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1 Introduction

QUESTIONS:
1 – What shapes do participles come in?
2 – How are these represented in phrase structure?
3 – What are the argument structure possibilities?

SECTION 2: Theoretical background
SECTION 3: Types of passives in Malagasy
SECTION 4: External arguments in Malagasy
SECTION 5: Phrase structure account of passives
SECTION 6: Conclusions

2 Theoretical background: Eventives, resultatives, statives

2.1 TYPES (E.G. EMBICK 2004)

(1) a. The door was opened.
   - EVENTIVE (Someone opened the door)
   - RESULTATIVE (The door was in the state of having become open)

b. The door was open.
   - STATIVE (The door was in the state of being open)

(2) Examples: RESULTATIVE and EVENTIVE passive – same morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Resultative</th>
<th>Eventive passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>√BLES</td>
<td>bless-éd</td>
<td>bless-ed</td>
<td>bless-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√AGE</td>
<td>ag-èd</td>
<td>ag-ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ROT</td>
<td>rott-en</td>
<td>rott-ed</td>
<td>rott-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√SINK</td>
<td>sunk-en</td>
<td>sunk-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√SHAVE</td>
<td>(clean)-shav-en</td>
<td>shav-ed</td>
<td>shav-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√OPEN</td>
<td>open-0</td>
<td>open-ed</td>
<td>open-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√EMPTY</td>
<td>empty-0</td>
<td>empti-ed</td>
<td>empti-ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√DRY</td>
<td>dry-0</td>
<td>dri-ed</td>
<td>dri-ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 TESTS (RESULTATIVES VS. STATES)

2.2.1 Manner adverbs
   
   o **either** not possible with state vs. resultative

   (3) a. The package remained carefully opened. (*remain* shows adjectival status)
   b. * The package remained carefully open.

   o **or** fewer readings with state vs. resultative

   (4) a. the recently open door (open at a recent point and probably no longer open)
   b. the recently opened door (*also*, still open, the opening having happened recently)

2.2.2 CREATION verbs (resultatives bad; states good)

(5) a. This door was built open.
   b. * This door was built opened.

(6) a. This new ruler was built long.
   b. * This new ruler was built lengthened.

2.2.3 Resultative secondary predicates (resultatives bad; states good)

(7) a. John kicked the door open/*opened. etc…

2.3 TESTS (EVENTIVES VS. NON-EVENTIVES: WASOW 1977)

2.3.1 by phrases

(8) The metal is hammered by John.
   only EVENTIVE reading (can tell because of habitual interpretation)
2.4 STRUCTURES (FROM EMBICK)

(9) a. VERBAL PASSIVE

\[ \text{AspP} \]
\[ \text{Asp} \]
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{v} \] \[ \sqrt{\text{ROOTP}} \]
\[ [\text{AG}] \]

- Asp\(_p\) always takes a complement headed by \(v[\text{AG}]\)
- \(v[\text{AG}]\) licenses \textit{by} phrase and gives \textit{EVENTIVE} reading

(10) a. RESULTATIVE

\[ \text{AspP} \]
\[ \text{Asp}\_r \]
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{v} \] \[ \sqrt{\text{ROOTP}} \]
\[ [\text{FIENT}] \]

- Asp\(_r\) always takes a complement headed by \(v[\text{FIENT}]\)
- \(v[\text{FIENT}]\) always takes a stative complement
- \(v[\text{FIENT}]\) licenses manner adverb and gives change of state interpretation

can see \textit{FIENTIVE} (inchoative) head in the morphology:

\[ \text{flat} \quad \text{– en} \quad \text{– ed} \]
\[ \text{ROOT} \quad \text{– FIENT– Asp} \]

(11) stative

\[ \text{AspP} \]
\[ \text{Asp}\_s \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{ROOTP}} \]

- Asp\(_s\) always takes a \textit{ROOT} complement

\[ \Rightarrow \text{turn to Malagasy} \]
3 Malagasy passives: 4 types

What is common to them:
- THEME in subject position (and will see later, can have external argument)

What is different about them:
- Event structure (stative vs. eventive; state vs. change of state)

3.1 THE DATA

3.1.1 Suffixed passive

(12) a. Sitranana ny aretinao √SITRANA+ina
cure-TT DET illness-2SG
‘Your illness was cured.’

b. Tapahina ny tady √TAPAKA+ina
cut-TT DET cord
‘The cord was cut.’

3.1.2 Voa passive

(13) a. Voatapaka ny tady √VOA+√TAPAKA
VOA-cut DET cord
‘The cord was cut.’

b. Voatsangana ny sari-vongona √VOA-√TSANGANA
VOA-stand DET statue
‘The statue was stood up.’

3.1.3 Tafa passive

(14) a. Tafatsangana ny ankizy √TAFAP-√TSANGANA
TAFAP-stand DET child
‘The child stood up.’

b. Tafalentika lalina tamin’ny tongotro ny tsilo √LENTIKAP
TAFAP-go.in deep PST.AMIN’DET foot.1SG DET thorn
‘The thorn went deep into my foot.’ (R-R 1971: 96)

3.1.4 Root passive

(15) a. Tapaka ny tady √TAPAKA
√cut DET cord
‘The cord is cut.’

b. Sitrana ny aretina maro √SITRANAP
√cured DET illness many
‘Many illnesses are cured.’ (R-R 1971:95)
3.1.5 ALL FOUR CAN HAVE EXTERNAL ARGUMENTS!!

(16) a. Tapahin’ny lehilahy ny tady √TAPAKA+ina (+ExtArg) cut-TT’DET man DET cord ‘The cord was cut by the man.’ (RH: 10/04)

b. Voatapaky ny antsy ny tady voa+√TAPAKA (+ExtArg) VOA-cut DET knife DET cord ‘The cord was cut by the knife.’ (RH: 10/04)

c. Tafavohan’ny lehilahy ny varavarambe tafa-√VOHA (+ExtArg) Tafa-open’DET man DET door ‘The door was opened by the man.’ (RH: 11/04)

d. Tapaky ny antsy ny tady √TAPAKA (+ExtArg) √cut DET knife DET cord ‘The cord is cut by the knife.’ (RH: 10/04)

3.2 THE DISTINCTIONS

3.2.1 Tense realization: Suffix vs. others

(17) | Present | Voa | Tafa | ROOT |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>no-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>ho-</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- like adjectives, the voa, tafa, root passives have only a future/non-future distinction
- like verbs, the suffixed passives have a three-way tense distinction

3.2.2 Natural endpoint/state achieved: Suffix vs. others (results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endpoint</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Voa</th>
<th>Tafa</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(18) a. Novorín’ny mpampianatra ny ankizy PST.reunited-TT’DET teachers DET children ‘The children were gathered by the teachers.’ (RH: avory)

b. ... nefa tsy nanana fotoana izy
(19) a. Voavorin'ny mpampianatra ny ankizy
    VOA-reunited’DET teachers DET children
    ‘The children were gathered by the teachers.’

b. * ... nefa tsy nanana fotoana izy

(20) a. Tafavory ny mpampianatra ny ankizy
    TATA-reunited’DET teachers DET children
    ‘The children were gathered by the people.’

b. * ... nefa tsy nanana fotoana izy

(21) a. Vitan'ny ankizy ny asa
    finish-GEN-DET children DET work
    'The children finished the work.'

b. *.... nefa mbola tsy vita foana (.... but still not finished yet)

3.2.3 Implicit external argument: Suffix and voa- vs. tafa- and root

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit ExtArg</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Voa</th>
<th>Tafa</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) a. Tapahina ny tady
    cut-TT DET cord
    ‘The cord is being cut (by someone).’ (RH: 10/04)

b. Voatapaka ny tady
    VOA-cut DET cord
    ‘The cord was cut (by someone).’ (RH: 10/04)

c. Tafalentika ny tsilo
    Tafa-go.in DET thorn
    ‘The thorn went in.’ (RH: 11/04)

d. Tapaka ny tady
    cut’DET DET cord
    ‘The cord is cut.’ (RH: 10/04)

Voa/Tafa- distinction is telic version lexical causative/unaccusative distinction
- Malagasy has many unaccusative/lexical causative pairs
- Malagasy is ‘atelic’ language (see Dell 1983 for Tagalog)
3.2.4 Tense interpretation: voa and tafa vs. suffix and root

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpret (ho)</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Voa</th>
<th>Tafa</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(24) a. Hovoríko izy ireo amin’ny fito
FUT-reunite-1SG 3PL AMIN’DET seven
‘They will be gathered by me at seven.’ (RH: avory)

b. Ho voavóríko izy ireo amin’ny fito (Rajemisa-Raolison 1971:96)
FUT VOA-reunite-1SG 3PL AMIN’DET seven
‘They will have been gathered by me at seven.’

c. Ho tafavórí izy ireo amin’ny fito
FUT TATA-reunite 3PL AMIN’DET seven
‘They will have gathered at seven.’

d. Ho tapaka ny tady amin’ny fito (RH: 11/04)
FUT cut DET cord AMIN’DET seven
‘The cord will be cut at seven.’

3.2.5 Tsy ela (change of state): Root vs. others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tsy ela</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Voa</th>
<th>Tafa</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) a. Notapahina tsy ela ny tady
PST.cut.TT NEG long.ago DET cord
‘The cord was cut not long ago.’ (RH: 10/04)

b. Voatapaka tsy ela ny tady
VOA.cut NEG long.ago DET cord
‘The cord was cut not long ago.’ (RH: 10/04)

c. Tafapetraka tsy ela ny sari-vongona
TATA-stand NEG long.ago DET statue
‘The statue was stood up not long ago.’ (RH: 11/04)
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d. *Tapaka tsy ela ny tady
    cut NEG long.ago DET cord
    ‘The cord was cut not long ago.’

3.2.6 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Tense form</th>
<th>Endpoint achieved</th>
<th>Implicit external</th>
<th>Tense interpretation</th>
<th>Tsy ela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voa</td>
<td>0/no/-ho-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tafa</td>
<td>0/0/ho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>future perfect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suffix vs. Voa,Tafa, Root:
- Telicity (results/states)

Suffix, Voa vs. Tafa, Root:
- External argument always there, i.e. always transitive
  (voa is telic counterpart of suffix passive)

Suffix, Voa,Tafa vs. Root:
- dynamic vs. stative

(26) Comparing English and Malagasy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Malagasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVENTIVE</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTATIVE</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>arrivé (French)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUFFIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tafa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Why are Tafa and Root considered passive in Malagasy?
- Need to understand relation of telicity and external arguments …
4 External arguments

Different from English in

- syntactic realization
- licensing (where that-role comes from)
- interpretation

4.1 REALIZATION


(i) N – Possessives

(27) a. ny tranon’ny olona
   DET house-DET people
   ‘the people’s house’

(28) a. NSO (Ritter 1986)

(ii) V – non-subject Agents

b. Sitranin’ny dokotera ny aretainao
   cure.TT’DET doctor DET illness-2SG
   ‘Your illness is being cured by the doctor’

(iii) P – object (R-R 1971:145)

(29) a. alohan’ny fararano
    before’DET rainy season(?)
    ‘before the rainy season’

(iv) A – cause (R-R 1971:43)

b. Lenan’ny orana
   wet’DET rain
   ‘made wet by the rain’

This is a generalized phenomenon ….
4.2 LICENSING

- unaccusatives aren’t telic

(31) a. Nivory ny olona
    PST.1.meet DET people
    ‘The people met.’

b. ? .... nefa tsy nanana fotoana izy

- **TAFA-ROOT** is the telic version of an unaccusative

(32) a. tafavory ny olona
    TAFA.meet DET people
    ‘The people met.’

b. * .... nefa tsy nanana fotoana izy.

- unaccusatives cannot have an external argument

(33) a. * Nivory ny ankizy ny mpampianatra.
    PST.1.meet DET children DET teacher

b. * Nivorin'ny mpampianatra ny boky

- **TAFA-ROOT** version does license an external argument

(34) Tafavory ny mpampianatra ny ankizy
    TAFA.meet.GEN DET teacher DET children
    ‘The teacher was able to gather the children.’

CONCLUSIONS:
- telicity (end-state) licenses external argument
- extend to pure states like adjectives (of a certain type)
- licensed in Spec, Asp (dependent on telicity)

4.3 INTERPRETATION

- If the root has an **AGENT**, the **AGENT** is non-volitional (Dell 1983 Tagalog)
- If the root has no **AGENT**, the external argument is **CAUSE**

(35) vP
    v'
        v
            AspP
                v
                    Asp'
                        CAUSE
                            “ACTOR”
                                Asp
                                    VP
                                        [+[telic]
                                            THEME
                                                V'
                                                    V
                                                        XP

- **AGENTS** in Spec, vP
- Arguments of dynamic v
- **CAUSES** in Spec, AspP
- Arguments of a telic Asp
5 Phrase structure account of passive types

(36) PASSIVES

DYNAMIC / STATATIVE

-telic / +telic

+implicit agent / -implicit agent

+change of state / -change of state

suffix passive / VOA passive / TAFA passive / ROOT passive

no v → not eventive, telic Asp, tenses like adjective

no Agt in LCS of root → no implicit external argument

no FIENT morphology in Asp → no change of state

(37) a. SUFFIX PASSIVE

(Embick – select V [AG])
eventive v
atelic Asp
volitional Agent

FP

F

vP

-na

AGENT

v

AspP

-i

[dyn]

-telic

0

THEME

v

achieved

(AGT, …)

b. VOA-PASSIVE

(Embick – select V [FIENT])
no v
voa- is change of state
selects V with Agent (in Spec, Asp)

FP

F

AspP

CAUSE

Asp

voa-

-telic

THEME

v

achieved

(AGT, …)
6 Conclusions

Different passives of Malagasy similar to different participles of English, but comparisons of two languages helps understand the constructions more:

- Verbal vs. adjectival in English comes out as difference in tense realization in Malagasy
- Lack of by phrase is lack true AGENT in Malagasy
- Existence of other external arguments in Malagasy due to independent difference between English and Malagasy (CAUSE in Spec, Asp of telic Aspect)
- Importance of telicity lost in English because eventives are also telic
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