1 Introduction

1.1 Main points

- Applicatives are independent of verbal morphosyntax and they can occur without verbs by combining with a root of an an undetermined category\(^1\)
- Certain nominal contexts come with restrictions on existential closure that can force overt realization of otherwise optional material
- A special type of D and its intensional properties
- Description of an Icelandic construction which has escaped notice

1.2 Core data

Causation of Experience (CEx)\(^2\):

\[(1)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Dansinn var stelpum } & \text{ góð skemmtun. (CEx, DP causer)} \\
\text{dance.the.NOM was girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM} \\
\text{‘The dancing entertained the girls well’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Stelpum var skemmtun } & \text{ *( af dansinum).} \\
\text{girls.the.DAT was entertainment.NOM *( by dance.the) (CEx, PP causer)} \\
\text{‘The girls were well entertained by the dancing’}
\end{align*}\]

For two til-variants of CEx, an intensional function word til is included and causation occurs in worlds compatible with a contextually salient plan:

\[\text{til-CEx Predicate:}\]

\[(2)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Dansinn var [stelpum til skemmtunar]. (til-CEx, DP causer)} \\
\text{dance.the.NOM was [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN]} \\
\text{‘The dancing was for the girls’ entertainment.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{til-CEx Adjunct:}\]

\[(3)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{Þeir dönsuðu [stelpum til skemmtunar]} & \text{ (til-CEx, Sentence Causer)} \\
\text{they danced [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN]} \\
\text{‘They danced for the girls’ entertainment’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^1\)I am grateful for all the advise I have received while developing this study. This work benefits greatly from conversations with Julie Anne Legate, Florian Schwarz, Tony Kroch, David Pesetsky, Jim Wood, Einar Freyr Sigurðsson, and fellow students at Penn. All mistakes are mine. Nobody I have talked to necessarily agrees with me on anything.

\(^2\)In some cases, there is a preference to modify the predicate, e.g. ‘good’ or to add some other material, such as by conjoining the predicate with another CEx predicate, e.g. ‘entertainment and pleasure’. This does not reflect a grammaticality distinction and I do not pursue the nature of these preferences; they might be pragmatic or prosodic. I design the examples to sound naturally.
Representative predicates compatible with CEx:


Empirical issues:
- Dative experiencer in a non-verbal context
- Obligatory adjunct in the PP causer variant

1.3 Syntactic analysis

(5) Structure to be motivated and elaborated:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{for} \\
\text{nP} \\
\text{n}_{\text{cause}} \\
\text{-ment} \\
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{the girls} \\
\text{Appl}_{\text{exp}} \\
\text{} \\
\text{√entertain-}
\end{array}
\]

Structure overview:
- Appl merges with an experience event of type \(<s,t>\) before the event’s category is determined
- Appl introduces and assigns dative to an experiencer DP
- The category is determined: ‘Noun’ in this case because of the \(n_{\text{cause}}\) nominalizer -an ‘-ment’
- A CAUSE relationship is introduced (here, bundled with \(n_{\text{cause}}\))
- The til variant of CEx (\(til\)-CEx) also includes a type of D, til ‘for’, which guarantees causation in worlds compatible with a contextually salient plan
- The experiencer, girls.the.DAT, usually moves to Spec,DP (via Spec,nP), but can also stay low in Spec,ApplP under heaviness/discourse reasons
2 Appl is independent of verbal morphosyntax

2.1 Root Selecting Event Applicatives

2.1.1 Framework

Pylkkänen’s (2008) framework involves the structural possibilities (6) and (7):

(6) High Event Applicative (individual-eventP; Pylkkänen’s High Appl)

\[
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{Appl}_{High} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{individual} \quad \text{V} \quad \ldots
\]

(7) Low Individual Applicative (individual-individual; Pylkkänen’s Low Appl)

\[
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{ApplP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{Appl}_{Low} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{individual} \quad \text{individual}
\]

(8) Root-Selecting Event Applicative (individual-√event: CEx construction)

\[
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{Appl} \quad \text{√event}
\]

Properties of (High) Event Applicatives:

- Appl relates a dative experiencer to an event
- The dative position is not available to agents
- The verb can appear without the applied argument

Additional property of root selecting event applicatives:

- Root selecting event applicatives can introduce dative experiencers with nouns and adjectives, not just verbs: Applicatives can appear without verbs
- We expect to find all of (9) in a language which has root selecting event(uality) applicatives:

(9) a. [vP v [ApplP DAT [Appl √root< s,t>]]]
   b. [nP n [ApplP DAT [Appl √root< s,t>]]]
   c. [aP a [ApplP DAT [Appl √root< s,t>]]]

\(^3\)For closely related general developments in the theory of applicatives and argument structure in general, see also McGinnis (2001); Cuervo (2003).
We will focus on nP here, but Icelandic adjectives also take dative experiencers:

(11) a. Stelpurnar eru kaldar.
   girls.the.NOM are.3P.PL cold.3P.FEM
   ‘The girls are cold.’ (a fact about their skin temperature)

b. Stelpunum er kalt.
   girls.the.DAT is.3P.SG cold.3P.NEUT
   ‘The girls feel cold.’ (experience being cold)

2.1.2 Agent constraint

The dative argument cannot be an agent:

(12) * Þeir sendu vopn óvinum til eyðileggingar
    * they sent weapons enemy.the.DAT for destruction
    Intended: ‘They sent weapons for the (agentive) enemy’s destruction’

(13) Dansinn var [stelpunum til skemmtunar].
    dance.the.NOM was [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN]
    #‘The dance had the effect that the girls entertained somebody.’
    #‘The girls used the dance to entertain.’

The semantic generalizations for dative experiencers are in general robust in Icelandic (Jónsson 2003):
Dative experiencer verbs cannot take nominative subjects unless a non-experience reading, e.g. agentive, is intended:

(14) Mér líkaði hundurinn.
    me.DAT liked dog.the.NOM
    ‘I experienced liking the dog.’ / #‘I clicked the like button on Facebook.’

(15) Ég líkaði hundinn.
    me.NOM liked dog.the.ACC
    #‘I experienced liking the dog.’ / ‘I clicked the like button on Facebook.’

2.1.3 Why not derive the noun from a verb?

Reasons not to derive the CEx nouns from verbs:

- The CEx construction is highly regular across predicates
- Potential verbal correspondences do not form a morphosyntactically coherent set: Being-on-a-list-properties are required, but they are not shared across categories
Lack of a pattern when comparing potential verb/noun correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEx predicate</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>closest verb</th>
<th>matching root(s)</th>
<th>dative argument</th>
<th>experienter argument</th>
<th>meaning available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skemmtun</td>
<td>entertainment</td>
<td>skemmta</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>léttir</td>
<td>relief</td>
<td>létt a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hvatnining</td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>hvetja</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yndisauki</td>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>auka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hressing</td>
<td>refreshment</td>
<td>hressa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dægradvöl</td>
<td>recreation</td>
<td>dvelja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skapraun</td>
<td>annoyance</td>
<td>skaprauna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vonbrigði</td>
<td>disappointment</td>
<td>bregða</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niðurlæging</td>
<td>humiliation</td>
<td>niðurlægja</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>álitshnekkir</td>
<td>reputation damage</td>
<td>hnekkja</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hypothesize that CEx licensing is independent of verbal properties but dependent on:
- Appropriate semantics (experience event)
- Being n_cause-compatible (the being-on-a-list-property involves acquisition of morphology)

2.2 The dative experiencer is part of the noun phrase

2.2.1 Clausal dative alternative

We need to rule out a clausal dative position:  

(17) VP  
    V - ApplP  
    DP_{DAT} - Appl ...   
    ... - DP t(DP) ...

2.2.2 Constituency

Topicalization:

(18) [Stelpunum til skemmtunar] dönsuðu þeir.  
    [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN] danced they  
    They danced for the girls’ entertainment

---

4 Matching root material: There exists a verb with the corresponding set of morphological roots  
Dative argument: The corresponding verb also takes a dative argument  
Experiencer argument: The corresponding verb takes an argument that has an experiencer reading  
Meaning available: The CEx meaning can be expressed using the verb

5 Trees in this spirit are sometimes discussed for other cases of non-nominative experiencers associated with nominals and in the context of possessor raising, see e.g. Adger and Ramchand (2006); Preminger (2009)
Clefting:

(19) Það er [stelpunum til skemmtunar] sem þeir dansa
it is [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN] that they dance
‘It is for the girls’ entertainment that they dance’

Replaced by adjunct wh-word:

(20) [Hvers vegna] dönsuðu þeir? [Stelpunum til skemmtunar].
[why] danced they? [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN]
‘Why did they dance? For the girls’ entertainment’

2.2.3 Base position and locality

A lower base generated position, Spec,ApplP, can be bad/acceptable/preferable, depending on the usual heaviness/discourse reasons:

(21) a. *Þeir dönsuðu [stelpunum til skemmtunar] mér].
   * they danced [for entertainment.GEN me.DAT]
   ‘They danced for my entertainment’

   b. Þeir dönsuðu [stelpunum til skemmtunar stelpunum].
      they danced [for entertainment.GEN girls.the.DAT]
      ‘They danced for the girls’ entertainment’ (acceptable)

   c. Þeir dönsuðu [stelpunum til skemmtunar stelpunum sem þeir hittu á hátíðinni].
      they danced [for entertainment.GEN girls.the.DAT that they met at festival.the]
      ‘They danced for the entertainment of the girls that they met at the festival’ (preferred)

In this respect, similar to the English parallel:

(22) a. *They danced for the entertainment of mine.

   b. They danced for the entertainment of the girls. (acceptable)

   c. They danced for the entertainment of the girls that they met at the festival. (preferred)

Quantifier floating suggests a movement relationship in CEx:

(23) Þeir dönsuðu [stelpunum til skemmtunar [öllum t(stelpunum)]].
    they danced [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN [all.DAT t(girls.the)]]
    ‘They danced for all the girls’ entertainment’

Echo questions are possible in CEx as in the English variant:

(24) a. They danced for whose entertainment?

   b. Þeir dönsuðu [hverjum til skemmtunar (hverjum)]?
      they danced [(whom.DAT) for entertainment.GEN (whom.DAT)]?
      ‘They danced for whose entertainment?’

Movement of the dative experiencers is constrained by locality that disallows positions further to the left:

(25) *Hverjum spiluðu þeir Guns ‘n’ Roses [til skemmtunar]?
    * (whom.DAT) played they Guns ‘n’ Roses [for entertainment.GEN]?
    ‘Whose entertainment did they play for’
Genitives can pied pipe their way out of a PP and strand the P (English and Icelandic):

(26) a. Whose entertainment did they play Guns ‘n’ Roses for?
b. *Whose did they play Guns ‘n’ Roses for entertainment?

(27) Myndbandi lvers dansaði hann í t(myndbandi lvers)?
video whose danced he in t(video whose)
‘Whose video did he dance in?’

For dative experiencers the locality restriction is absolute (they don’t pied pipe):

(28) a. *Hverjum skemmtunar spiluðu þeir Guns ‘n’ Roses til?
* whom.DAT entertainment.GEN played they Guns ‘n’ Roses for?
b. *Skemmtunar hverjum spiluðu þeir Guns ‘n’ Roses til?
* entertainment.GEN whom.DAT played they Guns ‘n’ Roses for?

2.2.4 Further case position facts

Ditransitive verb – recipient object in the clause + dative in noun phrase:

(29) Þau gáfu stáknum álfað [stelpunum til skemmtunar] 
they gave boy.the elf hat [girls.the.DAT for entertainment.GEN] 
‘They gave the boy an elf hat for the girls’ entertainment’

Case is not tied to the til in til-CEx, since there is no til in the non-til variants:

(30) Stelpunum var góð skemmtun af dansinum. 
girls.the.DAT was good entertainment.NOM by dance.the 
‘The girls were well entertained by the dancing’

Certain semantic properties of the predicate are a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for various clausal datives, e.g. experiencer subjects:

(31) Jóni líkaði bókin. 
John.DAT liked book.the.NOM 
‘John liked the book’

2.2.5 Appl Semantics

(32) Appl Semantics (Pylkkänen 2008):
[[Appl_{exp}]] = λx.λe.experiencer(e,x)
[[entertain]] = λe.entertaining(e)

(33) Event identification (Kratzer 1996)
fg → h
<e,<s,t>> <s,t> → <e,<s,t>>

(34) Output of Event Identification:
λx,λe.f(x)(e) & g(e)
λe.entertaining(e) & experiencer(e, the girls)
Derivation of Appl semantics:

$$\lambda e.\text{entertaining}(e) \& \text{experiencer}(e, \text{the girls})$$

the girls $$\lambda x.\lambda e.\text{entertaining}(e) \& \text{experiencer}(e, x)$$

Appl$_{\text{exp}}$ $$\sqrt{\text{entertain-}}$$

$$\lambda x.\lambda e.\text{experiencer}(e, x) \& \text{entertaining}(e)$$

[[ApplP]] = $$\lambda e.\text{experiencer}(e, \text{the girls}) \& \text{entertaining}(e) = \lambda e.\text{applP}(e)$$

(37) "For event e, the girls are the experiencers of e and e is an entertaining event"

Now we know that the dative is associated with the noun phrase rather than the clause!

3 Causation of experience

3.1 Causative analysis

3.1.1 The puzzle

The intuitive interpretation of CEx is that a causer/causing event causes an experience event where an experiencer can be mentioned as a dative argument:

(38) a. Dansinn var stelpunum gôð skemmtun. (CEx, DP causer)
    dance.the.NOM was girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM
    ‘The dancing entertained the girls well’

b. Stelpunum var skemmtun *( af dansinum).
    girls.the.DAT was entertainment.NOM *( by dance.the) (CEx, PP causer)
    ‘The girls were well entertained by the dancing’

There is a restriction against human causers, although coerced readings are possible, (39). Note that John may not even be aware of the consequences of his dancing, the girls may be peeking from behind a tree:

(39) Stelpunum var skemmtun *( af Jóni).
    girls.the.DAT was entertainment.NOM *( by John)
    ‘The girls were well entertained by John’s behavior (not just John the agent)’

We assume these DP’s do not agentively cause the caused event. This is not an unusual state of affairs:

(40) John concerned me.
    ✓‘John’s behavior causes me concern’
    ✓‘Some property of John causes me concern’
    #‘John is causing me concern intentionally.’

Obligatory PP causer puzzle: Adjuncts are generally optional, e.g. clausal by-phrases in passives:

(41) Stelpunum var skemmt *( af dansinum) (Optional by-phrase in clausal syntax)
    girls.the.DAT was entertained *( by Jóni)
    ‘The girls were entertained *( by John)’
Observation:
The causer in CEx can be expressed either as a DP subject or as an adjoined PP, but it cannot be excluded from the structure or left implicit.

3.1.2 [[CAUSE]]

Causation as a relationship between two events (Parsons 1990, Pylkkänen 2008):

(42) \[[\text{CAUSE}]\] = \(\lambda P, \lambda e. (\exists e') P(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e, e')\)

\[\exists \text{event} \cdots \exists \text{event}' \cdots \text{CAUSE(event, event')}\]

(43) “There exists an event of which various things hold, and another event of which various things hold, and the first event causes the second event”

(44) \[[\text{ncause}]\] = \(\lambda P, \lambda e. (\exists e') P(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e, e')\)

3.2 Obligatory event by-phrase

3.2.1 Analysis: Event-identity requirement

- Pylkkänen invokes an event identity Voice\(^6\) (here \[\text{Pred}_{evt}\]) for Japanese adversity constructions:

(45) \[[\text{Pred}_{evt}]\] = \[[\text{Pred}_{evt-PP}]\] = \(\lambda x_s. \lambda e. e = x_s\)

- To the extent that this type of argument introduction is motivated for Japanese, we would expect constructions cross-linguistically that only allow (45)

- **If, by hypothesis, the event identity requirement is not compatible with existential closure (possibly the same event can only be existentially closed once), a (45)-semantics-only construction requires an overt event DP**

\[
\begin{align*}
[[\text{ApplP}]] & = \lambda e. \text{experiencer}(e, \text{the girls}) \& \text{entertaining}(e) = \lambda e. \text{applP}(e) \\
[[\text{Pred}_{evt}]] & = [[\text{Pred}_{evt-PP}]] = \lambda x_s. \lambda e. e = x_s \\
[[\text{ncause}]] & = \lambda P, \lambda e. (\exists e') P(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e, e') \\
[[\text{Asp}]] & = \lambda P. (\exists e') P(e) \quad \text{(Here, just a concrete location for closing off event)} \\
[[\text{the dance}]] & = [[\text{by the dance}]] = \text{the dance}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^6\)Our Pred might as well be thought of as a special variant of Voice.
3.2.2 Syntax of DP causer variant

DP causing event in Spec, PredP:

(46)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \quad \text{PredP} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{Pred evt} \quad \text{nP} \\
\text{the dance} \quad \text{nP} \\
\text{n cause} \quad \text{ApplP} \\
\text{-ment} \quad \text{the girls entertain-}
\end{array}
\]

3.2.3 Semantics of DP causer variant

DP causing event in Spec, PredP satisfies the event identity requirement:

(47)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
(\exists e)(\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \land \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \land e=\text{the dance} \\
\text{Asp} \quad \lambda P. (\exists e) P(e) \\
\text{PredP} \quad \lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \land \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \land e=\text{the dance} \\
\text{DP} \quad \lambda x. \lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \land \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \land e=x_s \\
\text{Pred evt} \quad \lambda x. \lambda e. e=x_s \\
\text{nP} \quad \lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \land \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \\
\text{n cause} \quad \lambda P. \lambda e. (\exists e') P(e') \land \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \\
\text{ApplP} \quad \lambda e. \text{applP}(e) \\
\end{array}
\]

\[= \lambda e. \text{expericner}(e, \text{the girls}) \land \text{entertaining}(e)\]
3.2.4 Syntax of PP causer variant

PP causing event adjoined to PredP:

(48)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \quad \text{PredP} \\
\text{PredP} \quad \text{PP} \\
\text{Pred}_{evt-PP} \quad \text{nP} \\
\text{n} \quad \text{ApplP} \\
\text{ment} \quad \text{the girls entertain-}
\end{array}
\]

3.2.5 Semantics of PP causer variant

Adjoined PP causing event satisfies the event identity requirement:

(49)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \quad \text{PredP} \\
\text{PredP} \quad \text{PP} \\
\text{Pred}_{evt-PP} \quad \text{nP} \\
\text{n} \quad \text{ApplP} \\
\text{ment} \quad \text{the girls entertain-}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Asp} \\
\lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \& e=\text{the dance}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PredP} \\
\lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \& e=\text{the dance}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PredP} \\
\lambda x. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e,e') \& e=x
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Pred}_{evt-PP} \\
\lambda x. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e,e')
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{n} \\
\lambda P. \lambda e. (\exists e') P(e') \& \text{CAUSE}(e,e')
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ApplP} \\
\lambda e. \text{applP}(e)
\end{array}
\]

- \lambda e. \text{experience}(e, \text{the girls}) \& \text{entertaining}(e)
3.2.6 Ill-formed existential closure under the event identity requirement

\[(50)\]

Predicate (ill-formed, by hypothesis, perhaps b/c you can’t close same event twice)

\[
... \exists e ... \lambda x, \lambda e. (\exists e') \text{applP}(e') & \text{CAUSE}(e,e') & e=x
\]

Further thoughts:

- Stipulating different DP-introducing inventory per construction is not entirely satisfying
- Yet, having different flavors of Voice and Appl, is exactly how much of typological variation is accounted for, so we probably want that type of tool in our toolbox
- To the extent that an event-identity Voice/Pred is needed, e.g. in Japanese, it is a cross-linguistically available building block that might occur in a construction in the absence of other related strategies

**Empirical puzzle:** Material that can be expressed by an adjunct is obligatorily overt in CEx.

**Hypothesized analysis:** The building blocks available for the CEx construction require event identity in order to achieve well-formed existential closure of the causing event.

4 Syntax and semantics of til

4.1 til heads a DP, not a PP

4.1.1 Stranding and doubling

Is til ‘for’ really a type of D?

- til looks like a preposition
- The predicate, e.g. ‘entertainment’, is genitive which is the case assigned to complements of til

Prepositions can be stranded in Icelandic. (Thráinsson 2007:346): 7

\[(51)\] a. Filadelfíu fór hún til (en ekki New York)
Philadelphia went she to (but not New York)

Thráinsson notes that preposition stranding in Icelandic remains to be studied in more detail. Our judgments, and our informants' judgments, are somewhat more permissive than Thráinsson's, which may indicate a generational difference.
b. Hvāða lands mun hún fara til?
   which country will she go to?
   ‘Which country will she go to?’

Acceptability of P stranding is variably (under some obscure conditions) degraded for PPs that are not complements of verbs:

(52) a. ? Miðnættis.GEN dönsaðu þeir til en þá hættu þeir.
   ? midnight danced they to but then stopped they
   ‘Midnight, they danced until, but then they stopped.

b. ? Hvāða klukkustundar.GEN dönsaðu þeir til?
   ? which hour danced they to?
   ‘Which hour did they dance to/un til?’

c. Hvāða endalok a ætlar María að dansa til? (Endaloka alheimsins).
   which final moment plans Mary to dance to? (End of the universe)
   ‘To which final moment does Mary plan to dance? (End of the universe)’

d. (?) Hvāða Jóni ætlar María aðelda kjúkling með?
   (?) which John plans Mary to cook chicken with?
   ‘With which John does Mary plan to cook chicken?’

e. Myndbandi hvers dansaði hann í t(myndbandi hvers)?
   whose danced he in t(video whose
   ‘Whose video did he dance in?’

But, til cannot be stranded at all in CEx!

til-CEx adjunct:

   * girls.the.DAT entertainment.GEN played they Guns ‘n’ Roses to
   ‘The girls’ entertainment, they played Guns ‘n’ Roses for’

   * entertainment.GEN girls.the.DAT played they Guns ‘n’ Roses to
   ‘The girls’ entertainment, they played Guns ‘n’ Roses for’

c. * Skemmtunar spiluðu þeir Guns ‘n’ Roses stelpumum til?
   * entertainment.GEN played they Guns ‘n’ Roses girls.the.DAT to
   ‘Entertainment, played they Guns ‘n’ Roses the girls for’

til-CEx predicate:

(54) a. * Stelpumum skemmtunar var dansinn til.
   * girls.the.DAT entertainment.GEN was dance.the for
   Intended: ‘The dancing was for the girls’ entertainment’

b. * Skemmtunar stelpumum var dansinn til.
   * entertainment.GEN girls.the.DAT was dance.the for
   Intended: ‘The dancing was for the girls’ entertainment’

Preposition doubling is an option in Icelandic (Thráinsson 2007; Jónsson 2008) and its acceptability is affected by similar forces as stranding:

(55) a. Til hvaða lands mun hún fara til?
   to which country will she go to
   ‘To which country will she go?”
4.1.2 DP island vs. nP and raising to subject position

We can contrast the DP island with the ability of the experiencer to raise to subject position in the bare nP (non-til) variant. The highest argument becomes the subject. A coerced human DP in (59) shows that the DP causer is a syntactic subject (DP causer is PRO):\(^8\)

\[(59) \text{Maðurinn vonaðist til að PRO vera stelpunum gðð skemmtun man.the.NOM hoped for to PRO.NOM be girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM} \]
\[
\text{The man hoped to entertain the girls well}
\]

The experiencer becomes the subject in the PP causer variant:

\[(60) \text{Stelpurnar vonuðust til að PRO vera gðð skemmtun af dansinum. girls.the.NOM hoped for to PRO.DAT be good entertainment.NOM by dancing.the} \]
\[
\text{The girls hoped to be entertained well by the dancing}
\]

The alternative word order with a DP causer has the experiencer topicalized:

\[(61) \text{Stelpunum var dansinn gðð skemmtun. (DP causer, Topicalized DAT) girls.the.DAT was dance.the good entertainment.NOM} \]
\[
\text{The dancing entertained the girls well}
\]

The experiencer is not a subject in (61) as shown by (62).

\[(62) \ast \text{Stelpurnar vonuðust til að PRO vera dansinn gðð skemmtun.} \]
\[
\ast \text{girls hoped for to PRO.DAT be dance.the good entertainment.NOM} \]
\[
\text{The girls hoped to be entertained well by the dancing}
\]

\(^8\text{For discussion on subject tests in Icelandic, see Thráinsson (1979); Zaenen et al. (1985)\)}
The experiencer cannot be the subject in the *til*-variant:

(63) * Stelpurnar vomðust til að vera dansinn til skemmtunar.
    * girls.the,NOM hoped for to be dancing.the for entertainment
    ‘The girls hoped to be entertained well by the dance’

4.1.3 Word order

Canonical possessor position embedded under PP gives the wrong word order:

(64)

```
PP
  P
to
  DP
    DP
      girls.the,DAT entertainment
```

Have to assume an EPP-journey to Spec,PP:

(65)

```
PP
  girls.the,DAT
    P
to
    DP
      t(girls)
        ...
        entertainment
```

Why not?

- Pure stipulation
- Cannot be for case reasons, as established above
- DP is a natural locality domain, whereas escaping to Spec,PP but not higher, is suspicious (if you can get that far, why is Spec,PP not an escape hatch, or at least comparable to a real PP for stranding purposes?)
- Contrast with amply motivated movement to Spec,DP: Contrastive possessors frequently move there
- Syntactic properties is what matters, not superficial appearance. Note that a P word form is used as the English infinitival marker (the Icelandic inf. marker is used as P/C/T)
4.2 Causation relative to worlds

The semantics of *til* guarantees causation in all worlds compatible with a contextually salient plan.

(66) a. #Dansinn var stelpumum góð skemmtun en stelpumum var ekki dancing.the.NOM was girls.the.DAT good entertainment.NOM but girls.the.DAT was not skemmt.
entertained
‘The dancing was for the girls’ entertainment but the girls were not entertained.’
b. #Stelpumum var góð skemmtun af dansinn en stelpumum var ekki girls.the.DAT was good entertainment.NOM by dancing.the but girls.the.DAT was not skemmt.
entertained.
‘The girls were entertained by the dancing but the girls were not entertained.’

The *til*-CEx variants do not require successful causation:

(67) Þeir dönsuðu stelpumum til skemmtunar en stelpumum var ekki skemmt.
they danced girls.the.DAT for entertainment but girls.the was not entertained
‘They danced in order to entertain the girls but the girls were not entertained’

(68) Dansinn var [til skemmtunar stelpumum] en stelpumum var ekki skemmt.
dance.the.NOM was [for entertainm.GEN girls.the.DAT] but girls.the was not entertained
‘The dancing was for the girls’ entertainment but the girls weren’t entertained.’

Properties:

- In (68), causation is guaranteed in worlds compatible with a contextually salient plan.
- The plan might have its source in the mind of the dancers, the girls, some third party setting them up (somebody with a sense of humor, a higher power, a ghost, etc.), as long as it is understood to be a plan in the context
- If there is no plan, the causation is not restricted relative to worlds and vacuously holds in all worlds

(69) Scenario:
Eric, Amy and Betsy are walking around campus. They walk past an open window on the second floor where somebody is listening to Avril Lavigne and they happen to suddenly turn up the volume. Eric is Canadian and likes the music so he starts dancing. Amy and Betsy are entertained by the dancing.

(70) a. If this was all a coincidence, CEx does not restrict causation relative to worlds
b. If Eric was planning to entertain Amy and Betsy, CEx restricts causation to worlds compatible with Eric's plans
c. If the person on the second floor set the whole thing up, CEx restricts causation to the worlds that go according to that person’s plan
d. If Amy and Betsy decided to pay attention to the dancing, planning to be entertained, CEx restricts causation to worlds that go according to the girls’ plan
4.3 What type of D is *til*?

Is it really appropriate to call *til* a D?

- Judge words by their syntactic properties, not their superficial looks!
- *til* may have a similar status in noun phrases as infinitival markers have in clauses

Infinitival TP:

- Infinitival marker in T
- No finiteness
- No argument receives subject case (nominative)

*t*il*-DP:

- *til* in D
- No definiteness
- No argument receives subject case (genitive; although the predicate does)

Genitive arguments are impossible:

(71) *Þeir dönsuðu [stelpnanna til skemmtunar]*
    *they danced [girls.the.GEN to entertainment.GEN]*
    ‘They danced for the girls’ entertainment’

- The D is still assigning genitive, although only to the predicate.
- The genitive assignment to the predicate is admittedly P-compatible, but D frequently assigns genitive as well
- Overall, the properties of *til* reflects the sometimes delicate distinctions between functional elements in DP (cf. Kayne 1993 on English *of* as D/P)
- Blurry D/P distinctions plausibly reflect historical relatedness of the relevant constructions

The predicate cannot be definite:

(72) *Þeir dönsuðu [stelpunum til skemmtunarinnar]*
    *they danced [girls.DAT to entertainment.the.GEN]*
    ‘They danced for the girls’ entertainment’

We conclude that *til* is most appropriately analyzed as a special type of D, and not a P. Nevertheless, as long as the empirical properties of *til* are appropriately captured, nothing in the more important parts of the paper hinges on this exact label.
5 Conclusion

• To account for Icelandic facts, the mechanism that introduces dative experiencers must not depend on verbal morphosyntax.
  – We framed our proposal relative to the Pylkkänen (2008) framework by adding a structural variant where Appl selects a category independent root
  – More importantly, these are facts about the world

• The causing event in CEx can be expressed as a PP, while it cannot be left implicit.
  – The PP looks like a by-phrase and there are no obvious syntactic reasons why it must be expressed overtly
  – We hypothesize that the Pred inventory imposes an event identity requirement
  – We provided the analysis that the same event can only be existentially closed once.
  – The intuition that event identity is required can probably be formalized in multiple ways

• We discussed the properties of a function word til which looks like a P but behaves like a D

• We now have a description of an Icelandic construction which has escaped notice in the literature

References


