

that AdjP and Ver(P)P pps in at least German and English are structurally fully identical and that their distinct properties result from their auxiliaries' distinct lexical semantics. We implement this by adopting Wurmbrand (2001), including the clause structure in (8).

(8) AuxP > ModP > v/AspP > VP (Wurmbrand 2001: 144)

Following Wurmbrand on Ver(P)Ps, we propose that, in both AdjPs and Ver(P)Ps, pps lexicalize V and their auxiliaries minimally lexicalize v/Asp (cf. section 4). More broadly, Wurmbrand's account also provides a basis for the role of lexical semantics of the auxiliaries in these constructions: modals (i.e. other (semi-)functional items) like *müssen* 'must' have one lexical semantics but different interpretations, determined by the syntactic position which they lexicalize, e.g. *müssen* is interpreted as epistemic when it lexicalizes Aux but as deontic when it lexicalizes Mod (Wurmbrand 2001: 182-205). Here, we further argue that the lexical semantics of Ver(P)P auxiliaries is [-perf(ective)] (\approx inherent state/characteristic) and that of AdjP auxiliaries is [+perf(ective)] (\approx non-inherent state/characteristic): the respective semantics of lexical guises of *be/have* like (9a/b) ([-perf]) and (9c/d) ([+perf]).

(9) a. *John is tall.* b. *John has blue eyes.* c. *John is happy (today).* d. *John has a book.*

In English, these two lexically homonymous *bes* act as auxiliaries in the relevant passives. In German, [+perf] *be* appears in AdjPs and we assume that there is also a [-perf] *become* which appears in Ver(P)Ps. More direct evidence for this distinction is from Spanish which morphologically distinguishes a [+perf] *estar* 'be' and a [-perf] *ser* 'be', which, as expected, appear in AdjPs and VerPs respectively (e.g. Gehrke et al. 2014). Similarly, we propose that PoRs involve [+perf] *bes/haves* and EP/TPPs involve [-perf] *be/haves*. Initial evidence for this is languages like Icelandic which morphologically distinguish PoR and EP auxiliaries (e.g. McFadden 2007). Note finally that we are assuming no distinction between lexical and functional items (e.g. Lundquist 2008). Thus, the same *bes* appear in lexical guises like (9) as in the so-called auxiliary uses but lexicalize V rather than the relevant (semi-)functional projections.

4. The syncretism of auxiliaries. Firstly, adopting Wall (2018), we argue that, in Wurmbrand's (8), *temporally present* perfect auxiliaries (*here*: those in PoRs and EPs) lexicalize Mod and *temporally past* ones (*here*: those in TPPs) lexicalize Aux. Secondly, we adopt a Nanosyntactic lexicalization approach (e.g. Starke 2010), including late insertion, spell-out of non-terminal nodes, the Superset Principle (e.g. Starke 2010: 2-3), and the *Maximise span* competition principle (e.g. Pantcheva 2010), (10).

(10) Maximize span: *When a given syntactic node could be spelled out by one bigger lexical item or two or more smaller lexical items, the bigger one wins.* (Pantcheva 2010: 1061)

In the basic instantiations of AdjPs and VerPs, i.e. TSs, like (2a), and VerPs like (1a.ii), the relevant passive auxiliary lexicalizes v/Asp. The EP- and TPP-types of VerPP only differ from basic VerPs and each other, in that in EP-types [-perf] *ist* 'is' etc. lexicalizes Mod, whereas in TPP-types it lexicalizes Aux. This is in accordance with their respective temporally present and past semantics. In RSs, [+perf] *ist* 'is' etc. lexicalizes both v/Asp and Mod. This is possible as (i) [+perf] *ist* in German is a perfect auxiliary, as independently evidenced in active PoRs, and (ii) due to (10), as *ist* on its own supersedes any conceivable pair of smaller competitors. In contrast, English [+perf] *be* can lexicalize v/Asp but cannot lexicalize Mod, i.e. only *have* not *be* is a perfect auxiliary in English. As a consequence, in English RSs like (3), (10) cannot apply and v/Asp and Mod are lexicalized separately by *been* and *has* etc. What we are thus assuming, is that the lexical entries for e.g. [-/+perf] *ist* in German are syncretic: they carry the morphosyntactic features required to lexicalize multiple syntactic heads. Further, it is given the Superset Principle that, for instance, the relevant *be* in German TSs, EPs and TPPs can lexicalize only a subset of the functional features it must be specified for, but moreover that we can assume that the very same *be* appears in lexical guises lexicalizing V like (9a/c). This would not be possible in a Distributed Morphology-type approach which assumes the Subset Principle (e.g. Harley et al. 1999: 5), which requires underspecification rather than this overspecification of lexical items.

5. Conclusion. Our proposal that passive and perfect auxiliaries are lexically semantically distinct and syncretic captures the various distinctly behaving AdjPs and Ver(P)Ps in German, as well as English. Moreover, it provides considerable support to a Nanosyntactic lexicalization approach.

References: • Alexiadou, A., B. Gehrke, & F. Schäfer. 2014. "The argument structure of adjectival participles revisited." *Lingua* 149, 118-138. • Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Gehrke, B., & C. Marco. 2014. "Different *by*-phrases with adjectival and verbal passives: Evidence from Spanish corpus data." *Lingua* 149, 188-214. • Gehrke, B. 2015. "Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 33(3), 891-938. • Grønn, A. & A. von Stechow. 2017. "The perfect." To appear in: Matthewson, Meier, Rullmann & Zimmermann (eds.), *Wiley's Linguistics Companion (Companion to Semantics)*. • Klein, W. 1992. "The present perfect puzzle." *Language* 68, 525-52. • Kratzer, A. 2000. "Building statives." *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 24(1). • Lenz, B. 1993. "Probleme der Kategorisierung deutscher Partizipien." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 12(1), 39-76. • Löbner, S. 2002. "Is the German Perfekt a perfect perfect." *More than words: A festschrift for Dieter Wunderlich* (pp. 369-391). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. • Lundquist, B. 2008. *Nominalizations and participles in Swedish*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Tromsø. • McFadden, T. 2007. "Auxiliary selection." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(6), 674-708. • Mittwoch, A. 2008. "The English resultative perfect and its relationship to the experiential perfect and the simple past tense." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(3), 323-251. • Pantcheva, M. 2010. "The syntactic structure of locations, goals, and sources." *Linguistics* 48(5), 1043-1081. • Rapp, I. 1998. "Zustand? Passiv?—Überlegungen zum sogenannten „Zustandpassiv“." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 15(2), 231-265. • Starke, M. 2010. "Nanosyntax: A short primer to a new approach to language." *Nordlyd* 34(1), 1-6. • Wall, J. 2018. *Seeing double: The HAVE puzzle*. MA thesis, Utrecht University. • Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. •