The talk, in a nutshell:

I propose a common syntax for locative and object-experiencer psych verbs, whose thematic roles can be derived from the same generalized event structure.

(1) a. La crisis aterra a las familias
   Stimulus       Experiencer
   'The crisis frightens families.'

b. La sábana tapa la entrada
   Figure       Ground
   'The sheet hides the entrance.'

c. VP
   VP
   V
   aterra
   PP
   tapa
   La crisis
   La sábana
   P'
   P
   a las familias
   la entrada

1 Framing the problem

1.1 "Experiencers" in a framework without theta-roles

- Classic θ-theory: verbs lexically assign θ-roles that then map into certain syntactic positions (Chomsky 1981 et seq.)

  (a) Subcategorization frame
      \[ V, \{ - NP \} \]

  (b) θ-grid

      \[
      \begin{array}{cc}
      \text{Agent} & \text{Theme} \\
      \text{NP} & \text{NP} \\
      \end{array}
      \]

- Current approaches to argument interpretation: θ-roles are not grammatical primitives, but entailments from the event structure of the verbal predicate: an argument is understood to be an 'Agent' insofar as it is subject of a causative subevent; an argument will be a "Theme" (Undergoer, Resultee...) when it is subject of a dynamic or resultative projection (Hale & Keyser 1993; Ramchand 2008...).
Rather than \( \theta \)-roles, we should talk about thematic relations between the arguments of the verb and its event structure.

Psychological verbs pose two main challenges for a thematic relations approach:

1. It is far from obvious what aspectual notion can be invoked from which the roles of "Experiencer" and "Stimulus" could be derived. This question is only recently starting to receive some attention in the literature (Fábregas & Marín 2020a).

2. "Experiencer" arguments are not restricted to a single syntactic position, as you can see in (24a), adapted to Spanish from Belletti & Rizzi (1988). This is even more concerning for our purposes as all types are stative.

- a. Los muchachos detestan las arañas

\textbf{Experiencer} Subject experiencer (SEPV)

\textbf{Stimulus} 'The kids hate spiders.'

- b. Las arañas aterrnan a los muchachos

\textbf{Stimulus} Object experiencer (OEPV)

\textbf{Experiencer} 'Spiders frighten the kids.'

- c. A los muchachos les gustan las arañas

\textbf{Experiencer} Dative experiencer (DEPV)

\textbf{Stimulus} 'Spiders please the kids.'

1.2 The special grammatical status of Experiencer objects

- It has been noted in the literature that the objects of stative object experiencer psych verbs (OEPVs) show unique grammatical behavior that distinguishes them from the accusative objects of other transitive verbs.

- These are known as \textbf{psych effects} (Landau 2010) and are attested crosslinguistically, in Romance languages but also in Hebrew, Russian, Greek...

- The conclusion in Landau (2010): Experiencers are special.

\begin{quote}
My goal in this talk:

- Argue for a common syntax for OEPVs and locative verbs, with a generalized aspectual structure from which the roles of their arguments can be interpreted.

- The conclusion for Experiencer objects will be that...

- they are not unique: "Experiencers" have no special status in the grammar

- The \( \theta \)-role "Experiencer" (and the rest) are not grammatical primitives
\end{quote}

2 The data

2.1 OEPVs and locative verbs

- The data under study in this talk are stative OEPVs and locative verbs.

- Locative verbs denote a spatial relation between two entities, a Figure and a Ground (to adopt Hale & Keyser’s terminology). See the Spanish examples below.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{OEPVs}

- a. aburrir 'bore', agobiar 'overwhelm', asombrar 'astonish', asustar 'scare', entusiasmar 'enthuse', fascinar 'fascinate', fastidiar 'annoy', frustrar 'frustrate', importunar 'importune', molestar 'bother', mosquear 'annoy', obsesionar 'obsess', preocupar 'worry', sorprender 'surprise...
b. Las arañas aterrzan a los muchachos
Stimulus Experiencer
'Spiders frighten the kids.'

(5) Locative verbs

a. rodear 'surround', cubrir 'cover', flanquear 'flank', envolver 'wrap', tapar 'cover/hide from view', bloquear 'block', cercar 'fence', obstruir 'obstruct', revestir 'coat', poblar 'inhabit', inundar 'flood', llenar 'fill', cobijar 'shelter', decorar 'decorate', iluminar 'illuminate'...

b. Las arañas rodean a los muchachos
Figure Ground
'Spiders surround the kids.'

• In what follows (§2.2) I will present the "psych" effects that have been found in the literature, drawing mostly from the discussion in Landau (2010). For each "psych" effect, I will show how verbs also show the same effects.²

2.2 "Psych" effects in OEPVs and locative verbs

What "psych" effects tell us about both stative OEPVs and locative verbs:

• Their object has prepositional case, arguably dative (despite surfacing as accusative).

• They are unaccusative (Adapted from Landau's (2010) discussion for OEPVs)

2.2.1 Experiencer objects are islands for extraction (Italian)

• In (6a), we have a DP (il candidato) that is relativized out of a bigger accusative object DP (i sostenitori...). However, when the accusative object is an Experiencer, it constitutes an island for extraction (6b). The examples in (6) are from Belletti & Rizzi (1988: 325), following an original observation by Benincà (1986).

(6) a. Il candidato di cui questa ragazza apprezza i sostenitori.
the candidate of whom this girl likes the supporters

b. *Il candidato di cui questa prospettiva impaurisce i sostenitori.
the candidate of whom this perspective frightens the supporters

• As it turns out, the objects of locative verbs constitute islands for extraction in Italian as well.

(7) *Il candidato di cui questi muri/ queste siepi/ queste ralings circondano i sostenitori.
the candidate of whom these walls/ these bushes/ these railings surround the supporters

('The candidate whose supporters are surrounded by these walls/ these bushes/ these railings.') (Delia Bentley, p.c.)

2.2.2 Dative left-dislocated objects linked to accusative clitics (Italian)

• Accusative experiencer objects can appear as clitics related to a left-dislocated DP with a dative marker a (e.g. (8a)). This is not allowed with other transitive-accusative verbs, SEPVs included (e.g. (8b)). This is noted by Belletti & Rizzi (1988: 334), following an original observation by Benincà (1986).

(8) a. A Giorgio, questi argomenti non l'hanno convinto.
to Giorgio these arguments not him.have convinced

b. *A Giorgio, la gente non lo conosce.
to Giorgio the people not him.know.

• The objects of stative locative verbs can also appear as accusative clitics referentially linked to a dative-marked left-dislocated DP (e.g. (9)).

(9) A Giorgio, non lo circondano i palloni, lo circondano le sedie.
not to Giorgio the balls, but the chairs.

('Giorgio is not surrounded by balls, but by chairs.') (Delia Bentley, p.c.)

Context: there are several people with different objects around them. Speaker A believes that Giorgio has balls around him, but Speaker B corrects him by uttering (9).
2.2.3 No periphrastic causatives (Italian, Spanish)

- Belletti & Rizzi (1988) also observe that periphrastic causatives in Italian are not allowed with OEPVs (but they are with SEPVs). This pattern is exemplified in (12). The same effect holds in Spanish.

(10) a. *Questo lo ha fatto preoccupare/ commuovere/ attrarre ancora più this him has made worry move attract even more to Mario.
    b. Questo lo ha fatto apprezzare/ temere/ ammirare ancora più a Mario this him has made estimate fear admire even more to Mario 'This made Mario estimate/fear/admire him even more.' (Belletti & Rizzi 1988: 303)

    b. Esto hizo a Pedro [odiar/ admirar/ amar] a Pepito aún más. 'This made Pedro hate/admire/love Pepito even more.' (Belletti & Rizzi 1988: 303)

- Again, the same situation holds for stative locative verbs:

(12) a. *Questo lo ha fatto [bloccare/ decorare] la porta. this him has made block decorate the door
    'This made him [block/decorate] the door.' (Patrizia Farina, p.c.)
    X Stative reading: This made Pedro to statively continue blocking/decorating the door.
    ✓ Eventive reading: This made Pedro perform the action of blocking/decorating the door.

(13) Esto hizo a la policía rodear la casa. this made DOM the police surround the house
    'This made the police surround the house.'
    ✓ Stative reading: this made the police be around the house.
    X Eventive reading: this made the police get to be around the house.

2.2.4 No reflexives (Italian, Spanish)

- Italian OEPVs do not allow reflexives, but SEPVs do (e.g. () (Belletti & Rizzi 1988). Spanish behaves the same way (e.g. (15)).

(14) a. Io mi conosco.
    I myself know
    'I know myself.'
    b. *Io mi interessò.
    I myself interest
    (I interest myself.)
    (Belletti & Rizzi 1988: 296)

    María [loves/hates/loves/fears] to her self
    'María loves/hates/fears herself.'
    b. *María se [aburre/ desespera/ angustia/ preocupa/ obsesiona] a sí
    María [boreds/desperates/anguishes/worries/obsesses] to her self
    (María bores/desperates/anguishes/worries/obsesses herself.)

- Once again, locative verbs behave like OEPVs in that respect, both in Italian (e.g. (16)) and in Spanish (e.g. (17)).

    Pietro refl surrounds of stones
    (Pietro surrounds himself with stones.) (Non-habitual reading)
    b. *María si decora (con vernice argentata).
    María refl decorates with paint silver
    (María decorates herself with silver paint.) (Non-habitual reading)
(17) a. *Pedro se rodea (de piedras).
   Pedro refl surrounds of stones
   ('Pedro surrounds himself (with stones).') (Non-habitual reading)
   b. *María se decora (con pintura plateada).
   María refl decorates with paint silver
   ('María decorates herself (with silver paint).') (Non-habitual reading)

2.2.5 Verbal passives

• OEPVs do not form verbal passives in many languages, a fact that has been repeatedly observed in the literature (Belletti & Rizzi 1988; Legendre 1989; Franco 1990; Legendre 1993; Grimshaw 1990; Roberts 1991; Landau 2010; Marín 2011; Fábregas & Marín 2015, a.o.).

The examples in (18) from Belletti & Rizzi 1988 are actually adjectival passives, not verbal (see Appendix Belletti & Rizzi 1988 for the argumentation).

(18) a. Gianni è disgustato da lla corruzione di questo paese.
   Gianni is disgusted by the corruption of this country
   b. Gianni è affascina toda questa prospettiva.
   Gianni is fascinated by this perspective
   (Belletti & Rizzi 1988: 309)

• In Spanish, where verbal and adjectival passives are distinguished morphologically by the choice of auxiliary, we find exactly the same situation as in Italian: Verbal passives are out, adjectival passives are OK (e.g. (19)).

(19) *Tus padres eran [fascinados/ interesados/ desesperados/ angustiados/
   your parents were fascinated interested despairing anguished
   preocupados/ obsesionados] (por la situación).
   worried obsessed by the situation
   'Your parents were [fascinated/ interested/ despairing/ anguished/ worried/ obsessed] (by the situation).'

• The same happens with locative verbs in Spanish: verbal passives are out under the stative reading (e.g. (20)).

(20) a. *La casa era rodeada por una valla.
   the house was refl surrounded by a fence
   ('The house was surrounded by a fence.')

   b. *El porche era decorado por macetas.
   the porch was refl decorated by flowerpots
   ('The porch was decorated by flowerpots.)

2.2.6 The accusative-dative instability with OEPVs

• In dialects of Spanish that morphologically distinguish between accusative and dative 3rd person clitics, OEPVs are unstable with respect to the case marking of the clitic, with native speakers not showing a clear preference between accusative or dative (Gómez-Torrego 1993) (e.g. (21a)). The same situation seems to hold with locative verbs (e.g. (21b)).

   DOM/DAT María ACC DAT amazed a neighbor of her village
   'María was amazed by a neighbor of her village.'
   DOM/DAT María ACC DAT surrounded a wall impassable
   'María was surrounded by an impassable wall.'

2.2.7 Psych effects with locative verbs beyond Romance

• For further crosslinguistic evidence of the parallelism between OEPVs and locative verbs beyond Romance, see Appendix A.

→ A summary of the discussion can be found in Table 1.
Table 1: 'Psych’ effects with stative locative verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psych effects</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Stative OEPVs</th>
<th>Stative locative verbs</th>
<th>Other transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No verbal passives</td>
<td>Spanish, Italian, Hebrew</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No periphrastic causatives</td>
<td>Spanish, Italian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reflexives</td>
<td>Spanish, Italian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative-accusative unstability with 3rd person clitics</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative left-dislocated objects linked to accusative clitics</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relativization extraction out of accusative objects</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory resumptive clitic with relativized accusative object</td>
<td>Greek, Hebrew</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitic doubling with accusative objects</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No genitive of negation</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The analysis

- From Landau: Object experiencers are introduced by a preposition P.
- Contra Landau: This P does not assign an Experiencer θ-role (or any other specific role). There is no inherent case assignment, in the sense of Chomsky (1999).
  - If it did, we would at least need two different P heads with identical syntactic properties but different thematic properties, to accommodate locative verbs.
- Instead, the same P is involved in the structure of both stative OEPVs and locative verbs, since both verb classes display identical grammatical behavior.
- Also departing from Landau, I will assume that these verbs lexicalize both V and P in a span.
- Their lexical entry is specified as [V,P], where V is a stative unaccusative verbal head.
- This is the structure I propose for stative OEPVs and locative verbs:

\[
\text{(22) a. La crisis \textit{aterra} a las familias} \\
\text{Stimulus} \quad \text{Experiencer} \\
\text{La crisis aterra a las familias} \quad \text{OEPVs} \\
\text{b. La sábana \textit{tapa} la entrada} \\
\text{Figure} \quad \text{Ground} \\
\text{La sábana tapa la entrada} \quad \text{Locative verbs} \\
\text{c.} \\
\text{VP} \\
<\text{aterra}> <\text{tapa}> \\
\text{La crisis} \\
\text{La sábana} \\
\text{P} \\
<\text{aterra}> <\text{tapa}> \\
\text{a las familias} \\
\text{la entrada} \\
\]
3.1 Deriving the thematic interpretation

I propose that this silent P relates two arguments in an abstract spatial relation.

- My proposal builds on:
  * Hale & Keyser (2002): P is a birelational category.
  * Bouchard (1992); Landau (2010): Psych predicates are locative in some sense.

- P takes a complement and defines a space for it.
  - If the root is psychological...
    * the space will be mental
    * the complement will be an Experiencer.
  - If the root is locative...
    * the space will be physical
    * the complement will be a Ground (following Hale & Keyser 2002)

- P locates a second argument with respect to the first argument.
  - If the root is psychological...
    * the endpoint of this mental relation will be the Stimulus.
  - If the root is locative...
    * the endpoint of this physical relation will be the Figure.

- I formalize this idea with a generalized (and simplified) version of the semantics developed for locative structures in Svenonius (2006 et seq.)

- The lexical entry of P is as in (23):
  \[
  [P] = \lambda x,y \exists \varepsilon, V [\text{eigen}(\varepsilon, x) \land \text{project}(V, \varepsilon) \land \text{endpoint}(y, V)]
  \]

- P takes two arguments. For the first one (complement of P), an abstract space \( \varepsilon \) is retrieved. In turn, there are vectors \( V \) that project from this space and whose endpoint is the second argument (Spec,PP).

- How the vectors \( V \) project from this space \( \varepsilon \) is determined by the relation \text{project}, which is given content by the lexical root.

- To illustrate, see (24) and Figure 1.

(24) a. El río Nilo rodea el desierto de Bayuda.
   "The river Nile surrounds the Bayuda desert."
   b. \( [PP] = \exists \varepsilon, V [\text{eigen}(\varepsilon, \text{el desierto de Bayuda}) \land \text{rodea}(V, \varepsilon) \land \text{endpoint}(\text{el río Nilo}, V)] \)

- The relevant space \( \varepsilon \) of the Bayuda desert projects vectors from it as defined by the root \text{surround}, which have the river Nile as their endpoint (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Annotated map of the Nile passing around the Bayuda Desert (Sudan)

- We can think of \text{surround} as being the verbal version of \text{around}^4
- Just as there can be many (physical) spatial relations between entities (\text{around}, \text{behind}, \text{under}, \text{in front of}), there can be many mental relations between entities (\text{love}, \text{fear}, \text{disgust}, \text{amazement}...).
Wrapping up: How about subject and dative experiencers?

- We still need to figure out how to derive SEPVs and DEPVs:
  a. Los muchachos detestan las arañas
     Experiencer | Stimulus
  SEPVs
  b. A los muchachos les gustan las arañas
     Experiencer | Stimulus
  DEPVs

'Spiders please the kids.'

- For Spanish, there have been proposals to extend Landau’s (2010) analysis of Experiencers to SEPVs (Fábregas & Marín 2015) and DEPVs (Fábregas & Marín 2020a)

(25) The proposal in (Fábregas & Marín 2015, 2020a)

a. Subject experiencers

   VP
   PP
   \[P\] los muchachos \[V\] las arañas

b. Dative experiencers

   InitP
   PP
   \[P\] a los muchachos
   Init
   \[Init’\]
   \[V\] las arañas

The authors’ main goal: unify Experiencers around a single dative-assigning projection.

Problems with this approach:

- Experiencer subjects always surface as nominative, not dative.
- Both Experiencer and Dative subject psych verbs can be reflexive: it’s not clear how reflexivity could be derived under standard assumptions (binding or copies).
- Other than the labeling of the VP, both structures are virtually indistinguishable, but they have important differences, e.g. regarding case and the (im-)possibility of appearing in participial form with a by-phrase.
- I do not have a better proposal myself for SEPVs and DEPVs, but I do think it’s challenging to place the locus of ‘Experiencerhood’ in a single projection across constructions given the heterogeneity of psych constructions (Bouchard 1992).
- Be as it may, I hope to have convinced you that...

Notes

1. A clarification is to be made: these psych effects are claimed to only hold in non-agentive readings of OEPVs: when the psych verb is used agentively, it stops showing psych effects and behave like non-psych verbs (Kayne 1975; Franco 1990; Arad 1999; Anagnostopoulou 1999; Landau 2010; Fábregas & Marín 2015, a.o.). The agentive/non-agentive alternation has also been connected to the stative/eventive aspectual alternation in many works (Arad 1998, 2002; Rothmayr 2009; Landau 2010; Marín 2011; Fábregas & Marín 2013) and it is yet another trait that sets OEPVs apart from OEPVs and DEPVs verbs, which seem to be strictly non-agentive/stative across languages. I illustrate this alternation in (P2) for English. Also, not all OEPVs alternate aspectually with the same ease both within and across languages. Pesetsky (1999) notes for English that some verbs like scare favor an eventive reading, whereas others like depress are strictly stative. Marín (2011), on the other hand, notes that most OEPVs in Spanish are actually stative.

2. The Spanish data are my own intuitions. Data other than Spanish was elicited from informants, duly acknowledged.

3. But see Bouchard (1993); Pesetsky (1999); Pylkkänen (2000); Gehrke & Sánchez-Marco (2013); Fábregas & Marín (2020b) for a different view. Without getting into details, the general consensus is that verbal passives may be possible with OEPVs given an agentive-eventive reading thereof. As this presentation focuses on stative (readings of) OEPVs, I won’t discuss the matter further.

4. I do not necessarily claim that surround is morphosyntactically derived from the preposition around: I am simply noting the semantic analogy.
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Appendices

A  Psych effects beyond Romance

A.1 Genitive of negation (Russian)

- In Russian, when an object bears accusative case, it may shift to genitive under negation, as shown in (26a). Objects bearing other cases (e.g. instrumental), on the other hand, cannot shift to genitive under negation (e.g. (26b)). However, as pointed out by Legendre & Akimova (1993), the accusative objects of OEPVs do not show such asymmetry under negation, and accusative remains obligatory.

(26)  a. Ja ne našel tzvet/  tzvetov.
         I not found flowers.ACC flowers.GEN
         'I didn’t find (the) flowers.’

   b. On ne upravljal fabrikoj/ *fabriki.
      he not managed factory.INST factory.GEN
      'He didn’t manage a/the factory.’ \(\textit{Pereltsvaig 1997, via Landau 2010: 25}\)

   c. Šum ne orogčil ni odu devočku/ *odnoj devočki.
      noise.NOM not upset no one girl.ACC one girl.GEN
      'The noise didn’t upset a single girl.’ \(\textit{Legendre & Akimova 1993, via Landau 2010: 25}\)

The accusative objects of static locative verbs do not display the genitive of negation either (e.g. (27)).

(26c)  Šum ne orogčil ni odu devočku/ *odnoj devočki.
      noise.NOM not upset no one girl.ACC one girl.GEN
      'The noise didn’t upset a single girl.’ \(\textit{Legendre & Akimova 1993, via Landau 2010: 25}\)

(27)  a. Zabor ne okružaet dom/ *?/??doma.
      wall NEG surrounds house.ACC house.GEN
      'The wall does not surround the house.’

   b. Odejalo ne pokryvaet divan/ *?/??divana.
      blanket NEG covers sofa.ACC sofa.GEN
      'The blanket does not cover the sofa.’

   c. Rojal’zhe ne ukrašaet komnatu/ *komnaty.
      grand.piano.already NEG decorates room.ACC room.GEN
      'The grand piano does not decorate the room anymore.’

   d. Fonar’ ne osveš’aet dom/ *doma.
      streetlight NEG illuminates house.ACC/ house.GEN
      'The streetlight does not illuminate the house.’ \(\textit{Ekaterina Chernova, p.c.}\)

A.2 Clitic doubling (Greek)

- Anagnostopoulou (1999) notes clitic doubling with accusative objects is optional. However, accusative experiencers do not easily allow for clitic dropping, as (28) illustrates.

(28)  a. O Jannis (tin) ghnorise tin Maria se ena party.
         the John cl.ACC met the Mary.in a party
         'John met (her) Mary at a party.’

   b. O Jannis ?*(tin) endhiaferi tin Maria pano ap’ola
         the John cl.ACC interests the Mary more-than-everything
         'John interests Mary more than anything else.’ \(\textit{Anagnostopoulou 1999: 75}\)

   c. Rojal’zhe ne ukrašaet komnatu/ *komnaty.
      grand.piano.already NEG decorates room.ACC room.GEN
      'The grand piano does not decorate the room anymore.’

   d. Fonar’ ne osveš’aet dom/ *doma.
      streetlight NEG illuminates house.ACC/ house.GEN
      'The streetlight does not illuminate the house.’ \(\textit{Ekaterina Chernova, p.c.}\)

   e. Jannis ghnorise tin Maria se ap’ola party.
      the Jannis cl.ACC met the Maria in a party
      'John met Mary in a party.’

   f. O Vrakhos ?*(ton) mplokari ton Petro.
      the rock cl.ACC blocks the Petro
      'The rock blocks Petro.’ \(\textit{Giorgos Spathas, p.c.}\)

A.3 Obligatory resumptive clitic with relativized accusative object (Greek, Hebrew)

- Anagnostopoulou (1999) further discusses that dative objects can be relativized without the preposition being pied-piped provided a resumptive clitic appears, a property that

\(\textit{legendre & akimova 1993, via landau 2010: 25}\)
accusative objects do not have (e.g. (30)). Experiencer objects behave as regular dative objects in this respect: the resumptive clitic is obligatory when the Experiencer is relativized, regardless of whether it bears morphological dative (i.e. DEPVs) or accusative (i.e. OEPVs). This pattern is shown in (31).

(30) a. Simbetho ton anthropo pu o Petros tu edhose to vivlo.  
   like.1sg the man.acc that the Peter.nom Clark.dat gave to the book.acc  
   'I like the man that Peter gave him the book.'

b. *Simpetho ton anthropo pu ton sinandise o Petros  
   like.1sg the man.acc that Clark.nom met.3sg the Peter.nom  
   'I like the man that Peter met him.'

(31) a. O anthropos pu *(tu) aresi i Maria ine ilithios  
   the man that Clark.dat like.3sg the Mary.nom is stupid  
   'The man that Mary appeals to is stupid.'

b. O anthropos pu *(ton) endhiaferi i Maria ine ilithios.  
   the man that Clark.acc interests the Mary.nom is stupid  
   'The man that Mary interests is stupid.'

c. O anthropos pu *(ton) problimatizun ta nea bike mesa  
   the man that Clark.acc puzzle the news.nom came in  
   'The man that the news puzzles came in.'

• These relativization contrasts in Greek also hold for Hebrew, as Landau (2010) notes. In Hebrew, the absence of a resumptive clitic with relativized accusative objects is preferred, whereas its presence is required with relativized dative and oblique objects (e.g. (32a-b)). Experiencer objects behave like datives and obliques in that respect, as (32c) shows.

(32) a. ha-iš, še-Rina hikira *(to) o higia.  
   the-man that-Rina knew *(him) arrived  
   'The man that Rina knew has arrived.'

b. ha-iš, še-Rina xašva al-*av, pro, higia.  
   the-man that-Rina thought of *(him) arrived  
   'The man that Rina thought of has arrived.'

c. ha-muamadim še-ha-toca’ot hifiu *(otam) lo amru mila.  
   the-candidates that-the-results surprised *(them) not said word  
   'The candidates that the results surprised did not utter a word.' (Landau 2010: 31)

• This same effect regarding resumptive pronouns happens happens with stative locative verbs in Greek (e.g. (33)) and Hebrew (e.g. (34)).

(33) a. O anthropos pu *(ton) perikklonon ta epipla ine omorofos.  
   the man that Clark.nom surround the furniture is handsome  
   'The man that the furniture surround is handsome.'

b. O anthropos pu *(ton) kalipti i kuverta ine o Janis.  
   the man that Clark.nom covers the blanket is the John  
   'The man that the blanket covers is John.'

c. O anthropos pu *(ton) fotizi o provoleas ine o sigrafeas.  
   the man that Clark.nom illuminates the spotlight is the writer  
   'The man that the spotlight illuminates is the writer.' (Giorgos Spathas, p.c.)

(34) a. ze ha-iš še-ha-rihut makif *(oto).  
   this the-man that-the-furniture surrounding.pres.s says  
   'This is the man that the furniture surrounds.'

b. ze ha-iš še-ha-panas meir/še-ha-teura  
   this the-man that-the-flashlight illuminates.pres.m that-the-lighting  
   meira? *(oto)  
   illuminares.pres.f says  
   'This is the man that the [lighting/ lighting] illuminates.'

c. ze ha-iš še-ha-tsadafot mekastot *(oto)  
   this the-man that-the-seashells decorating.pres.s says  
   'This is the man that the seashells decorate.' (Itamar Kastner, p.c.)

B A brief stop: why OEPVs and locative verbs are not stative causatives

• Grimshaw (1990); Pesetsky (1995) claim that the subjects of OEPVs are in fact Causers, not Themes. In SEPVs, the 0-roles of Experiencer and Theme are realized as subject and
object, whereas in OEPVs the object is an Experiencer and the subject is a Causer, derived in Pesetsky (1999) by a null caus affix. The thematic hierarchy that Pesetsky assumes is provided in (35). Pesetsky refers to the Theme in OEPVs as the Target/Subject Matter (T/SM) of the emotion.

(35) Causer > Experiencer > Target/Subject Matter

• In a similar vein, locative verbs have been analyzed on a par with OEPVs elsewhere, claiming that they are both stative causatives (Kratzer 2000; Rothmayr 2009). When the subjects are agents (e.g. (36)), the verbs would be eventive causatives.

(36) a. Peter frightened Mary by screaming out loud. Eventive OEPVs
    b. The police surrounded the suspect in two seconds. Eventive locative verbs

• Abstracting away from the eventive version, I do not think this view for stative versions is correct (at least for the Romance data analyzed), for these reasons:
  – Both stative OEPVs and locative verbs are unaccusative.
  – There is no evidence that they are bieventive (no scope ambiguities with adverbs like again).
  – They do not accept instrument-PPs even with human subjects.