

other verb classes, that SPs depend on the presence of a **syntactically accessible predicate of states** that *ke DP* takes scope over.

$$(5) \quad \llbracket ke DP \rrbracket = \lambda P_{e, st.} \lambda e_s: \exists e' \exists x \in \llbracket DP \rrbracket^F \& x \neq \llbracket DP \rrbracket \& P(x)(e'). P(\llbracket DP \rrbracket)(e)$$

SPs in DAs. Both ADAs and RDAs license SPs. In the case of ADAs, Greek *ke* can give rise to a presupposition according to which **something other than x is maximally A**, as in, e.g., (6). Hence, the additive is licensed in (6), even though the alternative undergoes no change in the context.

- (6) John bought a yellow and a red shirt, but dropped both of them near some water. The yellow shirt stayed dry, but the red one got wet. At home ... stegnose *ke* to KOKINO pukamiso.
 dried.3SG also the red shirt
 ‘The *red* shirt dried too.’

In the case of RDAs, Greek *ke* can give rise to a SP according to which **something other than x exceeds the standard degree of A**, as in (7), for the DA build on the relative adjective *akrivos* ‘expensive’.

- (7) Bread and milk are expensive if they cost more than 1€ (per kilo). John opened a bakery in January and set the price of milk to 1,20€ and that of bread to 0,80€. In February, he raised the price of bread to 1,10€, so that ... akrivine *ke* to PSOMI ston furno tu Jani.
 expensive.3SG also the bread in.the bakery the John
 ‘The *bread* became expensive in John’s bakery too.’

Scalar analyses, as in (4), fail to license SPs, since they contain no stative component in their syntactic (or semantic) decomposition; the lowest constituent in which *ke DP* can attach to is (4d), but this only generates an eventive presupposition. Notice that appeal to a counter-directional *ke_{CD}* that would require something other than the associate to undergo negative change cannot predict the licensing of the additive in (6) and (7), since the alternative individual undergoes no change in these contexts. We conclude that a derivation like (1a) is necessary in order to explain the licensing of SPs.

Proposal. We propose to allow DAs to also be built on the basis of two independently available ingredients, a **measure function and *v_{BECOME}***. Next to the derivation in (4), **we also generate (8)** (ditto for *dry*). *ke DP* scoping below *v_{BECOME}* generates SPs for both RDAs and ADAs, the only difference being how the standard of the measure function is determined (contextual standard for RDAs, the maximum degree for ADAs, as per Interpretive Economy, Kennedy 2007).

- (8) a. $\llbracket [POS \text{ wide }] \rrbracket = \lambda x \lambda s. \text{wide}(x)(s) \geq \text{std}(\text{wide})$
 b. $\llbracket [_{VP} v_{BECOME} [\text{the river } [POS \text{ wide }]]] \rrbracket = 1 \text{ iff } [\text{wide}(r)(\text{init}(e)) \geq \text{std}(\text{wide})] = 0 \text{ and } [\text{wide}(r)(\text{fin}(e)) \geq \text{std}(\text{wide})] = 1$

Further evidence. Crucial evidence in favour of an ambiguity account comes from the fact that SPs are not licensed in the presence of **degree modification**, even when the resulting predications are telic; (9) is infelicitous in the context of (6) (ditto for RDAs). We assume with Kennedy and Levin (2008) that degree modifiers in the verbal domain require access to MOC, forcing the derivation in (4).

- (9) #stegnose stadhiaka/ siga-siga/ endelos *ke* to KOKINO to pukamiso.
 dried.3SG gradually bit-by-bit completely also the red the shirt
 ‘The red shirt gradually/ bit-by-bit/ completely dried too.’

RDAs transparently **built on the comparative form** of adjectives, like, e.g. *hiroterevo* ‘wors-en’, also fail to license SPs (data omitted). We take the comparative form to indicate a derivation based on *v_{COMP}*, as in (4). Scalar analyses that solely rely on derivations like (4) cannot explain the bleeding of SPs.

Inferential patterns. Introducing the derivation in (8) makes no discernible difference to the readings of ADAs. In the case of RDAs, (8) generates a **reading not generated by (4)** (‘x becomes A’). If so, a telic reading licensing positive inferences should be available for all RDAs (not just RDAs that can be associated with a conventionalized standard, e.g., *cool*, in Kennedy and Levin 2008). The initial results of a questionnaire show that 3 out of 6 Greek speakers accept positive inferences for RDAs in out-of-the-blue contexts, and all of them accept positive inferences in contexts with explicit arbitrary standards. Similarly, all speakers accept telicity detecting *in*-PPs and result state modifying *for*-PPs (Piñón 1999) in the presence of explicit standards. See Kearns (2007), McNally (2017) for arguments that a Kennedy&Levin-type of account is too restrictive for RDAs.

Conclusions. We have defended an ambiguity account that allows both (i) an event-decompositional derivation with a stative component, and (ii) a ‘comparative’ derivation that can generate telic readings for ADAs. Unlike previous accounts, we thus explain both the existence and distribution of SPs, as well as known differences between ADAs and RDAs.