

Passive in German and Dutch: The *sein* / *zijn* + past participle construction*

Barbara SCHLÜCKER
Freie Universität Berlin

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 + *worden*, 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_v²
The store becomes closed
‘The store is closed’
(b) De winkel is gesloten_v
The store is closed
‘The store has been closed’
- (2) (a) Der Laden wird geschlossen_v
The store becomes closed
‘The store is closed’
(b) Der Laden ist geschlossen_v worden
The store is closed become_{pp}
‘The store has been closed’
- (3) Der Laden ist geschlossen_v
‘The store is closed’

* I wish to thank Yvon Keromnes and Marc Fryd for numerous helpful comments on content and style.

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.

		GERMAN	DUTCH	
Passive (‘Vorgangs- passiv’)	imperfect tense	<i>Der Laden wird geschlossen</i>	<i>De winkel wordt gesloten</i>	‘The store is closed’
	perfect tense	<i>Der Laden ist geschlossen worden</i>	<i>De winkel is gesloten_v</i>	‘The store has been closed’
Passive (‘Zustands- passiv’)		<i>Der Laden ist geschlossen_v</i>	–	‘The store is closed’

[Table 1]

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_A*
‘The store is closed’
(b) *Der Laden ist geschlossen_A*
‘The store is closed’

Copula construction	<i>Der Laden ist geschlossen_A</i>	<i>De winkel is gesloten_A</i>	‘The store is closed’
---------------------	---	---	-----------------------

[Table 2]

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.

- (5) (a) Het seizoen is geopend / Die Saison ist eröffnet
The season is opened
'The season is open'
(b) Hij is omringd door soldaten / Er ist von Soldaten umringt
'He is surrounded by soldiers'

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 ist 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 Vooy (1967), Sassen (1968), Kraak & Klooster (1968), Van Es (1970), Hoekstra &

Moortgat (1979), Hoekstra (1984), Van der Putten (1997), Klooster (2001).⁴ 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.⁵ 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 duidt men wel aan respectievelijk met de termen ‘dynamisch passief’ en ‘statisch passief’.⁶

(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 ELLIPSENTHEORIE ('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 is 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 ~~become~~_{pp}
'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) Jeder mens is begaafd
 ‘Everybody is talented’
- (14) (a) Helena ist vorbestraft [[vor_P][bestraft_A]]_A
 ‘Helena has been previously convicted’
 (b) Ihr Schicksal war selbstgewählt [[selbst_{ADV}][gewählt_A]]_A
 ‘Her destiny was self-imposed’
 (c) De cursus is computerondersteund. [[computer_N][ondersteund_A]]_A
 ‘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).

- (15) (a) Sie sind seit kurzem benachbart. [be[nachbar_N]t]_A
‘They have been neighbours for a short time’
(b) Haar bovenarm is gespierd [ge[spier_N]d]_A
‘Her upper arm is muscle-bound’
(c) Helena is gehandicapt [ge[handicap_N]t]_A
‘Helena is handicapped’

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 gevefder dan de muren¹²
‘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

¹² <http://flowgi.org/nl/page.asp?id=60>; access 13.10.2008.

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.

- (27) (a) Die Akte ist versiegelt
'The document is sealed'
(b) Die Akte ist unversiegelt
'The document is unsealed'
(c) Die Akte ist von mir versiegelt ~~worden~~
The document is by me sealed ~~become_{PP}~~
'The document is sealed by me'
(d) Die Akte ist sorgfältig versiegelt ~~worden~~
The document is carefully sealed ~~become_{PP}~~
'The document is carefully sealed'
(e)* Die Akte ist von mir/sorgfältig unversiegelt
The document is by me/carefully unsealed ~~become_{PP}~~

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.

- (28) (a) Das Mädchen ist gestreichelt worden → ?? Das Mädchen ist gestreichelt
The girl is caressed become_{PP} The girl is caressed
(b) Das Mädchen ist geküsst worden → ?? Das Mädchen ist geküsst
The girl is kissed become_{PP} The girl is kissed

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.¹³ For this reason, in the appropriate context these constructions are perfectly acceptable, see for example (29).

- (29) (a) Die Öffentlichkeitsseele ist gestreichelt, und das ist ein schönes Gefühl.¹⁴
'The public soul is caressed, and this is a nice feeling'
(b) Der Frosch ist geküsst – wo bleibt der Prinz?
'The frog is kissed – where is the prince?'

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 become_{PP} 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 become_{PP} 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 ≠ Das Mädchen ist geliebt worden
The girl is loved The girl is loved become_{PP}
(b) Das Mädchen ist geliebt = Das Mädchen wird geliebt
The girl is loved The girl becomes loved

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
→ non-reflexive interpretation only
'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 become_{PP}
'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 Vooy's (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 *werden* 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 Vooy's (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 Vooy's (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 Vooy 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, Coppens 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 geveerd 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 ...?*

²⁰ <http://www.schwab-kolb.com/bmw%5Cde%5Cbmw00079.htm>; access 13.10.2008.

²¹ www.utwente.nl/fb/catering/faculty_club/wijnkaart.pdf; access 27.10.2008.

‘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 o). 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)'

- (51) (a) 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'
- (52) *Der Ball ist gerollt gewesen
The ball is rolled been

Another test has been proposed by Coppin (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).

- (53) (a) 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, Coppin 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.

- (54) (a) 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'
- (55) (a) 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 → next Saturday
‘I will have had my hair bleached on Saturday’
(b) Die Hose ist am Samstag gesäubert → next Saturday
‘The trousers will have been cleaned on Saturday’
(c) Der Kaffee ist am Samstag gekocht → next Saturday
‘The coffee will have been brewed on Saturday’
- (57) (a) Ich bin am Samstag fertig → next Saturday
‘I will be ready on Saturday’
(b) Die Hose ist am Samstag sauber → next Saturday
‘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 → ambiguous
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 → ambiguous
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, it 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).

²⁶ *Tiroler Tageszeitung*, 19.03.1999, accessed via DeReKo, www.ids-mannheim.de.

²⁷ http://www.schmusetiger.de/island_2008.htm; access 20.03.2009.

- (b) Het witte leer was slordig geverfd en erg slecht
'The white leather was coloured sloppily and very bad'
- (65) (a) Er ist zwei Jahre lang durch einen Reitunfall verletzt gewesen
'He was wounded for two years due to a riding accident'
(b) Het zwembad is door de bouwpolitie gesloten geweest
'The swimming pool has been closed by the building inspectors'

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 *zijn/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.

References

- ANS. 1997. 2nd ed. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Walter Haeseryn et al (eds). Groningen: Nijhoff.
- Askedal, John Ole. 1984. Zum Stellenwert der Fügungen *werden/sein/bleiben + Partizip II* im deutschen Passivsystem. In Juhan Tuldava et al. (eds.), *Voprosy obscego i sopostavitelnogo jazykoznanija. Linguistica 17 (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis 684)*, 9–34.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1924. *Deutsche Syntax. Band 2. Die Wortklassen und Wortformen. B. Adverbium. C. Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Booij, Geert. 2002. *The Morphology of Dutch*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brinker, Klaus. 1971. *Das Passiv im heutigen Deutsch. Form und Funktion*. München: Hueber Schwann.
- Coppen, Peter-Arno. 2000. Maandag is het bekend. *Linguïstisch miniatuurtje VXX* <http://www.neder-l.nl/newindex.html>?<http://www.neder-l.nl/bulletin/2000/09/000937.html>; access: 22.10.2008.
- Cornelis, Louise. 1995. Problemen met het Passief. *De nieuwe taalgids* 88.2, 124–136.
- Cornelis, Louise. 1996. English and Dutch: The Passive Difference. *Language Sciences* 18 1/2, 247–264.
- Cornelis, Louise. 1997. *Passive and Perspective*. Amsterdam: Rodopi (= Utrecht studies in language and communication 10).
- Cornelis, Louise & Arie Verhagen. 1995. Does Dutch really have a Passive? In Marcel den Dikken et al. (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 49–60. Dordrecht: Foris (= AVT publication 12).
- De Vooy, C. G. N. 1967. 7th ed. *Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Herzien door M. Schönfeld. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
- Den Hertog, C.H. 1892. *Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Eerste Stuk: De leer van de enkelvoudige zin*. Heruitgave ingeleid en bewerkt door H. Hulshof. Amsterdam: Versluys Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1973.
- Den Hertog, C.H. 1895. *Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Derde Stuk: De leer van de woordsoorten*. Heruitgave ingeleid en bewerkt door H. Hulshof. Amsterdam: Versluys Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1973.
- Duden-Grammatik. 2005. 7th ed. *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 7., völl. neu erarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Herausgegeben von der Dudenredaktion. Mannheim usw.: Dudenverlag (= Duden 4).
- Duinhoven, A.M. 1997. *Middel nederlandse syntaxis, Synchron en diachron. Deel 2: De Werkwoordgroep*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.
- E-ANS. versie 1.2. Elektronische versie van de ANS. <http://www.let.ru.nl/ans/e-ans/>, access: 14-11-2008.
- Ebert, Robert Peter et al. 1993. *Frühneuhochdeutsch Grammatik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Eisenberg, Peter. 1994. 3th ed. *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik*. Stuttgart, Weimar: J.B. Metzler.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1996. 3th ed. *Deutsche Grammatik*. 3., korrigierte Auflage. Heidelberg: Groos.
- Erben, Johannes. 1984. *Deutsche Syntax: eine Einführung*. Bern usw.: Lang.
- Glinz, Hans. 1952. *Die innere Form des Deutschen. Eine neue deutsche Grammatik*. Bern/München: Francke.
- Glinz, Hans. 1971. *Deutsche Grammatik II. Kasussyntax - Nominalstrukturen - Wortarten - Kasusfremdes*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.
- Grimm, Jakob. 1837. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung [Theil 4, Syntax].
- Grønvik, Ottar. 1986. *Über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung der aktiven Perfekt- und Plusquamperfektstrukturen des Hochdeutschen und ihre Eigenart innerhalb des germanischen Sprachraums*. Oslo: Solum Forlag.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1982. Bemerkungen zum Zustandspassiv (ein Diskussionsbeitrag). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 19, 97–102.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1983. Zustandspassiv, *sein*-Passiv oder Stativ? In G. Helbig (ed.), *Studien zur deutschen Syntax*. Band 1, 47–57. Leipzig.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1987. Zur Klassifizierung der Konstruktionen mit *sein + Partizip II* (Was ist ein Zustandspassiv?). In Centre de Recherche en Linguistique Germanique, Nice (ed.), *Das Passiv im*

- Deutschen. Akten des Kolloquiums über das Passiv im Deutschen, Nizza 1986*, 215–233. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Joachim Buscha. 1999. 19th ed. *Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*. Leipzig, Berlin: Langenscheidt.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Gertraud Heinrich. 1972. *Das Vorgangspassiv*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie (Zur Theorie und Praxis des Deutschunterrichts für Ausländer).
- Helbig, Gerhard & Fritz Kempster. 1975. *Das Zustandspassiv*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie (Zur Theorie und Praxis des Deutschunterrichts für Ausländer).
- Hoebeker, M. 1971. *Worden en zijn als hulpwerkwoorden van de lijdende vorm in de oudenaardse oorkondentaal. Taal en Tongval* 23, 106–111.
- Höhle, Tilmann N. 1978. *Lexikalistische Syntax: Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1984. *Transitivity. Grammatical Relations in Government-Binding Theory*. Dordrecht: Foris (= Linguistic Models 6).
- Hoekstra, Teun & Michael Moortgat. 1979. Passief en het lexicon. *Forum der Letteren* 20/2, 137–161.
- Hüning, Matthias & Barbara Schlücker. 2009. Konvergenz und Divergenz in der Wortbildung – Komposition im Niederländischen und im Deutschen. In D. Nübling, A. Dammel & S. Kürschner (eds.), *Kontrastive germanistische Linguistik*.
- Janssen, Theo A.J.M. 1986. Het voltooid deelwoord. *GLoT* 9, 57–78.
- Kern, J.H. 1912. De met het Participium Praeteriti omschreven Werkwoordsvormen in 't Nederlands. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeling Letterkunde*. Nieuwe Reeks, 12/2: 3–318.
- Klooster, Wim. 2001. *Grammatica van het hedendaags Nederlands*. Den Haag: Sdu uitgevers.
- Kotin, Michail. 2000a. Zur Diachronie des Verbs *werden*: Vollverb – Kopula – Auxiliar. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 16, 31–67.
- Kotin, Michail. 2000b. Das Partizip II in hochdeutschen periphrastischen Verfügungen im 9.-15. Jh. Zur Ausbildung des analytischen Sprachbaus. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 28, 319–345.
- Kraak, A. & W.G. Klooster. 1968: *Syntaxis*. Culemborg/Keulen: Stam-Robijns.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1994. *The Event Argument and the Semantics of Voice*. Chap. 2: Adjectival Passives. Ms. Amherst.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. *Building Statives*. Ms. University of Massachusetts at Amherst. <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GI5MmIoM/kratzer.building.statives.pdf>;access: 28.11.2007.
- Lang, Ewald. 1984. *The Semantics of Coordination*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins (= SLCS 9).
- Leirbukt, Oddleif. 1969. Gibt es ein *bleiben*-Passiv im heutigen Deutsch? In *Tillegnet Carl Hj. Borgstrøm. Et festskrift på 60-årsdagen 12.10.1969 fra hans elever*. Oslo - Bergen - Tromsø, Universitetsforlaget.
- Leiss, Elisabeth. 1992. *Die Verbalkategorien des Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der sprachlichen Kategorisierung*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Lenz, Barbara. 1994. Probleme der Kategorisierung deutscher Partizipien. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* (1993) 12/1, 39–76.
- Lenz, Barbara. 1996. *Sein, bleiben und werden* im Negations- und Partizipial-Kontext. *Linguistische Berichte* 162, 161–182.
- Litvinov, Viktor P. & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 1988. *Resultativkonstruktionen im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2007. Das Zustandspassiv: Grammatische Einordnung – Bildungsbeschränkungen – Interpretationsspielraum. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 35, 84–116.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1988. Resultative, Passive and Perfect in German. In V. P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, 411–432. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nicolay, Nathalie. 2007. *Aktionsarten im Deutschen: Prozessualität und Stativität*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (= Linguistische Arbeiten 514).
- Overdiep, G. S. 1928. *Moderne Nederlandsche grammatica*. Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink.
- Overdiep, G. S. 1949. 2nd ed. *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*. Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink.

- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English. A study in Subatomic Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rapp, Irene. 1997. *Partizipien und semantische Struktur. Zu passivischen Konstruktionen mit dem 3. Status*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg (= Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 54).
- Rapp, Irene. 1998. Zustand? Passiv? – Überlegungen zum sogenannten ‘Zustandspassiv’. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* (1996) 15/2, 231–265.
- Rigter, Bob. 1984. Passive and perfect in Dutch and English. In Hans Bennis & W.U.S. van Lessen Kloeke (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1984*, 159–168. Dordrecht-Holland/Cinnaminson-U.S.A.: Foris (=Publications in language science 17).
- Rosenthal, Dieter. 1984. *Studien zur Syntax und Semantik des Verbs bleiben. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Niederdeutschen und Niederländischen*. Göteborger Germanistische Forschungen 27.
- Sassen, A. 1968. Problems of Pre-, Post-, and Co-Existence and the Word-Class of Past Participles in Dutch. *Lingua* 21, 400–16.
- Schlücker, Barbara. 2007. *Diskurs im Lexikon. Eine Untersuchung der Kopula bleiben*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg (= Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 73).
- Schoenthal, Gisela. 1976. *Das Passiv in der deutschen Standardsprache*. München, Max Hueber Verlag.
- Stoett, F.A. 1923. 3th ed. *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst, Syntaxis*. 's Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Teuber, Oliver. 2005. *Analytische Verbformen im Deutschen. Syntax – Semantik – Generalisierung*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms (= Germanistische Linguistik Monographien 18).
- Thieroff, Rolf. 1994. *Vorgangs- und Zustandspassiv in romanischen und germanischen Sprachen. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 47/1, 37–57.
- Thieroff, Rolf. 2007. *sein*. Kopula, Passiv- und/oder Tempus-Auxiliar? In Ljudmila Geist & Björn Rothstein (eds.), *Kopulaverben und Kopulasätze*, 165–180. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Vaagland, Erling M. 1974. Zur Fügung *bleiben* + Partizip II im heutigen Deutsch. *Norwegian Journal of Linguistics* 29, 207–236.
- Van Bart, Johan Kerstens & Arie Sturm. 1998. *Grammatica van het Nederlands, een inleiding*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Van den Toorn, M.C. 1965. Het naamwoordelijk gezegde. *Levende Talen* 232, 629–639.
- Van der Putten, Frans. 1997. *Matter and Mind in Morphology. Syntactic and Lexical Deverbal Morphology in Dutch*. HIL Dissertations 36.
- Van der Wal, M.J. 1986. *Passiefproblemen in oudere taalfasen. Middelnederlands zijn/werden + participium praeteriti en de pendanten in het gotisch, het engels en het duits*. Proefschrift Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- Van Es, G.A. 1970. Plaats en functie van de passieve constructie in het syntactisch systeem van het Nederlands. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 86, 127–156.
- Verhagen, Arie. 1990. De interpretatiestructuur van passieve zinnen. *Forum der Letteren* 31, 81–92.
- Verhagen, Arie. 1992. Praxis of linguistics: Passives in Dutch. *Cognitive Linguistics* 3/3, 301–342.
- Welke, Klaus. 2007. Das Zustandspassiv. Pragmatische Beschränkungen und Regelkonflikte. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 35, 116–146.
- Wellmann, Hans. 2008. *Deutsche Grammatik: Laut. Wort. Satz. Text*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Wilmanns, W. 1906. *Deutsche Grammatik. Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch. Dritte Abteilung: Flexion, 1. Hälfte: Verbum*. Strassburg: Karl Trübner.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1997. Participle, Perfect and Passive in German. *Theorie des Lexikons*, Arbeiten des SFB 282 Nr. 99.
- Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. 3 Bde. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter (= Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 7).