

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910792037103321
Titolo	Non-canonical passives [[electronic resource] /] / edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Florian Schafer
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Amsterdam, : John Benjamins Pub. Co., 2013
ISBN	1-299-28379-9 90-272-7227-1
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (367 p.)
Collana	Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, , 0166-0829 ; ; v. 205
Altri autori (Persone)	AlexiadouArtemis SchaferFlorian
Disciplina	415/.6
Soggetti	Grammar, Comparative and general - Passive voice Grammar, Comparative and general - Topic and comment Causal relations (Linguistics) Generative grammar
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Non-Canonical Passives; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of contents; Non-canonical passives; 1. Foreword; 2. Introduction; 3. Defining passives; 3.1 The standard view; 3.2 On the syntactic reality of implicit agents; 4. Canonical vs. non-canonical passives; 4.1 The case of the English get-passive; 4.2 Beyond English; 5. Summary and overview; References; Adjectival passives and adjectival participles in English; 1. Identifying (different types of) adjectival participles; 2. Theme externalization; 2.1 Coordination and ATB; 2.2 Prenominal participles 3. Implicit Initiators in adjectival participles 3.1 Disjoint reference and coreference; 3.2 Constraints on by-phrases; 3.3. Purpose clauses; 4. Unaccusative-based participles; 4.1 Unaccusative participles are productive with clear result states; 4.2 Why transitives are not subject to the result state requirement; 5. Semantic and syntactic analyses; 5.1 Transitive resultative participles, externalization and implicit Initiators; 5.2 Other types of participles; 6. Conclusion; References; The get-passive at the intersection of get and the passive; 1. Introduction 2. Differences between the get-passive and the be-passive 2.1 Defining

the get-passive; 2.2 Sociolinguistic differences: Register and style; 2.3 Semantic differences: Adversative reading and secondary agent; 2.4 Syntactic differences: Get and the participle; 3. Corpus-based insights; 3.1 Corpus information; 3.2 Revisiting the adversity effect; 3.3 Revisiting the involved subject (secondary agent reading); 3.4 Revisiting the implicit argument; 4. Conclusion; References; Three "competing" auxiliaries of a non-canonical passive; 1. Introduction; 2. Previous research on the German GET passive
3. Auxiliaries of the German GET passive 3.1 Introduction; 3.2 Empirical analyses of auxiliary selection; 4. Summary; References; Variations in non-canonical passives; 1. Introduction; 2. On the chameleonic character of the get and bei passives; 3. The fine structure of the non-canonical passive; 4. On lexical choice and the syntax of the so-called 'give-passive' in Mandarin; 5. Summary and conclusion; References; How much bekommen is there in the German bekommen passive?; 1. Introduction; 2. Varieties of ditransitive verbs; 3. Experiment; 3.1 Method; 3.2 Results; 3.3 Discussion
4. Corpus study 5. General discussion; References; Haben-statives in German; 1. Introduction; 2. Haben-statives in the context of related constructions; 2.1 Stative vs. perfect construction with haben; 2.2 Haben-stative vs. bekommen-passive; 3. The adjectival status of the participle; 3.1 Some evidence; 3.2 Rothstein's approach (2007); 3.3 Critique of Rothstein's approach; 4. Towards an analysis of haben-statives; 4.1 Auxiliary and main verb haben; 4.2 Constituency and depictives; 4.3 Prenominal vs. postnominal adjective/participle; 5. An open question; 6. Concluding remarks; References
Another passive that isn't one

Sommario/riassunto

This paper highlights similarities between two classes of arguably non-canonical passives, namely 'deponent' verbs familiar from Latin, and 'inherent reflexive' verbs in Germanic and Romance, arguing that the latter are the counterparts of the former - notably, both classes of verbs are denominal/deadjectival. Building on the idea that overt morphological voice markings reflect feature distinctions associated with v0 in the syntax, I argue that the special 'unaccusative' morphology (i.e. reflexive or non-active) doesn't just bear on the absence of an external argument in the syntax, but
