Typological Studies in Language (TSL)

A companion series to the journal Studies in Language

General Editor       Michael Noonan
Assistant Editors    Spike Gildea, Suzanne Kemmer

Editorial Board
Wallace Chafe (Santa Barbara) Charles Li (Santa Barbara)
Bernard Comrie (Leipzig)    Edith Moravcsik (Milwaukee)
R.M.W. Dixon (Melbourne)    Andrew Pawley (Canberra)
Matthew Dryer (Buffalo)     Doris Payne (Eugene, OR)
John Haiman (St Paul)       Frans Plank (Konstanz)
Bernd Heine (Köln)          Jerrold Sadock (Chicago)
Paul Hopper (Pittsburgh)    Dan Slobin (Berkeley)
Andrei Kibrik (Moscow)      Sandra Thompson (Santa Barbara)
Ronald Langacker (San Diego)

Volumes in this series will be functionally and typologically oriented, covering specific topics in language by collecting together data from a wide variety of languages and language typologies. The orientation of the volumes will be substantive rather than formal, with the aim of investigating universals of human language via as broadly defined a data base as possible, leaning toward cross-linguistic, diachronic, developmental and live-discourse data.

Volume 68
Passivization and Typology: Form and function
Edited by Werner Abraham and Larisa Leisiö
Passivization and Typology
Form and function

Edited by
Werner Abraham
University of Vienna

Larisa Leisiö
University of Helsinki

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia
# Table of contents

Contributors’ addresses vii
Abbreviations ix

Introduction: Passivization and typology. Form vs. function – a confined survey into the research status quo 1
  Werner Abraham

Part I. Functional Approaches
  A. Active-passive and reflexives
  Passives in Lithuanian (in comparison with Russian) 29
    Emma Geniušienė
  Passive and middle in Indo-European: Reconstructing the early Vedic passive paradigm 62
    Leonid Kulikov
  
  B. Triggers – aspectual, semantic, and discourse-pragmatic: Case studies
  Pragmatic nature of Mandarin passive-like constructions 83
    Marja Peltomaa
  Development of the thiuk passive marker in Thai 115
    Amara Prasithrathsint
  The passives of Modern Irish 132
    Brian Nolan
  The passive in Erzya Mordvin folklore 165
    Merja Salo
  Grammatical voice and tense-aspect in Slavic 191
    Junichi Toyota and Melisa Mustafović
  Passive in Nganasan 213
    Larisa Leisiö

  C. Actor demotion
  ‘Agent defocusing’ revisited: Passive and impersonal constructions in some European languages 232
    Andrea Sansò
# Table of contents

Relations between Actor-demoting devices in Lithuanian:

Dedicated to Emma Geniušienė

Björn Wiemer

**274**

D. Grammaticalization in long-term diachrony

The rise and grammaticalization paths of Latin *fieri* and *facere* as passive auxiliaries

Michela Cennamo

**311**

Grammatical relations in passive clauses: A diachronic perspective

T. Givón

**337**

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_

**352**

Passive and argument structure

_Tor A. Åfarli_

**373**

Case-driven Agree, EPP and passive in Turkish

_Balkız Öztürk_

**383**

A unique feature of direct passive in Japanese

_Kenichi Ariji_

**403**

B. Actor demotion

Passive as a feature-suppression operation

_Dalina Kallulli_

**442**

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_

**462**

The impersonal passive: Voice suspended under aspectual conditions

_Werner Abraham and Elisabeth Leiss_

**502**

Simple preterit and composite perfect tense:
The role of the adjectival passive

_Monika Rathert_

**518**

Author index

**544**

Subject index

**548**
Contributors’ addresses

Werner Abraham
Institut für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Wien
Berggasse 11/3
A-1090 Wien, Austria
Werner.Abraham@t-online.de

Tor A. Åfarli
Institutt for nordistikk og allmenn litteraturvitskap
NTNU
N-7491 Trondheim, Norway
tor.aafarli@hf.ntnu.no

Kenichi Ariji
Shinshu University
3-1 Asahi
Matsumoto, Nagano
390-8621 Japan
k-ariji@shinshu-u.ac

Michela Cennamo
University of Naples Federico II
Dept. of Modern Philology
Via Porta di Massa 1
I-80133 Naples, Italy
micennam@unina.it

Emma Geniušienė
P.O. Box 75, 194021 St. Petersburg
Russia
nedjalkov@typology.spb.su

Tomas Givón
White Cloud Ranch
P.O.Box 1694
Ignacio, CO, 81137, USA
tgivon@uoregon.edu

Dalina Kallulli
Institut für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Wien
Berggasse 11/3
A-1090 Wien, Austria
dalina.kallulli@univie.ac.at

Leonid Kulikov
Leiden University, Faculty of Arts,
Dept. of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics
P.O. Box 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
L.Kulikov@let.leidenuniv.nl

Larisa Leisio
Mäntymäentie 10, 37800 Toijala, Finland
Larisa.Leisio@uta.fi

Elisabeth Leiss
Department für Germanistik
Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität
München Schellingstraße 3/RG
D-80799 München, Germany
c.leiss@germanistik.uni-muenchen.de

Melisa Mustafović
BCCN Project Assistant
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
Hansastraße 9A
D-79104 Freiburg i. Br., Germany

Brian Nolan
School of Informatics and Engineering
Institute of Technology Blanchardstown
Blanchardstown Road North
Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, Ireland
brian.nolan@itb.ie
Contributors' addresses

Balkiz Öztürk
Boğaziçi University
Department of Western Languages and Literatures
Bebek-Istanbul, 34342 Turkey
balkiz.ozturk@boun.edu.tr

Marja Peltomaa
Untuvaisenkuja 1 C 47
00820 Helsinki, Finland
mapeltom@mappi.helsinki.fi
marja.peltomaa@helsinki.fi

Amara Prasithrathsint
Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts
Chulalongkorn University
Bangkok 10330
Thailand
Amara.Pr@Chula.ac.th

Monika Rathert
Universität des Saarlandes
FR 4.1 – Germanistik
Gebäude 35, Raum 3.07
Postfach 15 11 50
D-66041 Saarbrücken, Germany
m.rathert@mx.uni-saarland.de

Merja Lilja Tuulikki Salo
Department of Finno-Ugric Studies
P.O. Box 25 (Franzeninkatu 13)
FI-00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
merja.salo@helsinki.fi

Andrea Sansó
Dipartimento di Linguistica
Università di Pavia
Corso Strada Nuova 65 1-27100
Pavia, Italy
sanso@humnet.unipi.it

Kan Sasaki
Sapporo Gakuin University
Bunkyo-dai Ebetsu
069-8555 Japan
ksasaki@sgu.ac.jp

Junichi Toyota
Lund University
Department of English
Box 201, SE-221 00 Lund,
Sweden
Junichi.Toyota@englund.lu.se

Björn Wiemer
Konstanz University
FB Sprachwissenschaft, Slavistik
Postfach 55 60, D 179
D-78457 Konstanz, Germany
Bjoern.Wiemer@uni-konstanz.de

Akie Yamazaki
Sapporo Gakuin University
Bunkyo-dai Ebetsu
069-8555 Japan
akie@sgu.ac.jp
### 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>$\Theta_1$, $\Theta_2$</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-defocusing; 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 text fit with respect to theme 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[bi] 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

\[
furon \ binkitos \ parentes \ de \ piscopu... \\
got.3pl \ defeated.ACC.MASC \ the \ parents.ACC.MASC \ by \ the \ bishop... \\
\]

(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, *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 adverbial 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 Cela ce ne dit pas – Norwegian Lysene lyses (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)

| Event Medium; high degree of elaboration | Bare happening Specific | Generic-potential pass
| Agent Non-human, diffuse entity, low individuation, none/low salience | Not encoded; de-emphasized | Not encoded; generic |
| Patient Human, high affectedness, low volition, high individuation, high salience | Low compactness, low individuation, none/low salience | |
| Mode – | Reals | Irrealis; deontic |
| Aspect – | Perfective | Imperfective |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italian patient-oriented process passive Periphrastic passive (mainly SV) Periphrastic passive (often VS); (мм passive)</th>
<th>Bare happening passive мм passive</th>
<th>Generic-potential passive мм passive occasionally periphrastic passive (VS) мм passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Periphrastic passive (мм passive)</td>
<td>Periphrastic passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(4) (1a–h) as well as Tables 1+2 leave unaccounted for:

- auxiliary change (Spanish ser-estar/German sein- werden/Gothic wesan- wairban) and the respective change of syntactic distribution and semantic reading;
- aspectual constraints; the agentivity criterion as a requirement for passivization in sundry, but not all, languages;
- the existence of the ‘ impersonal ’ passive (curriritur “ it-is run ”) in some, but not all languages;
- case as well as function and theta role identification in the framework of promoté vs. demoté arguments.

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

- What is behind all these typological differences (diachronic state of grammaticalization)?
- How come that the periphrasis could evolve as a passive in the first place?
- What is the link between reflexive (MM) passive and periphrastic passive?
- How come that the preterit participle is serving both the perfect active and the present passive (unambiguous implementation?)?
- 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?
- What is pragmatic, what is grammatical about these phenomena?
- Does a discourse criterion (Thema vs. Rhema status) come into play, and if so, how?
- How come that the Prepositional Infinitival ( is to beat ) has passive meaning? etc.

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 Sieverska 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 composite 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 constraints – 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 local/temporal resultative predications). What does aspect and Aktionsart have to do with passivization? If, indeed, there are links between passive diathesis and perfective 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 hypothesis’ 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 diathetically. By contrast, according to the ‘Aspect hypothesis’ 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 investigation 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 aspectual paradigms in Late Middle High German and Early Modern German, passivization changed to become motivated and triggered by conditions of verbal argument struct-
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 explanative 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* (geworden/worden/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) = "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 begonnen*), 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 *worden/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, eA, 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) Er hat den Baum gepflanzt

he has the tree planted

“He planted the tree”

a. OHG. Structure:

\[[cp \ h\hat{e}t, [vp \ d\otimes_{\text{acc}} \ bu\text{um} \ [\text{adj/v} \ g\text{ipf\text{-}l\text{n}z\text{o}t}]](v \ t_1)]]

c1. Modern German:

\[[cp \ c\text{h\at{a}t}, [vp \ do-\text{dp} \ den \ Baum] \ [v \ \text{gep\text{-}f\text{n}z\text{t}t} \ t_1)]]

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 bekommen/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 deducable 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 derive 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperfective verb</th>
<th>Perfective (particle) verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. der Wagen wird geschoben</td>
<td>der Wagen wird hineingeschoben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the wagon gets pushed</td>
<td>the wagon gets into-pushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. der Wagen ist geschoben</td>
<td>der Wagen ist hineingeschoben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the wagon is pushed</td>
<td>the wagon is into-pushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. der *geschobene Wagen</td>
<td>der hineingeschobene Wagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the pushed wagon</td>
<td>the into-pushed wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. der *getauchte Schwimmer</td>
<td>der untergetauchte Schwimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dived swimmer</td>
<td>the under-dived swimmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-selections 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:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. from among the dynamic Auxiliaries those with German \textit{werden\textsc{pres.inf}/geworden\textsc{ppm}} "become/get-become/gotten", Swedish \textit{blir/blivit\textsc{ppa}-bliven\textsc{ppp}},\textsuperscript{3} Dutch \textit{worden\textsc{pres.inf}/geworden\textsc{ppm}};
  \item b. from the Copulae those with German \textit{sein\textsc{pres.inf} – gewesen\textsc{ppm}}, Dutch \textit{zijn\textsc{pres.inf} – geweest\textsc{ppm}}, Russian \textit{byt’\textsc{pres.inf} – byl\textsc{ppp}}, English \textit{be\textsc{pres.inf} – been\textsc{ppm}};
  \item c. from among the Reflexive morphemes free ones: German \textit{sich}, Norwegian \textit{sig}; and bound ones: Scandinavian -s, Russian -sya.
\end{itemize}

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 \textit{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 \textit{werden} “become/get” as periphrastic finiteness support. As a full verb, \textit{werden} has maintained its perfective status. As such, it exists only in German and Dutch (\textit{worden – geworden}). Russian \textit{budet}, the translation equivalent of German \textit{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 form</th>
<th>Impersonal 'Passive'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>werden + Past Participle</td>
<td>Das Haus wurde gebaut, ( tV )</td>
<td>Es wurde getanzt, ( iV )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The house was built”</td>
<td>“There was dancing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-like ‘Medium’</td>
<td>Ein solches Haus baut (es!)</td>
<td>Polkas tanzt es/tanzen sich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no aspect differentiation</td>
<td>sich nicht <em>(leicht) fertig</em></td>
<td>*(leicht): Es tanzt sich gerne Polka “Polkas dance easily”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Such a house does not finish building easily”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swedish</strong></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><strong>Russian</strong></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+sya</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)stroit’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*  \( \Rightarrow \) 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 *(sich); die Lage verändert *(sich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“they met”; “the situation changes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch –</td>
<td>de situatie verandert *(sich) “the situation changes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French –</td>
<td>le sonnet[+tr] *entend de loin “the sound is audible from far”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Swedish de träffades “they meet”; läget förändrades “the situation changed” | *
| Russian (oni) vstretil’ “they meet”; polotnie izmenilos “the situation changed” | – |

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 (AG ≠ TH): AG and 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></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>tV: [Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td>=&gt; iV:</td>
<td>[Θ₂]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>tV: [Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td>=&gt; passive iC:</td>
<td>[Θ₂, by Θ₁]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td>=&gt; mC:</td>
<td>[Θ₂]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>tV: [Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td>=&gt; tV (ellipsis):</td>
<td>[Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>tV: [Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td>=&gt; mV:</td>
<td>[Θ₁, Θ₂]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>iV:[Θ₁, (Θ₂)]</td>
<td>=&gt; mC:</td>
<td>[Θ₂, by Θ₁]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>iV:[Θ₁, (Θ₂)]</td>
<td>=&gt; Passive:</td>
<td>[Θ₂]</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); Vₙ=n-place verb; (i)Tₙ=(in)transitive verb; V= Verb (Vⁿ), C=construction or constituent (of some maximal verb projection, VP or VP); Θ₁ denotes the theta role for the external argument (subject); Θ₂ 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, Θ₂, 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 Θ-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. NOUN/*ACC instruction was given us/we

(17) Es wird anständig der-subj/dur-do Popo gewaschen ... German
it is properly the NOUN/the ACC backside cleaned

(18) Vi/oss gavs inget 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... German  
   c. *... ist zu haben... 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)</td>
<td>*blir havd “gets had”</td>
<td>*blir ägdl “becomes possessed”</td>
<td>*blir fådd “becomes gotten”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive synthetic (reflexive)</td>
<td>has “gets had”</td>
<td>ågs “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”:

\[\text{Ich lasse ihn das machen}\]

... infinitive, ECM-subject

\[\text{Ich lasse das von ihm machen}\]

... 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></th>
<th>there is nothing to hear/to be heard</th>
<th>to see/to be seen</th>
<th>to feel/to be felt</th>
<th>is to sense/to be sensed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 German</td>
<td>nichts ist zu hören/*gehört zu werden (er is) nichts (om) te hören/*om gehoord te worden</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>*ist sich zu sehen</td>
<td>*ist sich anzufühlen</td>
<td>ist sich zu merken</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>niˇcego ne slyˇsitsya</td>
<td>vidneetsya</td>
<td>ċustvuetsya</td>
<td>zameˇcaetsya</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 localistic 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 sententi/Phys-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. alter &quot;change&quot;</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lexical Reciprocal: sich treffen</em> <em>Refl. meet &quot;meet&quot;</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cognate tv: beißen &quot;bite&quot;, stoßen &quot;push&quot;</em></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 \( [\text{Cop/ ?Aux+PP}] \) 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. \( \text{Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt} \) \( \text{... von-Agent} \)
      b. *\( \text{Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind schön} \)

(24) a. \( \text{Die Unterlagen sind vom Chef kontrolliert} \) \( \text{... von-Agent} \)
      b. *\( \text{Die Unterlagen sind vom Chef korrekt} \)

(25) a. \( \text{Der Brief war mit roter Tinte geschrieben} \) \( \text{... mit-Instrumental} \)

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
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
b. The documents are (being) checked by the boss
c. Les documents sont contrôlés par le chef
   the documents are controlled by the boss
   “The documents are controlled by the boss”
d. Milites gubernatoris superati sunt
   soldiers general.gen. overwhelmed.pp are
   “The soldiers of the general were defeated”

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

b.1 La iglesia es cerrada a las once ...
   the church is being closed at 11
   event passive with Aux estar

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

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).
(30) a. 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.

(31) a. Ellipsis of the event denotation:
Der Brief ist geöffnet *(deleted 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: [Kopula + 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 be-so boki mja
3p house inside-foc 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:
(36) 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).

(37) 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”.

(38) 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->: e.g., welder “to weld, solder” – (h)ewelder “welded, soldered”. The monosyllabic Iberian-source verb dal “to hit” also takes a partial prefix: (h)idal “hit”. The prefix (h)e- is in free variation with (d)i-, thus (d)idal.

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 text6 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 Reespeta 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{el e y} “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) \textit{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\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{-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 \textit{-m-} derived from the present tense stem and denoting simultaneity, and (b) the perfective (past) participle in \textit{-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 \textit{-m-} and in \textit{-t-} differ in frequency accounting for 27.4\% and 72.6\% of passive forms respectively in a corpus of 5730 usages.\footnote{As mentioned, passive forms, i.e. verb forms with a passive participle, have three related functions.}

\textit{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:\footnote{As mentioned, passive forms, i.e. verb forms with a passive participle, have three related functions.}

(1) a. Petro\textdiaeresis\textemdash atver-ia lang-\textlangleq\rangle \\
P.-\textit{nom} open-3.\textit{pres} window-\textit{acc.sg.m} \\
‘Peter opens (is opening) the window.’

b. Lang-as \textunderscore (\textit{yra}) atveria-m-as \textunderscore \textlanglePetr-\textit{o}\rangle \\
\textit{P.-nom} be.3.\textit{act} open-\textit{pr.pass} \textit{-nom} P.-\textit{gen} \\
‘The window is [being] opened (by Peter).’

(2) a. Petro\textdiaeresis\textemdash buvo atver-\textlangleps\rangle lang-\textlangleq\rangle \\
P.-\textit{nom} be.3.\textit{past} open-\textit{pact.nom.m.sg} window-\textit{acc.sg.m} \\
‘Peter (had) opened the window.’

b. Lang-as buvo atver-t-as \textunderscore \textlanglePetr-\textit{o}\rangle \\
\textit{P.-nom} be.3.\textit{pres} open-\textit{p.pass-nom} P.-\textit{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 atver-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 -t- (rarely in -m-) 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 vis-us kopūst-us.
   thief-NOM perf-RM-cut-3.PAST all-ACC cabbage-ACC.PL.M
   ‘The thief cut down all the cabbages.’

b. Vagi-es nu-si-kirs-t-a vis-i kopūst-ai.
   thief-GEN perf-RM-cut-p.pass-NT all-NOM cabbage-NOM.PL.M
   ‘[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-rhetic 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 post-fix -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-RM-BUY-3.PRES
‘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
door-NOM.PL.F PERF-RM-OPEN-3.PAST
‘The door opened.’

b. Dur-ys sunkiai at-si-dar-o
door-NOM hard PERF-RM-OPEN-3.PRES
‘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-lsg.past much money-gen.pl.m
    'I spent a lot of money.'

b. Daug pinig-ų much money-gen perf-rm-spend-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 admimative-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:

\[(9) \quad \text{a. } st\text{ato} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{a'}. \quad (yra) \quad st\text{ato}-m-as\]
\[\text{build.3.pres} \quad \text{be.3.pres} \quad \text{build-pr.pass-nom.m.sg}\]
\[\text{build/builds'} \quad '(\text{is being) built'}\]

\[\text{b. } (yra) \quad st\text{at-}\acute{e}s \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{b'}. \quad (yra) \quad st\text{aty-t-as}\]
\[\text{be.3.pres} \quad \text{build-p.act} \quad \text{be.3.pres} \quad \text{build-p.pass-nom.m.sg}\]
\[\text{‘has built’} \quad '\text{(has been) built’}.\]

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

\[(10) \quad \text{a. } buv\text{o} \quad pa-st\text{ato}-m-as\]
\[\text{be.3.past} \quad \text{perf-build-pr.pass-nom.m.sg}\]
\[\text{‘was built’}\]

\[\text{b. } buv\text{o} \quad pa-staty-t-as\]
\[\text{be.3.past} \quad \text{perf-build-p.pass-nom.m.sg}\]
\[\text{‘(was/had been) built.’}\]

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

\[(11) \quad \text{imperfective participle} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{imperfective verb (9a')}\]
\[\text{perfective participle} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{imperfective verb (9b')}\]
\[\text{imperfective participle} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{perfective verb (10a)}\]
\[\text{perfective participle} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{perfective verb (10b)}.\]

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:

\[(9a') \quad yra \quad st\text{ato}-m-as = \text{stroyt-sja} \quad ‘\text{is (being) built’}\]

and

\[(10b) \quad buv\text{o} \quad pa-staty-t-as = \text{byl po-stro-en} \quad ‘\text{was built’},\]

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: biūti ‘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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>a. Non-perfect active</th>
<th>a'. Perfect active</th>
<th>p. Passive in -m-</th>
<th>p’. Passive in -t-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>pađar-o ‘does (from time to time)’</td>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>1a’. (γρα) pađar-εs ‘has done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(γρα) pađar-o-m-a ‘(is) (being) done’</td>
<td>1p.</td>
<td>1p’. (γρα) pađary-t-a ‘(is) done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>’(has been) done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>pađar-e ‘did, ‘has done’</td>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>2a’. buvo pađar-εs ‘had done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>buvo pađar-o-m-a ‘was (being) done’</td>
<td>2p.</td>
<td>2p’. buvo pađary-t-a ‘was done, ‘had been done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past frequent</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>pađary-dav-o ‘used to do’</td>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>3a’. bū-dav-o pađar-εs ‘used to have done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>bū-dav-o pađar-o-m-a ‘used to be done’</td>
<td>3p.</td>
<td>3p’. bū-dav-o pađary-t-a ‘used to be done, to have been done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>pađary-s ‘will do’</td>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>4a’. būs pađar-εs ‘will have done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>būs pađar-o-m-a ‘will be (being) done’</td>
<td>4p.</td>
<td>4p’. būs pađary-t-a ‘will be done, ‘will have been done’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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’ \(\Rightarrow\) buvo daro-m-a ‘was (being) done’).

2. One active form may correspond in the tense-aspect meaning to two passive forms:
   
   \[2a \Rightarrow 1p' \text{ and } 2p';\]
   \[3a \Rightarrow 3p \text{ and } 3p'.\]

3. One passive form may correspond semantically to two active forms:
   
   \[1p' \Rightarrow 1a' \text{ and } 2a;\]
   \[2p' \Rightarrow 2a \text{ and } 2a';\]
   \[3p' \Rightarrow 3a \text{ and } 3a';\]
   \[4p' \Rightarrow 4a \text{ and } 4a'.\]

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.:

(12) a. \(\text{Tėv-as} / \text{suo} / \text{liet-us} \ iš-gasd\text{-i-o} \ \text{vaik-q.}\)

\(\text{father-nom dog-nom rain-nom perf-scare-3.past child-acc}\)

‘Father/a dog/the rain scared the child.’
b. Vaik-as buvo išgąsdin-t-as tėv-o / šun-s /
child-nom.sg.m was perf-scare-p.pass-nom.sg.m father-gen / dog-gen
liet-aus.
rain-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’; jās ‘you.PL’ → jasq i. <you.PL.GEN> ‘you’, ii. ‘your.PL’; jis ‘he.NOM’ → jo i. <he.GEN> ‘him’, ii. ‘his’;

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’, prauستis vanden-iu (INST) ‘to wash with water’), also cause, source, manner, time, place, etc., but never an agent (cf. Ambrazas 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 (Ambrazas 1997:277), though rather common in folklore; cf.:

(13) U-ti-ti šalta, 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 -\(a\)\(^8\) 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:

\[(14) \quad \text{Vaik-} \quad \text{muša-m-a}, \quad \text{kai ne-klaus-o.} \]

‘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’, iekškoti ‘to look for’, vengti ‘to (try to) avoid’, reikšiauti ‘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):

\[(15) \quad \text{a. Mes lauk-ė-me sveči-ų.} \]

‘We waited (were waiting) for (the) visitors.’

\[(15) \quad \text{b. Buvo laukia-m-i sveči-ai.} \]

‘The visitors were (being) awaited.’

\[(15) \quad \text{c. Buvo laukia-m-a sveči-y.} \]

‘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 postfix -\(sja\) (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-past-3.plm child-nom.plm
    ‘In the river, children bathed (were bathing).’
   b. Upė-je buvo maudo-m-a-si (vaik-ų).
    river-loc be-past bathe-pr.pass-nt-3plm child-gen.plm
    ‘In the river, bathing was (being) done (by children).’

(17) a. Vakar snig-o.
    yesterday snow-past
    ‘It snowed yesterday.’
   b. Vakar snig-t-a
    yesterday snow-past
    ‘There was snowfall yesterday.’
   c. (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 medži-ai oši-a.
    field-loc tree-nom.plm rustle-past
    ‘Outside, trees are rustling.’
   b. *Lauk-e ošia-m-a
    field-loc rustle-pr.pass
    ‘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.plm stand-past
    ‘Here, horses [had] stood.’
   b. Čia arkl-ų stovė-t-a
    here horse-gen.plm stand-p.pass
    ‘It seems there have been horses here.’
   c. Čia stovė-t-a. (better: Čia kažkieno stovėta)
    here stand-p.pass here someone.gen stand-p.pass
    ‘Someone stood here.’

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. Ėcia (žmon-ės) dirb-a.
here people-NOM.PL work-3.PRES
‘People work (are working) here.’

b. Ėcia (žmon-ių) dirba-m-a.
here people-GEN.PL work-PRA.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-gimsta-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-PRA.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>
<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%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Subjectless° (of intransitives)</td>
<td>~33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Subjectful (of transitives)</td>
<td>~10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Subjectless (of intransitives)</td>
<td>~4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>~100%</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 užiaup-ė jam burn-ą, bet rush-P.ACT.NOM.SG.F wife-NOM close-PAST.3.SG he.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) not-can-PAST.3 they.gen from head-GEN.SG.F throw.out-INF  
'(His) wife rushed up to him and pressed his mouth closed but the words had already been uttered and no one could 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-NOM.SG.M 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  
kontūz-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, vargoninink- as ...  
here here participate-3.PRES. priest-NOM.SG.M, organist-NOM.  
gieda-m-os giesm-ės, skambina-m-a varp-ais. (J. Ragauskas)  
sing-P.PASS.NOM hymn-NOM ring-P.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-es, 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 jiš pamirš tai, kaip beveik viskas pamiršta-m-a fast he forget.FUT that as almost everything forget-PR.PASS-NT paskul-ryje. (A. Bauža)

'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...'
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 kur buvo kreip-t-a-si, bet niekas ne-pad-ėjo. ("Tiesa")

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

The agent (žmonės '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 met-ų jis ėjo namo, ėjo at-si-kariau-ti savo Basiliškių, Ar be-spė-s? Ar perf-win.back-inf his.own 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-p.pass-nt perf-be.late-p.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 Basiliškiai. 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) ... muša-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 prtl. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Frequency of word order types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. S=Pt + O=Ag + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S=Pt + V + O=Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. O=Ag + V + S=Pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</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 theme 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-P.PASS-NOM.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 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 Antarktik-os žemyn-as. (K. Boruta)
    PERF-find-P.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 we.gen be.born-p.pass-nt where aug-t-a. (V. Mykolaitis-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:

(40a) a. Jis i-jung-ė radij-ą.
he.nom perf-switch-past.3 radio-acc.sg.m
‘He turned on the radio.’
b. Radij-ąs i-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):