

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Jakub Urban

Passive Voice in English

Bakalářská práce

Vedoucí práce: prof. Joseph Emonds, M.A., Ph.D.

Olomouc 2017

Autor: **Jakub Urban**

Studijní obor: Anglická filologie

Vedoucí práce: **prof. Joseph Emonds, M.A., Ph.D.**

Počet stran: 58

Počet znaků: 81 472

Olomouc 2017

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 4. května 2017

.....

I would like to thank my supervisor and a fellow left-hander, Prof. Joseph Emonds, for all the help, valuable advice and his willingness to explain even the most trivial things.

Abstract

The thesis will introduce and provide descriptions and syntactical characteristics of many types of passives and passive clauses, most notably adjectival passives, verbal passives, *be*-passives and *get*-passives. Furthermore, the study will examine contemporary arguments against some of the questionable claims that have been made in the past. This concerns adjectival and verbal passives, their similarities, assumed differences and the compatibility of *by*-phrases with these types of passives. The paper is partially dealing with the usage of passive voice in writing as well.

Key words

passive voice, adjectival passive, verbal passive, *get*-passive, *be*-passive, *by*-phrase

Anotace

Práce je zaměřená na popis různých druhů pasiv v anglickém jazyce a jejich jazykové vlastnosti. Autor přezkoumal několik současných tvrzení, která zpochybňují předchozí výzkum. To se týká hlavně společných jazykových vlastností mezi adjektivním a verbálním pasivem. V závěru se práce zaměřuje na využití trpného rodu v psaných textech.

Klíčová slova

passive voice, adjectival passive, verbal passive, *get*-passive, *be*-passive, *by*-phrase

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	9
2	General characteristics of passive voice	11
2.1	Description of passive voice.....	11
2.2	Failing to describe passives	12
2.3	Short and long passives	12
2.3.1	Restrictions of long passives	13
2.3.2	Restrictions of short passives	14
2.4	Adjectival passives	16
2.4.1	Grammatical tests	17
2.4.1.1	Modification by <i>very</i>	17
2.4.1.2	Occurrence with other verbs taking predicative complements.....	17
2.4.1.3	The negative prefix <i>un-</i>	18
2.4.1.4	Dynamic vs stative	18
2.5	<i>Be</i> -passives, bare passives, <i>get</i> -passives	18
2.5.1	<i>Be</i> -passives	18
2.5.2	Bare passives	19
2.5.3	<i>Get</i> -passives.....	19
2.6	Three other variants of passive clause.....	22
2.6.1	Prepositional passive	22
2.6.2	Embedded passive	22
2.6.3	Concealed passive.....	22
2.7	Voice constraints	23
2.7.1	Verb constraints.....	23
2.7.1.1	Active only	23
2.7.1.2	Passive only	24
2.7.1.3	Prepositional verbs	24
2.7.2	Object constraints	25
2.7.2.1	Clausal object	25
2.7.2.2	Phrasal object.....	26
2.7.3	Agent constraints	26
2.7.4	Meaning constraints.....	26
2.7.5	Frequency Constraints	27
2.8	Summary.....	27
3	<i>Get</i>-passives	29
3.1	<i>Get</i> -passive as a dynamic counterpart to <i>be</i> -passive	29
3.2	<i>Get</i> as an auxiliary	30
3.3	Various characteristics of <i>get</i> -passives.....	30
3.3.1	Subject responsibility	30
3.3.2	Lack of internalized complement	32
3.3.3	Animacy of subject and subjective viewpoint.....	32
3.3.4	Adversative reading	33

3.4	Questioning the <i>get</i> -passive.....	33
3.5	Summary.....	34
4	Adjectival and verbal passives	36
4.1	Assumed differences between adjectival and verbal passives	36
4.1.1	Raising.....	36
4.1.2	External Arguments.....	39
4.1.2.1	Eventive <i>by</i> -phrase	39
4.1.2.2	Other types of external arguments.....	40
4.1.3	Reflexives	41
4.2	All passive participles in English are adjectives	41
4.2.1	Distributional argument.....	42
4.2.2	Category difference	43
4.2.3	Difference in coordination.....	44
4.3	Summary.....	45
5	<i>By</i>-phrases	46
5.1	Established claims	46
5.1.1	Supporting the claims	46
5.2	Limitations of <i>by</i> -phrases	46
5.3	<i>By</i> -phrases with passives	47
5.4	<i>By</i> -phrases with nominals.....	48
5.5	Summary.....	49
6	The Passive voice in writing.....	51
6.1	Dull and static rather than lively and dynamic	52
6.2	Sneaky or evasive concerning agency or responsibility	52
6.3	Feeble and weak rather than bold and strong	53
6.4	Avoided by good writers	54
6.5	Summary.....	54
7	Conclusion	55
8	Resumé.....	56
9	Works Cited	57

Abbreviations

AP	adjectival phrase
e.g.	for example
ECM	exceptional case-marking
et al.	and others
etc.	and other things
i.e.	that is/that means
NP	noun phrase
PP	prepositional phrase
VP	verb phrase

1 Introduction

Although the passive voice has been previously discussed quite extensively (Wasow 1977; Keenan 1980; Klaiman 1988), there is still a lot of issues which concern the linguists of the 21st century. The topics that they address range from the questionable descriptions of certain kinds of passives, such as *get*-passives (Toyota 2008) or adjectival passives (Emonds 2006; Breuning 2014) and the approach towards the general problematics, to a controversial discussion about the usage of passive voice in writing (Pullum 2014).

The aim of this paper is to summarize some of these recent concerns regarding passive voice and illustrate what are the suggested solutions to these issues. Although the thesis will be dealing with topics that have quite extensively concerned past research, the paper is mainly interested in the contemporary studies and suggestions and their most recent approaches towards them.

The first chapter of the paper will focus on general and mostly syntactical description of passive voice in English. The chapter will provide the basic account of certain types of passives and passive clauses, most notably the characteristics of verbal and adjectival passives and the differences between them. Other topics that will be discussed are *get*-passives, *by*-phrases and various constraints on passive and active voice. The descriptions and data will largely be taken from the comprehensive grammar book written by Huddleston and Pullum (2002).

The second chapter will illustrate additional characteristics of the *get*-passives and compares them to *be*-passives. It will address some of the common approaches and assumptions as well. The main source will be a chapter on *get*-passives from Toyota (2008). The third chapter will focus on the different constructions with verbal and adjectival passives that were previously thought of as incompatible with one or the other type of passive. The chapter will be based on Breuning (2014) who re-evaluates these claims. The last section of the chapter will examine the suggestion that all passive participles in English are in fact adjectives.

The next chapter will re-evaluate previous studies in a similar manner. This time however, it will be on topic of *by*-phrases and their compatibility with verbal and adjectival passives. Once more, the main source will be another paper by Breuning (2013).

The last chapter will be based on a paper written by Pullum (2014) and will be dealing with the usage of passive voice in writing. It will try to illustrate how passive voice can be

beneficial in writing, contrary to many previous claims that passive voice should be avoided in most of it.

2 General characteristics of passive voice

2.1 Description of passive voice

Quirk et al. (2004, 159) see voice as a **grammatical category that allows us to present the action of a sentence from two different points of view**, while leaving the truth values unchanged. They introduce two grammatical levels in the active-passive relation:

- (1) a. Verb phrase level
- b. Clause level

Both levels undergo certain changes when the passive voice is formed. The verb phrase uses the auxiliary *be* which is followed by the past participle form of the main verb. The changes on the clause level that Quirk et al. (2004, 159) introduce, are the following:

- (2) a. **The active subject becomes the passive agent.**
- b. **The active object becomes the passive subject.**
- c. **The preposition *by* is introduced before the agent.**

However, the points in (2), especially (2a) and (2c), might need a revision, because Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1427), who describe the passive voice in terms of **semantic roles**, note that **not every active or passive clause has to necessarily express an action**. This means that the **subject does not act as an agent in every case**. This is illustrated in (3):

- (3) a. *Most members of the cabinet hated the premier.*
- b. *The premier was hated by most members of the cabinet.*

The semantic role of the subject *Most members* in active (3a) is **an experiencer** and the subject *The premier* in its passive counterpart (3b) is **a patient**.

Although Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1427) describe the voice mostly in terms of semantics, the authors claim that **the definition of the voice cannot rely on semantic properties only**. The grammatical category must be defined by its **syntactical properties**. Thus, the summary (4) provided by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1428) is more appropriate:

- (4) a. **The subject** of the active appears in the passive as the **complement of the preposition *by***.
- b. **The object** of the active appears as **the subject** of the passive.
- c. **The verb** of the active appears in the passive in **past participle form**.
- d. The passive contains an extra verb, **the auxiliary *be* or *get***.

2.2 Failing to describe passives

In his recent paper, Pullum (2014, 2) argues that **English grammars fail to describe passive voice correctly**, because **English grammar is still considered typologically similar to Latin**, in terms of inflection: “Latin had morphologically distinguishable infinitives, gerunds, gerundives, present participles, subjunctives, future tense forms, and passives, all with their particular endings on the verb. English has none of this, but is traditionally described as if it did” (2014, 2).

He also states that we need to look into **larger units** when trying to describe passives. Simply examining the verbs is not enough, because as illustrated in (2), **the form of the verb can be same for both passive and active clauses**:

- (5) a. *She has been questioned by the detectives.* (passive)
- b. *The detectives have questioned her.* (active)

The following descriptions of certain types and categories of passive clauses are taken from a grammar book written partially by Pullum, so it is assumed that the idea discussed in this section has been considered.

2.3 Short and long passives

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1428) distinguish between long and short passives:

- (6) a. *The board rejected his plan.*
- b. *His plan was rejected by the board.*
- c. *His plan was rejected.*

The example of long passive is presented in (6b) and short passive in (6c). The term **long passive** is used for passive clauses that **contain the *by*-phrase** while **short passives** are the ones, where **the *by*-phrase is omitted**. Huddleston and Pullum (2002,1428) refer to the *by*-

phrase as the **internalized complement**. This term is used, because the subject in the active clause is **external to the VP**, but in the passive, it becomes **internal to the VP**. Quirk et al. (2004, 160) use the term **agent phrase** which will not be used, because of the reasons that are mentioned in 2.1. This paper will mostly use the term *by*-phrase. The main difference between these two types of passives is the fact that, unlike the long passives, **short passives do not have an active counterpart with the same truth value**. Huddleston and Pullum explain this: “(6c) is not pragmatically equivalent to *His plan was rejected by someone* (the passive counterpart of *Someone rejected his plan*): we will generally understand from (6c) that the plan was rejected by the person or body to whom it was submitted. On the other hand, an active clause will encode some information about the subject that is not explicitly encoded in a short passive even if part or all of it is implied or suggested” (2002, 1428). Internalized complements are discussed in chapter 5. The following subsection will be focused on pragmatic restrictions of long and short passives respectively.

2.3.1 Restrictions of long passives

Pragmatic restrictions for the use of long passives is targeted on the *by*-phrase and the subject. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1444) state that **the information in the *by*-phrase must be newer than the information in the subject**:

- (7) a. *The Mayor’s term of office expires next month. [She will be succeeded by George Hendrix.]*
 b. *George Hendrix will take office next month. [#The current mayor, Angela Cooke, will be succeeded by him.]*
 c. *He will succeed the current mayor, Angela Cooke.*
- (8) a. *A press conference will be held by the president at 3 p.m. today.*
 b. *#A press conference will be held by me at 3 p.m. today.*
- (9) a. *Paul and Mary have agreed to help with the salads. We’ll serve a pasta salad and a traditional bowl of tossed greens. [The pasta salad will be made by Paul,] and Mary will bring the greens.*
 b. *Before the parade, a flag ceremony will be led by a troop of girl Scouts.*

In (7a), the information in the *by*-phrase is newer than the information in the subject, because *she*, **the subject of the second sentence, is referring to the subject of the first sentence**. In (7b), however, the information in **the *by*-phrase refers to *George Hendrix*, the subject of**

the first sentence, which means that the information conveyed by the subject of the passive clause *The current mayor* is newer than the information in the *by*-phrase. Huddleston and Pullum state that the active counterpart, showed in (7c), should be used instead (2002, 1444). Their example sentence (8b) is supposed to show that **the speaker is always interpreted as an old information** and (8a) can be used only if *the president* is mentioned for the first time. Furthermore, they comment: “The constraint is a matter of the relative discourse familiarity of the two NPs. It **excludes new + old** (7b, 8b), **allowing not only old + new** (7a, 8a), but also **old + old** (9a) and **new + new** (9)” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1444).

2.3.2 Restrictions of short passives

The pragmatic restrictions of the short passives are different. The restrictions about new and old information cannot apply to them, because **the information about the subject in short passives are missing**. This might be the reason why the short passive might be preferred over an active version in certain contexts. Once again, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1446) provide examples with a commentary:

- (10) a. *The house was built in 1924.*
 b. *Very little is known about the cause of the disease.*
 c. *Application forms can be obtained from the Departmental Secretary.*
 d. *Mom! The vase got broken!*
 e. *The delay in attending to this matter is regretted.*
 f. *The solution was drained under a hydrogen atmosphere, the deposits were washed with water and methanol and dried. A film of formvar was then cast on the deposit...*

The sentence (10a) could be used whenever **the speaker does not know who did the particular action**. (10b) can refer to **general human knowledge** and (10c) can be understood as **a general proposition**. (10d) is used **to avoid identification of the person responsible**. (10e) is an example of **a common usage of passives in government correspondence**, since **the active voice might sound too personal**. (10f) was used **in the scientific report**. Huddleston and Pullum comment: “Many of the short passives . . . serve to avoid explicit reference to the writer, and this is widely believed to give the writing a **more objective flavour** than is found in texts with 1st person references” (2002, 1446). The usage of short passives in writing is further discussed in section 6.3.

In addition, Veselovská (2016, 33) describes the process of deleting agent, which is called **deagentization** (11), and she illustrates **four possible types of agents** (12):

- (11) a. Patient becomes Subject/=Theme,
- b. Predicate can become clause final/= Rheme
- c. Agent disappears
- (12) a. **general** i. *It is believed...*
- ii. *It can't be explained.*
- b. **author** i. *As has been stated before...*
- ii. *This was studied in detail.*
- c. **hidden** i. *The team was beaten.*
- ii. *The house was searched.*
- d. **none** i. *The city is situated...*
- ii. *The two forms are distributed equally.*

Another pragmatic restriction on short passives is concerned with **prepositional passives** and **preposition stranding**. Two different types of prepositional passives are introduced in section 2.6.1. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1446), **passives with stranded preposition** should be used only if **the VP refers to a significance or a change of the state of the subject**. These rules are concerned with **locative prepositional passive clauses**:

- (13) a. *This bed was slept in by George Washington.*
- b. *The valley could be marched through in less than two hours.*
- c. *My new hat has been sat on.*
- (14) a. *#The river was slept beside.*
- b. *#The village hall could be met in.*
- c. *#The roof has been sat on all day.*

Huddleston and Pullum comment the examples in (13): “The fact that George Washington slept in the bed gives it some **historical interest** Similarly in (13b): if the valley could be marched through in less than two hours, this tells us **something significant** about its length and the terrain. As for (13c), if someone has sat on my new hat it will presumably have been squashed or otherwise affected, so there will have been a **change in a significant property of**

the hat” (2002, 1446–1447). This, however, is not the case with examples in (14), because **neither of them** bears any major significance, nor change the state of the subject in any way. In his more recent paper, Pullum (2014, 8) provides more examples:

- (15) a. *It may surprise you to learn that this chair was once sat in by Sir Winston Churchill.*
b. *#It may surprise you to learn that Swindon has been walked in by Sir Winston Churchill.*
- (16) a. *This bed has been slept in.*
b. *#The monastery has been slept in.*

He explains: “It is arguably a significant **historical property** for a chair to have had the great British prime minister sit in it; but no one could think it a significant property of a Wiltshire town that Churchill once walked in its streets, and that makes (15b) anomalous It **changes significant properties** of a bed to sleep in it (16a); but it **doesn’t change any important property** of a monastery to have had people sleep within its walls (16b)” (Pullum 2014, 8).

2.4 Adjectival passives

The verb *be* can act as a **copula** too. This is a case of **the complex-transitive construction**, where *be* takes a **predicative complement**. For a construction like this, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1431) use the term **adjectival passives**, while Quirk et al. (2004, 168) call it **semi-passives**. (17) illustrates a possible ambiguity that might arise between verbal and adjectival passives:

- (17) *The vase was broken.* (verbal or adjectival)

If we interpret the sentence as a verbal passive, then *broken* is a verb which describes the event of breaking the vase. In the other possible interpretation, *broken* acts as an adjective that describes the current state of the vase.

Huddleston and Pullum note **that adjectival passives “represent an extended and derivative sense of the term ‘passive’”**(2002, 1431). Quirk et al. (2004, 168) summarize adjectival properties (18):

- (18) a. coordinate the participle with an adjective;
- b. modifying the participle with *quite*, *rather*, *more*, etc;
- c. replacing *be* by a lexical copular verb such as *feel* or *seem*.

The following subsection will be focused on grammatical tests from Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1436–1439).

2.4.1 Grammatical tests

2.4.1.1 Modification by *very*

When the adjective in certain passive clause is **gradable**, its adjectival status can be easily proven by **modifying the adjective with *very* or *too*** (19). The verbal passive, on the other hand, can be modified by inserting *very much* or *too much* (20).

- (19) a. *It was [very enjoyable].*
- b. *They are [too quarrelsome].*
- (20) a. *We [very much enjoyed it].*
- b. *They [quarrel too much].*

This grammatical test is **sufficient** to establish the adjectival status of the passive clause. However, **it cannot be applied to non-gradable adjectives** (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1437). Even Breuning (2014) criticizes the usage of this test, as seen in section 4.1.1.

2.4.1.2 Occurrence with other verbs taking predicative complements

In case of adjectival passives, the verb ***be*** can be replaced with verbs like *seem*, *look* and *remain* (21). Such substitution is **impossible for verbal passives** (22):

- (21) a. *The new recruits were assembled outside the officers' mess.*
- b. *The new recruits remained/looked/seemed assembled outside the officers' mess.*
- (22) a. *The kitchen window was broken by the thieves.*
- b. **The kitchen window remained/looked/seemed broken by the thieves.*

This seems to be **the most reliable grammatical test**, since Huddleston and Pullum note: “There are **no adjectival passives that are restricted to occurrence with *be***, so this test

virtually provides a necessary condition for adjectival status” (2002, 1437). This means that this test can be applied to **every adjectival passive clause**.

2.4.1.3 *The negative prefix un-*

Adjectives can be negated by using prefix *un-* (23). This is not the case with verbs (24):

- (23) a. *They were unrepentant.*
b. *It was unmemorable.*
- (24) a. **They unrepented.*
b. **We unremembered it.*

The prefix can be used with verbs, but these verbs, such as *untie*, *unhorse*, are called reversives and their sense **differs from the sense of adjectives** with prefix *un-*. In case of verbs, the prefix is there to “indicate that the affected entity returns to the state obtaining before the process expressed in the base verb took place” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1689). In addition, this test was used by Breuning (2014). This can be seen in section 4.1.1.

2.4.1.4 *Dynamic vs stative*

Adjectival passives are **stative every time**. **Verbal passives, on the other hand, are not always dynamic**. For example, (25b) is a stative verbal passive:

- (25) a. *Everyone loves her.*
b. *She is loved by everyone.*

Because of this, both Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1438) and Quirk et al. (2004, 168) agree that **this is not a sufficient criterion** to establish whether we are dealing with a verbal or adjectival passive.

2.5 *Be-passives, bare passives, get-passives*

Furthermore, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1429) distinguish between **three variants of passive voice**. In this case, the focus will be put on the auxiliary verb of the passive clause.

2.5.1 *Be-passives*

The most common type are *be*-passives that use the auxiliary verb *be*. An example sentence of a long *be*-passive can be seen in (26b), with (26a) being its active counterpart:

- (26) a. *Pat was examining the contract.*
b. *The contract was being examined by Pat.*

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1429) comment that in the passive clause, **the inflection of the active verb falls on the auxiliary *be***. The person and number features, however, are distinguished by the agreement with the subject. They explain it with the example (26): “The gerund-participle inflection carried in the active (26a) by *examine* appears in the passive (26b) on *be*, with *examine* taking on the past participle inflection” (2002, 1430).

2.5.2 Bare passives

Another type of passive clauses is a bare passive. This type **omits the auxiliary completely**:

- (27) a. *He saw Kim mauled by our neighbour's dog.*
b. *My house wrecked by a tornado is something I don't ever want to see.*

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1430) note that bare passive clauses **usually appear without an overt subject**, as you can see in (27a), where the noun *Kim* acts as **an object** of the *see* clause. An example of a bare passive clause with an overt subject can be seen in (27b).

2.5.3 Get-passives

The auxiliary verb ***be* can be replaced with the verb *get***, in many passive clauses:

- (28) *They got frightened.*

The example (28) shows that **the ambiguity between verbal and adjectival passive is possible** with *get*-passives as well as with *be*-passives. This is caused by the fact that the verb ***get* can act as head of a complex intransitive clause**. On the other hand, the ambiguity is **much less common** with *get*-passives (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1441). This can be seen in (29), where (29b) can be interpreted **only as verbal passive**, while (29a) remains ambiguous:

- (29) a. *The window was broken.*
b. *The window got broken.*

The adjectival interpretation is **most common with gradable adjectives**.

Other common differences between *be*-passives and *get*-passives are summarized by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1442) in (30):

- (30) a. *Get*-passives **tend to be avoided in formal style**.
b. *Get*-passives are **found only with dynamic verbs**.
c. *Get*-passives are **more conducive to an agentive interpretation of the subject**.
d. *Get*-passives are **characteristically used in clauses involving adversity or benefit**.

They believe that (30a) do not need any commentary, but points (30b–d) are discussed further. They use (31) as a proof of (30b). In **the passive clauses with stative verbs** such as *believe* and *fear*, **the auxiliary *be* cannot be replaced with *get***:

- (31) a. *It was/*got believed that the letter was a forgery.*
b. *Obviously, the manager is/*gets feared by most of the staff.*

Because of this, **the potential ambiguity between adjectival and verbal is no longer present**. This is apparent in (32b), where *be* is replaced with *get*:

- (32) a. *The village was surrounded by troops from the first battalion.*
b. *The village got surrounded by troops from the first battalion.*

While (32) has both **verbal and adjectival interpretations**, (32b) is **no longer ambiguous**, because it lost its stative interpretation. Considering the point (30c), Huddleston and Pullum state: “*Get* tends to be preferred over *be* when the **subject-referent** is seen as having **an agentive role** in the situation, or at least as having some responsibility for it” (2002, 1442). The example sentences (33) serve as an illustration:

- (33) a. *Jill was arrested.*
b. *Jill got arrested.*

2.6 Three other variants of passive clause

More recently, Pullum (2014, 4–7) discusses three other types of passive clause that will be introduced only briefly: Prepositional, Embedded and Concealed.

2.6.1 Prepositional passive

According to Pullum's (2014, 4) definition, prepositional passives are those clauses where a PP is missing the NP complement which was moved from object position into a subject position. Below are his examples of long (37b) and short (37c) prepositional passive clauses:

- (37) a. *His friends laughed at him.* (active clause)
b. *He was laughed at by his friends.*
c. *He was laughed at.*

He further divides prepositional passives into **idiomatic** and **locative**. Below is a description of both types quoted directly from the paper (Pullum 2014, 7):

- (38) a. **IDIOMATIC** – “The preposition is specified by the construction itself . . . where the particular prepositions cannot be replaced by others”.
toyed with, taken advantage of, or looked up to by everyone
b. **LOCATIVE** – “The head preposition just has its ordinary locative meaning”.
My hat was sat on by one of the guests, The shop was broken into during the night

2.6.2 Embedded passive

Pullum (2014, 5) uses this term for passive clauses that are inserted inside the active clauses:

- (39) a. *The government had the police investigate the case.*
b. *The government had the case investigated by the police.*

There are two examples in (39). One with active clause (39a) and the second with passive clause (39b).

2.6.3 Concealed passive

Passives that have a gerund-participle as head, instead of a past participle (Pullum 2014, 7):

- (40) a. *This rug badly needs washing.*
b. *The situation needs looking into by experts.*

This type of passive is not discussed any further.

2.7 Voice constraints

When forming passive clauses, there are some restrictions that must be accounted for. These can be divided into several groups according to the type of restriction. The restrictions are summarized and discussed by Quirk et al. (2004, 162–166):

- (41) a. **Verb** constraints
b. **Object** constraints
c. **Agent** constraints
d. **Meaning** constraints
e. **Frequency** constraints

The first two points (41a, b) deal with **syntax** and affect the grammaticality of the sentence, which makes these constraints undoubtedly more restrictive than the other three (41 c–e). Those are concerned mostly with **semantics**.

2.7.1 Verb constraints

This type of constraint is further divided:

- (42) a. Verbs that can be used in active clause only.
b. Verbs that can be used in passive clause only.

2.7.1.1 Active only

Quirk et al. (2004, 162) claim that there is **bigger number of verbs that can be used in active voice only**. These verbs are listed below:

- (43) a. **Copular** verbs
b. **Intransitive** verbs
c. **Some transitive** verbs, called ‘middle’ verbs that are **part of the**

stative class of verbs of 'being' and 'having'

Some examples of (43c) are illustrated in (44):

- (44) a. *They have a nice house*
b. *He lacks confidence*
c. *John resembles his father*

On the other hand, stative verbs that express **volition or attitude** can be found in passive clauses (Quirk et al. 2004, 162):

- (45) a. *The coat does not fit you. ~ *You are not fitted by the coat.*
b. *The police want him. ~ He is wanted by the police.*

The examples in (45) contrast copular verb (45a) and verb of volition (45b).

2.7.1.2 *Passive only*

There are also **some verbs** that can be found **only in passive clauses**, namely *said* and *reputed*. (Quirk et al. 2004, 162):

- (46) a. *John was said/reputed to be a good teacher.*
b. **They said/reputed him to be a good teacher.*

They list two more verbs:

- (47) a. *be born* (with an irregular past participle)
b. *be drowned* (where no agent is implied)

The restriction is not commented any further.

2.7.1.3 *Prepositional verbs*

Quirk et al. (2004, 163) state that **verbal idioms** made from lexical verb followed by a preposition are **much more restricted in passive**:

- (48) a. *The engineers WENT very carefully INTO the problem/the tunnel*

- b. *The problem/?*The tunnel was very carefully GONE INTO by the engineers.*
- (49) a. *They eventually ARRIVED AT the expected result/the splendid stadium.*
- b. *The expected result/?*The splendid stadium was eventually ARRIVED AT.*

They comment: “It is clear that the difference in acceptability can be stated in terms of concrete/abstract passive subjects. It is only the abstract, figurative use that go into, arrive at, look into and many more examples accept the passive” (Quirk et al. 2004, 163). There are however some exceptions, such as a case of coordination:

- (50) *This private drawer of mine has been gone into and rummaged so many times that it is totally disarranged.*

This makes the matter less straightforward. Quirk et al. claim that this is concerned with “a scale of ‘cohesion’ between verb and preposition” (2004, 163).

2.7.2 Object constraints

2.7.2.1 Clausal object

According to Quirk et al. (2004, 163), there are some clausal objects that are restricted for **active voice only**:

- (51) a. Finite clause: *John thought (that) she was attractive. ~ ?* That she was attractive was thought (by John).*
- b. Nonfinite clause: Infinitive: *John hoped to meet her. ~ *To meet her was hoped (by John).*
- c. Nonfinite clause: Participle: *John enjoyed seeing her. ~ ?*Seeing her was enjoyed (by John).*

However, there are **two ways that can make the passive sentence grammatical** in some cases. This applies to **finite clauses only** (Quirk et al. 2004, 163):

- (52) a. *?* That she was attractive was thought (by John).*
- b. *It was thought that she was attractive.*
- c. *She was thought to be attractive.*
- (53) a. *John hoped to meet her.*

- b. ?*It was hoped to meet her.*

In (52b), the object clause was extraposed and substituted by anticipatory pronoun *it*. In (52c) the subject of the object clause was made into the subject of a passive superordinate clause. (53) shows that there this **does not work in every case** (Quirk et al. 2004, 164).

2.7.2.2 Phrasal object

There are three types of constraints on phrasal objects. The ungrammaticality is caused by a **coreference between subject and a noun phrase object**:

- (54) a. *John could see Paul/himself in the mirror.*
b. ~ *Paul/*Himself could be seen in the mirror.*
- (55) a. *We could hardly see each other on the fog.*
b. ~ **Each other could hardly be seen in the fog.*
- (56) a. *The woman shook my hand/her head.*
b. ~ *My Hand/?*Her head was shaken by the woman.*

The examples above illustrate that this restriction applies to **reflexive pronouns** (54), **reciprocal pronouns** (55), and **possessive pronouns** (56) (Quirk et al. 2004, 164).

2.7.3 Agent constraints

Quirk et al. (2004, 165) note that it might be impossible to create active clause that exactly corresponds to the passive clause, if the agent phrase¹ is omitted:

- (57) a. *Order had been restored without bloodshed.*
b. ~ *Colonel Laval (?)/ The administration (?)/ The army (?) had restored order without bloodshed.*

Agent phrases and internalized complements were discussed previously in section 2.3.

2.7.4 Meaning constraints

The propositional **meaning of active and passive clauses can sometimes differ** even in case of matching sentences:

¹ Although it was previously established that the term “agent phrase” will not be used when referring to internalized complement, the term will be used here, because Quirk et al. discuss specifically the semantic role of agent.

- (58) a. *Every schoolboy knows one joke at least.*
b. *~ One joke at least is known by every schoolboy.*

Quirk et al. comment: “The most likely interpretation of (58a) is quite different from the most likely interpretation of (58b): whereas (58a) favours the reading ‘Each schoolboy knows at least some joke or other’, (58b) favours the reading ‘there is one particular joke which is known to every schoolboy’” (2004, 165).

There might also be a **shift in modality** when changing passive clause into active and vice versa:

- (59) a. *John cannot do it. ~ It cannot be done (by John).*

The interpretation is following: “In the active, can here will normally be interpreted as expressing ability, whereas in the passive, it is interpreted as expressing possibility” (Quirk et al. 2004, 165). Although this constraint does not affect the grammaticality of the sentence, one should be aware of this possible change in meaning.

2.7.5 Frequency Constraints

Considering the frequency, Quirk et al. believe that it is **a matter of each text type**. The distinction between spoken and written English does not seem to be important. **The active voice** is much more often used **in imaginative prose**, while **the passive voice** is often used **“in informative writing, and is notably more frequent in the objective, impersonal style of scientific articles and news reporting”** (2004, 166). The topic of usage is further elaborated in chapter 6.

2.8 Summary

In this chapter, the goal was to present some basic characteristics of passive voice in general, such as general definition of the term voice together with the description of the differences between certain types of passive clauses. The reader was introduced to **verbal and adjectival passives**. **An ambiguity can arise** between those two types of passives. It was concluded that the ambiguity **can be most efficiently resolved by replacing the auxiliary *be* with verbs *seem, look or remain***.

Passives can be further separated into **short and long**, depending on the presence or absence of the *by*-phrase. According to the type of verb used in the passive clause, we can divide them to ***be*-passive, *get*-passives, bare passives and other minor types**.

There are also some **restrictions** that should be accounted for. For example, there are **some verbs and types of objects that cannot be used in a passive or active clause, because it would result in ungrammatical sentence**. In addition, one should bear in mind that the meaning of a clause can change when forming passive clause from active and vice versa. Since the data are taken from quite recent English grammar books, it is assumed that all the information is in general correct.

3 *Get-passives*

The previous chapter introduced the variant of the English passive known as the “*get*-passive.” There are **two common contrasting views** to consider when discussing the characteristics of *get*-passive clauses in English (Toyota 2008, 148):

- (60) a. The construction *get*+past participle is a dynamic counterpart of the *be*-passive.
- b. ***Get*+past participle is not a type of passive.** Instead, this type of construction only bears some additional semantic characteristics or pragmatic functions that are not present in *be*-passive.

It is also noted that **(60a) is the more traditional approach** towards the research of *get*-passive (Toyota 2008, 148). (60b) has been already pointed out in the previous chapter.

The following sections will provide more detailed characteristics of the *get*-passive in comparison with the characteristics of *be*-passive.

3.1 *Get*-passive as a dynamic counterpart to *be*-passive

Point (60a) is, according to Toyota (2008, 149), **the most common view of the *get*-passives.** However, he further argues that ***be*-passive itself is in many cases dynamic.** His diachronic analysis shows that the dynamic aspect might not be the reason why *get*-passive might be preferred over *be*-passive in some cases: “The emergence of the *get*-passive happened much later than the ME (Middle English) increase in dynamic reading in the *be*-passive. Both synchronically and diachronically, **the emergence of the *get*-passive seems redundant, if this construction is purely for the purpose of being the dynamic counterpart**” (Toyota 2008, 150). However, as stated in section 2.5.3, even *get*-passives can be adjectival, and those are inherently stative. Toyota does not address this point.

3.2 *Get* as an auxiliary

Toyota (2008, 151) refers to Haegeman (1985, 54–6) and Downing (1996, 183), who argue that *get* does not belong to the categories of auxiliary verbs, since it does not have the required so-called NICCEE properties²:

- (61) a. **Negation**, i.e. *He was not caught*, but **He got not caught*.
b. **Interrogative**, i.e. *Was he caught?*, but **Got he caught?*
c. **VP-ellipsis by deletion of the verb**, i.e. *He was caught and so was his friend*, but **He got caught, and so got his friend*.
d. **Coda or Tag properties**, i.e. *He was caught, wasn't he?*, but **He got caught, gotn't he?*
e. **Position of adverbs**, i.e. *He was never caught*, but **He got never caught*.
f. **Position of a floating quantifier**, i.e. *The boys were all caught*, but **The boys got all caught*.
g. **Existential *there***, i.e. *There was a plane hijacked*, but **There got a plane hijacked*.

The results of these tests make this argument quite convincing. Toyota comments: “In this respect, the *get*-passive should be treated as a construction ‘verb+past participle as complement’, like *go*+past participle or *fall*+past participle. However, the *get*-passive always involves some outer cause, and the subject entity is always a recipient of this cause” (2008, 151).

3.3 Various characteristics of *get*-passives

3.3.1 *Subject responsibility*

According to Toyota (2008, 156), *get*-passive makes the referent of the subject responsible for the event that the verb conveys. This is illustrated with the following examples:

- (62) a. *He was shot by the riot police.*
b. *He got shot by the riot police.*
(63) a. *He was shot by the riot police deliberately/was deliberately shot by the riot police.*
b. *He deliberately got shot by the riot police.*

² Negation, Interrogation, Coda, Contraction, Emphasis, Ellipsis (3a-f).

- (64) a. **He told her to be fired*.
 b. *He told her to get fired*.

He explains that in case of the *be*-passive in (62a), the intention applies to the NP *the riot police*. However, in case of (62b), the subject *He* acted with an intention/volition. He also states that **the intention is clearer, if one adds an adverbial, which itself expresses an intention**. This can be observed in (63), where the adverbial *deliberately* is inserted in the required position: “In (63a), the possible reading is that the riot police deliberately opened fire at him, while in (63b), he acted deliberately to be shot by the riot police”. The examples (64) are concerned with commands. While *get*-passives (64b) are compatible with commands, *be*-passives (64a) are not.

Toyota (2008, 156) divides subject control into **two types**:

- (65) a. **subject control**
 b. **generic characteristics of subjects**

While the subject of the *get*-passive in (62b), (63b) and (64b) can be considered controlled, Toyota says that it was previously argued about **the lack of control in passive subjects**: “[Klaiman (1988, 1991) argued that] the common property of passive subjects is that they are not in control. An entity which is in control tends to be the active subject. Thus, **the subject in the *get*-passive seems to contradict the common characteristics of the passive subject**” (2008, 157). However, he also states that the amount of control, which the subject in the *get*-passive can have, might differ. Similar points have been addressed in section 2.5.3.

The “term generic characteristics of subjects” is explained with (66):

- (66) *John got promoted last week*.

Toyota explains: “The event of promotion was made possible because of something that John possesses or does, such as his hard work, intelligence, connections to managers in the company, etc.” (2008, 157).

However, referring to Vanrespaille (1991, 107), he notes that **the subject responsibility relies heavily on semantics** and can even be measured on a scale. Because of this, **the characteristics of the subject in *get*-passives is never quite clear** (Toyota 2008, 158). This statement makes the point fairly questionable and opened for further research.

3.3.2 Lack of internalized complement³

Toyota (2008, 159) refers to previous linguistic research. He states that in Present-Day English there is about **20–30% of *be*-passive clauses** with expressed internalized complements, but only around **2% of *get*-passive clauses**. However, Toyota **does not show any details about the research** that he refers to. Nonetheless, this is **one of the major distinctions between *be*-passives and *get*-passives**. He provides some examples of *get*-passive clauses with expressed *by*-phrase:

- (67) a. *'Well, we're not going to bother to train anybody in our industry because they'll promptly get snapped up by another industry,' the Duke added.*
(LOB A12 107–108)
- b. *she gets flatly contradicted by Bernard every time she opens her mouth*
(LL 1 3 7212310 1 2 A 11 – 1 3 7212310 1 1 A 11)
- c. *I was getting quite impressed by this [orderliness and uniformity in new paintings of flats] (LL 4 4 12613200 1 1 D 11)*

The examples (67a) and (67b) are described as **volitional with an agent** and example (67c) as a **non-volitional outer cause** (Toyota 2008, 160).

3.3.3 Animacy of subject and subjective viewpoint

Toyota (2008, 162) uses the following description of subjective viewpoint: “**The speaker’s opinion on the event without his/her direct involvement**”. He states that: “the *get*-passive is capable of expressing meanings such as sentiment, sympathy, etc., of which the *be*-passive is not capable” (2008, 162). However, meanings such as these may require direct involvement of the subject. According to him, **animacy of the subject with *get*-passives does not play a crucial role**, when the speaker/writer is expressing their opinion on the event. On the other hand, he claims that with *get*-passives, the speakers/writers tend to associate themselves with animate (mostly human) entities, as seen from the data in (68):

- (68) Human subjects: 84.7 %
Non-human animate subjects: 1.0 %
Inanimate subject: 14.3 %

³ Toyota uses the term “actor phrase”.

The data are supposed to contrast with *be*-passives: “**The *get*-passive accommodates subjective viewpoint better than the *be*-passive**, which tends to force the speaker/writer to view the clause from the viewpoint of third person or inanimate entities” (Toyota 2008, 163). Once again, however, there are no details about the research.

3.3.4 *Adversative reading*

Two types of adversity are introduced by Toyota (2008, 168):

- (69) a. **lexical adversity**⁴: the main verb makes the adversative reading possible
(*arrest, beat, break, chase, hurt, steal, etc.*)
- b. **syntactic adversity**: the construction itself makes the adversative reading possible

Referring to his previous research (Toyota 2007), he notes that **only lexical adversity is possible with *be*-passives**. He illustrates two more examples of *get*-passive clauses with adversative reading:

- (70) a. *What do you mean a couple of hundred tiles? Why do you have a couple of hundred tiles? Oh I don' t know. You just get left with these things.*
(LL 210 28 2250 1 2 c 20 - 210 29 2270 1 1 B 11)
- b. *I mean but they can do something fairly minor and get sent there.*
(LL 4 7 15 1380 1 2c 12 - 4 7 16 1400 1 1c 11)

He comments: “The verbs *leave* and *send* on their own do not create a high degree of adversity, but we can detect a certain degree of adversity (suffering, annoyance, etc.) in each case” (2008, 168). The adversity seems to be one of the most prominent characteristics, since Huddleston and Pullum (2002) discuss adversity of *get*-passives in their grammar book too, as seen in section 2.5.3.

3.4 Questioning the *get*-passive

Overall, Toyota argues that **not only the dynamic aspect should be taken into consideration**, when comparing *get*-passive clauses with *be*-passive clauses: “The lengthy description above of various characteristics found in the *get*-passive, but not in the *be*-passive,

⁴ Toyota (2008, 168) notes that lexical adversity has been generally overlooked.

reassures us that the *get*-passive is not simply a dynamic counterpart of the *be*-passive” (2008, 172). The status of *get*-passive is questioned, when he compares the *get*-passive clauses cross linguistically, because **in other languages, these types of clauses might not even involve a verb in the past participle** (e.g. in Welsh, Irish and Tzeltal, there might be NP complement instead). This could be considered “an active voice with passive reading” (Toyota 2008, 173). Here are his other arguments that are supposed to question the status of *get*-passives:

- (71) a. generic characteristics of the subject: **only *get* can create additional meanings based on the subject’s characteristics.**
- b. subject’s animacy: **the *get*-passive shows a different pattern from that in the *be*-passive.**

On the other hand, these can be nothing more, but a list of differences between two types of passive clauses. The previous claim implies that if one wants to question the status of *get*-passive, the research must be cross linguistic.

3.5 Summary

This chapter was focused on the additional characteristics of *get*-passive clauses in Present-Day English, mostly in comparison with the *be*-passive clauses. The discussion lead to the conclusion that ***get* should not be considered an auxiliary**, for not having the syntactic properties that auxiliaries usually do have.

Furthermore, it can be argued that the ***get*-passive is not only a dynamic counterpart of *be*-passive**, because it has some unique characteristics that are not found with the *be*-passive. For example, there are some characteristics of the *get*-passive subjects that are vastly different from the subjects of *be*-passive, such as subject control, animacy or viewpoint. When addressing overtly expressed **internalized complements**, it was established that these are **quite uncommon with *get*-passives**, which makes a great contrast with *be*-passives. However, there are not any further details about the research that he referred to. The section aimed on **adversative reading** shows that **this type of reading is also formed differently with both types of passives.**

Overall, these points try to support the suggestion that ***get*-passive clauses should not really be considered a type of passive**, since some characteristics are quite different for *get*-

passive and *be*-passive. For the most part, however, it mostly seems to be just a comparison of different types of passives.

4 Adjectival and verbal passives

4.1 Assumed differences between adjectival and verbal passives

While section 2.4.1 discussed established differences between adjectival and verbal passives, this chapter will focus on the similarities between them. However, these similarities were originally thought of as differences too (Wasow 1977). It will be based on arguments introduced by Broening (2014), who quite recently presented his paper on passives that argues against some of the previous claims. These questionable claims are summarized below:

- (72) a. **Adjectival passives cannot be formed from raising to object**, but verbal passives can.
- b. **Adjectival passives do not contain an external argument**, unlike verbal passives, which do.
- c. **Verbal passives do not allow reflexive action**, but adjectival passives do.

In addition, the last section of this chapter will address the suggestion that all passive participles in English are in fact adjectives.

4.1.1 Raising

In the past was argued that adjectival passives cannot be created by raising to object (Wasow 1977). Some of the previously used examples to prove that raising is not allowed can be found in (73) and (74):

- (73) a. * *There seems believed to be corruption in high places.*
- b. * *Mary appears thought to be a genius.*
- c. * *John sounds considered to be a scoundrel.*
- d. * *Nixon acted found to be not guilty.*
- (74) a. * *Teddy already acts elected President.*
- b. ? *John seems considered a fool.*

Breuning (2014, 368) argues that these claims are based on quite **shallow analysis** that lacks enough examples to be considered valid. He criticizes mostly two facts. Wasow (1977) illustrated only eight raising verbs which inherently do not allow adjectival passives (*acclaim*,

believe, consider, elect, expect, find, know, think) and the use of modification by *very* as a grammatical test, similarly to what was said in section 2.4.1.1: “This is not the best contrast, because *very* may only modify gradable adjectives, and is not very good with non-gradable adjectives like *believed, considered, or expected* in the first place (compare **very expected* with *very unexpected*)” (Breuning 2014, 368). Thus, Breuning argues: “Logically, though, to show that no ECM/raising verb can form an adjectival passive, **one has to show that every verb that is ECM/raising does not allow an adjectival passive**” (2014, 368). He refers to Noël (2002, 6–7), who believes that **there are over one hundred raising verbs to be tested**.

The examples that Breuning (2014, 368) presents in his paper are **taken from the internet**. He acknowledges that many of the found examples sounds rather unnatural and some of them could even be considered ungrammatical. However, he chose to include only those that are **grammatical and written by native speakers**. Although Breuning made his assumptions about the appropriateness by himself, he is fairly confident in his judgement: “In most cases it is obvious whether a given example was produced by a native speaker or not, since the errors that they make are qualitatively different” (2014, 369). He used verbs that are followed by adjectives in every case. Some of the example sentences that he used are illustrated below:

- (75) a. **acknowledge**: *The real solution is to use a secure script, and the only one that appears acknowledged to be secure in these forums is called NMS FormMail.*
- b. **admit**: *In respect to criminal prosecutions, the difficulty seems admitted to be insurmountable . . .*
- c. **affirm**: *He seems affirmed to be one of the best I’ve known.*
- d. **allege**: *It’s the same for anyone charged with a crime or misdemeanour, they remain “alleged” to have committed the crime until they are judged on their crime and a verdict is reached.*
- e. **allow**: *North Korean citizens remain allowed to use mobile devices.*
- f. **assume**: *I’m really fuzzy on the whole blank file thing that seems assumed to be thought understood.*
- g. **believe**: *That transformation is not mentioned and seems believed to be magical.*
- h. **declare**: *. . . but which would appear declared to be execrable . . .*
- i. **make out**: *. . . their punishment often seems made out to be some kind of torture.*
- j. **permit**: *Citizens of both nations remain permitted to register as self-employed and start businesses, or work and study on a Yellow Card visa.*

- k. **purport**: *Sadly most legends are never quite what they seem purported to be.*
- l. **prove**: *. . . it seems proven to be effective. . .*
- m. **rumor**: *Now that the Redskins passed on drafting a quarterback, nearly every available veteran thrower of the pigskin seems rumored to be heading to Ashburn.*

Breuning (2014, 369) notes that he found **only few examples with the verb *affirm* and *allege***. On the other hand, he found **many examples for the verb *allow***. He concluded: “**The majority of ECM/raising verbs** (eleven out of fifteen, or thirteen out of fifteen counting *affirm* and *allege*) **can form adjectival passives** for many speakers of English (if not all)” (Breuning 2014, 372). He also shows some examples with the prefix *un-* (76):

- (76) a. *Therefore, those steps were undemonstrated to be true.*
 b. *We are against fad diets and questionable supplements that are unproven to be either safe or effective.*
 c. *Case reports have documented success in the treatment of EAC with drugs previously unreported to be useful for EAC.*
 d. *They are unspecified to be either constructive or destructive: they are ethically neutral phenomena.*

This test, as stated before in section 2.4.1.3, proves that the passive is undoubtedly adjectival.

In addition, Breuning (2014, 373) claims that adjectival passives formed from raising verbs can include **complements in a form of small clause** (77a) and **full non-finite complements** (77b):

- (77) a. *. . . and ever since then plays have taken on the fullest liberty of speech until profanity seems considered a necessary concomitant of realistic representation.*
 b. *The Otoes, Kansas, and others of the same stock, will not only marry several sisters, but their deceased brothers’ wives; in fact, this last seems considered a duty so that the orphan children of the brother may not be without a protector.*

Although Breuning (2014, 375) considers adjectival passives formed from rising acceptable, he agrees that not everyone can hold the same opinion. He states that the **acceptability can sometimes rely on the context** in which the passive clause is used and

notes that **semantics of adjectival passives can potentially provide an explanation for this**. As a proof, he adds more context (78b) to Wasow's (1977, 346) previously unacceptable adjectival sentence (78a):

- (78) a. ? *John seems considered a fool*.
b. *Also, Anne Elliot seems considered a spinster by everyone, including herself, . . .*

In Breuning's words: "Wasow's example in (78a) has **no supporting context**, and it is difficult to see how the state of being considered a fool could be relevant and also more or less apparent, as required by *seem*. In contrast, in (78b), it is clear that the producer of this sentence is describing how characters view each other in a 19th-century English novel, where the state of being considered a spinster is culturally relevant and could be more or less apparent" (2014, 375–376).

Modifiers too can make adjectival passives formed from raising more grammatical (79):

- (79) a. *JavaScript seems widely considered a bit of a mess, . . .*
b. *Bukowski's style seems widely considered to be composed of elements of extreme honesty and realism*.

He notes: "Searching for the string *seems widely considered* [shows] far more relevant examples than just *seems considered to be*." (Breuning 2014, 376).

4.1.2 External Arguments

To prove that adjectival passives contain external arguments, Breuning (2014, 379) introduces **eventive by-phrase** and **different types of external arguments**.

4.1.2.1 Eventive by-phrase

Breuning (2014, 379) argues that **external arguments do not necessarily act as a modifiers of the state**, which is denoted by the adjective, but they **can be associated with the event as well**. He used (80) as a proof of his claim:

- (80) a. *Invading Commander: I want the treasury left untouched!*
b. *Underling: Untouched by anyone but you, you mean.*

He comments: “In the response, the **by-phrase must be modifying an event**, since the resulting state need not involve any touching by the commander, or even any evidence of who had done the touching (or reading, or accessing, or seeing, . . . ; seeing, in particular, rarely leaves any traces)” (Breuning 2014, 379). For these types of external arguments, he uses the term **eventive by-phrases**.

- (81) a. *Unread by anyone but you.*
b. *Unaccessed by anyone but you.*
c. *Unseen by anyone but you.*
- (82) a. *Biden’s optimism undisturbed by Iraqi bombs.*
b. *Former investigator says he remains disturbed by what he saw at baby murder scene.*
c. *No longer does Tim Thomas appear trained by Tim Hortons.*

Examples in (81) are supposed to show that **untouched can be substituted for many other examples of adjectives with the prefix un-**. His arguments are further supported by more example sentences with eventive *by-phrases* (82) taken from the Internet (Breuning 2014, 379):

4.1.2.2 *Other types of external arguments*

Below are some of his example sentences of adjectival passive clauses with different types of external arguments:

- (83) a. *Dale Harwood seems considered by most to be the best living custom saddle maker.*
b. *The door is open and the deadbolt looks smashed with something heavy like a sledgehammer.*
c. *...for he seems dressed with more studied elegance than anybody here.*

These include adjectival passives formed from **ECM/raising verbs** (83a), **adjectival passives with instrumental phrases** (83b) and **adverbs expressing the manner of the action of the implicit argument** (83c).

Breuning (2014, 381) believes that the assumption that adjectival phrases do not include *by-phrases* came from **an insufficient analysis** made by Williams (1987). However, he agrees

that **verbal passives with these three types of external arguments are far more often seen than adjectival passives with an external argument**, simply because they are easily formed and more natural sounding for the speakers, which is supposedly connected to the eventiveness of verbal passives.

4.1.3 Reflexives

Breuning (2014, 382) states that **verbal passives do allow reflexive action**, contrary to the belief that only adjectival passives do so (Kratzer 2000; Meltzer-Asscher 2011):

- (84) a. *The children appear washed. They did it all by themselves.*
b. *The children are being washed. #They're doing it themselves.*
- (85) a. *The children are being sorted. They're doing it themselves. (sorted children)*
b. *The children are being divided into groups. They're doing it themselves. (the children appear divided into groups)*
c. *The children are being exposed to the disease. They're doing it themselves. (exposed children)*
d. *The children are currently being named. They're choosing their own names. (The children all appear named.)*

In this case, he argues that this claim was established prematurely, since it **lacks more proof**: “Only one or two examples have ever been given in support of this claim” (Breuning 2014, 382). (85) includes the examples used in favour of his argument. They are all based on the two example sentences (84) that were used by (Kratzer 2000; Meltzer-Asscher 2011) as a proof that reflexives are not acceptable with verbal passives. Breuning criticises the use of the verb *wash*.

4.2 All passive participles in English are adjectives

This hypothesis is based on the fact that **both verbal and adjectival passives can follow the verbs *be* and *get*** (Freidin 1975; Emonds 2006; Lundquist 2012). However, Breuning (2014, 413) evaluates the available data on the topic and argues that there are some major differences between verbs and adjectives that might prove this hypothesis to be wrong. His arguments are discussed below.

4.2.1 Distributional argument

Emonds (2007) argues, using examples such as the following, that **there are other various grammatical verbs that select verbal passive phrases** (*have, want, need, see and hear*):

- (86) a. *The players had [the ballboys sent boxes of chocolates for Christmas].*
b. *He wants [the table given a thorough cleaning].*
c. *She needs [her assistant brought a new smartphone].*
d. *You may see [the prisoners given their mid-day meal].*
e. *The players heard [insults shouted at them by irate fans].*

Breuning explains: “Emonds argues that the bracketed phrase in each example is a **passive phrase, with an underlying object promoted** The distributional generalization is that passive phrases can appear in any context that selects either AP or [NP AP]. The verb *get* allows either one” (2014, 413):

- (87) a. *Harry got sick.* (AP)
b. *We got [Harry sick].* (NP AP)
(88) a. *Harry got slipped a mickey.* (Passive)
b. *We got [Harry slipped a mickey].* (NP Passive)

The examples (86) have the verbs followed by [NP AP]. However, Breuning (2014, 414) does not agree with Emonds (2007), because of semi-grammatical verb ***make*** which **accepts [NP AP]** (89a), but **not a verbal passive** (89b, c):

- (89) a. *Such heavy use made [the table dirty].*
b. **I made [Baghdad approached].*
c. **I made [her assistant brought a new computer].*

For that specific reason, Breuning presents a different argument: “verbal passives can appear in the same position where an active, eventive VP headed by *V-ing* can appear. *Be* (90a) and *get* (90b, c) permit *V-ing*, as do all Emonds’s verbs (90 d–h). In contrast (91), *make* permits neither *V-ing* nor passives (though it does allow a bare V), but it does allow adjectives” (2014, 414):

- (90) a. *Harry is handing people leaflets.*
 b. *Harry got moving.*
 c. *Harry got [them moving].*
 d. *The players had [ballboys pitching them curveballs].*
 e. *The coach wanted [the players throwing each other curveballs].*
 f. *She needs [her assistant sending people bouquets of flowers].*
 g. *From here, you can see [spies slipping their contacts secret documents].*
 h. *The players heard [irate fans shouting insults at them].*
- (91) a. *Such heavy use made [the table disgusting].* (Adjective)
 b. *I made it disgust you.* (Bare V)
 c. **I made it disgusting you.* (V-ing)
 d. **I made him running around.* (V-ing)
 e. **I made [Baghdad approached].* (Passive)
 f. **I made [her assistant brought a new computer].* (Passive)

Breuning argues as follows: “**Verbal passives are permitted as the complements of verbs that also permit V-ing.** . . . verbal passives are truly verbal, just like (at least some) phrases headed by V-ing. **Verbal passives, just like verb phrases headed by V-ing, are selected by verbs which select VPs.** (Some verbs impose an additional restriction, selecting only bare VPs; these do not select V-ing or passive VPs.)” (2014, 415).

4.2.2 Category difference

The difference that Breuning (2014, 415) is proposing is concerned with verbs and adjectives and their **different roles in questions with how**. The differences are explained in (92), while the examples with the description are in (93):

- (92) a. adjectives **must** pied-pipe *how* – *how* only **questions degree**
 b. verbs **may not** pied-pipe with *how* – *how* **questions manner**
 c. If *how* does not pied-pipe with an adjective, the only possible reading is a **request for an explanation**
- (93) a. *How was he defeated?* (questions manner)
 b. *How defeated was he?* (questions degree)
 c. *How was he passed the secret plans?* (questions manner)
 d. **How passed the secret plans was he?* (pied-piping impossible with V)

- e. *How was he unfazed?* (only: requests explanation)
- f. *How unfazed was he?* (questions degree)

He argues that these points should establish that verbal and adjectival passives **do not belong to the same category**.

4.2.3 Difference in coordination

Breuning's (2014, 415) argument is based on claims previously made by Lundquist (2008):

- (94) a. adjectival passives can be coordinated with underived adjectives (95a),
- b. verbs cannot be coordinated with underived adjectives (95b),
- c. verbal passives cannot be coordinated with adjectives (95c).
- (95) a. *He made Bond angry and unconvinced that we were right.*
- b. **He made Bond angry and hand Xenia the secret plans.*
- c. **He made Bond angry and given a sedative.*

However, there are some grammatical examples of adjectives coordinated with verbal passives, contrary to (94c):

- (96) a. *With Bond semi-conscious and given a dose of truth serum, . . .*
- b. *With Bond semi-conscious and being given a dose of truth serum, . . .*

Despite this, Breuning argues that (96a) is in fact “**coordination of larger categories**, for instance some kind of non-finite clausal category” (2014, 415). Considering the second example, he states that: “The second conjunct in (96b) could not possibly be an AP. Where such larger categories are not possible, as in (95c), **coordination of verbal passives with underived adjectives is ungrammatical**” (2014, 416). On the other hand, the grammaticality of the example sentences in (96) seems rather questionable.

He concludes that namely **the distributional differences** between adjectival and verbal passives lead him to believe that **passive participles should not be viewed on the whole as adjectives**.

4.3 Summary

The chapter presented quite recent view on a topic that has been much discussed in the past. As mentioned a couple of times before in the chapter, it seems that **the previous discussion lacked an analysis that would be detailed enough**. With an extensive use of examples, Breuning (2014) has shown why his arguments against previously established claims should be considered. Other than that, he constructed a quite detailed and somehow complicated analysis in support of his claims. The analysis will not be discussed due to its aforementioned complexity. It seems that the **boundaries and differences between adjectival and verbal passives are not as clear as previously thought**. Raising to object seems to be allowed with adjectival passives, as well as the presence of the external argument, while reflexive action appears to be acceptable with verbal passives.

Although it is possible that the topic will be re-evaluated in the future, since these claims are recent, there are **a few points that seem to hold up well**. Breuning used an extensive number of relevant examples which were taken from the internet and novels. This definitely proves that **there is a general usage of passive constructions that were previously thought of as completely unacceptable** (Wasow 1977).

It was also suggested that all past participles in English are created from adjectives. However, it turns out to be quite complicated to come up with a straightforward answer whether it is or is not true. Despite this, the discussion in this chapter leads one to believe that this hypothesis should not be generally accepted as correct and needs further discussion.

5 *By-phrases*

5.1 Established claims

According to Breuning (2013, 1), there are many generally accepted **claims that need a revision** (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005; Keenan 1980). The claims that will be addressed in this chapter, are summarized below:

- (97) a. **The passive *by*-phrase can include any thematic role** (*by*-phrases in nominals have only limited set of roles).
- b. **The *by*-phrase itself cannot assign a semantic role.**
- c. **The *by*-phrase in passive has different properties than *by*-phrase in other environments.**

5.1.1 Supporting the claims

The examples below by Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) are supposed to show that **thematic role of experiencer and perceiver are not allowed with nominals**, but are allowed with passives:

- (98) a. *The present was received by my mother-in-law.* (recipient)
- b. *The damage was seen at once by the investigators.* (perceiver)
- (99) a. *the receipt of the present (*by my mother-in-law)* (recipient)
- b. *the sight (*by the investigators) of the damage* (perceiver)

Breuning comments: “This seems to indicate that the preposition *by* can assign a limited set of roles by itself outside of the passive (e.g., agent); but in the passive, some special syntactic mechanism is able to transmit the external role of the verb to the *by*-phrase, regardless of what that role is” (2013, 1).

5.2 Limitations of *by*-phrases

Breuning (2013, 2) notes that the *by*-phrase in a sentential domain is limited only to passives. The *by*-phrase is not allowed with, and **cannot assign a thematic role to: actives and other**

types of VPs that lack external arguments, such as unaccusatives (100a), middles (100b) and “sporadic advancements” (100c):

- (100) a. *The ship sank (*by a saboteur).*
b. *Politicians bribe easily (*by lobbyists).*
c. *\$5000 buys a lot of heroin (*by junkies).*

However, the *by*-phrase is **allowed with nominals that are not clearly derived from verbs**, where the *by*-phrase assigns a **thematic role of agent** (Keenan 1980):

- (101) a. *The move by United was unexpected.*
b. *The march on Washington by the farm workers was a success.*
c. *a wild pitch by Tanner*

Breuning comments: “These two facts together appear to indicate that in the sentential domain, ***by*-phrases are limited to passives**, and in passives, they have **properties that distinguish them from *by*-phrases elsewhere**. So, a theory of *by*-phrases needs a special account for passives” (2013, 2). In the following section, he argues that passive *by*-phrase does not have any special properties.

5.3 *By*-phrases with passives

Breuning (2013, 3) turns to **two types of adjuncts that can replace the preposition *by* in a passive clause: instrumentals (102a) and comitatives (102b):**

- (102) a. *The ship was sunk with a torpedo.*
b. *500 people were seated with flashlights.*

He states that the acceptability of these two types of adjuncts in different environments is **similar to the *by*-phrase**, meaning that these types of adjuncts are **unacceptable with the same types of VPs as *by*-phrases in passive**. (103) illustrates ungrammatical examples of instrumentals, while (104) illustrates comitatives:

- (103) a. * *The ship sank with a torpedo.* (unaccusative)
b. * *This theater seats 500 people with flashlights.* (sporadic advancement)

- c. * \$5000 buys a lot of heroin with computers these days. (sporadic advancement)
- (104) a. * The ship sank with a henchman. (unaccusative)
- b. * This stadium seats 50,000 ticketholders with the security guards.
(sporadic advancement)
- c. * \$5000 buys a lot of heroin with one's boss these days. (sporadic advancement)

Thus, Breuning (2013, 4) formulates the following hypothesis:

- (105) Hypothesis: **By-phrases, comitatives, and instrumentals require the presence of an external argument.**

He notes: “One way of thinking about this in the case of *by*-phrases is the following: ***by*-phrases do not add external argument roles, they fill them.** That is, they are an alternative realization of the external argument. But there must be an external argument for them to realize it” (Breuning 2013, 4). While these facts **do not provide an explanation for the limitations on *by*-phrases**, they do imply that that **there is not anything such as a special syntactic relation between the external argument and the *by*-phrase.**

5.4 *By*-phrases with nominals

Breuning (2013, 4) argues that a nominal *by*-phrase can take the same thematic roles as a passive *by*-phrase. He divides nominals into two following groups:

- (106) a. *receipt* and *knowledge* (semantic roles of recipient and holder of knowledge) – **allow the *by*-phrase**
- b. *sight*, *fear*, *sense*, *respect*, *smell*, and *taste* (semantic roles of perceiver and experiencer) – **do not allow the *by*-phrase**

According to previous research (Culicover and Jackendoff 2005; Jackendoff 1977), even the group (106a), which involves semantic roles of **recipient and holder of a knowledge state**, **should not be allowed with nominals.** To prove the acceptability of (106a), Breuning presents some examples found on the internet (107):

- (107) a. *To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number OPP-34143C in the subject line on the first page of your response.*

- b. *Suspicious trading points to advance knowledge by big investors of September 11 attacks.*

Interestingly enough, the semantic roles of **experiencer and perceiver are allowed with by-phrases, if the nominals are derived from the name of the semantic role itself** (Breuning 2013, 5):

- (108) a. *His inadequacies were finally perceived by his wife.* (passive)
b. *the perception of his inadequacies by his wife* (nominal)
- (109) a. *Pain can be experienced by the unborn.* (passive)
b. *the experience of pain by the unborn* (nominal)

In addition, he lists other nominals that are synonymous with the incompatible nominals in (106b), but do allow the *by*-phrase:

- (110) a. *see – detect, observe, recognize*
b. *sense – apprehend, discern*
c. *respect – admire, appreciate, venerate*
d. *smell – olfaction*

It is shown that **nominal *by*-phrases do accept semantic roles that were not supposed to be allowed**. Breuning (2013, 6) suggest that morphology or more detailed classification of nominals might provide partial explanation. However, he states that **more detailed analysis is required to fully understand the problem**.

5.5 Summary

The chapter addressed the claims that were introduced in (97). Breuning's approach proved **all three of them to be wrong** to at least some extent. He argues that **all the semantic roles in question are allowed with both nominal and passive *by*-phrases**, if one tries to look hard enough for the correct nominal that might express these roles, without interfering with the grammaticality of the phrase. He also argues that ***by*-phrases in passives do not have any special syntactic properties**, simply because **the *by*-phrases in the passives can be substituted with other types of phrases**, such as instrumentals and comitatives. These phrases share similar rules for acceptability in different environments with passive *by*-phrases.

Once again, Breuning's arguments imply that the claims regarding *by*-phrases were lacking enough proof and they were established prematurely. These arguments are further supported by a complex syntactical analysis that is not addressed.

6 The Passive voice in writing

In recent work, Pullum (2014) criticized grammarians and writing experts for their **inherently negative view towards passive clauses** used in writing: “Passives, we are told firmly, over and over again, should be shunned. A diverse assortment of unpleasant maladies will afflict your work, it is claimed, if you use passives: your writing will become weak, dull, vague, cowardly, bureaucratic, and dishonest” (Pullum 2014, 1). Below are some of the quotes from writers and writing experts that Pullum (2014, 1) used in his paper as examples of the negative criticism:

- (111) a. **“Do not use the passive voice when such use makes a statement clumsy and wordy . . . Do not, by using the passive voice, leave the agent of the verb vaguely indicated, when the agent should be clearly identified”** (Woolley 1907).
- b. **“Use the active voice . . . The active voice is usually more direct and vigorous than the passive . . .”** (Strunk 1918).
- c. **“As a rule, avoid the passive voice”** (Foerster and Steadman 1931).
- d. **“Never use the passive where you can use the active”** (Orwell 1946).
- e. **“The passive voice liquidates and buries the active individual, along with most of the awful truth. Our massed, scientific, and bureaucratic society is so addicted to it that you must constantly alert yourself against its drowsy, impersonal pomp”** (Baker 1985; quoted by Haussamen 1997).

It is worth noting that, these statements were made in the first half of the 20th century, except for (111e).

Pullum (2014, 17–18) summarizes some of the common points that are made in terms of criticizing the usage of passive voice in writing:

- (112) a. **dull and static** rather than lively and dynamic
- b. **sneaky or evasive** concerning agency or responsibility
- c. **feeble and weak** rather than bold and strong
- d. **avoided by good writers**

He **strongly disagrees** with the aforementioned claims: “[Educated Americans] are presented with a variety of different allegations about the passive voice (or the ‘passive style’—the two are not clearly distinguished) and what is so bad about it. Yet those allegations are hardly ever seriously supported” (Pullum 2014, 17). The following section of the paper will focus on the allegations mentioned in (112) and Pullum’s arguments against them.

6.1 Dull and static rather than lively and dynamic

This point is addressed only briefly. Pullum (2014, 18) quotes a section from Wikipedia article:

(113) *President Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas, Texas, at 12:30 pm Central Standard Time on November 22, 1963. . .*

He argues: “One could hardly imagine a way of making a statement introducing that shocking event that would be more vivid. And with Kennedy as the topic of the entire article, having his name as the subject like this is obviously the best stylistic option” (Pullum 2014, 18). While his argument is understandable, he is not very convincing with only one example.

6.2 Sneaky or evasive concerning agency or responsibility

Pullum (2014, 18) quotes one of the critics⁵, who most likely not agree with the usage of passive voice:

(114) “A sentence written in passive voice is the shifty desperado who tries to win the gunfight by shooting the sheriff in the back, stealing his horse, and sneaking out of town”.

(115) a. Active: *The committee will review all applications in early April.*
b. Passive: *In early April, all applications will be reviewed by the committee.*

The sneakiness and evasiveness refers to a missing agent in some of the passive clauses. This applies **only to short passives**, which has been already discussed in section 2.3. However, the example in (115b) illustrates a long passive clause. This fact is addressed by Pullum: “The administrative detail of who will undertake the examination of the applications (the

⁵ Sherry Roberts, author of the Internet article *11 Ways to Improve Your Writing and Your Business* at <http://www.editorialservice.com/writing-and-editing/11ways.html#7>

committee) has been made fully explicit” (2014, 18). To further support his argument, Pullum (2014, 19) illustrates examples of short passives that, according to him, **do not need to express an agent**:

- (116) a. *When the patient was first diagnosed with cancer her symptoms were minor.*
b. *Perhaps the mysterious mound was constructed as a memorial.*
c. *Since metallic sodium reacts violently with water it is usually shipped in oil-filled canisters.*
d. *The strange object found in the crater was apparently made from a material unknown to terrestrial science.*

Pullum (2014, 19) argues that **the agent is irrelevant** and, in addition, the example sentences (116) **cannot be easily made into an active voice**. This holds up quite well, especially since similar points were made in section 2.3.2.

6.3 Feeble and weak rather than bold and strong

Pullum (2014, 19) addresses two points. Whether the passive clauses can be in any way referred to as weak and whether bold writing should be inherently considered the right way of writing. The first issue is addressed with an example from a novel (Pullum 2014, 19):

- (117) *I was arrested in Eno’s diner.*

Pullum tries to illustrate that the **usage of active voice might affect the desired stylistic effect**: “Indeed, **filling in an agent as the arresting authority would actually have spoiled the exposition**: in the first scene of the novel Reacher is taken into custody suddenly and without warning, and has no idea what is going on, who has ordered his arrest, or what the motive might be” (2014, 19).

Other than that, he argues that the **bold writing should not be considered a norm**: “The writing advisers seem to have no doubt in their minds that every sentence is supposed to come at you like a punch in the gut from Jack Reacher’s fist, on top of assuming unjustifiably that passive clauses can’t deliver a gut punch. Both assumptions seem completely indefensible. This thought, however, is not supported by any examples that would illustrate the point” (Pullum 2014, 19). This point is quite similar to the previous one. The addition of stylistic argument makes Pullum’s points even stronger.

6.4 Avoided by good writers

In case of this allegation, Pullum (2014, 20–21) turns to statistics. He argues that many of the writers, even those who are against the use of passive clauses themselves, use passive clauses quite frequently. The most notable statistics is taken from George Orwell's essay, who himself advised not to use passive clauses, as illustrated in (111): “By one count, on average **in typical prose about 13% of the transitive verbs are in the passive**, whereas in Orwell's essay ‘Politics and the English language’ it is 20% While a careful count of the whole of Orwell's essay shows that 26% are passive. By either count, then, **Orwell uses more than one and a half times as many passives as typical writers**” (2014, 21). The numbers were taken from (Bryant 1962).

Pullum (2014, 21) concludes that the statistics might prove that **even some established writers themselves use or used passive voice quite often**. On the other hand, passive voice is generally more often used with objective writing, as stated in section 2.7.5. This might be the case of Orwell's essay.

Although there are additional statistics available in (Pullum 2014, 20–21), it does not seem to be enough to prove his point. Nonetheless, it is still interesting to see that someone who did not agree with the usage of passive voice in writing used it quite extensively himself.

6.5 Summary

This chapter provided an unusually positive insight into passives in writing. While it might be true that passive clauses can have a negative effect on writing, if not used carefully, we can conclude that there should not be similar generalizations regarding the use of passive voice in writing. It might be argued that **passives do not have to be necessarily stative or dull** when used in certain contexts. In some cases, **passive clauses could be even more appropriate than active ones** and in some of these cases, **agent can or even should be omitted without being evasive or sneaky**. Sometimes, **passive voice can even have a stylistic effect in writing**, for example to emphasize the unknown.

Even though **active should be preferred in literary writing**, as noted in section 2.7.5, and not all the points in this chapter are convincing enough, we might conclude that **passive does not have to be avoided in every case**, as previously thought by many.

7 Conclusion

This thesis has summarized many aspects of passive voice in English and illustrated recent approaches towards specific issues, re-evaluating some of the claims that have been made in the past.

The first chapter was designed to provide the basic definitions and characteristics regarding the passive voice in English. The chapter mostly discussed established syntactical aspects of passive voice. Furthermore, the reader was introduced to adjectival and verbal passives and the grammatical tests that can help distinguish between those two types of passive clauses. Some of the topics, such as *by*-phrases and *get*-passives were analysed further in the following chapters.

The second chapter focused on the *get*-passive. Even though it only summarized characteristics, similarly to the first chapter, the conclusions were not as straightforward as in the previous chapter. It seems that *get*-passives are one of the most controversial topics when discussing actual use of passive voice, one reason being the fact that some believe that *get*-passives are not in fact a type of passive.

The chapters on adjectival and verbal passives and *by*-phrases showed how current linguists challenge past research. It was concluded that the previous study seems to be quite outdated. It was argued that the past research was insufficient with several claims established prematurely. The current research is undoubtedly more detailed and insightful than the previous proposals.

The chapter on the usage of passive voice might be the most questionable one, since it challenges the long-lasting claims about the correct usage of passive voice. Although the arguments were not convincing enough in every case, it is still quite interesting to see a positive view towards the issue.

It can be argued that many of the discussed topics are still opened to debate. One of the reasons is the fact that all the research this thesis is based on is quite recent and still might be waiting for its re-evaluation in future years. However, it shows that the approaches to passives have drastically changed. Many of the previous claims are now getting debunked in a way which often proves that the previous research is quite obsolete.

Recent study shows that the topic of passive voice is still relevant, although there are many questions with unclear and questionable conclusions that should undoubtedly be discussed more in future years.

8 Resumé

Práce se zabývá trpným rodem v anglickém jazyce a jeho jazykovými vlastnostmi. První kapitola se věnuje definici trpného rodu a představuje několik jeho typů, které se v angličtině objevují, zejména adjektivní a verbální pasivum nebo *get-passive* a *be-passive*. Právě *get-passive* a jeho diskutabilní charakteristiky jsou hlavním tématem druhé kapitoly. Ukázalo se, že v případě *get-passive* není jednoduché přijít s jasnou definicí, protože někteří lingvisté zastávají názor, že *get-passive* není ve skutečnosti pasivum. Kapitoly věnující se adjektivním a verbálním pasivům se zaměřují na některá tvrzení z druhé poloviny dvacátého století, která se po nedávné analýze ukázala jako zastaralá a nepravdivá. Poslední kapitola se zaměřuje na negativní vlastnosti trpného rodu v textech. Prokázalo se, že některá z tvrzení, která kritizují užívání trpného rodu v textech, jsou neopodstatněná.

9 Works Cited

- Baker, Sheridan. 1985. *The Practical Stylist*. New York: Harper and Row, 6th ed.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2013. "By phrases in passives and nominals." *Syntax* 16.1.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2014. "Word formation is syntactic: Adjectival passives in English." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32.2.
- Bryant, Margaret M. 1962. *Modern American Usage*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
- Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Downing, Angella. 1996. "The semantics of *get*-passive". In Hasan, Ruqaiya, Carmel Cloran and David Butt, eds. *Functional Descriptions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 2006. "Adjectival passives." In Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, eds. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foerster, Norman and J. M. Steadman. 1931. *Writing and Thinking*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Freidin, Robert. 1975. "The analysis of passives." *Language* 51.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1985. "The *get*-passive and Burzio's generalization." *Lingua* 66.
- Haussamen, Brock. 1997. *Revising the Rules: Traditional Grammar and Modern Linguistics*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 2nd ed.
- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1977. *X Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1980. "Passive is Phrasal (not Sentential or Lexical)." In Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Michael Moortgat, eds. *Lexical Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Klaiman, M. 1988. "Affectedness and control: a typology of voice system". In Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. "Building statives." In Lisa J. Conathan, Jeff Good, Darya Kavitskaya, Alyssa B. Wulf, and Alan C. L. Yu, eds. *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Lundquist, Björn. 2008. "Nominalizations and participles in Swedish." PhD diss, University of Tromsø.

- Lundquist, Björn. 2012. *The category of participles*. Ms., available at <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/001545>.
- Meltzer-Asscher, Aya. 2011. "Adjectival passives in Hebrew: Evidence for parallelism between the adjectival and verbal systems." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29.
- Noël, Dirk. 2002. *Believe-type matrix verbs and their complements: Corpus-based investigations of their functions in discourse*. Available at http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/000/472/594/RUG01-00472594_2010_0001_AC.pdf.
- Orwell, George. 1946. *Politics and the English language*. Horizon.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2014. "Fear and loathing of the English passive." *Language and Communication* 37.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 2004. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Strunk, Jr., William and E. B. White. 2000. *The Elements of Style*. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 4th ed.
- Toyota, Junichi. 2007.: "An adversative passive in English: in search of origins". In Delbecque, Nicole and Bert Cornillie, eds. *The Construction of Meaning and the Meaning of Constructions: data-based approaches to transitivity motion and causation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Toyota, Junichi. 2008. *Diachronic change in the English passive*. Springer.
- Vanrespaille, Mia. 1991. "A semantic analysis of the English *get*-passive". *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5.
- Veselovská, Ludmila. 2016. *English Syntax*.
- Wasow, Thomas. 1977. "Transformations and the lexicon." In P. Culicover, A. Akmajian, and T. Wasow, eds. *Formal syntax*, New York: Academic Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1987. "Implicit arguments, the binding theory, and control." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5.
- Woolley, Edwin. 1907. *Handbook of Composition*. Boston: D. C. Heath.