

Passives

MIT, 24.951, We 24 Sep 2003

The Passive ‘Construction’ in GB**Passives and Case Theory: de-Casing of [NP,V']; de-thematization of Spec(IP)***De-Casing—distribution of NPs vs. CPs.*

- (1) a. *Mary anticipates **her** victory*
 b. *Mary anticipates **that she will win***
- (2) a. ***Her** victory is certain*
 b. ***That she will win** is certain*
- (3) a. *Mary is certain *(of) **her** victory*
 b. *Mary is certain **that she will win***
- (4) a. *The certainty *(of) **Mary's** victory*
 b. *The certainty **that Mary will win***
- (5) a. *They widely anticipated **Mary's** victory*
 b. *They widely anticipated **that Mary would win***
- (6) a. ** It is widely anticipated **Mary's** victory*
 b. *It is widely anticipated **that Mary will win***
- (7) ***Mary's** victory is widely anticipated*
- (8) a. *It appears that **Mary** has won*
 b. ** It appears **Mary** to have won*
 c. ***Mary** appears to have won*
- (9) Passivization as “De-Casing”: * ... [_{V'} V-en DP[“-Case”]] at Surface Structure???
- (10) *En la fiesta fue presentada María por su padre* (Spanish)
 In the part was presented(+FEM) Mary by her father

“Subjects” in [NP,V']? English vs. Spanish

- (11) a. *Llegó Juan*
 Arrived John

- b. *Vimos a Juan*
we-saw CASE John
- (12) a. *Le gustan las manzanas a Juan*
to-him please+3PL the+PL apples CASE John
'The apples please John'
- b. * *Le gusta las manzanas a Juan*
to-him please+3SG the+PL apples CASE John

Obligatory de-Casing? English vs. Dutch/German

- (13) *In de zomer wordt er hier vaak gezwommen* (Dutch)
'In the Summer it is swum here frequently'

(14) Movement in (7) and in (8c) for (abstract) Case?

(15) **Visibility Condition:**

- a. Each argument *A* appears in a CHAIN containing a unique visible θ -position.
- b. Each θ -position is "visible" in a CHAIN containing a unique argument.

A position *P* is VISIBLE in a CHAIN if the CHAIN contains a Case-marked position

- (16) a. *They sank the ships*
b. *They (the ships) were sunk*
c. *They appear to have been sunk*
d. *They are likely to appear to have been sunk*
e. *I believe them to have been sunk*
f. *I ask for them to be sunk*
- (17) a. *John_i is believed [IP *t_i to be likely [IP *t_i to win*]]*
b. *[PP Under the rug]_i seems to be [IP *t_i the only place I haven't searched*]**

The GB treatment

- (18) a. ... [_{V'} *sunk NP*]
b. *NP_i ... [V' sunk *t_i*]*
- (19) a. Why does *the ship* move in (16b)–(16f) (cf. (18b))?
b. Case? Why would passive participles not assign Case?

- c. What about the θ -criterion?

θ -criterion:

1. Each CHAIN is assigned exactly one θ -role.
2. Each θ -role is assigned to exactly one CHAIN.

De-thematization of Spec(IP)?

- (20) a. **Feature decomposition of lexical categories:**

	+N	-N
+V	A	V
-V	N	P

- b. -N items (verbs and prepositions) are Case assigners.

- (21) a. -EN is [+V,(0N)] and heads the passive participle

“We assume that affix hopping applies prior to surface structure and that it assigns *V+en* the category [+V] deleting [-N] from the verbal form [+V,-N]” (Rouveret & Vergnaud 1980:121)

Passive participles are ‘near’ adjectival ...

- (22) a. *My arm was broken by John*
 b. *My broken arm*

... but not quite adjectival

- (23) a. *The bed was unmade* vs. *Headway was (*un)made*
 b. *John was unknown* vs. *John was (*un)known to be the murderer*

Problems with above account

- (24) a. **John was seemed to be smart*
 b. **It was danced by everyone*
 c. **The book was been given*

An optimal (?) derivation of the passive—all in the syntax (BJR 1989)

- (25) a. *The sailors sank the ship deliberately/intentionally/willingly*
 b. *The ship was sunk deliberately/intentionally/willingly*
 c. ** The ship sank deliberately/intentionally/willingly*

(26) Passive in (25b) vs. unaccusative in (25c)

Two differences:

- a. Morphology: *-en* morpheme in (25b)
- b. (Implicit?) Presence of an argument—(non-)licensing of agent-oriented adverbs (Jackendoff 1972)

BJR's account collapses these two differences.

- (27) a. *-en* is “deep” syntactic clitic inserted as an argument in INFL (NB: *-en* is *phonologically* an affix).
- b. *-en* is inserted in the syntax and derives the morphological and syntactic structure in tandem—in a *single* component of the grammar.
- c. $[_{IP} \text{Spec}(IP) [_I' -en [_{VP} [_{V'} V NP]]]]$

As an argument in INFL, *-en* receives the external θ -role, which is assigned by the entire VP

- (28) a. *A baseball was thrown by Fernando*
- b. *Support was thrown behind the candidate by the CIA*
- c. *The match was thrown by the prizefighter*
- d. *The party was thrown by the department*
- (29) a. Since *-en* receives a theta-role, the Visibility Condition (in (15)) says it needs Case.
- b. Where does it get Case from? The verb.
- c. As a result, the object of the verb does not get Case.
- d. If object is NP, it needs to do something to get Case; thus the movements in (16b)–(16f).
- e. The next-higher subject position does not receive any external θ -role (which is taken up by *-en*), hence, movement into it is possible.

Consequences for Binding Theory

- (30) a. *John was shaved* (\neq by himself, interpretively, as well as overtly)
- b. *John is admired* (\neq by himself, interpretively, as well as overtly)

(31) **CHAIN Condition:** * $X_i Y_i t_i$ (Rizzi 1986)

(32) ****John_i*** was *shav-en_i* t_i (by ***himself_i***)

- (33) a. *They were seen by each other*
- b. $[They\ each]_k$ were *see+en_j* t_k by $[t_{each}\ other]_j$

Consequences for Control Theory

(34) PRO_{arb} as the referential value for *-en* in absence of a *by*-phrase (BJR 1989:228f)

(35) a. *PRO_{arb} to try it is PRO_{arb} to like it*

b. *PRO_{arb} to shave oneself can be fun*

(36) a. *?*This privilege was kept to themselves*

b. *Such privileges should be kept to oneself*

(37) *The ship was sunk*

(38) **If you're right, then such privileges must have been kept to oneself*

(39) a. **The article was published [PRO_{arb} to exonerate oneself]*

b. **This bureaucrat was bribed [PRO_{arb} to avoid paying one's taxes]*

Predictions? (Cf. (24))

(40) a. **John was seemed to be smart*

b. **It was danced by everyone*

c. **The book was been given*

Passives of unaccusatives in Lithuanian?

(41) *Ar būta tenai langinių?* (Lithuanian)

And be/pass+n/sg there window+gen

'Were there really windows there?'

(Literally 'And there had been existed by windows')

(42) a. In Lithuanian, *-en* is an N(P).

b. It can be generated in [NP,V'] (as well as in Spec(IP)).

c. Hence it can also get the internal θ -role (passive of unaccusative).

d. From its VP-internal position, *-en* NP-moves to the subject position, then it incorporates into INFL, from where it cliticizes on the verb.

How to rule out -en in object position of transitive verbs in Lithuanian?

(43) **John beat-en (by Bill)*

Double passives in Lithuanian?

- (44) *To lapelio būto vėjo nupūsto*
 That leaf+gen be/pass wind+gen blow/pass
 'By that leaf there was being blown down by the wind'
- (45) Two *-en* morphemes: one inside VP, one outside VP.

Dutch and German? (Cf. (13).)

- (46) *In de zomer wordt er hier vaak gezwommen* (Dutch)
 'In the Summer it is swum here frequently'
- (47) **Parameter (amendment to (15)):**

Visibility can be satisfied either by Case or by Incorporation (i.e., merging the head of the argument with an appropriate X^0 , e.g., V^0).

Unresolved issues:

- (48) a. Syncretism: *They have broken the vase / The vase was broken*
 Accidental homophony?
- b. *-en* incorporation paths (in, e.g., (42a)–(44)) can seem ad hoc. For example, why can't the passive morpheme in $[NP, V']$ incorporate *directly* into V (cf. (44))?
 Compare with incorporation data in Baker 1988 where incorporation into V takes place from object positions, not from subject positions.
 "Incorporation of a subject violates the ECP while Incorporation of an object does not. In this way, the [subject-object asymmetry re Incorporation] is explained in terms of a known principle of grammar." (Baker 1988:83)

More on movement in passives and in unaccusatives (in French):

- (49) *Les portes ont été repeintes par les ouvriers*
 The doors(FEM/PL) have been repainted(FEM/PL) by the workers
- (50) a. *Les ouvrières sont parties*
 The workers(FEM/PL) are left(FEM/PL)
 'The female workers have left'
- b. *Les ouvrières ont ri(*es)*
 The workers(FEM/PL) have laughed(*FEM/PL)
 'The female workers have laughed'