If psych, then stative

The problem. The aspectual value of psych verbs, and specially of object-experiencer psych verbs (OEPVs), is still a matter of debate. Arad (1998) *i.a.* proposes 3 types: (1a) *stative reading* (*Economy concerns Mary*) which denotes an (individual-level) state; (1b) *eventive reading*, where a change-of-state arises in the experiencer with no intentional agent (*The noise bothered Mary*), and (1c) *agentive reading*, where an agent intentionally acts triggering a change of state in the experiencer (*John frightened Mary deliberately*). We agree with Arad (1998) in that Spanish dative OEPVs (1a) denote (individual level) states. However, following Marín & McNally, 2011), we assume that accusative (non-agentive) OEPVs (1b) denote inchoative states, a particular type of stage-level states. The existence of two distinct subtypes of OEPVs (Marín 2011), *molestar*- 'bother' and *preocupar*- 'worry' verbs (2), is central to any analysis, as it defines divergent data sets (3). In essence, both verb types (*preocupar*-verbs **also** with animate subjects; *molestar*-type **only** with non-animate subjects) produce inchoative states (Marín, 2011). With agentive subject, *molestar*-vebs denote activities instead.

(1) a. El ruido le molesta mucho. 'The noice bothers her a lot'
b. El ruido molestó a Uma. / El ruido la molestó. 'The noise bothered Uma'
c. Uma molestó a Quentin deliberadamente / para que se fuera.
'Uma bothered Quentin deliberately/to make him go away'

(2) Type 1: *molestar* 'bother': accepts agentive subjects
Type 2: *preocupar* 'worry': do not take agentive subjects

(3) Uma molestó/#preocupó a Quentin deliberadamente / para que se fuera.
'Uma bothered/#worried Quentin deliberately / to make him go away'.

On the one hand, we note that agentive *molestar*-verbs pass major dynamicity tests. They allow the progressive (4a), serve as infinitival complements of perception verbs (4b), and yield habitual reading in the present (4c). On the other hand, agentive *molestar*-verbs are not telic. In fact, they are compatible with *for x time* –not with *in x time*– (5a) adverbials, they cannot serve as complements of *acabar* or *terminar* 'finish' (5b), and are not allowed in absolute clauses (5c).

(4) a. Uma está molestando a Quentin.
b. Vi a Uma molestar a Quentin.
c. Uma molesta a Quentin habitualmente / cada semana.

(5) a. Uma molestó a Quentin #en/durante dos horas.
b. #Uma acabó/terminó de molestar a Quentin.
c. #Una vez molestado Quentin, …

bother-verbs diverge by yielding dynamic (agent-controlled) events with defeasible (cancellable) root-named states (6) (Koenig & Davis 2001). This explains the availability of Failed Attempt readings and *should* modals (Martin 2016) giving deontic/epistemic [**D/E**] reading correlated with ±animacy, with **D** marking a**n activity that T should perform**.

(6) Tarantino ha molestado a Uma durante horas, pero ella no se molesta/no se molestó.
'Tarantino bothered Uma for hours, but she isn't bothered / she didn't bother.'

(7) a. Taratino debería molestar a Uma.
'Tarantino should bother Uma.' (^{ok}**D**/$^{??}$**E**)
b. El muro debería molestar a Uma.
'The wall should bother Uma' ($^{\#}$**D**/^{ok}**E**).

Based on similar semantic outputs, Martin *et al.* posit that some verbs (accomplishments), if agentive, yield a nonculminating reading also present in Romance OEPVs. Yet, in (6), does not reveal the cancellation of *molestar* endpoint/result (which, as an activity does not have any culmination to cancel), but rather a zero-Cos predication, as data above shows.

Analysis. We propose it all follows from constructional constraints shown by each root. We note that some verbs allow two possible constructions (10), but others (*preocupar*-type) have more specific requirements. *Molestar*-type verbs allow for either (i) an agentive construction with all the expected aspectual properties (animacy, agent-controlled event, dynamicity, defeasible psych state) (cf. *defeasible causatives*, Martin & Piñon 2012); or (ii) true psych constructions, where the psych state cannot be cancelled and stativity holds as expected. This would be directly constrained by the lexical-semantic properties of the root. We contend the above facts could be readily explained by proposing a fair workload division balancing a nonradical constructional account where the two predications decompose into distinct vP configurations and components combined with the root with certain (noticeable) lexical-based properties defining two distinct root types associated with distinct OEPVs generally subsumed.

Proposal. Psych roots like *preocup*- (and their counterparts in other languages) would be realized through 'psych' state roots (Levin 2006 *i.a.*). For this root type, only the stative construction, with the psych state as core (nondefeasible) part of the verb's predication would be available. For the *molest*- type, instead, both constructions are available, as these verbs would denote an act performed with intention of triggering a certain state, but this state is not part of the core denotation; therefore, a result does not have to truthfully occur for the predication to hold. For agentive|eventive predications, an activity type is syntactically and semantically more tenable, leaving the option to a constructionally added (not lexically entailed) result. Crucially, OEPVs are predicted to allow this alternative along with (non)defeasible results (Martin 2016, Martin & Piñon 2012). This allows a correlation between aspectual structure and syntactic realization: in eventive (agentive) constructions, arguments are canonical event participants (canonical subject/object positions, Arad 1998), whereas the stative (true psych) construction has neither an agent nor *change* event (hence, no canonical subject/object). Options depend on whether the agentive construction ((8)i) is available for a verb. In that case, the syntactic and semantic layout will be congruent with the type of predication/configuration required (activity vs. psych), the result dovetailing with the standard description (only agentive/eventive constructions are true transitives, all 'special' properties arise only in stative [true psych] constructions, Arad 1998 *i.a.*) and with ACH (9). (10) picks up our suggested analysis: **taking agentive-friendly OEPVs as default activity predications.**

(8) (i) agentive reading - external argument - canonical object – psych effects implied (noncore)
(ii) stative reading - no external argument - non-canonical object – psych state entailed (core)

(9) AGENT CONTROL HYPOTHESIS (ACH): Zero-CoS construals require the predicate's external argument to be associated with agenthood properties. (Demirdache & Martin 2015)

(10) **HYPOTHESIS 3** (Martin 2016). Agentive ongoing events are ontologically independent of their effects. Only nonagentive ongoing events entail their effects

Result. Based on data below we contend that (i) purely psych uses are always stative and the state cannot be cancelled; (ii) agentivity plays a key role only for some verbs, (iii) 2 classes (stative and agentive [eventive]) are relevant and sufficiently different. This follows as a result of a key observation on which the central claim builds: the criteria taken by Arad *i.a.* to operate the differentiation between possible constructions (whether there is an agent deliberately doing something to bring about a mental state in the experiencer; whether there exists a change of (mental) state in the experiencer) are in OEPVs in complementary distribution and fail to coexist as core part of the predication.