

On the Performative Use of the Past Participle in German

Ørsnes, Bjarne

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in:

Journal of Germanic Linguistics

DOI:

[10.1017/S1470542719000205](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542719000205)

Publication date:

2020

License

Unspecified

Citation for published version (APA):

Ørsnes, B. (2020). On the Performative Use of the Past Participle in German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 32(4), 335-419. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542719000205>

[Link to publication in CBS Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us (research.lib@cbs.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 04. Jul. 2025



Abstract

In German, past participles not only occur in root position with a directive force as in *Stillgestanden!* ‘(lit.) stood still:PTCP’, but also as performatives in responses such as in: *A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi.* ‘So you won’t tell dad.’ *B: Versprochen!* ‘(lit.) promised:PTCP’. Here B performs the speech act denoted by the verb by saying that it has been performed. The propositional argument of the participle (“what is promised”) is resolved contextually, and the agent and recipient arguments are restricted to the speaker and the addressee respectively.

The article presents a syntactic analysis of this rarely studied phenomenon arguing that the construction with a performative participle is no ellipsis, but an IP with a participial head and null-pronominal complements. The crucial parts of the syntactic analysis are formalized within Lexical-Functional Grammar. A pragmatic analysis is proposed arguing that the performative participle in its core use alternates with *yes!* to express acceptance of an assertion or a request, i.e. to express consent to the effect that a proposition *p* may safely be added to the Common Ground. The pragmatic analysis is cast within the dialogue framework of Farkas and Bruce (2010). Finally, the analysis is extended to performative participles in monological texts.

1 Introduction

It is well-known that past participles can occur in root position in German with a directive illocutionary force as in (1) (Fries 1983, Donhauser 1984, Gärtner 2013, Heinold 2014 a.o.).

¹ I wish to thank the anonymous reviewers from JGL for their extremely constructive and thorough comments. For extensive help with the data I thank (in alphabetical order): Jörg Asmussen, Esther Jahns, Stefan Müller, Ulrike Sayatz, Roland Schäfer and Robin Schmalzer. This work was presented at the Workshop *Participles: Form, Use and Meaning* at the SLE conference in Zürich 2017. I wish to thank the reviewers as well as the audience of the conference for comments and ideas. All remaining errors are my sole responsibility.

- (1) Stillgestanden!
 stood.still:PTCP
 ‘Stop!’

The directive interpretation is sometimes suggested to follow from the fact that infinite root clauses can be seen as a special case of imperatives: like imperatives they denote properties rather than propositions (Gärtner 2013:217). Still, past participles as root clauses do not have to exhibit directive illocutionary force as shown by Fries (1983:52), who gives the example *Abgemacht!* ‘agreed’² without commenting on the interpretation though. This example shows that past participles also occur in root position with a performative³ illocutionary force. Other examples are given in (2) and (3) where the speaker performs the speech act denoted by the verb by saying that the speech act in question has been performed, thus the illocutionary force is that of a performative (Searle 1989:536).

- (2) A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi. B: Versprochen!
 you say then nothing to dad promised:PTCP
 ‘A: You are not going to tell dad. B: I promise!’
- (3) Qualität ist wichtiger als Quantität. Geschenkt.
 quality is more.important than quantity granted:PTCP
 ‘Quality is more important than quantity. I grant that.’

The performative participles in (2) and (3) are formed from verbs denoting speech acts that express acceptance of a request (in a broader sense) or a statement. In (2) the participle is used as “linguistic feed-back” (Allwood et al. 1992): it serves as a response to accept a request by the hearer. In (3) the performative participle occurs in a monological text and it has

² In English the past participle of regular verbs is identical to the past tense form of the verb, e.g. ‘agreed’. These forms are supplied with the grammatical information ‘PTCP’ in the glosses. In the main text all English translations with the ending ‘-ed’ are intended to represent the participle and the information PTCP is not given. I am grateful to the copy-editor for pointing out this ambiguity.

³ I follow Eckardt (2012) in speaking of performatives instead of declarations and I follow Searle (1989:536) in assuming that performatives are by definition explicit performatives, i.e. they contain an expression naming the kind of speech-act being performed.

the – informationally redundant – effect of acknowledging the truth of a proposition: the speaker explicitly concedes to a widely held opinion. In both cases the performative participle alternates with the affirmative response particle *Ja!* ‘yes’ or *Nein!* ‘no’ if it is a confirmation of a negative sentence as in (2). The core use of the performative participle is to signal that **a proposition** *p* may safely be added to the Common Ground. The agent, which is understood to be the speaker, is left unexpressed, as is the propositional argument of the speech-act denoting verb: a contextually resolved propositional content counts as promised or granted by virtue of the participle being uttered. I will refer to this use of the past participle as the Performative Past Participle (henceforth: PfP).

It is not unusual for past participles to occur alone in various contexts in German as in (4) (Behr 1994, Redder 2003).

- (4) Da endlich das Wunder, ein Taxi hält. Er rein. Gerettet.⁴
 then finally the miracle a taxi stops he in saved:PTCP
 ‘Finally the miracle, a taxi stops. He jumps in. He is saved.’

In (4) the non-speech-act-denoting verb *gerettet* ‘saved’ is used assertively to state **that the character referred to as *er* ‘he’ is saved or rather considers himself to be saved**. Such uses lend themselves to an analysis as a reduced clausal structure along the lines: [*er ist*] *gerettet* ‘**he is** saved’. The same pertains to the following examples where the participles are used assertively ‘out-of-the-blue’ and the theme-argument in (5) (was has been managed) is found in the extra-linguistic context.

- (5) Geschafft! (Es ist geschafft! ‘it is managed’)
 managed:PTCP
 ‘I did it!’
- (6) Genug geredet! (Es ist genug geredet! ‘(lit.) it is enough talked’)
 enough talked:PTCP
 ‘There has been enough talking!’

Yet there is something special about the performative use, which sets it apart from these assertive uses. It is not possible to form PfPs out of all performative verbs. A verb such as

⁴ T06/NOV.03504 die tageszeitung, 18.11.2006,S.I-II; SEXBOMBE IM KINDERZIMMER.

beenden ‘to **end**’ which can be used performatively, can not occur as a PfP.

- (7) Das war der letzte Tagesordnungspunkt unserer Sitzung. #⁵ Beendet!
that was the last item.on.the.agenda of.our meeting ended:PTCP
‘(Intended:) That was the last item on the agenda of our meeting. I end the meeting!’

This verb is (marginally) better as a PfP if accompanied by *hiermit* ‘hereby’ forcing a performative reading.

- (8) Das war der letzte Tagesordnungspunkt unserer Sitzung. ??# Hiermit beendet!
that was the last item.on.the.agenda of.our meeting hereby ended:PTCP
‘That was the last item on the agenda of our meeting. I hereby end the meeting!’

The verbs found in the PfP, in contrast, do not require *hiermit* ‘hereby’ to be used performatively.

- (9) Das war der letzte Tagesordnungspunkt unserer Sitzung. Versprochen!
that was the last item.on.the.agenda of.our meeting promised:PTCP
‘That was the last item on the agenda of our meeting. I promise.’

Also performative verbs appear to lose the ability to be used assertively when they occur as participles in responses to a statement or a request.⁶

⁵ Throughout the article the examples will exhibit morpho-syntactic violations as well as pragmatic violations/infelicitous use. I will use ?, ?? and * to refer to morpho-syntactic violations of different degrees and ?#, ??# and # to refer to pragmatic violations of decreasing degrees of acceptability. The distinction between morpho-syntactic and pragmatic violations is not clear-cut in all cases, though.

⁶ This does not mean that participles of performative verbs occurring alone are never possible on an assertive reading. As (a) shows, they can occur as answers to *wh*-questions.

- (a) A: Wie ist es mit dem neuen Vertrag? B: Vereinbart.
how is it with the new agreement adopted:PTCP
‘A: What about the new agreement? B: It’s adopted.’

- (10) A: Kommt die Kanzlerin heute? B: Das ist vereinbart / ist vereinbart/ #vereinbart
 comes the chancellor today that is agreed is agreed agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: Will the chancellor be here today? B: It is so agreed.’

Participles of performative verbs occurring alone appear to be subject to special restrictions that do not follow from a general possibility of omitting recoverable linguistic material as in an ellipsis.

PfPs are primarily found in colloquial German, although participle constructions are generally taken to belong to a formal or literary style (Redder 2003:156).⁷ Participles in performative use are known from classical Semitic languages (Rogland 2001, Wild 1964:253/254) and also from Dutch⁸ (Rooryck & Potsma 2007). In German they appear to have received little attention in the literature. They are briefly mentioned in Dal (1966:120), in the influential account of non-finite main clauses in Fries (1983:52, 236) and also in Rapp & Wöllstein (2009:167), but they are not described as performatives, nor are they discussed in detail. Brandt et al. (1989:5) give an overview of performative utterances in German and provide one example of a past participle in root position: *Baden verboten* ‘(lit.) swimming forbidden’, while Liedtke (1998) and Colliander & Hansen (2004) do not mention the PfP at all in their discussions of speech-acts in German. The Duden grammar (2006) does not com-

They are also found in the so-called “Partizipialkette” (chain of participles) (Redder 2003, Hoffmann 2006).

- (b) Neuer Tarifvertrag vorgelegt, vereinbart.
 new labour.agreement presented adopted:PTCP
 ‘New labour agreement presented – then adopted.’

And in head-lines:

- (c) Vereinbart. Neuer Tarifvertrag wurde gestern vereinbart.
 adopted New labour.agreement was yesterday adopted:PTCP
 ‘Adopted! A new labour agreement was adopted yesterday.’

The exact conditions for the assertive interpretation of participles of performative verbs occurring alone await further study.

⁷ Redder (2003:256) also observes that participles are not necessarily “formal”.

⁸ Dutch allows a broader range of verbs to occur as PfPs than German, e.g. *bedankt* ‘(lit.) thanked’ and *gefeliciteerd* ‘(lit.) congratulated’ (Cf. Rooryck & Potsma 2007).

ment on this use of the past participle, while Zifonun et al. (1997:2226) describe examples such as *offen gestanden* ‘frankly admitted’ and *ehrlich gesagt* ‘honestly said’ as stereotypical phrases commenting the manner of speaking. The performative use as in *Versprochen!* ‘promised’ or *Geschenkt!* ‘granted’ does not seem to be mentioned.

Dal (1966:120) suggests that the use of a participle such as *offen gestanden!* ‘frankly admitted’ and *Zugestanden!* ‘admitted’, i.e. as root clauses, is of the same kind (“von ähnlicher Art”) as instances of the directive past participle, but this cannot be entirely true: performativity is not a sub-type of directive force (also Fries 1983:52 draws a distinction between participles with a directive reading and such with other readings) and there are differences between the two uses of the past participle. The directive participle can occur with a subject (indefinite or quantified) (Gärtner 2013:204 a.o.) and with an accusative object (Donhauser 1984:369, Gärtner 2013:210, Heinold 2014). The PfP permits neither of this.

- (11) a. Sonnenanbeter aufgepasst!⁹
 sun worshippers paid.attention:PTCP
 ‘Sun worshippers, look here!’
 b. *Wir abgemacht!¹⁰
 we agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) We have agreed’
- (12) a. Den Aufzug benutzt! (Gärtner 2013: 210)
 the lift used:PTCP
 ‘Use the lift!’
 b. * Den Beistand versprochen!¹¹

⁹ <https://urlaubsheld.de/deals/sonnenanbeter-aufgepasst-sandstrand-meer-und-sonne-satt-auf-sardinien>, accessed on October 31, 2017.

¹⁰ Fries (1983) shows that only quantificational subjects occur with infinitives and participles. This could be the reason why *wir* ‘we’ is impossible. Only *wir* ‘we’ or *ich* ‘I’ are eligible as possible agentive subjects since a performative utterance requires an agent in the first person (Eckardt 2012:24), with the exception of so-called delegated speech.

¹¹ A reviewer gives the following example of a PfP with what appears to be an accusative object.

- (d) Die Wähler (hiermit) beruhigt dahingehend, dass die Steuern nicht
 the voters.NOM|ACC hereby reassured:PTCP to.the.effect that the taxes not

the support promised:PTCP
'(Intended:) The support is hereby promised!'

A further striking difference is that the directive participle can be used 'out-of-the-blue', while the PfP needs a supporting context for its interpretation. Thus, the PfP is different from the directive participle and deserves a discussion on its own.

The goal of this article is to show that a participle in root position can indeed be used performatively in German and to provide a description and an analysis of this phenomenon given that it has received little attention. I will concentrate on PfPs used as responses and the main focus is on the description, but I will also briefly show how the observations can be captured in the formal framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG), even though I believe that the analysis can be formalized in other syntactic frameworks as well. Secondly, I will discuss the pragmatics of the PfP. I will show that the PfP is primarily used to express consent with an interlocutor and I will show how consent can be analyzed within a conversational framework such as the one developed for responses in Farkas & Bruce (2010). Finally, I will briefly show how the PfP is used for special rhetoric purposes in monological texts. Although there is a lot more to be said about the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of PfPs, it will only be possible to give a preliminary proposal for a syntactic and pragmatic analysis and to point to directions for future research.

erhöht werden

raised are

'The voters are hereby reassured – the taxes will not be raised.'

I have not been able to find any authentic examples of this kind and the example seems to be far less acceptable with unambiguous accusative case.

- (e) a. ??/*Dich (hiermit) beruhigt, ...
You.ACC hereby reassured:PTCP
'You can be quite calm, ...'
b. ??/*Den Wähler (hiermit) beruhigt, ...
the voter.ACC hereby reassured:PTCP
'The voter can be reassured, ...'

PfPs do allow recipient or theme arguments in the dative case (see section 5.1) so the fact that the putative accusative object *die Wähler* 'the voters' is an animate recipient or theme argument could improve the example in (d).

The article is structured as follows: in section 2 I show that the PfP in its core use is restricted to a subset of speech-act denoting verbs and in section 3 I discuss the performative interpretation of PfPs in German and compare the PfP with canonical (finite active) performatives. In section 4 I rule out alternative analyses by showing that the PfP is indeed a verbal participle and not a reanalyzed particle or a reduced clausal structure. In section 5 I discuss the syntax of the PfP and I show how the observations can be captured within LFG. Section 6 gives a preliminary account of the pragmatics of the PfP in dialogues and section 7 shows how this analysis can be extended to monological texts. In section 8, finally, I reach a conclusion. The examples are extracted from the Cosmas-corpus of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache in Mannheim. Examples from the internet are indicated with URL and the date. Examples without reference are constructed.

2 The PfP and performative verbs

The PfP is formed from performative verbs, i.e. verbs denoting actions that can be carried out by language. Performative verbs can be used assertively to describe the world (that someone has declared war or that someone has made a promise) and performatively to change the world (something comes into existence by being declared or by being promised). Searle (1989:547) refers to this latter use as declarations and claims that declarations have a double direction of fit between word and world. By a successful performance of the speech-act the world is changed according to the propositional content and at the same time the utterance is a description of this new state of the world. Thus, successful declarations are self-fulfilling. PfPs are not found with all performative verbs. Performative verbs can be divided into two groups according to the kind of outcome of the speech act, i.e. what comes into existence. On the one hand there are performative verbs such as *taufen* ‘to baptise’ and *trauen* ‘to wed sb.’. These verbs create a non-linguistic fact, namely that someone or something has been baptized, or that someone has been wedded. On the other hand there are performative verbs such as *mitteilen* ‘to communicate sth.’, *versprechen* ‘to promise’ and *zugeben* ‘to admit’, which create a new linguistic fact (Searle 1989:549). By uttering *Ich verspreche hiermit ...* ‘I hereby promise ...’, the speaker creates the fact that a promise has been made, which is a linguistic fact. The PfP is primarily observed with verbs creating a new linguistic fact. Verbs creating a non-linguistic fact are only marginally possible as PfPs if accompanied by *hiermit* ‘hereby’, while the PfP of verbs creating linguistic facts is possible without *hiermit*.

- (13) Dein Name sei Alexandra. ??# Hiermit getauft! / # Getauft!
 your name be.PRS.SBJV Alexandra hereby baptised:PTCP baptised:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) Your name shall be Alexandra. I hereby baptise you.’

But there are also differences within the class of performative verbs creating linguistic facts. Verbs denoting initiating speech functions such as *fragen* ‘to ask’, *sagen* ‘to say’, *mitteilen* ‘to announce’ or *beordern* ‘to order’ are only possible as performative participles if accompanied by *hiermit*, an adverbial or an internal argument (see section 6.1).

- (14) *(Ehrlich) gesagt, das ist keine gute Idee.
 honestly said:PTCP this is no good idea
 ‘Honestly, this is no good idea.’
- (15) *(Mal rhetorisch) gefragt, können wir überhaupt diese Wahlen gewinnen?
 just rhetorically asked:PTCP can we at.all these elections win
 ‘Just a rhetorical question, do we have any chance of winning the elections?’

Primarily verbs that can be used as a confirmation of an assertion or accept of a request are found as PfPs, but not such that contradict an assertion or refuse a request (#*Geleugnet!* ‘denied’, #*Geweigert!* ‘refused’).¹² I will return to a discussion of this restriction in section 6 and suggest that PfPs in are used as responses to express consent. Henceforth the abbreviation PfP is further limited to performative participles of the responsive kind unless otherwise indicated.

The following **past participles** are attested as PfPs used as responses.

<i>Garantiert!</i>	‘guaranteed’ ¹³	<i>Eingeräumt!</i>	‘admitted’
<i>Zugegeben!</i>	‘admitted’	<i>Zur Kenntnis genommen!</i>	‘acknowledged’
<i>Geschenkt!</i>	‘granted’	<i>Abgemacht!</i>	‘agreed’

¹² There is a notable counter-example to this claim, namely the verb *ablehnen* ‘to deny’ which can be used performatively *Abgelehnt!* ‘denied’. Moreover, some PfPs may occur negated in legal contexts *Nicht stattgegeben!* ‘not allowed/granted’. I will discuss these counterexamples in section 6.1. I am grateful to the reviewers for pointing this out.

¹³ *Garantiert* ‘guaranteed’ also occurs as an adverb with the same semantics as the verb. This will assume some importance in the discussion.

<i>Zugestimmt!</i>	‘agreed’	<i>Versprochen!</i>	‘promised’
<i>Geeinigt!</i>	‘agreed’	<i>Vereinbart!</i>	‘agreed’
<i>Geschworen!</i>	‘sworn’	<i>Verstanden!</i>	‘understood’
<i>Gestanden!</i>	‘confessed’	<i>Kapiert!</i>	‘understood’
<i>Bestätigt!</i>	‘confirmed’	<i>Akzeptiert!</i>	‘accepted’
<i>Angeschlossen!</i>	‘agreed’	<i>Genehmigt!</i>	‘allowed/granted’
<i>Versichert!</i>	‘assured’	<i>Stattgegeben!</i>	‘allowed/granted’

The status of the various verbs as PfPs differs though. PfPs such as *Versprochen!* ‘promised’, *Zugegeben!* ‘admitted’, *Abgemacht!* ‘agreed/settled’ and *Akzeptiert!* ‘accepted’ are well-established and generally accepted in performative use. Others such as *Geeinigt!* ‘agreed’, *Zugestimmt!* ‘agreed’, *Vereinbart!* ‘agreed/settled’ and *Angeschlossen!* ‘agreed’ are attested as PfPs, but are not found ‘natural’ by all informants and appear to be rare as PfPs. One way to explain this data is to assume that there is a core set of verbs allowing the PfP and that other verbs such as *sich einigen* ‘to agree’, *zustimmen* ‘to agree’ and *sich anschließen* ‘to agree’ are used as PfPs by way of analogy, i.e. resemblance with the core construction given that they express consent. Further evidence for this analysis is the fact that the problematic cases are often also syntactically deviant in selecting dative objects or genuine reflexive objects, while the core verbs select accusative objects.¹⁴ Whether these rare PfPs remain occasional uses or turn into established PfPs remains to be seen. It is in any case striking that even the deviant cases of PfPs conform to independently observed behaviour of past participles in root position, e.g. that the reflexive object is omitted in the PfPs *Geeinigt!* ‘agreed’ and *Angeschlossen!* ‘agreed’. In order to provide as comprehensive an account of the PfP as possible, I include such (possibly occasional) uses in the discussion and leave a more finegrained classification of core verbs and peripheral verbs in this construction for future research.¹⁵

¹⁴ I am grateful to a reviewer for this observation.

¹⁵ Also the so-called fake participle (Haig 2005) *einverstanden* ‘(lit.) being in agreement’ is used similar to the PfP, cf. (f). The adjective *einverstanden* is not synchronically related to any existing verb (**einverstehen*). *Einverstanden* is different from the PfP though since it is predicated of the speaker (the speaker is in agreement), while the PfP is predicated of some propositional content (something counts as promised or accepted).

Interestingly there are also at least two verbs in the PfP that do not usually qualify as performative verbs and that do not occur as performative verbs in finite active performative sentences, or only marginally so. These are the verbs *verstehen* ‘to understand’ and *kapieren* ‘to understand’ as shown for *verstanden* in (16). On the face of it *verstehen* and *kapieren* do not denote speech-acts: they do not report communicative events as other performative verbs (Condoravdi & Lauer 2011:157) and one doesn’t understand something, just by claiming to understand, i.e. one cannot define an utterance to be an understanding. Nevertheless, the past participle of these verbs is used as performative verb.

- (16) A: Halten Sie sich bereit! B: Verstanden! / ??# Ich verstehe das hiermit!
 keep you REFL ready understood:PTCP I understand that hereby
 ‘A: Please, be ready! B: Got it!’

-
- (f) A: Du holst jetzt das Auto in der Werkstatt ab. B: Einverstanden! / Akzeptiert!
 you pick not the car in the garage up agreed accepted:PTCP
 ‘A: You go and pick up the car at the garage immediately. B: Okay! / I accept!’

Verstanden ('understood') is understood performatively as acceptance of the request made by A in the PfP in (16), while *verstehen* is not possible in the canonical finite active performative with *hiermit*.¹⁶ The possibility of using participles of some cognitive verbs as performatives invite the conclusion some verbs can be coerced into performative verbs under special circumstances in the sense of Pustejovsky (1995) and Goldberg (1995:195). Another explanation is due to a reviewer, who suggests that the participle could be a fragment-answer to an implicit question containing the participle.

- (17) A: Halten Sie sich bereit. (*Haben Sie mich verstanden?*) B: Verstanden!
 keep you REFL ready have you me understood understood:PTCP
 'A: Please be ready. Have you understood? B: Understood!'

An analysis as a fragment answer does not explain that *verstehen* 'to understand' and *kapieren* 'to understand' are much better in this use than other verbs like e.g. *hören* 'to hear'.

- (18) A: Halten Sie sich bereit. Haben Sie mich gehört? B: ??# Gehört!
 keep you REFL ready have you me heard heard:PTCP
 '(Intended:) A: Please be ready. Have you heard? B: I have heard!'

¹⁶ The 1st person, present tense of *verstehen*: *verstehe* 'I understand' can indeed be used in a way reminiscent of the performative use of *verstanden*.

- (g) Fellner: Ich hab keine Freunde.
 Fellner: I have no friends
 Jeannèe: Verstehe.
 Jeannèe: understand:1SG.PRS
 'Fellner: I have no friends. Jeannèe: I see.'
 (PRF17/JUN.00156 profil, 12.06.2017, S. 13; Edelfedern)

Verstehe 'I understand' shares with the PfP that it is used as a response to a statement by the hearer, but it behaves as an assertive utterance. It does not allow *hiermit* (*#Verstehe hiermit!* 'I hereby understand') and it can be negated by the interlocutor: A: *verstehe!* 'I see' B: *Nein, tust du nicht!* 'No, you don't!'.

Why exactly the verbs *verstehen* and *kapieren* can be used as performative verbs as in (16) and what the special circumstances are, await further study.

3 The PfP as a performative speech-act

The canonical performative clause is a present tense, active clause containing a 1st person subject referent and *hiermit* ‘hereby’: *ich* V_{PERFORMATIVE} *hiermit* ... ‘I hereby V_{PERFORMATIVE} ...’. In (19) the speaker makes a promise by saying that s/he is making a promise, i.e. the speaker defines the utterance to be a promise (Eckardt 2012:22).

- (19) Ich verspreche hiermit, dass ich deinem Papi nichts sage.
I promise hereby that I your dad nothing say
‘I hereby promise that I won’t tell your dad.’

In a similar vein speaker B defines his answer to be a promise with the PfP in (20).

- (20) A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi. B: Versprochen!
you say then nothing to dad promised:PTCP
‘A: You are not going to tell dad. B: I promise!’

Performative speech-acts are canonically in the present tense as in (19), but the PfP – being non-finite – does not contain tense. Still the performatives in (19) and (20) are understood to have the same illocutionary effect of making a promise.

There is an aspectual difference between the two renderings of performatives: in the finite active performative the speaker makes a promise and a resulting state of *p* [:speaker not telling hearer’s dad] being promised is inferred (with the propositional content of the complement clause between square brackets). In the non-finite performative (the PfP) the resulting state is in focus: the speaker claims that a state of *p* [:speaker not telling hearer’s dad] being promised, is holding, and the event leading to this resulting state is inferred. The PfP denotes the state resulting from performing the speech act denoted by the verb and can be paraphrased as *With this message the state of p being Ved is holding*. A paraphrase of (20) is: *with this message, the state of [me not telling your dad] being promised is holding*. In this sense the PfP shows a clear affinity to the performatively used adjectival passive (Maienborn 2007:89, Schlücker 2009:109) as in (21). I will discuss this association in section 4.

- (21) Das ist hiermit versprochen!
 that is hereby promised
 ‘That is hereby a promise!’

The PfP shares with finite performatives the ability to license the adverb *hiermit* ‘hereby’. As hinted at a couple of times, it is actually more striking that *hiermit* is not mandatory for the performative reading to come about. Some performative verbs are more acceptable as PfPs if a *hiermit* forces a performative reading, cf. (8) and (13) above. For PfPs such as *versprochen* ‘promised’, *zugegeben* ‘admitted’, *geschenkt* ‘granted’ and *geschworen* ‘sworn’ the presence of *hiermit* is not required at all.¹⁷

- (22) Ich hole dich vom Bahnhof ab. Versprochen!
 I pick you from.the station up promised:PTCP
 ‘I will pick you up at the station. I promise!’
- (23) Organisation, Transport, Hygiene - in Rio funktionierte nicht alles. Geschenkt.¹⁸
 organisation transportation hygiene in Rio worked not all granted:PTCP
 ‘Organisation, transportation, hygiene – not everything worked in Rio. I grant that.’

Nevertheless, the diagnostic *hiermit* is licensed with PfPs. Eckardt (2012:26) proposes that *hiermit* ‘hereby’ refers to the ongoing information exchange as in the paraphrase *with this message* given for (20). This should be contrasted with examples where *hiermit* occurs with a verb that does not have to be speech-act denoting, and deictically refers to some extra-linguistic action having led to the successful completion of a task as in (24), and not to the utterance itself.

- (24) a. A: Unterschreiben Sie bitte! B: Hiermit erledigt!
 sign you please hereby done
 ‘A: Please sign! B: Hereby done!’

¹⁷ For the PfP *Geschenkt!* ‘granted’ there is not a single occurrence with *hiermit* ‘hereby’ in *W-Archiv der geschriebenen Sprache* in the corpus of the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache (IDS)*.

¹⁸ RHZ16/AUG.36106 Rhein-Zeitung, 23.08.2016, S. 11; Klaus Reimann zieht ein Fazit der Spiele in Rio

- b. A: Unterschreiben Sie bitte! B: #Mit dieser Äußerung erledigt.
 sign you please with this message done
 ‘A: Please sign! B: Done with this message!’

Another characteristic feature of performative utterances is their strict speaker-orientation. The subject of a finite performative verb is canonically in the 1st person as shown in (19). The PfP hardly ever appears with an overt agent-phrase (a *by*-phrase is accepted by some speakers, while a subject is ruled out), but the agent of the PfP is almost always associated with the speaker just like performatively used adjectival passives as in (21). The PfP in (25) can only mean that the speaker admits that Peter will be late, not that Peter has admitted, that he will be late.

- (25) A: Peter kommt zu spät. B: Zugegeben!
 Peter comes too late admitted:PTCP
 ‘A: Peter is late. B: I admit that.’ (≠ Peter has admitted that he will be late)

It even seems to be the case that a participle of a performative verb shows stronger speaker-orientation than a clause containing a finite performative verb. A clause with a finite performative verb can be used to assert that someone else has made a performative speech-act. In (26) the clause with the finite performative verb is embedded within reported speech as indicated by the use of the reportive subjunctive (*verspreche* ‘promise:PRS.SBJV’). The speaker is reporting that Peter made an explicit promise.

- (26) Peter sagte, dass er im Ferienhaus sei. Wir könnten ihn
 Peter said that he in summer.house was:PRS.SBJV we could:PST.SBJV him
 jederzeit in den Ferien besuchen. Das verspreche er hiermit.
 any.time in the holidays visit that promise:PRS.SBJV he hereby
 ‘Peter said he was in his summer house. We could come and visit him any time during the holidays. He hereby promised that.’

A PfP in the very same context of reported speech is degraded according to informants, *i.e.* the PfP is not understood to mean that Peter has made a promise.

- (27) ?# Peter sagte, dass er im Ferienhaus sei. Wir könnten ihn

Peter said that he in summer.house was:PRS.SBJV we could:PST.SBJV him
 jederzeit in den Ferien besuchen. Versprochen!
 any.time in the holidays visit promised:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) Peter said he was in his summer house. We could come and visit him
 any time during the holidays. That was a promise!’

This could be an indication that the PfP is even more strongly associated with performative use (and thus with speaker-orientation) than clauses with finite performative verbs. The discourse in (27) appears incoherent, since the speaker is reporting what someone else has said, and at the same time s/he is understood to make a promise to the effect that Peter has really said this, *i.e. the PfP is understood to mean that the speaker is making a promise*.¹⁹

If the PfP is indeed more strongly associated with the speaker than finite, active performatives, PfPs should not be expected to occur in delegated speech. In delegated speech the speaker is authorized to speak for someone else and the subject is in the 3rd person and not in the 1st person (Eckardt 2012:32-34, Tiersma 1986:203). In (28) the speaker makes a promise on behalf of the chancellor.

¹⁹ There are authentic examples where a PfP appears to be embedded in reported speech while showing figure-orientation rather than speaker-orientation. In (h) the PfP *Garantiert* ‘guaranteed’ is part of what the speaker of the commercial has said.

- (h) Das Freifallsystem sei eine patentierte Trendsportart,
 the quick-jump.freefall.system is:PRS.SBJV a patent.protected trend.sport
 versichert er. Risiken und Nebenwirkungen seien ausgeschlossen.
 assures he risks and side.effects are:PRS.SBJV excluded.
 Garantiert.
 guaranteed:PTCP
 ‘The quick-jump freefall system is a new trend in sport protected by patent, he assures.
 Risks and side effects are excluded. Under guarantee.’
 (A98/JUL.46780 St. Galler Tagblatt, 11.07.1998, Ressort: TB-KUL (Abk.); Am Ende
 lacht nur der Mond)

The example is not conclusive though, since *garantiert* ‘guaranteed’ also occurs as an adverb with the same semantics (Ørsnes 2014). Example (h) can be an instance of *garantiert* ‘guaranteed’ used as an adverb as part of direct quotation following reported speech.

- (28) Die Bundeskanzlerin verspricht hiermit, dass alle entschädigt werden!
 the chancellor promises hereby that everyone compensated is
 ‘The chancellor hereby promises that everyone will be compensated!’

It is difficult to determine whether PfPs are used in delegated speech, since PfPs hardly ever occur with explicit agents. The PfP in (29) seems marginal but it is hard to determine whether this is due to the presence of an explicit *by*-phrase or due to the fact it is an instance of delegated speech.

- (29) Alle werden entschädigt. ?# Von der Bundeskanzlerin versprochen!
 everyone is compensated by the chancellor promised:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) Everyone will be compensated. The chancellor promises this!’

Even though it is possible to imagine a scenario like the one in (30) where a parent is speaking for her child,²⁰ the lack of an explicit agent distinct from the speaker as in (28) makes it almost impossible to determine whether the parent intends the utterance to be a promise of her own or to be a promise that her child allows her to make.

- (30) A: Ihr Sohn wird also nicht mehr zu spät kommen. B. Versprochen!
 your son will then not more too late come promised:PTCP
 ‘A: So your son will not be late any more. B: That is a promise!’

The agent of the performative verb can be distinct from the speaker, when the PfP is used as a question. In this respect the PfP is again exactly like finite performative sentences occurring as questions. These utterances are strictly speaking not performatives until the hearer provides an affirmative answer, of course.

- (31) Du holst mich dann vom Bahnhof ab. Versprichst du mir das?
 you pick me then from.the station up promise you me that
 ‘You will pick me up from the station then. Will you promise me to?’

²⁰ I am grateful to a reviewer for suggesting that instances of delegated speech could be possible, even though the evidence is not conclusive.

- (32) Du holst mich dann vom Bahnhof ab. Versprochen?
 you pick me then from.the station up promised:PTCP
 ‘You will pick me up from the station. Will you promise to?’

The PfP further shares with the finite performative that it cannot be denied or confirmed by the interlocutor (Eckardt 2012:28/29). It is not possible for the hearer to deny that the speaker just made a promise and confirming is redundant since performative uses are always true (Condoravdi & Lauer 2011:151).²¹

- (33) A: Ich verspreche, dass ich dich morgen vom Bahnhof abhole.
 I promise that I you tomorrow from.the station pick.up
 ‘I promise that I will pick you up from the station tomorrow.’
 B: # Nein, das stimmt nicht! / # Ja, das stimmt!
 no that is.true not yes that is.true
 ‘No, that is not true!’ / ‘Yes, that’s true!’
- (34) A: Du holst mich also morgen vom Bahnhof ab.
 you pick me then tomorrow from.the station up
 ‘You will pick me at the station tomorrow.’
 B: Versprochen!

²¹ *Nein!* is possible as a response to a PfP formed from a symmetrical verb requiring a plural subject (or a comitative *mit*-phrase) like *abmachen* ‘to agree/settle’ as in (i). Here A does not negate B’s performative utterance, but rather his/her own presupposed participation – on second thoughts.

- (i) A: Wir sehen uns also morgen.
 we meet REFL then tomorrow
 ‘We’ll meet tomorrow then.’
 B: Abgemacht!
 agreed:PTCP
 ‘That’s a deal!’
 A: Nein, das stimmt nicht.
 not that is.true not
 ‘No, that’s not true’

promised:PTCP

‘I promise!’

A: # Nein, das stimmt nicht! / # Ja, das stimmt!

no that is.true not yes that is.true

‘No, that is not true!’ / ‘Yes, that’s true!’

So the PfP clearly exhibits all the crucial features associated with the canonical finite active performative – it even seems to be more strongly associated with performative use than finite sentences with performative verbs. An important difference between PfPs and finite performatives is, however, that the PfP is restricted to a subset of those verbs, which are observed in finite performatives. I will return to this in section 6.

4 Alternatives: PfPs as particles, adverbs or reduced clausal structures

The question is whether the PfPs considered so far are indeed verbal participles and not particles or adverbs and – if they are verbal – whether the PfP could be analysed as some kind of a reduced clausal structure, e.g. an adjectival passive as suggested by Fries (1983:236).

4.1. The PfP as a particle or an adverb

It is not unusual for past participles to be reanalyzed as other parts-of-speech. *Ausgenommen* ‘exempted’ is used as a preposition or a subordinating conjunction, *Verdammt* ‘dammed’ is used as an interjection and *ausgerechnet* ‘(lit.) calculated – of all things’ is used as an adverb. PfPs in turn alternate with (affirmative) response expressions such as *Ja!*, *Okay!*, *Jawohl!* ‘Yes, Sir’, *Stimmt!*²² ‘Right’ or *Genau!* ‘Exactly’.

(35) A: Wir sehen uns dann morgen!

we meet REFL then tomorrow

‘We’ll meet tomorrow then!’

B: Abgemacht! / Okay! / Jawohl! / Genau!

agreed:PTCP okay yes.sir exactly

‘That’s a deal! / Okay! / Yes sir! / Exactly!’

²² For ease of exposition I treat *Stimmt!* ‘right’ as a response expression. It is presumably an ellipsis: *(das) stimmt!* ‘that is.true’, since it can also be negated *Stimmt nicht!* ‘that is not true’. I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing this out.

From a synchronic point of view the PfPs might have been re-analyzed as responsive particles or adverbs so that they are listed as such in the lexicon. Still, the PfPs do exhibit unambiguous verbal properties. The PfPs license *hiermit* as in (36), manner adverbs as in (37) and (38), and even internal (recipient) arguments as in (39) and (40). Particles and adverbs do not.

- (36) Hiermit vereinbart! / *Hiermit Ja!
 hereby agreed:PTCP hereby yes
 ‘I hereby agree!’
- (37) ungern zugegeben²³ / *Ungern ja!
 reluctantly admitted:PTCP reluctantly yes
 ‘I admit that reluctantly’
- (38) Hoch und heilig versprochen!²⁴ / * Hoch und heilig Ja
 high and holy promised:PTCP high and holy yes
 ‘I promise this high and holy!’
- (39) Nicht nur allen Subaru-Freunden hiermit versprochen!²⁵
 not only all Subaru-friends hereby promised:PTCP
 ‘I promise this not only to all Subaru friends!’
- (40) Den Vorrednern hiermit angeschlossen: Wahnsinns Arbeit!²⁶
 the previous.speakers hereby subscribed.to:PTCP incredible work
 ‘I agree with the previous speakers: incredible work!’

Krifka (2007) further provides an example of a past participle used as a speech-act related expression, e.g. a speech act adverbial, i.e. an adverbial modifying a (possibly unexpressed) speech-act verb.

²³ <http://derkreuzberger.de/haftpflichtversicherung-fuer-politiker-denn-auch-der-hund-hat-eine/?print=print>, March 8 2020.

²⁴ BRZ06/MAI.02934 Braunschweiger Zeitung, 06.05.2006; Sachverstand, Pragmatismus und wohl auch göttliche Eingebung

²⁵ <https://www.subaru-community.com/subaru-foren/scooby-multimedia/1573-sti-gegen-porsche-in-ntv/index2.html>, accessed on December 8, 2014.

²⁶ <http://www.opel66-72.de/viewtopic.php?t=5891&start=270>, accessed on September 23, 2017.

(41) Zusammengefasst, die Performative Hypothese kann nicht stimmen.

summarised:PTCP the performative hypothesis can not be.true

‘In short, the performative hypothesis cannot be true.’

In (41) *zusammengefasst* ‘summarised’ can be interpreted as modifying an unexpressed performative verb such as *ausgedrückt* ‘expressed’ or *gesagt* ‘said’.²⁷ PfPs do not lend themselves to an analysis as speech-act adverbials. The verbs occurring as PfPs do not modify speech-acts and they cannot occur with speech-act denoting verbs. Moreover, the PfPs can occur alone as responses, while this is not possible for a speech-act adverbial such as *zusammengefasst* as shown in (42). A speech-act adverbial must adjoin to a clause.

(42) A: Die Performative Hypothese kann nicht stimmen. B: # Zusammengefasst.

the performative hypotheses can not be.true summarized:PTCP

‘A: The performative hypothesis cannot be true. B: In short.’

There is clear evidence that the PfP is indeed a verbal participle and not a particle, an adjective or an adverb.

4.2. The PfP as a reduced clausal structure

Rooryck & Potsma (2007:273/274) suggest for performative participles in Dutch that they are underlyingly (dynamic) passives and Fries (1983:236) suggests for structures like *Abgemacht!* ‘agreed’ in German that they are underlyingly adjectival passives. If the PfP has a

²⁷ As a reviewer observes, *zusammenfassen* ‘to summarize’ can itself be used as a speech-act denoting verb. An example such as (41) could be interpreted as a PfP even though it cannot occur alone as shown in (42). Possibly this verb would pattern with a verb such as *fragen* ‘to ask’ which is observed as a PfP when accompanied by an adverbial (see section 6.1).

- (j) KLIPP UND KLAR ZUSAMMENGEFASST: Diese Tracklist ist absichtlich
bluntly summarised:PTCP this tracklist is deliberately
mit falschen Interpreten bestückt worden,
with fake artists equipped been
‘Bluntly summarised: this tracklist has deliberately been equipped with fake artists, ...’
(<http://www.dancecharts.at/forum/archive/index.php/t-17200.html>, accessed on April 13, 2019)

recoverable finite clausal source, the difference in interpretation between directive participles and performative participles is immediately explained. Directive participles do not have a clausal source (Donhauser 1984) and Gärtner (2013:217) suggests that they receive a directive interpretation since they denote properties rather than propositions as mentioned in section 1. If the PfP has a finite clausal source, it denotes a proposition and not a property and following Gärtner's suggestion one would not expect it to be interpreted as a directive, but rather as a performative or assertive utterance.

Performative utterances are typically in the present tense (Dahl 2008, Eckardt 2012:24) so putative clausal sources for the PfP are such that contain a finite verb in the present tense and a past participle. This gives the possible sources in (43) exemplified for the verb *versprechen* 'to promise' with a propositional anaphor or a complement clause. Note that also the active perfect tense (*habe versprochen* 'have promised') is included. It satisfies the structural requirement of containing a present tense verb and a past participle and it is possible as a performative utterance. Note also that *hiermit* appears to be obligatory in (43a) and (43b).

- (43) a. Das habe ich hiermit versprochen / Ich habe hiermit versprochen, dass ...
 that have I hereby promised I have hereby promised that
 'I have hereby promised that' / 'I have hereby promised, that ...'
- b. Das wird hiermit versprochen / Es wird hiermit versprochen, dass ...
 that is hereby promised it is hereby promised that
 'That is hereby promised' / 'It is hereby promised, that ...'
- c. Das ist (hiermit) versprochen / Es ist (hiermit) versprochen, dass ...
 that is hereby promised it is hereby promised that
 'That is hereby promised' / 'It is hereby promised that, ...'
- d. Das sei (hiermit) versprochen²⁸ / es sei (hiermit) versprochen,

²⁸ (43c) has a finite indicative verb, while (43d) has a finite verb in the present subjunctive. This use of the present subjunctive in independent V2-clauses is described as an expression of wishes, requests or proposals in Duden (2006: §779) or of intentions or plans in Jørgensen (1976:vol. III, p. 68). The use of the present subjunctive in a "Heischesatz" can be characterized as 'setting the stage'. It is used to frame an ensuing discussion or an exercise as in mathematical texts: *Gegeben sei eine Menge A von ...* 'let there be given a set A of ...' or comments such as *Dies sei vorausgeschickt*, 'Let this be said in advance ...'. The example in (43d) could be paraphrased as *Let this be promised*.

that is:PRS.SBJV	hereby	promised	it is:PRS.SBJV	hereby	promised
			dass ...		
			that		
‘That is hereby promised’			/	‘It is hereby promised that, ...’	

As far as the active perfect in (43a) is concerned, Rapp & Wöllstein (2009:167) do suggest that the participle *Verstanden!* ‘understood’ occurring alone is an ellipsis of an active perfect. They observe that an auxiliary can be inserted.

- (44) (habe) verstanden
have understood
‘I have understood’

The verb *verstehen* ‘to understand’ is, however, not a canonical performative verb as briefly discussed in section 2 and no insertion of the auxiliary *haben* ‘to have’ is possible with bona-fide performative verbs like *versprechen* ‘to promise’ or *schwören* ‘to swear’.

- (45) A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi.
you say then nothing to dad
‘So you are not going to tell dad.’
B: (# habe) versprochen! / (# habe) geschworen!
have promised / have sworn
‘I promise! / I swear!’

There are also other reasons why the active perfect in (43a) or the present tense *werden*-passive in (43b) can hardly count as clausal sources for the PfP. Both the active perfect in (43a) and the *werden*-passive in (43b) appear to require the presence of *hiermit* in order to be interpreted as performatives. Without *hiermit* the clauses are rather interpreted as assertions, i.e. as a reminder that something has already been promised or that something will be promised.²⁹ B’s answer in (46) with the active perfect only seems possible on an assertive reading, while the present passive is marginal as a performative.

²⁹ A reviewer observes that (43b) can be construed as a performative without *hiermit* ‘hereby’ if the speaker is negotiating for a larger group, e.g. a company.

- (46) A: Du holst mich dann ab.
 you pick me then up
 ‘You will pick me up then.’
 B: Das habe ich versprochen. / ? Das wird versprochen.
 that have I promised that is promised
 ‘I have promised that.’ / ‘That is a promise.’

Hiermit is not necessary in the PfP as already mentioned. This difference makes it unlikely that (43a) and (43b). should be clausal sources for the PfP. No *hiermit* is required to enforce the performativity of the PfP, while *hiermit* appears to be necessary to enforce an interpretation of (43a) and (43b) as performatives. Moreover, the impossibility of genuine reflexive objects in PfPs would be a puzzle. Genuine reflexive objects are otherwise obligatory also when participles occur alone in structures that lend themselves to an analysis as an ellipsis, e.g. as term answers (Fries 1983:53). Cf.

- (47) A: Wie hast du auf die Enthüllungen reagiert?
 how have you to the revelations reacted
 ‘How did you react to the revelations?’
 B: *(mich) geschämt!
 REFL.1P.SG embarrassed:PTCP
 ‘I was embarrassed!’
 (48) A: Wie habt Ihr den Streit beigelegt?
 how have you the dispute resolved
 ‘How did you resolve the dispute?’
 B: *(uns) geeinigt!
 REFL.1P.PL agreed:PTCP
 ‘We settled on an agreement!’

Reflexive objects do not occur in PfPs as also noted for directive participles in Fries (1983:53), Rapp & Wöllstein (2009:168) and Heinold (2014:321).³⁰ This argument is weak-

³⁰ A reviewer notes that these participles could be analyzed as term answers, echoing an implicit question: *Haben wir uns geeinigt?* ‘Can we agree on this?’. This is definitely an idea

ened by the fact that *sich anschließen* ‘to subscribe to’ and *sich einigen* ‘to agree’ are judged to be marginal as PfPs by some speakers. Still, when these verbs are used as PfPs, they behave like other participles in root position in that the reflexive is omitted.

- (49) a. Solange niemand solches Material parat hat, könnte man tatsächlich „Mut
as.long nobody such material ready has could you indeed courage
zur Lücke“ zeigen und das Beywl u.a.-Beispiel löschen. -- CorradoX 18:36,
to gap show and the Beywl u.a.-example delete -- CorradoX 18:36,
15.Dez. 2008 (CET)
15.Dez. 2008 (CET)
Geeinigt ;-) (...) Lambada 19:35, 15. Dez. 2008 (CET)³¹
agreed:PTCP
‘As long as noone can provide such material you could indeed show the courage to
leave gaps and delete the Beywl a.o.-example -- CorradoX 18:36, 15. Dez. 2008
(CET)
I agree ;-) (...) Lambada 19:35, 15. Dez. 2008 (CET)’
b. (* mich / *uns / *sich) Geeinigt!
REFL.1P.SG REFL.1P.PL REFL.3P.SG agreed:PTCP
‘I agree!’

worth pursuing, but I am reluctant to appeal to echoic uses as long as the participles do not echo any overt linguistic material as in (49). The participle in (50) can indeed be echoic, but this need not be the case as (k) shows:

- (k) Nala: Hallo Peter. Ein :herzlich willkommen: hier im Forum ...
Hi Peter a warm welcome hier in.the forum
c0y0t: hiermit angeschlossen – herzlich Willkommen!
hereby subscribed.to:PTCP warm welcome!’
‘Nala: Hi Peter. A warm welcome to the forum. c0y0t: From me too – a warm welcome.’
(<https://www.ntv-forum.de/forum2/index.php?thread/16238-nicht-ganz-neu/&postID=197329>, accessed on April 2, 2019)

³¹ WDD11/G41.03491: Diskussion:Generisches Maskulinum/Archiv/2, In: Wikipedia - URL:http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diskussion:Generisches_Maskulinum/Archiv/2: Wikipedia, 2011

- (50) a. Ich denke die Herren Administratoren werden sich dem anschließen :)
 I guess the lordships administrators will REFL to.that subscribe
 (...)

 Oh Tanja, :)) ja hiermit angeschlossen:³²
 O Tanja, yes hereby subscribed.to:PTCP
 ‘A: I guess the lordships administrators will agree to that. B: O Tanja, Yes, I hereby agree.’
- b. (* mich / *sich) hiermit angeschlossen
 REFL.1P.SG REFL.3P.SG hereby subscribed.to:PTCP
 ‘I agree!’

Having ruled out the active perfect tense and the present tense *werden*-passive as possible clausal sources the next thing to consider is the adjectival passive in the indicative or the present subjunctive. The adjectival passives as performatives in (43c) and (43d) (Brandt et al. 1989:4, Searle 1989:537, Liedtke 1998:177, Maienborn 2007:89, Schlücker 2009:109) capture the intuition that the PfP is predicated of the (contextually resolved) internal argument *p*: *with this utterance, the state of p being Ved is holding*. Since the propositional content is resolved contextually, the putative clausal source can contain a propositional anaphor as the passive subject as in (51a) or the pronominal *es* ‘it’ with an extraposed complement clause as in (51b).

- (51) a. Das ist / sei versprochen!
 that is / is:PRS.SBJV promised
 ‘That is a promise / Let that be a promise!’
- b. Also ist / sei es versprochen, dass ich deinem Vater nichts erzähle.
 so is / is:PRS.SBJV it promised that I your dad nothing tell
 ‘So it is a promise / So let it be promised that I won’t that I won’t tell your dad.’

From a synchronic point of view at least, there is no direct syntactic relationship between the adjectival passive and the PfP. The adjectival passive is no prerequisite for the PfP to occur, since PfPs also occur with verbs that do not form adjectival passives. Adjectival passives are

³² <http://www.wohnzimmerriff.de/wbb2/index.php/Thread/495-Anfänger-Fragen/?pageNo=3>, accessed on July 28, 2017.

formed from verbs with internal arguments (theme or experiencer arguments) associated with a change of state along a unique one-dimensional scale (Gehrke 2015:908/909). Syntactically, they do not take genuine reflexive objects. The verbs *sich einigen* ‘to agree’ and *sich anschließen* ‘to subscribe to’ occur as PfPs (cf. (49) and (50) though judged to be marginal by some speakers as mentioned earlier), but they do not form adjectival passives.

- (52) *Darüber ist sich geeinigt
 thereover is REFL.3P.SG agreed
 ‘(Intended:) This has been agreed upon’
- (53) *Dem ist sich angeschlossen
 that is REFL.3P.SG subscribed.to
 ‘(Intended:) This has been accepted’

Interestingly reflexive verbs are better in “Heische”-clauses, i.e. clauses with the verb in the present subjunctive.

- (54) ?Darüber sei sich geeinigt
 thereupon is:PRS.SBJV REFL.3P.SG agreed
 ‘Let this be agreed upon / Let us agree upon that’
- (55) ?Dem sei sich angeschlossen
 that is:PRS.SBJV REFL.3P.SG subscribed.to
 ‘Let this be subscribed to / I’ll subscribe to that’

Examples such as (54) and (55) are judged to be better than adjectival passives in the indicative, but they are also judged to be somewhat stilted, while the PfP is very colloquial. Moreover, it would be hard to explain why a PfP can only be formed out of an adjectival passive in the subjunctive, while also adjectival passives in the indicative allow performative readings.

Vice versa there are also verbs forming adjectival passives with a performative reading but failing to occur as PfPs. This is unexpected on an analysis of the PfP as an ellipsis since ellipsis would have to be lexically restricted in these cases.³³

³³ The adjectival passive and the PfP also seem to have different distributions in monological texts. The PfP either precedes or follows the clause to which it is attached, while it is marginal in an interpolated position. The adjectival passive also occurs interpolated.

- (56) a. Der Teufel steckt halt im kleinsten Detail, daran sei erinnert.³⁴
 the devil lies PART in.the smallest detail thereof be reminded
 ‘I remind you, the devil lies in the smallest detail as we all know.’
- b. #Der Teufel steckt halt im kleinsten Detail, erinnert.
 the devil lies PART in.the smallest detail reminded:PTCP
 ‘I remind you, the devil lies in the smallest detail as we all know.’

An important difference between the adjectival passive and the PfP is that they do not have the same range of interpretations. The full copula clause allows for both an assertive and a performative reading. In (57) the adjectival passive serves as an answer to A’s polar question by asserting that the chancellor’s visit to the opening has been agreed upon. Note that *hiermit* is excluded here. In (58) the adjectival passive is used performatively and it serves as an acceptance of A’s request (provided that B is in a position to make arrangements for the chancellor). Here *hiermit* is possible.

-
- (l) a. Fischliebhaber, das ist versprochen, werden in Apulien glücklich.
 fish.lovers that is promised, get in Apulia happy
 ‘Fish lovers, I promise, will be happy in Apulia.’
 (NUN08/JUN.03328 Nürnberger Nachrichten, 28.06.2008, S. 16, Apulien leuchtet und schmeckt)
- b. ??# Fischliebhaber, versprochen, werden in Apulien glücklich.
 fish.lovers promised:PTCP get in Apulia happy
 ‘Fish lovers, I promise, will be happy in Apulia.’

This argument is contested by examples like (m) where the PfP does occur interpolated.

- (m) Und das, versprochen, ohne den Punkt Asyl/Migration auch nur anzutasten.
 And this promised:PTCP without the topic Asyl/migration only even to.mention
 ‘And this, I promise, without even mentioning the topic Asyl/migration.’
 (<http://kskjena.blogspot.de/2016/03/10/keine-wahlempfehlung/>, accessed on March 11, 2020)

³⁴ P02/JAN.03397 Die Presse, 29.01.2002, S. 28; Form und Norm

- (57) A: Kommt die Kanzlerin denn überhaupt heute? B: Das ist (# hiermit) abgemacht.
 comes the chancellor then at.all today that is hereby agreed
 ‘A: Will the chancellor be here today at all? B: So it has been agreed.’
- (58) A: Die Kanzlerin kommt dann heute. B: Das ist (hiermit) abgemacht!
 the chancellor comes then today that is hereby agreed
 ‘A: So the chancellor will be here today. B: That is a deal!’

The PfP does not allow for an assertive reading in the context of a polar question as in (59). It can only be used on a performative reading as in (60). If the PfP were an ellipsis it ought to exhibit the same range of readings as the adjectival passive.

- (59) A: Kommt die Kanzlerin denn überhaupt heute? B: #Abgemacht!
 comes the chancellor then at.all today agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) A: Will the chancellor be here today at all? B: So it has been agreed!’
- (60) A: Die Kanzlerin kommt dann heute. B: Abgemacht!
 the chancellor comes then today agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: So the chancellor will be here today. B: That is a deal!’

Another semantic difference between the adjectival passive and the PfP follows from this distribution of assertive and performative readings. The adjectival passive is ambiguous between having the speaker as the agent on a performative reading or a third party on an assertive reading as shown in B₁’s response in (61) where the third party can be the chancellor herself or her office. The PfP in B₂’s response in turn is unambiguous. Only the speaker can be the agent, since it only has a performative reading.

- (61) A: Die Kanzlerin kommt dann heute.
 the chancellor comes then today
 ‘So the chancellor will be here today.’
- B₁: Das ist versprochen.
 that is promised
 ‘That is a promise / That is the agreement’. (I promise that/She has promised that)
- B₂: Versprochen!
 promised:PTCP
 ‘That is a promise!’ (I promise that / ≠ She has promised that)

This ambiguity is also found when an adjectival passive is used in reported speech as mentioned in section 3. The adjectival passive in (62) is ambiguous: it can mean that someone else has promised Peter a compensation or it can mean that Peter was promising the hearer, that he will get a compensation for sure. The PfP in (63) cannot mean that some third party has promised Peter a compensation. **It can mean that the speaker is promising that Peter really said so or marginally that Peter was promising the hearer that he will get a compensation**³⁵. As an elliptical variant of an adjectival passive with a subjunctive one should expect (63) to be ambiguous as well, but it is not.³⁶

- (62) Peter sagte, er werde eine Entschädigung bekommen. Das sei
 Peter said he would:PRS.SBJV a compensation get that is:PRS.SBJV
 versprochen.
 promised.
 ‘Peter said he would get a compensation. That was a promise.’ (Someone had promised Peter/Peter promised so)
- (63) Peter sagte, er werde eine Entschädigung bekommen. Versprochen.
 Peter said he would:PRS.SBJV a compensation get promised:PTCP

³⁵ Some informants find the use of the PfP in reported speech deviant, exactly because it is understood as a performative and even with speaker-orientation rather than figure-orientation.

³⁶ For some informants there is a pragmatic difference between the Adjectival Passive and the PfP as well. While the Adjectival Passiv can be used to issue a threat, some informants find the PfP odd in such contexts.

- (n) Ich bringe dich um. Das sei hiermit versprochen!
 I kill you PART that is:PRS.SBJV hereby promised
 ‘I am gonna kill you. I hereby promise you!’
- (o) ?? Ich bringe dich um. Versprochen!
 I kill you PART promised:PTCP
 ‘I am gonna kill you. I promise.’

For some informants *Versprochen!* ‘promised’ in (o) seems to suggest that the speaker is doing the hearer a favour. This intuition is not shared by all informants though and a reviewer points out that judgements may be influenced by prosody, facial expression etc.

‘Peter said he would get a compensation. I promise/He promised.’ (≠ Someone had promised Peter’)

Thus, the PfP has distinct syntactic and semantic properties that do not follow from an analysis of the PfP as an ellipsis.³⁷ Also the PfP is different from evaluative adjective phrases occurring in root positions which are discussed in Günthner (2009).

- (64) A: Ich hole das Auto von der Werkstatt. B: Super!
I get the car from the garage great
‘A: I will go and get the car from the garage. B: Great!’

The PfP appears to share many properties with this construction: the evaluative adjective can occur alone leaving the clausal complement (what is considered great in (64)) to be resolved contextually and the adjective shows speaker-orientation inasmuch that the evaluator is understood to be the speaker (even though the adjective has no agent argument). Still, the evaluative adjective is interpreted assertively, while the PfP does not allow for an assertive reading. Also, the evaluative construction allows for evaluative expression of various categories (Günthner 2009:178-79), while the PfP does not seem to alternate with performative expressions of other categories.

- (65) A: Ich habe es geschafft! B: Hammer!
I have it made hammer(NOUN)
‘A: I made it! B: Great!’
- (66) A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi. B: ??# Ein Versprechen!
You tell then nothing to dad a promise
‘(Intended:) A: You are not going to tell dad. B: That is a promise!’

³⁷ Moreover, the PfP appears to be much more frequent than the Adjectival Passive. Cosmas – the corpus of the Institute für deutsche Sprache in Mannheim – contains 35 occurrences of *sei + versprochen* ‘is:PRS.SBJV + promised’ used performatively. There are more than 1000 instances of the PfP *versprochen!* ‘promised’. This is unexpected if the PfP is a derived structure.

Even if the PfP is a construction in its own right and not a reduced clausal structure just like the *adj+dass*-Clause in Günthner (2009),³⁸ it must be a different kind of construction than the *adj+dass*-Clause.

5 The syntax of the PfP

Two questions present themselves concerning the syntax of the PfP: what happens to the complements of the input verb and what is the constituent structure of the PfP?

5.1. The expression of arguments in the PfP

The verbs occurring as PfPs do not form a homogeneous group from a syntactic point of view. The only common property appears to be that they are at least two-place predicates. As a minimum the verbs select an agent (the speaker) and they allow a propositional argument,³⁹ namely what is communicated in the denoted speech-act: what is promised, admitted or agreed upon. The attested verbs occurring in PfPs all allow for a complement clause with the complementizer *dass* ‘that’. Verbs selecting a complement clause with the complementizer *ob* ‘if/whether’ appear to be excluded in the PfP. The restriction to the complementizer *dass* follows from the fact that the speaker commits to the truth of a proposition, while the complementizer *ob* is used for embedded clauses with an unresolved truth value (Zifonun et al. 1997:2258).

- (67) a. Versprochen!
 promised:PTCP
 ‘I promise!’
 b. Ich verspreche, dass / *ob ich dich abhole

³⁸ In Müller (2016:88) the *adj+dass*-Clause is analyzed as a clause lacking a copula where the adjective is in the prefield („Vorfeld“).

³⁹ Verbs selecting non-propositional objects do not seem to allow the PfP even though they are semantically eligible inasmuch as they express or establish consent, e.g. by complying with a request from the hearer. The verb *jmdm. etw. zuerkennen* ‘to award sb. sth.’ does not allow a propositional object and does not occur as a PfP.

- (p) A: Ich bekomme also den Professorentitel. B: Versprochen / #Zuerkannt
 I get then the professor.title promised:PTCP awarded:PTCP
 ‘A: So I will get the professor title. B: I promise! / (Intended:) I am awarding you it!’

- I promise that if I you pick.up
 ‘I promise that I will pick you up.’
- (68) a. #Erkundigt!
 inquired:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) I inquire!’
- b. Ich erkundige mich, *dass / ob das stimmt
 I inquire REFL that if that is.true
 ‘I am inquiring if that is true.’

Otherwise, a variety of complementation patterns are observed for the verbs occurring as PfPs:

- NPacc + NPdat: e.g. *jmdm. etw. bestätigen* ‘to confirm sth. for sb.’, *gestehen* ‘to confess’, *schenken* ‘to grant’, *versichern* ‘to assure’, *versprechen* ‘to promise’, *zugeben* ‘to admit’
- NPdat / NPdat + PP: *etw.D zustimmen* ‘to agree with sth.’, *jmdm. (darin) zustimmen*, *dass ...* ‘to agree with sbd. in sth.’
- NPacc: *akzeptieren* ‘to accept’, *verstehen* ‘to understand’, *kapieren* ‘to understand’
- NPacc + (comitative) PP: *etw. (mit jmdm.) abmachen* ‘to agree on sth. (with sb.) / settle sth. (with sb.)’, *etw. (mit jmdm.) vereinbaren* ‘to agree on sth.’
- NPrefl + NPdat / NPrefl + NPdat + *dass*-Clause: *sich etw.D anschließen* ‘to subscribe to sth.’, *sich jmdm. anschließen, dass ...* ‘to accord with sb. that ...’
- NPrefl + PP + (comitative PP): *sich (mit jmdm.) über etw. einigen* ‘to agree on sth.’

It is striking that some of these verbs such as *abmachen* ‘to agree/settle’ and *sich einigen* ‘to agree’ alternate between taking a plural subject and occurring with a comitative *mit* ‘with’-phrase. This accords well with the generalization that the PfP is used to express consent.

EXPRESSION OF THE AGENT

Fries (1983) shows for infinite clauses headed by infinitives that valency reductions are obligatory since non-finite verb forms usually do not license syntactic subjects. Müller (2002:146-148) building on a proposal by Haider (1986) suggests that past participles block the designated argument of the verb (the argument with subject-properties). An auxiliary such as *haben* ‘to have’ de-blocks the designated argument as in (69) to form a composite active

tense, while an auxiliary such as *werden* ‘(lit.) to become’ raises the second most prominent argument (with accusative case) to subject to form a passive as in (70). The blocked external argument can be realized as an oblique *by*-phrase.

- (69) Peter hat den Roman gelesen
 Peter has the novel read
 ‘Peter has read the novel’
- (70) Der Roman wurde von Peter gelesen
 the novel was by Peter read
 ‘The novel was read by Peter’

The PfP does not allow the agent to be realized as a nominative subject as shown as in (71), contrary to directive participles, which allow (subject-like) complements (Fries 1983:52, Rapp & Wöllstein 2009:168, Gärtner 2013:204, Heinold 2014:316), cf. (11a) above. Even more puzzling is that the PfP does not seem to occur with an oblique *by*-phrase either, as illustrated in (72). An oblique *by*-phrase appears to be better than a nominative subject, but no authentic examples have been found.

- (71) * Wir hiermit vereinbart!
 we hereby agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) We hereby agree!’
- (72) ? Von uns hiermit vereinbart!
 by us hereby agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) We hereby agree!’

As discussed in section 3, speaker-restriction is a defining characteristic of performatives. In an active performative the subject is a 1st person pronoun (or an NP denoting the speaker such as *der Unterzeichnete* ‘the undersigned’⁴⁰) and in passive performatives the (unexpressed) agent is understood to be the speaker as in (73).

⁴⁰ I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing this out.

- (73) Passagiere werden gebeten, unter Deck nicht zu rauchen. (Brandt et al. 1989:4)
 passengers are requested below deck not to smoke
 ‘Passengers are requested not to smoke below deck.’

Given that performatives are speaker-oriented any overt realization of the agent appears to be redundant unless it is independently required by the syntax, e.g. when an active verb requires a subject. Still, avoidance of redundancy cannot be the explanation why agent phrases are hardly ever seen in the PfP. Syntactically overt agents are possible in performative adjectival passives as in (74), even though they are syntactically optional. The *by*-phrase in (74) is redundant and it is not required by the syntax.

- (74) Und das ist hiermit von mir bestätigt!⁴¹
 and that is hereby by me confirmed
 ‘And that is hereby confirmed by me!’

Moreover, the agent would not be redundant in delegated speech where the speaker has been authorized to perform the speech act on behalf of someone else. And still agent phrases are hardly ever found in the PfP as in the constructed example in (75).

- (75) A: Wir verlangen, dass die Opfer der Krawalle eine Entschädigung bekommen.
 we demand that the victims of the riot a compensation get
 ‘We demand that the victims of the riot are granted a compensation.’
 B: ? Von der Kanzlerin versprochen!
 by the chancellor promised:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) The chancellor hereby promises that!’

Still, given the fact that an oblique *by*-phrase is much better with the PfP than NP subjects and even appears to be accepted by some speakers,⁴² I assume that the PfP has a passive argument structure and that the agent is linked to an oblique *by*-phrase. Since the oblique *by*-

⁴¹ <https://www.harmony-remote-forum.de/viewtopic.php?t=8743&start=30>, accessed on July 27, 2017.

⁴² I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing this out to me. This reviewer does accept oblique *by*-phrases with PfPs.

phrase (the agent) in the canonical use of the PfP is fully interpretable as the speaker I suggest that this *by*-phrase is restricted to be a null-pronominal in the 1st person (ignoring delegated speech as in (75)). The presence of a null-pronominal excludes overt realization of the argument. For those speakers who do accept an overt *by*-phrase, the restriction that it be a null-pronominal is optional. I will account for this in the analysis below.

EXPRESSION OF INTERNAL ARGUMENTS

The PfP licenses one kind of internal arguments. Though rarely seen, internal recipient arguments do occur, typically dative objects as already shown in section 4. The examples are repeated in (76) through (78).

- (76) Nicht nur allen Subaru-Freunden hiermit versprochen!⁴³
 not only all Subara-friends hereby promised:PTCP
 ‘I hereby promise not only all Subaru-friends!’
- (77) Den Vorrednern hiermit angeschlossen: Wahnsinns Arbeit⁴⁴
 the previous.speakers hereby subscribed.to:PTCP incredible work
 ‘I hereby agree with the previous speakers: incredible work’
- (78) Allen hiermit zugestimmt.⁴⁵
 to.everyone hereby agreed:PTCP
 ‘I hereby agree with everyone else.’

Other internal arguments are not allowed in the PfP. Reflexive objects are barred from occurring (cf. example (49) and (50)) as also observed for directive infinitives and participles in Fries (1983:53-54), Gärtner (2013:206) and Heinold (2014:321).

It is more puzzling that the PfP does not license overt internal propositional complements, neither as propositional anaphors as in (79) and (80) nor as a pronominal adverb as in (81).

⁴³ <https://www.subaru-community.com/subaru-foren/scooby-multimedia/1573-sti-gegen-porsche-in-ntv/index2.html>, accessed on December 8, 2014.

⁴⁴ <http://www.opel66-72.de/viewtopic.php?t=5891&start=270>, accessed on September 18, 2016.

⁴⁵ <http://meedia.de/2016/12/09/sat-1-bringt-genial-daneben-mit-hugo-egon-balder-im-fruehjahr-2017-zurueck/>, accessed on September 23, 2017.

- (79) ?? Das versprochen!
 that promised:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) I promise that!’
- (80) ?? Dem zugestimmt!
 with.that agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) I agree to that!’
- (81) ?? Darüber geeinigt!
 thereupon agreed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) We agree upon that!’

From a syntactic point of view it is not clear why the PfPs with internal arguments in (79)-(81) are ruled out. A participle licenses internal arguments either as complements inside the VP or as (passive or unaccusative) subjects of a Small Clause, the so-called absolute accusative (Fabricius-Hansen et al. 2012:80 ff.). In the discussion of the expression of the agent it was suggested that the PfP has a passive argument structure. Thus, the structure in (82) ought to be available for the PfP with a passive subject, but it is not as (79) shows.⁴⁶

- (82) [_{SC} DP [_{VP} [_V _{PERFPART}]]]

While the Small Clause structure in (82) could be available for PfPs with passive subjects (i.e. for verbs taking objects with structural (accusative) case), it would not be available for the PfPs in (80) and (81) with a dative-marked object and a prepositional object respectively, since dative and prepositional complements cannot be construed as passive subjects. However, these objects should be able to occur VP-internally in the structure in (83), but they cannot as (80) and (81) show.

- (83) [_{VP} DP/PP/ADVP _V _{PERFPART}]

⁴⁶ Dal (1966:120) and Zifonun et al. (1997, vol. 3: 2227) give examples of absolute accusatives with propositional anaphors. The example in (q) from Zifonun et al. (ibid.) receives a temporal interpretation. Note that this is an unaccusative subject and no passive subject.

- (q) Dies geschehen, wandte er sich neuen Aufgaben zu
 this happened:PTCP turned he REFL new duties to
 ‘As this has happened, he turned to new duties.’

Past participles are observed in root position with internal arguments in Small Clause structures like the ones in (84)–(86) (see also Fries 1983:52). As (86) shows these appear to be instances of the so-called Absolute Nominative Construction and they are also only possible with verbs selecting accusative complements.

- (84) Berichte hiermit versprochen⁴⁷
 reports hereby promised:PTCP
 ‘Reports will be delivered, that is a promise!’
- (85) Erlaubnis hiermit verweigert!⁴⁸
 permission hereby denied:PTCP
 ‘Permission is hereby denied!’
- (86) Neu-er Tarifvertrag vereinbart.⁴⁹
 new-NOM.MASC.SING labour.agreement agreed:PTCP
 ‘New labour agreement has been adopted.’

I do not consider these examples instances of the PfP though. Fries (1983:236) and Fabricius-Hansen et al. (2012:84) suggest that embedded absolute nominatives are clausal, i.e. elliptical passives. More importantly the absolute nominative as shown in (84)–(86) is special in that the nominative DP is a lexical NP without a determiner (cf. Fries 1983:53, who speaks of determiner ellipsis in conjunction with directive participles).

- (87) ?? Die Berichte hiermit versprochen
 the reports hereby promised:PTCP
 ‘The reports are hereby promised.’
- (88) ?? Die Erlaubnis hiermit verweigert
 the permission hereby denied:PTCP
 ‘The permission is hereby denied’

⁴⁷ <https://www.betabikes.de/index.php/kunena/al/1692-rr-350-efi-erste-er-fahr-ungen>, accessed on June 20, 2017.

⁴⁸ <http://noresstoday75.bboard.de/board/ftopic-86100696nx50426-12-225.html>, accessed on July 27, 2017.

⁴⁹ Prekär, Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft, Info 1, 2013, S. 11.

- (89) ?? Der neue Tarifvertrag vereinbart
 the new labour.agreement agreed:PTCP
 ‘The new labour agreement has been agreed upon.’

In the PfP, what is promised or agreed on is contextually resolved so it has to be a propositional anaphor such as *das* ‘that’ or *dies* ‘this’ and not a determinerless lexical NP. Therefore the PfP cannot be an elliptical version of the absolute nominative construction, which also would not explain the possibility of verbs with dative and prepositional complements in the PfP.

Since also the propositional argument is fully interpretable, but cannot be overtly realized, I suggest that it is a (propositional) null-pronominal, which is left to anaphoric resolution. This still leaves a problem, though. Occasionally the PfP allows for an extraposed complement clause as in (90), which, however, stems from a monological use and so does not exemplify a responding use.⁵⁰

- (90) Geschenkt, dass Clinton sich nicht zu schade ist zu berichten, wie sie nach der
 granted:PTCP that Clinton is.not.too.aloof to describe how she after the
 verlorenen Präsidentschaftswahl in Yoga-Pants auf ihrem Sofa ins Chardon-
 lost presidential.election in yoga-pants on her couch into.the chardon-
 nay-Glas weint und TV-Serien guckt, als hätte sie Liebeskummer.⁵¹

⁵⁰ It seems that PfPs only allows for *dass*-clauses and not for infinitival constructions with *zu*. A verb such as *versprechen* ‘to promise’ allows for either a complement clause or an infinitival complement, but only the former can occur with the PfP.

- (r) a. Versprochen, dass ich dich abhole
 promised:PTCP that I you pick.up
 ‘I promise that I will pick you up’
 b. ?? Versprochen, dich abzuholen
 promised:PTCP you pick.up:INF
 ‘I promise to pick you up’

This could follow from constraints on the passivization of subject control verbs, but this awaits further study. I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing out this problem.

⁵¹ <http://www.zeit.de/2017/39/hillary-clinton-buch-analyse-what-happened>, accessed on September 26, 2017.

nay-glass weeps and soaps watch as.if had she a.broken.heart
 ‘I grant that Clinton is not too aloof to describe how she sits on her couch in Yoga-Pants weeping into a glass of Chardonnay after having lost the election, watching soaps as if she were suffering from a broken heart.’

One way to explain this data is to say that the PfP does not allow an overt definite internal complement. The complement clause in (90) is licensed since it is not marked for definiteness. This would leave us to explain why complements marked for definiteness are barred from occurring. Complement clauses otherwise alternate with propositional anaphors such as *das* ‘that’ or *dies* ‘this’. Instead, I suggest that the internal argument of the PfP in (90) is also a null-pronominal and that the extraposed *dass*-clause is an adjunct adding a restriction to the null-pronominal. An argument in favour of this analysis for the PfP with a null-pronominal and a complement clause as in (90), is that a null-pronominal (just like an overt pronominal) is anaphorically dependent on an antecedent. This means that the extraposed *dass*-clause is adding a restriction to an already given discourse entity (the antecedent of the null-pronominal), i.e. the *dass*-clause is background information or discourse-old as shown for for *dass*-clauses with an overt pronominal *es* ‘it’ in Berman et al. (1998:13). Since the PfP is typically used to express consent, what is agreed upon is expected to be present in the discourse (or presupposed to be present in the discourse) as also observed for the evaluative *adj+dass*-clause-construction (Günthner 2009:159). In dialogical contexts, PfPs are infelicitous with discourse-new propositional content in the *dass*-clause:

- (91) A: Du machst mir überhaupt keine Versprechen über irgendetwas.
 you make me at.all no promises about anything
 ‘You don’t promise me anything at all.’
 B₁: Ich verspreche dir, dass ich erst in zwei Wochen wiederkomme.
 I promise you that I not.until in two weeks return
 ‘I promise you that I won’t be back for two weeks.’
 B₂: ??#Versprochen, dass ich erst in zwei Wochen wiederkomme.
 promised:PTCP that I not.until in two weeks return
 ‘I promise that I won’t be back for two weeks.’

In a monological use such as the one in (90) the content of the *dass*-clause is not discourse-old strictly speaking, but still the PfP can be replaced with *Stimmt!* ‘right’, as if the author

would be reacting to an anticipated objection from the reader.⁵² I will return to this effect of PfPs in section 7.

The construction with a PfP and an extraposed *dass*-clause in (90) behaves just like clausal structures with an overt pronoun *es* as in (92).

- (92) Sei es geschenkt, dass sein Vergleich mit 1929-1933 gewaltig hinkt –⁵³
 is:PRS.SBJV it granted that his comparison with 1929-1933 terribly limps
 ‘Let it be granted that his comparison with 1929-1933 is terribly off –’

The construction in (92) is an instance of the so-called correlative-*es*-construction in German (a.o. Cardinaletti 1990; Berman et al. 1998; Sudhoff 2003, 2016), where a sentence-internal nominal pro-form *es* ‘it’ is co-referential with a complement clause in the extraposition. The PfP-construction behaves just like correlative constructions. The correlative construction does not allow the complement clause to appear pre-verbally as (93) shows (Berman et al. 1998:5-6; Sudhoff 2003:55; Sudhoff 2016:24) and this is also observed in the PfP-construction in (94). This is explained on the analysis that the PfP contains a correlative null-pronominal.

- (93) Dass ich erst in zwei Wochen wiederkomme, sei (*es) versprochen.
 that I not.until in two weeks return is:PRS.SBJV it promised
 ‘That I won’t be back for two weeks, that is a promise.’
- (94) *Dass ich erst in zwei Wochen wiederkomme, versprochen.
 that I not.until in two weeks return promised:PTCP
 ‘That I won’t be back for two weeks, that is a promise.’

⁵² Günthner (2009:161) also observes that the evaluative *adj+dass*-clause-construction is found in head-lines and text-initially, even though the *dass*-clause in this construction is pre-supposed to be discourse-old.

- (s) Super dass es das Forum gibt!!!!!!!!!!!! (Example from Günthner 2009:162)
 great that there this forum is
 ‘Great that we have this forum!!!!!!!!!!!!’

⁵³ <https://community.eintracht.de/forum/diskussionen/122515?page=55#4335525>, accessed on July 12, 2018.

The analysis of an extraposed clause as adding a restriction to a null-pronominal also accounts for PfPs occurring with V2-clauses as in (95).⁵⁴

- (95) Zugegeben, die ungewohnte Ruhe war eigentlich ein ganz angenehmer
admitted:PTCP the unusual peacefulness was actually a rather pleasant
Einstieg in den frühen Freitagmorgen.⁵⁵
beginning of the early Friday.morning
'I must say, actually the unusual peacefulness was a rather pleasant beginning of the
early Friday morning.'

Correlative *es* is not found with V2-clauses (Sudhoff 2016:35), but verbs occurring with correlative *es* are also found in a construction with an anticipatory pronominal *es* and a V2-clause which is not syntactically subordinate to the verb as shown in (96) and (97). In these examples there is an intonational break before the V2-clause and sometimes a colon is used instead of a comma.

- (96) Aber die Ignoranz der Politiker und Gerichte haben es bewiesen, bei ihnen
but the ignorance of.the politicians and courts have it proven for them
spielen Menschenleben keine Rolle, sonst hätte man dieses größte Atomklo von
play human.lives no role otherwise had you this biggest atom.loo in
ganz Europa nicht in einer Stadt mit über 100 000 Einwohnern genehmigt.⁵⁶
whole Europe not in a city with more.than 100 000 inhabitants allowed.
'But the ignorance of the politicians and courts have proven it, they don't care about
human lives at all, otherwise you would not have allowed the biggest atom loo in the
whole of Europe in a city with more than 100.000 inhabitants.'

⁵⁴ I am grateful to a reviewer for pointing out the problem with PfPs occurring with V2-clauses.

⁵⁵ A97/AUG.21218 St. Galler Tagblatt, 30.08.1997, Ressort: TB-AMR (Abk.); Ohne Telefon geht nichts

⁵⁶ BRZ08/JUL.13441 Braunschweiger Zeitung, 28.07.2008; Atommüll nicht in der Nähe von Menschen

- (97) und hiermit sei es versprochen: Wir kommen bald wieder!!!⁵⁷
 and hereby is.PRS.SBJV it promised: we come soon back
 ‘And let this hereby be a promise: we will soon be back!!!’

Whatever the analysis of these constructions is, the PfP behaves exactly like verbs with an anticipatory *es* and this lends support to positing a null-pronominal for PfPs where a syntactically subordinate *dass*-clause or a non-subordinated clause can add a restriction (by contextual resolution in the latter case).

To sum up: the PfP licenses only internal recipient arguments. As for the impossibility of realizing the agent and the internal propositional complement, I suggest that they are constructionally restricted to null-pronominals.

5.2. The constituent structure of the PfP

As far as the constituent structure is concerned, there is very little to go by. There is evidence that the participle projects a VP. As shown in the sections 4 and 5.1 the PfP licenses VP-internal recipient arguments, possibly oblique *by*-phrases and manner adverbs. Manner adverbs are assumed to be adjoined to the verbal complex, i.e. to be VP-internal (Pittner 2004:260).

However, there is also evidence for an IP above the VP. The PfP allows for (evaluative) sentential adverbs such as *leider* ‘sadly’ or *selbstverständlich* ‘of course’ as in (98) and (99).

- (98) Und, leider zugegeben – es hätten noch viel mehr Karten verkauft werden⁵⁸
 And sadly admitted:PTCP there had even many more tickets sold be
 ‘And – I am sorry to say – there could have been sold even many more tickets’
- (99) Aber selbstverständlich versprochen, Herr Rrr, ich werde mich ganz fest
 but of.course promised:PTCP mr. Rrr I will myself very firmly
 zusammenreißen⁵⁹

⁵⁷ <http://www.gasthof-alte-muehle.de/gaestebuch.html?start=200>, accessed on July 11, 2018.

⁵⁸ <https://m.mainpost.de/regional/schweinfurt/Moliere-im-Theater-Ein-Edelmann-als-tuerkischer-Derwisch;art742,7791385>, accessed on May 25, 2018.

⁵⁹ <https://blog.tagesanzeiger.ch/zumrundenleder/blog/2009/04/14/london-calling-1/>, accessed on September 20, 2017.

pull.together

‘But of course I promise that, mr. Rrr, I will really pull myself together’

If sentential adverbs could adjoin to VP, they should also be expected to occur in Small Clauses, i.e. in absolute accusatives as the one in (100), but they cannot. The impossibility of (100) is explained if the absolute accusative contains a VP and not an IP.

(100) ?? DenKopf selbstverständlich zugedeckt stand Peter vor der Tür

the head of.course covered:PTCP stood Peter by the door

‘Peter was standing by the door with the head of course covered’.

The possibility of sentential adverbs is further evidence that the PfP cannot be a Small Clause occurring in root position with an empty DP. The structure would be that of an absolute accusative as in (101), but with an empty DP as shown in (102).

(101) [_{SC} [_{DP} Den Kopf] [_{VP} zugedeckt]] stand Peter vor der Tür

the head covered:PTCP ‘Peter was standing by the door’

(102) [_{SC} [_{DP} e] [_{VP} versprochen]]

promised:PTCP

Instead the possibility of sentential adverbs points to the conclusion that the PfP contains an IP. If sentential adverbs adjoin to IP⁶⁰ or I’, a PfP with a sentential adverb has the structure in (103).

⁶⁰ The example in (t) shows that a sentential adverb can also adjoin **to a full clause (an IP)**.

(t) Schon ein paar Wochen später mußte man sich korrigieren, weil leider
already a couple weeks later had.to you REFL rectify,’ because unfortunately
alles falsch war

everything wrong was

‘Already a couple of weeks later you had to rectify since, unfortunately, everything turned out to be wrong’

(S87/JAN.00175 Der Spiegel, 12.01.1987, S. 160; Aids: Sex-Verbot für Zehntausende?)

- (103) [_{IP} [_{ADVP} selbstverständlich] [_{IP} [_{VP} versprochen]]]
of course promised:PTCP

There is a further complication though. Brandt et al. (1989:16-17) show that performative utterances and sentential performative expressions such as *dankend* ‘(lit.) thanking’ can occur syntactically embedded in another clause. The PfP cannot be embedded, it can only occur unembedded as also noted for evaluative copula-less clauses in Müller (2016:88). If a past participle of a speech-act denoting verb is syntactically embedded, it can only be understood assertively. Conjunctions such as *weil* ‘because’ and *obwohl* ‘although’ can be followed by a clause, as well as a past participle or an adjective (Breindl 2011, Ørsnes 2017). In (104) the finite clause in the *weil*-clause can be understood as a performative, while the participle following *weil* in (105) can only be understood as an assertion: *because it has been confirmed*. Note that the *weil*-clause is syntactically integrated, being in the prefield. In this position *weil* ‘because’ cannot be followed by root-clauses such as V2-clauses or imperative clauses (Reis 2013:228).

- (104) Weil ich es bestätige, kannst du es auch weitererzählen (performative)
because I it confirm can you it also pass.on
‘You can pass it on to others, because I hereby confirm it.’
- (105) Weil bestätigt, kannst du es auch weitererzählen (assertive)
because confirmed:PTCP can you it also pass.on
‘You can pass it on to others, because it has been confirmed.’

To prevent the PfP from being syntactically embedded I suggest that it has the category *IProot*. This gives us the following structures for a simple PfP and a PfP with an internal dative argument or a manner adverb.

- (106) [_{IProot} [_{VP} versprochen]]
promised:PTCP
- (107) [_{IProot} [_{VP} Nicht nur allen Subaru-Freunden versprochen]]
not only all Subara-friends promised:PTCP
- (108) [_{IProot} [_{VP} hoch und heilig versprochen]]
high and holy promised:PTCP

To sum up: the PfP is an *IProot* dominating a VP. The agent of the past participle is (canonically) a null-prominal in the 1st person and the internal propositional argument is a null pronominal to be resolved contextually.

5.3. An account within Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG)

LFG posits two levels of syntactic representation: a c(onstituent)-structure and an f(unctional)-structure (Bresnan 2001, Dalrymple 2001). The c-structure represents the constituent structure with hierarchical relations and linear precedence. The f-structure represents – among other things – the grammatical relations between the syntactic constituents, i.e. the predicate-argument relationships. There is no one-to-one relationship between the c-structure and the f-structure. The f-structure can contain elements which are not explicitly represented in the c-structure. An example are null-pronominals that are present as elements in the f-structure, but which have no formal expression in the c-structure. This is exactly what can be claimed to hold for the PfP. There are no nodes in the c-structure corresponding to the agent or the propositional argument of the PfP *Versprochen!* ‘promised’. Still the oblique *by*-phrase and the propositional argument are present in the f-structure as selected grammatical functions with a semantic representation as pronominals. The attribute PRED represents the semantic form and [PRED ‘PRO’] means that the grammatical functions in question are interpreted as pronominals that are resolved contextually. Since they have no expression in c-structure, the PRED-specifications have to be added constructionally.⁶¹ For the PfP *Versprochen!* ‘promised’ in I propose the following c- and f-structure:

		PRED	'VERSPRECHEN < SUBJ OBL _{ag} OBJ _{dat} >'
		ILLOC	<i>performative</i>
		SPEECHACTTYPE	<i>consent</i>
IProot		SUBJ	[PRED 'PRO']
	VP	OBL _{ag}	[PRED 'PRO']
			[PERS 1 st]
	V	OBJ _{dat}	[PRED 'PRO']
			[PERS 2 nd]
		VFORM	<i>pastpart</i>
		PASS	+
	<i>versprochen</i>		

⁶¹ Alternatively, the agent and the propositional argument could be represented by empty categories in c-structure.

Figure 1 C- and f-structure for the PfP *versprochen* ‘promised’

The c-structure is very simple: it is merely an IProot dominating a VP. The f-structure shows that the main predicate is *versprechen* ‘to promise’, which selects a (passive) subject, an oblique *by*-phrase and a dative object. All selected grammatical functions are pronominals with the *by*-phrase restricted to the 1st person. As for the dative object of *versprechen* ‘to promise’ I assume that it is always restricted to the 2nd person, when omitted in a performative sentence (*ich verspreche (dir), dass ich komme* ‘I promise (you) that I will come’). The f-structure further shows that the clause is a performative and that the specific speech act denoted by the verb belongs to a type of speech-acts expressing consent. The distinction between illocution and speechacttype is intended to account for the fact that a performative utterance such as *Versprochen!* ‘promised’ creates a linguistic fact which is in itself a speech-act (Searle 1989:549). I will return to the pragmatics of PfPs in the next section and further justify that PfPs are pragmatically restricted.

The c- and f-structure are licensed by the following (simplified⁶²) c-structure rule with functional annotations.⁶³ This rule in combination with the lexical entry for the passive past participle *versprochen* ‘promised’ and a VP-rule which is not given, will license the c- and f-structures above.⁶⁴ The crucial point here is that this particular configuration of an IProot dominating a VP headed by a past participle of a verb semantically typed to denote a speechact expressing consent (in a broad sense) allows us to constructionally specify the pronominal elements and the illocutionary force.

⁶² The rule ought to rule out realization of a reflexive object. For ease of exposition this complication is left out.

⁶³ The rule can be extended to account for lexical idiosyncracies like the verb *ablehnen* ‘to reject’ by explicitly allowing a lexical item with the semantic form ‘ABLEHNEN<...>’. I have omitted this in the rule since the rule is intended to illustrate the generalization.

⁶⁴ The proposed rule does not account for the fact that the omitted dative object is restricted to the 2nd person. I assume that this restriction applies to all performative utterances with an omitted recipient argument and not just to the PfP so it calls for a more principled treatment.

IP _{ROOT} →	VP	Explanation:
	↑=↓	All f-structure information associated with VP is associated with IP _{ROOT}
(↑SPEECHACTTYPE) = _c <i>consent</i>		The speech-act type must be consent ⁶⁵
(↑ILLOC) = <i>performative</i>		The illocutionary force of is performative
(↑OBL _{ag} PERS) = 1 st		The oblique agent is in the 1 st person (i.e. the speaker)
((↑OBL _{ag} PRED) = 'PRO')		Brackets indicate optionality: the oblique agent is identified as a (null-)pronominal, unless an overt pronominal has contributed the specification [PRED 'PRO'] (<i>von mir bestätigt</i>)
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\uparrow \text{SUBJ PRED}) = \text{'PRO'} \mid \\ (\uparrow \text{OBJ}_{dat} \text{ PRED}) = \text{'PRO'} \mid \\ (\uparrow \text{OBL}_{\theta} \text{ PRED}) = \text{'PRO'} \end{array} \right\}$		Curly brackets indicate disjunction with separating the disjuncts: The propositional argument of the consent-verb is a pronominal linked to a passive subject, a dative object or an oblique object (a prepositional object) of the participle.
(↑VFORM) = <i>pastpart</i>		
(↑PASS) = +		The verbal head is a past participle The verbal head is passive

Figure 2 C-structure rule with functional annotations for the PfP

versprochen 'promised':

(↑PRED) = 'VERSPRECHEN<SUBJ OBL_{ag} OBJ_{dat}>'
(↑SPEECHACTTYPE) = *consent*
(↑VFORM) = *pastpart*
(↑PASS) = +

Figure 3 Lexical entry for the (passive) past participle *versprochen* 'promised'

6 The PfP as an expression of consent

In a performative utterance the speech-act performed is determined by the performative verb, i.e. whether it is a promise, an order, a request etc. The PfP allows for a variety of different verbs, but they can all be subsumed under the heading of consent: confirmation of a state-

⁶⁵ Technically this is a so-called constraining equation. This means that the VP must carry the specification [SPEECHACTTYPE *consent*], which is contributed by the V as the head of the VP. If this were not a constraining equation, the relevant information would be added to the VP in the absence of a specification for SPEECHACTTYPE. The use of a constraining equation avoids having to provide all verbs with a lexical specification for SPEECHACTTYPE which would not make sense for all the non-speechact denoting verbs.

ment: *einräumen* ‘to admit’, *gestehen* ‘to confess’, *schenken* ‘to grant’, *zugeben* ‘to admit’ and *zustimmen* ‘to agree’, or acceptance of a request: *abmachen* ‘to agree/settle’, *akzeptieren* ‘to accept’, *kapieren* ‘to understand’, *vereinbaren* ‘to agree on’, *versprechen* ‘to promise’ or *verstehen* ‘to understand’, *stattgeben* ‘to allow/grant’. In this section I will elaborate on this characterization of the PfPs and show that they are used as supporting, responding speech functions and this explains that they alternate with the responsive particle *Yes!* (or *No!* as response to a negative statement). At the same time they are only felicitous if the hearer is committed to the content under discussion, either by claiming it to be true or by wanting it to be true. I will suggest that these properties serve as a characterization of consent. Finally, I will briefly demonstrate how PfPs – just like responsive particles – are used in monological texts for special rhetorical purposes.

6.1. The PfP as a supporting responding speech function

Eggin & Slade (1997:183) present the following classification of speech functions. The grey-shaded cells illustrate where the PfP is found.

Initiating speech function	Responding speech functions	
	<i>Supporting</i>	<i>Confronting</i>
Offer	Acceptance	Rejection
Command	Compliance ⁶⁶	Refusal

⁶⁶ I will not discuss ‘compliance’ specifically here. Condoravdi & Lauer (2012:39) show, that offers can be expressed with imperatives so possibly they can be analysed just like requests within the framework of Farkas & Bruce (2010). Also PfPs appear to be rare as compliance with an offer, but this may also be due to politeness restrictions. The example in (u) appears somewhat rude in not expressing any kind of gratitude.

- (u) A: Nimm eine Tasse Kaffee! B: Angenommen!
 take a cup coffee accepted:PTCP
 ‘A: Have a cup of coffee! B: I’ll accept!’

As a reviewer shows with the example in (v) a PfP can be a valid response to an offer, though, if compliance with the offer is understood as a favour to the interlocutor.

- (v) A: Kann ich Sie wenigstens zu einem Glas Wein überreden?
 can I you at.least to a glass wine persuade
 ‘Could I persuade you to a glass of wine at least?’

Statement	Acknowledgement	Contradiction
Question	Answer	Disclaimer

Figure 4 Speech function pairs according to Eggins and Slade (1997:183)

At the first level initiating speech functions are distinguished from responding speech functions. As the examples in (109) through (111) illustrate, performative verbs denoting initiating speech functions are possible as finite performative utterances, but only as PfPs under special circumstances.⁶⁷ The examples illustrate statement, command and question respectively.

(109) a. Ich teile mit, dass wir Ihr Angebot ablehnen.

I tell PART that we your offer decline

‘I am telling you that we decline your offer.’

b. Wir lehnen Ihr Angebot ab. ??# Mitgeteilt.

we decline your offer PART told:PTCP

‘(Intended:)We are declining your offer. I hereby tell you.’

(110) a. Ich befehle dir, das Haus zu verlassen.

I order you the house to leave

‘I am ordering you to leave the house.’

B: (Na gut, meinetwegen,) Angenommen!

well all.right for.my.part accepted:PTCP

‘Well yes, why not, I’ll accept!’

In Dutch, the PfP *Bedankt!* ‘thanked’ is an example of compliance. This is not possible in German: # *Gedankt!* ‘thanked’ I have no explanation for this difference.

⁶⁷ A reviewer observes that some verbs denoting initiating speech functions can occur as what seems to be PfPs, if they precede the complement clause (see also Zifonun et al. 1998: 2236/2237).

(w) Mal angenommen, friedliches Zusammenleben ist möglich

well assumed:PTCP peaceful co-existence is possible

‘Well, let’s assume that it is possible to live peacefully together’

Other examples are *vorausgesetzt* ‘provided that’ and *gesetzt den Fall* ‘in the case that’.

Exactly these participles are sometimes classified as subjunctors when they occur with *dass* ‘that’ (Zifonun et al. 1997:vol. 3, 2240) and they appear to form a closed class. I will leave it open if they should indeed be interpreted as PfPs.

- b. Du musst das Haus verlassen. ?# Befohlen!⁶⁸
 you must the house leave ordered:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) You must leave the house. I order you!’
- (111) a. Ich frage, ob der Auftrag schon eingegangen ist.
 I ask if the order already received is
 ‘I am asking if the order has been received.’
- b. Ist der Auftrag schon eingegangen? # Gefragt!
 is the order already received asked:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) Has the order been received? I ask you!’

As mentioned in section 2 participles as initiating speech functions only seem to be possible if accompanied by *hiermit* or with the right prosody (and gesture) forcing a performative reading as in (112).⁶⁹ Also the addition of an adjunct as in (113) or an internal argument as in (114) improves PfPs of initiating speech functions considerably, but the exact conditions are unclear (actually the participle can be left out in (113)).

- (112) Undwehe der Tobi verschwindet hier. Du bleibst!!! Hiermit befohlen!!!⁷⁰
 and woe the Tobi disappears here you stay hereby ordered:PTCP
 ‘And woe Tobi is going to get away here. You are staying. I hereby order you!!’

⁶⁸ A reviewer notes that *Befohlen!* ‘ordered’ is more acceptable in cross-speaker cases.

- (x) A: Soll ich nun den Rasen mähen? B: Befohlen!
 should I then the lawn mowe ordered:PTCP
 ‘A: should I mowe the lawn then? B: ‘I order you to!’

As the reviewer notes, *Befohlen!* is here rather used as a responding speech function.

⁶⁹ An exception is the participle *dahingestellt* ‘(lit.) put aside’, ‘I cannot tell’.

- (y) Es eilig zu haben impliziert schliesslich die eigene Importanz – oder war es
 to.be.in.a.hurry implies after.all the own importance or was it
 Impertinenz? Dahingestellt.
 impertinence’ put.aside:PTCP
 ‘After all, to be in a hurry implies your own significance – or was it impertinence? I
 can’t tell.’

(SOZ13/JUN.03158 Die Südostschweiz, 18.06.2013, S. 7; Goodbye Goliath)

⁷⁰ <https://www.golfv.de/thread/46633-meiner-einer/?pageNo=20>, 21 September 2017.

- (113) Frau Göring-Eckardt, nochmal gefragt, so viel Vertrauen wie verloren gegangen
 Miss Göring-Eckardt, again asked:PTCP, so much confidence as lost gone
 ist, was muss passieren damit es wieder entsteht?⁷¹
 is what must happen so that it again emerges
 ‘Miss Göring-Eckardt, I ask again, with so much confidence being lost, what can be
 done to build it up again?’
- (114) Für Sie empfohlen⁷²
 for you recommended:PTCP
 ‘Our recommendation for you!’

The canonical PfPs belong to the category of responding speech functions and as such they belong to the inventory of linguistic feed-back. This is also the reason that they alternate with *Ja!* which is used as a response to an initiating speech function (among many different functions, see e.g. Hoffmann 2008).

- (115) A: Die Idee ist hervorragend! B: Zugegeben! / Geschenkt! / Ja!
 the idea is brilliant admitted:PTCP / granted:PTCP / yes
 ‘A: The idea is brilliant! B: I admit that! / I grant you that! / yes!’

Being a responding function the PfPs need a supporting context for their interpretation. Also the responsive particle *Ja!* is inherently anaphoric (Krifka 2014). Similarly, Holmberg (2013:31) proposes in his analysis of English and Swedish that answers to polar questions are sentential structures where the IP (the propositional content) is inherited from the question and then elided. This is parallel to the PfP where the argument of the speech-act verb is also

⁷¹ Transscript from Talkshow, Anne Will, May 27, 2018.

⁷² <https://www.ikastetikett.de>, accessed on September 19, 2017. In this particular case the specific text genre “advertisement” could play a role, since it aims at establishing customer contact. I am grateful to a reviewer for this suggestion. *Empfohlen* appears to be special in more respects: It most likely selects a non-propositional argument here (as noted by another reviewer) and – what is more puzzling – it does not seem to occur with *hiermit* ‘hereby’. A Google-search for *Hiermit für Sie empfohlen/Für Sie hiermit empfohlen* does not yield any results (April 4, 2019).

‘missing’. I do not assume any deletion though. The argument is resolved by pronominal resolution as detailed in section 5.

Responding speech functions, in turn, are either supporting or confronting. In supporting speech functions the speaker acknowledges a statement, accepts a request or s/he provides an answer to a question. In confronting speech acts the speaker contradicts a statement, rejects a request or refuses to provide an answer to a question. Examples of speech-act verbs denoting confronting speech functions are *bestreiten* ‘to dispute’, *widersprechen* ‘to contradict’, *leugnen* ‘to deny’, *sich weigern* ‘to refuse’ or *sich wehren* ‘to resist’. These verbs do not occur as PfPs, at least not without a supporting *hiermit*, while **the answer *Nein!* ‘No!’ is possible.**⁷³

- (116) a. A: Das ist eine gute Idee. B: ??# Bestritten! / ??# Widersprochen!
 that is a good idea disputed:PTCP contradicted:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) A: That is a good idea. B: I dispute that / I contradict that!’
- b. A: Holst du das Auto in der Garage? B: ??# Geweigert! ??# Gewehrt!
 get you the car from the garage refused:PTCP refused:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) A: Will you get the car from the service station?’ B: I refuse!’

⁷³ A search conducted on July 16, 2017 yielded the following results.

- *Hiermit geleugnet* ‘hereby denied’: Google: 0, Cosmas: *Geleugnet* (clause final) 0 (as PfP),
- *hiermit abgeleugnet* ‘hereby denied’: Google: 0 / Cosmas: *Abgeleugnet* (clause final) 0 (as PfP),
- *hiermit bestritten* ‘hereby disputed’: Google: 1 / Cosmas: *Bestritten* (clause final): 0 (as PfP),
- *hiermit ausgeschlagen* ‘hereby rejected’: Google: 0, Cosmas: *Ausgeschlagen* (clause final): 0 (as PfP)
- *Hiermit verweigert* ‘hereby refused’: Google: 1, Cosmas: *Verweigert* (clause final): 0 (as PfP)

The single example for *hiermit verweigert* ‘hereby refused’ is difficult to interpret. It serves as a head-line, and it is not clear what it is referring to:

<http://www.spiegel.de/forum/wirtschaft/sollten-aerzte-mehr-geld-verdienen-thread-13527-79.html>, accessed on September 25, 2017.

The alternation with *Ja!* is of course again an indication that the PfP is supporting. The PfP does not alternate with the negative response particle *Nein!* ‘no’, unless *Nein!* is used to indicate agreement with a negative clause as in (117). The examples in (117) and (118) illustrate that the response particle is polarity-based (Holmberg 2013:32), while the PfP is truth-based.

(117) A: Das ist keine gute Idee. B: Nein! / Zugestimmt!

that is no good idea no agreed:PTCP

‘A: That is no good idea! B: No! / I agree’

(118) A: Das ist eine gute Idee. B: Ja! / Zugestimmt!

that is a good idea yes agreed:PTCP

‘A: That is a good idea. B: Yes! / I agree!’

The PfP is not only a supporting speech function. Given that agreement or consent is generally assumed to be a preferred next action (Pomerantz 1984:63/64), the PfP represents a preferred conversational move.

As mentioned in section 2 there is a notable counter-example to the claim, that PfPs are used for supporting speech-functions, namely *Abgelehnt!* ‘refused’. A possible explanation is that the verbs *stattgeben* ‘allow’, *annehmen* ‘accept’ and *akzeptieren* ‘accept’ are licensed as supporting verbs and at the same time they can be negated as in *nicht stattgegeben!* / *nicht angenommen!* / *nicht akzeptiert!* ‘not allowed/accepted’. The verb *ablehnen* ‘refuse’ is synonymous with these negated PfPs and this could pave the way for a confronting verb into the PfP. On the other hand this does not explain why *Bestritten!* ‘contested’ cannot be used as an albeit stronger rendering of *Nicht bestätigt!* ‘not confirmed’. To explain *Abgelehnt!* ‘refused’ one would have to determine what *ablehnen* ‘refuse’ as a confronting verb has in common with supporting verbs and what sets it apart from other confronting verbs such as *sich weigern* ‘refuse’, *bestreiten* ‘contest’ and *leugnen* ‘deny’. This is far from clear and it is not given, that there is a linguistic explanation (in the strict sense). It may also be an idiosyncrasy based on usage, which should not overshadow the rather striking generalisation that can be made about the use of PfPs as expression of consent.

PfPs do not occur with all supporting speech functions. While PfPs occur as responses to statements and requests, they do not occur as answers to polar questions. German has two

verbs meaning *to say yes* or *to say no*, namely *bejahen* and *verneinen*. These verbs can not occur as PfPs in answers to a polar question just like *bestätigen* ‘to confirm’.⁷⁴

- (119) A: Ist der Vorschlag gut? B: Ja! / ??# Bejaht! / ??# Bestätigt!
 is the proposal good yes affirmed:PTCP confirmed:PTCP
 ‘(Intended:) A: Is it a good proposal? B: Yes! / I would affirm that! / I would confirm!’

The difference between statements and requests on the one hand and questions on the other hand is that a statement is biased towards the hearer agreeing, while a request is biased towards the hearer agreeing to comply with the request. A question is biased towards being answered, but it is not biased towards a particular answer⁷⁵ (Farkas and Bruce 2010:96). A statement or a request commits the speaker in a way that a question does not. By making a statement the speaker commits to the truth of the statement and by making a request the speaker commits to an interest (in a broad sense) in having the hearer comply with the request (Condoravdi & Lauer 2012:41 ff.). This commitment is a prerequisite for confirmation: the hearer must confirm something that the speaker has already committed to herself. It is not possible to confirm a question, only to provide an answer. For the response PfP(p) to be successful the hearer must have committed herself to p.

To sum up: the PfP is a supporting response to an assertion or a request where the hearer is committed to p. p is eventually added to the Common Ground (CG). I take this to be a characterization of consent.

⁷⁴ A PfP as a response to a polar question would only be possible in a (rare) context where a speaker has to approve a question before answering it. As a reviewer notes: This illustrates the difference between PfPs as responses and answers, cf. (z).

(z) A: Ist der Vorschlag gut? B: Akzeptiert! Die Antwort ist ja!
 is the proposal good accepted:PTCP the answer is yes
 ‘A: Is it a good proposal? B: It’s accepted. The answer is yes!’ (i.e. the speaker accepts the question)

⁷⁵ This pertains to neutral questions and not to the class of biased questions see e.g. Romero & Han (2004).

6.2. The PfP as confirmation of an assertion

In (120) the speaker confirms a statement of the hearer. This is the prototypical instance of consent where A and B both commit themselves to the same assertion.

- (120) A: Die Sitzung war sehr gelungen. B: Zugegeben! / Bestätigt!
the meeting was very successful admitted:PTCP confirmed:PTCP
'A: The meeting was very successful. B: I admit that! / I confirm that!'

Verbs found in this use are *bestätigen* 'to confirm', *zugeben* 'to admit', *sich einigen* 'to agree', *zustimmen* 'to agree', *sich anschließen* 'to subscribe to', *garantieren* 'to guarantee', *schenken* 'to grant', *gestehen* 'to confess', *eingestehen* 'to confess', *einräumen* 'to admit'. On the analysis in Farkas & Bruce (2010) A publically commits to the truth of the proposition: *the meeting was very successful* and B confirms the truth of this proposition and publically commits herself to the truth as well. Eventually the proposition is added to the CG. As confirmation of a statement the PfP alternates with the expression *Stimmt* 'right', which presupposes that the speaker has already committed to the truth of the proposition. Therefore *Stimmt!* has a more restricted use than *Ja!*: *Stimmt!* does not occur as an answer to a polar question.

- (121) A: Die Sitzung war sehr gelungen. B: Ja! / Zugegeben! / Stimmt!
the meeting was very successful yes admitted:PTCP right
'A: The meeting was very successful. B: Yes! / I admit that! / That's right!'
- (122) A: Ist die Sitzung sehr gelungen gewesen? B: Ja! / #Bejaht! / #Stimmt!
is the meeting very successful been yes affirmed:PTCP right
'A: Was it a very successful meeting? B: Yes! / I would affirm that! / right!'

There is a difference between the response expression *Stimmt!* and the PfP though. The expression *Stimmt!* can be used as an answer to a question about an observable fact with the paraphrase 'I know' as in (123), while the PfP is only felicitous in a context where a diverging opinion is easier to imagine as e.g. in a response to an assessment as in (124) or where an observable fact is somehow unexpected (125).

- (123) A: Es regnet. B: Ja! / Stimmt! / ??# Zugegeben! / #Zugestimmt!
 it rains yes right admitted:PTCP agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: It’s raining. B: Yes! / Right! / I admit that! / I agree!’
- (124) A: Diese Lösung ist gut! B: Ja! / Stimmt! / Zugegeben! / Zugestimmt!
 this solution is good yes right admitted:PTCP agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: This is a good solution! B: Yes! / Right! / I admit that! / I agree!’
- (125) B: Es regnet nie im August.
 it rains never in august
 ‘It never rains in August.’
- A: Es regnet aber im Augenblick.
 it rains however at the moment
 ‘Well, it’s raining right now.’
- B: Ja! / Stimmt! / Zugegeben! / ?# Zugestimmt!
 yes right admitted:PTCP agreed:PTCP
 ‘Yes! / Right! / I admit that / I agree!’

Farkas & Bruce (2010) only consider assertions expressed by declarative sentences. They do not account for non-declarative sentences denoting – or presupposing – propositions. In the canonical case a PfP occurs as a response to a declarative clause as in (124). However, a PfP can also serve as a response to other sentence types provided they introduce a proposition belonging to A’s discourse commitments. In (126) an exclamative clause figures as the initiating speech function for the PfP.

- (126) A: Hast du aber viel gegessen! B: Zugegeben! / Eingeräumt! / Geschenkt!
 have you but a lot eaten admitted:PTCP admitted:PTCP granted:PTCP
 ‘A: You have eaten quite a bit! B: I admit that! / I admit that! / I grant that!’

Exclamative clauses express the speaker’s attitude to a particular proposition: that something is surprising or noteworthy (Zanuttini & Portner 2003). In (126) the exclamative clause presupposes that B has (in A’s opinion) indeed eaten a lot (Michaelis 2001; Zanuttini & Portner 2003). In uttering an exclamative the speaker publically commits to the proposition which is considered noteworthy. B can confirm this proposition thereby making it a member of the CG. The crucial condition for the use of the PfP is that p already belongs to A’s discourse commitments. B subsequently confirms p.

There are (at least) two variations to this basic use of the PfP, where the PfP does not alternate with the expression *Stimmt!* The first one concerns the commitment of the speaker. Farkas & Bruce (2010) only consider confirmation and rejection as possible reactions to an assertion (the answers *Yes!* and *No!*). There is also a third possibility, namely that B neither confirms nor contradicts a statement by A. S/he simply acknowledges the fact that the hearer is holding this opinion (see also Allwood et al 1992:17). Linguistically this is signalled by the feedback items: *Ach so!* ‘really’, *Aha!* or *Verstehe!* ‘(lit.) I understand’. The PfP is also found in this use, e.g. with the complex verb *zur Kenntnis nehmen* ‘to take note of’ as in (127).

(127) Gut, hiermit zur Kenntnis genommen.⁷⁶

fine hereby taken.note.of:PTCP

‘Fine, I have hereby taken note of that!’

This use of the PfP differs from the canonical confirmation of an assertion in not being supporting. The speaker does not confirm p and p cannot be added to the CG. Only the fact that A is holding this opinion can be added to the CG.

Secondly, there is a use of the PfP where p is part of B’s discourse commitments and A asks whether p can indeed be added to the CG – or whether p can be kept in the CG after all. In this case the PfP is a response to an incredulous question which is biased towards a particular answer. PfPs are here: *Versprochen!* ‘promised’, *Geschworen!* ‘sworn’ or *Versichert!* ‘reassured’.

(128) A: Ist das wirklich ein wirksames Mittel? B: Versprochen!

is this really an effective means promised:PTCP

‘A: Is this really an effective means? B: I promise!’

(129) A: Hat er das wirklich gesagt? B: Geschworen!

has he that really said sworn:PTCP

‘A: Did he really say that? B: I swear!’

⁷⁶ http://www.n-tv.de/sport/der_sport_tag/HSV-wehrt-sich-gegen-Chaos-Vorwurf-article19884275.html, accessed on August 25, 2017.

This use of the PfP is like the confirmation of an assertion discussed above. The difference is that A does not make a public discourse commitment. But still B tries to establish consent in the sense that s/he claims that p may safely be added to the CG.

6.3. The PfP as confirmation of a request

The second group of verbs found with PfPs are verbs accepting a request (in a broad sense) made by the hearer. These are verbs such as *abmachen* ‘to agree/settle’, *akzeptieren* ‘to accept’, *annehmen* ‘to accept’, *kapieren* ‘to understand’, *vereinbaren* ‘to agree’, *versprechen* ‘to promise’ or *verstehen* ‘to understand’.

- (130) A: Wir sehen uns dann morgen! B: Ja! / Abgemacht! / Kapiert!
 we meet REFL then tomorrow yes agreed:PTCP understood:PTCP
 ‘A: We’ll meet tomorrow then! B: Yes! / That’s agreed upon! / Got it!’

Just like the confirmation of a statement the PfPs here are responding, supporting and based on a positive bias since the speaker has an interest in compliance with the request. On the face of it this use is much like the confirmation of a statement: B confirms a statement made by A. But still there is a difference: B commits herself (and sometimes also A) to some future action. This difference is reflected in the range of possible response particles alternating with the PfP. The PfP alternates with *Ja!* as expected, but it does not alternate with *Stimmt!* Instead it alternates with the particle *Okay!* or *Jawohl!* ‘yes sir’ depending on B’s evaluation of the strength of the request.

- (131) A: Wir sehen uns dann morgen! B: Ja! / ??# Stimmt!⁷⁷ / Okay! / Abgemacht!
 we meet REFL then tomorrow yes right Okay agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: We’ll meet tomorrow then! B: Yes! / Right! / Okay! / That’s agreed upon!’

This use also shows a clear bias towards a positive response. By making a request A performs a directive speech act wishing for the proposition expressed by the directive sentence to come true (Searle 1976:11, Condoravdi & Lauer 2012:41 ff.). By uttering a PfP like *Abgemacht!* ‘agreed’ or *Versprochen!* ‘promised’ B accepts to make the state-of-affairs true resulting in A

⁷⁷ *Stimmt!* is only possible if the clause is intended or understood as a confirmation of an already existing agreement.

and B sharing a goal. The confirmation of an assertion results in the sharing of an opinion, the confirmation of a request in the sharing of a goal.

Requests can be made in a variety of ways: declarative clauses, questions, imperative clauses and cohortatives can all be used to perform directive speech acts. The example in (131) and the example in (2) repeated below illustrate declaratives understood as requests.

- (132) A: Du sagst also nichts zu Papi. B: Versprochen!
you say then nothing to dad promised:PTCP
'A: You are not going to tell dad. B: I promise!'

Interestingly PfPs are also possible as answers to a polar question once the polar question is interpreted as a request as in (133) and not as a polar (information seeking) question.

- (133) A: Holst du das Auto in der Werkstatt ab? B: Versprochen! / Abgemacht!
pick you the car in the garage up promised:PTCP agreed:PTCP
'A: Will you pick up the car from the garage? B: That's a promise! / That's a deal!'

Out of context **A's question** in (133) can be a polar question and a request. B's response shows, that it is interpreted as a request and B commits to the goal suggested by A. The PfP is also felicitous as an answer to polar questions where A explicitly asks B to make a commitment by including the performative verb in the question.

- (134) A: Versprichst du mir, dass du das Auto in der Werkstatt abholst?
promise you me that you the car in the garage pick.up
'Will you promise me to go and pick up the car from the garage?'
B: Ja! / Versprochen!
yes promised:PTCP
'Yes! / That's a promise!'

As expected, however, the PfPs are not possible as answers to true information-seeking questions as discussed earlier. In the following example the modal particle *denn*, which only occurs in syntactically interrogative clauses (Reis 2003:165), and the adverb *überhaupt* 'at all' invite an interpretation as a polar question rather than as a request.

- (135) A: Holst du mich denn überhaupt morgen ab?
 pick you me then at.all tomorrow up
 ‘Are you really going to pick me up tomorrow then?’
 B: Ja! / #Abgemacht! / #Akzeptiert! / #Versprochen!
 yes agreed:PTCP accepted:PTCP promised:PTCP
 ‘Yes! / That’s a deal! / I accept that! / That’s a promise!’

The PfP is also felicitous if the PfP is a response to a declarative clause which is interpreted as a question usually due to a rising intonation (Niebuhr et al. 2010). Here the answer does not provide new information, rather it confirms a commitment which has already been under discussion, the so-called question of confirmation (*Nachfrage* or *Bestätigungsfrage*, Zifonun et al. 1997:vol I,643).

- (136) A: Du holst mich dann morgen ab? B: Ja! / Abgemacht!
 you pick me then tomorrow up yes agreed:PTCP
 ‘A: You will pick up tomorrow then? B: Yes! / That’s a deal!’

The PfP is also felicitous in co-hortatives, asking for mutual agreement. Here both A and B commit to (common) future action.

- (137) A: Lassen wir es so richtig krachen! B: Ja! / Abgemacht! / Kapiert!
 let we it so really crack yes agreed:PTCP understood:PTCP
 ‘A: Let’s catch that beat! B: Yes! / That’s a deal! / Got it!’

As response to an imperative the verbs *verstehen* ‘to understand’ and *kapieren* ‘to understand’ are possible.

- (138) A: Halten Sie sich bereit! B: Verstanden! / Kapiert!
 keep you REFL ready understood:PTCP understood:PTCP
 ‘A: Keep ready! B: Got it! / Got it!’

Verstehen and *kapieren* are strictly speaking not performative verbs. They are only used as performative verbs as past participles, as mentioned in section 2.

6.4. An account within the framework of Farkas & Bruce (2010)

In this section I will propose an account of the essential features of the pragmatics of the PfP, namely that it is a responding, supporting speech-function, which presupposes a positive bias on part of the hearer. The account will be modelled in the conversational framework proposed by Farkas & Bruce (2010) in their analysis of responses to assertions and polar questions.

PFPs AS RESPONSE TO ASSERTIONS

The diagram in Figure 5 depicts the conversational state after A has uttered the sentence *Die Sitzung war sehr gelungen* ‘the meeting was very successful’ in the framework of Farkas & Bruce (2010). By making this assertion the interlocutor A puts a syntactic object of the form of a declarative sentence (D) paired with its denotation p on the Table which contains what is referred to as the Question under Discussion in other frameworks (Farkas & Bruce 2010:86). At the same time A publically commits to the truth of the assertion. This is shown by having the denotation p as part of A’s Discourse Commitments (the cell right under A). p is not yet a mutual assumption and therefore not yet a member of the CG.⁷⁸ Every move to put something on the table is associated with a preferred reaction to empty the table represented in the Projected Set. An assertion made by A can be rejected, elaborated or questioned. The projected set, however, shows that the preferred move is for the assertion to be confirmed and added to the CG.

A	Table	B
p	<meeting-was-successful[D]; {p}>	
Common Ground cg_I		Projected Set $cg_I \cup \{p\}$

Figure 5: Conversational state after A has uttered an assertion.

By responding with a PfP such as *zugestimmt!* ‘agreed’ or *Zugegeben!* ‘admitted’ at this point of the conversation, B maps the context in Figure 5 to the output context depicted in Figure 6.

⁷⁸ The separation of individual discourse commitments and CG allows the model to show when A and B agree to disagree on a proposition. In that case the denotation p is a member of A’s discourse commitments, while $\sim p$ belongs to B’s discourse commitments. p is not a member of the CG. Another possibility would be to add to the CG that A believes that p .

A	Table	B
p	<meeting-was-succesful[D];{p}>	p
Common Ground cg_I		Projected Set $cg_I \cup \{p\}$

Figure 6: Conversational state after B has confirmed A's assertion.

In the output context, B confirms the proposition and p is added to Bs discourse commitments in accordance with the preferred move. Consent is obtained since the proposition p belongs to the discourse commitments of both interlocutors. Bruce and Farkas further assume a Common Ground increasing operation (Farkas & Bruce 2010:99) which moves a proposition present on the Discourse Commitments of both interlocutors to the CG. The resulting conversational state is depicted below.

A	Table	B
Common Ground $cg_I \cup \{p\}$		Projected Set

Figure 7: Conversational state after p has been added to the CG

The conversational states illustrate the three crucial features of the PfP: the PfP is responding in that it targets the top-most element on the Table. It is supporting by confirming A's discourse commitment, i.e. it represents the preferred conversational move in the Projected Set and p belongs to A's discourse commitments.

PfPs AS RESPONSE TO DIRECTIVES

Farkas & Bruce (2010) only deal with *Yes!* as a response to assertions and polar questions, not as a response to requests. In this section I will try to show how the PfP as a response to a request can be accommodated within the conversational framework of Farkas and Bruce. An elaborate discussion of the representation of imperatives or directives in general is beyond the scope of this paper though, and many problems will be sidestepped. The goal is to show what it means to reach consent within this conversational framework and to illustrate why PfPs cannot serve as responses to (information seeking) polar questions. For ease of exposition I will restrict myself to directives expressed by imperatives. I will not try to account for indirect speech-acts, where a directive is expressed by a V2 clause, a V2 question or a V1 question as shown above.

An approach to directives which requires no major extensions to the framework of Farkas & Bruce (2010) is to follow the analysis of imperatives in Kaufmann (2012) and treat directives as (modalized) propositions. Kaufmann (2012:59 ff.) proposes that an imperative sentence such as *Go home!* can be semantically represented as the (deontically) modalized proposition *You should go home* where the modal verb is understood as a performative modal (in contrast to a descriptive modal). The imperative in (139a) has the semantic paraphrase in (139b) on this approach.

- (139) a. Halten Sie sich bereit!
 keep you REFL ready
 ‘Please, be ready!’
 b. Sie sollen sich bereit halten!
 you shall REFL ready keep
 ‘You should be ready!’

The paraphrase in (139b) will be represented as: *ADR-should-P*, where P is the property of *being ready* and ADR is the addressee.

By treating imperatives as modalized propositions, directives can be treated parallel to assertions in the framework of Farkas & Bruce (2010). By uttering a directive like *Halten Sie sich bereit!* ‘please be ready’ speaker A makes a public commitment to the modalized proposition: addressee should be ready. This formally captures the speaker endorsement of Condoravdi & Lauer (2012), namely that the speaker has an interest (in a broad sense) in the coming about of what is denoted by the imperative clause. The imperative sentence and its denotation are added to the table along with the projected set, i.e. the preferred conversational move, namely that speaker B confirms this proposition so that the denotation is added to the CG. By confirming a modalized proposition with a PfP such as *Verstanden!* ‘understood’, speaker B commits herself to comply with the request denoted by the imperative sentence as shown in Figure 5. This is the only difference between confirming an assertion and confirming a request – the request commits the speaker to future action.

- (140) A: Halten Sie sich bereit! B: Verstanden!
 keep you REFL ready understood:PTCP
 ‘A: Please, be ready! B: Got it!’

A	Table	B
<i>ADR-should-P</i>	<i><be-ready[IMP]; {ADR-should-P}></i>	
Common Ground cg_1		Projected Set $cg_1 \cup \{ADR-should-P\}$

Figure 8: Conversational state after A has uttered a request

A	Table	B
<i>ADR-should-P</i>	<i><be-ready[IMP]; {ADR-should-P}></i>	<i>ADR⁷⁹-should-P</i>
Common Ground cg_1		Projected Set $cg_1 \cup \{ADR-should-P\}$

Figure 9: Conversational state after B has confirmed with a PfP

A	Table	B
Common Ground $cg_1 \cup \{ADR-should-P\}$		Projected Set

Figure 10: Conversational state after request has been accepted by B and added to the CG

This account requires no extensions to the frame-work in Farkas & Bruce (2010) as compared to the account in Portner (2004). Portner (2004) proposes a more elaborate discourse structure where assertions are added to the CG, Questions to a Question Set and commands are added to a To-Do-List (TDL) of the addressee. He also proposes that the semantic value of an imperative is a property of the Addressee rather than a modalized proposition. Thus, the imperative *Go home!* denotes the property of going-home of the Addressee. On this account a confirmation of an imperative makes sure that the property denoted by the imperative sentence is added to the TDL of the Addressee. This approach does not explicitly represent the attitude of the speaker, namely that the speaker in canonical directives wishes for the addressee to comply with the directive (Condoravdi & Lauer 2012:55). It is therefore difficult to show that the PfP is used to establish consent and that the two conversational agents agree in this framework. The account presented here explicitly spells out the commonalities between assertions and requests: the PfP serves as a supporting response and A has a positive

⁷⁹ I assume that the variable ADR is instantiated to the conversational participant B at this point, so that the modalized proposition pertains to B and not an Addressee.

bias towards the so confirmed proposition inasmuch as the proposition is belonging to the discourse commitments of A.

However, the representation of an imperative as a modalized proposition reveals some subtle differences between the response particle *Ja!* and the PfP. As a response to an imperative the PfP and the response particle both confirm that the speaker is intending to comply with the request.

- (141) A: Halten Sie sich bereit! B: Ja! / Verstanden!
keep you REFL ready yes understood:PTCP
'A: Please, be ready! B: Yes! / Got it!'

Applied to a modalized proposition like the one in (142), *Ja!* and the PfP have different effects.

- (142) A: Sie sollen sich bereit halten! B: Verstanden! / Ja!
you shall REFL ready keep understood:PTCP yes
'A: You should be ready! B: Got it! / Yes!'

With the PfP *Verstanden!* 'understood' the speaker agrees to comply with the request as was the case in (141). With *Ja!*, however, the speaker accepts the obligation, but s/he does not necessarily accept to comply with it. A refusal to comply with the request is not possible with the PfP, but it is possible with *Ja!*⁸⁰

⁸⁰ The same behaviour is observed for the particle and the PfP with a representation of the directive as a bouletic modal. But here the response particle does not really make sense at all.

- (æ) A: Ich möchte, dass du das Auto von der Werkstatt abholst.
I want that you the car from the garage pick.up
'I want you to pick up the car from the garage.'
B: ??# Ja! / Verstanden!
yes understood:PTCP
'Yes! / I have understood!'

- (143) A: Sie sollen sich bereit halten! B: #Verstanden! Aber ich tue es nicht!
 you shall REFL ready keep understood:PTCP but I do it not
 ‘A: You should be ready! B: Got it! But I am not going to!’
- (144) A: Sie sollen sich bereit halten! B: Ja! Aber ich tue es nicht!
 you shall REFL ready keep yes but I do it not
 ‘A: You should be ready! B: Yes! But I am not going to!’

The difference stems from two different readings of the modal verb as either descriptive or performative (Kaufmann 2012:59 ff). On the descriptive reading, the modal verb is used to describe the world with its possibilities and necessities, on the performative reading the modal is used to change the world wrt. possibilities and necessities (Kaufmann 2012:58). The PfP applies to the performative reading of the modalized proposition, while the response particle (also) applies to the descriptive reading. For the imperative only the performative reading is relevant. This difference shows that further consideration is needed for the treatment of response particles as responses to requests.

WHY THE PfP CANNOT BE USED AS RESPONSE TO A POLAR QUESTION

At this point it can be shown why the PfP cannot be used as a response to a polar question.

- (145) A: War die Sitzung denn erfolgreich? B: Ja! / #Bejaht!
 was the meeting MOD.PART successful yes affirmed:PTCP
 ‘A: Was the meeting successful? B: Yes! / (Intended:) I would affirm that!’
- (146) A: Sind Sie in der Lage, das Problem zu lösen?⁸¹ B: Ja! / #Geschworen!
 are you in the position the problem to solve yes sworn:PTCP
 ‘A: Are you capable of solving the problem? B: Yes! / (Intended:) I swear!’

⁸¹ A reviewer observes that the following question-answer pair is possible:

- (ø) A: Sind Sie in der Lage, das Problem zu lösen? B: Garantiert!
 are you in the position the problem to solve guaranteed
 ‘A: Are you capable of solving the problem? B: I guarantee!’

This example is inconclusive since *garantiert* ‘guaranteed’ is also found as an adverb with approximately the same semantics: *Bestimmt!* ‘certainly’. As example (146) shows, the example is not possible with bona-fide participles such as *Geschworen!* ‘sworn’.

The conversational state after A has uttered the polar question looks like this:

A	Table	B
	<i><meeting-was-successfull</i> [INT];{p,~p}>	
Common Ground cg_I		Projected Set $cg_I \cup \{p\} \vee cg_I \cup \{\sim p\}$

A polar question is added to the Table with the possible denotations p or ~p (corresponding to the answers *Yes!* or *No!*). The projected set shows no bias towards a particular answer: either p or ~p will be added to the CG. The crucial difference to the two previous situations is that A has made no public discourse commitment as to the content of the question. The cell under A is empty. For that reason no consent can be established and the PfP cannot be used felicitously.

7 The PfP in monological texts

Like other response particles PfPs are also found in monological texts as shown in (147) and (148) (Askedal 2001, Farkas & Bruce 2010:98).

(147) Ja, wir haben gefeiert!⁸²

yes we have partied

‘Yes, we did have a party!’

(148) Ich hole dich morgen ab. Versprochen! / Ja!⁸³ / Okay!

I pick you tomorrow up promised:PTCP yes okay

‘I will pick you up tomorrow. I promise! / Yes! / Okay!’

In a monological text the PfP serves to make explicit what kind of speech-act the speaker has just performed (or is going to perform in case the PfP is used cataphorically). Special rhetoric effects arise since the PfP (as also the responsive particles) seems to confirm or accept propositional content provided by the speaker herself. The PfP is informationally redundant and since it appears to violate Grice’s maxim of quantity stating that a speaker should not make her contribution more explicit than is actually needed (Grice 1975:45), the PfP has an added

⁸² <http://www.pnn.de/brandenburg-berlin/1195823/>, accessed on August 3, 2017.

⁸³ In this context *Stimmt!* ‘right’ would be a confirmation of an already made agreement.

pragmatic content. In the following I will briefly illustrate two pragmatic effects arising from this kind of self-confirmation. In the first use, the PfP is used to concede to an (anticipated) belief or objection from a (possibly unknown) hearer. In the second use the PfP serves to eliminate an (anticipated) doubt on part of a (possibly unknown) hearer. These uses illustrate that PfPs in monological texts behave similar to PfPs in dialogues: they apply to content on a Table (as in the model of Farkas and Bruce 2010), but in monological texts the PfP applies to a *p* which the speaker herself has put on the Table or which she presupposes to be on the Table. The hearer has made no public commitment to *p* herself. The speaker is assuming that the hearer is holding a certain belief or a certain doubt about *p* and the speaker aims to augment the CG with *p* or to keep *p* in the CG by confirming *p*.

Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson (2000:381) argue that the conversational exchange of concession is a recurrent pattern in dialogues. The speaker concedes to a statement before presenting a contrasting statement. In (149) the PfP *zugegeben* ‘admitted’ is an explicit representation of a concessional element *X*’, while *X* represents the statement that the speaker is conceding to. The contrasting statement *Y* is introduced with *trotzdem* ‘nonetheless’ to indicate the unexpected or contrasting conclusion. By using the concessive exchange in a monologue, the speaker concedes to an opinion, which the hearer is assumed to hold or is expected to advance as an objection to a following statement. In this way the PfP evokes the impression of a dialogue. The speaker is explicitly considering the knowledge state of an (imagined) hearer and *X* is treated as if it already belongs to the discourse commitments of the hearer or to the CG.

(149) Jeder spannt gerne zwischendurch aus und erholt sich. **X'**: Zugegeben. **X**: Nicht jeder macht gerne Urlaub in heissen Ländern. **Y**: Trotzdem, der Gedanke an Strand, Palmen und einen kühlen Drink im heissen Sand lässt keinen kalt.⁸⁴

‘Everyone likes to relax and recover every now and then.’ **X'**: Admitted:PTCP ‘I admit’. **X**: ‘Not everyone wants to spend their holiday in hot countries.’ **Y**: ‘Nonetheless, the thought of beach, palms and a cold drink in the warm sand is appealing to anyone.’

⁸⁴ A99/FEB.12434 St. Galler Tagblatt, 20.02.1999, Ressort: TT-SER (Abk.). Due to the complexity of the example it is not glossed. From a structural point of view only the occurrence of the participle is relevant.

The element Y can also be implicit as in the following (constructed) discourse where the speaker obviously anticipates a reproach from the hearer. Askedal (2001:136) presents a similar idea for Norwegian *Nei* ‘no’ as an explicit rejection of a possible or implied/imagined alternative way of action and Karagjosova (2006) discusses the use of *Doch!* ‘yes’ as a response to an anticipated negative statement.

- (150) Ich komme zu spät. Ja! / Stimmt! / Zugegeben!
 I come too late yes right admitted:PTCP
 ‘I’m late. Yes! / Right! I admit!’

The PfP can also serve to confirm a statement in anticipation of the hearer’s doubt. The PfP patterns with particle-like clauses and fragments serving to convince the hearer of the truth of the proposition such as *Ich schwör’s!* ‘I swear’ *Ohne Schmarrn!* ‘no kidding’ *Ehrlich!* ‘really’.

- (151) Garantiert: 4 Kilo pro Woche verschwinden von selbst⁸⁵
 guaranteed:PTCP 4 kilos per week disappear by themselves
 ‘We guarantee: 4 kilos disappear all by themselves per week!’
- (152) Aber wenn mir was auffällt, sag ich es euch zuerst. Geschworen.⁸⁶
 but if me something strikes tell I it to.you first sworn:PTCP
 ‘But if I notice anything, you will be the first to know. I swear!’

Also the verbs confirming a request are used as further emphasis as shown in (153) for *Versprochen!* ‘promised’.

- (153) Legen Sie das Kleidungsstück in die Sonne, sie erledigt das für Sie.
 put you the cloting in the sun it handles that for you
 Versprochen!⁸⁷

⁸⁵ <http://www.eyesaiditbefore.de/2005/04/22/nu-iss-doch-mal/>, accessed on September 26, 2017.

⁸⁶ NEW07/DEZ.00227 NEWS, 13.12.2007, S. 178; ‘Die ganz große Liebe unter Clown’

⁸⁷ A11/SEP.12104 St. Galler Tagblatt, 29.09.2011, S. 45; Tips ums Kürbiskernöl

promised:PTCP

‘Just leave the clothing out in the sun. It will take care of that for you. I promise!’

In (154) and (155) the PfP – and the affirmative particle – is used to (reluctantly) confess that something is the case.

(154) Ja! / #Stimmt! / Zugegeben! Wir haben abgetrieben!

yes right admitted:PTCP we have aborted

‘Yes! / Right! / We admit! We had an abortion!’

(155) Zugegeben. Ich habe keine Minute von Schweiz – Honduras gesehen.⁸⁸

admitted:PTCP I have no minute of Switzerland – Honduras watched

‘I admit. I didn’t watch a single minute of Switzerland-Honduras.’

In (154) and (155) the speaker has reason to believe that the hearer has difficulties in believing *p*, since *p* is considered controversial. It may represent a violation of what is assumed to be generally accepted conditions for apposite behaviour, like having an abortion (which may even be an infliction of the law) or failing to watch a national football match. The PfP cannot felicitously be replaced with the responsive expression *Stimmt!* if the hearer is assumed to have no prior knowledge of the speaker having done this. The PfP gives the impression of being the answer to an incredulous question.

In monological texts PfPs are used by the speaker to confirm the truth of his/her own statement in consideration of the knowledge state of an imagined hearer. The core meaning of the PfP as confirmation is the same as in dialogues: *p may safely be added to or kept in the CG*.

8 Conclusion

In this article I have shown that bare participles in root position in German are not restricted to directive force. They are also used performatively in a pragmatically restricted way: to express consent, i.e. to signal that a proposition may safely be added to the CG. I have also provided a basic description of this use of the past participle and shown how it can be captured in a framework such as LFG and in a conversational framework as the one developed by Farkas & Bruce (2010) for responses. Also, I believe that the discussion has raised a number

⁸⁸ A10/JUN.09075 St. Galler Tagblatt, 29.06.2010, S. 15; Ke Nako

of questions for future research: exactly what verbs can be used performatively as bare participles and why does *hiermit* ‘hereby’ improve PFPs considerably? In what contexts can a participle of a performative verb be understood assertively? To what kind of clause types can the PFP serve as an answer? To what extent is the PFP *zugegeben* ‘admitted’ in a process of grammaticalisation into a concessive particle? What is the use of past participles as performatives in a cross-linguistic perspective? At the same time I hope to have drawn attention to yet another linguistic means for expressing consent.

9 References

- Allwood, Jens, Joakim Nivre & Elisabet Ahlsén. 1992. On the semantics and pragmatics of linguistic feedback. *Journal of semantics* 64/9(1). 1-30.
- Askedal, John Ole. 2001. Mysteries of response particles in Norwegian and German. Toward a comparative study. *Making sense: From lexeme to discourse. In honor of Werner Abraham at the occasion of his retirement*, ed. by Geart van der Meer & Alice G. B. ter Meulen. 122-147. Groningen: Center for Language and Cognition.
- Behr, Irmgard. 1994. Können selbständige Partizipialsätze ein Subjekt haben? *Partizip und Partizipialgruppen im Deutschen*, ed. by Daniel Bresson & Martine Dalmas. 231-247. (Eurogermanistik 5). Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Berman, Judith, Stefanie Dipper, Christian Fortmann & Jonas Kuhn. 1998. Argument clauses and correlative *es* in German – deriving discourse properties in a unification analysis, *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King. University of Queensland, Brisbane: CSLI Publications.
- Brandt, Margareta, Gabriel Falkenberg, Norbert Fries, Frank Liedtke, Jörg Meibauer, Günther Öhlschläger, Helmut Rehbock & Inger Rosengren. 1989. Die performativen Äußerungen – eine empirische Studie. *Sprache und Pragmatik, Arbeitsberichte*, 12. 1-22. Lund: University of Lund.
- Breindl, Eva. 2011. Er ist sympathisch, weil menschlich. Weil als koordinierende Konjunktion? *Grammatische Stolpersteine digital. Festschrift für Bruno Strecker zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Marek Konopka & Roman Schneider. 153-59. Mannheim, Institut für Deutsche Sprache. Online in: Grammatik in Fragen und Antworten.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cardinaletti, Anna 1990. *Impersonal Constructions and Sentential Arguments in German*. Padua: Unipress.

- Colliander, Peter & Doris Hansen. 2004. *Sproghandlinger i tysk*. København: Handelshøjskolen forlag.
- Condoravdi, Cleo & Sven Lauer. 2011. Performative verbs and performative acts. *Proceedings of Sinn & Bedeutung* 15, ed. by Ingo Reich, Eva Horch & Dennis Pauly. 149-164. Saarbrücken: Universaar – Saarland University Press.
- Condoravdi, Cleo & Sven Lauer. 2012. Imperatives: meaning and illocutionary force. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9, ed. by Christopher Piñón. 37-58. Paris: CSSP.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Sandra A. Thompson. 2000. Concessive patterns in conversation. *Cause-Condition-Concession-Contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, ed. by E. Couper-Kulen & Bernd Kortmann. 381-410. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Dahl, Eystein. 2008. Performative Sentences and the Morphosyntax-Semantics Interface in Archaic Vedic. *Journal of South-Asian Linguistics*, vol. 1, issue 1. 23-45.
- Dal, Ingerid. 1966. *Kurze deutsche Syntax – auf historischer Grundlage*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Dalrymple, Mary 2001. *Lexical-Functional Grammar*. (Syntax and Semantics, vol. 34). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Donhauser, Karin. 1984. Aufgepasst. Überlegungen zu einer Verwendung des Partizips II im Deutschen. *Studia linguistica et philologica. Festschrift für Klaus Matzel zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Hans-Werner Erms, Bernhard Gajek & Herbert Kolb. 367-374. (Germanistische Bibliothek, 3. Reihe). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Duden. 2006. *Die Grammatik*. Völlig neu erarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Band 4. Mannheim: Dudenverlag.
- Duden. 2003. *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Duden Verlag.
- Eckardt, Regine. 2012. Hereby explained: an event-based account of performative utterances. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 35. 21-55.
- Eggins, Suzanne & Diana Slade. 1997. *Analysing casual conversation*. London, Washington: Cassell.
- Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine, Dag Trygve Truslew Haug & Kjell Johan Sæbø. 2012. Closed adjuncts – degrees of pertinence. *Big events, small clauses – the grammar of elaboration*, ed. by Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen, Dag Trygve Truslew Haug & Kjell Johan Sæbø. 55-92. (Language, Context and Cognition 12). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Farkas, Donka F. & Kim B. Bruce. 2010. On Reacting to Assertions and Polar Questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27. 81-118.

- Fries, Norbert. 1983. *Syntaktische und semantische Studien zum frei verwendeten Infinitiv*. (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik, 21). Tübingen: Narr.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2013. Infinite Hauptsatzstrukturen. *Satztypen des Deutschen*, ed. by Jörg Meibauer, Markus Steinbach & Hans Altmann. 202-231. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter.
- Gehrke, Berit. 2015. Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation. *Natural language and Linguistic Theory* 33. 897-938.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation. *Syntax & Semantics 3: Speech acts*, ed. by Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan. 41-58. Academic Press: New York.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2009. "Adjektiv + dass-Satz"-Konstruktionen als kommunikative Ressourcen der Positionierung. *Grammatik in Gespräch - Konstruktionen der Selbst- und Fremdpositionierung*, ed. by Susanne Günthner & Jörg Bücker. 149-185. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Haider, Hubert. 1986. Fehlende Argumente: vom Passiv zu kohärenten Infinitiven. *Linguistische Berichte* 101. 3-33.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2005. *Bescheuert und verlogen: (Schein)partizipien, Wortklassen, und das Lexicon*. *10 Jahre Ulrike Mosel am SAVS: Beiträge ihrer Absolventen zum Dienstjubiläum*, ed. by Yvonne Thiesen. 107-128. (SAVS Arbeitsberichte, Heft 4). Kiel: Universität Kiel.
- Heinold, Simone. 2012. Gut durchlesen! Der deutsche Imperativ und seine funktionalen synonyme. *Deutsche Sprache* 12.1. 32-57.
- Heinold, Simone. 2014. Eigenschaften von direktiven Partizipien im Deutschen. *Deutsche Sprache* 13.4. 313-335.
- Hoffman, Ludger. 2006. Ellipse im Text. *Text – Verstehen. Grammatik und darüber hinaus* ed. by Hardarik Blühdorn, Eva Breindl & Ulrich H. Waßner. 90-108. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Hoffmann, Ludger. 2008. Über *Ja*. *Deutsche Sprache* 3/08. 193-220.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2013. The syntax of answers to polar questions in English and Swedish. *Lingua* 128. 31-50.
- Jørgensen, Peter. 1976. *Tysk Grammatik I – III*. København: Gads Forlag.
- Karajosova, Elena. 2006. The German response particle 'doch' as a case of contrastive focus. In: *Ninth Symposium on Logic and Language*, Besenyötelek, Hungary. 90–98.

- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting imperatives*. Springer: Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. *Explizite Performative und Sprechakt-Adverbiale*. Handout. Berlin: Humboldt Universität Berlin. Online: http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h2816i3x/Lehre/2007_HS_Sprechakte/HS_Sprechakte_2007_05_Performative.pdf Accessed on May 14, 2019.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2014. *Ja, nein, doch* als sententiale Anaphern und deren pragmatische Optimierung. *Zwischen Kern und Peripherie. Untersuchungen zu Randbereichen in Sprache und Grammatik*, ed. by Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Andreas Nolda & Athina Sioupi. 41–68. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Liedtke, Frank. 1998. *Grammatik der Illokution – über Sprechhandlungen und ihre Realisationsformen im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2007. Das Zustandspassiv: Grammatische Einordnung – Bildungsbeschränkungen – Interpretationsspielraum. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 35. 84–116.
- Michaelis, Laura. 2001. Exclamative constructions. *Language typology and language universals*. 1038–1050. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex Predicates*. Stanford: CLSI publications.
- Müller, Stefan. 2016. Satztypen: Lexikalisch oder/und phrasal? *Satztypen und Konstruktionen im Deutschen*, ed. by Rita Finkbeiner & Jörg Meibauer, 72–105. (= Linguistik – Impulse und Tendenzen 65). Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter
- Niebuhr, Oliver, Julia Bergherr, Susanne Huth, Cassandra Lill & Jessica Neuschulz. 2010. Intonationsfragen hinterfragt – die Vielschichtigkeit der prosodischen Unterschiede zwischen Aussage- und Fragesätzen mit deklarativer Syntax. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 77 (3). 304–346.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2014. The faces of the German adverb “garantiert”. *Facets of linguistics. Proceedings of the 14th Norddeutsches Linguistisches Kolloquium 2013 in Halle an der Saale*, ed. by Anne Ammermann, Alexander Brock, Jana Plaeging & Peter Schildhauer. 35–46. (Hallesche Sprach- und Textforschung, 12), Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2017. Teuer war gestern und wir lieben billig. Über Adjektive als Subjekte und Objekte im heutigen Deutsch. *Deutsche Sprache* 45 (2). 97–115.
- Pittner, Karin. 2004. Where syntax and semantics meet: Adverbial positions in the German middle field. *Adverbials: The interplay between meaning, context and syntactic structure*,

- ed. by Jennifer R. Austin, Stefan Engelberg & Gisa Rauh. 253-288. (Linguistik Aktuell, 70). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pomerantz, Anita. 1984. Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. *Structures of Social Action*, ed. by J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage. 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Portner, Paul. 2004. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. Semantics and linguistic theory. *Proceedings from SALT XIV*, ed. by Kazuha Watanabe & Robert B. Young. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rapp, Irene & Angelika Wöllstein. 2009. Infinite Strukturen: selbständig, koordiniert, subordiniert. *Koordination und Subordination im Deutschen*, ed. by Veronika Ehrich, Christian Fortmann, Ingo Reich & Marga Reis. 159-179. (Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 16). Hamburg: Buske.
- Redder, Angelika. 2003. Partizipiale Ketten und autonome Partizipialkonstruktionen. *Funktionale Syntax – Die pragmatische Perspektive*, ed. by Ludger Hoffmann. 155-189. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Reis, Marga. 2003. On the Form and Interpretation of German Wh-Infinitives. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 15(2). 155-216.
- Reis, Marga. 2013. „Weil-V2“-Sätze und (k)ein Ende? Anmerkungen zur Analyse von Antomo & Steinbach (2010). *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 32(2). 221-262.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar: A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. by L. Haegeman. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rogland, Max. 2001. Performative Utterances in classical Syriac. *Journal of Semitic studies* 46: 2. 243-250.
- Romero, Maribel & Chung-Hye Han. 2004. On negative yes/no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27 (5). 609-658.
- Rooryck, Johan & Gertjan Potsma. 2007. On Participial Imperatives. *Imperative clauses in generative grammar. Studies in honour of Frits Beukema*, ed. by Wim van der Wurff. 273-296. (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics today 103). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schlücker, Barbara. 2009. Passive in German and Dutch: The *sein* / *zijn* + past participle construction. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 49, Thematic issue: The Passive in Germanic Languages, ed. by Marc Fryd. 96-124. Groningen: Center for Language and Cognition.
- Searle, John R. 1976. A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society* 5 (1). 1-23.

- Searle, John R. 1989. How performatives work. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12. 535-558.
- Sudhoff, Stefan. 2003. *Argumentsätze und es-Korrelate. Zur syntaktischen Struktur von Nebensatzeinbettungen im Deutschen*. Berlin: wvb.
- Sudhoff, Stefan. 2016. Correlates of Object Clauses in German and Dutch. *Inner-Sentential Propositional Proforms. Syntactic Properties and Interpretative Effects*, ed. by Werner Frey, André Meinunger & Kerstin Schwabe. 23-48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tiersma, Peter M. 1986. The language of Offer and Acceptance: Speech Acts and the Question of Intent. *California Law Review* 74 (1). 189-232.
- Valentin, Paul. 1994. Über Nicht-Partizipien und Partizipien im heutigen Deutsch. *Partizip und Partizipialgruppen im Deutschen*, ed. by Daniel Bresson & Martine Dalmás. 33-47. (Eurogermanistik 5). Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Wild, Stefan. 1964. Die resultative Funktion des aktiven Partizips in den syrisch-palästinischen Dialekten des Arabischen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 114, no. 2. 239-254.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamatives: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79 (1). 39-81.
- Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, Band I-III. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.