Canonical and reverse predication in the syntax of the active/passive alternation

Marcel den Dikken (SEAS/ELTE & RIL/HAS, Budapest)

This paper defends a novel analysis of the active/passive alternation. In both the active and the passive, the VP and the external argument are in a predication structure, with a RELATOR-head mediating the predication relation (Den Dikken 2006). In the active, the RELATOR builds a canonical predication structure (1a), with the VP in the RELATOR's complement position and the subject of predication as the specifier. In the passive, the VP-predicate is merged in the specifier position of the RELATOR-head and the external argument in its complement. The reverse verbal predication in (1b) is the structural signature of the passive voice. (This analysis shares with Collins' (2005) influential proposal the idea that the participial VP occupies a specifier position above the external argument; but unlike in Collins' analysis, the participial VP is base-generated there.) Obligatory auxiliation follows: V-to-T movement out of the specifier in (1b) is impossible. The familiar 'absorption' of accusative Case in transitive-based passives also falls out from (1b): the internal argument is not c-commanded by the Case-assigning RELATOR. For unaccusative-based passives (e.g. Dutch impersonal er werd voortdurend aangekomen en vertrokken 'there was constantly arrived and departed'; Zaenen 1993), the reverse predication analysis provides an account in conjunction with the well-supported hypothesis that the Theme, like the Agent, is a subject of a verbal predication. As shown below, (1b) also explains Visser's Generalisation (the ban on personal passivisation of subject control verbs) and the restrictions on referential dependencies in passives.

One syntax for all: A unified representational system for syntax and phonology Marcel den Dikken (ELTE/SEAS & RIL/HAS, Budapest) & Harry van der Hulst (UConn, Storrs)

In the development of the generative perspective on linguistic analysis over the past half century, the approaches to the phrase structure system and the sound system have grown further and further apart. Though there were, from the start, major differences between syntactic and phonological analysis, there was an emphasis initially on shared fundamental concepts (such as rule ordering and the cycle, essential ingredients of early generative approaches to both sound and phrase structure). However, with the rise and spread of the optimality-theoretic approach to phonology and the 'minimalist' approach to syntactic theory, the two primary subdisciplines of linguistic inquiry lost much of their kinship. The central aim of this presentation is to bring phonology and syntax together again with an outlook on linguistic analysis that uses the same representational system in morphosyntax and all levels of phonological analysis, including the prosodic system (phonological structure above the syllable), the internal organisation of the syllable and foot, and the structure of segments. A central tenet of the approach is the X-bar Theory of linguistic representation, designed for the purposes of syntactic analysis, for which the 'complement of', 'specifier of' and 'adjunct to' relations are well established, but also fundamental to phonological structure: X-bar theory is a very useful tool in the representation of geometrical relations of all kinds (both segmental and suprasegmental) in phonology.