Adjectival passives as a tool for decomposition: Instruments, Manner, Result, and the behavior of Roots in Context

Elena Anagnostopoulou, University of Crete

elena.anagnostopoulou01@gmail.com, anagnostopoulou@uoc.gr

The general aim of the talk is to explore how roots interact with syntactic and non-syntactic context (how much is coming from the meaning of the root and how much is coming from context?), and I use adjectival participles as a tool. Due to their **exceptional** properties (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2015), Greek adjectival participles constitute diagnostic environments for studying manner and result properties of verbs (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998, 2010; Rappaport Hovav 2014; Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2012, Anagnostopoulou 2017): (i) Target state adjectival participles (Kratzer 2000) bring out **result properties**. (ii) Resultant state adjectival participles (Kratzer 2000) retain **manner properties**. There are **2 keys** to the result vs. manner difference, as schematized in (1): (i) the absence vs. presence of **Voice**, and (ii) the obligatoriness vs. optionality of **Result** in the two kinds of participles:

(1)   a.   PRT   [v   [**Result**]]   **Target state participles**

        b.   PRT   [Voice [v   **(Result)**]]   **Resultant state participles**

I discuss **three classes of denominal instrument verbs** in Greek in the two contexts, addressing the question of whether there is a uniform ontological category **Instrument** uniquely identifying manner verbs with the aspectual characteristics described in Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and many others. A detailed case study based on several diagnostics shows that the answer to this question is negative. There are several refinements needed, which lead to a more refined taxonomy of instrument verbs. The investigation of the three verb classes reveals systematic effects of coercion and polysemy that need to be represented and understood. I propose a decomposition for each verb class focusing specifically on the representation of manners and results, also in connection to the manner-result complementarity hypothesis (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2010). Finally, I ask why the three classes behave in the way they do. I identify two relevant factors: (i) aspect, i.e. the accomplishment vs. achievement distinction, which relates to the requirement for an agent subject, as opposed to the option to also combine with a causer, and distinguishes polysemous from non-polysemous instrument verbs; (ii) whether the result is named by the root and/or whether it can exist independently of the action expressed by the verb, which is relevant for understanding why accomplishment instrument verbs undergo co-ercion or not in contexts forcing result interpretations.