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The Passive in Transformational Grammar

- Passive was the paradigmatic transformation in early TG.
- Motivations
  - Near paraphrase of active/passive pairs.
  - Simplified statement of cooccurrence restrictions.
    - E.g. *devour* must be followed by an NP, *put* by NP-PP
    - Such restrictions refer to pre-transformational ("deep") structure.
  - Intuition that active forms were more basic, in some sense.
- Its formulation was complex:
  - Promote object
  - Demote subject, inserting *by*
  - Insert appropriate form of *be*, changing main verb to a participle.
But transforming whole sentences is overkill

• Passive sentences look an awful lot like some actives:

  *The cat was chased by the dog* vs *The cat was lying by the door*

• Passives occur without *be* and without the *by* phrase:

  *Cats chased by dogs usually get away.*
  *My cat was attacked.*
So a lexical analysis seems called for

• What really changes are the verb’s form and its cooccurrence restrictions (that is, its valence).
• There are lexical exceptions
  – Negative:
    
    *Pat resembles Bo but Bo is resembled by Pat*
    
    *That look suits you but You are suited by that look*
  
  – Positive
    
    *Chris is rumored to be a spy but They rumor Chris to be a spy*
We posit a lexical rule

• Why not just list passive participles individually?
  • To avoid redundancy
  • To capture productivity (for example?)

• We make it a derivational (lexeme-to-lexeme) rule. Why?
  • Our constraints on lexeme-to-word rules wouldn’t allow us to make Passive one.
The Passive Lexical Rule

\[ d\text{-rule} \]

INPUT \[ \langle 1, [tv-lxm \text{ARG-ST} [\text{INDEX } i] \oplus \text{A}] \rangle \]

OUTPUT \[ \langle F_{PSP}(1), \begin{align*}
\text{part-lxm} \\
\text{SYN} & \quad [\text{HEAD } \begin{pmatrix} \text{FORM } \text{pass} \end{pmatrix}] \\
\text{ARG-ST} & \quad \text{A} \oplus \langle \begin{pmatrix} \text{PP} \\
\text{FORM } \text{by} \text{INDEX } i \end{pmatrix} \rangle
\end{align*} \rangle \]
Questions About the Passive Rule

- Why is the morphological function $F_{PSP}$?
- Why do we have a separate FORM value pass? Why not say the output is $[\text{FORM psp}]$?
- What kind of a PP is the $by$-phrase (that is, argument-marking or predicational)?
More Questions

- What makes the object turn into the subject?
- Why is the type of the input $tv-lxm$?
- What would happen if it were just $verb-lxm$?
Intransitives have passives in German

_In der Küche wird nicht getanzt._

in the kitchen is not danced

‘There is no dancing in the kitchen.’

NB: The exact analysis for such examples is debatable, but German, like many other languages, allows passives of intransitives, as would be allowed by our analysis if the input type in the Passive LR is _verb-lxm_.
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Passive Input & Output

If you have one of these....

Then you also get one of these....
Actually...

```
part-lxm
SYN
HEAD
FORM pass

ARG-ST
⟨ NPₗ ,
   PP
   ⟨ FORM by i ⟩ ⟩

SEM
MODE prop
INDEX s

RESTR
⟨ RELN love
SIT s
LOVER i
LOVED j ⟩
```
The *be* that Occurs with Most Passives

\[
\langle be \rangle \quad \langle 1 \rangle \quad \langle 1 \rangle
\]

\[
\langle be-lxm \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{ARG-ST} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{SYN} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{VAL} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{HEAD} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{SEM} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{INDEX} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{RESTR} \rangle
\]

\[
\text{verb} \quad \text{FORM pass}
\]

\[
\text{SPR} \quad \langle 1 \rangle
\]

\[
\text{COMPS} \quad \langle \rangle
\]

\[
\text{INDEX} \quad s
\]

\[
\text{RESTR} \quad \langle \rangle
\]
Questions About the Entry for *be*

- Why doesn’t it include valence features?
- What is the category of its complement (i.e. its 2\textsuperscript{nd} argument)?
- What is its contribution to the semantics of the sentences it appears in?
- Why is the first argument tagged as identical to the second argument’s SPR value?
Passive tree

Which rule licenses each node?
What is the SPR value of the upper VP?
What is the SPR value of the lower VP?
What is the SPR value of \textit{is}?
Any questions?
More Questions

• Why do we get
  *They are noticed by everyone*
  and not
  *Them are noticed by everyone?*

• Why don’t we get
  *They is noticed by everyone?*

• What would facts like these entail for a transformational analysis?
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Reading Questions

We see in 10.4 that one crucial point in analysis of passives containing be is that the same subject is referenced by both be and the passive VP complement. The text notes that building *be* into the passive lexical rule itself would be a mistake; rather we show the constraint in the lexical entry for *be*. Is this because passives can occur without some form of *be*? Are there other difficulties preventing us from expressing this constraint in a rule instead of as tags in a lexical entry?
Reading Questions

• It was apparent from the parenthesis "(a subtype of verb-lxm whose properties do not yet concern us)" on p. 320 that we will talk in more detail about the *be-lxm* down the road, but I was wondering two things about it: (1) does it cover all uses of the verb "be", including those not related to passive constructions, and (2) will any other verbs get their own lexical type, or is "be" an anomaly due to its wide variety of uses and relatively strange constructions/conjugations?
Reading Questions

• I'm not sure why the example sentence mentioned in Exercise 1, *A cat was a cat bitten by the dog*, is not licensed by our lexical entry for *be*. It's obvious that *A cat was bitten by the dog* is licensed. *A cat* is the specifier (licensed by the head verb), and *was bitten (by the dog)* is a legitimate VP. In the same way, isn't *was a cat bitten by the dog* a legitimate VP?
Reading Questions

• As there are more prepositions than the ones mentioned in this chapter, can we assume that there are also more FORM values for them (e.g. besides). And what about the preposition *there*, that we encountered in previous chapters? Is its FORM value also *there*, or does it take the FORM value of the preposition the word 'there' is substituting (e.g. *on* or *in*)?
Reading Questions

Isn't there a lot of implied syntactic (and semantic) meaning in, say, [FORM about] that we aren't talking about? Pretend we want to add the preposition across to the lexicon; does specifying [FORM across] simply tag the "shape" of this preposition? I don't see how this helps the grammar put together the puzzle. Don't we still have to manually change every lexical entry for every verb that can or must take across as a complement?
Reading Questions

- Are all FORM values for prepositions associated with one preposition in particular (as in FORM by)? Or put another way, are there any sets of prepositions that are similar enough in function that they could have the same FORM?
Reading Questions

• When are specific HEAD values established? FORM, AGR, and CASE are only ever properties of words, not lexemes, and are established either by i-rules or constraints that take effect upon the generation of a word by an i-rule, like "be" [p.320, (23)] to "was" [p.322, (25)]. But I see that the Passive Lexical Rule (a d-rule) establishes [FORM pass] for its output (and now going back to ch. 9 I realize other d-rules do this too). So, what can we say about when these values might be set?
Reading Questions

- On page 315-316 there is a discussion of the benefits of specifying CASE as a feature. We achieve this in the textbook via the English-specific Case Constraint, but this leaves me with a few questions: 1. Are there crosslinguistic reasons for avoiding case assignment in lexemes and treating CASE assignment as a property of words? 2. If so, what sorts of constraints are used in lieu of the Case Constraint? 3. If not, is there any reason why we shouldn't account for sentences like (14) by simply allowing a part-lx to have two possible CASE values for its SPR?
Reading Questions

• I'm curious about how tense is handled in the active-to-passive conversion. I know we haven't defined the RESTR value for past tense, but previously it's been indicated by "..." at least. In (23) though, it says RESTR is empty, and not even defeasible. Wouldn't the semantics of tense be added here though, to differentiate between, for example:

Congress makes the laws./The laws are made by Congress.
Congress made the laws./The laws were made by Congress.
• Why was it chosen to leave the RESTR list of \textit{be} empty? Also when I look at the examples in the book, I find it confusing on what can be left underspecified and what needs to be addressed in our feature structures. Is there a heuristic for knowing when something should be included?
Reading Questions

• I'm getting a little hung up on the optional PP in our Passive Lexical Rule. We specify in the ARG structures for the input and output that the subject becomes an optional complement, but we don't change anything in the semantics. If the by PP compliment isn't realized, does this mean that the agent listed in the semantics just isn't indexed with anything?
Reading Questions

- The Passive Lexical Rule as specified in (8) includes an optional PP appended to an existing ARG-ST list. The OUTPUT for this rule would allow for a sentence like, "He was told to stop coming to the house by Susan." What about in the case where this PP is moved? We can see this in a sentence such as, "He was told by Susan to stop coming to the house." Do we need another rule here?
Reading Questions

• The Constant Lexeme Lexical Rule simply changes the the second value of the lexical sequence from a lexeme type to type word. However in examples 18 and 19 on page 318, the ARG-ST list also appears to undergo some rearrangement: specifically ARG-ST seems to go from being a list in (18) to being a concatenation of lists (19) containing a sum of equivalent values. I don't understand the significance of this change, or its relationship to the Constant Lexeme Lexical Rule.
\[(18)\]

\[
\langle \text{loved}, \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{ARG-ST} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{SEM} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{INDEX s} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{RESTR} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{SPR} \langle [\text{AGR II}] \rangle \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{NP}_j \left( \left[ \text{PP} \left[ \text{FORM by} \right] \right] \right) \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{INDEX s} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{RELN love} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{SIT s} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{LOVER i} \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{LOVED j} \rangle
\]
The Constant Lexeme Lexical Rule then maps lexemes like (18) into words like (19):

Note that the effect of the ARP is seen in (19), since these lexical sequences involve words.
I know this grammar is process-neutral, but sometimes it is difficult to maintain that idea when we have examples such as (26)-(30) where we have lexical entries, then lexical sequences satisfying that entry, which can undergo lexical rules (which all seems very step-by-step and process-like.) How can we best think about this to keep these concepts straight?
Reading Questions

• The forms of be that appear in many passive sentences (was, were etc.) appear initially to each be the same word in all passive sentence structures (i.e. the same family of lexical sequences). Might the lexicon achieve even more parsimony by making this obvious in some way, such as defining an abbreviation for a "passive was," for example, that could be reused or easily picked out of the lexicon as needed?
Reading Questions

• Does a grammatical passive sentence exist for every grammatical transitive or ditransitive active sentence? What about ungrammatical sentences?

• What is the difference between passives and pseudopassives?

   *Dominique was laughed at by the younger kids.*