Voicing Aktionsart

Alfredo García-Pardo (University of Southern California)

Goals: I argue that VoiceP cannot be considered independently of the inner aspect/*Aktionsart* of the VP it takes as a complement. I provide novel evidence from Spanish stative causative verbs and argue that the projection that introduces the external argument (EA) is key to calculating the overall *Aktionsart* of the predicate, contra the received view. I propose that a universal articulation for the VP as VoiceP > *init*P > *proc*P > *res*P best captures the facts for Spanish while also accounting for the behavior of EAs in other unrelated languages, as well as for the existing causative analyses of unaccusative verbs.

Setting the stage: A highly debated issue in the literature on the VP is how the EA is projected in the syntax, and how exactly it relates to the verb that it is a participant of. Kratzer (1996) proposed that EAs are introduced by a projection she labeled VoiceP, whose head takes a VP as a complement. In Kratzer's work, later to be followed by most researchers, Voice comes in flavors and assigns 'agent' or 'holder' roles depending on the *Aktionsart* of the VP (eventive or stative). Crucially, however, VoiceP and the EA do not affect the *Aktionsart* of the underlying VP in any way, only on its argument structure.

Many authors following Kratzer have argued that Voice^o does not inherently encode causative semantics that allow for a causer interpretation of the EA. Rather, there is a separate projection introducing a CAUSE relation between events which is syntactically distinct from VoiceP (CauseP for Pylkännen 2008; v_{CAUSE}P for Alexiadou et al. 2006; Schäfer 2008, a.o.).

Yet other authors (Hale & Keyser 1993; Ramchand 2008) have argued that this CAUSE relation between events is not encoded in a specific syntactic head, but rather, it is derived by combining two event-denoting, argument-introducing projections which are read off as causative from their syntactic contiguity (VP1 and VP2 for Hale & Keyser; *init*P and *proc*P/*res*P for Ramchand). In these accounts, the higher phrase introduces the EA and the causing eventuality, while the lower one introduces the internal argument and the caused eventuality.

New data: The above authors, however, have largely focused on eventive predicates, namely changeof-state verbs and, to a lesser extent, activities. Stative causative verbs in Spanish (e.g. the stative readings of verbs like *rodear* 'to surround', *cubrir* 'cover' and other stative verbs like *gobernar* 'govern' or *proteger* 'protect') have the particularity that their EA cannot be suppressed. They cannot participate in the transitive-unaccusative/(anti-)causative alternation (e.g. (1)), unlike activities and change-of-state verbs, which generally can (e.g. (2) for activities and (3) for change-of-state verbs).

(1)	a. Los expertos	{protegieron/	vigilaron/	rodearon/	habitaron}	la fábrica.
	the experts	protected	surveilled	surrounded	l inhabited	the factory
	'The experts {protected/ surveilled/ surrounded/ inhabited} the factory.'					
	b. *La fábrica{r	protegió/ vigil	ó/ rode	eó/ hab	oitó}.	

the factory protected surveilled surrounded inhabited 'The factory {protected/surveilled/surrounded/inhabited}.'

a. Pedro rodó el barril.	b. El barril rodó.			
Pedro rolled the barrel	the barrel rolled			
'Pedro rolled the barrel.'	'The barrel rolled.'			
a. María explotó el globo.	b. El globo explotó.			
María exploded the balloon	the balloon exploded			
'María exploded the balloon.'	'The balloon exploded.'			
	 a. Pedro rodó el barril. Pedro rolled the barrel 'Pedro rolled the barrel.' a. María explotó el globo. María exploded the balloon 'María exploded the balloon.' 			

Moreover, stative causative verbs allow *by*-phrases when they form adjectival passives (e.g. (4a)). This is unlike change-of-state verbs, for which *by*-phrases are very restricted in such constructions (e.g. (4b)).

- (4) a. La fábrica está {vigilada/ controlada/ rodeada} por los trabajadores. the factory is surveilled controlled surrounded by the workers 'The factory is {surveilled/ controlled/ surrounded} by the workers.'
 b. *El globo está {explotado/ pintado/ colgado} por Pedro. the balloon is exploded painted hanged by Pedro
 - 'The balloon is {exploded/ painted/ hanged} by Pedro.'

The proposal: I follow a first-phase syntax framework (Ramchand 2008), which assumes three syntactic projections that together build meaningful argument and event structures. Each projection denotes an eventuality and these are interpreted in a casual relationship from their syntactic contiguity. Such projections are: (*i*) *init(iation)*P: Introduces an EA and denotes a state; (*ii*) *proce(ess)*P: internal argument introducer, denotes a dynamic event; (*iii)* res(ult)P: also introduces an internal argument and denotes a state, interpreted as resultative by causative entailment. Ramchand (2008) derives activities and change-of-state predicates as in (5) and (6), respectively: activities are a dynamic event (*proc*P) and change-of-state verbs a dynamic event followed by a result state (*proc*P > *res*P). As shown in the examples, they can be transitive or unaccusative predicates: I argue that they are formed as in (7): *init*P is the causing state and *res*P is the caused state: *proc*P is absent and thus the eventuality is stative.

- (5) a. Intransitive activity: procP b. Transitive activity: initP > procP
- (6) a. Intransitive change of state: procP > resP b. Transitive change of state: initP > procP > resP
- (7) a. Stative causative (no intransitive version): initP > resP

From this architecture, it follows that *init*P, the EA-introducing argument projection, is crucial in deriving the Aktionsart typology. Therefore, accounts that simply introduce an EA and integrate it thematically with the rest of the VP (Kratzer 1996; Marantz 1997 et seq) miss this important generalization.

Recent work by Harley (2013) has convincingly argued, from data such as the interaction of applicatives and causatives and passives in Hiaki, that the EA is introduced in two steps: one projection (her vP) introduces it semantically, along with causative semantics, while other (her VoiceP) introduces it syntactically. Adapting this to my model, I posit that *init*P does not project a specifier, but it only introduces an EA semantically (along with a state argument which, in combination with *proc*P or *res*P, is interpreted as causative). Voice^o, I argue, takes *init*P (and only *init*P) as a complement. VoiceP can come in (at least two) flavors: active, in which case a full-fledged EA is introduced, or passive, in which case no EA is syntactically introduced and the semantic variable standing for the EA is existentially closed. The proposal is as in (8).

(8) VoiceP > *init*P > *proc*P/*res*P

On causative analyses of unaccusatives: This approach, note well, is compatible with proposals for change-of-state predicates that posit causative semantics in both transitive and unaccusative predicates, which have as their underlying goal to do away with the BECOME predicate and collapse it into a single CAUSE, understood as a relation between a process event and a result state). Alexiadou et al. (2006) notice that, while unaccusatives show that the EA is indeed missing (e.g. they do not accept *by*-phrases or purpose clauses, as in (9)), they nonetheless accept reflexive *by*-phrases and *from*-PPs introducing a cause (e.g. (10)), which means that there must be causative semantics at some level.

- (9) *The boat sank {by Bill/ to collect the insurance}.
- (10) The glass broke {by itself/ from the pressure}.

These facts are easily accounted for under a Ramchandian framework. Since the first-phase syntax subevents are semantically glued together by a generalized causation relation, it follows that an unaccusative change-of-state structure (procP > resP) will also be causative, and hence allow for the patterns in (10), which diagnose causation. However, the lack of *initP*, and hence the absence of an implicit EA in unaccusatives, disallows agent-oriented modifiers such as *by*-phrases and purpose clauses as in (9).

References: Alexiadou, A, E. Anagnostopoulou & F. Schäfer. 2006. The Properties of Anti- causatives Crosslinguistically. *Phases of Interpretation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter,187-211 • Hale, K. & Keyser, Samuel J. 1993. On argument structure and lexical expression of syntactic relations. *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 53-109 • Harley, Heidi. 2013. External arguments and the Mirror Principle: On the distinctness of Voice and v. *Lingua*, 34–57 • Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from the verb. *Phrase structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109-37 • Marantz, Alec. 1997. No Escape From Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 200-225*, vol. 4 • Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing Arguments*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT • Ramchand, Gillian C. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: