

ON THE SEMANTICS OF THE INSTRUMENTAL  
CASE MARKING IN RUSSIAN:  
CONSTRUCTIONS WITH INSTRUMENTAL COMPLEMENTS

by

VALERIJA TRETIK

A THESIS

Presented to the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program  
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Master of Arts

September 2013

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Valeriia Tretiak

Title: On the Semantics of the Instrumental Case Marking in Russian: Constructions with Instrumental Complements

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program by:

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska  
Vsevolod M. Kapatsinski

Chair  
Member

and

Kimberly Andrews Espy

Vice President for Research and Innovation  
Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded September 2013

© 2013 Valeria Tretiak

## THESIS ABSTRACT

Valeriia Tretiak

Master of Arts

Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program

September 2013

Title: On the Semantics of the Instrumental Case Marking in Russian: Constructions with Instrumental Complements

This thesis examines the Instrumental case marking on complements in constructions with verbs denoting movement of body parts, verbs that allow an alternation of the Instrumental and Accusative case marking, and verbs with a semantic content of 'domination,' 'possession' and 'evaluation.' The Instrumental case marking in Russian is used in many ways and is not well understood. This thesis focuses on 'quirky' Instrumental case marking in constructions, in which the semantic motivation of the Instrumental case marking is less than obvious. These constructions represent the unpredictable and controversial uses of the Instrumental case marking and are of particular interest because there is little analysis of them in the scholarly literature.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Valeriia Tretiak

### GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene  
Karelian State Pedagogical University, Petrozavodsk, Russia

### DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies, 2013, University of Oregon  
Specialist degree in English and German Philology, 2004, Karelian State Pedagogical University

### AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Morphology and Syntax  
Neurolinguistics

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate teaching fellow, Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies Program,  
University of Oregon, Eugene, 2011-2013  
Teaching assistant, Department of Russian, Beloit College, 2009-2010  
English language instructor, Educational Center, Petrozavodsk, Russia, 2006-2009

### GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

Graduate Teaching Fellowship, Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies  
Program, 2011-2013  
Fulbright Scholarship, Foreign Language Teaching Assistant, Beloit College, 2009-  
2010  
Diploma with Honors, Karelian State Pedagogical University, 2004

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my committee chair, Professor Cynthia Vakareliyska, who continually and convincingly conveyed a spirit of academic rigor and precision in regard to research and scholarship. I would also like to thank Professor Vakareliyska for her useful comments, remarks and engagement through the writing process of this Master thesis. Without her guidance and invaluable and persistent help this thesis would not have been possible.

I would like to thank my committee member, Professor Vsevolod Kapatsinski, whose comments and suggestions significantly contributed to the improvement of this manuscript.

In addition, I thank the Department of Linguistics for allowing me to present part of this thesis at a linguistics colloquium in October 2012.

I also express my gratitude to the Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies Program and its chair, Professor Katya Hokanson. Being a graduate student in this program gave me an opportunity to further pursue my graduate career in Linguistics.

I thank Hope Marston for her everyday help with administrative matters and paper work.

To my first and most inspiring Linguistics Professor, Natalija Vladimirovna Gorbel,  
who tragically passed away in February 2011.

Und immer sind irgendwo Spuren Ihres Lebens: Gedanken, Bilder, Augenblicke und  
Gefühle. Sie werden mich immer an Sie erinnern und Sie dadurch nie vergessen  
lassen...

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE USES OF THE INSTRUMENTAL CASE MARKING IN RUSSIAN .....	3
III. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND .....	14
IV. OBLIQUE OR NOT OBLIQUE? .....	28
V. IS 'QUIRKY' INSTRUMENTAL CASE MARKING INDEED 'QUIRKY'? .....	37
VI. CONCLUSION .....	52
APPENDICES .....	55
A. THE DATA COLLECTION .....	55
B. ABBREVIATIONS .....	56
REFERENCES CITED .....	58



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the Instrumental case marking (ICM) on complements in constructions with verbs denoting movement of body parts, verbs that allow an ICM/ACM (Accusative case marking) alternation and verbs of domination, possession, and evaluation. These constructions represent the unpredictable and controversial uses of the ICM in Russian and are of particular interest because there is little analysis of them in the scholarly literature.

The ICM in Russian is used in many ways and is not well understood. This thesis focuses on 'quirky' ICM in constructions, in which the semantic motivation of the ICM is less than obvious.

It is important to note that this study examines *case marking* (CM) and not grammatical case itself. Unlike syntactic models, in which case is usually viewed as a syntactic phenomenon that encodes grammatical relations among the noun phrases (NPs) in a clause (Chomsky 1981, Mel'čuk 1986, Kiparsky 1988, de Hoop 1996), the present work considers case as a set of perceived physical and cognitive relations among the *referents* of the NPs in a sentence (Vakareliyska 1994: 7–8). These cognitive relations are expressed morphologically by CMs, or inflections, on the NP that is governed and assigned case by the verb in the sentence.

Unlike other works devoted to the Russian Instrumental case (INST) (Mrázek 1964, Kilby 1986, Wierzbicka 1980, Janda 1993, Raxilina 2011), this thesis makes a deliberate distinction between case and case marking. The scholarly accounts

mentioned above claim they examine the uses of the INST; in fact, however, they talk about the ICM. The distinction made in this thesis is crucial, since the INST in Russian does not always correspond to the ICM. For this reason, I will use INST to indicate the Instrumental case and ICM to indicate the Instrumental case marking.

The INST in Russian is polysemous and encompasses about 20 meanings (Raxilina and Tribušinina, 2011: 45), including agentive (*postroen Ivanom* 'built by Ivan'), comitative (when on the object with the preposition *s* 'with') (*s knigoj* 'with a book'), temporal (*spat' nočami* 'sleep at night'), locative (*idti polem* 'walk through the field'), and instrumental in the semantic role sense (*pisat' karandašom* 'write with a pencil'), to name just a few. In some instances, however, the meaning of the ICM does not seem to correspond to any of these meanings. Such instances include constructions with verbs denoting movement of body parts, verbs that allow an ICM/ ACM alternation, and verbs of domination, possession, and evaluation.

Chapter II discusses a distinction between the INST and ICM in Russian and gives a brief overview of the Russian CM system, providing examples of the ICM.

Chapter III provides a review of the relevant scholarly literature on the INST and constructions with 'quirky' ICM.

Chapter IV argues that the ICM on the NPs of certain transitive verbs does not mark an OBLIQUE but marks an entity that functions as a mandatory participant in a clause.

Chapter V analyzes non-reflexive constructions with the 'quirky' ICM.

Chapter VI presents conclusions with respect to the motivation for ICMs in the 'quirky' INST constructions discussed above.

## CHAPTER II

### THE USES OF THE INSTRUMENTAL CASE MARKING IN RUSSIAN

Contemporary Standard Russian has six cases: Nominative (NOM), Genitive (GEN), Dative (DAT), Accusative (ACC), Instrumental (INST), and Prepositional (Locative (LOC)). Each case in Russian is expressed morphologically on nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and numerals through a set of particular inflections, or case markers, specific not only for each word class but also for each grammatical category (number, gender). Thus, the marker *-oj* on a noun is unmistakably associated with a SG.FEM substantive in the form of the INST. Similarly, *-om* on a substantive is recognized as the INST marker of a SG.MASC noun.

Since case marking is a surface manifestation of deeper cognitive relations among the referents of the NPs in a clause, it is legitimate to say that case marking directly corresponds to case. In other words, a verb in a sentence assigns case and not case marking. The latter, in turn, takes this or that morphological form associated with that case, depending on the grammatical category such as number and gender, as in Russian. Thus, the ICM in Russian is always coherent with the INST, however the INST does not necessarily correspond to the ICM. Consider, for instance, the following example:

(1) Oxotnik ubil utku iz ruž'ja.

Hunter-NOM kill-PAST duck-ACC from-PREP gun-GEN

'A hunter killed a duck with a gun.'

The central meaning of the INST in Russian is that of an instrument or tool that helps perform the action of the finite verb. It is obvious that *ruž'e* 'gun' functions as the instrument in this event. However, instead of the expected INST, the NP receives the GEN. One tentative explanation that begs at once is that the INST might not have a direct correspondence with the ICM. At the same time, it is possible to say the following:

(2) Oxotnik ubil utku ruž'em.

Hunter-NOM kill-PAST duck-ACC gun-INST

'A hunter killed a duck with a gun.'

The difference between these two sentences is that in the first one the NP *ruž'e* is marked GEN, whereas in the second it is marked INST. We may speculate in this respect that the language simply uses its diverse grammatical inventory to express one and the same idea in different ways. However, if we acknowledge the functional nature of natural language, we may come up with a better explanation. Namely, why would a language use different forms to convey one and the same meaning? Probably because these different forms express different meanings. It seems possible to suggest that in the first sentence the "gun" is not viewed as the instrument of killing; more likely it is perceived as the instrument that helped perform the shot but not the act of killing itself. The shot is what caused the duck's death. In the second sentence, the same NP appears with the ICM, which describes a different event construal; namely here the "gun" itself is perceived as the instrument of killing and not the shot made with that

gun. This is what can be called indirect and direct cause, correspondingly. The ICM in this sentence suggests that the gun had physical contact with the duck and thus caused its death, and no shots were made with that gun. As Wierzbicka points out in this respect, in order for a thing to be considered an instrument of the action it must necessarily have a physical contact with the entity that is being acted upon (1980: 146).

At the same time, the sentence given below demonstrates that a real case that reflects the situation that is being construed may not correspond to a given CM:

(3) Novye nožnicy xorošo režut bumagu.

New scissors-NOM well cut-PRES paper-ACC

'The new scissors cut paper well.'

In real-world terms we would consider *nožnicy* 'scissors' an instrument that helps perform the act of cutting, and they are perceived as such in the given event construal, however the NP appears in the NOM, which is not a case marker.

It should be also noted that individual case markers associated with the INST do not have specific meanings of their own; instead they mark specific uses or functions of the INST itself. With this said, the SG.MASC inflection *-om*, for example, marks a number of relations among the referents of a NP on a clause level. Compare the following examples:

(4) Ivan zabil gvozd' molotk-om. (INSTRUMENT)

Ivan-NOM pin-PAST nail-ACC hammer-INST

'Ivan pinned a nail with a hammer.'

(5) Ivan leg spat' večer-om. (time)

Ivan-NOM go-PAST sleep-INF evening-INST

'Ivan went to bed in the evening.'

(6) My znali Ivana ešče rebenk-om. (temporary state)

We-NOM know-PAST Ivan-ACC still child-INST

'We knew Ivan when he still was a child.'

(7) Devočka složila guby bantik-om. (comparison)

Girl-NOM fold-PAST lips-ACC bow-INST

'The girl curved her lips in a bow.'

(8) My obično ezdim v Moskvu poezd-om. (MEANS of transportation)

We-NOM usually go-PRES to Moscow train-INST

'We usually take a train to Moscow.'

As seen from the examples provided above, one and the same SG.MASC.INST marker serves to encode various functions associated with the INST. The same applies to the SG.FEM marker *-oj*, which can occur in similar

constructions. The marker in isolated form does not convey any specific meaning of its own. Conversely, one and the same INST marker may acquire different meanings only in specific syntactic constructions. The meaning of a marker depends on the type/ types of relations associated with a particular case. This makes morphologically different but pragmatically related markers cohere as a set to the extent that whenever one of them acquires a new use, the other markers do too.

The central meaning of the INST in Russian, as well as in other Slavic languages, is that of an instrument or tool that helps the AGENT to perform the action represented by the verb, and thus the main function of the ICM in Russian is to mark the relationship between the AGENT and the participant that is perceived by the speaker as an INSTRUMENT.

(9) Ivan napisal pis'mo rukoi  
Ivan-NOM write-3SG.MASC.PAST letter-ACC.SG hand – INST.SG  
'Ivan wrote a letter by hand.'

(10) Ivan-NOM udaril Petra palkoi.  
Ivan-NOM hit-3SG.MASC.PAST Peter-ACC.MASC stick-INST.SG  
'Ivan hit Peter with a stick.'

Other uses of the ICM are the following<sup>1</sup>:

a) Manner:

---

<sup>1</sup> This classification is a compilation of several accounts, namely Jakobson 1936, Mrázek 1964, Švedova 1980, Wierzbicka 1980, Janda 1993.

(11) Ivan govoriš šepotom.

Ivan-NOM speak-3SG.MASC.PAST whisper-INST.SG

'Ivan spoke in a whisper.'

b) Means:

(12) Ivan pomog mne den'gami.

Ivan-NOM help-3SG.MASC.PAST me money-INST.PL.

'Ivan helped me by means of money.'

c) Circumstance of time:

(13) Ivan napisal pis'mo večerom.

Ivan-NOM write-3SG.MASC.PAST letter-ACC.SG evening-INST.SG

'Ivan wrote a letter in the evening.'

Examples (11) through (13) are the adverbial uses of the ICM, since the NPs marked INST answer the questions 'how' and 'when.' It can be argued, therefore, that, in addition to the 'INSTRUMENT' meaning, another basic usage of the ICM is also adverbial, in which case the ICM makes the predicate NP into an adverbial.

d) On a nominal predicate denoting a profession/ occupation/ capacity with a non-copula verb:



(14) Ivan rabotaet vračom.

Ivan-NOM works-3SG.PRES doctor-INST.SG

'Ivan works as a doctor.'

(15) Ivana vybrali dekanom.

Ivan-ACC choose – 3PL.IMPS.PAST chair-INST.SG

'Ivan was chosen the chair of the department.'

e) On a nominal predicate with a copula verb in the Past and Future tense:

(16) Ivan byl krasivym

Ivan-NOM be-3SG.MASC.PAST handsome-ADJ.INST.SG

'Ivan was handsome.'

(17) Ivan budet uspešnym.

Ivan-NOM be – 3SG.FUT successful-ADJ.INST.SG

'Ivan will be successful.'

It must be noted in this respect that the ICM on a nominal predicate is obligatory in the Future but is used in the Past only for temporary states. An NP that describes a permanent state is usually marked NOM. Similarly, an NP in the form of NOM is used in place of INST in the Present tense. One possible explanation as to why the Present requires NOM is the fact that there is no copula in similar

constructions in the Present tense. Compare the following examples:

(18) Ivan krasivyj i uspešnyj.

Ivan-nom handsome–ADJ.NOM and successful–ADJ.NOM

'Ivan is handsome and successful.'

The ICM also occurs in constructions in which there is a single complement of a transitive verb, but the complement is marked INST and not ACC, as illustrated in the examples below:

(f) Verbs expressing the notion of 'domination and possession':

(19) Ivan vladeet domom v Kalifornii.

Ivan-NOM own-3SG.PRES house-INST.SG in California.

'Ivan owns a house in California.'

(20) Ivan upravljaet firmoj.

Ivan-NOM run-3SG.PRES company-INSTR.SG

'Ivan runs a company.'

(h) With certain verbs denoting movement of body parts:

(21) Ivan sudorožno ševelil pal'cami.

Ivan-NOM convulsively move-3SG.MASC.PAST fingers-INST.MASC.PL

'Ivan convulsively moved (his) fingers.'

(22) Ivan otricateľ'no kačal golovoj.

Ivan-NOM disapprovingly shake-3SG.MASC.PAST head-INST.SG

'Ivan disapprovingly shook (his) head.'

(i) With certain verbs allowing an ICM/ ACM alternation:

(23) [...] (otec) vybežal na ulicu I uvidel, kak tolpa brosala kamnjami i grjaz'ju  
v bezumca v rubišče. (S. A. Eremeeva. *Lekcii po istorii iskusstva*, 1999)

(father) run-PAST on street and see-PAST how crowd-NOM throw-PAST  
stones-INST and dirt-INST at madman-ACC in rags-PREP

'[...] (father) ran out on the street and saw the crowd throw stones and dirt at a  
madman in rags.' (*my translation*)

(24) Ivan brosal kamni v vodu.

Ivan-NOM throw-3SG.MASC.PAST stones-ACC.PL into water-ACC

'Ivan threw stones into the water.'

(25) On vraščaet rulem vpravo-vlevo, i Moskva v oknax Gelendvagen  
povoračivaetsja to odnim bokom, to drugim. (Oleg Zajončkovskij. *Sčast'e  
vozmožno: roman našego vremeni*, 2008)

He rotate-PRES steering wheel-INST right-left and Moscow in windows  
Gelendwagen rotate-PRES either one side or another  
'He rotates the steering wheel to the right and to the left, and Moscow in  
Gelandwagen's windows rotates either to one side or another.' (*my translation*)

(26) Ivan krutil rul'.

Ivan-NOM rotate-3SG.MASC.PAST steering wheel-ACC.SG  
'Ivan rotated the steering wheel.'

(j) With certain verbs presenting emotional states and attitudes:

(27) Ivan uvlekaetsja lingvistikoj.

Ivan-NOM adore-3SG.PRES.REFL linguistics-INST.SG  
'Ivan adores/ is fond of linguistics.'

(28) Ivan vosxiščaetsja kartinoj.

Ivan-NOM admire-3SG.PRES.REFL painting-INST.SG  
'Ivan admires the painting.'

The data given above suggest that each kind of INST construction itself has a conventionalized meaning which may not be equivalent to the sum of the constituent meanings (Raxilina & Tribušinina 2011: 148). Due to the polysemous nature of the Russian INST and numerous usages that one and the same INST marker may have, the meaning of the ICM in the isolated form is sometimes hard to predict. The ICM acquires its particular meaning only in specific syntactic constructions.

## CHAPTER III

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter gives an overview of the major academic accounts that describe the INST in Russian. As has been noted earlier in this work, these accounts do not make a distinction between the INST and ICM. In many respects, however, their argumentation, which is intended as a description of the Russian INST, appears to be a description of the ICM.

The seminal works on the Russian case system are Jakobson's 1936/1958 treatment of the broad meanings of the individual inflections. Jakobson's approach to case is essentially morphological. He deals primarily with binary oppositions in meaning between pairs of case markers. Jakobson considers a single case marker as implying total identity of the markers used for expressing different individual uses of that case. This being said, one and the same marker encodes various meanings of a particular case, like the INST, for instance, which covers a wide range of different functions. The underlying understanding here is that, despite all the numerous meanings that a given case may have and different morphological expression of that case, it is still considered one case and not different cases.

Jakobson distinguishes the INST from other cases using three basic semantic features and defines the invariant meaning of the INST as composed by the features '+marginal', '- quantified' and '-directional'. Marginality emphasizes the object's peripheral relation to the described action, quantification presupposes the degree of the object's participation in the action; and directionality involves the direction of an

action towards the object.

Jakobson also views the Russian INST as '+peripheral' vis-à-vis the NOM, in that the NOM is entirely unmarked, while the INST is marked only for peripheral status. Jakobson considers all the oblique cases as marginal, but the INST is also peripheral. To account for the peripheral function of the INST, Jakobson uses the following argument: absence of a NOM or ACC NP from a transitive clause makes that sentence elliptical, and the omitted part can be easily reconstructed from the context, while the absence of the INST does not have that effect. As an example Jakobson offers a differential CM of the motion verb *švyrvat* 'throw':

(29) Čtoby probit' stenu, oni švyrtjali v nee **kamnjami** (INST).

'To breach the wall, they threw *stones* at it.' (1936:47–48)

(30) On bescel'no švyrtjal **kamni** (ACC) v vodu.

'He aimlessly threw *stones* into water.' (1936:47–48)

These sentences are of the same type as examples (23)–(26) in Chapter II. In (29) we deal with a purposeful action where the function of the stones is secondary, as they are mainly used to perform an action; the situation describing the action of the finite verb does not primarily relate to the stones. In (30), on the contrary, the stones are the things that undergo the throwing and they are used as primary participants in some purposeful activity.

Jakobson (1936: 48) characterizes the INST as indicating a phenomenon in the

background (of the narrated situation described by the sentence). These examples, according to Jakobson, demonstrate the opposition between a marginal case and a full case. A marginal case is thus an "indicator of the peripheral status of its referent in the overall semantic context of the utterance; a full case, in contrast, does not communicate anything about such a position. A periphery presupposes a center; a marginal case presupposes the *presence of a central point in the context of the utterance*, which the peripheral case helps determine" (Jakobson 1936: 46, *my translation*).

According to Jakobson, the ICM in the above-mentioned doublets designates an auxiliary or incidental role of the referent, while the ACM indicates the directness of an action toward the referent. The contrasting doublet pairs delineate the opposition between the medium and the goal, as well as between the implement and the self-sufficient object (Jakobson 1936: 46).

Jakobson's 1936 article gives a very general statement about the INST. According to Jakobson, the INST is marked as indicating a peripheral element of the utterance and unmarked as denoting involvement in the action. His later article on case (1958), refines the interpretation of INST as marked for peripherality (*periferijnost'*) and unmarked for both directionality (*napravlennost'*) and delimitation of extent (*ob'emnost'*) (1958: 174–175).

While Jakobson's model of the Russian case distinguishes between broad and abstract semantic features for the different cases, his works provide only a general analysis of the semantic features of the INST and does not account for the specific uses of the ICM in the constructions that are examined here. According to Jakobson,



constructions that allow an ICM/ ACM alternation, and constructions with verbs of domination and possession are the examples of the INST of *Precondition* ('der Instrumental der Bedingung') (1936: 47).

A different account of the ICM in Russian is proposed in Mrázek (1964), who differentiates between semantic and non-semantic uses of the ICM in the Russian language. The semantic uses of the ICM includes constructions in which the ICM expresses Instrumental and adverbial functions of NPs (examples (9) through (13) above). In the rest of the uses, the ICM is non-semantic and simply expresses a syntactic relation between the Subject, which Mrázek calls the 'dominating feature' and the corresponding Object, which is an NP marked INST and which is directly influenced by the Subject (1964: 180). This syntactic use of the ICM in Russian represents complementary (*ob"ektnye*) relations between the Subject and the only complement of the finite verb. Accordingly, constructions that describe complementary relations are called the 'INST Object'. The class of INST object constructions includes instances with verbs of domination and possession, body part constructions, constructions with an ICM/ ACM alternation, and reflexive constructions with verbs that denote emotional states and attitudes. This function of the ICM in Mrázek's work is distinct from other uses and meanings of the ICM proposed by Mrázek. Thus, the scholar suggests a set of criteria that help distinguish between semantic and non-semantic uses of the ICM (1964: 180–184):

1) In constructions with the INST objects, the ICM is required solely by syntax. An NP with the ICM experiences the intention of a governing verb. Mrázek gives the following VPs as examples of a non-semantic use of the ICM:

*interesovat'sja čem-nibud'* 'be interested in something,' *obmenivat'sja čem-nibud'* 'exchange something,' *obladat' čem-nibud'* 'own something' (1964: 181).

2) Unlike semantic uses of the ICM — where an NP marked INST can be easily omitted from the clause — the non-semantic use of the ICM implies that a substantive with the ICM is an indispensable constituent of a transitive clause. The lexico-grammatical nature of the governing verb requires the addition of a noun with the ICM. Mrázek further illustrates his claim with the following constructions in which the ICM is required by semantic considerations and expresses an INSTRUMENT: *ja pišu perom* 'I write with a quill pen' and *on pomog emu sovetom* 'he helped him with advice,' speculating that such constructions can be easily split into two interrelated utterances<sup>2</sup>, respectively: *ja pišu + ja pol'zujus' perom* 'I write and I use a feather pen,' *on pomog emu-DAT + on dal sovet-ACC* 'he helped him and he gave him advice.' According to Mrázek, these sentences involve two underlying predications, whereas constructions that represent a non-semantic use of the ICM, like *Ja vladeju rabami* 'I own slaves' or *My obmenivaemsja sovetami* 'We exchange advice,' have only one predication and cannot be parsed any further. This, as Mrázek claims, suggests that the complement with the ICM in such constructions is a syntactic element which cannot be omitted from the clause and, therefore, functions as the Object of the verb.

3) The non-semantic use of the ICM is characterized by the lack of any apparent adverbial or INSTRUMENT meaning. It simply serves to carry out a syntactic relation of an INST-marked NP to its governing verb and does not have any specific meaning of its own.

2 A similar interpretation of the ICM is given in J. Veyrenc (1971).

4) Finally, in constructions with a non-semantic use of the ICM, a governing verb alters the state of its complement, i.e. the verb affects the state of the referent of the noun. In contrast, a semantic use of the ICM, when the latter occurs on a NP that functions as an INSTRUMENT, always denotes a tool that helps implement the action directed toward another entity and, therefore, cannot change the state of the referent of the noun.

Considering constructions in which an ICM/ACM alternation is possible (examples (23)-(26) in Chapter II above), Mrázek argues that such instances do not contradict the government criterion, but that on the contrary, the occurrence of a parallel CM alternation with such verbs as *kidat'* 'throw' and *krutit'* 'rotate' corroborates his statement. Mrázek further suggests that a possibility of an ACM alternation underscores a non-semantic nature of the ICM in almost all of its uses, except for the uses when it expresses an INSTRUMENT or adverbial meaning.

Although Mrázek's description of the ICM in the analyzed constructions contravenes the approach presented here, namely that the ICM is almost always required solely by syntactic considerations, some of his observations are nevertheless relevant to this analysis. In particular, Mrázek's work conforms with Švedova's (1980) interpretation of the use of the ICM on the sole complement of a transitive verb that is provided in Chapter IV of this thesis. Moreover, Mrázek's account supports my claim in Chapter IV that in certain constructions, an NP with the ICM is a mandatory argument and functions as a logical complement of a transitive clause.

Another major analysis of the INST in Russian is given by Wierzbicka (1980). Her work considers the INST as encoding numerous interrelated meanings. At the

same time, Wierzbicka claims that it is more correct to speak about 10, 20, or more construction types with the ICM and their 10, 20, or more interrelated meanings, rather than about 10, 20, or more meanings of the INST *per se* (1980: 143).

Wierzbicka interprets the ICM as being both semantically specific and non-specific at the same time. She argues that the ICM is non-specific because there is a whole family of semantic formulae which prescribe the use of the ICM, but it is specific in that given a choice between two expressions (e.g., between the ICM and the ACM), there is always some reason why the ICM expresses the meaning it does. However, she does not offer an analysis to support this argument. According to Wierzbicka, the ICM in Russian expresses something which is acted on not in order for something to happen to it, but in order for something else to happen. In this sense, Jakobson's description of the INST as marking a 'peripheral' element in a clause finds a place in Wierzbicka's work.

Like Jakobson, Wierzbicka considers the ICM and ACM variants in sentences like examples (23)-(26) above as not equivalent. Following Jakobson, Wierzbicka points out that the ICM in this construction type denotes a peripheral role of the entity marked INST, while the ACM denotes an entity toward which the action described by the verb is directed. Extending Jakobson's explanation of the sentence *Čtoby probit' stenu, oni švyrjali v nee kamnjami* 'To breach the wall, they threw stones at it,' she points out that the ICM here expresses the Instrumental relationship between the AGENT and the thing being used to perform the act of throwing: X does something that affects some stones, and X does it not because X wants something to happen to the stones, but because X wants something to happen to something else (in this

particular case, to the wall) (1980: 147). The ICM thus shows the deemphasized status of the complement. This argument is pursued in Chapter V of this thesis.

Further analysis leads Wierzbicka to conclude that the ICM may also designate an aimless activity. Her claim is backed up with an example with the verb *igrat'* 'to play' which has different meanings depending on the CM. Wierzbicka argues that a clause with an NP with the ICM describes a random, casual activity: *Ot nečego delat'*, *Maša igrala kl'učom* 'because she had nothing to do, Masha played with a key;' whereas an NP with the ACM denotes an organized and purposeful activity (game): *Deti igrali mjačom* (INST) 'Children played with a ball/ *Deti igrali v mjač'* (ACC).

Such argumentation seems to be triggered by Polish examples which Wierzbicka offers as an analogy. She explains that the Polish verb *bawic się* 'play' may have different meanings depending on the CM on the NP. Thus, the ICM shows a pointless indolent activity, while the ACM implies an organized game played by the rules:

(a) *Dziewczynka bawila się warkoczem* (INST) (*kluczem*)

'A girl played with her braid (a key)' (1980: 148)

(b) *Dzieci bawily się w chowanego* (ACC)

'Children played hide-and-seek.' (1980: 148)

Although Wierzbicka's linguistic intuition is relevant for the Polish data, it is not accurate for the Russian examples. First, the verb *bawic się* 'play' is a reflexive verb, whereas its Russian counterpart is not. Second, Russian reflexive verbs almost

never have compliments with the ACM, and when they do, a preposition is always required, in which case it is the preposition that assigns the ACC, and not the verb itself. Third, Wierzbicka's claim that in the above-mentioned examples the ICM on *kl'učom* 'with a key' signals an idolent and pointless activity is true only because keys are not normally perceived as a toy for a game. Keys can be used in a playful activity that most likely will not be considered a game, since a game implies a set of rules. Similarly, any thing that is not intended to be used in an organized activity may suggest that this activity is simply an amusement or a passtime. The situation changes when the event construal that describes an activity implies a thing/ entity that is either normally used for that activity, or is specifically required for the activity to take place at all, like *mjač* 'ball' in *Deti igrali mjačom* 'Children played with a ball.' The National Corpora of the Russian Language provides numerous examples in which *mjačom* 'with a ball' is used in sentences describing both an idolent, pointless activity and a game with a set of rules. Compare the following examples:

(31) *Miška snačala igral bol'sim oranževym mjačom, a potom stal sobirat' opavšie list'ja.* (Andrej Gelasimov. *God obmana*, 2003)

Mishka first play-PAST big-INST orange-ADJ.INST ball-INST and then start-PAST pick fallen leaves

'Mishka first played with a big orange ball and then started to pick up fallen foliage.' (*my translation*)

This example indeed does not specify that the ball was used in a purposeful

activity or a game, like football or basketball, for instance. However, example (32) provided below describes a game, although the NP *mjač* 'ball' also occurs with the ICM:

(32) Takie processy neobratimy, poprobujte zastavit' sovremennyx futbolistov igrat' mjačom, nabitym trjapkami. (M. Gurevič. *Opirajas' na stekloplastik*, 1968)

Such processes irreversible try-IMPER make contemporary football players play ball-INST stuff-PPPART rags-INST

'Such processes are irreversible, try to make contemporary football players play with a ball stuffed with rags.' (*my translation*)

A more plausible explanation of the differential CM in the above-mentioned doublets is that the ICM on the NP underscores its referent's INSTRUMENT and auxiliary role in a game, whereas the ACM on the same NP makes the referent the game itself. This can be justified by the fact that names of games in Russian are always used with the preposition *v*, like *igrat' v tennis* (ACC) 'play tennis,' *igrat' v prjatki* (ACC) 'play hide-and-seek,' *igrat' v gol'f* (ACC) 'play golf.' In Wierzbicka's example, *igrati v mja* (ACC) is a set expression in which *v mja* is a name of the game. The latter can be any kind of game with a ball, like football or volleyball, or basketball, which makes it difficult to translate this sentence exactly, not knowing the rest of the context. In this light, Wierzbicka's examples with the verb *igrat'* 'play' do not seem to clarify the differential CM.

Nevertheless, Wierzbicka's argumentation on constructions with an ICM/ACM alternation makes the difference in the CM patterns more tangible. Following Jakobson, Wierzbicka postulates that the ICM in Russian, as well as in Polish, serves

to emphasize a peripheral and subordinate status of that entity. She further suggests that if someone *švyrjaet kamnjami* (INST) 'throws stones', *krutit rulem* (INST) 'rotates a steering wheel', or *igraet mjačom* (INST) 'plays with a ball', the action is not triggered off by a desire to alter the state of these objects/ things.

Janda (1993) attempts to approach the INST from both a semantics and syntax perspective, using a cognitive model. It should be mentioned that Janda, as well as Mrázek and Wierzbicka, uses the term INST, although in reality she is talking about the ICM.

Following Jakobson and Wierzbicka, Janda envisions the INST as case that encodes the center-periphery relationship between the AGENT and the participant expressed by an NP with the ICM, correspondingly. This means that the ICM occurs on NPs whose referents are considered secondary participants in the event construal.

Like Mrázek, Janda uses the term 'INST object' to describe certain constructions with complements that occur with the ICM, namely constructions with body parts and constructions that allow an ICM/ ACM alternation. In Janda's work the INST object falls under the category of 'conduit instrumental' (1993: 139), which is the entity that helps the AGENT perform an action that is directed towards other participants in the event. Janda's account claims a close relationship between the ICM on compliments in constructions with the so-called INST object and the ICM on compliments whose semantic function is an INSTRUMENT. According to Janda, the class of the INST object constructions is a subcategory of a bigger class of constructions with the compliments that denote INSTRUMENTS. In this respect, Janda's terminology, and hence her analysis, is somewhat ambiguous. On the one



hand, she uses a syntactic label to describe constructions like *brosat' (sja) kamnjami* 'throw stones,' *požat' plečami* 'shrug one's shoulders,' *xlopat' dver'ju* 'slam a door' (1993: 148), calling them INST objects; on the other hand, she compares them to INSTRUMENTS, which is a semantic role and does not necessarily reflect the syntactic distribution of the corresponding arguments. What follows from Janda's explanations is that a syntactic category (at least labeled as such in her work) is a variant of a semantic one, which does not make much sense in the account that claims to examine the semantics of the ICM.

Janda's interpretation of the ICM/ACM alternation reaffirms the assumption provided by Jakobson (1938/1958) and Wierzbicka (1980) that if a complement occurs with the ICM, it is not the goal of the action, but serves to facilitate the goal.

Janda treats constructions with verbs of domination and possession as instances of verbal government (1993: 160). Janda states that to verbal government belong constructions in which the INST is assigned by the verb and which are closely related to the INST object constructions. She further claims that verbal government is distinguished from the INST object constructions by two features, namely that verbal government includes a closed class of verbs which share the meaning 'dominate,' and also that in such constructions an NP with the ICM is always an obligatory argument (1993: 160). However, Janda does not offer an explanation of her terminology, which appears to contrast with Švedova's definition of verbal government as a type of a subordinating relationship between the verb and its complement which takes the form of an oblique case and as a syntactic binding that creates complementary relationships (1980: 26-27).

It is unclear in this respect why the constructions with verbal government in Janda's work are labeled differently from the constructions that she calls INST objects. First, Švedova's definition of verbal government includes the constructions that Janda calls INST objects. Second, earlier in her account, Janda claims that in instances with verbal government an NP with the ICM is a mandatory argument (1993: 160). Third, following Janda's terminology, INST objects also must be mandatory arguments in a clause, since an OBJECT is the other obligatory argument in a transitive construction. What Janda most likely means by making a distinction between the constructions with verbal government and constructions with INST objects is that the latter, besides the ICM, may also occur with the ACM. Such a distinction applies, however, only to a small class of motion verbs that denote throwing and rotation. In constructions with body parts, a CM alternation on an NP is not possible with the same verb. The CM choice depends on the verb that the speaker selects. Thus, some verbs take complements only with the ICM, and some — only with the ACM. This suggests that Janda's classification of the INST constructions is based on secondary features. What is more important for the understanding of such constructions is the type of the relationship between the verb and its complement, which Švedova defines as complementary and distinguishes it from the pure AGENT — INSTRUMENT relationship.

Janda catalogues the verbs that belong to the verbal government class according to their semantic content of 'dominate'. She further classifies such verbs according to the meaning of 'govern' (*vedat'* 'manage,' *verxovodit'* 'lord it over,' *zloupotrebljat'* 'misuse,' *komandovat'* 'command'), 'possess' (*vladet'* 'own,' *obladat'*

'have/ own,' *raspolagat* 'have at one's own disposal'), and 'evaluate' (*prenebregat* 'despise,' *dorožit* 'value'). Explaining the CM pattern in these constructions, Janda argues that an NP with the ICM can be treated as another example of the 'conduit instrumental,' since the IMC here occurs on the entity that helps the AGENT perform an action that is directed towards other participants in the event. At this point of discussion, Janda's argumentation seems controversial. On the one hand, she delineates the INST object constructions from the verbal government constructions, speculating that the former make a subclass of the 'conduit instrumental.' On the other hand, she later speculates that the verbal government constructions also belong to the 'conduit instrumental.' In this light, Janda's analysis looks inconsistent and begs additional questions.

The major findings of the scholars mentioned in this chapter shed light on some issues related to the Russian INST in general and the ICM in Russian in particular. Nevertheless, their accounts seem to provide different interpretations of the constructions that are analyzed in this thesis. Moreover, none of the accounts differentiate between the INST and the ICM, which in this thesis is envisioned as a fundamental distinction. Given this, the ICM in Russian seems to be subject for further examination. In the chapter that follows, I argue that in constructions with body parts, verbs of domination and possession, and in constructions that allow an ICM/ ACM alternation, an NP with the ICM is an obligatory participant and that such constructions should be differentiated from constructions in which the ICM expresses a pure Instrumental relationship between the AGENT and the participant that plays the role of INSTRUMENT.

**CHAPTER IV**  
**OBLIQUE OR NOT OBLIQUE?**

As shown in examples (23)–(26) above, there are a number of constructions in Russian in which either the ICM and ACM is possible in the NP which functions as an obligatory complement of a transitive verb:

(25) On vraščaet rulem vpravo-vlevo, i Moskva v oknax Gelendvarena povoračivaetsja to odnim bokom, to drugim. (Oleg Zajončkovskij. *Sčast'e vozmožno: roman našego vremeni*, 2008)

He rotate-PRES steering wheel-INST right-left and Moscow in windows  
Gelendwagen rotate-PRES either one side or another  
'He rotates the steering wheel to the right and to the left, and Moscow in  
Gelandwagen's windows rotates either to one side or another.' (*my translation*)

(26) Ivan krutil rul'.

Ivan-NOM rotate-3SG.MASC.PAST steering wheel-ACC. SG

'Ivan rotated the steering wheel.'

The construction in (26) above is a canonical example of an NP with the ACM functioning as a DO of the transitive verb *krutit'* 'rotate.' Example (25) is ambiguous in this respect, since here the same NP occurs with the verb 'rotate' with the ICM. The verb *krutit'* 'rotate' is not an activity verb, like *read*, *write*, or *sing* which can be used

without a complement, so that the NP with the ICM in (25) and the ACM in (26) is a mandatory argument, otherwise the sentence sounds infelicitous:

(33) ?Ivan krutil.

Ivan-NOM rotate-3SG.MASC.PAST

'Ivan rotated.'

Sentences (34)–(35) below are the examples of constructions with body parts that require either an ACM or ICM. Compare the following sentences:

(34) Učenik podnjao glavu.

Student-NOM raise-3SG.PAST head-ACC

'The student raised (his) head.'

(35) Učenik poklopio glavu.

Student-NOM nod-3SG.PAST head-INST

'The student nodded (his) head.'

In examples (34) and (35) the same NP *glava* 'head' can occur with either the ACM or the ICM, correspondingly. The difference between these constructions and those in examples (25) and (26) is that in the latter the same NP with either the ACM or the ICM occurs with the same verb *krutiti* 'rotate,' whereas in (34) and (35) the CM on the NP depends on the verb choice. Thus, the examples given below are

unacceptable:

(36) \*Učenik podnjaj            golovoj.

Student-NOM raise-3SG.PAST head-INST

'The student raised (his) head.'

(37) \*Učenik kačal            golovu.

Student-NOM nod-3SG.PAST head-ACC

'The student nodded (his) head.'

It will be explained in Chapter V of this thesis why the ICM does not work with *podnjat* 'raise' and the ACM with *kačat* 'nod.'

The data in (34) through (37) show that, unlike in (25) and (26), the use of the ACM or ICM with the same verb is not interchangeable but restricted to the lexical properties of a particular verbal lexeme. At the same time, in both (34) and (35), the NP, correspondingly marked ACC and INST, is an obligatory complement of the transitive verbs *podnjat* 'raise' and *kačat* 'nod.' In (34) the NP with the ACM is clearly a DO; in (35), since the NP occurs with the ICM, its syntactic status is not so clear. On the one hand, the argument *golova* 'head' in (35) occupies the same syntactic slot as *golova* 'head' in (34), namely directly follows the verb and is used without any preposition. On the other hand, in (35) the NP occurs with the ICM, which compromises its status as the DO. Nevertheless, in the absence of the NP *golova*, both constructions in examples (34) and (35) are infelicitous.

Examples (21) and (22), (23) and (25), as well as the constructions with the verbs of domination and possession ((19) and (20) above) have the ICM on the complement NPs. In many languages, however, including languages with case inflections, the complement for these verbs is unambiguously a DO. Compare these with the constructions in which an NP with the ICM functions as an overt oblique argument:

(38) Deti      pisali                  upražnenie                  karandašom.  
 Children-NOM write-3PL.PAST exercise-DO.ACC pencil-INST  
 'Children wrote an/ the exercise with a pencil.'

(39) Gorod byl                  razrušen                  navodneniem.  
 City-NOM be-3SG.PAST destroy-3SG.PPART.PASS flooding-INST  
 'The city was destroyed by a/ the flooding.'

(40) Rabočie      gruzili                  baržu                  rudoj<sup>3</sup>.  
 Workers-NOM load-3PL.PAST barge-DO.ACC ore-INST.  
 'The workers loaded the barge with ore.'

In examples (38)-(40) above, the NP with the ICM is indeed an oblique argument, since the core argument slots of Subject and Object are both occupied by

3 However, it is possible to say the following:

Rabočie      gruzili                  rudu                  na baržu.  
 Workers-NOM load-3PL.PAST ore-DO.ACC onto barge-ACC  
 'The workers loaded the ore onto the barge.'

other NPs. If the arguments with the ICM are taken away from these transitive clauses, the same Subject-Object relationship still holds intact. Thus, the uses of the ICM in (38) through (40) are different from those in (19) through (23), and (25). Hence I propose that the NP in these constructions functions for all intents and purposes on the syntactic level as the DO of a transitive verb. The OBJECT slot that is specified by the transitive verb needs to be occupied for syntactic reasons (in order to maintain the structure of a transitive clause) but the NP in that slot cannot take the ACM, for semantic reasons. The ICM on the complement in this construction type deemphasizes the role of the NP referent from that of a participant onto which the action is directed, and emphasizes instead its concomitant role as the manner or means by which the action is being performed. In other words, these complements serve two roles at once, both participant and means.

My claim that the ICM marks an obligatory participant in constructions with body parts, verbs of dominaton and possession, and in constructions with an ICM/ ACM alternation, finds support in Švedova's Academy Grammar (1980). According to Švedova (1980), an NP with the ICM in such constructions is referred to as "a noun in its complementary meaning" (*suščestvitel'noe v ob"ektnom značenii*) (27). However, she does not argue that a complement with the ICM is a DO.

Indeed, constructions, like *ševelil pal'cami*–INST 'I moved my fingers' or *vladeem domom*–INST *v Podmoskov'e* 'We own a house in Moscow region,' in which *pal'cami* and *domom* are the only complements of the corresponding transitive verbs, demonstrate that these complements do not pass syntactic tests for reflexivization and passivization. Compare the following examples:



(41) \*Pal'cy byli poševeleny.

Fingers–NOM be– 3PL.PAST move–3PL.PPART.PASS

'Fingers were moved.'

(42) Pal'cy Ivana ševelilis'.

Fingers–NOM Ivan-GEN move–3PL.REFL.PAST

'Ivan's fingers moved.'

Although (42) is a grammatically correct sentence, it does not mean the same as (43), for example:

(43) Dom stroilsja.

House–NOM build–3SG.MASC.REFL.PAST

'The house was being built.'

The major difference between the constructions in (42) and (43) is that (42) does not imply any other participant or entity that executes the move; instead, the movement is depicted as a natural physiological feature of body parts. In contrast, (43) suggests that there is another participant or participants that perform the construction. Moreover, it is obvious that (43) can be expanded to *Dom stroilsja rabočimi* 'The house was being built by construction workers,' in which case another argument is added, and this argument functions as a participant who does the construction work; whereas it is ungrammatical to say \**Pal'cy ševelilis' Ivanom*

'Fingers were moved by Ivan.' Similarly, the following example fails both syntactic tests:

(44) My vladeem domom v Podmoskov'e.

We-NOM own-1PL.PRES house-INST in Moscow region

'We own a house in the Moscow region.'

(45) \*Dom v Podmoskov'e vladeetsja nami.

House-NOM in Moscow region own-3SG.MASC.REFL.PRES we-INST

'A house in the Moscow region is owned by us.'

(46) \*Dom v Podmoskov'e byl vladeen

nami.

House-NOM in Moscow region be-3SG.MASC.PAST own-PPART.PASS we-INST

'House in Moscow region was owned by us.'

Part of the problem with (45) and (46) is that the verb *vladet'* 'own' does not have either a reflexive or a passive participle counterpart. The only grammatically correct use of *vladet'* is in the active voice, with a mandatory participant who owns the entity.

The data mentioned above illustrate that the complements with the ICM in these examples do not fit the necessary criteria for being considered DOs. This is why

Švedova (1980) does not argue that constructions with a complement that receives the ICM are instances with the DO. She states that a governed substantive in the form of the INST denotes a participant as an entity that undergoes an action or a procedural state, or an emotional attitude" (27). What follows from Švedova's definition is that an NP that denotes an entity undergoing an action, a procedural state, or an emotional attitude functions as a complement, or as she calls it, "a substantive in its *complementary meaning*" (*ob"ektnoe značenie*) (1980: 27). Some other examples of the complementary meaning of an NP marked INST are *upravljat' firmoj*-INST 'run a company' or *xvastat'sja uspexami*-INST 'boast one's success,' which are contrasted with a 'supplementary' meaning (*vospoln'ajuščee značenie*) of an NP with the ICM in *napitat'sja vlagoj*-INST 'be saturated with moisture' or *zarasti travoj*-INST 'be overgrown with grass-INST.' Švedova makes a distinction between different functions of NPs with the ICM. Thus, the ICM can occur on an NP denoting a participant that undergoes an action, procedural state, or emotional attitude, as well as on NPs whose referents serve as a *supplement* of the action or state described by the verb. Although Švedova does not provide any further comments, the distinction drawn in her work allows us to account for the nature of the arguments that receive the ICM. In some instances, NPs with the ICM function as mandatory arguments of a transitive verb (complementary meaning), whereas other NPs with the same CM (supplementary meaning) are not mandatory arguments since they occur with intransitive verbs, in which case they do not function as entities onto which the action described by the verb is geared. On the contrary, such NPs serve only to add a specific nuance to the event construal, while not being full-fledged participants of that event, unlike NPs

with the complementary meaning whose participation in the event is necessary in order for the action to take place at all.

## CHAPTER V

### IS 'QUIRKY' INSTRUMENTAL CASE MARKING INDEED 'QUIRKY'?

I would like to begin this chapter with some observations on the use of the ICM in constructions with body parts:

(21) Ivan sudorožno ševalil pal'cami.

Ivan-NOM convulsively move-3SG.MASC.PAST fingers-INST.PL

'Ivan convulsively moved (his) fingers.'

(47) Molodoj čelovek nedoumenno požal plečami.

Young man-NOM perplexedly shrug-3SG.MASC.PAST shoulders-INST.PL

'The young man perplexedly shrugged (his) shoulders.'

(22) Ivan otricateľ'no kačal golovoj.

Ivan-NOM disapprovingly shake-3SG.MASC.PAST head-INST.SG

'Ivan disapprovingly shook (his) head.'

A relatively small semantic class of Russian verbs requires the ICM on a complement representing a body part. To this class belong such verbs as *vertet'* 'twiddle,' *vraščat'*/*krutit'* 'rotate,' *dvigat'* 'move,' *dergat'* 'pull,' *kačat'* 'rock, nod,' *ševalit'* 'move, stir,' *trjasti* 'shake.' One tentative explanation why the NPs in sentences

(21)-(22) and (47) occur with the ICM is the nature of their referents. It should be noted that the above-mentioned verbs do not always take a complement that denote a body part, in which case the complement occurs with the ACM (examples (48) through (50)). The ICM on complements in such constructions is required only if a complement is a body part. It is interesting to note in this respect that the referents of the NPs representing a body part differ from the referents that denote entities other than body parts. Namely, it is expected that, with the exception of reflexive constructions, the AGENT and the PATIENT of a verb have different referents, like in the examples provided below:

(48) Vrač poševalil bol'nogo.

Doctor-NOM move-3SG.MASC.PAST patient-ACC.SG

'The doctor moved the patient.'

(49) Professor požal mne ruku.

Professor-NOM shake- 3SG.MASC.PAST me-DAT hand-ACC.SG

'The Professor shook my hand.'

(50) Ja perestala kačat' koljasku, i rebenok  
zaplakal.

I-NOM stop-1SG.PAST rock-INF baby carriage-ACC.SG and baby-NOM  
cry-3SG.PAST

'I stopped rocking the baby carriage and the child cried.'

In examples (48)–(50), the AGENT and the PATIENT indeed have different referents, but in (21), (22) and (47) the AGENT and the PATIENT obviously have the same referent, since a body part cannot be treated as separate from the AGENT (unless, of course, it is a body part of a different entity). It might be assumed therefore that the unalienability of body parts from the AGENT makes them be perceived in a completely different way compared to constructions in which the AGENT and the PATIENT have different referents.

Letučij suggests that body parts more likely correspond to the prototypical INSTRUMENT (2007). He does not specify, however, whether any body parts can be considered an INSTRUMENT or only those body parts that are expressed by an NP with the ICM. What can be inferred from his argumentation is that an NP denoting a body part gets the ICM because it corresponds to the prototypical INSTRUMENT. If all body parts behave like INSTRUMENTS, as Letučij claims, why do some NPs representing a body part occur with the ICM and some with the ACM? Following Letučij's logic, it may be assumed that if an NP whose referent is a body part does not receive the ICM it is no longer perceived as an INSTRUMENT. However, his analysis suggests the opposite.

If we think of an INSTRUMENT as an entity that helps the AGENT to perform an action directed toward another participant or other participants in the event construal, Letučij's hypothesis of the INSTRUMENT role of body parts in the analyzed constructions does not hold. Any INSTRUMENT construction in which both the AGENT and the INSTRUMENT are syntactically overt can be rephrased as "the AGENT used the INSTRUMENT to act on the PATIENT." Following this formula,

sentence (21) should be rephrased as *?Ivan ispol'zoval pal'cy, čtoby poševelit' pal'cy-* ACC (?INST) 'Ivan used his fingers in order to move his fingers,' which sounds infelicitous. The AGENT might use his will or muscles to make his fingers move, but not the fingers themselves. Being inalienable from the AGENT, body parts and the AGENT have the same referent. In this light it is hard to imagine the AGENT and the INSTRUMENT as such.

Also, an INSTRUMENT is very often a participant that is not overtly present in the structure of a clause, whereas a body part participant is generally a necessary overt constituent. Janda, however, argues that an NP which denotes a body part is often redundant. To support her claim she provides the following examples (1993: 160):

(51) Passažir      maxal platkom/ rukoj.

Passenger-NOM waved handkerchief/ hand-INST

'The passenger waved a handkerchief/ his hand.'

(52) V otvet      inžener      tol'ko kivnul golovoj.

In answer-ACC engineer-NOM only nodded head-INST

'In response the engineer only nodded his head.'

Janda's argument holds only for a small number of constructions in which the lexical properties of a motion verb make it clear which part of the body is meant. In her examples, the verb *kivat'* 'nod' is intrinsically associated with 'head,' just as *maxat'*



'wave' is associated with 'hand.' But Janda does not mention transitive motion verbs with broader meanings, like, *ševelit* 'move,' *dergat* 'pull,' *kačat* 'rock; to nod,' *trjasti* 'shake' which are not necessarily affiliated with a body part:

(53) My poševalili ugli v kostre.

We-NOM stir-3PL.PAST charcoal-ACC in fire

'We stirred the charcoal in the fire.'

(54) Ja dernula ručku i ponjala, što dver'

zakryta.

I-NOM pull-1SG.PAST handle-ACC and realize-1SG.PAST that door close-PPART.PASS

'I pulled the handle and realized that the door was locked.'

(55) Mama kačala rebenka, poka on ne usnul.

Mother-NOM rock-3SG.PAST baby-ACC till he no fall asleep-3SG.PAST

'Mother was rocking/ rocked the baby until it fell asleep.'

(56) Deti trjasli jablonju v sadu.

Children-NOM shake-3PL.PAST apple tree-ACC in garden-LOC

'Children shook the apple tree in the garden.'

Compare these with the constructions given below:

(57) Rebenok ševelil                      gubami    vo sne.

Baby-NOM    move-3SG.PAST lips-INST in sleep

'The baby moved (its) lips in sleep.'

(58) Mal'čik dernul                      rukoju        ot    boli.

Boy-NOM pull-3SG.PAST hand-INST from pain

'The boy pulled (his) hand because of the pain.'

(59) Vrač        neodobritel'no kačal                      golovoj.

Doctor-NOM disapprovingly shake-3SG.PAST head-INST

'The doctor disapprovingly shook (his) head.'

(60) Otvečaja na vopros, professor                      vseгда trjas                      borodoju.

Answering a question, professor-NOM always shake-3SG.PAST beard-INST

'Answering a question, the professor always shook (his) beard.'

A quick look at examples (53)–(60) suggests that the ICM occurs with body parts only when these verbs are used metaphorically, whereas the ACM is used when the verb is used in its literal meaning, together with a complement that is not a body part. However, this explanation does not seem to account for the restriction on the use of the ICM with the verbs in (61)–(63) given below:



marking, highlights the manner of the movement, rather than its result, take a complement with the ICM. They describe a situation in which the result of the movement is not important and therefore is left beyond the verb frame.

Accomplishment verbs, on the contrary, tend to accentuate the result, rather than describe a manner in which the movement was executed. I propose that this is why some transitive verbs of motion require the ICM on complements representing body parts, while others require the ACM. The NP complement occurs with the ICM if the manner of the movement is an inherent semantic property of the verb, and with the ACM if the result is encoded as a semantic property of a verb. The manner of the movement is a background of the situation and is peripheral to the result, which coheres with Jakobson's postulation of the ICM as indicating a phenomenon in the background (1936: 48).

I also propose that in the constructions mentioned above, a body part with the ICM functions as a *locus* in which a physiological sensation/motion occurs. It is interesting to note in this respect that a body part with the ICM does not change its locus as a result of the motion, whereas a body part with the ACM does. If someone nods his head, the latter always returns to the same point that was the beginning of the motion. However, if someone turns his head or raises his hand, the head and the hand completely change their locus.

Some of these observations can be partially applied to constructions which allow a complement either with the ICM or the ACM. Here, however, the use of the ICM is interchangeable with that of the ACM, in that both variants are acceptable and grammatical:

(64) Deti švyrjali kamnjami v sosedskij ogorod.

Children-NOM throw-3PL.PAST stones-INST in neighbor's garden

'The children threw stones in neighbor's garden.'

(65) Deti švyrjali kamni v sosedskij ogorod.

Children-NOM throw-3PL.PAST stones-ACC in neighbor's garden

'The children threw stones in neighbor's garden.'

(25) On vraščaet rulem vpravo-vlevo, i Moskva v oknax Gelendvarena povoračivaetsja to odnim bokom, to drugim. (Oleg Zajončkovskij. *Sčast'e vozmožno: roman našego vremeni*, 2008)

He rotate-PRES steering wheel-INST right-left and Moscow in windows

Gelendwagen rotate-PRES either one side or another

'He rotates the steering wheel to the right and to the left, and Moscow in

Gelandwagen's windows rotates either to one side or another.' (*my translation*)

(26) Ivan vraščal rul.'

Ivan-NOM rotate-3SG.PAST steering wheel-ACC

'Ivan rotated the steering wheel.'

The difference between the ICM and the ACM on the NPs *kamni* 'stones' and *rul'* 'steering wheel' is that the ACM implies that the motion executed with the steering wheel is unidirectional, whereas the ICM suggests that the steering wheel was

involved in an aimless multidirectional movement. It also can be argued that the ICM in (64) and (25) shifts the focus of attention: in (64) the focus of the action is "neighbor's garden," while "stones" functions as an INSTRUMENT or MEANS used to damage the garden for whatever reason. In (25), on the contrary, the focus and target of the action is "stones", whereas "neighbor's garden" is simply a location. Here the AGENT's intention is not to damage the garden, but to transfer the stones from one place to another, which in this case is the neighbor's garden. It turns out, therefore, that, although in both instances the stones are used to execute the motion of throwing, in (25) the ICM downplays their role as a concrete object that for whatever reason needs to be moved, emphasizing their INSTRUMENT function instead. In (26) the ACM signals that the stones are the things that underwent the throwing and eventually changed their location. That is why (66) is grammatical, while (67) is unacceptable:

(66) Deti švyrjali kamni rukami.

Children-NOM threw stones-ACC hands-INST

'The children threw stones with their hands.'

(67) \*Deti švyrjali kamnjami rukami.

Children-NOM threw stones-INST hands-INST

'The children threw stones with their hands.'

(67) is ungrammatical because the semantic roles of "stones" and "hands"

seem to overlap. This is unacceptable since a clause cannot contain two arguments with the same semantic role. At the same time, (68) is also unacceptable:

(68) \*Deti švyrjali rukami.

Children-NOM threw hands-INST

'The children threw their hands.'

The ambiguity of (68) arises from the fact that here "hands" are envisioned solely as an INSTRUMENT/ MEANS with the help of which the act of throwing was executed. The subcategorization frame of the transitive verb *švyrjat'* "throw" requires an entity/ thing which is necessary in order to perform the throwing, i.e., a physical object to be thrown. Otherwise, the sentence sounds infelicitous and ambiguous.

If the referent of an NP with the ACM is the point of the action described by the verb, the same NP with the ICM is a MEANS of executing the action. This, in turn, alters the entire event structure. The ACM/ ICM alternation represents two different situations with different pragmatic foci. The ACM on NPs underscores their role as referents of the action. The ICM emphasizes their implemental function, while their referential role is downplayed in the event structure.

Accordingly, the constructions in (25) and (26) are very similar to those in (64) and (65), in representing two different events. In (25) *rul'* 'steering wheel' receives the ICM to manifest a nonpurposeful motion performed by means of the steering wheel. In (26), on the contrary, the motion is purposeful, controlled, and forceful; such a

motion denotes the act of driving, whereas the motion in (25) does not evolve into driving and remains just a motion. In this respect it is interesting to note that (25) lacks a result, just as there is no result in the INST constructions with body parts, whereas (66) suggests an outcome, which is the act of driving, although both (25) and (66) are in the Imperfective aspect.

The use of the ICM on NP complements of verbs expressing the notion of 'domination' and 'possession,' such as *komandovat' armiej* 'lead an army,' *dirižirovat' orkestrom* 'conduct an orchestra,' *upravljat' restoranom/stranoj* 'run a restaurant/ rule a country' also leads to interesting observations. First, the verbs in these constructions do not imply a direct application of power onto the entity being led, conducted, or ruled. To dominate or govern means to *coordinate*, rather than to *act on* directly. Moreover, such an entity can be interpreted here as a collective entity: an army consists of soldiers, an orchestra consists of musicians, a restaurant is supposed to have workers/customers, a country implies citizens. It turns out, therefore, that the NPs standing for 'army,' 'orchestra,' 'restaurant,' and 'country' are collective nouns, in that they represent a group of human participants. In this respect, the choice of the ICM might be explained by the fact that the action of the verb is not directed onto the collective entity as a whole, but rather on the many individual constituents of this entity. The participant that leads, conducts or rules uses its superior status among the participants of the army/orchestra/restaurant/country to coordinate them. These abstract *collectives* are not the real target of the action, just as "hammer" is not the target of the action in *Ivan pol'zuetsJa molotkom* 'Ivan uses a hammer,' in which the hammer serves as a tool for executing a particular manipulation with a thing.



Moreover, in such constructions the participant who is being led performs along with the one who leads, just as "hammer" performs along with Ivan in the above-mentioned sentence. This fact suggests that in constructions with verbs of domination, the function of the NPs with the ICM overlaps with the INSTRUMENT function of tools, and therefore the choice of the ICM is reasonable.

An interesting observation is found in Prud'homme (1983). In the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries the verbs *rukovodit'* 'manage' and *dirižirovat'* 'conduct (an orchestra)' were transitives and took a complement with the ICM (1983: 257). In Contemporary Standard Russian, these verbs require the ICM and the ACM is unacceptable. Prud'homme suggests that the change in the CM patterns of these two verbs is a result of rethinking the relationships encoded by the Russian INST. In particular, besides the AGENT — INSTRUMENT relationship, the nuance of *control* was greatly strengthened in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century (1983: 257). Hence, Prud'homme claims, apart from signifying a simple *implement*, the ICM in Russian gradually came to be used with a broader range of nouns which are perceived of as controlled entities, to a certain extent.

It does not seem surprising that the notion of 'control' became to be affiliated with the INST. Any instrument represents a thing controlled by the participant that uses it. Since the central function of the ICM in Russian is to mark an entity that plays a role of an INSTRUMENT, and this entity is perceived as controlled by the AGENT, the feature of "being controlled by" seems to be intrinsic to an INSTRUMENT.

Prud'homme's argument finds support in Veyrenc's description of the use of the Russian ICM with verbs of domination as indicating 'an internal motif of competence'

(1971: 136), which can be interpreted as potential control over an entity.

Verbs of possession and evaluation demonstrate a slightly different semantic behavior. Compare the following examples:

(69) Moj staršij brat vladeet bol'sim domom v Kalifornii.

My elder brother-NOM owns big house-INST.SG in California.

'My elder brother owns a big house in California.'

(70) Sestra vseгда prenebregaet moimi sovetami.

Sister-NOM always neglect-3SG.PRES my-INST advice-INST.PL

'Sister always neglects my advice.'

(71) Sestra dorožit svoimi druž'jami.

Sister-NOM value-3SG.PRES her-INST friends-INST

'Sister appreciates her friends.'

It may seem unjustified to claim that the NPs with the ICM in (69)-(70) line up with the semantic behavior of the complements in the constructions with verbs denoting domination. Indeed, "house" and "pieces of advice" are not involved in the situation to the same extent as the constituents who compose the entity represented by the nouns 'orchestra,' 'army,' and 'company,' in the sense that they do not perform along with the participant that owns or neglects them. Hence we cannot treat such nouns as implements of the action. At the same time, however, it seems reasonable to

assume that 'house' functions as a medium by which the relationship of owning is expressed between the possessor and the possessed. The possessor is identified as such only in a construction that specifies particular cognitive roles. In other words, a participant becomes a possessor only given a possessed entity is present in the event construal. 'Possession' verbs, as well as 'domination' verbs, seem to share the same 'control' domain. Indeed, having something in possession implies a certain degree of control over the possessed entity. In this light, the ICM on NPs after verbs of possession in Russian is semantically motivated by the same feature that determines the CM choice in construction with verbs of domination.

I would also suggest that such evaluation verbs as *prenebregat'* 'misuse/neglect/ ignore' and *dorožit'* 'value' which in Russian require a complement with the ICM, belong to the class of verbs with possessive semantics, like *vladet'* 'own.' However, if the latter simply states the fact of an actual possession, without mentioning the possessor's attitude towards the possessed entity, *prenebregat'* and *dorožit'* describe the possessor's attitude towards an actual or potential possession, while downplaying the fact of possession itself. At the same time, if the verbs of domination and possession share the notion of 'control,' which determines the ICM on their complements, the verbs of evaluation also emphasize a certain manner in which a possessed entity is being disposed of, and this makes their complements occur with the ICM.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

This study has examined the ICM on complement-type NPs in constructions with certain categories of verbs: verbs that describe the movement of body parts, verbs whose semantic content allows an alternation of the ICM and the ACM, and verbs that denote domination, possession and evaluation.

The INST in Russian is polysemous and covers a broad range of semantic functions, some of which can be understood only in specific construction types. The data analyzed here suggest that, although the relationships encoded by the INST in Russian are interrelated, each construction type with an NP with the ICM needs to be parsed separately. This approach makes it possible to identify specific semantic nuances of each of the uses of the ICM in the Russian language.

I have demonstrated that in many instances, an NP with the ICM is a mandatory participant in a clause and serves as the sole complement of the verb. Usually the ICM on an NP changes the pragmatic focus of the event construal, downplaying the role of the referent and underscoring its implemental or locational function.

The ICM on NPs denoting body parts with transitive motion verbs emphasizes the manner of movement rather than the result of the motion, and indicates that a particular body part functions as a locus of the motion. This conclusion is supported by the fact that a body part with the ICM does not change its locus as a result of the motion, whereas a body part with the ACM does.

In constructions that allow an alternation of the ICM and the ACM, the ICM marks an entity by means of which an action is performed that has no resultative endpoint. The NP with the ICM designates an object or thing which is involved in a non-purposeful disorganized activity executed with its help. The role of the NP itself in such constructions is perceived by the speaker as implemental. The NP with the ICM is not the point of the action described by a motion verb, but serves to help fulfill the action. Conversely, the ACM in similar constructions represent an event with a purposeful activity that has a tangible outcome. The NP with the ACM is always the thing onto which the action of the motion verb is directed.

With verbs of domination, the ICM delineates a relationship of subordination between the subject referent and the referent of the complement that occurs with the ICM. The ICM on the referent of the complement suggests that it functions as a subordinate participant who acts according to the will of the subject referent, who has superior power, and at the same time indicates that the referent of the complement acts together with the subject referent. In constructions with verbs of possession, the ICM occurs on a possessed entity with the help of which the act of possession is being executed. The possessor is identified as such only in a construction that specifies particular cognitive roles. In other words, a participant becomes a possessor only given a possessed entity is present in the event construal. Both 'domination' and 'possession' verbs share the feature of 'control,' which is characteristic of the Russian INST and which determines the ICM on their complements.

The verbs of evaluation denote the possessor's attitude towards an actual or potential possession and thus describe a manner in which the possessed entity is being

controlled and disposed of. The complements of such verbs occur with the ICM because their referents represent possessed and controlled entities.j

The data analyzed in this thesis allow me to argue that, although the INST inflection is often viewed as the general 'leftover' marker or NPs that cannot take any other marking because of the specific meanings of the other case markers, it is never, in fact, 'quirky', but instead covers a range of individual nuances that none of the other cases can provide. One and the same INST inflection serves to mark various functions associated with the INST. The ICM in its isolated form does not always specify which of the numerous meanings it conveys. A particular meaning of the INST marker is acquired in specific syntactic constructions. The meaning of the ICM reflects the type/types of relations associated with the INST. Despite the many specific meanings conveyed by the ICMs and their morphologically different forms, they share one common abstract feature that makes them cohere as a set to the extent that whenever one of them acquires a new use, the other markers do too. This abstract feature postulated first in Jakobson (1938) and later refined in Wierzbicka (1980) is that an NP with the ICM always denotes a participant that is not directly acted upon by the AGENT, but serves to facilitate an action geared towards other participants in the event construal.

**APPENDIX A**  
**THE DATA COLLECTION**

All the examples data in this thesis were checked with 10 native speakers of Russian who permanently live in Russia. The constructions that seemed controversial to the native speakers were checked with and taken from the National Corpora of the Russian Language. Thus, examples (23), (25), (31), and (32) were reprinted from the Corpus of the Russian language. Such examples are provided with the author's name and work's title.

**APPENDIX B**  
**ABBREVIATIONS**

*	ungrammatical
?	infelicitous
1SG/PL	first person (singular/ plural)
2SG/PL	second person (singular/ plural)
3SG/PL	third person (singular/ plural)
ACC	accusative
ACM	accusative case marking
ADJ	adjective
CM	case marking
DAT	dative
DO	direct object
FEM	feminine
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IMPER	imperative
IMPF	imperfective aspect
IMPS	impersonal
INF	infinitive
INST	instrumental
ICM	instrumental case marking
LOC	locative



MASC	masculine
NEUT	neuter
NOM	nominative
NP	noun phrase
PASS	passive
PAST	past tense
PERF	perfective aspect
PPART	past participle
PREP	preposition
REFL	reflexive
VP	verb phrase

## REFERENCES CITED

- Apresjan, Ju. D. 1995. *Izbrannye trudy*. Tom 2: *Integral'noe opisanie jazyka i sistemnaja leksikografija*. Moskva.
- Blake, B. J. 2001. *Case*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris Press, Dordrecht.
- Dowty, D. 1991. 'Thematic proto-roles and argument selection.' *Language*, 67: 547-619.
- Eremeeva, S.A. 1999. *Lekcii po istorii iskusstva*. (National Corpora of the Russian Language)
- Fillmore, Ch. J. 1968. 'The case for case.' In *Universals of Linguistic Theory*, Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds), 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winson.
- Gelasimov, A. 2003. *God obmana*. (National Corpora of the Russian Language)
- Gurevič, M. 1968. *Opirajas' na stekloplastik*. (National Corpora of the Russian Language)
- Haspelmath, M. 2009. 'Terminology of case.' In *Oxford Handbook of Case*, Andrej Mal'čukov & Andrew Spencer (eds), 505-517. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Hoop, H. 1996. *Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation*. New York: Garland.
- Jakobson, R. 1936/1971. 'Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus.' *Selected Writings: Word and language II*, 23-71. The Hague: Mouton.
- Janda, L. A. 1993. *A geography of case semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental* (Cognitive Linguistics Research, 4). Berlin, New York.
- Kilby, David. 1986. 'The Instrumental in Russian: on establishing a consensus.' *Case in Slavic*, ed. by Richard D. Brecht and James S. Levine, 323-337. Slavica Publishers.
- Kiparsky, P. 1988. Agreement and Linking Theory. Unpublished MS., Stanford University.
- Letučij, A. B. 2007. 'Tvoritel'nyj padež pri russkix perexodnyx glagolax: konstrukcii s ob'ektami-čast'ami tela.'  
[http://aletuchiy.narod.ru/handouts\\_articles/Transitivity/article\\_instrumental.pdf](http://aletuchiy.narod.ru/handouts_articles/Transitivity/article_instrumental.pdf)

- Mrázek, R. 1964. *Sintaksis ruskogo tvoritel'nogo: structurno-sravnitel'noe issledovanie*. Praha.
- Padučeva, E. V. 2004. *Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moskva.
- Prud'homme, D. H. 1983. *The Russian prepositional Instrumental and case theory*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Alberta.
- Raxilina, E., Tribušinina E. 2011. 'The Russian Instrumental-of-comparison: constructional approach.' *Slavic Linguistics in a cognitive framework*, ed. by Marcin Grygiel and Laura A. Janda, 144-174. Peter Lang GmbH.
- Švedova, N. Ju. 1980. *Russkaja grammatika*. Vol. 1 Moskva: Nauka.
- Vakareliyska, C. 1994. 'A model of the Dative/Accusative opposition for Slavic languages based on data from aphasia'. *Sŭpostavitelno jazykoznane*. XIX. 7-16.
- Veyrenc, J. 1971. *Sintaksičeskij analiz tvoritel'nogo padeža. Issledovanija po sintaksičeskomu jazykoznaniu*, 129-39. Moskva.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1980. *The case for surface case*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Zajončkovskij, O. 2008. *Sčast'e vozmožno: roman našego vremeni*. (National Corpora of the Russian Language)