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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines the subjectlike properties of datives in three sentence types in modern Russian. The term "subjectlike" is used to mean syntactic and semantic behavior characteristic of the grammatical relation "subject of the sentence." It is a term enjoying wide currency in contemporary generative-transformational grammar. As Keenan (1976), Timberlake (1976), and Chvany (1975) have shown, the traditional grammatical relation of subject might most accurately be described as a bundle of semantic and syntactic properties rather than as a structural absolute. This novel approach to the notion of subject has inspired the present study, which is an attempt to explain the general intuition that the datives in sentences (1) through (3) perform subjective functions, and that such sentences truly are not subjectless, as Russian textbook grammars traditionally assert.

(1) Mne xolodno zdes'.
   to me cold here
   (1') I'm cold here.
(2) Nam e^ce nazad exat'.
   to us still back to go
   (2') We still have to go back.
(3) Ptice ne letitsja.
   to bird not flies
   (3') The bird just cannot fly.

1
It will be shown that in many respects the datives in sentences of these types can justifiably be termed subjects. Both semantic and syntactic evidence will be offered to support this claim.

The methodology on which the core of this study is based is that of the extended standard theory of transformational grammar as conceived by Chomsky (1965). This methodology makes it possible to specify the ways in which diverse morphological forms exhibit identical syntactic behavior. Other theoretical frameworks might serve equally well to demonstrate that datives might perform subjective functions, but none of these has been applied in a systematic and comprehensive study of the problem. This is rather surprising in view of the fact that acceptance of the principle of nonnominative subjects in modern Russian has become somewhat commonplace.

From the very beginnings of Russian syntactic study, datives in certain types of sentences have been recognized as subjectlike, although for only a brief period in the 1860s and 1870s did linguists label these datives podležačee. For most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, linguists have used the term subjekt in reference to the datives of sentences such as (1) through (3) above. The term is best translated as "logical subject." Throughout the present paper, we shall employ the term "subjective dative," which we prefer to such alternate labels as "dative complements of
one-part sentences," "datives in subjectless sentences," and "datives in impersonal sentences." Unfortunately, there is no completely unbiased label for sentences of the type investigated in this paper. The traditional Russian term "one-part sentence" may be appropriate for those sentences describing situations in which neither a logical subject nor predicate could be postulated, e.g., (4) and (5), but it is debatable whether sentences such as (1) through (3) should be regarded as "one-part." Certainly it would be self-contradictory for us to use the label "one-part" while attempting to prove that the datives are indeed subjects of bipartite sentences.

(4) Morosit. \[(4')\] It's drizzling.

(5) Uže pozdno. \[(5')\] It's already late.

Equally inappropriate, in our view, is the term "subjectless" to describe the sentence types we are dealing with. We cannot very well call (1) a "subjectless" sentence and then proceed to demonstrate that its dative, mne, is a subject. Whether we shall be successful in presenting a sound case for dative subjecthood remains to be seen. But even if we should fail in that purpose, we will surely be justified in eschewing the misleading term "impersonal sentences." All of the sentences with which we shall be concerned contain animate (usually human) experiencers of a psychological state, an
event of physical perception, a condition of modality. These experiencers (marked dative) are certainly more personal than the inanimate and inactive nominative subjects of (6) and (7), which according to convention occur in personal sentences.

(6) *Voda ne *Mista.*  
*water not clean*  

(7) *Eta kni*ça ne interesuet  
*this book not interests menja.*  
*me*  

(6') The water is not clean.  
(7') This book does not interest me.

We feel the tag "impersonal" should be restricted to sentences such as (4) and (5) which truly lack a personal referent.

In Chapter I, the history of subject study in Russian linguistics will be traced from Lomonosov's foundations to the latest edition of the Soviet Academy Grammar. In particular, we shall focus on the issue of oblique-case subject-hood. Chapter II presents the salient features of Chomsky's model of grammar with summarizations of important post-Chomskian works, including the case-grammar model, along with a description of the efforts of transformationalists working on Russian problems. Chapter III examines the body of sentence types herein investigated, concentrating on the meaning and usage of three basic sentence structures: "category-of-state" sentences with subjective datives; infinitival sentences with subjective datives; and sentences containing third-person singular forms of -sja verbs and
subjective datives. Chapter IV analyzes in detail the behavior of subjective datives in the contexts outlined above with respect to thirteen syntactic phenomena, namely: subject-verb agreement, the second dative problem, svoj and SEBJA behavior, equi-NP deletion, topic-controlled deletion, gerund formation, adverbial clause reduction, conjunction reduction, subject raising, passivization, nominalizations, and comparative reduction. In Chapter V the results of the analyses in Chapter IV are tabulated and hierarchized. The diversity of evidence (syntactic as well as semantic) adduced in Chapters III and IV is interpreted and the implications for the notion of "subject" in Russian are discussed in Chapter V. Finally, the insights gained from our investigation of subjective datives permit us to suggest certain amendments to the extended standard theory, namely recognizing the validity of basic case relations in deep structure.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1See Li (1976) for a number of pertinent articles on
the notion of subject and topic properties.

2The term подлежащее is best translated as
"grammatical subject," and in most Russian and Soviet works,
it is distinguished from "logical" or "psychological"
subject, for which the term субъект is used.
CHAPTER I

Before beginning our examination of the subjectlike behavior of datives in specified sentence types, which is based on the principles of current American generative-transformational grammar, it does not seem inappropriate to discuss the evolution of the basic concepts of subject and predicate in Russian linguistics. The purpose of this chapter is to explain the traditional criteria of subjecthood and demonstrate the inaccuracies and inadequacies of these criteria.

Study of the sentence and syntax in general developed relatively late in Russia. Lomonosov's monumental Rossijskaja grammatika of 1755, the most revered grammar of the language until the early nineteenth century, does not once make use of the term "subject." His syntax did not embrace units larger than the word phrase. The sentence and its principle parts fell under the heading of rhetoric. In the Rossijskaja grammatika, Lomonosov developed the concepts of government, concord, voice, transitivity (all of which are essential for the discussion of subject and predicate), but he did not systematically apply these categories to the analysis of the sentence. The subject and predicate relations were discussed in the rhetoric section of his manual
for eloquent speaking and writing (Lomonosov 1840). Here the term podležaščee was used to designate "the thing under consideration," and the term skazuemoe to denote "what we think about the podležaščee." These categories together with the element which links them are Lomonosov's principal parts of the sentence. He used the term predloženie to mean "spoken or written reasoning or thought." Here then is the outright equation of logical and grammatical concepts, which was the view of grammar espoused by the universalists of the West.

Lomonosov's student, A.A. Barsov, was the first Russian grammarian to concentrate on the sentence as a unit of linguistic inquiry. Barsov began the practice (which became rooted in Russian linguistic tradition) of using the terms podležaščee and skazuemoe to designate "grammatical subject" and "grammatical predicate" respectively (the exact meanings of which have fluctuated over the centuries) and subjekt and predikat to denote "logical subject" and "logical predicate." Barsov also began the practice of postulating "silent" elements to give sentences a logical tripartite structure with a subject, predicate, and linking unit. For example, Barsov argued that the predicate of (8) is the silent element dolžno 'necessary', the subject is the infinitive govorit' 'speak', and they are linked by the copula bylo 'was'.
Sentence (8) has a grammatical paraphrase containing dolžno, and Barsov held that these sentences are structurally identical.

(9) **Mne dolžno bylo govorit'.** (9') I had to speak.

In addition to infinitives, Barsov permitted entire clauses to be termed "subject." For example, in (10) the clause introduced by čto 'that' is considered the subject of the predicate, kažetsja 'seems'.

(10) **Każetsja, čto grom budet.** (10') It seems there'll be thunder.

The originality and boldness of Barsov's theories becomes apparent when one compares them with those presented in the Academy Grammar of 1802, which was published eleven years after Barsov's death. In that work, all discussion of the sentence and its principal parts is left to rhetoric and logic in the Lomonosov tradition, and the grammar amounts to exhaustive lists of verbs with comments on usage. Unfortunately, these lists really were not exhaustive, and no systematization of syntactic and semantic relations was even attempted.

One of the most influential Russian grammarians of the first half of the nineteenth century, N.I. Greč, was heavily indebted to the western universalists. He defined the sentence and its main elements in the classical way:
The subject is the entity under discussion, and the predicate is that which is said about the subject. Furthermore, a linking unit (often omitted) unites the concepts of subject and predicate. (Greč 1840:92)

All languages, Greč asserted, have nominative subjects, but in addition to these, Russian permits the subject to be in the genitive case in sentences containing negated existential verbs, e.g.,

(11) Brata moego net doma. (11') My brother isn't of brother my not at home home.

(12) Krovavogo vina ne stalo. (12') There was no red of red wine not existed wine.

No other oblique case, in Greč's view, can serve as a subject.

Like Barsov, Greč maintained that the core of the sentence is the verb, without which there is no sentence. Just as Barsov relied on "silent" elements, Greč found it necessary to postulate such units to complete his grammatical descriptions. For example, the structure of (13) in Greč's theory is (14):

(13) Byt' tebe nakazannym. (13') You are sure to be to be to you punished punished.

(14) byt' nakazannym LINK dolžno tebe to be punished must to you predicate subject

The structure of (15) is (16):

(15) Mne xoçetsja pit'. (15') I feel like drinking.

to me wants to drink

(16) pit' LINK xoçetsja mne to drink wants to me subject predicate
And the structure of (17) is (18):

(17) Mne kažetsja, čto on nezdorov.  
(17') He seems ill to me.

(18) čto on nezdorov  LINK  kažetsja mne  
that he unwell  seems to me

It is to be noted that Greč continued Barsov's practice of regarding the datives in sentences such as those above as part of the predicate, while ascribing subject status to infinitives as in (13) and (15), clauses as in (17), or even adverbs as in (19).

(19) Mne xolodno.  
(19') I'm cold.

The structure of (19), according to Greč, is (20):

(20) xolodno  LINK  mne  
cold  to me

A.X.Vostokov's Russkaja grammatika of 1831 was especially influential in the history of syntactic study in Russia. Perhaps the most important new idea presented in that work was the notion that "personal" simple sentences in Russian consist not of three principal parts, as Lomonosov, Barsov, and Greč maintained, but of two -- the subject and the predicate. Vostokov thus disposed of the linking unit, arguing that it is a component of the predicate. This view represented an important divergence from the practice of equating logical and grammatical concepts. Vostokov's definitions of subject and predicate, however, are
Vostokov held that subjects are dispensable for a large body of sentence types but no sentence can exist without a verb. In his view, "impersonal" sentences consist of a single principal part, the predicate. Thus the dative in (21) for example is considered to be a complement to an impersonal predicate:

\[(21) \text{Učit'sja vsjakomu polezno.} \quad (21') \text{It is useful for to study to everyone useful everyone to study.}\]

V.V.Vinogradov's important survey of Russian syntactic study (Vinogradov 1955) lists the names of scores of grammarians who contributed to the study of syntax in nineteenth-century Russia. Unfortunately, the majority of these obscure writers' works are unavailable in the West. Consequently, we must rely on Vinogradov's summarizations of their contents and his evaluation of their worth. Among the linguists cited by Vinogradov are the following individuals who argued that other cases besides nominative can mark subjects: P.Beljaevskij, N.Bogorodickij, V.N.Novakovskij, V.Klassovskij, V.L.Filipp'ev, and F.I.Buslaev.

The genitive case form was the most widely acknowledged nonnominative subject marker in nineteenth-century Russian syntactic theory. In addition to the more obscure writers, such major linguists as Greč and Buslaev believed that
genitives in the context of negated existential verbs could function as subjects. Recognition of dative subjects, particularly when the dative marked a personal pronoun or human substantive was also not uncommon. The example mne xočetsja... 'I feel like' appeared in numerous monographs of the period; the dative pronoun mne was held to be the structural equivalent of the nominative subject in the paraphrase sentence, ja xoču... 'I want'. V.Klassovskij compared the sentences below and observed that the nominative and dative pronouns refer to one and the same person and the same characteristic is attributed to that person in each sentence. On these purely semantic grounds, Klassovskij argued that the dative in (22) is a subject.

(22) Mne ne spitsja. (22') I just can't sleep.
    to me not sleeps
(23) Ja ne splju. (23') I'm not sleeping.
    I not sleep

As further support for the dative subject hypothesis, Klassovskij offered the following piece of structural evidence. The dative form on the predicate adjective of (24) is assigned by the grammatical principle of subject-predicate agreement in a way analogous to nominative assignment to the predicate adjective of (25). The principle of subject-predicate agreement, in his view, includes case concord.

(24) Mne nel'zja byt' veselu. (24') I cannot be happy.
    to me not possible to be happy
(25) Ona vesela. (25') She is happy.

Less universally accepted as a nonnominative subject marker was the instrumental case. Novakovskij argued that the subject can be rendered by the instrumental form in sentences such as (26):

(26) Gromom ubilo Ivana. (26') Ivan was killed by
by thunder killed Ivan
thunder.

The instrumental here marks the force or agent which accomplishes the action of killing, and therefore that element represents the subject, in Novakovskij's reasoning. Klassovskij, on the other hand, argued that the true subject of (26) is not expressed and is understood to be a higher force which controls such natural events as thunder and lightning. Both Novakovskij and Klassovskij, therefore, exhibit a tendency to favor an agentive meaning of subject.

Finally, even the locative case was considered capable of performing the subject function by some of the more extreme opponents of the nominative theory.¹ V.L.Filipp'ev was one such extremist. He provided the following example, in which the sentence-initial locational phrase serves as a subject:

(27) V bogatom žit'e kak v more. (27') A rich life is in rich life as in sea like the sea.

F.I.Buslaev is certainly the most prominent figure in the list of adherents to the nonnominative theory. Careful perusal of his monumental Istoricheskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka, however, has convinced us that Buslaev does not
belong in the group of radical nonnominativists. To be sure, he devoutly believed in the bipartite structure of all Russian sentences, including "impersonal" sentences, i.e., that all Russian sentences contain subjects and predicates. For example, sentence (28) contains a subject even though it is not overtly expressed. Buslaev argued that its subject is hidden in the verbal desinence.

(28) Smerkaetsja. (28') It's getting dark.

Buslaev (1959:273) pointed out that western languages employ semantically empty pronouns to fill the subject slot of such sentences, e.g., (29) through (31), while Russian employs verbal morphology to achieve the same end, e.g., (28), (32), and (33).

(29) Il pleut. (French) (29') It's raining.
(30) Man sagt. (German) (30') It is said...
(31) It's cold. (English)
(32) Govorjat, ¥to... (32') It is said that...
   they say that
(33) Tiše edeš', dal'¥e budeš'. (33') The slower you go, slower you go farther you be the farther you'll get.

Buslaev was eternally the target of Potebnja's ire because of his "heretical" view that the verb can contain its own subject, and because of Buslaev's acceptance of nonnominative subjects. But Buslaev (1959:273) explicitly states that the datives in structures such as mne xočeetsja... 'I feel like...' can be regarded as the subject only in a
logical sense. The grammatical subject, he argued, is concealed in the verbal ending. The dative's function in such structures, then, is to mark the subject, while the podležaše is contained within the verb. Buslaev called the dative of mne xočetsja... a complement (dopolnenie) to the reflexive verb. He argued that the dative "replaces" the nominative subject of the paraphrase sentence, ja xoču, but this is not to say the dative is a subject.

Buslaev accepted genitive subjects in the context of negated existential verbs, comparing the genitive and nominative forms in the following pair of sentences:

(34) Est' den'gi.   (34') There is money.
    exists money
(35) Net deneg.   (35') There is no money.
   not exists of money

But it should be recalled that acceptance of genitive subjects was already widespread in Russian linguistics prior to Buslaev's works, e.g., Greč.

Buslaev's unique approach to "impersonal" sentences, then, lies not in regarding oblique-case nominals as subjects but in imposing a bipartite structure on all Russian sentences.

In the 1870s and 1880s, study of the sentence as a grammatical unit and its historical development held center stage in Russian linguistics. Buslaev's theory of the bipartite structure of Russian sentences had become widely accepted. The debate over the morphological means of
expressing subjects grew more and more heated. In the list of adherents to the nominative theory, which gained favor toward the close of the century, were such writers as K.D. Ušinski, A.A. Dmitrevskij, G.A. Milovidov, and of course, A.A. Potebnja.

Ušinski classified all sentences into two categories: direct sentences (прямое предложение), in which the topic of discussion (предмет речи) appears in the nominative case and is therefore to be called a subject (подлежащее), and oblique sentences (косвенное предложение), whose topic of discussion is in an oblique case and cannot be labelled a subject. This is an interesting theory for several reasons. First, it differentiates topics and subjects, which had never been done before by Russian grammarians. It observes that topics do not obligatorily assume the nominative case form. It destroys the purely semantically-based definition of subject by injecting a morphological criterion. A subject is, therefore, a nominative topic.

A.A. Dmitrevskij departed from the commonly-held view of subject as one of the principal parts of the sentence. In his grammar, the verb is not only the sentence core in the semantic sense, but it governs all cooccurring nominals, including the subject. A nominal functioning as the sentence subject exerts some influence on the predicate, he conceded, and this is expressed morphologically in verbal agreement. But even this influence is inconsistent, as (36) illustrates.
The plural verb form of (36) registers logical agreement rather than grammatical agreement. The subject, in Dmitrevskij's opinion, is but another complement, answering "the question of the nominative case." Just what this "question of the nominative case" entails, however, Dmitrevskij did not impart. This curious theory of subject did not take root in nineteenth-century Russia, but the idea that subjects are governed by the verbal core of sentences has resurfaced in various twentieth-century works, e.g., Fillmore 1968b, Anderson 1971b, Kilby 1972.

The best case for the nominative theory is presented by A.A. Potebnja's work, Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike, in which subject was defined as follows:

> The subject (podležasce) of a main sentence is the overtly expressed entity which represents the direct producer (neposredstvennyj proizvodi tel') of the characteristics defined by the predicate. (Potebnja 1874:117)

From this definition, one can conclude that Potebnja rejected all "understood" or "implied" subjects outright, and that he was prejudiced in favor of agentive subjects, i.e., subjects do and act. Not only does he reject implied subjects, he even refuses subject status to nominative pronouns which convey "no new information." For example, Potebnja claims that (37) contains no subject, but (38) does, because the
pronoun of (38) bears emphatic stress, and this emphasis is new information.

(37) *Ja skazal ...* (37') I said ...  
I said

(38) *Ja skazal ...* (38') It was I who said ...
I said

But Potebnja's own examples disprove his case, since the personal pronoun in both (37) and (38) serves a specifying function which could not be rendered by the verb alone, i.e., the pronoun *ja* specifies person, while the verb *skazal* specifies only gender, number, and tense.

Potebnja was faced with a dilemma forced by his narrow view of subject. He had no means of differentiating subjectless sentences of the type illustrated by (39), in which there is an obvious personal referent, namely the first person singular pronoun, from the subjectless sentences for which no logical subject is conceivable, as in (40).

(39) *Govorju.* (39') I am speaking.  
I speak

(40) *Rassvetaet.* (40') It is getting light.  
dawns

He simply termed both types "subjectless."

Potebnja particularly disliked the grammatical theories of Buslaev, as noted above, and rejected vehemently the views that all Russian sentences have a bipartite structure and that subjects could have any case marking other than nominative. He placed the burden of proof on the nonnominativists, whose views began to recede in prominence by the end
of the century.

In the twentieth century, the nominative theory (with certain modifications) has become the standard view of subject. A.M. Peškovskij's much-respected Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osvešćenii offered the following highly conservative definition of subject:

The subject designates the acting entity which creates the characteristic expressed by the verbal predicate. (Peškovskij 1956:183)

As in the works of Potebnja and other subscribers to the nominative theory, Peškovskij's definition of subject bears a pronounced agentive bias. Continuing the reasoning of Vostokov and Potebnja, Peškovskij set up an array of one-part sentence types (odnosostavnoe predloženie), which contain no subjects and for which no "understood" or "silent" subjects are even postulated. Sentences such as (41) are considered "one-part" even though their verbal morphology directly indicates an "acting person":

(41) Ljublju. (41') I love.

Peškovskij's views on subject were based completely on morphological considerations. Only substantives and pronouns marked nominative have the ability to function as subjects, in his theory. Peškovskij (1956:203) asserted that in (42) the infinitive pit' 'to drink' is not a true subject, because an infinitive cannot designate an object (predmet) to which a characteristic can be ascribed. Yet he concedes that the
infinitive has a subjective function syntactically and must be distinguished from infinitives used in "impersonal sentences."

(42) Пит' чай в трактире (42') Drinking tea in an inn has a different significance for servants.

(42) Pit' čaj v traktire
     to drink tea in an inn
     imeet drugoe znacenie
     has different meaning
     dlja slug.
     for servants

Песковский was not unaware of the limits imposed by his narrow definition of subject. It dismayed him that the terms "subjectless" and "impersonal" failed to capture the basic structural and semantic differences manifested by the following pair of sentences:

(43) Mne bylo xolodno exat'. (43') It was too cold for me to go.

(44) Mne bylo svojstvenno krasnet'. (44') It was characteristic of me to blush.

Песковский (1956:355) called the infinitive of (43) an adjunct to the predicative word, xolodno, but termed the infinitive of (44) a subject replacer (заместитель подлежащего). It is puzzling why he refused to label such infinitives as those in (42) and (44) as subjects, especially since he felt they performed subjective functions, and the precedent for regarding infinitives as potential subjects had been set by such early theoreticians as Barsov and Греб."  

As noted earlier, Песковский rejected all nonnominative subjects. This included genitives in the context of negated existential verbs, dative in infinitive constructions (such
as sentence (43) above), instrumentals marking some uncontrolled force or instrument by which an action is achieved, e.g.,

(26) Gromom ubilo Ivana. (26') Ivan was killed by thunder.

A.A. Saxmatov's theory of subject is not appreciably different from Peškovskij's. Saxmatov (1944:21) promises to use the terms sub"ekt and predikat in reference to "psychological notions" and the terms podležaščee and skazuemoe in reference to "grammatical notions." This practice, as earlier observed, had been established long before by Barsov. But the term "psychological" is Saxmatov's own and presumably is interchangeable with the earlier "logical."

Saxmatov (1944:28) asserted that in every communication there must be a sub"ekt and a predikat, but not necessarily a podležaščee and a skazuemoe. He divided all Russian sentences into two groups: one-part sentences and bipartite sentences. In the former, both the sub"ekt and predikat are incorporated in a single sentence component, while in the latter, the two are expressed in separate components. These separate components deserve the labels podležaščee and skazuemoe, in his view, only if a manifest grammatical bond exists between them. This bond is subject-verb agreement. Thus, although (45) is a bipartite sentence, the dominant component (gospodstvujuščij sostav), vol 'ox', and the
dependent component (zavisimyj sostav), sil'nee lošadi
(stronger than a horse) exhibit no explicit grammatical bond,
no predicative agreement, and therefore cannot be called
podležaščee and skazuemoe respectively.

(45) Vol sil'nee lošadi. (45') An ox is stronger
    ox stronger than a horse

Following this line of reasoning, Šaxmatov denied the
designation, podležaščee, to infinitives, as in (46):

(46) Umirat' i vam budet (46') You also will be
to die also to you will
    strašno. terrifying

Šaxmatov (1944:134) acknowledged that the infinitive
in (47) is very subject-like in meaning, that the word veselo
'fun' is analagous to a predicative adjective, as in (48),
and that this instance of veselo is quite different from
that of (49):

(47) Katat'sja veselo. (47') It's fun to skate.
to skate fun

(48) Katanie bylo veseloe. (48') The skating was fun.
skating was fun

(49) Zdes' veselo. (49') It's fun here.
here fun

These obvious truths notwithstanding, Šaxmatov insisted that
without agreement to mark a grammatical bond between the main
members of a bipartite sentence, there is no grammatical
bond in fact, and consequently, no podležaščee, no skazuemoe.

In spite of his determination to be consistent in the
use of the terms sub"ekt and predikat as opposed to
podležašće and skazuemoe, Šaxmatov contradicts himself more than once. For example, sentences like (50) he terms odnosostavnoe besskazuemo-podležašćnoe 'one-part predicated less subjective sentences'. By the criteria he laid out above there can be no podležašće in such a sentence, because one-part sentences contain neither subjects nor predicates!

(50) Takaja beda! (50') Such woe!

Similarly, the label odnosostavnoe skazuemo-bespodležašćnoe 'one-part predicative-subjectless sentences' is ill-chosen to describe a sentence such as (51).

(51) Ax kak mil! (51') Oh, how sweet (he is).

Concerning nonnominative subjects, Šaxmatov denied their validity, since oblique-case forms cannot control predicate agreement. Even though they may be psychologically perceived as subjects, oblique cases mark the complements of the main components of one-part sentences, e.g., the dative in (52) is not a subject, but a complement.

(52) Xorošo nam s toboj (52') Life goes well for us here with you.

Vivetsja.
lives

In post-Šaxmatov Soviet grammars, a somewhat less restrictive view of subject has been formulated, and predicative agreement is no longer held to be the sole criterion for determining subject status. E.M.Galkina-Fedoruk's study of "impersonal" sentences lists nine
grammatical forms which can mark subjects, and these are generally accepted in current orthodox Soviet theory:

1. substantives in the nominative case;
2. concrete pronouns in the nominative case;
3. substantivized adjectives, participles, numerals in the nominative case;
4. quantifiers in combination with substantives in the genitive case;
5. substantives in the nominative case in combination with the preposition с 'with' and the instrumental case;
6. infinitives;
7. any noninflectable but substantivized word;
8. entire phrases;
9. entire clauses.

The Academy Grammar (1960:378) points out that infinitive subjects generally are restricted to sentences with predicate nominals, as in (53), but certain verbs can serve as predicates to infinitive subjects, e.g., (54):

(53) Vstreчит' друга — это (53') To meet a friend is бoliшая радость. a great joy.
     to meet friend it big joy

(54) Kurit' zaleсяет. (54') Smoking is banned.
     to smoke is banned

The Academy Grammar (1960:379) asserts that (55) is a normal bipartite sentence which happens to have an infinitive subject, whereas (56) is a one-part sentence in which the
infinitive functions as a complement.

(55) Sidet' odnomu doma - (55') Sitting alone at home
   to sit alone at home
   skučno.
   boring

(56) Sкуčno sidet' odnomu (56') It is boring to sit alone at home.
   boring to sit alone
   doma.
   at home

The argument for this claim rests on the intonational pause which separates the infinitive phrase from the rest of the sentence in (55), which allegedly marks a constituency break between subject and predicate, and the absence of such a pause in (56), indicating the sentence contains but a single component. Thus, phonological patterns have been introduced into the equation to determine sentence structure.

Galkina-Fedoruk's detailed but unfocused study of impersonal sentences in Russian revealed that the concepts of subject, predicate, and complement are still poorly defined. Her definitions, like Peškovskij's and Šaxmatov's, are morphologically founded, but she eliminates the prerequisite of predicative agreement to assign subject status to nominals. For example, (57) is considered a personal bipartite sentence whose subject is the nominative substantive ljudi 'people', while (58) is considered an impersonal, one-part sentence whose "main member" is the genitive complement of the negative existential, net.

(57) Est' ljudi na marse. (57') There are people on exists people on Mars

(58) Est' net. (58') There is nothing. (58') There is nothing.
The patriarch of post-Saxmatov Soviet linguistics is V.V. Vinogradov. Among his numerous contributions, however, little original work in sentence analysis can be found. The clearest statement of his theory of sentence structure is presented in the monograph, *Osnovnye voprosy sintaksisa predloženija* of 1955. In that work, Vinogradov decries the rarity of syntactic studies treating Russian on its own terms. In this connection, he appeals for more study of the one-part sentence, the relationship of intonation to sentence structure, and the significance of new and old information for sentence structure.

Vinogradov praises Saxmatov for attempting to systematize one-part sentence types, but criticizes the incompleteness and inconsistent terminology of his work. Vinogradov himself appears to have reached the unhappy conclusion that attempts to label the components of one-part sentences in terms of subject and predicate are futile. He dislikes the approach of regarding such sentences incomplete. In his view, they do not lack anything, and the practice of postulating "understood" elements in order to make them look like bipartite sentences is vacuous. Thus, Vinogradov continues the line of reasoning that one-part sentences comprise a separate class of sentences, that the oblique-form nominals which have a subjective meaning cannot
be termed podle\textsuperscript{a}M\textsuperscript{ee}.

The 1970 Soviet Academy Grammar edited by \v{S}vedova has followed up on several of Vinogradov's suggested lines of investigation, particularly with respect to word order, sentence intonation, and analysis of one-part sentences. The Academy Grammar (1970:560) reiterates Vinogradov's contention that the main member of a one-part sentence is neither a subject nor a predicate, because it does not occur with a second member in a predication relationship. The 1970 work has introduced some new terminology for describing one-part sentence types. In the so-called "nominal class" of one-part sentences, the main member is a substantival word, which may assume an oblique-case form. For example, the genitive is the main member of (59):

\begin{align*}
(59) & \text{Na nebe ni oblaka.} \quad (59') \text{There's not a cloud in the sky.} \\
\end{align*}

In the so-called "conjugated verb class" of one-part sentences, the third-person singular verb form is termed the "main member," and no syntactic label is afforded the genitive which accompanies the verb:

\begin{align*}
(60) & \text{Vremeni ne ostaetsja.} \quad (60') \text{There's no time left.} \\
\end{align*}

Sentences (59) and (60) clearly demonstrate the inadequacy of a morphologically-founded categorization of one-part sentences, since the genitives in both perform identical syntactic and semantic functions, i.e., to mark the nominal whose existence is denied by the negative particle. It makes
little sense to call the genitive in (59) a main member while refusing the label to the same genitive in (60). Similarly, in sentences of the so-called "adverbial class," the main member is the adverbial-form predicate (including short-form neuter singular past passive participles in -to and -no), e.g.,

(61) Ne polučeno otveta. (61') No answer has been not received of answer received.

And in sentences of the "infinitival class," the main member is an infinitive in combination with the negative particle, while the genitive once again gets no syntactic label, e.g.,

(62) Ego ne uznat'. (62') One wouldn't of him not to recognize recognize him.

A new syntactic class is created in the 1970 Academy Grammar to embrace other oblique-form substantives cooccurring with adverbials, infinitives, and third-person singular verbs in one-member sentences, i.e., the class of "determinants" (determinanty). The Academy Grammar (1970:624) defines "determinant" as an independent sentence element not grammatically bound with any one part of the sentence but modifying the sentence as a whole. There are two types of "determinants":

1. "circumstantial determinants," which convey local, temporal, causal, purposive, conditional, comparative, and limitational information. In the following examples, "determinants" are enclosed in parentheses:
(63) (So storony sada) raz-
from side of garden
dajutsja golosa.
resound voices

(63') From the direction
of the garden comes
the sound of voices.

(64) (Pervogo maja) budet
of first of May will
parad.
parade

(64') On the first of May,
there will be a
parade.

2. "subjective-objective determinants," which specify the entities perceived as the "subject," "the bearer of a condition," or the "addressee, the affected person." Again, "determinants" are enclosed in parentheses:

(65) Kak (nam) postupit'?
how to us to proceed

(65') How are we to proceed?

(66) (Dlja rebenka) zdes'
for child here
syro.
damp

(66') It's too damp here
for a child.

(67) (S toboj) ne do šutok.
with you not to jokes

(67') There's no joking with
you.

The 1970 Academy Grammar's treatment of subjective-objective oblique-form nominals as a subset of the larger class of sentence determinants is a bold theoretical step in Soviet linguistics, a step in the direction of a localist view of case and syntax. Particularly interesting is the fact that the traditional label "complement" (dopolnenie) has been eschewed in favor of the new term "determinant" within the context of "one-part" sentences.

The 1970 Academy Grammar reflects another trend in Soviet syntax, i.e., the recognition of a broader range of bipartite sentences. Now held to be grammatical predicates are comparative-degree adjectives in sentences such as (68),
comparative phrases introduced by certain conjunctions, e.g., (69), and clauses of purpose introduced by čtoby 'in order to':

(68) Syn umnee. (68') The son is smarter.
    son smarter

(69) Šum slovno na jarmarke. (69') The racket is like at a fair.
    noise like at fair

(70) Čta mašina čtoby sneg ubirat'. (70') This machine is for removing snow.
    this machine to snow to remove

It is impossible to summarize in a few sentences so many diverse views of subject, but perhaps we can at least extract their major features. If nothing else is clear, it can be said with impunity that the concept of subject has been, continues to be, and promises to remain an imprecisely defined grammatical category in Russian. The definitions borrowed from the classical Western tradition - that the subject is what is being discussed, and the predicate is what is being said about the subject - simply fail in Russian. These are definitions not of subject and predicate, but of topic and comment. In Mne xolodno 'I'm cold', for example, how can it be denied that the dative mne designates what is being discussed, and the predicative xolodno designates what is being said about mne? Likewise, definitions of subject as "the producer of an action" (see Potebnja and Peškovskij) are inadequate, as only subjects which are agentive are covered. In short, semantically-based definitions of subject are inevitably insufficient.
For most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, subjects have been seen as substantives with nominative-case marking. Some early theoreticians included infinitives, phrases, and clauses in the list of possible subjects, but later in the nineteenth century and for most of the twentieth century, these units were excluded from subjecthood. In recent decades, the domain of the bipartite sentence has been increasing in Soviet linguistics, and a greater variety of morphological forms are now accepted as potential subjects, but still, oblique-form nominals are shunned. The 1970 Academy Grammar invented the term "subjective determinant" to describe the datives in sentences of the Mne xolodno type, but this really sidesteps the question, "Is the dative a subject?"

One of the most widely accepted parameters of subjecthood is the manifest grammatical bond of predicative agreement, but even this yardstick has been found insufficient, and Galkina-Fedoruk and the 1970 Academy Grammar have abandoned it, arguing that infinitives, phrases, clauses can perform the syntactic function of sentence subject. Consequently, morphologically-based definitions, like semantically-based definitions, do not account for all possible occurrences of subjects.

It would be an ideal situation if once and for all an accurate, exhaustive definition of subject could be stated after reexamining the facts through the prism of a new and
improved theory of grammar such as that which has been evolving in the West since the appearance of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* in 1956. But unfortunately, just as there is no unanimity among generative-transformationalists on what the optimal model of grammar must entail, there is considerable disagreement on the nature of basic grammatical relations and on the function of subjects in particular. In brief, transformational grammar has not yet succeeded in providing the much-sought exhaustive definition of subject. Still, it has given linguists a powerful set of tools with which to pursue the quest.

In the following chapter, we shall present the salient features of several of the more interesting transformational analyses of Russian subjects. But before that discussion, we must briefly consider the general treatment of subject in Chomsky's extended standard theory.
NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1 These concise remarks on Barsov’s contributions were gleaned from Vinogradov (1958).

2 Barsov used the terms umolcanoe podlezashche and umolcanoe skazuemoe to designate "understood subject" and "understood predicate" respectively.

3 Again, these remarks are condensed from Vinogradov (1958).

4 Greč’s description of xolodno as an adverb has been modified in Soviet theory. Ščerba coined the term "category of state" for such words, and that label is widely accepted. Whether the "category of state" is a legitimate part of speech, however, is highly questionable.

5 This was the view held by V.V. Novakovskij, for example.

6 We shall return to Klassovskij’s argument that datives perform like subjects with respect to the principle of predicative agreement in Chapter IV.

7 As its name suggests, the nominative theory contends that only substantives and pronouns which bear the nominative case form are to be considered grammatical subjects.

8 The views of these three writers are excerpted from Vinogradov (1958).

9 This notion that a language can have two types of sentences differentiated by the form of the topic is currently regaining favor (see Keenan 1976).
Though not a Slavist, Noam Chomsky has profoundly influenced the course of Slavic syntactic study. The model offered in his *Syntactic Structures* (1956) and later refined in *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965) has been used as a theoretical framework for analyzing Slavic syntax by such prominent linguists as Edward Klima, Rudolf Růžička, John Ross, David Perlmutter, Catherine Chvany, Leonard Babby, Richard Brecht, and Robert Rothstein. Following is a summary of the salient features of the so-called extended standard theory of transformational syntax, hereafter to be abbreviated ATS (for *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*).

ATS posits the existence of two primary levels of syntactic description - surface structure (readily accessible) and deep structure (an abstract level where basic grammatical relations and cooccurrence and selectional restrictions are defined). These syntactic levels are distinct and separate in the ATS model. Surface structures are derived from deep structures by the application of a set of transformational rules, which apply cyclically in a fixed sequence, starting with the most deeply embedded sentence. The derived syntactic structure feeds a separate phonological component, which provides a phonetic
representation for the utterance. Both the phonological and semantic components are interpretative, i.e., they ... utilize information provided by the separate syntactic component concerning formatives, their inherent properties, and their interrelations in a given sentence. Thus, the syntactic component of a grammar must specify, for each sentence, a deep structure that determines its semantic interpretation and a surface structure that determines its phonetic interpretation. (Chomsky 1965:16)

Chomsky proposed the following phrase structure rule for the sentence:

\[(71) \ S \rightarrow \text{NP} + \text{VP} \]

(71) describes the following phrase marker:

\[(72) \ S \]
\[ \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \]

(72) states that the sentence consists of two immediate constituents, a subject (NP) and a predicate (VP). This is the view presented by Buslaev, for example, who argued that all sentences have a bipartite structure. Subject in ATS has a configurational definition, i.e., the NP immediately dominated by \( S \). Immediate domination by \( S \) is what distinguishes subjects from other NPs, which are embedded under intermediate nodes, e.g., \( \text{NP}_2 \) in (73).
This mechanical definition of subject, however, is valid only for an abstract level of syntactic description, as Chomsky points out:

In base structures, there is apparently never more than a single occurrence of a category such as NP in any structure immediately dominated by a single category, and our definitions of these notions relied on this fact. But this is not true of surface structures. In the sentence, "This book I really enjoyed," both "this book" and "I" are NPs immediately dominated by S. Apparently, then, order is significant in determining the grammatical relations defined by surface structures (not surprisingly), though it seems to play no role in the determination of grammatical relations in deep structure. (Chomsky 1965:220)

Chomsky refrains from assigning categorial labels to subject, object, and predicate in the phrase marker itself. His definition of the concept "subject of" is not very enlightening, however:

...the relation holding between the NP of a sentence of the form NP-Aux-VP and the whole sentence. (Chomsky 1965:69)

It apparently was not Chomsky's purpose to develop fresh definitions of the traditional syntactic categories, but rather to develop a practical notational convention.
In the ATS framework, the absence of overt subjects in a number of sentence types is explained by the operation of a deletion transformation. Imperatives, for example, are treated as bipartite in deep structure. The deep subject is deleted in the course of the derivation. The deep subject node must be filled in order to account for the correct assignment of person and number on the verb form, e.g.,

(74) *Poedemte!* (74') *Let's go!*
    go
    1st pl.

(75) *Sidi tixo!* (75') *Sit still!*
    sit
    still
    2nd sing.

(76) *Načinajte!* (76') *Begin!*
    begin
    2nd pl.

Similarly, the ATS framework would posit a deep subject for what Šaxmatov called "definite-personal subjectless sentences," e.g.,

(77) *Ljublju vas.* (77') *I love you.*
    love
    you
    1st sing.

(78) *Vsjakuju vešć' nado umet'* (78') *You must know how every thing must know how to take each and vzjat' - ponimaš'?
take understand
    to take understand?
    every thing,
    2nd sing.

Likewise, according to the ATS approach, Šaxmatov's "indefinite-personal subjectless sentences" have deep subjects, e.g.,

(79) *Tiše edeš', dal'še budeš'.* (79') *The slower you go slower go farther will be the farther you'll get.*
    slower go
    farther will be
    2nd sing. 2nd sing. get.
Although Chomsky prepared no exhaustive list of base phrase-structure rules, it appears that his grammar requires a filled subject node. One of Chomsky's students, Barbara Hall, however, convincingly defended the hypothesis that the subject node can be absent from certain deep phrase markers. For example, deep phrase markers built around the verb "break" might have a vacant subject node, but must have a filled object node. The verb "break" is thus inherently transitive, i.e., always transitive in deep structure. In surface structures, however, the situation is reversed. The verb must have a subject, and optionally takes an object. In other words there is only one lexical entry for "break" and it can occur in transitive sentences such as (81) or intransitive sentences such as (82).

(81) John has broken the window.

(82) The window has broken.

Hall (1965:25) argues that the deep structure of (81) contains a filled subject node, the agent "John," while sentence (82) has no subject in deep structure. The surface subject "the window" is created transformationally by object preposing.

A very similar treatment of passive and middle-voice sentences has been offered in recent works based on Russian data, e.g., Babby and Brecht (1975), Babby (1975a) and
Chvany (1975). In these works, it is proposed that certain verbs be subcategorized as requiring a filled deep object node and an optionally filled deep subject node. If the deep structure phrase marker has an empty subject slot, the object is fronted to fill that slot. To mark the operation of this object-preposing rule, the reflexive particle -sja is left as a trace and is automatically attached to the verb. Thus sentences (83) and (84) are derived from identical deep structures in which the object node must be filled (in this case by kalitka 'gate').

(83) Ivan otkryvaet kalitku. (83') Ivan is opening the gate.

(84) Kalitka otkryvaetsja Ivanom. (84') The gate is opened by Ivan.

In (85) the subject node is vacant in deep structure, and therefore the object NP, kalitka, obligatorily moves to the left, leaving -sja as a trace on the verb.

(85) Kalitka otkryvaetsja. (85') The gate is opening.

Babby (1975a) suggested that in some cases, a sentence might totally lack a deep subject node. Such a sentence is (86):

(86) Ego tošnilo ot pišči. (86') He was nauseated by him sickened from food.

The verb tošnit' would be subcategorized as requiring a direct object and optionally taking a prepositional complement, while forbidding object preposing.
Chvany's dissertation showed the great potential of the ATS framework for studying the various types of sentences lacking nominative subjects. Chvany (1970:72) showed that sentence (87) is ambiguous, a fact which can be explained only by postulating two separate underlying structures which by "conspiracy" have the same surface structure.

(87) Nužno čitat' Sobolevskogo. (87') It is necessary to read Sobolevskij.  
(87") What is needed is reading Sobolevskij.

The structures underlying (87) are (88) and (89), which gloss as (87') and (87") respectively.

Chvany asserts that the deep subject of (88) is an animate pro-form, which in this case is not lexicalized. If a lexical item were inserted to fill the subject slot of (88), Chvany says it would be marked dative, as the verbal entry nužno is subcategorized for an animate dative subject. In (89), on the other hand, Chvany posits the deep subject is the entire S, which is rendered in surface structure by the infinitive phrase, čitat' Sobolevskogo. Chvany's acceptance of the concept of dative subjects is based on such evidence as the occurrence of the reflexive pronoun under identity
with a dative antecedent, as in (90), and the occurrence of
datives with predicatives which take accusative objects, as
in (91):

(90) Dumaja ob ètom, emu bylo (90') Thinking about it,
thinking of it to him was he was ashamed of
stydno za sebja.
shameful for self

(91) Emu žal' sebja i svoju (91') He feels sorry for
to him pity self and his himself and his
mat'.
mother

Another adherent of the ATS framework, Micklesen offers
a different account of the deep and derived structure of
sentences containing subjective datives. According to
Micklesen (1968), in sentence (92), the dative marks the
subject of a deep-structure embedded sentence, while the
subject of the deep matrix sentence is a pro-form having the
following feature matrix:

```
+pro
-anim
+neut
[-pl]
```

This pro-form is freely deletable and is the underlying
subject of all "impersonal" sentences in Russian, in his
theory.

(92) Emu prixoditsja sil'no (92') He has to severely
to him comes strongly strain his voice.
naprjagat' golos.
to strain voice

In Micklesen's analysis, the dative is assigned to the
embedded subject when the embedded verb, naprjagaj-,
infininitivizes, at which point the embedded sentence ceases to
be a sentence and is transformed into an NP. Following this
reasoning, one cannot label the dative, *emu*, a subject in surface structure. Its syntactic function has been altered by the transformation of infinitivization, which destroys the integrity of the embedded sentence. Let us illustrate the derivation schematically. The deep structure of (92) is (93).

(93)

The following rules apply to derive the surface structure of (92), which is phrase marker (94).

1. Nominalization of $S_1$ by infinitivization of *naprjagaj-. (This destroys node $S_1$, and $NP_1$ is no longer a subject).

2. Dative assignment to $NP_1$. (This is not explained).

3. Definitivization of the indefinite subject, $NP_0$ by the embedded sentence. Thus the feature matrix of $N$ under $NP_0$ becomes:

   $\begin{bmatrix}
   +\text{pro} \\
   -\text{anim} \\
   +\text{def} \\
   +\text{neut} \\
   -\text{pl}
   \end{bmatrix}$

4. Case assignment to the subject, $NP_0$. (This marks $N$ under $NP_0$ nominative).
5. Agreement of subject and predicate. (This explains the surface form of the verb *prixoditsja* as third person singular).

6. Deletion of the pro-form, $NP_0$.

7. Rearrangement of word order, moving $NP_1$ to the left of *prixoditsja*.

(94)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{N} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{emu} \quad \text{prixoditsja} \quad \text{naprijagat'} \quad \text{golos} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Inf} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{NP}_1.0 \\
\text{N} \\
\end{array}
\]

Micklesean's analysis explains the surface forms well enough, but his infinitivization transformation remains rather mysterious, and the syntactic status of the dative is unclear. His analysis makes a claim which we find counterintuitive, namely that the dative marking on *emu* is assigned by virtue of the pronoun's proximity to an infinitive, rather than as a result of its semantic function marking the goal or location of the modality rendered by the verb *prixoditsja*. In Russian, datives accompany a wide range of modal lexical items, e.g., *możno* 'may', *nužno* 'must', *nel'zja* 'cannot', *predestoit* 'must' to mention a few. We believe Chvany's treatment of the dative NP as a deep subject of the modal verb is easier to justify semantically
than Micklesen's analysis. In addition, her treatment does not require an ad hoc rule to rearrange word order so that the dative ends up to the left of the verb.

One of the major modifications of the extended standard theory of transformational grammar is the case grammar model, which was developed by Charles Fillmore and presented in his classic, "The Case for Case" (1968b). Fillmore's model denies the validity of the grammatical relations of subject, predicate, and object in deep structure. The first PS rule of his grammar, then, is not \( S \rightarrow \text{NP} + \text{VP} \). Instead, he offers this view of basic sentence structure: \( S \rightarrow \text{Mod} - \text{Aux} - \text{Prop} \), where Mod = modality, Aux = auxiliary, and Prop = proposition. The first two units are not well developed concepts in Fillmore's writings. Modality is a general term to embrace sentence adverbials, negation elements, interrogative elements, and the like. Auxiliary covers matters such as tense, aspect. The real heart of the model is the proposition, which:

\[
\text{includes the verb and all those nominal elements which are relevant to the subcategorization of verbs. (Fillmore 1969:366)}
\]

These nominal elements were termed deep cases in Fillmore (1968b) but later renamed actants (Fillmore 1969). They represent basic universally valid semantic units, including such concepts as Agent, Object, Location, Goal, Source, Experiencer, Instrument, Force.
The surface categories of subject, predicate, and object are created transformationally in the case grammar model. There is a fixed pecking order for subject selection, which Fillmore calls "primary topicalization." That order is determined by the meaning of the verb, but generally speaking, if an Agent is present in the proposition, it is selected. If it is not selected, the sentence must have a passive form. According to convention, subject selection promotes the actant immediately adjacent to the verb on the right to the front of the sentence, i.e., to the left of the verb.

Some of the more interesting case-grammar analyses of Slavic syntactic problems are Channon (1971), Nichols (1973a), Klenin (1974), and Ružičková (1970). In recent years, an attempt has been made to integrate the advantages of Fillmore's view of case as semantically based with the advantages of Chomsky's ATS model. Chvany (1975) is the most successful of these efforts. In that important work, Chvany argues that Fillmore is right in his view that basic semantic categories such as Agent, Patient, and Experiencer belong in deep structure, but at the same time, so do the basic grammatical relations of subject, VP, and object. Other writers have reached the same conclusion (see Lee 1971 and Klenin 1974).

Nichols (1973a) maintains that datives in such sentences as (95), (96), and (97) directly represent the
case, Experiencer, which subject selection has not affected. These datives, in her view, are neither deep nor surface subjects.

(95) Mne xolodno. (95') I'm cold.
    to me cold

(96) Mne stalo legče. (96') It got easier for me.
    to me became easier

(97) Mne nezdorovitsja. (97') I'm feeling ill.
    to me is not well

There is a certain appeal in the straightforward manner with which the case-grammar model treats subjective datives. It is intuitively more satisfying to say these NPs are dative, because they originate in deep structure as Datives and no transformation has operated to change or neutralize their case marking. It is in general more intuitively appealing to have morphological case assigned in accordance with basic semantic relations than by the application of a superficial mechanical operation called "case marking" in the extended standard theory. For further discussion of the case grammar hypothesis, we refer the reader to the appendix at the conclusion of this paper.

It would be possible to devote the remainder of this dissertation to a description of other variations on the theme "subject in transformational-generative grammar." Persuasive evidence has been adduced for each of these hybrid theories. Our purpose here is not to select the optimal model, but to investigate the facts of a rather finite body of sentences in Russian, to present interesting
data, to determine regularity of semantic and syntactic patterns, and therefrom, to draw conclusions on the nature of subject in Russian.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1This is the conventional definition of deep structure, as reported in Lakoff and Ross (1973) for example.

2Micklesen's article contains no phrase markers. He used a bracketing system, which we find less convenient for purposes of comparing various transformational analyses.

3Fillmore's Dative in "The Case for Case" (1968) was subsequently replaced by several separate but semantically related cases. For example, in Fillmore (1971), the Dative is broken up into Experiencer (which occurs with psychological-event or mental-state verbs), Object (which accompanies nonpsychological verbs indicating a change of state, e.g., "dying"), and Goal (denoting the person toward which there is movement).
In the present chapter, we shall describe in greater detail the sentence types which fall within the scope of this study. As mentioned in the introduction, we have opted to use the term "subjective-dative sentences," which we feel is less prejudicial than either "one-part sentences containing datives," or "subjectless sentences containing datives," or "impersonal sentences containing datives." But let us attempt to more precisely define the notion of "subjective dative." We shall do this indirectly by enumerating the syntactic functions of datives which are not of a subjective nature and then describing the obvious subjective properties of the datives in the types of sentences herein discussed.

Datives in the following syntactic structures are not subjective and therefore are not examined in this study:

I. Datives in indirect object position, i.e., datives occurring with accusative-governing transitive verbs and representing the beneficiary or goal of the activity performed by the nominative subject, e.g.,

(98) Sonja kupila sestre (98') Sonja bought her
     Sonja bought to sister sister a blue skirt. 
     sinjuju jubku. 
     blue skirt
II. Datives of addressee complementing verbs of communication, e.g.,

(99) Irina skazala mne (99') Irina told me
Irina told to me about it.
ob ètom.
about it

III. Object-like complements of a number of dative-governing quasi-transitive verbs, e.g.,

(100) Veter sopustvoval (100') Wind accompanied
wind accompanied
dozdju.
to rain

IV. Dative prepositional complements, e.g.,

(101) Zima podxodila k (101') Winter was coming
winter approached
to koncu.
to end

V. Adnominal datives of all types, e.g.,

(102) Ja vam bol'she ne (102') I am no longer a
I to you more not
drug.
friend

VI. Dative complements of adjectival phrases, e.g.,

(103) Vy vstrečaete na (103') At each step one
you meet on
každom imja
each step name
ljubeznoe naukam.
beloved to sciences

As these examples show, we are not concerned with datives occurring in standard bipartite sentences, i.e., sentences with a nominative subject controlling the person, number, and gender morphology of the predicate. Rather, we are interested in those datives appearing in sentences which
lack subject-verb agreement. Such sentences fit into three general classes, which are detailed below. These simple formulae do not pretend to exhaustively define the full range of grammatical strings into which subjective datives can be inserted. They serve as mnemonic devices to expedite the discussion.

A. "Category-of-state" sentences:

a) N V d c.o.s.
   (104) Mne xolodno. (104') I'm cold.
   to me cold

b) N V V d c.o.s. inf.
   (105) Mne skučno čitat'. (105') I'm bored reading.
   to me boring to read

B. Infinitive sentences:

N V d inf.
   (106) Fakelam goret' (106') May the torches burn
   to torches to burn
   jarče! brighter

C. -sja sentences:

a) N V d -sja
   (107) Ptice ne letitsja. (107') The bird just
   to bird not flies cannot fly.

b) N V V d -sja inf.
   (108) Emu xočetsja spat'. (108') He feels like
   to him wants to sleep sleeping.
Before analyzing the structure and meaning of these three types of sentences, let us offer the following general observations on the subjective nature of their datives.

The classic definitions of subject which we encountered in our survey in Chapter I consistently entail two semantic units - agent and topic. The definition offered in Greč (1840:92), for example, concentrates on the notion of topic: predmet, o kotorom govoritsja v predloženii 'the entity about which something is said in the sentence', while Peškovskij (1956:183) stresses the agentive meaning of subject: dejstvujuščij predmet, sozdajuščij priznak vyražennyj glagol'nym skazuemym 'the acting entity which creates the characteristic expressed by the verbal predicate'. In the vast majority of cases, the datives in the sentence types described above meet at least one of these semantic parameters of subjecthood.

First, let us consider the semantic unit of agent. In the following examples (one for each of the three basic sentence types sketched above), the dative form marks the animate being whose performance of the activity depicted by the verb is qualified by a state of being or modality. That is to say, the NP bearing the dative form names both the experiencer of the state of being or modality and the performer of the activity.  

(109) Mne skušno čitat' Puškina. (109') To me it's a bore to me boring to read Pushkin.
(110) Emu v armiju idti. (110') He is to go into the army.

(111) Emu xoroiso rabotalos'. (111') He worked well.

The animate feature on such datives, we believe, contributes to their subjective quality, especially when the dative NP is the only participant in a situation. Serebrjakova found that 53% of the eighth-graders in her survey of Soviet grammar instruction considered (112) a bipartite, personal sentence, because it contains a personal referent, the animate subjective dative, tebe 'to you'. And this survey followed intensive study of one-part and bipartite sentence types!^5

(112) Ne nagnat' tebe bešenoj (112') You won't catch a not to catch to you mad runaway troika!

Next, let us consider the concept of topic. Word order in Russian is in part a function of the distribution of new and old information within the sentence. Which elements bear new and which bear old information is discourse determined. Typically, the topic (the given information) precedes the comment (the statement made about the given information). However, with contrastive stress, this principle can be ignored. The typical order of elements in subjective-dative sentences is that indicated in our simple formulae on page 52, with the dative preceding the predicative element. The dative typically marks an entity
known to both interlocutors or an entity just mentioned in the discourse, i.e., the dative is usually the sentence topic. As nominative subjects are also usually topics, it is a small jump in logic to extend the term "subject" to topics which are dative. This mental exercise can be expressed by a simple equation:

\[(113) \frac{N}{\text{nom}} : \frac{N}{\text{dat}} :: \frac{N}{\text{nom}} : \frac{N}{\text{dat}}\]

\[X = \text{subject}\]

A final contributing factor to the subjective quality of many of the datives in these sentences is the existence of paraphrases containing nominative subjects and predicates with the same roots as those found in the sentences with datives, e.g.,

\[(114) \frac{\text{Mne stydno.}}{\text{to me shameful}} \quad (114') I'm ashamed.\]

\[(115) \frac{\text{Ja styžus'}.}{\text{I ashamed}} \quad (115') I'm ashamed.\]

\[(116) \frac{\text{Mne xožetsja spat'}.}{\text{to me wants to sleep}} \quad (116') I'm sleepy.\]

\[(117) \frac{\text{Ja xoču spat'}.}{\text{I want to sleep}} \quad (117') I want to sleep.\]

\[(118) \frac{\text{Nam možno obedat'}.}{\text{to us possible to dine}} \quad (118') We can have dinner.\]

\[(119) \frac{\text{My možem obedat'}.}{\text{we can to dine}} \quad (119') We can have dinner.\]

In the following pages, we shall examine in greater detail the distribution and semantic range of datives in our three basic sentence types.
A. "Category-of-state" sentences.

The concept "category of state" is a Soviet invention. In the Soviet view, the category represents a separate part of speech with the morphological shape of a short-form neuter adjective which appears in sentences lacking an explicit subject for the adjective to agree with. Category of state sentences, therefore, are one-part in Soviet theory. The category was necessitated by the Soviet morphologically-biased view of grammar, which in the tradition of Potebnja and Peškovskij denies the validity of "understood" (in transformational grammar, "deep") sentence elements. In a sentence such as (114), what is the form stydno? It isn't a verb, because it doesn't have the verbal inflectional morphology. It isn't an adverb, since it has no verb, adjective, or other adverb to modify. And it isn't an adjective, in the Soviet view, because it has no substantive to modify. Since the word does not fit into any of these categories, a separate part of speech was set up and labelled kategorija sostojanja.

Compare the two columns of sentences below. Those on the left are bipartite sentences with nominative subjects and short-form predicative adjectives. Those on the right are "one-part" in Soviet theory and contain "category-of-state" words with dative complements. In the left column, the states or conditions depicted by the predicatives are directly attributed to their nominative subjects. The
relationship between the substantives and predicatives is that of "determined" to "determining," to translate literally the Soviet terms opredeljaemyj and opredeljajuščij. The nominative subjects in these copular sentences can denote either the experiencer of a state or condition, as in (120) and (122), or the bearer of a particular characteristic, e.g., (124), (126), (128). The sentences in the right column show no predicative agreement, and the form on the predicative is invariant, coinciding with the neuter singular adjectival morphology. The semantic relationship between the dative and predicative word is also invariant; the dative marks the experiencer of the state of being, the circumstances depicted by the predicative word, and never the source or bearer of that characteristic.

(120) Ivan vesel.  (121) Ivan u vesel.  
Ivan happy to Ivan happy

(120') Ivan is happy.  (121') Ivan's having fun.

(122) Ivan budet svoboden.  (123) Ivan u budet svobodno.  
Ivan will free to Ivan will free

(122') Ivan will be free.  (123') Ivan will feel free.

(124) Anna skučna.  (125) Anne skučno.  
Anna boring to Anna boring

(124') Anna is boring.  (125') Anna is bored.

(126) Oni prijatny.  (127) Im prijatno.  
they pleasant to them pleasant

(126') They are pleasant.  (127') It's pleasant for them.
Galkina-Fedoruk observed that only some of the dative "complements" of "category-of-state" predicatives bear the semantic meaning of subject, a notion she unfortunately fails to specify. To illustrate her point, Galkina-Fedoruk cites the paraphrasability of (130) with (131).

(130) Mne stydno. (130') I'm ashamed.
     to me shameful
(131) Ja styžus'. (131') I'm ashamed.
     I ashamed

The dative of (130) she considers a subject, which apparently means the dative is perceived as actively participating in the experience of "feeling shame." She contrasts such datives with those in sentences such as (132) and (133), to which she applies the term Dativus Commodi.

(132) Mne prostorno. (132') I have a lot of
     to me spacious
     room.
(133) Mne udobno. (133') I'm comfortable.
     to me comfortable

But Galkina-Fedoruk herself undermines this differentiation of datives complementing "category-of-state" words by indicating that the difference in meaning between (130) and (132) or (133) lies totally within the predicative element. The semantic function of the dative is constant -- to mark the experiencer of the state or condition described by the predicative. The lexical content of the predicative
determines whether the experience is of a psychological or physical nature. Thus, we feel it is vacuous to extend the label sub"ekt to only some datives in "category-of-state" sentences. All datives in these contexts denote animate beings capable of experiencing external or internal (i.e., physical or psychological) states of being.

It is when one introduces infinitives into "category-of-state" sentences that the fallacy of the category as a separate part of speech becomes apparent. Consider Saxmatov's well-known example:

(134) Katat'sja veselo. (134') To skate is fun.

(135) Veselo katat'sja. (135') It is fun to skate.

Saxmatov (1941:134) argued that these sentences do not differ grammatically but psychologically. The infinitive in both is very much like a subject, he felt, but no verbal form can be labelled подле%асце. Galkina-Fedoruk argued that the infinitive of (134) is indeed a subject, which makes veselo an adjective functioning as the predicate of the sentence, even though there is no subject-verb agreement. But the infinitive of (135), she argued, is a complement to the "category-of-state" word veselo. In this treatment, veselo is two parts of speech, which overlooks the fact that the word is morphologically and semantically identical in both sentences.
We believe a superior account of the predicative *veselo* is that offered in Miller (1973), which does not require the setting up of another part of speech. In Miller's analysis, *veselo* is considered an adjective regardless of its syntactic function, i.e., its grammatical relationship with the infinitive does not alter its membership in the part of speech "adjective." In (134), the adjective is the predicate for an explicit subject, the infinitive *katat'sja*. In (135), there is no explicit subject with which the predicate adjective can agree in terms of gender and number. But this presents no particular difficulty for an ATS grammar, as a pro-form NP with the features +neuter, +singular can be postulated as the deep subject of (135).

Although we believe the evidence supports Miller's arguments, we shall continue to use the label "category of state" in reference to the stative predicatives which commonly occur in conjunction with subjective datives. The label captures the fact that these predicatives describe states of being, situations in which the chief participants are experiencers or locations, rather than agents, patients, or instruments.

Let us now more closely examine the semantic role of the dative *subject* in sentences with the structure N V V, since the notion "experiencer" is rather d c.o.s. inf.
poorly defined.

The sense of "experiencer" is most strongly perceived when the dative accompanies stative predicatives which describe conditions which can be physically or psychologically experienced. Speaking about physical stimuli, Bojko (1973:67) observed:

The combination of such predicative adverbs with the infinitive and a dative subject characterizes not so much the environment as the perception of the environment by the subject in relation to the activity in which he is engaged.

Below are presented some typical examples of dative nominals in construction with "category-of-state" predicatives which denote physical states or conditions affecting the performance of an activity by an agent (which is coreferential with the dative experiencer).

(136) Idti nam bylo očen' svetlo. (136') It was plenty light enough for us to go.
(137) Nam bylo dušno i tesno pod nizkim i tjaželym potolkom. (137') It was stuffy and close for us living beneath a low and heavy ceiling.

Sentences (138) through (141) illustrate the use of the dative to mark the experiencer of a mental or emotional state arising as the consequence of the performance of an action by the coreferential agent.
(138) *I bylo emu do slez*
*and was to him to tears*
*toskliivo idti po*
*sad to go along*
*pustynnoj ulice.*
empty street

(139) *Emu nudno sidet' pod*
*to him irksome to sit*
*sapogom otca.*
under boot of father

(140) *Ej bylo muctel'no*
*to her was painful*
*pričinjat' emu gore.*
to cause to him woe

(141) *Marine bylo protivno*
*to Marina was disgusting*
*proiznosit' familiyu*
to utter surname
*Benediktina.*
of Benediktin

The experiential sense of the dative is much more
weakly perceived when the predicative defines a temporal or
spatial parameter. Consider the examples:

(142) *Emu bylo blizko xodit'*
*to him was close to go*
*v oficerskie klassy.
to officers' classes

(143) *Mne pozdnovato pere-
to me rather late to*
*učivat'sja.*
relearn

(142') *It was close for*
*him to walk to the*
*officers' classes.*

(143') *It's rather late in*
*the day for me to*
*learn it over.*

The datives in (142) and (143) designate the person whose
performance of a particular activity is affected by the
dimensions of time and space. Only in an abstract sense
could these datives be perceived as experiencers.
The dative in combination with certain predicatives designates the person for whom a particular activity is characteristic or habitual. If these datives bear an experiential meaning at all, it is only in the most abstract sense. One perceives that such datives have the primary function of specifying the location of the characteristic, i.e., the person who "houses" a particular tendency or habit. The close parallel with English is probably not accidental.

(144) Molodym ljudjam to young people svojstvenno bezzabotno peculiar carelessly obras'cja so to relate with sčetom vremeni. account of time

(145) Vam privyčno èto delat' (145') It is customary for to you customary it to do i ispolnjat' moi pros'by. and fulfill my requests

It may be stretching the imagination to claim the datives of (144) and (145) bear an experiential meaning, although it is conceivable that a person can experience a tendency or habit. In the following sentences, however, such an interpretation of the dative's semantic function is out of the question.

(146) Dovol'no vam po dvoram (146') Enough of your enough to you about yards xodit', draznit' sobak, to walk to tease dogs zapazdyvat' na rabotu. to be late to work
(147) Da polno vam, batjuška, (147') And enough of your and enough to you old man tormenting me with your wretched words, old chap.

tomit'-to menja

to torment me

žalkimi slovami.

with wretched words

The experiencers in the situations described by (146) and (147) certainly are not the datives, but the speaker. Note the English glosses could just as easily include identification of the speaker as the experiencer:

(146") I've had quite enough of your walking through the yards, teasing the dogs, and getting to work late!

(147") Now I've had about enough of your tormenting me with your wretched words, old chap!

How can this uncharacteristic semantic behavior of the dative in (146) and (147) be explained? We offer the following hypothesis.

It is probably not accidental that the dative of (146) does not begin the sentence, but follows the predicative word, dovol'no. If acceptable at all, (148) certainly sounds contrived with the dative in sentence-initial position.

(148) Vam dovol'no po dvoram xodit'...

to you enough through yards to walk

The predicative dovol'no opens the sentence, we believe, because it is one of the two immediate constituents of the sentence, while the dative is part of the other constituent, from which it cannot be separated. The surface structure of (146) is roughly:
(149) is derived from a more abstract structure:

These phrase markers are designed to illustrate that the nonexperiential meaning of the datives in (146) and (147) is due to the structure of the sentences. The dative is assigned not because of its semantic relation vis à vis the predicative dovolo'no in (146), but because of its position adjacent to the infinitive xodit'. We shall discuss the dative-infinitive relationship in the following pages.

B. Infinitive sentences.

The \( N_d V_{\text{inf.}} \) construction is a very productive sentence type in all styles of spoken and written Russian. The structure has become a common feature of journalistic prose, occurring in headlines with particular frequency. Two typical examples are:
(151) \textbf{Byt' lokomotivu ispravnym!} (151') The locomotive shall be in good repair!

(152) \textbf{Byt' prospektu dvuxetažnym!} (152') Let the avenue be lined with two-storey buildings!

A wide range of modal meanings are rendered by the dative + infinitive construction, from internalized obligation to imposed necessity to impossibility to inevitability to strong desire. It is often difficult to supply a precise semantic interpretation of this modality outside a discourse context. The following examples are extracted from various language handbooks. Paraphrases with explicit modal lexical items are nearly (if not completely) synonymous. Paraphrases are indicated by the subscript "p."

(153) \textbf{Mne vystupat' čerez polčasa.} (153') I have to appear after half an hour.

(153p) \textbf{Ja dolžen vystupat' čerez polčasa.} (153p') I have to appear after half an hour.

(154) \textbf{Emu v armiju idti.} (154') He is to go into the army.

(154p) \textbf{Emu nado v armiju idti.} (154p') He must go into the army.

(155) \textbf{Mne exat'! Uexat' daleko!} (155') I've got to go away! Go far, far away!
(155p) Как хочу уехать, how want to go
уехать далеко далеко! to go far far
(155p') Как I want to go 
далеко далеко! away, go far, far
away!

(156) Быть урагану! to be hurricane
(156') Быть урагану! There'll be a hurricane!

(156p) Обязательно будет ураган! necessarily will hurricane
(156p') Обязательно будет ураган! hurricane!

(157) Тебе не решить эту проблему to you not to solve this problem
(157') Тебе не решить эту проблему You won't be able to solve this problem.

(157p) Ты не сможешь решить эту проблему you not be able to solve this problem
(157p') Ты не сможешь решить эту проблему You will not be able to solve this problem.

As is the case with "category-of-state" sentences, the dative element can be omitted from infinitive sentences, but this frequently alters the mood or renders the sentence elliptical. Consider the following example:

(158) Всем студентам собраться! (158') All students are to gather at the main entrance.

If the dative of (158) is deleted, the sentence is converted to the imperative mood, with the unspecified addressee functioning as the agent of the activity.

(159) Собраться у главного входа! (159') Gather at the main entrance!

Deletion of the dative is facultative if the modality is one of "strong desire," as in (155) above. Frequently, this
modality is underscored by the particle by, e.g.,

(160) Vot by poji s nimi - (160') "If only I could go
here would to go with them with them," said
skazala Anna. Anna.
said Anna

If the agent of the activity expressed by the infinitive is unknown, obviously, there will be no dative. This is commonly the case in sentences with a modal meaning of impossibility, e.g.,

(161) Teper' selo Sušenskoe (161') Now one wouldn't
now village Susenskoe recognize the
ne uznat'. village of
not to recognize Sušenskoe.

The great variety of modal meanings rendered by the Nd V inf. structure notwithstanding, the relation obtaining between infinitive and dative has a constancy which is analogus to the dative-predicative relation in the "category-of-state" sentences examined above. The dative denotes the entity (usually an animate being) affected by a condition or state of existence (here the state of modality). In both Nd V inf. and Nd V c.o.s. V inf. sentences, the dative is coreferential with the agent (logical subject) of the activity expressed by the infinitive. The exception to this generalization are sentences such as (156), which denote inevitability. In such sentences, the dative typically marks an inanimate entity, and the infinitive describes not an activity, but existence. Sentences of this sort have bipartite paraphrases with nominative subjects and predicative agreement, e.g.,
We believe the anomalous behavior of such sentences (anomalous in that the datives are not animate) is a function of the lexical item byt', which is not subcategorized for the feature of animacy as are human-activity verbs like rešit' 'solve' and ljubit' 'love'.

Finally a word about the element order of Nd Vinf. sentences. The latest Soviet Academy Grammar (1970:609) states that the dative precedes the infinitive if it marks the topic and the infinitive marks the comment, e.g.,

(163) Vam načinat'.  
(163') You must begin.

to you to begin

This order is reversed when the dative bears the new information, e.g.,

(164) Načinat' vam (a ne komu-to drugomu).  
(164') It is you (and not somebody else) who is to begin.

to somebody else

This general principle can be violated if appropriate contrastive stress is placed on the dative for the sake of emphasis, e.g.,

(165) Vam že načinat'!  
(165') You must begin!

to you (emphasis) to begin
C. -sja sentences.

F.I. Buslaev's evaluation of the "impersonal" -sja sentence has an enduring validity regardless of one's theoretical orientation:

Our language likes to use this form to express initiatives and phenomena realized independently of the will of the human subject.
(Buslaev 1959:173)

Janko-Trinickaja (1962:213) stresses the independence, the spontaneity of the activity expressed by the -sja verb. The most important semantic characteristic of the construction in her view is that the activity depicted by the verb is not controlled by or produced by the agent, but simply happens. She provides this colorful example to illustrate her point:

(166) Ostav', Miša! Ne dumaj, "Stop it, Miša! Don't think, it'll make it worse!"
Samo dumaetsja, mamen'ka. "It's thinking by itself, Mama!"

Janko-Trinickaja (1962:216) terms the dative in N_d V -sja sentences an ob"ekt 'object', but adds it "represents a transformation of the sub"ekt, the producer of the activity." In other terms, the dative marks an agent. The degree of agentiveness is a function of the semantic content of the verb accompanying the dative.

There has been considerable disagreement among Russian linguists as to which verbs can accept -sja to form these sentences lacking nominative subjects. However, the following generalizations appear valid.
1. -sja addition is a productive derivational process, as the following example from Janko-Trinickaja (1962:52) demonstrates:

(167) Emu ne telegrafirovalos'. (167') He couldn't send to him not telegraphed a telegram.

2. Most of these -sja verbs have counterparts without the suffix, although a few counterexamples do exist, e.g.,

(168) Irine nezdorovitsja. (168') Irina does not to Irina not is well feel well.

3. Accusative-governing transitive verbs cannot accept -sja in sentences where the object is specified, e.g.,

(169) *Legko kosilos' travu. (169') The grass mowed easily mowed grass easily.

But in sentences where the object has been deleted, -sja addition is perfectly acceptable on these accusative-governing verbs, e.g.,

(170) Segodnja utrom legko (170') This morning the today in morning easily mowing went kosilos'. easily.

4. The verbs occurring in V-sja sentences generally denote a human activity, be it physical or mental.

5. Verbs already having the -sja affix cannot appear in V-sja sentences, e.g.,

(171) *Mne ne smeetsja. (171') I just can't laugh. to me not laughs

Logically, there is no reason why (171) cannot exist. The verb meets the semantic requirement of describing a human activity. But the suffix -sja, devoid of any grammatical
meaning (to mark voice, reflexivity, or reciprocity) is anomalously required on this verbal entry, and an additional -sja cannot be affixed.

Formally, these sentences are quite similar to the two types already described. As with the other types, \( N_d \ V \) -sja sentences can occur without an explicit dative experiencer, e.g., (170). Though deleted, an experiencer is presupposed in such sentences, and it is usually the speaker, although a person known to both interlocutors can be so perceived, e.g.,

(172) \( \underline{Ne \ spitsja.} \) \( \underline{not \ sleeps} \)  
(172') I can't sleep. \( ^8 \)

(173) \( \underline{Ploxo \ rabotaetsja \ segodnja.} \) \( \underline{poorly \ works \ today} \)  
(173') We're working poorly today.

Janko-Trinickaja (1962:215) in fact asserts that this -sja construction is impossible if the situation presupposes the absence of an experiencer subject, e.g.,

(174) \( *\underline{Ne \ te\v{c}etsja.} \) \( *\underline{not \ flows} \)  
(174') It doesn't flow.

(175) \( *\underline{Slabo \ kipitsja.} \) \( *\underline{weakly \ boils} \)  
(175') It boils weakly.

Russian is well stocked with -sja verbs which occur with nominative subjects and dative which have the same semantic characteristics as those datives in \( N_d \ V \) -sja sentences. Such datives frequently exhibit as many subjective characteristics as the nominative NPs which control predicative agreement in the sentence. For example, in (176), the dative designates the topic, marks the animate
experiencer-agent in the situation, and holds the position normally occupied by the subject, i.e., sentence-initial position. Yet the nominative NP, by the criterion of predicative agreement, merits the label of subject of the sentence.

(176) Mne vspomnilos' detstvo. (176') I recalled my to me recalled childhood childhood.

Other good examples of this phenomenon are:

(177) Otcu ponravilis' novye brjuki. (177') Father liked his to father appealed new trousers.

(178) Ej snilsja Ivan. (178') She dreamed of to her dreamed Ivan.

(179) Vezde mne viditsja tvoj vzor. (179') Everywhere I see your eyes.

(180) Vezde mne slyHsitsja tvoj golos. (180') I hear your voice everywhere.

There are also many verbs (not only -sja verbs) which take infinitival or sentential subjects while also occurring with subjective datives, e.g.,

(181) Mne pos'castlivilos' najti eti rukopisi. (181') I was fortunate enough to find these manuscripts.

(182) Lubencovu v lixorado^nom polubredu predstavilos', òto on naxoditsja na dal'nej sopke Voloc$aevki. (182') It seemed to Lubencov in his feverish semi-delirium seemed that he was on a distant hill of VolocSaevka.
Sentences such as (176) through (182) lack an important semantic element which is always present in the $N_d V_s$ sentences which do not have nominative subjects, i.e., the element of modality. It is significant that the verbs in $N_d V_s$ sentences require some kind of adverbial modification or negation. These modifiers are essential in creating a sense of modality. The sentences below are excellent examples of this principle. Note well the various modal meanings offered in the English glosses.

(183) Pod žurčan'e ručja
under babble of brook
sladko dremletsja.
sweetly slumbers

(183') To the babble of a brook a person can sweetly slumber.

(184) Mne ne pljašetsja, no
to me not dances but
ne pljasat' nel'zja.
not to dance cannot

(184') I'm not up to dancing, but not to dance is out of the question.

(185) Drožit sobaka. Net ej
the dog is trembling. It cannot bear it.
moči. Ne voetsja i ne
of strength not howls and it can't howl or
skulitsja ej.
not whimpers to her

(185') The dog is trembling. It cannot bear it. It can't howl or whimper.

(186) Ej daze na stule ne
she can't even keep
siditsja ot neterpenija.
sits from impatience

(186') She can't even keep seated on a chair, she's so impatient.

In summary, the three sentence types under investigation in this paper have many similarities. All contain datives with the semantic characteristics of subjects, datives which commonly correspond to nominative subjects in paraphrase sentences. The predicative forms of two of these sentence types ($N_d V_{c.o.s.}$ and $N_d V_{-sja}$) are available for service in
sentences with nominative, infinitive, or sentential subjects, which often occur simultaneously with subjective datives, e.g.,

(187) Мне понятна эта теория. (187') I understand this to me understood this theory theory.

(188) Мне понравилась она. (188') I liked her. to me appealed she

N_d V_{inf.} sentences are so similar to N_d V_{c.o.s.} V_{inf.} sentences that they could be viewed as a subtype of the latter if one is willing to accept the concept of an abstract unlexicalized pro-verb. For example, sentences (154) and (154p) are more than close paraphrases. Linguists as early as Barsov's time have noted their structural similarity and complete synonymy. If we postulate the existence of a pro-verb with the same semantic content as надо 'must' in the underlying structure of (154), then both (154) and (154p) would fall into the "category-of-state" sentence type.

(154) Эму в армию идти. (154') He is to go into to him to army to go the army.

(154p) Эму надо в армию идти. (154p') He must go into the to him must to army to go army.

In the next chapter, we shall finally examine the syntax of datives in these three sentence types, and we shall determine whether their subjective properties are syntactic as well as semantic in nature.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1See Moore (1971) for a good discussion of the lack of sound criteria for defining indirect object in Russian.

2Moore (1971) lists well over a hundred verbs which govern dative complements.

3The term "category of state" was coined by Scerba in 1928. Since that time, most Soviet writers (particularly Vinogradov) have defended the concept as a separate part of speech in Russian. We disagree with this view, as our discussion on page 56 and following pages explains. Nevertheless, we employ the label "category of state" for reasons of expositional convenience.

4We do not claim that the dative's primary function is to mark the agent in (109). It is our feeling that the dative's occurrence is mandated by the presence of a "category-of-state" or modal element in the predication. The NP carrying dative marking, however, must be coreferential with the agent of the infinitive or -sja verb. The deep subject of the infinitive in (109) is removed by the transformation of Equi-NP deletion, which we discuss in Chapter IV.

5The results of I.S. Serebrjakova's study are summarized in Fedorov (1972:137).

6We are not arguing that only subjects can be topics, although subjects usually are topics. We are attempting to schematicize the psychological process which leads grammar students to perceive dative topics as subjects.

7The term "copular sentence" is a convenient tag for sentences with the semantic structure X BE Y. In modern Russian, BE is not lexicalized in the present tense, but it is in the past and future tenses. This is an idiosyncrasy of the paradigm of byt'. The term "copular" will apply to sentences of the X BE Y semantic structure regardless of tense.

8A precise English gloss of such sentences in isolation is not possible. The unnamed experiencer could refer to the speaker, the listener, or a third party.
CHAPTER IV

In this chapter we shall discuss the syntax of subjective datives in the environments specified in the preceding chapter. We shall investigate the ability of datives to occur in contexts traditionally reserved for subjects only and to perform like subjects with respect to the operation of syntactic transformations.

1. Subject-verb agreement (SVA).

It is curious that the adherents of the nonnominative theory in the last century chose perhaps the weakest kind of structural evidence they could have adduced to prove that datives can be subjects, i.e., evidence of predicative agreement. Recall Klassovskij's argument that the dative form on the predicative adjective in (189) is assigned by the same principle of subject-verb agreement as the nominative form in (190).

(189) Mne nel'zja byt' veselu. (189') I cannot be happy.

to me cannot to be happy

(190) Ja ne vesel. (190') I am not happy.

I not happy

In contemporary Russian, (189) would be rendered:

(191) Mne nel'zja byt' veselym. (191') I cannot be happy.

to me cannot to be happy

The adjective is instrumental by virtue of its position as
the complement to the infinitive byt'. The gender and number of the adjective, however, shows concord with the dative antecedent. This in itself is no proof of the subjecthood of the dative, since an antecedent in non-subject position can also control these grammatical categories in adjectives, e.g.,

(192) Maša velela emu byt' (192') Maša told him to 
Masa ordered to him to be careful.

The dative in (192) certainly is not a subject, yet the adjective agrees with it. If we provide a deep structure phrase marker for (192), it becomes clear that the dative is coreferential with the subject of the embedded sentence in which ostorožnýn origins. That deep subject is what assigns the features of gender and number to the adjective, ostorožnýn-

(193)

The transformations required to derive (192) from (193) apply cyclically, beginning with the most deeply embedded S. SVA in S₁ marks the predicate adjective +masculine, +singular. This is followed by deletion of the subject, NP₁, under identity to the higher NP₀₁ (the transformation of Equi-NP
deletion), followed by deletion of the $S_1$ node according to Ross's tree-pruning convention. Formation of the infinitive occurs whenever the structural configuration of VP dominating VP arises in the course of a derivation, according to Babby (1974). The instrumental form will be assigned to ostoroŋ#n- upon formation of the infinitive byt'.

In the $S_O$ cycle, only two major transformations apply: case marking and SVA. In the ATS framework, nominative case will be assigned to $NP_{O,0}$ as the verb vele- will be subcategorized for a nominative subject. Similarly, $NP_{O,1}$ will receive dative marking as the result of the verb's subcategorization feature requiring a dative object. Though we offer no defense of the transformations listed above, they have been adequately defended in the literature, particularly in the pioneering works of Chvany and Babby (see Chvany 1970, Babby 1970, and Babby 1974 in particular). One of the transformations adduced, Equi-NP Deletion, will be discussed in considerable detail below.

As the derivation of (192) demonstrated, the dative NP does not control the assignment of gender and number on the predicative ostoroŋ#n-. This is accomplished already in the $S_1$ cycle and is controlled by $NP_1$, which happens to be coreferential with the dative object $NP_{O,1}$. Additionally, the dative $NP_{O,1}$ has nothing to do with the case marking on ostoroŋ#n-, which is instrumental.
Let us reexamine Klassovskij's example, sentence (189). Logically, this short sentence is composed of two predications. One says I BE HAPPY. The other says FOR ME X BE IMPOSSIBLE. The meaning of (189) requires the subordination of the first of these under the variable X. Based on this logic, the deep structure of (189) would look like (194).

(194)

(194) claims the predication I BE HAPPY is the deep subject of the matrix sentence, and that what surfaces as the dative, mne, originates in the VP as the object of nel'zja. A post-cyclical reordering of elements would be necessary to place the dative in sentence-initial position if (194) is taken as the deep structure of (189).

An alternative analysis of the structure of (139) would place the predication I BE HAPPY within the VP of the matrix sentence. According to this treatment, what surfaces as the dative, mne, originates in deep structure as the subject of the matrix sentence. We shall not take a stand at this juncture as to which of these analyses is the stronger.
Whether (194) or (195) more closely represents the actual underlying structure of (189) is not crucial for the present discussion. The important fact which both analyses reveal is that just as in (193) the dative antecedent does not directly control the assignment of number and gender in the predicate adjective by SVA, since these elements originate in separate clauses. The number and gender features are assigned by agreement with the deep-structure embedded subject, which is deleted under identity with the higher dative NP. Thus, the dative of (189) does not perform the subjective function of controlling gender and number assignment on the predicative. But what about the case marking on veselu in (189)? Various hypotheses might be offered to explain its occurrence. If either of the postulated underlying structures (194) or (195) is accepted, a post-cyclic case-copying rule would be required. Once NP₁ has been deleted by Equi-NP deletion, and the S₁ node has been eliminated, the adjectival vesel- would be under the
same S node as the dative, mne. The case-copying rule would be ad hoc, applying after considerable structure reduction, and it would not be accurate to call it subject-verb agreement. The rule of SVA has nothing to do with assignment of case in modern Russian. For example, sentence (196) demonstrates that even when the subject is nominative, and the predicate adjective originates in the same S, there is no guarantee of case concord.

(196) Ja byl togda veselym. (196') I was happy then.
      I was then         happy

Another explanation of the dative form on veselu would be to claim it is an instance of the so-called "second dative." Bernard Comrie's detailed study of the second-dative problem (Comrie 1974) provides an extensive body of examples, some of which are cited in the ensuing discussion.

Sentences (197) and (198) represent the closest thing in syntax to a minimal pair, to borrow a concept from phonology.

(197) Ivan xoet pojti odin. (197') Ivan wants to go
      Ivan wants to go alone alone.

(198) Ivanu xoetsja pojti odnomu. (198') Ivan wants to go
      to Ivan wants to go alone alone.

The case forms of the infinitival complements in both sentences show agreement with the antecedent Ivan-, which in both sentences precedes the matrix verb. The basic semantic relations between Ivan- and xote- and pojdi- are constant in both sentences.
The adjectival words *odon-* and *sam-* 'oneself' are unique in modern Russian in exhibiting agreement with their antecedents in contexts where other adjectival modifiers would prefer or require instrumental marking regardless of the case of the antecedent. Consider the following paradigms.

(199) Igor' *ušel pervyj.* (199') Igor left first.  
Igor left first (nom)  

(200) Igor' *ušel pervym.* (200') Igor left first.  
Igor left first (instr)  

(201) Igor' *ušel odin.* (201') Igor left alone.  
Igor left alone (nom)  

(202) *Igor' *ušel odnim.* (202') Igor left alone.  
Igor left alone (instr)  

Sentences (199) and (200) are both acceptable, though (200) may be stylistically the preferred variant, i.e., without case agreement with the nominative subject. However, as sentence (202) shows, case concord between the nominative subject and the adjectival odon-* is obligatory.

The paradigm below demonstrates that odon-* similarly shows concord with its antecedent regardless of the antecedent's syntactic position. This is clearly not the case with other adjectival words.

(203) *My zastali Ivana odnogo.* (203') We found Ivan alone.  
we found Ivan alone (acc)  

(204) *My zastali Ivana odnim.* (204') We found Ivan alone.  
we found Ivan alone (instr)  

(205) *My zastali Ivana svobodnogo.* (205') We found Ivan free.  
we found Ivan free (acc)  
free.
It would appear, then, that the dative form on odin- in (198) simply continues this pattern of case concord with the antecedent. However, the following sentences show that the matter is not so straightforward.

(207) My poprosili Ivana (207') We asked Ivan to go alone.  
we asked Ivan  
pojti odnomu.  
to go alone (dat)

(208) *My poprosili Ivana (208') We asked Ivan to go alone.  
we asked Ivan  
pojti odnogo.  
to go alone (acc)

The antecedent of odin- in (207) is in the accusative case, yet the dative form on odin- is obligatory. How can one explain this puzzle? Citing numerous parallel examples, Comrie discerned a pattern. The second dative is mandatory with an "objective infinitive," to use conventional Soviet terminology. An "objective infinitive" is one whose subject is understood to be the same as the object of the main verb of the sentence. Another syntactic environment in which the second dative is mandatory is when the complementizer ětoby 'in order to' intercedes between the complement and matrix sentences, e.g.,

(209) Volodja ne byl tak samo- (209') Volodja was not so presumptuous as to chase after a medal.  
Volodja not was so presumptuous as to  
nadejan, ětoby samomu sumptuous so that to self  
gnat'sja za ordenom, to chase after medal
Comrie proposes that in these examples the second dative does indeed exhibit concord, but concord with the underlying subject of the infinitive, which he claims must be in the dative case. In other words, the čtoby clause has a deep-structure subject, which is coreferential with the matrix subject, Volodja, and the clause has the structure of an \( N_d V_{\text{inf.}} \) sentence. The dative form on sam- in (209), then, exhibits concord with a deep dative subject, which is coreferential with Volodja in the matrix sentence.

Comrie's analysis would not account for the dative in (198), since neither of the environments he specified for the second dative are present, i.e., there is no explicit object preceding the infinitive and the complementizer čtoby is not used. We have already eliminated the possibility of the dative being assigned by SVA, a rule which does not assign case. Then how does one explain the dative on odin-? We submit this is indeed another example of the second dative, but some elaborate deep structures will be required to demonstrate this.

There are two possible explanations of odnomu in (198) as a second dative. The first of these is that yet another environment must be specified to account for all possible occurrences of the second dative. This other environment would be "subjective infinitives." By this analysis, (198) would have an underlying structure resembling (210).
Note that (210) claims the deep-structure origin of Ivanu is under the VP₀ node, not in the subject slot. Also note, the deep structure origin of odin- is within the NP whose head is Ivan-. Thus, the dative form will be assigned to odin- as well as to Ivan- when the transformation of case assignment applies to NP₁. In the derivation of (198) from (210), VP₁ will be infinitivized, followed by dative marking of NP₁, followed by Equi-NP deletion.

We believe a stronger case could be made that the deep structure underlying (198) does not have the predication IVAN GOES ALONE as the subject, but has Ivan- in that position. Following this analysis, the deep structure would resemble (211):
Taking (211) as the deep structure of (198) eliminates the necessity of postulating another environment for the occurrence of the second dative phenomenon, since (211) has an explicit object preceding the infinitive. Ivan- in object position \((\text{NP}_0.1)\) will be pronominalized and reflexivized under identity to the subject Ivan- \((\text{NP}_0.0)\). In this way, a straightforward account of the particle \(-\text{sja}\) would be provided. Essentially the same transformations will be needed to derive (198) from (211) as from (210). The most important thing to note is that Equi-NP deletion is operating on a dative NP in subject position \((\text{NP}_1)\). As our discussion of that transformation will show, only subjects can be deleted under identity to a higher NP. This provides important evidence of the subjecthood of datives, albeit the arguments are necessarily abstract.

This discussion has shown that there is deep-structure evidence for the theory of dative subjecthood, and that the second dative phenomenon, though now restricted to only two lexical items (sam and odin) provides surface-structure indications of these deep dative subjects.

2. The reflexive possessive pronoun.

The distribution of the reflexive possessive pronoun, svoj-, provides evidence of the subjecthood of noun phrases. Traditionally, Russian grammar textbooks state that the possessive reflexive pronoun is used in contexts where
possession of a particular entity is ascribed to the subject of the sentence, as in (212):

(212) Ja ljubljju svoju rabotu. (212') I love my work.

But those same grammars define subject as "the nominative nominal with which the predicate agrees." Obviously their principle of subject reference for svoj usage cannot account for all occurrences of the pronoun, as (213) and (214) demonstrate.

(213) Mne xorošo rabotaetsja to me well works
v svoem kabinete. in my study

(214) Dlja babuški bol'no for grandma painful
vospominat' o svoem to recall about her
detstve.

Counterexamples to the textbook rule of svoj usage fall into six basic categories.

A. Svoj refers to a subjective dative in a sentence lacking a nominative subject, e.g., sentence (213).

B. Svoj refers to the object NP in sentences with "objective infinitives," e.g.,

(215) Boris poprosil Mashu Boris asked Masha
Boris asked Masha
prislat' emu svoj to send to him her
novyj adres.
new address
C. Svoj refers to the instrumental of agent in a passive sentence, e.g.,

(216) Anekdot byl rasskazan (216') The story was told
story was told
by old teacher to his favorite
by starym učitelem svoim
students.

D. Svoj refers to the oblique object of a preposition, e.g., sentence (214).

E. Svoj refers to an unspecified "logical subject" of an infinitive, e.g.,

(217) Vypolnit' svoj dolg (217') To fulfill one's
to fulfill ones duty
before homeland it
duty to his homeland is a great
pered rodinoj ěto
velikaja čest'.
great honor

F. Svoj modifies a nominative subject, but its antecedent is another NP, e.g.,

(218) U Ivana est' svoja (218') Ivan has his own
at Ivan exists his
own car.
sobstvennaja mašina.
car

The traditional account of the function of svoj, then, is inadequate. If one accepts an abstract level of syntactic description, it is possible to formulate a single rule to account for most occurrences of svoj. There is one feature common to all the counterexamples listed above, namely, that the antecedent of svoj is a "logical subject." In transformational terms, the antecedent is a deep-structure subject. That deep subject is either removed by the transformation of
Equi-NP deletion, which will be discussed later in this chapter, or it is removed from subject position by passivization.

The deep structure of (215) contains an embedded S with an explicit subject NP, Masa, which is coreferential with the direct object of the matrix sentence. Within the embedded S, the possessive adjective modifying the object novyj adres is coreferential with the subject of that simplex S and therefore will surface as svoj. Upon deletion of the subject of the embedded S by the general rule of Equi-NP deletion, the embedded verb infinitivizes. After this occurs, only SVA and case assignment are required to complete the derivation.

Sentence (216) is a passive sentence, whose deep object has been moved into subject position and whose deep subject has been moved to a position to the right of the verb and marked instrumental. In this sentence, svoj is coreferential with the deep subject, not the derived subject.

Sentence (214) has a derivation similar to that of (215). In deep structure, the sentence has an explicit subject for the infinitive vospominat', which deletes under identity with the higher NP, babušk-. Just as in (215), the relationship holding between the embedded subject and its coreferential NP higher in the tree is that of command, e concept developed in Langacker (1969). And just as in (215)
the reflexive possessive svoj is coreferential with the deep subject of the embedded sentence in which svoj originates.

Sentence (217) differs from (215) and (214) in that it has no explicit NP in the matrix sentence with which the subject of the infinitive is coreferential. However, such an NP is implicit in the meaning of the sentence, and addition of either a dative or dlja + genitive phrase to denote the semantic unit "beneficiary" is consonant with the general meaning of the predication, e.g.,

(219) Vypolnit' svoj dolg pered rodinoj eto velikaja cest' dlja soldata. To fulfill his duty to the homeland it is a great honor for a soldier.

So in the deep structure of (217), the matrix sentence could contain a pro-form "beneficiary" phrase which commands and is coreferential with a pro-form subject of the embedded sentence. In this way, svoj receives the same explanation in sentences such as (214), (215), (216), and (217), i.e., svoj is inserted in deep sentences whose subjects become deleted or demoted on the way to surface structure.

To more graphically depict the transformational account of svoj in sentences such as (215), (214), and (217), we present below a simplified deep phrase marker and list the crucial transformations needed for the derivation of (214).
Derivation of (214) from (220) proceeds in the following fashion, irrelevant details omitted.

$S_1$ cycle:
1. svoj insertion under $NP_{1.1}$ by virtue of coreferentiality with $NP_{1.0}$, the subject of $S_1$;
2. case marking, which assigns nominative to $NP_{1.0}$ and accusative to $NP_{1.1}$;
3. Equi-NP deletion, which removes $NP_{1.0}$ by virtue of identity with PP in the matrix sentence;
4. S-node deletion, which eliminates $S_1$;
5. infinitive formation, which occurs presumably since the subject of $VP_1$ has been eliminated;

$S_0$ cycle:
1. case marking, which assigns genitive to the object of the preposition $d\text{lja}$;
2. SVA, which marks $bud-$ singular, neuter. Segmentation rules will spell out the copula only in the past and future tenses. $Bol'n-$ is marked singular neuter, which always occurs when such predicatives have
infinitive subjects. Post-cyclically, element reordering takes place, moving the phrase dlja babuški into sentence-initial position and the infinitival phrase to the right of the predicative, bol'no.

Sentence (218) appears to be a legitimate counterexample to the principle that the antecedent of svoj is a subject (either deep or derived). The grammatical subject of (218) is the nominative phrase svoja sobstvennaja mašina. This can be demonstrated by placing the predication in the past tense. The verb form is marked feminine singular, showing concord with svoja sobstvennaja mašina.

(221) U Ivana byla svoja sobstvennaja mašina. (221') Ivan had his own car.

Yet the antecedent for svoj in (218) is subjectlike in a number of respects, e.g., it occupies sentence-initial position; it is the topic of the sentence; it is animate; it is the grammatical subject in the paraphrase using the verb imet' 'have'.

(222) Ivan imeet svoju sobstvennuju mašinu. (222') Ivan has his own car.

In a word, there seem to be two loci of subjective functions in sentence (218). The phrase u Ivan has the subjective properties just enumerated plus it behaves like a subject with respect to the rule of svoj reference. The nominative
phrase *svoja sobstvennaja mašina*, on the other hand, functions as a subject with regard to the basic rule of SVA.

Finally, let us examine the counterexamples of category A, sentences containing subjective datives. Various transformational grammarians have noted the subject-like behavior of datives with respect to the distribution of *svoj*, e.g., Klima, Chvany, Klenin. The following examples demonstrate that *svoj* can appear in all the sentence types described in Chapter III, and that the antecedent for *svoj* in these structures is the dative NP.

I. \( N_d \quad V_{c.o.s.} \)

(223) *Mne stydno svoej neopytnosti.* (223') *I'm ashamed of my inexperience.*

II. \( N_d \quad V_{inf.} \)

(224) *Ne zit' ze mne v svoem dome!* (224') *I can't live in my own house!*

III. \( N_d \quad V_{sja} \)

(225) *Mne xoroko rabotaetsja v svoem kabinete.* (225') *I can work well in my own study.*

Unlike the other counterexamples to the subject-reference principle used in Russian textbook grammars, it is counterintuitive to parse (223), (224), and (225) in such a way that *svoj* would originate in an embedded sentence with a
subject which becomes deleted. Postulating a deep structure with a matrix and embedded sentence for (223) is actually inconceivable. Numerous examples in the N_d V_c.o.s. class easily come to mind, and for none of these can one imagine an underlying structure with an embedded sentence:

(226) Emu udobno v svoej
      to him comfortable in his
      kvartire.
apartment

(227) Irine skučno u svoej
      Irina bored at her
      teti.
aunt

(228) Nam bylo veselo so
      to us was merry with
      svoimi druz'jami na
      our friends at
      večerinke.
party

(226') He is comfortable in his apartment.
(227') Irina is bored at her aunt's.
(228') We were merry at the party with our friends.

Conceivably, one could construct very abstract underlying structures for (224) and (225) which might entail embedded sentences in which svoj would have a nominative subject antecedent. To draw such abstract structures, however, would be entirely ad hoc, and new transformations would be required to derive the surface forms they underly. We shall not offer any hypothesis about the underlying structure of either (224) or (225). It seems a more rational course to simply state at this juncture that with respect to the rule of svoj reference, datives in sentences of the structure N_d V_c.o.s., N_d V_inf., and N_d V-sja perform a subjective function.
3. The reflexive pronoun SEBJA.

The syntax of the reflexive pronoun (hereafter tagged SEBJA) provides further evidence of subjecthood. The following sentences illustrate the pronoun's usage in sentences containing nominative subjects.

(229) Otec sidit u sebja doma. (229') Father is sitting father sits at self home at (his) home. 
(gen)

(230) Anna smotrit na sebja. (230') Anna is looking at Anna looks at self herself. 
(acc)

(231) Masa kupila sebe znacok. (231') Masa bought herself Masa bought self pin a lapel pin. 
(dat)

(232) Ja derzu važne dokumenty (232') I keep my import-I keep important documents ant papers in my pri sebe v kabinete. study. 
(loc)

(233) Soldat byl poranen (233') The soldier was soldier was wounded wounded by himself. samim soboj. 
(instr)

In all of these sentences, SEBJA has as its antecedent the nominative subject of the sentence. The following generalizations can be made about the antecedence of SEBJA.

In most Russian sentences containing nominative subjects, the nominative subject is the antecedent of SEBJA. In sentences containing infinitival complements, SEBJA in the infinitive phrase (depending on the verb's meaning) can be coreferential with either the subject of the infinitive or the subject of the matrix sentence, e.g., in (234), Igor' or
syna can be coreferential with SEBJA.

(234) Igor' naučil syna  
Igor taught son
uvažat' sebja.  
to respect self

(234') Igor taught his
son to respect
him(self).

As Růžička (1973) and Comrie (1973) demonstrated, the ATS model is well-suited to explain the ambiguity of antecedence in sentences such as (234). Sentence (234) has two separate underlying structures, which are presented below.

(235) and (236) differ only in the lexical item inserted under NP\textsubscript{1.1}. The ambiguity of (234) is created when
transformations reduce the structures of (235) and (236), eliminating the $S$ nodes and bringing $NP_{1.1}$ up into the same $S$ in which $NP_{0.0}$ is located. The pronoun SEBJA has already been inserted at this point in the derivation of (235). In (236), SEBJA is inserted once the coreferential NPs ($NP_{0.0}$ and $NP_{1.1}$) fall under the same $S$ node. To reduce the structure of (235) and (236), the all-purpose transformations of Equi-NP deletion, $S$-node deletion, and infinitive formation operate. Comrie showed that if the structure of the embedded sentence is not reduced, as in (237), SEBJA cannot refer to the subject of the matrix sentence.

(237) Petja velel, čtoby ja (237') Petja told me to
kupil sebe cvety. bought self flowers

In (237), SEBJA must be coreferential with the explicit subject of the embedded sentence in which it occurs, i.e., ja.

It has been shown that SEBJA can be coreferential with both matrix and embedded subjects. This phenomenon is limited, however, to certain verbs, as the following examples from Comrie (1973) show. Coreferentiality is indicated by the subscript "i".

(238) Boris ne dal druz'jam (238') Boris didn't allow
ugovorit' sebjaj. to persuade self

Boris not gave to friends his friends to persuade him.
(239) *Boris* ne dal druz'jam (239') Boris didn't allow
Boris' not gave to friends his friends to
ugovorit' ego; to persuade him

(240) Petja velel mne kupit' (240') Petja told me to
Petja told to me to buy buy him (or myself)
sebe cvety. the flowers.
to self flowers

(241) Petja velel mne kupit' (241') Petja told me to
Petja told to me to buy buy him the flowers.
emu cvety. him flowers

(242) *Boris poprosil otca* (242')*Boris asked his
Boris asked father father to send him-
 poslat' sebja na front. self to the front.
to send self to front

(243) Boris poprosil otca (243') Boris asked his
Boris asked father father to send him
poslat' ego na front. to the front.
to send him to front

Thus SEBJA insertion is a lexically-governed rule, not an
"everywhere" rule. It is obligatory in sentences embedded
under dat', e.g., (238), optional in sentences embedded
under velet', e.g., (240), and prohibited in sentences
embedded under poprosit'.

The fact that SEBJA uniformly looks to the subject
position (either embedded or matrix subjects) for its
antecedent provides another test for subject identification,
as Chvany (1970) pointed out. The following examples
demonstrate that in the three types of sentences with which
this thesis is concerned, SEBJA has as its antecedent a
subjective dative.
I. N\textsubscript{d} V\textsubscript{c.o.s.}

(244) Mne sku\'no u sebja doma. (244') I'm bored at home.

to me bored at self at home

II. N\textsubscript{d} V\textsubscript{inf.}

(245) Molodym komunistam

to young communists

prigotovit' sebja

to prepare self

k bor'be.
to struggle

(245') Young communists

must prepare themselves for the

struggle.

(246') I can't get any

work done at home.

Since it is always desirable to write transformations
so as to capture the greatest number of generalizations, it
is clearly desirable to provide a single unitary explanation
for the insertion and interpretation of SEBJA in sentences
with nominative subjects and without nominative subjects.
If the datives in (244), (245), and (246) are accepted as
subjects, the rule for SEBJA insertion could be simplified
to:

(247) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP}_{1} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{NP}_{1} \quad X \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4
\end{array}
\] \[\rightarrow\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{SEBJA} \quad X \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4
\end{array}
\]

Condition: 1 is a subject.

The rule as written would not have to be sensitive to the
case marking on 1 if datives are considered possible subjects.

In *Syntactic Structures*, Chomsky first observed that conjunction is a test of constituency. He formulated the following general rule for sentential conjunction, which has since been modified by various writers.\(^{12}\)

If \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) are grammatical sentences, and \(S_1\) differs from \(S_2\) only in that \(X\) appears in \(S_1\) where \(Y\) appears in \(S_2\) (i.e., \(S_1 = \ldots X \ldots, \text{ and } S_2 = \ldots Y \ldots\)), and \(X\) and \(Y\) are constituents of the same type in \(S_1\) and \(S_2\) respectively, then \(S_3\) is a sentence, where \(S_3\) is the result of replacing \(X\) by \(X + \text{ and } + Y\) in \(S_1\) (i.e., \(S = \ldots X + \text{ and } + Y \ldots\)).

(Chomsky 1957:36)

Conjunction reduction, then, is possible only if the conjoined elements belong to the same constituent class. Thus conjunction reduction provides another means for identifying NPs which are subjects.

As in English, conjunction in Russian is both phrasal and sentential. It has been persuasively argued that phrasal conjunction belongs among the PS rules of the base component, i.e., phrasal conjunction does not reflect the operation of a syntactic transformation. Examples of phrasal conjunction are (248) and (249) below, which are straight Russian glosses of the English sentences adduced by Lakoff and Peters (1969) to demonstrate that not all instances of conjunction reduction represent the merger of separate underlying sentences.
(248) Ivan i Maša odinakovy. (248') John and Mary are alike.

(248a) *Ivan odinakov. (248a') *John is alike.

(248b) *Maša odinakova. (248b') *Mary is alike.

(249) Ivan i Maša vstretilis'. (249') John and Mary met.

(249a) *Ivan vstretilsja. (249a') *John met.

(249b) *Maša vstretilas'. (249b') *Mary met.

Certain sentences are ambiguous in that they exhibit conjunction which can be either phrasal or sentential, e.g.,

(250) Ivan i Maša ušli. (250') John and Mary left.

Sentence (250) has two meanings, which are paraphrased by (251) and (252).

(251) Ivan i Maša ušli vmeste. (251') John and Mary left together.

(252) Ivan ušel i Maša ušla. (252') John and Mary left separately.

Thus (250) has two different underlying structures and two derivational histories. The version which is paraphrased by (251) results from phrasal conjunction, while the version paraphrased by (252) results from the conjoining of separate sentences.

For our purposes, only sentential conjunction is relevant, since it alone will conjoin subjects originating in separate S's. If it can be shown that nominative
subjects can conjoin with postulated dative subjects, this will provide additional evidence of dative subjecthood.

Consider the following sentences exhibiting conjoined subjects:

(253) Po beregam stojat goroda(253')

Along the banks stand cities

i sela, točno prjaničnye.

and villages looking like honeycakes

(254) Rabotat' i polužit'

To work and to earn a diploma was his intention.

diplom bylo ego namerenie.

diploma was his intention

(255) Čto Einstejn byl genij, (255')

That Einstein was a genius, that he transformed our concept of time and space is known by everybody.

čto on preobrazoval naše ponjatie vremeni i pro-stranstva vsem izvestno.

that he transformed our concept of time and space to all known

Sentence (253) is an example of conjunction of nominative subjects. In (254), infinitive subjects have conjoined. And in (255), entire clauses have conjoined as the subject of the larger sentence. The question arises whether it is possible to conjoin subjects which have different morphological shapes. Klima (1963:148) demonstrated that morphologically dissimilar words can conjoin with this example:

(256) On xoros soboj i bez (256')

He is handsome and he good by self and without quite normal.

strannostej.

(256) conjoins an adjectival phrase with a prepositional phrase, which demonstrates their membership in the same higher structural category, predicative. However, it
appears that conjunction of morphologically dissimilar
subjects is not possible, e.g.,

(257) *Vyjti zamuz, byt'
to marry to be
mater'ju, i sčast'e
mother and happiness
èto ee nadežda.
it her dream

(258) *Borot'sja uporno i
to fight stubbornly and
pobeda budet naša
victory will our
strategija.
strategy

(259) *Vsegda xvarstat'sja i
always to brag and
čto Ivan ègoist
that Ivan egoist
očevidno.
obvious

(257')*To marry, to be a
mother, and happiness are her dream.

(258')*To fight stubbornly
and victory will be our strategy.

(259') To constantly boast
and that Ivan is an
goist is obvious.

In (257) and (258), the conjunction of infinitive phrases with
nominative subjects results in ungrammaticality. In (259),
conjunction of a sentential and infinitival subject also
proves unacceptable.

Finally, let us attempt to conjoin subjects which
belong to the same part of speech but exhibit different
inflectional forms. Sentences (260) through (265) reveal
that this also results in ungrammatical strings.

(260) Mne ne xočetsja pit' vina.(260') I don't feel like
to me not wants to drink of wine drinking any wine.

(261) Anna ne xočet pit' vina. (261') Anna doesn't want to
Anna not wants to drink of wine drink any wine.
Sentences (262) and (263) are acceptable, because the conjoined nominals have the case marking required by the verbs, i.e., nominative with xotim and dative with xočetsja. Sentences (264) and (265) are unacceptable for the simple reason that a dative cannot occur with the form xočet and a nominative cannot occur with xočetsja. The ungrammaticality of (264) and (265) is not necessarily proof that the datives are not subjects. The conditions prerequisite for conjunction reduction are not met in (264) and (265), i.e., the conjoined sentences differ in more ways than the case marking on the nominals. The sentences have differences in voice as well. Furthermore, there is a general rule in Russian which blocks the conjoining of NPs with different case marking, e.g.,

(266) Deti brosali kamnjami v sobaku. (266') The kids children threw with rocks at dog threw rocks at the dog.
The verb brosat’ can take either an accusative or instrumental object, but it will not tolerate mixing cases in a conjoined complement.

Thus, conjunction reduction certainly provides no support for the hypothesis that datives can be subjects, but neither does it erode the arguments adduced earlier. The transformation is simply irrelevant, because its structural description cannot be met by two sentences containing a nominative subject and a subjective dative. Such sentences do not meet Chomsky’s criterion of differing with respect to only one variable.

5. Equi-NP deletion.

Equi-NP deletion (hereafter tagged EQUI) is one of the indispensable rules for the transformational analysis of a wide range of syntactic problems. The best case for EQUI as a legitimate transformation in Russian is provided by noncontiguous dependencies such as (269) and (270), which Chvany (1970:42) used to demonstrate that the infinitival clauses contain deep-structure subjects.
Ivan promised Maša to be careful.

The most elegant explanation of the gender difference on the predicative, ostorožný- is to posit explicit deep-structure subjects in embedded sentences. These subjects control the assignment of gender and number to the predicative and are then deleted under identity to an NP higher in the sentence (the object in (269) and the subject in (270)).

EQUI is a structure-reducing rule, whose effect is to eliminate the subject and only the subject of an embedded sentence under identity with an NP in the matrix sentence. Sentence (271) below is well-formed, as EQUI has deleted the subject of the embedded sentence. But in (272), the object has been deleted under identity to a higher NP, resulting in an ungrammatical string.

(271) Ja ugovoril Annu (271') I persuaded Anna to kiss me.

(272) *Ja ugovoril Annu (272') I persuaded Anna to kiss.

The following sentence would appear to be a contradiction to the statement that EQUI eliminates only subjects, since the deep subject of the embedded sentence is Anna, which is not deleted.14
(273) Otec pozvolil pis'mu (273') Father permitted the
father allowed to letter letter to be kept
byt' deržimym Annoj. by Anna.
to be held by Anna

Phrase marker (274) demonstrates that Anna indeed does
hold the deep subject slot of the embedded sentence.

According to (274), the pis'm- embedded under S₁ could not
be deleted by our rule of EQUI, for that rule operates only
on subjects. However, before EQUI operates, pis'm- (NP₁.₁)
is moved into the subject position by passivization, which
demotes Ann- (NP₁.₀) to the right of the verb. If this
sequence of events were switched, and NP₁.₁ were eliminated
by EQUI before passivization, the latter transformation would
be blocked, since passivization operates to promote deep
objects. This discussion has shown that EQUI operates only
on embedded subjects, and that EQUI is an ordered transform-
ation which follows passivization.
Since only subjects of embedded sentences are removed by EQUI, it would be a convincing piece of evidence if subjective datives are affected by the rule. Let us take a grammatical sentence with a subjective dative (sentence (275) below) and embed it under a matrix sentence containing an EQUI-governing predicate, such as (276):

(275) Mne bylo veselo. (275') I felt happy.  
     to me was happy

(276) Ja xotel... (276') I wanted ...
     I wanted

(277) Ja xotel, čtoby mne bylo veselo. (277') I wanted to feel happy.
     I wanted so that to me was happy

Now if EQUI can apply to remove the dative of (277), this should indicate the subjecthood of that NP:

(278) Ja xotel, čtoby bylo veselo. (278') I wanted it to be merry.
     I wanted so that was happy

Although fully grammatical, (278) does not have the same meaning as (277). Deletion of the dative has removed a vital semantic unit from the embedded sentence. In addition, unlike the instances of EQUI we have examined, infinitive formation has not accompanied the deletion of the embedded NP in (278). Finally, the complementizer čtoby has not been removed in (278), which is also atypical of sentences affected by EQUI. Clearly then, (278) does not derive from (277) by application of EQUI or any other transformation.
The fact is EQUI will never have an opportunity to apply to embedded sentences of the structure \( N^d V^c.o.s. \) or \( N^d V^sja \). We shall discuss whether \( N^d V^\text{inf.} \) sentences might represent structures reduced by EQUI later in the present section. Verbs which govern EQUI have a semantic content incompatible with a stative embedded predication. EQUI verbs require complements which involve agents, i.e., NPs which purposely act, which control the action depicted by the verb of the embedded sentence. Below are listed some verbs which govern EQUI. Note the semantic role played by the subjects of the infinitive complements is consistently agentive.

**MODAL VERBS**

moč' 'be able' On možet xodit'. 'He can walk'.
dolžen 'ought' On dolžen zanimatsja. 'He must study'.

nužno 'must' Nam nužno čitat' Puškina. 'We must read Puškina'.

nel'zja 'cannot' Ej nel'zja pit' vina. 'She cannot drink any wine'.
uspet' 'succeed' Ona uspela dostat' bilety. 'She managed to get tickets'.

objazan 'obliged' On byl objazan zajti za nej. 'He was obliged to pick her up'.

**QUASI-ASPECTUAL VERBS**

načinat' 'begin' Ivan načal učit'sja. 'Ivan began to study'.

prodolžat' 'continue' Oni prodolžali borot'sja. 'They kept on fighting'.
perestat' 'stop' Rebenok perestal plakat'. 'The kid stopped crying'.
CAUSATIVE VERBS

zastavit' 'force' Otec zastavil syna rabotat'. 'The father forced his son to work'.

naučit' 'teach' Ja naučil ego govorit' četko. 'I taught him to speak clearly'.

ugovorit' 'persuade' Anna ugovorila menja ostat'sja. 'Anna persuaded me to stay'.

MISCELLANEOUS VERBS

obesčat' 'promise' Otec obesčal kupit' konfety. 'Father promised to buy candy'.

namerevat'sja 'intend' Ja namerevajus' prijti. 'I intend to come'.

starat'sja 'try' My staraemsja perestroit' garazh. 'We are trying to rebuild the garage'.

In a word, EQUI does not operate on embedded sentences of the structure \(N_d V_{c.o.s}\) and \(N_d V_{-sja}\), since the meaning of EQUI-governing verbs precludes their cooccurrence with complements lacking agentive verbs. EQUI always gives rise to an infinitive phrase, and neither \(N_d V_{c.o.s}\) nor \(N_d V_{-sja}\) sentences can be infinitivized.

Let us examine the behavior of datives in \(N_d V_{inf}\) structures embedded under an EQUI-governing verb. Recall that Comrie (1974) hypothesized the dative form on \(odin-\) and \(sam-\) in infinitival complements is a trace of the deleted subject of the infinitive, which must be in the dative form. Let us reexamine Comrie's example, whose verb is conveniently EQUI-governing.

(279) My poprosili Ivana pojti odnomu. (279') We asked we asked Ivan to go alone Ivan to go alone.
If Comrie's analysis of the dative _odnomu_ is correct, then EQUI has applied to remove the dative subject of the infinitive, i.e., the embedded sentence in which _odnomu_ originates would be:

(280) Ivanu _odnomu pojti_.
(280') Ivan alone is to go.

After deletion of the dative, _Ivanu_, a reordering of elements transposes _odnomu_ to the right of the infinitive.

This is a very neat explanation of the intriguing second dative phenomenon, but it creates problems. Recall that in the previous instances of EQUI cited in this paper, the rule is ordered before infinitive formation, a sequence which is motivated by the hypothesis that infinitives are created upon deletion of the sentence element which controls person, number, and gender assignment on the verb, i.e., the subject. This approach meshes well with Babby's mechanical definition of infinitives as the part of speech created when the structure of VP dominating VP arises in a derivation. But in Comrie's treatment, it is necessary to place the infinitive in the deep structure before the application of EQUI in order for the embedded subject to be marked dative. This is a paradox. If one accepts Comrie's explanation of the second dative, the transformational explanation of infinitive formation must be abandoned. Yet if the transformational account of infinitive formation is scrapped, a very bold claim is being made about the ability of SVA to operate
across an intermediate infinitive. Consider the derivation of sentence (281), which illustrates the quandary:

(281) \textit{Maša velela mne byt' veselym.} (281') \textit{Maša ordered Maša ordered to me to be happy me to be happy.}

In this derivation, we shall follow Comrie's hypothesis, inserting the infinitive in the base phrase marker.

From (282), derivation of (281) would proceed as follows:

\textbf{S\textsubscript{1} cycle:}

1. SVA, which copies the number and gender specifications of \textit{NP\textsubscript{1}} onto the predicate adjective. (Note this treatment requires SVA to operate across an intervening infinitive).

2. Case marking, which assigns dative to \textit{NP\textsubscript{1}} as the subject of an infinitive and instrumental to the predicate adjective as the complement of the infinitive, \textit{byt'}. 

3. \textit{EQUI}, which deletes \textit{NP\textsubscript{1}} under identity to \textit{NP\textsubscript{0.1}} in the matrix sentence.
S cycle:

1. SVA, which assigns gender and number specifications to the verb.

2. Case marking, which marks $\text{NP}_{o.o}$ nominative as the subject of a finite verb and $\text{NP}_{o.1}$ dative as the complement of the verb velela.

If one accepts this derivation, the subjecthood of datives is assumed from the start, one must accept the claim that SVA operates across infinitives, and one must argue that a non-nominative NP can control SVA. This is indeed a costly analysis. The evidence that EQUI deletes datives from embedded sentences of the structure $N_d V_{\text{inf}}$ is at best tenuous.

One has no difficulty finding examples of subjective dative sentences with infinitival complements. In such sentences, the dative is coreferential with the logical (underlying) subject of the infinitive, which in a transformational framework is eliminated by EQUI. Some examples are:

(283) $\text{Mne skučno čitat'}. \quad (283')$ I'm bored reading.

(284) $\text{Nam načinat' perestraivat'}. \quad (284')$ It is for us to begin to rebuild stolicu.

(285) $\text{Synu xočetsja pojti v kino}. \quad (285')$ My son wants to go to film.

The fact that subjective datives control deletion of
coreferential embedded subjects does not, however, constitute proof that the datives are subjects, because a wide range of syntactic positions can control EQUI. Below we provide a listing of the types of NPs which control EQUI in embedded sentences.

I. Nominative subjects, e.g.,

(286) My staralis' prijti vo vremja. (286') We tried to arrive in time.

II. Accusative objects, e.g.,

(287) Maša zastavila doč' (287') Maša forced her daughter to do her lessons.

III. Dative complements of verbs of communication or transfer, e.g.,

(288) Maša velela synu sidet' tixo. (288') Maša told her son to sit still.

IV. Prepositional complements. Unlike English, Russian resists deletion of embedded subjects under identity with prepositional complements. Only a few marginal examples come to mind, e.g.,

(289) Ja nakričal na Annu (289') I yelled at Anna to shut up.

(289a) *Ja nakričal na Annu zamol'cat'. (289a') I yelled at Anna to shut up.
There is a body of verbs in Russian which require the coidentity of their subjects and the subjects of the sentences embedded beneath them. With these verbs, EQUI is obligatory. Included in this group are verbs with a quasi-aspectual meaning, e.g., načinat' 'begin', prodolžat' 'continue', perestat' 'stop', uspet' 'succeed', along with predicatives bearing various modal shadings, e.g., moč' 'be able', sposoben 'be capable of', prinuzden 'be compelled to', objazan 'be obliged to'. None of the verbs just mentioned occurs with subjective datives, and all require nominative subjects.

There is another body of verbs in Russian which occur in subjective dative sentences and which require the coidentity of their subjective datives with the subjects of the sentences embedded beneath them. This body of verbs is semantically very similar to the first group which has the like-subject requirement. Both sets require application of EQUI, and both bear various aspectual-modal meanings. Among the verbs in the second set are: udat'sja 'succeed',prixodit'sja 'be required to', predstojat' 'have to',

(290) Ol'ga poslala pis'mo k drugu, ctoby on srazu priexat'. Ol'ga sent a letter to her friend so that he at once came. 

(290a) Ol'ga poslala pis'mo k drugu srazu priexat'. Ol'ga sent a letter to her friend to come at once.
nel'zja 'not be permitted to', nado 'have to', dovodit'sja 'have occasion to', nadležat' 'ought to', povezti 'be lucky to'.

These two sets of predicatives might share one lexical item, dol'n-. In the context of a nominative subject, the form of the predicative shows agreement in terms of number and gender, and the nominative subject must be coreferential with the subject of the complement sentence, e.g.,

(291) Ja doļzen byl govorit'. (291') I had to speak.

In the context of a subjective dative, the predicative assumes the neuter singular morphology, e.g.,

(292) Mne doļžno bylo govorit'. (292') I had to speak.

Sentences (291) and (292) were Barsov's examples, and (292) would be considered archaic today, according to Chvany (1970).

The lexical items moc' 'be able' and možno 'be able' belong to these two sets of predicatives, both having as one of their meanings 'to be permitted to'. The predicatives share the root mog-, and both require EQUI. They differ only in derivational morphology and the case marking on the cooccurring NP which controls EQUI. Miller (1973) argues that moc' and možno are syntactically conditioned allomorphs. The verb assumes one of the inflectional forms of moc' in the presence of a nominative subject and the form of možno in the presence of a subjective dative, e.g.,
(293) My možem obedat' v
we can to dine in
restorane.

(293') We can dine in a
restaurant.

(294) Nam možno obedat'
to us possible to dine
v restorane.
in restaurant

(294') We can dine in a
restaurant.

Thus, the lexical items dolžn- and moč' /možno, which have the like-subject requirement first discussed in Perlmutter (1970), exhibit the same semantic dependency between nominative subjects and embedded subjects as between subjective datives and embedded subjects. This is further evidence that the semantic role of the dative in "category-of-state" sentences is subjective in nature.


Gundel (1974) offered the hypothesis that Russian has a transformation akin to EQUI which deletes subjects under identity to the discourse topic. The transformation is needed, she argues, to account for the ambiguity of (295).

(295) Miša skazal, chto Leonid (295') Miša said that Miša said that Leonid Leonid recalls where pomnit, gde ostavil
recalls where left vašu knigu.
your book

The deleted subject of the gde sentence has two possible referents, Miša or Leonid. As the rule of EQUI is devised, it eliminates a repeating subject in a sentence embedded directly beneath the sentence which contains its coreferent, i.e., Leonid. Another rule must be adduced to account for
deletion of a subject under identity to an NP higher in the tree, i.e., Miša. Gundel demonstrates that deletion of a subject under identity to the discourse topic transcends sentence boundaries. A good example of this phenomenon is (296):

(296) A Vanja? Ne znaju, Vanja? I don't know, and Vanja not know
dajetsja, kupil sebe seems he bought
goes, bought self
novyj avtomobil'. himself a new car.
new automobile

Whether topic-controlled subject deletion is to be subsumed under EQUI is not central to the present study. What is of interest to us is the fact that the deletion affects subjective datives as readily as nominative subjects. The following example was found in Gor'kij's Detstvo 'Childhood':

(297) Ja vyskol'znul iz-pod I slid out of her
I slid out from under grasp. Didn't feel
ee ruki. (Mne) ne like leaving.
her hand to me not
xotelos' uxoridit'. wanted to go

In (297), the dative mne has been deleted, as it is coreferential with the discourse topic. Similarly, in the following sentences, the subjective datives have been deleted, being understood to be coreferential with the discourse topic, which in these instances is the speaker.

(298) I skuchno i grustno i It's boring and sad, and boring and sad and
and I have noone to
tekomu ruku podat'. give my hand to.
to nobody hand to give
7. Gerund formation.

Traditionally, Russian grammars observe that the understood subjects of gerund phrases must be coreferential with the nominative subject of the main sentence. In the transformational literature, various hypotheses have been constructed to make this semantic dependency explicit, e.g., Gladney (1970), Launer (1974), and Babby (1975b). The most cogent arguments in this regard are those of Babby, who claims that gerunds are not to be considered a separate part of speech in deep structure, but must be viewed as syntactically-derived surface-structure verbal forms. Gerunds, in the Babby hypothesis, are derived from embedded adverbial sentences which have explicit nominative subjects. These subjects are deleted in the transformational cycle by the general rule of EQUI, creating a structure of the form \( \text{VP} \), where AP = adverbial phrase. This structure defines the part of speech, gerund. In fact, Babby argues, there is no need for a separate transformation of gerund formation. Though finding Babby's arguments completely convincing, we have chosen to treat the topic of gerund formation apart from EQUI for reasons of expositional convenience.

The following sentences demonstrate that the logical subjects of gerund phrases in Russian are invariably

\begin{align*}
(299) & \text{Бол'ше не хочу.} & (299') & \text{I don't care for any more.}
\end{align*}
coreferential with the subjects of the matrix sentences. The teacher, explaining the theorem, drew geometric figures on the board.

(300) **Prepodavatel', ob'jasnaja (300')**

- The teacher,
- explaining
- theorem, drew
- geometric figures

(301) **Ona ušla iz kuxni, brosiv (301')**

- She left the kitchen, tossing a bunch of carrots on the table.

(302) **Smejas' i gromko govorja, (302')**

- Laughing and talking loudly, the sailors went into the bar.

The gerund phrases above perform adverbial functions, adding information of time, manner, place, cause, and the like to the predication. A sample derivation of a sentence containing a gerund phrase following Babby's approach is presented below. It is worth noting that Babby embeds the sentence in which the gerund originates under the node AP, which corresponds to the traditional Russian view that the deepričastie 'gerund' is an adverbial part of speech subordinate to the main verb. Gvozdev (1967:386) offers the following description of the deepričastie:

In modifying the action expressed by the verb, the gerund is like an adverb. Like adverbs, gerunds have an invariant form. The universal syntactic feature of the gerund's use is the fact that it is subordinated to the verb and through the verb is bound with the subject.

The underlying structure of (303) is the phrase marker (304).
Derivation of (303) from (304) proceeds as follows.

$S_1$ cycle:

1. Case marking, which assigns locative to the object of the preposition in PP.
2. EQUI, which eliminates $NP_1$ under identity with $NP_0$.
3. S-node deletion, which eliminates $S_1$.

$S_0$ cycle:

1. SVA, which copies the person, number and gender specifications of $NP_o$ onto the verb, $uvide_0$.
2. Case marking, which assigns nominative to the subject of $uvide_0$.

Note again, Babby's approach eliminates the need for a separate gerund-formation transformation. The segmentation rules of the language will spell out the verbal form automatically, since the structure which defines the part of speech, gerund, has been transformationally created. That
subject co-identity is obligatory for the derivation of sentences with gerund phrases is demonstrated by the following ungrammatical strings, in which matrix subjects and embedded subjects are not identical.

(305) *Ivan xoroshoponimaja (305') *Ivan understanding
   Ivan well understanding the theory well,
   'etu teori ju, Anna
   this theory Anna
   ob"jasnila ee studentam.
   explained it to students

(306) *Boris uvelkajas' (306') *Boris being mad
   Boris being mad about tennis, we
   tenisom, my oxotno
   by tennis we gladly
   ezdili na matč.
   went to match

(307) *Anna guldaja po parku, (307') *Anna strolling in
   Anna strolling about park the park, you will
   ty uvidiš' gruppu detej.
   you will see group of
   children.

It might be argued that (305), (306), and (307) are not well-formed for reasons other than the non-identity of embedded and matrix subjects. It might be argued, for example, that no gerund in Russian occurs with an explicit subject, and all of these examples give overt subjects to the gerund phrases. But that objection is at least partially nullified by the following example:

(308) Maša zaplakala, sama (308') Maša burst into
   Masa started crying herself tears, not knowing
   ne znaja počemu.
   not knowing why

In (308), the gerund clause appears to have an overt subject, sama, which is coreferential with the nominative subject of the matrix sentence. In fact, the pronoun sama cannot stand
alone as a subject, but must accompany a noun or another pronoun. In (308), it is a trace of the deleted subject of the gerund clause, supporting Babby's argument that gerunds have nominative deep-structure subjects.

Russian avoids ambiguity of reference in gerund phrases. Thus in (303), the gerund rabotaja denotes an activity in which the subject, on, is involved at the moment when the activity of the main verb, uvidel, transpires. Unlike English, the "logical subject" of a gerund can be coreferential only with the explicit subject of the main verb, never with the object.

Launer's brief discussion of gerund formation stresses the following point:

... in order for it to be possible to combine two kernel sentences into one, utilizing a verbal adverb, the identical NPs of both kernel sentences must function as sentence subjects. (Launer 1974:115)

If one accepts the classic definition of subject as exclusively nominative-form substantives with which predicates agree in terms of person, number, and gender, then it should not be possible for a gerund phrase to appear in a sentence with a subjective dative. The following sentences prove this not to be the case, i.e., gerunds freely occur in subjective-dative sentences.

(309) Dumaja o svoem detstve (309') Thinking about her thinking of her childhood childhood in Yalta, v Jalte, babuške stalo grustno. Granny became sad. in Yalta to grandma became sad
(310) Sidja pod jablonej v sadu, nam bylo ošen' prijatno.
(310') Sitting under the apple tree in the garden, it was very pleasant for us.

(311) Rasskazyvaja ob ētom, mne xočetsja podèrknut',
(311') Talking about this, to me wants to emphasize that...

(312) Vojdja v peščeru, mne stalo strašno.
(312') Having entered the cave, I got scared.

In all these sentences, the subjects of the gerunds are coreferential with the subjective datives. Unless one accepts the principle that datives can function as subjects, it will be necessary to write an ad hoc rule to explain the appearance of gerunds in (309) through (312), which would miss the following important generalizations:

1. Just as in (300), (301), and (302), where the embedded subjects are obligatorily deleted under identity to the matrix nominative subject, the embedded subjects of (309) through (312) have deleted under identity with NPs occupying the subject position in the matrix sentence.

2. If the subject of the embedded sentence is not coreferential with the matrix sentence's subjective dative, an ungrammatical string results with gerund formation, just as in those instances when the gerund subjects and the matrix nominative subjects are not coreferential, e.g.,
(313) *Babuške stalo grustno, (313') *Grandmother became sad, we talking about our childhood in Yalta.

my govorja o našem we talking of our detstve v Jalte. childhood in Yalta

3. The meaning intended by the ungrammatical string of (313) can be expressed only by employing a subordinate adverbial clause of time/cause containing an explicit subject (cf. (314) below), just as in those instances when the nominative subject and logical subject of the gerund do not coincide.

(314) Babuške stalo grustno. (314') Grandma became sad when we were talking about our childhood in Yalta.

kogda my govorili o when we talked of našem detstve v Jalte. our childhood in Yalta

4. Sam, the intensive reflexive pronoun, functions in gerund phrases subordinate to a sentence with a subjective dative in the very same way it functions in gerund phrases subordinate to a sentence with a nominative subject, i.e., sam serves as a trace of the nominative subject of the gerund, which is deleted under identity to the higher NP, e.g.,

(315) Anton rasserdilja na (315') Anton got angry at me, not knowing why

menja, sam ne znaja me self not knowing počemu. why

(316) Anne stalo grustno, (316') Anna became sad, not knowing why

sama ne znaja otčego. herself not knowing why
8. Adverbial clause reduction.

In his article on the syntax of gerunds, Babby observed that EQUI is required for the derivation of gerund phrases and also in the reduction of other types of adverbial sentences, thus giving rise to infinitive constructions. Our study has found this observation to be essentially accurate, but some refinements are called for.

The phenomenon of adverbial clause reduction is exemplified by the following sentence pairs. The (a) sentences have not undergone adverbial clause reduction, while the (b) sentences have.

(317a) Ja prileg na divan, čtoby (317a') I lay down on
I lay down on sofa so that
prošla golovnaja bol'.
passed head pain
my headache would pass.

(317b) Ja prileg na divan, čtoby (317b') I lay down on
I lay down on sofa so that
nemnogo otdoxnut'.
a little to rest
rest a little.

(318a) Mat' uskorila šagi, čtoby (318a') Mother hastened
mother hastened steps so that
ee ne dognali.
her not overtook
they wouldn't overtake her.

(318b) Mat' uskorila šagi, čtoby (318b') Mother hastened
mother hastened steps so that
ujti ot etix junčeij.
to leave from these youths
in order to get away from these youths.

(319a) Napivšis' kofeju, Levin (319a') Having drunk his
having drunk of coffee Levin fill of coffee, Lev-
uexal opjat' na pokos,
in left again for
left again to mowing
the mowing before
prézde čem Sergej Ivanovič Sergey Ivanovič had
before that Sergey Ivanovič
time to dress and
uspel odet'sja i vyjti v stolovuµ. come into the
managed to dress and come into d.r. dining room.
Before going to his own officers, Kozel'cov went to greet his company. In those sentences with adverbial clause reduction, the subject of the embedded sentence must be identical with the matrix subject. Without subject coidentity, reduction is impossible, according to Babby's account. Our research has revealed that this generalization is not totally accurate.

In the first place, not all embedded adverbial sentences permit reduction, even when the like-subject requirement is met. It appears to be a lexically governed phenomenon, since only certain adverbial clause types introduced by certain subordinating conjunctions can undergo subject deletion. Among the reducible clause types are:

A. Temporal adverbial clauses denoting the completion of the activity expressed by the matrix verb before completion of the activity expressed by the embedded verb and introduced by the complex conjunctions _pered tem, kak 'before', prežde čem 'before', ran'še čem 'before'._ Other temporal clauses do not permit reduction, e.g., clauses introduced by the complex conjunctions _posle togo, kak 'after', poka ... ne 'until', v to vremja, kak 'while', do tex por, poka 'until', s tex por, kak 'since', kak tol'ko 'as soon as', po mere togo, kak 'to the extent that'.20_
The following sentence pairs demonstrate to what extent adverbial clause reduction is a lexically-governed rule. The (a) sentences do not exhibit reduction, while the (b) sentences do.

(320a) Ran'še čem Ol'ga pročitala (320a') Before Ol'ga read
before that Ol'ga read
etu knigu, ona poznakomilas' read this book, she became
this book she became acquainted with
s istorięj ee sozdanija. the history of its creation.

(320b) Ran'še čem pročitat' etu (320b') Before reading
before that to read this
knigu, Ol'ga poznakomilas' book Ol'ga got
book Olga became acquainted
s istorięj ee sozdanija. acquainted with
with history of its creation
its creation.

(321a) Prezde čem budem drat'sja, (321a') Before we
before that we will fight
vy izvol'te pokazat' mne, you please to show to me
kak nado streljat'. how must to fire

(321b) Prezde čem učit' mal'ika (321b') Before teaching
before that to teach boy
ja dol'žen uznat' ego dušu. I must to know his soul
I must to know his soul.

(322a) Saljapin soverženno (322a') Chaliapin,
Chaliapin completely
spokojno vošel na scenu i completely at
calmly entered on stage and
calmly entered on stage and
zanjal svoe mesto za stolom took his place behind table
took his place behind table
takłączynamo przed tem, directly before that
neposredstvenno pered tem, before that
kak vzwilsja zanaves. as rose
curtain
curtain

(322b) Pered tem, kak pristupit' k (322b') Before setting
before that as to set to
operacii, vrač tšcatel'no setting to the
operation, the
operation doctor carefully
operation doctor carefully
podgotovilsja. prepared
podgotovilsja. prepared.
After she entered the university, Anna got interested in history.

After entering the university, Anna got interested in history.

As soon as the child saw the toy, he cheered up.

As soon as catching sight of the toy, the child cheered up.

B. Adverbial clauses of purpose introduced by the conjunctions ětoby 'in order to', liź by 'if only', dlja togo ětoby 'in order to', daby 'in order that', s tem, ětoby 'with the purpose of', and others.

The following sentences are examples of adverbial clauses of purpose which are reducible on the condition that
the subject coidentity principle is not violated. Again, the (a) sentences do not exhibit clause reduction, while the (b) sentences do.

(325a) Čtoby otec ne prospal, (325a') So that Father so that father not overslept mother set alarm clock

(325b) Čtoby ne prospat', otec (325b') So as not to oversleep, Father set alarm clock

(326a) Perestraxovščiki! Ja timid souls I
basnju vam prošel ne fable to you read not
dlja togo, čtoby vy for that so that you
nadejalis' na pčel. relied on bees

(326b) Kazalos', priroda narodno (326b') It seemed that
seemed nature purposely
izbrala ěti mesta dlja selected these places for
togo, čtoby pokazat' that so that to show
kakova možet byt' proiz-how can to be productive
voditel'naja sila zemlji. power of earth

(327a) On oxotno soglasalsja so (327a') He willingly he gladly agreed with
vsem, čto govoril kapitan, all that said captain
liš' by ne bylo neprijatnogo if only not was unpleasant
razgovora o nepravil'no post-conversation about improperly
avlennyx bakenax i posadke set buoys and grounding
paroxoda na mel'. of ship on shoals.
(327b) Odni iezuity utverždaju, [327b'] Only Jesuits
alone Jesuits assert
čto vsjakoe sredstvo xorоšо,
that any means good
liš' by dostignut' celi.
if only to achieve goal

Adverbial clauses which denote place, cause, concession, result, and the like do not permit reduction, e.g.,

(328a) Nesmotrja na to, čto on (328a') In spite of the
in spite of fact that he
umět organizovat' vremja,
knows how to organize
don ne uspevaet vypolnit'
he not manages to complete
vse zadanija.
all tasks

(328b) *Nesmotrja na to, čto 328b') In spite of
in spite of fact that he
umět' organizovat' vremja,
to know how to organize
don ne uspevaet vypolnit'
he not manages to complete
vse zadanija.
all tasks

(329a) Ja preklonjajus' pered (329a') I bend down
I bend down before
pravilami, potomu čto
laws because
ljublju porjadok.
love order

(329b) *Ja preklonjajus' pered 329b') *I bend down
I bend down before
pravilami, potomu čto
laws because
ljubit' porjadok.
to love order

Babby's generalization about subject coidentity and adverbial clause reduction is invalid in certain contexts. A very interesting case is the behavior of adverbial clauses embedded under nu^#n-. Consider the following example:
(330) Èta kniga nužna mne, (330') I need this book this book necessary to me to send to my čtoby poslat' ee drugu. so that to send it to friend.

The subject of the matrix sentence in (330) is èta kniga according to the criterion of predicative agreement. Yet the deleted subject of the adverbial clause of purpose is not kniga but ja, which is coreferential with the dative NP, mne. This is yet another instance of subjective functions being shared by two NPs in a sentence.

Another class of adverbial clauses which do not obey the like-subject requirement and yet exhibit infinitive forms are clauses of "manner of action" which are introduced by čtoby and bear a nuance of "result precluded."

Below are some examples of the phenomenon.

(331) Vopros nedostatočno važen, (331') The question is question not enough important not important čtoby na nego sejčas so that on it right now enough to answer in detail podrobno otvečat'. in detail to answer

(332) On slíškom vzvolnovan (332') He is too upset he too upset by what has happened slučivsimja, čtoby ego by what happened so that him rasspraživat' obo vsem ètom. to question about all this

(333) Na dvore ne tak teplo, (333') It isn't warm on yard not so warm čtoby idti bez pal'to. to go without a to go without coat

Sentences (331-333) are logical equations of the form: if X then not Y. The logical subject of the čtoby clauses
in these sentences is an indefinite animate pro-form, which is deleted in the course of the derivation to give rise to the infinitive clause. EQUI is not involved in the derivation of such clauses. A similar explanation (pro-form deletion) might be offered for the derivation of infinitives in certain conditional clauses, e.g.,

(334) Esli vzgljanut' na gorod (334') If one gazes down
    if to gaze onto city onto the city from
    sverxu, vsjudu vidny rast-
    from above everywhere seen levels of new build-
    uščie etaji novostroek.
    growing floors of new buildings everywhere.

To summarize, the like-subject requirement and EQUI do account for most instances of adverbial clause reduction, which is a lexically-governed rule. This explanation fails in three cases: a) purpose clauses embedded under neobxodim- and the synonymous neobxodim-, where the NP coreferential with the deleted embedded subject is a dative; b) adverbial clauses of manner with a connotation of "result precluded"; c) conditional clauses. Clause reduction in the case of b) and c) is explained by deletion of a pro-form subject, followed by infinitive formation. So with these refinements in mind, adverbial clause reduction does serve as a test for subject identification, since it is a phenomenon which makes reference to the subject position.

The following sentences demonstrate that subjective datives behave as do nominative subjects with respect to the rule of adverbial clause reduction. If the dative is
coreferential with the embedded subject, reduction is possible, but if this co-identity does not obtain, reduction is blocked.

(335) Pered tem kak prodolžat' (335') Before continuing before that as to continue your journey, you putešestvie dal'še, vam journey farther to you neobxodimo nemnožko necessary a little otdoxnut'.
to rest

(336) Nado samomu znat', prešde (336') One must know must to self to know before čem učit' drugix. that to teach others

(337) Prešde čem dobit'sja (337') Before getting to before that to attain istiny, mne prišlos' truth to me it came mnogo povozit'sja s much to struggle with etim voprosom. this question

(338) Mne xotelos' by kupit' (338') I would like to to me wanted to buy ětu knigu čtoby poslat' this book so that to send ee v podarok tovarischu. it to gift to friend

(339) Čelovek byl bol'sogo (339') The man was of man was of large stature, and rosta i dlja togo, čtoby stature and for that to projti v dver', emu ne pass into door to him not tol'ko nužno bylo nagnut' only must was to bend golovu, no i sognut'sja head but and to bend vsem telom. entire body
The following sentence is unacceptable, because the embedded subject and the dative are not coreferential:

(340) * _tu knigu mne xotelos'  (340') I would like to
      this book to me wanted
      _kupit', _toby ty ot-
      buy this book
      to buy so that you
      _vezti ee tovariscu v
      to take it to friend as
      _podarok.
      gift

The reduction in (341) must be explained by the same rule of pro-form deletion which is required to explain the infinitive clauses in (331-333) above:

(341) Babuske sli̱skom xolodno, (341') It's too cold for
      to grandma too cold grandmother to be tak-
      _toby vyvesti ee na ulicu. en outside.
      so that to take her onto street

Sentence (341) is another instance of the "if X then not Y" equation.

The following sentence is another example of a dative NP performing subjective functions in the presence of a nominative subject. The dative (not the nominative) controls the deletion of the coreferential embedded subject:

(342) Pered tem kak prodol'zit' (342') Before continuing
      before that as to continue your journey, you
      putešestvie dal'še, vam need a rest.
      journey farther to you
      neobxodima ostanovka.
      necessary rest

Sentences such as (342) and (330) bring to mind our examination of the peculiar behavior of svoj in sentences where the reflexive is coreferential not with the nominative subject, but with an oblique form, e.g.,
Thus, the limited evidence of adverbial clause reduction supports the dative subject hypothesis.

9. Subject raising.

Like EQUI, subject raising (hereafter tagged SR) is a structure-reducing transformation, whose effect is to eliminate embedded S nodes by removing the subjects of those embedded sentences. Whereas EQUI is a deleting rule, SR is a movement rule, by which embedded subjects are "raised" or "promoted" to a position higher in the phrase marker. Although the domain of SR in Russian is much more restricted than in English, being governed by only about a dozen semantically related verbs, the transformation does interest us, as it makes reference to the NP occupying the subject position. 22

Several writers have defended the transformation of SR in Russian, e.g., Babby (1970), Chvany (1970), Růžička (1970), Nichols (1973c), Klenin (1974). From these works, a corpus of only about a dozen verbs which govern SR can be compiled, and there seems to be little hope of expanding that list. Klenin (1974:188) found support for the validity of SR as a transformation in Russian in the behavior of svoj in sentence (344):

(343) U menja est' svoja maşina. (343') I have my own car.

(343) U menja est' svoja maşina. (343') I have my own car.
(344) Alla счётаёт Borja найлучшим (344') Alla considers Borja best representative of own region

The antecedent of svoj in (344) can be either the subject, Alla, or the direct object, Borju. To account for this ambiguity, it is necessary to postulate that in deep structure, Borja is the subject of the embedded sentence in which svoj originates. This really is not such an abstract hypothesis, since the paraphrase of (344) with the complementizer что 'that' maintains Borja in subject position:

(344p) Alla счётаёт, что Borja найлучшим представителем svoego rajona. (344p') Alla thinks that Borja is the best representative of his region.

On the surface of it, SR appears to move embedded subjects into two positions in the matrix sentence, i.e., subject position and object position. Examples of the former are sentences (345-347) which are juxtaposed with paraphrases in which SR has not operated.

(345) Anna казется усталой. (345') Anna seems tired.
(345p) Казется, что Anna устала. (345p') It seems that Anna is tired.

(346) Эта проблема оказалась неразреcимой. (346') This problem turned out to be insoluble.
It turned out that this problem is insoluble.

America is considered a mighty power.

It is thought that America is a mighty power.

The following sentences are examples of SR moving an embedded subject into direct object position. Again, these sentences are compared with paraphrases which have not undergone SR.

I consider Mary a nice girl.

I think that Mary is a nice girl.

The professor did not acknowledge my arguments as convincing.

The professor didn't acknowledge that my arguments were convincing.

The command and my comrades found my marriage incompatible with the dignity of an officer.
Klenin (1974) streamlined the rule of SR by hypothesizing that it moves embedded subjects only into the direct object position, i.e., up into the matrix VP. From there, another independently motivated transformation, NP-preposing, can move the raised NP into the subject position of the matrix sentence. This analysis has the advantage of simplifying the rule of SR, plus it gives an explanation for the occurrence of -sja on those verbs whose subjects originated in an embedded sentence, i.e., the Babby-Brecht version of -sja addition.

Let us reexamine all the examples of sentences which have undergone SR. The embedded sentences whose subjects are removed have one obvious common denominator, all are copular sentences, whose predicates are either adjectival or substantival. The ungrammaticality of the following sentences demonstrate that the embedded sentences must be copular.

(351) *Ja sčitaju Annu ljubit' Ivana. (351')?I consider Anna to love Ivan.

(352) *Ekzamen okazalsja soderžat' mnogo nejasnyx voprosov. (352') The exam turned out to contain many unclear questions.
Let us examine the applicability of SR as a test of dative subjecthood. As just noted, SR appears to operate only on embedded copular sentences. The sentences which this study is examining do not fall into that category, and as a result, subjective datives cannot be raised, as (354) proves.

\[(353) \text{Ja sčitaju, } čto emu prijatno. (353') \text{ I feel that it is pleasant for him.} \]

\[(354) \text{Ja sčitaju ego prijatnym. (354') I consider him pleasant.} \]

Although fully grammatical, (354) is not the paraphrase of (353). The dative of (353) has not been promoted by SR to create (354). The two sentences derive from different deep structures. The paraphrase of (354) is:

\[(355) \text{Ja scitaju, čto on prijaten. (355') I think that he is pleasant.} \]

Thus SR provides no evidence either for or against the dative subject hypothesis, since its domain is restricted to copular sentences, an environment in which subjective datives are not encountered.

The following sentence pair is intriguing in that (357) appears to be a paraphrase of (356) which has undergone some kind of raising process.

\[(356) \text{Kazalos', čto emu let } \text{za sem'desjat'. (356') It seemed that he was perhaps over seventy years old.} \]
Sentence (357) differs from (356) in that it contains no embedded S node introduced by the complementizer "čto", and the topic "emu" has been promoted to sentence-initial position. The English glosses precisely reflect the logic of the Russian. In the English versions, SR has clearly operated, and it appears that something akin to SR has also operated in the Russian. An embedded subjective dative has been lifted from its position in an embedded sentence and promoted to the position normally held by a matrix sentence subject, but no change in case marking has accompanied the shift.

10. Subject-object diathesis.

As one of the major syntactic processes in Indo-European languages effecting subject movement, passivization (subject-object diathesis in current Soviet terminology, e.g., Xolodovič 1970) must be examined in any study of the subject function. A typical Soviet textbook definition of passive voice is that offered in Pulkina (1968:486):

The passive construction is how one labels a sentence in which the subject denotes the object onto which the action is directed, while the complement denotes the acting person or thing and stands in the instrumental case without a preposition.

A good example of the active-passive correlation is the
following sentence pair:

(358) Metrostroevcy postroili  (358') The subway-builders
    subway builders built
    metro.  built the subway.
    subway

(359) Metro postroeno       (359') The subway was
    subway built
    metrostroevcami.  built by the
    by subway builders
    subway builders.

In (358) the subject is the performer of the action, the
agent; the object is the patient of the action; the verb is
active voice. In (359) the subject is the patient of the
action, the complement is the performer of the action, and
the verb has passive voice.

In the simplest transformational parlance,
passivization promotes a deep (traditionally, logical) object
to subject position, marking it nominative, and demotes an
underlying (logical) subject to a peripheral position or
deletes it altogether. At the same time, the verb is made to
agree with the derived subject and is given a passive
morphological shape. In the context of Russian, passivization
rearranges element order, with the underlying object assuming
sentence-initial position, and the underlying subject moving
to the right of the verb. This, however, is flexible, as the
following sentence demonstrates:

(360) Nami razrabotan rjad  (360') A series of devices
    by us developed series
    ustrojstv rabotajušćix  working by this
    of devices working
    po ètomu principu.  principle was
    by this principle
    developed by us.
In (360), the underlying object, made the surface subject by passivization, remains in its original position vis-à-vis the verb, while the underlying subject, demoted and marked instrumental, remains in its original position to the left of the verb. This superficially summarizes the transformational view of passivization as presented in such works as Schaarschmidt (1971) and Launer (1974). Lately, this conventional view has come under close scrutiny and the hypothesis has been offered that passivization is not a simple transformation, but a bundle of syntactic processes, including: object promotion, subject down-grading, case reassignment, predicate agreement with a derived subject, -sja attachment. Such a hypothesis has been defended by Babby and Brecht (1974) and Klenin (1974) for example.

What makes passivization as a unitary transformation in Russian suspect is: the large number of diverse operations involved, the seemingly arbitrary way in which certain verbal stems accept the perfective passive morpheme (which leads Babby to suspect passivization on perfective verbs is a problem for the lexicon), the lack of a single, unique verbal morpheme to denote passiveness (both -sja and -н-/т- are used, the former for imperfective verbs, the latter for perfectives), and the occurrence of sentences which appear to be only semi-passivized. An example of the last-mentioned is:

(361) Лодку нанесло волнами на камень. (361') The boat was boat carried by waves onto rock dashed onto the rocks by the waves.
In (361), the logical object has been promoted to subject position, and the logical subject has been demoted and marked instrumental. But the logical object keeps its accusative marking, and the verb does not bear a passive morpheme. In the following sentence, the underlying object remains in the genitive case (due to the negative particle ne), but it occupies sentence-initial position and the verb form is passive:

(362) Nikakix spleten pro no kind of gossip about
      vas ne sobiralos'. gathered about you.

We feel, in spite of the evidence just adduced, that a case can be made for passivization as a legitimate transformation, one involving several linked operations. Schaarschmidt defended the transformation on the grounds that it simplifies the lexicon. Without a passive transformation, it is necessary to state twice the selectional restrictions of a verb, i.e., in its active and passive forms. Without passivization, then, one misses the generalization that the cooccurrence relations holding between the object and verb in the active sentence duplicate those relations holding between the subject and verb in its passive counterpart. In addition to this persuasive argument, we offer the following pro-passive evidence.

The overwhelming majority of transitive (accusative-governing) verbs can occur in passive constructions,
according to Pulkina (1968). The idiosyncratic refusal of certain stems to accept a passive morphological form (e.g., (363) and (364) below) is not a crippling restriction on the syntax of Russian, as other means are available for achieving some of the results of passivization.

(363) Ivan vernul knigu v biblioteku. (363') Ivan returned Ivan returned book to library the book to the library.

(363p)*Kniga byla vernuta Ivanom book was returned by Ivan v biblioteku. to library.

(364) Saša uvidel Mašu na ulice. (364') Saša saw Saša saw Maša on street Maša on the street.

(364p)*Maša uvidena Sašej na ulice. (364p') Maša was Masa seen by Sasa on street seen by Sasa on the street.

One of the most important operations associated with passivization is the reordering of sentence elements according to their function as bearers of new or old information. Thus at least part of the meaning intended by a passive version of (363) can be rendered by element reordering, e.g.,

(365) Knigu vernul Ivan v biblioteku. (365') As to the book returned Ivan to library book, Ivan returned it to the library.

Another function of passivization, down-grading of underlying subjects, can also be achieved without marking the verb passive, e.g., the "indefinite personal construction," which uses the third person plural verb form without an explicit subject, e.g.,
(366) Mašu vybrali prezidentom. (366') Maša was elected by president.

So these verbs which do not have passive forms in their paradigms can occur in contexts highly reminiscent of the passive construction.

The restrictions which animacy places on the operation of passivization can for the most part be accommodated by making the rule sensitive to that feature. If both the deep object and subject are +animate, the majority of passivizeable verbs resist application of the rule. Counterexamples are rare but can be found, e.g.,

(367) Deti často balujutsja roditeljami. (367') Children often spoiled by parents.

In colloquial Russian, if the deep subject is +animate, its positioning to the right of the verb and concomitant instrumental marking is resisted, though such is certainly not the case in literary Russian.  

Distribution of the passive morphemes -sja and -n/-t- is extremely consistent, which does not suggest mere coincidence. The -sja morpheme attaches to imperfective stems, and -n/-t- attach to perfective stems. If -sja occurs on a perfective stem, with rare exceptions, the resulting verb is not passive, but reflexive or reciprocative. A splendid example of this principle is the following sentence from a recent Soviet newspaper:
(368) Odni iz nix pogibli ot Some of them died of gunshot wounds,
some of them died from others poisoned
ognestrel'nogo oruzija, themselves (or were
firearm weapon poisoned).
drugie - otravilis' (ili others poisoned self or
byli otravleny). were poisoned

The regularity of -sja and -n/-t- distribution is neatly handled in a transformational rule.

Passivization is needed as a cyclical transformational rule to explain a variety of other syntactic phenomena. Recall our discussion of EQUI, in which we showed that that transformation deletes only the subjects of embedded sentences. Sentence (369) was shown to be no counterexample to this principle, but only by relying on a passivization transformation which operates before EQUI (see pp.107-108 for discussion).

(369) Otec pozvolil pis'mu Father permitted the
father permitted to letter letter to be kept
byt' deržimym Annoj. by Anna.
to be held by Anna

Sentence (369) has been derived with one application of passivization (on the S₁ cycle). From (369) another grammatical string can be derived by application of passivization one more time (to the topmost S). This yields sentence (370).

(370) Pis'mo bylo pozvoleno The letter was permitted by father to
letter was permitted ootkom byt' deržimym to be kept by Anna.
by father to be held by Anna
Annoj.
by Anna
These two sentences prove the cyclical nature of the rule of passivization. Though extremely bookish and contrived (370) is presented by Xolodovič (1970) to demonstrate that an embedded object can end up as the subject of the matrix sentence.

The evidence strongly suggests passivization is a legitimate cyclical transformation, one which focuses on the subject and object relations. Let us now examine the behavior of subjective datives with respect to the transformation.

The types of sentences which contain subjective datives do not participate in the kind of agent-object interchange we have been describing. Their verbal morphology in fact coincides with that of passive structures, with the morphs -sja, and -n/-t- regularly occurring in subjective-dative sentences. Sentences such as these are not available for passivization, and subjective datives are consequently never shunted and marked instrumental (the fate of nominative subjects). But the fact that passivization does not move and instrumentalize subjective datives is not evidence against the dative subject hypothesis. Even many nominative subjects would fail that test. In the following intransitive sentences the nominative NPs would have to be categorized as nonsubjects if the criterion for subjecthood is the ability to be shunted in passivization.
None of these nominative subjects can be shunted by passivization, yet their subjecthood is not disputed.²⁵

In addition to agent-patient diathesis, Russian exhibits another form of "actant" interchange, which involves a psychological experiencer and a neutral object (i.e., an object which is not in any way affected by a physical activity). This other form of NP interchange is highly reminiscent of passivization. The phenomenon is exhibited in the following sentence pairs.

(374) Ja понима́ю эти теори́и. (374') I understand this theory.

(374p) Эта теори́я мне понятна. (374p') This theory is comprehensible to me.

(375) Везде я слы́шу тво́й го́лос. (375') Everywhere I hear your voice.

(375p) Везде мне слы́шится тво́й го́лос. (375p') Everywhere to me is heard your voice.

(376) Я вспомни́л детство. (376') I recalled my childhood.

(376p) Детство вспомни́лось мне. (376p') Childhood memories came to me.

(377) Я хочу́ что-нибудь поесть'. (377') I want something to eat.
In several respects, these sentence pairs resemble active-passive couplets. The first member of each pair contains an agentlike subject, i.e., an animate NP which can be perceived as the performer of an activity, albeit an internalized psychological activity. At the same time, these subjects denote the experiencer of a state or condition. The nominative subjects of psych-verbs, then, perform a dual semantic function. This unity is broken, however, by shunting the subject in a way which resembles the agent-demotion process in passivization. The (p) sentences above illustrate the phenomenon. The datives in the (p) sentences have as their primary semantic function to denote the experiencer of the psychological event. It is probably not accidental that in the (p) sentences (which have the neutral objects as subjects) the verb forms have the morphological trappings of passive verbs, i.e., the suffixes -sja and -n-/t-. Babby and Brecht (1975) argued that these morphs are attached to verbs whenever an object is promoted out of the VP to assume the subject role.

In a number of ways, then, experiencer-object interchange is similar to passivization. The dative form on the experiencer appears in those instances when the neutral object has been promoted to subject position. The dative
marks a demoted subject whose semantic function is that of experiencer, while the instrumental marks a demoted subject whose primary semantic function is that of agent.

11. Nominalization phenomena.

Passivization is but one of several grammatical phenomena in Russian which involve case alternation. The cases involved in the phenomena are what Kuryłowicz (1949) labelled "the grammatical cases," whose primary functions are syntactic. Kuryłowicz included the nominative, accusative, and genitive cases in this system. The genitive frequently functions to neutralize the syntactic opposition inherent in nominative and accusative forms. For example, the genitive accompanying a deverbal noun sometimes denotes the agent of an action and sometimes the object affected by an action. Prokopović (1955:153) provides the following examples of the phenomenon:

(378) Vyzov vrača na dom ... (378') The calling of the calling of doctor to house doctor to the house ...

(379) Vrač priexal po vyzovu (379') The doctor came doctor came according to call after the director's call direktora.
of director

(380) Direktor vyzval vrača (380') The director called director called doctor the doctor to the na dom. to house house.

The adnominal genitive of (378) corresponds to the direct object of sentence (380) and the subject of (379).
It is questionable whether nominalization is a legitimate syntactic transformation in Russian. But as Prokopovič points out, deverbal substantives in -nie/-tie are becoming increasingly common in the language, particularly in journalistic prose, and their syntactic behavior exhibits a high degree of predictability. The obvious morphological similarity of such nominalizations to passive participles is matched by a strikingly similar syntactic patterning. The following generalization seems valid: if a transitive verb can passivize and its subject can be shunted and marked instrumental, it typically can have a corresponding nominalization with an adnominal genitive which corresponds to the accusative object of the active sentence and an instrumental adjunct corresponding to the nominative subject of the active sentence. Prokopovič provides many examples of this pattern. Below we have listed a few of these, giving first the active sentences from which the nominalizations are formed.

(381) Studenty познали музей. (381') The students visited the museum.

(381n) посещение музея студентами (381n') the visiting of museum by students.

(382) Директор утвердил план. (382') The director confirmed the plan.

(382n) утверждение плана директором (382n') confirmation of plan by director.
A delegation of young people laid the wreath.

The laying of the wreath by a delegation of young people

Since nominalizations of this type "operate on" nominative subjects, we are obliged to inquire whether subjective datives are treated in like fashion. The answer appears to be in the negative, for the same reasons that datives don't behave like nominative subjects in passivization, i.e., datives do not function as the subjects of finite verbs with active voice and are therefore unavailable for shunting to the right of the verb and acquiring instrumental or genitive marking.27

Prokopović demonstrates that when oblique-case-governing verbs are nominalized, their oblique complements remain in their original form, with no case reassignment, e.g.,

(384) to entrust to Petrov
(384') poručit' Petrovu

to entrust to Petrov
(384n) poručenie Petrovu
commission to Petrov
(385') to liken to Stolz
upodobit' Štol'cu

to liken to Stolz
(385n) upodoblenie Štol'cu
likening to Stolz
(385n') a likening to Stolz
(386') to deprive of rights
lišit' prav

to deprive of rights
(386n) lišenie prav
denial of rights
(386n') a denial of rights
These examples show that the dative complements of seemingly transitive verbs do not lose their case marking, i.e., do not acquire genitive marking upon the nominalization of their verbs. Datives, then, are totally untouched by the case alternations associated with nominalization. If the datives are subjective, they cannot be shunted and marked instrumental; if they are objective, they do not give up their oblique marking when their verbs are nominalized.

12. Comparative reduction.

Another environment in which nominative-accusative oppositions are neutralized is the reduced comparative construction. Once again, it is the genitive case which effects the neutralization of the subject-object opposition, e.g.,

(388)  Ja ljublju Puškina
       I love Pushkin
       bol'še vsego.
       more of all

(389)  Ja ljublju Puškina
       I love Pushkin
       bol'še vsex.
       more of all

In both (388) and (389), the genitive-marked pronoun vs- represents a simplification in structure, replacing a comparative clause with an explicit subject and object. The
complete logical structure of (388) is:

\[(388p) \text{Ja ljubljju Puškina bol'še} (388p') \text{I love Pushkin more than I love everything (else).}\]

Reduction of (388p) eliminates repeating elements in the embedded sentence, stranding the object pronoun vse. At that point, a genitive-marking rule applies to yield (388).

The logical structure underlying (389) is:

\[(389p) \text{Ja ljubljju Puškina bol'še} (389p') \text{I love Pushkin more than everyone (else) loves Pushkin.}\]

Reduction of (389p) by elimination of all repeating elements in the embedded sentence strands the subject pronoun, vse, at which point a genitive-marking rule applies.

It appears, then, that comparative reduction is a legitimate test of subjecthood and objecthood. Subjective datives, as the following examples show, fail the test.

\[(390) \begin{align*}
a. \text{Mne skučno.} & \quad (390') \text{I'm bored.} \\
& \quad \text{to me boring} \\
b. \text{Vam skučno.} & \quad \text{You're bored.} \\
& \quad \text{to you boring} \\
c. \text{Mne skučnee čem vam.} & \quad \text{I'm more bored than you.} \\
& \quad \text{to me more boring than to you} \\
d. \ast \text{Mne skučnee vas.} & \quad \text{I'm more bored of you than you.} \\
& \quad \text{to me more boring of you} \end{align*}\]

Consider the paradigm below which is built around the verb nravitsja 'like'.

\[(391) \begin{align*}
a. \text{Mne nravitsja Anna.} & \quad (391') \text{I like Anna.} \\
& \quad \text{to me appeals Anna} \end{align*}\]
b. Ivanu nravitsja Anna.
   to Ivan appeals Anna

b. Ivan likes Anna.

c. Mne nravitsja Anna
   to me appeals Anna
   bol'še cem Ivanu.
   more than to Ivan

c. I like Anna more than Ivan does.

d. Mne nravitsja Anna
   to me appeals Anna
   bol'še Ivana.
   more of Ivan

d. I like Anna more than (I like) Ivan.

Sentences c and d are not paraphrases. The genitive form on Ivan in d has displaced the nominative case, not the dative.

The full logical structure underlying d is:

(392) Mne nravitsja Anna bol'še (392') I like Anna more
to me appeals Anna more
čem mne nravitsja Ivan.
than to me appeals Ivan

This demonstrates that although in several respects nravit'sja is anomalous in that the nominative NP with which it agrees in person, number, and gender often looks less like the subject than the cooccurring dative does, in terms of comparative reduction, the verb behaves normally in that the nominative (and not the dative) is displaced by the genitive form.

In the following chapter we shall attempt to synthesize the diverse data collected in this section, to reconcile the conflicting evidence, and to derive a theory of oblique-case subjecthood.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1The short-form adjective has only a predicative function in modern Russian and is not inflected for case.

2This example is borrowed from Chvany (1970:42).

3Ross (1969:288) proposes that the following convention be added to the theory of grammar: Delete any embedded node S which does not branch (i.e., which directly dominates only NP or VP).

4There may be superior accounts of infinitive formation in Russian, but we have not encountered any in the transformational literature.

5It may seem purely ad hoc to postulate the node NP_0 in order to have the proper environment for Comrie's account of the second dative, i.e., an objective infinitive. But there is also semantic motivation for such a node. NP_0 would represent a type of goal or beneficiary, or possibly even an ethical dative.

6This splendid example is from Klenin (1974:69).

7I thank Professor Rugaleva for pointing out that these remarks easily translate into the conventional Soviet description of the reflexive pronoun's usage. For example, Rozental' (1968:189) states: "... the reflexive pronoun must refer to the word which designates the producer of the corresponding activity." But it is not always clear which word does designate the producer of the corresponding activity. These cases of ambiguity are readily explained in the transformational model.

8In Langacker (1969) the relation "commands" is described in this way: "A node A "commands" another node B if (1) neither A nor B dominates the other; and (2) the S-node that most immediately dominates A also dominates B.

9A few counterexamples to this generalization can be found. For instance, with the verb zastat' 'to find', SEBJA can be coreferential with either the subject or the direct object. Klenin (1974:146) provided this pair of examples:
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1. Vра́ч застал больного у себя в клинике.
   doctor found patient at self in clinic

1. ' The doctor found the patient at his clinic.

2. Vра́ч застал больного у себя в постели.
   doctor found patient at self in bed

2. ' The doctor found the patient in his bed.

In 1., SEBJA is coreferential with the subject, врач. In 2., SEBJA is coreferential with the object больного. But we feel these sentences do not invalidate the subject-reference principle, since both derive from deep phrase markers which have embedded S nodes. In the derivation of 1., SEBJA is inserted after that S node is erased. In the derivation of 2., SEBJA is inserted already in the embedded S cycle. The deep structure for these sentences is identical, and they differ only in the lexical item inserted under the nodes PP1.o and PP1.1.

3. 

10 A governed rule is one which requires the presence of one of a set of specific lexical items. An "everywhere" rule is one which applies whenever the structural description for the rule obtains.

11 Professor Rugaleva has supplied me with the following example, which demonstrates that even попросить permits SEBJA insertion in infinitive complements, even though (242) is not acceptable:

4. Не повышая голоса, генерал попросил адъютанта не повышать голоса генерал asked adjutant to raise voice
   соедините себя с штабом.
   unite self with staff

4. Not raising his voice, the general asked the adjutant to join his staff.

Sentence 4. is ambiguous in that SEBJA can refer to either the subject, general, or the object, адъютанта.
For several stimulating discussions of various aspects of conjunction in English, see Reibel and Schane (1969:71-142).

Sentence (265') is grammatical in English, but the closer word-for-word gloss is just as unacceptable in English as in Russian:
(265") Neither I want nor Anna feels like drinking any wine.

This is a modified version of an example in Xolodović (1970:16), in which the dative NP was masculine gender, Amiru. We have substituted a feminine NP to make the displacement and instrumental marking of the deep subject all the more graphic.

Rothstein (1974) observes that the NP relevant for triggering EQUI is the object of the verb dominating the complement clause if that verb takes an object; otherwise, the relevant NP is the subject of the verb.

Perlmutter (1970) first proposed that the identity or nonidentity of matrix and embedded subjects before the application of transformational rules is relevant to the grammaticality of the resulting sentence. The like-subject requirement is a deep structure constraint.

Sentence (296) is a modification of one of Gundel's examples, which was rejected by Professor Rugaleva. I thank Professor Rugaleva for providing an acceptable example of topic-controlled deletion occurring across a sentence boundary.

These examples are from Gvozdev (1967:386).

Launer prefers the term "verbal adverb" to "gerund."

Professor Rugaleva suggests that the nonoccurrence of these temporal complex conjunctions with infinitives is an indication of the grammatical meaning of the infinitive, which can express only a forthcoming activity.

There is a standard Soviet label for each of the various types of subordinate clauses in Russian. "Manner of action" is a literal translation of pridatočnoe predloženie obraza dejstvij.

Russian has no counterpart to the English transformation of Object Raising, as in "Peter is easy to please." The closest Russian comes to this is object preposing, which does not involve assumption of subject characteristics by the deep
5. Podzemnye xranilišča nebol'sogo ob'ema effektivno ekspluatirovat' v pikovom režime.
Underground small-capacity storage sites are effectively exploited in a peak regime.

^Peškovskij (1956:118) pointed out that not only accusative-governing verbs have passive forms in their paradigms, e.g.,

Creditors threaten to him

6. 'Creditors are threatening him.

7. On ugrožaetsja kreditorami.
he is threatened by creditors

7. 'He is being threatened by creditors.

But the number of such passivizeable oblique-governing verbs in Russian is miniscule.

^23^E.I. Korolev in Xolodovič (1970:40) claims that verbs commonly used in conversational speech do not passivize. If they are passivized, the instrumental of agent is used to underscore the professional status of the actor, e.g.,

8. Kostjum sšit portnym.
suit sewn by tailor

8. 'The suit was made by a TAILOR.

^24^These remarks are admittedly rather facile. It is probably true, after all, that the primary function of passivization is not to demote a nominative subject, but to promote and topicalize an accusative object. By definition, an intransitive verb is not passivizable, as it has no object available for promotion. At best, then, passivization is simply irrelevant for the purpose of assigning subject status to datives. As the comments at the end of this section suggest, subjective dative sentences resemble passive sentences in terms of verbal morphology. This would lead one to believe subjective dative sentences might in fact represent a less basic type of sentence structure on which certain syntactic processes have operated. In any case, it
appears to be an exercise in futility to look for dative behavior analogous to the behavior of nominative subjects in sentences on which passivization operates.

26 Keenan (1976) observed similar dative behavior in German and Latin. In those languages, passivization advances accusative direct objects to subject position, where they acquire the full complement of coding properties, i.e., position, case, and verbal agreement. But dative direct objects are advanced, keeping their case marking, without verbal agreement. In such sentences, the verbs revert to a third-person singular form. Perhaps Russian continues the case-voice system inherited from Proto-Indo-European.

27 Professor Rugaleva suggests that the deverbal substantive nexotenie 'unwillingness' might represent the nominalization of the predicate ne xočetsja 'doesn't feel like'. If this is true, we have additional support for dative subjecthood, e.g.,

9. Emu ne xotelos' igrat' na rojale.
    to him not felt like to play on piano

9n 'He didn't feel like playing the piano.

9n Ego nexotenie igrat' na rojale očen' ogorčilo mat'.
    his unwillingness to play on piano very upset mother

9n' His unwillingness to play the piano upset his mother very much.

This evidence, however, is rather tenuous, as nexotenie could just as easily be the nominalization of ne xočet, which would occur with a nominative subject. Other such examples are not forthcoming.
CHAPTER V

In the preceding chapter, the syntax of subjective datives was analyzed in a transformational framework. This chapter will organize the information accumulated in that analysis and will reach a conclusion on the question of dative subjecthood.

The table below is a preliminary listing of the ways in which datives perform like subjects (indicated by the + sign) and ways in which they do not. The "revised evaluation" column is explained later in the chapter.

(393) Preliminary summation of subjective properties exhibited by datives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transformation or syntactic process</th>
<th>preliminary evaluation</th>
<th>revised evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) SVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Second dative problem</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Svoj reference</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) SEBJA reference</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) EQUI</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>?/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Topic-controlled subject deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Gerund formation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Adverbial clause reduction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Conjunction reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) SR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Passivization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Nominalization phenomena</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Comparative reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A table such as that presented above leaves unanswered the basic questions: What is a subject? Can datives be subjects then? How can one reconcile the apparently conflicting evidence? These questions will be answered, we hope, by systematizing the data which have been collected.

Reexamining the analyses of Chapter IV, we see that only one transformation categorically treats subjective datives differently from all nominative-subject NPs, namely SVA. The other transformations which do not treat datives like subjects also do not treat many nominative subjects like subjects. In other words, the failure of datives to meet these tests does not conclusively prove they are not subjects. This implies that a third symbol is needed in the table above, a symbol which designates that the evidence neither supports nor undermines the dative-subject hypothesis. Using "?" as such a symbol, the second column of the table provides a much clearer picture of the problem. Before interpreting these matrices of +/-0/? symbols, let us tersely describe how they were assigned for each transformation or syntactic phenomenon.

SVA. The tempting but superficial similarity of sentences (189) and (190) was shown to be a faux ami for the dative-subject hypothesis.

(189) Mne nel'zja byt' veselu. (189') I cannot be happy, to me cannot to be happy
(190) Ja ne vesel.  (190') I am not happy.
I not happy

The dative form on the predicative of (189) is not assigned by SVA. Case marking is not determined by the subject NP, and oblique-case NPs do not even control the gender-number-person specifications on predicative forms. We found this conclusion to be the inevitable consequence of accepting a transformational account of infinitive formation. If the transformational view of infinitives is eschewed, it is necessary to claim that subject-predicate agreement can proceed across an infinitive boundary, and that datives can control SVA. Abandoning the transformational view of infinitive formation has several other negative consequences:

1. Without transformationally deriving infinitives, there is no non-ad hoc way in which to explain the antecedent for the predicate adjective in (269) and (270), i.e., no way to account for the gender and number specifications on the adjective.

(269) Ivan vělel Maša byt'  (269') Ivan told Maša to be careful.
ostorožnoj.
careful

(270) Ivan obezpečal Maša byt'  (270') Ivan promised Masa to be to be careful.
ostorožným.
careful

2. Without transformationally deriving infinitives, there would be no explanation of the obligatory coreference between the "logical" subject of the infinitive and the
nominative subject in certain cases (e.g., sentence (286)),
the accusative object in certain other cases (e.g., sentence
(287)), or a dative in other cases (e.g., sentence (288)).

(286) My staralis' prijiti vo vremja. (286') We tried to
we attempted to arrive in time arrive on time.

(287) Maša zastavila do' (287') Maša forced
Maša forced daughter her daughter to
zanimat'sja urokami. do her lessons.
to be occupied by lessons

(288) Maša velela synu sidet' tixo. (288') Maša told her
Maša told to son to sit still son to sit still.

3. Without a rule of infinitive formation, SEBJA's
potential antecedents would be myriad, and the general
principle of subject reference would be lost. Furthermore,
there would be no straightforward account for the ambiguity
presented by sentences such as (234), in which SEBJA has two
possible antecedents.

(234) Igor' naučil syna (234') Igor taught
Igor taught son his son to
uvažat' sebja. respect
to respect self

4. Without a rule of infinitive formation which is
linked with subject deletion and S-node deletion, the
generalization that svoj refers to the subject of the S in
which it originates would be obliterated, and the systematization of svoj antecedents (of which there are at least
seven surface categories) would not be possible.

Therefore, formation of infinitives upon destruction of
embedded sentences is not only a legitimate transformation,
but an indispensable one. As a result, the verdict that SVA
can copy the person-number-gender specifications of datives directly onto predicatives to the right of intervening infinitives must be disavowed. The evidence indicates that SVA does not treat datives like subjects, and a 0 sign in our table on page 163 is appropriate. Thus datives do not meet the traditional absolute prerequisite for subjecthood, predicative agreement.

In the following pages, we review the discussion of those transformations which failed to provide conclusive evidence either for or against the dative subject concept. The evidence was inconclusive, simply because many nominative subjects also failed these tests.

SR. After proving the validity of SR as a test of subjecthood, we discovered that it is applicable only to the subset of subjects which occur in copular sentences, an environment from which subjective datives are banned. Not only datives, but nominative subjects in noncopular sentences are not affected by SR, as sentence (351) showed.

(351) *Ja sčitaju Annu ljubit' Ivana. (351') I consider Anna to love Ivan. If subject raising is considered to be an all-or-nothing transformation, i.e., with obligatory application of all of its several linked operations (removal of an embedded subject, S-node deletion, case reassignment, optional movement into matrix subject position with subsequent SVA), then datives certainly fail the test. But sentences (356) and
(357) demonstrate that subjective datives can be affected by three of the four major operations entailed by SR.

(356) Kazalos', ṣto emu let (356') It seemed that he seemed that to him of years was maybe over seventy years old.

(357) Emu kazalos' let za (357') He seemed to be to him seemed of years over maybe over seventy years old.

In (357), the subjective dative, which originates in the embedded S, ṣto emu let za sem'desjat', has been promoted into the matrix sentence to the left of the main verb, and the internal sentence boundary has been erased. No case reassignment has occurred, and there is no subject-verb agreement in the derived sentence (357). So to a limited extent, SR has affected a subjective dative.

Conjunction reduction. Again, the evidence is inconclusive. In this instance, it is inconclusive, because the transformation's structural description is not met by conjoining sentences with nominative subjects and sentences with subjective datives. Such conjoining, of course, is possible, but reduction cannot take place, for the simple reason that the sentences differ with respect to more than a single variable. As Chomsky's formula was written, conjunction reduction can occur only if two sentences differ with respect to the lexical unit inserted into a particular constituent. Therefore, the sentence pair below cannot undergo conjunction reduction, because in addition to the
different case marking on the NPs in subject position, the predicates differ in terms of the category of voice.

(260) Mne ne xojetsja pit' vina. (260') I don't feel like to me not wants to drink of wine drinking any wine.

(261) Anna ne xojets pit' vina. (261') Anna doesn't want Anna not wants to drink of wine to drink any wine.

Passivization. Passivization is a case-changing transformation, which involves but three of the eight cases of Russian, i.e., nominative, accusative, and instrumental. The genitive can be included in this set to accommodate diathetic pairs containing the negative particle, e.g.,

(394) Studenty ne razrešili students not solved zadaci. problem

(395) Zadača ne razrešena problem not solved studentami. by students

Though affected by some of the operations which are grouped in the passivization package, datives do not undergo case reassignment. Thus datives occupying the object position can be promoted to subject position, the verb can be changed from active to passive voice, but nominative marking and subsequent SVA are banned, e.g.,

(396) Ja velel emu ujti. (396') I ordered him I ordered to him to go to leave.

(397) Emu bylo veleno ujti (mnoj)^2 (397') He was ordered to him was ordered to go by me by me to leave.

Sentence (397) has been affected by the major processes of passivization, namely, promotion of the object NP (here the
dative of goal, emu) from the VP to the subject position, shunting of the nominative subject with concurrent instrumental marking (or deletion), and change of the verb's voice from active to passive. To that extent, the dative of (397) has participated in the passivization transformation and is analogous to a nominative subject derived by the operation of that rule. Similarly, the dative of (398) has been promoted to subject position by passivization to form (399):

\[
\begin{align*}
(398) \text{Prepodavatel' ukazal} & \quad (398') \text{The teacher pointed} \\
& \quad \text{teacher showed} \\
& \quad \text{Maša na ošibku.} \\
& \quad \text{to Maša to error} \\
(399) \text{Maša bylo ukazano na} & \quad (399') \text{Maša was shown her} \\
& \quad \text{to Masa was shown to} \\
& \quad \text{ošibku prepodavatelem.} \\
& \quad \text{mistake by teacher}
\end{align*}
\]

Datives, therefore, perform a syntactic function analogous to nominative subjects derived by passivization.

In Chapter IV, we showed that datives are not available for shunting to the right of the verb with concurrent instrumental marking. But again, many nominative subjects also fail this test of subjecthood, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
(372) \text{Lampa stoit u okna.} & \quad (372') \text{The lamp is standing by the window.} \\
& \quad \text{lamp stands at window} \\
(372p) \text{*U okna stoeno lampo.} & \quad (372p') \text{*The window was stood by lamp} \\
& \quad \text{by window stood by lamp} \\
\end{align*}
\]

We found evidence that the dative in quasi-passive constructions (i.e., with a passive-form verb and a deep object in subject position) is analogous to the instrumental
of agent in true passive constructions, e.g.,

(376) Ja vspomnil detstvo. (376') I recalled my childhood.

(376p) Detstvo vspomnilos' mne. (376p') Childhood came to me.

Nominalization phenomena. The evidence of nominalization, another diathetic phenomenon, does not support nor undermine the dative-subject hypothesis. The syntactic process of nominalization operates on sentences which have finite active verbs, an environment from which subjective datives are banned. Furthermore, objective datives do not give up their oblique marking when their verbs are nominalized, e.g.,

(384) poručit' Petrovu (384') to entrust to Petrov
(384n) poručenie Petrovu (384n') a commission to Petrov

Comparative reduction. Comparative reduction has not been defended in the literature as a legitimate transformation in Russian. Yet the paraphrase relations obtaining between full comparative clauses introduced by k'om 'than' and reduced comparative clauses containing genitive NPs are consistent and offer another parameter by which to measure subjectlike behavior. Once again, we found that datives cannot be genitivized, i.e., they refuse to give up their oblique case marking. In this regard, subjective datives behave unlike nominative subjects. As Kuryłowicz observed, datives do not belong to the subset of "syntactic cases" and
therefore cannot be replaced by them, e.g., by the genitive in nominalizations, the genitive in negated verb phrases, the genitive in reduced comparative clauses.

EQUI. We found that subjective datives cannot be embedded under EQUI-governing verbs. Such verbs require agentive verbs in the sentences embedded beneath them, and subjective datives are semantically incompatible with such verbs. We found numerous instances in which datives in matrix sentences controlled EQUI in embedded sentences. But this fact does not confirm the subjecthood of those datives, because a great range of syntactic roles can control EQUI, including datives which are clearly not subjective, e.g.,

(288) Maša velela synu
Maša told to son
sidet' tixo. to sit still

A tenuous piece of evidence for the dative-subject hypothesis is offered by the syntactic behavior of dolz#n- 'must' and moź'/moźno 'can'. These modal predicatives require coidentity of the subjects of the sentences embedded beneath them and the NPs which command them in the matrix sentence. In the case of moźno, that NP is a subjective dative. In the case of moź', it is a nominative subject. If one accepts Miller's generative-semantic approach, these predicatives would be regarded as allomorphs, and their surface realization would be determined on the basis of the case marking of their subjects. The lexical item dolz#n-
might be an even more convincing example of a predicative
which can cooccur with either a nominative or dative subject
and which requires the coidentity of embedded and matrix-
sentence subjects. Recall Barsov's example:

(291) Ja dolžen byl govorit'. (291') I had to speak.
     I must was to speak

(292) Mne dolžno bylo govorit'. (292') I had to speak.
     to me must was to speak

To summarize the negative and inconclusive evidence,
datives do not fully participate in those syntactic processes
which would alter their case marking, i.e., dative NPs
cannot acquire nominative, accusative, genitive, or
instrumental marking as the result of a syntactic transform-
ation such as SR, passivization, comparative reduction,
nominalizations in -nie/-tie. All of these transformations
or processes operate exclusively on subjects which control
the assignment of person, number, and gender specifications
on their predicates. Since datives lack the ability to
control SVA, they remain outside the subsystem of the
language of which SVA is the core.

In the following pages, we summarize the evidence which
supports the concept of dative subjecthood.

The second dative. Although we have not resolved to
our satisfaction the derivation of the so-called second
dative structure, the solution offered by Comrie supports the
notion of dative subjecthood. The ordering of rules
required by the Comrie analysis conflicts with the
hypothesis of the transformational derivation of infinitives, 
but we can offer no non-ad hoc alternative analysis. The 
problem remains open, and this evidence must be considered 
shaky.

Svoj antecedence. One of the earliest transformational 
defenses of dative subjecthood was based on the evidence of 
svoj antecedence, e.g., Chvany (1970). Our discussion 
revealed that svoj consistently looks for its antecedent in 
the subject position of the S in which it originates except 
for existential sentences, where a locational phrase (u + 
genitive) and not the nominative subject serves as the 
antecedent. The subject-reference principle, we argued, is 
valid and indicates the subjecthood of datives in sentences 
such as (225):

(225) Mne xorošo rabotaetsja (225') I can work well in 
to me well works 
v svoem kabinete. 
in my study

SEBJA antecedence. Our discussion of SEBJA showed 
that the ATS framework, which makes it possible to write a 
general rule of SEBJA insertion, provides an elegant 
explanation of the ambiguity of SEBJA antecedence in 
sentences such as:

(234) Igor' naučil syna (234') Igor taught his son 
Igor taught son 
uvažat' sebja. 
to respect self

It was argued that SEBJA consistently looks to the subject 
position of the S in which it originates for its antecedent,
thus providing another test of subjecthood. The SEBJA test indicates that datives in sentences of the type examined in this study perform like subjects.

Topic-controlled deletion. Gundel's argument that another transformation is needed (in addition to EQUI) to account for the deletion of subjects under identity with the discourse-determined topic is supportive of the dative-subject hypothesis. The following sentence was cited to demonstrate that subjective datives can be deleted by this rule:

(297) Ja vyskol'znul iz-pod ee ruki. Ne xotelos' uxodit'.
I slid out from under her hand not felt like to leave

(297') I slid out of her grasp. Didn't feel like leaving.

Topic-controlled deletion, then, treats nominative subjects and subjective datives equally.

Gerund formation. Among the most convincing evidence of dative subjecthood is the fact that the "logical" subjects of gerund phrases can be coreferential with subjective datives as well as nominative subjects. It was shown that if the subjects of the matrix and embedded sentences are not coreferential, the resulting sentence is not grammatical, and furthermore, the subject of the embedded sentence in which the gerund originates cannot be coreferential with any syntactic category other than subject. In Chapter IV, we listed four important generalizations which would be missed
by not viewing the datives which are coreferential with the gerund subjects as the matrix-sentence subjects. We refer the reader to pages 125-126 for discussion.

Adverbial clause reduction. Reduction of certain types of adverbial clauses can be a test of subjecthood, although not all such reductions are to be attributed to deletion by the like-subject requirement. For example, we found that adverbial clauses embedded under нуžну- and neobxodim- are anomalous in that the deleted subject of the embedded S is coreferential not with the nominative NP which controls predicative agreement, but with the dative in the matrix sentence, e.g.,

(330) Эта книга нуžна мне, чьтобы (330') I need this book this book necessary to me to to send to my send еe товаришку. friend.

In addition, clause reduction can be the result of the deletion of a lexically unspecified subject, a pro-form, e.g.,

(331) Вопрос недостаточно важен, (331') The question is question insufficiently important not important чьтобы на него сейчас so that on it now enough to answer in detail подробно отвечать. in detail to answer right now.

But in general, the like-subject requirement does handle most instances of adverbial clause reduction. With these limitations on the validity of the transformation as a test of subjecthood in mind, we showed that subjective datives behave like nominative subjects as far as controlling the reduction is concerned. If the dative is coreferential with
the subject of the embedded sentence, reduction is tolerated. If this coreference does not obtain, reduction is blocked.

The following pair of sentences was adduced to illustrate the principle:

(335) Pered tem kak prodolžat' (335') Before continuing
 before that as to continue your journey, you
 putešestvie dal'še, vam farther to you
 journey farther to you
 neobxodimo nemnožko necessary a little
 neobxodimo nemnožko
 neobxodimo nemnožko
 neobxodimo nemnožko

(340) *Etu knigu mne xotelos' (340')* I would like to buy
 this book to me wanted this book so that
 by kupit', čtoby ty you to take it to my
 to buy so that you
 otvezti ee tovarišču to take it to friend
 in gift
 v podarok.

This survey of transformations and processes has revealed six instances of subjectlike behavior for datives: the second dative, svoj reference, SEBJA reference, topic-controlled subject deletion, gerund formation, and adverbial clause reduction. We have observed that datives do not behave like subjects with regard to one primary grammatical phenomenon - subject-verb agreement. All the transformations which require application of SVA either in their structural descriptions or in the structural changes effected by their application fail to operate (at least to operate thoroughly) on sentences with subjective datives. We found five instances of this principle: subject raising, passivization, nominalization, comparative reduction, and EQUI. Finally,
we found that conjunction reduction provides no evidence at all, because subjective-dative sentences and sentences with nominative subjects differ in more respects than the case marking on the NPs which occupy the subject position.

The parameters of subjecthood which we presented on page 163 have been organized into a more sophisticated table below. In this revised tabulation, we have broken down complex transformations such as passivization and SR into their component processes, thus illustrating to what degree subjective datives do and do not perform like subjects. This table also compares the performance of subjective datives with that of nominative subjects which occur with transitive verbs, intransitive verbs, or the copula.
A hierarchy of subjective properties exhibited by nominatives and datives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFORMATION or PROCESS</th>
<th>nom.subj. &amp; trans. verb</th>
<th>nom.subj. &amp; intrans. verb</th>
<th>nom.subj. &amp; copula verb</th>
<th>subjective dative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. SVA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. SVA-linked rules:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. SR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotion of embedded NP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. case remarking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Passivization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. subj.shunting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. instr. marking</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. obj. promotion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SVA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Nominalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ gen. marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or instr. marking</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Comparative reduction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. EQUI-related phenomena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. embedded-subj. deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. control of embedded-subj. deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. like-subject requirement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Adverbial-clause reduction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Gerund formation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Pronominal problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. svoj reference</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SEBJA reference</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. sam/odin concord</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Other structure reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Topic-controlled subj. deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Conjunction reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRRELEVANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution of symbols in the table above supports the following hypothesis. There are at least two basic kinds of sentences in Russian — those with predicative concord and those without it. The subjects of sentences with predicative concord must be nominative. The subjects of sentences without predicative concord cannot be nominative. Only sentences with nominative subjects can be affected by the set of syntactic transformations and processes which require predicative concord in their structural descriptions or in the structural changes effected by those transformations. In sentences lacking predicative concord, datives are capable of performing many of the syntactic chores delegated to subjects, and therefore deserve the label of "subject." It appears, then, that Russian nominative and dative subjects are in a kind of complementary distribution. Curiously, this paper's rather involved abstract analyses of syntactic processes which didn't even have names in the nineteenth century have brought us to essentially the same conclusions which were offered by one K.D. Ušinskij, who argued that Russian sentences should be divided into two groups — direct sentences, whose topics of discussion are nominative, and oblique sentences, whose topics of discussion are in an oblique case. Keenan (1976) offered a similar hypothesis, that natural languages have two types of sentences — basic and nonbasic. The subjects of basic sentences participate
more fully in the gamut of transformations and processes which make reference to the subject role. In the context of Russian, sentences exhibiting subject-predicate agreement would be classified as basic sentences, and those lacking subject-predicate agreement would be nonbasic sentences.

When the syntactic evidence presented above is coupled with the semantic features of subjective datives (their animateness, their coreferentiality with the discourse topic, their function to mark the experiencer/agent of a situation), the cumulative effect is a fairly convincing defense of the dative-subject hypothesis.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1Except for datives in sentences built around a few anomalous verbs, e.g., ugrožat' 'threaten'.

2This example is from an article by G.G. Sil'nickij in Xolodovič (1970:55).

3Once again, the appropriateness of subject-demotion in passivization as a test of the subjecthood of datives is dubious at best. See note 25, p. 161-162 for discussion.

4This complementary distribution is imperfect in several respects. First, sentences lacking predicative concord do not obligatorily have subjective datives. They might lack any NP which could be perceived as a subject, e.g.,

1. Tam ne čisto.
   there not clean

1.' It's dirty there.

Second, nominative subjects can occur with subjective datives in the same sentence, e.g.,

2. Ėta kniga nužna mne, ľtoby poslat' ee tovarišču.
   this book necessary to me to send it to comrade

2.' I need this book to send to my friend.

Third, in some sentences lacking nominative subjects, an NP in another case besides dative might perform some subjective functions, e.g.,

3. U nego vsjakogo tovaru nagotovleno.
   at him of any kind of goods prepared

3.' He has about any kind of product prepared.

5Although it must be remembered, Ušinskij argued that nominative topics alone merit the label of subject.
In this brief section, we shall present some observations on the transformational model of Russian syntax we find most consonant with the findings of Chapters IV and V. These observations will be restricted to general theoretical principles on the nature of deep structure, case, and subject.

We concluded in Chapter V that the label "subject" can be extended to datives in the class of oblique sentences. This is not a claim that only datives can perform that function. It might be suggested that other oblique-form NPs are capable of performing subjective functions. Likely candidates would be genitives in sentences containing negated existential semantic units, e.g.,

(401) \text{Ivana ne bylo na koncerte.} \quad (401') \text{Ivan wasn't at the concert.}

(402) \text{Nikakix nedostatok ne obnaruzivalos'.} \quad (402') \text{No inadequacies of any kind were discovered.}

Accusatives in semi-passivized sentences might also qualify as oblique subjects, e.g.,

(403) \text{Ivana ubilo pulej.} \quad (403') \text{Ivan was killed by a bullet.}
And as we already observed, the phrase \( u + \) genitive has several subjectlike attributes.

(218) \( U \) Ivana est' svoja sobstvennaja mašina. (218') Ivan has his very own car.

Before asserting that these other oblique NPs deserve the label "subject," however, a thorough investigation of their syntactic behavior is called for.

Dative subjects differ from nominative subjects in two basic ways. First, the semantic range of dative subjects is rather narrowly defined, embracing the related notions of goal, benefactive, and experiencer. Nominative subjects, on the other hand, have no semantic common denominator. Lyons (1968:351) submitted that English speakers perceive subjects as somehow in control of the situation described by their predicates, which is a by-product of the fact that nominative subjects control the assignment of person, number, and gender on predicates. Not being a native speaker of Russian, however, we are in no position to claim that this intuition of "agentiveness" is inherent in Russian nominative subjects. Galkina-Fedoruk, as noted in Chapter III, hinted that such is the case when she explained that the dative in (114) is a sub"ekt, because (115), the paraphrase of (114), has a nominative subject denoting the acting person (dejstvujušče lico).
Second, dative subjects are unlike nominative subjects in that they do not fully participate in the subset of syntactic processes which require morphological case alternation. Therefore, sentences with dative subjects have fewer paraphrases, less flexibility of surface representation than do sentences with nominative subjects. This is consistent with Keenan's observations on the greater versatility of basic sentences and their subjects as compared with nonbasic sentences and their subjects.\(^1\)

In view of the remarkably consistent semantic role of dative NPs, irrespective of their syntactic function, it seems inherently wrong to us to assign dative marking by syntactic transformation, which is the ATS approach to case. The ATS model simply ignores the semantic motivation and predictability of the dative case, which on the whole is independent of its syntactic role.\(^2\) Recall the following examples from Chapter IV, which illustrate the invariant semantic role of the dative:

\[(335) \text{Pered tem kak prodol'\v{z}at'}\hspace{1cm} (335') \text{Before continuing before that as to continue your journey, you need to rest a bit.} \]
\[
\text{pute\v{s}estvie dal'\v{s}e, vat' neobxodimo nemo\v{z}ko otdoxnut'.}
\text{journey farther to you necessary a bit to rest}
\]
Based on the criterion of subject-verb concord, (342) is a direct sentence, and the dative is a predicate complement, denoting the experiencer of the state of being described by the predicative neobxodima. Sentence (335), lacking subject-verb concord, is an oblique sentence, and the dative has the syntactic function of an oblique subject. But the semantic role of the dative in (335) precisely duplicates that of the dative in (342). In other words, the semantic function of the dative is not altered or neutralized by its subjective function in (335).

In the model of grammar we find most appropriate for Russian, at least certain cases (perhaps these will be the concrete or "nonsyntactic" cases named by Kuryłowicz) should be specified in deep structure. Is this an endorsement of the case-grammar model developed by Fillmore? It is not. Fillmore's proposals, in our view, are thought-provoking and heuristically valuable but unworkably abstract. The distance between his "proposition" and derived structure is immense, with few specific syntactic transformations named or defended. The model he offers requires abandonment of the notions of subject and VP in deep structure, a theoretical leap we are unwilling to make. In his article,
"Some Problems for Case Grammar," Fillmore detailed several weaknesses inherent in his model, but among these he did not include the axiom that subject and predicate are purely superficial categories. We believe the evidence overwhelmingly supports the view that subjects do exist in deep structure.

Why are deep subjects necessary? Without repeating Chapters IV and V, let us only say that deep subjects are needed, because they simplify the grammatical description of sentences and make possible the capturing of many important generalizations about surface forms. The necessity of a deep subject node was shown time and again in our discussions of infinitive formation, phenomena of noncontiguous dependencies, svoj and SEBJA antecedence, gerund formation, adverbial clause reduction, comparative reduction, imperative morphology, to name a few syntactic problems.

We recommend a model in which basic grammatical relations are defined in deep structure and in which morphological cases (at least the concrete cases) are part of deep structure. Case in such a model operates on two levels - to directly reflect semantic roles and to mark the operation of syntactic transformations which are linked with movement into and out of subject position, subject and object deletion, and the like. Such transformations would include passivization, subject raising, comparative reduction, for example. We believe that at least the datives in the oblique sentences studied in this paper carry their case marking because of
their basic semantic role denoting experiencer or goal. This version of deep datives is intended to be far less abstract than Fillmore's.

Let us examine a Fillmorian analysis of the deep case Experiencer, the most common semantic function of the datives examined in this dissertation. First we shall discuss the case-grammar treatment of physical perception, one of the most common situations in which experiencers are encountered. Below are listed some typical sentences describing the experiences of smelling, tasting, feeling, hearing, and seeing. Note the variety of forms in which the stimuli and experiencers are manifested.

A. Smelling.

(404) v ětoj komnate paxnet (404') I (can) smell geraniums in this room, don't (can't) you?
with geranium not truth

In (404), the experiencer is not expressed, being understood to be the speaker. The stimulus is in the instrumental form.

(405) Ot nee paxlo tak xorošo, (405') It smelled so good, as only a freshly killed game bird can smell.
from her smelled so good
kak paxnet tol'ko ot
as smells only from
sejčas ubitoj dići.
now killed game bird

In (405), the experiencer again is not expressed, being the speaker, and the source of the experience is the locational phrase, ot nee.

(406) Vse zdes' paxnet. Paxnut(406') Everything smells here. Not only the
all here smells smell
ne tol'ko ovošći v pletenke, vegetables in the
not only vegetables in basket smell, but
The experiencer of (406) once again is not expressed, but this time, the stimulus is the nominative subject.

(407) Zapax postnogo masla (407') The stench of rancid smell of rancid butter butter hit me in the brosilsja mne v nos. nose.

was hurled to me to nose

In (407), the experiencer is the dative goal of the action verb, brosilsja, and the stimulus is the genitive phrase, postnogo masla.

(408) Čem zdes' vonjaet? (408') What stinks around with what here stinks here?

The experiencer in this situation is not expressed, being the speaker, and the stimulus is in the instrumental form.

B. Feeling.

(409) Žarko na ulice. (409') It's hot outside, hot on street

The experiencer in the situation described in (409) is not expressed, and the stimulus is unnamed, although the location of the perception event is specified.

(410) Ego obdalo xolodom. (410') He was overcome by him poured over with cold the cold.

The experiencer in (410) is the accusative object and the stimulus is in the instrumental form.

(411) Ego razmorilo ot žary. (411') He was worn out by him worn out from heat the heat.

In (411), the experiencer is the accusative object, and the stimulus is the locational phrase, ot žary.
(412) On počuvstvoval, čto kto-to (412') He felt some-
he felt that somebody body slap him
poxlopal ego po pleču. on the
slapped him on shoulder shoulder.

In (412), the stimulus is the embedded čto clause, and the
experiencer is the nominative subject on.

(413) Ja čuvstvuju kakoj-to (413') I taste some-
I sense some kind of thing bitter in
gor'kij vkus v etom supe. this soup.
bitter taste in this soup

The experiencer in (413) is the nominative subject, and the
stimulus is the accusative object, gor'kij vkus.

D. Seeing.

(414) Ja vižu tebja. (414') I see you.
I see you

The experiencer of (414) is the nominative subject, and the
stimulus is the accusative object.

(415) Vezde mne viditsja tvoj vzor. (415') I see your
everywhere to me seen your gaze eyes everywhere.

The experiencer of (415) is the dative, mne, and the stimulus
is the nominative subject, tvoj vzor.

(416) Čerez okno vidnelis (416') Through the win-
through window seen
dow, one could see
Ural'skie gory. the Ural Mountains.
Ural mountains

The experiencer of (416) is not specified, being the speaker,
and the stimulus is the nominative subject, Ural'skie gory.

(417) Mne ešče vidna ěta (417') I can still see
to me still seen this
velikolepnaja krasavica. that magnificent
magnificent beauty

The experiencer here is the dative, and the stimulus is the
nominative subject.
E. Hearing.

(418) 

Ja 

slyšu tvoj golos. 

(418') I hear your voice.

The experiencer of (418) is the nominative subject, and the stimulus is the accusative object.

(419) 

Vezde mne slyšitsja 

everywhere to me is heard 

tvoj golos. 

(419') Everywhere I hear your voice.

In (419), the experiencer is the dative mne, and the stimulus is the nominative subject, tvoj golos.

(420) 

Im slyšno vse, čto my govorim. 

everything we're saying.

(420') They can hear everything we're saying.

In (420), the experiencer is the dative complement, im, and the stimulus is the nominative NP vse plus the appositive clause, čto my govorim.

Sentences (404) through (420) describe nonvolitional perception events. Russian is fully stocked with agentive verbs, whose subjects willfully direct and control the perception apparatus in order to see, to smell, to taste, to feel, or to hear. How does the case-grammar model categorize the subjects of such verbs? Are they agents or experiencers? Below are some typical examples of such verbs.

(421) 

Oleg dolgo smotrel pered soboj, no ničego ne videl. 

(421') Oleg looked ahead for a long time, but he didn't see anything.

(422) 

Saša slušal muzyku po radio. 

(422') Saša was listening to music on the radio.
The child picked a few flowers and sniffed them.

The doctor felt his patient's forehead.

Just you try this coffee.

Sentences (404) through (425) demonstrate that there is no direct correspondence between Fillmore's deep cases and surface structure forms. His deep Experiencer can surface in literally any syntactic position. Frequently, the experiencer of a situation is simply not expressed, or if it is expressed, it can assume such forms as: nominative subject, accusative object, genitive prepositional complement, dative subject, dative complement, instrumental complement.

Experiencers in situations not describing physical perception can assume a wide variety of surface forms as well. We provide several examples below.

I. Subject. As subjects of psych-verbs and similar predicates, the experiencers are hard to differentiate from agents, e.g.,

I understood at whose benefit it was said.

She wants to become an actress.
(428) Ja užel davno stradajuz
 already long suffer
 bessonicej.
 with insomnia

(429) Ja ves' drožu.
 I all tremble

(430) My udivljalis' ee
 we marveled her
 povedeniju.
 to conduct

II. Accusative objects. These experiencers cannot be
differentiated from Fillmore's deep Object case either on
semantic or syntactic grounds.

(431) Ja ne budu vas
 I not will you
 bespokoit'.
 trouble

(432) On udivil nas svoim
 he amazed us by his
 povedeniem.
 conduct

(433) Les, reka, čistýj
 forest river clean
 vozduš delajut ix
 air make them
 energetičněe i sil'něe.
 more energetic and stronger

(434) Saša uveril menja v etom. (434') Saša assured me
 Saša assured me in this
 of this.

III. Instrumental adjuncts in passive sentences, e.g.,

(435) Položenie ěto prodolžalos' (435') This situation had
 situation this continued
 uže tretij den' i mučitel'no
 already third day and painfully
 čuvstvovalos' i samimi suprug-
sensed and themselves
 ami i vsemi členami sem'i
 spouses and all members of family
 i domočadcam.
 and by guests

(428') I have been suffering from insomnia for a long time.

(429') I'm trembling all over.

(430') We marveled at her behavior.

(431') I will not trouble you.

(432') He amazed us with his behavior.

(433') The forest, the river, the clean air make
 them feel more energetic and stronger.

(434') Saša assured me in this of this.

(435') This situation had continued already a third day and
 was painfully felt by the couples themselves and all
 members of the family and the house guests.
Such instrumental adjuncts bear the same agentive meaning as all instrumentals in passive constructions, and this overlies the experiential meaning.

IV. Prepositional phrases. The use of prepositional constructions to render Experiencer is not uncommon, but such phrases retain their concrete locational meanings. How does Fillmore categorize these roles? Are they Experiencers or Locatives?

(436) So mnoj včera slučilos' Something very with me yesterday happened
četo-to očen' prijatnoe. something very pleasant.
(436') nice happened to me yesterday.

(437) Bezdel'ë ploxo na nego Idleness affects idleness badly on him dejstvuët. acts
(437') him adversely.

(438) Otec dolžen vospityvat' A father should father must cultivate
silu voli i mužestvo strength of will and courage
v svoix detjax. in his children
(438') cultivate strong will and courage in his children.

(439) Protivnye postupki Mariny Marina's obnoxious obnoxious actions of Marina vyzvali udивlenie u ee evoked amazement from her druzej friends.
(439') friends.

(440) Žizn' Ejnštejna probudila Einstein's life life of Einstein awoke v čelovečestve ljubov' evoked in mankind a love for science.
(440') k nauke to science.

V. Datives. Experiencers are represented by datives in a variety of syntactic positions, which are listed below.
A. Dative objects of quasi-transitive verbs:

(441) Ja ne xoču vam dokučat'. (441') I don't want to bother you.

(442) Ego grubosti 'očen' dosaduet Mama. (442') His crudeness is very upsetting to Mama.

(443) Počemu ty nadoedaes'? (443') Why are you pester to me with questions?

B. Subject-like datives in sentences containing nominative subjects:

(444) Mne nравится твои novye sfufl. (444') I like your new slippers.

(445) Nam нузны novye učebniki. (445') We need new textbooks.

(446) Čto eto vam vzdušmalos' borodu otpustit'? (446') What made you think of letting your beard grow?

C. Dative subjects (as defined by the cumulative evidence tabulated and interpreted in Chapter V):

(447) Mne ne rabotalos' segodnya. (447') I couldn't get any work done today.

(448) Kak mne stydno svojej neopytnosti! (448') How ashamed I am of my lack of experience.

(449) Mne ne xocetsja vstavat', a nado. (449') I don't feel like getting up, but I must.
The diverse manifestations of the Experiencer case show that a great many elaborate syntactic transformations are going to be called for in order to map the proposition in which an Experiencer occurs onto derived structure. It is not scientific to simply list the semantic roles which accompany a particular verbal entry and expect the grammar to somehow move these entities into their proper places and assume their proper forms automatically. As we have seen, the case-grammar model is unable to delineate certain NPs as deep Agents or Experiencers, as deep Objects or Experiencers, as deep Locatives or Experiencers. But the model has another basic flaw - its claim to universality. Consider the following simple sentence:

(450) I taught Ivan mathematics.

Any native speaker of English attempting to analyze this sentence in Fillmore's framework will label "Ivan" as either a Goal, a Benefactive, or an Experiencer and "mathematics" as an Object. But would a Russian speaker reach the same conclusion, when in his language "Ivan" surfaces as an accusative direct object, and "mathematics" assumes the form of a dative complement? It seems highly unlikely. A Russian, we believe, would perceive "Ivan" as an Object and "mathematics" as a Goal.

(450') Ja učil Ivana matematike. (450) I taught Ivan
I taught Ivan to mathematics mathematics.
Our conclusion is that Fillmore's deep cases are so abstract and so removed from surface structure as to be syntactically irrelevant. But at the same time, it is our view that the ATS framework is deficient in its treatment of case as a mechanical operation taking place relatively late in the transformational cycle. Case has meaning and can reflect basic semantic relations holding between the participants in the situation described by the sentence. Since we found that datives never undergo a case-changing transformation, it only seems logical to us to make at least that case part of deep structure. Nominative, genitive, accusative, and instrumental can all be assigned transformationally by the various rules described in Chapter V, so it is uncertain whether those cases can be specified in deep structure.
NOTES TO APPENDIX

1Keenan (1976: 307) observed:

Basic sentences present the greatest range of tense, mood, aspect, mode, and voice distinctions. They will be the easiest to embed, to adjoin to other sentences, the easiest to nominalize and internally reorder, the easiest to relativize, question, and topicalize out of, the easiest to pronominalize and delete into, etc.

2It may be possible in certain cases to talk of a dative-assignment rule. Recall the example from Chapter III:

1. Dovol'no vam po dvoram xodit' ...
   enough to you about yards to walk

1.' Enough of your walking about the yards ...

We found no semantic motivation for this dative. It appears to be assigned by virtue of its position before the infinitive. Kilby (1973) provided another example, the VP delat' koto komu 'to do something to somebody', in which the patient is marked dative not on semantic grounds, but by virtue of the fact that it follows an accusative object, and Russian forbids juxtaposition of two accusative objects.

3Although (335) and (342) describe the same situation, they do not have the same deep structure. In (335), there is an embedded S with an explicit subject, which is coreferential with the dative vam. In (342), there is no such embedded S, and the deep structure subject node is filled by ostanovka.
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