Andrea Márkus
The morphosyntax of anticausativity: Hungarian

The data. The present study centers on the productive use of the Hungarian *Ód*-affix and the system of inchoative-causative alternations in Hungarian. I argue on the basis of collected material, syntactic diagnostics and artificially constructed minimal pairs that in present day Hungarian (i) *Ód*-affixation is the default strategy for anticausative-formation from transitive verbs without an unaccusative counterpart (e.g. *hegyez* ('sharpen') $\sim$ *hegyeződik* ('gets sharpened'), cf. also 2a-b), and that (ii) for radical speakers -*Ód* may also function as a productive mediopassive affix (ex. 3a-b). Mediopassive *Ód*-verbs, in contrast with anticausatives, involve a causing event (cf. *elgurul* ('roll') $\sim$ %*elgurítódik* ('gets rolled')); and while the anticausative 'moderate' use is accepted by all speakers, there is significant variation concerning the mediopassive 'radical' use.

(1) Opaque lexicalized form: *el.vág.ód.ik* (= prt.cut.ÓD.3Sg) 'to fall over'

(2) a. A pigment *kivonódik* a hajból (mikor megőszülünk).
   the pigment prt.extract.ÓD.Pres.3Sg the hair.from (when turn.grey.1Pl)
   'When one turns grey, the pigment gets extracted from the hair.'

   b. A ceruza magától *kihegyeződött.*
   The pencil itself.from prt.sharpen.ÓD.Past.3Sg
   'The pencil (got) sharpened by itself .'

(3) a. %Mennyi idő alatt *szállítódik* ki a csomag?
   How.much time under deliver.ÓD.Pres.3Sg prt the parcel
   'How long does it take for the parcel to get delivered?'

   b. %Mondtam, hogy merre gyere, de *lerakódott* a telefonod.
   told.1Sg that where come.2Sg but prt.put.ÓD.Past.3Sg the phone.your
   'I was telling you how to come but your phone got hung up.'

The behavior of *Ód*-verbs leads to a number of oppositions, namely between anticausatives and mediopassives, and between semiproductive and productive alternations:

(4) a. Semiproductive UA$\sim$TR: *gur.ul* $\sim$ *gur.ít* or *szak.ad* $\sim$ *szak.ít* ('roll' or 'rip')
   b. Productive UA$\sim$TR: *hegyez.őd.ik* $\sim$ *hegyez* ('sharpen')
   c. Mediopassive: *%hegyez.őd.ik or %gur.ít.ód.ik* ('gets sharpened or rolled')

Research questions. This set of data raises three important questions: (i) how can the difference between the moderate and radical use of -*Ód* be captured (cf. 4-b vs. 4-c); (ii) how is it possible that adding extra morphology to a transitive verb apparently takes away meaning (as in 4-b) [1]; (iii) and finally, how can the contrast between semi- (or un)productive vs. productive anticausative formation (4-a vs. 4-b) be accounted for?

Framework and assumptions. I adopt a specific version of the nanosyntactic framework developed by Starke (2009), which builds on the idea that a single morpheme can spell out several terminals (=phrasal spellout/spanning) [2]. This conception implies that the lexical representation of a morpheme may contain an entire subtree (e.g. Starke 2006, 2009) in addition to semantic, phonological and possibly further syntactic information. A cornerstone of this approach is underassociation/shrinking: for lexical insertion/spellout,

---

[1] At this point I diverge from Komlósy (2000) in that I take the data to indicate that *Ód*-affixation can be fully productive and that *Ód*-verbs may form real anticausatives.

[2] For alternative proposals of phrasal spellout developed independently of nanosyntax, see Weerman and Evers-Vermeul (2001), Williams (2003), Newson (2010) and Adger (in preparation); and for other versions of nanosyntax, Ramchand (2008a,b) and Taraldsen (2009a,b).

the subtree in the lexical entry has to be identical with or be a superset of the syntactic subtree (the Superset principle, Caha 2007). Furthermore, this particular implementation of nanosyntax assumes that lexical entries can refer to other entries in the lexicon: this is implemented by means of pointers.

In addition, I work with a fine-grained verb structure, which consists of the projections Init, Proc and Res (as proposed by Ramchand 2008). These may, with some simplifications, translate into a DM-flavored Minimalism as Voice, v and V. The head Init is responsible for the introduction of the agent. Furthermore, basing myself on recent studies of verb alternations (e.g. Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou and Schäfer 2005 or Svenonius 2006), I will separate agentivity from causation/causing event. In particular, I will split Init into Init and Cause, where Cause is present in but Init is missing from non-agentive caused events.

These premises I will have to further refine at one point. Specifically, I hypothesize the existence of a functional head, which turns verb roots into proper verbs (similarly to the *v* of certain varieties of DM, e.g. Marantz 2001). This head may be conceived of as an event head, which closes off the phase, maybe along the lines of Travis' (2010) inner aspect head. I will assume that in the case of transitive verbs, the closing of the phase is performed by Init; in the case of Init-less verbs like anticausatives and mediopassives, it is implemented by a corresponding, provisionally labelled Ev. Ev may be spelled out for instance by *-Ul* (cf. *gur-ul*), whereas *-ít* in *gur-ít* is a manifestation of Init.

Analysis. Given the functional sequence introduced above, I assign the following structures to the different verb types: (i) transitive verbs without an unaccusative counterpart (such as *hegyez* 'sharpen') are composed of Init, Cause and Proc (and possibly Res), while the verb roots which serve as the basis for the inchoative/causative alternation (as *gur* in *gurul/gurít*) will only consist of Proc (and possibly Res). The causative (or factitive) affixes, such as *-ít, -Aszt* or *-tAt*, will span Init and Cause, whereas the inchoative morphemes (e.g. *-Ul, -Ad* or the default unaccusativizer *-Ód*) spell out Ev. Pointers will combine the ingredients of the non-productive forms (e.g. *gur* with *-ít* or *-Ul*, or *szak* with *-Ad* or *-ít* etc.), while the productive anticausative and mediopassive *Ód*-verbs are derived compositionally by underassociation and *Ód*-affixation. Specifically, shrinking a transitive verb such as *hegyez* ('sharpen') to the size of Proc and combining it with the default Ev head *-Ód* will yield an anticausative. In addition, radical speakers can combine *-Ód* with Cause+Proc, which produces the mediopassive *%hegyeződik* ('gets sharpened') and *%gurítódik* ('gets rolled'). It follows from their morphological make-up that in the case of the former, *hegyez* spells out both Proc and Cause, whereas in the latter case *gur* spells out only Proc, and *-ít* is responsible for Cause. Thereby, both the semiproductive causative-inchoative pairs (*e.g. gurul ~ gurít*) and the productive anticausative/mediopassive *Ód* forms, such as (%)*kihegyeződik* and %*gurítódik* are obtained, whereas the hypothetical and ungrammatical forms **guródik, *gurulódik* or the anticausative (*ie.* Cause-less) **gurítódik* are underivable.

Conclusions. In this study I argue that the answer to research question (i) follows from the absence/presence of a causing event: in anticausatives, *-Ód* combines with Proc, whereas in mediopassives, it attaches to Cause+Proc. Speaker variation emanates from selectional differences: as opposed to moderate speakers, radical speakers allow for both types of mergers. In connection with (ii) I propose that it is not the full-fledged transitive verb that serves as an input to anticausative (or mediopassive) *Ód*-formation but an underassociated form; and finally, (iii) differentiation between semi-(or un)productive and productive affixation is made possible by the make-up of the lexicon. The analysis, which rests on the notion of phrasal spellout and underassociation, provides a comprehensive account of this aspect of the inchoative-causative alternation in Hungarian.