External and Internal States. Exploring the Predicate Taxonomy

Anton Zimmerling

https://pushkin.academia.edu/Anton Zimmerling

Venue

ЕСЕНЕН ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕН СЕМИНАР

Institute for Bulgarian Language, Bulgarian Academy of Science

https://ibl.bas.bg/esenen-lingvistitchen-seminar-2021/

25 November 2021, 11.00

Acknowledgments

- **При поддержке проекта РФФИ 18-512-18005 «Онтология состояний в лингвистических моделях: сопоставительное исследование болгарского и русского языков».**

- Лекцията е част от проекта „Онтология на ситуациите за състояние – лингвистично моделиране. Съпоставително изследване за български и руски", КП-06-ПРУСИЯ-78, финансиран от „Фонд научни изследвания" по Програма за двустранно сътрудничество България – Русия".

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

3

Summary, I.

- States are spatiotemporal things that holds during a time interval [Davidson 1980]. If p is a state and holds in some locus during an interval starting from t_0 and ending in t_n, that means p is true in this locus for every time point $t_i \in \{t_0...t_n\}$, so that p consists of homogeneous phases.
- All spatiotemporal things have an endpoint according to the Davidsonian analysis.
- Davidsonian states consist of homogeneous phases, while dynamic predicates do not.
- Genuine states (SLP) are opposed to non-spatiotemporal predicates of properties (ILP) and to resultatives.

Summary, II

The basic subcategorization of SLPs is the distinction of internal vs external SLPs [Zimmerling 2018a]. There are three relevant criteria:

(i) Internal SLPs denote situations with a priority semantic argument (semantic subject), external SLPs lack it.

(ii) External SLPs can be quantified based on their spatiotemporal characteristics, internal SLPs can be only quantified on their semantic subjects.

(iii) External SLPs denote sensually (visually or audibly) perceived situations, internal SLPs do not.

Summary, III

- External SLP (SLP_{EXT}) and internal SLP (SLP_{INT}) can be primary and secondary.

- Primary SLP_{EXT} and primary SLP_{INT} are represented by different word classes. Secondary SLP_{EXT} and primary SLP_{INT} are derived by semantic shifts

- A language that retains a lexical opposition of SLP_{EXT} and SLP_{INT} generally blocks or restricts some type of semantic shift. E.g. Modern Russian severely restricts the derivation $^?SLP_{EXT} > SLP_{INT}$, but regularly licenses in the opposite shift $SLP_{INT} > SLP_{EXT}$.

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

INTRO

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

General linguistics

- General linguistics is based on semantic theory and shared conventions concerning the language structure.

- In 1920-s, Ščerba and Peškovskij put forward important ideas that anticipated predicate taxonomies of the 1970-1980-s. However, they lacked explicit semantic theories: some of their claims must be critically assessed and revised.

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Metalanguage

- Linguistic terminology is elsewhere redundant. E.g. ščerbian *states* are largely equivalent to SLP predicates in the tradition of Greg Carlson.

- At the same time, similar terms can be misleading. E.g. ščerbian/davidsonian *states* are different from kimian or vendlerian *states*.

- The term *predicative* in the Russian tradition established by Isačenko (1955) refers to a **class of words**, while the homonymic term in the western syntactic line primarily refers to a **class of grammatical forms**.

1. DAVIDSONIAN STATES

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Spatiotemporality

- In 1960-s, Donald Davidson defined states as a kind of **spatiotemporal things** that hold during a time interval [Davidson 1980]. If p is a state and holds in some locus during an interval starting from t_0 and ending in t_n, that means p is true in this locus for every time point $t_i \in \{t_0...t_n\}$, so that p consists of **homogeneous phases**, cf. [Maienborn 2007].

- Later predicate taxonomies rooting in Davidson [Bulygina 1982] add to the distinction of spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal things another dimension — the distinction of **dynamic** vs **static** situations [Vendler 1957.

- ✓ Davidsonian states consist of homogeneous phases, while dynamic predicates do not [Seliverstova 1982: 126-127].

Vendlerian and Davidsonian classifications

❖ Vendler aims at classifying verbs according to their aspectual semantics: three types of dynamic predicates — a) activities, cf. *run*, *drive*, b) accomplishments, i.e. incremental or gradual predicates, cf. *build a house*, c) *achievements*, i.e. predicates of an instantaneous transition, cf. *notice* — are opposed to a single class of statives.

❖ Davidsonian taxonomies leave a possibility of classifying statives into different types. This is done in [Bulygina 1982: 82 — 85] and [Seliverstova 1982: 93 – 97], who distinguish spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal stative situations: the latter, called 'свойства' or 'качества' are analyzed as names of properties abstracted from any referential situations.

ILP and one-place nominal predicates in NOM

❑ In the Russian tradition, it is customary to illustrate properties with one-place nominal predicates (nouns or full adjectives or NPs) in the nominative case, cf. (1a-c).

1. Rus. a. Он$_{3SG.M.NOM}$ — мужчина$_{SB,NOM.SG.M}$·

      'He is a man.'

  b. Он$_{3SG.M.NOM}$ — сильный$_{ADJ.NOM.SG.M}$·
    'He is strong'

  c. Он — [$_{NP}$ сильный мужчина]$_{NOM.SG.M}$ ·
    'He is a strong man.'

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

13

SLP (- full agreement)

❑ Spatiotemporal statives are illustrated by sentences without full agreement. While *мужчина* and *сильный* can be used in argument or attributive position, short adjectives (2a) or the predicative instrumental (2b) are used only as part of the predicate.

❑ The idiomatic meaning confirms that they denote referential situations. (2a) actually tells that X was not dumb except for some situation where he *kept from talking*, while (2b) implies that X not only was a man, but also *behaved as a real man* during his life.

2. Rus.   a.   Он$_{3SG.M.NOM}$ был$_{PST.SG}$ нем$_{ADJ.PR.\ NOM.SG.M}$, как рыба.

'He was dumb a fish' i.e. 'X kept from talking'.

          b.   Он$_{3SG.M.NOM}$ был$_{PST.3SG.SG}$ мужчиной$_{INSTR.PRED}$.

'He was a <real> man.'

Ščerbian states

❑ The idea that the absence vs presence of agreement on a nominal predicate encodes the distinction of spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal stative situations in Russian was first introduced in 1928 in Lev Ščerba's paper "On parts of speech in Russian" [Ščerba 1928].

❑ Ščerba bluntly called spatiotemporal predicates *состояния* i.e 'states' and non-spatiotemporal predicates *качества* i.e. 'properties'.

❑ The same distinction under the cover terms '**stage-level predicates**' (SLP) vs '**individual-level predicates**' (ILP) was reintroduced 50 years later by Greg Carlson [Carlson 1977].

❑ I use the tags SLP and ILP for ščerbian states and properties, respectively.

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

2.SLP AND THE CATEGORY OF STATE

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Special non-agreeing word forms

- Ščerba and his followers [Vinogradov 1947; Isačenko 1955] believed that the core of the Russian SLP predication is represented by special non-agreeing word forms selecting an animate subject and either licensing dative-predicative structures (DPS) or a structure with a nominative subject, cf. *навеселе* 'tipsy', 'half drunk', 'half of the bag' in (4).

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

17

ILP vs SLP

3. Rus. a. $Я_{1SG.NOM}$ веселый$_{ADJ.NOM.SG.M}$. (ILP)

'I am cheerful.'

b. $Мне_{1DAT.SG}$ весело$_{PRED}$. (SLP)

'I am having fun.'

4. Rus. [$_{CoP}$ Вася и Катя] были$_{PST.3PL}$ навеселе$_{PRED}$. (SLP)

'Bazil and Kate were half in the bag.'

Parts of speech and SLP

- [Ščerba 2008: 91; Vinogradov 1947; Isačenko 1955] argued that Russian has a new class of indeclinable words in the making, so called Category of State (CatS) which stands for SLP.

- Neither Russian INSTR nor Russian short adjectives are good candidates to be listed in CatS, since they are part of declension paradigms.

- However, the semantic side of Ščerba's hypothesis is reliable. True indeclinable SLP predicates like those in (3b) and (4) invariably select animate semantic subjects in Russian, while presumable SLPs linked with declension paradigms like those in (2a—b) do not.

Tab.1 Two classes of Russian SLPs

	SLP	
	+ Animate	**($\pm$ Animate)**
Declension paradigm	NO	YES
Syntactic schema	N_{DAT} — V_{LINK} — PRED N_{NOM} — V_{LINK} — PRED	N_{NOM} — V_{FIN} — N/ADJ_{INSTR} N_{NOM} — V_{FIN} — N_{ACC} — N/ADJ_{INSTR} N_{NOM} — V_{LINK} — ADJ.PRED

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

20

3. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SLP

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Internal SLP vs External SLP

❑ The basic subcategorization of SLPs is the distinction of internal vs external SLPs [Zimmerling 2018a]. There are three relevant criteria:

(i) Internal SLPs denote situations with a priority semantic argument (semantic subject), external SLPs lack it.

(ii) External SLPs can be quantified on the basis of their spatiotemporal characteristics, internal SLPs can be only quantified on their semantic subjects.

(iii) External SLPs denote sensually (visually or audially) perceived situations, internal SLPs do not.

General semantics and vs specific morphosyntax

- The distinction of SLP_{EXT} and SLP_{INT} is supposedly universal.
- Meanwhile, it can be represented on a different level: a) in the lexicon, when SLP_{EXT} and SLP_{INT} correspond to different word classes = ***primary SLP_{EXT}, SLP_{INT}***. b) grammatically, if adding/dropping some marker (an extra syntactic slot, a special applicative morpheme etc.) changes the semantic type of the SLP predicate = ***secondary (derived) SLP_{EXT}, SLP_{INT}***.
- It makes sense to focus on productive patterns linked with SLPs, not on isolated verbal or nominal meanings. An alternative approach is applied in typological studies, when certain predicate meanings, cf. KNOW, NEED are tested in a sample of languages with different morphosyntax.

An applicative model

	PRIMARY SLP$_{EXT}$	**DERIVED SLP$_{INT}$**
Predicate meaning	COLD <in Z>	COLD + **APPL** = 'X feels cold'
	PRIMARY SLP$_{INT}$	**DERIVED SLP$_{INT}$**
Predicate meaning	**X** IS SAD	$\varnothing$ IS SAD/DREARY <in Z>

S_{INT} as methaphors/metonymic uses of S_{EXT}

- In some world's languages, S_{INT} are derived from S_{EXT} by adding a marker with the meaning 'inside', 'in the heart', 'in the stomach' etc.

- This partly holds for Slavic languages as well. E.g. Rus. *Он в ярости* 'He is **furious**', lit. 'He is **in-fury**' (S_{INT}) follows the locative pattern *Он в городе* 'He is in the city', *Он в сюртуке* 'He is **in a frock coat**'.

- This shift is **facilitated by the default nominative case-marking** on the subject argument. Meanwhile, the shift S_{EXT} > S_{INT} is substantially degraded with non-nominative subject arguments in Russian **мне пыльно*, int. 'It is dusty to me', since S_{EXT} like пыльно generally do not select dative arguments.

An illustration

S_{EXT}	S_{INT}
*Он **в майке*** 'He is wearing a T-shirt', 'He is in a T-shirt'.	*Он **в ярости*** 'He is in a fury.'
*Он **в трауре** = Он в траурной одежде* 'He is in mourning clothes.'	*Он **в трауре** = Он горюет* 'He is mourning'
*	*Он **не в своей тарелке*** lit. 'He is **not in his plate**' > 'He is not **at ease**.'

Hypothesis

- If a language has mixed lexical / grammatical coding of the SLP_{EXT} ~ SLP_{INT} distinction, the shifts deriving secondary SLP must be asymmetrical.

Indeclinability, agreement and ILP

❑ Russian lexical predicatives pattern into two classes — indeclinable forms, cf. *навеселе* 'X is tipsy' vs lacking agreement, cf. *боязно* 'X is afraid'.

❑ Their grouping in one shared word class is not felicitous, since the elements from the first class actually show gender-and-number agreement, cf. the phi-features on the copula: *Вася*NOM.SG.M **был**PST.SG.M *навеселе*PRED ~ *Катя*NOM.SG.M **была**PST.SG.F *навеселе*PRED ~ [CoP *Вася и Катя*]NOM.PL **были**PST.PL *навеселе*PRED, cf. (4) above.

❑ Contrariwise, the elements from the second class, which license DPS structures in Russian and case-mark their semantic subjects with the dative case — *Васе*DAT **было**PST.SG.N *боязно*PRED 'B. was afraid'— completely lack agreement morphology. This conclusion was first made by Nikolaj Pospelov in 1955 who claimed that DPS are totally incompatible with subject-predicate agreement [Pospelov 1955].

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Pospelov's analysis from a modern perspective

I find Pospelov's hypothesis correct, though he

1) made a concession to the traditional linguistics and excluded DPS realizations with sentential arguments (finite clauses or infinitives): in accord with the theories of his day, he assumed that sentential arguments always take the subject position by DPS predicatives (**which is dubious**, see [Zimmerling 2009])

2) analyzed such arguments as agreement controllers (**which is wrong**).

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

29

Predicative vs indeclinable secondary predicates

5. Rus.   a.   Мне_DAT было_PST.SG.N **не по силам₂^PRED** [_InfP решить_INF [_DP эти задачи]_ACC.PL].

'I was unable to handle these tasks.'

b.   Мне_DAT были_PST.PL **не по силам₁^ADJ** [_DPэти задачи]_NOM.PL.

'These tasks were too much for me.'

6. Rus. a.   [_DP Эти задачи]_NOM.PL были_PST.PL мне_DAT/для меня_GEN.PREP **непосильны_ADJ.NOM.PL**.

'These tasks were too much for me.'

b.   [_DP Эти задачи]_NOM.PL были_PST.PL для меня_GEN.PREP **непосильными_ADJ.INSTR.PL**.

Morphosyntax and semantics

- ✓ (5a) is a structure with **case copying**: the adjectival complement *непосильны* (a short adjective) copies all phi-features of its controller, the subject DP *эти задачи* and shows the Nom.Pl form. The experiential argument can be expressed here both with DAT and with the prepositional genitive.

- ✓ In (6b), the predicative adjective gets INSTR and the experiencer is preferably marked with GEN.PREP: prepositionless DAT $^?$*Эти задачи*$_{NOM.PL}$ *были **мне**$_{DAT}$ непосильными*$_{INSTR.PL}$ was early an option but is ackward now. The assignment of INSTR to the indeclinable adjectives like *не по силам*$_1$ is impossible, since they **lack morphological case**.

Dative-nominative-structures are external SLP

❑ Both non-agreeing predicatives like *не по силам$_1$* and indeclinable elements like *не по силам$_1$, непосильны*$_{NOM.PL}$, *непосильными*$_{INSTR.PL}$ in (5) and (6a—b) are SLPs and do not express ILP, as Ščerba correctly predicted.

❖ The relevant distinction is while *не по силам$_2$* and all other DPS predicatives have the meaning of internal ILPs (SLP-INT) and identify a priority semantic argument, *не по силам$_1$, непосильны* and all other elements licensing DNS denote a configurational relation between two arguments — the experiencer marked with DAT and the subject marked with NOM.

❖ **Neither DAT nor NOM has the features of the priority semantic argument**, which makes it possible to analyze all Russian DNS sentences as external SLPs (SLP-EXT).

4. SHIFTING THE SEMANTIC TYPE

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Primary and secondary states

✓ Let us assume that there exist *primary internal states* (S_{INT}) and *primary external states* (S_{EXT}), corresponding to different word classes.

✓ *Secondary states* are predicates shifting their semantic type in some syntactic contexts: either $S_{EXT} \rightarrow S_{INT}$, or $S_{INT} \rightarrow S_{EXT}$.

.Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

$S_{INT} \rightarrow S_{EXT}$

✓ Russian lacks the parameter of obligatory pronominal experiencer. The same predicatives can be realized in DPS structures as S_{INT}, and as S_{EXT} in sentences without an overt.

❖ The shift $S_{INT} \rightarrow S_{EXT}$ is not forced by the dropping of the overt subject position. Meanwhile, contexts, where meanings like «X-у Z-во» vs «Z-во» are contrasted indeed exist.

$^{??}S_{EXT} \rightarrow S_{INT}$

❑ Let us try to test whether primary Russian S_{EXT} can be used in DPS sentences diagnostic of Russian S_{INT}.

▪ In 2021, I checked 50 lexical items in the Russian National Corpus (RNC).

▪ The hypothesis was that if the shift $S_{EXT} \rightarrow S_{INT}$ is unlikely for some lexical predicative, the number of DPS clauses in the text sample (the 1Sg Dat.Sg subject pronoun *мне* in the contact position with the predicative) must be $0 < m < 3$, since $m = 3$ is the lower limit confirming that this lexical item belongs to the DPS vocabulary.

✓ This prediction holds for 49 predicatives from 50 (98%).

$S_{EXT} \rightarrow S_{INT}$: results

- ✓ The shift $S_{EXT} \rightarrow S_{INT}$ is not licensed in most idiolects of the speakers.

- ❑ Secondary S_{INT} of the type *??Х-у пыльно* int. 'to-me it is dusty' are not completely impossible…

- ✓ … but the speakers' experiments with producing secondary S_{EXT} are generally not approved by the majority of the speakers and characterize the individual periphery of the DPS construction, not its shared core vocabulary.

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

37

The grammar of yearning: Russian *тоскливо*

❑ I tested an RNC sample with 1632 clauses containing the element *тоскливо* 'dreary', 'drearily' in all syntactic positions: as predicatives (**_тоскливо_2**), agreeing adjectives in Sg.N. (**_тоскливо_1**) and adverbials (**_тоскливо_3**).

❑ The earliest examples are dated with 1909.

❑ The ratio of DPS clauses basing on this sample is m = 23.

❑ This confirms that *тоскливо_2* belongs to the core DPS vocabulary, i.e. is **a primary S$_{INT}$.**

❑ 83,3% of the speakers (15 from 18) confirmed that they use *тоскливо_2* as S$_{INT}$.

I. Краткое прил. ср.р. *тоскливо₁*	II. Предикатив *тоскливо₂*				III. Наречие *тоскливо₃*	
	ДПС		без дат. п.			
	+ *на душе*	без расши-рителя	+ *на душе/на сердце*	без расшири-теля	ADV1 (ADJ/ADV₂)	vP, VP
1	1 (0,32%)	306	59 (14,47%)	343	38	885
	307		402		923	

Таблица 2. Прилагательное, предикатив и наречие *тоскливо* в НКРЯ

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Syntactic context vs semantic type

✓ The sentences with *тоскливо$_2$*, containing **at least one marker of the priority argument** — either the dative NP/pronoun or the phrases *на душе/на сердце* 'in the soul/in the heart' — or both can be identified with S$_{INT}$.

✓ They take 50,63% from all *тоскливо$_2$* uses.

✓ However, the absence of these markers does not confirm the taxonomic meaning of S$_{EXT}$.

Semantic vs syntactic arguments

❑ NB. The phrase на *душе/на сердце* corresponds to an animate participant (i.e. is a semantic argument), **but does not encode the priority argument in Russian**.

✓ The phrase *на душе/на сердце* forms in Russian a **complementary distribution** with overt [syntacts] sentential arguments.

✓ Russian licenses sentences like *(Мне) было тоскливо₂ (на душе)* and *(мне) было тоскливо₂ выходить из дому*, but not sentences like ***было тоскливо₂ на душе выходить из дом**у*.

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Предикативы ДПС (307)			Предикативы без дат.п. лица (402)		
+ *на душе* (1)	без расширителя (306)		+ *на душе/на сердце* (59)	без расширителя (343)	
	что P	инфинитив		что P	инфинитив
0	1 (0,32%)	13 (4,24%)	0	2 (0, 49%)	57 (16,61%)

Таблица 3. Сентенциальные валентности предикатива *тоскливо₂*, по НКРЯ

Autoreferentialiy

✓ In 78,5% of cases the position of subject N_{DAT} with *тоскливо₂* is filled by **a personal pronoun** (245 examples from 307).

✓ With the contact position of the subject pronoun the share of the sentences in 1Sg equals **48%** (24 from 50), with the distant position — **61,78%** (118 from 191).

✓ This confirms the hypothesis that *тоскливо₂*, like most Russian S_{INT} is *autoreferential*, i.e. **oriented towards the describing the internal state of the speaker.**

Тоскливо$_2$ as S$_{EXT}$

❑ Ca 52 examples in the sample follow the pattern ***в Z-е тоскливо$_2$*** 'it is dreary in Z' and express the meaning of S$_{EXT}$.

❖ Some examples show that the speakers are aware of the fact that *тоскливо$_2$* has side uses as S$_{INT}$ as well as S$_{EXT}$.

Adverbial *тоскливо₃*

✓ The predicative *тоскливо₂* provides the basic context for the analysis of the adverbial *тоскливо₃*.

✓ In other words, the adverbial *тоскливо₃* can be analyzed as hidden stative predicate featuring either the meaning of S_{INT}, or the meaning of S_{EXT}.

Accessibility of animate participants

✓ Situations described by *тоскливо$_3$ и тоскливо$_2$*, are linked with two kinds of animate participants (as semantic arguments).

✓ These can be both overt and covert.

❑ The **subject of state (X)**, can remain covert, but is sometimes reconstructed unequivocally.

❑ The **observer** aka **subject of evaluation (Y)** generally remains coverts.

❑ If both X and Y are accessible, the sentence containing a stative predicate becomes **ambivalent**: it can both express the meaning of S$_{INT}$, or the meaning of S$_{EXT}$.

Ambiguity

o (7) *На противоположной стороне улицы (→ Y)* ***тоскливо мерзли*** *три милиционера (→ X).*

[Е. Строителева. «Иисус, как и Ленин, добра людям хотел» (2002) // «Известия», 2002.11.08].

'On the opposite side of the street, three policemen froze drearily.'

❑ Ex. (7) describes a situation, where some X is freezing outdours.

Covert argument as Y (=observer)

❑ The situation in (7) is visually accessible and can reflect the perspective of the observer Y, who stands somewhere on the *opposite side of the street*

(7а) «**Было тоскливо$_2$ (S_{EXT}) смотреть**, как на улице мерзли милиционеры».

'It was a dreary sight to look at the policemen freezing at the street'

Covert argument as X (=subject of state)

- ✓ But a sentence like (7) also can feature **the viewpoint of the X** (by the empathy of the speaker to Y).
- ✓ In this case, (7) can be analyzed as a sentence containing a hidden reference to S_{INT} and its bearer (= X).

- ○ (7b) На улице мерзли милиционеры, **и им было тоскливо$_2$ (S_{INT}).**

  '**Dreary policemen** were freezing outdoors.'

Conclusions

- For the sake of simplicity, I assumed that the classes of primary S_{EXT} vs primary S_{INT} are diagnosed in Russian based on a single syntactic criterion: primary S_{INT} regularly license dative-predicative structures (DPS sentences), while primary S_{EXT} lack regular DPS uses.

- This prediction holds for sentences with the overt position of a dative argument.

- Russian primary S_{INT} correlate with secondary S_{EXT} derived by the regular semantic shift $S_{INT} > S_{EXT}$.

- In sentences without an overt dative argument the diagnostics of S_{EXT} vs S_{INT} is to some extent possible, except for the ambivalent contexts.

AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

S_{EXT} vs S_{INT} revisited

❖One can preserve the initial hypothesis that states subcategorize into S_{EXT} vs S_{INT}, but give up the idea that all DPS predicatives select the same type of the animate argument (N_{DAT}) and assume that some DPS predicatives select Subject of state (**Experiencer, X**) as N_{DAT}, while other DPS predicatives select the Observer (**Subject of Evaluation, Y**) as their priority arguments.

States vs assessments

- The idea that Russian DPS contain both states (physical sensations, names of emotions and affections) and predicates of a different taxonomic type (i.e. *assessments*, *modalities* etc.) is not new.

- One can define 'states' in an 'anthropological' manner as some mental activity experienced by a human being and claim that in sentences like (8), the dative argument is not X (experiencer), but Y (subject of assessment).

- (8) **Мне глупо|наивно** *соглашаться на это предложение*.

  'It is **silly/naive for my part** to accept this proposal'

⇒ 'Y believes that p is silly', not *'X is in the silly state of mind".

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

53

APPENDIX: SLP ~ ILP DISTINCTION IN RUSSIAN SECONDARY PREDICATES

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

5. INSTR AND SHORT ADJECTIVES AS PRIMARY PREDICATES

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Short adjectives

❑ The idea that INSTR on the nominal predicate is semantically motivated and the choice of INSTR vs NOM case encodes the SLP vs ILP distinction in Russian goes back to Ščerba's contemporary Alexander Peškovskij [Peškovskij 1928: 316].

❑ This author (b. 1878) claimed that Russian short and long adjectives are always non-synonymic in the predicative position [ibid., 262—263], although he admitted that short adjectives are absent from colloquial Russian [ibid., 264].

❖ In the later generations the contrast of short vs full adjectives is degraded.

Expansion of Russian full adjectives

❑ In some contexts, the short forms of many adjectives are not used, and in different group of contexts, where the short form survived, the full form is licensed.

❑ In some contexts the SLP meaning can be expressed by three ways — by using the short and full forms of the adjective in NOM, cf. (5a—b) and by the INSTR form of the same adjective, cf. (5c).

❑ In the older usage, full adjectives do not take complements, so the combination *добрый ко мне* 'kind to me' is ill-formed, but even this constraint is violated in Modern Russian, cf. (5a).

Variation

5. Rus. a. Он был$_{PST}$ очень добрый$_{ADJ.NOM}$ ($^?$ко мне) на экзамене.

'He was very kind to me at the exam.'

b. Он был$_{PST}$ очень добр$_{ADJ.PRED. NOM}$ (ко мне) на экзамене.

'the same.'

c. Он был$_{PST}$ добрым$_{ADJ.INTSR}$ ($^?$ко мне) на экзамене.

'the same.'

✓ The variants (5a—c) have SLP semantics: they indicate that the event 'X was kind to Y' took place in some locus during the period of time 'at the exam' in some referential situation in the past.

Idioms

❑ Idiomatic expressions with short forms, cf. *готов* [PP *на все*] 'ready for anything', *готов* [InfP *стоять за дело мира*] 'ready to stand for the cause of peace' are resistant to the expansion of full forms. Cf.Ex. (6) from the song by Alexander Galitsch is a parody mocking illiterate speech.

6. Non-stand. Rus. *Но я **стоять**INF **готовая**ADJ.NOM.SG.F **за дело мира**. (A.Galitsch, 1970) (SLP)

'But I-fem. am ready to stand for the cause of peace'.

❖ In (6), the speaker declares her (actually — his, since a man is reading out the wrong text) will to stand for the cause of peace from now on. The full form *готовая* does not fit here — not because it brings an ILP meaning but because the cliché *готова стоять за дело мира* does not license the replacement *готова → готовая*.

Predicative Instrumental on primary predicates

❑ Another Peškovskij's hypothesis that the case-marking with INSTR vs NOM on the predicative complement encodes the SLP vs ILP distinction remains popular, see [Nichols 1981; Kosta 2014; 2020; Pitsch 2017; Zhuravleva 2018].

❑ The search must be narrowed with predicative adjectives and participles, since the semantic opposition *Он был*$_{PST}$ *инженер*$_{NOM}$ 'He was an engineer' (ILP) vs *Он был*$_{PST}$ *инженером*$_{INSTR}$ 'He was an engineer' (SLP) presumably valid in the early XX century seems to be lost [Guiraud-Weber 2007; Krasovitsky et alii 2008].

✓ With adjectival and participial complements, the main problem is that while **every use of INSTR conforms to the SLP meaning, not every use of NOM signals the ILP meaning.** In many contexts INSTR and NOM alternate without any clear contrast, cf. (7a—b).

Synonymy of short and full forms

7. Rus.

     a.   Он$_{\text{NOM.SSG.M}}$ был$_{\text{PST.SG}}$ уже   совсем больной$_{\text{ADJ.NOM.SG.M}}$, когда мы пришли.   (SLP)

     'He was already quite ill, when we came.'

     b.   Он$_{\text{NOM.SG.M}}$ был$_{\text{PST.SG}}$ уже   совсем больным$_{\text{ADJ.INSTR,SG.M}}$, когда мы пришли.   (SLP)

     'the same.'

6. THE PREDICATIVE INSTRUMENTAL, ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBIALS AS SECONDARY PREDICATES

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Predicative adjectives in NOM

Short adjectives in ACC, cf. **он*$_{\text{3SG.M.NOM}}$ *увидел*$_{\text{PST.SG.M}}$ *ее*$_{\text{3SG.F.ACC}}$

сердиту$_{\text{ADJ.PRED.ACC.SG.F}}$ int. 'He saw that she was angry' are no longer used.

Short adjectives in NOM are licensed as secondary predicates but are

bookish. There is no contrast between (8a) and (8b), both of them convey the

SLP meaning 'X was in an angry mood when he came', but (8b) is neutral,

while (8a) sounds archaic or ironic.

8. Rus.   a. Он$_{\text{3SG.M}}$ пришел$_{\text{PST.SG.M}}$ сердит$_{\text{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}}$ и зол$_{\text{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}}$.   (SLP)

'X came in angry and in malicious temper.'

b. Он$_{\text{3SG.M}}$ пришел$_{\text{PST.SG.M}}$ сердитый$_{\text{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}}$ и злой$_{\text{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}}$.

(SLP)   'the same.'

Intransitive and transitive clauses

❑   The productive types are linked with full adjectives in NOM and INSTR.

❑   In intransitive clauses, NOM is the standard option. INSTR with *пришел* 'came in' — [?] ***он пришел сердитым*$_{INSTR}$ *и злым*$_{INSTR}$** — is not completely out, but is rated lower than (8b).

❑   In transitive clauses with object control, cf. *увидеть кого-л.* 'to see anyone' ACC and INSTR alternate, but INSTR is more frequent.

Small clauses with adjectival predicates

❑ Russian small clauses are construed both with ACC/NOM and INSTR. In contexts like (9a—b), there is no semantic contrast between the construction with the second ACC and the construction with INSTR, both of them meaning 'I am hoping that you will be alive when I see you', but not 'I am hoping to see you live'.

9. Rus.   a.   Я$_{1SG.NOM}$ надеюсь$_{PRES.1SG}$ увидеть$_{INF}$ [$_{SC}$ вас$_{ACC.PL}$ живых$_{ACC.PL}$].   (SLP)

            lit. 'I hope to see you-pl living'

          b.   Я$_{1SG.NOM}$ надеюсь$_{PRES.1SG}$ увидеть$_{INF}$ [вас$_{ACC.PL}$ живыми$_{INSTR.PL}$].   (SLP)

          'the same'

Clauses with adverbial predicates

- ✓ In order to express the meaning 'I am hoping to see you live, not in the internet', one has to change the construction and use an adverbial secondary predicate. This can be done by inserting either *вживую* or *живьем*.

10. Rus. a. Я$_{1SG.NOM}$ надеюсь$_{PRES.1SG}$ увидеть$_{INF}$ вас$_{ACC.PL}$ живьем$_{ADV.PRED}$.
   'I am hoping to see you live.'

   b. Я$_{1SG.NOM}$ надеюсь$_{PRES.1SG}$ увидеть$_{INF}$ вас$_{ACC.PL}$ вживую$_{ADV.PRED}$.
   'the same.'

- ❖ It is unlikely that either (10a) or (10b) contain a small clause: both *живьем* and *вживую* are oriented here towards the matrix subject, i.e. the person who is hoping to see somebody, not towards the object of the embedded infinitive.

- ❖ The reading '*I am hoping that you will be alive, when I see you' for (10a) is excluded.

To catch the croc alive

✓ With *поймать кого-л.* 'to catch smb.' the picture is different: *живьем* is associated with the embedded object. The sentences (11a—b) have small clause syntax and SLP semantics. The non-agreeing predicative adverbial *живьем* proves synonymic here to INSTR.

11. Rus. a. Я$_{1SG.NOM}$ надеюсь$_{PRES.1SG}$ поймать$_{INF}$ [$_{SC}$ крокодила$_{ACC.SG.M}$ живьем$_{ADV.PRED}$]. (SLP)

   'I am hoping to catch a crocodile alive'.

   b. Я$_{1SG\ NOM}$ надеюсь поймать$_{INF}$ [$_{SC}$ крокодила$_{ACC.SG.M}$ живым$_{INSTR.SG.M}$]. (SLP)

✓ Both (11a) and (11b) force the SC analysis and the SLP reading 'I am hoping that the croc will be alive, when I catch it', but not the matrix reading *'I am hoping to be alive, when I catch the croc', see above (10b) for the contrast.

✓ The adverbial *вживую* is always associated with the matrix subject and does not license small clause readings like (11a). Finally, the variant with the second accusative — *надеюсь поймать* [$_{SC}$ *крокодила*$_{ACC}$ *живого*$_{ACC}$] — is possible but less natural.

Preliminary conclusion

❑ The correlation between SLP and the choice of INSTR is better preserved by secondary predicates, notably in the transitive clauses.

❑ The small clause syntax generally implies SLP semantics in argument clauses, but Russian argument small clauses with the SLP meaning do not necessarily include an INSTR element and are construed by more than one way, both with adjectives and with predicative adverbials.

7. THE PREDICATIVE INSTRUMENTAL WITH A ZERO COPULA

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Syntactic control

❑ Standard accounts of Russian grammar explain the INSTR case-marking on the predicative complement as an instance of the subject control. It is controlled by an overt clausal subject — either the matrix subject or the small clause subject — in the presence of a non-zero verbal head: $NP_1...$**v⁰**$...$ NP_2/ADJ**INSTR** ~ $NP1...$**v⁰**$...NP_2$ $....NP_3/ADJ$**INSTR** [Baylin 2011].

❑ However, on special occasions the predicative INSTR is assigned in the absence of an overt verbal head or in a structure without a nominative subject. One of the exceptions is described in [Zimmerling 2018c].

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

70

Russian-B: subject raising of sententional complement

12. Russian-B

Департаменту_{DAT} полиции стало_{PST.3G.N} **известным_{INSTR}**, [_{CP} что Вы переслали какое-то письмо отсюда].   (G.Gershuni, 1908)
‘The police department got to know that you have sent some letter from the prison.’

13. Russian-B
Мне_{DAT} стало_{PST.SG.N} **известным_{INSTR}**, [_{CP} что П. А. Столыпин удостоил П. Н. Дурново письмом.](V.Shul'gin, 1971)
‘I got to know that Stolypin had honoured Durnovo with a letter.’

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

71

Raising of sentential arguments and dialectal variation

❑ The matrix verb *стало* in (12) и (13) stands in 3Sg.N, which is the default agreement form, i.e. a non-agreeing form in terms of traditional grammar. The matrix clause has no subject DP in the nominative case, so the only available type of case controller is the raised that-clause [$_{CP}$ *что P*], which fills in the vacant position of the matrix subject.

❑ Standard Russian, i.e. Russian-A lacks raising of sentential arguments.

Absolutive constructions with INSTR

❏ INSTR is optionally assigned to the extracted attribute [Kosta 2014]

14. Rus. a. Холодным$_{INSTR.SG.M}$ [$_{DP}$ этот чай]$_{NOM.SG.M}$ невкусный $_{NOM.SG.M}$.
     (SLP)

   'This tea is tasteless when cold.'

   b. Холодный$_{NOM.SG.M}$ [этот чай] невкусный$_{NOM.SG.M}$.   (SLP)

   'the same.'

✓ Most speakers prefer the option (14b) with NOM, but (14a) is a licit structure. The underlying SLP sentence fixing the fact that the tea was cold at the moment it was consumed is either (15a) or (15b).

15. Rus. a. Чай$_{NOM.SG.M}$ был$_{PST.SG}$ холодным$_{INSTR.SG.M}$/холодный$_{NOM.SG.M}$.
     (SLP)

   'The tea was cold.'

   b. пить$_{INF}$ [$_{SC}$ чай$_{ACC.SG.M}$ холодным$_{INSTR.SG.M}$/$^?$холодный$_{NOM.SG.M}$.]
     (SLP)

   'to drink the tea cold.'

Absolutive constructions lack a generalized resultative meaning

• It can be speculated that the predicates (14) — (15) have the resultative meaning and denote the change of the state. Indeed, the sentence *The tea was cold* implies that the tea had initially been hot, but got cold.

• But this conclusion is hasty, since the change of the state implicature is brought in by the pragmatic context, not by the construction itself. With the adjective *сырой* 'raw', 'fresh' the sentence certainly does not add the implicature that the mushrooms initially had been cooked but then turned fresh, cf. (16a—d).

To eat the mushrooms fresh

16. Rus.

    a.   Сырыми$_{INSTR.PL}$ [$_{DP}$ эти грибы]$_{NOM.PL}$ невкусные$_{NOM.PL}$. (SLP)

'These mushrooms are tasteless when fresh.'

    b.   Сырые$_{NOM.PL}$ [$_{DP}$ эти грибы]$_{NOM.PL}$ невкусные$_{NOM.PL}$. (SLP)

    c.   [$_{DP}$ Эти грибы]$_{NOM.PL}$ были$_{PST.PL}$ сырыми$_{INSTR.PL}$/сырые$_{NOM.PL}$. (SLP)

'These mushrooms were fresh.'

    d.   есть$_{INF}$ [$_{SC}$ грибы$_{ACC.PL}$ сырыми$_{INSTR.PL}$/сырые$_{ACC.PL}$] (SLP)

'to eat the mushrooms fresh.'

Argument clauses and their paraphrases

❖   In Russian argument clauses, the complement marked with INSTR agrees in number and gender with its controller, i.e. the clausal subject. Cf. (17), where the agreeing adjective *сырыми* 'fresh' is replaced by the synonymic non-agreeing adverbial *в сыром виде* 'in the fresh form'.

17. Rus.   есть_INF [_SC грибы в сыром виде_ADV.PRED].   (SLP)

          'to eat the mushrooms fresh.'

❖ The same option is available in the absolute construction.

18. Rus.   В сыром виде_ADV.PRED [_SC   [_DP эти грибы]_NOM.PL ___]
невкусные_NOM.PL. (SLP)
                    'In the fresh form, these mushrooms are tasteless.'

8. RESULTATIVE SMALL CLAUSES AND SLP

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

The default form of INSTR

o   Resultative small clauses denote **the change of the state**, which requires a different morphosyntax.

o   The predicative INSTR takes the default form (Instr.Sg.M/N) and lacks a lexical controller, see (19).

o   The resultative meaning is also expressed by adverbial predicatives, mostly with prefixes *на-* and *до-,* cf. *насмерть* 'to one's death'*, насухо* 'to the dry condition', *досуха* 'the same', cf. (20) — (21).

Resultative clauses (default form of the secondary predicate)

19. Rus. Она$_{3SG.F}$ покрасила$_{PST.SG.F}$ стены$_{ACC.PL}$ синим$_{INSTR.SG.M/N}$ (*синими$_{INSTR·PL}$). (Res)

'She painted the walls blue.'

20. Rus. a. Он$_{3SG.M}$ разбился$_{PST.SG.M}$ насмерть$_{ADV.PRED}$. (Res)

He crashed to his death.'

b. Он$_{3SG.M}$ забил$_{PST.SG.M}$ соседку$_{ACC.SG.F}$ насмерть$_{ADV.PRED}$. (Res)

'He beat his neighbor to death'

21. Rus. Он$_{3SG.M}$ вытер$_{PST.SG.M}$ стол$_{ACC.SG}$ досуха$_{ADV.PRED}$. (Res)

'He wiped the board dry.'

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

79

Resultatives vs statives: summary

❑ Resultative predicates entail SLPs in the logical sense. If p (X beat Y to death) is true from the moment t, cf. (20b), then q (Y is dead) is also true from t: ~q… t… q.

❑ However, resultatives denote a single time point, not an interval. Despite the event p (act of killing, wiping the board etc.) takes some time in the real world, in the perspective of predicate taxonomy it is just a single point marking the transition from the state ~q to the state q.

❑ Another relevant feature of resultatives is that the final state q is triggered by some preceding activity or involuntary process p — e.g. the window is *open* (q), since X or a puff of wind *caused it to open* (p), while true SLPs like 'X is sad', 'X is wet' etc. and not determined causally by any external factors and denote situations which are conceptualized as underived. Such underived SLPs are indeed projected by the event structure of Russian argument small clauses, cf. (8) — (9), (11) — (18), but not by the event structure of Russian resultative SC.

9. CONCLUSIONS

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт
за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

Conclusions, Part 1

❑ We followed the distribution of Russian constructions expressing the SLP semantics and introduced a distinction of internal SLP (SLP-INT) vs external SLP (SLP-INT).

1. The semantics of SLP-INT is expressed in Russian by a large class of lexical predicatives selecting a dative subject and licensing dative-predicative structures and by a different class of indeclinable lexical predicatives selecting a nominative animate subject.

2. DPS predicatives **lack agreement**, while NOM predicatives are **adjective-type elements with defective morphology**. A general feature of all Russian lexical predicatives is that they do not produce ILP sentences, which is captured by Ščerba's hypothesis.

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

82

Conclusions, Part 2

3. The semantics of SLP-EXT is expressed in Russian by two different ways: 1) by a class of lexical predicatives **that neither license dative nor nominative subjects**; 2) by **agreeing nominal elements** (nouns, full and short adjectives) in the position of the primary and secondary predicate.

4. The distribution of short and full adjectives is no longer triggered by semantics, while the assignment of the instrumental case to the predicative complement serves as a marker of SLP-EXT.

5. There is a correlation between the syntax of Russian argument small clauses with the INSTR marking on the secondary predicate and the SLP-EXT meaning. However, the absence of INSTR in argument small clause does not necessarily signal the ILP meaning.

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

References (1)

o   Apresjan 1985 — Apresjan, Yury D. Sintaksičeskie Priznaki Leksem, Russian linguistics, Vol. 19, №. 2/3, 289 — 317.

o   Bulygina 1982 — Bulygina, Tatiana V. K Postroeniyu Tipologii Predikatov v Russkom Jazyke, Olga N.Seliverstova (ed.) Semanticheskie Tipy Predikatov. Moscow, Nauka, 7 — 85.

o   Carlson 1977 — Carlson, Gregory N. Reference to Kinds in English. PhD dissertation. MIT.

o   Davidson 1980 — Davidson, Donald. The Individuation of Events, Donald Davidson (ed.), Essays on Actions and Events, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 163 — 80.

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

84

References (2)

o Maienborn 2007 — Maienborn, Claudia. On Davidsonian and Kimian states, Comorovski, Ileana & Von Heusinger, Klaus (eds.), Existence. Semantics and Syntax, Dordrecht, Springer, 107–130.

o Nichols 1981 — Nichols, Johanna. Predicate Nominals: A Partial Surface Syntax of Russian. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

o Peškovskij 1928 — Peškovskij, Aleksandr M. Russkij Sintaksis v Naučom Osveščenii, 3-e izd., Moscow.

o Seliverstova 1982 — Seliverstova, Olga N. Vtoroj Variant Klassifikacionnoj Setki i Opisanie Nekotoryx Predikatnyx Tipov Russkogo Jazyka, Olga N.Seliverstova (ed.), Semanticheskie Tipy Predikatov, Moscow, Nauka, 86 — 157.

25/11/2021

Есенен лингвистичен семинар. Институт за български език БАН. 25.11.2021

85

References (3)

- Ščerba 1928 — Ščerba, Lev V. O Chastyax Rechi v Russkom jazyke, Russkaja Rech'. Novaja Seriya, II, Leningrad, Akademia, 5 —27.
- Vendler 1957 — Vendler, Zeno. Verbs and Times, The Philosophical Review, Vol. 66, No. 2, 143-160.
- Zhuravleva 2018 — Zhuravleva, Elena. Ispol'zovanie Tvoritel'nogo i Imenitel'nogo Padežej v Russkix Predikativnyx Konstrukcijax, MA, University of Potsdam.
- Zimmerling 2018a — Zimmerling, Anton V. Predikativy i Predikaty Sostojanija v Russkom Jazyke, Slavistična Revija, № 1, 45 — 64.