

**ADJECTIVAL USE OF V-EN :
PASSIVE OR PERFECTIVE***

Yoshiko Masaki

要約

V-en の形容詞的用法について

正木 芳子

形容詞的受け身と動詞的受け身についてはこれまでに様々な論文で扱われてきているが、V-en が形容詞的に用いられる場合、すべて受け身分詞として動詞的受け身と対比させるべきなのか、それとも過去分詞と受け身分詞に分類すべきなのかということについてはあまり論じられていないようである。

Cowper は動詞的に用いられる V-en は have の後ろに現われる完了分詞であれ、be の後ろに現われる受け身分詞であれ、すべて同じ接尾辞 [-en] がついた動詞として一律に扱われると論じている。本稿では、彼女の論に基いて、形容詞的に用いられる V-en も同様に一律に扱い、形容詞的 V-en の分類はもとの動詞の性質の違いによってなされるべきであることを論じていく。

まず、形容詞的 V-en と動詞的 V-en にはやはり差があり、その根本的な相違は品詞の違いにあることを述べる。すなわち、形容詞的 V-en は形容詞である以上、基本的に何らかの特性を表す状態的なものでなければならないのに対し、動詞的 V-en はもとの動詞から状態的か非状態的かの性質を受け継ぐことになるというわけである。

これを踏まえた上で形容詞的 V-en を見ていくと、動態動詞から派生される形容詞的 V-en は状態的になるために完了の意味素性が加えられなければならないのに対し、静態動詞から派生される形容詞的 V-en にはその必要がない。このことから、形容詞的 V-en を派生することのできる動態動詞には、状態の変化を表すものでなければならない・完了のポイントを持たなければならないという制約があることが自然と導かれる。さらに、完了分詞と受け身分詞を区別しないことにより、非対格動詞から派生される V-en についても、対格動詞から派生される V-en との意味構造の違いに基いた説明がされることになる。

1. Introduction

Cowper argues that perfective [-en] and passive [-en] are actually the same and that the function of the suffix [-en] is to discharge one thematic position and one structural case feature. She only argues about the verbal V-en, but how about the adjectival V-en?

Bresnan classifies V-en of so-called unaccusatives such as *fallen*, *elapsed*, and *departed*, with adjectival passives stating Participle-Adjective conversion rule. Is there any clear difference between passive and perfective [-en] when they are used as an adjective, or can we just say that there is a zero suffix which converts a verbal V-en to an adjectival V-en?

In this paper, I would like to focus on adjectival V-en's and examine their syntactic and semantic properties.

2. Adjectival V-en : Background

Before going into the discussion, let us define the adjectival passive comparing it with the verbal passive. Summarizing the argument of Wasow, Levin and Rappaport and Grimshaw, we can state the property of adjectival passives as follows:

- (I) Adjectival passives can be a complement of the verbs which only take an adjective as their complement such as *seem*, *remain*, *appear* and *look*.
- (II) Adjectival passives can appear prenominally.
- (III) Adjectival passives can be modified by *very*, but verbal passives must be modified by *very much*.
- (IV) Adjectival passives denote property; thus stative and not eventive, even if the base verb denotes an event

Each of the properties is exemplified by the following examples respectively.

- (1) a. John seems convinced to go.
b. *John seems given a book by Mary.
- (2) a. the painted wall
b. *the given a book boy.
- (3) a. John was very (*much) surprised at the news.
b. John was very *(much) surprised by the dog.
- (4) a. This building is well designed.
b. *This building is being well designed.
c. *That architect designs this building.
d. That architect is designing this building.

Most of the V-en's can be used both as a verb and as an adjective, but it has been noticed that there are some V-en's which can be used only as a verb.

- (5) a. John was considered a genius.
b. *John seems considered a genius.
- (6) a. John was believed to be a genius.
b. *John seems believed to be a genius.

Bresnan tries to capture the restriction by stating that only a theme can be the subject of the adjectival V-en. However, Levin and Rappaport oppose her argument pointing out that not only a theme, but also a Goal can be the subject of adjectival V-en's.

- (7) a. untaught skills
- b. untaught children

(Levin and Rappaport's (13))

They attribute the restrictions on the adjectival V-en to its status as an adjective; namely, it cannot assign Case, and it must have an external argument.

There are, however, some problems which must be taken care of. As Yumoto notes, V-en's derived from stative verbs can take their obligatory argument as part of the compound, but those derived from eventive verbs cannot be saved in that manner (the data below are taken from Yumoto).

- (8) a. *(accident-)ascribed failure, *(word-)based morphology, *(god-)attributed property
- b. *(*gas-)changed liquid, *(*baton-)handed runners,
*(*table-)placed books

These data cannot be explained by Levin and Rappaport's analysis.

In addition, there are some adjectival V-en's which cannot be used predicatively.

- (9) a. fallen leaves
- b. *The leaves are fallen.
- (10) a. the newly arrived package
- b. *?The package is newly arrived.

In order to take care of these data above, let us examine adjectival V-en's classifying them into two groups according to the property of their base verbs: namely, those derived from eventive verbs, and those derived from stative verbs.

3. V-en derived from eventive verbs

In this section, focusing on adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs, let us take up the V-en's derived from unaccusative verbs. Levin and Rappaport explain the existence of adjectival V-en's derived from unaccusative verbs on the base of their property that the only argument they have is an internal argument. They argue that unaccusative verbs such as *fall* have an internal argument which is not affected by the affixation of the passive morpheme while unergative verbs such as *run* have only an external argument which is suppressed by the affixation of the passive morpheme and thus cannot be the external argument of the adjectival V-en. Their argument has a serious problem, however. Neither unergative verbs nor unaccusative verbs can be passivized.

- (11) a. *The leaves were fallen.
- b. *The lettuce was wilted.
- (12) a. *The boy was run.
- b. *The students were swum.

Noticing the problem, they point out a possibility of considering adjectival V-en's

derived from unaccusative verbs as perfective participles rather than as passive participles in their footnote 36, which seems to be a plausible suggestion. They hesitate to say they are perfective participles because unergative verbs cannot form an adjectival perfective participle.

- (13) a. *the run boy
- b. *the swum students

It is not a problem, however. Unergative verbs cannot be in perfective without an object or an adjunct.

- (14) a. The boy has run *(a mile).
- b. The students have swum *(for an hour).

Using Pustejovsky's proposal of event structure, which is represented simply as (15), we can state perfective as (16).

- (15) a. State: love, know [_s e]_s
- b. Process: run, push [_p e₁... e_n]_p
- c. Transition: give, build, die [_t e₁ e₂]_t

- (16) Transition (P S) → (S)

Since there is no S in the event structure of unergative verbs, it cannot be in perfective while unaccusative verbs are able to be in perfective because the event they denote is a transition and the only argument that unaccusative verbs have involves the resultant state. Moreover, because the process before the state is crossed out in perfective, Cowper's argument that the external argument of the base verb, which is the main argument for process (see Grimshaw), is not linked to a thematic position any more when it is suffixed with [-en] is supported by this proposal. The external argument of the base verb is basically optional when it is suffixed by [-en], but in the case when the external argument of the base verb is involved in the resultant state, it cannot be suppressed as seen in (17b).

- (17) a. (moth-)eaten; (expert-)tested; (sun-)dried
- b. *(snow-)capped; *(tree-)surrounded

Grimshaw suggests that *capped* and *surrounded* need the external argument of the base verb because they are adjectival passives directly derived from the verbs. She argues that since *cap* and *surround* do not have an external argument in her definition, they cannot form a verbal passive. Her argument is not strong enough, however. Neither of the verbs allow progressive form even in the active voice. Therefore, we cannot apply the stativity test. On the other hand, *cover*, which is close in meaning to *cap*, and which shows the same restriction as *cap* has as indicated in (18a), can form a verbal passive as shown in (18b).

- (18) a. *(snow-)covered mountain
- b. The ground was being covered by snow while I was watching from the window.

A problem remains, however. As Grimshaw and Vikner point out, there are some accomplishment verbs which need obligatory adjuncts.

- (19) a. a ??(much-)photographed building

- b. a ??(locally-)grown tomato
- c. a *(carefully-)designed house
- d. a *(recently)built house

They argue that they need an obligatory adjunct because in the prenominal position, V-en's retain their property of complex events unless they have a state interpretation; that is, they must identify the process part as well as the resultant state part. This argument conflicts with our presupposition that prenominal V-en's are adjectives thus stative. I would rather attribute the low acceptability of the phrases in (19) to their low possibility of having a contrastive state. In other words, they need more information because as Yasui et al. state, prenominal adjectives have a property that they are non temporal and/or have classifying function. Accordingly, V-en's which do not have classifying information such as in (19) are not acceptable.

A more problematic case would be the verbs of achievement. As Yumoto notices, V-en's derived from verbs of achievement cannot appear prenominally by themselves.

- (20) a. the *(repeatedly) hit boy
- b. the *(well) performed play

She attributes the unacceptability of (20) to the lack of the change of state. Consequently, the same explanation applies to the verbs of "path-accomplishment" verbs such as *travel* and *read*.

- (21) a. the *(well) read book
- b. the *(much) traveled land

However, the data in (22) and the fact that the addition of a modifier saves the phrases in (20) and (21) suggest that it is not only temporaliness which explains the unacceptability of (20) and (21), but, again, the lack of information.

- (22) a. *The boy is hit.
- b. *The play is performed.
- c. *The book is read.
- d. *The land is traveled.

The reason they need further information to be used as an adjective is not clear though. As for the verbs of achievement, I tentatively suggest that since these verbs do not have a clear two place event structure as Yumoto notes, they cannot be in perfective in the sense of (16). As for the path-accomplishment verbs, the involvement of the agent is very strong, but at the same time, the agent itself is not in the state as in the case of *cap* or *surround*. How to differentiate the verbs such as *cap*, the verbs of path-accomplishment, and the verb of accomplishment using the event structure remains as a problem, however.

Before going on to argue about the stative verbs, let us go back to the issue suggested in section 2: why cannot the V-en's derived from unaccusative verbs be used predicatively? One possible explanation is that the predicative use of them sounds archaic, thus is not well accepted. In other words, because *have* took over *be* in the perfective use of unaccusatives in English, the predicative use of V-en's of the unaccusative verbs which follows *be* is unacceptable.

However, this seems too easy a solution. Helbig and Kempter point out that there are V-en's used attributively which cannot *be* used predicatively, in other words, which cannot be a complement of *be*, in German.

- (23) a. x bewundert die Frau.
b. Die Frau wird bewundert.
c. *Die Frau ist bewundert.
d. .die bewunderte Frau

Moreover, if *have*'s taking over *be* is the reason for the unacceptability of (9b) and (10b), the unacceptability of (24) must be given a different explanation.

- (24) a. *The leaves seem fallen.
b. *The package seems newly arrived.

Another possibility is that the event interpretation is too strong when used predicatively so that they are unacceptable as (25a) and (26a) are (examples taken from Fabb).

- (25) a. ?*This house seems designed by a French architect.
b. This house seems well designed.
(26) a. *He seems convinced by John.
b. He seems convinced by John's argument.

When used attributively, they can get stative interpretation having classifying information. The latter possibility is more plausible because the data in (27), which Grimshaw points out, is taken care of by the same explanation.

- (27) a. *The man is arrested.
b. the arrested man

In addition, the contrast between (29a) and (29b) can be explained on the same line.

- (28) a. the fast grown tomatoes
b. the carefully grown tomatoes
(29) a. *These tomatoes seem fast grown.
b. These tomatoes seem carefully grown.

Being grown carefully, tomatoes get some resultant property such as delicious and without a flaw, but being grown fast, they do not get any property as a consequence. Fast grown tomatoes can be differentiated from other tomatoes; however, which were grown in a normal way, which gives the adjective *fast grown* the classifying information. Therefore, *fast grown* can be used only attributively. As in the case of *fallen*, when used predicatively, it is forced to have an event interpretation which is not allowed.

The problem for the latter proposal is that unaccusative verbs take *have* rather than *be* when used in perfective in English. Cowper suggests that in English, the suffix [-en] discharges any thematic position so that *have* can get a free thematic content as its external argument in the case of V-en's of unaccusative verbs in the same way as it does in the case of V-en's of unergative verbs. If we try to state that the verbal V-en and the adjectival V-en are the same except their difference in syntactic category, it will be a serious problem. Here, I only tentatively suggest that English is on its way to lose the distinction between unaccusative verbs and unergative verbs¹. This can be supported by the fact that there are not many adjectival V-en's of unaccusative verbs and that some

of them are used only in a set phrase as in *risen Christ*, and *elapsed time*.

4. V-en derived from stative verbs

Now let us move to the V-en's derived from stative verbs. Unlike eventive verbs, they cannot be associated with perfectives as (30) shows.

- (30) a. John has known Mary *(for ten years).
b. *Melissa has believed that George is a genius.
c. *We have expected the result.

They can form adjectival V-en's, however, as in (31) and (32),

- (31) a. Mary seems known to everyone.
b. It seems widely believed that George is a genius.
c. The result seems expected.
(32) a. the well-known book
b. the widely believed theory
c. the expected result

For these V-en's, adjectival V-en's are not associated with perfective V-en's but the proposal made above does apply: namely, as Cowper argues, [-en] discharges external thematic position of the base verb. The event structure of stative verbs has only one state and there is no transition.

Now notice that there are only two differences between the verbal V-en and the adjectival V-en: one is, as Levin and Rappaport point out, that the adjectival V-en needs an external argument to be linked to the NP or the N which it modifies; and the other is, as Fabb points out, that the adjectival V-en must have stative interpretation. The latter part seems to play an important role here. In the case of adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs, being interpreted as perfectives, they can be interpreted as a state. On the other hand, in the case of adjectival V-en's derived from stative verbs, they do not need perfective interpretation; they are stative from the beginning.

Consequently, all the arguments which appear in the state the base verb denotes except its external argument must be linked with the derived V-en.

This helps to explain the contrast between (8a) and (8b), which are repeated here, and (8b) and (33) (examples also taken from Yumoto).

- (8) a. *(accident-)ascribed failure, *(word-)based morphology, *(god-)attributed property
b. *(gas-)changed liquid, *(baton-)handed runners, *(table-)placed books
(33) a. The liquid seemed changed *(into gas).
b. The baton remained unhanded *(to the runner).
c. The books remained neatly placed *(on the table).

Yumoto, recognizing the data in (33) and (34), points out that when adjectival V-en's are derived from eventive verbs, "the argument it is predicated of... is the unique argument which guarantees the completion of that event"² so that Goal, which delimits the event with the Theme, cannot be compounded in the adjectival V-en's.

- (34) a. ?sold cars; a paid check

- b. *government-sold cars (=cars sold to the government)
- *government-paid debt (=debt paid to the government)

On the other hand, there is no restriction like it when adjectival V-en's are derived from stative verbs. She attributes this difference to the property of adjectival V-en's which appear prenominally that they are [-temporary]. She argues that being derived from stative verbs, the phrases in (8a) are all [-temporary] from the beginning so that there is no restriction like the one for adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs which are [+temporary]. It seems plausible to take her suggestion into the proposal made here. Only V-en's derived from eventive verbs relate with perfective interpretation, which changes event into state.

It seems plausible to assume that there is a restriction as it changes the event structure. Yumoto attributes the unacceptability of the phrases in (8b), comparing it with the acceptability of the sentences in (34), to the temporaliness of the attributive and predicative use of adjectives, but as is pointed above in section 3, it does not seem to be a plausible explanation.

Rather, I suggest that adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs cannot contain an argument which delimits the event. Under this hypothesis, the phrases in (8b) are all ruled out as the adjectival V-en's contain an argument, Goal, which delimits the event in its compound while the sentences in (33) are well formed because the adjectival V-en's do not contain any argument in itself, but link their thematic positions properly outside itself.

Now, it might seem that we face a new problem: why do the phrases in (17b) need the external argument of the base verb while other V-en's derived from stative verbs such as (32c) do not even though in both cases the external argument involves in the state the V-en's denote?

- (17) b. *(snow-)capped; *(tree-)surrounded
- (32) c. the expected result

The phrases in (17) appear to be derived from (35), but it can be derived from (36) also.

- (35) a. Snow caps the mountain.
- b. Trees surround the pond.
- (36) a. God has capped the mountain with snow.
- b. People have surrounded the pond with trees.

If they are derived from (36), not from (35), the contrast between (17b) and (31c) is expected. *Snow* and *tree* in (17b) are no more external argument of the base verbs but are their material argument. I tentatively suggest that the verbs in (35) are derived from the ones in (36)³ and that zero-suffixed V cannot be suffixed with [-en].

5. Conclusion

In this paper, it was discussed that the adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs are associated with perfective participles and the adjectival V-en's derived from stative verbs are associated with passive participles.

At a glance, it might sound that there are two types of adjectival V-en's then, but

assuming Cowper's argument convincing enough that perfective [-en] is actually the same as passive [-en], we can say that there is only one adjectival V-en: those derived from one verbal V-en. The differences between these two V-en's, the adjectival V-en and the verbal V-en, are that the former is strictly stative while the latter inherits its status as stative or eventive from the base verb and that the former needs an external argument while the latter does not.

It is deduced from the former difference that there must be some system to change the eventive V-en to stative when adjectival V-en's are derived from eventive verbs so that there might be some more restrictions compared with when adjectival V-en's are derived from stative verbs which does not need such a change. Following Yumoto and Tenny's idea, it was proposed that adjectival V-en's derived from eventive verbs cannot contain an argument which delimits the event.

From the latter difference, the data in (37) are explained.

- (37) a. John was believed to be a genius.
- b. *John seems (widely) believed to a genius.
- (38) a. It was believed that John was a genius.
- b. It seems widely believed that John was a genius.

John in (37) is not an argument of *believe*, but of "be a genius". In the case of verbal *believed*, as it does not need an external argument, and it does not have it here, *John*, which cannot get a Case, can move up to the [NP, S] position to get a Case. On the other hand, in the case of adjectival *believed*, there is no way to get an external argument. The IP, "John to be a genius", can be a candidate as the CP, "that John was a genius", is an argument of *believe* so that (38b) is grammatical. Even if the IP can behave like the CP, *John* cannot get a Case from anywhere in this case; thus the sentence is ungrammatical according to the Case Filter.

Accordingly, we can divide the verbs which can form adjectival V-en's from the ones which cannot by looking into their event structure. As was seen above, only the predicate-argument structure as Rappaport and Levin propose does not suffice. Whether the verb denotes a state or an event, whether there is a transition, and whether there are more than one argument which delimit the event are the key points to check to see if the verb can form an adjectival V-en, which are not in the PAS. How to state the event structure is still open to further study though, I hope this paper will contribute to it.

NOTE

*This is a revised version of the paper presented at the workshop on morphology in the 9th National Conference of the ELSJ, held at Doshisha University in November 1991, and the paper presented at the English Department workshop of Kobe College Institute held in January 1992. I am grateful to the people who made valuable comments and suggestions on those occasions. Special thanks go to Tomoko Honjo, Eiko Itoh, Takane Itoh, Taro Kageyama, Tokuchiro Ono, Yoko Sugioka, and Yoko Yumoto. The remaining errors and inadequacies are, of course, my own.

1. See Napoli for the argument that there is no movement for ergative verbs in English.
2. See Tenny for the argument of delimitedness and completion of the event.
3. See Jackendoff that *surround* takes a Theme as a subject in (35b), which would be a problem to UTAH if it is not a derived structure.

References

- Bresnan, J. 1982. The passive in lexical theory. The mental representation of grammatical relations, ed. by J. Bresnan, 3-86. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press.
- Cowper, E. A. 1989. Perfective [-en] is passive [-en]. Proceedings of the Eighth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, 85-93.
- Fabb, N. A. 1984. Syntactic affixation. Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. Argument structure. Cambridge, MA : MIT Press.
- Grimshaw, J., and S. Vikner. 1991. Obligatory adjuncts and the structure of events. to appear in Knowledge and language: concepts in linguistic structure and beyond, eds. by Reuland and Abraham.
- Helbig, G., and F. Kempster. 1973. Das Zustandspassive. Leipzig : VEB Verlag Enzyklopadie.
- Jackendoff, R. 1976. Toward an explanatory semantic representation. LI 7. 89-150.
- Levin, B., and M. Rappaport. 1986. The formation of adjectival passives. LI 17. 623-661.
- Napoli, D. J. 1988. Review article. Language 64. 130-142.
- Pustejovsky, J. 1988. The geometry of events. MIT lexicon project working papers 24. 19-39.
- Rappaport, M., and B. Levin. 1988. What to do with θ -roles. Syntax and semantics 21 : thematic relations, ed. by W. Wilkins, 7-36. San Diego : Academic Press, Inc.
- Tenny, C. 1987. Grammaticalizing aspect and affectedness. Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Wasow, T. 1977. Transformations and the lexicon. Formal syntax, eds. by P. W. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian, 327-360. New York : Academic Press.
- Yasui, M., S. Akiyama, and M. Nakamura. 1976. Keiyoshi. Tokyo : Kenkyusha.
- Yumoto, Y. 1991. The role of aspectual features in morphology. to appear in EL 8.

(Received September 11, 1992)