Interactive properties: Modern Russian predicate adjectives in affirmative and negative contexts

Abstract

When discussing case variation in Modern Russian predicate adjectives, scholars usually rely on data found in affirmative contexts. However, an examination of predicate adjectives in negative alongside affirmative contexts reveals important statistical differences and usage asymmetries that help understand the factors involved in case choice. The fact that case choices are differently distributed under negation has been noted by Nichols (1981) who writes that "negation favors the instrumental, even with feminine adjectives" (Nichols 1981: 278). Ueda (1992) and Timberlake (2004: 288) adopt this view, noting that the increased modality of negation favors the instrumental. Examining statistical data gathered from the open web, this article updates the existing literature by showing that while the instrumental is more prominent with inanimate referents, the short nominative is significantly more prominent with animate referents. Additional usage asymmetries, such as the scarcity of the long nominative under negation, are also uncovered. Adopting the functionalist/construction-grammar perspective, I discuss the statistical results to show how case choice is influenced by animacy-related factors such as agentive control and narrative interaction, and how specific predicate adjective constructions are adopted for structuring viewpoint.

Keywords: case variation, predicate adjectives, predicate nominals, negation

1. Introduction

Predicate adjective constructions in Modern Russian exhibit case variation.[1] In the present tense, the choice is between the short nominative form of the adjective and the long nominative form, e.g. *moj otec beden* 'my father [is] poor.SNOM' versus *moj otec bednyj* 'my father [is] poor/miserable.LNOM'. In future and past tense, with the addition of the copula, a third choice of instrumental is added: *moj otec byl bednym/beden/bednyj* 'my father was poor.INSTR/SNOM/LNOM.' Factors such as definiteness, referentiality and individuation (Gustavsson 1976; Nichols 1981), class membership and temporality (Nichols 1981, Bulygina and Shmelev 1997, Timberlake 2004), focalization (Israeli 2007), 'observedness' (Zeldovich 2005; Israeli 2007) and stylistic considerations had been extensively discussed as influencing case choice.

Most scholars consider the choice of the instrumental separately from the choice of the short versus long nominative. The instrumental implies a certain change of state, a temporal boundary: thus, Timberlake (2004, 287) asserts that with adjectives, the instrumental implies a contrast between two polarities: one state holds while the other does not: *vstreča byla opjat' že bezrezul'tatnoj* 'the meeting was again result-less.INSTR.' The instrumental is said to be statistically prominent in the future tense, under negation, and with concessive and counterfactual constructions (Nichols 1980: 210).[2] In a recent article, Israeli argues that the instrumental often involves comparison between two different entities or states: "the instrumental suggests change, comparison, time limitation, or scope limitation" (2007:21).

---

[1] While predicate nouns also exhibit case variation, they often behave differently than predicate adjectives in similar contexts, and thus are not included in this examination.

[2] According to Ueda (1992, 142), it is the short nominative that is chosen in concessive and counterfactual conditionals. Although the discrepancy between the two statements merits further examination, it has not been included in this study due to space limitations.

Despite the abundance of literature on the topic, there are still gaps in our knowledge. First, there is a scarcity of statistical studies that offer suggestive results on this variation (only one detailed study has been undertaken so far, Nikunlassi (1993), whose methodology involves questionnaires with sentence-length contexts). In this study, I gather and analyze statistics for predicate adjective usage relying on context-rich data mined from the open web. This method has enabled me to highlight and discuss important, and previously overlooked, usage asymmetries.

One of these asymmetries involves the statistical discrepancy between case choice for adjectives modifying animate vs. inanimate entities. This has been touched upon by scholars, but has not been explicitly addressed through a detailed statistical study (for example, Israeli 2007, while making many insightful observations on variation, does not explicitly distinguish between animate and inanimate contexts).

Another asymmetry that comes to the fore in the statistics involves variation in affirmative vs. negative contexts. Case choice in predicate adjectives is usually discussed based on data found in affirmative clauses, even though the behavior of predicate adjectives is notably different under negation in terms of statistical distribution; Nichols writes that "negation favors the instrumental, even with feminine adjectives" (Nichols 1981: 278). Ueda (1992) and Timberlake (2004: 288) adopt this view, noting that the increased modality of negation causes the predominance of the instrumental; this hypothesis, however, has not been statistically tested. Moreover, since negation is said to favor - rather than to require - the instrumental case, increased modality cannot be the only factor involved in case choice; thus, the discrepancies of distribution merit further study. My study shows that while the instrumental is more prominent under negation with inanimate referents, the short nominative is significantly more prominent

with animate referents. Additional usage asymmetries, such as the scarcity of long nominative under negation, are also uncovered.

In addition to presenting statistical distributions, I analyze examples mined from the open web in order to explore the mechanisms involved in case variation. Some long-held views about predicate adjective variation are not borne out by the data. For instance, the view that short-form adjectives are stylistically colored for more 'serious', non-colloquial registers is traditional; a more cautious assertion is made by Timberlake (2004: 292), who remarks that in speech, the choice of short adjective is being replaced by long nominative when talking about people. Though this seems intuitively correct, the data only partially supports this claim. For example, let us examine some comments to a somewhat melodramatic story found in a pregnancy forum of the website for mothers, *mama.ru*. The poster is a woman pregnant from a man who left his first wife shortly after their baby was miscarried. The pregnant woman is now worried that her lover will leave her as easily if something goes wrong with this pregnancy. The context is very colloquial: the format of on-line forums is closest to conversational, and most of the *mama.ru* forum members are young people aged 20-30 seeking advice on parenting, while the subject matter itself encourages colloquial usage and informality. One would expect the long-form *beremennaja* 'pregnant.LNOM' to be the prevailing form used in this forum, both due to the colloquial context and the focus on people. Indeed, this form does occur often. However, the forum members, in their multiple replies to the story of a love triangle, use the short form *beremenna* 'pregnant.SNOM' exclusively when referring to complex relationships:

(1)	*S moim drugom detstva byla takaja istorija.Emu nagovorili pro ženu vsjakogo i*

on ušel. <u>Ona byla beremenna,</u> a on tverdil, čto rebjonok ne ot nego. Kogda syn rodilsja,

no ne srazu, u nih vsjo naladilos'. Ja pravda ne znaju kak.

‘This is what happened to my childhood friend. They told him all kinds of things about

his wife and he left. <u>She was pregnant.SNOM</u>, but he insisted that the child is not his.

When their son was born, not immediately, but they made up and got together again. I

don't know how, though.'	(Mama.ru forums, subforum "Beremennost' i rody")

Long nominative would be expected in (1); in addition, modality factors favor the choice of

instrumental in this context: pregnancy is a transitory state, and the woman is said to give birth in

the same narrative interval - she is no longer pregnant at the time of the speaker's report.

However, the short form is used (as we will see in the section 4, this is triggered by interaction

between two agentive entities: the woman's pregnancy directly affects the male agent, who does

not believe that he is the father.)

Similarly, in (2) below, the relationship between the husband and wife is discussed. A

future pregnancy might inspire the boyfriend to agree to marriage:

(2)	*My žili s mužem 2 goda graždanskim brakom... Kogda načinali žit' vmeste, on*

skazal, čto ne možet ženit'sja iz-za 2-h pričin. .... Koroče razgovor dlilsja s pereryvami

okolo mesjaca, čto on tol'ko ne otvečal: i čto material'no ne sozrel, i čto moral'no ne

sozrel, i čto štamp dlja NEGO ničego ne značit, i čto emu i tak so mnoj horošo, i davaj

doždemsja, kogda <u>ja budu beremenna</u> i t.d. i t.p.

'My husband and I lived together for two years without getting married. When we started

to live together, he said that he cannot marry for two reasons… In short, the discussion

lasted with interruptions about a month, and he said all kinds of things: that he's not

ready financially, and he's not ready emotionally, and that the legalities mean nothing to

HIM, and that he feels good with me as it is, and let's wait until I'm (=you're)

pregnant.SNOM, etc., etc.'   (Mama.ru forums, subforum "Svad'ba i semejnaja žizn'")

The context of (2) above can also be interpreted as instrumental, since the future tense of *budu*

beremenna favors instrumental usage. However, short form is chosen to discuss the interaction

between the two protagonists.

This is not to say that considerations of style should be discarded or disregarded, but

rather that stylistic concerns are most often overruled by functional and lexical-semantic

considerations. Below, I will show that the functional considerations include interactions

between different agents in narrative (favoring the short nominative), and focus on the properties

of a single individual (favoring the long nominative). Lexical considerations involve the kinds of

property that can be encoded by each adjective, such as accidental versus permanent, controlled

versus uncontrolled by the predicated entity, and others (see section 2 for a discussion).

1.1. Constructions examined

Not all predicate adjectives allow the three choices of short nominative, long nominative, and

instrumental: some allow only the long nominative versus the instrumental due to suffixation

patterns that make the short form impossible (*sel'skij/sel'skim* 'rural.LNOM/INSTR'); other adjectives allow only the short form (*velik* 'grand.SNOM'). My investigation is limited to adjectives that allow all three choices.

A limited number of verbs allow the choice of case with predicate adjectives. Three choices, the short nominative, long nominative and instrumental, are available with the copular *byt'* 'be.' Two choices, long nominative and instrumental, are allowed by what Timberlake (2004, 281-289) classifies as 1) modal co-predicates, i.e. constructions in which predicate states the condition for truth of the host predicate: *on brosaetsja na krovat' i spit odetyj* 'he throws himself upon the bed and sleeps dressed.LNOM'; 2) aspectual co-predicates, which report a position or motion: *on vernulsja grustnyj* 'sad.LNOM*/grustnym* 'sad.INSTR'; and 3) aspectual/modal copular predicates such as *javljat'sja* 'to be,' *okazat'sja* 'to turn out to be': *pesok okazalsja syrym* 'the sand turned out to be wet.INSTR'[3] In a thorough statistical and empirical study, Nikunlassi (1993) finds that aspectual/modal copular predicates such as *javljat'sja* 'to be,' *kazat'sja* 'to appear,' *ostavat'sja* ' to be left,' the usage of instrumental is almost obligatory. Timberlake writes that since the validity of the state is limited with those verbs, the instrumental is obligatory with nouns, and almost obligatory with adjectives (2004, 286). This article focuses on choices available the copular *byt'* 'to be.' The PA constructions are examined in the past and future tenses only, since those require the copula and thus allow the instrumental choice in addition to the short and long nominative.

1.2. Corpus

---

[3] Classifications after Timberlake 2004, 281-289.

Statistical data, as well as examples of specific constructions, were gathered from the open web accessed through *Google.com*. I chose the open web over a corpus of selected and edited texts (such as the Russian National Corpus) since the web provides a significantly larger sample of linguistic usage than an edited corpus; a greater variety of genres can be retrieved from the open web; and lack of an editorial process assures that new and emerging usages are included in the search. According to Meyer (2004), an artificially created and controlled corpus, even a large one, provides only a "snapshot" of the writers' usage; using the web is advantageous since it reflects more directly the speakers' production, rather than editorial choices by corpus creators.

One frequently voiced reservation to using the web as corpus is the fluid and often unreliable nature of statistical results retrieved by searches. The Google.com database is ever-changing; in addition, erroneous and duplicate results that are often retrieved by searches. Although the raw statistics mined from the web are often unreliable, the contribution of web-based statistics to linguistic research lies in obtaining relative frequencies, understood as the statistical counts for each case choice compared to each other. Such statistics can provide suggestive answers for linguistic questions (Thelwall 2005: 518; Meyer et al. 2003), especially when an unexpected scarcity of a certain construction is found (on statistical discrepancies between constructions under negation, see Perelmutter 2008a; 2010).

Even though the retrieval of raw data for obtaining relative frequencies is an accepted and useful linguistic tool, I checked and manually counted all retrieved results. Using this method, I eliminated non-predicate adjective contexts such as *on byl molodym pisatelem* 'he was a young.INSTR writer.INSTR' in the results for the search *on byl molodym* 'he was young.INSTR'; in addition, all duplicate results, non-Russian results and automatically generated spam pages were excluded from counts. This method resulted in more accurate and reliable statistical results.

Data was gathered by searching for the following strings: *on byl + ADJ* and *on ne byl + ADJ.* The inclusion of the third person pronominal reference *он* limits the number of retrieved results (e.g. clauses such as *Miša byl molod* 'Misha was young' will be excluded from statistical counts). This decision was made to limit the amount of results retrieved by search engines to a degree where manual counts of each adjectival context would be feasible. The main disadvantage of this search string is in limiting the results to definite contexts. For some manually counted contexts with limited hits, a search for *ne byl + ADJ* was also included.

The data was gathered from Russian websites and is defined as free use by the Russian Federation copyright law, which allows unauthorized usage of texts when the "citation in original or translation is done for "scientific, scholarly, polemic, critical, and informational purposes from lawfully published works in volume justified by the citation's goal, including citation of excerpts from newspaper and magazine articles" (Article 19 in the Copyright Law of 1993; Article 1274 in the Copyright Law of 2006). The data also falls under fair use according to the US copyright law, since the market value of the original texts is unlikely to be affected, the length of examples is limited, and the examples are used for research purposes (Liberman 2000). I follow the Principles of Reuse and Enrichment of Linguistic Data (Lewis et al. 2006), providing full names and titles of cited works where available; full URLs of internet examples are listed in Appendix 1.

2. Lexical-semantic properties of adjectives and their statistical distribution

When choosing the adjectives for this study, I wanted to examine how the lexical-semantic properties of each adjective interact with case choice. Timberlake (2004) suggests that the choice

of case for adjectives is in part lexically conditioned: some lexical classes of adjectives prefer the short form, e.g. adjectives of measure such as *velik* 'grand,' and of modality such as *vozmožen* 'possible'; transitory properties are said to prefer the short form, while permanent properties prefer long nominative: *on byl bolen* 'he was sick.SNOM (temporarily)' / *on byl bol'noj* 'he was sick.LNOM (chronically)' (see Bulygina and Shmelev 1997, 113-118; Timberlake 2004, 289).

Another property that I wanted to test for is agentive control, or *kontroliruemost'*, discussed by Bulygina and Shmelev (1997). Agentive control restricts some constructions; for example, only a controlled situation can combine with a specification of goal: *on upal na koleni, čtoby ubedit' ejo* 'he fell to his knees in order to convince her' is expected, but the uncontrolled **kamen' upal, čtoby ušibit' sobaku* 'the stone fell in order to injure the dog' is impossible (Bulygina and Shmelev 1997, 100). All of their cited controlled examples with predicate adjectives are in short nominative; however, Bulygina and Shmelev do not mention this feature or discuss how agentive control correlates with the choice adjectival form.

In addition to control, I was interested in examining the potential interaction between the entity predicated by the adjective and other entities (agents, events, circumstances) not necessarily involving control. According to Bulygina and Shmelev, agentive control over the whole situation can be exerted by a person other than the one subject, as in *bud' gotova k dvum časam, čtoby ne zastavit' nas ždat'* 'be ready.SNOM by 2PM, so that (you won't) make us wait' or in wishes or curses such as *bud' prokljata* 'be cursed.SNOM,' where the speaker "adopts control over the situation, as if assuming that he is able to bring it (the situation) to life by expressing the corresponding wish" (Bulygina and Shmelev 1997: 101). In this paper, I understand the property of agentive control to be exerted over the property only by the predicated agentive entity: thus, the property of readiness (*gotov-* 'ready') when predicating a person (*bud' gotova k dvum časam)*

is controlled by the agentive entity in the second person singular *ty* 'you'. However, the readiness of the addressee will affect the speakers: if the addressee will not be ready by 2PM, the speakers are going to be influenced by this situation (*čtoby ne zastavit' nas ždat'*). I call this type of influence <u>interaction</u> (this property is also discussed in Israeli 2007). Though the issues of control and interaction might appear similar, they are not identical. Thus, quality of politeness (*vežliv-* 'polite') is controlled by the predicated individual, but influences other individuals with whom he/she interacts. One example of a property that is not controlled but nevertheless exhibits interaction is the quality of being dead (*mertv -*), which is likely to be expressed when it is influencing other agents or events. Though this property is likely to interact with other agents/events, it does not, as a rule involve, agentive control, since the agent is no longer alive to exert it. According to Israeli (2007: 49), interaction correlates with the choice of instrumental: some "adjectives like *nesgovorčivyj* express qualities that can only be ascribed to an entity by an interacting participant, thus necessarily involving limitation in scope and requiring the instrumental". My statistical study shows that it is the short nominative, rather than the instrumental, that is chosen when interaction is present (Israeli's study compares between long nominative and instrumental choices, but does not discuss short nominative.)

In addition to control and interaction, I was interested in testing the reverse of these factors, namely the absence of control and the lack of interaction. Thus, the quality of youth (*molod-* 'young') is outside any individual's control. Some properties are less interactive than others; thus, qualities of being fat or young can potentially interact, as in the following sentence, where the quality of 'fat' interacts with the referent's ability to acquire friends: *On byl tolst i malokommunikabelen. Navernoe poètomu on imel malo druzej* 'He was fat.SHORT and uncommunicative.SHORT. Probably because of this he had only a few friends.' However,

interaction is not normally expected with those adjectives, which often appear in strictly descriptive contexts. On the other hand, the quality of being *zanjat-* 'busy' is almost always interactive, since this quality is only mentioned when it affects the referent's ability to interact with other agents and events.

This article focuses on adjectives modifying animate entities. However, statistical data and discussion of statistics is given for inanimate adjectives in section 2.2.

2.1 Animate contexts: Data and Analysis

Table 1 shows eight adjectives that predicate agentive entities and may be expected to display properties of agentive control and interaction, uncontrolled properties, and individual properties. In addition, these adjectives test for accidental/transitory versus permanent qualities. The adjectives are tolst- 'fat,' *molod-* 'young,' *um-n-* 'smart,' *mertv-* 'dead,' *trezv-* 'sober,' *golod-n--* 'hungry,' *zanjat-* 'busy,' *dovol'-n-* 'satisfied.' In Table 1, properties that are likely to be inherent are marked "X". Notes accompany properties that appear occasionally but are not inherent in the lexical semantics of the adjective.

Table 1. Lexical-semantic properties of predicate adjectives modifying animate entities.

Adjective	Accidental	Permanent	Uncontrolled	Controlled	Interaction
tolst-'fat'	X (can be accidental in contexts that talk about dieting)	X	X		possible, though usually descriptive
molod- 'young'	transitory		X		possible, though usually descriptive
um-n-'smart'		X			possible, though often descriptive
Mertv- 'dead'		X	X		always
trezv-'sober'				X	possible
golod-n- 'hungry'	X			X	possible
zanjat-'busy'	X			X	always
dovol-n- 'satisfied'	X			X	always

Table 2. Adjectives modifying animate referents

(Data had been counted manually to exclude duplicated and erroneous contexts).

A: affirmative context *он был + adj*
N1: negative context *он не был + adj*
N2: negative context *не был+adj*

	Properties		Long Nom		Short Nom		Instr.	
molod- 'young'	Accidental / Uncontrolled/ Interaction?	A	218	34.9%	322	51.6%	84	13.4%
		N1	0	0%	12	60%	8	40%
		N2	0	0%	28	36.8%	48	63.2%
mertv- 'dead'	Permanent/ Uncontrolled/ Interaction	A	66	19.5%	223	65.9%	49	14.4%
		N1	1	3.4%	21	72.5%	7	24.1%
trezv- 'sober'	Accidental / Controlled/ Interaction?	A	181	20.2%	613	68.3%	104	11.6%
		N1	4	23.5%	10	58.8%	3	17.6%
golod-n- 'hungry'	Accidental / Controlled/ Interaction?	A	118	17.6%	505	75.1%	49	7.3%
		N1	2	2.0%	69	70.4%	27	27.6%
dovol-n- 'satisfied'	Accidental / Controlled/ Interaction	A	22	2.7%	783	95.5%	15	1.8%
		N1	0	0.0%	179	98.4%	3	1.6%
tolst- 'fat'	Accidental + Permanent/Uncontrolled	A	279 (128*)	52.1%	135 (5*)	25.2%	121 (20*)	22.6%
		N1	4 (1*)	8.5%	12 (0*)	25.5%	31 (0*)	66.0%
um-n- 'smart'	Permanent/ Uncontrolled/Interaction	A	208 (1*)	43.8%	19	4.0%	248	52.2%
		N1	0 (**)	0.9%	546	98.2%	5	0.9%
zanjat- 'busy'	Accidental / Controlled/ Interaction	A	4 (***)	0.5%	761	98.8%	5	0.6%
		N1	0	0.0%	189	99.5%	1	0.5%

* (inanimate)
** Excluded were five instances of 'kakoj by on ne byl umnyj' in which the particle *ni* was misspelled as *ne*
*** (*on byl zanjatoj* retrieved only '*on byl zanjatoj čelovek*')

In affirmative contexts, the long nominative appears most frequently with properties that are not controlled and are not expected to be interactive. Thus, long nominative appears with 52% of all hits for *tolst-* 'fat' and with 34% of hits for *molod-* 'young'. As the chances of interaction increase, the long nominative appears less frequently: with *um-n-* 'smart'and *trezv-*

'sober' the long nominative appears with 20.8% and 20.2% of hits respectively. While these qualities can appear in purely descriptive contexts, these adjectives often appear when the quality of being smart or sober is relevant to other events or agents in the narrative. The percentage of the short nominative is even lower with adjectives that require interaction, like *mertv-* 'dead' and *golod-n-* 'hungry', with 19.5% and 17.6% hits respectively. The quality of 'hungry', moreover, is controlled either by the referent (who can choose to eat, or to continue being hungry) or by another individual who can feed or deny food to the referent. Control further lowers the chances that the long nominative will appear: qualities of being *dovol-n-* 'satisfied' and *zanjat-* 'busy', which are both interactive and controlled, show an extremely low occurrence of the long nominative with 2.7% and 0.5% respectively.

The presence of control and interaction boosts the chances that the short nominative will appear. Short nominative appears most frequently with *zanjat-* (98.8%), followed by *dovol-n* (95.5%), *golod-n-* (75.1%), *trezv-* (68.3%), *mertv-* (65.9%), *um-n-* (54.6%), *molod-* (51.6%), and *tolst-* (25.2%).

Instrumental hits fluctuate between 0.6% and 24.8%. The fluctuation seems to be influenced by the distinction *accidental* versus *permanent*, which ties in with the instrumental's connection to temporality. Accidental properties that are controlled and interactive have the lowest percent of instrumental hits: *zanjat-* (0.6%), *dovol-n-* (1.8%), *golod-n-* (7.3%). *Trezv-* (11.6% of instrumental hits) can be accidental, but often is not, since a change of state from sobriety to drunkenness is not expected for most individuals (unlike being drunk, which presupposes eventual sobriety for most individuals). Instrumental hits increase for *molod-* (13.4%), which is between accidental and permanent in that it presupposes an eventual change of state to 'middle-aged' or 'old', but the duration of the state 'young' can be quite prolonged. The

quality of being *mertv-* (14.4%) is a permanent quality that presupposes a previous change of state from living to dead. Finally, the biggest percentage of instrumental hits are for permanent, uncontrolled properties *tolst-* (22.6%).and *um-n-* (24.8%).

The short nominative is clearly preferred in negated contexts for properties that modify animate referents. Similar to affirmation, under negation the controlled and interactive properties have the most short nominative hits: *zanjat-* (99.5%), *dovol-n-* (98.4%), *mertv-* (72.5%), *golod-n-* (70.4%), *um-n-* (65.5%), *molod-* (60%), *trezv-* (58.8%, relative drop in frequencies here compared to the affirmative can be explained by the availability of the adjective *netrezv-* 'not sober',) and *tolst-* (25.5%). The short nominative is predominant with all adjectives except *tolst-*, where the instrumental is more common under negation. Instrumental hits span a range from 66% to 0.5% of all adjectives, with the lowest number of hits for interactive and controlled *zanjat-* (0.5%) and *dovol-n-* (1.6%) and highest number of hits for permanent and uncontrolled *tolst-* (66%). Finally, the long nominative is extremely rare under negation with all examined adjectives, and unattested with three of them.

2.2. Inanimate contexts: Data and Analysis

For this section, I chose to analyze adjectives that almost exclusively modify inanimate entities. Table 3 presents statistical data on the variation.

Table 3. Adjectives modifying inanimate referents

(Data had been counted manually to exclude duplicated and erroneous contexts).

A: affirmative context *он был + adj*
N1: negative context *он не был + adj*
N2: negative context *не был+adj*

	Properties		Long Nom		Short Nom		Instr.	
pust- 'empty'	accidental	A	245	26.1%	586	62.4%	108	11.5%

	interactive	N1	5	7.2%	25	36.2%	39	56.5%
trud-n- 'hard'	permanent	A	20	16.9%	41	34.7%	57	48.3%
	interactive	N1	2	22.2%	4	44.4%	3	33.3%
dešev- 'cheap'	permanent /accidental	A	60	33.1%	73	40.3%	48	26.5%
	Interactive can be controlled	N1	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	7	87.5%
grom-k- 'loud'	permanent /accidental	A	9	12.5%	17	23.6%	46	63.9%
	interactive controlled	N1	0	0.0%	1	6.3%	15	93.8%
med-n- 'brassy'	permanent	A	12	30.0%	0	0.0%	28	70.0%
	uncontrolled	N1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
	not interactive	N2	1		0	0.0%	3	
kirpič-n- 'made of brick'	permanent	A	14		0	0.0%	20	
	uncontrolled	N1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0%
	not interactive	N2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100%
derevjan-n- 'made of wood'	permanent	A	127 (2*)		0(2*)		265 (2*)	
	uncontrolled	N1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0%
	not interactive	N2	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	

*modify animate entities

As can be seen from Table 3 above, the statistical distribution varies quite significantly for adjectives modifying inanimate entities. Permanent, uncontrolled, purely descriptive (not interactive) properties like *med-n-* 'brassy', *kirpič-n-* 'made of brick' do not correlate with the short nominative. On the other hand, adjectives that allow for interaction exhibit a significant percentage of short nominative hits. For example, the quality of *pust-* 'empty' is often interactive in that the emptiness is observed by an animate entity and is relevant to that entity in some way, as in the following horror story about a young man stuck in the elevator. The neighbor/observer tries to rescue him, but *kogda lift priehal, to ona uvidela čto on byl pust. A pro Arkadija bol'še nikto i nikogda ne slyšal.* 'When the elevator arrived, she saw that it was empty. And nobody heard anything more about Arkadij'. 62.4% of the hits for this adjective are short nominative. Other potentially interactive qualities are *dešev-* 'cheap' with 40.3% of short nominative hits, *trud-n-* 'hard' with 34.7% and *grom-k-* 'loud' with 23.6%.

Under negation, the statistics for inanimate contexts are heavily skewed towards the instrumental (in agreement with Nichols's and Timberlake's statements that negation favors the

16

instrumental). The only exception to this is *pust-* 'empty', which has 56.5% instrumental hits and 36.2% short nominative hits (data under negation for *trud-n-* 'hard'are not discussed due to the paucity of retrieved results). Of the adjectives examined, *pust-* 'empty' is the most interactive, and thus the importance of interaction for the short nominative choice is preserved even under negation.

From table 3, we see that uncontrolled/not interactive, permanent properties such as *kirpič-n-* 'made of brick' hardly ever appear under negation. Since negation often expresses the thwarted expectations of an observer, and/or implies that a change of state either occurred or was expected by an observer to occur, negation correlates with interaction and control, as well as with accidental properties. Negation also favors predicate adjective contexts with animate referents, or referents that connect to animate referents. Thus, *pust-*'empty' modifies inanimate referents, but often appears in contexts that imply absence, e.g. 'the Observer expected a Person to be in Space, but it was empty (=Person was absent)'. Observers usually do not have expectations regarding the permanent properties of inanimate entities, e.g. 'the Observer expected Object to be made of wood, but it wasn't made of wood' is possible, but infrequent.

2.3 Summary of statistical findings

The most striking findings involve contexts of extreme paucity or dominance a certain adjectival choice. These extreme results correlate with either the long nominative or the short nominative, not the instrumental. Thus, the long nominative is scarce under negation in both inanimate and animate contexts; the short nominative is scarce with permanent, uncontrolled and not interactive adjectives in inanimate contexts; the short nominative is dominant in animate contexts with

interactive and controlled properties. Thus we can speak of a choice hierarchy. When interaction and control are present, especially with animate entities, the short nominative dominates. The statistics of instrumental usage are primarily conditioned by fluctuations in the statistics of the short nominative usage (dependant on properties of control and interaction) rather than by the lexical properties associated with the instrumental itself, such as temporality and scope limitation.

In the following sections, I examine the three adjectival choices in order to investigate and analyze the factors involved in these choices. The analysis is focused on adjectives modifying animate referents.

3. The Long nominative in Affirmative and Negative Contexts

3.1 The Long nominative in Affirmative Contexts

In affirmative clauses, the long nominative appears with animate entities in two contexts: proximate descriptions involving characters dependent on the speaker such as children or pets; and non-participatory perception.

3.1.1 Describing a Proximate Character

This long nominative context reports on qualities of the character him/herself or, more frequently, of the character's dependents such as children and pets. The speaker is more likely to use the long nominative if the properties in question involve the dependent's well-being, for which the parent or owner is responsible and which is ultimately controlled by him/her. This, the long form is frequent with the adjective *golodnyj* 'hungry', as in example (3),

18

(3)	*Ja …potom zavertelas' i zabyla položit' kotiku kušat'. Bednen'kij moj, ves' den'*

golodnyj byl, – prigovarivala Mama, vyvoračivaja v misku salaku, kotoruju Kot s"el

očen' bystro.

'I … was so busy I forgot to give the kitty something to eat. Poor darling, all day <u>you

were hungry.LNOM</u>, Mother exclaimed while filling his bowl with canned fish, which

the Cat ate very quickly.'	(S.Snegova. "Golovolomka dlja Kota")

Children and pets can be characterized by other adjectival forms if they are presented as individual, responsible entities, and if their qualities are stressed as being important for the rest of the narrative. In (4), a woman answers a question: "Can small children and dogs coexist?" She stresses the maturity and obedience of her poodle. The quality of obedience is relevant to the following narrative and to question asked, since the obedience assures that the dog and the baby can coexist peacefully:

(4)	*Kogda ja rodila u menja byla sobaka, korolevskij pudel'. On ne linjal, byl očen'*

poslušen (emu bylo 9 let). JA emu zapretila zahodit' v komnatu syna, i ego tam ni kto ne

videl.

'When I gave birth I had a dog, a royal poodle. He did not shed, <u>was very

obedient.SNOM</u> (he was nine years old). I forbade him to enter my son's room, and

nobody saw him there.'	(Mama.ru forums, subforum "Zverje moe")

19

The independent, human-like status of the poodle is stressed also by the switch to definite

reference *on* 'he,' rather than more neutral *sobaka* 'dog. FEM' / *ona* 'it.FEM' The breed of the dog

(poodle) is introduced to allow for the switch of gender; the breed is otherwise irrelevant.

Descriptions of family members and pets often involve a temporal specification (e.g.

using the adverbial *kogda* 'when' and '*togda*' then') with sentences of the type 'when he/she was

Adj, EVENT.' The coordinated event usually describes an episode from the predicated agent's

life. In (5), the speaker tells about his dog and the important event of his life, a kidnapping:

(5)   *A u menja èrdelju 16 let. ... <u>Kogda on byl molodoj</u>– ego pytalis' uvesti.(U 5-ti*

letnego syna vyhvatili povodok, poka ja zasmotrelas' v druguju storonu i potaščili - on

kinulsja,pokusal i pribežal k nam.

'My terrier is 16 years old... <u>When he was young.LNOM</u> – they tried to steal him. They

snatched the leash from my five-year-old son, when I was looking away, and dragged

him off – he jumped, bit (them), and ran back to us.'

(Mama.ru forums, subforum "Zverje moe")

Clauses with long nominative which involve a temporal specification seemingly overlap

with the usage of instrumental, since instrumental is said to imply a transitory state (both through

the quality of youth and through a discussion of specific period). However, when choosing long

nominative over instrumental in such instances, the speaker chooses to focus on the special close,

proximate and often dependent status of the predicated entity in his/her world.

3.1.2 Non-Participatory Perception

The first time a character appears in a narrative, he/she usually has not yet formed connections with other agents or events in the narrative, and is non-referential; a description of such a character presents an isolated picture. In addition to character introductions, a description can be isolating when the character is accidental in the narrative, either appearing episodically, or serving as an illustration of a concept. Example (6) illustrates an episodic appearance of a character introduced for the first (and last) time in an eyewitness account.

(6)   *On byl molodoj i krasivyj... Tak opisala svoego obidčika ograblennaja devuška.*

'He was young.LNOM and handsome.LNOM… So did a robbed young lady describe the man who assaulted her.'   (Novosti news.mail.ru)

In (6), the young woman gives a snapshot description of her offender - a visual image describing qualities (youth and handsomeness) that have nothing to do with the act of robbery.

The snapshot reporting of a quality with long nominative can often be found in expressions involving visual perception. This corresponds to Zeldovich's concept of *nabliudennost'* 'observedness' and Israeli's assertion that "nominative suggests either permanence of a feature or the speaker's presenting events as if witnessed." (Israeli 2007:21). Israeli points out that the long nominative can be used with non-involved observers, for example looking at photographs (2007:37-38); thus, in (7), a photograph of a disaster scene is described:

(7)   *Videohroniki. Foto "Sredi grudy mjasa sidel svetlovolosyj molodoj čelovek, on byl mertvyj"*

'Videochronicles. A photograph. "In a pile of meat there sat a blond young man, <u>he was</u>

<u>dead.LNOM</u>"'   (Novosti Vokruginfo.ru)

Introducing a new character is often done in the long nominative specifically because an

isolated picture of the character is presented. Such detached reporting can also appear with

referential characters when the reporter can no longer emotionally or physically participate in

events involving the character. In (8), the narrator reports on a death of a scientist familiar to

him, stressing that he can no longer interact with the individual or change his fate in any way:

(8)   *Ja uspel rassmotret' za šlemom ego bezumnoe konopatoe lico – moi*

           rassmatrivanija uže ne mogli emu povredit', ibo, kogda ja smotrel, <u>on byl mertvyj</u> i padal

           v mesivo, kiševšee večno golodnymi aspidami.

           'I had a chance to observe his crazy, freckled face in detail, but my observations could

           not harm him at this time, because, when I was looking, <u>he was dead.LNOM</u> and falling

           into the dirt that was crawling with ever-hungry serpents.' (A. Smirnov. "Yadernyj Vij")

Detachment from the observed property can involve the simple description of a character in

whom the narrator is not invested, or can imply denial of emotional involvement. In example (9),

a young murderess is not emotionally involved in the crime and does not reflect upon it, but

instead blandly states the facts.

(9)   *Slušat' takoj rasskaz iz ust 17-letnej devuški strašno. Strašno nabljudat' ee*

           spokojstvie i neraskajannost'. Net daže nameka na smuščenie. Daže legkogo volnenija. –

Alena, a ne hotelos' v opredelennyj moment ostanovit'sja, vy že ponimali, čto vy čeloveka ubivali? – Ostanovit'sja hoteli v kakoj-to moment. No potom podumali prosto, a čto že budet esli my vot sejčas ostanovimsja? Da i spohvatilis' uže togda, kogda <u>*on byl mertvyj*</u>. 'It is frightening to hear such a story from a mouth of a 17-year-old. Terrible to observe her calm and lack of remorse. There isn't even a hint of embarrassment. Even no light nervousness. – Alyona, didn't you want at a certain moment to stop, didn't you understand that you're killing a human being? – We wanted to stop at some moment. But then we simply thought : what will happen if we'll stop right now? And we only caught ourselves when <u>he was dead.LNOM</u>.' ("Podranki, chast' 5")

Detached narratives by grown-ups can seem child-like or 'dreamy' in that even though interaction is possible or even likely, an event is presented as a picture or a series of isolated frames, rather than as a cohesive narrative.

To summarize, the long nominative is used in two contexts. One involves detached observations of qualities. These qualities do not interact with other agents or events in the narrative, but rather are used to report static snapshots. Descriptions of non-referential agents (usually in introductions, or when describing accidental characters) fall under this category. The second context involves reporting on a proximate animate entity, usually a dependent such as a child or a pet; the entities predicated by the long nominative are conceptualized as a part of the speaker's domain. A property in the long nominative may be controlled or dependent on the speaker: thus, a child's or a pet's hunger can be caused or alleviated by the parent or the owner.

Reporting by children, as well as reporting on children, often involves the long nominative. Reporting on children is done as a part of the "dependent" context; reporting by

children involves perception through a series of visual snapshots, without further analysis or statements of possible impact (see Perelmutter 2008b for further analysis of non-participatory perception in child language and dream reports).

These long nominative contexts are similar in that they offer a non-narrative report on the quality. However, the lack of connection with the narrative is conditioned by different factors. The non-participatory perception contexts are unconnected to any entity, and are non-referential. In the dependent context, the qualities are reported as a part of a single individual's domain and thus do not interact with the rest of the narrative; limited referentiality is present. This distinction is important for discussing the long nominative under negation.

3.2 The Long nominative under Negation

As can be seen from tables 2 and 3, long nominative is scarce under negation (this has been briefly mentioned by Zeldovich, who predicts that long nominative will be avoided under negation, since it is hard to visualize a non-existent situation: *predskazuemo, čto soglasovannaja forma budet izbegat'sja pri otricanii: zrimo sebe predstavit' situaciju, kotoroj net, dostatočno trudno* (Zeldovič 2005:145). It seems that Zeldovič assumes here that only long nominative is correlated with visualizations – however, while detached observation indeed correlates with the choice of long nominative, visual reporting per se is not limited to long nominative; for example, observation with interaction can involve the short form: *ja videl, čto on byl pjan* 'I saw that he was drunk.SHORT', etc. The scarcity is not caused by some inherent inability of negation to correlate with visualizations. It is the lack of interaction that does not, as a rule, correlate with negation – thus the scarcity of detached visual reporting, which is usually done with the long

nominative. These constructions are isolating in a sense that they 1) report visual scenes, i.e. what is *present* before the eye, without analysis; 2) do not involve interactions, i.e. do not draw connections between the qualities observed and other elements in the text. Such interactions are specifically associated with negation, e.g. thwarted expectations (Horn 1989) and emotional involvement (Perelmutter 2005, 2008a). I have not found a single example that could be classified as detached visual reporting under negation. This confirms that negation is inherently referential. For Givón (1978), referentiality is narrowly understood as new versus old information: "negative sentences… are used in contexts in which the referential arguments have already been introduced in preceding context." We have seen that non-referential contexts are those that include all non-participatory, isolating contexts, such as detached visual reporting, the introduction of characters, and descriptions of accidental characters, i.e., all instances in which the qualities of the character do not interact with other elements in the broader context.

Even though long nominatives under negation as a rule are not attested with detached observation, they are sometimes found in the context of dependent qualities. This context is not truly isolating in that it interacts with a single person (rather than the larger narrative), i.e. the viewpoint character. The long nominative is chosen with adjectives that imply dependence and control, such as *голодный* 'hungry.' In example (10), a mother discusses her infant son:

(10)   *Ron'ka očen' dolgoe vremja prosypalsja poest' po nočam, hotja i ne byl golodnyj.*
        On tak sebja uspokaival i usypljal.
        'For the longest time Ron'ka woke up to eat at night, even though he wasn't
        hungry.LNOM. This is how he calmed himself and lulled himself to sleep.'

                                                                ("Kak nashi detki zasypajut")

The dependent qualities context is also possible with inanimate subjects, whose qualities depend on the viewpoint character, for example if the subject is a food item being prepared by the viewpoint character. In (11), the speaker is boasting his special recipe for *pel'meni* that impressed even Siberians:

(11)   *U menja vsegda farš otličnyj. Ja delaju tak: 2/3 govjadiny, 1/3 žirnoj svininy ... A čtoby farš ne byl suhoj, dobavit' holodnoj vody. … U menja v gostjah specy po pel'menjam iz Sibiri byli, hoteli menja svoim iskusstvom porazit', no moi pel'meni im bol'še ponravilis'.*

'My minced meat filling is excellent. That's how I make it: 2/3 beef, 1/3 fat pork… And then add cold water, <u>so that the filling won't be dry.LNOM</u>. I had guests who were pelmeni experts from Siberia, they wanted to impress me with their art, but they liked my pelmeni better.'   (Livejournal.com user donna_oliva, in response to "Pelmeni?")

In the dependent-qualities context, the long nominative appears only with accidental properties that are also controlled and involve physical rather than mental states (*golodnyj* 'hungry,' *mokryj* 'wet,' *suhoj* 'dry'); adjectives that involve permanent properties (*mertvyj* 'dead') or accidental uncontrolled properties (*molodoj* 'young') were not attested under negation.[4]

---

[4] A single example with *молодой* 'young' was found in a translation: Кроме того, <u>он не был молодой:</u> он был очень старый, когда я приходил к нему, и несколько лет продлевалось мое учение. This is a good example how non-canonical choices can be made in translations. The expected choice is the short form, due to the interactive factors involved.

To summarize, the long nominative is rare under negation, though it is not precluded by it. The long nominative in positive contexts appears in two templates. The more statistically frequent detached or isolating context is unattested under negation, due to its non-referential nature. The less frequent dependent-qualities context is attested under negation, but is further lexically restricted to certain classes of adjectives. Thus, a combination of discourse, semantic and lexical factors combine to make the long nominative significantly less likely under negation.

4. Short Adjectives

4.1 Short Adjectives in Affirmative Contexts

Between 73% to 84% of all hits for short nominative were found in contexts where the property interacts with some other property, event, or agent in the narrative.

Interaction with other agents and events is illustrated by example (20), which is a story involving a prison brawl between the protagonist and a bandit. The bandit's youth (and therefore strength and stamina) gives him an advantage in this exchange and is contrasted to the protagonist's bodily weakness:

(12)　　*Ja uvidel sovsem blizko ugrožajuščee, otvratitel'noe, s oskalennymi zubami lico huligana. On vzjal menja za gorlo. Ja ne mog otorvat' ètih pal'cev – i tože vcepilsja emu v glotku, v volosy. My oba ruhnuli na pol. On byl molod, a ja – poluživoj invalid, koža da kosti. ... On podmjal menja pod sebja, i ja naprasno staralsja sodrat' so svoej šei èti 10 železnyh pijavok.*

'Very close to me I saw the menacing, ugly face of the bandit, with protruding teeth. He took me by the throat. I could not tear away those fingers – and (I) also grabbed him by

the throat, the hair. Both of us fell to the floor. He was young.SNOM, and I – a half-dead invalid, all skin and bones. ... He pressed me under his body, and I tried in vain to tear those ten iron leeches away from my neck.'

(Ju.B. Margolin. "Putešestvie v stranu zè-ka")

Interaction with a temporal specification is illustrated by example (21), which discusses the reaction of the fans towards the rock star Boris Greben'shikov. Temporal coordination with *когда* 'when' is present. Two temporal coordinations (*now* and *then*) are juxtaposed here:

(13)   *Vam legko bylo ego ljubit', kogda on byl molod, ènergičen i pisal splošnjakom genial'nye pesni. A vy poljubite ego sejčas, kogda on star, neoprjaten i sam pohož na starika Kozlodoeva*
'It was easy for you (the fans) to love him when he was young.SNOM, energetic, and wrote genius songs without fail. Dare to love him now, when he is old, sloppy, and resembles the old Kozlodoyev (*an old lecher from one of his early songs-RP*).'

(S. Shmidt, Irkutsk. "Xudožniki i ih tvorenija")

While temporal specification is said to correlate with the choice of instrumental, here the short form is chosen because the property of the rock-singer – his youth – is relevant to other agents, the addressees. It is owing to his youth and energy that Grebenshikov was able to compose cult songs for which he is loved by the audience.

A property can be interactive in that it is used to explain other properties, e.g. the quality of youth is used to explain behaviors such as recklessness, unrealistic dreams to change the

world, etc. In (22), the feelings of the protagonist for his girlfriend and his optimistic attitude towards life are conditioned by his youthful quality:

(14)   *On sidel na starinnoj derevjannoj skamejke rjadom so svoej devuškoj (imja ee uže ne vspominalos')[…]ee blizost' napolnjala ego spokojnym sčast'em, on byl molod, v samom načale svoego puti, i on tak hotel žit'!*

‘He sat on the ancient wooden bench with his girlfriend (her name no longer came to his memory)… her closeness filled him with quiet happiness, he was young.SNOM, at the very beginning of his path, and he wanted to live so much!’

(Titan, "Zelenyje sady zemli")

4.1.1. Evaluation

In the previous examples, two interacting entities are referenced in the text – the main character (the perceiver) and the bandit in (12), the fan and the rock star in (13), the protagonist, his girlfriend, and the feelings towards his girlfriend in (14). Interactive examples with evaluation are similar, but they involve evaluation by observers, e.g. in (15), the soldiers hear a song in the darkness and make judgments about the singer's age:

(15)   *No hotel by ja uvidet' professional'nogo pevca, kotoryj hot' raz v žizni udostoilsja by takogo vnimanija, takoj ljubvi, s kakoj my slušali ètogo nevedomogo nam molodogo parnja. A v tom, čto on byl molod, my ne somnevalis'. Inače ne smog by čelovek tak toskovat', tak vzvivat'sja do samoj vysokoj vysi...*

'I would like to have seen a professional singer who even once in his life received such attention, such love, with which we listened to that unknown young man. And that <u>he was young.SNOM</u> we did not doubt. Otherwise the man would not be able to express such sorrow, to soar like that to the highest heights.'　　　　(V. Astaf'jev. "Arija Kavaradossi")

In section 3 we have seen that perception, especially vision, favors the long nominative. However, there are two possible kinds of vision. Vision discussed in the sections above is the "snapshot" reporting of a scene; it does not involve interaction with other events or agents in the narrative. In the second kind of vision, the observer is involved in evaluating and interacting with the predicated entity; if such an interaction occurs, the short form is found, e.g. in example (16), a father is emotionally involved in his son's well-being:

(16)　　　*Kogda Igor'ku ispolnilos' trinadcat', my, pozdraviv ego s dnem roždenija, opustili glaza: čto my mogli skazat'?… – Igorek... – skazal ja, sglotnuv sljunu. Čto ja mog poželat' svoemu synu, vstupavšemu v poslednij god žizni? – Ne nado, papa, – skazal Igorek. – JA vse i tak ponimaju. On byl mužestvennee menja, i ja ego za èto uvažal. I ja videl, čto <u>on byl sčastliv</u>[5], čto ja ego uvažaju.*

'When Igorek turned thirteen, we wished him a happy birthday and lowered our eyes – what could we say? "Igorek," I said, swallowing. What could I wish my son who was entering the last year of his life? "Don't say anything, dad," said Igorek. "I understand everything." He was braver than I was, and I respected him for it, and <u>I saw that he was happy.SNOM</u> that I respect him.'　　　　　　(Ja. Mel'nik, "Kniga sudeb")

---

[5] The short nominative appears more frequently with the adjective *sčastliv-* 'happy', which involves emotion on the lexical level.

With *zametil* 'noticed' rather than *videl/uvidel* 'saw.IPFV/PFV,' the short form appears to be even more frequent, since conscious evaluation is involved. In (17), the doctor notices symptoms of illness but is not able to interpret them correctly; as a result, the patient dies. The doctor thus evaluates the quality of excitement in the patient (*on byl vozbužden* 'he was agitated') as one of the symptoms that helps him arrive at a diagnosis, albeit a false one:

(17)　　　*Večerom 29 ijulja menja priglasili k zabolevšemu parnju. ... JA srazu zametil, čto*

　　　on byl vozbužden, obratil vnimanie na slezotečenie, suženie zračkov. Ponačalu, ne imeja

　　　opyta raboty s takimi otravlenijami, i ne predpoložil, čto èto možet byt' otravlenie.

　　　Dumal, kakaja-to infekcija.

　　　'In the evening of June 29th I was called to a sick young man… I noticed at once that <u>he</u>

　　　<u>was excited.SNOM</u>, noticed the tears and the narrowing of pupils. In the beginning, not

　　　having experience with such poisonings, I did not think it could be a poisoning. I thought

　　　it was some kind of infection.'　　　("Čečnja, hronika nasilija. Načalo 'minnoj vojny'")

Evaluation frequently occurs also with the verb *pokazat'sja* 'to seem.' Only the instrumental is allowed if directly controlled by this verb: thus, *on pokazalsja bol'nym* 'he appeared sick.' However, a choice of short form is possible and preferred in a paraphrased experiencer construction Experiencer.DAT pokazalos, čto N byl Adj: *mne pokazalos', čto on byl bolen* 'he seemed sick to me.' Out of a sample of 50 examples with *pokazalos', čto on byl*,[6] 45 examples involve short form adjectives, 4 examples use instrumental, and 1 example has long

---

[6] These are the 50 first examples retrieved by the Google.com search.

nominative (thus short form with 90%, instrumental with 8%, and long nominative with 8% of hits).

For example, in (18), a wayward father arrives to congratulate his daughter on her 16th birthday; his sobriety is evaluated by the daughter. The short-form choice of *trezv* 'sober' in this particular clause is strengthened by such factors as interaction between the father and the daughter (his leaving has an impact on her life) and emotional involvement (when he leaves, the daughter feels betrayed). As a result of the meeting, the daughter reevaluates her feelings and her relationship with her father:

(18) *Otec ostavil ih s mater'ju, kogda ej bylo vsego devjat'. Ona počuvstvovala sebja togda predannoj i obida ešče dolgo raz"edala ee iznutri. No kogda ej ispolnilos' šestnadcat', bukval'no čerez nedelju papaša prišel pozdravit' "docju" s dnem rožden'ja. On sil'no izmenilsja za èto vremja, ej daže pokazalos', čto on byl ne sovsem trezv.*
'Father left her and mother when she was only nine. She felt betrayed then, and the betrayal ate her from inside, for a long time. But when she turned sixteen, literally a week later the daddy came to congratulate his baby girl with her birthday. He changed a lot during this time, it even seemed to her that he wasn't entirely sober.SNOM.'

(Ksenečka. "Razbitaja čaška")

Other examples of *pokazalos'* 'seemed' with the instrumental (four overall) have to do with evaluating inanimate entities, in particular events such as concerts, shows and plays (2 with *gromkim* 'loud,' one with *korotkim* 'short', one with *duševnym* 'soulful') rather than animate referents:

32

(19)   *Koncert prošel na odnom dyhanii. Pokazalos', čto <u>on byl očen' korotkim</u>, hotja na*

samom dele dlilsja počti dva časa.

'The concert went very smoothly. It seemed to me that <u>it was very short.INSTR</u>, though

in reality it lasted almost two hours.'   (I. Lavrov. "Koncerty")

A single example with long nominative involves the person's feelings towards an individual

within her private domain – this is the man she loves, pities and wants to comfort (thus the man

falls under to the dependent qualities context); the following interval showcases her feelings and

thoughts about life, and does not describe any interactions with the lover:

(20)   *..ja ešče raz ubedilas', čto ja dejstvitel'no očen' sil'no ljublju... Mne počemu-to na*

koncerte, s odnoj storony, stalo očen' žal' Levu... <u>Mne pokazalos', čto on byl grustnyj i</u>

<u>*bol'noj.*</u>

'I became convinced again that I was very much in love. For some reason during the

concert I felt concern towards Liova. <u>He seemed sad.LNOM and ill.LNOM</u> to me.'

(Vostokova, "Re: Re: vostokova, ya rada za tebja")

Evaluation with *pokazalos'* 'seemed' routinely involves two persons, the perceiver and

the entity predicated by the adjective; the predicated entity and his/her qualities impacts the

evaluating entity and/or the narrative. Such a combination triggers short-form adjective usage,

though much more rarely, the instrumental is used in evaluating inanimate entities such as

events; long nominative may be triggered in narrative intervals about the speaker's private

domain.

4.1.2 Main Characters

About 20% of all short form hits report a property of an important character. We have seen that the short form routinely involves the interaction of a quality with the rest of the narrative. This quality often belongs to the viewpoint character or the focalized individual, i.e., either the narrator/perceiving entity or a significant protagonist, whose interaction with agents or events is signaled by the choice of case. In (22), the narrator tells a story of a boy Kol'ka, the central agent of the story. His quality of always being hungry interacts with the kinds of activities in which he leads the other children:

(21)   *no reč' u menja segodnja o Kol'ke. [..] Èto byl očen' krasivyj rebenok [..]I on vsegda byl goloden. Vse ego igry svodilis' objazatel'no k dobyče pišči. On prinosil kartošku iz podvala, i my pekli ee na kostre.*
'I am talking about Kol'ka today. He was a very handsome child. <u>And he was always hungry.SNOM</u>. All his games were about finding food. He brought potatoes from the basement, and we baked them on an open fire.' ("Chelovek - sozdanie nepostizhimoe")

Examples in this category sometimes closely resemble the usage of the long nominative in that they occur the first time a protagonist appears:

(22)   *On byl molod, horoš soboj, umen i blestjašče obrazovan. V studenčeskie gody on často i legko vljubljalsja i s takoj že legkost'ju zabyval o svoih privjazannostjah.*

'He (the actor) was young.SNOM, handsome, smart, and brilliantly educated. During his student years he fell in love frequently and easily, and just as easily forgot about his passions. ' (Ol'ga, "Akter")

Despite the similarity, there are important differences between the short form and long nominative in this context. The majority of the hits offer first descriptions of significant protagonists, such as main characters in the story, or real persons with some kind of significance, either famous social figures, role models (actors, writers, professors), not famous but still possessing admirable qualities, or newly deceased and thus presented as significant and admirable. The quality can also inspire an emotional response, as in (23), when the fact of the dog's death upsets the speaker:

(23)   *Reks, uslyšav moj golos, sdelal popytku podnjat'sja, minutu ili dve kačalsja na podgibajuščihsja nogah i snova upal. On byl mertv! JA v volnenii nagnulsja nad nim. ... èto byla lučšaja sobaka našej stai, samaja rabotjaščaja, terpelivaja, poslušnaja.*
'Rex, hearing my voice, tried to rise, wobbled for a minute or two on unsteady legs, then fell again. He was dead.SNOM! I bent over him in agitation. It was the best dog of our pack, the most hard-working, patient, obedient.'

(L. Platov. "Arxipelag Ischezaiush'ix ostrovov")

The short form is the most significant statistically for the adjective *mertv-* 'dead.' Predictably, interaction templates are much more important for this adjective than they are for *molod-*. The adjective *mertv-* is predominantly chosen in interactive contexts: 91.4% of all *mertv-* examples

involve interactions. Reporting the quality of 'dead' only happens when the death is important to someone or is influencing other events (see table 2 for statistics on this adjective).

4.1.3 Archaic Style

The short form is also said to be stylistically archaic. I did find short nominative in archaizing contexts; however, these are not as widespread as the literature suggests, amounting to only 5% to 8% of the hits for the short form. I counted as 'purely archaizing' contexts that attempt to represent an earlier language norm for the sake of style – this often happens in religious texts and fantasy, as in example (33), taken from a Tolkien-style amateur fantasy. Note other archaizing features: the use of instrumental form *soboju* 'by himself', lexical archaism *nispadali* 'fell down'.

(24)   *On byl molod i horoš soboju; ego černye volosy lokonami nispadali do pleč, para prjadej legla na lico*.
'He was young.SNOM and handsome; his black hair fell in tresses down to his shoulders, a couple of tresses lay on his face.'   (Bronveg, "Isxod")

4.2. The Short Nominative in Negative Constructions

Under negation, the main characters' qualities are also marked with short form: there is little difference between positive and negative constructions, except that under negation this construction is statistically more frequent. Under negation, the connection between the main protagonist's quality and other elements in the narrative is emphasized with the short form. Most

frequently, the connection implies expectation. For example, if the quality is hunger, the expected connection is that the protagonist will eat. Less expected causal connections can also be established, so in (25), the connection is between being angry and being hungry, and being hungry and killing:

(25)   *On byl zol. A kogda on zlilsja, <u>on byl goloden</u>. A kogda <u>on byl goloden</u>, on žaždal krovi. On hotel ubivat'.*
<u>'He was angry.SNOM</u>. And when he was angry, <u>he was hungry.SNOM</u>. And when <u>he was hungry.SNOM</u> wanted blood. He wanted to kill.'

(T. Rogova. "Večnost' na razdumje")

Under negation, the expected causal connection can be realized despite the absence of the quality, e.g. in (26), the narrator eats despite the absence of hunger, i.e. despite expectation that a man who is not hungry would not eat:

(26)   *<u>Ja ne byl goloden,</u> no, o bože, boršč, v kotoryj hozjajka Svetlana Viktorovna [...] postojanno pičkala smetanu!*
<u>'I wasn't hungry.SNOM</u>, but, oh my God, the borsht into which our landlady Svetlana Viktorovna constantly added sour cream!'   (F. Leont'jev. "Transafrika-96")

In (27), the focus of the narration temporarily shifts from the narrator to the predicated entity, a drunken man lying on the ground. Here, too, expectation is found: a body lying on the ground is usually expected to be dead, however, in this case the man is not dead but rather drunk. His

quality of not being dead forces the narrator to take action – transfer the body to a nearby dwelling:

(27)   *Bylo uže temno. Nedaleko ot kryl'ca na snegu ležal čelovek.* <u>*On ne byl mertv,*</u> <u>*on*</u>
         <u>*byl*</u> *v stel'ku* <u>*p'jan*</u>*. … I teper' bezzabotno zamerzal na snegu. Prišlos' podnjat' èto*
         besčuvstvennoe telo, i dotaščit' do poterjannogo žil'ja.
         'It was dark already. Not far from the porch in the snow lay a man. <u>He wasn't</u>
         <u>dead.SNOM</u>, <u>he was</u> dead <u>drunk.SNOM</u>. And now he was carelessly freezing to death in
         the snow. I was forced to pick up this unfeeling body and carry it to the lost dwelling.'

                                                      (A. Vjal'cev, "Jagody solncevorota")

The negated property under discussion is often contrasted to another, non-negated, property or properties. A comparison (drunk rather than dead), according to Israeli (2007), should trigger the instrumental; here, however, the interactive nature of the property, i.e. the fact that the observed drunkenness forces the observer into action, trumps the considerations of comparison and triggers short nominative. Similarly in (28), the positive qualities of the politician, such as being a good husband and neighbor, are contrasted to his negative qualities. Despite the expectation, the speaker does not consider those qualities to be bad, and attempts to justify them:

(28)   *Ja pomnju ego do togo, kak on byl vovlečen v črezvyčajno važnoe*
         gosudarstvennoe prestuplenie. …. <u>*On ne byl umen*</u> *– èto ne prestuplenie.*<u>*On ne byl*</u>
         dostatočno <u>*informirovan*</u> *– kak vse my v to vremja.*

'I remember him before he was sucked into an extremely important governmental crime.

He wasn't smart.SNOM– this is not a crime. He wasn't informed.SNOM well enough –

as we all at that time. '   (L. Kacirova. "Razbitaja žizn'")

To summarize, the factors that condition the appearance of short nominative under negation are

not radically different from affirmative contexts in that a) they predicate a character that becomes

important in a narrative for a certain narrative interval; b) they imply interaction of the quality

with other events and persons in the narrative; c) the interaction might involve causality. Under

negation, the following two factors are added: d) an expectation by the speaker/observer, and e)

possible contrasting of the absent quality with a present, positive quality.

5. Instrumental

5.1. Instrumental in Affirmative Contexts

My discussion of the instrumental in affirmative contexts will be brief, since it had been

exhaustively and successfully investigated by other scholars, most recently by Israeli (2007),

who observes that "the instrumental suggests change, comparison, time limitation, or scope

limitation." (Israeli 2007:21). In my data, the instrumental appears most often when temporal

subordination with *когда* 'when' and *тогда* 'when' is present in the clause, or in character

descriptions involving a temporal boundary. Interestingly, the instrumental appears with less

frequency than short and long nominative when predicating animate entities.

In example (29), the love affair between Stalin and Alliluieva is discussed. Long

adjectives are used for character description throughout, except for the discussion of pockmarks.

The interviewer wonders whether Stalin's pockmarked face could be attractive to women; the

interviewee remarks that this condition (prominent pockmarks) did not hold when Stalin was young. Presumably, the pockmarks had become more pronounced since that period, interfering with his ability to attract women:

(29)　　　　*-U nego že bylo izurodovano lico ospoj.*

　　　　　- Ospiny ne tak sil'no vydeljalis', kogda on byl molodym.

　　　　　'But his face was disfigured by pockmarks!

　　　　　The pockmarks weren't so visible when <u>he was young.INSTR</u>.'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(A. Maksimov. Interview with O. Trifonova.)

In addition, the instrumental is often used in contexts of memory. These contexts (with 13% of all instrumental hits) sometimes overlap with the temporal subordination in that the remembrance focuses on a condition that no longer holds. The context of memory corresponds to what Israeli labels as retrospective perspective (2007:28):

(30)　　　　*On nenavidit tekilu, no vsegda zakazyvaet imenno ee i sidit s odnoj rjumkoj ves'*

　　　večer, vspominaja te dni, kogda <u>on byl molodym</u>.

　　　'He hates tequila, but always orders it and sits with one shot for the whole evening,

　　　remembering the days when <u>he was young.INSTR.</u>'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Livejournal user tiomkin. "Kafe na Mormartre")

However, the retrospective perspective doesn't always trigger the appearance of the instrumental. The long nominative is often chosen with childhood memories (in accordance with

the preference for the long nominative in children's narratives). The long nominative is also possible when the remembered referent is a pet, i.e. in the dependent qualities context. In (31), the narrator remembers her fuzzy cat Ljapčik. Note that the memory is presented as a still picture, a *jarkij moment* 'bright moment':

(31)   *Vsegda, kogda razgovor zahodil o koškah, kotah i košakah, ko mne obraščalis' s voprosom, pomnju li ja Ljapčika. […] Mne bylo uže okolo 30, kogda menja opjat' sprosili ob ètom. Da! Ja pomnju Ljapčika! Ja pomnju, čto <u>on byl laskovyj i pušistyj</u>. Èto bylo tak davno, čto nikto ne pomnit, skol'ko mne bylo togda let. Èto, skoree, byl tot nesoznatel'nyj vozrast, kogda pomniš' tol'ko otdel'nye samye jarkie momenty.*

'Always when there was talk of female and male cats, I was asked if I remembered Ljapčik. I was around thirty when they asked me about this again. Yes! I remember Ljapčik! I remember that <u>he was affectionate.LNOM and fuzzy.LNOM</u>. This was so long ago that nobody remembers how old I was. Probably it was that unconscious age, when one remembers only separate bright moments.'   (Vera Timošina. Ljapčik)

The frequency of the instrumental examples grows when the property is used to refer exclusively to an inanimate noun. So for *pročnyj* 'sturdy,' only 8 hits are attested in the long nominative *on byl pročnyj* 'he was sturdy.LNOM,' 760 *on byl pročen* 'he was sturdy.SNOM,' but 15,200 for *on byl pročnym* 'he was sturdy.INSTR.' This is not surprising, since short adjectives are used to indicate interaction, most prominently between agents. Inanimate objects participate in such interactions less readily than animate ones.

5.2. The Instrumental under Negation

5.2.1 Interaction with Other Agents

  With an agentive subject, instrumental can often signal the backgrounded status of the referent in relation to other agents. In (32), the referent of the adjective *molodoj* 'young' is contrasted to the narrator and his preferences. The narrator is central to the narrative, while the other man is considered in comparison to the narrator's ideas of what friends should be like in terms of age:

  (32) *Mne ne nravilos', čto u nego vse raspisano, čto i kogda budet v ego žizni.*

    Dvadcatipjatiletnij paren', on, mne, v moi semnadcat' kazalsja počti starikom. <u>On ne byl</u>

    <u>*molodym*</u>*, on iz podrostka srazu stal zrelym. A mne ne hvatalo obščenija imenno so*

    sverstnikami.

    'I didn't like how he had everything worked out, what and when would happen in his life.

    Twenty five years old man, he seemed to me, a seventeen year old, almost a geezer. <u>He</u>

    <u>wasn't young.INSTR</u>, immediately after being an adolescent he became a mature man.'

              (E. Šestakova. Mir, ne znajuščij ljubvi)

A person (theme) formerly marked as focalized in the narrative can be marked instrumental at the moment he or she is unfavorably compared to other persons, usually the perceiving entity or entities. Thus example (33), which features Kol'ka as the main protagonist, continues with an instrumental of *умным* 'smart', where Kol'ka is evaluated as less smart than other children in (21):.

  (33) *No reč' u menja segodnja o Kol'ke. [..]I <u>on vsegda byl goloden</u>. […] <u>Kol'ka ne byl</u>*

    <u>*umnym*</u>*, a v našej dovol'no intellektual'noj kompanii kazalsja skoree glupym, no ego ne*

vysmeivali.

> 'I am talking about Kol'ka today... <u>And he was always hungry.SNOM</u>. … <u>Kol'ka</u>
>
> <u>wasn't smart.INSTR</u>, and in our quite intellectual company seemed even
>
> <u>stupid.INSTR</u>, but he wasn't teased.'   ("Chelovek - sozdanie nepostizhimoe")

Despite the negative evaluation, however, the child Kol'ka is not ridiculed; he is respected for his other, positive qualities.

There is often a juxtaposition between the negated quality and other, positive, quality or qualities. Unlike the qualities appearing in agreement under negation, the absence of a quality is often permanent with the instrumental, thus Kol'ka's quality of not being smart (33) is presented as permanent and uncontrolled.

Expectation is also possible with the instrumental, though less frequent than with the short form. In (34), a man is enclosed in ice; despite expectations, he is alive. The factor that triggers the instrumental here is again the ranking of the referent as less important compared to the main protagonist/perceiver. The referent of the instrumental adjective, Andrei, appears here only to give hints to the main protagonist:

(34)   *Ja podyšal na glybu, otčego nebol'šoj učastok nepronicaemo-belogo l'da stal*

> *prozračnym. I ja otšatnulsja, razgljadev v tolšče l'da lico Andreja. No <u>on ne byl mertvym</u>,*
>
> *on ulybnulsja posinevšimi gubami i proiznes, vyzyvaja zvonkie vibracii l'da: – Tam,*
>
> *dal'še, est' to, čto tebe nado.*

'I breathed on a slab of ice, which caused a small section of the impenetrable white ice to become transparent. I jerked back, seeing Andrei's face in the thick ice. And <u>he wasn't</u>

dead.INSTR, he smiled with blue lips and said, making the ice vibrate: "There, further, is what you need." '   (D. Jankovskij. (Mir večnogo livnja")

Under negation, the instrumental is more widespread than the short form with inanimate referents and abstract concepts. In (35), the viewpoint character's expectation of the forest's color is thwarted, with the instrumental though we would expect the short form. The property of the forest is presented as part of the scene-setting; the forest plays no further role in the narrative.

(35)   *Les byl ne pohož na sebja... Belyj zimoj, zolotoj osen'ju, prozračno-černejuščij*

vesnoj, letom on byl jarko-zelenym... <u>*Ètot les ne byl zelenym.*</u>

'The forest wasn't like itself. White in winter, golden in the summer, transparent-black in the spring, in the summer it was bright-green. <u>This forest wasn't green.INSTR</u>.'

(O. Kostyljova, " Bagrjanoe leto")

With properties that imply agentive referents and are interactive, controlled and accidental, the instrumental under negation is virtually nonexistent. Thus with the adjective *zanjat* 'busy,' instrumental was found in only three hits, all with abstract, non-referential entities, as in (36) from a dictionary:

(36)   *Naselenie, èkonomičeski neaktivnoe: Naselenie, kotoroe ne vhodit v sostav*

rabočej sily – èkonomičeski aktivnogo naselenija, to est' vse te, <u>*kto ne byl zanjatym*</u> *ili*

bezrabotnym v tečenie rassmatrivaemogo perioda.

'Economically inactive population: population, which is not part of the workforce, the economically active population, i.e. all those <u>who weren't busy.INSTR</u> or unemployed during the period under consideration.'   (*vslovar.org.ru*)

The same is found for *dovol'nyj* 'content,' another accidental/interactive/ controlled property. With uncontrolled properties the instrumental is statistically significant, even predominant, when both referential and general contexts are tested – 'wasn't+ ADJ' vs 'he wasn't ADJ' (thus with the adjectives *tolstyj* 'fat,' *molodoj* 'young'). The quality of interaction by itself does not preclude the appearance of instrumental under negation – see Table 2 for statistics on *mertvyj* 'dead.' It seems that it is control (cause/effect) semantics that favor short form versus instrumental under negation.

6. Conclusions

In this article, I've shown the strong correlation between the choice of adjectival form and animacy, a prominent grammatical category of Russian that has not been so far explicitly connected to this context of variation. Lexical-semantic properties important for predicating animate entities differ from properties important for inanimate entities. Most prominently, the consideration of interaction, i.e. the influence the predicated entity can exert on other entities or events in the text, is strongly correlated with animate entities, and the choice of short nominative. This observation was further reinforced in the article through comparison between the relative frequencies of adjectival choices in affirmative and negative contexts. In both contexts, choices are influenced by similar factors; however, their statistical distribution is different. These usage asymmetries arise because some factors, most prominently interaction, are more important for

animate vs. inanimate referents, and for negation vs. affirmation. Negation favors interactive

environments and does not appear in contexts which do not involve a participatory viewpoint.

References

Bulygina, T. V. and A. D. Šmelev, A. D. (1997) Jazykovaja kontceptualizacija mira: Na materiale russkoj grammatiki. Moskva: Jazyki russkoi kul'tury.

Givón, Talmy. (1978) "Negation in language: Pragmatics, function, ontology." Peter Cole, ed. Syntax and semantics 9: Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press, 69-112.

Gustavsson, Sven. (1976) Predicative adjectives with the copula byt' in Modern Russian. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. (Stockholm Slavic studies, 10.)

Horn, Laurence R. (1989) A natural history of negation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Israeli, Alina. (2007) "Nominative and instrumental variation of adjectival predicates with the \   Russian copula byt': reference time, limitation, and focalization." Dagmar Divjak and Agata Kochanska, eds. Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain. Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 21–54.

Lewis, William, Farrar, Scott, Langendoen, D. Terrence. (2006) "Linguistics in the Internet age: Tools and fair use." Proceedings of EMELD 2006 workshop on digital language documentation: Tools and standards: The state of the art.

Liberman, Mark. (2000) "Legal, ethical and policy issues concerning the recording and publication of primary language materials." Steven Bird and Gary Simons, eds. Proceedings of the workshop on Web-based documentation and description.

Merrill, Peter. (1985) "Aspect as evaluation: The case of negation." Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake, eds. The scope of Slavic aspect. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 129–52.

Meyer, Charles F. (2005) "Can you really study language variation in linguistic corpora?" American Speech 79.4: 339-355.

Meyer, Charles F., Roger Grabowski, Thomas Han, Konstantin Mantzouranis, and Stephanie Moses. (2003) "The world wide web as linguistic corpus." Charles F. Meyer and Pepi Leistyna, eds. Corpus analysis: language structure and language use. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 241-54.

Nichols, Johanna. (1981) Predicate nominals: A partial surface syntax of Russian. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nikunlassi, Ahti.(1993) Imenitelnyj ili tvoritelnyj? Sintaksičeskie prilagatelnye pri polznoznamenatel'nyh glagolakh v russkom jazyke: problemy vybora padeža. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press (Slavica Helsingiensia 12.)

Padučeva, E. V. (1992) "O semantičeskom podxode k sintaksisu i genitivnom subjekte glagola BYT'."Russian Linguistics 16 (1): 53-63.

Padučeva, E. V. (1997) "Roditelnyj subjekta v otricatel'nom predloženii: sintaksis ili semantika?" Voprosy jazykoznanjia 2: 101-16.

Padučeva, E. V. (2004) Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Perelmutter, Renee .(2005) "Case choice in Russian genitive/nominative absence constructions." Russian Linguistics 29.3: 319-46.

Perelmutter, Renee (2008a). "Referential negation: Syntax/semantics of negative constructions and their interaction with narrative structure in Modern Russian." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley.

Perelmutter, Renee. (2008b) "The Language of Dream Reports and Dostoevsky's The Double." Slavic and East European Journal 52.1.

Perelmutter, Renee. (2010). "Verbs of motion under negation in Modern Russian." Viktoria Driagina-Hasko and Renee Perelmutter, eds. New approaches to Slavic verbs of motion. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (forthcoming).

Thelwall, Mike. (2005) "Creating and using web corpora." International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 10.4: 517-41.

Timberlake, Alan. (2004) A reference grammar of Russian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ueda, Masako. (1992) The interaction between clause-level parameters and context in Russian morphosyntax: Genitive of negation and predicate adjectives. Otto Sagner, Munich (Slavistische Beiträge 295.)

Zeldovich, G. M. (2005) Russkoje predikativnoe imja. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersitetu Mikolaja Kopernika.