

Primary vs. secondary predicates in Russian and the SLP vs. ILP distinction revisited[†]

*Anton Zimmerling**

Abstract: This paper addresses the distribution of Russian constructions expressing SLP semantics and introduces a distinction of internal SLP (SLP-INT) vs external SLP (SLP-EXT). The semantics of SLP-INT is expressed in Russian by a large class of lexical predicatives selecting a dative subject and by a different class of indeclinable predicatives selecting a nominative animate subject. DPS predicatives lack agreement, while NOM predicatives are adjective-like elements with defective morphology. Russian predicatives do not produce ILP sentences. The semantics of SLP-EXT is expressed in Russian in two different ways: 1) by a class of 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. The distribution of short and full adjectives is no longer triggered by semantics, while the assignment of the instrumental case to the predicative complement is a marker of SLP-EXT. There is a correlation between the INSTR marking on the predicate and the SLP-EXT meaning. However, the absence of INSTR does not necessarily signal the ILP meaning.

Keywords: predicate taxonomy, SLP predicates, ILP predicates, internal states, external states, case, agreement, secondary predicates, small clauses, predicative instrumental

Русские конструкции с первичным и вторичным сказуемым и противопоставление состояний и свойств

Антон Циммерлинг

Резюме: Для русской грамматики релевантно противопоставление предикатов состояния (SLP) предикатам свойства (ILP), которые обозначают нелокализованные во времени ситуации. В структурах с вторичной предикацией ключевым фактором является падеж именного или адъективного элемента. Различаются внутренние (SLP-INT) и внешние состояния (SLP-EXT). Внешние состояния обозначают ситуации, доступные для внешнего наблюдения. Внутренние состояния недоступны для внешнего наблюдения и могут быть квантифицированы только по своему субъекту. Значение SLP-INT выражается двумя классами предикативов в структурах с первичной предикацией. Значение SLP-EXT может выражаться в структурах с первичной и вторичной предикацией. Все актантные малые клаузы с творительным предикативным имеют значение SLP-EXT.

Ключевые слова: семантические типы предикатов, состояния, свойства, внутренние состояния, внешние состояния, падеж, согласование, вторичная предикация, малые клаузы, творительный предикативный падеж

[†] The reported study was funded by Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project number 20-512-18005) and the Bulgarian National Science Fund (Programme for Bilateral Cooperation, Bulgaria–Russia 2019–2020, Project: “The Ontology of the Stative Situations in the Models of Language: a Contrastive Analysis of Bulgarian and Russian Languages”).

* Pushkin State Russian Language Institute / Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, e-mail: fagraey64@hotmail.com

1. Davidsonian states and SLP predicates

In the 1960s, 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 $t_i \in \{t_0 \dots t_n\}$, so that p consists of homogeneous phases, cf. (Maienborn 2007). Later predicate taxonomies rooting in Davidson (Bulygina 1982; Seliverstova 1982) usually add to the distinction of spatiotemporal vs nonspatiotemporal things another dimension — the distinction of dynamic vs static situations in the spirit of (Vendler 1957). Dynamic situations were initially claimed to have an endpoint, i.e. a point of transition from p to $\sim p$, contrary to stative situations. This criterion does not work, since all spatiotemporal things have an endpoint according to the Davidsonian analysis. However, the contrast between all types of dynamic predicates and Davidsonian states is captured by the homogeneity criterion: Davidsonian states consist of homogeneous phases, while dynamic predicates do not (Seliverstova 1982: 126–127). 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. Since there is only one class of statives in this account, Vendlerian verbal states like *know*, *love* are classified together with all kinds of non-verbal predicates lacking aspectual features, cf. *be cold*, *be stupid*, etc. Vendlerian taxonomy has been adapted to the needs of linguistic typology, with the proviso that the class of accomplishments is elsewhere called ‘resultatives’ (Ned’alkov 1983).

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. In the Russian linguistic 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.’

Remarkably, tentative spatiotemporal stative predicates are illustrated by Russian sentences without full agreement or at least without a special predicative form.

While *мужчина* and *сильный* can be used in argument or attributive positions, Russian short adjectives, cf. (2a) or the predicative instrumental, cf. (2b) are used only as part of the predicate. The idiomatic meaning sometimes conveyed by such constructions, confirms the hypothesis that they denote referential spatiotemporal situations. E.g., (2a) literally means ‘X was dumb as fish’, but 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 like 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 as 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.’

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 as early as 1928 in Lev Ščerba’s influential 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 semantic distinction under the cover terms ‘stage-level predicates’ (SLP) vs ‘individual-level predicates’ (ILP) was reintroduced 50 years later by Greg Carlson (Carlson 1977), cf. (Kratzer 1995). In the following, I use the tags SLP and ILP for Ščerbian states and properties, respectively.

2. SLP predication and the Russian Category of State

Ščerba and his followers incl. (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 (hence — DPS) or a structure with a nominative subject, cf. *навеселе* ‘tipsy’, ‘half drunk’, ‘half of the bag’ in (4). Ščerba’s initial illustration showed a SLP sentence with the DPS predicative *X-у весело* ‘X is having fun’, cf. (3b), against an ILP sentence with an agreeing full adjective from the same root *X веселый* ‘X is cheerful’, cf. (3a).

- (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. [Соп Вася и Катя] были_{PST.3PL} навеселе_{PRED}. (SLP)
 ‘Basil and Kate were half in the bag.’

Ščerba believed that the predicative instrumental as in (2b) and short adjectives as in (2a) belong to the periphery of the SLP predication. A major problem with

his approach that he combined or mixed up as, e.g. [Sperber 1972; Apresjan 1985] claimed semantic analysis with the issues of the part-of-speech classification. He and his followers, cf. [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. On obvious reasons, 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. If one assumes that all forms in (2a—b), (3b), (4) are SLPs without assuming that they make up any joint word class, morphosyntactic criteria provide a nice subcategorization of SLPs. 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	(± Animate)
Declension paradigm	NO	YES
Syntactic schema	$N_{\text{DAT}} - V_{\text{LINK}} - \text{PRED}$ $N_{\text{NOM}} - V_{\text{LINK}} - \text{PRED}$	$N_{\text{NOM}} - V_{\text{FIN}} - N/\text{ADJ}_{\text{INSTR}}$ $N_{\text{NOM}} - V_{\text{FIN}} - N_{\text{ACC}} - N/\text{ADJ}_{\text{INSTR}}$ $N_{\text{NOM}} - V_{\text{LINK}} - \text{ADJ.PRED}$

3. The predicative instrumental and Russian short adjectives as primary predicates

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 also 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). Peškovskij was born in 1878, the 1st edition of his book “Russian language from a scientific perspective” appeared in 1914, the 3rd edition in 1928. In the later generations, the contrast of short vs full adjectives is degraded. In some contexts, the short forms of many adjectives are not used, and in a different group of contexts, where the short form survived, the full form is licensed. Moreover, in some contexts the SLP meaning can be expressed in three ways — by using the short and full forms

of the adjective in the nominative case, cf. (5a—b) and by the INTSR 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’ should be ill-formed, but even this constraint is violated in Modern Russian, cf. (5a).

- (5) a. Он был_{PST} **очень добрый**_{ADJ.NOM} (?ко мне) на экзамене. (SLP)
 ‘He was very kind to me at the exam.’
 b. Он был_{PST} **очень добр**_{ADJ.PRED. NOM} (ко мне) на экзамене. (SLP)
 ‘the same’
 c. Он был_{PST} **добрым**_{ADJ.INTSR} (?ко мне) на экзамене. (SLP)
 ‘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. However, idiomatic expressions and clichés 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. 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. It is an SLP context. The full adjective *готовая* does not fit here — not because it brings an ILP meaning, cf. the full adjective *добрый* in a similar SLP context in (5a), but because the cliché *готова стоять за дело мира* does not license the replacement *готова* → *готовая*.

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 especially (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 20th century seems to be lost (Guiraud-Weber 2007; Krasovitsky et al. 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).

- (7) Rus. a. Он_{NOM.SSG.M} был_{PST.SG} уже **совсем больной**_{ADJ.NOM.SG.M}, когда мы пришли. (SLP)
 ‘He was already quite ill when we came.’

- b. ОН_{NOM.SG.M} БЫЛ_{PST.SG} уже совсем больным_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.M}, когда мы пришли. (SLP)
 ‘the same’

4. The predicative instrumental, adjectives and predicative adverbials as secondary predicates

Short adjectives in ACC and the oblique cases, cf. *ОН_{3SG.M.NOM} увидел_{PST.SG.M} ее_{3SG.F.ACC} сердиту_{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 sound 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_{3SG.M} пришел_{PST.SG.M} сердит_{ADJ.PRED.SG.M} и зло_{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}. (SLP)
 ‘X came in angry and in malicious temper.’
 b. ОН_{3SG.M} пришел_{PST.SG.M} сердитый_{ADJ.PRED.SG.M} и злой_{ADJ.PRED.SG.M}. (SLP)
 ‘the same’

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. 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} [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_{ISTR.PL}]. (SLP)
 ‘the same’

To express the meaning ‘I am hoping to see you live, not on the internet’, one has to change the construction and use an adverbial secondary predicate. This can be done by inserting either of the two adverbs — *живую* 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} живую_{ADV.PRED}.
 ‘the same’

(10a—b) are spatiotemporal and refer to a moment in the future, when p (X sees Y live) is true. However, they lack SLP semantics, since they do not denote any

time interval: in Vendlerian terms, these are accomplishments, not states. 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. Remarkably, with other transitive verbs, e.g. *поймать кого-л.* ‘to catch smb.’ the picture is different: *живьем* is associated with the embedded object, not the matrix subject. The sentences (11a—b) have small clause syntax and SLP semantics. The non-agreeing predicative adverbial *живьем* proves synonymic here to the predicative instrumental.

- (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 small clause 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 than (11b).

We conclude that 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 in more than one way, both with adjectives and with predicative adverbials.

5. The predicative instrumental with a zero copula and without a nominative subject

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: NP₁...v⁰... NP₂/ADJ^{INSTR} ~ NP₁...v⁰...NP₂ ...NP₃/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). A minority of Russian speakers from 18th up through the 21st century as a corpus study has shown license INSTR on the predicative adjective if a sentential argument is raised to the subject position. The standard dialect of Russian (= ‘Russian-A’) lacks raising of sentential arguments and applies non-agreeing predicatives instead of adjectives in structures like *было известно*_{PRED}, *что P* ‘it was known that P’. The RNC corpus examples (12) and (13) with the adjective *было известным*_{ADJ.INSTR}, *что P* ‘the same’ are tagged below ‘Russian-B’. The tag ‘Russian’ throughout this article refers to ‘Russian-A’, if the opposite is not explicitly specified.

- (12) Rus-B. Департаменту_{DAT} полиции стало_{PST.3G.N} **известным**_{INSTR}, [ср 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) Rus-B. Мне_{DAT} стало_{PST.SG.N} **известным**_{INSTR}, [ср 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.’

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 [ср *что P*], which fills in the vacant position of the matrix subject. Standard Russian, i.e. Russian-A lacks raising of sentential arguments.

Another deviation is discussed in (Kosta 2014; 2020) with the focus on (14a). It is an absolutive construction, where INSTR is optionally assigned to the extracted predicative attribute. In the present tense, the copular *быть* ‘be’ is represented by a zero, so that the predicative complement *холодным*_{INSTR} ‘when <the tea is> cold’ is case-marked with INSTR in the absence of an overt copula. It should be emphasized that INSTR in this position is optional and the same SLP meaning can be expressed by the nominative adjective, copying the case form of the controller, cf. (14b).

- (14) Rus. a. **Холодным**_{INSTR.SG.M} [DP этот чай]_{NOM.SG.M} невкусный_{NOM.SG.M}. (SLP)
 ‘This tea is tasteless **when cold**.’
 б. **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}/²ХОЛОДНЫЙ_{NOM.SG.M}.] (SLP)
 ‘to drink the tea **cold**.’

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).

- (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**.’

In Russian argument clauses, the complement marked with INSTR agrees in number and gender with its controller, i.e. the clausal subject. Likewise (11a—b), argument clauses with an adjective case-marked with INSTR occasionally have SLP equivalents in small clauses with predicative adverbials. 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, cf. (18).

- (18) Rus. В СЫРОМ ВИДЕ_{ADV.PRED} [SC [DP ЭТИ ГРИБЫ]_{NOM.PL} __] НЕВКУСНЫЕ_{NOM.PL}. (SLP)
 ‘**Fresh**, these mushrooms are tasteless.’

6. Resultative small clauses and SLPs

Resultative small clauses denote the change of the state, which requires different morphosyntax. The predicative INSTR takes the default form (Instr.Sg.M/N) and lacks a lexical controller, see (19) The resultative meaning is also expressed by adverbial predicatives, mostly with prefixes *на-* and *до-*, cf. *насмёрть* ‘to one’s death’, *насухо* ‘to the dry condition’, *досуха* ‘the same’, cf. (20) — (21).

- (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} разби_лся_{PST.SG.M} на_{смерть}_{ADV.PRED.}. (Res)
 ‘He crashed to his death.’ (Res)
 b. ОН_{3SG.M} заби_л сосе_дку_{ACC.SG.F} на_{смерть}_{ADV.PRED.}.
 ‘He beat his neighbor to death’ (Res)
- (21) Rus. ОН_{3SG.M} вы_тер_л дос_ку_{ACC.SG} до_{суха}_{ADV.PRED.}. (Res)
 ‘He wiped the board dry.’

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: $\sim q \dots t \dots q$. However, resultatives, unlike SLPs, denote a single time point, not an interval. Despite the event p (the act of killing, wiping the board, painting the wall, etc.) takes some time in the real world, in the perspective of natural language metaphysics and predicate taxonomy it is just a single point marking the transition from the state $\sim q$ 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 small clauses.

7. The morphosyntax of Russian lexical predicatives. Internal and external SLPs

We finally turn to indeclinable Russian lexical predicatives like <мне> *стыдно* ‘I am ashamed’, lit. ‘to-me is ashamed’, <они были> *навеселе* ‘<they were> slightly tipsy’. Here the taxonomic SLP semantics results from the interaction of two factors: the choice of the lexical item and the syntactic pattern. The basic subcategorization of SLPs in Russian and in general 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.

The criterion (i) predicts that the priority semantic argument is typically human or animate. Some types of external SLPs select one or more animate arguments, cf. *John is now in the city*, *John has a car*, *John is currently married to Mary*.

Such predicates describing some relational configuration of their arguments are both stative and spatiotemporal but lack a priority argument according to the approach outlined here. Contrariwise, internal SLPs like *Ивану стыдно* ‘John feels ashamed’, *Ивану стыдно за свою страну* ‘John is ashamed of his country’, *Ивану стыдно, что он опоздал* ‘John feels ashamed that he was late’ have a priority argument irrespective of the fact, whether it is sole or not. The notion of the priority semantic argument is close, but not identical to the notion of experiencer.

The criterion (ii) specifies that different persons X and Y can have different reactions and different states of the mind in the same locus and at the same time. Assume that John and Basil attend the same lecture: John (X) is *cold* and *bored*, while Basil (Y) is *not cold* and is *interested*. Therefore, the quantification of intentional states like ‘X is cold’ is only possible in the set of X-s mental states. Contrariwise, external SLPs like *Здесь пыльно* ‘It is dusty here’ or *Сегодня пасмурно* ‘It’s cloudy today’ can be quantified upon their spatiotemporal characteristics without recourse to the mental state of the observer: such predicates bring about a presupposition that the assessment ‘It is dusty here’ is shared by all possible observers.

The criterion (iii) specifies that despite internal SLPs as the feelings of anger, cold or shame, etc. can have external symptoms, they cannot be visualized, while external SLPs like ‘be dusty’, ‘be cloudy’ normally can.

7.1. Indeclinability, agreement and ILPs

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, CatS in the Šćerbian line is not felicitous, since the elements from the first class 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 incompatible with subject-predicate agreement (Pospelov 1955). I find Pospelov’s hypothesis correct, though he made an unnecessary 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 the discussion in (Zimmerling 2009)) and analyzed such arguments as agreement controllers (which is wrong).

While Ščerba's terminology is flawed, his semantic intuition is acute and astonishingly modern: Ščerba noticed that neither non-agreeing nor indeclinable predicative license ILP sentences. That means that Russian lexical predicatives do not denote any non-spatiotemporal things at all. The forms like *стыдно*, *боязно* are no longer associated with any declension paradigms of agreeing adjectives: such adjectives existed but fell into disuse already in Ščerba's day.¹ Several hundred forms like *неприятно* 'unpleasant' license DPS and correlate with the existing adjectives, cf. full forms *неприятн-ый*_{SG.M}, *неприятн-ая*_{SG.F}, *неприятн-ое*_{SG.N}, *неприятн-ые*_{PL} and short forms *неприят-ен*_{SG.M}, *неприят-н-а*_{SG.F}, *неприят-н-о*_{SG.N}, *неприят-н-ы*_{PL}.² If one accepts Pospelov's hypothesis, this correlation is no longer an obstacle: non-agreeing predicatives licensing DPS *Мне было неприятно*₂ 'I did not like it' and agreeing short adjectives in NOM-ACC.SG.N *Поражение*_{NOM.SG.N} *было очень неприятно*_{ADJ.NOM.SG.N} 'The loss was very unpleasant') are described as homonyms in syntax.

There is one complication remaining. Some predicatives of non-adjectival morphology, cf. *не по силам* 'unable', *невдомек* 'don't know'³ license both DPS as (22a) and dative-nominative structures (hence — DNS) as (22b). DNS have nominative subjects, which control the agreement of the copula. If Pospelov's hypothesis is accepted, the non-agreeing DPS predicative *не по силам*₂ in (22a) and the indeclinable but agreeing element *не по силам*₁ in the DNS sentence (22b) are homonyms. We tag *не по силам*₁ as indeclinable adjectives with a defective morphology, since they display the same syntax in DNS, as standard agreeing adjectives like *непосильный* in (23a—b).

(22) Rus. a. *Мне*_{DAT} *было*_{PST.SG.N} **не по силам**₂^{PRED} [_{INF} *решить*_{INF} [_{DP} *эти задачи*]_{ACC.PL}].

'I was unable to handle these tasks.'

b. *Мне*_{DAT} *были*_{PST.PL} **не по силам**₁^{ADJ} [_{DP} *эти задачи*]_{NOM.PL}.

'These tasks were too much for me.'

(23) 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}.

(23a) 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*

1 However, conservative authors try to revive the adjective *стыдный* now.

2 All forms are given in the nominative case.

3 Most of them are frozen PPs.

and shows the Nom.Pl form. The experiential argument can be expressed here both with DAT and with the prepositional genitive. In (24b), 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 awkward now. The assignment of INSTR to the indeclinable adjectives like *не по силам*₁ is impossible, since they lack morphological case.

Both non-agreeing predicatives like *не по силам*₁ and indeclinable elements like *не по силам*₁, *непосильны*_{NOM.PL}, *непосильными*_{INSTR.PL} in (22b) and (23a—b) are SLPs and do not express ILP, as Ščerba correctly predicted. The relevant distinction overlooked by the Ščerbian line 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).

Standard Russian lacks DNS sentences with the frozen short form ending on *-o/-i*, the example (24a) with the frozen short form of NOM/ACC.SG *тесно кому-либо* ‘too tight for someone’ in the presence of a plural controller *сапоги* ‘boots’ is ill-formed and must be repaired by inserting the plural form of this adjective, cf. (24b).

- (24) Rus. a. *[_{DP} Сапоги]_{NOM.PL} ему_{DAT} тесно_{PRED/ADJ.NOM.SG.N}.
 b. [_{DP} Сапоги]_{NOM.PL} ему тесны_{ADJ.NOM.PL}.
 ‘The boots are too tight for him.’

However, this pattern is attested in some Russian dialects [Pen’kovskij 2004: 141 — 143], cf. (25).

- (25) Rus. dial. [_{DP} Сапоги]_{NOM.PL} ему_{DAT} **вотесно**_{PRED/ADJ.NOM.SG.N}.

The bizarre construction in (25) probably explains by the special parameter licensing nominative objects in Northern Russian dialects, but the geographical distribution of this pattern is unknown. This option is lacking from standard Modern Russian.

7.2. Shifts of the semantic type

All Russian non-agreeing lexical predicatives licensing DPS like (3b), (23a) above have the meaning of SLP-INT if used with an overt referential dative subject. Indeclinable predicatives like *навеселе* in (4) selecting nominate subjects are SLP-INT, too. A group of non-agreeing predicatives like *Здесь пыльно* ‘It is dusty here’, *Сегодня пасмурно* ‘It is cloudy today’ do not license DPS and classify with SLP-EXT. All nominal elements licensing DNS are SLP-EXT. Shifting

the semantic type is at times possible but not forced by syntax. Genuine SLP-EXT from the class *пыльно, пасмурно* generally do not license DPS contexts i.e. adding of the dative valency, **мне пыльно, *мне пасмурно*. With genuine SLP-INT like *боязно* ‘X is afraid’, ‘X fears that P’ the dative argument generally can be dropped, but its elimination does not automatically bring about the shift SLP-INT → SLP-EXT, it is e.g. hardly possible to say **Здесь боязно* int. ‘It is fearsome here’ or **Сегодня боязно* int. ‘Today is fearsome’.

7.2.1. From SLP-EXT to SLP-INT

The shift SLP-EXT → SLP-INT is confirmed diachronically: during the last 500 years the volume of the class of DPS predicatives, all of which are SLP-INT increased several times and now includes more than 400 elements (Zimmerling 2018b). However, synchronically there is a systemic pressure preventing the speakers from using a large deal of these items. There is a considerable language-internal variation, since different speakers use non-identical sets of DPS predicatives. Russian authors occasionally put genuine SLP-EXT like *пыльно* ‘dusty’, *солнечно* ‘sunny’ in the DPS context, but such experiments are infrequent and have a low approval rate according to the sociolinguistic study (Zimmerling 2017). Moreover, collocations like *мне_{DAT} пыльно_{PRED}* often have not the predicted meaning *‘It is too dusty here for my taste’, but idiomatic meanings like ‘I am not interested in doing this’.

7.2.2. From SLP-INT to SLP-EXT

Russian, unlike Bulgarian and other Balcanic Slavic languages lacks the parameter of obligatory pronominal marking of the experiencer. In Bulgarian, if the priority experiential argument is present in the event structure of a SLP-INT predicate, it must be overtly indexed by a pronominal clitic (Džonova 2003; Ivanova 2016). This is not the case in Russian. If a Russian non-agreeing predicative licenses a DPS sentence *X-у (было) Z-во* ‘X was in the state of mind Z’, it always licenses a structure → *(Было) Z-во*. However, dropping an overt dative argument does not bring about a uniform semantic effect. Three scenarios are possible. 1) The reference to a specific experiential argument is still reconstructed; 2) the sentence gets a generic reading; 3) the sentence undergoes the shift SLP-INT → SLP-EXT. The last scenario is confirmed for several DPS predicatives incl. *X-у тоскливо* ‘X is sad’. This result is non-trivial, since *тоскливо* refers to the state of the mind and be rendered by such words as ‘wistful’, ‘dreary’, ‘depressing’. Russian authors nevertheless regularly produce SLP-EXT sentences like *В городе было_{PST.SG.N} тоскливо_{PRED}* lit. ‘It was **depressing** in the city’. In saying this, the

speaker assumes that the assessment ‘The atmosphere in the city was depressing at the moment *t*’ is shared by all real and potential observers. Russian predicatives with the *-o*-final have correlative adverbs, e.g. the predicative *тоскливо*₂ correlates with the adverbial *тоскливо*₃. The analysis shows that the event structure projected by such adverbials includes a sub-event with the embedded reference either to SLP-INT or to SLP-EXT. Many contexts remain ambiguous, but in some cases, one can reconstruct the underlying type of SLP unequivocally.

(26) Rus. Воспоминание_{NOM.SG.N} **тоскливо**_{ADV} стеснило_{PST.SG.N} грудь_{ACC.SG}.
→ SLP-INT
‘the memory made (my) chest ache’.

(27) Rus. Шестеренки_{NOM.PL} **тоскливо**_{ADV} скрипели_{PST.PL}. → SLP-EXT
‘The gears cracked miserably.’

In (26), the adverb *тоскливо*₃ projects a sub-event, where the predicative *тоскливо*₂ is used as SLP-INT: depressing memories are a sort of things that cannot be viewed or heard from outside, hence the interpretation ‘X felt sad when he remembered something’. On the contrary, (27) includes a reference to SLP-EXT, since gears have no mind and the only valid interpretation is ‘It was depressing to listen to the cracking gears’.

8. Conclusions

We followed the distribution of Russian constructions expressing the SLP semantics and introduced a distinction of internal SLP (SLP-INT) vs external SLP (SLP-EXT). 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. 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. The semantics of SLP-EXT is expressed in Russian in 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. 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. 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 clauses does not necessarily signal the ILP meaning.

References

- Apresian, Yurii: Sintaksicheskie priznaki leksem. *Russian linguistics*, Vol. 19, №. 2/3, 289–317. 1985. (in Russ.)
- Bulygina, Tatiana: K postroeniyu tipologii predikatov v russkom jazyke. Seliverstova, Olga (ed.): *Semanticheskie tipy predikatov*, 7–85. Moscow: Nauka, 1982. (in Russ.)
- Carlson, Gregory: *Reference to Kinds in English*. PhD dissertation. MIT. 1977.
- Davidson, Donald: The Individuation of Events. Donald Davidson (ed.): *Essays on Actions and Events*, 163–80. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Dzhonova, Marina. *Izrecheniia sas semantichnata rolia eksperientser v savremennii balgarski ezik*. Avtoreferat na disertatsiia, Sofiiski universitet „Sv. Kliment Ohridski”. Sofia, 2003.
- Guiraud-Weber, Marguerite: Sushchestvitel'nye v funkcii imennogo skazuemogo v sovremenom russkom iazyke: vozmozhno li eshche govorit' o semantichestkom protivostavlenii «im.vs tv.»?, *Voprosy iazykoznaniia*, 1(2007), 18–26. 2007. (in Russ.)
- Isačenko, Aleksandr: O vozniknovenii i razvitiu “kategorii sostoianiiia” v slavianskikh iazykakh. *Voprosy iazykoznaniia*, 6, 48–65. 1955. (in Russ.)
- Ivanova, Elena: Bezlichnye predlozheniia s obiazatel'nym mestoimennym vyrazheniem eksperientsera v bolgarskom iazyke. Zimmerling, Anton / Liutikova, Ekaterina (eds.): *Arkhitektura klauzy v parametricheskikh modeliakh: sintaksis, informatsionnaia struktura, poriadok slov*, 332–368. Moscow: LRC, 2016. (in Russ.)
- Kosta, Peter: *The Syntax of Meaning and the Meaning of Syntax: Minimal Computations and Maximal Derivations in a Label- / Phase-Driven Generative Grammar of Radical Minimalism* (= *Potsdam Linguistic Investigations* 31). Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.
- Kosta, Peter. *Adjectival and Argumental Small Clauses vs. Free Adverbial Adjuncts. A Phase-based Approach within the Radical Minimalism with Special Criticism of the Agree, Case and Valuation Notions*, 2014. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55999181>.
- Krasovitsky, Aleksandr / Long, Alison / Baerman, Matthew / Brown, Dunstan / Corbett, Greville: Predikativnye sushchestvitel'nye v russkom iazyke. *Russian linguistics*, 32, 99–113. 2008.
- Kratzer, Angelica: Stage Level and Individual Level Predicates. Carlson, Gregory / Pelletier, Francis J. (eds.): *The Generic Book*, 125–175. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1995.
- Maienborn, Claudia: On Davidsonian and Kimian states. Comorovski, Ileana / Von Heusinger, Klaus (eds.): *Existence. Semantics and Syntax*, 107–130. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007
- Nedialkov, Vladimir (ed.): *Tipologiiia rezultativnykh konstrukcii*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1983. (in Russ.)
- Nichols, Johanna: *Predicate Nominals: A Partial Surface Syntax of Russian*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press, 1981.
- Pen'kovskii, Aleksandr: *Očerki po russkoi semantike*. Moscow, LRC. (in Russ.)
- Peškovskii, Aleksandr: *Russkii sintaksis v nauchnom osveščanii*, 3-e izd. Moscow, 2004. (in Russ.)
- Pitsch, Hagen: *Kopula, Auxiliar, Prädikativ. Zur Satzstruktur in nordslavischen Sprachen* (= *Specimina Philologiae Slavicae* 196). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2017.
- Pospelov, Nikolai: V zashchitu kategorii sostoianiiia. *Voprosy iazykoznaniia*, 2, 55–65. 1955. (in Russ.)

- Seliverstova, Olga: Vtoroi variant klassifikacionnoi setki i opisanie nekotorykh predikatnykh tipov russkogo iazyka. *Semanticheskie tipy predikatov*, 86–157. Moscow: Nauka, 1982. (in Russ.)
- Ščerba, Lev: *Iazykovaia sistema i rechevaia deiatel'nost'*, 4th ed. Moscow: URSS, 2008. (in Russ.)
- Ščerba, Lev: O chastiakh rechi v russkom iazyke. *Russkaia rech'. Novaia Serii*, II, 5–27. Leningrad: Akademiia, 1928. (in Russ.)
- Sperber, Wolfgang: Ist die Zustandkategorie eine für die Beschreibung der Grammatik slawischer Sprachen notwendige Wortart? *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, Bd. 17, 402–409. 1972.
- Vendler, Zeno. Verbs and Times, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 66, No. 2, 143–160. 1957.
- Vinogradov, Victor: *Russkij iazyk. Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove*. Moscow / Leningrad: Vysshiaia shkola, 1947. (in Russ.)
- Zhuravleva, Elena. *Ispol'zovanie tvoritel'nogo i imenitel'nogo padezhei v russkikh predikativnykh konstruktsiakh*. MA, University of Potsdam, 2018. (in Russ.)
- Zimmerling, Anton: Dative subjects and semi-expletive pronouns in Russian. Zybatow, G. / Junghanns, U. / Lenertova, D. / Biskup, P. (eds.): *Studies in formal Slavic phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and discourse structure (= Linguistik International 21)*, 253–265. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Zimmerling, Anton: Dva dialekta russkoi grammatiki: korpusnye dannye i model'. *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies*, Issue 17 (24), 818–833. Moscow, 2018c.
- Zimmerling, Anton: Impersonal'nye konstrukcii i dativno-predikativnye struktury v russkom iazyke. *Voprosy iazykoznanii*, № 5, 7–33. 2018b. (in Russ.)
- Zimmerling, Anton: Predikativy i predikaty sostoianiia v russkom iazyke. *Slavistična Revija*, 1, 45–64. 2018a. (in Russ.)
- Zimmerling, Anton: Russkie predikativy v zerkale eksperimenta i korpusnoi grammatiki. *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies*, Issue 16 (23), 466–482. Moscow, 2017.