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**Abstract**

Italian *essere* (*be*) and *venire* (*come*) periphrastic passives differ in their aspectual properties, both lexical and grammatical. Squartini’s (1999) analysis of *venire* passives accounts for their incompatibility with perfect aspect. In the present study, I develop an account of passive *venire* in which it is analyzed as a light verb, rather than a lexical verb. This difference, together with certain assumptions about the syntax of lexical aspect are leveraged to account for passive *venire*’s incompatibility with perfect aspect, propredicative *lo*, and with stative verbs. In this way, the empirical ground covered by the previous analysis is substantially expanded.
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1. Introduction

Italian is one of several languages with a passive construction formed with a deictic motion verb, along with Bavarian German, Hindi, and Romansch, among others (Sansò & Giacalone Ramat 2016). These motion verb passives as well as their be passive counterparts are fully fledged passives in the sense that they suppress the external argument, which is a defining feature of passivization (Bruening 2013). However, motion verb passives often display systematic differences from their be passive counterparts in terms of their syntactic properties. The present study accounts for syntactic behavior of the Italian venire (come) passives via a light verb-based analysis. The final structure which will be leveraged to account for venire passives is shown in (1).

(1)  
```
vP
  \_ v
    AspP
      Asp PartP
        Part VP
          V DP
```

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the basic distributional and aspectual properties of venire (come) passives, and their essere (be) passives counterparts are discussed. In section 3, I summarize previous approaches to passivization, with a special focus on event structure-based approaches. In section 4, I account for the properties of venire passives by analyzing passive venire as a light verb together with the addition of an aspectual projection, AspP. In section 5, I briefly present a crosslinguistic connection between Italian venire passives and English get passives. Finally, section 6 offers concluding remarks and directions for future research.

2. Italian Periphrastic Passives

Italian has two distinct periphrastic passive constructions, each of which is formed with a different verb together with a participle. The essere passive is formed with the verb essere (be) together with a participle, as in (2), while the venire passive is formed with the verb venire (come) together with a participle as in (3). Note that in both (2) and (3), the participle chiusa agrees with the noun porta.

(2) Italian (adapted from Squartini, 1999)
```
La porta è chiusa.
The door be.PRES.3 close.PTCP.FEM
```

1 All examples accompanied by a citation are taken or adapted from the cited source, while those without a citation were constructed by the author and judged by two Italian native speakers from Florence and Avellino Italy respectively.
‘The door is closed’

(3) Italian (adapted from Squartini, 1999)
La porta viene chiusa
The door comes.PRES.3 close.PTCP.FEM
‘The door is closed’

Despite surface level similarities, there are several syntactic differences between the essere and venire passives. The essere passive can combine with a verbal or an adjectival participle, as demonstrated in (4) and (5).

(4) Italian (adapted from Volpato et. al. 2016)
La gara è aperta da Maria
The race be.PRES.3 open.PTCP.FEM by Maria
‘The race is opened by Maria’

(5) Italian (adapted from Volpato et. al. 2016)
La gara è apert-issima (*da Maria)
The race be.PRES.3 open-SPRL.FEM (*by Maria)
‘The race is very open’

The presence of a by-phrase containing the external argument Maria in (4) indicates that the participle aperta is verbal (Frigeni 2004). Conversely, the participle in (5) is adjectival, which is indicated by the presence of the superlative suffix -issima. Additionally, note that when (5) is made adjectival with the addition of the suffix -issima, the addition of a by-phrase containing the external argument Maria results in ungrammaticality.

The venire passive allows only verbal participles, as demonstrated by the contrast between (6) and (7).

(6) Italian (adapted from Volpato et. al. 2016)
La gara viene aperta da Maria
The race come.PRES.3 open.PTCP.FEM by Maria
‘The race is opened by Maria.’

(7) Italian (adapted from Volpato et. al. 2016)
La gara viene apert-issima a tutti
The race come.PRES.3 open-SPRL.FEM to everybody
‘The race is very open to everybody.’

As in (4), the presence of a by-phrase in (6) indicates that the participle is verbal (Frigeni 2004). In (7), we see that passive venire disallows adjectival participles, as when the participle is made adjectival via the addition of the superlative suffix -issima, ungrammaticality results.

Both the essere and venire passives also differ with respect to their compatibility with the passato prossimo, which is the Italian present perfect. The passato prossimo, is formed with one of two auxiliary verbs, either essere (be) or avere (have), together with a participle, as in (8) and (9).
The choice between these two auxiliary verbs is governed by an array of syntactic and semantic factors which are not relevant to the present discussion (see Sorace (2000) for an in-depth discussion). Unlike the English present perfect, the passato prossimo is not “…restricted to purely perfectual functions, also occurring in aoristic perfective contexts.” (Squartini, 1999: 344). This contrasts with English, in which the present perfect cannot have an aoristic meaning. The contrast between (11) and (12) makes this difference apparent.

(11) L’ impresa ha costruito l’ edificio nel 1988
    The company have.PRES.3 build.PTCP.MASC the building in 1988
    ‘The company built the building in 1988.’

(12) *The company has built the building in 1988.

In (11) we see that the passato prossimo is compatible with the punctual temporal adverbial nel 1988. This is because the passato prossimo has an aoristic meaning in addition to the perfectual one which English present perfect has. Under the aoristic meaning, the process of building is completed in the past at the time specified by the punctual temporal adverbial nel 1988. In (12), we see that the English present perfect does not permit this aoristic meaning. Rather, the English present perfect permits only a perfect meaning. When we force an aoristic meaning, via the presence of the punctual temporal adverbial nel 1988, ungrammaticality results.

While the essere passive can occur with the passato prossimo, the venire passive cannot. In (13), adapted from (Squartini 1999), the essere passive is combined with the passato prossimo. First, the passive auxiliary essere forms the passato prossimo together with its participle stato. Then, these combine with the participle of the lexical verb, in this case costruito.

(13) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)
    L’ edificio è stato costruito
    The building be.PRES.3 be.PTCP.MASC build.PTCP.MASC
    ‘The building has been built.’

In (14), however we see that passive venire may not combine with essere to form the passato prossimo.

(14) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)
    *L’ edificio è venuto costruito
    The building be.PRES.3 come.PTCP.MASC build.PTCP.MASC
    ‘The building has been built.’
In fact, the *venire* passive is systematically incompatible with perfect aspect, including the pluperfect and future perfect, while the *essere* passive exhibits no such incompatibility, with one exception to be discussed below. The contrast between (15) and (16) demonstrates that the *essere* passive is compatible with the pluperfect, while the *venire* passive is incompatible with the pluperfect.

(15) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)

L’edificio era stato costruito
The building *be.*IMP.3 *be.*PTCP.MASC *build.*PTCP.MASC
‘The building had been built.’

(16) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)

*L’* edificio era *venuto* costruito
The building *be.*IMP.3 *come.*PTCP.MASC *build.*PTCP.MASC
‘The building had been built.’

The contrast between (17) and (18) demonstrates that this pattern also holds for the future perfect.

(17) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)

L’edificio *sarà* stato costruito
The building *be.*FUT.3 *be.*PTCP.MASC *build.*PTCP.MASC
‘The building will have been built.’

(18) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)

*L’* edificio *sarà* *venuto* costruito
The building *be.*FUT.3 *come.*PTCP.MASC *build.*PTCP.MASC
‘The building will have been built.’ (Adapted from Squartini, 1999)

Interestingly, the *essere* and *venire* passives are both incompatible with the _trapassto remoto_ (Squartini 1999). The _trapassto remoto_ is a pluperfect tense which is formed with the auxiliary verb in the _passato remoto_, together with a participle. The _passato remoto_ is used for events which take place in the distant past, such as historical events, as can be seen in (19) and (20). Note that RMT is used in glosses to indicate the _passato remoto_.

(19) Dante scrisse La Divina Commedia
Dante *write.*RMT.3 *the* *divine* *comedy*
‘Dante wrote the Divine Comedy.’

(20) Michelangelo nacque nel 1475
Michelangelo *be-*born.RMT.3 *in.*the *1475*
‘Michelangelo was born in 1475.’

The ungrammaticality of (21) and (22) demonstrates that both the *essere* and *venire* passives are both barred from the _trapassto remoto_.

(21) Italian (adapted from Squartini 1999)

*L’* edificio *sarà* stato costruito
The building *be.*FUT.3 *be.*PTCP.MASC *build.*PTCP.MASC
‘The building will have been built.’ (Adapted from Squartini, 1999)
Despite the ungrammaticality of (21) and (22), passives do grammatically occur in the passato remoto, as can be seen in the examples in (23).

a. Il duomo fu costruito nel 1296
   The cathedral be.RMT.3 build.PTCP.MASC in 1296
   ‘The cathedral was built in 1296.’

b. Il duomo venne costruito nel 1296
   The cathedral come.RMT.3 build.PTCP.MASC in 1296
   ‘The cathedral was built in 1296.’

While it is an interesting question as to why both Italian passives are incompatible with the trapassato remoto, this property of Italian periphrastic passives will not be accounted for here.

The syntactic distribution of venire passives is also limited by lexical aspect. The literature on lexical aspect is vast and goes back to at least Vendler (1957). While I cannot comprehensively survey the literature on lexical aspect here, I will present the distinctions relevant for accounting for venire passives. Following previous literature, I distinguish four lexical aspectual classes: statives, activities, accomplishments, and achievements These classes are distinguished based on the semantic properties of punctuality, telicity, and dynamicity as shown in Table 1. (Andersen 1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Aspect</th>
<th>Punctual</th>
<th>Telic</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essere passives may occur with all aspectual classes, as shown in (24) - (27).

(24) La verità è conosciuta da tutti
    The truth be.PRES.3 know.PTCP.FEM by everyone
    ‘The truth is known by everyone.’
Venire passives, however, are aspectually restricted. They may not occur with statives, but may occur with the other aspectual classes, as shown in (28) - (31).

(28) *La verità viene conosciuta da tutti Stative
The truth come.PRES.3 know.PTCP.FEM by everyone
‘The truth is known by everyone.’

(29) Il carrello viene spinto da Luca Activity
The cart come.PRES.3 push.PTCP.MASC by Luca
‘The cart is pushed by Luca.’

(30) La carta viene rilasciato dal postino Accomplishment
The letter come.PRES.3 deliver.PTCP.MASC by the postman
‘The letter is delivered by the postman.’

(31) La porta viene chiusa da Aniello Achievement
The door come.PRES.3 close.PTCP.FEM by Aniello
‘The door is closed by Aniello.’

Apart from aspectual differences, essere and venire passives also differ in their compatibility with propredicative clitics. Italian, like many other Romance languages, has an invariant clitic lo, which can replace entire predicates which are either NPs or APs (Lorusso & Moro 2020). The examples in (32) demonstrate propredicative lo. Note that in these examples, the gender of the noun foto, is feminine as is indicated in the glosses.

(32) Italian (adapted from Lorusso & Moro 2020)
   a. le foto.FEM del muro sono la causa della rivolta
      the pictures of.the.wall are the cause of.the.riot
   b. *le foto.FEM del muro la sono
      the pictures of.the.wall itFEM,SG are
   c. le foto.FEM del muro lo sono
      the pictures of.the.wall itMASC,SG are

Lorusso & Moro (2020) note that this lo must have masculine/neuter morphology as in (32c). This is true even though the predicative NP to which lo refers
is feminine. If we attempt to establish an agreement relationship between propredicative lo and the predicative NP to which it refers, ungrammaticality results, as can be seen in (32b).

Crucially, there is a difference between essere and venire passives in terms their compatibility with propredicative lo, as can be seen in the contrast between (33) and (34).

(33) Questa lingua è parlata da molti, ma quella non lo è
    ‘This language is spoken by many, but that one is not.’

(34) *Questa lingua viene parlata da molti, ma quella non lo viene
    ‘This language comes spoken by many, but that one is not.’

Table 2 below summarizes the differences between the essere and venire passives, which will be accounted for in Section 3, but first we discuss previous approaches to passivization in the following section.

Table 2. Properties of Essere and Venire Passives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal Passives</th>
<th>Adjectival Passives</th>
<th>Perfect Aspect</th>
<th>Statives</th>
<th>Propredicative lo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essere</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venire</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Previous Approaches to Passivization

Classic accounts of passivization focus on thematic differences between actives and passives in terms of the projection/availability of external argument. For example, Jaeggli (1986) argues for “absorption” of the external θ-role by the passive morpheme, which can then be optionally retransmitted to the external to the external argument contained within a by-phrase.

Collins’ (2005) approaches passivization from the same starting point as active sentences, analyzing the external argument contained in a by-phrase as being assigned its θ-role via merger into Spec, vP. Crucial to Collins’ analysis are Participle Phrases, (PartPs) and their licensing. Collins assumes the structure in (35) for vPs with participles.

(35) \[ [vP DP [v' V [PartP -en [vp V DP]]]] \]
PartPs are what allow his analysis to work syntactically. PartPs are said to “smuggle” the verbs’ internal argument past the intervening external argument to Spec, TP.

Another more recent account of passivization is that of Bruening (2013). This analysis depart from standard theories of the syntax-semantics interface, eliminating \( \theta \) roles entirely, instead developing a system with two modes of selection. These two modes of selection are described in the following way: “Syntactic selection selects for categories and features (which together comprise labels). Semantic selection is type-driven function application” (Bruening, 2013: 23). With respect to the realization of the external argument in a by-phrase, Bruening analyzes them as adjoining to a projection of Voice.

While these analyses successfully capture the thematic differences between actives and passives, they do not speak to potential event structural differences between actives and passives. However, there are two analyses which approach passivization from an event structural perspective and are therefore relevant to the current study: Gehrke & Grillo (2009) and Biggs & Embick (2020).

The core insight of Gehrke & Grillo (2009)’s approach is that passivization relates fundamentally to event structure. Their approach has three main components. The first component is a VP shell account of event structure adopted from Travis (2000). Under such an approach, there are two VP shells. The lower VP shell, shown in (36) as VP\(_2\), introduces an event’s endpoint and the internal argument (DP\(_{\text{INT}}\)). The higher VP shell, shown in (36) as VP\(_1\), introduces the verb’s external argument, (DP\(_{\text{EXT}}\)) and the causing subevent. The association between VP\(_1\) and the introduction of causative semantics makes VP\(_1\) similar in function to vP, and for the purposes of discussion, I will assume their equivalence here.

\[(36)\]

The second component of their approach is the Tense-Aspect system developed by Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria (2000). In this system, Tense and
Aspect are both functional heads and spatiotemporal predicates which select internal and external arguments. As predicates, they establish different topological relationships among different reference times, the Utterance Time (UT-T), known in other models of temporal and aspectual reference as speech time, the Event Time (EV-T), which is the time of the event described by the verb, and the Assertion Time (AST-T) which is the portion of the event time focused. Following Smith (1991), Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria assume that “What is focused has a special status, which [is called] visibility. Only what is visible is asserted . . .” (Smith 1991: 99). As such, only what is focused is made available for semantic interpretation.

In order to understand how Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria’s system functions, an example derivation for the Present Perfect is shown in (37). They define perfect aspect in the following way: “Perfect Aspect is a spatiotemporal predicate with the meaning of AFTER. It orders the AST-T AFTER the EV-T: it thus picks out a time AFTER the interval defined by the EV-T.” (Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2000: 168).

(37) Henry has built a house.

![Tree Diagram](image)

Biggs & Embick (2022) also develop and event structural approach to passivization in order to account for the English get passive. In their analysis, they apply a series of event structural diagnostics such as the interpretation of by-adjuncts, as well as almost, again, and for X modification to argue that English get passives contain additional structure, which is not present in English be passives. The structure they propose is illustrated in (38).

(38) Several people got arrested.

![Tree Diagram](image)
For present purposes, the most important aspects of the structure in (38) is that Biggs and Embick analyze *get as realizing the higher v head. Additionally, they claim that both *be and *get passives contain the same participial substructure, which is the portion of the structure dominated by XP.

4. Accounting for Venire Passives

With the empirical landscape established, we can now account for the properties of venire passives in a systematic way. Recall that passive venire is incompatible with perfect aspect, as the ungrammaticality of (39) demonstrates.

(39) *L’ edificio è venuto costruito
   The building be.PRES.3 come.PTCP.MASC build.PTCP.MASC
   ‘The building was built.’

   The ungrammaticality of passive venire with perfect aspect contrasts with the grammaticality of non-passive uses of venire with perfect aspect as in (40).

(40) Il traditore è venuto dall’ Inghilterra.
   The traitor be.PRES.3 come.PTCP.MASC from England
   ‘The traitor came from England.’

   Based on this difference, let us assume the basic structural difference shown in (41), namely that passive venire is a light verb which realizes v while non-passive venire is lexical verb which realizes V.

(41) vP
    v
    venire_p passive
    VP
    V
    DP
    venire_lexical

   With this basic assumption, we can account for the incompatibility of the passive venire with perfect aspect. This is because in order to form perfect aspect, a participle is required. Folli & Harley (2013) argue that Italian participles are derived via movement of the verb from V to a higher participial projection, Part. Because light verbs in Italian are base-generated in v, they cannot raise to Part to derive a passive participle (Folli & Harley 2013). The tree in (42), adapted from Folli & Harley (2013) demonstrates their analysis of participle derivation in Italian.

(42) La torta è stata comprata
    The cake be.PRES.3 be.PTCP.FEM bought.PTCP.FEM
While Folli & Harley formulate this claim for the light verbs *fare* (*do*), *dare* (*give*), and *prendere* (*take*), I suggest that it can be extended to light verb *venire*. If passive *venire* is also a light verb which realizes $v$, then this accounts for its incompatibility with perfect aspect, because its structural position precludes it from raising to Part to derive a participle, which is necessary to form the perfect aspect in Italian.

Analyzing passive *venire* as a light verb also accounts for its incompatibility with propredicative *lo*. Crucially, propredicative *lo* occurs in copular sentences. Moro (1997) proposes that the copular *essere* (*be*) realizes $V$. In contrast, passive *venire* has been argued to realize $v$. With this distinction in mind, we can account for the contrast between (33) and (34), repeated here as (43) and (44).

(43) Questa lingua è parlata da molti, ma quella non lo è
This language is spoken by many, but that one NEG it$^{\text{MASC,SG}}$ is

‘This language is spoken by many, but that one is not.’

(44) *Questa lingua viene parlata da molti, ma quella non lo viene
This language comes spoken by many, but that one NEG it$^{\text{MASC,SG}}$ comes

‘This language is spoken by many, but that one is not.’

Following Lorusso & Moro (2020), if propredicative *lo* cliticizes to a copular verb, *essere* (*be*), which is a realization of $V$, then we straightforwardly account for its ungrammaticality with passive *venire*, as under the analysis developed here, passive *venire* is not a copular verb, which realizes $V$, but rather a light verb which realizes $v$.

The addition of an aspectual projection to the analysis developed thus far allows us to account for passive *venire*’s incompatibility with statives. Following MacDonald (2009), I assume the existence of an aspectual projection (AspP) between $vP$ and $VP$. This projection establishes the “domain of aspectual interpretation” (MacDonald 2009: 221), which is a syntactic domain in which elements must occur in order to affect the aspectual properties of the predicate. The tree in (45) demonstrates the location of AspP with the overall structure of the clause.

(45)

```
  vP
  v
  AspP
  Asp
  VP
   V
    ...
```
MacDonald argues for the existence of this projection based on evidence from object-to-event mapping and the interpretation of bare plurals vs. mass nouns. Additionally, he argues that statives do not project AspP based on the absence of a domain of aspectual interpretation for statives. Thus, only the eventive aspectual classes: activities, accomplishments, and achievements project AspP. Adopting this idea here, we can account for the incompatibility of passive venire with statives by claiming that passive venire is a type of v which selects an AspP as shown in (46).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\ldots \\
_{\text{venire}} \rightarrow \text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\ldots
\end{array}
\]

The existence of functional elements which select for eventivity has been independently argued for by Hallman (2004), who argues that the do of do so is one such element. He argues that the do of do so is an “...overt reflex of a functional head that licenses the external argument in eventive VPs.” (Hallman, 2004: 304). This claim is based on examples like those in (47) and (48).

(47) English (MacDonald 2009: 223)
   a. John drove the car and Frank did so too.
   b. John ate a cake and Frank did so too.
   c. John caught a raccoon and Frank did so too.

(48) English (MacDonald 2009: 223)
   a. ?John owns a book and Frank does so too.
   b. ?John owes money to the bank and Frank does so too.

In the approach to aspect adopted here, in which AspP is projected for activities, accomplishments and achievements but is not projected for statives, this difference is readily accounted for by claiming that the do of do so selects for an AspP. Because the do of do so, selects for eventivity, it is then reasonable to claim that passive venire is another such element which selects for eventivity.

5. A parallel with English get?

In this section, I present additional evidence of a potential structural difference between essere and venire passives, based on Biggs & Embick’s (2022) analysis for get passives in English. While they apply a number of different diagnostics to detect event structural differences between English get and be passives, I present only for X temporal phrase modification, as this is the only diagnostic whose application produces identical results to English.

According to Dowty (1979), for X temporal phrase modification is ambiguous in VPs which contain both states and events such as accomplishments. In these cases, for X, can specify “either a time period during which multiple events take place or the duration during which the target state produced by the event obtains.” (Biggs & Embick, 2022: 230). This ambiguity can be seen in in (49).
The robot opened the door [for three hours]
Readings: three hours of opening events
door maintained in an open state for three hours

In the active sentence in (49) we see that both the repeated events reading, in which the robot opens the door multiple times over a period of 3 hours, as well as the state duration reading, in which the door remains open for a period of time are both readily available.

However, in the passive, Biggs & Embick (2022) claim that in English, the available readings are determined by which verb is used to form the passive, either be or get as can be seen in (50) and (51)

The door was opened by the test robot (for three hours) …
(a) ✓ Continuation Available - to test the new hinge system.
(b) ✓ Continuation Unavailable - to let the fumes out.

The door got opened by the test robot (for three hours) …
(a) ✓ Continuation Available - to test the new hinge system.
(b) × Continuation Unavailable - to let the fumes out.

In (50) and (51), a and b are continuations which are designed to evoke the repeated events or state duration readings respectively. We see that in (50), with passive be maintains the same ambiguity found in the active. Both the (a) and (b) continuations are available because both the repeated events reading, and the state duration reading are available. On the other hand, we see that in (51), with passive get, only the (b) continuation is available because only the repeated events reading is available, while the state duration reading is unavailable.

The same pattern of available readings found for passive be and get in English, is also found for passive essere and venire in Italian. Example (52) demonstrates that in Italian, just as in English, both the repeated events and state duration readings are available in the active.

Il robot ha aperto la porta per tre ore
‘The robot opened the door for three hours.’
Readings: three hours of opening events
door maintained in an open state for three hours

However, in the passive, again just as in English, the available readings are determined by which verb is used to form the passive, shown in (53).

a. La porta è aperta dal robot per tre ore
‘The door is opened by the robot for three hours.’
Readings: three hours of opening events
door maintained in an open state for three hours
b. La porta viene aperta dal robot per tre ore
   'The door is opened by the robot for three hours.'

Readings: three hours of opening events

As can be seen in (53), for passive essere, akin to English passive be, both the repeated events as well as the state duration readings are available. With passive venire however, akin to English get, only the repeated events reading is available, while the state duration reading is unavailable.

In order to account for these interpretive differences Biggs & Embick (2022) make two key claims. First, they claim that passive get contains and additional, higher layer of structure which passive be lacks. Second, they claim that event structural modifiers like for X can attach at different heights based on the amount of structure available. However, because they remain unclear on precisely where modifiers like for X attach in the structure and why they should be forced to attach higher when additional structure is available, this difference in available readings is simply noted here as a parallel which supports the claim of structural differences between be passives on the one hand vs non-be passives, such as get or venire on the other.

6. Conclusion

This study examined Italian venire passives and accounted for their properties via a light verb-based analysis. Analyzing passive venire as a light verb which realized v, together with the addition of an aspectual projection, AspP allowed us to account for a host of restrictions present for the venire passive which do not exist for the essere passive. While the account of the venire passive developed here seems in principle compatible with various previous approaches to passivization, the fact that aspectual factors should impact passivization is most directly compatible with, and indeed predicted by Gehrke & Grillo’s approach, a connection which is also suggested by Belletti & Guasti (2015). This is because under Gehrke & Grillo’s (2009) approach, passivization relates intrinsically to event structure. Future research on venire passives should pursue this connection and further examine the relationship between passivization and event structure in greater depth, specifically developing an account of how event structural modifiers interact with passivization. Beyond this, the question of why both the essere and venire passives are incompatible with the passato remoto remains open. Finally, future research should adopt a more crosslinguistic perspective and examine whether the type of analysis pursued here is available for similar motion verb passives constructions such as those attested in Bavarian German, Hindi, and Romansch (Sansò & Giacalone Ramat 2016).
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