In search of causative structures in the root based morphology: a case of Polish roz-/roze- causatives

1. Introduction

Nowadays causative formations are usually mentioned in relation to anticausatives. While the formation of anticausative structures in Polish is a well researched area of morpho-syntax (recently by Junghanns et al. 2011, Rościńska-Frankowska, 2012, Malicka-Kleparska 2012 a ), causatives are by no means as popular. It is generally acknowledged that Polish, like other Slavic languages, has a productive anticausativization rule building unaccusative predicates with the clitic się, while the valency of the basic causative verb decreases. Causativization in Polish, however, has attracted little attention within the generative framework. In an early generative study Olszewska (1986) analyzed causative constructions in Polish, but since then the theory has changed beyond recognition.

In this paper we will tackle just one causative operation in Polish and we will try to show on this example the complex nature of the issues connected with causativization. We will take up the data where the causative character of the morphologically complex verb correlates with the presence of the

---

1 I would like to express my gratitude to both Anonymous Reviewers of this paper. I have tried to implement their suggestions and this attempt has resulted in a thoroughly revised analysis of stative and experiencer roots. Many of their questions must remain unanswered at present, especially these connected with morphologically complex variants of anticausatives in Polish.

2 Either the causative variant is taken to be derived from the anticausative one, e.g. by Dowty (1979), Lakoff (1968), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2012), or the anticausative verb is believed to be secondary, e.g. by: Chierchia (2004), Grimshaw (1982), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), Reinhart (2002), Koontz-Garboden (2009).

3 In root based approaches causatives and anticausatives share a common root, without direct derivational relationship between them, see e.g.: Alexiadou et al. (2006), Doron (2003), Alexiadou and Doron (2012), Embick (2009).

4 For the status of się in unaccusatives see e.g. Laskowski (1984 a), Junghanns et al. (2011), Rościńska-Frankowska (2012), Malicka-Kleparska (2012 ), also against a more extensive linguistic material - Rivero and Sheppard (2003).

5 How the valency decrease is obtained depends on a particular approach – the most recent proposal being that reflexivization is at the root of the process, see Junghanns et al. (2011).
morphe morpheme \textit{roz}^-{\textit{roze}}. Polish possesses a number of morphological exponents realizing causativizing functions, but \textit{roz} finds its way into a significant number of varied formations. In Present Day Polish the morpheme has been known to produce new words, like for instance a very recent, though colloquial \textit{rozkminić} ‘get at the heart of something, work something out’, thus the data with \textit{roz}- constitute a good starting point for a much needed broader discussion of (Polish) causatives. More particularly, we will try to establish what position can be taken up by \textit{roz}- in Polish causatives and related formations and how the semantics of the structure with this formative correlates with the structural position of \textit{roz}- with respect to the basic root. We will argue that \textit{roz}- performs the specific key function of the voice head element in Polish causatives and we will investigate the properties of the structures it appears in as well as of the verbal roots deriving the relevant causatives.

The theoretical framework relied on here will be introduced in section 2. A preliminary exposition of causativization in section 3. will highlight the standpoint that the causative meaning should be read off the proposed clausal structure and does not depend directly on the presence of the external argument. Subsection 3.1. will outline Koontz-Garboden’s (2009) findings bearing on the independence of causativisation from the co-existence of the external argument in a phrase. Then Polish unaccusatives will be tested for the presence of the causative meaning in their structures (3.2.). The analysis severing causation from the presence of the external argument will be situated against a broader spectrum of the relevant linguistic literature in subsection 3.3. Section 4. will be devoted to the research focused on

\footnote{Szymanek (2010: 166-169), whose recent monograph includes the said prefix, does not mention its valency changing properties. Wróbel (1984:504) adumbrates these functions of \textit{roz-froze} which we concentrate on here. Rościnska-Frankowska (2012) altogether undermines the role of prefixes in the formation of causatives in Polish. This may be true about some prefixes, but we do not think such reasoning can be applied to \textit{roz-froze}.

For the alternations involved see Gussmann (2007:106). Basically the variant \textit{roze} appears before most consonants and consonantal clusters, while \textit{roz} before vowels and other consonantal clusters. For our purposes the alternations are immaterial. From now on we will refer to both allomorphs as \textit{roz-}. In fact, as Olszewska (1986:79) maintains, the causative derivatives of the relevant kind have the complex circumfix-like formant: \textit{roz-\textit{-i(ć)}}. The basic form is not only prefixed, but also suffixed. To simplify the matters, we will refer to the morpheme as \textit{roz-}, as the prefixal data are much more salient in Polish than vocalic patterns involved in the formation of stems – see, however, Laskowski (1984b) for detailed information about the structure of the Polish verb and the role of stem forming suffixes, as well as the classic templates supplied for the verb in Slavic by Jakobson (1948) and in Polish by Schenker (1954). The structure of the verbal representation which in Polish may serve as the derivational basis of more complex forms has been very recently taken up by Bloch-Trojnar (2013), albeit in the lexicalist tradition.}
roots appropriate for building causative verbs. Schäffer’s (2007) (4.1.) and Embick’s (2009) (4.2.)
typologies will be introduced here. Polish causative material marked with prefixal element roz- will
occupy us in section 5. Particular subsections encompass superficially distinct root types co-occurring
with this prefix: subsection 5.1. concerns Schaffer’s (2007) unspecified cause roots, 5.3. – stative
roots, 5.4.- roots of experiencer verbs. Section 5.2. will establish the position of roz- as a voice head
in Polish causatives. The paper will terminate with conclusions and suggestions for further research
(6.).
In the text we opt for the type of analysis where the causative semantics is a derivative of proposed
structures. The whole group of causatives shares the class of roots, superficially varied, which,
however, can be reduced to a single characteristic: they are good predicates of events.

2. Theoretical framework

The theory which will be adhered to in this text represents a brand of Distributed Morphology (Halle
is that derived words are productively formed in the syntax, by means of rules which follow syntactic
regularities adopted from Chomskian Minimalist Program. Heads – realized by overt or zero
morphological material – attach to various positions in a structure which is potentially clausal. At the
heart of a linguistic derivation this theory places (after Hale and Keyser 1993, 1998, Embick 2004,
Alexiadou and Doron 2010) the ultimate referring unit entered in the lexicon – the root, which may be
category-neutral.8 The root does not carry any information concerning the external argument of a
clause – the information about this participant is contributed by the structure (see Marantz 1984,

---

8 Whether roots are equipped with the information concerning their categories is an open issue. Embick (2004,
2009), whose particular solutions concerning roots will be important in this text, opts for this possibility.
The theory of morpho-syntax resting on such initial assumptions allows researchers to bring new insights into the area of valency rearrangement phenomena. For instance, by looking at the relationships within the valency system which are not to be directly expressed via derivation, Alexiadou and Doron (2012) have been able to reduce the rich valency system of world languages to two major voice distinctions, addressing similarities between the passive, reflexive, anticausative and middle voice (as opposed to the active voice) by means of a common element of structure; In approaches based on the lexicalist principles passive structures are the work of syntax, reflexives either of syntax or of the lexicon (depending on a language), while anti-causatives and middles may be related by some semantic extension rule (see e.g. Chierchia 1995, Reinhart and Siloni 2005. In this paper we will rely on the theoretical tenets introduced in various analyses by Embick, Alexiadou, Agnostopoulou, Doron, Schäffer, and others with similar convictions to set the background for our own findings, which are such that causative meaning in Polish is predictable of the basis of the structure which may be proposed for causative verbs and that bases of causatives in Polish can be shown to constitute a coherent class of roots. In other words causativization in Polish, at least in the case of roz-, is predictable and can be productive, hence accountable for by the syntactic component along other morph-syntactic phenomena.

3. Causativization as a morpho-syntactic phenomenon in its own right

In this section the morpho-syntactic properties of causative verbs will be adumbrated and illustrated with some examples from the languages in which the valency enhancement is accompanied by

---

9 In this paper we will use various terms to refer to the verbs which describe the change of state of their internal arguments and which at the same time do not require the presence of any instigator of this change in their syntactic environment. A thorough discussion concerning the status and the problems associated with delimiting this class of verbs is to be found e.g. in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995:1-31). There such verbs are referred to as unaccusatives. However, various sources which we will use in this paper name various subclasses of these verbs differently. We will follow these sources in their original terminology as far as possible, unless this practice causes misunderstanding. Thus we will talk about anticausative verbs in those cases where morphological exponents suggest the derived nature of unaccusatives; Unfortunately the term prompts a definite direction of the derivation, which in our approach is not a legitimate claim to make: here anticausatives are just unaccusatives/change of state verbs with morphological exponents. Another term we will use encompasses a subclass of unaccusative inchoatives. This subclass is distinguished after Langendoen (1969:151) as: ‘Inchoative – designating a one-place predicate that asserts that the state of affairs described in its argument comes about’. Such verbs usually stress the beginning stage of a process. The varied terminology used in our work reflects multifarious nature of unaccusativity itself.
morphological exponents. This will be followed by a discussion advocating the separation of causative meaning from the presence of the external argument (3.1., 3.2., 3.3.).

Various languages involve processes which result in the addition of morphological material to a basic form and this surplus of form is accompanied by an enrichment of the event structure with an additional participant – a cause of the event. These processes can be illustrated with the examples below:

1. Polish: Chłopak ruszył powoli. ‘The boy went on slowly’ – Szklanka gorącego mleka rozruszała chłopaka. ‘A hot glass of milk has speared the boy on’

   English: John is bold. – This success emboldened John.

   Georgian: k’rep-ı ‘Sb. picks it’ – a-k’rep-in-eb-s ‘Sb. makes sb. else pick it’ (Lomashvili 2011: 60)

The examples in (1.) show the distinction between non-causative and causative structures containing the same root: Causatives are bi-argumental, as opposed to simpler non-causatives. An additional participant is equipped which the role of the Causer of the event specified by the non-causative predicate.

In the approach to morphology which codes valency rearrangements in terms of verbal structures based on roots, the more complex situation described by the verbs on the right, with more participants involved, must be reflected by a richer morpho-syntactic representation, as compared with the predicates on the left. The difference between the forms on the left and on the right may seem monobloc – the addition of one argument with the unvarying role of a Causer. However, when we consider a broader language perspective, we will notice that the presence of an additional argument and the causation effect do not have to go hand in hand and thus they may be separate phenomena, represented in distinct ways. Such a separation can be observed in the case of e.g. applicatives, Involuntary State Constructions, weather verbs (see e.g.: Pylkkänen 2008, Lomashvili 2011, and for

---

The presence of additional morphological material is not a prerequisite for the existence of a causative verb. In languages like English causative and unaccusative verbs usually do not differ morphologically, e.g.: John broke a branch vs. A branch broke, but they do not belong to the proper morpho-syntax.
Polish in particular - Rivero et al. 2010, Rivero and Arregui 2012, Malicka-Kleparska 2012 b, c), where the valency increase is not accompanied by the causative meaning.

Likewise, causative meaning can be visible independently of the (overt) presence of the external Causer argument. In this context passive structures or dispositional middles can be mentioned (see e.g. Reinhart and Siloni 2004, Alexiadou and Doron 2012).

The length limitations of this paper prevent us from discussing the above interrelations in any detail. Instead we will concentrate on less obvious arguments for the separation of causation from the external argument coming from the area of entailment.

### 3.1. Koontz-Garboden’s (2009) Monotonicity Hypothesis and Cause preservation in anticausatives

Among the sources which consider the separation of causation from argument addition in morphosyntax (see 3.3. below), an important contribution is made by Koontz-Garboden (2009), who argues for such dissociation in the case of anticausative verbs. For his Monotonicity Hypothesis\(^\text{11}\) to be tenable the Cause operator must stay in anticausatives derived from causatives, although the causing argument is lost in the derivation. Koontz-Garboden insists that a derived anticausative verb is associated with a representation of Cause, quite independent from the absent Causer argument. The data which he concentrates on are anticausatives created in the reflexive fashion (see also Chierchia 2004, Reinhart and Siloni 2004, 2005, Everaert et al. 2012 a), so from bi-argumental predicates. Consequently, anticausatives should imply the Cause element, as it is present with their bases – transitive change of state verbs. For us, the critical moment is the dissociation of the causative layer of the representation from the presence of the causative external argument, which is another way of looking at Koontz-Garboden’s data.

\(^{11}\) For precise formulations and justification of the Monotonicity Hypothesis see Koontz-Garboden (2009, 2012).
The arguments that he presents for the separation and which we can test for the Polish data predominantly come from the sphere of entailment. First and foremost he claims that a causative verb does not have to entail the corresponding anticausative. Such an entailment could be expected since the causative verb is believed to ‘contain’ the meaning of the change of state of its Theme: if somebody broke the cane then the cane is broken. Consequently, if the first part of this statement is true, the second one must be true as well. Koontz-Garboden proves this reasoning to be groundless if the inchoative situation of the Theme is expressed in terms of a (morphologically marked) anticausative verb:

2. *The cane did not break, you broke it.*

Or for Polish:

3. *Laska nie złamała się, to ty ją złamałeś. ‘The cane did not break, you broke it’.*

Koontz-Garboden interprets these entailment phenomena as the evidence that both the clauses in a complex sentence are caused by distinct Causes: the cane has not been broken by a different causer, so to speak, than it has been broken by, hence no entailment holds between the clauses in the complex sentence and it is grammatical. Thus anticausative verbs are not associated with overt arguments causing the change, yet Causes are present in their semantics.

We may take these entailment phenomena as evidence in favor of postulating a separate Cause layer in the structural representation of anticausative verbs or, alternately, anticasatives can be equipped with a characteristic structure from which the causative reading results. The first type of solution would follow the general lines drawn by Alexiadou and Doron (2012). Although they do not postulate the causative layer of structure for their anticasatives, they introduce such a projection in causative

---


13 Anonymous Reviewer (1) poses the question why in Polish the sentence: *Woda nie rozfalowała się, to wiatr ją rozfalował ‘Water did not roll in waves, the wind made it roll’* is grammatical, while the sentence *Woda nie faluje, to wiatr ją rozfalował ‘Water is not rolling, the wind has made it roll’* is not. These issues will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.2. and 5. To preview the solution, however, we will claim that in the first case the situation is like in (3.), while in the other case we have a stative verb falować – with the same root in a different – predicate of state – position and with no causation structurally encoded.
structures (headed by $\gamma$), which could be easily adopted if causation is recognized as part and parcel of anticausatives. The other solution, which we will adopt in the course of our analysis, has been prompted by the representations of target state verbs by Embick (2009). Embick does not assign a separate layer of structure to produce the causative reading for anticausatives, but proposes a specific structure for the verbs with inchoative (target state) interpretation (see sec. 4.2.), from which the causative semantics is gleaned (see (11.) below). We have decided on a variant along the lines taken by Embick over the otherwise elegant separate layer model since Embick’s structures equally apply to morphologically marked anticausatives and to such which are not morphologically marked in any obvious way. Koontz-Garboden (2009), Alexiadou (2010), as well as Alexiadou and Doron (2012) make it exceedingly clear that their models are applicative to morphologically marked unaccusatives, decidedly excluding unmarked ones. Particular levels of structure contain morphological material and thus unmarked unaccusatives will have poorer structure than anticausatives, equipped with morphological exponents. The two classes are predicted to behave differently in language. Our investigations of unaccusatives in Polish carried out below (see section 3.2.) and elsewhere (see Malicka-Kleparska 2012 a) show distinctly that morphologically marked and unmarked unaccusatives behave in Polish in the same way in most respects (see however section 5.2.) . Embick’s model, quite apart from the fact that it allows us to represent all the necessary information without redundancy and doubtful theoretical concepts, does not differentiate between marked and unmarked forms – just what is needed for the Polish data.

3.2. Polish marked and unmarked unaccusatives and Cause preservation

Before we proceed with other arguments adopted from Koontz-Garboden (2009), we have to make a detour into the area of Polish unaccusatives to modify Koontz-Garboden’s ideas about anticausatives versus other unaccusatives in accordance with the Polish facts.

Polish data speak in favor of deriving all unaccusatives (morphologically marked and unmarked) directly from roots with similar merge operations. The entailment phenomena will be focused below
and they will show that anticausatives with się and unaccusatives without such morphological marking point alike to the presence of two different causing forces for all unaccusatives:

4. Unmarked unaccusatives:

   *Ona nie utonęła, to ty ją utopiłeś*. ‘She did not drown, you drowned her’
   
   *To nie osiadło, ty to osadziłeś*. ‘It did not sink, you sank it’
   
   *Galareta nie zastygła, ja ją sama zastudziłam*. ‘Jelly did not set, I set it myself’

5. Marked anticausatives:

   *Student nie zniechęcił się, to ty go zniechęciłeś*. ‘The student did not give up, you dissuaded him’
   
   *Żołnierze nie cofnęli się, to ty ich cofnąłeś*. ‘Soldiers did not withdraw, you withdrew them’
   
   *Dziecko nie przeziębilo się, to ty je przeziębiles*. ‘The child did not chill, you chilled it’

The mono-argumental verbs in (4.) and (5.) are equally suggestive of the presence of the Cause element. Other kinds of mono-argumentals do not behave in the same way. Unergatives in (6.) will illustrate the difference:

6. *Ona nie śmiała się, to ty ją rozśmieszyłeś*. ‘She did not smile, you made her smile’
   
   *Pies nie biegł, to ty go wybiegałeś*. ‘The dog did not run, you walked it’
   
   *Dziecko nie siusiało, to ty je wysiusiałeś*. ‘The child did not pee, you made it pee’

Unergatives do not have the Cause semantics encoded in their structure and so they cannot be parts of grammatical sentences of the relevant kind. Negation cannot relate to the Cause of the unergative sentence, as it has none; it must scope over the whole event, which is presented in positive terms in the transitive sentence. Consequently, the complex sentence cannot be processed.

---

14 The examples involving unergatives have somewhat colloquial flavor, although they belong to the lexicon of Polish speakers. Polish does not have a rule productively forming transitive verbs on the roots which appear in unergatives. Such verbs are occasionalisms with a jocular character, at least at the beginning of their lexical history.
Koontz-Garboden (2009) puts forward also other arguments for the presence of Cause with anticausatives. For instance anticausatives can appear with the by itself phrase, suggesting causation, while e.g. stative verbs cannot take such PPs. An analogical situation obtains for the Polish data; Again no distinction can be noticed between morphologically marked and unmarked unaccusatives:  

7. Unmarked unaccusatives

_Znieruchomiał sam z siebie._ ‘He quietened by himself’

8. Marked unaccusatives

_Myśl narodziła się sama z siebie._ ‘The thougth got born by itself’

Stative verbs, as in Koontz-Garboden’s data, do not accept such PPs:

9. *_Postrzegał sam z siebie_ ‘He perceived by himself’

* _Mieszkał sam z siebie_ ‘He lived by himself’

* _Spał sam z siebie_ ‘He slept by himself’

We will account for this state of affairs in the course of our analysis (sections 5.1, 5.3. and 5.4) by showing that only the roots which are good predicates of events reside in the structures with causative meaning, while the roots in (9.) are good predicates of states.  

---

15 See, however, Jabłońska (2007) for the opposite opinion about the Polish data, contested in Malicka-Kleparska (2012 a).

16 Another explanation may be an option here as well. Segal and Landau (2012: 243) show that certain verbs have path semantics encoded in them and this path meaning has syntactic consequences. For instance directional PPs can be used with such verbs. Others, although their meaning should allow the same modifications, do not tolerate such phrases. This claim can be illustrated with the following sentences: _The branch fell to the ground_ vs. *_It rained to the ground._ In unaccusatives (and inchoatives in particular) the path reading manifests itself as the change of state that the argument undergoes, whereas in states of the type represented in (9.) no path, no vector of change or movement is implied. The phrase ‘_sam z siebie_’ may occur only with such verbs which have Cause projection and are consistent with the path reading. Notice that in Polish the phrase ‘_sam z siebie_’ contains the preposition _z_, which in other contexts has directional uses, e.g.: _z domu_ ‘out of the house’, _z miasta ‘from a city’, etc. This path meaning trace remaining in the expression ‘_sam z siebie_’ in Polish (literally: ‘alone out of oneself’) reflects the path meaning of the verb so that the two units of structure are semantically congruous. Stative verbs do not have roots allowing the path reading, they do not participate in the structures that allow causative interpretation and are not congruous with ‘_sam z siebie_’. The problem with such a solution will become obvious in sec. 5.3., where we will analyze the statives which have corresponding causatives. Possibly their roots are associated with path meaning too.
Having considered the entailment data and the occurrence of causative PPs discussed in this section, we feel entitled to claim that unaccusative verbs in Polish possess structures interpretable semantically as implying causation. These structures, however, are not tantamount to the introduction of additional arguments.

3.3. Other proposals for distinguishing causation from the augmentation of valency

Other researchers also propose independent projections for Cause related phenomena and for the addition of arguments. Pylkkänen (2008: 83-84) extensively argues that causatives are built not only and not always of the addition of an external argument. The Voice head introducing this argument can be ‘bundled’ with the causative head – constructing a morpho-syntactic unit (e.g. in English), but Finnish desiderative causatives or Japanese adversity causatives in Pylkkänen (2008), or Georgian adversity causatives in Lomashvili (2011) constitute such cases where Cause and Voice (introducing an additional argument) have to be independent of each other.

Alexiadou et al. (2006) in their analysis of anticausative and causative verbs also argue that agentivity and causation should be syntactically represented as distinct heads. Again the arguments are based on the appearance of causative PPs with anticausative verbs in English, Greek and German. Schäffer (2007, Ch. 4.) also shows, using data from various languages, that causation present in anticausatives is not to be identified with the presence of an external argument, even implicit. Embick (2009) represents causation not really as a structural element, but as a semantic interpretation of the relevant structure in which the target state and event are structural sisters and independent of other units. Approaches to causativizations which are not based on structure are also available; e.g. Neeleman and van de Koot (2012) argue that causation is a part of the semantic representation of causative structures, but it is not encoded as an additional layer of structure and does not result from the structure itself. ¹⁷

¹⁷ Some other sources refrain from dividing the causative element from the addition of the external argument. See e.g. the approaches which add the predicate (CAUSE) to the unaccusative verb: Lakoff (1968), Dowty (1979), Williams (1981), Pesetsky (1995), etc. Another line of reasoning is present in the analyses where arguments are characterized by the presence of the causative feature – see e.g. Reinhart (2000, 2002), Chierchia 2004, Everaert et al. (2012 a).
The so-far proposed analyses create theoretical constructs which are not easily observable in language data (additional layers of structure, heads, derivational links between anticausatives and causatives) and/or fail to connect the type of verb that can be derived with the kind of root it is based on. In our solution we will try to attain both: the maximum simplicity without redundancy and stipulated constructs and the uniform description of a class of the roots appropriate for the derivation of causatives in Polish.

4. Types of roots entering the causative alternation

4.1. Schäffer’s (2007) classification of roots

Schäffer (2007) proposes a universal system in which certain classes of roots participate in causative and anticausative structures. In the following parts of this paper we will analyze the behavior of various classes of verbal roots in Polish in the light of their predilection for the causative formation, at the same time referring to Schäffer’s (2007) system in order to see how Polish is situated with respect to more universal tendencies. We shall see that Schäffer’s (2007) root classification is of limited use for Polish data (sections 5.3. and 5.4).

Schäffer (2007: 278) maintains that verbal roots are situated on the so-called spontaneity scale, where they range from agentive, through externally caused, unspecified as to the cause, to internally caused. Only the roots which are marked for the unspecified cause participate in the causative/anticausative alternation: So for instance causatives from the agentive roots which build also unergative verbs are not an option.

In the course of our analysis we will show that only one subclass of Polish causatives is based on the appropriate roots (5.1.), so Schäffer’s system does not offer the distinctions relevant to the Polish data.

4.2. Embick’s (2009) root typology

---

18 This scale is widely adopted in other works within the root based morpho-syntax, e.g. in Alexiadou (2010) and Alexiadou and Doron (2012).

19 Cf. however fn 14.
While the previous system of classifying roots re their participation in the causative alternation will prove to be of limited significance for Polish data, Embick’s (2009) typology seems to work perfectly well for Polish roz- causatives. Embick came up with his system while working on the distinction between states and stative passives, and not on causative verbs. We find it very interesting and theoretically significant that a similar system proves useful in a different area of morpho-syntax. Embick (2009) claims that roots differ in the lexicon as to what they are good predicates of. √DARK is a good predicate of states, √BREAK – of states and events, √POUND – of events. The verbal structure containing such roots can be schematically represented as (after Embick 2009):

![Diagram](image)

In this structure position 1 is available for predicates of events (√BREAK, √POUND), i.e. such roots which are marked lexically as appropriate for predicates of events, position two – for predicates of states (√BREAK, √DARK). The configuration includes two sister nodes: v and √P, which represent the causing event and the caused state respectively. The causative relationship results from the specific structural configuration proposed in (11.). This combination, with the positions filled in a specific way will serve us as the structure we propose for all unaccusatives:

---

20 Unfortunately his analysis is available only in the handout form, thus it supplies scanty explanation and many issues are under-discussed, but no more extensive research has ever followed this pilot study. Thus our interpretation of his system may not be always faithful to his intentions.
The v which is the sister to the root \(\sqrt{}\) may be filled with morphological material, e.g.: -en in \(\sqrt{}QUIET\) + en. ST stands for the state caused by the manner\(^{21}\) predicate (based on the root of the eventive type); Consequently, according to Embick, ST’s lexical content can remain empty. The DP is the internal argument of the clause in which such a verbal structure is situated.\(^{22}\)

We will not go into any details of Embick’s (2009) analysis here as it deals with a different area of morpho-syntax; Suffice it to say that his root typology and the verbal structure whose semantic interpretation involves causation fit perfectly as instruments for analyzing unaccusative, stative and causative formations in Polish.

5. Polish \(roz\)- data

Polish causative formations having anticausative counterparts are built in a number of ways. Olszewska (1986) discusses syntactic (analytic) causatives as well as morphological causatives, where causation is connected with prefixation and suffixification, elicitization with \(się\), suppletion, etc. Out of the rich system of Polish causatives we have chosen just one morphological type, the prefixation with \(roz\)- exemplified below.\(^{23}\)

12. Pomruk zachwytu \(rozfalował\) thum ‘The murmur of wonder swayed the crowd’ vs. Zniecierpliwiony thum \(falował\) ‘The restless crowd swayed’

\(^{21}\)The initial position dominated by the event node may be also interpreted as the MANNER node (Embick 2009). So the root specifies the manner in which the state should be understood.

\(^{22}\)In intransitive clauses it will end up as the subject of the clause.

\(^{23}\)The data are taken from the National Corpus of the Polish Language, included in the references as Przepiórkowski et al. (2012). The verbs in many cases differ significantly in meaning in the causative and the non-causative frame, but these lexical discrepancies are not within the interest of this paper.
13. Trener rozgrzeszy Victora po meczu ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi ‘The coach will pardon Victor after the match with the United States’ vs. Goście w Grójcu skutecznością nie grzeszyli ‘The guests in Grójec did not sin by showing overly effectiveness’

14. mróz […] który roziskrzył śniegową powłokę ‘frost, which would make the snow coat glitter’ vs. śnieg iskrzy na gałęziach ‘snow glitters on branches’

15. Upadł tak pechowo, że roztrzaskał kask ‘He fell so badly that he cracked his helmet’ vs. W pewnej chwili coś zaczyna trzaskać pod nogami ‘At one moment something begins to crack under one’s feet’

16. Przedszkolaki były szczęśliwe i zadowolone, że mogą rozweselić smutne buzie chorych kolegów ‘The nursery children were happy and glad that they could make their ill friends’ faces cheerful’ vs. Smutni weseleją ‘The sad ones grow cheerful’

17. drzewa rozzielenią pąki tylko po to, żebym mogła któryś zerwać ‘Trees make their buds grow green only for me to pick one’ vs. gatunki o kolorowych liściach zielenieją ‘The species with colorful leaves grow green’

The verbs in the examples in the left hand column contain the morpheme roz- and manifest causative semantics, while their counterparts on the right have downgraded valency and varied semantics. This variation will be the topic of our investigations below; we will single out particular subclasses of causative verbs associated with (apparently) different classes of roots and distinct structures. The ultimate aim will be to show that the available structures allow us to glean from them the causative meaning and the types of roots can be reduced to predicates of events without external theta roles to assign.

5.1. Roz- causatives with corresponding anticausative verbs, based on the roots with unspecified cause

Some roots which participate in the causative alternation adhere to Schäffer’s (2007) regularity stated for unspecified causes:

---

24 The forms of causative verbs and non-causatives in (16.) show morpho-phonological alternations connected with the presence of the causative suffix –i(ć), which accompanies the prefix. Details of these alternations are not relevant for our text but can be found in Laskowski (1984 b).
18. rozjaśnić ‘lighten, caus.’ vs. jaśnieć ‘become light’, rozmiękczyć ‘soften, caus.’ vs. mięknąć ‘become soft’, rozrzedzić ‘dilute, caus.’ vs. rzednieć ‘become diluted’, rozzielenić ‘cause to become green’ vs. zieleńć ‘become green’, rozweselić ‘cheer up, caus.’ vs. weseleć ‘become cheerful’, roztrzeźwić ‘sober up, caus.’ vs. trzeźwieć ‘become sober’, etc.

Since the cause is not pre-conditioned by the root, for each verb we may have grammatical sentences with a number of various causers, both animate and inanimate:

19. Malarz rozjaśnił portret. ‘The painter lightened the portrait’ (Agent), Uśmiech rozjaśnił twarz. ‘The smile lightened the face’ (Instrument), Słońce rozjaśniło krajobraz. ‘The sun lightened the view’ (Natural Force)

Based on the findings of the root based morpho-syntax (in particular Alexiadou and Doron’s 2012), we propose to assign the following structure to the causative change of state verbs, where the (unspecified cause) root occupies the position of the predicate of the event causing the state in its complement (see 11. above). The structure below is given for the verb rozmiękczyć ‘soften’:
Following Embick’s (2009) insights we claim that the causative head is not necessary in such structures as the causative meaning results from the structure in which the causing event \((v_1)\) and the caused state \((\text{ST}_1)\) are sisters (see 10., 11. above). The semantic component automatically interprets the structure as causative (see Koontz-Garboden 2012, Embick 2009). Other sources, e.g. Alexiadou and Doron (2012), insist on the presence of the separate causative head \(-\gamma\), but since the meaning can be gleaned from the structure, a separate causative projection can be dispensed with. Polish unaccusatives are associated with causative meaning under all circumstances (see section 3.1., 3.2.), so proposing a structure where causation results directly from the grammatical form of unaccusatives is more convincing than supplementing unaccusatives with causative heads – which in principle can be merged or not, so, theoretically, can be dispensed with. The solution along the lines proposed by Embick, in which the part of the structure below the voice node \((v)\) resembles this for unaccusative verbs, excludes the tentative dispensing with causation for unaccusatives (as supported by the Polish data).

5.2. *roz*- as a voice head in Polish causatives

Notice that the morpheme *roz*- is believed to realize the voice head in (21.) above. This claim is not haphazard. First of all we have mentioned that the derivation with *roz*- is characterized by the presence of an additional argument: the transitive causative derivatives differ from unaccusatives first and foremost in the presence of the external argument in their semantics and formal structure.

---

25 The symbol for the category of voice- \(v\) (the Greek small letter ‘nu’) has been taken from Alexiadou and Doron (2012).
Thus the suggestion that *roz-* is a voice head, voice being responsible for the introduction of the external argument (see Kratzer 1996, Pylkänen 2008), finds justification in the data.

There are additional arguments though. Anticausatives are believed not to possess the active voice head, but a special non-active voice head represented as *μ*. In this assumption we follow Alexiadou and Doron (2012), who propose an analysis of anticausatives as belonging to the sphere of special non-active morphology. Significantly, in the Polish data we may notice that some formations with non-active heads, i.e. morphologically marked anticausatives, disprefer the *roz-* derivational morpheme, while with other verbs the morpheme appears frequently and it performs a number of additional semantic functions, in principle not excluded by anticausatives.

Szymanek (2010:166-169) discusses a few of such functions: *Roz-* may signify parting and dispersion, e.g. *rozjechać się* ‘drive apart’; distribution, e.g.: *rozesłać* ‘send away’; splitting, fragmentation, e.g.: *rozcięć* ‘cut up’; reversative function, e.g.: *rozebrać* ‘dismantle’; evolutive function, e.g. *rozkwitnąć* ‘flower’. Below we will supply some examples which show that the causative variant takes the morpheme *roz-* naturally, while its anticausative counterpart cannot co-occur with this morpheme in any of the above senses:


On semantic grounds nothing prevents these verbs from co-occurring with *roz-* in one of the few senses presented above. For instance the *roz-* with the sense of ‘disperse’ would be very appropriate in the case of *Mgła rozrzedła* ‘The fog drifted apart’. Nevertheless, such combinations do not get formed as a rule. The answer why such a situation arises may conceivably be connected with the fact that *roz-* is blocked by the non-active voice head in these anticausatives.
as roz- realizes the active voice head. Presumably, two voice heads cannot appear at the same time.

Exceptions to this regularity should be mentioned, like the inchoative form in (23.) below:


Such examples are isolated but a more disquieting body of data is the class of anticausatives possessing a clear derivational marker of their morpho-syntactic status, the clitic się. They are much more likely to take up roz-, e. g.:


Let me remind the readers that Alexiadou (2010) proposes the non-active voice head just for such clearly marked anticausatives – see (24. b.) in contradistinction to other unaccusatives, which have a simpler structure (see 24.a.):

24. Unmarked unaccusatives  Derivationally marked anticausatives

a)  
b)
Morphological data connected with the distribution of **roz**- in Polish strongly suggest that the
distinction proposed by Alexiadou (2010) may be on the right track. Voice (whether active, or non-active) introduces in its head morphological marking, which in the case of Polish anticausatives in (23.) would be the discontinuous morpheme: **roz**-...**się**. The morpheme would be appropriately lined

26 Anonymous Reviewer (1) notices that the non-active head introduced in this paper has the form **roz**- **się**, which strangely resembles the active voice head **roz**-. He/she also claims that the correlation between **roz**- and **roz**-...**się** words is ‘so productive that such independence seems suspicious’. We think that the correlation is not as great as it might seem at the first sight. Many **roz**- forms have the corresponding **roz**-...**się** counterparts, but some of them are reflexive formations and some stay unpaired (e.g. (I.)) below. We cannot go into the problem of reflexive formations too deeply as it is a very broad area of study, but reflexives would share a good part of the structure and the active voice head with the group of formations with **roz**- described in the text, and the **się** marker would be the exponent of reflexivization (see e.g. Reinhart and Siloni 2005, Alexiadou and Doron 2012 for similar correspondences in French, Greek and other languages).

I.  **Rozbroić** ‘disarm’ – **rozbroić się** ‘disarm, refl.’, **rozliczyć** ‘to square up with sb.’ – **rozliczyć się** ‘to square up with sb., refl.’, **rozciąć** ‘cut through’ – **rozciąć się** ‘reflexive’, **rozgromić** ‘make sb. perish’ – **rozgromić się**

As argued in this work, caustatives and anticausatives are based on the same roots (see 5.1.), so the corresponding causative and anticausative forms are to be expected. The direct derivational relationship between them is lost indeed (see however a criticism of derivational approach to causative – anticausative verbs in Everaert et al. 2012 a: 13-15), but the roots together with the shared portion of verbal structure safeguard the correspondence. The formal similarity of affixes should not worry us as most affixes in Polish are poly-functional (see e.g. descriptions of most verbal prefixes in Szymanek 2010).
up in the phonological component, not in the morpho-syntax itself. On the other hand morphologically simpler unaccusatives in (21.) might be produced without the voice projection (see 24. a.) and consequently could not take roz-, the active voice head, nor roz- się – a non-active voice head. Notice that the forms: 27 rozzielenieć się, *rozrzednąć się, *roztrzeźwieć się, *rozweselec się (cf. 23.) are not grammatical either. 28 The fact that the considerations concerning causatives in Polish neatly tie in with the quite independent analysis of anticausatives in the languages researched by Alexiadou (2010) and Alexiadou and Doron (2012) gives a new momentum to our small-scale Polish research. 

5.3. Roz- causatives versus stative verbs

Let us also point out that quite a few roz- się anticausative forms do not have the corresponding roz- causative counterparts, which may argue in favor of our solution. Some examples are given in (ii) below:

II. rozchichotać się ‘begin to chuckle away’ - *rozchichotać kogoś ‘make somebody to chuckle away’,
rozchlipać się ‘begin to whimper’ – *rozchlipać kogoś ‘make sb. to whimper’, rozkrochmalić się ‘go all soft’ - *rozkrochmalić kogoś ‘make sb. go all soft’, rozlać się ‘go into pieces’ – *rozlać coś ‘make sth. go into pieces’, rozchorować się ‘fall ill’ - *rozchorować kogoś ‘make sb. fall ill’, rozkraczyć się ‘break down (about a car)’ - rozkraczyć coś ‘make sth. break down’

Such gaps present no problem in root based approaches as both structures arise independently of each other, but in derivational ones they constitute inexplicable exceptions. Thus the correspondences mentioned by the reviewer need not be held against a root based morphological model.

27 On the internet we have found a single use of this form in the context: Gdy opadał, rozzieleniały się łąki, […] ‘When it was falling, the meadows got green’ in the memoirs of a poet, Izabela Płatowska-Śnieżawska. This is precisely the use which should have been excluded. However, as we have stressed before, this material, although created in the syntax, is then entered in the lexicon so the existence of exceptions is to be expected.

28 Such a solution would partly disagree with our previous findings concerning unaccusatives in Polish (see e.g. Author 2012 a).

29 Much remains to be worked out in this area. The Anonymous Reviewer (1) has noticed a problem concerning certain inchoative verbs which also differ in grammaticality, e.g.: zzieleniały (atelic) / *rozzieleniały się/ rozzielenity się (telic) ‘They grew green’. Such examples cannot be pooh-poohed away as irregularities since they are numerous. The difference in grammaticality has something to do with the Aktionsart of these verbs, but telicity alone cannot be taken to be the criterion deciding about the grammaticality of anticausative formations: both *rozmieszkać and rozjarzać would be atelic. Certainly the data we have considered in this paper are only a small piece in a much more extensive jigsaw puzzle.
In Polish more classes of roots undergo the morphological valency upgrading with the use of roz- than just these present in unaccusatives (see 5.1.). Roz- verbs quite frequently have stative\(^{30}\) counterparts, i.e. verbs of emission, and other state verbs. These roots do not adhere to Schäffer’s (2007) regularity, so his conception does not fit the Polish data.


*Słońce roziskrzyło śnieg* - ‘The sun made snow sparkle’ - *Śnieg iskrzył*. ‘Snow sparkled’

However, not all stative verbs are consistent with the causative meaning as we have already shown in (11.) above. Some fail to derive roz- causatives:

26. *Dziewczyna rozmieszkała swoją matkę*. ‘The girl made her mother live (somewhere)’

*Akt stworzenia rozistniał świat*. ‘The act of creation made the world exist’\(^{31}\)

*Generał rozpostrzegł żołnierza*. ‘The general has made the soldier perceive’

Consequently, we have to distinguish such statives whose roots derive causatives, form the statives whose roots do not derive them.

We would like to put forward the claim that the roots which allow the derivation with roz- are such that can appear both as predicates of events and as predicates of states, while those which refuse to take up roz- are only good predicates of states. Therefore, the first class will be able to appear in the following two structures:

27. Roots with features of predicates of events

---

\(^{30}\) Palmer (1974:73) defines these verbs as: ‘verbs which refer not to activity but to a state or condition’. We have verified their status by applying to prospective statives the tests relevant to Polish, adopted from Michaelis (2010) and Fábregas and Marín (2012), which cannot be presented here because of the space limitations.

\(^{31}\) Anonymous Reviewer (1) has pointed out the discrepancy in grammaticality between the causative forms: *rozespać* and *uśpić* ‘put to sleep’. The verbs are obviously based on the same root, so they should be equally grammatical or ungrammatical. Roz- is not the only voice head associated with transitive change of state verbs. The properties of the distribution of particular heads are yet to be discovered. So far we have established that roz- appears in the structures where an eventive part can be identified, so the troublesome gap would be created by *rozępić*, rather than *rozespać*. Also, the unaccusatives sharing parts of structure with roz- causatives were actual words. Possibly *rozępić* is not an ungrammatical form, but rather not an actual form, which seems very probable in the light of the fact that another causative form based on the same root, but with the \(u\)-voice head exists in Polish.
The structure represents the causative configuration already familiar from section 5.1., here illustrated by: *Słońce roziskrzyło śnieg* ‘Sunlight made snow sparkle’.

As our root *iskrz* can belong both to predicates of events and to predicates of states, it may also occupy another position in the structure in (9.) - the predicate of state:

28.
In this case the verb will not be able to take the active voice head *roz-, which introduces the external argument in the structures possessing the event element, as our earlier discussion seems to suggest. Instead, such structures as the one in (28.) derive true stative verbs, without external arguments introduced by the active voice head, e.g.: Śnieg iskrzy *Snow sparkles*.

Such a conclusion can be reached if we notice that the entailment facts connected with these stative structures work differently than with unaccusatives (compare (4.), (5.) above):³²

29. *Śnieg nie iskrzy, to słońce go roziskrzyło* ‘Snow does not sparkle; the sun has made it sparkle’

*Woda nie faluje, to wiatr ją rozfalował* ‘Water does not roll in weaves; the wind has made it roll’

The root *iskrz*, if set in the predicate of event position in a structure headed by a non-active voice head will show the opposite entailment facts:

30. *Woda nie rozfalowała się, to wiatr ją rozfalował* ‘Water has not rolled in weaves, the wind has made it roll’³³

³² I have been alerted to this difference by Anonymous Reviewer (1), who set side by side the examples with conflicting entailments of clauses with identical roots. These examples made me change the original idea voiced in the previous version of this paper. The present solution is, hopefully, better.

³³ The example has been contributed by Anonymous Reviewer (1).

³⁴ Many questions will have to remain unanswered here. One is the problem how particular non-active heads are matched with particular roots. Is that random, analogy driven or are there regularities to be discovered? Also the relationship between telicity of the verb and types of unaccusatives available has to be analyzed separately. See, however Krifka (1989), Dowty (1991), Willim (2006).
as +event, + state; these marked as predicates of states only have no corresponding causative roz-structures and do not show the causative meaning.³⁵

It has to be admitted, nevertheless, that the situation is not so crystal–clear as we might have wished. While researching the causative inferences of unaccusatives, we have applied also the sam z siebie test. The statives in (11.) above behave as predicted, it is they fail the test. The statives with ‘double face’ roots behave as if they had a trace of causative meaning:

31. Śnieg iskrzy sam z siebie. ‘Snow sparkles by itself’

Woda faluje sama z siebie. ‘Water rolls in waves by itself’

Twarz jaśnieje sama z siebie. ‘The face has brightened by itself’

All we can say at present is that perhaps the test with this specific prepositional phrase does not test for causation, but for the presence of the eventive feature with the root (as +state roots fail the test, see 11. above).

5.4. Roz- derivatives sharing roots with experiencer verbs

Another extensive group of roots to which the prefix roz- is added to form causatives consists of experiencer roots, which also constitute the base for subject experiencer verbs. Again they do not fit Schäffer’s (2007) classification of the roots which can participate in the causative alternation, as they are internally caused. Here we find such formations as:


Subject experiencer verbs behave as stative verbs with respect to various tests (see ftn. 30.).

³⁵ We have not been able so-far to discover specific semantic characteristics that would allow us to classify roots as predicates of states or predicates of events on independent grounds. We are convinced that such characteristics exist out there. Possibly the line of reasoning suggested in ftn. 16. might be an option, namely, roots without the path meaning are appropriate for predicates of states only and those with this meaning - for predicates of events.
The causatives formed on the basis of these roots possess structures just like other stative verbs (see 28. above). In our opinion the fact that they constitute a semantic group of experiencer verbs has no bearing on their structural representation. What distinguishes their roots from the ones which appear in stative verbs is the character of the thematic role that they are associated with in the lexicon. Subject experiencer verbs have Experiencer thematic roles to apportion\textsuperscript{36}, while statives are probably associated with the lexically specified Theme role. The results of the ‘sam z siebie’ test also show that experiencer verbs group together with the statives with roots in the predicate of event function:

33. \textit{Dziewczyna marzyła sama z siebie} ‘The girl was dreaming by herself’

\textit{Dziewczyna kochała sama z siebie} ‘The girl loved by herself’

Like with other statives the entailment test gives negative results testing for causation:

34. *\textit{Dziewczyna nie marzyła, to wieczór ją rozmarzył} ‘The girl did not dream, the evening made her dream’

*\textit{Dziewczyna nie kochała, to ty ją rozkochałeś} ‘The girl did not love, you made her love’

Grouping stative (+event, +state) roots and subject experiencer roots together is an idea which tallies with other analyses which identify stative verbs and experiencer verbs (see e.g. an extensive study by Rothmayer 2009), so our results are not that ad hoc. In our model both groups will belong to the class of roots which are eligible as predicates of events and thus can be situated in the structure deriving causative verbs:

35. Causatives based on subject experiencer verbs

\textsuperscript{36} Possibly the role should be rather Sentient, in terms of the role system in Everaert et al. (2012), since the role is realized externally to the lowest root projection and Sentients are believed to be merged externally. More in depth investigations of these roles and mechanisms of their assignment are certainly in order.
The derivation can be illustrated for instance with the sentence: *Wieczór rozmarzył Marię* ‘The evening made Mary dream’.

The root types we have mentioned so far in section 5. seem to be varied, but in all the cases it is possible to propose a similar structure, from which the causative meaning can result. Similarly, it is possible to assume that all the roots belong to the class of roots which are appropriate for predicates of events. Their varied morpho-syntactic behaviour in non-causative structures can be accounted for by claiming that some of them are also available as predicates of states (statives, subject experiencer verbs). Thus we have been able to propose one uniform structure for *roz*- causatives in Polish, as well as we have delimited the roots which are available for this derivation.

At least one reservation has to be made here. Not all predicate of event roots can derive causatives. Unergatives, for instance, will be based on precisely such roots additionally specified for the agentive arguments. There exists a limitation disqualifying the roots which are good predicates of events with agentive roles to assign from the causative derivation. This limitation can be overridden occasionally (see fn. 14.) though, which might suggest that the roots are of the appropriate type (predicates of events).

6. Conclusions

In this paper we have presented a possible model for the derivation of certain causative verbs in Polish. The analysis has been conducted within the root based model of generative morpho-syntax. Within this system causativization and argument addition have been shown to be separate elements of
the grammatical description, causativization being ascertained on the basis of a particular structural configuration consisting of the causing event and resultant state being juxtaposed in a structure. Roz-, the morphological head introducing the voice projection, has been argued not to be entangled with the causative layer of the derivation. The roots which allow in Polish the formation of causatives with the roz- head belong to one category – good predicates of events. The roots which are only predicates of states are excluded from forming causative transitive structures. Additionally, we have found interesting interactions between the structures with the non-active voice head, as proposed by Alexiadou and Doron (2012), which cannot take the active voice head roz-, as predicted by our analysis. Similarly, the unaccusatives which might not be able to take any voice projection are incapable of taking roz- either. Consequently, a local analysis of one causative prefixation in Polish may have wider significance as supporting the general overview of non-active morphology proposed for morphologically marked anticausatives. The analysis poses new questions with respect to the area of Polish causative morpho-syntax: Is the generalization concerning the types of roots allowing causative formation with roz- specific to this particular morpheme or does it obtain for other patterns of causative formation in Polish (in other languages)? How are theta roles associated with particular roots apportioned to structural positions (especially external vs. internal)? What are the relationships obtaining between valency rearrangement and telicity and/or aspect. These problems await further research, making the whole area of verbal valency so fascinating.

Summary

The paper deals with a wider problem of the representation of causative structures in the root based generative model of morpho-syntax on the basis of the Polish causativizing morpheme roz-. Following the analysis of Koontz-Garboden (2009) for anticausative verbs, we propose that the phenomenon of causation should be separated from the introduction of the additional causer argument brought in by the voice projection. In our analysis roz- is seen as the head of the active voice projection, as opposed to roz- się, - the non active voice head. Such an analysis allows us to account for distributional properties of roz- versus roz- się in Polish.
Another important issue tackled in the text is the typology of roots which can serve as bases for the causative structures taking the roz- voice heads. We have adopted a typology of roots developed by Embick (2009) to account for the properties of states and stative passives, which seems to work in the case of the roots deriving causatives. The roots appropriate for the predicates of states cannot derive the roz- causatives in Polish, while these appropriate for the predicates of events form such causatives. The analysis ties in with those presented for other areas of research into verbal valency by Alexiadou, Agnostopoulou, Schäffer and Doron, which makes it significant as a possible touchstone of more general claims concerning the overall model of valency related derivations in the root based approach.
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Streszczenie


Innym ważnym elementem jest próba określania, jakie rdzenie mogą stanowić podstawę dla czasowników kauzatywnych analizowanego typu. Przy użyciu typologii rdzeni Embicka (2009), zaproponowanej dla nieco innych struktur czasownikowych, udaje się stwierdzić, że rdzenie, które mogą wystąpić jako predykaty stanów nie tworzą czasowników kauzatywnych interesującego typu, podczas gdy rdzenie, które mogą istnieć jako predykaty zdarzeń nadają się na bazy tej derywacji. Analiza polskich czasowników pokazuje jednocześnie, że ustalenia Alexiadou, Agnostopoulou,
Schäffer i Doron, dotyczące bardziej ogólnych i nieco inaczej materiałowo nakierowanych badań struktur walencyjnych, doskonale sprawdzają się w przypadku prezentowanego materiału polskiego, dodatkowo potwierdzając słuszność tego kierunku poszukiwań językoznawczych.

Słowa-klucze: kauzatywizacja, czasowniki nie-akuzatywne, czasowniki anty-kauzatywne, rdzeń, morfo-syntaksa, polski
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