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ABSTRACT

This study investigates grammatical voice from a functional-semantic viewpoint. While previous studies have focussed mainly on the active-passive relationship or at times the active-middle relationship, this study takes a more comprehensive approach, assuming voice in a given language to be a system of values for expressing participant-to-event and subject-to-verb relations. The primary research compares the voice systems of four languages (two Indo-European and two non-Indo-European) in depth in order to discover the overarching motivation for their several organizations. Both inflectional and sentence-derivational voice types are included, with an attempt to integrate their functions. The interrelationships of voice with other grammatical systems such as aspect and modality are examined as well.

The study found that expressions of voice have two significant patterns of organization, motivated either pragmatically by considerations of empathy and topicalization (as in English and Hungarian) or semantically by modification of the properties of the subject and/or its relationship to the event (Russian and the affective passives of Japanese and English). These two motivating principles may and often do
intersect and overlap, producing the complexity which has proved so formidable in the study of voice. The notion of a 'basic' argument structure of the verb, which has serious implications for any analysis of voice, was explicated and shown to be inapplicable to some languages (e.g. Hungarian); the notion of a given language being 'biased' towards a transitive or an intransitive conceptualization of events was also found to be material to voice organization. Finally, the investigation of the interaction of voice with aspect and modality reveals that these three systems (and perhaps others) cooperate to produce a holistic perspective on an event in terms of actor-orientedness or patient-orientedness.
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CHAPTER 1
PERCEPTIONS OF VOICE

1.0 Introduction

The study of voice as a grammatical category has a very long yet uneven history, coming into and going out of fashion and often being redefined to suit the purposes of the moment. Most English speakers today tend to think of voice as choice of sentence type, active or passive. This is actually a relatively recent conception of voice. Up until the twentieth century, when most linguistic work was done by grammarians of classical languages, voice was understood as an inflectional distinction on verbs, active or middle. In the last five to ten years, however, the study of voice has entered a new period in which the sentence-type notion and the inflectional notion are both being reexamined and attempts are being made to reconcile and integrate the diverse phenomena that have been taken under the heading of voice. While this is the broader goal of the present study as well, we will be focussing particularly on certain voice phenomena that have been considered marginal or ignored altogether, in order to contribute some fresh ideas to an old problem. After an introductory survey of the more prominent approaches to voice, Chapter 2 will introduce some of the fundamental issues with a study of the Japanese affective passive. The following two chapters (Russian and Hungarian) will give a more
comprehensive comparative analysis of voice systems as a whole and the motivations for their overall organization, while the interaction of voice with related areas of grammar and semantics will be explored in our study of the English get-constructions.

1.1 The traditional framework: voice as expression of subject relations

The traditional approach to voice, which according to Norman (1972) can be traced back to Stoic and Late Alexandrian grammarians, is characterized chiefly by the use of multiple criteria (formal, semantic, and lexical) to describe and classify the various Greek morphological patterns and sentence constructions taken under the heading of voice. A similar approach was also used by Pāṇini and later grammarians in the description of Sanskrit, which has an active-middle inflectional pattern similar to that of Greek. In the following discussion we will use data from Greek to illustrate how the traditional framework developed (although many of the observations hold for Sanskrit as well). Note that the term 'traditional framework' denotes only a particular approach to voice, not a historical period.

1.1.1 Influence of Greek

In the traditional framework an initial formal division is made between active and middle voices, following the
Greek verbal inflection patterns. Examples (a) and (b) illustrate (Barber 1975:18):

(1) a. politeu- 5  b. politeu- omai
     be.citizen-ACT  be.citizen-MIDDLE
     'I am a citizen/
     have civic rights'
     'I act as a citizen/
     carry out my civic
     rights for myself'

A uniform semantic characterization of the active voice can be fairly readily identified: it is said to express a subject with a high degree of agenthood (Smyth 1956, Lyons 1968, Barber 1975). But a coherent internal semantic characterization for the middle voice inflection is not as evident. Jespersen (1924:168) wrote of the middle that

it has no separate notional character of its own: sometimes it is purely reflexive, i.e. denotes identity of subject and (unexpressed object), sometimes a vaguer reference to subject, sometimes it is purely passive and sometimes scarcely to be distinguished from the ordinary active; in some verbs it has developed special semantic values not easily classified.

In an attempt to deal with this complexity, further subdivisions of the middle inflection are made on a lexical -semantic basis to express the apparent diversity of its uses. These subdivisions include the familiar categories (as described for example in Smyth 1956) of full middle, deponent middle, reciprocal, reflexive, and passive use of the middle. The full middle is said to denote a subject
whose actions affect primarily itself. Our previous example illustrates the semantic distinction:

(1) a. politeu- ō be.citizen-ACT
    'I am a citizen/
    have civic rights.'

    b. politeu- omai be.citizen-MIDDLE
    'I act as a citizen/
    carry out my civic rights
    for myself.'

The deponent middle is said to denote bodily action or verbs of thinking and feeling—in other words, the physical or psychic disposition of the subject:

petesthai 'fly', orcheisthai 'dance', memfethai 'blame', akroasthai 'listen' (Smyth 1956:393).

Reciprocal and reflexive uses of the middle denote a dual or plural subject acting upon one another and a singular subject acting upon itself, respectively (Barber 1975:18):

(2) a. lou -ō ta himatia wash-ACT the cloaks
    'I wash the cloaks'

    b. lou-omai wash-MIDDLE (1sg.)
    'I wash myself'

    c. lou-ometha wash-MIDDLE (1pl.)
    'We wash ourselves' OR
    'We wash each other.'

Smyth also distinguishes a direct reflexive middle and an indirect reflexive middle. The direct reflexive middle indicates a subject acting directly on itself, the self being the 'direct object' of the action, while the indirect reflexive is said to represent the subject as
acting 'for himself, with reference to himself, or with something belonging to himself [with] self...often the indirect object' (1956:390), as for example in porizesthai 'provide for oneself'; cf. the active porizein 'provide', and filattesthai 'guard against'; cf. filattein, 'guard'. This use of the middle has also been called 'nucleonic' (Klaiman 1988:32), as the direct object can be said to be within the 'sphere' (Klaiman, citing Smyth 1974) of the subject/recipient.

A separate passive inflection in Greek evolved at a later stage and is thought by some to have developed out of the 'passive use' of the middle, due to the semantic characterization of the passive as representing the subject as undergoer (cf. Smyth 1956:394). The middle inflection is used in a passive sense to express subject as undergoer in all tenses except the aorist and some futures, in which a distinct passive inflection is used. Examples of the passive use of the middle voice include aireitai 'takes for himself' or 'chooses', as well as 'is chosen' and kechytai 'has poured itself' or 'has been poured'.

Barber (1975) also recognizes a 'catalytic' passive for later Indo-European, in which the affected subject catalyzes or induces the action by a separate agent. As an example of the catalytic passive, she cites the French Les portes se ferment à deux heures 'The doors get closed at two o'clock'.
To summarize, voice alternants are classified in the traditional framework according to semantic and formal morphological criteria simultaneously, with forms often assigned to one category on the basis of their morphology and to another on the basis of their assumed meaning. Lexical classification is an integral part of this approach as well (at least for Greek), with verbs often being grouped and listed according to which voice they take in given tenses (cf. Smyth's grammar).

It is generally assumed among grammarians working in the traditional framework (e.g. Smyth 1956, Barber 1975, and Lyons 1968) that voice is a mechanism for expressing the grammatical subject's thematic or broad semantic relationship to the verb: subject as doer of action (active), as undergoer of action (passive), as doer of action experiencing effects of action (middle), or as doer and undergoer of action simultaneously (reflexive, reciprocal). Recall that this framework was originally developed for the description of Greek, which has a verbal voice inflection (active/middle). Most modern Indoeuropean languages, however, no longer have (or never had) inflectional voice at all. A similar category for specifying the broad subject-verb relationship is frequently expressed formally by derived sentence types such as passives,
reflexives, etc. (This is especially true of English.)\footnote{This is not to imply that there is no morphological expression of voice in modern Indoeuropean. Romance and Slavic, for example, have morphological reflexives which often behave like middles. However, these are closer to derivational categories than to inflectional categories.} Moreover, the passive voice was not a separate formal device in early Greek. It was a later innovation (emerging not before the classical period [Lyons 1968:373]) and developed gradually, possibly as a transitive analogue to intransitive middles (both types having a non-agentive interpretation for the subject), so that at the time the traditional framework was being developed, the passive was not yet stable and had not acquired the functional load that it has in the modern period. Thus the traditional formal (and lexical) categories used in the description of Greek voice have lost much of their relevance for later Indoeuropean.

1.2 The generative framework: the passive's pivotal role in theory construction

The derived passive construction, in particular the English passive, has played a crucial role in the development of many of the major transformational and generative theories of the last thirty years, in which it has frequently been used as a proving ground for competing frameworks. As early as the mid-1960's, Svartvik (1966:1) wrote that 'the study of the grammatical category voice [read: passive construction] has enjoyed considerable popularity over the last few
years...Its sudden appearance in the grammatical limelight can be attributed largely to the advent of transformational grammatical theory, where the active-passive relation has been used as a prime illustration of the supremacy of the transformational model. Subsequently, however, the passive was also used as a prime illustration of the supremacy of the relational model (Perlmutter and Postal 1977 inter alia) as well as of the lexical-functional model (Bresnan 1982a and 1982b inter alia). Although the transformational, relational, and lexical approaches all differ in their analyses of the phenomena, they are similar in two important respects. First, voice as a unified and systematic abstract grammatical category is rarely if ever recognized or discussed. The focus is on the comparison of the active and passive constructions in particular and how they are generated or derived (although some discussion of impersonal passives and 'unaccusative' or middle constructions appears in later work), with little consideration given either to the semantic and functional relationships between the two or to an overarching motivation for the use of these constructions. (Compare the traditional approach, for example, in which voice is said to express the semantic relation of the subject to the verb.)

Voice categories other than the passive, such as middles, reflexives and reciprocals, when they are
discussed, are generally not recognized as parts of a coherent voice system. Since the primary goal of the present work is to explore the semantic and functional aspects of voice systems as they are manifested in various types of languages, and not to formulate syntactic derivations for active and passive sentences (or verbs), we will only briefly review some of the more prominent treatments.

1.2.1 The transformational and government-binding frameworks

The passive construction played a conspicuous role in the argument for the superiority of transformational grammar as presented in Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* in 1957. Chomsky used the active-passive relationship together with clause conjunction and the structuring of the auxiliary verb phrase in English to show that the rules for their derivation in a transformational grammar were greatly simplified compared to the rules for their expression in a phrase structure grammar. He claimed (1957:44) that 'by further study of the limitations of phrase structure grammars with respect to English, we can show quite conclusively that these grammars will be so hopelessly complex that they will be almost uninteresting unless we incorporate such rules [as the passive transformation] ...these supplementary rules lead to an entirely new conception of linguistic structure.' The passive in the
transformational approach is viewed strictly as a linear string of elements derived from another string of elements (an active sentence) with no reference to semantic or functional relationships between actives and passives or to the passive's role in a system of voice oppositions. The formulation of the passive transformation was at this stage extremely literal (1957:43):

If S1 is a grammatical sentence of the form
NP1 - Aux - V - NP2
then the corresponding string of the form
NP2 - Aux + be + en - V - by + NP1
is also a grammatical sentence.

It later became clear that this rule and others like it were applicable only to English and furthermore expressed almost no abstract generalities about constructions such as the passive, much less about grammatical categories such as voice. Work in the Government and Binding framework of the 80s, a direct descendant of transformational -generative grammar of the 60s and 70s, addressed these problems of the original formulation by decomposing rules such as 'Passivization' into more fundamental and abstract elements of subsystems of rules and principles (Chomsky 1981). The interactions of these general principles (claimed to be part of Universal Grammar), combined with the more concrete options ('parameters') provided by individual languages, are assumed to yield the
various constructions in various languages (Chomsky 1986). Although the description of the passive and the principles said to guide its derivation have been made more sophisticated, the essential attitude towards the passive as a purely formal category has not changed.

1.2.2. Relational Grammar

By the time that the newer perspectives expressed in Chomsky 1981 were introduced, however, discontent with the lack of abstraction and generality of transformations, among other problems, had already resulted in the emergence of competing theories. Relational Grammar, formulated primarily by David Perlmutter and Paul Postal, focusses on the passive once again as motivation for its principles (see especially Perlmutter and Postal 1977). The emphasis shifts from the derivation of passive sentence structures via transformations moving NPs around to the characterization of passivization as a change in the grammatical relations (subject, object, etc,) of the NPs to the verb. Passivization is a rule promoting a direct object to subject and demoting the initial subject to non-argument status ('chômeur'); furthermore, the promotion of direct object to subject is seen as a universal and defining characteristic of passives. The motivation for the relational approach to passive over the transformational-generative approach is that NP movement is not characteristic
of passives in all languages; there are many languages in which constituent order remains the same while only case marking changes on the NPs. Thus, permutation of constituent order is clearly not a universal and hence not a defining criterion for passivization, while promotion of direct object to subject is claimed to be a universal feature of passives. It is this argument regarding the passive which constitutes a principal advantage of the relational approach, according to Postal (1986:7, see also Perlmutter and Postal 1977):

Given the dominance of TG in recent decades it would be natural to inquire into the possibility of explicating passive in terms of its notions, specifically in terms of the concept (NP) movement rule. But it is not hard to show that no such characterization has any chance of success...since some NLs ([natural languages]) manifest word orders for corresponding active and passive which are systematically identical for the relevant constituents.

But the 'universal' characterization of passives as promoting direct objects to subject is discredited by the existence of impersonal and other passives in which the direct object is not promoted to subject (cf. Comrie 1977), and of constructions in which not the direct object but the indirect object or even a non-thematic role participant is promoted to subject. Subsequent work in Relational Grammar has been devoted to addressing these problems.
1.2.3 **Lexical-Functional Grammar**

The passive plays a pivotal role once again in the growth of lexical-functional grammar, in which its analysis as a *lexical* phenomenon was considered a major goal to be achieved in the development and elaboration of the framework. In 'The passive in lexical theory', Bresnan states (1982b:3) that 'passivization is so inextricably connected to the central grammatical systems of complementation in many languages that it poses major challenges for any lexical analysis', and much subsequent work is devoted to answering those challenges. The lexical approach to the passive is similar to the relational approach in that it abandons the concept of NP movement as a salient factor and in that grammatical relations play a key role in its explication. However, in the relational framework, passivization is still viewed as relating sets of sentences, active sentences being basic and passive sentences being derived from them, whereas in the lexical approach it is not the sentences which undergo derivation, it is the lexical forms of verbs which undergo derivation; hence passive sentences are considered to be syntactically basic rather than derived from underlying structures (i.e. active sentences). Each verbal lexeme is said to have an invariant 'predicate argument structure' or set of associated semantic (agent, theme, instrument, etc.) roles. The lexeme is then assigned a set of grammatical functions (subject,
object, etc.) to realize the predicate arguments. The basic, unmarked function assignment will be \{agent=subject, theme=direct object\} and so on, but a rule such as Passivization can rearrange the basic assignment to, for example \{theme=subject, agent=by-object\}. All other grammatical changes associated with the passive, such as permuted word order in English, follow from peripheral syntactic principles. The main advantage of the lexical-functional theory is that it restricts the overgeneration of passives characteristic of theories based on the syntactic derivation of passives. In other words, the unacceptable *Fun is being made of Joan by her friends will not be generated in LFG since the lexeme make fun of will be specified in the lexicon as being unavailable to undergo Passivization.

1.3 The Leningrad Typology Group: a comprehensive theory of verbal voice

Bresnan's conception of voice alternants as lexically determined mappings of semantic roles onto syntactic roles is not the first of its kind. The Group for the Typological Study of Languages (also known as the Xolodovič School) had been treating voice in much this way since before 1970. Voice is defined as 'a diathesis grammatically marked in the verb,...a pattern of correspondences between units at the syntactic level and units at the semantic level'
(Xolodovič 1970:13, quoted in Geniušiene 1987:52)². Ruzicka states (1978:18) that the type of 'syntactic actant' (grammatical role) for any given 'semantic actant' (semantic role) can vary according to the specifications of the verbal lexeme. The lexical-functional approach is thus very similar to this treatment.

1.3.1 Historical context

The work of the Leningrad typology group represents perhaps the most comprehensive theory of voice so far proposed, in that it attempts to deal with all voice phenomena in a universal framework, not just inflectional (active-middle) systems or the active-passive distinction. Since this theory did not emerge out of the blue but is rather the result of a long tradition in Slavic linguistics, it will be worthwhile to look at its origins.

1.3.1.1 Lexical-semantic tradition

The intricacy of the Russian voice system has long challenged Slavic grammarians and has provoked a strong interest in theories of voice and grammatical relations. Due to its slippery nature in Slavic, the status of voice as a category has often been questioned. Peshkovskij wrote (1956:113) that 'The category of verbal voice occupies in

²All translations from the Russian here are my own unless otherwise noted--CC.
some respects a highly exceptional position in the Russian grammatical system. It is not even a category in the strict sense of the word,' while Vinogradov (1947:606) describes voice as 'lying on the boundary lines between grammar, lexicology and phraseology, and with respect to grammar, closer to sentential syntax than to word morphology.' The tentative attitude reflected in these comments is characteristic of the Russian approach and has played a significant role in theory development.

Slavic scholarship in voice can be roughly divided into three methodological categories: the lexical-semantic approach, the formal-morphological approach, and the formal-syntactic approach. Of the three, the lexical-semantic approach is the oldest, continuing with occasional modifications the scheme of verbal classification and subject relations discussed in 1.1. According to Norman (1972:24 et passim), the earlier lexical-semantic approach (including for example the work of Smotrijskij, Lomonosov, Buslaev) suffered from indeterminacy and arbitrariness: 'Since each of the numerous meanings and submeanings existed only within a defined, lexically limited set of verbs, the overall category of voice lost grammatical systemicity.' For example, four voices in Russian--passive, reflexive, reciprocal, and 'general' (something approximating deponent middle) were said to be expressed with a single form, the -sja particle, while the middle voice was
said to be expressed by verbs both with and without the -sja ending. This use of Greek categories applied in such a chaotic way to Russian was eventually rejected for obvious reasons. With the work of Margulies (1924), the lexical-semantic approach came to be applied in a more sophisticated way, with Slavic verbs being reexamined on their own terms rather than in the Greek mold but still focussing on the semantic role of the subject.

1.3.1.2 Formal (morphological) tradition

The work of Nekrasov (1865), Fortunatov (1903) and Jakobson (1932) (and later Yanko-Trinitskaya 1962) represents a major departure from the traditional approach. In an attempt to achieve formal explicitness and to reduce the arbitrary number of voices posited by the lexical-semantic approach (cf. Norman 1972:31) to a one-to-one correspondence of function and form, these writers turned to a morphologically-based classificatory system: verbs ending in the reflexive particle -sja, and verbs not ending in -sja. Nekrasov claimed (1865:70,74) that the reflexive marker had lost all relationship to the reflexive pronoun sebja and indicated a general defocussing of subject:
Russian has two verb forms, strictly speaking: those ending in -t' and those ending in -t'-sja...

...Our language boldly adds -sja to a verb as soon as a thought is concentrated mainly on the manifestation of the event itself, and not on the relationship of this event to its subject.

While Nekrasov did not consider the reflexive/non-reflexive distinction as belonging to the category of voice, Fortunatov and Jakobson did, proposing that use of the reflexive marker signalled detransitivization (Norman 1972:33-34). Since there are many verbs ending in -sja in Russian which have no non-reflexive counterpart (e.g. otrekat'sja 'renounce', boit'sja 'fear', naest'sja 'eat one's fill'), Fortunatov excluded these from consideration as voice alternants, thus introducing an element of lexical classification into his analysis. Norman (1972:34) points out that in this approach linking reflexive marking to detransitivization, verb-object relations are now included in the domain of voice as well, in contrast to the lexical-semantic approach, which includes only subject-verb relations. It should go without saying, however, that the definition of voice as a particular morphological alternation (e.g. presence or absence of reflexive particle) is not universally valid.
1.3.1.3 Constructional approach

The third major approach to voice in Slavic is the syntactic or constructional view. Here voice is defined not as a preconceived set of semantic subject relations to be discovered in a language or as a binary morphological opposition but as a set of possible configurations of the grammatical relations subject, verb, and object. Havranek (1928:17) defined voice as variations that occur in the relationship of the verbally denoted action to the subject or to the construction as a whole without altering content. Norman (1972:29) notes that Stevanović also defined voice as a syntactic category, stating that voice distinctions are concerned with the 'relationship to subject, to event itself, and to object, and with the study of the position of the subject in this process,' and that Potebnya (1941) takes a similar view, describing voice as a purely syntactic 'relationship of subject to object'. It is from this context that the typological work of the 1970s and 1980s emerges.

1.3.2 The Xolodovič school

The work of A. A. Xolodovič and his colleagues represents a shift in focus from the study of Russian and Slavic voice and reflexivity to a more universal and typological approach to voice. Xolodovič's definition of voice contains no reference to peculiarly Slavic
categories; instead, voice is examined in many languages and described universally as 'regular designation in the verb of the correspondence between units of the syntactic level and units of the semantic level' (Xolodovič 1974:13), the units of the syntactic level including subject, direct object, indirect object and the units of the semantic level including subject, pervyi object ('first object') and vtoroi object ('second object') which are roughly equivalent to Foley and Van Valin's macroroles actor and undergoer (Foley and Van Valin 1984:30-32) plus a general recipient/benefactive type of role. This regular correspondence of syntactic and semantic units is referred to as 'diathesis'. Note that this definition of voice encompasses ergative constructions, antipassives, causatives, resultatives, etc., and is thus very broad. Later refinements of this definition (Sil'nickij 1974) build on Tesnière's concept of valence: a 'valence paradigm' for a lexeme consists of the set of possible 'constructions' for that lexeme, a 'construction' being defined as the set of governed syntactic positions occurring together with a particular instance of a verbal lexeme. Voice is then a grammatical category showing regular correspondence between the elements of a valence paradigm. (Sil'nickij's definition of voice does make reference to meaning changes between voice alternants and is thereby not entirely typical of the Xolodovič school.) Yaxontov's work focusses on the various
possible functions of voice alternation, such as expression of stativity (in passives), causativity, or modality (as in Japanese potential constructions), agent defocussing, detransitivization, thematization, promotion of non-agent to subject for performing certain grammatical operations limited to subject, etc. The attribution of these functions to voice is associated with Yakhontov's view (1974:46-54) that voice is a purely grammatical category with no universal meaning—in other words, that voice belongs to expression, not content.

'Diathesis' in the Xolodovič School rests on two important assumptions: first, that there is a basic sentence pattern or argument structure for any verbal lexeme, and second, that voice alternation consists specifically in the alteration of that basic argument structure. While this type of treatment may be quite useful for understanding constructional phenomena such as passives, causatives, etc., it cannot easily handle inflectional manifestations of voice since there is no 'basic' inflectional pattern and therefore the argument structure cannot be said to be 'altered' or derived. Moreover, the work done in this area has so far been limited strictly to voice explicitly encoded in the verb; non-verbal manifestations of voice are not examined.
1.4 Recent semantic and functional-semantic treatments

1.4.1 Semantic treatments

The use of semantic categories for describing the conceptual status of the subject (discussed above in section 1.1) still dominates—with certain modifications—the description of voice in more recent treatments. Klaiman's typology of voice systems (1988) is based once again on semantic criteria, but is deliberately restricted to what she calls 'basic' (inflectional) voice and does not attempt to explain 'derived' voice (sentence derivation). In this treatment, inflectional voice distinctions in various languages (Navajo, Tamil, Korean, Classical Greek and Sanskrit) are explained using the notion of 'control': the verb's voice inflection is determined by the extent of control the subject exerts in effecting the action (not agency). Klaiman states (1988:30-31) that 'a major claim...is that the conceptual status of sentential arguments plays a role in the organization of (basic) voice systems.'

A semantic distinction of centrality v. peripherality underlies the treatment of voice outlined in Davis and Huang 1989 and Huang and Davis 1989. The semantics of voice is thought to lie not simply in the subject's conceptual status vis-à-vis the event, but in the holistic configuration of the event and its participants, viewed as 'nucleus' and 'periphery'. Davis and Huang go beyond the familiar inflectional and sentence-derivation approaches to
voice, not restricting the field of inquiry a priori to any particular form or construction and taking into consideration as well the influence of such factors as animacy, referentiality, aspect, and verb classification.

1.4.2 Functional-semantic treatments

Although the functional approach to voice has become increasingly popular in recent years, it is not of recent invention. Jespersen's analysis of the English passive yielded five basic functions of the construction (1933:120-1):

1. Avoiding having to mention an unknown or awkward subject,
2. Suppression of a subject 'self-evident from the context,'
3. Avoiding mentioning a subject for reasons of tact or delicacy,
4. Expression of greater interest in passive subject,
5. Facilitation of certain syntactic operations, such as conjunction.

Most functional treatments, whether developed for English or not, build on these five functions in one way or another, in some cases adding additional functions. Givón's (1981) description of the passive voice, intended to be universal, posits a list of pragmatic and semantic functions including agent suppression, topicalization of non-agent, and detransitivization. Shibatani (1988b:3) defines voice as 'a mechanism that selects a grammatically prominent syntactic constituent--subject--from the underlying semantic functions
(case or thematic roles) of a clause...In accusative languages, the basic strategy is to select an agent as subject, and the active voice refers to the form resulting from this choice of agent as a subject. The active voice in accusative languages constitutes the unmarked voice [emphasis mine, CC].' This functional characterization of voice centers around the notional primacy of agent as subject, which enables Shibatani's definition of the 'prototypical passive' to be one which has the pragmatic function of agent demotion (cf. Jespersen's passive functions of suppression of agent-subject due to its being unknown, awkward, etc.). The reliance on the notion of agent reveals a semantic bias in Shibatani's treatment of voice since it appeals once again to the conceptual status of the subject vis-à-vis the event; the reference to 'unmarked voice' also implies a definition for derived only rather than derived and basic (inflectional) voice since it assumes a basic (unmarked) argument structure for a given verbal lexeme.

1.5 The functional and semantic approaches expanded

The treatment proposed in this study does not depart radically from the functional and semantic treatments, as we will attempt to discover how voice works, what the semantics associated with it is, and what communicative purposes it serves in a language. But here the functional approach will be applied in a more comprehensive way, since we will be
looking at voice systems and the overarching semantic and pragmatic principles informing the organization of these systems rather than merely examining isolated constructions or functions, or comparing pairs of constructions (such as the passive and active). In this way we hope to avoid the difficulties others have encountered in biasing the analysis towards either syntactic/'derived' or inflectional/'basic' voice.

The traditional semantic approach defines voice as 'the subject's relationship to action'; the functional approach defines voice essentially as the selection of subject from the available arguments of a verbal lexeme or from the participants in an event (cf. Shibatani 1988a). Both of these definitions are accurate and valuable but need to be augmented. Voice will be understood here as a system for expressing a particular participant-to-event semantics through subject selection. This semantics is more abstract than the traditional notion of 'subject's relationship to event' which merely identifies the semantic role of the subject. Furthermore, this semantics is not the same for every language, as we will see; it comes in different flavors, so to speak. Generally speaking, voice enables the speaker to cast a proposition from various perspectives by selecting a particular argument to be subject, and/or to realize finer semantic distinctions of the participant's role in the event. In this way, voice can be seen as an analogue of tense/aspect,
providing a shifting perspective on the proposition and further specifying it, but in terms of participant relations rather than time and Aktionsart.

Any discussion of 'subject selection' must address, however briefly, the notion of 'subject' and its status as a constituent. Without embarking on a long discussion on the matter, we will simply state here that our attitude is that, while subject may or may not be a universal category in languages, within any given clause in any given language, there will be a distinguished grammatical constituent (nominal). This distinguished grammatical constituent is what we will be taking as 'subject'. Subjecthood is generally realized (here we follow Keenan 1976) both morphologically by nominative or absolutive case marking, verb agreement, and/or a particular position in the clause, and syntactically by ability to control reflexivization, cross-clause ellipsis, raising-to-object, raising-to-subject, or other means. This is not to imply that subjecthood has no semantic content—quite the contrary. (Cf. discussion below.) Occasionally there may be two nearly equally salient constituents, in which case they may both be considered subjects, with semantic and syntactic subject properties taking precedence over morphological coding properties for subject identification. Hungarian exemplifies this type of situation, having sentences in which accusatively-marked constituents controlling deletion
and coreference may take precedence of subjecthood over nominatively-marked constituents.

The relativism of our attitude towards the definition of subject carries over as well into our attitude towards the formal definition of voice. Some have defined voice per se as a type of verbal inflection, some have defined it as a type of sentence derivation. Some have said that voice must be marked in verbal morphology (C. F. Hockett, p.c., for example). But in expressing the abstract semantics of participant-event relations, languages tend to use different means, some morphological, some constructional, some lexical, and most frequently, combinations of these. Following Davis and Huang 1989, we assume that the formal expression of voice must be therefore be identified on a language-specific basis (although verbal inflection and sentence derivation are by far the most common means).

The general organizational pattern for subject selection is depicted in Figure 1.1:
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Figure 1.1
The chart is designed to show that the process of subject selection involves in the first place the choice of some general semantic role (causer, agent, patient, etc.). There may then be additional refinements within that basic choice, specifying a particular type of agent or patient. The initial choice of basic semantic role frequently tends to be made according to the pragmatic functions of focussing of non-agent, defocussing of agent, etc. as mentioned above. It can often be said that variants in this type of choice do not reflect any significant alteration of propositional content, or alternatively that the variants are synonymous with one another. For example, the sentence The book was read by John is generally felt to be at least roughly synonymous with the sentence John read the book, not necessarily as far as focussing or empathy go, but as far as the event described is concerned. For this reason, we will refer to choices on this level as 'pragmatic voice'. If a more delicate distinction is made by a selection within one of the basic participant roles, that choice usually does reflect some distinction in propositional content (as for example the difference between John got himself shot vs. John shot himself). Hence we will refer to it as 'semantic voice.'

The schema presented in Figure 1.1 is intended to provide a universal organizational schema for voice. Any given language, however, will organize its own particular voice system in a more limited way than that shown in the
figure. Hungarian, for example, selects almost exclusively from the pragmatic level, but on that level, anything to the left of recipient/benefactive is available for subject. Russian, on the other hand, restricts its choice of clausal subject to the central area of the pragmatic level (agents and patients, with occasional dative subjects), but within those areas makes many finer distinctions. Moreover, as it turns out, constructional (sentence-derivational) types of voice (regardless of the particular language) often tend to correlate with pragmatic voice, and inflectional types of voice tend to correlate with semantic voice, although this is a rather broad generalization. But since the ideas presented here must remain rather abstract until applied to linguistic data, we turn in the following chapter to a problem from Japanese which is particularly well suited to their explication.
CHAPTER 2
VOICE IN JAPANESE

2.0 Introduction

Syntactic expressions built about a verb form containing -(r)are have a variety of semantic and pragmatic functions in Japanese, one of which is the so-called adversative passive. Its relation to the other (non-passive) forms in -(r)are provides a rich area of inquiry into the structure of voice systems. On the one hand, the adversative passive interacts with the non-adversative or plain passive in -(r)are; on the other, it interacts with a group of syntactically basic honorific, spontaneous and potential constructions, also in -(r)are. These two relationships of the adversative passive provide clear evidence of a dual pragmatic/semantic organization of voice in Japanese. The discussion will first center on the meaning and functions of the adversative passive and on its behavior vis-à-vis the non-adversative or plain passive; then the related non-derived constructions and their relationship to the adversative passive will be analyzed. Finally, the implications of this data for voice systems in general will be considered.

Passive constructions in Japanese formed with the verbal affix -(r)are are often said to be of two types, affective (or adversative) and non-affective (simple passive or pure passive). For reasons which will be discussed below, we shall adopt the more neutral term 'affective' following Klaiman
1987. Use of the affective passive presumably suggests that the subject of the clause has suffered or undergone a negative experience in some way (although some affective passives seem to be associated with positive effects), or at least that the speaker's attitude is that it was negative. The other type of passive does not suggest any special affective overtones and is usually felt by native speakers to be semantically neutral. For example, the affective passive:

(a) Chichi wa kodomo ni takai gakkoo ni nyuugakus-are-ta

(Klaiman 1987:421)
Father TOP child IO costly school LOC enroll-(R)ARE-PAST
'The father was subjected to his child enrolling in an expensive school'

is perceived as meaning that the father (i.e. the subject) was adversely affected by the child's enrolling in the expensive school, although this is only implied, not explicitly stated. On the other hand, the non-affective

(b) Ano syepado wa Satoo-san kara Tanaka-san ni
That German shepherd TOP Mr.Sato by Mr.Tanaka IO
ur -are -ta
sell-(R)ARE-PAST
'That German shepherd was sold to Mr.Tanaka by Mr. Sato'

does not imply any adverse effects for the German shepherd.

'All examples of Japanese are from my own notes unless otherwise attributed--CC.'
The problem is that what appears to be a single construction type, apparently involving the promotion of some non-agent participant to subject, the demotion of the agent to a ni-phrase (ni being also an indirect object marker), and the use of the verbal affix -(r)are is used for what according to the intuitions of native speakers are two separate ways of meaning. The standard formulation of the problem has been, 'Is there one passive or two, and how do you predict which is which?' Both formal (N. McCawley 1972, Kuno 1973, Howard and Niekawa-Howard 1976) and functional/semantic approaches (Alfonso 1971, Klaiman 1987, Wierzbicka 1979) have been applied to the problem, with a great deal of controversy over definitions and over the essence of the so-called adversative connotations.

One important formal property of the affective passive is that it frequently involves an increase—rather than a decrease, as is far more usual with passives—of syntactic valence. As in the first example given above, a non-argument to the verb can assume the role of the affected subject without the loss of any initial argument NP. Some writers have attempted to use this special property of valence increase as a basis for defining the affective passive, while others (N. McCawley 1972, e.g.) have claimed that any participant --including the direct object (which would involve no increase in valence)--can become the subject of an affective passive,
or in other words, that valence increase is not a defining characteristic of the affective passive.

As far as the semantics of affective passives is concerned, Klaiman (1987:406) has demonstrated that both the affected subject and the agent in these constructions must be animate or have 'at least a potential for sentience' in order for them to work as affective passives. Beyond these two characteristics—a possible increase of syntactic valence and an animacy requirement for both undergoer and actor—little else has been conclusively demonstrated to pattern the difference between the affective and the non-affective passive. However, as will be shown below, limiting the scope of the problem to the domain of passivization only—i.e. viewing the affective passive as either a pure passive or an odd pure passive—obscures the actual value of this construction in a system of voice oppositions. Our emphasis here is not on attempting to define a sharp boundary between the two types of construction but rather on examining the interplay between affective and non-affective semantics to discover how voice functions in Japanese. Accordingly, we shall reformulate the question as, 'What role does the affective passive play in the overall scheme of voice relations in Japanese?'
2.1 Data from Japanese

2.1.1 Structural and semantic characteristics of affective passives

Consider the following data:

(1) John ga ame ni hur -are -ta. (Kuno 1973)
John TOP rain IO fall-(R)ARE-PAST
'John got caught in the rain.'

(2) John ga kodomo ni asa-hayaku okir-are-ta. (ibid.)
John TOP child IO morning-early arise-(R)ARE-PAST
'John had the children get up early on him.'

(3) Taroo ga haha ni yorokob-are-ta. (ibid.)
Taro TOP mother IO be.happy-(R)ARE-PAST
'Taro had his mother be happy on him.'

(4) Taroo ga otooto ni seikoo s-are-ta. (ibid.)
Taro TOP brother IO be.successful do-(R)ARE-PAST
'Taro was subjected to his brother being successful.'

(5) Kireina ojoosan ni nak-are-ru to chotto uresii
Pretty girl IO cry-(R)ARE-PRES little.bit nice
mono da. (Alfonso 1971)
kind of
'It's kind of nice when a beautiful girl cries because of you.' (affected = speaker)

(6) Mary wa oto ni kanasim -are -ta.
Mary TOP husband IO be.sad-(R)ARE-PAST
'Mary was felt sad about by her husband.'

(7) John ga tuma ni sin-are -ta. (Kuno 1973)
John TOP wife IO die-(R)ARE-PAST
'John was died by his wife' or 'John's wife died on him.'

The verbs in the above sentences are all intransitive and the topic/affected subject NPs are 'extra noun phrases' as spoken of by Kuno—in other words, non-initial arguments to the verb. These sentences cannot be derived from any active sentence;
for example, (7) cannot be derived from *Tuma wa John o sinja
'The wife died John'. The wa-marked participants in these
sentences cannot be initial arguments to the non-derived verb,
but would be rather adjuncts, or possibly possessors, as in
(7). These sentences are all routinely judged affective by
native speakers of Japanese. However, they are not all
necessarily considered adverative for the undergoer;
sentences (3) and (5) have rather a positive connotation, at
least for some speakers. (Hence our use of the more neutral
term 'affective'.) The point here is that passives with
adjuncts or possessors as subject are nearly always judged
affective, whether beneficial or adverative.

The next set of examples lacks the extra noun phrase:

(8) Tanaka san wa Sato san ni kuruma o ur-are-ta.
(N.McCawley 1972b)
Tanaka HON TOP Sato HON IO car DO sell-(R)ARE-PAST
'Mr. Tanaka was sold the car by Mr. Sato.'

(9) Taroo wa Mary ni himitu o uciake-rare-ta.
Taroo TOP Mary IO secret DO reveal-(R)ARE-PAST
'Taro was told (confided) the secret by Mary.'

(10) Taroo wa Mary ni uso o tuk-are-ta.
Taro TOP Mary IO lie DO lie-(R)ARE-PAST
'Taro was lied to by Mary.'

(11) Taroo wa Mary ni ii sirase kik-as-are-ta.
Taro TOP Mary IO good news listen-CAUS-(R)ARE-PAST
'Taro was told ['made to listen to'] the good news
by Mary.'
The above five examples differ from the previous set in that they do have active counterparts and in that the affected subject of the passive is marked as an indirect object in the active. The affected subject is thus an initial argument to the verb in these examples, rather than an adjunct, possessor, etc., as in (1)-(7), so that these examples lack the structural characteristics considered to be the hallmark of the affective passive. Nevertheless, these sentences are judged affective by native speakers. Sentence (8), which actually was marked ungrammatical by N. McCawley (1972b:264), was accepted by my consultants, who explained that the sentence means that Tanaka was somehow prodded or urged to buy the car by Sato. It does not have the semantic neutrality that the active counterpart would have. Sentences (9), (10) and (11) were not felt to have a necessarily negative impact on the subject, but they do imply that being told the secret, the lie, or the good news was an unexpected surprise, which the hearer did not expect or had no control over. The sentences may not be used in a situation where the hearer could expect to be told a lie or receive good news, etc., as the active versions may. Sentence (12) does not imply anything unexpected, but is felt to emphasize the school's responsibility for the teaching of the manners over the
speaker's initiative. This will be discussed in more detail below. What all of these examples have in common is that, in the first place, they all have indirect objects as affected subjects rather than adjuncts or possessors, and in the second place, they not only lack the semantic neutrality of their active counterparts, they actually represent an event that is at least partially different from that of the active versions. The meaning differences between affective passives on the one hand and actives and non-affective passives on the other, will be elaborated on below.

While passives with adjuncts or possessors as subject are affective, not all passives with indirect objects as subject are affective. For example:

(13) Kinoo watasi wa Taroo ni zugan o osie-rare-ta.
    Yesterday I TOP Taro IO painting DO teach-(R)ARE-PAST
    'Yesterday I was taught painting by Taro.'

(14) Mary wa John ni jodan o yuw-are-ta.
    Mary TOP John IO joke DO tell-(R)ARE-PAST
    'Mary was told a joke by John.'

(15) Boku wa sensei ni kodo o home-rare-ta
    I TOP teacher IO child DO praise-(R)ARE-PAST
    'My child was praised by the teacher.'

These sentences were not judged to be affective by my consultants, even though they are very similar to sentences above which were felt to be affective. Notice also that (15)
has a possessor as affected subject rather than an indirect object. Clearly this is a hazy area, with judgments being influenced by situational context, lexical content, etc. We cannot say that indirect objects are or are not the cut-off point for eligibility as subject of an affective passive.

One further set of examples:

(16) **Kodomo wa oya ni Nihon ni nokos -are -ta.**
Child TOP parent IO Japan LOC leave-(R)ARE-PAST
'The child was left in Japan by its parent.'
(Howard and Niekawa-Howard 1976:210)

(17) **Ozawa san wa Suzuki san ni nizikan mo mat-as-are-ta.**
Ozawa HON TOP Suzuki HON IO 2 hours wait-CAUS-(R)ARE-PAST
'Ozawa was made to wait by Suzuki for as long as two hours.'

These two examples are from Howard and Niekawa-Howard 1976 and were presented as evidence that even direct objects can become the subject of affective passives in Japanese. However, the event represented in (16) does not actually differ in propositional content from that represented in its active counterpart, and the apparent affective semantics can be attributed to the nature of the lexical verb: in other words, it is reasonable to expect that a child being left by its parents to go to another country is an adversative situation. The example is thus inconclusive. Sentence (17) was described by Howard and Niyekawa-Howard as differing in meaning from the active sentence **Ozawa wa Suzuki o nizikan matta** 'Ozawa waited for Suzuki as long as two hours' in the sense that Ozawa was
forced to wait by Suzuki in the passive version, but (17) is actually the passive version of the causative Japanese sentence *Suzuki wa Ozawa o nizikan matasetā* 'Suzuki made Ozawa wait for two hours', and clearly the two versions--active causative and passive causative--do not differ in propositional content. Thus there is still scant evidence for patients being subjects of affective passives in Japanese.

To sum up the above observations on the characteristics of the affective passive, we present the following scale:

```
Agt/Exec  Pat.  Ben/Recp  Poss.  Adjunct
```

```
Nonaffective  Likelihood of becoming subject of aff. passive
```

```
Affective
```

```
Degree of involvement in basic event
```

**Figure 2.1**

Figure 2.1 shows that the likelihood of a participant's becoming the subject of an affective passive decreases the more to the left we go on the scale of involvement, dropping down to a small degree of likelihood between the benefactive /recipient and patient positions. Notice that the diagram indicates an indeterminate area for indirect objects,
which is reflected in the data by the fact that passives with indirect objects are sometimes affective, sometimes not, and sometimes vaguely so; recall (8)-(12) vs. (13)-(14). The diagram also reflects the observation that possessors and adjuncts as passivized subject nearly always involve affective semantics but possessors less so than adjuncts. So we see that not only must the subject be high on the animacy hierarchy as Klaiman (1987) points out, it will also occupy a certain position on a scale of participant involvement ('involvement' in the sense of D. Payne 1982). It would appear that when a more remote participant becomes subject of a passive, then it automatically 'ups' the transitivity of the proposition, as the participant is drawn into a more involved status; if so, this would explain why direct objects rarely function as subjects of affective passives: they are already closely enough involved in the event.

2.2 Functional aspects of affective passives

Now that we have presented some of the general structural and semantic features of affective passives, we will address the functional aspects, first presenting a more detailed analysis of the meanings of the above sentences.

(3) **Taroo ga haha ni yorokob -are-ta.**  
Taro NOM mother IO be.happy-(R)ARE-PAST  
'Taro had his mother be happy on him.'
Part of the meaning of (3) is that not only was Taro 'been happy about' by his mother, but that he did something to bring that state of affairs about, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Thus it could mean that he got an A on a test, that he found a golden egg, that he was handsome and popular, etc. Sentence (6) also implies, although not as strongly, that Mary did something or at least was in a situation such that she made her husband sad, whether deliberately or not. So we see from these two examples that the subject of the affective passive can influence the occurrence of the event intentionally or unintentionally. This runs counter to Alfonso's (1971) claim that the single most salient characteristic of affective passives is that the subject is invariably a helpless and unwitting victim of circumstance. Although this is frequently true of affective passives, it is not a defining characteristic.

Next, (8), and (12):

(8) Tanaka san wa Sato san ni kuruma o ur-are-ta.
Tanaka HON TOP Sato HON IO car DO sell-(R)ARE-PAST
'Mr. Tanaka was sold the car by Mr. Sato.'

(12) Watasi wa gakkoo de manaa o osie-rare -ta.
I TOP school LOC manners DO teach-(R)ARE-PAST
'I was taught manners in school.'
As mentioned earlier, (8) means that Mr. Sato has somehow prodded or persuaded Tanaka to buy the car. This implication is absent in the active version of the sentence. Sentence (12) as well emphasizes the school's active role in the teaching of the manners as opposed to simply stating the fact that the speaker learned manners and it happened to be in school where he or she did it. The affective component of each of these sentences emphasizes the greater potency of the agent over the patient. Although Shibatani (1985; 1988) has claimed that agent demotion is the essential characteristic of all passives, and while this may be true at least structurally for the affective passive (agents being marked by indirect and oblique case markers respectively in [8] and [12]), it does not seem to be strictly true semantically.

Now, (9) through (11):

(9) **TAROO wa MARY ni himitu o uciake-rare-ta.**
    Taro TOP Mary IO secret DO reveal-(R)ARE-PAST
    'Taro was told (confided) the secret by Mary.'

(10) **TAROO wa MARY ni uso o tuk-are-ta.**
    Taroo TOP Mary IO lie DO lie-(R)ARE-PAST
    'Taroo was lied to by Mary.'

(11) **TAROO wa MARY ni ii sirase kik-as-are-ta.**
    Taroo TOP Mary IO good news listen-CAUS-(R)ARE-PAST
    'Taroo was told ['made to listen to'] the good news by Mary.'

We stated earlier that (9) through (11) describe situations in which the subject (Taro) has no control over the action undergone, and that while this is not obligatorily the case in
affective passives, it is often characteristic of them, as these examples show. Notice that being told good news is treated the same way semantically and structurally as being told a lie or a secret; thus there is no evidence for distinguishing different types of beneficial or adversative affective passives, as Wierzbicka (1979) does. The 'affective meaning' here is simply that the subject had no control over what happened to him or her.

Reviewing the above observations, we can distinguish three salient characteristics of the affective passive. Two are semantic, namely, the expression of greater affectedness of recipient ([9]–[11]) and the expression of greater potency of agent ([8], [12]). The third has both syntactic and semantic consequences, namely the introduction of an additional argument to an intransitive or a transitive verb, thereby increasing valence by one. In all cases, a non-agent/experiencer participant is in subject position, and the agent is demoted syntactically. Rather than distinguishing three types of affective passives corresponding to the above three functions, we can generalize: the essential semantic function of the affective passive in Japanese is to express heightened transitivity as compared to a syntactically active representation of the same event, if indeed an active representation is even possible. This is not meant to imply that other, more typical passive functions, such as pragmatic focussing (by pragmatic here we intend 'external to event' in
the sense of Foley and Van Valin 1984), expression of empathy, etc., are not also involved. However, increase of transitivity is an integral function of the construction.

2.3 The affective passive in perspective: voice systems

Since it exhibits the same case marking and verbal morphology as the non-affective passive, and since a non-agent participant is promoted to subject, the traditional 'passive' status of the Japanese affective passive has not been questioned. In order to evaluate the role of this construction in the voice system of Japanese, we must first consider what passives are, and how voice systems are structured. As we discussed in Chapter 1, the passive has been defined by Perlmutter and Postal (1977) as a device for promoting direct objects into subject position; it has been defined by Shibatani (1985;1988b) as a device for demoting agents cut of subject position; and by Givón (1981;1988) as a construction having a range of functions from topicalization to agent suppression to de-transitivization. Most of these approaches treat the passive as a relatively isolated phenomenon, without relating it to voice constructions other than the active. The passive has been defined in more traditional works treating voice as a system (Barber 1975; Lyons 1968) as a construction in which the grammatical subject realizes the affected participant and is acted on by an outside participant (i.e. the agent). Many researchers also
associate the passive with reduced valence; the passive is often said to have one less participant than the active (at least syntactically). If we compare all of these definitions of the passive to the defining characteristics of the Japanese affective passive, we find that they are all appropriate (except for valence reduction) and perhaps even necessary conditions, but none of them, taken either separately or together, constitutes sufficient conditions for distinguishing the affective passive on its own terms. Although the affective passive shares certain features with the non-affective or pure passive—namely verbal morphology, case marking and promotion of non-actor to subject—it differs in some crucial functional aspects from the non-affective passive. Heightened semantic transitivity and an increase of syntactic valence are more typical of other voice constructions such as causatives; they are very atypical for passives, which are frequently associated with decreased valence and stativity. The affective passive clearly has a value distinct from that of the non-affective passive. However, there does not seem to be a place for constructions like it in treatments of passiveness or of voice systems in general as they have been handled so far. The answer to this problem lies in a more comprehensive understanding of voice and of the functions of voice alternants. Instead of recognizing only a simple binary active-passive voice system, or one with perhaps three values (active-middle-passive), the contrasting constructions of each
language should be allowed to determine the structure and range of the voice system which they comprise. In the Japanese case, the plain passive behaves very much as described in the above-mentioned approaches. It fulfills pragmatic functions such as promotion of non-agent and demotion of agent in order to express the speaker's point of view or empathy, topicalization of a participant salient in the current discourse, defocussing an unknown or irrelevant agent, etc. The affective passive, on the other hand, fulfills possibly all of these, but has a semantic aspect as well: it increases the transitivity of the proposition.

2.3.1 Related constructions: honorific, spontaneous, potential

The morpheme -(r)are found in both kinds of passives described above is used in non-passive constructions as well, specifically in intransitive spontaneous, honorific, and potential constructions. The correlation of the passive uses of -(r)are and the non-passive uses has been noted in the literature, most extensively by Shibatani (1985), but the implications of their relationship have never been fully explored. We will look at some examples of these constructions.

(18) Boku wa nemurare -nakat-ta. (Shibatani 1985:823)
I TOP sleep-(R)ARE-NEG-PAST
'I couldn't sleep.'
Although these sentences have verbs marked with -(r)are, they are not passives, affective or plain. They are all intransitive and have agents or experiencers in subject position; there are no grammatically promoted or demoted constituents. The role of the subject is, however, modulated in some way. Sentence (18) expresses lack of ability on the part of the subject; (19) expresses the distancing or defocussing common in honorifics (compare the English royal we); and (20) expresses the lack of agentive control associated with 'spontaneous' events. Shibatani (1985:822-23) describes the subjects as being 'demoted'; Davis and Huang (1989) point out that

The 'remoteness' of PERIPHERALITY is almost literally present as the distancing which connotes the 'politeness' of [18]. The AGENT/EXECUTOR's lack of command over the performance of the EVENT ('spontaneity')...i.e. [19], and the lessened effectiveness of a 'negative potential', i.e. [20], add to the PERIPHERAL semantics of the...AGENTS/EXECUTORS. Again, the semantics of CENTRAL - PERIPHERAL is implicated by the Passive form -(r)are-, although these examples are semantically more MEDIO-PASSIVE or MIDDLE than they are Passive.
Generally speaking, what \(-(r)are\) does in these examples (with the exception of the honorific use) is to specify the agent/experiencer's relationship to the event, to express not just the fact that the event was performed or experienced, but that it was done under certain circumstances or conditions. Compare the active-middle distinction in Greek or the verb agreement paradigms in Muskogean (cf. for example Payne 1982). These uses of \-(r)are\ function similarly. Sentence (21) shows, furthermore, that this special use of \-(r)are\ is not limited to intransitive verbs:

(21) a. Haha wa John kara Mary eno bara o azukat-ta.
    Mother TOP John from Mary for rose DO be.entrusted.with-
    PAST

b. Haha wa John kara Mary eno bara o azuke-rare-ta.
    be.entrusted.with-(R)ARE-PAST

'The mother got a rose from John for Mary.'

This nearly identical pair of examples is very unusual in that (21b) appears to be morphologically passivized although case marking and grammatical relations are not affected in any way with respect to (21a). There is no change in speaker's empathy or point of view, the grammatical subject remains the same, no participants are demoted or promoted--in other words, none of the typical features of the (plain) passive is present. There is a semantic difference, however. The second version of the sentence implies that it was John's idea to get the mother to keep the rose for Mary, that it was a favor he
asked of her. The first version implies simply that the mother received the rose. Once again we see -(r)are used to express a semantic nuance of the experiencer's relationship to the event; and since this construction does not rearrange the grammatical functions in any way (no grammatical promotion or demotion), it is more closely associated with the honorific, spontaneous, and potential constructions than with the passive.

2.3.2 Interrelationships of passives, affective passives and related constructions: the structure of voice systems

To review the uses of -(r)are in Japanese, we have seen how it behaves in three types of constructions: plain passives, affective passives and non-passive constructions. In the first group, plain passives, -(r)are together with a patient promoted to subject and an agent demoted to a ni-phrase or omitted achieves the pragmatic goal of getting a certain participant into or out of subject position, whether to focus or topicalize a non-agent, defocus an agent, or to express speaker's point of view/empathy. Formally, it helps signal which constituent will bear the relationship of the grammatical subject to the verb without manipulating the semantics of the basic proposition. In affective passives, -(r)are together with a non-actor promoted to subject and a demoted agent not only expresses the pragmatic functions of the plain passive, but also modifies the content of the proposition: it further specifies the relationship of the
primary participant to the narrated event. Finally, the non-
passive uses of -(r)are do not manipulate grammatical
relations; they modify the semantic relationship of the
agent/experiencer to the narrated event. Comparing these
latter forms in -(r)are ([18]-[21]) with their counterparts
lacking -(r)are marking, we see that the same participant
stands in the relation of grammatical subject to the verb; no
constituent is promoted or demoted, only the precise nature of
the agent/experiencer's relationship to the event is changed.

These two types of relationship, subject-to-verb and
experiencer-to-event, exemplify the pragmatic and semantic
voice, respectively, that we introduced in Chapter 1. This
distinction may be likened to Foley and Van Valin's (1984)
distinction of information internal- and external-to-event,
pragmatic voice expressing information external to the event
and semantic voice expressing information internal to the
event. Figure 2.2 shows these relationships.
As the figure illustrates, the affective passive forms an intersecting point for the two types of functions, pragmatic and semantic. It combines the pragmatic functions of topicalization and defocussing associated with the plain passive with the semantic functions associated with spontaneous and potential constructions.

This situation, with a particular construction type bridging the gap between pragmatic and semantic voice, may be similar to that of Ancient Greek at around the time that the periphrastic passive developed in that language. An active-middle or semantic voice distinction (i.e., one not promoting or demoting grammatical relations) was at first prevalent, then a separate passive inflection arose, and finally a periphrastic passive which actually manipulated grammatical relations developed at a later stage. Japanese grammarians have noted (Fred C.C. Peng, p.c. inter alia) that the non-passive uses of -(r)are are historically prior to the passive
uses and that the periphrastic passive in Japanese is a recent innovation, the use of which is sometimes said to have been influenced by the introduction of English in the last 100-150 years.

The study of voice in many languages seems to have been complicated by the coexistence of the two types of voice and by a failure to recognize them as separate but closely related phenomena. The difficulties grammarians have faced in attempting to systematically relate descriptions of passives to descriptions of active-middle distinctions, for example, reflects this confusion. The confusion is understandable when we consider the two planes of content and expression and how they intersect: the grammatical functions of a sentence (subject, object, verb) are symbols of the semantic components of the proposition (agent/experiencer, patient, event); the grammatical level represents but is not identical to the semantic level. The symbol (the sentence) has been confused with its referent (the proposition). In languages in which there is a relatively close bond between grammatical roles and semantic roles (cf. Comrie 1988), it is not surprising that a modification of one level, either the experiencer-event relation or the subject-verb relation, for whatever reason, would have comparable repercussions on the other, obscuring the picture. While we would not want to categorically claim that pragmatic voice has no semantic functions or that semantic voice has no pragmatic functions, it is important to
first recognize the two levels of phenomena before we can fully understand their interaction.

In Chapter 1 the traditional approach to voice was characterized as opposing active voice to non-active voices by a criterion of whether or not the subject was 'affected' by the verbally denoted action. If we consider voice distinctions to be based on the subject being 'affected' or 'not affected', the distinction between affective and plain passives becomes obscured, since in both construction types the subject can be described as 'affected'. It is also difficult in many cases to determine just what is meant by the term 'affected.' In an example such as Sensei ga waraw-are-ta 'The teacher laughed [hon.]', in what way and to what degree is the teacher himself actually affected? The difficulty becomes even more apparent in (20), Mukasi ga sinob-are-ru 'An old time comes [spontaneously] to mind'.

The inadequacy of the definition based on affectedness of subject arises with the characterization of another construction, the causative. The Japanese causative behaves syntactically much like the affective passive: the verb is marked with the causative morpheme -(s)ase and the syntactic valence is increased by the addition of a causer participant as subject and the 'demotion' of what would be the agent (in a non-derived counterpart) to a ni-phrase (or an o-phrase in intransitive sentences, depending on whether the coercive or permissive sense is intended):
(22) John ga Mary ni hon o yom-sase-ta. (Kuno 1973:345)
John TOP Mary IO book DO read-CAUS-PAST
'John made/let Mary read books.'

(23) John ga Mary o ik-ase-ru. (Kuno 1973:341)
John TOP Mary DO go-CAUS-PRES
'John makes Mary go.'

(24) John ga Mary ni ik-ase-ru. (ibid.)
John TOP Mary IO go-CAUS-PRES
'John lets Mary go.'

The counterpart to the 'subject as affected' non-active voice
distinction in the traditional approach is the 'subject as
non-affected doer of action' for active voices. As we see
with the Japanese causatives, this definition is as inadequate
for non-passive voices as the 'subject as affected' definition
was for non-active voices. If we define active voice
semantically as having an 'unaffected' agent in subject
position, then causatives will be definitionally equivalent to
non-derived actives.

The causative in Japanese shares with the affective
passive the semantic characteristic of an increase in
transitivity as well as the syntactic characteristic of
increased valence. This association of affective passives
with causatives is paralleled in English by get-constructions
such as get-passives (I got fired last week) and get-
causatives (I got him to do it). Voice in English will be
discussed in Chapter 5.

The existence of two types of voice patterning has been
recognized by Klaiman (1988 and p.c.); they are described as
'basic' and 'derived.' Basic voice is linked explicitly to inflectional marking of voice, such as the Greek and Sanskrit active and middle systems, Navajo animacy-based agreement, Tamil weak and strong tantums, etc.: 'the term 'basic voice'...denotes a type of relation encoded in verbal morphology...signaling which of several alternative conceptual statuses is borne by the sentential subject' (1988:29). Derived voice, on the other hand, involves 'processes like passive and antipassive...often signaled in verbal morphology by derivational markers, and...sometimes accounted for in terms of sentence-deriving rules' (ibid.), and 'meets any of several important functions (like nominal reference tracking, marking alternations in polyadicity of lexical verbs, etc.) which belong to the syntactic level of analysis' (p.c.). Although Klaiman appears to be distinguishing pragmatic ('derived') from semantic ('basic') voice, her treatment is problematic for two reasons. First, subject-verb relations are never clearly enough differentiated from experiencer-event relations, a step which is crucial to understanding either type of system. Secondly, each type of voice in Klaiman's treatment is explicitly linked to a particular formal realization, basic voice being evidently near to a synonym for 'inflectional' voice and derived voice being equated specifically with passives and antipassives. Linking a type of voice with a specific formal realization can obscure the analysis. As we have seen, the morpheme -(r)are is not
exclusively an inflectional marker. It looks two ways, working as a marker of canonical passivization in derived plain and affective passives much like the English passive -ed, and working also as a limited derivational morpheme elsewhere. It appears in both 'basic' and 'derived' constructions and can fulfill either grammatical or semantic functions or both at the same time, as in the affective passive. Furthermore, semantic voice is not always realized inflectionally and pragmatic voice is not always realized by sentence derivation, as we will see in following chapters. To understand how voice works, we must look not just at morphology or sentence derivation, but at how the grammatical relations and semantic roles are affected in various constructions.
CHAPTER 3

VOICE IN RUSSIAN

3.0 Introduction

In Chapter 2 we introduced some important issues in voice with a study of the Japanese affective passive, a construction particularly well-suited to illustrating the issues. In the present chapter, we will take a broader view and analyze a complete voice system, including some areas on the periphery of voice.

Russian has a complex and delicately articulated voice system, comprising a wide and varied range of distinctions. The set of constructions considered to constitute voice alternations and the criteria for their classification—lexical-semantic, morphological, or constructional (sentence-derivational)—have been the subject of protracted debate in Slavic linguistics (see Chapter 1). Some approaches have excluded all distinctions other than formally active vs. formally passive from consideration as voice relations (Isačenko 1960), while others have excluded all distinctions other than notionally active vs. notionally passive (Havranek 1928; Norman 1972). Others have considered only formally reflexive vs. formally non-reflexive (Nekrasov 1865; Fortunatov 1903; Jakobson 1932). Plural and neuter impersonals have generally been excluded from consideration as voice distinctions by most approaches since the verb is not
morphologically marked for voice (Xolodovič 1974; Norman 1972). They will, however, be examined in this chapter since they exhibit certain features central to the overall organization of Russian voice.

An important issue in Slavic approaches to (Slavic) voice has been that of transitivity (considered to be verb-object relations) and its role with respect to voice (considered to be subject-verb relations). Cf. Jakobson 1932, Vinogradov 1947, and Norman 1972. The question of whether or not to include object relations as a proper concern in studies of voice is perhaps largely due to the substantial role played in Russian and other Slavic languages by morphologically reflexive verbs with experiencer or patient as subject. The analysis presented in this study will not attempt to draw a strict a priori formal (or notional) boundary between what is and is not voice in Russian but will take as its departure point any modulations of the morphosyntactic treatment of the grammatical subject (including such parameters as case marking, verb agreement, and whether or not the subject is overtly expressed in the clause), whether there is any derivational morphology on the verb or not. In this way we hope to discover the overall patterning of and motivation for the Russian voice system.
3.1 The agent-elided plural impersonal

The agent-elided plural impersonal involves a verb conjugated for third person plural (Russian does not distinguish gender in the plural), an elided grammatical subject (a subject in Russian is that constituent normally found in the nominative case and triggering verb agreement), and optionally a patient and/or benefactive/recipient marked accusative and dative, respectively, and appearing in sentence-initial (topic) position. No constituent in the sentence is in the nominative case.

(1) Nam pokazyva-l-i vsjak-ie kinoe [sic] predstavleni-ja.
We-DAT show-PST-PL various-PL cinematic presentation-
(ACC/PL
'They) showed us all kinds of movies.'

(2) V Rossii eto ed-jat.
In Russia that eat-PRES/3PL
'They) eat that in Russia.'

(3) Muž -a ne puska-jut.
Husband-ACC/GEN NEG allow-PRES/3PL
'They) don't let the husband in/Husbands aren't allowed
in there.'

(4) Doč -enko! Menja vez -ut!
Daughter-DIM I-ACC take-PRES/3PL
'Baby girl! (They)'re taking me away!'

The agent(s) in all of these examples are human and unknown or non-referential. They contrast in this regard with constructions in which there is a 3rd person plural pronoun (oni) as subject; the subjects of these always refer to a discourse particular. Occasionally in Russian a known, highly
topical plural pronominal subject is omitted from a clause, but a referent can be found in the immediately preceding discourse. Such is not the case with the plural impersonal. In (5), the agent of ograbili does not necessarily have to be Ivan and Petja:

(5) Ivan i Petja—xuligany. Men-ja ograbi-1-i.  
Ivan and Peter—thugs. I-ACC rob-PAST-PL  
'Ivan and Peter are thugs. I was robbed.'

while in (6),

(6) Ivan i Petja—xuligany. Ograbi-1-i men-ja.

the second clause, Ograbili menja, is not an impersonal but rather a definite active clause (shown by object-final word order) with an elided highly topical subject. In other words, the referent of -li is Ivan and Petja. By the same token, (7)

(7) a. Menja ograbi-1-i. A potom oni pobi-1-i 
I/ACC rob-PAST-PL. And then they beat-PAST-PL my-ACC  
muž-a.  
husband-ACC  
'I was robbed. And then they beat my husband up.'

sounds strange since the subject of the second clause is definite and referring while the first is not. In this situation the speaker will attempt to remedy the discrepancy by construing an agent referent for the first clause from the
information in the second. A version of (7) with a singular
definite referent in the second clause is somewhat more
acceptable:

(7) b. Menja ograbi-1-i. A potom Ivan pobi-1 mo-ep
I/ACC rob-PAST-PL. And then Ivan beat-PAST/SG my-ACC
muž-a.
husband/ACC

'I was robbed. And then Ivan beat my husband up.'

Note that in this version, a specific referent (one separate
from the agent of the robbing) is named for the beating. By
the same token, if oni in (7a) were spoken with contrastive
stress, the sentence would be acceptable, but this would
indicate that the speaker was at that moment identifying a
new, specific, and separate referent for oni, for example
pointing to several defendants in a courtroom.

Xrakovskij (1974:23) does not classify the agent-elided
construction as an impersonal but does claim that it is non-
referring (with respect to the agent) because of the
neutralization of the singular v. plural distinction,
comparing it to constructions such as the French impersonal
(On vend la maison) in which the actual number of agents is
indeterminable, regardless of the singular marking. Use of
the agent-elided plural in Russian indicates a situation in
which the identity of the agent is unknown or indefinite.
Although the verb has no derivational morphology which would
indisputably mark the construction as a voice alternant, the
behavior of the (elided) 'subject' and the restrictions on the usage of the construction indicate that it has a particular functional difference from an ordinary active construction, and that is specifically to express the characteristics of indefiniteness or intangibility of a necessarily human agent/subject. The relevance of this factor will become more apparent in the following discussion.

3.2 The neuter impersonal

The neuter impersonal is a construction type in which the verb is marked third person singular neuter (neuter marking is visible only in the past tense), regardless of the gender of the agent or patient. The verb does not agree with any sentence constituent, and no constituent appears in the nominative case. This construction type differs somewhat from a dative subject construction firstly in that the subject/undergoer is in the accusative, and secondly in that overt agents may be expressed in an oblique phrase (instrumental—used also for agents of periphrastic passives).¹ Numbers (8)–(11) illustrate.

¹For an interesting discussion of neuter passives in North Russian, see A. Timberlake's (1976) article 'Subject properties of the North Russian passive'. In: Li (Ed.), 1976, 547–567.
(8) Tanj-u ubi-l -o molni -ej. (Comrie 1979:73)
Tanya-ACC kill-PAST-N lightning-INST
'The lightning killed Tanya/Tanya was killed by lightning.'

(9) Tanj-u ubi-l -o pul -ej. (ibid.)
Tanya-ACC kill-PAST-N bullet-INST
'The bullet killed Tanya/Tanya was killed by the bullet.'

(10) Sten-u razbi-l-o molni-ej. (Xrakovskij 1974:14)
Wall-ACC break-PAST-N lightning-INST
'Lightning destroyed the wall/The wall was destroyed by lightning.'

(11) Plat'e porva-l-o vety'-ju.
Dress-ACC tear-PAST-N branch-INST
'A branch tore the dress/The dress was torn by a branch.'

As in the plural impersonal, the verbs are morphologically 'active'; and the patient does not get promoted to subject. Here, however, the agent is not elided (in fact versions without overt agents are at best extremely marginal) but is demoted to instrumental case, just as agents of periphrastic passives are. In contrast to the plural impersonal, which is used only for indefinite human agents, this construction is used only when the agent is a natural force (weather phenomena, for example) or other inanimate yet mobile and potent entity (machines, projectiles, etc.). Siewierska (1988:277-8), citing Mel'chuk (1979:248), provides further evidence of the importance of the semantic features of the agent in her discussion of the following examples:

(12) a. Sil'nym udarom ego sbilo s nog.
strong:INST blow:INST he:ACC knock:3SG:N from feet
'He got knocked off his feet by a strong blow.'
b. **Sil'nyj udar sbil ego s nog.**
   strong:M blow:M knock:3SG:M he:ACC from feet
   'A strong blow knocked him to his feet.'

\[13\] a. **Soldaty brosilis' na Ivana, i srazu že sil'nym udarem ego sbilo s nog.**
   Soldiers rushed at Ivan and immediately strong-INST blow-INST he:ACC knock:3SG:N from feet
   'The soldiers rushed at Ivan, and immediately he got knocked off his feet by a strong blow.'

b. **Soldaty brosilis' na Ivana, i srazu že sil'nyj udar sbil ego s nog.**
   Soldiers rushed at Ivan, and immediately strong blow knock he:ACC from feet
   'The soldiers rushed at Ivan, and immediately a strong blow knocked him off his feet.'

Note that in (12 a and b), either the plain active or the neuter impersonal construction can be used; however, in (b) the interpretation is that the cause of the blow is a natural force, as explained above. The unacceptability of (13a) can be attributed to just this factor: when a specifically human agent is the source of the blow, the neuter impersonal is inappropriate, although the active with agent is acceptable, as in (13b). Siewierska (1988:278) suggests that 'since clauses such as [13b] display the same transitivity features as [13a], the change from nominative to instrumental marking cannot be attributed to differences in semantic transitivity. But there is no reason why it cannot be attributed to an additional semantic feature of one of the participants [emphasis mine--CC].' Thus, as we saw in the plural
impersonal, the use of this construction type depends on the semantic features of the agent.

3.3 The periphrastic passive

Russian has a periphrastic passive (similar to that of English) with an auxiliary form of 'be', a lexical verb in the form of a passive participle, a patient (but not benefactive or recipient or other role) promoted to grammatical subject and triggering agreement in the auxiliary, and the agent, when present, demoted to an instrumental phrase. It is well known that passives are rare in spoken Russian, far rarer than in English, although they are more commonly found in the written language, especially scientific texts.

Consider:

(14) My by-l- i šokirov-ann-ye.
We be-PAST-PL shock-PCPL-PL
'Ve were shocked.'

(15) Ona by-l -a potrjas-en-a eti-mi, vse-mi magazin-ami.
She be-PAST-F amaze-PCPL-F this-INST, all-INST store-INST
'She was amazed by these, all these stores.'

(16) Ja by-l ograb-len.
I be-PAST rob-PCPL
'I've been robbed.'

(17) My by -l-i evakuirova-nn-y.
We be-PAST-PL evacuate-PCPL-PL
'We were evacuated.'

In all of the examples found in the oral texts, the passivized subject (patient) was human and pronominal. Inanimate
subjects are possible in passives, as in the following elicited sentence:

(18) Stul by-l zan-jat dam-oi.
    Chair be-PAST occupy-PCPL lady-INST
    'The chair was taken (reserved) by the lady.'

(19) Plat'ye by-l-o porva-no vetv'-ju.
    Dress be-PAST-N tear-PCPL branch-INST
    'The dress was torn by the branch.'

but, predictably, they occur less frequently in spoken Russian than passives with animate subjects, given the generally higher topicality of the latter.

One of the striking characteristics of the passive in spoken Russian is that it seems to be used primarily for situations which can be described as affective (if not 'adversative'; cf. [14-17], which all have semantically very transitive events and strongly affected patients). Also, whatever causes the event (the 'agent') is usually either an uncontrollable situation or natural force, or is treated as such. All of the passives volunteered by the consultants followed this pattern. For example, the umbilical cord in (20) and the stores in (15) are not directly or volitionally acting upon the patient; likewise in (17), we may presume that the agent of 'evacuate' is human but too diffuse to warrant naming (and it is not surprising that (17) can vary with the impersonal Nas evakuirovali 'They evacuated us'). But the tendency to put affective situations with non-volitional or
ambient agents in the passive is shown by the speakers' preference for

(20) Ona by-l-a zakruč-en-a/obmota-n-a pupovin-oi.
She be-PAST-F wind/strangle-PCPL-F umbilical.cord-INST
'She was tangled up in/strangled by the umbilical cord.'

over the active

(21) *Be zakruči-l-a/obmota-l-a pupovina.
She-ACC wind/strangle-PAST-F umbilical.cord-NOM
'The umbilical cord was winding around/strangling her.'

The umbilical cord, a potent but not animate source of the event, is more comfortably expressed as an agentive instrumental than as an agentive subject (21). Note also that this is not a matter of pragmatic focussing (topicalization) as the information structure of both sentences is identical. Pragmatic focussing of the patient is a frequent concomitant of passivization in Russian, but it is not the main function of passivization.

The preference for

(16) Ja by-l ograb-len.
I be-PAST rob-PCPL
'I was robbed.'

over
(22) ?Ja by-l ograb-len imi.
    I be-PAST rob-PCPL they/INST
    'I was robbed by them.'

also illustrates the lack of affinity for overtly expressed animate agents in the passive. Sentence (22) is considered to be grammatically correct but odd-sounding. Note that no mention of an agent is made in (19); the focus is on what happened to the speaker (and note that it is adversative). The oddness of (22) is due to the combination of the passive voice with a definite, animate agent: the two do not mix well. Replacing imi with vor-om 'thief-INST' is equally unacceptable since it implies a particular thief. If, on the other hand, vorami 'thieves-INST' is used as the agent in (22) instead of oni, the sentence is more acceptable, because it has no specific referent (as the use of oni requires): if vorami is used, the speaker does not know if there were only one thief or many.

The contrast between the passive and the active impersonal is seen again in (14) and (23):

(14) My by-l-i šokiropa-nn-y (et-im).
    We be-PAST-PL shock-PCPL-PL (this-INST)
    'We were shocked (by this)'

over
(23) Nas şokirova-l-i (et-im izvestije-m).
   We-ACC shock-PAST-PL (this-INST news-INST).
   '(They) shocked us (with this news).

(The preference ranking for this pair of examples holds with
or without the material in parentheses; thus My byli
şokirovanny is preferred to Nas şokirovali). Sentence (23) is
an impersonal active construction, and the presumed agent of
the verb, as discussed above, is human but unknown or
indefinite. Significantly, this sentence sounds somewhat
awkward without the instrumental phrase denoting what actually
brought about the shock, while the passive version in (14) is
felicitous either with or without the mention of the
instrument. What seems to determine which construction is
more comfortable for the denoted event is the literal source
of the shock, and not the agent which is ultimately
responsible for it. Since the literal source of shocking will
be situations, events, or actions performed, possibly, by
people—but not the people themselves—the passive voice is
preferred to the active impersonal, which always has an
implied human subject.

The blurring together of the instrument and agent roles
in the Slavic periphrastic passive has been noted elsewhere.
Saloni, cited by Siewierska (1988:252), claims that in Polish
human or humanlike entities which are agents of passives tend
to appear only in prepositional phrases and not in the
instrumental case, while inanimate 'agents' or sources mainly
appear in the instrumental case but can appear as well in prepositional phrases. Sentence (24) and (25) illustrate this (Siewierska 1988:252):

(24) Piec został naprowiony przez fachowca/fachowcem.
    stove became fix:P.PART by expert/expert-INST
    'The stove was fixed by an expert.'

(25) Został uderzony cegłą /przez cegłę
    became hit:P.PART brick-INST by brick
    'He was hit with a brick/by a brick.

Saloni suggests that the inanimate instrumental agents in Polish passives do not correspond to the subject/agents of active constructions, but rather to instrumental adjuncts of active constructions and proposes that these constructions be analyzed as having elided underlying human subjects. Siewierska claims, however, that there are two reasons why the instrumental NPs in sentences such as

(26) Straty są spowodowane długotrwaną suszą
    losses are cause:P.PART long-term:INST drought:INST
    'The losses have been caused by a long-term drought.'

cannot be interpreted as adjuncts but must be 'underlying subjects': first, because they cannot cooccur with animate agents in prepositional phrases, and second, because of the unlikeness of sentences such as 'They caused the losses with a long-term drought.' The behavior of the Polish passives underscores the heavy influence of the semantic
characteristics of the agent/experiencer in influencing passivization in Russian and Slavic in general.²

While it is true that the semantics of the agent/causer and of the event itself (the 'adversative' aspect) plays an important role in the use of the passive in spoken Russian, the passive is also without doubt a pragmatic means of focussing attention on the patient. This is not the focus of given-new or of topicality, which functions are performed by word order and intonation in Russian, but the focus of a more affected, individuated patient (as discussed in Hopper and Thompson 1980), and this focus is revealed especially clearly in the aspectual behavior of the periphrastic passive and morphologically-reflexive constructions in Russian. The passive voice is associated in Russian, as in many languages, ²

²A similar association of oblique agents and instruments and their influence on voice oppositions is noted by Davis and Huang (1989) for Hindi, in which the postpositional mark _see used for instruments indicates, when used to express an agentive phrase in a passive, a 'decrease in forceful execution of the event'. In other words, the instrumental marking on an agent in Hindi demotes the agent semantically as well as syntactically. For example, the passive

raam-see rootii-0 khaa-ii ga-yii
raam-SEE bread-0 eat-PAST/FEM go-PAST/FEM
'Ram was able to eat the bread'

in which the agent, Raam, is in an instrumentally marked phrase, shows Raam's realized ability to eat the bread, while

raam-nee rootii-0 khaa-ii
raam-NEE bread-0 eat-PAST/FEM
'Raam ate the bread'

indicates his actual performance with no question of difficulty or effort on his part.
with perfective aspect, whereas passive-like propositions with imperfective aspect are expressed in morphologically reflexive -sia-constructions. Many writers (e.g. Cooreman 1988 for Chamorro; Davis and Huang 1989 for Maori, DeLancey 1982) have noted the frequent interaction of 'object-oriented' constructions (i.e. those with focussed or highly affected or strongly individuated objects) with particular aspectual distinctions, passives in accusative languages often being associated with perfective aspect and antipassives in ergative languages being associated with imperfective aspect. As Huang and Davis (1989) point out in their discussion of Atayal voice:

Because ROLE and VOICE both reside in the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relation, the two are inextricably intertwined. The EVENT-semantic base of VOICE is especially clear in Atayal in the ACTIVE-TRANSVERSAL-CULMINATIVE VOICES. The ACTIVE takes the fact of performance as the portion of the EVENT which is highlighted in the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relation. The TRANSVERSAL takes the implementation-aspect as the semantics which it underscores in the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relation. And the CULMINATIVE VOICE focuses on the outcome as the relevant semantics of the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relationship...Where the CIRCUMSTANTIAL VOICE coincides with the beneficiary, instrument, or adjunct ROLE; where the TRANSVERSAL or CULMINATIVE VOICE coincides with the patient or recipient role; and where the ACTIVE coincides with the agent; that is, where the choice of VOICE is congruent with its 'natural' and symmetric ROLE...the effect is to magnify the prominence of that ROLE.
The passive voice and perceptive aspect in Russian function analogously to the 'culminative' voice in Atayal in focussing on the outcome of the event. In many instances—those in which the demoted agent is human and indefinite—the passive and the agent-elided plural impersonal in Russian are nearly interchangeable. Yet only the passive has full promotion of patient to grammatical subject, whereas the patient of the impersonal remains in the accusative, and it is significant that the passive is strongly associated with perceptive aspect, while the impersonal behaves more freely as to which aspects it will cooccur with. The passive voice in Russian is commonly said to be restricted almost exclusively to scientific and other scholarly texts, and it is being replaced in spoken Russian by as the agent-elided plural impersonal. (English passives are most frequently translated as plural impersonals in Russian conversation.) The passive retains only certain characteristics, such as focus on result of action, ability to occur with non-human agent (where the plural impersonal may occur only with human agents), and a vague and intangible—yet palpable—association with adversative semantics. The last may be derivative of the general focus on the outcome of the event and the affectedness of the patient. In any case, these observations may perhaps explain why the passive is used so heavily in scientific and academic texts: there is a dearth of human agents, and results are of prime importance.
3.4 Constructions with verbs marked with the particle -sja

Constructions with verbs marked in -sja are notorious for their slippery behavior and their resistance to attempts at a general characterization. As Schaarschmidt (1970:9) notes, even assigning a term to the morpheme has proved problematic: it has been referred to variously as a 'particle', an 'affix', a 'clitic', or simply the whole verb plus -sja has been referred to as a 'reflexive verb'. The -sja particle was originally a reflexive/reciprocal marker in Russian and still retains some aspects of reflexive meaning, but is no longer the primary tool for marking reflexivization and reciprocalization in Russian (for further discussion see Norman 1972:58-60). That function is now mostly performed by a periphrastic reflexive with the pronoun sebja or periphrastic reciprocal with the pronominal phrase drug druga 'each other'; these will be discussed below. In modern Russian the use of -sja on the verb most frequently indicates an experiencer-oriented type of construction, that is, one in which the actor is in subject position and is affected by the action performed (which is close to but not identical with reflexives), but it can also appear in passive-like constructions, mediopassives or middles, impersonals, and once again reflexives and reciprocals. We will look at three major groups of -sja functions: one in which use of the particle -sja on the verb is productive, alternates regularly with corresponding verbs not marked in -sja, and causes a
predictable shift in grammatical roles without changing the basic semantic content of the proposition; a group of idiomatic verbs ending in -sja which either have no unmarked counterpart or which are non-synonymous with their non-sja counterparts; and a special group of constructions having a dative subject, a neuter verb marked with -sja, and no overt agent.

3.4.1 Productive

The productive class includes verbs which may freely add the -sja particle resulting in a predictable change in the configuration of grammatical roles and causing no change in lexical meaning. These occurrences are frequently considered to be detransitivizing or agent-defocussing. When -sja is added to an otherwise transitive verb, the undergoer (regardless of degree of control) will be the subject of the clause, and the clause will be syntactically intransitive: no direct object in the accusative may appear, and the construction cannot be passivized (although Timberlake 1976 discusses some North Russian dialectal variants with passivized reflexives). Only rarely are agents expressed in this construction; when they do appear, it is in an instrumental (oblique) phrase. Nekrasov wrote in 1865 (pp. 70,74, cited by Norman 1972:31) that 'Our language boldly adds -sja to a verb, as soon as a thought is concentrated mainly on the manifestation of the event itself and not on the
relationship of this event to its subject'. (Note that the 'relationship of the event to its subject' is what voice is frequently defined as, although Nekrasov in fact claimed that there was no formal evidence of a grammatical category of voice in Russian.) Cooreman (1988:585) gives a similar description for what she terms 'demoting antipassives' in Chamorro: this construction type 'is used to emphasize the action or state-of-affairs depicted in the predication. As a result, the identity of the Object becomes less important, since it is the activity itself which is highlighted.' The fate of the patient in the Chamorro demoting antipassive can be likened to that of the agent in the Russian -sja construction by this analysis: they both 'recede' semantically. Comrie (1979d:80) describes this use of -sja as a signalling on the verb of a grammatical role (subject) having a marked semantic role (non-agent)--in other words, as a signal that the agent is not in subject position. Norman (1972:131) claims that the reflexive marker is detransitivizing. Consider:

(27) Plat'e porva-1-o-s'.
   Dress tear-PAST-N-SJA
   'The dress tore.'

(28) Voina nača-1-a-s'.
   War begin-PAST-F-SJA
   'The war started.'

(29) Glaza nali-1-i -s' slez-ami.
   Eyes pour-PAST-PL-SJA tear-INST
   '(Her) eyes filled with tears.'
(30) Rebenok rodi-1-sja.
Child bear-PAST/M-SJA
'The child was born.'

(31) Vnuk očen' izmeni-1-sja.
Grandson very change-PAST/M-SJA
'The grandson changed/had changed very much.'

(32) My peresaživa-1-i -s' v New York-e.
We reseat-PAST-PL-SJA in New York-LOC
'We changed planes in New York.'

The verbs in all of these examples are syntactically intransitive and have unmarked counterparts which are transitive and which are synonymous lexically. For example, porvat' (without the -sja particle) is a transitive verb meaning 'to tear', and rodit' is a transitive verb meaning 'to give birth', etc. These -sja-marked constructions could be given various conventional labels to describe their grammatical/semantic configuration. For example, (27)-(29), each with an inanimate subject, may be referred to as mediopassives since they have inanimate subjects which are 'logically' incapable of performing the denoted action. Sentence (28) could also be described as an inchoative. Sentences (29)-(32), with animate subjects, might be described as middles of some sort since they have animate and active agents performing actions the results of which accrue to themselves. In any case, Russian is organized such that there is no basis for distinguishing these as separate construction types; they all behave in a parallel fashion, and a general and unified motivation for their use can be
discerned. As we saw in the above discussion of passives and impersonals, voice constructions in Russian seem to be heavily determined by the nature of the literal source of the action. In these examples, we see that the source of the action is presented as if lying within the undergoer of the action, which is of course very close to a definition of a typical middle (cf. Smyth 1956), but it is important for understanding the restrictions on the use of this construction. The contrast of (33a) and (33b) shows how this usage of -sja is more than syntactic detransitivization or pragmatic agent defocussing:

(33) a.   Ja zapisa-l-a-s' tuda.
        I enroll-PAST-F-SJA there
        'I signed up/enlisted/enrolled myself there.'

        b.   *Ja pripisa-l-a-s' tuda.
        I conscript-PAST-F-SJA there
        'I got myself drafted there.'

The (b) example above fails due to the fact that the action of conscription cannot logically be perceived as originating within the subject. It is as though one cannot be responsible for or participate in getting drafted. Note the behavior of (34) with various adverbs:3

---

3The English glosses here imply a passive type of construction, but this is misleading.
(34) a. Dom stroit-sja.
   House build-SJA
   'The house is being built/under construction.'

   b. Dom stroit-sja bystro/medlenno/*ploxo/*legko.
   House build-SJA fast/slowly/badly/easily
   'The house is being built quickly/slowly.'
   *'The house is being built poorly/easily.'

Only those adverbs which do not necessarily indicate a volitional agent—even an elided one—are possible. The adverbs bystro 'fast' and medlenno 'slowly' focus upon the emergence of the finished product (the building), while ploxo 'badly' and legko 'easily' focus upon the manner in which the activity is carried out, thus implying an agent. The house is presented as if it were 'building itself', so to speak, but lacks enough characteristics of animacy to control the quality of the building.

Agentive phrases are allowed to a limited extent in this type of -sja-construction, as seen in (35)-(38):

(35) Dom stroit-sja raboč-imi.
   House build-SJA worker-INST
   'The house is being built by workers.'

(36) Dom stroit-sja vladel'c-em.
   House build-SJA owner-INST
   'The house is being built by the owner.'

(37) Dom stroit-sja stal'ny-mi instrument-ami.
   House build-SJA steel-INSTR instruments-INST
   'The house is being built with steel instruments.'

(38) ?Dom stroit-sja pod'emn-ym kran-om.
    House build-SJA lifting-INST crane-INST
    'The house is being built with a crane.'
Sentences (35), (36), and (37) are the only three of these examples found in the data which are actually comfortable with an agentive/instrumental phrase. Sentence (38) can be understood as the owner causing the house to be built (i.e. by designing it, commissioning it, paying for it, etc.) without actually participating physically, which is unusual considering the general tendency we have seen so far for instrumental phrases to express literal rather than ultimate sources of action. Sentence (38) is grammatical and interpretable, but rather awkward. The explanation given by the consultant for the strangeness of (38) was that a building requires more than just a crane to get built—in other words, the crane alone is not the source. Interestingly, this set of sentences, all with the verb 'build', are the only ones found in the data which can easily tolerate an agentive phrase.

Compare (39)–(43):

(39) *Voina nača-1-a-s' Germani-ei.
    War start-PAST-F-SJA Germany-INST

(40) *Vnuk očen' izmeni-1-sja sobyti-jami.
    Grandson very change-PAST-SJA events-INST

(41) *My peresaživa-1-i-s' v New York-e stjuardess-oi.
    We reseat-PAST-PL-SJA in N.Y.–LOC stewardess-INST

(42) ?Kurica žarit-sja mam-oi.
    Chicken cook-SJA mother-INST
    'The chicken is being cooked by mother.'

(43) ?Plat'e porva-1-o-s' vetv'-ju.
    Dress tear-PAST-N-SJA branch-INST
    'The dress was torn by the branch.'
All of the verbs in these sentences are syntactically transitive when they appear without the -sja affix, so that their incompatibility with agentive phrases above is not due to their basic argument structure.

The last two examples are considered extremely awkward although interpretable. The only alternative that my consultant would accept as natural for (42) would be an active, transitive version (Mama žarit kuricu). Verbal semantics cannot really be used to explain the oddness of (42) as against (36): both verbs ('cook' and 'build') are very similar with respect to being processual, inchoative or semi-inchoative, requiring both human agents and tools, etc. A version of (42) with an instrument in the agentive/instrumental phrase is completely unacceptable:

(44) *Kurica žarit-sja skovorodk-oj.
    Chicken cook-SJA skillet-INST
    'The chicken is cooked (by means of) a skillet.'

although

(45) Kurica žarit-sja s skovorodk-oj.
    Chicken cook-SJA with skillet-INST
    'Chicken is cooked with a skillet.'

with a comitative-instrumental rather than agentive-instrumental phrase, is acceptable. As for (43), two more acceptable alternatives, aside from active transitive
constructions, were proposed by the consultant: neuter impersonal (46) or periphrastic passive (47):

(46) Plat'e porva-1-o vety'-ju.
    Dress tear-PAST-N branch-INST

(47) Plat'e by-1-o porva-no vety'-ju.
    Dress be-PAST-N tear-PCPL branch-INST

Since both of these construction types are comfortable with the overt expression of inanimate, 'circumstantial' types of agent/instruments, they are preferred over the -sja-construction. Thus, while the -sja-construction without the overt mention of an agent, as in Plat'e porvalos' 'The dress tore' or Kurica žaritsja medlenno 'Chicken cooks slowly', can be interpreted as having the source of action within the subject, the overt mention of an outside source of action--an agent--is uncomfortable or impossible with most of these constructions. The relevance of the notion of syntactic detransitivization as a means of expressing a pragmatic focus of attention on the action itself or on its effect on the patient as discussed above certainly cannot be discounted. However, their patterning restrictions with agentive phrases show that this is not an issue purely of point of view or empathy. A semantic factor simultaneously conditions their use as well--one that is consistent with the general pattern we have seen so far for Russian. With few exceptions, t'
sja-construction indicates that the source of the action lies within the subject/undergoer.

3.4.2 Idiomatic verbs in -sja

There is a large number of verbs in Russian which carry the -sja marking but which are not formed from their non-derived verbal counterparts. These verbs are generally formed from roots which participate in other verbs without the -sja marking and are frequently accompanied by one of the many verbal prefixes expressing Aktionsart in Russian. These verbs are idiomatic in the sense that their meaning cannot be predicted from the component morphemes (as the meaning of the productive type discussed above can), and they either have no counterpart without the -sja marking, or they have a meaning which is different from the corresponding verb without -sja marking. This class of idiomatic, formally reflexive verbs is generally excluded from discussions of voice (Geniusiene 1987; Norman 1972); however, these verbs have certain characteristics which may be at least partially relevant to the discussion of voice in Russian. We will first examine a few examples:

(48) 'Ona razrazi-l-a-s' potok-om žestok-ix slov.' (AK)⁴
She burst-PAST-F-SJA stream-INST harsh words.
'She burst out with a stream of cruel words.'

*razrazit'

⁴AK = Anna Karenina
(49) No postepeno priži -l-i-s', privyk-l-i...
But gradually settle-PAST-PL-SJA, accustom-PAST-PL
'But gradually we settled in, got used to it...'

*prižit'; žit' : 'live'

(50) Oni še nae -l-i-s' xleb-om.
They EMPH eat.up-PAST-PL-SJA bread-INST
'They filled up on bread.'

*næst'; est' : 'eat'

(51) 'On tverdo derža-l-sja te-x vzgljad-ov...'
He firmly hold-PAST-SJA those-GEN views-GEN
'He firmly adhered to those views...'

deržat': 'hold', 'keep'

(52) 'On ustavi-l-sja na barin-a.'
He fix-PAST-SJA on gentleman-ACC/GEN
'He stared at the gentleman.'

ustavit': 'set', 'place', 'put'

(53) 'My dobi-l-i-s' svedeni-jja iz Penzensk-o-go...'
We attain-PAST-PL-SJA audience-GEN from Penzenksy-GEN...
'We have been granted an audience from the Penzensky...'

dobit': 'finish off', 'kill'

Other verbs in this class include:

prosypat'sja/prosnut'sja ('wake up'; prosypat':
'oversleep')

otrekat'sja ('renounce'; *otrekat')

pytat'sja ('attempt'; pytat': 'torture', 'torment')

næst'sja ('eat one's fill'; *næst')

ulybat'sja ('smile'; *ulybat')

smejat'sja ('laugh'; *smejat')

All of the verbs in this class are syntactically intransitive; they cannot take direct objects in the accusative and cannot be passivized. However, many of them do take 'deformed'
objects in non-accusative cases such as the genitive (cf. [51], [53]) and the instrumental (cf. [50]), as well as in prepositional phrases ([52]). For this reason they may to a certain extent be considered semantically transitive, and in this respect differ significantly from the productive, 'detransitivizing' use of -sja. On the other hand, most of these verbs fit fairly well into certain traditional categories (based on Smyth 1956 for Greek), such as the 'nucleonic middle' (Klaiman's 1988:32 term), and the deponent middle. The nucleonic middle is said to indicate a situation in which the undergoer of the action either rests within the personal sphere of the agent (wash one's hands) or emerges from this personal sphere (sell, deliver a speech). This sort of category obviously accommodates individuated undergoers of some sort; hence the 'deformed' transitivity of the above. The deponent middle denotes the physical, emotional or mental disposition of the actor, as in ustavit'sja, prosypat'sja, ulybat'mja, and smejat'sja above. Thus while these idiomatic uses of -sja are no longer productive and do not participate in the voice system of modern Russian, their seemingly aberrant behavior can be seen as a relic of earlier Indo-European middle voice oppositions.

3.4.3 Neuter impersonals with -sja-marking

The final group of -sja constructions is limited to a small number of verbs. This type is quite similar to the
neuter impersonal and dative subject constructions in that the verb is always neuter singular, regardless of the gender or number of the subject, but in this case, the verb carries the -sja affix. The subject of this construction is invariably in the dative, and no constituent in the clause is in the nominative. Consider:

(54) Mne prixdit-sja uijti.
    I-DAT arrive-SJA leave
    'I have to leave.' Lit. 'It comes to me to leave.'

(55) Mne ne spit-sja.
    I-DAT not sleep-SJA
    'I can't sleep.' Lit. 'It doesn't come to me to sleep.'

(56) (Mne) očen' xote-l-o-s' teb-ja videt'.
    (I-DAT) very want-PAST-N-SJA you-ACC see
    'I really felt like seeing you.'

(57) Každ-omu kaza-l-o-s', što ta žizn'...
    Each-DAT seem-PAST-N-SJA that that life...
    'It seemed to everyone that that life...'

We will not enter into a lengthy discussion of the status of the subjecthood of the dative nominals here, but evidence that they indeed have subject properties comes from their behavior under coordination, as in (58):

(58) Ya seičas' prixa-l i očen' xote-l-o-s' teb-ja videt'.
    I just arrive-PAST and very want-PAST-N-SJA you-ACC see
    'I just got in and really felt like seeing you.'

Russian also makes extensive use of the familiar dative subject construction or, in Klaiman's (1981) terms, 'indirect
subject construction'. In the Russian version of this construction, the 'subject' is in the dative case; the verb—if there is one (Russian has a zero copula in the present tense)—is neuter, as are any adjectives or adverbs expressing the subject's condition; and the event type is very frequently attributive and stative rather than dynamic. Consider:

(59) Мне холодно.
    I-DAT cold
    'I'm cold.'

(60) Ему жаль.
    He-DAT pity
    'He's sorry about that/It's a pity to him'

(61) Нам надо найти работу.
    We-DAT need find work-ACC
    'We need to find work.'

These constructions are typical of dative subject or indirect subject constructions in that they express states such as perception, liking, wanting, needing, obligation, etc. (cf., among others, Sridhar 1976 for Kannada and Klaiman 1981 for Japanese, Russian, Bengali, and Georgian, as well as the discussion of modality in English in Chapter 5). We will not attempt a detailed analysis of this type of construction here, and accept Klaiman 1981's hypothesis that they generally express nonvolitional states and situations which seem to impose themselves onto the dative subject. The use of the neuter voice plus non-promoted subject (non-nominative subject/patient or undergoer) underscores the intangibility of
the agent, if indeed an agent can even be conceived of for these event-types. This is consistent with the overall patterning of Russian voice according to the semantic characteristics of the source of the event.

It is clear that these neuter impersonal and dative-subject construction types denote situations in which the subject is the nonvolitional 'recipient' of the expressed state or situation. The following example highlights the contrast between the non-volitional aspects of the dative subject construction and the volitional aspects of the ordinary active-accusative (Klaiman 1981:126):

(62) *Emu nastojatel'no xotel-o-s' kurit' nesmotrja na He-DAT insistently want-N-SJA smoke in.spite.of vozraženija otc-a.
    objections father-GEN

    *'He insistently felt like smoking in spite of his father's objections.'

(63) On nastojatel'no xotel kurit' nesmotrja na vozraženija He-NOM insistently want smoke in.spite.of objections otc-a.
    father-GEN

    'He insistenly wanted to smoke in spite of his father's objections.'

The dative-subject version of the sentence in (62) is incompatible with an adverb of volition, while the active-accusative, with the same verb, is not. In addition, sentences such as Mne xočet-sja est' are often translated as
'I feel like eating', whereas those such as *Ja xoču est* are translated as 'I want to eat.'

We will not attempt to explain here why some dative subject constructions are marked with *-sja* and why some are not, since the former are frozen and non-productive. Their relevance to the current discussion lies mainly in the fact that, like those idiomatic verbs presented in 3.4.2, they are limited to event-types which are most often expressed by middle voices.

3.5 Periphrastic reflexives and reciprocals

The *-sja* particle in Russian is etymologically a reflexive, being related to the reflexive pronoun *sebja*. Norman (1972:57-8) notes that Old Slavic retained two types of reflexive pronouns from Indo-European, a stressed form which could carry sentence stress and occur with prepositions as well as sentence-initially, and an unstressed clitic form. This reflexive pronoun *ca*, according to Norman, appeared to behave in both ways for a short time, after which the stressed usage died out and was replaced by the genitive *sebe*, reanalyzed as an accusative. Eventually the unstressed *ca* (*-sja*) element lost most of its characteristics as a reflexive pronoun (those now taken over by *sebe*) and acquired other functions (such as the middles and mediopassives mentioned above).
In modern Russian -sja participates in a few semantically reflexive and reciprocal constructions, but the primary means of forming reflexives and reciprocals in modern Russian is with a periphrastic construction, employing the reflexive pronoun sebja and the reciprocal pronouns drug druga' each other', respectively, as direct objects (accusatively marked) in a transitive clause. (There is also a dative form, sebe, of the reflexive pronoun.)

Reflexive

(64) On udar-il seb-ja.
   He-NOM hit-PAST self-ACC
   'He hit himself.'

(65) Ja uvlek -la seb-ja im.
   I-NOM distract-PAST/FEM self-ACC him-INST
   'I distracted myself with him.'

(66) Ja razreša-ju dočk-e odevat' sebja.
   I-NOM allow-PRES/1 daughter-DAT dress self-ACC
   'I let my daughter dress herself.'

Reciprocal

(67) Oni pomy-li drug druga.
   They-NOM wash-PAST/PL each other
   'They washed each other.'

(68) Vsje obnima-li drug druga.
   All-NOM embrace-PAST/PL each other
   'Everyone hugged each other.'

(69) Oni streja-li drug druga.
   They-NOM shoot-PAST/PL each other
   'They shot each other.'
(70) Deti besi-li drug druga.
Children rage-PAST/PL each other
'The children drove each other crazy.'

Schaarschmidt (1970) points out that the periphrastic reflexives and reciprocals have been seen as 'semantically equivalent' to -sja-marked verbs (Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij, Vinogradov, and Ružicka in Ružicka 1968, for example) and also as not entirely synonymous with them (Peškovskij 1956, Isačenko 1960). His own analysis is that the two are basically synonymous, differing only in contrastiveness: 'The occurrence of two sets of forms of the reflexive pronoun in Russian...can be explained in terms of a transformational rule which assigns emphatic stress under certain conditions. The particle -sja can thus be viewed as the non-stressed enclitic form of the reflexive pronoun, that is, Peškovskij's nadstavka, much in the same way as it is usually analyzed for Old Russian' (1970:22). Schaarschmidt bases this analysis on the behavior of sets such as (71):

(71) a. Mal'čik moet-sja.
Boy wash-SJA
'The boy is washing.'

   b. Mal'čik moet seb-ja.
Boy washes self-ACC/GEN
The boy washes himself.'

   c. Mal'čik moet sam-ogo seb-ja.
Boy washes very-GEN self-ACC/GEN
'The boy washes himself by himself.'
Note that (71b), Mal'čik moet sebja, is ungrammatical unless it is used contrastively with accompanying stress or a contrastive clause such as Mal'čik moet sebja, a ne brata 'The boy washes himself but [does] not [wash] his brother.'

The full reflexive pronoun is indeed used contrastively in Russian in some cases, but the assumption that this is its primary role is unwarranted. In most instances the two are not interchangeable, either semantically or syntactically. Schaarschmidt (1970:22) acknowledges the limitations of this analysis: 'It should be emphasized that these... generalizations can in no way guarantee the unique derivation of each individual reflexive construction in Russian. No explanation can be given, for example, to the fact that there are verbs that can take only sebja: videt' sebja 'see oneself', but not videt'sja in a reflexive meaning.'

In order to discover a pattern for the usage of the reflexive particle and the full reflexives pronouns, we will examine the behavior of (64)-(70) (the periphrastic reflexives and reciprocals) in contrast to similar clauses containing the reflexive particle:

(64) On udari-l seb-ja.
    He-NOM hit-PAST self-ACC/GEN
    'He hit (struck) himself.'

(72) On udari-l-sja.
    He hit-PAST-SJA
    'He got hurt.'
Here the contrast between the two constructions can be seen clearly: (64) is not merely an emphatic or contrastive version of (72), but rather a different event type. The two are not synonymous. Sentence (64) is a transitive, two-participant clause, analogous to On udaril menja 'He hit me,' while (72) is an intransitive, one-participant clause with middle-voice semantics: the subject of the clause is both actor and undergoer.

(65) Ja uvelek -l-a seb-ja im.
I-NOM distract-PAST-F self-ACC/GEN him-INST
'I distracted myself with him.'

(73) Ja uvelek -l-a-s' im.
I distract-PAST-F-SJA him-INST
'I got distracted by him, let myself get carried away.'

Here a contrast very similar to the previous one is seen. In (65), the actor-subject is a volitional, in-control agent deliberately permitting the distraction to take place. On the other hand, in (73), the subject is less in control, more of an undergoer; the event happens to her, probably without her wanting it to. Once again, we see the blending of agentive-instrumental (as in [73]) and comitative-instrumental (as in [65]) in Russian into a single participant type, instrumentally marked.

(66) Ja razreša-ju dočk-e odevat' seb-ja.
I-NOM allow-PRES/1 daughter-DAT dress self-ACC/GEN
'I let my daughter dress herself.'
(74) *Ja razreša-ju dočk-e odevat'sja.*
   I-NOM allow-PRES/1 daughter-DAT dress-SJA
   'I let my daughter get dressed/put her clothes on (herself).'

Sentence (66) here has a wider semantic range than (74); it can mean either 'I let my daughter shop for and pick out her own clothes' or 'I let my daughter put on her clothes herself.' Sentence (74), by contrast, has only the meaning expressing middle semantics 'I let my daughter put on her clothes herself.'

(67) *Oni pomy-l-i drug druga.*
   They-NOM wash-PAST-PL each other
   'They washed each other.'

(75) *Oni pomy-l-i-s'.*
   They-NOM wash-PAST-PL-SJA
   'They washed up.'

(68) *Vsje obnima-l-i drug druga.*
   All-NOM embrace-PAST-PL each other
   'Everyone hugged each other.'

(76) *Vsje obnima-l-i-s'.*
   All-NOM embrace-PAST-PL-SJA
   'Everyone was hugging' (seen from a distance, as couples on a dance floor)

The -sj particle may be used in reciprocal constructions just as it may also be used in reflexive constructions; but the contrast between fully active, transitive clause types and middle clause types holds here as well. This is shown clearly in (67)-(76) above. Only (67) and (68) have truly reciprocal semantics in the sense of two individuated actors/undergoers.
Sentence (75), on the other hand can mean only that each washed only himself and not the other. Sentence (76) indicates that, as seen at an isolated moment, everyone in the group was engaged in a hug or embrace with just one other person, in contrast to the repeated and various hugging going on in (68). The same types of contrast hold for (70) and (77), and for (69) and (78):

(70) Deti besi-1-i drug druga.
    Children rage-PAST-PL each other
    'The children drove each other crazy.'

(77) Deti besi-1-i-s'.
    Children rage-PAST-PL-SJA
    'The children were behaving wildly/The kids were out of control.'

(69) Oni streja-1-i drug drugu.
    They-NOM shoot-PAST-PL each other-DAT
    'They shot at each other.'

(78) Oni streja-1-i-s'.
    They-NOM shoot-PAST-PL-SJA
    'They shot it out.'

Sentence (78) means that the participants resolved their differences by dueling and that it was a premeditated, agreed upon, and concerted event.

These examples demonstrate that use of the reflexive pronoun in Russian indicates a transitive, two-participant event with clearly individuated actors and undergoers (even if coreferential), while the reflexive particle (-sja) is used for the various functions of the middle such as the deponent, mediopassive, etc. as described in traditional grammars.
3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter we have analyzed a range of construction types: agent-elided plural impersonals, neuter impersonals and dative subject constructions, periphrastic passives, productive as well as idiomatic uses of the -sja particle, and periphrastic reflexives and reciprocals. For the plural and neuter impersonals, we found that certain semantic characteristics of the agent, such as humanness, non-humanness, referentiality or intangibility controlled their usage. For the periphrastic passive, which, formally, represents a shift from non-derived (as in the impersonal constructions) to derived verbal morphology, we saw a shift from the centrality (in Davis' terms) of the agent to centrality of the patient (or in some cases the event), accompanied by association with a particular aspect (the perfective) and, somewhat less frequently, by adversative or affective semantics. For the productive uses of -sja-marking,

---

5 A very similar situation has been observed by Craig (1977:79-81) for Jacaltec, which has four passives, graded according to semantic features of the agent. The -ot passive is 'the most impersonal of all the passives...there is no mention or suggestion of who the agent is', while the -las passive generally has as agent 'an impersonal authority or some collective agent'. The -lo passive has 'the connotation of something difficult or impossible to do'; in other words, a less than potent agent. And the -ca passive 'is a type of causative conveying the idea that the patient...is either in a helpless situation or is not involved at all'; evidently it has a very potent agent, and Craig acknowledges that the -ca passive is most often translated by native speakers into Spanish as an active form.
in which a patient is promoted to subject and an otherwise transitive clause becomes intransitive, we demonstrated that the source of the action, in particular whether the source of the action was located within the undergoer, was crucial in determining acceptability or non-acceptability of the utterance. Although the idiomatic uses of -sia behave differently from the productive uses, the primary semantic motivation of the productive type--source of action located within undergoer--helps us to understand the similarities between the two types.\(^6\) That the source of action is located within the undergoer or that the subject of the clause is simultaneously actor and undergoer is typical of true inflectional middles in Indo-European. This provides a clue as to the type of semantic patterning for the idiomatic uses: many of them express the 'sub-functions' of the old Indoeuropean middle (nuclecnic, deponent, etc.). The separation of the middle functions from reflexive and reciprocal functions was demonstrated in 3.5, where it was shown that the preferred clause type for reflexives and reciprocals in Russian is active, transitive, and basic, with clear individuation of actor and undergoer. The middles, by contrast, generally are associated with derived (-sia-marked),

\(^6\)This is not to deny that the -sia construction occasionally behaves as a passive type of middle; however, its more typical function expresses coreference of actor and undergoer as discussed in 3.4.2.
syntactically intransitive clause types with low to no individuation of the actor and undergoer.

Even though some of the constructions we have considered have not traditionally been recognized as voice, either because there is no morphological marking of the verb or because they are idiomatic and non-productive, we have included them to show the common semantic thread that motivates all of these variations: they all reflect, to one degree or another, particular semantic characteristics of the source or agent of the action. For plural impersonals, the source is in an indefinite human entity. For neuter impersonals, it is in a natural force or abstract entity. For the middles, the source lies in the subject-undergoer. For the passive, however, we saw a focus not so much on source of the action as on the patient and event. Although this may seem anomalous, it is understandable when we recall that the passive is dying out in spoken Russian, its domain being taken over primarily by the plural impersonal, the neuter impersonal, and the -sja-marked constructions. (It might be that the passive in spoken Russian is being reanalyzed into an adversative or affective type of construction similar to the -(r)are-passive in Japanese or the get-passive in English.)

If we look at this group of constructions as bifurcated into two groups, those traditionally considered to be voice and those not, we find an interesting correspondence: those not traditionally considered voice, the impersonals, are more
agent-oriented in that the verbs have non-derived active morphology and in that the restrictions on their use are located entirely within the agents, while those traditionally considered voice, the passive and -sja-marked middles, are more patient-oriented in that they have derived verbal morphology and in that the patient (or recipient in the case of dative subject constructions) is always in subject position. This reveals a covert bias that has characterized voice studies of all periods: that marked 'voices' are just those constructions that have non-actors or experiencers as subject. But in the Russian case, we have seen that distinctions of voice for purely agentive subjects (the impersonal constructions) are also possible, although they have in fact been excluded from consideration as voice. Huang and Davis (1989) suggest that the 'set' of voices for a language may be thought of as composing 'an abstracted image of what constitutes an EVENT in that language.' From this point of view, we can see Russian as having an event structure conceptualized throughout by distinctions in the properties of the source of that event, whether that source lies in an 'agent' or a 'patient'. Thus the overarching principle motivating voice in Russian is that of participant semantics.
CHAPTER 4

VOICE IN HUNGARIAN

4.0 Introduction

'Voice' is not a term that has appeared frequently in discussions of Hungarian subject relations, and in fact the functional domain of subject selection has received little attention altogether. Where voice (as subject selection) has been examined, interest has most commonly been focussed on individual phenomena such as causatives (Hetzron 1976), passives--or rather the lack thereof (Dezső 1988), middles and mediopassives (Korponay 1980), or the opposition of transitivity and intransitivity (Károly 1982) (although Károly does include a comprehensive taxonomy of Hungarian voice types in his discussion of transitivity). This state of affairs in scholarship on Hungarian voice is not entirely unwarranted: if Hungarian can be said to have 'voice' at all, it does not exist in the comparatively orderly and systematic way that we saw in Russian. Form-to-meaning voice correspondences in Hungarian are at best chaotic, and the influence of the lexicon on all forms of voice is considerable. In this brief review we will will investigate the general principles motivating the Hungarian system and the influence of related

1This survey unfortunately does not include those publications not translated from the Hungarian.
areas such as topicalization and transitivity with voice and subjecthood. Finally we will show how assumed notions of 'basicness' in verbal semantics and clause organization must be challenged when dealing with languages of the Hungarian type.

4.1 Previous treatments of Hungarian voice

Very roughly speaking, voice in Hungarian can be outlined as having a robust system of causative formation, an extensive transitive-intransitive derivational system, and a very limited means of forming passives.

Korponay (1980) in his article on middle and causative constructions characterizes Hungarian voice as comprising on the one hand a set of three distinctions all having what he terms 'reflexive meaning' (with subcategories passive/impersonal, reflexive, and inchoative) opposed on the other hand to a 'causative' set having 'causative' (constructions having one agent, according to Korponay) and 'factitive' subcategories (constructions having two agents). Although he loosely associates these categories with particular morphological forms (-odik/-ik for passive and impersonal meaning, -ul/-ül for reflexive meaning, -ad/-ed for inchoative meaning, -t/-it for causative meaning, and -tat/-tet for factitive), Korponay's taxonomy is essentially based on preconceived logical-semantic criteria borrowed from the Greek tradition, and he assigns a priori semantic
qualities to any verb marked with a particular morpheme. The logical-semantic categories he proposes do not seem to fit the Hungarian morphological categories very well. It is difficult to see exactly how, for example, the sentence A vitoriá
kidag-ad-tak a szélben 'The sails swelled-INCHTV-3PL in the wind' has the 'reflexive meaning' that he claims it does due to its -ad marking (although it is what traditionally would be termed a mediopassive or middle), or why any clause having only one actor—in other words, a simple transitive clause—should be labelled a 'causative' (except perhaps because it is not a reflexive or middle).

Károly (1982) represents a more comprehensive and balanced view of Hungarian voice, recognizing a wide range of formal and semantic distinctions. The Hungarian voice system is seen as consisting of points along a scale of 'degrees of [semantic] transitivity', the endpoints being 'passive' and 'pure transitive'. Within this range he suggests nine voices (1982:192): passive; mediopassive ('closely resembles the category of passives, but...the action is conceived of as occurring without the agent'); inward-directed active ('do not have semantic object'); reflexive; reciprocal; intransitive outward-directed (verbs taking oblique [non-accusative] objects); factitive ('the object is indirectly involved, that is,...the subject of the sentence gets the action done by somebody else'); causative (in which 'an active and directly involved object corresponds to the subject of an active
sentence'); and pure transitive. Note that factitives and causatives are considered here to be less 'transitive' than the 'pure transitive' (accusative clause type). These categories of voice are supplemented with syntactic 'specifications' of each type but remain fundamentally logical-semantic. For example, Károly gives for each of the categories of mediopassive, inwardly-directed active, and intransitive outward direction the following examples, respectively: csavar-odik, vi. 'turn', rak-odik 'load', tudakol-odik, vi. 'ask after s.o.' Regardless of either the 'meaning' of these or of the type of object each may or may not take, it is unclear why these three forms sharing the same derivational voice morpheme should be classified as separate voices, since Hungarian does not seem to distinguish them formally. While Károly presents an exhaustive examination of possible voice types, the picture that emerges is not one that is necessarily accurate for Hungarian.

Robert A. Hall's Hungarian Grammar (1944) gives an interesting alternative viewpoint on this area of Hungarian verbal morphology. 'Voice' per se is not discussed, but Hall recognizes three conjugations (1944:36): 'indefinite (in traditional terminology "subjective"); middle or /-ik/ conjugation, used with certain verb roots instead of the indefinite; and definite, whose meaning is "presence of a clearly defined object of the action".' No further specification of voice types, such as reflexive, mediopassive,
etc. is given. His alignment of the indefinite with the middle ('used with certain verb roots instead of the indefinite') against the definite conjugation is intriguing and implies a voice classification not bound to the notion of agenthood.

Briefly reviewing partial treatments of voice, we find in Hetzron (1976) a description of the behavior of the vigorous causative system in Hungarian. He concludes that, although examples of clause types such as causative (in which a causer causes or creates an intransitive event type), factitive (in which a causer causes a transitive event type by acting upon a causee-agent), coercive causative (causatives of force), and permissive causative could each be identified in Hungarian, there is no actual basis for distinguishing them formally, and he takes due note of the extensive lexical, semantic, and pragmatic constraints on the productivity of the causative formants. Dezső (1988) discusses the well-known lack of a regular passive construction in Hungarian and relates it to the double-based verbal system, in which transitive verbs are derived from intransitives equally as often as if not more often than intransitive verbs are derived from transitives.

4.2 Overview of voice: verbal morphology and clause types

Hungarian voice is realized primarily by a rich and complex set of derivational verbal suffixes which can derive transitive verbs from intransitives and vice versa, and create
causative/factitives, reflexive/reciprocals, and middles and mediopassives simply by changing the verbal morphology. This derivational system enables any event participant to assume the role of grammatical subject with no further formal adjustments; for example, in the derived middles and mediopassives, a semantic patient may occupy the role of subject (without the sentence being a periphrastic passive) while in the derived causatives, a causer may occupy this role (without the addition of a subordinate clause expressing the caused event). Some of the suffixes are still quite productive, others are less so, and some are no longer productive at all; the occurrence of all types is strongly influenced by the lexicon and verbal classes. Those suffixes deriving transitive verbs from either intransitive verbs or neutral bases include: -t/-at/-et, -tat/-tet, -ait, -aszt/-eszt, and -it. Suffixes deriving intransitive verbs from transitive or neutral bases include: od(ik)/-őd(ik), -ad/-ed, -ul/ül/-l, -kozik/-kezik, and -atik. The following table from Károly (1982:226) provides a convenient overview of the possibilities:

---

2A glossary is provided in the appendix to this chapter.
1. Intransitive base

2. Transitive base

3. Specific cases of double base (1+2)

4. Double base with common root

5. Undivided homonymous base

Multiple shifts

Figure 4.1
Note categories (4) and (5) on the diagram. Hungarian has a large class of verbal roots which have no basic argument structure. Class (4) involves roots which are 'voice-neutral', and must be derived in both directions, transitive and intransitive, while class (5) verbs are unspecified for voice and do not derive in either direction although they may be used transitively or intransitively. Many of the class (4) verbs are denominal. Examples of these neutral verbal roots (and lexemes) include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>szép-ül</td>
<td>szép-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'grow more beautiful'</td>
<td>'beautify'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fak-ad</td>
<td>fak-aszt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'spring forth'</td>
<td>'cause to spring forth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bátor-odik</td>
<td>bátor-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'take courage'</td>
<td>'encourage'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep-ül</td>
<td>rep-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fly'</td>
<td>'fly s.t.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>él-ed</td>
<td>él-eszt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'come to'</td>
<td>'revive'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szár-ad</td>
<td>szar-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dry' (intr.)</td>
<td>'dry s.t.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3'Voice-neutral' is a term used by Tchekoff 1979 and 1980 to indicate a finite form of the verb which may take either agent or patient as subject without altering verbal morphology. Notice that in the Hungarian examples, we are using the term somewhat differently. Only the roots of the verbs are neutral; the finite form of the verb always carries derivational transitive or intransitive marking, except for the much smaller class represented by the last two example tart and cáfol.
INTRANSITIVE

tart
'last'
cáfol
'flout'

TRANSITIVE

tart
'hold'
cáfol
'flout s.t.'

As alternatives to the standard transitive clause type⁴, third-person plural impersonals, mediopassives and middles, and causatives all play a significant role in the Hungarian system, while periphrastic passives (in the sense of copula plus participle, for example) are almost non-existent in speech (cf. Hall 1944 and Dezső 1988). Dezső (1988:292) provides the following contrasting examples of clause types⁵:

(1) A köműves-ek fel-épít-ett-ék a klub-ot.
The bricklayer-PL up-build-PAST-3PL/OBJ the club-ACC
'The bricklayers built the club.'

(2) A klub-ot fel-épít-ett-ék.
The club-ACC up-build-PAST-3PL/OBJ
'(They) built the club' or 'The club was built.'

(3) A klub fel-ép-ül-t.
The club up-build-INTR-PAST
'The club has got built.'

(4) A klub fel van épít-ve.
The club up is build-ADV B
'The club has been built.'

⁴Hungarian word order is primarily SOV, but SVO occurs frequently as well. Cf. Dezső 1988 and Kiss 1981 for further discussion. All Hungarian data which is not otherwise attributed are from my field notes.

⁵OBJ = objective conjugation; INCHTV = inchoative
Sentence (1) represents a standard active transitive clause type; (2) is a third-person plural impersonal with transitive verbal morphology and the direct object in the accusative (note the alternative word order and elided agent); (3) is a typical intransitive or mediopassive with derivational verbal morphology; and (4) is an example of a passive formed from combining the copula with a deverbal adverbial suffix. As mentioned earlier, the last is very infrequent and sounds quite strained to a native speaker. Hetzron (1976:383-4) provides the following examples of causative formation in Hungarian:

(5) A mosógép kimos-ta a ruhák-at.
The washing machine wash-3/PAST the clothes-PL/ACC
'The washing machine washed the clothes.'

(6) A mosógép-pel kimos-tam a ruhák-at.
The washing machine-INST wash-1/PAST the clothes-PL/ACC
'I washed the clothes with the washing machine.'

(7) A mosónö-vel kimos-at-tam a ruhák-at.
The laundress-INST wash-CAUS-1/PAST the clothes-PL/ACC
'I had the laundress wash the clothes.'

Here the first two examples are transitives, and the third is a morphological causative. Some further examples:

(8) Meg-nevet-tet-tem a fiú-t. (Hetzron 1976:392)
PERF-laugh-CAUS-1/PAST the boy-ACC
'I caused the boy to laugh.'
(9) **Meg-tréfál-tam a fiú-t.**
PERF-joke-CAUS-1/PAST the boy-ACC
'I caused the boy to be played a joke on' or 'I made someone play a joke on the boy.'
*'I caused the boy to play a joke.'

(10) **Meg-tréfál-tam a fiút.**
PERF-joke-1/PAST the boy-ACC
'I played a joke on the boy.'

Note that in (8) the accusatively-marked participant ('boy') is the agent/experiencer of laughing (**nevet** is an intransitive verb), while in (9), the accusatively-marked participant is the patient of the joke-playing (**tréfál** is a transitive verb), not the causee/agent. Contrasts of this sort have led some scholars to claim that Hungarian has both causatives (causatives specifically of intransitive verbs) and factitives (causatives of transitive verbs), but the contrast is an artifact of the verb's inherent transitivity and not a regular morphological alternation between causative and factitive clauses.

Progressions of intransitive-transitive-causative using double causative morphology are also possible:

- **meleg-edik** 'get warm'
- **meleg-it** 'warm s.t.'
- **meleg-it-tet** 'make s.o. warm s.t.'
  
  (Hetzron 1976:381)

- **robban** 'explode'
- **robban-t** 'blow s.t. up'
- **robban-t-at** 'make s.o. blow s.t. up' (**ibid.**)
Evidently, Hungarian has a very flexible and productive system of verbal derivation. However, this derivational system is at an unstable stage of grammaticalization, and the lexical and semantic factors affecting the distribution and meaning of these morphemes are formidable. While the system overall is quite productive (transitivizing, causativizing, or detransitivizing any verb is usually possible one way or another), each of the individual derivational morphemes varies as to its own degree of productivity. Furthermore, among the less productive categories, the use of the derivational morpheme often signals a semantic shift in the verb's original meaning.

4.3 The Hungarian double-base verb system

The preceding overview of Hungarian verbal derivation shows the fairly equal balance in the number and productivity of transitivizing and intransitivizing suffixes as well as the significant amount of 'transitivity-neutral' verbs; in other words, there is no overwhelming directional bias in the Hungarian verbal system towards either transitivity or intransitivity although there is more of a tendency toward the
latter. (Recall the Russian system, in which the basic verbs tend to be transitive and in which there is a regular derivational suffix -sia for making them intransitive.) This salient feature of Hungarian grammar has been discussed extensively in the literature, most notably by Károly (1982:207-212 et passim). He describes Hungarian as a double-base language with a somewhat more dominant intransitive base, citing the following evidence:

(a) the use of transitive derivational suffixes is more regular, more grammaticalised..., (b) the forms of the transitive derivational suffixes are older, more balanced and uniform, consisting of mostly just -t, while intransitive suffixes are more varied; furthermore, in this role they are not of Finno-Ugric origin, they are the result of secondary development; (c) passive derivational suffixes are formed with the help of the transitive suffix: -at + -ik; (d) the number of root words which can be expressed through a combination of root + transitive suffix is much higher than those which can be expressed by means of roots + intransitive suffixes.

Dezső (1988:318), in comparing the Hungarian verbal system with the Russian transitivity-dominated system, also comments on the relatively stronger intransitive base in Hungarian as well as its relationship to causative derivation, citing Nedjalkov-Sil'nickij (1969:25-26): '...the causative suffixes

---

5By a 'transitively-dominated' system, we intend one in which the prototypical clause type has a verb with a semantic agent as subject and a patient (if present) as direct object. An 'intransitive' base, in the sense intended here, is one in which an agent or an experiencer is commonly found in subject position.
are more productive with intransitive verbs than with transitive verbs. There are languages in which causative suffixes can join only intransitive verbs.' It might be tempting at this point to speculate that all of Hungarian voice behavior (especially the prevalence of causatives and the lack of passives) is attributable entirely to the double base. But the typological implications of a double-based system for voice can be taken only so far. The fact that Hungarian has an especially solid intransitive base is not sufficient as an explanation for why the Hungarian system has very few periphrastic passives on the one hand and a very vigorous causative system on the other; this will be be quickly appreciated when we consider a language like English, which is also very flexible as to the transitivity and intransitivity of its verbs, yet has a robust passive and no morphological causative at all.7

The lack of a preference for a prototypically agentive subject (one acting upon an object) implied by the high frequency of intransitive verbs in Hungarian can also be seen in the relatively small number of split intransitive constructions (cf. Merlan 1985). A split intransitive system is one which inflects verbs subjectively or objectively, according to whether they belong to certain verb classes; verbs with non-prototypically agentive subjects are marked

---

7Other factors such as case marking and word order constraints obviously play their parts.
grammatically to indicate their special status. We may consider the dative subject construction (cf. Russian) as a type of objectively-inflecting construction found in split-intransitive systems, since the subject does not appear in the nominative case. Dative subject constructions are usually limited to animate subjects and deponent event types, especially those such as the experiencing of cold/heat, fear, and hunger, dreaming, sleeping, possessing, etc. Hungarian has such a dative subject construction, thus exhibiting at least some degree of split intransitivity, but this construction is far more limited than it is in other case-marking languages (i.e. Russian). Hungarian uses the dative subject construction for the deontic modals kell 'must' and kellene 'should': (Nekem) mennem kell 'I-DAT go-1/DAT must'; (Nekem) mennem kellene 'I-DAT go-1/DAT should', and also for showing possession: (Nekem) van egy könyvem 'I-DAT is one book'--'I have a book', but uses a nominative subject for all of the following: (En) fázok 'I'm cold', (En) félek 'I'm scared', (En) éhes vagyok 'I'm hungry', (En) álmodtam 'I dreamed', (En) nem tudtam aludni 'I couldn't sleep'. These stative, non-transitive event-types with a low degree of subject control for the most part do not exhibit split intransitivity and are comfortable with a nominative subject. In Russian, on the other hand, which has a much stronger transitive bias in the verb system and, as we saw in Chapter 3, a voice system closely organized around agent semantics, the low-control
event types (being cold, hungry, unable to sleep, etc.) must be grammatically marked by dative case and lack of verb agreement. Hungarian's lack of a distinction is further evidence of its low correlation of subject and agent.

4.4 Subject ellipsis in coordinate clauses

Processes of clause-combining and subject ellipsis provide further information about the nature of subject selection and the perception of subjecthood. Keenan (1976b:316-7) includes the ability to control co-reference across clause boundaries as part of the universal set of properties constituting subjecthood. We will see below how Hungarian frequently divides its subject coding properties (case marking and verb agreement) and subject behavioral properties (such as deletion and cross-reference) between two constituents in the clause and what this implies for the semantics of subject selection.

Hungarian has a fully realized set of person/number markers in all tenses; in other words, person and number distinctions are not neutralized in non-present tenses as they are in many other languages, such as English. Furthermore, with the objective conjugation (and some others, such as the dative conjugation—cf. 4.3 above), even more information about the subject is coded in the verbal morphology, such as whether the subject is the agent of a transitive construction with definite object. Thus, even with an elided subject, much
about the subject can still be determined. Figure 4.2 shows the conjugation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>megy-ek</td>
<td>mentem</td>
<td>ütom</td>
<td>ütöttm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>mész</td>
<td>mentél</td>
<td>ütöd</td>
<td>ütötted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>megy</td>
<td>ment</td>
<td>üti</td>
<td>ütötte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>megyünk</td>
<td>mentünk</td>
<td>ütjük</td>
<td>ütöttük</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>mentek</td>
<td>mentetek</td>
<td>ütitek</td>
<td>ütöttetek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>mennek</td>
<td>mentek</td>
<td>ütik</td>
<td>ütötték</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2

(Compare English, in which all distinctions in the past tense are neutralized for number and person [I ran; They ran], and Russian, in which only number and gender are maintained in the past tense [Ya znal; On znal; Oni znal]). The fact that Hungarian has maintained a full set of distinctions in both tenses makes subject ellipsis more feasible. The following examples demonstrate the flexibility of Hungarian coordinate-clause subject ellipsis:

(12) A madara-t lelőtték és le-esett
The bird-ACC shot-3PL/OBJ and down-fell/3SG the

a föld-re.
ground-LOC

'(They) shot the bird and (it) fell to the ground.'
(13) A madarak-at lelőtték és (azok) le-esettek
The birds-ACC shot-3PL/OBJ and (they) down-fell-3PL
a föld-re.
the ground-LOC
'(They) shot the birds and (they) fell to the ground.'

(14) A madarak-at megtalált-ak és ennek magyon megörültek.
The birds-ACC discovered-3PL and so very be.happy-3PL
'(They) discovered the birds, and (they) were very happy.'

(15) Sokáig üttött és végül elvesztett-e az
Long beat-3SG and finally lost-3SG/OBJ the
önuralm-át.
self.control-3POSS
'(He) beat (me) for a long time and finally (he) lost
his self-control.'

(16) Sokáig üttött (en-gem) és végül elvesztettem az
Long beat-3SG (I-DAT) and finally lost-1SG the
önuralm-am.
self.control-1POSS
'(He) beat (me) for a long time and finally (I) lost
self-control.'

(17) Sokáig ütöttek és végül elvesztettem az
Long beat-3PL and finally lost-1SG the self.control-
onuralm-am.
1POSS
'(They) beat me for a long time and finally (I) lost
my self-control.'

The verb of the initial clause of sentence (12) is a third
person plural with elided agent and with 'bird' as singular
direct object, and this direct object controls subject ellipsis in the second clause; 'bird' is the subject of the
second clause but does not have to be expressed. In (13), the
verb of the first clause is again a 3PL with something like 'hunters' as the implied grammatical subject. However, the second clause, which also has a 3PL verb with elided subject, does not refer to the same subject as the first clause ('hunters') but rather to the plural direct object of the first clause, 'birds.' Again, the direct object controls subject ellipsis. On the other hand, (14) shows that the direct object of a 3PL verb does not obligatorily control subject ellipsis in the following clause; the subject of both clauses refers to the same unidentified participant--it is not the birds who are happy, and this is assumed pragmatically. Sentence (15) has the same 3SG elided subject for both clauses. It exemplifies the use of the objective conjugation (in the second clause) which implies a definite object, here 'self-control'. The verb of the initial clause, by contrast, is not in the objective conjugation, implying that its object is either indefinite or non-third person--here it is assumed from the context that the object is the speaker (1st person singular). In (16) and (17) we see again that the direct object of the initial clause--even if elided--can trigger verb agreement in the following clause. (The first person dative pronoun in the initial clause of [16] is optional.) Note also that (15) and (16) have 3SG agents and are not impersonal constructions. The remaining sentences with 3PL agents may be interpreted either as impersonal or personal constructions, depending on the context.
If there is complete ambiguity as to the possible identities of subject and object, object-controlled ellipsis is restricted:

(18) A madarak-at megtaláltak és azok fel dühödt-ek.
The birds-ACC discovered-3PL and those get.mad-3PL '(They) discovered the birds, and they [the birds] got mad.'

In (18) the demonstrative pronoun azok is necessary to disambiguate the 3PL definite object and the 3PL subject. Thus the capability of the direct object to control subject ellipsis is strong but not absolute; in the case of ambiguity, the agent/subject (that is, the participant which is agent and which also triggers verb agreement in the initial clause) will be preferred over the direct object/topic. This is why it is necessary to include azok in the second clause, to emphasize that 'birds' is still the subject; otherwise (without azok), the hunters would be interpreted as the subject of the verb.

4.5 Subject and topic in Hungarian

It is clear from the examples in 4.4 that direct objects in Hungarian are capable of controlling coordinate clause subject ellipsis, the latter being a property frequently associated with 'subject.' We also saw in 4.3 that the double-base (transitive-intransitive) system and the accompanying low degree of split intransitivity in Hungarian also point towards a low correlation of subject and agent in Hungarian. A notion of subject as conflation of agent and
topic appears to be true only in a restricted sense. Is subject selection in Hungarian based on topicality, then?

To answer this question, we must first determine what is meant by topicality or topichood. 'Topic', when used in the phrase 'topic and comment' often appears as a synonym to 'theme' (as in 'theme and rheme'). In this sense, 'topic' is generally understood as 'what the sentence is about', the hook upon which the speaker places the predication or 'comment.' Thus in this sense, topic is meant as a discourse-pragmatic notion, implying that the topic of a clause is determined at least partially by the preceding discourse. This notion of topic is not essential to understanding voice in Hungarian, since management of topicalization and focus is carried out by sentence stress and word order in Hungarian (Kiss 1981; Dezső 1980:248-30; Dezső 1975). For example, the sort of topicalization which is realized by left dislocation in English is realized by placing the desired constituent in preverbal position (Kiss 1981:312-3):

(19) **Piroska a rock and roll-t szereti.**
Piroska the rock and roll-ACC loves 'As for Piroska, as for rock and roll, she loves it.'

(20) **Piroska szereti a rock and roll-t.**
Piroska loves the rock and roll-ACC 'As for Piroska, she loves rock and roll.'

The selection of grammatical subject is not affected by the choice of topic.
Another widely used sense of 'topic' refers, somewhat vaguely in most treatments, to a kind of 'almost-but-not-quite subject', that is, the type of constituent often found in Philippine languages which has many but not all prototypical subject properties (cf. Keenan 1976b) and usually co-existing with an actor-subject role. In his introduction to Subject and Topic, Li makes the following remarks about topic (1976:x): 'The identity of "topic" appears to be much more elusive than that of "subject." Unlike the notion of subject, the notion of topic is discourse-oriented...There is no exhaustive listing of the properties of topic...topics are described in contrast to subjects rather than independently.' The main point about this notion of 'topic' is the fact that they are not syntactically integrated into the clause in the way subjects are. However, although the term 'subject' has been minutely scrutinized in the last decade, the term 'topic' has still not been elucidated, and it seems often to be assumed non-problematic, or at least not enough important to warrant the kind of attention that 'subject' has. For example, Shibatani (1988c:115-130) devotes at least 15 pages to pondering the definition of subject with regard to Philippine languages, but the notion of topic is disposed of in a brief comment (1988c:119): 'Topic...has pragmatic prominence for being referential', and in a footnote (1988c:138):
I think that the Philippine topic can be characterized as the center of attention in general... This, incidentally, is apart from the problem of the difficulty associated with explicating what constitutes the 'center of attention.'

There are two key ideas in Shibatani's notes on topic here. The first is that topics are referential (and definite). The second is the notion that topic is the 'center of attention'. We will take up the notion of referentiality first and then discuss the idea of 'center of attention.'

Philippine languages are well known for their actor-focus and goal-focus constructions, in which either the actor or the undergoer can be selected as the grammatically most prominent constituent in a clause without demotion of a participant or derivation of the verb. The argument has centered, not surprisingly, on whether this 'grammatically prominent constituent' is to be defined as a subject or not (as well as on whether these languages are accusative or ergative). Whether it is analyzed as a subject or as a topic, this constituent is what Shibatani is referring to as the 'center of attention', and its behavior is heavily influenced by definiteness and referentiality. McFarland (1978), cited in Shibatani (1988c:109), gives the following rules of thumb for 'topic choice' in Philippine languages:

a. If there is only one referential nominal, make it a topic.
b. If both actor and goal are referential, opt for the goal-topic.
c. If the choice is between the referential actor and referential directional, give preference to the actor-topic.

Hungarian, with its high tolerance for non-agentive subjects, appears to have some similarity to Philippine languages, with their topic-oriented system. The referentiality of the direct object is an important factor in clause grammar and cross-clause ellipsis in Hungarian as well (cf. [21]):

(21) Egy madárt lelőtt-ek és az a járdá-ra
A bird-ACC shot-3PL/INDEF and that the pavement-LOC
esett.
fell-3SG

'(They) shot a bird and it fell to the ground.'

In contrast to the examples above with definite direct objects [(12-17)], the indefinite direct object of (21), 'a bird', is not sufficiently topical enough to control ellipsis in the second clause—the appearance of the demonstrative pronoun az in the second clause is obligatory. But the tendency of referentiality to influence clause formation is a relatively minor one, at least as far as voice is concerned. While subjects in Philippine languages may not be indefinite, subject selection in Hungarian occurs independently of whether the target participant is definite or indefinite:
(22) Egy macská-t simogat-nak.
   A cat-ACC pet-3PL
   'A cat is petted/(They) pet the cat.'

(23) Egy gyerek született itt tegnap.
   A child be.born-INTR-PAST here yesterday
   'A child was born here yesterday.'

(In [22], the indefinite NP is not the grammatical subject of
the sentence, but it is the only expressed participant in an
impersonal construction. In [23], the indefinite NP is the
grammatical subject.) So although Hungarian is similar to
Philippine languages, for example, in that either the actor or
the undergoer can comfortably fulfill the 'most prominent
grammatical role' (see also Schachter and Otanes 1972;
Schachter 1976; Shibatani 1988c), with the agent role acting
as a sort of default, Hungarian is different in that it does
not have the heavy referentiality restrictions controlling the
selection of that grammatical role; furthermore, Hungarian
subjects are strongly integrated into the syntax of the
clause. Topic in the discourse sense does not seem to be the
key issue here.

So far we have noted that subject selection--voice--in
Hungarian is not motivated by agenthood or by the semantic
characteristics of the agent participant, nor by 'topicality'
as it has been understood as a discourse notion. Furthermore,
subject properties may be shared between two participants in
Hungarian, as we saw in 4.4; verbal agreement is not always a
reliable indicator of subjecthood. What, then is the essence
of subjecthood in Hungarian? This leads us to the second key phrase in Shibatani's characterization of topic, 'center of attention,' which implies a more independent cognitive notion rather than a purely discourse-controlled notion. As Shibatani recognizes, this is an elusive area, but it is one that merits further inspection. Pléh (1982:459), in his discussion of Hungarian subject and topic, alludes to this issue as it applies to subject ellipsis in coordinate clauses: 'The recovery of the antecedent for a zero subject is not influenced by the thematic organization of the previous sentence: the zero subject tends to be interpreted as corresponding to the previous most active or most involved participant [emphasis mine, CC]...Somehow the interpretation procedure uses information about the basic semantic characteristics.' It is this notion of 'most involved participant' that we hypothesize is the motivation for subject selection in Hungarian.

An empirical basis for the analysis of 'center of attention' or 'most involved participant' has been offered by Davis (Davis 1987; Davis and Huang 1989; Davis and Saunders 1989; Huang and Davis 1989 inter alia), based on the notions of 'centrality' and 'peripherality' as they relate to clause organization. For a preliminary explication, we will be present their analysis of the expression of centrality and peripherality as it occurs in the Bella Coola voice morpheme -m-, since the behavior of this voice marker has implications
for Hungarian voice behavior. (See Davis and Saunders 1989 for a complete discussion.)

We will begin with some examples of the middle/mediopassive. The middle has been described (for Sanskrit) by Burrow (1955:293) as a voice used 'when the subject is in some way or other specially implicated in the result of the action...[and] in those cases where the direct object of the verb is a member of one's own body.' The mediopassive has been defined by Grady (1965:270) as 'an active voice syntactical pattern wherein the subject-verb relation is notionally passive.' As the following examples show, both of what are traditionally termed 'middle' and 'mediopassive' voices are marked by -m- in Bella Coola (Huang and Davis 1989:2):

(24) 1q-ak-m-0
    slap-hand-M-he
    'He clapped his hands.' (middle)

(25) ps-m-0 ti-stn-tx
    bend-M-it -stick-
    'The stick is bending.' (mediopassive)

(26) a. sxw-is ti-?imlk-tx wa-sul-c
    burn-he.it -man- -house-
    'The man burned the house.'

    b. sxw-m-0 wa-sul-c
    burn-M-it -house-
    'The house burned.'

(27) a. kaw -is 0 ti-piqiyala-tx
    deliver-he.it he -package-
    'He delivered the package.'
b. kaw -m -0 0 x-a-nap-c
   deliver-M-he he Prep- -thing-
   'He went to deliver the things.'

Hungarian exhibits a similar conflation of mediopassive and middle voices:

(28) El gyeng-ül-t.
    PREP weak-INTR-PAST
    'She became weak.'
    (middle)

(29) A klub fel-ép-ül-t.
    The club up-build-INTR-PAST
    'The club has got built.'
    (mediopassive)

Bella Coola -m- also occurs in active transitive constructions as well, however:

(30) a. ?aci-0 snac ?ul-ti-satla-tx
    sit-he snac Prep- -canoe
    'Snac sat in the canoe.'

    b. ?aci-m-is snac ti-satla-tx
    use-M-he.it snac -canoe-
    'Snac used the canoe.'

Davis and Huang (1989) note that -m- cannot be understood in terms of a marker of transitivity or intransitivity (whether grammatical or semantic): '...{m} may...deplete the Transitivity of a clause [sentences (26b), (27b)] as well as augmenting it [(30b)]. Note that the addition of -m- creates a grammatically transitive utterance from an intransitive in (30), while doing just the opposite in (26) and (27). Voice
understood as transitivity oppositions will fail here since 
-m- appears to participate in conflicting transitivity schemata. Huang and Davis provide an alternate conception of Bella Coola voice understood in terms of a participant's relative centrality to a propositional 'nucleus' as demonstrated by certain core grammatical phenomena (1989:4):

'Grammatically, position within the NUCLEUS [for Bella Coola] is signaled by involvement in the agreement morphology, by the absence of a preposition, and by occupation of the S or the O position in the VSO formula. Location in the periphery is then signaled by the lack of involvement in agreement patterns, the presence of a preposition, and by position to the right of any S or O.' Here, -m- can be seen as a sort of toggle switch of centrality and peripherality, its appearance altering the non-derived event/verb from its basic role structure to an alternative one, which alteration is accompanied by shifts in agreement, preposition use, and word order. Hence in (30) the basic role structure of ?aci- is actor plus (optional?) oblique object, but in (30b), -m- alters this to actor plus direct ('central') object. Then for kaw- in (27a) the basic role structure is actor plus direct object, and -m- alters that to actor plus oblique object. Thus we have a more concrete, empirical basis for determining the cognitive notion of 'involvement in event' or 'center of attention'. We will now examine how Hungarian subject selection may be understood in terms of centrality.
First of all, the definite/indefinite conjugation patterns for transitive verbs reinforce the pattern of prominence of definite direct objects seen earlier with coordinated clauses. Recall that in 4.1 we noted that, whereas nearly all analyses of Hungarian voice were based on the transitive v. intransitive opposition, Robert A. Hall set up an opposition in Hungarian verb conjugation between middles ('/ik/' verbs) and transitives of the indefinite conjugation on the one hand, and transitives of the definite conjugation on the other. The conjugation pattern for the middles and intransitives (31) and (32) does indeed align with that of the indefinite conjugation (33) against the definite conjugation (34):

(31) **Pel dühödt-ek.**
PERF get.angry-3PL/PAST
'They got angry.'

(32) **Menn-ek.**
Go-3PL/PAST
'They went.'

(33) **Egy madara-t lelőtt-ek.**
A bird-ACC shoot-3PL/PAST
'(They) shot a bird.'

(34) **A madara-t lelőtt-ék.**
The bird-ACC shoot-3PL/PAST/OBJ
'(They) shot the bird.'

The definite conjugation (-ék) marks the greater prominence of a definite direct object over that of an indefinite direct object; clauses with indefinite direct objects are classed
together with clauses with no object at all, and these are opposed to a unary class of clauses with definite direct object. The acquisition of certain subject properties of definite direct objects was also seen in their ability to control ellipsis in coordinate clauses:

(12) \textbf{A madara-t lelőtt-ék és le-esett}  
The bird-ACC shot-3PL/OBJ and down-fell/3SG  
a föld-re.  
the ground-LOC  
'(They) shot the bird and (it) fell to the ground.'

(21) \textbf{Egy madara-t lelőtt-ek és az a járdá-ra esett.}  
A bird-ACC shot-3PL/INDEF and that the pavement-LOC fell-3SG  
'(They) shot a bird and it fell to the ground.'

Sentence (21) is felt to be inappropriate without the demonstrative pronoun \textit{az} in the second clause to clarify what fell; the indefinite nominal referred to in the first clause ('a bird') does not command enough 'attention' for it to control the second clause. But the definite nominal in (12) (\textit{a madarat}), by contrast, is central enough to the event to control the second clause. Thus even though the verb agreement and case marking may indicate an agentive subject, the definite direct object exhibits a relatively high degree of centrality and hence subjecthood.
Furthermore, middles in Hungarian are not necessarily semantically intransitive:

(3)    A klub fel-ép-ül-t.
The club up-build-INTR-PAST
'the club has got built.'

(35)   A könyv meg-ír-ód-ott.
The book PERF-write-INTR-PAST
'the book has been written.'

(28)   El-gyeng-ül-t (a torna-tól).
PERF-weak-INTR-PAST (the exercise-INST)
'she became weak (by the exercise).' 

(36)   Meg-sér-ül-t (a kést-öl).
PERF-hurt-INTR (the knife-INST)
'he got hurt (by the knife).' 

Sentences (3) and (35) have subjects which cannot possibly be interpreted as the literal agents of the verbs. As (28) and (36) show, middles can co-occur with instrumental agents; the suggested semantic transitivity of (28) and (36) is underscored by the possibility of active counterparts with the instruments as subject/agent:

(37)    A kés sértette meg.
The knife wounded-PERF
'the knife wounded him.'

(38)    A torna el-gyeng-ít-ette.
The exercise PERF-weak-TRANS-PAST
'the exercise weakened her.'

The relative centrality of the patient nominal in Hungarian 'intransitive' and impersonal constructions is more
clearly revealed by adding further context to the clauses in question. Consider (39)-(41):

(39)  
A klub-ot fel-épít-ett-ék...
The club-ACC up-build-PAST-3PL/OBJ
'(They) built the club...

  a. és igen jól sikerül-t
  and indeed well succeeded-3SG
  'and (it) turned out very well.'

  b. és igen jó munká-t végezt-ek.
  and indeed good job-ACC did-3PL
  'and (they) did a very good job.'

In (39a), the elided subject of the 3SG 'succeed' is klub. In (b), the elided subject of végezetek is 'they' (presumably the construction workers). Here the perception of centrality is divided between the patient klub and the unnamed agent, as we can see from the fact that either of the following clauses is appropriate. We might say that the subject of (39a) is 'club' and the subject of (39b) is 'they'. But if the intransitive felépült is used in place of the impersonal felépítették, this flexibility is lost:

(40) a. A klub fel-épül-t és igen jól sikerül-t.
The club up-build/INTR-PST and EMPH well succeeded-3SG
'The club is built and (it) turned out very well.'

  b. *A klub fel-épül-t és igen jó munká-t végezt-ek.
  EMPH good job-ACC did-3PL
  'The club is built and (they) did a very good job.'
In the initial clause in (40), any notion whatsoever of an agent of 'build' is lost (notice that although the event type may theoretically be transitive, the verb is grammatically intransitive); thus (40b) fails unless an explicit agent nominal is introduced:

\[
\text{c. ... és a munkások ilyen jó munká-t végezt-ek.}
\]
\[
\text{the workers EMPH good job-ACC did-3PL}
\]
\[
\text{'The club is built and the workers did a very good job.'}
\]

A similar if somewhat subtler distinction is seen in (41):

\[
\text{(41) a. A disznó fel van hizlal-va.}
\]
\[
\text{The pig up is fatten-ADV}
\]
\[
\text{'The pig is fattened up.'}
\]

\[
\text{b. A disznó-t fel-hizlalt-ák.}
\]
\[
\text{The pig-ACC up-fatten-3PL/OBJ}
\]
\[
\text{'(They) have fattened the pig.'}
\]

The difference between (41a) and (b) lies in the point of view the speaker wishes to take. An appropriate context for (a) would be one in which the pig is ready to slaughtered and consumed, as just before a banquet. Sentence (b), on the other hand, might be spoken by a sympathetic and apprehensive father explaining to his little boy what has happened to the boy's pet pig. The speaker wishes to downplay the pig and shift the responsibility for its fate to the unspecified
agent, in contrast to (a), in which the pig is focussed on as the centerpiece of the upcoming banquet.

The ease with which patients (definite direct objects) acquire subject properties (centrality) and the fact that even semantically transitive event types do not require an agent as subject indicate that Hungarian does not organize subject selection according to transitivity relations. As we saw in 4.3, the correlation of agentivity and subjecthood is comparatively low in Hungarian—too low for agenthood to constitute a basic 'default' choice of subject.

There are some verbs in Hungarian which cannot take grammatically intransitive forms. These appear to include event types which have very high semantic transitivity, such as meggyilkolni 'kill' and megfojtani 'strangle'. Where above we saw a contrast between the intransitive and the impersonal transitive constructions, with these verbs, there is no such alternative:

\[42\] A férfi-t meg-gyilkolt-ák.
The man-ACC PERF-kill-3PL/OBJ
'(They) killed the man/The man was killed.'

\[43\] Ön-gyilkos lett.
self-killer became
'He committed suicide.'

Apparently meggyilkolni 'kill' cannot take a patient as subject as the verbs for 'build' and 'write' and others can,
even in a reflexive sense; cf. (43). The verb megfojtani 'strangle' has similar restrictions:

(44) a. (A kígyó) megfojtja a férfi-t.
(The snake) strangles the man-ACC
'The snake is strangling the man.'

b. Megfojt-ják.
strangle-3PL/OBJ
'(?They) are strangling (him).

Sentence (44a) might be the answer to the questions 'What's happening?' or 'What's the snake doing?', while (44b) answers the question 'What's happening to the man? (He's getting strangled.)' Even if both the speaker and hearer can see one particular snake strangling the man, the answer to 'What's happening to the man?' is (44b), the 3PL impersonal. With this event type, again, the patient cannot assume the centrality expressed by appearance as grammatical subject. It is worth while to note that the semantically transitive verbs that we have seen that are compatible with grammatical intransitivity are frequently those which imply a tangible result: building something (A klub felépült), writing something (A könyv megíródott), fattening something (A disznó fel van hízlal-va). Although this pattern is not absolute, it recalls the patient focus associated with perfective aspect which we saw for Russian in Chapter 3.

It is clear from our discussion that Hungarian, like Bella Coola, has a highly flexible system for indicating which
participant in the clause is the 'center of attention' or the most central participant to the proposition, and that this system is not based on primacy of the agent role (as it is in Russian, for example). However, whereas Bella Coola has a grammatical marker ־m-, which when attached to a verb alters that verb's basic participant schema, in Hungarian there is no basic participant schema for many verbs—recall the double base system and the complex system of lexical derivation of causatives, transitives, intransitives, mediopassives, etc. Evidently the participant roles are evaluated separately for each event rather than 'replayed' according to a default scheme. This also precludes the appearance of a set, grammaticalized derivational marker for voice, since if there is no sense of 'basicness', there can be no coherent opposing derivation. Hungarian's fundamental neutrality in the area of verbal semantics and its concomitant lack of influence by the semantics of agents or patients (cf. Russian and Japanese) provide a clear example of voice organization based on the cognitive principle of relative centrality to event.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 4

Hungarian glossary to accompany Figure 4.1

főz to cook (tr.)
búj-tat to hide
úsz-tat to swim (tr.)
zavar-ödik to become turbid
csuą-ödik to close (intr.)
hull to fall
hull-ajt to let s.t. fall
ször to sprinkle (tr.)
szór-ödik to sprinkle (intr.)
kopık to wear off (intr.)
kop-tat to wear off (tr.)
nyü to wear down (tr.)
nyűv-ödik to be worn down
jut to come to/get to
jut-tat to get s.t. to
ad to give
ad-atik to be given
fak-ad to spring forth
fak-aszt to make spring forth
sü-1 to bake (intr.)
sü-t to bake (tr.)
rep-ü1 to fly (intr.)
rep-it to let fly
tart to last (intr.)
 to hold (tr.)
cáfol to flout (intr.)
 to flout (tr.)
 fog to lessen
fogy-at-kozik to lessen
fogy-at-koz-tat to use up
CHAPTER 5

VOICE, ASPECT AND MODALITY IN ENGLISH

5.0 Introduction

The presentation of voice phenomena in the preceding chapters might give the impression that voice is to be treated as a wholly self-contained semantic subsystem with little involvement in other areas of the grammar and semantics. This is certainly not the case. The goal of the present chapter is to examine the related areas with which voice in English interacts as well as to identify the overarching semantics which defines this interaction. Therefore, we will not attempt to give a comprehensive account of the voice system of English (the be-passive in particular having been scrutinized sufficiently in the last decades) but will instead focus on a neglected area which turns out to be particularly illuminating of these 'interfaces': the various constructions built around get: the get-passive (as in Igor got fired), get as a copula (She got mad), the get-causative (as in Igor got him to put down the gun), and the get-permissive (as in Igor got to go to California). The behavior of get is interesting for several reasons. First of all, in the passive construction it provides a vivid contrast to the auxiliary be, a contrast which has been acknowledged in the literature (Jespersen 1933; Poutsma 1929; Hatcher 1949; Chappell 1980) but not fully analyzed. Additionally, get (like have) serves to express
certain voices in English such as causative and permissive in a semi-lexical fashion. Finally, the behavior of get highlights the involvement of the categories of aspect and modality in English voice through its distinctive semantics.

5.1 Characteristic approaches to the English passive

Before we begin the discussion of the get-constructions, it will be useful to review the be-passive and its standard treatments in the literature. Jespersen (1933:120-1) is perhaps the most widely cited and widely accepted authority on the semantic and pragmatic functions of the English passive. He proposes the following five basic motivations for its use:

1. To avoid mentioning an unknown or awkward subject
2. To suppress mention of a 'self-evident' subject
3. To avoid mentioning the subject out of tact or politeness
4. To express greater interest in the patient
5. To facilitate syntactic operations such as clause conjunction or reflexivization

The validity of these five basic passive functions has not been seriously challenged or refuted since Jespersen suggested them, although they have been reformulated and re-presented subsequently. For example, Shibatani's (1985; see also our discussion in Chapter 1) claim that passives in all languages are essentially agent-demoting corresponds to (1), (2), and (3) above, while Perlmutter and Postal's (1977; see also Chapter 1) claim that passives are essentially patient-
promoting corresponds to (4), although perhaps without the pragmatic overtones suggested by the phrase 'express greater interest'. Zandvoort (1966:53) takes the demotional view (1, 2, 3) of the English passive: 'The passive is especially used in sentences in which it is unnecessary or undesirable to mention the agent.'

These accepted functions of the English passive—demotion of agent, promotion of patient, and enabling of syntactic operations concerning subjects—indicate a conception of the passive's raison d'être as being essentially pragmatic in nature and not semantic; in other words, the passive preserves the propositional meaning of the active counterpart while simply focussing or defocussing a particular participant. A typical example of this pragmatic view on the passive is the statement by Quirk et al. (1985:160) that 'although the corresponding active and passive sentences appear to be radically different, the relations of meaning between their elements remain the same'. Bolinger (1977) is one of the few to suggest an alternative, semantic interpretation of the passive's meaning. Basing his conclusions on the behavior of phrasal verbs under passivization, he argues that the passive indicates not just a focussing or defocussing of a participant, but a particular propositional meaning implying that the subject is 'totally affected' as a consequence of the

'They do, however, recognize that the passive can induce a change in propositional meaning when negatives and quantifiers are involved.'
event. This semantic criterion of total affectedness may indeed be part of the semantics of the passive in English as we will see below. However, we accept as a given the established view that (given the fixed word order of English) one of the more important functions of the passive is to provide a means of pragmatically focussing a non-agent or defocussing an agent, and will turn our attention in this chapter to other, less-explored areas of English voice.

5.2 Get as a passive auxiliary

It might be argued that get's behavior is not really relevant to the issue of grammatical voice, since get may be considered to be merely a different lexeme from be, and not to represent an inflectional distinction (C. F. Hockett, p.c.). But actually the grammatical status of get as a passive auxiliary is ambiguous. On the one hand, by any of the standard tests (cf. Quirk et al. 1985:121-6) for behavior as an auxiliary, get fails. It cannot precede a negator (She was not fired v. *She got not fired); it cannot contract with a negator (*gotn't); it cannot undergo subject/operator inversion (*Got she fired?); it cannot occur in pre-adverbial position (*She got never fired), etc. Quirk et al. (1985:136) describe a category of 'verbs of intermediate function' containing central and marginal modals, modal idioms, semi-auxiliaries, and catenatives. Get plus past participle is included under the heading of catenatives, together with
appear, seem, fail when these are followed by an infinitival phrase. But it is quickly noted that get does not behave entirely like the other members of this category (1985:146):

The importance of the problem appeared/came/seemed to be realized by Sam.
*The importance of the problem got to be realized by Sam.

Nor is get a modal, since it does not behave like a true auxiliary and furthermore does not have an invariant shape across person and number (I can; he can; I get; he get-s). Yet get has undeniable parallels with the be auxiliary in acting as the finite operator of the past participle in the passive construction. Furthermore, whether get is considered to be 'merely' lexical or not, it is integral to several constructions (passive, causative, permissive) whose analogues in other languages are expressed by grammatical voice. Therefore, although we recognize the lexical argument, the syntactic and semantic behavior of get strongly indicate that it does express voice distinctions in English, whether in an overtly grammatical way or not.

5.3 Approaches to the get-passive

The get-passive, where it has been acknowledged, has provoked a great deal of discussion as to its semantic nuances (in contrast to the be-passive). Older works (Jespersen 1933, Poutsma 1926 inter alia) characterize get as strongly
colloquial and inappropriate to standard written speech. *Get* has probably gained more acceptance since the writing of those works over fifty years ago but is still informal. Although some writers (e.g. Chappell 1980) have completely dismissed the colloquial aspect of *get*, it is not entirely irrelevant to the discussion of the passive, since the formal-informal distinction does come into play with certain collocations, for example *be eulogized* vs. *?get eulogized*, or *?be ripped off last night* vs. *get ripped off last night*.

More important for the present discussion, however, is what these grammarians and others have said about the aspectual features of *get*. Jespersen (1933:4.108) classifies *get* and *become* as 'auxiliaries for the passive of becoming' and notes that 'with some verbs the distinction between them and *be* is particularly useful (as in *was/got married*). Poutsma (1926:1.11, 1.30) states that 'to *get* is...found to express both gradual and sudden change... it often implies the overcoming of some difficulties' and 'When connected with a past participle to *get* is apt to lose its character of a copula and assume a function which differs from that of to *be* as an auxiliary of the passive voice. The altered function of to *get*...postulates a change in the grammatical function of the participle, which, from being mainly adjectival, becomes almost purely verbal.' Zandvoort (1966:55) also casts *get* in aspectual terms: 'the difference between to *get* and to *become* as auxiliaries of the passive may be expressed by the terms...
'perfective' and 'durative'," and Quirk et al. (1985) classify get as specifically a 'dynamic conclusive verb', that is, one for which the event denoted results in a change of some sort and for which a resultative interpretation is possible. The following examples (not all necessarily true passives) emphasize the aspectual facet of get:

I'm completely confused. (Quirk et al. 1985:161)

I'm getting completely confused, as well.

It is not quite two years since we got to be friends. (Poustma 1929:13)

When I got to be a man and lost my illusions. (ibid.)

Another of our new cups got broken last night. (Zandvoort 1966:57)

Other, non-aspectual facets of get have been pointed out as well, in particular its so-called adversative/beneficial or affective connotations (Chappell 1980; Hatcher 1949; Lakoff 1971). Hatcher (1945:441) claims that the get-passive 'will be used for only two types of events--those felt as having either fortunate or unfortunate consequences for the subject.' R. Lakoff (1971) likewise interprets the get-passive as expressing especially positive or negative values but locates this judgment specifically in the speaker's attitude toward the event, not in the event. Both Hatcher and Lakoff suggest that part of the semantics of the get-passive consists of the notion that the subject was somehow responsible for inducing
the event (in contrast to the be-passive, in which the subject is felt to have 'no control' over the event's occurrence). Chappell (1980:445) considers largely the same issues as Hatcher and Lakoff and concludes that

The dichotomization of passive events into either fortunate or unfortunate and the possibility of making an inference of a negative or positive nature about the subject due to the latter's causal involvement are the features of the semantic structure of the get-passive that not only set it apart from the be-passive but also account for the emotive overtones that grammarians... incorrectly attributed to the colloquial nature of get.

Chappell proposes additional, secondary restrictions on the semantics of the get-passive without developing them fully or relating them to constructions other than the get-passive. For example, she claims (1980:421ff) that verbs of emotion and thought (love, like, consider, etc.) are not compatible with the get-passive; that get is not possible with verbs of 'spontaneous change' in conjunction with inanimate subjects (The windowpane got cracked); that the subject must be a 'pre-existing' and sentient entity (A baby got born on Christmas eve; Lord Mountbatten got buried in state); that the inchoative get should be distinguished from the passive auxiliary get since it has a 'one-argument semantic structure'; and finally that 'the notion of the speaker's causal involvement in the event is realized differently in the semantic structure of each get-passive' ('lients' is Chappell's notation for an unlikely utterance). Several of these
observations deserve fuller treatment (specifically those dealing with cognitive verbs and sentient subjects) and will be taken up below.

To summarize, the various approaches taken towards the *get*-passive (and towards *get* in other idiomatic constructions) can be classified into two basic groups: those focussing on the aspectual features of *get* and those focussing on the modal or quasi-modal features. As we will show below, it is the interaction of both of these domains together with voice that produces the particular semantics of the *get*-constructions.

5.4 Aspect

To see the influence of aspect in the *get*-constructions, we will examine *get* as a copula which can link subjects with predicate adjectives. *Get* as a copula with a participial predicate adjective can be distinguished from the *get*-passive by its ability to cooccur with adverbs of degree and intensity, such as

*Now don't get so excited.*
*He got completely entangled with his gun.*

In 5.2 we noted that many English grammarians, in particular Jespersen (1933), Poutsma (1926–9), Zandvoort (1966) and Quirk et al. (1985) have characterized the essence of *get* (in contrast to *be*) as denoting mutation, change, or
inception. The following examples are illustrative of this aspect of *get*:

(1) a. Deborah was really angry.
   b. Deborah got really angry.

(2) a. Jim and Chris were married.
   b. Jim and Chris got married.

(3) a. Anne Boleyn was divorced.
   b. Anne Boleyn got divorced.

(4) a. He was mysteriously entangled with his gun.
    b. He got mysteriously entangled with his gun.

(Poutsma 1926:11)

(5) a. I just want to be rid of this damn thing.
    b. I just want to get rid of this damn thing.

(6) a. *Now don't be excited.
    b. Now don't get excited.

(7) a. *Don't do that or Bill will be nervous.
    b. Don't do that or Bill will get nervous.

Looking at these examples, we see that a copular construction with *be* merely mentions that the subject is in a particular state, while one with *get* specifies the entrance into that state. The distinction can be made clearer by adding temporal adverbials of punctuality and iterativity to the above sentences or by putting them into imperative mood:

(8) a. Deborah was really angry all day long.
    b. *Deborah got really angry all day long.

(9) a. Jim and Chris were married last month.
    b. Jim and Chris got married last month.

(10) a. *Henry VIII was always being divorced.
    b. Henry VIII was always getting divorced.
(11) a. *Just when he was supposed to fire, he was entangled with his gun.
    b. Just when he was supposed to fire, he got entangled with his gun.

(12) a. ?Be rid of that filthy thing this second!
    b. Get rid of that filthy thing this second!

(13) a. ?The minute she walks into the room he's all excited/nervous.
    b. The minute she walks into the room he gets all excited/nervous.

Note that both (9a) and (b) are acceptable, but (a) is ambiguous: Jim and Chris could have already been married when the month began, or the ceremony could have been performed during that month. Sentence (b) on the other hand can have only the latter interpretation. The verb 'marry' seems to behave idiosyncratically when passivized.

The above examples demonstrate clearly that get is both dynamic (contrasting with the stative or non-specific be) and inceptive, marking the point of entrance into a state. This quality of inception of a state is characterized by Chung and Timberlake (1985:217) as exhibiting closure: 'Applied to states, closure implies a complete change of state, specifically inception rather than cessation. Thus, languages that have a morphological category (traditionally called perfective) to specify closure for processes often use the same category to signal inception of a state.'

While the inceptive is associated with the perfective as exemplifying 'closure', it should not be confused with
'resultative'. Quirk et al. (1985:207) state that what they call 'conclusive' verbs such as get 'allow a resultative interpretation of the perfective aspect... 'The weather has improved' implies that 'the weather is now better'. But the acceptability of the progressive with get as a copula:

(14) She's getting angrier and angrier.
(15) I'm getting confused.
(16) They're getting married this very minute.

shows that the get-inceptive requires only that the change-of-state have started to occur, not that it be complete.

5.5 Voice, transitivity, affectiveness, and modality

Our examination of the aspectual qualities of get has shown that an integral component of its meaning is the perfective of inception, or in Chung and Timberlake's terms, 'closure'. The perfective aspect has been shown to be associated with patient-oriented constructions (DeLancey 1982; Cooreman 1988; Davis and Huang 1989) such as the passive; cf. our discussion of Russian in Chapter 3. Additionally, Chung and Timberlake have tentatively suggested that there are correlations between perfective aspect ('closure') and deontic modality (modality of obligation and permission) (1985:256):

'Among the more interesting... interactions are two that we mention here. First, non-actual modality, and the deontic mode in particular, appears to induce perfective aspect more than does actual modality. For example,
Tagalog distinguishes perfective vs. imperfective aspect and realis v. irrealis mood (Schachter and Otanes 1972). The irrealis is used for ordinary future events... while the irrealis perfective is used for imperatives--that is, for deontic modality.'

This correlation between perfective aspect and deontic modality seems all the more likely when we extend the correlation to the notion of 'patient-oriented construction': the subjects of deontic clauses are controlled by outside forces (usually human); they are not 'free agents'. In this section we will show first of all how get-configurations, get-passives especially, are even more strongly associated with patient affectedness than regular passives; then we will establish get's involvement with deontic modality, and thus confirm get's overall function of expressing the high degree of 'patient-orientedness' suggested by the discussion on aspect.

5.5.1 Voice and transitivity

Bolinger (1977:77) claims that 'the English passive has established a semantic distinction for true transitivity' and that passives are not possible unless their subjects are 'true' patients. He demonstrates this with pairs such as

(17) a. My brother has lived in Chicago. (1977:68)
    b. ?Chicago has been lived in by my brother.
and

(18) a. They arrived at the house by five o'clock. (ibid.)
    b. The house was arrived at by five o'clock.

According to Bolinger, the passives here are unacceptable because the complements to the verbs \textit{live in} and \textit{arrive at} are not really affected by the actions of 'living in' and 'arriving at'. He goes on to note that 'patienthood' is not necessarily coded in the verbs themselves, but in the proposition, as various manipulations will show (1977:68):

'the conceptual difference between a true patient and a thing in space may show up through an association with mode [emphasis mine, CC]:

(19) a. Nobody is to camp beside this lake!
    b. This lake is not to be camped beside by anybody!
    ...

(20) a. You can't get to a place that far away in a short time.
    b. A place that far away can't be got to in a short time.

In (19b) camping is viewed as harming the lake. In (20b) the place is viewed as an objective to be taken.' (We will return to the role of modality below.)

Bolinger's observations on the transitivity features of the \textit{be}-passive can be extended to the \textit{get}-passive as well. However, in the case of the \textit{get}-passive, the condition of 'patient-affectedness' is even more crucial to the success of
the utterance; in other words, get-passives are more transitive semantically than be-passives. Not only must the patient be affected, it must be materially affected. Consider the following sentence pairs:

(21) a. Kathleen was fired from several jobs.
     b. Kathleen got fired from several jobs.

(22) a. Poor Donald was run over by a truck.
     b. Poor Donald got run over by a truck.

(23) a. Manolo was kicked out of the house by his girlfriend.
     b. Manolo got kicked out of the house by his girlfriend.

(24) a. Oriane was elated by the announcement.
     b. ?Oriane got elated by the announcement.

(25) a. Gorbachev was applauded for his stirring speech.
     b. ?Gorbachev got applauded for his stirring speech.

(26) a. Odette was loved by all.
     b. ?Odette got loved by all.

(27) a. I was absolutely stunned by that last bit of information.
     b. ?I got absolutely stunned by that last bit of information.

(28) a. He was warned several times by the principal.
     b. ?He got warned several times by the principal.

These sentences illustrate that whereas the get-passive is frequently as acceptable as a be-passive (if not interchangeable with it), there are cases in which the get-passive is inappropriate. Note that the contrast in these cases is not related to the stative/active or punctual/durative aspectual parameters, since the be-passives,
which are associated with stativity and durative aspect, can nevertheless be modified by punctual adverbs such as suddenly, immediately, and instantly:

(29) Oriane was instantly elated by the announcement.
(30) Gorbachev was immediately applauded for his stirring speech.
(31) Odette was suddenly loved by all.

The difference between (24b)-(28b), which are unsuccessful, and (21b)-(23b) lies in the semantics of the main verb. Sentences (24)-(28) have verbs of emotion, thought and communication (elate, stun, warn, love, applaud), while (21)-(23) have prototypical action verbs (fire, run over, kick out). Chappell has shown as well that verbs of cognition and emotion are incompatible with the get-passive (1980:421):

(31) a. John was considered a fool/genius.
    b. ?John got considered a fool/genius.
    c. John got considered for that job.

(32) a. The CIA was believed to be the source of information.
    b. ?The CIA got believed to be the source of information.

Returning to our above examples (21)-(28), we can see that getting kicked out, fired or run over has a far more tangible effect on the patient than being warned, elated, etc. Note also that while the sentences with verbs of cognition,
emotion, and communication² are unacceptable or marginal with the more transitive get, the action verbs are acceptable with either get or be. This is also demonstrated by the greater acceptability of get considered in (31c): in this case, get considered has a specialized and more transitive meaning; it is not merely a paraphrase of believe or think about, it is an process undertaken by a committee or individual. It cannot be paraphrased by a 'pure' verb of cognition, as in *John was believed for that job, *John was thought for that job. Furthermore, to be considered for a position clearly has an impact on the patient.

A further piece of evidence indicating the greater semantic transitivity of get is the fact that get is syntactically transitive as well. The following pairs exemplify this transitivity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>get fired</th>
<th>be fired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>get someone fired</td>
<td>*be someone fired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get published</td>
<td>be published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get someone published</td>
<td>*be someone published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This correlation of higher semantic transitivity and higher syntactic valence was established for the Japanese affective

²Philip Davis (p.c.) comments that certain verbs of communication are more comfortable with get than are those of emotion and thought. Cf. The story got reported first by NBC; I got told that rumor last week; His appeal finally got heard by the Supreme Court, all of which are acceptable.
passive in Chapter 2. We will look at further parallels between the two construction types below.

We have established that some event types are incompatible with get-passives because of their low transitivity/patient-affect value. But many event types are compatible with either a be-passive or a get-passive. Bolinger's observation (cited above) that the transitivity lies not in the verb itself but in the event or propositional semantics and pragmatics comes into play here. A verb can take either get or be as its passive auxiliary depending on the degree of transitivity to be communicated or alternatively on whether or not the speaker wishes to emphasize or downplay the affectedness of the patient. Some additional examples will help illustrate:

(33) a. Minnie's being petted.
    b. Minnie's getting petted.

(34) a. David's being yelled at.
    b. David's getting yelled at.

(35) a. She was kissed by Mel Gibson.
    b. She got kissed by Mel Gibson.

The meaning difference between these get and be pairs as well as those already presented above ([21]-[28]) is usually described as being one of adversative or beneficial semantics (Hatcher 1949; Lakoff 1971; Chappell 1980). Chappell (1980:445) attributes this affective factor of the get-passive to the subject's responsibility ('causal involvement') for the
event's occurrence claiming the get-passive is not possible in situations where 'the [subject's] ability to prevent misfortune is not brought into question, and because of this, the subject is considered to be totally passive.' She uses the following examples to support her claim (1980:425):

(36) a. Half the population of Kampuchea (was/§got) systematically annihilated under the Pol Pot regime.

(37) a. Vietnamese women and children (were/§got) massacred in the My Lai offensive.

(38) a. 'Women, especially black activists, have uncovered countless stories of Aboriginal women who (were/§got) sterilized without their consent or knowledge.' (WAAC newsletter, 1978)

(39) The platoon (was/§got) ordered to march.

(40) Seven slaves (were/§got) bought.

The first three examples are incompatible with get not, as Chappell claims, because the subject is an innocent victim, but because of the news-media register that they are written in and its aversion to the more colloquial get. This aversion is a form of the (mild) taboo on casting events as highly transitive in polite speech and/or high register; in

---

³Philip Davis (p.c.) attributes the contrasts cf (36-38a) and (36-38b) to a 'certain "out of control spontaneousness" to get', citing contrasting examples in which get is incompatible with planned, deliberate action: They got laughed at/*They got respected; They got lost/*They got discovered. This explanation does not hold, however, for sentences such as His appeal finally got heard by the Supreme Court or That story got reported first by NBC.
other words, this aversion is euphemistic. Paraphrasing the sentences in colloquial speech with get clearly shows that the infelicity of the above is due to register and not to participant semantics:

(36) b. Half the people in Kampuchea got wiped out under the Pol Pot regime.

(37) b. A lot of Vietnamese women and children got killed in the My Lai massacre.

(38) b. A lot of Aboriginal women got sterilized without knowing it.

One would hardly claim that in the paraphrases (36b)-(38b) the subjects are to be perceived as responsible for their fate. The infelicity of the other two examples (≠The platoon got ordered to march and ≠Seven slaves got bought) is once again attributable to the fact that the events are not sufficiently transitive—the subjects are not materially affected by these abstract occurrences. The source of the 'responsibility' overtones in the get-passive is probably more the resonance from the causative get than anything in the inherent semantics of the get-passive:

(41) Kathleen got fired today.
(42) Nicole got Kathleen fired today.
(43) Kathleen got herself fired today.

As far as the adversative and beneficial connotations go, Lakoff's (1971) observation that they lie in the speaker's
attitude 'good or bad' toward the events described is probably closer to the real situation. We have shown that the get-passive denotes higher transitivity, a more affected patient, than the be-passive. If this affectedness is perceived as positive in the eyes of the speaker, he/she can emphasize the affect by using the get-passive, in which case the semantics of the clause appears to be 'beneficial': *She got kissed by Mel Gibson.* If the affectedness is perceived as negative, the speaker may want to use the get-passive to highlight this situation (*Ooh gross! She got kissed by a monkey! Haha!* or use the be-passive as downplay it (*Well, actually, she was, er, kissed by a monkey*). Again, this is why the get-passive is not used in supposedly objective (newscasting) or euphemistic speech. The beneficial or adversative semantics is a result of the speaker's choice to either highlight or downplay the fact the subject's affectedness.

5.5.2 Get and modality

The get-passive exhibits the quasi-modal feature of affectiveness, but the more purely modal qualities of get are seen in the permissive and causative. The get-permissive is a deontic modal par excellence, as we can see from comparing it to other modals and permissives:

(44) He can go, but I can't.
(45) How come he always gets to go, and I don't?
(46) How come you always let him go and not me?
(47) How come you always allow him to go and not me?
The most striking thing to be observed about these three types of permissives (45)-(47) is that the get-permissive is the only one in which the target of permission is the grammatical subject of the sentence. Let, which takes a bare-stem infinitive complement, and allow, which takes a to-infinitive complement, both require that the target of permission be the direct object of the matrix clause. Not only is the target of permission the subject, but a source of permission cannot even be identified in the get-permissive.

(48) *How come John always gets him to go and I don't?
(49) *How come he always gets to go by mom and I don't?

The source of the permission is intangible--fate, if anything. At this point, we can mention the influence of yet another sense of get: that of 'receive', as in I got fifteen Valentines this year, in which the subject is a recipient, not an actor. It would appear, then, that this get-permissive is the closest thing English has to the dative impersonals in Russian, such as Мне хочется есть 'I feel like eating' and Мне приходится уйти 'I have to go.' (Note also the interesting relationship between the two modal senses of have and get, the former expressing obligation and the latter expressing permission.)

The close association of causative and permissive constructions has been discussed extensively in the literature, especially by Comrie (1975; 1976c; 1985).
According to Comrie (1985), the reason for this interaction is the relative amount of control over the event's occurrence exerted by the causer over the doer. He distinguishes between three types of causation, analytic or syntactic, in which the notion of causation is expressed by the formation of a complex sentence in which one clause realizes the causing and another clause realizes the event caused; morphological, in which a derivational morpheme is added to the event predicate to express causation; and lexical, in which case the lexeme itself contains the notion of causation. Analytic systems in his view generally have distinct predicates for causation proper and permission, and English is classified as having this type of system, with the causative predicates make and cause and permissive predicates let and allow, whereas in morphologically-causative systems such as Georgian, the same morpheme is frequently used to express both causation and permission. By this schema, the get-permissive and get-causative (Igor got him to put down the gun) would appear to fall more into the morphological type of system rather than the analytic which he posits for English, since the same predicate is used to express both permission and causation. Considering get's status as a semi-auxiliary as well, this analysis is even more likely. Comrie uses the analytical-morphological-lexical schema to predict the 'directness' of causation (1979:165): 'the continuum from analytic to morphological to lexical causative correlates with the
continuum from less direct to more direct causation.' So by this correlation, if we analyze get as a morphological causative formant, it should fall somewhere in the middle between direct and mediated causation. Our intuitions about get suggest that this is correct, as get differs from make, cause, and have in having a meaning of 'induce' rather than 'force' or 'achieve'. The OED defines this sense of get as 'To induce, prevail upon (a person)...to cause or set (a person) to do something for one.' More evidence of this indirect or attenuated causation of get can be found in its behavior with reflexives:

(50) a. She got fired by the boss.
    b. She got fired by herself.
    c. She fired herself.
    d. She got herself fired.
    e. ?She got herself fired by the boss.

Note that the get-passive (50b) does not mean the same thing as (50a); 'herself' is not the direct agent of firing. The contrast between active (c) and the causative (d) also suggests that 'she' is not the immediate agent of the firing in the causative. Sentence (e) is odd but not ungrammatical, and its ability to tolerate two 'agents' (if somewhat marginally), implies that neither one has full control over or responsibility for the action.

Another measure of the strength of the influence of the causer over the causee is suggested by Givón (1980). His
'binding hierarchy' proposes a means of predicting the syntactic structure of the complement to the verb of causation from the degree of 'binding' or strength of influence exerted by the causer over the causee: 'The higher a verb is on the binding scale, the less would its complement tend to be syntactically coded as an independent/main clause' (1980:337). The position on the binding scale is also loosely correlated with implicativeness (i.e., whether the semantics of the verb implies that the action is actually completed rather than only attempted), so that verbs with a high position on the binding scale usually (but not always) imply success of the intended manipulation. His claim for English is that 'make', 'have', and 'cause' will occupy points along the binding scale in the order just given, with 'make' being more implicative than 'have' and 'have' more implicative than 'cause', and that these observations are validated by the syntactic behavior of their complements (1980:337; his numbers):

Thus, 'make' and 'have' take the naked-stem form of the verb/complement...while 'cause' takes the to-\text{infinitive} complement:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(58a)] She made him work hard.
\item[(58b)] She had him work hard.
\item[(58c)] She caused him to work hard.
\end{enumerate}

Further, 'make', the highest on the scale, can almost affect predicate-raising of its complement verb, at least marginally, while with 'have' and 'cause' the same type of construction sounds much worse...:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(59a)] He made appear on the scene two dancing images.
\end{enumerate}
(59b) *He had appear on the scene two dancing images.
(59c) *He caused appear on the scene two dancing images.

Finally, 'cause', the lowest of the three on the binding scale, may take complement types in which the embedded agent/subject is not even raised to be a surface object of 'cause', as in:

(60a) The typhoon caused the city's instant destruction.
(60b) *The typhoon made the city's instant destruction.
(60c) *The typhoon had the city's instant destruction.

Givón does not discuss the behavior of get as a verb of manipulation. By his semantic criteria, it would most likely occupy a place between 'have' and 'cause' on the scale MAKE>HAVE>CAUSE, since it implies less agent-control than 'have', yet is more intentional than 'cause', which can be used for inadvertent acts. The predictions thus implicit for the syntax of the complement clause appear to be borne out, since the complement clause for get takes a to-stem infinitive:

(51) She made him do it.
(52) She had him do it.
(53) She got him to do it.
(54) She caused him to do it.

When the complement clause is a transitive and passive, however, difficulties are encountered with the binding hierarchy:
(55) She made him be fired.
(56) She had him fired.
(57) She got him fired.
(58) She caused him to be fired.

Here, make should be lower on the binding hierarchy than have and get since its complement clause is less integrated into the matrix clause. Also, force, which should occupy a high place on the binding hierarchy by virtue of the strength of influence of the cause and implicativeness associated with it, occupies a very low position whether with an intransitive or transitive passive complement (She forced him to be fired; She forced him to do it).

A more interesting perspective on the nature of get with respect to other English causatives can be found when we modalize sentences by using try:

(59) a. She tried to get me to go.
     b. She tried to get me fired.

(60) a. She tried to have me go.
     b. She tried to have me fired.

(61) a. She tried to make me go.
     b. She tried to make me be fired.

(62) a. She tried to cause me to go.
     b. She tried to cause me to be fired.

(63) a. She tried to force me to go.
     b. She tried to force me to be fired.

The fact that get is the only verb which is compatible with both the intransitive and the transitive passive complements...
reinforces the indirect nature of the causation. With make and force, the manipulation must be exerted on the performer of the action. In other words, the direct object of the matrix clause must be identical with the agent of the lower clause; hence they are incompatible with the passive complements, which have patients as subject of the lower clause. Cause is inappropriate with both constructions presumably because of the intentionality expressed by try to conflicting with its 'unintentional' overtones. Only get and have are indirect enough in causation and yet intentional enough to tolerate a passive complement. (Recall the lack of a tangible source of control in the get-permissive, which shows up as well in the have of obligation: He has to go.)

This leaves only the question of why have is incompatible with the intransitive lower clause (60a), but get is not. Get in this case aligns with the other more transitive verbs make and force. The explanation is probably to be found in the semantic transitivity features of these verbs. As we showed at length above, get is a dynamic and semantically transitive verb, while have, on the other hand, is relatively more stative.

5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter we have seen how the behavior of constructions involving ... illustrates the interaction of voice and transitivity, aspect, and modality in English.
These interactions should not, however, be considered as specific to English. Our discussion of the Japanese affective passive in Chapter 2 shows some striking parallels between these two unrelated languages in the areas of voice and modality. Firstly, we showed that the distinctions between the plain and affective passives in Japanese can be explained by the differences in semantic (and syntactic) transitivity associated with each of them; now we have seen the same correlation for the English get and be passives, including the concomitant associations with beneficial and adversative semantics simultaneously. Secondly, recalling the non-passive uses of -(r)are in spontaneous and potential constructions, we see the strong influence of modality and aspect on the semantics of the related passive constructions:

(14) Boku wa nemur-are-nakatta.
I TOP sleep-RARE-NEG-FAST
'I couldn't sleep.'

(65) Mukasi ga sinob -are -ru.
Old.time NOM think.about-RARE-PRES
'An old time comes spontaneously to mind.'

We concluded in Chapter 2 that these expressions in Japanese realized a distinction between 'semantic' and 'pragmatic' voice, that the so-called affective and modal uses of -(r)are expressed voice distinctions that went beyond the selection of agent or patient as the grammatical subject of the sentence to further specify the semantics of the proposition. The same is
true for English, as we see from the get-passive. The be-passive may express the pragmatic focussing and defocussing as suggested by Jespersen and others. But the get-passive, while selecting a patient as subject like the be-passive, goes on to imply more about the patient, specifically that it was materially affected by the event: the get-passive encodes a more transitive event than the be-passive. This distinct semantics resonates strongly with deontic modality and perfective aspect (more specifically 'closure') to complete the sense of patient orientation associated with get. This particular correlation of voice, aspect, and modality carries with it a range of contingent semantic associations, including nuances of spontaneity, responsibility of the patient for its fate (in the get-passive and causative), adversity, benefit, etc., which are not necessarily in the semantics of the various get-constructions but 'around' them. The identification of the more general components of heightened transitivity, deontic modality, and perfective aspect of the get-constructions serves both to unite them semantically and to contrast them with their counterparts. This semantic coherence reveals a dimension of voice in English that has long been overlooked.
CONCLUSION

Our goal in this study as defined in Chapter 1 was to discover what voice is and how it works by identifying the overarching semantic principles motivating its expression. We assumed that voice was a mechanism for realizing participant-to-event semantics through subject selection. As we examined different languages, we saw that this general framework held up but was played out in different ways. As for the formal aspects, we encountered a wide range of devices, some of which have been largely ignored in studies of voice. This range included verbal voice inflection (as in the basic Japanese -(r)are construction), manipulations of gender and number agreement (the Russian and Hungarian impersonal constructions), the use of verbal derivational particles (Russian -sja), lexical derivation of verbs (Hungarian transitive and intransitive derivation), sentence derivation (periphrastic passives), and combinations of the above (English get-constructions). If we had taken the approach of limiting voice to a particular formal realization, such as verbal inflection or active-passive sentence derivation, as many previous treatments have, then not only would the investigation have been very dull, but it would also have been impossible to recognize the broader principles motivating voice.
As for these 'broader principles', we saw that these are not necessarily the same across languages, any more than is the formal expression of voice. Russian organizes its voice system by focussing on the 'participant end' of the participant-to-event base. Thus the particular participant-to-event relations expressed by subject selection in Russian involve subtle distinctions in the semantic features of the source/actor role. Hungarian, by contrast, leans toward the 'event' end, organizing subject selection according to how each event is evaluated and which participant in any given instance is most central to the proposition. In the comparison of the Russian and Hungarian systems, we discovered the importance of explicitly identifying the basic orientation of a language in terms of transitivity and of how events are conceptualized. The strong and consistent bias of Russian towards a transitive, actor-oriented conception of events enables a coherent and structured system of voice oppositions which articulates fine points of deviation from that norm. Hungarian on the other hand appears to have no a priori bias one way or the other as to how a proposition (as expressed by a verbal lexeme) should be cast; each particular event will be evaluated according to its own set of circumstances. The lack of a basic bias results in what appears to be a chaotic, unstructured voice system, and once again we are reminded of the importance of understanding a language's overall conceptualization of propositional structure. We have looked
at this conceptualization and its implications in depth for two languages (Russian and Hungarian—both of which are said to be of the 'accusative' type, although it might be disputed for Hungarian whether this is a useful description at all), and this is obviously only a first step. Many more languages of differing types should be examined—reexamined—to discover the principles underlying voice. Two very conspicuous areas include the so-called ergative languages (are they mirror images of accusative languages as far as voice organization is concerned?) and languages in which existence of a coherent 'subject' has been called into question (Philippine languages, for example, in which the traditionally recognized subject properties appear to be spread over two or more constituents).

What is the role of voice (understood as subject selection) in a language with no subject, if indeed there are such languages? Although our analysis of Hungarian nodded towards this issue, it deserves greater attention than we were able to devote to it here.

The influence of other areas of grammar and semantics was examined in the chapters on Japanese and English, where it was found that certain types of aspect and modality correlate with certain types of voice to express qualities such as patient-orientedness. It is as if these three areas of voice, aspect, and modality (and possibly others) converge to form a suite of semantic features modifying the proposition. We found perhaps only the tip of the iceberg in this study and suggest for
future research both a more extensive analysis of aspect and modality, as well as of pragmatic factors such as empathy, honorification, register, etc. And although we deliberately avoided extensive discussion of topicalization and pragmatic focussing, since these have been covered more than thoroughly in the literature on voice, their influence on voice should not be discounted.

Inasmuch as voice realizes shifting perspectives in the conceptualization of propositional structure, its semantics should be presumed to be universal. Whatever its formal realization, voice will play a role in all languages, and its study will provide further insights into the perception and representation of events.
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