James Lavine, Bucknell University   Case and Events in Ukrainian Experiencer Predicates

Background. The properties of the verb's extended functional projection (*v*P) identify aspects of event structure that are detectable indirectly by certain case possibilities (similar to the workings of Aktionsart—the aspectual dimension of event structure). It has been suggested widely in recent work that the argument-projecting property of *v* is potentially distinct from *v*'s function as an accusative probe (a.o., Bowers 2002, Pylkkänen 2008). The most straightforward way to distinguish these functions of *v* is to consider predicates in which *v*, if present, is not argument-projecting, as in the case of the transitive impersonal constructions in Ukrainian (non-agreeing, passive in form). Unaccusative transitive impersonals, such as those in (1-2), freely allow accusative to occur, so long as the predicate is dyadic and the non-Theme argument asserts causation (a causative subevent). Notice, however, that the construction is ungrammatical in the case of Experiencer predicates, also dyadic unaccusatives, but crucially stative, rather than eventive (3-4). The Experiencer predicates in (3-4) occur grammatically in finite agreeing form (5-6), now as eventive "Causative Experiencers", and in passive participial form as states in (7-8) (although, as indicated below, with different sets of truth conditions). I will show that accusative is consistent only with the eventive interpretation and, more generally, that the eventuality denoted by the verb directly reflects case and agreement patterns.

Proposal. While Object Experiencer verbs (unlike their Subject Experiencer counterparts) are potentially eventive (Grimshaw 1990), Experiencer *impersonals* project only a state—the eventive extended projection (*v*) is not constructed. In the terms developed here, the non-Experiencer argument, as a Theme, fails to identify a causative subevent (i.e., initiate causation when put in motion)—it is "inert" with respect to event structure (Ramchand 2008). On the analysis of Pylkkänen 2008, *v* comes in an argument-projecting variety with causative semantics (*v*-VOICE + *v*-CAUSE) and in a non-argument projecting variety with only the latter property (*v*-CAUSE). *v*-CAUSE enters the syntax "unbundled" with VOICE via "event identification" (van Hout 2000, Pylkkänen 2008, Ramchand 2008) in the form of an internal argument with causative semantics (the instrumental NP in (1a, 2a). That is, *v*-CAUSE enters the syntax (with accusative probe) when identified by an internal argument that asserts a causing event, in the same way that certain internal arguments, perfective prefixes, and verbal particles identify a telic event (also with well known morphosyntactic consequences, particularly with respect to case) (see, a.o., Borer 2005). The appearance of accusative case on Experiencers follows directly from the role the non-Experiencer plays in constructing the event. This is demonstrated in the case of the agreeing transitives in (5-6), in which the subject asserts causation (Pesetsky 1995). Experiencer predicates thereby surface with accusative only when *v*-CAUSE is identified (by the Causer argument). The ungrammatical transitive impersonals in (3-4) are (by hypothesis) stative. As a result, following Pylkkänen (2008), there is no accusative-probing *v* (*v*-CAUSE), and correspondingly no source for accusative case on the Experiencer. Aside from different case possibilities, the two predicate types have different sets of entailments. For the grammatical stative participial Experiencer predicate in (8) to be true, it is sufficient only that the news concern Ivan's consolation, not directly cause or provoke it. For (6) to be true, the news must itself cause Ivan's consolation. Thus it is possible for (8) to be true in a scenario in which the news is personally devastating to Ivan, but the mere act of receiving it consoled him, whereas (6) would not be true under such circumstances (see Pesetsky 1995 for similar facts, and author, to appear). That states in the transitive impersonal construction are infelicitous is further demonstrated by the examples of stative predicates in (9), where the *agreeing* passive participial form is strongly preferred. Accusative is ruled out in (9a) because there is no person or cause (even abstract and covert) that can concentrate the meaning of a word into its root.

Larger Picture. V and its extended projection reflect the eventuality denoted by the predicate. Internal arguments play a crucial role in the composition of event structure, potentially with observable morphosyntactic reflexes (here, structural case), suggesting an augmented role for internal arguments in identifying the functional projections necessary to construct events. Finally, Object Experiencer verbs must come in two varieties: (i) a causative variety, which is eventive and accusative-case assigning; and (ii) a stative variety, in which an event is not asserted and accusative is correspondingly not deployed.

Transitive Impersonals: "Causative Unaccusatives"

(1) a. Dim   bulo spaleno   blyskavkoju.   [dyadic]
       house:ACC was   burned-down:[−AGR] lightning:INST
       'The house was burned down by a strike of lightning.'
    b. * Dim   zhoreno.   [monadic]
         house:ACC burned-down:[−AGR]
       [Intended: 'The house burned down.']

(2) a. Kulju   rozirvano   cvjaxom.   [dyadic]
       balloon:ACC pierced:[−AGR] nail:INST
       'The balloon was pierced by a nail.'
    b. * Kulju   trisnuto.   [monadic]
         balloon:ACC burst:[−AGR]
       [Intended: 'The balloon burst.']

Experiencer Predicates: Transitive Impersonals

(3) *Ivana   bulo zdyvovano   ihraškoju.   [stative]
      Ivan:ACC was   surprised:[−AGR] toy:INST
     [Intended: 'Ivan was surprised at the toy.']

(4) * Ivana   bulo vtišeno   novynoju.   [stative]
      Ivan:ACC was   consoled:[−AGR] news:INST
     [Intended: 'Ivan was consoled at/by the news.']

Experiencer Predicates: Finite Agreeing Form

(5) Ihraška   zdyvuvala   Ivana.   [eventive]
    toy:NOM.F.SG surprised:F.SG Ivan:ACC
    'The toy surprised Ivan.'

(6) Cja novyna   vtišyla   Ivana.   [eventive]
    this news:NOM.F.SG consoled:F.SG Ivan:ACC
    'This news consoled Ivan.'

Experiencer Predicates: Agreeing Passive Participial Form

(7) Ivan   buv zdyvovanyj   ihraškoju.   [stative]
    Ivan:NOM.M.SG was surprised:M.SG toy:INST
    'Ivan was surprised at the toy.'

(8) Ivan   buv vtišenyj   novynoju.   [stative]
    Ivan:NOM.M.SG was consoled:M.SG   news:INST
    'Ivan was consoled by the news.'

Transitive Impersonals: States

(9) a. ???Osnovne značennja   slova   zoseredženo   v koreni.
          basic   meaning:ACC of-word concentrated:[−AGR] in root
    b. Osnovne značennja   slova   zoseredžene   v koreni.
       basic   meaning:NOM.N.SG of-word concentrated:N.SG in root
       'The basic meaning of the word is concentrated in its root.' [Shevelov 1963: 142]

Borer, H. 2005. *Structuring sense: The normal course of events*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Bowers, J. 2002. "Transitivity". *Linguistic inquiry*. 33: 183–224.
Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Pesetsky, D. 1995. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Pylkkänen, L. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Ramchand, G. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A First-Phase syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shevelov, G. 1963. *The syntax of Modern Literary Ukrainian*. The Hague: Mouton.
van Hout, A. 2000. "Projection based on event structure". Peter Coopmans, et al. eds. *Lexical specification and insertion*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 403–27.