

The morphological structure of a PA like *rozczarowująco* ‘disappointingly’ motivates the syntactic decomposition in (6). I assume that theme vowels realise the category-defining head *v* (Svenonius 2004, Biskup 2019) and that 2IMP merges on top of *v*. Given this analysis, we must conclude that neither *v* nor 2IMP are sufficient to license [+event] (*pace* Harley 2009).

If *v* and 2IMP do not license [+event], then what does? I follow Borer (2005, 2013) in linking [+event] to the functional head introducing the external argument, call it Voice-Event. The semantic restrictions on PAs might then follow from the absence of this functional head in (6). Suppose that Stimuli/ Causes can be introduced by a ‘flavour’ of *v*, but that Voice-Event is necessary to license Agents/Initiators. Suppose further that activity verbs like *wy-cier-a(j)-ć* ‘to wipe’ conceptually entail an Agent/Initiator, but that this argument must still be licensed in the syntax, e.g. by Voice-Event. In this way, we correctly rule out **wy-cier-aj-qc-o* in (3).

Next, consider the agentive nominalisations in (7). Their referent corresponds to the external argument of the underlying verb. The internal argument, if present, takes the form of a genitive complement. Crucially, *-acz/-arka* nominals contain theme vowels as well as the 2IMP suffix.

- (7) a. od-gruz-ow(a)-yw(a)-acz mieszkań mieszkań GEN b. wy-ład-ow(a)-yw(a)-arka towaru
 from-rubble-TH-2IMP-N flats.GEN out-load-TH-2IMP-N product.GEN
 ‘declutterer of apartments’ ‘unloader of products’

Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1992) distinguish between [+event] and [-event] *-er* nominals in English. [+event] nominals take genitive complements and give rise to event entailments. In contrast, [-event] nominal lack complements and do not imply events. To give an example from Polish, (8a) preferentially refers to a person or a machine (Agent/Initiator) that has erased some ink in the past. In contrast, (8b) is ambiguous between Agent and Instrument, and it does not entail the existence of any ink-erasing events. (The optional PP forces the Instrument reading.)

- (8) a. z-maz-(a)-yw(a)-acz atramentu atramentu GEN b. z-maz-(a)-yw(a)-acz (do atramentu)
 from-blot-TH-2IMP-N ink.GEN out-load-TH-2IMP-N for ink.GEN
 ‘eraser of ink’ ‘(ink) eraser’

Following van Hout & Roeper (1998), I assume that the [+event] / [-event] ambiguity has a structural source (cf. Alexiadou & Schäfer 2010 for a different view). On this analysis, [+event] nominals embed Voice-Event (9a), while [-event] nominals do not (9b). In the latter case, the role of Agent/Initiator is contributed directly by the nominaliser *-acz/-arka*. Once again, we find that *v* and 2IMP do not give rise to event entailments and Argument Structure in (8b)/(9b).

- (9) a. [*n* [Voice-Event [2IMP [*v* [√ [ARG_{INT} LPFX]]]]]]]]
 b. [*n* [2IMP [*v* [√ [∅ LPFX]]]]]]]]]]]

How do deverbal formations inform our understanding of the 2IMP suffix? As already mentioned, 2IMP is not sufficient for the emergence of event and argument structure, i.e. it does not entail [+event]. Furthermore, 2IMP occurs in constructions which lack the Voice-Event projection, cf. (5)/(8b). Assuming that heads which ‘go missing’ in deverbal formations are structurally higher than those which remain, I conclude that 2IMP is below Voice-Event.

Finally, the relatively low position of 2IMP indicates that the semantics of this head should not be modelled at the level of temporal relations. This is especially so since the PAs in (1)/(4b) are event modifiers: their type is $\langle st, st \rangle$. It follows that 2IMP cannot be involved in the shift from predicates of events $\langle s, t \rangle$ to predicates of times $\langle i, t \rangle$ (*pace* Ramchand 2008). Rather, 2IMP is an inner-aspectual operator which either binds off the result state introduced by the prefix (Tatevosov 2015, 2017) or asserts that the event predicate is homogenous (Łazorczyk 2010).

Selected References:

Acedo-Matellán & Mateu (2012). The manner/result complementarity revisited: a syntactic approach. **Alexiadou, A. & F. Schäfer (2010)**. On the syntax of episodic vs. dispositional *-er* nominals. **Borer, H. (2005)**. *The Normal Course of Events*. **Borer, H. (2013)**. *Taking Form*. **Czaykowska-Higgins, E. (1998)**. Verbalizing suffixes and the structure of the Polish verb. **Harley, H. (2005)**. How do verbs get their names? **Van Hout, A. & T. Roeper (1998)**. Events and aspectual structure in derivational morphology. **Levin, B. (1993)**. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. **Łazorczyk, A. (2010)**. *Decomposing Slavic Aspect*. **Ramchand, G. (2008)**. Perfectivity as aspectual definiteness: time and the event in Russian. **Rappaport Hovav, M. & B. Levin (1992)**. *-er* nominals: implications for a theory of argument structure. **Svenonius, P. (2004a)**. Slavic prefixes and morphology. **Tatevosov, S. (2011)**. Severing perfectivity from the verb. **Tatevosov, S. (2015)**. Severing imperfectivity from the verb.