

## Roots, States, Stative Passives

I examine the question of how different components of meaning are represented in natural language, concentrating on the interaction between "Root" meanings and the syntactic structures in which Roots appear. Many different theories have been proposed to deal with the fact that "simple" states like **red, dark, open** etc. differ from "resultative" or "target" states like **broken, destroyed, pumped up** etc. A proposal common to different approaches, ranging from Levin and Rappaport-Hovav to Kratzer and others, is that the latter type of state is built from verbs that contain Target States as part of their basic meaning. This type of theory is intended to account for several generalizations showing asymmetries between the two types of states.

This talk develops the hypothesis that Target State meaning is not a possible component of a Root's meaning. Rather, this interpretation is derived in a particular type of syntactic configuration; i.e., it is "syntactic", not "lexical". The generalizations that motivate the "build result state into the Root" approaches above are shown to derive from a different type of theory, in which Roots are predicates of different types of eventualities. These ideas are fleshed by examining different predictions of the "lexical" and "syntactic" treatments. The discussion is centered on

- 1) Root distributions;
- 2) The formation of Stative Passives, including some problems with **un**-prefixation; and
- 3) Apparent "competition" effects, where the status of a participial form seems to depend on whether or not the language has a "simple" adjective built on the same Root.