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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*  
  *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 \text{ resembles } Bo \text{ but } *Bo \text{ is resembled by } Pat
    
    \]
    
    \[
    That \text{ look suits you } \text{ but } *You \text{ are suited } \text{ by that look}
    
    \]
  - Positive
    
    \[
    Chris \text{ is rumored to be a spy } \text{ but } *They \text{ 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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INPUT} & \quad \langle 1, \left[ tv-lxm \right] \text{ARG-ST} \left[ \text{INDEX } i \right] \oplus [A] \rangle \\
\text{OUTPUT} & \quad \langle F_{PSP}(1), \left[ part-lxm \right] \text{SYN} \left[ \text{HEAD } \left[ \text{FORM } \text{pass } \right] \right] \oplus \langle \left[ \text{PP} \right] \text{ARG-ST } \left[ \text{INDEX } i \right] \rangle \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
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.
Passive Input & Output

If you have one of these....

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ SYN } & \quad \text{ HEAD } \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{verb} \\
\text{FORM} \\
\text{pass}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{ ARG-ST } & \quad \langle \text{ NP}_j , \left( \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PP} \\
\text{FORM} \\
\text{by} \\
\text{INDEX} \\
\text{i}
\end{array} \right] \right) \rangle \\
\text{ SEM } & \quad \langle \text{ loved , } \\
\text{ RESTR } & \quad \langle \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{RELN} \\
\text{LOVER} \\
\text{s} \\
\text{i} \\
\text{LOVED} \\
\text{j}
\end{array} \right] \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
The *be* that Occurs with Most Passives

\[
\left\langle be, \begin{array}{c}
\text{ARG-ST} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{be-lxm} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{VAL} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{HEAD} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{VERB} \\
\text{SEM}
\end{array} \\
\text{SPR} \\
\text{COMPS} \end{array} \right.
\]
Questions About the Entry for *be*

- Why doesn’t it include valence features?
- What is the category of its complement (i.e. its 2nd 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 *is*?
Any questions?
More Questions

• Why do we get
  \[\text{They are noticed by everyone}\]
  and not
  \[\ast\text{Them are noticed by everyone}\,?\]

• Why don’t we get
  \[\ast\text{They is noticed by everyone}\,?\]

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

• Why can't the whole passive sentence be [ FORM pass ]? That is, why should the be verb be [ FROM fin ]? Does it have to do with examples without be, like Liked by many, …?

• Why do we need the value pass for FORM at all? Is it related to the specifier sharing?
Reading Questions

• In *Awarded with honors, she thanked her parents for their support*. do we modify SPR, similar to the Imperative Rule?

• *Liked by many people but respected by few, Jean will have to run an aggressive reelection campaign*. Will these exs get handled in a future chapter? How does the subject of *liked* get linked to *Jean* in the next part of the sentence?
Reading Questions

• Why does *be* get its own lexeme type?

• Can we say that *be* is the most irregular verb in English?

• Where does *be-lxm* fit in to the lexical type hierarchy?

• How do we handle the inflectional forms of *be*?
Reading Questions

• Will passive *get* also be *be-lxm*?

• Will *be-lxm* for passives also be used for the copula?

• (23) does not show any semantic RESTR for *be*, that seems to be an exception for verbs. Are there other verbs that have an empty RESTR list?

• Why doesn't the [FORM pass] verb take *be* as its SPR?
Reading Questions

• Would a verb that exists only in the passive, the way "rumored" does in modern English, exist in the lexicon simply as a lexeme of type part-lxm (and not needing to go through the Passive Lexical Rule)?

*Napoleon is rumored to be short.
*They rumor that Napoleon is short.
Reading Questions

• Are active/passive pairs semantically the same when the PP[by] is dropped in the passive? What happens to the semantic role feature corresponding to that element?

• Also, do transitive verbs necessarily require a subject (in the semantic sense of actor)? What if the actor is unknown or an event occurred spontaneously?
Reading Questions

• How could *a cat bitten by a dog* be an S?
• What does it mean by "the case constraint applies to lexical trees (word structure), not to lexemes"?
In this chapter, we used evidence from French to classify the passive lexical rule as a d-rule, but if I remember correctly in chapter 8 we said that our notion of inflectional vs derivational rules and how we implemented them were English-specific. How do we know when it's appropriate to use evidence from other languages to support a decision for our English grammar?
Reading Questions

• How do we handle *The book written by Chris impressed everyone.*?

• How do we handle both *A message was sent to an old friend by Chris* and *A message was sent by Chris to an old friend*?
Reading Questions

• The grammar has changed to allow for the transformation from active to passive. Is it safe to assume that transforming from passive back to active is just a reversal of the INPUT and OUTPUT? That would also mean that FPSP would have an inverse function?
Reading Questions

• How do we handle pseudo-passives?
  • *Kim was relied on by everyone.*
  • *The idea was talked about by the speaker.*