DATIVE-PREDICATIVE STRUCTURES AND LEXICAL PREDICATIVES IN RUSSIAN AND UKRAINIAN

Anton Zimmerling (Moscow State University for Humanities) & Elena Kulinich (University of Montreal)
THE 5TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SLAVIC LINGUISTIC SOCIETY

- 29-30 October 2010
- University of Chicago, Saturday, October 30
- Session 3-B: Case. 9.30-10.00 AM
- Anton Zimmerling (Moscow State University for Humanities) & Elena Kulinich (University of Montreal)
- ‘Dative-predicative structures and lexical predicatives in Russian’.
DATIVE CASE MARKING ON THE SUBJECT

- A prominent feature of Slavic, Baltic and Germanic languages are sentence patterns with the dative case marking on the semantic subject.

- The predicative nucleus in these patterns can be represented by a) an infinitive used in Dative-Infinitive Structures \( N_{\text{dat}} \rightarrow V_{\text{inf}} \), cf. [Mrazek 1990]; b) a special finite verbal form, as in Latvian [Holvoet 2001]; c) a non-agreeing nominal predicate called slovo kategorii sostojanija (lit. ‘Category-of-State form’ in the Russian tradition [Ščerba 1974], or lexical predicatives in [Zimmerling 2010].
Contrary to Grishina (2002) there is no uniform dative sentence pattern in Russian.

In Russian, Dative-Predicative Structures (DPS) and Dative-Infinitive Structures (DIS) are formally and semantically heterogeneous.

DPS only take animated subjects, the subject of DIS may be inanimate.

The Dative case in DPS is assigned lexically, the Dative case in DIS is assigned non-lexically.

Negation test, cf. (Kondrashova 2007).

Subject strength criterion, cf. (Zimmerling 2009).
DIS AND DPS WITH MODAL PREDICATES IN RUSSIAN

- The opposition of modal predicates in the construction with an infinitive as a core element (DIS) and in the construction where the core element is a LexP and the infinitive is its descending valency (DPS) conforms to a formula:

- DPS is used both for deontic and for alethetic predication, but DIS does not express deontic meanings and is always used in situations of external compulsion.
Deontic and Dynamic Uses of Russian DPS

- Sentences with LexPs надо and нужно in many contexts allow (1) or even require (2) deontic interpretation.

1) Девушкам надо чаще улыбаться. <Тогда их карьера и личная жизнь будут успешными>.

2) Инессе не нужно улыбаться во время доклада начальника. <Это действие может повредить X-y>.
RUSSIAN DIS: only deontic readings

- Russian DIS do not convey deontic meanings and always signal dynamic (alethetic) modality, i.e. situation of external compulsion.
- Examples (3) and (4) pattern with the same type, despite (3) has an animated dative NP, while (4) has an inanimate dative NP.
- (3) Грузовикам тут не не проехать. (P is excluded).
- (4) Девушкам – идти в постель и улыбаться! <Такова воля Атамана.> (External compulsion makes P inevitable)
The paper discusses the status of lexical predicatives used in dative-impersonal structures in two neighbor Slavic languages, Russian and Ukrainian.

Both languages have large classes of non-agreeing nominal forms which are used as Stage-level predicates and denote state of affairs that cannot be interpreted as a direct result of any process or activity, cf. Ukr. *Meni sumno* “I am sad”, Rus. *mne grustno* “the same”.
Lexical predicatives (LexP) in Russian

- LexP = an indeclinable non-verbal word, denoting that a specific animated subject is found in some psychological and/or physiological state during some period of time (cf. Rus. Х-у муторно, стыдно, грустно, весело, жаль).

- Semantic subject is marked by a prepositionless dative and is specified as {+ animated}.

- The valency on the dative of person for Russian LexPs is not a trivial feature — it outlines a subclass of Stage-level predicates (predicates of inner states).
**LexPS: morphology and semantics**

- Inner states = predicate expressions denoting that their subject is found in some invariable state which did not result from any direct coercion, during some period of time.
- The majority of Russian and Ukrainian inner states are morphologically derived forms.
- The absence/presence of an adjective correlate (грустный vs *стыдный) is irrelevant for State predication in Russian and Ukrainian, but indeclinable forms with an o-final capable of filling the Pred slot in the DPS structure $N_{dat} — V_{link} — Pred$ cannot be derived from many adjectival stems.
Predicate categories and adjectival stems

- Adjectival stems should be divided into a class permitting derivation of Stage-level predicates and a class banning it.
- Stems banning derivation of Stage-level predicates can only produce designations of properties tied up to specific referents.
- Stems permitting derivation of Stage-level predicates as a rule also produce designations of properties, but there are few exceptions, where predicatives with an o-final don’t correlate with any agreeing forms, cf. *stydno ‘X is ashamed’, *stydnyj, *bojazno ‘X is frightened’, *bojaznyj.
- The forms like *stydno are more typical of Russian than of Ukrainian, where adjectives *stydnyj, *bojaznyj exist.
ADJECTIVAL STEMS I

- Russian has ca. 300 predicatives, which select a dative subject with the feature [+Animate], Ukrainian has 200-210 predicatives of this kind.
- The majority of predicatives in both languages have an –o-final and are derived from adjectival stems (cf. sumn-yj, grustn-yj).
- We argue that the ability to take a dative subject is a non-trivial feature in both languages: both Russian and Ukrainian have many adjectival stems from which no Stage-level form can be derived, cf. Rus. mne smeshno ‘it makes me laugh’, smeshn-oj adj. ‘funny, amusing’, but Rus. *mne smeshlivo, smeclivyj, adj. ‘X is easily amused’.
ADJECTIVAL STEMS II

- Stems, from which LexPs and attributive words are produced are classified with 3 groups:
  - 1) Stems with an actant polarity only produce expressions linked with a specific referent and do not produce situative designations.
  - 2) Stems with a situative polarity only produce LexPs in standard Russian.
  - 3) Ambivalent stems produce expressions of both types.
RUSSIAN AND UKRAINIAN LEXPS: SUMMARY

- LexPs with a taxonomic meaning of inner State can be produced from only one class of qualitative adjectives.
- Semantic features \{+ Animate; + experential + specific; - generic\}.
- The main syntactic pattern: DPS \([N_{\text{dat}} \rightarrow V_{\text{link}} \rightarrow \text{Pred}]\).
- Volume of the class: ca. 350-400 LexPs in Russian, over 250 LexPs produced from adjectival stems, ca. 210 LexPs in Ukrainian.
- Productivity: the class of LexP can be expanded but the number of lexical meanings is denotatively restricted.
We argue that the parallelism of Russian and Ukrainian syntax of predicatives is a result of contact development.

While the patterns of the dative-predicative structures in both languages are almost identical, Ukrainian and Russian share about 100 predicative stems, roughly one half of the entire Ukrainian class.

The origin of this shared stock has never been investigated.
We assume that a minor part of the shared stems might be inherited from a common source, while the major part was borrowed from Russian into Ukrainian.

The tentative borrowings from Russian always have close synonyms in predicatives attested only in Ukrainian and lacking from Russian.

The borrowing in the opposite direction is unlikely since the class of predicatives is larger in Russian, and their lexical meanings are more varied.
LexPS and Predicative Meanings

- Predicatives of Ukrainian origin (= non-Russian for sake of comparison), cf. *sumno, zhurno, tuzhno* ‘X is sad, bored, distressed’) do not add new lexical meanings compared with their equivalents in codified Russian.

- The chances that such items can be absorbed by the Russian lexicon are low, since they introduce new predicative stems which are synonymic to the existing ones. Such forms don’t get a high social status and are associated with stylistically non-neutral texts.
RUSSIAN LEXPS AS AN (ALMOST) OPEN CLASS

- More recent LexPs with an o-final which came to existence in the last decades and became widespread in Russian slang are no longer linked adjectival stems producing agreeing short forms.

- Х-у стремно, Х-у очково, Х-у ссыкотно.

- The emergence of new LexPs is not excluded, since the number «X-y is afraid up to a degree that a physiological reaction $Z_1, Z_2 \ldots Z_n$ arises» can be prolonged.

- At the same time, the number of lexical meanings which can be expressed by DPS [$N_{dat} \rightarrow V_{link} \rightarrow Pred$] is denotatively restricted by psychological and physiological reactions of a human being.
PRODUCTIVITY

The class of predicatives is closed in neither language and can accommodate borrowings and new formations.

Cf. Ukr. colloquial *meni kul’n-o* ‘I feel cool’ < Eng. *cool* and Rus. colloquial *mne fioletov-o* ‘It doesn’t matter to me’ < *fioletov-yj* ‘purple’.
Any ultimate list of Russian LexPs is based on a consent which texts are shared by a majority of native speakers.

The emergence of new LexPs is explained by a rotation of synonyms and ousting of archaic words by new colloquial formations and not with adaptation of entirely new lexical meanings.

Colloquial \(X\)-у лениво replaces neutral \(X\)-у лень and bookish \(X\)-у невместно, and slang \(X\)-у фиолетово – is an epatage variant of colloquial \(X\)-у по барабану or neutral \(X\)-у все равно, \(X\)-у безразлично.
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