

Katukina-Kanamari antipassive

Francesc Queixalós

1. Introduction¹

If we take seriously linguistic form — a stand which does not preclude the necessity of taking seriously other structuring levels of language such as semantics and pragmatics —, then some level ought to be defined on purely formal grounds. I take grammatical relations subject and object as being part of such formally defined linguistic notions. In dealing with a linguistic entity, and particularly with grammatical relations, we have probably much to gain by clearly distinguishing between definition — the set of properties identifying it —, and motivation — the reasons that move a speaker to put it at work (see section 2.5). The main aim of this paper is to present data of a very little documented, strongly ergative, language of Amazonia as an illustration of the considerations just made. The particular grammatical point chosen for that purpose is the basic divalent transitive clause and its valence reducing voice, antipassive. I will attempt to show that in a clearly hierarquizied system of grammatical relations, voice change has a primary target which is the accessibility restrictions bearing on the lower ranked argument of a two-place clause. Of course, the idea that such a generalization could embrace antipassives in the different kinds of so called ergative languages, and beyond, passives in all kinds of languages, appears immediately as a blatant impossibility: functional — semantic, pragmatic — motivations for the existence of voice are too pervasive everywhere. Nevertheless, the dialectics between both types of motivation for voice changes is a little bit blurred by the quest of all-or-nothing — formal / functional — typological definitions (for passive, see Comrie 2008; Givón 2008). In the spirit of Cooreman's (1994) work on antipassives or Givón's (2009) on passive, diachrony — a depository for the effects of formal and functional pressures — has yet much to say on voice mechanisms as partial subproducts of the interaction between 1) the basic alignment type of a language, and 2) the communicative needs of speakers.

Katukina-Kanamari, apparently the only surviving language of the small family Katukina, is present in a large region of Amazonia comprised between the Purus and the Javari rivers, and between the Japura river and the

extreme south of the state of Amazonas, Brazil. About two thousand people, or even less, speak this language. Adelaar (2000) suggests a genetic link with the Peruvian isolate Harakmbut/Amarakaeri.

Simple phonology, sparse morphology, clearcut lexical classes with no primitive adjectives, no trivalent verbs other than ‘say’, head marking, predicate initial², strong configurationality in terms of constituency, neat grammatical relations hierarchy, predominant ergative patterning in almost all regions of its grammar, and split transitivity, are a few typological features apt to roughly characterize this language.

The paper is organized in the following manner. I first present the basic patterns in terms of formal features such as coding, constituency, behaviour, and coreference control, followed by the explicitation of the consequences of these phenomena for the grammatical relations issue. Then I turn to describe a voice change operated upon the basic divalent transitive clause: the participant mapped to the highest grammatical relation is deprived of its core argument status, thereby allowing the extant participant to fill the slot of unique argument of a one-place clause.

2. Basic patterns

The most unrestricted way of rendering an event involving Mayon, “cut” and “wild meat” is shown in

- (1)^{ITQ} *Mayon-na=* *tukman* *barahai*
 Mayon-MKCASE= cut wild_meat
 ‘Mayon cut the wild meat’³

where: the verb is in medial position, the patient phrase, unmarked for case, follows the verb, and the agent phrase, marked for case by *na*, precedes the verb.⁴

For an event involving “man” and “go away”, we have

- (2)^{ITQ} *daan* *piya*
 go;walk man
 ‘the man went away’

Lexically monovalent verbs like *daan* do not enter other types of clause structure.

2.1. Coding

Comparing (2) to (1) shows a clear ergative alignment in terms of case marking — agent in (1) explicitly marked for case, patient in (1) unmarked as well as the unique argument in (2) —, and word order — preverbal agent, postverbal patient and unique. Moreover, pronominal forms are bound for agent and free for patient and unique. Respectively:

(3) ^{BIA}		singular	plural
	1	<i>yo</i> ⁵	<i>tyo</i> -
	2	<i>no</i> -	<i>na</i> -
	3	<i>a</i> -	<i>ma</i> -
(4) ^{ITQ}		singular	plural
	1	<i>adu</i>	<i>adik</i>
	2	<i>idi:k</i>	<i>idi:ki</i>
	3	<i>anyan</i> ⁶	<i>anyan hinuk</i>

No coding of gender surfaces in pronominal forms. (In the examples, third-person forms will be translated according to their referent(s) in the particular circumstances they were uttered.)

2.2. Constituency

The predicate and its sister, external, argument⁷ appear in that order. The other possible order is allowed, with, probably, slight pragmatic effect.

(5) ^{ITQ}	<i>piya daan</i>
	man go;walk
	‘the man went away’

A subclass of lexical predicate heads generates syntactically complex predicate phrases. These are: divalent verbs (6), divalent nouns (7), and postpositions (8). All take an obligatory internal, pre-head, argument. All other lexical predicate heads, that is, monovalent verbs (9), monovalent nouns (10), and adverbs (11)-(12), only take an external, post-predicate, argument. Examples follow.

Divalent heads:

4 *Francesc Queixalós*

verb
 (6)^{BIA} [*Ayobi-na=* *bo:dak*] *tawami*
 Ayobi-MKCASE= roast manioc_dough
 ‘Ayobi is roasting the manioc dough’

noun
 (7)^{ITQ} [*opatyin-na=* *wadik*] *Warohan*
 child-MKCASE= name Warohan
 ‘Warohan is the child’s name’

postposition
 (8)^{BIA} [*Raidi-na=* *katu*] *Apikaru*
 Raidi-MKCASE= COM.INSTR Apikaru
 ‘Apikaru is with Raidi’

Monovalent heads:

verb
 (9)^{BIA} *datikan* *pi:na*
 sink hook
 ‘the hook sank’

noun
 (10)^{BIA} *totyawa idi:k wa*
 shaman you PROSPECT
 ‘you will be a shaman’

adverb
 (11)^{ITQ} *kodo* *kamodya*
 in_the_higher_part monkey_sp.
 ‘the monkey sp. is up there’

(12)^{BIA} *kiman idi:k*
 quickly you
 ‘quick!’

Clause initial, final and intermediate positions can be occupied by dis-course particles and adverbs in adverbial function. However, none of them,

nor any other kind of word, can intervene between a phrase head and its left adjacent case marked dependent. For example, on (6) with the particle *niama*, ‘then’:

- (13)^{BIA} *niama* [*Ayobi-na=* *bo:dak*] *tawami*
 then Ayobi-MKCASE= roast dough
- [*Ayobi-na=* *bo:dak*] *niama* *tawami*
 Ayobi-MKCASE= roast then dough
- [*Ayobi-na=* *bo:dak*] *tawami* *niama*
 again-MKCASE= roast dough then
- *[*Ayobi-na=* *niama* *bo:dak*] *tawami*
 Ayobi-MKCASE=then roast dough
- *[*Ayobi* *niama* *-na=bo:dak*] *tawami*
 Ayobi then -MKCASE=roast dough
- ‘then Ayobi roasted the manioc dough’

As will be amply illustrated immediately, all external arguments listed up to now occupy one and the same syntactic position. They also share the same coding features in terms of case (zero marking) and word order (typically, postpredicative). Since what we could want to call the *ergative* case of (1), marked by *-na=*, is in all coding respects identical to that of the genitive, example (7), and of the “object” of postposition, example (8), I keep for these three semantically different but structurally identical instances of *-na=* the generic label *marked case*. In fact, *-na* as an allative mark is the only case affix allowed to occur on a noun phrase in an adjunct relation to the predicate, as in (14). All other meanings are rendered by postpositions.⁸

- (14)^{BIA} *Koni-na=* *dahu* *wankurun* *hak-na*
 Koni-MKCASE= take_away pot house-ALL
 ‘Koni took the pot to the house’

2.3. Behaviour

This section is devoted to the syntactic asymmetries between external and internal arguments, and will show the extent to which the alignment of the unique argument of monovalent verbs to the expression of the patient of transitive verbs is confirmed.

2.3.1. *Movement*

Only external arguments can be moved from their postpredicative position to a prepredicative, pragmatically marked, one. We saw that in example (5), resumed here.

- (15)^{ITQ} *piya daan*
 man go_away
 ‘the man went away’

This capacity of movement is shared by the external arguments of all kind of predicates, e.g. divalent verb, and noun, respectively:

- (16)^{ITQ} *ma-obatyawa kotyia-na= dyoro*
 3PL-wife otter-MKCASE= copulate_with
 ‘the otter copulated with their wives’

- (17)^{ITQ} *Inu Aro-na= tyo*
 Inu Aro-MKCASE= daughter
 ‘Inu is Aro’s daughter’

A possible pragmatic effect of external argument fronting is an attenuated contrastive focus (see below). No movement of the internal argument is allowed unless other formal changes take place — loss of case mark on the noun and presence of person prefix on the verb, (19)-(20). Compare, starting from the basic constituent order in (18):

- (18)^{ITQ} *nyama-na= kionyuk a-okpu*
 mother-MKCASE= comb 3SG-son

- (19)^{ITQ} *a-kionyuk nyama a-okpu*
 3SG-comb mother 3SG-son

- (20)^{ITQ} *nyama a-kionyuk a-okpu*
 mother 3SG-comb 3SG-son
 ‘the mother combs her son’

As to pragmatic effects of these movements, no information is available for (19), and for (20) they seem to be different from that in (16), something like left-dislocation ‘as for mother, she combs her son’. As both (19) and (20) show, the extraction of the agent noun phrase has to leave behind the pronominal prefix on the verb. The constraint underlying this alternance is simply that the internal argument must be realized phonologically. In addition to possible prosodic subtleties, the mere presence of the pronominal prefix instead of the proclitic case marker is evidence that the initial noun phrase *nyama* in (20), if compared to (18), is not a component of the verb phrase. Now, section 2.3.5 will show that while moved external arguments keep their grammatical relation to the predicate, moved internal arguments fall outside the clause core. No datum, be it spontaneous or elicited, shows two simultaneous movements — left-dislocation for internal argument and fronting for external argument. Moreover, my lack of control on prosodic clues for constituency has prevented me from submitting to my informants a plausible tentative example. The default hypothesis, then, would be that (20) shows a moved agent phrase and a patient phrase *in situ*, rather than something like (19) plus a fronted agent phrase.

2.3.2. Elision

Only external arguments can be elided.

- (21)^{ITQ} *kitan-nin*
 sleep-DUR
 ‘(he) is sleeping’
- (22)^{BIA} *Koni-na= dahu*
 Koni-MKCASE= take_away
 ‘Koni took (it) away’

The “zero pronoun” allows for a third person indefinite reading (see section 3.2.10).

Elision of an internal argument has the same consequence as extraction: the need for a pronominal verb prefix referring to this argument.

- (23)^{ITQ} *a-hudyi homo*
 3SG-bring hammock
 ‘he brought the hammock’

An indefinite reading of the plural third person prefix is the closest equivalent to a functional passive in this language.

- (24)^{ITQ} *ma-dahu tyowipikon tyo*
 3PL-carry glass_beads EXCL
 ‘someone took away the glass beads!’

2.3.3. *Ostension*

Only external arguments can be modified or replaced by a demonstrative, (25)-(26) and (27)-(28), respectively.

- (25)^{ITQ} *kitan-nin itiyán wa:pa*
 sleep-DUR this dog
 ‘this dog was sleeping’

- (26)^{BIA} *yo-hoki itiyán⁹ oman*
 1SG-put this log
 ‘I put this log (over there)’

- (27)^{ITQ} *kitan-nin itiyán*
 sleep-DUR this_one
 ‘this one was sleeping’

- (28)^{ITQ} *wa:pa-na= ti itiyán*
 dog-MKCASE= kill this_one
 ‘the dog killed this one’

2.3.4. *Coordination*

No explicit element other than concatenation is involved in coordinating noun phrases. External arguments can be coordinated, (29)-(30), but not internal ones, (31).

(29)^{ITQ} *opatyin-na= wu awa nyama a-ponhanya*
 child-MKCASE= want his_one mother 3SG-sister
 ‘the child loves his mother and his sister’

(30)^{ITQ} *tyuku wa:pa takara*
 die dog hen
 ‘the dog and the hen died’

(31)^{ITQ} **Nodia Hanani-na= hoho-nin Owi*¹⁰
 Nodia Hanani-MKCASE= call-DUR Owi
 ‘Nodia and Hanani are calling Owi’

2.3.5. *Focalization*

Moving to clause initial position and postposing a particle (*ka*)*na* is the device for achieving contrastive focus on noun phrases. This process is accessible to external arguments but not to internal ones.

(32)^{ITQ} *waro kana kitan-nin*
 parrot FOC sleep-DUR
 ‘it is the parrot that is sleeping’

(33)^{ITQ} *wiri na tyo-ikihak*
 wild_pig FOC 1PL-spear
 ‘it is a wild pig that we speared’

Starting from (34), related sequences that were rejected by consultants in elicitation include (35)-(36), where the scope of the focus particle would be the internal argument.

(34)^{ITQ} *mapiri-na= duni takara*
 anaconda-MKCASE= catch hen
 ‘the anaconda caught the hen’

(35)^{ITQ} **mapiri-na (ka)na duni takara*

(36)^{ITQ} **mapiri (ka)na na=duni takara*

Focus displays an asymmetry which can be viewed as evidence that the pre-predicate position — that is, the position preceding the predicate *phrase* — is different for moved external / internal arguments. The former undergoes a dislocation that keeps it within the clause core, and in that position it can be focused, (32)-(33). The latter is truly left-dislocated (see section 2.3.1) and no more available for focus, (37).

(37)^{ITQ} **waro kana a-boni wa:pa*
 parrot FOC 3SG-peck dog
 ‘it is the parrot that pecked the dog’

2.3.6. *Constituent questions*

External argument positions are eligible for questioning.

(38)^{ITQ} *hanian tu¹¹ tatan koniok-nin*
 who(m)/what INT here talk-DUR
 ‘who is talking here?’

(39)^{ITQ} *hanian tu no-toman?*
 who(m)/what INT 2SG-shoot
 ‘what did you shoot?’

Internal arguments cannot be questioned as such.

2.3.7. *Relativization*

Data on relativization are too fragmentary to allow for reliable conclusions regarding the structure of relative clauses and the nature of the relativizing element. The following is offered as a first insight into one more extraction process that seems to show the same asymmetries already seen in focus and questions. In the Itaquai dialect the presumably deictic element *nyan* — perhaps related to the third person free pronoun, see (4) — opens the relative clause. The relativized noun follows, but sometimes it is found *in situ* —

with a preference, however, for fronting. This means that relatives are basically “head-internal” in this language. The verb is suffixed by *-nin*, which in independent clauses denotes durative aspect, see (38), and on subordinate predicates marks dependence. Only external arguments can be relativized.

(40)^{ITQ} *i-hik nyan anyan piya waokdyi-nin*
 1SG-know DEIC this_one man arrive-DEP
 ‘I know the man who arrived’

(41)^{ITQ} *i-hi:k nyan tukuna Kontan-na= dahudyi-nin*
 1SG-know DEIC person Kontan-MKCASE= bring-DEP
 ‘I know the person that Kontan brought’

2.3.8. Nominalization

Morphology in divalent verb nominalizations shows that these are inherently patient oriented, (42), as monovalent verb nominalizations are oriented toward the unique participant, whatever its specific semantic role, as in (43)-(44). Nominalization is achieved by postposing the deictic element *nyan*, just seen above for relativization, to the lexical verb stem, while keeping, in divalent verbs, the same bound expression for the agent.¹² Noteworthy differences between nominalized verb and relativized clause include not only the position of the deictic element *nyan*, but also: the absence / presence, respectively, of a relativized noun, and the absence / presence, also respectively, of the subordinating verbal suffix *-nin*. As for aspectuality, nominalization seems to be indifferent to denoting entities involved in events, as in (42) and (43), or characterized by properties / habitual activities, as in (44).

(42)a^{ITQ} *yo-wahak barahai*
 1SG-cook wild_meat
 ‘I cooked the wild meat’

b^{ITQ} *bak tu yo-wahak nyan*
 be_good NEG 1SG-cook DEIC
 ‘my cooked thing is not good’

(43)a^{ITQ} *dapoki opatyin*
 fall child
 ‘the child fell’

b^{ITQ} *dapoki nyan*
 fall DEIC
 ‘the fallen one’

(44)a^{ITQ} *donman piya*
 go_fishing man
 ‘the man went fishing’

b^{ITQ} *donman nyan adu*
 go_fishing DEIC 1SG
 ‘I am a fisher’

The divalent verb agent is not directly accessible to nominalization, see 3.2.8.

We have so far demonstrated that in basic divalent clauses the argument representing the patient ranks formally above the argument representing the agent as far as constituency and behaviour properties are concerned (location with regard to verb phrase, elision, movement, extraction), and aligns with the unique argument of monovalent clauses in terms of these same properties as well as of coding properties (case marking, pronominal paradigms).

Let us now turn to a less neatly hierarchized domain, that of coreference.

2.4. Control

The simplest way of characterizing how arguments establish coreference pivots between lexical noun phrases and zero or bound pronominal forms is to say that in some sub-domains the hierarchy is straightforward whereas in others we face a fuzzy situation. (I will not supply here a fullfledged exposition of the topic, which can be found in Queixalós 2004, 2010.) Let us begin with the latter.

At the intraclausal level, functional (semantic, pragmatic) conditions prevail over syntactic constraints such as linear order and rank in constituency hierarchy (“c-command”) for core arguments, (45)-(47) (square brackets delimitate the verb phrase). In (45) the external argument controls the possessive marker prefixed to the internal argument, as expected from constituency hierarchy but not from linear order. In (46) the internal argument con-

trols the possessive on the external argument, counter the constituency hierarchy but in tune with linear order. Disjunct reference appears in (47).

(45)^{ITQ} [*a₁-obatyawa-na= todiuk*] *Mayon₁*
 3SG-wife-MKCASE= hate Mayon
 ‘Mayon₁’s wife hates him₁ (lit.: His₁ wife hates Mayon₁)’

(46)^{ITQ} [*Dawi₁-na= bobo*] *a₁-obatyawa*
 Dawi-MKCASE= beat 3SG-wife
 ‘Dawi₁ beat his₁ wife’

(47)^{BIA} [*pi:da₁-na= buro:*] *a₂-mimi*
 jaguar-MKCASE= leap 3SG-blood
 ‘Jaguar₁ leaped his₂ blood’

Other domains show a slight preference for pivots where the patient argument is involved. For example intraclausal coreference between core arguments and adjuncts; both (48) and (49) are allowed, but informants tend to interpret the latter with a patient as the antecedent. For disjunct reference a free pronominal form (*anyan*) is appealed to, (50).¹³

(48)^{ITQ} *Dawi₁-na= toman Poroya₂ [a₂-wa mokawa*
 Dawi-MKCASE= shoot Poroya 3SG-GRN gun
*katu]*¹⁴
 COM.INSTR
 ‘Dawi₁ shoot Poroya₂ with his₂ gun’

(49)^{ITQ} *Dawi₁-na= tohik ityaro₂ [a₁-wa hak to]*
 Dawi-MKCASE= see woman 3SG-GRN house LOC
 ‘Dawi saw the woman in his house’

(50)^{ITQ} *Dawi₁-na= tohik ityaro₂ [anyan₃-na= wa hak to]*
 Dawi-MKCASE=see woman 3SG-MKCASE= GRN house LOC
 ‘Dawi₁ saw the woman₂ in his/her₃ house’

Coreference pivot involving patient is default with intraclausal adverbs of manner and location, and in subordination. I just give an example of the latter in order to keep this section within reasonable limits (square brackets

delimitate the dependent clause). As mentioned before, a suffix *-nin* works as a durative aspect mark of main predicates, (21), and as a subordinator.¹⁵

- (51)^{BIA} *a₁-makaudyaran* \emptyset_2 [*dyahian-nin* \emptyset_2 *ama*]
 3SG-stride_{over} stand_{up}-DEP GOAL
 ‘He strode over her to have her stand up’

An obligatory patient pivot shows up in control constructions.¹⁶ Compare (52)-(53) for alignment between patient and unique (square brackets delimitate the predicate phrases).

- (52)^{ITQ} [[*i-ti-nin=*] *wu*] *idi:k*
 1SG-kill-DEP= want 2SG
 ‘I want to kill you’

- (53)^{ITQ} [[*donman-nin=*] *wu*] *adu*
 go_{fishing}-DEP= want 1SG
 ‘I want to go fishing’

A few comments are in order. In this kind of constructions we have a main finite verb, here *wu*, ‘want’, heading a clause where the internal argument is a clause complement containing the subordinate non finite lexical verb, here divalent *ti*, ‘kill’, and monovalent *donman*, ‘go fishing’, marked for dependency by *-nin*, which phonologically procliticises to the syntactically main verb *wu* — the “auxiliary”.¹⁷

The crucial point is that the external argument of the divalent non finite complement clause is either the patient, ‘you’ in (52), or the unique in its monovalent counterpart, ‘I’ in (53). (To finish with, let me call attention to the external argument of the main verb as being coreferential with the external argument of the complement clause.¹⁸)

All the two-place clauses seen so far I call ergative clauses. They feature the formal properties induced by basic active transitive predicates. An alternative two-place clause type is accusatively aligned in, as far as I can say presently, all the aspects enumerated in the previous sections (see 3.2.10 for details).

2.5. Subject and object

What we have, then, is a morphosyntactic configuration where, in divalent clauses, all the formal properties currently lent to the notion of grammatical pivot converge almost perfectly toward the patient argument of the divalent clause as they do toward the unique argument of the monovalent clause.

I wish, however, to make two caveats on aspects of the evidence adduced here that could weaken my interpretation.

First, the value of nominalization in identifying the alignment patterns of a language. A particular set of so-called ergative alignments attested cross-linguistically should deserve a special status in typology since they appear 1) in peripheral regions of grammatical systems — ‘peripheral’ meaning *non basic* alignments, *non basic* clause types —; and 2) in all kinds of languages, be they ergative, accusative, active or other. Argument alignments in nominalizations are among the most notorious exponents of what I call *ubiquitous ergativity*, along with number distinctions on the arguments of simple / reduplicated verbs, “possessor” raising through nominal incorporation, and beyond (Keenan 1984). Indeed, if the nominalization facts displayed in 2.3.8, and in 3.2.8 below, are mere instances of ubiquitous ergativity, they should not count as criterial for the establishment of a language type in terms of alignment. But what is at stake here, as it will become fairly evident in a moment, is the morphology of voice as captured for the nominalization purposes which shows that divalent verbs are clearly patient-oriented.

Second, the underdetermination of my claim by the coreference data. The language can be grossly characterized as pivotless for coreference or, better, slightly biased to an ergative-type pivot. For this reason, coreference can only be counted as a light clue converging, along with much heavier ones, to ergative syntax. But — and this is crucial to the understanding of ergativity — the fact that the weak zone of ergative syntax is precisely coreference shows, in my view (Queixalós 2010), that this kind of grammatical organization is of recent appearance in this language.

We get back to the grammatical relations issue. The original motivation for the notion of *pivot* in Dixon (1994) was to subsume in a single cluster the formal properties of subjects, so as to let semantically based notions like *agent* permeate the notion of *subject*. It should be clear from what precedes that this mix of levels is in my view the key factor for a significant part of the chronic misunderstandings that have weighted upon the different approaches to ergativity. Were not the mapping of semantic roles on the expression of arguments, the facts adduced above would lead anyone to clearly posit the existence of a grammatical subject and a grammatical object in

Katukina ergative clauses. This is *exactly* the stand I take,¹⁹ since the ergative clause presented so far cannot be seen as an inverse: there is no direct clause to be held as its more basic counterpart. In Katukina, then, the linguistic expression of the semantic role patient in a basic divalent clause displays the formal properties of subjects; if the grammatical relation *subject* is formal in nature, which I believe, then the patient argument is the subject, along with the unique argument of the monovalent clause; the other, *lower ranked argument in the basic active divalent clause*, can be but an object, despite its semantic role correlate, agent. This, of course, runs counter the general assumption of a radical incompatibility between the semantic role of agent and the grammatical relation of direct object (e.g. Givón 2001: 200). Now, that grammatical relations are, synchronically, formal entities does not rule out the possibility of diachronic grammaticalization processes whereby functional motivations — mainly pragmatic, e.g. topic maintenance — can be the source of converging forces that lead a given argument to capture the set of characteristics which will make it the syntactically privileged argument of a given construction, that is, a subject (I take up this diachrony issue in Queixalós 2010).

3. Antipassive

As we have seen, in the ergative clause the expression of the agent is barred from a number of properties attached to subjects, such as sisterhood with the predicate phrase — same level of constituency —, zero case marking, pronominalization by free forms, extraction, and so on. By means of a voice process the expression of the agent can access all these properties.

3.1. Form

Antipassive is built upon the ergative clause, by suppressing the internal argument position. Its formal properties are:

- the agent prefix paradigm slot is made inaccessible to any referent by means of an invariable morpheme *wa-* that blocks the agent's morphological slot;
- no noun phrase can show up within the verb phrase;
- the agent surfaces as an external argument;
- the patient, demoted from its external argument position, is either omitted (54), instantiated as object of postposition (55), or instan-

tiated with no relational marking (case or postposition) (56); the postposition for the demoted noun phrase in the antipassive clause is the comitative instrumental marker *katu*, already seen in examples (8) and (48).²⁰

See examples.

(54)^{ITQ} *wa-pu* *adik* *tyo*
 ANTIP-eat 1PL EXCL
 ‘we eat!’ (Context: ‘We are happy in our land’.)

(55)^{BIA} *wa-wu* *dyara* *tukuna* *anya-na=*
 ANTIP-want white_people indian woman-MkCASE=
katu
 COM.INSTR
 ‘Whites like Indian women’

(56)^{ITQ} *piya wa-pu-nin* *barahai*
 man ANTIP-eat-DUR wild_meat
 ‘men are eating wild meat’

As far as the verb-argument(s) core is concerned, constituency factors no more constrain word order, since the predicate phrase is devoid of any internal, dependent, noun phrase. As an external argument, the agent phrase is basically post-verbal, as in (54)-(55). But as such also, it can be fronted, as in (56). If both participants are overtly present, which is rare in spontaneous discourse but plainly admitted in elicitation, a few restrictions obtain.

When instantiated through an object of postposition, the patient phrase is post-core, as in (55). One clue to its adjunct status is the behaviour of the ‘future’ particle *wa*. Its position in the sentence is necessarily post-core and predominantly — not obligatorily — final. Both (57) and (58) are grammatical, whereas (59) is not.

(57)^{BIA} *wa-toman* *adu* *wiri* *katu* *wa*
 ANTIP-shoot 1SG wild_pig COM.INSTR FUT
 ‘I will shoot wild pigs’

(58)^{BIA} *wa-toman* *adu* *wa* *wiri* *katu*
 ANTIP-shoot 1SG FUT wild_pig COM.INSTR
 ‘I will shoot wild pigs’

(59)^{BIA} **wa-toman* *wa* *adu* *wiri* *katu*
 ANTIP-shoot FUT 1SG wild_pig COM.INSTR

Despite its adjunct status, the patient expression has a privileged status among non core constituents, since all other adjuncts appear after it, even when headed by the same postposition *-katu*, (60).

(60)^{BIA} *wa-toman* *adu wa* *wiri* *katu*
 ANTIP-shoot 1SG FUT wild_pig COM.INSTR
mokawa *katu*
 gun COM.INSTR
 ‘I will shoot wild pigs with a gun’

It is not definitely clear whether patient instantiation by a bare noun phrase still bears any grammatical relation to the predicate, but the answer is presumably negative, see section 3.1. As to word order, noun phrases are either both located preverbally, in which case the agent always precedes the patient, (61), or distributed one on each side of the verb, the agent coming far more frequently before the patient, (62), with very few cases of the reversed order, (63).

(61)^{ITQ} *kaina moroho* *idi:k* *wa-binik* *tyo*
 toad_sp. 2SG ANTIP-swallow EXCL
 ‘the toad sp. swallowed you!’

(62)^{ITQ} *piya wa-pu* *barahai*
 man ANTIP-eat wild_meat
 ‘the man eats wild meat’

(63)^{BIA} *tawa wa-pukni* *Kirak*
 manioc ANTIP-pull_out Kirak
 ‘Kirak harvested manioc’

Note that the preverbal position of the patient is compatible with an adjunct status, since postpositional phrases are accessible to fronting, as in the following primitive one-place clause:

- (64)^{ITQ} *ityowa* *ityonin* *naki* *adik*
 POSS.1PL territory LOC 1PL
tyuru
 grow
 ‘in our territory we grew up’

No saliency hierarchy seems to be at work here, in the sense that something of a core argument status is being conferred to the patient phrase in a more or less inverse fashion. See the following examples, where the patient is either preverbal but low on the animacy scale, (65), or first person but in postverbal position, (66).

- (65)^{ITQ} *Wura poako wa-buhuk a-ama*²¹
 Wura paddle ANTIP-make 3SG-GOAL
 ‘Wura made a paddle for him’

- (66)^{ITQ} *Owi wa-hoho adu*
 Owi ANTIP-call 1SG
 ‘Owi called me’

When only one participant accesses overt expression in the antipassive, the agent is massively represented, whereas instances of patient noun phrases are extremely rare in texts, and straightforwardly rejected in elicitation: “Pacu fishes don’t spear” reacted the informant when proposed (67).

- (67)^{BIA} **wa-hak bamak*
 ANTIP-spear pacu_fish

Antipassive clauses made up of the single verb are more frequent in texts than the sum of antipassives with one or two lexical instantiation(s) of participant(s). Most of the time we observe that what is being reported is an activity, not an event,²² and that the agent is either a resident topic in the fragment of discourse under scrutiny, or first person,²³ or both, as in this excerpt from an ode to the happiness of life in ancient times (plenty of food and so on).

- (68)^{ITQ} *wa-pu niama kotuda*
 ANTIP-eat then again
 ‘then we ate again’

In synthesis, Katukina antipassive displays a formal device that consists in preventing the verb from taking any internal argument. The morphological means for that move is blocking the agent prefix paradigm with a mark *wa-*. The agent migrates to the external argument position, which is also that of the single argument of monovalent verbs and the patient of divalent verbs. Since the patient either migrates to an adjunct, sometimes obliquely marked, position or, more frequently, is deprived of linguistic expression, we can safely say that we are left with a typical one-place clause. Now, the patient can also be instantiated through a bare noun phrase. One could think of it as occupying a non syntactic position, since no clause type with two external arguments is independently attested in the language.²⁴ Something of an afterthought element, were it not examples like (61), recalled here.

(69)^{ITQ} *kaina moroho* *idi:k* *wa-binik* *tyo*
 toad_sp. 2SG ANTIP-swallow EXCL
 ‘the toad sp. swallowed you up!’

Maybe we could be led to admit the possibility that in some specific cases, Katukina antipassive retains the non-promoted argument. After all, if the antipassive in a syntactically ergative language must be overwhelmingly devoted to lend pivothood to the agent, the natural output of the voice process should be one that retrieves both arguments, since the action depicted by the verb has undergone no change as to number and identity of its central participants. I will get back to this issue below.

3.2. Motivations

Obviously, such an amount of restrictions imposed upon the expression of the ergative clause agent —sections 2.3 and, to a lesser extent, 2.4— necessarily entails, as a direct effect, the existence of a voice device whereby these restrictions are circumvented. Because this language is almost homogeneously ergative, the antipassive has mainly formal motivations, and its functional ones are somewhat difficult to observe.

I will here take one by one the processes enumerated in sections 2.3 and 2.4 as barred for access to the ergative internal argument, in order to show how they apply on an antipassive agent’s expression.

3.2.1. Movement

An antipassive agent can be moved to clause-initial position, as in

- (70)^{ITQ} *ikik wa-pu-nin barahai*
 one ANTIP-eat-DUR wild_meat
 ‘only one is eating wild meat’

3.2.2. Elision

An antipassive agent can be elided, if recoverability of reference is granted.

- (71)^{ITQ} *wa-o-nin*
 ANTIP-drink-DUR
 ‘(she) was drinking’

3.2.3. Ostension

An antipassive agent can be modified, as well as pronominalized, by a demonstrative. Respectively:

- (72)^{ITQ} *itiyān kawahiri wa-duni tyon*
 DEM.PROX cat ANTIP-catch rat
 ‘this cat caught the rat’

- (73)^{ITQ} *itiyān wa-duni tyon*
 DEM.PROX ANTIP-catch rat
 ‘this one caught the rat’

3.2.4. Coordination

Two nominals referring to two participants in the same agent role can be coordinated if expressed as external argument of an antipassive predicate.

- (74)^{ITQ} *Nodia Hanani wa-hoho-nin Owi*
 Nodia Hanani ANTIP-call-DUR Owi
 ‘Nodia and Hanani were calling Owi’

3.2.5. Focalization

An antipassive agent can be focussed.

- (75)^{ITQ} *Aro kana wa-nuhuk a-batyawa kariwa-na=*
 Aro FOC ANTIP-give 3SG-wife non_indian-MKCASE
ton
 REC
 ‘It was Aro who gave his wife to the white man’

3.2.6. Constituent questions

An antipassive agent can be questioned.²⁵

- (76)^{BIA} *hanin tan wa-dyuman tahi yu?*
 who(m) here ANTIP-spill water INT
 ‘Who spilled the water here?’
- (77)^{ITQ} *hanian tu kana Pawi wa-toman tyo?*
 who(m) INT FOC Pawi ANTIP-shoot EXCL
 ‘who killed Pawi?’

3.2.7. Relativization

An antipassive agent can be relativized. Compare (78) to the relativization of the patient in an active clause, (41), renumbered here as (79).

- (78)^{ITQ} *i-hi:k nyan piya wa-dahudyi-nin Hiowai*
 1SG-know DEIC man ANTIP-bring-DEP Hiowai
 ‘I know the man who brought Hiowai’
- (79)^{ITQ} *i-hi:k nyan tukuna Kontan-na= dahudyi-nin*
 1SG-know DEIC person Kontan-MKCASE= bring-DEP
 ‘I know the person that Kontan brought’

3.2.8. Nominalization

A divalent verb, a-examples below, cannot undergo an agent nominalization unless it turns into antipassive, b-examples.

(80)^{aITQ} *a-bi:wik-nin* *obakon*
 3SG-smoke-DUR cigar
 ‘he is smoking the cigar’

b^{ITQ} *i-toman* *wa-bi:wik* *nyan*
 1SG-shoot ANTIP-smoke DEIC
 ‘I shot the smoker’

(81)^{aBIA} *a-hak* *bamak*
 3SG-spear pacu_fish
 ‘he speared a pacu fish’

b^{ITQ} *ki:tan* *wa-hak* *nyan*
 sleep ANTIP-spear DEIC
 ‘the spearer slept’

3.2.9. Control

To say it in a nutshell, in active ergative clauses no straightforward coreference pivot is observed except for proper control structures, where patient (and unique) pivots are mandatory, see above 2.4 *in fine*. Otherwise, either patient or agent can establish distant coreference links. But a bias toward patient can be observed in several areas, such as adverbial phrases (possession on object of postposition, semantic scope of manner and location adverbs) and interclausal relations (subordination, coordination).

(82) is a sequence of clauses where the inclusion of a divalent verb agent and a monovalent verb participant in a coreference pivot requires the antipassive. In elicitation, when faced to strictly symmetrical extralinguistic situations leading to potential ambiguity such as (83), the speaker spontaneously antipassivizes the verb to make clear its agent’s involvement in a coreference pivot.

(82)^{ITQ} *padyi, wa-pu* *niama, koniohin niama*
 arrive ANTIP-eat then dance then
 ‘they arrived, then they ate, and then they danced’

(83)^{ITQ} *Nodia-na=* *toman* *Yowai* *a-tohi:k-nin* *annin*
 Nodia-MKCASE= shoot Yowai ANTIP-stare_at-DEP EMPH²⁶

‘Nodia shot Yowai while the latter was staring at something’

We have listed not less than eight purely syntactic situations where anti-passive is requested to allow accessibility to the agent of a divalent verb. None of these applies to the genitive noun phrase, in spite of its coding and constituency properties, identical to the agent of an ergative clause. For instance modifying or pronominalizing a noun by means of a demonstrative, (84)-(85), or questioning a referent, (86), are plainly admitted for a genitive noun. This proves that the internal arguments of verb and noun phrases are distinct syntactic elements.²⁷

(84)^{ITQ} *daan niama itiyān ityaro-na= tyo*
 go;walk then DEM woman-MKCASE= daughter
 ‘then, the daughter of this woman went away’

(85)^{ITQ} *itiyān-na= tyo kana tona-nin tyo*
 DEM-MKCASE= daughter FOC leave-DUR EXCL
 ‘it is this one’s daughter that is leaving’

(86)^{ITQ} *hanian-na= okpu tu*
 who(m)/what-MKCASE= son INT
annin?
 EMPH
 ‘whose son is this?’

Concerning the focus example (75), notice that although the motivation for focussing is in itself of a pragmatic nature, the syntactic consequences of it — that is, fronting a noun phrase and postposing the focus particle (*kana*) — are the direct *formal* cause for resorting to the antipassive when the process applies to the internal argument of the active verb phrase.

We turn now to the functional motivations for antipassive.

3.2.10. *Semantics & pragmatics*

A few common semantic or pragmatic constraints inducing antipassive cross-linguistically are taken over in Katukina-Kanamari by other, and diverse, formal devices.

A possible function for antipassive is the agent's pragmatic promotion. Specifically in Katukina this promotion is tantamount to contrastive focus. We know that this kind of pragmatic process is achieved through the particle (*ka*)*na* on external arguments. Section 2.3.5 shows examples (32)-(33) for unique and patient, and section 3.2.5 shows example (75) for antipassive agent. However, the simple fronting of an external argument — remember that the canonical position for an external argument is post-verbal, *cf.* section 2.2 —, hence of the antipassive agent, has something of an attenuated contrastive focus effect. Informants insist that the best equivalent for (87) is not the plain “my wife cooked wild meat” but something like “it’s my wife that cooked wild meat”. A fine spontaneous example of that is (61), in spite of the more neutral translation given above. Plausibly more than one single degree of focus are available to speakers.

(87)^{ITQ} *yo-obtayawa wa-wahak bara*
 1SG-wife ANTIP-cook wild_meat

Among morphosyntactic devices triggered by the patient's properties we have the accusative pattern announced in section 2.4. The language features a transitive split whereby an accusatively aligned construction is appealed to when the patient is semantically generic, (88)-(89). An iterative or habitual aspect is not necessarily involved, as the first clause of (90) shows. The accusative clause is a perfect inversion of the ergative one in terms of constituency: it has the patient as its internal preverbal argument, the agent as external and typically postverbal argument. The patient is obligatorily instantiated through a noun phrase, since no person prefix attaches to the verb. Formal properties of both arguments are more or less identical for ergative and accusative patterns as long as we express these properties in terms of internal / external noun phrases. Of course, in terms of semantic roles they are inverted.

(88)^{ITQ} [*wiri hak*] *adu*
 wild_pig spear 1SG
 ‘I speared wild pigs’

(89)^{ITQ} [*takara duni*] *mapiri dawa*
 hen catch anaconda today
 ‘the anaconda is catching hens today’

- (90)^{ITQ} [mokawa wu] adu [wiri toman] niama
 gun want 1SG wild_pig shoot PURP²⁸
 ‘I want a gun to shoot wild pigs’

While the language allows for noun incorporation, the accusative pattern cannot be analyzed as such since monovalent (i.e. “alienable”) nouns only incorporate if the verb also undergoes an applicative process (see in Queixalós 2008 the notion of *redistributive incorporation*). Compare (91) with a divalent noun incorporated, to (92)-(93) with a monovalent noun.

- (91)^{ITQ} nyama-na= ki-onyuk a-okpu
 mother-MKCASE= head-scratch 3SG-son
 ‘the mother combed her son’

- (92)^{ITQ} *yo-obtayawa-na= bara-wahak
 1SG-wife-MKCASE= wild_meat-cook
 ‘my wife cooked wild meat’

- (93)^{ITQ} yo-obtayawa-na= ma-bara-wahak
 1SG-wife-MKCASE= APPL-wild_meat-cook
 ‘my wife cooked wild meat for him’

There seems to be, however, some overlapping in the semantics of the patient between antipassive and accusative clauses: no differential quantification feature has, so far, been identified between patients in (88) and (95). Nor can non-referentiality be held as distinctive between both patterns. Compare, for the accusative clause, (88) with a referential patient, to (90), with two non-referential patients, and for the antipassive clause, (94) with a referential patient, to (95), with a non referential patient.

- (94)^{BIA} hanin koya wa-buhuk?
 who(m) pap ANTIP-make
 ‘who made the pap?’

- (95)^{ITQ} adu don wa-buhuk-nin= bak
 1SG fish ANTIP-make-DEP= be_good
 ‘I am a good fisherman (litt. I am good at making fish)’

Another common functional feature associated to antipassive patients is indefiniteness. This language shows no incompatibility between an indefinite patient and the ergative clause, and the simplest means of packaging an indefinite patient is to let a zero pronoun (“pro”, see 2.3.1) fill the external argument slot of the ergative clause provided that no plausible referent be available in the situational or discourse environment. This will automatically cause an indefinite reading. The following examples show a piece of information containing an indefinite patient with no overt expression, (96), followed by a quite natural question (97). A single noun phrase preceded by an indefinite prefix *a-* is no less a natural answer. This prefix allows the indefinite patient to be represented as an explicit noun phrase, (98).

(96)^{ITQ} *oman-na= ti na tyo*
 tree-MKCASE= kill FOC EXCL
 ‘the tree killed someone!’

(97)^{ITQ} *hanian ti tu na oman-na= ti tyo?*
 who(m)/what RESTR INT FOC tree-MKCASE= kill EXCL
 ‘whom did the tree kill, precisely?’

(98)^{ITQ} *oman-na= ti a-tukuna*
 tree-MKCASE= kill INDEF-indian
 ‘the tree killed someone [who is an Indian]’

We have come across several instances of ergative clauses with an agent overranking a patient in saliency hierarchies, e.g. (1), (6), (14), (47) to mention but a few. Now, not only the same hierarchy can obtain in antipassive clauses, as in (56), but an inverted hierarchy is no motivation to trigger an antipassive, as (99) shows. Nor do semantic hierarchies in the accusative clause favor an inverse interpretation, although generic patients tend *per se* to be less salient. (100) shows a human patient confronted to a non-human agent, to be compared to (101), where, in the same accusative pattern, a non-human “patient” faces a human “agent”.²⁹ Hence, neither antipassive nor accusative clauses can be viewed as part of a direct / inverse system.

(99)^{ITQ} *dyoko-na= hak-dyi adu tyo*
 dart-MKCASE= perforate-CENTRIP 1SG EXCL
 ‘the dart perforated me’

(100)^{BIA} *pi:da ityaro botyana*
 jaguar woman follow
 ‘<the> jaguar>s< follow<s> women³⁰’

(101)^{BIA} *pi:da ohiya Ayobi*
 jaguar fear Ayobi
 ‘Ayobi fears jaguar(s)’

Now, if we assume that strictly formal motivations should lead antipassive clauses to retain overt expression of patient — be it bare or oblique —, the very existence of antipassive clauses with covert patients is a clear clue to the possibility of concomitant functional motivations for voice alternation in this language. We have come across a typical instance of such functional antipassive above: description of an activity (*vs.* an event), in (68). An additional example is (102). Close to that function is the description of an ability (or inability), as in (103).³¹ An uninteresting patient — non significant, irrelevant, obvious — is the common feature to both types.

(102)^{ITQ} *opatyin hinuk niama wa-o ti*
 children group then ANTIP-drink RESTR
 ‘then the children just drank’

(103)^{BIA} *wa-hak tu (adu)*
 ANTIP-spear NEG 1SG
 ‘I’m a bad fisher (lit.: I don’t spear)’

4. Conclusion

In synthesis, formal motivations for antipassive in Katukina are clear. This does not rule out the possibility that functional motivations exist simultaneously. The latter, however, are partially overlapping — competing with — other morphosyntactic devices related to the speaker’s intention to semantically / pragmatically promote an agent or demote a patient. The residue of antipassives whose motivations are not formal or whose functions are not also taken over by other grammatical devices consists — at the present stage of knowledge — of the description of two semantically contiguous configurations: activities, and agents’ abilities.

Such a comparatively overwhelming weight of formal purposes for voice settles, in my view, the issue of the grammatical relations hierarchy in this language, along with the direct objecthood of an argument — the agent — which is: in the marked case, internal to the verb phrase, and promotable to *syntactic* subject through recessive voice change. In sum, the formal side of morphosyntax in a syntactically ergative language is much the same than the one observed in many accusative languages. At first sight, a heavy restriction to this similarity is the always present feature of split transitivity, so characteristic of ergativity. But note that accusative languages have their own lot of split transitivity: besides the above mentioned ubiquitous ergativity, we have differential marking of object, even differential marking of subject. The crucial specificity of syntactically ergative languages is not, then, their formal mechanics *per se*, which is in itself rather common whatever the basic alignment type, but the mere mapping of semantic roles upon grammatical relations (Mel'čuk 1979, Marantz 1984). Our current ideas on this topic are certainly valid generalizations for 99,9 per cent of the documented languages of the world, but this tiny 0,1 per cent means that they are not strict defining features of human language.

Abbreviations

1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; ALL = allative; ANTIP = antipassive; APPL = applicative; CENTRIP = centripetal ; COM = comitative; DEIC = deictic; DEM = demonstrative; DEP = dependent marker; DUR = durative; EXCL = exclamatory mark; FOC = focus; FUT = future; GOAL = goal; INDEF = indefinite; INSTR = instrumental; INT = interrogation; LOC = locative; MKCASE = marked case; NEG = negation; GRN = generic relational noun; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PROSPECT = prospective; PROX = proximal; PURP = purposive; REC = recipient; RESTR = restrictive; SG = singular

References

- Adelaar, Willem F. H.
 2000 "Propuesta de un nuevo vínculo genético entre dos grupos lingüísticos indígenas de la Amazonía occidental: Harakmbut y Katukina."

- In *Actas del I Congreso de Lenguas Indígenas de Suramérica* 219-236. Universidad Ricardo Palma.
- Comrie, Bernard
 2008 “What is a passive?” In *Studies in Voice and Transitivity*, Zarina Estrada, Søren Wichmann, Claudine Chamoreau and Albert Alvarez (eds.), 1-18. München: Lincom Europa.
- Cooreman, Ann
 1994 “A functional typology of antipassives.” In *Voice: Form and Function*, Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), 49-88. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T.
 1997 “Introduction.” In *Grammatical Relations: a Functionalist Perspective*, T. Givón (ed.), 1-84. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
 2001 *Syntax: an Introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
 2008 “On the relational properties of passive clauses: A diachronic perspective.” In *Studies in Voice and Transitivity*, Zarina Estrada, Søren Wichmann, Claudine Chamoreau and Albert Alvarez (eds.), 19-32. München: Lincom Europa.
 2009 *The Genesis of Syntactic Complexity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Keenan, E.
 1984 “Semantic correlates of the ergative/absolutive distinction.” *Linguistics* 22: 197-223
- Marantz, A.
 1984 *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- Mel’čuk, I.
 1979 *Studies in dependency syntax* Ann Arbor: Karoma
- Queixalós, F.
 2004 “Split transitivity and coreference in Katukina.” In *Ergatividade na Amazônia III, Atas do terceiro encontro do projeto Manifestações da ergatividade na Amazônia*, Queixalós, F. (ed.), 175-188. Paris: CELIA/CNRS.
 2008 “Incorporation nominale en sikuani et en katukina-kanamari.” *Amerindia* 31: 61-86.
 2010 “Grammatical relations in Katukina-Kanamari.” In *Ergativity in Amazonia*, Spike Gildea and Francesc Queixalós (eds.), 237-285. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Notes

1. Many thanks to Katharina Haude, Tomas Givón and Gilbert Lazard for comments on a previous version of this paper.
2. ...with some amount of flexibility, as we will see. “Predicate” is taken in the acception “predicate phrase”.
3. ITQ is a mention of the Itaquai river, where the data from the Kanamari dialect were collected. BIA will stand for the river Bia, a Jutai tributary, and origin of the data from the Katukina dialect.
4. Specific semantic roles are no particular issue in this paper, so for two-place verbs I will simply rely on prototype semantics based terms agent and patient. MkCase stands for ‘marked case’, for which a justification will be proposed below. Phonologically, the case suffix cliticizes to the verb, yielding the sequence of phonological words *#mayon# #natukman# #barahai#*. This is assumed to be the result of a diachronic process of procliticization of the case suffix to the phrase head (other examples of head attraction include auxiliarization, see 2.4). In spite of the well established tradition of organizing grammatical examples relying on the phonological properties of clitics rather than on their grammatical properties, I adopt a different convention in such a case of strict contiguity between the grammatical host and the phonological host of an intermediate form: the clitic *na* is restored beside its grammatical host, the notation {A-x= B} reflecting the restitution of the element x — phonologically bounded to an adjacent following element B — to its adjacent preceding grammatical host A.
5. The tables are after the dialect showing the simplest allomorph inventories.
6. Third person pronouns seem to be demonstrative in origin.
7. I use “argument” with its formal acception of “linguistic expression of a participant required by the semantic structure of the verb”, as I do for “internal”, “external”, that is, instantiated respectively inside or outside the predicate phrase.
8. Of course, the diachronic hypothesis of a grammaticalization path allative > genitive > agentive, together with an ancillary hypothesis on the origin of postpositions as divalent nouns, is mostly appealing as it has far-reaching consequences for the understanding of the genesis of Katukina ergativity (see Queixalós 2010). Postpositions display differential object marking (see footnote 14).
9. The phonological form of the demonstrative is slightly different between both dialects.
10. One single instance of this construction was accepted by a speaker of another geographical area (Jurua).
11. In this dialect, the negation particle *tu* — or an homophonous element — occurs in constituent and yes/no questions. In the Bia dialect the form of the interrogation particle is *yu*, whereas the negation particle remains *tu*. See below for two comparable examples.
12. As far as the Itaquai dialect is concerned. In the Bia dialect nominalizations are quite different in form, which suggests a diachronically recent innovation in at least one — presumably the former — dialect.
13. As to English gender in pronouns, the translations reflect the circumstances in which the examples occurred. Square brackets delimitate the postposition phrase. I have no explanation as to the need to code disjunct reference on the postpositional phrase in (50) but not on the external argument of (47). Intersentential coreference is another domain of preferred pivots involving patient.
14. *Mokawa*, ‘gun’, and *hak*, ‘house’, are monovalent nouns — i.e. nouns unable to head a phrase containing a genitive. To do so, they must let a generic relational noun (GRN) *-wa* mediate between them and the genitive expression, be it a per-

-
- son prefix, as in the example, or a case marked lexical noun. Usually, non human nouns as internal arguments of post-positions do not take the case mark -na=.
15. I assume a diachronic link between both functions, plausibly a nominalizer surviving in subordination but reanalyzed as aspect in main verb.
 16. A possible alternative interpretation (raising) is suggested in Queixalós (2010). Since in terms of hierarchy the conclusion remains untouched — patient privileged —, I will not go into details here .
 17. Phonologically, these utterances are organized as /iti##ninwu##idi:k/, and /donman##ninwu##adu/. Similarly to the case marker -na=, the dependence marking suffix -nin has endured a diachronic process of head attraction, leaving its grammatical host to phonologically bind to the phrase syntactic head that immediately follows it. Consistently with the stand taken in footnote 4, and even at the cost of introducing some diachrony in a synchronic account, I let grammatical structure considerations override phonological structure ones in presenting the examples.
 18. Which means that, for the construction with a divalent complement clause at least, this argument is no semantic participant at all of the syntactically main verb. This is the point in favor of a raising reading of this structure, in spite of the atypicality of the putative raising verb.
 19. At first sight in line with Givón's (1997 : 34) statement that formal properties reflect “more faithfully” grammatical relations; in fact qualitatively different in that, for me, this is not a question of more or less.
 20. Only the Bia dialect allows for the oblique patient antipassive. Several hints converge to the idea that, regarding the evolution of ergativity, this dialect could be more conservative than Kanamari.
 21. See this postposition as purpose subordinator in (51).
 22. Here I wish to posit a distinction between event: conditions of existence endowed with 1) dynamicity, 2) spatio-temporal coordinates, and 3) one or more participant(s), and activity, that is: conditions of existence serving to characterize an entity because they involve that entity in a repetitive or (more or less) exclusive manner.
 23. First person as external argument frequently remains unrealized in spontaneous speech.
 24. With the exception of ‘say’ clauses, see Introduction.
 25. Recall the slightly different form for the interrogative pronoun and particle in both dialects.
 26. The basic meaning of *tohi:k* is just ‘look at’. It is still unclear what particular kind of pragmatic emphasis this form — *an-nin*, copula-dependence — conveys.
 27. Or, putting it differently, that noun and verb phrases have different syntactic statuses.
 28. The grammatical status of *niama* is unclear here. This particle serves as discourse connector ‘then’, and also as purpose subordinator, as it seems to do here in spite of the lack of the dependence verbal suffix -nin in the example. Maybe a more accurate translation could be ‘I want a gun. Then I’ll shot wild pigs’, but then the problem would be the absence of the future particle *wa*.
 29. Quote marks are for non prototypical agent and patient required by this particular verb.
 30. The inverted angles notation is used for obligatory but disjunctive occurrence: <x> y >z< stands for xy, yz, *y, *xyz, that is: either x or z must occur.
 31. These aspects are akin to imperfectivity, a common feature of antipassives. Imperfectivity plausibly accounts for the observed slightly higher frequency of the durative (-nin) in antipassive clauses. I was led to check this point after a remark by K. Haude.