

# On Voice

Dalina Kallulli & Ian Roberts

University of Vienna

University of Cambridge

[dalina.kallulli@univie.ac.at](mailto:dalina.kallulli@univie.ac.at)

[igr20@cam.ac.uk](mailto:igr20@cam.ac.uk)

## 1. Introduction

### Basic observations ...

Voice-related syncretisms:

- What counts as a ‘passive’ form does not exclusively correspond to passive syntax the way this phenomenon is described for languages like English or German, i.e., ‘passive’ form does not entail ‘passive’ syntax:

(1) a. *Auctor opus laudat.* (Ov. Pont. 3, 9, 9)

author<sub>NOM</sub> work<sub>ACC</sub> praise<sub>3S,PR,ACT</sub>  
‘The author praises (his) work.’

b. *Laudatur Apronius a Trimarchide.* (Cic. Verr. 2, 3, 155)

praise<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Apronius<sub>NOM</sub> from Trimarchides<sub>ABL</sub>  
‘Apronius is praised by Trimachides.’

(2) *Africano illi superiori coronam sibi in convivio ad caput adcommodanti,  
cum ea saepius **rumperetur**,* (Cic. de orat. 2, 250)

while it<sub>NOM,F,SG</sub> many.times break<sub>3S,SUBJ,IPFV,NACT</sub>

P. Licinius Varus: “noli mirari” inquit “si non convenit; caput enim magnum est!”.  
‘While Africanus, during the dinner, was putting back again on his own head the crown, since it (the crown) kept on breaking, P. Licinius Varus said: “You shouldn’t wonder that it doesn’t fit. In fact, you have a big head!”’

(3) *Abditur Orion.* (Cic, Arat. 462, 26)

hide<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Orion  
‘Orion hides himself.’

- (4) a. *Fëmija po lahet.* (Albanian)  
 child.the<sub>NOM</sub> PROG wash.NACT,PR,3S  
 (i) 'The child is washing itself.' → reflexive  
 (ii) 'The child is being washed.' → passive
- b. *To agori plithike (mono tu ) / (apo ti mitera tu).* (Greek)  
 the boy washed.NACT,3S (alone his) / (by the mother his)  
 (i) 'The boy washed himself.' → reflexive  
 (ii) 'The boy was washed (by someone).' → passive
- (5) a. *Vazoja \*(u) thye.<sup>1</sup>* (Albanian)  
 vase.the<sub>NOM</sub> NACT broke<sub>AOR,3S</sub>  
 (i) 'The vase broke.' → anticausative  
 (ii) 'The vase was broken.' → passive
- b. *To grama kaike / \*ekapse.* (Greek)  
 the sheet burned.NACT,3S / burned.ACT  
 (i) 'The sheet burned.' → anticausative  
 (ii) 'The sheet was burned.' → passive
- Moreover, in Latin/Albanian/Greek the *by*-phrase diagnostic cannot be applied to distinguish between passives and anticausatives because it also means *from* (i.e. it may also introduce the external cause of an event); see (1b) & (6):
- (6) a. *Anna u dogj nga dielli mbi urë.* (Albanian)  
 Anna NACT burnt<sub>AOR,3S</sub> by/from sun.the on bridge  
 (i) 'Anna burned from the sun on the bridge.'  
 (ii) 'Anna was burned by the sun on the bridge.'
- b. *To grama kaike apo ti fotia.* (Greek)  
 the sheet burned.NACT by/from the fire  
 (i) 'The sheet burned from the fire.'  
 (ii) 'The sheet was burned by the fire.'
- Similar syncretisms in languages with no fully-fledged voice paradigms:
- (7) a. *Martina \*(si) guarda allo specchio.* (Italian)  
 Martina REFL,3 watches in-the mirror  
 'Martina watches herself in the mirror.' → reflexive
- b. *Lamela \*(si) mangerà domani.*  
 the apple REFL,3 eat.3S,FUT tomorrow  
 'The apple will be eaten tomorrow.' → passive

<sup>1</sup> Albanian employs three distinct means with a fixed distribution to build the non-active paradigm: affix, (4a), clitic, (5a), and auxiliary choice ('to be'). The distribution of non-active realization follows the pattern in (i):

- (i) **If** the clause contains Perfect: (Kallulli & Trommer 2011: 284)  
 express non-active by choice of the auxiliary  
**Else: If** the clause contains Tense but not Aspect or Admirative:  
 express non-active by an inflectional affix  
**Else:** express non-active by a clitic

- c. *Lo specchio \*(si) è rotto.*  
the mirror REFL,3 is.3S broken  
'The mirror has broken.'  
→ anticausative
- (8) a. *Ralf rasiert \*(sich).* (German)  
Ralf shaves REFL,3  
'Ralf is shaving/shaves (himself).'
- b. *Dieser Roman liest \*(sich) gut.*  
this novel reads REFL,3 well  
'This novel reads well.'  
→ middle
- c. *Die Tür öffnete \*(sich).*  
the door opened REFL,3  
'The door opened.'  
→ anticausative
- Moreover, both language types contain a class of verbs where the special morphology doesn't bear on argument-structure alternations; hence, the ungrammaticality of (10b), (12b), (14b) must be due to a theta-criterion violation:
- (9) a. *Martina si lava.* b. *Martina lava la camicia.* (Italian)  
Martina REFL,3 washes Martina washes the shirt  
'Martina washes herself.' 'Martina washes the shirt.'
- (10) a. *Martina si arrabbia spesso.* b. *\*Martina arrabbia spesso Piero.* (Italian)  
Martina REFL,3 angers often Martina angers often Piero  
'Martina often gets angry.'
- (11) a. *Martina wäscht sich.* b. *Martina wäscht das Hemd.* (German)  
Martina washes REFL,3 Martina washes the shirt  
'Martina washes herself.' 'Martina washes the shirt.'
- (12) a. *Ich schäme mich.* b. *\*Ich schäme dich / (die) Eva.* (German)  
I shame myself I shame you / (the) Eva  
'I am ashamed of myself.'
- (13) a. John washed (himself).  
b. John washed the child / us.
- (14) a. John behaved (himself) / \*us.  
b. \*John behaved the child.

Reuland (2009): "[s]omething special must be said about [the paradigm in (14a,b)]: Is it about binding or is it about argument structure?"

Question:

- What then is the role of the reflexive element in (10a), (12a), (14a)?

Answer (Kallulli 2013 et seq., to be revised below):

- the reflexive element is the counterpart of non-active or passive morphology in the class of verbs known from traditional grammars of Latin as ‘deponent’ verbs:

(15)		<u>Pres.act.</u>	<u>Pres.pass</u>	(Latin)
a. alternating		<i>am-ō</i> ‘I love’	<i>am-or</i> ‘I am loved’	
b. deponent	—		<i>hort-or</i> ‘I encourage’	
(16)	<u>Non-active</u>		<u>Active</u>	(Albanian)
a.	<i>dergjem</i> ‘I linger’		<i>a´.*dergj</i>	
b.	<i>përgjigjem</i> ‘I answer’		<i>b´.*përgjigj</i>	
c.	<i>krenohem</i> ‘I take pride in’		<i>c´.*krenoj</i>	
d.	<i>ligem</i> ‘I weaken’		<i>d´.*lig</i>	
e.	<i>pendohem</i> ‘I regret’		<i>e´.*pendoj</i>	
	...			

- The morphological expression of non-active varies but within bounds (NACT, REFL clitic/pronoun, auxiliary choice, ...), but indicates that non-active voice is a syntactic category
- Therefore, we may among other things expect null exponents, as in e.g. English:

(17) English has:

- No (verbal) clitic or affix in reflexives: *John likes himself.*
  - Null deponent marking on the verb: *John absented himself.*
  - No morphological marking of anticausatives: *John broke the vase. / The vase broke.*
  - No morphological marking of middles: *Bureaucrats bribe easily.*
- So, with the exception of the participial passive (see below), English has null exponence of NACT (cf. Keyser & Roeper 1984, 1992 on abstract clitics in English)

## ... and the basic contention

- We'll look at each construction type in turn, arguing that non-active features are systematically associated with Voice across all these systems, with differing morphological exponence:
  - Reflexives (including deponents)
  - Anticausatives
  - Middles
  - Participial passives

## 1. Reflexives

Question:

- Is (REFL/NACT) Voice always implicated in reflexivity?

Our contention:

- Yes, (REFL/NACT) Voice is always implicated in reflexivity

Reasons to think that Voice is implicated in reflexive constructions:

- Frequent cross-linguistic deployment of the same morphological markers for reflexives and voice alternations (see above)
- The “unaccusative analysis” of reflexives (Marantz 1984, Pesetsky 1995, Embick 2004 i.a.)
- Very similar locality conditions (explicitly, and slightly too strongly, captured by subjecting both reflexives and NP traces to Principle A of GB Binding Theory):

- (18) a. Mary was declared (Mary) bankrupt.  
 b. \*John was believed that (John) was bankrupt.  
 c. John was believed (John) to be bankrupt.  
 d. \*John was believed Mary to like (John).

- (19) a. Mary has declared herself bankrupt.  
 b. \*John believed that himself was bankrupt.  
 c. John believed himself to be bankrupt.  
 d. \*John believed Mary to like himself.

- Cross-linguistically common subject-orientation of reflexives, while voice-alternations always implicate subjects/external arguments
- Italian reflexive *si* merges in Voice, like non-active markers, and raises with the verb; the Latin non-active *-r* paradigms are naturally associated with Voice (however exactly the Latin verb is built, on which see Calabrese (2021)):

(20) a. *Gianni si ama / lava.* (Italian)  
 Gianni REFL love.3s / wash.3s  
 ‘Gianni loves/washes himself.’

b. *Abditur Orion.* (Latin)  
 hide<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Orion  
 ‘Orion hides himself.’

- SELF-anaphors on the other hand are merged as true arguments, i.e. XPs; note the complementarity of SI/NACT with SELF-anaphors however:

(21) a. *Beni po lan veten / Anën.* (Albanian)  
 Ben PROGwash<sub>ACT,PR,3S</sub> self<sub>ACC</sub> / Anna<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Ben is washing himself / Anna.’

b. \**Beni po lahet veten / Anën.* (Albanian)  
 Ben PROGwash<sub>NACT,3S</sub> self<sub>ACC</sub> / Anna<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Ben is washing himself / Anna.’

(22) a. *Gianni lava se stesso / Anna.* (Italian)  
 Gianni washes himself / Anna  
 ‘Gianni washes himself / Anna.’

b. *Gianni si lava (\*se stesso / Anna).* (Italian)  
 Gianni REFL,3 washes himself / Anna  
 ‘Gianni washes himself.’

(23) *John is washing himself / Anna.* (English)

### Our analysis:

(24) General cross-linguistic schema and dimensions of variation:

- [VoiceP [Voice REFL] ... [VP V IA-pronoun ]], where:
  - REFL is the Voice-feature which marks the predicate as reflexive (Reinhart & Reuland 1993), in the sense that reflexivity needs to be licensed
  - Cross-linguistic exponence of REFL: (affix, clitic BE, zero ...)
  - E.g., Albanian has all three, i.e., affix (4a), clitic (25a), BE (25b) (only the (i)-readings are relevant):

(25) a. *Beni \*(u) la.*  
 Ben NACT wash  
 (i) ‘Ben washed himself.’  
 (ii) ‘Ben was washed (by someone).’

b. *Beni ishte larë.*  
 Ben was washed  
 (i) ‘Ben had washed himself.’  
 (ii) ‘Ben had been washed (by someone).’

- English has zero exponence (cf. Keyser & Roeper 1984, 1992):  
 (26) John Ø loves/washes himself.

- REFL licenses IA-pron in all cases:

(27) a. *Gianni si ama pro.* (cf. (20a))  
 Gianni REFL love.3s  
 'Gianni loves himself.'

b. *Abditur Orion pro.* (cf. (20b))  
 hide<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Orion  
 'Orion hides himself.'

c. *John Ø hates himself.*

- Nature of IA-pron (*pro*, weak pronoun e.g. *sich*, special/body-part pronoun e.g. *X-self*, ...)

Questions bearing on variation:

- In (27), we see realisation of either licensor or licensee: can we have both?  
 E.g.:  
 (28) *John \*self-hates / ??self-promotes / ?self-nourishes / self-selected / self-harmed himself.*
  - If not, is this because it is dispreferred by morphological economy?
    - But in fact, we do find this pattern, e.g., *afto*-prefixation in Greek:  
 (29) *O Yanis afto-katastrafike.*  
 the Yani self-destroy.NACT,3SG  
 'Yani destroyed himself.'
- Can we have neither? E.g.:  
 (30) *John hates.* [Interpreted as: *John hates himself.*]
  - If not, is this because (30) is dispreferred by recoverability?

Analogy with clitic doubling, as in Sportiche (1996):

(31) [Cl OCL ] .... [VP V IA ]]

(32) Dimensions of variation:

- Exponence of OCL (clitic, affix, zero ...)
- Nature of IA (pronoun, specific DP, zero ...)
- Cross-linguistic preference for exponence of just OCL or IA but it's well-known that both can be realised (classical cases of clitic doubling); the neither option may be East-Asian style null objects (Huang 1984, Saito 2007)

Observation (cf. Anagnostopoulou & Everaert 1999: 102)

- Unlike Spanish, (33a), Greek and Albanian don't allow doubling of X-self with overt REFL but crucially, unlike in Spanish, there is clitic doubling, (32b,c):

- (33) a. *Fernando<sub>i</sub> se<sub>i</sub> / \*lo lava [a si mismo]<sub>i</sub>.* (Spanish)  
 Fernando REFL/CL washes a himself
- b. *Ben<sub>j</sub> e<sub>i/\*j</sub> do [veten<sub>i</sub> e vet<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub>.* (Albanian)  
 Ben CL(A) loves self.the(A) own  
 'Ben loves himself.'
- c. *[O Petros]<sub>j</sub> ton<sub>i/\*j</sub> agapai [ton eaf<sub>to</sub><sub>i</sub> tu<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub>.* (Greek)  
 the Petros CL(A) loves the self(A) his  
 'Petros loves himself.'

A uniform analysis for (33a,b,c):

- the REFL clitic in Spanish, Albanian *e* and Greek *ton* are (NACT) Voice with a REFL feature; this is compatible with:
  - **Woolford's (1999) argument**  
 Object agreement is incompatible with anaphors, unless the agreement is a special anaphoric form.
- English, which has no clitics (but see Keyser & Roeper 1984, 1992), could be:  
 (34) *John<sub>j</sub> likes  $\emptyset$ <sub>i</sub> [ his<sub>j</sub> self<sub>i</sub> ]<sub>i</sub>.*
- Taking stock, we revise (24) as (24'):  
 (24') [<sub>VoiceP</sub> [<sub>Voice</sub> REFL ] ... [<sub>VP</sub> V IA-SELF/BODY(PART) ]]

Upshot:

- Accounting for selectional restrictions with pseudo-reflexives:
- (35) a. The ascetic<sub>i</sub> inured himself<sub>i</sub> / his<sub>i</sub> body to hardship.  
 b. Mary<sub>i</sub> exerted herself<sub>i</sub>.  
 c. Mary<sub>i</sub> exerted every ounce of her<sub>i</sub> { energy / strength }.
- (36) a. \*The ascetic inured my body to hardship.  
 b. \*Mary exerted every ounce of John's { energy / strength }.

### Conclusion:

If we treat reflexives as involving Voice, they fit into a consistent, independently attested pattern of cross-linguistic variation in properties of functional heads.

## 2. Anticausatives

- (37) a. *Lo specchio si è rotto.* (Italian, cf. (7c))  
 the mirror REFL,3 is broken  
 'The mirror has broken.'
- b. ... *ea saepius rumpeatur.* (Latin, cf. (2))  
 it<sub>NOM,F,SG</sub> many.times break<sub>3S,SUBJ,IPFV,NACT</sub>  
 'it breaks many times'
- c. *The window broke.* (English)
- d. *Vazoja u thye.* (Albanian, cf. (5a))  
 vase.the<sub>NOM</sub> NACT broke  
 'The vase broke.'
- e. *Die Tür öffnete sich.* (German, cf. (8c))  
 the door opened REFL,3  
 'The door opened.'

- Same morphosyntactic variants as for the reflexives, see below

### (38) General cross-linguistic schema and dimensions of variation:

- [VoiceP [Voice A-CAUS ] ... [VP V (IA) ]], where
  - A-CAUS is the Voice-feature which marks the predicate as anticausative
  - Exponence of A-CAUS as for reflexives (clitic, affix, BE, zero ...)
  - E.g., Albanian has all three: clitic (5a), affix (39a), BE (39b):
 

(39) a. *Çelësi thyhej sa kthente bravën.*  
 key.the<sub>NOM</sub> break.NACT,P,3S when turned lock  
 'The key would break as soon as it turned the lock.'

b. *Vazoja ishte / \*kishte thyer.*  
 vase.the<sub>NOM</sub> was / had broken  
 'The vase had (been) broken.'
  - Null exponence also possible, as in English (37c) above
- But here the question of the representation of the external argument arises (only the (i)-readings are relevant in (40c,d)):

- (40) a. *Lo specchio si è rotto dalla pressione.* (Italian)  
 the mirror REFL,3 is broken from-the pressure  
 'The mirror broke from the pressure.'
- b. *The window broke from the heat.* (English)
- c. *Anna u dogj nga dielli mbi urë.* (Albanian)  
 Anna NACT burnt.AOR,3S by/from sun.the on bridge  
 (i) 'Anna burned from the sun on the bridge.'  
 (ii) 'Anna was burned by the sun on the bridge.'

- d. *To grama kaike apo ti fotia.* (Greek)  
 the sheet burned<sub>NACT</sub> by/from the fire  
 (i) 'The sheet burned from the fire.'  
 (ii) 'The sheet was burned by the fire.'
- e. *Die Tür öffnete sich durch den Luftzug.* (German)  
 the door opened REFL,3 from the draft  
 'The door opened from the draft.'

- Is the *fromP* the external argument? See below:

(41) [VoiceP [Voice A-CAUS] ... *fromP* ... [VP V (IA) ]]

- A-CAUS licenses *fromP*
- Double exponence? Depends on argument or adjunct status of *fromP*.

### 3. Middles

- (42) a. *Questi libri si leggono facilmente.* (Italian)  
 these books REFL,3 read.3PL easily  
 'These books read easily.'
- b. *Bureaucrats bribe easily.* (English)
- c. *Dieser Roman liest sich gut.* (German)  
 this novel reads REFL,3 well  
 'This novel reads well.'
- d. *Ky libër lexohet kollaj.* (Albanian)  
 this<sub>NOM</sub> book read<sub>NACT,PR,3S</sub> easily  
 'This book reads easily.'

- Same morphosyntactic variants as for the reflexives and anticausatives above

(43) General cross-linguistic schema and dimensions of variation:

- [VoiceP [Voice MIDDLE] ... [VP V (IA) ]], where
  - MIDDLE is the Voice-feature which marks the predicate as a middle
  - Exponence of MIDDLE as for reflexives and anticausatives (affix, clitic, BE, zero ...)
  - E.g., Albanian has all three: affix (42d), clitic (44a), BE (44b); only the (i) readings are relevant here:

- (44) a. *Ky libër u lexoka kollaj.*  
 this<sub>NOM</sub> book NACT read<sub>ADM,PR,3S</sub> easily  
 (i) 'Hmm, so this book reads easily.'  
 (ii) 'Hmm, so this book is easy to read.'

- b. *Ky libër qenka / \*paska lexuar kollaj.*  
 this<sub>NOM</sub> book be<sub>ADM,3S</sub> / \*have<sub>ADM,3S</sub> read easily  
 (i) ‘Hmm, so this book has read easily.’  
 (ii) ‘Hmm, so this book has been easy to read.’

- Null exponence also possible, as in English (42b) above

- On the representation of the external argument in middles:

- (45) a. *This book reads easily for me.* (English)  
 b. *?Dieser Roman liest sich leicht für mich.* (German)  
 this novel reads REFL,3 easily for me  
 ‘This novel reads easily for me.’  
 c. *Physik-Bücher lesen sich leicht für Mathematiker...* (German)  
 physics books read.3PL REFL,3 easily for mathematicians  
 ‘Physics books read easily for mathematicians (but not for linguists).’  
 d. *Ky libër u lexoka kollaj (edhe) për mua.* (Albanian)  
 this<sub>NOM</sub> book NACT read<sub>ADM,PR,3S</sub> easily also for me  
 ‘Hmm, this book reads easily (also/even) for me.’

BUT Italian:

- (46) *\*Questi libri si leggono facilmente per noi / gli alunni.*  
 these books REFL,3 read.3PL easily for us / the pupils

- Here the *per*-phrase only has the “according to” interpretation; the external argument is interpreted as arbitrary (L. Russo-Cardona, pc). So, Italian doesn’t quite fit the cross-linguistic pattern for reasons that are unclear
  - NB the corresponding *tough*-example is ok with a *per*-phrase corresponding to the external argument:

- (47) *Questi libri sono facili da leggere per noi / gli alunni.*  
 these books are easy to read for us / the pupils

- So perhaps this is a peculiarity of Italian adverbs (?).

Hoekstra & Roberts (1993), Stroik (1999):

- the *for*-phrase is the external argument. So:

(43') [VoiceP [Voice MIDDLE ] ... [AdvP ADV *for*P ] ... [VP V (IA) ]]

- MIDDLE licenses *for*P
- Double exponence? Depends on argument or adjunct status of *for*P (as for anti-causatives)
- Null exponence also possible, as in English (42b) above
- See Cinque (1999: 101-3) on Voice and the middle adverb
- Dispositional/property reading arises because the external argument is an Experiencer (cf. Belletti & Rizzi’s 1988 Class I psych verbs, stative with

Experiencer external arguments, e.g. *love, fear, want*, etc.); cf. also dispositional/affective dative subjects in Albanian and elsewhere, which crucially in Albanian and Slavic employ non-active and reflexive morphology, respectively (see Kallulli 2006):

- (48) *Benit i hahej një mollë.*  
 Ben<sub>DAT</sub> CL,DAT,3S eat<sub>NACT,P,3S</sub> an apple  
 ‘Ben felt like eating an apple.’

- Middles arise when an agentive, eventive transitive verb takes an Experiencer external argument instead of an Agent (no verb can have two external arguments).

#### 4. Passives

- (49) a. *Questi libri sono stati venduti / si sono venduti.* (Italian)  
 these books are been sold / REFL,3 are sold  
 ‘These books have been sold.’
- b. *Laudatur Apronius a Trimarchide.* (Latin, cf. (1b))  
 praise<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Apronius<sub>NOM</sub> from Trimarchides<sub>ABL</sub>  
 ‘Apronius is praised by Trimachides.’
- c. *The bureaucrats were bribed.* (English)
- d. *Dieser Roman wurde gelesen.* (German)  
 this novel was read  
 ‘This novel was read.’
- (50)a. *Fëmija po lahet.* (Albanian, 4a)  
 child.the<sub>NOM</sub> PROG wash.NACT,P,3S  
 (i) ‘The child is washing itself.’ → reflexive  
 (ii) ‘**The child is being washed (by X).**’ → passive
- b. *To agori plithike (mono tu ) / (apo ti mitera tu).* (Greek)  
 the boy washed.NACT,3S (alone his) / (by the mother his)  
 (i) ‘The boy washed himself.’ → reflexive  
 (ii) ‘**The boy was washed (by X).**’ → passive
- (51) a. *Vazoja \*(u) thye.* (Albanian)  
 vase.the<sub>NOM</sub> NACT broke.AOR,3S  
 (i) ‘The vase broke.’ → anticausative  
 (ii) ‘**The vase was broken.**’ → passive
- b. *To grama kaike.* (Greek)  
 the sheet burned.NACT  
 (i) ‘The sheet burned.’ → anticausative  
 (ii) ‘**The sheet was burned.**’ → passive

## (52) Cross-linguistic pattern:

- [VoiceP [Voice PASSIVE ] ... *by*P ... [VP V (IA) ]]
  - NB: we disagree regarding the status of the *by*-phrase as argument (Roberts) vs adjunct (Kallulli) but agree that it is licensed by passive Voice
- Here the cross-linguistic situation is different in that English, German, Italian, Albanian (subject to tense/aspect distinctions; see Kallulli & Trommer 2011) and Latin (in perfect tenses) all have participial passives:

(53) a. *Beni ishte larë.* (Albanian, cf. (25b))Ben<sub>NOM</sub> was washed

(i) 'Ben had washed himself.'

(ii) '**Ben had been washed (by someone).**'b. *A me Lesbia amata mea est.* (Latin, Catull. 87, 2)from me Lesbia<sub>NOM</sub> love<sub>PST,PTCP,NOM,SG</sub> mine<sub>NOM,SG</sub> is

'My Lesbia has been loved by me.'

- The exponence of PASSIVE involves a BE auxiliary and a participle, either as in (a) or as in (b):

## (54) a. [VoiceP [Voice BE ] ... [PrtP V+Prt [VP (V) (IA) ]]

## b. [AuxP BE [VoiceP [Voice V+Prt ] ... [VP (V) (IA) ]]

- Kallulli & Trommer's (2011) analysis of Albanian favours (54b) if AuxP is interpreted as Perfect; this would be also consistent with Harwood's (2013) analysis of the English auxiliary system. However, there could be cross-linguistic variation permitting (54a)
- In Latin non-perfect contexts, Greek and Albanian (subject to tense/aspect conditioning) PASSIVE is realised by a dedicated morpheme (Calabrese 2021:8, note 16, says that *-u-* in Latin is an epenthetic vowel; this also holds for *-h-* in Albanian, (55b)); only the (ii) readings are relevant in (55b,c):

(55) a. *Laudat-ur Apronius a Trimarchide.* (Latin, cf. (1b))praise<sub>3S,PR,NACT</sub> Apronius<sub>NOM</sub> from Trimarchides<sub>ABL</sub>

'Apronius is praised by Trimachides.'

b. *Fëmija po la-h-et.* (Albanian, (4a))child.the<sub>NOM</sub> PROG wash.<sub>NACT,PR,3S</sub>

(i) 'The child is washing itself.' → reflexive

(ii) 'The child is being washed.' → passive

c. *To agori pli-thike (mono tu ) / (apo ti mitera tu).* (Greek, cf. (4b))the boy washed.<sub>NACT,3S</sub> (alone his) / (by the mother his)

(i) 'The boy washed himself.' → reflexive

(ii) 'The boy was washed.' → passive

## 5. Summary: What is Voice?

- We have seen the following scenarios involving non-active Voice:

- (56) a. [VoiceP [Voice REFL ] ... [VP V IA-SELF/BODY(PART) ]]
- b. [VoiceP [Voice A-CAUS ] ... *fromP* ... [VP V (IA) ]]
- c. [VoiceP [Voice MIDDLE ] ... [AdvP ADV *forP* ] ... [VP V (IA) ]]
- d. [VoiceP [Voice PASSIVE ] ... *byP* ... [VP V (IA) ]]

- To which we can add Active Voice:

- (57) [VoiceP [Voice ACTIVE ] ... [VP [VP V IA ]]

### What underlies these alternations?

- For (56b,c,d) we propose abstract oblique Cases: ablative (*from*), dative/benefactive (*for*), instrumental/ergative (*by*). In some languages (Greek, Albanian, Latin -- see above), there is syncretic realisation of ablative and dative.
- To which we can add that Active Voice licenses an Accusative IA.
- If Voice can license exactly one Case, then we understand why the IA cannot be accusative in (56b,c,d) and must therefore move.
- If REFL licenses SELF, then reflexive marking is a kind of Case (Pesetsky 2011).
- Many/most languages have a single non-active marker for (56b,c,d), although participial passives are an exception.

### On the first-merge position of the external argument

Two options: SpecVoiceP or SpecvP:

- If the former, then in non-active Voices (except REFL) the external argument can be suppressed or be an implicit argument of some kind, with the PP adjuncts Case-licensed by Voice
- If the latter, then the PPs can be seen as the external arguments but the question arises as to why the EA does not get REFL in (56a) and accusative in the active. For the latter, Roberts (2019) suggests inheritance of Case features from Voice to v. For reflexives, we could say the same or adopt the unaccusative analysis, unifying reflexives with (56b,c,d) (this option is preferred by Kallulli).

## 6. Conclusions

Non-active Voices are:

- licensors of abstract oblique Case
- show an exponence/doubling pattern reminiscent of clitic doubling (see Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989 on passives)
- tend to show the same exponence/doubling pattern in a given language (with Albanian a particularly interesting and complex case; Kallulli & Trommer 2011)
- partly or wholly (depending on the question of the status of the external argument) as a consequence of Case-licensing affect the surface realisation of both the external and the internal argument.

Further questions:

- why do we observe the different patterns of exponence that we do?
- Why are participial passives a special case?
- The status of implicit arguments.
- Impersonals (almost certainly a different animal, not connected to Voice, but the exponents tend to be similar to those for non-active Voice).

## References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena & Martin Everaert. 1999. Towards a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1): 97-119.
- Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson & Ian Roberts. 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:219-51.
- Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych verbs and  $\theta$ -theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 2021. Sic itur ad astra/Così si ascende alle stelle: On the Latin passive morpheme /-r/ and its morphosyntactic similarity with Romance SI. Manuscript, University of Connecticut.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Embick, David. 2004. Unaccusative syntax and verbal alternations. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou and M. Everaert (eds.) *The Unaccusativity Puzzle* 137-158. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harwood, Will. 2013. Being progressive is just a phase. PhD dissertation, Ghent University.
- Hoekstra, Teun & Ian Roberts. 1993. Middle constructions in Dutch and English. In Eric Reuland and Werner Abraham (eds.) *Knowledge and language*. Vol. 2, *Lexical and conceptual structure* 183–200. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-74.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 2006. Unaccusatives with dative causers and experiencers: a unified account. In Daniel Hole, André Meinunger & Werner Abraham (eds.) *Datives and Other Cases*. [Studies in Language Companion Series 75] 271-301. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Kallulli, Dalina. 2007. Rethinking the passive/anticausative distinction. 2007. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(4):770-780.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 2013. (Non-)canonical passives and reflexives: Deponents and their like. In Artemis Alexiadou & Florian Schäfer (eds.) *Non-Canonical Passives* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 205] 337-358. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kallulli, Dalina & Jochen Trommer. 2011. Closest c-command, agree and impoverishment: The morphosyntax of non-active voice in Albanian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 58(3):277-296.
- Keyser, Samuel Jay & Thomas Roeper. 1984. On the middle and ergative constructions in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:381-416.
- Keyser, Samuel Jay & Thomas Roeper. 1992. Re: The Abstract Clitic Hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(1): 89-125.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Reuland, Eric. 2009. Binding, locality, and sources of invariance. Handout of talk given at the Conference on Minimalist Approaches to Syntactic Locality. Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, 26-28 August.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 2011. Dependent Case as Binding Theory. Invited talk at NELS 42, Toronto.
- Reinhart, Tanya & Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657-720.
- Roberts, Ian. 2019. *Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Mamoru. 2007. Notes on East Asian argument ellipsis. *Language Research* 43: 203-27.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1996. Clitic constructions. In Rooryck, J. & L. Zaring (eds) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, vol 33. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Stroik, Thomas. 1999. Middles and reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1):119-31.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1999. More on the anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:257-287.