Grammatical (non-)identity in Greek participles
The diachrony of Greek -menos

Laura Grestenberger

University of Vienna
Laura.Grestenberger@univie.ac.at

Theoretical approaches to grammatical (non-)identity in synchrony and diachrony, DGfS 2020, March 4–6, 2020
Introduction: synchronic and diachronic (non-)identity

(1) Synchronic (non-?)identity: perfect/passive participle “syncretism” in German, English, Romance ...

a. Die Livia hat die Schildkröte gewaschen \textit{perfect} \\
b. Die Schildkröte wurde \textit{gewaschen} \textit{eventive/verbal passive} \\
c. Die Schildkröte ist \textit{gewaschen} \textit{adjectival/stative passive}
Introduction: synchronic and diachronic (non-)identity

(1) Synchronic (non-?)identity: perfect/passive participle “syncretism” in German, English, Romance ...
   a. Die Livia hat die Schildkröte *gewaschen* perfect
   b. Die Schildkröte wurde *gewaschen* eventive/verbal passive
   c. Die Schildkröte ist *gewaschen* adjectival/stative passive

▶ ≈ same affix in different contexts
▶ Synchronically “identical” in terms of their synsem-features, selection of functional structure, “attachment site”....?
Introduction: synchronic and diachronic (non-)identity

Today’s puzzle:

   b. Synchronic (non-)identity? Two types of passive readings of MG -menos.

▶ How did AG -menos become MG -menos? What changed? Selectional properties, features of the suffix?
▶ Can these changes shed light on (non-)identity in participles more generally?
Introduction

Outline

- Background on participles and voice morphology
- Syntax of MG “passive” -menos
- Syntax of AG -menos: “middle” properties of the suffix
- Analysis
  - Changes in selectional properties result from reanalysis under “structural ambiguity”—for participles (usually) from stative→ eventive (but also vice versa).
  - Synchronic identity ensues when an additional reading (= more structure) is gained through diachronic reanalysis.
  - Diachronic non-identity is the result of loss of functional structure.
Background: Participles & Voice
Participles

- Participles: deverbal nominalizations that are integrated in a verbal paradigm; nonfinite verbal forms or "adjectival verb forms" (Lowe 2015).
- In a non-lexicalist approach (here: DM), "integrated into a paradigm" is not relevant—what’s important is the notion that participles share "some verbal properties" with finite verb forms.
Participles

- Participles: deverbal nominalizations that are integrated in a verbal paradigm; nonfinite verbal forms or “adjectival verb forms” (Lowe 2015).
  - In a non-lexicalist approach (here: DM), “integrated into a paradigm” is not relevant—what’s important is the notion that participles share “some verbal properties” with finite verb forms.

- Differences in participial syntax result from different attachment sites of the participial suffix.

→ “faint identity” approaches (Wegner 2019a)
Passive participles

**Passives**: “verbal” vs. “adjectival” passives:

(3)  
   a. The letter was written by Mary  (verbal)  
   b. The letter is well-written  (adjectival)
Passive participles

**Passives:** “verbal” vs. “adjectival” passives:

(3)  
   a. The letter was written by Mary  (verbal)  
   b. The letter is well-written  (adjectival)

More fine-grained distinction (Kratzer 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Embick 2004b, etc.):

(4)  
   a. The door was opened  (eventive)  
   b. The door was opened  (resultative; state resulting from an event)  
   c. The door was open  (state; no prior event)

(Embick 2004b; eventive ≈ resultant state in Anagnostopoulou 2003; resultative ≈ target state)
Passive participles

- Cross-linguistic variation in lexification of these options (*open*—*open-ed*); eventive passives often synthetic; syncretism between some or all of these contexts.
Passive participles

- Cross-linguistic variation in lexification of these options (open—open-ed); eventive passives often synthetic; syncretism between some or all of these contexts.
- Modern Greek: Two types of “passive” participles: -menos (-men-o-s) vs. -tos (-t-o-s).

(5) -menos vs. -tos participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>-menos</th>
<th>-tos</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vrazo</td>
<td>vras-menos</td>
<td>vras-tos</td>
<td>‘boiled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psino</td>
<td>psi-menos</td>
<td>psi-tos</td>
<td>‘grilled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anigo</td>
<td>anig-menos</td>
<td>anih-tos</td>
<td>‘opened; open’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klino</td>
<td>klis-menos</td>
<td>klis-tos</td>
<td>‘closed’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MG passive participles


▶ -menos has event implications, -tos does not.
▶ Only -menos is used in periphrastic verbal constructions.
▶ -menos licenses manner adverbs, -tos does not, (6).

(6) To thisavrofilakio itan prosektika anig-meno / *anih-to.
the safe was cautiously open-PTCP / open-PTCP
“The safe was cautiously opened” (Alexiadou et al. 2015, 156, ex. (26a))
-menos can license agent by-phrases, -tos never does.

(7)  
To psari itan tiganis-\textit{meno} / *tigan-\textit{ito} apo tin Maria.
the fish was fry-PTCP / fry-PTCP by the Maria
“The fish was fried by Maria” (Alexiadou et al. 2015, 156, ex. (23a))
**MG passive participles**

Anagnostopoulou 2003, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2008, Alexiadou et al. 2015:

- *-tos* attaches directly to the root, (8).
- *-menos* either selects \( v \) (“target state participles”), (9a) or \( v + \text{Voice} \) (“resultant state participles”), (9b).

(8) **MG *tos*-particiles:** \( \text{anih}-t(os) \) ‘open’

\[
\text{Asp} \\
\sqrt{\text{ANIG}} \quad \text{Asp} \\
\quad \text{Asp} \\
\quad -t-
\]

(9) **MG *menos*-particiles:** \( \text{anig}-men(os) \) ‘opened’

a. \[
\text{Asp} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\sqrt{\text{ANIG}} \quad \text{v} \\
\quad \text{Asp} \\
\quad -men-
\]

b. \[
\text{Asp} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\sqrt{\text{ANIG}} \quad \text{v} \\
\quad -men-
\]
Passive participles: MG -menos

Target vs. resultant state (Kratzer 2001)

- **Target state participles** express reversible states and can be modified by the adverb *akoma* ‘still’, (10a).

- **Resultant state participles** express an irreversible state and are incompatible with *akoma*, (10b) (ex. from Alexiadou et al. 2015, 157).

(10) a. *Ta pedhia ine akoma kri-men*na*
   the children are still hide-PTCP
   “The children are still hidden.”

      the clothes are (still) dry-PTCP
      “The clothes are (still) dried.”
Passive participles: MG -menos

Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2015, 159: “the target state construal of participles is blocked in the presence of Voice in Greek, which forces a resultant state interpretation.”

- -menos-participles that are modified by akoma ‘still’ are incompatible with agent by-phrases, while resultant state participles are fine with them:

(11)  *Ta lastiha itan (* akoma) fusko-mena apo tin Maria*
the tires  were ( still)  inflate-PTCP by  the Maria
“The tires were still inflated by Maria” (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 22)
Additional assumptions

▶ “PTCP” (participial/nominalizing morphology) spells out Asp if there is no verb movement to T (or Agreement with T is blocked).
“PTCP” (participial/nominalizing morphology) spells out Asp if there is no verb movement to T (or Agreement with T is blocked).


“PTCP” = a contextual allomorph of Asp.

- Can realize different features of Asp (e.g., perfective vs. imperfective).
- Can realize Asp in different environments, e.g. adjacent to Voice[±ext.arg.]—difference between AG active and nonactive/middle participles, Grestenberger 2018, To appear.
Voice morphology in AG & MG

Morphological alternation between **active** and **nonactive** on the inflectional endings in specific **canonical contexts**:

(12) Voice alternations in Modern Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Nonactive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td><em>sikon-ome</em> ‘rise’</td>
<td><em>sikon-o</em> ‘raise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td><em>plen-ome</em> ‘wash myself’</td>
<td><em>plen-o</em> ‘wash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfbenefactive</td>
<td><em>promithev-ome</em> ‘supply myself’</td>
<td><em>promithev-o</em> ‘supply’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medio)passive</td>
<td><em>skoton-ome</em> ‘am killed’</td>
<td><em>skoton-o</em> ‘kill’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Voice alternations in Ancient Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Nonactive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td><em>daío-mai</em> ‘burn, blaze’ (itr.)</td>
<td><em>daí-¯ o</em> ‘burn sth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td><em>loúo-mai</em> ‘wash myself’</td>
<td><em>loú-¯ o</em> ‘wash sth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfbenefactive</td>
<td><em>phéro-mai</em> ‘carry (away) for myself’</td>
<td><em>phér-¯ o</em> ‘carry, bear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medio)passive</td>
<td><em>theíno-mai</em> ‘am struck, killed’</td>
<td><em>theín-¯ o</em> ‘kill, strike’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voice morphology in AG & MG

Morphological alternation between active and nonactive on the inflectional endings in specific canonical contexts:

(12) Voice alternations in Modern Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Nonactive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td>sikon-ome ‘rise’</td>
<td>sikon-o ‘raise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>plen-ome ‘wash myself’</td>
<td>plen-o ‘wash’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfbenefactive</td>
<td>promithev-ome ‘supply myself’</td>
<td>promithev-o ‘supply’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medio)passive</td>
<td>skoton-ome ‘am killed’</td>
<td>skoton-o ‘kill’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Voice alternations in Ancient Greek:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Nonactive</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td>daío-mai ‘burn, blaze’ (itr.)</td>
<td>daí-ō ‘burn sth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>louí-o-mai ‘wash myself’</td>
<td>louí-ō ‘wash sth.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfbenefactive</td>
<td>phéro-mai ‘carry (away) for myself’</td>
<td>phé-r-ō ‘carry, bear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Medio)passive</td>
<td>theíno-mai ‘am struck, killed’</td>
<td>theín-ō ‘kill, strike’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voice morphology in AG & MG

- **Voice syncretism** (Embick 1998, 2004a): the same morphological exponent (here: nonactive/NACT) surfaces in different syntactic environments.

Nonalternating verbs: Verbs that either take only active endings (*activa tantum*) or only nonactive/"middle" endings (*media tantum*).

- (14) a. Some AG *activa tantum*: *eimí* ‘am’, *e˜ımi* ‘go’, *rhé¯o* ‘float’, *mímn¯o* ‘stay’, etc.
- b. Some AG *media tantum*: *érkhomai* ‘walk’, *ke˜ımai* ‘lie’, *dúnamai* ‘am able to’, *házomai* ‘am in awe of’, *pétomai* ‘fly’, etc.

- Media tantum: mostly verbs of movement, psych/experiencer verbs, states.
Voice morphology in AG & MG

- **Voice syncretism** (Embick 1998, 2004a): the same morphological exponent (here: nonactive/NACT) surfaces in different syntactic environments.


Nonalternating verbs: Verbs that either take only active endings (*activa tantum*) or only nonactive/“middle” endings (*media tantum*).

(14)  

- Media tantum: mostly verbs of movement, psych/experiencer verbs, states.
Voice morphology in AG & MG

- active vs. nonactive morphology in AG & MG = determined by features of Voice.
Voice morphology in AG & MG

- active vs. nonactive morphology in AG & MG = determined by features of Voice.
- Voice syncretism in AG/MG = a property of VoiceP:

(15) Voice → Voice[NonAct]/_ No DP specifier
(Alexiadou et al. 2015, 102, after Embick 2004a, 150)
Voice morphology in AG & MG

▶ active vs. nonactive morphology in AG & MG = determined by features of Voice.

▶ Voice syncretism in AG/MG = a property of VoiceP:

(15) Voice → Voice[NonAct]/_ No DP specifier
  (Alexiadou et al. 2015, 102, after Embick 2004a, 150)

▶ ACT = elsewhere.
Voice morphology in AG & MG

(16) Distribution of active vs. nonactive morphology (Kallulli 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ext.arg.</th>
<th>-ext.arg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>NONACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ “[-ext.arg.]” = cover term for different contexts without an agent argument, or different “flavors” of Voice (Alexiadou et al. 2015, Schäfer 2017, Kastner 2019, etc.):

▸ Semantic: does Voice introduce an agent $\theta$-role?
▸ Syntactic: is Voice $[\pm D]$?
Voice morphology in AG & MG

(17) Alexiadou et al. 2015, Schäfer 2017: Typology of Voice (modified):

a. Active Voice: \{ \lambda x \lambda e [\text{agent}(e, x)], +D \} (active)

b. Medio-passive Voice: \{ \lambda e \exists x [\text{agent}(e, x)], -D \}
   ▶ “unsaturated Voice”: introduces an agent \( \theta \)-role, but no external argument DP \( \rightarrow \) agent = existentially bound

c. Medio-marked expletive Voice: \{ \emptyset, -D \}
   ▶ Morphologically nonactive anticausatives, various \textit{media tantum}, etc.

d. Passive input Voice: \{ \lambda x \lambda e [\text{agent}(e, x)], -D \}
   ▶ “unsaturated Voice”: introduces an agent \( \theta \)-role, but no external argument DP
   ▶ \( \rightarrow \) input for “high passive” Voice head with an adjoined agent \textit{by}-phrase which saturates the \( \theta \)-role (Bruening 2013, Schäfer 2017)
Ancient Greek - *menos*
Distribution

AG -menos can be formed to any verb that inflects as nonactive in the finite forms, independent of its argument structure/valency → “middle” participle.

(18) AG -menos and finite verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alternating</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>nonactive</th>
<th>-menos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phér-ō</td>
<td>phéro-mai</td>
<td>pheró-menos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘carry’</td>
<td>‘carry for myself’</td>
<td>‘carrying for myself’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aíth-ō</td>
<td>aítho-mai</td>
<td>aithó-menos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘kindle’ (tr.)</td>
<td>‘burn, blaze’ (itr.)</td>
<td>‘burning, blazing’ (itr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media tantum</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>keí-mai</td>
<td>keí-menos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘lie’</td>
<td>‘lying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>érkho-mai</td>
<td>erkhó-menos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘walk’</td>
<td>‘walking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activa tantum</td>
<td>ei-mí</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘am’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AG -menos

► “middle” participle: AG -menos has the same range of functions as the corresponding finite forms (reflexive, selfbenefactive, anticausative), including the various *media tantum* uses.

(19) Intransitive/motion verb (Hom., *Il.* 4.514–16)

```
autàr Akhaioûs ōrse (...) kudíst-ê
but Achaeans.ACC urged most.glorious-NOM.F
Tritogéneia erkho-mén-ê kath’ hómilon
Tritogeneia.NOM.F walk.PRES-PTCP.NACT-NOM.F among crowd
```

“But (as for) the Achaeans; ... the most glorious Tritogeneia urged (them) on, *walking among the crowd* ...”
AG -menos

(20) Transitive, self-benefactive (Hdt., Hist. 1.66.3)

hoi Lakedaimónioi, (...) hoì dè pédãs
the Lakedaemonians.NOM they PTCL chains.ACC
pheró-men-oi epì Tegeētās estrateúonto ...
carry.PRES-PTCP.NACT-NOM.PL on Tegeans.ACC advanced

“The Lakedaemonians, (...) they advanced on the Tegeans (with their army), carrying chains ...”

(21) (Medio)passive (Hdt., Hist. 2.29.2)

tò plōion oíkhetai pheró-men-on hupò
the boat.NOM goes.off carry.PRES-PTCP.NACT-NOM.SG.N by
iskhúos toû rhóou
strength.GEN the.GEN current.GEN

“... the boat gets lost, carried off by the strength of the current.”
**AG -menos and stem-forming morphology**

- AG -menos can combine with all tense/aspect stems: present, aorist, perfect, future.

(22) Nonactive finite forms & menos-participles of tīthemai ‘place/put for myself; am placed’ in AG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Finite Verb</th>
<th>Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>tīthe-mai</td>
<td>tīthē-menos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>(e)thé-mēn</td>
<td>thé-menos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>téthei-mai</td>
<td>téthei-menos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AG -menos and adverbial modification

AG -menos (and its active counterpart) can be modified by manner- and event-oriented adverbs such as eũ ‘well’, pálin ‘again, re-’ and biaióteron ‘violently’:

(23) AG -menos + manner/event adverbs (Thuc., Pelop. War, 3.89.5)

... tên thállassan kai eksapínēs pálin
  the.ACC sea.ACC and suddenly again
epispō-mén-ēn biaióteron tên epíklusin
recoil.PRES-PTCP.NACT-ACC.SG.F violently the.ACC flood.ACC
poieīn
do.PRES-INF

“... the sea, suddenly recoiling again violently, causes the flood.”
AG -menos and agent by-phrases

Passive uses of -menos are compatible with agent by-phrases.

(24) Passive -menos + demoted agent (Hdt., Hist. 1.19.1; George 2005, 24)

\[ tōi \ dē \ duōdekátōi \ étei \ lēíou \]
\[ the.DAT \ PTCL \ twelfth.DAT \ year.DAT \ crop.GEN \]
\[ empipra-mén-ou \quad hupò \ tēs \quad stratiēs \quad ... \]
\[ burn.up.PRES-PTCP.NACT-GEN \ by \quad the.GEN \ army.GEN \]

“In the twelfth year, when the crops were being burned by the army, ...”
Ancient Greek -*menos* forms “middle” (anticausative, reflexive, mediopassive, ...) participles.

... from any stem that is compatible with nonactive finite verbal morphology (voice morphology relevant, not valency).

AG -*menos* can take direct objects, i.e., is compatible with active, transitive syntax.

compatible with intransitive verbs (esp. itr. *media tantum*).

combines with all tense-aspect stems.

(limited use in periphrastic constructions, except for the perfect nonactive participle).
Recap: Modern Greek -menos
Recap: Modern Greek -*menos*

**MG -menos**
- only combines with the perfective stem \(\approx\) ‘perfect passive participle’.
  - formally continues AG perfect/aorist participles after the collapse of the distinction by Early Modern Greek (Holton & Manolessou 2010).
- forms exclusively *passive* participles.
- combines with morphologically active or nonactive verbs (valency relevant, not voice morphology):

(25)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>participle</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agapo</td>
<td>‘love’</td>
<td><em>agapiménos</em></td>
<td>‘loved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deno</td>
<td>‘tie’</td>
<td><em>deménos</em></td>
<td>‘tied’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalo</td>
<td>‘call’</td>
<td><em>kalesménos</em></td>
<td>‘called’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metahirizome</td>
<td>‘use’</td>
<td><em>metahirisménos</em></td>
<td>‘used’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varieme</td>
<td>‘am bored’</td>
<td><em>variestiménos</em></td>
<td>‘bored’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekmetalevome</td>
<td>‘exploit’</td>
<td><em>ekmetalevménos</em></td>
<td>‘exploited’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recap: Modern Greek -\textit{menos}

MG -\textit{menos}

- never takes direct objects.
- does not combine with intransitive verbs
  - Exceptions: Holton et al. 1997, 237: \textit{(ine) perpatimenos} ‘has walked’.
  - anticausative/unaccusative psych verbs (active) form stative
    - \textit{menos}-participles, e.g., \textit{thimono} ‘get angry’: \textit{thimoménos} ‘angry’
      (Alexiadou & Iordăchioaia 2014, 63, Alexiadou 2018, 18).
- is compatible with manner and event-oriented adverbs.
- is compatible with demoted agents (resultant state reading).
- is used in periphrastic (perfect) passive constructions:

\begin{equation}
\text{To vivlio ine gram-meno apo tin Maria} \\
\text{the book is written by the Maria} \\
\text{“The book is written by Maria”}
\end{equation}
Summary

(27) Properties of -menos in AG vs. MG

transitive, ACC-object possible

\begin{tabular}{ll}
AG & ✔ \\
MG & ✗ \\
\end{tabular}
Summary

(27) Properties of -menos in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic passives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

(27) Properties of -menos in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic passives</td>
<td>(✔️)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to finite verb voice morphology</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to valency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive reading</td>
<td>(possible)</td>
<td>(required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by-agent possible</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

active syntax  passive syntax
Summary

(27) Properties of *-menos* in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic passives</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deponents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to finite verb voice morphology</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary

(27) Properties of *-menos* in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic passives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to finite verb voice morphology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to valency</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

(27) Properties of *-menos* in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic passives</td>
<td>(✓)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to finite verb voice morphology</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to valency</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive reading</td>
<td>✓ (possible)</td>
<td>✓ (required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary

(27) Properties of *-menos* in AG vs. MG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive, ACC-object possible</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periphrastic passives</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deponents</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to finite verb voice morphology</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitive to valency</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive reading</td>
<td>✔ (possible)</td>
<td>✔ (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>by</em>-agent possible</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis
Analysis: AG

Properties of AG -\textit{menos} (direct obj., “voice syncretism”, adverbial modification, etc.) suggest selection of (at least) VoiceP + vP:

(28) a. \textit{pher-ó-men-o-s} \hspace{1cm} \text{‘carrying (for one’s own benefit)’}
    \begin{align*}
    \text{carry-V-PTCP.NACT-M-NOM.SG}
    \end{align*}

b. \begin{tikzpicture}
    \node {Asp}
    \child {node {Voice}
        \child {node {v}
            \child {node {Root}
                \child {node {\textsl{\sqrt{PHER}}}}
                \child {node {-\textsl{o}-}}}}
        \child {node {Voice}}}
    \child {node {Asp}
        \child {node {-\textit{men(os)}}}}
\end{tikzpicture}
Crucially, judging from the fact that AG -menos was compatible with all flavors of “Voice[-ext.arg./-D]” (not just mediopassive, but also anticausative, selfbenefactive, etc.), it was not restricted to selecting just “passive input Voice”.
Analysis: AG

- Crucially, judging from the fact that AG -menos was compatible with all flavors of “Voice[-ext.arg./-D]” (not just mediopassive, but also anticausative, selfbenefactive, etc.), it was not restricted to selecting just “passive input Voice”.

- The distribution/realization of nonactive -menos- and active -nt-participles therefore mirrors that of the active/nonactive finite endings:

\[(29) \quad \text{Realization of AG participles (Grestenberger 2018, cf. Embick 2000):} \]

a. Asp ↔ -men(os)/ Voice[-ext.arg] 

b. Asp ↔ -nt-: elsewhere
Analysis: MG *-menos*

- No Voice in target state participles (Anagnostopoulou 2003, etc.), (30a).

(30) MG *menos*-participles: *anig-men(os)* ‘opened’ (modified)

a. Asp
   \[ \sqrt{\text{ANIG}} \ v \ Asp \]
   -men-

b. Asp
   \[ \text{Voice} \ v \ Asp \]
   \{agent, -D\}
   -men-

- Loss of VoiceP = loss of “middle” properties.
  - E.g., the ability to occur in transitive (selfbenefactive, etc.) contexts with an ACC object, etc.

- MG resultant state, (30b): selects Voice\{λxλe[agent(e, x)], -D\} → demoted agent.
This suggests that the starting point for the loss of “middle” uses of -menos were (medio)passive contexts in which the participle could be interpreted as (target state) passive participle

- presumably -menos-participles from AG perfect stems of transitive verbs → very often passive already in Homeric Greek (Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950, Napoli 2017).
- perfect participles in -menos are the only menos-participles used in periphrastic constructions in AG, and predominantly in Early Post-Classical Greek (Bentein 2012).

→ VoiceP failed to be acquired during L1 acquisition in these contexts
→ -menos only compatible with a target state/passive reading.
(Re)analysis

(31) Periphrastic perfect passive ptcp. (Hdt., Hist. 6.98.3)

\[ \text{kai\ en\ khrēsmōi\ ēn\ gegram-mén-on\ peri\ autēs} \]
and in oracle was write.PERF-PTCP.NACT-NOM.N about self.GEN
thus

“And in the oracle thus (it) was written about it(self) (the island Delos): ...”

Contrast with syntactically active, transitive present nonactive participle
\[ \text{graphómenos} \] & aorist nonactive participle \[ \text{grapsámenos} \] in the same work:

(32) \[ \text{bublía\ grapsá-men-os\ pollà} \]
letters.ACC write.AOR-PTCP.NACT-NOM.M many.ACC

“having written many letters” (Hdt., Hist. 3.128.2)
(Re)analysis

Postclassical/Early Byzantine examples:

(33) a.  *A. Thom. 122.11–12* (Bentein 2012, 232)

\[\text{oukh } \text{hēmeĩs } \text{tās } \text{thūras } \text{ēsphalisâmetha } \text{kaî } \text{pōs } \text{nūn}\]

not we the doors.F fastened and how now

\[\text{aneõig-mén-ai } \text{eisîn } \text{kaî } \text{hoi } \text{desmōtai } \text{éndon}\]

open.PERF-PTCP.NACT-NOM.PL.F are and the prisoners inside

“did not we fasten the doors? And how are they now open, and the prisoners within?”


\[\text{memuk-õta } \text{gār } \text{éskhe } \text{tā } \text{ómmata, } \text{kaî } \text{mēdamõs}\]

shut.PERF-PTCP.ACT.PL.N for had the eyes.PL.N and not.at.all

\[\text{anoigó-men-a}\]

open.PRES-PTCP.NACT-PL.N

“he had his eyes closed and not at all opened”
Loss of functional structure: AG -*menos* → MG -*menos*

(34) a. AG “middle” *menos*-ptcp (selects Voice); b. AG/postclassical perfect passive ptcp/MG resultant state ptcp (selects Voice{agent,-D}); c. MG target state ptcp (selects v).
Loss of functional structure: AG -menos → MG -menos

Besides the change in the context for insertion, the aspectual features realized by -menos also changed—suggested by the fact that MG -menos is restricted to the perfective stem:

(35) Postclassical -men(os):
    Asp[pfv] ↔ -men(os)/ Voice{agent,-D} _

On the way to MG, the Voice head was lost in contexts where acquirers had inadequate evidence for positing agentive semantics, resulting in a “split” of Asp[pfv] into a target state participle and a resultant state participle → “faint identity”:

(36) MG -men(os):
    a. Asp[pfv/targ] ↔ -men(os)/ v _
    b. Asp[pfv/res] ↔ -men(os)/ Voice{agent,-D} _
Loss of functional structure

Loss of functional structure


▶ Reanalysis leads to changes in an acquirer’s lexicon, crucially in the features of lexical items (realization of functional heads, contexts for insertion, etc.).
  ▶ Hale 2007, Walkden 2014 ...

▶ Some evidence that English-acquiring children first acquire adjectival/stative passives before they acquire eventive ones (Israel et al. 2000) → suggests that they begin with the lower functional projections before adding the higher ones (cf. also Cournane 2017).
Conclusion

- Diachrony of Greek “passive” participle suffix -menos suggests that synchronic identity (≈ syncretism?) in derivational categories is the result of reanalysis under **acquisitional ambiguity**.

- But this ambiguity must be synchronically available in the input as well—e.g., the target vs. resultant state distinction in MG, or the difference between stative and eventive passives in AG.

- In Minimalism/DM-based approaches, syntactic change = change in the formal features of the lexicon.

- In the case of Greek -menos, the change resulted in a more restricted environment for the suffix([-ext.arg.] to only passive)—but there are also cases in which the environments seemingly expands → lexical entries becomes less restricted.
  - E.g., development of “active” *-nt-, Grestenberger To appear.

- Diachrony of participial forms suggests that this is a regular path of development for adjectival suffixes/“stativizers” → passive participles (Haspelmath 1994).
Thank you!
AG -\textit{menos} and deponents

Deponents are \textbf{noncanonical nonactive} verbs with an agent subject and active (mostly transitive) syntax = \textbf{morposyntactic mismatch}.

(37) Definition of deponency (Grestenberger 2018, 23, 2019):
“\text{In an active–nonactive voice system, a deponent is a verb with an agent subject that appears in a syntactically active context and is morphologically nonactive.}”

▶ “narrow” definition of deponency, subclass of \textit{media tantum}. 
AG -menos and deponents

Deponents are noncanonical nonactive verbs with an agent subject and active (mostly transitive) syntax = morposyntactic mismatch.

(37) Definition of deponency (Grestenberger 2018, 23, 2019):
“In an active–nonactive voice system, a deponent is a verb with an agent subject that appears in a syntactically active context and is morphologically nonactive.”

▶ “narrow” definition of deponency, subclass of media tantum.
▶ AG deponent verbs have transitive menos-participles:

(38) AG deponent dízēmai ‘seek sth.’, ptcp. dizémenos (Hom., Od. 1.261-2)

óikheto gàr kai keīse thoês epi nēòs Odusseûs
went PTCL and there swift.GEN on ship.GEN Ulysses.NOM
phármakon andro-phónon dizé-men-os
poison.ACC man-slaying.ACC seek.PRES-PTCP.NACT-NOM.M

“And then Ulysses went into his swift ship, seeking (some) man-slaying poison.”
MG -$menos$ and deponents

- MG -$menos$-participles of deponents are always passive (unlike in AG).

(39) Non-deponent $grapo$ ‘write’:
   a. To $gramma$ ine $grammeno$
      The letter.NOM is written
      “The letter is written”
   b. To $grammeno$ $gramma$
      The written letter

(40) Deponent $metahirizome$ ‘use’:
   a. To $lexiko$ ine $metahirismeno$
      The dictionary.NOM is used
      “The dictionary is used”
   b. To $metahirismeno$ $lexiko$
      The used dictionary
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