Event semantics aligned with Bech's status of the verbum infinitum

Werner Abraham
Ludwig-Maximilian-University Munich

Abstract
The paper aims at extending Bech's survey of complement valence in Standard German with examples from Southern German ('Oberdeutsch'), where gerundial forms replace prepositional infinitives of Standard German as well as bare infinitives governed by non-modals (in the function of the so-called 'absentive'). In a second step, an attempt is made to align the result of this extended inventory with Carlson's distinction between individual and stage level predicates. The idea behind this comparison is that stage level readings as well as individual level readings are dependent on aspectual properties of the complements in a variety of typical cases. This fact by itself appears to warrant such an attempt and decidedly enriches Bech's system for German and partly extends to Dutch.

1. Background and goal

The present discussion extends Gallmann's (2014) reinterpretation of Bech (1983) adding above all gerundial forms in German Southern dialects as well as seeking modes of alignment with semantic verb classification in the sense of Carlson (1977). In this sense, the paper goes far beyond Bech and Gallmann.

Drawing on distinctions of non-finite verbal forms in Classical Latin, the Danish linguist Gunnar Bech developed the following classification of non-finite verbal forms and functions in German (Bech 1983:12-13). The novel idea of this classification rests in the fact that valence is not viewed under the angle of the valence governor, but under the perspective of the complement. Such a view is fruitful only under clear restrictions on the type of complement, in our specific case non-finite verb forms governed

Sten Vikner, Henrik Jørgensen & Elly van Gelderen (eds.): ***Let us have articles betwixt us – Papers in Historical and Comparative Linguistics in Honour of Johanna L. Wood.***
Dept. of English, School of Communication & Culture, Aarhus University,
pp.11-42,

by finite predicates. See Table 1 (where G=German, E=English, D=Dutch.- Notice that, following German and Dutch orthographic use, full sentences begin with a capital letter, non-sentential examples, however, with a small one.).[1]

	Grade 1: non-finite complement of full verb	Phrase status	**Grade 2:** predicative	Phrase status	**Grade 2:** attributive
Status 1: bare infinitive complement					
1 G	Er konnte es nicht länger **lesen.**	bare infinitive. PRES	(ein es) **lesend**(er.M. NOM. SG)	PresP	.M.NOM.SG
E	He could no longer **read** it.		a *it **reading** one	*	-
D	Hij kon ´t niet langer **lezen**.		‘n het **lezend(e)**	PresP	.NOM.SG
Status 2: prepositional/P-infinitive complement					
2 G	*Er vermochte es nicht mehr **zu lesen.***	P-infinitive. PRES	*ein es **zu lesen(d**(er*.M. NOM.SG)	P-PresP	.F.NOM.SG
E	*He was no longer able **to read** it.*		*(*an (*it) **to read** one)*	*	-
D	*Hij was niet in staat het te lezen.*		´n het ***te lezend(e***. NOM.SG)	P-PresP	.NOM.SG
Status 3: Participle perfect passive/PPP-complement					
3 G	*Diese Zeilen bleiben **verehrt.***	Predicate result/PPP	***verehrt(e***.NOM.PL)	(result) PPP	.N.NOM.PL
E	*These lines remain **adored.***		***adored***	PPP	PL
D	*Deze lijnen blijven **geliefd.***		***geliefd(e***(NOM. PL))	PPP	NOM.PL

Table 1: Status-grade classification of non-finite verb forms in German, English, and Dutch

[1] Thanks are due to Dr. Jan Kuipers (Groningen). Abbreviations: ACC=accusative case, Compl=complement, Cop(ula), DAT=dative case, GER=gerund (active V-derived substantive), GERV=gerundival (passive V-derived substantive), NOM=nominative case, Pred/Adj=Predicate/adjective, OV=object verb/left directed verb valence, PL=plural, PPP=participle past/ passive, P-infinitive= prepositional infinitive, Pres=present (tense), PresP= present participle, RES=resultative, VO=verb-object/right-directed verb valence.

It is perhaps not quite obvious at first sight that what Bech meant to underline with this classifying strategy is the valence status of verbal complements (for German OV/left-directed government, i.e. CompV: $[V_{[-FIN]}\ [V_{[+FIN]}]]$). The underlying three status stages (first column in Table 1) comprises bare infinitive - prepositional infinitive - past participle. By contrast, grade 1-2 (first line in Table 1) distinguishes uninflected (and thus predicative) non-finites (infinitive, participles) as opposed to inflected ones (thus only applicable in attributive function).[2]

Bech's status may be compared with nominal case declension, which depends on the function of the nominal. Thus, status determines the morphological type of the verbal complement: i.e. bare infinitive, prepositional infinitive, and participles as complements of V in VP. Grade (German 'Stufe') indicates the syntactic function of the complement form: i.e. predicative verbal/adjective or attributive adjectival, thus either again V in VP or V in AP. The typologically intriguing fact is that German verb infinitives are hybrids between verbals and nominals. As verbs they extend case and prepositional valence, while as nominals (and adjectivals) they are subject to paradigmatic agreement with the DP-head they are attached to as attributes. See Table 1 for this threefold status distinction and twofold (or equally threefold) grade distinction.

Bech's idea was not only to base a great number of grammatical and paradigmatic phenomena on this fundamental classification, but also to derive other more or less related phenomena with a twofold goal: to extend the range of phenomena to be placed under the roof of this basic classification; and to embed all phenomena in an fully axiomatized system. In pursuing this goal, Bech positioned himself as a predecessor to modern systematic linguistics, above all formal approaches such as structuralism and generative lingusitics, both cast in the form of templatic or derivational systems (see also Fabricius-Hansen 1983 in her preface to Bech 1983). Bech's impact on languages other than German is practically zero, although one can transfer some aspects of the classification to other languages (e.g., following Gallmann 2014:6, French *Jeanne désire* ***entrer*** 'J wants to enter' – *Jeanne se decide à entrer* 'J decides to enter'- *Jeanne rêve* ***d'entrer*** 'J dreams of entering'; English: *John will* ***work*** - *John*

[2] As maintained by Vikner (2001) as well as others, the link between uninflected and predicative only holds in Germanic SOV-languages like German, Dutch, Afrikaans, Frisian, and Yiddish (and vacuously English), not, however, in Romance or in Scandinavian, where predicatives do show agreement morphology.

begins ***to work*** - *John begins* ***working***). The most complete form paradigm is provided by Latin: *Augustus templum* ***restituere*** *iussit* (bare infinitive) 'A ordered the temple to be restored' - *Augustus templum* ***restituendum*** *curavit* (gerundive) 'A took care to have the temple restored' - *Augustus* ***ad templi restituendum*** *curavit* (gerund) 'A took care to have the temple restored'[3] - *Caesar Germanos* ***venientes*** *vidit* (Present participle) 'C saw the Germanics arriving' - *Iulia ad cubiculum* ***dormitum*** *iit* (Supine I) 'J went to bed to sleep' - *Horribile* ***dictu*** (Supine II) 'horrible to say'.

The present discussion takes up Bech's classification and tries to integrate forms that were beyond the interest of the Danish author. These forms are part of dialects and regiolects, more oral than written, and they reach back to previous stages of German, Old High German (750-1050) and Middle High German (1050-1350) and presumably even later into Early New High German (1350-1550). This is how we will proceed in this discussion. First, the new data will be introduced and set against the schema in Table 1. It will be seen that no easy reclassification is possible. In another grade, Carlson's classification of events will be taken to accommodate the new data from German. In the conclusion, we will wrap up the brief discussion and say where the advantages of either Bech's or Carlson's approach lies. Throughout it will be interesting to see how the distinctions in German are reflected in modern English and partly also in modern Dutch.

2. Syntactic systematization and the new data

While Bech's classification is based on morphological criteria, Table 2 lists the syntactic distinctions alluded to already in less formal ways in the side columns (columns 3 and 5) in Table 1. [OV-'left projecting' refers to German and Dutch embedded clauses only, while VO-'right projecting' refers to all three languages in matrix clauses].

[3] The difference between the last two Latin versions cannot be rendered in English.

Status L-type	**Grade 1:** full verb complement-left projecting	**Grade 2a:** copula complement-left projecting	**Grade 2b:** attributive-right projecting
1 OV	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *warten*] *konnte*]	??[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *jagend*] *sein*]]]	[$_{NP}$ [$_{A/V}$ *liebender*] *Mann*]
VO	*could wait*	*be hunting*	*loving man*
OV	*<kon> wachten <kon>*	*jagende zijn*	*'n minnende man*
2 OV	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *zu warten*] *vermochte*]	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *zu lieben*] *sein*]]]	[$_{NP}$ [$_{A/V}$ *zu liebender*] *Mann*]
VO	*was able to wait*	*to be loved*	*man to be loved*
OV	*te wachten in staat was*	*bemind zijn*	*man om bemind te zijn*
3 OV	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *ausgetauscht*] *bleiben*]]]	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *geliebt*] *bleiben*]]]	[$_{NP}$ [$_{A/V}$ *geliebter*] *Mann*]
VO	*be/remain exchanged*	*to remain loved*	*loved man*
OV	*onverwisseld zijn/ blijven*	*bemind blijven*	*beminde man*

Table 2: Syntactic analyses of Bech's status and grade distinctions

It is easy to see that Bech's classification is incomplete to the extent that status 1/grade 2 is not represented in modern German. The present participle in predicative usage, *jagend sein* 'be hunting', was last used in Middle High German ((near-)adjectival exceptions are discussed in Lübbe 2013). Leaving this slot unfilled for modern German would severely jeopardize Bech's classification. On the other hand, naturally, it would show us in which respect the diachronic development of verbal complementation of German changed. However, what is completely unaccounted for are forms like *zum Kotzen sein* 'to.DAT.N vomit be'(more often replaced by *um zu kotzen* 'for to vomit', Dutch *om te kotsen',* at least in Standard German). However, this gerundial variant is the rule in oral Southern German in that it supplants entirely the prepositional infinitive of Standard (written) German. In the following examples, mStG=modern Standard German, SG=Southern German ('Upper German').

(1) a mStG Das ist gut zu sehen.
this is good to see/to be seen
b SG i Das ist gut zum Sehen. [4]
this is good to.DAT see
ii Es ist gut (dies) zu sehen.
It is nice for someone to see (this)
iii Das ist gut zu sehen.
This is nice to see
iv Das ist gut zu sehen.
This can clearly be seen
c Dutch vi Dit is goed (om) te zien.
this is good (for) to see
vii Dit is goed te zien.
this is good to see

Variants such as SG (1bi), a clear substantivized use of the infinitive (called henceforth 'gerund' in line with the traditional grammatical terminology; cf. Abraham 2015c), is unknown in the other Germanic languages. The reason is, to all appearances, that the type of cliticized case inflection as in *zum*.NOUN. NEUTER.DATIVE.SINGULAR has no way of representation in other languages. What we then have to do is to extend Bech's classification with respect to the gerund and insert another status subclass under grade 1 as a complement not only of a limited class of full verbs (comprising *versuchen* 'attempt' and *beabsichtigen* 'intend') and above all the copula (*Da ist nichts zum Sehen* 'there is nothing to be seen') and a limited class of other full verbs. What we are interested in is thus (a) which slots have become empty in the diachronic course of German and (b) which forms existed earlier (as, presumably, retained in dialects of SG), but are difficult to account for in Bech's systematics.

Let us list then non-finite forms in complementation of the copula as in Table 3 (with the attributive slot left out as redundant here).

[4] As there is no P-infinitive in SG, this form is ambiguous between (1a,b).

Status	**1st grade:** bare infinitives complemented-left projecting	**2nd grade:** gerund complements-left projecting
1 G	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ **warten sein*]] [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *jagen sein*]	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *jagend(e)*] *sein*]]] [$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{PP}$ *am/beim* [$_{V/N}$ *Jagen*]]*sein*]]
E	*to be waiting/hunting*	*to be hunting*
D	**wachten/jagen zijn*	*wachtend(e)/jagend(e) zijn*
2	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *zu *warten/sehen*] *sein*]	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *zu *schlafend`*/liebend*] *sein*]]]
E	*to be *wait/*see*	*to be sleeping/loving*
D	*te *wachten/zien zijn*	*to be waiting/seeing*
3	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *verehrt*] *sein*]]]	(ein-) [$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *verehrte-*] *sein*]]]
E	*to be adored*	*to be *(an) adored (one)*
D	*vereerd zijn*	*(`n) vereerd- zijn*

Table 3: Distinct copula complements extending cross-classifying Bech's status and grade system

Obviously, status 1/grade 1 is ungrammatical for specific predicate lexemes (**warten sein*) as opposed to others (*jagen sein*). Note that copula+bare infinitive carries a specific reading, i.e. an absentive one. According to Abraham (2006), this needs to be accounted for by a covert predicate denoting absence (such as *(weg) sein jagen* 'to be off hunting'). Notice that the very same account does not work for other verbs, i.e. *(weg) *warten sein* 'be off waiting' although *jagen* 'hunt; chase' and *warten* 'wait' are identical under the criterion of mono-valence. Note also that the same functional status is missing under grade 2, i.e. complemental present participle.

What carries even more weight is the fact that there are profound differences under status 2 in that only transitive verbs are eligible, thus eliminating intransitives. Yet, see German (2a,b) as opposed to German (2c), which replaces the subject *dies* 'this' by the expletive *es* 'it'.

(2) a. Das ist gut zu sehen.
This is good to see/to be seen
b. *Das ist gut zu warten/laufen.
This is good to wait/run
c. Es ist hier gut zu warten/laufen.
It is good to wait/run here.

German *sehen* 'see' in (2a) is transitive, while *warten* 'wait' and *laufen* 'run' in (2b) are intransitives. The subject in (2a) has object status with respect to *sehen* 'see', whereas no such valence status can be addressed for the subject function in (2b). We draw the obvious conclusion that the P-infinitival construal passivizes only where the required demotion can be carried out with transitives. With intransitives, there is no external argument to be demoted yielding ungrammatical (2b). Yet, passivization of intransitives, a special asset of German, is possible. Not even Dutch is on a par. See Dutch (3a-c) as distinct from German (2c) and (3d,e).

(3) a Het/er is om de hoek beter *(om) te wachten.
It/Expl is around the corner better (for) to wait
b Het/er is op deze bosbodem goed *(om) te lopen.
It/Expl is on this forest ground good (for) to run
c Deze bosbodem loopt beter.
This forest ground runs comfortably
d Es läuft sich gut auf diesem Waldboden.
*it-runs-*REFL*-well-on-this-forest ground*
e *Dieser Boden läuft (sich) angenehm.
*this ground-runs(-*REFL*)-comfortably*

Dutch (3c) is a middle construction with the original place adverb raising to subject of a valence promoted verb *lopen* 'run'. Nothing reflects this valence change on the verb in the languages under discussion except in German, which uses the reflexive to signal valence demotion (Abraham 1994). Neither English nor Dutch signal such up- or downgrading of lexical valence, while German possesses only very few verbs ambiguous between both valences, i.e. transitive/causative as well as intransitive/anticausative represented by one lexical form only (Abraham 2000, 2008). German allows no underspecification of morphological valence, while the other Germanic languages do freely.

There is one other type of phenomenon to be reclassified in Bech's system. See the following illustrations common in Southern German dialects to even outranging the prepositional infinitive in Standard German as a verbal complement. While (4a,b) are common Austrian-Bavarian, (5a-d) are modern High Alemannic (Montafon, Vorarlberg in Western Austria). Notice the gerundial forms where StG would use P-infinitives as in (1a,b). [iV=intransitive verb, tV=transitive verb; MStG unless indicated]

(4) Gerund object (Bavarian-Austrian regiolectal)
a Er versucht noch **zum Warten**$_{iV}$.
he tries still to.DAT wait.INF.N
b Er beginnt das Auto **zum Warten**$_{tV}$.
he begins the car to.DAT service.INF.N

(5) (High Alemannic, Tschagguns/Montafon)
a Se senn (aweg) ötschas **ga regla**$_{tV}$.
StG gloss: *sie sind etwas gen regeln*
StG translation: *Sie sind **(weg)** etwas **zu** regeln*
they are (off) something to take care of

(High Alemannic, Bludenz/Vorarlberg)
b (Er isch net doo. -) Er **isch (aweg) gi iikoofa**$_{iV}$.
StG translation: *Er ist nicht da -) Er ist (weg) **zum** Einkaufen.*
(he is not here.-) he is (off) shopping

(High Alemannic, Tschagguns/Montafon)
c Eer is (aweg) ötschas **ga iikoofa**$_{tV}$.
StG gloss: *er ist (weg) etwas gen einkaufen*
StG translation: *Er ist (weg) etwas einkaufen*
he is (off) something to shop

(High Alemannic, Tschagguns/Montafon)
d Eer goot ötschas g**a öbrkoo**$_{tV}$.
StG gloss: *Er geht etwas gen (überkommen/)bekommen.*
StG translation: *Er wird etwas bekommen*
he goes/is off getting something

The Alemannic examples use the preposition *ga/gi,* deriving from MHG *gen/gegen* 'toward' (which assigns accusative, which, however, does not show on the infinitives). The equally gerundial usage is much clearer in Austrian-Bavarian *zum* in (4) with the clitical neuter dative singular morphology *–m* (German infinitives decline as neuters: *das*$_{NOM}$ *Warten/ Laufen / zu (de-)m*$_{DAT}$ *Warten/Laufen*).

The two types of gerundial forms in (4)-(5) have a couple of prepositional parallels. See the copula dependent infinitival complements (6) with prepositions instead of *ga* and *zum*.

(6) a Er ist noch **am** Warten.
he is still on wait
b **beim** Frisieren sein
with hair styling be
c **mit** dem Kochen noch warten
with the cooking still wait
d Er ist den Hahn **am** Schlachten.
he ist he cock on slaughter

German grammars classify (6a, b, d) as Rhenian progressives with their status rated as verbal forms. Abraham (2015c) argues on the basis of distributional distinctions that they are to be seen as gerunds, i.e. nominalized infinitives. All grammars of Old and Middle High German agree that infinitives as complements of prepositions declined the preposition+clitic article for case (cf. Abraham 2015c).

One immediate way to reclassify the pertinent gerunds in Bech's system would be to extend status 2/grade 1 to these phenomena. Needless to say that the implications are profound, related to the definite article in cliticized form and nominal gender, number, and (dative) case. Bech's system foresees no classificatory labels and, consequently, there are no system slots for this. Table 3 sketches this situation including the new data material under list numbers 14-21. Table 4 also focuses those slots that are not valid in modern standard German (starred examples). The gerundial forms need to be seen as competitors with Bech's representations in status 2 of the Verbum infinitum of standard German. In Table 5 the finite predicate is the copula *sein* 'be'.

Table 4 surveys possibilities of alignment of verbal and nominal infinitival complements licensed by full verbs and the copula in Bech's system.[5]

[5] Notice that there are (cells filled by) starred examples and cells with minuses in them. Minuses mean that the grammaticality decisions are the same as in the same column higher up, albeit with different lexicals, and the respective forms are not repeated.

Status 1, Grade 1 - predicative	Word class	Grade 2a - copula-predicative	Word class	Grade 2b - adj. attribute	DP-agree-ment
1 *Er durfte sie nicht* ***lieben***$_{tV}$. he was allowed her not love	Pres. infinitive	****liebend***$_{tV}$	Pres. parti-ciple	*ein* ***lieben-der***	Pres. parti-ciple
2 *Er konnte nicht länger* ***warten***$_{iV}$. he could not longer wait		****wartend***$_{tV}$		*ein* ***warten-der***	
3 *Er mag das Auto* ***warten***$_{tV}$. he likes the car service		****wartend***$_{tV}$		***ein warten-der/-*es***	
4 *Holz kann heftig* ***brennen***$_{iV}$. wood may vehemently burn		****brennend***$_{iV}$		*ein* ***bren-nendes***	
5 *Er kann alles* ***verbrennen***$_{tV}$. he may all burn up		****ver-brennend***$_{tV}$		*ein* ***verbren-nender/*-es***	
6 *Der Holzstoß muss* ***verbrennen***$_{eV}$. the wood pile must burn up		****ver-brennend***$_{eV}$		*ein* ***verbren-nendes/-*er***	

Status 2a, Grade 1 (predicative)		Grade 2a		Grade 2b	
7 *Er begann sie* ***zu lieben***$_{tV}$. he began her to love	Pres.P-infinitive	***zu liebend***$_{tV}$	Pres.P-GER	*ein* ***zu liebender***$_{tV}$	Pres. GERV
8 *Er versuchte noch* ***zu warten***$_{iV}$. he tried yet to wait		***zu wartend***$_{iV}$		* *ein*$_{SUBJ}$ ***zu wartender***$_{iV}$	
9 *Er versprach das Auto* ***zu warten***$_{tV}$. he promised the car to tune up		***zu wartend***$_{tV}$		*ein*$_{DO}$ ***zu wartendes***$_{tV}$	
10 *Holz begann heftig* ***zu brennen***$_{iV}$. the wood began vehemently to burn		***zu brennend***$_{iV}$		***ein* *zu brennendes***$_{iV}$	
11 *Er begann alles* ***zu verbrennen***$_{tV}$. he began everything to burn up		***zu verbrennend***$_{tV}$		*ein* ***zu verbrennendes***$_{tV}$	
Status 2b, Grade 1 (predicative)		Grade 2a		Grade 2b	
12 *Er versucht noch* ***zum Warten*** . he tried still to.dat wait.NOUN	PresP-GER/ P-object	–	–	–	–
13 *Er beginnt das Auto* ***zum Warten***. he starts the car to.dat maintain.NOUN		–		–	

Status 2c, Grade 1 (predicative)		Grade 2a		Grade 2b	
14 *Se senn ötschas* ***ga regla***. they are something to take care of	Pres. P-gerd / copula P-com-plmt.	–	–	–	–
15a *(Er isch net doo. -) Er isch* ***gi iikoofa***. he is not here – he is to shop		–		–	
15b *Eer goot ötschas* ***ga öbrkoo***. he goes something to get		–		–	
Status 2d, Grade 1 (predicative)		**Grade 2a**		**Grade 2b**	
16 *Er ist noch* ***am Warten***. he is yet on waiting	Pres. P-GER / Cop+P Compl	–	–	–	–
17 ***beim Frisieren*** *sein* on hairstyling be		–		–	
18 ***mit dem Kochen*** *noch warten* with the.DAT cook still wait		–		–	P-adverb
19 *Er ist* ***den Hahn am Schlachten***. he is the cock on slaughter	DO-excor-porating GER	–	–	–	hybrid between V and adverb

Status 3, Grade 1 (predicative)		Grade 2a		Grade 2b	
20 *Diese Seiten bleiben* ***ausgetauscht*** these pages remain undistributed	Past participle	***ausgetauscht*** *(sein) distributed be*	Past Participle	*diese*$_{DO}$ ***ausgetauschten*** *these distributed ones*	Attribute
21 *Er hat fleißig* ***gearbeitet*** he has diligently worked		***gearbeitet*** *(haben)* worked have		**ein*$_{SUBJ}$ ***gearbeitet-(seiend/ ?habend)er***	

Table 4: Verbal and nominal infinitival complements licensed by full verbs and the copula in Bech's system

In contrast to Table 4, the following Table 5 varies the finite verb, replacing full verbs by the copula, which results in new predicate clusters with different syntactic behaviour and valence licenses.

Status 1/Grade 1 (predicative): copulae: *sein* 'be', *bleiben* 'stay'	morph category	Status 1/ Grade 2a predicative	Morph category	Status 1/ Grade 2b (Adj-Attrib)	DP-agr.
22 *Er ist gerade* ***unterrichten*** he is just now teach	Pres. Inf.	*??* ***unterrichtend*** teaching	Pres. Part.	*ein* ***unterrichtender*** a teaching (person)	Pres. Part.
23*??Er bleibt noch* ***unterrichten*** he keeps still teach					
24 #*Es bleibt noch* ***unterrichten*** it.EXPL keeps still teach					
25 *Er/Es ist* ***zu unterrichten*** he/it.EXPL is to teach	Pres. P-inf.	****zu unterrichtend*** to teaching	Pres. P-GER	*ein* ***zu unterrichtender*** a to teaching.M.SG.NOM	Pres. GERV
26 **Er/Es ist noch länger* ***zu warten*** he/it.EXPL is still longer to wait		****zu wartend*** to wait			
27*??Es bleibt noch länger* ***zu warten*** it.EXPL keeps still longer zu wait		****zu wartend*** to wait			

Status 2a Grade 1		Status 2a Grade 2a		Status 2a Grade 2b	
28 *Er/Es ist* ***zum Unterrichten*** he/ it.EXPL is still **to**.DAT.SG.N teach	Pres. GER	–	–	–	–
29 *Es ist noch* ***zum Warten*** it.EXPL is still **to**.DAT.SG.N wait		***zum wartend*** to.DAT. SG.N wait		**ein* ***zum Wartendes*** a to.DAT. SG.N wait. SG.N.NOM	
30 *#Es bleibt noch* ***zum Warten*** it.EXPL keeps to.DAT.SG.N wait					
31 *beginnt das Auto* ***zum Warten*** begins the car to tune up					
Status 2b Grade 1		Status 2b Grade 2a		Status 2b Grade 2b	
32 *Er ist/bleibt* ***am Unterrichten*** he is/keeps on.DAT. SG.N teach	Pres. PP-GER	–	–	–	–
33 *Er ist/*bleibt noch am* ***Warten*** he is/keeps on.DAT.SG.N wait					
34 *Er ist* ***den Hahn am Schlachten*** he is th cock on.DAT. SG.N slaughter	DO-ex-corpor-ating GER	–	–	–	–
35 *Sie ist* ***auf ihn am Warten*** she is for him on.DAT.SG.N wait					

Status 3 Grade 1		Status 3 Grade 2a		Status 3 Grade 2b	
36 *Diese Seiten sind* ***ausgetauscht*** these pages are unexchanged	PPP state-property	***ausgetauscht*** exchanged	PPP state-property	*ein* ***ausgetauschter*** an exchanged one	Attribute
37 *Diese Seiten bleiben* ***ausgetauscht*** these pages keep exchanged		***getauscht bleibend*** exchanged remaining			
38 *Kinder sind/* ***bleiben geliebt*** kids are/keep loved		***geliebt bleibend*** loved keeping		*ein* ***geliebt bleibender*** a loved keeping. SG.N. NOM .	

3. Carlson's event type system applied to Bech's system

This section tries to align Bech's formal valence system with Carlson's event type verb system. The distinction between stage level predicates (SLP) and individual level predicates (ILP) goes back to Carlson (1977). Let us see how (7a-d) link with space and time adverbials. (7a-d) represent the SLP-type as in *stören(d sein)* '(be) disturb/annoy(ing)' or *küssen(d sein)* '(be) kiss(ing)', as opposed to (8a-d) that are ILP as in *gescheit sein* and *lieben* 'be clever' and 'love', respectively.

(7) a Hans war im Büro störend.
Hans was disturbing/annoying in the office
b Hans küsste Maria im Büro.
Hans kissed Maria in the office
c. Hans war am Abend störend.
Hans was disturbing/annoying in the evening.
d. Hans küsste Maria am Abend.
Hans kissed Maria on the evening.

(8) a ##Hans war im Büro gescheit.
Hans was smart in the office.
b ##Hans war am Abend gescheit.
Hans was smart in the evening.
c ??Hans liebte Maria am Abend.
In the evening, Hans loved Maria.

When configured adverbially with space and time coordinates, individual level predicates turn into stage level predicates. Referring to the property *(be) smart* this can only mean that *gescheit sein* (adj+$sein_{ser}$) will reread as *sich gescheit verhalten* 'behave smart' or *zeitweise gescheit sein* ,be temporarily smart' (adj+ $sein_{estar}$). Space and time adverbials constrain the quasi-analytic predication *Hans is smart* to synthetic *Hans is clever (only) in the evening* as do focus particles in DP constructs (*only in the evening*). More generally, the phenomenon that $sein_{estar}$, unlike $sein_{ser}$, is contingent on space and time appears to be shared only by a few non-verbal categories. There are a few adjectives that, like resultative participles, imply space-time-coordinates such as *reif* 'ripe', *müde* 'tired' in line with the verbal participles *gereift* 'ripened', *ermüdet* 'fatigued', 'unaccusative adjectives' (in Abraham's (1995/2013) terminology). Compare the adequate adverbial modification in *am 8.1.1954 reif sein* 'be ripe on 8-1-1954' as opposed to ??*am 8.1.54 gescheit sein* 'be smart on 8-1-1954'. Note that this empirical fact weakens Diesing's (1992) und Kratzer's (1995) criterion of argument expansion to keep apart ILP (argument simplex) and SLP (argument expanded).

As seen above, space and time adverbials may block or imply expansion on individual predicates/ ILP (cf. Maienborn 2003:151ff.). According to Chierchia (1995:178) and Manninen (2001:6), an interpretation of (8a) must be something like 'Hans has a double personality which involves switching his mental capacities on and off in an abnormal manner' presupposing something like 'John's being smart as his *smart behaviour*'. As to (8c), it may be the case that John is undecided between affection and aversion to Maria, or what exactly his relationship with Maria is (see also Manninen 2001:6):

(9) a *Hans was smart*/ILP
= Hans was (always and without exception) smart
= Hans behaved stupidly yesterday, but today he was quite smart
b *Hans loved Maria*/SLP
= Hans loved (always and without exception) Maria
= Hans really loved Maria yesterday: he brought her flowers and chocolates and even took her to the opera

Basically the reinterpretation from ILP to SLP was proposed already by Kim (1969, 1976) and confirmed by Rothmayr (2009). It amounts to a distinction between two stative predicate classes (see also Engelberg 2000, 2005): situational stative predicates, which are similar to action predicates, such as *sit, stand, lie, sleep, wait, glow,* on the one hand, and Kimian statives (named after Kim 1969, 1972) such as *be wise, be tired, weigh, know, resemble,* which are similar to properties. This classification covers the distinction introduced by Diesing, Kratzer, and Manninen (among others) in terms of Carlson's stage and individual distinction. Accordingly, place, time, and mood adverbials apply in terms of distributive degrees of identification.

I follow Moltmann (2011:9) in defining a Kimian state. See (10a,b).

(10) a for a property P of object o, the state s(P, o) obtains at a time t iff P holds of o at t.
b for properties P and P ', objects o and o', and times t and t', s(P,o,t) s(P,o',t') iff P =
= P', o = o', and t= t'.

The following two tables, Table 6 and Table 7, summarize Carlson's system. In Table 6, Carlson's four classes are aligned with event aspectual characteristics and the respective adverbial modification.

Reading as:	**Event feature**	**Space/time-ADV in Spec/ *v*P ∩*v* P**	**Habitual ADV in Spec/AspP**
Individual level predicate/ILP: *be clever, love,. ...*	[- habitual]	No	No
Kimian State predicate/ KSP: *be clever/behave smart, be tired, (be) similar*	[- habitual]	Yes	Yes
Habitual event : *disturb, satiate, kiss, smoke, drink*	[+ individual event], [+ habit], [+ iterative]	Yes	Yes
Stage level predicate/ SLP : *annoying, satiating, kiss, smoke*	[+ individual event], [-habitual]	Yes	No
Stage level predicate/ SLP derived from ILP: *gescheit tun/sich gescheit verhalten, lieben - sich liebend geben*	[+individual event] [- habitual]	Yes	No

Table 6: Feature combinations and the licensing of adverbials of space and time

Table 6 clearly shows a far-reaching overlap of Kimian state features with those of the stage events derived from ILP. Are they convergent?

To achieve a finer set of distinctions, let us introduce in Table 7 the criterion of speech act reference (Origo relation). Let a proposition P apply to speaker x at speech act time t or let it also apply at the time of t * where t ≤ t * or more specifically: ¬$e(t(e)=t*(e)).[6] This shows whether the concurrency operator should, or should not, be a relevance operator. In Table 7 it is revealed even more clearly under examination of the speaker origo that KSs and SL polarizations are the same.

[6] See (10a,b) above for Moltmann's (2011:9) definition of Kimian states.

Reading as:	**Event feature**	**Setting space/ time-ADV**	**Origo relation: ¬$ e(t(e)=t*(e))**
Property-Individual level/ ILP: *gescheit sein, lieben, gleichen/be clever, love, resemble*	[- habitual]	No	No (since e is independent from t)
Kimian Staten predicate stage = SLP derived from IL: *gescheit sein(=gescheit tun- sich gescheit verhalten), ähneln (=ähnlich sein) // be smart/behave cleverly– resemble*	[+individual event]. [- habitual]	Yes	Yes
Habitual event: *störend* – sät*tigend sein, küssen, rauchen // be annoying-satiating, kiss, smoke*	[+individual event], [+ habitual]	Yes (periodic iterativity)	Yes
Stage event/SLP: *störend/sättigend sein, küssen, rauchen - disturbing/satiating, kiss, smoke*	[+individual event], [-habitual]	Yes	Yes
Stage event/SLP derived from ILP: *gescheit tun-sich gescheit verhalten, ähneln; stören, sättigen // behave cleverly, resemble, disturb, satiate*	[+individual event]. [- habitual]	Yes	Yes

Table 7: Event feature combinations referring to Buhler's utterance origo

Table 8, finally, aligns syntactic-type predicates with Carlson's event classes and the two grades, bare infinitival complement and present participle complement under the copula head.

Status 1, Grade 1		**Status 1, Grade 2**	
39 [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *jagen*$_{iV}$] *sein*] hunt be	SLP-A	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ (*)*jagend*] *sein*]]] hunting be	(*)SLP
40 [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ **warten*$_{iV}$] *sein*] wait be	*SLP	$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ #*warten*$_{iV}$] *seiend*] *to wait/tune up being	SLP
41 **gescheit tun sein* smart do be	*KSP	**gescheit tun seiend* smart do being	*KSP
42 **sich gescheit verhalten sein* REFL smart behave be	*KSP	**sich gescheit verhalten seiend* smart behave being	*KSP
43 **ähneln sein* be similar be	*KSP	**ähneln seiend* be similar being	*KSP
44 **stören sein* disturb be	*HAB	**stören seiend* disturb being	*HAB
45 *rauchen sein* smoke be	HAB-A	*rauchen seiend* smoke being	HAB-A
46 **lieben/lieb haben sein* love/lovely be	*ILP	**lieben/lieb haben seiend* love being	*ILP
47 **verachten sein* despise be	*ILP	**verachten seiend* despise being	*ILP

Status 2, Grade 1		**Status 2, Grade 2**	
48 [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *zu jagen*$_{iV}$] *sein*] to hunt be	SLP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *zu lieben*] $^{\#\#}$*seiend*]]] to love being	##SLP
49a [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ $^{\#}$*zu warten*$_{iV}$] *sein*] to wait be	#SLP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ $^{\#}$*zu warten*$_{iV}$] *seiend*] *to wait/tune up being	#SLP
49b [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ $^{\#}$*zu schlafen*$_{iV}$] *sein*] to sleep be	*KSP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *zu* $^{\#}$*schlafen*] $^{\#\#}$*seiend*]]]] to sleep being	*KSP
50 **gescheit zu tun sein* smart to behave be	KSP	**gescheit zu tun seiend*	KSP
51 **sich gescheit zu verhalten sein* REFL smart to behave be	KSP	**sich gescheit zu verhalten seiend*	KSP
52 **zu ähneln sein* to liken be	HAB	**zu ähneln seiend*	HAB
53 *zu stören sein* to disturb be	HAB	*zu stören seiend*	HAB
54 $^{\#}$*zu rauchen sein* to smoke be	ILP	**zu rauchen seiend*	ILP
55 *zu lieben/lieb zu haben sein* to love/loving to have be	ILP	*zu lieben/lieb zu haben seiend* [$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *geliebt*] *sein*]]]	ILP
56 *zu verachten sein* to despise be		*zu verachten seiend*	

Status 3, Grade 1		**Status 3, Grade 2**	
57 [$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *ausgetauscht*] *sein*]]] exchanged be	SLP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{CopP}$ [$_{V'}$ *ausgetauscht*] **seiend/bleibend*]]]	*/OKSLP
58 [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *gejagt*$_{iV'}$] *sein/bleiben*] chased be	SLP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ *gejagt*$_{iV'}$] **seiend/bleibend*] chased being/remaining	*/OKSLP
59 [$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ **gewartet*$_{iV'}$] *sein*] waited be	*SLP	[$_{VP}$ [$_{DO(=CP)}$ **gewartet*$_{iV'}$] *seiend*] waited being	*SLP
60 **gescheit getan sein* smart done be	*KSP	**gescheit getan seiend* smart done being	*KSP
61 **sich gescheit verhalten sein* REFL smart behave be	*KSP	**sich gescheit verhalten seiend* REFL smart behave being	*KSP
62 **geähnelt sein* likened be	*KSP	**geähnelt seiend* likened being	*KSP
63 *gestört sein* disturbed be	RESULT	*gestört seiend/bleibend* disturbed being	RESULT
64 **geraucht sein* smoked be	RESULT	**geraucht seiend* smoked being	RESULT
65 *geliebt/?lieb gehabt sein* loved/likened had been be	OK/?ILP	*geliebt/*lieb gehabt seiend/bleibend* loved/likened had been being	OK/*ILP
66 *verachtet sein/bleiben* despised be/remain	ILP	*verachtet *seiend/bleibend* despised being/ remaining	OK/*ILP

Table 8: Syntactic-functional motivation of Bech's status und grades of verbal classes SLP-KSP-HAB-ILP governed by the copula

Legend to Table 8:
(i) # on $^{\#}$*zu warten* (status 2/grade 1) indicates 'only for impersonal subject/expletive' as in *Es ist jetzt zu schlafen* – there-is-now-to-sleep 'Everybody has to sleep now'.
(ii) (*) on $^{(*)}$*jagend*] *sein*/$^{(*)}$SLP indicates stylistic inacceptability rather than grammatical inaccepatbilty (acceptable in MHG as well in modern Dutch).
(iii) ## on *zu lieben* $^{\#\#}$*seiend* indicates that the predicative construal underlying attributive *zu liebend-* is inacceptable in mStG.
(iv) SLP-A as for *jagen sein* indicates the absentive reading (restricted to predicates of the SL-type since space configurationality in the sense of [+hic-et-nunc] underlying absentive semantics is unactivated in space-unconfigured IL-predicates).

4. Discussion of the findings in Tables 1 to 8

Our systematic extension of Bech's morphological forms into syntax and semantics clearly brings out new aspects of the three Bechian formal valence forms (his three status levels). It has further been shown that once we include forms of oral-only vernaculars of German, new classes have to be opened extending Bech's system quantitatively and qualitatively. This by no means diminishes Bech's merit and pre-Generativist achievements in German infinitival grammar. However, adding semantic selection criteria provides Bech's analysis with an axiomatically more solid basis.

4.1. Gaps and subclasses in Bech's system of morphological categories

There are clear gaps in that the predicative active participles were deactivated centuries ago and narrowed down to an attributive function. Illustrations are listed in Table 4 (column 4), where the copulas with present participles as complements are ranged out as no longer acceptable in MStG), while the attributive versions are very productive in written modern German. On the other hand, gerundial forms are still alive, and not just in oral vernaculars, but even replace the prepositional infinitive entirely. We argued that this may be due to the advantages of semantically und functionally underspecified forms. The gerundial forms appear at quite some variance as under status 2c-2f, exemplified by 14-21 in Table 4. Past participles change between passive and active participles depending on the auxiliary that is licensed by the temporal auxiliary: either *sein* 'be' or *haben* 'have' – a lexically determined split that is shared by Dutch (and some of the Scan-

dinavian and Romance languages), but not by English or any of the Slavic languages. See status 2b in Table 4. It should not be necessary to point out that the agreement inflection on the attributive use of the different forms and grades are missing in English (and that the predicative forms also have agreement morphology in some Scandinavian and Romance languages). See Table 3 for illustrations.

4.2. Advantages and drawbacks in Carlson's event type system: Carlson's classification, originally of English lexical predicates, is not based on form, but purely on semantic interpretation, with semantics even narrowed down to event characteristics. In this respect, and even focusing on Kimian state-phase transfers, the classification appears to be applicable cross-linguistically. The claim in the present context is that our inclusion of clusters of copula dependence brings out the language differences more clearly. See the examples in (1) (repeated below under (11)) as well as the first columns in table 7 with the four event classes in the first column. What the profound consequences deriving from the four event classes with respect to thetical as opposed to categorical discourse types including position and grammaticality of weak subjects (Abraham 2015c) are not focused in this context it needed highlighting that it is the link between Bech's morphological (copula-non-finite verb form) and Carlson's semantic classifications that allow such conclusions on discourse (thematic vs. rhematic) structure.

4.3. Overall language comparison

Haider (2012) has shown that OV has clear structure-preserving and structure–extending advantages over VO. This shows also in our comparison irrespective of the lack of morphological distinctions both in Dutch and English.[7]

(11) a mStG Das ist gut zu sehen.
this is good to see/to be seen

[7] To draw conclusions concerning the OV-VO difference when focusing only on English as the only VO-language is quite obviously too sweeping, but I will have to leave it at that for the time being.

b SG i Das ist gut zum Sehen. [8]
this is good to.DAT see
ii Es ist gut (dies) zu sehen.
It is nice for someone to see (this)
iii Das ist gut zu sehen.
This is nice to see
iv Das ist gut zu sehen.
This can clearly be seen
v *Das ist gut um gesehen zu werden.
This is good for people to see

c Dutch vi Dit is goed (om) te zien.
this is good (for) to see
vii Het is prettig om dit te zien.
It is nice for to see
viii Dit is goed te zien.
this is good to see
ix #Dit is goed om gezien te worden.
This is good for people to see.

d English x This is good to see.
xi *This is good (for X) to be seen.

The two main differences are that (i) neither English nor Dutch have the gerund – for the obvious reason that there is no declensional morphology to the definite article cliticized onto the preposition; and (ii) that English, but neither German nor Dutch, gives explicit expression to the passive reading as in (11dx). Generally, one may say that German underspecifies heavily by the gerund, a form that is missing in its variety of functions in MStG. A solid part of the German gerund is taken over by the Dutch purposive infinitive – cf. (11cvi, viii).

English, finally, fuses formally what were different forms in its history, i.e. the gerund ending in *–yng(e)* and the present participle (cf. Los 2005). See Table 3.

---

[8] As there is no P-infinitive in SG, this form is ambiguous between (1a,b).

4.4. Language internal comparison of morphological categories

German has more disambiguating morphology than Dutch, and Dutch, in turn, has more than English. However, the situation concerning the present participle is very different, to the effect that English uses the form predicatively, as does Dutch, but not German. Notice that, given the gerundial forms licensed also by prepositions, the bare infinitive as complement to the copula (but not the homonymous auxiliary as well as a selection of full verbs) need to be taken as a gerund (and consequently and, against all odds of the orthographic norms, be capitalized: *Er ist (am/beim/zum) Laufen* 'he is running'. See Table 5 items 28-35. Compare also where German and Dutch passivize also intransitives, although without demoting an external argument, i.e. in ways that are very uncommon to semantically and syntactically rooted passivization (items 25-27). Throughout, second grade predicative is out in German, whereas it is acceptable and productive both in Dutch and in English. Since, on top of the latter, gerunds on second grade predicatives and attributives are out too (specifically, items 28-30, and, more generally, 32-38), the conclusion is confirmed that gerunds are not verbals, but substantivized nominals, since, if they were verbals, 30-**zum wartend* should be possible. Items 34-35 (and the exclusion of **Er ist* ***am den Hahn Schlachten*** as well as *Sie ist* ***am auf ihn Warten***) show beyond doubt that the P-gerund is nominal (as it is the complement of a preposition) as well as verbal (as it assigns case to the object). The determining issue for this hybrid is that the object accusative is outside the direct licensing force of the verb (*schlachten*+DO*, warten*+PP). Dutch behaves exactly the same way (cf. *Ze is het kleintje aan het verschonen* 'she-is-$[[_{DO}$ the little one$]_i$-$[_{PP}$ on-$[_{DP}$ the $[_{V'}$ e_i washing]]]]', where the direct object, *het kleintje,* is outside the direct licensing force of the verb *verschonen*). Nothing of this sort is possible in English.

4.5. Aligning Bech and Carlson

Table 7 shows that Carlson's event type classification and Kim's extension transfer without any restriction to German. Dutch could no doubt easily be added. However, given the event type base of the relations, nothing else was to be expected.

It seems only consistent to align the two systematic descriptions by Bech and Carlson. The main reason is that Carlson's systematics allows us to classify those morphological categories that we found no categorial slot

for in Bech's system. This alignment may be considered as a combination of Bech's non-finite verb morphology and Carlson's lexical predicate semantics. See Tables 7 and 8 for such an attempt.

This is what Table 8 yields. As items 39-40 (shaded) show, Bech's status 1 falls apart with respect to stage *jagen* 'hunt/chase' and stage *warten* 'wait'on the distinguishing absentive feature (examples *Er ist jagen* 'He is hunting' vs. **Er ist warten* 'he-is-wait'). This is explained against an extended concept of Bühler's origo theory. Descriptively spoken, the activity of hunting as such can be imagined to take place outside the control of the speaker (telephone speaker to caller explaining the subject referent's absence), while there is no such activity as waiting allowing the same inference. One may escape by adding *for X to waiting* (*Er ist auf X warten* 'He is waiting for X') implying that this happens outside of the speaker's control, thus in the referent's absence from the deictic origo situation). Notice that, as soon as we use *warten* 'wait/service' in the sense of *das Auto warten* 'servicing the car' (cf. items 48-49), the presupposed absence conditions are met. I leave open for the time being whether a DO is implied also with *jagen* ('deer/sow hunting').

With respect to items 58-59 in grade 2, notice that the copula *sein* has a more restricted use than the semi-copula *bleiben.*

Comparison of items 63 and 64 point to the difference between clear telic verbs (*gestört sein* 'be disturbed') and atelic ones (**geraucht sein* 'be smoked'). This is rooted in the Aktionsart distinction resulting in state PPPs for telics, but not for atelics. Only telic states require *sein*, while atelics do not.

Items 65 and 66, on the one hand, confirm the difference between *sein-seiend* and *bleiben-bleibend* as predicative present participles. *seiend,* although fully transparent, is just out stylistically, whereas *bleibend* is fully acceptable. Periphrastic *lieb haben/gehabt,* on the other hand, perfectly projecting the same meaning as *lieben,* makes a too clumsy *lieb haben/gehabt* **seiend/*?bleibend* – to all appearances just a parsing problem.

The general conclusion to the preceding discussion is that verb complementation under the copula *sein* and its semi-relative *bleiben* brings to light more phenomena than under full verbs in that Bech's grade 2 types can be exhausted more deeply and in that the absence phenomenon on status 1/grade 1 receive an even deeper explanation if integrated into Carlson's distinctions. Needless to say once again that the specific

differences between the three languages under inspection are due to this specific comparative and axiomatic attempt linking semantic eventuality with Bech's morphosyntactic six-way distinctions.

5. Conclusion

The paper discussed Bech's inventory of complement valence in Standard German and extended it with examples from regiolectal and dialectal Southern German ('Oberdeutsch'), where gerundial (verb-derived nominal) forms regularly replace prepositional infinitives of Standard German as well as bare infinitives governed by non-modals (in the function of the so-called 'absentive'). In a second step, Bech's extended inventory was aligned with Carlson's distinction of individual and stage level predicates. The main reason is that Carlson's systematics allows us to classify those morphological categories that we found no categorial slot for in Bech's system. This alignment may be considered as a combination of Bech's non-finite verb morphology and Carlson's lexical predicate semantics. The idea behind this comparison was that stage as well as individual level readings are dependent on aspectual properties of the complements in a variety of typical cases. This criterion by itself warrants such a comparison and decidedly enriches Bech's system for German and partly extends it to Dutch.

References

Abraham, Werner. 1994a. Fokusgrammatik und Indefinitheit. In: Brigitte Haftka (ed.) *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation? Studien zu einem Interaktionsfeld von Grammatik, Pragmatik und Sprachtypologie,* 235-245. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Abraham, Werner. 1994b. Diathesis: the middle, particularly in West Germanic. What does reflexivization have to do with valence reduction?" In: Werner Abraham, Talmy Givón & Sandra Thompson (eds.) *Discourse grammar and typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3-47.

Abraham, Werner. 1995/^{3}2013. *Deutsche Syntax im Sprachenvergleich.* [Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 41]. Third edition Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Abraham, Werner. 2000. Zwischen extensionaler Ökonomie und intensionaler lokalistischer Präzisierung: Dativobjekte im Deutschen und ihre Wiedergabe im kasuslosen Niederländischen." In: Andreas Bittner, Dagmar Bittner & Klaus-Michael Köpcke (eds.) *Angemessene Strukturen: Systemorganisation in Phonologie, Morphologie und Syntax,* 299-316. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Abraham, Werner. 2006. Absent argument on the Absentive: an exercise in silent syntax. Grammatical category or just pragmatic inference? *Language Typology and Universals (STUF)* 61/4: 358-374.

Abraham, Werner. 2008. Reflexiv- und Passivdiathesen im germanisch-romanischen Vergleich. Ein Ansatz. In: Elisabeth Stark, Roland Schmidt-Riese & Eva Stoll (eds.) *Romanische Syntax im Wandel*, 87-112. Tübingen: G. Narr. ISBN 978-3-8233-6368-2

Abraham, Werner. 2014. Strong modality and truth disposability in syntactic subordination: What is the locus of the phase edge validating modal adverbials? *Studia Linguistica* 69.3: 1-41.

Abraham, Werner. 2015a (in print). Discourse marker equal to Discourse particle equal to Thetical equal to Modal particle? A futile comparison. In: Josef Bayer & Volkmar Struckmeier (eds.) *Discourse Particles – Formal Approaches to their Syntax and Semantics*. [Linguistische Arbeiten]. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Abraham, Werner. 2015b (in print). Pervasive underspecification of diathesis, modality, and structural case coding: the gerund in historical and modern German. *Linguistische Berichte.*

Bech, Gunnar. 1983. *Studien über das deutsche Verbum infinitim.* [Linguistische Arbeiten 139]. Tübingen: Niemeyer. (Second edition after original 1955-1957 in the *Histo-filologiske Meddelelser udgivet af Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab*).

Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: G. Fischer. Englisch: *Theory of language: The representational function of language*. [Foundations of Semiotics 25] 1990. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Carlson, Gregory N. 1977. Reference to kinds in English. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Printed version 1980 Garland Press, New York.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. Individual level predicates as inherent generics. In: Gregory N. Carlson & Francis J. Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic book*, 176-223. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Engelberg, Stefan. 2000. *Verben, Ereignisse und das Lexikon.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Engelberg, Stefan. 2005. Stativity, supervenience, and sentential subjects. In: Claudia Maienborn & Angelika Wöllstein (eds.) *Event arguments in syntax, semantics, and discourse,* 45-68. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 1983. Über die "Studien über das deutsche verbum infinitium". In: G. Bech 1983: VII-IX.

Gallmann, Peter. 2014. Infinite Verbformen. Die Unterarten von infiniten Verbformen: der sogenannte Status. Ms. University of Jena, Summer 2014. <*www.personal.uni-jena.de/~x1gape/Wort/Wort_Verb_infinit.pdf*>

Haider, Hubert. 2012. *Symmetry breaking in syntax.* Cambridge, UK: CUP.

Kim, Jaegwon. 1969. Events and their descriptions: some considerations. In: Nicholas Rescher et al. (ed.) *Essays in honor of Carl G. Hempel,* 198-215. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Kim, Jaegwon. 1976. Events as property exemplifications. In: Myles Brand & Douglas Walton (eds.), *Proceedings of the Winnipeg Conference on Human Action*, 159-177. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 2014. Die Konstruktion *sein*-Infinitive vom Althochdeutschen zum Neuhochdeutschen. Poznan SEL-2014 conference paper.

Los, Bettelou. 2005. *The rise of the* to-*infinitive*. Oxford: OUP.

Lübbe, Anja. 2013. Das regulär prädikative Participle I. *Deutsche Sprache* 41/2: 97-114. Online version <*www.DSdigital.de/DS.02.2013.097*>

Maienborn, Claudia. 2001. On the position and interpretation of locative modifiers'. *Natural Language Semantics* 9.2, 191-240.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2003. Die logische Form von Kopulasätzen. [studia grammatica 56]. Berlin: Akademieverlag.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. On the limits of the Davidsonian approach: the case of copula sentences. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31.3., 275-316.

Maienborn, Claudia. 2007. On Davidsonian and Kimian states. In: Ileana Comorovski & Klaus von Heusinger (eds.) *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*, 107-130. Berlin: Springer.

Manninen, Satu. 2001. A Minimalist analysis of stagel level and individual level predicates. *The Department of English in Lund: Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 1-18.

Moltmann, Friederike. 2011. On the distinction between abstract states, concrete states, and tropes. In: Claire Beyssade, Alda Mari & Fabio del Prete (eds.) *Genericity*. Oxford: OUP.

Rothmayr, Antonia. 2009. *The structure of stative verbs.* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 143]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vikner, Sten. 2001. Predicative Adjective Agreement. In Kirsten Adamzik & Helen Christen (eds.). *Sprachkontakt, Sprachvergleich, Sprachvariation: Festschrift für Gottfried Kolde*. Niemeyer, Tübingen, 399-414. <*www.hum.au.dk/engelsk/engsv/papers/vikn01b.pdf*>