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.)

\begin{align*}
(1) & & \text{A} & & \text{casa ainda está } & & \text{demol-i-d-a/} & & \text{*constru-i-d-a} \\
& & \text{DEF.ART.F house still to.be-PRES.3SG} & & \text{demolish-TH-PART-F/} & & \text{build-TH-PART-F} \\
& & \text{etermine the house is still demolished (TS)/*built (RS)} \\
(2) & & \text{a. TS: } & & [\text{Infl} & & \text{Infl \text{\backslash \text{ROOT}}}] & & \text{b. RS: } & & [\text{Infl} & & [\text{I \text{\& v} & & [\text{\text{\backslash P [PRO \text{\backslash \text{ROOT}}]]}]]}]
\end{align*}

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[[√ROOT v ] v] Stat]
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