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INTRODUCTION

The object of the study is Russian non-prepositional phrases containing a noun in the genitive case governed by another noun.

The term nominalization means that the phrases under investigation are used in the place of a sentence when the process of communication requires that a certain situation, previously described by a sentence (explicit or implicit), be referred to in the form of a noun phrase: (Kapitan byl vozbužden). Vozbuždenie kapitana peredalos' drugim členam komandy. '(The captain was excited). The captain's excitement (lit. 'the excitement of the captain') communicated to other members of the crew.' The head noun does not necessarily belong to the type traditionally called deverbal or deadjectival (Adamec, 1973). Phrases like dom otca 'the father's house', l'vy Afriki 'the lions of Africa' are also considered the object of study, on the ground that they refer to a situation which can otherwise be described by a sentence: Otec imeet dom 'Father has a house', V Afrike imejutsja l'vy 'There are lions in Africa'.

A localist account suggests that the adopted approach to the material is essentially that of localist generative grammar which has more or less shaped by now in the works of some European linguists. Since the historical perspective, critique and exhaustive bibliographies of localist theories can be found elsewhere (Anderson 1971b; Kilby 1972; Miller 1974), I will confine myself to a concise statement concerning their principal theses, inasmuch as I need them as the starting point from which to proceed to my own framework.

The theoretical background of the proposed framework also includes the situation model as developed by Gak (1969, 1972, 1973) and Shaumyan (1974), and some of the insights of Fillmore's case grammar.

The objectives of the study are:

1) to investigate nominal structures with the genitive case related to various sentence types;
2) to account for the similarity of the surface structures which correspond to different sentence types;
3) to arrive at the underlying semantic model and discover some of the processes which are involved in generating both the genitive case structures and the corresponding sentences from the underlying localist semantic representation.
As is usually the case with a hypothetico-deductive method of study, a certain feedback from the material is expected. On the one hand, an abstract generative semantic model is hypothetically postulated, and the Russian genitive case phrases are accounted for in terms of this proposed model. On the other hand, the properties of the material investigated help gain a deeper insight into the model itself. In other words, the role of the genitive case nominalizations is twofold: they are both the object and the instrument of the study.

Though the linguistic material is taken from Russian, the suggested framework is not confined to Russian, but appears to be generally applicable.

In Chapter I a general theoretical background will be stated briefly, and a generative semantic model proposed. Chapters II-IV will explore in detail how various sentence types are related to nominal structures with the genitive case, and how both are generated from an underlying localist semantic representation. The proposed theoretical framework will be illustrated with examples and at the same time elaborated from different angles. The results will be summarized in Conclusion, and some related problems will be mentioned if only by way of contemplating further research.
CHAPTER I

Theoretical Background and Framework.  
Situation Model and Topicalization.

Localism has been primarily concerned with the description of grammatical cases. It claims that absolutely all relationships expressed by (oblique) cases are essentially spatial.

As is the case with many other modern linguistic theories, the roots of localism go centuries back. A localist account of cases was offered by the Byzantine grammarian Maximus Planudes; it can also be found in the works of a number of scholars through the 19th century, when a reaction against the localists' speculations on the origin of language set up, and a syntactic theory of case was developed. In the 20th century up to 1967, the most consistent localist approach to case was advocated by Hjelmslev (see Anderson 1971b:5-11). It hardly needs saying that all 'pre-generative' localist analyses dealt with case as a surface morphological category. The inevitable controversies in most of the older localist theories resulted from a sharp delineation of the static and dynamic in the language, when only the diachronic aspect was granted dynamism at all, whereas synchronic studies considered the language as a static conglomeration of fixed forms.

The impetus for the revival of localism should be sought for in the wide spread of the ideas of generative grammar with its synchronic interpretation of process, and the distinction between underlying and surface structures. A localist approach to locative, existential and possessive sentences was explored in Lyons 1967; 1968a and Christie 1970, where it was suggested that existential and possessive sentences derive synchronically, as well as diachronically, from locative sentences. After Fillmore's (nonlocalist) case grammar (1968), the latest localistically oriented studies have been carried out on at least two assumptions: first, that the system of surface case representations is distinguished from an underlying system of case functions; second, that every noun, including the subject in the nominative case, is dependent on the verb.

Anderson adheres to both principles in his case grammar (1971b) and introduces localism in it by postulating that the underlying case relationships are essentially spatial. It was the first large-scale localist case theory within a generative framework. His verb-dependency model contains verbs as well as nouns in the underlying semantic representation.
In the subsequent localistic studies, one tendency is especially worthy of mention, since it is evident in almost all recent works on semantics (not necessarily localist). This tendency consists in reducing the number of categories postulated in the deep semantic structure. The most common device is to take two (or more) surface categories which are traditionally considered different parts of speech, and to demonstrate, through their syntactic, semantic, or formal similarities, that they are, in fact, one category. Thus, much of the work published by a number of linguists assumes that the verb and the adjective represent one category (Fillmore 1968, Lakoff 1970, Lyons 1968b, Postal 1971 and others); that adverbs are contextually determined, i.e. surface, variants of some other parts of speech (Lyons 1968b; 7.6.5). Prepositions have been claimed to be the same category as verbs (first proposed by Brjndal 1948), it has also been argued that they are nouns (Fillmore 1968, 5.4). Bach (1968) suggests that all 'full' parts of speech are represented by one category in the base component.

In a localist account of Russian cases, Miller (1974) follows this general trend and removes adjectives, prepositions and all verbs but two: the locational BE and the directional MOVE, from the underlying structure. Moreover, he admits that MOVE can also be removed, since movement is derived from two different locations at two different times. In Miller's model there are two categories in the base: nouns, which he represents as stems, and ideally one verb BE. Thus the Russian surface sentence with a verb Petr ponimaet teorij 'Peter understands the theory' has a complex structure represented by a verb-dependency tree as in Fig. 1.
The structure is glossed as 'Understanding, such that understanding is at the theory, is at Peter' (Miller 1974: 254). In the shape outlined above, the localist theory has been taken as one of the points of departure for my framework.

Another source is Shaumyan's applicative generative grammar, especially its latest version, which introduces a situation model into the genotype language—a hypothetical ideal system of linguistic objects which functions as an abstract model for natural languages (Shaumyan 1974). The situation model, which is basically localistic, predicts case relationships in natural languages. Sentences of a natural language are considered to be the names (translations, or concrete linguistic forms) for certain situations. A situation model is postulated as an invariant, and the relationship between this invariant and its empirical interpretation is that of isomorphism. The abstract genotype language is an internally consistent deductive system, and its objects are constructed from the initial simple abstract objects according to the postulated rules. This means that not every abstract object can be put into correspondence with an empirical object; in other words, some constructs which are obtained in the semantic model may not find an interpretation in a particular language (Shaumyan 1971, 1973, 1974).

The emphasis on the nominational aspect of a sentence, i.e. the interpretation of the sentence as a 'situation name', is peculiar for what may be called semantic syntax. Semantic syntax is preoccupied with the linguistic means of denoting a complete event, or the state of things, rather than with the logical structure of thinking; and as such it becomes part of general onomatology. A number of studies conducted by Soviet scholars (Gak 1969, 1970, 1972; Lomtev 1969; Sil'nickij 1972) are oriented on the 'situation'. A situation is understood as a complex semantic unit expressed by a sentence. The referent of a situation is a segment singled out by the speaker from the continuum of events. The choice of the name for the situation is a probability selection which depends on both extralinguistic and linguistic factors. One and the same situation referent may be reflected in different situations, and one and the same situation can be expressed by different sentences. For example, sentences (1)

(1) a. Ja vernul bratu knigu.
    'I returned the book to my brother.'

b. Brat polučil ot menja knigu obratno.
    'My brother got the book back from me.'

c. Kniga vozvrascena mnoj bratu.
    'The book is returned by me to my brother.'

describe the same situation whose elements are 'I', 'my brother', 'the book', and the process of 'returning - receiving' (Kacnel'son 1970: 107).
According to Gak, the structure of the sentence and the choice of the participants (actants) in the situation, and their 'names', are interdependent; he calls it the process of mutual 'adjustment' of the words and the structure. He thus rejects the idea that a certain sentence structure is built up from separate words. His standpoint should also imply that the 'priority' of structure over the lexical items is equally incorrect, though he contradicts himself by saying that words are selected to fit the structure (Gak 1972: 364).

The outline of the proposed framework comes immediately below. The basic notions and the terminology used to denote the elements of the situation model are the same as in Shaumyan 1974; the tree-representation is used only for its graphic conveniences; no special notation is invented for the elements of underlying structures, instead I use actual Russian words.

Any situation consists of the participants of the situation and a certain relation between them. The participants of the situation are called the terms, and the relation is called the relator. Terms are amorphous neutral parts of speech, which serve as names for objects in their most general sense, i.e. terms are names for objects, properties and relationships. Relators are nonlexicalized predicate relations between the situation members. The Russian sentence General poslal depešu v štab s naročnym 'The general sent a dispatch to headquarters with a courier' corresponds to the situation whose terms are not only the general, the dispatch, the headquarters and the courier, but also the process itself of sending-carrying-receiving of the dispatch.

The terms can be ascribed semantic roles, or cases, which are essentially spatial, i.e. they describe each participant of the situation as located at, or moving from, through, or to, a certain point in space. Thus the sentence

(2) Poezd idet iz Moskvy v Leningrad čerez Bologoe.
    'The train goes from Moscow to Leningrad through Bologoe.'

can be said to be representing a situation where Moscow designates a term in the ablative, i.e. the starting point, or the source; the term in the allative - Leningrad - designates the point of destination; Bologoe, which is the point on the route through which the object passes, corresponds to a term in the prolatlve; the train expresses the term in the objective and designates a moving point. The role of the name for the process itself, i.e. 'moving' will be discussed later; at this point it may be observed that this term can fulfil any of the semantic roles mentioned above, or it can be locative as in (3).
Both movement and location are understood in the most general sense; they can be spatial, temporal, or abstract. An abstract motion can be interpreted, for instance, as an action inflicted by one participant of the situation onto another. Thus, ablative can be interpreted as a starting point in time or space (4), or as a source, or an agent (5).

(4) a. S utra nezdo rovisja.
   'Since morning I have not been feeling well.'

b. S gory bežit potok provornyj.
   'From the hill runs a swift stream.'

(5) a. On umen ot prirody.
   'He is intelligent by/from nature.'

b. Ot carja byl ukaz.
   'From the tzar there was an order.'

Prolative may express instrument, any point on the route, the entire distance or time between the beginning and end of an action.

(6) a. Šlju pis'mo aviapofitoj.
   '(I) am sending the letter by airmail.'

b. Turisty prošli četyre kilometra.
   'The tourists walked four kilometers.'

c. Poezd šel vsju noč.
   'The train was running all night.'

Allative expresses the point of destination or the experiencer of the action only when it is counterposed to ablative or prolatlve, whether overt or implied, or, which amounts to the same, when the process involves any kind of motion:

(7) a. Otec edet v Moskvy s juga (poezdom, čerez Kursk, tri dnja etc.)
   'Father is going to Moscow from the south (by train, via Kursk, three days etc.)'

b. On vpal v tosku (ot bezdel'ja).
   'He lapsed into melancholy (from idleness).'

Otherwise allative should be reinterpreted as locative, that is as a point of location:
Surface verbs and adjectives emerge as the result of the conflation of an underlying term and the relator. Shaumyan calls this process skleivanie 'gluing together' or slijanie 'fusion, conflation.' The notion of conflation is essentially the same as that of predicate-raising, widely used by generativists. All sentences in (9) have the same underlying situation model, whose tree representation is shown in (10).

(9) a. Rebenok byl v veselii.  
   'The child was in joy.'

   b. Rebenok byl vesel.  
   'The child was joyful.'

   c. Rebenok veselilsja.  
   'The child enjoyed himself.'

(10)

```
+-------+  +---------+
|   R   |  |    loc   |
|-------|  |----------|
|  obj  |  |  veselie |
| rebenok  |  | 'child'  |
| est'y  |  | 'is in'  |
| veselie |  | 'joy'    |
```

Symbol R stands for the relator; obj and loc for the terms. The terms are represented by nouns in the nominative case for the sake of convenience. It should be remembered that they are neutral elements and not actual words. Likewise, the two-place relator can only conventionally be glossed as est'-v 'is in.' In a semantic model there are no verbs at all, and therefore there is no verb BE. All realizations of BE or its equivalents: naxoditsja 'is found,' imeetsja 'there is' etc., are surface lexicalized forms. Any representations of terms and relators in situation models with the help of words of a natural language can be nothing but a conventional device which is used in order to avoid too many symbols.

The surface sentence (9a) is more revealing as to the underlying localist semantic model than (9b) or (9c), in which the surface adjective and verb are generated by the operation of conflation.

As was mentioned elsewhere, surface grammatical cases should not be confused with the semantic cases ascribed to the actants of the situation model. In order to discriminate between the two systems, both terminologies will be used: e.g. in the surface
sentence (9a) the noun rebenok 'child' will be referred to as the nominative case, while in the situation model (10) the term glossed as rebenok will be said to be in the objective case. (The term 'objective' is used by Fillmore and Shaumyan where Anderson and Miller use 'nominative').

From Shaumyan's description of the situation model it follows that the distribution of semantic roles among the situation actants precedes the introduction (or, at least the 'shaping') of the relator, since, according to him, predicate relators are determined by the set of cases (Shaumyan 1974: 52, 61). A reverse relation implicitly follows from a verb-dependency approach, which maintains that 'every noun...is regarded as dependent on the main verb in the clause: that is to say, all nouns in a clause are considered to be complements of the verb, not just the nouns in the oblique cases' (Miller 1974: 246). Kacnel'son apparently implies interdependence between the propositional function and the actants, or 'places', when he first says that the relational predicate is determined by the number and the meaning of the arguments, and shortly after this, that the predicate itself performs the segmentation of the referent into discrete units and ascribes roles to them (Kacnel'son 1970: 108-9).

I wish to emphasize the idea of interdependence, or, to use again Gak's words 'mutual adjustment' between the relator and the terms, and to make it a special point in the proposed model. The assertion that relators are determined by the semantic roles of the actants is true; equally true is the assertion that relators determine these roles. It is impossible to establish the priority among the steps which are involved in the formation of the situation model. In fact, there are no two distinct steps: the introduction of the relator and the distribution of the semantic roles is one step.

The above conclusion is not a vacuous one; its linguistic meaning being that paraphrase relations are not necessarily derivational relations. In other words, of two expressions that are paraphrases of one another, one is not necessarily closer to the underlying situation model than the other, rather they may be realizations of two different situation models. For instance, there can exist two situations (11) and (12), each with the same two types of actants: a person mat' 'mother' and an emotional state otćajanie 'despair', but with a different distribution of semantic cases.
In (11) the term denoting a person is in the objective, and the term denoting emotion is in the locative, relator $R_1$ denotes an abstract localization, in other words, it 'places' the person in a certain emotional state. In (12) the term in the objective denotes an emotion, which is localized by relator $R_2$ at, or by, the person. Underlying both (11) and (12) there is a set of two shapeless ('caseless', 'roleless') amorphous elements. To form a situation, one of the elements must be placed in the position of a term in the objective, and a certain relation should be established between the two terms. I prefer to consider it one process, which is in principle unbreakable into two consecutive steps.

Situation models (11) and (12) are said to be in a converse relation, or related to each other through an operation of conversion; none is prior to the other. The surface actualizations of (11) can be both (13a) and (13b), in generating (13b) the operation of conflation is involved. (12) can be realized on the surface as (14).

\[(11)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{mat'} \\
\end{array}
\quad \Rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{loc} \\
\text{otčajanie}
\end{array}
\]

\[(12)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{mat'}
\end{array}
\quad \Rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{loc} \\
\text{otčajanie}
\end{array}
\]

(13) a. Mat' v otčajanii.
'Mother is in despair.'

b. Mat' otčaivaetsja.
'Mother despairs.'

(14) U materi otčajanie.
lit. 'At mother is despair.'

Sentences (13) and (14) are also said to be in a converse relation, for they correspond to two converse situation models. In this sense (13) is not derived from (14) neither is (14) derived from (13); rather they are paraphrases. On the other hand, (13b) can be said to be generated from (13a) because they correspond to one situation model, and in the derivation of a structure underlying (13b) an extra operation is involved, that of conflation.

The leftmost term, i.e. the term in the objective is called the topic; all the rest, i.e. the remaining term and the relator constitute the comment. I wish now to substitute a new definition for the objective case for the previously mentioned impressionistic interpretation of the term in the objective as the name of a moving point. Hereafter the objective case will be understood as
the case for the topic; the case of a term included in the comment can be any of the locational cases except the objective.

Now comes the principal thesis for the description of sentence generation. It is maintained that the dichotomic topic-comment division is the basic semantico-syntactic process which makes the generation of sentences from amorphous caseless sets of actants possible at all. Topicalization starts at the very first step of the generation process; it is not the last, or optional, operation performed over the surface sentence. Any multiactant situation is surfaced through a number of consecutive steps; each intermediate structure being split into the topic and the comment.

At the same time, topicalization provides for an adequate analysis of surface multinomial structures, which means that any surface sentence, no matter how many members it has, or what parts of speech they are, can be decomposed into dichotomous phrases. The semantic role of the term in the right part in any such structure will always be one of the spatial cases; whereas the left term is always the objective, i.e. the topic. Therefore, the objective is included into the set of spatial cases conventionally, since it does not have a spatial, or localist, meaning.

As has been stated above, a surface sentence can be broken down into a hierarchy of binary structures.

Thus, (16) is the decomposition of (15).

(15) Motor vraščaet koleso.
    'The motor rotates the wheel.'
(16)                       obj
|                       obj
|                       R
|                       R
|                       l
|                       isxodit ot
|                       'comes from'
|                       motor
|                       'motor'
|                       koleso
|                       (est')v
|                       vraščenie
|                       'wheel'
|                       'is in'
|                       'rotation'

Model (16) can be glossed as To (tot fakt), čto koleso vo vraščenii, isxodit ot motora 'That (the fact that) the wheel is in rotation comes from the motor.' The term in the ablative in the upper segment, which denotes an agent, or a source, is placed in the comment; the topic of the upper segment is interpreted by a referential word to 'that', tot fakt 'the fact'. The objective of the upper segment is
expanded as a clause in the lower segment; the lower segment is also split into topic and comment. The lower branch surfaces in Russian as (17a) and (17b).

(17) a. Koleso vo vraščení.  
' The wheel is in rotation.'

    b. Koleso vraščaetsja.  
' The wheel rotates.'

If the topic and the comment change places, then a converse situation model may be represented as (18), and its overtly localist surface realization will be (19).

(18)

```
    obj       R       loc
  vraščenie     est'-u     koleso
   'rotation'    'is at'    'wheel'
```

(19) U kolesa vraščenie.  
    lit. 'At the wheel (there) is rotation.'

It will be shown now how surface nominalizations with the genitive case can be described within the proposed model. It is claimed that a genitive case phrase can be considered an actualization of a locative situation model, such that the term in the objective corresponds to the head noun, and the term in the locative corresponds to the noun in the genitive case. Then (20) is a surface realization of (18).

(20) vraščenie kolesa  
' the rotation of the wheel'

The relationship between two surface structures (20) and (17b) is the same as the relationship between their semantic models, (18) and (16) respectively. Therefore, the process of nominalization can be interpreted as an operation of conversion, or of the topic-comment exchange in a dichotomous segment. The term vraščenie 'rotation', which is in the locative in (16), and from which the superficial verb vraščaetsja 'rotates' is generated, becomes the objective in (18) and surfaces as the head noun in the genitive case nominalization (20). At the same time, the topic in the objective koleso 'wheel' in (16) becomes part of the comment in (18) and is now in the locative case. Its locative origin is obscured in the unprepositional structure (20), however examples in Russian can be found where the preposition used with the genitive case makes their locative origin obvious. It is assumed that the situation model for both sentences in (21) will be the same.
The proposed account for nominalized phrases suggests that the topic-comment exchange occurs prior to the operation of conflation. This assumption implies that nominalized phrases are generated 'independently' of verbal or adjectival sentences. The assumption accounts for those cases when the derivation is believed traditionally to proceed from the noun to the verb: gold—golodaet 'hunger—starves'; gore—gorjuet 'grief—grieves.' However, it contradicts the traditional interpretation of nominalization for other instances, where the direction of derivation is established (mainly for morphological reasons) from the verb/adjective to the noun: rešaet—rešenie 'solves—the solving'; ser’eznyj—ser’eznost' 'serious—seriousness.'

In order to resolve this contradiction, two processes are postulated. One is the process of conflation, i.e. the generation of the verb from an underlying term and relator. It is shown as (22), and the surface realizations of each step as (23). It should be kept in mind that all operations are performed over underlying models, which contain terms, not nouns or verbs of the real language. Thus, the conflated element in (22c) is obtained from a term and the relator in (22b). It is accidental that the surface realizations of these two steps, shown as (23c) and (23b), contain a verb and a noun respectively. The direction of derivation b-c in actual words gore—gorjuet is isomorphic to the direction of the operation of conflation; only in this sense gorjuet can be said to be derived from gore. The term 'nominalization' can be applied to the phrase gore Ivana only conventionally, since this term itself implies an opposite derivational relation. Likewise, the paraphrase relationship a—b between the surface structures in (23) is isomorphic to the relation by conversion in (22); no direction of derivation can be established.

The other process works in the opposite direction. The derivation of step (24c) is not shown in the scheme: the conflated element, actualized as rešaet in (25c), is generated from a term in the locative which is found in the structure exactly like (22b). However, this preceding step cannot be interpreted by an actual Russian sentence. Now, it is claimed that alongside the process of conflation, there exists a process of decomposition, which breaks down the 'verb' in (24c) into two elements: a term and the relator. Of course, such decomposition will result in a structure similar to the one from which (24c) has been generated, the difference between them being that this new structure (24b) finds an interpretation in the language. The deverbal noun rešenie in (25b) actualizes the term in the locative, which is glossed also as rešenie in (24b). The topic-comment exchange
(22)  
(a)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Ivan gorjuet} \\
\text{Ivan' 'grieves'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(b)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Ivan (est') v gore} \\
\text{Ivan' 'is in' 'grief'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(c)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Ivan' 'is at' 'Ivan'} \\
\end{array}
\]

(23)  
(a)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Ivan' 'grief'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(b)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Ivan v gore} \\
\text{Ivan' 'is in grief'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(c)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Gore(u)Ivana} \\
\text{Ivan' 'is at' 'Ivan's grief'} \\
\end{array}
\]

(24)  
(a')  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{rešenie (est')u učenik} \\
\text{rešenie' 'is at' 'student'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(b')  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{učenik (est')za rešenie} \\
\text{učenik' 'is at' 'solving'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(c)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{učenik rešaet} \\
\text{student' 'solves'} \\
\end{array}
\]

(25)  
(a')  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{rešenie učenika} \\
\text{rešenie' 'is at' 'student'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(b')  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{učenik za rešenjem} \\
\text{učenik' 'is at' 'solving'} \\
\end{array}
\]
(c)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{Učenik rešaet} \\
\text{Učenik' 'solves'} \\
\end{array}
\]

"The student solves"  
"The student is at solving"  
"the student's solving"
brings about (24a) which surfaces as the nominalization with the genitive case: rešenie učenika. Thus, the process of nominalization involves decomposition and conversion.

I maintain further that one process presupposes the other. They both provide for a dynamic equilibrium which, on the one hand, makes the language a complete system at a given synchronic stage, and on the other hand, always contains 'points of development.' The coexistence of these two processes is an instance of co-existence of analysis and synthesis in sentence generation.

Before proceeding to the description of nominalized phrases related to different sentence types in Russian, I will summarize the innovations of the proposed model as compared with the existing theories of localism, situation model and case grammar.

1. No semantic roles are ascribed to the actants in the deep(est) semantic level. They are amorphous caseless elements which represent the original partition of an event into discrete units.

2. This set of amorphous elements becomes a situation when one of the terms is chosen as the topic, and a relator is introduced. These two operations occur simultaneously, in fact, they are one operation.

3. Topicalization begins at the very first step of generating, and permeates through the entire generation. A multiactant situation is broken down into a hierarchy of binary topic-comment segments. The process of generation, thus, involves analysis.

4. The choice of the topic is a probability selection; therefore paraphrase relations between two or more surface sentences do not necessarily imply derivational relations between them.

5. Alongside the process of predicate raising, i.e. a synthetic process of conflation of a term and the operator, there exists an opposite process--that of decomposition, which is part of nominalization in the traditional sense. Another operation involved in nominalization is conversion, or topic-comment exchange.
CHAPTER II

Transitive and Intransitive Sentences
and Their Nominalizations.

In this paper only sentences with the so-called action verbs will be considered. Action verbs will be referred to, in a simplified manner, as those not denoting perception, emotion or mental activity, or those not equivalent of byt' 'be' and imet' 'have'. It has been shown elsewhere that this distinction can be made on both syntactic and semantic criteria (Miller 1970).

From the point of view of surface syntax, the verbs dealt with in this chapter can be one and two-place predicates; in other words, both transitive and intransitive constructions will be examined.

(26) a. Les molčit.
     'The forest is silent (keeps silence)'.
  b. Koleso vraščaetsja.
     'The wheel is rotating.'
  c. Balerina tancuet.
     'The ballerina is dancing.'
  d. Rebenok spit.
     'The child is sleeping.'
  e. Malčik guļjaet.
     'The boy is having a walk (walking).' 

(27) a. Inžener ispytyvaet ustanovku.
     'The engineer is testing the plant.'
 b. Rabočij obtačivaet vтуlku.
     'The worker is grinding the bushing.'
  c. Korrektor pravit stat'ju.
     'The corrector is proofreading the article.'
  d. Pianist ispolniaet sonatu.
     'The pianist is playing the sonata.'
  e. Kolumb otkrył Ameriku.
     'Columbus discovered America.'

The discussion will center around the following points:

1) a semantic situation model will be proposed for the given sentence types;
2) nominalized phrases will be obtained, and the operation involved in the process of nominalization will be defined;
3) the traditional division into transitive vs. intransitive constructions will be re-evaluated in the proposed model.
4) the active vs. passive opposition will be re-examined; in
the localist framework passive will be shown as more basic, i.e.
allowing for a more uniform description of sentence-generation,
than active.

Underlying a sentence with an intransitive verb as in (26)
there is a two-term situation containing the objective, the
locative, and the relator of abstract localization. The relator
places one actant, i.e. the term in the objective, within, or at,
a place designated by the other actant, i.e. the term in the locative.
The semantic model for (26) is shown in (28).

(28)

\[
\text{obj} \quad R \quad \text{loc}
\]

les
'second'
molčanie
'silence'
koleso
'wheel'
yraščenie
'rotation'
balerina
'ballerina'
tanec
'dance'

Surface verbal sentences may be viewed as containing at least
one extra argument which is concealed in the verb, in addition to
other arguments which are identified as surface noun phrases.
The last observation implies that there cannot exist one-place
predicate relations in the semantic representation. It was
claimed previously that the process of sentence generation is
based on a binary segmentation of multiactant situations, although
it was not explicitly stated that there can be no segments with
less than two terms. A more accurate definition of a binary
segment should specify that both the topic and the comment contain
a term; or to put it differently, the comment cannot consist of the
relator only.

An overtly locative surface realization of (26) is found in (29).

   'The forest is in silence.'
  b. Koleso vo vraščenii.
   'The wheel is in rotation.'
  c. Balerina v tance.
   'The ballerina is in dance.'
  d. Rebenok vo sne.
   'The child is in sleep' (...'in the state
     of being asleep').
The two-place predicates (est')-v '(is)-in', (est')-na '(is)-on, at' interpret the relator. It is obvious that sentences (29) are more revealing as to their localist origin; they are at least one step closer to the situation model (28), if we assume for our purposes that predicate raising constitutes a one-step operation. I wish to note again that the terms in the situation model are amorphous nonspecified lexical elements. They are glossed in (28) and therefrom as nouns in the nominative case for the sake of simplicity, and in order to avoid introducing new symbols, or using an awkward stem notation like molčanij- for the term which surfaces as molčanje. It should also be mentioned that the verb byt' 'be' as well as the prepositions are the language-specific realizations of an abstract nonlexicalized relator. There are no verbs in the situation model, not even the verb 'be'. Prepositions are also language-specific, and very often idiomatic, i.e. their surface form is unpredictable (cf. on v p'janom užare 'he is dead drunk' lit. 'he is in intoxication' and on pod xmel'kom 'he is under the weather' lit. 'he is under intoxication').

It seems proper to clarify at this point what is understood here by an actual Russian sentence. I do not intend to evaluate sentences from the point of view of their stylistic acceptability or usage in everyday speech. There is no doubt that some of the examples of surface sentences are at the very least stilted. However, they are understood by any Russian speaking person in exactly the same sense in which they are interpreted here; they 'make sense.' Besides, even if some of them are not likely to be met as a separate sentence, they can be used as part of a longer utterance. Or else a similar situation can have a perfectly good real language interpretation, but with different lexical items. For instance, sentence (29c) Balerina (est') v tance 'The ballerina is in dance' will be considered awkward by many Russian speakers, while utterances like (30) are perfectly acceptable stylistically.

(30) a. Balerina v tance prekrasnoe zrelišče.  
    'A ballerina in dance is a beautiful sight.'

b. Ona vsja byla v tance, v muzyke.  
    'She was all in dance, in music.'

Therefore, no sentence used as an actualization of a situation model will be marked with an asterisk or a question mark, although its stylistic acceptability may vary.
The nominalized genitive case phrases corresponding to (26) are given in the following set.

(31)  a. molčanie lesa
      'the silence of the forest'
  b. vraščenie kolesa
      'the rotation of the wheel'
  c. tanec baleriny
      'the dance (dancing) of the ballerina'
  d. son rebenka
      'the sleep of the child'
  e. progulka mal'čika
      'the walk of the boy'

In structures like (31) the noun in the genitive case is traditionally regarded as the modifier (attribute) of the head noun, very much like an adjective: cf. molčanie lesa 'the silence of the forest and lesnoe molčanie lit. 'forest's silence.'

The predicative nature of an adjectival attribute has been extensively discussed by linguists of various persuasions, especially by transformationalists and generativists. It seems only logical to investigate now the predicativeness contained in the genitive case modifier. It somehow happens that when nominalizations of this type are dealt with it is usually the verbal origin of the head noun which is taken into consideration: molčit--molčanie 'is silent--silence,' whereas the status of the governed element, which formerly was a noun phrase, is neglected.

In this study the predicative nature of the noun in the genitive case is emphasized. Assuming that prepositions express relations, and that they are language manifestations of deeper semantic relators, predicate localist relationship can be found in prepositional constructions closely related to phrases (31). Compare, for instance, examples (a) and (b) in the following:

(32)  a. Son rebenka byl bespokojnym.
      'The sleep of the child was troubled.'
  b. Son u rebenka byl bespokojnym.
      lit. 'The sleep at the child was troubled.'

(33)  a. Tanec Ulanovoj ispolnen vysokogo masterstva.
      'Ulanova's dance is full of high artistry.'
  b. Tanec u Ulanovoj ispolnen vysokogo masterstva.
      lit. 'The dance at Ulanova is full of high artistry.'

(34)  a. Progulki Saši vsegda končal's drakoj.
      'Sasha's walks always ended in a fight.'
b. Progulki uSaši vsegda končalis' drakoj.
   lit. 'The walks at Sasha always ended in
   a fight.'

In the situation model which underlies (31), there is a binary
topic-comment structure where the topic is in the objective, and is
realized on the surface as the head noun, whereas the comment is com­
posed of the relator plus the term in the locative, and is realized
on the surface as the noun in the genitive case. The situation
model (35) will be obtained from (28) by the operation of conversion,
 i.e. by such an operation during which the actants change their
semantic roles.

(35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obj</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>molčanie</td>
<td>les</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'silence'</td>
<td>'forest'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vraščenie</td>
<td>koleso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'rotation'</td>
<td>'wheel'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanec</td>
<td>balerina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dance'</td>
<td>'ballerina'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Situations (35) can be actualized on the surface either as noun
phrases (31), or as sentences (36) (see also prepositional com­
bínations in (32), (33), (34)).

(36) a. Molčanie bylo v lesu.
   lit. 'Silence was in the forest.'

b. Vraščenie u kolesa.
   lit. 'Rotation is at the wheel.'

c. Tanec byl u baleriny.
   lit. 'The dance was at the ballerina.'

The noun phrases lack the modal constituent of a sentence: tense,
mood, aspect, but their nominalational content is the same. In
other words, both sentence and the noun phrase are the language
forms (names) for the same situation.

I am coming now to transitive structures of the type exemplified
by (27). The hierarchy of dichotomous topic-comment segments (37)
has a double interpretation. The generation of the transitive super­
ficial sentence is an 'upward' process; viewed 'downward', this
topic-comment splitting is interpreted as the analysis of the
surface sentence down to its underlying semantic representation.
The structure of (37) becomes more transparent if it is glossed
as (38).
The lower branch of (37) contains the same semantic roles as (28) and (35), and the same relator which locates the actant in the objective within the place ('process', 'state of things') designated by the term in the objective.

The upper branch also has a binary structure with the objective as the topic, and the ablative as the comment. The relator operating in the upper branch has the basic function of denoting movement from the ablative, and the ablative thus is the starting point, or the source, of this movement. Miller believes that movement can be derived from two different locations of a point at two different times (Miller, 1974: 254). Foreseeing the final results of this study, it should be mentioned that the process involved in nominalization, i.e. that of the topic-comment exchange, will always take place in a segment with only one of the spatial cases as the comment, namely the locative. It means that under closer examination all binary structures will inevitably be those containing the objective and the locative. So whatever standpoint is accepted in the interpretation of movement, and therefore of such
semantic roles as ablative, allative or prolative, it will not influence the outcome of this investigation. It might be mentioned, however, that the interpretation of movement through location seems highly plausible. It agrees with the proposed binary segmentation of the situation on its way up to the surface sentence; it also implies that the comment is always in the locative, and that there is only one type of relation: localization of a point in space.

Representation (37) is considered canonic for the proposed model, because all the segments in it are organized in a uniform manner, with the topic of each segment in the objective. Sometimes transitive structures are described as generated through predicate raising involving causative (e.g. Shaumyan 1974: 84). In my framework a causative structure as in (39) can be obtained without predicate raising, but rather through an operation which simply changes places of the actants in (37) without changing their semantic roles.

(39)

A gloss for a causative structure, which is comparable to (38) would be as follows:

(40) a. Inžener vyzyvaet/kauziruet to, ěto ustanovka v ispytanii.  
'The engineer causes that (the fact that) the plant is in testing.'

b. Rabočij kauziruet to, ěto vtulka v obtočke.  
'The worker causes that (the fact that) the bushing is in grinding.'

Since the upper branches in (37) and (39) do not influence in any way the nominalizations of the lower branches, their structure and derivation can be disregarded for the moment.

The operation of conversion performed over the lower branch, which is the same in (37) and (39), results in a structure where the term denoting process is in the objective and, therefore, surfaces as the head noun in the nominalized phrase, and the term in the locative surfaces as the noun in the genitive case.
Semantic model (41), derived by conversion from the lower branch, can be interpreted in Russian as nominalized structures (42) with the so-called 'genitive of object.' Phrases in (42) represent one possible set of nominalizations of transitive sentences (27).

(41)

\[
\text{obj} \quad R \quad \text{loc}
\]

- ispytanie
- obtočka
- ispolnenie
- ustanovka
- vtulka
- sonata

(42) a. ispytanie ustanovki
   'the testing of the plant'

b. obtočka vtulki
   'the grinding of the bushing'

c. pravka stat'ı
   'the proofreading of the article'

d. ispolnenie sonaty
   'the performance (performing) of the sonata'

e. otkrytie Ameriki
   'the discovery of America'

The same sentences (27) correlate with yet another set of nominalizations (43) with the genitive case which is traditionally called 'genitive of subject.'

(43) a. ispytanie inženera
   'the testing of/by the engineer'

b. obtočka rabočego
   'the grinding of/by the worker'

c. pravka korrektora
   'the proofreading of/by the corrector'

d. ispolnenie pianista
   'the performance of/by the pianist'

e. otkrytie Kolumba
   'the discovery of Columbus'

It is true that not all these phrases are equally acceptable stylistically if taken out of some specific context: (43 d-e) are perfectly well-formed structures even if used by themselves; (43c) will be accepted by most speakers with a minimal contextual expansion (Pravka ětogo korrektora obyčno bezuprečna 'The proofreading of this corrector is usually faultless'); (43 a-b) will be most objectionable, and even perceived as a pun (obtočka rabočego--X obtačivaet rabočego 'the grinding of the worker--X grinds the worker').
It is a commonplace to say that most deverbal nouns correlated with transitive verbs denote the result of an action, which fact explains the unambiguous reading for all examples in (42). However, my intention is to exploit the acceptability of (43). I claim that all examples of the 'genitive of subject' presented here are grammatical, at least in specific contexts. Thus, for instance (43a) can be used in a longer utterance: Ispytaniya inženera byli vypolneny s bolej vysokoj točnost'ju, čem ispytaniya rabočego 'The tests of the engineer were fulfilled with a better precision than the tests of the worker.' To be more exact, it is not the acceptability of these phrases in itself which I believe to be significant, but rather an equally possible acceptability of both (42) and (43).

In other words, I approach the much discussed issue concerning the structure of priglašenije professoara 'the invitation of the professor' from a different angle. Usually, when this nominalization is dealt with its semantic ambiguity is given full attention. The ambiguity is explained through two distinct derivations: either from a subject (the professor invites X), or from an object (X invites the professor) source. It is the difference in the derivation that is emphasized, while the coincidence in the surface realization is considered accidental.

I proceed from an opposite side: my intention is to account for the similarity of the form in which both the subject and the object of a transitive verb are realized when nominalization takes place. The position of the noun in the genitive case governed by a deverbal noun is, therefore, regarded as the position of neutralization of the subject-object opposition.

The neutralization is observed in two cases. One case involves the nominalizations of sentences with transitive verbs when both the subject and the object of the same verb may become the governed noun in the genitive case, as is the case with (42) and (43). The fact that this cardinal subject-object opposition is mediated through the position of the genitive case in a nominalized structure can be explained by postulating an underlying structure which is the same for both nominalizations. If (41) underlies (42), then a similarly organized model (44) must underly (43).

(44)

```
(44)

obj

R

| ispytanie
| pravka
| ispolnenie

loc

| inžener
| korrektor
| pianist
```
If an operation of conversion is applied to (44), another binary situation model is derived: (45). In this new model the term denoting process is included in the comment. The conflation of this term with the relator will generate a verb on the surface. We can say, therefore, that (45) underlies either an overtly localist sentence as in (46), or a sentence with a finite verb, as in (47).

(45)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{obj} \\
\text{inžener} \\
\text{korrektor} \\
\text{pianist} \\
\text{R} \\
\text{ispytanie} \\
\text{pravka} \\
\text{ispolnenie} \\
\text{loc}
\end{array}
\]

(46) a. Inžener (sejčas) na ispytanii. 'The engineer (at the moment) attends the testing.'
   b. Korrektor za pravkoj (; ne bespokojte ego). 'The corrector is at the proofreading (do not bother him).'
   c. Pianist (ves') v ispolnenii. 'The pianist is (all) in the (act of) performing.'

(47) a. Inžener ispytyvaet (s bol'soj tščatel'nost'ju). 'The engineer tests (with great precision).'
   b. Korrektor pravit (; a redaktor izdaet). 'The corrector proofreads (; and the editor publishes.'
   c. Ėtot pianist ispolnjaet s bleskom. 'This pianist performs brilliantly.'

The status of the verb in sentences similar to (47) has been discussed in literature from various points of view: as a transitive verb in some kind of an elliptical structure, i.e. with a zero position of the direct object; as a polyfunctional verb, i.e. being both transitive and intransitive depending upon the number of its valences; as a polysemantic word whose meaning depends upon the lexical context, etc. For the purposes of the present discussion, the most significant fact concerning these verbs is believed to be their ability to be used in sentences like (47) at all. This fact implies that 1) there is no crucial difference between transitive and intransitive constructions; 2) both types can be generated from binary topic-comment segments; 3) they are derived from underlying structures that are essentially passive.
Once again, all these assumptions rely on actual language data, namely on nominalized phrases.

The other case of neutralized subject-object opposition is observed while comparing the nominalization of sentences with transitive and intransitive verbs. The object of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive verb both correlate with the noun in the genitive case in nominalization. The comparison of (43) and (31) illustrates this point, the former being the nominalizations of transitive sentences (27), and the latter the nominalizations of intransitive sentences (26).

As it has already been stated, the deep semantic roles of the ablative (source), prolatitive (point on the way of motion), and allative (goal, or terminal point) have interpretation only when there are more than two actants in the situation. In the binary segments there can be only two actants—the objective and the locative. When nominalization occurs, it operates on a two-member structure, and it is always the term in the objective that acquires the genitive case in a nominalized phrase. As the language evidence of the truth of this assertion consider the following. Both nominalizations of (27e), for instance, contain a noun in the genitive case.

\[(42e) \text{otkrytie Ameriki 'the discovery of America'}\]
\[(27e) Kolumb otkryl Ameriku 'Columbus discovered America'}\]
\[(43e) \text{otkrytie Kolumba 'the discovery of Columbus'}\]

However *otkrytie Kolumba Ameriki 'the discovery of Columbus of America' is impossible. The ungrammaticality of two genitive cases co-subordinated to one head noun means that Kolumb and Amerika cannot belong to one and the same topic-comment segment. They surface as different grammatical cases in one nominalization otkrytie Ameriki Kolumbom 'the discovery of America by Columbus' because they come from different levels in the process of derivation. Nevertheless, if each of them is considered within its own segment, it is ascribed the same semantic role, and therefore each can become the genitive case. It becomes the genitive case governed by a deverbal noun in a two-member nominalized phrase. The same regularity is found in English, where 'lynching of Old Gus by the mob' is possible, but 'the lynching of Old Gus of the mob' is not
The phenomenon appears to be a linguistic universal for nominative languages.

It has been mentioned previously that verbs are generated by conflating a term and a relator. In this connection Shaumyan (1974) distinguishes two classes of predicates: simple and compound. A simple predicate is a relator, i.e. a purely relational element determined by the semantic roles of the actants. A compound predicate is composed (by conflation) from a term and a relator. Thus the sentence Koleso (est') vo vraščenii 'the wheel is in motion' contains a simple two-place predicate (est') - vo, 'is in' while the sentence koleso vraščaetsja 'the wheel rotates' contains a compound one-place predicate expressed by the verb.

In the surface sentence containing a verb with a full lexical meaning (polnoznachnyj gлагол), the number of the arguments ('places', 'valences') of the verb is at least one less than the number of actants in the deep semantic model. In a verbal surface sentence one object does not occupy a place in the relation, instead it is implicit in the name of the relation itself, i.e. in the verb (Veličko 1973).

In this light it is only logical to conclude that actual sentences containing a 'delexicalized' verb with a complement are closer to the semantic situation model, i.e. they are generated in a fewer number of steps. In such sentences the structural center (verb) and the semantic informativeness do not coincide, because the main semantic contents is concentrated in the noun. It is true of auxiliary verbs in (29), as well as of completive pairs in (48).

(48)

(a) vlijaet--okazyvaet vlijanie
   'influences'--'exerts influence'
(b) ispytyvaet--provodit ispytanija
   'test'--'carries out tests'
(c) nabljudaet--vypolniaet nabljudenja
   'observes'--'fulfils observations'
(d) pomogaet--osuščestvijaet pomoč'
   'helps'--'renders help'

The collision loaded into the verb is resolved in the completive phrase: the semantic information is concentrated in the noun, while the verb expresses relation (plus, of course, modality, which is disregarded here). Actually, the polarization of lexical and grammatical information takes place. Evidently all lexical information is contained in the names of the situation actants; so the polarization makes the actants explicit.
After the 'extraction' of the actant, the remaining verbal element becomes the finite verb in the sentence; it takes over all verbal characteristics: person-number, tense, aspect, etc. Having become a finite verb, it may, in its turn, be also represented as containing a term and a relator. Since a term can be extracted, such a verb must possess at least some sort of lexical meaning. Therefore, it should be considered only partially delexicalized. However, the lexical meanings of the verbs in the right column of (48) differ from the meanings of the verbs in the left column. The lexical meaning of the former is more general: it is wider in scope, but poorer in content. In our case it is the categorial meaning of 'doing,' 'performing.' But it is still a lexical meaning, and as such it can be 'extracted' from the verb in the form of an actant:

(49) a. okazyvaet—osuščestvljaet okazanie
    'exerts'—'brings about the exertion'

b. provodit—vypolnjaet provedenie
    'carries out'—'fulfils the carrying out'

c. vypolnjaet-provodit vyplnenie
    'fulfils'—'carries out the fulfilling'

d. osuščestvljaet--proizvodit osuščestvlenie
    'brings about --executes the bringing about'

The semantic component singled out while splitting the verb is a deverbal noun. The verbal element in such decompositions is chosen arbitrarily from a synonymic group of Russian verbs all of which have a broad conceptual meaning of 'doing,' 'performing,' or 'fulfilling'. They are interchangeable, and the process, in theory, is iterative and, therefore, infinite.

In (49) the verb-noun pair is as incomplete semantically as the verb from which it is obtained. In a sentence, both would require an informationally charged complement: okazyvaet vlijanie (pomošč, sodejstvie)—okazanie vlijanija (pomošči, sodejstvija) 'exerts influence (help, assistance)—the exertion of influence (help, assistance).' The accusative case of the verb complement is transformed into the genitive case after the deverbal noun. Since the process is the same for all types of verbs, including delexicalized verbs (provodit vypolnenie—provedenie vypolnenija 'carries out the fulfillment— the carrying out of the fulfilment'), an indefinitely long string can be generated: provedenie vypolnenija osuščestvlenija okazanija . . . 'the carrying out of the fulfilling of the executing of the rendering . . . 'etc. Even the fact that the synonymic group of verbs of 'doing' is a closed set in a natural language does not prevent the process from being limitless since interchangeable elements can be iterated:
These strings of genitive cases represent something more interesting than a scholastic exercise. Their significance for the present discussion lies in the fact that there does not exist such last step after which the splitting would become impossible. It means that no actual surface verb can be considered an absolutely adequate representation of the abstract relator, no matter how abstract or general the meaning of the verb is. Any verb can be decomposed into two parts, one part being a term.

In the process of decomposing a verb, the 'extracted' term, or the complement, acquires the form of the accusative case in the surface sentence. It makes the completive pairs in (48) and (49) similar to a combination of a transitive verb with a direct object. Besides, the complement behaves like a direct object in all subsequent steps of nominalization: after a deverbal noun it changes into the genitive. In nominalization, a sentence with a completive pair undergoes the same changes as a sentence with a transitive verb and a direct object.

(50) a. Brigada rabotaet—
    'The team works'
    Brigada vypolnjaet rabotu—
    'The team fulfils the work'
    vypolnenie raboty brigadoj—
    'the fulfilment of the work by the team'.

b. Balerina tancuet—
    'The ballerina is dancing'
    Balerina ispolnjaet tanec—
    'The ballerina is performing a dance.'
    ispolnenie tanca balerinoj
    'the performing of a dance by the ballerina'

Transitive verbs are decomposed in the same manner: the direct object of the verb becomes the genitive when the verb is nominalized, and the deverbal noun, which is now in the accusative, occupies the position of the direct object.

(51) a. Inžener ispytyvaet ustanovku—
    'The engineer tests a plant'
    Inžener vypolnjaet ispytanie ustanovki—
    'The engineer fulfils the testing of a plant'
vypolnenie ispytaniya ustanovki inženerom
'the fulfilment of the testing of a plant by the engineer'

b. Korrektor pravit stat'ju
'The corrector is proofreading the article'
Korrektor osušchestvlyaet pravku stat'ju
'The corrector carries out the proofreading of the article'
osušchestvlenie pravki stat'ju korrektorom
'the carrying out of the proofreading of the article by the corrector'

Beginning with the second step, all constructions in (50) and (51) are identical; in (51) the direct object becomes the genitive case and remains in that position without interfering with any further transformations. The newly formed deverbal noun in (51) occupies the position of the complement of the partially delexicalized verb denoting action; this deverbal noun concentrates in itself the semantic component of the original transitive verb. The difference between transitive and intransitive verbs shows up only in the presence or absence of one extra member in the sequence of hierarchically subordinated noun positions. Indeed, the verb in the second sentence of each example in (50) and (51) can be decomposed, in its turn, into another verb and a deverbal noun; then the newly derived verb can be decomposed again, and so on. As has been stated above, in principle there is no maximum number of such decompositions. Infinite strings generated by decomposition in (52) and (53) can be the continuation of (50a) and (51a) respectively, the former starting with an intransitive, and the latter with a transitive verb.

(52) Brigada rabotaet.---
'The team works.'
Brigada vypolnjaet rabotu.---
'The team fulfils the work.'
Brigada provodit vypolnenie raboty.---
'The team carries out the fulfilment of the work.'
Brigada osušchestvlyaet provedenie vypolnenija raboty.---
'The team executes the carrying out of the fulfilment of the work.'
Brigada proizvodit osušchestvlenie provedeniya vypolnenija raboty. . .'
'The team performs the executing of the carrying out of the fulfilment of the work. . .\n
(53) Inžener ispytyvaet ustanovku.—
'The engineer tests the plant.'
Inžener vypolniaet ispytanie ustanovki.—
'The engineer fulfils the testing of the plant.'
Inžener provodit vypolnenie ispytaniya ustanovki—
'The engineer carries out the fulfilment of the testing of the plant.'
Inžener osuščestvijaet provedenie vypolnenija ispytaniya ustanovki...
'The engineer executes the carrying out of the fulfilment of the testing of the plant...'

A reverse synthetic process of 'folding up' strings is of the same nature as the process of generating verbal sentences by conflation. I leave open the question how 'active' structures are derived from what I consider to be canonic passive semantic models. I can merely avoid this problem here; whatever theory is accepted for the derivation of active sentences, it will not influence the description of the two processes: the analytic decomposition of a verb, and the synthetic folding up of a completable pair. The latter will be called conflation, since the delexicalized verb displays all the properties of an abstract relator, while the deverbal noun is a term in the situation model. As was mentioned previously, the segmentation of any verb, no matter to what extent it is desemantized, is limitless, which means that no verb can be considered a surface equivalent of the relator. It will be shown later that no surface actualization of the relator is possible at all, that even BE and prepositions can be traced down to terms. So even in this respect, the operations performed over verbs will be similar to those involving relators.

The operation of conflation performed over the strings in (52) and in (53) will yield the same structures, except for the last step. Deverbal nouns, loaded with semantic information, easily combine with a desemantized verb, generating a new verb with a full lexical meaning:

(54) vypolniaet rabotu—rabotaet
'fulfils the work'—'works'

If a deverbal noun itself relates to a desemantized verb, and if then it contaminates with another desemantized verb, a new verb is formed which also lacks specific lexical information except for the general meaning of performing an action. That is why a way to iteration is open:
(55) a. osuščestvljaet vypolnenie--vypolnjaet;  
'executes the fulfilment'--'fulfils'  
vypolnjaet osuščestvljenie--osuščestvljaet  
'fulfils the executing'--'executes'  
b. provodit ispolnenie--ispolnjaet;  
'carries out the performing'--'performs'  
ispolnjaet provedenie--provodit;  
'performs the carrying out'--'carries out'  

From (54) and (55) it follows that conflation is possible in two cases: 1) when the pair contains one semantically loaded component, the other component being, at least partially, delexicalized, as in (54), which in my framework would mean that only one term can be conflated with the relator; 2) when there is no semantically prevalent component in the sense that the semantic informativeness of the noun is no greater than that of the verb; then one is chosen as the term and other as the relator. Significantly, it is the element that has the form of a noun that assumes the role of the term, and the verb resulting from such fusion has the same stem as the noun, not as the verb (see 55). The completive pair in which both elements are equal as to their semantic weight follows the pattern of such a completive pair in which one element dominates semantically. Two sets of examples, (56) and (57), show the process of conflation in arbitrarily long strings.

All steps in (56) and (57) are identical but for the last one. To be more exact, in (56) there is no step identical with (57e). In both sequences all steps except the last ones contain completive pairs in which the verb is completed by a deverbal noun in the accusative. At every step the lexical meaning of this noun is blended with the grammatical category of the verb. Simultaneously, the noun in the genitive, following the noun in the accusative, becomes the complement in the accusative. Now, at the next step, this new accusative can, in its turn, be incorporated into the verb, generating still another verb, and taking as its complement the next following noun and transforming it from the genitive into the accusative, etc.

This telescope folding goes on until the last deverbal noun is blended with the verb. In (57) the verb rabotaet 'works' is the end of the conflation. In (56) the end is ispytivaet ustanovku 'tests the plant', and no further incorporation is possible. The generated verb ispytivaet 'tests' has a distinct lexical meaning of its own; the noun ustanovku 'the plant', which now occupies the position of the accusative, cannot be combined with the verb. The resulting combination ispytivaet ustanovku 'tests the plant' is traditionally called a transitive verb with a direct object. Here both the verb and the governed noun are significant semantically, thus there are two lexical centers, and neither one can be incorporated into
(56)

a. инженер осуществляет проведение в испытания установки
   'executes the carrying out'

b. инженер проводит испытания установки
   'carries out the fulfillment'

c. инженер возвращает испытания установки
   'fulfills the testing'

d. инженер проверяет испытания установки
   'tests the plant'

(57)

a. бригада производит осуществление проведения в исполнении работы
   'performs the executing'

b. бригада осуществляет проведение в исполнении работы
   'executes the carrying out'

c. бригада проводит исполнение работы
   'carries out the fulfillment'

d. бригада возвращает исполнение работы
   'fulfills the work'

e. бригада работает
   'works'
the other. Comparable to it will be (57d) vypolnjaet rabotu 'fulfils the work', for at this step there is still a noun in the accusative governed by the verb. But (57d) lacks one lexical center, as compared to (56d), so the semantically empty verb easily incorporates the noun, thus generating a new verb, and the process can proceed one step further, generating an intransitive verb in (57e).

In discussing verb decomposition, only active structures with transitive and intransitive verbs have been considered. It will be shown now how nominalized structures obtained in the process of verb decomposition can be related to the canonic passive representation.

In (58) and (59) both representations are shown, the only difference between them being a converse arrangement of the actants in the topmost branches. At this point I am still calling (58) a canonic representation, and (59) noncanonic. Only the topmost branches are reversed; everything else, i.e. all that underlies the highest term in the objective is the same in both representations. Later I will consider an alternative representation of the upper branch in (59).

Now both representations will be examined in greater detail. From the schemes it follows that each binary segment at any level has a counterpart which is related to it through the operation of conversion. The choice of one or the other of two conversely related segments is, of course, arbitrary. However, it determines subsequent operations, as well as the surface realizations of all resulting steps. For (58) and (59) two derivations will be demonstrated in each case: the derivations will begin at the same level from either of the alternative conversives. Each subsequent step will be shown below the preceding one; the starting step will be at the top; the direction of derivation is downward. Surface Russian interpretations will accompany each step.

First the canonic passive model will be examined. As the starting step I choose the middle branch and consider each of the two variants related by conversion.

The term in the objective in (60a) ispytanie 'testing' can be regarded as a given term in a situation, or else as obtained by conflation from an underlying binary segment vypolnenie ispytaniya 'fulfilment of the testing', and the term vypolnenie in its turn can be obtained by the same process from a segment one step deeper, etc. Since the process can go on indefinitely, any level can be considered the starting point, and a situation can be formed from an arbitrary set of discrete actants.
In (61) we proceed from a converse structure. The lower branch of set (a) contains the term ispytanie 'testing' in the comment. Now the conflation is possible of this term and the relator because the term denotes a process. The result of the conflation--step (b)--surfaces as a verb: ispytyvaetsja 'is tested.' Proceeding to step (c), the 'verb' from the preceding step is conflated once again with the relator which is glossed here as isxodit ot 'comes from'. The relator denotes movement, and as such, is not considered here at all. Likewise, it is not quite clear what happens to the term in the ablative. I suspect that the surface instrumental inženerom 'by the engineer' might have an underlying prolative. Anyway, the processes involving the relationship of movement have no direct bearing on those segments which are connected with nominalization, and therefore, they will not be considered here. After examining (61), it becomes clear that when derivation starts from a segment in which the process term is in the comment, then verbal structures are generated. It means that nominalization of such structures will necessarily involve decomposition and conversion, because a nominalized genitive case phrase uspytanie ustanovki can be obtained only from a segment in which the process term is in the objective (see 60a).

Now I will examine two variants of the non-canonic active (causative) representations. The derivations will also start from the middle branches as they are shown in (59). Each of the converasive alternatives will be considered in turn. Step (62a) shows that the term in the objective, which denotes process, can be split down infinitely. The term in the comment does not denote a process, and it cannot conflate with the relator. Therefore, it is glossed in step (b) as a nominalized phrase with the genitive case. The subsequent conflation results in a sentence with a verb in step (c). No further conflation is possible because both the verb and the object are semantically informative.

Variant (63) is uninteresting for research into nominalization because the term in the locative in the lower branch of step (a) conflates with the relator to generate the verb ispytyvaetsja 'is (being) tested' in step (b). The conflation of the causative relator with the term ustanovka is impossible; the generation process stops at this point.

I wish now to re-examine the semantic cases ascribed to the terms in what I have so far called a non-canonic representation, the position of the topic being occupied by the term in the ablative, and the position of the comment by the term in the objective. Such representation follows Shaumyan (1974) and Miller (1974), who interpret the superficial subject of a verb denoting action only as ablative.
That the testing is exerted over the plant, comes from the engineer.

The testing of the plant is conducted by the engineer.

The testing of the plant by the engineer (was done in time).
(61)

a. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obj</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>abl</th>
<th>insten</th>
<th>inžener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ustanovka</td>
<td>ispytanie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'To, что установка (est') в испытании, исходит от инженера. That the plant is in testing comes from the engineer.'

c. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obj</th>
<th>(Rloc)</th>
<th>insten</th>
<th>inžener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ustanovka</td>
<td>ispytyvaetsja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'To, что установка является, исходит от инженера. 'That the plant is being tested, comes from the engineer.'

c. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>insten</th>
<th>inženerom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ustanovka ispytyvaetsja inženerom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Установка испытывается инженером. The plant is (was) tested by the engineer.'
Inžener kauziruet to, čto ispytanie rasprostranjaetsja na ustanovku.
'The engineer causes the fact that the testing is exerted over the plant.'

Inžener vypolniaet ispytanie ustanovki.
'The engineer fulfills the testing of the plant.'

Inžener ispytyvaet ustanovku
'The engineer tests the plant.'
(63)
a.

Inžener kauziruet to, čto ustanovka (est') v ispytani.
'The engineer causes the fact that the plant is in the testing.'

b.

Inžener kauziruet to, čto ustanovka ispytyvaetsja.
'The engineer causes the fact that the plant is being tested.'
There can be proposed another interpretation for active sentences, with the same role distribution as in passive sentences. Then (39) and (59), for instance, can be rewritten as (64).

(64)

```
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 | CAUS  |                 |
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|  inžener        |       |  ustavovka      |
| 'engineer'      |       | 'plant'         |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|  ispytanie      |       |                 |
| 'testing'       |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
| obj             | loc (all) |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
|                 |       |                 |
+-----------------+       +-----------------+
```

The term which surfaces as the subject, and which is the topic, is now represented as being in the objective, and the term entering the comment as being in the locative. In support of such interpretation I have two arguments.

First, the nominative in the surface sentence normally indicates the topic; the closest interpretation of localist two-actant topic-comment structures, in all examples above, also employs the nominative to render the underlying objective. It is held, therefore, that whatever semantic role underlies the surface nominative (in many cases it may be ablative designating the source), at some step in the derivation this actant should acquire the status of the objective, so that the semantic role of the actant in question is related to the nominative case on the surface through the objective case. My interpretation does not contradict the views of other localistically oriented theories in that the active doer of an action originates from the ablative. What I want to point out, is that in the surface syntax of Russian the tendency is to generalize sentence structures according to the predominant mechanism operating in sentence derivation, this predominant mechanism being the hierarchical segmentation into binary topic-comment structures. Besides, the model appears to be more consistent if in a two-actant segment (where one of the actants is supposed to be in the objective) it is the objective which is made the topic, and thus opposed to other locative cases.

Second, the surface accusative can be related to a semantic case denoting goal, or the point of destination (as in priexal v Moskvy 'came to Moscow'), and the point of destination is expressed by the allative. As it was stated previously, the allative is a variant of the locative. The locative is re-interpreted as the allative when motion is involved. Action verbs can be viewed as denoting motion in an abstract sense.
This alternative interpretation of active sentences can be explored while accounting for the nominalizations of intransitive sentences, and in discussing the question of transitive vs. intransitive opposition.

Two models for generating intransitive sentences can be proposed. One was already shown in (28); it will be repeated here as (65) for the sentence Brigada rabotaet 'The team works.'

(65) b.

```
(65a) can be glossed as Brigada (est'v rabote 'The team is in work', or Brigada (est') za rabotoj 'The team is at work'. The verb in (65b) is generated by conflating the relator and the term in the locative. The relator expresses abstract localization and is actualized as the verb B E and a preposition. Structure (65a) is overtly passive; it is claimed therefore that Russian sentences with intransitive verbs can be interpreted as 'passive' in their deep semantic representation.

The other model for generating the same sentence Brigada rabotaet is similar to models proposed for transitive active structures. I am not going to explore all variants derived by conversion; I will analyze only the model which opens way to nominalized phrases at a certain step. The final step in (66) is identical with the final step in (65): both are actualized as Brigada rabotaet 'The team works'. However, they are generated in different ways. In (66) the verb is the result of the conflation of the relator expressing causation, or 'motion to', and a term in the allative, while in (65) the verb is obtained by conflating the relator of location and the term in the locative. In this sense the sentence Brigada rabotaet is semantically ambiguous. Depending upon its derivation it can have an active or a passive connotation.
а. Brigada javljaetsja istočnikom togo, čto vypolnenie rasprostranjaetsja na rabotu.
  'The team is the cause of the fact that the fulfillment is exerted over the work'.

в. Brigada provodit vypolnenie raboty.
  'The team carries out the fulfilment of the work'.

с. Brigada vypolnjaet rabotu.
  'The team fulfills the work'.

d. Brigada rabotaet.
  'The team works'.

(66)
(67)

a. 

\[
\text{obj} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{abl} \quad \text{brigada} \\
\text{obj} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{loc} \quad \text{vypolnenie} \\
\text{rabota} \quad \text{vypolnjaetsja} \\
\]

To, čto rabota (est') v vypolnenii, isxodit ot brigady.
'That the work is in execution, comes from the team'.

to-

b. 

\[
\text{obj} \quad \text{R} \quad \text{abl} \quad \text{brigada} \\
\text{obj} \quad \text{R} \quad (\text{Rloc}) \quad \text{vypolnjaetsja} \\
\text{rabota} \quad \text{vypolnjaetsja} \\
\]

To, čto rabota vypolnjaetsja, isxodit ot brigady.
'That the work is being fulfilled, comes from the team.'

to-

c. 

\[
\text{obj} \quad \text{vypolnjaetsja} \quad \text{abl} \quad \text{brigada} \\
\text{rabota} \quad \text{vypolnjaetsja} \\
\]

Rabota vypolnjaetsja brigadoj.
'The work is being fulfilled by the team.'
(68)

a.

```
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Comparing the models for intransitive (66) and for transitive (62) sentences, it becomes obvious that all operations in them are identical except for the last ones. To be more exact, in (62) there is no operation similar to the last step (d) in (66). The last step in (62) is, in fact, identical with the last but one step in (66).

It is suggested that within this framework the difference between intransitive and transitive structures can be expressed in the possibility or impossibility of this last step in derivation. Intransitive structures are generated when one extra operation of conflation is possible. Previously, it was shown that conflation is possible when one of the two elements to be conflated is non-informative semantically. In transitive structures, both elements are equally significant semantically, and, therefore, this extra operation cannot take place.

Another opposition in the surface syntax, namely that of active vs. passive structures, can be re-evaluated when explored in this framework. This re-evaluation is based on the demonstrated similarity in the generation of transitive and intransitive sentences.

Traditionally, the active vs. passive opposition applies only to superficially transitive structures, which is natural, of course, since the verb must have at least two arguments to occupy the position of the subject in two different structures.

It has been shown that intransitive sentences can be generated in two ways: as 'passive' and as 'active' ones. This ambiguity is in itself suggestive, for it makes doubtful the existence of crucial difference between active and passive structures. Another way to show how elusive the borderline between active and passive structures is, will be to postulate a 'passive' counterpart of an intransitive structure like Brigada rabotaet 'The team works'.

If the interpretations of (62) are considered active, and the interpretations of both (1)(60) and (61) their passive counterparts, then the active interpretations of (66) must be related in the same way to their 'passive' counterpart in (67). It is obvious that the relationship between (62) and (61) is particularly significant, for exactly the same relationship is established between (66) and (67). Here is how the superficial sentences are arranged in an active-passive proportion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(62c) Inžener ispytyvaet ustanovku.</td>
<td>(61c) Ustanovka ispytyvaetsja inženerom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The engineer tests the plant.'</td>
<td>'The plant is tested by the engineer.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In (66d) the complement is concealed within the verb. In passivization (that is in the operation of conversion) it is extracted. Only after that it can be made the subject in passive (67c). This is achieved through lexical decomposition of the verb, during which a deverbal noun is obtained. In other words, in order to make brigada rabotaet passive, nominalization should be employed.

The same correspondences are observed on various levels of decomposition. Below, sentence pairs are brought together in which decomposition results in strings of deverbal nouns. The active-passive opposition here is built upon further neutralization of the transitive-intransitive opposition.

**Active** | **Passive**
---|---
(62b) Inžener vypolnjaet ispytanie ustanovki. | (60b) Ispytanie ustanovki vypolnjaetsja inženerom. 'The engineer carries out the testing of the plant.' 'The testing of the plant is carried out by the engineer.'
(66b) Brigada provodit vypolnenie raboty. | (68b) Vypolnenie raboty provoditsja brigadoj. 'The team conducts the carrying out of the work.' 'The carrying out of the work is conducted by the team.'

It has been mentioned on several occasions previously that lexical decomposition, and, therefore, nominalization, goes on in the direction opposite to conflation, i.e. verb generation. Two processes coexist in the language. The evidence of the second process is known: it is the existence of verbs with full lexical meaning. At the moment I am more interested in the evidence of the process of decomposition.

A number of facts about Russian not only prove the existence of the process of decomposition, but testify to its high productiveness.
It is true that predominantly transitive verbs may occasionally lack the right-hand valence when it is irrelevant informationally, as in examples (b) in the following:

(69) a. Assistant vyčislijæt pogrešnost'. 'The assistant is calculating the error.'
    b. Assistant vyčislijæt. 'The assistant is calculating.'

(70) a. Raskol'nikov ubil staruxu. 'Raskolnikov killed the old woman.'
    b. Raskol'nikov ubil. 'Raskolnikov has killed.'

However, very often the absence of the second actant is felt as an ellipsis, especially in supersentential utterances.

(71) Assistant vyčislił pogrešnost'. Vyčislił, no neverno. 'The assistant calculated the error. Calculated, but incorrectly.'

There are also cases when a sentence with a transitive verb lacking one argument is perceived as ungrammatical, or awkward. It is especially true of perfective verbs.

(72) a. *Kolumb otkryl. 'Columbus discovered'
    b. ?Assistant vyčislił. 'The assistant has calculated.'
    c. ?Astronom nabljudaet. 'The astronomer observes.'

Verbs in (72) tend to be used in transitive constructions. Therefore, in order to make the sentence transitive, and avoid at the same time the second actant (which may be unknown or irrelevant) the language resorts to lexical decomposition. The deverbal noun resulting from it occupies the position of the direct object. Structures (73) are balanced syntactically and are no longer felt as incomplete or ill-formed, though their semantic information is the same as that of (72).

(73) a. Kolumb sdelal otkrytie. 'Columbus made a discovery.'
    b. Assistent proizvel vyčislenija. 'The assistant made calculations.'
    c. Astronom vedet nabljudenija. 'The astronomer conducts observations.'
The tendency to use completive pairs with deverbal nouns instead of verbs is governed not only by the requirements of grammatical well-formedness, as in (73). This tendency is very active in Russian, as well as in other languages: cf. 'make a decision (statement, observation)'; 'give a definition (promise)'; 'faire une promenade (la guerre, un voyage)' etc. Moreover, the verb may be split into a delexicalized verb and a noun even when the verbal structure is perfectly grammatical and acceptable stylistically. For instance, sentence with a transitive verb Centr obrabatyvaet informaciju 'The center processes the information' is very likely to be substituted by the completive structure Centr vedet obrabotku informacii 'The center is conducting the processing of the information' (the example is taken from Adamec 1973).

It is not my purpose to discuss the stylistic aspects of such constructions, nor shall I investigate the semantic relations between the verb and the related deverbal noun. These topics have been extensively studied (e.g. Adamec 1973, Arutjunova 1972, Hjelmslev 1959, Kuryłowicz 1962, Zolotova 1971). It might be mentioned that nominalized phrases are particularly characteristic of scientific prose (and pseudo-scientific jargon) and official style. The process is so active in the language that sometimes the desire to avoid a verb results in clumsy successions of consecutively subordinated genitive cases, not unlike those in (56) and (57).

Summary

Verbal sentences with action verbs have been shown to be derived from localist situation models through a hierarchy of binary topic-comment segments. Locative situation models underly both verbal sentences and their nominalizations; the terms occupying the positions of the topic and the comment in them are reversed. In verb derivation the operation of conflation is employed. Nominalization is an opposite process which involves lexical decomposition and conversion.

The analysis provides some insight into two important oppositions characterizing Russian surface verbs: transitive vs. intransitive and active vs. passive.

Both transitive and intransitive verbs are generated from the same type of binary segments and by the same operations. The superficial evidence of their similar derivational history is found in nominalizations, in particular in their ability to be lexically decomposed in the same way.

The active-passive opposition is likewise mediated through nominalized structures. It has been shown that underlying passive and active surface sentences, there are identical semantic models.
Besides, sentences which are traditionally regarded as intransitive, can also have passive counterparts. Nominalization is involved in the passivization of intransitive sentences.

The justification for postulating an underlying localist situation model, as well as both processes: conflation and decomposition, is found in real language phenomena. One of them is the ease with which practically any Russian verb can be decomposed into a desemanticized verb and a noun, the former being an analog of the relator, the latter of a term.
CHAPTER III

Expressions of Possession
and Their Nominalizations.

In possessive phrases with the genitive case the head noun normally does not denote a process, but rather a concrete 'thing' possessed.

(74) a. dom otca

'father's house' (lit. 'the house of the father')

b. mašina brata

'brother's car (lit. 'the car of my brother')

Though traditional grammar and most of the transformational accounts of possessive phrases assume that they are derived from sentences expressing possession, the phrases themselves are not considered nominalizations, at least, not of the type discussed in Chapter II. My main objective will be to show that the process of derivation of dom otca 'the house of father' involves the same operations as the derivation of ispolnenie sonaty 'the performance of a sonata', and that the segments over which these operations are performed have the same structure as the segments underlying nominalizations of the ispolnenie sonaty type. I wish to be very careful in stating this assumption: I do not claim that dom otca is actually derived from sentences like otec imeet dom, or O otca est' dom 'Father has a house', or any other sentences denoting possession. What I assume is only that all the relations established between Pianist ispolnjaet sonatu--ispolnenie sonaty 'The pianist performs a sonata--the performance of a sonata' hold true for Otec imeet dom--dom otca 'My father has a house--the house of my father'.

Quite a number of linguistic studies have convincingly demonstrated the structural parallelism between possessive and existential-locative constructions in different languages (Anderson 1971b, Bach 1967, Bendix 1966, Benveniste 1960, Christie 1970, Fillmore 1968, Langacker 1968, Lyons 1967, 1968b). Though there is much cross-reference in these studies, each time a new evidence is brought to light to prove the 'locative' essence of passive sentences. Significantly, no special study is devoted to proving
the locative origin of Russian possessive sentences. The reason for this may be found in the fact that there is no need in special argumentation for the locative 'background' of possessive sentences in Russian. The most common expression of possession is overtly locative: _U otca est dom 'At/by father is a house.' This fact might explain the lack of interest in the derivational history of other sentences expressing possession in Russian, such as verbal structures: _Otec vladeet /obladaet domom 'Father possesses a house.'

One question has never been given any special prominence in the studies of Russian syntax and semantics. It is a question concerning the secondary (both synchronically and diachronically) development of the verb _imet' 'have.' In English studies, however, the status of 'have' is discussed by transformationalists and generativists. Lyons (1968b, 8.4.4) makes it a point to disprove postulating 'have' in an underlying structure. This interest to 'have' is not surprising because a 'have'-sentence is the most unmarked and matter-of-fact means to express possession in English, whereas in Russian it is a locatively organized structure which is usually used to denote possession.

As far as the parallelism between possession and existence is concerned, Russian locative-existential expression of possession is no less suggestive than an opposite device utilized, for instance, by Serbocroatian _ima dana 'there are days', or by French, which employs the verb _avoir 'have' also to express existence in _il y a. Russian, for that matter, employs the same device when a possession verb is used to denote existence, for instance, in the phrasing of a mathematical problem: _Pust' imetsja (passive of 'have') treugol'nik ABC...The English translation resorts to the existential 'be' here: 'Let there be triangle ABC...'

When examples are given in order to demonstrate the locative structure of possessive sentences, it is normally the 'possessor' that is shown as playing the locative role. As far as I know, only Anderson briefly mentions in a footnote that the 'thing possessed' may be locative as well, though he does not seem sure that the latter arrangement is possible in the deep structure (Anderson 1971b:107).

I maintain here that the relation between the possessor and the thing possessed is a two-member relation of abstract localization. In the underlying situation model, where there are two terms and the relator, any of the terms: the possessor or the possessed, can be chosen as the topic and ascribed the semantic case of the objective. It means that the other term, i.e. the one in the locative, can be either the possessed or the possessor respectively. Models (75) and (76) are related by the operation of conversion.
In examples (77) - (80) sentences (a) correspond to model (75) with the possessor in the locative; sentences (b) correspond to model (76) with the possessed in the locative. The surface prepositions are overtly locative.

(77) a. U nego est' (byli, ostals', pojavilis') den'gi.
   lit. 'At him is (was, remained, appeared) money.'
   b. O n (byl, ostalsja, stal) pri den'gax.
   'He is (was, remained, became) with money.'

(78) a. U nego (byla) vlast'.
   lit. 'At him is (was) power.'
   b. O n (byl) u vlasti.
   'He is (was) at power.'

(79) a. U staruxi (ostalos') razbitoe koryto.
   lit. 'At the old woman is (remained) a broken trough.'
   b. Staruxa (ostalas') u razbitogo koryta.
   'The old woman is at/with a broken trough.'

Idiom: 'The old woman is no better off than at the start.'

(80) a. U nego (byl) krupnyj vyigryš.
   lit. 'At him is (was) a big gain.'
   b. O n (byl) v krupnom vyigryše.
   'He is (was) in big gain.'

Consider also negative (81), which is extremely common in everyday usage.
(81) On byl ne u del (ne pri dele, ne pri den'gax, ne u vlasti etc.)
    'He was out of business (not in business, not with money, not in power etc.)'

Investigating the nominalizations of possessive sentences, I will disregard the nuances in the meaning of possession proper, availability, and inalienable possession. Whatever other syntactic discrepancies may result from differences in meaning, they do not influence the similarity in structure and in generation of the genitive case structures in (82).

(82) a. kvartira Igorja
    'Igor's apartment'

b. den'gi soseda
    'my neighbor's money'

Sentences of the type (83a) and (83b), which correspond to phrases (82a) and (82b) respectively, may be considered two ways ambiguous. They may denote either permanent possession, or availability (cf. Lyons 1968a, 8.4.5).

(83) a. U Igorja est' kvartira.
    'Igor has an apartment.'

b. U soseda est' den'gi.
    'My neighbor has money.'

Disambiguation is achieved by contextual expansion, or by paraphrase. For instance, (83b) may be disambiguated into (83b') to denote availability, or into (83b") to denote permanent possession.

(83) b'. U soseda est' den'gi s soboj (pri sebe).
    'My neighbor has money with/on him.'

b". U soseda vodjatsja den'gi.
    'My neighbor is a moneyed man.'

On the other hand, the denotatum of the thing possessed may be of such a type which hardly permits the interpretation of immediate availability. The disambiguation is, therefore, extralinguistic. For example, things like dom 'house', kvartira 'apartment' would normally denote a permanent ownership. Moreover, for a person living in Russia, kvartira will have a stronger connotation of a permanent possession, than dom for a person living in this country. For such things to denote availability, a highly specified context is required, as in (84).
As I have stated already, I consider the similarity in the structure of nominalized phrases to be the evidence not only of their own common origin, but also of the common origin of the sentences which correspond to them. I assume, therefore, that despite all distinctions in connotation, possessive sentences in (83) all have the same underlying situation model like (75), and that their nominalizations are generated from a converse situation model which is the same as (76). It should be noted in passing that I share Anderson's view concerning the semantic distinctions discussed above. He believes that possessive sentences are 'merely indifferent (rather than ambiguous) with respect to such distinctions' (Anderson 1971b:114). It is assumed here that the similarity in nominalizations is one manifestation of this 'indifference', or neutralization.

Now I am going to examine possessive sentences and their nominalizations in the light of active-passive opposition. It was shown in the preceding chapter that the two member topic-comment segment is essentially passive when the topic is expressed by the term in the objective case. When, in language actualization, the surface subject corresponds to the term in the objective, the actual sentence of the language is also said to be passive. If the superficial subject actualizes the term in one of the locative cases (ablative, prolatlve or locative), then such sentence is said to be active.

The discussion will center around the following questions: Can a correlation be established among Russian expressions of possession similar to the traditional active-passive correlation among structures with the action verbs discussed in Chapter II? If such a correlation exists, what features do active possessive sentences share with the active sentences denoting action, and what are the differences? If there are differences, how are they manifested in actual language structures, and how can they be accounted for in the proposed framework? More importantly, if there are similarities, how can they be explained in terms of the semantic model and what are their linguistic implications?

In all localistically oriented studies it is maintained that the verb imet' 'have' is not a deep-structure verb, but that it is introduced or generated somewhere on the way up to the surface sentence. The mechanism which triggers this 'have'-transformation (and which is known as 'subjectivization', 'ergativization', topicalization') is described by Lyons as such a mechanism which brings the 'person interested', or 'possessor', into subject position (Lyons 1968b: 397).
Lyons maintains that the relation between possessive and locative sentences, e.g. 'I had a book on the table' and 'There was a book on the table', is the same as the relationship between active and passive sentences. It implicitly follows from the above that locative sentences are passive counterparts of the active possessive sentences containing the verb 'have'.

Russian possessive sentences (77a)-(80a), whose structure is overtly locative, are, of course, passive. Russian sentences with imet 'have' display some of the features characteristic of what is traditionally regarded as transitive active structures: the verb itself is active in form, and the noun denoting the thing possessed is in the accusative. The relation between (a) and (b) in (85) is the same as that between (a) and (b) in (86), sentences (a) being active, and (b) passive.

(85) a. Brat imel mašinu.
   'Brother had a car'.
   b. U brata byla mašina.
   lit. 'At brother was a car.'

(86) a. Brat vypolnjal rabotu.
   'My brother was fulfilling the work.'
   b. Rabota vypolnjalas' bratom.
   'The work was fulfilled by my brother.'

(86b) can be paraphrased into an overtly locative (86b') which shows an even stronger resemblance to the passive possessive (85b).

(86) b'. Rabota vypolnjalas' u brata (vsegda) vo-vremja.
   'With my brother the work was (always) done in time.'

One of the strongest arguments against placing the English 'have' in the deep structure is usually found in its inability to form passive: *A book is had by John. This argument proves useless if applied to Russian imet 'have'. Its reflexive form imet'sja is used in the same passive meaning in (87) in which vypolnjal'sja is used in (86b).

(87) U brata imelas' kniga.
   lit. 'At brother there was a book.'

The fact that in such passive sentence the 'person interested' is expressed by a prepositional locative phrase rather than by the instrumental, as is the case with a truly passive (86b), is not a very serious objection. As it follows from (86b'), the agent can be expressed by locative in a passive sentence with an action verb as well. More examples of this type are given in (88).
The surface sentences with active and passive forms of the verb have been shown to manifest the underlying relation of conversion. It should be mentioned that conversives may not necessarily be the forms of one verb, but they may be different lexical items instead, e.g. prodavat'--pokupat' 'to sell--to buy.' As far as Russian sentences of possession are concerned, the pair imet'--imet'sja exemplifies the first type of conversives, and the pair imet'--byt' the second. Other Russian verbs expressing possession can also constitute conversive pairs. For instance, both sentences in (89) are active counterparts of the passive (90).

(89) a. Brat vladeet mašinoj.  
   'My brother owns a car.'
   b. Brat obладает машиною.  
   'My brother possesses a car.'

(90) Mašina prinadležit bratu.  
   'The car belongs to my brother.'

In the proposed framework, the surface verbs of possession must be generated by conflation. An underlying abstract relator must be conflated with a term. The term should be charged with the lexical meaning conveying the notion of having-possessing-belonging. Meanwhile, it has been claimed that the verb 'have' does not originate in the depth, and, more importantly, that the semantic representation of possessive sentences contains only a relator of abstract localization. It is not quite clear where the concept of possessing-belonging comes from to be materialized on the surface in the form of a verb. In support of postulating a possessive term in the underlying model, one can cite an overtly locative possessive sentence (91) where the verb est' (naxoditsja) 'is (is found)' corresponds to the deep relator, and the notion of possession is concentrated in the term sobstvennost' 'property, possession'. (91) and (90) are the language realizations of two consecutive steps in the situation model (92).

(91) Mašina est' (naxoditsja) v sobstvennosti brata.  
   'The car is in my brother's possession.'
From this model it follows that the phrase sobstvennost' brata is the nominalization of possessive sentences (89) and (90). My original intention, however, is to prove that genitive case phrases in (74) are also nominalizations of sentences denoting possession. In other words, I must demonstrate that mašina brata is also the nominalization of these verbal sentences, not only of the verbless U brata mašina.

If (92) underlies mašina brata, then the loss of the term sobstvennost' must be accounted for. So far, in discussing nominalizations, it was only the relator of abstract localization which was dropped out, but not a term. This is why a situation model like (75) can be considered as underlying (74). One possible account is, of course, postulating two unrelated situation models, one without any term of possession, like (75), for mašina brata; the other containing a term with the meaning 'possession-ownership-belonging' underlying verbal possessive sentences and nominalizations like sobstvennost' brata, but not like mašina brata. However, such a solution will divorce various expressions of possession; which will be, first, contrary to actual language facts (paraphrases, dictionary definitions etc.), and second, will be uninteresting theoretically, because many generalizations will be lost.5

I will argue that all possessive sentences, as well as the nominalized phrases, contain a term of possession in the underlying model. It needs hardly be mentioned that this situation model is locative. Indeed, just as (75) can be said to denote 'direct' location u brata 'at my brother', (92) can be said to be doubly locative: v sobstvennosti u brata'among my brother's possessions'. The principal task, therefore, is to explain what happens to this second term which has a generic meaning of possession.

If we decide that it drops out altogether, then we will have to assume that the genitive case structure itself bears the meaning of possession. Then we will have to rule out those genitive case structures which do not denote possession, such as ispolnenie sonaty 'the performance of the sonata' and son rebenka 'the sleep of the child.'
At first sight, this can be done by distinguishing 'abstract' nouns from 'concrete', and ascribing the meaning of possession only to such genitive case phrases whose head nouns are of the latter category. However, even if we leave aside the difficulty of setting up the criteria for such semantic distinction, it will be impossible to explain why some phrases with the abstract head noun can be paraphrased into possessive sentences: *krasota devuški*—*Devuška obladala udívitel'noj krasotoj* 'the girl's beauty—the girl possessed an exceptional beauty.'

Another solution is to assume that the term denoting possession can conflate with another term, so that the meaning of possession, or rather that of the thing possessed is concealed within this other term. For model (92) it will mean that the term sobstvennost' can be conflated with the term маšina, that the result of such conflation will be the surface noun маšina, and that this latter noun will be charged with the meaning 'something which is possessed.' (It should be reminded that the conflation of the term sobstvennost' with the relator generates a surface verb, for instance принадлежать 'belong'.)

Before turning to the question of how two terms can be conflated, consider the following two sets of examples. Nominal phrases with the genitive case (93) correspond to sentences (94).

(93) a. sonata Betxovenova
'Beethoven's sonata'

b. roman Dostoevskogo
'Dostoevsky's novel'

c. film Kurosava
'Kurosawa's film'

(94) a. Betxoven sočinil sonatu.
'Beethoven composed a sonata.'

b. Dostoevskij napisal roman.
'Dostoevsky wrote a novel.'

c. Kurosava postavil film.
'Kurosawa produced a film.'

Two things should be mentioned concerning nominal phrases (93): they do not express possession in the same sense in which маšina brata does, but rather the result of some creative activity; their head nouns are not abstract, at least not as abstract as the head nouns in the nominalizations of action-verb sentences.

In some respects nominalizations (93) resemble nominalizations of action verbs; in other they behave like nominal phrases denoting possession. It is claimed that underlying (93) there is a situation model (95), not unlike (92).
A possible surface realization of (95) is an overtly locative construction which is very much like the possessive (91), or the passive locative (29).

(96) Ėtot film' byl v postanovke Kurosavy.

'This film was in Kurosawa's production.'

Since all verbs in (94) are action verbs, two nominalizations will be generated in the same way in which ispolnenie sonaty and ispolnenie pianista were generated for (27d) Pianist ispolnjaet sonatu 'The pianist performs the sonata.' For (94c) these will be postanovka fil'ma and postanovka Kurosavy. However, (93c) fil'm Kurosavy (which is yet another nominalization) is related to (94c) Kurosava postavil fil'm in such a way in which 'sonata pianista' 'the pianist's sonata' can hardly be related to (27d).

Nominal phrases in (93), alongside the general meaning of 'creation' which they all have in common, each express also a distinct meaning of their own, which is clear from their sentential counterparts. It may be said that this specific meaning which is conveyed by the term in the underlying semantic representation, and by the verb in the surface sentence, is included in the head noun of the nominal phrase. In other words, the meaning of musical composition is included in the meaning of 'sonata' (93a), the meaning of literary creation is included in the meaning of 'novel' (93b), the meaning of cinematographic production is included in the meaning of 'film' (93c) etc.

This conclusion is far from being new. Any study in semantics would single out the 'notional core', or generic term, while defining the meaning of a word. It has special significance for the present study, because it confirms the correctness of the postulating in the underlying model of a term which bears this generic meaning.

To what degree the implied relationships within the nominal phrases in (93) and in others of such type are 'regular', and therefore unambiguous, depends on an extra-linguistic context:
cultural, social, professional etc. This is especially true of proper names, which, being purely referential, can stand for any generic notion. If both the head noun and the noun in the genitive case are proper names, then the structure is two or more times syncopic: not only the generic notion of 'creation' is implied, but also one or more specific terms on different levels in the process of generation. Thus 'Doktor Zivago' Pasternaka 'Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago' is doubly syncopic as compared with poema Pasternaka 'Pasternak's poem,' Doktor Zivago X'a 'X's Doctor Zhivago' can be many ways ambiguous, for it can mean a film made by a producer, a role played by an actor, a picture painted by an artist etc. Besides, a situation is not impossible when such a phrase will express possession, and the proper name will stand not for the owner, but for the thing possessed, as in 'Doktor Zivago' moego sosed a 'My neighbor's Doctor Zhivago'. The more specific the implied relation is, the greater restrictions are imposed on the context. In terms of this framework that means a longer way (a greater number of steps) in generating the nominal phrase from the underlying situation model, since a greater number of meaningful terms will have to be incorporated in the superficial noun. For example, both nouns in the nominal phrase can stand for authors, as in Rachmaninov Kliberna 'Cherubin's Rachmaninoff', and this relation of double authorship: musical pieces created by a composer and played by a pianist, will be concentrated in the head noun.

Now a parallel can be drawn between the structures discussed above and the nominalizations of sentences with action verbs. In Chapter II it was shown that an action verb, as well as the related deverbal noun, can be decomposed into two elements, one of which has a general conceptual meaning of 'doing' or 'performing' and the other bears all specific lexical information: rabotaet--osuSchestvijaet rabotu 'works—fulfils the work' exemplifies a verb decomposition, and rabota--osuSchestvenie raboty 'work—the fulfilment of the work', the decomposition of the corresponding deverbal noun. Note that in decompositions the second element also contains a semantic component of 'doing' in its meaning, although this component has been additionally extracted from it into a separate word. It means that osuSchestvenie raboty, for instance, is tautological because one semantic component (sme) is repeated twice. Note also, that it is this tautology, which may also be called information redundancy, or semantic iteration (see Gak 1971), which makes possible the conflation of two elements into one: osuSchestvijaet rabotu--rabotaet. Now, it may be said that when Otec rabotaet 'Father works' is nominalized into rabota otca 'the work of the father', the semantic component of doing is present in the head noun rabota 'the work' because the same nominalization stands also for Otec osuSchestvijaet rabotu. Likewise, when (93a) sonata Beethoven sov roman sonatu, the noun sonata can be regarded as the conflation of the generic concept of 'creating' with a specific term which bears all the additional information about a sonata. In the first case the conflation can generate both the noun rabota and the verb rabotaet.
In the second case only the noun sonata is generated: Russian does not have a surface verb which would interpret the result of the conflation of сочинил sonatu. This fact should be regarded as accidental and language specific, for while there is no such verb as *sonatiruet, there are verbs musiciruet and val'siruet which can be viewed as the respective conflations of пишет/исполняет musicu 'writes/perform music' and исполняет/tancuet val's 'performs/dances a waltz.' For all these reasons sonata Бетховена may be called a nominalization, and similar to работа отца.

By the same token машина брата is said to be the nominalization of any related possessive sentences (85), (89), (90), (91), and the concept of possession to be included in the meaning of the noun which denotes the thing possessed. Therefore the head noun in possessive genitive case phrases of the type presented in (74) can be viewed as the result of conflation. The composite semantic nature of such nouns is manifested in actual language data. Just as работа инженера 'the work of the engineer' is related to инженер находится за исполнением работы 'the engineer is at the fulfilling of his work,' so is дом отца related to отец находится во владении домом 'father is in possession of the house'; and as исполнение работы is conflated into работа, so is владение домом conflated into дом (consider also домовладение 'homeowning', землевладение 'landowning', рабовладение 'slave owning').

Since the underlying models and the processes for action-verb sentences and for possessive sentences are the same, there are many similarities in their various realizations on the surface. Below, various actual Russian structures are grouped together in order to demonstrate such similarities.

Set (97) is a syntactic paradigm of an action verb; set (98) exemplifies the same types of sentences related to such a nominalization where the head noun designates the result of some creative activity; set (99) is a paradigm of possessive structures. Parallel structures come under the same letter in all three sets. Each set starts with a nominalized phrase with the genitive case (a). Examples (b) demonstrate the locative origin of nominalizations, which is evident in the preposition у 'at'. In all three cases the prepositional phrases are paraphrasable with the nonprepositional phrases in (a). Examples (c) - (h) are active sentences to which these nominalizations are related; (i) - (k) are passive sentences.

The localist nature of underlying semantic models is reflected in the overtly locative (b), (e), (f), (j), also in the directional (g), (h), (k). The conflation does not result in a surface verb in (98c) and (99c); these slots are empty. Notice also that although (99e) is awkward and (99g) doubtful, (99f) and (99h) are perfectly normal.
(97) a. rabota inženera
   'the work of the engineer'
b. Rabota u inženera čto-to ne sportitsja.
   'The work of the engineer is not progressing very well.'
c. Inžener rabotaet.
   'The engineer works.'
d. Inžener ispolniaet rabotu.
   'The engineer fulfils the work.'
e. Inžener naxoditsja za rabotoj.
   'The engineer is at work.'
f. Inžener naxoditsja za ispolneniem raboty.
   'The engineer is at the fulfilling of the work.'
g. Inžener pristupil k rabote.
   'The engineer got down to work.'
h. Inžener pristupil k ispolneniju raboty.
   'The engineer got down to the fulfilling of his work.'
i. Rabota ispolniaetsja inženerom.
   'The work is (being) done by the engineer.'
j. Rabota sejčas naxoditsja v ispolnenii
    inženera.
   'The work is now being done (lit. in the execution) by the engineer.'
k. Rabota postupila v ispolnenie inženera
tol'ko včera.
   lit. 'The work came into the execution of the engineer only yesterday.'

(98) a. roman pisatelja
   'the novel of/by the writer'; 'the writer's novel.'
b. Roman u pisatelja tak i ne vyšel v svet.
   'The novel of the writer was never published.'
c. 

d. Pisatel' pišet roman.
   'The writer writes a novel.'
e. Pisatel' sejčas za novym romanom.
   'The writer is now at his new novel.'
f. Pisatel' sejčas ves' v sozdanii novogo
    romana.
   lit. 'The writer is now all in the creation of a new novel.'
g. Pisatel' pristupil k romanu.  
'The writer began (got down to) the novel.'

h. Pisatel' pristupil k sozdaniyu novogo romana.  
'The writer got down to the writing of a new novel.'

i. Roman pišetsja (byl napisan) pisatelem.  
'The novel is being (was) written by the writer.'

j. Ėtot roman naxoditsja sredi lučšix proizvedenij pisatelja.  
'This novel is among the writer's best creations.'

k. Roman ne byl vključen v sobranie sočinenij pisatelja.  
'The novel was not included into the collection of works of the writer.'

(99) a. dom otca  
'father's house.'

b. Dom u otca byl založen.  
'Father's house was mortgaged.'

c. ______

d. Otec imeet dom (vladeet, obладаєt domom).  
'Father has (possesses, owns) a house.'

e. Otec byl v domovladenii.  
lit. 'Father was in homeowning.'

f. Otec byl vo vladenii ėtim domom vse ėti gody.  
'Father has been in the possession of this house all these years.'

g. Otec vstupil v domovladenie.  
'Father assumed (came into) the homeowning.'

h. Otec vstupil vo vladenie domom.  
'Father assumed (came into) the possession of the house.'

i. U otca (est', imeetsja) dom.  
'Father has a house' (passive). lit.  
'At father is a house.'

j. Dom byl v sobstvennosti otca.  
'The house was in father's property.'

k. Dom postupil v sobstvennost' otca.  
'The house came into father's property.'
Summary

Underlying Russian expressions of possession there is a locative situation model. The postulated operation of conversion requires that not only the possessor, but also the thing possessed, may occupy the position of the locative, i.e. the comment. The hypothesis is confirmed by a number of language data. The model, thus, has been shown to have predictive power.

The relationship of conversion, which was shown previously to underly the active-passive opposition in action-verb sentences, has also been shown to underly the same opposition existing among possessive expressions.

The same two processes: conflation and decomposition take place in generating possessive expressions. Conflation can bring about not only a surface verb, but a noun as well. And vice versa, not only verbs, but nouns too may be decomposed. It has been shown that in order to account for the relation of possession, an underlying term with this meaning must be postulated. The conflation of this term with the relator surfaces as a verb, its conflation with another term surfaces as a noun denoting the thing possessed. The process is the same as that which generates surface action verbs or related deverbal nouns. Therefore, semantic relations, such as, for instance, possession or authorship, whether they are expressed by verbs, or implied in nominal phrases, are traced down to a term (terms) in the underlying situation model.

The fact that one and the same surface nominal phrase may express different relations (as is the case with various connotations superimposed upon the meaning of authorship) is explained by a different number of terms which originate at different levels in the situation model and conflate into the surface noun.

Genitive case phrases expressing possession should be considered the nominalizations of possessive sentences for the same reasons for which phrases examined in Chapter II are considered the nominalizations of action-verb sentences. The proposed semantic model provides a uniform description of both types. Numerous superficial parallels reflect the underlying similarity.
CHAPTER IV

Adjectival Complements. Existence and Location.

The term 'complement' is used here conventionally to designate the adjectival part in sentences (100). Since in a localistic model the parts of speech are idiosyncratic surface phenomena, I do not have to elaborate here the premise that adjectives, like verbs and nouns, are one category in the underlying semantic representation.

\[(100)\]

\[\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ Nina umnaja.} & \text{Nina is intelligent.} \\
b. & \text{ Mat' byla pečal'na.} & \text{Mother was sad.}
\end{align*}\]

\[(101)\]

\[\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ u Niny} & \text{'Nina's intelligence' (lit. 'the intelligence of Nina')} \\
b. & \text{ pečal' materl} & \text{'mother's sadness' (lit. 'the sadness of mother')}
\end{align*}\]

Phrases in (101) are called the nominalizations of (100) for the same reasons for which beg mal'čika 'the running of the boy' is called the nominalization of Mal'čik bezit 'The boy is running', or dom otca 'the house of the father' is called the nominalization of Otec imeet dom 'The father has a house.' It may be recalled here that two surface constructions are said to be related by nominalization if the semantic representations underlying them are related to, or obtained from, each other by the operation of conversion. The operation of conversion works on a two-member segment in which one term is in the objective, the other term is in one of the locative cases, and the relator is that of abstract localization. Both members of the conver- sive pair may have various surface realizations: some of them may be overtly locative, while the locative origin of others may be ob- scured by generative processes, such as, for instance, the conflation of two terms, or of a term and the relator.

In the situation model nominalization involves the topic-comment exchange: the term which has been in the locative case, and therefore, the source of a surface verbal, adjectival or other predicate, moves
into the position of the topic in the objective case, and may be realized on the surface as the head noun of a nominalized phrase. As was shown in the preceding chapters, it is not always easy to find overtly locative Russian structures corresponding to both conversives. On the whole, however, there are more locative actualizations in the language than it has been previously believed (see examples in (97), (98), (99)).

If (101) is the nominalization of (100), then the situation models which underly them: (103) and (102) respectively, will be in a converse relationship. Since neither (101), nor (100) are overtly locative, other surface expressions will be sought as evidence of their underlying localism, and parallels will be drawn with possessive and action-verb sentences and their nominalizations.

An overtly locative realization of (103) may take the form of regular possessive sentences (104):

(104) a. U Niny est' um.
   'Nina has intelligence.' (lit. 'at Nina there is intelligence').
   b. U mater'i (byla) pečal'.
   'Mother is (was) sad.' (lit. 'At mother was sadness').

Most often sentences like (104a), which denote inherent property, or inalienable possession, contain a modifier of the noun expressing this property. Thus (105) is more frequent in usage.

(105) U Niny (byl) ostryj (neobyknovennyj, analitičeskij) um.
   'Nina had a keen (unusual, analytical) mind.'

However, sentences like (104a), though contextually restricted, are not impossible. Besides, if more than one inherent properties are mentioned, the absence of the modifier is neither elliptical, nor marked.
Model (102) is said to underly adjectival sentences. Evidently, surface adjectives are generated by a process which is similar to that which generates intransitive verbs from a term and the relator. In fact, a verbal surface sentence (107) will be another realization of (102). Both the verb in (107) and the adjective in (100b) are generated by operations of conflation. Why this operation results in different surface parts of speech will be discussed later. Another possible actualization for (102) is an overtly locative sentence (108) which is generated when conflation does not take place. All three sentences listed below have the same underlying situation model, and the same nominalization, (101b).

(100b) Mat' byla pečal'na.
'Mother was sad.'

(107) Mat' pečal'las'.
'Mother grieved (was sad).' 

(108) Mat' byla v pečali.
'Mother was in grief (sadness).'</p>

The sentences above denote a temporary state rather than an inherent property. Notice that (100a) has no verbal paraphrase. Nina umničaet 'Nina pretends that she is clever' is, of course, possible, but, as the translation suggests, the generation of this particular verb involves more terms and relators to be conflated than just one relator of abstract localization. For the meaning of 'pretending' to be incorporated into the verb, at least one additional level is needed. This is why Nina umničaet is not a paraphrase of (100a) in the sense in which (107) is a paraphrase of (100b).

Inherent property is not expressed by overtly locative sentences of the same type as (108). Normally, expressions like *Nina byla v umě 'Nina was in mind' are ungrammatical. However, a locative structure of such kind might occasionally be observed in an idiom. Consider the following idioms which express locative relations: On ne v svoem umě 'He is not in his right mind,' Ty v (svoem) umě? 'Are you in your right mind?'; also related to them directional expressions, as, for instance, ablative in sojti s uma 'to go mad, to go off one's head', or allative in vchodit' v um (v razum) 'to grow reasonable, to come to one's senses.'

It was observed by linguists that the difference between verbs and adjectives, as well as within verbs and adjectives, consists in the degree of their stativeness or non-stativeness. Some adjectives are
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more stative than others, and adjectives in general are more stative than verbs (Lyons 1968b, Miller 1970). Adjectives denoting inherent property are the most stative because their situation models are never actualized as verbal sentences.

To account for this surface difference, model (102) must be revised. The terms which underly adjectives should be analysed as complex units which themselves are generated from a number of underlying locative structures. At some level in their derivation there is a term with the same type of generic meaning as, for example, the term denoting possession.

For (100a) this generic term can be specified as 'class' (see also Anderson 1971b, Shaumyan 1974: 86). A revised model may look like (109). All terms in the objective except the topmost one denote 'class'. The downward branching of (109) is nonterminal theoretically, because the terms with the generic meaning can be iterated (see (56), (57) for iteration in action verb decomposition). In generating (100a) Nina umnaja the specific term um conflates with the generic 'class'-terms. Depending upon how far the conflation goes the realizations on the surface may contain one or several generic terms, or none. In examples below the number of surface words denoting class decreases from three in (110a) to zero in (100a) where the conflation is complete. Notice the obvious locativeness of most structures denoting class inclusion.

(110) a. Nina - odna iz tex devušek, kotorye otnosjatsja k klassu umnyx ljudej.
   'Nina is one of those girls who belong to the class of intelligent people.'

b. Nina otnositsja k klassu (razrjady, kategori) umnyx ljudej.
   'Nina belongs to the class (rank, category, type, sort) of intelligent people.'

c. Nina otnositsja k umnym ljudej.
   'Nina belongs to intelligent people.'

c'. Nina - umnyj čelovek.
   'Nina is an intelligent person.'

c". Nina - umnaja devuška.
   'Nina is an intelligent girl.'

(100) a. Nina umnaja.
   'Nina is intelligent.'
As far as (100b) is concerned, the modification of the model will consist of the introduction of a 'state'-denoting term. The overtly locative (111) demonstrates how this term may appear on the surface if no conflation takes place.

(111) Mat' byla v sostojanii pečali (radosti, veselija, unynija).
    'Mother was in the state of sadness (joy, gaiety, depression).'

This inclusion of this generic term into the specific one results in the surface noun, also in a locative construction (108). A subsequent conflation with the relator brings about a surface verb (107), or an adjective (100b).

Thus, the difference between inherent property and temporary state is explained by the presence of one of the two generic terms in the underlying model: 'class' or 'state' respectively. This difference is manifested on the surface in the ability of the adjective denoting a temporary state to be paraphrased into a verb, or into a noun in a locative sentence, which means that sentences like (107) and (108) are possible only for the temporary state model. Besides, the form of the deadjectival noun in a genitive case phrase may also express this difference. Some speakers of Russian would insist that in the following pairs the first noun expresses a permanent quality, and the second a temporary state: veselost' - veselie 'gaiety', rassejannost' - rassejanie 'absentmindedness', unylost' - unynie 'despondency'.

On the other hand, this semantic difference disappears (or is neutralized) in adjectival sentences, and also in most nominalizations. Both meanings can be conveyed by an adjective, as is shown in (100a) and (100b). Moreover, one and the same adjective can have both meanings, that is to say, it can denote either a class inclusion or a state: On veselyj čelovek 'He is a joyful person', On (segodnja) veselyj (v sostojanii veselosti) 'He is full of joy today (in the state of gaiety)'. Besides, in nominalizations, deadjectival nouns like veselost', unylost', rassejannost' which have been said to denote inherent property, may sometimes denote a temporary state as well, cf. ego prirodnaia veselost' his natural joyfulness' and ego včerašnjaia veselost' 'his yesterday's joyfulness'.

The neutralization (which is always based on hidden similarity) suggests that the two revised models proposed above are not adequate, or rather that it is incorrect to postulate two distinct models: one involving class inclusion, i.e. abstract localization within a class, the other—localization within a state. In any event, the ontological status of 'being in a certain state' is not quite clear. One possible solution will be to say that both meanings may originate
from a class-membership model, and that for the 'state' interpretation a term denoting 'temporariness' might be introduced. Then 'being in a state of unhappiness' would be interpreted as 'being temporarily in the class of unhappy people.'

Now I wish to examine another type of adjectival structures related to nominal phrases with the genitive case. The relationship of conversion, which is explicated by models (102) and (103), implies that both terms may alternately occupy the position of the locative. It has been demonstrated that if a term conflates with the relator, a superficial adjective is generated. So far all adjectives have been generated from one such term in the locative, namely from model (102). As it turns out, the operation of conflation applied to a converse model, that is to (103), will also result in a surface adjective. In this way adjectival phrases (112) are generated.

(112) a. materinskaja pěčal'
    'mother's (maternal) sadness'

b. devičij um     
    'girl's cleverness'

c. mal'čišeskaja derzost'
    'boy's (boyish) insolence'

Model (103), therefore, is the common source for both the genitive case structure (101b) pěčal' materi and the adjectival structure (112a) materinskaja pěčal'. My framework corroborates the traditional view concerning the similarity between adjectival and genitive case attributes.

Pěčal' materi may mean either 'sadness of any mother', and thus refer to any member (all members) of a class, or it may mean 'sadness of the (my, his) mother', and refer to a definite person. Materinskaj pěčal' is usually associated with the first meaning. The latter fact seems to impose certain restrictions on the underlying term in the locative: it must have a generalized meaning of 'class'. If phrases (112) are analysed through model (109), it will mean that their generation cannot involve the top branch in which the term denotes a concrete person. Of course, each branch of (109) must first be transformed into a converse one in order to generate (112).

These restrictions imply that proper names (which are purely referential, i.e. unable to represent a class) are the least likely candidates to generate an adjective. They explain, for instance, why an adjective cannot be generated from the term underlying the genitive Nin in um Nin. There are counterexamples, however. Even if forms like Ninin um 'Nina's cleverness', materina pěčal' 'mother's sadness' are left aside, and only bona fide adjectives are considered, there still can be found adjectives in Russian which are derived from proper names, as in (113).
It is true that in the derivation of these adjectives from proper names a considerable number of steps are involved, and that some of them may include class membership as part of their meaning. For instance, (113a) and (113b) can be interpreted as 'one of Chekhov's heroes/Chopin's études', or else they may have a wide spectre of connotations, e.g. 'a person who looks, behaves, dresses like one of Chekhov's personages' (cf. 'a Chekhovian character'). Even (113c) allows for similar interpretations due to the metaphoric usage of the proper name Hamlet, although here class membership is excluded.

But it is also true that any one of these examples can be interpreted without any connotation of class inclusion. In (113d), the uniqueness of both terms precludes a class-membership interpretation altogether. On this last reading phrases (113) denote authorship, and are related to the genitive case nominal phrases (114) in the same way in which materinskaja pečal' is related to pečal' materi.

In the remaining part of this chapter location and existence will be explored through their relatedness to nominal constructions with the genitive case. It will be shown how locative and existential sentences are related to possessive sentences, and to adjectival phrases.

That the genitive case phrases in (115) originate from a locative situation model is evident from their sentential paraphrases (116).
(115) a. l'vy Afriki
   'the lions of Africa'
b. slony Indii
   'the elephants of India'c. aromaty Aravi
   'the perfumes of Arabia'd. ljudi zemli
   'the people of the earth'

(116) a. L'vy naxodjatsja (živut, obitajut) v Afrike.
   'Lions are found in (live in, inhabit) 
   Africa.'b. Slony obitajut (živut...) v Indii.
   'Elephants inhabit (live in) India.'c. Èti aromaty vyvozjat iz Aravii.
   'These perfumes are exported from 
   Arabia.'d. Ljudi živut na zemle.
   'People live on earth.'

The obviousness of these trivial examples is significant. They 
are locative not only in the depth, but on the surface as well. It 
can be said about the genitive case phrases in (115) that they also 
express location. Whatever other connotations can be read into 
them, their primary meaning of physical localization remains intact.

Both possessive and adjectival structures can be found in 
Russian which are paraphrases of (115) and (116), e.g. V Afrike 
imejutsja (passive 'have') l'vy 'There are lions in Africa', Aravija 
obladaet ekzotičeskimi aromatami 'Arabia has (possesses) exotic 
perfumes'; also afrikanskie l'vy 'African lions', indijskie slony 
'Indian elephants', aravijskie aromaty 'Arabian perfumes.' It is 
only a matter of lexical resources of the given language that (115d) 
ljudi zemli do not have an adjectival form.

Thus, the common origin of adjectival, possessive and 
locative-existential sentences can be proved proceeding from both 
sides: not only are possessive and adjectival expressions considered 
locative because their paraphrases can be locative in form, but 
also sentences expressing physical location can, in their turn, be 
paraphrased as possessive or adjectival structures.

How close adjectival and locative structures are, and how 
extensively the Russian language resorts to their similarity, can be 
illustrated by the following stanza from Tyutchev's lyric. The 
example needs no further comment.
One observation concerning physical location is worthy of mention. In (117) there are two instances of adjectives derived from locatives. The locative \(v \text{ lesu} \) 'in the wood' is repeated as the adjective \(\text{lesnoj} \) 'in the wood' (lit. 'wood's). The preposition of localization \(v \) 'in' is not overtly present in the adjective. The other prepositional phrase \(gory \) 'down the hill' (lit. 'from the hill') is, in fact, directional (ablative), and the locative would be \(na \) 'on the hill.' It is from this implied locative that the adjective \(\text{nagornyj} \) 'hillside' (lit. 'on-the-hill's') is derived. The preposition \(na \) 'on' which denotes a specific location 'on top of something' (also 'on the surface') is carried over from the locative phrase onto the adjective, where it becomes a prefix. Notice that the preposition \(v \) 'in' cannot function as an adjectival prefix, and that *\(v\text{lesnoj} \) is impossible. In adjectives examined earlier, as well as in the genitive case phrases, there has been no surface morpheme to be considered the trace of a preposition of location. Besides, if such adjectives have been paraphrased into locative structures, the preposition of abstract localization has, in most cases, surfaced as \(v \) 'in'.

In (118) each example describes a specific physical location, i.e. a specific position of an object relative to another object. The prefix of each adjective copies the preposition denoting this specific position. Non-prepositional genitive case paraphrases are impossible.

(118) a. ulica \(na \) 'on (top) the hill' -- 'hillside street'
   b. kanava \(pridorožnaja \) 'ditch beside the road' -- 'roadside ditch, gutter'
   c. korm \(pod \) 'under feet' -- 'pasture (lit. under-feet forage)'.
d. mešok za plečami—zaplečnyj mešok (but *mešok pleč)
   'sack behind shoulders'—'knapsack'

e. nomer nad vorotami—nadyrattyj nomer (but
   *nomer vórot)
   'number over the gate'—lit. 'over-
   the-gate number'

In the situation model underlying each of the above expressions there must be a term which contains the specific information about the object's position. This specific information requires explicit realization on the surface. It may be recalled at this point, that generalized concepts, such as 'possession', 'authorship', 'class-membership' etc., are not explicitly present in the surface adjectives (cf. dom v sobstvennosti soseda--sosedskij dom 'the house in the property of my neighbor--my neighbor's house'). The concrete and specific meanings of phrases in (118), however, are expressed by distinct linear elements.

It is accidental that this underlying term takes the form of a preposition on the surface. Like other parts of speech, prepositions are surface categories, and are, therefore, language specific. It is not accidental, however, that there exist such paraphrases of prepositions in which a noun is easily discernible: na gore 'on the hill'—naverxu gory 'on-top the hill'—na samom věrхu gory 'on the very top of the hill'. Historically, many Russian words which function as prepositions are noun case forms. Their structure is transparent: the noun is quite distinct from the preposition, e.g. naverxu 'on-top', vbliži 'near', speredi 'before, in front of' (compare the English 'behind', 'ahead', 'beside'). In my framework, this is another instance of the work of the dialectical process of conflation--decomposition. Conflation conceals the locational term in the surface preposition na 'on'; the decomposition extracts this term and makes it overt: naverxu 'on the top.'

Interestingly, some of such composite prepositions have the preposition v 'in' in front of the noun element, although in the conflated form they are realized as different words.

(119) a. vverxu/naverxu piramidy--na piramide
   'on the top of the pyramid'—'on the pyramid'

   b. vbliži dorogi--pri doroge, u dorogi.
   'near the road'—'at the road, beside the road.'
A close examination of (119) reveals the following: 1) composite prepositions _vverxu, vnizu_ consist of preposition v 'in' plus the locative grammatical case of nouns verx 'top', b1iz 'nearness, proximity', niz 'bottom'; 2) the composite prepositions govern the genitive case, whereas the conflated forms govern different cases. It means that the surface prepositions originate from underlying terms denoting location by conflation with the relator of abstract localization.

It might seem that preposition v 'in', since it denotes the most abstract notion of location, should be considered the realization of this relator. Indeed, it is the only preposition which is used with generic terms: v sostojanii 'in a state', vo vladenii 'in possession', v processe 'in process'. This interpretation of v, however, contradicts one of the principal statements of my theory, namely, that no surface word actualizes the relator. I maintain, therefore, that v also originates from an underlying term. My argument is that v denotes not only abstract, but also physical location 'inside', and as such, it can also be shown to contain a term, cf. v pešcere 'in the cave' and vnutri pešcery 'inside the cave.'

In conclusion I will discuss the generation of the verb _byt_ 'be'.

In Chapter I it was mentioned that by common effort of a number of linguists the number of categories in the base component is being gradually reduced. One by one parts of speech are removed from the underlying structures and considered as surface forms of some basic semantic categories. The verb 'be', however, is very seldom if ever encroached upon. What is more, it is either implied, or openly stated to be one of the few (no matter how few) basic categories. Thus, Miller (1974) leaves 'be' as the only verb in the deep structure, and reduces all other parts of speech, including verbs, to 'nouns'. Bach (1968), who postulates one category ('contentive') for what he calls full parts of speech, does not state explicitly whether 'be' should also be derived from a 'contentive', but from the way he glosses his base component it follows that 'be' is not a 'contentive', but rather a separate category. Bashiri (1973) goes still further when he claims that 'be' preceeds other 'linguistic primitives.' His viewpoint is clearly proclaimed in the title of his book 'To Be' as the origin of syntax.

An opposite view is held by Lyons (1968b) who excludes 'be' in all its functions, existential as well as copulative, from the base. To prove his standpoint he draws examples from Russian, Greek and Latin where the copula is facultative in the unmarked present tense.
In my analysis of 'be' I will resort to the same device which I have employed throughout this paper while discussing the origin of different surface words: if a surface verb, adjective or a preposition are paraphrasable as locative structures, or if nominalizations are found for this word, then this word is considered to be generated from an underlying term.

Both existential and copulative byt' are found in such nominalizations as bytie, bytnost' 'being, existence.' Besides, certain nouns expressing existence or non-existence are used as paraphrases of byt': naličie 'presence, availability,' prisutstvie 'presence,' naxoždenie 'being, presence,' otsutstvie 'absence'. The following examples are self-explanatory. In (120) and (121) the nominalized 'be' is existential, in (122) locative, in (123) and (124) copulative.

(120) U kogo bytie,
    A unego eda i pitie
    Opredeljajut soznanie (Mayakovskij).
    'For some, it is existence, but
    for him--it is eating and
drinking that determine
consciousness.'

(121) kanut' v nebytie--perestat' byt' (žit')
    'to sink into non-existence'--
    lit. 'to stop being (living)'

(122) kogda diplomat byl v Moskve--v bytnost'
    diplomata v Moskve
    'when the diplomat was in Moscow'--
    lit. 'in his being in Moscow'

(123) kogda on byl studentom--v svoju bytnost'
    studentom
    'when he was a student'--lit. 'in his
    being a student'

(124) esli budet kvorum--pri naličii kvorum
    'if there is a quorum'--lit. 'in there
    being a quorum.'

As it was the case with action verb decomposition, numerous examples of nominalizations of byt' are found in bureaucratic and pseudo-scholarly jargon. Indeed, instead of a 'too simple' verbal expression: tak kak v splave est' uglgerod 'because there is carbon in the alloy' one is more likely to come across a nominalization: fakt prisutstvija uglgeroda v splave 'the fact of the presence of carbon in the alloy.' Instead of a clause: esli plan ne budet vypolnen 'if the plan is not fulfilled', an official would say: pri otsutstvii vypolnenija plana 'in the absence of the fulfillment of
the plan.' Iteration and tautology can be found in such nominalizations,
as in other decompositions, as for instance in the following masterpieces of bureaucratese: otsutstvie naličija 'the absence of presence', naličie otsutstvija 'the presence of absence', and even naličie prisutstvija 'the presence (being) of presence.'

The fact that byt' nominalizes like other verbs suggests that in the semantic model a term denoting 'being' can be postulated. The relator in such model will be that of abstract localization, the most abstract and general localization which can be expressed in a natural language.

The locative nature of existential sentences can be interpreted in more than one sense. Thus, in Lyons' words:

...from the point of view of their semantic analysis, existential sentences might be described as implicitly locative (or temporal). The assertion that something exists, or existed, requires 'complementation' with a locative (or temporal) expression before it can be interpreted. (Lyons 1968b: 390).

On his interpretation, in 'Lions exist' the location at a place (or in time) is implied, and only in this sense this existential sentence may be called locative.

I believe that existential sentences may be considered locative in yet another sense. If the place (or time) of location is not expressed, then the object is just placed, or located, in 'existence'. Thus, in (121) a location in, or rather motion to, non-existence is expressed. Consider also Anderson's example from English: 'There are giants in existence' (Anderson 1971b: 112).

Summary

Surface adjectival complements originate from a term in the locative. Like verbs, they are generated by the process of conflation. Adjectival sentences and their nominalizations are derived from situation models which are related to each other by conversion. Situation models for adjectival sentences and their nominalizations are similar to those underlying expressions of possession.

Inherent property is accounted for by postulating an abstract location in a 'class', and a hierarchy of generic terms denoting 'class'. Temporary state can also be explained through class-inclusion, the difference will be in the number of steps in derivation.
The same term in the locative which underlies the noun in the genitive case underlies also an adjective. A common origin accounts for their functional similarity in the surface syntax: they both play the role of an 'attribute' to the noun. Any noun, even a proper name, which is found in the position of the comment in the situation model, can be the source of an adjective. Nominal genitive case phrases, as well as adjectives can mean not only abstract, but concrete location as well.

Neither prepositions, nor the verb 'be' represent the situation relator: both are generated from a term. The relator, therefore, cannot be lexicalized. In other words, no surface lexical item can be regarded as an interpretation of the relator.
CONCLUSION

The results of the investigation of concrete language material were summarized at the end of Chapters II-IV. These were mainly generalizations about relationships between various sentence types in Russian and their nominalizations. I will not repeat them; instead I will touch upon the methodological aspect of this study.

An abstract hypothetico-deductive model has an advantage over inductive generalization. Not all its constructs need necessarily find interpretations in the real language. It is necessary, of course, that a considerable part of the hypothetical system should correspond (up to isomorphism) to empirical data. But the main requirement which such a system must satisfy is its internal consistency, for only in this case it possesses predictive power and presents an adequate apparatus for describing relations among language structures.

A localist model provides for wide generalizations and allows to establish relations which are obscured by surface peculiarities. The proposed variant of a localist model differs from the existing ones in that it introduces topicalization into the underlying situation model, whereas usually this operation is considered to take place on the surface level, i.e. when all forms and relations have already shaped up. It is believed that this modification allows for a more systematic account of a number of surface phenomena. Thus, it is easier to explain the lexical realization of the verb on the surface, if an early topicalization is postulated in the depth, i.e. when a choice among conversives of the type posylat'--poluchat' 'send--receive' is made at the start of derivation.

The conclusion that verbs, adjectives and nouns are not different categories in the deep structure is not new. It has not been my primary task to prove it because the hypothetical model itself postulates their identity in the form of an amorphous term. If I mention it on several occasions it is done only because nominalizations, if viewed in the proposed framework, prove to be an effective instrument for reaching down into the deep structure and relating different surface parts of speech to one common source. It is a new result, however, that such 'relational' categories as prepositions and 'be' also originate from a term. In this light the notation adopted can be evaluated. It was implicit in my argumentation that
if a surface verb, adjective, or preposition could be paraphrased into a noun phrase which is at least formally locative, then this noun phrase should be considered the closest interpretation of the underlying situation model. Glossing underlying terms as nouns appeared not only convenient, but also consistent with the logic of the model.

Reducing all surface categories to a term, and all relations to locative ones, may have interesting implications for describing the modal aspect of the sentence. Mood, tense, modal verbs are usually regarded as superordinate relations over the proposition. My framework can be extended so that a corresponding term is postulated for each such relation, and the whole (tenseless) situation can be viewed as 'located' in this term. The surface evidence will again be found in nominalizations, e.g. *в прошлом 'in the past', в настоящем 'in the present, at present', он не в состоянии сделать 'he is in no condition to do it' (from он не может сделать 'he cannot do it').

It has been argued elsewhere (e.g. Kacnel'son 1970) that it is wrong to interpret generative process, which is sometimes called a grammar for the speaker, only as synthesis, and a grammar for the listener as analysis. In generation, both analysis and synthesis are involved. In the proposed framework analysis begins at the beginning of generation with the binary segmentation of multi-actant situation into topic-comment structures. Another example is co-existence of two opposite processes of conflation and decomposition. The actual work of these two processes has been demonstrated on the Russian language material. It has been shown that decomposition is very 'active' in the language and that a whole stylistic tendency is based on it which consists in using nominal rather than verbal constructions.

This tendency appears to be characteristic not only of the Russian language. I wish to conclude with several English examples from Edwin Newman's book *Strictly Speaking* (Newman 1974). The special value of these examples is the 'non-linguistic' purpose of the author who collected them. The book represents a purely stylistic evaluation of certain trends in Modern English usage, and the author is far from being impartial, of course (which is evident from the tell-tale subtitle: 'Will America be the death of English?'). This means that the structures which he discusses do not simply exist in the language, but that they seem to be growing in number and are becoming, in his words 'the death of English.' In his numerous examples one can find all manifestations of word-decomposition similar to the ones which have been discussed in this study. One word is decomposed in two elements, one of which is a generic term: 'thunderstorm activity', according to Newman is preferred to 'thunderstorms', 'shower activity' to 'showers' (p. 23),
'confidence factor' to 'confidence' (p. 24), and 'traffic situation' to 'traffic' (p. 180). Abundance of overtly locative phrases used instead of verbs and adjectives is significant. 'Any number of people', writes Newman, 'might render the line in the television commercial, "I ate the whole thing," as "I ate the thing in its totality" (p. 9); 'Psychologists no longer speak of children playing but of children in a play situation... People burying their dead are now said to be in an acute grief situation' (p. 24); in the academic world 'somebody talking to somebody else is considered to be engaged in information transfer' (p. 42); and at a party convention it is 'not thought proper merely to say that somebody has been nominated. He or she has to be placed in nomination' (p. 92).

The following two examples taken at random from a magazine article can be added to Newman's in order to illustrate the nominalization of (negative) 'be': 'in the absence of strong actions'; and the decomposition of a modal verb into a locative structure which results in informational redundancy: 'they need to put themselves in a position to deal with runaway union demands' (cf. 'they must deal with...') (US News and World Report, Nov. 10, 1975, p. 34).

It remains to be investigated to what extent various language categories and relations lend themselves to a localist analysis; also whether nominalizations can be used as the instrument for such analysis. It is to be supposed that the generative processes of conflation and decomposition are linguistic universals. However, because of the limited material studied I am unable now ('not in a position,' that is) to prove this supposition.
Allan (1970), Anderson (1973), Miller (1972) have proposed localist analyses of verb aspect.

Shaumyan (1974) defines the operation of conversion differently. In his theory, the operation of conversion consists in such an exchange of places among the actants, that each actant retains its semantic role. For example, a term in the locative, which is in the comment, may change its place and become the topic, remaining however in the locative. What I understand by conversion, i.e. the change of places and of roles, Shaumyan calls 'the renaming of the terms' ('pereimenovanie termov'). My model does not admit any conversion in Shaumyan's sense since the binary segments should be organized uniformly, the topic always being in the objective case. Therefore, when the actants change places they are bound to change their semantic roles as well.

It will be of some interest to mention here Barxudarov's (1973) observations to this effect. He maintains that nominalized phrases with deverbal nouns present evidence of certain ergative features in the Russian language, as well as in other nominative languages. Assuming that the characteristic feature of an ergative system is one and the same case form for the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb, the ergativity in Russian can be found in nominalized phrases: 

`president prinjal delegaciju--priem delegacii prezidentom 'the president received the delegation'--'the reception of the delegation by the president';
Ivan priexal--priezd Ivana 'John arrived'--'the arrival of John.'`

The genitive case in both nominalized phrases, alternating with the direct object in the first sentence and the subject in the second sentence, is a trace of ergativity. The actants which are similarly shaped in nominalization go back to one semantic case--'objective' ('absolute', 'common', 'nominative' in other terminologies)--juxtaposed to 'ergative'case of the agent, which, in a nominalized Russian phrase correlated with a transitive-verb structure, is expressed by the instrumental prezidentom 'by the president.' Obviously, the ergative, which designates a performer, or a source of an action, will be the ablative in the model proposed here.

Here is one indirect, though significant, evidence of a certain 'markedness' of have-sentences in Russian. It is a known fact that in the speech of bilingual or near bilingual people,
patterns of both languages interfere with each other. According to my observations, the longer a native Russian has lived in an English-speaking community the more likely he is to use a have-sentence instead of a locative one, e.g. Ja imeju vremja 'I have time' instead of 'U menja est' vremja' (lit.) At me there is time.' Still more significant is not this very slight shift in the preferred pattern (after all, the first sentence is a perfectly normal Russian sentence), but the reaction to such usage on the part of a 'fresh' Russian, who would invariably note: Èto ne po-russki 'It is not Russian.'

5 I consider this to be theoretically uninteresting in the same sense in which it is uninteresting, for example, to deny the existence of polysemy, and consider each meaning of a polysemantic word to be a separate word, and as such, unrelated to its other meanings.

6 A dictionary or encyclopedia definition will be an excellent example of how the generic meaning is singled out in a word, and then the specific information is added. See Webster's definition of a sonata: 'a composition for one or two instruments, usually in three or four movements contrasted in rhythm and mood but related in tonality and having unity of sentiment and style.' Pottier (1965) calls this generic meaning 'archisme.'

7 The Russian term svojstvo (from the possessive pronoun svoj 'one's own') denoting the function of adjectives is no less suggestive than the English term 'property.'
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