## Russian depictives and attributives: the role of the verb

Russian secondary predicates can use two different case patterns: the instrumental case or the agreeing case. In this paper we discuss the behavior of the adjective in the position of the secondary predicate and we refer to the patterns of agreement discussed above as depictive constructions (taking the instrumental) and attributive constructions (taking the agreeing case), see the examples (1-2).

(1) Depictive construction:				
X <sub>nom</sub>	V	$(Y_{acc})$	Ains	
On	vstretil	ego	pjanym	
hei	met	him <sub>i</sub>	drunk <sub>i/j</sub>	

(2) Attributive construction				
X <sub>nom</sub>	V	$(Y_{acc})$	$A_{nom}/A_{acc}$	
On	vstretil	ego	p'anyj/p'anogo	
hei	met	him <sub>i</sub>	drunk <sub>i/j</sub>	

Although some researchers (see, for example, Bailyn 2001) propose a purely syntactic approach to the choice of pattern, most scholars agree that the mechanism of the predicate case choice is semantically ruled. It is usually pointed out that a depictive construction has of meaning of temporality or instability and allows only stage level predicates as in (3) (see Borkovskij and Kuznecov 2006 [1963]; Nichols 1981; Strigin and Demjanow 2001; Timberlake 2004).

In this paper we show that the verb in the construction needs to be taken into account. Verbs of change of state (e.g., *stat*' 'become') and verbs of perception (e.g., *kazat'sja* 'seem')¹ can be also used with individual level predicates (4-5). These verbs provide the whole construction with temporality or instability meaning. This happens because verbs of change of state contrast the event before and after acquiring the feature, the same way as verbs of perception contrast the actual facts with the perception of them. In both cases the final event does not fulfill initial expectations, which makes it unstable. The instability feature of the construction is satisfied and the construction does not have specific requirements for the adjective. Therefore both stage level and individual level predicates are allowed.

- (3) Poezd prišel čist-ym/\*nov-ym/\*dlinn-ym/ \*železn-ym. train:NOM.SG arrived clean-INS.SG/new-INS.SG/long-INS.SG/metal-INS.SG The train arrived clean/new/long/metal.
- (4) Nosok vyšel dlinn-ym. (change of state) sock:NOM.SG came.out long-INS.SG

The sock happened to be long.

(5) Dver' vygljadit železn-oj. (perception) door:Nom.sg looks metal-INS.sg

The door looks like metal.

It is usually claimed that predicates with more specified temporal properties favor the depictive construction (see, for example, Krasovitsky et al. 2008). This would mean that a depictive construction tends to use stage level predicates, while an attributive construction tends to use individual level predicates. However, an attributive construction has the same restrictions on the adjective as a depictive construction: it allows only stage level predicates (6).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>And their causative counterparts such as *sdelat* 'make' – causation of change of state, and *sčitat* 'consider' – causation of perception.

Nevertheless, its compatibility with the verbs is different. It does not allow verbs of perception, as in (7), and it allows only those verbs of change of state which contain only the fact of the presence of a feature (8). The verb of change of state that compares the moment before and after having the feature is not allowed in the attributive construction (see (9)).

(6) Poezd prišel čist-yj/\*nov-yj/\*dlinn-yj/\*železn-yj.
train:Nom.sg arrived clean-Nom.sg/new-Nom.sg/long-Nom.sg/metal-Nom.sg

The train arrived clean/new/long/metal.

(7) \*Dver' vygljadit železn-aja.
door:Nom.sg looks metal-Nom.sg
The door looks like metal.

(8) Tort polučilsja sliškom sladk-ij.
tart:NOM.SG turned.out too sweet-NOM.SG
The tart was too sweet.

(9) \*Verbal'noe obščenie sdelaetsja nenužn-oe.
verbal communication:Nom.sg become :FUT unnecessary-Nom.sg
Verbal communication will become unnecessary.

The attributive construction also marks instability of the event. However, if the verb implies the comparison of presence and absence of the feature, the event cannot be described by this construction.

To sum up: variables in both constructions are connected to each other. The same verbs and adjectives can be allowed in the construction in one context and prohibited in the other. Both constructions have only one semantic restriction – instability of the event, which can be encoded anywhere in the construction. It can be expressed by the verb or by the adjective. The difference between the two constructions lies in the presence of the background of the event. The background can contain information on how it was before the appearance of the feature expressed by the adjective or how the event is perceived in contrast with the actual state of affairs. If such background information is presented, only a depictive construction can be used, but if only the fact of the presence of the feature is stated both depictive and attributive constructions are allowed.

## References:

Bailyn, J. (2001) The syntax of Slavic predicate Case. ZAS Papers in Linguistics 22, 1-26.

Borkovskij, V. I., & P.S. Kuznecov, P. S. (2006 [1963]). *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva.

Krasovitsky A., A.Long, M. Baerman, D. Brown, G. Corbett (2008). Predicate nouns in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 32: 99–113.

Nichols, J. (1981). *Predicate nominals. A partial surface syntax of Russian* (University of California Publications, 97). Berkeley.

Strigin, A. and Demjjanow, A. (2001) Secondary predication in Russian. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 25:1-79.

Timberlake, A. (2004). A reference grammar of Russian. Cambridge.