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**Whither the Agent?**

- English is odd in allowing the agent to appear freely:

  (1)  **Arabic:**

  a. Matta fataха al-baab.
  "Matt opened the door."

  b. Al-baab in-fataъ(*min Matta).
  the-door pass-opened (*by Matt)
  "The door was opened (*by Matt)."

- Other common differences from English:
  - Different prepositions for different subject θ-roles.
  - No special marking of the agent with morphology.

- *Finally*: passive isn’t the only voice morphology around.
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Theorizing the Passive

Common Idea about Passives

The passive removes the verb’s structural accusative case (and are therefore unaccusatives). It does not allow for a DP in [Spec,VP] at D-Structure.

- Recall:
  - One DP (the external argument) doesn’t receive Case in VP.
  - The DP that does is given accusative.
  - The other DP raises to [Spec,TP] and gets nominative.

- Consequences of taking away ACC from V:
  - Only one DP can get case (*ceteris paribus*).
  - The object must *raise* to get nominative.
  - You need something else to license the subject, if present.
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Causative Preliminaries

(2) Luganda (Bantu, Uganda):
   a. Abalenzi ba-li-fumb-a lumonde.  
      boys agr-fut-cook-fv potatoes
      “The boys will cook potatoes.”
   b. Kapere ba-li-fumb-is-a abalenzi lumonde.  
      Kapere agr-fut-cook-caus-fv boys potatoes
      “Kapere will make the boys cook potatoes.”

Characterization of Causatives

The causative adds a novel subject to a verb. The previous subject becomes the object, and any previous object becomes a second object.
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What about Transitivity?

- Transitivity is actually somewhat irrelevant to causatives:

  (3)  
  a. The mirror *broke*.
  b. Archer *broke* the mirror.

- Not just about agentivity, either:

  (4)  
  a. Wanafunzi *wa-ta-imb-a*.
       pupils     AGR-FUT-sing-FV
       “The pupils will sing.”
  b. Mwalimu *a-ta-wa-imb-ish-a* wanafunzi.
       teacher   AGR-FUT-AGR-sing-CAUS-FV
       “The teacher will make the pupils sing.”

- Many languages have periphrastic constructions where causatives would appear (English, German, . . . ).
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Synthetic Causatives: movement of V to $V_{caus}$
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In some languages, causatives look like voice morphology.

Some languages don’t allow more than one object in causatives.

Some languages treat the embedded VP like a clause, others don’t.

Some languages allow/require the causee to be an oblique.

**Direct vs. Indirect causatives:**

1. **Direct** causatives involve the agent controlling the event.
2. **Indirect** causatives involve the agent not directly controlling the event.

(5)  

a. Llana emptied the bottle.  
b. Llana had the bottle emptied.
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Only Scratching the Surface...
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Reflexive/Reciprocal Preliminaries

(6)  
(a) Malcom saw Ollie.  
(b) Malcom saw himself.  
(c) Malcom and Ollie saw each other.

Characterization of Reflexives/Reciprocals

The reflexive and reciprocal both require that the denotation of the object of the verb include the denotation of the subject of the verb.

- Not every language has morphology for this (Germanic, Romance, ...).
- When a periphrastic construction occurs, the object element is sometimes called an anaphor.
- Some languages (e.g., Semitic) have the same morphology for both.
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Characterization of Reflexives/Reciprocals

The reflexive and reciprocal both require that the denotation of the object of the verb include the denotation of the subject of the verb.
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Reflexives

Characterization of Reflexives

Reflexives mark that the object and subject of the predicate denote the same thing.

(7) Yurok (Algonkian; Humboldt County, CA):
   a. skuyk-, “to treat well.”
   b. skuykep- “to treat oneself well.”
   c. sımıt-, “to beat”
   d. sımıt̕ep-, “to beat/kill oneself”
Reflexives mark that the object and subject of the predicate denote the same thing.

(7) Yurok (Algic; Humboldt County, CA):
   a. skuyk-, “to treat well.”
   b. skuykep- “to treat oneself well.”
   c. sımıt-, “to beat”
   d. sımıtеп-, “to beat/kill oneself”
Reflexives mark that the object and subject of the predicate denote the same thing.

(7) Yurok (Algic; Humboldt County, CA):
   a. skuyk-, “to treat well.”
   b. skuykep- “to treat oneself well.”
   c. sımıt-, “to beat”
   d. sımıtep- “to beat/kill oneself”
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object includes the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:
   a. ḫamaṣ, “to gather, meet”
   b. ḫ-t-amaṣ, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal meaning.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object *includes* the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:

a. ḥamaṣ, “to gather, meet”
b. ḥ-t-amaṣ, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal *meaning*.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocal

Characterization of Reciprocal
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object includes the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:
   a. ḥamaṣ, “to gather, meet”
   b. ḥ-t-amaṣ, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal meaning.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object *includes* the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:

a. ḍamaʕ, “to gather, meet”

b. ḍ-ṭ-amaʕ, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal *meaning*.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object includes the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:
   a. ﺯﺎ mamma, “to gather, meet”
   b. ழ-zilla, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal meaning.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object *includes* the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:

a. ُ nadzieję, “to gather, meet”

b. ُ-ت-حْرْن, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocals.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal *meaning*.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object *includes* the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:
   a. ðama{|, “to gather, meet”
   b. ð-t-ama{|, “to meet one another”

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal *meaning*.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Reciprocals mark that the denotation of the object *includes* the denotation of the subject.

(8) Arabic:
   a. َъَاْلَا، "to gather, meet"
   b. َهُ-ُاْلَا، "to meet one another"

- We won’t get into theory here; take Syntax III. Reasons:
  - Not all languages have synthetic reflexivization/reciprocalisation.
  - There are constraints on the use of reflexives/reciprocals.
  - It requires a theory of reflexive/reciprocal *meaning*.
  - There’s evidence they don’t form a natural class.
Anti-Causatives

1. Leftover Passives
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Anti-Causatives

Anticausative Preliminaries

- English doesn’t give us evidence for a direct of derivation in (9):

(9)  
  a. The mirror *broke*.
  b. Archer *broke* the mirror.

- (9a) → (9b): A causative derivation.
- (9b) → (9a): An anticausative derivation.

Characterization of Anticausatives

An anticausative is the intransitive version of a transitive verb with the agent completely suppressed.
Anticausative Preliminaries

- English doesn’t give us evidence for a direct of derivation in (9):

  (9)  
  a. The mirror *broke*.
  b. Archer *broke* the mirror.

- (9a) $\rightarrow$ (9b): A causative derivation.
- (9b) $\rightarrow$ (9a): An anticausative derivation.

Characterization of Anticausatives

An anticausative is the intransitive version of a transitive verb with the agent completely supressed.
**Anticausative Preliminaries**

- English doesn’t give us evidence for a direct of derivation in (9):
  
  \[(9) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \quad \text{The mirror broke.} \\
    b. & \quad \text{Archer broke the mirror.}
  \end{align*}\]

- \((9a) \rightarrow (9b)\): A **causative** derivation.
- \((9b) \rightarrow (9a)\): An **anticausative** derivation.

**Characterization of Anticausatives**

An anticausative is the intransitive version of a transitive verb with the agent completely suppressed.
Anticausative Preliminaries

- English doesn’t give us evidence for a direct of derivation in (9):

  (9)  
  a. The mirror **broke**.
  b. Archer **broke** the mirror.

- (9a) \(\rightarrow\) (9b): A causative derivation.
- (9b) \(\rightarrow\) (9a): An anticausative derivation.

Characterization of Anticausatives

An anticausative is the intransitive version of a transitive verb with the agent completely suppressed.
Marking How? Marking Who?

• Some languages do mark the anticausative:

(10) Russian:
  a. Devufka sloma-la palk-u.  
     girl break-past.fem.sg stick-acc  
     “The girl broke the stick”
  b. Palk-a sloma-la-s’.  
     stick-nom break-past.fem.sg-antic  
     “The stick broke.”

(11) German:
  a. Die Frau öffnet die Tü.r.  
     the woman opens the door  
     “The woman is opening the door.”
  b. Die Tü.r öffnet sich.  
     the door opens self  
     “The door is opening.”
Marking How? Marking Who?

- Some languages do mark the anticausative:

(10) Russian:

a. Devuska sloma-la palk-u.  
girl break-past.fem.sg stick-acc  
“The girl broke the stick”

b. Palk-a sloma-la-s’.  
stick-nom break-past.fem.sg-antic  
“The stick broke.”

(11) German:

a. Die Frau üffnet die Tür.  
the woman opens the door  
“The woman is opening the door.”

b. Die Tür öffnet sich.  
the door opens self  
“The door is opening.”
If the language allows the agent to be expressed, it will be in as an oblique:

(12) Hausa:
   a. Shawarar nan ta dama Audu.
      thing this tns worry Audu.
      “This matter worries Audu.”
   b. Audu ya dam-u da sawarar nan.
      Audu tns worry-ANTIC with thing this
      “Audu worries about this matter.”

(13) Hindi:
    Paanii (*Ram-dwaaraa) ubal raha thaa.
    water (*Ram-by) boil prog be.PAST
    “The water was boiling (*by Ram).”
Marking How? Marking Who? II

- If the language allows the agent to be expressed, it will be in as an oblique:

(12) Hausa:

a. Shawarar nan ta dama Audu.  
   thing this worry Audo.  
   “This matter worries Audu.”

b. Audu ya dam-u da sawarar nan.  
   Audu worry-antic with thing this  
   “Audu worries about this matter.”

(13) Hindi:

Paanii (*Ram-dwaaraa) ubal raha thaa.  
water (*Ram-by)  boil  prog be.past  
“The water was boiling (*by Ram).”
Common Idea about Anticausatives

Anticausatives are unaccusative verbs — they don’t assign ACC to their complement.
Theorizing Anticausatives

Common Idea about Anticausatives

Anticausatives are unaccusative verbs — they don’t assign ACC to their complement.

[Diagram of a tree structure showing the syntactic structure of a sentence with a verb "broke" and its complement "The glass".]
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Theorizing Anticausatives

Common Idea about Anticausatives

Anticausatives are unaccusative verbs — they don’t assign acc to their complement.

The glass

\(TP \rightarrow DP \rightarrow \text{The glass} \rightarrow \text{NOM} \rightarrow V \rightarrow \text{broke} \rightarrow t_{obj.}\)