

LEXICAL VERSUS TRANSFORMATIONAL PASSIVES IN MODERN GREEK<sup>1</sup>

CHRYSSOULA LASCARATOU, IRENE PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON

In what follows, Modern Greek (M.G.) passives are analysed to provide some additional empirical evidence in support of Wasow's (1977) claim that the postulation of both transformational and lexical rules within EST is justified by the distinct functions fulfilled by these two rule types<sup>2</sup>. Thus, on the basis of Wasow's distinguishing criteria, it will be argued that M.G. *be*-passives are adjectival and should, therefore, be lexically derived, whereas non-*be*-passives require a transformational derivation.

Table 1 gives the first person singular of the M.G. verb paradigm in both the active and passive voice, as it appears in grammar books.

Table 1  
The verb *γράφω* (write) in the active and passive

ASPECT	IMPERFECTIVE		PERFECTIVE		PERFECT	
	Non-Past	Past	Non-Past	Past	Non-Past	Past
ACTIVE	γράφω	έγραφα	γράφω	έγραψα	έχω γράψει	ίχα γράψει
PASSIVE	γράφομαι	γράφόμουν	γράφτώ	γράφτικα	{ έχω γραφτί ίμε γραμένος }	{ ίχα γραφτί ίμουν γραμένος }

The inflectional endings of the forms in the second line of this table are not unique to passives; they can also be found in the so-called deponent middle verbs, which can be transitive with an active meaning. E.g.,

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE) which was held in Athens from the 8th to the 11th of September 1982.

<sup>2</sup> On the controversy between lexical vs transformational passives see Freidin (1975), Bresnan (1976) and Chomsky (1981:117-127). On M.G. passives see Tzartanos (1936), Warburton (1975), Lascaratou and Philippaki-Warburton (1981) and references cited there.

- (1) *eryázome.*  
work-I  
(I work.)
- (2) *θimúme to jáni.*  
remember-I the-acc. John-acc.  
(I remember John.)

Furthermore, the passive forms of active transitive verbs may be used with a reflexive or reciprocal meaning. E.g.,

- (3) *dínome.*  
dress-I myself  
(I dress myself.)
- (4) *ayapjúnde.*  
love-they each other  
(They love each other.)

We will not deal here with the semantic or structural connections between the passive and the middle voice. We will, instead, restrict our discussion to the passive forms of those verbs which exhibit both an active transitive and a passive intransitive paradigm, such as the verb *γράφω* given above.

The first thing to note, when one compares the active with the passive sets of forms, is that there is no one-to-one parallelism between them. Specifically, although the passive paradigm exhibits the same oppositions of tense and aspect as those found in the active, the passive has two forms for the perfect and pluperfect, while the active has only one form for each of these tenses. Thus, in exact agreement with the *έχο* (*have*) perfect of the active, the passive has a form consisting of the auxiliary *έχο* plus an infinitival form based on the perfective aspect stem. In addition to this perfect form, the passive has an *ίμε* (*be*) plus perfect participle form. The two perfects, which we will refer to as the *have*- and the *be*- passives, are presented in the grammar books as alternative expressions of the same set of features inside the inflectional paradigm.

The question which we would like to examine is the character of the relation between *be*- and *have*- passives. In other words, are these two types of perfect passive two alternants of the same derivational process, or are they the products of two different processes?

Our discussion will be carried out in the light of the theoretical distinction between syntactic (transformational) and lexical passives, which was first made by Wasow (1977) and which has been adopted by Chomsky (1981).

The most obvious answer to our question about the relationship between *be*- and *have*- passives is that the latter constitute the perfect of the syntactic passive, which includes all the other tenses, while *be*-passives are periphrases using a lexically derived participle and they are not part of this inflectional paradigm. In other words, *be*-passives, on the one hand, are the outcome of a lexical derivation, whereas

*have*-passives, together with all the other non-*be*-passives, are the product of a syntactic derivation.

If we can show this to be the case, we will have presented further evidence from yet another language to support, and thus reinforce, the theoretical distinction of syntactic vs lexical passives, which has been shown to be valid in English (Wasow (1977), Chomsky (1981)) and Russian (Babby & Brecht (1975)), among others.

As Triantafyllidis (1941:374) has pointed out, the so-called passive participles involved in the *be*-forms of the perfect behave very much like adjectives. The adjectival character of these participles is revealed in several ways. Thus, like adjectives,

(i) they can occur in prenominal position to modify nouns; e.g.,

(5)	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{éna} \\ \text{a-nom.} \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{to} \\ \text{the-nom.} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ksexazméno} \\ \text{forgotten-nom.} \\ \text{aniyméno} \\ \text{opened-nom.} \\ \\ \\ \text{aδjazméno} \\ \text{emptied-nom.} \\ \text{zoγrafizméno} \\ \text{painted-nom.} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{bukáli} \\ \text{bottle-nom.} \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{sto} \\ \text{to-the-acc.} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tu} \\ \text{the-gen.} \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{trapézi.} \\ \text{table-acc.} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{krasjú} \\ \text{wine-gen.} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\}$
	$\left( \begin{array}{l} \{ A \\ \text{The} \} \end{array} \right)$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{forgotten} \\ \text{opened} \\ \text{emptied} \\ \text{painted} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left( \text{wine-bottle was on the table.} \right)$		

(ii) they may be used in the comparative and superlative degree; e.g.,

- (6) a. o jánis íne pjo kurazménos apó ména.  
the- John is more tired than me-acc.  
nom. nom. nom.
- (John is more tired than me.)
- b. o jánis íne o pjo δisarestiménos ap ólus.  
the- John- is the- most displeased- of all-acc.  
nom. nom. nom. nom.
- (John is the most displeased of all.)

(iii) they can be conjoined with true adjectives; e.g.,

- (7) a. o andréas íne árostos ke eknevrizménos.  
the- Andrew- is ill- and upset-nom.  
nom. nom. nom.
- (Andrew is ill and upset.)

- b. o andréas ine pjo eknevrizménos pará árostos.  
 the- Andrew- is more upset-nom. than ill-nom.  
 nom. nom.

(Andrew is more upset than ill.)

(iv) they can occur as AP complements with such verbs as *fénome* (appear), *mjázo* (look), *díxno* (seem), *akúyome* (sound) and *paraméno* (remain); e.g.,

(8)	o the-nom.	mixális Michael-nom.	fénete appears	éksipnos. intelligent-nom.											
			mjázi looks	evjenikós. polite-nom.											
			díxni seems	apoyoitvménos. disappointed-nom.											
			akújete sounds	enθusiasménos. delighted-nom.											
			paraméni remains	disarestiménos. displeased-nom.											
<table border="0" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="font-size: 3em; vertical-align: middle;">(</td> <td style="padding: 0 10px;">Michael</td> <td style="font-size: 3em; vertical-align: middle;">)</td> </tr> </table>		(	Michael	)	<table border="0" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">appears</td> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">intelligent.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">looks</td> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">polite.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">seems</td> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">disappointed.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">sounds</td> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">delighted.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">remains</td> <td style="padding: 0 5px;">displeased.</td> </tr> </table>	appears	intelligent.	looks	polite.	seems	disappointed.	sounds	delighted.	remains	displeased.
(	Michael	)													
appears	intelligent.														
looks	polite.														
seems	disappointed.														
sounds	delighted.														
remains	displeased.														

The evidence provided by the (5) to (8) examples clearly shows that M.G. passive participles must be analysed as adjectives. According to Wasow's analysis, these participles can only be lexically derived, since Criterion 2 does not allow transformations to change grammatical categories.

Further evidence for considering passive participles as adjectives is provided by Tzartanos (1946:250), who notes that the NP denoting the agent is often prefixed to the passive, only if the latter occurs in the form of the passive participle. Compare, for example:

- (9) a. iljomavrizménos (suntanned)  
 but not b. \*iliomavrízo (suntan-I)  
 c. \*iliomavrízome (get-I suntanned)
- (10) a. astrapokaménos (burnt by lightning)  
 but not b. \*astrapokéyo (burn-I by lightning)  
 c. \*astrapokéyome (get-I burnt by lightning)

- (11) a. sarakofayoméno(s) (eaten up by wood-worm)  
 but not b. \*sarakotróyo (eat-I up by wood-worm)  
 c. \*sarakotróyome (get-I eaten up by wood-worm)

The passive participles of the above examples exhibit a morphological complexity which does not occur in either the active verb forms or the rest of the passive paradigm. According to Wasow, such morphologically complex participles must be lexically derived, since a syntactic derivation would presuppose the existence of a corresponding active verb form.

Some interesting evidence in support of our argument that M.G. passive participles should be lexically derived is provided by the distribution of the prefix *pára-*, meaning 'in excess'.

This prefix is freely attached to active verbs. E.g.,

- (12) a. *paratrávikse* aftí i istoría.  
 lasted-it too long this-nom. the-nom. affair-nom.  
 (This affair has lasted too long.)  
 b. ta *paralés*.  
 them-acc. say-you in excess  
 (You exaggerate.)

In the passive, *pára-* gets freely prefixed to monolectic forms and to *have-* forms. E.g.,

- (13) a. (Monolectic form) *paraeknevrízese* xorís lóyo.  
 over-get-you upset without reason-acc.  
 (You get too upset for no reason.)  
 b. (*Have* prefixed) *paraéxis* eknevrísti xorís lóyo.  
 over-have-you got upset without reason-acc.  
 (You have got too upset for no reason.)  
 c. (Infinitival prefixed) *éxis paraeknevrísti* xorís lóyo.  
 have-you over-got upset without reason-acc.  
 (You have got too upset for no reason.)
- (14) a. (Monolectic form) *paraenθusiástike* me ta kalá néa.  
 over-got-(s)he with the-acc. good-acc. news-acc.  
 delighted  
 ((S)he got too delighted with the good news.)  
 b. (*Have* prefixed) *paraéxi* enθusiastí me ta kalá néa.  
 over-has- got de- with the- good- news-  
 (s)he lighted acc. acc. acc.  
 ((S)he has got too delighted with the good news.)  
 c. (Infinitival prefixed) *éxi paraenθusiastí* me ta kalá néa.  
 has-(s)he over-got with the- good- news-  
 delighted acc. acc. acc.  
 ((S)he has got too delighted with the good news.)

As we can see, in the case of *have-* passives the prefix *pára-* gets attached to either

of the two verbal elements (small *v* in Chomsky's terminology), i.e. the auxiliary *éxo* or the infinitival, which belongs to the passive inflectional paradigm.

With *be*-passives, however, *pára-* shows a strong preference to getting prefixed to the *be-* form rather than the passive participle. Thus, we can say,

- (15) a. (*be* prefixed) *paraíse* eknevrizméni.  
over-are-you upset  
(You are too upset.)  
but not b. \*(Participle prefixed) *íse paraeknevrizméni.*  
are-you over-upset

Equally, we can say

- (16) a. (*be* prefixed) *paraíne* enθusiasménos.  
over-is-(s)he delighted  
((S)he is too delighted.)  
but not b. \*(Participle prefixed) *íne paraenθusiasménos.*  
is-(s)he over-delighted

In some cases, however, *pára-* may be prefixed to either the *be* form or the participle. E.g.,

- (17) a. *paraíne* fortoméno*s* / *íne* parafortoméno*s*.  
(He is over-loaded.)  
b. *paraíne* zalizméni / *íne* parazalizméni.  
(She is too dizzy.)  
c. *paraíne* vrazméno / *íne* paravrazméno.  
(It is over-boiled.)

Given that *pára-* does not get prefixed to true adjectives, it follows that the strong preference of this prefix for getting attached to the *be* element rather than the passive participle lends additional support to the claim that passive participles are adjectives. The following examples show that *pára-* treats participles like adjectives. Compare,

- (18) a. *paraíne* psilós.  
over-is-he tall-nom.  
(He is too tall.)  
but not b. \**íne* parapsilós.  
is-he over-tall-nom.
- (19) a. *paraíse* evjenikós.  
over-are-you polite-nom.  
(You are too polite.)  
but not b. \**íse* paraevjenikós.  
are-you over-polite-nom.
- (20) a. *paraíne* apoγoitvéméno*s*.  
over-is-he disappointed-nom.  
(He is too disappointed.)

- but not b. \*ine paraapoyotevménos.  
is-he over-disappointed-nom.
- (21) a. paráine disarestiméni  
over-is-she displeased-nom.  
(She is too displeased.)
- but not b. \*ine paradisarestiméni.  
is-she over-displeased

What has been said about the distribution of *pára-* shows that this prefix differentiates verbs from adjectives. It can accompany the former but not the latter, and in this way it dissociates passive participles from the verbs and associates them with the adjectives.

Further evidence for the lexical (adjectival) character of M.G. passive participles is provided by the fact that manner adverbials ending in the typical (-a) suffix of adverbials can be formed from the neuter gender of passive participles. For example,

- (22) i pavlína ton kítakse  
the-Pauline- him-acc. looked-she  
nom. nom.
- |                           |   |                     |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------|
| taraýména.                | } | in an upset manner. |
| apelpizména.              |   |                     |
| apoyotevména.             |   |                     |
| in a disappointed manner. |   |                     |
- |                                 |              |           |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-----------|
| ( Pauline looked at him in a(n) | upset        | } manner. |
|                                 | desperate    |           |
|                                 | disappointed |           |

Here, Wasow's Criterion 4 entails that the rule deriving M.G. passive participles cannot be transformational, since it feeds a lexical rule, namely, the rule of adverb formation.

Another very strong argument for lexically deriving passive participles is the fact that many such participles are derived from active verbs which have no other passive forms. Most of these verbs are intransitive and their participles usually denote some natural, physical or mental state (Triantafyllidis 1941:374 and Tzartanos 1946: 330-331). E.g.,

- (23) a. anθízo (bloom) → anθizménos (blooming)  
 b. jernó (grow old, age) → jerazménos (aged)  
 c. ðakrízo (weep) → ðakrizménos (weeping)  
 d. ðipsó (be thirsty) → ðipsazménos (thirsty)  
 e. taksiðévo (travel) → taksiðeménos (one who has travelled a lot)  
 f. peθéno (die) → peθaménos (dead)  
 g. paýóno (freeze) → paýoménos (frozen)  
 h. iðróno (sweat) → iðroménos (sweating)

If these participles were transformationally derived from the active verbs, we would need some *ad hoc* device to block the generation of all the other passive forms. Besides, such a syntactic derivation would require that the active verbs were transitive, which is not true of most of these verbs. All these problems are eliminated, if the participles are analysed as adjectives, in which case it follows from Wasow's Criterion 2 that they can only be lexically derived.

Let us now turn to the non-*be*-passives. Obviously, we do not have to 'prove' that M.G. non-*be*-passives are verbs, since they clearly have all the inflectional characteristics of verbs. What, however, interests our discussion is to show that they must be transformationally (i.e. syntactically) derived.

The necessary justification for transformationally deriving non-*be*-passives is given by Wasow's Criterion 4, which entails that 'if transformation T feeds rule A, then A cannot be a lexical rule' (Wasow, 1977:330). Therefore, all we need is a passive construction which will presuppose the application of some other transformational rule. Such a construction is the passive of derived (i.e. not basic) direct objects. Chomsky (1981: 118), following Wasow (1977), argues that '...syntactic passives are not restricted to direct objects of verbs...'

In what follows we will show that the passive construction of derived direct objects can also be used in M.G. as a distinguishing criterion which naturally divides *be*-passives as lexical, and non-*be*-passives, i.e. monolectic and *have*-passives, as syntactic ones.

As it has been argued by Philippaki-Warburton (1979) and (1982), there is a Subject-to-Object Raising rule in M.G. (See also Joseph (1976) and Kakouriotis (1980).) The effect of this rule is to move the subject NP of a complement clause, after a certain class of main verbs, to direct object position of the higher verb. For example,

- (24) ipolojizo óti i eryasies tha teljósun síndoma.  
 estimate-I that the-nom. works-nom. will finish-they soon  
 (I estimate that the works will finish soon.)
- (25) ipolojizo tis eryasies óti tha teljósun síndoma.  
 estimate-I the-acc. works-acc. that will finish-they soon  
 (I estimate the works that they will finish soon.)

Now if this raised and, therefore, derived object of sentence (25) can be promoted to main clause subject position via the NP Preposing rule involved in the derivation of passive sentences, we must conclude that the Passive involves a transformational rule and not a lexical one. As a matter of fact, sentence (26) is the passive of (25):

- (26) i eryasies ipolojízonde óti tha teljósun síndoma.  
 the-nom. works-nom. are-estimated-they that will finish-they soon  
 (The works are estimated to finish soon.)

In (26) the verb is in the monolectic present imperfective passive form. In this environment, all other monolectic forms as well as the *have*-passives can occur. E.g.,



- (27) i eryasies ipolojístikan óti tha teljósun síndoma.  
 the-nom. works-nom. were-estimated-they that will finish-they soon.  
 (The works were estimated to finish soon).
- (28) i eryasies éxun ipolojístí óti tha teljósun síndoma.  
 the- works- have- been- that will finish- soon  
 nom. nom. they estimated they  
 (The works have been estimated to finish soon).

Our analysis of M.G. passive participles as lexically derived deverbal adjectives, on the one hand, and non-*be*-passives as transformationally derived structures, on the other, predicts that *be*-passives should not appear in the syntactic environment which requires a transformational passive derivation. The following examples show that our prediction is borne out. Thus, the non-*be*-passives are perfectly grammatical, whereas the *be*-passives are starred as ungrammatical. We can say

- (29) i eryasies  
 the-nom. works-nom.  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{ipolojízonde} / \textit{éxun ipolojístí} \\ \textit{are-estimated-they} / \textit{have-they been-estimated} \\ \textit{provléponde} / \textit{éxun provlefstí} \\ \textit{are-forseen-they} / \textit{have-they been-forseen} \\ \textit{apokalíptonde} / \textit{éxun apokalifstí} \\ \textit{are-revealed-they} / \textit{have-they been-revealed} \\ \textit{ðjapsévðonde} / \textit{éxun ðiapsefstí} \\ \textit{are-denied-they} / \textit{have-they been-denied} \end{array} \right\}$

óti tha teljósun síndoma.  
 that will finish-they soon.

The works are/have been  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{estimated} \\ \textit{forseen} \\ \textit{revealed} \\ \textit{denied} \end{array} \right\}$  to finish soon.

but not

- (30) \*i eryasies íne  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{ipolojizménes} \\ \textit{*provre...} \\ \textit{apokaliménes} \\ \textit{ðjapsevzménes} \end{array} \right\}$  óti tha teljósun síndoma.

We have, therefore, shown that the passive construction of derived direct objects can also be applied to M.G. passives as a criterion for distinguishing lexically from transformationally derived passives. Thus, monolectic and *have*-passives are transformational because the rule deriving them may be fed by the Subject-to-Object Raising Transformation, whereas *be*-passives are lexical, because they cannot be fed by any Transformation.

In the above discussion, we have presented a series of arguments, most of which are comparable to those used by Wasow, which led us to the conclusion that the distinction between lexical and transformational passives is also valid in Modern Greek. This in turn provides further support for the theoretical significance of the formal differentiation between two types of passive. In addition to this, we were able to provide two arguments which apply specifically to Modern Greek leading to the same conclusion, and, thus, we have also reinforced somewhat the validity of the standard criteria used for this theoretical position.

*Ir. Philippaki-Warburton*  
*Department of Linguistic Science*  
*University of Reading*  
*Whiteknights*  
*Reading RG 6 2AA*  
*England*

*C. Lascaratou*  
*The University of Athens*  
*Department of English Studies*  
*19-21 Arachovis str, Athens*  
*Greece*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babby, L. and R. Brecht (1975). 'The Syntax of Voice in Russian'. *Language* 51, pp. 342-367.
- Bresnan, J. (1976). 'A Realistic Transformational Grammar', in Halle, M., J. Bresnan, G. Miller, eds., *Linguistic Theory and Psychological Reality*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, pp. 1-59.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding. The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Freidin, R. (1975). 'The Analysis of Passives'. *Language* 51, pp. 384-405.
- Joseph, B. (1976). 'Raising in Modern Greek: a copying process', in Hankamer J. and J. Aissen, eds., *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, 2, Cambridge, pp. 241-278.
- Kakouriotis, A. (1980). 'Raising in Modern Greek'. *Lingua* 52, pp. 157-177.
- Lascaratou, C. (1980). *The Use of the Passive in Modern Greek*. Unpublished M.A. Project, University of Reading.
- Lascaratou, C. and I. Philippaki-Warburton (1981). 'The Use of Passive Constructions in Modern Greek'. *Μαντατοφόρος* 17, pp. 53-64.
- Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1982). 'Constraints on Rules of Grammar as Universals', in Crystal D., ed., *Linguistic Controversies*. London: Arnold.
- Τριανταφυλλίδης, Μ. (1978). *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (τῆς Δημοτικῆς)*, ἀνατύπωση τῆς ἐκδόσεως τοῦ ΟΕΣΒ (1941) μέ διορθώσεις. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἰνστιτούτο Νεοελληνικῶν Σπουδῶν, Ἰδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη.
- Τζάρτζανος, Α. (1946). *Νεοελληνική Σύνταξις (τῆς Κοινῆς Δημοτικῆς)*. Τόμος Α'. Ἀθήναι: Ὄργανισμός Ἐκδόσεως Σχολικῶν Βιβλίων.

- Φιλιλπάκη-Warburton, E. (1979). «'Ο Μετασχηματιστικός Κανόνας τής 'Ανώψωσης στα Νέα 'Ελληνικά». 'Επιστημονική 'Επετηρίδα τής Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του 'Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Τόμος ΙΗ', σ. 491-526.
- Warburton, I. P. (1975). 'The Passive in English and Greek'. *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 13, pp. 563-578.
- Wasow, T. (1977). 'Transformations and the Lexicon' in Culicover, P., T. Wasow and A. Akmajan, eds., *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 327-360.