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1. Introduction

In the closely related languages German and Dutch, the passive is, not surprisingly, realized in a similar way: both German and Dutch use the two passive auxiliaries (German) *werden*, (Dutch) *worden* ‘become’ and (German) *sein*, (Dutch) *zijn* ‘be’ in conjunction with the past participle. Despite this striking equivalence, a closer look reveals an important difference between German and Dutch passives with regard to the status of the construction *sein/zijn* + past participle (pp).¹

According to general belief, in the Dutch passive system, *worden* + pp is used for the imperfect tenses and *zijn* + pp for the perfect tenses, see (1). The respective forms in German are *werden* + pp and *sein* + pp + *werden*, see (2). However, German, too, has a form *sein* + pp, and it has often been assumed that there are two different passives in German: the so-called ‘Vorgangspassiv’ (‘eventive passive’) on the one hand, which describes an ongoing action, and the ‘Zustandspassiv’ (‘stative passive’) on the other, which describes a resulting state, cf. (3). The *sein/zijn* + pp construction therefore has a different status in German and Dutch, as can be seen from Table 1.

(1)  
(a) De winkel wordt gesloten
    The store becomes closed
    ‘The store is closed’
(b) De winkel is gesloten
    The store is closed
    ‘The store has been closed’

(2)  
(a) Der Laden wird geschlossen
    The store becomes closed
    ‘The store is closed’
(b) Der Laden ist geschlossen worden
    The store is closed become
    ‘The store has been closed’

(3)  
Der Laden ist geschlossen
    ‘The store is closed’

¹ In this paper, the notion ‘construction’ is not used in the sense of constructionist approaches (but see note 7).
² The indices _V_ and _A_ in (1)–(4) and in Tables 1, 2 indicate the verbal and adjectival status of the past participle respectively.

* I wish to thank Yvon Keromnes and Marc Fryd for numerous helpful comments on content and style.
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However, the situation is even more complicated as *sein/zijn* is also a copular verb. This means that, both in German and Dutch, there are copula constructions of the type *sein/zijn* + pp where the participle is adjectival, see (4) and Table 2.

(4)  
(a) De winkel is gesloten<sub>A</sub>  
‘The store is closed’  
(b) Der Laden ist geschlossen<sub>A</sub>  
‘The store is closed’

*Sein/zijn* + pp therefore seems to be ambiguous between a passive structure, where the participle is verbal and *sein/zijn* is a passive auxiliary, and a copula construction, where the participle has been adjectivized and the *sein/zijn* is a copular verb. However, the German passive *sein* + pp is not equivalent to the Dutch passive *zijn* + pp; rather, German has — according to the very common view introduced above — an additional passive voice.

Whereas, for Dutch, this state of affairs has been disputed only occasionally both in traditional and more recent research, there is a longstanding discussion about the status of the *sein* + pp construction in German which sometimes leads to the claim that the ‘Zustandspassiv’ does not exist at all.

In this paper, I will defend this claim, too. To my knowledge, the status of the *sein/zijn* + pp construction has not been studied from a contrastive perspective so far. Building on single-language studies, I approach the analysis of this construction in a contrastive way. I will show how contrastive data can support the claim that German *sein* + pp is always a copula construction, as opposed to the Dutch structure, which is ambiguous between a passive and a copula construction.

1.1 Definition of the data

The *sein/zijn* + pp constructions under discussion are formed by transitive verbs, which are typically either resultative or stative verbs, see (5). They may be accompanied by a von-/door-PP ‘by PP’ which refers to the agent of the event denoted by the base verb.
According to Rapp (1997), the restriction on these verb classes is due to the semantic condition that the verbs involved must imply a stative predicate, which is true for stative and resultative verbs. The *zijn/sein* + pp construction then ‘picks out’ these states. The verbs in (6) do not imply such a stative predicate, and this explains why these examples sound odd.³

(6) (a)?Die Statue ist berührt
The statue is touched
(b) ?Der Film ist gesehen
The movie is seen
(c) ?Die Katze ist gestreichelt
The cat is stroked

For Dutch, these restrictions apply only for the copular structure of *zijn* + pp but not for the passive construction.

Also, in section 3.2 we will argue that, even for the copular reading, this restriction on the formation of *zijn/sein* + pp is too strict. We will see that it is not a semantic restriction on this construction but rather a condition for its felicitous use and interpretation. In fact, there are only a few rare instances of absolute restrictions on the formation of the *zijn/sein* + pp construction, e.g., (7). They are ungrammatical whatever the context (see Maienborn 2007: 104):

(7) (a)*Es ist geregnet / *Het is geregend
It is rained
(b) *3 Euro sind gekostet / *3 Euro zijn gekost
3 Euro are cost

In addition, as *sein/zijn* serves as a copular verb and an auxiliary both in German and Dutch, there are more constructions of the type *sein/zijn* + pp, but these do not fall within the scope of the present study. Most importantly, the *sein/zijn* + pp construction is also used to express the perfect tense of motion verbs, perfective intransitive verbs and ergative verbs, see (8). We will not be dealing with these perfect tense forms here.

---

³ For the distinction between such resultant states as ‘Resultant States’ and ‘Target States’ see Parsons (1990: 234ff).
(8) (a) Hij is gekomen / Er ist gekommen
   He is arrived
   ‘He has arrived’
   (b) Ze is verdwenen / Sie ist verschwunden
   She is disappeared
   ‘She has disappeared’

In addition, some German grammars mention another construction of the type sein + pp, the so-called ‘Zustandsreflexiv’ (e.g. Helbig & Buscha 1999), which is formed by reflexive verbs like sich verlieben ‘fall in love’ or sich erkälten ‘catch cold’.

(9) (a) Sie is verliebt
    ‘She has fallen in love’
    (b) Sie ist erkältet
    ‘She has caught a cold’

Forms of this type behave exactly like those in (4) and (5). For this reason, we do not assume a separate category, instead considering such forms as instances of the sein/zijn + pp constructions which we are investigating. In the following, when we refer to ‘all zijn/sein + pp constructions’, we mean ‘all’ within the limits described above, i.e. excluding zijn/sein + pp as perfect tense (active voice).

In this paper, the meaning of sein/zijn + pp will be discussed only insofar as it is used as an argument for the equivalence with or the distinction between different constructions. We will not present or discuss an analysis of the meaning of sein/zijn + pp as such. Following Maienborn (2007), I assume that these sein/zijn + pp constructions are instances of copula constructions. Hence, the meaning of a sein/zijn + pp construction is that it ascribes a property to the subject referent, and this property is the resultant state of the event denoted by the base verb.

The structure of the paper is as follows: the next section presents a concise overview of the research history and the theoretical paradigms that can be found in the literature on the German and the Dutch sein/zijn + pp construction respectively. Section 3 presents arguments and counter-arguments for these theoretical approaches. We will discuss the diagnostic tests available in the literature, either for German, Dutch, or both, and we will examine whether they can be applied to the other language in each case. We will see that the contrastive analysis provides additional evidence for the claim that sein + pp in German is always (i.e. within the scope of the data sketched above) a copula construction. Section 4 discusses some problems facing an analysis of this kind. Finally, a conclusion is given in section 5.

2. Research history & theoretical paradigms
2.1 Dutch

In the Dutch literature, the analysis of zijn + pp is by and large quite uncontroversial: many traditional and recent analyses hold the view, introduced above, that zijn + pp is ambiguous between the perfect tense form of the passive and a copula construction, cf. Den Hertog (1892, 1895), Kern (1912), Overdiep (1928, 1949), De Vooys (1967), Sassen (1968), Kraak & Klooster (1968), Van Es (1970), Hoekstra &
Moortgat (1979), Hoekstra (1984), Van der Putten (1997), Klooster (2001). Many of these works are concerned with the question as to how to distinguish between the passive and the copula construction, and they introduce various diagnostic tests. Also, many authors assume that zijn + pp is a morphologically independent construction. In that case, zijn has to be analyzed as a temporal and passive auxiliary at the same time, e.g. Klooster (2001). Others consider zijn to be merely a temporal auxiliary, in which case the passive meaning is said to be associated with the participle of the passive auxiliary worden, geworden, e.g. Van Bart, Kerstens & Sturm (1998). In contrast to German, however, the ‘full’ form zijn + pp + geworden does not exist in Standard Dutch and never did, although it can sometimes be found in the spoken variants of (mostly Southern) Dutch. There is thus little support for an ‘association relation’ of this type. We therefore assume that, in the case described here, zijn is a temporal and a passive auxiliary at the same time. Finally, the Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst (ANS 1997), a large Dutch reference grammar (called E-ANS in its electronic form) states that the difference between a passive with worden and a passive with zijn is not merely one of tense but a semantic and pragmatic one:

Passieve zinnen met worden hebben een gedeeltelijk andere betekenis en gebruikswaarde dan passieve zinnen met zijn. Passieve zinnen met worden geven de overgang weer naar een bepaalde toestand, uitgedrukt door het passief deelwoord; ook als de uitvoerder van de handeling helemaal naar de achtergrond verdwenen is en niet expliciet in de zin voorkomt, roepen zulke zinnen onwillekeurig toch de gedachte aan een uitvoerder op. Passieve zinnen met zijn daarentegen geven een resultaat, een bestaande toestand weer, waarbij de gedachte aan een uitvoerder of veroorzaker die om een of andere reden niet genoemd wordt, vaak veel minder of niet voor de hand ligt. […] Deze twee vormen van passieve zinnen duiden men wel aan respectievelijk met de termen ‘dynamisch passief’ en ‘statisch passief’.

(E-ANS, chapter 22–1)

According to the E-ANS, the main difference between (10a) and (10b) lies in the fact that, in the case of the worden construction, the focus is on the act of communication which is closely connected to the agent of this act, whereas in the zijn construction the focus is on the fact that a certain communication took place at a certain point in time.

---

4 Thieroff (1994), in contrast, claims that zijn + pp is ambiguous between the perfect tense of the worden passive and the ‘Zustandspassiv’.

5 For a discussion of the historical development of this construction in German and Dutch, see section 3.2.

6 ‘Passive sentences with worden have a partially different meaning and use than passive sentences with zijn. Passive sentences with worden denote a change to a state expressed by the participle; even if the agent of the event is in the background and does not appear explicitly in the sentence, sentences of this kind invoke the idea of the agent. In contrast, passive sentences with zijn denote a result or an existing state, and the idea of the agent or the causer is often much less obvious. […] These two forms of passive sentences are called ‘dynamic passive’ and ‘stative passive’ respectively.’
(10)  (a) Het besluit om een deel van het personeel te ontslaan, werd gisteravond (door de directie) aan de werknemers meegedeeld.
(...), became yesterday evening (by the management) to the employees communicated.
'The decision to dismiss a part of the staff was communicated to the employees yesterday (by the management).'
(b) Het besluit om een deel van het personeel te ontslaan, is gisteravond pas aan de werknemers meegedeeld.
(...), is yesterday evening only to the employees communicated.
'The decision to dismiss a part of the staff was not communicated to the employees until yesterday evening.'

(E-ANS, chapter 22–1)

However, a look at the pertinent Dutch literature reveals that the perception of the *worden* and the *zijn* passive as ‘dynamic’ and ‘stative’ does not in fact seem to be a common analysis. For German, on the other hand, this analysis is widespread (see section 2.2). As the work of one of the main representatives of this German analysis, Gerhard Helbig, is mentioned in the references given in the E-ANS (Helbig & Heinrich 1972, Helbig & Kempter 1975), this analysis seems to be influenced by the theory on German rather than being an independent analysis of the Dutch form. However, a similar idea can be found in the work of Verhagen (1990, 1992), Cornelis & Verhagen (1995) and Cornelis (1995, 1996, 1997), who apply a quasi-constructionist approach:7 firstly, the passive is considered to be an independent form and not a transformation of the active clause, i.e. a construction. Secondly, the *worden* passive is considered to be the only ‘real’ passive because only the *worden* + pp construction necessarily implies an external causer of the event denoted by the base verb. This causer may or may not be expressed by means of a *door* phrase, but in either case it is present in the interpretation.

In (11), as in the examples in (10), the *worden* construction necessarily implies an external causer, i.e. someone (other than the bodyguard) who equipped the bodyguard, whereas the *zijn* construction just refers to the fact that the bodyguard was equipped with weapons, without paying attention to the agent of this event.8

(11)  (a) Haar lijfwacht werd uitgerust met automatische wapens.
    Her bodyguard became equipped with automatic weapons
    ‘Her bodyguard was equipped with automatic weapons’
(b) Haar lijfwacht was uitgerust met automatische wapens.
    ‘Her bodyguard was equipped with automatic weapons’

(Cornelis 1997: 67)

The *zijn* + pp construction is considered to form an instance of a network of passive-like constructions labelled ‘*zijn*-like stative constructions of verb + pp’ (other constructions within this network are *blijven* ‘remain’ and *liggen* ‘lie’ + pp, for

---

7 Although Cornelis & Verhagen do not make explicit reference to constructionist approaches, their use of the notion of ‘construction’ in fact seems to be related to such theories.
8 For the question as to how to account for *door* phrases (agentive phrases) in *zijn/sein* + pp constructions, see section 4.
instance), and it is obviously intended to comprise both the perfect (tense) and the copular use of that particular form (see Cornelis 1997: 68, footnote 16; Verhagen 1990: 89).

Regardless of whether zijn + pp is considered as a construction (in the constructionist sense) or not, we will see in section 3 that there are many properties indicating that we are in fact dealing not with one distinct form but with two.

2.2 German

Compared to Dutch, there is (and always has been) a much more controversial discussion of the status of sein + pp constructions in the German literature. There are three major groups of analyses.9 The oldest analysis of this construction in present-day language is the so-called ELLIPSETHEORIE (‘ellipsis theory’) which can already be found in Grimm (1837), Wilmanns (1906) and Behaghel (1924) and which was re-introduced primarily by Lenz (1994, 1996). According to this theory, sein + pp is either a copula construction or an ellipsis of the perfect tense of the werden passive in which the final worden has been deleted:

(12) Der Laden ist geschlossen worden
    The store is closed
    ‘The store is closed’

Thus, according to the Ellipsentheorie, there is only one passive auxiliary werden. Sein is either a temporal auxiliary (indicating perfect tense) or a copular verb.

The second analysis is the GENUS VERBI-THEORIE which was introduced by Hans Glinz (Glinz 1952). According to this theory, sein + pp is a passive voice in its own right in addition to the werden passive. These two passives are called ZUSTANDSPASSIV and VORGANGSPASSIV (or sein-Passiv and werden-Passiv) respectively (i.e. stative and eventive passive). The Genus verbi theory has many defenders and can be found in many recent grammars, cf. Brinker (1971), Helbig (1982, 1983, 1987), Helbig & Kempter (1975), Schoenthal (1976), Erben (1984), Askedal (1984), Eisenberg (1994), Engel (1996), Zifonun, Hoffmann & Strecker (1997), Helbig & Buscha (1999)10, Duden-Grammatik (2005), Wellmann (2008) and others.

---

9 In addition, there are several other, less common analyses of the sein + pp construction in German. Firstly, an analysis of sein + pp as a resultative (‘Resultativum’) has been proposed by Leiss (1992) as well as by Litvinov & Nedjalkov (1988) and Nedjalkov (1988). Secondly, Teuber (2005) claims that all sein + pp constructions are copular, even those which are otherwise regarded as perfect tense active voice. Thirdly, Nicolay (2007) argues that the sein + pp construction cannot be clearly analyzed as either verbal (i.e. a passive) or adjectival (i.e. a copula) but that it instead constitutes a construction in its own right which marks the transition between the verbal and the adjectival use of the participle. As these theories are only marginally relevant for the point I want to make here, i.e. the contrastive analysis with the Dutch construction, a detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this paper. For an overview see Maienborn (2007), Schlücker (2007), Thieroff (2007).

10 Helbig & Buscha (1999) seem to be undecided about the classification of sein + pp: on the one hand, they promote the Genus verbi theory, on the other hand, they claim that the Zustandspassiv is formally derived from the Vorgangspassiv through deleting the final worden. Accordingly, a Zustandspassiv is only possible if the Vorgangspassiv also exists (p. 161f; 175).
Finally, COPULA ANALYSIS claims that sein + pp is a copula construction not only in the cases in which the adjective is unambiguously adjectival (see section 3.1) but as a general rule. Advocates of this analysis are, among others, Kratzer (1994, 2000), Rapp (1997, 1998), Wunderlich (1997), Welke (2007) and Schlücker (2007). In particular Maienborn (2007) provides a comprehensive analysis which accounts for many of the problems previously discussed by Kratzer, Rapp and others.

3. Sein/zijn + pp: passive or copula?

In this section, arguments and counter-arguments for the theoretical approaches introduced above as well as the diagnostics involved are discussed in a contrastive way. In sections 3.1 and 3.2, I will briefly show why a copula analysis is indispensable for at least some of the data and why the ellipsis theory fails both for German and for Dutch. Section 3.3 presents arguments in favour of the copula analysis, again both for German and for Dutch.

3.1 No escape from the copula analysis

A very fundamental argument in favour of copula analysis is that there are several clear cases of adjectival participles, which means that, in these cases, sein/zijn + pp is a copula construction. This does not necessarily mean that all constructions of the type sein/zijn + pp are copula constructions, but it is an argument against the view that sein/zijn + pp is generally a passive.

The first group of adjectival participles consists of isolated participles, compounds and pseudo-participles. Isolated participles are lexicalized participles for which the basic verb does not exist any more, at least not with that meaning, see (13). The participles in (14) are compounds that combine with verbal, nominal and other first constituents. Finally, pseudo-participles are derived by affixing ge-/be- ... -t/-d to a nominal base, see (15).\[11\]

(13)  (a) Helena ist bescheiden
      ‘Helena is modest’
   (b) Helena ist bescheuert
      ‘Helena is crackbrained’
   (c) ieder mens is begaafd
      ‘Everybody is talented’

(14)  (a) Helena ist vorbestraft
      ‘Helena has been previously convicted’
   (b) Ihr Schicksal war selbstgewählt
      ‘Her destiny was self-imposed’
   (c) De cursus is computerondersteund.
      ‘This course is computer-assisted’

\[11\] Compounding of the type X (especially N) + pp is very productive in German and Dutch, and these compounds are used either in prenominal position or as a predicate in copula constructions, cf. Hüning & Schlücker (2009).
Secondly, the past participle must be adjectival when it appears in a comparative degree, see (16) and (17).

(16) (a)Meine Schultern sind verbrannter als ich dachte
‘My shoulders are more burned than I thought’
(b) Von allen Suppen ist diese am gesalzesten
‘Of all soups, this is the saltiest’

(17) We waren dan ook zelf geverfder dan de muren\(^2\)
‘We ourselves were more painted than the walls’

A last important indicator of adjectival participles is prefixation with un-/on- ‘un-’: in contrast to the situation in English, un-/on- in German and Dutch is an adjectival and nominal prefix that cannot combine with verbs. A participle with an un-/on-prefix must therefore be adjectival, see (18) and (19).

(18) (a)Der Brief ist ungeöffnet
‘The letter is unopened’
(b) Die Tassen sind ungespült
‘The cups are unwashed’

(19) (a)Alle vrijgezellen zijn ongetrouwd
‘All bachelors are unmarried’
(b) Deze regels waren altijd ongeschreven
‘These rules were always unwritten’

In all of these cases, the participle is unambiguously adjectival and the whole construction is a copula construction. For this reason, sein + pp cannot generally be analyzed as the passive voice.

Also, word order regularities in Dutch embedded sentences can be used to verify that on-prefixed participles are indeed adjectival and that zijn + on-pp is a copula construction, just like zijn + any genuine adjective. As has been noted by Van den Toorn (1965), Kraak & Klooster (1972), Hoekstra & Moortgat (1979), Hoekstra (1984), Van der Putten (1997), E-ANS (1.2) and others, in an embedded clause, a (verbal) participle may either precede the finite verb or follow it (‘groene en rode volgorde’). An adjective, however, may only precede the finite verb, see (20). Word order can thus be used in order to test whether a participle is verbal or adjectival, i.e. to disambiguate the Dutch zijn + pp construction. In contrast to Dutch, German does

not make such a distinction as the finite verb always occupies the final position, see (21); for this reason, this test cannot be applied to the German construction.

(20) (a) dat hij de deur geverfd heeft / heeft geverfd  
    that he the door painted has / has painted  
    ‘that he painted the door’  
(b) dat de deur groen is / *is groen  
    that the door green is / is green  
    ‘that the door is green’

(21) (a) dass er die Tür gestrichen hat / *hat gestrichen  
    that he the door painted has / has painted  
    ‘that he painted the door’  
(b) dass die Tür grün ist / *ist grün  
    that the door green is / is green  
    ‘that the door is green’

The sentences in (22) allow both word orders, and this indicates their verbal (passive) structure. In (23), however, the participle must precede the finite verb, and this indicates its adjectival status. In (23a) this has of course to do with the prefix on-, (23b), which is taken from Booij (2002: 77), is an example of a lexicalized participle with a deviant meaning: gesloten in this case means ‘mentally closed, tight-lipped’ rather than just ‘closed’ (see also Kraak & Klooster 1968: 154). Thus, the examples in (22) are clear cases of verbal passives whereas (23) are copula constructions.

(22) (a) omdat Piet in dat vak getraind is / is getraind  
    because Piet in this profession trained is / is trained  
    ‘because Piet is trained in this profession’  
(b) Ik dacht dat die deur gesloten was / was gesloten  
    I thought that that door closed was / was closed  
    ‘I thought that that door had been closed’

(23) (a) omdat Piet in dat vak ongetraind is / *is ongetraind  
    because Piet in this profession untrained is / is untrained  
    ‘because Piet is untrained in this profession’  
(b) Ik vind dat deze jongen gesloten is / *is gesloten  
    I find that this boy closed is / is closed  
    ‘I find that this boy is tight-lipped’

A related test has been proposed by Hoekstra & Moortgat (1979), Hoekstra (1984) for Dutch: in embedded clauses, a prepositional complement precedes the verb, see (24a). However, a prepositional complement of an adjective follows the adjective, see (24b). This difference can be illustrated most clearly by preposition stranding: a stranded preposition must precede the verb but it follows the adjective, see (25):
(24)  (a) dat Piet zeker op jou gerekend heeft  
that Piet certainly on you counted has  
(b) dat Piet zeker goed in wiskunde is  
that Piet certainly good in mathematics is

[Hoekstra 1984: 164]

(25)  (a) dat Piet er goed in is / *in goed is  
that Piet there good in is / in good is  
(b) dat Piet er zeker op gerekend heeft / *gerekend op heeft  
that Piet there certainly on counted has / counted on has

Again, this test can be used to distinguish between zijn + pp as a copula and as a passive. The on-prefixed participles behave just like genuine adjectives, see (26b–c), and the verbal word order (i.e. the passive) is only possible if the participle is not prefixed, see (26a).

(26)  (a) dat Piet er zeker in getraind is  
that Piet there certainly in trained is  
(b) *dat Piet er zeker in ongetraind is  
that Piet there certainly in untrained is  
(c) dat Piet er zeker ongetraind in is  
that Piet there certainly untrained in is

Thus, the examples in (13)–(26) show that there are a lot of data in which the past participle is adjectival and in which zijn/sein + pp is a copula construction. For part of the data, at least, we therefore cannot do without the copula analysis. In the following sections, however, we will argue that zijn/sein + pp is also copular in constructions other than those presented above.

3.2 The elliptical approach

The insight that a copula analysis is indispensable for a part of the data led the exponents of the ellipsis theory to assume that sein + pp is ambiguous between a copula structure and a passive in which sein + pp is an ellipsis from the werden passive and not a passive voice in its own right, see for example Lenz (1994, 1996). (27a) is an example of an ambiguous construction of this type. In (27b), the ambiguity is resolved: the un-prefixed participle indicates its adjectival status, so it is a copula construction. The agentive phrase von mir ‘by me’ and the event-related modifier sorgfältig ‘carefully’ in (27c–d), on the other hand, indicate a passive structure because they refer to the event which results in the state denoted by the participle; for this reason, these are ellipses of the perfect tense of the werden passive.

The assumption that sein + pp is structurally ambiguous between a passive and a copula construction is supported by the observation that event-related modifiers and un-prefixed participles obviously cannot co-occur in one construction, see (27e). This restriction follows naturally because sein + pp cannot be a passive and a copula construction at the same time.
However, it can be shown very clearly that sein (or zijn) + pp cannot result from the omission of worden. For reasons of space, I will introduce these arguments only briefly; for a more detailed discussion, the reader is referred to the pertinent literature cited below, in particular Rapp (1997, 1998).

The first argument is that the resulting structure when worden is omitted sometimes seems to be ungrammatical whereas the full form (sein + pp + worden) is perfectly grammatical.

In fact, these are instances of the restrictions on the semantics of the base verb that were mentioned in section 1.1. Küssen ‘kiss’ and streicheln ‘caress’ are verbs denoting activities (or processes), i.e. they do not contain a state predicate, and according to Rapp (1997), this explains the oddness of these examples. However, these are obviously not grammatical restrictions on the formation but pragmatic ones. For this reason, in the appropriate context these constructions are perfectly acceptable, see for example (29).

Thus, the examples in (28) can only be used as an argument against the ellipsis theory insofar as both structures obviously have different conditions controlling their use: although the full form (sein + pp + worden) is not ungrammatical in (29), its use is not appropriate: what is relevant here is the actual condition of the subject

---

13 For further discussion, see Maienborn (2007).
14 http://jupe.twoday.net/stories/553171/comment; access 11.03.2009.
referents as a result of the activity denoted by the basic verb, not the act of completing this activity.

The second argument, however, is a real counter-argument. It has been noted by Höhle (1978) and Rapp (1997, 1998) that the full form and the ellipsis are not semantically equivalent, as can be seen from the combination with temporal adverbials:

(30)  
(a) weil der König seit einem Jahr/vor einem Jahr von seinen Feinden besiegt worden ist  
because the king since one year/one year ago by his enemies conquered becomePP is  
(b) weil der König seit einem Jahr/*vor einem Jahr von seinen Feinden besiegt ist  
because the king since one year/one year ago by his enemies conquered is

In a similar way, Höhle (1978) has observed that sein + pp has a perfect tense with gewesen, but this cannot be attached to the full form because the result would be perfect doubling:

(31)  
(a) Das Mädchen ist verletzt gewesen  
The girl is hurt been  
(b) *Das Mädchen ist verletzt worden gewesen  
The girl is hurt becomePP been

Moreover, in the case of stative verbs, there is equivalence between the sein + pp construction and the present tense of the worden passive rather than the perfect tense:

(32)  
(a) Das Mädchen ist geliebt  
The girl is loved  
(b) Das Mädchen ist geliebt worden  
The girl is loved becomePP

A last argument against the ellipsis theory is that the sein + pp construction allows a reflexive interpretation whereas this is impossible for the full form (see Kratzer 1994, Rapp 1997, 1998):^{15}

(33)  
(a) Das Mädchen ist angezogen  
→ non-reflexive or reflexive interpretation  
(b) Das Mädchen ist angezogen worden  
‘The girl is dressed’

This reflexive interpretation is due to the co-reference of the referent of the subject and an implicit controller. Maienborn (2007: 89) points to the fact that the notion of

^{15} For the same observation for Dutch, see E-ANS (version 2.1), chapter 22–1.
implicit control is also responsible for the performative use of the sein + pp construction such as in (34a); in this case it is the situation which is controlled by the speaker. The full form (34b), on the other hand, does not lend itself to performative use.

(34)  
(a) Das Büfett ist eröffnet  
The buffet is opened  
‘The buffet is open’  
(b) Das Büfett ist eröffnet worden  
The buffet is opened becomePP  
‘The buffet has been opened’

These tests show very clearly that sein + pp cannot be analyzed in terms of an ellipsis of the perfect tense of the worden passive.

A further argument can be made by taking the historical development of German and Dutch into account. In the Germanic languages, (the equivalents of) werden/worden and sein/zijn are already in use in conjunction with the past participle. In the beginning they have a predicative meaning, so Er ist verletzt ‘He is hurt’ receives the interpretation ‘He is a hurt one’. These original constructions are thus clear cases of copula constructions, e.g. De Vooys (1967), Van der Wal (1986), Grønvik (1986), Kotin (2000a, 2000b).

The development of werden/worden as a passive auxiliary starts around the 10th century; see, among others, Kotin (2000a) for German, Hoebeke (1971), Duinhoven (1997), Van der Wal (1986) for Dutch. In the course of this development, the first sporadic appearances of the perfect tense of the German werden passive (i.e. sein + pp + worden) can be found in the 13th century, and it is only since the middle of the 17th century that this construction has been fully integrated into the paradigm of the worden passive, cf. Ebert (1993: 418). In Dutch, too, constructions of the type zijn + pp + geworden can be found sporadically since the 13th century, see Den Hertog (1895), De Vooys (1967). In contrast to the situation in German, they have never fully become a part of the paradigm of the worden passive, although, as mentioned above, this construction is used occasionally in spoken language. Two conclusions follow from these historical facts: firstly, they form a strong argument against the ellipsis theory, see also Den Hertog (1895: 184), Kern (1912), Van der Wal (1986: 194–201) and De Vooys (1967):
De voorstelling dat in de verbinding van zijn met het participium het deelwoord geworden zou zijn ‘weggelaten’, mist alle grond. In het algemeen Beschaafd is de konstruktie met zijn geworden dan ook niet gangbaar en in de oudere levende taal nooit gangbaar geweest. In de geschreven taal is aan invloed van het Duits te denken, maar bij Zuid-Nederlanders, die er ook in de omgangstaal gebruik van maken, is veeleer invloed van het Frans aan te nemen (...). (...) Het Mnl. kent de konstruktie alleen in late, onder Duitse invloed staande teksten en in de irrealis.16, 17 (De Voops 1967: 159–160)

Secondly, the copula structure is the oldest (i.e. the original) form of the sein/zijn + pp construction, and this emphasizes its prominence, especially with regard to the discussion of the status of the German construction.

3.3 Zijn/sein + pp as copula construction

The exponents of the ellipsis theory argue for an analysis according to which sein + pp is ambiguous between a verbal structure (an ellipsis of the perfect tense of the werden passive) and an adjectival structure (a copula construction). The benefit of an analysis of this type is obvious: no extra structure has to be introduced as both the werden passive and the copula construction exist anyway. This is exactly the situation we find in Dutch, but with the important difference that zijn + pp in Dutch actually is the perfect tense of the worden passive and not an ellipsis of this form. For German, on the other hand, we have encountered several arguments against an elliptic structure of this type. Accordingly, the only way we can account for the (presumed) verbal structures as in (27c–d) is to analyze them as an independent verbal passive voice. The result is that, compared with Dutch, German has an additional passive voice, the Zustandspassiv, see Table 1.

My claim is, in contrast, that German, just like Dutch, has only one passive form, the worden/werden passive. Whereas the Dutch construction is really ambiguous between a copula construction and the (perfect tense of the) passive, the German construction is a copula construction in all cases. In the following, I will show that German sein + pp is equivalent to the Dutch copular zijn + pp construction but not to the Dutch passive construction, and this is in line with Van der Wal (1986: 10). In addition to the language-specific arguments known from the literature, this observation provides new, contrastive evidence for a general analysis of the German construction as a copula construction.

In this section, I will compile the tests speaking in favour of a (general) copula analysis that can be found in the literature on the German and the Dutch construction. Some of these arguments can be found for both languages, others have

16 ‘The idea that the participle geworden has been ‘omitted’ in the combination of zijn and the past participle lacks any ground. In the standard language the construction with zijn geworden is not accepted and has never been in the older living language. Concerning written language, one might think of a German influence, but regarding speakers of Southern Dutch, who use this construction in colloquial speech, one should rather assume influence from French. (...) In Middle Dutch, the construction can only be found in late texts written under the influence of German and in the subjunctive.’

17 See also Stoett (1923: 190), opmerking II, and Kern (1912), §52.
been used for one language only, and tests will be made in order to determine whether those can be transferred to the other language in each case. We will see that the tests used for Dutch to disambiguate the passive and the copula construction reveal that sein + pp is always a copula construction in German (insofar as they can be applied to German). In the same way, the tests used for German will support the Dutch analysis of zijn + pp as being either a copula or a passive construction.

However, I will not reconsider the tests from section 3.1 which show that a copula analysis is indispensable for participles with the un-/on prefix etc. The pertinent literature uses more or less all of these tests, and there is little discussion about them. It is more important to discuss the status of the past participle and the sein/zijn + pp construction in other, unclear cases.

A first test is the substitution of the presumed copular verb sein/zijn with other copular verbs. A test of this kind has been proposed for German as well as Dutch (Lenz 1996, Maienborn 2007; Sassen 1968, Coppen 2000). Such alternatives are bleiben ‘remain’ in German and blijven ‘remain’, lijken ‘seem’, ‘appear’, blijken ‘turn out’, ‘be found’ in Dutch.18

(35)  (a) Der Computer ist (un-)beschädigt.
    ‘The computer is (un-)damaged’
  (b) Der Computer bleibt (un-)beschädigt
    ‘The computer remains (un-)damaged’

(36)  (a) De computer is (on-)beschadigd
    ‘The computer is (un-)damaged’
  (b) De computer blijft (on-)beschadigd
    ‘The computer remains (un-)damaged’
  (c) De computer lijkt (on-)beschadigd
    ‘The computer seems to be (un-)damaged’
  (d) De computer blijkt (on-)beschadigd
    ‘The computer turns out to be (un-)damaged’

The data in (35)–(36) show that sein/zijn can easily be substituted with other copular verbs, and this very clearly supports the assumption that sein/zijn + pp is a copula construction.19

The second test has been proposed by Maienborn (2007) for German. Based on the assumption that, in coordination structures, both conjuncts have to be of the same type (see Lang 1984), the fact that genuine adjectives and the past participle are often coordinated in sein + pp constructions is used as evidence for the adjectival nature of the participles in these constructions (and thus as evidence for the copula

---

18 Of course, worden/werden ‘become’ are copular verbs, too, but due to their functional ambiguity (copular verb, temporal/modal/passive auxiliary) they are unsuitable for use in this test.

19 To adhere to the Zustandspassiv analysis for German would therefore mean assuming that bleiben ‘remain’ is also a passive auxiliary - something which has indeed been proposed in the literature (‘durative Variante des Zustandspassiv’), e.g. Leirbukt (1969), Glinz (1971), Vaagland (1974), Askedal (1984), Rosenthal (1984), Helbig (1987). However, there is little evidence for such an analysis, in particular considering that bleiben is very frequent in combination with un-/prefixed participles, obviously for semantic reasons, see Schlücker (2007).
analysis), see (37a–b). The same holds for the coordination of participles with pseudo-participles, see (37c).

(37) (a) Die Tischdecken waren gebügelt und blütenweiß.
   ‘The tablecloths were ironed and pure white’
(b) Die Fassaden sind geputzt und frei von Graffiti
   ‘The fronts are cleaned and free from graffiti’
(c) Das Cockpit des BMW ist klar strukturiert und fahrorientiert20
   ‘The cockpit of the BMW is clearly structured and made for driving’

Coordination data of this kind can also be found for Dutch, see (38). Further evidence of the adjectival status of these participles comes from the fact that coordination of those participles and undoubtedly verbal participles (perfect tense active voice) is impossible, see (39):

(38) (a) Het witte leer was geverfd en erg slecht
   ‘The white leather was coloured and very bad’
(b) De wijn is fris en goed gebalanceerd met aroma’s van kersen en rode bessen21
   ‘The wine is fresh and well-balanced with flavours of cherry and redcurrant’
(c) De colleges zijn computerondersteund en begeleid door tutoren’
   ‘The courses are computer-assisted and coached by tutors’

(39) (a) *Er ist verletzt und eingeschlafen
   He is wounded and fallen asleep
(b) *Hij is begonnen en beledigd
   He is started and offended

The coordination test thus provides further evidence of copula analysis both for German and Dutch.

A third test used to disambiguate the Dutch zijn + pp construction is TEMPORAL MODIFICATION. In section 3.2., temporal adverbials were used to illustrate that German sein + pp and sein + pp + worden are semantically non-equivalent, e.g., (30). The same test is used in the Dutch literature to disambiguate the zijn + pp construction, cf. Sassen (1968), Rigter (1984), Van der Putten (1997). Temporal adverbials like gisteren ‘yesterday’, in 2005 ‘in 2005’, vor einem Jahr ‘one year ago’ specify a point of time with respect to an event described - in other words, they locate an event at a certain point of time. These temporal adverbials therefore indicate an event denotation, and in our case this is the passive structure. In contrast, adverbials like al jaren ‘for years’, 25 jaar ‘for 25 years’, seit einem Jahr ‘for one year’ specify the duration of a period and can therefore be used to specify (the duration of) a state. Another test is to embed these constructions in question sentences: Questions like Wanneer ...? ‘When ...?’; Hoe lang heeft het geduurt tot dat ...? ‘How long did it take until ...?’ indicate an event denotation whereas questions like Sinds wanneer ...?

‘Since when ...?’,  
Hoe lang ...? ‘How long ...?’ indicate a state denotation. These tests illustrate that the Dutch  
zijn + pp construction is indeed ambiguous between a  
passive and a copula construction: the examples in (40) are copula constructions. They denote a state and its duration is specified by the temporal adverbial. (41), on the other hand, are passives. They denote an event which is completed (perfect tense) and the temporal modifier specifies the event time.

(40) (a) Hij is 25 jaar gescheiden  
He is 25 years divorced  
‘He has been divorced for 25 years’  
(b) Sinds wanneer is het geweer geladen?  
Since when is the gun loaded?  
‘Since when has the gun been loaded?’

(41) (a) Hij is in 2005 gescheiden  
He is in 2005 divorced  
‘He was divorced in 2005’  
(b) Wanneer is het geweer geladen?  
When is the gun loaded?  
‘When was the gun loaded?’

Temporal modification also has an effect on the word order regularities as discussed in section 3.1. In (42), the passive, indicated by the event-related modifier gisteren ‘yesterday’, allows both word orders, whereas in the copula construction, indicated by the stative modifier al jaren ‘for years’, the participle must precede the finite verb. This again shows the adjectival nature of the participle and thus the copular structure of this construction.

(42) (a) dat het zwembad gisteren gesloten is / is gesloten  
that the swimming pool yesterday closed is / is closed  
‘that the swimming pool was closed yesterday’  
(b) dat het zwembad al jaren gesloten is / *is gesloten  
that the swimming pool already years closed is / is closed  
‘that the swimming pool has been closed for years’

In contrast, the data in (43)–(44) show that the German construction sein + pp only has a stative reading as the combination with event-related temporal adverbials is ungrammatical, see (44). Event-related modifiers can only be used in passive sentences like (45) (which are equivalent to the Dutch passives in (41)). In contrast to the situation in Dutch, therefore, the German construction is not ambiguous between a stative and an eventive interpretation.

(43) (a) Er ist seit 25 Jahren geschieden  
He is since 25 years divorced  
‘He has been divorced for 25 years’  
(b) Seit wann ist das Gewehr geladen?  
Since when is the gun loaded?
‘Since when has the gun been loaded?’

(44)  (a) *Er ist 2005 geschieden
      He is 2005 divorced
(b)  *Wann ist das Gewehr geladen?
      When is the gun loaded?

(45)  (a) Er ist 2005 geschieden worden
      He is 2005 divorced become\_PP
      ‘He was divorced in 2005’
(b) Wann ist das Gewehr geladen worden?
      When is the gun loaded become\_PP
      ‘When was the gun loaded?’

Proponents of the Genus verbi theory could of course argue that the Zustandspassiv also has a stative meaning, and this would explain the data in (43)–(44). So far, however, we have had no reason to assume an additional structure of this kind (but have only found arguments against it). In contrast, the data suggest that both the German and the Dutch examples in (40) and (43) are copula constructions.

The fourth argument has to do with tense. In section 3.2, the perfect tense of the German sein + pp construction formed by adding the past participle of sein, gewesen was already used as an argument against the ellipsis theory (cf. Höhle 1978, example 0). A related argument has been used for the analysis of the Dutch zijn + pp construction, see Sassen (1968), Kraak & Klooster (1972). One of the basic differences between the two underlying structures of sein/zijn + pp is that the copula construction is present tense whereas the passive is perfect tense. The perfect tense of the copula construction is formed by adding geweest / gewesen. The use of geweest thus indicates a copula construction, and it can therefore combine with stative modifiers like twee weken ‘for two weeks’ and 25 jaar ‘for 25 years’, see (46), just like copula constructions with genuine adjectives do, see (47).

Surprisingly, geweest can also be used in constructions with event-related modifiers, see (48). However, this does not provide a counter-argument: these sentences are only grammatical when they receive a stative interpretation. In this case, the modifier does not denote the event time of a specific event. In contrast, it specifies a point in time at which a certain state applies (and the question as to whether that state also applies beforehand and afterwards is left undecided). Again, the same is true for constructions with genuine adjectives, see (49).²² Importantly, an eventive reading is excluded in conjunction with geweest.

(46)  (a) De winkel is twee weken gesloten geweest
      The shop is two weeks closed been
      ‘The shop has been closed for two weeks’

²² It has been remarked by native speakers of Dutch that (48) and (49) are less natural than (46) and (47). This can be explained by the fact that the temporal modifiers één week geleden or gisteren normally trigger an eventive interpretation whereas geweest requires a stative interpretation. The interpretation of those temporal modifiers as referring to a state obviously requires additional effort which makes these sentences less natural.
(b) Hij is 25 jaar getrouwd geweest
   He is 25 year married been
   ‘He has been married for 25 years’

(47)  (a) De winkel is twee weken dicht geweest
      The shop is two weeks closed been
      ‘The shop has been closed for two weeks’
  (b) Hij is 25 jaar gezond geweest
      He is 25 year well been
      ‘He has been well for 25 years’

(48)  (a) De winkel is één week geleden gesloten geweest
      The shop is one week ago closed been
      ‘The shop was closed one week ago’
  (b) De winkel is gisteren gesloten geweest
      The shop is yesterday closed been
      ‘The shop was closed yesterday’

(49)  (a) Hij is één week geleden ziek geweest
      He is one week ago ill been
      ‘He was ill one week ago’
  (b) Hij is gisteren gezond geweest
      He is yesterday well been
      ‘He was well yesterday’

According to our claim, German sein + pp is generally a copula construction and thus
denotes a state. For this reason, the combination with gewesen should be fine, and
this is exactly what can be found, see (50), just like in constructions with genuine
adjectives, see (51). On the contrary, sein + pp constructions that denote an event
(like the perfect tense active) do not allow the combination with gewesen, see (52).²³

(50)  (a) Er ist zwei Wochen lang verletzt gewesen
      He is two weeks long hurt been
      ‘He was hurt for two weeks’
  (b) Sein Haar ist 25 Jahre lang gefärbt gewesen
      His hair is 25 years long dyed been
      ‘His hair was dyed for 25 years’
  (c) Sein Haar ist gestern gefärbt gewesen
      His hair is yesterday dyed been
      ‘His hair was dyed yesterday’

²³ However, sometimes gewesen also seems to combine with the perfect tense active, at least in
colloquial speech, see (i). This does not provide a counter-argument, however: sein + pp with verbs
that form the perfect tense with sein often seem to be ambiguous between an eventive (perfect tense)
construction and a stative (copula) construction. Thus, (i) does not denote an event, but a (resultant)
state and can therefore combine with gewesen.
(i) Wir sind (seit zwei Stunden) angekommen gewesen
    ‘We have been arrived (since two hours)’
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Er ist zwei Wochen lang krank gewesen
He is two weeks long ill been
‘He has been ill for two weeks’
(b) Er ist gestern gesund gewesen
He is yesterday well been
‘He was well yesterday’

*Der Ball ist gerollt gewesen
The ball is rolled been

Another test has been proposed by Coppen (2000). He observes that a temporal modifier like zaterdag ‘Saturday’ without further specification does not indicate past, present or future time. In contrast, this depends on the tense of the sentence of which this modifier forms a part: present tense only allows the future interpretation, past tense only allows the past interpretation, and perfect tense allows both, see (53).

Ik voetbal zaterdag → next Saturday
‘I play soccer on Saturday’
(b) Ik voetbalde zaterdag → last Saturday
‘I played soccer on Saturday’
(c) Ik heb zaterdag gevoetbald → ambiguous
‘I played soccer on Saturday’ OR
‘I will have played soccer on Saturday’

On the basis of the temporal difference between zijn + pp as a copula and as a passive construction, Coppen proposes using this temporal modifier for distinguishing between the copula and the passive construction. As the sentences in (54) only allow a future interpretation, zijn + pp is present tense and thus a copula construction here. The examples in (55), on the other hand, allow both a future and a past interpretation. For this reason, zijn + pp is perfect tense, and it is therefore passive in these cases.

We zijn zaterdag 25 jaar getrouwd → next Saturday
‘We will have been married for 25 years on Saturday’
(b) De winkel is zaterdag gesloten → next Saturday
‘The store is closed on Saturday’

We zijn zaterdag in de stromende regen getrouwd → ambiguous
‘We were married in the pouring rain on Saturday’ OR
‘We will be married in the pouring rain on Saturday’
(b) We zijn zaterdag door de burgemeester getrouwd → ambiguous
‘We were married by the mayor on Saturday’ OR
‘We will be married by the mayor on Saturday’

This test can also be applied to German. The examples in (56) show – in line with our claim – that the use of (am) Samstag ‘on Saturday’ in sein + pp constructions always yields the future interpretation whereas the interpretation ‘last Saturday’ is ruled out, just like in copula constructions with a genuine adjective, see (57). This test thus
provides additional evidence for the claim that German sein + pp is a copula construction.

(56) (a) Ich bin am Samstag blondiert
    ‘I will have had my hair bleached on Saturday’
(b) Die Hose ist am Samstag gesäubert
    ‘The trousers will have been cleaned on Saturday’
(c) Der Kaffee ist am Samstag gekocht
    ‘The coffee will have been brewed on Saturday’

(57) (a) Ich bin am Samstag fertig
    ‘I will be ready on Saturday’
(b) Die Hose ist am Samstag sauber
    ‘The trousers will be clean on Saturday’

In contrast, in verbal constructions of the type sein + pp (perfect tense active voice), the combination with Samstag yields two possible readings (the past reading being much more obvious).

(58) (a) Der Ball ist am Samstag gerollt
    The ball is on Saturday rolled
    ‘The ball rolled on Saturday’ OR ‘The ball will have rolled on Saturday’
(b) Wir sind am Samstag angekommen
    We are on Saturday arrived
    ‘We arrived on Saturday’ OR ‘We will have arrived on Saturday’

Again, this shows that the sein + pp constructions under discussion form a uniform class whose properties are identical with the properties of copula constructions with genuine adjectives and different from the verbal sein + pp construction.

The tests discussed in this subsection provide evidence that German sein + pp is generally to be analyzed as a copula construction whereas Dutch zijn + pp is ambiguous between a passive form and a copula construction. A comparison between Dutch and German shows that there is no need for, and that there are no arguments in favour of, an analysis according to which German has an additional passive voice called ‘Zustandspassiv’. In contrast, it has been shown that those constructions correspond exactly to the Dutch copula constructions.

However, although the equivalence of zijn/sein + pp with zijn/sein + genuine adjective has been taken as evidence of the copula analysis in many tests described above, there are cases in which the former behave differently. More specifically, in some cases the adjectival participles exhibit quasi-verbal properties which – obviously – have to do with their verbal origin. The next section examines those constructions and discusses whether they provide counter-evidence for the copula analysis.
4. Problems of a uniform copula analysis: Verbal properties of zijn/sein + pp constructions

Section 3.2 touched very briefly on the role of event-related modifiers and agentive phrases in sein/zijn + pp constructions. Agentive phrases are von-/door-PPs ‘by PPs’ that refer to the agent of the event denoted by the base verb. For this reason, the referent of these phrases is often called the logical subject of the event described. Event-related modifiers are adverbs like zorgvuldig ‘carefully’, geduldig ‘patiently’ or instrumental phrases like mit einer Zange ‘with nippers’ or in zoete saus ‘in sweet sauce’.24

In the preceding sections, I have claimed that sein + pp is generally a copula construction. If this is true, however, the occurrence of event-related modifiers is not expected because event-related modifiers relate to events and not to states whereas copula constructions are denotations of states. This explains why they are not allowed in conjunction with genuine adjectives, see (59).

(59) *Die Akte ist von mir/sorgfältig schwarz
The document is by me/carefully black

However, in (27d–e), we saw that event-related modifiers are in fact found in German sein + pp constructions. It is for this reason that Lenz (1994), as we have seen above, sees the presence of event-related modifiers as being indicative of a passive structure, in contrast to un-prefixation of the participle, which indicates a copula construction (see section 3.2). This dichotomy is supported by the observation that event-related modifiers and un-prefixed participles apparently cannot co-occur in one sentence, see (27e).

For Dutch, to my knowledge, little attention has been paid to the role of event-related modifiers with regard to the analysis of zijn + pp as a passive or a copula construction. Many papers assume without further discussion that agentive phrases are only used in passives. Janssen (1986: 66) assumes both a stative and an eventive interpretation (i.e. copula construction or passive) for zijn + agentive phrase + pp, again without discussing the role of the agentive phrase in the respective constructions. As an exception, Hoekstra & Moortgat (1979) discuss this question, and they argue that agentive phrases and event-related adverbs are only allowed in the passive. In fact, they follow exactly the same line of argument as Lenz (1994) by considering the ungrammaticality of the co-occurrence of event-related modifiers and on-prefixed participles as being evidence of two distinct structures, i.e. the passive and the copula construction:

(60) *dat het vliegveld zorgvuldig ongeopend is
that the airport carefully unopened is
(Hoekstra & Moortgat 1979: 144)

24 I also use the term ‘event-related modifier’ to include agentive phrases, and I only use the latter term when discussing properties that concern agentive phrases and nothing else.
Of course, Dutch *zijn* + *pp* is in fact ambiguous between a passive and a copula construction. Still, is has to be discussed whether event-related modifiers can also occur in copula constructions. There is obviously an important difference between copula constructions with a past participle and a genuine adjective: the latter only denote states whereas the former denote resultant states. A resultant state implies an underlying event and it is this event which is specified by the modifiers under discussion.

If we wish to support the claim that German *sein* + *pp* is generally a copula construction, the occurrence of event-related modifiers has to be explained, and the same holds for copular *zijn* + *pp* constructions in Dutch. The most important argument then is the observation that there are many examples of event-related modifiers which occur in constructions that have been identified unambiguously as copula constructions above, for example in constructions with *un-*/on*-prefixed participles, see (61) and (62).25

(61) (a) Die neue Rechtschreibung ist von den Österreichern ungeliebt26
   ‘The new spelling rules are unloved by the Austrians’
   (b) Der Vorsitzende war allerdings von diesen Vorwürfen ungerührt
      ‘The chairman was unmoved by these accusations, however’
   (c) Die Pferde sind unbeeindruckt von den Fahrzeugen (...)27
      ‘The horses are unimpressed by the vehicles’
   (d) Weitere Chancen sind von den Grün-Weißen noch ungenutzt
      ‘Further chances are still unused by the Green-Whites’

(62) (a) Ik was onbevredigd door de verscheidenheid aan informatie in het web
    ‘I was unsatisfied by the diversity of information in the web’
   (b) De aanpak hier is onbelast door valse tradities
      ‘This approach here is unburdened by false traditions’

Event-related modifiers can also occur in constructions with stative temporal modifiers, in conjunction with genuine adjectives and with *geweest*/gewesen, see (63)–(65).

(63) (a) dat Piet al jaren in lesgeven getraind is
    ‘that Piet has been trained in teaching for years’
   (b) Sinds wanneer is het geweer zo slordig geladen?
      ‘Since when has the gun been so sloppily loaded?’
   (c) dat het zwembad al jaren door de bouwpolitie gesloten is
      ‘that the swimming pool has been closed by the building inspectors for years’

(64) (a) Die Fassaden sind mit Hochdruckreinigern geputzt und frei von Graffiti
    ‘The fronts are cleaned with pressure washers and free from graffiti’

---

25 It goes without saying that event-related modifiers and *un*-prefixed participles do not generally combine. For an explanation of the restrictions, see Schlücker (2007).
The examples in (61)–(65) show that event-related modifiers occur in copular *zijn/sein* + pp constructions. Of course, event-related modifiers can also occur in the Dutch *zijn* + pp passives, but they are not necessarily indicators of a passive structure. For this reason, the occurrence of event-related modifiers does not provide counter-evidence for a general analysis of *zijn/sein* + pp as a copula construction.28

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have compared German and Dutch *zijn/sein* + pp constructions. The contrastive approach used here has provided new insights and evidence for the analysis of the German and the Dutch *zijn/sein* + pp construction.

We have argued that the Dutch construction is ambiguous between a passive and a copula construction whereas the German construction generally has to be analyzed as a copula construction. Whereas this analysis of the Dutch construction is widely accepted in the literature, this is not the case for the analysis of German *sein* + pp as a copula construction. This paper provides additional evidence of this analysis from language comparison.

We have compiled the diagnostics used in the pertinent literature on Dutch and German (substitution with other copular verbs, coordination, temporal modification, word order, and tense) and applied them to both languages as far as possible. As a result, we have seen that the German *sein* + pp construction corresponds exactly with the Dutch copular *zijn* + pp construction. There is no correspondence between German *sein* + pp and the Dutch passive *zijn* + pp; in contrast, tests with temporal modifiers have shown that those Dutch passives correspond with the German perfect tense of the *werden* passive (*sein* + pp + *worden*). We have also shown that the *zijn/sein* + pp construction which is traditionally analyzed as perfect tense active voice exhibits different properties than the construction under discussion, and this again demonstrates the independency of those two constructions.

In the last section, we discussed the occurrence of event-related modifiers in *zijn/sein* + pp constructions. We argued that their occurrence does not conflict with a copula analysis, and this was illustrated by several tests known from section 3. The

---

28 The next question, then, is how to account formally for the occurrence of these modifiers in *zijn/sein* + pp constructions and also how to explain the restrictions on their occurrence. As this question is beyond the aims and the scope of this paper, the reader is referred to Kratzer (1994), Rapp (1997, 1998) and Maienborn (2007). In a nutshell, these analyses suggest firstly that the verbal participle is converted (by means of an adjectival zero affix) into an adjectival one and secondly that either only the verbal participle is taken as the basis of adjectivization or the verbal participle plus an event-related modifier.
assumption that event-related modifiers occur in copula \textit{zijn} / \textit{sein} + pp constructions is especially important with regard to the Dutch construction because this question has rarely been discussed before and it has often been implicitly assumed that they only occur in passives.
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