Splitting the agentive components of reflexives

Reflexivization is typically formulated as a process which identifies the Agent and Patient of a verb, giving rise to an event description in which an Agent carries out an action on herself. We show that the process is more complex based on *pseudo-reflexive* verbs in Modern Hebrew. In these cases, the DP referring to the Patient is the subject, but this referent is not the one carrying out the action. The generalizations we uncover lead us to split the role of Agent into Initiator and Executor; only the Initiator must be coreferential with the Patient in a reflexive.

The puzzle. The relevant verbs are in the Hebrew template *hitXaYeZ*, a non-active template associated with readings that normally fall under 'middle' morphology, including reflexive. With some verbs, the Patient is not the Executor of the action: I do not usually hospitalize myself (1), interview myself (2) or draft myself (3). We explore these *pseudo-reflexive* contexts.

(1) *be-atsat   ha-rofim   hitaʃpaz-ti   be-jom   ʃlisi*
in-advice.of   the-doctors   hospitalize.REFL-1SG on-day   third
'Based on the doctors' advice I got hospitalized/hospitalized myself on Tuesday.'

(2) *hitraajan-ti   ba-radio   etmol*
interviewed.REFL-1SG   on.the-radio   yesterday
'I gave a radio interview yesterday. '

(3) *leaxar   hitlabtujot   rabot hitgajas-ti   la-tsanxanim*
after   deliberations many   enlisted.REFL-1SG   to.the-paratroopers
'After much deliberation I enlisted into the Paratroopers.'

These clauses are not passive or anticausative, since they typically attribute the initiation of the action to the subject (unlike in passives), while the Executor is not usually expressed directly:

(4) *hitaʃpaz-ti   neged   retson-i   (*al-jedej   ha-rofe)*
hospitalized.REF-1SG   against   will.of-mine   (*by   the-doctor)
'I was hospitalized against my will.'   [Against my better judgment, not by force]

(5) *hitxasan-ti   be-xarada*
inoculated.REFL-1SG   in-fear
'I was scared when getting inoculated.   [I was fearful, not the nurse]

A baseline account of reflexivization would wrongly align Agent (i.e. Executor) with Patient. How can these cases be accommodated?

Splitting agentive components. We connect this phenomenon to the one in which the referent of the subject of a causative sentence "delegates" responsibility, making the causation less direct (Kiparsky 1982):

(6) I painted my house.   [The painters did the painting; the painters painted the house]
(7) The king killed his opponents.   [His soldiers carried out the killing]
(8) I cut my hair.   [The hair dresser cut my hair]

This phenomenon is not restricted to causative verbs. We exploit the idea that agentivity is a complex notion (Cruse 1973, Dowty 1990) and distinguish the individual who is in some broad sense responsible for the action taking place (the Initiator) from the individual who actually carries out the action denoted in the described event (the Executor). Prototypically, the Initiator and Executor of an agentive event are identical. In (6)-(8), the Initiator can delegate the execution to a different referent, while maintaining the status of subject. When the Initiator and Executor are split in simple transitive sentences, either can be the subject, but with one difference. If the Executor

alone is subject then the Initiator can be expressed in a *for* phrase, but if the Initiator alone is the subject there is no appropriate preposition to mark the Executor (similar data hold for Hebrew):

(9) I built the barn for the farmer.   [Executor = Subject, Initiator = PP]
(10)   The farmer built the barn ?with/?by/?through the farmhands.   [Initiator = Subject]

Reflexive Generalizations. Splitting Executor from Initiator allows us to formulate an overarching generalization about Hebrew reflexives: a reflexively marked verb always requires co-reference with the Initiator but not necessarily with the Executor. The split between Initiator and Executor plays out differently for different classes of verbs. We identify 4 classes of verbs distinguished by (i) whether they are or are not canonically reflexive and (ii) how the Initiator and Executor roles become split. There is a dependency between these properties.

- Shaving verbs (*hitgaleax* 'shaved', *hitaper* 'applied make-up', *hitstalem* 'got a photo taken' and others): Canonically reflexive. Initiator can *relinquish* execution to another in culturally accepted circumstances; Patient remains coreferential with the Initiator, but not the Executor.

(11)   *hitgalaxti*   *etsel   ha-sapar   ha-ahuv   ala-j*
         shaved.REFL-1SG   at   the-barber   the-favorite   on-me
         'I shaved at my favorite barber's.'

- Washing verbs (*hitraxets* 'washed', *hitkaleax* 'showered', *hitstajed* 'got equipped'): Canonically reflexive. In the unmarked case, there is no relinquishment of execution. A context that would allow the Executor to be someone else would be much narrower, for example if I require physical assistance, or if I am royalty being bathed by servants (cf. Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011:105). Only in these narrow cases, is the Patient co-referent with Initiator and not the Executor.

(12)   *ani   holex   le-hitraxets.   ha-sajaat   tirxats   oti*
         I   am.going   to-wash.REF   the-assistant will.wash   me
         'I'm going to wash. My nurse will wash me.'

- Hospitalization verbs like those in (1)-(3): Not canonically reflexive. The Patient usually *assumes* initiation. That is sufficient for marking the verb reflexively, as Initiator and Patient are coreferential. For this class, the Patient can sometimes be the Executor as well, but then one wouldn't use the reflexively marked verb but a transitive verb with a reflexive DP anaphor.

- Ceremonial verbs (*hitgajer* 'converted to Judaism', *hitxaten* 'got married'): Not canonically reflexive. Similar to the previous case but here Patient cannot be the Executor. Still, because the Patient is typically the Initiator, it is sufficient to cause the verb to be reflexively marked.

(13)   *hitgajar-ti*   *(# be-ʃitat   ase   zot   be-atsmexa)*
         converted.REFL-1SG (# in-method   do   it   by-yourself)
         'I converted to Judaism (# in the 'do it yourself' way).'

Discussion. The emergent generalization is that with canonically reflexive verbs the split comes about when the *Agent relinquishes initiation*, and with non-canonically reflexive verbs the split comes about when *the Patient assumes initiation*. Ongoing work is exploring the formal aspects of this view of reflexivization and non-active morphology, its crosslinguistic parallels, and its relation to notions such as direct/indirect causation.

Selected references. Cruse, D. (1973). Some thoughts on agentivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 9. Rooryck, J. and Vanden Wyngaerd, G. (2011). *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford: OUP.