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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 $N_{\text{dat}} - V_{\text{inf}}$, 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].
THE PREDICATIVES: WHY ‘LEXICAL’?

- The term specifies that non-agreeing nominal predicates used in Dative-Predicative Structures of the type \( N_{\text{dat}} - V_{\text{link}} - \text{Pred} \) are not identical with any participles or adjectives.

- LexPs lack such verbal categories as voice, aspect, tense or mood and do not denote states of affairs that can be interpreted as a direct result of any process or activity.
Dative-Predicative-Structures with lexical predicatives are attested in Ukrainian, Czech, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croat, Old Icelandic, Old Swedish, Modern Icelandic, Lithuanian.

In these languages agreeing adjectives and participles are used for expressing predicative meanings of a different type.

Meanwhile, most of these languages have or have earlier had productive word-building mechanisms deriving lexical predicatives from a subclass of adjectives. In Germanic, it is strong adjectives, in Slavic and Baltic it is short adjectives: The ending of Nom.-Acc. Sg. Neut. is the most common marker of predicatives in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic areas.
Nominative Complements

- One needs a syntactic procedure for identifying lexical predicatives and keeping them apart from agreeing adjectives.
- In Russian and Ukrainian, both lexical predicatives and agreeing adjectives can take dative arguments, but agreeing adjectives can also take non-sentential nominative arguments, while lexical predicatives cannot.

Премудрость я оставил. Не надо (LexP) мне (Dat.) она (Nom).
A nominal non-agreeing form can be identified as a lexical predicative in Ukrainian and Russian if it selects a dative subject and is used in dative-predicative structures in such a way that:

- Or:

  - it can at once take the dative subject and be expanded by an infinitival complement, cf. Rus. *mne nužno [ujti]* ‘I need [to leave/go]’.
SYNTACTIC PROCEDURE II

- ALexP can at once take the dative subject and be expanded by a CP-argument with complementizers

- And:

- it can at once take the dative subject and the semi-formal pronoun Rus. eto ‘it’, Ukr. ce, cf. Rus. mne eto ne nužno ‘I don’t need it’, Ukr. meni ce cikavo ‘it is interesting to me’.
Illustration I

- One and the same lexical predicative may allow for options (i-iv), but this is not a general requirement.
- If a nominal form only allows for the option (iv), but not (i-iii), it is not a predicative, but an agreeing adjective.
ILLUSTRATION II

The conclusive proof that čuždo in (1) is not a non-agreeing predicative and exhibits an agreement relation with *eto, comes from the fact that čuždo does not allow for options (i-iii):

(i) Rus. *mne čuždo.
(ii) Rus. *mne čuždo pisatj knigi intended meaning “It is alien to me to write books”.
(iii) Rus. *mne čuždo, čto on pišet knigi intended meaning “It is alien to me that he writes books”.
SUMMARY

- Russian and Ukrainian lexical predicatives are used as Stage-level predicates. The presence/absence of agreeing correlates (cf. Rus. *smešnoj* vs *stydnyj*) does not have any impact on the semantics of a predicative in any language.

- At the same time, the presence/absence of agreeing correlates is relevant for a structural classification of adjectival stems. The non-trivial feature of stems from the class *stydn* is that they are used only for producing Stage-level predicates and cannot be used for denoting properties of objects or persons.
SUBJECTHOOD AND SUBJECT FEATURES (SELECTED)

- 1. Canonic vs non-canonic.
- 2. Strong (non-alternating) vs weak (alternating).
- 3. Realization as XP vs $X^\circ$.
- 4. Can have a pro-form.
- 5. Substitution by an NP.
- 6. Role - opaque.
- 8. Control of the predicate agreement.
- 9. Control of the embedded non-finite clause.
- 10. Binding of reflexives.
- 11. {Syntactic} Case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-zero NP in the NOM.</th>
<th>DIS subject</th>
<th>Melchuk’s zeros</th>
<th>DPS subject</th>
<th>CP/IP</th>
<th>Semi-expletive эмо</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canonic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong / Weak</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>X°</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-forms</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-substitution</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-opaque</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referentially opaque</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of the predicate agreement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of embedded non-finite clause</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive binding</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>NOM.</td>
<td>DAT.</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>(NOM)</td>
<td>(NOM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Subject-like arguments in Russian
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