





Passive states¹

Berit Gehrke
Universitat Pompeu Fabra

CLARENDON PRESS • OXFORD

2011

¹ For useful discussion and comments on earlier versions of this paper, I am grateful to Klaus Abels, Sascha Alexejenko, Boban Arsenijević, Helga Gese, Claudia Maienborn, Louise McNally, Olav Müller-Reichau, Lisa Travis, and Carla Umbach, as well as two anonymous reviewers. This research has been supported by MICINN grant HUM2007-60599 and by an award from the Fundació ICREA to Louise McNally.



Contents

- 0.1 Introduction 1
- 0.2 German BE-passives 2
- 0.3 The proposal 7
- 0.4 Event kind vs. state token modifiers: Two types of *by*-phrases 11
- 0.5 Implications for the Syntax-Semantics Interface 16
- 0.6 Different readings in previous proposals 20
- 0.7 Conclusion 26

0.1 Introduction

German morphologically distinguishes between so-called verbal (or eventive) and adjectival (or stative) passives (Kratzer 1994, 2000; Rapp 1996; Maienborn 2007a, among others). In particular, a past passive participle combined with *werden* ‘become’ appears with verbal passives ((1-a)), and with *sein* ‘be’ with adjectival passives ((1-b)) (example after Kratzer 2000).

- (1) a. *Die Reifen werden aufgepumpt.*
the tires become up-pumped
‘The tires are being inflated.’
b. *Die Reifen sind aufgepumpt.*
the tires are up-pumped
‘The tires are inflated.’

The semantics of sentences like (1-b) is the topic of this paper, and throughout, I will employ the descriptive labels BECOME- and BE-passive to distinguish between these two constructions in German.²

The traditional view (Wasow 1977; Bresnan 1982; Borer 1984; Levin and Rappaport 1986) holds that adjectival passives are copula-adjective constructions, with the participle built in the lexicon, whereas verbal passives are periphrastic verb forms derived in the syntax, and this is also the common view for German. Nevertheless, the underlying event is still accessible in BE-passives, as evidenced by the availability of event-related modifiers ((2)) (Kratzer 1994, 2000; Rapp 1996, 1997; Schlücker 2005; Maienborn 2007a, 2009).

- (2) a. *Der Brief ist mit roter Tinte geschrieben.*
the letter is with red ink written
‘The letter is written with red ink.’
b. *Das Haar war schlampig gekämmt.*
the hair was sloppily combed
‘The hair was combed in a sloppy manner.’

Kratzer (1994, 2000) and Rapp (1996) take the availability of such modifiers as evidence for the possibility of phrasal adjectivisation of VPs. Hence, in addition to lexical adjectivisation, which takes a verb as its input, they assume that also a VP in combination with a VP modifier in Spec, VP can be the input to adjectivisation. Schlücker (2005) and Maienborn (2007a), on the other hand, argue that the participle in BE-passives is derived by lexical adjectivisation only,

² Also other languages make this distinction, even when they lack morphological differentiation; see, e.g., Embick (2004); Emonds (2006) and literature cited therein, for English; Dubinsky and Simango (1996) for Chichewa; Anagnostopoulou (2003) for Greek; Travis (2005a, b) for Malagasy.

based on particular prosodic and word order facts, and as a conclusion they argue that event-related modifiers are merely pragmatically licensed. In this paper, I will argue, contra the latter, that the particular modifiers available with BE-passives are indeed VP modifiers, which are licensed semantically. The paper is organised as follows. Section 0.2 addresses the relation of a BE-passive to the underlying verb, its input requirements, and restrictions on event-related modification. Based on this discussion, Section 0.3 proposes a semantic account of BE-passives taking into account the difference between event kinds and tokens. Section 0.4 focuses on *by*-phrases as one type of event-related modifier with this construction, whereas Section 0.5 spells out the syntax of BE-passives. Section 0.6 discusses different readings that have been described in previous accounts and relates them to the current proposal. Finally, Section 0.7 concludes.

0.2 German BE-passives

In the literature on German, the view prevails that the participle in BE-passives is not verbal but adjectival (Kratzer 1994, 2000; Rapp 1996; von Stechow 1998; Maienborn 2007a),³ and that the participle expresses the result or outcome of an event. If BE-passives are copula-adjective constructions, this means that the semantics has to be the one associated with such constructions, namely that a stative property is ascribed to an individual.

However, BE-passives can co-exist with ‘true’ copula-adjective constructions, i.e. those employing genuine adjectives, since both options are equally grammatical and attested ((3)) (examples from Maienborn 2009).

- (3) a. *Die Schublade ist geöffnet / offen.*
 the drawer is opened / open
 b. *Die Schublade ist geleert / leer.*
 the drawer is emptied / empty

This suggests that there has to be some difference between the two. In the following, I discuss the relation of a BE-passive to the underlying verb, its input requirements and semantic peculiarities, as well as restrictions on the availability of event-related modification with this construction.

³ There are a few verbal analyses of BE-passives (e.g. Helbig 1987; Leiss 1992); see also Emonds (2006) for English. Arguments in favour of an adjectival analysis come from the availability of *un*-prefixation, comparative and superlative morphology, as well as from the fact that participles in BE-passives can be coordinated with genuine adjectives.

0.2.1 *The contribution of the underlying verb in BE-passive constructions*

The stative property, as a rule, is ascribed to the internal theme argument of the underlying verb. The external argument, on the other hand, is completely absent, as illustrated by the unavailability of purpose clauses or depictives ((4)).⁴

- (4) a. **Der Reifen war aufgepumpt, um die Fahrt fortzusetzen.*
the tire was inflated in order the journey to continue
b. **Das Buch war mit Absicht / betrunken geschrieben.*
the book was with purpose / drunk written

A first attempt at stating the input requirements for a BE-passive construction is based on the assumption that the stative property has to be recovered from the event structure licensed by the underlying verb. This means that only verbs which license an event structure with a stative component should be able to derive BE-passives. This is basically the hypothesis defended in Rapp (1996). Indeed, the data show that BE-passives are fully acceptable with accomplishment and achievement verbs, which lexically specify a consequent state (in the sense of Moens and Steedman 1988), a state that results from a transition or a specific change of state ((1-b), (5)).

- (5) a. *Die Tür ist geöffnet / geschlossen.*
the door is opened / closed
b. *Der Antrag ist eingereicht.*
the application is submitted
c. *Die Lampe ist repariert.*
the lamp is repaired

With other verbs, BE-passives are not acceptable, though they improve considerably in certain contexts ((6)-(8), b. examples due to Maienborn 2009) (see also Kratzer 2000). With activities ((6), (7)), this is to be expected: The event structure does not contain a stative component.

- (6) a. #*Die Katze ist gestreichelt.*
the cat is stroked
b. *Anna hat ihre Nachbarspflichten erfüllt: Der Briefkasten ist geleert, die Blumen sind gegossen, und die Katze ist gestreichelt.*
emptied the flowers are watered and the cat is stroked
‘Anna has done her neighbourly duties: the mailbox is emptied, the flowers are watered and the cat is stroked.’

⁴ This contrasts with BECOME-passives, where the external argument is syntactically active, even when implicit (cf. Gehrke and Grillo 2009, and literature cited therein).

- c. *Die Katze ist ??(genug/ fertig) gestreichelt.*
 the cat is enough/ ready/done stroked
 ‘The cat has been stroked enough / (Someone) is done stroking the cat.’
(example due to Rapp 1996, 259)

The BE-passive of a semelfactive verb like *streichen* ‘stroke’ in (6-a) is rather bad out of context.⁵ However, if we create a context under which someone promised his or her neighbour to take care of the apartment and its content while the neighbour is on holiday, and one of the chores is to stroke the cat, the construction becomes acceptable ((6-b)). (6-c) illustrates that the BE-passive also becomes acceptable with a resultative component like *fertig* ‘ready, done’, which adds a consequent state component to the event structure (see, for instance, Dowty 1979; Rothstein 2004), or an element like *genug* ‘enough’, which arguably serves to create something like a consequent state. Similarly, the performative verb *zitieren* ‘cite’ out of context, as in (7-a), is not a good candidate for the construction because it does not license an event structure with a stative component. In the right context, in this case with the added *by*-phrase *von Chomsky* ((7-b)), the sentence becomes acceptable again.⁶

- (7) a. #*Das Manuskript ist zitiert.*
 the manuscript is cited
 b. *Das Manuskript ist von Chomsky zitiert.*
 the manuscript is by Chomsky cited
 ‘The manuscript is cited by Chomsky.’

What is not expected if all we needed were a stative component to license the construction, is the fact that there are also restrictions on deriving BE-passives from some stative predicates ((8), though see (10), below).

- (8) a. #*Die Antwort ist gewusst.*
 the answer is known

⁵ The terms activity, accomplishment, and achievement are used here in the sense of Rothstein (2004). It could be debated whether semelfactives (or performatives, as in (7-b)) are activities, but there is general agreement that semelfactives and performatives do not lexically specify a consequent state.

⁶ A German PP headed by *von* ‘of, from’ in these contexts, such as the one in (7-b), is commonly translated into English with a *by*-phrase. However, since it is generally claimed for English that *by*-phrases are not possible with adjectival passives, it is not fully clear whether (a) this claim is simply wrong (exceptions for English exist; German data are discussed in more detail in Section 0.4); or (b) whether German *von*-phrases are not fully equivalent to English *by*-phrases. Given the general absence of an external argument (recall data in (4); the observations there extend to combinations with acceptable *by*-phrases), we have to assume that these *by*-phrases are still different from the *by*-phrases with eventive passives, which introduce ‘true’ external arguments.

- b. *Ist die Antwort gewusst oder geraten?*
 is the answer known or guessed

The BE-passive of *wissen* ‘know’ out of context is rather bad but gets better when embedded under the question in (8-b).⁷

It is important to note, however, that many speakers do not even accept (7-b) and (8-b) with the additional context, whereas (6-b) is accepted by everyone, a point that I will return to in Section 0.6. Given these facts I propose the hypothesis in (9).

- (9) *Hypothesis:*
 Only verbs that lexically specify a consequent state derive BE-passives.

This means, that accomplishment and achievement verbs, whose internal argument undergoes a change of state and as a result is the bearer of a consequent state, are good inputs to this construction. Furthermore, a number of psych predicates, which are sometimes classified as stative verbs but which easily allow an inchoative interpretation are also fine, as can be seen in (10), which contrasts with (8-a).

- (10) *Marie ist genervt / verärgert / amüsiert.*
 Marie is annoyed / angered / amused

This hypothesis also makes sense of the fact that the stative property is always ascribed to the internal (theme) argument of the underlying verb: Changes of state, as a rule, affect theme arguments.

I will now turn to limitations on the availability of event-related modifiers with BE-passives.

0.2.2 Restrictions on event-related modification

We saw in (2) and (7-b) that the underlying event can be modified by event-related modifiers, foremost instrumentals and manner modifiers, but sometimes also *by*-phrases. However, not all event-related modification is acceptable. In this section, I will show that only two types of modifiers are allowed, namely state modifiers or event kind modifiers.

In the literature, it has often been observed that event-related modification with BE-passives is only possible if it pertains to the consequent state; cf. the contrast between (11) and (12), (13) (examples after Rapp 1996).

⁷ The example is due to Maienborn. Carla Umbach (p.c.) remarks that it is strange to use the verb *wissen* ‘know’ with the internal argument *Antwort* ‘answer’; however, the more natural *kennen* ‘know’ is still not good in the BE-passive. Other stative predicates that are not good inputs to BE-passives include *lieben* ‘to love’, *sehen* ‘to see’, *hören* ‘to hear’, among others.

- (11) *Der Mülleimer ist (*von meiner Nichte / *langsam / *genüsslich / *mit der Heugabel) geleert.*
the rubbish bin is by my niece / slowly / pleasurably / with the hay fork emptied
- (12) a. *Das Haus ist von Studenten bewohnt.*
the house is by students in-lived
b. *Er ist von der Musik beeindruckt.*
he is by the music impressed
- (13) a. *Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt.*
the drawing is by a child made
b. *Der Brief war mit einem Bleistift geschrieben.*
the letter was with a pencil written

Modifiers like those in (11) are reported to be out because they refer to an event participant or the manner of the event that (could have) brought about the particular state described by the sentence without having an impact on or being ‘visible’ during the consequent state. In contrast, the event participants described by the *by*-phrases in (12) clearly belong to the state described. Similarly, it is assumed that the modifiers in (13) are acceptable because the objects that resulted from the underlying event, in this case the drawing and the letter, still display an impact of these event participants.

To make sense of these restrictions, I will argue that there are two different types of modifiers that are acceptable with BE-passives. In cases like (12), we are dealing with modifiers that modify the (consequent) state directly. The modifiers in (13), on the other hand, do not directly modify the consequent state, but are rather event participants who affect the outcome of the event in a more indirect way. In essence, these modifiers modify an event kind and serve to create a new event kind (or a subkind) out of the event kind identified by the verb alone, here the subkinds of drawing by children and writing with pencils.

A further argument in favour of the view that we are dealing with event kind modifiers comes from the fact that the underlying event cannot be temporally or spatially modified. For example, a modifier like *recently* cannot modify the underlying event but only the state ((14)).

- (14) *Die Tür war kürzlich geöffnet.*
the door was recently opened.
‘The door was opened recently.’

This sentence can only mean that the door was in the opened state recently, but probably is no longer, hence *recently* applies to the state. It cannot apply to the underlying event, because a reading under which the door is in the opened state, with the opening having taken place recently, is not available.

Furthermore, BE-passives are incompatible with temporal frame adverbials ((15-a)), which need access to the prior event; only temporal adverbials applying to the state itself are acceptable ((15-b)) (examples due to von Stechow 1998) (see also Rapp 1996, 1997).⁸

- (15) a. **Der Computer ist vor drei Tagen repariert.*
the computer is before three days repaired
(‘The computer is repaired three days ago.’)
b. *Der Computer ist seit drei Tagen repariert.*
the computer is since three days repaired
(‘The computer has been repaired since three days.’)

Finally, spatial modifiers that pick out the location of the event that brought about the consequent state are also generally bad ((16)).⁹

- (16) a. #*Die Reifen sind in der Garage aufgepumpt.*
the tires are in the garage inflated
b. #*Das Kind war im Badezimmer gekämmt.*
the child was in the bathroom combed

From these data I conclude that the event associated with the underlying verb lacks spatiotemporal location. To capture this fact, the account to be proposed in the following crucially builds on the assumption that BE-passives involve event kinds, not event tokens.

0.3 The proposal

Based on the discussion in the previous section, I propose that a BE-passive refers to the instantiation of a consequent state kind of an event kind ((17)).

- (17) a. *Die Tür ist geschlossen.*
the door is closed

⁸ This has to do with the fact that a BE-passive like the one in (15) is a statement about the present, in contrast to present perfect verbal passives, which are statements about the past. See also Rapp (1996); Kratzer (2000); Maienborn (2007a) and literature cited therein for arguments against treating the BE-passive as an ellipsis of a verbal passive perfect construction (which employs the auxiliary BE in German).

⁹ I used # instead of * because these sentences are acceptable if the states are located in the locations referred to by the PPs. For example, (16-a) is ok if the tires are inflated while they are in the garage, but outside the garage they are not inflated, which is a rather odd reading. The oddness or even inacceptability of spatial and temporal modifiers with stative predicates is discussed in Katz (2003); Maienborn (2007b), among others.

- b. $\exists e_k, s_k, s [\text{BECOME}(e_k, s_k) \wedge \text{THEME}(e_k, \mathbf{door}) \wedge \mathbf{closed}(s) \wedge \text{THEME}(s, \mathbf{door}) \wedge \mathbf{R}(s, s_k)]$

R in (17) is Carlson’s (1977) realisation relation. **BECOME** should be understood as an event semantic version of Dowty’s (1979) **BECOME**-operator, associated with accomplishment and achievement predicates; e.g. (18).

- (18) *Informal event semantics of BECOME (von Stechow 1996)*
 $[[\text{BECOME}]] (\text{P})(e) = 1$ iff e is the smallest event such that P is not true of the prestate of e but P is true of the target state of e .

The use of **BECOME** is motivated by the hypothesis in (9).

The data discussion in the previous section revealed that the event in BE-passives has no spatiotemporal manifestation, and I concluded from this that we are dealing with an event kind rather than with an event token. This is directly implemented in the analysis, under which event-related modifiers can access either the event kind or the state (kind or token). An event token, on the other hand, is not available, and hence event token modifiers like spatial or temporal ones are not acceptable.

In the following, I will further motivate the claim that BE-passives involve event kinds and thus first concentrate on event kind modification. In Section 0.4, I will contrast event kind modification and state token modification by discussing one particular kind of modifier with BE-passives, namely *by*-phrases.

There are ontological as well as empirical arguments in favour of the concept of event kinds. Event kinds are natural to expect if we assume that events form a subsort in our ontology of (token) individuals (Reichenbach 1947; Davidson 1967; Parsons 1990); that kinds form another subsort in that ontology (Carlson 1977); and as a rule, any token in the ontology should be the realisation of some kind in that ontology. Event kinds have an analog in e.g. the Situation Semantics notion of event type (Barwise and Perry 1983), though the formal details are quite different. Under an additional Neo-Davidsonian view, events can be structurally complex, which motivates the use of the notion of consequent state kinds of an event kind.

Empirical arguments for event kinds as an ontological category have been brought forward by e.g. Landman and Morzycki (2003); Ginzburg (2005); Sailer (2010); Gehrke and McNally (2011). For example, Landman and Morzycki (2003) propose to model manner modification in terms of kinds. Since their line of argumentation provides additional support for my analysis of BE-passives, the following section will briefly recapitulate the relevant points.

0.3.1 *Event kind modification (Landman and Morzycki 2003)*

Landman and Morzycki (2003) observe semantic and syntactic parallels of *so*-anaphora in the nominal and verbal domains across various languages. Their examples from German are given in (19).

- (19) a. *so ein Hund (wie dieser)*
 so a dog (like this)
 ‘such a dog like this one’
 b. *Er hat so getanzt (wie Maria).*
 he has so danced (like Mary)
 ‘He danced in the same manner as Mary.’

In (19) there is a direct semantic parallel in the adnominal and adverbial uses of *so*, which refers back to a particular kind of entity (a kind of dog or a kind of dancing event). There is furthermore a syntactic parallel in that both can occur with an additional clause of comparison introduced by *wie* ‘like’.

Given that elements like *so* under the adnominal use ((19-a)) (English *such*), are commonly treated as kind anaphors, following Carlson (1977), Landman and Morzycki (2003) treat adverbial *so* analogously, as anaphor to event kinds. In particular, they propose that (adverbial) *so* denotes a property of events that realise a (particular contextually supplied) kind ((20)).

- (20) $[[so_i]] = \lambda e.e \text{ realises } k_i$

An additional argument that kinds are involved comes from the fact that temporal and locative adverbials generally cannot antecede adverbial *so* ((21)) (all the following examples due to Landman and Morzycki 2003).

- (21) a. **Maria hat am Dienstag getanzt, und Jan hat auch so getanzt.*
 Mary has on Tuesday danced and John has also so danced
 b. **Maria hat in Minnesota gegessen, und Jan hat auch so gegessen.*
 Mary has in Minnesota eaten and John has also so eaten

Such modifiers are only acceptable, if they can be seen as creating a new (or sub-)kind ((22)).

- (22) *Maria schläft in einem Schlafsack, und Jan schläft auch so.*
 Mary sleeps in a sleeping bag and John sleeps also so
 ‘Mary sleeps in a sleeping bag and John does so, too.’

In (22), the locative modifier does not serve to specify the location of a particular sleeping event, but rather serves to create a new sub-kind of sleeping event, namely the kind of sleeping in sleeping bags. Hence, it is not a proper spatial modifier but rather used as a kind of manner modifier. They conclude that it is viable to treat manner modifiers as modifying event kinds in general.

0.3.2 Event kind modifiers with BE-passives

Returning to the topic of this paper, BE-passives, we see that the same kind of modifiers that are acceptable antecedents for *so* are also possible with BE-passives, namely and foremost manner modifiers. Spatial and temporal modifiers, on the other hand, are possible neither as antecedents of *so* nor with BE-passives, as observed in the previous section.

If manner modification, in general, modifies event kinds, the restriction on event-related modification with BE-passives is straightforwardly accounted for under the current proposal. If BE-passives involve event kinds, kind-related event modification is possible, including modifiers that serve to create a new or a subkind. However, modifiers that need to access an event token, such as temporal and spatial modifiers, are not acceptable.

To illustrate how the kind-based approach captures one type of restriction on event-related modification with BE-passives, namely to event kind modifiers, let us return to the contrast between (11) and (13).¹⁰ The example in (11) without the modifier describes the state the rubbish bin is in as a result of an emptying event kind. Combining event-related modifiers with the BE-passive should only be allowed either if the modifier creates a new event kind (a subkind), by narrowing down the event kind of emptying rubbish bins, or if they access the (consequent) state (token) directly. The particular modifiers in (11), however, do not do either, since they do not relate to the consequent state itself and since there are also no common or established (sub)kinds of rubbish-bin-emptying by my niece, slowly, with pleasure or with the hay fork.¹¹ The modifiers in (13), in turn, pick out particular subkinds of the events in question, namely childish drawings or pencil-writings, and are therefore acceptable.

The proposal also sheds light on a fact, observed by Welke (2007), that sometimes a BE-passive is only possible with an additional modifier ((23), (24)).

- (23) a. *?Der Brief ist geschrieben.*
the letter is written
b. *Der Brief ist mit roter Tinte geschrieben.*
the letter is with red ink written

¹⁰ I will come back to the second type of modifiers, namely state modifiers with stative predicates such as in (12), in Section 0.4.

¹¹ This contrasts with modifiers like the one in (i), which is perfectly fine, given that we can think of rubbish-bin-emptying event kinds being professional.

- (i) *Der Mülleimer ist professionell geleert.*
the rubbish bin is professionally emptied

Of course, this begs the question as to how we can determine what an acceptable or appropriate event kind is. I do not have an answer to this, but this is probably also not a question that can be directly answered by linguistics.

‘The letter is written with red ink.’

- (24) a. *?Das Brett ist gesägt.*
the plank is sawn
b. *Das Brett ist in zwei Teile gesägt.*
the plank is in two parts sawn
‘The plank is cut in two pieces.’

As Welke notes, it is somewhat odd to talk about a letter in a state of being written ((23-a)) or a plank being sawn ((24-a)), given these are the normal states for letters or planks to be in, i.e. letters are usually written and planks are usually sawn. Under the current account, we can explain the improvement of the examples because adding the modifiers here creates a subkind, such as written with red ink or cut in two pieces, and thus attributing such a property to letters and planks becomes informative again.

In the following section, I will return to the issue of *by*-phrases with BE-passives, which directly relates to some of the examples that have already been discussed.

0.4 Event kind vs. state token modifiers: Two types of *by*-phrases

In this section, I will take a closer look at one particular type of event-related modifier acceptable with BE-passives, namely *by*-phrases. It will be demonstrated that such *by*-phrases fall into two types, one that modifies a state token (the consequent state) and one that modifies an event kind. *By*-phrases that need to apply to an event token, however, are not acceptable. Thus, the data confirm the initial claim that in BE-passives, only the event kind or the state token are accessible for modification.

0.4.1 Differences in stress

Based on different stress patterns, Schlücker (2005) observes the need to distinguish between two types of *by*-phrases with BE-passives. She argues that one type constitutes ‘VP-adjuncts’ ((25)), which do not form a prosodic unit with the participle (following Maienborn 2004).

- (25) a. *weil Peter von dem GeJAmmer genervt ist*
because Peter by the lamentation irritated is
‘because Peter is irritated by the lamentation’ CONTRASTIVE
b. *weil Peter von dem Gejámmer geNERVT ist*
because Peter by the lamentation irritated is
NEUTRAL

Neutral sentential stress with these phrases is on the participle, secondary stress on the modifier (the latter point is not mentioned by Schlücker; see Hoekstra 1999; Gehrke 2008, for similar facts from Dutch). Stress on the modifier, on the other hand, indicates contrastive focus on this constituent.

The second type of *by*-phrases are argued to be ‘V-adjuncts’ ((26), (27)), which form a prosodic unit with the participle with neutral stress on the modifier.¹²

- (26) a. *weil die Wände von FEUer geschwärzt sind*
 because the walls by fire blackened are
 ‘because the walls are blackened by fire’ NEUTRAL
- b. *weil die Wände von Feuer geSCHWÄRZT sind*
 because the walls by fire blackened are
 CONTRASTIVE
- (27) a. *weil seine Töchter von der SANGesmuse geküsst sind*
 because his daughters by the muse of singing kissed are
 ‘because his daughters are kissed by the muse of singing’
 NEUTRAL
- b. *weil seine Töchter von der Sangesmuse geKÜSST sind*
 because his daughters by the muse of singing kissed are
 CONTRASTIVE

Stress on the participle, on the other hand, is associated with contrastive focus. Schlücker observes that the intonation facts with ‘V-adjuncts’ match those with other event-related modifiers that are allowed with BE-passives ((28), (29)).

- (28) a. *weil die Birnen in ROTwein gedünstet sind*
 because the pears in red wine steamed are
 ‘because the pears are steamed in red wine’ NEUTRAL
- b. *weil die Birnen in Rotwein geDÜNSTet sind*
 because the pears in red wine steamed are’
 CONTRASTIVE
- (29) a. *weil der Brief mit WACHS versiegelt ist*
 because the letter with wax sealed is
 ‘because the letter is sealed with wax’ NEUTRAL
- b. *weil der Brief mit Wachs verSIEgelt ist*
 because the letter with wax sealed is’
 CONTRASTIVE

She concludes that these latter event-related modifiers, as well as *by*-phrases which behave like ‘V-adjuncts’, are pragmatically licensed in line with the

¹² I use Schlücker’s labels ‘V-adjunct’ and ‘VP-adjunct’ as mere descriptions. In Section 0.5, I will argue that we are dealing with VP and AP modifiers, respectively.

account proposed by Maienborn (see Section 0.6.1), by forming a complex ad hoc property with the stative property denoted by the verbal participle. In addition, Schlücker notes that the two types of *by*-phrases differ with respect to the nature of their complements. With ‘VP-adjuncts’, animate entities are commonly expressed by proper names or members of a group denoted by a collective noun, e.g. *Polizist* ‘police-man’. Inanimate entities are referred to by definite uses of mass nouns, e.g. *vom Feuer* ‘by the fire’, or by appellatives used definitely, e.g. *von der Bombe* ‘by the bomb’. With ‘V-adjuncts’, on the other hand, it is stated that animate entities are referred to by collective nouns, e.g. *von der Polizei* ‘by the police’, inanimate entities by generic uses of mass nouns (*von Feuer* ‘by fire’) or indefinite uses of appellatives (*von einer Bombe, von Bomben* ‘by a bomb, by bombs’). From this description, I conclude that ‘V-adjunct’ *by*-phrases have a more generic, ‘VP-adjunct’ *by*-phrases a more concrete character.

The data discussed in Schlücker and the conclusions drawn from these are in need of the following qualifications. A first observation is that the ‘V-adjuncts’ discussed by Schlücker are parts of collocations or idioms. For example, there is no literal ‘verbal’ meaning in (27), in the sense that the muse of singing actually kisses or kissed the daughters.¹³ A second type of *by*-phrases that behave like ‘V-adjuncts’ is found in examples already discussed in previous sections, such as (7-b) and (13-a), repeated in (30), with the neutral stress pattern indicated that identifies these phrases as ‘V-adjuncts’.

- (30) a. *Das Manuskript ist von CHOMsky zitiert.*
the manuscript is by Chomsky cited
‘The manuscript is cited by Chomsky.’
b. *Die Zeichnung ist von einem KIND angefertigt.*
the drawing is by a child made

Under the current proposal, these modifiers fall under event kind modifiers. The ‘VP-adjuncts’ discussed by Schlücker, on the other hand, are fully acceptable only with stative predicates. An example from previous sections, which displays this intonation pattern, is (12-b), repeated in (31).

- (31) *Er ist von der Musik beEINdrückt.*
he is by the music impressed

¹³ One reviewer was wondering why example (26) counts as a collocation or idiom. A search on google revealed that the participle *geschwärzt* ‘blackened’ in combination with *von* ‘by’ basically appeared with three different nouns only, namely *Feuer* ‘fire’, *Rauch* ‘smoke’, and *Ruß* ‘soot’, but there were practically no combinations with other nouns. I therefore assume that it is quite safe to count such expressions as collocations.

With other, non-stative predicates, however, I find the examples discussed by Schlücker rather bad. More importantly, however, I do not share the judgments about the intonation identifying them as ‘VP-adjuncts’, and other native speakers I consulted do not either. If acceptable at all, such *by*-phrases with non-stative predicates rather behave like ‘V-adjuncts’ ((32), Schlücker’s examples, my judgments about stress).¹⁴

- (32) a. ... *weil der Saal von der Heinrich-BÖLL-Stiftung gemietet ist.*
because the hall by the Heinrich-Böll-foundation rented is
‘because the hall is rented by the Heinrich-Böll Foundation’
NEUTRAL
- b. ... *weil der Saal von der Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung geMIETet is*
because the hall by the Heinrich-Böll-foundation rented is
CONTRASTIVE

I conclude from these facts that *by*-phrases which behave like ‘VP-adjuncts’ are only acceptable with states and furthermore that they modify a state token.

0.4.2 (In)compatibility with *un-* and word order differences

A similar modification restriction to stative predicates with BE-passives is observed in Rapp (1996). Rapp notes that *by*-phrases that relate to an action or a process are generally incompatible with *un-*prefixation ((33)), whereas with stative predicates *by*-phrases in combination with *un-* are acceptable ((34)) (examples due to Lenz 1993).

- (33) a. *Die Suppe ist (*von Maja) ungewürzt.*
the soup is (*by Maja) unseasoned
- b. *Der Brief ist (*von Maja) ungeschrieben.*
the letter is (*by Maja) unwritten
- (34) a. *Die Dresdner Bürger sind von solchen Problemen unbeeindruckt.*
the Dresden- citizens are by such problems unimpressed
‘The citizens of Dresden are not concerned with such problems.’
- b. ... *weil sie von ihrer Arbeit unbefriedigt ist.*
because they by their work unsatisfied are
‘... because they are not satisfied by their work’

Following Kratzer (1994), Rapp assumes that we are dealing with phrasal adjectivisation of a full VP in case the BE-passive combines with an

¹⁴ In addition, I would mark these examples with at least two question marks. Further syntactic tests to distinguish between ‘V-’ and ‘VP-adjuncts’, mentioned by Schlücker (2005), such as the relative placement (with respect to modifier and participle) of sentence negation, sentence adverbials and floating quantifiers, yield the same results.

event-related modifier, and such adjectivisation is not compatible with *un-* (33).¹⁵ Given the absence of a clash between *un-* and a *by*-phrase in (34), she concludes that the *by*-phrases with these verbs do not relate to an activity or action but express arguments of the adjective itself. In particular, the construction expresses the attitude of an experiencer with respect to his stimulus. She furthermore observes that there are word order differences between non-action-related *by*-phrases ((35-a)) and other event-related modifiers in the BE-passive ((35-b)).

- (35) a. ... *weil sie unbefriedigt von ihrer Arbeit ist.*
because they unsatisfied by their work are
- b. *... *weil der Brief geschrieben von einem Experten / mit roter Tinte ist.*
ink is

Only the former can be extraposed, whereas the latter have to remain within the VP (or the verbal cluster).

Given that genuine adjectives in combination with PP arguments, such as, for example, *(un)glücklich über diese Entwicklung* ‘(un)happy about this development’, are also compatible with *un-* prefixation and can appear before the PP, she concludes that the modifiers in (34) and (35-a) modify the adjective (the AP), while those in (35-b) modify a VP which is then the input to adjectivisation. In Section 0.5, I will spell out the syntactic repercussions of such an analysis.

0.4.3 Summary

To take stock, there are two kinds of *by*-phrases with BE-passives, diagnosed by differences in stress and word order, as well as (in)compatibility with *un-*. The first type (Schlücker’s ‘V-adjuncts’) behaves like other event-related modifiers with BE-passives in that they are prosodically integrated into the participle, do not allow *un-* prefixation, and are unacceptable in a position after the participle. These *by*-phrases are only possible with collocations or idioms, or when they serve to create a new (sub-)kind (e.g. (13-a)), and I assume they modify the underlying event kind.

In contrast, there are *by*-phrases which contrast with other event-related modifiers with this construction (Schlücker’s ‘VP-adjuncts’), in that they can appear after the participle, are not prosodically integrated into the participle, and are compatible with *un-* prefixation. Such *by*-phrases are fully acceptable only with stative predicates, in which case they do not refer to agents (i.e. they are not true external arguments). For example, with psych predicates, they rather refer to

¹⁵ I will say more about the underlying syntactic assumptions in Section 0.5.

the stimulus of the state expressed. Given that they behave like PP arguments of genuine adjectives, such phrases can be treated as arguments of the AP, along the lines of Rapp, rather than arguments of the underlying VP. In particular, then, they are not modifying the event kind but the state token.

Schlücker’s observation, then, that the complements of ‘V-adjunct’ *by*-phrases have more of a generic character fits these conclusions and the overall proposal. If the *by*-phrase modifies an event kind rather than an event token, the potential agent of such a kind naturally has a more generic character. With the ‘VP-adjuncts’, on the other hand, we have *by*-phrases modifying an actual state token, so they are prone to be more concrete.

The following section spells out the syntactic assumptions about BE-passive constructions, also in combination with modifiers.

0.5 Implications for the Syntax-Semantics Interface

As has been noted in Section 0.2, the common view is that a BE-passive construction combines an adjectivised participle with a copula (Kratzer 1994, 2000; Rapp 1996; von Stechow 1998; Maienborn 2007*a*, among others). Following Lieber (1980), it is generally assumed that the participle is turned into an adjective by zero-affixation ((36)).


(36) COP [_{AP} [_A [_{VPart} geöffnet] ∅]]

Given the absence of an external argument, as evident from data like those in (4), I follow Kratzer (1994, 2000) in assuming that the participle morphology in BE-passives licenses the absence of verbal inflection, but is in itself meaningless (see also von Stechow 1998). The lack of verbal inflection, in turn, implies the lack of an external argument which, according to Kratzer, is introduced VP-externally, by a separate head VoiceP (or *vP* in other frameworks). Hence, the input to adjectivisation can at most be a bare VP.

Under the current account, the event in BE-passives is an event kind. I therefore propose that a bare VP represents an event kind, and furthermore that, in order to individuate an event, we need additional verbal structure, such as *vP* (or VoiceP). Since such structure is generally absent in BE-passives, the event remains in the kind domain.


I will furthermore follow Kratzer (1994) in assuming the possibility of phrasal and lexical adjectivisation (see also Rapp 1996; Kratzer 2000). We are dealing with lexical adjectivisation, when the input is the verb alone, e.g. *geschlossen* ‘closed’ in (37).

(37) Lexical adjectivisation




When the BE-passive combines with an event-related modifier, the whole VP with the modifier in its Specifier is adjectivised and we are dealing with phrasal adjectivisation. Given the previous discussion, I propose that this is the case with event kind modifiers, i.e. Schlücker’s ‘V-adjuncts’, such as *mit Wachs versiegelt* ‘sealed with wax’ or *von Chomsky zitiert* ‘cited by Chomsky’ ((38)).

(38) Phrasal adjectivisation: Event kind modifiers



This analysis captures the fact that the PP is prosodically integrated into the participle and that it cannot appear after it. It also follows that *un*-prefixation is not possible, since only lexical adjectivisation is compatible with *un*-. Finally, I will assume with Rapp (1996) that the second type of modifiers with BE-passives, namely those that modify a state (token) (Schlücker’s ‘VP-adjuncts’), modify the adjective directly, i.e. the AP, as in *von der Musik (un)beeindruckt* ‘(un)impressed by the music’ ((39)).

(39) State modifiers: Modifiers of AP



It follows directly from this analysis that these modifiers are not prosodically integrated into the participle, that they can appear after the participle, and that the participle itself, which is the output of lexical adjectivisation, is compatible with *un*-.

Schlücker (2005) and Maienborn (2007a) argue against the possibility of phrasal adjectivisation and assume that event-related modifiers with BE-passives never modify a VP, but rather a V only, and that they are merely pragmatically licensed.¹⁶ Maienborn, for example, argues that the modifiers should behave just like VP-modifiers with BECOME-passives if they were modifiers of a VP, and she shows that this is not the case when it comes to neutral stress with such constructions. In particular, neutral sentential stress falls on the modifier with BE-passives ((40-a)) but on the participle with BECOME-passives ((40-b)).

- (40) *Anna sah sofort, ...*
 Anna saw immediately ...
 ‘Anna saw immediately ...’
- a. *dass der Brief mit WACHS versiegelt war.*
 that the letter with wax sealed was
 ‘that the letter was sealed with wax.’
- b. *dass der Brief gerade mit Wachs verSIEgelt wurde.*
 that the letter just now with wax sealed became
 ‘that the letter was being sealed with wax.’

Hence, what these data show is that the modifiers of BE-passives are prosodically integrated into the participle, whereas those of BECOME-passives are not.¹⁷ Following Jacobs (1999), Maienborn assumes that we are dealing with integration of the modifier into the participle in the BE-passive cases but not in the BECOME-passive cases, since with integration stress always falls on the integrated element (in this case on the modifier) (cf. the prosodic rule 3 in Jacobs 1993, 85).

Maienborn furthermore shows that event-related modifiers can be scrambled only with BECOME-passives but not with BE-passives ((41)).

- (41) a. *... weil hier jeder Brief mit Wachs versiegelt ist/wird.*
 because here every letter with wax sealed is/becomes
 ‘.. because here, every letter is / gets sealed with wax.’
- b. **... weil hier mit Wachs jeder Brief versiegelt ist.*
 because here with wax every letter sealed is
- c. *... weil hier mit Wachs jeder Brief versiegelt wird.*
 because here with wax every letter sealed becomes

¹⁶ They are not very explicit about the syntactic structure, hence I will not address this here. It is even less clear how Schlücker would analyse her ‘VP-adjunct’ cases given she rejects phrasal adjectivisation.

¹⁷ Given the previous discussion, these modifiers are clear examples of event kind modifiers.

Since Jacobs argues that elements that are obligatorily integrated cannot scramble whereas non-integrated elements can, the data, again, show that event-related modifiers with BE-passives are integrated whereas those with BECOME-passives are not. Maienborn’s overall conclusion is that modifiers with BE-passives, which are integrated into the participle, have to modify a V, whereas the non-integrated modifiers with BECOME-passives are VP modifiers. There is a fundamental problem with this line of argumentation, though. It is true that the data discussed by Maienborn show that the modifiers are integrated into the participle with BE-passives but not with BECOME-passives. However, this does not mean that a modifier with BE-passives cannot modify a VP, since Jacobs never argued that integration can only hold between a modifier and a head. In fact, in Jacobs (1993), for instance, he discusses many cases where a constituent is integrated into a phrasal sister constituent. We can therefore still assume that the modifier here is in Spec, VP and gets integrated with the VP (the participle). The actual question, then, is why integration is not taking place with BECOME-passives, but this is a completely separate issue and cannot be taken as an argument against phrasal adjectivisation in the case of BE-passives. Not being an expert on integration, which, in any case, seems to be orthogonal to the topic of this paper, I can only speculate here. It could, for example, be the case that the participle in BECOME-passives is integrated into the auxiliary and is thus part of an already integrated structure. Jacobs argues that integration into already integrated structures is generally blocked (e.g. Jacobs 1993, 70). In this context, the contrast in (42) seems relevant.

- (42) a. ... *weil der Brief mit Wachs verSIEgelt wurde.*
because the letter with wax sealed became
‘... because the letter was (being) sealed by wax.’
b. ... *weil er den Brief mit WACHS versiegelte.*
because he the letter with wax sealed
‘... because he sealed the letter with wax.’

With the BECOME-passive in (42-a) there is no integration of the VP modifier into the participle, as evidenced by sentence stress falling on the participle itself. However, in (42-b) we are dealing with an active simple past tense sentence, in which the VP modifier is integrated into the verb in the absence of an additional auxiliary.

In sum, I conclude that there are no compelling arguments against treating event kind modifiers with BE-passives as VP modifiers that, as integrated parts of the VP, together with the participle serve as input to phrasal adjectivisation. In the last section of this paper, I will compare the current proposal to previous accounts of BE-passives, which acknowledge the existence of two different readings of these constructions.

0.6 Different readings in previous proposals

The hypothesis in (9) and the current account predict that only accomplishment and achievement verbs are good inputs to a BE-passive construction, and furthermore that they should all be equally good inputs. There are some challenges to this approach. First, we saw in Section 0.2 that context can improve the acceptability of verbs other than accomplishments and achievements, and we need to say a bit more about how this may be so. Second, it seems that even among accomplishment and achievement verbs, some are more common in BE-passives than others, which might not be expected if all we needed was an event structure with a BECOME component (and with a consequent state). In particular, the construction is most natural if the state expresses something like an opposite state¹⁸. For example, (5-a) is rather neutral and in most cases merely expresses the stative property of the door being open/closed (as a consequent state of an opening event kind). In contrast, (5-b) and (5-c) have an additional flavour that Kratzer (2000) describes as ‘the job is done’. A sentence like (5-c), for instance, is fairly natural in a situation where it was someone’s job to repair a lamp, and after being done repairing it, (s)he can say this sentence.

Finally, the literature about BE-passives discusses two different readings of this construction, which do not directly follow from the current account. One of the first people to note these readings, exemplified in (43), was Brandt (1982) (examples via Rapp 1996).

- (43) a. *Das Fleisch ist gekocht. Wir können jetzt essen.*
the meat is cooked we can now eat
‘The meat is done. We can eat now.’
b. *Das Fleisch ist gekocht. Es ist nicht gebraten.*
the meat is cooked it is not fried
‘The meat is cooked. It is not fried.’

Rapp’s (1996) assessment of these two readings is that in both cases we are dealing with an adjective-copula construction, and that the difference is a mere pragmatic one between a consequent state reading ((43-a)) and a characterisation reading ((43-b)). Maienborn (2007a), and consequent work, also treats the difference as a pragmatic one between a temporal reading ((43-a)) and a qualitative reading ((43-b)), whereas Kratzer (2000) makes a semantic differentiation between resultant state passives (~ (43-a)) and target state passives (~ (43-b)).

¹⁸ I will leave this notion at a more intuitive level, but it should become clearer towards the end of the section what an opposite state might be.

In the following, I will briefly outline Maienborn’s and Kratzer’s accounts and compare them to the current proposal.

0.6.1 *The pragmatic approach (Maienborn 2007a, and subsequent work)*¹⁹

According to Maienborn, BE-passives are always pragmatically licensed and possible across all verb classes. They are argued to ascribe a ‘pragmatically salient ad hoc property [in the sense of Barsalou (1983), and subsequent work], conceived as resulting from the event referred to by the participle’ (Maienborn 2009, 40) ((44)).

- (44) a. Adjectival \circledast -affix: $\lambda P \lambda x \lambda s \exists e [s: \mathbf{Q}(x) \wedge \mathbf{result}(e, s) \wedge P(e)]$
 b. *Das Manuskript ist eingereicht.*
 the manuscript is submitted
 $\exists s [s: \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{the\ manuscript}) \wedge \mathbf{result}(e, s) \wedge \mathbf{submit}(e)]$

The free variable **Q** in (44) stands for the property that holds for the subject referent *x* in a state *s*. **Q** is further restricted as resulting from the verbal event *e*. Apart from that, the grammar is argued not to supply any more information about the actual kind of property.

Maienborn furthermore states that a BE-passive is pragmatically licensed if the context provides a contrasting alternative state *s'* which differs from *s* with respect to either the temporal ((45-a)) or the qualitative dimension ((45-b)) (see also Gese 2010).²⁰

- (45) *Das Manuskript ist eingereicht ...*
 the manuscript is submitted ...
 ‘The manuscript is submitted ...’
 $\exists s [s: \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{the\ manuscript}) \wedge \mathbf{result}(e, s) \wedge \mathbf{submit}(e)] \dots$
 a. (... *jetzt können wir uns an den Projektantrag machen.*)
 now can we us to the project-proposal make
 ‘... now we can turn to the project proposal.’
 $\dots \wedge \mathbf{contrast}(s, s') \wedge s': \neg \mathbf{Q}(x) \ \& \ s' < s$
 b. (... *aber nicht angenommen / veröffentlicht / ...*)
 but not accepted / published / ...

¹⁹ Works that build on Maienborn’s account include Schlücker (2005); Gese (2010).

²⁰ Nothing is said as to whether this requirement can be derived from some more general pragmatic principle. It is only stated that it is necessary to situate the *ad hoc* property in the subject’s property space (see also Maienborn 2007a, 102f.), so I assume it has to do with Barsalou’s notion of ad hoc properties. In Maienborn (2009, 42) Barsalou’s ad hoc categories are described as ‘goal-derived categories that are created spontaneously for use in more or less specialized contexts. Under this perspective adjectival passives may be seen as a means to extend and contextualize a concept’s property space with respect to contextually salient goals.’

‘... but not accepted / published / ...’
 $\dots \wedge \mathbf{contrast}(s, s') \wedge s': \mathbf{Q}'(x)$

The temporal reading in (45-a) is stated to involve a post state of a submitting event, where the context provides a salient alternative state s' that temporally precedes s and in which x does not have the property \mathbf{Q} . Under the qualitative reading in (45-b), on the other hand, the manuscript is argued to belong to the class of submitted papers, where s' exemplifies a contextually salient property \mathbf{Q}' that is qualitatively distinct from \mathbf{Q} .

The question, then, is how we can integrate these observations into the current proposal. First, we could state an alternative hypothesis to the one in (9) such as the one in (46).

- (46) *Alternative hypothesis (to be rejected):*
 Only verbs that lexically specify a state which can be interpreted as an opposite state are fully acceptable in BE-passives.

If the state in BE-passives is a state evaluated with respect to an opposite state on some scalar dimension, we still derive that the most straightforward opposition is given by the event structure of predicates involving a BECOME component, and the scalar dimension is temporal in the course of the derivation. This is already evident from the original formulation of BECOME in Dowty’s (1979) framework, but also from any reformulation of BECOME in event semantic terms such as von Stechow’s (1996) provided in Section 0.3.

Under this hypothesis, then, accomplishment, achievement, and some state verbs are predicted to be good inputs because consequent and inchoative states generally contrast with a prior state (the state before the change). With other verbs, on the other hand, a BE-passive is only possible if an opposite state can be derived contextually. For example, in (6-b), an opposite state is construed on some temporal scale: The cat is now in the state it was supposed to be in; there is an opposition between the job not being done yet at some previous time, and the job being done now. In (7-b), the state is opposed on some qualitative scale: The manuscript is cited by Chomsky and not just by some undergrad student in a term paper. Also in (8-b), we are dealing with a qualitative scale: The answer is more certain (more likely to be correct), because it is known and not just guessed.

However, it was also noted in Section 0.2, that not all speakers accept the qualitative readings. I therefore assumed throughout this paper the more restrictive hypothesis in (9), and proposed that the semantics of BE-passives crucially involves a consequent state (and something like BECOME). A main problem of Maienborn’s account, then, is that not all BE-passives have an ‘ad hoc’ flavour or are in need of pragmatic licensing. In fact, BE-passives are fully acceptable with verbs lexically specifying a consequent state, without additional

pragmatic effects (see also Welke 2007). The context dependency that Maienborn observes seems to be relevant only in combination with other verbs. Another problem that Maienborn’s account faces is the following. She points out that the state of BE-passives is evaluated with respect to some opposite state, but this does not follow from her account in (44-a). Furthermore, it is not clear how the state that the individual *x* is in is related to the event *e*; what is *x*’s role in *e*? Hence, I reject a purely pragmatic account of BE-passives as too weak since there are clear input requirements. When these are not met, the construction can still be pragmatically licensed, by imposing a scale underlying BECOME, which gets interpreted not temporally but along a qualitative dimension, and for this we need a pragmatic account, possibly along the lines of Maienborn’s (or Schlücker 2005). I will not attempt to spell out the details here, but the general idea is the following. An opposite state has to be contextually or pragmatically licensed with verbs that do not license an event structure containing a consequent state. I assume, then, that qualitative readings come about by shifting the common temporal interpretation of BECOME (a state evaluated with respect to its opposite state along a temporal scale) to a different dimension so that we get a state evaluated with respect to its opposite state on a qualitative dimension. The fact that not all speakers accept the qualitative readings, in particular with verbs other than accomplishments and achievements, however, should be taken as an indication that these readings are not directly part of the semantics of the construction.

A similar distinction between two readings is made by Kratzer (2000), who builds the difference into the semantics. I will turn to her account next.

0.6.2 Target state vs. resultant state passives (Kratzer 2000)

Based on the (in)compatibility with *immer noch* ‘still’, Kratzer (2000) makes a distinction between target state passives, which allow modification by *immer noch* ((47-a)), and resultant state passives, which do not ((47-b)).²¹

- (47) a. *Die Reifen sind (immer noch) aufgepumpt.*
the tires are (still) up-pumped
‘The tires are still inflated.’ TARGET STATE PASSIVE
- b. *Das Theorem ist (*immer noch) bewiesen.*
the theorem is (*still) proven
‘The theorem is proven.’ RESULTANT STATE PASSIVE

According to Kratzer, target state passives characterise reversible, transitory states and are only possible with category-neutral stems with an event argument

²¹ See also Kratzer (1994). The terminology is adopted from Parsons (1990), though Kratzer seems to have a more narrow notion of ‘target state’.

as well as a target state argument. These stems are argued to be unspecified for syntactic category because they can be used to build verbs or adjectives. In addition, target state passives can be lexical ((48-a)) or phrasal ((48-b)) (based on *(das Boot) aufgepumpt* ‘(the boat) inflated’).

- (48) Target state passive stative: $\lambda\mathbf{R}\lambda s\exists e\mathbf{R}(s)(e)$
- a. Lexical case, output:
 $\lambda x\lambda s\exists e[\mathbf{pump}(e)\&\mathbf{event}(e)\&\mathbf{inflated}(x)(s)\&\mathbf{cause}(s)(e)]$
 - b. Phrasal case, output:
 $\lambda s\exists e[\mathbf{pump}(e)\&\mathbf{event}(e)\&\mathbf{inflated}(\mathbf{the\ boat})(s)\&\mathbf{cause}(s)(e)]$

In contrast, resultant state passives are argued to refer to states resulting from an event, which is over by the time of reference, where the state ‘has to hold forever after’. These passives are assumed to be derived from category-neutral stems as well as from verbs, as long as they allow a ‘job is done’-reading. Furthermore, this passive is argued to have perfect aspect, since the derivation involves an aspectual operator ((49)).

- (49) Resultant state passive stative: $\lambda\mathbf{P}\lambda t\exists e[\mathbf{P}(e)\&\tau(e) < t]$
 Output: $\lambda t\exists e[\mathbf{prove}(\mathbf{the\ theorem})(e)\&\tau(e) < t]$

This means that the semantics of resultant state passives is very similar to the perfect construction of a BECOME-passive; the main difference being that there is no agent (syntactically, there is no *v/VoiceP*, as discussed in previous sections).

One way to adapt the current proposal to Kratzer’s could be to rephrase the distinction between target and resultant state passives by refuting to the difference between event kinds and event tokens. If we are dealing with consequent states of actual events that took place, we have something that is similar to a perfect of result, i.e. similar to Kratzer’s resultant state passives (or to Maienborn’s temporal readings). If, on the other hand, the states are merely of the correct kind to have resulted from an event of some kind, this is similar to Kratzer’s target state passives (or to Maienborn’s qualitative readings). However, the problem we are facing now is that we do not really want an event token in the representation, since there is no spatiotemporal location of the event, as observed in Section 0.2.²² Furthermore, it was outlined above that

²² The same problem arises under von Stechow’s (1998) account. One reviewer suggests that under an analysis of the BE-passive as involving perfect aspect, these restrictions could be seen as an instance of the Present Perfect Puzzle, i.e. the fact that the present perfect in some languages is incompatible with a past adverbial locating the event. The first problem with such a view is that this incompatibility disappears with the past perfect or with tenseless perfects. With BE-passives, on the other hand, the event can never be located in time, independent of the tense on the copula. Second, German is not among the

non-temporal readings could be the result of reinterpreting the scale underlying BECOME as non-temporal. More generally, if event kinds lack spatiotemporal location, a reinterpretation of something like BECOME along a non-temporal dimension might be a natural possibility, and we could get the distinction between temporal and non-temporal readings for free.

Furthermore, I have doubts about the *still*-diagnostics and Kratzer’s assumptions as to what it actually diagnoses. Intuitively, the (un-)availability of modification by *immer noch* ‘still’ has more to do with whether or not the consequent state of the event type associated with a verb can be *and* is expected to be reversed, rather than with a clear semantic distinction.²³

The verbs whose participles are compatible with *immer noch* (e.g. *versteckt* ‘hidden’, *abgeschraubt* ‘screwed off’, *geräumt* ‘evacuated’, *versperrt* ‘obstructed’) have clear antonyms, whose consequent states express something like a more ‘natural’ state. There are different reasons, then, why other participles do not allow *immer noch*. For one thing, with examples like *gegrüßt* ‘greeted’, the underlying verb does not lexically encode a consequent state, and a BE-passive is quite bad even without the modifier. With other participles, the underlying verbs are derived from adjectives, e.g. *geleert* ‘emptied’ or *getrocknet* ‘dried’. In such cases, even with the underlying adjectives, the use of *immer noch* seems more marked (50).

- (50) a. *Die Wäsche ist immer noch trocken.*
the laundry is still dry
‘The laundry is still dry.’
b. *Der Briefkasten ist immer noch leer.*
the mailbox is still empty
‘The mailbox is still empty.’

In (50-a), one wonders whether being dry is not ideally the state laundry should be in. In (50-b), there is some expectation that someone should put mail in the mailbox; but this is not necessarily the more natural state for a mailbox to be in. Note also that negation of the participle renders modification by *immer noch* possible again ((51)) (see also Schlücker 2005, for similar observations).

- (51) a. *Das Theorem ist immer noch unbewiesen.*
the theorem is still unproven

languages that displays the Present Perfect Puzzle (for a general discussion of the Puzzle, see Portner to appear, and literature cited therein). Finally, this would not explain the fact that spatial modifiers are also not possible with BE-passives.

²³ If we treat *still* as a focus-sensitive aspectual particle, along the lines of Krifka (2000), the expectation that a state modified by *still* ceases to hold at some later point in time, should follow automatically, though I have not worked out the details of such an account.

- ‘The theorem is still unproven.’
- b. *Der Briefkasten ist immer noch ungeleert.*
 the mailbox is still unemptied
 ‘The mailbox is still unemptied.’

Given these observations, it is not clear that the distinction between these two readings necessarily has to be built into the semantics of this construction. I therefore continue to assume that the difference is merely pragmatic in nature.²⁴,
²⁵

0.7 Conclusion

This paper proposed an account of German adjectival passives (BE-passives), which employed the concept of kinds in the domain of eventualities. In particular it was argued that BE-passives instantiate the consequent state kind of an event kind. Therefore the input requirements for this construction involve a participle derived from a verb whose event structure contains a consequent state, which was captured by building BECOME into the structure. It was shown that event-related modifiers with BE-passives are only acceptable if they modify either the event kind or the (consequent) state token. This followed directly from the account, which made available an event kind and a state token, but not an event token. Given that the event kind is not spatiotemporally located, I further assumed that it is also possible to interpret the scale underlying BECOME in a non-temporal way, which yields non-temporal readings of BE-passives.

²⁴ A reviewer pointed out that Greek might be a problem for dismissing Kratzer’s distinction as a purely pragmatic one, given that Greek has two distinct morphemes, *-tos* and *-menos*, to derive the two types of adjectival passive participles (the eventive passive is expressed synthetically, see Anagnostopoulou 2003, for more details). However, Anagnostopoulou (p.c.) reports that with adjectival participles in *-tos*, the underlying event can still be temporally and spatially located. I therefore assume that it is yet another form of adjectival passive, somewhere in between a (German adjectival) BE-passive and a (German verbal) BECOME-passive, allowing for cross-linguistic differences in this respect.

²⁵ Another somewhat different distinction, between stative and resultative readings of adjectival passives in English, is made by Embick (2004), and similarly Dubinsky and Simango (1996) for Chichewa and Travis (2005*a, b*) for Malagasy. Judging from the data discussed by Embick it seems that stative readings are possible only when there is no primary adjective expressing this reading (e.g. in the case of *closed*), and we could assume that such participles have undergone a grammatical change and have been reinterpreted as primary adjectives. Koontz-Garboden (this volume) discusses a second type of stative reading with participles derived from verbs that allow an extent reading (e.g. *surround*). He argues convincingly that such stative readings can still be related to something like a consequent state if the event is interpreted spatially rather than temporally.

We could speculate now whether it might be possible, after all, unlike commonly assumed, to ascribe the same semantics to past passive participles across different constructions, i.e. a consequent state (in the broadest sense). With adjectival passives, then, we get a consequent state that is predicated over the internal argument; there is no prior process in the semantics, just a state resulting from a change of state, but still associated with the event kind. With verbal passives, a consequent state is predicated over the internal argument, resulting from a process (in most cases) of an actual event token (see Gehrke and Grillo 2009, for more details). Finally, with perfect tenses, the external argument is in the consequent state of having done something (at least from a diachronic perspective; in many languages perfect tenses have been grammaticalised as past tenses). The more general question, then, is how much of the event remains in the kind domain and how much is instantiated or realised.

Bibliography

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003). Participles and Voice. In *Perfect Explorations* (ed. A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert, and A. von Stechow), Interface Explorations 2, pp. 1–36. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Barsalou, Lawrence (1983). Ad hoc categories. *Memory and Cognition*, **11**, 211–227.
- Barwise, Jon and Perry, John (1983). *Situations and Attitudes*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Borer, Hagit (1984). The Projection Principle and rules of morphology. In *Proceedings of NELS 14*, pp. 16–33.
- Brandt, Margareta (1982). Das Zustandspassiv aus kontrastiver Sicht. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, **19**, 28–34.
- Bresnan, Joan (1982). The passive in lexical theory. In *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations* (ed. J. Bresnan), pp. 3–86. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Carlson, Gregory Norman (1977). *Reference to Kinds in English*. Ph.D. thesis, UMass.
- Davidson, Donald (1967). The logical form of action sentences. In *The Logic of Decision and Action* (ed. N. Resher), pp. 81–95. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.
- Dowty, David (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague’s PTQ*. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Dubinsky, Stanley and Simango, S. Ron (1996). Passive and stative in Chichewa: Evidence for modular distinctions in grammar. *Language*, **72**, 749–781.
- Embick, David (2004). On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, **35.3**, 355–392.
- Emonds, Joseph (2006). Adjectival passives: The construction in the iron mask. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Volume I* (ed. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk), pp. 16–60. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Gehrke, Berit (2008). *Ps in Motion: On the Syntax and Semantics of P Elements and Motion Events*. Ph.D. thesis, Utrecht University. LOT Dissertation Series 184.
- Gehrke, Berit and Grillo, Nino (2009). How to become passive. In *Explorations of Phase Theory: Features, Arguments, and Interpretation at the Interfaces* (ed. K. Grohmann), Interface Explorations 17, pp. 231–268. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Gehrke, Berit and McNally, Louise (2011). Frequency adjectives and assertions about event types. In *Proceedings of SALT 19*, pp. 180–197.
- Gese, Helga (2010). Implizite Ereignisse beim Zustandspassiv. Paper presented at the workshop ‘Zugänglichkeit impliziter Ereignisse’, University of

- Tübingen, July 2010.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan (2005). Situation Semantics: The ontological balance sheet. *Research on Language and Computation*, **3.4**, 363–389.
- Helbig, Gerhard (1987). Zur Klassifizierung der Konstruktion mit *sein*+Partizip II (Was ist ein Zustandspassiv?). In *Das Passiv im Deutschen: Akten des Colloquiums über das Passiv im Deutschen, Nizza 1986* (ed. Centre de Recherche en Linguistique Germanique), pp. 215–233. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Hoekstra, Teun (1999). Auxiliary selection in Dutch. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, **17**, 67–84.
- Jacobs, Joachim (1993). Integration. In *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur* (ed. M. Reis), pp. 62–117. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Jacobs, Joachim (1999). Informational autonomy. In *Focus: Linguistics, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives* (ed. P. Bosch and R. van der Sandt), pp. 56–81. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Katz, Graham (2003). Event arguments, adverb selection, and the Stative Adverb Gap. In *Modifying Adjuncts* (ed. E. Lang, C. Maienborn, and C. Fabricius-Hansen), pp. 455–474. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1994). The Event Argument and the Semantics of Voice. Ms. UMass.
- Kratzer, Angelika (2000). Building statives. Ms. UMass.
- Krifka, Manfred (2000). Alternatives for aspectual particles: Semantics of *still* and *already*. Paper presented at the Berkeley Linguistics Society Meeting, February 2000.
- Landman, Meredith and Morzycki, Marcin (2003). Event-kinds and manner modification. In *Proceedings of the Western Conference in Linguistics (WECOL) 2002* (ed. N. M. Antrim, G. Goodall, M. Schulte-Nafeh, and V. Samiian). California State University, Fresno.
- Leiss, Elisabeth (1992). *Die Verbalkategorien des Deutschen: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der sprachlichen Kategorisierung*. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Lenz, Barbara (1993). Probleme der Kategorisierung deutscher Partizipien. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, **12**, 39–76.
- Levin, Beth and Rappaport, Malka (1986). The formation of adjectival passives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, **17**, 623–661.
- Lieber, Rochelle (1980). *On the Organization of the Lexicon*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Maienborn, Claudia (2004). Arbeitsteilung von Grammatik und Pragmatik beim Zustandspassiv. Paper presented at the 3rd Student Workshop of the Graduiertenkolleg Berlin/Potsdam and Leipzig, May 2004, Berlin.
- Maienborn, Claudia (2007a). Das Zustandspassiv: Grammatische Einordnung - Bildungsbeschränkung - Interpretationsspielraum. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*, **35**, 83–144.
- Maienborn, Claudia (2007b). On Davidsonian and Kimian states. In *Existence: Semantics and Syntax* (ed. I. Comorovski and K. von Heusinger), pp.

- 107–130. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Maienborn, Claudia (2009). Building ad hoc properties: On the interpretation of adjectival passives. In *Proceedings of SuB 13* (ed. A. Riester and T. Solstad), pp. 35–49. University of Stuttgart.
- Moens, Marc and Steedman, Mark (1988). Temporal ontology and temporal reference. *Computational Linguistics*, **14.2**, 15–28.
- Parsons, Terence (1990). *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics*. Current Studies in Linguistics Series 19. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Portner, Paul (to appear). Perfect and progressive. In *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning (Vol. 1)* (ed. C. Maienborn, K. von Stechow, and P. Portner). de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Rapp, Irene (1996). Zustand? Passiv? Überlegungen zum sogenannten “Zustandspassiv”. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, **15.2**, 231–265.
- Rapp, Irene (1997). *Partizipien und semantische Struktur: Zu passivischen Konstruktionen mit dem 3. Status*. Stauffenburg, Tübingen.
- Reichenbach, Hans (1947). *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. MacMillan, London.
- Rothstein, Susan (2004). *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Sailer, Manfred (2010). The family of English cognate object constructions. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (ed. S. Müller), pp. 191–211. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Schlücker, Barbara (2005). Event-related modifiers in German adjectival passives. In *Proceedings of SuB 9* (ed. E. Maier, C. Bary, and J. Huitink), pp. 417–430. Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Travis, Lisa deMena (2005a). Passives, statives, roots and Malagasy. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association AFLA* (ed. J. Heinz and D. Ntelitheos), pp. 379–393. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, no. 12.
- Travis, Lisa deMena (2005b). States, abilities and accidents. In *Proceedings of the 2005 Canadian Linguistics Association Annual Conference* (ed. C. Gurski).
- von Stechow, Arnim (1996). The different readings of *wieder* ‘again’: A structural account. *Journal of Semantics*, **13**, 87–138.
- von Stechow, Arnim (1998). German participles II in Distributed Morphology. Ms. University of Tübingen.
- Wasow, Thomas (1977). Transformations and the lexicon. In *Formal Syntax* (ed. P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian). Academic Press, New York.
- Welke, Klaus (2007). Das Zustandspassiv: Pragmatische Beschränkungen und Regelkonflikte. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*, **35**, 115–145.