

### Event-related modification with adjectival passives

In German, so-called verbal (eventive) and adjectival (stative) passives are formally distinct, in the sense that verbal passives appear with *werden* ‘become’ ((1a)), adjectival passives with *sein* ‘be’ ((1b)) (BE-passives in the following) (Rapp 1996, Kratzer 2000, Maienborn 2007, i.a.).

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

The traditional view, since at least Wasow (1977) (cf. also Levin & Rappaport 1986, i.a.), holds that adjectival passives are copula-adjective constructions, whereas verbal passives are periphrastic verb forms, and this is also the dominant view for German. Nevertheless, an underlying event is still accessible with BE-passives, as evidenced by the availability of particular event-related modifiers, such as instrumentals, manner modifiers, and some *by*-phrases ((2), see also (5), (6)) (Rapp 1996, Kratzer 2000, Schlücker 2005, Maienborn 2007, i.a.).

- (2) a. Der Brief ist mit roter Tinte geschrieben. b. Das Haar war schlampig gekämmt.  
the letter is with red ink written the hair is sloppily combed

Furthermore, BE-passives are fully acceptable only with verbs that lexically specify a consequent state (in the sense of Moens & Steedman 1988), but rather bad with other verbs ((3), examples from Maienborn 2007; these improve with the right context, hence the #, and I assume that such cases involve coercion of the underlying event type).

- (3) a. #Die Katze ist gestreichelt. b. #Das Manuskript ist zitiert. c. #Die Antwort ist gewusst.  
the cat is petted the manuscript is cited the answer is known

In this paper, I will propose a semantic account of BE-passives that makes use of a difference between event kind and event token reference (extending Carlson’s 1977 kind-token distinction to the event domain). In particular, I postulate that a BE-passive refers to the instantiation of a consequent state kind of an event kind ((4), with **R** being Carlson’s realisation relation).

- (4) a. Die Tür ist geschlossen.  
the door is closed  
b.  $\exists e_k, s_k, s$  [BECOME ( $e_k, s_k$ )  $\wedge$  THEME ( $e_k$ , **door**)  $\wedge$  **closed**( $s$ )  $\wedge$  THEME ( $s$ , **door**)  $\wedge$  **R**( $s_k, s$ )]

The use of BECOME is motivated by the lexical input restrictions discussed above. The idea that we are dealing with event kinds and not with event tokens, in turn, is motivated by the fact that not all event-related modification is possible. In particular, only two types of modifiers are available, those that modify a state token ((5)) and those that modify an event kind or that serve to name or create an event subkind ((2), (6)).

- (5) a. Er ist von der Musik beeindruckt. b. Peter ist von dem Gejammer genervt.  
he is by the music impressed Peter is by the lamentation annoyed  
(6) Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt.  
the drawing is by a child made

Spatial and temporal modifiers, on the other hand, which need to access an event token ((7)), as well as event-related modifiers that do not name an established event subkind ((8)), are bad.

- (7) a. Der Computer ist (\*kürzlich / \*vor drei Tagen) repariert.  
the computer is (recently / before three days) repaired.  
(intended: The computer is recently / three days ago repaired.)  
b. \*Die Reifen sind in der Garage aufgepumpt.  
The tires are in the garage inflated.  
(8) Der Mülleimer ist (\*von meiner Nichte / \*langsam / \*mit der Heugabel) geleert.  
the rubbish bin is (by my niece / slowly / with the hay fork) emptied

These restrictions follow directly from the semantic representation in (4), which makes available an event kind and a state token to be modified, but not an event token. (See also Landman & Morzycki 2003 for an account of manner modification as event kind modification.)

Furthermore, data discussed by Rapp (1996) and Schlücker (2005) for partially different reasons, reveal that the two types of modifiers differ in stress, word order possibilities and the (in)compatibility with *un-*. State token modifiers are not prosodically integrated into the participle (i.e. the main stress is on the participle, secondary stress on the modifier), can appear before or after the participle, and are compatible with *un-* ((9)). Event kind modifiers, on the other hand, are prosodically integrated into the participle (i.e. main stress is on the participle), can only appear before the participle, and are incompatible with *un-* ((10)).

- (9) a. ... weil er von der MuSÍK beEINdrückt ist.  
           because he by the musik impressed is  
       b. ... weil er beeindruckt ist von der Musik.  
           because he impressed is by the music  
       c. Er ist von der Musik unbeeindruckt.  
           he is by the music unimpressed
- (10) a. ... weil die Zeichnung von einem KIND angefertigt ist.  
           because the drawing by a child made is  
       b. \*... weil die Zeichnung angefertigt ist von einem Kind.  
           because the drawing made is by a child  
       c. \*Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind unangefertigt.  
           the drawing is by a child unmade

These facts fall out naturally from particular assumptions about the syntax-semantics interface. Following Lieber (1980), it is generally assumed that the participle in BE-passives is turned into an adjective by zero-affixation. With Kratzer (1994, 2000), I take it that the input to a BE-passive can at most be a bare VP (lacking a *vP* or VoiceP), given that (at least an active) external argument is completely absent, as evidenced by the unavailability of purpose clauses, depictives and the like. I propose that a bare VP represents an event kind, but that in order to individuate an event, we need additional verbal structure, such as *vP* (or VoiceP). Given that such structure lacks in BE-passives, the event has to remain in the kind domain. I furthermore follow Kratzer (1994, 2000) and Rapp (1996) in differentiating between lexical adjectivisation of a verbal head (which is compatible with *un-*), and phrasal adjectivisation (which is incompatible with *un-*), which takes the VP together with a modifier in its Specifier as the input. I propose that in the latter case, we are dealing with event kind modifiers of the type in (10). From this syntactic structure it also follows that the modifier is prosodically integrated into the participle and cannot appear after it. Finally, I will follow Rapp (1996) in treating state modifiers of the type in (9) not as modifiers of V or VP, but instead as modifiers of the AP. This in turn means, that the AP is derived via lexical adjectivisation, which is compatible with *un-*, and it also follows directly that the modifier is not prosodically integrated into the participle and can appear before or after it.

### ***Selected References:***

**Kratzer** (2000). Building statives. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 26. **Maienborn** (2007). Das Zustandspassiv: Grammatische Einordnung - Bildungsbeschränkung - Interpretationsspielraum. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*. **Landman & Morzycki** (2003). Event-kinds and manner-modification. *Proceedings of the WECOL 2002*. **Rapp** (1996). Zustand? Passiv? Überlegungen zum sogenannten „Zustandspassiv“. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*. **Schlücker** (2005). Event-related modifiers in German adjectival passives. *Proceedings of SuB 9*.