On Some Recent Claims of Relational Grammar

Author(s): Thomas F. Shannon

Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1987), pp. 247-262

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

ON SOME RECENT CLAIMS OF RELATIONAL GRAMMAR

Thomas F. Shannon

University of California, Berkeley

1. Introduction. Recent work in R[elational] G[rammar] has attracted considerable attention because of a number of interesting universal and language-specific claims that have been made with respect to *inter alia* passives, perfect auxiliaries, and the so-called Unaccusative Hypothesis. The aim of this paper is to challenge these claims and proposals, using data from German and Dutch. Instead of the largely formal, nonfunctional analyses offered by RG, we will present accounts based on transitivity and prototype theory. It is our contention that the RG proposals are misguided in attempting to provide formal syntactic solutions to what are essentially semantico-pragmatic problems.

2. RG and Passive. One of the important claims of RG is that it can provide valid and insightful universal characterizations of grammatical constructions such as passive. In the RG analysis passive is characterized by the advancement of a direct object or 2 to subject or 1, thereby causing the original 1 to lose its subjecthood or become a *chômeur*; in fact, it is claimed that *chômage* is always so motivated ("Motivated Chômage Law"). Cf. the passive versions (1c/d) of the German and Dutch sentences (1a/b).

- (1) a. Die Terroristen zerstörten viele Häuser.
 b. De terroristen verwoestten vele huizen.
 'The terrorists destroyed many houses.'
 c. Viele Häuser wurden (von den Terroristen) zerstört.
 d. Vele huizen werden (door de terroristen) verwoest.

Now impersonal passives as in (2c/d) seem to offer *prima facie* counterexamples to this advancement analysis of passive (cf. Comrie 1977). Here it appears that an initial 1 has gone en *chômage* spontaneously, as depicted in the stratal diagram (A).¹ However, Perlmutter and Postal (1984b) claim that impersonal passives universally involve the insertion of a dummy element as a 2, which is then advanced to 1, as in (B). This of course saves the analysis.

- (2) a. Die jungen Leute tanzen hier oft. b. De jongelui dansen hier vaak.
 'The young people dance here often.'
 c. Es wird hier (von den jungen Leuten) oft getanzt.
 d. Er wordt hier (door de jongelui) vaak gedansd.
 'There's often dancing done here by the young folks.'

In fact, it is contended that all sentences universally contain a final subject ("Final 1 Law"). Even sentences which do not appear to have even a dummy subject (cf. 3) are claimed to have "invisible" dummy subjects.

- (3) a. Hier wird oft getanzt. b. Hier wordt vaak gedansd.

A.

P	1	Loc
P	$\hat{1}$	Loc
dance	young folks	here

B.

P	1		Loc
P	1	2	Loc
P	$\hat{1}$	1	Loc
dance	young folks	dummy (es/er)	here

Positing dummy subjects even where none are there looks like nothing more than an ad hoc trick of the linguist to salvage an analysis which is wrong; later I will argue that this is in fact the case here. Therefore, it is imperative that RG provide strong evidence for the claim that a dummy is inserted as a 2 and gets advanced to 1 in impersonal passives. The main argument given is that together with another universal principle, the “1 Advancement Exclusiveness Law” (1AEX) (cf. 4), the advancement analysis allows us to correctly predict the non-existence of certain passives.

- (4) **1-ADVANCEMENT EXCLUSIVENESS LAW:** *The set of advancements to 1 in a single clause contains at most one member.*

Here the so-called U[naccusative] H[ypothesis] plays an important role. According to this hypothesis, there are two kinds of intransitive verbs, unaccusatives (which contain an initial 2 but no 1) and unergatives (which initially contain a 1 and no 2), and certain syntactic phenomena—such as passive and perhaps perfect aux selection—are sensitive to this distinction. It is thus correctly predicted that unaccusative verbs (5a/b) cannot passivize (cf. 5c/d) because their active subject already advances to 1 and in order to derive the passive here there would have to be a second advancement to 1 (cf. 5e), which is prohibited by the 1AEX.

- (5) a. Heutzutage wachsen die Kinder schnell.
 b. Tegenwoordig groeien de kinderen snel.
 ‘Nowadays (the) children grow quickly.’
 c. *Heutzutage wird (von den Kindern) schnell gewachsen.
 d. *Tegenwoordig word (er) (door de kinderen) snel gegroeid.

e.

P	2	
P	1	
P	1	2
P	$\hat{1}$	1
grow	children	dummy

Thus, accepting the advancement analysis of impersonal passives together with the UH and the 1AEX, we supposedly have an explanation for these impossible passives. Similarly, these principles would preclude the possibility of impersonal passives of personal passives (6), so-called inversion clauses (7), and raising clauses (8), all of which already have an advancement to 1.

- (6) a. Niemand wird von der alten Frau geküßt. b. Niemand wordt door de oude vrouw gekust. 'No one is kissed by the old lady.'
 c.*Es wird von der alten Frau von niemand geküßt.
 d.*Er wordt door de oude vrouw door niemand gekust.
- (7) a. Der Wein schmeckt/gefällt ihm nicht. b. De wijn smaakt/bevalt hem niet. 'The wine doesn't taste (good) to/please him.'
 c.*Ihm wird von dem Wein nicht geschmeckt/gefallen.
 d.*Hij/Hem wordt door de wijn niet gesmaakt/bevallen.
- (8) a. Maria scheint krank zu sein. b. Maria schijnt ziek te zijn. 'Maria seems to be sick.'
 c.*(Von) Maria wird geschienen krank zu sein.
 d.*(Door) Maria wordt geschenen ziek te zijn.

However, this analysis can be objected to on several grounds. First of all, the 1AEX is patently arbitrary, totally without external motivation. Why then should it exist and how do we in fact know that it exists? Even assuming for the moment that it correctly describes the data, it still does not really explain them. Moreover, since the principle itself is arbitrary, how would speakers come to have it? It hardly is learnable without trial and error and hence negative correction, which is very unlikely. The only alternative would seem to be that it is an innate linguistic universal, which seems equally implausible. Similar objections could also be directed at the Final 1 Law, the Motivated Chômage Law, and the existence of invisible dummies, especially in languages like Turkish where the dummy can never appear. How do speakers know they exist? Of course, if none of these exist, speakers would not have to know or learn about them. Also apart from the 1AEX, little evidence is offered in favor of the advancement analysis of impersonal passives. There is no independent evidence that passive dummies are inserted as 2s, other than they have to be in order to make the whole thing work. The little evidence given to show that the dummy is a final 1 concerns Indefinite Extraposition in Dutch and German (cf. Perlmutter and Zaenen 1984); in previous work (Shannon, to appear a) I have refuted this claim.

Moreover, RG proposes a lot of syntactic machinery, but to my knowledge has never shown how it would work correctly. Of course, many "details" such as case, prepositions, auxiliaries, finite and nonfinite verb forms, word order, etc. are simply ignored, but in the long run they can't be. Most importantly, how do we know that the (largely unformulated) syntactic rules would apply properly? Apparently rule features will be necessary to indicate when certain (minor?) rules like Inversion (which advances a 3 → 1 from a transitive [i.e. 1 + 2] stratum) apply and when other (major?) ones like Unaccusative Advancement do not, e.g. in German sentences like *Mich* [acc.] *friert/hungert*. 'I'm freezing/hungry.' *Mir* [dat.] *träumt/schwindelt*. 'I dream/am dizzy.' Furthermore, rules may have to be extrinsically ordered, e.g. to prevent passive from applying to Inversion verbs *before* Inversion. In light of the heavy criticism that rule ordering came under in the seventies, this is not an attractive possibility. In addition, it is not clear why elements which supposedly bear the same GR do not behave alike. For instance, a *î* in the

passive acts differently from a *Î* in Indefinite Extraposition (cf. Shannon, to appear a): while the latter still acts like a true surface subject, the former does not (not in nominative, doesn't trigger verb agreement). Dummy *Is* also act differently at times: the 'dummy' *es/er* in Indefinite Extraposition does not act like a subject (does not trigger verb agreement and in German can only appear in the prefield), whereas the dummy *l* with impersonal verbs is a different word in Dutch (*het* vs. *er*) and in both languages acts like a *l* (e.g. verb agreement and does not disappear in German when not in the prefield). The RG proposal of a "brother-in-law relation" here is only ad hoc handwaving to remove the apparent problem. If these elements are the same, why do they behave so differently? Relational grammarians have begged these questions long enough: the time has come for them to show how their theory would handle objections like these and, specifically, how they would ultimately derive the actual surface forms in a consistent, principled fashion.

Observe that if we do not accept the 1AEX the main motivation for the advancement analysis of impersonal passive is lost, since there is then no reason to believe that a dummy subject exists in such sentences. If an independent explanation for the non-existence of the above-mentioned passives can be found, then the dominoes of the theory start to tumble: there is spontaneous demotion and the Motivated Chômeage Law and the Final *l* Law are both false, as is the universal characterization of passive as the advancement of a 2 to 1. In the next section we will propose just such an account, which casts serious doubt on all these proposed RG syntactic "universals".

3. An Alternative Account of Passive. Instead of a purely syntactic approach to passive, we advocate here a semantico-pragmatic one. Kirsner (1975:99) already offered a realistic formulation for passive in Dutch: the passive in Dutch, he claimed, backgrounds a relatively agentlike subject. It is important to note that *relatively agentlike* subjects are involved here, for Perlmutter and Postal (1984a:103) considered a semantic account of passive and found it wanting, but only because they merely considered a straw man—a limitation to purely agentive subjects. Kirsner's formulation avoids the obvious objections that they bring forth.² In particular, inanimate subjects of transitive verbs—the only type of counterexample cited by Perlmutter and Postal—can often quite easily be construed as natural extensions of the prototypical active animate agent subject to similarly potent, though inanimate entities. In fact, in the examples they give an animate noun could be substituted for the inanimate one given and in each instance the animate entity would be construed as very high in potency (i.e. an agent).

More recently, Shibatani (1984) has proposed a more detailed universal prototype analysis of passive which enables us to correlate it with certain other constructions such as the reflexive, not just in morphosyntactic terms but also in terms of semantics and pragmatics. In Shibatani's view, the primary function of passive is the defocusing of an agent subject, which (we may add) is in fact usually omitted in personal passives and almost always left out in impersonal passives (cf. Drosowski 1984:177ff.). Divergences from this schema can be seen as reflecting deviations from the prototypicality of the agent and/or the transitivity of the clause (cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980; Van

Oosten 1984, and now especially Rice 1987, Langacker to appear): passifizable active clauses are richer in transitivity properties—e.g. the verb is an action predicate denoting an effect brought about in the patient object by the agent subject acting on its own volition as a consequence of which the patient is in the resultant state. The active subject is human, a high potency (and therefore unaffected) individual separate from the patient object and is in control of and responsible for the action, its energy source. Conversely, the prototypical passive clause is then very much on the opposite end of the transitivity scale: it has no object, the subject is a patient and the predicate denotes a change undergone by the subject, who is not in volitional control of the situation. An agent is definitely implied, though usually not named; if so it bears a tangential relation to the clause in the form of an optional adjunct. Viewed against this semantico-pragmatic prototype, the admissibility of passives is seen as dependent on the function of passive and the clause's transitivity and not merely a result of formal syntactic principles like the 1AEX. Therefore, it will be instructive to compare the two approaches and see how well they handle different instances of unacceptable passives.

4. On Explaining Unacceptable Passives. Grammars like the German *Duden* (Drosdowski 1984:182f.) or the Dutch *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (Geerts 1984:1053f., 1058) point out several kinds of verbs which do not normally passivize. For example (*Duden*), intransitive verbs “whose personal subject is not the agent or instigator of the action” are not normally passifizable (9), nor are those which “can only be combined with an impersonal subject” (11-12).

- (9) a. In den Tropen altert man schnell. b. In de tropen veroudert men snel.
 ‘In the tropics one grows old dies quickly.’
 c. *In den Tropen wird schnell gealtert.
 d. *In de tropen wordt (er) snel verouderd.
- (10) a. Sie ähnelt ihrem Bruder. b. Zij lijkt op haar broer.
 ‘She resembles her brother.’
 c. *Ihrem Bruder wird (von ihr) geähnelt.
 d. *Op haar broer wordt (door haar) geleden.
- (11) a. Diese Aussage beruht auf einem Irrtum. b. Deze uitspraak berust op een vergissing. ‘This statement is based on an error.’
 c. *Auf einem Irrtum wird von dieser Aussage beruht.
 d. *Op een vergissing word door deze uitspraak berust.
- (12) a. Es regnet/schneit/blitzt/hagelt. b. Het regent/sneeuwt/bliksemt/hagelt.
 ‘It’s raining/snowing/lightning/hailing.’
 c. * Es wird geregnet/geschneit/geblitzt/gehagelt.³
 d. *Het wordt geregend/gesneeuwd/gebliksemd/gehageld.

Presumably RG would have to invoke the 1AEX in all these cases. The “unaccusative” verbs e.g. (cf. 5, 9) would fit in here—they are largely perfective patient-subject predicates—as would personal passives (cf. 6) and raising verbs (cf. 8). Perhaps the subjects in (10-11) could also be analyzed as initial 2s and the verbs in (12) as some sort of unaccusatives or as having an inserted

dummy 2 which advances to 1, although I know of no independent evidence for such a claim. The 1AEX would then disallow passivization of such examples. But the unacceptability of all these passives follows straightforwardly from our prototype account without any such syntactic prestidigitation. Clearly, such clauses are very low on the transitivity scale: none of the verbs in question takes a (n accusative) direct object, and they all have a non-agentlike (e.g. patient or theme) subject. Semantically, (9) is in fact already very close to the passive prototype, except that there is no (implied) agent—it is a spontaneously occurring process, not the result of an action. Of course, if the verb is much higher in transitivity, e.g. *helfen* (which like *ähneln* takes a dative object—signalling a less affected object), then the passive is fine.

(13) a. Wir helfen dem Mann. 'We help the man.'

b. Dem Mann wird (von uns) geholfen.

Here the verb denotes a volitional action carried out by high potency individuals and thus passive is acceptable, even though the object is not directly affected, at least not according to German case marking (dative).

It has frequently been remarked, however, that some verbs which normally do not allow passivization (e.g. ones taking BE in the perfect like *bleiben* and *sterben*; cf. section 3) sometimes are used in the passive, especially in the spoken colloquial language, "in order to express an energetic order" (Drosowski 1984:183), as in examples 14b/d below.

(14) a. Er ist hier geblieben. 'He (has) remained here.'

b. Es wird hier geblieben! 'Now (you'll) stay here!' [Duden]

c. Der Vater hat geschlafen. 'He (has) slept.'

d. Jetzt wird aber (*vom Vater) geschlafen! [Duden]

'Now there'll be some sleeping done (*by father)!'

e. Für den lieben König und Herrn wird alles getan, wird treulich gekämpft, wird willig geblutet, wird freudig in den Tod gegangen, für ihn wird mehr als gestorben... [Curme 1960:338]

'For the beloved king everything is done, battle is faithfully fought, blood is willingly shed, happily they march into death, for him more is done than (just) die...'

Of course, RG could handle cases like these by labelling the verbs in question alternatively unaccusative or unergative. In fact, noting the problematic nature of sentences like (14e), Perlmutter and Postal (1984b:11f.) propose such a solution, claiming (as part of their "Universal Alignment Hypothesis"; cf. Rosen 1984) that there is a difference in meaning which correlates with unaccusativity (non-volitional reading) vs. unergativity (volitional reading). But this move is completely ad hoc, for we do not seem to be dealing with homophonous verbs here. Moreover, it does not explain why these verbs frequently occur in this particular use of the impersonal passive as an indirect imperative nor why impersonal passives in general presuppose a human or at least animate (agentlike) active subject (cf. Heidolph 1984:551; Geerts 1984:1057).

Now in terms of our passive prototype, such clauses range toward the lower end of the transitivity scale, e.g. they do not have an accusative (affected) object and the subject is not agentlike; in fact, in (14e) the subject is clearly a patient. Note, however, that in (14b/d) the subject is not affected (no change of state in the subject), and in all these cases the event in question is viewed as somehow under the subject's volitional control. Thus the verbs in (14b,d) can easily be used in the imperative, and even *sterben* can be so used at times (cf. *Oh bitte, stirbe [sic] nicht!* 'Oh please don't die!' from the German comedian Otto Waalkes). The fact that the passive of such verbs is often used as an indirect imperative (in which case the agent apparently cannot be specified; cf. 14d) also follows naturally, since this use heightens the aspect of volitional control. Moreover, since there is no subject (impersonal passive), the event itself is foregrounded, not as something happening to an individual but as something the individual can choose to do/control, not something he undergoes but rather something he participates in. Finally, the agent restriction on impersonal passives is also understandable. Since they are based on non-prototypical actives with a single participant and thus do not foreground a patient, the agentivity required of the active subject is greater and thus restricted to humans, or at least animates; cf. Kirsner (1975) for a fuller, though slightly different account.

Turning next to transitive verbs, we again find impersonal verbs not passivizing, e.g. the impersonal expressions *es gibt*, *es setzt* in German (15-16), as well as verbs of knowing (17), verbs whose object denotes an amount/sum (18) or a relation (cf. 7),⁴ especially one of possession (19).

- (15) a. *Es gibt viele Tierarten.* b. **Viele Tierarten werden gegeben.*

'There are many kinds of animals.'

- (16) a. *Es wird Schläge setzen.* b. **Schläge werden (davon) gesetzt werden.*

'There will be blows.'

- (17) a. *Henk kennt alle.* b. *Henk kent allen.* 'Henk knows everyone.'

c. **Alle werden von Henk gekannt.* d. **Allen worden door Henk gekend.*

- (18) a. *Das Buch hat zehn Dollar gekostet.* b. *Het boek heeft tien dollar gekost.*

'The book cost ten dollars.'

c. **Drei Dollar wurden von dem Buch gekostet.*

d. **Drie dollar werden door het boek gekost.*

- (19) a. *Ihr Freund hat/besitzt ein Vermögen.* b. *Haar vriend heeft/bezit een vermogen.* 'Her friend has/owns a fortune.'

c. **Ein Vermögen wird von ihrem Freund gehabt/besessen.*

d. **Een vermogen wordt door haar vriend gehad/bezeten.*

Presumably RG would account for these restrictions by appealing to the 1AEX once again. Verbs like those in (7) are analyzed as "inversion verbs" whose initial 1 becomes a 3 and whose initial 2 then advances to 1 (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1984a:113f.), the 1AEX then precluding further advancement to 1 through passive. I am not certain how RG would handle the other cases—perhaps they too are some sort of inversion verbs; I assume this can be done, but not in a natural and non-arbitrary manner. Our analysis, on the

other hand, accounts for these facts too, but in much more direct, motivated, and plausible fashion by tying them to the pragmatic/semantic function of passive and the meaning of the clauses (particularly the verbs) in question. The restrictions encountered here are as expected, since these are low transitivity clauses (non-agentlike subjects, non-affected object, verbs expressing static relations not actions, etc.) and hence do not passivize.

One especially peculiar restriction with transitive verbs is the following: verbs with an (accusative) direct object which denotes a part of the subject's body do not passivize (Drosdowski 1984:182; Geerts 1984:1054).

(20) a. Ich schüttelte den Kopf. b. Ik schudde het hoofd.

'I shook the [my] head.'

c.*Der Kopf wurde von mir geschüttelt.

d.*Het hoofd werd door mij geschud.

Observe that these verbs normally present no obstacle to passivization, provided the object in question is not a body part belonging to the subject.

(21) a. Die Frau schüttelte die Flasche. b. De vrouw schudde de fles. 'The woman shook the bottle.'

c. Die Flasche wird (von der Frau) geschüttelt.

d. De fles werd (door de vrouw) geschudt.

In fact, the passive sentences in (20c/d) are perfectly acceptable if it is not the speaker's head that is being shaken, but, say, a detached part of a statue or perhaps a macabre war trophy. Why should there be such a restriction? As far as I can see, RG has nothing to say about such cases, although something could probably be cooked up. In our view, however, this restriction is quite natural: the prototypical agent is separate from the patient and in fact unaffected by the action. This is only true in an example like (20c/d) if the head in question is not his own; this explains why the passive is only acceptable here on this reading. If the subject is identical or partially identical with the object, then passivizing will not really defocus the agent; nor will it focus on a separate patient. It must be considered a great advantage of our analysis that it can handle this at first seemingly bizarre restriction in a non-arbitrary, non-ad hoc fashion without further adjustment.

The just-mentioned observations can also help us with the following generalization: reflexive verbs normally do not allow passivization (cf. Drosdowski 1984:183; Geerts 1984:1053).

(22) a. Peter wäscht sich. b. Piet wast zich. 'Peter washes himself.'

c.*Von Piet wird sich gewaschen. d.*Door Piet wordt zich gewassen.

(23) a. Sie freuten/ärgerten sich über das Kind. b. Zij verheugden/ergerden zich over het kind. 'They were happy/angry about the child.'

c.*Über das Kind wurde sich von ihnen gefreut/geärgert.

d.*Over het kind werd zich door zij verheugd/geërgerd.

(24) a. Die Tür öffnete sich. 'The door opened.'

b.*Von der Tür wird sich geöffnet.⁵

This restriction falls out naturally from our analysis: since reflexives refer back to the subject, they render the subject an affected entity which is not separate from the patient object—therefore not a suitable candidate for passive. Since the subjects are affected, reflexive constructions are similar to passives already—even more so, the less agentlike (potent) the entity in question is. In the above examples we see something of a cline of potency until in (24a) the subject is hardly potent at all; in cases like these the reflexive construction is used to express spontaneous events, those which are normally brought about by an agent but are being viewed atypically as occurring without the intervention of an agent, as if the patient brings it about itself. Note also that in such reflexive examples an agent may never be mentioned. It is not clear how RG would handle these cases, particularly (22), which is neither an unaccusative clause nor a reflexive passive, as far as I can see. Example (24) could possibly be regarded as a reflexive passive: here plain passive could not apply due to the 1AEX. However, it is not clear to me how to distinguish Perlmutter and Postal's "reflexive passives" from other reflexives, especially since the only example ever given (*Solche Sachen sagen sich nicht.*) is rejected by my informants. Examples like (22), on the other hand, might be analyzed as unaccusatives (cf. Perlmutter and Postal 1984b:157 on *sich ärgern*).

Observe, however, that reflexive verbs may sometimes be passivized (at least in German, though not in Dutch!).

(25) a. Jetzt wird sich hingelegt/gewaschen! 'Now (you'll) lie down/get washed!'

b. Hier wird sich nicht geärgert/gelangweilt/bewegt!

'There'll be no anger/boredom/movement here!'

c. Da wurde...in zitternder Angst sich verkrochen.

'Then there was crawling away in trembling fear.' [Curme 1960:338]

Such examples are of great interest since they present problems for any analysis: why are they possible, while generally passives based on reflexives are not? Observe that as usual these impersonal passives presume a human agent, which, however, cannot be mentioned in this usage. The reflexive construction is typically passivized in spoken colloquial speech as an indirect imperative: we observed earlier that this construction foregrounds the event itself, highlighting the volitional/control aspect and thus heightening the agentlike (potency) properties of the entity in question and playing down its affectedness, i.e. its has the reading of increased transitivity.⁶ Note that when it is difficult to imagine the thing in question as under some sort of volitional control, the sentence becomes bizarre.

(25) d. ?*Hier wird sich nicht erkältet!

'There'll be no catching colds here!'

These reflexives are restricted to third person forms only; this is because only here is the agent actually defocused. Moreover, in (25c) another aspect of transitivity—intensity—is highlighted by the use of the phrase *in zitternder Angst*: this event is an intense reaction to external pressure. All of this is not handled in the RG analysis, as far as I can see; in fact, sentences like (25b), which RG would apparently analyze as containing unaccusatives, should never allow passivization, although they clearly at times may.

5. Passivizability and Perfect Auxiliary Selection. Finally, I would like to consider here a related set of questions concerning the perfect auxiliary. In both languages the perfect aux is either HAVE (*haben/hebben*) or BE (*sein/zijn*). What principles govern the aux selection and what connection, if any, is there with passivizability? First of all, it can be noted that in German and Dutch most intransitive verbs which form their perfect with *sein* cannot be passivized. How can we explain this correlation? Moreover, the BE-aux verbs seem to form a subset of the intransitives which looks suspiciously close to the unaccusatives. It would be attractive if somehow these observations could be tied together so that both the aux chosen and the inability to passivize follow from the same property. Perlmutter (to appear; cited in Rosen 1984: 46) in fact offers an analysis of perfect aux selection for Italian based on GRs, though not for German and Dutch. Hoekstra (1984), however, puts forth a very strong hypothesis—mainly for Dutch, but also by implication for German—that unaccusative predicates select BE and unergatives HAVE. He furthermore claims that “[w]hereas the unaccusative verbs do not allow the formation of impersonal passives, intransitives that select *hebben* as their temporal aux freely allow it.” Examples such as (26-29) are supposed to bolster this claim.

- (26) a. Die Kinder sind da geblieben. b. De kinderen zijn daar gebleven.
 ‘The children stayed there.’
 c. *Es wird (von den Kindern) da geblieben.
 d. *Er wordt (door de kinderen) daar gebleven.
- (27) a. Das Wasser war bald verdampft. b. Het water was vlug verdampt.
 ‘The water had soon evaporated.’
 c. *Es war bald (durch das Wasser) verdampft worden.
 d. *Er was vlug (door het water) verdampt.
- (28) a. Ein Kind hat lange geweint. b. Een kind heeft lang gehuild.
 ‘A/One child cried for a long time.’
 c. Es wurde lange geweint. d. Er werd lang gehuild.
- (29) a. Man hat oft darüber gesprochen. b. Men heeft vaak daarover gesproken.
 ‘People have often talked about that.’
 c. Darüber wird oft gesprochen. d. Daarover wordt vaak gesproken.
- Thus Hoekstra establishes the tightest possible connection between unaccusatives, BE-aux, and passivizability; unfortunately, however, this claim, though in many instances correct, does not hold water fully. Moreover, even if it were correct, it offers no explanation for the facts. Observe first of all that there are HAVE-aux verbs which do not allow passive, pace Hoekstra; cf. Fagan (1986).
- (30) a. Der Vortrag hat stundenlang gedauert.
 b. De lezing heeft urenlang geduurd.
 ‘The lecture lasted for hours.’
 c. *Es wurde stundenlang gedauert. d. *Er werd urenlang geduurd.

(31) a. Das Kind hat gestunken. b. Het kind heeft gestonken.

'The child stank.'

c. *Es wurde (von dem Kind) gestunken.

d. *Er werd (door het kind) gestonken.

Furthermore, as noted previously for German (cf. 14a/b), there are cases of BE-aux Dutch verbs which may at times passivize; cf. (32a-d) from Geerts (1984:1058) and (34e) from Perlmutter and Postal (1984b:110).

(32) a. Wordt er nu nog begonnen, of hoe zit dat?

'Is it going to get started or what?'

b. Wordt er vandaag noch naar huis gegaan?

'Is there going to be any going home now?'

c. En nu wordt er ingeslapen!

'And now there's going to be some sleeping (done).'

d. Daar wordt koortsachtig geleefd en gestorven.

'There living and dying are carried out at a feverish pace.'

e. In het tweede bedrijf wordt er door de nieuwe acteur op het juiste ogenblik gevallen. 'In the second act there was falling by the new actor at the right moment.'

Just as with their German counterparts, these Dutch examples occur in contexts which accentuate their transitivity, especially volitionality, which is again what we would expect given our analysis. As noted earlier for German, such impersonal passives are frequently used as an indirect imperative ("to indicate a strong wish": Geerts 1984:1058), as in (32a-c). In fact, Perlmutter and Postal point out that if volitionality is not presumed in examples like (32e), the passive is out. However, volitionality is not the only factor involved in heightening transitivity, as (32d) shows, first of all because living and dying are not (viewed here as) volitionally controllable, and secondly because the context here refers to underwater life, which is not close to the agent prototype. In this example (32d), however, the activity is particularly intense, as indicated by the adverb *koortsachtig*, and the entity is thus viewed more as a participant than just an undergoer. Although examples like these are problematic and unexplained in analyses which strictly link passivizability to HAVE-aux verbs, they do not cause such problems for our approach. But we still have not offered an account of BE-aux verbs and their normal lack of passivizability. We turn next to this question.

6. Toward a Prototype Account of Perfect Aux Selection. Basically I would like to consider perfect aux selection in terms of prototypes: prototypical HAVE-aux verbs are very high in transitivity, whereas BE-aux verbs are low in it, with HAVE often the default for unclear cases (e.g. many statives). Specifically, prototypical BE-aux verbs are single participant perfective predicates denoting the beginning or end point of a change which the patient subject non-volitionally undergoes and which is not (conceived of as) brought about by another agentlike entity. This is the rationale behind the traditional claim in grammars of German and Dutch that BE-aux verbs typically express a change of state or place (Curme 1966 calls such verbs "mutatives"). Thus,

prototypical HAVE verbs should easily passivize, while prototypical BE verbs should not, since they already have a patient subject. It is only when the clause is more transitive, when the active subject can also be viewed as agent-like —e.g. has [some] volitional control over the event—that a passive becomes acceptable with BE-aux verbs, e.g. verbs denoting locomotion.

However, the farther away from the prototypical extremes one gets, the more room for variation we find. It is clear that in a number of non-prototypical cases there is room for differences of interpretation, since the criteria are “fuzzy” and allow for varying possibilities of construal. This is perhaps best seen in cases where a given verb can take either HAVE or BE, but with fairly clear semantic differences which correspond to our prototypes (cf. Curme 1960:287ff., Drosdowski 1984:121ff., Jørgensen 1966:32ff. for German; Geerts 1984:518ff. for Dutch). In both languages we find many transitive/causative versus intransitive/resultative verb pairs such as *auftauen/ontdooien* ‘to thaw’, *brechen/breken* ‘to break’, *heilen/genezen, helen* ‘to heal’, *reißen/scheuren* ‘to tear’, *schmelzen/smelten* ‘to melt’, *trocknen/drogen* ‘to dry’, *verderben/bederven* ‘to spoil’, *verbrennen/verbranden* ‘to burn (up)’, *ziehen/trekken* ‘to pull, move’, etc. Here the verbs relate very closely to the opposite prototypes and therefore take the corresponding perfect aux (cf. 33).

(33) a. Er *hat* das Eisen gebrochen/geschmolzen.

b. Hij *heeft* het ijzer gebroken/gesmolten.

‘He has broken/melted the iron.’

c. Das Eisen *ist* gebrochen/geschmolzen.

d. Het ijzer *is* gebroken/gesmolten.

‘The iron broke/melted.’

Moreover, there are a number of intransitive verbs in both languages which can take either HAVE or BE: HAVE is used when the duration of the action or event is focused on, whereas BE is found when the completion or result is the focus (cf. 34). This list appears to be much larger in German, where it includes verbs such as *altern* ‘to age’, *bleichen* ‘to bleach, fade’, *faulen* ‘to rot’, *gären* ‘to ferment’, *heilen* ‘to heal’, *reifen* ‘to ripen’, *trocknen* ‘to dry’, etc. as in (35) (cf. Curme 1966:290). Note also that several of these verbs also have transitive counterparts, which of course only take HAVE.

(34) a. Es *hat* heute nacht gefroren. b. Het *heeft* vannacht gevroren.

‘There was a frost last night.’

c. Das Wasser *ist* zu Eis gefroren. d. Het water *is* tot ijs gevroren.

‘The water has frozen to ice.’

(35) a. Onkel Harre...*hatte* in der letzten Zeit so merklich gealtert, daß...

‘Lately Uncle Harre had aged so noticeably that...’

b. Obgleich sie furchtbar gealtert *war*. ‘Although she had aged terribly.’

c. Die Wunde *hat* gut/*ist* geheilt. ‘The wound healed (well).’

In addition, intransitive verbs of motion normally take BE in both languages, because even though the subject may act under his own power, the

view is toward his being affected in the sense of changing his position—especially if a goal is mentioned. However, for at least some verbs in both languages HAVE or BE can be used in the perfect, depending on whether the emphasis is on the change of position toward a goal or simply on the activity involved. This leads to well-known contrasts as in (36).

(36) a. Viele Leute *haben* getanzt. b. Vele mensen *hebben* gedansd.

‘Many people danced.’

c. Die Kinder *sind* nach draußen getanzt.

d. De kinderen *zijn* naar buiten gedansd.

‘The children danced outside [= goal].’

Similar examples can be found with any number of other verbs of motion in both languages: HAVE places emphasis on the activity itself continuing in time (non-perfective; cf. 37a/b), as opposed to attaining an endpoint or directional goal (perfective; cf. 38), which also correlates with the occurrence of different adverbs. However, the tendency with pure verbs of locomotion seems to be to use BE always.

(37) a. Ich *habe* stundenlang geschwommen/gerudert.

b. Ik *heb* urenlang gezwommen/geroeid.

‘I swam/rowed for hours.’

(38) a. Ich *bin* zur anderen Seite geschwommen/gerudert.

b. Ik *ben* naar de overkant gezwommen/geroeid.

‘I swam/rowed to the other side.’

Finally (cf. Jørgensen 1966:34), when the subject of verbs of motion like *fließen* ‘to flow’, *laufen/rinnen* ‘to run’, *tropfen* ‘to drip’ denotes the entity which moves (i.e. patient/theme), as is normally the case (cf. 39), the aux is BE (and furthermore, we can note, if the subject is human, e.g. with *laufen*, the clause may passivize!). However, when these verbs are found with a “transposed subject” indicating the source/location (cf. 40) instead of the patient or theme, then the aux is HAVE (and, we note, passive is not possible!), since the meaning then corresponds more to that of the HAVE-aux type (non-affected subject, durative).

(39) a. Der Wein *ist* aus dem Faß gelaufen/geronnen/geleckt.

‘The wine ran (flowed)/leaked out of the keg.’

b. *Vom Wein wird aus dem Faß gelaufen/geronnen.

c. Das Faß *hat* gelaufen/geronnen/geleckt.

d. *Vom Faß wird gelaufen/geronnen/geleckt.

(40) a. Das Wasser *ist* auf den Boden getropft.

‘The water dripped onto the floor.’

b. *Vom Wasser wird auf den Boden getropft.

c. Der Wasserhahn *hat* getropft. ‘The faucet dripped.’

d. *Vom Wasserhahn wird getropft.

There are many more cases of aux selection which merit discussion here. Interesting differences are to be found within the same language between

dialects, e.g. the German positional verbs *liegen* 'to lie', *sitzen* 'to sit', and *stehen* 'to stand', which in the North take HAVE but in the South BE; between closely related languages like German and Dutch, e.g. verbs denoting a beginning or end, which take HAVE in German but BE in Dutch; and finally between languages of less closely related families such as Germanic and Romance, e.g. in reflexive clauses, which take HAVE in Germanic but BE in Romance. There also remain some verbs which apparently represent quite marked exceptions to the prototypes, e.g. *sein/zijn* 'to be', *bleiben/blijven* 'to remain'), which take BE, and in Dutch there are even some apparently transitive verbs which take BE in the perfect, e.g. *verliezen* 'to lose', *vergeten* 'to forget', *volgen* 'to follow'. Possibly such synchronic exceptions can only be explained historically (cf. Shannon to appear c). Lack of space, however, precludes here the discussion which such examples warrant. Suffice it to say that the predicates in question are not prototypical BE-aux or HAVE-aux verbs and the differences seem to have arisen due to the fuzziness of the criteria in such nonprototypical cases which leads to different possible construals.

7. Conclusion. In this paper we have shown that the 1AEX proposed by RG to account for the lack of certain passives is not necessary since the same data (and others) can be accounted for in a much more natural and plausible fashion. Instead we have proposed a prototype analysis of passive as defocusing agentlike active subjects and thus being sensitive to the transitivity properties of the clause in question. This alternative approach was seen to be superior to that of RG both empirically and in terms of its explanatory value. Since the 1AEX essentially provided the only evidence in favor of the so-called advancement analysis of impersonal passives, we also have indirectly brought the latter analysis, as well as the laws and principles which interact with it—viz. the Motivated Chômage Law and the Final I Law—into serious question. In addition, in place of the analysis of perfect aux selection in terms of unaccusativity, a prototype analysis was given here: prototypical HAVE-aux verbs are very high in transitivity, whereas prototypical BE-aux verbs are low in it. This also helps explain the noted frequent, though not necessarily exclusive correlation between BE-aux and lack of passivizability: since BE-aux verbs are typically low in transitivity (especially: they have patient-like subjects), they should not normally undergo passive, which defocuses agent-like subjects. In general, it seems that RG suffers from the same problem of other autonomous syntactic theories: in looking for interesting syntactic accounts one does not try very hard to pursue alternative semantic explanations, even when the data beg for such an explanation. I hope to have shown here that such alternatives definitely can and should be pursued.

NOTES

1. For typographical reasons I use boxlike stratal diagrams instead of the standard arc-shaped ones; for convenience I also use English glosses to stand for the German and Dutch lexemes in question. Note also that many of the examples given here are taken from or modelled after those in the literature, although the sources are not always indicated.

2. The same holds true for Perlmutter's (1981, 1982) arguments against formulating verb agreement in Achenese in semantic terms. Pace Perlmutter, it appears that the Achenese verb agrees with the most agentlike entity in the clause down to but not including the very low end of the spectrum, i.e. patients. This accounts for the fact—which Perlmutter (1982:297) finds puzzling—that the predicate 'to sleep' has agreement, but 'to be asleep' does not; clearly the former is to a certain extent volitionally controllable, whereas the latter is not. Cf. Shannon (to appear b) for more on control.
3. Heidolph (1984:551) points out that such verbs may indeed passivize, but only—as we would expect from our analysis—if a personal agent is presupposed, as in (i), which is based on a sentence like (ii).
(i). Es wurde gegen die Tür gedonnert. 'There was thundering against the door.'
(ii). Er hat gegen die Tür gedonnert.
4. Note that the verbs in (7) are not strictly speaking transitive (i.e. ones taking an accusative direct object), at least not in German.
5. Such a passive would violate the restriction against inanimate agents in impersonal passives. Note also that the corresponding Dutch verb is not reflexive, but it still does not passivize, due to its patient subject.
i. De deur opende. ii. *Door de deur werd geopend.
6. In a sense perhaps the reflexive object is here incorporated into the verb, as is possible elsewhere in German (as opposed to Dutch) as in (i) (from Curme 1960: 338), where the verb does not agree with the apparently non-advanced active objects; note that in the last part the object is even written together with the verb as one word.
i. Unter diesen wurde [sg.] fleißig Karten [pl!] gespielt, gemäßigte Parkpromenaden [pl.] gemacht...und unabsehbar viel 'kannegegossen'.
'Among these [folks] there was diligently played cards, leisurely walks in the park taken...and a lot of "can pouring" [= political bantering] done.'

REFERENCES

- Comrie, Bernard. 1977. "In defense of spontaneous demotion: The impersonal passive." In *Syntax and semantics 8: Grammatical relations*, edited by Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, 47-98. New York: Academic Press.
- Curme, George O. 1960². *A grammar of the German language*. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Drosdowski, Günter (ed.). 1984⁴. *Duden. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Fagan, Sarah M. B. 1986. "The unaccusative hypothesis and a reflexive construction in German and Dutch." Paper presented at the Second Symposium on Germanic Linguistics.
- Geerts, G. et al. (eds.). 1984. *Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst*. Groningen/Leuven: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Heidolph, Karl Erich et al. 1984². *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*. (East) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

- Hoekstra, T. 1984. *Transitivity. Grammatical relations in government-binding theory*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hopper, P. & S. Thompson. 1980. "Transitivity in grammar and discourse." *Language* 56: 251-299.
- Jørgensen, Peter. 1966. *German grammar III*. New York University Press.
- Kirsner, Robert S. 1975. "On the mechanism of the restriction of the Dutch 'pseudo-passive' to human actions." *CUWPL* 2: 109-143.
- , 1979. *The problem of presentative sentences in modern Dutch*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Langacker, Ronald W. To appear. "Transitivity, case, and grammatical relations: A cognitive grammar prospectus."
- Perlmutter, D. M. 1981. "Functional grammar and relational grammar: Points of convergence and divergence." In *Perspectives on functional grammar*, edited by Teun Hoekstra et al., 319-352. Dordrecht: Foris.
- , 1982. "Syntactic representations, syntactic levels, and the notion of subject." In *The nature of syntactic representation*, edited by Pauline Jacobson and Geoffrey H. Pullum, 283-352. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- , To appear. "Multiattachment and the unaccusative hypothesis: The perfect auxiliary in Italian."
- & Paul M. Postal. 1977. "Toward a universal characterization of passivization." In *BLS* 3, 394-417.
- & Paul M. Postal. 1984a. "The 1-advancement exclusiveness law." In Perlmutter & Rosen, 81-125.
- & Paul M. Postal. 1984b. "Impersonal passives and some relational laws." In Perlmutter & Rosen, 126-170.
- & Carol G. Rosen (eds.). 1984 *Studies in relational grammar* 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rice, Sally. 1987. "Toward a transitive prototype: Evidence from some atypical English passives." Paper presented at BLS 13.
- Rosen, Carol G. 1984. "The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations." In Perlmutter and Rosen, 38-77.
- Shannon, Thomas F. To appear a. "Passives, dummies and relational grammar in Dutch." To appear in the Proceedings of the third international conference on Netherlandic Studies.
- , To appear b. *Aspects of complementation and control in German*.
- , To appear c. "The history of the perfect auxiliary in Germanic and Romance." Paper to be presented at the VIIIth International Conference on Historical Linguistics.
- Shibatani, M. 1985. "Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis." *Language* 61: 821-848.
- Van Oosten, Jeanne H. 1984. *On the nature of subject, topics and agents: A cognitive explanation*. UCB dissertation.