

MAPPING FROM 3 TO 3: IS IT ONE TO ONE?

Andrea Márkus

CASTL, Universitetet i Tromsø

1. Types of the passive. The longstanding distinction between adjectival and verbal passives (cf. Wasow 1977) has recently been split into a more fine-grained typology, distinguishing two varieties of adjectival passives: target states/stative participles and resultant states/resultatives (cf. Parsons 1990, Kratzer 2000, Embick 2004), which yields three types together with eventive passives. Although the particulars of this grouping may vary from one account to another, most of the proposals subscribe to the view that eventive passives describe an event with agents (cf. (1a)); resultant states (as in (1b)) are generally taken to be states with event implications (but not eventivity) and without involving agents (although cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003), whereas target states display neither event implications, nor agentivity (1c).

- (1) (a) The door was (recently) opened (by John).
(b) The door is (recently) opened (*by John).
(c) The door is (*recently) open (*by John).

The structural approach entertained, among others, by Kratzer (1994), Embick (2004) and Anagnostopoulou (2003), contends that in the different types of passive participles, Asp attaches to distinct structural positions: the root, vP/FientP, or VoiceP/vP with an agent. The syntactic differences assumed by the structural approach are bound to have morphological correlates in at least some languages. Apparently, Hungarian is one language that morphologically distinguishes between passive participles; therefore, this study sets out to investigate how the morphological distinction made in Hungarian corresponds to the variation at size presumed by the structural approach.

2. Passive participles in Hungarian. Arguably, Hungarian has two passive participial morphemes: *-Vt(t)* (henceforth, *T*) and *-vA*. *T* participles are productively formed from transitive and unaccusative verbs (cf. Laczkó 2005), and can only be used attributively (Laczkó 2000, Kenesei 2000):

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| (2) (a) a megoldott feladat | (b) *A feladat megoldott. |
| the prt-solve-T task | the task prt-solve-T |
| 'the solved task' | 'The task is solved.' |

On the other hand, passive *-vA* participles can only occur predicatively, as the complement of the copula. Two different copulas may combine with *-vA* participles: *van/volt* ('is/was') and *lett/lesz* ('became/will be(come)'):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (3) (a) A feladat meg van/volt oldva. | (b) A feladat meg lett oldva. |
| the task prt is/was solve-vA | the task prt became solve-vA |
| 'The task is/was solved.' | 'The task was ('became') solved.' |

Moreover, *van/volt* + *vA* participles are congruous with transitive or unaccusative verbs (cf. Laczkó 2005), whereas *lett* + *vA* constructions are only compatible with transitive verbs (cf. Bene 2005).

This means that Hungarian has three distinct passive participial constructions: *T* participles are attributive, whereas passive *-vA* participles are used predicatively, as the

complement of the copula *van/volt* ('is/was') or *lett* ('became'). The purpose of my study is to ascertain what the correlation is between the three Hungarian participles and the recently proposed three-way distinction between eventive passives and the two adjectival types.

Since attributive passive participles are generally regarded as adjectival/stative (e.g. Wasow 1977, Levin and Rappaport 1986; for further references see Anagnostopoulou 2003, p. 3), attributive *T* participles are predicted to be stative, while *van/volt* + *vA* participles with the stative ('is/was') copula are expected to form resultant states, and *lett* + *vA* constructions are envisaged as manifestations of the eventive passive. This state of affairs would mark the contrast between the passive types morphologically (*T* vs. *van* + *vA*) and syntactically (*van* + *vA* vs. *lett* + *vA*).

3. Results. I employ three tests to tell apart eventive passives, resultant states and target states: (i) *mostanában* ('recently') has event implications; therefore, it is only resultant states and eventive passives that are congruent with this adverb. (ii) Agentive *by*-phrases, on the other hand, are used to distinguish resultant states from eventive passives. Target states, which are incompatible with both agents and eventivity, are diagnosed by the adverb (iii) *még (mindig)* ('still') on the basis of Kratzer (2000). However, the tests conducted in the case of each participle type (*T*, *van/volt* + *vA* and *lett* + *vA*) with all the four aktionsarts yield unexpected results: the ternary distinction between target states, resultant states and eventives crosscuts *T* and *-vA* participles: therefore, there is no correspondance between morphology and passive types. Instead, the diagnostics indicate that what Hungarian encodes morphologically is *exclusively* the positional difference: attributive participles are marked by *T*, while predicative participles involve the *-vA* suffix. The result is intriguing, since the difference between the predicative and attributive usage of the same participle type is not very well-understood, and is often regarded as syntactically irrelevant.

However, despite the absence of a morphological correlate, it can be shown that the size of the participles varies in Hungarian, as well. Unlike the expectations about morphological marking, the prediction about the choice of copula is partially born out by the data: whereas the attributive *T* spans target states, resultant states and the eventive passive, *van/volt* + *vA* constructions function as target or resultant states, and *lett* + *vA* participles are eventive. I demonstrate through tests that systematically compare copula + adjective and copula + *vA* constructions that in eventive *-vA* passives, eventivity is contributed by the copula, but the participle supplies agentivity. In terms of functional material, the copula with more structure (*lett*, 'became' vs. *van/volt* ('is/was')) selects for participles with more functional layers (involving agents), giving rise to a matching effect between agentivity and eventivity in eventive passives (contra resultant states with pure event implications). The claim that in Hungarian *-vA* participles, eventivity is lexicalized by the copula contrasts with English passive constructions, in which the same auxiliary may select for participles with or without eventivity, as bolstered by the observation that passive constructions such as *The door was opened* are ambiguous between an eventive and a resultant state reading (cf. Embick 2004, p. 356).

The last issue raised by Hungarian passive participles is the interaction between the verb class (transitive, unaccusative or unergative) and the passive type, familiar from other languages as well (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2007, p. 5, and references therein). In the current literature unaccusatives, unergatives and transitives are assumed to be structurally different; similarly, the three passive types are also presumed to involve different amounts of functional structure. I propose to bring together the two phenomena by adopting a nanosyntactic approach (Starke 2006), which holds that morphemes can spell out a whole sequence of terminals. On my account, passive participial *T* spans functional heads from the stativizer up to tense, while *-vA* lexicalizes the functional sequence ranging over a somewhat narrower domain. The material spelled out by the given suffix shrinks or expands, depending on the verb class (transitive, unaccusative or unergative) and passive type (stative, resultative or eventive). This way, the mechanism and extent of shrinking derives the incompatibility of unaccusatives with eventive passives.