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Abstract

This paper deals with an interesting problem of circumfixed causatives in Polish, which do not behave with respect to anticausatives in the way causative structures function in other (European) languages. This subclass of causatives does not have corresponding monolexical anticausatives, while other causatives in Polish have such correspondents. We propose to explain this situation within the model of root based construction morphology where causatives assume no derivational connection with other verbs: Nevertheless they arise from substructures resulting in causative meaning and shared with anticausatives. The substructures, together with the delimited class of roots that causatives and anticausatives share, allow us to account for the similarities in the alternating part of the material. The adverse impact that circumfixed causatives have on the formation of anticausatives will be accounted for with the use of active voice and non-active voice distinction drawn by Alexiadou and Doron (2012) for a number of languages.

1. Theoretical model

Recent contrastive studies in generative morpho-syntax, and verbal valency phenomena in particular, have critical significance for the overall shape of morphological theory: They pivot around the problem of the status of morphological rules and their place in grammatical components.

Two major trends are pitted against each other: the derivational approach and the root based construction approach. These sub-theories rest on different axioms and make different predictions; Thus they can/should be tested against morphological data to decide which is more adequate.

If we apply the standards of generative linguistic theory proper, the second approach (see Marantz 1984, Hale and Keyser 1993, 1998, Kratzer 1996, Arad 2005, Pylkkänen 2008, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2004, Embick 2004, Alexiadou 2010, Alexiadou and Doron 2012, Lomashvili 2011, etc) is more attractive: the syntactic component is the only generative module and morphological rules adhere to the requirements of syntax. More local syntax of words intermingles with clausal syntax into a single massive system. In the generative approach to language, where simplicity, economy and universality are highly valued, this line of research looks promising.

On the other hand the first approach has a much longer tradition and more extensive body of analyses to support its validity (see e.g.: Lakoff 1968, Dowty 1979, Grimshaw 1982, Levin and
such concepts as rule directionality and morphological motivation, central to this approach, are taken for granted for all practical purposes. These concepts are believed to capture relevant relationships among morphological data. However, none of these grammatical mechanisms constitutes an option in the root based approach. Consequently, to take the latter model seriously, it has to be shown that not only it is superior on theoretical grounds, but also descriptively adequate. Thus either the relationships it fails to describe are illusory, or it is able to reflect these relationships after all.

The valency increase/decrease phenomena in Polish, presented against a more extensive panorama of European morpho-syntax, suggest that directionality of word-formation rules may be overrated as a device for capturing morphological relationships. Significant semantic and formal similarities may be expressed in the root based approach without resorting to rules deriving classes of lexemes from other lexemes. Common sub-structures with alike delimited group of roots may serve the same purpose.

The body of data that seem to be a stronghold of derivational approach are members of the anti-causative alternation: causatives and anticausatives. The research in generative morpho-syntax suggests that the two classes are derivationally connected, although the direction of the derivation is disputed: Dowty (1979), Lakoff (1968), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2012) argue that causatives are derived from anticausatives, Junghans et al. (2010, 2011), Reinhart (2002), Reinhart and Siloni (2004) derive anticausatives from reflexive verbal structures, and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), Chierchia (2004), Grimshaw (1982), Koontz-Garboden (2009) - from causatives in particular.

Whatever the particular direction of the derivation is assumed, the very existence of the anticausative alternation is not disputed. If however, we will be able to show that the relationship is non-existent, or as a matter of fact there may appear the adverse productivity effect between causatives and anticausatives in a language, then the rationale behind the model which takes for granted the existence of such relationships may be undermined.

In this text we will show that the morphological system of Polish contains an extensive area, not just random instances, where causatives do not coincide with anticausatives based on the same root. Adopting the idea presented by Alexiadou and Doron (2012), we will claim that causatives and anticausatives differ in taking on different voice heads: causatives – the active voice head, anticausatives – non-active voice head. Consequently, the two structures cannot be derived from each other. If two forms exist in a language and they are based on the common root, they are derived in a parallel fashion side-by-side. The semantic correspondences are due to the common root

---

1 For the source of these concepts in morphology see Aronoff (1976), Allen (1978).

2 Alexiadou and Doron (2012), whose work we will refer too throughout this paper, make claims which should be viewed as universal, though most of other analyses of the data which interest us and to which we will refer have been conducted on Greek, Slavic and Romance languages.

3 Non-derivational relations between causatives and anticausatives have been suggested too, albeit in very general terms: See e.g. Haspelmath (1993), Piñon (2001), Szczęsniak (2008) .
and similarities in the structures that they subsume. The erratic distribution of the alternants results from their separate derivational histories.

2. Circumfixed causatives in Polish

Polish causatives are formed with a variety of morphological elements. These formatives, as described by e.g. Olszewska (1986: 78-82) and Wróbel (1984: 503-504), contain a number of prefixes with the unvarying suffixal element –i. Such complexes will be referred to here as a circumfixes. The prefixes are: do-, na-, α-, ob-, od-, po-, prze-, przy-, roz-, u-, roz-, wy-, z. Some of the prefixal uses will be illustrated in (1.) below. All the forms behave in the same way with respect to the anticausative formation: Whatever the prefix, the regularity is preserved – the circumfixed causatives do not possess mono-lexical corresponding aticausatives. Morphologically complex mono-lexical aticausatives arise in Polish in other cases – formed with the suffixal formative –e- (Wróbel 1984: 498), e.g.: siwieć ‘grow white (about one’s hair), łysieć ‘grow bold’, pleśnieć ‘grow moldy’. In fact the whole group of verbs signifying the change of visible qualities, like colors, manifests the causative alternation: czerwienieć ‘grow red’- czerwienić ‘make red’, czernieć ‘grow black’- czernić ‘make black’, etc. but aticausatives systematically refuse to be coined with the roots which appear in the circumfixed causatives. Below we give a selection of examples of such causatives which do not have the corresponding aticausatives. The examples are taken from the National Corpus of the Polish Language (Przepiórkowski et al. 2012):

1. *ítulo nam się wyodrębnić ich strukturę... ‘We managed to distinguish their structure’ vs. wyodrębnić (potential aticausatives with the meaning ‘become separate’).

   ... kule mogłyby poranić konie... ‘The bullets could hurt the horses’ vs *ranieć, *poranieć.

   Niemcy uniemożliwią dostawy do kraju... ‘The Germans will prevent the supplies to the country’ vs. *uniemożliwieć, *uniemożliwieć.

   ...upodobnij je do swego Ciała... ‘Make them similar to your body’ vs. *podobnieć, *upodobnieć.

   ...wszystkich nas rozdrobnili na rozmaite psychologiczne atomy... ‘We all have got minced to various psychological atoms’ vs. *drobnieć, *rozdrobnieć.

Uczestnictwo Rosji w rozbiorach Polski powiększyło jej stan posiadania... ‘The participation of Russia in the partition of Poland has increased its possessions’ vs. *większeć, *powiększeć.

Bóg wszystkie Jego sugestie uprawomocnił... ‘God made all his suggestions binding’ vs. *prawomocnieć, *uprawomocnieć.

4 Olszewska (1986), in her extensive study of Polish caustativization, mentions also other patterns, albeit not so productive/numerous, e.g. suffixes –ować (e.g. prostować ‘straighten’), -ować (e.g. krystalizować ‘crystallize’) as well as analytic causatives. We will not analyze such data in this paper though.

5 We are not concerned with details of the distribution of morphological allomorphs, additional meanings or phonological processes involved. For these see e.g. Wróbel (1984), Gußmann (2007).

6 In section 8. we will mention anicausatives with the clitic element się, which also bear on the present topic.
There are exceptions to this regularity as well – which may seem to gainsay our model of the derivation of the circumfixed causatives/anticausatives. They will be dealt with in section 6. We have to stress at this point that the exceptions are not numerous. They can be illustrated by the forms in (2.) below:


The data in (1.) en masse suggest that anticausatives and causatives and causatives in Polish (at least in the sphere of circumfixed causatives) are not derived from each other and a derivational rule linking the verb classes is not supported by the data.

Instead we will describe correspondences between causative and anticausative forms in terms of the shared portion of structure and roots. The differences will be reduced to distinct voice projections: causatives will have the active voice head with the external argument introduced in its specifier (see Marantz 1984, Kratzer 1996, Pylkkanen 2008), anticausatives – the non-active voice head without the power to introduce the external argument. What remains problematic is the causative semantic element. We will argue below that both causatives and anicausatives are equipped with such semantics and that it is read off the shared portion of structure. In the next section we will insist that
anticausatives entail the causative element. The presence of causation with causatives will be treated as self evident.

3. Causative semantics of anticausatives

Especially interesting arguments severing causation from the presence of transitive causative verbs equipped with external arguments have been offered for Spanish and Ulwa by Koontz-Garboden (2009). We will extrapolate his arguments onto Polish.

Koontz-Garboden (2009) shows, while analyzing entailment data, that anticausatives are associated with a semantic realization of Cause. His main line of reasoning can be summarized in the following way: causative verbs entail anticausatives as both classes of verbs specify a change of state of the internal argument. Consequently, the sentence like:

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

should not be grammatical since the semantics of the anticausative part should be included in the causative clause and just one of the clauses is negated, while the other is not. Still the complex sentence is grammatical. Koontz-Garboden explains this state of affairs reasoning that negation scopes over the Cause of the event. If we interpret the Causes to be different for the two simple clauses, then negating one of them does not affect the other one; if *the cane* did not break because of a different Cause (e.g. *frost*) than it was broken by (e.g. *you*) then the sentence is grammatical.

The Polish data behave in the same way:

4. *On nie spowolnił, to alkohol go spowolnił* ‘He did not slow down, it was alcohol which slowed him down’.

Other arguments in favor of recognizing causation as an element of anticausative semantics come from the area of possible modifications of anticausative clauses. *Sam z siebie* ‘by oneself’ phrase suggests that an event is caused:

5. *On spowolnił sam z siebie* ‘He slowed down by himself’

Notice that stative verbs do not allow such a modification:

6. *Mieszkał sam z siebie* ‘He lived by himself’

The modifying phrase *sam z siebie* resumes the Cause element present in the anticausative and thus (5.) is grammatical; the stative clause in (6.) does not supply a pretext to refer to a similar Cause.

---

7 Rościńska-Frankowska (2012) holds the opinion that anticausative (inchoative) verbs in Polish do not possess the causative element in their meaning. We do not find her data impeccable. Contrary to what she claims anticausatives can be modified by phrases like: *sam z siebie* ‘by oneself’ – see (5.) above and extensive, corpus based data in Malicka-Kleparska (2012).

8 See Jabłońska (2007) for a more thorough presentation of similar facts for Polish, see also a discussion in Malicka-Kleparska (2012).
The arguments quoted by Koontz-Garboden (2009) tally with similar data studied by Alexiadou et al. (2006) and Schäffer (2007) for English, Greek and German. Various other arguments for dissociating the addition of external arguments form the area of causation have also been presented by Pykkänen (2008) re Finnish desiderative causatives and Japanese adversity causatives, and by Lomashvili (2011) re Georgian adversity causatives. The data supporting the dissociation are available in a variety of languages, so we feel entitled to claim that the causative meaning is real in anticausatives and that it does not result from the addition of the external argument in the active voice projection.

4. Structural representation of causation

If causation is not part and parcel of the active voice projection of causative verbs, we have to answer the question what it is. We would like to suggest that it is a piece of information read off the specific verbal structure that both causative and anticausative verbs have in common and which has been proposed in a different theoretical context by Embick (2009). This part of structure is represented in (7.) below:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{v} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{\sqrt{1}} \\
\text{\sqrt{2}} \\
\text{DP}
\end{array} \]

The structure requires an explanation (see also Malicka-Kleparska to appear): Position 1 is occupied by specific roots, which are called by Embick (2009) predicates of events. A root is described in its lexical entry as a good predicate of both events, a good predicate of states or both. Depending on this description, it may occupy position 1 — for predicates of events, or position 2 — for predicates of states. Some roots may appear in both of these positions (+ predicate of events, + predicate of states). The configuration in (7.) with position 1 filled by the root is specific to anticausative and causative verbs, i.e. it represents these parts which are responsible for the caused change of state. Position 2 is not filled with any morphological material. More specifically in the verbs of the classes interesting us it should be represented as in (8.):

---

9 Compare, however, Neeleman and van de Koot (2012).

10 Embick (2009) is available in a handout form and the research has never been fully developed. Consequently, our analysis may not be in full agreement with the original intentions of the author, especially as the handout was designed to model the distinction between stative passives and states and causation and inchoative verbs were only mentioned en passant. However, it is especially intriguing that so many of his conceptions seem to work so well with a different body of data than the one originally analyzed.
ST stands for the state caused by the event specified by the left-hand branch of the structure. This event specifies the manner in which the state comes about. As the ST position is not filled with any morphological material in our structures then it is interpreted as equaling the manner of the change. The lowest v position may be filled with morphological material, e.g. verb forming affixes like –en in *blacken*. The DP stands for the internal arguments of the clause.

The structure in (8.) is the common structural element for anticausatives and causatives and the particular configuration results in the causative meaning – its semantic by-product. The parallels obtaining between anticausatives and causatives are due to this structural element.

The other factor securing the descriptive adequacy of our analysis is the type of roots which occur in both the classes of verbs: Anticausatives and causatives are based on similar or identical (sub)classes of roots. This point has been extensively argued for by Haspelmath (1993), Alexiadou et al. (2006), Schäffler (2007), Junghanns et al. (2010, 2011). Obligatorily agentive causative verbs are an exception here: for instance verbs like: *szacować* ‘evaluate’, *usynowić* ‘adopt as one’s son’, *balamucić* ‘lead astray’ are not expected to have anticausative corresponding forms. ¹¹ This regularity may be expressed by means of derivational rules, but it may be also expressed by delimiting a common class or roots that may appear in the structure in (8.).

We have been able to specify such a class of roots for Polish. Using Embick’s (2009) terminology, they are the roots which make good predicates of events. ¹² Additionally, the roots which can be shared by causatives and their valency-reduced correspondents are not specified in their lexical entries for agentive external roles or internal Theme roles. This excludes the class of roots which are agentive – with the Agents named in their lexical entries, and the internally caused roots with the Themes lexically mentioned – to exclude such derivatives that can be only unaccusative in meaning – e.g. *więdnąć* ‘wilt’, *chorzeć* ‘fall ill’, *znikać* ‘disappear’, etc.

¹¹ Also internally caused verbs are said not to participate in the anticausative alternation – see e.g. Schäffler (2007), Junghanns et al. (2010, 2011). Incidentally, in Polish the group of such verbs is very scarce. Even such a verb as *umierać* ‘die’ has an obsolete by now variant: *morzyć głodem* ‘cause to starve’, which is a causative verb.

¹² It would be desirable to be able to delimit this class of roots with a specific semantic description, instead of proposing just lexical marking. We firmly believe that behind any such lexical marking lies some semantic regularity. At this point, however, we have not been able to find it, although we believe that the line suggested in Segal and Landau (2012: 243) may be very promising: they suggest that certain predicates have the *path meaning* associated with them, the suggestion based on the behavior of such predicates in the contexts studied therein. The roots which are good predicates of events may possess the path meaning in their description. At this point it must remain a mere option though. For more information concerning this concept see Malicka-Kleparska to appear.
5. The roots appearing in the valency enhancement/valency reduction alternation

We have chosen Embick’s root classification of morphological roots, as Schäffer’s (2007:278) better known suggestion that the roots with unspecified cause enter the anticausative alternation does not work for all the Polish data: In Polish, apart from typical unaccusatives (see 9.) also certain statives and subject experience verbs enter the opposition with causative verbs. Neither static verbs (see 10. below) nor subject experiencer verbs (11.) may be justly described as having roots associated in the lexicon with an unspecified (or specified) causer of any sort. Below we include examples of different subclasses of valency reduced verbs corresponding to causatives in Polish, i.e. anticausatives, statives and subject experience verbs.

8. Anticausatives/causative verbs:


9. Statives/causative verbs:


10. Subject experiencer/causative verbs:


If we want to express the relationship between these groups of transitives and intransitives then the description of the relevant roots has to be different than in Schäffer’s (2007:278) classification. Embick’s (2009) class of good predicates of events, proposed independently for another body of data and conveniently more general than Schäffer’s seems to serve this purpose much better.

6. Statives with corresponding causatives

A question arises here how the stative verbs in (10.) are formed on the basis of the roots which are good predicates of events. Let us remind you that there is a class of roots in Embick’s system which is marked at the same time as good predicates of events and good predicates of states. Such roots can enter the causative alternation in Polish as well since they are [+ predicates of events] after all. A more thorough review of the Polish stative verbs will allow us to distinguish the two subclasses: the verbs with just [+good predicates of states] roots and these with the double marking. Only the second group possesses causative correspondents, while the verbs based on the first group are more thoroughly stative also in other respects.

The statives in (12.) possess the corresponding causatives and, as the examples in (13.) show, they also are comfortable with the sam z siebie ‘by oneself’ modification (suggesting the eventive element in the meaning - see fn. 12.):
11. Drapanie rozkrwawiło ranę. ‘Scratching has made the wound bleed’ – Rana krwawiła ‘The wound bled’
Burza rozfalowała wodę. ‘The tempest made water roll in waves’ – Woda falowata ‘Water rolled in waves’
Słońce roziskrzyło śnieg. ‘The sun made snow sparkle’ – Śnieg iskrzył ‘Snow sparkled’

12. Rana krwawiła sama z siebie ‘The wound bled by itself’
Śnieg iskrzył sam z siebie. ‘Snow sparkled by itself’
Woda faluje sama z siebie. ‘Water rolls in waves by itself’

On the other hand the statives in (14.) do not have the corresponding causatives and they cannot be modified by sam z siebie (15.):

13. *Dziewczyna rozmieszkała swoja matkę. ‘The girl made her mother live (somewhere)’ – Matka mieszkała w Lublinie ‘The mother lived in Lublin’
*Akt stworzenia rozistniał świat. ‘The act of creation made the world exist’ – Świat istniał ‘The world existed’
*General rozpostrzegł żołnierza. ‘The general has made the soldier perceive’ – Żołnierz postrzegał ‘The soldier comprehended.’

14. *Postrzegał sam z siebie ‘He perceived by himself’
*Mieszkał sam z siebie ‘He lived by himself’
*Spał sam z siebie ‘He slept by himself’

Consequently we claim that the statives in (12.) are based on the roots which are marked as good predicates of events and states, while the ones in (14.) – as good predicates of states only.

The first group – if set in the structure in (8.) – ultimately derives causatives – when equipped with the active voice head – the circumfix in the cases described in this paper.

15.
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The structure is adopted from Alexiadou and Doron (2010), who propose to use the symbol v for the active voice projection

Alternately, the root can also be situated in the static verb structure given below:

16.
They will be also equipped with the active voice projection by further structure formation to derive stative verbs.

No anticausative verbs result from such roots, which is supported by the data we have supplied in (1.), although they are not ruled out by the grammar – as examples in (2.) show. Simply stative verbs take over the relevant contexts in which anticausatives would be used.

Possibly there is some mechanism which selects the active voice head over non-active one in verb creation – but such a suggestion needs much more research in the area of morpho-syntax than this paper can offer. The suggestion can be supported at this point by some additional data. The roots of the verbs in (9.), where no circumfix is added, allow causative, stative and anticausative derivations quite regularly; The model that Alexiadou (2010) put forward for the distinction of two classes of unaccusative verbs may come in useful here. According to her some anticausatives (morphologically marked) are equipped with the non-active voice projection, while others (without specific morphological marking) are not:
17. Unmarked unaccusatives                               Derivationally marked anticausatives

a) vP
  DP
  "The door"
  v √OPEN

b) VoiceP
   -ext. arg
    Voice’
     vP
      DP
      v’
      v √OPEN

This analysis may be extrapolated onto the material presented above: the anticausatives in (9.) just do not have the voice projection and thus they can arise comparatively freely in Polish – no clash between the competing voice heads will result. These remarks should be treated rather as options for future research than definite proposals though.

In this section we have explained how stative verbs come to be members of the causative/non-causative opposition in Polish and suggested why anticausatives do not arise as based on the same roots. In the next section we will deal with subject experiencer verbs which show parallel behavior and they will be treated in a parallel fashion.

7. Experiencer verbs with corresponding causatives

A similar causative alternation may be observed between causatives and subject experience verbs in Polish, exemplified in (11.) above. We will treat subject experience verbs also as basically stative (see also Rothmayer 2009).

We have verified the status of subject experience verbs by applying to them the tests relevant to Polish, adopted from Michaelis (2010) and Fábregas and Marín (2012). The tests are: ‘when (overlap)’ test, indirect-discourse test, epistemic must test and powoli ‘slowly’ test. A sample of the results is shown below in (19.) for the verb kochać ‘love’:

18. ‘when (overlap)’ test: No consecutive reading of the verbs in the two clauses is required, which testifies to the stative character of the one in the main clause:
   Kiedy ją pozałam, kochała Janka. ‘When I first met her, she loved John’

Indirect-discourse test: No consecutive reading of the predicates in the two clauses is required, which testifies to the stative character of the one in the subordinate clause:
   Ona oświadczyła, że kochała Janka. ‘She said that she loved John’
Epistemic *must* test: In the present tense epistemic meaning is the only option, while deontic meaning is excluded:

*Ona musi kochać*. ‘She must love’ (epistemic meaning)

Modification by some adverbs, like *powoli* ‘slowly’, is not admissible with (non-dynamic) stative verbs:

*Ona kochała powoli*. ‘She loved slowly’

Consequently, the structures for causatives and corresponding experiencers will look as follows:

The tests allow us to classify subject experience verbs as statives. In our model they will be based on the roots which are good predicates of states and good predicates of events.\(^{13}\) The causative structures associated with them are illustrated in (20.) below:

![Diagram 19: Causatives based on subject experiencer verbs](image)

Experiencers will be based on the stative structure in (21.):

![Diagram 20: Experiencers based on stative structure](image)

\(^{13}\) A distinction among experiencer verbs – some being more state like, some more event like - in Involuntary State Constructions has been proposed in Malicka-Kleparska (2012 b: 75-83). The treatment of some of experience verbs as based on +eventive roots constitutes and interesting corroboration of the previous studies.
The mechanism preventing the creation of anticausatives with the same roots as subject experience verbs will be also like the one suggested for statives.

8. *Się* anticausatives in Polish

Our model concerning the grammatical theory of relationships in causative/decreased valency verbs is additionally supported by the possibility of deriving *się* anticausatives which relate to circumfixed causatives in Polish: All the examples from (1.) possess (potential) *się* anticausatives (see 22.). Such anticausatives in Polish, just like in many European languages, are intimately related with reflexives, both in term of the formal exponent (*się*) and argument reducing semantics – see e. g. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), Chierchia (2004), Grimshaw (1982), Koontz-Garboden (2009) Their formal relation with reflexives, as well as the very productive way in which they are formed suggests that they are formed at a higher hierarchical level of clausal structure – the voice level. Anticausatives are defined at the lower level – below the voice projection. The reflexive-like creations vary from true reflexives through dispositional middles to anticausative-like verbs and constitute a cline – for us particular meanings are affected by performance – see Tabakowska (2003).

In the National Corpus of the Polish Language for the causatives in (1.), which do not have monolexical anticausatives, we have found *się* formations in the majority of cases:

21. ...martwy prostokąt wyodrębnił się na moment... ‘An empty rectangular showed for a moment’. Złapała kawałek lustra i poraniła się... ’She caught a bit of a broken mirror and cut herself’. ...upodobnił się do morza... ‘He turned similar to a porpoise’. ...Gruza rozdrobniła się feudalnie ‘Georgia had broken into feudal pieces’. Polska powiększyła się o nowego obywatela ‘Poland has broadened by a new citizen’. ...wyroki jeszcze nie uprawomocniły się ...’Verdicts have not been made binding yet’. Odwodni się pan ‘You will dehydrate’. ...by...tak odrealnić się ‘In order to loose touch with reality’. grzyby nie przyrumieniły się nadmiernie ‘Mushrooms did not fry too much.’ ...oswoił się już z tą myślą ... ‘He has already reconciled himself with this thought’. Karol aż zadławił się piwem. ‘Charles choked on beer’.

If the limitations in the distribution of circumfixed causatives and anticausatives indeed result from the particular distribution of active voice and non-active voice heads, it should come as no surprise that they do not affect *się* anticausatives since they all arise already at the point when the verbal structure has been supplemented with the active voice head deriving reflexive structures.

9. Conclusion.

The model we have proposed allows us to show the necessary relationships between causatives and their non-causative counterparts without resorting to the doubtful device of lexical word-formation rules, which are not able to account for the adverse relationship of circumfixed causatives and anticausatives. The common substructure by which causatives and anticausatives are supported accounts for their causative meaning. The common class of roots they are based on explains the existing parallel derivations, as well as parallel derivations of statives and subject experience verbs. The possible preference for active voice verbs over the non-active voice ones explains why circumfixed causatives arise freely, but anticausatives do not. At the same time statives and subject experiercer verbs arise in such cases – as they possess active voice heads. Likewise, reflexive-like anticausatives are formed easily since again active voice heads are involved in such derivations. Many issues adumbrated in this paper require much more extensive corroboration, but the construct of active
and non-active voice structural projections proposed for a variety of languages seems to explain the inner mechanism of causative alternations in Polish.

So, consequently, we may wonder how causation got to be encoded with both forms and not to look for their derivational relation. Especially that none of the forms is so significantly more complex on the plain of forms (there are also such forms as zieleniec zielenic.

The model which we would like to present is such that they both possess a common element of structure

But with distinct voice heads: active for causatives and non-active – for anticausatives. That they can both possess the same roots:…. and the same portions of form explains why in many cases they are based on the same roots and they all have causation. On the other hand the lack of correspondence in the above cases is explained by the fact that a form cannot have both heads at the same time (so no decausatives or causatives can be derived from the opposite member). On the other hand occasionally both formations can be created independently – these forms without prefixation for decausatives.

So Alexiadou doron allows us to exolain the facts of Polish and the facts of Polish support their analysis designed for a different body of data.

It has been noticed that się forms are there. They will be with the active voice head – which explains their similarity to reflexives.