THE SYNTAX OF STATIVE PARTICIPLES IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE

Braulio Lopes & Alison Biggs McMaster University

Stative ("adjectival") passives, like the participle in *The goat is hidden*, play a foundational role in architectural discussions of word formation. Proposals that such participles are formed Lexically (unlike eventive "verbal" participles) (Wasow 1977) are argued against in later work that identifies heterogeneity in stative participial types, with recent work taking some (Kratzer 2001) or all (Embick 2004) stative passives to be built syntactically. The syntactic analysis of each stative type is contentious, however (Bruening 2014, Alexiadou *et al.* 2015, Ramchand 2018, Bešlin 2023, Paparounas 2023). A dominant view is that stative passives may express two kinds of states (Kratzer 2001): *target states* (TS) (a kind of resultative) or *resultant states* (RS) (similar to perfects; cf. Parsons 1990). Medeiros (2008) argues that Brazilian Portuguese (BP) statives provide evidence that TS/RS semantic contrasts result from variation in syntactic attachment site of participle morphology (cp. Anagnostopoulou 2003, Alexiadou *et al.* 2015, Bešlin 2023). This talk shows BP semantic contrasts are pragmatically conditioned (cf. Maienborn 2009) and provides evidence for an alternative analysis in which BP TS/RS participles are built from a single underlying eventive syntactic structure (cp. Biggs & Embick 2023, Paparounas 2023).

The participle(s) at issue in BP are built with suffix -d 'PART' and occur with auxiliary estar (a stative form of to be) (1). Medeiros (2008) draws on cross-linguistic work (Kratzer 2001) to argue that in BP, TS participles, but not RS participles, are: (i) modifiable by still (1a-b), and (ii) durative for-phrases; (iii) potential complements of become, remain; and (iv) unmodifiable by manner adverbs. Each test in (i-iv) is said to diagnose a state (TS), and TS participles are analyzed as Infl (=stative inflection) direct merging with a root (2a). RS participles are said to fail (i-iv) as RS include an event. RS are analyzed with eventive v and Infl attached 'high' (2b). (Roots merge with PRO in (2b) for theory-internal reasons involving Case, irrelevant to his participle analysis.)

- (1) A casa ainda está demol-i-d-a/ *constru-í-d-a DEF.ART.F house still to.be-PRES.3SG demolish-TH-PART-F/ build-TH-PART-F 'The house is still demolished (TS)/*built (RS)'
- (2) a. TS: [InflP Infl [Infl \sqrt{ROOT}] b. RS: [InflP [I $_{\nu P}$ [ν [ν [P [PRO \sqrt{ROOT}]]]] (Medeiros 2008:185)

Medeiros defines RS/TS by the presence/absence of eventivity, a distinct definition to e.g. Kratzer 2001. We show that in fact both TS/RS in (1) are eventive; tests includes that neither can be complements of verbs of creation (test from Embick 2004). Second, distribution of by indicates that even apparent RS readings of BP statives are incompatible with Voice, contra recent RS analyses (Alexiadou et al. 2015, Bešlin 2023). Finally, close review of (i-iv) shows: (i') as is known for English and Greek, still diagnoses potential for reversibility, which can be distinguished from TS; build in (1) is fine in (a reversible) context (cf. Baglini & Kennedy 2017); (ii') for-phrases diagnose duration, not TS, meaning they are pragmatically strange in contexts where duration is irrelevant; (iii') the complement of remain requires (contextual) reversibility, which again can be distinguished from TS, and complements of become require results of events that are perceptible (irrelevant to RS/TS); (iv') Manner modifiers actually modify both RS/TS participles, so long as a visible state is contextually possible (cp. McIntyre 2013). We conclude that the contextual sensitivity identified for each of (i'-iv') support an analysis in which RS readings of BP stative participles are pragmatically conditioned (as argued for German by Maienborn 2009, Gese 2011).

In the absence of evidence for variation, we propose a unified analysis of the participles in (1) as in (3), in which an event variable is introduced by (categorizing) little v (realized by the theme vowel), under stativizer Stat. (3) is shown to correctly derive all properties identified above.

(3) *Unified structure:* [StatP[[VROOT v] v] Stat]

References

- Alexiadou, A. and Anagnostopoulou, E. (2008). Structuring participles. In *Proceedings of the* 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, pages 33–41.
- Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E., and Schäfer, F. (2015). External arguments in transitivity alternations: A layering approach. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). Participles and voice. In Alexiadou, A., Rathert, M., and von Stechow, A., editors, *Perfect explorations*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bešlin, M. (2023). Revisiting passive participles: Category status and internal structure. Linguistic Inquiry, 54(4), 729–758.
- Biggs, A., & Embick, D. (2023). On the interpretation and structure of English stative passives. Talk given at the LAGB, Cambridge, England.
- Bruening, B. (2014). Word formation is syntactic: adjectival passives in English. *Natural* Language and Linguistic Theory, 32:363–422.
- Embick, D. (2004). On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35(3), 355–392.
- Gese, H. (2011). Events in adjectival passives. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 15, pages 259-274
- Kratzer, A. (2001). Building statives. In Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 26.
- Maienborn, C. (2009). Building event-based ad hoc properties: On the interpretation of adjectival passives. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 13, pages 31–46.
- Medeiros, A. B. (2008). Tracos morfossintáticos e subespecificação morfológica na gramática do português: Um estudo das formas participiais. [Doctoral Dissertation, UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro].
 - https://minerva.ufrj.br/F/?func=direct&doc_number=000696268&local_base=UFR01
- Paparounas, L. (2023). Voice from syntax to syncretism. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Parsons, T. (1990). Events in the semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA
- Ramchand, G. (2018). Situations and syntactic structures: Rethinking auxiliaries and order in English. The MIT Press.
- Wasow, T. (1977). Transformations and the lexicon. In Culicover, P., Wasow, T., and Akmajian, A., editors, Formal Syntax, pages 327–360. Academic Press, New York.