1. Introduction

With a few notable exceptions (mainly in the context of psych verbs), nominalizations of stative predicates have not really received a lot of attention in the literature.

First of all, it is not clear that such nominalizations support argument structure (AS), a point that relates to the general debate concerning the presence of an event argument with stative verbs.

Recall Grimshaw’s (1990) partition of nominals into complex event and result nominals. In her view, nouns such as examination are ambiguous between a complex event reading that supports AS, and a non-event reading that does not.

(1) a. the examination of the patients took a long time  
    b. the examination was on the table

Table 1 summarizes the criteria Grimshaw introduced to distinguish between the two types of nominals in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result nominals</th>
<th>Complex event nominals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-θ-assigner, No obligatory arguments</td>
<td>θ-assigners, Obligatory arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No event reading</td>
<td>Event reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agent-oriented modifiers</td>
<td>Agent-oriented modifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects are possessives</td>
<td>subjects are arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by phrases are non-arguments</td>
<td>by phrases are arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No implicit argument control</td>
<td>Implicit argument control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No aspectual modifiers</td>
<td>Aspeccual modifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifiers like frequent, constant only with plural</td>
<td>Modifiers like frequent, constant appear with singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be plural</td>
<td>Must be singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Grimshaw, AS is associated with the presence of an event structure. For instance, an accomplishment verb like x constructs y is analyzed as an activity in which x engages in construction plus a resulting state in which existence is predicated of y (Grimshaw 1990: 26). This can be represented as in (2):

(2)  

   event  
   /     
  /      
activity state
AS includes an aspectual dimension in that argument relations are jointly determined by the thematic properties of the predicate (i.e. the thematic hierarchy) and by the aspectual properties of the predicate, its event structure. The argument that participates in the first sub-event ('activity') is more prominent than the argument which participates in the second sub-event ('result').

- Grimshaw (1990): if a predicate lacks an event structure, it will also lack AS and will never take any grammatical arguments at all.

Concerning deverbal nouns, Grimshaw proposes that the real distinction responsible for their multiple readings is that between nouns that have an associated event structure (the so-called complex event nominals) and nouns that lack an event structure. Complex event nominals are amenable to an event structure analysis of the type in (2) and hence are capable of licensing arguments.

- Is this the right distinction?


- There is no link between eventivity/complex event structure and AS in nominals (and perhaps in general).

i) AS-nominals need not be eventive and may be stative. Two examples:

- nominals derived from adjectives: as noted in Borer (2003), whenever the adjective in question can occur with arguments, these are directly carried over to the nominal derived from it:

(3)  

a. The court is aware of the problem  
b. Pat is conscious of my presence  
c. Jill is fond of classical music  
d. Robin is ready to leave  
e. Marcia is close to her parents  
f. The party is satisfied with the counting results

(4)  

a. The court’s awareness of the problem  
b. Pat’s consciousness of my presence  
c. Jill’s fondness of classical music  
d. Robin’s readiness to leave  
e. Marcia’s closeness to her parents  
f. The party’s satisfaction with the counting results

- This is also the case for nominals derived from proto-typical stative verbs. In (5), as was the case in (3) and (4), the arguments of the verb are carried over to the nominal derived from it:

(5)  

a. John knows algebra  
b. John’s knowledge of algebra
These nominalizations lack a complex event structure, and this is reflected in the fact that they do not admit the passive construction (as first noted in Chomsky 1970 and references therein), but still they license AS.

(6)  
   a.  *the fact's knowledge    b.  knowledge of that fact
   c.  the book's destruction    d.  the destruction of the book

This restriction is captured by the **Affectedness constraint**, formulated by Anderson (1977):

(7)  
   if the head noun does not express an action which affects, i.e. modifies, the state of the object, the latter cannot occur in the prenominal position.

In more recent literature, this is taken to be a reflex of the event complexity of the nominal, see Doron and Rappaport Hovav (1991) and Sichel (to appear) among others for discussion:

(8)  
   y is an affected argument of V (x, y) iff the event-structure of V contains a sub-eventuality e such that y, but not x, is an argument in e.

*Destroy* is such a predicate type, i.e. one can distinguish between a Cause and a Become part, *Know* is not such a predicate type, as one cannot distinguish between sub-eventualities.

ii) Nominals can be eventive and still lack AS:

Borer (2003): many nominals which denote an event behave like *R*-nominals, and not like *AS*-nominals. Among these are nouns such as *event, metamorphosis, journey, trip*, etc. as illustrated by (9), Borer’s (25):

(9)  
   a.  *The constant race to the mountains
   b.  *The event in three hours
   c.  *John’s deliberate trip to the mountains
   d.  *A race from the station by Mary
   e.  *The metamorphosis of the town in order to win a me

Alexiadou (2009), Harley (2009), Alexiadou & Schäfer (to appear), Roßdeutscher & Kamp (to appear): derived nominals may contain structural eventive layers but still lack AS.

In several cases the presence of event structure is signalled by a verbal head, which can have a number of morphological realizations. In e.g. English there is verbalizing morphology:  

(10)  

\[
 vP \\
 |    \sqrt{P} \\
 -ify \sqrt{} (DP) \\
 -en horr- (theme) \\
 -ize neat- \\
 -ate terror- \\
\]

The attachment of nominalizing morphology takes place outside the verbalizing head, (11).
However, the noun *decoration* does not always have AS.\(^1\)

(12)   a. the decoration of the Christmas tree took a long time (AS + E-reading)
       b. the decoration was expensive (R-reading)
       c. the decor was expensive (R-reading)

   • Assuming then that (a complex) event structure is not a prerequisite for the licensing of AS in nominals, in this talk I will examine the properties of stative nominalizations, focusing on deverbal stative nominals in (mainly) Greek.

Issues:

i) Since there are several classes of stative verbs, do they all give equally good nominalizations?

ii) Do we observe cases of affix rivalry/specialization?

iii) What is the structure of stative verbs and their corresponding nominalizations?

iv) What licenses AS?

2. Classes of stative verbs\(^2\)

2.1 What are stative verbs?

In e.g. Vendler’s (1967) four-way classification of verbs (inner Aspect/Aktionsart), *state* is defined as an eventuality in which there is no perceptible change.\(^3\)

(13) a. activities: Mary danced for an hour.
       b. accomplishments: Mary built three houses in a year.
       c. achievements: The window broke.
       d. states: Mary knows the answer.

---

\(^1\) There is a further argument from interpretation certain modifiers target directly the event introduced by this verbalizer head inside the nominal (Larson 1998), see Roßdeutscher & Kamp (to appear), Alexiadou & Schäfer (to appear):

(i) a. die grobe Messung  b. eilige Lieferung
   the rough measurement  the fast delivery

The observation here is that in these cases the adjective fast and/or rough modifies the event of measuring or delivering respectively even if the nouns themselves have a result/object interpretation. Assuming that event modification makes necessarily reference to the presence of v, this means that both AS and non-AS nouns, as the nominals in (i), contain v.

\(^2\) See Martin (2006), Rothmayr (2009), Spencer & Zaretskaya (2003). In terms of event structure, Dowty (1979) argues stative predicates are the smallest and simplest building-blocks of event structure. For Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2005), stative verbs have a less complex structure than eventive verbs.

\(^3\) Thus the term eventuality includes states and events, whereas the term event only refers to the eventive type of eventuality.
Two kinds of statives:

Bach (1986) argues that two kinds of statives must be distinguished, namely dynamic and static states, see (14), from Bach (1986: 6) and the examples in (15a-b):

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{eventualities} & \text{states} \quad \text{non-states} \\
\hline
\text{dynamic} (a) \text{ static} (b) \text{ processes} (c) \text{ events} & \\
\hline
\text{protracted} (d) \text{ momentaneous} & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

(15)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. sit, stand, lie + LOC
  \item b. be drunk, be in New York, own x, love x, resemble x
  \item c. walk, push a cart
  \item d. build x, walk to Boston
  \item e. recognize, notice
  \item f. die, reach the top
\end{itemize}

In more recent literature, there is some debate concerning the presence of an event argument with the two types of stative verbs. Three main directions have been proposed:

I) All stative verbs lack a Davidsonian argument (Katz 2000).
II) There are two classes of stative verbs, one with and one without a Davidsonian argument, e.g. Kratzer (1995), Maienborn (2005).
III) All stative verbs have a Davidsonian argument, e.g. Parsons (1990), Mittwoch (2005), Martin (2006).

• What kind of criteria can be used to determine this?

Types of modification that distinguish between the two classes of statives under view (II):

a) manner-modification: manner modification is out with ‘static-statives’:

(16)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *Jo owned the house quickly \hspace{1cm} (Borer 2005: 234)
  \item b. Carol sat motionless at the table \hspace{1cm} (Maienborn 2005: 31a)
\end{itemize}

b) degree-modification (Maienborn 2005): in e.g. German the modifier \textit{ein bisschen} ‘a little’ is ambiguous in two ways. It can be interpreted either as a degree modifier or as modifying the temporal extension of an event. Both readings are possible with an eventive verb like \textit{schwitzen} (sweat) as in (17).

(17)  Carol hat gestern ein bisschen geschwitzt. \hspace{1cm} \textit{degree and eventive reading}
Carol has yesterday a little bit sweated.

The time-span reading is only available for verbs that bear a Davidsonian argument, since \textit{ein bisschen} specifies that the event didn’t last very long (18a). In verbs that lack such an argument, ‘static-statives’, a time-span reading is excluded. Therefore either only the degree reading is available, as in (18b), or the modifier is completely ungrammatical, as in (18c).
Both criteria can be used in Greek as well:

(19) a. *O Janis iksere Galika grigora  
   The John knew French quickly
b. I Maria miazi ligo sti giagia tis  
   The Mary-nom resembles a little to grandmother hers
   Mary resembles her grandmother a little

• Statives, however, form an event type:

Modification by *for x-time* distinguishes between *quantity* vs. *non-quantity* eventualities (Borer 2005). This applies to those statives that lack a Davidsonian argument as well:

(20) a. Kim loved Robin for three years
b. #Kim loved Robin in three months

The criterion works for Greek as well:

(21) a. I Maria agapuse to Jani ja tria hronia  
   Mary loved the John for three years
b. #I Maria agapise to Jani se tris mines  
   Mary loved the John in three months

Grimshaw (1990): aspectual modification signals complex event structure.

Borer (2005): Well-formedness of *for x-time* makes reference to *non-quantity*, equally possible with activities and statives.

• For Borer, *for x-time* is an operator on outer Aspect, while *in x-time* modifies inner Aspect; *in x-time* makes reference to quantity only.

• The domain of licensing of *for-x time* is aspectually distinct from the output of events.

In what follows, I will examine the nominalizations of *two major classes of stative verbs* in Greek. As in Borer’s work, I will take

a) the licensing of *for x-time* as evidence that there is event structure present in stative nominalizations (see also Markantonatou 1992).

b) the absence of manner modification/event reading for ‘a little’ to be a signal of the presence of the eventuality type state.

**Two classes:**

I. Verbs that are ambiguous between a stative and an eventive reading (2.2)
II. Verbs that are unambiguously stative (2.3)
2.2 Verbs ambiguous between a stative and an eventive reading

- All these verbs fail the manner modification test and only have (if at all) the degree reading of ‘a little’ in their stative use

i) Obstruct verbs (*surround, cover, decorate, fill, block;*) Kratzer (2000) notes that in case of the eventive variant, the verb expresses a causal relation between the event and the resultant state. The stative variant is quite similar, here the causal relation holds between two states:

(22) a. O stratos perikiklose to horio eventive
The army surrounded the village
b. To tihos perikloni to horio stative
The wall surrounds the village

(ii) Object-experiencer verbs assigning accusative case (*e.g. anisiho ‘worry’, provlimatizo ‘puzzle’, enohlo ‘bother’, diaskedazo ‘amuse’, fovizo ‘frighten’, endiafero ‘interest’;*) (Anagnostopoulou 1999). These qualify as transitive in that they show evidence of assignment of accusative case. These are ambiguous between an eventive (agentive or non-agentive) and a stative reading (Landau 2010, Arad 1998 and references therein):

(23) a. O Janis enohlise ti Maria epitides/ athela tu eventive
John bothered Maggie on purpose/unintentionally.
b. I sokolota enohli ti Maria stative
The chocolate bothers Mary.

The stative reading holds as long as the perception trigger is exposed to the experiencer (Arad 1998). Stative verbs of this class qualify as unaccusative, according to Landau (2010).

Note that several verbs of this class have subject experiencer intransitive counterparts that are stative (Pesetsky 1995, Reinhart 2002, Landau 2010; Markantonatou 1992 for Greek); these fall into two groups:

Group I surfaces with active morphology (24a) and group II with non-active morphology (24b):

(24) a. I Maria aidiase me ti sokolata
The Mary disgust-3sg with chocolate
Mary is disgusted with chocolate
b. I Maria endiaferete ja ti musiki
The Mary- nom interest-non-active 3sg for the music
Mary is interested in music

What corresponds to the causer of the transitive verb surfaces in a PP, often distinct from the one found with Greek anticausatives/passives (*ja ‘for’* (24b) vs. *apo ‘from’/me ‘with’* in anticausatives/passives), but sometimes similar to that, (24a).

The morphological pattern is generally found with the anticausative alternation (see Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2006 for details). I take it thus that the verbs in (24) behave as unaccusatives.\(^4\)

\(^4\) There is an issue as to whether these verbs are unaccusative or unergative. In view of the fact that they can form an adjectival participle, I consider them unaccusative:

(i) O Janis ine enohlimenos me ti musiki
2.3 Non-ambiguous stative verbs

- All these classes fail the manner modification test and only have (if at all) the degree reading of ‘a little’

i) Measure verbs: are verbs that express the degree of a certain property such as length or duration.

(25) To vivlio kostizi 5 euro
the book costs 5 Euros

ii) Verbs of existence/presence and absence:

(26) iparhun pori
exist-3pl resources
Resources exist

iii) Verbs of modal state: mostly these have the form copula + noun but there are a few verbs of modal state.

(27) To sholio hriazete kalus daskalus
the school needs good teachers

iv) Verbs of spatial configuration (verbs which take PP complements):

(28) I Galia sinorevi me ti Germania
France borders with Germany


(29) a. o Janis agapai ti Maria
John-nom loves the-Mary-acc
John loves Mary

Note that several subject experiencer verbs in Greek e.g. *fear* bear non-active morphology, but license accusative Case and have causative counterparts that are object experiencer verbs.

(29) b. o Petros fovate tis kategides
the-Peter-nom fears-non active-3sg the storms
Peter is afraid of storms

c. I kategides fovizun ton Petro
the storms frighten-3PL the Peter-acc
Storms frighten Peter

and b) experiencer predicates with a dative/PP experiencer e.g. *aresi* ‘like’, *ftei* ‘bothers/matters’ that qualify as unaccusatives (Anagnostopoulou 1999):

John is bothered with the music
3. Nominalization of statives

3.1 A cross-linguistic perspective

For Catalan: stative psych verbs give productive nominalizations (Picallo 1991: 310):

(31) el temor d’en Juan als terratrémols
    the fear of John to earthquakes

The preposition that precedes the theme is the same one as in the case of the verbal counterpart.

For Russian: There are very few genuine stative verbs which have nominalizations. There are two main classes of exceptions to this generalization, verbs of configuration/existence (32) and psychological states, see Spencer & Zaretskaya (2003).

(32) Otsutstvie sredstv bol’še vsego nas bespokoit
    absence of resources more of all us worries
    ‘What worries us most is the absence of resources’

For Polish: stative psych verbs give productive nominalizations (Rozwadowska 1997).

(33) szacunek Piotra do Maii była czytelna
    respect Peter-gen for Mary was very clear
    ‘Peter’s respect for Mary was very clear’.

NB. -nie nominalizations of psych verbs are possible but denote ‘transitions’.

For Spanish: Verbs of existence and measurement give productive nominalizations. The former seem to be selecting the suffix -encia, see Jaque (2010).

3.2 Stative nominalizations in Greek

Kolliakou (1995): m- affixation is a productive process to build nouns out of verbs, but it is sensitive to the type of verbal predicate it attaches to. It namely requires a durative verb:

- m- does not combine with stative predicates; activities are compatible with -m-
- Accomplishments are also compatible with –m- and receive a durative/atelic interpretation:

(34) a. agapo (love-1sg) b. pistevo (believe-1sg)
    c. *agapima (loving) d. *pistepsimo (believing)
(35) a. perpatao walk-1sg
    b. to perpati-m-a the walking
    c. htizo ena spiti build-1sg a house
    d. to htisimo enos spitiu the building of a house
but: there are several nominalization of **psych stative** verbs that take -m-:

(36) sevome seva-sm-os thavmazo thavmazm-os
    respect-1sg respect-ms admire-1sg admiration

- -m-: contrary to what has been assumed so far it seems to be selecting for **non-quantity** (outer-aspect).

I. Nominalizations derived from ambiguous stative/eventive verbs

i) **Obstruct verbs**: only the eventive reading can survive in the nominalization:

(37) to perikiklo ma tu horiu (apo to strat 0/*apo ton tiho) only eventive
    the surrounding the village-gen (by the army/by the wall)

ii) **Object experiencer verbs**: eventive nominalizations possible.

(38) a. i tapinosi tis Marias (apo to Jani) eventive (agentive)
    the humiliation the Mary-gen by John

    **stative nominals are derived from the stative class** see (24), similar to (42); aspectual modification for-x-time licit:

    b. i aidia tis Marias ja ti sokolota epi tosa hronia
    Mary’s disgust for chocolate for so many years

    c. to endiaferon tu Jani ja ta fita epi dekaeties
    John’s interest in plants for decades

II. Non-ambiguous stative verbs

i) **Measure verbs**: nominal form possible; no aspectual modification:

(39) to kostos tu vivliu
    the cost the book-gen
    The book’s cost

ii) **Verbs of existence/presence and absence**: nominalizations possible; aspectual for-x-time modification licit:

(40) i iparksi poron epi tosa hronia
    the existence resources-gen for many years
    The existence of resources for many years

iii) **Verbs of modal state**: these verbs do not give nominalizations.

iv) **Verbs of spatial configuration (PP complements)**: nominal form possible; no aspectual
modification.

(41) ta sinora tis Germanis me ti Gallia
the borders of Germany with France

v) *Psych verbs*: productive; *for x-time* aspectual modifiers licit:

a) Subject experiencer verbs seem to be able to form nominalizations productively:

(42) i agapi tis Marias ja to Jani epi tosa hronia
the love the-Mary-gen for John for many years
Mary’s love for John for so many years

Productive nominalizations of verbs that bear non-active morphology:

(43) a. o fovos tu Jani ja tis kategides epi tosa hronia
the fear the John-gen for storms for many years
John’s fear of storms for many years

b. i lipi tis Marias ja ta gegonota epi mia vdomada
the sadness the Mary-gen for the events for one week
Mary’s sadness because of the events for one week

c) ‘Object-dative experiencer’ class: these verbs do not seem to be able to nominalize productively. To the extent that a nominal form is available, it is only tenuously related to the verbal form:

(44) O Jianis eksefrase tin areskia tu
The John expressed the satisfaction his
John expressed his satisfaction (Markantonatou 1992: 90)

Similar observations hold for Catalan (Picallo 1991).

- **Generalization concerning Greek psych-verbs** (Markantonatou 1992: 89): state AS nominals appear to have the experiencer argument encoded by the genitive.6

---

5 It is a general observation that nominalizations can only be related to the non-causative forms of the predicates that distinguish between causative and non-causative readings (cf. Chomsky 1970, Grimshaw 1990, Pesetsky 1995:72, Markantonatou 1992: 90f.). Note here that Grimshaw (1990) argued that causative nominalizations are blocked as the corresponding verbs lack an external argument. According to her, the kind of nominalizations that are excluded are of the non-agentive process ones. Result nominals and agentive process nominalizations are in:

(i) a. the humiliation of the bystanders
b. John’s/*the event’s humiliation of Mary

6 Knowledge here seems to be the exception, gnosi tis algevras ‘knowledge of algebra’. But importantly in Greek the counterpart of (i) does not give a nominalization, suggesting that Greek ignorizo is not the counterpart of know.

(i) O Janis kseri algevra
John knows algebra
Conclusions:

- Productive stative nominalizations:
  i) stative object experiencer verbs (unaccusatives)
  ii) subject experiencer verbs
  iii) verbs of existence (unaccusative), and
  iv) verbs of measurement
  v) verbs of spatial configuration

- (i-iii) all pass the aspectual criterion. (iv-v) not.
- The type stative should be included in the context of AS licencing.

3.3 The morphology of stative nominalizations in Greek

If we look at the form of the pure stative nominals, at first sight, these seem to be bare, i.e. they do not contain a particular nominalization affix. (45) shows that if the corresponding verb contains verbalizing morphology (marked with bold), the nominalization lacks such a morphology:

(45)  
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mis-o</td>
<td>mis-os</td>
<td>pist-ev-o</td>
<td>pist-i</td>
<td>agap-a-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hate-1sg</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>believe-1sg</td>
<td>belief</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gnor-iz-o</td>
<td>gnos-i</td>
<td>aidi-az-o</td>
<td>aidi-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>know</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>disgust</td>
<td>disgust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This pattern is relatively systematic across classes of stative verbs:

Second, in cases where the verb contains non-active morphology, the noun is bare:

(46)  
|  | endiafer-om-e | endiafer-on |
|  | am interested | interest-neut |
|  | lip-ame | lip-i |
|  | am sorry non-active | grief-fem |
|  | fov-ame | fov-os |
|  | am afraid-non-active | fear-masc |

But the picture is a bit more complicated than that:

(47)  
|  | aidi-az-o | aidi-a | aidi-as-m-a/-os |
|  | disgust-1sg | disgust-fem | disgust-m-neut/ms |
|  | eknevr-iz-ome | eknevr-iz-mos sevome | sevas sevas-m-os |
|  | irritate-non-active | irritation-ms respect-nonactive respect-neut respect-ms |

Still (47) is consistent with the generalization proposed in Alexiadou (2009) that -m-surfaces outside the verbalizing morphology.

- When doublets exist, -m- and non -m- forms are not identical; -m- forms seem to be eventive:
The above picture suggests that we find affix rivalry to some degree.

4. The syntax of stative verbs

Assumption 1: stative is an event type

Assumption 2: a characterization of statives must be possible in terms of syntactic structure (Hale & Keyser 2002, Borer 2005)

Assumption 3: the external argument of a stative verb is a holder (Kratzer 1996)

Kratzer (1996): stative verbs contain only a single (structural) argument which is the holder of the state:

(49) Mittie owns the dog

In (49) the verb is stative and the external argument denotes, according to Kratzer, the person who is the holder of the state consisting in owning the dog.

Under the assumption that external arguments are introduced by ‘light’ heads, to compute the meaning of (49), we need a Voice head adding the external argument, which is different from that introducing the argument of an eventive predicate. In Kratzer's system one cannot combine the holder function with the denotation of an action predicate or the agent function with the denotation of a stative predicate. This explains for Kratzer why there is a connection between the Aktionsart of a verb and the thematic role of its external argument. Thus, subjects of stative verbs can be understood as possessors, experiencers and not as true Causers.

Kratzer proposes that the external argument of stative verbs is introduced at the level of Voice\textsubscript{stative}.

(50) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Voice}' \\
\text{Voice}_{\text{stative}} \\
vP
\end{array}
\]

- Which stative verbs contain Voice?
- Subject experiencer verbs (know, love, hate) are the ones can be represented on the basis of (50) above, i.e. they contain Voice\textsubscript{stative}. These are transitive and assign accusative.
- The other stative verbs lack Voice (e.g. stative object accusative, dative experiencer verbs, and verbs of existence); these are all unaccusative, see Landau (2010) on experiencers.

Characterization of statives in terms of syntax:

With respect to the stativity effect, this must come from the lower vP, see Kratzer’s comments above.

\footnote{But see Arad (1998) and Landau (2010) for arguments that subject experiencers are mental locations, and thus should receive an analysis as in (53).}
• Stativity is a syntactic relation, characterized as lack of change.

Hale & Keyser (2002): stativity is the result of an inclusion of a PP relation, namely a PP of central coincidence, which is responsible for the lack of change interpretation.

The PP introduces an/the second argument (in the case of transitives), in a manner similar to non-core activity transitive verbs, Marantz (2005).  

(51)  
\[
\text{Voice}'
\]
\[
\text{Voice}_{\text{stative}} \rightarrow \text{vP}
\]
\[
v \rightarrow \text{PP}
\]
\[
\sqrt{\text{respect}} \rightarrow v \rightarrow P \text{ the truth}
\]

Evidence for v in Greek: at least some stative verbs in Greek have a morpho-syntax similar to that of eventive verbs.

(52)  
\[
\text{Voice}'
\]
\[
\text{Voice}_{\text{stative}} \rightarrow \text{vP}
\]
\[
az- \rightarrow \sqrt{\text{AIDI ‘disgust’}}
\]

A PP is generally assumed to be present with the verbs of existence, see Alexiadou & Schäfer (2010) for recent discussion.

(53)  
\[
[v \text{ [PP theme in } \text{place}]]
\]

(53) is involved in the case of unaccusative statives, i.e. those stative verbs that lack Voice.

(54)  
\[
\text{vP}
\]
\[
v \rightarrow \text{PP}
\]

\[
\sqrt{v} \rightarrow \sqrt{v}
\]

**NB on experiencer verbs that bear non-active morphology:**

Two cases:

a) verbs that assign accusative, as in (55); since they are transitive, we can assume that they include Voice\textsubscript{stative}. As to the locus of the morphology, two options are available to us: i) root-encoded (Embick 2000) or ii) Voice-encoded, which still preserves the availability of licensing accusative.

8 For Hale & Keyser, categories that are inherently stative in this sense are: i) the heads that define the external projection of A; ii) certain prepositions (e.g. in) and iii) the copula. Measure verbs are like copulas (note they cannot passivize and the measure phrase is not a referential argument).

(i)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad *\text{One ton is weighed by that building.} \\
b. & \quad *\text{What didn’t John say that the fish weigh <what>?}
\end{align*}
(55) o Petros foveate tis kategides
Peter-nom fears-nonactive the storms

(55) is traditionally classified as a deponent verb. The counterpart of (55) in e.g. German is inherently reflexive; some of these verbs in Greek also have a PP complement:

(56) a. Er fürchtet sich vor dem Sturm
He fears reflexive from the storm
b. *Er fürchtet mich vor dem Sturm
He fears me from the storm

Could one hypothesize that they are brought about by a general mechanism also involved in inherent and naturally reflexives, in a sense as comparable to middles Kemmer (1993), Kaufmann (2001), Alexiadou & Doron (2010)? The latter are also formed with non-active morphology:

(57) O Janis plithike
John washed-non-active-3sg

b) Verbs that are intransitive (= unaccusative); I assume here that these contain an expletive Voice_{stative}, Schäfer (2008):

(58) O Janis endiaferete ja ti musiki
The-John-nom interest-non-active for music
John is interested in music

5. The syntax of stative nominalizations

Recall: the licensing of for x-time as evidence that there is event structure present in the stative nominalization.

Claims: event type (state) = v + PP (+ Voice_{stative})

\[\text{for x-time} = \text{Outer Aspect}\]

(59) \[
\text{nP} \\
\text{ AspectP (for x-time) } \\
\text{ -m- } \\
\text{ ∅ } \\
\text{ Voice’ } \\
\text{ Voice}_{stative} \\
\text{ vP } \\
\text{ v } \\
\text{ PP } \\
\sqrt{\text{respect}} v \text{ for the truth }
\]

Recall: state AS nominals appear to have the experiencer argument encoded by the genitive experiencer argument introduced in Voice_{stative} in the case of transitive statives.
a. o sevasmos tu Jani ja tus gonis tu
   the respect the John for the parents his
b. I agapi tis Marias ja to Jani
   the love the Mary-gen for John

Ban on double genitives:

- In Greek, but also in other languages, only one genitive is allowed within the DP.
- When a second argument is realized, this surfaces as a PP, as is the case in nominalization. In this case, the central coincidence preposition is overtly realized.
- In the case of change of state verbs, nominalization = passive (of sorts), Grimshaw (1990), Alexiadou (2001).
- State AS nominalizations cannot be passive; no psych stative passives in general, Landau (2010). In this particular case, this would involve a kind of pseudo-passive, since the theme is an argument of the PP, an option in general not available in Greek.
- The highest argument is realized as genitive, Marantz (1991).

Why does the v morphology go (sometimes)?

- If the presence of morphology relates to the presence of v, then the absence of morphology should signal absence of v.

But: are these nominalizations a kind of antipassive formation?

On some analyses, antipassive is derived from the transitive verb through an affixation process, sometimes, but not always, truncating a transitivizing morpheme of the transitive verb. The AP affix can be zero with some verb stems (Relational Grammar; Fortescue 1984).

Verbs of existence (and other unaccusatives): the single argument surfaces with genitive:

Verbs of existence (and other unaccusatives): the single argument surfaces with genitive:

nP: responsible for the assignment of inflectional class.

- How about further layers?

As far as I can tell, stative nominalizations do not pluralize (a properties shared with activities); hence NumberP should be excluded.
6. Conclusions

Two important observations:

**Observation I**: across languages we find productive stative nominalizations of certain class of experiencer verbs, and verbs of existence

**Observation II**: state AS nominals appear to have the experiencer argument encoded by the genitive in Greek

- What is special about these two classes?

All stative verbs that form AS nominals lack a Davidsonian argument (manner modification).

- The verbs that do not form AS nominals share one important property, namely they cannot be characterized as non-quantity (or quantity), i.e. are not event types(?)

From a structural perspective, these could be simply nominalizations of a PP or PredP (in the terminology of Roy to appear).

- state = an event type, non-quantity(?)
- states vs. non-states = distinguished on the basis of manner modification, presence vs. absence of Davidsonian argument
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