

SWEDISH PASSIVES UNDER CONTROL

During the last few years, there has been an increased interest in different types of passives (see e.g. Embick 2004, Kratzer 2000 and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2008). The difference between adjectival and verbal passives has been treated in several non-lexicalist frameworks, and described in terms of presence vs. absence of certain functional categories in the participle, or height of attachment of the participial affix. For example, Embick (2004) separates three types of passive participle, 'stative', 'resultative' and 'verbal' where the *-ed* attaches to the bare root, root + Fient head, and root + Fient + Voice respectively. This talk treats the difference between the periphrastic passive (*bli/vara* + participle) and the morphological passive (verb-*s*) in Swedish in a parallel fashion. Both the periphrastic and the *-s*-passive have verbal readings (1), though only the periphrastic passive also has a stative passive reading (2):

- (1) a. Han blev mishandlad av två män klockan åtta igår.
'he was manhandle.PART by two men clock.DEF eight yesterday'
- b. Han misshandlades av två män klockan åtta igår
'He manhandle.PAST.PASS by two men clock.DEF eight yesterday'
- (2) a. Dörren är fortfarande stängd. (Only state-denoting)
'The door is still closed'
- b. Dörren stängs fortfarande. (Only habitual or episodic)
'The door is still (being) closed'

It has however been noticed that even in eventive contexts, there are semantic differences between the *s*-passive and the periphrastic passive, that are related to the notion of "control" (see Sundman 1987 and Engdahl 2006). Three contexts where the difference is seen are given below:

1. Complement of 'manage' and 'try': The derived subject is interpreted as subject of 'try' and 'manage' in periphrastic passives (3) while the demoted subject is interpreted as the subject of 'try' and 'manage' in the *-s*-passive (4) (though contextually restricted):

- (3) a. Han lyckades/försökte bli omvald.
'He managed/tried to be/get re-elected'
- b. ??Han lyckades/försökte omväljas.
- (4) a. Målen lyckades/försökte uppnås under första månaden.
goals.DEF managed/tried up.reachPASS during first month (i.e., "they managed/tried to reach the goals during the first month")
- b. *Målen lyckades/försökte bli uppnådda under första månaden

2. Control into purpose-clauses: The derived subject can control a PRO in purpose clause only in the periphrastic passive:

- (5) a. (?)Han_i blev skadad för att PRO_i slippa spela i andra halvlek.
He was/got injured to avoid play the second half.
- b. *Han_i skadades för att PRO_i slippa spela i andra halvlek.

3. Imperatives: Only periphrastic passives are allowed in imperatives.

- (6) a. Bli inte arresterad!
be/get not arrested ('Don't get arrested')
- b. *Arresteras inte!

I will claim that the morphological passive suffix (*-s*) always attaches higher up in the structure than the participial suffix *-de*, even in the parallel eventive passives. This is not a novel claim, and is straightforwardly obvious given that *-s* attaches outside Tense, while the participial suffix attaches below Tense, leaving Tense to be expressed by an auxiliary (see Julien 2007 for discussion). My novel claim is that the difference in attachment site also affects thematic interpretation. More specifically, I will claim that the locus for volitionality, or the mental involvement of the clause, is below the passive *-s* but above the

passive participle suffix. Instead of Embick's Fient and Voice, I will take the verb phrase to consist of (at least) a Proc(ess) Phrase and a Res(ult) Phrase (see Pustejovsky 1995), encoding two different subevents, and connected to each other by a "leads to"-relation (see Ramchand 2008). Directly dominating the ProcP I hypothesize that Men(tal)P is located, and here the mental center of the action is encoded. The proposed selectional frames for the passivizers in Swedish are given below:

- (7) a. periphrastic passive: -de [Proc [Res]] (= eventive passive), or -de [Res] (stative, adjectival passive)
 b. Morphological passive: -s [Tense [Men [Proc [Res]]]]

Following Baker (2003) I will assume that arguments receive their thematic interpretation by binding an index in the verbal heads, and following Ramchand (2008) I will assume arguments can bind more than one index, and thereby get complex thematic interpretations. The verbal roots carry the features Proc and Res and are inserted by matching the corresponding features in the lexicon. Verbs are lexically specified for the coreference relations between the arguments: an unaccusative verb has the lexical entry Proc_i, Res_i ("The binder of *i* is the argument of a process that leads to a result in which the binder of *i* is the argument", where the nature of the process and result is given by the lexical content of the verb); the transitive verb has the entry Proc_i, Proc_j (which leads to an interpretation similar to that of the unaccusative verb with the crucial difference that the argument of Proc and the argument of Res are not co-referent).

The Men(tal) head also carries an index, and if one and the same argument binds both the Mental index and the Process index, this argument will be interpreted as a volitional causer. (If this index is bound by another DP, this argument will presumably be interpreted as a benefactive or indirect causer, see Pylkkänen 2002). Most verbal entries in Swedish carry the feature Men in addition to Proc and Res, and in that case, Men is always co-indexed with Proc ((8-a)). Other verbs, e.g. object oriented psych-verbs, lack the Men feature, and the carrier of the mental properties will be contextually specified:

- (8) a. *arrestera* ('arrest'): Men_i, Proc_i, Res_j
 b. *fascinera* ('fascinate'): Proc_i, Res_j

In an -s-passive, the demoted subject will still be interpreted as the mental center, given that the verb carries a Men-feature. Hence the derived subject cannot be interpreted as a mental source of the event. I will claim that only the mental source can be the argument of 'try' and 'want', and further that the mental source is the only potential controller of PRO's in purpose-clauses (i.e., the mental source is the one who starts the event for a particular purpose), which explains the data in (4)-(6) above. Further, the subject of an imperative necessarily has mental control over the event, and hence, the derived subject of an -s-passive is not suitable, given that the underlying verb has a specified Men-feature. Notice that e.g. object psych verbs are fine in imperative -s-passive:

- (9) Kom hit och fascineras av den vackra naturen.
 'Come here and be fascinated by the beautiful nature'

I show that the periphrastic passive is only used in two contexts (abstracting away from attributive participles and stative passives under *vara*): (1) When the participle is truly adjectival (i.e., when the participial suffix is merged on top of ResP), as in *jag blev väldigt fascinerad av filmen* ('I got very fascinated by the film'), and, more importantly, (2) when the Mental index is relocated to the derived subject. In both these contexts, the periphrastic passive receives semantic interpretations that are not available for the morphological passive. Thus, I will argue that the morphological passive is the unmarked passive in Swedish, and that the periphrastic passive only is used when it makes a distinct semantic contribution.

I will also touch on the differences within the Scandinavian languages with respect to passives. In Danish and Norwegian, the choice of passive is mainly determined by Tense, and the periphrastic passive has properties that the Swedish periphrastic passive lacks, as e.g. control in to purpose clauses by a demoted agent ((10) is out in Swedish):

- (10) En pistol ble kjøpt for å myrde mafiabossen. ('a gun was bought to murder the mafia-boss')

These data further support the idea that the distribution of the different passives is in part controlled by language specific 'competition' with other forms.