



snippets

Issue 21

April 2010

Contents

1. Teresa Biberauer and Roberta d' Alessandro. *On the role of gemination in passives: the case of Abruzzese.*
2. Andrew Ryan Dowd. *More on instrumental denominal verbs.*
3. Alex Drummond. *An argument for the existence of null DPs.*
4. Akira Omaki and Chizuru Nakao. *Does English resumption really fail to repair island violations?*
5. Yosuke Sato. *Evidence for the bimorphemic analysis of 'everything' from relative clauses.*
6. Yosuke Sato. *Nominative case without Tense in the Niigata dialect of Japanese.*
7. Christos Vlachos. *Merchant says that MaxElide works for instances of wh-movement followed by VP-deletion but it's not clear how or how it does.*



1.

Teresa Biberauer - *University of Cambridge and Stellenbosch University*

Roberta d'Alessandro - *Leiden University*

On the role of gemination in passives: the case of Abruzzese

mtb23@cam.ac.uk, r.dalessandro@hum.leidenuniv.nl

In his crosslinguistic survey of passive constructions, Keenan (1985:251) observes that reduplication and gemination are not possible morphological expressions of the passive voice. That this is not true of reduplication has since been shown i.a. for Older Egyptian (Reintges 2003) and Hanis Coos (Coosan, Oregon Coast; Keenan and Dryer 2007). As far as we know, the accepted wisdom regarding the role of gemination in passive formation, however, remains that passives cannot be realised via this mechanism.

Here we show that this is also not universally true: Abruzzese, a central Italian variety, features an active/passive distinction which is signalled solely by means of *Raddoppiamento fonosintattico* (RF), a sandhi phenomenon involving the gemination of initial consonants (cf. Nespor and Vogel 1986, Loporcaro 1997):

- (1) a. ACTIVE: So viste Si viste
 am-1S seen are-2S seen
 'I have seen' 'You (s) have seen'
- b. PASSIVE: So [v]viste Si [v]viste
 am-1S seen are-2S seen
 'I am seen' 'You(s) are seen'

As (1) shows, active and passive structures in Abruzzese involve the same auxiliary (a form of BE) and differ only in respect of the presence vs absence of RF on the element immediately following the auxiliary. That (1) in fact entails a productive gemination process, involving an RF trigger, and not simply a lexically encoded morphophonological difference between active and passive participles is shown by (2):

- (2) So [s]sembre viste allà
 am-1S always seen there
 'I am always seen there'

Here the adverb immediately adjacent to the auxiliary, *sembre*, undergoes RF, while the participle does not; the structure, however, receives a passive interpretation and contrasts with the corresponding RF-lacking active.

(1) and (2), then, suggest that languages can productively harness gemination as a means of realising the active/passive distinction. What remains to be explained is what the gemination trigger is. Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2006) show that it is the auxiliary, which, being an oxytone, fits the phonological profile of RF triggers. More specifically, they propose, adopting Chomsky's (2001) Derivation by Phase model, that when the auxiliary is sent to Spellout as part of the same spellout domain as adjacent material, as it is where (defective) passive vP is present, it is able to induce RF on the immediately adjacent element; where it is sent to Spellout separately, as with active vPs, where the contents of VP are sent to Spellout independently of the contents of the vP and TP, this is not possible. The relevant difference is schematised in (3) (outline indicates material sent to Spellout upon completion of the vP-phase):

(3) a. [_{TP} *so* [_{vP} *so* [_{VP} *viste*]]] (active)

viste and *so* sent to PF separately → no RF

b. [_{TP} *so* [_{vP} *so* [_{VP} *viste*]]] (passive)

so viste sent to PF together → RF: *viste* → *vviste*

What led to Abruzzese employing gemination in passives, when this appears to be a crosslinguistically otherwise unattested phenomenon, remains a question for future research. Here we conclude simply that this option exists alongside reduplication, internal vowel change and various types of affixation.

References

- Biberauer, T. and R. D'Alessandro (2006) "Syntactic doubling and the encoding of voice in Eastern Abruzzese," in *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. D. Baumer, D. Montero and M. Scanlon. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 87 – 95.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by phase," in *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1-52.
- Keenan, E. (1985) "Passive in the world's languages," in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause structure*, ed. T. Shopen. Cambridge: CUP, 243-281.
- Keenan, E. and M. Dryer (2007) "Passive in the world's languages," in *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure*, ed. T. Shopen. Cambridge: CUP.
- Loporcaro, M. (1997) *L'origine del raddoppiamento fonosintattico*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Nespor, M. and I. Vogel (1986) *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Reintges, C. (2003) "The reduplicative passive in Older Egyptian: description and typology," in *Afrasian: Selected Comparative-Historical Studies in Memory of Igor M. Diakonoff*, ed. M. Bender, G. Takács and D. Appleyard. Munich: Lincom, 175-186.