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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A(G)</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Aktionsart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative case morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrP</td>
<td>agreement phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
<td>auxiliary (verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative case morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Exceptional Case Marking (AcI; Accusativus cum Infinitivo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Extended Projection Principle (universal principle for clausal subject realization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eV</td>
<td>ergative (unaccusative) verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Government and Binding theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iV</td>
<td>intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Linear Crossing Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mC</td>
<td>middle construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Minimalist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mV</td>
<td>middle verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>negative polarity item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEP</td>
<td>ongoing event passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Optimality Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(AT)</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(REP)</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>passive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>active past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>past passive morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>passive past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>privileged syntactic argument (acting as the pivot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>quantifier phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-expression</td>
<td>referential expression/noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>reflexive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>resultative passive (German Zustandspassiv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRR</td>
<td>Role and Reference Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rV</td>
<td>reflexive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rgveda (Vedic Sanskrit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/E/R</td>
<td>speaker/event/reference time point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQA</td>
<td>Specific Quantified Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense-aspect-modality (system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>(semantic role) theme; (discourse) thema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>tense phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tV</td>
<td>transitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>(small) verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>(big) verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XN</td>
<td>Extended now (meaning of English present perfect form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ₁, Θ₂</td>
<td>theta role: 1=subject-, 2=direct object-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction: Passivization and typology

Form vs. function – a confined survey into the research status quo

Werner Abraham
Universität Wien, Austria

1. Background: Is the passive a unified phenomenon?

1.1 Passive and information structure

This introduction focuses on the grammatical opposition between form and meaning of the lexical and grammatical components of passivization. The specific claim is that ‘pragmatic-functional perspectives’ have little, if anything, to do with the form and derivational mechanics of passivization although admittedly discourse-functional and fine semantic components and triggers affect the usage of passives in considerable measure (as certain contributions to this volume will demonstrate). It is beyond doubt that ‘word-order free’ languages such as Russian or German – i.e., languages where, as opposed to English, any part of speech can move into the clause-initial (or any other) position to indicate non-basic (thus, contrastive, topicalized) focus. Languages with lesser freedom of word order such as English will need (split) clefts or stacks thereof – or passives – to achieve the same goal of appropriate contextualization. In other words, there may be languages which, for reasons of an appropriate information structure (establishing text Themata vs. text Rhemata), will not even have to possess passive form such as Chinese (Peltomaa, this volume) or Thai (Prasithrathsint, this volume). The pragmatic-informational goals may be achieved by grammatically simpler means such as movement within the simple sentence, CP, or beyond the simple sentence, i.e., by CP-expansion (Rizzi 1997; van Gelderen 2003 for diachronic accounts within one and the same language) of the base (merged) structure, thus maintaining active voice in the clause (as in Russian, Polish, and German) or by applying structures that make use of semantic notions such as adversativity (Chinese, Thai; see Prasithrathsint in this volume). In languages of the first type, German and Russian, formal passivization may then remain reserved for purposes other than information structure: e.g., for ex-
pressing certain functions of aspect/Aktionsart (see Frajzyngier 1982, 2004; Abraham & Leiss (in this volume)).

1.2 Semantic mapping and other functional accounts – passive by form vs. passive by sense

Passive and passivization, as other constructions and their derivations, have different aspects of formal and of semantic and/or eventive identification. It goes as common sense by now to ascribe the core characteristics in (1) to passivization (Cinque 1974; Siewierska 1984; Shibatani 1985, (ed.) 1988; Haspelmath 1990; Andersen 1994; Givón 1994; Cennamo 2004; among others).

(1) a. Passives are agent-defocussing; this entails Agent suppression and (Direct) Object-orientation and reduction by one valence place: e.g., detransitivization;
   b. Passivization entails predicative stativization (under a perfective-resultative perspective and marked verbal morphology);
   c. Passivization entails subjectivization of a non-Agent (Patient/Recipient, an original DO/IO);
   d. Passivization entails topicalization of a non-Agent (e.g., for more adequate context fit with respect to thema continuation);
   e. Passivization presupposes the affectedness of the surface subject (implied by Agent loss and Patient promotion);
   f. Passivization may be sensitive to perfective aspect (e.g., where the object referent in the passive accusative allows for no reading other than result, while the finite verb *furon* “(they) become” must still have full lexical verb status, i.e., it is not an auxiliary; cf. the predicative, accusative marked resultative participle of Latin in (2) below);
   g. Passives never go without special morphological marking: either from a separate passive or medial paradigm by Aux+verbal Anterior (participial form), or by virtue of reflexive suffixation – in certain languages even as an unbound reflexive morpheme.
   h. Passives are detransitivizers both in terms of designated theta roles and as syntactic valence determinants. In other words, passives reduce the valence of a predicate by the designated external, or subject, argument. The fact that the internal argument next in designated line/numeration promotes to obtain the subject function in the syntactic passive or the lexical decausative follows from general clause-formation principles (e.g., the ‘Extended Projection Principle’ in Generative Grammar): Clauses and verb valences without (designated nominative) subjects are highly marked and seem fragile.

Farrell’s (2005:66) definition is somewhat more laconic: “A clause is said to be passive if it

a. is an intransitive clause of a type that functions as a systematic alternative to some more basic transitive clause type, and if
b. the dependent that would be the A[(gent)] in the basic clause type does not have any A/S[subj]/O[obl] function.
Farrell’s definition comes short of the phenomenon of ‘impersonal passives’, which do not detransitivize a basic transitive in the first place. Surveys as that by Shibatani (1985, 1988) are not exhaustive as will be demonstrated presently. Compare that (1a–e) appear to be violated in as much as the illustration (2) from Old Sardinian does not satisfy these criteria.

(2) Old Sardinian

\[\text{furon} \quad \text{binkitos} \quad \text{parentes} \quad \text{de piscopu...}\]

\[\text{got.3pl} \quad \text{defeated,ACC.MASC} \quad \text{the parents,ACC.MASC} \quad \text{by the bishop...}\]

(Cennamo 2004:2)

There is no subject nominative in (2), the accusative object has been maintained as in the basic active clause although the original Agent subject appears in demoted instrumental form (prepositional ablative), and plural agreement in the finite predicate, \textit{furon}, is not formally (albeit semantically) vindicated. Thus, (1) is short of the entirety of passive properties that need to be analyzed and accounted for cross-linguistically. Furthermore, one can develop principled methodological qualms with a few of the components in (1): Are they only necessary or even sufficient for the identification of passive? What alters on the theta status except that the Patient moves to the subject position? The latter is implied by promotion of clause membership. Why, next to stativization, not also eventiveness with the adjectival passive? Furthermore, as (2) illustrates, neither Topicalization nor Subjectivization of the agent (AG) are necessary concomitants of the passive. Much rather, the main component is detransitivization or valence reduction for the highest “structural argument/valence actant”. For German, no doubt, semantic agentivity of the predicate is a necessary prerequisite for passivization – does this hold for other languages also?

It could therefore be assumed that the list in (1a–h) allows for modifications in certain respects such as retention of the (D)O-status (often dependent upon the referential status of the (D)O-NP violating (1c), while maintaining (1e)). In many modern languages, the perfectivity characteristic is missing to the extent that the combination of a stative auxiliary and the Anterior participle does not, or no longer, refer to aspectual resultativity as is the case in Modern Standard English. In one of the grammatical passives of German (stative or adjectival passive as well as ‘impersonal passive’), however, the aspectual perfective qualities are still intact. The same holds for the analytically formed passive in Russian. The fact that passives with overt expression of the Agent are rare cross-linguistically (Siewierska 1984:35) implies that, indeed, passives are used to subjectivize and topicalize those NPs that would not be topics otherwise. Notice, however, that this cannot be generalized. There are plenty of languages that topicalize just any argument or adverbia for contextual fit without any such need to make those subject. In other words, it would be wrong to recognize the NP-reorganization as a universal triggering property of the passive for the simple reason that languages have different means to topicalize for context fit. For passivization, subjectivization, or promotion of an internal argument, is just an epiphenomenon used at an interface that is outside of core grammar (namely, discourse fit).
1.3 Between active and passive: Reduced transitivity – semantic mapping

Though the passive features in (1) above may seem to converge with most other characterizations there are yet questions to be answered which arise under quite different views on passives such as certain functional and form-meaning relating approaches: Is the passive a unified phenomenon? Based on, and extending, mechanisms such as “passive situation types” and “semantic mapping” (Croft 2001:317; Kemmer 1993:147–149; Haspelmath 2003:231, and others), Sansó (2003:76), this volume; see Tables 1 and 2) arrives at the following squishy division of passive types and representations across certain Romance languages.

(3) a. patient-oriented process: Italian
   (che) Paolo sia stato eletto bibliotecario sessant’anni fa
   “Paul was appointed librarian 60 years ago”

b. bare happening: Italian
   Sono stati dispiegati anche Italiani
   “Also some Italians were deployed”

c. generic potential passive: French Norwegian
   Cela ce ne dit pas – Lysene lyser (hver kveldi)
   “This is not said” “The lights are lit (every night)”

Let us see what remains unaccounted for under such a functional account. See (4).

Table 1. Semantic event typing (Sansó 2003:84)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient-oriented process passive</th>
<th>Bare happening passive</th>
<th>Generic-potential passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Medium; high degree of elaboration</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Non-human, diffuse entity, low individuation, none/low salience</td>
<td>Not encoded; de-emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Human, high affectedness, low volition, high individuation, high salience</td>
<td>Low compactness, low individuation, none/low salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Reals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Formal passive typing: typological comparison (Sansó 2003:90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient-oriented process passive</th>
<th>Bare happening passive</th>
<th>Generic-potential passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Periphrastic passive (mainly SV)</td>
<td>Periphrastic passive (often VS); (мм passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Periphrastic passive (мм passive)</td>
<td>мм passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(4) (1a–h) as well as Tables 1+2 leave unaccounted for:

a. auxiliary change (Spanish ser-estar/German sein-wenden/Gothic wesan-wairban) and the respective change of syntactic distribution and semantic reading;

b. aspectual constraints; the agentivity criterion as a requirement for passivization in sundry, but not all, languages;

c. the existence of the ' impersonal' passive (currirur “it-is run”) in some, but not all languages;

d. case as well as function and theta role identification in the framework of promoté vs. demóté arguments.

Above all, we have no response to indispensable questions like:

e. What is behind all these typological differences (diachronic state of grammaticalization)?

f. How come that the periphrasis could evolve as a passive in the first place?

g. What is the link between reflexive (MM) passive and periphrastic passive?

h. How come that the preterit participle is serving both the perfect active and the present passive (unambiguous implementation)?

i. Are the passive types (Table 2) atomic, underivable notions or are they derivable from their syntactic form and argument (agent – patient) distribution? What are passive characteristics that would make these features derivable or even epiphenomenal?

j. What is pragmatic, what is grammatical about these phenomena?

k. Does a discourse criterion (Thema vs. Rhema status) come into play, and if so, how?

l. How come that the Prepositional Infinitival (is to beat) has passive meaning? etc.1

The attempt will be made in this introduction to answer these questions.

2. The Passive between two conflicting explanations: Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics

2.1 Traditional argument down-typing or basic aspectual condition?

The derivation of what is generally called Passive is not a uniform construction across languages. Apart from the fact that not all languages have a straightforward passive morphology (Hungarian, Chinese, Thai, Korean, among many others: for an overview, see Siewierska 1984, for Thai see Prasithrathsint, in the present volume), it is morphologically simple – i.e., suffixal – in some languages, but periphrastic in others as in many Indo-European languages. Furthermore, in some languages, there are two different passive forms (periphrastic, reflexive: cf. Russian, Scandinavian) with slightly different meanings and functional uses. Some languages, such as German, can passivize only when the basic subject is an agent; other languages do not appear to have this requirement, such as Modern English (compare English As soon as the station was arrived at . . . and German *Sobald auf der Station angekommen wurde, . . .). Also, the history of the passive in some languages, such as the Germanic ones, shows that Ante-
rior participles that are ambiguous today between an active past and a passive reading
were not at all ambiguous in earlier stages such as in Gothic and Old High German.

In order for a predicate to be passivized, the continental West-Germanic languages
and Latin require one lexical external argument (the designated subject argument),
whereas languages such as English, French, and Russian (for Russian on the com-
posite passive, not the reflexive passive) require one external and one internal argument
(i.e., subject and (direct) object). Cross-classified to this criterion and on top of this
argument requirement, passives in German and Russian are subject to aspectual con-
straints – quite distinctly different from English. Including historical levels, languages
such as German need to be seen as a coding system whose original aspectual paradigm
was visibly manifest and without exceptions, with Old High German, its latest stage,
doing without any passive syntax, and from which Modern Standard German emerged
with composite passivization and without paradigmatically manifest aspect (albeit
with sufficient lexical Aktionsart classification in terms of verbal particles and lo-
cal/temporal resultative predications). What does aspect and Aktionsart have to do
with passivization? If, indeed, there are links between passive diathesis and perfec-
tive aspect, what are the exact linking steps that lead from aspect to verbal gender,
and what does the diachronic scale look like on which the different languages locate
their passive-emergent characteristics? Abraham (in this volume) has discussed these
two questions under the title ‘Passive Argument hypothesis’ vs. ‘Passive Aspect hy-
pothesis’ entailing that passivization can be seen in some, but not other languages,
as deriving under the denominator of argument structure of the basic predication or
as deriving under criteria of aspectual distinctions. The ‘Argument hypothesis’ claims
that the criteria triggering passivization are manipulated by the argument structure of
the predicate to be derived diachetically. By contrast, according to the ‘Aspect hypothe-
sis’ passivization is aspect contingent. Abraham (this volume) claims that passivization
in Modern German can best be described by invoking conditions of perfective aspect
and Aktionsart. Any diachronic stage of bridging the two grammatical paradigms,
argument structural vs. aspect semantic, deserves our specific interest just as well as
typological differences along these lines.

In what follows the different routes sketched above are investigated somewhat
more deeply. The reason for this choice is two-fold. First, since Modern German as
well as Modern Dutch have a rather manifest lexical inventory of resultatives, the in-
vestigation of the Aspect Hypothesis for passivization in these two languages is at least
methodologically warranted. The typological route to follow is to see to what extent
passivization in German shares characteristics with aspects of passivization in Russian.
Second, since the predecessor stages of Modern German, Old High German (850–1050
AD) and Middle High German (1050–1350) as well as its remotest ancestor, Gothic
(300–500), were paradigmatic aspect languages without a clear formal passive, the
question becomes urgent as to how a grammar dominated by the aspectual system
expressed passive meanings in the first place and how, following the loss of aspec-
tual paradigms in Late Middle High German and Early Modern German, passivization
changed to become motivated and triggered by conditions of verbal argument struct-
ure. The latter view receives an extra motivating aspect given that modern regiolects and dialects of South German have limited expressions of the past to one composite preterit (dropping the original simple variant of the past altogether), simultaneously disconnecting the composite (periphrastic) past from its original perfective import. These are the phenomena that we will be concerned with in our following survey.

2.2 ‘Argument hypothesis’ vs. ‘Aspect hypothesis’

The following horizon has been drawn by Abraham (1995, 2005). The passive voice (passive diathesis) across (Indo-)Germanic has a striking property in so far as it employs a participial form which is ambiguous between a passive and a past active reading.

(5) *hat begonnen active anterior vs. ist begonnen (worden) passive anterior*

has begun has begun been

This observation is not new (see, for similar ideas, albeit less explicitly formalized, Andersen 1994; see Anagnostopoulou 2003 for a discussion of the stative passive in Modern Greek along the lines of Kratzer 2000, and see, finally, Rathert in this volume), but it has not been discussed in any detail for the West Germanic languages. German exhibits something peculiar to the extent that passive form and meaning in the historical predecessors, Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German were much more limited than in Modern German. ‘Passive sense’, in this pre-modern stage of German was restricted to perfective predicates. Passive sense emanated only on the basis of transitive verbs – something that does not hold for Modern German. The term ‘passive sense’ (as opposed to ‘passive morphology’), then, is more appropriate for the historical stages of German, as opposed to today’s German and English, where one simply says that “there is a passive” and that it is one of the verbal genders and that it is part of verbal diathesis – i.e., that it is co-classified with categories such as causative-decausative, transitive-reflexive-middle verb, transitive-detransitive, etc. How do we understand the shift from the aspectually laden object predication in the periods before Early Modern German to the verbal passive gender in Modern Standard German? Did the modern language add another verbal gender category out of the blue, as it were?

For the sake of ease and brevity, let us speak about the diachronic change sketched above in terms of the ‘diachronic passive riddle’ (DPR). The DPR circumscribes the unexplained phenomenon that in Modern German, all of a sudden, passive verbal gender emerges which had not existed before. Notice that one does not gain anything in explanatory quality by taking recourse to the terminology of verbal valence. The simple reason is that passivization does not consist of the reduction of the active valence by one argument position alone and, furthermore, that the original subject of the active voice changes its clausal status in the ‘passive diathesis’ promoting the original direct object – something that the term ‘argument inversion under passivization’ would in fact suggest. To be sure, the verbal arguments are inverted syntactically in some sense. But this is a very specific notion of inversion, one that is not to be identified with
the semantic inversion relation between geben 'give' and erhalten 'receive' given their thematic roles goal and agent.

The Passive riddle, DPR, receives extra urgency if learnability is considered. One can either assume that passive syntax is derived on the basis of the individually learned lexemes or that the acquisition of the abstract syntactic passive operation makes it possible that lexical elements can be learned alongside with their passive forms. It is an open question whether the child acquires the competence to disambiguate the two meanings of the Past participle morpheme any worse than the adult (Active-perfective vs. Passive reading). Clearly, this cannot be supported by the lexical acquisition hypothesis. The following three steps make evident that this would lead into an aporia even under the syntactic learning hypothesis. Take the homonymous past participle morpheme, PM, Dutch begonnen 'begun'.

(6) a. begonnen: Active, begonnen (hebben) 'begun have' vs. passive begonnen (gewor-den/zijn 'begun become / be')?

b. Aux-selection cannot contribute to a solution of (1a), since sein/zijn selected by begonnen triggers active as well as passive meaning: cf. that het is begonnen (it-is-begun(-become) = “it has been started” or active-perfective wij zijn 't begonnen 'we-are-it-begun' = “we have started”. Notice that it would be wrong to say that in Dutch (as in German), the Aux has a double function. What changes, and thereby disambiguates, is the selected context: direct object+PM in the active voice (wij zijn 't beginnen), on the one hand, and promotion of the direct object and, consequently, valence reduction, + inchoative (ge)worden making it passive, on the other hand (German Es ist begonnen worden).

c. Even the assumption that, under the criterion of object selection, what we have is either a passive participle or an active preterit participle, leads to an indeterminacy since beginnen is both one- and two-place (two-place with DO-ellipsis or one-place).

Whatever turn you give the problem, straightforward L1-learnability appears to be excluded for a number of verb lexemes such as Dutch beginnen "begin". Any decision, it appears, will have to be lexically based since the pure syntactic decision is not feasible. This, in turn, will not contribute to easy learnability in the first place. Easy L2-learnability is as implausible: There are languages that do not provide a passive in the sense of West Germanic in the first place.

2.3 Constructional components of the verbal passive in West Germanic: German, Dutch, and English

It may rightfully be speculated that the fact that the following characteristics have been taken to be necessary and indispensable criteria of passivization in the pertinent literature is not without scholastic bias. See for (7a–c) also Shibatani (1985) (albeit in different, i.e., non-generative terms), who did not include German, however.

(7) a. The Perfect participle morpheme (PPM) selects werden/worden/been or sein/zijn/be under the determining criterion of Aux-Selection.
b. Promotion of the clause member direct object (‘Case assignment principle for NP’); loss of Accusative government (‘bi-implicative Case assignment principle’). Determining criterion: Case filter – ‘no NP without case assignment’.

c. The original (lexically designated) external argument is demoted to a by-constituent (by a computational syntactic principle?); this basic external argument, εA, remains implicit even if it does not surface (in generative jargon: ‘Agent absorption by the passive morpheme’); the determining criterion in terms of generative syntax is: ‘Agent-Role is bound by the passive morpheme on the level of Logical Form’ (Logical Form: where the semantics of a structure is determined).

I take this list of passive voice properties to be highly metaphorical and, in fact, vague – i.e., ineffective for computational processing. Part of this unsatisfactory state is that it is not clear how (7a–c) are interlinked to one another. What, e.g., do (7a–c) have to do with object predication in Old High German (see (8a–c) below)? How does modern passivization emerge from it? How are the modal corollaries of passivization derived from the active source (see Ariji, in this volume)? Which interface links diathetic factors and categories with categories of discourse function – a topic in Mandarin Chinese (treated by Peltomaa, in this volume). Which interface properties need be addressed for non-passivizing languages such as Hungarian and Finnish vis-à-vis passives in the West Germania (German, Dutch, English)?

Since forms outside the composite passive with PPM share the passive sense, it will be argued that passivity cannot be determined by a passive form alone. This, in turn, leads to the question what it is that is shared by different forms such that passive sense can result. The claim will be that the passive construction components listed in (7a–c) are epiphenomena the central question being: How can the ambiguous PPM be represented and what are the disambiguating contextual clues? It will be claimed that the PPM, while always expressing Anteriority, nevertheless does not have a single fixed meaning. Rather, it is ambiguous, its definite sense being determined by contexts and selection.

The main question will be what is gained by descriptive steps like those in (7a–c) and how links can be established to languages which have no passive form in the first place and yet contextualize functionally just like passivizing languages. A main source of evidence will be formed by those languages which provide an unambiguous, since paradigmatically maintained, synthetic passive, such as Latin and Classical Greek. Recall that in languages with a composite passive the PM component proves to be ambiguous and in no way reliably representing passive diathesis. What, then, are the diathetic or other relations neighboring passivity with similar contextual functions? Answers to this array of questions are provided by Peltomaa (in this volume) on the discourse-functional (topic) nature of Mandarin passive-like constructions, by Prasithrathsint (in this volume) discussing discourse functional equivalents in Thai, by Salo (this volume) on the special polyfunctional derivative suffix -v to render passive meaning, and by Sasaki & Yamazaki (this volume) in terms of the agent removal
in spontaneous constructions imposed by the simplification of the logical structure of the predicate. Finally, but by far not in the least, it has to be pointed out that perfective aspect, or Aktionsart, plays a determining role in passivization in stages of West Germanic stages prior to the modern stages (Abraham, in this volume, for Modern German; Toyota & Mustafović 2005 (this volume) for several modern Slavic languages).

Let us consider the diachronic issue first. Given what we know from Old High German (and, likewise, Gothic and Middle High German, in the latter with lessening pervasiveness; cf. Abraham 1987, 1993) the syntactic difference is minimal. See (8). [Modern German (8) mirrors the well-known sentence by the Old High German scribe Notker].

(8) \[ \text{Er hat den Baum gepflanzt} \]

he has the tree planted

a. OHG. Structure:

\[ [cp \ 0 \ [c \ \text{habet}_i \ [v_p \ \text{ob/acc Baum} \ [a\text{dv/acc gepflanzot}_i]_i]_i]_i] \]

b. = Late Latin: \( \text{habet arborem plantat} \)

c1. Modern German:

\[ [cp \ Er \ [c \ \text{bekam}_i \ [v_p \ \text{do-acc den Baum}] \ [v \ \text{gepflanzt}_i]_i]_i] \]

c2. Structure for bekam gepflanzt "got planted":

\[ [cp \ Er \ [c \ \text{bekam}_i \ [v_p \ \text{do-acc den Baum} \ [a\text{dv/acc schon gepflanzt}_i]_i]_i]_i] \]

He got the tree as planted

“He got the tree as a planted one”

As to (8c2), consider the structural similarity with Modern Irish (Nolan, this volume). (8) provides a direct link to object predication in OHG and MHG the connection being a small-clause syntax and haben “have” as a full verb with postposed PPM inflected for nominal gender, case, and number, but without agreement with the direct object. Furthermore, there is formal homonymy between the OHG small clause construction in (8a) and the bekomen/got-passive in Modern German (8c2). Both (8a) and (8c2) are perfectivity based with perfectivity being expressed syntactically as an object predication in syntactic terms of a small clause. Notice that the account of the passive in German and Dutch in aspectual terms allows a well-motivated diachronic transfer from the oldest stages to the modern stage in semantically well-founded syntactic terms.

What is gained from the assumption that the passive meaning is derivable from the stative function of the PPM as well as that passivity cannot be deduced formally in any direct way? For one, the very question what changes in passive gender – the typical shift between active and passive morphology in terms as illustrated by (7a–c) – becomes meaningless. For what else should ‘Passive’ be as distinguished from the formal change of the verbal morpheme from \{haben/sein ‘have/be’\}Active to \{werden/sein ‘become/be’\}Passive and that, furthermore, the thematic structure (valence) is reduced syntactically while the semantic valence remains untouched? The fact that in the pas-
sive the promoted subject produces a new text topic (cf. the prominent place that this descriptive characteristic takes in Shibatani 1985) has nothing to do with the grammar on the clausal level. In languages that allow objects to be topicalized, such discourse functional effects could easily achieved by object topicalization without any shift of verbal voice. Such discourse functional properties have nothing to do with the passive verbal morphology: Consider the synthetic passive in Latin throughout all tenses and moods, which usually is not accompanied by object promotion. Likewise, consider the Russian reflexive-derived sja-passive suffix as well as the s-passive suffix in Scandinavian. This leads to an answer to the question how the ‘Passive’ emerges in the first place. The past participle morpheme, PPM, has lexically designated, fixed thematic and aspectual properties. From these properties, the non-agentivity of the dynamic passive reading, the aspectually motivated presupposition component, and the implied Agent are deduceable making the superfluous the question whether the PPM has a passive meaning in the first place. The PPM by itself is underdetermined with respect to an active and a passive reading. The pure stative meaning of the PPM excludes by implication any Agent valence. Given its stative meaning, the past participle has non-agentive adjectival status. See the contribution by Abraham (in this volume) as well as Abraham & Leiss (in this volume). Notice that such a chain of arguments leads to the more radical position that in languages with even fewer interface links, the conclusion is plausible and legitimate that the passive cannot be not derived from the active in any systematic way (see Ariji, in this volume, on Japanese).

Let us now address the 2nd defining component in (7b) above: The designated (lexically basic) Agent is demoted to non-obligatory prepositional constituent. It minimizes the computational quality that reductive processes of different sorts should yield further unavailability for secondary changes of diathesis: Agent (transitive) reflexives cannot be passivized as if Agent (transitive) reflexivization were deeply akin to passivization. Likewise, the ‘Agent absorption’ image (to all appearances a metaphorical loan from Relational/Arc-Pair-Grammar with their suggestive imagery) is too theory-biased to yield algorithmic usability. However, explanative, theory-independent power is yielded by saying that a PPM which has been recategorized to Adjective under sein/werden-selection (i.e., from [+V,-N], to [+V,+N]), cannot select an Agent as designated subject. However, some other meaning component of PPM as binder/implier of such a designated subject Agent or in some other clause-functional status cannot be excluded. What offers itself as a semantic role for the participle adjective as a resultant of a precedent emergent event is Source expressed by German von (for human originators), durch (for non-human object originators), Scandinavian av, French par, and for an event-accompanying P: Spanish para. Witness the lexical-syntactic parallel between the passive-accompanying von/durch-Agent and the pure lexical diathesis in (AG geb-/give- GOAL/REC) ⇒ (GOAL/REC erhalt-/receive [Source von/from/through AG]).

Finally, the specific Agent morphology between Active and Passive in the ergative languages is telling: Ergative morphology is derivable through preposition incorporation (Abraham 1993; Mahajan 1994). In other words, the Agent ergative – i.e., the non-pivot case in an ergative system – originally was a source-linked case: either geni-
tive or ablative in Latin. By contrast, the Absolutive as Pivot clause function carries the unmarked voice relationship between two-place and one-place unmarked verb forms.

West Germanic, among which specifically German, provide immediate distributional evidence for an aspectual basis for the passive derivate directly relating to the Aspect hypothesis. The specific Auxiliary constraint between Active and Passive distinguished on perfective vs. imperfective verbals cannot be accounted for in terms of predicative voice, or verbal gender, alone. See (9).

\[(9) \quad \text{Impperfective verb} \quad \text{Perfective (particle) verb}
\]
\[
a. \quad \text{der Wagen wird geschoben} \quad \text{der Wagen wird hineingeschoben}
\]
\[
\text{the wagon gets pushed} \quad \text{the wagon gets into-pushed}
\]
\[
b. \quad \text{der Wagen *ist geschoben} \quad \text{der Wagen ist hineingeschoben}
\]
\[
\text{the wagon is pushed} \quad \text{the wagon is into-pushed}
\]
\[
c. \quad \text{der *geschobene Wagen} \quad \text{der hineingeschobene Wagen}
\]
\[
\text{the pushed wagon} \quad \text{the into-pushed wagon}
\]
\[
d. \quad \text{der *getauchte Schwimmer} \quad \text{der untergetauchte Schwimmer}
\]
\[
\text{the dived swimmer} \quad \text{the under-dived swimmer}
\]

The selection of the auxiliary is lexically derivable for the mere reason that it is motivated by the lexical Aktionsart of the single verbal lexeme, i.e., by the opposition ‘telic vs. non-telic’. Consider again the sein/zijn-verb in (6a, b) in both diatheses as in Dutch Hij(Ag) is iets(TTh) begonnen/verloren/vergeten ‘is begun/lost/forgotten’ as Active-Perfective and likewise in Het(TTh) is begonnen/verloren/vergeten as Adjectival Passive-Perfective. Compare also verbs of movement in German such as (nach Athen) gelaufen/geschwommen sein ‘(to-Athens) run/swum-be’ vs. (den ganzen Tag) gelaufen haben ‘all-day-run-have’ or, respectively, das Buch durchgegangen sein ‘the-book -through-read-be’. Clearly, Aux selection as a diagnostic is not absolutely reliable in German. It is not the Aux selection alone that serves the unambiguity diagnostics. What counts is solely the lexeme-individual semantic aspectual event structure of the verb (sterben/__sein ‘die/__be’ vs. schwimmen/__haben ‘swim/__have’, or the predicate constituent, in den Graben gesprungen sein ‘into-the-moat-jumped-be’ vs. im Graben gesprungen haben ‘in-the-moat-jumped-have’). The fact that the Aux remains unchanged between Active and (state/adjectival) Passive, on the one hand, as in Dutch ... is [...] begonnen in (6) above and that, on the other hand, in passivization the subject simultaneously transfers from Agent to Patient/Thema, renders sufficient support for the conclusion that the Active-Passive-diathesis is at least aspectually codetermined. Finally, the Dutch deletion of the geworden-participle (see (6b)) is direct evidence for the ‘Perfect effect’ given that the inchoative phase denoted by the Perfect participle of the bi-phasic event predicate is straightforwardly implied by the adjectival participle + zijn ‘be’. This distribution suspends the distinction between the Event passive and the Static/Adjectival passive – cf. de veldslag is geslagen (?/*geworden) ‘the-battle-is-fought(-gotten’); geworden ‘been’ proves an unnecessary luxury for Dutch. This is mirrored in the sein/be-selector of etymologically cognate verbs in early phases of German (Behaghel 1924:§647–650).
Let us first get an idea what the lexical and syntactic passive forms in English, Swedish, German, and Russian are like.

3. The principled event semantics of verbal gender/voice

3.1 Personal vs. impersonal, dynamic vs. statal (event) passive

In Russian, the periphrastic Passive is motivated exclusively by aspect (i.e., by perfectivity of the predicate to be passivized, as opposed to the simple, synthetic passive, which is derived by means of a reflexive suffix, -sya). The very same opposition held for older stages in Germanic, i.e. Gothic and Old High German until right into Middle High German. From among the auxiliaries accompanying the passive form, one has to distinguish by form:

(10) a. from among the dynamic Auxiliaries those with German werden.pres.inf/geworden.ppm “become/get-become/gotten”, Swedish bli/blev (PPA)-bliven (PPP); Dutch worden.pres.inf/geworden.ppm;
b. from the Copulae those with German sein.pres.inf – gewesen.ppm, Dutch zijn.pres.inf – geweest.ppm, Russian byt.pres.inf – byl--.ppm, English be.pres.inf – been.ppm;
c. from among the Reflexive morphemes free ones: German sich, Norwegian sig; and bound ones: Scandinavian -s, Russian -syna.

In general, bound Reflexive morphemes can only bind the promoted internal theta role. In German, however, even the free Reflexive can (but need not) bind the (demoted) external theta role (inevitably Agent), as is the case for the medial construction and medial verbs. As argued before, in an aspectually motivated Passive scenario such as in Russian, there is no impersonal passive – a Russian iV cannot be passivized (somewhat, but not totally, opposed to Polish; cf. Frajzyngier 1982).

What is the distribution of synthetic vs. periphrastic passives across the three languages we are looking at more closely? See Table 3 below (see also Andersson 1998).

Notice that no impersonal ‘Passive’ is formed of the analytic Passive form in Swedish and Russian – except in German. There is a logic to this once we consider the original inchoative status of the dynamic Aux werden “become/get” as periphrastic finiteness support. As a full verb, werden has maintained its perfective status. As such, it exists only in German and Dutch (worden – geworden). Russian budet, the translation equivalent of German werden, is the future form of the copula – which is not equivalent in the first place. This makes the passives in German and Russian profoundly different.

3.2 Lexical and syntactic reflexivization -s- verbs and reflexive constructions

There are different distributional restrictions. Syntactic reflexivization is grammatical binding the demoted external argument role (Agent). German has not developed
Table 3. Passive between Reflexive Passive and periphrastic composition [tV = transitive verb, iV = intransitive verb]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive form</th>
<th>event passive</th>
<th>impersonal 'Passive'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>werden+Past Participle</td>
<td>Das Haus wurde gebaut ___ __tV</td>
<td>Es wurde getanzt ___ __tV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-like 'Medium':</td>
<td>Ein solches Haus baut (es!) ___iV</td>
<td>Polkas tanzt es/tanzen sich ___iV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no aspect differentiation</td>
<td>sich nicht <em>(leicht)</em> fertig ___iV</td>
<td><em>(leicht)</em>: Es tanzt sich gerne ___iV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Such a house does not finish building easily” ___iV</td>
<td>Polka “Polkas dance easily” ___iV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blir+ Past Participle</td>
<td>Huset blev byggt ___ __ __ __ __</td>
<td>0 (*Det blev danset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal stem++</td>
<td>Huset bygdes “The house was built” ___</td>
<td>Det dansades “There was dancing” ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective V:</td>
<td>Dom stroilsya “The house was being built”</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stem+syra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective V: byt’+ Past Participle</td>
<td>Dom byl postroen “The house was finished building”</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>(po)stroi’sya “finish building”</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the same way as Scandinavian or Russian given that medial constructions (mC) and medial verbs (mV) both use the free reflexive morpheme. See (11)–(14) below.

(11) Die Diva[+TH] unterhält sich[+AG] nicht leicht ... middle construction (mC)
“the diva is easy to entertain”

(12) Der Baum[+TH] biegt *(sich)[+AG] | ... middle verb (decausative)
“the tree bends”

(13) Die Bodenturnerin[+AG] biegt sich[+TH] ... reflexive tV (causative)
“the floor gymnast bends”

(14) Er[+AG] wäscht sich[+TH] ... thematic reflexive anaphor
“he washes (himself)”

Despite the differences (see, partly, Andersson 1998), these are the shared characteristics: The true, thematically independent Reflexivization in German – (13)–(14) above – is on a par with syntactic Reflexive Passives in Swedish and Russian to the extent that such reflexive suffixation exclude passivization. See (15) below as well as Table 4.

(15) a. Er wäscht sich
he washes himself

b. *Er wird *(sich)* gewaschen
he is (himself) washed
Introduction: Passivization and typology

Table 4. The reflexive morpheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphological Reflexive</th>
<th>Syntactic Reflexive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German –</td>
<td>*sie trafen <em>(sich)</em>; *die Lage verändert <em>(sich)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“they met”; “the situation changes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch –</td>
<td>*de situatie verandert <em>(sich)</em> “the situation changes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French –</td>
<td>*le sonnet[+rux] &quot;entend de loin &quot;the sound is audible from far”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish de träffades “they meet”; läget förändrades “the situation changed”</td>
<td><em>de träffade sig; förändrade sig</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian (oni) vstretil’s “they meet”; polotenie izmenilo “the situation changed”</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was argued (Abraham 1995:Ch. 12) that this is due to a deep Coreference Criterion saying that co-referent arguments cannot be passivized despite distinct theta roles for external and internal structural arguments (\(\text{AG} \neq \text{TH}\)): \(\text{AG}\) and \(\text{TH}\) share identical reference excluding satisfaction of the Semantic Transitivity Criterion (i.e., that, with proper passivization, an object or property must transfer from the external argument (clausal subject) to the internal argument (direct object)). Proper anaphoric reflexives, thus, disallow passivization because they fail to satisfy semantic transferability from the Agent to the bearer of the thematic object. In line with this criterion, middle constructions as well as middle verbs cannot be passivized.

3.3 Typology of argument reduction

Table 5 displays the different modes of argument reduction in German and English both lexically and syntactic (Abraham 1997).

Table 5. Typology of argument reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>tV: [(\Theta_1, \Theta_2)] =&gt; iV: [(\Theta_2)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [(\Theta_1, \Theta_2)] =&gt; passive iC: [(\Theta_2, (by \Theta_1))]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [(\Theta_1, \Theta_2)] =&gt; mC: [(\Theta_2)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [(\Theta_1, \Theta_2)] =&gt; tV (ellipsis): [(\Theta_1, (\Theta_2))]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [(\Theta_1, \Theta_2)] =&gt; mV: [(\Theta_2, (sich))]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>itV: [(\Theta_1, (\Theta_2))] =&gt; mC: [(\Theta_2, (sich))]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>itV: [(\Theta_1, (\Theta_2))] =&gt; Passive: [(\Theta_2)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Abbreviations and explanations: iC= intransitive (verbal) construction (e.g., im Saal tanzen “dance in the hall”); mV= medial verb (vgl. der Baum) biegt sich “the tree bends); mC = medial construction (e.g., (civil servants) bribe easily or (crispy bread) bakes not so easily); V\(_n\)=n-place verb; (i)tV=(in)transitive verb; V= Verb (V\(_n\)), C= construction or constituent (of some maximal verb projection, VP or VP); \(\Theta_1\) denotes the theta role for the external argument (subject); \(\Theta_2\) denotes the theta role of the structural object, i.e. the internal argument]
Legend for Table 5:

Line 1: If an English verb detransitivizes (tV > iV), not only is the range of arguments reduced, but the basic object role, $\Theta_2$, is promoted to the derived subject making the verb one-less-place. This is a lexical process since in the derivation two lexical paradigms are involved.

Line 2: The identical type of detransitivization is undergone in passivization the only difference being that the process is controlled not in the lexicon, but in morphosyntax and in semantics.

Line 3: Reanalysis of an English transitive verb, tV, into a medial construction, mC, likewise detransitivizes with an identical valence result, i.e., valence reduction. It is assumed, however, that this is not a syntactic derivation due to the highly modal semantics of the middle construction (Officials bribe easily “officials CAN be bribed easily”). Detransitivation of tV to middle verbs, mV, however, does not carry this modal semantics.

Line 4: If a German transitive verb, tV, superficially realizes only the subject, not however the structural (direct) object, DO, nothing changes semantically. The invisible VP-internal $\Theta$-role retains its argument position in Logical Form. Some quantification of the DO referent will always be implied and reconstructed. This is crucial for the semantic interpretation: The syntactic passive retains the basic Agent in a durch/by-prepositional constituent. In the lexical process, however, as illustrated in line 6, the basic Agent is only lexically implicit; no prepositional constituent can be projected as an Agent adverbial.

3.4 Direct object (DO) accusative retained with the Passive

As illustrated in (17) and (18), the object accusative need not promote to subject.

(16) Inget besked-subj/do gavs oss/vi ... Swedish
     Kein(*en) Bescheid wurde gegeben uns/*wir ... German
     No.nom/*acc instruction was given us/we

(17) Es wird anständig der-subj/dem-do Popo gewaschen ... German
     it is properly the.nom/the.acc backside cleaned

(18) Vi/oss gavs not besked ... Swedish
     we/us were/was given no instruction

(19) *Wir/uns wurde(n) kein Bescheid gegeben ... German
     we/us was/were no instruction given

Unpromoted DO-accusative is usually only acceptable if the object is predicate-incorporated – a phenomenon sometimes tough to distinguish. In any case, the reference determiner of the structural object is usually indefinite (unlike in (17), though).
4. Accompanying auxiliaries: Possessive HAVE

HAVE is an auxiliary for transitives and imperfective intransitives in all Germanic languages. But it has also retained its old status as a full verb. Possessive verbs like haben “have” are agentless, but transitive. Since passivization presupposes agentivity in German, not, however, in English,

(20) a. This can be had; this is to be had; this is to have – see the difference to (20b)

b. *... kann gehabt werden

   can had become

   German

c. ... ist zu haben

   is to have

German

Clearly, (20c) raises the question how come that prepositional infinitives (gerunds) can receive passive readings. Is this a context-induced phenomenon? Has it to do with the fact that, due to a principled underspecification of non-finites (such as past participles and present P-infinitives), the surface mention of Agent-PPs serves as a disambiguator in the first place?

See the typological passive and medial distributions of quasi-possessive transitive HAVE in Table 6.

Table 6. HAVE-Passivization and other possessives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: analytic Passive</th>
<th>*wird gehabt “gets had”</th>
<th>*wird besessen “becomes possessed”</th>
<th>*wird bekommen “becomes gotten”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passive-like Middle</td>
<td>(Was) hat (es damit an) sich? “What is it about?” (Damit) hat sich’s “That’s it”</td>
<td>besitzt sich (nicht ohne Kummer) “One does not own this without worries”</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian: analytic Passive only with perfective transitives</td>
<td>imeetsya “gets had”</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>polučaetsya “becomes gotten”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish: analytic (blir) Passive synthetic (reflexive)</td>
<td>*blir havd “gets had”</td>
<td>*blir ägd “becomes possessed”</td>
<td>*blir fådd “becomes gotten”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>has “gets had”</td>
<td>ägs “becomes possessed”</td>
<td>fås “becomes gotten”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Passive derived from underspecified categories: Embedded (zu “to”+ ) infinitive as key to passive readings?

Sansó (in this volume) as well as Wiemer (in this volume) investigate whether or not the specific PP-Agent chômeur can be accounted for in syntax independent terms. However, the question is whether it can be explained syntactically in the first place.
See the demoted Agent von ihm “by him” in (21b) below. The voice of the infinitive machen is active.

(21) embedding lassen “let”:

a. Ich lasse ihn das machen
   I let him ACC AG that ACC TH do ... infinitive, ECM-subject

b. Ich lasse das von ihm machen
   I let that by him AG do ... infinitive, demoted actor

It might be questioned whether (21b) is in fact a passive. It is not formally, no doubt. Non-finites are voice hybrids on account of their blocking syntactically the subject (failing for the external argument to raise to the functional Tense or agreement category) – quite similarly the past participle, PPM. von ihm in (21b) is a free adjunct with the semantic SOURCE role. The determining evidence for the claim that infinitives are voice-underspecified is that there is no passive derivation from the simple past, nor are there passive derivations of all the periphrastic tense forms (future, pluperfect, past-in-the-future). Of course, this is obvious from there not being infinitival forms in these composite tenses in the first place (future, pluperfect, past-in-the-future, present perfect).

Notice that this yields the conclusion drawn by Abraham (in this volume) that the mere Argument Hypothesis as an explanation of the passive mechanics is not sufficient. If (active voice) infinitives have the same subject-theta absorption effect as passivized verbal morphology, the mere demotion and promotion of the basic structural arguments is not a sufficient identificatory property of PPMs in terms of passive voice.

The following table illustrates the different strategies some languages pursue in regard to non-finites rendering passive function.

Table 7. Infinitival passive reading without passive morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gerund</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Past Participle</th>
<th>Future Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 German</td>
<td>nichts ist zu hören/ *gehört zu werden (er ist) niets</td>
<td>zu sehen/*gesehen zu werden</td>
<td>zu fühlen/*gefühl zu werden</td>
<td>ist zu merken/*ist gemerkt zu werden is te zien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dutch</td>
<td>(er is) niets (om) te horen/*om gehoord te worden</td>
<td>niets om te zien/*om gezien te worden</td>
<td>niets om te voelen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 German</td>
<td>*nichts ist sich zu hören</td>
<td>*ist sich zu sehen</td>
<td>*ist sich anzufühlen</td>
<td>ist sich zu merken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 English</td>
<td>nothing to hear/to be heard</td>
<td>to see/to be seen</td>
<td>to feel/to be felt</td>
<td>to (be) realize(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Swedish: periphrastic passive</td>
<td>inget *blir hört</td>
<td>*blir sett</td>
<td>*blir känt</td>
<td>*blir märkt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Swedish: s-passive</td>
<td>inget hörs</td>
<td>ses; syns</td>
<td>käns</td>
<td>märks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Russian</td>
<td>ničego ne slyšitsya</td>
<td>vidneetsya</td>
<td>čustvuetsya</td>
<td>zamečuetsya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice, first, that in German, the reflexive P-infinitive, *ist sich zu hören*, is ungrammatical; second that, by contrast, English has an active as well as a passive P-infinitive with passive meaning; and, third, that both Swedish and Russian have the reflexive equivalent. This appears to indicate that there is a semantic slot for a morphological form rendering the passive meaning of the German P-infinitive in *nichts ist zu hören* and Dutch *(om) te horen* in the formal passive paradigm. All that German and Dutch do is either suppressing or deleting the lexically designated external argument. This happens through non-finiteness (i.e., no raising trigger to AgrP/TP) or by nominal government in the infinitival PP (cf. the gerundial form *zum Hören/Sehen/Anfühlen/ Merken* (*TO.NOMINAL DAT hear/see/feel/sense*) in the German substandard replacing throughout the infinitive of (written) Standard German). In other words, there are several distinct semantic and syntactic configurations triggering passive meaning. The English/German/Dutch prepositional infinitival *zu/*(om) *te/to*V appears to trigger passivity due to its lexical locational allativity, which mimics the aspectual inchoative phase of perfective predicates (not only verbs). Thus, the P-infinitive is telic on account of the preposition *to*. It is concluded on the basis of this that passivity is basically a composite aspectual. This is the main conclusion in the contributions by Abraham ("Aspect vs. Argument Hypothesis", this volume) as well as Abraham & Leiss (this volume).

6. Wrap-up: Comparison of passive forms

Let us see briefly in Table 8 how the non-transitive passives distribute between the three languages German, Swedish, and Russian. In line with our line of argument in the previous chapter, the lexical examples in Table 8 below have been chosen with the aim to exclude any eventive transfer of action both lexically and periphrastically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lexical classification</th>
<th>form</th>
<th>Periphrastic Passive</th>
<th>Synthetic s(yu)-Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive verb: <em>HAVE</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verba sentiendi/Psych-verbs (no Agent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial verb: <em>sich verändern</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>REFL</em> alter &quot;change&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical Reciprocal: <em>sich treffen</em> <em>REFL</em> meet &quot;meet&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognate tv: <em>beißen</em> &quot;bite&quot;; <em>stoßen</em> &quot;push&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recall that the Russian reflexive passive is always imperfective; no perfective predicate can form a reflexive passive. Yet, the Russian imperfective passive is never impersonal – there is no impersonal passive in Russian (as opposed, e.g., to Polish; see Frajzyngier 1982). Evidently, impersonal passives are always human-agent derived due to their implicative semantics (Kirsner 1976; Frajzyngier 1982), a fact that appears to make them autonomous, i.e. non-derived passive forms in the first place. Russian imperfective passives are from the reflexive suffix paradigm when the subject is an agent. As opposed to German, the agent has been demoted and the basic direct object has replaced the former agent subject.

Strikingly enough and to all appearances beyond chance, the passive periphrasis as well as coreference and transitive action transfer are in complementary distribution. This has been concluded when fathoming out the link between aspect and verbal gender (Abraham, in this volume; see also Toyota & Mustafović, in this volume, for Russian and a number of other Slavic languages). The main insight is that the meaning of the past participle (PPM) is active for imperfective predicates, but passive for perfective predicates. See again (4b, c, d) above. In either case, since divergent with respect to Aktionsart, the converging meaning of the PPM is that of state.

7. Predicative adjective or Stative (= resultative) passive? Categorial options

The determining question to be asked is what category the stative passive belongs to. See the similarity between (22b) and (22c), which invites the inference of the category status of an adjective: The letter is opened/open.

(22) a. \[
\text{Der Brief wird geöffnet} \]
   \[\text{... event passive}\]

b. \[
\text{Der Brief ist geöffnet} \]
   \[\text{... adjectival '(passive)}\]

c. \[
\text{Der Brief ist offen} \]
   \[\text{... predicative adjective}\]

Notice, first, that the usual claim that Agent-PPs are out for the AdjPass are not borne out (cf. Maienborn 2004). This seems to indicate that the complex [Cop/ ?Aux+PP] also relates to events. Notice that we have not decided yet what status the PP has: temporal Anterior/Past, verbal gender Passive, or Resultative? Only the latter presupposes a particular Aktionsart or Aspect, namely that of telicity/terminativity/perfectivity. Compare (23)–(26).

(23) a. \[
\text{Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt} \]
   \[\text{the newspaper is by a child made}\]
   \[\text{... von-Agent}\]

b. \[
\text{Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind schön} \]
   \[\text{the newspaper is by a child beautiful}\]

(24) a. \[
\text{Die Unterlagen sind vom Chef kontrolliert} \]
   \[\text{the documents are by the boss checked}\]
   \[\text{... von-Agent}\]

b. \[
\text{Die Unterlagen sind vom Chef korrekt} \]
   \[\text{... mit-Instrumental}\]

(25) a. \[
\text{Der Brief war mit roter Tinte geschrieben} \]
   \[\text{the letter was with red ink written}\]

Notice, first, that the usual claim that Agent-PPs are out for the AdjPass are not borne out (cf. Maienborn 2004). This seems to indicate that the complex [Cop/ ?Aux+PP] also relates to events. Notice that we have not decided yet what status the PP has: temporal Anterior/Past, verbal gender Passive, or Resultative? Only the latter presupposes a particular Aktionsart or Aspect, namely that of telicity/terminativity/perfectivity. Compare (23)–(26).
b. *Der Brief war mit roter Tinte leserlich
   the letter was with red ink written legible

(26) a. Die Birnen waren in Rotwein gedünstet
   the pears were in red wine steamed
   ... in-Local

b. *Die Birnen waren in Rotwein weich
   the pears were in red wine soft

The event-identifying PPs with different theta readings demonstrate beyond doubt that the complex [Cop/Aux+PP] has a verbal base.

(27) a. Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt worden
   the newspaper is by a child made become
   “The newspaper has been made by a child”

b. Die Unterlagen sind vom Chef kontrolliert worden
   the documents are by the boss checked become
   “The documents have been checked by the boss”

Is it then the case that all stative passives are elliptical event readings? This conclusion appears to be invited for English and Modern French. Italian and Spanish, on the other hand, have stative essere/-estar- and event venire-/ser-passives (Milan 1985). See (28) vs. (29).

(28) a. The drawing is (being) made by a child
   ... English

b. The documents are (being) checked by the boss


c. Les documents sont contrôlés par le chef
   ... French

d. Milites gubernatoris superati sunt
   soldiers general.gen overwhelmed.pp are
   “The soldiers of the general were defeated”

(29) a.1 I documenti vengono controllati dal capo
   the documents come checked by the boss
   “The documents are (being) checked by the boss”

   event passive with Aux venire

a.2 I documenti sono controllati dal capo
   the documents are stood checked by the boss
   “The documents are (being) checked by the boss”

   event passive with Cop essere

a.3 I documenti sono stati controllati dal capo
   the documents are stood checked by the boss
   “The documents have been checked by the boss”

   stative passive with Cop essere stato

b.1 La iglesia es cerrada a las once
   the church is being closed at 11

   event passive with copula ser

b.2 La iglesia está cerrada a las once
   the church is/has been closed at 11

   stative passive with copula estar

In German, copula passives are usually confined to perfective verbs. See (30a, b).
Der Wagen ist geschoben *(worden) ... schieben "push" = [–perf]
The cart is pushed (become)
"The cart is (being)/(has been) pushed"

b. Der Wagen ist hineingeschoben *(worden) ... hineinschieben "push in" = [+perf]
The cart is into-pushed (become)
"The cart is (being) pushed in/(has been pushed in)"

For this aspect driven difference see Abraham (in this volume). Notice that being in English does not elicit the same semantics as *(ge)worden* in German: The former collapses speech time, S, and event/reference time, S/E/R, whereas the latter is clearly an Anterior, i.e., E/R < S (in Reichenbach’s terms). By the same token, *(ge)worden*, itself an Anterior/past participle, denotes an incremental event property, whereas being, a present participle, does not.

Traditionally in German grammar writing, stative passives have received the following distinct explanations.

a. Ellipsis of the event denotation:
Der Brief ist geöffnet *(worden)*
Structure: [Perfect-Aux. + verbal form]

b. Diathesis/voice/verbal gender:
Der Brief ist geöffnet as a consequence of Der Brief wird geöffnet.
Structure: [Stative passive-Aux. + verbal form]

c. Resultative:
Der Brief ist geöffnet presupposing Der Brief wurde geöffnet just as in Der Brief kommt an is followed by Der Brief ist angekommen.
Structure: [Resultative-Aux. + verbal form]

d. Kopula + Adjektiv:
Der Brief ist geöffnet on a par with Der Brief ist offen.
Structure: [Copula + deverbal adjective]

It is not implausible to see (31b) as the most straightforward answer to (23)–(26), whereas (31d) appears to be in need of extra motivation both empirically and structurally the main obstacle being that event-relating modifiers (such as in (23)–(26) above) are incompatible with the category of adjective. The PPMs in (23)–(26) are all resultatives implying a prior incremental event phase. Adjectival category status is confirmed by the possibility to prefix the privative un-, while by/ von/durch+AGENT phrases (as in (23)–(26)) are indicative of verbal category status.

8. L2-passivization: A side glance at Creole passivization

Is passivization a grammatical process of secondary order – and therefore difficult to acquire? What are the main functions of passives, if any, if acquired in adult transfer? If creolization is a key to universal categories and processes, we are specifically interested in reactions to the following questions: Is there subject demotion in creolization? Is there object promotion to passive subject? Is there passive morphology, or is there
no passive morphology at all – no passive participle, no auxiliary/copula to tense the passive participle, no optional BY-phrase?

In the general introductory texts to Pidgins and Creoles one usually finds statements to the extent that passive constructions in Creole languages are absent and that there is a preference for active constructions with 3PL-subjects with arbitrary reference. In line with this, if ‘passives’ are intended, the most widespread construction is the simple ‘bare’ detransitivization, i.e., the valence reduced form NP V without any morphological modification for passive voice on the verb (with the normal range of options for tense, mood, and aspect particles). Such a ‘bare passive’ involves promotion of the object to subject and obligatory suppression of the agent role. Since there is no BY-phrase, the agent cannot be expressed in any way.

(32) Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1994):
eni wari ben-so boki mja
3p house inside-focus money make
“(It is) in their house (that) money is made”

(33) Saramaccan (Alleyne 1994):
di wosu ta mbei
the house aspect make
“The house is being built”

In contrast with these cases, Papiamentu has developed a European-style passive, as in (34) (from Kouwenberg & Mervyn 1994).

(34) E projekto a ser entregá pa X
def project perf pass.aux submitted for x
“The project was handed in by X”

(35) E potret aki a wordo saká dor di X
def photo here perf pass.aux taken by of x
“This picture was taken by X”

Note the different auxiliaries, which are freely exchangeable: ser vs. wordo (wordu for Curaçaoan speakers). Also, the different BY-phrases: pa X (typically Curaçaoan, but ambiguous between ‘by’ and ‘for’ readings) vs. dor di X (used by both Aruban and Curaçaoan speakers). And saka ‘to take (a picture)’ appears here in its participle form (with final stress, hence the acute). Papiamentu is the only Caribbean Creole to use actual passive auxiliaries, with a participle form, and an optional BY-phrase. This passive arose in Papiamentu in the course of the late 19th century, and the auxiliaries were borrowed from the languages with which it is in close contact (Papiamentu speakers have a choice of wordu < Dutch “worden”, German “werden”, or ser Spanish, in free variation). The form of the participle is identical to the past participle of the active, as in They have seen it?

The Anterior participle, PPM, of Papiamentu verbs can be formed in one of the following ways:
If the verb is bisyllabic and of Iberian source, its uninflected form has a LH melody, with stress on L-toned syllable; the participle is formed by “stress shift”, i.e., the final H-toned syllable is also stressed in the participle: e.g. saka (L/stress-H/no stress) vs. saká (L/no stress-H/stress).

If the verb is longer and of Iberian source, its uninflected form has final H + stress; the participle form is identical to the uninflected form: e.g., entregá “to submit, hand in”, but also participle “submitted, handed in”.

If the verb is of non-Iberian origin, it is typically either monosyllabic or bisyllabic, and if bisyllabic, it typically has an HL melody. These verbs take a prefix in the participle form, obviously calqued from Dutch <ge-> [ɣ]: e.g., welder “to weld, solder” – (h)e- “welded, soldered”. The monosyllabic Iberian-source verb dal “to hit” also takes a partial prefix: (h)eadal “hit”. The prefix (h)e- is in free variation with (d)al, thus (d)adal.

In addition to its use in the passive, the postposed participle can be used attributively as in (39).

(39) a. un piská hasá
   “a fish fried”
   b. un pida hewelder
   “a piece welded”

It is to be noticed that, despite the existence of the PPM in passives, there is no active construction that uses a participle. Papiamentu has a preverbal perfective marker, and constructions containing that particle simply use the uninflected form of the verb, as in (40a, b).

(40) a. Nan a hasa e piská
    3PL PERF fry def fish
    “They (have) fried the fish”
    b. Nan a welder e pida
    3PL PERF weld def piece
    “They (have) welded the piece”

The brief text in (41) below, presumably, translated from Dutch so as to be read to the slaves, contains the passive verbs poeblika (publiká in modern spelling) and kitaar (modern spelling: kitá), both without an auxiliary or a BY-phrase. Strikingly, the passive subject e ley appears in postverbal position. Papiamentu allows postverbal subjects in some limited contexts.

(41) Na dia 30 di September di anja pasa, a poeblika e ley, pa
On the 30th of September of last year, PAST published the law, with
kwal noos Rey Respeta a hanja boon di resolvé, koe na dia
which our King Respected has found (it) appropriate to decide that on the
promeer di July 1863, sklabitoed lo ta pa seemper kitaar foo
1st day of July 1863, slavery will for ever (be) removed from
di Curaçao i isla dependiente.
Curaçao and islands dependent
What can we conclude from this brief survey of Creole passivization? We asked the following questions, and we have received, to all appearances, the following answers:

- Is there subject demotion in creolization? No, there is not, at least not in the standard fashion of an optional \textit{by}-phrase. Needless to say, there is valence reduction as in (41).
- Is there object promotion to passive subject? There definitely is: See the (postposed) passive subject \textit{e ley} “the law” derived from the direct object of the verb \textit{poeblika} “publish” in (41).
- Is there passive morphology or no passive morphology at all? There is no formal (passive) PPM, the exception being in Dutch-calquing Papiamentu. See (36)–(38) as well as \textit{ki-taar} “removed” in (41).
- There is no passive auxiliary/copula to tense and agree the passive-\textit{by}-sense predicate or (Papiamentu) participle.

If this brief survey can be generalized for Creoles, passivization is indeed a grammatical process of secondary order to the extent that predicates remain unmarked for voice and the accompanying auxiliary. The only function that is represented by form is valence reduction. This can work only when the link to the lexical active base of the verb is present in the working memory and its adjoined parsing mechanism. Consequently, it needs to be seen as derived, albeit not driven by a syntactic mechanism. Nothing allows the conclusion that it is therefore difficult to acquire for adults. In terms of Minimalism and parsing expedience, the effort afforded is minimal resorting to the lexical process of valence reduction, i.e., (late) merge only. This is what we expect under the general claim that Creolization and L-acquisition proceed under maximal economy. And, again, this appears to be in line with the economy executed in Creoles with respect to the TAM-system: Creoles are inherently aspectual making unnecessary tense$^7$ (Givón 1982).

Notes

* Thanks are due to Leonid Kulikov (Leiden and Göttingen) for valuable help on the proofs.

1. Detailed comparison between German and Japanese (Seino & Tanaka 2006) demonstrates that the valence reduction component in the list of passive characteristics has exceptions in at least Modern Japanese in as much as a new role, experiencer, is added in the Japanese proposition to yield a passive reading thereby extending the valence of the basic predication.

2. Next to the ‘direct’ Japanese passive, which is similar to that in English, Japanese has a peculiar indirect passive, which has the property of extending the argument frame of a predication/verb instead of stepping down the valence of the predicate passivized. See Note 1.

3. In distinction to German, Dutch, and English, Swedish distinguishes an active past participle (PPA) from a passive past participle(PPP).

4. Thanks to Alessandra Giorgi (Venice) for help on Italian.
5. Many thanks are due to Silvia Kouwenberg for an insightful discussion and for pointing out the relevant literature.

6. Extract from a Papiamentu text of the 1863 proclamation of the emancipation of slaves.

7. A fact replicated in first language acquisition as well as in pre-literate cultures.
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PART I

Functional Approaches

A. Active-passive and reflexives
Passives in Lithuanian
(in comparison with Russian)

Emma Geniušienė
St. Petersburg

This paper is concerned with passives and related phenomena in Lithuanian, namely, actional, statal, and evidential passives (all of these marked with the help of passive participles), and quasi-passives (with reflexive marking). The purpose is to show the features they share and the distinctions between them in the formation, tense paradigms, and functions. Comparisons with Russian are drawn to bring into relief the specific nature of Lithuanian passives and quasi-passives.

The passive form of the verb serves the functions of marking (a) syntactic changes, viz. patient promotion and/or agent demotion/deletion, (b) the pragmatic function of highlighting the action denoted by the verb, and (c) semantic functions, i.e. expression of a meaning absent in the active forms, viz. stativization (the meaning of the state resulting from a prior action) and evidentiality – in the case of statal and evidential passives. The syntactic changes named are not the ultimate goal of passive marking. They in their turn have the pragmatic functions of foregrounding and/or backgrounding of the arguments (cf. Kazenin 2001:907–908). Passive forms are assigned to the class of actional, statal or evidential passives by force of their function.

This paper is based on my previous research on passives, reflexive verbs and resultatives (Geniušienė 1973, 1974, 1987; Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988).

Introduction

The reader will find two papers in this volume on passives in Lithuanian: the other paper is authored by B. Wiemer. My paper is a factual corpus-based description of the passives and their functions, while B. Wiemer’s is a theory-oriented explanation of some aspects of passives against a broader typological background. These papers are compatible and, in a way, supplement one another, though the emphasis is laid on different issues. It may be surprising that the two papers show few, if any, differences in the approaches and interpretation of the phenomena discussed, in view of the fact that the authors never discussed passives or any related issues.
1. Overview

This paper is aimed at the analysis of Lithuanian passive forms which are either periphrastic, being comprised of a passive participle and auxiliary *bati* 'to be', or consist of a passive participle alone. These forms have three genetically related functions: periphrastic forms are actional or statal passives, and simple forms comprised of a passive participle alone are evidential passives. Semantically close to passives are derivatives with the reflexive postfix-infix -si/-s with passive-like (potential and admirative) meanings. All these categories retain the semantic role structure of the underlying base verb (Agent – Patient in the case of transitives or Agent alone in the case of intransitives) and undergo valency decrease. Syntactically, the latter finds expression in Agent subject demotion or deletion in the course of transformation or derivation and, in the case of transitive verbs, Patient object promotion to subject. Anticausatives with the reflexive marker are excluded from the range of passives because they do not retain the semantic role structure of the underlying causative verb due to the loss of the Agent.

1.1 Forms with passive participles

There are two passive participles in Lithuanian: (a) the imperfective (traditionally termed present) participle in -m- derived from the present tense stem and denoting simultaneity, and (b) the perfective (past) participle in -t- derived from the infinitive stem and denoting a prior action. The temporal meanings of simultaneity and priority of the participles relate to the moment of speech or some specified moment or action. In texts, predicates with participles in -m- and in -t- differ in frequency accounting for 27.4% and 72.6% of passive forms respectively in a corpus of 5730 usages. As mentioned, passive forms, i.e. verb forms with a passive participle, have three related functions.

1. Actional passive. Both the active base and the passive form denote the same situation, therefore passive transformation involves no change in the tense form of the predicate. The auxiliary is usually omitted in the present tense; the agent phrase in the genitive case is optional:

(1) a. Petr-as *atver-ia* lang-q.
   P.-nom open-3.pres window-acc.sg.m
   ‘Peter opens (is opening) the window.’

   b. Lang-as (yra) *atver-t-as* (Petr-o)
   window-nom be.3.pres open-pr.pass-nom P.-gen
   ‘The window is [being] opened (by Peter).’

(2) a. Petr-as *buvo* *atver-ės* lang-q.
   P.-nom be.3.past open-p.act.nom.m.sg window-acc.sg.m
   ‘Peter (had) opened the window.’

   b. Lang-as *buvo* *atver-t-as* (Petr-o)
   window-nom be.3.pres open-p.pass-nom P.-gen
   ‘The window was opened (by Peter).’
2. **Statal passive (= object-oriented resultative).** It is formally combined with the actional passive; but in contrast to it it is expressed by passive forms in -t- only, the auxiliary also usually omitted in the present tense; the human agent expression is banned. Derivation of statal passives involves a shift in the tense form (cf. past in (3a) denoting an action as the first phase and present in (3b) denoting the subsequent resultant state as a second phase of a complex situation).

(3) a. Petr-as atvér-ė lang-ą.
   P.nom open-3.past window-acc.
   ‘Peter (had) opened the window.’

b. Lang-as (yra) (vis dar) atver-t-as (*Pet-ro).
   window-nom be.3.pres still open-p.pass.nom P-gen
   ‘The window is (still) opened (*by Peter).’

3. **Evidential (inferential) passive.** It shows that an event is inferred from some observable evidence or based on a guess or hearsay, etc. The passive participle in -m- (rarely in -t-) is used in this function as a predicate, without an auxiliary. Thus the evidential has only two forms, the -m- participle corresponding to the simple present tense of the active and the -t- participle corresponding to the simple past tense, while actional and statal passives have complete tense paradigms. The agent expression is obligatory.

(4) a. Vag-is nu-si-kirt-o
   thief-nom perf-3m-cut-3.past all-acc cabbage-acc.plm
   ‘The thief cut down all the cabbages.’

b. Vagi-es nu-si-kirs-t-a
   thief-gen perf-3m-cut-p.pass-nt all-nom cabbage-nom.plm
   ‘[Evidently,] a thief [had] cut down all the cabbages.’

As in other languages with free word order, actional passive serves the communicative purposes of emphasis and/or de-emphasis and change of the thema-rhematic structure, being denotationally synonymous with the corresponding active form, while statal and evidential passives serve in the first place to express the additional meanings mentioned. The three categories differ sharply in two more ways:

(a) in the use of the passive participles, statals containing participles in -t- exclusively, actional passives formed with both participles, evidentials almost exclusively with -t- (for exceptions see Section 4);

(b) in agent expression which is forbidden in statal passives, optional in actional passives, and obligatory in evidentials.

In texts, the three functions differ in frequency: statal passives comprise about 53% (3037), actional passives 43% (2464) and evidentials about 4% (229) in the corpus of 5730 passive forms.

Note that further on, **passives and passive constructions** are used loosely as cover terms for all the three types.
1.2 Passive-like derivatives with the reflexive marker

Lithuanian does not use the reflexive postfix/infix -si-/s for marking the passive voice, contrary to Russian where passive is the most productive function of the reflexive postfix -sja (Korolev 1968). Otherwise, the reflexive marker in Lithuanian has a range of derivational semantic functions similar to Russian (Geniušienė 1987:74–137), differing, rather expectedly, in the productivity of these functions (cf. 800 anticausatives in a dictionary list of 5,680 reflexives in Lithuanian and 1,400 in a list of 8,000 reflexives in Russian; Korolev 1968:21). Among numerous reflexive derivatives with direct object promotion to subject, alongside anticausatives, whose meaning does not include the agent, there are two semantic subclasses of derivatives with the agent present in the semantic structure but banned syntactically. They differ from actional passives in the additional component of meaning reflected in the name of each subgroup. They express two meanings: the potential-passive (5) and admirative-passive meaning of unexpected result. Similar quasi-passive derivations are sometimes termed passive-like middles (cf. Kemmer 1993:20, 147–149). They are semantically and syntactically close to actional passives, on the one hand, and anticausatives with a reflexive marker, on the other.

Here are illustrations of these two types which are closest to passives semantically.

1. Potential-passive reflexives. (About 90 items in the dictionary verb-list of 5680 reflexives). They are labelled so because of their modal meaning of potential possibility of performing the action named by the stem upon the patient, mostly due to the inherent properties of the latter. They may also be interpreted as a characteristic of the subject-referent. They derive from both imperfective and perfective verbs and are used in the present tense exclusively with the habitual meaning, usually with qualitative adverbials like _gerai_ ‘well’, _sunkiai_ ‘with difficulty’, _lengvai_ ‘easily’, _greitai_ ‘fast’, _blogai_ ‘badly’, etc., or with negation. The meaning of the verb stem strongly implies a human agent: the action cannot take place without it (him?). It is usually a generalized human agent (cf. (5)–(6b)).

   money-nom.pl.m fast perf-3 campaigning
   ‘Money spends fast.’

A number of reflexives occur in the potential-passive meaning only, whatever the context, like (5). Some verbs, however, acquire this meaning only in the present tense if an adverbial or negation is added, otherwise they are anticausative. Thus potential quasi-passives are close to anticausatives not only formally; cf.:

(6) a. Dur-ys _at-si-dar-ė_ (anticausative)
   door-nom.plf perf-3 campaigning
   ‘The door opened.’

b. Dur-ys sunkiai _at-si-dar-o_ (potential-passive)
   door-nom hard perf-3 campaigning
   ‘The door opens with difficulty’ (= ‘is hard to open’).
2. Admirative-passive reflexives. (About 100 items in the dictionary verb-list). They express a resultant state of the subject-referent or consequences of the action and acquire a modal sense like 'unexpectedly', 'surprisingly', 'luckily', 'by chance', etc. Being derived from perfective transitive verbs, they occur in the past tense with the perfect meaning only and always imply a concrete or indefinite, never a generalized agent. As mentioned above, agent expression is banned in both subtypes of quasi-passives.

(7) a. Iš-eikv-ojau perf-spend-1sg.past much money-gen.pl.m
     'I spent a lot of money.'

b. Daug pinig-q perf-1sg.past
     much money-gen perf-spending-3.past
     'A lot of money got spent' (= unexpectedly).

The two subclasses of quasi-passives overlap, but they always differ at least in the tense form; cf.:

(8) a. Batai greit nu-si-av-i. (potential-passive)
     shoes fast perf-rm-wear-3.pres
     'Shoes wear down fast.'

b. Batai greit nu-si-av-ėjo. (admirative-passive)
     shoes fast perf-rm-wear-3.past
     'The shoes got worn down fast.'

(For more details see Geniušienė 1987: 109–118).

Potential-passive reflexives are also attested in Russian and other languages, while admiralive-passive reflexives are absent in Russian.

Note that the main valency-decreasing functions of reflexive markers cross-linguistically follow the sequence: anticausative > quasi-passives > actional passive. The Russian reflexive marker has developed all these functions, while Lithuanian stopped short at quasi-passives and did not develop the actional passive function.

Further on, these passive-like reflexives are not considered.

2. Actional passives

In this section, different aspects of the morphology and syntax and functioning of actional passive constructions are discussed in a rather fragmentary way.

Some of the characteristics also apply to statal and evidential passives as well. The specific properties of the latter two categories are discussed in Sections 3 and 4 respectively.

2.1 Passive marking of perfective and imperfective verbs

In Lithuanian, a verb, either imperfective or perfective or of dual aspectual nature, has two passive forms, both with the participle in -m- and in -t-. They are counterparts
of simple (non-perfect) and periphrastic (perfect) active forms respectively. Thus, the
imperfective verb statyti 'to build' has two passive forms in each of the four tenses; cf. its active and passive present tense forms with an imperfective (9a') and perfective
(9b') participle:

(9) a. stato → a’. (yra) stato-m-as
    build.3.pres be.3.pres build-pr.pass-nom.m.sg
    ‘(is being) built’

b. (yra) stat-q̣s → b’. (yra) staty-t-as
    be.3.pres build-p.act be.3.pres build-p.pass-nom.m.sg
    ‘has built’
    ‘(has been) built.’

Compare the passive forms of the perfective verb pa-statyti 'to have built' in the past
tense:

(10) a. buvo pa-stato-m-as
    be.3.past perf-build-pr.pass-nom.m.sg
    ‘was built’

b. buvo pa-staty-t-as
    be.3.past perf-build-p.pass-nom.m.sg
    ‘(was/had been) built.’

Thus, the following combinations of the aspectual value of the participle and the aspect
of the verb in passive forms are used:

(11) imperfective participle – imperfective verb (9a’)
    perfective participle – imperfective verb (9b’)
    imperfective participle – perfective verb (10a)
    perfective participle – perfective verb (10b).

Russian has only “simple” tense forms (except the periphrastic future tense form of
imperfective verbs: budu delat’ ‘(I) will be doing’) and no periphrastic perfect tense
forms, therefore in each tense a verb has only one active and, correspondingly, one
passive form. Another difference is that the passive form of Russian imperfective verbs
is synthetic and marked with the reflexive postfix -sja and the passive form of perfective
verbs is periphrastic: it is composed of the auxiliary byt’ ‘to be’ and a passive participle
in -t-, a cognate of the Lithuanian -t- (-n- is used on a few verbs, see (10b) below).
Therefore only two of the above four passive forms in (9) and (10) have counterparts
in Russian:

(9a’) yra stato-m-as = stroit-sja ‘is (being) built’

and

(10b) buvo pa-staty-t-as = byl po-stro-en ‘was built’;

the latter with the same morphological structure as the Lithuanian counterpart.
Lithuanian (9b’) and (10a) have no Russian counterparts. This pertains to all
the tenses.
However, in Lithuanian, we observe a mutual attraction between the type of the passive participle and aspect of the verb: perfective verbs are more common in the form with the perfective participle in -t- (87% of the passives in -t-, and only 5.4% of imperfective verbs in my corpus) and imperfective verbs are more more common in the -m- passive form (71% of the passives in -m-, and only 22% with perfective verbs) (the lacking percentage are verbs of dual aspect).

2.2 Semantic relations in the active-passive paradigm

Table 1 below shows the paradigm of and semantic relatedness, i.e. correspondences in the tense-aspect meaning (indicated by arrows), between the active and passive forms of the perfective transitive verb pa-dary-ti <PERF-do-INF> ‘to have done, made’ (cf. Geniušienė 1974:223). (Active non-perfect forms are synthetic; active perfect forms are periphrastic: būti ‘be’ + active past participle with the NOM.SG.M ending and no special marker).

Any verb used in the passive voice (actional), either transitive or intransitive, including those with a reflexive marker, has the same type of tense-aspect paradigm.

| Table 1. Semantic relations in the active-passive paradigm (shown by arrows) |
|---|---|
| Tense | Voice | a. Non-perfect active | a’. Perfect active |
| p. Passive in -m- | p’. Passive in -t- |
| 1. Present | Active | padar-o ‘does (from time to time)’ | 1a. (yra) padar-ys ‘has done’ |
| | Passive | (yra) padaro-m-a ’(is) (being) done’ | 1p. (yra) padary-t-a ’(is) done’ |
| 2. Past | Active tense | padar-e ‘did, ‘has done’ | 2a. buvo padar-gs ‘had done’ |
| | Passive | buvo padaro-m-a ‘was (being) done’ | 2p. buvo padary-t-a ‘was done, ‘had been done’ |
| 3. Past frequent. | Active | padary-dav-o ‘used to do’ | 3a. bū-dav-o padar-ys ‘used to have done’ |
| | Passive | bū-dav-o padaro-m-a ‘used to be done’ | 3p. bū-dav-o padary-t-a ‘used to be done, to have been done’ |
| 4. Future tense | Active | padary-s ‘will do’ | 4a. bus padar-ys ‘will have done’ |
| | Passive | bus padaro-m-a ‘will be (being) done’ | 4p. bus padary-t-a ‘will be done, ‘will have been done’ |
Thus 8 active and 8 passive forms comprise the tense-aspect paradigm of a single verb. They enter into complicated semantic relations which do not always coincide with the formal correspondences, due to a number of factors, such as the tense of the predicate, aspect of the verb and the relative temporal meaning of the participle: the main meaning of participles in \(-m\) is the relative meaning of simultaneity and duration (with the moment of utterance or a certain moment of time) and that of participles in \(-t\) – of anteriority and completion. Moreover, one active form may be semantically related to two passive forms, and one passive form to two active forms.

All the eight passive forms of the paradigm are actional passives, and the four passive forms with the participle in \(-t\) in the right-hand column may also have a statal meaning, given the verb is terminative perfective. The following should be noted.

1. Active and passive forms formally corresponding to one another may be unrelated semantically (= can differ in the tense-aspect meaning); see 2a–2p in the past tense and 4a–4p in the future tense, due to the conflict between the perfective value of the verb and imperfective value of the passive participle in \(-m\); in the case of imperfective verbs these forms have the same tense-aspect value, cf. past tense: dar-ė ‘did, was doing’ ⇒ buvo daro-\(m\)-a ‘was (being) done’).

2. One active form may correspond in the tense-aspect meaning to two passive forms:

   2a ⇒ 1p’ and 2p’;
   3a ⇒ 3p and 3p’.

3. One passive form may correspond semantically to two active forms:

   1p’ ⇒ 1a’ and 2a;
   2p’ ⇒ 2a and 2a’;
   3p’ ⇒ 3a and 3a’;
   4p’ ⇒ 4a and 4a’.

In other words, each passive form with the perfective participle of a perfective verb corresponds to two active forms with a perfective meaning one of them formally marked (the perfect form) and the other non-perfect, its perfective meaning determined by the aspect value of the verb itself.

2.3 Expression of the agent

The usual marking of the agent in passive constructions, both actional and evidential, is the genitive case, be the subject referent of the underlying active construction human or inanimate (e.g. denoting an instrument or means or a cause); cf.:

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{a. } & \text{Tēv-as} & / & \text{šuo} & / & \text{liet-us} & iš-\text{gūdin-o} & \text{vaik-q}.
\end{array}
\]

\text{father-NOM} \text{ dog-NOM} \text{ rain-NOM} \text{ PERF-scare-3.PAST} \text{ child-ACC}

‘Father/a dog/the rain scared the child.’
b. Vaik-as buvo iš-gašdin-t-as tėv-o / šun-s / child-nom.sg.m was PERF-scare-p.pass-nom.sg.m father-gen / dog-gen
liet-aus.
rais-gen.

‘The child was scared by father/a dog/rain.’

The main meaning of the genitive case is possessive (cf. vaik-o (GEN) motina ‘the child’s mother’), when a noun is used as an attribute, and also partitive (cf. išgerti vanden-į (ACC) ‘to drink (all) the water’ – išgerti vanden-s (GEN) ‘to drink some water’). It is used instead of the accusative if the verb contains negation (cf. ne-gerti vanden-s ‘not to drink water’).

However, if the agent is the personal 1.SG or 2SG pronoun, and preserved in the passive construction, the pronoun acquires the possessive form: mano ‘my’ instead of man˛es ‘me.GEN’ , tav-o ‘your.SG’ instead of tavo ‘you.GEN’. As for the remaining personal pronouns, their genitive case form is identical with the respective possessive pronouns: mes ‘we.NOM’ → masy i. <we.GEN> ‘us’, ii. ‘our’; jas ‘you.PL’ → jasy i. <you.PL.GEN> ‘you’, ii. ‘your.PL’; jis ‘he.NOM’ → jo i. <he.GEN> ‘him’, ii. ‘his’; jie ‘they.M (or M+F)’ → jių i. <they.GEN> ‘them’, ii. ‘their’; jos ‘the.NOM’ → jos i. <she.GEN> ‘her’, ii. ‘her’; jos ‘they.F’ → jių i. <they.GEN> ‘them’ ii. ‘their’.

It has been noted in typological literature that expression of the agent by the means with a genitive (i.e. possessive) function in the passive voice does occur in some languages (cf. Keenan 1985:263–264). The other two typologically common devices are instrumental and locative marking.

As is known, Russian employs the instrumental case for the agent expression. In Lithuanian, the instrumental is used to denote an instrument or means (e.g., rašyti pieštuk-u (INST) ‘to write with a pen’, prausitis vanden-iu (INST) ‘to wash with water’), also cause, source, manner, time, place, etc., but never an agent (cf. Ambrāzas 1997:511–517).

2.4 Agreement

In passive constructions, except evidentials, the predicative participle usually agrees with the subject, if there is one, in case (always NOM, therefore glossed only in the first sentential example), gender and number (cf. (1b)–(3b), (9b)). In evidential constructions with transitive verbs, absence of agreement with the nominative patient phrase is the rule (cf. (3) above). Actional passives without subject agreement are possible, but they are peripheral in Standard Lithuanian (Ambrāzas 1997:277), though rather common in folklore; cf.:

(13) U-ti-ti šaltu, pyrag-ai ne-mal-t-a ...
INTERJ cold pie-nom.pl.m not-grind-p.pass-nt
‘Oh, it is cold, [flour for] pies (is) not ground ...’
In this case, and also in subjectless constructions with intransitive verbs, the participle takes the final marker -a\textsuperscript{s} termed Neuter gender (= NT) in Lithuanian grammars, though the noun has only two genders (F and M).

2.5 Direct object retention in passive constructions

Sometimes, though extremely rarely, the object of a transitive verb is not promoted to subject, in which case the subject-agent is obligatorily deleted. This may occur in actional passive constructions which are in fact gnomic sayings with a generalized agent. Compare:

(14) Vaik-\textsuperscript{a} muša-m-a, kai ne-klaus-o.
child-ACC-SG beat-PR.PASS-NT when not-obey-3.PRES
‘A child is beaten (= it is customary to beat a child) if he does not obey’;
or ‘They beat a child if he does not obey.’

This does not seem to happen in evidential passives.

2.6 Non-direct object promotion to subject

Patient promotion to subject is also allowed by a few two-place intransitives: (a) verbs with the genitive object lauk-ti ko nors <wait/expect-INF> ‘to wait for’, ieškoti ‘to look for’, vengti ‘to (try to) avoid’, reikalauti ‘to require’, nekęsti/neapkęsti ‘to hate’, etc; (b) a few verbs with the dative object, e.g. vadovauti ‘to direct’, įsakyti ‘to order’, etc. (cf. Ambrazas 1997:278). They allow both variants which differ in meaning: the promoted oblique object is definite (15b), and the preserved object in a subjectless clause is indefinite (15c):

(15) a. Mes lauk-ė-me sveči-\textsuperscript{-}ų.
“we.nom wait-PAST-1.PL visitor-GEN.PL.M
‘We waited (were waiting) for (the) visitors.’
b. Buvo laukia-m-i sveči-ai.
be.3.PAST wait-PR.PASS-NOM.PL.M visitor-NOM.PL.M
‘The visitors were (being) awaited.’
c. Buvo laukia-m-a sveči-y.
be.3.PAST expect-PR.PASS-NT visitor-GEN.PL.M
‘Some visitors were expected.’

2.7 Restrictions on the passive form

There is a number of rather insignificant formal and semantic restrictions on the passive voice, which are rather limited in scope. Participial passive forms in Lithuanian are naturally much more regular than, for instance, in Russian where about 95 percent of imperfective transitive verbs have passive forms with the reflexive postfixed -sja (Korolev 1968:17).
In Lithuanian, the passive form can be acquired by both transitive (cf. (1)) and intransitive (cf. (20)–(21)) and even two or three meteorological impersonal verbs (17), and also by formally reflexive verbs of some semantic classes (e.g. semantic reflexives, autocausatives, reciprocals, etc.; cf. (16)), while in Standard Russian it is the domain of transitives almost exclusively, with very few exceptions.

   river-loc bathe-3.FAST.RM child-NOM.PL.M
   ‘In the river, children bathed (were bathing).’

   b. Upė-je buvo maudo-m-a-si (vaik-u).
   river-loc be.3.FAST bathe-PR.PASS-NT-RM child-GEN.PL.M
   ‘In the river, bathing was (being) done (by children).’

(17) a. Vakar snig-o.
   yesterday snow-3.PAST
   ‘It snowed yesterday.’

   b. Vakar snig-t-a
   yesterday snow-P.PAST
   ‘There was snowfall yesterday.’

(17b) is an actional passive because the verb is imperfective and corresponds to (17a) in its aspect-tense meaning: a fact is stated with certainty rather than inferred.

1. Regular restrictions. The most common trivial restriction seems to be on the agentless passive use of intransitive verbs if the subject-agent is not human:

(18) a. Lauk-e medzi-ai oši-a.
   field-LOC tree-NOM.PL rustle-3.PRES
   ‘Outside, trees are rustling.’

   b. *Lauk-e ošia-m-a
   field-LOC rustle-PR.PASS-NT
   ‘Outside, there is rustling.’

An agentless passive construction with an intransitive verb is invariably interpreted as one with an implied human agent (19c). Note that the same intransitives can be used with a demoted subject in an evidential passive, as in (19b) (see also Section 4):

(19) a. Čia arkl-ai stov-ėjo.
   here horse-NOM.PL.M stand-3.PAST
   ‘Here, horses [had] stood.’

   → b. Čia arkl-ų stovė-t-a
   here horse-GEN.PL.M stand-P.PASS-NT
   ‘It seems there have been horses here.’

   cf.: c. Čia stovė-t-a, (better: Čia kąžkieno stovėta)
   here stand-P.PASS-NT here someone.gen stand-P.PASS-NT
   ‘Someone stood here.’ ‘Someone stood here, it seems.’

In the case of intransitive (one-place and nearly all two-place) verbs, the construction is subjectless. The (human) agent is either optionally expressed by the genitive case (20b) or omitted (21):
(20) a. Čia (žmon-ės) dirb-a.
   here people-NOM.PL work-PRES
   ‘People work (are working) here.’

   b. Čia (žmon-ių) dirba-m-a.
   here people-GEN.PL work-PASS-NT
   i. ‘Here work is being done (by people).’
   ii. ‘It is people who work here.’ (if the agent is overt).

(21) Didvyri-ais ne-ginsta-m-a, didvyri-ais miršta-m-a.
    hero-INST.PL.M not-be.BORN-PASS-NT hero-INST.PL.M die-PASS-NT
    ‘One is not born a hero, one dies a hero.’

2. Occasional specific restrictions. There is a systemic formal restriction based on incompatibility of morphemes: passive participles of unprefixed transitive verbs with the reflexive marker -si/-s due to its final position have only the neuter form in -a. Therefore, if the subject requires agreement with the passive participle in gender (M or F), the passive form cannot be used, as masculine and feminine endings are incompatible with the final reflexive marker which they precede. In the case of the neuter ending, the passive form is possible, e.g.: 

viskas skolina-m-a-si <everything.NOM borrow-PASS-NT-RM> ‘everything is [being] borrowed.’

2.8 Actional passive constructions in discourse

As in other languages, the most important issue in the use of actional passives is their raison d’être, which is to serve pragmatic purposes of redistributing prominence, viz. communicative highlighting of some constituents involving backgrounding of other constituents in an utterance, and thema-rhematic function, depending on the word order.

The choice of passive constructions instead of active denotational synonyms in discourse is determined by their functionally relevant features, including the constituent structure, i.e. presence of the subject-patient and/or of agent phrase, resulting in four syntactic types of constructions, each with its own sphere of usage and frequency in texts shown in Table 2.

The four types of actional passives have different functional counterparts among active constructions: passives with an overt agent correlate with active constructions with the subject-agent, and agentless passives in most cases correlate with indefinite-

Table 2. Frequency of the functional types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of actional passive construction</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agentless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Subjectful (of transitives)</td>
<td>~ 52.5% (= 1293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Subjectless² (of intransitives)</td>
<td>~ 33%  (= 820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Subjectful (of transitives)</td>
<td>~ 10.5% (= 259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Subjectless (of intransitives)</td>
<td>~ 4%   (= 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>~ 100% (= 2,464 clauses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal active constructions (with zero subject) and inherit from them the indefinite or generalized or a concrete suppressed agent.

Each transformational change in passives is functional on the communicative level: (a) the use of a constituent in the form not typical of it (passive form instead of active, genitive instead of nominative, nominative instead of accusative) is a means of emphasizing it; (b) promotion to subject is also a means of placing emphasis on the constituent and giving it the status of the most important participant; (c) agent demotion is a means of de-emphasis as it lowers its communicative status; (d) both agent demotion and deletion add prominence to the remaining constituents, especially to the predicate in the case of an intransitive verb.

Another important factor is the position of a constituent in the linear structure of the sentence, because it determines its thematic or rhematic status, the first position (being) the most prominent thematically, the final one rhematic.

Due to these factors, the four syntactic types of passive constructions can be used for the following purposes, depending on the set of their functional properties:

- For redistribution of prominence in comparison with the corresponding active constructions, i.e. highlighting the communicative function of one constituent (patient) and respective backgrounding of the other (agent);
- For highlighting the action expressed by the predicate, especially in subjectless constructions with one-place intransitives, as it remains the only main constituent;
- Agentless passives can be used for expression of the indefiniteness or generic nature of the agent for its concealment;
- Given a certain word order, passives, mostly subjectless, can be used for stylistic purposes to achieve expressiveness, due to the unusual distribution of participants along the syntactic roles and discord between the syntactic and thema-rhematic sequence of the components in the linear structure.

These motivations can be at work simultaneously in various combinations. Moreover, they may co-occur with the statal meaning of the passive predicate.

Each of the four types of passive constructions has its own range of usages determined by the syntactic structure and sequence of the constituents. In this respect Lithuanian passives seem to be very similar to passives of other languages with free WO, like Russian.

2.8.1 Type 1. Agentless passive constructions

As in other languages, agentless actional passives, both subjectful and subjectless, are used with the following aims, optional agent omission having the same functions across languages.

(a) They are used if the agent is irrelevant for the communication because it is already known (22) or entirely unknown and of no interest, or if its presence is redundant and makes the utterance too “heavy”, i.e. it has an “intrusive effect” (Duškova 1972:107–108):
(22) Puol-usi žmon-a užčiaup-ė jam burn-ą, bet rush-P.ACT.NOM.SG.F wife-NOM close-PAST.3.SG be.DAT mouth-ACC but žodži-ai jau buvo pasaky-t-i ir niekas word-NOM.PL.M already be.PAST.3 utter-P.PASS-NOM.PL.M and no.one ne-gal-ejo jų iš galvos išmes-ti. (LTN)

‘(His) wife rushed up to him and pressed his mouth closed but the words had already been uttered and no one could throw them out of his head.’

(b) These passives can be used to avoid naming the agent for extralingual reasons, e.g. as a means of “authorial modesty”:

(23) ... šiame darb-e ir norė-t-a ... patyrin-ti ...
this.LOC work-LOC.SG.M and want-P.PASS-INF investigate-INF
kalb-os struktūr-ą. (J. Palionis)
language-GEN.SG.F structure-ACC.SG.F
‘... in this work it was desired to investigate... the structure of language.’

(c) Omission of the human agent expression serves to denote its indefiniteness (24). The agent is not recoverable from the context, though it may be recoverable from the situation. In principle, passive constructions like (24a) and the italicized clause in (25a) are denotationally, though not pragmatically, equal to and interchangeable with indefinite-personal constructions with zero subject:

(24) a. Dukart buvau sužeis-t-as,
    twice be-PAST.1.SG PERF-wound-P.PASS-NOM.SG.M
    kontūzy-t-as.
    shell.shock-P.PASS.NOM.SG.M
    ‘I was twice wounded, shell-shocked.’

≈ b. Mane dukart sužeid-ė ...
LACC twice PERF-wound-3.PAST
‘[They] wounded ... me twice.’

(25) a. Štai čia dalvyauja kunig-as, vargoninin-k-as ...
here here participate-PRES. priest-NOM.SG.M, organist-NOM.
gieda-m-os giesm-ės, skambia-m-a varp-ais. (J. Ragauskas)
sing-P.PASS.NOM hymn-NOM ring-PR.PASS-NT bell-INST.PL.M
‘Over here, participate the priest, the organist, ... hymns are sung, there is bell ringing.’

≈ b. Čia gied-a giesm-ės, skambin-a varp-ais
here sing-3.PRES hymn-ACC.PL.F, ring-3.PRES bell-INST.PL.M
‘Here (they) sing hymns, ring the bells.’

(d) The suppressed agent can be generalized and refer to ‘one, everyone, all people’ (26)–(29). It occurs with the passive in -m- only; most of these constructions are gnomic sayings (cf. also (21) above).
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(26) Greit jis pamirš, tai, kaip beveik viskas pamiršta-m-a
fast he forget.FUT that as almost everything forget-PR.PASS-NT
pasaul-yje. (A. Bauža)
world-LOC.SG.M

‘He will soon forget it, as almost everything is [usually] forgotten in this world.’

(27) Jeigu dorai elgia-m-a-si, niekas ne-muš-a. (I. Simonaitytė)
if decently behave-PR.PASS-NT-RM no-one not-beat-3.PRES

‘If one behaves decently, no one will beat (one).’

(28) Elen-ai vis atrod-ė, kad visur meluoja-m-a, visur
E.-dar all.time seem-3.PAST that everywhere lie-PR.PASS everywhere
veidmainiaja-m-a ... (V. Rimkevičius)
be.hypocritical-PR.PASS-NT

‘It seemed to Helen that everywhere there were lies, hypocrisy ...’

(29) ... į tiksl-ą eina-m-a per darb-ą ir kov-ą ... (J. Avyžius)
to goal-ACC go-PR.PASS-NT by work-ACC.SG.M and struggle-ACC-SG.F

‘... one achieves one’s goal through work and struggle...’

In the subsections, the specific features of each subtype of agentless passives are shown.

2.8.1.1 Type 1a. Subjectful actional passives without an agent. These clauses commonly derive from transitive verbs and they are the most frequent in texts (1293 clauses), which supports the fact that these passives are the most widespread across languages and therefore termed basic passives (Keenan 1985:247ff.; note that Latvian, the closest relative of Lithuanian, has only this type of passives and occasional passives of intransitives). The deleted agent is concrete in 59 percent (as in (30)), indefinite in 32 percent and generalized in 9 percent of these constructions. As in other languages, due to their syntactic structure, the passive makes the patient communicatively prominent by promoting it to subject. Note that in (30) the patient subject is dominated by the rhematic object (‘telegramos’) in final position in the previous clause, and its promotion also helps to achieve better coherence of the text. In 86 percent of these passives the subject-patient is thematic due to its initial position. Their frequency shows that the main function of this type of basic passives is thema-rhematic.

(30) Karalienė skubiai griebiasi telegram-os ... Telegrama
K. hurriedly grabs telegram-GEN telegram-NOM.SG.F
at-plėš-t-a aki-s už-mes-t-a. (I. Simonaitytė)
PERF-tear-PASS-NOM.SG.F eye-NOM PERF-throw-PASS-NOM.SG.F

‘Karaliena grabs the telegram in a hurry... The telegram is opened, a glance is thrown [at it].’

2.8.1.2 Type 1b. Subjectless passives without an agent. They are rather numerous in my corpus (820 clauses). Besides a very small number of passive clauses with transitive verbs with retained direct object (see 2.5), they are passives of intransitive verbs.

This type of constructions (92 percent of those with one-place intransitives and 80 percent of passives with two-place intransitives) usually contain an adverbial. The
most common word order (in 90 percent of cases) is “adverbial – predicate [– oblique object]”. The initial adverbial serves as a link with the preceding text. Due to the absence of both the subject and agent noun phrase, these constructions are used for a number of purposes that are not specifically Lithuanian.

(a) They are used to emphasize the action itself, which usually correlates with a concrete and known agent whose mention is therefore redundant (cf. (32) below). Moreover, in (31) passive helps to avoid repeating the same form of the preceding predicate:

(31) Dažnai žmon-ės į laikraštį kreip-ia-si tada, kai daug of people-NOM.PL to newspaper-ACC appeal-3.PRES-RM then when many kur buvo kreip-t-a-si, bet niekas ne-pad-ėjo. (“Tiesa”)

where be.3.PAST appeal-PASS-NT-RM but no.one not-help-3.PAST

‘People often appeal to the newspaper after they had appealed (lit. ‘it has been appealed’) wherever they could, but no one helped.’

The agent (žmonė ‘people’) deletion helps to avoid its repetition as well as repetition of the same predicate in the active voice and shows a close link with the preceding head clause. The passive clause is interchangeable with the corresponding active, with inevitable de-emphasis of the action and stylistic degradation of the sentence.

The main aim can be that of achieving a stylistic effect, the passive being more emphatic and expressive than the active counterpart:

(32) Po daugelio metų jis ėjo namo, ėjo after many year-GEN.PL he.NOM go.3.PAST home go.3.PAST at-si-kariau-ti savo Basuliškių-ą, Ar be-spė-s? Ar

perf-RM-win.back-INF his.own B.-GEN.PL QU perf-be.in.time-FUT QU

ne-bu-s pa-vėluo-t-a? Pa-vėluo-t-a su vis-u

not-be-FUT perf-be.late-PASS-NT perf-be.late-PASS-NT with all-INST

gyvenim-u. (M. Katiliškis)

life-INST.SG.M

‘After many years he was going home, he was on the way to win back his Basuliškiai. Will he be in time? Won’t he be too late? Too late with all his life?’

As mentioned, the direct object of a transitive verb can preserve its status in the passive construction, which makes the latter subjectless. Their use is accounted for by the difference in the functional properties of subjectful and subjectless agentless passives: patient promotion to subject makes it prominent and thematic, while its retention serves to foreground the action itself and stress the generalized meaning of the deleted agent. As mentioned, for the latter purpose indefinite-personal constructions (like Jį visur kviečia <he.ACC everywhere invite-3.PRES> ‘(They) invite him everywhere’) are commonly used: the passive is resorted to for emphasis (due to its rarity) and when an indefinite-personal construction is not allowed by the structure of the context; cf.:
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(33) ... muš-a-m-a vaik-q tada, kai nežino-m-a, kas beat-PR.PASS-NT child-ACC.SG.M then when not-know-PR.PASS-NT what dary-ti. ("Literatūra ir menas")

do-INF

['It seems to me that] one beats the child (= the child is beaten) when one does not know what to do.'

(34) ... netgi klaus-ti – ar myli-m-a žmog-uje tik privalum-us ..., even ask-INF QU love-PR.PASS-NT person-LOC.SG.M only merit-ACC.PL.M

kažin ar teisinga. ("Jaunimo gretos")

hardly PR.TL Correct

'... even asking whether one loves in a person only his merits ... is hardly correct.'

2.8.2 Type 2. Agentive passive constructions

As in other languages, due to agent demotion, these passives are naturally used to lower the pragmatic importance of the agent by demoting it to a minor syntactic position. They also serve to highlight the action denoted by the predicate.

2.8.2.1 Type 2a. Subjectful agented passives. These clauses (320 items) are almost exclusively passives of transitive verbs. They are naturally used for highlighting the patient, besides diminishing the communicative weight of the agent. Their choice is dictated by the context requiring that the clause be included in the chain of prominent noun phrases via its patient noun phrase. In this type of passives the word order is significant:

Table 3. Frequency of word order types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S=Pt + O=Ag + V</td>
<td>59% = 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S=Pt + O+Ag + V</td>
<td>32% = 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O=Ag + V + S=Pt</td>
<td>5% = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other sequences</td>
<td>4% = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% = 320 clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In languages with rigid SVO order, like English, these passives can have only linear sequence ‘Sb=Pt + V + O=Ag’ and thus serve to change the thema-rhematic structure of the clause, while in languages with free word order they may have other functions, depending on the linear arrangement of the constituents.

1. The most common linear word order ‘S=Pt + O=Ag + V’ (59 percent). Notice that in 75 percent of passives with this word order the agent is human.

(35) Atėjo žinia, kad šiaurės ašigalis Piri-o pasiek-t-as. (K. Boruta)

came news that north pole-NOM.SG.M Piri-GEN teach-P.PASS-NOM.SG.M

'The news came that Piri had reached the North pole', lit. '...that the North Pole [is] by Piri reached.'
The middle position of the agent noun phrase shows that it is necessary as part of the old information, but communicatively it has the lowest status, the subject being the theme dictated by the previous context and the final predicate – the rheme of the information. Substitution of the active construction, even with the sequence OSV, content-wise corresponding to that of the passive counterpart, would unduly emphasize the agent, which is not the purpose of the report.

2. The functional type with the sequence 'S=Pt + V + O=Ag' is typical of passives if the subject of the active construction is inanimate and the patient is human (in 65% of these passives); cf.:

(36) a. Jis buvo iš-kank-in-t-as  
he was PERF-exhaust-CAUS-PASS-NOM.SG.M  woryt-GEN.SG.M  
'He was exhausted by worry.'

The patient, being human, is naturally made prominent and thematic, because it is dominated by the previous context. The inanimate agent (= cause) is made rhematic by its final position. The sentence is much more expressive than respective active (36b); the statal reading of (36a) is not outruled:

(36) b. Jį iškankin-o  
he.ACC exhaust-3.past  worry-NOM  
'Worry exhausted him,' lit. 'Him exhausted worry.'

Substitution results in the loss of the prominence of the human patient and undue prominence of the rhematic subject 'nerimas', and also in the loss of expressivity and possibility of resultative interpretation.

3. Passives with the sequence 'O=Ag + V + S=Pt', though rare (5 percent), deserve attention because in respect of the thema-rhematic sequence they correspond to the neutral and therefore the most common 'S(=Ag) + V + O(=Pt)' word order in the active voice. This sequence makes passives highly expressive, with particular emphasis on the rhematic subject-patient:

(37) Rusų jūrinink-ų  Belinshauzen-o ir Lazarev-o buvo  
Russian seaman-GEN.PL.M  B.-GEN and L.-GEN was  
su-ras-t-as  Antarctik-os žemyn-as.  (K. Boruta)  
PERF-find-PASS-NOM  Antarctic-GEN continent-NOM.SG.M  
The Russian seamen Bellinshausen and Lazarev discovered the Antarctic Continent.'

2.8.2.2 Type 2b. Subjectless agented passives. These clauses, being the least numerous in my list (16 clauses) are derived from intransitive verbs. They are used for placing emphasis on the action by means of the marked form of the predicate and suppression of the main constituent, viz. subject. As a rule, they are much more expressive stylistically than neutral actives. All these effects can be achieved simultaneously. Compare:
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(38) Ir pamirš-om visi, kur mūs gim-t-a, kur and forget-PAST.1.PL all-NOM.PL.M where ųe.gen be.born-P.PASS-NT where aug-t-a. (V. Mykolačitietis-Putinas)

grow.up-P.PASS-NT

‘And all of us forgot where we grew up, where our birth-place is’ (lit. ‘was born’).

(39) Mano miego-t-a visai trumpai. (V. Sirijos Gira)

my sleep-P.PASS-NT quite briefly

‘My sleep was very brief.’ (lit. ‘By me [it was] slept ...’)

In 98 percent of these passives the agent expression retains its initial position, as in the corresponding active clauses: it is obligatory pragmatically as a link with the previous context, but it is downplayed by demotion. This shows that passives of this syntactic type are used mostly for emphasis and not for changing the thema-rhema structure.

3. Statal passive (object-oriented resultative)

As mentioned, statal passives account for about 53 percent of all passive forms in my corpus. Among present tense predicates with the participle in -t- forms with the statal meaning account for 75%, among those in the past tense for 64 percent (none in the frequentative past) and 15 percent in the future tense.

Lithuanian statal passives manifest a great similarity to statals in Russian in all respects (see, for instance, a detailed analysis of Russian actional and statal participial passives in Knjazev 1989).

3.1 Derivation of statal passives

Passive forms with a perfective participle of perfective terminative transitive verbs are combined forms: they serve not only as the perfect form of actional passives but also as statal passives expressing the state of the subject-patient resulting from the prior action of the agent; as mentioned, these constructions are typically agentless. Compare:

(40) a. Jis į-jung-ė radij-at.

he.nom perf-switch-PAST.3 radio-ACC.SG.M

‘He turned on the radio.’

b. Radij-as ą-jung-t-as.

radio-NOM.SG.M perf-switch-P.PASS-NOM.SG.M

‘The radio is turned on.’

(40a) denotes an action in the past, and (40b) denotes a subsequent resultant state of the patient subject; (40b) is in the present tense, to show the temporal relation between the prior action and resultant state. (40d) with the meaning of resultant state in the past formally relates to the pluperfect active form (40c), while semantically it relates to both (40a) above and (40c):
c. Jis buvo į-jung-es radij-q.
   he.nom be.3.past perf-switch-p.act.nom.sg.m radio.acc.sg
   'He had turned on the radio.'

d. Radij-as buvo į-jung-t-as.
   radio-nom.sg.m be.past.3 perf-switch-p.pass-nom.sg.m
   'The radio was turned on.'

Both (40b) and (40d) have a resultative reading due to the minimal context: because of it the first reading of ambiguous constructions that comes to mind is usually resultative. It should be stressed that the overlap of the actional and statal passive is restricted only to the passive form of perfective terminative transitive verbs: it can be either actional or resultative (statal) in meaning, depending on a number of contextual factors, such as the presence or absence of the overt agent, temporal adverbials and broader context, including the temporal relationship of the predicate in question with the preceding predicates (cf. Siewerska (1988:249) on Russian actional and statal passives).

Note that the tense paradigm of statal passives contains only four forms, while that of actional passes consists of eight forms (see Table 1 above).

Derivation of statal passives is restricted to a number of lexical-semantic verb groups, mostly to verbs denoting concrete physical actions which result in a change in the patient, usually observable, e.g. creation or destruction of the object, change of its appearance, properties, position in space, etc., or psychological influence resulting in the psychological change in the human patient which usually finds outer expression. The resultative form usually denotes a permanent state or one of long duration. Depending on the lexical meaning of the base verb, the resultant state may be terminated by another action:

(41) Kambarys buvo užlietas šviesos, bet saulė pasislėpė ir pasidarė tamsu.
   'The room was filled with light, but the sun disappeared and it became dark.'

The statal passive is regarded here as a special category distinct from the actional passive due to a shift in the aspectual meaning taking place in comparison with the respective active construction. It is shown to be a distinct category in Nedjalkov (1988), because of two main factors: (a) non-synonymy of a resultative construction and its active counterpart denoting different situations (or two phases of the same situation; cf. Lenngren 1970), viz. the prior action and the subsequent state following one another and thus related in time; (b) existence of subject-oriented resultatives derived from intransitive perfective verbs and denoting the resultant state of the agent (see Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988:3–9ff.). In Lithuanian, the former shares its expression with the actional passive and the latter with periphrastic perfect active forms. Examples of subject-oriented resultatives (these derive mostly from intransitive process, or change of state, verbs):

(42) a. Žolė iš-džiuvo.
   grass-nom.sg.f perf-dry.3.past
   'The grass (has) dried.'
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Some stative passives have counterparts with the same temporal-aspectual meaning – same-stem imperfective verbs or complex predicates with an adjective: yra pakabintas ‘is hung’ \(\approx\) kabo ‘is hanging’; yra atidarytas ‘is opened’ \(\approx\) yra atviras ‘is open’.

With respect to statals, Lithuanian differs from Standard Russian which has no perfect and uses the same forms with the past passive participle both for subject- and object-oriented resultatives (for details on relations between statals (= resultatives) and passive and active perfect see Geniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988:369–386). But it is similar to the Russian north-western and other dialects with the same type of object-oriented resultatives and also subject-oriented resultatives combined with active perfect forms of intransitives (see Trubinskij 1988:389–409); cf. dialectal Russian:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(44) a.} & \quad \text{Syn ženi-l-sja.} & \quad \text{b.} & \quad \text{Syn ženi-vši.} \\
& \quad \text{son marry-past-rm} & \quad & \quad \text{son marry-ger} \\
& \quad \text{‘The son got married.’} & \quad & \quad \text{‘The son is married.’}
\end{align*}
\]

3.2 The use of statal passives

The statal meaning naturally requires the patient in subject position as the main constituent pragmatically, and this meaning makes naming the agent redundant as it is irrelevant in the resultant state of the patient, though implied by the verbal meaning.

Actional and statal passives differ in the way they are integrated in the chain of predicates with respect to the causal and temporal relationship between them. This is explicated by the \(\pm\) interchangeability with the respective active form: an actional passive can be replaced by the counterpart active form (provided the word order is retained) without violating the temporal and causal relations in the text, whereas the resultative cannot be replaced in this way: this results in a change of the temporal relations with the preceding predicates and violation of the logical sequence of events because the statal is included in the temporal chain of predicates according to its meaning of resultant state and not the prior action. Two types of predicate chains are prevalent.

1. A statal passive can occur in a chain of imperfective verbs in the same present or past tense denoting actions or states simultaneous with it:
'A full moon is reflected in the window glass. But inside there is some light, too. There a lamp is burning. And the window is not closed.'

Compare the respective past tense active form which breaks the chain of simultaneous events in a static description:

b. ... atsišviečia pilnija ... yra švieselė... dega lempa. Ir lang-o

ne-už-skleidė.

'... a full moon is reflected... There is a light inside... a lamp is burning. And [they, someone] did not close the window.'

2. It also occurs in a chain of perfective verbs, either in the present or past tense, denoting a sequence of actions. In this case it tends to denote a kind of general background, a state during which all the actions named occur, or a state that exists while the actions are performed:

(46) a. Iš tvartų iš-lenda berniuk-as. Jis ... nu-ein-a

from barns gets.out-3.PRES boy-NOM.SG.M he.NOM perf-go-3.PRES

prie kleti-es dur-ų. Ant dur-ų ...

to store-room-gen.SG.F door-gen.PL.F on door-gen.PL.F

j-kabin-t-a ... spyn-a. Vaikis

perf-hang-PASS-NOM.SG.F padlock-NOM.SG.F lad.NOM.SG.M

at-rakin-a, ... dur-ys at-si-dar-o ... (I. Simonaitytė)

perf-lock-3.PRES door-NOM.PL.F perf-RM-open-3.PRES

'Out of the barns a boy gets out. He goes to the store-room door. On the door, ... a padlock is hung. The lad unlocks [it] ... the door opens.'

The active past tense form instead of the present statal is out of place here because it breaks the sequence of a chain of actions:

b. ... išlenda berniukas. Jis ... nueina prie durų ... Ant durų

gets.out boy he goes to door on door

j-kab-in-o ... spyn-a. Vaikis atrakina, ... durys atsidaro.

perf-hang-CAUS-3.PRES padlock-ACC lad unlocks door opens

'... a boy gets out. He goes to the door. On the door, [they] hanged a padlock. The lad unlocks ... the door opens.'

However, a statal passive can be replaced by the same-stem imperfective anticausative intransitive verb with a stative meaning, if there is one (cf. (46c)), or the actional passive with the present participle of a stative verb (51), or a compound predicate with the
same-stem adjective, in both cases with the loss of the implication of the prior action, of course; cf.:

\begin{verbatim}
c. ... islenda berniukas. Jis ... nueina prie durų ... Ant durų kab-o
gets.out boy he goes to door on door hang-3.PRES
spyn-a. Vaikis atrakina, ... durys atsidaro.
padlock-ACC lad unlocks door opens
'... a boy gets out. He goes to the door, [on the door] is hanging a padlock. The lad
unlocks ... the door opens.'
\end{verbatim}

Generally speaking, the statal passive is integrated in the chain of predicates according to the same rules as imperfective verbs.

3.3 Adverbial indicators of the statal meaning

Actional and statal passives occur with different adverbials, especially those of time. These rules seem to coincide with those in Russian (cf. Knjazev 1989:82–99). Three semantic types of adverbials are relevant here.

1. Adverbials of duration, like visa laiką ‘all the time’, ilgai ‘a long time’, nuolat ‘all the time, permanently’, (vis) dar ‘still’, etc.; these, and especially (vis) dar and the prefix tebe- ‘still’ always point to the statal resultative meaning and they cannot occur with the non-perfect or perfect meaning of actional passives.

\begin{verbatim}(47) Kad ir vaistinė nakt-imis už-dary-t-a,
that and chemist’s-NOM night-INST.PL perf-close-P.FASS-NOM.SG.F that GEN
ne-žin-ai? (A. Vienuolis)
not-know-PRES.1.SG
'Don’t you know that the chemist’s shop is also closed at nights?'
\end{verbatim}

2. Adverbials denoting a certain moment or period of time, e.g. dvyliktą valandą ‘at twelve o’clock’, prieš valandą ‘an hour ago’ , vakar ‘yesterday’, and the like. They are possible with both types of predicates, being more common with actional passives, in which case they often take the rhematic final position in the sentence:

\begin{verbatim}(48) Rezultatai buvo pa-skelb-t-i pirmą valandą.
results were perf-announce-P.FASS-NOM.PL.M first o’clock
'The results were announced at one o’clock.'
\end{verbatim}

In (49) the temporal modifier is expressed by a clause and the reading is ambiguous, though the statal reading seems to be preferable, whatever the position of the subordinate clause:

\begin{verbatim}(49) a. Kai jis įėjo, šviesa buvo iš-jung-t-a.
as he entered light was perf-switch-P.FASS-NOM.SG.F
'When he entered, the light was switched off.'
\end{verbatim}

It can be disambiguated by additional context: the adverb dar ‘still’ or the prefix tebe- ‘still’ would point to the statal meaning.
3. Adverbials with the meaning of completion: jau 'already', pagaliau 'at last', etc. They are typical of the perfect meaning of actional passive, which is revealed by the interchangeability with the corresponding active perfect form:

\[(50) \text{Stovėjo Laukys ne-judamas ir tada, kai karst-as jau buvo}\]
\[\text{stood L. not-moving, and then as coffin-nom already was}\]
\[\text{nu-\text{leis-t-as}} \quad (= \text{karst-q buvo nu-\text{leid-f}}) \quad \text{į duobę.}\]
\[\text{PERF-\text{put-PASS-NOM.SG.M coffin-ACC were PERF-\text{put-down-P.ACT.PL}} \text{ in grave}}\]
\['\text{Laukys stood motionless even when the coffin was already lowered}\]
\[\text{ (= [they] had already lowered the coffin) into the grave.'} \]

In minimal contexts, when no adverbials of time are used, the ambiguous form is usually interpreted as resultative.

A contextual indicator of resultatives may be an adverbial of place, especially in the initial position: the statal serves as a kind of predicative link between the place named and the subject referent, and it can be replaced by a corresponding imperfective verb denoting position, the temporal correlation with the preceding predicates of the broader context being retained:

\[(51) \text{Birutė išvedė vyrus pro kitas duris prie daržinės, kur buvo}\]
\[\text{B. took.out men through other door to barn where were}\]
\[\text{su-krau-t-i} \quad (= \text{buvo; buvo laiko-n-i)}\]
\[\text{PERF-\text{pile-PASS-NOM.PL.M were were STORE-PR.PASS-NOM.PL.M}}\]
\[\text{kolūki-o} \quad \text{pašar-ai. (I. A\v{y}žius)}\]
\[\text{collective.farm-GEN fodder-NOM}\]
\['\text{Birute took out the men through another door to the barn where the collective farm fodder was piled (= was, was kept)'}\]

Indicators of the actional passive are adverbials of manner like lėtai 'slowly', greitai 'fast', palaičiuoti 'gradually, by degrees', etc.; cf.:

\[(52) \text{Dur-ys buvo palaičiuoti ati-dary-t-os.}\]
\[\text{door-NOM.PL.F were gradually PERF-OPEN-PASS-NOM.PL.F}\]
\['\text{The door was gradually opened.'} \]

The statal can be coordinated with compound adjectival predicates used in the same tense and denoting simultaneous states (the actional passive does not seem to occur in this type of contexts):

\[(53) \text{Sodyb-os vart-ai nauj-i, žaliai nu-\text{dažy-t-i, tokie}\]
\[\text{farm-GEN gate-NOM new-NOM green PERF-paint-PASS-NOM such}\]
\[\text{iškilmingi. (I. Simonaitytė)}\]
\[\text{festive}\]
\['\text{The farm gates are new, painted green, so festive.'} \]
3.4 Statal passives with ‘quasi-agent’ phrase

There are rare cases when due to the lexical meaning of the verb, the state is the result of a simultaneous process, usually in the present, and lasts as long as the action/process lasts:

(54) a. Kambar-į  
room-ACC.SG.M  
uz-lieja  
perf-pour.3.pres  
švies-a.  
light-NOM.SG.F
‘Light floods the room.’

b. Kambar-ys  
room-NOM.SG.M  
už-lie-t-as  
perf-pour-PASS-NOM.SG.M  
švies-os.10  
light-GEN.SG.F
‘The room is flooded with light.’

As we see, another condition of statal passives is violated here: the inanimate subject referent of (54a) is not an agent but rather a means and it is obligatory in (54b), because the verb itself is semantically incomplete and thus serves as a kind of semantic link between the place and the means.

3.5 Statals of intransitive verbs (impersonal statals)

Occasionally, the resultative meaning of state can be expressed by the passive form of intransitives and absolutive transitives (antipassives). An observable state is usually ascribed to a place where the action took or had taken place rather than to a non-existent patient. In most cases these statals occur in coordination with adjectival predicates, all in the neuter form.

(55) a. Kambaryj-e  
room-LOC  
prė-rūk-ė,  
perf-smoke-3.PAST  
švar-u,  
clean-NT  
ne-iš-tryp-t-a  
not-perf-trample-PASS-NOM.NT
‘In the room[they] had smoked, it was clean, no footmarks left (lit. ‘not trampled’).’

b. Kambaryj-e  
room-LOC  
buvo  
a-kur-en-o,  
perf-smoke-PASS-NOM.3.PAST  
namusor-en-o.  
perf-litter-PASS-NT
‘In the room there was cigarette smoke, it was littered.’

(56) Mano  
my  
but-e  
flat-LOC  
buvo  
wanced-NT  
cosy-NT  
nice-NT  
not-perf-trample-PASS-NOM.NT
‘In my flat it was clean, cosy, nice, no footmarks left (lit. ‘not trampled’).’

Occasionally, similar usages are possible in colloquial Russian, especially in the dialects (Trubinskij 1988:403); cf. the Russian translation (57) of (55b), and also (58a) and (58b):

(57) V komnat-e  
in room-LOC  
bylo  
a-kur-en-o,  
na-musor-en-o.  
perf-smoke-PASS-NOM.3.PAST  
perf-litter-PASS-NT
‘In the room there was cigarette smoke, it was littered.’

(58) Lithuanian  
Russian
a. Ten  
there  
uzkary-t-a.  
close-PASS-NT
‘It is closed there.’

b. Tam  
there  
zakry-t-o.  
close-PASS-NT
(same translation).
There is an even further development: statal passives are possible even from a few meteorological impersonal verbs. (59) and (60) with perfective terminative verbs describe subsequent states rather than inferred earlier actions and therefore they are not evidential.

(59) a. (Liet-us) pri-lijo.
   rain-nom.sg perf-rain.3.past
   ‘It (had) rained (a lot).’

b. (Liet-aus) pri-ly-t-a.
   rain-gen.sg perf-rain-p.pass-nt
   ‘It has rained (a lot),’ or ‘There is a lot of puddles after the rain.’

Compare also:

(60) Pri-snig-t-a
   perf-snow-p.pass-nt
   ‘It has snowed (abundantly),’ or ‘There is [a lot of] snow (on the ground).’

This usage of impersonal verbs seems to be not registered in Standard Russian.

4. Evidential passive

Predicates consisting of a past (rarely present) passive participle without an auxiliary can express an evidential meaning. They show that the statement is inferred from some evidence of a prior (or simultaneous) event or, sometimes, hearsay and imply the speaker’s certainty or doubt, surprise, etc. To quote Timberlake (1982:510):

In texts these passives usually function to signal epistemological uncertainty – inferentiality, supposition, evidentiality, dubitativity, or the like – so it is reasonable to translate them as English active sentences with an additional evidential adverb.

(61) Ėčia kiški-o gule-t-a.
    here rabbit-gen.sg.m lie-p.pass-nt
    ‘A rabbit must have lain here’ (inferred from the marks).

Instead of the tense-aspect paradigm of a verb comprising 8 passive forms, a verb can have only two evidential forms, a participle in -t- and the other in -m-. Participles in -t- are prevalent in the evidential use, participles in -m- are rare. An exception is the lexical verb būti ‘to be’ often used in the evidential meaning: both its present participle esa-m-a <be-pr.pass-nt> and past participle bū-t-a <be-p.pass-nt> occur as evidential predicates 110 times (54 and 56 respectively) and thus comprise about two thirds of all the evidentials in the corpus of 5,730 passive forms. Note that būti is not used in the passive voice proper.11

(62) Ak, kokių gerų žmoni-ų esa-m-a! (M. Sluckis)
    oh, what nice people-gen.pl be-pr.pass-nt
    ‘Oh, there are nice people, as it happens!’ (expression of surprise, admiration)
(63) Panašių atsitikimų ir kituose kraštuose. (K. Boruta)  
'Similar incidents, it is likely (they say), occurred in other lands, too.'

Usually, the evidential is regarded as the meaning of regular passive forms. But evidentials, it seems, are somewhat formally distinct from passives proper: (a) in this usage the subject is obligatorily demoted and cannot be omitted; (b) a verb can have only two evidential forms (cf. eight tense forms of the passive proper); (c) a passive participle is always used without an auxiliary, i.e. it alone functions as a simple predicate. An exception are correspondences to compound active forms when the auxiliary, and sometimes even the participle (sic!), also acquire the passive form (64b). However, the form with the active participle of the notional verb, which agrees with the agent noun phrase in case (cf. (64c)), seems to be more acceptable:

(64) a. Jis buvo pa-si-slėęję.  
'He had hidden (himself);'

b. Jo bu-ta pa-si-slėę-ta  
'(They say/Evidently) he had hidden himself;'

c. Jo bu-ta pa-si-slėę-usi  
(same translation.) (cf. Timberlake 1982:517, ex. (33)).

It seems plausible to consider evidentials as a special category: (a) semantically, it is distinct from actional passives, and (b) formally, it coincides only with subjectful passives in the present tense with an omitted auxiliary. Evidentials of intransitive verbs do not differ formally from actional passives in the indicative mood if the auxiliary is omitted. Due to the expressive colouring of actional passives, there is no clearcut boundary and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between them.

Evidentials are more common with intransitives than with transitives. Not only these lexical verbs, but even some impersonal meteorological verbs, like byti ‘to rain’, snigi ‘to snow’, not to mention the verb buti ‘to be’, can be used in the evidential mood.12 Note that the predicate in (65) is an imperfective verb and cannot denote a resultant state.

(65) Naktį bu-ta.  
'At night it rained.'

In all the examples of this section the passive predicates are evidential by default.

An additional contextual indicator of evidential passives can be an introductory word or phrase like maty-ti <see-INF> ‘it seems’, pasirodė <turn.out-PAST.3> ‘it turned out’, tur bu-ti <must be-INF> ‘most probably/likely’, etc.
On the other hand, these indicators may also occur with proper passives as lexical markers of evidentiality; e.g.:

(67) Maty-ti, jų tenai ne kartą buvo gyven-t-a. (K. Boruta)
see-inf they-gen there not once be.3.past live-pass-nt

‘One can see, they have lived there not once.’

The evidential passive is indifferent to the semantic type of subject: it may be human, animate, inanimate; e.g.:

(68) Tōs jėg-os tūno-t-a ne vien that.gen strength-gen.sg.f hide-pass-nt not only raumen-yse. (M. Katiliškis)
muscle-loc.pl.m

‘That strength was hidden, it seemed, not only in the muscles.’

In evidential passives of transitive verbs the patient is promoted to subject but the predicate does not agree with it, as a rule, and has the neuter form in -a; cf. muskirsta kopastai ‘cabbages were cut down’ in (66); see also (69).

The absence of agreement can hardly be regarded as a formal marker of the evidential passive of transitics, because it also happens with actional passives.

Characteristically, the word order in evidential passives is nearly always object-agent – predicate [– subject-patient]: the constituents change their form and syntactic functions but not their position; cf. (59) and the following:

(69) Žmon-os taip pat at-si-kel-t-a anksti, atlik-t-a
wife-gen.sg.f also perf-rem-tise-pass-nt early, perform-pass-nt
vis-i darb-ai. (R. Kašauskas)
all-nom.pl.m chore-nom.pl.m

‘Obviously (my) wife also got up early, has done all the chores.’

Evidentials seem to be more common in dialectal speech and in folklore than in Standard Lithuanian, but they are not unusual in the latter.

5. Conclusions

The following is a summming up of the basic claims made in this paper with respect to Lithuanian passives and related phenomena.
1. The passive voice in Lithuanian is expressed by more homogeneous and regular means than in Russian: it is periphrastic and consists of the auxiliary *būti* ‘to be’ usually omitted in the present tense, and a passive participle, either the imperfective participle with the suffix \-*m-* or the perfective participle with the suffix \-*t-*. In Russian, the passive voice of imperfective verbs is marked by the reflexive marker -sja.

2. There is no reflexive passive: participles in -m- mark non-perfect passive forms formally corresponding to simple forms of the active paradigm and those in -t- mark perfect passive forms corresponding to perfect active forms. Each passive form, practically derives from both perfective and imperfective verbs.

3. The reflexive marker derives quasi-passives with passive-like meanings, their affinity manifesting itself in patient promotion to subject position and suppressed human agent (potential-passive and admirative passive of unexpected result). Among derivatives with a reflexive marker they are closest to passives.

4. The agent of the passive form is expressed by devices whose main or only meaning is possessive: the genitive case of nouns and the possessive form of the 1st and 2nd person pronouns.

5. The passive form has three functions, or rather, serves three categories:
   – actional passive in which I include both subjectful and subjectless (impersonal) passives,
   – statal passive (= object-oriented resultative) and
   – evidential (inferential) passive.

6. The agent expression is forbidden in statal passive, optional in actional passive and obligatory in evidential passive.

7. Actional passive is much more regular in Lithuanian than in Russian. Passive forms derive from transitive verbs, two-place and one-place intransitives, including transitive and some semantic classes of intransitive derivatives with the reflexive marker -s-.

8. Direct object which is commonly promoted to subject can be retained in the passive construction as a marginal case; it occurs in constructions with deleted agent used in the generic sense.

9. Statal passive (= object-oriented resultative) is formally combined with the perfect actional passive in -t-. And there is subject-oriented resultative combined with the active perfect. This distribution corresponds typologically to that in the Russian Pskov and Novgorod dialects, but not in Standard Russian. There are no multi-diathesis (both object- and subject-oriented) resultative forms.

10. Actional passives have communicative functions of changing the distribution of emphasis on the constituents and the thema-rhema of a clause if word order cannot be used in this latter function.

11. Statal passives have one type of construction coinciding with the basic passive constructions (patient subject – predicate); they have a semantic function of denoting the state of the patient resulting from a prior action.
12. In contrast to actional and statal passives with a full tense paradigm, evidential passives have only two tense forms, a participle in -m- as an equivalent of the present tense and a participle in -t- as an equivalent of the past tense, both used without an auxiliary. Evidentials also have a semantic function – of showing that an event is inferred from some evidence or based on a guess or hearsay.
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Abbreviations

ACC – accusative
Ag – agent
caus – causative suffix
comp – comparative degree
F – feminine gender
Gen – genitive case
ger – gerund
inf – infinitive
inst – instrumental case
interj – interjection
ipfv – imperfective aspect
loc – locative case
M – masculine gender
nt – neuter marker -a on participles
nom – nominative case
O – object
pres – present tense
past – past tense
p.act – active past participle
pfv – perfective aspect
pl – plural number
p.pass – past passive participle
perf – perfectivizing prefix
pr.act – active present participle
pr.pass – present passive participle
Pt – patient
Passives in Lithuanian

Notes

1. Lithuanian is one of the two live East Baltic languages, the other being Latvian. It is the official language of the Republic of Lithuania, spoken natively by about 83.4 percent of the population (2,907,293 out of 3,483,972, census of 2001) Lithuania. The genetically closest relatives are the Slavic languages. Lithuanian is probably the most conservative among the Indo-European languages. Other known languages are West Baltic Old Prussian extinct since ca. 1700 and attested from some written documents, and East Baltic Karonian, Zemgalian, Selian, also extinct (cf. Voegelin & Voegelin 1977: 50; Bright 1992: 156).

2. All the counts of passives in this paper are based on a corpus of 5730 clauses with passive forms registered in 19 written texts (16 are fiction, and 3 popular science). These passives comprise about 2.6 percent of 220,000 verbal predicates contained in these texts (Geniušienė 1973). In fiction, the average frequency of passive forms expressing all the three categories varies between 0.7 and 3.4 percent of the predicates. In newspapers and popular science, passive forms comprise about 7.2 percent of predicates. Their frequency in political texts is about 21.9 percent, and in linguistic texts 32 percent of verbal predicates. The description of quasi-passive reflexives is based on the data collected for the investigation of Lithuanian reflexives in Geniušienė (1987): a dictionary verb-list of 3,680 verbs with the reflexive marker entered in the Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian (Kruopas 1972) which contains 190 reflexive quasi-passives, and rather rare usages of these verbs in a corpus of about 10,000 sentences with formal reflexives from written sources.

3. The following minimal grammatical information is relevant for the further description. The noun has two genders, feminine (F) and masculine (M), number (SG and PL), and case (NOM, GEN, DAT, ACC, INST, LOC). The verb has aspect, imperfective and perfective usually marked by prefixes; cf.: staty-ti <build-INF> ‘to build’ → pa-staty-ti <PERF-build-INF> ‘to build, have built’. There is a considerable number of verbs of dual aspect which are perfective in the simple past tense and imperfective in the present. There are three tenses in Lithuanian: present, past and future. In the past tense, there is "simple" past and frequentative past with the marker -dav-. The verb also has the category of perfect represented by periphrastic forms opposed to synthetic forms in the active voice, cf. the past tense forms (a) non-perfect [jis] stat-ė <[he.NOM] build-3.PAST> ‘[he] built, was building’ – (b) perfect [jis] buvo stat-ės <[he.NOM]> be.3.PAST build-P.ACT.NOM.SG.M> ‘[he] had built, had been building’; the active past participle in (b) has no special marker, its form consisting of the stem and agreement endings. In the periphrastic active and passive forms, both the auxiliary and the participle agree with the subject: the former in person and number, the latter in case, number and gender. For the active perfect compare (b) just cited and the following: cf. jie yra stat-ė ‘they, have been building’; ji yra stat-ėsi ‘(she) has been building’ – jos yra stat-ėsius ‘(they,F) have been building’. Passive endings of the participle: -as <NOM,M.SG> – -i <M.PL>, -a <ESG> – -as <F.PL>. The word order is relatively free, the neutral sequence being SVO. Change of word order serves the thema-rhematic function.
4. The reflexive marker has the allomorph -si- when used as an interfix [between prefix and root (cf. nu-si-kirt-o in (4a)); when used as a postfix in final position, it may be either -si- (rengia-si ‘(s/he) dresses’) or -s (rengsi-s ‘will dress’), their distribution being rather complex (for details see Geniušienė 1987: 19).

5. Compare Keenan (1985: 254): “If we take the implication of the existence of an Agent as definitional of passives, and the lack of such an implication as definitional of middles, we would say that only (18b) (viz. La porte s’est ouverte ‘The door opened’ – E.G.) is a middle and not a passive.”

6. The passive forms of the same tense differ subtly in meaning, due to the interplay of the aspect-tense meaning of the perfective or imperfective participle, the aspect of the verb and the meaning of the passive tense form marked on the auxiliary. The translations in (9)–(10) do not adequately render the meaning of the original forms as the latter happen to have a different semantic range than their English counterparts. Form (10b) has both the actional and statal meanings, thus serving as a combined form of two categories.

7. This system calls to mind four combinations of the verb aspect and aspectual value of the past tense forms (Perfective Aorist, Imperfective Aorist, Perfective Imperfect and Imperfective Imperfect) in Bulgarian (Comrie 1976: 31).

8. Contrary to Wiemer (this volume: 1.1) I prefer to consider the final -a in impersonal passive forms as a separate marker – as one of the paradigm of the agreement markers -as (M) and -a (F). Hence the markers of passive participles are -am and -at, be it subjectful or impersonal (subjectless) passives, rather than -ta and -ma for impersonals.

9. Subjectless constructions are usually termed impersonal (cf., for instance, Timberlake 1982; Siewierska 1984), but I prefer the more neutral term ‘subjectless’, because the term ‘impersonal’ sounds somewhat contradictory when applied to passives with a deleted and especially overt human (highly “personal”) agent.

10. This transform is also relatable to an active construction with the simple past predicate, in which case they form a regular resultative opposition:

   c. Kambarį užliejo švies-a.
   room-ACC perf-pour.3.PAST light-NOM
   ‘The light flooded the room.’

11. Here I disagree with Wiemer (this volume: 4) that the passive participles of this verb can be actual (impersonal) passives: in my opinion, their only function is evidential, with a broad range of emotive nuances.

12. Timberlake (1982: 510–513) seems to consider most, if not all of subjectless passives of intransitive verbs as evidentials, even those with a deleted agent. My data seem to show that this is not the case, evidentials constituting a smaller part of the passive forms in question (see passives proper in 2.2.3). His examples (12) and (13) with the forms paly-t-a <rain-PASS-NT> ‘rained’ and pa-snig-t-a <snow-PASS-NT> ‘snowed’ (p. 512) are certainly not evidentials, nor are the subsequent (14) and (15) without the genitive of human agent (ibid.) – they are passive proper with an implied agent.
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Passive and middle in Indo-European

Reconstructing the early Vedic passive paradigm*

Leonid Kulikov
Leiden University

The present paper deals with the passive function of the middle diathesis in Vedic Sanskrit, one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages. It gives a general survey of passive formations of the three main tense systems (present, aorist and perfect) and discusses forms which are traditionally considered non-characterized middle formations ('bare middles'). It will be argued that these forms should be grouped with those formations which have specialized markers of passive. I will further inventory the actually attested present passives with the suffix -yā-, discussing the defective character of the passive paradigm of the present, aorist and perfect tense systems. In conclusion, I briefly discuss possible Proto-Indo-European sources of the Vedic passive paradigm and the historical relationships between the categories of perfect, stative and middle, as well as perspectives of a diachronic typological study of valency-changing categories, such as passive and causative, outlining the main tendencies in the evolution of the Proto-Indo-European middle.

1. Passive and middle in Indo-European and Vedic: A historical background

The present paper concentrates on the development of the category of passive in Vedic Sanskrit, one of the most ancient attested Indo-European languages and the oldest documented Indo-Aryan language.1

There are two basic tendencies which determine the evolution of the Old Indo-Aryan (Sanskrit) passive and, to some extent, its further developments in later, Middle and New Indo-Aryan, periods. One the one hand, Indo-Aryan languages attest the rapid growth of new formations which serve to express valency-changing categories, foremost in the present tense system. These include, in particular, passives with the suffix -yā- and causatives with the suffix -āya-.

One the other hand, we observe the loss of several grammatical functions of the ancient Indo-European middle. It is a commonplace in the Indo-European scholarship that the proto-language was lacking specialized markers of passive (see, e.g., Beekes 1995:225). This is not to say, however, that passive constructions (i.e. constructions where the initial direct object of a transitive verb was promoted to the subject position)
were impossible. This function was taken over by the middle diathesis 2 – alongside with a number of other intransitive derivations, such as anticausative (decausative), reflexive and reciprocal. Thus, the passive is usually said to be one of the basic functions of the (ancient) Indo-European middle. 3

This might be the case indeed in Proto-Indo-European, as well as in some ancient Indo-European languages such as Ancient Greek (see e.g. Jankuhn 1969). However, one of the oldest documented Indo-European languages, Vedic Sanskrit, seems to attest the decay of the original system. Already in early Vedic, that is, in the language of the two most ancient texts, Rgveda (RV) and Atharvaveda (AV), 4 these functions are largely taken over by special markers.

In what follows, I will focus on the alleged passive function of the middle diathesis. In Section 2, I will offer a general overview of formations of the three main tense systems, those of present, aorist and perfect, used in passive constructions. Sections 3 and 4 will be dealing with two groups of forms which are traditionally considered non-characterized middle formations (‘bare middles’). I will argue that they should be grouped with those forms which have specialized markers of passive (as described in Section 2). In Section 5, I concentrate on the passives within the system of present (with the suffix -yá-), inventoring the actually attested forms and demonstrating the defective character of the present passive paradigm. Section 6 is a brief survey of the (few) non-characterized (‘bare’) middle forms attested in passive constructions. Section 7 recapitulates the early Vedic passive paradigms of the three main tense systems. Section 8 contains some speculations on the Proto-Indo-European sources of the Vedic passive paradigm and on the historical relationships between the categories of perfect, stative and middle. The final Section 9 is dedicated to the perspectives of a diachronic typological study of valency-changing categories, such as passive and causative, outlining the main tendencies in the evolution of the Proto-Indo-European middle and in the system of valency-changing categories.

2. Early Vedic passive formations in the three main tense systems:

A general overview

The Old Indo-Aryan (Vedic) verbal paradigm includes three main classes of forms, called present, aorist and perfect systems. Within each of these sub-sets, forms are built on the same stem, i.e. on present, aorist and perfect stems, respectively. Each tense system includes a number of finite forms and a pair of participles, active and middle. In what follows, I will discuss in detail the inventories of passive forms within each tense system.

As mentioned above, bare middle forms of all the three main tense systems are generally said to be able to function as passives. On closer examination, it turns out, however, that within all tense systems, passive is typically expressed by means of characterized formations, rather than by means of bare middles. Alongside present passives with the accented suffix -yá- 5 (e.g. yuj ‘yoke, join’: 3sg. yujyáte ‘is (being) yoked, joined’, etc.), which will be dealt with at length in Section 5, there are two forma-
tions typically employed in the passive usage. These include (i) the (medio-)passive aorist and (ii) the stative. Both formations have a defective paradigm. The best attested forms are 3rd person singular and 3rd person plural: passive aorists in -i and -ran (-ram) (e.g. yuj ‘yoke, join’: 3sg. ayoj, 3pl. ayurjan) and statives in -e and -re (e.g. hi ‘impel’: hinvé ‘(it) is / has been impelled’, 3pl. hinviré ‘(they) are / have been impelled’). Besides, there are two very rare stative forms, 2sg. in -(i)še (attested for ši ‘possess, rule’ and šru ‘hear’: šiše, šrviše) and 3sg.impv. in -ām (attested for duh ‘give milk, be a milk(-cow)’ and ši ‘lie’: duhm RV+, sayām AV). Both formations do not have specific stems: passive aorists are derived from the bare root (which is also used as the base for the root aorist derivation), while statives “dwell” on the stems of several formations (in particular, on those of presents and intensives). Nor do statives have specific endings; or, to put it more exactly, they share endings with the middle perfect (cf. kr ‘make’: 3sg.pf.med. cakr-ē, 3pl.pf.med. cakri-rē). Whilst -yá-presents and aorists in -i/-ran (-ram) function as passives in the present and aorist systems, respectively, some of the statives seem to supply passives in the system of perfect. The attestations of most of the non-present formations are mainly limited to the oldest Vedic text, the RV. Already in the AV we find no 3pl. passive aorists in -ran (-ram) and only isolated examples of statives (see Kümmel 1996). The only non-present finite passive form surviving into middle and late Vedic and, later on, into post-Vedic (Classical) Sanskrit is the 3sg. aorist in -i.

To sum up, the three above-mentioned formations employed in passive usages are characterized either by a special formative (present stem suffix -yá-), or by a special set of endings (aorists in -i/-ran/-ram), or, finally, by a unique combination of stem and endings (statives in -e/-re; cf. hinv-ē: present stem hinv- + perfect ending -ē). They represent the core of the early Vedic passive paradigm. Beyond this core, there remain two large groups of non-characterized middle forms (which I will call ‘bare middles’) employed in passive usages, middle perfects and middle athematic participles with the suffix -āna-. Apparently, they form the main evidence for the claim about the common passive usage of the bare middles. In the following two sections I will concentrate on these two groups of forms, arguing that they are morphologically (grammatically) ambiguous and therefore do not represent true exceptions to my claim about the rare or exceptional character of the passive function of the bare middles.

3. Passive -āna-participles

One such exception is a group of athematic middle participles (with the suffix -āna-), which exhibit quite unusual syntactic properties in early Vedic, particularly in the language of the Rgveda. While the finite forms with which these participles are said to belong together are employed only transitively, the corresponding -āna-participles are attested both in transitive and intransitive (passive) constructions. This fact was noticed already by Delbrück in his seminal *Altindische Syntax* (1888:264).

Elsewhere I have demonstrated (Kulikov, forthc.) that the grammatical characteristics of such passive -āna-participles should be reconsidered. Here I will only briefly
summarize my conclusions, discussing two typical examples, participles *hinvānā*- and *yujānā*-.

The participle *hinvānā*- (root *hi* 'impel'), taken by all grammars as the middle participle of the nasal present with the suffix -*nō/-*nu*- (class V in the Indian tradition), occurs 18 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (1a)), and 10 times in transitive constructions (as in (1b)) in the Rgveda (see, e.g., Kümmel 1996:141):

(1) a. (RV 9.12.8)

'Soma, being impelled, flows.'

b. (RV 9.97.32)

`... índrāya pavase ... hi-nv-ānó.`  
'You (sc. Soma) purify yourself for Indra, impelling (your) speech with the (religious) thoughts of the poets.'

The syntactic properties of *hinvānā*- clearly differ from those of the finite middle forms made from the same stem (3pl.med. *hinváte* etc.), with which *hinvānā*- is supposed to belong together. These forms can only be employed transitively, meaning 'to impel', as in (2):

(2) (RV 9.65.11)

`hi-nv-é vájeśu vájinam impel-pres-1sg.med price:loc.pl runnet:acc.sg`  
'I spur on this runner [in the race] for prices.'

Similarly, the participle *yujānā*- (root *yuj* 'yoke') occurs 8 times in intransitive (passive) constructions (as in (3a)) and 14 times in transitive constructions (as in (3b)) in the Rgveda (as rightly pointed out by Kümmel (1996:90)):

(3) a. (RV 6.34.2c)

`rātho ná mahé śavase yuj-ānāḥ chariot:nom.sg like great:dat power:dat yoke:aor-part.med:nom.sg.m`  
'... like a chariot yoked for the great power.'

b. (RV 6.47.19a)

`yuj-ānāḥ haritā rāthe yoke:aor-part.med:nom.sg.m.f fallow:acc.du chariot:loc.sg`  
'... (Tvāṣṭāt,) yoking two fallow [horses] to the chariot.'

Vedic grammars treat *yujānā*- as a middle participle of the root aorist (see, for instance, Whitney 1885b:132; Macdonell 1910:370). However, again, as in the case of *hinvānā*- , the corresponding finite forms (3sg.med. *áyukta* etc.) can only be employed in transitive constructions, as in (4):

(4) (RV 7.60.3)

`dā-yuk-ta saptā haritāḥ aug:yoke:aor-3sg.med seven fallow:acc.pl`  
'He yoked (now) his seven fallow [horses].'
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Such remarkable syntactic behavior of the middle participles requires an explanation: Why do these participles show a syntactic feature (an ‘unoriented character’ in terms of Haspelmath 1994) that is different from those of the corresponding finite forms? Apparently, in order to find a clue to our problem, we have to look for such finite forms which are derived from the same stem as the participles in question (i.e. hinv- and yuj-) and can be employed as passives. Such forms indeed exist. In the case of hinvānā-, these are statives 3sg. hinvē ‘(it) is impelled’, 3pl. hinvirē ‘(they) are impelled’.

In the case of yujānā-, passive usages are attested for the passive aorist 3sg. āyoji ‘(it) was yoked’, 3pl. āyujran ‘(they) were yoked’.

To put it in morphological terms, the stem hinu-/hinv- is shared by the nasal present (3pl.med. hinvāte etc.), which never occurs in passive constructions, and the stative (3sg. hinvē), which is employed in passive usages (‘is impelled’). Likewise, the stem yuj-/yoj- (i.e. bare root) is shared by the root aorist (3sg.med. āyukta etc.), never used in passive constructions (āyukta can only mean ‘(he) yoked’, not ‘was yoked’), and the passive aorist (3sg. ā-yoj-i, 3pl. ā-yuj-ran), always employed as passive (‘it was yoked’, ‘they were yoked’).

Thus, for morphological reasons, we can assume that the participle hinvānā- may belong either with the transitive nasal present (hinvāte etc.) or with the stative (3sg. hinvē, 3pl. hinvirē). Likewise, yujānā- may be a member of the paradigm either of the (transitive) root aorist (āyukta etc.) or of the passive aorist (3sg. āyoji, 3pl. ayujran). The immediate corollary of this assumption is that hinvānā- and yujānā- can be employed either transitively (when belonging with the transitive nasal present and root aorist, respectively), or intransitively (passively) — when belonging with the stative and passive aorist, respectively. Thus, these participles are homonymous, or morphologically (grammatically) ambiguous, but their grammatical characteristics can be distinguished by their syntax. hinvānā- is a middle present participle when employed transitively, meaning ‘impelling’, and a stative participle when employed intransitively (passively), meaning ‘impelled’. Likewise, yujānā- is a middle root aorist participle when employed transitively (‘yoking’) and a passive aorist participle when employed in passive constructions (‘yoked’):

Although, traditionally, Vedic grammars do not include participles into the paradigms of statives and medio-passive aorists, the assumption that passive -ānā-participles should be listed within these paradigms seems quite attractive, since it easily explains their abnormal syntax.
In the following Section I will discuss another large group of forms which are traditionally considered non-characterized middle formations ('bare middles') employed in passive constructions.

4. Middle passive perfects and statives

Middle perfects employed in passive usages almost exclusively are 3sg. and 3pl. forms in -e and -re. In my view, some occurrences of these two forms should be taken as statives rather than perfects. Again, as in the case of the passive -āna-participles, this is a topic for a separate study (see Kulikov 2003b); here I only briefly summarize my argumentation and main conclusions.

The following two facts are relevant for a discussion of the Vedic statives:

(i) they have no specific stems, “dwelling” on the stems of other formations (foremost, on those of presents and intensives);
(ii) they have no specific endings; or, to put it more exactly, they share endings with the middle perfect (3sg. -e, 3pl. -re).

The direct corollary of these two facts is that some of the 3sg. and 3pl. middle perfects might be considered, at least in synchronic terms, as statives built on perfect stems.

Here it will be in order to recall Kümmel’s (2000:94) assumption that middle perfects have been secondarily created by adding the stative endings, 3sg. -e (going back to Proto-Indo-Iranian *-ā(i)) and 3pl. -re (< PIIr. *-rá(i)), to the perfect stem. In my view, this diachronic statement has also important implications for a synchronic interpretation of the early Vedic verbal system. Specifically, as long as the stative existed as a separate morphological formation (i.e. during the early Vedic period, in the language of the Rgveda), at least some of the 3sg. and 3pl. forms with the endings -e and -re built on perfect stems (traditionally taken as middle perfects) could remain statives without being reinterpreted as middle perfects. In other words, some of these forms were morphologically (grammatically) homonymous: they could represent either (old) statives derived from perfect stems or (newly-built) middle perfects. As in the case of the participles with the suffix -āna-, discussed in the preceding section, the grammatical characteristics of such forms are prompted by their syntactic features. Specifically, there are good reasons to assume that early Vedic 3sg. and 3pl. middle perfects employed in the passive usage should be interpreted as statives built on perfect stems. For instance, the form dadhē (root dhā ‘put’) should be taken as a 3sg. form of the middle perfect when meaning ‘has put’, as in (5a), and as 3sg. of the stative when meaning ‘is put / has been put’, as in (5b):

\[(5) \begin{align*}
a. \quad & (RV \ 9.18.4) \\
& yó v(cards) vár(ious) vás(um) hástayor \quad \text{dadh-é} \\
& \text{who} \quad \text{all} \quad \text{desirable:ACC} \quad \text{goods:ACC} \quad \text{hand:LOC.DU} \quad \text{put:PF-3SG.MED} \\
& \text{‘The one who holds / has put all desirable goods in his hands ...’}
\end{align*} \]
b. (RV 1.168.3)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hāṣṭeṣu} & \quad \text{khādiś} \quad \text{ca} \quad \text{krīś} \quad \text{ca} \quad \text{sāṃ} \\
\text{hand:loc.pl} & \quad \text{brooch:nom.sg} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sward:nom.sg} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{together}
\end{align*}
\]

dadh-é
put:stat-3sg.med

'Brooch and sward is put in [your] hands.'

Likewise, the form \textit{yuyujrê} (root \textit{yuj}'yoke') should be taken as 3pl.pf.med. when meaning 'have yoked', as in (6a), and as 3pl.stative when meaning 'are yoked / have been yoked', as in (6b):

\begin{enumerate}
\item (RV 5.58.7)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vātānu} & \quad \text{hy} \quad \text{āśvan} \quad \text{dhury} \quad \text{ā-yuyuj-rē} \\
\text{wind:acc.pl} & \quad \text{since} \quad \text{horse:acc.pl shaft:loc.sg prev-yoke:pf-3pl.med}
\end{align*}
\]

'Since [the Maruts] have yoked the winds as their horses into the shaft . . .'

\item (RV 1.168.3)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dhiyā} & \quad \text{yuyuj-rā}^{12} \quad \text{āṅkavar} \\
\text{thought:ins.sg yoke:stat-3pl.med sap:nom.pl}
\end{align*}
\]

'The [Soma-]saps have been yoked with a religious thought.'
\end{enumerate}

The same holds true, \textit{mutatis mutandis}, for middle participles made from perfect stems and employed in passive usages. Such forms should be taken as belonging with statives rather than with middle perfects, as in the compound \textit{yuyujānda-sapti} 'with yoked horses':

\begin{enumerate}
\item (RV 6.62.4)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yuyuj-āndā-saptī} \\
\text{yoke:stat-part.med-horse:nom.du}
\end{align*}
\]

'[these two Aśvins] which have yoked horses'
\end{enumerate}

Thus, early Vedic 3sg. and 3pl. middle perfects employed in the passive usage can be explained as statives built on perfect stems. As in the case of some -\textit{āna}-participles, forms which are built on perfect stems and occur both in transitive and passive usages, such as \textit{dadhé}, should be taken as morphologically (grammatically) ambiguous: \textit{dadhé} 'has put' is a perfect, but the same form meaning 'is / has been put' should be taken as a stative.

Next to these three forms, i.e. 3sg., 3pl. and participle, early Vedic attests no examples of middle perfects in the passive usage. Given the defective character of the stative paradigm, the lack of other middle forms employed in passive constructions indirectly supports the analysis of the three forms listed above as statives built on perfect stems. The only exception is 2sg.med. \textit{bedhiṣe} 'you are bound' (root \textit{bandh} 'bind') in AV 6.63.3 = 6.84.4 (see Kümmel 2000:329; Kulikov 2001:124). This form can be compared to the (rare) 2sg. statives \textit{īṣe} and \textit{ṣeṇviṣe}, thus being an exception that proves the rule.

Leaving now the systems of aorist and perfect, I will concentrate on the -\textit{yā}-formations, functioning as passives within the system of present.
5. The passive paradigm in the system of the present

Among the three Sanskrit tense systems, that of the present is the most developed. It includes, alongside the present tense proper, one more tense, the imperfect, as well as four non-indicative moods: injunctive (= augmentless imperfect), imperative, subjunctive (functioning in the early Vedic period as future with additional modal meanings), and optative (rather rare in the early period). In each of the six tense-moods, nine forms corresponding to possible person-number combinations can be built (1st, 2nd and 3rd persons × singular, dual and plural numbers). In total, this makes up 54 finite forms in each of the two diatheses (active and middle), as well as the present participle. Since passive forms exclusively take the middle inflexion, I will hereafter concentrate on the middle part of the paradigm. An example of the middle present paradigm is given in Table 1 (verb *bhr˚ ‘bear, carry’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE</th>
<th>IMPERFECT</th>
<th>INJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>OPTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>bháre</td>
<td>á-bhare</td>
<td>bháre</td>
<td>(= subj.)</td>
<td>bháreya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>bhára-se</td>
<td>á-bhara-thás</td>
<td>bhára-thás</td>
<td>bhára-sva</td>
<td>bhára-se,-sai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>bhára-te</td>
<td>á-bhara-ta</td>
<td>bhára-ta</td>
<td>bhára-tám</td>
<td>bhára-te,-tai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>bhár¯avahe</td>
<td>á-bhár¯avahi</td>
<td>bhár¯avahi</td>
<td>(= subj.)</td>
<td>bhár¯avahai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>bhárethe</td>
<td>á-bhárethám</td>
<td>bhárethám</td>
<td>bhárethám</td>
<td>bháraithe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>bhárete</td>
<td>á-bhárethat</td>
<td>bhárethat</td>
<td>bhárethat</td>
<td>bháreta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>bhár¯amahe</td>
<td>á-bhár¯amahi</td>
<td>bhár¯amahi</td>
<td>(= subj.)</td>
<td>bhár¯amahai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>bhára-dhive</td>
<td>á-bhára-dhvam</td>
<td>bhára-dhvam</td>
<td>bhára-dhive</td>
<td>bháreedhvam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>bhára-nte</td>
<td>á-bhára-nta</td>
<td>bhára-nta</td>
<td>bhára-ntám</td>
<td>bhára-nte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the maximal inventory of middle forms of the present system, which, as one might expect, should constitute the present passive paradigm (e.g. 1sg.pres. *yujyé, 2sg.pres. *yujyáse, ... 1sg.impf. *dujyé, ... etc.). In fact, however, only less than one fourth of these theoretically possible forms are actually attested in the two early Vedic texts, Rigveda and Atharvaveda.

Within the sub-system of the present forms proper, only the 3rd person singular and plural forms are well-attested. Next to a dozen of 2sg. forms (*yujyáse ‘you are (being) yoked’, *sasyáse ‘you are (being) praised’, etc.), we only find one occurrence of a 3du. form, *ucyete (RV 10.90.11) ‘[the two feet] are called’ and one (philologically and grammatically rather unclear) form -panyámahe, which may represent 1pl. (‘we are (being) glorified’ (?); see Kulikov 2001:112–114). 1sg., 1du., 2du. and 2pl. forms are unattested.

Next to present forms proper, participles and rare imperatives (10 forms or so in the RV and AV), only exceptional attestations of other tense-moods are found. These include as few as four forms:14
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(i) 3sg.impf. an¯ıyata '(she) was brought’ in the late RV (8.56.4 = V¯alakh. 8.4) and 3pl.impf. -ásicyanta '(they) were besprinkled’ in AV 14.1.36;
(ii) 3sg.inj. s¯uyata '(he) is consecrated' in the late RV (10.132.4) (see Kulikov 2001:216–217);
(iii) 3sg.subj. -bhriy¯ate (RV 5.31.12) 'it will be brought'.

Optatives of the present passive do not occur before the middle Vedic period.

The inventory of the present passive forms attested in the RV and AV is shown in Table 2. The members of the paradigm are mainly exemplified by forms of the verb yuj ‘yoke, join’ (which exhibits one of the most complete attested paradigms), supplemented by forms of other verbs where those of yuj are unattested. The lacking tense-moods of the passive paradigm (which include imperfect, injunctive, subjunctive and optative) is shown with dark grey shading – with the exception of a few hapaxes marked with middle gray shading; 1× = one attestation; RV_{L} stands for late RV.

Table 2. The inventory of the present passive forms attested in the RV and AV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>IMPERFECT</th>
<th>INJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>OPTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>yujiy-sc</td>
<td>-niya-ta RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-te RV_{1}</td>
<td>dhiya-sva AV</td>
<td>dhiya-tām AV</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-te RV_{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-niya-ta RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-te RV_{1}</td>
<td>dhiya-sva AV</td>
<td>dhiya-tām AV</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-te RV_{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-niya-ta RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-te RV_{1}</td>
<td>dhiya-sva AV</td>
<td>dhiya-tām AV</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-te RV_{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-niya-ta RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-te RV_{1}</td>
<td>dhiya-sva AV</td>
<td>dhiya-tām AV</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-te RV_{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>uv˚e RV_{1}</td>
<td>-siya-nita RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-dhavam</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-mānu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-siya-nita RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-dhavam</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-mānu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-siya-nita RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-dhavam</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-mānu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yujiy-te</td>
<td>-siya-nita RV_{1}</td>
<td>yujiy-dhavam</td>
<td>bhriy˚a-mānu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only from the middle Vedic period onwards, when the present passive system becomes well-established, do we find a good many imperfects, subjunctives and optatives of -yá-passives.

The gaps in the paradigm of the -yá-passives can hardly be accidental. They possibly point to the fact that the present passive paradigm was not yet well-established in the early Vedic period (= the language of the RV and AV). These gaps have been noticed by several Sanskritists, but did not yet receive satisfactory explanation. It seems that there are several factors and constraints belonging to different layers of the linguistic system which may be responsible for the defective inventory of the present passive paradigm. These constraints may include the following:

(i) **Semantic and pragmatic reasons**

One might assume that the semantics and pragmatics of certain moods is incompatible with the passive perspective. Thus, the rarity of passive imperatives may be due to the fact that one cannot “order someone to do something that is by nature automatic, neither requiring nor allowing intentions or effort” (Jamison 1989:62). This constraint
does not hold, however, for other non-indicative moods, such as subjunctive, optative and injunctive (which are even rarer than imperatives), nor does it explain the exceptional character of the passive imperfects.

(ii) Paradigmatic and analogical reasons
The rare (or exceptional) character of the present passive forms other than 3sg., 3pl. and participle may be due to the influence of the defective non-present (i.e., aorist and perfect-stative) passive paradigms, which consist of these three forms only. Note that the process of establishing the complete present passive paradigm is nearly simultaneous with (or immediately following) the loss of the bulk of the non-present passive forms (i.e., 3pl. passive aorists, statives built on non-perfect stems and passive -ana-participles), which can be dated to the middle Vedic period.

The function of the past tense (imperfect) and injunctive could be (partly) taken over by the passive aorist in -i/-ran (-ram) and the aorist injunctive, as well as by constructions with perfect passive participles in -ta-/na-; cf. (8). As for the non-indicative moods, such as subjunctive, their meanings could be rendered by passive constructions with the gerundive, as in (9):

(8) (RV 8.58.1)
yó anūcānō brāhmaṇō yuk-tā
who:nom learned priest:nom.sg yoke:part.pf.pass:nom.sg.m
āsit
(≈ impf. ayujyata)
bec:impf:3sg.act
‘The priest which is learned was yoked (i.e. appointed) [for the sacrifice] . . .’

(9) (RV 1.101.6)
yāḥ śārebhīr hát-yaḥ
who:nom hero:ins.pl invoke:ger:nom.sg.m
‘. . . who will/should be invoked by the heroes.’

(iii) Phonological reasons
Finally, the development of the passive paradigm could be suppressed by some constraints and tendencies of a purely formal (phonological) nature. As has been argued elsewhere (Kulikov 2005), there existed a tendency to avoid sequences of two long syllables, which may account for the secondary vowel shortening in a number of nominal and verbal formations. This is, in particular, the case of the nominal derivatives of the root pū(y) ‘blame, scorn’ (cf. pūy-, pūyaka-, pūyatnā- ‘scornful’ vs. pūyāru- id., with the secondary short i in the root) and the -yu-presents built on some CRi roots, which normally lengthen the root vowel before the suffix -ya- (cf. -ṣīya, . . ., -vliye . . . instead of the regular -ṣīye, . . ., -vliye . . .). Since most of the passive -yā-stems have long root syllables (the only exception being passives derived from Cř roots, such as kriyā- and bhriyā-), this phonological tendency could have retarded the derivation of the passive subjunctive and optative forms, which have long suffix vowels (e17 a). Note, incidentally, that the only early Vedic example of a passive subjunctive (RV -bhriyāte) is derived from a Cř root, bhṛ.
The same phonological tendency may be responsible for the rare character of dual passive forms, where the passive suffix -y[á]- is followed by a long vowel, e. We find only one dual form in early Vedic, 3du. ucýete (RV 10.90.11) ‘[the two feet] are called’. The vestige of yet another dual passive form may be tujete (RV 1.61.14) ‘[they two] are put to panic’. In spite of its non-passive morphology (the lack of the suffix -y(a)-), this form is employed in the passive usage:

\[ \text{(10) (RV 1.61.14)} \]

\begin{verbatim}
ayá āḥ u bhā́yā . . . dyā́vā . . . bhā́mā jaṇāśas
his fear:INS heaven:nom.du earth:nom.du birth:GEN

tujete
put.to.panic:pres:3du.med
‘Because of the fear of his (= Indra’s) birth, . . . heaven and earth are put to panic.’
\end{verbatim}

As I have argued elsewhere (Kulikov 2001:81–82), tujete is likely to result from the reduction of the consonant cluster in the original passive *tujéte (which has made the long root syllable short) – again in order to avoid the sequence of two long syllables.

6. Bare middle forms in the passive usage: Residuals

The bare middle forms attested in the passive usage which remain after sifting the Vedic evidence (i.e. after explaining away passive -áná-participles and 3sg. and 3pl. middle perfects) form a tiny set. Most of them can be explained as secondary formations created on the basis of regular passives. Let us have a closer look at these forms.

6.1 Present formations

The present formations other than -yá-passives attested in the passive usages include: class I pres. stávate ‘is praised’, class IX pres. grń́té ‘is praised’, pres. -tundate (RV 1.58.1) ‘is goaded’ and class III (reduplicated) pres. mímítte ‘is measured’ (RV 8.2.10). stávate is the only formation in this group which quite commonly occurs in passive constructions in the RV.

With the exception of stu ‘praise’, -yá-passives of these roots do not occur in (early) Vedic (see Kulikov 2001:557–558), so that three of the above-listed forms, grń́té, -tundate and mímítte, supply in fact the lacking -yá-passives *grń̄táte, *tudýáte and mń́yáte.18

stávate and grń́té are likely to be based on the stems of the statives stáve (see Narten 1969) and grń́ ‘is praised’, instantiating a sort of back derivation (Rückbildungen). For two other formations statives are unattested (except for an unclear form tundáná- ‘impelled, goaded’ (stative participle?) in AV 6.22.3).
6.2 Aorist formations

Passive usages are attested for a few forms of sigmatic aorists. Most of them are 3pl. forms: *ayuksata* '(they) were yoked', *adrksata* '(they) were seen, visible, (they) appeared', *asrksata* '(they) were set free'. Apparently, these forms could fill some lacunae in the paradigm of the passive aorist and, at some stage, replace the more archaic 3pl. passives in *-ran* (*-ram*). The close paradigmatic association of sigmatic aorists with medio-passive i-aorists has been noticed by several scholars (see, for instance, Narten 1964:25ff., 215, 223, 227, 270ff.; Insler 1968, 1969, 1995; Kümmel 1996:130ff., 2000:555; Kulikov 2001:558–560).

Apart from these sigmatic aorists, there are also a few isolated occurrences of middle aorists of other morphological types found in passive constructions. These include a 3sg. form of the thematic aorist of *khyā* 'see, consider, reckon' (*-akhyata*) at RV 9.61.7 (cf. (11)) and a 3sg. form of the root aorist of *śā* 'sharpen' (*-āśīta*) at RV 1.57.2 (cf. (12)); see Kulikov 2001:58–61, 505. Interestingly, both occurrences are compounds with the preverb *sām* 'together':

(11) (RV 9.61.7)

\[
\text{sām \ aditiyēbhir \ a-khya-ta}
\]

\[
\text{PREV \ Adityā:INS.PL \ aUG-CONSider:AOR-3SG.MED}
\]

'[Soma] was reckoned with the Āditya-deities.]

(12) (RV 9.61.7)

\[
yāt \ . . . \ \text{sām-ā-śī-ta \ haryātā \ īndrasya}
\]

\[
\text{when \ PREV-AUG-sharpen:AOR-3SG.MED \ enjoyABLE:nom.sg.m} \ \text{Indr:GEN}
\]

\[
vājra \ . . .
\]

\[
vajra:nom.sg
\]

'It must be noted that *khyā* `see, consider, reckon' and *śā* `sharpen' do not form *-yā*-passives in early Vedic;¹⁹ nor are passive i-aorists attested. Thus, as in the case of the verbs the middle presents of which are attested in passive constructions (see Section 6.1), *-akhyata* and *-āśīta* may supply the lacking *-yā*-passives and/or passive i-aorists.

7. The early Vedic passive paradigm: A recapitulation

The early Vedic passive paradigm is summarized in Table 3 below. An almost complete paradigm is attested for the verbs *su* `press (out)' and *yuj* `yoke, join'. In the cases where forms of these two verbs are unattested, I put in square brackets forms made from other roots. Different degrees of shading show the status of the corresponding forms: dark grey = lacking and morphologically impossible; middle grey = morphologically possible but unattested or only exceptionally attested (underdeveloped part of the paradigm); light grey = morphologically possible but rare (perhaps, foremost for pragmatic reasons; cf. the rarity of passive imperatives).
8. A few remarks on the Proto-Indo-European sources of the Vedic passive paradigm

A detailed discussion of the sources and development of the Proto-Indo-European stative and perfect goes beyond the scope of the present paper; for the evolution of the (early) Proto-Indo-European system of verbal endings see especially Kortlandt (1979:66–68 et passim, 1981:128–129 et passim). Here I will confine myself to a few brief remarks on this issue. There are good reasons to assume that the Indo-European categories ‘perfect’ and ‘middle’ are historically related and probably originate in one single proto-category. This hypothesis, going back as far as Kuryłowicz (1932) and Stang (1932), is based, foremost, on the fact that the sets of endings used by the active perfect and middle diathesis share a number of features.20

Thus, originally, in early Proto-Indo-European (= Stage I), the active/middle opposition could be irrelevant for perfect forms. The vestiges of this state of affairs can still be found in early Vedic, where the active perfects of some verbs are employed in the same syntactic usage as the corresponding middle presents, i.e. as non-passive intransitives; cf. middle present pádyate ‘falls’ // active perfect papáda ‘has fallen’, middle present mriyáte ‘dies’ // active perfect mamára ‘has died’.21 (Active) perfect forms of some verbs could be employed both intransitively and transitively, thus being syntactically labile (see Kulikov 2003a:106–107).

At the next stage (II = Proto-Indo-European), we may reconstruct a number of innovations resulting from a contamination of endings belonging to different sets. Thus, some elements of the stative inflexion could be introduced into the present paradigm (see Kortlandt 1979:67). These newly built forms must have retained the functional connection with the statives, which was closely associated with the intransitive syntax. Such could be the origin of the middle diathesis used to mark several intransitive derivations, such as the passive, anticausative, reflexive, and reciprocal.
Finally, at Stage III, in some Indo-European dialects (in particular, in Proto-Indo-Iranian), the active/middle distinction was introduced into the perfect paradigm under the influence of the present system, which results in the universal character of the active/middle opposition applied across the paradigm (for details, see Renou 1925:Ch. 5–8; Jasanoff 1978:16, 81f.; Kümmel 2000:94). This scenario is schematically represented in the chart below:


The discussion of other intransitivizing categories (reflexive, reciprocal, anticausative) goes beyond the scope of my paper. Here, it suffices to mention that, as in the case of passive, they can be – quite rarely – expressed by non-characterized middle forms. However, already in early Vedic we observe the rise and development of new morphemes used to mark these valency-decreasing derivations. These include the reflexive pronouns tanā- (originally meaning ‘body’) in early Vedic (RV, AV) and atmān- (‘breath’) from the AV onwards, as well as a number of reciprocal markers: preverbs vi and sām added to the forms with middle inflexion, the adverb mithās ‘mutually’ and the reciprocal pronoun anyō ... anyā- (anyō’nyā-, anyonyā-), literally meaning ‘another ... another’. The old ‘middle reflexive’ and ‘middle reciprocal’ (i.e. reflexive and reciprocal expressed by bare middle forms) have eventually shared the fate of the decaying middle passive.22

This development, which might be called ‘degrammaticalization’ of the middle diathesis, has a number of implications for a diachronic typological study of valency-changing categories.

As mentioned in Section 1, we cannot reconstruct specialized marker(s) of passive for Proto-Indo-European. Most likely, the middle type of inflexion functioned as a syncretic marker of several intransitive derivations, such as the passive, reflexive, and reciprocal.

This situation changes dramatically in the daughter languages. No language has preserved the functional value of the active/middle distinction completely. We find two basic types of the restructuring and development of the original Proto-Indo-European system of markers of intransitive derivations (including the passive).
On the one hand, many languages of the Western part of the Indo-European area, including most Germanic, Romance, and Slavic, replace the old syncretic marker with a new one, in the great majority of cases going back to the reflexive pronoun *su-. (one might call this type of evolution 'syncretic'). In some languages, this *s-morpheme is supplemented by 1st and 2nd person pronouns. This marker is manifested as a reflexive clitic in some languages (cf. German sich, French se, Polish się etc.) and as a bound morpheme in some others (cf. Russ. -sju, Swedish -s).

By contrast, some other daughter languages, including Indo-Aryan, develop specialized markers both for several intransitivizing derivations (passive, reflexive, reciprocal) and for causatives (one might call this type 'non-syncretic'). Most interestingly, the parallel development of the new non-syncretic passive and of a very productive causative seems to be an isogloss shared by several Eastern Indo-European languages, in particular, by Indo-Aryan, Iranian and Armenian.

Thus, in Armenian, the causative marker -uc'anem is based on a nasal present derived from a sigmatic aorist (see Kortlandt 1999). Furthermore, Armenian shares with Indo-Iranian the development of the passive use of the Proto-Indo-European present stem suffix *-i/o-. In yet another Eastern Indo-European language, Tocharian, we find a productive causative marker going back to the Proto-Indo-European present suffix *-sk-.

Indo-Iranian (and, especially, Indo-Aryan) appears to exemplify the most typical representative of the non-syncretic type. Thus, Vedic Sanskrit attests the rapid development and productivity increase of two valency-changing categories, present causatives with the suffix -áya- and present passives with the suffix -yá-. Although both suffixes can be traced back as far as Proto-Indo-European,23 only in Indo-Aryan do these causatives and passives gain more ground as very frequent morphological formations, and the increase of productivity is well-documented in texts.

Thus, in early Vedic, the -áya-causatives are only derived from intransitives, as well as from a few verbs of perception and consumption (drś 'see', vid 'know', pā 'drink'), which can be constructed either with the accusative or with some other oblique cases (locative, genitive, etc.), being 'intransitive/transitive' in Jamison's (1983) terminology. Causatives of transitives first appear in middle Vedic (i.e. in the language of the Vedic prose): kṛ 'make' – kārāyati (Br. +) 'cause to make', vač 'speak' – vācāyati (YVp+) 'make speak', ḫṛ 'take, carry' – harāyati (YVp+) 'make take, make carry' (see Thieme 1929; Jamison 1983:186f.; Hock 1981:15ff.). Finally, in late Vedic and post-Vedic texts (Sūtras, Epic Sanskrit) the productivity of the -áya-causatives further increases, and, from the late Sūtras onwards, we find the earliest attestations of a new formation, hyper-characterized causatives in -apaya-, such as aś 'eat' – aśapayati (MāṅGS) (opposed to the simple causative āśayati (Br. +)), kṣāl 'wash' – kṣālāpāyita (Sū.) (opposed to the simple causative kṣalayati (Br. +)). In Middle and New Indo-Aryan such forms have eventually given rise to double causatives.

The growth of productivity of the -yá-passives has also been repeatedly mentioned in the literature (see, e.g., Whitney 1885a: xxxivf.; Lehmann 1974:183f.; Kulikov 2001:522ff.). While in early Vedic -yá-passives are attested only for about 40 roots,
Table 4. Growth of productivity of -yá-passives and -áya-causatives in Vedic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>early Vedic (RV, AV)</th>
<th>middle and late Vedic (YV, Br.)</th>
<th>post-Vedic (Sūtras, Epics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hypercharacterized causatives in -apaya-</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passives of causatives of transitives</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causatives of transitives</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passives of causatives of intransitives</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causatives of intransitives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passives of non-causative transitives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the younger mantras (Atharvaveda and Yajurveda) double this number. The middle Vedic texts not only attest numerical growth of the -yá-passives, but also the first examples of -yá-passives derived from secondary stems, such as causatives and desideratives. The earliest attestations of causative passives appear in the young Yajurvedic mantras: ā-pyāyāmāna- ‘being made swell’ (root pyā ‘swell’) VS +, pra-vartyāmāna- ‘being rolled forward’ (vr ‘turn’) MSm, sādyāte ‘is (being) seated, set’ (sad ‘sit’) YVm+. Other formations of this type are attested from Vedic prose onwards and become more common in the Brāhmaṇas, in particular, in the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa and Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa.

Until the very end of the Vedic period only causatives built to intransitives can passivize. Passives of causatives derived from transitive or intransitive/transitive verbs first appear in late Vedic and early post-Vedic texts, from the Śrautasūtras onwards. The earliest examples are: ni-dhāpyāmāna- (Vaištīya 5.17) ‘being made put’, -pāyāmāna- (ApŚ ŚS) ‘being made drink, being watered’, yāyyāmāna- (VadhŚ) ‘being caused to perform a sacrifice’, vāucyāmāna- (VaiḵŚ ŚS 18.5:256.6, KauŚ ŚS) ‘being caused to speak, to pronounce’.

Quite remarkably, the increasing productivity of the -yá-passives parallels the increasing productivity of the -āya-causatives, as shown in Table 4.

The exact reasons of such an “antisyncretic” development shared by several Eastern Indo-European branches are unknown, but it might be due to the influence of some adjacent languages, presumably of agglutinative type, such as Dravidian (in the case of Indo-Aryan) or Altaic (in the case of Tocharian). Incidentally, these four genetic groups are now included by some scholars (Hock 2003) into the large Central Asian - South Asian linguistic area.
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1. The oldest layer of Vedic is attested in the language of the Rgveda (RV), which can approximately be dated to the 2nd half of the second millennium BC. Within the RV, we can distinguish between the early RV ('family books', or maṇḍalas, which include books II-VII) and the late RV (encompassing, above all, maṇḍalas I and X, as well as a part of book VIII, Valakhñīya); books VIII and IX are chronologically rather heterogeneous. The language of the second most ancient text, the Atharvaveda (AV), resembles in many respects (and is essentially synchronic with) the language of the late RV. Early Vedic is followed by middle and late Vedic (= the language attested in the Brāhmaṇas, Aranyakas and Upaniṣads). The absolute chronology of these periods poses serious problems (see e.g. Witzel 1995: 97f.), so that we can only afford very rough approximations. Thus, the early Vedic period cannot be dated later than to 1500 BC (and hardly begins much later than 1200 BC); the middle Vedic period probably starts after 800 BC; and the post-Vedic period must have started somewhere in the second half of the first millennium BC, hardly much earlier than 300 BC.

2. Hereafter, the term ‘diathesis’ is used to refer to the morphological opposition between two classes of verbal endings and two groups of participial suffixes, active and middle (cf. in Vedic: active: 2sg.pres. -si, 3sg.pres. -ti, 3pl.pres. -nti, part.pres. -nt- ∼ middle: 2sg.pres. -se, 3sg.pres. -te, 3pl.pres. -nte, part.pres. -māna- / -āna-), not in the sense adopted in the tradition of the Lenigrad/St.Petersburg typological school, where this term refers to patterns of mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic functions.

3. See e.g. Szemerényi 1970:234–238; Neu 1968: 5–8, 109–116 et passim. For the passive function of the middle in the Rgveda, see, in particular, Gonda 1979:19–21 et passim. The original scope of the diathesis in the proto-language is unclear in some respects; in Vedic, the active/middle opposition applies to (nearly) all finite forms and participles.


5. Finite verbal forms are normally unaccented except when appearing in a subordinate clause and/or at the beginning of a sentence or metrical unit (pāda), i.e. a verse which forms the minimal constituent of a stanza.


7. On these formations, see Kümmel 1996.

8. According to Kortlandt’s (1981: 123) plausible suggestion, the 3sg. form in -i may represent the uninflected form (= form with the zero ending) of the nominal neuter i-stems; thus, (ā-)kāri ‘was made’ < *kṛṇi ‘making’ or the like.

10. -ó is the same ending as in yuj¯an-áh in (3a), resulting from the sandhi before a voiced consonant (-áh h- → -ó h-).

11. For a detailed study of Vedic perfects, see Kümmel 2000.

12. -ra is the same ending as in yuyuj-ré in (6a), with a resulting from the sandhi before a vowel (-e i- → -a i-).

13. Note the terminological homonymy: the same term ('present') is used to denote either (i) the system of present as a whole, or (ii) the present tense properly speaking. Accordingly, all formations belonging to the present system (imperfect, imperative, etc.) are called 'present formations' in the broader sense (i) of the word.

14. I do not count here two RVic imperfect forms, -apracyanta (RV 1.110.4) '(they) united' (intr.) and -acyanta (RV 5.54.12) '(they) bent together' (intr.). Both of them are likely to belong with non-passive -ya-presents (i.e. presents with the suffix -ya- and root accentuation = class IV presents in the Indian tradition); see Kulikov 2001: 118–122, 339–342 for discussion.

15. The earliest attestations of passive optatives are 3sg. forms vr˚jyeta 'may it be gathered' and -bhriyeta 'may it be spread' in a young mantra found in RVKh. 5.7.3.a and some Sanhītās of the Yajurveda (see Kulikov 2001: 131).


17. Phonetically, Sanskrit e is as long as the vowels a, i and u (which form a phonological opposition with their short pendants, a, i and u); however, due to the lack of opposition to a short vowel of the same quality (e), it is traditionally written without the length mark.

18. The passives *g¯ıryáte and *tudyáte do not occur in Vedic texts; the first reliable occurrences of m¯ıyate 'is measured' appear in late Vedic / early post-Vedic (from the Śrāutasūtras onwards); see Kulikov 2001:134f.

19. The passive khy¯ayáte occurs from middle Vedic (Brāhmaṇas) onwards (see Kulikov 2001:58ff.); -ysi-passive of śa is unattested.

20. Cf., for instance, Ved. 1sg.med. (athematic secondary ending) -i (< -*H2) ~ 1sg.pf.act. -a (< -*H2e), 2sg.med. -thās (secondary ending) ~ 2sg.pf.act. -thā, etc.


22. More viable was the anticausative function of the middle (cf. such Vedic pairs as med. vārdhate 'grows' ~ act. vārdhate 'makes grow, increases', med. réjate 'trembles' ~ act. réjati 'makes tremble'; see for instance, Gotō 1987: 52). However, even in this case the contribution of the diathesis opposition into the expression of the anticausative is weakened by the stem opposition of the type vārdhate 'grows' ~ caus. vardhāyati.

23. Thus, reflexes of PIE *-éi- (> Ved. -dyā-) are found, for instance, in the Gothic jan-causatives and Slavic i-causatives.
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Part I

Functional Approaches

B. Triggers – aspectual, semantic, and discourse-pragmatic: Case studies
Pragmatic nature of Mandarin passive-like constructions*

Marja Peltomaa
Department of General Linguistics University of Helsinki

This paper examines the Mandarin bei-construction, which is one of the passive structures typical to many East Asian and South-East Asian languages. The relationship of these passives to the more familiar Indo-European passives has been a topic of much discussion. Huang (forth.:37) suggests that the Indo-European type of languages use passive morphology, which directly alters the argument structure of the active, while East Asian languages use embedding of an active clause or a VP under a ‘get’-like predicate. One of the defining factors of the Indo-European type of passives is the demotion of the Agent (or the suppression of the external argument). Huang (forth.:40) notes, however, that because of the complex structure, the Agent is not demoted in East Asian passives such as the Mandarin bei-passive and the Japanese ni-passive. Yet, unlike Huang, I argue that the Mandarin bei-passive is a simple structure and that lack of Agent demotion does not follow from complementation. I suggest that the obligatory Agent demotion in Indo-European passives is the consequence of the thematic hierarchy reflected in the subject-object hierarchy in the basic sentence structure. In Mandarin on the other hand, semantic roles and argumenthood are not the main factors determining the assignment of participant roles in syntax, but pragmatic roles contest with semantic roles. I show that different passive constructions, such as the bei-construction, and different focusing constructions, such as the ba-construction, are components of a voice-like system in Mandarin. I call the these constructions together topic constructions. In many respects, they resemble the focus constructions in languages such as Tagalog. The framework used for the analysis is the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) and the starting point is the fact that Mandarin is a topic-prominent language lacking purely syntactic relations.

1. Introduction

Mandarin Chinese and the other Sinitic languages in China, as well as many South-East Asian languages, are topic-prominent, isolating languages with a limited morphological system. Topic prominence is critically important in analyzing the passive. For the Topic (TOP) category, I adopt the definition proposed by Li and Thompson (1976:464), according to whom the function of the Topic is to set a framework within
which the predication holds. The Topic is always definite or generic and need not be
an argument of the predicate verb (ibid.). In Mandarin, the Topic occurs in the ini-
tial position of the clause. In addition to the Topic, I define here another pragmatic
category, the grammatical Focus (FOC). The functional role of the Focus is to point
out the participant which is the most immediate for the discussion. This is a definite,
salient constituent which is both topical and focal. In accordance with this definition,
I call here the constituent marked with the preposition ba the Focus in Mandarin.

I use Van Valin’s and LaPolla’s (1997) Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) as my
framework. According to RRG, a given clause-internal relation may be syntactic, se-

mantic or pragmatic (id.:250). The precondition for a voice system is the existence of
syntactic relations, such as subject and object (id.:290). To meet this precondition, a
language must have at least one construction with a restricted neutralization of se-

mantic roles for syntactic purposes (id.:255). After testing different constructions in
Mandarin, Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:260–263) come to the conclusion that the
language has no purely syntactic relations.3 I claim, however, that in spite of the lack
of syntactic relations, Mandarin has a voice-like system consisting of passive construc-
tions formed by using prepositions like bei and focusing constructions formed by using
prepositions like ba.

To understand the Mandarin voice system based on the grammar of basic sen-
tences, let us start by examining more generally the interaction between semantics,
pragmatics and syntax. Regardless of the framework, it has become a tradition to look
at the interaction between semantics and syntax from the perspective of semantic roles
and argumenthood. Dowty (1991) defines the semantic protoroles of proto-Agent and
proto-Patient according to their prototypical properties based on the thematic hi-
erarchy. The thematic hierarchy is then reflected in the syntactic hierarchy between
the subject and the object. As Bisang (forth.:2) notes, this kind of tradition takes for

granted the semantic roles in the sense of Dowty (1991), as well as the status of the
syntactic categories. Bisang (forth.:2) points out, however, that there is no evidence
for the relevance of the thematic hierarchy for syntax in the following two cases:

1) Some languages lack syntactic constructions where the subject acts as the pivot.4

As noted above, Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) analyze Mandarin as belonging to
this type.

2) In some languages, semantic roles and argumenthood are not the main factors
that determine the assignment of nominal participants to subject and object. As
an example of this type, Bisang (forth.:3) suggests Tagalog.

Bisang (forth.:3) notes that the main factor determining the assignment of partici-
pants to syntax in type two languages is the referential status of the participants, while
semantic roles are of secondary importance. Instead of the traditional term focus or
topic, Bisang (forth.:10), following Schlachter, uses the term trigger to refer to the privi-
leged syntactic argument (PSA) acting as the pivot.5 Citing Kroeger, Bisang (forth.:11)
shows that this PSA differs from nominative subjects, because it is open to any se-

matic role that is lexically determined by the verb to be part of the voice-like system.
Unlike Van Valin and LaPolla, I consider both Mandarin and Tagalog to be type two languages. The PSA in Mandarin is the participant acting as the Topic.

A prominent feature of the Tagalog voice-like system is that the semantic role of the PSA is marked on the predicate. In Mandarin, however, the topic position can in principle be occupied by any semantic role determined by the language system with no marking on the verb. The only case where the role of the Topic is marked on the predicate is when the Patient contests with the Agent. This kind of Patient is a definite constituent which is both focal and topical (e.g. the grammatical Focus). I claim that although the preposition bei in Mandarin joins a detopical Agent semantically, syntactically, it functions as a verbal passive marker (patient-topic marker). Likewise, the preposition ba joins a potentially topical, definite, salient Patient semantically, but syntactically, it functions as a verbal focus marker (agent-topic marker).

As mentioned above, topic and focus are the traditional terms for referring to the PSA of languages like Tagalog. According to Bisang (forth.:63), this PSA cannot, however, be described adequately in terms of information structure. Citing Kroeger, he notes that this kind of PSA does not exhibit topic continuity in the same way as discourse topics do (id.: 64). Likewise, on the basis of wh-question-answer pairs and contrastive focus, it does not depend on focus properties either (ibid.). Thus, Bisang (forth.:64) suggests that the Tagalog voice-like system marks referentiality. Citing Kroeger he notes that the PSA is described as being always definite, having a given or pre-established referent (ibid.).

Instead of taking referentiality as the basis of the voice-like system in these languages, I suggest that the topic system in Mandarin as well as the focus system in Tagalog are based on the grammaticalized discourse categories of the Topic and the Focus. I take the consequences of the grammaticalization to be the following:

1) Both the Topic and the Focus are definite (or specific). This makes the Focus a salient constituent, which is both focal and topical, i.e. the most immediate for the discussion.
2) The Topic loses its discourse continuity.
3) The Focus loses its contrastiveness and connection to the new information.

Unlike the corresponding discourse categories, the grammatical Topic and the grammatical Focus are built into the syntactic structure of topic-prominent languages.

Thus, my model of the voice-like system in Mandarin is based on the grammaticalized categories of the Topic (TOP) and the Focus (FOC). The existence of these categories is a unique feature of Bisang’s type two pragmatic languages. These categories differ from the discourse topic (dtop) and the discourse focus (dfoc) commonly found in languages. As the discourse topic (dtop) and the discourse focus (dfoc) on one hand and the grammatical Topic (TOP) and the grammatical Focus (FOC) on the other hand are two distinct sets of categories functioning at different levels of the grammar, the non-grammaticalized discourse categories continue to perform their discourse functions at the pragmatic level, which interacts with the syntactic level.
To understand the difference between the grammaticalized and non-grammaticalized pragmatic categories, let us look at the following examples in Mandarin.

Example (1) illustrates the difference between the discourse topic (dtop) and the grammatical topic (TOP):

(1) a. Huā kè wǒ zúi xǐhuān [zìsè dē pro_m] (dtop2)
   ‘As for flowers, I like the most purple ones’

b. dàochú dōu shì pro_m
   everywhere (dtop3)
   ‘They are seen everywhere.’

Clause (1a) contains a topicalization with two grammatical Topics (TOP), the first of which is also the secondary discourse topic (dtop_2) hua ‘flowers’, and the second is also the primary discourse topic (dtop_1) wǒ ‘I’. Clause (1a) also introduces a new discourse topic (dtop_3) zìsè de hua ‘purple flowers’ which is the discourse topic of (1b). In (1b), the grammatical Topic (TOP) dàochu ‘everywhere’ is a frame topic expressing location. The grammatical Topic may thus be the same as some discourse topic or be realized as a frame topic expressing time or location.

Example (2) illustrates the difference between the discourse focus (dfoc) and the grammatical focus (foc):

(2) Shì yì pí liúmáng bā tā dǎ sì le.
   cop [one cl hooligan] (dfoc) [bā (foc) he-p] (prf)
   ‘It was a gang of hooligans that beat him dead.’

In (2), the discourse focus (dfoc) yì pí liúmáng ‘gang of hooligans’, expressing new information, is placed after the copula shì; and the grammatical Focus (foc) tā ‘he’, expressing the participant most immediate to the discussion, is marked with the preposition bā.9

Even though both the Topic in Mandarin and the Focus in Tagalog may act as the pivot in some syntactic constructions, I argue that the most typical function of these categories, related to their origin, is their pragmatic function in syntactically neutral environments to indicate salience or topicality of a constituent. Languages like Mandarin show topic-prominence in which the default choice for the Topic (TOP) is the Agent. This is the consequence of the grammaticalization of the Agent into Topic in clause-internal syntax. On the other hand, languages like Tagalog show topic-prominence in which the default choice for the Topic-Focus (TOP-foc) is the Patient. Here, the Patient originates in a position marking the head of the relative clause and is grammaticalized into Topic-Focus in clause internal syntax (see Foley & Van Valin 1984:146–147).
Finally, as Bisang (forth.: 57–61), citing Kroeger, shows for Tagalog and Huang (forth.: 4–7) for Mandarin, the Agent keeps its argument status irrespective of the noun phrase in PSA. In Huang’s model, this is the consequence of a complex structure where bei acts as a matrix verb. I offer an alternative to Huang’s solution. I argue that the underlying principle behind the Mandarin topic system as well as the Tagalog focus system is the separate marking of semantic and pragmatic roles. The pragmatic roles are assigned by the topic or focus system, and the semantic roles are marked by word order. Because of the separate marking of the semantic and pragmatic roles, there is no need for Agent demotion when the pragmatic functions of the semantic roles are changed, and the assumption of a complex structure turns out to be unnecessary. Thus, in my model, both Tagalog and Mandarin are languages that lack purely syntactic relations (in the sense of Van Valin and LaPolla) but have clause-internal semantic and pragmatic relations.

I call the passive used for changing the syntactic relations of the semantic roles a syntactic passive. This is the passive found in languages like English which have syntactic relations. In the syntactic passive mainly used in syntactic constructions, the Patient is normally promoted and the Agent is obligatorily demoted. I claim that even though Mandarin does not have a syntactic passive, it uses a corresponding structure to change the pragmatic functions (such as the function of topic or focus) of the semantic roles. I call this structure a pragmatic passive. This type of passive appears in languages that have pragmatic and semantic roles, but lack purely syntactic relations. I will show that in the pragmatic passive, the Agent is not demoted, but both the Agent and the Patient preserve their positions as the arguments of the predicate verb. As languages with pragmatic passives often lack syntactic rules or structures which demand the use of voice contrasts, the pragmatic passive is mainly used in clause internal syntax for semantic-pragmatic purposes.

I proceed as follows: in Section 3, I introduce Mandarin passive marking prepositions and their relationship with the corresponding main verbs as well as the relationship between the semantic and pragmatic meanings of these prepositions. I also introduce the basic sentence types in Mandarin. In this section, I show that the basic properties of East Asian and South-East Asian passives are the syntactic structure inherited from the complex serial verb construction and the pragmatic nature based on the grammaticalization of the pragmatic roles of the topic and the focus.

In Section 4, I will present the syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of the ba- and bei-constructions, their historical development out of a serial verb structure as well as the implications of this development for the modern structures. I show that in modern structures, prepositions like bei and ba join the detopicalized Agent and the salient Patient semantically, but act syntactically as markers of the passive and the focus respectively. This means that in these structures both the Agent and the Patient preserve their status as syntactic arguments of the verb. In the end of Section 4, I give the syntactic representation of the ba- and bei-constructions using the RRG. Finally, in Section 5, I give some examples of the syntactic and pragmatic use of the ba- and bei-constructions in clause chains.
2. Mandarin passive

Passive structures in many East Asian and South-East Asian languages have developed out of serial verb structures in which the first verb has become a preposition that joins the passive Agent semantically. As a result, this preposition often carries an implication inherited from the original meaning of the serial verb. Mandarin has several of these prepositions, such as *bei* ‘suffer’, *rang* ‘let, make’, *jiao* ‘tell, make’ and *gei* ‘give’. They all have an adversative meaning, which very likely is inherited from the most common preposition *bei*. In most cases, the original function as verb is also preserved so that the passive prepositions have to be distinguished from the homophonic main verbs. As Siewierska (1984:154) points out, this is normally not a problem, since both the distribution and the semantics differ. As an illustration, I will briefly present the prepositions *gei*, *rang* and *jiao*, which function both as main verbs and as prepositions, and then I proceed to the preposition *bei*, which no longer functions as a main verb:11

1) *Rang* 'let, make' and *jiao* 'tell, make'
Both *rang* and *jiao* function as main verbs with a causative meaning:

3) a. Zhè jiān shì ràng tā shàngxǐn.
   [this CL thing]-A/top CAUS he-P=A/top be sorry
   ‘This thing makes him sorry.’
   b. Nǐ zhè yī shēn yǐfu, shízhǎi kàn le prô,
   you-poss/top [this one CL clothing]-A/top really look prf
   ‘Only to see this clothing of yours
   jiào rén xiào.
   CAUS person-P=A/top laugh
   makes one laugh.’
   (Li 1986:139)
   CAUS causative; poss Possessor

Both *rang* and *jiao* also function as passive-markers. A passive marked with *rang* or *jiao* must have an overt Agent:

4) a. Píngyuánpíng xùdùo xiāngchéng xiānhòu
   plains-poss/top [many town]-P/top one after another
   ‘Many of the towns on the plains
   jiào dírén zhànlǐng le.
   CAUS enemy-A occupy prf
   were occupied by the enemy.’
   (Yang 1992b:1)
   b. Nǐ liángxīn ràng gǒu chī le.
   you-poss/top conscience-P/top RANG (pass) dog-A eat prf
   ‘Your conscience has been eaten by a dog.’
   (Liu 1992:205)

2) *Gei* 'give'
*Gei* functions both as a main verb, as in (5a), and as a complement verb, as in (5b):

5) a. Tā gěi guò wǒ qián.
   he-A/top give-V PRC 1-rec money-P
   ‘He has given me money.’
b. Tā bù huì jiān rǎng gěi biérén
he-A/top NEG will BA(foc) opportunity-P give up-v give-c other-rec.
‘He won’t give up the opportunity for others.’ (Liu 1992:113)

Furthermore, gei functions as a passive-marker:

(6) Nǐ gěi dìzhǔ hài sǐ dié,
you-pass/top GEI(PASS) landlord-P harm die father-P
‘Your father was killed by the landlord,
wǒ gěi dìzhǔ hài sǐ niáng.
I-pass/top GEI(PASS) landlord-P harm die mother-P
‘(and) my mother was killed by the landlord.’ (Li 1986:208)

A passive marked with gei can have a covert Agent:

(7) Guīzǐ sī de sī
devel-LOC/top [die nom]-P/TOP die
‘Some of the devils died
pro shàng de
(loc/top) [wound nom]-P/TOP wound
(and) others were wounded
pro gěi pro huó zhúō le hǎo - jǐ - ge.
(loc/top) GEI(PASS) (A) alive capture PRF many-P
(and) many were captured alive.’ (Li 1986:208)

Finally, gei functions as a focus-marker. In this function, the gei-construction focuses on an Agent which is left covert and refers back to the Agent of the clause. In (8a) the Agent is the Topic and in (8b) the Agent is detopicalized:

(8) a. Wǒ gěi dàmén gěi suǒ shàng lé.
I-top/A BA(foc) door-P GEI(foc) (A) lock up PRF
‘I locked the door.’ (Lao She 2000:95)
b. Tā chàdiǎn ràng héhuòrén, gěi pro kāichū le.
she-top/P almost RANG(PASS) partner-A GEI(foc) (A) fire PRF
‘She almost got fired by her partners.’ (Zhang 2002:34)

According to Siewierska (1984:154), distinguishing passive-marking prepositions from the homophonic main verbs in East Asian and South-East Asian languages is a process similar to the distinction between passive auxiliaries and the homophonic main verbs in Indo-European languages.

There is nevertheless one crucial aspect in which the East Asian and South-East Asian passives differ from their Indo-European counterparts: in prototypical Indo-European passives, the reanalysis leads to a new syntactic structure in which the Agent is demoted and the Patient is promoted, but in Mandarin, the syntactic features of the complex serial verb structure are inherited by the passive construction. In Mandarin, the grammaticalization of the first verb into a preposition leads to a simple structure where the predicate consists of a serial preposition–verb construction and both the
Agent and the Patient preserve their status as the syntactic arguments of the predicate, as will be shown in Section 4.

Unlike the other prepositions, bei 'suffer' no longer functions as a homophonic main verb. As was mentioned, the adversative meaning of the verb is, however, inherited by the preposition and also extended to the other passive prepositions. This original adversative function of the bei-passive can be seen in (9) where the event expressed by the verb ya 'escort' is adversative from the point of view of the Topic Qian xiansheng 'Mr Qian':

(9) Qián xiansheng bèi sì ge dìbing yà zhe wáng
Mr Qian-p/TOP bei (PASS) [four CL enemy soldier]-A escort res towards
nán zǒu.
south walk
'Mr Qian was escorted by four enemy soldiers walking towards the south.'

Furthermore, Li (1986:223) states that the original adversative meaning is clearly seen in certain groups of neutral verbs, such as in the verbs of perception or cognition. When these verbs are used, the situation described by the bei-passive verb is always interpreted negatively. So, in (10), the consequences of the cognitive act described by the verb zhidao 'know' can only be understood as negative from the point of view of the speaker:

(10) Zhè jiàn shì yàoshi chàoráng kāi,
this CL thing-if make noise away
'bèi Lìusì zhídào le ne?
bei (PASS) Liusi-A know PRF MOD
what about Liusi getting to know this thing?
(Lao She 2000:47)

Li (1986:223) continues, however, that although the use of the bei-passive to express a negative evaluation is still common, the bei-passive has spread to positive contexts as well. This can be seen in (11), in which the context in (11a) is negative and in (11b), positive:

(11) a. Bèi fòjué le.
bei(PASS) reject PRF
'(He) was rejected.'

b. Bèi tòngguò le.
bei (PASS) accept PRF
'(He) was accepted.'

(Li 1986:224)

The spreading of the bei-passive to positive contexts is the result of grammaticalization. The bei-passive, as well as the passive constructions marked by other prepositions, not only convey adversity, but have also become the passive counterparts of the focusing constructions, such as the ba-construction (see ba-construction in (13b) and
bei-construction in (13c)). Thus, in addition to implying adversity, the passive prepositions have a common pragmatic function, namely to indicate the detopicality of the Agent. Example (12) shows that a detopical Agent may be, for instance, an indefinite Agent (12a), which can not be chosen as Topic, or an inanimate Agent (12b), which is low in the topic hierarchy and not easily chosen as Topic:

(12) a. Zhuàngjià bèi láobáixìng shōu gè wán le.
    crop- Pass people- A harvest finish PRF
    'The crop has been harvested by people.'

b. Tā de tóufá bèi yǔshǔ
    [he NOM hair]- Pass rain-A
    tiè zài liǎn - shang.
    stuck be face - on
    in his face.' (Li 1986:210)

Thus, prepositions like bei indicate the detopicality of the Agent and promote the Patient to Topic. By doing so they act as counterparts of prepositions like ba, which indicate the salience, i.e. the focality and the topicality, of the Patient and leave the Topic position for the Agent.

Before going on to the characteristics of the ba- and bei-constructions, I will briefly present the four basic sentence types in Mandarin. These can further be divided semantically into two active and two passive constructions: the passive term bei dong 'passive' refers not only to the passive-like structure introduced above, but also contains patient-topic clauses, which are much more frequent than passive-like structures (He et al. 1983:219). The opposite term zhu dong 'active' also contains two different structures.12

Clause (13a) is a basic active clause (an unmarked structure):

(13) a. Wǒ zhāo dào le zhè běn shū.
    look for- v find-c PRF [this cl book]-P
    'I found this book.'

In (13a), the Agent is the Topic and precedes the verb phrase. The Patient can be definite or indefinite and follows the verb.

Clause (13b) is an active ba-clause (a marked structure):

b. Wǒ bǎ zhè běn shū zhāo dào le.
    ba (FOC) [this cl book]-P look for-v find-c PRF
    'I found this book.'
    ba (FOC) focusing ba-construction

In (13b), the sentence focuses on a salient (both focal and topical), definite Patient, which is marked with the preposition ba and precedes the verb phrase. The Patient marked with ba is the grammatical Focus (FOC). The Topic (TOP) position is left for the Agent.

Clause (13c) is a passive bei-clause (a marked structure):
In (13c), the preposition bei marks the detopicalized Agent. When the Agent is detopicalized, the salient, definite Patient can be promoted to Topic (TOP), which is unmarked. If the Agent is left covert, the preposition bei remains. Clause (13d) is a patient-topic clause (an unmarked structure):

```
c. Zhè běn shū bèi (wǒ) zhǎo dào le.
   [this CL book]-p/top BEI (PASS) (T-A) look-for-V find-C PRF
   'This book was found (by me).'
```

In (13d), the Patient is the Topic and precedes the verb phrase. This is an agentless clause which belongs to the passive type semantically, but not syntactically.

In brief, I have introduced the basic properties of adversative passives found in topic-prominent East Asian and South-East Asian languages. These are the syntactic structure inherited from the complex serial verb constructions and the pragmatic nature based on the grammaticalization of the pragmatic roles of the topic and the focus. In the next section, I will analyze in detail the structure and the function of the ba- and bei-constructions.

3. Ba- and Bei-constructions

I start my analysis of the Mandarin voice-like system by looking into the relationship between the ba- and the bei-constructions. They occur in similar contexts and obey the same constraints. The relationship can be seen in (14). In (14a), the person x (pro), which is not mentioned, is the Agent and the tiger is the Patient. The ba-construction highlights the activity of the person x and the affectedness of the tiger. By contrast, in (14b), the person x is the Patient and the tiger is the Agent. Here the bei-construction highlights the person x as the target of the adversative activity of the tiger:

```
(14) a. huózhe pro₁ bā lǎohū dà sǐ,
    either (A/top) BA (FOC) tiger-P hit-V die-C
    'either (he) will kill the tiger,' 
  b. huózhe pro₁ běi lǎohū chī diāo,
    or (P/top) BEI (PASS) tiger-A cat-V lose-C
    or (he) will be eaten up by the tiger,
  c. èr zhe pro₁ bì jū qí yī
    two NOM (P/top) must be situated of these one
    (he) must choose between (these) two.'  (He et al. 1983:405)
```

Clause (14a) is a ba-clause. The ba-construction precedes the verb phrase and consists of the preposition ba and the NP-complement lǎohū ‘tiger’. The Patient lǎohū must be definite. The verb phrase is a telic verb-complement construction consisting of the
main verb (V) da ‘hit’ and the complement verb (C) si ‘die’. Clause (14b) is a bei-clause. The bei-construction precedes the verb phrase and consists of the preposition bei and the NP-complement laohu ‘tiger’. The Patient pro; (person x), functioning as the Topic, must be definite. The verb phrase is again a telic verb-complement construction consisting of the main verb (V) chi ‘eat’ and the complement verb (C) diao ‘lose’.

Example (14) illustrates of the following syntactic constraints, which both the ba- and bei-constructions must obey:

1) The Patient of the ba- and bei-construction clauses must be definite (or specific).
2) The predicate must be telic. The verb phrase explicitly expresses the temporal end point of the change which the Patient undergoes. This is accomplished by using an aspect particle or a verb-complement construction.14 (He et al. 1983: 213–220).

Example (14) reveals that semantically, the preposition bei joins a detopical Agent and the preposition ba a salient Patient. According to Li (1986: 221–222), however, syntactically speaking, bei is not a marker of the Agent. The ba-construction is used to move the Patient to the position in front of the verb phrase and the bei-construction to move the Patient to the beginning of the clause (ibid.). Both the ba- and bei-constructions thus target a salient, definite Patient.

The passive structures of the East-Asian and South-East Asian languages have raised several questions among linguists. Palmer (1994: 149) notes that if bei in Mandarin is analyzed as an Agent marker, the verb does not have any passive marker. But if bei is analyzed as the passive marker, nothing in the clause marks the demotion of the Agent. Palmer seems thus to assume that the Mandarin bei-construction is a syntactic passive in which the Agent is demoted. Moreover, as mentioned before, Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 260–263) suggest that Mandarin lacks syntactic relations altogether. From their point of view, the bei-construction cannot be a syntactically relevant passive structure. Furthermore, Huang (forth.: 3) notes that in the field of generative linguistics there have been basically two different lines of research in the analysis of the Chinese passive: (i) the passive is derived by NP-movement, i.e. an underlying object moves to a surface subject position in the presence of the morpheme bei; (ii) the passive is derived by postulating a structure where bei ‘suffer’ acts as a matrix verb which takes a complement clause whose object is deleted under identity with the matrix subject. Refering to the suggestion by Ting, Huang (forth.: 8–9) combines these approaches with complementation and movement as depicted in (15):
Bei ‘suffer’ selects an NP as its subject and a clausal category IP as its complement. The complement IP involves a NOP-movement (noll-operator movement) of the embedded zero object which is adjoined to IP. The NOP-movement is an instance of A’-movement. In Huang’s analysis, the Agent NP following bei ‘suffer’ is thus not a prepositional object but a subject of the complement clause. Bei ‘suffer’ is analyzed as a matrix verb close to having a status of an auxiliary. The advantages of the above analysis are the base generated status of the matrix subject and the compatibility of A’-movement with long-distance dependences. This kind of dependences are found in Mandarin passives of serial verb constructions of the form A=P/S called pivotal sentences. Huang (forth.:12) analyzes these passives as complementations where bei ‘suffer’ functions as the matrix verb.

In this paper, I offer an alternative solution that takes into account both the syntactic and the semantic-pragmatic aspects of the passive constructions in Mandarin. Unlike Huang, I argue that bei ‘suffer’ does not remain a verb in modern Mandarin but grammaticizes into a passive marking preposition in a serial verb construction (concerning serial verbs, see Folley & Van Valin 1984:207–208). This construction is of the form P=A/S where the Patient of the first verb bei ‘suffer’ is also the Agent of the second verb. Let us once more examine clause (14b), here (16), in which the structural interpretations in parentheses show the role of the components in the original serial verb structure, which differs from the modern passive structure: (The syntactic representation of (14b) is given in (28.).)

(16) Tāi huì bèi láohu chī diào (pro).
  he--event will bei(pass) tiger-ASP eat-v lose-c (p)
  he-(A) (suffer) tiger-(p)=ASP

‘He, will be eaten up by the tiger.’
In (16), *bei* acts semantically as a preposition joining the detopicalized Agent *laohu* ‘tiger’. However, if we look at the historical development of this construction, we will see that syntactically *bei* is not an Agent marker.

The original structure involved complementation where the verb *bei* ‘suffer’ acted as the matrix verb and where the the Agent of the matrix clause was coreferential with the Patient of the complement clause. This Patient was represented by a pronoun. As a result of the reanalysis, a serial verb construction of the form $P = A/S$ was created, and the pronoun representing the coreferential constituent was replaced by *pro*. In (16), the shared constituent $P = A$ is *laohu* ‘tiger’, and the coreferential constituent, represented by *pro* in the second clause, is $ta_i$ ‘he’.

So, the emerging *bei*-construction has only two overt NPs, one of which is the Patient-Topic $ta_i$ ‘he’, and the other is the Agent *laohu* ‘tiger’. Thus, because of the coreferential constituent of the original structure, the complement of the preposition *bei* (here *laohu* ‘tiger’) in the emerging *bei*-construction is neither an oblique argument nor a modifier but preserves its status as a macrorole syntactic argument. Therefore, syntactically, *bei* is not a preposition taking a complement but joins the predicate forming a *bei*+$V$ structure (here *bei*+$chi$ $diao$ ‘bei+eat up’) where *bei* functions as a syntactic passive marker. Likewise in (14a), semantically, *ba* acts as a preposition attaching to a potentially topical, focal Patient, but syntactically, it joins the predicate forming a *ba*+$V$ structure where *ba* functions as a syntactic focus marker. (For the syntactic representation of (14a), see Appendix I.)

The development of the *bei*-construction has thus the following two phases:

1. the original complementation construction, in which *bei* ‘suffer’ acts as the matrix verb and the Agent of the matrix clause is coreferential with the Patient of the complement clause, is reanalyzed as a serial verb construction of the form $P = A/S$ and the coreferential constituent in the second clause is replaced by *pro*; (2) the verb *bei*, which takes the shared constituent $P = A$ as its complement, is reanalyzed as a preposition which semantically indicates the Agent of the *bei*-construction but syntactically functions as a passive marker. This analysis leads to a simple structure in which a serial preposition-verb construction acts as the predicate. In this structure, the passive marker *bei* is a preposition which semantically joins the passive Agent.

Passives of serial verb constructions involving long-distance dependences are analyzed here as passive structures in which the defining relationship $P = (BEI)A/S$ between the argument roles in active also holds in passive. The fact that the relationship between the arguments also holds in passive is one piece of evidence of the argument status of the passive Agent marked with *bei*. To see how the passive marking preposition behaves syntactically in long-distance passives, let us consider the passive of a serial verb construction $P = A/S$. In a serial verb construction, the preposition can leave its position and follow the Patient promoted by the passive predicate. The Patient is promoted to Topic of the whole serial verb construction regardless of the clause where it comes from. The behavior of the preposition *jiao* can be seen in (17):
Sentence (17a) contains an active serial verb construction of the type \( P = A \). The shared constituent is 'dog', which is the Patient of the first clause and the Agent of the second clause. The predicate of the second clause is a verb-complement construction 'bite badly'. The corresponding passive of the type \( P = (B)EiA \) is found in (17b). The syntactic behavior of the preposition 'promote' to 'Topic of the whole construction, the preposition', which semantically joins the Agent 'dog', leaves its position in the second clause and follows the promoted Patient 'grandmother'. Not only the prepositions 'bei' and 'gei', which can have a covert Agent, but also the prepositions 'rang' and 'jiao', with which the Agent must be overt, are able to leave their position and follow the Patient. This behavior gives more evidence of the independent syntactic function of the passive marking prepositions.

The syntactic behavior of the preposition 'is seen in -constructions which correspond to non-promotional -constructions. In a non-promotional -construction, the topic position is occupied by a semantic role that is not an argument of the verb. Correspondingly, the focus position can also be occupied by a role that is not an argument of the verb. This shows that the preposition 'is not a simple Patient (object) marker but a verbal marker used for choosing the participant which functions as the Focus. In the following example, (18a) presents a -construction in which a non-argument Possessor functions as the Topic, and (18b) presents a corresponding -construction in which a non-argument Possessor functions as the Focus:

Furthermore, (19a) presents an adversative -passive (formed by using the passive -construction and the focusing -construction together), in which the passive Agent has no role in the corresponding basic sentence, and (19b) is an adversative
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gei-active, in which the focused constituent has no role in the corresponding basic sentence. In both examples, the preposition gei highlights the intention of the focused constituent (Experiencer):

(19) a. Wó, ràng tā gei pro, pāo le.
   l-p/top rang (pass) 1-a gei (foc) (a/exp) run prf
   ‘I was caused to run by him.’
   (forth.:27)
   (He threw me out.)
   rang (pass) passive rang-construction; gei (foc) Agent focusing gei-construction

b. pro hái bù gei wǒ gùn chū qù.
   (A) still neg gei (foc) 1-exp roll go out go
   ‘Get the hell out of here!’ (Cao Yu 2000:218)
   gei (foc) Patient focusing gei-construction; exp Experiencer

Next, I will turn to the pragmatic nature of the topic constructions. As was indicated above, in spite of the fact that prepositions like bei syntactically mark the passive and prepositions like ba the focus, semantically bei indicates the detopicality of the Agent and ba the salience of the Patient. Furthermore, syntactically, the focusing gei-construction marks the Agent focus, but semantically, it highlights the intention of the Agent. The different pragmatic functions of the topic constructions are seen in (20–22).21

Example (20) illustrates the gei-construction together with the ba-construction:

(20) Wó, zhòngyú bǎ ní gei pro, zhǎo zhǎo le.
   1-a/top finally ba (foc) you-p gei (foc) (a) seek find prf
   ‘I finally found you.’
   (Liu 1992:143)
   (Literally: I finally found you by (me).)

In (20), the preposition ba indicates the salience of the Patient ní ‘you’. Moreover, the preposition gei highlights the intention of the Agent wó ‘I’, which also functions as the Topic of the clause. (For the syntactic representation of (20), see Appendix III.)

Example (21) illustrates the gei-construction together with the rang-construction and the ba-construction:

(21) Pro, zǒng suàn shí tuō le xiǎn pro, méi
   (A/top) finally consider cop escape prf danger (p/top) neg
   ‘I finally could escape the danger (and) was not
   ràng lǎng’ bǎ wǒ, gei pro, yǎo sǐ.
   rang (pass) wolf-a ba (foc) 1-p gei (foc) (a) bite die
   eaten by the wolf.’
   (Li 1986:219)
   (Literally: ...(I) was not eaten by the wolf me by (it).)
   rang (pass) passive rang-construction; gei (foc) focusing gei-construction

In the second clause of (21), the preposition ba indicates the salience of the Patient wó ‘I’, which is also coreferential with the Topic of the clause and thus the target of the adversative activity of the passive Agent. Furthermore, the preposition gei highlights the intention of the passive Agent lǎng ‘wolf’. Finally, the preposition rang indicates the ad-
versative relationship of the passive Agent lang ‘wolf’ with the focused participant wo ‘I’ also acting as the Topic. (For the syntactic representation of (21), see Appendix III.)

Finally, let us look at the non-promotional bei-passive, which is used in sentences where neither the Agent nor the Patient occurs in the Topic position:

(22) Nà - shí tāi huì 'At that time he might have
yi jiāo dì dào shānjiān - li, pro
one stumbling fall arrive mountain fall-inside (poss/top)
stumbled and fallen into the mountain falls,

bā gūròu běi yēyīng zhúo jīn.
ba (top) bones and flesh-p bēi (pass) vulture-a pick wholly
(so that) (his) bones and flesh would have been picked up by the vultures.’
(Literally: ‘...(of him) the flesh and bones would have been picked up by the vultures.’

In the second clause of (22), the participant chosen as the Topic is the deleted Possessor ta ‘he’, (pro). The preposition bei indicates the adversative relationship of the passive Agent yēyīng ‘vulture’ with the participant ta ‘he’ acting as the Topic. Moreover, the preposition ba indicates the salience of the Patient gūròu ‘flesh and bones’, which is related to the Possessor ta ‘he’ acting as the Topic. (For the syntactic representation of (22), see Appendix I.)

For a deeper understanding of the relationship between the ba- and bei-constructions and their syntactic structure, I will briefly discuss their connection to the final phase of the history of the verb-complement construction (VC). Shi and Li (2001:66–68) observe that during the Song Dynasty (960–1279), the serial verb constructions in which the first verb expressed the action and the second verb the result were treated as a group that was set apart from other serial verb constructions. Part of this group grammaticalized directly into a verb-complement construction as illustrated by the following historical change:

(23) V P C → VC P

The rest of the above-mentioned group was marked by the structural particle de, which was placed after the verb expressing the action, as illustrated by the following historical change:

(24) V P C → V DE P C

To move the Patient from between the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C), the structure V DE PC developed in the following directions (id.: 76):

a) Basic active clause (see (13a)): A V DE P C → A VC P
b) Patient-topic clause (see (13d)): V DE P C → P VC
c) Verb copying clause: A V DE P C → A V P V DE C23
d) *Ba*-construction (see (13b)): \( A \ V \ P \ C \rightarrow A \ [BA \ P] \ VC \), where BA is a preposition which grammaticalized out of the verb *ba* 'take'. This preposition is introduced to the structure for moving the Patient (P) from between the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C).

e) *Bei*-construction (see (13c)): \( A \ V \ DE \ P \ C \rightarrow P \ [BEI \ A] \ VC \), in which BEI is a preposition which grammaticalized out of the verb *bei* 'suffer'. As preposition BA, also preposition BEI is introduced to the structure for moving the Patient (P) from between the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C).

The motivation for adopting the prepositions *ba* and *bei* was thus to move a definite, salient Patient (P) in a highly transitive clause to the topical position in front of the predicate. As a result, the predicate in the emerging *ba*- and *bei*-clauses must be of accomplishment type consisting of a main verb (V) and a complement verb (C), and the Patient must be definite (or specific) (rf. (14)). Thus, passive constructions like the *bei*-construction took their final form in a verb-complement construction where the Patient-Topic (P) originates from between the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C), as depicted in (25):

\[
\text{(25) } P \overset{\text{*bei* 'suffer'}}{\longrightarrow} A \overset{V \ (P) \ C}{\longrightarrow} P \ [BEI \ A] \ VC
\]

Likewise, focusing constructions like the *ba*-construction took their final form in a verb-complement construction where the Patient (P) originates from between the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C), as depicted in (26):

\[
\text{(26) } A \overset{\text{*ba* 'take'}}{\longrightarrow} P \overset{V \ (P) \ C}{\longrightarrow} A \ [BA \ P] \ VC
\]

Along with the development of the verb-complement construction, the potentially topical, definite, salient Patient, found between a highly transitive verb expressing the action and a complement verb expressing the result, was moved to the topical position in front of the verb phrase. When moving the Patient, it was possible to use either a preposition which developed out of a non-action verb, such as *suffer*, or a preposition which developed out of an action verb, such as *take*. A preposition based on a non-action verb, which takes an Agent complement, was used to move the Agent from the topic position and let the Patient act as the Topic. A preposition based on an action verb, which takes a Patient complement, was used to move the Patient to the position in front of the verb phrase and let the Agent keep the topic position. Thus, as a result of grammaticalization, a voice-like *topic system* was created. This subsystem of highly transitive clauses consists of two participant roles, the Agent and the Patient, and two prepositions, one marking the Agent and the other marking the Patient, and is used for modifying the pragmatic functions of the semantic roles.
Since the preposition *bei* indicates the detopicality of the Agent, the natural endpoint of the grammaticalization is a situation where the Agent is left covert, illustrated by the following change:

(27) \[ P \ [bei \ A] \ VC \rightarrow P \ [bei \ (A)] \ VC \]

As was pointed out in example (4) concerning the prepositions *rang* and *jiao*, not every passive construction reaches this end point.

The preposition *ba*, on the other hand, indicates the salience of the Patient, which must be overt. The different behavior of prepositions *ba* and *bei* is, however, pragmatic, not syntactic. In accordance with their historical background as prepositions which choose an argument role as their complement, *ba* and *bei* do not modify the relationship between their complements and the predicate but function instead as a part of the predicate, thus forming a preposition-verb construction. So, both the Agent and the Patient preserve their positions as syntactic arguments of the predicate and function syntactically as verbal markers of the focus and the passive, respectively. Thus, topic-prominent languages, like Mandarin, differ from the Indo-European type of subject-prominent languages, in which the passive Agent loses its argument position, and the passive is used mostly for syntactic purposes.

To illustrate the syntactic structure of the Mandarin *topic constructions*, I give a syntactic representation of the *bei*-construction in (14b), here (28), using the RRG. This simple structure, in which the predicate is a serial preposition-verb construction, can be compared with the complex structure in (15), which presents Huang’s analysis using the generative framework:

(28)
Pragmatic nature of Mandarin passive-like constructions

The core has three argument slots. The first argument slot is for the Topic. The second argument slot is for the detopicalized Agent or the focused Patient. Finally, the third argument slot is for the NP-complement of the predicate verb (here empty). Furthermore, the second argument slot, which is the same as the distributional slot for prepositional phrases, can be occupied by more than one phrase (see Appendix I–III). The prepositions marking the passive or the focus belong syntactically to the predicate and are connected to the nucleus. In the syntactic representation, the verbal character inherited by the prepositions is indicated by core level junctures in which the prepositions and the predicate verb share arguments forming together the predicate of the bei-construction clause. Finally, the main verb (V) and the complement verb (C) form a phrase-level junction in which the complement verb is represented as an aspectual operator modifying the nucleus.

In this section, I have analyzed the structure and the function of the passive bei-construction and the focusing ba-construction. In the next section I will turn to the examples of the syntactic and pragmatic use of these constructions.

4. Syntactic and Pragmatic Use of Ba- and Bei-constructions

To demonstrate the function of topic constructions in speech and texts, I will give some examples of clause chains. Example (14) in Section 3 presented ba- and bei-constructions in a topic chain where the topic remains the same in all three clauses. In (14), both the syntactic and the pragmatic motivations support the choice of the ba-construction in the first and the bei-construction in the second clause. Sometimes, however, the syntactic motivations may take priority over the pragmatic motivations. In (29), the ba-construction is used to let the discourse topic enter the Topic position in a topic chain which consists of several clauses:

(29) a. Chángjiāng, shí Zhōngguó zuǐ chà de yì tiáo hēiü, Yangts-e-v/top be China most long nom one cl. river 'The River Yangtze is the longest river in China,' b. pro héngguàn zài Zhōngguó de fùbù, (as/v/top) flow through be China nom internal parts (it) flows through the internal parts of China, c. pro bˇa Zhōngguó qièduàn chéng nán bˇei liˇang bˇàn, (as/v/top) ba (foc) China-p divide become south north two half (and) (it) divides China into two halves, south and north, d. pro sˇulái háochéng bˇu kˇe yˇuyüe de “tiˇanqiˇan”, (v/top) always call not can cross nom natural ravine (and) (it) has always been called an uncrossable “natural ravine.”

(He et al. 1983:401)
Marja Peltomaa

The discourse topic 'the River Yangtze', which is mentioned in the first clause, remains the same throughout the topic chain and is deleted in (29b–d). For maintaining the discourse topic in the topic position, the active ba-construction is chosen in (29c). The Agent in the Topic role, the River Yangtze, is an inanimate entity, which is low in the topic hierarchy. Thus, outside the topic chain as in (29c'), it would be preferable to present an Agent like this inside the bei-construction and give the Patient the role of the Topic.

When the syntactic and pragmatic choices do not conform, preference is usually given to the semantic-pragmatic properties. This is manifested in clause chains in which the Topic together with the viewpoint changes from one clause to another. The ellipses of the constituents acting as the Topic are not controlled by the Topic of the preceding clause, but by some other constituent such as the NP-phrase inside the ba- or bei-construction. Sentence (30) is an example of a long clause chain:

(30) a. Rénmèn, céng jiāng bái - shì tòu zhū - yáng, people-\textsc{a/top} once jiāng (foc)\textsc{26} [about hundred cl. big and sheep]-\textsc{p}
   ‘In the past the people threw about a hundred pigs and sheep
   pāo - xià chéngqíáng,
   throw down city wall
down from the city wall,
   b. pro\textsc{1} qütú dáfá lângqûn\textsc{k} lìkâi,
   (\textsc{a/top}) plan drive away a pack of wolves\textsc{-p} leave
   planning to drive away a pack of wolves,
   c. dân zhû - yâng, shùnjîn bêi pro\textsc{2} yâojiáo yi kông,
   but bigs and sheep-\textsc{p/top} moment bei (pass) (a) bite one empty
   but the pigs and sheep were eaten up in a moment,
   d. liân yi piàn pîmáo yi gén gûtû dòu méiêyû liû - xià,
   even one cl. hair-\textsc{p/top} one cl. bone-\textsc{p/top} all not be left
   (so that) not a hair nor a bone was left,
   e. pro\textsc{1} rèng shì wêî zhe chêng bû zîî,
   (\textsc{a/top}) still cop circle res city not leave
   (wolves) were still circling the city without leaving.’
   (Jia 2000: 4)

The Topic in (30a, c) is renmèn ‘people’. It then changes in (30c, d) into zhu yang ‘pigs and sheep’. The deleted Topic in (30e) is, however, lângqûn ‘pack of wolves’, which is neither of the above mentioned, but is instead the NP-complement of the verb in (30b) and the deleted NP-phrase inside the adversative bei-construction in (30c).

Example (31) contains a short clause chain, in which the Topics in successive clauses are adversative to each other and the viewpoint changes from one clause to another. The Topics are the hero ta, ‘he’, who is an underground revolutionary, and his adversary dîtan ‘enemy spy’, sent by the police to shadow the hero:
(31) a. tā cèng jí - cí zài jiētōu bèi dìtàn guănzhòng, follow
   ‘He (=hero) had already been followed in the street a couple of times by the enemy spy.’

   b. pò suǐrán méi - cí dōu bèi tā jīzhi-de shuǎi diào le, although every time all bèi (PASS) he-A smartly shake off PRF
   although (the spy) had been shaken off smartly by him every time,

   c. pò dàn bù néng bù tígáo jīngti.
   (A/top) but not can not heighten caustiousness-P
   (he=hero) could do nothing but be even more cautious.’ (Yang 1992a:186)

Clause (31a) represents the hero’s viewpoint. The bèi-construction highlights the hero as a target of the spy’s adversative activity. Clause (31b), on the other hand, represents the viewpoint of the spy. The bèi-construction highlights the spy’s failure in his mission. The deleted Topic ‘enemy spy’ in (31b) is coreferential with the NP-phrase inside the bèi-construction of the preceding clause. Finally, (31c) represents again the viewpoint of the hero. The deleted Topic ‘he’ is coreferential with the NP-phrase inside the bèi-construction of the preceding clause.

Sentence (32) is an example of a short clause chain. The Agent is detopicalized but the Patient is not promoted. In this clause chain, the bèi-construction is used especially for adding an adversative meaning from the point of view of the participant ‘she’:

(32) a. zhèng yǐnwei tā píngrì kàn - de - qí tài kàn jian shìbài.
   ‘just because she-A/top usually look up to him-P that by her his defeat would be seen first.’ (Lao She 2000:43)

In (32c), the Agent tā ‘she’ is marked with the preposition bèi to highlight the negative affect of the situation expressed by the verb jian ‘see’ to the Topic pò referring to tā ‘he’.

All the examples are cases in which the deleted constituent is the grammatical Topic. The difference between the Indo-European languages and Mandarin is, however, that in Mandarin, the Topic may also be deleted when the controller of the ellipsis is some other constituent than the Topic (subject) of the preceding clause, for instance an NP-phrase inside the ba- or the bèi-construction. It should be also noticed that although the above sentences are all examples of the deletion of the Topic (TOP), a discourse topic (dtop) that occurs in other than the Topic position can be dropped as well.
5. Summary

My analysis of the Mandarin passive bei-construction offers an alternative to the generative tradition. This alternative has the following advantages: (1) The structure is simple and the preposition bei has a two-fold function. Because bei does not function as a main verb in Mandarin any more and seems to join both the Agent and the predicate, this model is cognitively real. (2) According to this model, the replacement of the common constituent of the original structure by pro leads to a simple structure where bei acts as a passive marking preposition and the Agent preserves its argument position. This development gives Chinese passives the typical characteristics pointed out by Huang (forth.:40), namely the undemoted status of the passive Agent and the ability of the passive predicate to take a complement as happens in the non-promotional passive. (3) The derivation of the bei-construction, where the original complementation construction is reanalyzed as a serial verb construction and, furthermore, the first verb bei ‘suffer’ of the serial verb construction as a passive preposition, follows the general lines of the historical change found in serial verb languages. (4) In this model, the passive bei-construction and the focusing ba-construction are analyzed in an analogical way. Because these constructions are connected historically and because they occur in similar linguistic contexts and obey the same syntactic constrains in modern Mandarin, the structural analogy between them suits both the historical facts and the modern situation.

I have demonstrated that the prepositions like bei in passive constructions and ba in focusing constructions originate from serial verbs. Semantically, they indicate the detopicality or the salience of their complement, respectively, but syntactically preserve their inherited structure as a part of the predicate. I have argued that it is in particular its origin that gives the voice-like system in Mandarin its special characteristics: the inherited syntactic structure and the pragmatic nature of the prepositions leads to a voice-like system in which both the Agent and the Patient preserve their positions as the arguments of the predicate verb. This system is used for changing the pragmatic functions of the semantic roles. Both the passive bei-construction and the focusing ba-construction target a salient Patient which is both focal and topical. Thus the ba-construction focuses on the Patient moving it to the position in front of the predicate verb and leaving the Topic position for the Agent, while the bei-construction promotes the Patient to Topic. I have shown that the grammaticalization of the pragmatic roles of topic and focus is the precondition for developing a Mandarin kind of voice system.

The bei-construction, which is one of the East Asian and South-East Asian adversative passives, is thus one component of the voice-like system in Mandarin. The bei-construction is based upon the grammaticalization of topic, which seems to be a more common phenomenon in East Asian and South-East Asian topic-prominent serial verb languages than the grammaticalization of focus. The bei-construction emphasizes the topicality of the Patient and may also carry an adversative meaning, while its counterpart, the ba-construction, emphasizes the activity of the Agent and the affect directed to the Patient. I have shown that, in spite of its semantic-pragmatic nature,
Mandarin *bei*-passive can also be used for syntactic purposes to promote the Patient in topic chains of several clauses. This syntactic function is further evidence of the syntactic relevance of the Mandarin topic system.

**Abbreviations**

- **A**: Agent
- **BA (FOC)**: focusing *ba*-construction
- **BEI (PASS)**: passive *bei*-construction
- **C**: complement verb
- **CAUS**: causative
- **CL**: classifier
- **COP**: copula
- **EXP**: Experiencer
- **FOC**: Focus
- **GEI (FOC)**: focusing *gei*-construction
- **GEI (PASS)**: passive *gei*-construction
- **LOC**: Location
- **MOD**: modal particle
- **NEG**: negative
- **NOM**: nominalizer
- **JIANG**: focusing *jiang*-construction
- **JIAO (FOC)**: passive *jiao*-construction
- **P**: Patient
- **POSS**: Possessor
- **RANG (PASS)**: passive *rang*-construction
- **REC**: Receiver
- **RES**: resultative aspect
- **PRC**: perfect
- **PRF**: perfective aspect
- **TOP**: Topic
- **V**: main verb

**Notes**

* I thank Werner Abraham, Orvokki Heinämäki, Fred Karlsson, and Larisa Leisiö for advice and many valuable comments, and Kathleen Moore for advice on the English form of this text.

1. The examples given in this paper are from novels, from linguistic literature, and those examples where no source is mentioned are my own. Moreover, the glosses, translations and analyses are also my own and follow the model presented in this paper.
2. According to Shi (2000:383), there are three different standpoints concerning the preverbal NPs in languages like Mandarin: The first one maintains that the subject-predicate is the fundamental relationship between the VP and preverbal NPs, so that the preverbal NPs are analyzed as subjects. The second one, which is followed here, divides languages into subject-prominent and topic-prominent. According to this view the preverbal NPs in languages like Mandarin are topics. The third standpoint supports the view that both topics and subjects exist as separate notions and may appear in the same sentence.

3. As Bisang (forth.:7–8) shows, their position may, however, be too extreme.

4. A constituent which acts as a controller or a target in a syntactic rule is called a syntactic pivot in the RRG.

5. From now on, I will use a more general term *privileged syntactic argument* (PSA) instead of Bisang’s trigger.

6. Notice that even if both the Agent and the Patient are qualified to function as PSA, it is still possible to select neither. This leads to a non-promotional passive, in which some other role functions as the Topic.

7. The Tagalog focus system marks the constituent which functions as the Focus, while the Mandarin topic system marks the constituent which does not get the status of the Topic.

8. In Mandarin, there are several focusing constructions, such as the *ba*-construction, and several passive constructions, such as the *bei*-construction. In glosses, I indicate the name of the construction, such as BA or BEI, and give the general function, such as focus (FOC) or passive (PASS), in brackets.

9. In translation, the discourse focus (dfoc) is expressed by using a cleft construction, while the grammatical Focus (FOC) is expressed by bold font.

10. I suppose that at clause level, all sentences in Mandarin are syntactically active. This is manifested in the fact that there are no structures in the language in which either the Agent or the Patient would be demoted. Both the Agent and the Patient always preserve their positions as syntactic arguments of the predicate. I suggest, however, that Mandarin has a clause internal subsystem consisting of topic constructions, one of which is the passive *bei*-construction. Using these constructions, it is possible to change the viewpoint of the sentence so that the syntactic structure changes while the semantic structure remains the same.

11. In (3–12), the structure under consideration is indicated by bold font.

12. In (13), the semantic and pragmatic roles, as well as the passive or focusing construction used in the sentence type, are indicated by bold font.

13. In (14), the components of the *ba*- and *bei*-constructions, as well as the components of predicates, are indicated by bold font.

14. Aspect particles are actually fully grammaticalized complements verbs.

15. P is the Patient of a transitive clause, A is the Agent of a transitive clause, and S is the only argument of an intransitive clause, i.e. the Agent or the Patient. In a serial verb construction P=A/S, P is the Patient of the first verb, and A/S is the Agent or the only argument of the second verb.

16. In (16), the passive construction and the components forming the passive predicate are indicated by bold font.

17. Although the Patient of the second clause in this structure is usually obligatorily deleted, there are some environments in which *pro* can be replaced by a resumptive pronoun.
The passive construction in the second clause of (17b), as well as the arguments and the predicate both in the active (17a) and the passive (17b) are indicated by bold font.

In (18), the Possesser argument and the construction applied in the clauses are indicated by bold font.

Huang (forth.: 27) uses the term *adversative passive* when referring to the Mandarin structure in (19a) in accordance with the corresponding Taiwanese structure. Originally, the term refers to the Japanese passive structure in which the adversely affected constituent has no role in the corresponding active sentence. Furthermore, Huang (forth.: 28) uses the term *adversative active* when referring to a Taiwanese structure that seems to correspond to the Mandarin structure in (19b). Even though my interpretation differs, I use the same terms for convenience. The Experiencer argument and the construction used are indicated by bold font.

In (20–22) different topic constructions are indicated by bold font. In translations, the Focus is expressed by bold font.

Shi and Li (2001) use the categories S=subject and O=object. S is here replaced by Agent (A) and O is replaced by Patient (P).

According to Shi and Li (2001: 111–112), the predicate of the verb copying structure VP V DE C is an activity verb with an indefinite or a non-referential object. The structural particle DE is preserved as a marker of a structure where the main verb is an activity verb and the complement verb expresses the way in which the activity is carried out. Thus, the verb coping construction forms a sharp contrast with *ba*– and *bei*-constructions where the predicate is an accomplishment verb and the Patient must be definite or specific.

Although the *ba*– and *bei*-constructions got their present form in the interaction with the emerging verb-complement construction (Shi & Li 2001: 104), both structures existed already before the final phase of the grammaticalization of the verb-complement construction (Shi & Li 2001: 5). Thus, in this final phase, the verbal element moving the Agent or the Patient may have already been a preposition emerging out of the corresponding verb.

Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 456) analyze Mandarin verb-complement constructions as complex structures at the level of the nuclear juncture. However, Shi and Li (2001: 54) note that as a result of grammaticalization, these constructions are actually phrase level units. Thus, the syntactic representation in (20) represents them as phrase level units, i.e. aspectual operators.

JIANG (FOC) is a focusing jiang-construction.
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Appendix I

(14)  a.  

Tā hui bā lăohu dà sì

'The will kill the tiger.'
(22) a. Tā hui bā gǔróu bèi yèying zhuó jìn.

Tā hui bā gǔróu bèi yèying zhuó jìn.

‘His bones and flesh would have been picked up by the vultures.’
Appendix II

(17) a. 'The landlord let the dog loose (and it) bit the grandmother badly.'
b. `Grandmother, (as) the landlord let the dog loose, was bitten badly by (it).`
Appendix III

(20)

Wǒi zhōngyú bā nǐ gěi pro, zháō zháō le.
I finally found you.
(21)

Wǒi méi ràng lángk bā wǒi gěi prok yǎo shí
top neg rang (pass) wolf-A ba (foc) i-p gěi (foc) a bite-v shí.

'I was not eaten up by the wolf.'
Appendix IV

Li and Thompson (1976: 460, 483) present the following two tables in which they give the typological division of a group of languages. The tables are organized according to whether the notion of the topic or the notion of the subject plays a dominant role in the language:

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-Prominent Languages</th>
<th>Topic-Prominent Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Lahu (Lolo-Burmese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finno-Ugric</td>
<td>Lisu (Lolo-Burmese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinitic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyirbal (Australian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinitic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyirbal (Australian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject-Prominent and Topic-Prominent Languages

| Japanese                 | Tagalog                   |
| Korean                   | Illocano                  |

Table 2.

Korean, Japanese

Tp

Lisu

Chinese, Lahu

Philippine

Malagasy

English, French, Twi, Indonesian
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Development of the *thùuk* passive marker in Thai*

Amara Prasithrathsint  
Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

Based on an approximately four-million-word corpus of Thai and some other related languages covering a time span of seven centuries (from the end of the 13th century to the present time), this study shows that the present passive marker in Thai (*thùuk*-) has developed from a lexical word originally meaning 'to touch' or 'to hit on the point'. The development of this lexical word into the passive marker involves 8 stages:  
1) lexical transitive verb *thùuk* 'to touch, to hit on the point'  
2) lexical intransitive verb *thùuk* 'to be suitable'  
3) lexical transitive verb *thùuk* 'to suit'  
4) modal intransitive verb *thùuk* 'must, have to, to be obliged to'  
5) modal intransitive verb *thùuk* 'to be affected by'  
6) modal intransitive verb *thùuk* – adversative passive marker  
7) auxiliary verb *thùuk* – non-adversative passive marker  
8) the prefix *thùuk*-  

the true passive marker in Thai.

1. Introduction

Thai is an isolating language, in which grammatical categories, such as number, case, tense, aspect, and mood, are not marked by morphological inflections, but are implicit, and their identification depends on syntactic environments. Concerning word order, Thai is an S-V-O and Head-Modifier language.

With reference to passives, a review of studies on passives in Asian languages reveals that there is controversy as to whether the languages have a passive or not. The studies that argue that a passive does not exist in a language under investigation accept that there is a particular construction that looks like the passive but argue that it is not a passive. It was labeled as "the so-called" passive. The reason they give is that there is no grammatical marking. For example, Thạch (1991) argues that in Vietnamese the constructions that are marked by certain words and have been called passive constructions are not passives because the verbs that mark those constructions are "semantically and syntactically full verbs". Likewise, Li and Thompson (1976:476) have pointed out that the passive is common among "subject prominent languages", but in "topic prominent languages", such as Japanese and Vietnamese, the passive is assumed to be absent or marginal; moreover, it carries a special meaning, like misfor-
tune or adversity. On the other hand, those who maintain that the passive exists in the languages argue that there are universally several types of passive and that one of them is the adversative passive, which conveys an unfavorable meaning. They recognize the existence of the adversative passive, in which the subject is affected (e.g. Liem 1969; Chu 1973; Howard & Niyekawa-Howard 1976; Shibatani 1985). Prasithrathsint (2004) asserts that the adversative passive is a distinctive areal feature of Southeast Asian languages. The evidence provided by this study shows that the adversative passive in Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao, Thai, and Malay is similarly marked by a word meaning ‘to contact, to undergo (an unfavorable experience)’ and that such a word is likely to develop from the homophonous word originally meaning ‘to touch or hit on the point’.

The present paper holds that passives exist in Thai and other Southeast Asian languages. Following Siewierska (1984:2–3), “passive” is defined here as a construction that has the following three characteristics:

a. its grammatical subject is the object of its corresponding active construction;
b. the subject of the active counterpart is expressed in the passive in the form of an agentive adjunct or is left unexpressed;
c. the verb in the passive construction corresponds to the transitive verb in the active counterpart and is marked passive.

With reference to passives in Thai, grammarians and syntacticians have split opinions concerning passives marked by ที่ผ่าน. Those people who deal with passives in Thai can be divided into three groups. The first group maintains that there is no passive in Thai for the reason that ที่ผ่าน is not a grammatical marking and that the concept of “passive” is a Western grammatical calque, which should not be applied to Thai since it is not part of its original grammar. Indeed, it is suggested in Thai traditional grammar that in a transitive sentence the performer of the action be the subject of the sentence. Therefore, they would consider a sentence the subject of which is the receiver of the action to be non-Thai. The second group argues that the passive in Thai is marginal – it bears an adversative meaning and is not identifiable in voice terms as in Western languages. In other words, they recognize only constructions in which the verbs have unfavorable meanings (such as ฆ่า ‘to kill’, คอม ‘to attack’, ดู ‘to scold’, ตี ‘to hit’, ทรม ‘to punish’, etc.); i.e., they regard a sentence of the same structure (i.e. marked by ที่ผ่าน) but with a verb having a neutral or favorable meaning as ungrammatical. The third group accepts that there is a neutral passive in Thai. A study on change in the passive constructions in Thai during the Bangkok period (Prasithrathsint 1988) reveals that a non-adversative passive has emerged in the language. Furthermore, another study on passives in Thai (Prasithrathsint et al. 2003) confirms that ที่ผ่าน has become a grammatical passive marker, which occurs with all types of transitive verbs. For example, it occurs with verbs with clearly favorable meaning, such as เลือก ‘to elect’, ชวน ‘to invite’, ตั้ง ‘to appoint’, สร้าง ‘to build’, etc., which never occurred in the ที่ผ่าน passive construction but are now commonly found in the passive construction. Similarly, verbs of perception, emotion, and cognition, such as ห็น
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The passive in present-day Thai

In the studies of the non-adversative or neutral passive in Thai (Prasithratsint 2001; Prasithratsint et al. 2003), it was found that the neutral passive had not been established before in present-day Thai (1990–2003). It is interesting to note that although the first incidence of the neutral passive was found around the beginning of the 20th century (Prasithratsint 1985:104), it is still regarded by Thai people as an innovation or “foreign element” in the language. The neutral passive and the adversative passive are different in three aspects – see (a) to (c) below.
a. the adversative passive is limited to only transitive verbs with unfavorable meanings, whereas the neutral passive occurs with other transitive verbs;
b. the subject of the adversative passive is normally animate, whereas the subject of the neutral passive can be either animate or inanimate;
c. the adversative passive has an adversative context, which signifies that the speaker perceives the event as unpleasant or unfortunate; on the other hand, the neutral passive has a neutral context, which implies the speaker's neutral perspective on the event.

Examples (1) and (2) are neutral passives, and (3) is an adversative passive. (Note that NTRL stands for “neutral”, ADVS for “adversative”, PSSV for “passive” and CLSS for “classifier”).

(1) ACTIVE:
khruu sōm nāk-rian hāy sūphāap
teacher teach student for be polite
'The teacher teaches the student to be polite.'
NTRL PASSIVE:
 nāk-rian thūuk sōm hāy sūphāap
student PSSV teach for be polite
'The student is taught to be polite.'

(2) ACTIVE:
khàw sāa bāan lān nii thīi-lēow
he/they build house CLSS this year last
'They built this house last year.'
NTRL PASSIVE:
bāan lān nii thūuk sāa ppi thīi-lēow
house CLSS this PSSV built year last
'This house was built last year.'

(3) ACTIVE:
mēs tii lūuk
mother beat child
'Mother beat her child.'
ADVS PASSIVE:
lūuk thūuk (mēs) tii
child PSSV (mother) beat
'The child was beaten (by his/her mother).'

As can be seen, the passives in (1)–(3) are all marked by thūuk. Based on the principles put forward by Thepkanjana (1986) and Bisang (2003), those passives would be regarded as serial verb constructions. Although they are without context, it is clear that (1) and (2) are neutral passives because the verbs sōm ‘teach’ and sāa ‘build’ do not have unfavorable meanings and the subject is both animate, as in (1), and inanimate, as in (2). In contrast, (3) is an adversative passive because the verb tii ‘beat’ has an unfavorable meaning and the subject lūuk ‘child’ is animate.
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It should be noted that the neutral passive marker – the verb thùuk in (1) and (2) – is currently in the process of further development into a true passive morpheme, which will be shown in 3.8.

Based on both diachronic and synchronic data, this study will show that the true passive morpheme has been grammaticalized from a lexical verb, which originally meant ‘to touch’ or ‘to hit on the point’. The grammaticalization process from the original state of the word thùuk to the grammatical marker seen today involved several stages, which will be explained in the following sections.

3. Stages of development of the thùuk passive marker in Thai

3.1 Stage 1 – The original meaning of thùuk

The oldest written documents in Thai created around the middle of the 14th century show the occurrence of the word thùuk as a lexical transitive verb meaning ‘to touch’, ‘to hit off exactly’ or ‘to hit on the point’, as in examples (4)–(6) below. Henceforth thùuk of each stage will be marked by a corresponding number. Thus, thùuk1 denotes the form thùuk that belongs to Stage 1 of the development; thùuk2 to Stage 2, and so on.

(4) cháa [saraay aw ñuag man kham laa pay... an yixy thùuk1 elephant troop take trunk it grope way go which droop touch/hit húa cāw-si-thātha-cụ̄hā-cụ̄hā-mūnīi head name of a prince
‘The troop elephant groped his way with his trunk, which hung downwards and touched the prince’s head.’

(5) pīn yīn khāw pay kāw3 thùuk13 gun shoot enter go consequently hit off exactly
‘(Whenever) they shoot the gun, it will hit (the target). . .’

(6) cee∂i thɔŋ thīi kāw # rājsamī thùuk1 sān tīŋ praaay riang pagoda gold that old rays touch/hit permeate touch glittering bright ɲaam4 beautiful
‘The old golden pagoda, rays of light spread onto every part of (it and make it) glitteringly bright and beautiful.’

The construction with thùuk1 has the structure of a transitive sentence. The verb thùuk1 requires an object. However, in (5) and (6) the object NP of thùuk1 is elliptically deleted. This is a normal syntactic phenomenon in Thai, as asserted in Horn (1984), Huang (1984, cited in Goldberg 2005) that many languages including Russian, Korean, Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Hungarian, Arabic, Thai, and Laos routinely allow arguments to be omitted.

It should also be noted that thùuk at this stage is not a passive marker and the construction with it is not a passive construction.
3.2 Stage 2 – From \textit{thùuk1} ‘to touch/ hit on the point’ to \textit{thùuk2} ‘to be suitable/right’

In documents of the period around the second half of the 14th century, and the early 18th century, the word \textit{thùuk2} meaning ‘to be suitable’ or ‘to be right’ was found as in (7) and (8). I assert that the meaning ‘to touch or hit on the point’ of the word \textit{thùuk1} in Stage 1 had developed into ‘to be suitable or right’ in Stage 2. In fact, the two denotations are related; when one hits a target or touches something accurately, it can also mean that one gets the suitable or right result. Therefore, this semantic change is plausible.

(7) sukhothay nii lêc wâay dîi phalii \textit{thùuk2} miaŋ nii thîa miaŋ
Sukhothai this respect good sacrifice suitable city this stable city
nii dîi
this good
‘This City of Sukhothai, if the homage is good and the sacrifice is suitable/right, then the city will be stable and good.’

From example (7), it is clear that in order to make the sacrifice suitable or correct, the person in charge would have to meet certain standards. The standards could be compared to a target that one has to hit exactly. This makes plausible how \textit{thùuk1} ‘to hit on the point’ could have developed into \textit{thùuk2} ‘to be suitable, right’.

(8) le kaw khwam boî me pi lak-ni-kham-mu’ng bak khwam
and say words worship mother year cycle of sixty years compose words
\textit{thùuk2} ko ke \textit{thùuk1} kiw si’ng
right then correct touch misfortune country
‘...and pay homage to the mother of the cycle of sixty years. If you compose the right words, they will alleviate the misfortune of the country.’

Example (8) shows the occurrences of both \textit{thùuk1} and \textit{thùuk2}. The former, a transitive usage, means ‘to touch/hit’ and is followed by the noun phrase meaning ‘the misfortune of the country’, which is like ‘the target’ of the verb ‘to hit’. The latter means ‘right’.

It is important to note that although \textit{thùuk2} has emerged at this stage, the use of \textit{thùuk1} is still found in the data, as in (9).

(9) mu’w \textit{thùuk1} khang cacw
when hit body ruler
‘When (it) hits the ruler.’

The fact that earlier patterns of \textit{thùuk} still persist in later periods of development seems to confirm the common position that linguistic change is gradual. New forms are added to the stock of old forms before replacing them completely.
3.3 Stage 3 – From thūuk2 ‘to be suitable/right’ to thūuk3 ‘to suit/be compatible with’

The next stage in the development of the word thūuk (in the 18th century) is that it becomes a transitive verb meaning ‘to suit’ or ‘to be compatible with’, as in (10) and (11).

(10) rang kan pong kan thūuk3 ku kho8 consult each other agree each other suit every item
    ‘They consulted each other agreeing in all respects.’

(11) kham man bɔ thūuk3 khoɔ9 word he not suit neck
    ‘His words are not agreeable.’

The occurrence of thūuk3 is found in documents later than the first incidence of thūuk2, so it is placed in an ensuing stage of development.

As can be seen in (10) and (11), the word thūuk3 is a transitive verb, followed by a noun phrase. At this stage, it has become syntactically similar to thūuk1, i.e. followed by a noun phrase, but semantically close to thūuk2, i.e. both meaning ‘suitable or right’.

The semantic development of thūuk as seen from thūuk1 to thūuk3 is interesting. Actually, both the thūuk homonyms are followed by a noun with the same semantic case [+goal], but the noun seems to change from concrete (e.g. ‘head’) to abstract (e.g. some set standards or even something that is only metaphorically hit or touched, such as ‘something that touches the neck’, meaning ‘something agreeable’).

Again, it should be emphasized here that at every stage, incidences of earlier patterns also occur. This will apply throughout all the stages to be mentioned henceforth.

3.4 Stage 4 – The emergence of thūuk4 ‘must/have to’

The documents of the 18th century also show the occurrence of another thūuk, which means ‘must’, ‘have to’, or ‘to be obliged to’, as in (12)–(14).

(12) thūuk4 hit hun kham 2 luk hun ngu’n 2 luk hun ca’n 2 luk10 must make shape gold 2 piece shape silver 2 piece shape lead 2 piece
    ‘(You) must make two golden shapes, two of silver, and two of lead.’

(13) sang neuw ming-kham lak-ni cam khaw pak laka cam ti-nang mu’ng if star Ming-Kham Lakni then enter mouth Naga then queen country thūuk4 tai11 must die
    ‘If the Ming Kham Star or the Star of the Cycle of sixty years (Lakni) enters the mouth of the Naga, then the queen must die.’

(14) khong kin hu khwai kay pit ka-phong ko thūuk4 eu ka bai thing eat cow buffalo chicken duck some then must take go place
    na hun12 in front of shape
'And some of the food stuffs, cows, buffaloes, fowl, and ducks, (you) must place (them) in front of the image.'

(Instructions for making a sacrifice to gods)

It should be pointed out that thïuk⁴ was found to be used very frequently in the documents of the same period as Stage 3. Yet, it is placed in this stage because its syntactic and semantic behavior is different from that of thïuk³. At this stage, thïuk⁴ has become a modal intransitive verb denoting ‘obligation,’ which is found to be followed by another verb. The construction with thïuk⁴ is a serial verb construction.

Example (14) seems to foreshadow the passive structure, which emerged later at Stage 6. Indeed, it could already be considered a passive construction if we take the noun phrase that precedes thïuk⁴ as the subject of the sentence. However, it is more likely for the noun phrase to be interpreted as the topicalized object rather than the subject of the sentence. This phenomenon of placing the object in front of the sentence has been commonly accepted among several linguists; for example, Panupong (1989:25) points out that in Thai the subject can be moved to the end of the sentence and the object to the beginning; Chung (1976:80) uses the term “object preposing” to label the topicalization of the object, while Li and Thompson (1976:460) assert that such a phenomenon is most common in “topic-prominent languages”, as in Chinese and mainland Southeast Asian languages.

Regarding the semantic change of the word thïuk, there is an interesting etymological question as to why the denotation ‘to be suitable or right’ changed to ‘to be obliged to’. It is assumed that the concept of ‘suitable’ or ‘ought to’ and that of ‘obliged’ or ‘must’ are in the same scale of the semantic continuum. The development of thïuk⁴ from thïuk³ is marked by an increase in the degree of ‘having to do something’ in its denotation. However, its syntactic behavior has also significantly changed – from a transitive verb, which requires an NP object, to a modal verb, which adds a modal meaning to the verb that follows it (see the syntactic and semantic features of each of the thïuk homonyms in Table 2 in Section 4).

3.5 Stage 5 – The emergence of thïuk⁵ ‘to be affected by’

By this stage (around the early 19th century), thïuk⁵ has undergone considerable syntactic and semantic change. It is a modal verb with non-specific meaning – only denoting adversity or misfortune. It is modal in the sense that it reflects the mood of the predicate from the perspective of the speaker – that the event is unfortunate. The incidences of thïuk⁵ at this stage have first been discovered in the documents of the early Bangkok period (around the mid 19th century), as in (15).

(15) khâw thïuk⁵ yaa-phït¹⁴
he be affected by poison
‘He was hit or affected by poison’ = ‘He was poisoned.’

Semantically speaking, thïuk⁵ ‘to be affected by’ is very close to thïuk¹ ‘to hit on the point’ – the denotations ‘to hit’ of thïuk¹ and ‘to be hit (affected) by’ of thïuk⁵ are
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polarly related. However, thūuk1 and thūuk5 are syntactically different. The former is a lexical transitive verb, whereas the latter is treated here as an intransitive verb that conveys a modal meaning. It requires a complement NP, like some other verbs that look superficially transitive, such as mian 'to resemble', nāk 'to weigh', which also need a complement. Constructions with these verbs, including thūuk5, are not transitive because they cannot be passivized.

3.6 Stage 6 – The emergence of thūuk6 as an adversative passive marker

At this stage (around the early 19th century), thūuk6 emerged as an adversative passive marking verb meaning ‘undergo (an unfavorable experience)’. The first incidence of the adversative passive construction shown in (16) was found at the same time as thūuk5. However, it has a combined feature of both thūuk4 and thūuk5 in it. Semantically, thūuk6 carries the same sense of adversity as thūuk5. Syntactically, it is similar to thūuk4 – they form serial verb constructions. Both thūuk4 and thūuk6 are modal intransitive verbs followed by another verb. However, thūuk6 is followed by a transitive verb only, whereas thūuk4 can precede any kind of verb.

A serial verb construction with thūuk6 is considered to be an adversative passive. It can be without an agent as in (16), or with an agent, as in (17).

(16)  
<image>

In (16), the verb thūuk6 is followed by the transitive verb khian 'to whip'. In (17), it is followed by an agent + transitive verb: khruu tii 'teacher beat'.

It may be interesting to point out that the structure of (16) is exactly the same as that of thūuk4, as in (13), but the verb with an unfavorable meaning that follows thūuk6 makes it clear that the construction is an adversative passive. The structure of (17) is clearly a combination of that of thūuk5 and thūuk6 – it looks as though khāw thūuk5 khruu 'he was affected by the teacher' and khāw thūuk4 tii 'he was affected by hitting' have been put together to form an agentine passive.

The occurrence of thūuk6 was found to be limited. It is used only with verbs that have unfavorable meanings. A sentence that contains this type of thūuk normally has an animate subject, which is unfavorably affected by the action represented by the verb that follows thūuk This limitation has caused the construction to be marginal and results in its being labeled "the so-called passive" in Thai. A study of this type of passive in some other Southeast Asian languages (Prasithrathsint 2004) reveals that the adversative passive markers in those languages have interestingly developed along the same lines as thūuk6 in Thai.
3.7 Stage 7 – thùuk becomes a neutral passive marker in Thai

The data shows that in the latter half of the 20th century, the meaning and syntactic distribution of the adversative passive marker (thùuk6) have become generalized. It has developed into thùuk7 – a non-adversative or neutral passive marker in Thai.

Semantically, the thùuk neutral passive marker is different from the thùuk adversative passive marker in that the neutral one has no sense of adversity. Syntactically, unlike the adversative one, the neutral passive marker occurs with any transitive verb. Furthermore, it occurs more often without an agent (see examples (1) and (2) in Section 2). If the neutral passive construction has an agentive phrase, the phrase tends to occur at the end of the sentence in the form of a prepositional phrase introduced by dooy ‘by’, as in (18), rather than before the transitive verb, as in an adversative passive construction – (3) in Section 2 and (19) below.

(18) rõök chānît nū thùuk7 khôn-phốp dooy nák-wittayaasāat
    disease kind this pssv discover by scientist
    chaaw-cin (agent)
    Chinese
‘This kind of disease was discovered by a Chinese scientist.’

(19) tua kmuńt thùuk7 way-rūn (agent) sū môt
    ticket concert pssv teenager buy all
‘The concert tickets were all bought by teenagers.’

Since the pattern of the neutral passive construction occurs more commonly without an agent and with an agent in the ‘by’ phrase, the serial verb construction tends to be recognized as one in which thùuk is immediately followed by the main verb. At this stage, it is likely that thùuk has become an auxiliary verb marking the neutral passive. What is meant by "auxiliary verb" is a helping verb that must be immediately followed by another verb. Its function is grammatical: it marks a certain grammatical category on the main verb that follows it. In this case, thùuk changes the active verb into a passive one.

Evidence shows that the first incidence of this type of passive emerged around the beginning of the 20th century during King Chulalongkorn’s reign, which was the period of westernization of Thailand. The force of the western powers precipitated the country’s modernization. Several aspects of Thai syntax underwent abrupt changes induced by contact with English during this period. For instance, there are studies that show that certain new syntactic structures of the superstratum emerged in the language. In addition, there was an enormous increase in the use of the passive constructions, relative clause constructions, adverbial clauses of time, and nominalization (see, in this spirit, Prasithrathsint 1988, 1997a, 1997b; Wattanasomboon 1994; Phrompaphakorn 1996). King Chulalongkorn himself was a Thai-English bilingual. His private letters and memoirs, written in Thai, show a considerably high frequency of this type of passive – obviously as a result of Thai coming into contact with English (Prasithrathsint 2003b).
The form thùuk7 was once more limited in occurrence, probably because of the control of conservative language authorities allegedly holding that the neutral passive is “western” and ungrammatical because it is not authentic Thai. At present, the frequent use of this pattern in both spoken and written Thai seems to have reduced this attitude and made it more acceptable among Thai grammarians (see Prasithrathsint et al. 2003).

3.8 Stage 8 – thùuk is developing into a prefixed passive marker

At this last stage (the present time), thùuk7, the neutral passive marker, is developing into thùuk8 – a true passive marker. It has lost all of its denotative and connotative meanings: it no longer means ‘undergo’ or ‘be affected by’, and neither does it convey the ‘non-adversative’ or ‘neutral’ connotation. It only carries a grammatical meaning of ‘passive marker’. Even though Thai is an isolating language, which normally has no morphological marking, this passive marker behaves like a grammatical morpheme attached in front of a transitive verb turning it into a passive verb form.

There are three reasons why thùuk8 should be analyzed as a passive prefix. First, the data of present-day Thai shows that this passivization process is very productive. Indeed, virtually all types of transitive verbs in the language can be passivized by adding thùuk8 as a prefix. Even verbs with very favorable meanings, such as têñ-tâñ ‘to appoint’, sôñ-sôm ‘to promote’, sanâp-sânun ‘to support’, sâa ‘to build, to create’, verbs of cognition, such as khâw-cay ‘to understand’, rû ‘to know’, and verbs of emotion, such as râk ‘to love’, chiûn-chom ‘to admire’, can now be passivized. This usage was not possible a few decades ago and would have been considered ungrammatical then. Secondly, some Thai grammarians (p.c.) have begun to use the thùuk8 passivization process as a test to determine whether a certain verb is transitive or not; i.e., any verb that cannot be passivized with thùuk8 is not a transitive verb. Thirdly, the passive verb form with thùuk8 such as thùuk-thàam ‘to be asked’, thùuk-pít ‘to be closed’, is like a single word within which nothing can be inserted. This is supported by the fact that approximately 90 percent of the thùuk passive constructions found in the data of present-day Thai are agentless passives and passives with the dooy ‘by’ agent phrase. Passives with an agent inserted between thùuk and the main verb are very rare today. Finally, more interesting evidence is found which reveals that another word that has a similar meaning to the first stage thùuk is now developing along the same lines as thùuk and is likely to replace thùuk in the adversative passive. That word is doon (see Prasithrathsint 2001). This supports the idea that thùuk has lost its adversative meaning and become a grammatical morpheme with empty denotation and connotation.
4. Summary of the development of the thùuk passive marker

Within the time span of approximately 700 years, the true passive marker in Thai has developed from a lexical verb meaning ‘to touch or hit on the point.’ The development involves eight stages summarized in Table 1 below.

The data shows that in each of these eight stages, the forms in the earlier stages still occur but with diminishing frequency. For instance, in the latest stage, the passive morpheme is the most frequent one, but earlier usages of the form thùuk are still valid, but less productive. In short, the change is not like one form being replaced by another, but rather a gradual “next-to-one another” with shifting frequencies.

The syntactic and semantic change of thùuk can be summarized in terms of the various structures of the constructions in which thùuk occurs, as shown in Table 2. Both binary and specific features are used so that the structures of constructions of different stages can be compared and the changes can be perceived clearly.

Table 1. Stages of the development of the thùuk passive marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>thùuk as</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mid 14th C.</td>
<td>lexical transitive verb</td>
<td>‘to hit on the point’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>late 14th C.</td>
<td>lexical intransitive verb</td>
<td>‘to be suitable/right’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18th C.</td>
<td>lexical transitive verb</td>
<td>‘to suit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18th C.</td>
<td>modal intransitive verb</td>
<td>‘must/have to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>mid 19th C.</td>
<td>modal intransitive verb</td>
<td>‘to be affected by’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>mid 19th C.</td>
<td>modal intransitive verb</td>
<td>adversative passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>early 20th C.</td>
<td>auxiliary verb</td>
<td>neutral passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>end of 20th C.</td>
<td>grammatical marker</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Change in ways of talking

More independent evidence confirms that the emergence of the neutral passive in Thai is a result of contact with English. For example, Rutnin (1978), Wibulsri and Woraphan (1983), and Kullavanijaya (1974) all recognized that the increase in the use of passives, especially the neutral passives, is caused by “foreign” influence on Thai. Indeed, this passive pattern did not exist until Thailand began to have Thai-English bilingual speakers around the beginning of the 20th century. Their alternate use of Thai and English led to language contact, which resulted in lexical and grammatical borrowing. The passive is one of the grammatical features that have been transferred from English to Thai. This is justified by the fact that the passive occurs more frequently in texts translated from English than in those written originally in Thai (Prasithratsint 1988).

However, it should be noted that it is not “the English passive” that was transferred straightforwardly to Thai. Of course, the passive in Thai is never derived from the ac-
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### Table 2. Syntactic and semantic change of `thìuk`

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | NP `thìuk1` NP | `kràsìm thìuk1 phàw`  
+ anm  
+ Agent + trns + Goal  
+ 'hit on the point' + cncr  
'The bullet hit the target' |
| 2     | NP `thìuk2`  
± anm  
+ Actor - trns  
+ 'right'  
'Your answer is right.' |
| 3     | NP `thìuk1` NP  
± anm  
+ Agent + trns + Goal  
+ 'to suit' - cncr  
'The food is not delicious.' |
| 4     | NP `thìuk4` VERB  
± anm  
+ Agent - trns  
+ mood  
+ 'must'  
'He had to go to the party.' |
| 5     | NP `thìuk5` NP  
± anm  
+ Patient - trns + advs  
+ mood  
+ 'be affected'  
'He was cursed.' |
| 6     | NP `thìuk6` (NP) V  
± anm  
+ Patient - trns + Agent - finite  
+ mood + advs + pssv  
'He was scolded by his mother.' |
| 7     | NP `thìuk7` (NP) V  
± anm  
+ Patient + aux + Agent - finite  
+ pssv - advs  
'The door was closed.' |
| 8     | NP `thìuk8-V` (doo+y+NP) V  
± anm  
+ Patient - trns ± anm  
+ pssv  
'He was well-brought up.' |

**Notes:**  
NP = noun phrase  
V = verb  
pssv = passive  
anm = animate  
trns = transitive  
aux = auxiliary  
advs = adversative
tive counterpart as in English – by changing the active transitive verb into the verb to be + the past participle of that verb. Before contact with English, sentences containing an action verb in Thai rarely had an inanimate subject. Also, Thai had only a marginal passive that is adversative. The subject of this type of passive is normally a noun denoting an animate being, which can be affected by an unfortunate experience (e.g., khāw thúuk khāa ‘He was killed.’ khāw thúuk tham-thōot ‘She was punished.’). Unlike the constrained Thai version of the adversative passive, the English passive construction can have either an animate or inanimate noun as subject. Contact with English has established the use of inanimate nouns as subjects of sentences in Thai, especially through the passive. Therefore, it is plausible to say that what has been imported into Thai is the use of an inanimate noun as subject of a transitive sentence. This may be regarded as a new way of talking in Thai.

6. Conclusion

This paper shows how a true passive marker in Thai developed from a lexical verb over a time span of seven centuries. Diachronic data shows that the process of change was gradual but considerably abrupt in a late stage when the neutral passive emerged due to the influence of English during the period of Thailand’s westernization. The true passive marker in Thai has developed from the neutral passive and is in the process of being established permanently in Thai. This new element not only marks a great change in the Thai grammar, but also symbolizes an important shift in Thai culture – from traditional to modernized.

Notes

* I am grateful to Werner Abraham, who painstakingly edited this paper. His comments and suggestions were very valuable and helpful. I would also like to thank Larisa Leisio for her support, and Pranee Kullavanijaya and Kingkarn Thepkanjana for their useful comments on the first draft. Many thanks go to Michael Crabtree for polishing this paper and making the final version more readable. Some of the content of this paper is based on the findings of the research project on “Controversial constructions in Thai grammar: Relative clause constructions, complement clause constructions, serial verb constructions, and passive constructions” (Prasithrathsint et al. 2003), which was funded by the Thai National Research Council.

1. The data is composed of sorted sentences with thúuk taken from a two-million-word corpus used in the research project on “Parts of Speech in Thai: A syntactic analysis based on a corpus of two-million-word corpus of current Thai” (Prasithrathsint 2000) financially supported by the Thailand Research Fund. The rest of the data was taken from on-line word concordances based on a corpus of the Department of Linguistics, Chulalongkorn University, texts transformed from Sukhothai stone inscriptions, and Ahom Tai documents (Tai Ahoms and the Stars–Three Ritual Texts to Ward Off Danger. Translated and edited by B. J. Terwiel and Ranoo Wichasin, 1992. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, and the AHOM BURANJI. Translated by Ranoo Wichasin, 1996. Bangkok: Amarin
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Printing and Publishing, Co. Ltd.). The total length of the texts used for analysis is approximately four million words.

3. From Sukhothai Stone Inscriptions, No. 2, Side 1, Line 81, 1341–1367 A.D. (estimated)
5. From Sukhothai Stone Inscriptions, No. 1 (Ramkhamhaeng Inscription), Side 3, Lines 8–9. It should be noted that the date of the creation of the Ramkhamhaeng Inscription has been estimated as 1292 A.D. – during the reign of King Ramkhamhaeng. However, according to Pranee Kullavanijaya (p.c.), several scholars now believe that this stone inscription was more likely made in the reign of King Lithai; i.e., 1354–1376 A.D. I adopt this latter date.
6. From *Tai Ahoms and the Stars. Three Ritual Texts to Ward off Danger*. Translated and edited by B. J. Terwiel and Ranoo Wichasin, 1992, Line A57. The texts were dated around the early 18th century. Notice that I transcribe this word in Ahom Tai the same as the cognate in Standard Thai. The pronunciation of this word in Ahom Tai may be slightly different.
13. The data shows that the noun that follows this type of *thùuk* normally has an unfavorable meaning. However, even if it did not, as in *phˇom kh ˇaw thùuk náam* ‘Her hair is affected by water,’ this sentence would be interpreted as an adversative – somewhat like ‘the hair loses its nice shape because of the water.’
14. From King Rama IV’s manuscripts (1855 A.D.)
15. From King Rama IV’s manuscripts (1855 A.D.)
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The passives of Modern Irish
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This paper is about the passive construction, of which modern Irish (a vso language) has two primary forms, the personal passive and its variants, and the impersonal. An empirical question is posed as to whether a third passive form exists within the language, that of a functionally defined get passive. To deliver a unified analysis of the various passive constructions, a perspective that takes account of the complete event is necessary.

Irish supports three variants of the personal passive construction (i.e. perfective, progressive, prospective) each of which involves the substantive verb (one of two forms of the verb "to be" found in Irish) in a periphrastic form. The agent can optionally be represented obliquely. The active verb takes a non-finite form as a verbal adjective or verbal noun, depending on the personal passive variant.

The impersonal passive form occurs with all verbs of Irish, across all tenses, whether intransitive or transitive. The impersonal passive form is also to be found productively with the substantive verb across all tenses. It does not under any circumstances occur with the copula verb. Our view is that the impersonal passive construction has an indefinite actor at the level of the semantics and that the impersonal passive verb expresses this as a third person indefinite pronoun in the syntax via a synthetic post-verbal suffix rendered on the matrix verb. When considered in this way, the behaviour of the impersonal passive verb in the syntax is shown to be the same with respect to definite subject pronouns when they are expressed in a non-analytic manner, that is, in the synthetic form of the verb.

We investigate whether there is a third passive construction to be found in Irish, a get passive. The get passive is attested in many, but not all, of the world’s languages (Siewierska 1984). We find evidence that a particular subset of constructions precisely exhibits the characteristics of the get passive under strictly defined constraints. On the basis of this evidence, we claim that there is a functionally defined get passive in modern Irish.

The commonality underpinning the passive constructions, including the functionally defined get passive, can be explained in terms of the windowing of attention analysis in the sense of Talmy (1996), that is, a functional analysis with an event frame perspective sensitive to prototypicality. Irish follows a vso word order with the subject more closely bound to the verb than the object. As well as looking at each of the passive constructions, we also briefly examine how the vso word order is maintained through each.
1. Introduction

This paper is about the passive construction, of which Irish has two primary forms, the personal passive and its variants, and the impersonal. An empirical question is posed as to whether a third passive form exists within the language, that of a functionally defined get-passive. We argue in this paper that the commonality underlying each of the passive constructions casts a different component of the event frame into the foreground, in the sense of a "windowing of attention" (Talmy 1996a). In his 1996a paper, Talmy sets out a system with which languages can place a portion of a coherent referent situation into the foreground of attention by the explicit mention of that portion, while placing the remainder of that situation into the background of attention by omitting mention of it. His term for this cognitive process is the windowing of attention. This windowing of a referent situation takes place in an event-frame and the portions of event frame that are foregrounded by inclusion are said to be windowed. Similarly the portions that are backgrounded by exclusion are gapped. In Talmy's view, the windowing of attention is a part of the much vaster cognitive system constituting the conceptual structuring of language.

1.1 Modern Irish

Irish, or Gaeilge as it is known in the Irish language itself, is, together with Scottish Gaelic and Manx, a member of the Q-Celtic grouping of Insular Celtic. The date of the introduction of the language into Ireland is unknown and many theories have been proposed, for which see O'Dochartaigh (1992:11ff.) for details. One theory recounted by O'Dochartaigh attempts to derive the language from some supposed invasion by an Indo-European warrior aristocracy in the first millennium BC as part of the large-scale expansions of the earlier Bronze Age from the heartland of central Europe. The earliest evidence for Q-Celtic in Ireland, however, dates from the period of Ogam inscriptions of around the first century AD. The position of the Irish language within the Celtic family of languages is indicated in Figure 1.

Within Modern Irish, there are three distinctive dialect areas, generally called Munster, Connacht, and Ulster or Donegal Irish (O'Siadhail 1991) after the regions in which they are found. Within the verbal system, O'Dochartaigh notes that the main diagnostic of dialect is the use of synthetic forms in the Munster dialect, with the other dialects having a preference for analytic constructions with the subject pronoun appearing as a separate morpheme. For a morphological and phonological analysis covering all dialects see O'Siadhail (1991).

Modern Irish is a vso language and therefore, in common with the other Celtic languages, the order of elements in the structure of transitive sentences is verb-subject-object. The verb and the subject are tightly bound.
In this paper we use the following abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula verb of 'to be,'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTV</td>
<td>Ditransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERS</td>
<td>Impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGKR</td>
<td>Ingressive/Inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Logical Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAST  Past Tense
PL    Plural
PP    Preposition
PRED  Predicate
PRES  Present
REL   Relative Particle
RRG   Role and Reference Grammar
SG    Single
SUBV  Substantive verb of 'to be, exist'
TNS   Tense
TV    Transitive
V     Verb
VA    Verbal Adjective
VN    Verbal Noun
VP    Verb Phrase
1.2 Analysis of the Irish passive in the literature

To date, to my knowledge, there has been no unified treatment of the passives of Irish. There has been research that examines the various personal constructions individually. In this section we review a number of these earlier analyses. Noonan (1994:281) confirms that Irish is a consistent VSO head-initial language and presents data from Irish concerning constructions that conform to the structural characteristics of the passive but which fail to conform to the functional characterization. The functional characteristics of the traditional passive prototype are patient topicalization, agent deletion/defocusing, and stativisation. Noonan then proceeds to deliver an analysis towards an information structure of Irish passive clauses encompassing the personal, or traditional, passive and the impersonal passive. For Noonan (1994:305), the impersonal passive fails the structural characterization of traditional passive, but conforms to the functional characterization very well. A consequence of his analysis is that structural passives need not be functional passives. Noonan does not address the get passive.

Harley (2000) argues, based on Stenson (1989), that the subject argument must be present in the Irish impersonal construction; that is, the external argument is not “suppressed” or “absorbed” as in a passive construction. Three reasons are offered: 1) the impersonal forms of causative/inchoative alternating verbs necessarily imply the causative construction when an overt argument appears, and may not receive the agentless inchoative interpretation. That is, they behave as if they had two arguments, not one. 2) Verbs whose subject does not admit of a possible arbitrary interpretation are ungrammatical with impersonal morphology, such as the weather verb in example (1b), and 3) impersonal morphology may appear on passives.

(1) a. Chuir sé sneachta
   putV-PAST it:PN shown
   It snowed

b. *Cuirdeadh sneachta
   putV-IMPERSONAL-PASS-PAST shown
   (They/One) snowed.

Noonan (1994:288) observes that impersonal passive counterparts exist not just for transitive sentences but also for intransitives and sentences formed with the substantive verb (the non-copula té ‘to be’). He also notes that (personal) passives can also have impersonals and that the only real constraint on impersonal passives is that sentences with non-referential subjects do not have impersonal counterparts.

More recently, Blevins (2003:500), quotes File (1993:14, 15) in relation to impersonal forms in the Celtic languages:

Another shared trait in the verbs is the presence in the paradigm of the ‘impersonal’ or ‘autonomous’ verb form. Basically, all Celtic languages possess an impersonal form for each tense which is neutral as to the person and number features of the subject … While this form can often be translated as a passive … the ending also occurs with intransitive verbs, as with Irish táthar ‘they/people are’ … The actual usage of these
forms has diverged significantly over time (in Welsh these have become rather literary constructions, but are everyday forms in Irish), but the presence of a special verbal inflection for an unspecified subject is another particular feature of Celtic.

Blevins (2003:500ff.) notes that descriptions of impersonal passive forms in individual languages typically highlight the role of human agency, and an insensitivity to transitivity, which constrains the formation of passives. For Irish, the impersonal passive form of a verb expresses the verbal action only without any mention of the agent (the subject) or any indication of person or number. These properties support Fife’s (1993) treatment of impersonals. Their logical subjects are suppressed rather than deleted, and non-subjects may be realized as objects. Blevins argues further that an indefinite human interpretation is appropriate as suggested by O’Siadhail (1991:180) who assigns it to Irish impersonal passive forms.

1.3 The approach of this paper

The functional approach in this paper makes use of many of the insights of Van Valin & LaPolla (1997) in that the semantic representation of sentences is based on the lexical representation of the verb. We employ a decompositional representation based on distinctions of Aktionsart proposed originally in Vendler (1957 [1967]). The lexical representation of a verb or other predicate is its logical structure. The semantic representation of an argument is a function of its position in the logical structure of the predicate and the linking system between the semantics and syntax refers to an element’s logical structure position. Valin & LaPolla (1997) posit two generalised semantic roles which play a central role in the linking system. These roles are actor and undergoer, and they encapsulate the usually accepted clusters of thematic roles. They are the primary arguments of a transitive predication. In an intransitive predicate, the single argument can be either an actor or an undergoer, depending on the semantic properties of the predicate. The relationship between the logical structure argument positions and generalised semantic roles is captured by the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy (AUH). In this (see Figure 2), the leftmost argument in terms of the hierarchy will be the actor and the rightmost argument will be the undergoer. Transitivity is therefore defined semantically in terms of the number of generalised semantic roles of a predicate.

We assume a linking system between semantics and syntax with two major steps. The first step consists of the determination of the sentence level logical structure, based on the logical structure of the verb (or other predicate) in the clause. The second step is concerned with the mapping of the logical structure and other arguments into the syntactic functions.

Shibatani (1985:821–848) argues that there has been an increasing awareness that linguistic structures tend to show partial resemblances amongst themselves and that this has prompted linguistics to adopt a framework of prototype theory in their study of language grammar. A framework based on prototypes considers that various con-
The Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument of DO</th>
<th>1st Argument of DO</th>
<th>1st argument of pred(x, y)</th>
<th>2nd argument of pred(x, y)</th>
<th>Argument of state pred(x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Effector</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>Perceiver</td>
<td>Stimulus</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emitter</td>
<td>Cogniser</td>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer</td>
<td>Wanter</td>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Judger</td>
<td>Possessed</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Possessor</td>
<td>Emoter</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Experiencer</td>
<td>Emoter</td>
<td>Consumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Attributant</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>Attributant</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Locus</td>
<td>Implement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[→ = Increasing markedness of realisation of argument as macrorole]

Figure 2. The actor-undergoer hierarchy (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:146)

Instructions exist along a continuum in which certain ones are prototypical as best exemplars of the construction. Others are similar to a degree and others share no properties with the prototype. In addition, along with Comrie (1977), Shibatani argues for a re-appraisal of the passives as involving object promotion. Comrie points out that impersonal passives do not involve promotion of a direct object, despite the fact that subject demotion occurs and suggests that this is better understood via a mechanism of spontaneous demotion of a subject nominal. Comrie (1977:54) notes, for example, that the same impersonal passive forms are used with all verbs of Welsh, a sister Celtic language to Irish, whether they are transitive or intransitive, and that, for Welsh, the expression of the underlying subject is possible. Welsh therefore (ibid. 1977:57) "provides an example of a language where Subject Demotion may take place spontaneously, with any Object promotion." Comrie provides a compelling argument that it is "precisely subject removal that links personal and impersonal passives, and only if we accept removal as a possibility independent of promotion (i.e. spontaneous removal, including demotion with deletion) do we have an explanation for the similarities, down to morphological identity in many cases, between personal and impersonal passives in various languages." Comrie's hypothesis is that the impersonal and other types of passive involve the demotion of the subject. An interesting objection, or perhaps more correctly, refinement to Comrie's hypothesis is to be found in Frajzyngier (1982:267–290), where a strong claim is made that whenever there is a passive form of intransitive verbs, then such a form implies that the sentence has an indefinite human agent. Frajzyngier observes that
the semantic category of the indefinite subject seems to have been grammaticalised in Indo-European languages by the use of an already existing device, for example, 3rd person plural., and argues that in Old Irish, the passive of intransitive verbs serves to express the indefinite human agent, e.g., tiágar 'let people, someone go' meaning, literally, 'let it be gone', ro-both 'people have been' (Thurneysen 1946:328). The impersonal passives according to Frajzyngier are active in function, but differ from other active sentences in having an indefinite human subject whereas the active sentences have a specified subject, human, non-human, animate or non-animate.

Shibatani suggests that passives involve no mention of agents for contextual reasons and claims instead that the primary function of the passive is to defocus the actor. His view of the passive is different from that of Givón (1979:186) who defines the passive as follows: "passivation is the process by which a non-agent is promoted into the role is a main topic of the sentence. And to the extent that the language possesses coding properties which identify main topics as subjects and distinguish them from topics, then this promotion may also involve subjectivalization." Shibatani observes that unexpressed agents are typically obscure or unknown, or refer to indefinite persons, but may be obvious from the utterance context. That is, passives centre around agents and their fundamental function is to do with the defocusing of agents. All entities which correspond to the arguments in a semantic or valence frame are essential elements and require the listener’s attention in decoding the message. They are highlighted against the background of all other entities which are not semantically coded. These semantically coded elements are more prominent than others, since they are more salient in the speakers mind, and call for more attention on the part of the listener. Less attention is required by other arguments because they are unimportant or unidentifiable. An argument which requires the least amount of attention is subjected to a defocusing strategy, and the most obvious way, according to Shibatani, of defocusing is not to code it syntactically. The passive represents such a defocusing strategy.

Shibatani also argues (1985:832ff.) that the syntactically encoded elements have varying degrees of focus with the argument coded as subject having the highest degree. Focus decreases along the hierarchy of grammatical relations of subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique objects, and their strength of focus is correlated with their various syntactic and morphological properties. The passive avoids the focusing of an agent. The passive which does not syntactically code an agent has defocused it to the full extent while a coding of an agent in an oblique position defocuses it to the degree assigned to the oblique position, that is, the lowest degree of focusing among the syntactically encoded elements. Defocusing, of course, can be achieved by using the indefinite rather than the definite, or the plural rather than the singular. The indefinite forms have the opposite effect from individuation or the singling out of an entity. The use of an indefinite form for the passive, or an impersonal marking, is readily explainable in this framework.

The defocusing is an agent in the passive is therefore, for Shibatani, not a consequence of an object promotion or of topicalization, but is instead the primary function of the passive. Topicalization is concerned with creating a topic, or theme, of a sentence
whereas the primary pragmatic function of the passive is the defocusing of the agent. Since the defocusing of an agent is taken to be the primary pragmatic function of the passive prototype, it therefore follows that passives of intransitives, passives without promotion, and the other passives are passives to the extent that they share this function. That is, that they exhibit a “family resemblance” along a continuum from the prototype best exemplar. In the prototypical passive, an agent is a component part of the semantic valency frame and as such, it is conceptualized and defocused only at the level of syntactic coding. Many languages, of course, sanction a passive agent in an oblique position and these are to be understood as involving an incomplete defocusing is the agent. For Shibatani, the prototype involves a complete defocusing.

As we have mentioned, the approach of Shibatani differs from that of Givón (1990:575). Givón, in arguing for a promotional and topic analysis of passive, suggests that the promotional passive, in which the topic of passive undergoes full promotion to subject-hood, also tends to 1) allow the agent of passive to optionally appear in an oblique case; 2) code the passive verb with a more stative-intransitive grammatical form; and 3) restrict the range of non-agent case-roles that can become the topic of passive. For Givón, non-promotional passives (i.e. impersonal passives) are constructions in which the topic of passive does not undergo full promotion but, instead, retains its characteristic active clause case-marking. They also tend to 1) delete the agent or subject of active obligatory; 2) code the passive verb with a more active-transitive grammatical form; and 3) permit a wider range of non-agent case-roles to become the topic of passive.

Our argument follows the Shibatani analysis and not that of Givón. The Shibatani prototype analysis is re-inforced by the windowing of attention as described by Talmy (1996). In this analysis we will demonstrate that the different windows allow for a prototypical characterisation along a continuum of family resemblance over the various passive constructions if Irish. We will argue that the passive constructions of Irish can be best understood with a windowing of attention analysis by the speaker in a discourse context where certain elements of the construction are focused or defocused, foregrounded or backgrounded.

2. The personal passive

The Irish language supports three variants of the personal passive construction, each of which involves a particular form of the verb in a periphrastic form. It is important to explain here at the start of the analysis that Irish has two verbs of ‘to be’. The first of these is the copula isCOP ‘be’. This is used to represent permanent or intrinsic attributive states. The second verb is táSUBV ‘to be’ and the form of interest to us here. This verb is generally called the substantive verb in Celtic linguistics to distinguish it from the copula. The copula is never involved with passive constructions of any form whereas the substantive verb, as we have defined it, is generally used. We will provide evidence of the importance of this verb to our understanding of the passive in this analysis.
The three variants of the personal passive relate to the nature of the syntactic aspect and are, accordingly: the progressive, the prospective and the perfective (O’Siadháil 1991:294ff.; Stenson 1981:145ff.; Russell 1995:100ff.). The passives just described are personal passives (i.e., not impersonal) in the sense that a noun phrase, which does not represent the agent, appears as the subject of the substantive verb in the first argument slot following the substantive verb in the position reserved for the grammatical subject. The agent can optionally be represented obliquely by a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition ‘at’ or ‘from’ and containing the nominal denoting the agent. In this paper we distinguish between the three different, but related, forms of the personal passive by reference to the following schemata. The specific prepositions in each of the schema are a necessary part of the constructions.

**Personal Passive**

1. **Perfective Passive**

   (2) Perfective Passive  
   \[
   \text{SUBV NP}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{ VA } (+agpp NP_{actor}) \ldots \\
   \text{by/at}
   \]

2. **Prospective Passive**

   (3) a. Prospective Passive  
   \[
   \text{SUBV NP}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{ lepp VN } (+agpp NP_{actor}) \ldots \\
   \text{with by/at}
   \]

   b. Prospective Passive  
   \[
   \text{SUBV NP}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{ dopp + adjpN possessive VN } (+agpp NP_{actor}) \ldots \\
   \text{for his by/at}
   \]

3. **Progressive Passive**

   (4) a. Progressive Passive  
   \[
   \text{SUBV NP}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{ (dh)ipp + adjp possessive VN } (+agpp NP_{actor}) \ldots \\
   \text{to+for by/at}
   \]

   b. Progressive Passive  
   \[
   \text{SUBV NP}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{ ipp ADJ possessive VN } \ldots \\
   \text{in}
   \]

The personal passive construction reframes the event with a focus on the resulting state or the condition of the undergoer participant, depending on the particular variant of the personal passive. Similar to the English or German stative/adjectival passive versus the eventive ongoing passive in German, this state may be static if the action is completed, as in a perfective passive, or dynamic, as in a passive progressive construction. Each of these potential situations is reflected in the choice of the passive construction template employed. This process of reframing the event to focus on a resulting state, or the condition of the undergoer, involves the use of a *be* verb, that is, the substantive verb (but never the copula). It also involves the use of less finite verb form, i.e. a *verbal adjective* or *verbal noun*, the removal of the actor participant, or the demotion of the actor participant to an oblique position in the syntax. In the personal passive construction, the actor is subject to demotion or suppression while the undergoer carries the stative-resultative aspects of the event in focus. As we will see from our examples, the personal passive is usually not agent deleting but is agent demoting.

### 2.1 Perfective variant of the personal passive

We now examine the variants of the personal passive constructions, starting with the perfective variant of the personal passive, and following this, with the progressive and prospective variant constructions respectively. To represent the demoted actor in the
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personal passive we employ the convention of ‘∧ Actor(x)’ where ‘x’ is an reference variable that would, in an active clause be contained in a logical structure such as ‘\[do’(x, [pred'(x, y)])\]’.

(5) Tá an leabhar leite agam.
BESUBV-PRES the\:det book\:n read\:va by\:pp+me\:pn
The book is read by me.
\[do’(0, [read’(0, an leabhar)]) ∧ Actor(mé)]

The agentive phrase is optional and the construction may equally well be expressed without any mention of the agent in (6).

(6) Tá an leabhar leite.
BESUBV-PRES the\:det book\:n read\:va
The book is read.
\[do’(0, [read’(0, an leabhar)])]\\n
We have examined the first of the variants of the personal passive constructions, the perfective variant of the personal passive. We look at the progressive variant next and follow this with the prospective variant constructions.

2.2 Prospective variant of the personal passive

Constructions in the prospective variant of the personal passive are classified as imperfective as they do not denote an action that has finished. Instead, the action has not yet taken place but is expected to occur at some future time. Examples of the passive prospective clause are to be found in (7) and (8). In each, the agent is represented obliquely in the logical structure as ‘∧ Actor (éinne)’.

(7) Tá an tsaol seo le mothú ag an leacacha an bhaile
BESUBV-PRES breadth\:n the\:det life\:n this\:det with\:pp feeling\:vn by\:pp
ejinne on\:pp flagstones\:n the\:det town\:n
The breadth of life is to be felt by anyone on the town streets.
\[ar leacacha an bhaile’([do’(0, [feed’(0, anal an tsaol seo)]) ∧ Actor (éinne)]\\n
(8) Tá an leabhair le leamh agam.
BESUBV the\:det book\:n with\:pp reading\:vn by\:pp+me\:pn
The book is to be read by me.
\[do’(0, [read’(0, an leabhar)]) ∧ Actor(mé)]\\n
In contrast to the above examples we can see the active prospective clause in (9). In this example the actor is not in an oblique position in the logical structure and therefore links directly to grammatical subject position in the syntax. The subject position is immediately post adjacent to the substantive verb.

(9) Tá mé le leamh an leabhair.
BESUBV me\:pn with\:pp reading\:vn the\:det book\:n
Brian Nolan

I am to read the book.

[do'(mé, [read'(mé, an leabhar)])]

We have examined the second of the variants of the personal passive constructions, the progressive personal passive. We will now look at the prospective variant.

2.3 Progressive variant of the personal passive

Examples of a progressive personal passive are given below in (10)–(12). The variant indicates the dynamic ongoing state of the undergoer, the passive subject, hence the inclusion of the do' activity operator in the logical structure representation. This indicates that the construction is progressing and dynamic, and, as such, is imperfective. The construction utilises [dhá:pp vn] where dhá:pp may be glossed as ‘to+for’ and vn is the verbal noun form of the matrix verb.

2.3.1 The (a) template form of the progressive passive construction

In (10), the agentive prepositional phrase is introduced by ag 'at/by' and contains the optional np_actor. In this instance, the agent is expressed via the prepositional pronoun agam 'by+me'. This prepositional form incorporates the pronoun into the preposition to form the prepositional pronoun agam. While ag:pp vn 'at vn-ing' is allowed in substantive verb clauses, it does not occur within these clauses in the personal passive. The reason being that with the ag:pp vn construct the actor is expressed and is the clause subject. In the passive, the dhá:pp vn construct is required, as with this the undergoer now appears in the argument slot immediately post adjacent to the substantive verb and before the dhá:pp vn. The undergoer is then the clause subject.

(10) Tá an doras dhá phéinteáil agam.
    Be:SUBV-PRES the:DET door:N to:PP+for:PP painting:VN by:PP+me:PN
    The door is being painted by me.
    [do'(0, [paint'(0, an doras)]) ∧ Actor(mé)]

In (11), no agent is shown in the oblique position in the syntax or in the associated logical structure.

(11) Bhí hataí agus miotógaí dhá scabadh
    through:ADV the:DET air:N
    The hats and belongings were being scattered through the air.
    [frí:PN an aer ([do'(0, [scatter'(0, hataí agus miotógaí)])]]

This variant of the personal passive may also appear with á 'to' instead of dhá 'to+for', as we indicated with (dh)á in the syntactic schema (4) indicated earlier. We see this in (12) where no agent is specified and the undergoer in subject position following the substantive verb is an inanimate non-human entity.
The passives of Modern Irish

(12) Bhí an gloine á bhriseadh.
    Be(subv-past) the(det) glass:np to:pp+for:pp breaking:vn
    The glass was being broken.
    [do'(0, [break'(0, an gloine)])]

In (13), no oblique agent is shown.

(13) Bhí an liúdar á rúscadh agus na bádaí
    Be(subv) the(det) coal-fish:n to:pp+for:pp stirring:vn and:conj the(det) boats:n
garn.
scaicheadh
    The coal-fish were being stirred but the boats were scarce.
    [do'(0, [stir'(0, an liúdar)]) & (gann'(na bádaí)]

In this section we have examined the (a) template of the progressive passive construction in which the agentive prepositional phrase was introduced by ag 'at/by' and contained the optional np actor. We have seen that the the agent can be expressed via the conjugating prepositional pronoun agam 'by+me'. We now look at the rather unusual, and therefore interesting, (b) template variation of this construction.

2.3.2 The (b) template form of the progressive passive construction

The examples in (14)–(16) have been claimed to be syntactic personal passives by O’Siadhail (1991:295) and are therefore included in this analysis. O’Siadhail argues that syntactically they pattern with the other personal passives and therefore must be considered passives even thought we might think they differ with what one would usually classify as personal passives in a semantically motivated syntax. As we will see, these constructions are nonetheless interesting and have a particular set of characteristics worthy of investigation. Noonan (1994:282) calls these passives "action state" constructions and that they "refer to a situation where the state of the subject is characterized with reference to an activity".

The constructions below follow the (b) schema and involve the possessive adjective. In these examples the undergoer of the action is affected and this participant appears in position next after the substantive verb with the activity denoted in a non-finite form as a verbal noun. These examples are syntactically passive and progressive (O’Siadháil 1991:295), reflecting an ongoing dynamic state. The verbs, here expressed in the non-finite verbal noun form, are a special class of passive form of stative verbs which refocus the view on the state in a certain way. Crucially, in these examples, the sole participant of the verbal action is in the state of undergoing the action denoted by the matrix verb in verbal noun form, i.e, [be-in'([pred_{VN}'(x)], x), and shown as a schema in (14).

(14) Schema Template for first person singular participant:
    Tá mé _ in mo_ vn.
    Literally: 'I am in my vn-ing'.
    I am vn-ing.
    [be-in'([pred_{VN}'(mé)], mé)
Instances of these constructions can be seen in (15) and (16). Both exactly pattern to the schema in (14) and the undergoer of the verbal action has the grammatical relation of subject.

(15) \[ Tá mé i mo choidladh. \]
\[ Be:SUBV-PRES mé:PN in:PP my:poss-adj sleeping:VN \]
Literally: ‘I am in my sleeping’.
I am sleeping.
\[ \text{[be-in'(sleepVN'(mê)), mê]} \]

(16) \[ Tá mé i mo chónaí. \]
\[ Be:SUBV-PRES mé:PN in:PP my:poss-adj living:VN \]
Literally: ‘I am in my living’.
I am living.
\[ \text{[be-in'(liveVN'(mê)), mê]} \]

As well as having particularly stative qualities, each of these verbal nouns characterises an action that, if expressed in active voice with a finite verb, would use an intransitive verb, for example (17) which shows an active clause with a 1st person singular participant.

(17) \[ Rith mé. \]
\[ Run:V-PAST mé:PN \]
I ran.
\[ \text{[do'(mê, [rith'(mê)])]} \]

Common to each of these constructions is the utilisation in the syntax of the substantive verb followed by the clause subject, followed in turn by the preposition i ‘in’ and a possessive adjective coindexed to the subject, followed immediately by the verbal noun. No oblique actor is specified with this construction. That is, this particular construction does not sanction any oblique actor. The evidence suggests that, while they are syntactically passive-like, semantically they are perhaps better understood as unaccusative-like and stative with their sole participant an undergoer. An open question is whether these constructions are unique to Irish, or are to be found in related languages.

2.4 Personal passive summary

In the personal passive constructions of modern Irish, the actor is backgrounded by demotion down to an oblique position within a prepositional phrase introduced by ag ‘by/at’, or deleted. We represented the demoted actor in the logical structure of the personal passive by employing the convention of ‘∧ Actor(x)’ where ‘x’ is an reference variable that would, in an active clause be contained in a logical structure representation such as ‘[do'(x, [pred'(x, y)])]’. Given that no actor is available, we can predict, from the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, that the next candidate participant in the logical structure to become the grammatical subject in the syntax is the undergoer. This linking at the semantic-syntactic interface gives the appearance that the object of the
active verb is promoted up to become the grammatical subject of the substantive verb of “to be” in the personal passive construction. This is, however, a side effect of the defocusing (in the sense of Shibatani 1985:821–848) of the actor of the active clause in the passive voice construction. We have discussed the defocusing side effect in Section 1.3 of this paper.

3. The impersonal passive

3.1 The impersonal passive construction

The impersonal passive verb form occurs with all verbs of Irish, across all tenses, whether intransitive or transitive. The impersonal passive form is also to be found productively with the substantive verb across all tenses. It does not under any circumstances occur with the copula verb. The impersonal passive form can be followed by a prepositional phrase, but only one that is introduced by le ‘by/with’ or ó ‘from’.

All Irish verbs with the sole exception of the copula have an impersonal passive form. We will argue that with the impersonal passive form of a verb, no specific definite actor is elaborated in logical structure. The actor is instead specific but indefinite. The actor remains specific because we are committed to their actual existence, but is indefinite to the degree that there is no subject available in argument structure. The type or kind of this specific indefinite actor is animate, usually human.

Payne (1977:206) notes that impersonal passives can be formed from intransitive as well as transitive verbs and that, for impersonal passives, the identity of the participants in the action are not central to the speaker’s communicative goal; only the fact that action took place. The function of the impersonal passive is, therefore, to downplay the centrality of the agent. In this regard, and to further motivate our argument, we need to consider how certain noun phrases refer to entities that the speaker judges should be identifiable by the addressee. The term definite has been used to describe the status referred to as identifiable. Noun phrases can be identified or made identifiable is several ways, for example, through the use of a proper noun which implies that the speaker assumes the listener can identify the referent. Identifiability is not necessarily explicit and is significant in relation to the communication situation. That is, according to Payne (1997:264) “something is treated as identifiable if its referent is explicit enough for the speaker’s current purposes”. Referentiality is not identical to identifiability in that an “entity is objectively referentially if it exists as a bounded, individual entity in the message world” (Payne 1997:264). Referentiality is also referred to as specificity. A noun phrase may be specific (objectively referential or non-specific (non-referential). Pronouns may also be indefinite and Haspelmath (1997:12) identifies, for English, some key examples:

(18) a. someone, something, somewhere, somehow, …
   b. anyone, anything, anywhere, anyhow, …
   c. no one, nothing, nowhere, never, …
Haselmath also notes (1997:278ff.) that Irish has three series of indefinite pronouns, all derived from generic nouns. That is, nouns that allow a generic referent to be identifiable in the sense that a speaker assumes the listener can identify the genera. Haselmath (1997:52) argues that indefinite pronouns are sometimes derived from generic ontological-category nouns such as ‘person’, ‘thing’, ‘place’, ‘time’, and ‘manner’, and that these generic nouns are very similar in meaning to indefinite pronouns like those mentioned in, for example (18) above in the case of English. Irish has dún eígín ‘some person/someone’ = ‘a certain person’. The full inventory of Irish indefinite pronouns across the ontological-category nouns such as ‘person’, ‘thing’, ‘place’, ‘time’, and ‘manner’ is to be found in Haselmath (1997:278ff.). For our purposes we are concerned with eígín ‘some’ usages (in specific known, specific unknown and irrealis non-specific usages) in relation to impersonal passives and argue in favour of Haselmath’s hypothesis within our analysis of the Irish impersonal passive construction.

An indefinite noun phrase can be specific or non-specific. According to Haselmath (1997:45), a semantic factor that is sometimes relevant in choosing different indefinite series is the knowledge of the speaker. The speaker may or may not be able to identify the referent of the indefinite pronoun but, for specific phrases, the identifiability of the referent is presupposed. With non-specific phrases, identifiability by the speaker does not arise as such expressions are necessarily unknown to the speaker. The relation between definite and indefiniteness, specificity and non-specificity, and knowledge of the speaker is given in Figure 3.

Again, for Haselmath (1997:52), some of the main functional distinctions between specificity and non-specificity that occur cross-linguistically are summarized in (19) while generics (20) are a class of entity that is definite and known to the speaker and hearer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Non-specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referent exists</td>
<td>Referent does not exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lyons (1999:165) also argues along lines very similar to Haselmath. In particular, indefinite noun phrases do not involve a referent identifiable to the hearer. An in-
definite noun phrase may be used to denote a particular entity, or to speak of an arbitrary member of the class described by the noun phrase. Definites may refer while indefinites do not refer. The referent of a specific indefinite is not identifiable to the hearer, whereas the referent of a specific definite is identifiable to both the speaker and the hearer. Lyons (1999:150), like Haspelmath, makes note of the common pattern in indefinite pronouns within the use of a noun in a general sense (i.e., 'person', 'thing'), either alone or modified by a determiner. We have already seen examples of these earlier, for Irish, in relation to *duine éigin* 'some person/someone' and *rud éigin* 'something.

What is common to the Irish impersonal passive constructions in this section is that the actor is backgrounded to the extent that it is indefinite and not in anyway in focus. The *type or kind* of the agent is available as human and animate, but the animacy may be more evident than the human characteristic. In such a case, the humanness may be metaphorical. Crucially, this actor must be specific while indefinite for quite particular reasons. Semantically, the impersonal construction is transitive with two participants recorded in the logical structure, an actor and undergoer. The actor is, however, an 'impersonal agent'.

The impersonal passive clause is syntactically intransitive in that only one argument is expressed in the syntax, that of the undergoer which links to grammatical object. The actor/impersonal agent is unexpressed and consequently there is no overt subject in the syntax. However, as the object stays in the same position and maintains object marking, the situation that holds at the level of the semantics must be visible to the syntax. Specifically, the object is not promoted to subject in this construction and the unexpressed agent is noted in the syntax by the morphosyntactic device of marking by a suffix on the matrix verb. The behaviour of the clause object is very evident when the nominal is a pronoun. Ahlquist (1978:172), in relation to the position of pronouns notes that:

subject pronouns in contemporary Modern Irish cannot be separated from the verb, except in so far as so-called subjects of passive verbs are concerned. Consider *rugadh agus tógadh ann sa gcómharsanacht é* 'he (=é) was born and brought up in the neighbourhood'. Again, the final position of the pronoun is not obligatory as illustrated by *caillleadh é in n-am ghearr* 'he (=é) died within a short time'. However note that the pronoun has the same form (without s-) as if it were the object of an active verb. Thus one might describe these pronouns as objects of impersonal verbs, not subjects of passive ones.

In (21), the matrix verb is in the impersonal passive form. No subject is expressed in the clause. A grammatical object is expressed in the form of a third person pronoun, marked with accusative case. The reflexive-emphatic marker *féin* is post adjacent to the grammatical object of the sentence giving an emphatic interpretation. Rather than a reflexive, emphatic use of *féin* with a grammatical object is sanctioned as simple proximity to the object entity is all that is required.
This example illustrates the use of the reflexive marker \textit{féin} with an impersonal passive construction but deployed in an emphatic mode only, and not reflexively. That is, it is used as a fake reflexive which serves to add a discourse emphasis within the utterance.

3.2 Discussion on the impersonal passive

In impersonal passive constructions the actor is backgrounded to the extent that it becomes indefinite, and not, in any way, in focus. The type or kind of the actor is available as animate, usually human. Crucially, the actor must be specific while indefinite for quite particular reasons as we have discussed. Semantically, the impersonal construction is transitive with two participants recorded in the logical structure, an actor and undergoer. The actor is, however, an "impersonal agent". The clause is syntactically intransitive in that only one argument is expressed in the syntax, that of the undergoer which, however, links to the grammatical object relation. The actor is unexpressed and consequently there is no overt subject in the syntax. However, as the object stays in the same position within the syntax, and maintains object marking, the situation that holds at the level of the semantics must be visible to the syntax. Specifically, the object is not "promoted" to subject in this construction and the unexpressed actor is noted in the syntax by the device of a suffix morphologically marked on the matrix verb. The behaviour of the clause object is very evident when the nominal is a pronoun.

We have already noted that Haspelmath (1997) has examined indefinite pronouns across a substantial number of the world’s languages, over nine different functional domains. These domains are: specific known, specific unknown, irrealis non-specific, question, conditional, indirect negation, comparative, direct choice and lastly, free choice. He finds that in most languages several indefinite pronouns overlap in their distribution, that is, some functions may be expressed by several different indefinite pronouns. For Irish, Haspelmath (1997: 278) identifies an inventory of three series of indefinite pronouns, all of which are derived from generic nouns. The series consists of 1) the non-emphatic \textit{éigin} ‘some’ series, 2) the negative-polarity series marked by \textit{aon} ‘any’, and 3) the emphatic \textit{ar bith} ‘at all’ series. Some of these are indicated in (22).
An example of an active clause with specific known/unknown is:

(23) Dúirt: v-past
    duine éigin: n
    éigin: pn
    liom: pp
    é: pn

Somebody told it to me.

Where:
- *duine éigin* is + human,
- + animate, and
- + foregrounded

The impersonal passive equivalent of the above clause (23), with exactly the same meaning, is indicated in (24). The pronoun *é* may be glossed as either ‘he’ or ‘it’ depending on the context. Note that in example (21) the appropriate gloss is *é* ‘he’ whereas in examples (23) and (24) the correct gloss is ‘it’.

(24) Dúradh: v-impers-pass-past
    liom: pp
    é: pn

Somebody told it to me.

Where:
- *x* is + human,
- + animate, and
- – foregrounded

This evidence suggests that the impersonal passive, with the specific indefinite or impersonal actor morphologically recorded as a suffix on the matrix verb, is an extension of the cline within the functional domains. For example, the agentive indefinite actor and syntactic subject of the active clause in (23) is made more indefinite in the impersonal passive (24) by the backgrounding to the extent that it is no longer explicitly expressed in the syntax of the impersonal passive. We still have a commitment to the actual and real existence of the actor that is now expressed at the semantic level only, in logical structure, and, because of this, it is *specific* but *indefinite*. The indefiniteness hierarchy may therefore be:
Within these examples, the actor in the semantics of logical structure is backgrounded but still visible to the syntax as a conflated subject morphologically recorded on the verb. The evidence for this is that the object does not, and cannot, occupy the grammatical subject position in these constructions. The subject that is conflated is specific and indefinite, animate and human. Because this participant is specific but indefinite, the morphosyntactic behaviour is very similar to that of normal pronouns when expressed in synthetic forms of the verb, for instance, the third person pronoun with these human attributes.

I argue that the behaviour of the impersonal passive is in line with morphologically richer synthetic verb type behaviours, i.e., 1st person singular and 1st person plural, and others, across the tenses. Irish commonly exhibits this mix of synthethic and analytic usages, but to a greater or lesser degree depending on the region or locality (O’Siadháil 1991; Stenson 1989). The impersonal passive behaviour is, therefore, motivated by the use of the device of conflated subject as a means of backgrounding, but not fully deleting, the actor, and of highlighting the action of the verb itself.

Our view is that the impersonal passive construction has an specific indefinite actor at the level of the semantics and that the impersonal passive verb expresses this as a 3rd person indefinite pronoun in the syntax via a synthetic post-verbal suffix rendered on the matrix verb. When considered in this way, the behaviour of the impersonal passive verb in the syntax is exactly the same with respect to definite subject pronouns when they are expressed in a non-analytic manner, that is, in the synthetic form of the verb. Because of this 3rd person indefinite pronoun, marked synthetically on the verb, the impersonal passive construction does not usually express an oblique agent.

The analysis here supports the view that there is a strong link, reinforced by immediate proximity, between the verb and subject underpinning the Irish vSO linear word order. We might observe also that the object NP remains an object in the impersonal passive construction. Some (historical) support for our hypothesis can be found in Ahlquist (1978:174) who notes that:

In Middle Irish the choice between using a pronoun with s- and one without s- was dictated not only by the function of the pronoun, i.e. whether it occurred as a subject or as an object, but also by its position in relation to the verb, i.e. whether it came immediately after the verb or was separated from it by an adverbial complement or even an object. Later, it seems that subject pronouns could be no longer separated from the verb, perhaps because they had been, at least to a certain degree, assimilated into the same system as the synthetic verbal endings.

This provides additional evidence that the object is less tightly bound to the verb than the subject. More importantly, it supports the view that the impersonal passive construction has a specific indefinite actor. Historically, this may have arisen from an encoding as a 3rd person indefinite pronoun, but is now expressed as a synthetic suffix
on the matrix verb, that is, the impersonal passive verb endings available across all the tenses for all verbs, including the substantive, but not the copula.

4. Impersonal passive of the substantive verb

4.1 The substantive verb

We have mentioned earlier that Irish has two forms of the verb ‘to be’ – the copula is ‘be’ and the substantive verb tá ‘to be’. The substantive verb can take a conjugation across all the tenses. For each of those tenses the substantive verb tá ‘to be’ also has an impersonal passive form. The substantive verb tá ‘to be’ therefore fully supports the impersonal passive construction and all substantive verb constructions have a corresponding impersonal passive form.

As a prelude to our examination of this particular form of the impersonal passive, we list below the verbal forms which code the impersonal passive as it is found for each of the aspectual tenses. We follow this with an analysis of this construction.

(26) Impersonal passive forms of the substantive verb

| Present tense | Táthar | (somebody) is |
| Habitual Present Tense | Bítear | (somebody) is |
| Past Tense | Bhíothas | (somebody) was |
| Habitual Past Tense | Bhítí | (somebody) used to be |
| Future tense | Beifear | (somebody) will be |
| Conditional Mood | Bheifí | (somebody) would be |
| Present Subjunctive | goPP rabbhir | may (somebody) be |

This means that a speaker may choose to utilise the active form of a matrix verb, or may instead utilise a substantive verb construction for the personal passive with any of the three variants discussed earlier in the first section of this paper. It also means that personal passive forms using the substantive also allow for an additional form, that is, one based on the the impersonal passive form of the substantive construction.

4.2 The Impersonal passive form of a substantive verb

An impersonal passive form of a substantive verb in a syntactically imperfective construction is illustrated in example (27). The state-of-affairs denoted by the clause is that of a progressing ongoing activity. The actor of the construction is backgrounded
and does not appear anywhere in the syntax. The denoted action is represented by the verbal noun _obair_ 'working', and this is fronted by the preposition _ag_ 'at'. As the verb _obair_ 'work' is lexically intransitive, no verb undergoer is available and therefore no clause object is expressed in the syntax. The verb _obair_ 'work' can also be deployed with the impersonal passive form of the verb _obair_ itself.

(27) *Bítear Be:*  
    _subv-imper-pass-hab-pres ag obair._  
    (Someone was working. (=People were working)  
    [do'(x, [work'(x)])] where x is unspecified.

(28) *Bítear Be:*  
    _subv-imp-pass-hab-pres ag bhriseadh an gloine._  
    Someone was breaking the glass. (=People were breaking the glass)  
    [do'(x, [break'(x, an gloine)])] where x is unspecified

The example in (28) illustrates the impersonal passive form of the substantive verb, with the verbal noun form of a transitive verb denoting a progressing unbounded activity. No actor is expressed. The undergoer is expressed as the direct object of the verbal noun, that is, the direct object of the construction.

4.3 Summary of the impersonal passive of the substantive verb

The availability of the impersonal passive of the non-copula, substantive verb _tá_ 'to be' means that a speaker has a considerable number of strategies that can be deployed as the situation demands. We diagram this map of possibilities in (29). We have provided an example of each with a brief discussion.

(29)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active construction</th>
<th>Transitive verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal passive construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal passive construction using substantive verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Impersonal passive construction using substantive verb |

A speaker may choose to use an active intransitive construction to express a given situation, or may instead use an impersonal passive construction containing the intransitive verb or, alternatively, a construction containing an impersonal passive of the substantive verb. Similarly, a speaker may use an active transitive construction or may instead use a personal passive construction using one of the variants identified earlier for the transitive verb.
Alternatively, the speaker may use an impersonal passive construction based on the transitive verb or the impersonal passive of the substantive verb. The map of possibilities in (29) therefore indicates, for example, that a construction containing an intransitive verb can be deployed in an impersonal passive construction or an impersonal passive construction using the substantive verb but not in a personal passive construction. It also indicates that a construction with a transitive verb may be deployed in any of the passive constructions.

5. The get passive

5.1 Background

We now argue that a third passive construction is to be found in Irish, that is, a get passive. The get passive is attested in many, but not all, of the world's languages (Siewierska 1984). From the literature, the defining characteristics of the get passive include the following, which may be used as diagnostics to test for its discovery:

(30) get passive characteristics

a. get passives are "normally used in constructions without an agent" (Leech & Svartvik 1994:330).
b. get passives place "the emphasis on the subject rather than the agent, and on what happens to the subject as a result of the event" (Quirk & Crystal 1985:161).
c. get passives emphasise the subject referent's condition, which is "usually an unfavourable condition" (Quirk & Crystal 1985:161).
d. get passives "describe events that are perceived to have either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject" (Siewierska 1984:135).
e. The get passive is likely to have a human subject that is non-agentive, affected and involved, (Givón 1983:119ff.).
f. The get passive is more likely to be inchoative and punctual, that is, ingr rather than become (Arce-Arenales, Axelrod, & Fox 1993:11ff.).
g. A get passive may have an agentive phrase in an oblique position, similar to a be passive (Arce-Arenales, Axelrod, & Fox 1993:11ff.).

These diagnostics contain a mix of semantic and/or syntactic criteria and, as such, may not be fully applicable to other languages, for example, German or Dutch. The empirical question here is whether, and to what extent, they apply to Irish. We will find that these do, in fact, apply.

As noted in Siewierska 1984, constructions categorised as get passive constructions are to be found in many of the world's languages. For example, Huang (1999:6, 30) observes that Chinese bei-passive constructions behave on a par with get passives in English, but differently from personal passives. He discusses instances of get passives constructions with respect to the Mandarin, Taiwanese, Cantonese dialects of Chinese (Huang 1999:37), along with similar constructions in Japanese and Korean (Huang 1999:39). Huang (1999:45ff.) further observes that, like English, the Romance
languages also display a full range of be passives, ergative get passives, and causative get passives.

From a different part of the world, evidence of get passive constructions in Estonian is provided by Torn (2002:81–106). According to Torn, the saama-passive, as the dynamic passive in Estonian, is a typical get passive (31). As it does not use the passive participle, the construction cannot be considered the prototypical personal passive construction. However, the undergoer participant links to the subject grammatical relation. The subject occurs in the nominative and agrees with the verb. All examples in Estonian, along with their glosses, are from Torn (2002).

(31) Lapsed said ema käest noomida.
children.nom get.pret.3pl mother.gen from reprimand.da
The children were/got reprimanded by the mother.

Torn observes that this Estonian passive construction is always dynamic in meaning. It is restricted in its use and occurs with verbs that denote attitude, such as the Estonian rieilda ‘tell off’, peksa ‘beat’, kitta ‘praise’. In addition, the construction can be impersonalised as illustrated by (32) below.

(32) Saadi ema käest noomida.
get.pret.imp mother.gen from reprimand.da
Someone got reprimanded by the mother.

The saama get construction can be used to form the personal passive in Estonian. According to Torn, the saama + tud-participle construction has a resultative meaning.

(33) Ma sain (sõprade poolt) meeskonda valitud.
I get.pret.1sg (friends.gen by) team elect.pass.part
I was/got elected to the team by my friends.

Although the agent phrase can be added, Torn notes that it sounds unnatural in Estonian and that the construction saama + passive participle is considered a borrowing from German. In English the get passive permits both dynamic and stative interpretations, whereas in Estonian only the saama passive evokes the dynamic reading of the event, while the personal passive is confined to describing the resulting state and exhibits an interpretation characteristic of a copula + deverbal adjective construction. The Estonian saama get construction has behaviours similar to the Irish faigh get passive. We can note therefore that get passive constructions are indeed to be found in diverse languages and that the diagnostics identified from the literature are not predicated on English as the name of the construction – get passive – might, at first glance, suggest.

5.2 The verb faigh

The Irish verb faigh ‘get’ that is a candidate for this construction. To determine whether it meets the required diagnostic characteristics, we need to look at its deployment over a number of get constructions. The verb faigh has a different morphological shape
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over the tenses and, for simplicity, we will use faigh to refer to these in a general way. The verb faigh has an impersonal passive form for each tense as well as a non-finite verbal noun (vn) and verbal adjective (va) form. In addition to the impersonal passive form, the verb faigh can also undergo each variant of the personal passive.

The verb faigh is transitive, taking two participants, an actor and undergoer. There is a quality about this verb in transitive usages under certain conditions that is particularly interesting. This is when the first participant is not an actor, but an undergoer, and the second participant is a nominal that represents a state. The action of the verb records, then, the fact of the first participant undergoing the state change identified by the nominal in the second participant position. Even thought faigh constructions are transitive, there is a qualitative difference between the construction fuair \[\text{v} \text{np}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{np}_{\text{entity}}\] and the construction fuair \[\text{v} \text{np}_{\text{undergoer}} \text{np}_{\text{state}}\]. The second construction codes a state as a nominal, rather than as a verbal adjective coding a resultative state as found in the perfective variant of the personal passive. By entity we mean a member of the ontology of things that physically exist in the world and that have semantic characteristics that may be described by the theory of nominal qualia (Pustejovsky 1991:426–7). A state has the features [+static], [–telic], and [–punctual].

The argument in subject position is that of the undergoer. The fact that the undergoer is coded in subject position reinforces the non-volitional and non-control attributes of the participant. No actor is coded. Indeed no actor coding in subject position is possible with this second construction in transitive form. The construction is transitive with the undergoer coded as subject, and the state that affects the undergoer strongly marked as a full nominal in clause object position. The relative coding of these arguments in the construction follows the animacy hierarchy with the human and animate participant coded first as subject and the non-human and inanimate entity coded next as object. The focus of the event is on the resultant state that the undergoer will be in after the event. Syntactically, that the construction is transitive can be seen from (34) and (35). Schematically the construction differs regarding the role of the participant that takes subject position in the syntax. In example (34) below, the x participant is expected to be the undergoer that receives the state change denoted by the second participant, the theme. The undergoer must be animatic and is typically human.

(34) Fuair \(x\) bás.
   GOV\-past \(x\)N death\:N
   \(x\) got death. (=\(x\) got killed)
   \[\text{do}^0(0) \text{cause } \text{become be-in'}(\text{bás, } x)\]

The above schema may be compared to (35) where the y participant merely receives simple possession of the entity denoted by the second participant, the theme. No state change takes place in relation to the first participant. The first participant need not be human or animate in this version of the construction. The clause typically codes for an accomplishment situation type.
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(35) *Fuair* y an úl.
    *Gouv-past* y:n the:det apple:n
    y got the apple.
    [do'0] *cause* [become be-at'(an úl, y)]]

The situation types underlying the transitive clause are those of accomplishment or achievement, depending on whether the state change is instantaneous or gradual. This is reflected by either become or ingr in the logical structure representations along with the major state change on the undergoer affected by action of the verb, such that undergoer undergoes the state changes denoted in the second NP from the verb. Therefore, the first participant NP is an undergoer, and the second participant NP is neither actor or undergoer but that of other.

In example (34) above, x must be prototypically human and animate but non-prototypically, must be animate at the minimum. The NP *bás* ‘death’ is an nominal, from the verb *bisigh* ‘die’, denoting the most prototypical state change that a human can undergo, that is, from animate to inanimate. The NP in the second example (35), *an úl* ‘the apple’ is an inanimate entity. No state change is involved and the first NP merely comes into possession of the entity. The first example is indicative of the get passive construction whereas the second example does not denote the get passive qualities exhibited by the first example. The particular quality of x in the first example relates to the fact that x is the undergoer/experiencer/patient. This undergoer macrorole maps to the grammatical subject. The NP x in (35) is not agentive and not the controller of the action in any volitional way. The undergoer simply undergoes the condition denoted by the clause object. The Irish get construction can occur in a personal passive form (36), similar to the example we have seen earlier for Estonian. Note that raibh is a special morphological form of the substantive verb bhí that is used in relative clauses.

(36) bhí cóip faighte d’iris ina
    *Be*svg-past copy:n gotten:VA of:PP+magazine:CN in:PP+that:REL
    raibh grianghraf di.
    was:subv-past photo:CN of:PP+her:PN
    A copy of a magazine was gotten in which was a photo.

In (37) we see another example of the get construction in a personal passive form but with the undergoer obliquely coded within a prepositional phrase. This example illustrates the veracity of the diagnostic (30g) for Irish get passive constructions.

(37) bhí an facs faighte aici.
    *Be*svg-past the:det fax:n gotten:VA by:PP+her:PN
    The fax was gotten from her

The Irish get construction can be impersonalised, similar to the Estonian *saama* get construction.
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5.3 GET constructions that demonstrate the state change

5.3.1 State is beneficial for undergoer

Example (39) illustrates this phenomenon and encodes a beneficial state change. The clause is transitive with two participants. The first participant is human and animate, and the undergoer of the action. The second participant codes the state change that the first participant will undergo. After the event has taken place, the first participant will be transformed in a major way and will have, as a characteristic, the state denoted by the second participant. The state change will not be simple possession. What is important is the affectedness of the undergoer as a consequence of the event. The affectedness is beneficial to the undergoer in this particular example. Pragmatically, healing is taken to be beneficial to the undergoer.

(39) Fuair sé léigheas ar sin.
Gouv-past he: pn healing/medicine: n on: pp that: det
He got healed of that.
[do'(0) cause [become be-in'(léigheas, sé)]]

Similar to (39), the example in (40) below is transitive with an undergoer participant as the clause subject. The object of the clause consists of two conjoined nominals that syntactically code the state. A determiner with universal logical scope, uile ‘every’, ranges over the plural subjects, such that each member of the set of undergoers is affected by both of the states denoted in the complex sentence object. The affectedness represented by the state is beneficial to all of the undergoers.

(40) Fuair an uile dhuine a chroí agus
Gouv-past the: det every: det person: n their: poss-adj heart: n and: conj
a aigneadh ar an tsliabh.
their: poss-adj disposition: n on: pp the: det mountain: n
Every person found their heart and their character on the mountain.

In examples (39) and (40) we have provided evidence from Irish where the undergoer participant undergoes a state change and is beneficially affected.

5.3.2 State has negative consequences for undergoer

In contrast to the above examples, the affectedness seen in example (41) is detrimental to the welfare of the undergoer. The verb in (41) is transitive with a human animate undergoer as the first participant and a second nominal representing the state that will affect the first participant. An adverbial of time informs us as to when the event happened with respect to a certain point in time known to the dialogue participants, that is, *ceithre bliana roimhe sin* ‘four years before that’. The second nominal encodes the most major state change that a living human can undergo, that is, death. This is precisely what this example encodes. As a consequence of this event the animate human will be dead, that is, human but inanimate. The affectedness is not beneficial to the undergoer.

(41) *Fuair m’athair bás ceithre bliana roimhe sin.*

LIT: ‘My father got death four years before that.’

My father died four years before that.

Example (42) and (43) demonstrate similar characteristics. The states described have two or more major negative consequences for the undergoer.

(42) *Fuair Brighid Ní Mhaoldoraidh íosbáirt agus an-bháis in an réagún a raibh sé in a sheachadh region* that.rel beSUBJ-PAST sheCPN

Brighid Ní Mhaoldoraidh got hardship and a violent death in the region that she was in.

(43) *Fuair sé cupla scannradh.*

He got several frights.

In each of the examples in this section the undergoer participant undergoes a state change with negative consequences. In addition, the diagnostics (30c), (30d) and (30e) hold for each of these examples of beneficial and negative consequences. That is, *get* passives emphasise the subject referent’s condition, which is “usually an unfavourable condition” (Quirk & Crystal 1985:161), and *get* passives “describe events that are perceived to have either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject” (Siewierska 1984:135). Also, the *get* passive is likely to have a human subject that is non-agentive, affected and involved (Givón 1983:119f.).
5.4 Discussion of the get passive construction

Syntactically, get constructions code the semantic undergoer as grammatical subject. However, not all get constructions are functional get passives, only those where the direct object encodes a state in which the undergoer will be transformed, in some non-trivial way. A get passive is not a syntactic passive in the same way that we understand a personal passive construction to be; rather it is a functionally defined passive that exhibits the characteristics discussed. In the type of get construction that we have examined, we have found evidence that a particular subset of constructions of Irish precisely exhibits these characteristics under strictly defined constraints.

In our analysis we have seen how the examples from Irish meet the diagnostics from the literature identified in (30). Specifically, we have seen that, for Irish, that a) get passives are “normally used in constructions without an agent” (Leech & Svartvik 1994:330), b) get passives place “the emphasis on the subject rather than the agent, and on what happens to the subject as a result of the event” (Quirk & Crystal 1985:161), c) get passives emphasise the subject referent’s condition, which is “usually an unfavourable condition” (Quirk & Crystal 1985:161), d) get passives “describe events that are perceived to have either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject” (Siewierska 1984:135), e) The get passive is likely to have a human subject that is non-agentive, affected and involved, (Givón 1983:119ff.) and f) The get passive is more likely to be inchoative and punctual, that is, INGR rather than BECOME (Arce-Arenales, Axelrod, & Fox 1993:11ff.). We have attested within Irish g) where “a get passive may have an agentive phrase in an oblique position, similar to a be passive” (Arce-Arenales, Axelrod, & Fox 1993:11ff.).

On the basis of this cluster of evidence, we claim that this is a functionally defined get passive. We will shortly place the functionally defined get passive in relation to the other passive constructions analysed. Before we can approach this we need to examine the word order in the passive constructions.

6. Word order in the passive constructions

We have already mentioned that Irish follows a vso word order and that the subject is more closely bound to the verb than the object. Having looked at the form of each of the passive constructions, we can now briefly examine how word order is maintained through each. The word order in each construction including the active is reflected in (41). Clearly, we can see that the vso order is maintained across each of the constructions.

(44) Active: vsox
      be Passive: subv Undergoer/NPSUBJECT VA/VN [PP NPOBJ] [ag ‘by/at’ Actor/NP]
      get Passive: v Undergoer/NPSUBJECT NSTATE/OBJECT
      Impersonal Passive: VPIMPER-PASS+Indefinite_Human, Actor SUBJECT Undergoer/NPOBJECT
      be Impersonal Passive: subVPIMPER-PASS PP VN [Undergoer/NPOBJECT]
The need to preserve vso order across all constructions and preserve structural ambiguity can be understood to motivate the various construction schemata, and, therefore, some of the behaviours of passives. For example, if the subject is deleted from the active clause with [vso] then we are left with [vo], but this is confusing with intransitive, i.e. [v np]. If the subject is not deleted but simply demoted from [vso] then we arrive at a structure of [vos], but this causes confusion with the interpretation of transitives using [v np np]. In the case of the impersonal passive where we have [v impersonal np do], the verb is marked morphologically to signify this fact, as we seen in our analysis. Where, we might ask, does case marking enter into the equation? Diachronically old Irish had case marking. In the modern Irish language, apart from morphological marking for the genitive, partitive and vocative cases, the nominative and accusative cases can only be seen marked on pronouns. For nouns, a common form is utilised for nominal and accusative cases. For pronouns, for example, we have the forms sé/sí/said ‘he/she/they’ when they occur in nominative case and the corresponding forms é/í/iad ‘him/her/them’ when they occur in the accusative.

The different syntactic construction templates are therefore necessary for the avoidance of structural confusion and the functional communication of the intended meaning by the speaker to the hearer. This provides an interesting linguistic example of the conjunction of form and function. We have seen that in the personal passive, the vso word is maintained in that the subject of the substantive clause follows immediately post adjacent to the substantive verb, thereby maintaining the vs proximity. In addition, the substantive verb agrees with the grammatical subject, that is, the “promoted” non-actor and active sentence object. The subject of the active clause very frequently appears as an oblique prepositional phrase, that is, it is sometimes demoted and not always deleted. Throughout, the vsox order is maintained. Indeed, from the evidence presented we can see that vso order is maintained across each of the passive constructions discussed so far, and that it is necessary to do so.

7. A unified analysis of the passive voice constructions

In this paper we have examined the personal passive (and each of its variants), the impersonal passive and the impersonal passive form of the substantive verb. Comrie (1977) has claimed that any explanation of the “impersonal passive should be within the passive domain”. This means that, ideally, the impersonal passive should be explainable in a unified way that includes the other passive voice constructions. We have demonstrated this in our analysis.

We provided evidence in support of the argument that a third passive forms exists, that of a functionally defined get passive. To confirm our analysis, we determined the characteristics of the get passive from the literature these as a set of diagnostics for testing our hypothesis. We demonstrated that sufficient evidence exists to support our hypothesis, that Irish does have a functionally defined third passive construction, the get passive.
To deliver a unified analysis of the various passive constructions, a perspective that takes account of the complete event is necessary. The impersonal passive, because of the synthetic form of the verb, can be interpreted as an example of the use of a conflated subject as a means of demoting, but not deleting, the actor/subject. Both the impersonal passive and the be passive constructions tend to be demotional and not promotional in nature. The “promotional” elements of the be passive constructions are simply secondary side effects or behaviours to the primary behaviour, that is, to create the necessary focus for the construction.

7.1 Window of attention in an event frame

We have already mentioned that Talmy (1996) sets out a system with which languages can place a portion of a coherent referent situation into the foreground of attention by the explicit mention of that portion, while placing the remainder of that situation into the background of attention by omitting mention of it. Talmy calls this cognitive process the windowing of attention. This windowing of a referent situation takes place in an event-frame and the portions of event frame that are foregrounded by inclusion are said to be windowed. In our analysis the event-frame is represented by the logical structure representation of the clause. Similarly the portions that are backgrounded by exclusion are gapped. Talmy argues that the windowing of attention is part of the much vaster cognitive system constituting the conceptual structuring of language.

Central to the idea of attentional windowing is the fact that linguistic forms can direct the distribution of one’s attention over a referent scene in a certain way, with a certain type of pattern. Involved in this is the placement of one or more windows of greatest attention over the scene. This process is the *windowing of attention* and in this process, one or more portions of a referent scene will be placed in the foreground of attention while the remainder of the scene is backgrounded. The linguistic device that mediates this cognitive process is the inclusion in a sentence of explicit material referring to the portion(s) of the scene that are to be foregrounded. Alternatively, this can be the omission of material that would refer to the remainder of the scene intended for backgrounding. We suggest that the commonality underpinning the passive constructions can be best explained in terms of the windowing of attention analysis which concerns itself with operations on the event frame, i.e. backgrounding, foregrounding, or gapping of event participant elements. The strategies for different types of passive constructions are primarily motivated by the need of a speaker to foreground or background some component of the event. This commonality between each of these passive forms is clearly demonstrated in (45) and we can note where the particular window of attention lies with each construction type.

(45) Window of attention for each construction type

**Active clause construction:** The logical structure represents the event frame with the window of attention resting on the *actor*, or most prominent participant in a construction with no actor.

**be passive construction:** The logical structure represents the event frame with the win-
dow of attention on the resulting state on the undergoer.

get passive construction: The logical structure represents the event frame with the window of attention on the undergoer that transforms to the resulting state. Prior to the event the undergoer was not in this state.

Impersonal passive construction: The logical structure represents the event frame with the window of attention on the verbal action. The actor is backgrounded, but not deleted.

be impersonal passive construction: The logical structure represents the event frame with the window of attention on the verbal action. The actor is not available.

Indeed, Geniusiené (1987:279) has argued that the "personal passive serves to transpose focus on the referent of the promoted direct object and the impersonal passive serving to focus on the verbal action. Both however, serve to defocus the subject referent by deleting it or demoting it to a minor syntactic position". This windowing of attention is informed by the need of a speaker to create a certain focus of some component of the event, that is, by focus considerations. This commonality between each of these passive forms is clearly demonstrated in (45) and which indicates where the particular window of attention lies with each construction type.

7.2 Divergences from the clause prototype

In terms of divergences from a clause prototype, that is, the active transitive, we have found the following:

(46) Clause prototype model

| Prospective passive: | SUBV s undergoes le VN (ag NP_a) |
| Progressive passive:  | SUBV s undergoes (dH)d VN (ag NP_a) |
| Perfective passive:   | SUBV s undergoes va (ag NP_a) |

Prototype: Active Transitive: v so
Active Intransitive: v s of SUBV s ag VN
get passive: v s undergoer O
Impersonal passive: v^impersonal+ Indefinite_Human_Actor SUBJECT O_undergoer
BE Impersonal passive: SUBV^impersonal PP VN O_undergoer

By taking the active transitive clause as the base of the prototype we can project the divergences along two divergence dimensions. In one dimension we find substantive verb constructions with the undergoer as subject. These substantive verb constructions code for the three variants of the personal passive. In these, the verbal action is denoted by a verbal adjective in the first divergence and by a verbal noun in later divergences. The actor is optional in each. In the divergences dimension in the other direction following the prototype base we first have the active intransitive. This can take either of two typological forms. After the active intransitive form we get the functionally defined get passive which has an undergoer as subject and an object np that represents the state. This is followed by the canonical impersonal passive in the first instance and by the impersonal passive form of the substantive verb. There is a func-
tional basis to these constructions in casting into focus particular elements of the event frame. Through each of these constructions the word order of vso is maintained.

In Section 1.3 we noted how Shibatani (1985:821–848) argued for an increasing awareness that linguistic structures tend to show partial resemblances amongst themselves and that this, in turn, has motivated researchers to adopt prototype theory in the study of language grammar. In particular, a framework based on prototypes considers that various constructions exist along a continuum in which certain ones are prototypical as best exemplars of the construction while others are similar to a degree and others again share no properties with the prototype. This is precisely the behaviour that we have seen in our study of the various passive constructions of Irish. Since the defocusing of an agent is taken to be the primary pragmatic function of the passive prototype, it therefore follows that passives of intransitives, passives without promotion, and the other passives are passives to the extent that they share this function. That is, that they exhibit a “family resemblance” along a continuum from the prototypical best exemplar. In the prototypical passive, an agent is a component part of the semantic logical structure frame and as such, it is conceptualized and defocused only at the level of syntactic coding. The focusing and defocusing in the family of passives of Irish is explained within the window of attention analysis of Talmy (1996).

8. Discussion

We have analysed three passive construction types and demonstrated that they have an underlying commonality that is best explained in a functional analysis with an event frame perspective. This analysis takes the active transitive clause as the base prototype, from which the other constructions diverge with respect to key functionality and the windowing of attention tabulated in (46). Included in this commonality is the functionally defined get passive.

Throughout this study we have seen evidence of a semantically motivated syntax. In this analysis we used a compositional approach in the tradition of Vendler (1957 [1967]) to characterise the interrelationship between the lexical semantics and syntax of verbs. An account of the interaction between semantic and syntactic valency requires the consideration of event structure as a vital mediating component and using this, we have therefore characterised each of the passives found in modern Irish.
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The passive in Erzya Mordvin folklore*
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The aim of this research is to shed some light on the Mordvin passive, an inadequately studied grammatical aspect of the language. Passive sentences contain a special polyfunctional derivative suffix \(-v\)\. Since only some groups of verbs with this suffix are passive, final judgement on the meaning can be rendered only in context. The relationship between the derivative and the root verb is illustrated using valence roles of case grammar. There are two groups of passive clauses: 1) where the primary actant is reflected as the agent in the surface structure, and 2) where the primary actant is not visible in the surface structure. A concise historical overview of the 170-yearlong study of Mordvin passive is also presented.

1. Introduction

1.1 General information on the language under discussion

With respect to its size – according to the 1989 census there were roughly 1.15 million Mordvins in the former Soviet Union, of whom two thirds declared a Mordvin language to be their mother tongue – the Mordvin languages may well be among the least known in Europe.¹ There are two primary ethnic and linguistic subgroups of Mordvins, the Erzya and the Moksha. Due to the fact that these varieties have low mutual intelligibility, both have developed a literary language of their own based on Cyrillic letters. These differ to some degree at all levels of language, of which the lexical differences are the most pronounced. The distance between the two might be approximately the same as between Finnish and Estonian, and a little more than between Swedish and Norwegian. The Mordvins have their own republic in central Russia, but constitute only a third of its population, while over 70% of Mordvins live scattered over neighbouring areas and even much further – from the Ukraine and Caucasus to as far away as Siberia. It is generally estimated that there are twice as many Erzya speakers as Moksha speakers.

Like the Finnic languages of the Finno-Ugrian language group, the Mordvin languages are typologically agglutinative and SVO languages. The verbal system of Mordvin is known for its ability to take several derivational suffixes one after another. Of these, two can be used to form the passive: the highly productive \(-v\) and the un-
productive -t-. The suffix -v- usually precedes the verb-final infinitive marker -ms (or personal suffixes). There is only one frequentative suffix that can be interspersed between the suffix -v- and the infinitive/personal marker. The suffix -v- can combine with almost all derivational verbal suffixes which precede it (Mészáros 1999:140) and is of Finno-Ugrian origin, having cognates in the Finnic languages and in Saami, Mansi and Hungarian. In Finnish its cognate is the basic deverbal derivative -u/-y- with general intransitive meaning occurring in many compound derivatives (Bartens 1999:160; on Finnish U-verbs see Kulonen 1985; Räisänen 1988; Koivisto 1991, 2004; on Saami cognates see Schlichter 1953 [= 1968], Schiefer 1983; on Mansi cognates see Kulonen 1989; general information on the Finno-Ugrian passive is offered by Schiefer 1983).

1.2 Preceding studies of the Mordvin passive

The Mordvin passive is very inadequately studied and in practice almost unknown to the broader international linguistic community. (In scientific terms Mordvin usually means both Erzya and Moksha, scholars having been unwilling to discern any difference between them or point out their common origin.) Even recently published handbooks do not always mention this. For example, Raun (1988:107) writes laconically: “Note that there is no formal passive in Mordvin”. Zaicz offers only the following information: “[the derivational suffix] -v- makes reflexives and mediopassives”, but does not give proper example (Zaicz 1998:203). The largest Mordvin handbook in decades published outside Russia describes the suffix -v- as being “passive-reflexive-modal” (Bartens 1999:160). There are no examples of passive sentences in this source. Geniušienė (1987) is possibly the only source written in English with several references to Mordvin, and in which an adequate presentation of -v- verbs is made. However, this author concentrates on reflexives and gives mostly infinitives containing the suffix -v- in several meanings. There are no examples of a regular passive sentence.

The first examples of passive sentences predicated by -v- verbs can already be found in the first scientific grammar of Moksha Mordvin by Ornatov from from the year 1838 (more in Feoktitstov 1976:127–130; Stipa 1990:355–356). Ornatov was a professor (MA) at the Teachers college of Tambov teaching Moksha from 1834 on (Ornatov 1838:X). His grammar had an impact on further grammatical tradition and development of Moksha literary language. In the chapter entitled O glagolah [About verbs] the author has the interesting term stradatel’naja [passive] unfortunately here meaning something else, namely object conjugation. He presents the “wrong” passive (§87) on several pages with tables (Ornatov 1838:25, 39–50). Further, he has the right forms under the wrong title Forma vozvratnaja [Reflexive form]; see (1). When presenting cases governed by a verb (§171) he surprisingly offers passive samples naming them reflexive – see (2) – and mentioning that the reflexives take two members, one in the nominative, the other in the dative.2
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(1) *Mon vätä-v-an.*

1 lead-PASS-PRES.1SG

'Ja mogu byt’ veden.' (Ornatov 1838:68)

[It is possible to pull me. / I can be pulled.]

(2) *Mon aläša-t'i af uska-v-an.*

1 horse-DEF.DAT not carry-PASS-PRES.1SG

'Lošad’ menja ne možet vest.' (Ornatov 1838:93)

[I cannot be carried by horse.]

The first scientific grammar of Erzya Mordvin was published almost simultaneously by von der Gabelentz (1839) (more in Bartens 2002:69–76). His material comes from a translation of four Gospels from 1821 the unreliability of which being recognised by him. In the beginning of 19th century verbatim translations were typical of all languages in the Volga region (Feoktistov 1976:73). According to von der Gabelentz (1839:270, 415), the passive consisting of the suffix -v- is also used as a reflexive or middle. He was able to present whole passive paradigms of present and past tense of v-derivatives. By chance there are some passive sentences among his examples:

(3) *Erväjke tschuvo soda-v-i es raschtamo-n kuvalmo.*

Every tree recognize-PASS-PRES.3SG own growth-GEN pop(for)


[Every tree is recognized by its own fruit.]

In his two studies of Mordvin based on fieldwork, Ahlqvist (1859:9, 1861:42–43; the first is his dissertation on Moksha verbs in Swedish, the second its extended version in German) gives short examples of the root verbs in Moksha, and the v-derivatives, only in the first person singular, but the translations are in the third person singular: *pand’an* [pandžan] ‘öffnen’ [I open], *pand’ivan* [pandžovan] ‘geöffnet werden, sich öffnen’ [I am going to be opened, I open (intr.)]. Ahlquist points out that the suffix -v- can add a nuance of potentiality. He also presents the Finnish and other Finnic and Saami cognates with it.

At the same time probably the first comparative studies of the passive in different languages was published by von der Gabelentz (1861). Due to his background in general linguistics he was able to give a typological taxonomy of passive constructions. He places the Mordvin passive in the chapter *Passivum durch eine Reflexivform* (von der Gabelentz 1861:521). The next grammar of Erzya (based partly on translation of four Gospels from 1821 and partly on interviewings of soldiers in Reval) was published in 1865 by Wiedemann, who allotted almost two pages for verbs with the suffix -v- (Wiedemann 1865:25–27). According to him, their function is close to that of the medial verbs in Greek but in German translations the passive is often very useful. He gives a long list of examples and the root verbs for the derivatives. Wiedemann noticed that their meaning is often linked with some potential nuance (‘can, be able to’ [”können”]) as well. The subject of an active sentence can in a passive sentence be expressed in the dative case. His
examples – see (4) and (5) below – are translatable not only in the passive but also with modal auxiliary verbs.

(4) Vese teje-v-i te-nk.
   Everything do-pass-pres.3sg you(pl.dat)*-px.2pl
   *(=pop+px.2pl instead of pers.pron) with personal pronouns Erzya always has two alternatives in the dative
   'Alles ist euch möglich / ihr könnt alles thun.' (Wiedemann 1865:27)
   [Everything is possible for you / you can do everything.]

(5) Ki-nen-gak a karda-v-il' son.
   Somebody-dat-sx not prevent-pass-1.pret.3sg he
   'Niemandem war er möglich gehindert zu werden.' d.h. 'Niemand konnte ihn hindern.'
   (Wiedemann 1865:27)
   [It was not possible for somebody to prevent him. / Nobody could prevent him.]

In his grammar from the year 1876 (based on earlier grammars) Budenz gives less than a page to the reflexive v-verbs with different meanings. He was the first to combine both Mordvin languages in one study. Among his sentences are also several passive examples, in Erzya (6) and (7), and in Moksha (8):

(6) Te ki-nen-gak a teje-v-i.
   This who-dat-sx(too) not do-pass-pres.3sg
   'Ez senkinék nem tevődik (ezt senki sem teheti).' (Budenz 1876:64)
   [Nobody can do it / it cannot be done by somebody / anybody.]

(7) Mo-nen te kando-v-i.
   I-dat this carry-pass-pres.3sg
   'Nekem ez hordódik (én ezt hordhatom).' (Budenz 1876:64)
   [This can be carried by me.]

(8) Mon te-t kepide-v-an.
   You(pop.dat instead of pers.pron)-px.2sg lift.up-pass-pres.1sg
   'Én neked emelődöm (engem te főlemelhetsz).' (Budenz 1876:64)
   [I can be lifted up by you. / You can lift me up.]

Following these pioneers the next linguist to examine the Mordvin languages properly and to write a comprehensive grammar was the first native Erzya scholar Evsev'ev. He offers five different meanings for the suffix -v- without any context: 1) the possibility of performing an action, 2) the possibility of performing an unintentional action, 3) a perfective action, 4) a reflexive action, and 5) the passive defined as having the possibility of doing something, as seen, in (9) and (10). Even a sixth one is subsequently offered, meaning ‘to want to do something’ and occurring in dialects of the district of Nizhni Novgorod and Zakadomsk (Evsev’ev 1928: 188–190 [1961: 172–173] & 1931: 124–125). At the end of his grammar is a large appendix concerning the Moksha language, but with no mention of the passive or v-derivatives.
(9) **maksu-v-an**

`give-pass-pres.1sg`


[it is possible that I am given]

(10) **čavu-v-an**

`hit-pass-pres.1sg`


[it is possible to hit me / that I am beaten]

After the Second World War Koljaden'kov's grammatical information on the verbs in the Erzya-Russian dictionary was the basis of further analyses for decades (Koljaden'kov 1949:279–299). He distinguishes four different meanings of v-derivatives: 1) the possibility of performing an action: *mol'evems* 'to be able to go' derived from *mol'ems* 'to go'; 2) an unintentional action: *sirgavoms* 'to move unintentionally (intr.)' derived from *sirgams* 'to move (intr.)'; *st'avoms* 'to rise, go up unintentionally' derived from *st'ams* 'to rise, go up'; 3) a reflexive action: *vačkod'evems* 'to hit, strike, dash, crash (intr.)' derived from *vačkod'ems* 'to hit, strike (tr.)'; and 4) a passive action: *lovovoms* 'to be counted; to belong' derived from *lovoms* 'to count' (Koljadënkov 1949:280, 1955:103–104). A few years later this author (Koljadënkov 1954:175) points out that the same verbs can have either a reflexive or a passive meaning depending on the context:

(11) **Mon moni orša-v-an.**

I myself dress-refl(=inten)-pres.1sg

'Ja sam imeju vozmožnost' odet'sja.' or 'Ja sam mogu odet'sja.' or 'Ja sam odenus.' (Koljadënkov 1954:175) 

[I myself have the possibility to dress. / I can dress. / I dress myself.]

(12) **Mon ta-`net’ orša-v-an.**

you(sg)-dat' dress-pass-pres.1sg

'Ja mogu byt' odetym toboju.' or 'Ty možeš' (v silah) menja odet.' (Koljadënkov 1954:175)

[I can be dressed by you. / You can dress me.]

In the same year, 1949, a Moksha-Russian dictionary was also published. It contains a grammatical appendix written by Potapkin. He distinguishes only three meanings of v-derivatives (Potapkin 1949:348): 1) the possibility of performing an action: *tu-v-s* 'he was able to go' derived from *tums* 'to go'; 2) a reflexive action: *toka-v-oms* 'to be injured, hurt' derived from *tokams* 'to hurt, injure'; and 3) a passive action, as seen, in (13) and (14).

(13) **Son toka-v-š.**

he hurt-pass-pret.3sg

'Ego ušibli / on ušiblen.' (Potapkin 1949:348).

[He was hurt by somebody.]
In the 1950s a less-known but important study about Mordvin derivational suffixes was made in Estonia (Hallap 1955). Only recently has the whole study been published in its original language, Estonian. It presents 31 common Mordvin verbal derivational suffixes including the suffix -v- with 39 lexemes having many meanings, but few examples are given (Hallap 2000:139–150).

Approximately the same account of -v-verbs as stated above by Koljadënkov is made in the grammar of Mordvin (Grammar 1962:254–255) which presents several examples of passive sentences with the expression of agent (examples (15) in Erzya, (16) in Moksha):

(15) Ejkakš-tı-ne-neinen pıađa-v-i tonavriema-i.
child-def.pl-dat finish-pass-pret.3sg study-def.nom
'Det'ni zakončeno učenje.' (Grammar 1962:254)
[Children have finished the study. / The study is ended by the children.]

(16) Kolhoz-nik-ı-ne-id'i tıże-i uțada-v-i.
Kolhoz worker[<Russ]-def.pl-dat hay-def.nom remove-pass-pret.3sg
'Kolhoznikami seno ubrano.' (Grammar 1962:254)
[Kolkhoz workers have made the hay. / The hay is made by the kolkhoz workers.]

It is also pointed out (Grammar 1962:254, 258) that passive sentences are rare in contemporary Mordvin, that voices in Mordvin do not have a clear grammatical form, and that in many cases the difference between the passive and reflexive voice must be deduced from the context.

The three next grammars of Mordvin (Alëškina 1980:325–335; Kelin 2000:143–170; Cypkajkina 2000:204–205, the latter two in native languages), as well as the textbooks (Mosin & Bajuškin 1979:77, aimed at Russian students studying in Moldavia; Mosin & Bajuškin 1983:107–108, an extended version of this in Finnish), do not add anything new compared to the above-mentioned sources. Poljakov (1993, 1995), and Imajkina (1996), do not even pay attention to the concept of the passive.

The second monograph (Mészáros 1999) on verb derivation in Mordvin is based on rich but insufficiently utilized folklore material giving long lists of verbs with Russian translations, but neither statistics on their frequency nor context are presented. According to the author’s observations (Mészáros 1999:137–138) verbs with the suffix -v- constitute 14.4% of all derived verbs.

Only recently has one more meaning for this suffix been found (Salo 1990), where verbs containing the suffix -v- have been presented with examples. The following meanings were distinguished: 1) automatic (a novel term meaning a special type of passive without an agentive, so far used only by Finnish linguists e.g. Kulonen 1985, 1989:109–151; Koivisto 1991, 2004. It corresponds to the more generally known term, anticausative, e.g. Comrie 1985:325–327), 2) passive, 3) intentional (a special group
of reflexives, the same as autocausative in Geniušienė 1987:251–253), 4) ‘to happen to do something’ (Koljaděnkov’s unintentional), 5) ‘to be able/want to do something’ (dynamic modality, rare, partly the same as Evsev’ev’s dialectal sixth meaning), 6) perfective (or resultative, also in Evsev’ev), and 7) zero meaning (new finding, occurs very seldom). (See Section 3.4.)

2. Materials and methods

2.1 The data

For the present research, the eight volumes of *Mordwinische Volksdichtung* (MV 1938–1981) and the two-part *Proben der mordwinischen Volkslitteratur* (PM 1891 & 1894), altogether totalling 4400 pages, have been analysed. All of this folklore material – both prose and lyrics – was collected by the renowned researcher of Mordvin, Heikki Paasonen (1865–1919) or by his assistants, who were native speakers of Mordvin trained during his long field trips in 1889–90, 1898–99 and 1901. These assistants stopped sending texts only in the year 1912. The material covers all the main Erzya and Moksha dialects spoken in central Russia and is also the basis of the extensive dictionary *H. Paasonens mordwinisches Wörterbuch* (MW 1–6, 1990–1998, 2700 pages). The texts are supplemented with German and to a lesser extent Russian translations. The translations by Paasonen, his native assistants and the later Finnish editors have been crucial in understanding the semantic nuances of the suffix -v-, as the context is often the determining factor.

In addition, verb roots for the v-derivatives as well as the alternative ways in Mordvin of expressing the meanings conveyed by the v-derivative have been collected. Based on a preliminary analysis, Paasonen’s Erzya folklore texts contain approximately 300 verbs having the derivational suffix -v-, examples of which were found in more than 1000 affirmative sentences and approximately 500 negative ones. Of these 1500 sentences, around 200 have a passive meaning. There was less material for Moksha, and this still awaits analysis.

2.2 Methodology

The data was examined to find the roots of verbs having the v-derivative, in order to illustrate the changes caused by the v-derivative in the syntactic behaviour of the verbs. I have shown the relationship between the derivative and the root verb using valence roles from case grammar. For the analysis, I have used the same roles as distinguished in Geniušienė (1987:39–41). In the passive sentences I discerned three roles for the semantic subjects: agentive, experiencer and causer (or force). The fourth role, neutral, occurs only in automative expressions (see Kulonen (1989:11), neutral being approximately the same as Anderson’s nominative (1971:37)), with the fifth role, actor, occurring only in intentional sentences. For semantic objects, I have used
two roles: goal/patient and content. One role is sufficient for the semantic dative: benefactive. These roles are examined in detail in the sections on the passive. At some points of the analysis other roles are necessary: locative (expressing motion into/towards, or the location of the referent), source (expressing a starting point of a motion or an indicator of origin, not used with passives), and instrument (inanimate agent of the action). In addition, one constituent, namely a predicative adverbial, does not quite fit into any of the roles mentioned above. The roles used in this paper are also used in Hakulinen and Karlsson (1979:102–104) in the description of the basic sentences in Finnish.

3. Data analysis

3.1 Passive v-derivatives

Grammars of Indo-European languages have traditionally considered the passive to be a transformation where the subject and object of a transitive active sentence become the agent and subject of a passive sentence: John broke the vase. > The vase was broken by John. (Fillmore 1977:69). This is primarily a thematic phenomenon: the object of the action is brought to the fore and the performer is sent to the background. In relational grammar terms, the object is promoted to the position of syntactic subject and the performer is demoted to the oblique, or deleted completely. As a result of the passive transformation, the number of mandatory verb-related actants or arguments decreases by one. The status of the agent is purely facultative. In an active sentence the first or primary actant appears in the subject position. When the primary actant is demoted from the subject position, its place is occupied by the secondary actant. According to some authors (e.g. Comrie 1985: 325–326), if the subject of the basic verb can appear as an agentive phrase in the passive, there is valence-rearrangement, rather than valence-decrease. Siewierska (1984:2–3) adds that according to the most widely accepted definition, the verb is marked passive. This type of transformation is what has occurred in those Erzya sentences which in the present study have been classified as passives. In Erzya, the expression of agent is mostly absent.

3.2 Passive sentences having the expression of agent

Although the majority of passive sentences in Erzya do not have an expressed agent, it is possible to supply them with one. A smaller number of sentences have been found with an agent expressed. The agent is often topicalized by placing it at the beginning of the sentence. It is expressed in the dative or in the postpositional phrase with postposition turtov. In these types of passive sentences the subject is the goal/patient (rarely content) by the semantic role and it often has the conspicuous feature [+animate].
The passive in Erzya Mordvin folklore

(17) Š´nardo dušman-než saje-ve-ze Ivan.

then evil.witch-DAT take-pass.pres.optat.3sg I.

‘Dann soll Ivan in die Gewalt des bösen Zauberers geraten.’ (MV III: 97, Salo 1990:33)

[Then Ivan will fall under the domination of the evil sorcerer.]

derived from sajem’s ‘to take; to conquer, grab; to get’

Completely passive sentences (i.e. sentences having both the subject and the object of the active construction expressed) are extremely rare in Erzya and even rarer in the translations. At least one obvious reason is that the German translations are in verse form and the lines ending in infinitives look coherent. If the agent is visible in the surface structure, the subject of the passive sentence is frequently referred to only by the finite forms of the verb.

(18) Piñe-ne pova-v-at.
dog-DAT strangle-pass.pres.2sg

‘Ein Hund kann dich erwürgen.’ (MV VI:186, Salo 1990:33)

[A dog can strangle you / you can get strangled by a dog.]

derived from povam’s, pu- ‘to suffocate, choke, strangle, hang’

In the following, the agent is expressed in the postpositional phrase. The postposition turtov, tortov ‘for, because of; to’ is often translated into Russian using the preposition dlja or k.

(19), (20) Žar-do mo-ň dušman-an tortov ñet’ kuiš’tima-t’ne
when-ABL I-GEN opponent-GEN pop(for) those stairs-def.PL
kuiš-v-it’
ascend-pass.pres.3pl descend-pass.pres.3pl

‘Wenn meine Widersacher jene Treppe hinauf und hinuntersteigen können.’ (MV III:210, MW 2:993)

[When my opponents can ascend and descend those stairs.]

derived from küzem’s ‘to climb; to rise, ascend, go up, step up’
derived from valgoms ‘to get down, descend; to land; to settle’

According to the grammars, turtov can occasionally be used to replace the dative, e.g. in conjunction with the verb l’eždams ‘help’ which governs in the dative case:

(21) Ist’a l’ežd-an ava-neñ.
so help-pref.1sg mother-dat(+px.1sg)

‘Autan näin äitiä*.’ (Mosin–Bajuškin 1983:52, 133)

[In this way, I help my mother.]

(22) Kojär-do mon l’ežd-an ñi-ñ turtov.
sometimes-ABL I help-pref.1sg wife-gen(+px.1sg) pop(for)

‘Joskus autan vaimoa*.’(Mosin–Bajuškin 1983:57, 134)

[Sometimes I help my wife.]

*The Finnish translations are without possessive suffixes, since Finnish is also economical to some extent in using these. If the context is clear, as here, there is no need to further underline the kinship.

"The Finnish translations are without possessive suffixes, since Finnish is also economical to some extent in using these. If the context is clear, as here, there is no need to further underline the kinship."
These Erzya dative (21) and genitive (22) forms (translated into English as having possessive suffixes) are actually identical to the forms of common declination having no possessive suffixes. However, such forms are exceptional, as Aduškina points out (2000:95).

(23) **Ava-án**
turtov mol’an.
mother-gen(+px.1sg) pop(for) go-pres.1sg
[I go to my mother.]

In example (23) the postposition clearly seems like a translation of the Russian preposition *k*. At least it is an accurate equivalent of it (cf. example (24) and its counter-example (25) in the dative).

(24) **Ad’a-do mën ñej mol’-d’ano, pokš-unok**
turtov ñej jovta-ns.
let’s-2pl we now go-pres.1pl head-nom.pl pop(for) now tell-inf
‘Kommt, laßt uns gehen unserem Oberhaupt erzählen.’ (MV I:24, MW 4:2353)
[Come, let’s go now and tell to our head.]

(25) **A mol’-an, mokšo, to-ñet’ kozejka-ks.**
not go-pres.1sg Moksha you(sg)-dat wife[< Russ]-transl
‘Ich werde nicht, Mokschane, dein Weib.’ (PM 1:60; MW 2:1277)
[I am not going to be your wife, Moksha.]

In the following example, *turtov* corresponds to the Russian preposition *dlja*. The counter-example in the dative comes after:

(26) **T’e-án**
turtov anokst-i-ñ
gost’innè-t’.
father-gen(+px.1sg) pop(for) prepare-pret-1sg present[Russ]-pl
[I prepared / made presents for my father.]

(27) **Anoksta-k, vasta-j, mo-ñe kat-]/- praksta-t.**
prepare-imp.2sg spouse-vocat 1-dat bast.shoe-pl foot.cloth-pl
‘Mache mir, Frau, Bastschuhe und Fußzeug fertig.’ (MV I:146; MW 1:46)
[Make me, wife, bast shoes and foot cloths.]

In Mordvin, the dative would probably be equally appropriate in these sentences. It is even possible that *turtov* is needed to complete the declension of nouns with possessive suffixes, the plural possessive suffixes not being used in genitive or dative cases (Aduškina 2000:95–97), as the following example points out:

(28) **T’e kazne-i**
turtov têrd’è-ñ
gost’-et’
this present-def.sg.nom invite-perf.ptc guest[< Russ]-pl pop(for)
ul’e-ze.
be-optat.3sg
‘Dieses Geschenk sei für deine eingeladenen Gäste!’ (MW 4:2353)
[May this present be for your invited guests!]

* Sometimes in the possessive declension the number of possessed nouns is not shown.
In the folklore material the agent of the passive sentence does not necessarily need to be animate – parts of the body can also be used to refer to the whole person.

(29), (30) *Kel'-ne ked' id'e-v-i, ked'-ne kel' a tongue/language-dat skin save-pass-pres.3sg skin-dat tongue/language not id'e-v-i.

save-pass-pres.3sg

‘Mit der Zunge kann die Haut losgekauft werden, (aber) mit der Haut kann die Zunge nicht losgekauft werden.’ (MV VI: 222, MW 1:440)

[The tongue can save the skin, the skin cannot save the tongue.]

derived from *id'ems to (set) free, release, save, let loose, redeem

According to current terminology the force agent, a dynamic force of nature, is found only in a few sentences. These verbs have such meanings that they clearly require an animate performer. The allative-dative is also used for animate beings. I do not discuss negative verb forms beyond what I say below, which should not cause any problems as I do not focus on the nuances in meaning brought about by negation. In negative sentences the agent appears to be more common than in positive sentences. An animate or inanimate GOAL/PATIENT is the second actant.

(31) A puigine-ne l'ed'e-v-i not thunder-dat shoot-pass-pres.3sg

(32) a jondol-ne toka-v-i.
not lightning-dat touch-pass-pres.3sg

'(Dahin) kann der Donner nicht schießen, der Blitz kann es nicht berühren (treffen)?’ (MV VI: 210, Salo 1990:33)

[The thunder cannot shoot it, the lightning cannot touch it.]

derived from l'ed'ems to shoot, fire; to mow, cut

derived from tokams to touch; to strike, hurt, injure; to hit

The first actant of certain cognitive and mental verbs appears to be EXPERIENCER and not AGENTIVE. In these cases the second actant is then CONTENT, which does not in any way participate in the situation expressed by the verb; everything takes place in the EXPERIENCER’s head. The EXPERIENCER does not necessarily have any control over his or her senses (Comrie 1981:55). It is, however, possible to question if the action in the following examples should be interpreted as being dynamically performed by an agentic performer.

(33) Pek večke-v-i L'ova t'en-ën.
much love-pass-pres.3sg L. 1(dat)*-px.1sg

*(=POP+PX.1SG instead of perspron)

‘Ich liebe Ljova sehr.’ (MV V: 286, Salo 1990:33)

[Lyova is much loved by me / I love Lyova very much.]

derived from večkems to love; to like (much); to respect

It has been suggested that Mordvin has an inessive agent:
However, this inessive can be considered an instrument – snow is clearly a material word and not a dynamic force of nature. The verbs in this kind of context must be classified as automatives. (This example probably originates from Grammar 1962:254, also in Moksha, [in Russian: ‘Pole pokrylos’ snegom.’] in Geniušienė 1987:333.)

3.3 Agentless passive sentences

For those passive sentences that do not have an agent, the agentive representative is either not known or excluded on purpose; however, this hidden agentive can always be inferred to be animate. In these sentences the surface subject has the semantic role of goal/patient, benefactive or content. Often, the only actant given is an inanimate goal/patient.

(35) **Kodak jovt-a-v-š’** ie val-t’ne.

when say-pass-pret.3pl these word-def.pl

‘Sobald sie diese Worte ausgesprochen hatte’ (MV VII: 256)

[When she had spoken these words / when these words were/had been spoken (by her).]

derived from jovtams ‘to say, tell, describe; to explain’

(36) **Arčak kuda potmo-i št-a-v-e kuli-diš’ mej’e,**

just house inside-def.nom wash-pass-pres.3sg dead-def.abl pop (after)

‘Kaum daß das Innere des Hauses nach dem Gestorbenen gewaschen worden ist,’ (MV VIII: 230)

[The inside of the house is hardly being washed after the dead person,]

derived from (k)štams ‘to wash (tr. & refl.)’

(37) **Osks-ost ozno-v-i,**

prayer-pst.3pl pray-pass-pres.3sg

‘Das Gebet wird gebetet.’ (MV V: 64)

[Their prayer is being prayed.]

derived from oznoms ‘to sacrifice; to pray; to fast’

(freq. < ozams ‘to sit down; to collapse, fall down; to fall’ Keresztes 1986:101–102)

(38) **Jomavto-v-š’ koda-jak t’eji’er-em,**

kill-pass-pret.3sg somehow-sx(too) daughter-pst.1sg

‘Meine Tochter ist auf irgend eine Weise umgebracht worden.’ (PM II:83, MW 1:522)

[My daughter has been killed in some way.]

derived from jomavtoms ‘to lose; to kill; to spoil, ruin’

(causat. < jomams ‘to disappear, be lost; to perish’)
The passive in Erzya Mordvin folklore

(39) **Éra-v-´st'** live-pass-PRET.3PL order-PERF.pte.<Russ>(dimin)-(pl)PX.1SG
\[^{\text{Meine festgesetzten Wochen sind verflossen.}}\ ({\text{MV II:454, MW 1:372}})\]

[The weeks given to me have gone.]

derived from **etams** ‘to live, exist; to experience; to used to do something’

('This verb can be used also in a transitive meaning 'to live a certain period of time'.)

There are numerous examples in which the agent is not expressed grammatically, but where it can be inferred from the context. Actually, the agent has been added to the German translation of the next two sentences.

(40) **Kol'i se-t' usto-v-´it'**
if it-PL warm.up-PASS-PRES.3PL

(41) **kol'i se-t' jafto-v-´it'**
if it-PL warm.up-PASS-PRES.3PL
paro t'et'a-ž ejkakš-at
good father-gen child.be-PRES.2SG
píaŋoja av-a-ž t'aka-jat.
able<Russ> mother-gen child.be-PRES.2SG

\[^{\text{Wenn du sie (die Wachstropfen) heizen kannst}}\]
[wenn du sie wärmen kannst,]

\[^{\text{bist du Kind eines guten Vaters,}}\]
\[^{\text{bist du Kind einer braven Mutter.}}\] (MV II: 285)

\[^{\text{If you can warm them [the wax drops] up / if they [the wax drops] can be warmed up}}\]
\[^{\text{[by you] (∙ 2)}}\]
\[^{\text{you are the child of a good father}}\]
\[^{\text{you are the child of an able mother.}]}\]

\[^{\text{derived from uštons} ‘to warm up, burn (tr.)’}\]
\[^{\text{derived from jaro(aw)tons} ‘to warm up; to sleep enough; to quench one’s thirst’ (causat.)}\]

It appears that passive sentences seldom contain constituents other than GOAL/PATIENT.

According to my material, the INSTRUMENT and an agent do not appear simultaneously in one sentence. Perhaps it is not even necessary because the INSTRUMENT already alone refers directly to the existence of an animate agent. Of two synonymous verbs for ‘bewitch’, one uses an illative INSTRUMENT, the other an inessive INSTRUMENT. My informant Aduškina believes that the cases used could also be reversed (oral information).

(42) **Baba-nzo ̄ sel'm-se** Kul'a ̄ sel'med'e-v-š
grandmother<Russ>-PX.3SG.gen eye-ines K. bewitch-PASS-PRET.3SG

(43) **baba-nzo ̄ valne-s** Kul'a ̄ osod'a-v-š
grandmother-PX.3SG.gen word(dimin)-illat K. fall.under.a.spell<Russ>-PASS-PRET.3SG

\[^{\text{‘Kulja wurde durch die Augen ihrer Großmutter behext,}}\]
\[^{\text{Kulja wurde durch die Worte ihrer Großmutter behext.’}}\] (MV VII:60, MW 3:1470, 4:2133)
Merja Salo

Kulya was bewitched by the eyes of her grandmother.
Kulya was bewitched by the words of her grandmother.

derived from *sél’med’ems* 'to give someone the evil eye'

derived from *osod’ams* 'to do damage with an angry / evil / envious look / spell' < Russ *osudít’* (MW 3:1470)

Various local constituents can be added to almost any sentence. For example, if the base verb has three actants and if the performers goal/patient and locative are attached to it, the (lative or illative) locative can be preserved, even though there is no agent in the surface structure. These types of locatives are quite rare in passive sentences.

(44) **Ruz-iń** vjera-ś eźdža-t'ie-ń
Russian[< Russ]-gen religion[< Russ]-def.nom Erzya-def.pl-gen

**jutk-s** umok **vet’a-v-ś.**

pop(among)-illatt long.time.ago take-pass-pref.3sg'

‘Der russische Glaube ist schon vor langer Zeit unter die Ersänen eingeführt werden.’

(MW 4:2636)

[The Russian religion was spread among the Erzya people a long time ago.]

derived from **vet’ams** 'to lead, guide, pull, draw, take, accompany, carry'

There are only a few benefactives (or recipients), a type of semantic dative, as surface subjects; when these are used, the instrument of the deep structure would appear to be more easily retained than the actual performer. A few rare examples of the inessive instrument exist. (The agent does not appear in these sentences.)

(45) **A puškińe** rodińe-m

ø little<dimin> family[< Russ][dimin]-px.1sg

**kroški-ńe-se** andu- -sv-i

crumb[< Russ][dimin]-ines feed-pass-pres.3sg

(46) **kape-pikie-se** simd’a- -sv-i.

drop[< Russ][dimin]-ines drink-pass-pres.3sg

‘Meine kleine Verwandtschaft
kann man mit Brosamen füttern
kann man mit Tröpfchen tränken.’ (MV II:360, MW 1:44, 4:2156)

[My little family
will be fed with crumbs
will be given drops to drink.]

derived from **andoms** 'to feed'

derived from ** simd’ems** 'to make drink' (causat. < **simems** 'to drink')

My informant said that the instruments in sentences (45) and (46) could also be ablatives, though the meaning is not exactly the same; the instruments for the base verbs (andoms 'feed', simd’ems 'make drink') meaning food or drink cannot be in the inessive. The use of the ablative is likely to stem from the verbs 'eat' and 'drink' taking an ablative object. With the verbs andovoms and simd’evems, the ablative instrument could be considered to be the predictable and original. In the dictionaries and textbooks there apparently is a tendency or perhaps even a normative idea to present all these instruments only in the ablative, but at least in real dialectal material inessive
INSTRUMENTS also occur. It could be that the influence of the Russian instrumental case in favour of the inessive is probably strong, or that the use of the passive expands the use of the cases, as the INSTRUMENTS of these verbs in traditional poems are often in the inessive. In any event, the new comprehensive Erzya-Russian dictionary gives the following examples (47) and (48) with ablative INSTRUMENTS, and then Paasonen’s material, (49) and (50).

(47) Skal-tne kurok karm-it’ vazija-mo, olgo-do a ando-v-it’.
    cow-DEF.PL soon shall-PRES.3PL calve-INF STRAW-ABL not feed-PASS-PRES.3PL
    ‘Korovy skoro načnut teš’tija, solomoj ih ne prokormiš.’ (ERS 49)
    [The cows are going to calve soon, they cannot be fed with straw.]

(48) ando-ms ejaks-otit’ pot’e lovco-do
    feed-INF child-DEF.GEN breast milk-ABL
    ‘kormit’ reběnka grud’ju’ (ERS 49)
    [feed the child with breast milk]

(49) Vašia, puće-đe, simd’-i-ńđ’ze.
    first heavy.honey.drink-ABL make.drink-PRET-(OBJ.3PL)3SG
    ‘Zuerst gab er ihnen Met zu trinken.’ (MV V:260)
    [First he made them drink mead.]

(50) Ksnav pěka-do and-ī-še.
    pea pastry-ABL make.eat-PRET-(OBJ.3SG)3SG
    ‘Fütterte ihn mit Erbspirogen.’ (PM I: 224)
    [He fed him with pea pastries.]

At least one passive verb still uses the BENEFACTIVE subject and the inessive INSTRUMENT. Typically, in example (51) there is no agent in the surface sentence, either.

(51) Ašo koccke-se vel’ya-v-i-t’.
    white cloth(DIMIN)-INES cover-PASS-PRET-2SG
    ‘Du hast dich mit weißem Linnen bedecken lassen.’ (MV VI: 36)
    [You have been covered with a white cloth.]

In addition, the CONTENTS appear to be unusual as surface subjects. There are examples of this for only a few verbs.

(52) Čuſto maro aza-v-at
    tree POP(with) not.know-PASS-PRES.2SG

(53) t’ikše maro aza-v-at.
    plant POP(with) not.know-PASS-PRES.2SG
    ‘Bist du nicht von den Bäumen zu unterscheiden,
    bist du nicht vom Gras zu unterscheiden.’ (MV III:42, MW 1:97)
    [You cannot be distinguished/separated from a tree,
    you cannot be distinguished/separated from a plant.]
    derived from azadams ‘to not know’ < a’ ‘negation’ + sodams ‘to know; to feel; to can’

The CONTENT is the semantic object of the aforementioned verb večkevens ‘be loved’ in sentence (33) (see above). There are many of examples of this verb, more than 20, of which approximately half have a visible animate EXPERIENCER agent. The remainder of
the examples are evident from the context, so that almost all of the sentences have had the experiencer added to the translation. Only once is the surface subject inanimate; the rest of the time, it is either animate or a body part. Usually the context of a verb in the passive is not particularly complicated, but exceptions occur. A peculiar structure can be found in two sentences, neither of which have a separate grammatical (visible) agent although it is present in both cases (in (54) and (55) as a free adjunct and in (56) as a personal suffix of the verb). In the first case there is a II or -mo/-me infinitive (a kind of lative infinitive meaning goal or purpose, comparable to the Finnish III infinitive in the illative: -maan, -mään) and in the second a predicative adverbial and its qualifiers in the translative.

(54), (55) Večki-v-an  a večki-v-an, vratš-kaj
    love-pass-pres.1sg not love-pass-pres.1sg sister-in-law-vocat
    ní(e) valhe-t’ne-ā marto suva-mo?
    these word(dimin)-def.pl-gen pop(with) come.in-II.inf
    ’Läßt du mich gern, Schwägerin,
    mit diesen Worten hineintreten?’ (MV VII: 204)
    [Sister-in-law, are you not pleased to let me come in with these words?]

(56) Uštuma-ā kād’-i matuška,
    warm+up-gen hold-pres.ptc dear.mother[< Russ]
    bud’im-ks  večki-v-an toki-it’ ez-ga
    if[< Russ]-transl love-pass-pres.1sg your.self-gen pop(-prol=’along’)
    l’iš-iša-ks, sovi-ka-ks, go.out-pres.ptc-transl come.in-pres.ptc-transl
    ’Du Beherrscherin des Ofens, Mütterchen.
    Wenn du mich mit Liebe annimmst als eine, die an dir vorbei herein- und hinaustritt,’
    (PM I:196, MW 4:2583)
    [Mother dear, keeper of warmth (= mistress of the warm oven),
    Do you take me with love as one who passes by you on the way in and out,]

It would appear that emotional verbs in Mordvin express an action that requires energy the same way as they do in Finnish. The Finnish irresultative verb rakastaa ‘love’ corresponds well to the aforementioned examples. At least potentially it can bring about a state where the object’s referent becomes the result of the event depicted by the sentence, for example:

(57) Runodija rakast-i muusa-n ramma-ksi
    poet love-imperf.3sg muse-gen/acc cripple-transl
    (Leino 1986:119–120) [The poet loved the muse [so much that the muse became]
    crippled.]

In this case the subject of the sentence can perhaps be considered to be a mental agentive, not an experiencer, with the object correspondingly being the patient.
### 3.4 Other meanings of v-derivatives

The *automatives* constitute the largest group of *v*-derivatives, occurring in approximately 400 sentences. Their root verbs are always transitive. In these examples only one argument is present, and the surface subject is either EXPERIENCER or NEUTRAL. Parts of the body could be considered to be some kind of quasi-EXPERIENCERS. These cannot control the situation expressed by a verb. The AGENTIVE is never involved in the surface or deep structure levels. A second participant can be LOCATIVE (60), INSTRUMENT (61) or predicative adverbial (62).

(58) \[ \text{Kurgi}´ne-ze avto-v-i. } \]

* mouth\(^{\text{DIMIN}}\)-px3sg open-autom-pres.3sg

*Ihr Mund öffnet sich.* (MV VI:208, MW 1:95, Salo 1990:32)

[Her mouth opens*].

*In the English translation the verb would look better in the past tense.

derived from avtoms, avt’ems ‘to open (tr.)’

(59) \[ \text{Vaj koda paz-ui son zor-a-} \] laz-o-v-i. \]

* oh* when god-gen he/she* dawn\(<\text{Russ}\)-px3sg burst-autom-pres.3sg

*Wenn Gottes Morgenrot anbricht* (MV II:26, MW 2:1042, Salo 1990:32)

*Folklore texts often contain dummy words such as these two, for the obvious reason that the syllables’ counting metre as in Mordvin, sometimes needs empty short words to get the right number of syllables.

[When the God’s dawn bursts.]

derived from lazoms ‘to break, split, chop; to burst, split (intr.)’

(60) \[ \text{Alo mastor-s } \] Ileˇlejka vaˇckod’e-v-i. \]

* down ground-illat I. hit(tr.)-autom-pret.3sg

*Ilelejka wurde auf den Boden geschlagen.* (MV VII: 272)

[Ilelejka was hit to the ground.]

derived from vaˇckod’ems ‘to hit, strike’

(61) \[ \text{Vasi}´n kaˇcam-s } \] arta-v-i. \]

* first smoke-illat scorcht-autom-pres.3sg

*mazi čama l’ičine-m. beautiful face face\(<\text{Russ}\)](DIMIN)-px1sg

*Wird (schon) vom ersten Rauch mein schönes Gesicht schwarz.* (MV II: 286, MW 1: 65–66)

[Already] from the first smoke

my beautiful little face turns black.]

derived from artams, artoms ‘to paint, colour; to scorch, smoke’

(62) \[ \text{Ton kadu-v-at } \] saldatka-ks. \]

* you leave-autom-pres.2sg wife.of.soldier\(<\text{Russ}\)-transl

*Du wirst als Soldatenweib zurückbleiben.* (MV VII: 258)

[You are going to remain a wife of a soldier.]

derived from kudoms ‘to leave; to postpone; to stop (tr.)’

The semantic reflexivity usually associated with the passive (and automative) is not frequently expressed in Erzya with this suffix. Some other kind of material might, of course, give a different result. Instead, reflexivity is expressed in two other ways: ei-
ther by 1) an underived verb root that already has a direct transitive and intransitive meaning, such as the verbs (k)štams ‘to wash (tr. & intr.)’ and pekstams ‘to close (tr. & intr.), or by 2) a reflexive pronoun such as (es) pra ‘(one’s own) head’. A small group of reflexives having the special meaning of moving in some direction have been named intentionals. Their root verbs are transitive. The subject of these sentences is actor, the role of which is often to be the only participant in situations denoted by intransitive actional verbs of activity and motion, or to be the main participant in situations denoted by transitive verbs of body-part motion (Geniušienė 1987:39). The second role is very frequently lative locative.

(63) Veře-š kaja-v-š skal-oňt lanj-k-s.
wolf-def.nom* attack-inten-pret.3sg cow-def.gen pop(on)-lat
‘Der Wolf fiel die Kuh an.’ (MW 2: 570–571)
[The wolf attacked the cow.]
‘This may be a shortened form, since in definitive declension the regular nominative form for this word should be veřgiz-ešt.

derived from kajams ‘to throw, sprinkle; to hit, strike; to put; to pour; to undress (tr. & intr.); to pay; to do magic tricks’

There is a small group of v-derivatives meaning ‘to happen to do something, to do something unwillingly, unintentionally’. Here the suffix -v- does not change the syntactic behaviour of the root verb, and at least the valence roles remain untouched. Only one restriction seems to prevail: the verbs cannot conjugate in object conjugation, which means that the subject role in these sentences is experiencer. Locative in lative form is very often present as well.

(64) Pokš kija-va mol’e-mste...
big road-prol go-elat.ger
Ki ve boka-v ara-v-i-ň.
Road one side[< Russ]-lat place-unint-pret-1sg
‘Minä tulin asettuneeksi tien viereen.’ Paasonen, MV II: 141
[When I was going along the big road . . .
it happened that I placed myself to the side of the road.]
derived from arams ‘to place (intr.), settle down; to become, change [in]to’

(65) R’eve-ň stada-s eške-v-i-ň.
sheep-gen (= adj) flock[< Russ]-lat hit-unint-pret-1sg
‘Ich bin in eine Schafherde geraten.’ (MV V: 396, MW 1: 389, Salo 1990:34)
[I fell into a flock of sheep.]
derived from eškems ‘to hit, knock; to blow’

The suffix -v- can also express dynamic modality, ‘to be able to do something, can; to want to do something’. With intransitive root verbs the valence remains untouchable, while with transitive verbs the situation is more complicated: object conjugation is not possible, but an object in the ablative case (67) is allowed. Most of the examples
contain negation. This group is regarded by von der Gabelentz (1839:273) as its own mood, the potential.

(66) Ul’ca-v kužo-v I’ši-v-at.
street< Russ>-LAT meadow-LAT go.out-MOD-PRES.2SG
‘Du kannst auf die Straße, auf den Anger gehen.’ (MV V: 390, Salo 1990:34)
[You can go out to the street, to the meadow.]
derived from l’šens ‘to go out, come out; to germinate’

Evsev’ev’s dialectal meaning ‘to want to do something’ from the district of Nizhni Novgorod and Zakadomsk, is not mentioned in grammars afterwards (Evsev’ev 1928:190 [1961:173] & 1931:125). According to him, it corresponds to the Russian expression hotet’ ‘to want’ and its reflexive counterpart hočet’šja with the animate participant in the dative. This kind of derivative is rather rare in folklore texts, but obviously more common in real life, because the verbs express basic body functions.

(67) Mokke .d’e jara-v-an!
Moss-ABL eat-MOD-PRES.1SG
‘Ich* möchte Moos fressen!’ (MV III: 287, MW 1: 499)
[I would like to eat moss!]
*The speaker is a bear.

Some of the v-derivatives have the perfective or resultative meaning ‘to do something to the end, finish.’ The root verbs can be either transitive or intransitive. The examples are scanty, but it seems that it is not a question of usual action directed towards an object but rather that the subject does something sufficiently, enough, to his/her own satisfaction. Valence-decrease occurs with transitive verbs, a visible object not being possible in these sentences, whereas with intransitive verbs the changes are not significant.

(68) Kurok rango-v-i.
soon SCREAM-PERF-PRET-3SG
‘Es (das Kind) wird bald ausgeschrieen haben.’ (MW 3: 1882, Salo 1990:34)
[He/she [the child] is soon going to have screamed enough.]
derived from rango ‘to scream, shout; to roar; to thunder’

(69) Nu jarka-v-št’ pop di d’iakon.
well< Russ> CAT-PERF-PRET.3PL priest< Russ> and< Russ> deacon< Russ>
‘Der Pope und der Diakon assen sich voll.’ (MV III: 312, Salo 1990:35)
[The priest and the deacon ate sufficiently.]

The last and smallest group are v-derivatives with zero meaning. The root verbs are derived from adjectives. There is no change either in the valence or in the meaning.

(70) T’ot’a-nzo kudo-s sited’e-v-i.
father-PX3SG house-LAT grow.old-0-PRET.3SG
[She was growing old in her father’s house.]
derived from sited’e ‘to grow old, age’
Merja Salo

(71)  T’at’a-t   kudo-s   si’e suka,   stied’-i-t’.
       father-px2sg  house-lat  old  bitch[<Russ]  grow.old-pret-2sg

‘Du bist, alte Hündin, (schon) im Hause deines Vaters alt geworden.’ (MV V: 272, Salo 1990:35)

[You, old bitch, grew old in your father’s house.]

4. Discussion

Based on the analysed material, the Mordvin -v- appears to be a purely deverbal derivational suffix for verbs. This is contrary to Mézáros (1999:178), who claims to have found three denominal v- derivatives, all Russian borrowings from adverb stems. Mézáros does not indicate sources or give sentence samples. Earlier it had also been proposed that some v-derivatives are denominal (Wiedemann 1865:26). This has prudently been rejected by Hallap (2000:147–148). According to the material presented here with the suffix -v-, only transitive root verbs are used to form the passive. In general, a base verb can be found for all derivatives, the only exception being some of the sja-verbs borrowed from Russian, e.g. opal’avom ‘to fall ill all of a sudden’ from the Russian opalit’sja (MW 3: 1454; this may be a dialectal meaning as the verb usually means ‘to scorch, burn (intr.)’). In some cases, however, both the Mordvin base verb and the v-derivative have counterparts in Russian. When this occurs, it is impossible to decide if they have both been borrowed separately or if Erzya has its own independent derivative.

Of the seven meanings of the Erzya derivational affix -v- only one is discussed thoroughly in this presentation. The first actants vary from the agentive consciously controlling his/her actions to the inactive neutral. All the roles mentioned above are needed for classifying the different nuances of the v-derivatives’ meanings. Occurrences that have been interpreted as passive have two actants in their deep structure, generally agentive and goal/patient, but as first actant, experiencer and causer (or force) are also possible, as are content or benefactive as second actant. These occurrences do not arise spontaneously. Rather, they always presuppose an animate or animated performer. A feature common to all v-derivatives is that they never take endings of the object conjugation. The object in these sentences is also rare, and it seems that the only case allowed for the object is the ablative, it being already restricted to certain verbs only. The influence of the suffix -v- is more easily explained with the intransitive verbs, while with transitive verbs the picture is not always clear. One might even ask what happens to the transitivity if object conjugation does not occur. At least one might surmise that in these sentences the agentive has been weakened and possibly even replaced by the experiencer. On the grounds of the earlier studies mentioned in the introduction, it appears that in Moksha the v-derivatives are more infrequent and have fewer meanings than in Erzya.

The rare derivational affix -t- can also be used to express certain meanings of the derivational affix -v-, in addition to the passive. Differences can be found in both the
deep structure and the surface structure. These comparisons, however, need new material and more examination. In some instances the passive sentences formed with the derivational affix -t- are extremely close to the (so-called) Finnish one personal passive, in which the primary actant (always a human or at least +animate) can never be expressed as the agent in the surface structure even though it is always semantically present (Vilkuna 2004). On the other hand, the Mordvin v-passive resembles to some extent the reflexive passive found in many Indo-European branches such as the Slavic, Germanic and Romance languages and certain Turkic languages (Siewierska 1984:162–185). This observation, as a matter of fact, was already made by von der Gabelentz (1861:520–525).

5. Future perspectives

The analysis of passive sentences as presented in this article forms a starting point for the study of passive and reflexive categories in languages of the Volga region. In my forthcoming papers Mordvin language material over 100 years old will be compared to contemporary language, and the connection of the suffix -v- to Russian reflexive verbs having the suffix -sja will be investigated. In this study only lexical borrowings from Russian have been indicated, in brackets. Paasonen’s extensive dictionary concentrates on representing different Mordvin dialect forms, and their phonological variation, while their grammatical circumstances have unfortunately been given little consideration. Especially interesting would be a study of the syntactical behaviour of verbs, but, for this, Paasonen’s folklore texts must be searched. In any event, his folklore collection offers an excellent base of material from a time when not so many Mordvins were fluent in Russian. Naturally the passive in Moksha Mordvin as well as the other meanings of this suffix will also be studied further.

Notes

* This article is part of my work for the project “The Ethnic, Linguistic and Cultural Making of Northern Russia”, funded by the Academy of Finland (SA 208153). I am indebted to Werner Abraham, Ulla-Maija Kulonen, Larisa Leisiö and Tapani Salminen for many helpful comments on the form and content of the paper. I am also grateful to Raija Bartens for originally proposing this subject to me and for her good counsel over the years.

1. The new preliminary results of the census of 2002 show that the number of Mordvins has fallen considerably, being now only 843 000 (FUW 2004:8–9). The statistics have not been completed but appear to show an approximate 10% decrease in the Mordvin population in Mordovia and a 20–30% decrease in adjacent areas. This seems very alarming, but until the final areal results are published, it will be difficult to know how accurate these figures are.

2. For the grammatical terms, see Note 5 and Abbreviations after this Note section.

3. The older examples do not always follow the phonematic principle mentioned in Note 5. I have quoted the sentences written in the Latin alphabet directly, but the Cyrillic examples have been...
transliterated. Any other language (German, Hungarian, Russian, Finnish) in the translations, except English, comes from the original sources.

4. The both books have the same examples, only the orthography is different. These examples are more from Ahlqvist 1859. Later Ahlqvist (1861) has a special marker under the letter <d>, an arch meaning the same as дж = dž in Russian or <j> in English, and the <i> has a small circle under it meaning a reduced middle vowel.

5. In the example sentences I use simplified phonematic transcription for Erzya; this means that palatalization is only shown for dentals. Mordvin has two declensions: the definite and the unmarked basic inflection. In the morphological analysis the forms of the definite inflection have been marked by a def, while the forms of the normal inflection are not indicated separately, and neither are the singular and nominative. The object declension has been marked in parentheses, and by an obj and the person. Unmarked features such as singular with the nouns and indicative with the verbs are never marked in the glosses. All glosses needed for interpretation are listed under Abbreviations. Occasionally, sentences that include an underived base verb for comparison have also been presented. In 1988–90 I cross-checked some of my material with Nina Semënovna Aduškina from the State University of Mordovia, then the visiting lecturer on Erzya at the University of Helsinki. Due to the phonematic principle in Paasonen’s Mordvin originals, all words had been written in small letters, even at the beginning of a sentence, or with proper names. This has been altered in response to a demand of the editors of this volume.

6. This is a common Finno-Ugrian feature of verbal government. In Finnish these same verbs can also have an object in the partitive which is the continuator of the former ablative (or separative) of the proto language. In sentence (i) vet’t’e can be thought of as an adverbial, too, which is evident from sentence (ii):

i. `sim-an vet’-t’e
   drink-pres.1sg water-ABL
   ‘juon vetťi’ (Itkonen l966: 307)
   [partitive in Finnish meaning a partial object]
   [I drink water = I drink some of the water]

ii. kando-ą vet’-t’e simd’a-siň
   carry-perf. ptc water-ABL make.drink-(obj.3pl)1sg
   ‘kannetu vedellä ne juotan’ (Itkonen l966: 307)
   [adessive in Finnish meaning instrument; normal in this kind of use]
   [kannetusta vedestä, elative in Finnish meaning ‘out, from’; exceptional]
   [I make them drink the water carried (by someone)]

As well, a third stem verb kavaňams ‘to entertain, regale’, with its perfective (or resultative) derivative kavaňavoms ‘to get entertained enough’, act syntactically in the same way.

iii. kavaňa-v-ons moroženoj-de
    entertain-perf-inf ice-cream]<Russ>-ABL
    ‘ugostiť’ja moroženym’ (ERS 221)
    [to get enough ice-cream]

iv. kavaňa-ms pšaka-do
    entertain-inf pastry-ABL
    ‘ugoščati’ pirogami’ (ERS 221)
    [entertain [somebody] to pastries]
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what-ABL sx(too) entertain-INF.PTC-IL.PRET.3SG guest-[< Russ]-DEF.NOM
‘Mit irgend etwas sollten wir den Gast verpflegen.’ (PM 2: 116, MW 2: 652)
[We had to entertain our guest with something.]

References


Glosses

abl ablative
acc accusative
adj adjective
autom automotive
causat. causative
dat dative
def definite
dimin diminutive
el.ger elative gerund with temporal meaning
freq. frequentative
gen genitive
illat illative
imp imperative
imperf imperfect
inten intentional
ines inessive
inf infinitive
inf.ptc infinitival participle
intr. intransitive
mod modal (dynamic)
nom nominative
obj object conjugation
optat optative
pass passive
perf perfective
pers.pron personal pronoun
pl plural
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Grammatical voice and tense-aspect in Slavic*

Junichi Toyota and Melisa Mustafović
Lund University and University of Freiburg

In this paper, we analyse the prototypicality of the passive voice in the Slavic languages. We argue that there are some variations in the periphrastic passive, which stem from the historical development of the tense-aspect system, particularly from an earlier resultative construction in the case of Indo-European languages. The periphrastic construction in some languages has abandoned the earlier tense-aspectual features, while in other languages they are still preserved. The periphrastic construction in every branch of Slavic has been considered passive in previous works. However, we claim that it is a case of the passive in East and some of West Slavic, while that in South Slavic is better considered as a resultative. This diversity motivates the continuum of tense-aspect and passive in Slavic.

1. Introduction

In this paper we demonstrate the complexity involved in the category of passive voice and analyse its prototypicality in Slavic languages. The passive is an elusive category, and various constructions are considered under this term. When this fact is considered diachronically, the definition becomes even more complex. The passive voice in Slavic has been much discussed in the literature, and the periphrastic construction with the passive participle, found in all branches of the Slavic languages, is collectively considered passive. We question whether these periphrastic constructions are really cases of the passive voice, following similar questions raised earlier, e.g. Comrie (1981); Abraham (1999, 2004). We also analyse whether there is a difference in the interpretation of the periphrastic construction over the different branches of the Slavic languages. In order to answer these questions we examine the periphrastic constructions both synchronically and diachronically. In particular, we demonstrate that the historical aspect of this construction plays an important role in our analysis.

We organise this paper as follows: first, we review the relationship between the tense-aspectual system and the passive, paying particular attention to the periphrastic passive construction and passive prototype. We then examine constructions generally considered to be passive in the Slavic languages: we question the passiveness of these constructions and analyse them synchronically, focusing on the stative-dynamic aspectual difference and the causer-causee relationship. Finally, we analyse the periphrastic
Table 1. Slavic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Slavic</th>
<th>West Slavic</th>
<th>South Slavic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Kashubian</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>Rusyn</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Slovene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbian (Upper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbian (Lower)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

passive construction diachronically. This allows us to clarify the prototypicality of the passive in relation to tense and aspect because the periphrastic construction is not necessarily the passive in every language.

The languages shown in Table 1 are what we consider as modern Slavic languages for purposes of this paper. It is a common practice, following Ruhlen (1990:327), to divide them into three groups, i.e. East, West, and South. We adopt this distinction since it will be useful in our later argument. Ruhlen’s list of Slavic languages, however, does not include Rusyn. As noted in Tommola (2000:471, Fn. 1), whether Rusyn belongs to West Slavic (due to the similarity to Slovak), East Slavic (since most speakers live in the Ukraine) or even something else is questionable. In this work, we adopt the view that, based on the grammatical characteristics, it belongs to the West Slavic group.

In addition to the languages listed in Table 1, there are several more in the course of development. Proto-Slavic (sometimes known as Common Slavic) was the origin of the Slavic branch of Indo-European languages. It dates from approximately 3,000 BC. The division into the current three branches occurred between the 6th and the 9th century AD. Some grammatical and phonological characteristics of Proto-Slavic are reconstructed, but there were various written records in the later stage of the historical development. This involves Old Church Slavonic (as early as the 10th–11th century BC), Old East Slavic (also known as Old Russian), Old Ukrainian, Old Polish, etc. Also, there is another extinct Slavic language called Polabian, which was spoken as late as the 18th century. As we will see, the data from this language also helps in our analysis.

2. Relationship between passive and tense-aspect

2.1 Tense-aspect and periphrastic passive

A number of scholars have identified the relationship between the tense-aspectual system and the passive. For example, Givón (1990:571–572) claims that stativisation is one of the main functions of the passive in the sense that passivization includes the use of the auxiliary ‘be’ with less finite verb forms such as the adjectival, perfect participial, or nominal form. There are varying degrees of restrictions according to each language: in Germanic languages, for example, it is common to find two auxiliaries, e.g. ‘be’ and
'become', with 'be' normally used for expressing the state (except in Dutch and Frisian, where 'be' is exclusively used to express the perfective aspect; cf. (1) for an example in Dutch), while the other choice, 'become', exclusively expresses the dynamic aspect. In these cases, the aspectual difference is achieved by the choice of auxiliary. Other language families in Indo-European languages, such as the Romance languages, do not have this binary choice of auxiliary and 'be' often stands on its own, expressing mainly state. However, the dynamic aspect is often expressed by the same auxiliary. Beyond the boundary of Indo-European, a case similar to the latter can be found in Finnish, as in (2), where the perfect, as well as the resulting state, is optionally expressed.

Dutch

(1) Jan is slecht behandeld
   Jan is badly treated.
   'Jan has been treated badly.'

Finnish (Harris & Campbell 1995:91)

(2) Seinä-t o-vat maala-tu-t
    wall-nom.pl be-3pl paint-past.part-pl
    'The walls are painted' or 'The walls have been painted.'

We note that stativity can be divided into two subtypes: natural state (state without outer case) and secondary state (state resulting from some outer cause) (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988:4). The clause expressing the state in periphrastic constructions like (1) and (2) is normally the secondary state. See Section 3.3 below for the importance of outer cause. When the tense-aspect is analysed in relation to the passive, it is always the stative-dynamic distinction that is considered relevant. The periphrastic construction in Slavic is often analysed in this context (Harrison 1967:22–37; Siewierska 1988:247–251; Thieroff 1994:11; Bulanin 1995:122; Schoorlemmer 1995; Tommola 2000:463). Furthermore, notice that these examples are all periphrastic passives. This may indicate that the tense-aspect is related exclusively to the periphrastic passive. However, the morphological passive in some cases can be related to the statisation, although it is extremely rare typologically. One such language is Arabic. Arabic involves internal vowel changes to mark tense distinctions. The basic tense system of Arabic consists of present, past and future and lacks perfect and imperfect tenses. Thus, the perfect/imperfect tenses are expressed by what is known as the passive as in (3) (vowel pattern C-u-C-i-C-a for perfect, C-a-C-a-C-u for imperfect). The same vowel change pattern can be also applied to monovalent verbs, as shown in (4).

Arabic

(3) a. Qutila Zaydun
    kill_PASS Zaid
    'Zaid was killed.' (perfect passive)

b. Yaqtalu Zaydun
    kill_PASS Zaid
    'Zaid has been killed.' (imperfect passive)
(4) a. "muwwita
   die.prf
   ‘One died.’ (perfect active)

b. Yumawwatu
   die.imprf
   ‘One has died.’ (imperfect active)

Notwithstanding the examples in (3), when the passive is considered to be related to
the tense-aspect system, its construction is normally periphrastic.

The relationship between the passive and tense-aspect seems to be widely recog-
nised. However, in some extreme cases, what is commonly known as the passive is only
considered an aspectual construction: Some earlier works such as Beedham (1981,
1982) consider the Russian periphrastic passive to be a type of aspectual con-
struction and not a grammatical voice construction per se. Andersen (1991:92–95) also
considers that the English passive is basically used as an aspectual construction. Such
a view is criticised by Palmer (1994:139), who claims that there are various aspec-
tually marked constructions which appear together in the periphrastic passive. For
example, English uses two distinctive auxiliaries, be for the passive and have for the
perfect tense. These can be used in a same clause, e.g. This TV has been fixed by my
friend. Cross-linguistically, however, the relationship between the tense-aspect and the
passive is highly questionable, as Haspelmath (1990:38) notes “there is no direct re-
lation between passives and states.” There are some cases of the passive morpheme
relating to dynamicisation in languages such as Nimboran (Indo-Pacific) and Mw-
era (Niger-Kordofanian). However, stativisation is not really crucial in the passive.
The periphrastic constructions are indeed sometimes better considered aspectual con-
structions. In addition, the periphrastic passive is both geographically and genetically
restricted mainly to Indo-European languages, as we will see in more details in Section
4. For the moment, it suffices to claim that the stativisation is not directly related to
the grammatical passive.

2.2 Passive prototype

Identification of passive is not easy, as may at first appear, but it is in fact rather com-
plex. As Siewierska (1984:1) says, “the analysis of the various constructions referred
to in the literature as passive leads to the conclusion that there is not even one single
property which all these constructions have in common.” Let us consider a case pre-
sent in Lazard (1995:192): he usefully provides various cases of what is commonly
described as passive to illustrate the diversity of its syntactic properties. The list of
forms in (5) illustrates what is commonly considered the passive where Vp stands for
a passive verb and Vr, a reflexive verb. The inclusion of reflexive verbs alone indicate
that the boundary between the passive and the reflexive verbs is not clear. The reflexive
is known to express the passive, once the subject’s volitionality is reduced (cf. Croft,
Shyldkrot, & Kemmer 1987).
(5) – V changes to Vp (passive voice), Y becomes ‘subject’, X drops or becomes Xn (n = oblique marker): this is the ‘canonical’ passive as found in Western European languages;
– V changes to Vp, Y remains unchanged, X drops or becomes Xn: this is the ‘impersonal passive’, as, for example, in French;
– V changes to Vp, X and Y remain unchanged (Jinghpaw (Sino-Tibetan));
– V changes to Vr (reflexive), Y becomes ‘subject’, X drops or becomes Xn (Russian);
– V changes to Vr, Y remains unchanged, X drops: ‘impersonal’ (Spanish);
– V remains unchanged, Y becomes ‘subject’, X drops or becomes Xn (Chinese).

In most theoretical approaches, each category is clearly distinguished, and needless to say, the passive is commonly considered a distinctive category.

The approach we employ in this paper is somewhat different, and we do not assume distinctive categories, say, between the passive and the reflexive. Instead, we posit the idea of a continuum (cf. Comrie 1989; Givón 1984:164; Shibatani 1985, 1998). This idea has been used in some earlier works. Shibatani (1985:821), for example, claims that “passives form a continuum with active sentences.” However, the passive seems to be related not only to the active but also to other categories, such as the middle, inverse voice, anticausative, etc., as more recently discussed extensively in Croft (2001:283–319). We consider that each voice category does not exist independently and that they are somehow related to each other, whether the relationship is syntactic, semantic or functional. However, it is important to note that each category has a prototype and, by employing the continuum, we do not exclude any overlaps of properties among different categories.

So what is the passive prototype then? This may be one of the hardest questions one can ask about the passive. One obvious characteristic is that the passive requires a formal marking, whether the construction is periphrastically or morphologically marked. However, apart from that, it seems difficult to achieve a consensus among scholars as to what the passive prototype is. There have been numerous works discussing the definition of the passive (cf. Siewierska 1984:265; Keenan 1985; Cooreman 1987; Dik 1989:219–221; Givón 1990:567; Haspelmath 1990; Dixon 1991:229; Palmer 1994:117–127; Thompson 1994; Payne 1997:204, to name but a few). Among them, several points are repeatedly mentioned, which involve the following:

(6) i. The passive has an active counterpart, i.e. the passive subject corresponds to the active object, and the oblique actor phrase of the passive corresponds to the active subject, i.e. NP₁(SUBJ)–VP(ACCT)–NP₂(OBJ) = NP₂(SUBJ)–VP(PASS)–(NP₁)
   (OBL, optional)
   ii. The passive is reduced in valence by one argument as compared to its active counterpart, i.e. divalent active verb becomes monovalent in the passive.
   iii. The passive subject is more topical than the active object.
   iv. The oblique actor phrase in the passive, whether it is overtly expressed or not, is highly non-topical and its identity is often unknown.
   v. The passive subject tends to be lower entity in the animacy hierarchy (cf. Silverstein 1976), typically inanimate.
It is obvious that characteristics (i) and (ii) in (6) are more morphosyntactic, while (iii) and (iv) are functional. The morphosemantic characteristics of characteristic (v) (cf. Comrie 1977; Givón 1990:295–303; Toyota 2003:111–113), which claims that the passive subject tends to be inanimate while the active subject tends to be human, has been much discussed in the literature. We consider these five characteristics as properties of the prototypical passive.

3. Slavic passive: Synchronic analysis

3.1 Myths of Slavic periphrastic constructions

A number of previous works, such as Harrison (1967), Siewierska (1988) and various descriptive grammar books of individual Slavic languages, claim that Slavic languages possess several constructions, such as the reflexive, which express meanings commonly associated with the passive voice. The construction that we consider as the passive per se in Slavic languages is a periphrastic passive construction, shown below in (7) to (9).

Russian (Babby & Brecht 1975:342)

(7) Kalitka byla otkryta Olegom
    gate.nom was open.part pass Oleg instr
    'The gate was opened by Oleg.'

Czech (Duškova 1972:101)

(8) Princeton pokus byl provden blinikem a
    Princeton experiment was perform.part pass aluminium instr and
    zlatem
    gold instr
    'The Princeton experiment was performed with aluminium and gold.'

Serbo-Croatian

(9) Dokaz je pronađen (od naučnika)
    proof is find.part pass of scientist
    'The proof is found (by the scientist).'

There seem to be several reasons to believe that these constructions are passive, which can be listed below:

(10) i. The subject is an undergoer, not an actor
    ii. The actor can be expressed in an oblique phrase (cf. (9)) or by the instrument case (cf. (7))
    iii. The construction differs from unmarked active constructions, in having an auxiliary and the main verb in passive participle form.

Also notice that (7) to (9) represent each branch of the Slavic languages. These examples are all considered passive (see, for example, Siewierska 1988 and various other
descriptive grammars), and this view has gone somewhat unchallenged so far. The characteristics in (10) fit with the characteristics indicated in i, ii and v in (6), which motivates the claim that (7) to (9) are instances of the passive. However, what appears to be a periphrastic passive in Slavic can be another construction in disguise. Once the historical development is taken into consideration, it is possible to consider them as a type of tense-aspectual construction in some branches. This is discussed extensively in Section 4, but before this, we take a look at some synchronic characteristics.

3.2 Stative-dynamic aspectual distinction

In distinguishing the passive voice from the tense-aspect relationship, one of the key factors is the aspectual distinction between the stative and the dynamic aspects. Since the passive is not supposed to be related to the stative aspect (cf. Section 2.1), a clause expressing the dynamic aspect is more likely to be considered the passive. A number of scholars use such criteria as a diagnostic of the passive (cf. Estival 1986, 1989; Siewierska 1988; Givón 1990:600–602; Toyota 2003). It is often cited that the particular syntactic environment can help us to identify the dynamic reading (cf. Freed 1979:57–58; Dowty 1979:55–56; Brinton 1988:242). With specific reference to Germanic languages, for example, the ‘have’-perfect and the progressive constructions are often used as an indicator of the dynamic aspect (cf. Toyota 2003:55–60). However, these tests are not useful in Slavic, since the Slavic verbs always carry derivational morphologies distinguishing between the perfective and imperfective aspect. This, combined with the overt tense marking, can create tense-aspectual distinctions, including the perfect and progressive. In theory, the passive participle in Slavic can be formed with both perfective and imperfective verbs, but in reality, the participle tends to be formed with the perfective verb, perhaps with the exception of Polish (Siewierska 1988:247). Russian, in fact, always forms the passive participle with the perfective verb. This tends to cause the clause to be viewed as an entirety, but the overall interpretation of the clause can be contextual, too (Bulanin 1963).

A possible test applicable to the Slavic is the insertion of a time adverbial (cf. Przygoda 1976). For example, anything referring to the duration of time, such as for two weeks, always, etc., expresses the stative aspect, while others such as by tomorrow, in two days, etc. denote the dynamic aspect. Consider the following examples of dynamic clauses: (11) is an example with a temporal adverb indicating the dynamic aspect and (12) is based on the contextual clues. An important point in examples like (11) and (12) is that the use of the copula does not affect the overall aspectual distinction, i.e. the copula is an inherently stative verb, but the overall aspectual interpretation of the clause comes from the past participle.

Russian (Siewierska 1988:249)

(11) Za dva časa vsio bylo ulazeno
in two hours everything was arrange.past.part.pass
Everything was arranged in two hours.'
Polish (Siewierska 1988:250)

(12) Wkrótce skóra była zdjęta i udzieć oddzielony
shortly skin was remove.PAST.PART.PASS and leg separate.PAST.PART.PASS
od grzbietu
from back
'Shortly the skin was removed and the leg separated from the back.'

Phrases referring to egressive aspect are a sign of dynamic aspect, since the stativity
cannot refer to the end of state or action. The phrase referring to ingressive aspect, on
the other hand, can be both stative and dynamic.

Apart from what we have seen so far, some West Slavic languages, namely Pol-
ish and colloquial Sorbian, use an auxiliary ‘become’ to express the dynamic aspect
overly, as shown in (13) (colloquial Sorbian) and (14) (Polish). 1 This auxiliary does
not appear in the tense-aspect related constructions. So it can be considered a passive
auxiliary.

Colloquial Sorbian (Knjazev 1988:367)

(13) Hdyž běchu plany wobkrucene, wordowachu chěže skok
after be.PAST plan approve.PAST.PART become.PAST.3PL houses short.time
natwarjene
build.PAST.PART
'After the plan had been approved, the houses were built in short time.'

Polish (Siewierska 1988:251)

(14) Pokój została pomalowany w zeszłym roku
room become.PAST paint.PAST.PART in last year
'The room was painted last year.'

Upper Sorbian optionally omits the auxiliary być ‘be’, but it still allows wordować ‘be-
come’ to appear at colloquial register. Lower Sorbian allows both byść ‘be’ and wordowaś
‘become’. Polish does not use auxiliaries for tense-aspect (except for ‘have’ in a col-
loquial speech, cf. Note 2) and the additional choice, found only in the passive, may be
taken as an indicator for the establishment of the category of passive.

What is crucial in the tense-aspectual domain of the passive is that the whole clause
needs to express the dynamic aspect. As long as a clause expresses stative aspect, it can
be considered related to the tense-aspectual construction. The dynamic aspect from
the periphrastic construction is only possible in a limited number of Slavic languages:
East Slavic and some of West Slavic (Polish, Czech and Slovak). What is common
among them is that these languages have a much more grammaticalised past tense,
which originated in the earlier periphrastic construction. We discuss this in detail,
later, in Section 4.2.
3.3 Causer-causee relationship

What appears to be the passive can be an adjectival construction or a tense-aspectual construction in disguise. For example, constructions like *The house is located in the city centre* or *The box is covered with dust* in English are considered passive. Structure-wise, this example is identical to the verb passive. However, what distinguishes constructions like this from the passive is the presence of outer cause or causer-causee relationship. This is related to the characteristic (6i), where the active counterpart is expected. These examples merely describe the state of the subject, with no outer cause implied in the clause. So these examples should be excluded from the passive category.

The causer-causee relationship is often considered in terms of transitivity. The term transitivity is normally used very loosely in linguistic theory, and at least two types can be identified. Semantic transitivity is concerned with the transfer of action or event from one entity (actor) to another (undergoer). Syntactic transitivity is solely concerned with whether the direct object is present (transitive) or absent (intransitive). Alternatively, transitivity can be viewed as a continuum, as proposed in Lakoff (1977) or Hopper and Thompson (1980). What we are concerned with here is the outer cause, so we are concerned more with semantic, rather than syntactic, transitivity. According to this type of transitivity, when a lexical verb is transitive, such as a verb of creation or destruction (cf. Kozinsky 1980; Testelec 1998), passivisation is more easily done. Kittilä (2002:23) rightly points out this correlation of the passive and transitivity as follows:

> Passivization makes it in many (but not all) cases possible to separate transitive clauses from less transitive ones, since ... only clauses conceived of as somehow transitive are to be passivized in many languages. The acceptability of passivization correlates to some extent with transitivity: the more transitive a clause is, the more readily it can be passivised. (see, for example, Lehmann 1991:224ff.; Rice 1987)

So once the clause is interpreted as the passive, it needs not only the recipient of outer cause, i.e. undergoer, but also the presence of an outer cause, i.e. actor (whether it is overtly expressed or not).²

In other branches of Indo-European languages, various tactics, such as the ‘have’-perfect in the Germanic, were developed to accommodate the growing demands for the actor-oriented resultative construction. The following example shows earlier stages of the resultative in Germanic languages. The actor is expressed in the dative case.

Gothic (Toyota 2003:49)

(15) *iþ marei winda mikilamma waiandin arraisida was*

and sea wind.dat great blowing raised was

‘and a great blowing wind raised/has raised the sea’ (John 6.18)

The periphrastic resultative construction often uses the auxiliary ‘have’ in Indo-European languages, and such characteristics lead to the distinction of *be*-language and *have*-language (cf. Isačenko 1974). Interestingly, the use of actor in dative case in (15) corresponds to the expression of possessor in the periphrastic possessive construction in Gothic, as shown below:
As is obvious, the possession acquired the lexical verb ‘have’ in almost all Indo-European languages, although its etymology is not clear (cf. Meyer 1915:224–237; Hamp 1954; Markey 1986:8; Davis 1986:114–115, 134). In Germanic or Romance languages, the resultative construction (stative clause with undergoer-orientation) acquired the actor-oriented construction with an invention of ‘have’. In Slavic, the active and passive participle distinction creates a difference in orientation. However, construction-wise, the actor is not clearly distinguished from the undergoer in the resultative.

The actor phrase can be also found in modern Slavic languages. It is expressed by either case marking (instrument in (17)) or prepositions as in (18), (19) and also earlier examples (7) and (9).

Russian (Wójcik 1973:119)

(17) Konservacija byla zaakončena rabotnikami
conservation.nom was finish.past.part.pass workmen.instr
‘The conservation work has been finished by the workmen.’

Polish (Siewierska 1984:10)

(18) Majatek był administrowany przez Pana Tadeusza
estate.nom was administer.past.part.pass by Mr. Tadeusz
‘The estate was administered by Mr. Tadeusz.’

Bulgarian (Radewa 1984:214)

(19) L’v’t bese zatvoren ot horata
lion was lock.up.past.part.pass from people
‘The lion was locked up by people.’

Superficially, the presence of actor indicates high transitivity, and these examples appear to be passive. However, this can be a different construction in disguise. As shown in Gothic examples in (15) and (16), the actor of resultative construction can be expressed in the oblique phrase. This can be proven by analysing the historical development of the Slavic languages.

4. Historical development

The passive involves two types of overt marking, i.e. periphrastic and morphological. This difference in construction seems to correspond to the geographic distribution of each form. Dryer (1982:55) claims “the use of copula plus an adjective in passive clause is rare outside Indo-European. In most languages, the passive is formed by adding a
passive suffix to the verb.” Haspelmath (1990:29) and Anna Siewierska (p.c.) also express the same view. To this, we add languages in South-East Asia, such as Vietnamese, Thai, etc. and the Finnic languages (cf. (2)).

This geographic distribution is closely related to the origin of the construction, i.e. the periphrastic construction in the Indo-European languages as well as the Finnic (but not the languages in South-East Asia) stems from the earlier resultative construction, i.e. a construction that describes the resulting state with undergoer-orientation (Davis 1986; Givón 1990:600–602; Estival 1986, 1989; Toyota 2003). Needless to say, the Slavic languages fit in this type. However, there are varying degrees of development and the form in modern Slavic can be either resultative or passive. In the following three sections, we first demonstrate the origin of the passive and then the developmental path. Finally we illustrate how historical developments can be useful in deciding on the prototypicality of the passive.

4.1 Origin of Slavic passive

The older Slavic languages already had periphrastic constructions, which involve the copula and a deverbalised adjective, such as an adjectival participle. This means that the participle often carries inflectional markers at earlier stages (cf. Szemerenyi 1980:297; Davis 1986:24; Greenberg 2000:182–186). Examples in (20), as well as (22) and (23), show the agreement marker of person, number and gender on the participle.

Old Church Slavonic (Hantley 1993:152)

(20) prišel˘u jestu vasilisku
come.prf.past.part.masc be.impf.pres.3sg Basiliscus
‘Basiliscus has come.’ (Suprasliensis 20.2)

(20) is concerned with aspect and the construction is active. Some modern Slavic languages still preserve this agreement system (cf. (24) and (25)). As we have seen in Section 3.3, the presence of outer cause is indispensable if a clause is to be considered a passive. However, the implication of outer cause is not sufficient to claim a construction as a passive: what appears to be the passive in (21) to (23) is, in fact, still related to tense-aspectual constructions, like the Gothic example (15). The hint of earlier passive constructions can be found in these examples, especially in terms of its structure and the existence of outer cause expressed in the instrument case in (21) and (22) or by the use of preposition ‘of’ (23).

Old Church Slavonic (Schmalstieg 1983:191)

(21) ni čísomu že bodet˘u k˚a tomu du isypana bodet˘u vin˚u i popiraema
for nothing more will.be to this that thrown will.be out and trampled.on
č(lov˚ek)y men.instr
‘It will be good for nothing so that it will be thrown out and trampled on by men.’ (Matt. 5.13)
Old East Slavic (Dorosz 1975:89)

(22) I bie obieszczano Duchom Swiatym nie wideti smerti
and was proclaim.past.part.neut ghost.instr holy.instr not see death

‘And it was proclaimed by the Holy Ghost that death will not be seen.’

Old Polish (Dorosz 1975:92)

(23) . . . by thesz krolesthwo tho nakonyecz abo skazano
so also kingdom this end or sentence.past.part.neut of
nyeprzyaczol, abo posyandzyno od paganov nye bylo
enemies or possess.past.part.neut of pagans not be

‘. . . and also so that the kingdom will never be overrun by its enemies or possessed by pagans.’

This superficial similarity to the typical passive is due to the undergoer-orientation and the actor expressed in the oblique phrase. However, this is one of the inevitable stages in the development of Indo-European languages, i.e. the resultative was only possible with an undergoer-orientation. The origin of this construction may well date back to as early as Proto-Indo-European, especially where the distinction between the passive and active participle is concerned. In Proto-Indo-European, the basic binary nominal distinction into active and inactive nouns played an important role in the grammatical construction (cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995). Active nouns refer to entities which are capable of acting on their own. Therefore, they tend to be animate. The referent of inactive nouns, on the contrary, cannot initiate an action and therefore, they are normally inanimate. Proto-Indo-European perfect is believed to have been derived from the monovalent inactive noun construction, where the state of the subject was expressed (cf. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995:260). This lack of initiative to act automatically makes the inactive noun the undergoer, which can be considered to have created the undergoer-orientation in the perfective passive participle. The active participle was a later innovation. Also, due to the lack of the initiative expressed in the passive participle, this participle is also considered to have contributed to the emergence of the middle voice (Gamkrelidze & Ivanov 1995:260–261). This is so, since the middle voice can express the spontaneous event, without implying the input of outer cause. So it is obvious by now that the earlier resultative is the origin of the Slavic passive.

4.2 The development of tense systems

Constructions like (21) to (23) are, however, not yet fully considered passive, and the development into a more prototypical passive is aided by the change in the tense system, especially the past tense. The tense-aspect system in the Slavic languages has not changed much. For example, Polabian has preserved the Proto-Slavic tense-aspectual system (Polański 1993:814). However, it does not exclude any changes, and we restrict our argument to changes relating to the ANTERIOR. The earlier aorist expressed the past without referring to the aspectual difference and it had its own conjugation. In the course of historical development, the periphrastic construction
like (20) to (23) became popular, although it sporadically existed even in Proto-Slavic (Schenker 1993:94). When the copula and the past participle, both active and passive, were used in the same clause, it often expressed a resultative or perfect. The difference between the active and passive participle is orientation, i.e. the active participle has actor-orientation and the passive participle, undergoer-orientation. This type of construction still thrives in some of modern Slavic languages.

The copula is historically the oldest choice of auxiliary, but some languages developed to use different ones: some West Slavic languages use ‘have’ as an auxiliary for the perfect, as in Czech (24), Kashubian (25) as well as in Macedonian (26).³

Czech (Maslov 1988:80)

(24) Mám úlohu napsaňou
    have.1sg task-acc fem write-past-part-acc sg fem
    ‘I have written my task.’

Kashubian (Stone 1993:777)

(25) On mò to wszétko zrobiony
    he have.3sg it all do past part act masc
    ‘He has done it all.’

Macedonian (de Bray 1980a:207–208)

(26) Imam radoteno
    have.1sg work past part pass
    ‘I have worked.’

Furthermore, some express the same meaning without the use of auxiliary, as shown in the following examples:

Belarusian (Tommola 2000:445)

(27) a. Ja/Ty wžo atrymał-a zameţny pašpart
    pron.1/2sg already get prf past fem foreign passport
    ‘I/You (have) got my/your passport already.’

    b. My/Vy/fany pra-gljadze-l-i kambinacy-ju
    pron.1/2/3pl through look past pl combination acc
    ‘We/you/they (have) overlooked the manoeuvre.’

Czech (Tommola 2000:446)

(28) Ne, ještě se nevráti-l-a
    no still ref return neg past fem
    ‘No, she’s still gone.’

These examples show that the suffix -l functions as a past tense marker. The past tense form in languages without the auxiliary used to be the active participle (de Bray 1980c:77, 153–154). This participle is formed with an infinitival form of verb and the suffix -l, which now functions as a past tense marker in the languages forming the past
tense without auxiliary. Since it was a participle earlier, it was inflected in gender and number (e.g. masc -l; fem -la; neut -lo; pl -li), as in (29).

Old East Slavic (Tommola 2000:459)

\[(29) \quad \ddashtext{fast\text{-}time} \quad \ddashtext{pass.\text{-}prf\text{-}past\text{-}part\text{-}act\text{-}fem\text{-}cop} \quad \text{‘A part of the fast-time has passed.’}\]

Notice the presence of the copula in (29). When it is dropped, the suffix -l became reanalysed as an inflectional past tense marker, but the agreement is still preserved as shown in (27) and (28).\(^4\) The omission of the copula can be found in East Slavic and West Slavic except for Rusyn and Lower Sorbian. In Kashubian and Upper Sorbian, however, the copula is optionally allowed. Thus Kashubian, in particular, uses three different constructions, with ‘have’ (25), with ‘be’ (30a), and without an auxiliary (30b).

Kashubian (Stone 1993:777)

\[(30) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a. } \ddashtext{I work.\text{-}past\text{-}part\text{-}act} \\
\text{I worked.‘I worked.’}
\end{array}
\]

\[(30) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{b. } \ddashtext{I work.\text{-}past\text{-}part\text{-}act} \\
\text{I worked.‘I worked.’}
\end{array}
\]

Stone (1993:776–777) notes that the construction with ‘be’ in Kashubian is found within literature or used by an older generation. This shows that constructions with ‘have’ (25) or without auxiliary (30b) are newer.

There is a general pattern in the grammaticalisation of auxiliary, ranging from a lexical verb to its loss through a period of auxiliary, cliticisation and affixation (cf. Givón 1984:270–271; Haspelmath 1990:38; Heine 1993), and the grammaticalisation of the past tense in the Slavic can be roughly formulated as in Figure 1. The arrow in the scale indicates the direction of historical change. Thus ‘be’ in the South Slavic is at the stage of full lexical verb or auxiliary, and in the East and West Slavic, it has developed further into its loss. Polish, however, still preserves its affixation stage (cf. Note 4).

The distribution of the different types of construction is more or less uniform according to the branch within the Slavic groups, except for West Slavic. For example, the omission of auxiliary is common in East Slavic, but not so in South Slavic, and West Slavic, such as Kashubian and Upper Sorbian, has a mixture of constructions. We

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full lexical verb</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Cliticisation</th>
<th>Affixation</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Slavic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>East and</td>
<td>West Slavic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Schematic representation of past tense auxiliary
Table 2. Periphrastic constructions in modern Slavic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>With auxiliary</th>
<th>Without auxiliary</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashubian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusyn</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbian (upper)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbian (lower)</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovene</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ✓ = characteristic is present; × = characteristic is absent; ( ) = characteristic is optional; * = 'have'-perfect is restricted to the spoken, colloquial register; † = 'have'-perfect cannot be formed with all the transitive verbs.

summarise the details of various types we have seen so far in Table 2. We divide the constructions into two types, with or without auxiliary. We compare this distinction according to the type of past participle, i.e. whether active or passive. The subtle differences found in the West Slavic indicate the transitional stage into more uniformity in the tense-aspect system and judging from the direction of change, the auxiliary will be deleted in the future (cf. Figure 1). Considering the changes observed in the East and West Slavic, South Slavic languages seem to be at the beginning or intermediate stage of the change towards the past tense. Also, note that we consider Table 2 as a summary of modern Slavic languages, so older languages, including Polabian, are not listed. This table clearly shows that the East and South Slavic are uniform, but West Slavic languages show more diversity. This, then, holds an important clue in the emergence of the passive.

4.3 The emergence of the passive in Slavic

With regard to the degree of grammatical change in the ANTERIOR constructions, those which express the tense-aspect without the auxiliary show a higher degree of grammaticalisation. So it is possible to say that the East Slavic languages do not rely heavily on the periphrastic construction any longer to deal with the subtle difference in tense-aspect. This can be applied to some West Slavic languages too and begs the ques-
tion why the periphrastic construction with the passive participle exists at all in these languages. Or let us put it in a slightly different way: those which have the periphrastic construction even with the active participle, such as South Slavic, may need the active participle construction in order to express some difference in tense-aspect, since the active and passive participle can form the binary opposition. What is the function of this stranded passive participle construction in East Slavic and some of West Slavic? In our view, this construction can be considered as the passive, but when it has its active counterpart, like in South Slavic, it is still used for the tense-aspect purpose.

Considering the details of the historical change of periphrastic construction, what is important in the grammaticalisation of the passive is that the whole clause should represent the aspect expressed by the participle, not by the auxiliary 'be'. This means that when the auxiliary went through the semantic bleaching, the aspectual distinction should rely on the participle. This characteristic is not mentioned in (6), since this is a particular characteristic to periphrastic constructions, but on understanding the distinction of passive and tense-aspect relationship, it is crucial (cf. Siewierska 1988; Toyota 2003, for the same point). The stative reading in the passive is one of the crucial features in describing the historical development, but it is only relevant at the earlier stage and once the passive is grammaticalised, the clause should be able to express dynamic aspect.

Such a change often results in ambiguous examples. As demonstrated in Thieroff (1994:11), the following Russian example illustrates a case where the aspectual difference cannot be easily determined:

Russian

(31) Kogda ja prišel v pjad’ čas-ov, dver’ by-l-a
    when I come.PAST prep five hour-gen.pl door cop-PAST-FEM
    zakry-t-a no ja ne zna-ju, kogda on-a
    shut.prf-past.part.pass-fem but I neg know-1sg when pron-fem
    by-l-a zakry-t-a
    cop-PAST-FEM shut.prf-past.part.pass-fem

‘When I came at five, the door was shut, but I don’t know when it was shut.’

This type of ambiguity is a natural result of historical changes, but even the fact that the dynamic reading is possible indicates a sign of historical development, since it was not possible earlier. When the dynamic aspect becomes stabilised in the periphrastic construction, another problem is expected. As argued in Toyota (2003:85–89), the English passive with inherently stative verbs demonstrates a typical syntactic behaviour of the dynamic verbal passive, but the overall interpretation of aspect is still stative. It is highly likely that the East Slavic and some of the West Slavic periphrastic constructions encounter a similar ambiguity.

In order to determine the category passive in Slavic, the development of the past tense is crucial: when the past tense started to be expressed morphologically, the periphrastic construction with the passive participle is given a new function, i.e. the stranded passive participle construction became more attached to the grammatical
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voice, most likely due to its orientation. The loss of a binary counterpart in terms of orientation in East Slavic and some West Slavic languages creates the markedness in terms of the orientation, which is crucial to the passive. This means that the passive construction does not develop on its own, but it is created due to the changes in the tense-aspectual domain and those languages that form the past tense without an auxiliary have the marked passive constructions. What is left from the earlier construction, which has a passive participle with an undergoer-orientation, is given a new function. Therefore, the construction itself has not changed much except for the aspectual coding, but such a change can also be attributed to the reanalysis of other constructions.

Based on Table 2, we compare the use of the auxiliary and the presence or absence of the passive. When the auxiliary is absent, in our view, the construction with the passive participle can be considered to be a passive, as illustrated in Table 3. When the construction is considered to be a passive, the choice of auxiliary is also illustrated. The passive is found in East Slavic and some of West Slavic, but not at all in South Slavic. West Slavic is a mixture of characteristics from East and South Slavic as far as the passive is concerned. Kashubian and both Upper and Lower Sorbian are considered to be at an intermediate stage, which is mainly due to the optionality of the auxiliary 'be'. In addition, Sorbian (both upper and lower) uses 'become' just for the periphrastic construction with the passive participle, and these languages are sensitive to the distinction of stative-dynamic distinction. Since 'become' is not used for the tense-aspectual constructions, it can be considered as a passive, but the presence of the 'auxiliary with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tense-aspect</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Periphrastic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aux. present</td>
<td>Aux. absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashubian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(✓')</td>
<td>‘be’/‘become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’/‘become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusyn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbian (upper)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(✓')</td>
<td>‘be’/‘become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorbian (lower)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(✓')</td>
<td>‘become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovene</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ✓ = characteristic is present; ( ) = characteristic is optional.
active participle’ construction indicates the lesser degree of grammaticalisation than the construction with the passive participle only.

5. Conclusion

We have investigated whether there really exists a passive in the Slavic. Furthermore, we have demonstrated how the historical relationship between the tense-aspect and the passive affects the interpretation of the Slavic passive. We have argued that the periphrastic construction with the passive participle synchronically looks like the grammatical passive, that previous works, in fact, consider it passive in every branch of Slavic languages but that this can be misleading. The Slavic languages have often preserved an earlier periphrastic aspectual/resultative construction. Nonetheless, there have been changes, too. In the modern East Slavic and some of the modern West Slavic, the past tense is formed morphologically based on the earlier periphrastic construction with the active participle. This gave an opportunity for the old periphrastic construction with the passive participle to be reanalysed as the passive. However, this change has not happened in the South Slavic languages. This diversity influences the determination of the category passive in the Slavic languages.

The passive voice, therefore, does exist in the Slavic languages, but only in the East and some of the West Slavic, which express the past tense without auxiliary (cf. Table 3). The South Slavic languages still use the periphrastic construction as a means of expressing the ANTERIOR. Historically, the passive did not exist in the earlier periods in the Indo-European languages. This suggests that the passive is a new category, and it may still be developing further. This is exactly the case in Slavic languages. In order to determine grammatical categories like the passive, it is important to incorporate the historical development of the construction and see the extent to which it has been grammaticalised.

Following from the diachronic relationships found in grammaticalisation, we have demonstrated that the diachronic development of the passive as well as tense-aspect is crucial to the correct analysis of the grammatical voice and tense-aspect in Slavic.

Notes

* We would like to thank Werner Abraham, John Saeed, Larisa Leisiö, Donncha O’Croinin, Brian Nolan, and Maireád Bates for valuable comments and suggestions, which improved the original version of this paper. Any shortcomings are, needless to say, our own. Abbreviations used in this work: act, active; aor, aorist; comp, complementiser; cop, copula; dat, dative; fem, feminine; gen, genitive; impf, imperfect; imrpf, imperfect(ive); instr, instrumental; intr, intransitive; masc, masculine; neg, negative; neut, neuter; nom, nominative; part, participle; pass, passive; past, past; pl, plural; pres, present; prep, preposition; prf, perfect(ive); pron, pronoun; ref, reflexive; sg, singular; tr, transitive; 1, first person; 2, second person; 3, third person.
1. Also historically, Polabian used *vårdot* 'become' as an auxiliary, as shown below, along with *bait* 'be'.

Polabian (Polański 1993: 815)

i. *Vårdol* 
   **baitë** 
   **become.PAST.3SG** **beat.PAST.PART.PASS**

   'He was beaten.'

2. Note the presence of outer cause, in addition to the stativity, makes the passivisation of perception verbs difficult, since the transitivity is not so high in this construction. The perception verbs also often have marked actor markings, such as the use of different cases. This also signals the peculiarities of these verbs.

3. In addition to these examples, some even claim that Polish has the 'have'-perfect. Bubenik (2000: 82) says that "the 'have'-perfect is more or less limited to spoken language and it cannot be formed from all transitive verbs." However, the use of 'have' in Polish is generally not mentioned in the reference grammar (cf. de Bray 1980b; Bielec 1998) and there is no example cited in Bubenik.

4. In Polish, however, the further development can be observed: it uses a former past participle active, like the East Slavic, but it also requires an agreement marker, which is derived from the copula *być* 'be' (de Bray 1980c: 311), e.g. compare -em, -eś, -o in the examples below with the ending of the copula, jest-em 'I am', jest-eś, 'you are (sg)'; jest-o , 'he/she/it is'. Notice that it differs from the original agreement marker in the participle.

Polish (Tommola 2000: 444)

i. a. *Porna-ł-em* 
   **ja** 
   **meet-PAST.1SG** **her**

   'I have met her.'

b. *Odrobi-ł-eś* 
   **już** 
   **lekcje?**

   'Have you done the homework?'

c. *On(-a)* 
   **czyta-ł(-a)** 
   **tę** 
   **książkę**

   **pron.3SG.MASC/FEM** **read-PAST.3SG.MASC-(FEM)** **this book**

   'He/She has read this book.'

The development of *być* 'be' in particular illustrates an important step in the development. By this, we mean that in the East Slavic, the earlier copula became an auxiliary and now it is realised as a part of tense-aspectual affix. Cf. Figure 1.

5. We have not indicated the exact period of change, since it may vary from language to language. Shevelow (1993: 967), on Ukrainian, claims that "it is safe to assume that in the Central Ukrainian area the imperfect was lost at the latest in the twelfth century, the aorist in the fourteenth century and the use of the auxiliary verb in the perfect by the seventeenth century."

6. In South Slavic, however, this form still survives with a different degree of mixture of older and newer forms: in Slovene, for example, the aorist and imperfect forms totally disappeared and the periphrastic construction became the past. Bosnian and Croatian dialects of Serbo-Croatian still preserve the aorist and imperfect form, but they are generally considered literary archaisms, but in Serbian dialect, they are still used, although the periphrastic construction is edging its way (Savić 1991; Lindstedt 2000: 374).
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In this paper, the passive constructions in Nganasan will be discussed from a semantic-functional point of view. Nganasan (also called Tavgi and Tavgi-Samoyed) is one of the Northern Samoyed languages belonging to the Uralic language family. Nganasan is an essentially agglutinative accusative SOV language.

In Nganasan, there is a derivational verbal suffix which turns transitive verbs into passive ones. The structural object of the transitive verb becomes the subject of the corresponding passive construction. The formation of passive verbs is quite productive. The discussion will concentrate on the aspectual and modal properties of the passive verb constructions, the semantics of subjects, and the discourse functions of these constructions.

Along with the passive verbal constructions, there are passive constructions based on participles. An analysis of Nganasan participial passive constructions will be provided and the criteria for the use of a particular participle will be discussed. In the conclusion, the main function of the Nganasan passive will be formulated.

An analysis of syntactic and discourse functions of Nganasan passive verb constructions and the criteria of the participle choice in the participial passive constructions constitute a new input in the research of Nganasan syntax.

1. Introduction

1.1 Preliminaries

In the accusative languages, the passive voice is a mechanism that denies the actor the subject role. The personal passive selects an undergoer as a subject. The impersonal passive denies both the actor and the undergoer the subject role: both are either syntactically unexpressed or their integration in syntax is marginal1 (Shibatani 1988:3).

Among the Uralic languages,2 all Baltic Finnic languages have an impersonal passive. In Mari and Hungarian, personal passives are obsolete. Personal passive is reported to be frequent only in the Ob-Ugric languages (Khanty and Mansi) (Comrie 1988:468). It is also found in the Northern Samoyed languages: Nenets, Enets and Nganasan have a derivational verbal suffix that serves to derive a passive verb from
transitive bases. The treatment of a derivational suffix as a means of the expression of voice may be ambiguous: the derived passive verb is a new lexeme that usually develops other meanings in addition to being a passive version of the active verb. The derivational passive in the Northern Samoyed languages can be considered a passive voice, since this derivational model is productive and the resulting formation systematically takes a passive meaning. The following discussion aims to demonstrate this for Nganasan.

The Nganasan participial passive constructions are based on two types of participles. These are participles with the morphological passive marker and participles without such a marker. Such participles, referred to as relative (Lehmann 1984:49–58), or unoriented (Haskelmath 1994; Lehmann 1984:152), can be found in many languages, which differ genetically and typologically. Among Uralic languages, unoriented participles are known in Samoyed (Northern Samoyed: Nenets, Enets and Nganasan, as well as Selkup) and Ob-Ugrian languages (Khanty and Mansi). Additionally, Permic languages (Udmurt and Komi), Hungarian, and the Kildin dialect of Eastern Saami have an unoriented past participle.4

1.2 Nganasan in a social and historical context

Nganasan is a dying language, which still exists in an oral form, progressively losing its speakers. The ethnic territory of the Nganasans used to be the central and northern interior of the Taimyr Peninsula, in North-Eastern Siberia, to the North-East from the lower basin of the River Yenisei. Nganasans are the northernmost population in Eurasia. Traditionally, they were nomads living in the tundra: they used to fish, hunt and breed domestic reindeer. Since the beginning of the 1960s, the Nganasans have been living in three villages to the south of their traditional territory. Nowadays, there are 800 individuals who identify themselves as Nganasans, of whom the number of native speakers hardly exceeds 200.5 All the speakers of Nganasan also speak Russian. As a rule, young parents speak Russian to their children, and the youngest age of fluent speakers can be approximated between 45 and 55. As a result, children do not speak Nganasan.

1.3 The preceding research on the Nganasan passive

Terešćenko (1979:232–234) was the first researcher to point out the morphological passive voice in Nganasan, but she only recognised this category in connection with participial predication (Terešćenko 1979:264–265, 270–271). Although she presented examples with the passive verb as passive constructions (Terešćenko 1979:83, 229, 230, 234), she did not identify the passive morphological marker of the verb. This marker was identified by Helimski (1998:510) in his concise description of Nganasan. Helimski also insightfully explained the implementation of the passive verb in discourse (see below).
2. Description of the passive constructions in Nganasan

Nganasan is an essentially agglutinative SOV language with a rich morphology and numerous morphophonological rules (see Helimski 1998).

In Nganasan, there are two morphologically marked passives: a passive verb derived from transitive bases with the derivational passive marker –RU, and a passive participle with the formative marker –M₆₆. The passive verbs and passive participles can be formed only from transitive bases. In an active transitive sentence, an actor is a syntactic subject and an undergoer is an accusative or dative object. In a sentence predicated by the corresponding passive verb, the undergoer becomes the syntactic subject, and it triggers verb agreement in person and number, while the actor can be expressed in the lative case.

The passive participle can modify undergoer-headed NPs and predicate a sentence with an undergoer as a subject. Of the other Nganasan participles, those with transitive bases can be used as both passives and actives. Thus, while passive verbs and passive participles are inherently oriented toward the undergoer, i.e., choose the latter as a pivot, non-passive participles with transitive bases are contextually oriented: in principle, they can head syntactic constructions with either the actor or undergoer as a pivot.

In Table 1, morphological and syntactic characteristics of the Nganasan passive constructions are summarized.

In column 1 of Table 1 above, the verbal element of the passive construction is indicated. Column 2 accounts for the presence / absence of the morphological passive marker in the verbal element. As mentioned above, there are only two passive markers in Nganasan. There are also participles formed from passive verbs: they are not specially indicated in the table.

With the exception of the passive participle, the other participles are formally active, but those of them that are formed from transitive bases can also express a passive meaning. Their use is considered below (Section 2.2.1). The abessive participle in-

Table 1. Passive construction types in Nganasan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. VERBAL ELEMENT</th>
<th>2. PASSIVE MARKER</th>
<th>3. SYNTACTIC FUNCTION</th>
<th>4. UNDERGOER</th>
<th>5. ACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finite verb</td>
<td>–RU-</td>
<td>predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive participle</td>
<td>–M₆₆-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abessive participle</td>
<td>–M₆₆-tuma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present participle</td>
<td>–N₆₆-</td>
<td>modifier, predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past – su₆₆-</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessitative, or future participle – sut₆₆</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dicates an action/activity that has not (yet) taken place. The necessitative participle points at an action/activity that is to take place in the future. The past marker ɗ, shown in the past participle, can also be added to abessive, necessitative and passive participles, so that the meaning of the resulting formation shifts to the past. For instance, the participle combined with the marker ?sut ɗ (the necessitative and past markers) indicates a situation that was supposed to occur but failed.

Participles function as modifiers in NPs and as predicates in the main and relative clause. An auxiliary, a form of the verb ‘be’, is only used in forms other than the present indicative.

The semantics of arguments of passive constructions is captured in terms of the macroroles of actor and undergoer. Column 4 shows that there is only personal passive in Nganasan. A modifying participle agrees with the first argument in number, and a predicate agrees with the first argument in person and number.

In column 5, the form of the expression of initiative, or volitional, actor is indicated. The form is enclosed in parentheses – this means that the expression of an actor is optional. The initiative actor differs from the instrument and source. The instrument in Nganasan is expressed in the locative and elative case. The expression of these two semantic roles is the same in both passive and non-passive constructions.

In the following section, constructions predicated by forms of the passive verb are discussed.

### 2.1 Passive verb

The aim of the present section is to discuss semantic roles of the grammatical subject of the passive constructions and to analyse the use of the passive verb in the discourse.

Passive verbs are productively derived from transitive bases, both perfective and imperfective ones (Helimski 1998:510). The actor is optionally expressed in the locative case. The personal forms of the verb are reflexively or subjectively conjugated.

The passive verb has a full verb paradigm and is the base of converbs and verbal nominal forms, in particular, all the participles except a passive one. The marker of passive verb can be followed by aspectual and modal markers.

Example (1) illustrates the evidential mood, and Example (2) illustrates the habitual aspect.

   dream-LOC-PX1 take-pass-EVID-REFL wolf-LAT
   ‘In my dream, I happened to be taken by the wolf.’ (Tereščenko 1979:229)

2. nų-ʔ luuʔ taaʔ kuhu-gitə sot’uʂə-ru-mumba-tandɔʔ.
   Nganasan-PL cloth-PL reindeer-PL fur-PL.ABL sew-PASS-HABIT-3PL.REFL
   ‘Nganasan clothes are usually made of reindeer fur.’ (Tereščenko 1979:234)

From an aspectual viewpoint, the evidential of the passive verb is typically resultative, indicating an event inferred by the speaker on the basis of its observable consequences.
A combination of the evidential and the resultative meaning is attested in many languages of the world (Bybee et al. 1994:95–96).

In (1), the actor is focal and it is expressed in the lative case. The lexical expression of the grammatical subject is ellipted, as is usual for the 1st and 2nd person. In (2), the actor is unspecified. The semantic roles of the undergoer are the theme (1) or the effected patient (2).12

The grammatical subject of the passive verb can also be a recipient. The verb munud (ipfv) ‘speak’ governs the dative of the recipient NP.13 In narratives, a non-first turn in a dialogue is usually introduced with a passive verb: munu-ru-sa ‘speak-pass’ (< munud ‘speak’):

(3) «——» (a direct speech by character A)
Response of character B:
toni muna-ru-sa B: «——»
this say-pass-INF B: «——»
‘Having been said this B: «——» (a direct speech by character B)’

The main predicate, the verb ‘say’, is often lacking, being represented by the following direct speech. As in (3), the infinitive clause has the same subject as the main clause.

According to Helimski (1998:510), “the high textual frequency of passive forms and constructions in Nganasan is determined by the stylistic rule which seeks to preserve the same grammatical subject in a sequence of sentences that form a discourse.” In accord with a tendency attested in many languages, the subject in Nganasan normally encodes the topic, always, if possible, referring to the most topic-persistent participant. A consequence of this subject-topic identification is an extensive pro-drop phenomenon: the subject can control zero-anaphora far ahead from the sentence in which it has been referred to by a full NP. Thus, the passive-verb construction is typically used if the undergoer is topical. When expressed in the passive construction, the agent is often focal. In the following example, both zero-anaphora and a focal agent can be found as triggers of the passive.

Example (4) is an extract from a story (in Nganasan, d‘ürïmï) about an orphan girl. The passage reproduced below contains sentences 1–8 of the story. The passive predicates are presented in bold face. The translation attempts to closely follow the original. In the translation, the ellipted subjects are indicated in square brackets. Only the passive sentences are glossed:

(4) a. kançægq a důbaru nì n‘u a n‘ilid‘i ñabu.
   kançægq důbaru mì n‘u a n‘ilid‘i ñabu.
   [kançægq důbaru nì n‘u a n‘ilid‘i ñabu]

   aLL-lat.pl offend-pass-PST3REFL
   [sibai-ru-důüdd]

   c. ñuði, ñanasq n‘en‘e ñuði ñuði, ñuði.
   [ñuði ñanasq n‘en‘e ñuði ñuði, ñuði]

d. nì n‘u a n‘onwaatu ma‘adet‘i? kou‘a.
   [nì n‘u a n‘onwaatu ma‘adet‘i? kou‘a]

     hut.former-lat.pl leave-pass-INF longadv CRY-PST3

  f. tazyu nìidiisi konata‘u.

  g. hiræq‘aku nì konde‘a di‘iñ‘iq‘u.
‘(a) Once an orphan girl lived, as it is told. (b) [The girl] was offended by everyone. (c) Once the people went to a new place. (d) The girl alone remained at the place of the former camp. (e) Having been left at the place of the former camp, [she] cried for a long time. (f) After that [the girl] started going. (g) [The girl] climbed upon the hill. (h) There she was seen by the Master of the earth.’

The subject of sentence (4a) controls zero-anaphora in sentence (4b). The predicate of sentence (4b) is the passive verb with the imperfective base. The agent in the lative is the universal quantifier ‘all’, and its expression serves to emphasise the overwhelming effect of the situation of ‘offending’. The subject reference is changed in sentence (4c). In sentence (4d) the subject of sentences (4a)–(4b) is reintroduced and referred to by a noun. This subject controls zero-anaphora of sentences (4e)–(4g) and the personal pronoun in sentence (4h). In sentence (4d), the predicate is the intransitive non-passive verb kou³ (remain-3Sg). The transitive version of this verb, ‘leave’, is the base for the passive infinitive in sentence (4e). The subject of the passive infinitive clause is co-referential with the subject (zero-anaphora) of the main sentence. Thus, in (4d) the main character performs an intransitive action, but the same situation is referred to by the passive infinitive clause in sentence (4e). Through this passivization, the storyteller emphasizes the absence of volitional acting on behalf of the main character, the girl, who does not control her life but experiences the consequences of the unfair treatment by the people. The passive infinitive clause in sentence (4e) latently refers to the subject of sentence (4c) as its agent. In sentence (4h), in which the passive subject is indicated by a personal pronoun, the actor, ‘Master of the earth’, is introduced as a focal element, to overtake the status of the main agent in the story. This focal position signals that the main character of the story, the girl, is removed from the sphere of influence of the previous agent to that of a new one. The subject position is associated with the topic and, thus, is dispreferred for the focal participant, which is expressed by the lative case.

Let us analyze the functional parts of this narrative (following Labov 1972:370). The orientation consists of sentences (4a) and (4b). The complicating action (the plot of the story) starts in sentence (4c). This movement is corroborated by the change of the subject reference. The next phase of the plot is prospected in sentence (4h), in which the topical subject reference is retained, and a new character is introduced as the agent in the lative. Looking again at the preceding part of the story through the prism of the functional partition, we find that the passive sentence (4b) and the passive infinitive clause in sentence (4e) belong to the internal evaluation of the story, in which the emotional attitude of the storyteller is interspersed within narrating. The evaluation is provided through the passive verbal constructions – the situations underlined in these constructions reveal that the orphan girl is a victim in the hands of the unjust people, who treated her unfairly. In this story, the main character is an undergoer, who is affected by the two volitional actors. In the passive construction in sentence (4h), a
new actor is introduced to replace the previous one. A typical grammatical expression of the main character is the subject of a passive or inactive intransitive clause while the volitional actors, if focused, are expressed in the lative.

Thus, the passive verb is the first choice in a situation in which the topical referent is affected. Two operations trigger the passive construction: topicalizing the undergoer and focusing the actor. The subject of the passive verb construction has the same referent as the accusative object and sometimes the dative object of the corresponding active construction.

2.2 Participial passive constructions

Since the following discussion will mainly concentrate on non-final participial constructions, it is important to introduce the difference between a modifier and a relative clause.

Typologists (e.g., Keenan 1985; Givón 2001:190–191) distinguish pre-nominal and post-nominal relative clauses. Thus, in the Finnish Example (5), *pöydällä tanssinut* is considered to be a pre-nominal relative clause (Keenan 1985:144):

(5) Pöydällä tanssinut poika oli sairas.

on.table having.danced boy was sick

'The boy who danced on the table was sick.'

(Keenan 1985:144, glossing of the original)

In Finnish linguistics, a relative clause is considered an attributive finite clause that follows the head (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1977:125–126). According to this view, in (6), a paraphrase of (5), *joka tanssi pöydällä* is a relative clause, while the past participle *tanssinut* in (5) is a modifier:

(6) Poika, joka tanssi pöydällä, oli sairas.

boy which danced table-ASP was sick

'The boy who danced on the table was sick.'

Thus, the typologists' starting point for a definition of the relative clause is functional-semantic, while the researchers of a particular language prefer to take into consideration the morphosyntactic features. Following the latter approach, which is also common in the research of the Uralic languages, I will treat pre-nominal participles as modifiers.

The discussion will proceed as follows. First, the unoriented participles in the passive use will be considered. After that, the use of the passive participial constructions will be overviewed. This will be followed by a discussion of the distribution of the participles in participial passive constructions. Finally, the participial constructions located post-nominally will be addressed.
2.2.1 Unoriented participles in passive constructions

Those Nganasan participles which have no morphological markers of the passive and which can be oriented either toward the verb’s actor or toward the verb’s undergoer are considered unoriented. In the following, the passive use of unoriented participles will be discussed, in particular concerning the syntactic functions of actor and undergoer.

The abessive, past, present, and necessitative participles are regularly formed of any derived or non-derived Nganasan verb. There are no aspect- or transitivity-related restrictions on their formation. Consequently, in each group of participles, there are perfective and imperfective ones. For instance, the present participles with perfective bases indicate an action which has just occurred, while present participles derived from imperfective bases indicate an activity under way.

The non-passive participles with transitive bases may be both undergoer- and actor-oriented. The orientation of a participle becomes clear from the context. Sometimes there are morphosyntactic indices of the orientation. The unmarked position of a modifying participle is before the head. In the passive use of a participle, the agent in the genitive can precede the participle. However, many Nganasan nouns have the same form for the nominative, genitive, and accusative. That is why the accusative of the object can formally be the same as the genitive of the agent. Consider the following example, with active use of an unoriented participle:

(7) tåra sad'eo t'eni-ntio sademëi nojabori.
    summer way[ACC] know-ptPres seventh November
    ‘the seventh of November that knows the summer way’
(Kosterkina & Helimskij 1994:94, lines 735 and 736)

The noun phrase sademëi nojabori (vernacularized Russian sed'moe nojabrja) is the head of the present participle t'enintio ‘knowing’, ‘being known’. The noun sad'eo has the same form in the nominative, accusative, and the genitive. Thus, formally the expression can also mean ‘The seventh of November, known by the summer way’. Nevertheless, as has become clear from a broader context, the speaker meant that on the seventh of November, he would better see the following summer than at the moment of speech, which was in August. Metaphorically, the seventh of November will know the next summer better than the present moment does.

In the following example, the same participle is used as passive.

(8) t'eni-ntio-nto yuwi tande siúdá-mi-ndo kmiats-bahu-ra.
    know-ptPres-accPxt job[ACC] kin-gen end-vn-lat keep-rpt-2>sg
    ‘They say that you will keep up the job that you know to the end of the mankind.’
(Kosterkina & Helimskij 1994:70, line 448)

In (8), the present participle used in the passive use joins the possessive suffix that refers to the actor. The possessive suffix added to the participle can be considered as a sign of the passive use of this participle.

Nevertheless, a possessive suffix can also be added to an active participle, the latter being substantivized. In this case the suffix points to the possessor. For instance,
present participles are often substantivized as a name of profession, e.g., basütəa 'hunter' lit. 'the one who hunts'. Occasional substantivization can also take place:

(9) d'ügu-tua-mu  ndi-ʔa-ra.  
  lose-one's-way-PtPres-Px1Pl  find-prf-2SG  
  'You have found that of ours who has lost his way.' (Terešćenko 1979:263)

In (9), the participle is substantivized in active use. The possessive suffix of the active intransitive participle refers to the possessor and not to the actor.

In (10), the past participle in passive use is occasionally substantivized:

(10) mito-d'iadiŋ-i mə-li-ŋa  baarbą  n'ëmi-ntə.  
  give-PtPst-Px3  take-pass-prf3  host(gen)  woman-lat  
  'The one given by him was taken by the wife of the host.' (Terešćenko 1979:106)

The 3rd person singular, referred to by the possessive suffix of the participle, is an agent of the action 'give'. The predicate of the main clause, 'was taken', is expressed by the perfect form of the passive perfective verb. The situation indicated by the participle, 'given', precedes the situation of the main clause. The past form of the participle is a response to the tense-sequence requirement.

In (11), the past participle in passive use heads the clause. The actor and the possessor of the subject are not co-referential:

(11) n'ësbtti  taa-mə  d'edi-nə  huturų-suad'io.  
  front  reindeer-Px1  father-gen-Px1  harness-PtPst  
  'The front reindeer of mine is harnessed by my father.' (Terešćenko 1979:269)

In contrast to the 1st and 2nd person, the 3rd person of the predicate is not marked with a special personal suffix.

In (12), the necessitative participle in passive use indicates the presumable nature of the indicated situation:

(12) nīli-ti  d'ali-θi-mə  Koturə,  Sīrə  nöt'i-śutə-roku.  
  live-PtPres  day-dest-Px1  K.[GEN]  S.[GEN]  let-PtFut-Pcl('like')  
  lit: Living day for me looks like to be given by K. and S.  
  'It seems that K. and S. (the Nganasan Gods) would give me days of life.'  
  (Kosterkina & Helimskij 1994:66, line 402)

The participle functions as a predicate, while the patient, the destinative form of the noun 'day for me', is a subject. The agents are personal nouns Koturə and Sīrə, which have the same forms in the nominative and in the genitive.

The abessive participle in passive use can be a negation of both passive and unoriented participle. In (13), an abessive participle and a passive participle head two coordinative semantically contrastive clauses. In (14), the same abessive participle takes a possessive suffix pointing to the agent.
In (13), the participle is a predicate, whereas in (14) it is a modifier. Thus, unoriented participles used as a modifier can join a personal suffix. This suffix is an index of the passive use of the participle: it points to the actor of the situation in which the noun modified by the participle is an undergoer.

### 2.2.2 Passive-participle constructions

According to Tereščenko (1979:270–271), the passive participle in *-m₃* indicates a state of the undergoer as a result of the preceding action. The definition is close to that of resultative, which expresses a state that presupposes a previous event (cf. Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1983:7). An analysis of the passive participles in spontaneous discourse shows that the passive participles are used to indicate essential and permanent characteristics of the subject. The following example is taken from my fieldwork notes of 2004:

(15) taa *b'aj-tam* boms sot‘e-m₃o i-s‘üa. tətii3 sot‘ür-a-tii seam-pl-sew-pst-pl these seam-pl-Px2 *d‘iis‘o-m₃o*-i s‘üa. paint-PtPass-pl be-fut3-pl ‘All (shroud) is sewed with the hair of reindeer. These seams are painted.’ (Leisiö 2003–2004: fieldwork)

### 2.2.3 The distribution of participles in passive constructions

Based on my analysis of naturally occurring texts, I suggest that the passive constructions based on unoriented participles include the expression of an actor, while the passive participle and participle derived from the passive verb are used if the actor is not expressed. This hypothesis was checked during my fieldwork in 2003–2004.

(16) *tsu-ůńd’o*-řa taa-du n‘aagö. bring-PtPst-Px2 reindeer-Px3 good ‘His reindeer that is brought by you is good.’

(17) *tsu*-m₃o taa-du n‘aagö. bring-PtPass reindeer-Px3 good ‘A brought reindeer of his is good.’ (Leisiö 2003–2004: fieldwork)
In Example (16), the actor of the situation indicated in NP 'brought-your reindeer-his' is the 2nd person singular. It is referred to by the possessive suffix on the modifying unoriented past participle. The actor differs from the possessor of the head nominal, which is the 3rd person singular. In the similar NP of Example (17), the actor is unspecified. The modifier is in the form of the passive participle. The comparison of Examples (16) and (17) shows that the unoriented participle makes the reference to an actor, whereas the use of a passive participle is a corollary of an unspecified actor.

Deviations from this tendency were also found, although not in natural discourse but as examples provided by other researchers. In the following, the passive participle is used along with the agent expressed in the lative.

\[ (18) \]
\[
\text{b'ojka'a koni-di}\text{n'ia-ri} \ h\text{utura-maa}\text{-}\text{taa-gito.}
\]
old.man go-PST3 child-LATPl. harness-PTPASS-PL reindeer-ABLPL.

'The old man stepped away from the reindeers harnessed by the children.'
(Kovalenko 1992:60)

In (18), the agent is not focal, as far as it is possible to judge on the base of a single sentence.

In the passive NP constructions in Examples (19)–(21), the actor is unspecified. The modifier is expressed by the passive participle in Example (20) and the participle based on a passive verb in Examples (19) and (21). The base is the imperfective verb \textit{honsi} 'wear, possess'. In (19), the present participle of the passive verb \textit{honcjlisi} 'be under possession, be under wear' indicates an on-going or habitual situation – '[a cloth that is] being worn', '[a cloth that is] usually on'. The passive participle in (20) indicates an action that has been performed at least once: '[a cloth that] has been put on'. Thus, the situation in (20) is resultative. The past participle of Example (21) can indicate the same perfective action as in (20) or the imperfective situation that took place at some period of time in the past, 'that has been worn':

\[ (19) \]
\[
h\text{onj-lj-ti}\text{o lau heku-ti.}
\]
wear-PASS-PPTPres cloth be.hot-PRES3

'The cloth that is being worn [the cloth that one wears] is hot.'

\[ (20) \]
\[
h\text{onj-mao lau ni' s'ero?}
\]
wear-PTPASS cloth neg-IMP2 PULON-CONNNEG

'Do not put on the cloth that has been worn.'

\[ (21) \]
\[
h\text{onj-lj-si}\text{ndao lau ni' s'ero?}
\]
wear-PASS-PPTPast cloth neg-IMP2 put.on-CONNNEG

'Do not put on the cloth that has been worn/that was worn.'
(Leisiö 2003–2004: fieldwork)

Thus, if an actor is lacking, the passive participle is chosen to depict a resultative situation. The other tense-aspect characteristics can also be expressed by the participle based on the passive verb. On the other hand, in Examples (19)–(21), the participles are close to adjectives by their function, and their original verbal characteristics do not matter in these particular situations.
Predicating the main clause, the participle takes a person marker pointing to the subject if the latter is the 1st or 2nd person; the third person is unmarked. Example (22) contains an (unoriented) participle that takes the suffix of the 1st person singular, while the actor is expressed by the noun in the genitive. The personal suffix of the participle refers to the subject. The participle with the passive base along with the actor in the lative is judged by the informant as an equal or even a slightly preferable alternative, see Example (23). The passive participial construction provides a possibility to focus the actor – the lative is apparently a more prominent expression for the focal actor than the genitive used in the construction predicated by the unoriented participle. Note that in Examples (22) and (23), the 1st person singular personal pronoun is treated by the informant as a possessive form ('my') and not as a subject ('I') – there are no formal means which could differentiate these two forms. If the 3rd person of the subject and actor coincide, the use of the possessive suffix referring to the actor is possible, see Example (24), in which the predicate is an unoriented past participle.

(22) mnu n’emi-no ćenimti-siod’o-m. 
   pn1 mother-genPx1 know-ptPst-1
   ‘I am taught by my mother.’

(23) mnu n’emi-nta-no ćenimti-ri-siod’o-m. 
   pn1 mother-lat-Px1 know-pass-ptPst-1
   ‘I am taught by my mother.’ or: ‘It is my mother that I am taught by.’

(24) sìtobi imidi-no d’ébni-duad’o-ði. 
   Fairy.tale grand.mother-genPx1 tell-ptPst-Px3
   ‘The fairy tale is told by my grandmother.’ (Leisiö 2003–2004: fieldwork)

2.2.4 Post-nominal participle
Previously we considered the cases in which the modifying participle precedes the head nominal. This section is concerned with the opposite word order. In (25), the same possessive suffix is on the passive participle and on its head, and both suffixes refer to the possessor.

(25) d’udi-ntu matsu-maça-mtu sarai-∫i tug-tomu. 
   hand-ACC Px3 cut-PASS.ACC Px3 bind-PRT3 cloth-LOC
   ‘She has bound her cut hand with the cloth.’ (Tereščenko 1979: 264)

By its properties as a modifier, the post-nominal participle is prominently restrictive. The difference between pre-nominal and post-nominal position can also be accounted for in the same way as Rothstein (1985) accounts for the difference between secondary predication (She eats meat raw) and modification (She eats raw meat), – in terms of non-logical relation: post-nominal position implies a weak causative relationship between the state of the hand (injured) and it being bound, while the pre-nominal position would not imply such a relation. Tereščenko (1979: 264) also underlines this explanation, by saying that the post-head position makes the verbal properties of the participle more sound.
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In Example (25), the possessive suffix of the head is repeated on the following modifier to strengthen the agreement within the NP as a compensation for the reversed word order.

In Example (26), the post-nominal necessitative participle forms a purpose construction ‘[the shrubs] for lighting’:

\[(26)\] l\'and\'\(\dot{a}\)-pl hual\'-sii\(\dot{u}\)-n\(\dot{u}\)-bik\(\dot{a}\)-m\(\dot{a}\)-nu i-t\(\dot{u}\)-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{a}\).

shrub-pl light-PUR-PX1PL RIVER.GEN near-PRO be-PRES-3PL

‘The shrubs that I will set fire with grow along the river bank.’ (Kovalenko 1992:58)

In (26), the possessive suffix on the participle refers to the agent and indicates the plural of the patient NP, the head of the participle.

In Example (27), the actor is indicated on the unoriented present participle sîn-erïbtïtï-tï. The possessor of the pivot ‘three jobs’ is the 2nd person singular, and this possessor coincides with the actor:

\[(27)\] nag\(\dot{u}\)-\(\hat{u}\)-n\(\hat{u}\)-\(\ddot{a}\) t\(\ddot{a}\)-hual\(\dot{u}\)-hu sînerïbtï-tï-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(r\)-\(\ddot{a}\).

three work-PX2 be-BPT3 think-PTR-PRES-PX2

‘They say that there are three jobs of yours which you are thinking about.’

(Kosterkina & Helimskij 1994:45, lines 171–172)

Post-nominal participles should be considered the predicate of a restrictive relative clause, which can also implicate a weak causation, as in (25), or a purpose, as in (26) and (27).

3. Conclusion

The characteristics of the English passive assigned by Foley and Van Valin (1984:110–111) hold true for the Nganasan passive, too: Its function is to allow the undergoer to occur as a subject, or to put it better, as a syntactic pivot. Syntactic implementations of pivots are subjects, the head of an NP with a participial modifier, and the head of a relative clause, which is omitted in this clause. The demoting of the actor follows as a result of the main operation of promotion of the undergoer. Thus, the Nganasan passive construction is always personal: it always has a syntactic pivot, although the latter does not necessarily have a lexical representation in the same sentence. The actor may be either non-specified, or specified and omitted, or explicit – expressed by the lative in morphologically marked passive constructions and by the genitive or/and a possessive suffix in unoriented-participle constructions.

Nganasan has a derivational passive suffix. The treatment of derivational means of voice causes problems if the derivates diverge in their meaning. Nevertheless, this problem does not arise in Nganasan: The verbs formed with suffix –RU from transitive bases are used in passive constructions. The passive derivation is regular. The high frequency of passive verbs in the texts helps to maintain topic continuity. Nganasan is a subject-prominent language: the subject is usually the most topical item in a sentence,
and the same subject tends to be retained in a sentence chain that forms a unit of a narrative. The semantic role of the subject in this chain can vary between the actor and undergoer.

Participial passive constructions can be based on a passive participle, a participle formed of the passive verb, and an unoriented participle as a predicating or modifying element. The voice interpretation of unoriented participles depends on the context. The passive use of unoriented participles is unrestricted: any two-place participle can be used actively as well as passively.

Unoriented participles usually occur in passive constructions with an explicit actor. The actor is typically referred to by the possessive suffix added to the participle or/and by the noun in the genitive. The passive participles and the participles of the passive verb are usually used if the actor is not specified, or if it is focal, in which case it is expressed in the lative.

While the unoriented participles and participles of passive verbs retain the aspect characteristics of their base verbs, the passive participles in Nganasan have a resultative meaning. Consequently, the pivot of the passive participle is typically a true patient – it is affected or effected in the result of the action. This participle has more nouny and fewer verbal characteristics than other participles.15 In particular, it is more time-stable, and it cannot bear a reference to the actor (cf. the possessive suffix in Example (25)).

The passive participle construction is close to the prototypical passive in the sense that its pivot is a patient and the agent is usually omitted.16 The unoriented participle passive constructions come close to the ergative prototype, sharing with the latter two features. First, they are morphologically unmarked: the morphological complexity of unoriented participles does not exceed that of the participles in active use. Second, the agent reference is integrated into the syntax of the clause, being expressed by a possessive suffix on the participle or/and the genitive. An important characteristic is the unmarkedness of the participle concerning voice. In some Turkic and other Uralic languages, there are participles with a passive meaning that take suffixes referring to the agent. In particular, they are observed in Turkish and in Finnish. But in both these languages the corresponding participles also have the passive markers.

Conventions

*Italics* is used for non-English strings and for emphasis. Nganasan phonemes are indicated in *small caps*, and their phonetic representation is shown in small letters. In the examples, the passive verbs as well as passive and unoriented participles are in bold.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 1st, 2nd, 3rd person

2>sg objective conjugation: 2nd person singular of the subject, singular of the object
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ABL ablative
ACC accusative
ADE adessive
CONNNEG connegative
DAT dative
DEST destinative form (of nouns)
EVID evidential
FUT future
GEN genitive
IMP imperative
INF infinitive
IPFV imperfective (a lexical characteristic of the Nganasan verb)
LAT lative
OBJ object conjugation
PASS passive
PRF perfect (in perfective verbs only)
PL plural
PFV perfective
PCL particle
PRES present
PRO prolative
PN personal pronoun
PST past
PTAbess abessive participle
PTFUT necessitative (future) participle
PTPass passive participle
PTPres present participle
PTPst past participle
PX possessive suffix
REFL reflexive conjugation
RPT reported mood
VN verbal noun

Singular and nominative forms, as well as subjective conjugations are not indicated. The only exception is made for the objective conjugation, in which the number of a singular object is shown. Non-overt elements are enclosed in square brackets. Independently of the source, the transliteration of Nganasan is unified in consistency with Helimskij (1998) and Kosterkina et al. (2001). In examples from Kosterkina and Helimskij (1994), the glossing is mainly consistent with the terminological apparatus used in the present paper. In the examples from other sources, the glossing is mine.
Notes

* I am grateful to Werner Abraham, Martin Haspelmath, and Irina Nikolaeva for their valuable comments and repair suggestions. This research is made within a study of Nganasan syntax (project No 103372 financed by the Academy of Finland).

1. The semantic account in the terms of macroroles of actor and undergoer follows Foley and Van Valin (1984: 27, 29). The macrorole of undergoer “expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate or control any situation but rather is affected by it in some way.” On the contrary, the actor is the “argument of a predicate which expresses the participant which performs, effects, instigates or controls the situation denoted by the predicate” (Foley & Van Valin 1984: 29).

2. The Uralic language family comprises Baltic Finnic languages (Finnish, Estonian, Karelian, and etc.), Volga Finnic languages (Mari and Mordva), Permic languages (Komi and Udmurt), Ugrian languages (Hungarian and Ob-Ugrian: Mansi and Khanty), as well as the Samoyed language branch, which includes Northern Samoyed (Nenets, Enets, and Nganasan), Selkup and (extincted) Southern Samoyed languages. All Uralic languages are essentially accusative languages.

3. Adjectival modifiers are oriented toward their head, and finite verbs can be said to be oriented toward their subject. Adopting the notion of orientation from Lehmann (1984:152), Haspelmath (1994: 153–154, 174 En. 6) indicates, that there are inherently oriented participles and contextually oriented ones. Haspelmath (1994: 154, 165–66) presents examples from Lezgian, which participle can be oriented toward any of the verb's participants. In some Uralic languages and in Nganasan in particular, the orientation of the relevant participles can change between the undergoer and the actor. The latter are called relative participles (Lehmann 1984:49–58) and sometimes also unoriented participles (Haspelmath 1994:169). In the present paper, the term unoriented participles will be used.


5. The number of the Nganasans is reported according to Census 1.01.2002. The evaluative number of the Nganasan speakers is based on my own fieldwork experience.

6. The concept of pivot is due to Foley and Van Valin (1984:110–148, passim). “The pivot of a syntactic construction is the NP around which construction is built” (Foley & Van Valin 1984:110). I prefer pivot to subject, because the pivot can be associated with other syntactic roles.

7. Most of the Nganasan morphological markers undergo morphophonemic alternations depending on their position in the word and phonemic environment. Basic morphemes are indicated in small caps while their realisation in the word (an allomorph) stays in small letters. The Nganasan strings are presented in phonemic transcription. The symbol ʌ stands for the mid-low non-front unround vowel and symbol ʔ stands for the glottal stop. The abbreviation lar indicates the lative case used, e.g., as a form of the spatial adverbial with the meaning ‘into something’.

8. According to Tereščenko (1979:230), there are personless sentences with a passive verb as a predicate. Nevertheless, the example sentences (ibid.) are not personless, – the verb always shows the number and person agreement with the semantic object, although the latter is placed finally in the sentence. The reason for this deviation from the unmarked SOV word order is difficult to understand, since all the examples are given without a context.
9. There are three conjugation types in Nganasan. Transitive verbs can conjugate objectively and subjectively. The intransitive and passive verbs can conjugate subjectively or reflexively. Objective conjugation includes the reference to the number of an object. Reflexive conjugation indicates that the object is impossible.

10. Helimski (1998:503) calls the mode produced with this suffix 'inferential'.

11. See the list of abbreviations in the end of the paper.

12. The characteristics of "affected" usually include "changed", whereas "effected" means "created".

13. The status of the dative marker is between a case marker and a postposition. The latter point of view is based, for instance, on the fact that this marker is added to the genitive form in an appropriate number – Nganasan postpositions take the genitive. Further, the possessive suffixes are added to the nominal and not to the dative marker, while the other case markers are followed by possessive suffixes.

14. The category of aspect is lexical, i.e. transitive or intransitive aspect can be recognized in the infinitives of most Nganasan verbs.

15. A noun-verb cline is discussed in Haspelmath (1994:171) and Ross (1972).

16. I refer to the prototypical features in accord with the discussion of criteria for distinguishing between the passive and ergative in Comrie (1988:9–23).

References


PART I

Functional Approaches

C. Actor demotion
‘Agent defocusing’ revisited
Passive and impersonal constructions in some
European languages

Andrea Sansò
Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università di Pavia

This article presents some descriptive generalisations about the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions in five European languages (Italian, Spanish, Polish, Danish, and Modern Greek). The constructions analysed include (but are not limited to) passive/impersonal constructions in which a reflexive marker is used (Italian, Spanish, and Polish), or in which there is a bound morpheme historically connected to the reflexive pronoun (Danish); so-called impersonal passives, i.e. constructions in which there is an unequivocal formal relationship of the predicate with passive morphology, but either there is no patient, or the patient is marked in the same way in which it is marked in the active sentence (e.g., the -no/-to construction in Polish, the impersonal passive in Danish); man-clauses, i.e. impersonal active clauses having some general noun (“man”, “people”, etc.) as subject (Danish). The corpus consists of Umberto Eco’s novel Il nome della rosa, and its Danish, Modern Greek, Polish, and Spanish translations.

Much in the spirit of Myhill (1997), it is argued that the distribution of these constructions in texts is sensitive to the distinction between different types of agent defocusing: there are some discourse conditions under which a given construction is preferred to others, and this can only be captured through a careful inspection of texts. Three basic situation types are identified which are systematically associated with certain modes of expression in each of the five languages of the sample: these are configurations of prototypical semantic features and discourse conditions concerning the agent, the patient (if present), and the nature of the event. The statistical significance of the correlation between situation types and construction types is carefully evaluated, and the results are encouraging: in each of the languages of the sample there is a consistent division of labour among passive and impersonal constructions. This allows us to conclude that the facts surveyed are hardly accidental, and to advance some descriptive generalisations, of both a formal and a functional nature. It is suggested that there is a functional cline of agent defocusing ranging from those cases in which the agent is easily recoverable from the context to those in which it cannot be identified but generally. This cline is correlated with a syntactic gradient of patient
and agent coding, although the goal of finding perfect correlations between function and form in the realm of discourse is to be abandoned.

1. Introduction

The major purpose of this paper is descriptive rather than explanatory. I will present some generalisations about the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions in five European languages which have not, to my knowledge, been noticed or acknowledged before. I will also formulate some hypotheses, of both a functional and a formal nature, explaining why a certain construction has a certain distribution.

To date, most linguists have been dealing with passive and impersonal constructions on a fairly abstract level, mainly without discussing problems posed by concrete analyses of textual facts. Passive and impersonal constructions are usually described as serving the function of agent defocusing. This notion is generally taken to be self-explanatory, and earlier work on this topic (e.g., Givón 1981; Shibatani 1985) has paid little attention to the discourse conditions under which agent defocusing comes into play. The present analysis will attach considerable importance to discourse patterns, which hold the key to some intriguing regularities.

A second serious problem is that the functional similarity between passive and impersonal constructions is taken for granted in the typological literature (Givón 1981; Siewierska 1984), and has rarely been questioned. The result is a misanalysis of individual constructions: the notion of agent defocusing, as it is spelled out in current functional approaches, is somewhat rudimentary, and does not do justice to the variety of specific circumstances associated with the use of passive and impersonal constructions across languages.

The difficulties connected with agent defocusing are not news to linguists. Myhill (1997), for instance, expresses his frustration at the absence of a detailed typology of agent defocusing: although we can as a preliminary step refer to a general function of ‘agent defocusing’ that is manifested in a variety of ways in the languages of the world, it is necessary in order to advance our understanding of this phenomenon to distinguish between different types of agent defocusing, not only structurally . . . but also functionally (Myhill 1997:839).

Much in the spirit of Myhill, in this paper I will argue for the existence of an array of situation types which have agent defocusing as their basic component but show some crucial differences that can result in their being coded in different ways both within a single language and across languages. Put another way, it will be argued that the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions in texts is sensitive to the distinction between different types of agent defocusing: there are some discourse conditions under which a given construction is preferred to others, and this can only be captured through a careful inspection of texts.

The languages investigated are Italian, Spanish, Polish, Danish, and Modern Greek. The idea underlying this study is that a full consideration of the uses of pas-
sive and impersonal constructions in real texts from a limited number of languages is a significant step forward in understanding the function of these constructions in general and might contribute to an increased comprehension of agent defocusing in other languages as well.

The remainder of this article is organised as follows: in Section 2, I shall briefly introduce the range of phenomena investigated, tackle the issue of their cross-linguistic relatedness, and illustrate the textual spirit of this study. In Section 3 the corpus used in the present investigation is described and a few terminological remarks are made. Sections 4.1 to 4.3 introduce three configurations of semantic properties and discourse conditions concerning the agent, the patient, and the nature of the event: these are labelled situation types, following Kemmer (1993:7). The aim of Section 5 is to show that in each of the five languages of the sample there is a consistent division of labour among various passive and impersonal constructions: each construction is shown to be preferentially associated with one or more situation types. The statistical significance of these correlations is also carefully evaluated. In Sections 6 and 7 I shall draw some general conclusions and offer some formal and functional generalisations concerning the data surveyed in the article. In particular, in Section 6 I shall discuss whether the association between passive/impersonal constructions and situation types is only epiphenomenal (i.e., whether the three situation types may be derived from the syntactic form of the constructions that encode them); the answer is only partially positive, and in Section 7 I will suggest that there is a functional cline of agent defocusing ranging from those cases in which the agent is easily recoverable from the context to those in which it cannot be identified but generally. This functional cline may be mapped onto a syntactic cline of agent and patient coding, but the matching is not perfect. In the end, some issues for further research are also briefly introduced.

2. Passive and impersonal constructions: Some methodological preliminaries

To set the stage for the analysis of individual constructions, some important methodological points must be made. One fundamental assumption of the present study is that the choice of a passive/impersonal construction can always be motivated in terms of discourse conditions: Apart from those “passivitis” phenomena that seem to be typical of some text types (e.g. policy papers, computer manuals; see Cornelis 1997:Ch. 5), the use of a given passive or impersonal clause always offers a particular perspective on the real-world state of affairs described by that clause. This does not mean, of course, that there is always a one-to-one correspondence between form and function in the realm of discourse: rather, there are correlations whose statistical significance is to be evaluated carefully. Accordingly, the findings and discussions in this paper are partly qualitative, partly quantitative. With respect to both dimensions, the claim is that a full understanding of the function(s) of the constructions examined would not be possible without an in-depth analysis of texts. Quantitative data are fundamental in order to reach correct generalisations, but they have to be complemented by a close inspec-
tion of individual cases of usage, which alone can reveal some fine-grained details of the functions of passive and impersonal constructions that could not be discovered otherwise.

The construction types analysed in this paper were chosen on the basis of their frequency in the written corpus described in §3. They include:

(i) so-called periphrastic passives, in which the verb phrase consists of an auxiliary plus the past participle of the verb (Italian, Spanish, Danish and Polish);

(ii) a morphologically marked medial diathesis (Modern Greek), which has a number of interpretations/functions other than the passive (most notably it can be interpreted, depending on the context, as an active "with reflexive relation of the event denoted by the verb to its subject" (Abraham 1995:4), or as an indirect reflexive, i.e. a situation in which "there are three participants, an Agent, a Patient, and a Recipient or a Beneficiary [and] the Agent and the Recipient/Beneficiary are coreferential" (Kemmer 1993:74); thus, the form _loúomai_ can mean, given the relevant context, "I am washed", "I wash (myself)" or "I wash (something) for myself";

(iii) passive and impersonal constructions in which a reflexive marker is used (as in Italian, Spanish, and Polish), or in which there is a bound morpheme historically connected to the reflexive pronoun (as in Danish); these constructions will be collected under the rubric of middle constructions (see §3);

(iv) so-called impersonal passives, i.e. constructions in which "the predicate is associated with passive morphology" (Werner Abraham, this volume), but either there is no patient (i.e. the corresponding active clause is intransitive), or the patient is marked in the same way in which it is marked in the active sentence (e.g. the -no/-to construction in Polish; the impersonal passive of Danish, which has parallels in many Germanic languages);

(v) impersonal active clauses such as the so-called _man_-clauses, i.e. constructions having some general noun ("man", "people", etc.) as subject (Danish);

(vi) constructions involving the impersonal or vague use of a personal pronoun, or the corresponding inflected form of the verb (so-called "vague you" and "vague they" constructions).

This list is not intended to cover all forms that linguists in different languages call "passive" or "impersonal", or which are associated with the function of agent defocusing across languages. However, some among the aforementioned construction types were not included in Myhill’s pivotal study (in particular, types (iii), (iv) and (v)), and the analysis conducted throughout this paper should clarify which particular type of agent defocusing is associated with these construction types.

Probably the most important and controversial issue that arises at the beginning of any contrastive study is the problem of the cross-linguistic identification of the object of study. Formulated in one way or another, the most common solution to this problem presupposes a language-independent definition of the domain of inquiry, one that is based on both functional and formal considerations. With respect to function, the
perspective adopted in this paper takes it for granted that the aforementioned construction types share the basic component of agent defocusing and are parts of the same system of functional options: the aim of this paper is precisely to tease out all the specific discourse conditions associated with the use of such constructions and to show how different types of agent defocusing are expressed across languages. With respect to form, the “region” of syntactic space relevant to both passive and impersonal constructions revolves around two dimensions, namely the coding of Agent and Patient. This syntactic space represents the structural diversity of passive and impersonal constructions across languages. Grammars use plenty of labels for constructions belonging to this syntactic space; in general, the following rule applies: the more the patient is coded as object-like, the more likely is the construction in question to be labelled as impersonal, and, conversely, the more it is coded as subject-like, the more likely is the construction to be labelled as passive. Between these two poles, a number of intermediate cases are possible: for the sake of simplification, I will use traditional labels such as “periphrastic passive” or “man-clause” even when they are evident misnomers (as in the case of so-called “impersonal passives”, Abraham, this volume; Turley 1998:137–138), with one major exception, namely the class of middle constructions (see below, §3), under which constructions labelled variously in reference grammars are comprised (pasiva refleja, “reflexive passive”; in Spanish; si passivante, “passivating si construction”, and si impersonale in Italian; reflexive impersonal/passive in other languages). For the time being, no further claims are made about the formal and functional relatedness between passive and impersonal constructions. The reader is referred to §6, where some generalisations concerning the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions based on structural properties will be advanced.

3. Data and terminology

The discussion in this study is limited to the written language, in which passive and impersonal constructions are more likely to appear, and is based on a maximally homogeneous corpus. The corpus consists of an Italian text and its Danish, Modern Greek, Polish, and Spanish translations. The text selected for this purpose is Umberto Eco’s novel *Il nome della rosa* (henceforth NRI; the Danish, Modern Greek, Polish, and Spanish versions of the same novel are labelled, respectively, NRD, NRMG, NRP, NRS; the translation of the examples is taken from the English version of the same novel, henceforth NRE). A sample of approximately 1100 passive and impersonal clauses has been collected from the original version of the novel. Each clause has been progressively numbered and classified according to the situation type encoded (see below, §4). The analysis of how these clauses are translated in the other languages of the sample allows us to describe the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions in each of these languages, and to identify the factors which may affect this distribution.

Some terminological/theoretical points remain to be made. Firstly, I will avoid referring to “underlying” subjects and objects. Rather, I will henceforth refer to the
participants in a passive/impersonal clause as *agent* and *patient*, using the names of the most prototypical roles of those participants. These terms are used as macro-roles because other roles are possible as well (effector, causer, experiencer on the agent’s side, and theme or undergoer on the patient’s side).

Secondly, I will deal with a number of constructions involving the use of a reflexive marker (Italian, Spanish, Polish), or a bound morpheme which is historically related to the reflexive marker (as in Danish). These constructions are often labelled as *reflexive passives* or *reflexive impersonals* in reference grammars of the languages considered. I will refer to constructions falling under this type as *middle constructions*, following, among others, Abraham (1995:7–10) and Steinbach (2002). At first, the use of the term “middle” for this class of constructions may look arbitrary and confusing for a number of reasons:

– firstly, the label *middle marker* is used by some authors to refer to a special form of the reflexive marker which is similar, but not identical to the reflexive proper (e.g. Danish *Lars vaske sig*, ‘Lars washes himself’ vs. *Bogen sælge-s*, ‘The book is sold’), and which is used as an indicator of valency reduction: in such cases the reflexive marker is usually nominal or pronominal, while the middle marker has less phonological “body” than the reflexive marker, and is often a verbal affix. Thus, the term “middle” might look inappropriate for those cases in which there is no formal distinction between the true reflexive (e.g. Spanish *Juan se vio*, ‘John saw himself’) and its passive/impersonal use (e.g. *se venden casas*, ‘houses are sold’);

– secondly, there are many structural differences among these constructions: for instance, when the clause contains a patient (i.e. when the corresponding active clause is transitive), it may or may not take on some subject properties (e.g. it governs agreement in Italian, Danish and Spanish, but not in Polish, where the verb in the middle construction is in the third person neuter form, and the patient is marked as an object); other structural and distributional differences among these constructions (e.g. whether an obligatory manner adverb is present or not) are described by Abraham (1995:34–40).

However, there are strong reasons to believe that these constructions are functionally comparable across languages, and the analysis conducted in this paper will provide evidence for this claim. Thus, the use of a neutral label such as *middle constructions* allows us to collect these constructions under the same rubric, and to propose consistent generalisations concerning this class of constructions.

### 4. Situation types

Somewhat surreptitiously, in Section 1 I introduced the notion of *situation types* associated with the passive and impersonal constructions under investigation, but did not elaborate on that point. What is meant by situation types will become clear throughout this paper. Suffice it to say now that the semantic contribution of a passive/impersonal
clause to the discourse in which it is embodied crucially depends on the way the clause conceptualises the event denoted by the verb. Every language has a large inventory of lexico-grammatical devices that allow a given real-world situation to be portrayed in different ways, under any conceivable set of discourse conditions. The constructions examined in this paper are precisely among those lexico-grammatical devices that allow different conceptualisations of the same states of affairs: they share the basic component of agent defocusing, but encode different situation types. Situation types can thus be defined, following Kemmer (1993:7), as

sets of situational or semantic/pragmatic contexts that are systematically associated with a particular form of expression. By 'semantic/pragmatic contexts' I do not mean simple 'real world contexts' existing independently of the language-user; situational contexts include 'real world' information, but that information is necessarily filtered through the conceptual apparatus of the speaker.

The analysis presented in this paper involves (i) the recognition of three situation types commonly associated with passive and impersonal constructions (§§4.1–4.3); (ii) the mapping of the set of constructions examined onto the functional domain formed by these situation types (§§5.1–5.4), and (iii) the search for some regularities within this domain, of both a functional and a formal nature (§§6–7).

### 4.1 Patient-oriented process

Real-world states of affairs (events, processes or states) are conceptualised for linguistic purposes as including one or more participants and relations connecting participants. A prototypical transitive (two-participant) event involves a transmission of force from a human, highly individuated entity (Agent) to another human, individuated entity, the Patient (Hopper & Thompson 1980).

A prototypical patient-oriented process represents a two-participant event from the point of view of the patient: in discourse this kind of conceptualisation is employed to ensure coherence when the text is about a certain entity and this entity is the patient. In a patient-oriented process the agent is typically identifiable from the context, or even syntactically encoded as an oblique, but less discourse-central and individuated than the patient. The passive clauses in (1) and (2) encode typical instances of patient-oriented processes: they are used in the middle of passages in which "the patient is a person . . . and this person is being focused upon and [the writer] wants to have this person as the subject in order to contribute to a general feeling of empathy with this person" (Myhill 1997:808–809). "Empathy" must be intended here in its most neutral meaning: the clauses in question are in the context of a series of clauses related to the situation of the patient so that things are being seen from the patient’s perspective. In (1) we can figure out from the context that Benno has been named assistant by the former librarian, but since the passage is about Benno, the use of the periphrastic passive enables the writer to create a topic chain (Givón 1983) and to link sentences to one another: the result is a coherent text that is easier to comprehend than an incoherent
text with active clauses only. In (2) the agent is “organizational” in the sense of Myhill (1997:807): it is quite possible that the decision to name Bernard Bishop of Galicia has been taken by one particular person (John), but it is equally possible that a group of people concurred in this decision. Bernard is the continuing discourse topic of this passage, and the vagueness of the agent(s) prevents the use of an active clause with a possibly discourse-new agent.

(1) “Ora che Malachia e Berengario sono morti, chi è rimasto a possedere i segreti della biblioteca?” “L’Abate, e l’Abate dovrà ora trasmetterli a Bencio… se vorrà…; ” “Perché se vorrà?” “Perché Bencio è giovane, è stato nominato aiuto quando Malachia era ancora vivo, è diverso essere aiuto bibliotecario e bibliotecario. Per tradizione il bibliotecario divenuta poi abate…” (NRI: 423).

“Now that Malachi and Berengar are dead, who is left who possesses the secrets of the library?” “The abbot, and the abbot must now hand them on to Benno… if he chooses…; ” “Why do you say ‘if he chooses’?” “Because Benno is young, and he was named assistant while Malachi was still alive; being assistant librarian is different from being librarian. By tradition, the librarian later becomes abbot…” (NRE: 421).

(2) “Bernardo è stato per anni martello degli eretici nel tolosano e ha scritto una Practica officii inquisitionis heretice pravitatis a uso di tutti coloro che dovranno perseguire e distruggere valdesi, beghini, pinzocheri, fraticelli e dolciniani.” “Lo so. Conosco il libro, mirabile di dottrina.” “Mirabile di dottrina,” ammise Guglielmo. “È devoto a Giovanni che negli anni scorsi gli ha affidato molte missioni nelle Fiandre e qui nell’alta Italia. E anche quando è stato nominato vescovo in Galizia non si è mai fatto vedere nella sua diocesi e ha continuato l’attività inquisitoriale. Ora credevo si fosse ritirato nel vescovado di Lodève, ma a quanto pare Giovanni lo rimette all’opera e proprio qui nell’Italia settentrionale.” (NRI: 213).

“For years Bernard was the scourge of heretics in the Toulouse area, and he has written a Practica officii inquisitionis heretice pravitatis for the use of those who must persecute and destroy Waldensians, Beghards, Fraticelli, and Dolcinians.” “I know. I am familiar with the book; remarkably learned.” “Remarkably learned,” William conceded. “He’s devoted to John, who in recent years has assigned him many missions in Flanders and here in northern Italy. And even when he was named Bishop of Galicia, he was never seen in his diocese but continued his activity as inquisitor. I thought he had now retired to the bishopric of Lodève, but apparently John is recalling him to duty, right here in northern Italy.” (NRE: 210–211).

Example (3) is similar to (1)–(2): the patient is salient and the passive is used to make it the subject. However, it is somewhat different, as the heretic Fraticello cannot be said to be the continuing discourse topic. In this case the passive is used with the intention of introducing a new topical character at the beginning of a lengthy story about him.

(3) Fu così che appena vi arrivai sentii parlare di un caso che stava agitando tutta la città. Un fraticello eretico, imputato di delitti contro la religione, e tratto davanti al vescovo e altri ecclesiastici, era in quei giorni sottoposto a severa inquisizione. E seguendo coloro che me ne parlavano, mi portai al luogo dove avveniva l’evento, mentre udivo la gente dire che questo fraticello, a nome Michele, era in verità uomo molto pio, che aveva predicato penitenza e povertà (NRI: 236).

And so it was that when I had barely arrived I learned of a great trial that was stirring
Andrea Sansò

up the whole city. A heretic Fraticello, accused of crimes against religion and haled before the bishop and other ecclesiastics, was being subjected to severe inquisition at the time. And, following those who told me about it, I went to the place where the trial was taking place, for I heard the people say that this friar, Michael by name, was truly a very pious man who had preached penance and poverty (NRE:233).

Thus, when the text is about some entity and this entity is to be focused upon in order to ensure thematic coherence, agent defocusing allows the speaker/writer to tie together clauses in which the subject position is filled by the same entity. The prototypical features of patient-oriented processes are summed up in Table 1.

Table 1. The prototypical patient-oriented process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Event properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High individuation; high focus</td>
<td>Low individuation; none or low focus; typically identifiable from the context, or even syntactically encoded as an oblique, but less discourse-central and individuated than the patient.</td>
<td>Medium/high degree of elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree of elaboration of the event is the degree at which an event is conceptually distinguished into separate participants and sub-events. All the situation types identified in this section involve a decrease in event elaboration, although to different degrees: they are to be seen as strategies for signalling a departure from the canonical transitive event in the direction of a less distinguished/elaborated event. Agent defocusing can be considered as the major component of this decrease: if the agent is defocused, it does not stand out conceptually as a well-delimited and sharply defined entity, and the less the participants are distinguished the less the event is elaborated:

The variation in elaboration of events reflects alternative conceptualizations by the speaker: The speaker has a choice of either making reference to events as undifferentiated wholes, or making reference to their substructures or component parts. (Kemmer 1993:208)

In a patient-oriented process, however, there is a participant (the patient) that is focused and individuated. Now, since the degree of event elaboration is in a direct, positive relationship with individuation of participants, the degree of event elaboration of patient-oriented processes is quite high if compared to the other situation types described below, although not as high as in prototypical transitive clauses.

4.2 Bare happening

The label bare happening is taken to mean a conceptualisation of the event depicted by the verb as a naked fact, at the lowest level of elaboration. The arguments of a prototypical transitive clause represent distinct, clearly individuated participants that are sharply differentiated from one another and from other entities that could virtually
participate in the event. When the event is conceptualised as a bare happening, none of the participants is focused: as a result, the event too is characterised by low salience. The essential features of this situation type are displayed in Table 2.

To illustrate this conceptualisation in action, consider example (4). Here, the passive and impersonal clauses in boldface encode bare happenings: their reference is quite vague, and there is no explicit mention relating to any of the people who might have mocked the faith of the simple, or eviscerated the mysteries of God (though being clear from the context that Abelard is indirectly responsible for this). Nor are the patients in these clauses particularly individuated. As a result, the events encoded by these clauses are not sharply delineated from or highly distinguishable within the setting in which they occur, and are presented in summary fashion. Similarly, in (5), the events or the people that will sweep away all kingdoms are not mentioned. We might even venture a patient-incorporating existential gloss for such clauses. For instance, we might gloss the first passive clause in (4) as there was faith-mocking. While somewhat forced, this gloss nevertheless illustrates that the patient is not focused, and the event is conceptualised as a monadic unit.

(4) “Venerabile Jorge, mi sembrate ingiusto quando trattate da castrato Abelardo, perché sapete che incorse in tale triste condizione per la nequizia altrui…” “Per i suoi peccati. Per l’albugia della sua fiducia nella ragione dell’uomo. Così la fede dei semplici venne irrita, i misteri di Dio furono sviscerati (o si tentò, stolti coloro che lo tentarono), questioni che riguardavano le cose altissime vennero trattate temerariamente, si irrita ai padri perché avevano ritenuto che tali questioni andavano piuttosto sepite che sciolte.” “Non sono d’accordo, venerabile Jorge. Dio vuole da noi che esercitiamo la nostra ragione su molte cose oscure su cui la scrittura ci ha lasciato liberi di decidere” (NRI: 139).

“Venerable Jorge, you seem to me unjust when you call Abelard a castrate, because you know that he incurred that sad condition through the wickedness of others…” “For his sins. For the pride of his faith in man’s reason. So the faith of the simple was mocked, the mysteries of God were eviscerated (or at least this was tried, fools they who tried), questions concerning the loftiest things were treated recklessly, the fathers were mocked because they had considered that such questions should have been subdued, rather than raised.” “I do not agree, venerable Jorge. Of us God demands that we apply our reason to many obscure things about which Scripture has left us free to decide” (NRE: 132).

(5) “E sarà a questo punto, che è appunto questo,” tuonò Jorge, “che l’Anticristo avrà la sua blasfema parusia, scimmia qual vuol essere di Nostro Signore. In quei tempi (che sono...
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questi) saranno travolti tutti i regni, vi sarà carestia e povertà, e penuria di messi, e inverni di eccezionale rigore. E i figli di quel tempo (che è questo) non avranno più chi amministrì i loro beni e conservì nei loro depositi gli alimenti e saranno vessati sui mercati di compere e di vendita” (NRI: 405).

“And it will be at this point, precisely this,” Jorge thundered, “that the Antichrist will have his blasphemous apparition, ape as he wants to be of our Lord. In those times (which are these) all kingdoms will be swept away, there will be famine and poverty, and poor harvests, and winters of exceptional severity. And the children of that time (which is this) will no longer have anyone to administer their goods and preserve food in their storerooms, and they will be harassed in the markets of buying and selling” (NRE: 402).

To put it simply, this situation type involves events in which the agent is conceptualised as sufficiently unimportant to be backgrounded even though the patients in these clauses are not particularly topical. The corpus analysis conducted in this paper will show that there is a lot of variation across languages in the encoding of this situation type: virtually all the construction types examined may be used to express actions/events in which the agent is so unindividuated/irrelevant that it is defocused even if the patient is not very individuated. As was noted above, the overall degree of elaboration of the event is markedly decreased as a result of the low degree of individuation of both participants. In discourse, passive/impersonal clauses encoding bare happenings are usually employed as a strategy for depicting events which do not belong to the main narrative/expository line: bare happening clauses are often satellites, in the sense of Mann and Thompson (1988).\cite{MannThompson}

Thus, the function of the passive and impersonal clauses in (4) and (5) cannot be reduced to the defocusing of the agent: what is distinctive about these passive/impersonal clauses is that they encode events as either “marginal” – i.e. non-nuclear – information added to the previous discourse span, which provides basic information; or as included in a series of events that is more relevant than the single events it consists of. The analysis conducted in this paper will show that the distinction between patient-oriented processes and bare happenings is susceptible to linguistic coding, and that in some languages of the sample (e.g. Polish, and, to a lesser extent, Italian) there are passive and impersonal constructions that specialise in the encoding of this situation type.

4.3 Agentless generic event

Under the rubric of agentless generic event I will comprise situations in which an agent, usually human, is understood to exist, but is defocused because of its genericity. This is a domain in which middle constructions are generally used across languages. One such example of the use of middle constructions is the so-called facilitative middle, or passive middle (Kemmer 1993: 147ff.):

(6) Le livre se vend bien (French)
The book sells well
This usage consists of an expression indicating the ease or difficulty with which the event denoted by the verb takes place. Other uses of middle constructions connected to (6) and (7) are exemplified in (8) and (9):

(8) *Cela ne se dit pas* (French)
This is not said/one doesn’t usually say this

(9) *Lysene lyses* (*hver kveld*) (Norwegian; from Kemmer 1993:149)
The lights are lit (every evening)

These uses are typically infused with special semantics of genericity/habituality. Deontic nuances are also possible. In this paper it will be shown that also construction types other than the middle construction may encode this situation type, and, conversely, that middle constructions are used to encode also other situation types.

The key prototypical property of this situation type is the *genericity of the event*. This is a multifaceted notion comprising the following prototypical features:

(a) the construction expresses a gnomic proposition;
(b) there is an understood generic human agent which is not explicitly mentioned; it cannot be identified but generically (people in general, people in a given location, etc.);
(c) the predicate has imperfective aspect and is atelic;
(d) the action is irrealis (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1980), i.e. it does not correspond directly with a contingent real event; *irrealis* will be considered here as a complex notion subsuming future, hypothetical, deontic, potential, and habitual predications;
(e) the predicate contains an adverbial of place, time or manner.\(^9\)

The prototypical agentless generic event can be represented as in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Event Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low individuation/low focus (or absent)</td>
<td>Generic (not encoded); representing virtually all humanity, or a subgroup thereof (e.g. people in a given location)</td>
<td>Low elaboration; irrealis; generic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples (10) and (11) illustrate some cases of agentless generic events. These include prescriptions, as in (10), and potential and deontic situations such as those described in (11).

(10) *E mi raccontò una strana storia. Disse che si poteva rendere qualsiasi cavallo, anche la bestia più vecchia e fiacca, altrettanto veloce di Brunello. Occorre mescolare nella sua avena un’erba che si chiama satirion, ben tritata, e poi ungere le cosce con grasso di cervo.*
Poi si sale sul cavallo e prima di spronarlo gli si volge il muso a levante e gli si pronuncia nell’orecchio, tre volte a voce bassa, le parole “Gaspare, Melchiorre, Merchisardo” (NRI:223).

And he told me a strange story. He said that any horse, even the oldest and weakest animal, could be made as swift as Brunellus. You had only to mix into his oats an herb called satirion, chopped fine, and then grease his thighs with stag fat. Then you mount the horse, and before spurring him you turn his face eastward and you whisper into his ear, three times, the words: “Nicander, Melchior, and Merchizard” (NRE:219).

(11) Negli anni in cui scoprii il testo dell’abate Vallet circolava la persuasione che si dovesse scrivere solo impegnandosi sul presente, e per cambiare il mondo. A dieci e più anni di distanza è ora consolazione dell’uomo di lettere (restituito alla sua altissima dignità) che si possa scrivere per puro amor di scrittura (NRI: 15).

In the years when I discovered the Abbé Vallet volume, there was a widespread conviction that one should write only out of a commitment to the present, in order to change the world. Now, after ten years or more, the man of letters (restored to his loftiest dignity) can happily write [lit. one can write, AS] out of pure love of writing (NRE:5).

As anticipated above, the bare happening and the agentless generic event are distinguishable in terms of (±) genericity of the event. In the bare happening the event is conceptualised as realis: even in (5) above, where the event conceptualised as a bare happening is a future one, it is presented as effective, being in the context of a religious prophecy about the Antichrist uttered by the visionary monk Jorge from Burgos. On the other hand, agents of irrealis actions, such as those presented in examples (10) and (11), are intrinsically more vague than agents of realis actions; the latter are often past actions, and thus there must have been one or more specific agents. In both (10) and (11), the agents of the passive and impersonal clauses cannot be identified but generically (“anyone”, “people in general”, “people in a given location”, etc.), and there is no restriction whatsoever on who could be the agent.

The main differences between the bare happening and the agentless generic event are summarised in the following table. The properties listed in the table should be intended as prototypical features of the two situation types:10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Bare happening and generic passive/impersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be shown below, the distinction between the bare happening and the agentless generic event is susceptible to linguistic coding. In almost all of the languages of the sample, two different constructions are used for the two situation types.
Table 5. Prototypical features of the three situation types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patient-oriented process</th>
<th>Bare happening</th>
<th>Agentless generic event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuation of the patient</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuation of the agent</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for defocusing agent</td>
<td>Agent is less topical than the patient/unimportant</td>
<td>Agent is irrelevant/unimportant</td>
<td>Agent is generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>Irrealis (deontic, potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual salience of the event</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three situation types are to be conceived of as prototypes. The patient-oriented process and the agentless generic event are maximally opposed on several dimensions. The bare happening situation type is less clearly differentiated from both the patient-oriented process and the agentless generic event, and hence is, in a sense, less prototypical than the two other situation types. The prototypical features of the three situation types are synoptically displayed in Table 5. The prototype analysis, by respecting the maximal distinctness of the patient-oriented process and the agentless generic event, also predicts that the less differentiated situation type varies in its expression across languages. This pattern seems to be corroborated by the present analysis: only one language out of the five languages analysed has independent coding means which are exclusively associated with the bare happening. (On the other hand, in three languages out of five the bare happening is clearly differentiated from the patient-oriented process.)

5. Passive and impersonal constructions in five European languages

In what follows, I will report on the most robust patterns of distribution of passive and impersonal constructions in the languages of the sample: I will show that different construction types are not messily distributed, and that there is a consistent division of labour among them. Such a description is a preparatory step towards presenting some generalisations concerning meaning-form correlations in the functional domain of agent defocusing.

5.1 Italian and Spanish

The Italian and Spanish constructions under investigation are structurally similar: in both languages the periphrastic passive consists of the auxiliary *be* (Spanish *ser*, Italian *essere*) plus the past participle. In the middle construction the patient (if present)
surfaces as subject (or, at least, it controls agreement with the verb)\footnote{13} and the active inflected verb is marked by the reflexive/middle marker (Spanish se, Italian si).\footnote{14}

Patient-oriented processes are generally encoded by the periphrastic passive in Italian. (12) is an example containing two periphrastic passives: the first one introduces a new topic, Adelmo of Otranto, which is the subject of the second one. Prior to this passage, the narrator has been alluding several times to an unusual event that had taken place in the abbey a few days before. This is the first time he introduces this event, namely Adelmo’s murder, and Adelmo becomes the continuing discourse topic for several pages following this excerpt:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(12)] Si era dunque dato il caso che Adelmo da Otranto, un monaco ancor giovane eppure già famoso come grande maestro miniaturatore, e che stava adornando i manoscritti della biblioteca di immagini bellissime, \textit{era stato trovato} una mattina da un capraio in fondo alla scarpata dominata dal torrione est dell’Edificio. Poiché \textit{era stato visto dagli altri monaci} in coro durante complieta ma non era ricomparsa a mattutino, \textit{era probabilmente precipitato durante le ore più buie della notte} (NRI: 40).
\end{enumerate}

What had happened, then, was this: Adelmo of Otranto, a monk still young though already famous as a master illuminator, who had been decorating the manuscripts of the library with the most beautiful images, \textit{had been found} one morning by a goatherd at the bottom of the cliff below the Aedificium. Since \textit{he had been seen by other monks} in choir during compline but had not reapereed at matins, he had probably fallen there during the darkest hours of the night (NRE: 31–32).

It could also be the case that the agent is a major character that has been mentioned repeatedly in the preceding discourse, as in (13). Here, the passive construction is used because the patient, Salvatore, is more discourse-central than the agent (Remigio, the cellarer) in the local context:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(13)] Comunque Salvatore non andò dagli infedeli perché dovette allontanarsi al più presto dalle terre francesi. Passò nel novarese, mi disse, ma su quanto avvenne su questo punto fu molto vago. E infine arrivò a Casale, dove si fece accogliere nel convento dei minoriti (e qui credo avesse incontrato Remigio), proprio ai tempi in cui molti di essi, perseguitati dal papa, cambiavano di saio e cercavano rifugio presso monasteri d’altro ordine, per non finir bruciati. Come infatti ci aveva raccontato Ubertino. A causa delle sue lunghe esperienze in molti lavori manuali . . . , \textit{Salvatore fu subito preso dal cellario come proprio aiutante}. Ed ecco perché da molti anni stava colaggiù, poco interessato ai fasti dell’ordine, molto all’amministrazione della cantina e della dispensa, libero di mangiare senza rubare e di lodare il Signore senza essere bruciato (NRI: 197).
\end{enumerate}

In any case, Salvatore did not reach the infidels, because he had to leave French territory in a hurry. He went into the Novara region, he told me, but he was very vague about what happened at this point. And finally he arrived at Casale, where he was received by the convent of Minorites (and here I believe he met Remigio) at the very time when many of them, persecuted by the Pope, were changing habit and seeking refuge in monasteries of other orders, to avoid being burned at the stake. As, indeed, Ubertino had told us. Thanks to his long familiarity with many manual tasks . . . \textit{Salvatore was immediately taken on by the cellarer as his personal assistant}. And that was why he had been here for many years, with scant interest in the order’s pomp, but
much in the administration of its cellar and larder, where he was free to eat without stealing and to praise the Lord without being burned (NRE: 194).

In (14) and (15) the middle construction is used to express agentless generic events. In (14) the middle construction is in the context of a description of the Aedificium, and has a habitual/generic meaning, whereas in (15) the middle construction has a gnomic flavour and the agent represents virtually all humanity.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(14)] Era la prima volta che ponevo piede in quel luogo, che al di fuori era di modeste dimensioni e sobrie fattezze; mi avvidi che era stato ricostruito in tempi recenti sulle spoglie di una primitiva chiesa abbaziale, forse distrutta in parte da un incendio. Entrando da fuori si passava sotto un portale alla moda nuova, dall’arco a sesto acuto, senza decorazioni e sovrastato da un rosone (NRI: 340).

It was the first time I had set foot in that place. On the outside it was of modest dimensions and sober design; I realized that it had recently been rebuilt over the remains of a primitive abbatial church, perhaps partly destroyed by fire. Entering from the outside, you passed beneath a portal in the new fashion, with a pointed arch and no decorations, surmounted by a rose window (NRE:336).

\item[(15)] Non c’erano più padroni e Dio, ci dicevamo, era con noi. Non dico che avessimo ragione, Guglielmo, e infatti mi vedi qui, perché lì abbandonai ben presto. Ma è che non ho mai capito le vostre dispute dotte sulla povertà di Cristo e l’uso e il fatto e il diritto... Te l’ho detto, è stato un gran carnevale, e in carnevale si fanno le cose alla rovescia. Poï diventi vecchio, non diventi saggio, ma diventi ghiottone. E qui faccio il ghiottone... Puoi condannare un eretico, ma vuoi condannare un ghiottone? (NRI: 276).

There were no more masters; and God, we were told, was with us. I’m not saying we were right, William, and, in fact, you find me here because I abandoned them before long. But I never really understood our learned disputes about the poverty of Christ and ownership and rights. . . . I told you, it was a great carnival, and in carnival time everything is done backward. As you grow old, you grow not wise but greedy. And here I am, a glutton. . . . You can condemn a heretic to death, but would you condemn a glutton? (NRE:272–273)
\end{enumerate}

Pronominal patients are not promoted to subject in the middle construction, as examples (16)–(17) show. As pronominal patients are by definition highly topical referents, these examples show that the middle construction in Italian is used to some extent even when the patient is topical, although lack of similar examples in the corpus prevents us from formulating further generalisations. It should be remarked, however, that the following examples are not prototypical cases of patient-oriented processes: in both (16) and (17) the patients are highly individuated and salient, but the event described is generic (it has imperfective aspect and the agents cannot be identified but generically)

Thus, the choice of a middle construction in Italian appears to be driven by the nature of the event rather than by considerations about the nature of the patient.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(16)] Nello scambio generale dei saluti, non fu come gli altri affettuoso o cordiale, ma sempre e appena appena cortese. Quando vide Ubertino, che già conosceva, fu con lui molto deferente, ma lo fissò in modo tale da indurire in me un brivido di inquietudine. Quando salutò Michele da Cesena ebbe un sorriso difficile da decifrare, e mormorò senza calore:
“Lassù vi si attende da molto tempo”, frase in cui non riuscii a cogliere né un cenno d’ansia, né un’ombra di ironia, né un’ingiunzione, né peraltro una sfumatura di interesse (NRI: 304).

In the general exchange of greetings, he was not affectionate or cordial like the others, but always and just barely polite. When he saw Ubertino, whom he already knew, he was very deferential, but stared at him in a way that gave me an uneasy shudder. When he greeted Michael of Cesena, his smile was hard to decipher, and he murmured without warmth, ”You have been awaited there for some time,” a sentence in which I was unable to catch either a hint of eagerness or a shadow of irony, either an injunction or, for that matter, a suggestion of interest (NRE:301).

The parchment did not seem like parchment. . .. It seemed like cloth, but very fine. . .” Benno went on. “Charta lintea, or linen paper,” William said. “Had you never seen it?” “I had heard of it, but I don’t believe I ever saw it before. It is said to be very costly, and delicate. That’s why it is rarely used. The Arabs make it, don’t they?” “They were the first. But it is also made here in Italy, at Fabriano” (NRI:443).

The bare happening in Italian is encoded by either periphrastic passives or middle constructions. In (18), the periphrastic passive is used in a parenthetical clause, which is by definition a clause by means of which some marginal information is added in summary fashion. In (19), on the other hand, we see many instances of periphrastic passives with VS word order, all used to encode events as bare happenings. The context is as follows: Ubertino is telling Adso, the narrator, the story of Dolcino. Prior to this excerpt, Ubertino has recalled that Dolcino had settled on Bald Mountain waging war against the nearby towns. Adso then asks whether all the towns were opposed to Dolcino, and Ubertino explains that he had involved himself in the knot of local dissensions. In the excerpt, Ubertino gives Adso some historical background on what he has been telling until this excerpt, and uses periphrastic passives to do so. It is noteworthy that the passive clauses in (19) are near other active clauses whose subjects are quite vague and not sharply individuated (Many took up the cross; there were constant clashes). In both (18) and (19) the agents are identifiable but de-emphasised due to their irrelevance to the current discourse, and the patients are not particularly topical (they are discourse-new and their persistence rate, in the sense of Givón 1983, is also low or none).
of Goth, he of the slaughter of Carpentras (during which, incidentally, the cardinals were relieved of all their jewels). He had laid his hands on his uncle’s treasure, which was no trifle, and John had not overlooked anything Bertrand had stolen (NRE:293).


“Meanwhile winter had come, the winter of the year 1305, one of the harshest in recent decades, and there was great famine all around. Dolcino sent a third letter to his followers, and many more joined him, but on that hill life had become intolerable, and they grew so hungry that they ate the flesh of horses and other animals, and boiled hay. And many died” “But whom were they fighting against now?” “The Bishop of Vercelli had appealed to Clement the Fifth, and a crusade had been called against the heretics. A plenary indulgence was granted to anyone taking part in it, and Louis of Savoy, the inquisitors of Lombardy, the Archbishop of Milan were prompt to act [lit. were asked for help, AS]. Many took up the cross to aid the people of Vercelli and Novara, even from Savoy, Provence, France; and the Bishop of Vercelli was the supreme commander. There were constant clashes between the vanguards of the two armies, but Dolcino’s fortifications were impregnable, and somehow the wicked received help.” (NRE:229).

VS order is considered to be the means of expressing thetic statements in many Romance languages (cf. Sasse 1987, 1995). Thetic statements are expressions in which no statement about an entity is made, but merely a given situation is recognised (such as intransitive VS clauses used in newspapers headlines or sudden news, cf. Bernini 1995). The predication in VS clauses is “monomial” in the sense of Sasse (1995:3–4), i.e. no argument is picked out as a predication base, and the entire situation, including all of its participants, is asserted as a unitary whole. VS order may be said to iconically reflect the “unitary” assertion of a given situation: the element about which the predication would be made in the corresponding SV utterance is subsumed under the predicate. Given this function of verb-initial order in information packaging in Romance languages, it is legitimate to consider VS word order in the Italian periphrastic passive as a signal that the patient does not stand out as an autonomous, clearly individuated entity. SV and VS periphrastic passives in Italian cannot be thought of as two different constructions: yet, the polarisation of two different word orders is significant and provides a piece of evidence in favour of the linguistic significance of the distinction between patient-oriented processes and bare happenings (cf. Sansò 2003:114–120).
Example (20) shows that the middle construction is also used to encode bare happenings. This is the only possible choice when the verb is intransitive (i.e., when there is no patient), because the periphrastic construction in Modern Italian is only possible if the verb is transitive. The use of middle constructions to encode bare happenings may also be favoured by the fact that in this construction the natural, unmarked word order is VS, i.e. the patient, though syntactically promoted to subject, appears in the non-topical postverbal position.

(20) “Ho detto che qualche pagina di predicatore dei giorni nostri deve avere suggerito a qualcuno le parole che hanno spaventato Adelmo e con cui Adelmo ha spaventato Berengario. Mai come in questi ultimi anni i predicatori hanno offerto al popolo, per stimolarne la pietà e il terrore (e il fervore, e l’ossequio alla legge umana e divina), parole truculente, sconvolgenti e macabre. Mai come ai giorni nostri, in mezzo a processioni di flagellanti, si sono udite laudi sacre ispirate ai dolori di Cristo e della Vergine, mai come oggi si è insistito nello stimolare la fede dei semplici attraverso l’evocazione dei tormenti infernali.” “Forse è bisogno di penitenza,” dissi. “Adso, non ho mai udito tanti richiami alla penitenza quanto oggi, in un periodo in cui ormai né predicatori né vescovi, e neppure i miei confratelli spirituali sono più in grado di promuovere una vera penitenza…” (NRI:125–126).

“As I said, a page of a modern preacher must have prompted someone to repeat the words that frightened Adelmo and with which Adelmo frightened Berengar. In these last few years, as never before, to stimulate piety and terror and fervor in the populace, and obedience to human and divine law, preachers have used distressing words, macabre threats. Never before, as in our days, amid processions of flagellants, were sacred lauds heard inspired by the sorrows of Christ and of the Virgin, never has there been such insistence as there is today on strengthening the faith of the simple through the depiction of infernal torments.” “Perhaps it is the need for penitence,” I said. “Adso, I have never heard so many calls to penitence as today, in a period when, by now, neither preachers nor bishops nor even my brothers the Spirituals are any longer capable of inspiring true repentance…” (NRE:118).

The association of Italian passive and impersonal constructions with the three situation types introduced above is summarised in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient-oriented process</th>
<th>Bare happening</th>
<th>Agentless generic event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic passive (mainly with SV order)</td>
<td>Periphrastic passive (often with VS order); middle construction</td>
<td>Middle construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This distribution is not impressionistic. It is based on statistical counts. For each clause in the corpus, some properties of the participants have been measured. If a clause encodes a patient-oriented process, the patient is likely to display the following discourse properties:
'Agent defocusing' revisited

1) it is likely to be discourse-old (in the sense of Givón 1983); 
2) it is likely to be persistent, i.e. to appear in subsequent clauses after its first mention; persistence has been measured, following Givón (1983), in terms of number of clauses to the right of the one under analysis in which the referent continues to appear; 
3) it is likely to be individuated (in the sense of Hopper & Thompson 1980).

The agent, on the other hand, is likely to be discourse-new, non-persistent, and less individuated than the patient. In clauses encoding other situation types the patient, if present, is characterised by very low continuity and persistence, and is generally a non-individuated entity. Bare happenings have been distinguished from agentless generic events on the basis of the features collected under the rubric of genericity (see above, §§4.2–4.3).

Table 7 portrays the distribution of passive constructions in NRI. The direction is from function to form: the table shows to what extent each situation type is encoded by each construction type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation type</th>
<th>encoded by the middle construction</th>
<th>encoded by the periphrastic passive (with SV order)</th>
<th>encoded by the periphrastic passive (with VS order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient-oriented process</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>97.56%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare happening</td>
<td>47.92%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentless generic event</td>
<td>95.33%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike Italian, the Spanish periphrastic passive is almost exclusively used to encode patient-oriented processes, as the following examples illustrate:

(21) “Llevas un nombre grande y muy bello” dijo “¿Sabes quién fue Adso de Montier-en-Der?” preguntó. Confieso que no lo sabía. Y el mismo Jorge respondió: “Fue el autor de un libro grande y tremendo, el Libellus de Antichristo, donde profetizó lo que habría de suceder… pero no lo escucharon como merecía.” “El libro fue escrito antes del milenio” dijo Guillermo “y esos hechos no se produjeron…” (NRS: 122).
“You bear a great and very beautiful name,” he said. “Do you know who Adso of Montier-en-Der was?” he asked. I did not know, I confess. So Jorge added, “He was the author of a great and awful book, the Libellus de Antichristo, in which he foresaw things that were to happen; but he was not sufficiently heeded.” “The book was written before the millennium,” William said, “and those things did not come to pass…” (NRE: 83).

(22) Es un hombre instruido, ha estudiado leyes en Montpellier y medicina en París, ha sabido cultivar sus amistades con habilidad suficiente como para obtener los obispados y el sombrero cardenalicio cuando lo consideró oportuno, y cuando fue consejero de Roberto el Sabio, en Nápoles, su perspicacia causó el asombro de muchos. Y como obispo de Aviñón dio a Félix el Hermoso los consejos justos… para que lograra la ruina de los templar-
Andrea Sansò

...Y después de la elección supo escapar a una conjura de los cardenales, que querían matarlo... Pero no me refería a esto, sino a su habilidad para trascender los juramentos sin que pueda acusársele de perjurio. Cuando fue elegido, y para ello prometió al cardenal Orsini que volvería a trasladar la sede pontificia a Roma, juró por la hostia consagrada que si no cumplía esa promesa no volvería a montar en un caballo o en un mulo... Pues bien, ¿sabéis qué hizo, el muy zorro? Después de la coronación, en Lyon..., ¡regresó a Aviñón en barco! (NRS: 418–419).

He is a cultivated man, he studied law at Montpellier and medicine in Paris, he cultivated his friendships in the ways best suited to win the episcopal seats and the cardinal’s hat when it seemed opportune to him, and as counsellor of Robert the Wise in Naples he amazed many with his acumen. When Bishop of Avignon, he gave all the right advice... to Philip the Fair about how to ruin the Templars. And after his election he managed to foil a plot of cardinals who wanted to kill him... But this is not what I meant to talk about: I was speaking of his ability to betray vows without being accused of swearing falsely. To be elected [lit. when he was elected, and to be elected, AS] he promised Cardinal Orsini he would return the papal seat to Rome, and swore on the consecrated host that if he were not to keep his promise, he would never mount a horse or a mule again. Well, you know what that fox did? After he had himself crowned in Lyons..., he travelled from Lyons to Avignon by boat (NRE: 292–293).

In some cases patient-oriented processes are encoded by middle constructions, especially with inanimate patients that are very topical, as examples (23)–(25) illustrate. This pattern is more widespread than the corresponding Italian pattern, exemplified in (16)–(17), and is consistent with the claim that the middle construction is gradually spreading so as to become the only passive/impersonal construction of Spanish at the expenses of the periphrastic construction (Mendikoetxea 1999: 1669).

(23) Nicola cogió la horquilla que Guillermo le ofrecía. La observó con gran interés, y exclamó: “Oculi de vitro cum capsula! ¡Me habló de ellas cierto fray Giordano que conocí en Pisa! Decía que su invención aún no databa de dos décadas. Pero ya han transcurrido otras dos desde aquella conversación” “Creo que se inventaron mucho antes” dijo Guillermo (NRS: 126–127).

With great interest, Nicholas took the forked instrument William held out to him. “Oculi de vitro cum capsula!” he cried. “I had heard tell of them from a brother Jordan I met in Pisa! He said it was less than twenty years since they had been invented. But I spoke with him more than twenty years ago.” “I believe they were invented much earlier,” William said (NRE: 86).

(24) Venancio, que conoce... que conocía muy bien el griego, dijo que Aristóteles había dedicado especialmente a la risa el segundo libro de la Poética y que si un filósofo tan grande había consagrado todo un libro a la risa, la risa debía de ser algo muy importante. Jorge dijo que muchos padres habían dedicado libros enteros al pecado, que es algo importante pero muy malo, y Venancio replicó que por lo que sabía Aristóteles había dicho que la risa era algo bueno, y adecuado para la transmisión de la verdad, y entonces Jorge le preguntó desafiante si acaso había leído ese libro de Aristóteles, y Venancio dijo que nadie podía haberlo leído todavía porque nunca se había encontrado y quizás estaba perdido. Y, en efecto, nadie ha podido leer el segundo libro de la Poética. Guillermo de Moerbeke nunca lo tuvo entre sus manos. Entonces Jorge dijo que si no lo habían encontrado era...
porque nunca se había escrito, porque la providencia no quería que se glorificaran cosas frívolas (NRS:160).

Venantius, who knows ... who knew Greek very well, said that Aristotle had dedicated the second book of the Poetics specifically to laughter, and that if a philosopher of such greatness had devoted a whole book to laughter, then laughter must be important. Jorge said that many fathers had devoted entire books to sin, which is an important thing, but evil; and Venantius said that as far as he knew, Aristotle had spoken of laughter as something good and an instrument of truth; and then Jorge asked him contemptuously whether by any chance he had read this book of Aristotle; and Venantius said that no one could have read it, because it has never been found and is perhaps lost forever. And, in fact, William of Moerbeke never had it in his hands. Then Jorge said that if it had not been found, this was because it had never been written, because Providence did not want futile things glorified (NRE:112).

Michael had sent letters of excuse, declaring himself ill – something no one doubted – and had sent in his stead Brother John Fidanza and Brother Umile Custodio from Perugia. But it so happened, the cardinal went on, that the Guelphs of Perugia had informed the Pope that, far from being ill, Brother Michael was in communication with Louis of Bavaria. In any case, what was past was past, and now Brother Michael looked well and serene, and so was expected in Avignon. However, it was better, the cardinal admitted, to consider beforehand, as prudent men from both sides were now doing, what Michael would finally say to the Pope. (NRE:339–340).

Middle constructions also encode bare happenings (as in (26)); the middle construction is also the most frequent way of encoding agentless generic events in Spanish (as in (27)–(28));

(26) “A todo esto, llegó el invierno, el invierno de 1305, uno de los más rigurosos de aquellas décadas, y la miseria se instaló en las comarcas circundantes. Dulcino envió una tercera carta a sus seguidores, y otros muchos se unieron a su gente. Pero allí arriba la vida se había vuelto imposible y el hambre llegó a ser tal que comieron la carne de los caballos y otros animales, y heno cocido. Y muchos murieron.” “Pero, ¿contra quién peleaban en aquel momento?” “El obispo de Vercelli había apelado a Clemente V y éste había convocado una cruzada contra los herejes. Se decretó la indulgencia plenaria para todos aquellos que participaran en la misma, y se pidió ayuda a Ludovico de Saboya, a los inquisidores de Lombardía y al arzobispo de Milán. Fueron muchos los que cogieron la cruz para auxiliar a las gentes de Vercelli y de Novara, desplazándose incluso desde Saboya, desde Provenza y desde Francia, y todos se pusieron bajo las órdenes del obispo de Vercelli. Los choques entre las vanguardias de ambos ejércitos se sucedían con mucha frecuencia, pero las fortificaciones de Dulcino eran inexpugnables, y los impíos se las
Y Adelmo citó en aquella ocasión a otra autoridad eminentísima, la del doctor de Aquino, cuando dijo que conviene que las cosas divinas se representen más en la figura de los cuerpos viles que en la figura de los cuerpos nobles (NRS: 120).

And Adelmo that day quoted another lofty authority, the doctor of Aquino, when he said that divine things should be expounded more properly in figures of vile bodies than of noble bodies (NRE:81).

But you come from another order, where I am told that merriment, even the most inopportune sort, is viewed with indulgence (NRE:79).

The association of Spanish passive and impersonal constructions with the three situation types introduced above is summarised in Table 8.

Table 8. Situation types and associated constructions in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient-oriented process</th>
<th>Bare happening</th>
<th>Agentless generic event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic passive; (middle construction)</td>
<td>Middle construction</td>
<td>Middle construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 portrays the distribution of passive constructions in NRS.

Table 9. Situation types and their encoding in Spanish; results widely exceed chance ($\chi^2 = 184.99$; d.f. = 2; $p < 0.05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>encoded by the middle construction</th>
<th>encoded by the periphrastic passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient-oriented process</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>74.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare happening</td>
<td>87.64%</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentless generic event</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Polish

Three Polish constructions appear to be associated with the situation types described in §4. In this section, their distribution in NRP will be analysed.

The first construction in point is the periphrastic passive. It is formed from both perfective and imperfective transitive verbs by combining the passive participle with an auxiliary (zostać, ‘become’; być, ‘be’). The agent can be expressed as an oblique (przez plus accusative):

(29) Dom był/jest/będzie budowany (przez społdzielców)
The house was/is/will be (being) built (by cooperative members)

(30) Dom został/zostanie zbudowany
The house was/will be built
The second construction in point is the middle construction (cf. (31)), in which the verb is in the third person (neuter) form, and the patient maintains its accusative marking:

\[(31) \quad \text{Tu się pije wódę} \]

One drinks vodka here

The third construction belongs to the class of so-called impersonal passives: the verbal form is related to the passive participle (Siewierska 1988:271), and the patient, if present, retains object marking. This construction is named -no/-to construction (Fici Giusti 1994; Billings & Maling 1995a, 1995b; Lavine 2000) because the verbal form ends in either -no or -to:

\[(32) \quad \text{Wypiło całą butelkę} \]

drunk N whole ACC F bottle ACC F

A whole bottle was drunk

In this construction no copula is possible, the action is limited to the past and the agent is obligatorily human (even if it cannot be expressed). The -no/-to construction occurs also with many verbs that do not otherwise form a passive participle (for instance, intransitive and reflexive verbs). A full account of the syntactic properties of this construction is beyond the scope of this paper (the reader is referred to Lavine 2000). Given what was said directly above, it is entirely plausible that this construction encodes almost exclusively the situation type labelled bare happening: the past action/event designated by this construction is conceptualised as an undifferentiated whole and neither the agent nor the patient are salient. That the -no/-to construction may be associated with such a conceptualisation of the event is clearly indicated by native speakers (Anna Słoń, p.c.; Agnieszka Latos, p.c.). The following table shows the distribution of the three aforementioned constructions in NRP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient oriented process</th>
<th>Periphrastic passive encodes</th>
<th>-no/-to construction encodes</th>
<th>Middle construction encodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.39%</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare happening</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentless generic event</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>83.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples illustrate the division of labour between the three Polish constructions under investigation. Example (34) is the translation of the Italian excerpt in (33), with a passive clause in the pluperfect. Interestingly, Italian passive clauses in the pluperfect are always translated into Polish -no/-to constructions. This is because the pluperfect is a marker of backgrounded events: when the pluperfect is used in a clause, the clause encodes an event at a low degree of elaboration, usually expanding what has been said immediately before, and it can be removed without affecting the
overall narrative/argumentative structure of a text. In (35), the claim that in Avignon crucifixes of a particular kind were displayed directly follows the statement that the Pope is a Midas and that he issued bulls against the ideal of poverty. Neither the agent nor the patient of this clause are salient, and the action itself is asserted unitarily, as a monominal predication.

(33) Restai perplesso per un istante. Poi ricordai. Era vero! Forse mi ero scordato il titolo, ma quale monaco adulto o monacello irrequieta non ha sorriso o riso sulle varie visioni, in prosa o in rima, di questa storia che appartiene alla tradizione del rito pasquale e dei ioca monachorum? Proibita o vituperata dai più austeri tra i maestri dei novizi, non c'è tuttavia convento in cui i monaci non se la sussurrata a voce, variamente riassunta e riaggiustata, mentre taluni piamente la trascrivevano, assicurendo che sotto il velo della giocondità essa nascondeva segreti insegnamenti morali; e altri ne incoraggiavano la diffusione perché, dicevano, attraverso il gioco i giovani potevano più facilmente retenere a memoria gli episodi della storia sacra. Ne era stata scritta una versione in versi per il pontefice Giovanni VIII, con la dedica: “Ludere me libuit, ludentem, papa Johannes, accipe. Ridere, si placet, ipse potes”.


I remained puzzled briefly. Then I remembered. He was right! Perhaps I had forgotten the title, but what adult monk or unruly young novice has not smiled or laughed over the various visions, in prose or rhyme, of this story, which belongs to the tradition of the paschal season and the ioca monachorum? Though the work is banned or execrated by the more austere among novice masters, there is still not a convey in which the monks have not whispered it to one another, variously condensed and revised, while some piously copied it, declaring that behind a veil of mirth it concealed secret moral lessons, and others encouraged its circulation because, they said, through its jesting, the young could more easily commit to memory certain episodes of sacred history. A verse version had been written for Pope John VIII, with the inscription “I loved to jest; accept me, dear Pope John, in my jesting. And, if you wish, you can also laugh.” And it was said that Charles the Bald himself had staged it, in the guise of a comic sacred mystery, in a rhymed version to entertain his dignitaries at supper (NRE:437).
To król Midas, który wszystko, czego się łknie, zamienia w złoto spływające do kas Aw-
inionu. Za każdym razem, kiedy wchodziłem do jego apartamentów, zastawałem tam
bankierów, wymieniających monety, i stoły zawalone złotem, i kleryków, którzy liczyli
i układali w słupki floreny... I zobaczysz, jaki pałac kazał sobie wybudować pełen bo-
gactw, które nigdy nie przypisywano tylko cesarzowi Bizancjum albo Wielkiemu Chanowi
Tatarów. I teraz pojmujesz, czemu wydał wszystkie te bulle przeciwko idei ubóstwa. Czy
wiesz, że skłonił dominiikanów, niechętnych naszemu zakonowi, by wyrzeźbił Chrystusa
w królewskiej koronie, tunice z purpury i złota i w bogatym obuwiu? W Awinionie wys-
tawiono krucyfiksy z Jesusem przybitej jedną tylko ręką, bo druga ręka sakiewkę za-
wieszoną u pasa, by wskazać, że On godzi się na użycie pieniędzy dla celów religijnych... (NRP:410).

He is a Midas: everything he touches becomes gold and flows into the coffers of
Avignon. Whenever I entered his apartments I found bankers, moneychangers, and
tables laden with gold, clerics counting florins and piling them neatly one on top of
another... And you will see the palace he has had built for himself, with riches that
were once attributed only to the Emperor of Byzantium or the Great Khan of the
Tartars. And now you understand why he issued all those bulls against the ideal of
poverty. But do you know that he has driven the Dominicans, in their hatred of our
order, to carve statues of Christ with a royal crown, a tunic of purple and gold, and
sumptuous sandals? In Avignon they display crucifixes where Christ is nailed by a
single hand while the other touches a purse hanging from his belt, to indicate that he
authorizes the use of money for religious ends (NRE:294).

Example (37) is interesting in that it illustrates two different translation strategies
used by the Polish translator in order to distinguish between two different concep-
tualisations of the same kind of event: in the first case, the event is presented as a
well-individuated one, occurring in the real world at a given point in time; in the sec-
ond case, the same event is presented as a generic, repeated action occurring several
times in the past but without any temporal limit. Interestingly enough, in the Ital-
ian version of the passage in (36), the same construction is used and the difference in
conceptualisation is encoded through the use of two different tenses.

Ma ormai avrai udito anche tu queste mormorazioni... che ci fosse uno strano rapporto
tra Malachia e lui... Cose vecchie, poi sai che si mormorò di Berengario e di Adelmo, e
gli scrivani giovani dicevano che Malachia soffriva in silenzio di un’atroce gelosia... E
poi si mormorava anche dei rapporti tra Malachia e Jorge, no, non nel senso che puoi
credere... nessuno ha mai mormorato sulla virtù di Jorge! (NRI:423).

Ale ty też pewnie zdajęś leżyć te pogłoski... że między nim a Malachiaszem jest
dziwnego rodzaju związek... Stare dzieje, sam wiesz, że mówiono też o Berengarze
i Adelmusie, a młodzi kopiski powiadam, iż Malachias cierpi w milczeniu straszliwą
zazdrość... Poza tym szeptali się o związkach między Malachiaszem a Jorge’em, nie, nie
w tym znaczeniu, jakie możesz mieć na myśli... nikt nigdy nie podawał wątpliwość

They also said – but you must have heard these rumors yourself by now – that there
was a strange relationship between him and Malachi... Old gossip. Then, as you
know, there was talk about Berengar and Adelmo, and the young scribes said that
Malachi silently suffered horrible jealousy... And then there was also murmuring
about the ties between Malachi and Jorge. No, not in the sense you might believe – no one has ever murmured against Jorge’s virtue! (NRE: 420–421).

In (38) the periphrastic passive is used to encode a patient-oriented process. (39) contains an instance of the middle construction expressing an agentless generic event.

There is a period, however, before Nicholas came, when Paul of Rimini was librarian. How long was he in that post? We weren’t told. We could examine the abbey ledgers, but I imagine the abbot has them, and for the moment I would prefer not to ask him for them. Let’s suppose Paul was appointed librarian sixty years ago. Write that. Why does Alinardo complain of the fact that, about fifty years ago, he should have been given the post of librarian and instead it went to another? Was he referring to Paul of Rimini? (NRE: 440).

And why limit our suspicions only to those who took part in the discussion of laughter? Perhaps the crime had other motives, which have nothing to do with the library. In any case, we need two things: to know how to get into the library at night, and a lamp. You provide the lamp. Linger in the kitchen at dinner hour, take one… (NRE: 140).

5.3 Danish

The association of Danish passive and impersonal constructions with the situation types introduced above is displayed in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation Type</th>
<th>Encoded by the Periphrastic Passive</th>
<th>Encoded by the Impersonal Man-Construction</th>
<th>Encoded by the Middle Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient-oriented process</td>
<td>94.66%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare happening</td>
<td>71.83%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentless generic event</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>53.19%</td>
<td>41.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The periphrastic passive is constructed with a form of the auxiliary *blive*, 'remain', plus the past participle. The agent may be encoded as an oblique (the prepositional phrase is headed by *af*). This construction is typically used to encode patient-oriented processes, as in (40), where Malachi is introduced as a new topic for further reference in subsequent discourse.


“I, too, have heard talk of that, but it is an old story, dating back at least fifty years. When I arrived here the librarian was Robert of Bobbio, and the old monks muttered about an injustice committed against Alinardo. Robert had an assistant, who later died, and Malachi, still very young, was appointed in his place. Many said that Malachi was without merit, that though he claimed to know Greek and Arabic it was not true, he was only good at aping, copying manuscripts in those languages in fine calligraphy, without understanding what he was copying.” (NRE: 420).

The periphrastic construction is also the main strategy used to encode bare happenings (cf. (41)). Another construction type usually associated with bare happenings is the so-called impersonal passive: its building blocks are the same as the periphrastic passive (i.e. *blive* plus past participle) but the patient is not promoted to subjecthood, and the weak deictic *der* is inserted as a formal subject (cf. (42)). A similar pattern is found in other Germanic languages (cf. Sansò 2003: Ch. 5 on Dutch and German), and is generally considered to be a means of presenting an action/event globally:


Translation: see example (18).


“Who was the monk you were speaking of?” William asked. He looked at us, stunned.
“Whom was I speaking of? I cannot remember . . . it was such a long time ago. But God punishes. God nullifies. God dims even memories. Many acts of pride were committed in the library. Especially after it fell into the hands of foreigners. God punishes still....” We could get no more out of him, and we left him to his calm, embittered delirium. William declared himself very interested in that exchange: “Alinardo is a man to listen to; each time he speaks he says something interesting.” (NRE:303–304).

Danish provides some evidence that could lead us to revise the arrangement of situation types proposed in §4. The situation type named agentless generic event should possibly be subdivided into (at least) two situation types if we want to account for the Danish facts. But let us see in detail. Consider first example (43):

(43) Hvor mange klostre var ikke for to hundrede år siden lysende midtpunkter for storhed og hellighed, mens de nu er tilholdsstader for dovenkroppe. Ordenen er stadig magtfuld, men stanken fra byerne strammer sig sammen omkring vore hellige steder, Guds folk er nu henfalden til handel og partistridigheder. Dernede i de store befolkede områder, hvor helligheden ikke længere sidder i højsædet, ikke bare taler man ... men man skriver også på folkesproget. (NRD: 36).

How many of our abbeys, which two hundred years ago were resplendent with grandeur and sanctity, are now the refuge of the slothful? The order is still powerful, but the stink of the cities is encroaching upon our holy places, the people of God are now inclined to commerce and wars of faction; down below in the great settlements, where the spirit of sanctity can find no lodging, not only do they speak . . . in the vulgar tongue, but they are already writing in it. (NRE:36).

Here, the agent is generic but anchored somehow in space (in the great settlements . . . they speak in the vulgar tongue). This is a typical case of vague agent in the sense of Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990:746ff.), i.e. an agent representing a subgroup of humanity (in this case people living in the great settlements at a given point in time). According to Kitagawa and Lehrer, this characterisation of the agent is to be distinguished from the so-called impersonal agent, i.e. from those cases in which the agent is intended as representing potentially all humanity (with no spatio-temporal delimitation). The “impersonal agent” often correlates with potential and deontic situations, as in (44), which is an example of a potential activity virtually open to anyone:

(44) Han erklærede nemlig den romerske kirke for en skøge, og sagde ... at en indviet kirke ikke er noget værd for bønnen, ikke mere end en stald, og at Kristus kan tilbedes i skove såvel som i kirker. (NRD:220).

He declared the Roman church a whore, [and] said that . . . a consecrated church was worthless for prayer, no better than a stable, and Christ could be worshiped both in the woods and in the churches. (NRE:228–229).

In both (43) and (44) the event described is generic, although to different degrees. The “impersonal agent” exemplified in (44) is intrinsically more generic than the “vague agent” in (43) and thus can ideally be placed at the bottom of a hierarchy of agent defocusing (cf. §7). Accordingly, habitual predications and generalisations (usually correlated to the “vague agent”) are, in a sense, less generic than potential, deon-
Table 12. Agentless generic events in NRD. Results exceed chance ($\chi^2 = 9.73$; d.f. = 1; $p$ between 0.1 and 0.25; Yate’s correction applied).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Encoded by the impersonal man-construction</th>
<th>Encoded by the middle construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent represents all humanity</td>
<td>44.87%</td>
<td>55.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent represents a subgroup thereof</td>
<td>68.37%</td>
<td>31.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tic and hypothetical predication (usually co-occurring with the “impersonal agent”): the meaning of the latter “approximates that of sentences with universally quantified NPs” (everyone, anyone, etc., Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990: 743), whereas in the former the speaker/writer believes that a group of individuals who fit the description in the predicate exists (in (43) the inhabitants of the great settlements outside the abbey). The data obtained from NRD show that there are two constructions which are associated with the agentless generic event. The first construction in point is the impersonal active clause with the generic noun man as subject, exemplified in (43). The second one is the middle construction exemplified in (44). The areas of use of these two constructions partially overlap, but there appears to be a preferential correlation between, respectively, the impersonal man construction and the vague agent, and between the middle construction and the impersonal agent. If this correlation turns out to be statistically significant, then we should subdivide the situation type labelled as agentless generic event into two situation types: in order to justify this subdivision, we need at least one language that has different formal expressions for these two functions, and this is precisely the situation of Danish. Unfortunately, this correlation is significant only to a limited extent ($p$ between 0.1 and 0.25, cf. Table 12), and levels of usage and registers may also be relevant here.

More research is thus needed in order to answer the question whether we should rearrange the functional domain described in §4: Modern Greek too provides some pieces of evidence in favour of the cross-linguistic significance of the distinction between “vague” and “impersonal” agent. Even in Greek, however, the correlations identified are not statistically significant, as will be shown below.

5.4 Modern Greek

Modern Greek is the only language of the sample which has a morphologically marked medial diathesis with its own endings for each tense of the verbal paradigm. This verbal form may be interpreted as a passive given the relevant context. As Table 13 shows, this medial diathesis, though preferentially used to encode patient-oriented processes, is equally used in the expression of other situation types.

Example (45) shows the use of the medial diathesis in the encoding of the bare happening: the two events described, namely the torture of the priests and the throwing of an Augustinian into the lions’ pit, directly follow the statement that many sad
Table 13. Situation types and their expression in NRMG; results widely exceed chance ($\chi^2 = 114.7$; d.f. = 6; $p < 0.05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>encoded by the medial diathesis</th>
<th>encoded by topicalising constructions</th>
<th>encoded by the “vague you” construction</th>
<th>encoded by the “vague they” construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient-oriented process</td>
<td>77.27%</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare happening</td>
<td>80.76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agentless generic event</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

facts were taking place in Rome, and are to be considered as an elaboration of this statement:20


Marsilius had been named spiritual vicar of Rome, but through his fault, or his weakness, things very sad to report were taking place in that city. Priests loyal to the Pope and unwilling to say Mass were tortured, an Augustinian prior had been thrown into the lions’ pit on the Capitoline. Marsilius and John of Jandun had declared John a heretic, and Louis had had him sentenced to death. But the Emperor’s misrule was antagonizing the local lords and depleting public funds (NRE: 498).

In (46) the same form encodes a patient-oriented process, with a topical, highly individuated patient (Gherardo and his sect):


“He enjoined his disciples to imitate the apostles, and he chose to call his sect the order of the Apostles, and his men were to go through the world like poor beggars, living only on alms…” “Like the Fraticelli,” I said. “Wasn’t this the command of our Lord and of your own Francis?” “Yes,” Ubertino admitted with a slight hesitation in his voice, sighing. “But perhaps Gherardo exaggerated. He and his followers were accused of denying the authority of the priests and the celebration of Mass and confession, and of being idle vagabonds.” (NRE: 222).

In a number of cases, Italian passive constructions expressing patient-oriented processes are translated by means of other strategies in Modern Greek: these include
mainly left-dislocations and topicalisations. This happens occasionally also in other languages of the sample, but only in Greek this translation strategy is quite widespread. For the sake of convenience, these cases are counted together in Table 13, where they are collected under the rubric of *topicalising constructions*. One such example is (47):

(47) To trapézi fainótan áthikto, ótan ómos o Gouliélmos éskipse amésos yia na exetásei ta filla pou Ítan sto káto ráfi, áfise éna epifónima disaréskheias. "Leípei típotat?" rótisa. "Eíha deí xímera edó dio vivlía, kai to éna Ítan sta elliniká. Afsí einfai pou leípei. Kápoios to píre, kai málista viastiká, yiati tou épese mia pergamíni edó sto pátoma". “To trapézi ómos to filagon… ” “Vévaioi. Isos kápoios na áplose to héri tou mólis prin apó ligo” (NRMG: 293).

The desk appeared to be in order, but William bent at once to examine the pages on the shelf below, and he cried out in dismay. “Is something missing?” I asked. “Today I saw two books here, one of them in Greek. And that’s the one missing. Somebody has taken it, and in great haste, because one page fell on the floor here.” “But the desk was watched…” “Of course. Perhaps somebody grabbed it just a short while ago” (NRE:162).

Two constructions concur in the expression of the agentless generic event, both involving the generic use of a personal pronoun, or an inflected form with person agreement features (the second person singular in (48) and (49), and the third person plural in (50) and (51)).

(48) Ipírhane sti fisiognomía tou to íhni pollón pathón pou ithísei eíhe ipotáxei, ma pou émioeuzan na èhouous simadépsei ta haraktiristiká, pou den kiriarhoúsan pia. Thlópsi kai afstirótita déspozan stis grammés tou prosópou tou, kai ta mátia tou ítan tóso éntona, pou éna tous vlémma arkoíse na diapérwsei tei kardía tou sinomilitou tou kai na diavásei tis mistikés tou sképseis, étsi pou dískola ántehes ti dieísdisí tous kai prospathoúses na deíteri forá (NRMG: 136–137).

In his physiognomy there were what seemed traces of many passions which his will had disciplined but which seemed to have frozen those features they had now ceased to animate. Sadness and severity predominated in the lines of his face, and his eyes were so intense that with one glance they could penetrate the heart of the person speaking to him, and read the secret thoughts, so it was difficult to tolerate [lit. *you could hardly tolerate*, AS] their inquiry and one [lit. *you, AS*] was not tempted to meet them a second time (NRE:73).

(49) O kairós heirótéreve. Elhe skothel énas krios aèras kai o ourános sképatosan me omíhli. Mánteses ton iilo na diei piso ap’ ta perívília, kai skotádi aplonótan stin anatolí, ópou katefthinómastan pernóntas dipla apó to horostásio tis ekklíseis kai fítanontas sto píso tmíma tou oropedíou (NRMG:158).

The weather was turning bad. A cold wind had risen and the sky was becoming foggy. The sun could be sensed [lit. *you could sense*, AS], setting beyond the vegetable gardens, and toward the east it was already growing dark as we proceeded in that direction, flanking the choir of the church and reaching the rear part of the grounds (NRE:84–85).

(50) “Ligo polí. Oi peiratés tou makrinoú Vorrá éftanan apó ta potámia kai leitaiotisai ti Rómi. Oi eidololatrikoi naai katérrean kai oi xristianikoi den sipran akómi. Kai mónon oi monahoi tis lèrnis sta monastíria tous égrafan kai diávazan, diávazan kai...”
égrafan: kai mikrografoustan, ki istera ebainan se mikri ploutaria ftaigména apo dérma/zónon ki étan an s/aften tis perihèsh gia na kírixun to Evangelio san na íxan en autoi, kataláves? Píyes sto Bobbio, to idríse o Áyios Koloubános, pou étan enas apo stois. Ki éti, dein peirázei pou epinoisan mia néa latínikí, afoú stin Efrópi den gnorízan pia tin paliá. Ítan spoudaioi ánthropoi. O Áyios Vrandános étan os ta Nisiá tis Kalis This kai paráflese tis aktés tis Kolásis, ópou eide ton Ioúda allosedéno s'énan vráho, kai mia méra áraxe kai katévike s'éna nísi, to opoio étan éna thalássio tèras. Ítan treloí, fisiká”, epanélave me ikanopoíisi (NRMG: 559–560).

“More or less. Vikings from the Far North came down along the rivers to sack Rome. The pagan temples were falling in ruins, and the Christian ones did not yet exist. It was only the monks of Hibernia in their monasteries who wrote and read, read and wrote, and illuminated, and then jumped into little boats made of animal hide and navigated toward these lands and evangelized them as if you people were infidels, you understand? You have been to Bobbio, which was founded by Saint Columba, one of them. And so never mind if they invented a new Latin, seeing that in Europe no one knew the old Latin any more. They were great men. Saint Brendan reached the Isles of the Blest and sailed along the coasts of hell, where he saw Judas chained to a rock, and one day he landed on an island and went ashore there and found a sea monster. Naturally they were all mad,” he repeated contentedly (NRE:312–313).

(51) Étis, gnorísame ton Nikóla tou Morimóndo, ton arhialourgó tou monís. Mas exíyise otí sto písó méros tou ergastirión ftaisían to yialí, enó sto brostínó, ópou ítan oi tehnítes, topothetóisan to yialí sta molvidína pláisia yia na kánoun tous iolopínakes (NRMG: 160).

Thus we met Nicholas of Morimondo, master glazier of the abbey. He explained to us that in the rear part of the forge they also blew glass, whereas in this front part, where the smiths worked, the glass was fixed [lit. they fixed glass, AS] to the leads, to make windows (NRE:85).

As in Danish, it might be argued that there is a distinction between the expression of the “vague” agent (i.e., an agent representing a subgroup of humanity, preferentially expressed by means of the vague they construction) and the expression of the “impersonal” agent (i.e., an agent representing virtually all humanity, usually encoded by the vague you construction). Unfortunately, neither in this case does statistics support any final decision, as Table 14 shows.

Table 14. Agentless generic events in NRMG; results are only limitedly significant (χ² = 5.17; d.f. = 1; p between 2 and 2.5; Yate's correction applied).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent representing all humanity</th>
<th>Agent representing a subgroup thereof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encoded by the vague you construction</td>
<td>55.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encoded by the vague they construction</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Generalisations

The facts surveyed above are hardly accidental, and make it reasonably feasible to advance some descriptive generalisations about the function of passive and impersonal constructions. In this section the major points of the analysis are briefly restated, and then some of its implications are discussed. The point of departure of the present study was the optimistic assumption that it would prove possible to refine the traditional notion of agent defocusing through the analysis of textual data. The results are encouraging: in each of the languages of the sample there is a consistent division of labour among passive and impersonal constructions. Three situation types have been identified which are systematically associated with certain modes of expression in each of the five languages of the sample.

Of course, some hypotheses explaining why a given construction has a certain function and distribution can be formulated, but they are secondary to the primary task of demonstrating that there are some general regularities in the area of agent defocusing that can be successfully captured by means of an in-depth analysis of texts.

Perhaps the main question raised by the present study is whether the situation types described in §4 are atomic, underivable configurations, or whether they are derivable from the syntactic form of the constructions that instantiate them. In other words, the question to be addressed is whether there are any syntactic features of the constructions investigated here that would make the three situation types only epiphenomenal. The answer to this question can be only partially positive. In principle, it could be stated that the more the patient is coded as subject-like, the more likely is the construction in point to encode a patient-oriented process, as the following facts demonstrate:

(a) the periphrastic passive (as well as the middle diathesis in Modern Greek), in which the patient is fully promoted to subjecthood (it governs agreement and appears before the verb), are generally used to encode patient-oriented processes;
(b) in the Italian periphrastic construction VS order favours a conceptualisation of the event as a bare happening, and may be said to reflect iconically the “unitary” assertion of a given situation. It is a fact that post-verbal position is a structural (or, rather, behavioural in the sense of Haspelmath 1999) feature of non-subjects in Italian. The same post-verbal position of the patient is the unmarked case in the Polish -no/-to construction. In the Danish impersonal passive, which is generally used to encode bare happenings, the patient also appears post-verbally;
(c) middle constructions, in which patients are only partially promoted to subjecthood (e.g. they normally appear post-verbally), are consistently associated with bare happenings and agentless generic events across the languages of the sample;
(d) other impersonal constructions, such as the impersonal man construction in Danish, are not unexpectedly associated with bare happenings and agentless generic events.
Some of the data discussed above, however, challenge any explanation invoking a one-to-one correspondence between form and function:

(e) firstly, and most importantly, even when two languages have the same range of construction types, it is by no means automatic that these construction types have the same distribution. Italian and Spanish data are instructive in this respect: in Spanish VS order, though admitted, is almost never used in the periphrastic passive (Sansò 2003:84ff.); unlike Italian, the Spanish middle construction is spreading at the expenses of the periphrastic passive in the encoding of patient-oriented processes as examples (23)–(25) show. This fact is also signalled by grammars of Modern Spanish (cf. e.g. Mendikoetxea 1999:1673). In the other languages of the sample, the middle construction is rarely associated with patient-oriented processes. Assuming that the two pairs of Italian and Spanish constructions are used under the same conditions (which would be perfectly reasonable on the basis of form alone) would put us on the wrong track, and only a detailed analysis of texts may tease out all the mechanisms at work;

(f) in many of the languages examined the bare happening is encoded in the same way as the patient-oriented process: in Italian, there is a significant number of cases in which SV periphrastic passives are used to convey bare happenings (recall Table 7); in Danish and Modern Greek the same construction is used for both situation types; a similar pattern is observed in German and Dutch (Sansò 2003:123ff.). Now, since we have some pieces of evidence in favour of the linguistic significance of the distinction between patient-oriented process and bare happening (mainly the fact that there is a language in the sample, namely Polish, which has an impersonal construction that has been shown to encode almost exclusively the bare happening), the only way we are left with to account for this discrepancy between function and form is to admit that the functional range of a given construction does not depend on its structure, but is relatively free, and there is no restriction, at least in theory, on the distribution of constructions within the functional space formed by the three situation types described in this paper.

However fond we may be of a strict (one-to-one) correspondence between form and function, it should not blind us to the possibility that the truth may lie somewhere in the middle. Given some structural properties of a passive/impersonal construction, it is perfectly plausible that this construction is used to express a given situation type, but this is by no means automatic, and there are other factors that play a role in the distribution of passive/impersonal constructions within the functional domain of agent defocusing. Thus, although we can, as a preliminary statement, invoke a syntactic gradient of patient and agent coding which is correlated with a functional gradient of patient and agent prominence, we should also acknowledge, in order to advance our understanding of this functional domain, that the function and use of a given morphosyntactic structure is also determined by the functional domain formed by the three situation types described in §4, and by other structures available in the coding of that domain. Processes of functional extensions of a given construction at the ex-
Table 15. A cline of agent defocusing

| Agent less discourse-central than the patient | Patient-oriented process: the state of affairs is represented from the point of view of the patient | Periphrastic constructions (agent expressed as an oblique); medial diathesis |
| Agent easily recoverable from the context; patient highly topical | Bare happening: the event is conceptualised as a naked fact, in summary fashion | Agentless periphrastic constructions; medial diathesis; (middle constructions) |
| Agent de-emphasised, irrelevant; Patient not particularly topical | | Periphrastic passives; medial diathesis; impersonal passives; middle constructions |
| Agent not specified but identifiable as a subgroup of humanity; patient not particularly topical | Agentless generic event: the action/event is irrealis | middle constructions, man-clauses, vague they constructions |
| Agent representing virtually all humanity; patient not particularly topical | | |

In addition to other constructions, the choice of other constructions is perfectly plausible and motivated if we postulate a functional domain of agent defocusing. Equally plausible and motivated are distributional differences between similar constructions in different languages, which may well be ascribed to differences in the inventory of construction types: for instance, the (range of) function(s) of a given construction type in a language in which it is the only structure in the coding of this functional domain may be different from the function of the same construction type in a language that has several constructions encoding the same functional domain.21

7. Agent defocusing: A tentative hierarchy

The discussion thus far suggests that there is a functional cline of agent defocusing ranging from those cases in which the agent is easily recoverable from the context to cases in which it cannot be identified but generally. In the following table, this cline is shown in association with the construction types preferentially associated with the various situation types described in this paper.

While this table of correlations is in no way definitive, it nonetheless suggests some interesting remarks. Firstly, the status of the agent alone is not sufficient to determine the choice of a given passive/impersonal construction; the status of the patient also partly concurs to this choice. An array of situation types arranged along a cline of event elaboration appears to account more realistically for the facts surveyed above than a hierarchy of agent defocusing based solely on the properties of the agent. The notion of event elaboration, being in a direct relationship with the individuation of
both agent and patient, subsumes the notions of agent defocusing and patient promotion (cf. Sansò 2003:Ch. 3) and allows for a more realistic representation of linguistic complexity.

That the correlations sketched above are not to be considered as definitive is underscored by a number of other facts: on the one hand, even in a typologically homogeneous sample of languages, structurally similar constructions show considerable differences in usage, and thus it is perfectly plausible that more exotic languages will complicate this picture; on the other hand, even in such a reduced sample, there are strong indications that the label “agentless generic event” is a comfortable shortcoming, and that this situation type is to be subdivided into two or more situation types in order to account for the distribution of different agent-defocusing constructions across languages. In the languages analysed there are no clear cut-off points between agent-defocusing strategies associated with this situation type, and no possibilities in this regard can be suggested on the basis of these data solely. However, the data from Danish and Modern Greek make it reasonably clear (although not statistically significant) that we ought to distinguish between those cases in which the agent represents virtually all humanity and those in which it represents a subgroup thereof. Modern Greek data also show that there are subtle semantic and functional differences between the vague you and the vague they constructions. This fact is corroborated by independent pragmatic studies of English discourse such as Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990), according to whom the non-referential use of you virtually applies to anyone and/or everyone, whereas the non-referential use of they excludes the speaker and the addressee, and needs to be anchored somehow in space or time (Kitagawa & Lehrer 1990:749; see also Myhill 1997:818ff.). This makes you a more plausible candidate for potential or deontic predications, which typically apply to anyone, whereas they is more suitable for the expression of generic actions anchored in space or time (cf. above, ex. (50) and (51)).

A further question to ask is about the mental reality of the situation types identified in this paper. Of course, “this is a question that cannot be answered with the linguist’s tools, i.e. the observation of the behaviour and distribution of expressions in naturally occurring texts and speakers’ intuitions” (Haspelmath 2003:237). Suffice it to say here that it is reasonable to assume that the basic cognitive processes that allow us to conceptualise events at different levels of elaboration are the same or essentially similar in every language (cf. Sansò 2005).

Finally, it is worth emphasising that refinements of the functional domain proposed in this paper will be possible and even wanted. One crucial factor affecting the distribution of passive and impersonal constructions is the complexity of their inventory in a given language, and thus any new language can falsify the generalisations proposed in this paper. Furthermore, the present research has deliberately removed an issue which certainly encroaches on this functional domain, namely the existence of aspectual constraints on the use of passive and impersonal constructions (but cf. Sansò 2003:106ff.). The descriptive insights of this paper are only half of the story (not the most uninteresting one, I believe): the exact discrimination of what a given construc-
tion type can and cannot do across languages (its functional “limits”, so to speak) will only originate from a much more detailed cross-linguistic investigation.
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Notes

1. Passives of transitive verbs and impersonal passives are often considered (e.g. by Kirsner 1976; Comrie 1977; Perlmutter 1978) to be the same phenomenon on the basis of their derivational and structural properties. Others (e.g. Frajzyngier 1982; Shore 1988; Blevins 2003; Abraham, this volume) deem their similarities less important than their differences, and advance arguments towards the recognition of the class of impersonal constructions and impersonal passives in both functional and syntactic terms.

2. These constructions are in general quite rare in the literary language (Myhill 1997: 808, 819, and passim). Modern Greek is the only language in the sample in which these constructions are used consistently to translate passive and impersonal constructions of the original text.

3. As a result of Latin linguistic scholarship, however, the term “passive” has been systematically misapplied to a class of impersonal constructions, especially in Balto-Finnic and Balto-Slavic (Shore 1988: 151–154; Blevins 2003).

4. It might be objected that original Spanish, Polish, Danish, and Greek data were to be preferred to translation data. A number of considerations override the problem in this case. Firstly, the generalisations proposed here for Italian and Spanish are corroborated by the results of a larger-scale investigation based on a wider corpus of texts (Sansò 2003). Secondly, and more importantly, translators of fictional texts are professionals who consciously re-produce a text for a new audience. Moreover, the translated text is very often revised by editors and publishers, who are further away from the source version, so that in the end the translated text becomes a target language text with its own history. The legitimacy of the use of translation corpora for cross-linguistic semantic studies has been convincingly defended by Noël in a recent paper (2003).

5. The reflexive/middle marker has a number of uses that are not dealt with in detail here (cf. Kemmer 1993; Frajzyngier & Curl 2000; Steinbach 2002: 17ff.). Typically, it is analysed as an indicator of valency reduction, and is lexicalised within a class of transitive verbs in order to express their intransitive counterpart (anticausative). Passive/impersonal uses of the middle marker differ from the anticausative use in that, even when the former has no agent, the existence of a person/thing bringing about the event/action is implied, whereas the anticausative is consistent with the situation coming
about spontaneously (cf. Comrie 1985:326). Besides the anticausative, there is a class of middle verbs which lack a transitive counterpart (e.g., German sich schämen, ‘be ashamed’), and there are languages such as English and, to a lesser extent, Dutch, which do not insert a reflexive/middle marker for what are clearly middle (anticausative) constructions and middle verbs (Kemmer 1993:10–11; Abraham 1995:29ff.).

6. *Individuation* is a complex notion subsuming a number of other notions. An entity is more individuated if in any of the following oppositions it represents the former pole: referential vs. non-referential, human vs. non-human, animate vs. inanimate, concrete vs. abstract, singular vs. plural, definite vs. indefinite, discourse-old vs. discourse-new, high- vs. low-ranking on the empathy hierarchy (Hopper & Thompson 1980:253). This notion may be extended in scope to cover also the event: prototypical transitive events are maximally individuated, while intransitive events are low in individuation.

7. The reader is referred to Sansò (2003), where the notion of elaboration of events is thoroughly explored in connection with passive constructions in Italian, Spanish, German, Dutch, and Polish.

8. According to Mann and Thompson (1988), when interpreters read a text, they naturally understand it as divided into parts related in various ways by a number of rhetorical relations. Each relation holds between two text spans, called the *nucleus* and the *satellite*: the nucleus is broadly defined as that span which is independent from the other; the satellite is the member of the pair which is more suitable for substitution. Typically, nuclear chunks belong to the main narrative line and move forward the reference time, whereas satellites do not: thus, the result is a discourse in which some clauses (nuclei) are physically near other clauses (satellites) but actually function as distinct entities, in that only the latter may be removed without much change to the function of the text as a whole.

9. The need for adverbial modification lies in the newsworthiness of the proposition: given a sentence like *dieses Buch liest sich gut*, since everyone knows that books are read, what is newsworthy is that a particular book can be read easily, quickly or whatever. The notion of genericity in connection with middle constructions is discussed by Turley (1998).

10. Mode “refers to the distinction between ‘realis’ and ‘irrealis’ encoding of events. An action which either did not occur, or which is presented as occurring in a non-real (contingent) world, is obviously less effective than one whose occurrence is actually asserted as corresponding directly with a real event” (Hopper & Thompson 1980:252).

11. It is also clear that the boundaries between these three situation types are not distinct, but fuzzy to some degree. Nonetheless, the differentiation between the three situation types appears to be realistic, as all situation types have a focal point around which the prototypical cases tend to cluster. For the present purposes, whenever there was uncertainty about the classification of a given clause, that clause has been eliminated from the statistical counts.

12. In Italian, the auxiliary *venire*, ‘come’, is also possible: it has nearly the same range of uses as *essere*, ‘be’, but, unlike *essere*, it cannot be used in compound tenses. Its use is largely favoured whenever there is ambiguity between a passive reading and an adjectival reading (*la porta veniva chiusa* may only mean ‘the door was being closed’, whereas *la porta era chiusa* is ambiguous). The data obtained from the present corpus, and from the larger corpus used in Sansò (2003), confirm that there are no other distributional differences between *venire*- and *essere*-passives. In Spanish there is no ambiguity between the adjectival interpretation and the passive one. The adjectival passive is normally expressed by means of the auxiliary *estar*, ‘stay’, plus the past participle (*El coche está arreglado desde ayer*, ‘the car is repaired since yesterday’).
13. In Italian, when there is a patient, it is generally promoted to subject; admittedly far less common is the pattern without agreement (e.g. *si vede le stelle*, refl sees the stars, ‘one sees the stars’): as Lepschy (1992: 93) correctly observes, “*si vede le stelle* è un costrutto duro, se non inaccettabile e... normalmente si usa, con lo stesso valore, *si vedono le stelle*”. In Spanish, the patient subject is usually inanimate; if it is animate, it is typically indefinite and unindividuated. When the patient is pronominal, the middle construction is non-promotional in both Italian and Spanish (cf. exx. (16)–(17), and (25)).

14. In both cases the agent may be only human, and may be expressed as an oblique; in Italian the overt expression of the agent is rejected by some speakers and is not attested in the present corpus and in the larger corpus used in Sansò (2003) either. In the following real example the agent is introduced by *da parte di*, ‘on the part of’; far less common is the expression of the agent by means of the preposition *da*, ‘by’ (lit. from), as in the periphrastic passive:

(i) *Se da parte di utenti stranieri si desidera usufruire temporaneamente del patrimonio della Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, si tenga conto del fatto che libri e riviste nella grande maggioranza dei casi non sono consultabili immediatamente.*

If foreign users want to access the collections of the Bavarian State Library on a short-term basis, they should be aware that in most cases books and periodicals cannot be consulted on the spot. In Spanish there is no agreement among reference grammars about the possibility of expressing the agent in the middle construction. Agentive middle constructions are found mainly in the literary language and in newspapers (e.g. *el gran arcaísmo de la epopeya castellana se va ya aceptando por todos*, ‘the archaic character of Castillian epic poetry is nowadays accepted by everybody’, Mendikoetxea 1999: 1683).

15. In this and the following tables frequencies are given as percentages. However, the $\chi^2$ test was performed on the raw observed frequencies, as their conversion into percentages may disguise significant results or magnify non-significant values of $p$.

16. *-no and -to are two allomorphs of the neuter singular form of the past participle, now ending in -ne/-te in Polish. The -no/-to construction is strictly related to the so-called possessive perfect of Northern Russian (cf. Timberlake 1976, who speaks of a passive construction): *U menja bylo telenka zarezano*, by me aux.sg.n calf.acc slaughtered.sg.n, ‘by me there’s been slaughtered a calf’ (Timberlake 1976: 548). In synchronic descriptions of Polish this form is never described as an impersonal passive (cf. Frajzyngier 1982: 272–275 and references therein); instead, it is described as indicating an indefinite human subject.

17. The adjectival/stative construction with the auxiliary *være*, ‘be’, plus the past participle will not be included among the data discussed in this section.

18. Unlike Danish, in German and Dutch the patient does govern agreement. *Der* can also be used in connection with the middle construction (e.g. *der sås mange folk på gaden*, many people were seen in the street); the total amount of periphrastic and middle constructions with *der* is markedly low in my corpus, and is removed from the statistical counts displayed in Table 11.

19. The Danish middle construction is structurally different from other middle constructions found in the other languages of the sample. The middle marker is a bound morpheme attached to various active forms of the verb.

20. The transliteration of Modern Greek examples follows the guidelines of the *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*.

21. A different but related question is whether the distributional differences described may be indicative of different locations of the passive/impersonal marker along the paths of diachronic development
Andrea Sansò

(cf. for instance Haspelmath 1990): it is a well-known fact that there are many sources from which passive morphology arises via grammaticalisation; there are no cross-linguistic data about the diachronic origin of impersonal constructions, but it is reasonable to assume that the sources from which impersonal morphology arises are roughly the same as passive morphology. One simple answer to this question would be that the variety of uses of the construction types investigated here challenges any explanation in terms of different locations of the passive/impersonal marker on the path of grammaticalisation, and passive and impersonal constructions from different sources across languages may become functionally indistinguishable, as Haspelmath (1990:53) wisely cautions us.
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This article is devoted to a systematic account of Lithuanian Actor-demoting devices, both grammatical (with participles, only to a limited extent by the reflexive marker) and lexical (by the reflexive marker), and their interplay in the contemporary language. Occasional comparisons with Latvian are drawn, and the typological background is laid out briefly. The account is based on Role&Reference Grammar and on the taxonomy of valency changes described for so-called reflexive verbs in the pioneering work of Geniušienė (1987). As one of the main outcomes of the present study we may consider the confirmation of a systematic restriction of the so-called ‘impersonal passive’ to predicates with a human being representing the highest-ranking (often sole) argument. This restriction has been observed for many other languages with impersonals. The crucial point however is that this restriction is stronger than argument-based restrictions, a fact which becomes particularly manifest within a small group of lexical converses marked with the reflexive marker, for reflexive-causative constructions and for two-place intransitive verbs whose single macrorole must be an Undergoer (rather than an Actor). Another main conclusion to be drawn from the analysis is the existence of a functional split with impersonals which can acquire an inferential reading: in this case the restrictions of referential properties stated above as well as orientation toward any macrorole are cancelled. Differently from Geniušienė’s contribution to this volume, here no aspectual functions are discussed, nor is there any focus on discourse-pragmatic properties of Actor-demoting devices. Instead, the clear focus of this article lies on the impersonal (‘subjectless passive’ in Geniušienė’s terminology) and its interaction with lexical valency-changes caused by the reflexive marker.

Introduction

In the present paper I want to show how Lithuanian passive constructions, which are created exclusively on the basis of participles, can interfere with agent-deranking achieved by the reflexive marker -si/-s.¹ This device, in turn, is enormously widespread and represented by a broad array of valence-changing (in particular valence-
Reducing) types of “reflexive derivation” – with the remarkable exception of the passive (both “personal” and “impersonal”, for the distinction see below). I thus want to show in which way the participial passive can be combined with lexical valence-changes conditioned by the reflexive marker (henceforth RM), and which kinds of constraints can be formulated. The different behaviour and distribution of passive and impersonal in contemporary Lithuanian allow for the conclusion that these construction types act differently on the lexical structure of verbs and participate in different functional domains. The Lithuanian passive and impersonal differ with respect to how the hierarchy of arguments and their inherent referential properties (i.e. properties according to ontological hierarchies) interact with each other. As concerns the impersonal, referential properties happen to be more important than constraints based on argument structure (logical decomposition), and referential restrictions, in turn, can be overruled by evidential functions (which are by themselves unrelated to lexical structure).

On this occasion I have to stress that impersonal and evidential functions are by no means mutually exclusive. They intersect, because they describe properties of different domains: the label ‘impersonal’ belongs to the syntax-semantics interface, as is refers first and foremost to the syntactic coding of arguments, whereas ‘evidential’ (as well as ‘inferential’) are notions on a pragmatic or discourse level which describe the speaker’s desire to signal that s/he did not experience by him/herself the situation denoted by the respective predicate(s).

Before I discuss these particular issues in Section 3, it seems convenient to lay out the theoretical and typological background on which argument-demotion devices will be assessed here (Section 1). The theoretical layout involves some pertinent basic data about Lithuanian (and extant Baltic in general; see 1.1 and 1.3–1.4), but it also concerns the theoretical equipment necessary for the treatment of the lexicon-syntax interface (1.2, 1.5). Section 2, then, gives an account of the typological background of agent-demotion, which will, I hope, be helpful in assessing the particular Lithuanian data to be presented in Sections 3–4. Section 5 brings together further threads, which are necessary to make sense of the picture obtained from the data. The results of the analysis will be summarized in Section 6.

1. Theoretical framework

1.1 On participial constructions in Lithuanian

Basically, Lithuanian participles pertinent for argument-demotion are encountered in two kinds of constructions, which can formally (and in a somewhat simplified manner) be represented as follows:
I. \( \text{NP}_\text{nominative} - \text{V}_\text{auxiliary} (\text{optional in present tense}) - t/m\text{-participle}_\text{nominative} - \text{NP}_\text{genitive} (\text{optional}) \)

\((=\) lowest-ranking argument\(=\) highest-ranking argument\))

II. \( \text{NP}_\text{genitive} (\text{optional}) - \text{V}_\text{auxiliary} (\text{only for past and future tense}) - \text{ta/ma-participle} \).

(See the list of abbreviations before the notes.)

Construction I. schematizes what can be called the canonical passive, with a subject in the nominative triggering gender and number agreement on the nominal part of the predicate; i.e. the inflected participle. The subject represents the lowest-ranking argument of a predicate with no less than two arguments; its highest-ranking argument can optionally be expressed by a NP in the genitive. Construction II. represents the so-called “impersonal” passive. Contrary to the first construction, it does not have a syntactically privileged argument (on which see 1.2). In other words: the \( ta/ma\)-forms block agreement, their highest-ranking argument (often the only one) can be coded in the genitive. The realisation of this argument is optional (as with construction I.), unless the whole construction acquires inferential function (see Section 4). Differently from the agreeing construction I., \( ta/ma\)-participles can be (and frequently are) derived from intransitive verbs. Their form reflects the remnant of the otherwise lost neuter gender (with the unstressed suffix -\( a\)).

In both constructions the participle is derived from a verb with a suffix, either -\( t\)- or -\( m\)-. The first of them can be considered an anteriority participle, the second does not mark anterior time reference, but can basically be characterized as marking simultaneity or lack of discrete location in time. Since neither of them is restricted to transitive verbs, it seems inadequate to name them “passive participles” (although they constitute the core of Lithuanian passive constructions). They serve as passive participles proper only if applied to transitive stems in construction I. (see 1.3).

The auxiliary (which could also be regarded simply as a copula) is always a form of the verb \( \text{būt}i\) ’to be’. It is optional. With construction II. the use of the auxiliary (copula) is very restrictive: it never appears in the present tense (regardless of its function). Moreover, it often acquires evidential (more precisely: inferential) function, especially with the \( ta\)-participle (because of its anterior time value); see Section 4. Since the inferential reading of construction II. with the \( ta\)-participle is already based on reference to an anterior state of affairs, it extremely rarely occurs with an additional past auxiliary; it virtually never combines with an auxiliary in the future tense. It is important to stress that, apart from the present tense, the restrictions on the auxiliary in construction II. are valid only with respect to the evidential function; if it functions simply as an impersonal (without any additional inferential “flavour”), a past or future tense auxiliary is far from unusual (see, for instance, ex. (28)). The intersection of the impersonal and the evidential function of construction II. will be discussed in Section 4 (see also Wiemer, to appear I: Section 3; to appear 3: 3.3).

The following examples may be used as standard illustrations of the basic structures I–II:
I. foregrounding passive, with privileged syntactic argument (PSA):

(1) Namas buvo pastatytas praeitais metais.
    house.nom.sg.m (=PSA) cop.past.3 build.ar.nom.sg.m last year.ins.pl
    ‘The house was built last year.’

(2) Namas yra statomas jau dvejus metus.
    house.nom.sg.m (=PSA) cop.prs.3 build.sp.nom.sg.m already two year.acc.pl
    ‘The house has been being built for two years.’

II. backgrounding / “impersonal” passive (without PSA):

(3) Praeitą naktį (mūsų) (buvo) miegota blogai.
    last night.acc.sg we.gen cop.past.3 sleep.ap.neut badly
    ‘We slept badly last night.’

(4) Paskutiniu metu (vaiko) miegama blogai.
    latest time.ins.sg child.gen sleep.sp.neut badly
    ‘The child has been sleeping badly recently.’

Construction II can acquire an inferential interpretation, but such a reading is by no means mandatory. Many informants consider them synonymous with sentences containing finite verbs and a PSA, as in

(3’) Praeitą naktį mes miegojome blogai.
    last night.acc we.nom (=PSA) sleep.past.1.pl badly
    ‘Last night we slept badly’.

(4’) Paskutiniu metu vaikas miega blogai.
    latest time.ins child.nom (=PSA) sleep.prs.3 badly
    ‘The child has been sleeping badly recently.’

The unstable (and often unpredictable) evidential character of the construction with the ta/ma-participle (as well as of the present perfect with active participles, which will not be discussed here, since they do not bear any relationship to the passive) is one of the most complicated problems in the grammar of Lithuanian. Although I will tackle the question of evidential (inferential) readings with regard to argument structure and the ontological nature of the involved referents in Section 4, a thorough enough discussion of the conditions under which the probability of an evidential reading of ta/ma-participles increases would be a task beyond the scope of this contribution.

1.2 The lexicon-syntax interface in Role & Reference Grammar

By and large, Role & Reference Grammar (RRG) has proven to be a model very appropriate for the description of the semantics-syntax interface (cf. Van Valin & LaPolla 1997). In general, RRG can be regarded as a lexicalistic model of syntax, which op-
erates with lexical decomposition and the concept of macroroles. These are defined as “generalizations across classes of specific argument positions in logical structure” (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:142). Each predicate can have no more than two macroroles, Actor and Undergoer; it is then considered M-transitive. Often it possesses only one (M-intransitive), it may also not have any macrorole (M-atransitive). Transitivity is thus understood in semantic terms, it is not a syntactic notion.

Very briefly, we can say that macroroles are arranged as poles on a scale of specific argument positions, on which the Actor corresponds to the most agent-like role/position, the Undergoer to the most patient-like role/position. In RRG specific case roles (or: thematic relations) are re-defined on the basis of argument positions in logical structure (decomposition), projected onto the Actor-Undergoer-hierarchy. This is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Actor-Undergoer-hierarchy (with thematic relations based on argument positions in decomposition)](image)

Macroroles, being conceived of as semantic concepts, are also necessary in order to explain the linking from the lexical representation of argument structures to their (morpho)syntactic encoding, and vice versa. For not every semantic argument of a predicate (verb) can acquire macrorole status. This status can be ascribed only to those semantic arguments which allow for restricted neutralizations. These are, in turn, the cornerstone in defining grammatical relations. In particular: macroroles establish a ‘privileged syntactic argument’ (PSA) in marked and unmarked voice constructions. One of the most prominent representatives among PSAs is the subject, which in Lithuanian is realized in the nominative. In the case of the passive the PSA can be captured as a derived subject, which codes the Undergoer.4

Thus, roughly speaking, in languages with NOM-ACC-alignment the PSA of an active construction (= unmarked voice) coincides with the Actor, whereas in the passive (= marked) voice it codes the Undergoer. If, then, the lowest-ranking (i.e. most patient-like) argument of a two- or three-place verb is not realized as PSA in marked voice, it cannot be recognized as the Undergoer (cf., for instance, ex. (28), (31), (47)). In such a case the verb is considered M-intransitive.

The distinctions made here in accordance with RRG are sufficient to draw a clear-cut demarcation line between the passive proper and the impersonal: the former has a PSA which is extensionally identical with the Undergoer, while the latter does not show any PSA. In RRG terminology the former is called ‘PSA modulation voice’, the latter
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'argument modulation voice' (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:294f.). Other, synonymous manners of naming these two constructions are 'foregrounding' vs. 'backgrounding passive'. However, having made these distinctions explicit, I will simply speak of 'passive' and 'impersonal' (despite the unfortunate naming of the latter; see Section 4).

1.3 Lithuanian participles and macrorole orientation

According to this framework it seems justified to say that the derivation of participles achieved in Lithuanian by both t- and m-forms focuses on the lowest-ranking (= most patient-like) argument of the respective verb. As a rule, this can be recognized as an Undergoer. However, there are a couple of instances in which it is at least questionable whether the respective argument can be treated as a macrorole at all. This is reflected, first of all, in adnominal participles like

\[ (5) \text{miego-ti 'to sleep'} \Rightarrow \text{miega-} m\text{-asis kambarys 'sleeping room'} \text{ (i.e. the room to be slept in)} \]

\[ (6) \text{gyven-ti 'to live'} \Rightarrow \text{gyvena-} m\text{-oji vieta 'place for living'.} \]

In other cases the argument focussed on by these suffixes (mostly by -m-) is actually the Actor, i.e. the highest-ranking role (and also macrorole), even if an Undergoer belongs to the verb's lexical structure, too. Compare the following examples:

\[ (7) \text{ramin-ti 'to calm (tr.), soothe'} \Rightarrow \text{ramina-} m\text{-ieji vaistai 'soporific medicine' (i.e. "medicine which soothes").} \]

\[ (8) \text{gaivin-ti 'to refresh'} \Rightarrow \text{gaivina-} m\text{-ieji gėrimai 'refreshing drinks'.} \]

These patterns conform to common devices of contemporary standard Lithuanian, but they are productive only when it comes to forging special terms (in different professional branches). They are rarely encountered in predicative use, so that it is correct to say that t/m-participles are genuine passive participles (i.e. participles oriented toward the Undergoer) only when they are used predicatively (cf. Wiemer 2004b:288–293).

1.4 Pseudo-passive constructions with RM-forms in Baltic

The fact that Lithuanian and Latvian do not have a passive based on the RM is remarkable insofar as these languages, in particular Lithuanian, demonstrate an extraordinarily broad array of valence-changing derivations indicated by the RM, most of which have remained more or less productive. In Lithuanian all kinds of subject- and object-oriented types of derived diatheses are attested, except for the passive proper (cf. Geniušienė 1987, to appear, this volume). In fact, Lithuanian uses the RM for the purposes of the so-called "modal" (or "generic", or "quasi-" ) passive. These labels refer to a whole sack of diatheses derived from transitive verbs whose Actor is demoted syntactically: it loses PSA status and can be mentioned at best in the dative (see ex. (12)).

Here belong such cases like the following ones:
The syntactic demotion of the Actor inherent to the lexical structure of the deriving transitive verbs is what brings these cases close to the passive. There are, however, some characteristics which show that these RM-constructions do not exactly correspond to the active voice denotationally, first of all because the Actor referent gets deprived of some of its agentive properties. It may even be deranked to a merely presuppositional element of the clause. As a consequence, these pseudo-passive constructions are to be considered intermediary between the proper passive and anticausatives (which describe state-changing events without a lexically presupposed Actor). This kind of semantic demotion appears to be a consequence of one of the following sets of properties: in one case of pseudo-passives the potential human Actor is only generic, the construction cannot be used episodically, i.e. with discrete time location, and an alethic component is added, which is absent in the active (ex. (9)–(10)). In this case the construction is usually acceptable only if it is accompanied by a manner adverbial (see ‘easily’ in ex. (10)). In other cases the Actor (not necessarily a generic one) is devoid of control over the particular circumstances (manner, time span, etc.) under which the action takes place or is accomplished. In this case the situation is time-located (ex. (11)–(12)); it is accompanied by a resultative implication, if the predicate is in (simple) past tense (ex. (11)).

Such pseudo-passive constructions (both cases) are more productive in Latvian than in Lithuanian, where, though amounting to about 190 units (among 5680), they are rather restricted to a lexically closed set (as they are in Russian and other Slavic languages). Cf. Holvoet (2001a:176–181) for a detailed account and inner-Baltic comparison, Geniušienė (this volume: 1.2) for the statistical data. Holvoet is certainly right in claiming that pseudo-passives created with the aid of the RM are to be considered not as separate verbal items in the lexicon, but as RM-forms of transitive verbs (Holvoet 2001a:181–183, 188f.). The proper reason for such a stand should, in my opinion, be not so much the productivity of pseudo-passives in Latvian (which seems to be unique in the whole language area), but rather the argument that pseudo-passives are clearly semantically derived from highly transitive verbs.

Another type of RM-diathesis which is clearly derived from causative verbs is the reflexive-causative discussed in 3.5. However, in the predominant number of RM-diatheses (distinguished in Geniušienė 1987) the direction of semantic derivation is by no means self-evident. The direction of derivation is unclear in particular also in those valence-changing operations indicated by the RM which have traditionally been lumped together in the so-called “medium” (into which Abraham 1995 includes the pseudo-passives just discussed; see F. 11). This brings us to the next point.
1.5 Grammatical vs. lexical impersonals

In addition (and independently of RRG) a distinction between lexical and grammatical derivation and, correspondingly, between lexically and grammatically conditioned impersonals is necessary for a proper understanding of the facts discussed immediately below. Grammatical derivation leaves the verb’s lexical structure intact, lexical derivation influences it to some degree or other (cf. Wiemer 2004b:280–282; to appear 2). Thus, the RM, which is a very wide-spread device of lexical derivation in Baltic as well as in Slavic languages, can be seen as a means of grammatical derivation only if it functions as the central part of a genuine passive, insofar as the lexical structure of active and passive voice is identical (see 1.4). A genuine passive does not add (or alter) any semantic components (which would change its denotational value), it rather gives but another semantics-syntax linking than the active (unmarked) voice.9 The same applies to grammatical impersonals, with but one, though important difference: impersonals betray a systematic referential restriction to human (or at best animate) beings, which is untypical for well-established passives proper. I will come back to this during the following discussion of data.

Lexical impersonals, in the most typical case, are those PSA-less constructions which correspond to unmarked syntactic realizations of either zero-place verbs (e.g., Lith. Griaudžia ‘It is thundering’ or Temsta ‘It is getting dark’) or one- or two-place verbs with no argument being coded as Actor and a questionable Undergoer, which cannot be made the PSA of a passive (e.g., Lith. Man.dat skauda galvą,acc lit. ‘To me (it) is aching (my) head’ = ‘I have a headache’, Jam.dat jos.gen pagailo lit. ‘To him (it) hers became pity’ = ‘He began to feel sorry for her’).

In this investigation lexical impersonals as such are beyond the scope of our interest, but we will need to concern ourselves with them once more in Section 4.

2. Combinations of passives and impersonals: typological background

Passives and impersonals can in principle be regarded as mutually independent constructions, which may also have different histories. This assertion is corroborated by two kinds of facts. First, there are languages in which both types of constructions are marked by different devices. This does not seem to happen very often, but at least the following languages have at their disposal different markers for passives and impersonals: Irish (Russell 1995:55f., 101f.; Shibatani 1998:117), Welsh (Frajzyngier 1982:284f.), Finnish and Kannada (Siewierska 1984:98, 100), Plains Cree (Wolfart 1991). The second, and actually more important, piece of evidence consists in the fact that there are languages in which impersonal and passive may be combined in one form of the verb. We might speak of “impersonalized passives”, but it often seems more adequate to characterize such constructions as ‘deranking of an indefinite or generic Actor’ (which often remains implicit), because they require that the Actor be animate or, even more specifically, human (cf. Shibatani 1998). We encounter this sit-
uation not only in Irish (Keenan 1985:276; Noonan 1994:284, 289) and Latin (in both its early and post-classical stages, cf. Wehr 1995:30f., as well as in Medieval Latin, cf. Hirt 1937:14f.), but also in German (Plank 1993), Italian and Ibero-Romance (Wehr 1995:62) as well as in Polish (see below) and Lithuanian (Geniušienė 1987:141).

For example, let us look at the passive in German, which is marked by the auxiliary **werden** 'to become'. It can be applied to transitive RM-verbs. In this case the RM marks lexical derivation (it introduces a beneficiary) and does not have an impersonalizing function. Grammatical Actor demotion, instead, is indicated by the form of the 3rd person singular of the auxiliary **werden**, the syntactically demoted Actor may not even be expressed by an oblique NP or PP. From a syntactic viewpoint, the whole construction can retain a direct object, but this object is semantically incorporated into the predicate and, therefore, does not represent an Undergoer:

(13)  
(13) a. Jetzt werden sich (*von allen / *den Kindern) die Zähne geputzt.  
    lit. ‘Now (it) gets cleaned the teeth (by everybody / the children).’  
    ‘It’s time (for you / the children) to clean your / their teeth.’

Apart from this, utterances with accusative objects of impersonal passives usually occur in an imperative function. This holds also for impersonals with the passive auxiliary **werden** of other types of RM-verbs, e.g. with reciprocal meaning:

(14)  
(14) a. Hier wird sich nicht gezankt.  
    lit. ‘Here (it) is not quarrelled,’ i.e. ‘Don’t quarrel here!’

Such utterances with RM-verbs (with and without accusative objects) are odd if used simply as descriptions of (episodic) situations, e.g.

(13)  
(13) b. Gestern wurde sich die Zähne geputzt.  
    lit. ‘Yesterday (it) was cleaned the teeth.’  
    ‘Yesterday one / we cleaned his / our teeth.’

(14) b. Vor zehn Minuten wurde sich hier heftig gezankt.  
    lit. ‘Ten minutes ago (it) was furiously quarrelled.’  
    ‘Ten minutes ago we / some people were quarrelling here furiously.’

Nonetheless they imply volitionality on the part of the implicit Actor, since one can hardly say something like

(15) Jetzt wird sich das Bein gebrochen  
    lit. ‘Now (it) is broken the leg.’ (Maybe in an instruction for masochistic practices?)

(16) Jetzt wird sich nicht mehr gehaßt. (vs. Jetzt wird sich nicht mehr verabredet.)  
    lit. ‘Now (it) is no longer hated each other.’ vs. ‘Now (it) is no longer made arrangements.’  
    ‘Stop hating each other.’ vs. ‘Don’t make any more arrangements with each other.’
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Neither do German benefactive-reflexive verbs allow the passive. The RM must be omitted:

(13) c. Gerade werden (*sich) die Zähne geputzt.
   ‘The teeth are just being washed.’

(17) Gestern wurden (*sich) neue Fernseher gekauft.
   ‘Yesterday new TV sets were bought.’

Passives of reflexive-benefactive verbs sound weird with RM even if used as a command, as, e.g., in the following example from Plank (1993:147):

(18) Zum letzten Mal:
    Here wird (sich) täglich der Hals gewaschen!
    lit. ‘Here is oneself daily the neck washed!’
    ‘For the last time: you’d better wash your neck every day!’

This clearly distinguishes German from Lithuanian, where the RM is regularly preserved both in impersonals and passives.11 One reason has to be sought in the fact that Lith. -si- is a movable, but bound morpheme (see F.1), whereas Germ. sich is intermediate between a clitic and a free (stressable) morpheme. Another reason lies in the different control properties of the RM in these two languages: in Lithuanian they are based much more on semantic grounds than in German (see 3.1). A further difference from German is that Lithuanian impersonals do not show any tendency to be used as equivalents of imperatives (see Section 3).

In German another possibility of impersonalizing passives consists in embedding the passive (always participial) in the scope of the so-called impersonal (or rather: indefinite-generic) pronoun man (compare French on). In this case the Actor can be expressed as in any other passive construction:

(19) Man ist von allen gelobt worden.12
    lit. ‘One has been praised by everybody.’

Contrary to this, in Italian, Spanish and Polish, where the passive likewise centres around participles, it is the RM which is used as the “impersonalizer”. In this case Italian and Spanish do not allow the Actor to be expressed in the standard fashion (by the preposition It. da ‘from’, Sp. por ‘through’, i.e. ‘by’; on Spanish cf. Mel’čuk 1993:21), but at best by something like the Italian PP da parte di ‘from the side of’, whereas in Polish the Actor can be expressed obliquely in the same way as in “canonical” passives. See (20) for Italian, (21) for Polish:

(20) Da parte di tutti si guarda con sospetto alla politica
di Bush.
    lit. ‘From the side of everybody (it) is looked at the politics of Bush with suspicion.’
    ≈ ‘Bush’s politics is looked at (evaluated) suspiciously by everybody.’
In Baltic (Lithuanian, Latvian) and Fennic (e.g., Estonian) we also find deverbal nouns as a means of deranking the verb's highest-ranking argument in passive-like (“impersonal”) constructions (cf. Holvoet 2001b:367ff.; Tommola 1997:182ff.). However, as concerns Fennic, the distinction between passive and impersonal itself is highly problematic. Furthermore, contrary to German, Italian and Polish, the Baltic and Fennic languages are almost incapable of embedding passives in impersonal constructions. The reason most probably is to be seen in the fact that these languages neither have a specific indefinite-generic pronoun of the German *man*-type, nor are passive and impersonal marked sufficiently distinctly, i.e. by two different morphological devices (as in Polish), to permit the insertion of a passive into an impersonal. The only exception is Lithuanian, in which we occasionally can come across a passive inserted into an impersonal that structurally somewhat reminds the Polish construction in (21). It is however much rarer and cannot be identical to it, because in Lithuanian both the passive and the impersonal are based only on participles. In addition, the participle marking the passive must agree with the Undergoer-NP in the genitive (as well as in number and gender); cf. Ją,gen (= Undergoer) būtis,gen.sg.m (= Actor) gerbiamo,gen.sg.m 'He (apparently) was esteemed by everybody’. Thus, contrary to the Polish construction (ex. (21)), the Lithuanian embedded passive requires both macroroles to be expressed in the impersonal.13 In general, both constructions described in 1.1 allow for oblique Actor phrases, whereas the Polish impersonal prohibits it.

Let us then illustrate this in the following section, in which the distribution of passives and impersonals is given depending on the type of diathesis marked by the RM.

### 3. Constraints on passives and impersonals of RM-verbs

When we say that Lithuanian cannot combine a passive with an impersonal, this, among other things, is conditioned by the absence of a RM-passive. This, however, does not mean that RM-verbs, i.e. verbs for which the RM serves as a marker of lexical derivation, cannot be passivized or “impersonalized”. Plank (1993:146) formulated the assumption that “passives of reflexives are only possible if reflexive markers are sufficiently similar to middle markers to, as it were, deceive the general constraints on permissible relationships between controllers and reflexives”. He mentions Lithuanian among those languages in which this condition is fulfilled. Following his reasoning, we should further assume that the RM, which in Baltic and Slavic is etymologically connected to a reflexive pronoun (< *sen or *sej; cf. Ambrazas 1979:119–121) and lost its referential functions (conditioning control) long ago, has spread within a semantic space of valence-changing derivations and therefore been able to apply as a marker of
very different lexically derived diatheses of the verb.\textsuperscript{14} This kind of “space” is usually represented by maps like those in Haspelmath (1987, 2003:Fig. 17) or Kemmer (1993).

On the basis of these assumptions I would like to formulate more precisely the conditions under which Lithuanian RM-verbs can be “impersonalized” and/or passivized. For this purpose I will use Geniušienė’s (1987) classification of diathesis types of RM-verbs and try to combine it with the tenets of RRG explained in 1.2. There are clear restrictions with regard to both subject impersonal (without a PSA) and the passive proper (with a PSA), especially for those derived diatheses which have traditionally been included into the so-called “middle voice”.\textsuperscript{15}

Probably the most trivial rule concerning the passive reads that there must be both macroroles, Actor and Undergoer, available in the predicate’s logical structure. This is, of course, nothing but a reformulation of the requirement that the predicate from which a passive is derived must be (semantically) transitive. The impersonal differs from the passive in that it does not need an Undergoer to operate on. This actually amounts to saying that both the passive and the impersonal always imply an Actor, and we can predict that neither of them can be created from RM-verbs which have only an Undergoer as their single macrorole. These simple rules seem to be self-evident (and they have been accounted for, in one way or other, by various theories). Below we will see that these rules explain the range of the passive and most restrictions on the impersonal. Nonetheless the conclusion that the impersonal always requires an Actor proves to be deficient when it comes to some particular cases where the impersonal is possible, although no Actor is present (or its presence is highly questionable). There will be three problematic cases to be considered: the first are RM-verbs whose single macrorole should be classified as an Undergoer (3.2), the second are RM-verbs in a converse relationship to their transitive equivalents (3.4); both cases represent M-intransitive verbs. The third case are impersonals from zero-place verbs (Section 4). Let us approach these problems step by step. I will do this by illustrating the behaviour of different classes of RM-verbs, before entering the question of how to treat “impersonals” of zero-place verbs.

3.1 Passives of reflexive-benefactives and criteria of control

The rule just formulated is in accordance with the productive usage of the passive from reflexive-benefactive verbs, since these are transitive. See the following sentence (the accent on the participle marks only stress, in order to distinguish it from the impersonal form, which is always stressed on the stem):

\begin{verbatim}
(22) Tokia tvarka mūsų pa-si-rink-t-á
    such order.nom.sg.f we.gen pref.rm chooscaarp.nom.sg.f
    ne tiek del geografinës eilës, kiek del tarmių fonetinës sistemos.
    'Such an order was chosen by us not so much for geographical reasons, but rather because of the phonetic system of the dialects.'

(from: Lietuvių tarmės III, pratarmė, p. 3)
\end{verbatim}
Contrary to the passive, impersonals of reflexive-benefactives are encountered extremely rarely. The reason for this is obvious and confirms the rule stated above: impersonals operate only on the Actor and do not promote the Undergoer to PSA; the direct object therefore remains in its place. In fact, we should rather say that Lithuanian avoids transitive impersonals. One of the extremely rare authentic examples in which a direct object is retained is the following:

(23) Vilnų vardas rodo, kad indo-europiečių jau senai
Indo-European.gen.pl already long_ago
pri-si-jaukin-ta avi ir laiky-ta ta
pre.ERG.domesticate.ARM neut sheep.acc and keep.ARM her.acc
ne tik dėl mėsos ir kailio, bet ir dėl vilnos.
lit. '(it is [= was]) domesticated the sheep and kept it [sc. the sheep']
'The name vilnos shows that the Indo-Europeans domesticated the sheep already many centuries ago and kept it not only for its meat and fur, but also for its wool.'
(Lith. vilna.sg.f, vilnos.pl.f = wool)

Informants normally do not interpret this kind of example as bearing an inferential meaning, though such a reading cannot be excluded for pragmatic reasons: the propositional content of the clausal complement of rodo 'shows' cannot rest on direct experience, but only on inference.

Anyway, the same avoidance can be observed if a reflexive object pronoun is used with a transitive verb (24b). This contrasts with the possibility of impersonalizing a RM-verb with a semantically reflexive meaning ((24c) = (33)). With finite forms both possibilities exist, in which case the reflexive pronoun is practically synonymous with the RM-form (although the variant with the reflexive pronoun appears to be less idiomatic); compare (24a):

(24) a. Priverčiame save / Pri-si-verčiame dirbti.
prefer.IMP2S.PL referpr / pre.ERG.PRS.1.PL work.INF
'We force ourselves to work.'

b. *Priverčia-ma save dirbti.
prefer.IMP3S.FNEUT referpr,ACC work.INF

c. Pri-si-verčia-ma dirbti.
pre.ERG.PRS.3.SG neut work.INF
≈'One forces oneself to work.'

When we now return to example (22) we further notice that the RM included in the participle (and therefore the passive predicate) is not controlled by the Undergoer-PSA (tokia tvarka 'such order'), but by the obliquely marked Actor (mūsų 'by us'). An analogous remark is in order with respect to examples like the next, in which the reflexive possessive pronoun savo, being part of an instrumental NP, is controlled not by the Undergoer-PSA reikšmės 'meanings', but by the implicit Actor of the predicative m-participles skaidomos and pateikamos (⇐ skaidyti 'to split, divide', pateikti 'to present, render'): 
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(25) Toliau reikšmės skaido-m-os ir pateikia-m-os nuožiūra, todėl jų išskyrimas ir tūdėjimas del difuziškumo gali būti ginčytinas. 'Further the meanings are differentiated and presented at one’s own discretion; therefore, due to diffusiveness, their differentiation and arrangement may be disputable.' (from: A. Vidugiris, LKK XXVIII 1989:45)

The same can be observed with passive participles used attributively. In the following example it is the Actor (= first person plural) of the syntactically superordinate predicate prekiaujame ‘we sell, trade’ which controls the reflexive pronoun (and intensifier) pats. The latter, in turn, is the oblique Actor of the attributive participle augintomis (⇐ auginti ‘to grow’) and coreferential with the Actor of prekiaujame:

(26) a. Jau prekiaujame pačių augintomis rožėmis. lit. ‘Already we sell roses we have grown ourselves.’ (sign at a flower stand in Vilnius, autumn 2001)

The same would apply to the impersonal of prekiauti ‘to sell’, although it could probably be encountered not in an advertisement, but in a setting with a purely descriptive purpose, e.g.:

(26) b. Mūsų kaimynams verslas sekasi. tikimasi gero pomidorų derliaus. lit. ‘To our neighbours business is successful. Already (it) is sold roses of their own cultivation, (it) is expected a good harvest of tomatoes.’

≈ ‘Our neighbours are getting well with their business. One (i.e. they) is already trading with roses cultivated by oneself (themselves), one (= they) expects a good yield of tomatoes.’

i.e. ‘Our neighbours’ business is flourishing. Roses of their own cultivation are already on sale, a good harvest of tomatoes is expected.’

All these pieces of evidence show that control of reflexives is established on semantic grounds, not on syntactic ones. In these cases Behavior Properties are prior to Coding Properties. A similar phenomenon can be observed with German participles and the reflexive intensifier selbst/selber used in passives (cf. Plank 1993:139–146). See the following authentic example, where the Actor is only implicit:

(27) Seminare mußten selber bezahlt werden // lit. ‘Courses had to be paid for themselves.’

‘Courses had to be paid for by the participants themselves.’

(11.9.2004, German speaker in his early 20s, during a short interview in a TV report.)
3.2 RM-verbs without a transparent derivative relation to a transitive verb

The rule that RM-verbs can be impersonalized, but not passivized, if they have only one macrorole argument, concerns not only RM-verbs in a transparent derivative relation to a transitive verb (for details on these see 3.3–3.4). It also holds for those RM-verbs which – on a contemporary level – have lost their derivational relationship to verbs without the RM. Compare a few examples: įsigilinti/gilintis ‘to go deep into, absorb o.s. with’, tikėtis ‘to hope, expect’, apsispręsti ‘to make up one’s mind’, gėrėtis ‘to admire, to be charmed by’, grožėtis ‘to admire the beauty of’. For gilintis there is a causative verb gilinti ‘to deepen, enhance’, but it is used only in a concrete spatial sense or in the sense ‘to enhance one’s knowledge’ (gilinti savo žinias); apsispręsti does not have any counterpart without the RM (*apspręsti) and allows only for a clausal complement; tikėtis (see the impersonal tikimasi from this verb in the last part of ex. (26b)) stands in a semantic relationship to tikėti ‘to trust, believe’, but this verb, in turn, is only low-transitive and the RM does not serve as a “detransitivizer” here. Finally, gėrėtis and grožėtis do not have any transitive equivalents, and the semantic relationship with the intransitive grožėti ‘to become more beautiful’ and gerėti ‘1. to become better, improve; 2. to recover from illness’, respectively, is by no means trivial (see the entries on these verbs in LKŽ III 1956).

Apart from the derivational history of these RM-verbs it is important to indicate that the ta/ma-participles do not necessarily require an Actor; they may also operate on verbs whose sole macrorole is an Undergoer. For many of these RM-verbs denote rather states than activities, and therefore their single macrorole should be classified as an Undergoer. Cf., for instance, tikimasi ‘it is hoped, expected’ or grožėtasi gamtovaizdžiu lit. ‘it (= one) was taken away by the landscape’. As will be argued for in 3.4, even if such predicates are to be decomposed as states and their second argument cannot be considered a macrorole, so that the remaining argument is to be regarded as an Undergoer (pred’ (y) or pred’ (x, y) [MR1]), they nonetheless allow for the impersonal, because the referent of the Undergoer is necessarily human.

The same holds for plenty of other RM-verbs without a transparent semantic relationship to those verbs from which they derive morphologically (cf. Geniušienė 1987:145–152, 210–213, 299f. for an overview of this highly heterogeneous agglomeration of verbs). Many of these RM-verbs have two arguments, but only one of them becomes a macrorole. For verbs like gilintis ‘to go deep into’ this is the Actor. As usual, in the impersonal the Actor can be expressed by the genitive. Cf. prisidėti in the meaning ‘to contribute’, which does not stand in any standard relationship to the three-place transitive pridėti ‘to append, put (in addition)’. The lower-ranking (non-macrorole) argument of prisidėti is encoded by a PP (with prie ‘at, near to’) or a pro-form:

(28) Jei pakelsim miestą ant kojų, bus čia ir tavu
if raise.FUT.1.PL.town.ACC on legs.GEN CORFUT.3 here also YOU.GEN/POSS
prisidėta.
PREF.RORM.contribute.APF.NEUT
lit. 'If we raise the town on its legs, here yours will be contributed, too.
'If we revive the city, it will not be without your contribution.'
(cited from LKG II 1971:52)

In such a case, again, no passive can be created, because there is no Undergoer: the lower-ranking argument is not realized as direct object (in the accusative or genitive). Notice that the oblique Actor ĭavo (literally 'yours') controls the action denoted by the participle. This parallels our observations concerning the passive, in which it was not the PSA that controlled the denoted situation, but the oblique Actor (see 3.1); the difference is only that (28) lacks a PSA (i.e. a potential syntactic controller).

3.3 Subject-oriented RM-verbs with a transparent derivative relation to transitive verbs

Reflexive-benefactive verbs (like pasirinkti 'to choose for o.s.' in ex. (20)) have to be counted as subject-oriented RM-verbs. Among subject-oriented RM-verbs they are the only kind which allows for a passive, but practically not for the impersonal. The reason is, of course, that they are transitive (i.e. there is an Undergoer to be operated on). Other kinds of subject-oriented RM-verbs (cf. Geniušienė 1987:74–118 for a systematic account) have only an Actor; they therefore exclude the passive, but are widely attested as input for the impersonal. They thus show the reverse to the behaviour of reflexive-benefactives (see 3.1). Compare autocausatives related to body movements (29), 'partitive object verbs' (30) and deaccusatives (31). Also reciprocals (32) and even RM-verbs which have to be considered as semantic reflexives (33) can occur in the impersonal:

(29) Pasiškępta. (⇐ paslėpti 'to hide')
   lit. '(One has) hidden.' = 'People hid (intr.).'

(30) Užsimerkta. (⇐ užmerkti (akis) 'to close one's eyes')
   lit. '(One has) closed one's eyes.' = 'One's eyes were closed.'

(31) Sva이domas akmenimis. (⇐ svaidyti 'to throw')
   lit. '(It is being) thrown with stones (at each other).'
   'Some people are throwing stones at each other.'

(32) Parke bučiuojamas. (⇐ bučiuoti 'to kiss (tr.)')
   lit. 'In the park (it is) kissed.' = 'Some people kiss in the park.'

(33) Prisiveržiami dirbtì. (⇐ priversti 'to force').
   lit. '(It is) forced (oneself) to work.' = 'People force themselves to work.'

It might be argued that the reciprocal and the semantic reflexives ((32)–(33)) are just RM-forms, whereas the other RM-classes ((29)–(31)) are to be regarded rather as RM-verbs in their own right (on this discussion see 1.4). But however we may decide on this question (if we decide on it at all), the possibility of impersonalizing a subject-oriented RM-verb does not depend on whether the derivation from a transitive verb marked by the RM should be regarded as a separate lexical entry (i.e. a RM-verb)
or rather as a RM-form of the transitive. The same holds for the group of object-oriented RM-diatheses: both anticausatives (i.e. rather RM-verbs) and pseudo-passive (i.e. RM-forms) do not allow for the impersonal, but other groups of object-oriented RM-derivations do allow. This will be shown in the following subsection.

3.4 Impersonals from object-oriented RM-verbs

The data demonstrated hitherto show how the general rules put forward at the beginning of this section work for more or less obvious cases. Nonetheless there remains a very small, but intriguing class of object-oriented RM-verbs, whose single macro-role is more conveniently ascribed the status of an Undergoer and which yet allow for impersonals.

The reason why most object-oriented RM-verbs can neither be passivized nor impersonalized is trivial: there is no Actor, and the Undergoer is already coded as PSA. Most clearly this can be shown with anticausatives. To see this, look, for instance, at the verb *užsidaryti*. It is derived from the causative *uždaryti* ‘to close’. This verb is polysemous, since it can mean either ‘to close (intr.), get closed’ (= *užsidaryti*¹) and then represents a genuine anticausative (e.g., *Durys užsidarė* ‘The door closed’), or it may be used as an autocausative derivative with the meaning ‘to close oneself in’ (= *užsidaryti*²).¹⁶ Only in the latter case can it be used as the input to an impersonal:

(34) Užsidaryta₂ kambaryje
    ≈ 'Somebody / One has closed oneself in the room'.

(Compare Germ. *Man schloß sich selbst im Zimmer ein*.)

Let us take another example. The RM-verb *atsirsti* (⇐ *atrišti* ‘to untie’) can have the anticausative meaning ‘to become untied’ (= *atsirsti*¹, e.g., *Virvė atsiršo* ‘The rope has become untied/undone’), but it may (though more marginally) also be used in the autocausative meaning ‘to untie oneself’ (= *atsirsti*²). Only in the second meaning does it allow for an impersonal (see ex. (35c)–(35c‘)).¹⁷ Compare the following sentences:

(35) a. Petras atrišo arklių / vežimėlį nuo krūmo.    
    'Petras untied the horse / the cart from the bush.'

b. Vežimėlis atsirsta₁ nuo krūmo.    anticausative ⇒
    'The cart got untied from the bush.'

b’. Vežimėlio atsirsta₁ nuo krūmo.    (for the star see F. 17)
    lit. 'By the cart was / became untied from the bush.'

b. Arklys atsirsta₂ nuo krūmo.    autocausative ⇒
    lit. 'The horse untied itself from the bush.'

b’. Arklio atsirsta₂ nuo krūmo.    (for the star see F. 17)
    lit. 'By the horse was untied from the bush.'

We can compare these two verbs with RM-verbs which have only anticausative or pseudo-passive meanings as, for instance, *išsiekti* ‘to be spent/wasted, embezzled
(about money or energy), a derivative of the causative *išeikvoti* 'to spend (much) money / energy on, waste; embezzle':

(36) a. *Jis išeikvojo visus pinigus.* ⇒
    ‘He has wasted / embezzled all the money.’

    b. *Visi pinigai išišiekvojo.*
    ‘All money (has) got wasted / embezzled.’

Not all informants freely accept the anticausative verb (36b). But even those who accept it reject both the impersonal (36c) and the passive construction (36d):

    c. *Išišiekvota.*
    d. *Visi pinigai išišiekvoti.*
    intended meaning: ‘All money has been spent / got spent.’

Anticausatives can be regarded as the most numerous class of object-oriented RM-verbs. Their only argument is to be ascribed Undergoer status, whereas the Actor, which is part of the logical structure of the related causative verb, does not belong to the anticausative’s logical structure. In derivational terms one might say that the Actor has been “absorbed” during the argument-deranking operation indicated by the reflexive marker (see ex. (38a–b)).

Now there are also object-oriented RM-verbs that still possess two arguments, but only one of them can be regarded as a macrorole. What about them? Let us examine RM-verbs whose argument structure shows a converse relationship in comparison to the causative verbs from which they derive. This group is very small and shows a specific argument structure (cf. Geniušienė 1987:118–124, 271–273, 332–334): one argument can be treated as macrorole, since it normally is coded as the PSA of the clause. The other argument, which does not have macrorole status, is marked as an oblique object and corresponds to the Actor of the deriving causative verb. See, for instance, *džiaugtis* ‘to take pleasure in, be happy’ (⇐ *džiuginti* ‘to cause joy to, make happy’) in (37b):

(37) a. *Svečiai / gėlės* džiungina *šeimininkę.*
    guest / flower.nom.pl make_happy.prs.3 housewife.acc.sg.f
    x (=A), PSA (subject) y (=U), direct object
    lit. ‘The guests / flowers are making/make happy the housewife.’
    ‘The guests / flowers make the the housewife happy.’

    b. *Šeimininkė* džiaugiasi *svečiais / gėliemis.*
    housewife.nom be_happy.prs.3.rmn guest / flower.ins.pl
    y (=U), PSA (subject) x (no macrorole), oblique object
    ‘The housewife is taking pleasure in her guests / the flowers.’

Compare this with anticausatives, for instance *atsidaryti* ‘to open’ (intr.) in (38b):

(38) a. *Berniukas* atidarė *dūris.*
    boy.nom(=A) open(tr).past.3 door.acc(=U)
    ‘The boy opened the door’ ⇐

    b. *Dūrys* atidarė *dūrą.*
    door.nom(=U) pref.rm.open(intr.).past.3
    ‘The door opened’.
Contrary to anticausatives, the x-argument of causative verbs does not disappear in the logical structure (lexical entry) of converse RM-verbs. Its referent is, as it were, “consumed” by the referent of the y-argument, which becomes the macrorole argument of the converse RM-verb; the x-argument is therefore no instrument, but rather a kind of medium (if one wants to give this argument the name of a specific case role). On the contrary, the referent berniukas ‘boy’ – the Actor of the causative verb in (38a) – does not remain in any lasting contact with the Undergoer referent durys ‘door’, nor is it “consumed” by the latter; and it vanishes from the semantic structure of the anticausative (38b). In (37b), on the contrary, the former Actor sveˇciai / gėlės ‘the guests / flowers’ (see ex. (37a)) is preserved as an argument in the lexical entry of the RM-verb, and the Undergoer referent šeimininkė ‘housewife’ is subject to causation by that referent as long as some kind of contact (physical, perceptual, psychical) will not be interrupted.

In this sense converse relationships can be found in the following three domains: emotive-mental, perceptive, and physical (see below). Whether we understand the x-argument as an active being or a static thing (or circumstance), in any case it constitutes the proper reason (cause) for the physical or psychical state of the y-argument’s referent. Briefly, contrary to causatives which are the basis for anticausatives, with converse RM-verbs (which preserve a two-argument structure) causation is not mediated and it does not cease, because the causing state (or event) remains in some kind of contact with the entity whose state has been changed.

In general, the passive may be understood as a converse relationship, too. But it differs from lexical converses in the regularity and range of verbs involved: lexical converses are severely restricted, because they require a very specific semantic relation between their two arguments (see below). In addition, in Lithuanian lexical converses and the passive are distinguished also by the case which marks the demoted Actor: RM-converses of causative verbs use the instrumental (or the dative, if derived from transitive perceptive verbs; see below), whereas the oblique Actor of the passive is marked with the genitive (genetivus auctoris). There is no option of using the instrumental instead; cf., for instance

(39) Novelė buvo parašyta jūzmaus rašytojo
novel.nom.sg.f cop.past.3 write.apn.nom.sg.pp.nom.sg.f famous write.gen.sg.m
/* ‘įžymių rašytojo. */

‘The novel was written by a famous writer.’

Interesting, now, is the observation that causative verbs like džiuginti ‘to make happy, cause joy’, from which converse RM-verbs are derived, usually do not allow the passive. See the inacceptable example (40), which is meant to be denotationally equivalent to (37a–b):

(40) *šeimininkė yra džiugina-ma svečių / gėlių,
housewife.nom(=U) cop.prs.3 make_happy.pp.nom.sg.f guest/flower.gen.pl
intended meaning: ‘The housewife is (being) made happy by the guests / the flowers.’
As a rule, the passive is not created from causative verbs which derive RM-converses (N. Maskalūniūnienė, p.c.). One may suggest that the reason is to be sought exactly in their denotational equivalence or, at least, functional closeness. Nonetheless one can come across examples in which causative verbs that serve as bases for RM-converses are passivized, e.g. *apniaukt* 'to cover (with clouds)' in *Dangus.noms buvo apniauktas juodų debesų gen.pl.* 'The sky was covered with [lit. by] clouds' (E. Geniušienė, p.c.). Compare this passive (44b), containing the converse verb *apsinaukti* 'to become cloudy'. A separate investigation should clarify here which causative verbs and why allow for the passive despite the fact that they also derive RM-converses.

Denotational closeness also may be considered as a reason why the passive cannot at all be created from RM-converses. Beside this factor, since the Undergoer is already promoted to PSA by virtue of the lexical changes in the converse verb, there is nothing left for the passive to operate on. In this respect RM-converses share the same property with other anticausatives. Therefore the question remains why some lexical RM-converses, however, can become the input for the impersonal. This question we are going to investigate right now.

As small as the number of RM-verbs in a converse relationship to their transitive (mostly causative) bases is, it can further be subdivided into three even smaller sets: one group is represented by emotive verbs, to which belongs the already mentioned verb *džiaugtis*. The second subgroup is composed of verbs denoting perceptive impressions and can, in turn, be further differentiated into RM-verbs with an animate experiencer (i) and RM-verbs with other coding and referential properties of the *x*-argument (ii). The third subgroup consists of verbs which denote physical contact (possibly also related chemical processes) and states following from them (in part also telic processes). The borderlines between these groups are not totally strict.

(41) converse RM-verbs

a. emotive subgroup: *džiaugtis* 'to rejoice, be happy', *stebėtis* 'to be surprised, marvel', *žavėtis* 'to admire, be charmed', *susivilioti* 'to become attracted, tempted', *nusivilti* 'to feel disappointed', *tenkintis* 'to be satisfied, satisfy o.s. with'

b. perceptive subgroup: (i) *matyti* 'to be seen', *girdėtis* 'to be heard', *pasirodyti* 'to appear', *sapnuoti* 'to appear in a dream' (ii) *atsispindėti* 'to be reflected, reverberate', *atsiminti* 'to be reflected, reverberate', *atsiviešti* 'to be reflected' (about light); *persiūoti* 'to be passed, descend', *jaustis* 'to feel (somehow)'

c. physical contact subgroup: *apsinaukti* 'to become gloomy, cloudy', *apsivalkstyti* (debesimis) 'to become gloomy, cloudy', *trauktis* (debesimis) 'dito', *laikytis* (ant ko) 'to be supported', *rentis* 'dito', *užsilaukti* 'to be retained'.

These lists are probably near to exhaustive (at least as for the emotive and perceptive subgroups). Here are some examples illustrating the second and third subgroups:
perceptive (i):

(42) a. Mergaitė girdėjo triukšmą.
   ⇒
   girl.nom(=A) hear.past.3 noise.acc(=U)
   'The girl heard the noise.'

b. Mergaitėi girdėjo triukšmas.
   girl.dat hear.past.3.rm noise.nom(=U)
   lit. 'to the girl was heard the noise.'
   'The girl could hear the noise.'

perceptive (ii):

(43) a. Veidrodis atmuša spindulius.
   ⇒
   mirror.nom(=A) reflect.prs.3 ray.acc.pl(=U)
   'The mirror bounces off (reflects) the rays.'

b. Veidrodyje atsimuša spinduliai.
   mirror.loc.prepare.rm.reflect.prs.3 ray.nom.pl(=U)
   'The rays are reflected in the mirror.'

physical contact:

(44) a. Dangų apniaukė debesys.
   ⇒
   sky.acc(=U) cover.past.3 cloud.nom.pl(=A)
   'The clouds covered the sky.'

b. Dangus apsiniaukė debesimis.
   sky.nom(=U) prepare.rm.cover.past.3 cloud.ins.pl
   'The sky was covered with clouds.'

Again, converse RM-verbs do not derive a passive, because they lack a direct object (in the accusative or genitive). The subgroups above differ, however, as far as the impersonal is concerned; only RM-verbs from the emotive subgroup can be “imper- sonalized”. This, of course, eliminates the PSA (in the nominative) and replaces it by a NP in the genitive; the other (non-macrorole) argument remains without any changes (here: in the instrumental). See an impersonal derived from džiaugtis ‘to enjoy, take pleasure in’ used in (37b):20

(37) d. Šeimininkė džiaugiasi svečiais / gėlėmis.
   housewife.gen take.pleasure.prs.3.rm guest / flower.ins.pl
   'The housewife is taking pleasure in the guests / flowers.'

Converse RM-verbs of the two other subgroups do not by any means allow for an impersonal. In this respect they behave themselves like anticausatives (e.g. išsieiktoti; see ex. (36b–d)).

How can we explain the different behaviour of the emotive subgroup of RM-verbs? To answer this question we should first of all notice that the two arguments (x, y) of converse RM-verbs are particularly close to each other on the Actor-Undergoer-hierarchy: they represent the arguments of a two-place state predicate (pred’ (x, y)), which are situated directly beside one another on that scale (see Fig. 1). Consequently, they differ only slightly in terms of agenthood-patienthood. The same holds for their
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transitive (as a rule causative) equivalents, since the derivative operation (transitive/causative \(\Rightarrow\) converse RM-verb) does not change the semantic relation between both arguments, but only their accessibility for morphosyntactic coding (reflected in their status as macrorole vs. non-macrorole arguments).

Having understood this, we should consider how to represent the relation between the lexical structures of the RM-verbs and their transitive equivalents in each of the subgroups. They evidently differ. To begin with the least complicated case, the lexical entries of the RM-verbs of the perceptive subgroup (i) can be represented in the same way as their transitive counterparts with the addition of a [MR\(\alpha\)] feature. This diminishes by one the number of macroroles, and since both RM- and transitive verbs are state predicates the remaining macrorole has to be regarded as an Undergoer (cf. van Valin/LaPolla 1997:154f.). Thus we get, for instance, *girdėti* ‘to hear’ (\(x, y\)), \(x = A, y = U\), but *girdėti* ‘to be heard’ (\(x, y\)) [MR1], \(y = U\), coded as the PSA of the clause (\(x\) is left without macrorole status); compare (42b).

The lexical entries of the perceptive subgroup (ii) are comparable to those of the perceptive subgroup (i), regarding their general structure: there is no causative component involved, the logical decomposition thus requires only a two-place state predicate, thus \(\text{pred'}(x, y) [\text{MR1}]\). See, for instance, *atmušti* ‘to reflect’ (\(x, y\)), \(x = A, y = U\) vs. *atsimušti* ‘to be reflected’ (\(x, y\)) [MR1], \(y = U\) and PSA (\(x\) loses its macrorole status); compare (43b).

The lexical structure of the physical contact subgroup is much more complicated, because the transitive counterparts of the RM-verbs are causative. We are therefore faced with the question whether the causative component has to be a dynamic (activity) or a state predicate, and what is to happen with it in the converse RM-verb. As for the first part of this question, see, for instance, *apniaukti* \(\approx\) ‘to cause to become gloomy, cloudy’ (cf. ex. (44a)). It seems appropriate to postulate the following logical structure: \(\text{do'}(x, \emptyset) \text{CAUSE (BECOME } \text{gloomy'}(y))\). But here we have to add a referential restriction, namely: that \(x\) refers to weather phenomena (clouds, fog, etc.) and \(y\) to the sky. On account of this a \(\text{do'}\)-predicate as first part before the \(\text{CAUSE}\) operator appears arguable; we might justly postulate a state predicate here (e.g. *exist'(x)* \(\text{CAUSE} \ldots\)). However we may decide on this point (i.e. the components of the lexical structure of the causative verb), there remains the second part of our question: how to represent the converse RM-verb (cf. ex. (44b))? Its lexical structure would be represented insufficiently by just \(\text{BECOME } \text{gloomy'}(y)\), since – as was argued above – the RM-verb preserves the same two arguments. Again we need a [MR1] feature in order to “suppress” the macrorole status of the \(x\)-argument (whose Actor status is debatable). To achieve this the [MR1] feature of *apniaukti* must apply to the whole LS representing the causative verb *apniaukti*, including its \(\text{CAUSE}\) operator (which remains, as it were, in the background as a presupposition).

We are faced with a similar problem when analyzing the verbs from the emotive subgroup. Let us illustrate this with *žavėtis* and its causative counterpart *žavėti*. The RM-verb denotes an emotional state with approximate equivalents in English ‘to admire’ or ‘to be charmed’. These equivalents should give an idea why it may be difficult
to decide whether žavėtis has to be considered a state or an activity (i.e. dynamic) predicate. At least from a naïve viewpoint, an emotional feeling may be regarded not just as a passively experienced state, but it may include an active component on the part of the animate being experiencing that feeling (just as, say, Eng. to remember and its equivalents Russian vspominat’, Polish przypominać sobie, Lithuanian atsiminti, pristiminti, German sich erinnern may refer either to spontaneously arisen, involuntary states or to conscious, aim-directed activity). Emotive and mental predicates are notoriously difficult for any theory of decomposition, because their meanings are vague with respect to agentivity and may differ among each other exactly for this reason, and there is nothing in logical decomposition that predetermines the proper aspectual and causal nature of these predicates. The causativity relation between, say, žavėtis and žavėti is thus even more complicated than in the case of the physical contact subgroup.

I will not try to decide on this complex issue. Nonetheless, the more adequate assumption seems to be that the converse RM-verbs of the emotive subgroup denote states. In this case žavėtis may be represented just as the causative entailment (after . . . CAUSE) of the event or state evoking the emotion; it can then be analyzed simply as charmed’ (y), with the CAUSE operator as a presuppositional component in the background (as in the case of the physical contact subgroup).

As concerns the causative equivalent, we may consider the following logical structure of žavėti: do’ (x, Ø) CAUSE (BECOME charmed’ (y)). Again we face the problem that the x-argument may not at all be a variable of an activity predicate, but of a state predicate. For what charms may be (and usually is) just a fact, an impression, or something else that does not act in any way, but simply exists (at least in the minds of those who are being charmed or feeling admiration). We should then assume the following logical structure: pred’ (x) CAUSE (BECOME charmed’ (y)). The first predicate may be considered to be more specific, e.g.: exist’ (x) CAUSE . . .’ but probably the semantic nature of the x-argument (including its referential properties) can be regarded as underspecified, since, as we have said, one can be charmed or enchanted virtually by anything or anybody.

What is not underspecified, however, is the referential nature of the y-argument: it must be a sentient (animate), preferably human, being. Certainly this is the key for a proper understanding of the different behaviour of the emotive subgroup in comparison to the other subgroups of converse RM-verbs, despite the fact that these RM-verbs do not differ with respect to the Undergoer status of their single macro-role. Thus, the crucial point apparently is that all RM-verbs of the emotive subgroup imply that their y-argument refers to a sentient being, whereas the referential properties of the y-argument of the other subgroups are either unspecified or they include only referents which are situated much lower on ontological hierarchies of the Silverstein type. Animate referents are even practically excluded, for instance, in the physical contact subgroup.

To summarize: converse RM-verbs code the y-argument as PSA (nominative subject), but they clearly differ in terms of referential restrictions. Regardless of whether the y-argument of emotive RM-verbs should be assigned Undergoer or Actor status
(which remains arguable), their $y$-argument necessarily denotes an animate (typically human) referent. Such a restriction may hold also for the $x$-argument. This is the case with the subgroup (i) of perceptive converse RM-verbs, whereas their $y$-argument remains unspecific. This is exactly the reverse situation compared to the emotive subgroup. The $x$-argument of RM-verbs however is not accessible for grammatical operations, so that referential preferences of the impersonal cannot apply.

We therefore arrive at the conclusion that referential properties correlating with the upper end of ontological hierarchies may override a (macro)role-based rule which says that predicates without an Actor cannot serve as input for a grammatical impersonal. This rule was given at the start; it works for most cases, but has to be slightly modified for those RM-verbs which are converses of causatives and denote emotive states. For these imply sentient beings occupying the place of the single macrorole (our $y$-argument in the illustrations above). This is an example of how referentiality (ontological status) gains prevalence over argument structure and macrorole assignment.

Actually, this conclusion does not come as a surprise if we account for a general restriction which has often been attested for grammatical impersonals, namely: that these are limited to verbs whose highest-ranking argument names a human referent (see Section 2). There may be finer-grained distinctions (see Section 4), but we may generalize that such impersonals imply that the referent named by the highest-ranking argument is placed on the very top of animacy hierarchies. Such impersonals are thus functionally and distributionally equivalent to constructions with indefinite-generic pronouns like Germ. *man* or Fr. *on*.

### 3.5 Impersonals from reflexive-causatives?

This survey would be incomplete if we did not account for a construction which belongs to RM-derivations and whose lexical input is again restricted to a highly limited group of causative verbs. I have in mind the reflexive-causative construction. It can be paraphrased by analytic constructions like Eng. ‘$X$ gets $Y$ to perform $P$ on him/herself,’ with $P =$ lexical content of the deriving causative verb. The semantic structure is complex, because it involves two agents: an indirect one ($X$) giving the permission to another subject ($Y$), who, in turn, acts as direct agent on the indirect one. As far as I can see, all activities described by such RM-verbs pertain to changes performed on the indirect agent’s body (body parts or clothing), and the direct agent is coded obliquely with the preposition *pas* ‘at’ (+ accusative).21 Cf., for instance, the relationship between *apkirpti* ‘to cut someone’s hair’ and *apsikirpti* ‘to have someone cut one’s hair’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(45) a. } & \text{Kirpejas } apkirpo \text{ draugę.} \\
& \text{barber.nom pref.cut_hair.past.3 female_friend.acc} \\
& \text{‘The barber cut the friend’s hair.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Draugę } apsikirpo \text{ pas kirpeją.} \\
& \text{female_friend.nom pref.rm.cut_hair.past.3 at barber.acc} \\
& \text{‘The friend made the barber cut her hair.’}
\end{align*}
\]
The formal relationship between the causative verb and the RM-derivative requires us to count it among object-oriented RM-classes, although, as just mentioned, the semantic structure of this construction and its relationship to the causative is much more complex. It is justified to regard this construction as a RM-form, not as a separate RM-entry in the lexicon, because derivation is undoubtedly directed from the causative to the reflexive-causative. Insofar this case can be compared with the pseudo-passive (see 1.4), and it differs from the RM-converse verbs discussed in 3.4.

The reflexive-causative construction cannot be passivized, since there is no Undergoer left as direct object. A sentence like (45c) would therefore be uninterpretable. Impersonalization can however be imagined, although (45d) sounds odd unless it is uttered under certain circumstances (see below):

**passive**

(45) c. *Draugė apsikirptá buvo kirpėja. female_friend.nom.sg.f cut_hair.prf.rm at barber.acc

**impersonal**

(45) d. ?Draugės apsikirpta buvo kirpėja.

female_friend.gen cop.past.3 cut_hair.prf.rm at barber.acc

≈ '(Evidently,) the friend went to the barber's to make her hair cut.'

I do not have any example from text corpora, and most informants rejected sentences like (45d). One might conjecture that the explanation lies in the fact that the subject of (45b) (draugė 'friend') has a double role, due to the complex semantic structure formulated above, and therefore it is not an appropriate Actor to operate on.

I think, however, that the key to this question is of a different, merely functional nature. One informant gave an explanation which clarifies under which conditions a slightly modified version of (45d) would sound natural. According to this informant (45d′) could be used when she meets her friend, who has a very nice hair-cut, so that she infers that, for instance, contrary to what that friend normally does, this time she went to a barber's shop and that the barber did his job in a very professional manner:

(45) d′. *(Tą kartą) jos apsikirpta buvo gera gerq kirpėja.

this time she.gen cop.past.3 hair-cut.prf.rm nom.acc at good.acc barber.acc

' (Obviously,) this time she went to a good barber to make her hair cut.'

This kind of explanation suggests that an otherwise weird or unacceptable impersonal can be derived from an active construction, if additional factors come into play. In this case the decisive clue appears to be that the reported observation ran counter to the speaker's expectations (or, contrasted with them): the friend did the hair-cut not herself at home (as usual), but went to a specialist. I will come back to this circumstance in Section 4.
Table 1. Compatibility of RM-derivatives with the passive and the impersonal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of RM-derivative</th>
<th>examples from the text</th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>impersonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reflexive-benefactive (transitive)</td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(−)(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without transparent semantic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation to non-RM-counterpart</td>
<td>(subsection 3.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autocausative</td>
<td>29, 34</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive object</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deaccusative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reciprocal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantically reflexive</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticausative</td>
<td>35b, 36b–d</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>converse (with subgroups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotive</td>
<td>37b, 37d</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceptive</td>
<td>42–43</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical contact</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflexive-causative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>(+)(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)hardly attested
\(^2\)“counter-expectational” (“contrastive”) ? (→ inferential; see Section 4)

However, not all informants who accepted (45d) feel forced to impute such a kind of “counter-expectational” or “contrastive” interpretation. On account of this the reason why the impersonal is at all possible lies again in the presence of an argument with a human referent which can be given the status of a PSA (as in (45b)); this class of referent is anyway predetermined by the very semantics of the reflexive-causative construction. This brings it closer to subject-oriented diatheses (see 3.3) and to the emotive subgroup of lexical RM-converses (see 3.4).

The facts illustrated in Sections 3–4 are listed in Table 1.

4. “Impersonals” of zero-place verbs: A residual case?

The findings disclosed so far corroborate the assumption brought forward in Section 2 that passives and impersonals are constructions which operate differently on the argument structure of the lexical input. We can furthermore infer that the so-called “impersonal” is inaccurately named, because the referential class which such constructions focus on are people. This has been demonstrated for diverse languages (cf. Shibatani 1998; Siewierska 1984:96, 100f. and the survey in Vogel 2006:Ch. 1), and the differences among them seem to concern rather questions like: can an impersonal refer to a group of people not containing a male adult?, or: does the impersonal exclude the speaker (or even the addressee)?\(^2\) Quite often impersonals begin to replace the 1st person plural (as in French, some Italian dialects or Finnish). All this indicates that the label “impersonal” has actually to be regarded as a misnomer (cf. Abraham, this volume; Geniušienė, this volume: 2.8).
Judged only on this background Lithuanian ta/ma-participles prove to be "well behaved". On closer inspection, however, they behave strangely, insofar as the referential restrictions just worked out can be invalidated. In fact, the Lithuanian impersonal shows contradictory properties and restrictions. On the one hand, it betrays the same referential restrictions as do impersonals in other languages. It is generally considered ungrammatical even if the implicit referents of the action denoted by ta/ma-participles are animate beings, but located below humans on ontological hierarchies. Thus, ta/ma-participles of verbs whose primary referents are animals occur only if another condition is fulfilled (on which immediately below); otherwise they are judged deviant. Compare: *Kieme lojama 'There is some barking in the yard', *Visur bliaunama 'Everywhere it is being bleated', *Krimumose perima 'In the bushes there is some breeding', *Maistomasi 'It is being jibbed / There is some jibbing' (see also Geniušienė, this volume: 2.7). Such utterances can at best be used metaphorically to verbalize the evaluation of certain kinds of human behaviour (for more details cf. Wiemer, to appear 3: 3.3).

On the other hand, we encounter ta/ma-participles derived from zero-place verbs or from verbs whose arguments are not coded as macroroles. Such verbs belong to lexical impersonals and were mentioned briefly in 1.5. See, for instance, the ta/ma-participle from the zero-place verb lyti 'to rain' (46) and from the verb reikėti 'to need' (47), which has two arguments, but they are not coded as macroroles. Instead its x-argument is coded with the dative, the y-argument with the genitive (and this coding remains unchanged with the ta/ma-participle); this verb is thus M-atransitive: **need**' (x, y), [MR0]. Even the copula būti 'to be' can be used in the impersonal form; the predicative adjective then agrees with the single argument in case (genitive), gender and number (48).24 The ta/ma-participle of būti occurs also in its function as an existential verb (cf. Geniušienė, this volume: Section 4, ex. (62–63)).

(46)  Naktį **lyta.**
night:acc:pl rain:ap

‘Obviously it rained at night.’

(47)  Jai **reikėta** draugės
she:dat need:ap.neut female_friend:gen

‘She evidently needed a (female) friend.’

(48)  Mindaugo **būta** žiaurus.
Mindaugas:gen:sg:m cop:ap.neut cruel:gen:sg:m

‘(People say / Legend has it that) Mindaugas (= first Lithuanian king) was cruel.’

As indicated by the English translations, all these examples are preferably read with an evidential meaning. As a rule, the meaning is inferential, rather than reportive (more on this issue in Wiemer, to appear 1: Section 3; to appear 3: 3.3). The same reading proves to be the only sensible one if occasionally the ta/ma-participle is applied to one of those verbs which above were mentioned as referring to animals and other beings below humans on the ontological hierarchy; for instance:

(49)  Anksčiau čia dažnai **buvo čirškiama** (žvirblių).
≈ ‘Formerly chirping (by sparrows) happened often here.’
Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian

According to Geniušienė (this volume, Section 4), a further condition for an inferential reading is the obligatory oblique coding of the demoted macrorole argument (in the genitive), and it normally occurs clause-initially (as in general does the subject in unmarked word order).

Usually no M-transitive verbs are encountered; all examples given here (and in the literature on the subject) are one- or zero-place, with the exception of reikėti, but since this verb has no macrorole, it is M-attransitive. The normal case for the input of ta/ma-participles in inferential function are M-intransitive verbs (cf. Ambrazas 2001:22f.). Their sole argument may be an Actor (as with čirkėti ‘to chirp’ in ex. (49)) or an Undergoer (see ex. (48)), depending on whether in decomposition they correspond to a dynamic or a state predicate (see 1.2).

However, M-transitive verbs as input for ta/ma-participles show up somewhat more frequently in a passive construction in which the Undergoer is coded in the nominative, but this NP does not agree with the predicative participle; cf. for instance:

(50) Tai jūsu pasiūsta dvidešimt penki rubliai.

P:TC you.volgpl= pl. sent.app neut twenty.nom five.nom ruble.nom.pl=pl

‘So, (obviously) the 25 rubles were sent by you.’

or: ‘It was you who sent the 25 rubles.’

(A. Sprindis, “Pasikalbėjimas Kauno rotušėje”)

Whether the nominativial NP (penki rubliai ‘five rubles’) can be regarded as a true PSA remains to be investigated. Normally such utterances are not tightly integrated into narrative discourse, so that the verification of PSA-properties other than triggering of verbal agreement will be a difficult task to perform. From a syntactic viewpoint this construction can be considered as intermediary between the passive and the impersonal, and one may interpret it simply as a passive with lacking agreement. This seems justified at least for the reason that in Lithuanian lack of agreement occurs also with other nominal predicates (cf. Ambrazas 1990:200ff.). This can be illustrated by the following example:

(51) Pagaliau svarbu ne pas term. Svarbu esmė.

finally important.neut neg self.m.sg term.m.sg important.neut essence.f.sg

‘Finally, what is important isn’t the term. It is the essence which is important.’

(A. Rasimavičius)

From all this it follows that ta/ma-participles, if interpreted in an evidential function, do not only lose their restriction concerning the ontological nature of their referents (only human beings), but they also lose their clear preference for the Actor, since in general they do not any more need to operate on any macrorole.

5. Competing motivations?

These contradictory facts force to infer that with Lithuanian ta/ma-participles a functional split has occurred: there is more than one motivation for the use of these forms, i.e. for demoting an argument (often the single one). Different motivations may lead to
a “clash” of restrictions. If we want to gain a really comprehensive picture of the ta/ma-impersonal (= construction II. from 1.1), we must take into account evidentiality as another, “rivalling” domain.

It is a hitherto unsolved question in which diachronic relation the evidential function of ta/ma-participles (= construction II.) and their impersonal function (with its referential restrictions) stand to each other. But independently from this question it makes sense to ask whether there might not be a functional reason for which evidentiality (more precisely: inferentiality) has come to be marked by the same technique as has the voice-like operation of deriving impersonals. Shibatani (1998), who discussed this question in passing from a typological viewpoint, was probably on the right track when he put forward parameters for intransitive-based passives (i.e. impersonals). These parameters constitute a hierarchy which hinges on essentially the same kind of properties as have been discussed above, namely: inherent referential features (à la Silverstein) and volitionality (otherwise: control over the denoted situation); see the table in Shibatani (1998:121). His premises are partially different from mine, but the conclusion concerning a functional split of impersonal passives is basically the same. It is intriguing that Shibatani’s hierarchy holds for intransitive predicates, since the usual input for Lithuanian ta/ma-participles in inferential function are M-intransitive verbs (see above). If we account for the fact that ta/ma-impersonals from M-transitive verbs are encountered extremely rarely – and if they occur they do not by necessity evoke an evidential reading —, we arrive at the conclusion that M-intransitive verbs are in general the basic “domain” for impersonal (or, subject-demoting, “PSA-blocking”) participles to spread from in the lexicon.

Now, whereas an evidential form “disclaims the speaker’s direct knowledge of the reported incident” (Shibatani 1998:122), the impersonal devoid of evidential flavour simply marks a syntactic deranking of the predicate’s highest-ranking argument (and macrorole). Again we have to remember that in the latter case the ta/ma-participles are restricted to predicates with a human macrorole referent. We could thus suggest that in non-evidential use ta/ma-participles (like other impersonal constructions) fulfil the pragmatic purpose of pretending detraction from, or lack of control over, the situation denoted by the verbal stem.26 This function, of course, is not identical with disclaiming speaker’s direct experience of the reported state of affairs, i.e. the evidential function of ta/ma-participles. But both such a disclaim of direct experience and the (pretended) detraction from the related situation have at least in common that they entail less involvement of the speaker into that situation (and all pragmatic implications which may follow from this).

This reasoning is somewhat speculative and should be treated as a hypothesis to be substantiated further by a thorough investigation of the pragmatic functions of ta/ma-constructions (based on text corpora). But whether it will be sufficient to install a functional link between an evidential (inferential) and an impersonal function, which in the first place could justify the parallel development of the ta/ma-participle (= construction II.) from a somehow common communicative motive, seems questionable to me, anyway. Let alone the question to which extent functions which we can
detect at the contemporary stage of the language will allow for a reconstruction of the diachronic development of these forms (which was not at stake here).

6. Conclusions

Let me conclude by summing up the basic findings of this paper.

1. Passives and impersonals are constructions (or rules) which operate differently on the argument structure of their lexical input. They intersect only insofar as, to be applicable, they need an Actor. Their lexical input, however, differs, since the passive does not show the kind of lexical (referential) restrictions which are typical of the impersonal (see further points), while at the same time being restricted to M-transitive verbs. On the contrary, the basic domain of the impersonal are M-intransitive verbs, regardless of whether their single macrorole is an Actor or an Undergoer.

2. Plank’s (1993:146) hypothesis concerning impersonals of RM-verbs (see beginning of Section 3) can basically be confirmed. However, the RM must not only be “sufficiently similar to middle markers”, it must also lead to a derivation whose single macrorole is represented by a human being.

3. As a rule, this macrorole corresponds to an Actor, so that impersonals of RM-derivatives are almost entirely restricted to subject-oriented RM-verbs (in the sense of Geniušienė 1987). This condition can, however, be overridden if the sole macrorole argument of the RM-verb is an Undergoer with the inherent referential property [+ human]. In other words: a rule based on argument structure can be superseded by ontological criteria (in the sense of a Silverstein hierarchy), i.e. by referential properties.

4. This happens only with lexically highly restricted classes of M-intransitive RM-verbs (i.e. with verbs having one or two arguments, but only one macrorole), namely: with lexical converses of causative verbs denoting (changes of) emotion and with a couple of other RM-verbs denoting emotions, perception or mental activity. In their case the Undergoer (= single macrorole of related RM-verb) is human by virtue of the lexical meaning of these verbs.

5. The ta/ma-construction betrays a functional split, since it does not only serve as an impersonal (without any additional meaning components), but also as an inferential evidential. In the latter case restrictions concerning the structure and inherent referential properties of arguments are invalidated. Whether these two functional domains can be traced to a common motive remains questionable.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST, PFT, PRS, FUT</td>
<td>past, perfect, present, futur tense (stem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP, PASSAUX</td>
<td>copula, passive auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREF</td>
<td>prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP, SP</td>
<td>anteriority, simultaneity participle (ta/ma-participle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>passive participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, F, NEUT</td>
<td>masculine, feminine, gender neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>1st, 2nd, 3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG, PL</td>
<td>singular, plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>reflexive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFPROM</td>
<td>reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDPROM</td>
<td>indefinite generic pronoun (German, French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFART</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM, GEN, DAT, ACC, INS, LOC</td>
<td>nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, U</td>
<td>Actor, Undergoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Privileged Syntactic Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr., intr.</td>
<td>transitive, intransitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1. The reflexive marker -si- is suffixed to the stem if there is no prefix (including negation), it then loses the vowel (unless added as suffix to an “impersonal” participle as in construction II. below). Otherwise it occurs between the prefix and the stem (and is thereby treated like an infix). This rule does not depend on the functional relation of the RM to the stem. For instance: tiketi-si ‘to hope, expect’ (with the impersonals tiki-ta-si, tiki-ma-si), but with negation ne-si-tiketi.

2. The neuter gender has become extinct as controller gender (in nouns) and continues to appear almost only in predicative adjectives and participles. Cf. Semenienë (2003) for the most recent empirical account of contemporary Lithuanian.

3. Grammatical relations are captured as follows: “grammatical relations (syntactic relations) exist in a language only where the behavioural patterns of a language give evidence of a syntactic relation independent of semantic and pragmatic relations; that is, only where the behaviour patterns are not reducible to semantic or pragmatic relations can we say there is evidence of syntactic relations” (Van Valin/LaPolla 1997: 274; cf. also ibid.: 251–255).

4. Other well-known PSA properties are participial relativization, control of reflexives and equi-NP-deletion (cf. Van Valin/LaPolla 1997: 264ff.). Control phenomena will be discussed in 3.1.


6. Alethic modality concerns “the necessary and contingent truth of propositions” (Lyons 1977: 791) and can typically be paraphrased by conditional sentences; e.g. This novel reads swiftly \(\equiv\) One can read this novel swiftly ‘If one wants to read this novel, it will be an easy task (for him/her)’. It belongs to participant-external modality, insofar as a person (= potential subject) may wish to perform the task named in the predicate (here: the manner in which the novel has been written), but the possibility to perform it in practice depends on objective premises (here: the relative ease with which the novel can be read). Compare the Lithuanian examples (9–10) and their English translations.

7. Cf. Abraham (1995) for these conditions in analogous cases in West Germanic, particularly in German, for which he notices that “the obligatory adverbial always goes with the generic interpretation” (ibid.: 16).

8. This roughly coincides with Geniušienë’s (this volume: 1.2) ‘potential-passive’ (ex. (9)–(10)) and ‘admirative passive reflexive’ (ex. (11)).

9. For a justification of this cf. Wiemer (2004b: 273–276). This view is in accordance with the argument referred to in Geniušienë (1987:9–11) and given by Mel’čuk (1993, in particular p. 11), the only essential difference being that the latter two authors avoid the term ‘derivation’, only because for them derivation cannot be paradigmatic and lexeme-preserving. The same is true for Holvoet (2001a:183–189) and Holvoet/Semenienë (2004:41–60), although these authors differ also from Geniušienë and Mel’čuk in that they argue for the paradigmatic (and therefore, according to common reasoning, inflectional) character of the “medium voice”. There is neither space nor need for entering this debate in the present article.

11. For abundant data on German (and other languages) cf. Abraham (1995). He however brings impersonals into a closer connection with pseudo-passives (as a representative of the "medium") than this is intended here.

12. Beyond the scope of this paper is the issue under which conditions passives (with or without an indefinit-generic pronoun) replace the 1st person or, on the contrary, exclude the speaker and/or addressee. See, however, my short remark on that topic in Section 4.

13. For some more details on this peculiar impersonal cf. Wiemer (to appear3: 2.2).

14. In this sense we might speak of semantic bleaching. This kind of functional development (expansion) occurred with the so-called medial marker -r- in Italo-Celtic, too, when, in later stages of the successor languages (Latin; Welsh, Cornish etc.), it became also a sort of defunctionalized marker in deponent verbs.

15. Geniušienė (1976: 142) still wrote that verbs containing -si- are always capable of passivization, following the same principles as the non-reflexive verbs of the respective valence classes. However she adduces examples only with subject-oriented, in particular reflexive-benefactive (transitive) RM-verb as, for instance, pristinti 'to remember; to remind o.s.' or mašpirkti 'to buy for o.s.' Her generalization is not confirmed by the data presented below, even if we restricted ourselves to the impersonal.

16. There is an alternative to polysemy assumed here, which rests on lexical rules applied directly to the lexical entries. For such an approach cf. Holvoet/Semienienė (2004: 54–60), for whom lexical rules would be the consequence of their claim that "medium voice" is the result of a paradigmatic operation on transitive verbs (see F. 9). No further discussion of this complicated issue is necessary here.

17. In the anticausative meaning atsiristi 'to get untied' can occasionally become an input for the impersonal, but then it acquires an inferential function. This loosening of macrorole and referential requirements, otherwise characteristic of impersonals, fits into the general picture described in Sections 4–5 for the intersection of impersonals and evidentials.

18. In this case the derivational relation is indicated morphologically not only by the RM, but also by a combination of ablaut and metatony (iūž/iaūž) and the presence vs. absence of the causative suffix -in- (the same holds, e.g., for steb-e-ti-s 'to be astonished' ⇔ steb-in-ti 'to astonish' in list (41a)). These are simply details of morphological marking, which do not touch upon the basic relationship between the causative stem and its decausativized equivalent. Whether, from a diachronic viewpoint, it is the latter which is derived from the former, or the other way around, is no issue to be decided here and irrelevant for the following discussion.

19. Likewise, in more specific terms šeimininkė 'housewife' in (37a–b) could be considered an experiencer, svečiais 'guests' and gelėmis 'flowers' the stimulus. This is however irrelevant for the semantic decomposition and macrorole assignment (see 1.2).

20. Cf. for an analogous example with žavėtiš 'to be charmed; to delight o.s.' (⇐žavėti 'to charm, fascinate') in Christen (1995: 36).

21. All these semantic restrictions and the coding manner are identical to those in Russian and Polish, which use u + genitive.

22. There, again, is a second, truly autocausative (i.e. subject-oriented) meaning 'to cut one's own hair'.

23. Both questions have been topics of considerable debates with respect to Polish (cf. Wiemer, to appear3: 2.1).

25. Cf. also Geniušienė (this volume: 2.4 and the second part of her ex. (69)). As with other impersonals in evidential function the copula is omitted.

26. A hypothesis naturally arising from such a reasoning would be that this “pretention”, i.e. the pragmatic purpose behind it, vanishes when the impersonal construction really starts to replace the first person (in descriptive, i.e. not in imperative-like, utterances). This would, of course, concern also indefinite-generic pronouns (Germ. man, Fr. on), which can be regarded as functional equivalents of participial impersonals (see Section 2).
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Functional Approaches

D. Grammaticalization in long-term diachrony
The rise and grammaticalization paths of Latin 
*fieri* and *facere* as passive auxiliaries

Michela Cennamo  
University of Naples Federico II

This paper discusses the various stages of the change leading to the emergence of the Latin verbs *fieri* ‘to become, to be done/made’ and *facere* ‘to do, to make’ as imperfective and perfective passive markers, respectively, between Late Latin and early (Italo)-Romance.

It is argued that the grammaticalization of these verbs involves an initial stage in which they become equivalent to the copula. Only gradually they expand into the verbal system and become T(ense), A(spect), M(odality) and passive markers. As for the latter function, crucial to the passive interpretation of the sequence *fieri/fakere* + past participle is a change in the aspectual nature of the verbs entering the construction, from causative accomplishments to active accomplishments and activities.

It is also shown that the rise of these passive verbal periphrases is related to radical changes affecting the domains of voice and grammatical relations, which cut across, at some point in time, the aspectual morphological cleavage existing in the Latin verbal system between imperfective and perfective verbal forms.

1. Introduction

In this paper we examine the rise of Latin *fieri* ‘to become, to be done/made’ and *facere* ‘to do, to make’ as markers of the passive voice (so-called passive auxiliaries) in the transition from Latin to (Italo-)Romance, in patterns consisting of a finite form of the verbs *fieri* and *facere* + the past participle of the lexical verb, as in Late Latin *fiat recompensatus* ‘(that) be (lit. become) rewarded’ and Old Logudorese Sardinian *fekit pettita* ‘She was (lit. made) asked for’.

We show that the initial stage of the auxiliarization of these verbs involves their equivalence to the copula and that the rise of these verbal periphrases is part and parcel of deep and pervasive changes affecting the encoding of the argument structure of the clause between Late Latin and early Romance.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we discuss the notions of auxiliation and voice, which are illustrated with reference to Late Latin and early (Italo-)Romance in Section 3. In Section 4 we investigate the various steps leading to the grammatical-
ization of Latin *fieri* and *facere* as passive markers. Finally, in Section 5 we summarize the conclusions.

2. Auxiliation and voice

The constructions under investigation fall under the general notion of auxiliation and exemplify the change of lexical verbs denoting change of state (*fieri*) and activity (*facere*) into T(ense) A(spect) M(odality) and voice markers.1

In line with Heine 1993, among others, we take auxiliaries to be clines, paths with “focal points where phenomena may cluster” (Hopper & Traugott 1993:7), ranging from full lexical items (e.g. verbs) to grammatical ones (marking tense-aspect-modal distinctions, so-called TAM chain), involving most typically the following stages (see Hopper & Traugott 1993:108, int. al.):

1. full verb > (vector verb)2 > auxiliary > clitic > affix

They tend to be finite and are identified by the interplay of four parameters, whose relevance varies according to the type and stage of the auxiliation involved: desemanticization (loss of lexical content, ‘semantic bleaching’), decategorialization (reduced verbal behaviour), cliticization (loss of morphosyntactic status as an independent word), erosion (e.g., loss of phonetic substance) (Heine 1993:55–58; 131).

In the auxiliarization process the structure of the sentence changes: the lexical verb becomes a TAM marker and the original (non-finite) verbal complement (e.g., a past participle) becomes the main verb (i.e., the lexical verb). The two predicates, originally two distinct constituents, merge into one. Therefore the sentence, initially biclausal, consisting of a verb plus a sentential complement, becomes monoclausal, with the original lexical verb becoming an auxiliary to another verb (i.e., the original complement, that is reinterpreted as the ‘main’ (i.e. lexical) verb) (Heine 1993:55; Harris & Campbell 1995:172–173):

(2) *carnes* [coctae] [funt /*fecerunt*] >
meat–pl.nom cook–pp.f.pl.nom become.pres.ind.3pl /*make.perf.ind.3pl
[coctae] funt /*fecerunt* (Late Latin)
cook–pp.f.pl.nom become.pres.ind.3pl /*make.perf.ind.3pl
[complement] [lexical verb] > [lexical verb auxiliary]
‘Meat cooks (lit. becomes cooked)’ > ‘Meat is (being)/gets cooked’

In the Late Latin example in (2), for instance, as a result of auxiliation, the lexical verbs (*funt* ‘become’/*fecerunt* ‘made’) become TAM markers and their non-finite complement (the past participle *coctae* ‘cooked’) becomes the main verb, i.e., the lexical verb. The two elements, originally belonging to two different clauses, coalesce into one.

The auxiliary verbs *fieri* and *facere* in (2) also mark O3-orientation and Agent defocusing, functioning as passive auxiliaries.
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Following Comrie 1981, 1988; Givón 1984; Shibatani 1985, 1988, 1994 among others, we view the passive voice as a marked system of correlations among (morpho)syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features, instantiating different points along a Detransitivization continuum, as illustrated in Table 1 (see also recent discussion in Abraham, this volume):

In many languages and varieties of languages core passives are characterized by O-orientation, a marked verb morphology (often a form of the verb 'to be'), agent suppression, topicalization and subjectization of a non-agent, as in (3a–b), respectively from Latin and Old Logudorese Sardinian, the early Italo-Romance vernacular where the continuation of Latin *facere* occurs as a passive auxiliary:

(3) a. *puella amata est*
   
   girl-NOM love.PP.FSG.NOM be.PRES.IND.3SG
   
   ‘The girl was loved (past perfective)/The girl has been loved (present perfective)’

   b. *furun binkitos*
   
   be.PERF.3PL defeat.PP.M.PL
   
   ‘They were defeated’

The affectedness and topicality of the (non-Agent) subject are instead the least important among the properties of the passive continuum listed in Table 1. As a matter of fact, they also characterize non-passive patterns, e.g., the *esse*+pp construction in Latin under the adjectival function of the past participle, as in (3a) *puella amata est* under the meaning ‘the girl is loved’.

Passives with overt expression of the Agent are rare cross-linguistically (Siewierska 1984:35, int. al.). They may be regarded indeed as less prototypical, in that they merely reorganize the encoding of the two participants, A and O, according to the discourse perspective, whereas the propositional content of the clause does not change. In Latin, for instance, they have a low frequency and appear mainly in the past tense (Stempel 2002:331). They are rare also in Old Logudorese Sardinian (4a), where, when both A and O are expressed, usually the active, with right dislocation of the object occurs instead of the passive (4b) (see discussion in §4.2):

(4) a. *furun binkitos parentes e(O) de piscopu Jorgi Maiule (A) (CSPS 79.8)*
   
   defeat.PP.M.PL relative-PL by bishop Jorgi Maiule (A)
   
   ‘The relatives were defeated by the bishop Jorgi Maiule’

---

Table 1. The passive continuum

- Agent-defocusing (e.g., Agent suppression)
- Stativization (Perfective-resultative perspective on the event/Marked verbal morphology)
- Subjectization of a non-Agent (Patient/Benefactive/Recipient, an original DO/IO)
- Topicalization of a non-Agent
- Affectedness of surface subject
b. los (O) beat binkotos piscopu Jorgi Maiule (A) sos them have.pres.ind.3sg defeat.pp.m.pl bishop Jorgi Maiule the relatives (id. 79.11–12)

‘The bishop Jorgi Maiule has defeated the relatives (lit. them has won the bishop Jorgi Maiule the relatives)’

Passives may also be differentiated according to whether they have a processual/eventive interpretation, sometimes referred to in the literature as dynamic passives (Giacalone Ramat 2001b), as in (5):

(5) a. laudamur
    praise.mpass.pres.ind.1pl
    ‘We are being/get praised’

b. laudati sumus (Classical Latin)
    praise.pp.m.pl be.pres.ind.1pl
    ‘We were praised’ (past perfective interpretation)

c. constructae fiunt (Late Latin)
    build.pp.f.pl nom become.pres.ind.3pl
    ‘They are being/get built’

d. fuit/fekit pettita (O. Logudorese Sardinian)
    be-perf.3sg/make.perf.3sg ask.pp.f.sg
    ‘She was asked for’

O-oriented patterns with a marked verbal morphology and a perfective-resultative interpretation, denoting the state resulting from a previous action, as affecting the O argument, instantiate instead so-called resultative-stative passives (6) (see also Cennamo 2003a, 2005).

In Latin in the perfect they have the same expression as dynamic passives (cf. (6b) and (6a)); in O.Logudorese a resultative form (i.e., the pattern with istadu ‘been’), from the verb istare ‘to stay’ is only attested in the 15th century (6c) est istatu datu. In earlier texts instead no such form occurs and, depending on the context, esse+pp may instantiate both a resultative stative passive, as in (6b) sun fattos and a copular construction, with the past participle in adjectival function (e.g., sun fattos = ‘are made, consist of’) (see discussion in Cennamo 2003a):

(6) a. laudati sumus (Classical Latin)
    praise.pp.m.pl nom be.pres.ind.1pl
    ‘We have been praised’

b. ki sun fattos in servu meu (CSPS 95. 4–5)
    who be.pres.ind.3pl make.pp.m.pl through servant my
    ‘Who have been procreated by my servant’ (O. Logudorese Sardinian, 11th–13th century)

c. est istadu dadu
    be.pres.ind.3sg be.pp.m.sg give.pp.m.sg
    cumandamentu (CSPSO (4r.)15) (15th century)
    order
    ‘It has been ordered’
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In the following sections the notions of auxiliation and voice are discussed with reference to the rise of the Romance passive verbal periphrases *fieri* and *facere* +pp.

3. Voice, aspect and argument linking in Late Latin/ Early Romance

We now illustrate the changes taking place in the encoding of voice distinctions and grammatical relations in Late Latin, leading to the temporary loss of the voice dimension. We also explore the way these changes interact with the aspectually determined morphological cleavage existing in the Latin voice system, between forms expressing imperfective and perfective aspect, to determine the rise of the passive constructions investigated in the present study.

3.1 Analytic passives and tense-aspectual shifts

The (morphological vs syntactic) expression of the passive voice in Classical Latin reflects the imperfective-perfective nature of the linguistic situation expressed by the verb. Forms expressing imperfective aspect (roughly an ongoing, continuous, repetitive situation), so-called *infectum* (present, imperfect, future) are encoded by means of an inflectional ending, the (medio-passive) -R suffix, which is added to the verb stem (e.g., *am-or* ‘I am loved’); forms expressing perfective aspect (denoting a completed event), so-called *perfectum* (perfect, pluperfect, future perfect) are realized by means of a form of the verb ‘to be’, *esse* + the past participle (e.g., *am-a-tus sum* ’I was loved/I have been loved’). In the perfect a passive form (*esse*+pp) can convey three different functions. It can refer to a past event (dynamic passive reading) (7a), it can express the current relevance of a past event (resultative-stative interpretation) (7b) or it can mark a copular pattern, with the past participle having an adjectival function (marking a result state) (7c) (see also note 4): 6

(7) a. *ianua clausa* est (dynamic passive-eventive interpretation)
   *door-nom close.pp.f.sg.nom be.pres.ind.3sg*
   ‘The door was closed’

b. *ianua clausa*
   *door.nom close.pp.f.sg.nom*
   est (resultative stative passive-perfective-resultative interpretation)
   be.pres.ind.3sg
   ‘The door has been closed’

c. *ianua clausa*
   *door-nom close.pp.f.sg.nom*
   est (stative reading- past participle=adjectival function, result state)
   be.pres.ind.3sg
   ‘The door is closed’
In the other perfective tenses the ambiguity involves the resultative-stative (7d) and copular (7e) interpretation of the esse+pp pattern, the dynamic passive function being conveyed by the synthetic passive form (7f):

(7) d. *ianua clausa erat* (resultative stative passive)
   *door-nom close-pp.f.sg be-imf.ind.3sg*
   ‘The door had been closed’

e. *ianua clausa erat* (copular sentence) (*clausa*=adjective)
   ‘The door was closed’

f. *ianua claudebatur* (synthetic passive)
   *door-nom close-imf.ind.mpass.3sg*
   ‘The door was being/got closed’

A major innovation taking place in the domain of aspect and voice in the transition from Latin to Romance is the use of different patterns to carry the dynamic passive and resultative-stative functions of a passive form. The former value is conveyed by a form of esse+pp, not only in the perfectum, as in Classical Latin, but in the infectum as well. Esse+pp, in fact, comes to be used in imperfective function (8a), initially apparently in some tenses only, the present indicative and the present subjunctive (Svennung 1935:457–58; Winters 1984) – probably developing a rare and marginal use of the pattern already occurring in C(lassical) L(atin) and confined to some tenses (Herzog 1910:§41; Bassols de Climent 1948:§40) – and supplants the morphological passive, which dies out of use (see recent discussion in Herman 2002):

(8) a. *ianua clausa est* (dynamic passive – imperfective function)
   *door-nom close.pp.f.sg.nom be.pres.ind.3sg*
   (< a. *ianua clauditur*)
   ‘The door is being/gets closed’

b. *ianua clausa fuit* (dynamic passive- (past) perfective function)
   *door-nom close.pp.f.sg.nom be.perf.3sg*
   (< b. *ianua clausa est*)
   ‘The door was closed’

The resultative-stative interpretation of esse+pp comes to be expressed, instead, by a double compound form (8c), which did not exist in Classical Latin (and which indeed seems to be an early Romance pattern, attested to a different extent and at different stages in the Romance languages (see discussion in Cennamo 2003a with reference to early Italian vernaculars):

(8) c. *ianua est stata clausa* (resultative-stative passive)
   *door-nom be.pres.ind.3sg be.pp.f.sg.nom close.pp.f.sg.nom*
   ‘The door has been closed’

Perfectivity, therefore, is no longer marked by the construction as a whole, but by the past participle, whereas the forms of the verb ‘to be’, esse, are merely tense-aspect-mood and person markers (Winters 1984:446, int. al.).
The received opinion on the tense-aspectual changes in the voice system illustrated above usually ascribes them to phonological levelling (e.g., the blurring out of the endings of the active infinitive in -e and the passive in -i, whereby amare ‘to love’= amari ‘to be loved’) as well as to the reshaping of an aspectual distinction (the imperfective-perfective contrast) into tense differences (Winters 1984:450; Vincent 1988:58; Hewson & Bubenik 1997:314; Klausenburger 2000:70, int.al. and references therein). The phenomenon is also regarded as the manifestation of a more general trend in the transition from Latin to Romance, the emergence of ‘analytic’ structures in several domains of the grammar (see Herman 2002 for an overview and criticism of this traditional view), whereby grammatical and lexical meanings are no longer strongly intertwined within a word, but come to be conveyed by distinct and originally autonomous words (Maiden 1995, int.al.). In the case of the analytic passive replacing the original synthetic passive, as in (8a), tautua clausa est, substituting for (8a’), tautua clauditur, the grammatical meaning (e.g., third singular, present indicative, passive) is expressed by a form of the verb ‘to be’ (est), whereas the lexical meaning (‘closed’) is expressed by the past participle of the lexical verb (clausa).

We argue that the use of the analytic passive esse+pp in imperfective function (with the ensuing tense-aspectual shifts) as well as the rise of other passive periphrases in Late Latin, are related instead to the temporary loss of the voice dimension, clearly attested by the end of the 6th–7th century A.D. (see also Cennamo 1998, 2003a, 2003b, 2005).

3.2 Recasting of the voice system and changes in argument marking/linking

Towards the end of the 4th century A.D., confusion and equivalences in the use of voice morphology as well as ‘quirky’ uses of case-forms signal that significant changes had taken place/were taking place in the spoken language in the encoding of Transitivity. In particular, the active voice increasingly occurs in intransitive, anticausative function (9) to mark the spontaneous manifestation of a process (mainly denoting change of state/location) – at times alternating with/replacing the reflexive pattern and the -R form, depending on the verb, on the author’s preferences and the type of text – so-called Intransitivization (Feltenius 1977) (see also Cennamo 1998):

(9) a. *ut confirmet* (sc. vulnus) (Chiron 670)
   in-order-to heal.fut.3sg (wound)
   ‘So as it (sc. the wound) heals’

In some authors the active also occurs with verbs with an ‘Agent-oriented meaning component’ (Haspelmath 1993:93) (thus debarring the spontaneous interpretation of the process) which in Archaic and Classical Latin did not allow the anticausative transformation (cf. (9d) vs (9c), from the end of the 4th century A.D.). In point of fact, a pattern such as (9e) marmur citatur in Classical Latin could only have a passive function (Svennung 1935:462; Hofmann-Szantyr 1963:§165; Feltenius 1977; Cennamo 1998):
(9) b. in temporibus collections faciunt (Chiron 184)
in temples abl abscesses nom make pres ind 3pl
‘Abscesses appear on their temples (lit. make)’
c. aut marmur si ei citaverit (id. 606)
or cancer nom if he dat develop perf fut 3sg
‘Or if it develops cancer’
d. *marmur citat (anticausative)
cancer nom cause pres ind 3sg
‘*Cancer causes’
e. marmur citatur (passive)
cancer nom cause mpass pres ind 3sg
‘Cancer is caused’

Verbs such as citare ‘to cause’, facere ‘to do/make’, vexare ‘to oppress’ differ in aspectual terms from the verbs most typically occurring in the anticausative transformation in Archaic and Classical Latin – namely denoting change of state/location, such as movere ‘to move’, mutare ‘to change’, scindere ‘to crack’ and so forth – in that they are atelic/non-inherently telic, depending on the syntactic context in which they occur (i.e., on the boundedness of their object) (see also Note 8).

At some point, therefore, there occurs a change in the aspectual classes of verbs allowing the anticausative transformation (and the active morphology realizing it), namely from telic/punctual verbs denoting change of state/location (i.e., causative accomplishments/achievements) (e.g., mutare ‘to change’, movere ‘to move’, scindere ‘to break’ (trans.) to non-inherently telic/atelic ones (active accomplishments/activities) (e.g., facere ‘to do/make’, citare ‘to cause’, vexare ‘to oppress’, concludere ‘to surround’) (see Cennamo 1998, 2001b for a full discussion of this issue).

In some authors the active may even occur in a clearly passive function (10a) (apparently already attested in an isolated example from the 2nd century A.D. (10b)), with the Agent/Causer overtly expressed by means of a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition in (10a) (see Bonnet 1890:628–630; Haag 1898:57; Löfstedt 1977:275–276; Cennamo 1998, 2001a):

(10) a. item si a rota vexaverit (sc. equus) (Pelagon. 233; Feltenius 1977:137)
then if by wheel abl trouble perf fut 3sg (horse)
‘If it (=the horse) will be troubled by the wheel’
b. quomodo alius facitis, sic et faciet
the way other pl dat make pres ind 2pl thus and make fut 3sg
you pl dat
(=fiet) (Clm. Epist. Ad Cor. 13.2; Svennung 1935:568)
‘What you do to others will be done to you (lit. the same way you will do to others
so will do (=will be done) to you’
c. petens ut per eius auxilium liberaret (=liberaretur)
ask pres prt in order to by his gen help neut free impf subj 3sg
(Fredeg. Chron. IVc 183.17; Haag 1989:57)
‘Asking to be set free with his help’
Concomitant with the use of the active in passive function is the appearance of the passive in active function, with intransitive as well as transitive verbs (cf. (11a–b), a phenomenon referred to in the literature as Deponentization, occurring alongside the opposite tendency (attested throughout the history of the language, though to a much lesser extent than in Late/Medieval Latin), whereby deponents become active (Norberg 1943:153–157; Löfstedt 1977:274–275; Cennamo 1998):

(11) a. si iumentum scabia presum fuerit (Chiron 613) if beast of burden-nom scabies-nom take-perf.pl neutr be.fut.perf.3sg 'If the beast of burden has developed scabies (lit. will be taken scabies')

b. principes... ad pugnam ire compulsus est prince-pl to fight-inf go.pres.inf. force-perf.pl neutr be.pres.ind.3sg (Hist. Daretis, Mon. Germ. Mer. II, 195, 21; Norberg 1943:157) 'He forced the princes to fight (lit. to go to the battle)'

c. omnes res suas in integrum all-pl.nom thing-pl.nom his.f.acc in whole-acc recipiatur (Lex Cur. 24, 24) (ibid.) take-back.m.pass.fut.subj.3sg 'That he get his property back'

Deponentization should not be thought of as a sign of the vitality of the passive (morphology) even at a very late stage (Flobert 1975). It is, instead, a further sign of the temporary loss of the voice dimension, clearly perceivable in 6th–7th century texts (see further examples in Norberg 1943), leading, at some point, roughly by the first half of the 8th century A.D. (e.g., in Merovingian Latin) to the abandonment of the passive as a strategy, which is generally replaced by the active (cf. (12a) vs (12b), sometimes with overt expression of the agent, also when it is lacking in the original passage reproduced in a text (cf. (12c) vs (12d)). Only occasionally the ‘new’ tools which had become available, esse +pp in imperfective function, the reflexive passive and various types of verbal periphrases (e.g., fieri, venire ‘to come’, manere ‘to remain’+pp) are employed (Herman 2002; Cennamo 2003a; see also Svennung 1935:460):

(12) a. iussit eum occidere (LHF 9 (252.27) (Herman 2002) order.perf.3sg he.acc kill.inf.act 'He ordered to kill him'

b. eum... feriri mandavit (Greg. II.27 (88.12) (ibid.) he-acc wound-inf.mpass order.perf.3sg 'He ordered that he be killed'

c. dum missarum celebrantur while Mass-gen.pl celebrate.mpass.pres.ind.3pl solemnia (id. II.34 (98.2) (ibid.) ceremony-pl.neut 'While Masses were celebrated'

d. dum missarum sacrificia... celebraret while Mass-gen.pl sacrifice-pl.neut celebrate-impf.subj.3sg (sc. sanctus Mamertus) (LHF 16 (260.20) (ibid.) (saint Mamertus) 'While he (sc. saint Mamertus) celebrated Masses'
Owing to the equivalences in function among voice forms, and in particular among the active and passive morphology, in Late Latin the ambiguity of a passive pattern in the perfect no longer involves tense-aspectual distinctions (i.e., its eventive vs resultative-stative interpretation) as in Classical Latin. It concerns instead the assignment of grammatical functions to the verbal arguments, the so-called linking rules, which appear to be reversed: the active no longer signals unequivocally an A participant in subject function, and the passive no longer entails an O participant in subject function. The passive, therefore, can also mark an A argument in subject function, as in (13) under the active interpretation of the pattern (a), though it may continue to have a passive meaning (b):

(13) *puella* laudata est  
    girl-NOM praise.PP.F.SG.NOM be.PRES.IND.3SG  
    a. ‘The girl has praised/praised’ (active) *puella* = A  
    b. ‘The girl has been praised/was praised’ (passive) *puella* = O

It is still possible, however, to differentiate the verbal arguments owing to case-marking and agreement, as in (11b) *principes... compulsus est* and (11c) *res suas... recipiatur*. Once case-marking (and to a lesser extent agreement) starts operating on an active-inactive and at a later stage even on a neutral alignment, as testified by the use of the accusative in ‘subject’ function with intransitive verbs/(unaccusatives) (14a–b) as well as transitives (14c) (the so-called extended accusative (Plank 1985), the ambiguity of a passive pattern involves the identification of the verbal arguments, i.e., their A/O status as well (15) (see also Cennamo 2001b):

(14) a. *crepitavit* panem in furno (Agnell. 391, 26)  
    crackle.PRF.3SG bread-ACC in oven-ABL  
    ‘Bread crackled in oven’  
    b. *cutem non manducetur* (Anthim. 41)  
    skin-ACC not eat-MPASS.PRES.SUBJ.3SG  
    ‘The skin should not be eaten’  
    c. *filios et nepotes fecerunt* (ILCV 3052.B)  
    son-PL.ACC and nephew-PL.ACC make.PRF.3PL  
    ‘Her sons and nephews made (it) (sc. the tomb)’

(15) *puellam laudatam* est  
    girl.ACC praise.PP.F.SG.ACC be.PRES.IND.3SG  
    a. ‘The girl was loved/has been loved’ (passive)  
    b. ‘The girl has loved/loved’ (active) *(amata est = amavit)* *(puellam = A)*  
    c. ‘(She) has loved/loved the girl’ (active – *puellam* = O)

The system is overburdened: new strategies therefore arise to identify verbal arguments as well as to convey the imperfective-perfective distinction, that, as already pointed out (see §3.1), represented a major division in the Classical Latin verb system. In particular, esse+pp comes to mark imperfective passives. Since, however, the tense-aspectual functions of esse+pp continue to be ambiguous (between the canonical perfective passive reading and the ‘new’/emerging imperfective passive one), in the change leading
to the use of esse+pp in imperfective passive function, various periphrases are brought into use in order to convey the various nuances within the imperfective-perfective spectrum, among which fieri+pp in imperfective passive function and facere+pp in a perfective passive one (see Cennamo 2003a and 2005 for a discussion of the rise of other passive periphrases in Late Latin).

We believe indeed that the loss of the voice dimension and its interaction with changes in argument marking/linking concomitant with and partially related to it are at the nub of the rise of the passive periphrases in the transition from Latin to Romance.

4. Fieri and facere as TAM and voice markers

We now consider the grammaticalization paths or ‘chains’ of Latin fieri and facere as passive auxiliaries. They instantiate the different paths of development of two related verbs, the activity verb facere ‘to do, to make’ and the accomplishment verb fieri ‘to become, to arise’, which also functions as its lexical passive/anticausative throughout the history of the language.

Interestingly, these verbs end up marking the two opposite poles of the imperfective-perfective continuum. Fieri comes to be used in imperfective passive function, whereas facere occurs as a marker of perfective passive.

The former is attested already in texts from the late imperial age (§ 4.1) and continues in some early Northern Italian varieties (Cennamo 2003a). The latter is not attested in Late Latin, and apparently only shows up in one early Italo-Romance vernacular, Old Logudorese Sardinian, and only for a short period of time (11th–13th century) (§ 4.2).

4.1 fieri-passive

By the same time and in the same texts in which the analytic passive esse+pp starts appearing in imperfective passive function (16a), that is by the end of the 4th century A.D., the verb fieri occurs in auxiliary function, marking imperfective passives only (cf. (16b), (17a)), often in alternation with the synthetic passive (cf. (17a–b)). Initially it is attested only with inanimate subjects (16b); at a later stage (8th–9th century A.D.) it also occurs with animate subjects (16c), sometimes with the overt expression of the agent (introduced by the preposition per) (16d), unlike in its early attestations (Muller 1924; Reichenkron 1933; Svennung 1935:456–458; Winters 1984):

(16) a. per biennium... est stercore et adsidua
   for two-years-ACC be.pres.ind.3sg compost-ABL and continuous-ABL
   runcatione nutrita (Pall., 4, 9, 10)
   pruning-ABL nourish.pp.f.sg.nom
   ‘It (=the plant) is nurtured for two years with compost and continuous pruning’
b. *pilae laterculis constructae fiant* (Pall. I, 39, 2)
   pillar-pl.nom brick-pl abl. build-pf.pl.nom become-pres.subj.3pl
   ‘That pillars be built with bricks’ (lit. become built)

c. *et fiat battutus et missus in and become.pres.subj.3sg beat.pp.m.sg.nom and put.pp.m.sg.nom in carcer (Lex Cur. Addit. VIII, 42)*
   jail
   ‘And that he be beaten and imprisoned’

d. *per sacerdotes fiat by priest-pl.nom become-pres.subj.3pl
gubernatas (Cap. Gen. 783; Muller 1924: 79) govcki.pp.f.pl.acc
   ‘That they be governed by the priests’

e. *fiat secundum legem nostram become.pres.subj.3sg according-to law-acc our-acc condemnatus (id. Addit. X, 3)*
   condemn-pp.m.sg.nom
   ‘That he be condemned in accordance with our law’

(17) a. *interpositae orationes fiunt* (Per. Aeth. 35, 6)
   intersperse.pp.f.pl.nom prayer.pl.nom become-pres.ind.3pl
   ‘Prayers are being/get interspersed’ (lit. become interspersed)

b. *interponuntur orationes* (id. 37, 6)
   interperse-m-pass.pres.ind.3pl prayer.pl.nom
   ‘Prayers are being/get interspersed’

Whereas in the early occurrences of the pattern the auxiliary follows the past participle (16b) (as in SOV languages), at a later stage the auxiliary may also occur before the past participle, with which it may be discontinuous (16e), probably as a result of the shift from a predominantly SOV language (Latin in some registers) to SVO languages (Romance) (see also Cennamo 2005 and Pinkster 1991 for a critical evaluation of the alleged SOV nature of Latin word order).

The *fieri*-passive shows a specialised verbal behaviour, in that it only occurs in some tenses, the present indicative/subjunctive and in some persons, the third person singular/plural (though the issue needs further study), that is, it only occurs in imperfective tenses. It differs from the canonical Latin passive auxiliary, *esse* ‘to be’ and from the other passive auxiliaries developing in Late Latin (e.g., *venire* ‘to come’) in that it occurs in participial constructions such as (18), ranging from patterns where *fieri* retains its full lexical value, denoting the ‘transition to a state’, as in (18a), *elixi facti*, ‘made boiled’ (where *elixi* is the complement of the lexical verb *fieri*) to cases where it is devoid of any lexical meaning and appears to be a mere resultative marker, as in (18b), *vaporatas factas* ‘(that have been) stewed’, (18c), *capriati facti* ‘(that have been) marinated’:

---

...
The rise and grammaticalization paths of Latin *fieri* and *facere* as passive auxiliaries

(18) a. *pectenis optima caro elixi facti*

   Scalia-gen excellent-GEN meat-NOM make.PP.PL.NOM
   and *assati in testo suo* (Anthim. 48. 1))
   and *roast.PP.PL.NOM in shell-ABL its-ABL*

   ‘Scallop is excellent if (it has been boiled) and roasted in its shell (lit. boiled made
   and roasted)’

b. *vaporatis factas et in sodinga factas*

   stew-PP.PL.ACC make.PP.PL and in pan-ABL make.PP.PL
   *coctus (sc. carnes)*

   *utendum (id. 3.1)*

   ‘One should use meat that has been stewed and cooked in a pan’

c. (Pulli) *capriati facti melius comeduntur* (id. 23)

   *marinate.PP.PL.NOM make.PP.PL.NOM* better
   eat.MPASS.PRES.IND.3PL

   ‘Chicken tastes nicer if it has been marinated (lit. are eaten better marinated
   made)’

d. *lenticula et brassica vis (=bis) cocta facta* (Orib. Syn. 4, 30).

   *lentil.SG.NOM and cabbage.SG.NOM twice* cook.PP.SG.NOM
   make.PP.SG.NOM

   ‘Lentils and cabbage cooked twice (lit. twice cooked made)’

Although it is difficult to ascertain the difference between the pattern with and without
the compound participial form (e.g., between *vaporatus* and *vaporatas factas*), on the
basis of the evidence available, one may hypothesize that when the pattern occurs with
the compound participle, the past participle of the lexical verb (*vaporatus* ‘stewed’,
*coctus* ‘cooked’) has a verbal function, unlike in the simple participial form, where it
has an adjectival function instead (see Svennung 1935:459 for a different view). This
interpretation is confirmed by the occurrence of the verbal adjective *elixi* in (18a) *elixi
facti* (rather than the verbal participle *elixatus*). In point of fact, the latter syntagm in
(18a) is coordinated with the verbal participle *assati*, rather than the verbal adjective
assi, which occurs in the plain form (i.e., without *fieri*). Coordination therefore
appears to be a good syntactic test for detecting the difference between the pattern with
and without the double participial form (in point of fact, although the coordinated
elements may not be of the same form class, they must be alike in their function (Pinkster
1988:30, 124 for Latin). The double participial form therefore appears to single out the
verb from the adjectival function of the past participle when the latter may be am-
biguous between either interpretation, most typically with change of state verbs (i.e.,
causative accomplishments/achievements9) (e.g., *coquere* “to cook”, *vaporare* “to stew”
(trans.)). The past participle of *fieri* in the above examples then functions as a marker
of O-orientation and perfective-resultative aspect, highlighting the event giving rise
to a result state rather than the (result) state itself.10 Late Latin, therefore, seems to
develop at some stage a resultative participle.
4.1.1 Origin of fieri-passive

The auxiliarization of fieri seems to be related to two different and at some point converging paths or 'chains'.

One path of change, probably the initial one, appears to involve the equivalence of fieri to the copula esse, attested by the end of the 4th century A.D. (19a–b) and even more so in later centuries (see (19c–e), of the 6th century A.D.) and (19f), from early Medieval Latin (10th century A.D.), whereby fieri, which in its 'fientive'11 use marks a result state (19a), may also occur in copular function, to mark a non-result state (18c), at times alternating with the copula esse within the same text) (19d–e):

(19) a. donec sanum fiat (sc. iumentum) (Chiron 728)=
   until fit-neut become-pres.subj.3sg (beast of burden)
   'Until it (the beast of burden) recovers (lit. becomes fit)'

b. si sanum non fuerit (sc. iumentum)(id. 723)
   if fit-neut not be.fut.3sg
   'If it (the beast of burden) does not recover (lit. if it will not be fit)'

c. utilis fiat ina, ut in lactes caprunos
   useful-nom become.pres.subj.3sg thus that in milk-pl.acc goat-pl.acc
   useful-nom become.pres.subj.3sg thus that in milk-pl.acc goat-pl.acc
   'Thus it is useful to cook lamb in milk'

d. difficilior fiat ad curandum (Orib. Syn. La d-a)=
   more-difficult-nom become.pres.ind.3sg for cure-ger-neut
   'It is (more) difficult to cure'

e. difficilis est ad curandum (id. 8, 7, A)
   difficult-nom be.pres.ind.3sg for cure-ger-neut
   'It is difficult to cure'

f. fiat ei fermum et stabilem (Cod. Cajet. 906; De Bartholomaeis 1902:§73)
   become-pres.subj.3sg he.dat firm-acc and stable-acc
   'That it be firm and stable to him (lit. that it become)'

Also the converse phenomenon is attested, whereby esse, that in Classical Latin in predicative structures occurred for inherent states/qualities (20a), may occur for result states as well in Late Latin12 (cf. (20b) fungosae sunt (=fiunt)), sometimes in the same texts where fieri substitutes for esse (20c), replacing the corresponding lexical anticausative in the -R form (20d) (Svennung 1935:460):

(20) a. nix alba est (inherent quality) (*nix alba fit)
   snow-nom white-f.nom be.pres.ind.3sg
   'Snow is white'

b. laetamen non est ingerendum... quia inde
   manure-neut not be.pres.ind.3sg add-ger-neut because from-it
   spongy-pl.nom be.pres.ind.3pl (=become.pres.ind.3pl) (roots)
   'Manure is not to be added, in that they (=the roots) become spongy (lit. are)'

c. (= 19b) si sanum non fuerit (sc. iumentum)
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The equivalence involves also the non-fientive use of \textit{fieri} (i.e., its non-predicative function):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{donec sanetur} (Veg. 2, 88, 7)
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
                      donec  sanetur
                     \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    until heal-PRES.SUBJ.MPASS.3SG
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    ‘Until it recovers’
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
\end{itemize}

\textit{Fieri} and \textit{esse} therefore at some point (roughly by the end of the 4th–5th century A.D.) become interchangeable, in all their uses.

The equivalence \textit{fieri-esse} illustrated in (19)–(21) appears to be the first step towards the auxiliarization of \textit{fieri}, whereby the verb becomes a semantically empty copula, a tense-aspect carrier like \textit{esse}. Indeed, the grammaticalization of \textit{fieri} may be regarded as a case of ‘copula auxiliarization’ (Dik 1987:57) or ‘expansion’ (Heine & Reh 1982 in Dik 1987:58), a change whereby a copula acquires further grammatical meanings, becoming fully integrated into the tense-aspect-mood and person marking system of the language.

The second path involves a change in the complement of the verb, from noun/adjective (22a) or adjectival participle (22b–c) to verbal participle (22d–e). In the early attestations of the pattern the past participle is formed mainly from causative accomplishments/achievements (namely verbs denoting change of state (e.g., \textit{coquere}, \textit{constringere}) and, depending on the context, the construction may be ambiguous between the lexical (i.e., fientive meaning) and auxiliary (i.e., TAM marker) function of \textit{fieri}, as in (22b–c):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Marcus consul fit /tumor durus}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
                          Marcus  consul  fit  /tumor  durus
                        \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    Mark-NOM consul-NOM become-PRES.IND-3SG/ swelling-NOM hard-NOM
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    fit become-PRES.IND-3SG
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    ‘Mark became a consul/The swelling becomes hard’
  \end{quote}
  \item \textit{maxillae constrictae fiunt}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
                      maxillae  constrictae  fiunt
                    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    the-jaws.PL.F.NOM contract.PP.PL.F.NOM become-PRES.IND-3PL =
    constringuntur
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    ‘The jaws become contracted’ = ‘The jaws get contracted’
  \end{quote}
  \item \textit{caro cocta fit}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
                     caro  cocta  fit
                 \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
    meat-NOM cook-PP.F.SG.NOM become-PRES.IND-3SG =
    coquitur
    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \begin{quote}
    ‘Meat gets cooked/cooks’
  \end{quote}
  \item \textit{interpositae orationes fiunt}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
                      interpositae  orationes  fiunt
                    \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
  \item \textit{fiant gubernatas}
  \begin{quote}
    \begin{verbatim}
          fiunt  gubernatas
                 \end{verbatim}
  \end{quote}
\end{itemize}
Under its fientive interpretation the construction *fieri*+pp is biclausal: the past participle (*constrictae/cocta*) in (22b–c) in fact is a complement of the verb *fieri*, that occurs in its full lexical meaning, denoting the transition to a state and the pattern replaces the corresponding synthetic anticausative form (*constringuntur/coquitur*). Under the auxiliary function of *fieri* (as in the passive interpretation of (22b–c), *fieri* is a TAM marker and the past participle is the main (i.e., the lexical) verb. The pattern is therefore monoclausal. Whereas when the past participle is formed from causative accomplishment/achievement verbs the construction may be both biclausal and monoclausal, when the past participle is formed from either an active accomplishment (e.g., *interponere* in (22c)) or an activity verb (e.g., *gubernare* in (22d)), the pattern can only be monoclausal, with the past participle having a clear verbal function. In point of fact, no spontaneous (i.e., anticausative) interpretation of the pattern is possible, but an external Causer is implied, which at a late stage can also be overtly marked (cf. (16d)).

The change in the different bracketing of the construction, stemming from the different aspectual nature of the participial complement, can be summarized as in (23):

(23) a. [fieri] + [adjectival participle] > b. [fieri + verbal participle]

The aspectual nature of the verb therefore appears to play a major role in the passive interpretation of the pattern *fieri*+pp, as with other passive constructions in the transition from Latin to Romance (Michaelis 1998; Cennamo 2003a, 2005).

### 4.2 facere-passive

In late Medieval texts (11th–13th century) from one Italo-Romance variety, Old Logudorrese Sardinian, there occurs an unusual and apparently isolated passive verbal periphrasis, consisting of the verb *fakere* 'to do/to make' (a continuation of the Latin verb *facere*) in auxiliary function + the past participle of the lexical verb, in such forms as *fekit pettita* "She was asked for" (lit she made asked for), in alternation with *essere*+pp (Cennamo 2003a, 2003b).

This pattern is attested only in the third person singular/plural, in two tenses, the perfect (*fekit* 3rd singular – *fekeron* – 3rd plural) and the pluperfect (*fekeron – 3rd singular*) and marks a perfective passive. It occurs mainly with [+An] [+Hum] subjects (there are only 2 examples of [–An] subjects out of 11 occurrences of the pattern) and dies out in later centuries, replaced by the *essere* periphrasis, with which it alternates in the texts investigated (Cennamo 2003a, 2003b; also Blasco Ferrer 1995). Most typically, the Agent is unexpressed (24a–d). There are only two examples with the agent overtly expressed (24c–d), realized as a prepositional phrase introduced by the preposition *de* (denoting cause) (24c) or *ave (=abc)* (24d):

(24) a. *ca non fekeron pettita s’ankilla de scu.*

| that not make-PLUFF.IND-3SG ask-PP-SG.F the-servant of saint Peter (CSPS 33, 5–6)

Peter

'Because S. Peter’s servant had not been asked for’
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b. *et issara iirait... ca ad Elene de Funtana*\(^{14}\) a.llarga and then *swear-perf.3sg* that to Helene of Funtana away

*fekit levata* *ki non fekit pettita*

*make-perf.3sg*, *take.PP.SG.F* that *not make.perf.3sg ask.PP.SG.F*

*alicando* (id. 27, 8–9)

never

‘And then . . . he swore that Elena de Funtana was taken away (lit. made taken), that she was never asked for (lit. made asked for)’

c. *su seruum vostru... iectatu... fekit de donnu et de*

the servant your *throw-PP.M.SG* *make-perf.3sg* by master and by

*seruos de Trullas* (CSNT 311, 4)

*servant-PL* of Trullas

‘Your servant was cast out (lit. thrown made) by his master and by the servants of Trulla’s’

d. *ki fekerun datos a Mariane de Capathennor ave iudice that make-perf.3PL give-PP.M.PL to Mariane of Capathenner by judge Mariane*

*Mariane (CSNT 270, 1)*

Mariane

‘That were given (lit. made given) to Mariane of Capathonner by Judge Mariane’

As already pointed out (p. 4), when both verbal arguments (A and O) are expressed, an active pattern with dislocation of the object is preferred (compare (25a) with (25b), which have the same propositional content):

(25) a. *(=24c) su seruum vostru... iectatu... fekit de donnu et de seruos de Trullas* (CSNT 311, 4)

b. *ki... l’avian ietatu... su servum vostru sos that him (O).have.IMPF cast.out.PP.M.SG the servant (O) your the*

*servos de Sanctum Nicolas de Trullas* (CSNT 332, 3)

*servant-PL* (A) of Saint Nicolas of Trullas

‘Because S. Nicola from Trulla’s servants had cast your servant out’ (lit. ‘him had thrown away your servant S. Nicolas of Trulla’s servants’)

The *facere*-passive has an overall low frequency (3 examples in CSNT and 8 examples in CSPS), and only occurs in some Logudorese texts.

*Facere* is also attested in predicative constructions, in what appears to be a truly copular function, not only in O. Logudorese (26a) but also in other O. Sardinian varieties (e.g., O. Campidanese) where it does not occur as a passive marker (26b):

(26) a. *(Gosanthine de Thori)... fegit malabitu de sa* Gosantine of Thori *make.perf.3SG ill-SG.M* of the

*plaga* (CSNT 218.2) (attributive)

wound

‘Gosantine of Thori was ill because of his wound’

b. *Jurgia Cucu... aligando muniaria non fegit* (CV 13.10) (identificational)

Jurgia Cucu *never servant not make.perf.3SG.*

‘Jurgia Cucu was never a servant’
According to some scholars (Merci 1992:110, note to card 218.1), the copular use of *facere* is subsequent to its passive auxiliary function. However, since this use also occurs in texts where *facere* is not attested as a passive auxiliary and continues a well-established copular function of this verb in Late Latin (see discussion in §4.1.1), we argue that it might be the initial stage in the auxiliarization of this verb (cf. also Cennamo 2003a, 2003b).

### 4.2.1 Origin of *facere*-passive

The auxiliarization of the verb *facere* appears to stem from three different chains interacting at different times.

The initial stage is related to some desemanticized, copular-like uses of the verb developing in Late Latin (attested, to some extent already by the 1st century A.D.), where it equals the verb *valet* "It is good, useful" (27a–b) (J. Herman, p.c.):

(27) a. *idem remedium optime facit* (Colum. 60, 15, 1)
   same remedy-neut excellently make.pres.ind.3sg
   ‘The same remedy is very good if (lit. does excellently)’
   b. *facit autem ad id vitium absinthium* (Chiron 454)
   make.pres.ind.3sg then to this disease-neut absinth-neut
   ‘Then absinth is good for this disease’

Patterns such as (27a–b) indeed appear to be the direct antecedents of the copular function of the verb, well-attested by the 6th century, when it sometimes alternates with the canonical copula *esse* (28):

(28) a. *si autem et thimum ... et absinthium cum fermentum*
   if then and thymus-neut and absynth-neut with yeast-neut.
   *admisceas obrimum facit* (Colum. 60, 15, 1)
   mix.pres.ind.2sg excellent-neut make.pres.ind.3sg
   ‘If you mix thyme ... and absinth, this makes an excellent remedy’
   b. *sed in olla factile meliorem saporem*
   but in pan-abl clay-abl better-acc taste-acc
   *facit (=fit/est?)* (fientive/copula?)
   make.pres.ind.3sg
   ‘But it tastes better in a clay pan (lit. the taste makes=is better in a clay pan)”

Also existential uses of the verb in the impersonal form (facit) (29a–b), occurring in 5th–6th century texts (e.g., S. Augustin and *Vitae Patrum*) (Salonius 1920:256; Svennung 1935:567–568; Hofmann-Szantyr 1964:§221c) appear to be related to the gradual loss of semantic content of the verb (J. Herman, p.c.):

(29) a. *numquam fecit tale*
   never make.perf.3sg this-neut
   *frigus* (Aug. Serm. 25, 3; Hofmann-Szantyr 1964:§221c)
   cold-neut
   ‘It has never been so cold (lit. made cold)”
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b. *sed* *hodie* *bonum aerem facit* (*Vitae Patrum* 5, 11, 51 (ibid.))
   but today good-ACC weather-ACC make.PRES.IND-3SG (impersonal)
   ‘But today it is (lit. it makes) good weather’

A second chain in the grammaticalization process of *facere* is related to the equivalence among voice forms, consequent to the loss of the grammatical dimension of voice discussed in § 3.2, whereby at some point the forms of the verb *facere* are used interchangeably with the corresponding forms of its lexical passive *fieri*, both in its anticausative (30a) and (marginally) its passive functions (30b) (Svennung 1935:459–460; Hofmann-Szantyr 1963:§165):

(30) a. (=9c) *in temporibus collectiones faciunt* (anticausative)
   ‘Swellings appear (lit. make) on its head’
   b. (=10b) *quomodo aliis facitis, sic et faciet vobis* (passive)

The equivalence between the two verbs all their uses, therefore it involves also the fientive (31a–b) and copular functions (31c):

(31) a. *lacrimosum oculum faciet... et extumidior fit* (id. 70)
   tearful-ACC eye-ACC make.FUT-3SG and swollen-NOM become.PRES.IND-3SG
   ‘Its eye will become (lit. will-make) tearful... and becomes swollen’
   b. *cataplasmabis eam (sc. tumorem) donec maturum faciat* (Chiron 91) (fientive)
   make.PRES.SUBJ.3SG
   ‘You will smear it (the swelling) with a poultice till it becomes soft (lit. soft-Acc makes-subj)’
   c. (=28b) *sed in olla fictile meliorem saporem facit (=fit/est?)* (fientive/copula?)

At some point, therefore, *facere* might have occurred in anticausative/passive-like function, (according to the context), replacing the canonical form *fieri*, in the corresponding intransitive form (32) of analytic patterns of the type *facere* + a past participle in predicative function (32’):

(32) *carnes assatae fecerunt (=factae
   meat-NOM.PL roast-PP.PL.F.NOM make.PERF.3PL = make.PP.F.PL.NOM
   sunt)
   bc.PRES.IND.3PL
   ‘The meat became/got roasted (lit. ‘meat roasted made’ (=became)’
   (<32).carnes assatas facisti = assavisti)
   meat.ACC.PL roast.PP.F.ACC make.PERF-2SG = roast-PERF.2SG
   ‘You made the meat roasted=you roasted the meat’

Analytic structures of the type *facere*+pp for the synthetic ones (e.g., *coctum facere* (lit. ‘cooked make’) = *coquire* (‘to cook’) and the corresponding intransitive (anticausative) forms (e.g., *coctus fit* (lit. ‘it cooked becomes’ = *coquitur* ‘it cooks’) are already attested by the 1st century A.D. (33a–b) and develop the early Latin common use of the past participle in predicative function after transitive (causative) verbs such as *facere*, *curare* (e.g., *aliquem missum facere* ‘to let someone go’ (lit. ‘someone
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(33) a. *mei pl.nom coci pl.nom etiam vitulos aeno
coci pl.nom etiam pl.nom coci pl.nom
coctos solent facere (=coquere) (Petr. 47.25)
coci pp.pl.m.acc use.pres.ind-3pl make-inf (=cook-inf)
‘My cooks cook veal (lit. make veal cooked) in a bronze cauldron’
b. iussit perf.3sg ut aeno coctus
iussit perf.3sg that bronze-cauldron-ABL coctus
fieret (sc. gallus) (id. 74.4)
become.impf.subj (hen)
‘He ordered that it (=the hen) cooked/was (lit; became) cooked in a bronze cauldron’

The last step in the auxiliarization of facere, the trigger of its use as a passive marker would involve a change in the aspectual classes of verbs occurring in the participial form. Starting from a construction in which facere equals fieri in anticausative/passive-like function as in (32) (*carnes assatae fecerunt) above, facere might be deemed to acquire a truly auxiliary passive function once the aspectual classes of the verbs occurring in the participial form change and no longer belong to causative accomplishment/(achievement) verbs (e.g., assare, coquere), but spread to active accomplishments/activities as well (e.g., curare, munire). In point of fact, whereas with causative accomplishment and achievement verbs (i.e., telic verbs denoting change of state) the pattern may be ambiguous between a spontaneous (anticausative) and an induced process interpretation (passive function), depending on the context, with active accomplishments/activities the latter interpretation is impossible, and an external human causer is (necessarily) implied (passive function).

The grammaticalization of facere would appear to follow therefore the same path as that of fieri discussed in Section 4.1 and of other passive auxiliaries arising in the transition from Latin to Romance (Cennamo 2005).

In particular, it seems to involve a stage at which facere equals esse, whereby it too would exemplify a case of “copula auxiliarization” (Dik 1987:57), the process whereby a grammatical element (the copula) receives an extra grammatical function, gradually expanding into the domain of the verbal paradigm.

It also appears to result from a change in the nature of the verbal complement, from noun/adjective (as in its copular/fientive use) and possibly an adjectival participle at some point, to verbal participle.

The possible stages in the rise of facere as a passive auxiliary (from Latin to O. Logudorese may be summarized as in (34):

(34) a. tumor maturus facit/equus sanus facit (=fit=est) (‘the swelling becomes/is soft/the horse recovers’)
b. *carnes assatae/*coctae faciunt (=fiunt) (=coquuntur/assantur) ‘meat becomes/is/gets roasted/cooked’>
c. ancilla fekit pettita ‘the servant was asked for’ (O. Logudorese)
Like in other auxiliation processes, the original complement of the verb (i.e., the past participle) is reinterpreted as the 'main' lexical verb. The construction therefore becomes monoclausal, with the two predicates, originally two different constituents, merging into one:

\[(35) \quad \text{caro [cocta]} \quad \text{[facit]} \quad > \quad \text{caro [cocta facit]} \]

Stage a) results from the equivalence *facere/esse/fieri* and exemplifies the copular and fientive uses of *facere*. At stage b) (hypothesized) the pattern would be ambiguous between a two-constituent/one-constituent analysis, owing to the ambiguity of interpretation of the past participle (adjectival∼ verbal). At stage c) no ambiguity arises, in that the past participle is formed from an activity verb, so it is clearly verbal in function.

Also in the grammaticalization of the verb *facere* as a passive auxiliary, therefore, the aspectual class of the verbs occurring in the participial form plays a crucial role, triggering the induced process (i.e., passive) interpretation of the construction.

Furthermore the rise of the *facere* passive shows a type of grammaticalization which not only involves the desemanticization and decategorialization of a lexical verb into a TAM marker, but also reflects changes in argument linking taking place in Late Latin, related to the restructuring of the voice system and, more generally, of the encoding of the argument structure of the clause (see Cennamo 1998, 2001a, 2001b).

5. Conclusion

The investigation of the auxiliation process of the Latin verbs *fieri* and *facere* as imperfective and perfective passive markers, respectively, has revealed that they involve the same grammaticalization chains:

- A stage at which *fieri* and *facere* acquire a copular function, equalling the canonical copula *esse*;
- A change in the nature of the complement of the verbs, from noun/adjective/adjec-
tival participle to a verbal participle;
- A change in the aspectual classes of the verbs occurring in the participial form, from causative accomplishments to active accomplishments/activities.

The equivalence of *fieri* and *facere* to the copula appears to be the initial stage in the grammaticalization process, one in which these verbs start to occur as mere tense-aspect carriers.\(^{17}\) A subsequent stage involves their gradual integration into the verbal paradigm, as testified by their use with past participles in anticausative function (i.e., as anticausative markers), to mark the spontaneous manifestation of a situation (most typically a change of state), well-attested for *fieri* (*caro cocta fit = coquitur 'The meat cooks') but only postulated for *facere* (*oryza cocta facit = fit=coquitur 'Rice cooks').

The last step in the change of these verbs into markers of the passive voice is related to a change in the verbal classes occurring in the participial form, from telic verbs
denoting change of state (i.e., causative accomplishments and perhaps achievements as well) (e.g., Late Latin *assare* 'to roast', *coquere* 'to cook', *constringere* 'to contract') to non-inherently telic/atelic ones (e.g., active accomplishments/activities) (Latin *battere* 'to beat up', *gubernare* 'to rule/govern', *mittere* 'to send for/out', O. Logudorese *dare* 'to give', *iectare* 'to throw', *binkere* 'to defeat', *petire* 'to ask for'). With the latter verbs, in fact, the spontaneous interpretation (i.e., anticausative function) is impossible and an external human causer is implied (passive function).

In addition, the rise of these verbal periphrases and generally of periphrastic passives in Romance, appears to be one of the outcomes of radical changes taking place in the domains of voice and transitivity in Late Latin, which at some point cut across the aspectually determined morphological cleavage existing in the Latin verbal system (between forms of the *infectum* and of the *perfectum*), leading to the rise of new tense-aspectual and voice systems in the transition to Romance.

Notes

* I wish to thank Werner Abraham, Bernd Heine, Józef Herman, Mair Parry, and Harm Pinkster for commenting on earlier drafts of the paper and for stimulating discussions, at different stages, of the data and arguments presented in this paper, some of which were first presented at the *Xth International Conference of Latin Linguistics* (Amsterdam, 24–27 June 2001) and at the *XVIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics* (Copenhagen, 11–15 August 2003). I am also very grateful to both audiences for their feedback. The usual disclaimers apply.

1. The following abbreviations are used: *abl* = ablative (case); *acc* = accusative (case); *act* = active; *dat* = dative (case); *f* = feminine; *fut* = future; *gen* = genitive; *ger* = gerundive; *imf* = imperfect (tense); *ind* = indicative; *inf* = infinitive; *intr.* = intransitive; *m* = masculine; *mpass* = medio-passive marker -R; *neut* = neuter; *nom* = nominative (case); *pass* = passive; *perf* = perfect (tense marker); *pl* = plural; *pres* = present (tense marker); *pres.prt* = present participle; *pp* = past participle; *plup* = pluperfect (tense marker); *sg* = singular; *trans.* = transitive; 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person.

2. Vector verbs, also referred to as serial/light verbs, often represent (optional) intermediate stages in the verb-affix cline. They consist of a sequence of two or more verbs which act syntactically as a single verb (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 108–109, int.al.).

3. S, A, O/P are syntactico-semantic primitives referring to the core arguments of the verb/clause, following a well-established terminology (see recent discussion in Mithun & Chafe 1999 and therein references).

4. Note that in (2a) the analytic passive, *esse*+*pp*, which in Latin occurs in the perfective only, is ambiguous between a past perfective and a present perfective interpretation. With states, (causative) accomplishments and achievements the past participle may also have an adjectival interpretation, whereby, depending on the context, *amata est* can also mean 'She is beloved' (see discussion in § 3).

5. Interestingly, a similar situation obtains in contemporary Italian dialects (see Cennamo 1997).

6. Indeed, as pointed out by W. Abraham (p.c.), the ambiguity between the resultative stative and the adjectival (i.e., result state) reading of the *esse*+*pp* pattern is not surprising, since they imply one another (see also the discussion in Abraham 1990).
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7. The term refers to the intransitive use of transitive structures, in which the original object becomes the subject of the (derived) intransitive pattern. Unlike passives, which imply an external human causer, anticausatives denote the spontaneous manifestation of a process and only actions which can occur without an initiating actor can be anticausativized (Haspelmath 1987: 7, int. al).

8. We follow the Role and Reference Grammar classification of predicates, whereby active accomplishments are the telic use of activity verbs with definite, referential objects (e.g., Latin *puer tres epistulas scripsit* child.nom three-ACC.pl letter-ACC.pl ‘the child wrote three letters’). Like causative accomplishments (e.g., Latin *mutare* ‘to change’ (transitive)), they denote a temporally extended telic change (of state/activity); unlike causative accomplishments, they are not inherently telic and denote the sequence of two events rather than a relationship of causation between two events (Van Valin & La Polla 1997: 101, 111–112; also Levin 2000).

9. Although in the texts scrutinized we only found examples with causative accomplishments, we cannot exclude the occurrence of the double participial form with causative achievements as well (see also Cennamo 2005).

10. It is worth noticing in (17d) the occurrence of the adverb *vis=bis* ‘twice’, which gives the participial form a clearly eventive (i.e., verbal) force, thereby further supporting our interpretation.

11. The term refers to predicative constructions, generally derived from adjectives, denoting the transition from a state to a new state (Haspelmath 1987: 33, 1990: 34).

12. Recall, however, that *esse* already had the function of marking result states in the resultative stative interpretation of the perfect passive and in the adjectival value of the past participle (see Cennamo 2005 and §3.2).

13. The texts where the *facere*-passive occurs are so-called *Condaghi* (namely the *Condaghe di San Pietro di Silki* (CSPS) and the *Condaghe di S.Nicola di Trullas* (CPST)), “registers containing the official records of wills, donations, permutations, buys, sells, as well as juridical decisions (acts of law) on the monastery’s patrimony” (Merci 1992: 11, Note 1).

14. Note in this example that the subject of the passive clause retains its original object marking, the preposition a, that in O. Logudorese Sardinian generally marks human objects, most typically proper names (see Meyer-Lübke 1902: 52; Blasco Ferrer 1995: 48, N. 3; Cennamo 2003b)).

15. In (28b), however, *facit* may also be interpreted as equalling *fieri* (“The taste becomes better in a clay pan”).

16. Although no such examples as *oryza cocta facit* (rice.NOM cook.PP.F.SG.NOM make.PRES.IND.3SG ‘rice cooks’, lit. ‘rice cooked makes’) as the corresponding anticausative form of *oryzam coctam facit* – rice.ACC cook.PP.F.SG.ACC make.PRES.IND.3SG – ‘He cooks the rice (lit. ‘(He) rice cooked makes = cooks’) are attested, further investigation might reveal the occurrence of the anticausative use of *facere* + a past participle formed from a causative accomplishment (/achievement) verb already in Late and Medieval Latin texts.

17. Interestingly, a similar path of development for verbs of becoming as copulas has been recently pointed out by Dahl (2000) for several Northern European languages.
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The paper first recapitulates a point made repeatedly elsewhere (Givón 1981, 1994 ed., 1995, 2001, 2002): that a syntactic typology of any clause-type, including the passive, is meaningless unless clause-types are first characterized as functional domains. Using as examples six widely-attested types of passive clauses, the paper then shows that the relational (GR) properties of those clauses, much like their other structural properties, are completely predictable from the structural properties of their source – non-passive – constructions. Because functional re-analysis is the earliest stage of diachronic change, the diachronic predictability of the structural properties of newly-reanalyzed clauses is most conspicuous at the earlier stages of grammaticalization, when structural re-shaping has not yet taken place. The diachronic determination of syntactic structures thus closely parallels the evolutionary determination of biological structures. An extant ('synchronic') structure in both domains is thus best characterized by the pathway through which it came to be. Consequently, much like in biology, where the most meaningful universals are evolutionary, the most meaningful universals of linguistic structure are diachronic.

1. Introduction

It may be a mere accident that three of my favorite linguists – Ed. Keenan, Bernard Comrie, and Matt Shibatani – had all spent a considerable portion of their careers working on both grammatical relations (GRs) and voice. However, coincidental as this may have been, it suggests the following question, one that I will try to answer in this paper: Are the relational properties of passive clauses predictable, and if so on what grounds?

One answer, following Comrie (2004), is to say yes – but a yes that leaves me, at least, somewhat dissatisfied, since it is done by a preemptive definition – that is, if one may define the passive by purely structural means as "that type of construction as in Latin where the agent is marked as an oblique and the patient/topic as a nominative". Consequently, the question I am interested in raising becomes not only moot but al-
together meaningless. But to begin with, as Keenan (1975) has noted, the acquisition of nominative properties by the patient/topic of the passive may be a matter of degree even in Latin. What is more, as I have argued exhaustively elsewhere (Givón 1981, ed. 1994, 1995, 2001:Ch. 13, 2002:Ch. 6), there are good reasons why the purely structural definition of syntactic constructions *in general* is untenable. Rather, a typology of syntactic constructions, including the passive, requires a functional definition of syntactic domains.

What I will attempt to demonstrate in this paper is a necessary corollary to the functional approach to syntactic typology – that a diachronic account of the relational properties of passive clauses best predicts the relational properties of such clauses, since by and large such properties follow, at least initially, those of their respective source constructions. From the functional-adaptive perspective pursued here, the diachronic underpinnings of syntactic typology closely parallel the evolutionary underpinnings of biological structures and biological classification. This perspective is, in turn, consonant with both Hermann Paul’s (1890) and Joseph Greenberg’s (1969, 1978, 1979) intellectual agenda.

2. The typology of passive constructions

One can define the passive clause functionally as “the clause-type whereby the agent of the corresponding active is radically de-topicalized and its patient role becomes, by default, the only topical argument”. If one subscribes to such a definition, then a theoretically revealing cross-linguistic typology of passive clauses should be, ideally, the a list of the most common major clause-types that perform this function. For the purpose of this discussion, I will consider the following six major types from this list (Givón 1995, ed. 1994, 2001, 2002):

(A) The adjectival-stative passive
In some languages, such as English, a passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally and relationally, predicate-adjective (stative-resultative) clauses, as in:

(1) a. Passive:
   It was broken (by someone)

   b. Perfect-resultative:
   It has been broken

   c. Adjectival-stative:
   It is broken

   d. Predicate-adjective:
   It is big
(B) The reflexive passive
In some languages, as in the case of the English GET-passive, a passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally at least to some extent, a reflexive middle-voice construction, as in (Givón & Yang 1994):

(2) a. Causative:
   Mary got them to fire John
b. Causative with passive complement:
   Mary got John (to be) fired
c. Reflexive-causative (passive complement):
   Mary got herself fired
d. GET-passive:
   Mary got fired

(C) The serial-verb adversative passives
In some languages, the passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resemble structurally, an adversative serial-verb construction. In the process of grammaticalization, an adversative serial verb such as 'suffer' first becomes the grammaticalized marker of an adversative passive, as in Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Thai or Vietnamese. Such a construction may eventually expand its functional scope to become a generalized passive, as in Mandarin (Li & Thompson 1981):

(3) a. Adversative passive (older):
   ta bei (gongsi) chezi-le
   s/he suffer (company) fire-perf
   ‘S/he was fired (by the company)’
   (lit.: ‘S/he suffered (when) the company fired her’)
b. Generalized passive (newer):
   sheng-cheng bei jiefang-le
   province-capital pass liberate-perf
   ‘the provincial capital was liberated’
   (lit.: ‘the provincial capital suffered (when someone) liberated it’)

(D) The VP-nominalization passive
In some languages, such as Ute, a passive clause arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally, a nominalized verb phrase, as in (Givón 1980):3

(4) a. Passive:
   múusa-chi paxá-ta-pùga
   cat-obj kill-pass-rem
   ‘The cat was killed’
b. Verb-phrase nominalization:
   múusa-paxá-ta ka-‘ay-wa-t ‘ura-‘ay
   cat-kill-nom neg-good-neg-nom be-rem
   ‘Cat-killing is bad’
(E) The Left-dislocation-cum-impersonal-subject passive:
In some languages, such as Kimbundu, a passive construction arises diachronically from, and still resembles structurally, a blend of the L-dislocation construction with the impersonal subject construction with 'they', as in:

(5) a. Passive:
   Nzua a-mu-mono kwa meme
   John they-him-saw by me
   'John was seen by me'
   (lit.: 'John, they saw him by me')

b. L-dislocation with full-NP subject:
   Nzua, aana a-mu-mono
   John children they-him-saw
   'John, the children saw him'

c. L-dislocation with pronominal subject:
   Nzua, a-mu-mono
   John they-him-saw
   (i) Anaphoric active: 'John, they saw him' (anaphoric/active)
   (ii) Impersonal passive: 'John, he was seen' (impersonal/passive)

(F) The zero-anaphora passive
Finally, in many languages the passive clause arises from, and still structurally resembles, the active clause with a highly-topical, referring and anaphoric agent; that is, from a clause with a zero anaphoric agent. Thus in Sherpa:

(6) a. Non-anaphoric active:
   ti mi-ti-gi chenyi chaq-sung
   DEF man-DEF-erg cup/ABS break-PAST/EVID
   'The man broke the cup'

b. Anaphoric agent:
   chenyi chaq-sung
   cup/ABS break-PAST/EVID
   (i) Active interpretation: 'He/she broke the cup'
   (ii) Passive interpretation: 'The cup was broken',
        'Someone broke the cup'

What gave rise to this typological diversity of passive constructions is, manifestly, the fact that each passive type A through F arises diachronically from a different source construction. But this is only possible because each source constructions shared some functional features with the passive, in at least one of the relevant sub-domains of de-transitivity. In other words, the source construction exhibits a (partial) functional overlap or functional similarity with the passive clause. This functional overlap is summarized below for each other the six passive types:

Type A:
The adjectival-resultative construction in English, like a typical passive, is agentless, and its subject is thus by default a topicalized patient.
TYPE B:
The GET-causative-reflexive in English, much like the passive, has a non-distinct agent-patient single argument that is, by default, also its topicalized patient.

TYPE C:
The Mandarin adversative serial-verb clause has a topicalized patient and, most commonly, also a de-topicalized, non-referring agent.

Type D:
The Ute VP nominalization, like a typical passive, is agentless and (by default) topicalizes the surviving non-agent argument.

TYPE E:
The Kimbundu L-dislocation clause, much like the passive, has a topicalized patient; and the impersonal ‘they’ construction has a de-topicalized, non-referring agent.

TYPE F:
Somewhat more difficult to press into this explanatory mold is the zero-anaphoric passive of Sherpa. This is because the anaphoric zero agent of its source construction is highly referring and topical, while the zero agent of the structurally-identical passive is neither referring nor topical. However, one may as well note, first, that the very same is also true for antipassives, where a zero-coded object may be either the anaphoric topical patient of the active, or a non-referring, non-topical patient of the antipassive. For both the passive and antipassive, thus, there is a functional similarity between the two seemingly-disparate uses of zero arguments: Unexpressed information in general is prompted by two major cognitive-functional factors: (a) predictability; and (b) irrelevance (Givón 1983a, 1988).

Functional similarity – or partial functional overlap – is one of the crucial motivating factors, albeit not the only one, in diachronic extension from various source domains towards a common target domain. And it is the functional definition of both source and target domains that makes grammaticalization pathways as predictable as they are. And in the early stage of grammaticalization, invariably, the same structure performs two similar but non-identical functions.

Here again, diachronic change in language closely parallels biological evolution, where the functional re-assignment of organs is considered a major component of the evolutionary mechanism. In this connection, Ernst Mayr cites no less an authority than Darwin himself:

...By far the most important principle in the interpretation of the origin of new structures is that of the “change of function”...Darwin recognized quite clearly that the possibility for a change of function usually depends on two prerequisites. The first of these is that a structure or an organ can simultaneously perform two functions: “Numerous cases could be given amongst the lower animals of the same organ performing at the same time wholly distinct functions”...The other is the principle of duplication: “Again, two distinct organs, or the same organ under two different forms, may simul-
taneously perform in the same individual the same function, and this is an extremely important means of transition”... (Mayr 1976:97–98; italics added)

3. Early vs. late stages of grammaticalization

The early stages of grammaticalization are characterized by functional ambiguity. This is because functional re-analysis is the earliest step in diachronic change, be it syntactic or lexical. Functional re-analysis takes place instantaneously, as a spontaneous activity by individual speakers during communication, as they extend the use of old constructions (and words) to novel contexts (Paul 1890). The structural adjustments (structural re-analysis) eventually follows, giving rise to more precise (‘iconic’) coding of the newer vs. older functions, now as two distinct constructions. Such re-analysis occurs later, often much later, in the diachronic cycle, and is subject to different constraints and dynamics (Givón 1971, 1975, 1991, ed.1997; Heine et al. 1991; Traugott & Heine (eds.) 1991; Hopper & Traugott 1993; Bybee et al. 1994; *inter alia*).

In this respect too, one may note the strong analogy between biological evolution (cf. Mayr 1976, above) and diachronic change. This analogy can also be extended, with obvious caveats, to ontogenesis and neuro-cognitive development, summarized in (7) below.

(7) **Time-course of functional vs. structural change:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>time course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evolution</td>
<td>early: adaptive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late: genetic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diachrony</td>
<td>early: functional extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late: structural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>early: conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late: automated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processor</td>
<td>early: soft-wired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late: hard-wired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ontogenesis</td>
<td>early: plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>late: rigidification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six passive constructions discussed above are relatively young diachronically. In five out of the six types A through F, the very same construction still performs both the pre-passive (source) and the passive (target) function. Thus, respectively:

(8) **English adjectival passive (A):**
   a. Resultative-adjectival:
      (Then we looked and saw that) the window was broken.
   b. Passive:
      The window was broken (last night by a burglar).

(9) **English GET-passive (B):**
   a. Reflexive:
      She got herself transferred (to Atlanta).
   b. Adversative-passive:
      She got herself fired (for insubordination)
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(10) Ute VP-nominalization passive (D):

a. Nominalization:
   múusachi paqxa-ta-'u ka-'ay-wa-t 'ura-púga
   cat/obj kill-nom-3/POSS neg-good-neg-nom be-rem
   'His/her killing (of) the cat was bad'

b. Passive:
   múusachi paqxa-ta-púga-γ-'u
   cat/obj kill-pass-rem-3/obj
   'The cat was killed'

(11) Kimbundu L-dislocation/impersonal 'they' passive (E):

Nzua a-mu-mono
John they-him-saw

a. Active, anaphoric agent:
   'John, they saw him'

b. Passive, impersonal agent:
   'John was seen'

(12) Sherpa zero-anaphora passive (F):

chenyi chaqx-sung
cup/abs break-past/evid

a. Active, anaphoric agent:
   'he/she broke the cup'

b. Passive, impersonal agent:
   'The cup was broken'
   'Someone broke the cup'

The lone exception here is the serial-verb passive of Chinese (3; C). The initial functional ambiguity here was between a clause-chain (source) and a single event-clause (goal) interpretation. The diachronic change involved here is a type of clause union, whereby the erstwhile two chained single-event clauses are re-interpreted as a single-event serial-verb clause (Osam 1997; Givón 1991, 1995:Ch. 6). And the re-structuring involved, intonational re-analysis, is the type that happens, universally, earliest in grammaticalization – in this case a change from a two-clause to a single-clause intonation contour.

4. Grammatical relations in the passive clause

Let us turn now to purely structural, in this case relational (GR), properties of the various passive clause-types (A through F above). We have already note that while their synchronic function as passives is roughly similar, their diverse structures still reflect – most conspicuously when they are diachronically younger – the design features of their respective source constructions. This is a direct consequence of what we have just noted above – that in diachronic change, much like in biological evolution, structural re-adjustment invariably lags behind functional innovation.
The most general typological feature of the passives discussed above is the distinction between promotional and non-promotional passives. That is, whether the non-agent topic of the passive clause is or is not its nominative subject. But this feature is entirely predictable from the relational properties of the source construction: The passive types A, B and C above are all promotional passives – because the patient was already the grammatical subject in their respective source constructions. Types D, E and F, on the other hand, are all non-promotional passives – because the patient was coded as the grammatical object in their respective source constructions. Structural re-analysis has not yet tampered with these features, which have been passed down from the source construction. In the next section we will discuss structural re-analysis of the relational properties of more ‘mature’ passive clauses.

5. Structural re-analysis in late-stage grammaticalization

Once structural re-analysis occurs, the diachronic predictability of the relational properties of passive clauses can, of course, be offset and gradually obliterated. Constructions sooner or later enter their more ‘mature’, ‘middle-life’ phase in the cycle of grammaticalization. In this section I would like to illustrate this with three examples. Two involve a change from non-promotional to promotional passive. The third involves change in the opposite direction.

5.1 Reversion to nominative subject in the Lunda passive

As noted above, the Kimbundu passive (type E, see (5) above) arises from the conflation of two de-transitive constructions both of which leave the patient coded in a non-nominative case, the same as in the corresponding active. This remains, presumably, the relational situation in the resulting non-promotional passive of Kimbundu. In a closely related language, Lunda-Ndembu, the very same passive construction also exists. However, a more detailed analysis of the relational properties of this passive, particularly the behavior-and-control (’governed’) properties of the two main arguments, reveals a gradual if so far only partial shift of subject properties to the patient-topic of the passive (Givón & Kawasha 2001). These facts conform to Haspelmath’s (1999) observation that behavior-and-control properties are much less conservative in diachronic change than morphological properties (’overt-coding’ properties; Keenan 1975, 1976). Similar observations were made in Givón (1995:Ch. 6).

5.2 Reversion to nominative in the Guarijío and Tarahumara passive

Félix-Armendáriz (2004) reports a promotional passive in Guarijío, i.e. one in which the non-agent topic of the passive clause is its grammatical subject. The passive suffix -\textit{tu} in Guarijío is probably a cognate of the Ute passive subject -\textit{ta}, and most likely an
old nominalization marker (Medina-Murillo 2004). What is more, the promotional passive in Guarijio allows an overt oblique agent, something that is not possible in the Ute passive, and indeed is atypical of non-promotional passives. Thus:

(13) a. Owéru wicho-ré wakirá
   Women wash-PFV clothes
   'The women washed the clothes'
b. wicho-ré-tu wakirá (owéru-e)
   wash-PFV-PASS clothes (women-INSTR)
   'The clothes were washed (by the women)'

A similar situation is reported in Tarahumara (Valdez-Jara 2004), a closely related language with the related passive suffix -ru. In Tarahumara, however, the agent-of-passive is inadmissible in the passive clause, making the Tarahumara passive more conservative; that is, more like an impersonal passive. Thus:

(14) a. mué-ka nechí choná-re
   you-enf me/obj hit-PERF
   'You hit me'
b. né-ka choná-ru-re
   I-enf hit-PASS-PERF
   'I was hit (*by you)'

While absolute proof is not available, the most likely interpretation of the Guarijio-Tarahumara data is that the -tu/-ru-marked passive arose from a nominalized clause as, to begin with, a non-promotional agent-suppressing passive, as in Ute. In both languages, the passive was later restructured as promotional. But only in Guarijio did the change move further, allowing the overt appearance of an oblique agent. The late acquisition of an oblique agent by a promotional passive is well documented in English and elsewhere (see also Chamoreau 2004).

5.3 Reversion away from nominative in the Spanish reflexive-passive

As noted in the discussion of the English GET-passive (type B), one would predict from general considerations that a reflexive-derived passive clause would be promotional, given the universal trend to preserve the subject and delete the object in reflexive clauses. This is indeed true in other reflexive-derived passives, as in Semitic, Modern Greek (Manney 1998, 2000), Russian, Polish, etc. The Spanish se-marked impersonal passive is thus a clear anomaly, in that in its most common current form it is non-promotional. But this is a relatively late development in Spanish.

The marker se- was originally the reflexive – and then also reciprocal – pronoun, going back to the Latin sui (Monje 1955, citing the Quixote):

(15) a. Reflexive:
   se armó de todas sus armas
   REF arm/3s with all his weapons
   'he armed himself with all his weapons'
b. **Reciprocal:**

\[
\text{donde se combatían}
\]

\[
\text{where RECIP fight/impf/3p}
\]

‘where they fought each other’

Four important features of Spanish syntax conspired in the eventual re-analysis of the
\text{se}-marked reflexive into a non-promotional ‘impersonal’ passive. First, the existence
of an impersonal-subject construction, with neutral 3rd person plural agreement,
roughly like the still extant:

(16) \text{le-vieron en la calle}

\[
3s/\text{obj-saw/3p} \text{ in the street}
\]

‘They saw him in the street’ (anaphoric)

‘He was seen in the street’ (impersonal-passive)

Second, the \text{se}-marked reflexive also evolved into a middle-voice construction, as in:

(17) a. **Active:**

\[
\text{quebraron las ventanas}
\]

\[
\text{broke/3p the windows}
\]

‘they broke the windows’

b. **Middle-voice or impersonal passive:**

\[
\text{se-quebraron las ventanas}
\]

\[
\text{REFL-broke/3p the windows}
\]

‘the windows were broken’ (passive)

‘the windows broke’ (middle)

Third, word-order flexibility in Spanish allows placing the subject after the verb. In a
\text{VO} language, the word-order difference between subject and object is thus effectively
neutralized:

(18) a. **VO order, active:**

\[
\text{curaron los caballos}
\]

\[
\text{cure/past/3p the horses}
\]

‘They cured the horses’

b. **VS order, middle:**

\[
\text{se-curaron los caballos}
\]

\[
\text{REFL-cure/past/3p the horses}
\]

‘The horses got well’

Fourth, in earlier times, human objects in Spanish did not require the dative prepo-
sition \text{a-}, nowadays an obligatory human direct-object marker. Thus (Marín 1989a,
1989b; cited from *El Poema de Mio Cid)*:

(19) a. \text{veremos vuestra mugier}

\[
\text{see/fut/1p your woman}
\]

‘We will see your wife’

b. \text{veré a la mugier}

\[
\text{see/fut/1s DAT the woman}
\]

‘I will see (my) wife’
The difference between subject and object was thus neutralized not only in terms of word-order but also of case-marking.

These four factors conspired to neutralize the reflexive, middle-voice and impersonal-passive interpretation of the se-marked clause in a period prior to the obligatory a-marking of human objects. Thus:

(20) se-curtaron los brujos
    \text{ref-cure/past-3p} \text{the sorcerers}

a. Reflexive: 'The sorcerers cured themselves'
   b. Middle: 'The sorcerers got well'
   c. Passive: 'The sorcerer were cured'

Eventually, a non-promotional impersonal-passive construction evolved, with the topic-of-passive marked as object, and a neutral 3rd-person singular verb agreement, as in (21a) below. But the promotional passive survives to this day with plural subjects, as in (21b):

(21) a. Impersonal passive:
    se-curó a los brujos
    \text{ref-cure/3s dat} \text{the sorcerer}
    'Someone cured the sorcerers'
   b. Promotional passive or middle:
    se-venden bien los apartamentos
    \text{ref-sell/3p well the apartments}
    'Apartments sell well'
    'Apartments are sold well'

The use of an oblique agent in the se-marked passive in Spanish is odd to this day, although the beginning of such a pattern can be seen in both the promotional and the impersonal passive, respectively (De Mello 1978):

(22) a. Promotional se-passive:
    las pirámides se-construyeron por esclavos
    the pyramids \text{ref-constructed/3p by/with slaves}
    'The pyramids were constructed by/with slaves'
   b. Non-promotional ('impersonal') se-passive:
    se-destruyó a la nación por los malos gobernantes
    \text{ref-destroyed/3s dat} \text{the nation by the bad rulers}
    'The nation was destroyed by the bad rulers'

The ambiguity of por, either 'because' or 'by', no doubt facilitated this development.

6. Conclusion

I have shown, I think, that the relational properties of passive clauses depend absolutely, at least in the early stages of grammaticalization, on the relational properties of their respective source constructions. There is nothing surprising about this observa-
tion, nor anything particularly unique to the passive. Such structural similarity – or functional overlap – between the source and the target constructions are standard fare in early-stage diachronic change, as it is in the early stages of bio-evolutionary change.

Late-stage restructuring is not only possible but perhaps inevitable, as the two distinct functions conspire, gradually, to also become syntactically distinct. The acquisition of oblique agent-of-passive in many erstwhile agent-suppressing passive constructions, whether promotional or non-promotional, is one such late change. But functionally such agented passives are probably inverse rather than passive constructions (Shibatani 1988; Hidalgo 1994). Changes in the relational properties of the passive clause are another.

There remains one intriguing fact that, in a way, redeems Comrie’s contention that the Latin-type promotional passive – with a nominative non-agent topic (though not with an overt oblique agent⁵) is in some sense the idealized syntactic prototypical passive clause. But the reasons for this are functional-iconic rather than structural. The nominative subject of simple clauses is most commonly its topical argument. While this correlation is never absolute, it is nonetheless statistically powerful (Givón ed. 1994, ed. 1997). The eventual – and often gradual – acquisition of subject properties by the non-agent topic of erstwhile non-promotional passives is an expression of this generalization, perhaps driven by the most powerful help-mate analogy can marshal – the power of high usage frequency.

Notes

1. I am indebted to Bernard Comrie, Bernd Heine, Matt Shibatani, Werner Abraham and the participants in the Second Workshops on Passives and Grammatical Relations at the University of Sonora, Hermosillo, November 2004, for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. They are all hereby absolved of responsibility for the final product.

2. Many other types can be found in Haspelmath (1990). The question of what constitutes a ‘major’ type is not uncontroversial, not only here but in taxonomy in general. As Aristotle noted long ago, and as Ernst Mayr reaffirmed more recently, all taxonomies of natural phenomena are in principle logically arbitrary but pragmatically motivated, depending on the purpose or perspective of the taxonomist (see Givón 2005).

3. A similar development of a nominalization into a agent-suppressing passive may be seen in modern Dutch (Kirsner 1976), where it involves an existential-presentative construction.

4. ‘Early’ is of course a relative matter in diachrony. Given the notorious conservatism of morphosyntactic structure (except intonation!), functionally ambiguous structures and their attendant non-iconicity may persist for centuries with little re-structuring (Givón 1979: Ch. 6).

5. As noted by Shibatani (1988), the functional prototype of the passive is agent-suppressing. A clause with an oblique agent is thus more likely to function as an inverse (Hidalgo 1994).
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Part II

Formal Approaches

A. Argument structure and case
Two types of detransitive constructions in the Hokkaido dialect of Japanese*

Kan Sasaki and Akie Yamazaki
Sapporo Gakuin University

The Hokkaido dialect of Japanese, spoken in the northern island Hokkaido, has two detransitivizing strategies, namely passivization and spontaneous construction formation. Passive and spontaneous morphemes share the function of demoting the transitive subject, although different strategies are used in each case. In passive constructions, transitive subjects are demoted and they may appear as elements with oblique case. In spontaneous constructions, however, the transitive subjects are completely removed. This paper argues that this difference in the subject demotion strategy is motivated by the aspectual differences between the two detransitive constructions. It will be shown that the agent removal in spontaneous constructions is imposed by the simplification of the logical structure of the predicate while the subject demotion (to oblique status) in passive constructions is not.

1. Introduction

One of the features characterizing the dialects spoken in the northeastern part of Japan is the productive use of the suffix -rasar. Linguistic studies tend to agree that the main function of the suffix is that of deriving jiha tu 'spontaneous' constructions (Kato 2000 for the Utsunomiya dialect, Moriyama & Shibuya 1988 for the Yamagata dialect, Takeda 1998 for the Morioka dialect, and Yamazaki 1994 for the Hokkaido dialect, to name but a few). The spontaneous constructions are further subdivided into three usages, known as the unintentional, the potential and the valence reduction function.1

(1) a. watasi-wa gohan-ga tabe-rasa-ru (unintentional)
   1sg-top  rice-nom eat-sp-pres
   ‘I can’t stop myself eating rice.’

b. kono pen-wa joku kak-asar-u (potential)
   this pen-top well write-sp-pres
   ‘This pen writes well.’

c. okina maru-ga kak-asat-te-ru (valence reduction)
   big circle-nom draw-sp-prog
   ‘A big circle has been drawn.’
Among these usages, the first two are easy to define in semantic terms, whereas the third is not. The valence reduction usage of -\textit{rasar} suffixation affects argument structure. Unlike the syntactic effect of -\textit{rasar} suffixation, the effect on the semantic interpretation of the predicates has not been explained in a satisfactory manner so far.

The valence reduction usage of -\textit{rasar} is sometimes described as a passive (see Takeda 1998) or a voice-like expression (Yamazaki 1994), noting the similarity between this usage of the spontaneous construction and the passive construction. Indeed, the passive and the spontaneous constructions share the function of deriving intransitive sentences from transitive sentences and deriving subjects from direct objects of the corresponding active sentences. Thus, it can be said that the two constructions are similar with respect to their promotional aspects. The question arises: why are there two distinct forms, namely spontaneous and passive, with apparently the same function? Is there any difference between the two?

The aim of this paper is two-fold: to describe the formal and semantic difference between the two detransitive constructions, namely the valence reduction usage of the spontaneous construction, and the passive construction and to clarify the connection between the formal and the semantic properties through the examination of data from the Hokkaido dialect. It will be argued that the two detransitive constructions differ with respect to the demotion strategy applied. Subject demotion in passive sentences turns the subjects of the corresponding active sentences into oblique case elements. On the other hand, subject demotion in a spontaneous construction results in the total removal of the active subject.

Besides the difference in detransitivizing strategy, the aspectual properties of these constructions are also different. Spontaneous formation with valence reduction always results in certain aspectual changes. Spontaneous predicates derived on the basis of accomplishment and activity verbs display the aspectual properties of achievements. The properties are manifested by the resulting state interpretation of progressive forms and the co-occurrence restrictions with time adverbials. On the other hand, passivization does not necessarily result in an aspectual change. This paper argues that the difference in subject demotion in the two constructions is motivated by the aspectual differences between them. We will show that the subject demotion in spontaneous constructions is imposed by the simplification of the logical structure of the predicate, i.e., the deletion of the causing (activity) events, while the subject demotion in passive constructions is not. This observation leads us to the conclusion that the valence reduction usage of spontaneous construction is better described as an anticausative type rather than as a passive one.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Similarities and differences between passive and spontaneous constructions}
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline
\textbf{Similarity} & \textbf{Passive} & \textbf{Spontaneous} \\
\hline
Detransitivization & Yes & Yes \\
Promotion & From object to subject & From object to subject \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textbf{Table 1.} Similarities and differences between passive and spontaneous constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Spontaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detransitivization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>From object to subject</td>
<td>From object to subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 will discuss some of the formal properties of the two constructions; i.e. morphological properties and case frames. Sections 3 and 4 will be devoted to the presentation and the analysis of the distinction between the two constructions with respect to lexical aspectual properties. Section 5 will present the conclusions.

2. Formal properties of passive and spontaneous constructions

Hokkaido Japanese, spoken in the northern Japanese island Hokkaido, shares many grammatical traits with the northern-eastern dialects of Honshu (main island of Japan). One of the most prominent features of the Hokkaido dialect is the productive use of the spontaneous suffix -rasar. The suffix is found in constructions of the form ⟨NP-nom NP-Obl V-rasar⟩, where V is a transitive or a ditransitive verb. The morpheme has the syntactic function of detransitivizing the verb to which it attaches, as illustrated in (2).

(2) a. Active: hos-u ‘dry’ (tr.)
   ⟨NP₁-nom NP₂-acc NP₃-dat V⟩
   Haha-ga sentakumono-o sao-ni hos-u.
   ‘Mother dries the laundry on the bamboo pole.’

   b. Spontaneous: hos-asar-u ‘dry’ (intr.)
   ⟨NP₂-nom NP₃-dat V-rasar⟩
   Sentakumono-ga sao-ni hos-asar-u.
   ‘The laundry dries on the bamboo pole.’

The Hokkaido dialect also has another suffix with detransitivizing function, namely the passive suffix -rare, which is found in most of the Japanese dialects. In this section, we will illustrate the formal properties of the two detransitive constructions employing these morphemes. First, we will describe the morphological properties of the predicates found in these constructions and proceed to the case-frames.

2.1 Morphological properties

The spontaneous construction and the passive construction involve morphological forms derived through the affixation of consonant initial suffixes to the verbal root. The suffix for the passive is -rare, and the suffix for the spontaneous form is -rasar. In both cases, the initial consonants of the suffix are dropped when the verb roots end in a consonant. This is for the avoidance of consonant sequences, and obeys the general tendencies of Japanese phonotactics.
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(3) Passive: vowel final verb roots consonant final verb roots
situke-rare mom-rare \rightarrow momare
discipline-pass massage-pass

Spontaneous: vowel final verb roots consonant final verb roots
situke-rasar mom-rasar \rightarrow monasar
discipline-sp massage-sp

Passive predicates conjugate in the same way as other vowel final verbs and do not undergo any phonological processes. On the other hand, spontaneous predicates conjugate in the same way as other consonant final verbs incurring suffix initial consonant deletion in the present forms and undergoing gemination in the past forms.

(4) Passive Spontaneous

Present form
situke-rare-ru situke-rasar-ru \rightarrow situkerasaru
discipline-PASS-PRES discipline-SP-PRES
(no deletion) (suffix-initial consonant deletion)

Past form
situke-rare-ta situke-rasar-ta \rightarrow situkerasatta
discipline-PASS-PST discipline-SP-PST
(no gemination) (gemination)

These two voice changing suffixes differ with respect to productivity. The passive suffix is like the tense suffix, in that it can attach to practically any verb. Spontaneous suffixation is subject to semantic restrictions. Attachment of -rasar is basically limited to accomplishment and activity verb roots. Affixation of the spontaneous suffix to achievement and state verb roots results in ungrammaticality (*sin-asar-u ‘die-sp-pres’, *ar-asar-u ‘exist-sp-pres’). Despite this semantic restriction, the range of suffixation of the spontaneous morpheme is predictable, compared to the suffixes for lexical transitivity alternations. See the following intransitive – transitive pairs.

(5) Lexical pairs: intransitive transitive
ag-ar-u ‘rise’ (intr.) ag-e-ru ‘raise’ (tr.);
ak-u ‘open’ (intr.) ak-e-ru ‘open’ (tr.);
ar-e-ru ‘be ruined’ (intr.) ar-as-u ‘ruin’ (tr.);
wak-u ‘boil’ (intr.) wak-as-u ‘boil’ (tr.);
or-e-ru ‘be broken’ (intr.) or-u ‘break’ (tr.).

The brief list in (5) clearly shows that for lexical pairs the selection of the suffixes depends on each individual verb and that it is not predictable.

Both passive and spontaneous forms co-occur with the progressive auxiliary element -te-ru, but with different interpretations. The semantic difference regarding the progressive forms is important for understanding the nature of the difference in de-motion strategies between the two constructions. This point will be discussed after the description of the case-frames.
2.2 Argument structure and case marking properties

Differences related to the case marking properties of constructions derived through -rare and -rasar affixation can be observed in two respects, namely the status of the demoted subject from the corresponding active sentences and the case marking properties of the element undergoing promotion to subject in the derived sentence. The following subsection examines the status of the demoted subject in passive constructions and the range of elements that can undergo promotion to subject position. The behavior of spontaneous constructions is discussed in Section 2.2.2.

2.2.1 Passive constructions

We begin by discussing the promotional properties of passive constructions. Subjects in passive constructions correspond to the complements of the active counterparts.

(6) a. Active (transitive)  
\[\text{ozi:san-ga \ taro-o \ situke-ta}\]
\[\text{grandfather-nom \ Taro -acc \ discipline -pst}\]
\[\text{`The grandfather disciplined Taro.'}\]
b. Passive, S1→Obl.2, DO1→S2  
\[\text{taro-wa \ ozi-san-ni \ situke-rare-ta}\]
\[\text{Taro-top \ grandfather -dat \ discipline -pass -pst}\]
\[\text{`Taro was disciplined by his grandfather.'}\]

It is a property of Hokkaido Dialect, shared by Standard Japanese, that not only direct objects but also indirect objects can be promoted into the passive subject position as illustrated in examples (7b) and (7c).

(7) a. Active (ditransitive)  
\[\text{dareka-ga \ sinse:sjo-o \ taro-ni \ okut-ta}\]
\[\text{someone-nom \ application -acc \ Taro -dat \ send -pst}\]
\[\text{`Someone sent Taro an application.'}\]
b. Passive, S1→Obl.2, DO1→S2  
\[\text{sinse:sjo-ga \ dareka-kara \ taro-ni \ okur-are-ta}\]
\[\text{application-nom \ someone -abl \ Taro -dat \ send -pass -pst}\]
\[\text{`An application was sent to Taro by someone.'}\]
c. Passive, S1→Obl.2, IO1→S2  
\[\text{taro-wa \ dareka-kara \ sinse:sjo-o \ okur-are-ta}\]
\[\text{Taro-top \ someone -abl \ application -acc \ send -pass -pst}\]
\[\text{`Taro was sent an application by someone.'}\]

The subject in the active sentences is demoted to oblique status in the passive sentences, without being entirely removed. The subject to oblique demotion is an essential part of the passive construction case frame properties. This property is found not only in direct passive constructions exemplified in (6) and (7) above but also in indirect passive constructions such as watasi-wa ame-ni hur-are-ta ‘I was rained on’, which corresponds to the intransitive construction ame-ga hut-ta ‘It rained’. For the notion of direct and indirect passive, readers may refer to Howard & Niyekawa-Howard (1976).
We will argue in the following section that the manner of subject demotion can help distinguish between passive and spontaneous constructions.

### 2.2.2 Spontaneous constructions

Affixation of -rasar can yield constructions with the same valence as the base construction, or it can result in valence reduction, exhibiting, thus, a behavior parallel to that of the passive morpheme. We first describe the cases where valence reduction occurs and then return to the second type of spontaneous construction.

In the case of valence reduction, affixation of the spontaneous suffix reduces the valence of the transitive or ditransitive verb roots and forms derive intransitive verb roots. See the examples in (8) with transitive verb roots. An agent realized as subject in the active construction does not surface in the spontaneous construction. A theme is realized as direct object in the active construction and as the subject in spontaneous constructions.

(8) a. Active, transitive (data from Yamazaki 1994)

\[\text{watasi-ga} \times henna zi-o \times kak-u\]

1sg-NOM funny letter-ACC write-PRES

‘I write funny letters’ or ‘My handwriting looks funny’

b. Spontaneous (data from Yamazaki 1994)

\[\text{henna zi-ga} \times kak-asat-te \times (komar-u)\]

funny letter-NOM write-sp-comp embarrassed-PRES

‘Embarrassingly, my letters come out funny.’

The detransitivization in spontaneous constructions shares with the passive constructions the property of promotion of the complement to subject position. However, the candidates for promotion are not the same as in the passive. The examples in (9), in the case of ditransitive verbs, illustrate the fact that the candidates for promotion are restricted to the direct object.

(9) a. Active (ditransitive)

\[\text{dareka-ga} \times \text{sinesjo-o} \times \text{taro-ni okut-ta}\]

someone-NOM application-ACC Taro-DAT send-PST

‘Someone sent Taro an application.’

b. Spontaneous, DO$_1$ → S$_2$

\[\text{sinesjo-ga} \times \text{taro-ni okur-asat-ta}\]

application-NOM Taro-DAT send-sp-PST

‘An application was sent to Taro.’

c. Spontaneous, *IO$_1$ → S$_2$

\[\text{*taro-ga} \times \text{sinesjo-o okur-asat-ta}\]

Taro-NOM application-ACC send-sp-PST

In all the spontaneous examples above, the subjects (agents) of the active sentences are completely removed. The overt expression of agents with oblique case results in ungrammaticality. Compare the ungrammatical examples in (10) with the grammatical examples of passive sentences with overt oblique agents in (6).
(10) Ungrammatical spontaneous constructions with oblique agent

a. ozi:san-ga Taro-acc situke-pst
   grandfather-nom Taro-acc discipline-pst
   'The grandfather disciplined Taro.'

   grandfather-dat discipline-sp-pst

c. watasi-ga henna zi-o kak-u.
   1sg-nom funny letter-acc write-pres
   'I write funny letters' or 'My handwriting looks funny'

d. *watasi-ni henna zi-ga kak-asat-pst.
   1sg-dat funny handwriting-nom write-sp-pres

In the spontaneous constructions, the agent cannot surface and is not semantically implied. The co-occurrence restrictions with the adverb wazato 'intentionally', illustrated in (11), indicate that the spontaneous construction lacks an agent semantically. A transitive predicate and the corresponding passive predicate, both of which involve an agent, can co-occur with the adverb wazato, as illustrated in the examples (11a) and (11b) respectively. This indicates that the adverb wazato co-occurs with predicates that select an agent irrespective of its grammatical status. With respect to the co-occurrence restrictions with the adverb wazato, the spontaneous construction exhibits a different behavior. A predicate derived with the spontaneous suffix does not co-occur with the adverb wazato. This suggests that the agent is not implied in the spontaneous constructions.

(11) a. Transitive with wazato (grammatical)
   karera-wa sono butuzu-o wazato kowasi-pst.
   3pl-top that statue of Buddha-acc intentionally break-pst
   'They broke that statue of Buddha intentionally.'

b. Passive with wazato (grammatical)
   sono butuzu-wa karera-nijotte wazato kowas-are-pst.
   that statue of Buddha-top 3pl-by intentionally break-pass-pst
   'That statue of Buddha was broken by them intentionally.'

c. Spontaneous with wazato (ungrammatical)
   *sono butuzu-wa wazato kowas-asat-pst.
   that statue of Buddha-top intentionally break-sp-pst

Another piece of evidence in favor of the idea that the agent is not semantically implied in the spontaneous construction is provided by the behavior with respect to control. As can be seen from the examples in (12), the passive construction pairs with the active construction with respect to the possibility of controlling the subject of a subordinate purpose clause. In an active construction such as (12a), the subject of the main clause controls the subject of the subordinate clause. In the passive construction, example (12b) below, although there is no overt agent, the subject of the purpose clause is controlled by the implied agent of the main clause. In the case of spontaneous constructions, however, control into the purpose clause is not possible, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of example (12c).
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   fine successor do-pres for parents Taro-acc discipline-prog
   ‘The parents are disciplining Taro in order to make him a fine successor.’

   fine successor do-pres for Taro-top discipline-pass-prog
   ‘Taro is being disciplined in order to make him a fine successor.’

c. *[pro rippana atotori-ni su-ru tameni] taro-va situke-rasat-ta.
   fine successor do-pres for Taro-top discipline-sp-pst

In conclusion we could say that although passive and spontaneous morphemes share the same detransitivizing function, the manner of achieving this function is different. Subject demotion results in an oblique agent in passives while it results in total agent removal in spontaneous constructions. Promotion of the complement to subject is restricted to the direct object in spontaneous constructions while the indirect object is allowed to promote to the subject position only in the passive.

This formal difference is also found in the case of spontaneous constructions with no valence reduction. As shown in (13), spontaneous formation with intransitive verb roots is possible. In this case, the subjects of active sentences remain in the subject position. Subject demotion to an oblique element does not occur. Thus, spontaneous formation does not yield any oblique elements, contrary to passivization.

(13) a. watasi-wa marujama-kara nisino-made arui-ta.
   1sg-top Maruyama-abl Nisino-up to walk-pst
   ‘I walked from Maruyama to Nisino.’

b. watasi-wa marujama-kara nisino-made aruk-asat-ta.
   1sg-top Maruyama-abl Nisino-up to walk-sp-pst
   ‘I walked from Maruyama to Nisino (unintentionally).’

The translation line in (13b) suggests that spontaneous constructions based on intransitive verb roots have an unintentional reading. We conclude that spontaneous constructions have as their main function the total semantic removal of any implication of agentivity or intentionality merged to the action or process/state described by the verb. Spontaneous constructions with valence reduction are but a subclass to this general phenomenon.

3. Aspectual properties

Passive and spontaneous constructions show not only formal differences but also semantic differences. They differ with respect to aspectual properties. Passive constructions have the same aspectual properties as the corresponding active sentences. In active–spontaneous correspondences, however, we can observe aspectual differences. This distinction is important when considering the source of the difference in subject demotion. Before discussing the data concerning the active–spontaneous correspondence, we would like to demonstrate the general properties of aspectual classes with active sentences.
3.1 Aspectual properties in active sentences

We will adopt Vendler’s classification of verbs into four lexical aspectual classes: state, achievement, activity, and accomplishment (Vendler 1967; Dowty 1979; Foley & Van Valin 1984). For lack of space we will illustrate the lexical aspectual properties of Hokkaido dialect verbs through the co-occurrence restrictions with temporal adverbials and the semantic interpretation of the progressive form.

Verbs of state can be accompanied by durational time adverbials (for a week), but not by inclusive time adverbials (in a week).

(14) a. State verb with durational adverbial
   *issju:kan soko-ni kanban-ga at-ta
   ‘A signboard was there for a week.’

   b. State verb with inclusive adverbial
   *issju:kan-de soko-ni kanban-ga at-ta
   ‘A signboard was there for a week.’

State verbs cannot take a progressive form in any interpretation contrary to other aspectual classes.

(15) *at-te-ru
    be-prog

The co-occurrence restrictions of Achievement verbs with time adverbials are the inverse of those found with State verbs. Achievement verbs co-occur with inclusive adverbials, but not with durational adverbials.

(16) a. Achievement verb with durational adverbial
   *itizikan sin-da
   ‘It took (him) one hour to die’

   b. Achievement verb with inclusive adverbial
   itizikan-de sin-da
   ‘It took (him) one hour to die’

The progressive form of Achievements is interpreted as the resulting state. The example (17) describes the state [-alive] of some individual. The state is the result of a dying event which occurred at some unidentified past time. There is no parallel interpretation to the English progressive counterpart, Someone is dying.

(17) Achievement verb (resulting state reading)
    sin-deru
    die-prog
    ‘(Someone) has died (and s/he is not alive).’

The activity/accomplishment distinction is not clear-cut in Japanese. The reading depends on the context. These two aspectual classes share a semantic property. Their progressive forms are identically interpreted as progressive. In this respect, they are distinguished from achievements.
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(18) a. Activity verb (progressive reading)
   \textit{ojoi-deru}
   \textit{swim-prog}
   ‘(Someone) is swimming.’

   b. Accomplishment verb (progressive reading)
   \textit{hige-o}
   \textit{sot-te-ru}
   \textit{shave-prog}
   ‘(Someone) is shaving his beard (have not shaved it off yet).’

The distinction between activities and accomplishments can be made through time adverbials. When the aspectual property of the construction is interpreted as an activity, the construction can include durational time adverbials but not inclusive time adverbials.

(19) a. Activity verb with durational adverbial
   \textit{itizikan}
   \textit{ojoi-da}
   for an hour \textit{swim-pst}
   ‘(Someone) swam for an hour.’

   b. Activity verb with inclusive adverbial
   \textit{*itizikan-de ojoi-da}
   in an hour \textit{swim-pst}
   A sentence with inclusive time adverbials like (19b) is grammatical when the construction accompanies a phrase delimiting the event such as \textit{soko-made ‘up to there’}. The aspectual properties of the construction are those of accomplishments.

(20) \textit{itizikan-de soko-made ojoi-da}
    in an hour there-up to \textit{swim-pst}
    ‘(Someone) swam up to there in an hour.’

Verbs implying causation of change of state can be regarded as inherent accomplishments. Accomplishments generally do not co-occur with durational time adverbials. See the examples in (21). However, this generalization does not always hold as illustrated in the examples in (22). The construction with this type of verb can be accompanied by either durational or inclusive time adverbials.

(21) a. Accomplishment verb with durational adverbial
   \textit{*setotati-ga itizikan kot:te-ni okina maru-o kai-ta.}
   students-nom for an hour ground-dat big circle-acc draw-pst
   ‘Students drew a big circle on the ground in an hour.’

   b. Accomplishment verb with inclusive adverbial
   \textit{setotati-ga itizikan-de kot:te-ni okina maru-o kai-ta.}
   students-nom in an hour ground-dat big circle-acc draw-pst
   ‘Students drew a big circle on the ground in an hour.’

(22) a. Accomplishment verb with durational adverbial
   \textit{itinenkan situke-ta}
   for a year discipline-pst
   ‘(Someone) disciplined (someone) for a year.’
b. Accomplishment verb with inclusive adverbial

\textit{itinenkan-de situke-ta}

in a year discipline-pst

'(Someone) disciplined (someone) in a year.'

Previous studies (Dowty 1979; Foley & Van Valin 1984) of aspect assume that accomplishments can be decomposed into two sub-events, namely a causing event (mainly activity) and a caused event (resulting state). A construction with durational adverbials like in (22a) does not imply the completion of the event. The interpretation of the construction with durational adverbials focuses on the activity sub-event. The semantic tests for each aspectual class are summarized as Table 2.

Table 2. Semantic tests for aspectual classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-occurrence with durational time adverbials</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-occurrence with inclusive time adverbials</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of progressive form</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>resulting state</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Aspectual properties of detransitive constructions

The aspectual properties of passive sentences are basically the same as those of the corresponding active sentences although passive forms exhibit certain state-like properties not shared by the active counterparts. The examples in (23)–(24) illustrate that the same interpretation for the progressive forms can be obtained for both active and passive constructions. The passive form of 'draw' in (24b) is somewhat marginal, due to the animacy restriction on passive subjects. The resulting state interpretation is also possible for the passive examples below. However, what is important here is the possibility of the same aspectual interpretation with the corresponding active construction. This type of interpretation cannot be found in the valence reduction usage of spontaneous constructions (the interpretation of the progressive form with spontaneous predicates will be illustrated in (29)–(30)).

(23) a. Active (progressive reading)

\textit{situke-te-ru}

discipline-prog

'Disciplining is going on.'

b. Passive (progressive reading/resulting state reading)

\textit{situke-rare-te-ru}

discipline-pass-prog

'(Someone) is being disciplined (by someone).'</p>

'(Someone) has been disciplined (by someone).’
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(24) a. Active (progressive reading)
   se:totati-ga ko:te:-ni o:kina maru-o kai-te-ru
   students-NOM ground-DAT big circle-ACC draw-PROG
   ‘Students are drawing a big circle on the ground.’

b. Passive (progressive reading)
   ko:te:-ni o:kina maru-ga se:totati-nijotte kak-are-te-ru
   ground-DAT big circle-NOM students-by draw-pass-PROG
   ‘A big circle is drawn on the ground by the students.’

Co-occurrence restrictions with time adverbials are also the same in both active and passive sentences. Compare the passive examples in (25) and (26) with the active counterparts in (21) and (22), respectively.

(25) Passive counterparts of the examples in (21)

a. Durational adverbial
   *itizikan kote:-ni o:kina maru-ga se:totati-niyotte kak-are-ta.
   for an hour ground-DAT big circle-NOM students-by draw-pass-PST
   ‘A big circle was drawn by students in an hour.’

b. Inclusive adverbial
   itizikan-de kote:-ni o:kina maru-ga se:totati-niyotte kak-are-ta
   in an hour ground-DAT big circle-NOM students-by draw-pass-PST
   ‘(Someone) was disciplined (by someone) for an year.’

(26) Passive counterparts of the examples in (22)

a. Durational adverbial
   itinenkan situke-rare-ta
   for a year discipline-pass-PST
   ‘(Someone) was disciplined (by someone) for a year.’

b. Inclusive adverbial
   itinenkan-de situke-rare-ta
   in a year discipline-pass-PST
   ‘(Someone) was disciplined (by someone) in a year.’

On the other hand, the detransitivization strategy associated with spontaneous formation leads to an aspectual change. Spontaneous constructions formed through detransitivization of accomplishment predicates exhibit the aspectual properties of achievements. Like other achievements, the spontaneous forms cannot co-occur with durational time adverbials, as illustrated in examples (27a) and (28a) below. Sentences with spontaneous predicates in the progressive form are interpreted as referring to resulting states rather than to events in progress, see examples (29)–(30). For co-occurrence restrictions with time adverbials, compare the spontaneous data in (27)–(28) with the active data in (21)–(22) and the passive data in (25)–(26).

Co-occurrence with time adverbials

(27) a. Durational adverbial
   *itizikan kote:-ni o:kina maru-ga kai-asi-ta
   for an hour ground-DAT big circle-NOM draw-sp-PST
b. Inclusive adverbial
\[ \text{itizikan-de kate-ni okina maru-ga kak-asat-ta} \]
in an hour ground-dät big circle-nom draw-sp-pst
'A big circle has been drawn in an hour.'

\[(28)\] a. Durational adverbial
\[ ^* \text{itinikan situke-rasat-ta} \]
for a year discipline-sp-pst
b. Inclusive adverbial
\[ \text{itinikan-de situke-rasat-ta} \]
in a year discipline-sp-pst
'It took one year to discipline (him).'

**Interpretation of progressive form**

\[(29)\] Spontaneous (resulting state reading)
\[ \text{kate-ni okina maru-ga kak-asat-te-ru} \]
ground-dät big circle-nom draw-sp-prog
'A big circle has been drawn on the ground.'

\[(30)\] Spontaneous (resulting state reading)
\[ \text{situke-rasat-te-ru} \]
discipline-sp-prog
'(Someone) has been disciplined.'

Thus, aspectual tests such as the interpretation of the progressive forms and the cooccurrence restrictions with time adverbials indicate that active and passive constructions display the properties of accomplishments, whereas spontaneous forms display the properties of achievements.

The aspectual difference associated with the active – spontaneous correspondence can be described as in (31), through a semantic representation using lexical decomposition of predicates in the manner of Dowty (1979) and Foley & Van Valin (1984).

\[(31)\] Active – spontaneous correspondence in logical structure (accomplishment-based)
\[ \text{situke-ru 'discipline' – situke-rasar-u 'be disciplined'} \]
Active (accomplishment): \[ \text{[do'(x)] CAUSE [BECOME disciplined'(y)]} \]
Spontaneous (achievement): \[ \text{BECOME disciplined'}(y) \]

The predicate of the active construction has a logical structure consisting of two subevents. The first is the causing event in which the referent of the subject performs some activity upon the referent of the object. This leads to the second sub-event, namely the one describing the resulting state of the referent of the object. Compared to the corresponding accomplishment predicate, the representation in (31) shows that the logical structure of the spontaneous form lacks the causing event. The predicate consists of a single sub-event, describing the change of state of the referent of the subject, without giving any information as to its cause. This indicates that the affixation of the spontaneous suffix has the effect of deleting the activity sub-event from accomplishment predicates.
The change of aspectual properties is not limited to spontaneous formation with inherent accomplishment verb roots. Spontaneous formation with inherent activity transitive verb roots displays a similar aspectual change. See examples (32)–(33).

Co-occurrence with time adverbials

(32) a. Active construction with durational adverbial
   *itizikan niku-o tatai-ta
   for an hour meat-ACC beat-pst
   ‘(Someone) beat some meat for an hour.’
   
   b. Active construction with inclusive adverbial
   *itizikan-de niku-o tatai-ta
   in an hour meat-ACC beat-pst
   ‘(Someone) beat some meat in an hour.’

(33) a. Spontaneous construction with durational adverbial
   *itizikan niku-ga tatak-asat-ta
   for an hour meat-NOM beat-sp-pst
   ‘The meat became soft after an hour (of beating).’
   
   b. Spontaneous construction with inclusive adverbial
   itizikan-de niku-ga tatak-asat-ta
   in an hour meat-NOM beat-sp-pst
   ‘The meat became soft after an hour (of beating).’

Interpretation of progressive form

(34) a. Active (progressive reading)
   niku-o tatai-te-ru
   meat-ACC beat-prog
   ‘(Someone) is beating meat.’
   
   b. Spontaneous (resulting state reading)
   niku-ga tatak-asat-te-ru
   meat-NOM beat-sp-prog
   ‘Meat becomes soft (as a consequence of beating).’

The data (32)–(34) indicates that the aspectual properties of spontaneous constructions derived from activity verb roots are those of achievements. The semantic representations for the active and spontaneous constructions in (32)–(34) are described in (35). Unlike accomplishments, activity predicates have a simple logical structure consisting of a single sub-event. The sub-event describes the activity performed by the referent of the subject of the verb. Spontaneous forms derived from activity verbs are achievements, i.e. they describe the change of state undergone by the referent of the subject.

(35) Active – spontaneous correspondence in logical structure (activity-based)
   tatak-u ‘beat’ – tatak-asat-u ‘be softened’
   Active (activity): DO(x, [beat'(x, y)])
   Spontaneous (achievement): BECOME soft(y)

In the case of spontaneous constructions derived from activity predicates, the semantic correspondence between active and spontaneous constructions cannot be captured in the same straightforward manner as with accomplishment-based active – spon-
Kan Sasaki and Akie Yamazaki

taneous correspondences. Since activity predicates consist of a single sub-event, the deletion of this activity sub-event from the semantic representation of the active forms should yield a semantically empty structure. The spontaneous forms are, however, interpretable and they imply a resulting state not present in the initial logical structure of the activity predicate. The activity verb *tatak-u* 'beat' describes the activity of hitting without implying any resulting state. The spontaneous form *tatak-asar-u* 'beat-sp' implies a change of state leading to the resulting state of softness.

To account for this situation, we should take into account the fact that spontaneous constructions of this type are possible only when the activity expressed by the active form is carried on with the aim of changing some property of the object. For example, in (32a) the meat is beaten with the intention of softening it. The spontaneous constructions express the change of state from the initial property to the desired resulting property. The change is brought about through the activity expressed by the active predicate. This consideration is supported by the fact that the valence reduction usage of the spontaneous construction is not available when the internal argument of *tatak-u* 'beat' is not an object which is assumed to undergo some change of state through beating.8 This is illustrated by the examples in (36).

(36) a. *tukue-o* tatai-te-ru
   desk-ACC beat-PROG
   '(Someone) is beating a desk.'

b. *tukue-ga* tatak-asat-te-ru
   desk-NOM beat-sp-PROG

In conclusion, although the lexical structure of the active predicates does not include the required sub-event structure, the function of the spontaneous morpheme seems to be the same, once we take into account the implied resulting state.

(37) Active – spontaneous correspondence mediated by unrealized implication

Active (activity): DO(x, [beat'(x, y)])

(Implied result): [DO(x, [beat'(x, y)])] CAUSE [BECOME soft'(y)]

Spontaneous (achievement): BECOME soft'(y)

From the observation above, it is clear that detransitivization through the affixation of the spontaneous suffix accompanies the aspectual change resulting in activity sub-event deletion. In the next section we will demonstrate that this semantic characteristics is a crucial factor behind the subject demotion difference between passive and spontaneous constructions.

4. The source of the difference in demotion strategies

Both of the two detransitive constructions result in subject demotion. However, the manner of demotion is different. In the formation of passive constructions, subjects are demoted but are not completely removed semantically. They are realized as oblique
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verbal arguments. Thus, passive constructions can be regarded as a case of detransitivity, but not as a case of valence reduction. On the other hand, in the formation of spontaneous constructions, subjects in the active sentences are completely removed indicating that this construction represents not only a case of detransitivity, but also a case of valence reduction. Moreover, the argument structure is not changed in the passive construction. However, it is changed in the spontaneous construction through the complete removal of the agent argument. This can be schematized as in Figure 1.

The two detransitive constructions differ not only with respect to their formal properties, but also with respect to the semantic interpretation. The semantic distinction concerns the lexical aspectual properties discussed in the previous section. We have seen that the spontaneous constructions exhibit lexical aspectual properties not shared by the active forms, whereas passive constructions belong to the same lexical aspectual class as the corresponding active constructions.

The aspectual distinctions among constructions reflect the differences in logical structure. The primary function of the affixation of the spontaneous suffix seems to be the deletion of the activity sub-event in logical structure, see Figure 2 below. The removal of the transitive subjects is a consequence of this operation because it accompanies the deletion of the first argument of the activity predicate, which corresponds to the agent. Spontaneous constructions do not include a slot for an agent in their argument structure. Transitive subject removal in spontaneous constructions is not an essential property of the construction and can be regarded as a by-product of the simplification of the logical structure. On the other hand, grammatical function change in passives is not motivated by such aspectual factors and seems to be syntactically motivated by the demotion of the external argument to oblique status. We may conclude that the two detransitivizing affixes operate at distinct levels: the passive at the syntax – semantics interface (mapping from argument structure to grammatical function), and

Figure 1. Subject demotion and valence reduction among active, passive and spontaneous
the spontaneous in logical structure. The correspondence among active, passive, and spontaneous constructions at each level is schematized in Figure 2.

The level differentiation proposed here is also useful for the explanation of the direct element restriction for spontaneous subjects. As mentioned before, only the direct objects can undergo promotion to spontaneous subjects, while oblique complements, including indirect objects, cannot. Direct objects are elements undergoing a change of state; they appear as the first argument of the predicate embedded under the inchoative operator BECOME in Figure 2. Subjects of achievement intransitives are also elements bearing this property, i.e. the subject argument is the sole argument of the predicate embedded under BECOME. The subject selection in spontaneous constructions is not different from that of other achievement intransitives. Namely, the argument that can appear in subject position is an element undergoing a change of state. The referents of indirect objects do not undergo a change of state, whereas direct objects do. The direct element restriction for spontaneous subjects can be considered as a natural consequence of the aspectual properties of the construction.

This characterization, based on data with transitive verb constructions, can be extended to passive and spontaneous constructions with intransitive verb roots.

Subject demotion to oblique element is an essential property for passives based on both transitive and intransitive verbs. As observed in 2.2.1, the subjects in active sentences correspond to oblique elements not only in transitive-based passives, but also in intransitive-based passive constructions.

Intransitive-based spontaneous constructions have the semantic property of un-intentionality as shown in (13). The logical structure of activity predicates includes the operator DO according to Foley & Van Valin (1984:50), which is associated with the semantic feature of intentionality. We can regard the unintentional reading of the spontaneous constructions as an effect of DO deletion. The logical structure of the intransitive-based active – spontaneous correspondence can be schematized as (38).

(38) Active – spontaneous correspondence in logical structure (intransitive-based)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Obl. Subj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pred(x, y)</td>
<td>pred(x, y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do'(x)</td>
<td>do'(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause</td>
<td>cause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Operation in different levels

![Logical Structure Diagram](image)

(Aspectual property) [BECOME pred(y)]

This deletion of the upper clause activity predicate in logical structure is parallel to the deletion of the activity predicate in the case of transitive-based spontaneous construc-
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In both cases, affixation of the spontaneous suffix induces the simplification of the logical structure in both transitive-based and intransitive-based cases. Thus, the characterization of passive and spontaneous constructions based on their detransitivization data is applicable to the analysis of intransitive-based cases. The primary function of the affixation of the passive suffix is to block the mapping of the external argument to subject. This is not different from the characterization of the passive in other languages (Comrie 1977:58; Bresnan & Kanerva 1989:26–27). While the formation of the passive affects the mapping between argument structure and grammatical relations, the affixation of the spontaneous suffix changes the logical structure. Passive constructions in the Hokkaido dialect match the description of the passive prototype advocated by Shibatani (1985) to the extent that they are intransitive in syntax while transitive in semantics in the sense that they include both agent and patient in their argument structures. On the other hand, the valence reduction usage of the spontaneous construction is different from the passive prototype in that it is intransitive not only in syntax, but also in semantics. The valence reduction usage of spontaneous construction must be part of another type of derived intransitive construction.

Our analysis reveals that the semantic contribution of spontaneous suffixation is a simplification of the logical structure of the predicate. From a semantic point of view the relation between the transitive verb and the spontaneous form is that between a causative verb and the corresponding decausative predicate. The transitive form covers two sub-events, i.e., the causing event and the caused event, whereas the spontaneous form refers only to the caused event. Morphologically, however, the transitive verb is simple and the spontaneous form is complex. This situation is identical to the relation between transitives (semantic causatives) and the corresponding anticausatives.

There are three types of morphological alternations for causative and non-causative pairs according to Haspelmath (1993), namely causative, anticausative and non-directed alternation. When the non-causative verb is basic and the causative verb is morphologically more complex, the alternation is called causative (e.g., aruk-u ‘walk’ – aruk-ase-ru ‘cause walk’ in Japanese). Anticausative is a label for the construction morphologically more complex than its causative counterpart (e.g., katat'-sja ‘roll (intransitive)’ – katat ‘roll (transitive)’ in Russian). In the case of non-directed alternation, neither causative nor non-causative expressions are derived. Several types of non-directed alternations are distinguished (see Haspelmath 1993 for details). The suffix -rasar fits the description of the anticausative pattern since the morphologically complex form is associated with the semantically less complex structure, i.e. the intransitive reading.

Passives and anticausatives share the function of detransitivization (see Kulikov 1998). However, the two detransitive constructions differ with respect to the strategy for agent demotion. In the passive constructions, agents exist even though they are demoted, at least in the prototypical cases. On the other hand, anticausatives, consisting only of the caused event, have no slot for an agent. This is precisely the situation observed in the case of the valence reduction usage of the spontaneous constructions.
In other words, the relation between the two detransitive constructions (V-rare vs. V-rasar) can be considered parallel to that between passive and anticausative constructions.

5. Concluding remarks

This paper demonstrates that the grammatical effects of the two detransitivizing suffixation processes are relevant on different levels, i.e., the passive at the mapping between argument structure and grammatical relations, and the spontaneous at the level of logical structure. The effect of spontaneous formation on logical structure can be regarded as a type of event structure simplification that can be regarded as an instance of anticausative formation. Based on cross-linguistic studies, Klaiman (1992) defines voice as a rearrangement of the mapping between semantic roles and grammatical realizations. According to Klaiman’s definition, both of the two detransitivizing strategies in Hokkaido Japanese can be regarded as representing the voice function, because both change the grammatical coding of semantic roles. However, for the passive, the voice function is the primary function, while for the spontaneous, it is a by-product of logical structure simplification. The intransitive-based spontaneous constructions, which undergo the logical structure simplification without incurring the subject demotion, support this characterization.

In this paper we have concentrated on the syntactic and semantic properties of the passive and the spontaneous constructions, leaving aside the discourse function of the two constructions. There is no study discussing such pragmatic distinctions, and, at the present stage of our investigation, we are unable to offer any reliable conclusions regarding this aspect. We leave this topic for future investigation.
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* This article is based on our talk at the Workshop on Passive at the 20th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics. We are grateful to Werner Abraham, Daniela Caluianu, Emiko Hayatsu, Mitsuko Idzutsu, Leonid Kulikov, Takashi Masuoka, Koko Takeda and Tasaku Tsunoda, for their invaluable comments and suggestions. Thanks also go to Don Hinkelman for his stylistic improvements. The present study has been supported in part by the Sapporo Gakuin University Research Support Grant (SGUS0420100601). All errors and shortcomings are our own.

1. We will use the following abbreviations in this paper: ABL = ablative, ACC = accusative, COMP = complementizer, DAT = dative, INST = instrumental, NOM = nominative, PASS = passive, PRES = present, PROG = progressive, PST = past, SG = singular, SP = spontaneous, TOP = topic.

2. We will make use of the data from Hokkaido dialect we obtained through our research for the generalization. The scope of our discussion is limited to the data from this dialect. Cross-dialectal considerations are basically out of scope. This limitation is due to the lack of a systematic description
of the two detransitive constructions with aspectual interpretation crucial for the discussion in other
dialects (Kato 2000 is an exception in this respect).

3. Shibatani (1990) classifies the Standard Japanese verbal suffixes into two types, root-attaching and
stem-attaching. Root-attaching suffixes are suffixes for tense i.e., present -ru and past -ta, and voice,
i.e., causative -sase and passive -rare. The negative -nai, the polite -masu and the desiderative -tai are
regarded as stem-attaching suffixes. Although the members of the voice suffix class are not the same,
the Hokkaido dialect is parallel to Standard Japanese in this respect. Tense suffixes (-ru and -ta) and
voice suffixes (-sase, -rare and -rasar) attach to verb roots.

4. This element is equivalent to Standard Japanese progressive form -te i-ru. It is formed through the
truncation of /i/.

5. Japanese has two types of passive constructions, known in the literature as the direct and the in-
direct passives, respectively (see Howard & Niyekawa-Howard 1976). We will limit our discussion
to the direct passive construction the indirect passive construction shares few syntactic or semantic
properties with the spontaneous construction. The addition of details concerning the indirect passive
construction would only make our argument more confuse.

6. Standard lexical aspectual tests generally yield the expected results in Japanese, the Hokkaido di-
alect included. The semantic effect of attaching the progressive form, -te iru, to the four aspectual
classes in Japanese is different from the interpretation of progressive forms in English. The most con-
spicuous difference is the effect of -te iru attachment to achievement predicates. Whereas in English
the interpretation of such forms, when acceptable, is future or repetitive, in Japanese the -te iru form
of achievement verbs has only a resulting state reading, see Kondaichi (1950) for details.

7. Koko Takeda (p.c.) informed us that, in the dialect spoken in Morioka city, the interpretation of
progressive forms of spontaneous predicates is the same as in our data.

8. Emiko Hayatsu (p.c.) suggested us this point.

9. The anticausative nature of spontaneous construction was pointed to us by Leonid Kulikov (p.c.).

10. "Grammatical voice is manifested in systems in which alternations in the shapes of verbs signal al-
ternations in the configurations of nominal statuses with which verbs are in particular relationships,"
(Klaiman 1992)
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Passive and argument structure

Tor A. Åfarli
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU

This paper argues that argument structure does not exist in the sense of a lexical specification of the number and types of arguments of a given verb, but, rather, that argument structure is essentially syntactic, stemming from an interaction between independently generated (syntactic) frames and the (non-linguistic) conceptual content of the verb and the arguments.

This connects to passivization in the sense that it is not dependent on the availability of the appropriate argument structure in the active version of the verb, such specification not existing in the first place. It is claimed that any verb that can be assigned an agentive (conceptual) reading can thus be passivized, even if it is an unaccusative verb. Thus, even though passivization is obviously a structural phenomenon, it is triggered by semantics.

0. Introduction

In most syntactic theories (e.g. principles & parameters theory, lexical functional grammar, head-driven phrase structure grammar), syntax is lexicon-driven in the sense that what is taken to be the verb’s inherent lexical-semantic argument structure (or theta-grid) is projected into the syntax and displayed as syntactic structure. Thus, Baker (2003: 95) says: “[S]yntacticians are accustomed to specify the theta-grid of a lexical item and to having this grid determine the syntactic structure that the word appears in.” Naturally, in such an approach, the derivation of passives is also lexicon-driven, roughly such that passive morphology is taken to map the argument structure specification of the active version of the verb into an argument structure specification for the passive version verb. The passive argument structure is then projected into the syntax as a syntactic passive structure.

In this paper, I will follow recent neo-constructionist analyses (see the beginning of Section 2 for a sketch of what a neo-constructionist analysis is), and I will argue that syntax is not lexicon-driven in this way. In fact, I shall argue that verbs do not have an argument structure as part of their lexical specification and specifically not in the sense that a putative lexical argument structure is projected into the syntax as syntactic structure. I shall argue, on the other hand, that there exist basic syntactic argument structure templates or frames that are generated independently of the verbs,
and further I shall argue that verbs are inserted into such frames. Thus, the verb gets an argument structure by being inserted into a particular frame. It does not impose a syntactic argument structure on the sentence in the lexicon-driven manner. I also assume that even though verbs do not have a lexical argument structure specification that is projected into the syntax, they have a rich conceptual content (including conceptual role information) that interact with the independently generated syntactic frame to produce what we wrongly perceive as the verb’s argument structure.

What I would like to do in this paper, is to corroborate this tenet by looking at the analysis of passive from a neo-constructionist point of view, trying to find out how the passive analysis should be construed given that the derivation of passive is not lexically driven. I will also discuss some empirical facts that seem to lend support to a neo-constructionist approach to the analysis of passive.

1. Passive in lexicon-driven approaches

Any lexicon-driven analysis of the passive is quite straightforward. Take for example a popular analysis within the principles & parameters framework (Jaeggli 1986; Baker et al. 1989; Åfarli 1989). There the passive morpheme is construed as a type of verb internal argument (call it PASS) requiring the external role assigned by the verb. Thus, any active verb inserted into such a passive environment will have its external role redirected, as it were, to the verb internal passive morpheme, which explains at least the two observations in (1).

(1) a. The external role will be implicit in the passive clause.
   b. The subject position will be theta-free (de-thematized).

In turn, the property mentioned in (1b), i.e. theta-free subject position, explains why impersonal passives may exist (an expletive subject occupies the theta-free subject position), and it also explains why an internal argument may be promoted to the subject position, cf. the Norwegian examples in (2a) and (2b), respectively.

(2) a. Det vart tatt ei bok frå biblioteket.
   b. Ei bok vart tatt frå biblioteket.
   
   it.exp. was stolen a book from the library
   a book was stolen from the library

Moreover, since the verb internal morpheme PASS is construed as an argument that requires the external theta-role assigned by the verb, this analysis nicely explains why verbs that do not assign an external theta-role, fail to have passive forms, cf. (3). (3a, b) are periphrastic passives; (3c, d) are reflexive passives.

(3) a. *Det vart forsvunne ei bok frå biblioteket.
   b. *Ei bok vart forsvunne frå biblioteket.
   
   it.exp. was disappeared a book from the library
   a book was disappeared from the library
The derivation of the two passive verbs used in the example sentences (2) and (3) (\textit{tatt} ‘taken’ and \textit{forsvinne/forsvinnes} ‘disappeared/disappear-s’) is sketched in (4).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{ta} ‘take’: Th, Th $\Rightarrow$ __
  \item \textit{forsvinne} ‘disappear’: Th $\Rightarrow$ *__
\end{enumerate}

In (4a) the external role is redirected to PASS and the resulting passive argument structure is well-formed. In (4b) there is no external role, therefore PASS, being an argument, violates the Theta Criterion, and the resulting passive argument structure is not well-formed.

To sum up very briefly, fundamental to lexicon-driven analyses is the idea that the verb comes with a fixed set of external and/or internal theta-roles that are part of the verb’s inherent lexical specification. The success of the lexicon-driven analysis works on the interplay between the property of PASS as an argument requiring an external theta-role and the lexically specified argument structure that each verb is assumed to have.

As I have already mentioned, I think the lexicon-driven analysis is wrong. The reason for this is that its basic premise is wrong, namely that theta-roles and argument structure are projected into syntax from the lexicon. I will now try to explain why it is wrong, and I will also try to sketch what I take to be the right analysis of the lexicon-syntax interface, namely that argument structure is syntactically determined in a crucial sense.

\section{Argument structure is not projected from the lexicon}

In Construction Grammar and various neo-constructionist approaches (e.g. Borer 1994, 2001; van Hout 1996), argument structure is not taken to be projected from the lexicon. Rather, to quote Borer (2001:2), “[...] the syntactic structure gives rise to a template, or a series of templates, which, in turn, determines the interpretation of the arguments.” In this approach, then, there exists a series of syntactic argument structure templates or ‘frames’ (as I prefer to call them) that are generated independently of any putative lexical argument structure of particular verbs. The arguments grouped around the verb do not receive their particular roles from the verb, but rather from the position that the argument occupies in the syntactic frame. In other words, the arguments receive what might be called constructional theta-roles.

Thus, in the structure I want to adopt, shown in (5) (developed from Bowers 1993, 2001; Baker 2003), the specifier of PredP is the canonical agent position, and the complement position in VP is the canonical patient (theme) position. Further-
more, the specifier of VP is the canonical beneficent (source) position. The canonical interpretations are as indicated in (5).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PredP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AG} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Pred'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Pred} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{BEN} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PAT}
\end{array}
\]

Corresponding to this enhanced role of syntactic structure in determining argument structure, the import of the lexical content of the verb is much reduced. In fact, the semantic properties of verbs are fundamentally considered to have no linguistic relevance, strictly speaking. This is not to say that they have no content or meaning, but what they have is conceptual meaning, incorporating world knowledge etc., as opposed to linguistic meaning. See Fodor (1998) and Fodor & Lepore (2002) for an interesting view of lexical content that is very similar to the one suggested here.

To sum up, there are two basic features of neo-constructionist analyses that I want to emphasize. First, there exists a set of basic syntactic frames that are generated independently of lexical items (verbs), i.e. the frames are not projected from the verbs. Second, there exists an impoverished lexicon as seen from a linguistic point of view, however, the (open class) lexical items are stuffed with conceptual content that interacts with the structural semantics of the frame.

Now, I will very briefly review some of the evidence for the neo-constructionist view of the lexicon-syntax interface. The evidence given below is discussed more fully in Åfarli (2003), see Goldberg (1995) or Borer (2001) for similar reasoning.

The first piece of evidence has to do with made-up verbs, cf. e.g. (6).

(6) a. How to Russell a Frege-Church. (title of article by David Kaplan)
   b. Kaplan vigorously Russelled a Frege-Church.

Here the proper noun Russell is used as a verb, specifically as a transitive verb with an external and internal argument. Given a lexicon-driven approach, Russell must be listed in the lexicon as a verb with the appropriate argument structure specification. Since all proper nouns (and all nouns, for that matter) may (exceptionally) be used as verbs, all nouns must be listed as verbs in addition to their "normal" listing, which is absurd. I conclude that argument structure cannot be projected from the lexical specification of the item that functions as the verb.

Next, consider a type of evidence that is well-known from Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995), namely the striking argument structure flexibility of verbs (largely ignored in other frameworks, but still a very common phenomenon). That is, the "same"
verb may easily occur in different syntactic environments (frames), and moreover it
does not occur only in what is felt as “normal” syntactic environments. In fact, verbs
are often used in odd ways to attain certain literary effects etc. Here are some examples
from Norwegian both of “normal” and somewhat “odd” uses of the verb *dans* ‘dance’.

(7)  a. Per dansa. (intransitive)
     ‘Per danced.’
 b. Per dansa ein vals. (transitive with cognate object)
     ‘Per danced a waltz.’
 c. Per dansa Marit (som ho aldri hadde vorte dansa før). (transitive with non-
cognate object)
     ‘Per danced Marit (like she never had been danced before).’
 d. Per dansa Marit ein vals. (ditranstive)
     ‘Per danced Marit a waltz.
     ‘Per danced a waltz for Marit.’
 e. Per dansa Marit ut av rommet. (resultative)
     ‘Per danced Marit out of the room.’

If verbs have this syntactic flexibility, then, given a lexicon-driven approach, there must
be a different lexical specification for each syntactic environment (frame) that the verb
can occur in. But then the idea that the putative argument structure of the verb ex-
plains why the verb occurs in certain syntactic frames has no force, since the verb will
be ascribed whatever argument structure specification that corresponds to the syn-
tactic frame that it occurs in. It seems rather that argument structure is syntactically
determined by *independently generated* frames.

I conclude from this that argument structure is *not* projected from the verb, but
that it is syntactic in nature, i.e. determined by syntactic configuration (frames). Thus,
I subscribe to a *syntactic bootstrapping* hypothesis regarding argument structure and
the interpretation of arguments, see Gleitman (1990) for an excellent defence of using
syntactic bootstrapping in the analysis of argument structure. Syntactic bootstrapping
is opposed to the customary lexicon-driven approach, which amounts to semantic
bootstrapping.

Now, if theta-roles are interpreted on the basis of syntactic structure, and if they
are specifically *not* projected from the lexical properties of the verb, what then about
the analysis of the passive? Recall that the very success of the traditional lexicon-driven
analysis of the passive is crucially based on the idea that theta-roles are projected
from the lexicon, and, more specifically, that the external theta-role is redirected or
reassigned to the verb internal PASS morpheme.

3. Passive in a neo-constructionist approach

In a neo-constructionist analysis, there can be no question about redirecting a lexically
specified external role, since there are no lexically specified theta-roles in the first place.
Nor is there any “projection” of lexical-semantic properties into the syntax in the sense
that lexical-semantic properties determine syntactic structure. Rather, there are non-
grammatical conceptual properties of lexical items. In addition, there are syntactic
frames that have constructional interpretations of their own. The question is what
happens when the semantics of a frame that is marked as passive, is forced to interact
with the conceptual content of the lexical item (verb).

There are two fundamental problems here. The first is general, and it is not re-
stricted to passives. It is the following. If role is determined by position, how come that
the subject position can be void of role so that an expletive can occupy that position,
or that a non-agent argument (i.e. an internal argument) can be promoted to that po-
sition? This question opens a large area, which I have treated previously in joint work
with Kristin Melum Eide (Åfarli & Eide 2000). I will just state the essential points here.

The subject position is unlike any other argument position in that it is always po-
tentially a pro-forma position resulting from proposition formation (i.e., a predication
operator opens up a pro-forma subject position in order to form a proposition). The
other argument positions (DO, IO) are never pro-forma positions in this way, and they
can only be motivated as semantically “charged” argument positions inducing a cer-
tain canonical valence based role interpretation. However, like these other argument
positions, the subject position can also have a canonical interpretation, in addition to
its pro-forma function. In other words, the subject position is always potentially a pro-
forma position resulting from the requirement of proposition formation. In addition,
it can have a canonical role interpretation (constructional theta-role). Non-subjects
only have canonical role interpretations.

The alternating functions of the subject position are illustrated in (8). The
particular function is in each instance dependent on the semantics of the lexical
items involved.

(8) a. Det ropar i naborommet.
   it.EMPL shouts in the adjoining room
   ‘There is shouting in the adjoining room.’

b. Nokon ropar i naborommet.
   someone shouts in the adjoining room

c. #Det ropar i drivhjulet.
   it.EMPL shouts in the driving wheel
   ‘There is a shouting sound in the driving wheel.’

d. #Det syng i naborommet.
   it.EMPL sings in the adjoining room
   ‘There is singing in the adjoining room.’

e. Nokon syng i naborommet.
   someone sings in the adjoining room

f. Det syng i drivhjulet.
   it.EMPL sings in the driving wheel
   ‘There is a singing sound in the driving wheel.’

No comparable alternation between an expletive pronoun and a contentful argument
is possible for non-subjects.
The other fundamental problem concerning neo-constructionist analyses of passives is the following. How can certain verbs (in particular unaccusatives) fail to have a passive version? Also, the subject position in the passive should in principle be a potential constructional role position (agent), but in fact it is not. It cannot have a constructional agent role.

Now, consider first unaccusative type verbs. Unaccusative type verbs normally fail to have a constructional agent role, that is, their subject position is normally of the pro-forma type. That means that the subject position can be occupied by an expletive pronoun, or alternatively an internal argument can be promoted there, cf. (9).

(9) a. Det rullar ein ball bortover vegen.
   it.expl rolls a ball along the road
b. Ein ball rullar bortover vegen.
   a ball rolls along the road

However, depending on the semantic/conceptual properties of the lexical items involved, an interpretation with a constructional agent role is possible even with unaccusative type verbs, and I think that is generally the case with unaccusative type verbs. This is shown in (10).

(10) Mannen rullar bortover vegen (med vilje / for å imponere Marit).
   'The man rolls along the road (on purpose / in order to impress Marit).'

That is, unaccusatives can in principle have a constructional agent role, if the conceptual content of the verb and the argument involved allows such an interpretation.

Now, what about the passive? Passives never allow that its subject is interpreted as a constructional agent role, unlike what we have seen is the case with unaccusative verbs. However, as is well known, passives have an implicit agent role. Therefore, I suggest that the following is a property of passive morphology.

(11) Passive morphology blocks a constructional agent interpretation of the subject position (so that only the pro-forma function is possible), and simultaneously passive morphology itself requires a constructional agent interpretation.

The problem about passives can now be formulated as follows. In a neo-constructionist analysis, passive formation is a question about assigning an interpretation to the verb that imputes on it an agent role, conceptually. That follows from the requirement that passive morphology implies an implicit agent reading. In other words, the question is, given a verb with passive morphology, is it possible, given the conceptual content of the verb, to impute on it an agentive reading, if necessary by stretching the content?

I will now try to answer this question. First, consider unaccusative type verbs. If an unaccusative type verb can have an agent reading, as in (10), it is also expected that it can possibly have a passive version, because that agent reading could also be imposed on the passive morphology, as required by (11). As shown in (12), that expectation is fulfilled.
(12) Det vart rulla bortover vegen i vilt tempo berre for å imponere Marit.

This indicates that the possibility for passivization is dependent on the interpretative possibilities that exist for the verb and argument in question, and not on the structural verb type itself.

The examples in (13) and (14) amplify this point.

(13) a. Studenten arbeidde tungt heile dagen.
    the student.[+AG/+hum] worked heavily the whole day
b. Det vart arbeidd tungt heile dagen.
    it.EXPL was worked heavily the whole day
c. Påhengsmotoren arbeidde tungt heile dagen.
    the outboard-motor.[-AG/-hum] worked heavily the whole day
d. #Det vart arbeidd tungt heile dagen.
    it.EXPL was worked heavily the whole day

(14) a. Studenten stod på kjøkkenet heile natta.
    the student.[+AG/+hum] stood in the kitchen the whole night
b. Det vart stått på kjøkken heile natta.
    it.EXPL was stood in the kitchen the whole night
c. Tv-apparatet stod på kjøkkenet heile natta.
    the TV kit.[–AG/–hum] stood in the kitchen the whole night
d. #Det vart stått på kjøkkenet heile natta.
    it.EXPL was stood in the kitchen the whole night

In (13) and (14), the b- and d-versions are intended to be the passive versions of the a- and c-versions, respectively. As can be seen, a passive version is felicitous only when the active subject is an agent. Again, this shows that what matters for passivization, is not verb type, but rather the possibility of an agent reading.

(15) and (16) show similar examples where the availability of an agentive interpretation makes it possible to passivize even typical unaccusative verbs like ‘fall’ and ‘disappear’. Imagine that (15) and (16) are uttered as stage instructions.

(15) a. Skuespillerne faller altfor tungt.
    'The actors fall much too heavily.'
b. Det må falles langs mer forsiktig.
    it.EXPL must fall-s (= be fallen) much more gently
(16) a. Du forsvinner for åpenlyst.
    'You disappear too visibly.'
b. I en slik situasjon må det forsvines på en mer sofistikert måte.
    in such a situation it.EXPL must disappear-s (= be disappeared) in a more sophisticated manner

Last, consider the main verb ‘have’. In certain circumstances, this verb can either have a possessive reading or an agentive reading. For instance, in (17) both readings are available. In that case, the verb can be passivized, but the passive version has the agentive reading only.
Passive and argument structure

(17) a. Jon har litt salt i gryta. Possessive OR agentive reading
Jon has some salt in the pan
b. Det has litt salt i gryta. Agentive reading; possessive reading is #
it.expl. has-s (=is had) some salt in(to) the pan
c. Litt salt has i gryta. Agentive reading; possessive reading is #
some salt has-s (=is had) in(to) the pan

(18), on the other hand, has only the (inalienable) possessive reading, but then passivization is impossible, as shown in (18b, c).

(18) a. Jon har et arr på kinnet. Possessive reading; agentive reading is #
Jon has a scar on his cheek
b. #Det has et arr på kinnet.
it.expl. has-s (=is had) a scar on the cheek
c. #Et arr has på kinnet.
a scar has-s (is had) on the cheek

These examples again indicate that passivization is dependent, not on verb type, but on what reading is available for the verb and the arguments.

4. Conclusion

I have argued that argument structure does not exist in the sense of a lexical specification of the number and types of arguments that a given verb takes. Rather, I have argued that argument structure is essentially syntactic, stemming from an interaction between independently generated (syntactic) frames and the (non-linguistic) conceptual content of the verb and the arguments.

As for passives, I have argued that the possibility of passivization is not dependent on the availability of the appropriate argument structure specification in the active version of the verb (since such specification does not exist). Rather, any verb that can be assigned an agentive (conceptual) reading, can be passivized, even though if it is an unaccusative verb. Thus, even though passivization is obviously a structural phenomenon, it is triggered by semantics, and therefore, in a certain sense, it is crucially a semantic phenomenon, too.

I think the approach followed in this article can be integrated mutatis mutandis into a broader generative analysis of the principles and parameters type. Although I have drawn heavily on insights associated with Construction Grammar in this article, my own inclination is toward a more developed syntactic analysis. Perhaps Hagit Borer’s recent work (e.g. Borer 2001) is the closest theoretical relative to the analysis presented here.
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Case-driven Agree, EPP and passive in Turkish

Balkız Öztürk
Boğaziçi University

This study argues for a movement-free account of passivization in Turkish. It shows that unlike what is observed in English passives, neither case nor EPP can motivate movement in Turkish passives, since, first, TP and vP do not play a role in syntactic case-checking; and second, EPP feature is not checked by Move XP in Turkish. It proposes that derivation of Turkish passives is an in situ phenomenon, dependent on morphological case realization, rather than on syntactic case-/EPP-checking via movement, which is also absent in the derivation of transitive, unaccusative and raising constructions in Turkish. Lack of such movement further accounts for the exceptional behavior of Turkish double-object constructions in terms of locality under passivization.

Introduction

In the Government and Binding (GB) literature, passivization is taken to be the canonical example of A-movement triggered by both case and EPP features. Within the Minimalist Program (MP), on the other hand, it is assumed that under passivization objects fail to undergo case-driven Agree with vP, which is deficient for object case, therefore, establish a case-driven Agree relation with TP and move into its Spec for purposes of EPP.

(1)  a. John broke the window.
    b. [TP The window [\textit{\text{was}} [vP broken t]]].

Movement for EPP
\hspace{1cm} Case-driven Agree

The main aim of this study is to show that neither case-driven Agree nor movement for EPP holds for passive constructions in Turkish. We will present a movement-free account of Turkish passives and argue that passivization in Turkish is an in situ phenomenon sensitive to morphological case realization. In the following, we will first discuss the function of TP and vP in Turkish in terms of their roles in syntactic case-checking. We will mainly argue that there is no case-driven Agree with TP and vP and no EPP-driven NP movement in Turkish presenting evidence from unaccusative and raising constructions, as well as from regular transitive structures. Then we will
focus on passives in Turkish and show that passives also lack case-driven Agree and movement for EPP based on the evidence from the passivization of transitives and double-object constructions in Turkish. Finally we will discuss in detail how morphology plays a role in determining the case alternations observed in passives in Turkish in the absence of movement.

1. Case-driven Agree in Turkish

In languages like English argument DPs introduced into theta positions have to form a case-driven Agree relation with the functional categories vP and TP to check case. Such case-checking is also highly crucial for the derivation of passive constructions. In the following, we will argue that there is no case-checking with higher functional projections in Turkish, which will have certain implications for the derivation of passives. We will first focus on the role of vP in terms of object case-checking then we will discuss TP with respect to subject case checking, before we start discussing the derivation of passives in Section 2.

1.1 vP in Turkish

Chomsky (1995) introduces vP as the locus of object case-checking and the node where external argument is merged into the structure:

(2) vP
    MERGE → EA v' v
    Agree → v VP V' V Obj

In the following, we will go over the arguments in the literature given to motivate vP in languages like English, checking their applicability to Turkish and consider whether Turkish provides any motivation to propose vP as a functional projection in its phrase structure.

1.1.1 Burzio’s Generalization and Turkish

The generalization proposed by Burzio (1986) forms the basis of the configuration given in (2) where object case checking and merging of the external argument take place within the same vP projection:
Burzio’s Generalization: Abstract accusative case is assigned if and only if an external theta-role is assigned. However, Burzio’s generalization has been strongly challenged cross-linguistically (Harley 1995; Pylkkänen 2002; Markman 2003; Öztürk 2005). Pseudo-incorporation of agents in Turkish illustrated in (3) also argues against Burzio’s generalization:

(3) Ali-\text{acc} polis tutukla-dı.
Police arresting happened to Ali.

The police arrested Ali to interrogate him intentionally.
Police-arresting happened to Ali to interrogate him intentionally.

As discussed in detail in Öztürk (2005), pseudo-incorporation of agents shown in (4b) does not allow control or agent oriented adverbs targeting external arguments unlike the case with canonical subjects shown in (4a). This implies that in pseudo-incorporation agents are not in canonical subject positions, functioning as “external arguments”. Given that it is possible to have accusative marked objects along with pseudo-incorporated agents in the absence of external arguments, Turkish posits a challenge for Burzio’s generalization. Thus, we conclude that Burzio’s generalization does not provide a very strong argument to motivate vP cross-linguistically, given the counter evidence from Turkish as well as from other languages discussed extensively in the literature.

1.1.2 Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2001)
Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2001) also provide another argument for vP based on its object case feature. They propose (5) as a cross-linguistic principle, which is illustrated by the stylistic inversion phenomenon in French given in (6):

(5) By Spell-Out VP can contain no more than one argument with an unchecked Case feature.

(6) a. Je me demande ou Marie mangera demain
I wonder where Marie will eat tomorrow
b. Je me demande ou mangera Marie demain.
c. Je me demande ou Marie mangera sa pomme
I wonder whether Marie will eat her apple
d. *Je me demande ou mangera Marie sa pomme (Boeckx 2003:182)

As seen in (6d) in French more than one argument cannot remain VP-internally. This follows from the case features on the functional heads v and T, as the complex head formed by v-to-T movement cannot have active case features of both v and T according
to Alexiadou & Anagnostopoullou (2001). Therefore, they claim that one of the case features must be eliminated before the complex head is formed to avoid multiple case-driven movement operations targeting the same head.\(^1\) Their account crucially relies on the presence of a \(v\) node and its case-checking features.

Turkish, however, strongly challenges the restriction provided in (5), since all arguments can remain in their theta positions. In (7) if it is assumed that negation is introduced right above all the theta role introducing functional projections, then as the subject unambiguously takes narrow scope below negation, it is obvious that both the subject and the object are in situ, that is, they are in their theta positions:\(^2,3\)

\[(7) \quad \text{[CP[TP [NegP [AgentP Bütün \text{çocuklar} [ThemeP o test-e [vP[gir-me-di]]]]]}\quad \text{All children that test-dat take-neg-past}\]

Movement out of theta positions is possible in Turkish, yet, reverses the scope relations as seen in (8). When the subject moves into [Spec, TP], preceding the TP level adverb, it can take scope over negation, triggering subject-verb agreement. We propose that overt subject-verb agreement implies the dislocation of the subject from its theta position:

\[(8) \quad \text{Bütün \text{çocuklar} (Allahtan) o test-e gir-me-di-lar.}\]

The restriction proposed by Alexiadou & Anagnostopoullou (2001), however, seems to hold in quite a number of languages. Since this restriction is sensitive to the presence of \(vP\) with an active object case, the only way to resolve the lack of such a restriction in Turkish is to assume that there is no \(vP\) in Turkish providing objective case. In other words, if there is no \(vP\) level, there will be no need for a restriction in Turkish against leaving more than one argument in situ. This further explains why Turkish disobeys Burzio’s generalization as well, which also strongly relies on a relationship between the external argument and the object case exhibited within the domain of \(vP\), and thus highlights the need to eliminate \(vP\) from the phrase structure of Turkish. It also implies that \(vP\) should be parametrically defined cross-linguistically and in its absence Burzio’s generalization or the restriction given in (5) does not need to be obeyed.\(^5\)

1.1.3 \(vP\) Fronting

\(vP\) fronting given in (9a) as discussed by Huang (1993), which is also represented in minimalist terms by Abels (2003) as in (9b), forms another argument for \(vP\). As shown in (9b), \(John\) and \(himself\) cannot be coindexed since the trace of \(Bill\) – the external argument introduced at the level of \(vP\) – still c-commands the reflexive, implying that the fronted constituent is \(vP\) rather than \(VP\). Thus, this type of data identifies \(vP\) as a syntactic constituent:

\[(9) \quad a. \quad \text{John said that } [vP\text{[wash himself \text{Bill}/\text{John}]} [TP_Bill, certainly would \text{tVP}]
\]
\[(9) \quad b. \quad \text{John said that } [[vP\text{[\text{Bill}]} [vP\text{[wash himself \text{Bill}/\text{John}]}]]\text{ Bill certainly would } t_{VP}]
\]
However, it is not possible to identify vP via fronting in Turkish, although the data in (10b) seems to be very similar to vP fronting on the surface. In (10b) the subject has moved to [Spec, TP], as only wide scope reading for the subject is possible:

(10) a. Her血管 çocuk oda-sın-a git-me-di.
   Every child room-3ps-dat go-not-past
   i. It is not the case that every child went to his room (not>every)
   ii. Every child is such that he didn't go to his room (every>not)

If (10b) is indeed a vP fronting case, where the rest of the clause is fronted after the subject moves to [Spec, TP], then the same phenomenon should be available in embedded clauses as well. Consider:

(11) a. Ali [her血管 çocuk-un oda-sın-a git-me-diğ-i-]ni söyledi
   Ali every child-gen room-3ps go-not nomin-3ps-acc said
   Ali said that every child didn't go to his room.

   b. *Ali [oda-sın-a git-me-diğ-i-]ni her血管 çocuk-un söyledi
      Ali room-3ps go-not nomin-3ps-acc every child-gen said
      Ali said that every child didn’t go to his room.

   c. her血管 çocuk-un Ali [oda-sın-a git-me-diğ-i-]ni söyledi
      every child-gen Ali room-3ps go-not nomin-3ps-acc said
      Ali said that every child didn’t go to his room.

   d. Ali [oda-sın-a git-me-diğ-i-]ni söyledi her血管 çocuk-un
      Ali room-3ps go-not nomin-3ps-acc said every child-gen
      Ali said that every child didn’t go to his room.

However, it is not possible to embed (10b) in a matrix clause as seen in (11b), which obviously argues against vP-fronting. Therefore, we conclude that the structure in (10b) is simply an instance of NP movement, where the NP adjoins to the matrix CP level (Kural 1994). This is further supported by (11c) and (11d), where the subject of the embedded clause can be adjoined to the matrix CP. Therefore, we conclude that Huang’s test for English is not applicable to Turkish, thus it cannot be used to argue for the presence of a vP level.

Another argument against vP we find in Turkish is the availability of object-stranding. Object-stranding, which is not possible in languages like English, is totally possible in Turkish, hence, provides further evidence for the lack of an identifiable vP level in Turkish, where the verb and the object form a syntactic unit. As seen in (12) it is perfectly possible to strand the object, when only the verb is substituted:

(12) Ben ev-i hayır kurumu-na bağlaşayacağım, Mehmet de araba-yı öyle yap-acak.
    I house-acc charity-dat donate-1ps Mehmet and car-acc thus do-fut
    I will donate the house to the charity and Mehmet will do so the car.
In summary, it is not possible to reduplicate any of the arguments for vP provided in the literature for Turkish. Therefore, we conclude that it is not possible to argue for the presence of vP as a case-assigning functional projection in the phrase structure of Turkish. Turkish does not exhibit any motivation for an identifiable vP level. It is also immune to several restrictions which lead to ungrammaticality in languages with vP.\(^6\)

Given that there is no identifiable vP level in Turkish, objects will not be able form a case-driven Agree with a vP and thus remain in their theta positions unlike what is observed in languages like English. ECM constructions support this proposal as well:

\[(13) \begin{array}{l}
{[S_1]}{Ben} \quad {[S_2]}{Kürşat-ı \ her \ zaman} \quad {[geç \ kal-iyor]} \quad {san-iyor-du-m}.
\end{array} \]

"I thought Kürşat was always being late."

(NOT: I always thought Kürşat was being late) (Aygen 2002:254)

As discussed in detail by Aygen (2002) unlike in English, in ECM constructions in Turkish adverbs following the subject of the embedded clause unambiguously modifies the verb of the ECM clause but never the matrix verb as illustrated in (13). When considered within the GB terms, this implies that the subject of the embedded clause does not raise into the Spec of matrix vP for case purposes. Given the proposal here that there is no independent vP level in Turkish, this is clearly expected.

1.2 TP in Turkish

In languages like English TP is assumed to be the functional category associated with EPP and the subject case (Chomsky 1995). The presence of TP as the location of Tense feature in Turkish is uncontroversial (Kural 1994; Kornfilt 1997; Aygen 1998, 2002; Kelepir 2001 and others). However, whether TP in Turkish is also associated with subject case and EPP or not has not been questioned substantially, but it has generally been assumed that Turkish exhibits EPP, which needs to be satisfied by the movement of subjects into [Spec, TP] and that subjects undergo case-checking with the T head (Kural 1994; Kornfilt 1997; Aygen 1998, 2002; Kelepir 2001, and others).

In Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), it is argued that in pro-drop languages with rich verbal agreement the head movement of the verb can check EPP. That is, EPP checking is done via MOVE X, but not via MERGE XP. Öztürk (1999, 2002) has also independently proposed that in Turkish the verbal agreement satisfies EPP, implying that [Spec, TP] does not have to be projected at all times in Turkish. In other words, movement to [Spec, TP] is not obligatory unlike English. Scope relations observed in Turkish provides strong evidence for this. As discussed above in Turkish constituents can stay in their theta positions as illustrated by the narrow scope subject in (14a), which suggest that [Spec, TP] is not projected. However, in (14b) the subject moves into [Spec, TP] to achieve wide scope triggering subject-verb agreement:
Case-driven Agree, EPP and passive in Turkish

(14) a. \[[TP| NegP| AgentP \text{Bütün çocuklar} | ThemeP \text{test-e} | VP \text{gir-me-di}]]
   All children that test-dat took-neg-past
   All children did not take that test
   (*all> not, not>all)
b. \[[TP| Bütün çocuklar| NegP| AgentP \text{ti} | ThemeP \text{test-e} | VP \text{gir-me-di-ler}]]
   All children that test-dat took-neg-past-pl
   All children did not take that test
   (all> not, *not>all)

Derivation of unaccusative sentences also provide further evidence for the lack of movement into [Spec, TP] for EPP reasons (also for case within the GB framework under case-driven A-movement) in Turkish:

(15) a. \[[TP| NegP| ThemeP \text{Bütün çocuklar} | VP \text{gel}-me\text{di}]]
   All children come-neg-past
   All children did not come
   (*all> not, not>all)
b. \[[TP| Bütün çocuk-lari | NegP| ThemeP \text{ti} | VP \text{gel}-me\text{di-ler}]]
   All child-pl invite-neg-past-pl
   All children were such that they did not come.
   (all> not, *not>all)

As seen in (15a) the NP merged at the Spec of ThemeP – the functional projection introducing the theme under the Neo-Davidsonian model assumed here – takes narrow scope with respect to negation, implying that subjects do not raise to [Spec, TP] in unaccusatives. Such a raising is only possible to achieve wide scope interpretation, triggering subject-verb agreement as shown in (15b), again highlighting the same point that [Spec, TP] does not need to be projected at all times in Turkish.

Raising constructions in Turkish also argue for the lack of movement into [Spec, TP]:

(16) a. Bana \text{sen yarıʃma-yı} kazan-acak-sn gibi gel-iyor.
   to-me you competition-acc win-fut-2ps like come-prog
   It seems to me that you will win the competition.
b. \text{Sen} bana yarıʃma-yı kazan-acak gibi geliyor-sun.
   you to-me competition-acc win-fut like come-prog-2ps
   It seems to me that you will win the competition. (Uygun 2005:4)

(17) a. \text{Hepiniz sorular-ı anla-miş-sunuz} gibi görün-m-iyor.
   all.of.you questions-acc understand-past-2ppl like seem-neg-prog
   It does not seem to be the case that all of you have understood the questions.
   (*all>not, not>all)
b. \text{Hepiniz sorular-ı anla-miş gibi görün-m-iyor-sunuz}
   all.of.you questions-acc understand-past-2ppl like seem-neg-prog-2ppl
   All of you do not seem to have understood the questions. (all>not, *not>all)

As seen in example (16) the subject of the embedded clause does not have to raise to [Spec, TP]. This is evidenced by the absence of subject agreement on the main verb, but on the embedded verb in (16a). The opposite is observed in (16b), where only the matrix verb bears subject agreement, whereas the embedded verb lacks it. This implies that in (16b) the embedded subject raises to the matrix [Spec, TP] triggering agreement under Spec-Head configuration. However, in (16a) the embedded subject raises only as high as the embedded [Spec, TP]. Scope facts given in (17) also provides
further evidence for the lack of raising into matrix [Spec, TP]. As seen in (17b) only in the case of agreement with the matrix verb the embedded subject can take scope over negation, otherwise, it only takes narrow scope in the case of agreement with the embedded verb as seen in (17a). Note that neither in (16b) nor in (17b) the subject moves to [Spec, TP] for the purposes of case or EPP, since under the absence of such movement (16a) and (17a) are equally grammatical.

As shown above Turkish does not exhibit movement of subjects into [Spec, TP], unless there is a semantic motivation such as to create a wide scope interpretation for the subject. As discussed above, within the GB framework, movement of subjects into [Spec, TP] is not only for EPP reasons but also for case checking, since T head is assumed to be the nominative case assigner. However, if assumed within the GB theory, Turkish does not exhibit any motivation for movement into [Spec, TP] for case purposes. That is, there is no case-driven A-movement into [Spec, TP] à la GB terms and T head is not the locus of nominative case feature. If we extend this GB notion to our current minimalist framework, it implies that there cannot be an Agree relation between the T head and the subject in the theta position for case purposes, since the T head does not host the case feature. Therefore, we conclude that the T head does not play a role in case feature checking in Turkish.

To summarize, there is no case-driven Agree with higher functional projections such as vP and TP in Turkish. This implies that all arguments can remain in their theta positions unlike the case in languages like English.

2. Passivization in Turkish

Given the proposal above that there is neither case-driven Agree with higher functional projections nor EPP-driven movement in Turkish, now let us consider how passives are derived in Turkish.

In Turkish passivized verbs bear a specific morphology and as in the case of English, the object bearing accusative case morphology becomes the nominative subject as illustrated in (18):

    Ali child-pl-acc invite-past
    Ali invited the children. (active)

b. Çocuk-lar çağır-il-di.
    child-pl invite-pass-past
    The children were invited. (passive)

Thus, on the surface Turkish passivization seems to behave very similar to passivization in English, where objects are promoted to subject position, i.e. [Spec, TP]. However, given what we have observed in the previous section regarding the limited projection of [Spec, TP] in Turkish, we should check whether objects are really hierarchically promoted to subject position via movement under passivization in Turkish or not,
too. If there is no need to move into \([\text{Spec, TP}]\) for case or EPP reasons in Turkish, then we would expect passives to reduplicate the same scope effects that are observed in transitives, unaccusatives and raising constructions given in the previous section above. Consider:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[ [\text{TP}] [\text{NegP}] [\text{AgentP}] [\text{ThemeP}] \quad \text{Bütün çocuk-lar} \quad [v_\text{çağır}] \quad [\text{-il}]-\text{ma}-\text{di}] \]
\[ \text{all child-pl invite-pass-neg-past} \]
\[ \text{All children were not invited} \quad (\text{*all> not, not>all}) \]
\item \[ [\text{TP}] \quad \text{Bütün çocuk-lar,} \quad [\text{NegP}] [\text{AgentP}] [\text{ThemeP}] \quad \text{ti} \quad [v_\text{çağır}] \quad [\text{-il}]-\text{ma}-\text{di}-\text{lar}] \]
\[ \text{all child-pl invite-pass-neg-past-pl} \]
\[ \text{All children were such that they were not invited} \quad (\text{all> not, *not>all}) \]
\end{enumerate}

As seen in (19a) in the absence of agreement on the verb the subject unambiguously takes narrow scope with respect to negation, implying that it remains in situ in its theta position, however it takes wide scope when there is verbal agreement, implying that it raises to \([\text{Spec, TP}]\). Thus, the scope facts observed in (19) are identical to the ones we saw in (14), (15) and (17) above. This implies that in passives, too, there is no obligatory movement into \([\text{Spec, TP}]\) unlike what we observe in languages like English. \([\text{Spec, TP}]\) does not need to be projected at all times, but only when motivated through scope relations.\(^{10,11}\)

This, however, immediately raises the following questions: Why is there a change in case morphology, if objects do not need to leave their base-positions at all in passivization and how do nominative marked themes gain subject status under passivization? In the following section we will investigate these questions based on data from the passivization of double object constructions in Turkish and provide an answer to this question based on the distinction between syntactic and morphological case.

2.1 Passivization of Double-object Constructions in Turkish

Double-object constructions exhibit different characteristics under passivization cross-linguistically. Languages like Norwegian, Swedish, Albanian are symmetric passive languages, where either the goal or theme can be passivized as shown in (20). Languages like English, Icelandic, Greek, on the other hand, exhibit asymmetry in terms of passivization, where only the goal can undergo passivization in double object constructions as in (21):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[ (20) \quad \text{Swedish:} \]
\[ a. \quad \text{Johan forarades en medalj} \quad \text{John was presented a medal} \]
\[ b. \quad \text{Medaljen forarades Johan} \quad \text{the-medal was presented Johan} \]
\[ ^{2}\text{The medal was presented John.} \quad (\text{Anagnostopoulou 2003:124}) \]
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[ (21) \quad \text{Mary gave John a medal.} \]
\item \[ \text{John was given a medal.} \]
\item \[ ^{3}\text{The medal was given John.} \]
\end{enumerate}
This contrast in terms of passivization possibilities has been accounted for in the literature based on either case or locality. Case theoretic accounts of asymmetric passive languages mainly focus on how themes and goals are case assigned and what kind of case they receive – i.e., whether structural or inherent (Baker 1988; Larson 1988). Locality based accounts, on the other hand, explain the differences in terms of the relative ordering of theme and goal and their movement possibilities.

There is also asymmetry in the passivization of double object constructions in Turkish. Goals do not undergo passivization, but only themes can be passivized:

(22) a. Ayşê Ali-ye bu kitab-ı ver-di
    Ayşê Ali-dat this book-acc give-past
    Ayşê gave Ali this book

    This book Ali-dat give-pass-past
    This book was given to Ali.

    Ali this book-acc give-pass-past

Given that there is no movement in passivization in Turkish, in the following we will discuss why we observe such an asymmetry in double object constructions. We will argue that this asymmetry neither follows from syntactic locality constraints nor structural vs. inherent case distinctions, but it is due to constraints of morphological case realization. This in return will explain the case alternation we observe in the passivization of transitive constructions in Turkish in the absence of movement.

2.1.1 Relative ordering of Theme and Goal
Turkish is a scrambling language where the dative marked goals and accusative marked themes can occur in any order. This raises the question of what the underlying order of themes and goals is in Turkish:

(23) a. Ali kitab-ı Ayşê-ye ver-di. (Theme>Goal)
    Ali book-acc Ayşê-dat give-past
    Ali gave Ayşê the book

b. Ali Ayşê-ye kitab-ı ver-di. (Goal>Theme)
    Ali Ayşê-dat book-acc give-past
    Ali gave Ayşê the book

In parallel to the account of Japanese ditransitives by Miyagawa & Tsujioka (2004), Öztürk (2005) also argues that there are two goal positions (a high possessive goal and a low locative goal) in Turkish based on reconstruction facts:

(24) high goal\_Possessive...theme ... low goal\_Locative

As noticed by Kural (1992), under scrambling Turkish allows reconstruction only in the presence of a contrastively focused element. That is, under contrastive focus scrambling behaves as an instance of A-bar movement, otherwise, it is parallel to A-movement. As seen in (25a) in the absence of contrastive focus the goal can bind the
theme when the theme follows it. When the theme is scrambled to a position where it precedes the goal, on the other hand, the goal cannot bind the theme in the surface order given in (25b), as this is an instance of A-scrambling. However, when contrastive focus is introduced into the structure, yielding A-bar movement effects, the theme can reconstruct into a position below the goal as in (25c). This implies that goal is higher than theme. Note that the high goal here is interpreted as a possessive goal.

   every man-dat picture-3ps-acc give-past-1ps
   I gave every man his picture
b. resm-in-i/-j her adam-ai ver-di-m.
   picture-3ps-acc every man-dat give-past-1ps
   I gave every man his picture
c. resm-in-i/-j her adam-ai DÜN ver-di-m.
   picture-3ps-acc every man-dat yesterday give-past-1ps
   I gave every man his picture YESTERDAY

When a verb like koy- “to put” which forces a locative interpretation for the goal is chosen, on the other hand, Theme precedes the goal in the neuter order as in (26a). A-scrambling yielding goal>theme order leads to ungrammaticality, since reconstruction is not possible as shown in (26b). When contrastive focus is introduced as in (26c), on the other hand, the ungrammaticality disappears and the goal can reconstruct below the theme. This argues for the opposite order where the theme precedes the goal.

(26) a. Resm-i/-j çerçeve-sin-e/-j koy-du-m.
   picture-acc frame-3ps-dat put-past-1ps
   I put the picture in its frame.
b. çerçeve-sin-e/-j resm-i/-j koy-du-m.
   frame-3ps-dat picture-acc put-past-1ps
   I put the picture to his/its frame.
c. çerçeve-sin-e/-j resm-i/-j BEN koy-du-m.
   frame-3ps-dat picture-acc I put-past-1ps
   I put the picture to his/its frame.

   picture-3ps-acc frame-dat put-past-1ps
   I put his/its picture in the frame.
   picture-3ps-acc frame-dat YESTERDAY put-past-1ps
   I put his/its picture to the frame.

When we have the reverse possessor-possessee relations as in (27) the binding facts observed in (26) do not change. Still in (27a) the goal following the theme fails to bind it. If this ordering were due to A-scrambling of the theme over the goal as in the case of (25b), we would expect that introduction of contrastive focus fix the ungrammaticality, as in the case of (25c). However, as seen in (27b) even after the introduction of contrastive focus reconstruction is not allowed. This supports the observation in (26) that there is also a goal position below the theme in Turkish as shown in (24).
The order in (24) is further supported by the availability of two goals in a single sentence. Note that (28a) is not fully acceptable and this follows from the double-case restriction in Turkish, which does not allow presence of two constituents bearing the same morphological case within a single clause (Aissen 1974; Zimmer 1976; Taylan 1979, 1984; Göksel 1993, among others). This is what causes the degraded acceptability.

### 2.1.2 Passivization in Ditransitives

Given the base order High Goal > Theme > Low Goal in ditransitives proposed above, let us go back to the issue of passivization of double-object constructions in Turkish. As discussed above in (22), double-object constructions exhibit asymmetry under passivization. Dative arguments can never be passivized, but only the accusative marked arguments can be. Dative in Turkish can be considered to exhibit some inherent case properties. Unlike accusative marked arguments it never alternates with nominative case under passivization and never occurs on the subject in ECM constructions. When considered under case theoretic accounts like Larson (1988), if dative is an inherent case associated with goals it is expected that it will be invisible for passivization. Thus, it seems that case-theoretic accounts can explain why dative marked goals can never be passivized, leading to the asymmetry mentioned above.

Locality based accounts also seem to explain this asymmetry. If we are dealing with a Theme > Low goal order, then it is expected that the higher argument theme will be passivized as in (29). However, if we are dealing with the High Goal > Theme order, then, again given its inherent case properties the dative goal will not intervene in locality. Therefore, the theme following the high goal can undergo passivization as in (30). Thus, at first sight passivization of Turkish ditransitives does not seem to behave exceptionally with respect to of the cross-linguistic understanding of ditransitive constructions and can easily be accounted for under the case or locality based views.

\[
\begin{align*}
(29) & \quad [\text{TP} \quad [\text{Theme} \quad [\text{Low Goal}]]] \\
(30) & \quad [\quad [\text{High Goal_{inherent case}} \quad \text{Theme}]]
\end{align*}
\]

Note that only a configuration as in (31), on the other hand, will yield ungrammaticality under locality-based accounts, as the intervention of an argument bearing structural case, will block the passivization of a lower argument violating locality (Anagnostopoulou 2003).
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There is, however, one piece of data problematic for both views. The dative case we get on agents in causative constructions in Turkish is definitely not inherent, as it is not associated with any theta roles as illustrated in (32b).

   Ayşê this book-acc read-past
   Ayşê read this book.
   Ali Ayşê-dat this book-acc read-caus-past
   Ali made Ayşê read this book.

As agent arguments occur higher in the structure than themes (Kratzer 1994), if a construction like (32b) is passivized, due to locality restrictions only the higher argument i.e. the agent should be passivized as observed in languages like English as in (33). The ungrammaticality of (33c) follows from the configuration violating locality given in (34):

(33) a. John made Bill eat the cake.
 b. Bill was made to eat the cake.
 c. *The cake was made to be eaten by Bill.

(34) [\Agent_{structural\ case} [Theme]]

Given the dative in (32b) is non-inherent and also occurs higher in the structure, it is expected to yield similar locality effects as the one in (34) and thus block the movement of the theme, which is lower in the structure.

   Ayşê this book-acc read-caus-pass-past
   Ayşê was made to read that book.
 b. Ayşê-ye bu kitap oku-t-ul-du
   Ayşê-dat this book read-caus-pass-past
   This book was caused to be read by Ayşê

However, Turkish facts are just the opposite of what is expected. As seen in (35a) it is not possible to passivize the agent argument unlike English, but only the theme can be passivized, as shown in (35b). As both the agent and the theme bear structural case and the theme is lower in the structure than the agent, (35b) should be considered to be a strict locality violation. However, it is fully grammatical and moreover it is the only form of passive allowed under causativization.

Interestingly, though, when the intervening argument is not dative but accusative, under causativization only the higher accusative argument can be passivized in contradiction to what we observe in (35) above:
In (36a) the complement of the verb *bak- "see" inherently takes dative case. When it is causativized, due to the double case constraint in Turkish, the agent is marked for accusative to avoid double dative as in (36b). Under passivization only the higher agent marked with accusative can become the subject as in (36c), replicating the English facts given in (33), whereas passivization of the dative theme is not allowed.

The data in (35) and (36) are in contradictory terms when locality is considered. It seems that Turkish is exempt from locality restrictions which apply cross-linguistically. However, given the proposal above that there is no movement observed under passivization, it is not surprising that locality is irrelevant for Turkish passives. Thus, double-object constructions provide further evidence for the lack of movement under passivization in Turkish. If there were movement, we would expect Turkish passivization to behave on a par with other languages such as English, where locality constraints hold. Therefore, we once again conclude that there is no movement in passivization in Turkish.

Lack of movement in the passivization of ditransitives is further highlighted by the scope facts as well. Consider:

(37) a. [TP [NegP [VP bütün çocuklar okul-a yolla]-n]-ma]-di
   All children school-dat send-pass-neg-past
   All children were not sent to school (*all> not, not>all)
   b. [TP Bütün çocuklar [NegP [yolla-a okul-n]-ma]-lar]-lar
   All child-pl invite-pass-neg-past-pl
   All children were such that they were not sent to school (all>not, *not>all)

As seen in (37) the verb *yolla- “send” is introduced with a theme and a locative goal role ordered as theme>locative goal. In (37a) the theme cannot take scope over negation introduced right above VP, implying that the subject is still VP internal. Only in (37b), when the subject raises to TP, wide scope reading is possible for the subject, which in return yields overt agreement on the verb.

Same scope facts are observed when the verb *yolla- “send” is introduced with an animate goal interpreted as a high possessive goal, base-generated as preceding the theme:
As seen in (38a), when the base order high goal>theme is retained, the theme always takes narrow scope with respect to negation. This suggests that it is still VP internal. However, scrambling of the theme over high goal forces wide scope interpretation for the theme under neutral intonation. This implies that the theme has left its VP internal position. However, this does not mean that it has left the VP internal position for case purposes.

As highlighted via the scope facts observed in double-object constructions, passivization is not derived via movement in Turkish. However, the questions we have raised above still remains: If there is no movement in passivization, then what determines the subject status of themes in passives and ensures that they are marked with nominative case?

Going back to the data in (35) and (36), there is one very clear point which is not contradictory at all. That is, in either case dative arguments, whether structural or inherent, resist passivization. This brings up the possibility that what we are dealing under passivization in Turkish is simply morphology, given that it cannot be syntactic movement. The following section investigates this possibility.

### 2.2 Case realization in passives

It has been widely noticed in the literature that morphological case realization is independent from syntactic case checking (Kuroda 1988; Miyagawa 1991; Marantz 1991; et al.).

Harley (1995) also elaborates on the issue of case realization and proposes the following Mechanical Case Parameter:

\[(39)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. If one case feature is checked structurally in a clause, it is realized as Nominative (mandatory case)} \\
\text{b. If two case features are checked structurally in a clause the second (in a sequential sense) is realized as accusative.} \\
\text{c. If three case features are checked structurally in a clause, the second is realized as Dative the third as Accusative.} \\
\text{d. The mandatory case in a multiple-case clause is assigned in the top/bottom AgrP.}
\end{align*}
\]

Turkish also provides evidence for the independence of morphological case realization from syntactic case checking. Consider:

\[(40)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Ali koş-tu.} \\
\text{Ali run-past} \\
\text{Ali ran.}
\end{align*}
\]
As seen in (40) when an unergative is causativized in Turkish the agent gets accusative case. However, if there is a transitive construction with an accusative object as in (41) then under causativization the agent is marked for dative as the second argument, while the accusative object is considered the third. Example (42), on the other hand, illustrates that if there is an inherent dative case on the object as in (42a) then given the causer is realized as nominative in (42b), the agent can only get accusative as the second argument to be marked for structural case. Thus, Turkish morphological case realization is relative to how many arguments there are in a given structure and takes place in a top-down fashion.

Now let us go back to passives in Turkish. We have shown that theme arguments do not need to raise out of VP to get case. Case is available for them in situ.12 If it is assumed that passive morphology suppresses the agent in (43a), then the theme argument will be the only available NP in the structure to check syntactic case in (43b).

In the literature it has been widely noticed that presence of accusative case is dependent on the presence of nominative in a given clause (Yip, Maling & Jackendoff 1987; Harley 1995; Jónsson 1996; Schütze 1997; Nakamura 1999; Burzio 2000; Mahajan 2000; Woolford 2000, 2003; et al.). This is the case we observe in Turkish, too. In Turkish accusative case can only be realized if there is a nominative marked NP within the same clause. In (43b) when the agent argument is suppressed, the theme becomes the only overt NP in the clause, however, at the level of morphology, it cannot retain its accusative case, as it is dependent on nominative. Therefore, even though it does not move out of VP to check syntactic case, it still has to be realized as nominative in situ at the level
of morphology. Note that nominative is the mandatory case à la Harley (1995) or it is
the least marked case à la Woolford (2003) so that it has the priority over other mor-
phological cases. In Turkish, only the nominative can agree with the T head in finite
clauses, which highlights its distinct status as a case marker.

In the passivization of ditransitives, then what enables the realization of nomina-
tive case on the theme argument is simply morphology:

    Ayşe Ali-dat this book.acc send-past
    Ayşe sent this book to Ali.

    Ali-dat this book.acc send-pass-past
    Ali was sent this book.

    This book Ali-dat send-pass-past
    This book was sent to Ali.

    Ali this book.acc send-pass-past

When (44a) is passivized, the agent is suppressed, the dependent accusative case on
the theme cannot be retained, otherwise it causes ungrammaticality as in (44b). As in
(44d), on the other hand, the goal cannot get nominative and be interpreted as the
subject, since dative case never alternates with nominative case in Turkish. This leaves
(44c) as the only grammatical option available. Since agent is suppressed the only case
that can alternate with nominative is the accusative case marked on the theme argu-
ment. When accusative alternates with the obligatory nominative, the theme gains the
subject status, since nominative case is the only case, which can agree with a finite T.

To summarize, in the absence of movement morphology is the determining factor
for subjecthood under passivization in Turkish.

3. Conclusion

To conclude, in this study we have proposed a movement free account of passive
constructions in Turkish. Based on the lack of case-driven Agree with the functional
categories vP and TP as evidenced in transitive, unaccusative, ECM and raising con-
structions, we have argued that passivization is an in situ phenomenon which is sen-
sitive to morphological case realization. This in return explains why double object
constructions in Turkish behave exceptionally in terms of locality constraints, which
are observed cross-linguistically.
Notes

1. Boeckx (2003) presents an alternative account for the problem. He assumes an Agree operation between T and the complex head v/V formed after V-to-v movement. He argues that the ungrammaticality in (6d) is due to that the “v/V possesses a reflex of Case checking with the accusative element, that is, a valued φ-feature set (Boeckx 2003:183)” Both the external argument, which must check its case with T and v/V, which also carries a set of valued φ-feature compete for Agree with T. Thus, the ungrammaticality follows. If there is no object which gets into a case-checking relation with v/V, then there will not be any ungrammaticality since v/V will not have a valued φ-feature set, which will qualify it to undergo an Agree relation with T.

2. Note that we are assuming a Neo-Davidsonian model here where all the arguments of the verb are introduced via separate functional projections à la Lin (2001) and Borer (2004).

3. Aygen (1998) and Kelepir (2001) assume that in Turkish negation is introduced by NegP projected right above VP, which includes all arguments of the verb. When this is adopted to the Neo-Davidsonian model assumed here NegP has to be introduced right above all theta role related projections as shown in (7).

4. This test has been adopted for Turkish from Miyagawa (2001).

5. Öztürk (2004) proposes that in languages without vP the object case feature is borne on the functional projection introducing the theta role associated with the object, that is, similar to inherent case, it is introduced in the theta position. See Öztürk (2004) for the typology based on the presence or absence of vP as the object case provider in languages.

6. Chomsky (1999) argues that in addition to CP, vP also forms a phase and creates a domain subject to Phase-Impenetrability Condition. Thus, an element within the domain of vP can only move outside of it, if it moves or is merged to the edge of vP. Legate (2003) introduces three arguments for the phasehood of vP in English: (i) reconstruction of wh-phrases to the vP edge, (ii) quantifier raising in ACD constructions targeting the vP edge and (iii) parasitic gaps licensed at the vP edge. However, neither of these arguments are applicable to Turkish. Turkish does not have ACD constructions. It does not exhibit parasitic gaps either, being an object drop language. Also it is a wh-in-situ language. Therefore, it is not possible to argue for the phasehood of such a domain, namely vP in Turkish along the arguments proposed by Legate (2003).

7. See Öztürk (2005) for the issue of what type of elements can move into [Spec, TP].

8. See Boeckx (2004) for the proposal that Agree always requires movement of the agreeing category.

9. Öztürk (2005) discusses that Turkish is a in situ case-checking language, that is, case feature is not introduced by the functional categories TP and vP but it is available in theta positions. Due to space limitations we are not getting into the details of this proposal. See Öztürk (2005) for the discussion.

10. Impersonal passives also provide further evidence for the proposal that [Spec, TP] does not need to be projected for EPP reasons in Turkish. Impersonal passives in Turkish are derived from unergatives without any recourse to expletives:

(i) Koş-ul-du.
    run-pass-past
    Running happened.

11. See Caprìta, Göksel & Kempson (1991) and Göksel (1990, 1993) for an independent movement free account of passivization in Turkish under the Labelled Deductive System.
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It has long been assumed that in the English passive a passive subject (such as the boy in The boy was scolded by Professor Smith) undergoes NP-movement from its original object position to get Nominative Case. Similarly, the direct passive in Japanese (e.g., Sono-otokonoko-ga Smith-sensei-ni oko-rare-ta. 'The boy was scolded by Professor Smith.'), which has been assumed to correspond to the abovementioned English passive, has been proposed to involve NP-movement of a passive subject from the object position (Kuno 1973; Miyagawa 1989; Kubo 1990, among others).

The main evidence provided by researchers which advocate such an NP-movement view for the direct passive comes from the behavior of a floating quantifier in direct passives. Miyagawa (1989) offers the mutual c-command requirement on a floating quantifier, according to which, in Japanese, a floating quantifier is allowed only when it mutually c-commands the host NP (or a trace of the host NP) which the floating quantifier modifies. Thus if a floating quantifier for a passive subject is possible in the direct passive, it has been thought to indicate that there is a trace of the passive subject in the object position, which in turn suggests that the passive subject undergoes NP-movement. Indeed, the direct passive allows a floating quantifier (e.g., Otokonoko-ga Smith-sensei-ni san-nin oko-rare-ta. 'Three boys were scolded by Professor Smith.'). In this way the view that the direct passive involves NP-movement similar to the English passive seems to be well motivated.

However, I argue against the NP-movement view for the direct passive. I show that the evidence from floating quantifiers is not conclusive enough to conclude that a passive subject in the direct passive undergoes NP-movement. A closer inspection reveals that the mutual c-command requirement itself has to be dismissed, and furthermore, a floating quantifier does not necessarily imply that there is a trace. Therefore, the NP-movement view supported by the evidence from floating quantifiers is nullified.

The NP-movement view has to be recast in a broader empirical investigation. I present several new pieces of empirical evidence on the direct passive, which unequivocally support the totally opposite view from the NP-movement view: a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement; rather it is base-generated in the subject position, [Spec, TP], throughout the derivation (cf. Kuroda 1979; Hoshi 1991; Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992; Matsuoka 2002). Empirical evidence comes from (i) Binding Conditions in the passive, (ii) scope interpretation (scope of negation) in the passive,
(iii) Variable Binding in the passive, (iv) V-V compound (long passive) in the passive, and (v) a negative polarity item, sika-phrase, in the passive.

1. Introduction

It has long been assumed in the literature of Japanese generative grammar that a direct passive construction is derived by NP-movement of a logical object (Kuno 1973; Miyagawa 1989; Kubo 1990, among others). In this paper, however, I attempt to refute such a standard view of the Japanese direct passive; I scrutinize various aspects of the direct passive, including Binding Conditions, scope interpretation (scope of negation), Variable Binding, long passive in V-V compound, Negative Polarity Item (NPI) -sika, and put forth an analysis in which the direct passive does not involve NP-movement of a logical object: a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement; rather it is base-generated in a subject position [Spec, TP] throughout the derivation.

This paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2 I give an overview of the NP-movement view for the direct passive in Japanese, and review the main evidence to presume NP-movement of a logical object to a subject position in the direct passive. In Section 3 I demonstrate that the NP-movement analysis loses support since the main evidence, which is assumed to show that the direct passive undergoes NP-movement, is dubious. Sections 4 and 5 offer new empirical evidence showing that a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement; rather it is base-generated in a subject position throughout the derivation, which I call the Base Generation Approach. Section 6 further elaborates the Base Generation Approach for the direct passive: (i) the theta-assignment to a passive subject is performed by V-to-T raising, and (ii) the passive morpheme -(r)are does not constitute an independent verb: the structure of the direct passive is simplex in that it has only one layer of verb phrase, which is in contrast to Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992) who posit two layers of verb phrases in the direct passive. Section 7 summarizes the main arguments on this paper.

2. NP-movement approach for the direct passive

In the English passive, as shown in (1), the NP the boy originates in the object position of the verb kick, and subsequently moves to the subject position of the sentence:

(1) The boy was kicked by the girl.

As illustrated below, it has been widely held that (i) the passive morphology absorbs the ability of a verb to assign (or check) Accusative Case to its object NP, and (ii) in order to get Case, the object NP has to move to a position where it is able to be assigned
Case (in this case, [Spec, TP] for Nominative Case); otherwise it lacks Case, leading to ungrammaticality (Jaeggli 1986; Baker, Johnson, & Roberts 1989).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(i) \quad TP} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{VP by the girl} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{was kicked} \\
\hline \\
\text{(ii) \quad TP} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP by the girl} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{was kicked} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{id the boy} \\
\end{array}
\]

Japanese has some types of passives, one of which is what is called the direct passive, as exemplified in (2):\(^1\)

(2) Direct Passive:

\[
\text{Sono-otokonoko-ga \ sono-onnanoko-ni \ ke-rare-ta.} \\
\text{the-boy-NOM \ the-girl-by \ kick-PASSIVE-PAST}
\]

'The boy was kicked by the girl.'

Traditionally, it has been explicitly or implicitly assumed that the Japanese direct passive such as (2) corresponds to the abovementioned English passive as in (1); thus it has been proposed that the Japanese direct passive such as (2) also involves NP-movement (Kuno 1973; Miyagawa 1989; Kubo 1990, 1992 \textit{inter alia}), as illustrated below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(i) \quad TP} \\
\quad \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{sono-onnanoko-ni} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{sono-otokonoko-kas} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{ke-rare} \\
\hline \\
\text{(ii) \quad TP} \\
\quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{sono-onnanoko-ni} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{sono-otokonoko-kas} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{ke-rare} \\
\end{array}
\]

The main evidence provided by researchers that advocate the NP-movement view for the Japanese direct passive comes from the behavior of a floating quantifier in passives (Miyagawa 1989; Kubo 1990, 1992). Floating quantifier has been taken as a diagnosis for the presence of a trace since Miyagawa (1989): in Japanese, the availability of a floating quantifier has been considered as evidence which indicates whether there is a trace or not and also pinpoints where a trace is located in a sentence.

Miyagawa (1989) proposes that the mutual c-command relationship between a quantifier and an NP it modifies is necessary for a quantifier to float, which is called the mutual c-command requirement:
(3) **Mutual c-command requirement**

For a predicate to predicate of an NP, the NP or its trace and the predicate or its trace must c-command each other. (Miyagawa 1989:30)

The mutual c-command requirement states that a floating quantifier is licensed if and only if it mutually c-commands the host NP (or a trace of the host NP) which it modifies. Consider (4) in order to see how the requirement works. In (4a) the numeral quantifier *san-satu* 'three-cl' modifies the host NP *hon* 'book', and (4b) is an example of floating quantifier in which the numeral quantifier floats from the host NP which it modifies.

(4) a. Gakusei-ga [VP san-satu-no hon-o kat-ta].

    student-nom three-cl-gen book-acc buy-past

    ‘Students bought three books.’

b. Gakusei-ga [VP hon-o san-satu kat-ta].

    student-nom book-acc three-cl buy-past

    ‘Students bought three books.’

Miyagawa (1989) assumes the following flat structure for VP:

(5) VP

hon-o san-satu kat-ta

In this VP structure, the NP *hon* and the numeral quantifier *san-satu* c-command each other, satisfying the mutual c-command requirement; therefore, (4b) is grammatical. Now let us look at the following example:

(6) Hon-o gakusei-ga [VP san-satu t, kat-ta].

    book-acc student-nom three-cl buy-past

    ‘Students bought three books.’

(6) is a sentence in which the object NP *hon* is scrambled to the sentence-initial position. The grammaticality of (6) is accounted for by the mutual c-command requirement in the following way: given that a scrambled phrase leaves behind its trace (Harada 1977; Saito 1985), the numeral quantifier *san-satu* and the trace of the scrambled phrase modified by *san-satu* mutually c-command; hence the mutual c-command requirement is satisfied in (6), being grammatical. Now consider (7):

(7) a. Futa-ri-no tomodati-ga Shinjuku-de [VP Tanaka-sensei-ni at-ta].

    two-cl-gen friend-nom Shinjuku-loc Prof. Tanaka-dat meet-past

    ‘Two friends met Prof. Tanaka at Shinjuku.’

b. Tomodati-ga Shinjuku-de [VP Tanaka-sensei-ni futa-ri at-ta].

    friend-nom Shinjuku-loc Prof. Tanaka-dat two-cl meet-past

    (Lit.) ‘Two friends met Prof. Tanaka at Shinjuku.’

In (7b) the numeral quantifier *futa-ri* ‘two-cl’ floats from the subject NP *tomodati* ‘friend’. This sentence is ungrammatical since the numeral quantifier does not
c-command the subject NP. Thus the mutual c-command requirement correctly excludes (7b) as ungrammatical.

Having observed how the mutual c-command requirement on the floating quantifier works, now let us get back to the argument why the availability of a floating quantifier in the direct passive tells us that a passive subject is derived by NP-movement (Miyagawa 1989; Kubo 1990, 1992). The logic is that if a floating quantifier that modifies a passive subject is possible in the object position, it indicates that there is a trace of the passive subject in the object position, which in turn suggests that the passive subject undergoes NP-movement. With this in mind, consider (8) to examine whether a passive subject in the direct passive allows a floating quantifier:

(8) Yuube, kuruma-ga doroboo-ni ni-dai nusum-are-ta.

‘Last night, two cars were stolen by a thief.’ (Miyagawa 1989:38)

As (8) shows, the direct passive indeed allows a floating quantifier: it is grammatical although the subject NP ‘car’ and the numeral quantifier ‘two-cl’ which modifies the subject NP are separated in a similar way as (7b). According to Miyagawa (1989) and Kubo (1990, 1992), the fact that (8) is grammatical suggests that the passive subject undergoes NP-movement that leaves behind its trace; hence the mutual c-command requirement is satisfied since the trace of the passive subject and the numeral quantifier mutually c-command, as schematically illustrated in (9):

(9) mutually c-command

YP: Yuube, kuruma-ga doroboo-ni ni-dai nusum-are-ta.

Taken together with the mutual c-command requirement, the NP-movement analysis claims that the Japanese direct passive involves NP-movement on the basis of the fact that the direct passive allows a floating quantifier of the passive subject, and the analysis appears to be well motivated.

3. Against evidence for NP-movement approach

As observed in the preceding section, the floating quantifier data (8)–(9) are considered as evidence supporting the view that the direct passive in Japanese involves NP-movement. I concur with the data: (8) is grammatical, but I do not concur with the basic idea that the behavior of a floating quantifier is a diagnosis for the presence of a trace.

Some might argue that the mutual c-command requirement is no longer characterized in its original intention in the current framework of generative grammar:
in the recent framework, phrase structures are the binary branching (i.e., the flat VP structure such as (5) is not maintained), on which the mutual c-command relation does not hold any more. Although this kind of counterargument on the mutual c-command requirement might be reasonable, yet my argument is rather empirical. I show that the argument based on the floating quantifier data is dubious on the following two reasons: (i) a close scrutiny reveals that the mutual c-command requirement itself which the NP-movement view relies on does not hold (Section 3.1) and (ii) a floating quantifier is possible even if there is no trace of a host NP which it modifies (Section 3.2).

3.1 Against the mutual c-command requirement

There has been a broad disagreement on the mutual c-command requirement ever since Miyagawa (1989). A sentence which the mutual c-command requirement excludes as ungrammatical could be fully acceptable with some minor modifications (see also Ariji 1998; Takami 2001; Ishii 2001).

First, consider (10). (10) is ungrammatical, which is exactly the same as (7b) in relevant respects: since the floating quantifier san-nin ‘three-cl’ cannot c-command the host NP gakusei ‘student’, the mutual c-command requirement correctly accounts for its ungrammaticality.

(10) *Gakusei-ga student-nom syukudai-o assignment-acc san-nin three-cl teisyutu-si-ta. submit-do-past

‘Three students submitted their assignments.’

Now take (11) as an illustrative example which shows that the mutual c-command requirement does exclude acceptable cases as unacceptable:

(11) Gakusei-ga student-nom syukudai-o san-nin teisyutu-si-wasure-ta. submit-do-forget-past

‘Three students forgot to submit their assignments.’ (Ariji 1998)

Notice that (11) is the same as (10), except that (11) has another verbal ending wasure ‘forget’, forming a complex verb. As obvious, in (11) the floating quantifier san-nin cannot c-command the host NP gakusei on a par with (10); nevertheless (11) is fully acceptable. Thus the mutual c-command requirement alone does not appropriately distinguish grammatical cases from ungrammatical ones. The first point to notice is that the floating quantifier data which the mutual c-command requirement is drawn from are not firm enough to establish the mutual c-command requirement as first proposed by Miyagawa (1989). The mutual c-command requirement does not hold in its original form.
3.2 Floating quantifier without trace

As shown in (6) above, if a floating quantifier is possible although a host NP is separated from a floating quantifier, then it has been thought to indicate that such a sentence involves movement since a trace of the host NP is necessary which props up a floating quantifier. To put it the other way around, the mutual c-command requirement implies that there should be no case such that ‘a floating quantifier is possible although there is no trace of a host NP which is separated from a floating quantifier’. Thus the mutual c-command requirement expects that it should be ungrammatical if a floating quantifier is separated from its host NP without a trace of the host NP. If such a case exists as grammatical, the availability of a floating quantifier on the direct passive (as in (8)) cannot tell that there is a trace of the moved passive subject. As will be shown below, however, there are some cases where a floating quantifier is possible even if there is no trace.

Japanese has some types of passives, one of which is an indirect passive, as shown in (12):

(12) Indirect Passive

\[
\text{Tozankyaku-ga gouu-ni hur-are-ta.}
\]

‘Climbers got caught in a downpour.’

The subject of the indirect passive tozankyaku ‘climber’ does not bear any apparent grammatical relation with the verb hur- ‘rain’ that is suffixed by the passive morpheme. There is a large body of empirical evidence showing that there is no trace in the indirect passive: a passive subject in the indirect passive is not derived by NP-movement (Kubo 1990, 1992; cf. Kuno 1973; Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992, inter alia).

If the mutual c-command requirement is right, it is predicted that the indirect passive with a floating quantifier of the passive subject is ungrammatical since, in the indirect passive, a floating quantifier does not mutually c-command the passive subject, and furthermore, there is no trace of the passive subject which a floating quantifier c-commands. Contrary to the prediction, however, a floating quantifier is possible even in indirect passives in which there is no trace of the passive subject that a floating quantifier modifies, as shown in (13):

(13) Tozankyaku-ga gouu-ni yo-nin-mo hur-are-te,

\[
\text{gezan-dekinai-de-iru-rasii.}
\]

‘Four climbers got caught in a downpour, and it seems that they cannot go down a mountain.’

In (13) the floating quantifier yo-nin ‘four-cl.’ is separated from the host NP tozankyaku ‘climber’, and there is no trace of the host NP around the floating quantifier; nevertheless, the sentence is fully acceptable. The acceptability of (13) indicates that the mutual c-command requirement is suspicious on empirical grounds.
There is another case showing that a floating quantifier is possible without a trace of a host NP. Now consider (14) which is an instance of the right-dislocation (Kuno 1978).

(14) Maiko-ga yon-da yo, atarasi-i-ehon-o.
    Maiko-nom read-PAST particle new-picture book-ACC
    'Maiko read them, new picture books.'

The accusative-marked NP atarasi-i-ehon 'new picture book' appears in the rightmost position of the sentence. What has to be noted here is how to treat the right-dislocated element. It is first proposed by Kuno (1978) and extended in more detail by Tanaka (2001) that the right-dislocated element does not undergo 'rightward movement'; it is base-generated in the right end. Thus, the first clause of the right-dislocated sentence (i.e., Maiko-ga yon-da yo in (14)) does not contain any traces related to the right-dislocated element; instead it contains an empty pronoun, pro, as illustrated in (15).

(15) Maiko-ga pro, yon-da yo, atarasi-i-ehon-i-o.
    Maiko-nom read-PAST particle new-picture book-ACC
    'Maiko read them, new picture books.'

Keeping this in mind, examine whether a floating quantifier is allowed in the right-dislocation. Assuming the pro analysis proposed by Kuno (1978) and Tanaka (2001), it should be predicted by the mutual c-command requirement that the right-dislocation does not allow a floating quantifier since there is no trace of the host NP atarasi-i-ehon 'new picture book' which a floating quantifier c-commands. However, even the right-dislocated sentence allows a floating quantifier, as in (16):

(16) Maiko-ga san-satsu yon-da yo, atarasi-i-ehon-i-o.
    Maiko-nom three-CL read-PAST particle new-picture book-ACC
    'Maiko read them, three new picture books.'

The mutual c-command requirement incorrectly excludes this as ungrammatical since the host NP atarasi-i-ehon and the floating quantifier san-satsu do not mutually c-command and there is no trace of the host NP around the floating quantifier. The grammaticality of (16) is not accounted for by the mutual c-command requirement.

On the basis of the mutual c-command requirement, the NP-movement analysis argues that the example such as (8) illustrates that a passive subject leaves its trace which a floating quantifier modifies, and therefore, a passive subject is derived by NP-movement. However, as observed in this section, the mutual c-command requirement has fatal problems. The floating quantifier data for the mutual c-command requirement are dubious, and the availability of a floating quantifier cannot be a diagnostic test on whether there is a trace or not. Therefore, it cannot be concluded, on the basis of the floating quantifier data and the mutual c-command requirement, that the direct passive involves NP-movement of the passive subject. Now the NP-movement view which is primarily based on the floating quantifier data needs to be reconsidered. The issue whether the direct passive involves NP-movement has to be scrutinized in a broader empirical investigation.
4. Making a fresh start for the direct passive in Japanese

As observed above, the NP-movement analysis is not so cogent since the main evidence which it relies on (i.e., the mutual c-command requirement on a floating quantifier) is considerably dubious. It is evident that the NP-movement analysis is not the only way to derive the direct passive; there are (at least) three logically possible derivations for the direct passive, as summarized in Figure 1:

1. Overt Movement Approach
2. PF Movement Approach
3. No NP-movement: Base Generation Approach

Figure 1. Three possible derivations

A way of how to derive the Japanese direct passive is first classified into two types; one is the NP-movement view, and the other is that the No NP-movement view, which I call the Base Generation Approach. The NP-movement view is further divided into two categories: one is that NP-movement takes place in overt syntax, which is the standard NP-movement view given above; for convenience, I dub it the Overt Movement Approach, and the other is that it takes place in the phonological component, which I call the PF Movement Approach.4

As illustrated in Figure 2, the difference between the Overt Movement Approach and the PF Movement Approach is the timing of when movement of a passive subject is triggered: in the overt component or in the phonological component. In the Overt Movement Approach, an NP which originates in an object position of a verb moves to a passive subject position in the overt component, and the desired PF sequence for direct passives 'NP-ga XP-ni V-rare' (e.g., (2) Sono-otokonoko-ga sono-onnanoko-ni ke-rare-ta. 'The boy was kicked by the girl.') is yielded at PF; the LF representation contains a trace of the moved NP. In the PF Movement Approach, on the other hand, movement of a passive subject takes place in the phonological component; thus, a passive subject stays in the object position in the overt and covert (LF) components. See Figure 2.

Figure 2. NP-movement approach
In the Base Generation Approach, movement of a passive subject does not occur: a passive subject is not derived by any kinds of movement. Instead, it is base-generated in the subject position [Spec, TP]. The representation in the overt component is identical to the one at PF and LF, as in ‘NP-ga XP-ni V-rare’. See Figure 3.

3. Base Generation Approach

These three approaches produce the same phonological sequence in PF and can yield the desirable phonological sequence for the direct passive ‘NP-ga XP-ni V-rare’. The point to be noted here is that the LF representation is completely distinct among these three approaches, as summarized in (17) below.

(17) 1. Overt Movement Approach    LF: NP    ...XP    ...NP ...V
     e.g., otokonoko-ga [VP onnanoko-ni t otokonoko ke-rare-ta ].

2. PF Movement Approach         LF:    ...XP    ...NP ...V
     e.g., [VP onnanoko-ni otokonoko-ga ke-rare-ta ].

3. Base Generation Approach    LF: NP    ...XP    ... ...V
     e.g., otokonoko-ga [VP onnanoko-ni ke-rare-ta ].

The LF representation under the Overt Movement Approach contains a trace of the passive subject NP which moves overtly from the object position. In the PF Movement Approach, the passive subject NP is in the object position at LF, whereas it is in the subject position at LF in the Base Generation Approach. Each approach generates the distinct LF representations. Therefore, the empirical facts which are sensitive to the LF representation reveal which approach properly describes the Japanese direct passive.

5. New empirical evidence: Sorting out three approaches

In Section 5 I present several pieces of empirical evidence which attempt to decide the correct approach for the direct passive among the three approaches. Empirical evidence comes from (i) Binding Conditions in the direct passive, (ii) scope of negation in the direct passive, (iii) Variable Binding in the direct passive, (iv) V-V compound
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(long passive) in the direct passive, and (v) Negative Polarity Item (NPI) -sika in the direct passive.

5.1 Binding conditions in the direct passive

5.1.1 Binding Condition A in the direct passive

This subsection deals with Binding Condition A in the direct passive. As a background, let us see the following examples:

(18) a. T aro i-ga kare-zisin-no yuujin-o uragit-ta.
   Taro-NOM himself-gen friend-ACC betray-PAST
   (Lit.) ‘T aro betrayed a friend of himself.’

b. Jiro j-wa [ T aro i-ga kare-zisin/*j-no yuujin-o uragit-ta to ] it-ta.
   Jiro-TOP Taro-NOM himself-gen friend-ACC betray-PAST say-PAST
   (Lit.) ‘Jiro said that T aro betrayed a friend of himself.’

The anaphor kare-zisin ‘himself’ is subject to Binding Condition A. Here I assume an ‘anywhere’ application of Binding Condition A (cf. Belletti & Rizzi 1988; Epstein et al. 1998; Saito 2003):6

\[(19) \quad \text{Binding Condition A}
\]

An anaphor has to be bound by its local antecedent at any point in the derivation (except PF).

Since in (18a, b) the NP T aro c-commands and locally binds the anaphor kare-zisin ‘himself’, Binding Condition A is satisfied. In (18b) the matrix subject NP Jiro does c-command the anaphor, but does not locally bind it; hence, the NP Jiro cannot be coreferential with the anaphor in (18b).7

Now let us examine how the direct passive – a passivized sentence of (18a) – behaves with respect to Binding Condition A by using the following schema.

(20) Schema: \[ \text{NP (subject) ... Anaphor ... } \ldots \text{by-phrase Antecedent } \ldots \text{V-passive} \]

This schema indicates that the passive subject contains an anaphor, and its potential antecedent is within the by-phrase. To this schema, each of the three approaches for the direct passive yields the following predictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: Anaphor...Ant-by...(Anaphor)</td>
<td>LF: ...Ant-by...Anaphor</td>
<td>LF: Anaphor...Ant-by...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4A. Predictions on Binding Condition A

The Overt Movement Approach predicts (20) to be grammatical since the anaphor in the passive subject can be bound by the antecedent in the by-phrase before the passive subject undergoes NP-movement to the subject position, and the PF Movement Approach also predicts it to be grammatical since the anaphor in the passive subject can be bound by its antecedent in the by-phrase.8 In contrast to these two approaches,
the Base Generation Approach makes an opposite prediction: the schema (20) is predicted to be ungrammatical since the anaphor in the passive subject, which is assumed to be base-generated in [Spec, TP], has no chance to be bound by its antecedent in the by-phrase. Note that, under the Base Generation Approach, the anaphor in the passive subject is always higher than the antecedent in the by-phrase throughout the derivation since the VP-internal subject hypothesis is not adopted (see Section 6.1 as to why the VP-internal subject should not be adopted under the Base Generation Approach; cf. Fn. 5).

With these predictions in mind, consider the following example for the schema.

(21) *Kare-zisin-no yuujin-ga Taro-ni uragi-rare-ta.
   himself-gen friend-nom Taro-by betray-passive-past
   (Lit.) ‘A friend of himself was betrayed by Taro.’

The example (21) is ungrammatical, which suggests that the Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches are empirically incorrect in this respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4B. Empirical Fact on Binding Condition A

Someone might argue that (21) is ungrammatical simply because the anaphor precedes the antecedent in a linear fashion. However, the precedence relation between the anaphor and the antecedent is irrelevant. Consider a scrambled sentence of (18a), which is grammatical even if the anaphor precedes the antecedent, as in (22):

(22) Kare-zisin-i-no yuujin-o Taro-ga uragiti-ta.
   himself-gen friend-acc Taro-nom betray-past
   (Lit.) ‘Taro betrayed a friend of himself.’

Many researchers such as Harada (1977) and Saito (1985) argue that a scrambled sentence is derived by movement of an object noun phrase, leaving behind its trace. Thus the antecedent Taro can bind the anaphor kare-zisin before the object NP containing the anaphor is scrambled to the sentence-initial position.

Before leaving this subsection, let us examine another instance of Binding Condition A in the direct passive. As shown in the schema (23), the antecedent is contained in the passive subject, and the anaphor in the by-phrase.

(23) Schema: [NP (subject) ...Antecedent ...] ...[by-phrase Anaphor] ...V-passive

If the direct passive is derived by PF movement of a passive subject, the schema (23) should be ungrammatical since the anaphor in the by-phrase is not bound anywhere by the antecedent in the passive subject. On the other hand, both Overt Movement and Base Generation Approaches predict (23) to be grammatical since the anaphor in the by-phrase is bound by the antecedent in the passive subject.
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Table 5A. Predictions on Binding Condition A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: Ant ... Anaphor-by... (Ant)</td>
<td>LF: ... Anaphor-by... Ant</td>
<td>LF: Ant ... Anaphor-by...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5A. Predictions on Binding Condition A

The fact is that the schema (23) yields a grammatical sentence, such as (24):

(24) Taro-ga kare-zisin-no yuujin-ni uragi-rare-ta.
Taro-nom himself-gen friend-by betray-PASSIVE-PAST
(Lit.) 'Taro was betrayed by a friend of himself.'

The grammaticality of the example (24) vividly shows that the PF Movement Approach is empirically incorrect.

Table 5B. Empirical Fact on Binding Condition A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5B. Empirical Fact on Binding Condition A

5.1.2 Binding Condition C in the direct passive
This subsection deals with a Condition C effect in the direct passive. As the example (26) indicates, Japanese obeys Binding Condition C at LF as stated in (25): the example (26) is ungrammatical since the pronoun kanozyo ‘she’ binds the R-expression Maiko.

(25) Binding Condition C (cf. Tada 1993)
An R-expression must be free at LF.

(26) *Kanozyo-ga Maiko-s-ga koibito-o home-ta.
shenom Maiko-gen boyfriend-ACC praise-PAST
(Lit.) 'She praised Maiko's boyfriend.'

Now let us examine a Condition C effect in the direct passive, using the following schema where the pronoun is contained within the passive subject, and the R-expression within the by-phrase:

(27) Schema: [NP (subject) . . . pronoun . . .] . . . by-phrase R-expression | . . . V-passive

The three approaches make the following predictions for the schema:

Table 6A. Predictions on Binding Condition C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: pronoun...R-exp-by...(pronoun)</td>
<td>LF: ...R-exp-by...pronoun</td>
<td>LF: pronoun...R-exp-by...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6A. Predictions on Binding Condition C

The Overt Movement and the Base Generation Approaches both predict (27) to be ungrammatical since the R-expression in the by-phrase is bound by the pronoun in the passive subject at LF, yielding a violation of Binding Condition C. In contrast, the
PF Movement Approach predicts it to be grammatical since the R-expression in the 
by-phrase is free at LF, satisfying Binding Condition C.

Now consider the example (28) below which points out that the PF Movement 
Approach yields a wrong prediction on Binding Condition C in the direct passive.

(28) *Kanozyo-ga Maiko-ko koibito-ni home-rare-ta.
    she-nom Maiko-gen boyfriend-by praise-passive-past
    (Lit.) 'she was praised by Maiko’s boyfriend.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6B. Empirical Fact on Binding Condition C

To summarize this subsection 5.1, only the Base Generation Approach can cope 
with all the examples on binding; Binding Conditions A and C, overall, constitute 
convincing evidence for the Base Generation Approach.

5.2 Scope interpretation in the direct passive

The test of whether a relevant construction exhibits scope ambiguity is often used 
to see whether the construction involves movement or not. The typical schema is as 
follows (‘α > β’ indicates ‘α takes scope over β’):

(29) a. NP₁ ... NP₂ (NP₁ > NP₂, * NP₂ > NP₁)
    b. NP₁ ... NP₂ ... t₁ (NP₁ > NP₂, NP₂ > NP₁)

(30) Scope Principle (Aoun & Li 1989)
    α may have scope over β iff a c-commands β or a member of the chain headed by β.

Assuming the Scope Principle (30), scope ambiguity as shown in (29b), especially, an 
inverse scope reading (NP₂ > NP₁), ensures that NP₂ c-commands NP₁ somewhere in 
the derivation; thus NP₁ moves over NP₂.

Consider the following pair of sentences; one is an active sentence and the other is 
a scrambled counterpart.

(31) a. Active sentence:
    Dareka-ga subete-no seihin-o kensa-si-ta. (Unambiguous:
        someone-nom every-gen product-acc test-do-past  \( \exists \gamma; \forall \exists \))
        ‘Someone tested every product.’
    b. Scrambled sentence:
    Subete-no seihin-o dareka-ga kensa-si-ta. (Ambiguous:
        every-gen product-acc someone-nom test-do-past  \( \exists \gamma; \forall \exists \))
        ‘Someone tested every product.’

It has long been noted in the literature that scrambling induces scope ambiguity 
(Kuroda 1970; Hoji 1985 among others). This has been taken as evidence showing that
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5.2.1 Scope of negation

As has been observed above, scope ambiguity is a diagnosis of whether a construction involves movement or not. An immediate question arises whether the direct passive induces scope ambiguity. If the direct passive induces scope ambiguity, it is said to involve NP-movement. In this subsection I show that the direct passive does not exhibit scope ambiguity by examining an interaction between a quantifier and a negation.

First, observe the following sentence which has a universal quantifier as an object and a negative morpheme -nai ‘not’ on a verb.


Prof. Tanaka-NOM all-ACC praise-NEG-PAST

a. *Total negation ( ∀ > not): ‘Prof. Tanaka praised no one.’
b. Partial negation (not > ∀): ‘It is not the case that Prof. Tanaka praised everyone.’

The example (32) is said to be unambiguous (cf. Miyagawa 2003). The lack of ambiguity in (32) is explained as follows: assuming that Negation (NegP) is intermediate between TP and VP as illustrated below, negation c-commands the universal quantifier zenin ‘all’, not vice versa; hence, only a partial negation interpretation in which negation takes scope over the universal quantifier is obtained.

(32')
Keeping this background in mind, let us examine whether the direct passive induces scope ambiguity between a quantifier and a negation, using the schema (33) where a universal quantifier is contained in the passive subject and a verb is negated.

(33) Schema: \[ \text{NP (subject) \ldots All} \ldots \text{[by-phrase NP] \ldots } V\text{-passive-not} \]

The three approaches for the direct passive make the distinct predictions, summarized in Figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                  | LF: All...NP-by...
(all > not; not > all) | LF: All...NP-by...
(*all > not; not > all) | LF: All...NP-by...
(all > not; *not > all) |

Figure 7A. Predictions on Scope of Negation

Assuming the Scope Principle (30), the Overt Movement Approach predicts that the schema (33) induces scope ambiguity since the universal quantifier c-commands Neg (all > not), and Neg c-commands a trace of the universal quantifier (not > all). In contrast to that, it is predicted to be unambiguous under the PF Movement and the Base Generation Approaches, but they differ as to which interpretation – total negation (all > not) or partial negation (not > all) – is available. The PF Movement Approach allows only a partial negation interpretation (not > all) since the universal quantifier does not c-command Neg although Neg c-commands the universal quantifier, whereas the Base Generation Approach allows only a total negation interpretation (all > not) since Neg does not c-command the universal quantifier although the universal quantifier c-commands Neg.¹¹

Let us see a concrete example for the schema (33):

(34) Zenin-ga Tanaka-sensei-ni home-rare-nakat-ta. 
     all-nom Prof. Tanaka-by praise-passive-neg-past

a. Total negation (\(\forall > \text{not}\)): ‘No one was praised by Prof. Tanaka.’
b. *Partial negation (\(\text{not} > \forall\)): ‘It is not the case that everyone was praised by Prof. Tanaka.’

Interestingly enough, in a passive counterpart of (32), only a total negation interpretation is obtained. This means that the Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches are empirically incorrect since both cannot account for the fact that the schema (33) allows only a total negation interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(all &gt; not; not &gt; all)</td>
<td>(*all &gt; not; not &gt; all)</td>
<td>(all &gt; not; *not &gt; all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
<td>Unambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(all &gt; not; *not &gt; all)</td>
<td>(all &gt; not; *not &gt; all)</td>
<td>(all &gt; not; *not &gt; all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7B. Empirical Fact on Scope of Negation
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In order to confirm that (34) is unambiguous in that it lacks a partial negation reading, let us examine (35).

(35) "Zenin-ga Tanaka-sensei-ni home-rare-nakat-ta ga, suu-nin-wa
    all-nom Prof. Tanaka-by praise-passive-NEG-PAST but some-cl-top
    home-rare-ta.
    praise-passive-PAST

    (Lit.) ‘Everyone was not praised by Prof. Tanaka, but some of them were praised.’

In (35) the latter part of the sentence (suu-nin-wa home-rare-ta ‘some of them were praised’) does not contradict a partial negation interpretation; nevertheless, the sentence as a whole is awkward, which indicates that (34) lacks a partial negation interpretation (see Fn. 10). If (34) has a partial negation interpretation, the latter part of (35) should not be contradictory to the former part of it, which is contrary to fact.

As observed above, the direct passive does not induce scope ambiguity; therefore, a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement in the direct passive, which is in support of the Base Generation Approach.12

5.3 Variable binding in the direct passive

A test of whether variable binding is obtained in a given construction is similar to the test on scope ambiguity. Thus if the following configuration allows variable binding, it tells us that movement is involved in the configuration since QP needs to bind a pronoun for a bound variable reading.

(36) pronoun . . . Quantifier Phrase (QP) . . . t; . . .

Hoji (1995, 2003) observes that the so- series demonstratives can be construed as a bound variable in Japanese.13 Take (37) as an illustrative example. In the example (a) below the QP Sony-sae ‘even Sony’ binds the pronoun so-ko; hence the pronoun is construed as a bound variable reading; on the other hand, in the example (b) below the pronoun so-ko fails to be bound by the QP, being unacceptable on the intended reading.

(37) a. Sony-sae-ga so-ko,-no kogaisya-o uttae-ta.
    Sony-even-nom it-gen subsidiary-ACC sue-PAST
    ‘Even Sony sued its subsidiary.’

b. *So-ko,-no kogaisya-ga Sony-sae-o uttae-ta.
    it-gen subsidiary-nom Sony-even-ACC sue-PAST
    (Lit.) ‘Its subsidiary sued even Sony.’

As shown in (38), even if the pronoun so-ko in (37a) is scrambled to the sentence-initial position, the bound variable relation is still obtained:

(38) So-ko,-no kogaisya-o Sony-sae-ga uttae-ta.
    it-gen subsidiary-ACC Sony-even-nom sue-PAST
    ‘Even Sony sued its subsidiary.’
The grammaticality of (38) suggests that the PF precedence relation (i.e., QP must precede a pronoun at PF) is irrelevant to the availability of bound variable reading for so-ko (see also Hoji 2003; Ueyama 1998). (38) is grammatical since the QP Sony-sae 'even Sony' binds the trace of the so-ko at LF. Thus an LF condition applies to a bound pronoun.

(39) **Bound Variable Condition** (Ueyama 1998; Hoji 2003)
A pronoun must be bound by QP at LF in order for the pronoun to have a bound variable reading.

Now let us examine whether the bound variable reading is obtained in the direct passive. As shown in (40), the schema is that the passive subject contains a pronoun, which is bound by QP within the by-phrase.

(40) **Schema:** [NP (subject) ...pronoun ...] ...[by-phrase QP] ...V-passive

To this schema, the Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches yield the same prediction, according to which the pronoun in the passive subject can be construed as a bound variable since QP in the by-phrase is able to bind (the trace of) the pronoun at LF. On the other hand, the Base Generation Approach predicts that the pronoun in the passive subject cannot be construed as a bound variable since the pronoun fails to be bound by QP in the by-phrase at LF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Not Bound Variable Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: pronoun...QP-by... (pronoun)</td>
<td>LF: ...QP-by...pronoun</td>
<td>LF: pronoun...QP-by...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8A. Predictions on Variable Binding

For these predictions, the empirical fact is that, as shown in (41), the bound variable reading cannot be obtained.

(41) *So-ko-i-no it-gen kogaisya-ga subsidiary-nom Sony-i-ni-sae... sue-passive-past uttae-rare-ta. Sony-by-even sue-passive-past
(Lit.) 'Its subsidiary was sued by even Sony.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Not Bound Variable Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: pronoun...QP-by... (pronoun)</td>
<td>LF: ...QP-by...pronoun</td>
<td>LF: pronoun...QP-by...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>Not Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Not Bound Variable Reading</td>
<td>Not Bound Variable Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8B. Empirical Fact on Variable Binding

As observed in (41), the bound variable reading is impossible in the direct passive, which is in contrast to the scrambled sentence (38) that has been assumed to be derived by movement. The movement approaches for the direct passive – the Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches – cannot deal with the unavailability of a bound variable reading in the direct passive. In contrast, the Base Generation Ap-
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proach can easily account for the data as follows: in (41) a bound variable reading is impossible since the QP Sony-sae ‘even Sony’ in the by-phrase cannot bind the so-ko pronoun at LF.

5.4 V-V compound (long passive) in the direct passive

This subsection examines the long passive in the direct passive, which makes it clearer that the direct passive does not involve NP-movement of the passive subject.

In the sentences (42) below the verb is not a simple verb but a V-V compound predicate. (42a) is an active sentence with a V-V compound predicate; (42b) is its passive counterpart, which is called the long passive since in (42b) movement of the passive subject by passivization crosses two VPs (i.e., VP1 and VP2) due to a V-V compound predicate. Note that the passive sentence as in (42b) is the so-called niyotte-passive in which the by-phrase is expressed by niyotte rather than ni. There has been a consensus that the niyotte-passive involves NP-movement, as in Sensyu-ga [VP1 kantoku-niyotte [VP2 sensyu nagu-rare-ta]] ‘The player was hit by the manager’ (Kuroda 1979).

(42) a. Active sentence:
   Kantoku-ga [VP2 [VP1 sensyu-o naguri]-tuzuke]-ta.
   ‘The manager continuously hit the player.’

b. Long passive sentence:
   Sensyu-ga kantoku-niyotte [VP2 [VP1 sensyu nagu-rare]-tuzuke]-ta.
   ‘The player was continuously hit by the manager.’

Not every verb allows the long passive in Japanese; the availability of the long passive is dependent on a certain class of V2 (i.e., the second verb in V-V compound; e.g., in (42) V2 is -tuzuke ‘continue’), as summarized in (43):

(43) a. Type 1 Verb ⇒ Long passive is possible

b. Type 2 Verb ⇒ Long passive is impossible
   -kakeru ‘be about to’, -sokoneru ‘fail to’, -tukareru ‘be tired’
   (cf. Kageyama 1993, 1999)

V2 verbs in Type 1 allow the long passive (e.g., (42b)); on the other hand, V2 verbs in Type 2 do not allow the long passive, as in (44b)

(44) a. Kantoku-ga [VP2 [VP1 sensyu-o naguri]-kake]-ta.
   ‘The manager was about to hit the player.’

b. *Sensyu-ga kantoku-niyotte [VP2 [VP1 sensyu nagu-rare]-kake]-ta.
   ‘The player was about to be hit by the manager.’
A broad generalization to be drawn from the above data is as follows:\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{equation}
(45) \text{Blocking effect on long passive} \\
V_2 \text{ in Type 2 blocks NP-movement in passivization out of } V_1. \\
\text{NP}_1 [\text{VP}_2 [\text{VP}_1 t_1 \text{V}_1\text{-passive}] \text{-V}_2 ] \quad (V_2=\text{Type 2})
\end{equation}

What is significant here is that the (un)availability of the long passive in Type 2 verb is utilized as a test to see whether the direct passive involves movement or not. Let us examine whether the long passive is possible in the direct passive when \( V_2 \) is a Type 2 verb by using the following schema.

\begin{equation}
(46) \text{Schema: } \text{NP}_1(\text{subject}) \ldots [\text{by-phrase } \text{NP}_2] \ldots \text{V}_1\text{-passive-V}_2 \\
(V_2 \text{ in V-V compound is Type 2})
\end{equation}

If the direct passive involves NP-movement, either overt or PF movement, the long passive is predicted to be impossible when \( V_2 \) is a Type 2 verb, as in (44b), since the overt or PF movement of \( \text{NP}_1 \) is blocked by \( V_2 \) in the V-V compound. In contrast, the Base Generation Approach predicts that in (46) the long passive is possible since the passive subject \( \text{NP}_1 \) bears no relation with the V-V compound region: the passive subject \( \text{NP}_1 \) is not derived from the V-V compound region. Thus, the blocking effect on long passive is not observed under the Base Generation Approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>1. Overt Movement</th>
<th>2. PF Movement</th>
<th>3. Base Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Long passive is impossible</td>
<td>Long passive is impossible</td>
<td>Long passive is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF: \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}<em>1 t</em>{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]]</td>
<td>\text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}<em>1 t</em>{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]]</td>
<td>\text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\hline
Prediction & Long passive is impossible & Long passive is impossible & Long passive is possible \\
LF: \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 t_{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] & \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 t_{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] & \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Predictions on Long Passive}
\end{figure}

Consider the following example for the schema (46):

\begin{equation}
(47) \text{Sensyu-ga} \text{ kantoku-ni} [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 \text{hit-passive}]-\text{V}_2]-\text{ta}. \quad \text{(vis-à-vis (44b))} \\
'\text{The player was about to be hit by the manager.'}
\end{equation}

Surprisingly, even when \( V_2 \) is a Type 2 verb, long passive is possible in the direct passive: the example (47) clearly contrasts with the ungrammatical example (44b).\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\hline
Prediction & Long passive is impossible & Long passive is impossible & Long passive is possible \\
LF: \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 t_{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] & \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 t_{\text{NP}_1} \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] & \text{NP}_1 \ldots \text{NP}_2\text{-by} \ldots [\text{VP}_2[\text{VP}_1 \text{V}_1\text{-passive}]] \\
\hline
Fact & Long passive is possible & Long passive is possible & Long passive is possible \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Empirical Fact on Long Passive}
\end{figure}
The availability of the long passive in the direct passive shows that a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement. Under the Base Generation Approach for the direct passive, (47) is derived as illustrated below:

Since, under the Base Generation Approach, the passive subject is not derived by NP-movement out of the root verb phrase VP2-VP1, V2 in Type 2 does not block passivization. Hence, the long passive is possible for the direct passive even in the case that V2 is Type 2.17

5.5 Negative polarity item (NPI) in the direct passive

In this subsection I examine how a negative polarity item -sika is licensed in the direct passive, demonstrating that the direct passive does not involve NP-movement.

5.5.1 Linear Crossing Constraint (LCC)

It has been observed in the literature that a negative polarity item (e.g., -sika 'only') is required to have a negative morpheme -nai 'not' in the same clause, as the following examples indicate:

    Taro-NOM sushi-only eat-NEG-PAST
    'Taro ate only sushi.'

    Taro-NOM sushi-only eat-PAST
    (Lit.) 'Taro ate only sushi.'
c. "Hanako-wa | Taro-ga sushi-sika tabe-ta to | iwa-nakat-ta.
   Hanako-top Taro-nom sushi-only eat-past that say-NEG-past
   (Lit.) ‘Hanako didn’t say that Taro ate only sushi.’

An intriguing feature on Negative Polarity Item (NPI) -sika is the interaction between a wh-phrase and an NPI -sika: a wh-phrase cannot occur inside the c-command domain of an NPI -sika, as in (49a), but the ungrammaticality can be circumvented by scrambling a wh-phrase outside the c-command domain of an NPI, as in (49b) (cf. Takahashi 1990).

(49) a. *Taro-sika nani-o tabe-nakat-ta no?
   Taro-only what-ACC eat-NEG-PAST Q
   (Lit.) ‘What did only Taro eat?’

   b. Nani-o Taro-sika tabe-nakat-ta no?
      what-ACC Taro-only eat-NEG-PAST Q
      ‘What did only Taro eat?’

   (Lit.) ‘What did only Taro eat?’

In order to explain the (un)grammaticality of (49a–b), the Linear Crossing Constraint (hereafter, LCC) has been proposed by Tanaka (1997, 2003).18

(50) Linear Crossing Constraint (LCC)
   Nesting A'-dependencies are permissible, but crossing A'-dependencies are ruled out at LF.

An NPI -sika makes a linear dependency with its licenser, a negative morpheme -nai, and a wh-phrase also makes a linear dependency with its licenser, a question particle -no or -ka; the LCC prohibits these two dependencies from crossing. As illustrated below, (49a) is excluded as ungrammatical since these two dependencies, viz. a wh-phrase and a question particle -no; an NPI -sika and a negative morpheme -nai, cross. (49b) is permissible since these two dependencies do not cross; hence, the LCC accounts for the well-formedness of (49b).

(49) a’. Crossing dependencies ⇒ Not permissible representation:
   *Taro-sika nani-o tabe-nakat-ta no?

   b’. Nesting dependencies ⇒ Well-formed representation
      Nani-o Taro-sika tabe-nakat-ta no

5.5.2 NPI in the direct passive
In Japanese a passive subject can be scrambled long-distance to the sentence-initial position, crossing a clause boundary.

   which-book-nom Taro-top Hanako-by criticize-PASSIVE-PAST Q
   know-prog-pres
   ‘Taro knows which book was criticized by Hanako.’
In a sentence such as (51), the long-distance scrambled wh-phrase dono-hon ‘which book’ has been assumed to be put back to its original position (i.e., a position where it resides at D-structure) in the LF component, in order to fix its scope by the question particle -ka, which is called radical reconstruction (Saito 1989, 1992).

Three approaches assign distinct LF representations for (51) when the wh-phrase is reconstructed to its original, D-structure, position at LF in accordance with radical reconstruction.19

(52) a. Overt Movement Approach
   LF: Taro-wa | Hanako-ni dono-hon-ga hihans-are-ta ka | sit-te-iru.

b. PF Movement Approach
   LF: Taro-wa | Hanako-ni dono-hon-ga hihans-are-ta ka | sit-te-iru.

c. Base Generation Approach
   LF: Taro-wa | dono-hon-ga Hanako-ni hihans-are-ta ka | sit-te-iru.

In the case that an NPI -sika is attached to the by-phrase Hanako-ni in (51) and the embedded verb hihans- ‘criticize’ is negated, the following predictions are yielded: Figure 10A. Predictions on NPI

Under the Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches, the two dependencies – viz. a wh-phrase and a question particle -ka; an NPI -sika and a negative morpheme -nai – cross at LF, yielding ungrammaticality, but on the other hand they do not cross at LF under the Base Generation Approach.

With this much as background, consider the following example (53):

(53) Dono-hon-ga Taro-wa | Hanako-ni-sika hihans-are-nakat-ta ka | sit-te-iru.
    know-prog-pres ‘Taro knows which book was criticized by only Hanako.’

The grammaticality of (53) suggests that the two dependencies do not cross at LF, which is in support of the Base Generation Approach. The Overt Movement and the PF Movement Approaches cannot give a reasonable account of the grammaticality. Figure 10B. Empirical Fact on NPI
Summarizing this section, I have observed various aspects of the Japanese direct passive (Figure 4 to Figure 10), with an attempt to decide which approach among the three can capture the properties of the direct passive in Japanese. Surprisingly enough, all the pieces of empirical evidence I presented above converge to support only the Base Generation Approach for the Japanese direct passive. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Base Generation Approach is the correct description of the Japanese direct passive. Although the Overt Movement Approach, i.e., the NP-movement view for the direct passive, has long been accepted as a standard view for the direct passive in Japanese, now the ‘standard’ view for the Japanese direct passive is the Base Generation Approach, such that the direct passive does not involve NP-movement of the passive subject.20

6. Elaborating the base generation approach: Syntactic structure and derivation of the direct passive in Japanese

A closer inspection on the behavior of the direct passive led to the conclusion that the Japanese direct passive should be analyzed under the Base Generation Approach. However, some crucial issues remain unsolved; for example, how is the direct passive derived under the Base Generation Approach? What kind of syntactic structure is assigned to the direct passive? This section aims to deal with the derivation and the syntactic structure of the direct passive under the Base Generation Approach.

6.1 Theta-assignment in the direct passive under the base generation approach

Adopting the Base Generation Approach, a question immediately arises as to how a passive subject gets a theta-role from its verb. In the generative tradition, a verb assigns its theta-role(s) to its argument(s) in the minimal domain, VP. Recall that I assume, crucially, that a passive subject is base-generated in [Spec, TP] throughout the derivation (see Fn. 5). That is, it is not the case that a passive subject is first posited in [Spec, VP] in line with the VP-internal subject hypothesis and moves to [Spec, TP]. Assuming that the by-phrase is an adjunct to VP (i.e., the by-phrase is structurally higher than [Spec, VP]), if a passive subject is first generated in [Spec, VP], the various empirical facts observed in Section 5 cannot be captured correctly. For instance, (21) is wrongly predicted to be grammatical since the antecedent in the by-phrase which is higher than [Spec, VP] is able to bind the anaphor in the passive subject resided in [Spec, VP]; (34) is also wrongly predicted to be ambiguous since Neg can c-command the trace of the universal quantifier in the passive subject in [Spec, VP], allowing the interpretation in which Neg takes scope over the universal quantifier. In this way, a passive subject should not be generated in [Spec, VP] under the Base Generation Approach.

As stated just above, since a passive subject is not generated in [Spec, VP] and is not close to its verb, it cannot be assigned a theta-role within VP. Hence, it is neces-
sary to elaborate on how to assign a theta-role to the base-generated passive subject in \([\text{Spec, TP}]\). There are two solutions: one is ‘\textit{Theta-transmission via pro}’ (Section 6.1.1) and the other is ‘\textit{Verb-raising}’ (Section 6.1.2).

### 6.1.1 Theta-transmission via pro

First, let us see how a passive subject is theta-marked by theta-transmission via pro, which will be rejected later. Similar to the Base Generation Approach I pursue here, some researchers (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992; Matsuoka 2002) have advocated the view that a passive subject is base-generated in \([\text{Spec, TP}]\); they posit an empty pronoun, pro, in an object position, as illustrated below.

(54)

\[
\text{TP} \\
\text{NP} \\
Sono-otokonoko-ga} \\
\text{VP} \\
T \\
\text{T} \\
\text{ta} \\
\text{NP} \\
Sono-onnanoko-ni \\
\text{VP} \\
V' \\
V \\
\theta\text{-transmission} \\
\text{pro} \\
\theta:\text{patient}
\]

In this structure a theta-role for the passive subject, \textit{sono-otokonoko-ga}, is first assigned to the co-indexed pro in the object position, and is transmitted via pro to the passive subject. That is, pro mediates between the passive subject in \([\text{Spec, TP}]\) and the verb. In this way the passive subject which stays in \([\text{Spec, TP}]\) gets a theta-role from a verb.

The pro analysis appears to work well, yet it is faced with an empirical problem. Consider the following pair of sentences. (55a) is an active sentence where two quantifiers are contained, and it has been pointed out in the literature that it exhibits scope rigidity. (55b) is a right-dislocated sentence of (55a); it is an intriguing observation that (55b) is scopally ambiguous as compared with (55a).

(55)

\begin{enumerate}
\item[a.] \textit{Active sentence:}
Dareka-ga dono-ronbun-mo yon-da. (Unambiguous: \(\exists y; \forall z \cdot \exists y\))
\textit{someone-nom every-thesis-emp read-past}
\textit{‘Someone read every thesis.’}
\item[b.] \textit{Right-dislocation:}
Dareka-ga pro_1 yon-da yo, dono-ronbun_mo. (Ambiguous: \(\exists y; \forall z \cdot \exists y\))
\textit{someone-nom read-past particle every-thesis-emp}
(Lit.) ‘Someone read it, every thesis.’
\end{enumerate}
Recall that, according to Kuno (1978) and Tanaka (2001), an empty pronoun, pro, is posited in the object position in right-dislocation. What is crucial here is that scope ambiguity observed in (55b) suggests that pro can be computed in scope determination although it is phonetically unrealized. The scope ambiguity of (55b) is explained as follows. As illustrated in (56), assuming that a right-dislocated element is adjoined rightward to TP, the quantified NP (QNP) *dono-ronbun* ‘every thesis’ c-commands the other QNP *dareka* ‘someone’; hence, the reading in which *dono-ronbun* takes scope over *dareka* (∀ > ∃) is obtained. Concerning the other reading in which *dareka* takes scope over *dono-ronbun* (∃ > ∀), *dareka* c-commands pro coindexed with *dono-ronbun* although *dareka* does not directly c-command the right-dislocated *dono-ronbun*.

Given that pro is assumed to be counted in scope computation, scope ambiguity found in (55b) is naturally accounted for; otherwise, it remains mysterious since *dareka* never c-commands *dono-ronbun* in the derivation.

Based on the observation that pro is counted in scope computation, the pro analysis in the direct passive proposed by Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992) and Matsuoka (2002) makes an incorrect prediction such that a direct passive construction yields scope ambiguity, contrary to fact (see Section 5.2.1, Fn. 12). Let us consider (57).

(57) Dareka-ga daremo-ni home-rare-ta. (Unambiguous: ∃ > ∀; ? ∀ > ∃)
    someone-nom everyone-by praise-passive-past
    ‘Someone was praised by everyone.’ (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992:7)

The pro analysis predicts that the sentence (57) induces scope ambiguity. As illustrated in (58) below, the reading, *dareka* ‘someone’ > *daremo* ‘everyone’, is obtained since the NP *dareka* in the passive subject c-commands the NP *daremo* in the by-phrase. More importantly, in the pro analysis, the other reading, *daremo* ‘everyone’ > *dareka* ‘someone’, is predicted to be induced since the NP *daremo* ‘everyone’ c-commands pro coindexed with *dareka* ‘someone’ in the passive subject although the former does not directly c-command the latter.
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(58)

```
TP
  NP Dareka_ga
  VP ta
  NP daremo-ni
  VP
    V' pro
    V home-rare
```

However, the fact is that the sentence (57) is said to be scopally unambiguous. Only the wide scope reading of dareka is permissible, which means that pro cannot be posited in an object position. Therefore, the pro analysis according to which pro is posited in an object position in direct passives is not maintained.

6.1.2 Theta-assignment by verb-raising

As has been discussed above, theta-transmission via pro cannot be a solution to an issue of how to assign a theta-role to a base-generated passive subject. Hence, it is necessary to look for another way for theta-marking, which, I pursue here, is Verb-Raising (V-to-T raising)(cf. Koizumi 2000; Bošković & Takahashi 1998). As noted, a passive subject is base-generated in [Spec, TP] which is ‘far away’ from a verb. In the V-to-T raising analysis, a verb raises to T, and, by raising to T, it can directly assign a theta-role to a base-generated passive subject, as illustrated in (59); that is, a theta-domain is extended from VP to TP by verb raising to T.

(59) V-to-T raising

```
TP
  NP Sono-otokonoko_ga
  VP
    T
    NP Sono-onnanoko_ni
    VP
      V V T
        T
          V
            t_1
            Verb raising to T
```

Supporting evidence for the V-to-T raising in the direct passive comes from the stress assignment. Cinque (1993) provides a theory of sentence stress; its points are summarized in (60):
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\((60)\) Stress Assignment Rule:

- The Nuclear Stress Rule assigns main stress to the most deeply embedded phrase in a sentence.
- When two phrases are in a sister relation, the embeddedness is determined by the direction of syntactic projection: i.e., the right node bears stress in right-branching structures; the left node bears stress in left-branching structures.

In Japanese the preverbal phrase normally bears main stress in a neutral sentence. Hence, in the direct passive, sentence stress is found on the by-phrase, as in \((61b)\) (capitals indicate main stress). Assuming the theory of stress assignment proposed by Cinque (1993), if a verb is not overtly raising to T, it is the most deeply embedded phrase in a sentence. Hence, a verb is incorrectly assigned main stress by the stress assignment rule, as in \((61a)\). If a verb moves overtly to T, the most deeply embedded phrase is the by-phrase, sono-onnanoko-ni ‘by the girl’; hence, the correct sentence stress is assigned as in \((61b)\).

\[(61)\]

- \#Sono-otokonoko-ga sono-onnanoko-ni KE-RARE-TA.
  - the-boy-nom the-girl-by kick-passive-past
  - ‘The boy was kicked by the girl.’
- Sono-otokonoko-ga SONO-ONNANOKO-NI ke-rare-ta.
  - the-boy-nom the-girl-by kick-passive-past
  - ‘The boy was kicked by the girl.’

On the basis of the stress assignment in the direct passive, it is reasonable to suppose that a verb overtly raises to T in the direct passive.

Summarizing this subsection, as observed above, Verb-raising is more promising than Theta-transmission via pro. Therefore, it is natural to assume that a passive subject which is based-generated in [Spec, TP] gets a theta-role from a verb in the manner that a verb overtly raises to T and directly assigns a theta-role to the base-generated passive subject.

\[6.2\] Passive morpheme -rare

Some researchers have claimed that the passive morpheme -(r)are constitutes an independent verb, which indicates that in the Japanese direct passive there are two layers of verb phrases: one is the passive morpheme, and the other is a root verb (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992; Matsuoka 2002). However, I am opposed to the idea, arguing that the passive morpheme -(r)are in the direct passive is not an independent verb but an affix attached to a verb (cf. Kuno 1973; Kuroda 1979).

It has been argued that the passive morpheme -(r)are functions as an independent verb on the grounds that it imposes some selectional restriction on a passive subject on its own (cf. Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992; Matsuoka 2002). Consider the following example which shows that the selectional restriction is imposed on passive subjects:

\[(62)\]

- *Newton-no housoku-ga Tanaka-sensei-ni syoumeis-are-ta.
  - Newton-gen law-nom Prof. Tanaka-by prove-passive-past
  - ‘Newton’s law was proven by Prof. Tanaka.’
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(62) is said to be unacceptable. This has been considered to indicate that the selectional restriction by the passive morpheme -(r)are requires that a passive subject be an entity that can be “(negatively) affected” (Kuroda 1979; Hoshi 1991). In the example (62) the passive subject Newton-no housoku ‘Newton's law’ is an immutable NP and cannot be interpreted as an affectee; therefore, (62) is said to violate the selectional restriction imposed by the passive morpheme -(r)are, and is unacceptable (cf. Hoshi 1991).21

However, the selectional restriction which is said to be imposed by the passive morpheme -(r)are is not so robust. First, consider the following sentence (63), which is a minimal pair of the sentence (62) except the case particle on the passive subject: it is a nominative case-marker -ga in (62) and a topic case-marker -wa in (63).

(63) ?Newton-no housoku-wa Tanaka-sensei-ni syoumeis-are-ta.
   Newton-gen law-top Prof. Tanaka-by prove-passive-past
   ‘I ti sN e w t o n ’ s l aw w a sp r o v e nb yP r o f . T a n a k a . ’

In contrast to (62), the example (63) is highly acceptable. Whatever treatment is taken for a topic-marker -wa in the passive subject, the high acceptability of (63) cannot be reasonably accounted for by the selectional restriction imposed by the passive morpheme. (63) is incorrectly ruled out due to a violation of the selectional restriction since the passive subject Newton-no housoku ‘Newton’s law’ in (63) is also an immutable NP and cannot be an affectee.

Next, consider the example (64) in comparison with (62):

(64) Touji, Newton-no housoku-ga ookuno-kagakusya-ni
   at that time Newton-gen law-nom many-scientist-by
   hihans-are-ta koto-wa amari sir-are-te-i-nai.
   criticize-passive-past that-top well know-passive-prog-pres-NEG
   ‘I ti sn o tw e l lk n o w nt h a tN e w t o n ’ s l aw w a sp r i t i z i z e db ym a n ys c i e n t i s t s a t t h a tt i m e . ’

Although the passive subject in (64) is also an immutable NP which is exactly the same as the passive subject in (62), (64) is fully acceptable, which is in sharp contrast to (62). If the passive morpheme -(r)are alone imposes the selectional restriction on the passive subject, the example (64) should be unacceptable as the example (62) since the passive subject in (64) is also an immutable NP and cannot be an affectee. Thus it is dubious that the passive morpheme -(r)are is set up as an independent verb on the grounds that it imposes the selectional restriction on the passive subject. The acceptability of the sentence (64) suggests that it is true that some selectional restriction is imposed on the passive subject, but the restriction is not imposed by the passive morpheme -(r)are alone. It is a combination of the root verb and the passive morpheme -(r)are that imposes the selectional requirement on the passive subject. In (64) the whole predicate hihans-are ‘be criticized’ in which the root verb hihans- ‘criticize’ and the passive morpheme -(r)are is combined can negatively affect the inanimate passive subject Newton-no housoku ‘Newton's law’, whereas in (62) the whole predicate syoumeis-are ‘be proven’ is hard to negatively affect the inanimate passive subject Newton-no housoku ‘Newton’s law’, being unacceptable.22
There is further evidence showing that the passive morpheme -(r)are cannot be an independent verb; rather it is an affix attached to a verb. First, consider (65). An independent verb can be detached from the root verb by other elements: for example, the verb -kureru ‘favor’ in te-kureru ‘do me/us a favor of’ form can be detached from the root verb by the Q particle -mo, as exemplified in (65b):

(65) a. tasuke-te-kure-mo-si-ta  
   help-favor-q-do-PAST  

b. tasuke-te-mo-kure-ta  
   help-q-favor-PAST

If the passive morpheme -(r)are behaves as an independent verb, it is expected that the passive morpheme -(r)are can be detached from a verb as in (65b). However, it cannot be detached from a verb by other elements: in (66b) the Q particle -mo cannot separate the passive morpheme -(r)are from the verb tasuke- ‘help’.

(66) a. tasuke-rare-mo-si-ta  
   help-passive-q-do-PAST  

b. *tasuke-mo-rare-ta  
   help-q-PASSIVE-PAST

The distinct behavior of -(r)are from an independent verb implies that the passive morpheme -(r)are may not be an independent verb. If the passive morpheme -(r)are is an independent verb, the contrast given above remains mysterious.

Furthermore, let us examine VP-preposing in the direct passive. Japanese allows VP-preposing when a verb has a focus particle -sae ‘even’, as in (67):

(67) VP-preposing:  

Hanako-by kick-PASSIVE-even Taro-NOM do-PAST  
(Lit.) ‘Get kicked by Hanako, Taro did.’

Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992) argue that the passive morpheme -(r)are is an independent verb and assigns an external theta-role to a passive subject (e.g., Taro-ga in (67)). Consider the example (68), which I call double passive for convenience: two passive morphemes are contained in one passive.

(68) Double passive:  

Hanako-ni ke-rare-sae   Taro-ga s-are-ta.  
Hanako-by kick-PASSIVE-even Taro-NOM do-PASSIVE-PAST  
(Lit.) ‘Get kicked by Hanako, Taro was done.’

If the passive morpheme -(r)are is a theta-assigner as an independent verb as argued by Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992), this sentence should be ungrammatical since there is no argument to which the passive morpheme -(r)are on s-are ‘be done’ discharges its external theta-role. The passive morpheme -(r)are on s-are ‘be done’ cannot assign its external theta-role to the passive subject Taro since, according to Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992), the passive subject is already assigned a theta-role by the other passive morpheme -(r)are on ke-rare ‘be kicked’. Thus, the acceptability of (68) suggests that the
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passive morpheme -(r)are is not a theta-role assigner as an independent verb, but it is, indeed, an affix attached to a verb in lexicon.

To sum up this subsection, it is reasonable to suppose, in line with the null hypothesis, that the passive morpheme -(r)are is not an independent verb; it is an affix attached to a root verb.\footnote{\textsuperscript{23}} Hence, there is only one layer of verb phrase in the syntactic structure of the direct passive, not two VP layers.

In this section I argued that (i) a base-generated passive subject in [Spec, TP] can be assigned a theta-role from a verb due to Verb Raising (V-to-T raising) in the derivation, and (ii) the passive morpheme -(r)are is an affix rather than an independent verb; hence, the syntactic structure of the direct passive has a single VP layer.

7. Concluding remarks

Drawing on several pieces of empirical evidence pertaining to the Japanese direct passive, I have argued that the direct passive does not involve NP-movement. Thus, a passive subject is not derived by NP-movement; rather it is base-generated in [Spec, TP] throughout the derivation, which is in sharp contrast to the English passive which involves NP-movement of a passive subject. This property in the Japanese direct passive is unique as compared with the English passive. Moreover, I have demonstrated that a passive subject is directly theta-marked by V-to-T raising in the derivation, and the syntactic structure is simplex in that there is only one VP layer in the verbal domain; the passive morpheme -(r)are does not constitute an independent verb phrase on its own. The main points are illustrated in Figure 11.

![Figure 11. Derivation and structure of the direct passive](image-url)

The several pieces of empirical evidence I presented, which have demonstrated that the direct passive does not involve NP-movement, can be utilized to probe into the properties of other types of passives, such as the niyotte-passive, the indirect passive, and the possessive passive, etc. I leave the application of the empirical evidence to other passives for future research.
Notes

* This paper summarizes the presentations made at the Workshop on Passive at the 20th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics held in Helsinki in January, 2004. I am grateful to the audience of the 20th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, Workshop on Passive, and Mikinari Matsuoka, and Tomokazu Takehisa for their valuable comments and criticisms on various aspects of this paper. My special thanks go to Werner Abraham and Larisa Leisiö for the opportunity to publish the paper in this volume. The research reported here was partially supported by the Government of Canada Awards and McGill Major Arthur Tagge Fellowship. Any remaining errors and inadequacies are of course my own responsibility.

1. The examples are glossed as follows: nom = Nominative, acc = Accusative, gen = Genitive, loc = Locative, dat = Dative, past = Past Tense, pres = Present Tense, prog = Progressive, passive = Passive morpheme, neg = Negation, q = Question particle, top = Topic, cl = Classifier, emp = Emphatic particle, conj = Conjunction.

2. Japanese was argued to be a “non-configurational language”, which means that Japanese has no VP (cf. Hale 1980), but the idea was refuted by Saito (1985) on the basis of evidence from scrambling and pronominal reference in Japanese. Since then it has been taken as a standard assumption that Japanese has VP, and a flat structure was assigned to VP, as shown in (5). In the current framework of generative grammar, however, the phrase structure is assumed to be the binary branching; therefore, the flat structure for VP such as (5) is not the correct description of VP in the recent framework.

3. Even if the VP-internal subject hypothesis is adopted, the numeral quantifier in (7b) does not c-command either the subject NP or its trace in [Spec, VP].

4. The LF Movement Approach is logically possible but not available for the Japanese direct passive. The desired PF sequence for the direct passive is ‘NP-ga XP-ni V-rare’. The passive subject is in the object position at the initial stage of the derivation, as in ‘XP NP V-rare’; thus, LF movement of the passive subject cannot produce the correct PF sequence. In the LF Movement Approach there can be another possibility that the passive subject is base-generated in the passive subject position as the Base Generation Approach (i.e., NP XP V-rare) and LF movement of the passive subject takes place, yielding the LF representation [ t NP XP NP V-rare ]. This can produce the correct PF sequence for the direct passive; however, assuming that downward movement is prohibited in the grammar, this possibility is rejected.

5. I do not take the position that a subject is first generated in [Spec, VP], and then moves to a higher clause, TP (the VP-internal subject hypothesis). Thus the Base Generation Approach which I pursue here does not involve even movement from [Spec, VP] to [Spec, TP] (see Section 6.1 as to why the VP-internal subject hypothesis should not be adopted in the Base Generation Approach). As will be extensively discussed in Section 6.2, I assume that theta-marking to a passive subject base-generated in [Spec, TP] is done by V-to-T raising.

6. As shown in (i–b) below, in German subject coreference yields nothing but ungrammaticality in passive constructions, which possibly poses a problem for Binding Condition A in general (Abraham, personal communication). The passive subject Er ‘he’ is capable of binding the reflexive phrase in the by-phrase; nevertheless, it is ungrammatical.

(i) a. Er_1 sah sich_1 im Spiegel.
   he-NOM see-PAST himself-ACC in the mirror
   ‘He saw himself in the mirror.’
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he-nom be-past by himself in the mirror see-past participle

(Lit.) ‘He was seen by himself in the mirror.’

At least in Japanese, however, the problem does not arise. Japanese equivalents are fully grammatical: Japanese allows reflexives inside the by-phrase that are bound, as in (ii) below (see also (24)):

(ii) Taro i-ga kare-zisin-no musuko-ni hihans-are-ta.

Taro-nom himself-gen son-by criticize-passive-past

(Lit.) ‘Taro was criticized by a son of himself.’

It is grammatical with respect to Binding Condition A simply because the passive subject Taro can bind the reflexive kare-zisin ‘himself’ in the by-phrase.

7. As to Binding Condition A in Japanese, caution is in order. In Japanese there are some forms that correspond to the English anaphor ‘-self’: zibun ‘oneself’, zibun-zisin ‘myself’, etc. Their behavior substantially differs from kare-zisin ‘himself’ used in (18a, b) with respect to Binding Condition A. Unlike English, zibun ‘oneself’ allows long-distance binding, as shown in (i):

(i) Jiro j-wa [Taro-ga zibun-ni/’no yuujin-o uragit-ta to] it-ta.

Jiro-top Taro-nom oneself-gen friend-acc betray-past that say-past

(Lit.) ‘Jiro said that Taro betrayed a friend of oneself.’

The anaphor zibun-zisin ‘myself’ also allows long-distance binding, but it is marginal as compared with (i), as in (ii):

(ii) Jiro j-wa [Taro-ga zibun-zisin-ni/’no yuujin-o uragit-ta to] it-ta.

Jiro-top Taro-nom myself-gen friend-acc betray-past that say-past

(Lit.) ‘Jiro said that Taro betrayed a friend of myself.’

8. Someone might argue that if the by-phrase is PP, the antecedent NP within the by-phrase cannot c-command anything outside the by-phrase (cf. Miyagawa 1989). However, Matsuoka (2002: 80–86) presents convincing evidence showing that the by-phrase in the direct passive is not PP but a bare NP (i.e., ‘ni’ by the by-phrase is not a postposition, but a dative case marker). Even if it turns out to be PP, it has been assumed in the literature that PP is invisible for c-commanding; thus an element within a PP node is able to c-command elements outside the PP node, as evident in examples such as (i):

(i) It seems [pp to every boy, ] that his, first girl friend is the most unforgettable. (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992: 14)

In (i) the pronoun his is construed as a bound variable, which suggests that the NP every boy inside PP is able to c-command the pronoun his.

9. It has been widely accepted in the literature that, unlike English, an active sentence in Japanese is unambiguous (i.e., exhibiting scope rigidity), as shown in (31a). However, some native speakers of Japanese detect scope ambiguity even in the active sentence, as shown in (i):

(i) Dareka-ga uti-no subete-no sensyu-o bikoosi-te-iru. (Ambiguous: someone-nom our-gen all-gen athlete-acc shadow-prog-pres \( \exists > \forall, \forall > \exists \))

‘Someone is shadowing every athlete of ours.’ (Ueyama 1999: 18, Fn. 24)

10. The lack of total negation in (32) was hard for some of my informants to observe (i.e., some of them reported that a total negation interpretation is available in (32)). Consider the example (i) below
in which the latter part of the sentence contradicts the total negation interpretation. If the sentence (32) is judged to have a total negation interpretation alone, the sentence (i) should be unnatural.

(i) Tanaka-sensei-wa Prof. Tanaka-
zenin-o home-rare-ta. 

Prof. Tanaka did not praise everyone, but some of them were praised.

However, those who judged (32) as having a total negation interpretation reported that the following sentence is natural. This indicates that they, in fact, detect a partial negation interpretation.

11. If the Scope Principle also applies at PF, the PF Movement Approach predicts that the schema (33) induces scope ambiguity, which is contrary to fact.

12. Kitagawa & Kuroda (1992) independently make a similar observation that the direct passive does not show clear scope ambiguity by examining an interaction of two quantifiers, as in (i):

(i) Dareka-ga someone-nom 
edaremo-ni everyone-by home-rare-ta.

(\textit{Unambiguous: } \exists > \forall \neq \exists \neq \forall)

'Someone was praised by everyone.' (Kitagawa & Kuroda 1992: 7)

13. It is well known in the Japanese linguistics literature that, unlike English (as in (ii) below), the overt pronoun karena ‘he’ cannot be construed as a bound variable, as in (i):

(i) *Daremo-i-ga everyone-nom 

Everyone broke the toy that he had made.'

(ii) Everyone i broke the toy [ that hei had made ].

14. Among the so- series demonstratives, there is a so-no-NP ‘the NP’. According to Hoji (2003) and Ueyama (1998), the so-no-NP must satisfy the PF precedence relation (i.e., QP must precede a so-no-NP), as in (i):

(i) *So-i-no [koreanaiya-no subsidiari-gen seihin-o product-acc Sony-sae-ga Sony-even-nom sue-past 

(Lit.) ‘Even Sony sued the products of the subsidiary.’

15. It seems that the constraint, Blocking effect on long passive, does not hold for movement in general. To take an example, (i) is a scrambled sentence; V2 in Type 2 does not block scrambling out of VP1.

(i) Sensyu-o player-acc kantoku-ga manager-nom
sensyu-naguri-kake-rare-ta. (hit-be about to-past

'The manager was about to hit the player.'

16. The verbal morphology naguri-kake-rare-ta is also possible although it sounds less natural than nagu-rare-kake-ta such as in (44b) and (47). Even in the case of naguri-kake-rare-ta, the contrast between the direct passive and the niyotte-passive, as in *(44b) vs. (47), still holds:

(i) *Sensyu-ga player-nom kantoku-niyotte manager-by naguri-kake-rare-ta.

hit-be about to-past

'The manager was about to hit the player.'


hit-be about to-past

'The player was about to be hit by the manager.'
17. This contrast is well observed in an animate passive subject such as (44b) and (47). A question then arises as to the contrast between (44b) and (47) holds in an inanimate passive subject. It is difficult to examine the question since it has been observed that the direct passive is not compatible with an inanimate subject such as (i) below:

(i) *Kono-machi-wa kokuren-ni kensetsus-are-ta.
   this-city-top the United Nations-by build-PASSIVE-PAST

cf.
Kono-machi-wa kokuren-nyotte kensetsus-are-ta.
this-city-top the United Nations-by build-PASSIVE-PAST
'This city was built by the United Nations.'

There are, however, some examples in which the direct passive allows an inanimate subject as in (ii):

(ii) Kono-machi-wa America-gun-ni hakais-are-ta.
   this-city-top American Army-by destroy-PASSIVE-PAST

cf.
Kono-machi-wa America-gun-nyotte hakais-are-ta.
this-city-top American Army-by destroy-PASSIVE-PAST
'This city was destroyed by American Army.'

Here let us observe whether the contrast holds even in an inanimate passive subject by using the example (ii) which allows an inanimate subject. Strangely enough, the contrast found in an animate passive subject as in (44b) and (47) is subtle in an inanimate passive subject, as illustrated in (iii):

(iii) a. Kono-machi-wa America-gun-ni hakais-are-kake-ta.
   this-city-top American Army-by destroy-PASSIVE-be about to-PAST

b. *Kono-machi-wa America-gun-nyotte hakais-are-kake-ta. (vis-à-vis (44b))
   this-city-top American Army-by destroy-PASSIVE-be about to-PAST
'That city was about to be destroyed by American Army.'

So far, it is not evident why the contrast is well observed only in an animate subject as in (44b) and (47). It calls for further investigation as to why the animacy of a passive subject affects the (im)possibility of the long passive and how the difference between an animate subject and an inanimate subject in the long passive (if any) is treated.

18. Although Tanaka (1997) first characterized the LCC as an S-structure condition, Tanaka (2003) reconsiders it as an LF condition. See Ariji (2004) as to further evidence showing that the LCC should be an LF condition.

19. According to Saito (1989, 1992), the wh-phrase which is radically reconstructed to the D-structure position subsequently moves to [Spec, CP] to fix its scope and is in the Spec-Head (CP) relation with a question particle in C at LF. However, the idea that the reconstructed wh-phrase finally lands in [Spec, CP] does not have sufficient empirical support, and there is another option for fixing the scope of a wh-phrase: Q-binding (a Q particle in C binds a wh-phrase to fix its scope). If a wh-phrase moves to [Spec, CP] to fix its scope at LF, the ungrammatical case (49a) is wrongly predicted to be grammatical in the light of the LCC since the two dependencies do not cross at LF. Under Q-binding the two dependencies in (49a) do cross at LF, being ungrammatical in the light of the LCC. Thus, the reconstructed wh-phrase does not need to move to [Spec, CP] to fix its scope; rather Q-binding fixes its scope. Hence, in (51) the LCC applies to the wh-phrase at the reconstructed position, not to the wh-phrase in [Spec, CP]. Note that, under the account of the LCC, the grammaticality of (49b) suggests that short-scrambling, not long-distance scrambling, is not subject to reconstruction at LF.
If in (49b) the short-scrambled *wh*-phrase *nani* ‘what’ is reconstructed to its initial position at LF, the two dependencies cross, and it is incorrectly ruled out as ungrammatical by the LCC.

20. There are some psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic studies which imply that the direct passive in Japanese involves NP-movement, either overt movement or PF movement (e.g., Hagiwara 1993). However, the empirical data presented by such psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic studies can be translated to the Base Generation Approach. Thus the psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic evidence is not unequivocal for the NP-movement view. See Ariji (2003) for more detailed discussion on this issue.

21. In contrast to the direct passive, the *niyotte*-passive does not have the selectional restriction imposed on a passive subject:

(i) Newton-no housoku-ga Tanaka-sensei-niyotte syoumeis-are-ta.
Newton-gen law-nom Prof. Tanaka-by prove-PASSIVE-PAST
‘Newton’s law was proven by Prof. Tanaka.’

22. The notion ‘affectedness’ is vague and has been quite controversial among researchers. There are indeed some examples which are hard to explain by the notion ‘affectedness’. As shown in the examples below, the contrast found between (62) and (64) is not clear-cut in some cases: in the examples (i) and (ii), the whole predicate (i.e., the root verb plus the passive morpheme) does not ‘negatively affect’ the passive subject; nevertheless, the sentences are actually perfectly acceptable.

(i) a. Kono-hon-wa ookuno-hito-ni ais-are-te-iru.
   this book-top a lot of people-by love-PASSIVE-PROG-PRES
   (Lit.) ‘This book is being loved by a lot of people.’

   b. Kono-hon-wa ookuno-hito-ni yom-are-te-iru.
   this book-top a lot of people-by read-PASSIVE-PROG-PRES
   (Lit.) ‘This book is being read by a lot of people.’

(ii) Kaikai-ga gityoo-ni sengens-are-te-iru-toki, jisin-ga
   opening-nom chairperson-by announce-PASSIVE-PROG-PRES-when earthquake-nom
   occur-past
   ‘When the opening of the meeting was announced by the chairperson, an earthquake occurred.’

   cf. ‘Kaikai-ga gityoo-ni sengens-are-ta.
   opening-nom chairperson-by announce-PASSIVE-PAST
   ‘The opening of the meeting was announced by the chairperson.’ (Inoue 1976: 83)

This indicates that the notion ‘affectedness’ has to be refined in more systematic ways. To fully discuss this problem is beyond the scope of this paper.

23. There is additional (indirect) evidence which shows that the passive morpheme -(r)are is not an independent verb. There are idioms which are formed by using the passive morpheme -(r)are.

(i) nikum-are-guti
   hate-PASSIVE-mouth
   ‘Idiom meaning: malicious remarks’

Assuming that an idiom is formed and stored in lexicon, the existence of such an idiom involving -(r)are implies that the passive morpheme -(r)are is attached to a verb in lexicon, constituting one unit in lexicon.
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Formal Approaches

B. Actor demotion
Passive as a feature-suppression operation*
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The major goal of this article is to examine some properties of the passive cross-linguistically and the ensuing ramifications for a universal theory of the passive. Building on my previous work (Kallulli 2006a, b), this article argues for a uniform derivation of the passive and the anticausative construction. The main claim is that passives and anticausatives differ only with respect to the respective building blocks that enter syntactic computation but both arise through the same operation, namely suppression of a feature in $v$. Passive constructions across languages can be made compatible by relegating the differences to simple combinatorial properties of verb and prepositional types and their interactions with other event functors/aspectual operators, which are in turn encoded differently morphologically across languages.

1. Introduction

It is well known that in many languages, notably Indo-European, anticausatives systematically involve morphological marking that is shared by reflexive and/or passive predicates, involving a pronoun, a clitic or verbal inflection. In this paper, based primarily on data from Albanian, which has two distinct conjugational paradigms, namely active vs. non-active, I will try to account for the common properties of passives and anticausatives, which is presumably what enables their uniform formal expression. Specifically, I will present arguments in favour of the view that both the passive and the anticausative formations can be formally and uniformly derived by adopting the idea that non-active (and/or other unaccusative or intransitivizing) morphology operates in a linear and therefore fully predictable way in the syntax, by suppressing the first feature in a predicate structure (Kallulli 2006a, b). The crucial observation is that while in (adult) English passives sanction $by$-phrases and anticausatives sanction $from$-phrases (but not vice versa), languages that collapse (at least some of the time) the morphological distinction between passives and anticausatives (e.g. Albanian/Greek/ Latin) typically also fail to differentiate between $by$- and $from$-phrases (or their distribution), reminiscent of English child language. The central claims that I put forward are: (i) universally the passive and the anticausative arise from the suppression of a feature in little $v$ that encodes the ontological event type of the verbal root; (ii) $by$- and $from$-phrases simply make reference to this (ontologically

* This is a preprint and is subject to change.
different) suppressed feature; (iii) the differences between adult and child English and English and languages that do not distinguish between by- and from-phrases are due to differences in terms of aspectual encoding; (iv) rationale clauses (RCs) in passives are controlled by animate participants introduced not by non-oblique arguments (implicit or syntactically present, depending on the theory), but by by-phrases and these may in turn be either overt or implicit.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the main patterns with non-active morphology in Albanian. In Section 3, I undertake a detailed comparison of the Albanian and the English passive and anticausative formations. The ultimate goal of this section is to show that certain common diagnostics of the passive construction in English, such as by-phrases and purpose clauses or so-called agent-oriented adverbs, are granted a theoretical status that is simply not justified. In Section 4, summarizing and extending my earlier work on non-active morphology (Kallulli 2006a, b), I show how both passives and anticausatives arise basically from the suppression of a feature in little v that encodes the ontological event type of the verbal root.

2. Albanian non-active voice: The basic patterns

Albanian has two distinct conjugational paradigms, Active vs. Non-active, as illustrated in (1) for simple present.

(1) Active (ACT) Non-active (NACT) (from Kallulli 1999b:264)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active (ACT)</th>
<th>Non-active (NACT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>tha-3</td>
<td>tha-h-em²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry-act</td>
<td>dry-nact, 1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I dry (stuff)'</td>
<td>'I get/become dry'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>tha-n</td>
<td>tha-hesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>tha-n</td>
<td>tha-het</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>tha-jmë</td>
<td>tha-hemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>tha-ni</td>
<td>tha-heni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>tha-jnë</td>
<td>tha-hen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-active conjugation, often referred to as medio-passive in traditional Albanian grammars (cf. Demiraj 1986), is realized by employing three different linguistic means with a well-defined distribution, namely: (i) special formants suffixed to the verbal stem – for all simple tenses except the aorist – as in (1); (ii) the pre-verbal reflexive clitic u – for the aorist and the non-finite forms of the verb – as in (2); and (iii) the auxiliary jam 'be' plus the participle form of the verb – for all periphrastic tenses – as in (3).

(2) Gjethet u thanë.  
leaves-the NACT.AOR dry.3P  
'The leaves dried'  

(3) Jam bërë pis.  
am become diry  
'I have become dirty.'
Turning now to the environments associated with non-active voice, several construction types can be distinguished. First, passive verbs, as in (4), are always morphologically non-active, that is, they are incompatible with active voice.

(4) Libri u lexua me interes nga publiku.
book.the NACT.AOR read.3S with interest by public-the
‘The book was read with interest by the public’

Likewise, lexical reflexives, as in (5), are invariably non-active morphologically.3

(5) Djali la-het.
boy-the wash-NACT
‘The boy washes’ / ‘The boy is washing’

Similarly, the verb in the middle construction is also obligatorily in the non-active voice, as the contrast between (6a) and (6b) shows.

(6) a. Ky libër lexohet kollaj.
this book read.NACT.3S easily
‘This book reads easily’

b. *Ky libër lexon kollaj.
this book read.ACT.3S easily

In addition, there is a class of lexically non-active verbs, that is, verbs which do not have active forms. One could call such verbs ‘deponent’ after Latin grammars.4 Some examples (adapted from Kallulli 1999b) are given in (7). Typically, raising verbs in Albanian are lexically non-active.

(7) kreno-hem$_{nact}$ – *kreno-j$_{act}$
‘I am proud’
zoto-hem – *zoto-j
‘I swear’
dergi-em – *dergj
‘I linger’
dridhto-hem – *drithto-j
‘I shiver’
pendo-hem – *pendo-j
‘I regret’
mrekullo-hem – *mrekullo-j
‘I wonder’
përgjigj-em – *përgjigj
‘I answer’
duk-em – *duk
‘I look/appear’

Finally, verbs that are commonly assumed to belong to the unaccusative class in English (Perlmutter 1978 and related literature) are mostly formally non-active in Albanian. For instance, as already stated, verbs of appearance have no active counterparts. Likewise, while the transitive alternant of a transitive-inchoative alternating verb is invariably active morphologically, as is shown in (8a), the intransitive/inchoative (or
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Anticausative) alternant normally appears in the non-active voice, as is shown in (8b) for the verb thyej ‘break’. Note the grammaticality contrast between the minimal pair in (8b) with the verb in the non-active voice and (8c), in which the verb is in the active voice.

(8) a. Beni theu dritare-n.
    Ben.the nom broke.ACT,AOR,3S window-the
    ‘Ben broke the window’

b. Dritar-ja u thye.
    window-the NACT break.AOR,3S
    ‘The window broke’

c. *Dritar-ja thye.
    window-the break.ACT,AOR,3S
    ‘The window broke’

However, many verbs which are commonly assumed to belong to the unaccusative class in English are formally active in Albanian, as shown in (9).

(9) a. Beni shkoi / erdhi / hyri / doli.
    Ben.the go.ACT,3S,P / come.ACT,3S,P / enter.ACT,3S,P / exit.ACT,3S,P
    ‘Ben went (away) / came / entered / exited’

b. Irm-a jetoi / vdiq në Austria.
    Irma-the live.ACT,3S,P / die.ACT,3S,P in Austria
    ‘Irma lived / died in Austria’

Moreover, as I have described in Kallulli (1999a, b), these formally active unaccusatives may undergo impersonal passivization, which is generally taken to signal unergativity (Perlmutter 1978; Marantz 1984; Grewendorf 1989; Zaenen 1993). This is illustrated in (10).

(10) a. Shkohet / vihet / hyhet / diket këtej.
    go.NACT,3S,Pr / come.NACT,3S,Pr / enter.NACT,3S,Pr / exit.NACT,3S,Pr
    ‘One goes / comes / enters / exits this way’

b. Në Austria jetohet giatë / nuk vdiset i ri.
    in Austria live.NACT,3S,Pr long / not die.NACT,3S,Pr young
    ‘One lives long / doesn’t die young in Austria’

Finally, certain verbs participating in the transitive-inchoative alternation may appear either in active or in non-active form, as in (11).5

(11) a. Dritar-ja u kris nga presioni.
    window-the NACT,AOR crack.ACT,3S from/by pressure.the
    ‘The window cracked from the pressure’

b. Dritar-ja krisi nga presion-i.
    window-the crack.ACT,AOR,3S from/by pressure-the
    ‘The window cracked from the pressure’

In spite of distinct voice morphology on the verb, the sentences in (11a) and (11b) entail each other (that is, they are fully synonymous).6
To summarize, it may be stated that the Active/Non-active voice dichotomy in Albanian corresponds roughly to the unergative/unaccusative distinction. This correspondence is rough by virtue of the fact that while unergatives and transitives are always active morphologically, some unaccusative verbs appear in this voice (i.e. are morphologically unmarked), too. Crucially, however, unergatives (and transitives) cannot be formally non-active, just as passives, lexical reflexives and middles cannot be formally active, a state of affairs that holds also in Greek (Alexiadou & Anastopoulou 2004).

Yet another pattern with non-active morphology remains to be described. This is what I have in previous work referred to as the dative unaccusative construction (Kallulli 2006a, b). As shown in the examples in (12), the dative unaccusative construction is a non-active formation combined with a dative DP and may have either an involuntary state and/or unintended causation reading (depending on factors that are identified in Kallulli (1999a, b, 2006a, b)), an affected reading (in the sense of benefactive/malefactive), or a possessor reading.7

(12) a. Ben-it i-u ndërtua (një shtëpi).
   Ben-the dat him build.3S a house
   (i) 'Ben felt like building (a house)' or: 'Ben was in a (house-)building mood'
   (ii) 'A house/something was built for Ben/ on Ben’s behalf/as a favour to Ben'
   (iii) 'Ben’s house was built'

b. Benit i-u thye dritar-ja.
   Ben-the the dat broke.3S window
   (i) 'Ben unintendedly broke the window'
   (ii) 'The window broke to Ben'
   (iii) 'Ben’s window broke'

Thus, non-active morphology in Albanian raises several questions, perhaps the most obvious being whether the various constructions (to wit: the passive, anticausative, middle, lexical reflexive as well as the dative unaccusative construction) and their various readings (to wit: the involuntary state, unintended causation, affected and possessor) can be formally and uniformly derived. While as I have argued in previous work such an analysis is indeed feasible (Kallulli 2006a, b), this paper focuses on the properties and the derivation of the passive and the anticausative formations.

3. Passives vs. anticausatives in English and Albanian

3.1 By-phrases vs. from-phrases and the significance of the comparison

Theories of the passive in English and similar languages make much of the fact that the logical-subject argument, not realized on an NP in passives, is realized in a by-phrase (Baker, Johnson, & Roberts 1989 and references therein), which as Marantz (1984) shows, is independent of its theta-role.
(13) a. Hortense was pushed by Elmer. (AGENT)
b. Elmer was seen by everyone who entered. (EXPERIENCER)
c. The intersection was approached by five cars at once. (THEME)
d. The porcupine crate was received by Elmer’s firm. (GOAL)
e. The house is surrounded by trees. (LOCATION) (Marantz 1984:129)

The fact that the logical-subject of a passive can be realized in a by-phrase has been taken as evidence that the syntactically suppressed argument of a passive verb is present, nonetheless, in argument structure – its presence being manifested among others in the sanctioning of by-phrases, as shown in (14) (Roepner 1987; Grimshaw 1990). Likewise, Baker, Johnson and Roberts (1989) take the fact that passives may combine with a by-phrase as evidence for their alternative analysis, namely that the passive morpheme en is itself an argument.

(14) The window was broken by Pat.

In contrast, as is also well-known, by-phrases are generally not licensed in anti-causatives, as is shown in (15).8

(15) *The window broke by Pat.

In sum, the complete English paradigm can be depicted through (16): a passive licenses a by-phrase irrespective of whether the logical-subject is a participant capable of willful agency (such as ‘John’) or an extrinsic instigator (such as ‘the wind’). In contrast, anticausatives do not license by-phrases.

The fact that anticausatives are bad with by-phrases has been taken to show that the binding of the external cause in an anticausative takes place in the mapping from the lexical semantic representation to argument structure (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995).

(16) a. The window was broken by John / the wind.
b. *The window broke by John / the wind.

However, anticausatives even in English can generally license from-phrases identifying the (external) cause of an event, as in (17), an example due to J. Emonds (personal communication).9

(17) The window cracked from the pressure.

Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) do not discuss the fact that anticausatives in English may systematically combine with from-phrases, the implication being that from-phrases in anticausatives, unlike by-phrases in passives, do not make reference to an implicit argument in the argument structure of anticausatives. However, a closer look at the distribution of from-phrases in English is revealing of certain facts that have hitherto not been discussed. These facts motivate the ideas for an alternative analysis of both the passive and the anticausative formation developed later in this paper.

First, note that even with respect to the licensing of from-phrases in anticausatives an interesting asymmetry obtains: while a from-phrase is generally fine with anti-
causatives, it is bad when the external causer is a participant capable of willful agency, as in (18).

(18) *The window cracked from John.

Secondly, the difference in grammaticality between (17) and (18), effected by the distinction between an extrinsic instigator and a participant capable of willful agency, is also replicated with unaccusatives that do not participate in the transitive-inchoative alternation, such as ‘die’, as shown through the opposition of (19a) and (19b).

(19) a. Mary died from cancer.
    b. *Mary died from John.

Thirdly, from-phrases are disallowed in passives. Moreover, this does not seem to be related to whether the causer introduced by the preposition is a participant capable of willful agency or a natural cause. Both (20a) in which the cause is a natural one and (20b) in which the cause is a human are ungrammatical.

(20) a. *Mary was killed from cancer.
    b. *Mary was killed from John.

Finally, though from-phrases identifying causers are licensed not only with anti-causatives but also with other unaccusatives (that is, unaccusatives that do not participate in the transitive-inchoative alternation), they are not licensed with all unaccusatives. For instance, as (21) shows, unless the from-phrase is interpreted as a location, both a from-phrase and a by-phrase are bad with the unaccusative verb arrive.10

(21) *The refugees arrived from the invasion.

The fact that not all unaccusatives license from-phrases suggests that not all unaccusatives have underlying causative semantics, in line with Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) and contrary to Chierchia (1989, 2004).

Thus, a look at the distribution of from-phrases identifying the causer of a certain event reveals the generalization in (22).

(22) Generalization

From-phrases identifying the external cause in anticausatives cannot combine with participants capable of willful agency (that is, with animate beings).

The generalization in (22) is important because it emphasizes the fact that the distribution of by- and from-phrases in English cannot be captured merely through a distinction between passives and anticausatives.

Turning now to Albanian, probably the most striking property concerning passives is that, strictly speaking, it is not possible to distinguish between passives and non-active anticausatives. This for two reasons. First, as discussed in the previous section, unlike in English, passives and anticausatives in Albanian (like Greek) are often homomorphic (i.e. they bear the same morphology, namely non-active). Second, Albanian (like Greek) collapses by- and from-phrases.11 Note in this context that while
English disallows by-phrases in middles (Baker, Johnson, & Roberts 1989), in Albanian middles are fine with a by/from-phrase, a fact also known for Greek (Condoravdi 1989; Tsimpili 1989; Lekakou 2005). Indeed any formally non-active predicate can combine with a by/from-phrase in Albanian.

So then, the licensing of by-phrases, which is taken to be one of the most salient properties of the passive in English (Baker, Johnson and Roberts (1989) and references therein) and one that distinguishes passives from anticausatives, cannot be applied to Albanian. To illustrate, the Albanian counterparts of the sentences in (17) and (18) are given in (23a) and (23b), respectively. As expected then, the grammaticality contrast between the English (17) and (18) is not replicated in Albanian.

(23) a. Dritar-ja u kris nga presion-i.
    window-the NACT,AOR crack.3S from/by pressure-the
    ‘The window cracked from the pressure’

b. Dritar-ja u kris nga Xhon-i.
    window-the NACT,AOR crack.3S from/by John-the
    ‘The window was cracked by John’

In the previous section I showed that the anticausative alternant of the Albanian verb kris ‘crack’ may appear either in active or in non-active voice, as was illustrated in (11). Interestingly, the formally active anticausative can still combine with a by/from-phrase only when the causer is a participant that is not capable of willful agency, such as an event nominal. This is illustrated through the opposition in (24a) vs. (24b).

(24) a. Dritar-ja krisi nga presion-i.
    window-the crack.ACT,AOR.3S from/by pressure-the
    ‘The window cracked from the pressure’

b. *Dritar-ja krisi nga Xhon-i.
    window-the crack.ACT,AOR.3S from/by John-the
    ‘The window cracked from/by John’

So then, the contrast between (24a) and (24b) is a replication of the contrast between the English sentences (17) and (18): like in English, the non-specially marked anticausative can combine with a from/(by)-phrase only when the latter introduces a causer participant that is not capable of willful agency. This fact combined with the fact that, unlike English, Albanian collapses by- and from-phrases lends support to the generalization in (22).

Taken together, the arguments presented in this section, in particular the fact that the distribution of by- and from-phrases in English cannot be captured by appealing merely to the distinction between unaccusatives (whether anticausative or other) and passives, as well as the fact that there are languages that altogether collapse the distinction between by- and from-phrases, suggest that by- and from-phrases might be more closely related than has been assumed in discussions that focus on the licensing of by-phrases. It is clear that once we draw into the picture languages that do not make the distinction between by- and from-phrases, the ability to license a by-phrase irrespective of the ability to license a from-phrase cannot be granted such a theoretical status.
as it has in studies that focus on the English verbal passive. Interestingly, as Clark and Carpenter (1989) note, children commonly use from-phrases instead of by-phrases in English passives, too. Specifically, as I will propose in Section 4, it is conceivable that by- and from-phrases do not differ as to their ability to identify arguments (either implicit or syntactically expressed, depending on the theory), but rather with respect to other features that distinguish the passive and the anticausative formations. What exactly these features are I will discuss in Section 4.

3.2 The issue of purpose clauses and subject-oriented adverbs

Another set of facts frequently brought forward in discussions on the presence of an understood logical-subject in passives versus their absence in middles or unaccusatives involves purpose clauses and so-called subject- or agent-oriented adverbs. For instance, citing Manzini (1983) and Roeper (1987), Baker, Johnson and Roberts (1989) claim that in passives but not in middles the understood subject of control clauses (or rationale clauses, in their terminology) may be “controlled”, and subject-oriented adverbs may find an argument to modify, as in (25) and (26).

(25) a. This bureaucrat was bribed [PRO to avoid the draft].
   b. *This bureaucrat bribes easily to avoid the draft.

(26) a. This bureaucrat was bribed deliberately.
   b. *This bureaucrat bribes deliberately.

Baker et al. (1989) take this as evidence for their view that the passive morpheme -en in English is an argument, since purpose clauses and subject-oriented adverbs require the syntactic presence of an argument.

It is well-known that, unlike in passives, in anticausatives purpose clauses are illicit, as is shown in (27).

(27) a. The boat was sunk to collect the insurance. (Roeper 1987:268)
   b. *The boat sank to collect the insurance.

Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) take this fact as evidence for their view that the binding of the external cause in anticausatives takes place in the mapping from the lexical semantic representation to argument structure and since the binding of a position in the lexical semantic representation prevents the projection of that position to argument structure, no reference can be made to the bound argument.

Likewise, unlike in passives, in anticausatives agent-oriented adverbs are illicit, as is shown in (28).

(28) a. The ship was sunk deliberately.
   b. *The ship sank deliberately.

Two issues arise here. First, all that purpose clauses and so-called subject- or agent-oriented adverbs do is to identify an intention-bearing (i.e. animate) event participant as the source or initiation of the event described by the verb. However, in no way
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does this entail that animate or intention-bearing participants have to act intentionally. Therefore the term ‘agent-oriented’ is not a good fit. For this reason, I will refer to such adverbs more neutrally as adverbs of animacy.

Crucially, it can be shown that so-called ‘agent-oriented’ adverbs are not incompatible with unaccusative syntax, a point also made in Folli & Harley (2004). Folli & Harley (2004) give the Italian examples in (29), which demonstrate that both the unaccusative verb cadere ‘fall’, and rotolare ‘roll’, continue to exhibit the characteristic essere ‘be’ (vs. avere ‘have’) selection, typical of unaccusatives, even when the subject is clearly performing the action on purpose.

(29) a. Gianni é caduto/*ha caduto apposta. John is fallen / has fallen on purpose.

b. Gianni é rotolato/*ha rotolato giu apposta. John is rolled/has rolled down on purpose.12

Similarly, the example in (30) describes the same fact for German (note the selection of the auxiliary sein ‘be’ and not haben ‘have’).

(30) Peter ist absichtlich eingeschlafen. ‘Peter fell asleep on purpose’

Likewise, while it is uncontroversial that the logical-subject of the matrix clause serves as an antecedent for the PRO subject of the purpose clause, this antecedent does not need to be an agent as is shown by the German examples in (31), in which the matrix verbs are unaccusative, as witnessed by the fact that they take the auxiliary sein ‘be’ and not haben ‘have’.

(31) a. Die Pflanzen wachsen nach oben, um ans Licht zu kommen. ‘Plants grow upwards in order to reach the light’

b. Eva ist gekommen um mir zu helfen. ‘Eva came to help me.’

In sum, all that purpose clauses and/or so-called agent-oriented adverbs do, is that they make reference to, or imply an animate participant. I contend, however, that the animate participant in a passive construction is not introduced by a non-oblique argument (implicit or syntactically present, depending on the theory), but by a by-phrase and, this may in turn be either overt or implicit. If, as established in the previous section, animate causers are disallowed with from-phrases and anticausatives only license from-phrases but not by-phrases, then the inability of anticausatives to combine with purpose clauses and adverbs of animacy follows straightforwardly without further stipulations. Further empirical evidence for this view involves the fact that whenever a purpose clause is licit, a by-phrase can be inserted overtly.

I now turn to the formal derivation of the passive and the anticausative formations.
4. Passive vs. anticausative: What d(e)rives the distinction?

The analysis that I develop here builds on my previous work, especially Kallulli (2006a, b), which I summarize and extend. Three main ideas are introduced. The first concerns an ontological distinction between roots that denote activities and roots that denote causative events, the second the distinction between agentive and non-agentive predications, and the third the definition of non-active morphology. Various extensions follow.

4.1 Two ontological primitives: [act] vs. [cause]

In Kallulli (2006a, b) I have assumed that activity verbal roots (e.g. build) differ from causative roots (e.g. break) in that the former project an [+act] feature and the latter a [+cause] feature in v. Since this distinction is crucial to the analysis of passive and anticausative developed later in this section, I summarize the main empirical arguments motivating my assumption that [+act] and [+cause] are primitives.

In Section 2 I introduced among others the dative unaccusative construction (DUC) illustrated through the examples in (12) repeated for ease of reference under (32).

(32) a. Ben-it i-u ndërtua (një shtëpi). (Albanian)
   Ben-theau him-cl-nact,aor build,3S a house,dat
   (i) ‘Ben felt like building (a house)’ or: ‘Ben was in a (house-)building mood’
   (ii) ‘A house/something was built for Ben/on Ben’s behalf/as a favour to Ben’
   (iii) ‘Ben’s house was built’

b. Ben-it i-u thye dritar-ja. (Albanian)
   Ben-theau him-cl-nact,aor broke,3S window-the,dat
   (i) ‘Ben unintenionally broke the window’
   (ii) ‘The window broke to Ben’
   (iii) ‘Ben’s window broke’

As stated in Section 2, the DUC is a non-active formation combined with a dative DP and may have either an involuntary state and/or unintended causation reading – in addition to an affected reading, or a possessor reading. Since the derivation of the affected and the possessor readings is of no concern for the purposes of this article, let us abstract away from these and focus on the (i) readings in (32a, b), that is, the involuntary state reading of (32a) and the unintended causation reading of (32b). As I have shown in Kallulli (2006a, b), while the unintended causation reading is missing in (32a), both the involuntary state reading and the unintended causation reading may obtain with one and the same predicate. This is illustrated through the Albanian examples (33a) and (33b), which differ in terms of their grammatical aspect only. As revealed in the glosses in (33a, b), Albanian has two forms for simple past tense (P) that differ in their aspectual value: aorist (Aor), which is perfective, and imperfective (Imp). Only the perfective sentence in (33a) but not the imperfective in (33b) can get
an unintended causation reading. On the other hand, with imperfective aspect only the involuntary state reading but not the unintended causation reading obtains.

(33) a. Ben-it i-\textit{u} thye dritar-ja.
   Ben-the\textsubscript{na}t him\textsubscript{na},nact,Aor break.3S window-the\textsubscript{nom}
   (i) ‘Ben unintendedly broke the window’
   (ii) ‘Ben felt like breaking the window’

b. Ben-it i \textit{thy-hej} dritar-ja.
   Ben-the\textsubscript{na}t him\textsubscript{na}, break-Nact,P,Imp.3S window-the\textsubscript{nom}
   (i) ‘Ben felt like breaking the window’
   (ii) ‘Ben unintendedly broke the window’

The semantic complementarity observed in (33) does not obtain with a non-external causation verb. The sentences in (34a) and (34b) differ morphologically exactly in the same way in which (33a) and (33b) differ. However, the unintended causation reading of (33a) does not obtain in (34b).

(34) a. Ben-it i nd\textit{erto-hej} (një shtëpi).
   Ben-the\textsubscript{na}t him\textsubscript{na}, build-Nact,P,Imp,3S a house\textsubscript{nom}
   (i) ‘Ben felt like building (a house)’
   (ii) ‘Ben unintendedly built (a house)’

b. Ben-it i-\textit{u} nd\textit{ertua} (një shtëpi).
   Ben-the\textsubscript{na}t him\textsubscript{na},nact,Aor build.3S a house\textsubscript{nom}
   (i) ‘Ben felt like building (a house)’
   (ii) ‘Ben unintendedly built (a house)’

The question arises as to why the pattern in (33) does not replicate in (34). The only possible explanation must be that non-active morphology interacts differently with different (feature) primitives. That is, the lexical (and consequently syntactic) feature composition make-up of (the root of) build is different from that of break. For this reason, I will continue to assume that activity verbal roots (e.g. build) differ from causative roots (e.g. break) lexically (and syntactically) in that the former project an [+act] feature and the latter a [+cause] feature in $v$.

4.2 Deriving the anticausative and the passive

In Kallulli (2006a, b) I analyze non-active (and other unaccusative) morphology as an operation that applies linearly in the syntax, as in (35).

(35) Definition of non-active morphology
   Non-active and/or reflexive morphology suppresses the first feature in a predicate structure.

In Kallulli (2006a, b) I have argued that the anticausative and the passive are derived when non-active morphology applies to non-agentive causative and non-agentive activity predications, defined as in (36) and (37), respectively.13
(36) The structure of non-agentive causative predications

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{Spec: Causer} \\
\text{v'} \\
\langle [+cause] \rangle \\
\text{break} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Compl}
\end{array}
\]

(37) The structure of non-agentive activity predications

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{Spec: Actor} \\
\text{v'} \\
\langle [+act] \rangle \\
\text{build} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Compl}
\end{array}
\]

Non-active morphology was in (35) defined as an operation that suppresses the first feature in a predicate structure. Note that the first feature in the structures in (36) and (37) is [+cause], and [+act], respectively, so when non-active morphology operates on these structures, it will suppress this feature. Consequently, no Causer or Actor argument can be merged in Spec of vP in (36) and (37), respectively. In other words, the operation of non-active morphology on the structures in (36) and (37) yields basically monadic structures, as shown in (38) and (39).

(38)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\langle [+active] \rangle \\
\text{break} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Compl}
\end{array}
\]
I submit that the structure in (38) is that of the anticausative, which is derived when non-active morphology operates on the structure of a non-agentive causative predication. On the other hand, the structure in (39) is that of the passive, which is derived when non-active morphology operates on the structure of a non-agentive activity predication. In other words, I contend that the passive and the anticausative formations differ only in that the former is derived from an activity predication, i.e., a structure that contains a [+act] feature in v (which is suppressed by non-active and/or other passivizing morphology), and the latter from a causative predication i.e., a structure that has a [+cause] feature in v (which also gets suppressed by non-active and/or other intransitivizing morphology). I suggest that the difference between by- and from-phrases in English and other languages that make this distinction is simply a reflection of the ontological difference between activity and causative predications. In other words, the by-phrase in the passive in English does not make reference to an implicit non-oblique argument, but to the [+act] feature in v that is suppressed by unaccusative (i.e. passive) morphology in the syntax. Likewise, a from-phrase identifying the external cause of an event in the anticausative in English makes reference to the syntactically suppressed [+cause] feature in v. Note that, unlike [+cause], the feature [+act] entails an actor, that is, animacy. Since in the passive this feature is suppressed by passive morphology in the syntax, no actor can be merged in the Spec of VP. However, the actor can be realized obliquely in a (by-)phrase, as can the causer in the anticausative (through a from-phrase). In other words, a by-phrase simply makes reference to the syntactically suppressed actor and a from-phrase to the syntactically suppressed causer.

The question arises, if a by-phrase simply makes reference to the feature [+act] (i.e. to the syntactically suppressed actor), how can we account for the fact that external causation verbs passivize? That is, how can a sentence like (14) – repeated here under (40) – be derived? The sentence in (40) is a passive construction containing the verb ‘break’, i.e. a verb that is typically associated with causative semantics and not classified as an activity-denoting verb (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995 and references therein).

(40) The window was broken by Pat.

In order to work out a tentative answer, I will first introduce an intuition from Emonds (2000), namely that due to the fact that English lacks a verbally finite synthetic passive,
both verbal and adjectival passives are in a sense “more adjectival,” than say in Latin, or even Albanian (or Greek), which as described in Section 2 have at least a partially verbal finite synthetic passive. Emonds’ intuition is fundamentally an aspectual one, it seems to me. Indeed anticausatives are more eventive than passives in English, a point which cannot be made with respect to the Albanian passive, which as discussed in Section 3 simply collapses the morphological distinction between passives and non-active anticausatives. So then, the passive in English in a sentence like (40) implies that the breaking of the window by Pat was more sustained or involved an activity (though not necessarily volitional) on her part, as compared to the breaking event in an anticausative, which happens spontaneously or all-at-once. That is, the English passive, whether or not due to its special (adjectival) morphology, induces an implicature of activity even for external causation verbs, which is all too obvious through a comparison with an anticausative like the one in (41).

(41) The window broke.

Above, I stated that the feature [+act] entails an actor, that is, animacy. The question then arises how to account for sentences such as (42) where a natural force, namely the earthquake combines with the by-phrase. I think it is not unreasonable to assume that nominals denoting natural and/or other forces in sentences like (42) are personifications.

(42) The window was broken by the earthquake.

The analysis that I have outlined here entails among other things that neither the passive, nor the anticausative are derived from agentive predications. However, the passive can still combine with purpose clauses and adverbs of intentionality because as already mentioned in Section 3, purpose clauses and adverbs of animacy simply make reference to participants capable of intentionality. However, it would be a big and illogical leap to conclude on this basis that the animate participant controlling the purpose clause or adverb of intentionality in a passive construction is a non-oblique argument either implicit (i.e. not expressed syntactically, as espoused by Grimshaw (1990)) or syntactically present (Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989). In particular, as I already suggested in Section 3.2, there is at least one more logical alternative, namely that the animate participant in a passive construction is not introduced by a non-oblique argument (implicit or syntactically present, depending on the theory), but simply by a by-phrase, which may be either overt or implicit. Especially in view of the fact that, as discussed in Section 3, animate causers are disallowed with from-phrases and anticausatives only license from-phrases but not by-phrases (modulo Note 9), this alternative is quite obvious.

To conclude, in this section I have shown that the English verbal passive can be made more compatible with its Albanian cousin by relegating the differences with respect to the licensing of by-phrases to simple combinatorial properties of verb and prepositional types.
5. Conclusion

The main purpose of this article was to examine some properties of the passive through a close comparison of two typologically different languages, Albanian and English, as well as the ensuing ramifications for a universal theory of the passive construction. A range of empirical arguments go to show that the picture depicted for the passive in English is way too idiosyncratic, and that the properties that have attained the status of identificational criteria of the passive are simply not revealing or even maintainable when looking at other languages. In particular, neither by-phrases nor purpose clauses or adverbs signaling the presence of participants capable of willful agency, generally assumed to witness the presence of a non-oblique argument (either implicit or syntactically present, depending on the theory), do that. In contrast, the analysis that I have laid out here derives many properties of the passive and anticausative both in Albanian and English. The main conclusion here is that anticausatives and passives differ only with respect to the ontological event type feature (in \(v\)) of the verbal root which can be affected by morphological operations in the syntax. The distinction between by- and from-phrases in English is a simple reflection of this feature: a by-phrase introduces an oblique actor upon suppression of [+act] and a from-phrase an oblique causer upon suppression of [+cause] by unaccusative morphology.

I have glossed over some aspects which need to be dealt with in the framework of an integrated theory of the syntactic projection of passives. Most obviously, I haven’t gone into issues concerning the inability of accusative case assignment, but this specific aspect can in general be dealt with along the lines of Bennis (2004).
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2. The segment \(h\) in (1) between the stem of the (active) verb and non-active morphology is a hiatus preventing one. Since this segment is inserted whenever non-active morphology attaches to an active verb whose stem ends in a vowel sound, I have for simplicity of presentation not distinguished it from the non-active inflection.

3. Of course it is also possible to express reflexive relations through a transitive construction through a self-anaphor in object position, in which case the verb will be in active voice invariably.

4. This fact is reminiscent of so-called deponent verbs in Greek (Embick 1998; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2004). According to Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004) deponent verbs in Greek take a nominative subject and may combine with an accusative object. In Albanian, however, non-active paradigms are incompatible with accusative case.
5. As will be discussed in detail in Section 3, Albanian has two distinct prepositions nga and prej both meaning both ‘by’ and ‘from’, hence the translation of nga as ‘from/by’ in the gloss of (11a). Consequently, from- and by-phrases are non-distinguishable in Albanian.

6. The pattern described in (11a) and (11b) is also found in Greek, as described in Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004). According to these authors, unlike in Albanian, in Greek there are meaning differences between the active and the non-active anticausative.

7. According to Rivero (2004), what I have referred to as the dative unaccusative construction is found in all the languages of the Balkans with the same range of readings, except for Greek and Rumanian where the involuntary state reading does not obtain.

8. However, as Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) note, anticausatives in English are perfect with the phrase by itself. This is shown in (i) and (ii).

(i) The plate broke by itself.

(ii) The door opened by itself.

Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995:89) note that this “adverbial appears to be modifying a cause, which, given its anaphoric nature, it identifies as the theme argument itself”. However, the fact that the phrase by itself can appear with anticausatives substantially weakens the generalization that by-phrases are not sanctioned in anticausatives.

9. J. Emonds (personal communication) points out that, though in general anticausatives with from-phrases are fine, often the acceptability seems a bit weak. Also, for the “weak” cases, there is undeniably some variation with respect to judgments: some speakers find even the “weak” cases fine, others don’t like them. Crucially, however, even for those speakers who have trouble accepting all anticausatives with from-phrases, there is a clear distinction between anticausatives with by-phrases – these are simply ungrammatical – and anticausatives with from-phrases – which relative to anticausatives with by-phrases are judged as much better.

10. The example in (21) is due to Peter Svenonius (personal communication).

11. More specifically, while in Greek the same word is used both for by and from, Albanian has two distinct prepositions both meaning by- and from (see also Note 6). Consequently, by- and from-phrases are indistinguishable.

12. Folli & Harley (2004) also note that although rotolare is better with ha than cadere is, this is due to the fact that rotolare is optionally transitive, so the ha rotolato sequence, while ungrammatical in the structure in (29), is familiar from transitive constructions; it’s a type of garden-path effect.

13. Following Davis & Demirdache (1995) and Demirdache (1997) on agentive vs. non-agentive causatives, in Kallulli (2006a, b) I have argued that agentive predications of both varieties (i.e. agentive causative predications and agentive activity predications) and non-agentive (causative and/or activity) predications are universally derived from distinct frames, in my formalization (ordered) tuples of features in v. Specifically, in Kallulli (2006a, b) I have defined agentive causative predications as an ordered tuple consisting of the features < [+intent], [+cause]> in v, whereas agentive activity predications as an ordered tuple consisting of the features < [+intent], [+cause]> in v. In contrast, I have argued that the structures of non-agentive causative and activity predications are as in (36) and (37), respectively.

14. As shown in Section 2, middles in Albanian are also non-active morphologically. Here I assume that the distinction between passive/anticausative on the one hand and middle on the other is due to the difference between a dispositional (imperfective) operator and/or other aspectual morphology. Specifically, the middle construction is derived when the verb in the structures in (38) and (39) is
under the scope of a dispositional operator (Lekakou 2005). In contrast, passive/anticausative obtains when the verb in (38) and (39) is not under the scope of such an operator.
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PART II

Formal Approaches

C. Event semantics – Aspectual and semantic triggers
The compositional nature of the analytic passive

Syntactic vs. event semantic triggers.
“Argument Hypothesis” vs. “Aspect Hypothesis”

Werner Abraham
Universität Wien, Austria

A challenge in which a successful outcome is assured isn’t a challenge.”
Jon Krakauer *Into the wild.* 1996

It is claimed that in languages without a synthetic passive verbal morphology, the passive diathesis is compositional derived by implication or radical underspecification rather than generated in a direct way. As finitizing auxiliaries, equivalents of *BE/ESSERE* or *HAVE/HABERE* are employed together with the participial *ANTE-RIOR* (‘past’) morpheme. A distinction needs to be made between ‘passive sense’ and ‘passive denotation.’ The claim is that languages such as German, along with numerous other languages, may be seen to provide a ‘passive’ by derivation from the complex ‘AUX+past participle’. The main body of the paper consists of evidence for the assumption that no direct passive meaning is provided by this complex ‘AUX+Anterior participle’, foremost from German. The past participle form has more than one function, an active and a passive one. The claim is that the past participle is void of any diathetic/voice denotation except for the categorial status of adjectival. The latter allows the inference of a number of syntactic properties, i.e., most prominently a none-agentive external argument which, in syntactic collocation with the monovalent copulas *sein* and *werden*, contributes to the passive sense. A further distinction will be made between two different past participle lexicals: one on the basis of aspectual perfectivity implying an ‘approach phase’, antecedent to a result phase and presupposing an agentive external argument; and another, imperfective PP, which is amenable to the presupposition of such an ‘approach phase’ by way of pragmatic implicature. This distinction will be spelled in some detail in terms of formal semantics. Evidence for the formal and empirical correctness of this approach will be drawn from various languages similar to German in some, but not all, respects: Russian, Swedish, Dutch, and Latin. Turning to passive syntax it will be shown that the mere assumption of a passive morpho-syntact to be represented directly in UG-terms will not do justice to the evidence provided by the data and their distributional properties. Rather, it will be
held and shown in some detail that passives are to be distinguished in accordance with their derivational basis as perfectives or imperfectives, not only as lexicals but also in terms of true clausal aspectual phrases (e.g., as regards directional vs. non-directional adverbs). Ergatives, commonly held to be a verbal class in their own right, will turn out as belonging to the perfective type of voice.

In essence, this paper wants to demonstrate that there are principally two pathways toward a solution for the undecided semantics of the past participle forms: the ‘pragmatic’ solution presented in Section 4.5., where the fundamental semantics of the participle form is taken to be past without any voice reading. In Section 10, on the other hand, it is assumed that the participle form is a categorically underspecified 'root' in terms of Distributed Morphology reaching a specific reading only in an extended morphosyntactic context.

0. Preamble: What to focus on?
Grammatical form-meaning opposition vs. pragmatic-functional perspectives.

The present essay focuses on the grammatical opposition between form and meaning of the lexical and grammatical components of passives. The functional division indicated in the caption will be decided in favor of ‘Grammatical form-meaning opposition’. It will be seen that there are sufficient real problems involved and to be solved. On the other hand, the second component, ‘pragmatic-functional perspectives’, has little, if anything, to do with the form and derivational mechanics of passivization (but see Givón 1994). Consider ‘word-order flexible’ languages such as Russian or German – i.e., languages where, as opposed to English, any part of speech can move into the clause-initial (or any other) position to indicate non-basic (thus, contrastive) focus. Languages with lesser word order flexibility, such as English, will need (split) clefts or stacks thereof – or passives – to achieve the same goal of appropriate contextualization. Naturally, then, there may be languages which, for reasons of an appropriate information structure (such as establishing text themata vs. text rhemata), will not even possess forms expressing passive voice. One case in point is Thai (Prasithrathsint, in this volume). In German, Russian, Polish, and Czech, the pragmatic-informational goals may be achieved by grammatically simpler means such as ‘stylistic’ movement (or, in more grammatical terms, either CP-expansion (Rizzi 1997) of the base (merged) structure maintaining active voice in the clause (as in Russian, Polish, and German). Other languages apply structures that make use of pragmatic notions such as adversativity (Chinese, Thai). In languages of the first type, German and Russian, formal passivization may then remain reserved for purposes other than information structure: e.g., for expressing aspect (see Frajzyngier 1987, Abraham & Leiss, in this volume).

The present essay on passivization in terms of various forms and across languages is based on a few assumptions that need spelling out. First and foremost, it is assumed that for composite passives – i.e., passives consisting of an auxiliary and a past partici-
ple – a composite derivation is appropriate or at least worth trying as a form that grew diachronically. This is not the most widely pursued path of description and explanation – for good reasons, as we shall discuss in detail. The solution pursued here will comprise a modular approach – i.e., involving a semantic-syntactic compartment as well as a pragmatic one (see Section 4.5). The assumption is that the default reading of the past participle is Past without any voice specification. An alternative is the one developed in Section 8 assuming no prior voice and tense specification of the morphological ‘root’ of the past participle form arriving at a specific reading not before further morphosyntactic context is specified. Both approaches are discussed in great detail the main presupposition being that no such solution is possible unless either componential approach is pursued. As far as I see it, this is the novel claim with respect to what has otherwise remained an unchanging non-composite position over the years.

1. Bridging diathetic categories: The ‘Past participle ambiguity’

1.1 Syntactic solutions

‘Past participle ambiguity’ addresses a widely ignored phenomenon: How to capture, in analytic terms, the difference between the homonymic passive and perfect participles. Modern formal syntax has a simple answer in terms of the case-government chain. See (1) and the ensuing discussion.

(1) Participial Morphology (PM) bears the external argument role, eΘ (for example, AGENT), iff it governs case (cf. Roberts 1985).

Considering perfect constructions as (2a), we observe that they have only an active/agentive interpretation, as opposed to constructions like (2b) where the subject, we, does not have agentive status.

(2) a. We [VP have [v hidden [DO-DP fugitives]]]
   b. We have [Predicative/Small Clause fugitives [PDP hidden]]

In (2b) there is a secondary/(object) predication (small clause, SC), the subject of which receives case from the main verb have – i.e., accusative case, but no theta role (cf. Abraham 2005:Ch. 5). In (2a), however, have assigns case to PM. As a consequence, V, hide, assigns case and theta role to the direct object/internal argument, iA, fugitives. In such a case (i.e. in active perfect tense clauses) PM and the subject constitute an argument/valence chain, hence only the active interpretation of PM is allowed.

The crucial role of have in licensing PM-argument can be traced in the prenominal, attributive, use of truly intransitive (ungerative) verbs. In this case, the participle morpheme (PM) receives the thematic role from the verb and hence must have a case assigner. Such a case/valence governor/assigner/licenser is absent in examples like (3). Thus, the ungrammaticality of (3) follows from (1):

(3) *the worked children / *a worked housewife/...
Under this analysis passive and perfect participles represent the same item, the properties of which depend on the syntactic environment. The PM may be used to construct the perfect clauses with the auxiliary have licensing the active PM or passive clauses with BE the latter disposing of no such case-governing option.1

In what follows, we discuss the event semantic properties of PM. What is more, we shall demonstrate what exactly the distribution of theta roles is on the different readings of PM – i.e., PM as a passive as opposed to an active participle.

1.2 Participle event semantics

As to the question of what “past participles” in the Indo-European languages are, one can never be sure by the form alone whether it is simply an Anterior or whether it is passive voice (verbal gender passive). Usually, the co-locative finite or non-finite Auxiliary disambiguates as is the case in Modern Standard German. See (4) below.

(4) a. Der Hund ist gefüttert worden  ... event passive, composite past
   the dog is fed  become
   “The dog has been fed”
b. Der Hund wurde gefüttert  ... event passive, simple narrative past
   the dog was fed
   “The dog was fed”
c. Der Hund ist (un)gefüttert  ... adjectival passive, present tense
   the dog is (un)fed

Both ist-Anterior-worden and wurde-Anterior select the passive variants of the past participles. As soon as the copula replaces these Auxiliaries the result is an adjectival (passive) often called state passive. Compare (4c). Only adjectives allow for the privative prefix un-. Thus, one can say that there are languages which uniquely disambiguate Anterior participles by way of selective Auxiliaries. Other languages do not. See English and Latin in (5)–(6).

(5) a. The dog is/was fed/has/had been fed
   Pres/Past/Pres.Perfect/PastPerfect  Anterior Participle
   ‘The student was/had been/will be praised”
b. discipulus laudatus est/erat/erit
   student praised.ANTERIOR.N.PART is/was/will be

The differences of English vs. Latin are telling beside the fact that both languages do not possess Auxiliaries that express the event as directly as German werden. The eventive passive meaning is equally expressed by the stative be or have in English and by stative (the copula) esse in Latin. English changes between the Auxes be and its periphrastic perfect have been, whereas Latin goes by forms of the copula only. No have/habère is involved in Latin. But, more importantly, Copula+Anterior Participle denotes the perfect tense in Latin, whereas it is the Present tense in English, this being so because Latin has full synthetic paradigms for the Present, Imperfect, and Future Passives. Thus, the Past Participle PM denotes Anterior/Past directly in Latin, whereas it
denotes Passive in English. The fact that other paradigms sit next to the periphrastic passive forms influences the specific implication – i.e., the Participle being a Past or a Passive – in the different languages.

But this is still only an approximation to the cleavage between what is expressed and what is denoted. Any \( \textbf{beCop} \) or \( \textbf{haveV-Poss} \) in syntactic collocation with the non-finite Participle can denote, at some historical stage, Copula/Possess+Adjective with some preceding emergent event. This is clearly the profile of perfective or resultative predications. Cf. (6) (see Abraham 2004b). [\( E_n \) event realized at time n].

\[(6) \]
\begin{enumerate}
\item Late Latin: *dividi \( \text{divisum esse} \) “– having been divided”
\begin{itemize}
\item only perfective verbs
\item t\(_1\) \( \neg E\) \(_1\) \( t\)\(_m\) \( E\)\(_1\) \( t\)\(_n\)
\end{itemize}
\item Late Latin: *laudari \( \text{laudatus esse} \) “– having been praised”
\begin{itemize}
\item only perfect tense
\item t\(_1\) \( E\)\(_1\) \( t\)\(_m\) \( E\)\(_2\) \( t\)\(_n\)
\end{itemize}
\item Early Romance: vexatus est \( \text{vexatus erat} \) “be tortured –”
\begin{itemize}
\item also imperfectives
\item \( t\)\(_m\) \( t\)\(_5\) \( t\)\(_n\)
\end{itemize}
\item Early Romance: laudatus esse \( \text{laudatus fuisse} \) “being praised –”
\begin{itemize}
\item also present tense
\item \( t\)\(_1\) \( E\)\(_1\) \( t\)\(_m\) \( E\)\(_2\) \( t\)\(_n\)
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

Notice that \( \text{esse}+\text{Anterior PP} \) is ambiguous between three readings: an adjectival one (PP=Adj) as in (7a) below, a perfective/resultative one (PP=V\(_{telic}\)) as in (7b), and an ongoing one (PP=V as in (7c). It is from the latter reading that, loosening the restriction to resultative predications, the passive reading of imperfective predicates arises; see (7d) (Abraham 1995:Ch. 12). The serialization (a)–(d) reflects the diachronic path of grammaticalizing extension, with imperfectives undergoing periphrastic pasts not before (7c) has been reached as opposed to the necessary precedent (7b).

\[(7) \]
\begin{enumerate}
\item divisum esse “is (more) divided (than)”
\begin{itemize}
\item no Anterior
\item \( \text{} \)
\item \( \text{} \)
\end{itemize}
\item divisus esse “having been divided”
\begin{itemize}
\item Anterior \( E\)\(_1\) implied by \( E\)\(_2\)
\item \( \text{} \)
\item \( \text{} \)
\end{itemize}
\item divisus esse “being divided”
\begin{itemize}
\item Posterior \( E\)\(_2\) implied by \( E\)\(_1\)
\item \( \text{} \)
\item \( \text{} \)
\end{itemize}
\item laudatus esse “being praised”
\begin{itemize}
\item no Anterior, no Posterior
\item \( \text{} \)
\item \( \text{} \)
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
Quite clearly, Latin *dividere* “divide” is perfective, whereas *laudāre* “praise” is not. In other words, such constructions, be they as in Latin or in English, carry their diachronic origin on their sleeves. German, by contrast, does not. See (8). [CAPS signal word accent].

(8) a. *Der Wagen ist geschoben*  ...  [–perfective]
    the wagon is pushed

b. *Der Wagen ist hineingeschoben*  ...  [+perfective]
    the wagon is into-pushed

Clearly, Aktionsart plays a role in the formation of the stative, or adjectival, passive in German. The adjectival passive of the imperfective, (8a), has no reading disallowing the implication of a prior incremental event, whereas (8b), since perfective, does allow an adjectival passive passive reading. We know that originally, all OHG unprefixed perfective verbs, V, carried *ga-/gi-*V, partly still MHG *ge-*. This aspectual paradigm eroded during MHG and was virtually given up in Early New High German.

In terms of an intuitively plausible graphics, this is what we come up with to describe and distinguish the different passive and active uses of the past participle and, in particular, with a close eye on the impersonal passive as opposed to the stative passive.

(9) a. impersonal passive: |
    ≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈
    | i.e., a uniform sequence of event points
    since imperfective/durative; aspect/ Aktionsart dependent; event typing
    identical to English progressive

b. The impersonal passive is the aspectual inverse of the stative passive in as much as the former is imperfective, the latter, however, is perfective; clear aspect/Aktionsart dependency.

c. The demotion of the external argument (eA) in the impersonal passive only serves the purpose of rendering indefinite the covert Agent reference.

d. Assuming that unaccusative (‘ergative’) predicates in German (cf. Abraham 2000) are intransitive perfectives, the impersonal passive stands in an interesting detransitivizing hierarchy:
   (i) Detransitivization of 2-place *perfectives* yield *perfective* 1-place passives; this is a derivation identical, on the lexical level, to the German unaccusative;
   (ii) no detransitivization of an (perfective) unaccusative is possible since the unaccusative is already derived under an identical process of theta reduction;
   (iii) The German *impersonal passive* is the valence reduction of a 1-place intransitive; it is restricted to *imperfectives* and consequently does not permit stative passivization.

As goes for the past participle form, the following graphics have non-unambiguous readings: eA and iA again for ‘external/internal argument’ predicated of the respective event phases.
(10) a. perfective transitive: *erpressen* “blackmail”
   \[ e_A,i_A \]
   reading for \( i_A \): stative passive: \( i_A \text{ ist erpressed} \)
   reading for \( e_A \): (i) ongoing passive in perfect tense: \( i_A \text{ ist erpressed worden} \)
   (ii) \text{sein/be-perfects (intransitive verbs of motion):} \( e_A \text{ ist abgelaufen} \) “is finished”

b. \[ e_A,(i_A) \]
   reading for \( e_A,(i_A) \):
   (iii) ongoing passive for non-perfectives: \( i_A \text{ ist behauptet worden} \) “has been claimed”
   (iv) impersonal passive: \( E \text{ is gearbeitet worden (von e_A)} \) “There was working”
   (v) ongoing active perfect: \( e_A \text{ hat gearbeitet} \) “has worked”

We shall return to the ambiguities (i)–(ii) as well as (iii)–(v) in Section 8.

1.3 The perfect effect in Russian

Past participle morphemes (PPMs) by themselves are unspecific, or ambiguous, between Perfectivity (Participium Perfecti Activi = PPA) and Passivity (Participium Perfecti Passivi = PPP). The question is whether the two designations can be linked in a principled way such that, for example, the PPA represents the presupposed event phase leading to the PPP state, and, if so, in what terms this would have to be described. One may further ask whether in German, much like in Russian, Aspect has to be considered as the privative field of opposition where the tense-structural properties of the ‘Perfective’ are in agreement with those of the Perfect, whereas the Imperfective remains undefined tense-structurally. Given that (11) holds specifically also for German, the latter assumption is not implausible. See also (12a) below (Maslow 1957).

(11) Perfective predicates have the tense structure of the perfect, i.e. \( \text{E}_R,S \); this does not hold inversely. In other words, from \( \text{E}_R,R,S \) no perfective biphasic structure such as in (10a) or (17a) below can be derived.

For perfective verbs, the Resultant phase inevitably implies the incremental phase leading toward it (sc., the Resultant phase) – a fact which is implied tense-referentially by \( \text{E}_R,R,S \) in (10a) above. Given the phasically undivided event structure of imperfective predicates (viz. (9a) and (10b), the Perfect tense structure \( \text{E}_R,R,S \) for durative verbs allows for no conclusion in terms of perfectivity. Nevertheless, we shall say that the temporal perfect of monophasic (= imperfective/durative) predicates relates to the speech act time. How specific this relation is and what its components are is still to be resolved. See (9) above. We will not lose sight of the historical fact that the demise of the simple preterit in (spoken only) South German is an explanatory consequence
of this tense-aspect-structural relation extending to imperfective verbs (see Abraham 1998; Abraham & Conradie 2001). Add the fact that the Perfect tense is most frequently indicative of veridical evidentiality.

1.4 The Russian preterit (‘Imperfect’) of perfective verbs

Consider the facts of Russian for the following two reasons. For one, the so-called ‘Perfect effect’ should be discussed in the context of languages other than Russian; more specifically, we want to investigate what the role is the ‘Perfect effect’ plays between German Aktionsart and the tense configurations. Second, it is just Russian that resembles older stages of German (like Old High German, 750–1050) in its strong aspectual anchoring. Recall what we have called the ‘Passive riddle’: How are we to imagine the emergence of verb gender (voice) from its pure Aspect predecessor? This question entails what the grammaticalizing sequence was leading to the voice paradigm in Modern German, while the old Aspect paradigm was deconstructed.

What is to be considered is an emerging separation of E and R in the German tensed sentence (cf. Comrie 1985; Hornstein 1990; Giorgi & Pianesi 1997; van Gelderen 1997).

(12) a. bandity ubili Vanyu
    bandits killed Vanya (Schoorlemmer 1995:240, author’s ex. (58))
    c. E__R__S = E__S,R__S

where E__R stands for the aspectual (perfective) relation and E__S for the temporal past relation of the preterit.

Unlike in English and German, R and S do not coincide in the preterit of Russian perfective verbs. Rather, the event is looked at from a point of reference in the past following the event immediately, but located before the speech act time, S. This collapses the Russian past with the reading in (7b), the Present Perfect in English as well as one of the interpretations of the periphrastic perfect in German. The reading in (7c), on the other hand, makes identical the readings of the pluperfect in English and German. For Russian it holds generally that perfective verbs express the event relation E__S, irrespective of the tense realization (which is expressed by the relation R__S).

1.5 The Russian preterit (‘Imperfect’) of imperfective verbs

As in German, the preterit of an imperfective Russian verb designates the simple past (Aorist) irrespective of its Aktionsart (Schoorlemmer 1995: the author’s example (13)).

(13) a. E,R__S² = E__S,R__S
E and R coincide in imperfective verbs, again irrespective of the tense indication: for example, in the present.

In addition, the perfect tensed imperfective verb in German relates to the speech act time, S. Compare what Schoorlemmer (1995) observes for Russian.

(13) c. “The sentence in the perfect, as opposed to the simple past tense, provides a perspective from S, but also the implication that (in very vague terms) the situation in which the event took place still goes on, an implication that is absent in the simple past. I will refer to this implication as perfect effect (as opposed to perfect temporal structure), abbreviated PE."[.]" [. . .]” [. . .] precisely those verbs and sentences that derive PE can derive PPPs (except for unaccusative verbs) since a PPP obligatorily co-occurs with PE.” (Schoorlemmer 1995:245)

d. “Perfective aspect combined with perfective temporal structure optionally triggers PE.” (Schoorlemmer 1995:251, the author’s example (87)).

e. “PE is possible only in a clause showing compositional telicity. [. . .] Compositional telicity in Russian is accessible as part of the aspectual system only if no imperfective trigger is present. [. . .] PE is derived on the basis of the presence of a specified quantified argument object (internal argument), [+SQA].” (Schoorlemmer 1995:253, her example (94)).

f. “[. . .] the quantificational properties of the internal argument [. . .] are crucial for deriving compositional telicity.” (Schoorlemmer 1995:256)

g. “Passives always derive PE.” (Schoorlemmer 1995:265)

h. “[+]PE is a feature on Asp°.” [. . .] (Schoorlemmer 1995:272)

(14) a. \[
\text{Asp}^\text{NP}[^{+}\text{PE}] \text{V}^\text{+Asp}[^{+}\text{PE}] \text{[VP t}\text{t}^\text{t}_\text{v}]\]
(Schoorlemmer 1995: her example (121)) . . . raising to a functional Aspect category in the spirit of Minimalism

b. “Spelling out PE derives a passive.” (Schoorlemmer 1995:277)

In what follows we shall compare this with German.

1.6 Perfect effect in German?

Schoorlemmer’s observations with respect to the Perfect effect in English and Russian are no doubt correct and valuable. But I prefer a different conclusion. In particular, Schoorlemmer’s conclusion (Schoorlemmer 1995:27) that spelling out PE entails passive formation is rejected as too theory-driven and not sufficiently supported by empirical insight. Much rather, it is more plausible to assume that the way how PE is realized event-semantically, given the Aktionsart of the verbs and given the selected Auxiliary verb and its specific selectional properties, determines verbal gender (voice). What exactly the derivative steps are will be investigated. The second fundamental reservation vis-à-vis Schoorlemmer rests on her claim that those aspectual properties are identified by PE that play a role in passivization. It will be seen that is an empirically unmotivated assumption.

Let us reconsider what the goal of our investigation is. What we were wondering was what the contribution of German Aktionsart and Aspect is for the formation of passives. In other words, is the passive in German aspect derived or is it independent of aspect.
1.7 Aspect phases and Aktionsart (AA) predication

Aktionsart oppositions between terminative (perfective) and non-terminative (imperfective) predicates can be represented in the following explanatory way (see first Abraham 1987).

(15) a. bi-phasic terminatives: versenken/versenkt "sink/sunk" as tV

versenken[AGi,THj] versenkt[THj] tense structure for PPM:

|>>>>>>>>>>|------------------| E__R,S or E__R,R,S

\[ t' \quad \quad t'' \]

b. mono-phasic interminatives: helfen/geholfen “help/helped”

helfen[AGi,goj] geholfen [THj]

|∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼|∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼∼| E,R__S or R__S.E.R

The properties defined in 1.3. refer to t" in (15a) above. There are no culmination points or resultant states for imperfectives according to Parson’s approach.

The generalized stance is taken that each periphrasis in German can be described compositionally. Grammatical and ungrammatical periphrases rest on specific compositionality constraints. Compositions are the result of projections of a tense or aspect structure onto another tense structure. The category extending wider scope has projection priority over the narrower one. This mechanism mirrors the linear relations of functional verb categories (elements hosted by the categories of Agreement, Tense, Mood, and Voice). It also reflects the diversity of such linearities in different languages. See (16) for German.

(16) [v. . . [v-finP [v-fin wird] [PPM versenkt]]] “...gets sunk”

gets sunk

|{(E,R)}|{(E,R)}| E,R E,R |

[tense structure: ( PP]) Aktionsart axis: (versenken) ⇔ versenkt[+perf]

werden ⇒ (geworden)

C-anchored (Hornstein 1990)

∴ wird gerade versenkt ⇔ wird versenkt sein (implication based on the perfective AA)

From (16) follows that the finite component denoted by (E,R,)S,R with sein “be” or werden “become/get” is situated (“S-anchored”) by S-projection (speech act time) onto E,R or E__.R. In other words, wird “become/get” is projected onto the 1st (incremental) phase of the full verb. V determines by virtue of (E,R,E__R) which implications hold.

What then is the projection like for imperfective verbs? See (17). In (16) as well as in (17) tense structure according to Reichenbach’s notation and the Aktionsart configuration are separated.
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(17) \[v_{f} \ldots [v_{f_{-}n} \text{ wird } [\text{PPM untersützt}]]] \text{ “...becomes/gets supported”}

gets supported

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
[(E,R)] & [E\_R] & \text{Tense structure:} \\
[\text{Infinitiv}] & [\text{PPM}] & E,R & E\_R \\
(\text{unterstützen})[AG_{1},TH_{1}] & \text{Aktionsart axis:} \\
\lllllllllllllllll\text{unterstützt}[TH_{1}] & (\text{unterstützen}) \leftarrow \text{unterstützt}[-\text{perf}] \\
\lllllllllllllllllwerden & \text{werden} \leftrightarrow (\text{geworden}) \\
\text{E,R,S,R} & (E\_R) & \text{E,R,S,R} & (E\_R)
\end{array}
\]

\[. \text{ wird gerade versenkt} \text{ (no implication of a resultant state: imperfective Aktionsart with unterstützen “support”)}

See Section 10 below for an alternative solution to disambiguating the participial form.

(17) shows that what Schoorlemmer (1995:245 et passim) has called ‘Perfect effect’ is not covered precisely by (16)–(17). After all, what the ‘Perfect effect’ amounts to mirrors the traditional denotation of the Present perfect, i.e., present relevance as a consequence of an event in the past. What the phenomena in (16) and (17) relate to is something similar, and yet distinctly different also. The difference is that the incremental event is denoted by the PPM-state either by direct implication (for perfective predicates) or by an inference by analogy (for imperfective verbs). Let us call this the ‘Perfective effect’. See the different Aktionsart configurations and tense structures in (16)–(17), where the ‘Perfective effect’ rolls out as a proper implication extended by PPM for [+perf]-predicates – i.e., implied solely on the strength of the Aktionsart-structure as a ‘Perfect effect’. On the other hand, for [-perf]-verbs there is no such implication extended by PPM (see the bold implication arrows for the Aktionsart-configuration in (16)–(17)). The assumption was, however, that every PPM irrespective of its lexically inherent Aktionsart has an identical tense configuration: i.e., E\_R. One can consider this as a weak version of the Aktionsart-motivated Perfective effect. This version emerges to the extent that the Resultant state implied by the PPM does not hold up to S, as is the case in Russian and in the English reading of the ‘Present perfect’. Rather, the PPM-State is of ‘relevance’ for S. This is a property of tense structure rather than the Aktionsart configuration: see E,R,R\_S for the pure Preterit as well as the equivalences of what can be seen as the deperefectivized analytic preterit represented by the ‘South German Preterit demise’ designating – counter to E\_R,R,S for the English Present perfect – a ‘Relevance perfect’. Notice that the precise difference between Present perfect and the Relevance perfect is not brought forward through the Aktionsart configuration and the Tense structure signaled by Reichenbach’s notation alone.

1.8 The concepts of ‘extended now’ and ‘resultant state’

We have seen that Schoorlemmer’s (1995) Perfect effect is fully captured in the present approach by the Perfective effect of the PPM. There is not only full formal equivalence,
but, what is more, empirical convergence in as much as the perfectivity observations are accounted for. Compare (11) and (17). The conceptual basis for the Aspect account is the tense concept developed in discussions by Dowty (1979), Parsons (1990), and Giorgi & Pianesi (1997). Dowty’s ‘extended-now theory’ is covered by the concept of interval semantics. More concretely, the ‘extended now’ is a time predicate $XN(t)$ that holds at $t'$ iff between $t$ and $t'$ a certain temporal relation holds (Giorgi & Pianesi 1997:90). See (18).

(18) Definition ((51) by Giorgi & Pianesi 1997) “$XN(t)$ holds for the time point $t'$ iff $t'$ is a final sub-interval of the interval signaled by $t$.”

Parsons (1990) introduced a similar concept, i.e., that of the consequent, or resultant, state; short RS). The construction in (19a) has the logical form as in (19b),

(19) $a.$ Johann hat einen Apfel gegessen
John has an apple eaten
“John has eaten an apple”

$b.$ $\exists x(\text{ess-}(e) \land \text{Agent}(e, \text{Johann}) \land \text{Patient/Thema}(e,x) \land \text{Apfel}(x) \land \text{holds}(\text{RS}(e), S))$

where RS (for Resultant State) is a sub-function of events on events, which assigns a Resultant state to every event $e$. In other words, (19b) means that at speech act time, $S$, a Resultant State holds for that event. Consequent states of this sort are defined exclusively for culminating event points or final sub-events. In addition, (20a) holds (cf. Giorgi & Pianesi 1997:92f.; 98):

(20) $a.$ The Resultant State (RS) holds of $t$ iff $e$ at $t$ or some time prior reaches its Culminating point ($\text{Calm}$).

$b.$ $\forall e \forall t(Calm(e) \lor e \preceq t \rightarrow \text{holds}(\text{RS}(e), t))$ (see Giorgi & Pianesi 1997:93)

$c.$ $x$ is a Resultant State (RS) of $e$ where $e$ is closed topologically $=_{\text{at}}$ Left boundary$(x) =$ Right boundary$(e); \text{cf.} (11), (17a)$ as opposed to (17b)

The semantic contribution of PPM consists in a relation $\text{RS}(e', e)$ between two events, $e'$ and $e$, iff $e'$ is the Resultant State of $e$. Auxiliary verbs such as haben “have”, werden and sein “be” operate on event variables. As long as PPM–clauses are linked to auxiliary verbs the event variables relate to them such that $e'$ becomes the final event, $\rho$, of $e$: $p(e_{\text{Aux}}$, $e'$). What participle morphologies contribute is that the event denoted by VP leads to a culminating point of the event and a topologically final point which introduces a consequent event, the Resultant State.

(21) $a.$ Montag hatte Johann das Rennen gewonnen
Monday had John the race won

$b.$ (Bis heute) hat Johann das Rennen noch nicht gewonnen
to date has John the race not yet won

(22) $a.$ $\exists e' \exists e(\text{gewinn}(e) \land \text{Agent}(e, x) \land \text{CS}(e', e) \land p(\text{Montag}, e') \land \text{Montag} < S)$

$b.$ $\neg \exists e' \exists e(\text{gewinn}(e) \land \text{Agent}(e, x) \land \text{CS}(e', e) \land p(S, e'))$
For (21a) there is a winning event and a Resultant State $e'$ such that $e'$ is in the $\rho$-relation to Donnerstag “Thursday”. By contrast, for (21b) there is no Resultat State for any relevant subevent – i.e., in the $\rho$-relation with the speech act point $S$.

In what follows the ‘precedent (incremental) phase’ implied by PPM ($= RS(e), t$) is but roughly defined in reference to (20a–c) above. See (20d–g).

(20) 

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{d.} A precedent phase (PRE) holds at $t$, iff $e$ at $t$ or some time prior to $t$ reaches its Culmination point.
  \item \textbf{e.} $\forall e \forall t (Culm(e) \land e \leq t \rightarrow es gilt (RS(e), t))$ \hspace{1cm} (= (20b))
  \item \textbf{f.} Redundancy rule: $RS(e, t) \rightarrow PRE(e, t-n)$
  \item \textbf{g.} $x$ is a precedent (incremental) phase, $PRE(e, t-n)$ of $RS(e,t)$ where $e$ is topologically closed =$_{df} (Right \ boundary(e) = Left \ boundary(x))$.
\end{itemize}

(20d–g) distinguishes properties (i.e. states without a precedent (incremental) phase) from ‘reached states’. It remains open, however, whether the precedent phase is implied lexically or syntactically. (20g), more concretely, turns around the relation in (20c).

\section*{1.9 ‘Unaccusativity’ and its aspectual derivation}

The Aspect hypothesis developed in the preceding chapters has wider implications – ones that do not come into the picture in precedent discussions in the first place (except for Schoorlemmer 1995; see also Schoorlemmer 2004). As will be seen, this link has profound empirical implications which cannot be left aside without severely violating principles of observational and descriptive adequacy.

Ergative, or unaccusative, verbs (eV) are a separate verbal class only in the framework of the Argument hypothesis. Under the Aspect hypothesis they are nothing but perfective intransitives (Abraham 1993, 1995, 1998, 1999, 2004).). What is the event semantic representation of perf-iV (=‘eV’) like?

The point of departure to argue in favor of this is the fact that unaccusatives, eV, cannot be passivized. If they were the result would have to be an impersonal passive since the only (internal) structural argument, iA, would be demoted leaving a structure without any argument representation. From the point of view of the Argument hypothesis for passivization (in German), there is no plausible reason why impersonal passives of eV should not be possible given that German allows impersonal passives for any agentive verb. Notice, however, that under the Aspect hypothesis there is an easy and plausible explanation: If eV are perfV in the first place it follows that they cannot project impersonal passives under any circumstances, since the latter are invariably imperfective (see also Abraham & Leiss, this volume), while eV are always perfectives.

Is this result reflected in any direct way in the event semantic representations in (16)–(17) above? We have claimed that passives generally result from the projection of finite Auxiliary verbs onto the secondary phase of the total event (precedent + Resultant phases). Generally, PPMs irrespective of their specific Aktionsart, are semantically akin to eV. Formally, the semantics of perf(ective)-iV(=eV) predicates reduce to perfective PPM(=Resultant state)+the transition point from the inchoative prephase. This
transition point is the only $t$ for which both the Incremental phase and the Resultant state are predicated alike. However, since we have an imperfective PPM also, we need to distinguish two perfective intransitives. \(\text{[perf-iV = perfective intransitive verb]}\).

(23) Perf-iV with an extended inchoative (incremental) phase, extendable to verbal complexes with a telic object or telic adverbial phrase: \emph{e.g.} \text{das Haus bauen} “build the house”; \emph{durch den ACC Fluss schwimmen} “swim thru the river”; \emph{über den ACC Graben springen} “jump over the moat”; \emph{untergehen} “go under/sink”. The infinitive of these predicates denotes the event of the inchoative phase as well as the transition point, the verge, to the Resultant state.

(24) Those perf-iV for whom the inchoative phase coincides with the Resultant phase. This occurs for those verbs for whom the transition point, the verge, conflates properties of either phase, the incremental one and the Resultant state; thus the punctual perf-iV \emph{entschlafen} “fall asleep”, \emph{ankommen} “arrive”, \emph{sterben} “die”, \emph{versinken} “sink down/under”, \emph{heraustreten} “step out” (punctual perf-iV are \emph{find}, \emph{betreten} “step in(to)”, etc.).

For such punctual perfective verbs, the inchoative auxiliary \emph{werden} “become, get” projects onto this verging point. Since points have no extension the typical perfective diagnostic with adverbs of time extension lead to ungrammaticality unless the incremental preceding phase is implied (\emph{found it/died in a minute}).

How is the difference between (23) and (24) to be represented event-structurally? Let us first see where passivity is yielded – this then would be the explanatory path under an aspectual/Aktionsart criterion. (25)–(26) are ‘impersonal passives’ (i.e. ‘passives devoid of arguments’).

(25) \emph{Es wurde in den Graben gesprungen} / \textit{sein Haus gebaut} / \emph{durch den Fluss geschwommen} it was into the moat jumped / one’s home built / through the river swum

(26) \emph{Es wurde gefunden, angekommen, versunken, eingetreten, ausgelöst, gestorben} it was found, arrived at, sunk, entered, triggered, died (irrespective whether with or without a (cognitive) direct object)

(27) ad (26):

\begin{align*}
\text{sterben/finden/ankommen} & \quad \text{“die/find/arrive at”} \\
(\text{[>>>>>>>>>>>]}&\text{[----------------]}\text{E\textsubscript{R,S} bzw. E\textsubscript{R,R,S}}) \\
&\uparrow \\
(\text{[>>>>>>>>>>>]}&\text{[----------------]}\text{wird})
\end{align*}

(28) ad (25):

\begin{align*}
\text{springen} & \quad \text{in} \\
&\text{den Graben} \\
(\text{[~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~|[----------------]}\text{E,R\textsubscript{S} bzw. R\textsubscript{S} E,R}}) &\uparrow \\
(\text{[>>>>>>>>>>>]}&\text{[----------------]}\text{wird})
\end{align*}
The mapping arrow in the event graph, \( \uparrow \), is reflected in the syntactic derivation as incorporation raising. We shall return to this presently. What has to be, and has in fact been, explained here was the non-passivizability of ergative/unaccusative verbs, eV, solely in the perspective unfolded by the Aspect hypothesis.

It is crucial for Schoorlemmer’s line of argumentation that the distinction between unaccusative/ergative, eV, and unergative predicates bears out naturally from her discussion of passivization in Russian (Schoorlemmer 1995:Ch. II, 2.2). It was argued here that eV are nothing but perfective iV. Thus, the account of eV as opposed to iV rests on an aspectual criterion – one that does not play any role in Schoorlemmer’s discussion. Unaccusatives, eV, Schoorlemmer claims, are different from unergatives, iV, because they occur in aspectually identical transitive clauses (Schoorlemmer 1995:263). Among the diagnostic criteria for eV that Schoorlemmer employs is the ungrammaticality of impersonal passivization. This is canonical for the discussion of this phenomenon. I dispelled this generalization on empirical grounds. Furthermore, I extended the range of explanation in as much as what counts and lies at the bottom of any good explanatory coverage is the aspectual classification of the predicate to be impersonally passivized. The reader is reminded of our argument that composite passivization (i.e., passivization with a past participle, PP) in German (and Dutch as well as West Frisian) is constrained to predicates with an external (Agent) argument. On the other hand, the constraint is less narrow in as much passivization in English and Russian external as well internal arguments are possible (‘Argument hypothesis for passivization’).

Consider, as an orientation, the following two key identifications and grammaticality reviews for the ‘impersonal’ passive.

‘ergative/unaccusative’ (/terminative, perfective intransitive) Predicates:

    it becomes/gets now just / yet once again arrived
    (werden)
    become/gotten
b. Es wird einfach nicht nicht angekommen!
    it becomes simply not not arrived
    ... only with imperative reading
c. **Es ist angekommen
    it is arrived
d. Er ist angekommen
    he is arrived “he has arrived”
e. **Er ist angekommen worden
    he is arrived become/gotten
f. **Er wird angekommen
    it becomes/gets arrived
g. **Es war gestorben
    it was died
h. Es wurde im I. Weltkrieg mit Inbrunst gestorben
    it became in WW1 with zeal died
'unergative' (/ imperfective intransitive) Predicates:

\[(30)\]

a. Es wird (hinaus)gegangen (werden)
   it becomes/gets (out)gone (become/got)

b. **Es ist gegangen ... **unless in specific grammaticalizing contexts; cf. (29)
   it is gone

c.(*).Er wird gegangen
   he becomes/gets gone

Notice, first, that, while state passives are definitely out for eV (ergative/unaccusative verbs), impersonal passives appear not to be out altogether. Second, (30c) has a terminative reading, whereas similar constructions on the basis of *ankommen* "arrive" and *sterben* "die" are definitely out. Can we account for that on the basis of what we have reached so far?

An attempt is made to account for the specific grammaticality evaluations in terms of compositional event phase semantics. It is true that perfective intransitives, iV, such as *ankommen* "arrive" and *sterben* "die", quite plausibly cannot undergo passivization. But this is not categorically excluded. Why are (29a, b, d, h) acceptable, not, however, (29c, e, f, g)? The question has two answers. This is why it is not possible in principle (thus accounting for the ungrammatical versions in (29)). *wird*, as a full aspectual verb, denotes the inchoative process leading to a resultant state. *wird* has compositional mapping priority over the mapping of the participle, *angekommen*. In other words, *wird* tries to select the inchoative phase which is in line with its own aspectual characteristic. However, it does not find one since the inchoative phase is not denoted directly, but only implied by the PP *angekommen* "arrived" (inchoative phase in parenthesis, (|>>>>>>>>>))).

\[(31)\]

\[
\text{
\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{\textit{ankommen}[thi]} \text{\textit{angekommen}[thi]} \ “arrive-arrived”} \\
\text{|-----------------|} \\
\text{\uparrow} \\
\text{|----------------|} \\
\text{\textit{becomes/gets-become/gotten}} \\
\text{\textit{wird} (geworden)}
\end{tabular}
\]

Needless to say, the demoted Agent argument can be argued to play the ‘transitive’ thematic roll completing the necessary biphasic satisfaction (i.e., the argument assignment to both event phase predicates).

Notice that (30b) is not impossible (as opposed to literal (30c)) either once one considers felicitous reading contexts for (29a, b, h). Likewise, in the latter case, the Perfective effect emerges quite clearly: viz. the Resultant phase implying the Inchoative phase. Notice also that according to the ‘Aspect point of view’, ergatives/unaccusatives possess object-like subjects only for the reason that, as perfective intransitives, both satisfy the event phase by means of just one single argument. This is because a (Resultant-) state never permits an Agent, but only the hierarchically lower Patient/Thema as an argument. Therefore, no passive can be derived (‘Agent requirement’ for passivization in German and Dutch). This holds also under the ‘Argument passive hypothesis’.
But why is it that (29c, e, f, g) fail to satisfy grammaticality requirements? Consider the following. According to the ‘Argument hypothesis’ the ungrammaticality of (29c) is accounted for by the general ‘Unaccusativity hypothesis’, which says that any argument that has been promoted to external argument status becomes syntactically immobile. In other words, unaccusativity is a lexically passive diathesis. Typologically, Schoorlemmer claims, no syntactic diathesis has been registered that emerges through more than one single valence reduction. May that be as claimed. It strikes one, however, that under Schoorlemmer’s ‘Unaccusativity hypothesis’ aberrations as in (29c, e, f, g) are not accounted for. In fact, (29a, b, h) should definitely be out. However, under the ‘Aspect hypothesis’ such grammaticality differences are accounted for. Consider the irreparable ungrammaticality of (29e) as opposed to (29d). It is suggested that perfective verbs denote the first event phase, the inchoative one, already in the synthetic present – i.e., on the basis of [E,R,S,R]. *werden*, on the other hand, forces another mapping onto the Inchoative phase – two mappings as it were. This may be the reason for the ungrammaticality. (Nevertheless, it is admitted that there is not sufficient empirical-typological evidence to legitimate, or disallow, double mappings of this sort.)

Consider, then, (30a–c). What is crucial for (30a–c) is the fact that in order to achieve the metaphorical (and idiomatically quite frequent) reading the perfective verbal particle *hinaus-/raus* - ‘there-out’ is usually imagined additionally. It is admitted, however, that this leaves undecided whether the elliptical, presupposed Agent roll is the trigger for passivization or whether this is determined by the equally elliptical terminative verbal particle *hinaus-/raus*. Furthermore, agentivity can be forced even for unaccusatives by adverbs of intent and implied activity as in (29a, b, h). This is evidence for the strong theta-semantic basis of German grammaticality judgments, while simultaneously the grammatical core perspective is maintained.

2. A few cross-linguistic data

2.1 Conditions of distribution in Russian and German

Russian is an excellent probing ground for the denotation of the past participle morpheme (PPM) for the following reasons: first, because perfective and imperfective predicates are morphologically distinct; second, because the implicative consequences are distinct from the implicatures; third, because the formation of PPM is dependent upon aspect/Aktionsart; and, fourth, because tense and aspect are in interaction. See Fig. 1.

These opposition fields of Russian differ fundamentally from those in German – yet, the total picture is not without similarities. For a general typology of reflexive diatheses see Geniušienė 1986. Compare Fig. 2.

The most striking distributional constraints are the following ones. See Fig. 3. The state passive can only be formed from perfective verbs; see (32).
The compositional nature of the analytic passive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preterit</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>otkryval “opened”</td>
<td>otkryvaet “opens”</td>
<td>budet otkryvat “will open”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reflexive-) Passive</td>
<td>otkryval'sya</td>
<td>otkryvaetsya</td>
<td>budet otkryvat'sya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no periphrastic forms</td>
<td>“opens.REFL.”</td>
<td>“opens.REFL.”</td>
<td>“will.REFL open”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>otkryl “opened”</td>
<td>0: no S-anchoring possible by E__R</td>
<td>otkroet “will open”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive:</td>
<td>byl otkryt “was opened”</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>budet otkryt “will be open”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>otkrylya</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>otkroetsya “will open.REFL”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>otkryt “has been opened”</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object resultative appears as

Perfective-Passive, albeit with present representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>byl otkryt “was opened”</th>
<th>otkryt “is opened”</th>
<th>budet otkryt “will be opened”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(only for tV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Russian PPM – gap of present tense and future tense for perfectives

(32) PM

(|<<<<<<<<<<<<<<-|--------------------------|
<werden> (geworden) “become/get.become/gotten” <sein> “be”

Selection rules:

(33) a. PPM+sein \implies PPM+worden sein for [+perf] as well as E__R

not, however:

b. PPM+worden sein \implies PPM+sein for [–perf], albeit linked to E__R by the Perfect effect

Selection rules cross-linguistically:

(34) German:

a. PPM[–passive]+haben: tV
b. PPM[+passive]+sein: iV[+perfective]
c. PPM[+passive]+werden: iV[±perfective]
d. PPM[–passive]+sein: FBV-iV such as laufen "run", gehen "go", schwimmen "swim", particularly with a telic reading

e. PPM[–passive]+haben: iV[–perfective] such as schlafen "sleep", träumen "dream"

Dutch:

f. PPM[–passive]+zijn i.e., besides de kar werd geschoven “the wagon was pushed” there is also de kar is geschoven;

PPM of worden “become/get” is generally left out: cf. Ik ben er verslagen (geraakt/*geworden)

“I was beaten”.

Werner Abraham

480 g. tV[+perf]: beginnen “begin”, verliezen “lose”, vergeten “forget” – this also holds for tV:

_Ik ben mijn portemonnaie vergeten/verloren_

“I forgot/lost my wallet”

Dutch (34f) shows in a direct way that the Perfect effect is a step in the grammaticalization of the passive. Was is formally a stative passive in German being subject to Aspect constraints has emerged in Dutch as the expression of the event passive on the basis of the mandatory implication of the precedent phase albeit unconstrained by any aspect property on the verbs involved.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>tV</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“pushed”</td>
<td>“pushed”</td>
<td>“is”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“run”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“ran”</td>
<td>“run”</td>
<td>“is”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>tV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“pushed”</td>
<td>“pushed”</td>
<td>“has”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“run”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“ran”</td>
<td>“run”</td>
<td>“is”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>tV</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“pulled out”</td>
<td>“pulled”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“arrived”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“arrived”</td>
<td>“arrived”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive: e2=Passive Subject</td>
<td>tV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“was pulled out”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1=Passive Subject</td>
<td>tV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“was pulled out”</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject no</td>
<td>tV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>“it was pulled out”</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject no</td>
<td>iV</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>“it was pulled out”</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 2. German – personal diathesis and impersonal ‘passive’

(eA=external Argument; e1 = lexically designated, e2 = syntactically derived (‘passive subject’))
The compositional nature of the analytic passive

The form that is expected from this aspectually motivated PPM-identifying scenario is the complex \textit{werden}+PPM. The position was defended that the same result can be achieved on the strength of tense structure even without appealing to aspect. In other words, E\_R holds also for imperfective PMs. This is on the basis of the Perfect effect: The precedent phase to PM is implied with the Relevance effect for R,S or E,R,R,S, respectively.

2.2 Passive forms of intransitive verbs devoid of ‘passive sense’:

Key oppositions and key forms

Let us first compare the canonical differences in PPM formation given their passive vs. active readings (Helbig & Buscha 1976; Thieroff 1994). See Fig. 4.

The question mark in the column for ‘Event passive’, Fig. 6, and ‘[+perf]’ refers to samples such as (35d) below (suggestion by a theater director – no doubt, plausible). See (35a–c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative/Adjectival passive</td>
<td>*ist geschoben ‘is pushed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event/Ongoing passive</td>
<td>*es(ExP) w ird angekommen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. German aspect distribution between event (ongoing) passive (with \textit{werden}) and state ‘passive’ (with the copula \textit{sein})
(35) a. impersonal passive: \( Es/*E \text{r wird/ wurde gelaufen} \) [–passive] it/he becomes/became beaten
b. detransitive passive: \( E \text{r wird geschlagen} \) [+passive]; ‘personal’ passive “he becomes beaten”
c. \( E s \text{ wird geschlagen} \) [–passive]; form of an impersonal passive it gets beaten
d. \( A b \text{ jetzt wird angekommen} \) [–passive]+[+perf] for eV from now on gets arrived at

Let us say that impersonal passives have no true passive sense since the subject, es, or pro as in (35d) above does not project a thematic role. But we concluded that this is an epiphenomenon: Passive sense is not elicited because imperfective verbs (no matter whether iV or tV) possess no telic arguments (clausal parts of speech/valences). See the difference between (36a/b) and (36c).

(36) a. *\( E \text{r wird gelaufen} \) vs. he gets run
b. \( E s \text{ wird gelaufen} \) Expi. gets run
c. \( E r/E s \text{ wird geschlagen} \) he/it gets beaten

2.3 Requirement for PPM: statehood (= [+ perfect], [α passive])

What are the building stones for the German passive? What could serve as proof beyond doubt that the German passive derives from certain aspect configurations – not only in diachrony (where this is beyond doubt), but also in synchrony? Let us consider the synchronic arguments first.

2.3.1 Impersonal ‘passive’
The so-called ‘impersonal passive’ is not a passive in the sense that the indispensable semantic-transitive transfer of property does not take place (see Abraham & Leiss, in this volume). What is expressed, rather, is an active progressive event. This clearly attests to its aspect phenomenality. Cf. the fact that there is no meaning difference between the impersonal active and the impersonal passive. Likewise, event-semantically there is no change for an imperfective as in (37b) below.

(37) a. \( M a n \text{ tanzt} \) …‘impersonal’ iV one dances
b. \( E s \text{ wird getanzt/gegangen} \) … passive-derived iV=‘impersonal passive’ it gets danced/walked
c. \( E s \text{ wird gehoben} \) … from tV/iV it/Expl. gets lifted
d. *\( E s \text{ wird gefunden/herausgezogen} \) …perfective tV it gets found/out-pulled
This distribution holds independently of whether or not the respective predicate is transitive or intransitive as demonstrated by (37c). What is contingent upon the transitive/intransitive distinction and Aktionsart, however, is the semantically theta-role void, purely formal ‘impersonal’ passive. See (37d, e) above. Despite this distinct property, we distinguished above punctual and non-punctual perfectives. From such a distinction, the difference in (37d, e) can be derived. Notice that the mapping of the inchoative process extended by wird onto the event point represented by a punctual perfective verb, as with gefunden “found”, does not yield a plausible reading.

One of the key constructions is (37b), Es wird getanzt/gegangen ‘it-gets-danced/walked’ “there is dancing/walking” – which is not a true passive in the first place. Compare by contrast Er wird getanzt/gegangen ‘he (e.g., der Walzer “the waltz”) -gets-danced/walked’, with gegangen meaning, in jargon and somewhat ludicrously, “He is being dismissed/sacked”, literally “he is made going/leaving”. In other words, as soon as the expletive es “it” is replaced by a true personal pronoun a true semantic passive reading becomes available.

Figures 5–6 lead to answers to our first question: “How does the Passive in German come about?” See gegangen “gone, walked”, which allows for the passive reading only if a thematic subject is assigned. This is the configuration when the state argument – which can only be a subject argument – selects the statal phase of the participial composite form and the bi-phasic diathetic composite is reconstructed in which the state argument of the post phase was an object (cf. Pustejovsky 1991). Passive sense results, quite traditionally (cf. Latin trans-it-ive “across-go-suffix”), when an action transfer takes place from the Agent to the terminal point occupied by the Patient. Where such an object or action transfer is not possible for lack of two thematic roles instantiating this transfer – such as in the case of intransitives and the impersonal “passive” – no semantic passive sense is yielded (except for the event of ongoingness).

2.3.2 Thematic and non-thematic Passive
Strikingly, (38d) below forces the conclusion that, unless geworden is added to the PPM, the incremental prephase to the Resultant State is implied. This is fully grammaticalized in Modern Standard German. [StP=state/adjectival passive, German Zus-tandspassiv restricted to perfective verbs and perfective constructions].
(38) a. **Er wird gelaufen
   he gets run
   vs. Es wird gelaufen
   Expt. gets run
   "there is running"

b. StP: *Der Wagen ist geschoben
   the car is pushed
   vs. Der Wagen ist herausgeschoben
   the car is out-pushed

c. only as a metaphor, otherwise*:
   Er wird gegangen
   he gets gone = "he gets fired"

d. Dutch de kar is geduwd (*geworden)
   the car is pushed (gotten)

What about (38c)? The lexicon-designated (‘merged’) object patient *Er “he” introduces a telic point. In other words, the progressive implied by the impersonal ‘passive’ is suspended for the very reason that situating the telic object-NP quasi-perfectivizes the event. Notice that this conclusion is in favor of the Aspect Hypothesis and against the Argument Hypothesis.

2.4 Conclusion: Past Participle Morpheme with Adjective status

The very asymmetry of the analyses of the passive forms as demonstrated in (38a, b) and Figures 4–6 shows beyond doubt that there is at least a partial aspectual dependence of the German passive. Wherever a passive sense can be identified, theta-role transitivity, as well as mandatory Agent-hood of the predicate lexeme, must be heeded. Intransitive predicates do not possess a passive sense despite the passive form (Abraham 1995: Ch. 3, 161ff.). However, fact is that in the diachrony of German (as well as the other Continental West-Germanic languages, Dutch, West-Frisian, and Yiddish) a passive form emerged for what is definitely not a passive sense. This is clear indication for our conclusion that the aspectual-temporal force of the PPM (past participle, active and passive) is also the primary one under a synchronic perspective. It also means that passive sense derives from resultant state aspectuality of the PPM. Given this statehood of the PPM, Agent-hood is implicitly excluded. By implication, deagentivization of the PPM with passive sense derives from adjectival status of the PPM.

In what follows the core mechanisms of passive sense in German is listed. Since nothing appears to contradict these criteria they will be taken to universally characterize passive sense (but not passive form). Notice that similar lists as those collected, on a wide typological basis, by Shibatani (1985, 1988 ed.) or Siewierska (1984) are not quite congruent at least as far as German and Dutch are concerned – certainly not among the most negligible Indo-European languages to be co-considered in such a universal attempt at a characterization.

(39) PPM denotes a state, thus Adjective status. Consequently, PPM entails non-Agenthood.

(40) PPM presupposes an emergent phase, a prephase to the resultant phase, triggered either by [+perfective] Aktionsart or by the composite past tense configuration even if [+perfective] (to be true, only for the periphrastic Perfect, given the specific implication of the emergent prephase to the result phase denoted by PPM).
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(41) The disambiguation as passive is supported semantically either by a telic object, or by a telic verb-particle, or a corresponding verbal affixoid; syntactically it is supported by the specific Aux-selection as represented in (34a–g).

Let us assume that the diachronic criteria in (6)–(7) above will not be falsified. Then, (42)–(44) below cannot be plausible final stages of Modern German given the initial configuration in (39). It is the assumption here, counter to that held by van Gelderen (1997) and many others, that the syntactic representation has to mirror the semantic Aktionsart and tense configuration in (15)–(17) more faithfully.

It is relevant to point out that the last conclusion changes many assumptions made in the rich typological tradition of the discussion of passivization. One thinks of the scathing criticism that Nerbonne (1982) has forwarded against the ‘One-Advancement-Law’ in the framework of Arc Pair Grammar (Perlmutter/Postal 1984) and what receives a new stage lighting in the context of the passivization of intransitive verbs. Nerbonne argues that, since intransitives can be passivized in German (just like the synthetic passive in Latin; viz. *itur* ‘it-is-gone/run’ “there is going/running”), Perlmutter’s law cannot hold universally. As we have argued, however, passive meaning (‘trans-it-ive’ “(theta) transfer”) has to be distinguished from passive form. If so, just formally passivized constructions like the impersonal ‘passive’ do not counter-sample Perlmutter/Postal’s typological prediction.

3. The syntactic representation of Aspect and Voice/Verbal gender
   in Modern English

3.1 Functional categories and Agreement

In what follows I assemble what I deem interesting suggestions from the literature (van Gelderen 1997) as for structural representations of the periphrastic passive and perfect involving the PPM, as in German and in English as well as other European languages. This comparison is pursued in order to make more visible the fundamentally different position pursued in the present approach. It is to be noticed that the morphosyntactic structures contain event designations in TP or below as structural nodes.

(42) Present-active structure of transitive sentences (Van Gelderen 1997:5; the author’s example (4)) *Zora reads books*:
   \[
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{IP Spec[D]}[\text{Case}] \rightarrow \text{vP Spec[D]} \rightarrow \text{v'}[\text{DP Zora[phi][Case]}][\text{v reads[DP books[phi]][Case]}] \\
   \end{array}
   \]

(43) ‘Present perfect’ (van Gelderen 1997:8; her ex. (13) *They have gone*):
   \[
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{CP [S[Pres]][vP they[VP R-ha(w)][t][\text{EventTP}[\text{EventT gone][Past]}][\text{VP v[t]]]]]} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

(44) Event structure for the past participle:
“*have* is taken out of the lexicon as an element with present features that are checked in I; *gone* has past features and checks those in EventT.” (v. Gelderen 1997:9).

(45) Simple Preterit (for *She went*):
\[
\text{[CP \ [C' \ S- \ [Pres] \ [IP \ she \ [I' \ R- \ [Past] \ [EventTP \ E- \ [Past] \ [VP \ [V' \ went]]]]]]]
\]

(46) Progressive + perfect (van Gelderen 1997:21 (62) *She has been going*):
\[
\text{[CP \ [C' \ S \ [ip \ she \ [r- \ [Pres] \ [PerfP \ [Perf \ [\textit{has} \ [\textit{eventP} \ [\textit{vp} \ [\textit{E-} \ [Past] \ [\textit{progP} \ [\textit{been}]]]]]]]]]]]]}
\]

(47) Perfective active
\[
\text{[IP \ [I' \ [t] \ [Tr a nsP \ [Tr a ns'P \ [Goal] \ [VP \ [V' \ ate]]]]]]}
\]

According to van Gelderen (1997:16), the tree structure below holds for the Active perfect in English, for *Someone ate the apple*, where the telic preposition remains unrealized and where, furthermore, ’Trans(P)’ (= AgrO). The semantic category of telicity as well as the semantic feature [\textit{Goal}] correspond to what currently is expressed by verbal particles in other languages – usually a stranded preposition or adverb (as in *We got it in for you)*.

(48) Passive:
\[
\text{[IP \ [I' \ [t] \ [TransP \ [Trans'P \ [\textit{P(goal)}] \ [VP \ [\textit{V' \ ate}] \ [\textit{VP \ the \ apple}]]]]]]}
\]

See the passive sentence *She may have been being warned* (van Gelderen 1997:23; the author’s (68)). Structural arguments in favor of (48) are the following:

(49) a. the word order is the fixed sequel: \textit{MODAL-PERFECT-PROGRESSIVE-PASSIVE-VERB}
b. topicalization concerns only certain projections, others not at all (e.g., the progressive, not, however, the Perfect nor the Passive)
c. \textit{do so} replaces VP, but none of the other projections.

In order for this to be discussed comparatively, let us cast a look at the diachronic development of passive sentences in German. This is pursued in the next Chapter, 4.

4. Historically transparent relations: Their significance for Modern German

4.1 Semantics

In Old High German, and diminishingly so in Middle High German, the Passive occurred exclusively as object predicative. In other words, it occurred only for transitive verbs with the object-internal subject structured as an embedded Small clause (object predicate; predicative) and the complex predicate inevitably being perfective (terminative). The internal predicate of the Small clause is the perfectivizing verbal
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compartment, most frequently the verbal particle or an affixoid. See (50). ['SQA' = (mereological) Specific Quantified Argument]

(50) a. [+SQA]_{DO-TH} in object predicative (Small clause) only with TH-subject and invisible copula! ⇒ (50b) below.

b. (50a) ⇒ [+SQA]_{DO-TH}, i.e., without Small clause and all other implications: no longer the transitivity condition, no longer the Perfectivity condition.


b. werden is added: historically first as an inchoative full verb selecting [+N, –V], i.e. exclusively adjectives and nominals; later also [–N, +V], i.e. verbs.

4.2 Syntax

The pervasive, exceptionless constraint on [+SQA] holding for the passivized finite predicate was dismissed in the course toward New High (Modern) German. From this does not follow, though, that the Small Clause-Syntax was given up completely, but only that it was linked and constrained originally by the feature [+SQA] yielding small clauses for object predication in a more measured way. haben and werden emerge as 'Auxiliary verbs', i.e., as raising verbs not sharing a thematic selection for subject and object in their own right.

As for the structure of the German verb, this is our present structural assumption as opposed to frequent suggestions forwarded for English (as above in (42)–(49)). In line with the distribution of prefix particles perfectivizing imperfective verbal stems in German (and Dutch), it is assumed that the German syntactic structure differs from that for English distinctly with the perfective separable prefix particles in a low merge position. The simple verb raises to (Spec)AspP to pick up the derivational particle or the phrasal XP.

(52) [v P Subject [v’ [AspP-Perfective in den Graben [Asp’ (hinein)] [VP motion-Vo]]]]

XP under AspP is the internal argument of VO. Compare (53) below, the structure of the Old High German object predicate, with Modern German in (54).

(53) phígboum habeta sum giflanzot an sinemo uwingarten
fig tree(ACC.SG.MASC) had.1SG as planted.ACC.SG.MASC in his vineyard
"I had planted a fig tree in my vineyard"
(Tatian (after Tatian 1960:146) Evangelienharmonie, 102,2)

(54) Er hat den Baum gepflanzt
he has the tree planted

(i) Old High German structure:

[cp pro [c
habeta [vP [sc-do-av phígboum[Asp sum giflanzotan]]][v to]]]]

habeta boum (sum) gipflanzot plantat

= late Latin Structure: habet arborem plantatum
(ii) Modern German structure:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Er} & \quad \text{hat} & \quad \text{den Baum} & \quad \text{gepflanzt} & \quad \text{t} & \quad \text{t} \\
\text{Er} & \quad \text{bekam} & \quad \text{den Baum} & \quad \text{als} & \quad \text{gepflanzt(en)} & \quad \text{t} & \quad \text{t} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Er bekam den Baum (als = OHG sum) gepflanzt(en)

‘he got the tree (as) planted (one)’

“he achieved the tree to be planted”

(55) The structure of the OHG sentence as well as the Modern Standard German (MStG) hat/bekommen-clause:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Er} & \quad \text{hat} & \quad \text{den Baum} & \quad \text{ModGerman/OHG sum} & \quad \text{gepflanzt} & \quad \text{t} & \quad \text{t} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The passive structure in OHG is presumably as in (56).

(56) Passive structure in OHG; cf. (54i) as well as (48) for Modern English:

The clausal structure in (56) is incomplete to the extent that a functional category has to take care of the Agreement morphology on PPM. Such an Agreement node is missing in (56). It is assumed that corresponding phi-features do the job.

(57) Passive structure in Modern German: emerged through structure simplification (no more AspP); moreover, the functional Agreement category for the OHG object predicate has been dropped in Modern German. No phi-features to be heeded since no agreement morphology.
Die diachronic development from OHG (56) to Modern German (57) accounts for the empirical fact that there is no separate syntactic class of ergative verbs, eV, in German. German eVs are perfective iVs as has been argued above. The fact that the periphrastic predicate is nevertheless similar to the structure of OHG (and Russian) shows by the fact that the complement character of the PPM is identified in dependence of the selected Aux (ist/wird). The assumption is that the passive structure in Modern German has changed from Old High German only to the extent that the PPM in Modern German implies pragmatically the incremental phase. The determining change lies in the selectional constraint of werden: It constrains its inchoative, lexically full verb status to that of the adjective or nominal categories. As a consequence, werden selecting PPM (as well as the present participle, albeit under high stylistic marking) unambiguously adopts auxiliary status and, as a consequence, loses its selectional constraints.

5. General summary: The interaction between voice and aspect

In terms of intuitively plausible graphics, this is what we come up with to describe and distinguish the different passive and active uses of the past participle and, in particular, with a close eye on the ‘impersonal passive’ as opposed to the stative passive.

(58) a. Event property of the impersonal passive: $\approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx \approx$
i.e., a uniform sequence of event points since imperfective/durative; aspect/Aktionsart dependent; event typing identical to English progressive.

b. The ‘impersonal passive’ is the aspectual inverse of the stative passive in as much as the former is imperfective, the latter, however, is perfective; clear aspect/Aktionsart dependency.

c. The demotion of the external argument (eA) in the impersonal passive only serves the purpose of rendering indefinite the covert Agent reference.

d. Assuming that unaccusative (‘ergative’) predicates in German (cf. Abraham 2000) are intransitive perfectives, the impersonal passive stands in an interesting detransitivizing hierarchy:

i. Detransitivization of 2-place perfectives yields perfective 1-place passives; this is a derivation identical, on the lexical level, to the German ergative/unaccusative, eV;

ii. No detransitivization of an (perfective) unaccusative is possible since the unaccusative is already derived under an identical process of theta reduction;

iii. The German impersonal passive is the valence reduction of a 1-place intransitive; it is restricted to imperfectives and, consequently, does not permit stative passivization.

As goes for the past participle form, the following graphics have non-unambiguous readings:
(59) a. perfective transitive: \( \text{erpressen} \) "extort"

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{eA,iA} \\
\text{iA} \\
\text{reading for iA: stative passive: iA ist erpressen} \quad \text{`is-extorted'} \\
\text{reading for eA:} \\
\text{(i) ongoing passive in perfect tense: iA ist erpressen worden} \quad \text{`is-extorted-become'} \\
\text{(ii) sein/be-perfects (intransitive verbs of motion): eA ist gelaufen} \quad \text{`is-run'} \quad \text{`has run'}
\end{array}
\]

b. \( \text{[eA(iA)]} \) reading for eA(iA):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ongoing passive for non-perfectives:} \\
iA \text{ ist behauptet worden} \quad \text{`is/has been claimed'} \\
\text{(iv) impersonal passive:} \\
\text{E \( \text{si s\, t\, g\, e\, a\, r\, b\, e\, i\, t\, e\, w\, o\, r\, d\, e\)\, (voneA)} \quad \text{`it-is-worked-gotten'} \quad \text{`it has been worked'} \\
\text{`there has been working'} \\
\text{(v) ongoing active perfect: } eA \text{ hat gearbeitet} \quad \text{`has-worked'}
\end{array}
\]

As for the ambiguities (i)–(ii) as well as (iii)–(v), see Section 1.4. above.

6. So far for Behaghel (1924)

Most strikingly, Behaghel (1924), with his keen sense for the grammar of Modern German fed by his deep diachronic insight, meets all of the conclusions that have been drawn for the present state of passivization. See the following quotation: “Ein persönliches Passive bilden Verba, die einen Akk[usativ] zu sich nehmen, falls diese eine zu einem Ergebnis herbeiführende Tätigkeit bezeichnen” (‘A personal passive is formed by verbs governing an accusative if these verbs designate an action yielding a result’; Behaghel 1924:211), and further: “Ein unpersönliches Passiv bilden Verba mit Ergänzung durch Gen[etiv] oder Dativ oder ohne kasuelle Ergänzung, die eine Tätigkeit bezeichnen” (‘An impersonal passive is formed by action verbs governing a complement in the genitive, or dative, or without any case valence’; Behaghel 1924:211). The general conditions for passivizability are the following according to Behaghel: “A. [...] daß dabei das Zeitwort \( \text{werden} \) beteiligt ist, das einen Vorgang, eine Veränderung bezeichnet (‘werden”become” is part of it denoting a change of action’; Behaghel 1924:211). B. [...] daß dabei das Part.Prät. beteiligt ist, das ursprünglich ein Adjektiv ist and den durch eine Tätigkeit geschaffenen Zustand bezeichnet (‘The past participle is part of it deriving from adjectival status and denoting a state resulting from a prior action’). C. [...] daß die Bezeichnung des Urhebers der Handlung beim Passive ursprünglich keine Stelle hat.” (‘The constituent denoting the causer of the action has no grammatically necessary part in the passive construction’; Behaghel 1924:210f.).

A comparison with Shibatani’s (1985) list of passive diagnostics shows that, for one, the passive conditions of Continental West Germanic (German, Dutch, Yiddish, Frisian) are more specific. What is more, however, is that the clue to the modern com-
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7. Addendum: Decomposition of auxiliaries

The between Aspect and verbal diathesis/voice sketched above are mirrored by the connections between the three auxiliary verbs sein “be”, werden “become”, and haben “have”. Decomposition of auxiliary verbs:

\[
\begin{align*}
(60) & \quad \text{werden}(e) \iff \lambda e \lambda e_1 \lambda e_2: e(e_1, e_2) \land \text{Inchoative}(e_1) \land [\text{Ras} \text{State}(e_2) \land \text{Calm}(e_1) \land e(e_1 < e_2)] \\
(61) & \quad \text{haben/eignen}(e_2) \iff \lambda e_2 \lambda x \lambda y: \text{State}(e_2) \land e_2(x, y) \land \text{Poss}(x) \land \text{Th}(y) \\
(62) & \quad \text{sein}(e_2) \iff \lambda e_2 \lambda y: \text{State}(e_2) \land e_2(y) \land \text{Th}(y) \\
(63) & \quad \text{bekommen}(e) \iff \lambda e \lambda e_1 \lambda e_2: \text{haben werden}(e) \iff [e(e_1, e_2) \land \text{Inchoative}(e_1) \land \text{Calm}(e_1) \land e(e_1 < e_2) \land \text{haben}(e)]
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that eignen “own” has an argument structure which is converse to that of haben “have”: ich. Nom, habe etwas.ACC \equiv mir.DAT, eignet etwas. NOM.

There are thus the following lexical links:

(i) between haben “have” and sein “be”, illustrated by Late Latin, where habère (x-Nominative, y-Accusative) equivocates esse(y-Dative, x-Nominative as in Russian “to-me-is”);
(ii) between bekommen “get” (crucial for the Dative passive) and haben werden “will have”;
(iii) summarily, between haben “have”, werden “become”, and sein “be” to the extent that the distribution of the sub-events is specific for the three predicate types. Cf. (56)–(59) above.

8. Participle disambiguation, distinct diatheses, and the mechanics of underspecification

This section presents a solution to participle disambiguation which is an alternative to the one discussed in Section 4.5 above. While the latter discussion took the passive participle as the default reading of the past participle form and derived the active reading pragmatically, the present approach pursues a different path. Participles are principally underdetermined as to their reading as past or passive morphemes – they remain ambiguous as morphological “roots” until the morphological context allows for categorical determination and an unambiguous semantic reading. This solution follows ideas developed by Distributed Morphology discussed by Embick (2004), among others.
Source categories (roots) and derivative categories

The term ‘diathesis’ conflates all verbal genders and their prederivative roots, including the non-verbal ones (viz. de-adjectival verbs), presupposing simultaneously that all such categories be represented on a common basis along distinct and non-ad hoc derivational mechanisms. (64) lists which data such a representational strategy should minimally unpack into categorial components as well as jointly employ derivational steps in the context of passive diathesis. The category sample of six in (64a, bi–iii) is not exhaustive.

(64) a. Adjectives: root sources for adjectival verbs such as German offen – (sich) öffnen “openA-(Refl) openV”, θ – (sich) schließen “0A-(Refl) closeV”, etc.

b. Past Participles (PP) with the following selectional distinctions:

   (i) PP+sein “be”: geöffnet “opened”, geschlossen “closed”

   (ii) PP+werden “become”: geöffnet “opened”, geschlossen “closed”

   (iii) PP+haben “have”: geöffnet “opened”, geschlossen “closed”

   (iv) intransitives: (müde) gelaufen sein

   (v) transitives: (seine Füße platt) gelaufen haben

   (vi) de-intransitive: Es wird gelaufen/ *Es wird hineingelaufen

   (vii) unpromoted direct object: Es wird den Marathon gelaufen

   (viii) ongoing imperfective passive participle:

   Der Hund wird (von Konrad) gepeitscht

   the dog gets (by Conrad) whipped

Passivization of perfectives will receive extra attention here. Notice that not all derivation chains are supported by lexical fillers for each chain member; see θ-(sich) schließen “0A-(Refl) closeV” in (64a), which has no chain-inceptive adjectival (‘deinchoative’) lexical. Nevertheless, given the numerous derivative realizations, adjectives are considered in general to be sources for lexical inchoative and transitive derivations. They will consequently be considered in the ensuing derivative formats. Notice further that intransitive resultative predicates as in (64civ) are taken to be equivalent to what are called unaccusatives, or ergatives, eV, in other languages (Abraham 2000, 2004a)

Accounting for both the commonalities and the differences in (64a–c/i–v) means that syntactic representations will be selected in particular instances that can plausibly be argued for. The following partial tree structure will be assumed to accommodate the syntactic categories required for the phenomena to be accounted for.
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The category Asp(ect) hosts perfective features of the verb, e.g., separable particles and other phrasal bounding adjectives and affixoids typical of the perfective verbal projection transition from the imperfective verbal stem in the Germanic languages and particularly in Dutch and German. See (66a–c) – **small caps** signal distinct word accent.

(66) a. separable particles:
   
   *essen-aufessen* 'eat-up-eat', *trinken-austrinken* 'drink-out-drink'
   
   b. bounding adjectives:
   
   *laufen-sich müde laufen* 'run - Refl tired run',
   
   c. bounding affixoids/pronominal adverbs:
   
   *gehen-hinübergehen* 'walk Deixis-over walk'

The fact that perfective, resultative Aspect is located inside of vP accounts for the fact that both adjectives and the adjectival, stative passive participle – see (64a, b–i) – carry event properties. This is what the oblique dividing line in (65) above is to demark.

In order to represent both relations and differences between the categories in (64a–c), a neutral 'root' category is assumed underlying each of the categories in (64a–c) the specifics being that it is stripped of all distinguishing features determining the realizable category lexemes in (64a–c). The following different feature voids appear to account for the differences of the homonyms in (67a–c).

(67) a. Adjectives: void of the event feature characterizing actional verbs; no person, number and agreement features.

b. Past Participles (PP):
   
   (i) **STATE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE** – eV participles:
      
      void of the event feature characterizing actional verbs (no prepositional Agent phrase projectable); no person, number and agreement features.
   
   (ii) **ONGOING EVENT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE**:
      
      event feature present (prepositional Agent phrase projectable); void of person, number and agreement features; designated valence reduced.
   
   (iii) **ONGOING EVENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE**:
      
      event feature present; void of person, number and agreement features; designated valence maintained.
c. Resultative past participle (RPP) constructions:
   (iv) intransitives (irRPP):
      no event feature present; void of person, number and agreement features;
      designated valence reduced.
   (v) transitives (trRPP):
      no event feature present; void of person, number and agreement features;
      designated valence reduced.

With the feature distribution in (67) in mind, in order to achieve syntactic distinc-
tions among the categories in (64a–c), the following syntactic distributions will be
considered to lie at the basis.

(68) a. offen (sein) – b e o p e n A d j e c t i v e : A ∩ Asp
   b.i geöffnet (sein) – b e o p e n Stative participle: v ∩ Asp
   b.ii geöffnet (werden) – g e t opened Ongoing passive participle: V/A ∩ V
   b.iii geöffnet (haben) – h a v e opened Ongoing active participle: V/A ∩ v

(68a) and (68bi) can be jointly represented in the stative category by A/V. The two
resultative participle complexes, (64c–iv–v), cannot be categorized as simply. Their
structurally distinct representation will be presented later.

Let us take the neutral unprojected root category (in the sense of Distributed Mor-
phology; see Halle & Marantz 1993 and, most recently, Embick 2004) to be signalled
by A/V. It will be assumed that the content of underspecified A/V is whatever is left
after the specific categorial features of verbs (eventivity: tense and mood; agreement
for person and number) and of adjectivals (stativity) have been left unassigned (i.e.,
undecided between + and −).

8.2 Distributional diagnostics

It is particularly telling to see which ambiguities exist for the English past participle in
sentences like (69) below when compared with highly form-content disambiguating
languages like German.

(69) The door was opened
(70) a. Das Tor wurde geöffnet ... ongoing event passive in the direct past
    b. Das Tor war geöffnet worden ... ongoing event passive pluperfect
    c. Das Tor war geöffnet ... stative passive in the past

(69) is usually called ‘eventive passive’. As such it would translate more specifically
as “the door was in a state of becoming, or getting, open” corresponding to German
(70a), whereas the equivalent of German (70c) would be “the door was in a state of
having become open” (result of a preceding incremental event). See the graphs in (71a)
below for the ongoing event in the past and in (71c) for that of the stative passive. Keep
in mind that the verbs in participial form are perfective. (70b) appears to be more or
less equivalent to (70a) only for perfective verbs, not for imperfective ones.

Notice the following graphic distinctions between (71a–c). Recall that the verbs in
participial form are perfective. The t*-induced downward arrow signals which phase
of the biphasic Aktionsart property is directly denoted (while the remaining phase, emerging (|>>>|) or resultative (|-----|), is always implied). No such bi-implication holds for imperfective predicates as in (72) below.

(71) a. *Das Tor wurde geöffnet
   the door was opened
   \[ t_k \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow t_s \]
   \[ |>>>|\rightarrow|\ldots| \]
   ... ongoing event passive in the past perfective
   The door was opened

b. Das Tor war geöffnet worden
   the door was opened/had been opened
   \[ t_k \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow t_s \]
   \[ |>>>|\rightarrow|\ldots| \]
   ... ongoing event passive pluperfect
   The door was opened/had been opened

c. Das Tor war geöffnet
   the door was opened
   \[ t_k \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow t_s \]
   \[ | \ldots | \rightarrow | \ldots | \]
   ... stative passive in the past
   The door was open

(72) Das Tor wurde gestrichen
   the door was painted
   \[ t_k \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow t_s \]
   \[ | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \rightarrow | \right)
b. *das Tor ist/war geöffnet
   the open door
   ... RP
   
   *das Tor wird/wurde geöffnet
   the open (become) being door
   ... OEP

c. *das geöffnet (worden) seiende Tor
   the opened (become) being door
   ... RP

(d) show that the attributive OEP readings are possible (albeit stylistically stigma-
tised) if the Aux is covert in present participial form derived either from sein “be” or
from werden “become/get”.

If a temporal adverb modifies the attributive RP and A the RP-readings are different.

(75) a. die kürzlich eröffnete Taverne
       E          S. . . . . S
       >>>>>>><<<<<---------------
       the recently opened tavern
   
   b. die kürzlich offene Taverne
       E          S. . . . . S
       --------------------------
       the recently open tavern

The reading in (75b) dates back the event state described to the past, while the time
reference of being opened refers to the verging point between the two phases in (75a).

(76) Verbs of creation such as (er)bauen “build”, erschaffen “create”, machen “make”, grün-
den “found” create a perfective context (Kratzer 2003; Embick 2004:357), which is not
expected to be compatible with another perfective predicate. This is borne out.

   a. *die Türe war/wurde offen erbaut *(worden)
      the door was built open
      ... A

   b. *die Türe war geöffnet erbaut *(worden)
      *the door was built opened
      ... RP

(77) a. Der Verein war groß gegründet *(worden)
      the club was founded big
      ... A

   b. *Der Verein war vergrößert gegründet *(worden)
      *the club was founded enlarged
      ... RP

Notice that, counter to Embick’s appreciation of the English equivalents (Embick
2004:357), the (b)-versions in (76)–(77) are not resultatives, but cannot be but OEPs.
This is clearly indicated by the (a)-versions since the Aux werden/worden cannot
be gapped.

(78) The privative prefix un- is usually adjoinable only to A, not to verbs (at least in Ger-
man – albeit not regularly). In the present context, however, this turns out not to be
true since RPs are amenable to un-prefigation in contrast to the infinitive and all finite
verbal forms.
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Given that adjectives and RPs can be prefixed in this way (though not without lexical restrictions on the A-category) is in line with the attributive property, the be-Aux selection as a stative (both resultative and category-undetermined).

(79) The ability to occur as secondary resultative constructions (object predicative) is open for A, not for RP:

a. Der Verein gründete sich groß/*vergrößert
   the club founded itself big/enlarged
b. Jupiter stieß die Wolken auf/*geöffnet
   Jupiter pushed the clouds open/opened
c. Der Schmied schlug das Eisen flach/*abgeflacht
   the smith beat the iron flat/down-flattened

8.3 Syntax and underspecified components

The eventive (ongoing) passive (here of a perfective predicate, öffnen): the agentive reading is associated with the feature [Agent] on v (cf. Embick 2004:364 referring further to Marantz 1984; Kratzer 1997, 2003). The bold structural component in (79) marks the difference to the stative passive participle in (81) below. The perfectivizing particle is zero (0) for the deadjectival verb öffnen in (80) as well as in (81). A/V is the underspecified category of the past participle neutral between A and V.

(80) Die Tür wird (vom Zimmermann) geöffnet (derived from the adjective offen)
   'the door becomes/gets/is being opened by the carpenter'
   [PERF Asp 0- [VP Agent [A/V offen [dp die Tür]]]]

The stative (non-ongoing) passive: no agentive PP adjoinable to v.

(81) Die Tür ist (*vom Zimmermann) geöffnet
   'the door is (*being) opened (by the carpenter)'
   [PERF Asp 0- [A/V offen [dp die Tür]]]

Both the eventive (ongoing) passive of perfectives and the stative (non-ongoing) passive (restricted to perfective predicates) involve an inchoative component which has a structure in its own right (Embick 2004:365). See (71a, c).
(82) Resultative intransitives: in German and Dutch ergative/unaccusative, since perfective:

\[
\text{Die Wolken lockern auf } \text{“The clouds dilute”}
\]

\[
\text{[perfAsp auf- } \text{DP Die Wolken [v’ become [A/V locker]]]}
\]

The structure of any adjective-derived inchoative/resultative intransitive without a perfectivizing prefix or particle is then the following:

(83) \text{Der Abend dunkelt/dämmert “The evening darkens”}

\[
\text{[v’ der Abend [v become [A/V dunkel/dämmrig]]]}
\]

The adjective or the neutralized, underspecified category, dunkel/dämmrig “dark”, is the complement of the atomic category become.

(84) Resultative transitives: the component in bold face marks the difference between the intransitive perfective (= unaccusative) in (79) and the resultant transitive in (80). See also Embick (2004:379).

\[
\text{Der Sturm lockert die Wolken auf} \text{‘the storm dilutes the clouds’}
\]

\[
\text{[perfAsp auf- } \text{vP der Sturm [caus [dp die Wolken [v become [A/V locker]]]]]}
\]

The structure of any adjective-derived resultative transitive without a perfectivizing prefix or particle, but a perfectivizing adjective is the following:

(85) \text{Der Hufschmied hämmert das Eisen flach ‘the farrier hammers the iron flat’}

\[
\text{[vP der Schmied [caus [dp das Eisen [v become [A/V flach]]]]]}
\]

\[
\text{[v’ hämmert-]]}
\]

The adjective flach “flat” as well as main verb, hammer-, will raise to the perfAsp-node to materialize the perfective property. In the prior case of a perfectivizing verbal particle, auf: “up”, the become-locker derived main verb, lockern “dilute”, will raise and adjoin to the particle in perfAspP.

8.4 Conclusion

See the following summary of the findings in relation to other chapters of passivization.

(86) The impersonal passive has imperfective structure, \[\ldots\], since it can be formed only for the verb-aspectual feature \[\neg \text{perf}\]. This is in itself an indication of the aspect/Aktionsart contingency of the impersonal passive.

(87) The impersonal passive is thus contrary to the stative passive; the latter can be formed only from perfectives/terminatives: \[\ldots\] \[\ldots\].


a. \(\text{(Das Fenster wird) geöffnet “the window is being opened”: } \lambda x \lambda s [\text{geöffnet}(x)(s)]\)

b. \(\text{(Das Fenster ist) geöffnet “the window is opened”: } \lambda x \lambda s \exists e [\text{geöffnet}(x)(s) \wedge s=\text{target}(e)]\)

c. \(\text{(Es wird) geöffnet “there is opening”: } \exists e [\text{geöffnet}(e)]\)

(89) Quantification and impersonal passive: indefinite durative event.
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(90) Demotion of the eA in the impersonal passive serves the indefiniteness of the argument only. It indicates full event predication without overt argument assignment apart from \( \exists x [\text{AG}(x) \land (e \rightarrow x)] \) or apart from \( \lambda e \exists x [e(t1-tn) \land [e(t1) - e(t2)] \land e(x)] \)

(91) The semantics of the participle, theta role projection, and homonymic forms:

*ongoing active perfect = Aux selection only for verbs of movement and a few other selected verb lexemes. The orthogonal arrow signals which structural arguments are pivotal in the formal grid of the predicate.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eA, iA} & \quad \text{iA} \\
\text{ongoing active perfective event} & = |>>>>>\|>>>>>|
\end{align*}
\]

Definition:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eA, iA} & \quad \text{iA} \\
\text{ongoing active, but imperfective event} & = |\sim\sim\sim\sim\|\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim|
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eA, iA} & \quad \text{iA} \\
\text{ongoing passive, but imperfective event} & = |\sim\sim\sim\sim\|\sim\sim\sim\sim|
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eA, iA} & \quad \text{iA} \\
\text{impersonal passive, imperfective event} & = |\sim\sim\sim\sim\|\sim\sim\sim\sim|
\end{align*}
\]

What speaks in favor of the assumption that past participles are categorically underspecified?

(92) V-status indicated by \( by\)-PP for Cop+PP

(93) Adj-status because of \( un\)-prefixation etc.; see (78a–e) above.

(94) The option to make dependent the determination between Anterior-P and passive P is contingent upon the choice between types of Aux and COP.

(95) The underspecified A/V-status is to be linked to AA/Aspect status which controls the empirical distribution in German (as well as in Russian and Italian).

(96) A/V status is codetermined by \( tV \neq iV \neq \text{impersonal passive} \); the impersonal passive is incompatible with the resultative/adjectival passive (durativity \( \neq \) perfectivity).

Notes

1. A similar analysis may be applied to infinitives, where PRO(noun) can be treated analogously to the overtly absent external argument in passives. It can be argued that, just like in the case of PM, it is infinitival morphology that bears an argument role and requires case, which means that we do not need PRO any more. See Abraham 2004a.

2. or, perhaps, E__R,S?

3. This is, in a way, related to Schoorlemmer’s much later article, Schoorlemmer (2003).
4. *es ist gelaufen* ‘it-is-run’ “there is running” is part of the structure where $e_1 = e_2$ – which is excluded in any case and can only be understood metaphorically: “it is done”.

5. Pustejovsky’s idea, however, is not identical to the present one for it was not based on an event configuration.
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1. Motivation of the topic

The aim of our approach to the impersonal passive is threefold:

1. It will be shown that the impersonal passive is strongly linked to imperfective aspectuality. Impersonal passives can be construed from imperfective predications only. In this respect, the impersonal passive is the very opposite of the stative passive, which is restricted to perfective verbs. These affinities to aspectual qualities make it impossible to construe stative passives from predications qualifying for the impersonal passive in German (see also Abraham’s contribution, this volume).

2. There is no bi-implication between impersonal passives and imperfectives. Not all imperfective passives are impersonal passives, whereas all impersonal passives are imperfective constructions.

3. Beyond doubt, the impersonal passive does not involve any passive semantics. In this sense, impersonal “passive” is a misnomer to the extent that it is not a true passive. It is not “impersonal” either given that it is more ‘personal’ than the personal passive: Impersonal passives are always derived from one-place arguments where the demoted subjects of these constructions carry the features [+AGENT], [+HUMAN]. In this respect our discussion is a direct follow-up to Abraham (introduction as well as this volume) the link being that for a construction to be a real passive, the semantic transitivity transfer from an Agent/Actor to a Patient/Undergoer has to be met. These conditions exclude the impersonal passive from proper passivization – a fact corroborated by non-passive translation equivalents in other languages than German, for example in English.
2. The aspectual bias of impersonal passives

To the best of our knowledge, it has gone unnoticed so far that impersonal passives are derived from imperfective predications only.\(^1\) What is implied by the term, however, is that impersonal passives derive from intransitive verbs or intransitively used predicates.\(^2\) Yet, the intransitivity criterion does not suffice to define to which extent intransitive verbs allow the derivation of impersonal passives. See (1a–c).

(1) a. Es wurde ausgetanzt.
   it was out-danced
b. Es wurde ausgerechnet.
   it was out-calculated
c. Es wurde untergetaucht.
   it was under-dived

As (1a–c) show, perfective verbs are dispreferred or even avoided in impersonal passivizations, whereas imperfective verbs enter into the construction readily as shown in (2). If readings as (1a–c) should turn out possible, then what changes is that they go imperfective anyway – i.e., in the present cases they go iterative: Es wurde immer wieder untergetaucht – which is exactly what we expect and predict in the first place: Constructional imperfectivity (= impersonal passivization) overwrites lexical perfectivity.\(^3\)

(2) a. Es wurde getanzt.
   it was danced
   “There was dancing”
b. Es wurde gerechnet.
   it was calculated
   “There was calculating”
c. Es wurde getaucht.
   it was dived
   “There was diving”

Note that this in line with our intuition of the ongoing event aspect of impersonal passives. The lexical or constructional aspectual quality appears to be the crucial and most distinct factor as to the selection of verbs und adverbs in construction with, and compatible with, impersonal passivizations. It is mirrored by the fact that English invariably translates the German impersonal passives by “There was V-ing (+durative adverb)”, indisputably presentative imperfective constructions. Furthermore, the imperfective quality of impersonal passives is in conflict with perfective adverbs, whereas durative adverbs are aspectually compatible with the ongoing event quality of the impersonal passive. Cf. (3a–c).

(3) Imperfective verbs in impersonal passive (with perfective, delimiting adverbial phrases):
   a. *Es wurde in einer Stunde (fertig) gelaufen.
      it was in an hour up run
      “There was running in an hour”
b. *Es wurde in (bis zu) einem halben Tag (von den Hühnern) tüchtig gelegt.
   it became in up to half a day (by the chickens) plenty laid
   “There was plenty of egg-laying by the hens in half a day”

(4) Imperfective verbs in impersonal passive (with durative, non-delimiting adverbial phrases):
   a. Es wurde (den ganzen Tag (lang)) gelaufen.
      it became (all day long) ran
      “There was running all day long”
   b. Es wurde ((über) den halben Mai) tüchtig (von den Hühnern) gelegt.
      it became (over half of May) plenty by the chickens laid
      “There was plenty of egg-laying by the hens half of May”
   c. Es wurde (die restliche Stunde (hindurch)) getaucht.
      it became the remaining hour through dived
      “There was diving going on the remaining hour”

Thus, impersonal passives select primarily intransitive imperfective verbs. Yet, the intransitivity criterion is no more than a strong tendency. To the extent that transitive objects can remain in situ unpromoted, transitive clauses allow for impersonal passivization as well, at least in German.

(5) a. Es wird fleißig Treppen hochgestiegen
      it is industriously stairs.äcc. up climbed
b. Es kann ihnen nicht so leicht die Leviten gelesen werden
      it can.sg them not so easily the lectures.pl.äcc. read
      “They will not easily be lectured”

This demonstrates that the intransitive criterion is not an absolute must. However, what has gone unnoticed is, to the best of our knowledge, the essential indispensability of the aspectual criterion. There is a hint in Zaenen (1993:138–142) as to the sensitivity of impersonal passives to aspect in Dutch. According to Zaenen, impersonal passives “avoid” the telic Aktionsart. Telic Aktionsart verbs are clearly of perfective aspectual eventivity in the sense that they mereologically describe non-homogeneous, non-additive, and non-divisible events. They are sensitive to the adverbial tests as demonstrated in (3) vs. (4) above (a test that Zaenen does not subject her sample predicates to.) Yet, Zaenen’s main point is that the acceptability of the impersonal passive depends on sentential aspect and not on lexical aspect. Aspectual sensitivity is well known in a large range of constructions. We have been taught by Indo-Europeans that the grammaticalization of the perfect tense starts with perfective verbs and that of the imperfect tense with imperfective aspect until the verbal constructions give up selectional restrictions and turn out to be open selectionally for any verbal aspect. However, it appears that the impersonal passive (IP) never stalls its selectional restrictions. The IP does not open up for perfective verbs. Thus, the feature of imperfectivity must be one of the fundamental, i.e. unmistakable and solidly defining features of the
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The aspectual distinction between the dynamic event passive and the stative passive, on the other hand, is well known: Only stative (adjectival) passives (“Zustandspassiv” in German) are restricted to perfectives (Leiss 1992; Abraham 1995). Only the ongoing (dynamic) passive is neutral to the aspect of the predicate. Thus, passives (the impersonal as against the stative) are clearly selective with respect to the aspect of the predicate to be passivized.

3. The aspectual bias of stative passives

As to its aspectual bias, the impersonal passive turns out to be in complete complementary distribution with the stative passive, whose derivation is restricted to perfective verbs.

(6) a. *Das Heu ist gefahren
the hay is wagoned

b. Das Heu ist eingefahren
the hay is in-wagoned

“*The hay has been wagoned in”

This confirms that the stative (adjectival) passive (with be/sein) pairs only with perfective, [+PERF], predicates, never with imperfectives, [−PERF]. This leads us to the generalization in (7) below.

(7) Stative Passivity Generalizations:

a. Stative passivity and Imperfective Aspect/Aktionsart are incompatible.

b. Stative passivity is compatible only with Perfective Aspect/Aktionsart.

c. Due to (7a) above, the Stative Passive is not of the same event property as the dynamic/ongoing event passive (formed in German exclusively with the Aux werden “become”). (What exactly is the event property of the Stative Passive participle? Is there only one, or are there more than one event properties to one single participial form?)

d. Since the Stative Passive is formally identical to the Result Phase of Perfective Past Participles, sein-linked Past Participles (in German, as well as in Dutch with zijn) are ambiguous between an (lexicalised, non-derived) adjectival meaning and a (derived) dynamic Result Phrase meaning (the latter for those verbs that select sein “be” for Aux in the composite past).

e. Imperfectivity Criterion: Impersonal passives are incompatible with Stative Passive constructions (i.e., past participles with the Aux sein) of whatever event denomination (in the sense of (d) above).

(7a–d) are generalizations about the data – i.e., they are purely empirical conclusions. But what is behind that? We shall return to this question. The imperfectivity criterion by itself excludes uniquely and unambiguously the participial category of impersonal stative passives, morphologically past participles with sein. Impersonal passives occur
only with the Aux \textit{werden} "become", which never read as stative/adjectival passives. See (8a) below, which does not have a stative passive reading according to the Stative Passivity Generalizations in (7a–e) above.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Es ist/war (von den Bauern) eingefahren.} \textit{stative passive, [+PERF]}
\item \textit{Es wird/wurde (von den Bauern) eingefahren.} \textit{dynamic passive, [+PERF], past}
\item \textit{Es ist (durch die Bauern) eingefahren worden} \textit{dynamic passive, becomes/became by the farmers wagoned in [+PERF], past}
\end{enumerate}

By contrast, (8b, c) are read as dynamic event passives. The generalization in (7a, b, e) holds irrespective of the transitivity status of the passivized predicate. In other words, we can form impersonal passives from transitive (2-place) predications. See the following examples, (9a–j). [dynamic = ongoing (event)].

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Es wird} \textit{gearbeitet} \textit{imperative passive; 1-place ongoing passive present}
\item \textit{Es ist gearbeitet} \textit{... as a 1-place stative passive}
\item \textit{Es ist gearbeitet worden} \textit{... 1-place ongoing passive past}
\item \textit{Es ist geschlagen} \textit{... as a transitive + perfective verb}
\item \textit{Das Heer ist geschlagen} \textit{... 2-place stative passive [+PERF]}
\item \textit{Der Hund ist geschlagen} \textit{... as a 2-place stative passive [-PERF]}
\item \textit{Der Hund ist totgeschlagen} \textit{... 2-place stative passive [+PERF]}
\item \textit{Der Hund ist geschlagen worden} \textit{... 2-place ongoing passive past}
\item \textit{The dog has been beaten/wrapped} \textit{... extended now perfect}
\end{enumerate}

According to traditional insight (e.g., Pancheva 2003), (9g), with the English 'extended now' present perfect, usually disallows a reading (for imperfective verbs). What (9a–h) show is that any verb used intransitively (i.e., deprived of its arguments), such as in (9d), disallows stative passivity. Therefore, the conclusion must be that, first, the formability of stative passives is a surface phenomenon, because, fundamentally, verbs like \textit{schlagen} "beat[--perf]; defeat[+perf]" maintain their deep transitive valence despite their surface appearance in (9d). Yet, stative passivity is ungrammatical providing no reasonable reading. Second, and more crucially, true – i.e., theta role semantic – passivity is restricted to true transitives – i.e., valences where some property or object changes from the agent external argument referent to the patient internal argument referent. True 1-place predicates do not provide such a 'transition' of properties or objects simply because there are no two arguments between which the transition can take place. Let us call this insight the \textbf{Semantic transitivity criterion for passivizability}.
Notice that the argument above is in line with the insight that stative passives are resultative adjectives. After all, there are resultative monovalent verbs (die, drown, fall down, arrive). Yet, no stative passive can be formed with such inherently perfective verbs.

(10) a. *It is died — *Es ist gestorben
b. *It is arrived — *Es ist angekommen

But this would be an improper line of argument in as much as resultative monovalents (equivalent to ‘ergative/unaccusative’ verbs in German; see Abraham 2000) lack the prime quality for passivization: agentivity. Monovalent resultative verbs do not qualify for a test where true transitivity appears to play the major triggering role. See (11a, b), which should be grammatical if they were to be functional in the attempt at proving resultativity as a necessary and sufficient prerequisite for impersonal passivity.

(11) a. *Es ist gestorben worden it is died become 
    *‘it has been died”
  b. *Es ist angekommen worden it is arrived become 
    *‘it has been arrived”

For to show beyond doubt that the resultativity/perfectivity criterion alone is not the restriction placed upon the formability of the impersonal passive, what we would like to investigate are two types of diagnostic questions. For one, if, according to traditional views, the stative passive is fundamentally adjectival (for a brief survey and controversial options represented in the literature, see Anagnostopoulou (2003:2–3)), there should exist a type of adjective sharing resultative properties – is there such a category of “resultative adjectives”? We believe that the answer has to be ‘yes’. There are: ‘resultative’ adjectives, i.e. those with a preceding incremental phase (see Abraham 1995/2005 (Ch. 4.6 for the assumption of ‘unaccusative’ adjectives): alt (= gealtert) “old”, welk (= verwelkt) “wilted”, krank (= krank geworden) “ill”, anderntags “the other day”; düster (= gedunkelt) “dark”, dämmrig (= gedämmert) “dusky”, satt (= gesättigt) “satisfied”, hungrig (= hungrig geworden) “(become) hungry”.

This list of ‘resultative’ adjectives as such only serves the purpose of showing that it is not implausible to speak of a class of adjectives that might be seen as collaterals of resultative past participles. Possible compatibilities emerge by virtue of perfective adverbials such as noch immer nicht “not yet”, schon “already”, which can be incorporated into the inventory of diagnostics tests. Cf. (12).
(12) schon/noch immer nicht . . . PP/ADJ "already/not yet . . . PP/ADJ"

(i) PP [+perf]: schon/noch immer nicht hineingeschoben
   "already/not yet pushed in"

(ii) PP [–perf]: *noch immer nicht geschoben
     "already/not yet pushed"

(iii) ADJ [+perf]: schon/noch immer nicht alt
    "already/not yet old"

    [–perf]: *schon/noch immer nicht jung
    "already/not yet young"

(iv) ADJ: [+perf]: schon/noch immer nicht welk
     "already/not yet wilted"

    [–perf]: *schon/noch immer nicht frisch
    "already/not yet fresh"

(v) ADJ: [+perf]: schon/noch immer nicht satt
    "already/not yet satisfied"

    [–perf]: *schon/noch immer nicht ungesättigt
    "already/not yet unsatisfied"

(vi) ADJ: [+perf]: schon/noch immer nicht hungrig
    "already/not yet hungry"

Second, since the transitivity criterion does not seem sufficient in itself given the clearly transitive dative object and genitive objects as in (13), there is the need to reconstruct a syntactic equivalent for the reference-semantic argument of 'transitive feature transition' as a triggering criterion for true passivization excluding impersonal passives. [** signals clear ungrammaticality].

(13) a. Dir ist gut/hinreichend geholfen/geraten
    you.dat is well/sufficiently helped/advised

b. **Dir ist verraten
cf. Dir ist das Geheimnis verraten
    you.dat is betrayed you.dat is the secret betrayed

d. **Bier ist vorgezogen
cf. Wein ist Bier vorgezogen
    beer.dat is preferred wine.acc is beer.dat preferred

e. **Des Verrats ist bezichtigt
cf. Er ist des Verrats bezichtigt
    the.gen betrayal is accused he is the.gen betrayal accused

f. **Seiner ist geharrt
cf. Seiner ist geharrt worden
    his.gen is waited his.gen is waited become

(13a) is obviously grammatical with datives for the two-place helfen and the three-place raten "advise". The added adjuncts prove beyond doubt the status of the modified adjectival participles. The list in (13a–f), on the other hand, attests to the claim that intransitivity of more than monovalent verbs such as helfen/raten/verraten/vorziehen/ bezichten/harren "help, advise, betray, prefer, accuse, wait" is a valid explanation for the claim that impersonal passives disallow stative passives.

Let us return to the initial question: Why is there no impersonal stative passive? The core insight is that, first, non-divisible perfectivity with its incremental and the resultative event phases does not map onto the simple divisible imperfective event phase. Second and more important, what is behind true passivity appears to be a property
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transition between a source role (Agent) and a goal role (Patient) (Semantic transitivity criterion). The impersonal passive fails to satisfy such a referent-semantic criterion. The impersonal passive carries passive morphology alright, but its theta role relation to the verb (just Agent) does not refer to any such transient referent-semantics (in the true sense of Latin trans-ire ‘over-go’ and the traditional grammatical notion of transitivity). Note that, beyond this restriction, (13a–d) confirm the above claim that this kind of reference-semantic transitivity is at the bottom of true passivity: For both helfen “help” and raten “advise” in (13a), a carry-over of property (from the Agent-nominative to the Goal-dative) is characteristic. This is not the case for the other examples, (13b–e). Thus, our claim that true reference-semantic transitivity is a prerequisite for passivity bears out. The Semantic transitivity criterion poses a valid restriction to the impersonal passive, something that is otherwise a morphological passive.

4. Impersonal passives cross-linguistically?

Current terminological usage makes “impersonal passives” (IP) constructions in which the predicate is associated with passive morphology (either Past Participle, PP, or a synthetic Reflexive passive suffix), but where no DP fills the subject position (Frajzyngier 1982:267). More specifically, there is no DP in the nominative case (for NOM-ACC languages) which would trigger agreement in the finite verb or the verbal noun (e.g. gender, number for the participle). Furthermore, as Kirsner (1979) and Frajzyngier (1982) have demonstrated convincingly, IP require an indefinite human agent to be implicated rather than a subject which the passivized intransitive predicate would select semantically (such as canine for bark). See (14a, b).

(14) a Polish:
Zaszczeka-no do drzwi
bark-pass at door
“There was barking at the door”
(Frajzyngier 1982:273)

b. German:
An der Tür wurde gebellt = An der Tür war Bellen
at the door was barked[+hum] at the door was barking[+hum]

(14a, b) both mean that a human barked at the door. In this sense, “impersonal” passive is a misnomer. Nothing whatsoever restricts any passive subject to the feature [-human]. The characteristics of what is meant by the term is that such passives are not confined to active transitive predicates and thus are derived from one-place predicates such that the only designated verbal argument is dropped and the remaining construction reduces to a zero argument predication. See (15) (for Scandinavian cf. Sigurðsson 1989:310ff.; Barðdal/Molnár 2003). See other illustrations.

(15) a. Es wird gelaufen from NP[+human] läuft
it becomes run NP runs

… German
b. Wird (*es) heute gelaufen?  
becomes (*it) today run  
... German

c. Currit- ur  
run, pres-pass.3.sg  
... Latin

d. Er/*Het wordt gelopen  
there/it becomes run  
... Dutch

e. *It is run  
... English

f. *Il est couru from On([human] cours  
it is run one runs  
... French

g. Pad er dansað í skólanum  
it is danced in school.the  
... Icelandic

h. I skólanum er (*pad) dansað.  
in school.the is (*it) danced  
... Icelandic

i. Er (*pad) dansað í skólanum?  
is (*it) danced in school.the  
... Icelandic

j. Det dansas i skolan.  
it dance,refl-pass in school.the  
... Swedish

k. I skolan dansas det.  
in school.the dance,refl-pass it  
... Swedish

l. Dansas det i skolan?  
dance,refl-pass it in school.the  
... Swedish

Clearly, what is suppressed (but not deleted) and implied is a general actor (∃x: run(x) ⊗ agent(x)) for the running event. Nothing particular on the passive morphology triggers this general implication.

It will be clear from the above discussion that the best terminology, instead of “impersonal passive”, would be “subjectless passives” (since intransitives have no object to be promoted in the first place).

For the Germanic languages in general it appears that it has remained unclear whether “impersonal” passives arise earlier than, or even simultaneously with, “personal” passives (i.e., passives with an agreeing DP). Their diachronic developments seem to indicate that passives arose first from transitive verbs (or, more generally, from verbs with more than one argument, with the highest-ranking argument being demoted), before passive morphology started being applied to intransitive verbs (more precisely: verbs with only one argument). The history of German confirms this general view (Vogel 2004). For this reason, we might have assumed that “impersonal” passives – the natural consequence of the demotion of the single argument of an intransitive verb – are diachronically secondary. However, notice that the findings for the diachrony of German are somewhat surprising. After all, the older stages of German not only knew pronoun drop, but also expletive drop (Abraham 1992/93). Nothing in this structural respect would therefore exclude that early German had something like (15a) above. Logically promotion of the highest ranking active argument presupposes demotion of a lower argument in the lexical grid of the verb (see Comrie 1977 on “spontaneous demotion”, in which only demotion of the highest-ranking argument occurs, without promotion of a lower-ranking one). It is an open question how purely
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1. Demotional constructions appeared as compared to the emergence of “promotional passives”. See (16) for an example from German.

(16) a. Heute abend wird richtig (*die) Zähne geputzt/zähnegeputzt/zahngeputzt tonight becomes readily (the) teeth brushed/teethbrushed/toothbrushed
b. Heute abend werden/*wird die Zähne richtig geputzt tonight become/*becomes the teeth cleanly brushed

(16a, b) clearly shows passive morphology. The direct object remains unpromoted to subject only if in close syntactic relation to the verb, either fully incorporated or at least unspecified and indefinite. Any definite DO must be promoted to passive subject. Notice the position of the verbal adjunct, richtig, in (16a) vs. (b). This indicates that the DO is verb-incorporated in (16a), but not in (16b). Another example is the Polish construction with the petrified -no/to-participle (former neuter sg. of the nominal declension; Björn Wiemer p.c.) and the retained ACC-object in (17a).

(17) a. Dano mu.dat.sg.m ksiazke.acc.sg.f
   was given him book
   “He was given a book”
   b. Gosciom.dat.pl.m pokazuje.3.sgs.pres sie.rm wille.acc.sg.f
to the guests is shown Reflexive the cottage
   “The cottage is shown to the guests”

(17a) is a rather late development, not known to Common Slavic. The same holds for Polish “reflexive impersonals” with an ACC-object as in (17b), which is an even later development (most probably by analogy to -no/to).

Little to nothing appears to be known how such “passives” with retained (or regained as in the Polish example, (17b)) active government have arisen and in which diachronic relation do they stand to “real” passives, both from transitive and intransitive verbs.

5. The expletive in the impersonal passive

5.1 Historical emergence of the impersonal passive

Given the principled difference between the personal, ‘transitive’ passive (derived intransitivity) and the impersonal, ‘intransitive’ one (underived intransitivity), it is not quite clear how the impersonal passive has emerged over time. Which of the features spelled out above contributed more to its emergence than the others? Which fostered the passive form, which did not? That much is clear, however: The aspectual system still prevalent in Old High German and partly continuing into the Middle High German period eroded radically before the impersonal emerged. After all, the passive, in the aspectually active period, had allowed passivization only for perfective verbs. Do we have safe evidence for this conclusion? Some evidence at least does not speak against it. According to Vogel (2004:4), the determining step to the inclusion of objectless in-
transitives in the passive-morphology paradigm occurs no earlier than in the period of
the 12–13th centuries – i.e., towards the end of Middle High German. Recall that this
was the period when the pervasive aspect paradigm, with the morphological distinc-
tion between perfective and imperfective verbs, came to be lost completely.7 Demoted
subjects in impersonal passives could leave behind empty pros in the older stages of
German (Abraham 1993).

Now let us go into synchronic material. There are two crucial questions with
respect to (18a–g). The first concerns the semantically empty subject position.

5.2 The determining function of the West-Germanic expletive.

The “semantic transitivity condition” vs. the expletive alternatives:

German es, English there, Dutch er

There are two crucial questions with respect to (18a–g) and (19). First, why this uneven
distribution across languages so closely related? Second, why is the German expletive
possible only in topic position. And, third maybe, why (19) is odd.

(18)  

a. Es wurde (da) getanzt  ... German
b. Da wurde (*es) getanzt

c. Es wurde sich geschämt
   it became Ruri. shamed
d. *It was danced       ... English
e. *There was danced
f. *Het werd gedansd
   it got danced          ... Dutch
g. *(Er) werd gedansd/   Werd *(er) gedansd
   there got danced/     Got there danced

(19) *Es wurde (den Hund) toegeschlagen

According to (18a–b), the expletive cannot be obligatory and carry a theta role. Dutch
(18e) confirms that Dutch het is different from German es. Its diachronic forerunner is
locative daar “there”, German “da(r)”. This locative behaves differently in German also.

Among the attempts at an explanation as to the different results of impersonal
passivization across languages, there was the one which grouped those languages
which are confined to the “semantic transitivity condition”: Only those passives can
be formed that derive from transitive agentives – something that hosts the faculty
that an object or property be transferred from the Agent actant to the Goal actant.
Since for intransitives no such transfer is possible for lack of the receiving actant,
most (Indo-European) languages pass out on a passive derivation from (agentive)
intransitives.

This is a negative explanation to the extent that it does not clarify why German,
Dutch, and Scandinavian extend the passive form to imperfective readings. Notice that
the generic man-active construction renders exactly the same reading.
The impersonal passive

(20) a. *Es wird
getanzt*

   it  

   became.ongoing danced.Pres.Passive

b. *Man
tanzt*

   man/one dances.Pres.Active.ongoing/generic

c. *There is dancing (going on)*

German and Dutch have no grammatical morpheme expressing ongoingness or durativity. It is plausible to assume that it is the ongoingness feature inherent to the Aux *werden* that German opts for the imperfective passive form to give expression to what is an explicit form of ongoingness in English as well as other languages. See (20c).

This would seem to settle the question "why (the passive form in one language) and why not (the passive form in other languages)?". However, the question as to the status of the expletive in subject function is not touched by this explanatory channel. Cf. (14a–g) as well as (15a–m) above. In order to approach the typological differences with a minimal bias, let us take as a point of departure that the personal pronouns German *es* “it” and Dutch *het* “it” as well as English *it* have different selectional distributions in terms of (21a, b).

(21) The expletive *es/het/it* cannot be inserted unless it

   a. signals the position of an extraposed clause (Was *(it) claimed that...?*),
   b. or it is a quasi-argument (as in weather verbs: it is cold/is *(it) cold?*), possibly among other features.

Given (21a), Dutch *het* is out in impersonal passives because it cannot occur in subject position in passives. Remains *er* “there” to be inserted as expletive. Recall that the German locative equivalent, *da*, can take over just as well. The same holds for English *there*. Furthermore, English is different from German and Dutch since its passive Auxiliary, *be*, does not express ongoingness without any explicit morphological signal, -*ing*. Cf. (20c) above. Mohr (2004:Ch. 2.6.3.) has discussed more details in essentially the same direction. An identical situation appears to hold in Russian with the synthetic *syat*-derivation as the passive form for imperfectives next to the *byt*-be-form for the perfective passive derivation.

To all appearances, then, the fact whether the periphrastic passive form allows for extension into ongoingness in passive form depends fundamentally on the availability of an Aux meaning inchoative/fientive, *werden* "get, become". Unless a languages provides such a fientive Aux form, an impersonal passive cannot be formed.

It appears that the two data and distribution details, passive form typologically and the form of the subject expletive, are fundamentally different phenomena not interlinked with one another. However, either wants an explanation in the context of "impersonal passives across languages".

The question, then, whether it makes sense to ask why German, the Scandinavia, and Dutch sport an impersonal passive, while other Indo-European languages do not has plausibly been answered. In the context of aspect, it is clearly an imperfective in the sense of (22b) below. In the context of voice, however, little of what 'transitive passivity' is about is exploited. What carries the voice (verbal gender) form is the feature of
durative ongoingness which is brought in by the two components of the periphrasis construction: For one, by the fientive Aux *werden*, and, second, by the durative preterit participle. Notice that this `voice' phenomenon takes us back to nothing but aspect: fientivity and durativity.

6. Summary

In terms of an intuitively plausible graphics, this is what we come up with to describe and distinguish the different passive and active uses of the past participle in particular with a close eye on the impersonal passive as opposed to the stative passive.

(22) a. impersonal passive: \[≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈\]
i.e., a uniform sequence of event points since of imperfective/durative event quality; aspect/Aktionsart dependent; event typing identical to English progressive.

b. The impersonal passive is the aspectual inverse of the stative passive in as much as the former is imperfective, the latter, however, is perfective; clear aspect/Aktionsart dependency.

c. The external argument (eA) in the impersonal passive is demoted in order to avoid a personal subject, i.e., a subject too low in referentiality to be tolerated in subject (= thema) position. The ‘special indefiniteness’ of demoted subjects in impersonal passives yields ‘generic agenthood’. Consider that any IP can be paraphrased by the indefinite human pronoun *man* in German, *one* in English, and *si* in Italian.

d. Assuming that unaccusative (‘ergative’) predicates in German (cf. Abraham 2000) are intransitive perfectives, the impersonal passive stands in an interesting detransitivizing hierarchy:
   (i) Detransitivization of 2-place perfectives yield perfective 1-place passives; this is a derivation identical, on the lexical level, to the German unaccusative.
   (ii) No detransitivization of an (perfective) unaccusative is possible since the unaccusative is already derived under an identical process of theta reduction; German unaccusative/ergative (phrasal) verbs denote the incremental phase of intransitive resultatives and therefore imply a stative result.
   (iii) The German impersonal passive is the valence reduction of a 1-place intransitive; it is restricted to imperfectives and consequently does not permit stative passivization.

As goes for the past participle form, the following graphics have non-unambiguous readings [eA,iA = e(external)/i(nternal) a rgument = lexically designated subject/object as in the verbal argument/valence grid eA[vp iA\_]] (see Abraham, this volume, as well as Abraham, introduction – this volume):
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(23) a. perfective transitive: *erpressen* “blackmail”
   \[eA,iA\]  
   \[<<<<<<|-------\] reading for iA: stative passive: iA *ist erpresst* “is blackmailed”
   reading for eA: (i) ongoing passive in perfect tense:
   \[iA\] *ist erpresst worden* “has been blackmailed”
   (ii) *sein/be*-perfects (intransitive verbs of motion):
   \[eA\] *ist gelaufen* “has run”

b. \[eA(iA)\]
   \[≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈\] reading for eA(iA): (iii) ongoing passive for non-perfectives:
   iA *ist behauptet worden* “has run”
   (iv) impersonal passive:
   *Es ist gearbeitet worden (von eA)* “there was working (by eA)”
   (v) ongoing active perfect:
   eA *hat gearbeitet* “has worked”

As for a discussion of the ambiguities (i)–(ii), (iii)–(v) in (23a–b) and their unraveling mechanisms, see Abraham (in this volume a).

Notes

1. See, though, Carnie/Harley (2005:46), who claim that it is a “well-known fact”. They do not substantiate this claim by any bibliography, however.

2. Viz. passives where the direct object does not promote, as in German *Es wurde allengehörig die Leviten.acc.pl gelesen* “expl-was-(to) all-unpleasantly-the-lectures-given” “They were all lectured unpleasantly”.

3. There are seeming counter examples such as *Jetzt wird in den Saal hineingetanzt* “Now, let us dance into the hall”. Notice that, first, this occurs only as an indirect imperative speech act. Second, the perfectivity appears to be suspended by the temporal *jetzt (endlich)* “now (finally)”. The temporal (or local) adjunct generates temporal (local) referentiality, which in turn suspends the genericity imposed by impersonal passives. All of this leaves our tenet untouched that impersonal passives occur only under imperfectivity.

4. Quite possibly, neither (5a) nor (5b) can be counted as true transitive passives. (5a) is a case of object incorporation, and (5b) provides near-incorporation due to its idiomaticity.

5. For the present purposes, Aspect/Aktionsart need not be distinguished – although, quite clearly, German has both: lexical perfective/terminative Aktionsart such as \(\text{(i/er)}\)sterben “(part-)die” as well as phrasal Aspekt as in *in den Graben (hinein)springen* “into-the-moat jump”, either morphological and morphosyntactic means paradigmatically firmly established.

6. ... *ist geraten/verraten*, the only verbs that appear to contradict this generalization, are clearly elliptical versions of the ongoing passives with *worden* “become”. Such ongoing event passives are always
possible, of course, and as such do not invalidate our general claim that intransitives (irrespective of quantitative valence status) do not project stative passives.

7. According to Leiss (1992), the whole case system became restructured as a consequence, with the massive original genitive objects giving way to either the accusative or prepositional case as the most prominent changes. The genitive object case plays virtually no role in Modern Standard German any longer.

8. We consider imperfective constructions such as am Tanzen sein at-dancing.dat be “be adancing” to be gerunds. Their imperfectivity is lexically derived by P+[n V] + be.

9. This motivated Leiss (1992) to the terminological distinction of ‘definite’ (= personal/transitive derived) vs. ‘indefinite’ (= intransitive derived) passives.

10. This is why what are distinguished in Italian grammar writing as ‘si-impersonale’ and ‘si-passivante’ are so difficult to distinguish in the first place. See Abraham 1994.
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This paper explores several interrelated pragmatic issues connected to the (verbal and adjectival) passive and the periphrastic perfect tense. The language of investigation is German. In Sections 1 and 2, I start with tense selection, as both verbal passives and Extended-Now-adverbs impose restrictions on the tenses they can co-occur with. While the passive selects the preterit (among the tenses referring to the past), Extended-Now-adverbs select the perfect. The paper then shows how the selection restrictions on tense interact with other restrictions on the use of Extended-Now-adverbs. It is demonstrated in Section 3 how this complex interaction can be described in a coherent pragmatic Optimality-Theoretic framework together with a standard semantics of tense and adverbials. The paper then concludes with Section 4, which deals with criteria shared by the adjectival passive and the perfect. Pragmatic errors in usage and the necessary repair mechanisms are also dealt with.

Introduction

There are two past tense forms in languages such as German: the simple preterit (kam “came”, arbeitete “worked”) and the composite perfect (ist gekommen “has come”, hat gearbeitet “has worked”). The most recent approaches to the perfect (Alexiadou et al. 2003; Rathert 2004) are from a semantic point of view. However, there are phenomena which escape a purely semantic account, e.g. the ban against the perfect in passive sentences at least in certain regiolectal versions of German as in Hans wurde 1941 in Berlin geboren (*ist geboren worden), ’Hans was born in Berlin in 1941’ (*has been born). The main goal of this paper is to give an overview about phenomena like the ban against the perfect in passive sentences and sketch possible analyses along pragmatic lines. This will be done without losing out of sight the results of the semantic analysis. On the contrary, an attempt will be made to unify pragmatic and semantic factors of the analysis.

It is a well-known fact of the German language that the distribution of preterit and perfect in general is a delicate matter. To account for the actual usage of the two tenses, Latzel (1977:42ff.) mentions the following five pragmatic principles: contamination,
substitution, deficiency, introduction, coherence. They will explained one by one, starting with the first principle, namely contamination.

Latzel (1977:42f.) observes that in sentences like in (1), the preterit cannot be substituted for the perfect.

(1) Der Herr dort bekam das Gulasch (*hat... bekommen).
    the man there got the goulash (*has... got)
    ‘The man over there gets the goulash.’ (*has... got)

To explain this, Latzel (1977:42f.) claims that the preterit bekam in (1) is actually a combination (or "contamination") of a deleted main-sentence preterit and a subordinate-sentence present. Latzel (1977:42f.) argues that (1) is derived from (2).

(2) Der Herr dort sagte vorhin: Ich bekomme ein Gulasch.
    the man there said before: I get a goulash
    ‘The man over there said before that he gets a goulash.’

Latzel (1977:42f.) maintains that bekam ‘got’ in (1) is derived from the following composite: the deleted main-sentence preterit sagte ‘said’ in (2) plus the embedding present bekomme ‘get’ in (2).

It is difficult to see that this yields the required derivation. Sentences like (1) appear to be highly lexicalized and are probably idiomatic usages of the preterit. In the same context as (1), (3) is impossible.

(3) *Der Herr dort nahm/ probierte das Gulasch.
    the man there took/ tried the goulash
    ‘The man over there takes/tries the goulash.’

The deviance of (3) is not to be expected in Latzel’s analysis, because (3) should be derivable, according to Latzel (1977:42f.), from the following grammatical (4).

(4) Der Herr dort sagte vorhin: Ich nehme/e/ probier-e das Gulasch.
    the man there said before: I take/ try the goulash
    ‘The man over there said before that he takes/tries the goulash.’

Latzel would have to claim that nahm ‘took’ in (3) is derived from the deleted main-sentence preterit sagte ‘said’ in (4) plus the subordinate-sentence present nehme ‘take’ in (4). He would have to claim this because, according to his analysis, bekam ‘got’ in (1) is derived from the deleted main-sentence preterit sagte ‘said’ in (2) plus the subordinate-sentence present bekomme ‘get’ in (2). Thus, both nahm ‘took’ in (3) and bekam ‘got’ in (1) are derived forms. The problem with the derivation is that (3) is ungrammatical while (1) is grammatical, and the derivation does not tell us why there is a difference in grammaticality. Thus, deriving bekam ‘got’ in (1) from a sentence like (2) seems to be an ill-fated analysis.

Latzel’s next principle (cf. Latzel (1977:45)), i.e. the principle of substitution, is based on the following observation: In the presence of the auxiliaries sein ‘to be’ and haben ‘to have’ as well as in passive or modal sentences, the perfect normally cannot be used. Only the preterit is acceptable. See (5).
(5) Auxiliary: sein
Das war eine langweilige Party. (*ist gewesen)
this was a boring party (*has been)
'This was a boring party.' (*has been)

(6) Auxiliary: haben
Das Geschäft hatte geschlossen. (*hat geschlossen gehabt)
the shop was closed (*has closed been)
The shop was closed.' (*has been closed)

(7) Passive
Hans wurde 1941 in Berlin geboren. (*ist geboren worden)
Hans was 1941 in Berlin born (*has born been)
'Hans was born in Berlin in 1941.' (*has been born)

(8) Modal
Hans musste 1945 Berlin verlassen. (*hat verlassen gemusst)
Hans had-to 1945 Berlin leave (*has leave must)
'Hans had to leave Berlin in 1945.' (*must have left)

Latzel (1977:45) argues that all the preterits we find in (5)–(8) are true substitutes
for perfects. He therefore uses the term Ersatzpräteritum ('substitute-preterit'). The
unacceptability of the perfect in (5)–(8) depends to some degree on the nature of the
text at hand. See Latzel (1977:82ff.) for a detailed statistical analysis of this fact that
takes into account different types of texts (literary works, news texts, judicial texts)
and even oral communication.

Another principle that governs the distribution of perfect and preterit is the prin-
ciple of deficiency. There are verbs with a defective tense morphology, i.e. they either
have no perfect or no preterit. For an overview of verbs which lack a perfect, see Mater
(1969). Latzel (1977:47f.) tries to organize Mater’s material and adds observations of
his own. The most interesting points are the following:

(9) verbs lacking a perfect:
   a. verbs that would otherwise be adjacent to another past participle:
      Das war gelogen. (*ist gelogen gewesen)
      that was lied (*is lied been)
      'That was a lie.' (*been lied)
   b. polysemic verbs in their figurative meaning:
      Sie kam aus gutem Hause. (*ist aus gutem Hause gekommen)
      she came from good house (*is from good house been)
      'She was from a decent family.' (*been from a decent family)
   c. verbs with zu-infinitive:
      Der Mann schien betrunken zu sein. (*hat betrunken zu sein geschienen)
      the man seemed drunken to be (*has drunken to be seemed)
      'The man seemed to be drunken.' (*has seemed to be drunken)

For an overview on verbs lacking a preterit, see Latzel (1977:79ff.):
(10) verbs with an idiomatic meaning (often atemporal readings) lack a preterit:
Sie hat ausgesorgt. (*Sie sorgte aus)
'she has finished-worrying (*she worried finished)
'She doesn't have to worry any more.' (*she finished worrying)

Another important one of Latzel's principles is the principle of introduction. Latzel (1977:125) states that it is a stable rule for text-introductory sentences of texts to be in the perfect. The preterit is avoided, cf.:

(11) Context: the speaker enters the room
Meiers haben im Lotto gewonnen! (*gewannen)
'Meiers won the lottery!' (*won)

Only for novels this rule is not valid – introductory sentences in the preterit are frequently found in this type of text.

The final (and maybe most important) of Latzel's principles governing the distribution of perfect and preterit is coherence. Texts must be coherent with respect to the tenses in use. Latzel (1977:102) shows statistically that it is not common to alternate between preterit and perfect both in fictional and non-fictional texts. Especially for sentences connected by und 'and', it does not occur that in [S₁ und S₂] S₁ may be in the preterit if S₂ is in the perfect (and vice versa). This is a problem in second language acquisition, as learners often believe that perfect and preterit are more or less equivalent. The error-corpus of the Goethe-Institut records errors like the following (cited from Latzel (1977:102)):

(12) *Ich bin einmal nach Istanbul gefahren und besichtigte das Museum Topkapi.
'I have been once to Istanbul gone and visited the museum Topkapi
'Once I went to Istanbul and visited the Topkapi-museum.'

Furthermore, Latzel (1977:104) states that if the frame story is narrated in the present tense, a change to the perfect but not to the preterit is possible. In the following sentence, the perfect cannot be substituted by the preterit:

(13) Bei einer Fahrt durch die Stadt kann man immer wieder sehen, daß
during a trip through the town can you always again see that
das Erdbeben ganze Viertel zerstört hat. (*zerstörte)
the earthquake whole quarters destroyed has (*destroyed)
'Taking a trip through town, you can see again and again that the earthquake destroyed whole quarters.' (*destroyed)

1. Tense selection I: Verbal passives select preterit

As already mentioned in the introduction, we use Ersatzpräteritum ('substitute-preterit') if a sentence that refers to past events contains sein/ haben 'to be/to have', the passive form or modals. The use of the perfect is not possible in these cases, cf. Latzel (1977:82ff.). Schipporeit (1971:102) agrees with Latzel's substitution analysis:
It is, however, quite common even in non-journalistic German to employ the imperfect in lieu of the perfect tense in the following cases:

(i) in sentences with modals, i.e., wollte instead of hat wollen
(ii) in sentences with modal-like-constructions, e.g., er schien zu kommen (hat geschießen is impossible)
(iii) in sentences with to be, i.e., war instead of ist gewesen
(iv) in sentences with to have, i.e., hatte instead of hat gehabt
(v) in sentences with the passive voice, e.g., wurde geboren instead of bin geboren worden (according to Schipporeit 1971:102)

Let us concentrate on the verbal passive, i.e. Schipporeit's case (5). Simple queries with www.google.de have shown that the passive forms of the perfect are seldom found. For the internet queries, I chose three highly frequent verbs: sehen 'to see', lieben 'to love', and suchen 'to search'. The first query compares the verbal passive perfect form "gesehen worden" 'to have been seen' with the verbal passive preterit form "wurde OR wurden gesehen" – sind gesehen worden' 'was OR were been seen' (both as google entries). Table 1 illustrates the results.

**Table 1.** "gesehen worden" 'to have been seen' vs. "wurde OR wurden "gesehen" – worden" 'was OR were been seen'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>perfect</th>
<th>preterit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sehen ('to see')</td>
<td>47,900</td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieben ('to love')</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suchen ('to search')</td>
<td>8,780</td>
<td>4,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sums</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td>6,899,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of a total of 6,959,500, less than 1% (0.86%) occurs with the perfect. The query above abstracts over singular and plural. However, if a particular singular form is tested the results are the same, as the next query shows. Comparing directly the perfect singular form "bin gesehen worden" 'have been seen' with the preterit singular form "wurde gesehen" 'was seen' leads to similar results:

**Table 2.** 'bin gesehen worden" 'have been seen' vs. "wurde gesehen" 'was seen'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>perfect</th>
<th>preterit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sehen ('to see')</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieben ('to love')</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suchen ('to search')</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sums</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>249,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, less than 1% (0.03%) of 249,970 tokens use the perfect. Thus, Latzel's and Schipporeit's claim is fully warranted empirically. The passive selects the preterit among all tenses referring to the past.
2. Tense selection II: XN-adverbs select perfect

The last section has shown the restrictions of passivization on tense. This section is concerned with the restrictions of Extended-Now-adverbs (=XN-adverbs, like *schon immer* 'ever since' or *schon oft* 'ever often') on tense. But what is the general status of XN-adverbs and what are the tense restrictions XN-adverbs introduce?

XN-adverbs like *schon immer* 'ever since' or *schon oft* 'ever often' only occur with the perfect and pluperfect. They are impossible with the preterit:

\[(14)\]  

**perfect:**  
\[
\text{Sie hat schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet.}
\]

'She has worked with clay ever since.'

**pluperfect:**  
\[
\text{Sie hatte schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet.}
\]

'She had worked with clay ever since.'

**preterit:**  
\[
\text{*Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton.}
\]

'She worked with clay ever since.'

To understand why adverbs like *schon immer* 'ever since' are called Extended-Now-adverbs, \((14a)\) serves as explanation. The event of habitually working with clay started in the past and reaches up to the now of speech time. If \((14a)\) is viewed from the now of speech time, this now seems to extend into the past. These Extended-Now-readings of perfect sentences are only possible if Extended-Now-adverbs like *schon immer* 'ever since' are present, cf.:

\[(15)\]  

**perfect:**  
\[
\text{Sie hat mit Ton gearbeitet.}
\]

'She has worked with clay.'

Sentences like \((15)\) simply refer to a past event of working with clay. This event does not reach up to the now of speech time.

A next important question concerns the significance of XN-adverbs for a general theory of tense. Rathert (2004:108ff.) argues that the behavior of XN-adverbs makes the traditional Reichenbachian perfect-semantics untenable and that the correct one is the Extended-Now-theory. The Anteriority-Theory of the perfect says that the event time \(E\) takes place before the reference time \(R\). Reference time and speech time coincide. In a short formula, presupposing a linear model of time, we get \(E < R,S\) (read: the event \(E\) is before \((<)\) reference time \(R\), and \(R\) and speech time \(S\) are simultaneous \((R,S)\)) as a representation of the meaning of the perfect. However, this will not work for the perfect and pluperfect examples above (cf. \((14)\)). In these examples, the event "working with clay" \((E)\) does not precede \(R\). Instead, it continues up to \(R\). This is the point at which traditional Anteriority-Theory, as represented e.g. by Comrie (1995), Thieroff (1992, 1994), Ballweg (1988), Ehrich (1992) or Latzel (1977), fails. The following illustration shows how native speakers of German understand the perfect-example in \((14)\) (the arrow from left to right symbolizes time):
The following formula shows how this sentence would be analyzed in Anteriority-Theory. Counter to empirical fact, however, Anteriority-Theory states that working with clay precedes R:

\[(17) \ E < R \ & \ R,S \ & \ \text{work-with-clay}(E) \ & \ \text{ever since}(E)\]

In this formula, E is too far away from R. This is where Anteriority-Theory makes the wrong predictions, as the following diagram also illustrates:

\[(18) \ \text{diagram for (17)}:\]

The diagram above shows how Anteriority-Theory analyzes a sentence like the perfect-example in (14) ("Sie hat schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet, 'She has worked with clay ever since"). It seems clear that this analysis fails. *Sie hat schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet* means that her working with clay continues up to speech time. In the diagram (18) however, the event E of her working with clay stops before speech time. Now notice that this flaw of Anteriority-Theory could be repaired. Instead of saying that E takes place before R, one could claim that E takes place before R or abuts R. This Revised Anteriority-Theory is exemplified by Musan (2001, 2002). She can easily explain the perfect- and pluperfect-examples above – they are cases where E abuts R. But Musan cannot explain why the preterit-example in (14) is impossible. The meaning of the preterit in Musan’s Revised Anteriority-Theory (and in Anteriority-Theory in general) is that E coincides with R. Both stand before S (E,R < S). In Musan’s system nothing accounts for the ungrammaticality of *Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton* ‘She worked with clay ever since’ in (14) – why should E not be modified by schon immer ‘ever since’ in this case? The following formula also helps to illustrate the problems of Musan’s theory (2001, 2002):

\[(19) \ E,R < S \ & \ \text{work-with-clay}(E) \ & \ \text{ever since}(E)\]

As a semantic translation of *Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton* in (14), the formula in (19) should display the ungrammaticality of this sentence. However, this does not occur. Nothing is wrong with the formula in (19) as the following diagram shows.
So far, it was reasoned why Anteriority-Theory in whatever version is unsatisfactory. But what is the solution to the data-pattern in (14)? The perfect- and pluperfect-sentences are the easy cases. The syntactic structures assumed for them are the following. See (21).

Thus, the present perfect is decomposed into the tense “present” (Pres) and the “perfect” (Perf) itself. The perfect has its own projection, i.e. the Perf-phrase (PerfP). In analogy to the present perfect, the past perfect is split up into the tense “Past” and “Perf”. One might reject this decomposition for morphological reasons. German morphology does not reflect any such decomposition. The German tense paradigm provides only hatte “had” or hat “has”, while the auxiliaries do not possess any two separable parts in the first place. The principle reason to assume decomposition is provided by temporal adverbials that scope between the tense-node T, on the one hand, and Perf, on the other hand. It is shown in Rathert (2004:124ff.) that in the case of the future perfect, there are such adverbs between tense and Perf. Thus, decomposition makes sense.

This is the semantics that is assumed for schon immer ‘ever since’ and the perfect:

\[ F(\text{schon immer})(P)(t) = 1 \text{ iff left-infinite}(t) \& \forall t' \in D, [t' \subseteq t \& C(t') \rightarrow P(t')] \]
Here, \( t \) and \( t' \) are intervals of time, elements of \( D_i \) (the denotation of \( D_i \) equals \( T \), the set of times). The relation “\( \supset \subset \)" is the abut-relation. *Schon immer 'ever since' demands the interval \( t \) to be left-infinite. Within this \( t \), there are many intervals \( t' \) at which \( P \) is true. *Schon immer 'ever since' does not refer to all subintervals of \( t' \). This is the reason why I use the contextual restriction \( C(t') \). In (14) she does not work with clay without interruptions. When she works at all, she uses clay. The perfect establishes an interval of time \( t \) that abuts the reference time \( t \). This interval \( t' \) is called the Extended-Now-interval. It is assumed that this Extended-Now-interval is left-infinite.

Referring back to the two syntactic structures in (21), it is obvious that the sentential meanings are correct, provided that the meaning of Pres and Past are as usual — i.e., Pres denotes the point of speech, Past denotes some definite time before the time of speech. Or, formally:

\[
\begin{align*}
(24) & \quad F(\text{Pres})(P)(t) = 1 \iff \exists t \in D_i \ [t = s^* \land P(t)] \\
& \text{Read: There is a time } t \text{ which is simultaneous to speech time } s^*, \text{ and } P \text{ happens at } t. \\
& \quad F(\text{Past})(P)(t) = 1 \iff \exists t \in D_i \ [t < s^* \land \text{finite } (t) \land P(t)] \\
& \text{Read: There is a time } t \text{ which is before speech time } s^*, \text{ } t \text{ is finite, and } P \text{ happens at } t.
\end{align*}
\]

One might wonder about the finiteness condition in the rule for Past. This condition expresses the definiteness that is required for Past. Past requires that the time of reference be specified either contextually or by an adverb of time. Without a suitable temporal adverb, Past cannot be used felicitously, since Past must refer to some finite interval of time. This is in sharp contrast to the perfect, which does not need a finite interval. The finiteness condition stated in (24) for the preterit mirrors Latzel's principle of *introduction*. Remember that Latzel (1977:125) states that a stable rule for introductory sentences of texts is for them to be in the perfect. The preterit is avoided, cf.:

\[
(25) \quad \text{Context: the speaker enters the room} \\
& \quad \text{*Meiers gewannen im Lotto!} \\
& \quad \text{Meiers won in-the lottery} \\
& \quad \text{‘Meiers won the lottery!’}
\]

The precise semantic translations of the trees in (21) are provided in (26a, b) below:

\[
(26) \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{a. } \text{Sie hat schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet ‘She has worked with clay ever since’:} \\
& \quad \exists t \in D_i \ [t = s^* \land \exists t' \in D_i \ [t' \supset \subset t \land \text{left-infinite}(t') \land \forall t'' \in D_i \ [t'' \subseteq t' \land C(t'') \rightarrow \text{she works with clay at } t'']] \\
& \text{Read: There is a time } t \text{ that is identical to the point of speech } s^*, \text{ t has to its left some interval } t'. \text{ This } t' \text{ and } t \text{ really abut, } t' \text{ is left-infinite, and it contains many intervals } t'. \text{ At these } t'', \text{ she works with clay.}\\

\text{b. } \text{Sie hatte schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet ‘She had worked with clay ever since’:} \\
& \quad \exists t \in D_i \ [t < s^* \land \exists t' \in D_i \ [t' \supset \subset t \land \text{left-infinite}(t') \land \forall t'' \in D_i \ [t'' \subseteq t' \land C(t'') \rightarrow \text{she works with clay at } t'']] \\
\]
\]
Read: There is a time t that is before the point of speech s*, t has to its left some interval t’. This t’ and t really abut, t’ is left-infinite, and it contains many intervals t’’. At these t’’, she works with clay.

The translations are appropriate since it was stipulated that the Extended-Now-interval denoted by the perfect is left-infinite. Cf. also the following illustrations in (27) and (28):

(27) Tense-Event diagram for (26a): the black circles each represent a "working-with-clay-event", the white circle represents speech time

![Tense-Event diagram for (26a)](image)

(28) Tense-Event diagram for (26b): the striped circle represents a past reference time

![Tense-Event diagram for (26b)](image)

However, an account is still missing for the full data-pattern in (14). (29) is the syntactic tree assumed for the preterit-sentence.

(29) Syntactic structure for (14): preterit

```
Preterit:
  TP
    VP
      T
      Past
      schon immer
      sie mit Ton gearbeitet
```

This syntactic tree has the following semantic translation:

(30) *"Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton 'She worked with clay ever since':

\[\exists t \in \mathbb{D}_1 \left( t < s^* \land \text{finite}(t) \land \text{left-infinite}(t) \land \forall t' \in \mathbb{D}_1 \left( t' \subseteq t \land C(t') \rightarrow \text{she works with clay at } t' \right) \right) \]

Read: There is a time t that is before the point of speech s*, t is finite and left-infinite, and it contains many intervals t’. At these t’, she works with clay.

The translation in (30) is contradictory as the time denoted by Past is assumed to be both finite and left-infinite. Thus, the translation in (30) mirrors the ungrammaticality of *"Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton. As no version of Anteriority-Theory known mirrors this ungrammaticality (not even Musan (2001, 2002)), the present Extended-Now-Theory can be assumed to be empirically adequate.
The following examples illustrate the failure of Anteriority-Theory in comparison to the Extended-Now-Theory from another angle.

    Goethe has always with Schiller work-together want
    ‘Goethe always wanted to work with Schiller.’

    Goethe has already always with Schiller work-together want
    ‘Goethe has wanted to work with Schiller ever since.’

As both Goethe and Schiller have been dead for a long time, we can only talk about them as persons in the past. Thus, at first sight, Anteriority-Theory should predict the correct reading. But using Anteriority-Theory, one wrongly predicts grammaticality for the ungrammatical (31b). This is accounted for by (32).

(32) Anteriority-Theory for sentence (31b):
    E < R & R,S & want-to-work-with-Schiller(E) & ever since(E)

(33) Tense-Event diagram for (32):

Here we talk about Goethe as a person in the past. Neither the formula nor the illustration prove that (31b) is ungrammatical. Compare this to the analysis within the Extended-Now-Theory, starting with the syntactic tree in (31b):

(34) Syntactic structure for (31b):

This tree has to be translated into a semantic representation or formula using the meaning rules given before for the present, the perfect, and schon immer ‘ever since’. This translation leads to the following representation:

(35) \[ \exists t \in D. [\text{t equals s*} & \exists t' \in D. [\text{t' extends to the left} & \text{left-infinite(t')} & \forall t'' \in D. [\text{t'' is within t'} & C(t'') \rightarrow \text{Goethe wants to work with Schiller at t''}]] \]

Read: There is a time t that equals speech time s*. Abutting t is a time t’; t’ extends infinitely into the past. For all relevant times t” within t’, it is true that Goethe wanted to work with Schiller.
The diagram below illustrates the formula:

\[(36) \text{Tense-Event diagram for (35) (} s^* \text{ is the speech time):} \]

\[
\text{MANY } t'' \text{ where Goethe wants to work with Schiller } t=s^* \\
t' \rightarrow t
\]

As the (36) shows, we do not talk about Goethe as a person in the past. The illustration in (36) suggests that Goethe is still alive. As both illustration and translation are contradicted by our world-knowledge, we realize that the sentence structure cannot be correct. Here again, the Extended-Now-Theory makes accurate predictions, whereas Anteriority-Theory proves to be wrong.

The distinguishing property of XN-adverbs is clear now. XN-adverbs are important for the theory of the perfect as their distributional behavior in fact decides between different possible theories. They refute the traditional Reichenbachian Anteriority-semantics of the perfect and strongly suggest that the correct perfect-semantics is the Extended-Now-Theory.

However, the data in (14) (repeated below as (37)) about the unavailability of XN-sentences in the preterit are not as simple and clear-cut as it seems.

\[(37) \text{perfect: } \text{Sie hat schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet.} \quad \text{she has already always with clay worked} \quad \text{‘She has worked with clay ever since.’} \]

\[(37) \text{pluperfect: } \text{Sie hatte schon immer mit Ton gearbeitet.} \quad \text{she had already always with clay worked} \quad \text{‘She had worked with clay ever since.’} \]

\[(37) \text{preterit: } *\text{Sie arbeitete schon immer mit Ton.} \quad \text{she worked already always with clay} \quad \text{‘She worked with clay ever since.’} \]

In fact, there are acceptable preterit sentences with XN-adverbs. But those are treated as exceptions and I explain their existence within an OT-framework, as the relevant sections in Rathert (2004:185ff.) suggest. It is hypothesized that all preterits are semantic perfects or pluperfects.

In order to to clarify the status of preterit-sentences with \emph{schon oft} ‘ever often’ and \emph{schon immer} ‘ever since’, some corpus-work was conducted. 200 sentences containing \emph{schon oft} ‘ever often’ and \emph{schon immer} ‘ever since’ were selected from newspaper texts provided in http://corpora.ids-mannheim.de/∼cosmas. The following distribution of tenses was found. See Table 3.

Before drawing conclusions, it is necessary to compare this tense-distribution with the standard tense-distribution in newspaper texts. Within the total of 168 sentences without \emph{schon oft} ‘ever often’ or \emph{schon immer} ‘ever since’ taken by random selection from newspaper texts provided in COSMAS, the following distribution was found in Table 4.
Table 3. Tenses with schon oft 'ever often' and schon immer 'ever since'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pluperfect</th>
<th>preterit</th>
<th>perfect</th>
<th>present</th>
<th>future</th>
<th>future II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>schon immer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schon oft</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sums</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Tenses, normal distribution in the same corpus as for Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pluperfect</th>
<th>preterit</th>
<th>perfect</th>
<th>present</th>
<th>future</th>
<th>future II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sums</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a remarkable difference between the tense distribution in standard texts, on the one hand, and the tense distribution in schon immer/ schon oft sentences, on the other hand. In standard texts, present and preterit clearly dominate (together about 93%). Both perfect and pluperfect rarely occur (together about 7%). In schon immer/schon oft sentences, the opposite is the case: Perfect and pluperfect dominate (together about 71%), while present and preterit are less frequent (together about 29%).

In addition to this, a query was made in www.google.de about the frequency of schon immer/ schon oft plus frequent verbs in the preterit in comparison to the frequency of immer/ oft plus the same frequent verbs in the preterit. Two crucial insights were yielded. First, schon oft is less common than schon immer. However, this is just a fact about word-frequency. This hardly has any consequences for our investigation. Second, it was found that there is a remarkable difference in frequency between schon immer/schon oft + verb in the preterit and immer/ oft + verb in the preterit – whereas the schon-variant is rare. The second finding is to be expected in the above mentioned theory. After all, the preterits in schon immer/schon oft sentences are regarded as semantic perfects. Here are the frequencies:

Table 5. Preterits with (schon) + quantification vs. quantificational adverb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>schon immer</th>
<th>schon oft</th>
<th>immer</th>
<th>oft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arbeitete</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lebte</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suchte</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>träumte</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanzte</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wohnte</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sums</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final sums</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td>3124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers are quite unexpected: 238 tokens with schon immer/schon oft in combination with the preterit against 3,124 tokens with immer/oft. Thus, quantificational adverbs like oft/immer do not impose any restrictions on the preterit. However, adding
schon to oft/immer leads to severe restrictions in the domain of tense making the preterit impossible. The numbers in Table 5 are surprising because they clearly display the ban against the preterit in the case of schon oft/schon immer.

This section has established several interrelations. First, it was demonstrated that XN-adverbs select the perfect and the pluperfect, while being impossible with the preterit. I argued that XN-adverbs make the traditional Reichenbachian theory of the perfect untenable. Second, the syntax and semantics of sentences containing XN-adverbs in the different tenses was specified. Third, the authentic numbers of XN-adverbs that are possible with the preterit proved to be quite unexpected. The solution to these unexpected preterits will be given in the next section. They will be reanalyzed them as semantic perfects.

3. Pragmatics I: Selectional restrictions in Optimality Theory

This section shows how numerous restrictions can be handled in a coherent pragmatic Optimality-Theoretic framework. The constraints assumed are LEXICON, PRAGMATICS, and SEMANTICS. They are defined in the following way:

(38) **LEXICON:** sein 'to be', haben 'to have', passive, and modals select the preterit lexically. This preterit is also called Ersatzpräteritum. The idea originates with Latzel (1977), Schipporeit (1971) and many others mirroring the observation that sentences like Ich hatte einen Cocktail 'I had a cocktail' are better, for euphonic reasons, than Ich habe einen Cocktail gehabt 'I have had a cocktail'. LEXICON is violated if and only if sein 'to be', haben 'to have', passive, or modals do not occur with the preterit.

(39) **PRAGMATICS:** Stay with the tense you are using if you do not want special effects. Thus, if the context is in the preterit, do not jump to other tenses than the preterit used so far. If the context is in the present, do not jump into other tenses than the present. This idea goes back to observations by Behaghel (1924). PRAGMATICS is violated if and only if a tense-shift leads to no special effect. A special effect may be a flashback or a preview.

(40) **SEMANTICS:** Schon oft/ schon immer select perfect lexically. SEMANTICS is violated if and only if schon immer/ schon oft occur with other tenses than pluperfect and perfect.

The ranking of these constraints is the following:

(41) **LEXICON ◦ PRAGMATICS >> SEMANTICS.**

The symbol “◦” represents domination as usually defined in Optimality Theory. The notation "LEXICON ◦ PRAGMATICS" represents the tie between LEXICON and PRAGMATICS. The basic idea of a tie is that two (or more) constraints are equally important. In Table 6 below, the tie between LEXICON and PRAGMATICS is represented by vertical dotted lines. I use the concept of conjunctive local ties from Legendre et al. (1995, 1998) and Müller (1997, 2001). Within this concept, a tie is treated as a normal constraint. The two (or more) constraints of the tie merge into a single constraint that is interpreted via logical conjunction: A candidate violates a tie if it violates a con-
straint that is part of this tie. Multiple violations add up. See the following definition from Müller (2001:295):

\[(42)\] Suppose that \( \Gamma = < CON_1 >> \ldots >> CON_n > \) is a total constraint order in language L, and \( CON_i \) \((1 \leq i \leq n)\) \( \in \Gamma \) is a tie \( CON_i \ldots \) \( \vdash \) \( CON_n \). Then, \( CON_i \) is violated by a candidate C if and only if there is a constraint \( CON_i \) that is violated by C.

The ranking of the three constraints leads to the effect that the semantics of schon oft/ schon immer (SEMANTICS) may be suppressed by the need to have Ersatzpräteritum (LEXICON) or by the need to have preterit as the tense of the current text (PRAGMATICS).

To see the Optimality-Theoretic mechanism at work, let us have a look at some examples. The first one shows violation of all three constraints:


... dass das [...] schon immer in mir war.
... dass this has been within me ever since.

Table 6. Interrelations between LEXICON and PRAGMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEXICON</th>
<th>PRAGMATICS</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEXICON is violated with the perfect and pluperfect as sein ‘to be’ demands an Ersatzpräteritum. PRAGMATICS is violated with the perfect as the narration changes between the preterit and the pluperfect.

(44) below shows more violations in PRAGMATICS as well as new violations in LEXICON:


Ich suchte schon immer die Nähe von Freunden.
I searched already always the nearness of friends
‘I wanted the close contact with friends ever since.’
Table 7. Interrelations between LEXICON and PRAGMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEXICON</th>
<th>PRAGMATICS</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠ Preterit</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEXICON is violated with the perfect and pluperfect as only the preterit is idiomatic with figurative meanings of polysemic verbs like *suchen* ‘to search’. PRAGMATICS is violated with the perfect and pluperfect as the whole narration is strictly kept in the preterit.

Finally, consider two examples where LEXICON plays no role at all:

(45) sie hatten geredet. natürlich. der keim müsste gegossen werden, um wachsen zu kön- 
nen. gelacht auch. *er hatte genau den blick, den sie suchte, schon immer erahnt hatte.* 
weitfremd. genau wie ihrer. er kam ihr sehr bekannt vor. er muss wunderschöne dinge 
gesehen haben, um so blicken zu können. sie konnte nicht einmal sagen, welche farbe 
sie hatten. wir sassen. nicht lange. hatten schon lange nicht mehr geredet. die melodie 
seines gesichtes war wunderbar: perfekt unvollkommen. es war, als würden sie eine 
frucht essen. papaya vielleicht. sie aßen sich kaum zu atmen. schlangen ohne zu schlucken. als hätten sie 
sie schon ihren geschmackssinn erkannt. sie lagen. er wollte gehen. er ging. sie hätten 
reden sollen. länger. dafür war es umso kürzer. es war. und blieb im moment. als puzzle 
von impulsen in meinem sinn gefangen. in allen fünf sinnen. es würde nie wieder 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEXICON</th>
<th>PRAGMATICS</th>
<th>SEMANTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠ Preterit</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRAGMATICS is violated with the perfect as the text changes between the preterit and the pluperfect.

The next example is similar, LEXICON also plays no role:

(46) Es lebte einmal ein kleiner Bär, der hieß Kai. Kai war ein Jahr alt. Er war ein 
Braunbär. *er suchte schon immer seine Familie aber er hat noch nichts gefunden.* 
aber er hatte einen Freund gefunden. Der Frosch hieß Willi. Er war schon sieben 
yahre alt. Sie hatten schon so viel gemacht aber Kai suchte immer noch nach seiner 
Familie. Er musste auch über eine Brücke gehen. Das hat er nicht gemacht. Aber 
der Frosch hat gesagt: Du kannst es. Mach es bitte, sagte der Frosch. Kai hat die 
Brücke doch überquert. Er sucht immer wieder nach seiner Familie. http://wir-in-
berlin.de/teddy/zwill/asslar/seite4.htm
Er suchte schon immer seine Familie.
he searched already always his family
‘he has been searching his family ever since.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Interrelations between LEXICON and PRAGMATICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEXICON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRAGMATICS is violated with the perfect and pluperfect as the whole text is kept in the preterit throughout.
This section has shown that the pragmatic principles established by Latzel (1977:47ff.) can be reconstructed in a formal Optimality-Theoretic framework that also makes use of semantics. I believe that this unifying way of argumentation is very promising.

4. Pragmatics II: Errors with adjectival passives and seit in perfect sentences

Durative adverbs like seit ‘since’ and since are often encountered in the semantic literature on tense. This is due to the fact that they are associated with a universal/existential-ambiguity, and the correct analysis of this ambiguity has an impact on the theory of the perfect in general (Abusch & Rooth 1990; Dowty 1979; Fabricius-Hansen 1986; Heny 1982; Hitzeman 1997a, b; Iatridou et al. 2001; Kamp and Reyle 1993; Mittwoch 1988; Musan 2002; Rathert 2004; Richards 1982; Stechow 1999). Cf. the following sentence.

(47) John has been in Boston since Tuesday
This sentence is ambiguous in its interpretation. John might be seen as being in Boston all the time (universal/u-reading) or as being there at least once (existential/e-reading). Cf. the following illustrations, the first for the universal and the second for the existential reading.

(48) Event-Tense Diagram for (47):

\[
\text{Tuesday} \quad \text{since-interval=} \quad \text{be-in-Boston-interval}
\]

Reads: John starts being in Boston at one time on Tuesday, and he is still in Boston at the moment of utterance.
Simple preterit and composite perfect tense

Thus, the duration of the event is only specified by the durational phrase \textit{since Tuesday} in the case of the u-reading.

Activities in perfect sentences with \textit{seit} 'since' are u/e-ambiguous. However, with achievements there is no true u-reading:

(49) \textit{Die Bombe ist seit gestern explodiert}. (e-reading and quasi-u-reading)

\textquote{The bomb is exploded since yesterday}.

One reading of (48) is called "quasi-u-reading" because it is no true u-reading. Remember that in the case of a true u-reading, the event happens throughout the interval specified by the durational phrase. However, with the quasi-u-reading in (49), the event happens only at the beginning of the \textit{seit} 'since'-interval.

Regarding the morphology of the quasi-u-reading of (49), one might suppose that it is an adjectival passive. Adjectival passives in German are formed with the auxiliary \textit{sein} 'be' in combination with a past participle, like in \textit{Das Buch ist gelesen} 'the book is read'. German and English have three homophonous past participles that are used in three functionally different constructions, namely in the perfect, the verbal passive and the adjectival passive. Cf. the following examples.

(50) German

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Perfect: \textit{Maria hat die Äpfel gegessen.} \hfill \textquote{Maria has eaten the apples.}
  \item Verbal passive: \textit{Die Äpfel werden von Maria gegessen.} \hfill \textquote{The apples are eaten by Maria.}
  \item Adjectival passive: \textit{Die Äpfel sind gegessen.} \hfill \textquote{The apples are eaten.}
\end{enumerate}

(51) English

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Perfect: \textit{Maria has eaten the apples.}
  \item Verbal passive: \textit{The apples are eaten by Maria.}
  \item Adjectival passive: \textit{The apples are eaten.}
\end{enumerate}

Note that the auxiliary is no reliable indicator of the construction in question, neither language-internally nor cross-linguistically. As the data in (51b, c) show, the auxiliary \textit{be} is used both in verbal and adjectival passives in English. In German, however, \textit{sein}
‘be’ occurs only in the adjectival passive construction, see (50c). For the German verbal passive, the auxiliary werden ‘become’ is needed, cf. (50b). If the German composite perfect tense is formed with sein ‘be’ instead of haben ‘have’, there is a homophony between the perfect and the adjectival passive construction, cf. the following examples.

(52) a. Perfect: Die Bombe ist explodiert.
     the bomb is exploded
     ‘The bomb exploded.’

b. Adjectival passive: Die Bombe ist explodiert.
     the bomb is exploded
     ‘The bomb is exploded.’

English never has this homophony between the perfect and the adjectival passive construction, as the perfect in English is always formed with have, never with be.

The analysis of the adjectival passive has been a matter of considerable debate. As for English, Lieber (1980) has suggested to derive the participle used in the adjectival passive construction from the perfect participle. Bresnan (1982) argued against this view with a semantic argument. According to her, the apples in (51c) are apples that have been eaten by someone, not apples that have eaten something else. Thus, she argues, it is much more plausible to derive the adjectival passive participle in (51c) from the verbal passive participle in (51b). Wasow (1977) treats adjectival passives as lexical processes, in opposition to verbal passives which are located in the syntax. Abney (1987) treats adjectival passives as lexical processes, in opposition to verbal passives which are located in the syntax.

Abney (1987) was the first to assume syntactic processes for both kinds of passives. According to Abney, the verbal passive ending -en combines with a full VP to yield an AP. The adjectival passive -en, however, combines with a bare V to yield only an A. Thus, Abney treats adjectival passives as lexical and passive in nature.

It was Kratzer’s innovation (Kratzer (1994, 2000)) to call both elements of Abney’s (1987) analysis of adjectival passives into question. Kratzer showed that adjectival passives are not always lexical and never passive, contra Abney (1987). As for the lexicality of the adjectival passive, consider the following data (Kratzer (1994:17)):

(53) a. Das Haar ist schlampig gekämmt.
     the hair is sloppily combed
     ‘The hair is combed sloppily.’

b. *Das Haar ist schlampig fettig.
     the hair is sloppily greasy
     ‘The hair is sloppily greasy.’

c. Das Haar ist ungekämmt.
     the hair is uncombed
     ‘The hair is uncombed.’

d. *Das Haar ist schlampig ungekämmt.
     the hair is sloppily uncombed
     ‘The hair is sloppily uncombed.’

A manner adverb like schlampig (‘sloppily’) cannot modify an adjective like fettig (‘greasy’), as the ungrammatical sentence in (53b) shows. The negating prefix un- in (53c) is typical of adjectives. It attaches to adjectives and yields adjectives in re-
turn, like in un- plus gut (‘good’), ungut (‘un-good’ = ‘bad’). Naturally, an adjective like ungekämmt (‘uncombed’) cannot be modified by a manner adverb like schlampig (‘sloppily’), as the ungrammatical sentence in (53d) shows. As (53a) is grammatical, the participle gekämmt (‘combed’) cannot be an adjective – if it were an adjective, the modification with schlampig (‘sloppily’) in (53a) should lead to ungrammaticality, contrary to the facts. However, if gekämmt (‘combed’) in (53a) is not an adjective, it must be of a higher bar-projection. Thus, there are adjectival passives like the one in (53a) which are not lexical, but phrasal, pace Abney (1987).

Kratzer (1994, 2000) also showed that adjectival passives are never passive, as the agent of the action in question cannot be made salient with a by-phrase. Cf. the following data.

(54) a. **Maria hat Sonja die Haare gekämmt.**
   Maria has Sonja the hair combed
   ‘Maria combed Sonja’s hair.’

b. *Sonjas Haare sind von Maria gekämmt.
   Sonja’s hair are by Maria combed
   ‘Sonja’s hair is combed by Maria.’

c. **Sonjas Haare sind gekämmt.
   Sonja’s hair are combed
   ‘Sonja’s hair is combed.’

(55) a. **Maria leert den Eimer.**
   Maria empties the bucket
   ‘Maria empties the bucket.’

b. *Der Eimer ist von Maria geleert.
   the bucket is by Maria emptied
   ‘The bucket is emptied by Maria.’

c. **Der Eimer ist geleert.
   the bucket is emptied
   ‘The bucket is emptied.’

The sentences in (54a) and (55a) are active, with the agent in the prototypical subject position. The corresponding adjectival passive sentences with the agent made salient in a by-phrase are ungrammatical, cf. (54b) and (55b). If the agent is left out (like in (54c) and (55c)), the adjectival passive sentences are perfectly grammatical.

An additional argument against the passive nature of adjectival passives concerns adverbial modification. Cf. the following sentences.

(56) a. **Maria hat Sonja langsam/ sorgsam die Haare gekämmt.**
   Maria has Sonja slowly/ carefully the hair combed
   ‘Maria combed Sonja’s hair slowly/ carefully.’

b. *Sonjas Haare sind langsam/ sorgsam gekämmt.
   Sonja’s hair are slowly/ carefully combed
   ‘Sonja’s hair is combed slowly/ carefully.’

c. **Sonjas Haare sind gekämmt.
   Sonja’s hair are combed
   ‘Sonja’s hair is combed.’
The active sentence in (56a) may of course contain manner adverbs like *slowly* or *carefully* that characterize the action of the agent. However, the corresponding adjectival passive sentence is only grammatical if agent-related adverbs are left out, as in (56c) versus (56b). As the agent in adjectival passives is not available for modification, it is highly plausible that there is no agent at all in adjectival passives. As for the syntax of adjectival passives, this is equivalent to saying that there is no Voice-projection within the participle.

Adjectival passives exclude agent-oriented adverbial modification, but allow other kinds of adverbial modification. Adverbs of duration like *für ein paar Stunden* (‘for some hours’) and Extended-Now-adverbs like *immer noch* (‘still’) are possible in adjectival passives, cf.:

(57) a. *Das Schlauchboot ist für ein paar Stunden aufgepumpt.*
   The rubber-dinghy is for a some hours pumped-up
   ‘The rubber dinghy is pumped up for some hours.’

b. *Das Schlauchboot ist immer noch aufgepumpt.*
   The rubber-dinghy is always still pumped-up
   ‘The rubber dinghy is still pumped up.’

The adverbs of duration in (57a, b) specify the duration of the resultant state of being pumped up. The mentioned adverbs, however, are only possible with resultant-state-participles in the sense of Kratzer (1994, 2000). Resultant-state-participles specify states that are reversible. The rubber dinghy in (57a, b) may lose air, thus its current state of being pumped up is reversible. Target-state-participles in the sense of Kratzer (1994, 2000) denote irreversible states. They are incompatible with adverbs of duration, cf.:

(58) a. *Das Theorem ist für ein paar Stunden bewiesen.*
   The theorem is for a some hours proven
   ‘The theorem is proven for some hours.’

b. *Das Theorem ist immer noch bewiesen.*
   The theorem is always still proven
   ‘The theorem is still proven.’

A theorem that is proven once is proven forever. Thus, the target state of being proven cannot be specified by adverbs like ‘for some hours’.

Back to the seit-sentence in (49), repeated here as (59):

(59) *Die Bombe ist seit gestern explodiert.* (e-reading and quasi-u-reading)
   the bomb is since yesterday exploded
   ‘The bomb is exploded since yesterday.’

A true u-reading would denote an event that happens throughout the interval specified by the durational phrase *seit gestern* ‘since yesterday’. Naturally, an achievement like *explode* cannot have such a huge extension in time. Nevertheless, (59) is grammatical and has two distinct readings, an e-reading and a quasi-u-reading. The e-reading denotes a situation where the bomb explodes at some time within the *since*-interval. With the quasi-u-reading of (59), the explosion happens at the beginning of the *since*-interval.
Again, regarding the morphology of the quasi-u-reading of (59), one might suppose that it is an adjectival passive. Since the work of Kratzer (1994), it is generally accepted that adjectival passives contain no VoiceP but are bare APs. According to Kratzer (1994:180ff.), adjectival participles are conversions from verbal participles. Kratzer’s perfectivizer PERFECT has the following denotation:

(60) $\text{PERFECT}' = \lambda P_{\chi,\lambda}, \lambda s, \lambda e. \left[ P(e) \land s = \text{ftarget}(e) \right]$.

The lexical entry for build is formalized by the following expression:

(61) $\text{build}' = \lambda x, \lambda e. \left[ \text{building}(e) \land \exists x \left( \text{ftarget}(e) \right) \right]$.

As we want to construct an adjectival passive of build, we have to combine the meaning of build in (61) with the perfectivizer PERFECT from (60) above via function composition. This yields the following expression:

(62) $(\text{build PERFECT})' = \lambda x, \lambda s, \lambda e. \left[ \text{building}(e) \land \exists x \left( \text{ftarget}(e) \right) \right] (e) \land s = \text{ftarget}(e)$.

Read: There is a building-event e and the target state of this event is a state s, s is defined as the existence of x.

Thus, if the quasi-u-reading of (59) were an adjectival passive, it would have a meaning analogous to the one in (62). The auxiliary ist would just agree with the AP. Notice, however, that analyzing the quasi-u-reading of (59) as an adjectival passive is problematic as there are also haben-variants displaying quasi-u-readings:

(63) Charlie hat die Lampe seit gestern umgeworfen.

It is technically impossible for haben ‘to have’ to agree with an AP delivered by PERFECT. As the quasi-u-reading of (59) must be treated similar to the quasi-u-reading of (63), I assume that with quasi-u-readings there is no AP at all. In other words, there is neither an adjectival passive in (59) nor in (63).

If quasi-u-readings are no adjectival passives, what could they be? To answer this question, another look at the data is helpful. It is a remarkable feature of sentences with quasi-u-readings that um may be substituted for seit:

(64) Charlie hat die Arbeit seit um 3 abgegeben.

The um-sentence is grammatical and verbal (contains no AP), but the corresponding seit-sentence is only marginally acceptable. It might be possible that those speakers who accept the seit-variant reinterpret it as an um-sentence. However, this needs to be proven empirically. In this context, it is very interesting to regard certain haben-activities like duschen ‘to shower’. Usually, we say ich habe geduscht (‘I took a shower’). But to talk about the results of showering, we use sein “be”: 
The sentence in (71) is a quasi-u-reading. (71) employs the adjective *tot* that denotes the target state of being dead. (71) cannot be expressed with an adjectival passive, as the ungrammatical sentence in (70) shows. In (59), the participle can be mistaken for an adjectival passive participle because there is no better way in the morphology...
to express a quasi-u-reading. For getötet 'killed' in (70) we can use tot to express a quasi-u-reading. But for explodiert 'exploded' in (59), there is no equivalent lexeme.

This section has shown that the adjectival status of passive participles is not always easy to determine. In contrast to the verbal passive, the adjectival passive imposes no restrictions on the tenses it can co-occur with.

5. Conclusion

This paper has explored some pragmatic issues connected to the (verbal and adjectival) passive and to the perfect. I proposed new and integrative solutions to well-known and interrelated puzzles.

In German, the distribution of preterit and perfect is notoriously delicate. To describe the usage of the two tenses, Latzel (1977) has established several pragmatic principles: contamination, substitution, deficiency, introduction, coherence. It was demonstrated that these principles have descriptive adequacy, with the exception of contamination. Sticking to the principle of substitution and with the help of www.google.de, it was pointed out that we use Ersatzpräteritum ('substitute-preterit') if a sentence that refers to past events contains sein/haben 'to be/to have', furthermore the passive form, or modals. The use of the perfect is not possible in these cases. It was shown with the help of www.google.de that the passive forms of the perfect are rarely found. For the internet queries, highly frequent verbs were chosen. Out of a total of 6,959,500, less than 1% (0.86%) occurs with the perfect.

Furthermore, it was demonstrated that XN-adverbs select the perfect and the pluperfect while being impossible with the preterit. It was argued that XN-adverbs make the traditional (and influential) Reichenbachian theory of the perfect untenable, which specifies that E is before R. The syntax and semantics of sentences containing XN-adverbs in the different tenses was specified.

Numerous restrictions on tense can be handled in a coherent pragmatic Optimality-Theoretic framework. The constraints assumed here are LEXICON, PRAGMATICS, and SEMANTICS. The pragmatic principles established by Latzel (1977) can be reconstructed in a formal Optimality-Theoretic framework that also makes use of semantics. I believe that this unifying way of argumentation is very promising.

Finally, we saw that adjectival passives are completely different from verbal passives due to the fact that they impose no restrictions on tense.

Taking all these facts and puzzles about the perfect and the passives together, I hope to have shown that any semantic analysis of them has to be complemented by a pragmatic one.
Note
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