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ABSTRACT
Traditional analyses of passive voice (cf. Lascaratou, Warburton) have claimed that there are two kinds of passives in Modern Greek, namely one 'monolectic', i.e. morphologically formed (e.g. active: *kataskεvazo 'make' and passive: *kataskε vazome 'be made') and another one 'peripherastically expressed' that is, made up of the copular verb *ime 'be' and the __menos passive participle (roughly equivalent to the English __en, i.e. *ime kataska ev as menos. A further claim made by the traditional analyses was that whereas the monolectic passive was 'syntactically derived' (verbal), the periphrastic was lexical (adjectival). Earlier papers of the present speaker (Kakouriotis 1989) have claimed that a clear-cut division analysis was problematic, given that the copular + __menos construction displayed verbal (syntactic) behaviour in many cases instead of lexical.

We shall address many questions in this paper, trying to probe into the real nature of this so-called passive participle in connection with: (a) unaccusativity, (b) the role played by the 'agentive' *apo ('by')-phrase, (c) above all, the time honoured notion of affectedness, (firstly introduced by Mona Anderson (1979)), and (d) the event structure. As a consequence, the traditional division of verbs into transitive and intransitive will be abandoned; instead, an analysis of four classes of verbs will be adopted, given that it will provide our analysis with more explanatory power.

0. INTRODUCTION
The present paper constitutes an epitome of two previous attempts of mine (Kakouriotis, (1989), (1994,)) to offer a unified account of the -ménos mediopassive participles in Modern Greek, such as: *agorasmenos, 'sold' *proetimasm enos, 'prepared' *pramenos, 'written', klem enos, 'stolen',

* The writer of this paper wishes to express his thanks to Prof. Elizabeth MelAthanassopoulou for her hospitality and kindness as well as for her excellent organization of the Symposium; I would also wish to express my gratitude to Mr Nicos Athanasopoulos, an ex student of this department, who worked indefatigably behind the scenes so as to make the guests' stay as pleasant as possible.
katapiesmenos, 'oppressed' et c. In Laskaratu & Philippaki, (1987) it was claimed that the formation of "monolectic" (morphological) passives such as katapiez-ome, deriving from the active form katapiez-o are **verbal**, whereas the periphrastic passives made up of the copular verb ime, 'be' and the -menos participle as illustrated in the example, (ime katapiezmenos), are **adjective**.\(^1\) In my analyses (Kakouriotis 1989, 1994) their claim was questioned in the face of ample evidence, in particular as far as the data related to the status of periphrastic passive is concerned, which they claimed to be always non-verbal. Consider first (1) and then go to (2), where the periphrastic passives do exhibit verbal behaviour:

(1)a. Active Verb: stelna., 'send'
   b. Monolectic Passive: stelnome (apo kapjon), be sent (by sb.)
   c. Periphrastic Passive: ime stalmenos (apo kapjon), be sent (by sb.)\(^3\)
   d. afo to stama ine stalmeno se mena apo ena filo
      ‘This parcel has been sent to me by a friend
   e.o diplomatis ina stalmenos apo ton idios ton proeboro
      ‘The diplomat has been sent by the president himself’
      (cf. Active: o idios o proeboro exi still to diplomati,
      ‘The president himself has sent the diplomat’)

My two analyses however, as well as that of Laskaratu & Philippaki (op cit) have examined the -menos participles from the passive formation viewpoint even ignoring the fact that ime, 'be' and -menos form a perfective passive. For instance (2c) below is synonymous to (2b) rather than to (2a). We shall not pursue this point any further but leave it for future discussion; nevertheless it is worth mentioning:

\(^1\) Modern Greek is a language with a relatively rich inflectional system. It is useful to mention that: -menos (Masc), (Sg), (Nom) has a genitive case -men or an accusative -meno(n); its plural : -meni (Nom) has a genitive -menon and an accusative -menus.
Femin. (Sg) (Mom) is -menes, gen. -menon and acc. -menes.
Lastly the neuter is -meno, -meno -men in (Sg) and -mena, -menon, -mena in (Pl).
\(^2\) In the present paper all verbs are identified in the Imperfective present 1\(^{st}\) person Sg normally ending in -o, e.g. pezo, ‘play’, trexo, ‘run’, viepo, ‘see’, pinao, ‘get hungry’ etc.
\(^3\) Notice that Classical Greek uses periphrastic passive, that is elnav+ -menos participle interchangeably with monolectic in the 3\(^{rd}\) PL: λελυνναι or λελυμένοι ειαν in Present Perfect, passive voice. (The verb is λδειν, ‘to untie’
(2) a. τα διαφαντίρια δέν ελεύθερο η απο τον τελονιάκο
   ‘The passports are not checked by the customs officer’

b. τα διαφαντίρια δέν ελεύθερο απο τον τελονιάκο
   ‘The passports have not have not been checked by the customs officer’

c. τα διαφαντίρια δέν ελεύθερο απο τον τελονιάκο
   ‘*Our passports are more checked than yours’

d. *τα διαφαντίρια μια είναι πιο ελεύθερο απο τα σικά σας
   ‘*My passport is very checked’

Notice that the allegedly adjectival passives in (2): (a) take the agentive apo-
phrase, which is the Greek equivalent of the English by-phrase, and which is
one the main diagnostics for verbal passives and (b) do not accept either
comparative degree or degree adverbs i.e. poli, ‘much’, ‘very’, also a good
diagnostic for adjectival passive which, however does not apply to (2d) or
(2e). In a similar fashion in (1) poli or pio produce ungrammatical sentences
i.e. *poli/pioсталмενος, ‘very/more sent’. I arrived therefore at the
conclusion that there were periphrastic passives (ending in –menos) which
do not by any means exhibit adjectival behaviour in connection with the
diagnostics set forth by Wassow (1977) and other scholars.

Furthermore, the feature [+CHANGE] which I had adopted in
Kakouriotis (1989) was found inadequate, to cover all passive participle
formation cases and I decided instead to opt for the notion "Affected" (see
in particular M. Anderson, (1979) for a definition of this concept) in a sense
related to: (a) the event structure (cf. Grimshaw (1990)) and (b) to
Argument Structure of the verb. (.Grimshaw op cit), among many other
scholars. This has enabled me to offer a more principled account for the
–menos participle formation and, although I cannot claim that I have come up
with some definitive solution, the results seem to me at the time to be quite
promising, and on the right track: the notion of affected entity still works
and seems to constitute the most reliable approach for dealing with such a
complex subject as the one I am going to deal with in the present paper.4

In what follows I will attempt: (a) to establish predicate relations in
connection with –menos participles and (b) to produce a lot more evidence
so as to bolster up the argument concerning affectedness and the so-called

4 To make things easier for the reader I identify ‘affected’ with what corresponds to
the logical object of a psych verb; this can either be the grammatical subject if the verb
is used transitively i.e. ego tromazo, ‘I am frightened’; or, the grammatical the
grammatical object, if the verb is used transitively, i.e. ego tromazo kapion, ‘I frighten
somebody’. 
affectedness constraint, something that I did not do adequately enough in Kakouriotis (1994).

1. PREDICATE RELATIONS AND THE -MENOS PARTICIPLES
A considerable part of the job which was to establish the predicate relations of the -menos participle was left undone in Kakouriotis (1989), (1994) and this will be dealt with in this paper through a comparison with the -ikos (ergative/unaccusative) adjectives, e.g. eknevrístikos, tromaktíkos singlonístikos etc., which are the Greek counterparts of the English -ing adjectives, ‘upsetting’, ‘frightening’, ‘shocking’ and differ from -menos adjectives in one important respect: they lack an external argument, because these adjectives, just like their base psych verbs (to be dealt with below), do not assign either a θ-role to their subject position, or Case to the object position, if any. Following Chomsky (1986) we assume that adjectives can assign θ-role to their subject (i.e. the external argument) in sentences like the pair below, where the subject NP i katiki, ‘the inhabitants’ is assigned one thematic role by the verb engatélipsan, ‘abandoned’, and another one by the adjective endromi, ‘panicky’.

(3) a. i katiki engatélipsan spitia tus endromi
   ‘The inhabitants abandoned their houses panicky’
   b. o neodiórisístis ipúros γírisi spiti tu panéftixis
   The newly appointed minister returned home extremely happy

In (3a) the argument NP in the subject position, i.e. i katiki, ‘the inhabitants’, is also assigned a θ-role by the adjective endromi, ‘frightened’, ‘panicky’, with which it is predicated and agrees in gender (masculine), case (Nom) and number (Pl). We may further assume that if an adjective cannot occur in a context like that of (3), where predicate relations hold, this is so because of its inability to assign an external θ-role to the subject position. As a matter of fact, this is exactly what happens with -ikos adjectives which cannot stand in a predicate relation with a subject NP, unlike the -menos adjectives:

---

5 Anderson points out that the difference between (i) and (ii) below is due to the fact that whereas in (i) movement is possible in (ii) is not because only in (i) is the NP

(i) The destruction of the city ➔ The city’s destruction
(ii) The avoidance of the car ➔ *The car’s avoidance
1.1 -ikos vs. -menos adjectives

(4) a. o pavlos eftase spiti *eknevristsikos/eknevrismenos
   ‘Paul arrived home upsetting/upset’
b. o petros afise tus filus tu *aiáistakos/aiáiasmenos
   ‘Peter left his friends disgusting/disgusted’
c. O xipiz engatelišse ti vil *exonlitikos/exonlimenos
   ‘The hippie abandoned the villa annoying/annoyed’
d. o Menelaos afise to somatico tis Ellenis *singlonistikos/singlonismenos
   ‘Menelaos left Helen’s bedroom shocking/shocked’
e. o ipalillos afise to γραφίο tu *kurastikos/kurasmenos
   ‘The clerk left his office tiring/tired’

Thus, it appears that -ikos adjectives behave just like the non-stative psychverbs they derived from in the sense that like them, and unlike -menos adjectives, they are unable to assign a θ-role to the external argument. To be more precise, the adjectives in question have a θ-grid just like the verbs they are derived from, i.e. nevriazo ‘upset and get upset’, tromazo ‘frighten and get frightened’, etc. However, argument realization is different because various categories differ in the ways that they realize their arguments syntactically; thus, (4) proves that -menos participles do form predicate relations.

We will now proceed to add further evidence from the well known class of verbs called psych-verbs which denote a psychological change of state and which have an argument that bears a role that we shall call “affected Experiencer” after Jackendoff (1990) by comparing the -ikos adjectives with the -menos adjectival participles in connection with reflexivization. It appears that they face the same problem as the verbs they derive from do (cf. Kakouriotis, 1994), where I had proven that *nevriazo/ *iremo/tromazo/ ton eafio mu ‘upset’, ‘calm’, ‘frighten’ ‘myself’ are ungrammatical out, whereas thavmazo/ ektimo/ latrevo/ ton eafio mu, ‘admire’, ‘value’/appreciate, ‘adore’ ‘myself’ which are stative and do not have an affected Experiencer argument are okay. Compare, the data with -menos and -ikos adjectives below:

---

6 A category of psych-verbs in Modern Greek differ from their English counterparts in that they allow causative alternation, compare (iii.a, b) with (iva, b) (cf. Kakouriotis(1991)): (iii) a. I skili tromaksan/ δiakèdesan/ ayrieponsan/ ta peòia
   b. ta peòia tromaksan/ δiakèdesan/ ayrieponsan (Active Voice as in (a))
   (vi) a. The dogs frightened/amused the kids
     b. The kids were frightened/amused (Passive Voice)
1.2 Reflexives

(5) a. o katax strat is ine aidi asmenos/apo yo ive menos/ me/apo ton eaf to tu
   'The embezzler is disgusted/disappointed/satisfied with himself'

   b. * o katax strat is ine aidi astikos/apo yoite tikos/ikan opi itikos s ton eaf to tu
   'The embezzler is disgusting/disappointing/satisfying to himself'

In the data you see below, owing to the inability of the adjective to assign
Case to the Theme (object), on the one hand, and an external role to the
subject position, on the other, the Theme NP will move to the e(mpty)
subject position, where it receives Case from INFL:

c. * o katax strat is ine aidi astikos t [s ton eaf to tu]
   
   Even so, however the above example is ungrammatical because the reflexive
acts as a binder, intervening between the NP o katax strat is and its trace. But
why don't the -menos adjective in (b) face a similar problem, too? The
difference between an -ikos and a-menos adjective, in that respect, has to do
with the crucial distinction between a syntactic and a lexical rule. In
Kakouriotis (1989), where the -menos adjectives were discussed in detail, it
was claimed that adjectival passive participle formation (i.e. the -menos
adjective formation)/ was a lexical rule whereby an affected (i.e. state-
changed) argument was externalized. Such a process, however, involved no
syntactic (alpha) movement and consequently there were no traces left
behind. Thus, in our case, a sentence like:

d. o katax strat is ine aidi asmenos me ton eaf to tu
   'The embezzler is disgusted with himself'

involves (a): a process of category conversion, i.e. the verb becomes an
adjective (cf. Levin & Rappaport (1986, 1993) and Kakouriotis (1989)) and
(b): a lexical operation whereby an affected argument is externalized. The
Experiencer argument can, then, be assigned (inherent) Case through the
mediation of the preposition me, 'with' and all is well.

2. ADJECTIVAL AND VERBAL PASSIVES

A claim made in my analysis (1989) about periphrastic passives and which
still seems to be valid was that there was no clear-cut distinction between
purely adjectival passives, on the one hand and verbal passives, on the
other. Rather, as far as the -menos participles are concerned, from which
adjectival passives can be formed, with the help of the copula, could be
shown to exhibit a kind of spectrum starting from more adjectival to the less
adjectival (with a verbal-like behaviour), a fact which mainly depended on the lexico-semantic properties of the base verb.

Thus, the psych-verbs below which were claimed to be the most adjectival looking -menos participes given that they could exhibit all the diagnostics set forth by Wasow (1977), among other others: they can become complements of the verb fenome, ‘seem’ and some others, e.g. parameno ‘remain’; (b) like most adjectives, they can take degrees of comparison, (c) like most adjectives, they can take degree adverbs like poli, ‘very’, they, d) they can even have adverbs formed from them through the addition of the adverbial affix -a, the Greek counterpart of -ly and finally (e), they can take pre-nominal position:

The most reliable predicates: psych verbs

(6) a. i kopela fenete nevriasmeni
   The-Fem girl-Fem seem-3Sg upset-Fem.
   ‘The girl seems upset’

b. i kopela fenete pio nevriasmeni apo mena
   ‘The girl was more upset than me’

c. i kopela ine poli nevriasmeni
   ‘The girl is very upset’

d. i kopela apanduse se olus nevriasmena
   ‘The girl was answering everybody angrily’

e. i nevriasmeni kopela arxise na fonazi
   ‘The angered girl began to yell’

2.1. Perlmutter’s Pure Unaccusatives

A second but less adjectival -menos participle formation derives from a class of verbs known as pure "unaccusatives" in the strict Perlmutter’s (1978) sense; see Haegeman (1990) who claims that only those verbs qualify for unaccusatives) because it is only these verbs that are supposed to have a direct internal argument and no external argument, or, put it the other way a deep structure object at some stage of their derivation but no subject. The internal argument of this class of verbs cannot be assigned (accusative) Case and thus has to move to the subject position which is empty and has not been assigned a thematic role following what is known as "Burzio’s generalization". This class of Modern Greek verbs includes pefto, ‘fall’, idoro, ‘sweat’, xreokopo, ‘go bankrupt’, petreno, ‘die’, jernao, ‘age’ antizo, ‘blossom’, sapizo, ‘rot’ mxiiazot, ‘moulder’, ‘get mouldy’. Given that passives and the ‘pure’ unaccusatives are in complementary distribution. Compare a and b in (7) below:
(7) a. pefto → ime pesmenos  
   'fall' "I am fallen"
   b. *peftome (passive)
   a. iōrono → ime iōromenos
   'I sweat' "I am sweated"
   b. *iōronome (passive)
   a. xreokopo → ime xreokopimenos
   'I go bankrupt' 'I have gone bankrupt'
   b. *xreokopume (passive)
   a. muxliazo → ime muxliasmenos
   'moulder' 'get mouldy'
   b. *muxliazome (passive)

One of course may object that passive cannot obtain because those verbs appear as intransitives on the surface structure. However, contrary to the claim made by Haegeman (op. cit.) about the necessity of distinguishing ergatives in the sense of Burtzio (1986) from unaccusatives, in the sense of Perlmutter, does not hold for Greek the former, since they can have an external argument inserted which will occupy subject position and thus both subject and object will receive Case: I take unaccusatives in the sense of Haegeman (cf. Perlmutter (1978)):

(8) a. ekini i peftera tu ton peftane to jani: (from the "intransitive": o Janis peftane, the that (Fem) shrew the mother-in-law of-his died 3Sg Aor. The (Masc) John (Acc)  
   'That shrew of his mother-in-law caused John's death'
      b. ta vasana ton jerasan proora to jani (from o janis jerase proora)
   the troubles of the life: Fem of his him grew old; Aor prematurely
   'The troubles of his life caused him to become prematurely old'

However passivization of such "active constructions is impossible:

c. * yerastike proora apo ta vasana
   grow-passive-aorist affix prematurely from the troubles

Similarly to psomi muxliase, 'The bread moulded/got mouldy', I yrasia muxliase to psomi 'humidity caused the bread to moulder' to psomi ine muxliasmeno, but not to psomi muxliastike (passive).

As already pointed out, Passive and unaccusatives are strictly in complementary distribution. This second class of verbs, the unaccusatives, form -menos participles which exhibit adjectival behaviour, too but less distinctly than that of psych-verbs, given that, for one thing, adverb formation do not obtain here.
The fact that those verbs are unable to form passives, e.g. *peftome
*iôronome, *xreokopume,* anôizome, but also *apotixanome (‘fail’+Pass
Aff.), lipoθuimjeme, (‘faint’ +Pass Aff) could be accounted for in terms of
1AEX constraint whereby double movement is prohibited and
unaccusatives have already their object moved to the subject position to
receive Case; thus the second movement that passive involves cannot apply.

2.2. Verbal Behaviour
The third group of verbs, which are supposed to have the least Adjectival
and the most verbal status, are all are those verbs which have an Agent
<Patient/Theme> Argument Structure. Note that the -menos participles in
that case are very close to verbal passives in their construction with the
copula. For instance, they can take an Agent by-phrase which, according to
most analyses appears only with verbal passives in English (cf. Wassow
(1977)).

The third group seems to exhibit verbal passive behaviour, although
from a morphological point of view, we still have adjectives which agree in
gender, number and case with the subject. On the other hand, however, it is
not only that we have just an apo-phrase in (5) and (6) which is the Modern
Greek counterpart of the English by-phrase, but also that this phrase, as we
have pointed out, refers to specific individuals, i.e. it is not generic as in
some cases of adjectival passives where a by-phrase (see relevant examples
in Zubizarreta (1987)). Note that a psych-verb may also be modified by an
apo-phrase but this phrase does not normally refer to prototypical Agents
but rather to a Cause, e.g. ine enoxlìmenos apo ti simberifora su (*apo
sena), ‘he is/seems annoyed by your behaviour (by you)’. This is also
proved by the fact that it can alternate with a me-phrase, ‘with-phrase’, ine
θimomenos me ti simberifora su. but also me sena or even mazi su, despite
the fact that a genuine verbal passive cannot substitute me, ‘with’ for apo
‘by’.

(9) a. i aposkeves mu ine leyemenes apo (*me) ton teloniako
   ‘My luggage are (have been) checked) by (*with) the customs officer’

   b. o Roxamis ine perikklomenos apo (*me) tus astinomikus
   Roxamis is surrounded by (*with) some policemen

   c. aftos o stratotitis ine xtipimenos apo enan eleftero skopefti
   ‘This soldier has been shot by a sniper’
d. I Maria ine ȍimomeni/nevriasmeni me/*apo to Jani
   'Maria is angered / upset with John'

e. ??* I Maria ine tromaymeni apo to Jani
   'Maria is frightened by John'

(9a, b) and in particular (9c) are verbs which exhibit verbal behaviour; (9d and e) will not accept an apo-phrase but they can accept all the adjectival diagnostics (poli/pio nevriasmeni).

3. SOME APPARENT PROBLEM WITH THE ANALYSIS

Veloudis’(1990) has somehow taken exceptions to my analysis, which are based on his (partly) correct assumption that it is too powerful, since it cannot account for the ungrammaticality of -menos participles like paximenos, ‘fattened’ which ought to derive from the verb paxeno, ‘fatten’, ‘gow fat’, but the same time, he claims, it is weak given that it cannot predict the grammaticality of -menos constructions like diastavromenē pliroforia, ‘a crosschecked piece of information’, and paraðiýmata ksesikomena apo alu, ‘examples copied from elsewhere’, given that, whereas in the former case a -menos cannot obtain, although change is involved, in the latter examples, the participle does obtain, although there is change involved.

Let us take the "powerful" part of the analysis first. It is true that verbs like ksányeno, ‘make blond’, 'become blond', and even psych-verbs like iremo, 'calm', which Veloudis (op. cit) does not mention, although, they are the most productive set as far as -menos participles are concerned; they do not seem to form -menos constructions, despite the fact that they are ergative verbs, in the sense of Burzio (1986), Levin and Rappaport (1993), and as I have shown in Kakouriotis (op. cit.), ergative verbs as well as psych-verbs (ergative for many scholars and Greek verbs showing ergative alternation in my analysis) are quite productive in -menos participle formation:

3.1. Stage level and individual level predicates:
(10) a. o ilios ksan9ine ta malja tis elenis(Causative alternant)
    The sun Adj+ Caus-V-AF the hair of-the Helen
    The sun caused Helen’s hair to become fair(blond)

b. ta malja tis elenis ksan9inan (me ton iljo) (Ergative)

c. *ta ksan9imenata malja
    The blond +menos AF hair

(11) a. to farmako iremise to koritsi (Causative alternant)
The medicine calmed (down) the girl
b. to koritsi iremise (me to farmako) (Ergative alternant)
   `The girl was calmed down with the medicine'
c. * to iremimeno koritsi
   The calm +meno(s) girl

However, Veloudis seems to have failed to distinguish between lexical rules, like -menos formation, where exceptions are quite possible, and syntactic rules which are more productive and have fewer exceptions. For instance, Belleti & Rizzi (1988) offer some Italian data, where participle formation from psych-verbs does not obtain and instead the verb has a corresponding adjective:

(12) a. Le sue idee mi stufano/stancano/entusiasmano
   `His ideas tire me/excite me'
b. * Sono stufato/stancato/entusiasmato dalle sue idee (Participles)
   `I am tired/excited of his ideas'
c. Sono stufo/stanco/entusiasta delle sue idee (Adjectives)
   `I am tired/excited of his ideas'

But all the impossible -menos participles that Veloudis has found have corresponding adjectives, or more precisely, are derived from adjectives, e.g. paxis, `fat', ksanðos, `blond', `fair haired', iremos, `calm', `serene'. However as seen below, some adjectives, apart from expressing states, can also refer to a resultant state, just as the participles do. We consider this possibility in the section below.

4. THE SEMANTICS OF ADJECTIVES AND ADJECTIVAL PARTICIPLES
The claim to be made in this section is that a copula + adjective construction can, in some cases express the meaning of the adjectival -menos participle and thus a circular process whereby an adjective turns into a causative verb and then goes back to its adjectival status is unnecessary and thus militates against the principle of the least effort. We will support the claim that some canonical adjectives can function like -menos participles. We will first take a careful look at the semantics of those adjectives. More specifically, we shall discuss the Event Structure of the ergative verbs (in the sense of Grimshaw (1990)) that cannot form -menos participles in some cases and then compare it to that of some adjectives.
4.1. On the Event Structure of Ergative Verbs: Stage Level and individual stage predicates

The causative-ergative alternation verbs express a process or an activity and the resultant state. Following recent work by Grimshaw (op cit); we may assume that predicates have both an argument structure and an event structure. The former is an inventory of semantic roles, hierarchically structured, whereas the latter represents an aspectual analysis of the predicate and by extension of the whole clause. Event structure divides verbs into aspect-related subeventualities. Thus, the egative predicates we are discussing, have an event structure which changes from a complex causative event to a state when the -menos participles are formed:

(13) a. [activity/process state] → [state]
    b. x acts y in state → y is in state

Thus (13) above relates the causative X broke Y to the ergative Y broke, and finally to the statal participle: Y is broken.

Now as far as canonical adjectives are concerned, they are normally supposed to express states. This is not the case with all adjectives, however. Some of them appear to be processual rather than stative, e.g. active, careful, busy, etc. Even more importantly, adjectives, just like verbs, can be distinguished into stage level and individual level predicates. The subjects of those predicates denote different types of entities. For instance, stage level predicates refer to temporary or transitory properties of entities, e.g. Sue is ready/available. On the other hand, individual level predicates express permanent, or inherent properties, e.g. The earth is round or man is mortal. We can say that Sue is ready/available now but not The earth is round now or Man is mortal now. However, it appears that some adjectives are ambiguous in that respect. Thus, an adjective like iremos, 'calm' may normally express an individual stage property and as such they have an event argument and what is more they may be ambiguous in that respect:

(14) a. o janis ine iremos anthropos
    'John is a calm man' (by constitution)
    b. o janis ine iremos torna (istera apo tin enesi)
    'John is calm now' (after the injection)

(14b) may imply that on a certain occasion John is calm without the necessary implication that calmeness is an inherent property of John's, unlike (14a). English has a way of differentiating one reading from the other, as can be seen, with the distinction simple vs. progressive:
(15) a. He is a calm man
   b. Now he is being calm (thanks to the tranquilizer the nurse gave him)

(16) a. X acts Y in state Y in state (i.e. injection brought about Ed’s
calmness—Ed is now calm)
   b. Y in state (Ed is always in a state of calmness)

(16b) above may refer to a permanent quality of Y and in that case the
event structure is that of (13b), i.e. there is no resultant state involved in
that interpretation. On the other hand, however, (11b) may refer to a
transitory quality; in that case X stands for the CAUSE that brought about
a resultant state, i.e. y’s state. E.g. X may be a tranquilizer, a pain killer or a
person that has brought about John’s state of calmness ;. Similarly, in a
sentence like i maria ine vsanbî , ‘Mary is blonde’, the subject’s state may
be transitory and X stands for a hairdresser or Mary herself (i.e.Y) or,
alternatively, the sentence may refer to a permanent quality of Y’s which, in
this case, is expressed in the event structure (13b).

It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that adjectival participles like
*vsanbîmenos or *irombîmenos, paxîmenos, etc., do not occur because the
event structure of vsanbîs, iromos and paxis, is such that enables them to
express the resultant state in the same way that a -menos participles can
express it.

Note that -menos adjectival participles formed from ergative verbs,
which derive from adjectives are not totally excluded. However, when both
are available, there is a clear cut distinction in their event structure. Thus
from kitrinos, ‘yellow’, ‘pale’, we can form an ergative verb, kitrinizo, ‘turn
yellow’ and, subsequently, from this ergative verb, we can obtain the
adjectival participle kitrinismenos. The basic difference here is that the
passive participle can render both the resultant state after an act process, etc.
and the state on its own, unlike the passive participle

(17) a. o Janis kituse ?ta kitrina/kitrinizmene fila tu palju vivliu
   ‘John was looking one by one at the yellow/yellowed leaves of a book

b. o Janis kituse tis kitrines/*kitrinizmenes maryarites
   ‘John was looking at the yellow/yellowed daisies’

I think we can explain why omorfos, ‘beautiful’, ‘pretty’ will not form an
adjectival participle *omorfîmenos from the ergative verb omorfeno.
Cosmetic surgery has work miracles. How else could some stars survive?
5. -menos PARTICIPLES AND AFFECTEDNESS
The second objection to my analysis, raised by Veloudis (op. cit), however, i.e. the fact that the [+change] feature that I propose in my previous paper cannot account for the grammaticality of examples like *paradiyymata ksesikomena apo alu* "examples' copied from elsewhere" and also *dīastavromeni pliroforia*, "a crosschecked piece of information", is at first glance more serious, given that there is no a [+change] feature involved in these two examples, as Veloudis claims.

The notion of affectedness, which expresses a property of arguments, has been widely used in the literature by many scholars. In a somehow naïve characterization "affected" is used to mean 'changed', 'moved', in a concrete or *abstract* sense, 'altered in status' or 'created' (cf. Anderson (1979)). In a more sophisticated analysis (cf. Tenny (1988)) an affected object is a direct argument that "delimits" the event denoted by the verb. This aspectual definition of affectedness, according to Tenny (op. cit.) can cover a wider range of verbs which the notion of change. cannot. According to her analysis, affectedness, which cover verbs that describe events that are "measured out and delimited by their direct arguments", (Tenny op. cit) applies to a wider range of verb classes. Not only verbs of change of state but also verbs of consumption, creation, achievement and verbs of motion, are all encompassed in her definition of affectedness: the copy moves away from the original, in some abstract sense, and is recreated; one the other hand, a piece of information moves from a source to meet another bit of information which verifies the former. I should think that both counterexamples offered by Veloudis can be covered by Anderson’s definition. However, even if a definition of affectedness (which is wide enough to include change of state) is available, we still have to explain why a verb with an affected object can form an adjectival passive. We will adopt an analysis proposed by Doron & Hovav Rappaport (1991), which employs event structure (a somehow slightly if at all modified version of Lexical Argument Structure and an Argument Structure to explain phenomena related to adjectival passive formation).

5.1. On the Two Subeventualities of Some Verbs.
According Doron & Hovav Rappaport (op. cit.), the definition of an affected argument runs as follows:

(18) *y* is an affected argument of a verb possessing an argument structure like
(19):

(19) *V x < y >*, iff the event structure of this verb contains a sub-eventuality e such that *y* but not *x* is an argument of *e*. (Slightly adapted from D. & H R p.83)
Verbs like katastrefo, ‘destroy’, spazo, ‘break’, ksesikono, ‘copy’ etc. have an event structure different from verbs like γνωρίζω, ‘know’, ἀποφεύγω ‘avoid’, θαυμάζω, ‘admire’. In the sense that the latter verbs’ event structure does not contain two subeventualities. We offer a more complex Event Structure below (cf. (21a,b)):

(20) a. Event Structure for katastrefo ‘destroy’:
   CAUSE (DO (x)) BECOME (destroyed (y))

In (a) there is a subeventuality which contains y but not x. On the other hand, in a verb like γνωρίζω, ‘know’, there are no CAUSE or DO abstract predicates. The event structure of such verbs will be as follows:

b. Event Structure for θελô:
   BECOME (STATE want (x y)) and thus: *θελîmenos.

(20b) does not contain two subeventualities, as (20a) does. Besides, it contains both x and y, i.e. two arguments. Hence the grammaticality of (18) which have an event structure like that of (a) compared to the ungrammaticality of (19), which have the (17b) event structure:

(21) a. i polî ine katestrameni (i katestrameni poli)
    ‘The city is (has been) destroyed’
   b. to potiri ine spasmeno (to spasmeno potiri)
    ‘The glass is (has been) broken’
   c. to paraðîyma ine ksesikomeno apo alu (to ksesikomeno paraðîyma)
    ‘The example is (has been) copied from elsewhere’

(22) a.* o ipûryos ine γνωρîsmenos (* o γνωρîsmenos ipûryos)
    ‘The minister is known’ ‘The known minister’
   b.* o ipûryos ine ἀπωμασmenos (*o ἀπωμασmenos ipûryos)
    ‘The minister is admired’ ‘The admired minister’
   c.* o ipûryos ine ἀποφεύγmenos (*o ἀποφεύγmenos ipûryos)
    oli apofeûyun ton ipûyro
    ‘they all avoid the resigned minister’

5.2. The Most "Verbal" Adjectival Participles in Modern Greek
We have pointed out that a condition for the formation of adjectival participles is that the Event Structure be divided in two subeventualities. Adjectival Passives can be derived provided that we have a monadic structure like y BECOME destroyed or broken or copied, which is the second part of the total eventuality expressed by the verb. That is, the
formerly most prominent argument is no longer an argument (it may be "denoted to the status of an adjunct, though) and the direct internal argument, the one that delimits the event, as Tenny claims, becomes the most prominent argument, when adjectival passive obtains.

Recall, however, that the two subeventualities represented an event (or process) and a resultant state. Now consider some examples below:

(23) a. afti it enia ine skinoqetimeni *(apo ton angelopulo)
   "This movie is (has been) directed *(by Angelopulos)"
b. afti inuvela ine yrameni *(apo te samarakii)
   "This novel is(has been) written *(by Samarakis)"
c. afto to forema ine xeıdasmeno *(apo ton aslanii)
   "This dress is(has been) designed *(by Aslanis)"
d. afto to trapezi ine kataskevasmeno *(apo enan kalo marango)
   "This table is (has been) made *(by a good carpenter)"

The sentences in (23) cannot normally occur without an apo-phrase. The reason why is that both subeventualities co-occur: one is expressed by the Theme and subject of the sentence, (i.e. the state), and the other is expressed by the Agent apo-phrase, (i.e. the activity or process). Semantically, then (23) are not stative in any sense. Adjectives can very rarely receive a by-phrase that refers to a prototypical Agent, i.e. Mary is pregnant by Ed might be such exceptional case. Anyway, the fact that there are adjectival participles with an obligatory Agent phrase proves that Modern Greek, too, has a semantically "verbal" passive although externally it is an adjective that agrees in case, person and number with the noun it is in subject-predicate relation with.

6. AFFECTEDNESS AGAIN.
Are we now in a position to accept that affectedness can embrace all cases of the -menos participle formation? The more evidence we can obtain the better. Consider some more examples with the verb spazo and compare a and b qua literary and metaphorical sense:

(24) a. espase to roloj tu /to paraqiro/ to klari /to vazo
   'S/he broke the watch /the window/the branch/ the music record'
   'to roloj /to paraqiro /to klari/ ine spasmeno/ o δισκος ine spasemenos'
   'The watch /the window/ the branch /the music record is broken'
b. espase to simvoleo /ti simfania/ to rekor / tin aperyia
   'S/he broke the contract /the agreement/ the record/ the strike'
c. * to simvoleo /I simfania/ to rekor / ine spasmeno/ *i aperyia ine spasmeni
   'The contract /the agreement/ the record/ the strike is broken'
The although broken is still there; the window’s integrity likewise has been affected but it highly that it can be repaired and restored. And the same applies to the vase with those miraculous glues available in the market. I’m not an agriculturist to suggest anything about the broken branch. But even that is still there although it has come apart from the rest of the tree: the truth is that it is an affected entity 100/00-

In the b examples we do not refer to affected entities; in fact, we do not refer to entities at all. Thus-menos participle formation is excluded. Even in the example

(25) a. exo eksantlisi oli tin ipomoni mu,
   b. ‘I have exhausted all my patience’ morphological passive:
   c. oli I ipomoni mu exi eksantliti,
      ‘All my patience has been exhausted’ the periphrastic passive:
   d. * oli I ipomoni ine eksantlimeni
      ‘all my patience is exhausted’ is out or, very marginal, unlike the sentence

(26) a. i neosilekti exun eksantliti
   ‘the newly-recruited soldiers have been exhausted’
   b. i neosilekti ine eksantlimeni,
      ‘the newly recruited soldiers are exhausted’,

which is okay, given that patience cannot count as affected entity, whereas the recruits can. Here also the passive has its morphological counterpart: i neosilekti exun eksantliti

I will now examine some more verbs which bolster my claim, take first the verb pefto, ‘fall’ qua passive participle formation. Consider the difference between the three examples below:

(27) a. o aolitis exi pesi sto edafo
    ‘The athlete has fallen on the ground’
   b. o aolitis ine pesmenos sto edafo
    ‘The athlete has (?)is fallen on the ground’
   c. o aolitis exi pesi sto potami γia na sos to pe̞i pu pniyete
    ‘The athlete has fallen into the river to save the drowning child’
   d. * o aolitis ine pesmenos sto potami γia na sos to pe̞i pniyete
    ‘The athlete has (?)is fallen into the river to save the drowning child’

Note further that the same passive participle behaves as pefto is a psych verb where the meaning is ‘depressed’, ‘feeling down’:

   e. apopse ine poli pesmenos; pio pesmenos apo kaße ali for a (but not *o pesmenos filos)
    ‘Tonight he is very fallen (depressed); more fallen (depressed) than ever’
(26d) is ungrammatical because *peťo has a rationale complement clause για na which implies an agent; and agents are not normally affected entities except in a few cases, i.e. *ἀριστος τίσιαστική για na sosi τς ανθρώπους ‘Christ was sacrificed to save humanity’ which in fact is reflexive with Christ both an agent and an affected entity; and even here we cannot say *ἀριστος in ή τίσιασμον για na sosi τς ανθρώπου.

6.1. A Comparison of English and Modern Greek
It is somehow implied in this work that the English counterpart of the –menos participle is the –en (-ed) in English: *spasmenos, ‘broken’, *ramenos, ‘written’ klemenos, ‘stolen’, etc. On the other hand the –tis Greek counterparts of the so called agentive nominals (Kakourirotis, (1993) ending in –er are never supposed to refer to affected entities. English and Greek differ here:

a. kerōismanos-xamenos vs. winner-loser
Greek appears to be inconsistent: for winner, there is no corresponding *kerōisitis; but English also appears to be inconsistent in the second noun: for xamenos, the entity affected by some kind of loss, there is no corresponding noun lost: the counterpart of the –menos is loser. We leave aside the fact that the examples above are taken to be nouns and not adjectives as being irrelevant. Schlesinger (1988, p. 205) claims that:

Each language provides its speakers with options (not necessarily the same for all languages) for talking about.
The world and thus organizes and categorizes it...[and]
in dealing with linguistic issues it will not do to confine oneself to ontology; one has to take into account the way a given language ‘treats’ the world.

One would here expect a differentiation between two opposites in meaning (kerōismanos-xamenos) as in the case of nikitis-nikimenos. The fact that kerōismanos is okay in Greek may be put down to an application of the affectedness constraint: affectedness does imply a change of state, among other things (cf. Anderson, (1979)) and here we have a typical case of one who from a state of non-winner changes into one of winner. As far as the English example is concerned, the loser may be taken to be an entity who is conducive to his losing in English but not in Greek: in the second language what is mainly implied is bad luck and subsequent loss leading to a status of “affected”; in English, on the other hand the entity that loses is taken to be primarily responsible for one’s losing.
CONCLUSION
We have reconsidered Modern Greek -menos participles basing our analysis on the notion "affected" and we have employed the "affectedness" constraint to account for a mass of data. Furthermore, we have established the predicate relations as far as -menos participles are concerned. Particular interest present cases where a verb can form a -menos only as long as their semantics involve the notion of affectedness cf. i kanata ine spasmpei “the jar is broken” vs. *i aperia ine spasmpe “the strike is broken”; more work has to be done towards a clearer definition of the term “affected” as it is now taken in a somewhat intuitive sense. There nothing wrong with intuition especially in an empirical science like linguistics. Our intuition so far has led us to the conclusion that the syntactic behaviour of the -menos participles is clearly determined by semantic factors; the literary meaning is higher in hierarchy than the abstract i.e. eksanto. The psychological state higher that the physical i.e. the two pefto.
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