

Reviews

Bożena Rozwadowska and Anna Bondaruk, eds. *Beyond emotions in language: Psychological verbs at the interfaces*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2020. 325 pp. [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 263.] Available at: <https://benjamins.com/catalog/la.263>.

Reviewed by Jadwiga Linde-Usiekiewicz

The book *Beyond Emotions in Language: Psychological Verbs at the Interfaces* offers formal semantic and syntactic analyses of two related issues: psychological verbs and various types of datives. The two issues are semantically related, because while not all psych verbs require the Experiencer to appear in the dative case, it is argued that some datives appearing with verbs that would not be considered psychological on lexical grounds introduce an affected participant that would experience some psychological or mental state as the result of the event. The two languages studied in detail are Spanish and Polish, against a vast background of data from typologically diverse languages and against a comprehensively presented body of research into psych verbs, datives, and related issues. Chapters 2 through 4 focus on the event structure of psych verbs, and Chapters 5 through 7 focus on datives.

Chapter 1, “Psych verbs: Setting the scene”, serves as an informal introduction to the entire volume. That is why when reporting on its contents I will also be referring to subsequent chapters. Bożena Rozwadowska, Arkadiusz Nowak, and Anna Bondaruk, the chapter’s authors, offer an overview of psych-verbs studies done within the generative paradigm. First of all, they present a typology of psych verbs. These include (a) Subject Experiencer verbs (SE), (b) Object Experiencer verbs (OE), and (c) Dative Experiencer verbs. Each subtype is illustrated by an Italian example: *temere* ‘to fear’ for SE verbs, *preoccupare* ‘to worry’ for OE verbs, and *piacere* ‘to please’ for DE verbs. According to the literature cited by the authors, SE verbs are stative transitive, DE are stative but unaccusative, while OE verbs are ambiguous between stative, eventive, and agentive. The issue is addressed in more detail in subsequent chapters. It should be noted, however, that the formal typology of psych verbs according to the surface syntactic function of the Experiencer is not straightforward. Thus in Chapter 5, “The syntax of accusative and dative Experi-

encer verbs in Polish”, Anna Bondaruk presents both accusative and dative Experiencer verbs as belonging to Object Experiencer verbs, further divided into subclasses according to Belletti and Rizzi’s (1988) typology. According to Bondaruk, verbs that have the Experiencer marked for the accusative case belong to class II, while verbs that have the Experiencer marked for the dative case belong to class III.

In Chapter 1 the authors then go on to present two accounts of what they call “the psych phenomenon”: a purely syntactic one and a semantic one. Within the first type of account, following Belletti and Rizzi (1988), phenomena observable in psych verbs are syntactically derived. Thus verbs in the *temere* class select the Experiencer as the external θ -role and assign structural case to the internal argument. Verbs belonging to the *preoccupare* and *piacere* classes assign no external θ -role; the Experiencer is linked to inherent case (dative or accusative respectively), and the Theme, which has no assigned case in its original position, has to move to subject position to get its structural case assigned there. Yet another purely syntactic account is that of Landau (2010), where he reduces the syntactic properties of psych verbs to those of locative structures, with Experiencers reanalyzed as mental locations.

The second major type of account, more semantically oriented, focuses on the event structure of psych-verbs and proposes a more fine-grained distinction within their thematic features. One of the claims is that the subject of OE verbs differs from the object of SE verbs: the former is the Causer or Cause, while the latter is either Target of Emotion or Subject Matter of Emotion. Further analyses focus on the eventive structure of psych verbs. It should be noted that both types of accounts seem well represented in the book. In the first three of the following chapters (2–4) the semantic account prevails, while the subsequent three (5–7) are more syntactically oriented.

The next section of Chapter 1 presents psych verbs in a diachronic perspective. The authors focus on English, for which there is an available body of research. Here the authors point out that English psych verbs have varied between Nominative Experiencer and Accusative/Dative Experiencer. Following van Gelderen (2018) they point to the fact that Old English psych verbs fall into three distinct classes: those which take Dative Experiencer and Nominative Theme (type I), those that have Nominative Experiencer and Genitive Theme (type II), and those that have either Dative or Accusative Experiencer and Genitive Theme (type N). Among these, types I and N denote telicity, whereas type II denotes stativity (the aspectual distinction is crucial to those subsequent chapters that focus on event structure). In addition, they point out that Old English psych verbs derive semantically from non-psych verbs and that the original non-psych meaning might have determined the case selection. They also discuss the observed shift from impersonal (Dative) to personal (Nominative) structures with psych verbs, or rather from OE to SE type, and link it to semantic changes, as in the case of *like* that shifted from the sense

of giving pleasure to that of receiving pleasure. They also link the shift to the semantic features of the two arguments involved and a conflict between the Animacy hierarchy, which puts Experiencers above Cause or Subject Matter of Emotion, and the Thematic hierarchy, which puts Causer over Experiencer. According to van Gelderen (2018), animacy has won out in English and the shift has led to reanalyzing thematic roles to obtain more parallelism between the two hierarchies. The authors also comment on the inchoative/causative alternation within the historical changes of psych verbs.

In the concluding passages of the diachronic section the authors announce that some of the assumptions and generalizations about psych verbs will be challenged in the subsequent chapters. These include a strong distinction between causative eventive and agentive readings on the one hand and stative on the other, as well as the sufficiency of a typology of event types that includes only accomplishments and achievements among changes of state.

In Chapter 2, "Polish psych verbs as non-achievement", Bożena Rozwadowska convincingly argues that Polish perfective psych verbs, of both SE and OE types, defy the traditional Vendlerian classification of verbs, even in its amended version that includes semelfactive verbs as a subtype of non-telic verbs. In the Introduction section, she provides an overview of previous research, with special attention to the following issues: (a) the simple, stative nature, unanalyzable into subevents, of SE psych verbs, (b) the stative nature of DE verbs, and (c) the ambiguity of some OE verbs as to stative, eventive, or agentive readings. However, a crucial issue in her presentation is that, following the Vendlerian tradition of studies of aspect and event structure, the focus is on the endpoint of eventualities and not their initial points. Rozwadowska argues that in Polish perfective psych verbs the initial boundary is crucial to their meaning. Moreover, she shows that Polish perfective psych verbs cannot be analyzed as change-of-state verbs. The introductory section is followed by a discussion of psych verbs' analyses that focus on final points. One of the accounts discussed is that by Arad (1998), which distinguishes stative OE verbs, in which the psych state of the Experiencer and the stimulus are cotemporal, as in *John's haircut annoys Laura*,¹ from non-stative OE verbs, where the stimulus and its perception precede the Experiencer's mental state, as in *The thunderstorm frightened Laura*. Another is that of Rothmayr (2009), according to which the semantic structure of stative psych verbs differs from that of eventive/agentive ones by the presence of a BECOME operator in the latter (both stative and eventive psych verbs structure contain the CAUSE operator).

In the subsequent section Rozwadowska discusses the initial-point approaches, and more specifically Bar-el's (2005) and Marin and McNally's (2011) accounts. She shows that Polish perfective psych verbs, marked with an

¹ Unless indicated otherwise, examples come from the reviewed volume. Glosses have been adapted to fit *JSL* style.

appropriate prefix, have inceptive and not achievement interpretations. She presents her argument by contrasting Polish psych verbs with both achievement and accomplishment non-psych verbs, applying several tests. Among those only one, i.e., the compatibility with the verb *przestać* 'to stop', renders the same positive results for both telic verbs and psych verbs. By contrast, the event-continuation test (*Janek pokochał Marię i nadal ją kocha* 'Janek started to love Maria and still loves her'), the culmination cancellation test (*Językoznawstwo zafascynowało Janka i nie przestało go fascynować* 'Linguistics started to fascinate Janek and has not stopped fascinating him'), and one type of entailment between perfective and imperfective, i.e., perfective at one time entails imperfective at a subsequent time (**Maria pokochała Janka ale go nie kocha* 'Maria started to love Janek but she does not love him') give positive results for psych verbs and negative results for either accomplishment or achievement verbs. On the other hand, the gradual-onset reading test (**Maria złościła Jana, ale go nie rozzłościła* 'Maria was annoying Janek but she did not get him annoyed') and compatibility with the verb *skończyć* 'to finish' (**Maria skończyła kochać Jana* 'Maria finished loving Janek'), which give positive results for achievement and accomplishment verbs, give negative results for psych verbs. The author thus concludes that "the relation between the imperfective form of the stative psych verb and its perfective variant is not idiosyncratic but systematic. The perfective form of stative psych verbs makes the beginning of the state visible, and not its final stage" (54).

In the next section Rozwadowska contrasts the possibilities of passivization of psych verbs and non-psych verbs. She shows that in contrast to non-psych verbs, which accept the so-called resultative passive, or stative passive in her terminology (with perfective participle and auxiliary *być* 'to be'), e.g., *Drzwi są otwarte/zamknięte (przez Janka)* 'The door is opened/closed (by Janek)', psych verbs are not possible in the resultative passive (**Prezydent jest pokochany przez naród* 'The president is loved_{PRF} by the nation'). This, together with some other tests, leads her to argue that "perfective psych verbs neither have a result phrase nor an underlying prior causative event in their denotation. This syntactic behavior nicely corresponds with the lack of the final end-point and the lack of the gradual onset" (64).

The subsequent section offers a formal analysis of Polish psych verbs' semantic structure. For this purpose the author adopts a modified version of Ramchand's (2004) model, replacing the result phrase with a state phrase. In fact, she discusses two alternative models consistent with her analysis: they differ as to the higher DP either being the Spec of the Initiation Phrase (InitP) or of the State Phrase (StateP). She follows her discussion by amending Ramchand's (2004) analysis of aspect: she introduces the Inceptive as a subtype of Transition within the Perfective.

In her conclusion Rozwadowska argues, convincingly in my opinion, that aspect languages differ from aspect-less languages among other ways in the

area of psych verbs because perfectivity is not equivalent to telicity. What I find the most valid argument, theory independently, is her aligning with Ramchand (2019) to say that “the [linguistic] behavior cannot be predicted directly from the semantics of real-world situations, but that facts about situations in the world feed, but underdetermine the way in which events are represented linguistically” (70).

While my judgments of acceptability of some of the examples differ from those presented in the text, they mainly concern examples that are not crucial to the argument. For example, I do not find the sentence *Janek zdobywał szczyt, ale go nie zdobył* ‘Janek was reaching the summit, but he did not reach it’ (46) acceptable. But other examples provided for achievement verbs are not controversial. Possibly *zdobyc* in the sense of reaching the summit is not an achievement but an accomplishment.

In Chapter 3, “Encoding inception in the domain of psych verbs in Polish”, Adam Biały provides further evidence for Polish psych verbs not being achievements, in contrast to what has been postulated in the literature for German and English verbs. His evidence is based on the compatibility of Polish psych verbs with aspectual affixes. He also argues that Polish psych verbs are invariably simple, non-dynamic events. He argues that prefixation (both possibilities and restrictions) can serve as a diagnostic for event structure. For Polish it is also important that prefixed perfective psych verbs invariably acquire an inceptive value, which confirms the findings offered by Rozwadowska in the previous chapter. For his argumentation Biały follows the view generally accepted in the generative literature that aspectual prefixes fall into two groups: lexical prefixes and superlexical prefixes (Romanova 2004). However, in Polish, there is a widespread and recognized syncretism between the two types: the same form appears as a lexical prefix with some verb stems, and as superlexical with others. The distinction between two types of prefixes is further related to two types of event structures: simple and complex (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1999). The author argues that prefixes appearing in the context of a complex structure are interpreted as lexical and originate in the Result Phrase. By contrast, superlexical prefixes do not affect the event-structure composition of the verb they combine with. This diagnostic is discussed for all kinds of Polish verbs and once its value is confirmed, it is applied to Polish psych verbs. It is shown that psych verbs combined with perfective prefixes give rise to inceptive readings only, and not resultative ones (the tests are similar to those applied by Rozwadowska in the previous chapter). Once those features of Polish psych verbs are confirmed, Biały turns to examining SE and OE verbs. Although initially he puts forward a hypothesis that SE verbs and OE verbs differ as to event structure (with SE verbs corresponding to simple events and OE verbs corresponding to complex ones), this hypothesis is rejected given the behavior of the two types of verbs. Thus Biały arrives at the conclusion that both SE and OE psych verbs correspond to simple events, but

OE verbs are non-homogeneous insofar as some of them are non-episodic stative predicates, and others are episodic stative predicates.

The author concludes that, contrary to what has been postulated in the literature, all Polish psych verbs are simple state verbs, and in the cases when OE verbs can be interpreted as accomplishments, this is due to coercion. In general, his findings mesh with what was argued by Rozwadowska.

In Chapter 4, “Initiators, states, and passives in Spanish psych verbs”, Antonio Fábregas and Rafael Marín discuss Spanish psych verbs within a framework similar to the one adopted by Rozwadowska and Biały in the two previous chapters. They focus on OE psych verbs, and specifically, the possibilities and constraints on their passivization. The paper challenges Landau’s (2002) claim that the availability of eventive passives for OE psych verbs (OEPV) in a given language correlates with the presence of pseudopassives. Thus English has both, e.g., *Mary was terrified by John* and *This bed has been slept in*, while Italian has none: **Maria è stata terrorizzata da Gianni* and **Questo letto è stato dormito in*. Fábregas and Marín state that the situation is much more complex in Spanish, where the eventive passive is possible with some of the OEPV but not with others.

On the basis of possible restrictions on eventive passives, which in Spanish are formally distinguished from the stative passives (the auxiliary verb is *ser* for eventives and *estar* for statives), they divide Spanish verbs that involve mental states into three groups. The first group is composed of verbs that show no restrictions whatsoever on eventive passives. Concerning these the authors arrive at the conclusion that although they can be considered psychological verbs on the basis of their “real-world semantics” (see quote from Ramchand (2019) above), they are not psych verbs grammatically. In fact, they describe them as “telic verbs of other types whose lexical meaning involves the entailment that the object experiences a psychological state for the event to culminate” (117), and they even comment that in some cases the resulting psychological state is not an entailment but only an implicature. The group includes such verbs as: *acosar* ‘harass’, *consolar* ‘comfort’, *estimular* ‘stimulate’, *humillar* ‘humiliate’, *importunar* ‘pester’, *ofender* ‘offend’, *seducir* ‘seduce’, among which the first two do not entail a psychological state. The second group consists of verbs that, though they accept eventive passives, require them to be non-specific, i.e., without a definite agent and without a definite time period. This group includes *aliviar* ‘relieve’, *apaciguar* ‘calm down’, *asustar* ‘scare’, *atemorizar* ‘frighten’, *confundir* ‘confuse’, *contrariar* ‘disappoint’, *deslumbrar* ‘fascinate’, *desmotivar* ‘demotivate’, *excitar* ‘excite’, *fastidiar* ‘annoy’, *frustrar* ‘frustrate’, *perturbar* ‘distress’, *sorprender* ‘surprise’. The third group does not accept eventive passives under any circumstances, and comprises *aburrir* ‘bore’, *apasionar* ‘make someone be passionate about’, *apenar* ‘make sad’, *apesadumbrar* ‘make sad’, *consternar* ‘dismay’, *deprimir* ‘depress’, *desesperar* ‘exasperate’, *enfadar* ‘anger’, *enfurecer* ‘make furious’, *enojar* ‘make angry’, *enorgullecer* ‘make proud’,

entristecer ‘make sad’, *entusiasmar* ‘excite’, *espantar* ‘frighten’, *fascinar* ‘fascinate’, *desilusionar* ‘disappoint’, *indignar* ‘outrage’, *interesar* ‘make interested’, *mosquear* ‘annoy’, *obnubilar* ‘bewilder’, *obsesionar* ‘obsess’, *ofuscar* ‘obfuscate’, and *preocupar* ‘worry’. This group is further divided into two subgroups. For the first of them it is noted that the grammatical subject of the active form, even if human, should not be interpreted as the Causer of emotion but its Target. The evidence includes marginality of imperatives and the fact that, for active sentences including a prepositional phrase, the stative passive can contain a human Target but cannot contain a non-human Initiator (127–28).

- (1) Pedro enfadó a María con su artículo.
 Pedro anger_{PST.3SG} DOM² María with his article
 ‘Pedro angered María with his article.’
- (2) *María está enfadada con el artículo de Pedro.
 María is angered_{F.SG} with ART article of Pedro
 ‘María is angry with Pedro’s article.’
- (3) María está enfadada con Pedro.
 María is angered_{F.SG} with Pedro
 ‘María is angry with Pedro.’

The second subgroup of group three possesses another characteristic, namely, when used in the progressive periphrasis, “the progressive tense is interpreted with the object already experiencing the state denoted by the verb”.

- (4) La situación está aburriendo a María. (p. 129)
 ART situation is boring DOM María
 ‘The situation is boring *María*.’

This contrasts with what characterized the verbs from group two, e.g.:

- (5) La situación está aliviando a María. (p. 125)
 ART situation is relieving DOM María
 ‘The situation is relieving DOM *María*.’

² DOM stands for differential object marking. It glosses the preposition *a* that is usually but not exclusively used to mark direct objects as human and can serve as a marker of a semantic distinction. A homonymous preposition is used to mark dative objects, as in Chapter 5.

In (5) the progressive periphrasis “means that *María* has not completely reached the mental state that is described as *aliviada* ‘relieved’, but she is close to it” (125).

The lists of verbs belonging to the three groups are given here at length to show that intuitively synonymous verbs can belong to different groups.

According to the authors the differences between the three groups result from differences in the semantico-syntactic representation in each group. The telic verbs from group one present a complex event structure, “with at least two subevents, one of them dynamic”, with the active subject as Initiator (INIT) and the object as the entity that undergoes the process denoted by the Process Phrase, or more accurately by the element PROC. The verbs from the second group contain the INIT but no PROC; that is why they denote just the initial state of the eventuality. The third group is characterized by structure similar to group two, although their InitP layer is defective. This model is one of the two adopted by Rozwadowska in Chapter 2.

The three chapters discussed so far, although they concern similar phenomena, can perfectly well be read independently, since each of them introduces the relevant framework on its own, even if the theoretical framework is shared. The reader is thus able to pick and choose specific topics and languages relevant for their research interests. However, this independence of chapters can at the same time be seen as a slight disadvantage, as reading all three chapters as a whole leaves the reader with some unanswered questions. From the formal analyses presented by Rozwadowska in Chapter 2 and by Fábregas and Marín in Chapter 4, the reader is led to think that Rozwadowska assumes or believes, possibly rightly, that Polish psych verbs can be considered as such both on semantic and on grammatical grounds. But an explicit confirmation would be helpful, in particular since the issue of what a psych verb in fact is is left somehow to be inferred from the examples provided. Additionally, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández in Chapter 6 broadens the notion of psych verb even more and includes all verbs that accept datives denoting a psychologically affected human being (see below). Another interesting question concerns the differences between formal representations for Polish and Spanish: why it is necessary to posit the Result Phrase for Spanish psych verbs and not for Polish—whether it is only the question of Polish having morphological, either lexical or superlexical markers for the perfective / imperfective distinction, or some other issues are at play here. Finally, when Polish and Spanish passivization is compared, it seems that Polish psych verbs do not accept stative passives, as shown by Rozwadowska, but accept eventive passives, while Spanish psych verbs seem to do the opposite: they do not accept eventive passive. This is a marginal but interesting twist in the results.

Chapter 5, “The syntax of accusative and dative Experiencers in Polish”, constitutes an excellent transition between the previous and subsequent chapters since it deals both with Datives and with psych verbs. In this chap-

ter Anna Bondaruk compares the syntactic characteristics of OE psych verbs that combine with accusative or dative case. The main question she raises is whether the structures are unaccusative or simply transitive. In order to analyze the relevant structures the author applies a series of tests recognized in the generative literature. These include anaphor binding and pronominal variable binding as well as passivization. She shows that dative Experiencers can bind subject-oriented anaphors in specific conditions that enable them to control the Anaphor Agreement Effect, while accusative Experiencers cannot. Therefore she concludes that dative and accusative Experiencers must be projected in different syntactic positions, with accusatives projected VP-internally, and datives in the Spec *v*P position.

Her other tests revealing syntactic properties of OE verbs show that neither for verbs combining with accusative Experiencers nor for those combining with dative Experiencers can it be argued that they fall within any previously recognized verb classes. Yet the special status of both types of OE verbs cannot be accounted for in a uniform way. In consequence she offers two distinct analyses for Experiencer-first ordering of Polish OE psych verbs.

The next two chapters go beyond psych verbs as their subject matter and focus on datives in Spanish (Chapter 6) and Polish (Chapter 7). In Chapter 6, "The information structure of high and low datives and their psychological import", Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández broadens the linguistic scope of psych phenomena and assumes that "most datives are involved in some (vague) psychological experience as a consequence of the event" (216). Hence, he broadens the definition of psych verbs to include all those accompanied by an argument with a psychological import. To include all types of Spanish datives in a psych-verb study, he proceeds to prove that they are in fact arguments and not adjuncts. In his material he includes all the types of Spanish datives recognized by Campos (1999) as shown below.

(a) Goal Datives, e.g.

Les dije la verdad a mis padres.
 CL_{3PL}.DAT tell_{PST.1SG} ART truth to my_{PL} parents
 'I told *my parents* the truth.'³

(b) Dative of Interest, e.g.

Le corté el cesped a Maggie.
 CL_{3SG}.DAT cut_{PST.1SG} ART grass to Maggie
 'I cut the grass *for Maggie*.'

³ Spanish examples and glosses come from the work discussed. It should be noted that Polish counterparts of these examples also bear appropriate datives, though without the clitics *le* (singular) and *les* (plural), e.g., *Powiedziałam rodzicom prawdę* 'I told my parents the truth'.

- (c) Source Dative, e.g.
 Le quitaron el pasaporte al Sr. Guevara.
 CL_{3SG.DAT} remove_{PST.3PL} ART passport to.ART_{SG.MASC} Mr. Guevara
 'They took the passport from *Mr. Guevara*.'
- (d) Existential Dative, e.g.
 A Kiko le falta un millón de pesos para construirse
 to Kiko him miss ART million of pesos to to.build.REFL
 la piscina
 ART swimming pool
 'Kiko doesn't have a million pesos to build a pool for himself.'
- (e) Sympathetic Dative, e.g.
 Le rompieron la camisa a Pedro.
 CL_{3SG.DAT} break_{PST.3PL} ART shirt to Pedro
 'They tore *Pedro's* shirt.'
- (f) Ethical Dative, e.g.
 Me suspendieron al niño de la escuela.
 CL_{1SG.DAT} fail_{PST.3PL} to.ART child_{MASC} of ART school
 'They kicked my kid from school.'
- (g) Relational Dative, e.g.
 A Choche le pareció buenísima la idea de Ximena.
 to Choche CL_{3SG.DAT} seem_{PST.3SG} very.good ART idea of Ximena
 'Ximena's idea seemed very good to *Choche*.'

To which he adds the so called anticausative constructions of the kind: *A Pedro se le quemó la comida* 'Pedro has (unintentionally) burned the food'. (Cf. Polish: *Piotrowi przypaliło się jedzenie*, see the discussion of the final chapter of the book.)

In order to prove that all these datives are in fact arguments and not adjuncts (since their status is not uniformly recognized as such in Spanish linguistics) he applies the test proposed by Gutiérrez Ordóñez (1999). The test consists in focalizing the dative in a conditional clause and identifying it as Contrastive Focus in the main clause. If an indefinite dative is obligatory in the conditional clause, then it is an argument and not adjunct (222).

The test works for sentences with psych verbs of the kind *gustar* 'please' and for all the datives included in the list above, with the test phrase taking the form *Si *(a alguien) le dije la verdad, fue a mis padres* 'If I told the truth *(to anybody), it was to my parents'. In all cases the indefinite pronoun *alguien* 'anybody' is obligatory. Since the original Gutiérrez Ordóñez's test was carried out for accusative objects vs prepositional objects and did not involve clitics in the conditional clause (*Llevaba la bandeja* 'She was holding the tray'

and *Si *(algo) llevaba, era la bandeja* 'If she was holding *(anything), it was the tray'), one might wonder if the test was appropriately modified, and if the obligatory nature of the indefinite pronoun was due to the presence of the dative clitic *le(s)* in the conditional clause. However, a native speaker of Spanish I consulted judged variants without the dative clitics in the conditional clause either incorrect or awkward, so these concerns do not seem warranted. One may, however, have another concern about the validity of this test. I tried to apply it to the Polish counterparts of the Spanish examples, e.g., *Jeśli *(komuś) powiedziałam prawdę, to rodzicom* 'If I told the truth *(to anybody), it was to my parents' and the results were similar to those obtained for Spanish. However, when I applied the same test to other types of Polish sentences used to illustrate various tests for argumenthood, the situation was not that straightforward. For example, in my opinion there is little discernible difference between Time and Goal in goal sentences in Polish, e.g., *Jeśli [?](gdzieś) przyjechał, to do Warszawy* 'If he arrived (somewhere) it was in Warsaw' vs. *Jeśli [?](kiedyś) przyjechał, to wczoraj* 'If he arrived (at some time) it was yesterday' and vs. *Jeśli płakała, to ze złości* 'If she cried, it was from anger'. At a first glance it seems to me that in Polish some alleged adjuncts do tend to behave like arguments when focalized, which makes sense from the Information Structure point of view; however, the question remains why some do not.

Further on, the author draws an important distinction among dative arguments. Some of them are so-called low applicatives, i.e., those where the Applicative Phrase headed by the dative clitic is derived below *v*, within the *v*P. By contrast, high applicatives are derived above *v*P. The test proposed to distinguish the two involves the possibility of fronting the dative in all-focus sentences. While high applicatives can be fronted, low applicatives cannot, which provides evidence for the validity of the analysis. What I missed in the Conclusion section is an explicit division of the eight datives presented in the typology offered into high and low applicatives. I tried to produce one myself on the basis of the data presented in the text and came up with the following result: only Goal, Source and, rather counterintuitively, Dative of Interest seem to be derived as low applicatives, while all the other types discussed in the chapter appear as high applicatives. It would be interesting to see whether this distinction affects their psychological import, announced in the chapter's title but left somehow under-elaborated.

In the final chapter, "Polish impersonal middles with a dative as syntactically derived experience events", Ewa Willim examines Polish structures featuring a transitive verb in the imperfective aspect, an overt dative argument understood to be (coreferential with) the Agent of the activity event denoted by the VP, an adverb like *łatwo* 'easily' or a PP like *z przyjemnością* 'with pleasure', and the (formally) reflexive *się*, e.g., *Słuchało mi się tego przyjemnie* 'It was pleasant for me to listen to this.' Upon comparing these structures with personal middles, e.g., *Ta koszula prasuje się ciężko* 'This shirt irons with difficulty'

among others, the author arrives at several conclusions that improve upon previous analyses. First of all, she argues that these constructions (DIM—dative impersonal middles) are not parasitic upon either generic impersonal structures of the kind *Tu się dobrze siedzi* ‘It is nice to sit here’ [my example] nor upon personal middles (PM)

She analyzes DIMs as structures without Agent in which the evaluative adverbial is parametrized to the Dative Experiencer, which seems intuitively correct not only on formal but also on pre-theoretical semantic grounds. Both the dative Experiencer and the adverbial are thus parts of the same Applicative Phrase, and by the same token the adverbial remains outside the VP. The adverbial is further analyzed as a judge-dependent Degree adverbial, with the judge equated with the Experiencer. *Się* is analyzed as an argument expletive, and not as a vocabulary item realizing Voice morphology, as is the case in personal middles. She also notes that Polish DIMs and PMs differ as to their Information Structure properties: in DIMs it is the dative which is information-structure prominent (as topic), while in PMs it is the verb’s object that is information-structure prominent. Since both PMs’ and DIMs’ datives are unaffected by the genitive of negation, both datives are analyzed as inherent and not structural. Yet another one of Willim’s findings is that Polish DIMs defy Burzio’s (1986) generalization, since their Accusative case is assigned to the object of the verb, without there being a subject with an assigned θ -role. Through this she contributes to the body of research on what she calls anti-Burzio structures.

The volume as a whole does exactly what the editors promise in their introductory passage. It is an important contribution to the formal study of psychological verbs and structures with psychological import. Focus on two typologically distinct languages brings to the fore several important issues: the differences and similarities between various ways of encoding psychological phenomena; differences in understanding the very term “psych verb” and the distinction between semantically psychological verbs and grammatically psychological verbs, and more specifically the fact that synonymous or near-synonymous lexical items within the same language can belong to distinct classes; differences in event structure of grammatically psychological verbs cross-linguistically; and the role of information structure both as a diagnostic tool and as a distinctive feature among broadly similar phenomena within a single language.

As all of the chapters report on formal studies, the volume tends to require of its readers a solid familiarity with generative grammar and also some familiarity with previous studies concerning psych verbs.

References

- Arad, Maya. (1998) "Psych-notes". *UCL Working papers in linguistics* 10: 203–23.
- Bar-el, Leora. (2005) *Aspectual distinctions in Squamish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi. (1988) "Psych-verbs and θ -theory". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6: 291–352. DOI 10.1007/BF00133902.
- Burzio, Luigi. (1986) *Italian syntax: A government-binding approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI 10.1007/978-94-009-4522-7.
- Campos, Héctor. (1999) "Transitividad e intransitividad". Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, eds. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1519–74.
- Gelderen, Elly van. (2018) *The diachrony of verb meaning: Aspect and argument structure*. London: Routledge. DOI 10.4324/9781315180335.
- Gutiérrez-Ordóñez, Salvador. (1999) "Los dativos". Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, eds. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1855–930.
- Landau, Idan. (2002) "A typology of psych passives". Masako Hirotani, ed. *The Proceedings of the 32nd Conference of the North Eastern Linguistic Society, NELS 32*. Amherst, MA: GLSA, 271–86.
- . (2010) *The locative syntax of experiencers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. (1999) "Two structures for compositionally derived events". Tanya Matthews and Devon Strolovitch, eds. *Proceedings of SALT 9*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, 199–223.
- Marín, Rafael and Louise McNally. (2011) "Inchoativity, change of state, and telicity: Evidence from Spanish reflexive psychological verbs". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 29(2): 467–502. DOI 10.1007/s11049-011-9127-3.
- Ramchand, Gillian. (2004) "Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes". Peter Svenonius, ed. *Nordlyd* 32(2): 323–61. [*Special issue on Slavic prefixes.*]
- . (2019) "Event structure and verbal decomposition". Robert Truswell, ed. *The Oxford handbook of event structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 314–41.
- Romanova, Eugenia. (2004) "Superlexical vs. lexical prefixes". Peter Svenonius, ed. *Nordlyd* 32(2): 255–78. [*Special issue on Slavic prefixes.*]
- Rothmayr, Antonia. (2009) *The structure of stative verbs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI 10.1075/la.143.