Causative, anticausative, and lability). In *Aspekty polisintetizma: Očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* (Aspects of Polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe Grammar), Yakov Testelets (ed.), 372–428. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2009c. Towards a typology of labile verbs: Lability vs. derivation. In *New Challenges in Typology: Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions*, Alexandre Arkhipov & Patience Epps (eds), 147–168. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2012. Ergativity in the Adyghe system of valency-changing derivations. In *Ergativity, Valency and Voice*, Gilles Authier & Katharina Haude (eds), 323–354. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110227734.323

Letuchiy (|Letučij), Aleksander B. 2013. *Tipologija labil'nyx glagolov* (Typology of Labile Verbs). Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2015. Scope versus ordering of operations: Causativization and ordering of valency-changing operations in Adyghe. In *Affix Ordering across Languages and Frameworks*, Stela Manova (ed.), 53–81. Oxford: OUP. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190210434.003.0003

Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 1998. Building verb meanings. In *The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors*, Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (eds), 97–134. Stanford CA: CSLI.

Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical Transitivity* [Typological Studies in Language 72]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.72

Nouguier-Voisin, Sylvie. 2002. Relations entre fonctions syntaxiques et fonctions sémantiques en wolof. PhD dissertation, Lumière University Lyon 2.

Paris, Catherine. 1995. Localisation en tcherkesse: Forme et substance du référent. In *Les Préverbes dans les langues d'Europe. Introduction à l'étude de la préverbation*, André Rousseau (ed.), 345–379. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion.

Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative Constructions*. Oxford: OUP.

Plank, Frans. n.d. Introductory notes. *Das grammatische Raritätenkabinett*, University of Konstanz. <http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/rara/intro/index.php?pt=1> (28 May 2017).

Polinsky, Maria. 2005a. Applicative constructions. In *World Atlas of Language Structures*, Matthew Dryer, Martin Haspelmath, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds), 442–445. Oxford: OUP.

Polinsky, Maria. 2005b. Antipassive constructions. In *World Atlas of Language Structures*, Matthew Dryer, Martin Haspelmath, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds), 438–441. Oxford: OUP.

Polinsky, Maria. 2017. Antipassive. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, Jessica Coon, Diane Massam & Lisa D. Travis (eds), 308–331. Oxford: OUP.

Renaudier, Marie. 2011. *The antipassive in accusative languages: The case of Sereer (Senegal, Atlantic)*. Handout, February 2011. <https://www.academia.edu/10478452> (1 August 2018).

Say, Sergey S. 2008. K tipologii antipassivnyx konstrukcij: Semantika, pragmatika, sintaksis (Towards a typology of antipassive constructions: Semantics, pragmatics, syntax). PhD dissertation, Institute of Linguistic Studies, Saint Petersburg.

Say, Sergey S. Antipassive and the lexical meaning of verbs. In *Antipassive: Typology, Diachrony, and Related Constructions* [Typological Studies in Language 130], Katarzyna Janic & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (This volume).

Serdobolskaya, Natalia V. 2011. Grammaticalization patterns of the Adyghe instrumental case. In *Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus*, Vittorio S. Tomelleri, Manana Topadze & Anna Lukianowicz (eds), 515–539. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.). 1976. *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. New York NY: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368842

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1998. Voice parameters. In *Typology of Verbal Categories. Papers Presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Leonid I. Kulikov & Heinz Vater (eds), 117–138. Tübingen: Niemeyer. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110913750.117

Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.). 2001. *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation* [Typological Studies in Language 48]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smeets, Rieks. 1992. On valencies, actants and actant coding in Circassian. In *Caucasian Perspectives*, George Hewitt (ed.), 98–144. Munich: Lincom.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. Split case-marking patterns in verb-types and tense/aspect/mood. *Linguistics* 19(5–6): 389–438.

Vigus, Meagan. 2018. Antipassive constructions: Correlations of form and function across languages. *Linguistic Typology* 22(3): 339–384. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2018-0013