

A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF RUSSIAN IMPERSONAL SENTENCES*

In Young Lee

The purpose of this paper is to show that the affective value of Russian Impersonal Sentences (IPS) can be accounted for by the close examination of underlying (semantic and syntactic) structures of various types of IPS. For this purpose, I utilize a somewhat modified version of Simon Dik's Functional Grammar as a framework. I define IPS as sentences marked by the absence of a participant in the narrated event in the subject role. On the basis of this definition various types of Russian IPS are examined, primarily in terms of their semantic functions. A detailed analysis of such types reveals that there are restrictions on the semantic structure, which account for the affective value: "backgrounding" of a "major" source or "foregrounding" of its absence.

1. Introduction

The Russian IPS (henceforth utilized as an abbreviation for both "impersonal sentence" and "impersonal sentences") has been studied by many linguists both within the U.S.S.R. and abroad. However, the semantic features which distinguish the IPS from personal sentences have not been clarified. This is due first of all to the fact that most linguists were primarily concerned with surface phenomena such as syntactic and morphological characteristics. In addition, most investigators tried to account for the semantic peculiarities of the IPS from the viewpoint of personal sentences.

Thus, for example, Russian grammarians, starting with Buslaev, view the "mne" in "Mne ne spitsja" 'me(dat.)-not-sleep[goes]' as a so-called "logical subject," because it corresponds to the "ja" in "Ja ne splju 'I(nom.) don't sleep'." This approach fails to account for the semantic difference between the two sentences; the latter lacks the special modality implied in the former.

Another example is the approach favored by Eastern European and Russian transformationalists. These scholars assume that an IPS represents a transformation of an underlying personal sentence or, at least, that an IPS and a personal sentence with the same lexemes have the same deep structure. This approach again fails to account for the above-mentioned difference between "Mne ne spitsja" and "Ja ne splju."

In the West there have been attempts to apply Fillmore's Case Grammar to the semantic study of the Russian IPS. This approach, I would say, gave birth

*I thank G. Schaarschmidt for his valuable comments on this paper.

to the first serious semantic study of the Russian IPS not based on a vague correspondance to a personal sentence. I here attempt to clarify the semantic characteristics of the IPS more effectively by utilizing as a theoretical framework Dik's Functional Grammar (Dik, Simon C. *Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. and revised. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications, 1981), which is in fact an elaboration and modification of Case Grammar. The Functional Grammar approach has the following advantages: (1) we need not view the IPS as the derivative of personal sentences, because the deepest structure is semantic, i.e. independent of subject and surface cases, (2) "semantic functions," as a more elaborated and developed version of the "deep cases" of Case Grammar, provide us with an appropriate tool for semantic analysis.

The arbitrary nature of the term IPS has been widely recognized by many linguists. In view of this arbitrariness, I shall attempt to provide the reader with a working definition of the term "IPS," before embarking on a more detailed investigation of these sentences. In the following section several, mostly productive, groups of IPS are examined. On the basis of the analysis of these groups, I shall discuss certain overall characteristics of the semantic structure of the IPS and the affective value resulting from them.

2. Definition of Russian IPS

I define the IPS as **A SENTENCE MARKED BY THE ABSENCE OF A PARTICIPANT IN THE NARRATED EVENT IN THE SUBJECT ROLE.**¹ The IPS may have a participant in the narrated event but the participant is never in the subject role.

Superficially, elliptic sentences (e.g. *Ivan otkryl okno. Videl dedušku.* 'Ivan opened the window. [He] saw Grandpa'), and "indefinite-personal sentences" (e.g. *Govorjat, što on bolen* '[They] say that he is ill') or "generalized-personal sentences" (e.g. *Čas edeš', dva stoiš'* '[You] go one hour, [you] stand two hours')

¹ Although the term "subject" is crucial in the definition of the IPS, I would rather not touch on that broad topic. I shall simply adapt the Functional Grammarian definition, "a constituent which refers to the entity which is taken as a point of departure for the presentation of the state of affairs in which it participates" (Dik, p. 87). I propose that "subject" should be kept distinct from the notion of "Agent" or "topic," although the "Prototype" of "subject" is composed of "Agent" and "topic" (Comrie, p. 101). Subject also need not be identical with the nominative case. (And thus so called "genitive sentences" can have a subject—e.g. *Nateklo vody* 'accumulated (neut. sg.)—water (gen.)'.)

I applied the notion of "participant" in the definition on the practical reason; semantic properties of a participant (in the subject role) play a significant role in other types of sentences which will be compared with the IPS later in this section.

Finally, we must admit that our definition of the IPS does not eliminate certain problems resulting from the ambiguous status of constructions including infinitives or "čto 'that'" clauses. These problems require further study. I prefer to leave the matter open.

seem to be “one-component sentences (odnosostavnye predloženiia)” as is the IPS. However, unlike the IPS, all these types of sentences do have a participant in the narrated event in the subject role, which makes them what I would call “personal sentences.” The participant in the subject role may be either definite (in the case of elliptic sentences) or indefinite (in the case of “indefinite-personal” or “generalized-personal” sentences, e.g. “ljudi ‘people’” or “vsiakij ‘anyone’” as underlying subject).

The existence of an underlying human participant distinguishes “Indefinite-personal” and “generalized-personal” sentences from the IPS. While the IPS always has a predicate in the third person singular in the present and in the neuter singular in the past, the “indefinite-personal sentence” has a fixed form in the third person plural, and the “generalized-personal sentence” always occurs in the second person singular. Thus, in the Jakobsonian sense, whereas the desinences employed in the IPS are unmarked with respect to the grammatical categories of person, number, and gender, those employed in the “indefinite-personal” and in the “generalized-personal” sentences signal the presence of a participant in the subject role by virtue of specific markings such as plural or second person.²

3. Analysis of Some Types of Russian Impersonal Sentences

3.0. Some General Remarks on the Framework

Functional Grammar postulates three different levels, semantic, syntactic, and practical. The semantic level, which determines the state of affairs of the predication, i.e. “Action,” “Position,” “Process,” and “State,” is composed of a predicate and arguments to which semantic functions such as “Agent,” “Goal,” and “Recipient” are assigned (e.g. GIVE_v (Xi:JOHN(Xi))Agent (Yi:BOOK(Yi))Goal (Zi:BILL(Zi))Recipient, for “John gave the book to Bill”). At the syntactic level, a subject and/or an object are assigned to the arguments (e.g. GIVE_v (Xi:JOHN(Xi))Agent Subject (Yi:BOOK(Yi))Goal Object (Zi:BILL(Zi))Recipient). At the practical level topic and focus (or what is called “theme” and “rheme”) are assigned (e.g. GIVE_v (Xi:JOHN(Xi))Agent Subject Topic (Yi:BOOK(Yi))Goal Object (Zi:BILL(Zi))Recipient Focus, as an answer to the question “To whom did John give the book?”). Finally, the expression rules, such as case-marking, word-order and intonation, determine the way in which the functional structures described above are mapped onto the syntactic structures of linguistic expressions. The predication as a whole designates one member of the set of four states of affairs defined in terms of

² See Jakobson, “Shifters, . . . ,” pp. 134-37.

the parameters "Dynamism" and "Control":³

Dynamism \ Control	+	-
+	Action	Process
-	Position	State

The semantic functions most often utilized in the present paper are as follows:⁴

Agent: an animate entity which controls an Action, e.g. *Ivan rabotaet 'Ivan is working'*

Goal: an entity to which an Action is applied, e.g. *Ivan čitaet knigu 'Ivan is reading a book'*

Positioner: an animate entity which controls a Position, e.g. *Ivan sidit doma 'Ivan is sitting at home'*

Force: an inanimate autonomous (not controlling) cause or instigator of a Process, e.g. *Veter gonit lodku 'The wind is driving a boat'; Lodku gonit vetrom 'The boat(acc.) is driven by the wind'*

Processed: an entity affected or effected by a Process, e.g. *Veter gonit lodku; Lodku gonit vetrom*

Recipient: an animate entity to which something is transferred by an Action or Process, e.g. *Ivan dal Anne knigu 'ivan gave Anna a book'; Tebe dostanets-ja ot otca 'You(dat.) will catch it from father'*

Zero: an entity which is under a certain State, e.g. *V komnate stoit stol '[There] stands a table in the room'*

Experiencer:⁵ a human entity which experiences a certain State, e.g. *Ja čuvstvujju sebja xorošo 'I feel good'; Menja znobit 'me(acc.)—[it] shivers'; U menja tjanet život 'in me(gen.)—[it] drags—the stomach(acc.)'*

AND ALSO

Possessor, Instrument, Indirect Cause, Location, Direction, Source, Time, Complement, Quality, Manner

³ Dik, p. 34.

⁴ Most of the definitions are taken from Dik, pp. 37-39.

⁵ "Experiencer" is absent in Dik's work. I should note that in the present paper this term has a different definition from those given in Case Grammar. In the latter it is usually defined as "one whose mental disposition or mental processes were affected." Thus, Whalen assigns "Experiencer" to "Menja strašilo 'me(acc.)—[it] frightened'," while assigning "Object" to "Menja tošnit 'me(acc.)—[it] nauseates'." It is difficult to agree with this, since, in my opinion, there is no clear-cut borderline between "mental disposition" and "physical experience." Dik's Functional Grammar rejects (Case Grammarian) "Experiencer" entirely, on the ground that there are "no distinct coding devices" and that there is "hesitation between different types of expression in the treatment.

I believe that the same surface case may correspond to different semantic functions and vice versa. A typical example of the former situation is the nominative case. Being the most unmarked, it corresponds to various semantic functions (e.g. Agent, Goal, Positioner, Zero, Experiencer). The opposite situation is well illustrated by the semantic function "Experiencer." It may be implemented by various surface cases.

Certain features which characterize the arguments and the predicate are included in the description of semantic structures. The features employed in the present paper are as follows:

1. features characterizing arguments
 - a) Animacy: [+ Human]; [+ Animate]; [+ Part of body]
 - b) Definiteness: [- Definite]
2. features characterizing the verbal predicate
 - a) Animacy: [+ Human] (verbs used exclusively with [+ Human] subject); [+ Animate] (verbs used exclusively with [+ Animate] subjects); [U Animate] (verbs used with both [+ Animate] and [- Animate] subjects); [- Animate] (verbs used exclusively with [- Animate] subjects); [+ Implied] (verbs requiring a subject whose lexical meaning is implied in, or predictable from the verbal lexeme); [+ Impersonal] (verbs used exclusively in IPS)
 - b) Dynamism: [+ Dynamic] [- Dynamic]

As regards the feature [Dynamic], I emphasize that there can arise a conflict between the lexicon and the semantic level. This is often the case when the predication includes "Experiencer." The predication, which is by definition a "State" (- Control, - Dynamic), imposes on the verbal lexeme the loss of "Dynamism" (see the definition of an "Experiencer" above).

3.1. The Type "Gremit 'It's thundering'"

SS: V[+ Impersonal, + Dynamic]/V [- Animate, + Dynamic]/V [+ Implied, + Dynamic] (Xi)Location

ST: Natural/surrounding ambient phenomena

SF: (Prep + N - prep +) Vi

Sample Verbs: svetat' 'to dawn', temnet' 'to darken', v'južit' 'to be stormy', doždit' 'to be rainy', snežit' 'to snow', tumanit'sja 'to be foggy', jasnet' 'to become clear', xolodnet' 'to become cold'

The present group describes mostly visible or sensible natural phenomena. This type of IPS allows only verbs marked with [+ Impersonal, + Dynamic], [- Animate, + Dynamic], or [+ Implied, + Dynamic]. It consequently excludes the presence of "Agent" in the semantic structure. Furthermore, the verbs applied in this group imply "ambience," i.e. an "all encompassing event which

is without reference to some particular 'thing' within the environment."⁶

The "environment" is indicated in the deep structure in the semantic function "Location." In this regard, I agree with Bühler who states that "die wirklich vergleichbaren Sätze sind nicht 'es regnet' und 'Caius schläft', sondern 'es regnet am Bodensee' und 'Caius schläft'; denn nur diese beiden Äusserungen sind ungefähr gleich weitgehend aus den Umständen der Sprechsituation entbunden (sympraktisch frei)."⁷ However, as is shown in many of the above sample sentences, there is frequently no item in the surface structure corresponding to an argument marked with "Location," particularly in the case of "natural phenomena." The absence of an item corresponding to a "Location" at the surface level is accounted for, in the case of "natural phenomena," by the fact that the narrated event refers to the total relevant environment.

The Russian and East European transformationalists who believe that this type of IPS is derived from underlying personal sentences posit, for example, "Dal' svetaet 'The distance is dawning'" and "Den' večereet 'The day is growing dark'" as the sentences underlying "Svetaet" and "Večereet" respectively (see Ružička⁸).

The advantage of our deep semantic structure over this hypothesis consists in the fact that we do not need to posit arbitrary, or at least stylistically marked, sentences as the underlying sentences.⁹

Since Russian which is one of the richest languages in IPS often utilizes personal sentences for the expression of "natural phenomena," let us now examine briefly personal sentences with a "natural-element-subject" (e.g. *Veter duet* 'Wind is blowing'; *Grom gremit* 'Thunder is thundering').

According to Isačenko, subject and predicate in these sentences are so firmly fused that they are no longer perceived as two distinct concepts:¹⁰

Die russischen Verbindungen sehen formal wie zweigliederige Sätze aus, doch sind hier Substantiv und Verb derart eng miteinander verbunden, dass man die Substantive "dozhd'," "sneg," "grom," usw. kaum als "Subjekte" zweigliederiger Sätze auffassen kann. Es handelt sich vielmehr um enge phraseologische Verknüpfungen.

Kacnel'son classifies such personal sentences into three different types. In the first, the "etimologičeskaja figura" is tautologically repeated (e.g. *Grom gremit* 'Thunder is thundering', *Veter veet* 'Wind is blowing'). In the second, the predicate reproduces only some of the semantic features of the nominal (e.g.

⁶ Chafe, p. 102.

⁷ Bühler, p. 378.

⁸ Ružička, p. 29.

⁹ For the verbs marked [+ Impersonal], for example, "doždit," transformationalists would posit *dožd' doždit and then obligatorily delete the subject, or use Pro-form or Δsubject.

¹⁰ Isačenko, p. 278.

Dožd' l'et 'Rain is pouring'). In the third, the predicate is semantically empty and expresses only tense (e.g. Dožd' idet 'Rain comes').¹¹ This third type, in which the semantic content of the predicate is extremely reduced, if not "zero," is particularly interesting, since it approaches the "existential" or even "nominal" sentence in which the predicate slot remains totally devoid of semantic content.

I would posit the same underlying semantic structure for both "Gremit" and "Grom gremit": GREMET'v (Xi)Location. The presence of "grom" in the latter sentence can be accounted for by the appearance of a "pseudo-force," at a later stage. I use the term "pseudo-force," because the noun does not correspond to an underlying semantic function "Force" but is merely a surface structure nominalization of the process named in the verbal root. This type of "pseudo-force" is, of course, possible only with the verbs possessing the feature [+Implied].

(The same reasoning leads us to view the sentences with a "divine subject" (e.g. Juppiter pluit) as corresponding to an underlying semantic structure identical with that underlying the IPS. The "divine being" is, in fact, a "pseudo-agent.")

3.2. The Type "V lesu šumit 'in the forest—[it] is noisy'"

SS: V[U Animate, +Dynamic] (Xi)Location

ST: Surrounding non-ambient phenomena

SF: Prep + N – prep + Vi

Sample Verbs: gudet' 'to buzz', groxotat' 'to roar', stučat' 'to knock', želtet'sja 'to become greenish', rjabit'sja 'to ripple'

This group denotes audible or visible surrounding phenomena. The semantic and surface structures of this group are very similar to those of the previous groups; both groups require the semantic function, "Location," and both groups include only intransitive verbs. The major difference consists in the fact that the verbs in this group are [U Animate]. Furthermore, unlike the verbs in the previous group, those belonging here do not imply "ambience," i.e. the phenomenon is not viewed as covering the whole location of the narrated event unless such total coverage is lexically specified, by adding, for example, "ves' whole'" (e.g. Zarevelo po vsej reke 'It began to roar on the whole river').

Since all of the verbs in this group can occur with any subject, an IPS belonging to this group always coincides in surface structure with a corresponding "elliptic sentence." Thus, "Stučit" by itself is ambiguous. It can be either an elliptic personal sentence (e.g. Ivan stučit 'Ivan is knocking') or an IPS (e.g. V lesu stučit 'In the forest—it's knocking'). This ambiguity accounts for the frequency of explicit locative expressions in the IPS of the present group. In

¹¹ Kacnel'son, p. 61.

this respect, one may say that the (preposed) locative expression “signals” the IPS.

Since all the verbs in this group allow a nominative subject, and in view of the fact that the predicate has a neuter ending in the past tense, many scholars, particularly the transformationalists mentioned earlier, tend to regard this type of IPS as derived from sentences with an indefinite-pronominal subject, “čto-to ‘something’” or “nečto ‘something’.”

As evidence of the fact that the speaker has in mind a concrete (animate or inanimate) “nečto” in this type of IPS, Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij cites the following phrase from Turgenev’s “Sobaka”:¹²

I predstav'te vy sebe, gospoda: tol'ko-čto ja zadul sveču, zavozilos' u menja pod krovat'ju?
Dumaju: krysa? Net, ne krysa . . .

And imagine, please, gentlemen: I just blew out the candlelight, and [I perceived] [something] playing under my bed? I think: is it a rat? No, it's not . . .

The identification of this type of IPS with sentences with “čto-to ‘something’” arises from a confusion of the non-exclusion of a concrete substance (or being) and the explicit specification thereof. In “Zavozilos' u menja pod krovat'ju,” in the extra-linguistic world, there may exist a “source” such as “čto-to” or “krysa ‘rat’” or even a human being. However, on the linguistic plane, the sentence completely lacks a referent, in contrast to “Čto-to zavozilos' u menja pod krovat'ju” or “Krysa zavozilas' u menja pod krovat'ju.” Besides, in “Zavozilos' pod krovat'ju,” there may be multiple “sources” for the noise, whereas the “source” is not only definite but also unique in “Čto-to zavozilos'” or in “Krysa zavozilas'.” I conclude that “Zavozilos' pod krovat'ju” and “Čto-to zavozilos' pod krovat'ju” correspond to different semantic structures:

- (1) a. Zavozilos' pod krovat'ju—SS: VOZIT'SJAv
(Xi:KROVAT'(Xi))Location
b. Čto-to zavozilos' pod krovat'ju —SS: VOZIT'SJAv
(Xi: – Definite(Xi))Force (Yi:KROVAT'(Yi))Location

3.3. The Type “Lodku gonit vetrom ‘the boat (acc.)—[it] drives (3rd, sg.)—by the wind (inst.)’”

SS: V[U Animate, + Dynamic] (Xi: – Animate(Xi))Force (Yi)Processed

ST: Concrete phenomena affecting an entity

SF: N–acc + V + N–inst

Sample Verbs: brosit' ‘to throw away’, tolkat' ‘to shove’, šatat' ‘to shake’, lomat' ‘to break’, otorvat' ‘to tear off’, ubit' ‘to kill’, udarit' ‘to hit’, zasypat' ‘to fill up’, razmyt' ‘to wash away’, obvoloč' ‘to cover’

¹² Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij, pp. 194-95.

The present group describes concrete, mostly traumatic phenomena, such as “displacement,” “violent movement,” “casualty,” “injury,” “destruction,” or “blockade.” The obvious structural difference between this group and the previous ones is the presence of arguments marked with “Force” and “Processed,” “an entity affected or effected by the Process.” At the surface level, most typically, “Processed” is marked with the accusative case, while “Force” is marked with the instrumental. “Force” may not be expressed in the surface structure. I regard such case as elliptic (e.g. *Dym tjanulo k oško* ‘smoke (acc.)—[it] drew (3rd, sg., neut.)—toward the small window’ ←SS: TJANUT’v (Xi: – Definite(Xi))Force (Yi:DYM(Yi))Processed (Zi:OKOŠKO(Zi))Direction).

The argument marked with “Force” is by definition – Animate (e.g. *Korabl’ švyrjalo volnami* ‘the ship(acc.)—[it] threw—by waves(inst.)’, but, **Kamni švyrjalo det’mi* ‘the stones(acc.)—[it] threw—by children(inst.)’). Most frequently the “Force” argument is either a natural element or a concrete object such as a machine or weapon.

There has been considerable controversy over the semantic interpretation of the [– Animate] nominal at the surface level. Some scholars view this instrumental nominal as an “agent,” since it causes the change of condition in the accusative nominal, while others view it as an “instrument,” on the ground that, being inanimate, it cannot control the state of affairs and therefore should be considered as an instrument of an unexpressed human agent.

The supporters of the former view refers to the instrumental nominal of this group as “subject of process (Švedova)¹³,” or as “non-personal subject (Zolotova).”¹⁴ The problem with this view is that it fails to account for the semantic difference between this type of instrumental nominal and that encountered in passive constructions. Compare the following sentences:

- (2) a. *Lodku gonit vetrom* ‘the boat(acc.)—[it]drives—by the wind(inst.)’
 ←SS: GNAT’v (Xi:VETER(Xi))Force (Yi:LODKA(Yi))Processed
 b. *Risunok nabrosan xudožnikom* ‘the picture (nom.)—has been
 sketched—by an artist(inst.)’ ←SS: NABROSAT’v (Xi: XUDOŽNIK
 (Xi))Agent (Yi:RISUNOK(Yi))Goal

Thus, according to our hypothesis, the IPS and passive constructions have totally different underlying semantic structures.

Galkina-Fedoruk states that the instrumental nominal of the present group is an “instrument.”¹⁵ The instrumental nominal under consideration, however, differs from the one denoting a “pure” instrument, i.e. “non-causer.” Compare the following sentences:

¹³ Švedova, p. 15.

¹⁴ Zolotova, p. 168.

¹⁵ Galkina-Fedoruk. p. 146.

- (3) a. Risunok nabrosan perom 'The picture has been sketched with a pen'
 ← SS: NABROSAT'v (Xi: – Definite(Xi))Agent (Yi:RISUNOK(Yi))
 Goal (Zi:PERO(Zi))Instrument
- b. Xudožnik nabrosal risunok perom 'The artist sketched the picture
 with a pen'← SS: NABROSAT'v (Xi:XUDOŽNIK(Xi))Agent (Yi:
 RISUNOK(Yi))Goal (Zi:PERO(Zi))Instrument

Thus, an "Instrument" which always presupposes the presence of an "Agent" is precluded from the semantic structure of the IPS.

In my opinion, the semantic function, "Force," an "inanimate autonomous cause of a Process," can solve the problem. "Force" is different both from "Agent" and from "Instrument." Several Case Grammarians have already proposed "Force," in order to deal with the problem of the "natural-element-subject," as in "The wind opened the door" (e.g. Gregory Lee,¹⁶ Huddleston¹⁷). This idea can be readily applied to the Russian IPS with an instrumental nominal denoting a "natural element." This, however, does not account for the case, in which the instrumental nominal is a concrete object, as in "Otca pereexalo avtomobilem 'father(acc.)—[it] ran over(neut.)—with a car(inst.)'" In this case, many linguists still tend to see an "Instrument." For example, Dean Worth states that when the instrumental nominal is something at the disposal of human beings, the IPS is identical with the "indefinite-personal sentence" (e.g. Otca pereexalo avtomobilem = Otca pereexali avtomobilem 'father(acc.)—[somebody] ran over(3rd, pl.)—with a car(inst.)').¹⁸

In my view, the above two sentences have different underlying semantic structures:

- (4) a. Otca pereexalo avtomobilem← SS: PEREEXAT'v (Xi:AVTOMOBIL'
 (Xi))Force (Yi:OTEC (Yi))Processed
- b. Otca pereexali avtomobilem← SS: PEREEXAT'v (Xi: – Definite(Xi))
 Agent (Yi:OTEC(Yi))Goal (Zi:AVTOMOBIL'(Zi))Instrument

Thus, as alternative functions indicating "cause," "Agent" and "Force" are in complementary relationship; if there is "Agent," there is no "Force," and vice versa. Since there is an "Agent" in (4b), the "automobile" does not function as "Force," while it does in (4a).

So far we have examined the instrumental nominal of the present group and concluded that the underlying semantic function is "Force." We shall now inquire as to the difference between an IPS of this type and the corresponding sentence with a "'Force'-subject." The latter is almost always possible, because the verbs belonging to this group are [U Animate].

¹⁶ Lee, p. 110.

¹⁷ Huddleston, p. 503. See also Chafe, p. 155 for the proposal of "Potent" instead of "Force."

¹⁸ Worth, p. 285.

In my view, an IPS of this group and the corresponding sentence with a “‘Force’-subject” have one and the same underlying semantic structure. For example, both “Lodku gonit vetrom” and “Veter gonit lodku” correspond to the semantic structure, GNAT’v(Xi:VETER(Xi))Force (Yi:LODKA(Yi))Processed. However, at the syntactic level in one case, “Force” is assigned as subject, and in the other, it is not. In the IPS it is implemented by the instrumental case, which is, according to Jakobson, marked with [+Peripheral].¹⁹

Thus, the difference between the “Force” in a personal sentence and that in an IPS can be summed up as “center vs. periphery,” or “foregrounding vs. backgrounding.”²⁰ As regards the “backgrounding” of the semantic function, the passive construction is similar to the IPS. This similarity leads Ružička to propose a “passive transformation” for the generation of this type of IPS from the personal sentence.²¹ The similarity of the passive construction to the IPS is partly evidenced by the fact that, in languages which lack this type of IPS, this type of IPS is frequently translated by a passive (e.g. Podval zalilo vodoj ‘the cellar(acc.)—[it] inundated (3rd, sg., neut.)—with/by water(inst.)’→Le sousol a été inondé).²²

3.4. The Type “Mne kololo grud’ ‘me(dat.)—[it] pricked (3rd, sg., neut.)—the breast (acc.)’ ”

SS: V[U Animate]/ V[+ Impersonal]/V [– Animate] (Xi: + Human(Xi))Experiencer OR

V[U Animate]/V[– Animate] (Xi: + Human(Xi))Experiencer (Yi: + Part of body(Yi))Location

ST: Physical/mental condition (usually accompanied by unpleasant feeling)

SF: N – acc/N – dat/‘u’ + N – gen [+ Human] + V (+ N – acc/Prep + N [+ Part of body])

Sample Verbs: davit’ ‘to squeeze’, znobit’ ‘to shiver’, korobit’ ‘to warp’, lomāt’ ‘to break’, pučit’ ‘to become swollen’, udarit’ ‘to hit’, tošnit’sja ‘to feel sick’,

¹⁹ Jakobson, “Morphologičeskie . . . ,” p. 158.

²⁰ This same difference is observed in ergative languages. In ergative languages the marked ergative case is used for the agent—in the general sense, not in the specific meaning of our semantic functions—with a transitive verb, while the unmarked absolute case is used for the patient with a transitive verb and the agent with an intransitive verb. As regards the semantics of the ergative constructions, Pontoppidan-Sjövall states that “the necessary condition for an event to occur in this world is that the ‘person’ concerned should be in a position outside the event.” (Pontoppidan-Sjövall, p. 41)

²¹ Ružička, p. 25.

²² The example is taken from V. V. Vinogradov, p. 503. The utilization of the passive construction seems to be inversely proportional to that of the IPS both within one language and interlinguistically. Furthermore, from the stylistic viewpoint, they seem almost mutually exclusive. Thus, in colloquial Russian where the IPS is very rich, the use of the passive construction is severely restricted.

zudet' 'to buzz', česat'sja 'to itch', streljat' 'to shoot', bit' 'to beat'

The semantic structure underlying this group includes "Experiencer," to which there corresponds at the surface level a dative, accusative, or an "'u' + genitive" construction.

Many scholars have dealt with the dative or accusative [+ Human] nominals. Šaxmatov,²³ Švedova,²⁴ and Belošapkova²⁵ term them "subject," Gasparov calls them "subject-object,"²⁶ and Adamec and Grabe refer to them as "adjuncts drawn toward the meaning of subject."²⁷

One characteristic common to all the above mentioned statements is the attribution of the property "subject" to the dative or accusative [+ Human] nominal. This might be motivated by the paraphrastic relationship between sentences with such a nominal and those with a nominative nominal (e.g. *Ee znobit* 'her(acc.)—[it] shivers'—*U nee oznob* 'in her(gen.)—shivering(nom.)'—*Ona v oznobe* 'she(nom.)—is in shivering(loc.)').

I agree with the view held by most of the above mentioned scholars to the effect that the dative and accusative [+ Human] nominals correspond to the same semantic function. I propose to expand the hypothesis so as to include "'u' + genitive" constructions. A comparison with other Slavic languages supports this hypothesis. Thus, Czech, according to Kubík, has either an accusative (e.g. *Škrábe mě v krku* '[it] itches—me(acc.)—in the throat' cf. *U menja češet-sja v gorle*) or a dative (e.g. *Zatmelo se mi v očich* '[it] became dark—me(dat.)—in the eyes' cf. *U menja v glazax potemnelo*) in phrases corresponding to Russian "'u' + genitive."²⁸ I also find cases in which this construction corresponds to a dative in Polish (e.g. *Dzwoni mi w uszach* '[it] rings—me(dat.)—in the ears' cf. *U menja zvonit v ušax*) and in Slovak (e.g. *Huči mi v hlave* '[it] is noisy—me(dat.)—in the head' cf. *U menja šumit v golove*).²⁹ Considerations of word order also seem to indicate a common semantic function for such nominals. In a neutral context all these nominals precede the [+ Part of body] nominals and most frequently occupy the initial position in a sentence.

On the other hand, the function "Experiencer" underlying the accusative in "*Menja udarilo v viski* 'me(acc.)—[it] hit—[to] the temples(acc.)'" is different from that underlying the same case in "*On udaril menja prjamo v lob* 'he—hit—me(acc.)—directly—[to] the forehead(acc.)'," which is clearly "Goal." In Potebnja's terms, the function underlying the former accusative

²³ Šaxmatov, pp. 97-98.

²⁴ Švedova, p. 15.

²⁵ Belošapkova, p. 30.

²⁶ Gasparov, p. 191.

²⁷ Adamec and Grabe, p. 191.

²⁸ Kubík, p. 45.

²⁹ The examples are found in *The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary, Vol. II: Polish-English*, and in *Vel'ký rusko-slovenský slovník, Vol. V*.

is an “inner item,” in contrast to that underlying the latter, which is an “outer item.”³⁰

The “Experiencer” in this type of IPS may be accompanied by arguments marked with the feature [+ Part of body]. I utilize the term “part of body” in the broad sense, including the less tangible parts, such as “duša” or “um.” The arguments marked with [+ Part of body] are implemented by various surface cases.

I hypothesize that such various surface cases are an implementation of one and the same function, “Location.” Let me stress first of all that I reject the possibility of “Processed,” in, for example, “U menja tjanulo život ‘in me(gen.)—[it] dragged—the stomach(acc.)’.” This function is incompatible with “Experiencer,” since “Processed” requires a “Process,” while “Experiencer” requires a “State.” Secondly, I also reject the possibility of “Direction” in such cases as “Mne stuknulo v golovu ‘me(dat.)—[it] knocked once—to] the head(acc.)’” and of “Source” in “S duši tjanet ‘[from] the heart(gen.)—[it] drags’,” because the arguments marked with [+ Part of body] under discussion do not represent, in fact, ‘entities towards/from which something moves or tends to move.’³¹ They simply present the “Location,” in which something happens or exists.

This hypothesis is supported by the fact that one and the same verb can combine with various surface types of nominals indicating a “part of body.”

In conclusion, I hypothesize that “Mne kololo grud’ ‘me(dat.)—[it] pricked—the breast(acc.)” and “U menja kololo v grudi ‘in me(gen.)—[it] pricked—in the breast(loc.)” or “U menja streljaet v golove ‘in me(gen.)—[it] shoots—in the head (loc.)” and “Mne streljaet v golovu ‘me(dat.)—[it] shoots—to] the head(acc.)” are derived from the same underlying semantic structures, KOLOT’v (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer (Yi:GRUD’(Yi))Location, and STRELJAT’v (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer (Yi:GOLOVA(Yi))Location, respectively.

3.5. The Type “Mne ne spitsja ‘me(dat.)—not—sleep[goes]’ ”

SS: V[+Animate]/V[+Human] (Xi:Human(Xi))Experiencer Syntactic Level:
+ “sja”

ST: Involuntary tendency toward a certain act/condition

SF: N–dat + V[+sja]

Sample verbs: pet’ ‘to sing’, dyšat’ ‘to breathe’, rabotat’ ‘to work’, čitat’ ‘to read’, verit’ ‘to believe’, dumat’ ‘to think’, terpit’ ‘to endure’

The distinguishing feature of this group is the addition of the reflexive particle “sja” at the syntactic level. Furthermore, in contrast to those in the previous groups, the verbs are marked with [+Animate] or [+Human].

³⁰ See Potebnja, p. 335.

³¹ Dik, p. 39.

The addition of “*sja*” imposes a certain “modality” on the predication. I utilize the term, “modality,” in the Jakobsonian sense, i.e. “the relation between the narrated event and its participants with reference to the participants of the speech event.”³² The “relation” in this group is specifically an “involuntary tendency toward the act or condition” indicated in the verbal lexeme.

Many scholars have commented on the “modality” of this group. For example, Peškovskij describes it as a “special nuance of easiness of an act”³³ and Svetlik as an “implicit expression of the relationship between an act or a state and a person.”³⁴

Some scholars tend to view this type of IPS as derived from or synonymous with personal constructions including the verb without “*sja*” (e.g. *Emu ne rabotaetsja* ‘him(dat.)—not—work [goes]’ vs. *On ne rabotaet* ‘He doesn’t work’). The grammaticality of sentences such as “*On rabotaet, kak budto emu ne očen’ rabotaetsja* ‘He works, as if he doesn’t feel like working’” or “*Po utram mne krepko spitsja, no ja ne xoču spat* ‘Every morning I feel like sleeping very much, (i.e. I feel very sleepy) but I don’t want to sleep in the morning’” proves the inappropriateness of this hypothesis.

The difference between the IPS and the personal sentence with the same verb is tied to the different semantic functions underlying the dative and the nominative nominals.

In my view, the underlying function of the dative nominal under discussion is “Experiencer.” “*Mne rabotaetsja* ‘me(dat.)—work [goes] [easily]’” and “*Mne veritsja* ‘me(dat.)—believing [goes] [easily]’” are derived from the semantic structures, *RABOTAT’v* (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer, and, *VERIT’v* (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer. On the other hand, “*Ja rabotaju* ‘I work’” and “*Ja verju* ‘I believe’” are derived from the different semantic structures, *RABOTAT’v* (Xi:JA(Xi))Agent, and *VERIT’v* (Xi:JA(Xi))Positioner, respectively. Thus, when the verb is compatible with functions other than “Experiencer,” the presence of “Experiencer” requires the addition of “*sja*,” which in turn requires the absence of subject.³⁵

According to Jakobson, “*sja*” restricts participation in the narrated event.”³⁶ In the case of the “*sja*” imposing “modality,” its presence is possible only within a semantic structure containing “Experiencer.” Furthermore, the addition of such a “*sja*” changes the verbal feature [+Animate] or [+Human] to [+Impersonal]. Compare this “*sja*” with that in passive constructions:

³² Jakobson, “Shifters, . . . ,” p. 135.

³³ Peškovskij, p. 346.

³⁴ Svetlik, p. 194.

³⁵ We may have another alternative: instead of the addition of “*sja*” at the syntactic level motivated by the existence of an “Experiencer,” we may consider that “*sja*” is already added to the verb at the semantic level by derivational process, i.e. SS: [V[+Animate]/V[+Human]]V – *sja* (Xi:Human(Xi))Experiencer.

³⁶ Jakobson, “Shifters, . . . ,” p. 135.

- (5) a. Mne čitaetsja segodnja 'me(dat.)—reading [goes] [easily]—today'
 ←SS: ČITAT'v (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer (Yi:SEGODNJA(Yi))Time
 b. Eta kniga čitaetsja mnogimi ljud'mi 'this book(nom.)—is read—by
 many people'←SS: ČITAT'v (Xi:MNOGO LJUDEJ(Xi))Agent (Yi:
 ETA KNIGA(Yi))Goal

Unlike the “sja” in (5a), the “sja” in (5b) requires a semantic structure with “Goal” and the subject assignment. While the addition of “sja” in (5a) results in the change of the verbal feature [+ Human] to [+ Impersonal], the same process in (5b) results in the change to [U Animate].

The present group shows several lexico-semantic restrictions:

i) an “adverb of manner” seems to be incompatible or at least very awkward with an “Experiencer (e.g. ?*Mne bystro rabotaetsja 'me(dat.)—quickly—work [goes] [easily]’)³⁷

ii) if there already exists a homonymic reflexive form of the verb (e.g. myt'sja ‘to wash oneself’), the impersonalization through the addition of “sja” is impossible (e.g. *Mne moetsja 'me(dat.)—[it] washes oneself’)

iii) the verb must be marked with the feature [+ Animate] or [+ Human] (e.g. *Mne šumitsja 'me(dat.)—[it] is noisy’)

iv) verbs which always require “Goal” are incompatible with this type of IPS (e.g. *Mne ne daetsja 'me(dat.)—not—[it] gives’).³⁸

In short, this type of IPS is very productive but is subject to various selectional restrictions.

4. Semantic Characteristics of Russian Impersonal Sentences

In the previous sections, I discussed the peculiarities of several types of Russian IPS. In the present section, I shall examine the common semantic and stylistic characteristics of the IPS. I clarify beforehand that the following remarks are based not only on the previously mentioned types but also on all the other types of the IPS with verbal predicates.

4.0. Restrictions on the Semantic Structure

The Russian IPS can be divided into two large categories: the “subjective category” with an “Experiencer” (see 3.4 and 3.5) and the “objective category”

³⁷ One of the anonymous readers mentioned the grammaticality of “Mne ne bystro rabotaetsja.” In my opinion, such a sentence, if possible at all, is extremely rarely found.

³⁸ One of the anonymous readers questioned the value of (iv), quoting the examples such as “Mne trudno daetsja russkoe udarenie ‘to me(dat.)—difficultly—is given—Russian stress(nom.),’” “Zoloto samo mne v ruki dalos’ ‘gold(nom.)—itself—to me(dat.)—to hands(acc.)—was given.’” The above examples, however, are not considered as IPS in the present paper, since there exist obviously “subjects,” which happen to be in the neuter gender. Furthermore, the semantic function underlying “mne” in the examples are not “Experiencer” but “Recipient.”

without one (see 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). This categorization will play an important role in our discussion of the stylistic effect of the IPS in 4.1.

In contrast to personal sentences, the IPS never involves the semantic functions, "Agent," "Positioner," and "Zero." Since "Agent" and "Positioner" are absent (i.e. the absence of [+Control]), the states of affairs, "Action" and "Position" are automatically excluded. The "objective category" (except a few cases in which verbs are marked with [-Dynamic]) exhibits "Process," while the "subjective category" exhibits "State."

Note that the "Process" which is normally achieved by the function "Force" is either not achieved by that function (see 3.1 and 3.2) or achieved only by the "backgrounded Force" (see 3.3). In this regard, one may conclude that the "Process" exhibited by the "objective category" is of low rank in the hierarchy among various "Processes" and that the IPS shows a tendency toward the weakening of dynamism (or a tendency toward [-Dynamic]) in the state of affairs.

4.1. Affective Value of Russian Impersonal Sentences

Modern Soviet scholars seem to agree that the affective value of the IPS is "stixijnost' (spontaneity)." I believe that we can account for the above mentioned "spontaneity" of the IPS on the basis of comparative analyses of the underlying structures of the IPS and the other possible linguistic expressions for the description of one and the same "extralinguistic reality."

In what follows I shall use the term "source" (not to be confused with the semantic function "Source") to denote "an actor in or producer of a phenomenon, or a carrier of properties." Sources are indicated in the following semantic functions: "Agent," "Positioner," "Force," "Zero," "Indirect Cause," and "Source." I shall call sources indicated by the first four semantic functions, i.e. functions directly related to the state of affairs, "major" sources, while sources indicated by the last two semantic functions, i.e. the functions not directly related to the state of affairs, will be referred to as "minor" sources.

Keeping this in mind, let us compare the following alternative semantic structures for the description of the same phenomenon:

- (6) a. V lesu stučalo 'in the forest—[it] knocked' ←SS: STUČAT'v (Xi: LES(Xi))Location (see 3.2)
- b. V lesu čto-to stučalo/veter stučal 'in the forest—something—knocked/wind—knocked' ←SS: STUČAT'v (Xi:—Definite/VETER) Force (Yi:LES(Yi))Location
(cf. V lesu stučalo. 'in the forest—[it] knocked'—Čto že eto bylo? 'what was that'—Veter 'wind')

In (6b) the source is indicated by "Force," while in (6a) it is not indicated at all. The semantic structure of the IPS does not include any indication of the source. In other words, the IPS presents a phenomenon as if it lacks a source,

i.e. as if it happened spontaneously.

Now, compare the following sets of alternatives:

- (7) a. *Otca pereexalo avtomobilem* 'father(acc.)—[it] ran over—by/with a car (inst.)'←SS: PEREEXAT'v (Xi:AVTOMOBIL'(Xi))Force (Yi:OTEC(Yi))Processed (See 3.3)
- b. *Avtomobil' pereexal otca* 'The car ran over Father'←SS: PEREEXAT'v (Xi:AVTOMOBIL'(Xi))Force (Yi:OTEC(Yi))Processed
- c. *Kto-to pereexal otca avtomobilem* 'Somebody ran over Father with a car' *OR*
Otca pereexali avtomobilem 'father(acc.)—[somebody] ran over— with a car'←SS: PEREEXAT'v (Xi: – Definite(Xi))Agent (Yi:OTEC(Yi))Goal (Zi:AVTOMOBIL'(Zi))Instrument

If we compare the semantic structures of (7a) and (7b) with that of (7c), we see a shift from "Agent," the highest in the hierarchy of semantic functions in (7c) to "Force," a function lower than "Agent" in the hierarchy in (7b).³⁹ in (7a) this lower function is "backgrounded" at the syntactic level by the case marked [+Peripheral].

According to Weinreich, (grammatical) "backgrounding" results in a lack of "full assertion."⁴⁰ In my opinion, the "backgrounding" of "Force" in (7a) weakens its role as an indicator of a "major" source.

The IPS so far examined present reality as if there were no "major" source, even though the existence of corresponding personal sentences indicates that such a source does underlie the phenomena in question. There is thus a gap between extralinguistic reality and its expression in the IPS. In other words, the IPS "downgrades" the "major" sources, either by "semantic backgrounding," i.e. by giving no indication of the "major" source at the semantic level or by "syntactic backgrounding," i.e. absence of subject assignment to the function indicating the "major" source.

We find that the IPS with "semantic" or "syntactic" "backgrounding" belong predominantly to what I referred to as the "objective category." Within this "objective category," I find the type "Gremit" exceptional in the sense that there is no "backgrounding" at all (see 3.1).

I hypothesize that "Gremit" and "Grom gremit" have the same underlying semantic structure, which lacks functions indicating any source whatsoever. This would seem to be so, simply because the extralinguistic phenomenon itself lacks a source. The surface structure of the IPS reflects this lack of source more faithfully than that of the personal sentence. The following statement by Whorf

³⁹ For a discussion of the highest rank of "Agent," see Dik, p. 70. See also Comrie, p. 53 for the treatment of "Agent" and "Force" as labels representing the highest (in the case of "Agent") and the next highest (in the case of "Force") points along the continuum of control.

⁴⁰ Weinreich, pp. 172-73.

supports my analysis:⁴¹

We are constantly reading into nature fictional acting entities, simply because our verbs must have substantives in front of them. We have to say 'It flashed' or 'A light flashed,' setting up an actor, 'it' or 'light,' to perform what we call an action, 'to flash.' Yet the flashing and the light are one and the same!

Let us now take a look at the "subjective category":

- (8) a. *Menja znobit* 'me(acc.)—[it] shivers'←SS: ZNOBIT'v (Xi:JA(Xi))
Experiencer (see 3.4)
b. *Ja čuvstvujuz oznob* 'I feel shivering'←SS: ZNOBIT'v (Xi:JA(Xi))
Experiencer

I posit the same underlying structures for (8a) and (8b), since "čuvstvovat' oznob" can be viewed as an example of "Xverb→"semantically empty" verb + Xnoun," as in the case of "Dožd' idet 'Rain comes.'" In both (8a) and (8b) there are no semantic functions indicating a "major" source.

A "major" source is not indicated also in the following structures:

- (9) a. *Mne ne spitsja* 'me(dat.)—not—sleep [goes]'←SS: SPAT'v (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer (see 3.5)
b. *Ja ne mogu spat* 'I cannot sleep'←SS: MOCH'v (Xi:JA(Xi))Experiencer (Yi:[JA SPLJU](Yi))Complement

I hypothesize that the absence of a semantic function indicating a "major" source corresponds to the fact that such a source does not exist.

However, I find that native speakers are inclined to regard the [+ Human] argument of the personal sentences as indicating a "major" source in examples (8)-(9).

Consider, for example, the following statements of Gasparov:⁴²

Različie v smysle predloženiuz "Ja čuvstvujuz oznob" i "Menja znobit" sostoit imenno v tom, čto v pervom slučae čelovek sam javljaetsja dlja sebja istočnikom dannogo sostožanija, ono postupaet k nemu čerez posredstvo ego sobstvennoj <dežatel'nosti>, sostožasčez v osožnaniuz, čuvstvovanii etogo sostožanija (v etom smysle predloženiuz "Ja čuvstvujuz oznob" i "Ja preodolevaju oznob" v suščnosti, odnogo porjadka).

The difference in the meaning of the sentence "I feel shivering" and "me(acc.)—it shivers" lies precisely in that in the former man himself appears as a source of that state, which comes up to him by means of his own <act> existing in the consciousness and the feeling of this state (in this regard, sentences "I feel shivering" and "I overcome shivering" are in fact of the same order).

In my opinion, the conflict between the deep semantic structure and the native speaker's interpretation of the surface structure may be accounted for

⁴¹ Whorf, p. 243.

⁴² Gasparov, p. 27.

by the native speaker's tendency to associate a given surface structure with the type of semantic structure that most frequently underlies it.

On the surface level, the IPS is marked in that it precludes a subject corresponding to a function indicating a "major" source. By virtue of this markedness, the surface structure of the "subjective category" of IPS clearly indicates the absence of a "major" source.

On the other hand, a personal sentence is unmarked with regard to underlying semantic functions indicating a source. The subject may or may not correspond to a semantic function which indicates a "major" source. Thus, in the most typical construction (e.g. "active personal sentences") indication of a "major" source implies the presence of subject but the reverse is not true.

However, functions indicating a "major" source are normally assigned the subject role in personal sentences. In Jakobsonian terms, personal sentences tend to acquire as their "narrow meaning" the opposite of the meaning which is the mark of the IPS. Hence personal sentences tend to be interpreted as implying the "presence of functions indicating a 'major' source." The lexical feature, [+Human], seems to facilitate this assessment of the narrow meaning. According to Chvany, this feature occupies the highest rank in the "Saliency Hierarchy," i.e. a grammatical measure of stylistic foregrounding.⁴³

My hypothesis is basically in line with the following statement by Whorf:⁴⁴

The Indo-European languages and many others give great prominence to a type of sentence having two parts, each part built around a class of word—substantives and verbs . . . Following majority rule, we therefore read action into every sentence, even into 'I hold it.'

The utilization of a personal sentence in reference to a phenomenon with no "major" source "foregrounds" the function assigned as a subject, i.e. "Experiencer" in our examples. This "syntactic foregrounding" of "Experiencer" has exactly the opposite effect of the "syntactic backgrounding" of "Force." While the latter disguises the assertion of the presence of a "major" source, the former "obscures" the absence of such a source. Thus, the "syntactic foregrounding" of "Experiencer" accounts for the fact that the personal sentence appears more "active" than the IPS, while the latter remains as what Gasparov calls a "low-key statement."⁴⁵

To sum up, while the "objective category" of IPS (except for the type "Gremit") "backgrounds" the "major" source as if it did not exist, the "subjective category" (and the type "Gremit") "foregrounds" the absence of such a source. The "objective category" (except for the type "Gremit") thus differs radically from the reality by imposing "spontaneity," while the "subjective

⁴³ See Chvany, p. 11 and p. 2.

⁴⁴ Whorf, pp. 241-43, passim.

⁴⁵ Gasparov, personal communication.

category” (and the type “Gremit”) simply confirms the “spontaneity” of the reality.

5. Conclusion

In the present paper I have attempted to show how the affective value of IPS could be accounted for by the close examination of underlying (semantic and syntactic) structures of various types of IPS. For this purpose, I analysed various types of IPS. The analysis revealed that there are restrictions on the semantic structure, which account for the affective value: “backgrounding” of a “major” source or “foregrounding” of its absence.

I hope that the semantic analysis attempted in this paper will contribute to the development of Functional Grammar. Finally, there remains as a further task an examination of the semantic structures of the types of IPS not covered by the present paper, for example, the IPS with so called “category of state” (e.g. Mne xolodno ‘me(dat.)—[it] is cold’).

REFERENCES

- Adamec, Prežemysl and Grabe Vladimir (1968) ‘Transformacija, sintaksičeskaja paradigmatika i členy predloženiya,’ *Slavia* XXXVII 2, 185-92.
- Allen, W. Sidney (1964) ‘Transitivity and Possession,’ *Language* 40.3, 337-43.
- Anderson, John M. (1971) *The Grammar of Case: Toward a Localistic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Belošapkova, V. A. (1977) *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: sintaksis*, Vysšaja škola, Moskva.
- Bloomfield, L. (1970) ‘Subject and Predicate,’ in Charles F. Hockett, ed., *A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Bühler, Karl (1934) *Sprachtheorie*, Gustav Fischer, Jena.
- Bulas, Kazimierz and Whitefield, Francis J. (1961) *The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary Vol. 2: Polish-English*, Mouton & Co., The Hague.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1970) *Meaning and the Structure of Language*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Chvany, Catherine V. (1984) ‘Backgrounded Perfectives and Plot Line Imperfectives: Toward a Theory of Grounding,’ to appear in M. S. Flier and A. H. Timberlake, eds., *The Scope of Slavic Aspect*.
- Comrie, Bernard (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dik, Simon C. (1981) *Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed. rev., Foris Publications, Dordrecht, Holland.

- Filkusová, M., et al. (1960-70) *Vel'ký rusko-slovenský slovník*, 5 vols, Vydavatel'stvo Slovenskej Akademie vied, Bratislava.
- Galkina-Fedoruk, E. M. (1958) *Bezličnye predloženiya v sovremennom russkom jazyke*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, Moskva.
- Gasparov, B. M. (1971) 'Neopredelenno-subjektnye predloženiya v sovremennom russkom jazyke,' *Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, Trudy po russkoj i slavjanskoj filologii: serija lingvističeskaja* 19, 3-58.
- Huddleston, Rodney (1970) 'Some Remarks on Case-Grammar,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 1.1, 501-11.
- Išačenko, Aleksandr V. (1968) *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*, Part I: *Formenlehre*, Veb Max Niemeyer Verlag, Halle.
- Jakobson, Roman (1971) 'Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb,' *Selected Writings*, Vol.2, Mouton, The Hague.
- _____ (1971) 'Morphologičeskije nabljudeniya nad slavjanskim sklonenijem,' *Selected Writings*, Vol.2, Mouton, The Hague.
- Jurčenko, V. S. (1972) *Prostoe predloženie v sovremennom russkom jazyke*, Prevolžskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo, Saratov.
- Kacnel'son, S. D. (1972) *Tipologija jazyka i rečevoe myšlenie*, Nauka, Leningrad.
- Kubík, Miloslav (1971) *Lektsii po sintaksisu russkogo jazyka*, Statní pedagogické nakladatelství, Praha.
- Lee, Gregory (1971) 'Subjects and Agents,' *Working Papers in Linguistics* 7, 1-118, Ohio State University.
- Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij, D. N. (1912) *Sintaksis "russkago jazyka*, 2nd ed. rev. S.-Peterburg", Izdanie I. L. Ovsjaniko-kulikovskoj.
- Peškovskij, Aleksandr Matvevič (1956) *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osvveščeni*, 7th ed., Gosudarstvennoe pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosvveščeniya RSFSR, Moskva.
- Pontoppidan-Sjövall, Karin (1968) 'Categories of Content and Form in Language: a Study of the Personal and Impersonal Constructions in Russian,' *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Slavica Upsaliensia* 5, 7-102.
- Potebnja, A. A. (1968) *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, Vol.3, Gosudarstvennoe pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosvveščeniya RSFSR, Moskva.
- Ružička, R. (1963) 'O transformacionnom opisanií tak nazываемyx različnyx predloženíj v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke,' *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 12.3, 22-31.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, M. I. (1953) *Istorija skandinavskix jazykov*, Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, Moskva, Leningrad.
- Svetlik, Jan (1970) *Sintaksis russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim*, Slovackoe pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo, Bratislava.
- Šaxmatov, A. A. (1963) *Sintaksis russkogo jazyka*, reprinted and edited by E. S. Istrina, Mouton, The Hague.
- Švedova, N. Ju. (1974) 'Mesto semantiki v opisatel'noj grammatike (sintaksis),'

- in N. Ju. Švedova, ed., *Grammatičeskoe opisanie slavjanskix jazykov*, Izdatel'stvo "nauka", Moskva.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1972) *Russkij jazyk*, 2nd ed., Vysšaja škola, Moskva.
- Weinreich, Uriel (1963) 'On the Semantic Structure of Language,' in Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of Language*, 2nd ed., MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956) *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. by John B. Carroll, The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Worth, Dean Stoddard (1958) 'Transform Analysis of Russian Instrumental Constructions,' *Word* 14.2-3, 247-90.
- Zolotova, G. A. (1973) *Očerok funkcional'nogo sintaksisa russkogo jazyka*, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", Moskva.

Department of Russian
Seoul National University
San 56-1 Sinlim-dong, Kwanak-ku
Seoul 151
Korea