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§ Acehnese, also called or spelled Atjeh, Atjehnese, Achinese, and Achehnese, is a Malayo-Polynesian language spoken by approximately 3 million people mainly in the costal area of Aceh Province, the northern tip of Sumatra, Indonesia. The data presented in this study were elicited during Field Methods course offered at Cornell University, the spring semester 2007, and subsequent individual meetings with the language consultant in October 16-18 2007, May 13-15 2008, and September 19 2008. I follow the orthographic system used in Daud & Durie’s (1999) Acehnese-Indonesian-English Thesaurus.
1. Introduction

• The (Anti-)Causative alternation (Schäfer 2008:9):

(1) a. English
   i. John broke the window. Transitive Causative
   ii. The window broke. Intranstive Anticausative/Inchoative

b. German
   i. Hans zerbrach das Fenster
   ii. Das Fenster zerbrach

b. Italian
   i. Gianni ha rotto la finestra
   ii. La finestra si è rotta

(2) Schema for the two variants in the causative alternation (Schäfer 2008:9)
   a. agent V-transitive theme (causative)
   b. theme V-intransitive (anticausative)

• Previous approaches: causativization vs. detransitivization

(3) Two possible directions of derivation in the causative alternation (Alexiadou 2006)
   a. Intransitive Form: V basic
   Transitive Form: V-X
     Causativization: intransitive → transitive
     e.g., Dowty (1979) among others
   b. Intransitive Form: V-Y
   Transitive Form: V basic
     Detransitivization: transitive → intransitive
     e.g., lexical binding (L&R 1995), reflexivization, expletivization (Reinhart 2002)

• Problems of the unified approaches:

(4) Variation in the direction of formal derivation (Hausel 1993:89)
   a. Russian: inchoative derived from causative
      causative: rasplavit’ ‘melt (tr.)’
      inchoative: rasplavit’-sja ‘melt (intr.)’
   b. (Khalkha) Mongolian: causative derived from inchoative
      causative: xajl-uul-ax ‘melt (tr.)’
      inchoative: xajl-ax ‘melt (intr.)’

(5) Non-directed Alternations (Hausel 1993:91-92)
   a. Equipollent: both are derived from the same stem
      Japanese atum-aru ‘gather (intr.)’
      atum-eru ‘gather (tr.)’
   b. Suppletive: different verb roots are used.
      Russian goret’ ‘burn (intr.)’
      žeč ‘burn (tr.)’
   c. Labile: the same verb is used both in the inchoative and in the causative sense.
      Modern Greek svino 1. ‘go out’
      2. ‘extinguish’
• Alexiadou et al.’s (2006) non-unified approach:

[ Voice [ CAUS [ Root ]]]

(7) a. Anticausative structure I:  
unmarked anticausatives

\[
\text{vP} \quad \text{v} \quad \text{open} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{the door}
\]

b. Anticausative structure II:  
marked anticausatives

\[
\text{VoiceP} \quad \text{Voice'} \quad \text{-ext. arg} \quad \text{Voice} \quad \text{-AG} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{v} \quad \sqrt{\text{v}}
\]

(8) PP modification

a. *The window broke by John / with a stone / by the storm.

b. The window broke from the pressure / the explosion

• Acehnese causative alternation: both causativization and detransitivization are involved:

(9) Two types of anticausatives in Acehnese

a. \textbf{ngop} ‘to sink (intr.)’

\[
\text{unmarked anticausative} \quad \text{causativization}
\]

b. \textbf{peu-ngop} ‘to sink (tr.)’

\[
\text{marked anticausative} \quad \text{detransitivization}
\]

c. \textbf{teu-peu-ngop} ‘to be in the state of having been sunk (intr.)’

\[
\text{marked anticausative}
\]

• The main questions addressed in this paper:

i. How alike and/or different are the two types of anticausatives in Acehnese?

ii. What are the theoretical implications of the findings in (i) on the syntactic structure?

• Answers to the questions in advance:

i.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agentivity</th>
<th>Causativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unmarked anticausatives</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marked anticausatives</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passives</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


• Outline:

§2 Background and assumptions

§3&4 Evidence for splitting VoiceP and vP

- Three-way contrast between unmarked anticausatives, marked anticausatives, and passives

- Distribution of morphological markings

§5 Structures for Acehnese anticausatives
2. **Background and Assumptions**

2.1. **Passive Agreement in Acehnese** (*Legate 2008; Lawler 1977; Durie 1988*)

(10) Agreement with the agent in active and passive (Lawler 1977:224-225)

a. Gopnyan ka geu-côm lôn. (active)
   3sg Perf 3-kiss 1Sg
   ‘She kissed me.’

b. Lôn ka geu-côm lé gopnyan. (passive)
   1Sg Perf 3-kiss by 3Sg
   ‘I was kissed by her.’

- Lawler (1977): the verbal agreement in the passive is triggered by the ‘underlying’ subject (*agent*).
- Durie (1988): this is not a passive, but a word order variant of the active.
- Legate (2008): this *is* passive.
   - the raised theme occupies an A-position
   - *lé + agent* behaves as a PP, not a DP
   - the ‘agent agreement’ is not agreement, but rather interpretable features on *v*

- Position of agreement morphology in clausal structure (Legate 2008):

(11) low position of the agreement morphology (Legate 2008:(23))

a. Droeneuh (*neu)-pasti ka *(neu)-pajoh sie
   you 2-must Perf 2-eat meat
   ‘You must have eaten meat.’ (II:21b)

b. Ureueng inong nyan (*geu)-teungoh *(geu)-taguen bu
   person female that 3Pol-Prog 3Pol-cook rice
   ‘The woman is cooking rice.’ (II:21b)

(12) **Object Voice** (Legate 2008:(25)) (cf. Sportiche’s 1996 *Doubly Filled Voice Filter*)

a. Aneuk miet nyan uleue nyan (*di)-kap
   child small that snake that 3Fam-bite
   ‘The snake bit the child.’ (I:97)

b. Aneuk miet nyan akan ureueng inong nyan (*geu)-tingkue
   child small that will person female that 3Pol-carry.in.cloth
   ‘The woman will carry the child.’ (II:11)

2.2. **Split Intransitivity**

- Acehnese is a *split intransitive* language (Durie 1987:366, Legate 2008):

(13) a. Lôn ka (*lôn)-reubah. (unaccusative: no agreement)
   I Perf (*I)-fall
   ‘I fell.’

b. Ureueng agam nyan geu-plueng. (unergative: agreement)
   person male that 3-run
   ‘The man runs.’
c. Hasan geu-buka pintô nyan. (transitive: agreement)
   H 3-open door Dem
   ‘Hasan opened the door.’

2.3. Morphological Causative and Syntactic Decomposition

• Acehnese has a morphological causative construction: causative prefix *peu-* + category-neutral root

• The ‘agreement’ geu- always precedes the causative prefix *peu-.*

(14) Causativization in Acehnese: morphologically marked ‘lexical’ causatives

a. noun ubat ‘medicine’ → *peu-ubat ‘to cure’
   Doto geu-*peu-ubat* aneuq miet nyan.
   doctor 3-Caus-medicine child small Dem
   ‘The doctor is treating/treated the child.’ cf. ubat ‘medicine, drugs’

b. adjective raya ‘big’ → *peu-raya ‘to enlarge’
   Hasan geu-*peu-raya* rumoh gopnyan.
   H 3-Caus-big house s/he
   ‘Hasan enlarges his house.’

c. unaccusative reubah ‘to fall’ → *peu-reubah ‘to cause to fall’
   Hasan geu-*peu-reubah* aneuq nyan.
   H 3-Caus-fall child Dem
   ‘Hasan caused the child to fall.’

d. unergative2 khém ‘to laugh’ → *peu-khém ‘to laugh at; sneer at’
   Fatimah di/geu-*peu-khém* Hasan.
   F 3-Caus-laugh H
   ‘Fatimah laughed at Hasan.’

e. transitive pajôh ‘to eat’ → *peu-pajôh ‘to make eat; feed’
   Fatimah geu-*peu-pajôh* (keu) Hasan boh mamplam.
   F 3-Caus-eat to Hasan mango
   Fatimah geu-*peu-pajôh* boh mamplam *(keu) Hasan.
   F 3-Caus-eat mango to H
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan eat a mango.’ ~ ‘Fatimah fed Hasan a mango.’

• ‘Again’ as a probe into syntactic decomposition:


   Fatimah geu-*peu-reubah* Hasan lôm.
   F 3-Caus-fall H again
   ‘Fatimah caused Hasan to fall, and that had happened before.’
   ‘Fatimah caused Hasan, and Hasan had fallen before.’

---

1 Acehnese has both morphological and periphrastic causatives which can be distinguished by various ‘bi-clausality’ tests. The morphological causative is a ‘lexical’ causative: contra Ko (2008), there is no distinction between ‘lexical’ vs. ‘syntactic’ causative in Acehnese (cf. Travis 2000; Harley 2006). See Ko (2009) for the causative constructions in Acehnese.

2 In general, unergative and transitive verbs can’t be causativized, although there are exceptions to this. Causativization from unergatives involves non-compositional/idiomatic meaning: e.g., *peu-jaq* ‘Caus + to go’ → ‘to accompany/attend someone to some place’, *peu-khém* (12d) ‘to laugh at; sneer at.’ Causativization from transitives involves double object constructions as in (12e). See Ko (2009) for the detail.
2.4. Basic structures

(16) a. unaccusative intransitive verbs

\[ vP \]
\[ \text{VBE or BECOME} \]
\[ \sqrt{P} \]
\[ \sqrt{DP} \]

*b\text{geu}-unaccV due to lack of \text{VoiceP}


b. unergative and transitive verbs

\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{Voice}' \]
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \sqrt{P} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{CALUS}} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{su/peu-}} \]


3. Two types of anticausatives in Acehnese

3.1. Typology of anticausatives

• ‘anticausative’ = ‘change of state without an external argument’ (Alexiadou et al. 2006).
  cf. Haspelmath (1993); ‘an intransitive verb derived from a transitive one.’

• Typology of Voice (Schäfer 2008:174-8):

(17) Interpretation: Syntax: Spell-out:

active: \[ \text{[Agent [Voice_{D,agent} [v [Root]]]} \] (active)
passive: \[ \text{[Voice_{agent} [v [Root]]]} \] (non-active)
anticausative-I \[ \text{[Expl. [Voice_{D,Ø} [v [Root]]]} \] (sich)
anticausative-II \[ \text{[Voice_{Ø} [v [Root]]]} \] (non-active, clitic-\text{si})
anticausative-III \[ \text{[v [Root]]} \] (unmarked)
(Schäfer 2008:176)

(18) a. thematic active Voice: \text{active}

\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ \text{Voice}' \]
\[ \text{Voice}_{\text{agent,Ø}} \]
... (Schäfer 2008:175)

b. thematic passive Voice: \text{passive}

\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \sqrt{P} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{CALUS}} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{su/peu-}} \]

\[ \text{Voice}_{\text{agent,Ø}} \]
...

c. non-thematic active Voice: \text{anticausative I}

\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ \text{Voice}' \]
\[ \text{Voice}_{\text{Ø,Ø}} \]
... (Schäfer 2008:175)

d. non-thematic passive Voice: \text{anticausative II}

\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \sqrt{P} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{CALUS}} \]
\[ \sqrt{\text{su/peu-}} \]

\[ \text{Voice}_{\text{Ø,Ø}} \]
...
• The two types of anticausatives in Acehnese:
  
i. *unmarked anticausatives*: anticausative-III
  
ii. *marked anticausatives*: anticausative-II

(19) a. Peurahô nyan ngop. (unmarked anticausative) anticausative III
    boat  Dem  sink
    ‘The boat sank.’

b. Peurahô nyan teu-peu-ngop (marked anticausative) anticausative II
    boat  Dem  Acaus-Caus-sink
    ‘The boat has been sunk.’

c. Hasan  geu-peu-ngop peurahô nyan (causative)
    H     3-Caus-sink  boat  Dem
    ‘Hasan sank the boat.’

d. Peurahô nyan geu-peu-ngop lé Hasan (passive)
    boat  Dem  3-Caus-sink  by H
    ‘The boat was sunk by Hasan.’

3.2. Three-way contrast between *unmarked anticausatives, marked anticausatives and passives*

A. *by*-phrase (lé+DP)
B. adverbial modification
C. *so*-that (supaya) construction
D. modification by *by itself* (keu droe-jih)

A. *by*-phrase (lé DP)

• *by*-phrase (lé + DP) is, in general, found in passives, but not in anticausatives.

• However, an unintentional/non-volitional causer in marked anticausatives…

  cf. accidental actions or involuntary events/states in Durie 1985

(20) a. Peuraho nyan geu-peu-ngop lé Hasan. ✓ passive
    boat  Dem  3-Caus-sink  by H
    ‘The boat was sunk by Hasan.’

b. Peuraho nyan ngop (*lé Hasan.*) *unmarked anticausative
    boat  Dem  sink  by H
    ‘The boat sank.’

c. Peuraho nyan teu-peu-ngop (lé Hasan.) *marked anticausative*
    boat  Dem  Acaus-Caus-sink  by H
    ‘The boat was sunk by Hasan (unintentionally/non-volitionally).’

3 The meaning of the symbols: ✓ grammatical, * ungrammatical, § acceptable in a special meaning or condition.
• Inanimate cause of the event:

\[(21)\]
\[
a. \text{Pintò nyan } \text{teu-buka } \text{lé angen.}
\]
\[
door \ Dem \ \text{Acaus-open by wind}
\]
\[
‘The door has been opened by the wind.’
\]
\[
b. \text{Hasan } \text{teu-moe } \text{lé filom nyan.}
\]
\[
H \ \text{Acaus-Cau-cry by film} \ \text{Dem}
\]
\[
‘Hasan has been made to cry by the movie.’
\]

• Unmarked anticausatives do not allow this by-phrase:

\[(22)\]
\[
a. *\text{Peuraho nyan } \text{ngop } \text{lé bom nyan.} \quad \text{*unmarked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{sink} \ \text{by bomb Dem}
\]
\[
‘The boat was sunk by the bomb.’
\]
\[
b. \text{Peuraho nyan } \text{teu-peu-ngop } \text{lé bom nyan.} \quad \checkmark \text{marked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{Acaus-Caus-sink by bomb Dem}
\]
\[
‘The boat was sunk by the bomb.’
\]

B. Agent-oriented adverbs

• (pure) manner adverb vs. agent-oriented manner adverb:

\[(23)\]
\[
a. \text{Peurahô nyan } \text{geu-peu-ngop} \ \{\text{bacut-bacut} / \text{meu-teugoh-teugoh}\} \ (\text{lé Hasan.}) \quad \text{passive}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{3-Caus-sink slowly / cautiously by H}
\]
\[
‘The boat was sunk slowly / cautiously (by Hasan).’
\]
\[
b. \text{Peurahô nyan } \text{ngop} \ \{\text{bacut-bacut} / \text{*meu-teugoh-teugoh.}\} \quad \text{unmarked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{sink slowly / cautiously}
\]
\[
‘The boat sank slowly / *cautiously.’
\]
\[
c. \text{Peurahô nyan } \text{teu-peu-ngop} \ \{\text{bacut-bacut} / \text{*meu-teugoh-teugoh.}\} \quad \text{marked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{Acaus-Caus-sink slowly / cautiously}
\]
\[
‘The boat sank slowly / *cautiously.’
\]

• singaja ‘on purpose’:

\[(24)\]
\[
a. \text{Peurahô nyan } \text{singaja geu-peu-ngop} \ (\text{lé Hasan.}) \quad \checkmark \text{passive}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{on.purpose 3-Caus-sink (by H)}
\]
\[
‘The boat was sunk on purpose (by Hasan).’
\]
\[
b. *\text{Peurahô nyan } \text{singaja} \ ngop. \quad \text{*unmarked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{on.purpose sink}
\]
\[
‘The boat sank on purpose.’
\]
\[
c. \text{Peurahô nyan } \text{singaja teu-peu-ngop.} \quad \$\text{marked anticausative}
\]
\[
\text{boat} \ \text{Dem} \ \text{on.purpose Acaus-Caus-sink}
\]
\[
‘The boat was sunk on purpose (e.g., following the collective will of the people.)’
\]
• The combination of *singaja* ‘on purpose’ + *by* phrase is not allowed in marked anticausatives:

(25) Combination of *singaja* ‘on purpose’ + *by* phrase

a. Peurahô nyan *singaja* geu-peu-ngop lé Hasan. ✓passive
   boat Dem on-purpose 3-Caus-sink by H
   ‘The boat was sunk by Hasan on purpose.’

b. *Peurahô nyan *singaja* teu-peu-ngop lé Hasan. *marked anticausative
   boat Dem on-purpose Acaus-Caus-sink by H

C. so-that construction: *supaya*

(26) so-that construction

a. ✓passive
   Mandum peurahô nyan *geu-peu-ngop* supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det 3-Caus-sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem
   ‘All the boats were sunk so that people cannot leave the island.’

b. *unmarked anticausative
   *Mandum peurahô nyan ngop supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem
   ‘All the boats sank so that people cannot leave the island.’

c. ✓marked anticausative
   Mandum peurahô nyan *teu-peu-ngop* supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det AntiC-Caus-sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem
   ‘All the boats have been sunk so that people cannot leave the island.’

D. by itself: *keu droe(-jih)*

• Acehnese *keu droe(-jih)* ‘by itself’ can be present in unmarked anticausatives, but marginal in marked anticausatives, and cannot appear in passives.

(27) *keu droe(-jih)* ‘by itself’: anticausatives but not passives can be modified by *by itself*

a. *Peuraho nyan di/ji-peu-ngop keu droe(-jih) *passive
   boat Dem 3-Caus-sink to self(-3Sg)
   ‘The boat was sunk by itself.’

b. Peuraho nyan ngop keu droe(-jih) ✓unmarked anticausative
   boat Dem sink to self(-3Sg)

c. ??Peuraho nyan teu-peu-ngop keu droe(-jih) ??marked anticausative
   boat Dem Acaus-Caus-sink to self(-3Sg)
   ‘The boat sank by itself.’

• implies that the change of state in this construction is not spontaneous but caused externally.5

4 However, this can mean ‘The boat was sunk by someone himself/herself.’

5 An anticausative might sound better if it has no overt realization of the causative morpheme *peu-*:

i. Pintô nyan teu-ø-buka (keu droe-jih).
   door Dem Acaus-Caus-ø-open by itself
   ‘The door opened (by itself).’
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Summary
• The test results are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unmarked anticausatives</th>
<th>marked anticausatives</th>
<th>passives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meu teugoh teugoh</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘carefully/cautiously’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singaja ‘on purpose’</td>
<td>* ($_)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lê DP ‘by’-phrase</td>
<td>* ($)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supaya ‘so-that’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keu droe(-jih)</td>
<td>✓ (?!)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘by itself’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Further evidence for the Caus component in marked anticausatives
• Unintentional/non-volitional actions can be expressed with marked anticausatives without changing valency.

(28)  a. Fatimah teu-kap bibi Hasan.
       F   Acaus-bite lip H
       ‘Fatimah bit Hasan’s lip (unintentionally).’

   b. Fatimah teu-poh Hasan.
       F   Acaus-beat H
       ‘Fatimah hit/beated Hasan (unintentionally).’

4. Distributional evidence that teu- is in Voice
• Teu- and geu- are in complementary distribution. cf. the agreement geu-: a Voice head
• Teu- is restricted in its distribution:

       Hasan Perf Acaus-cry
       ‘Hasan is in the state of crying.’

   b. Pintô nyan teu-buka.
       door Dem Acaus-open
       ‘The door has been opened.’

   c. Aisyah teu-jôq boh mamplam.
       Aisyah Acaus-give mango
       ‘Aisyah was given the/a mango.’

       mango Acaus-give *(to) Aisyah.
       ‘The/a mango has been given to Aisyah.’
(30) a. *teu-UnaccusativeV: *teu-reubah (reubah ‘to fall’)  
    b. *teu-Adj: *teu-beuhë (beuhë ‘brave’)  
    c. *teu-N: *teu-ubat (ubat ‘medicine’)  

• Teu- cannot co-occur with the agent agreement marker geu-.

(31) Teu- cannot co-occur with the agent agreement marker geu-  
      H  3-Acaus-bite  
      H  Acaus-3-bite  
      ‘Hasan has been bitten.’  

• Teu- is higher than peu-. cf. peu-: a little $v_{\text{CAUS}}$ head in (11)

(32) buka ‘to open’ $\rightarrow$ teu-buka ‘to be in the state of having been opened’  
    $\rightarrow$ *peu-teu-buka ‘to make open’  
      H  (3)-Caus-Acaus-open door Dem  
    b. Hasan geu-peu-gêt pintô nyan teu-buka.  
      H  3-Caus-okay door Dem Acaus-open  
      ‘Hasan made the door open.’  

      door Dem 3-Caus-Acaus-open by H  
    b. Pintô nyan teu-buka lé Hasan.  
      door Dem Acaus-open by H  
      ‘The door was opened by Hasan (unintentionally).’  

• Thus, I conclude that teu- is in Voice.

5. Structures for anticausatives

(34) Acehnese anticausative morpheme teu-: a Voice head with [-agent, -D] feature
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Examples:

a. teu- with ø in the little v

VoiceP

Voice

vP

v'

vCAUS

√P

Ø

√

 kap DP

e.g. teu-kap
Acaus-bite

b. teu- with peu-

VoiceP

Teu

vP

v'

vCAUS

√P

Ø

√

peu DP

ApplP

peu

Appl'

DP

√

Appl

√

pajôh DP

e.g. teu-peu-pajôh (peu-pajôh ‘feed’) Acaus-Caus-eat

This VoiceP analysis of teu-,

- gives a syntactic explanation for the incompatibility of teu- with unaccusative verbs:
  \[ \text{teu- requires as its complement a vP headed by } \sqrt{vCAUS}, \text{ not a vP headed by } \sqrt{vBE/BECOME}. \]

- captures the parallelism/complementary distribution between Acaus teu- and Agr geu-:
  \[ \text{Specified [+agent], geu- takes Agent DP.} \]
  \[ \text{Specified [-agent], teu- suppresses the external argument.} \]

- explains the three-way contrast among unmarked anticausatives, marked anticausatives, and passives.

- provides a non-volitional causer argument with a position to merge.

(36)
6. Conclusions

- Acehnese has two types of anticausatives: unmarked vs. marked.
- These two types of anticausatives are structurally distinct:
  - unmarked anticausatives lack both agentivity and causativity.
  - marked anticausatives lack agentivity but have causativity.
- This can be captured by splitting VoiceP and vP (Alexiadou et al 2006, Harley 2007).
- Morphological markings also support this analysis.
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