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0. Roadmap

0.1 Puzzle: Certain Adversity Impersonals can optionally have a second internal argument in instrumental case


0.3 Proposal: The instrumental DP is licensed in the presence of a result state

0.4 Analysis: AIs select Result Phrase (Ramchand 2005), which introduces INST DP

0.5 Conclusion

1. Puzzle

1.1 Adversity Impersonals (AI)

Adverse events without external arguments (see Appendix A)
- ACC with no nominative case marked DP, contra Burzio’s Generalization (Burzio 1986)
- Non-agreeing verbal morphology (Past: 3p, sg, neut –lo)

(1) Soldata ranilo pulej.
   *soldier[ACC] wounded[AOR] bullet[DAT]
   ‘A soldier was wounded by a bullet.’ (Lavine & Freidin 2002: 258)

1.2 Restrictions on the second internal argument (first pass)

Psych verbs disallow the instrumental DP (2), (3)
- The second internal argument must be introduced by a P (3)

(2) a. Non-psy(h)ch(ological) verb
    Rebënka pridavilo igruşkoj.
    child[ACC] crushed[ACR] toy[DAT]
    ‘The child got crushed by a toy’
    b. Psych AI
    *Rebënka napugalo igruşkoj.
        child[ACC] frightened[ACR] toy[DAT]
    ‘The child got frightened by a toy’

(3) a. *Ivana vžbesilo etimi slovami
    Ivan[ACC] enraged[ACR] these words[PL]
    ‘These words enraged Ivan’
    b. Ivana vžbesilo [et ot etix slov]
       Ivan[ACC] enraged[ACR] from these words[GEN]
       ‘The toys are crushing Ivan’

2. Previous analyses

2.1 Tsedryk (2004)

Psych verbs denote different kinds of predication

(4) Psych imperfective: Individual level/categorical
    Ivana pugajut igruski.
    Ivan[ACC] frighten[IMPR] toy[PL]
    ‘Toys frighten Ivan.’

(5) Non-psy imperfective: Stage level/thetic
    Ivana pridavliajut igruski.
    Ivan[ACC] crush[IMPR] toy[PL]
    ‘The toys are crushing Ivan.’

PredP is a CFC and therefore Spelled-out in (b)

(6) a. [+psych]
    (7) [T [ [VP Pred [DP Theme]]] [-psych]

DP Theme Spelled out without case, INST is assigned as a default

(7) [T [ [VP Pred [DP Theme]]] [-psych]
    (Tsedryk 2004: 437)
2.1.1 Challenges for this analysis

Als from psych verbs in the perfective form can denote events, cf. (2), (3)

Spell-out of PredP predicts that the second internal argument will never bear
nominative case (see (35) in Appendix B) (Assuming they have the same argument
structure, cf Babby (1994))

2.2 Lavine and Franks (2008), Lavine (2010)

Accusative case is assigned to the lower thematic argument ("Accusative First
Syntax")

(8) Thematic Hierarchy (Jackendoff 1972)
Agent > Causer > Experiencer > Instrument/Goal/Source > Theme > Location

(9) a. Non-psych AI: Source > Theme
   Ego oslepilo molniej.
   'He was blinded by lightning'
   (Lavine and Franks 2008)

   b. Psych AI: Experiencer > Source
   *Rebënka napugalo igruškoj.
   'The noise delighted the child'
   (Tsednyk 2004: 426)

2.2.1 Lavine (2012)

Causation, introduced by a vCAUS head (Appendix A: Markman 2004), is sufficient to
license ACC, telicity as introduced by vTELIC/QUANT need not be present

(10) Počemu kogda plaješ, ot sliož ekčet glaza?
    why when cry from tears burn eyes
   'Why is it that when you cry, your eyes burn from the tears?'
   (Lavine 2012: 13)

2.2.2 Challenges for this analysis

Testing with a "Causing event identifying" Source is difficult

(11) Event-identifying Source > Experiencer
   ?Ivana napugalo grozoj.
   'Ivan was frightened by the storm.'
   (Lavine & Franks 2008)

(12) a. Event-identifying Source? > Experiencer
    *Rebënka napugalo televizionnoj programmøj.
    'The television program frightened the child'

   b. *Rebënka voskhitoto šumom.
      'The noise delighted the child'

   c. ?Rebënka uvleko muzëkoj.
      'The child was fascinated by the music.'

Causation is sufficient to license ACC, and indeed is entailed by Markman (2004)
VCAUS proposal
   - It is necessary, but NOT sufficient to license the second internal argument

3. Proposal

3.1 The instrumental DP is licensed in the presence of a result state

Parsons (1990) provides a distinction between two kinds of result state
   - Target: Temporary, reversible states
   - Resultant: Permanent - the state of having had some experience

I propose that something closer to a clear target state is necessary to license the
second INST argument
   - Crucially, telicity or boundedness is not sufficient

Non-psych AI ? Target state: The child is squashed flat
(13) Rebënka pridavilo igruškoj.
    'The child got crushed by a toy'

Psych AI ? Resultant state: The child is in the state of having been scared
(14) *Rebënka napugalo igruškoj.
    'The child got frightened by a toy'

3.2 Predictions

This proposal provides some strong predictions:
   A. If you remove the target state, the INST DP is grammatical
   B. If you impose a target state, an INST DP is grammatical
3.3 Brief background: Russian verbal prefixes

3.3.1 Lexical (LP) vs Superlexical (SLP) (see Svenonius 2004, among others)

LPs: Have spatial or idiosyncratic meaning (15)
   Can change argument structure of a verb (16)

(15) a. dumat’ za-dumat’
    think.IMPF think.PRPF
   ‘to think’ ‘to plan’
   b. krutit’ za-krutit’
    turn.IMPF turn.PRPF
   ‘to turn’ ‘to screw in’

(16) a. bit’ (*gvozd’)
    hit.IMPF nail.ACC
   ‘hit [‘nail’]’
   b. v-bit’ (*gvozd’)
    LP-hit.PRPF
   ‘tap in a nail’

SLPs: Simply quantify over the event

(17) pere- distributive
    ‘to do smth. one by one’
   po- delimitative
    ‘to do smth. for a while’
   za- inceptive
    ‘to start doing smth.’
   na- cumulative
    ‘to do smth. a lot’

(18) Imperfect: Perfect:
   čitat’ počitat’
   ‘to read’ ‘to read’

3.3.2 Imperfective vs perfective verbal pairs

A subset of SLPs simply induces perfective aspect (18)
   - The prefix of the psych verb examples (no- in (2): vz- in (3)) make them
     perfective

3.3.3 Lexical prefixes can introduce result state (Spencer and Zaretskaya 1996)

Note that (19) also entails a target state The table can become dirty again

(19) vyteret’ stol
    wipe.ACC table.ACC
   ‘to wipe the table (clean)’

(20) O → Target state [blind]
    Na plazhe nas 0-slepilo solncem.
    on beach usACC blinded.ACC sunINST
    ‘At the beach, we got blinded by the sun’

(21) No prefix → No result state at all
    a. *Na plazhe nas slepilo bleskom vody.
       on beach usACC blinded.ACC glare.ACC water.ACC
       ‘At the beach, we were getting blinded by the glare of the water’
    b. Na plazhe nas slepilo ot bleska vody.
       on beach usACC blinded.ACC from glare.ACC water.ACC
       ‘At the beach, we were getting blinded from the glare of the water’

3.4 Supporting data

3.4.1 Removing prefix from non-psych verb, removing the target state → no INST DP

For each set, the causing event is still present:

Set 1: slepít [‘to blind’]

(20) O → Target state [blind]
    Na plazhe nas 0-slepilo solncem.
    on beach usACC blinded.ACC sunINST
    ‘At the beach, we got blinded by the sun’

(21) No prefix → No result state at all
    a. *Na plazhe nas slepilo bleskom vody.
       on beach usACC blinded.ACC glare.ACC water.ACC
       ‘At the beach, we were getting blinded by the glare of the water’
    b. Na plazhe nas slepilo ot bleska vody.
       on beach usACC blinded.ACC from glare.ACC water.ACC
       ‘At the beach, we were getting blinded from the glare of the water’

Set 2: 2čí [‘to burn’]

(22) S → Target state [down]
    Dom SO-žglo .
    house.ACC burned.ACC down.ACC
    ‘The house got burned down’

(23) No prefix → No result state at all
    a. *Dom žglo korotkim zamykanijem.
       house.ACC burned.ACC [short circuit]INST
       ‘The house was burning by the short circuit’
    b. Dom žglo iz-za korotkogo zamykanija.
       house.ACC burned.ACC from short circuit
       ‘The house was burning because of the short circuit’

Set 3: portít [‘to ruin’]

(24) iz → Target state [ruined]
    Fotografiju iz-portilo vspyškoj
    photograph.ACC from-port.ACC glare.ACC
    ‘The photograph got ruined by the flash.’

(25) No prefix → No result state at all
    a. *Fotografiju portilo vspyškoj
       photograph.ACC from-port.ACC glare.ACC
       ‘The photograph was getting ruined by the flash.’
    b. ??? Fotografiju portilo iz-za vspyški.
       photograph.ACC from-port.ACC because.of glare.ACC
       ‘The photograph was getting ruined because of the flash.’
3.4.2 Adding target state to psych verb → INST DP allowed?
- Compare to (2)

Needs to be a very clear target state

(26) DO → Target state [dead]
  a. ??Bol'nogo DO-pugalo do smerti šumom v koridore
     The sick person got frightened to death by the noise in the hallway'
  b. ??Bol'nogo DO-pugalo do smerti ot šuma v koridore
     The sick person got frightened to death by the noise in the hallway'

(27) PP 'do smerti' → Target state [dead]
  a. Bol'nogo napugalo do smerti šumom v koridore
     The sick person got frightened to death by the noise in the hallway'
  b. ??Bol'nogo napugalo do smerti ot šuma v koridore
     The sick person got frightened to death by the noise in the hallway'

4. Analysis

4.1 Ramchand (2005): In First Phase Syntax, lexical prefixes head Result Phrase

The subject of the result state is also the "holder of the result" - DP 'dog' moves from its position as Figure to Spec of RP, becomes Ground

Lexical prefixes in Russian are generated in R, here vy-

(28) a. Boris vy-brosil sobaku.
    Boris threw out the dog
    v
     V
      SC/RP
       throw
        DP 'sub' of Process
          V
            Prt
             out
              the dog
                DP 'figure'
                  R
                    PP
                      R
                        SC/RP
                          throw
                            the dog
                              DP 'figure'
                                Prt
                                 out
                                   the dog
                                     Ramchand 2005: 336,7)

4.2 Proposal: Adversity impersonals can select for an RP

(29)

Step 1: R (pri-) selects for a small clause (SC)
- SC is comprised of undergoer and target state

Step 2: R introduces Instrument and assigns inherent instrumental case

(30) PRI → Target state [flat]
  a. Reběnka pridavilo igruškoj.
     The child got crushed by a toy
     [state [Fl]]

  b. DP 'sub' of Process
     V
      V
       SC/RP
        throw
          the dog
            R
              PP
                R
                  SC/RP
                    throw
                      the dog
                        DP 'figure'
                          Prt
                           out
                             the dog
                               (Ramchand 2005: 336,7)
4.3 Semantics of R

Modeled after Kratzer (1996)’s Voice head and Event Identification
  - Voice introduces Agent, R introduces Instrument

RP: Semantic interpretation

1. \[[flat]] = \lambda x \lambda s [flat(x)(s)]
2. \[[child]] = the child
3. \[[child flat]] = \lambda s [flat(child)(s)]
   From 1 and 2 by Functional Application
4. \[[port]] = \lambda s [Instrument(s)(s)]
5. \[[[[port]]][[[child flat]][[port]]]] = \lambda s [Instrument(child)(s) & flat(child)(s)]
   From 3 and 4 by State Identification
6. \[[toy]] = the toy
7. \[[[Instrument][[toy]]][[toy]]] = \lambda s [Instrument(toy)(s) & flat(toy)(s)]
   From 5, and 6 by Functional Application

4.4 No clear result state \rightarrow No INST DP

This proposal accounts for the ungrammaticality of the second internal argument of certain illness verbs, first discussed by Babby (1994)
  - Prefix s- in (31) doesn’t introduce a target state

(31) a. *Menja tošnit ryboj
   MeAcc be.nauseous.Acc fishINST
   ‘The fish nauseate me’

b. *Menja stošnilo ryboj
   MeAcc be.nauseous-INST fishINST
   ‘I got nauseous from the fish’

c. Menja tošnit ot ryby
   MeAcc be.nauseous-INST from fishGEN
   ‘I’m nauseous from the fish’

Here, s- is a Superlexical prefix originating in Aspect

(32)

5. Conclusion

5.1 Observation: The presence of causation is necessary but not sufficient to license an INST argument in an Adversity Impersonal

5.2 Proposal: The presence of INST DP should not be linked to the type of verb (psych vs non-psych), but rather to the presence of a target state

5.3 Analysis: Als with two internal arguments select a Result Phrase, headed by R which has the following properties
  A. Pronounced as a lexical verbal prefix (Ramchand 2005)
  B. Selects a small clause, which relates the Theme to a target state
  C. Introduces the instrument of the event and assigns it inherent INST
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Appendices

A. Suppression of external argument

No implicit agentive argument:

(33) a. Dom solagle (*special’no).
    houseMASC.ACC burnedMASC ‘on purpose’
    ‘The house got burned down (*on purpose)’

b. Berēzu svalilo (molniej) / (*Dimoj).
    birchFEM.ACC fellFEM ‘on purpose’ / (*by Dima).
    ‘The birch got fallen down (by lighting) / (*by Dima).’

(Markman 2004: 2)

Markman (2004): Russian has “unbundled” Voice and Cause
- Cause introduces event (a la Pylkkänen (2002)) and assigns ACC

(34) [Her (11b)]

```
  VoiceP
     \   /
      \ /  \'
    Voice  Voice'  CausP
       \       /     /     \  
      Voice  Caus   [ACC]  VP

B. Personal variant of impersonal construction

(35) a. Adversity Impersonal
    Ego oslepilo molniej.
    lightningFEM blindedFEM himMASC
    ‘He was blinded by lightning’

b. Adversity Personal
    Molnija osleplila ego.
    lightningNOM blindedFEM himACC
    ‘The lightning blinded him’

(C) Any imposed target state must be very obvious

(36) PP ‘do krasnolicnosti’ → Target state [redfaced]?
    a. *Ivana vzbesilo etimi slovami do krasnolicnosti
        IvanMASC enraged-AGR [these words]GEN until redfacedness
        ‘Ivan got enraged by these words until he was red in the face’
    b. Ivan vzbēsil [ot eti slov] do krasnolicnosti
        IvanMASC enraged-AGR from [these words]GEN until redfacedness
        ‘Ivan got enraged from these words until he was red in the face’

(Markman 2004: 2)