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Abstract
Two verbal templates in Modern Hebrew allow for any kind of verbal construction, except for a simple transitive verb. Unaccusatives, reflexives, reciprocals and unergatives that take an obligatory indirect object are all attested, but transitive verbs are not allowed. I discuss what the morphology of these templates actually signals, given that external arguments and internal arguments are both possible. Working in Distributed Morphology, I propose that a number of functional heads conspire to produce the existing alternations in argument structure, with implications for theories of anticausativization, reflexivization and reciprocalization.
Nonactive Voice in Hebrew and Elsewhere: Between Unaccusativity and Agentivity

Itamar Kastner

1 Introduction

A central distinction in studies of argument structure is that between transitive and intransitive verbs. A related distinction is that between active and nonactive morphology, meaning morphological marking that signals the existence or lack of an external argument. This paper addresses a number of questions relating to nonactive morphology by examining two verbal templates in Modern Hebrew. At the paper’s core lies a distinction between what is often described as “middle” or “reflexive” morphology— as with Romance *se*, Latin *-r* - and Russian *-sja*— and the underlying syntactic structure. The claim is that a certain “middle” affix does not necessarily entail that the verb is unaccusative, lacking an external argument. Instead, the affix indicates the presence of a functional head which manipulates arguments in a systematic way.

The empirical domain departs from the well-studied affixes and clitics in the languages mentioned above and focuses on the two Hebrew verbal templates *niXYaZ* and *hitYeYeZ*. Verbs in these templates are never transitive, in that they do not have a direct object. But it is not the case that these verbs are nonactive: some are agentive and volitional. The *hitYeYeZ* template is also unique in that it is the only template that houses reflexive and reciprocal verbs. We will see how the possible interpretations of different Hebrew roots result under this morphology.

We begin in Section 2 by surveying the relevant verb classes and sketching out an analysis. Section 3 lays out the assumptions and architecture of the system, providing an implementation. Section 4 then discusses a possible alternative and some loose ends, before Section 5 concludes.

2 Active Templates and Nonactive Templates

In Hebrew, as in other Central Semitic languages, verbs are comprised of an abstract consonantal root (notated √XYZ; most roots are triconsonantal) instantiated in a prosodic template. Descriptively, the template inserts certain vowels between the consonants and might add a prefix.

The focus of this paper is on two of the seven verbal templates of Hebrew, the “middle” template *niXYaZ* (as instantiated in verbs such as *nišbar* ‘broke’) and the “intensive middle” template *hitYeYeZ* (as instantiated in verbs such as *hitparek* ‘fell apart’). Throughout the discussion, I will use the term “middle” as a morphological term to refer to verbs in the *niXYaZ* (“middle”) and *hitYeYeZ* (“intensive middle”) templates. To distinguish among underlying syntactic structures, I reserve the term active verbs for verbs with an external argument and possible internal arguments, and the term nonactive verbs for verbs without an external argument, i.e., unaccusatives. We will next see that both of the two middle templates occur with both active and nonactive verbs. Crucially, none of the constructions listed in this section allow for a transitive verb, viz. a subject and a direct object.

2.1 Nonactive: Anticausatives

The basic intuition behind middle verbs as nonactive is that they are the anticausative counterparts of a causative verb in another template. For instance, it is often the case that an unaccusative change-of-state verb in *hitYeYeZ* is derived from an active counterpart in the “intensive” *XiYeZ* template, as in (1a). Similarly, some *niXYaZ* verbs are derived from active counterparts in the “simple” *XaYaZ*
template (1b). In these cases, the middle version is a detransitivized form of the active version and shares the same root as the active verb. The derived verbs in (1) are all intransitive and their bases transitive. Call these derived middle verbs anticausatives.

(1) a. hitXaYeZ: hitparek ‘fell apart’ (< pirek ‘dismantled’), hitpocce ‘exploded’ (< pocce ‘detonated’), hitbašel ‘got cooked’ (< bišel ‘cooked’).

b. niXYaZ: nišbar ‘broke’ (< šavar ‘broke’), nigr’a ‘tore’ (< kara’ ‘tore’), nimtax ‘stretched’ (< matax ‘stretched’).

The unprefixed base forms are active, whereas tests such as incompatibility with by-phrases and agent-oriented adverbs show that these derived middle verbs are indeed anticausative and allow no agents.

(2) a. ha-coref pirek et ha-camid the-jeweler dismantled.INTNS ACC the-bracelet ‘The jeweler took the bracelet apart.’

b. ha-camid hitparek me-acmo the-bracelet dismantled.INTNS.MID from-itself ‘The bracelet fell apart of its own accord.’

c. * ha-camid hitparek { al-yedey ha-coref / be-meyomanut } the-bracelet dismantled.INTNS.MID by the-jeweler in-skill (int. ‘The bracelet was dismantled by the jeweler/skillfully.’)

To account for this derivational process, we will posit a nonactive functional head that merges above the existing causative verb, thereby anticausativizing it. In Section 3 I propose that this is a special kind of Voice head.

2.2 Nonactive: Inchoatives

Unlike with anticausative verbs, it is not always the case that an active version of a middle verb exists in another template. Some middle verbs could not have been derived from a counterpart in XaYaZ or XiYeZ, because the root is never instantiated in the active template. I call these middle verbs inchoatives; their interpretation arises directly from composing the root with a nonactive functional head, without building on an existing causative verb.

(3) a. hitXaYeZ: hit’alef ‘passed out’ (< *’ilef), hit’ateš ‘sneezed’ (< *’iteš), hit’arex ‘grew longer’ (< *’irex).

b. niXYaZ: nirdam ‘fell asleep’ (< *’radam), ne’elam ‘disappeared’ (< *’alam).

To account for these verbs being nonactive, we will want to use the same functional machinery used for the anticausatives above. In Section 3 we will do just that, arguing that the same nonactive Voice head is at play.

2.3 Nonactive: Reflexives

Next, verbs in hitXaYeZ can be reflexive: the internal argument is interpreted as coreferential with the external argument. Since only one argument exists in reflexive constructions, I treat these verbs as inherently nonactive.


b. niXYaZ: —

Whatever makes hitXaYeZ different from niXYaZ will also need to explain why only hitXaYeZ verbs can be reflexive. I argue below that this is due to added agentive semantics that hitXaYeZ has but niXYaZ lacks. This agentive semantics is the result of an additional head in hitXaYeZ that also brings about the morphophonological difference between the two templates.

The two last types of middle verbs are the ones I analyze as underlyingly active.
2.4 Active: Figure Reflexives

Among the active middle verbs, there are some that are volitional in nature and take an indirect object (prepositional phrase) as their obligatory complement. These constructions are called figure reflexives by Wood (2014) in his study of Icelandic -st.

\[(5)\]

- **b.** niXYaZ: nixnas le- ‘entered (into)’, nidxaf derex/le- ‘pushed his way through/into’, niršam le- ‘signed up for’, nilxam be- ‘fought (with)’, ne’exaz be- ‘held on to’.

Figure reflexives might denote an action (hitmared neged ‘rebelled against’), motion (histare’a al- ‘sprawled over’) or coming into being of an emotional state (hit’acben al- ‘got mad at’). In all cases, a prepositional phrase is the obligatory complement of the verb. To account for these, I will propose that a functional head licenses the prepositional phrase. Since no direct objects are allowed, this functional head must head a projection that is the complement to the verb; in other words, these verbs select for a certain kind of indirect object but not for an ordinary DP object.

2.5 Active: Reciprocals

Lastly, hitXaYeZ can also host reciprocal verbs. Reciprocal constructions require two distinct arguments; this cannot be achieved in a nonactive structure but only in an active one (Siloni 2012). The syntax will thus be essentially the same as with figure reflexives: the complement to the verb is a prepositional phrase. This analysis captures the fact that arguments of reciprocal verbs are introduced by a preposition in Hebrew, namely im- ‘with’.

\[(6)\]

- **a.** hitXaYeZ: hitnašek im- ‘kissed (with)’, hitzabek im- ‘hugged (with)’, hitkatev im- ‘corresponded (with)’, hitvakeax im- ‘argued (with)’.
- **b.** niXYaZ: —

The indirect object is obligatory, as in (7). Nevertheless, when both arguments are expressed as a collective subject, the pP need not be expressed, (8). The structure is still non-transitive, in that a direct object is not licensed, (9):

\[(7)\] dani hitnašek *(im yosi) Danní kissed.INTRNS.MID with Yossi ‘Danny and Yossi kissed’

\[(8)\] dani ve-yosi hitnašk-u Danní and-Yossi kissed.INTRNS.MID-3PL ‘Danny and Yossi kissed’

\[(9)\] * dani ve-yosi hitnašk-u et {dina / ha-klavlav} Danní and-Yossi kissed.INTRNS.MID-3PL ACC Dina the-puppy (int. ‘Danny and Yossi kissed each other and also Dina/the puppy’)

In the analysis, I assume that reciprocals are constructed similarly to figure reflexives. However, the extra agentive semantics of hitXaYeZ will be the reason that this template allows for reciprocal verbs whereas niXYaZ does not.

To recap, the middle templates host anticausative and inchoative verbs, as well as a type of unergative I call the figure reflexive, but never transitive verbs.\(^2\) hitXaYeZ is especially interesting because it is the only template that allows reflexives and reciprocals. This is a puzzling state of affairs: if internal arguments and external arguments are both possible, only not together, what is the morphology signaling? To derive the middle templates and answer this question, we will next posit a number of functional heads as alluded to above.

\(^2\)There is one established counterexample to this generalization, transitive hictarex ‘needed’. Any theory of hitXaYeZ, including mine, must treat this verb as a genuine exception which must be learned independently.
3 Analysis

3.1 The System

My analysis is set in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993), with vocabulary insertion proceeding outwards from the root (Bobaljik 2000, Embick 2010). A functional head v introduces an event and categorizes a root as a verb. The higher functional head Voice introduces the external argument (Kratzer 1996, Pylkkänen 2008, Marantz 2013). The functional head p introduces the external argument of a preposition, also called its Figure (Svenonius 2003, 2007, Wood 2014). This is a system in which the syntax limits possible interpretations of the verb, leaving the lexical semantics to the root (Schäfer 2008, Myler 2014, Wood 2015): in Hebrew as in English there is no difference between the functional heads that make up the verb *buy* and those that make up the verb *dance*. The former is transitive simply because the root √BUY is compatible with Voice and an internal argument, and the latter is intransitive simply because √DANCE is incompatible with most types of internal arguments (save for cognate objects); the syntax is identical.

A root denotes in a general semantic field though the interpretation of a root in a template is idiosyncratic: there is no way to predict what the root √rˇsm, which has to do with writing down, will mean when it is instantiated in a given template. In the “simple” template, raˇsam means ‘wrote down’. In the “middle” template, nirˇsam le- means ‘signed up for’. In the “intensive middle”, hitraˇsem me- means ‘was impressed by’. What the syntax does in this approach is constrain the possible interpretations, as in the middle templates where verbs are never transitive. See Arad (2005) for discussion of these morphologically-conditioned meanings.

The three functional heads—Voice, v and p—are by default covert and place no restrictions on the resulting verb. To derive the full range of verbs in Hebrew, I use a number of overt variants of these heads.

First, v heads introduce an event. Alongside default, silent v, I posit vACT. In the semantics, this head types the event as an Action (Doron 2003) or self-propelled (Folli and Harley 2008). In the phonology, vACT is spelled out as a predictable set of vowels slotting between the root consonants. vACT also blocks intervocalic spirantization of the middle consonant (though see Adam 2002, Martínez 2008 and Gouskova 2012 for finer details).3

The head vACT is attested elsewhere in the verbal system, namely in the “intensive” template XiYeZ. In (10) both agent and cause are possible with a “simple” verb, but in (11) only the agent is available with an “intensive” verb that is analyzed as containing vACT. Note also the lack of spirantization ([v]∼[b]) and the different vowel patterns in the latter example.

(10) {√ ha-yeladim / √ ha-tiltulim ba-argaz} šayr-u et ha-kosot
the-children the-shaking in.the-box broke.SMPL-PL ACC the-glasses

‘The children / Shaking around in the box broke the glasses.’

(11) {√ ha-yeladim / X ha-tiltulim ba-argaz} šibr-u et ha-kosot
the-children the-shaking in.the-box broke.INTNS-PL ACC the-glasses

‘The children / *Shaking around in the box broke the glasses to bits.’ (Doron 2003:20)

Next, Voice and p heads introduce a DP in their specifier. In a regular, unmarked active clause, default (silent) Voice introduces the external argument. The head p was proposed by Svenonius (2003, 2007) to act in similar fashion to Voice or Chomskyan little v: it merges above the PP, introducing the Figure (subject) of the preposition. In (12), the Figure is the DP book and p, which introduces it, is circled for ease of reference.

3Another possibility is that what I call vACT is not a v head at all, but rather an action root √ACTION. This possibility is called for since the morpheme has an interpretation in the phonology and semantics but does not manipulate the syntax, just as roots do in this theory. Further, there is little crosslinguistic support at this time for semantic “flavors” of v like the one I am proposing here. Since this issue does not bear on the phenomena discussed in the paper, I set it aside.
To these heads I add nonactive counterparts, namely Voice$_\varnothing$ and p$_\varnothing$. These two heads dictate that nothing may be merged in their specifiers. Voice$_\varnothing$ blocks the introduction of an external argument (Doron 2003, Alexiadou and Doron 2012, Alexiadou 2014b, Wood 2014, 2015, Spathas et al. 2015) and p$_\varnothing$ blocks merger of a DP in the specifier of pP (Wood 2015). The different kinds of Voice/p manipulate the syntax: they only dictate whether a DP may or may not be merged in their specifier. As mentioned above, default Voice and p are silent. But Voice$_\varnothing$ and p$_\varnothing$ are spelled out by adding a prefix and certain vowels.

Table 1 summarizes the syntactic, semantic and morphophonological effects of these heads, deriving a subset of the verbal system of Modern Hebrew. Special Voice/p heads are underlined; see their effects under “Syntax” and as a prefix under “Phonology.” The special v head $v_{ACT}$ head is boldfaced; see its effects under “Semantics” and “Phonology.” Note in particular that the $hitXaYeZ$ template is morphologically complex. It is prefixed, indicating the existence of an overt Voice$_\varnothing$/p$_\varnothing$ head, and de-spirantized, indicating the existence of $v_{ACT}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Phonology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>(underspecified)</td>
<td>(underspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$v_{ACT}$</td>
<td>(underspecified)</td>
<td>$Action$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice$_\varnothing$</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>No EA</td>
<td>(underspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>EA = Figure</td>
<td>$Action$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice$_\varnothing$</td>
<td>$v_{ACT}$</td>
<td>No EA</td>
<td>$Action$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>$v_{ACT}$</td>
<td>EA = Figure</td>
<td>$Action$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The requirements of some functional heads in the Hebrew verb.

In what follows I suggest two main structures for middle verbs. Section 3.2 argues that nonactive middle verbs are unaccusative, built using Voice$_\varnothing$. Conversely, Section 3.3 argues that active middle verbs always take a prepositional phrase complement, built using p$_\varnothing$. The basic intuition behind this analysis is that some middle verbs seem more volitional than others, just like in English unaccusative break is less volitional than unaccusative arrive.

The structure alone will not be enough to derive the full typology of middle verbs: functional heads interact with the lexical semantics of the root so that they constrain the meaning of the resulting verb but do not dictate it. For example, the difference between a reciprocal verb and a figure reflexive is not in the structure but in the type of root: $kissing$ is inherently reciprocal whereas $charging$ is inherently disjoint, though the structure of the two is identical.

### 3.2 Nonactive Structures

Nonactive middles are derived using the head Voice$_\varnothing$. As this head does not allow anything to be merged in its specifier, no external argument can be introduced into the structure. The difference

---

4A number of authors have posited different structures for change-of-state unaccusatives like break and movement unaccusatives like arrive. See Irwin (2012) for one such approach and Alexiadou (2014a) for a brief overview.
between niXYaZ in (13a) and hitXaYeZ in (13b) is that hitXaYeZ utilizes the special v head \( v_{ACT} \) (circled for ease of reference).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{niXYaZ nisgar ‘closed’:} \\
& \text{b. } \text{hitXaYeZ hitparek ‘fell apart’:}
\end{align*}
\]

The spell-out of these heads is as follows: \( \text{Voice}_\emptyset \) provides the prefix ni-, or its allomorph hit- in the environment of \( v_{ACT} \). Templates differ from each other also in the vowels that appear between the root consonants, so I assume for now that each of the overt functional heads used in this system triggers readjustment rules that insert the right vowels (Embick and Halle 2005).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Voice}_\emptyset \leftrightarrow \text{hit-} + \text{READJUSTMENT} / \quad v_{ACT} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Voice}_\emptyset \leftrightarrow \text{ni-} + \text{READJUSTMENT}
\end{align*}
\]

The head \( v_{ACT} \) triggers readjustment rules and blocks postvocalic spirantization of the medial root consonant. This phonological effect may be notated as a floating mora docking onto a particular consonant, in a nod to the original gemination from which the modern de-spirantization arose. See Wallace (2013) for an analysis of gemination in Akkadian and Arabic using a similar mechanism.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad v_{ACT} \leftrightarrow \mu + \text{READJUSTMENT}
\end{align*}
\]

Exact implementation of the phonological component, in particular the readjustment rules, is left to future work.

In terms of syntax and semantics, these structures produce the desired results. Anticausatives are derived by taking an existing active vP (either vP XaYaZ or \( v_{ACT}P \) XiYeZ) and merging \( \text{Voice}_\emptyset \), thereby detransitivizing the verb. This results in causative alternations as in (16).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{‘Simple’ template, } [v [v \sqrt{\text{br}}] \text{ DP}]: \text{savar ‘broke’ (transitive)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{‘Middle’ template, } [\text{Voice}_\emptyset [v [v \sqrt{\text{br}}] \text{ DP}]]: \text{nisbar ‘got broken’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{‘Intensive’ template, } [v_{ACT} [v_{ACT} \sqrt{\text{prk}}] \text{ DP}]: \text{pirek ‘dismantled’ (transitive)}
\end{align*}
\]

“Intensive middle” template, \( [\text{Voice}_\emptyset [v_{ACT} [v_{ACT} \sqrt{\text{prk}}] \text{ DP}]]: \text{hitparek ‘fell apart’}

Turning to inchoatives (nonactive middles not derived from causative counterparts, e.g., nir-dam ‘fell asleep’), not much needs to be said about niXYaZ since default v is not active in the syntax or the phonology. More interesting is the case of hitXaYeZ, in which \( v_{ACT} \) is still doing its morphophonological work but does not create the “intensive” XiYeZ verb in (18).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{hit’alef} \quad \text{b.} & \quad * \text{’ilef} \\
\sqrt{\text{TF};\text{INTNS.MID};\text{Past}} & \quad \sqrt{\text{TF};\text{INTNS.Past}} \\
\text{‘fainted’} & \quad \text{(int. ‘made someone faint’)}
\end{align*}
\]

Our analysis leaves open the possibility of the nonexistent XiYeZ form arising as an innovation. This seems to be the case: for some young speakers it is possible to say ‘ilef’ to mean ‘amazed’, though this coinage is substandard (Laks 2014).

As noted above, reflexives are possible only in hitXaYeZ, which differs from niXYaZ in having added agentive semantics. If the basic reflexive structure in Hebrew is nonactive (with \( \text{Voice}_\emptyset \)), adding \( v_{ACT} \) licenses an interpretation in which there is an agent but the only argument in the structure

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hit’alef} & \quad * \text{’ilef} \\
\sqrt{\text{TF};\text{INTNS.MID};\text{Past}} & \quad \sqrt{\text{TF};\text{INTNS.Past}} \\
\text{‘fainted’} & \quad \text{(int. ‘made someone faint’)}
\end{align*}
\]
is the internal argument, thereby forcing the internal argument to be interpreted as the agent. While we do not have space to develop this idea here, I believe it falls along the same lines as the analysis of Kannada reflexives in Lidz (2001) and especially Greek after-reflexives in Spathas et al. (2015).

We have now accounted for three kinds of nonactive verbs. In effect, I proposed that anticausatives, inchoatives and reflexives are all unaccusative verbs. The important point is that the sole argument is the internal argument and that there is no agentive external argument. Whether or not the resulting verb is construed as volitional depends on the root: reflexive verbs are more volitional than anticausatives. The analysis implies that anticausatives, inchoatives and reflexives ought to pass unaccusativity diagnostics. This is true for the first two but not for the last. I return to this point in Section 4.2, after discussing the active middle verbs.

3.3 Active Structures

Just as nonactive middles are derived using VoiceØ, active middles are derived using pØ. The two main consequences of this configuration are that an external argument may be merged in Spec,VoiceP and that the obligatory prepositional phrase does not have a subject of its own. Since pØ does not allow anything to be merged in its specifier, the preposition introduced by p does not have an immediate subject. Instead, the predicate pØ “waits” until the external argument is merged in Spec,VoiceP and this DP is then interpreted as the subject of the preposition. Wood (2014, 2015) gives a detailed semantics of this phenomenon in Icelandic. Under his analysis, pØ needs to assign a semantic role (Figure) to a DP, but there is no DP in its specifier. The predicate remains unsaturated, and the denotation passed on up in the derivation, until a DP is merged in Spec,VoiceP and saturates Voice and pØ at the same time. Our analysis follows Wood’s lead.

Figure reflexives (e.g., hitnapel al- ‘charged’, nixnas le- ‘entered’) can be seen as unergative verbs with an obligatory pP complement. Since there is an external argument in Spec,VoiceP, Agent-oriented adverbs are possible:

(19) a. ha-kelev hitnapel [pØ al ha-davar] be-za’am
the-dog charged_INTNS.MID on the-mailman in-rage
‘The dog attacked the mailman in a fit of rage’

b. dani nixnas [pØ la-kita] be-bitaxon
Danny entered.MID to.the-classroom in-confidence
‘Danny confidently entered the classroom.’

We aim to account for reciprocals, which are possible only in hitXaYeZ (e.g., hitnašek im- ‘kissed’), in similar fashion: the internal argument is merged as the complement of P and the external argument in Spec,VoiceP, then interpreted as coreferential with the subject of pØ (the Figure). The analysis of reciprocal hitXaYeZ verbs as a kind of figure reflexive captures two fundamental facts about them: that they are volitional (agentive external argument with νACT) and that they require an indirect object (complement of pØ). As with reflexives, a detailed working out of the compositional semantics will wait for future work. Spathas et al. (2015) have argued that dedicated reflexivizers are not necessary for deriving reflexives in Greek. I go one step further, claiming that neither dedicated reflexivizers nor dedicated reciprocalizers are necessary in Hebrew, and that the same functional head can be used to derive both.

4 Alternatives and Lingering Issues

4.1 A Lexicalist Alternative

A lexicalist account of causative alternations in Hebrew was proposed by Reinhart and Siloni (2005) and Laks (2011, 2014), who argue that a process of decausativization creates valency reduction in the language. Under such a view, causative verbs are the basic verbal forms in the language, from which the speaker derives reflexives, anticausatives and reciprocals in other templates. Each template thus has its own role in the lexicon.
The question then arises of how to account for nonactive verbs that have no active alternation in another template. This is exactly the case of inchoative middle verbs such as nir dam ‘fell asleep’: if there is no active base, how can an alternation arise? The proposed solution is that the causative verb exists in the lexicon as a frozen entry, a verb that cannot be used in the syntactic derivation but can be used in the lexicon to derive other forms.

Two additional questions now arise. First, this theory does not explain why a given template has whatever morphosyntactic behavior it has, e.g., transitive or intransitive, reflexive or not. This behavior is simply stipulated on a template-by-template basis. The second problem has to do with the notion of a “frozen” lexical entry. According to Laks (2014:116), “[F]rozen entries lack phonological matrix and morphological properties [. . . ] but they are assumed to be conceptually represented in the lexicon. The frozen entry, which is not accessible for syntactic derivations, can nonetheless serve as input for lexical operations.” It is unclear how this notion of abstract lexical material is different from what other lines of research call a root. Fadlon (2012) presents experimental results that are claimed to provide evidence against a root-based approach and for an anticausativization approach, although the results seem consistent with a root-based analysis as well.

4.2 Between Unaccusativity and Agentivity

Finally, I have suggested that reflexives in Hebrew are underlying unaccusative (contra Reinhart and Siloni 2005). There are two accepted tests for unaccusativity in Hebrew, the possessive dative and verb fronting. Whereas anticausatives and inchoatives pass both tests, reflexives fail them.

The possessive dative was proposed as an unaccusativity diagnostic by Borer and Grodzinsky (1986), but has recently been recharacterized by Gafter (2014) and Linzen (2014, to appear) as a diagnostic of saliency or animacy. Verb fronting has gone unchallenged as a diagnostic (Shlonsky 1987), and as just mentioned, is not possible with reflexives. On the face of it, the analysis of reflexives as underlying unaccusatives cannot be correct if reflexives fail unaccusativity diagnostics. I would like to argue instead that the consequence is unclear. In the analysis of reflexives proposed here, as in the one proposed for Greek by Spathas et al. (2015), the internal argument undergoes A-movement and ends up higher than its original position. Verb fronting in Hebrew might only diagnose surface unaccusativity, that is, a structure in which the internal argument remains in its base-generated position (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). For Greek, Alexiadou and Schäfer (2013) and Alexiadou (2014b) run through different diagnostics and conclude that reflexives do not unambiguously pass or fail them. That is, reflexives pass some unergativity diagnostics and some unaccusativity diagnostics. The authors interpret these results as indicating that Greek reflexives do have an internal argument that undergoes some change of state. As put by Embick (2004:142), “[T]he unaccusative analysis of reflexives holds that reflexives and unaccusatives have some properties in common; not that they are identical.” It could be that the broad notion of “unaccusativity” is not enough to describe reflexives in Hebrew and Greek. If unaccusativity means that the surface subject started off as the internal argument, then surface unaccusativity diagnostics might not identify reflexive structures in which the internal argument raised to subject.

5 Conclusion

The main issue addressed here was the following: how is the argument structure of active and nonactive predicates derived, and how does this tie into the causative-anticausative alternation. I argued for a system in which neither θ-roles nor valency-reducing operations are necessary. Instead, an active syntactic structure and a nonactive syntactic structure—that is, one with an external argument and one without—can both result in the same “middle” or “nonactive” morphological marking. The correct interpretation of the verb is a result of composing functional heads with a lexical root.

The analysis presented here attempted to answer one general question and one specific question relating to the morphology of Modern Hebrew. Generally, it is the case that one cannot predict the meaning of a verb from its morphophonological form (its template), nor can one predict what template a verb will have based on its meaning. The solution to this mapping problem was implemented
in a system that builds syntactic structure and then interprets said structure at PF and LF. A more specific question relating to Hebrew verbs is that of middle verbs, which never take direct objects. Furthermore, only of the two middle templates allows for reflexives and reciprocals. The theory developed here provides an explanation for this behavior: these templates have specific functional heads, with their own predictable phonology and semantics, that can lead compositionally to all and only the correct interpretations. Reflexive interpretations are then possible when embedded in a nonactive structure and reciprocal interpretations—when embedded in an active structure. The wide variation in meanings of middle verbs can be achieved by using specific heads that manipulate arguments in the syntax, rather than using dedicated reflexivizers, decausativizers and reciprocalizers.
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