

Reports on the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of
the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society

Some Remarks on Adjectival Past Participles

Joe Morita, Hideki Tanaka, and Masanobu Ueda

Adjectival passive participles (henceforth, APPs) have two uses, namely, the attributive use and the predicative use, just as do adjectives. We bring up two special topics related to the respective uses: APPs as compounds out of verbs with resultative predicates and APPs derived from a certain type of causative verb.

Let us begin with the first topic. A compound formed from a verb with a resultative is exemplified by the expression *the white-painted wall*, which is derived from the resultative expression *to paint the wall white*. Yumoto (1991:117) claims that this kind of APP is quite productive, as in (1a). We observe, however, that compounds out of resultative expressions are not always acceptable.

- (1) a. the white-painted wall, the red-dyed hair, the clean-wiped table
 b. *the smooth-dragged log, *the thin-run pavement, *the dry-drunk teapot

What is it that distinguishes (1a) from (1b)? We claim that the former is distinguished from the latter in terms of Washio's (1997) classification of resultative predicates. Verbs in base expressions of (1a) type inherently specify the result state of the object, and resultative predicates elaborate the result state. On the other hand, verbs in base expressions of (1b) type do not specify the result state of the object, and thus resultative predicates describe the result state independently of the verbs' meaning. More specifically, in the base expression *to paint the wall white* (1a type), the verb phrase *to paint the wall* implies a change in color of the wall, and the resultative *white* specifies the color. In the base expression *to drag the log smooth* (1b type), by contrast, the verb phrase *to drag the log* does not imply any change in state of the log, and the resultative *smooth* by itself specifies the result state of the log.

In Washio's (1997) terminology, resultative predicates occurring in (1a) are called "weak resultatives," and those occurring in (1b) "strong resultatives." Adopting this classification, we conclude that APP compounds are acceptable only when they are derived from resultative expressions of weak type.

The following example appears at first glance to pose a problem for the above conclusion, which shows that the APP derived from *hammer* with the resultative *flat* is at best marginal, if not totally unacceptable as in (2).

- (2) ??flat-hammered metal

We would like to attribute this marginality to the verb *hammer* as a non-prototypical transitive verb. Indeed, examples given in Jackendoff (1990:226) seem to provide support for our solution. He observes that *hammer* in transitive use is odd, as in (3a), whereas the verb can occur felicitously with an oblique complement, as in (3b).

- (3) a. ?Harry hammered the metal.
 b. Harry hammered on the metal.

It follows from this consideration that *hammer* is not a prototypical transitive verb. In light of Washio's claim that only transitive verbs can enter into weak resultatives, the resultative expression *to hammer the metal flat* is not a prototype of the weak

resultative. For this reason, (2) is degraded in acceptability. It is worth noting that (2) is better than (1b). It may be presumed that (2) is situated at an intermediate point on the continuum whose ends are weak and strong resultatives. Aspects defining the continuum would include the specificity of the result state in the frame evoked by a given verb.

Let us turn to examples with APPs in their predicative use. Based on the insight which Iwata (1995) has given to psych-predicates, we examine the status of the *by*-phrase in the first place, and then the kind of complement clause that verbs of *convince* type select. Consider the following pair of APPs:

- (4) a. *It appeared challenged by the lawyers.
 b. It seemed challenged by the new findings.

The difference between (4a) and (4b) resides in the agentivity of the entities in the *by*-phrases. In contrast with *the new findings* in (4b), human nouns such as *the lawyers* in (4a) have a high degree of agentivity. We can thus say that APPs are incompatible with entities with high agentivity. What follows is to explain this fact.

Of the properties that *convince*-type verbs have, what attracts our attention most is the finite/non-finite contrast observed in the following pairs of examples:

- (5) a. He seems persuaded that John will leave. (Fabb 1984: 155-6)
 b. *He seemed persuaded to take the trolley.
 (6) a. John's persuasion of Mary that she (should) be examined by the doctor
 b. *John's persuasion of Mary to be examined by the doctor (Oishi 1998:64)

APPs and nominalizations allow finite clauses, as in the (a) examples, but not non-finite clauses, as in the (b) examples. We attribute the contrast in (5-6) to the absence vs. presence of what Iwata (1995) calls CAUSE_R. We claim that it is responsible for the agentivity that these verbs may have. Interestingly, some causative verbs, which take only a nonfinite complement clause, differ from verbs of *convince* type in that they can appear as APPs, as shown in (7):

- (7) a. Caesar feels forced/compelled/impelled to go to Egypt.
 b. *Caesar feels convinced/persuaded to go to Egypt.

These causative verbs are regarded as having CAUSE, but not CAUSE_R in conceptual structure, with the former not going against APPs for some reason. We leave open, however, the issue as to why these two "CAUSE" functions differ in this respect.

REFERENCES: Fabb, N. A. J. (1984) *Syntactic Affixation*. Ph.D dissertation, MIT; Iwata, S. (1995) "The Distinctive Character of Psych-Verbs as Causatives." *Linguistic Analysis* 25, 95-120; Jackendoff, R. (1990) *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA; Oishi, T. (1998) "Keitairon to Togoron no Togo ni tsuite." *Report of the Special Research Project for the Typological Investigation of Languages and Cultures of the East and West* (Part I).; Yumoto, Y. (1991) "The Role of Aspectual Features in Morphology." *English Linguistics* 8, 104-123; Washio, R. (1997) "Resultative, Compositionality and Language Variation." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6, 1-49.