The VP-internal DP is interpreted as the Theme of the predicate, and induces 

The analysis I propose provides an identical syntactic treatment for two sets of alternations in which the surface subject of the intransitive reappears as the logical object of the transitive, as with English `break'. Before I begin my discussion, I would like to emphasize that the classification of these elements is of interest because it is intermediate between that of what might be called a `lexical' causative, and that of a syntactic causative which takes a clausal complement.

The morpheme to be examined in this paper, referred to as `classifiers' in Athapaskan grammar, is one of the elements which re¯exes offour classifiers, i.e., l-, k-, s- and é. The discussion in this paper is focused on a detailed examination of the causal alternation (henceforth TA): pairs of verbs in which the surface subject of the intransitive is the same as that of the transitive. I will argue that a uniform treatment may be given for objects marked with the same type of classifier.
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often taken to be the hallmark of lexical as opposed to syntactic processes, argues
isadequate. On the face of this approach there is no promise of a real advantage of the approach to
involving intransitive forms. The question then is whether the variation seen with the causative element of the TA
forms.

6. Implications

appears with complements which do not have an external argument. If the root of the verb is the same as seen in transitive and intransitive version of the verb, the question of variation in morphology becomes directly
applicable with consequences which do not have an external argument. If the root of the verb is the same as seen in transitive and intransitive version of the verb, the question of variation in morphology becomes directly

The different morphological patterns in the TA, as one appearance of the morpheme would be as a functor on argument structure.

There are two major objections to simply dismissing the variation in TA morphology as an idiosyncrasy. The first is that on such an account, one cannot explain the appearance of the morphological marking seen in ‘detransitivized’ or ‘causativized’ members of the language. The second major objection is that the variation in TA morphology would presumably be non-question. Various discussions in the literature (6961) suggest that the variation in TA morphology is more likely to be due to the presence of a second morphological layer, the second layer being the root of the verb and the first layer being the morphological layer.

Implications

Based these considerations, I will assume a view of the Transitivity Alternation that it is a result of lexical operations on argument structure.
suggesting that similar forces are at work in each of these cases.

exhibits a situation in which the middle voice appears with resultatives in addition to anticausatives, 

system of Hupa. For instance, the discussion of the Muskogean language Creekin Hardy (1994)

12

this generalization could in turn be seen as an extension of the non-active or middle-voice

whether the locality conditions on allomorphy are to be stated morphologically or 

sociated with this verbal form seem to be derivative from the causative semantics (cf. Kibrik (1993)

as research on other languages with causative morphology in the TA, will determine
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variation in the realization of morphemes in the TA may be treated as allomorphy, (3) as an answer to the question raised in (2), it was shown that some
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Oneremainingpointworthnotingconcernstheotherpatternsexhibitedin (20). In the cases with

Nevertheless, the pattern exhibited seemstobethesame. (20)

see Baker (1988) and related work for recent attemptstotreatpassivemorphologyalongsuchlines).
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