1. **From the 20th to the 21st century**

1) a. Theta roles, theta hierarchy  
   b. VP, IP, CP  
      \[\longrightarrow\text{Configurationally determined grammatical roles}\]
   c. Argument structure operations in lexicon  
   d. Mapping

2) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{...VoiceP} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{Voice'} \\
\text{Init} \\
\text{Voice} \quad \text{vP} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{v'} \quad \text{Proc} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{...} \\
\text{Result}
\end{array}
\]

How did we get here, syntactically speaking?  
- Ditransitive verbs (Larson 1988)  
- Unergative/unaccusative & bare phrase structure (Chomsky 1994, Hale & Keyser 1993)  
- Causative/inchoative alternations (…)  
- Agentless idioms (Kratzer 1994, 1996)  
- Result state modification, readings of *again* adjuncts (…, von Stechow 1996)

\[\rightarrow\text{Some hypotheses about the composition of events:}\]

- vP is where the dynamic event argument is introduced  
- VP introduces a stative eventuality  
- VoiceP introduces the external argument and relates it to the eventuality of the vP

\[\rightarrow\text{Some hypotheses about the syntax/morphology interface}\]

- Heads have the potential to contribute a morph to a verb form  
- Locality to v correlates with potential for irregularity, (un)productivity
2. Morphosyntax of argument structure

→ Analyses invoking different sizes of embedded constituents e.g. TP vs CP
→ Wurmb (1998, 2001) on restructuring infinitives: TP vs vP vs VP

2.1 Greek participles
(Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2008, Anagnostopoulou & Samioti 2014)

3) -tos
characteristic state ppls
no prior event
ok in creation complement
no manner mod
no agent-oriented mod
no by-phrases
[ [VP] Asp]

-menos
target-state ppls
prior event
not in creation complement
result oriented mod
no agent-oriented mod
no by-phrases
ok with ‘still’
[ [ [VP] v] Asp]

-menos
resultant-state ppls
prior event
not in creation complement
result oriented mod
agent-oriented mod
by-phases
no ‘still’

4) I porta chtistike anix-t-i/*anig-men-i
The door.nom build.Nact.3sg open-Tos-agr/open-Men-agr
“The door was built open/*opened.”

-tos ability ppls
agent-oriented mod
by-phrases

-tos ‘worth’-compound ppls
implicated agent
no by-phrases,
no agent-oriented mod
??

-tos negated ppls
-opposite of -menos
-no by-phrase
-no manner mod
-no agent-oriented
-regular
??

(Alexiadou 2018)

-menos: Perfect of result, event implications: embeds v/Voice
-tos: characteristic state (embeds v/V), ability passive (embeds middle Voice), negated (...v?)

2.2 Applicative typologies: English vs Spanish vs Hiaki

→ Applicatives introduce an unselected object/goal argument
→ External argument > Applied argument > Selected object

$\rightarrow [\text{DP}_{\text{Agent}} [\text{Voice'} \ldots [\text{DP}_{\text{applied}} [\text{APpl'} \ldots [\text{DP}_{\text{Theme}} \ldots ]]]]]$

\[
* [\text{DP}_{\text{applied}} [\text{APpl'} [\text{VP} \text{DP}_{\text{Agent}} [v \ldots ]]]]
\]

5) Academic American English:
   a. Pat baked (Tracy) a cake. creation verbs
   b. Pat broke (*Tracy) the radio change-of-state transitive verbs
   c. Pat held (*Tracy) the suitcase stative transitive verbs
   d. Pat danced (*Tracy) unergative verbs

6) Spanish:
   a. Valeria le diseñó una pollera a Adreína
      Valeria CL.DAT.SG designed a skirt DAT Adreína
      “Valeria designed Adreína a skirt.” creation
   b. Pablo le rompió la radio de la vecina a Valeria
      Pablo CL.DAT.SG broke the radio of the neighbor DAT Valeria
      “Pablo broke the neighbor’s radio on Valeria” CoS transitive
   c. Pablo le sostuvo la valija a Andreína
      Pablo CL.DAT.SG held the suitcase DAT Andreína
      “Pablo held the bag for Andreína” stative transitive
   d. *Pablo les bailó a los invitados
      Pablo CL.DAT.PL danced DAT the guests
      “Pablo danced for the guests.” unergative

7) Hiaki
   a. Maria Jose-ta panim ho’o-ria-k
      Maria Jose-acc bread make-APPL-pfv
      “Maria made bread for Jose.”
   b. Simo Maria-ta maso-ta mea-ria-k
      Simon Maria-ACC deer-acc kill.sg-APPL-pfv
      “Simon killed the deer on/for Maria.”
   c. Ume pascolam ume uusim yi’i-ria-n
      The pascolas the children dance-APPL-p.impf
      “The pascolas were dancing for the children.”

$\rightarrow$ Low applicative: $[\text{DP} [\text{Voice} [v [v [\text{DP}_{\text{applied}}]\ldots]]]]$ created DPs
$\rightarrow$ Middle applicable: $[\text{DP} [\text{Voice} [v [\text{DP}_{\text{applied}} [v \ldots ]]]]$ transitive results
$\rightarrow$ High applicable: $[\text{DP} [\text{Voice} [\text{DP}_{\text{applied}} [v [v (\text{DP})]]]]]$ unergative activities
→ Predicts position of applied argument in hierarchy (DP\text{Agent} > DP\text{Appl} > DP\text{Theme}), no need for mapping theories

→ Predicts applicatives will always participate in single event within VoiceP

2.3 Morphological causative typologies: Japanese vs Turkish

[DP\text{Causer} ... [ (DP\text{Agent}) ... [ DP\text{Theme} ...]]]

→ Biclausal morphological causatives in Japanese

8) Adverbial control: 2 subjects
Taroo-wa arui-te Hanako-o ik-ase-ta
Taroo-Top walk-te Hanako-acc go-sase-pst
Readings: ‘Taro made Hanako go, walking.’
‘Taro, walking, made Hanako go.’ (Harley 2008: 30)

9) Binding condition B: 2 domains
   a. Toru_i-wa Kitahara_j-ni kare*/j-*o syookai si-ta.
      Toru-TOP Kitahara-DAT he-ACC introduction do-PST
      ‘Toru introduced him to Kitahara.’

   b. Toru_i-wa [Kitahara_j-ni kare/*/j-o syookai s]-ase-ta.
      Toru-TOP Kitahara-DAT he-ACC introduction do-CAUS-PAST
      ‘Toru made Kitahara introduce him.’ (Horvath & Siloni 2011)

10) Coordination of embedded clause:
   Hanako-ga [[ Masao-ni uti-o soozisuru]-ka
   Hanako-NOM Masao-DAT house-ACC clean-or

   [ heya-dai-o haraw]-ase-ru kotoni si-ta
   room-rent-ACC pay- CAUS-INF that to.do-PAST

   ‘Hanako decided to make Masao clean the house or pay room rent.’
   Reading: -(s)ase scopes over ‘or’; Masao has a choice. (Kuroda 2003: 455)

→ Monoclausal morphological causatives in Turkish (Key 2013)

11) Adverbial control: One subject
   Tarkan,Hakan-a_j Mehmet-i bilerek/*/j döv-dür-dü.
   Tarkan Hakan-DAT Mehmet-ACC know-PART beat-CAUS-PAST
   ‘Tarkan made Hakan beat Mehmet on purpose/knowingly.’
(bil-erek, ‘knowingly’, only controlled by Tarkan, not Hakan)

12) Binding condition B: One domain

a. Hakan initiator on-u+/-i döv-dü
   Hakan 3SG.ACC beat-PST
   ‘Hakan beat him.’

b. Tarkan initiator Hakan-Hakan a-j on-u+/-i döv-dür-dü
   Tarkan Hakan-DAT 3SG beat-CAUS-PST
   ‘Tarkan made Hakan beat him.’

13) No coordination of caused events

*Hakan Mahmut-a ev-i temiz-le- veya kira
   Hakan Mahmut-DAT house-ACC clean-v- or rent

öde-t-me-ye karar ver-di.
pay-CAUS-NOM-DAT decision give-PAST
Intended: ‘Hakan decided to make Mahmut clean the house or pay rent.’

⇒ Biclausal productive morphological causatives: [VoiceP [Caus [VoiceP [vP [VP]]]]]s
   -Causee required, core argument
   -Two eventualities

⇒ Monoclausal productive morphological causatives: [VoiceP [Caus [vP [VP]]]]
   -Causee implicit or adjoined
   -One eventuality

⇒ Lexical causatives: [Caus [VP ]]}

3. New horizons

⇒ Minimalist, monotonic view of productive valence-changing morphology possible
   ⇒ Including a monotonic account of valence-reducing morphology
⇒ No generative lexicon, no mapping theory
⇒ Potentially unified view of argument introduction via a few varieties of functional heads (P, Appl, Voice), (Wood & Marantz 2015)
⇒ Neo-Davidsonian, radically minimal theory of argument interpretation possible
⇒ Clear structural, semantic and morphological predictions for different hypotheses
⇒ Can clearly ask questions about the semantic contributions of roots vs structure (Levin &/or Rappaport (...), Levinson 2007, 2014, Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2020, Yu, Smith &/or Ausensi 2019, 2020)
⇒ Productive subfield!