Abstract
This paper presents a semantic analysis for Psych Verb Constructions in Modern Greek.

1. Introduction: the data
This paper proposes a linking theory for the following constructions:

1. I Maria fovate tis kategides.
   the Maria.N fear.3S the storms.A
   „Mary is afraid of the storms.”
2. I Maria fovate me tis kategides.
   the Maria.N fear.3S with the storms.A
   „Mary is afraid of the storms.”
3. I Maria eksorgizi ton Giani.
   the Maria.N enrage.3S the Giani.A
   „Mary enrages John.”
4. I Maria ton eksorgizi ton Giani.
   the Maria.N cl.A enrage.3S the Giani.A
   „Mary enrages John.”
5. I kategides to fovisan to pedi.
   the storms.N,PL cl.A frighten.PAST.3PL the child.A
   „The thunderstorm frightened the child.”

(1) and (2) represent Experiencer Subject Psych Verb Constructions (henceforward ESPVCs) in Modern Greek (henceforward MG), while (3)-(5) represent Experiencer Object Psych Verb Constructions (henceforward EOPVCs).

2. The challenges
The challenges that these data pose are the following:

a. The split syntactic realization of the „experiencer“ argument which with verbs like fovate in (1) and (2) is syntactically realized as the subject of the sentence, whereas with verbs like the ones in (3)-(5) it is syntactically realized as the object of the sentence.
b. The split syntactic realization of the „experienced“ (henceforward EXPD) semantic role (the term is due to Markantonatou 1995\(^1\); i.e., the traditional „theme“ semantic argument) which in constructions like (1) is syntactically realized as the object of the sentence, while in constructions like (2) it is syntactically realized as the object of a prepositional phrase.

In their attempt to account for the syntactic properties of PVCs, syntactic, (lexical) semantic, and linking theories developed in different frameworks have most of the times sacrificed their success, and consistency, by resorting to idiosyncratic assumptions concerning the syntactic realization of the experiencer semantic argument. The semantic properties and the syntactic behaviour of the EXPD argument have also been left unaccounted for in most of the analyses proposed for PVCs. In the generative tradition, for instance, Grimshaw’s 1990\(^2\) linking theory, which on the one hand relies on thematic roles, but on the other suggests that argument selection is determined by a causal aspectual structure on a separate „tier“ from thematic structure, fails to provide a consistent and parsimonious account for PVCs, since it counter-intuitively stipulates that ESPVCs are no different than normal causative verbs of any natural language.

Dowty 1991\(^3\) is also obliged to admit that his linking theory, which argues for a direct mapping from events in the world and their participants to surface grammatical relations via proto-role entailments, cannot account unproblematically for PVCs either (for more see Dowty 1991, pp. 579-580).

3. The proposal

The semantic and linking theory we propose for MG PVCs is (a) sensitive to the morphological, as well as to the syntactic encoding of the semantic properties of agentivity and causation, and (b) is developed in HPSG (Pollard and Sag 1994)\(^4\), where the semantics is


\(^4\) Carl Pollard and Ivan A. Sag, 1994, Head-DrivenPhrase Structure Grammar, University of Chicago Press.
couched within a situation theoretic framework, according to which verbs are lexically specified for a CONTENT feature with a RELN attribute and a list valued ROLES attribute.

3.1 The syntax and the semantics of MG EOPVCs
As far as the syntax of MG EOPVCs is concerned:
1. the accusative experiencer of MG Agentive EOPVCs is not clitic doubled, while the converse is true for MG Causative EOPVCs;
2. Anagnostopoulou 1994\(^5\) has convincingly shown that MG Agentive EOPVCs differ from Causative ones as far as control of absolute constructions, coordination, and anaphoric binding is concerned;
3. Kordoni 1999\(^6\) has shown that neither the agentive, nor the causative alternant of MG Accusative EOPVCs can undergo passivization.

As far as the semantics of MG EOPVCs is concerned, we apply the Situation Semantics notion of *notion* as used in Wechsler 1995\(^7\), and we propose that:
1. Agentive Accusative EOPVCs in MG entail that the individual denoted by their subject NP has a notion of the individual denoted by their object NP, while the converse entailment does not go through;
2. Causative Accusative EOPVCs in MG do not entail that the semantic argument realized as their subject (animate or inanimate) has any notion of the individual denoted by their object NP. It acts only as the cause (natural or other) initiating the mental state experienced by the individual denoted by their object NP.

3.2 The syntax and the semantics of MG ESPVCs
As far as the syntax of MG ESPVCs is concerned:

---


1. Markantonatou 1995 has shown that MG ESPVCs do not passivize;
2. she has also shown that they are not the passive forms of the corresponding EOPVCs;
3. finally, MG ESPVCs realize syntactically the EXPD semantic role either as the object of the sentence, or as the complement of a prepositional phrase.

As far as the semantics of MG ESPVCs is concerned:
1. MG ESPVCs convey the meaning that „in order for y to love or fear some individual x, y must have a notion of x, since that notion is the content of y’s love, or fear, respectively“;
2. we also suggest that in the case of MG ESPVCs the semantic argument denoted by their object NP or PP is semantically underspecified, in the sense that it is entailed to bear neither Proto-Agent nor Proto-Patient properties;
3. the assumption in 2. helps us formulate a unified linking account of both the transitive and the „intransitive“ MG ESPVCs.

4. Overview
Following Anagnostopoulou 1995⁸ and drawing on the morphological properties of clitic doubled constructions in MG, we provide a semantic and syntactic distinction between the so called Agentive and Causative EOPVCs in MG. Considering Wechsler’s Notion Rule to be the semantic basis of our analysis, and relying on the linking theory of Davis and Koenig 2000⁹, we offer a linking account that makes the correct predictions for the linking of ESPVCs, as well as Accusative, and Causative EOPVCs in MG. Finally, following some of the insights of the linking theory of Markantonatou and Sadler 1996¹⁰, as well as our linking theory of ESPVCs, we formulate a linking theory that accounts for the linking of ESPVCs in MG whose SOA semantic role attribute is syntactically realized as an oblique argument (i.e., the object of a PP), as well as for MG ESPVCs whose SOA semantic role attribute is neither syntactically realized, not existentially quantified.