

Title: Passivization and Argument Structure in Russian and Lithuanian
Author: Cori Anderson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

In this paper, I discuss how the argument structure of a verb relates to its ability to passivize in Russian and Lithuanian. First, I discuss verbs with oblique-case internal arguments, as in (1) and (2) below. It has been claimed (Freidin 1992, Woolford 2006) that the ability of a verb to form the passive is limited to those that assign structural case to their internal arguments. However, the verbs in (1) and (2) assign non-structural case. Thus, the validity of passivization as a test for structural case is called into question.

In addition to issues of oblique case with the passive, examples such as (3) can be found, in which an adjunct is promoted to the subject position under passivization. However, this passivization seems to be limited to instruments, locations, and paths. This is similar to the restriction on English pseudo-passives, from verbs with stranded prepositions of the type ‘This bed was slept in’ (Ramchand & Svenonius 2004). Furthermore, there is an associated meaning of affectedness for these promoted-subject adjuncts; in (3), the spoon is somehow affected by its previous use.

I explore the connection between argument structure and event structure, given the promotion of non-accusative, non-direct objects to subject position under passives. Following the decompositional vP approach of Ramchand 2008, in which subevents (initiation, process and result) of a verb are represented in the syntactic structure, I examine how these oblique case arguments and adjuncts compare structurally to their accusative-case counterparts.

- (1) a. Borisov upravljaet fabrikoj.
 Borisov:NOM manages factory:INST
 ‘Borisov manages the factory’
- b. Fabrika upravljaet-sja Borisovym.
 factory:NOM manages-REFL Borisov:INST
 ‘The factory is managed by Borisov’ (Fowler 1996: 519)
- (2) a. Jonas vadovauja fabriku.
 Jonas:NOM manages factory:DAT
 ‘Jonas manages the factory’
- b. Fabrikas buvo Jono vadovau-t-as.
 factory:NOM.M.SG was Jonas:GEN manage-PASS-M.SG
 ‘The factory was managed by Jonas’
- (3) a. Tu valgai šituo šaukštu.
 you:NOM eat:PRES this:INST spoon:INST
 ‘You are eating with this spoon’
- b. Šis šaukštas tavo valgo-m-as.
 this:NOM.M.SG spoon:NOM.M.SG you:GEN eat:PASS-M.SG
 ‘This spoon has been eaten with by you’ (Jablonskis 1997:132)

Fowler, G. 1996. “Oblique Passivization in Russian.” *Slavic and East European Journal* 40, 3:519–545.

Freidin, R. 1992. *Principles of Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Jablonskis, J. 1997: Lietuvių kalbos gramatika [Grammar of the Lithuanian language]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *A First-phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramchand, Gillian & Peter Svenonius. 2004. Prepositions and External Argument Demotion. In Torgrim Solstad, Benjamin Lyngfelt, and Maria Filiouchkina Krave, eds. *Demoting the Agent: Passive and Other Voice-related Phenomena*, 93–99. University of Oslo.

Woolford, E. 2006. “Lexical Case, Inherent Case, and Argument Structure.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 37 (1):111–30.