

Между объектом и ситуацией: способы выражения актантов ментальных глаголов в русском языке

Object or situation: the factors of expressing the arguments of mental verbs in Russian

Alexander Borisovich Letuchiy
Russian State University for Humanities
alexander_letuchiy@hotmail.com

Natalya Vadimovna Serdobolskaya
Moscow State University
natasha_serd@yahoo.com

Аннотация

В фокусе внимания настоящего исследования находятся ментальные, эмотивные глаголы и глаголы восприятия, вторая валентность которых может заполняться именем или ситуацией (напр., *Вася увидел Петю* и *Вася увидел, что Петя рисует*). Мы рассматриваем факторы прагматического порядка, регулирующие выбор говорящим именного или сентенциального актанта. В работе показано, что несмотря на различие в составе семантических ролей, одни и те же факторы оказываются релевантными для глаголов восприятия и эмотивных глаголов.

Annotation:

The paper examines mental, emotive and perception verbs, that can take both noun and clausal complements (e.g. *Vas'a uvidel Pet'u* 'Vas'a saw Peter' and *Vas'a uvidel, čto Pet'a risujet* 'Vas'a saw Peter drawing' lit. 'that Peter draws'). We examine the pragmatic factors influencing the speaker's choice between the noun and clausal complement. It is shown that the same factors are relevant for both perception and emotive verbs, despite the difference in argument structure.

0. The goal of the paper

This paper examines Russian mental, emotive and perception verbs, that can take both noun and clausal complements¹, e.g. the verb *uvidet'* 'see' in *Vas'a uvidel Pet'u* 'Vas'a saw Peter' and *Vas'a uvidel, čto Pet'a risujet* 'Vas'a saw Peter drawing something' lit. 'that Peter draws'. In these sentences the noun *Pet'a* and the dependent clause *čto Pet'a risujet* occupy the same valency slot of the verb *uvidet'* and encode the semantic role of Stimulus. We focus on the properties of the Stimulus that are relevant for the speaker when choosing, whether the object or the situation is to be expressed. To achieve this goal, we first find out morphological and syntactic devices, which are used to encode the Stimulus of the verbs in question; then we identify semantic and pragmatic factors determining the choice of the construction, encoding the Stimulus.

It is well-known that in Russian one and the same emotive predicate can have different number of syntactic valency slots in the same lexical meaning (A. Zaliznjak 1992: 416). For instance, the verb *serditsja* 'to be angry' can have the argument structure <X *serditsja* na Y> 'X is angry at Y' and <X *serditsja* na Y za Z> 'X is angry at Y for Z', where Y denotes the Stimulus, and Z denotes the Cause semantic role:

- (1) *Papa serditsja na Pet'u. Papa serditsja na Pet'u za to, čto on razbil časy.*
'Dad is mad at Peter. Dad is mad at Peter, because he has broken his watch.'

It is assumed that *serditsja* is a three-place predicate, taking the Experiencer, Stimulus, and Cause participants (see the article on *serditsja* in Апресян (1999)), where Stimulus and Cause may be unexpressed (e.g. *Papa serditsja* 'Dad is angry'). Taking this argument structure for *serditsja* we could assume that all the three participants exist independently, i.e. denote different entities in the real world. However, this presumption is evidently wrong for the Stimulus and Cause participants. The verb

¹ Perception verbs (*u*)*videt'* (see), (*u*)*slyšat'* (hear), (*po*)*čuvstvovat'* (feel), emotive verbs (*ras*)*serditsja* (be/become angry), *rasstroitsja* (be defeated, troubled), *udivit'sa* (be surprised), (*razo*)*zljitsja* (be/become mad), (*ob*)*radovatsja* (be glad), (*po*)*nravitsja* (like), *zavidovat'* (envy), and mental verbs (*vs*)*pomnit'* (remember) and (*u*)*znat'* (know, get to know).

serditsja denotes the emotional reaction of the Experiencer to the situation (Cause), where the Stimulus is a participant of the Cause situation (most often, the subject of the dependent clause encoding the Cause). This intuitive reading is justified by the possibility of the construction, where Cause is encoded as a dependent clause, where the Stimulus is the subject:

(2) *Papa serditsja, čto Pet'a razbil časy.*

Dad is angry, because Peter has broken the watch. (lit. that Peter...)

The verb *serditsja* has a much wider range of possibilities, concerning Stimulus and Cause encoding, cf. (we give below the variants elicited from the informants):

(3) *Papa serditsja, potomu čto kot xuliganil vs'u noč.*

Dad is angry, because the cat has been playing tricks all night long.

(4) *Papa serditsja iz-za tvoix kaprizov.*

Dad is angry because of your whims.

(5) *Papa serditsja iz-za razbitoj vazy.*

Dad is angry because of the broken vase.

(6) #² *P'otr Ivanovič serditsja na radikulit.*

P'otr Ivanovich is angry because of the sciatica (lit. at the sciatica).

(7) # *P'otr Ivanovič serditsja na ne sdelannoje domašneje zadanije.*

P'otr Ivanovich is angry because of the homework (lit. at the uncompleted homework).

In (3) Cause is encoded by an adverbial clause (cf. the complement clause in (2)) with *potomu čto* 'because'. The Stimulus (*kot* 'the cat') is not an argument of *serditsja*, as it fills the subject position in the dependent clause. (4) seems to resemble (3) in that Cause does not fill any valency slot of the matrix verb, and is expressed through a prepositional phrase; nor does the Stimulus, expressed as the verbal noun's subject. In both (3) and (4) the NP, most likely to occupy the Stimulus valency slot of the matrix verb, appears as subject of the dependent clause. In (5) Cause (*to, čto kto-to razbil vazy* 'the fact that someone has broken the vase') does not occupy an argument position in the matrix clause, nor an adverbial position, but is expressed as attribute of the noun *vaza* 'vase'. The sentences (6) and (7) are interesting, because the NP taking the preposition seems to refer at the same time both to Stimulus and Cause (see Volf (1989) for such cases). I.e. the referent of the noun phrase is "a mix" of the two participants, which would be impossible if they would be conceived as independent entities. Therefore, the presumption that Stimulus and Cause denote different entities in the real world, seems to be untenable. Intuitively, they are parts of one and the same entity. The question arises, why they are often realized as different syntactic units. This question is to be answered below.

What can be observed on the syntactic level, is the striking diversity of possible alternations in argument representation, that can be observed not only with the verb *serditsja*, but, as shown below, with most of the perception, mental and emotive verbs in Russian. Such a diversity arises problems for any formal theory of language. As far as MTT is concerned, the question arises, whether the constructions in (1)-(7) can be listed in one and the same lexical unit, or should correspond to the different lexical meanings of the matrix verb in question. On the one hand, *serditsja* in (1)-(7) is believed to have one and the same lexical meaning (see Apresjan (1999)). On the other hand, the sentences (1)-(7) differ not only in the overt marking of Stimulus and Cause, but also their position in the argument structure of *serditsja*: in (2) Cause appears as a complement of *serditsja*, in (3) rather as an adverbial (see the discussion of the argument structure of emotive verbs in A. Zaliznjak (1992)).

We explain the observed diversity by the factors lying outside the idiosyncratic semantic properties of the matrix verb. We argue that it resides in the semantic and pragmatic factors discussed below. To verify our point, we 1) find out the morphological and syntactic devices, that are used to encode the non-Experiencer arguments of the listed verbs, and 2) check the relevance of the above-mentioned pragmatic factors in the series of psycholinguistic experiments.

To avoid any misunderstanding arising from difference in argument structure of perception and emotive verbs we do not use the notions Stimulus, Cause, or Theme. For the sake of simplicity, we will further use the notions SST (situation as Stimulus/Cause/...) and OST (object as

² This symbol (#) marks the examples that have been elicited from the informants, but do not seem to be quite acceptable as to the our judgement.

Stimulus/Cause/...), where SST denotes the clausal complement (Stimulus or Cause) of the perception/emotion verbs (e.g. *Pet'a razbil časy* 'Peter has broken the vase' in (2), *Vaza razbita/razbilas'* 'The vase is broken / broke' in (5)), and OST denotes the object, stimulating the Experiencer's emotional reaction by its actions, properties, location in space etc. (*Pet'a* in (1)-(2), *kot* 'the cat' in (3), *ty* 'you' in (4), *vaza* 'vase' in (5)).

As we aim to analyze rather the colloquial speech than the literary language, quite a number of examples offer constructions, "unusual" or even unacceptable for literary Russian.

1. Morphological and syntactic constructions used to express OBJECT (OST) and SITUATION (SST)

1.1. Primarily, it was our purpose to list all possible constructions appearing with the verb in question. To achieve this goal we studied the data from the National Corpus of Russian Language. To estimate the approximate frequency of these constructions in colloquial speech we undertook an experiment where the informants were to complete sentences (as *Vas'a rasserdils'a*, *Ty znaješ...?*). This way we endeavoured to elicit the constructions, most frequent for colloquial speech. The most interesting peculiarities of the constructions elicited are given below.

The list of elicited constructions is given below:

- OST alone is expressed (*rasserdils'a na Vas'u* 'got angry at Vas'a');
- SST alone is expressed:
 - a) as a clausal complement (*udivils'a, čto Vas'a ne prišol* '(he) was surprised that Vas'a had not come');
 - b) as an adverbial clause with a temporal, causal or conditional conjunction (*rasserdils'a, kogda mne na nogu uronili batareju* '(I) got angry when somebody let a radiator drop on my leg');
 - c) as a converb (*razozlils'a, uslyšav ob etom* '(he) got mad after having heard about it');
- Both OST and SST are expressed:
 - a) OST is expressed as a noun complement, SST — as an action/state/property nominal (*rasserdils'a na Vas'u za jego povedenije* 'got angry at Vas'a for his behaviour');
 - b) OST is expressed as a genitive noun or a possessive pronoun modifying an action/state/property nominal, which refers to the SST (*uslyšal voj sobaki* '(he) has heard a dog's howling', *udivilsja Vasinomu povedeniju* '(he) was surprised at Vas'a's behaviour');
 - c) SST is expressed as an adverbial clause with a temporal, causal or conditional conjunction, and OST — as an NP with a preposition (*Otec rasserdilsja na Pet'u, tak kak Pet'a polučil dvojku* 'Father got angry at Peter, because he had got a bad mark');

It is significant that (both in this and other experiment series) the most frequently elicited construction is the one when the verb has a noun complement only. The exact frequency of different constructions depends on the matrix verb; still, for all the verbs analyzed, the noun complement construction is much more frequent, than the clausal complement one. Even if a situation is conceived as a Stimulus of emotion or perception, often it is the agent alone which is expressed (see (13)-(15) below).

At this primary stage of investigation, the following results seem to be of interest. A range of constructions has been elicited, uncommon or even unacceptable in literary Russian:

- "Unusual" arguments' marking (e.g. instrumental case on SST with the verb *udivilsja* 'to be surprised');

(8) # *Ja udivilsja svoim postupkom.*

I was surprised by my (own) action.

- "Unusual" syntactic constructions: a number of matrix verbs can have both a noun and clausal complement occupying one and the same syntactic position:

(9) # *On uvidel Kuz'ku, čto on tvorit / čto on š'ekočet čeloveku p'atki.*

He saw Kuz'ka doing something (lit. He saw Kuz'ka what he did) / He saw Kuz'ka tickling the man's heels (lit. He saw Kuz'ka that he was tickling the man's heels).

(10) # *Nafan'a rasserdilsja na Kuz'ku, čto on xuliganit.*

Nafan'a got angry at Kuz'ka for playing tricks (lit. at Kuz'ka that he was playing tricks).

1.2. Most frequent is the construction where the SST remains overtly unexpressed:

(11) *Otec rasserdilsja na t'ot'u. Žena obradovalas' mužu.*

Father got angry at aunty. The woman was glad at seeing her husband (lit. at her husband).

The OST most frequently must be overtly expressed; with some verbs, as *rasserditsja*, its omission leads to unacceptability:

(12) [?] *Papa rasserdilsja na/za dvojki /[?] Papa rasserdilsja iz-za dvojki.*

Dad got angry at the bad marks / Dad got angry because of the bad marks.

Such a construction is possible, though not frequent, with other verbs:

(13) *Ja obradovalsja uspehu.*

I was glad to have such a success (lit. at the success).

The SST can be expressed as a prepositional phrase or a relative clause, modifying the OST:

(14) *Žena obradovalas' buketu cvetov ot muža.*

The woman was glad that her husband gave her a bunch of flowers (lit. glad at the bunch of flowers from her husband).

(15) *Žena obradovalas' cvetam, kotoryje podaril jej muž.*

The woman was glad that her husband gave her flowers (lit. glad at the flowers that her husband gave her).

As a rule, the frequency of the construction where SST is expressed as a clausal complement (and OST as a subject of SST clause, see (16), (17)) is unexpectedly low (less than 40 %).

(16) *Otec rasserdilsja, tak kak Pet'a polučil dvojku.*

Father got angry, because Peter had got a bad mark.

(17) *Žena obradovalas' vozvraš'eniju muža. Žena obradovalas', čto jeje muž polučil povyšenie.*

The woman was glad at her husband's coming back home. The woman was glad that her husband was given a promotion.

Thus, any of the matrix verbs in question in one and the same lexical meaning allows a number of argument structure alternations. We argue that the choice between the alternative argument structures is regulated by the semantic and pragmatic properties of OST and SST.

What seems to be an interesting result is that the frequency of the construction where OST and SST are encoded separately (i.e. occupying independent syntactic positions) is unexpectedly low, though they are grammatically correct. If both OST and SST are expressed separately, most often only one of them fills a valency slot of the matrix verb. If the matrix verb assigns the case marking to the SST (17), then OST is realized as subject in the complement clause. If the matrix verb assigns the case marking to the OST, SST is most often encoded as a prepositional phrase, adverbial, or relative clause. In 2.2 we show that this peculiarity is due to the pragmatic factors discussed below.

1.3. A rather frequent construction (as far as emotive verbs are concerned) is the one where SST is encoded as a causal adverbial clause headed by conjunctions *tak kak* and *potomu čto*, temporal adverbial clauses with *kogda* and adjunct clauses. The problem is, that in this case, argument status of the Cause participant can be disputable. On the one hand, it is encoded by the syntactic devices, usually marking the cause, time e.a. adverbials (cf. *Vas'a ne pošol v školu, potomu čto zabolet* 'Vas'a didn't go to school, because he was ill'). On the other hand, the Cause of emotion (as in *Papa rasserdilsja na Vas'u, potomu čto tot rugajetsa ploximi slovami; On udivilsja, uvidev strašiliš'e*) belongs to the definition of the emotive verb in question (see the definitions in (Apresjan 1999)), and therefore fills the valency slot of such a verb. That is, the Cause of emotion can take an intermediate position between an argument and an adverbial (about the scalarity of arguments/adverbials distinction see (Xrakovskij 1999)). The question is, whether Cause, so encoded, is a complement or an adverbial in the matrix clause.

Following the point argued in (A. Zaliznjak 1992), we distinguish between the following cases: *On ispuğalsja, potomu čto uvidel volka* 'He was frightened, because he had seen a wolf', where introduces the direct Cause of emotion and *On uspuğalsja, potomu čto on voobš'e truslivyj* 'He was frightened, because he is faint-hearted', where it introduces a more distant Cause. "Sledujet... različat' pričinu kak rol' odnogo iz učastnikov situacii, opisivyvajemoj predikatom vnutrennego sostojanija, i

pričinu kak osnovanije dl'a ocenki... kotoraja ne javl'ajetsa učastnikom situaciji"³ (A. Zalznjak 1992: 416). We consider only the first sort of constructions.

2. Semantic and pragmatic factors determining the choice of OST and SST encoding

2.1. The purpose of the second experiment was to define the most important factors, that influence the choice of constructions with the mental verbs in texts. The experiment was organized as follows: the informants were to fill the gaps in texts, which described four two minute-fragments taken from the cartoons ("Prikl'učenija domovenka" ("Little bogy's adventures") and "Sledstvije vedut kolobki" ("Kolobki hold an investigation")). The texts were compiled in order to use the verbs under consideration.

The experiment has shown that the following factors can regulate the choice of the diatheses of the verbs under consideration:

- 1) Pragmatic properties of the situation (for instance, aforementionedness).
- 2) Properties of the OST: salience (protagonist/non-protagonist), animacy.
- 3) Semantic and syntactic properties of the main predicate; idiosyncratic lexical features.
- 4) Markedness of the SST.
- 5) Dynamicity of the SST.

The most important factor is the aforementionedness: for designating aforementioned situations and objects informants use other means, than for the new ones. For the SST the pronoun *eto* 'this' and abstract nouns like *povedenije* 'behaviour', *proisxod'aščeje* 'the things which happen' are used; the OST is encoded by the anaphoric pronouns. The factor under consideration is interesting, because usually the SST and the OST are both aforementioned or both new. If the situation has been mentioned in the previous text, it increases the probability that the OST alone (not the SST) would be expressed. On the contrary, new situations, which have not been mentioned, tend to be expressed as a whole. For example, the verb *ispugat'sja* 'fear' chooses the sentential strategy in 80 % of cases and *dogadat'sja* 'guess' in 100 %, although the construction with a noun would be grammatically correct – cf. *dogadat'sja o proiššedšem* 'guess what happened'. Presumably it is motivated by the fact that the Stimulus of these verbs is most often new. New situations tend not to have any salient participants, that could be used as OST instead of the name of the situation.

The pragmatic status of the participant and its animacy is also significant for the choice of a diathesis. If the participant, that appears in the fragment of the cartoon, is animate, especially if it is the protagonist of the situation, it tends to occupy the argument position, hence, the informants choose the OST construction (cf. the sentence *Vorona uvidela (Babu-Jagu i kota)* 'The crow saw (Baba-Jaga and the cat)', where the OST construction was used by 53 % of informants). If the participant is inanimate and is not a protagonist, constructions with SST tend to be chosen.

Properties of participants are closely related to another parameter – properties of the matrix verb. It is trivial that the semantics of the verb in many cases determines its argument structure: for example, the OST of the verb *rasserdit'sja* is expressed much more often than the SST, and verbs like *radovat'sja* 'be glad', *udivit'sja* 'be surprised' the OST is rarely expressed in a separate verbal or nominal phrase (cf. *Vas'a obradovalsja, čto Pet'a prišel* 'Vas'a was glad, that Pet'a came', where the OST *Pet'a* is expressed inside the SST phrase *Pet'a prišel* 'Pet'a came' vs. *On obradovalsja za tebjja* 'He was glad for you', see also Apresjan 1999). However, choice from all possible diatheses is influenced by pragmatic factors. The first and second experiments give some interesting data, proving that even semantically close predicates can choose different constructions: for example, probability of the sentential strategy with the verb *slyšat'* 'hear' is greater than with *videt'* 'see' and it is even greater with *čuvstvovat'* 'feel'.

Finally, the markedness and dynamicity of the described situation is relevant. Let us compare, for example, the frequency of sentential and nominal strategies for two sentences with the verb *videt'* 'see': the first of them describes the situation 'Nafan'a saw that Kuz'a tickles the man's feet' – the SST is a dynamic situation. Only 36% informants filled the gap with OST constructions (like *On uvidel Kuz'ku* 'He saw Kuz'ka'), whereas in the whole sample frequency of the nominal strategy is 57 %.

³ It is important to distinguish Cause as an obligatory participant in the situation introduced by inner-state predicates, and Cause as evaluation base... that is not an obligatory participant of the situation introduced by inner-state predicates.

The second sentence describes the situation ‘Kuz’ka saw (that there is) a pot on the table’ – the SST is a static situation. In this case 96 % informants chose the nominal strategy (*On uvidel kastr’ul’u* ‘He saw a pot’).

2.2. The purpose of the last experiment was to define the relational degree of importance of different factors. The informants were to describe photographs, using constructions of the type “I see ...”. In this experiment only the predicate *videt’* ‘see’, which is especially important for our purposes, was analyzed.

The photographs, used for this experiment, differed according on the basis of those characteristic properties, which were discovered in the second experiment. Only the factor “the number of participants” has been added:

I. Properties of the situation as a whole:

- 1) Dynamic/static. Even though photographs are always in a sense static, they let us define, whether the situation is dynamic (for example, the photograph representing a football match) or static (people, lying on a sofa).
- 2) Marked/unmarked situation. Unmarked situations are those, which are usual for everyday life, marked are unusual (for example, the situation of meditation is not usual).

II. Properties of the participants of the situation.

- 1) Quantity of participants (one/two/more than two).
- 2) Unmarked/marked participants. The participants can be marked as to their appearance (e.g. have “unusual” clothes, haircut etc.).
- 3) Known/unknown (identifiable/non-identifiable by the informant) participant. (The value of this feature “unknown” was substituted by “known” if the answer showed that the informant identified a participant, that was considered non-identifiable.)

In the course of the experiment the following ways of expressing the second argument of the verb *videt’* were found:

- 1) Subordinate clause (clausal argument): *Ja vizhu, čto l’udi lov’at rybu* ‘I see that people are fishing’;
- 2) Nominal object: *Ja vižu Valerija Leont’jeva* ‘I see Valery Leontiev’;
- 3) Verbal noun (name of a situation): *Ja vižu igru v futbol* ‘I see a football match’;
- 4) Combination of a nominal object and a participle: *Ja vižu človeka, igrajuščego v m’ač* ‘I see a person playing with a ball’;
- 5) Combination of a nominal object and a relative clause: *Ja vižu l’udej, kotoryje tancujut* ‘I see people dancing’ (lit. people, who are dancing);
- 6) Combination of a nominal object and a prepositional phrase: *Ja vižu l’udej na pl’aže* ‘I see people on the beach’.

It has been argued for the verbs of perception that it is basically a situation (not its participants) that is perceived (cf. Kirsner, Thompson 1976). On the syntactic level the perceived situation can be realized as a dependent clause or a NP. If the valency of Stimulus is filled with a noun, such construction is considered as deficient realization of the dependent clause (for example, *a cat* in the sentence *He saw a cat* is a reduced realization of the clause *A cat was walking/liing/eating* etc.). In terms of [Gak 1976], the speaker chooses “reductive nominalization” – a metonymical transfer, like in *He cannot go to the cinema because of his brother* (i.e. *because of brother’s actions/brother’s sickness*). In other words, the nuclear pattern for verbs of perception is supposed to be <Nominative, S>, where S is an embedded clause. Adopting this approach, we must suppose that the construction with a clausal complement expressing the Stimulus of the verb *videt’* ‘see’ should be the most frequent. But this is not the case. Such a pattern has a relatively low frequency:

Table 1: Frequency of different constructions (with the verb *videt’* ‘see’)

Total ⁴	Embedded clause	Verbal noun	Noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
356	45 (17%)	31 (12%)	141 (54%)	14 (5%)	17 (7%)	12 (5%)

⁴ Here and further the total number of answers does not suit the sum in columns, because in columns only the relevant constructions were presented (for example, we omit the “direct speech” comments, as *Oh, it’s so beautiful* etc.).

In total, the construction where the perceived situation does not occupy a syntactic position as an argument of the verb *videt'*, but is expressed in the sentence (by a participial phrase, a relative clause or a prepositional phrase) was chosen in 20 % of all examples only. The most frequent strategy of expressing the Stimulus of *videt'* is the nominal one.

Frequency of the clausal strategy increases (and frequency of the nominal strategy decreases) if the perceived situation is highly marked (18) or dynamic (19):

(18) *Otec, mat' i doč' stranno sid'at.*

'The father, the mother and the daughter are sitting in a strange way' (the photograph represents a scene of meditation).

(19) *Čelovek igrajet na pianino, koška mešajet.*

'Somebody is playing piano, and the cat is interfering'.

Tables 2 and 3 represents dependence of the results on dynamicity of the situation and its markedness:

Table 2: Dynamicity of the situation (SST)

	Total	Embedded clause	Noun	Verbal noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
Dynamic	144	21 (15%) ⁵	59 (41%)	11 (8%)	7 (5%)	6 (4%)	5 (3%)
Static	210	23-25 (12%)	82 (39%)	20 (10%)	7 (3%)	11 (3%)	7 (3%)

Table 3: Markedness of the situation (SST)

	Total	Embedded clause	Noun	Verbal noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
Marked	144	19 (13%)	53 (37%)	8 (6%)	6 (4%)	7 (5%)	6 (4%)
Unmarked	209	26 (12%)	88 (42%)	23 (11%)	8 (4%)	10 (5%)	6 (3%)

More relevant factor is the properties of participants of the situation, to be precise, with their markedness (according to the informant's judgement). The clausal strategy is likely to be chosen, if the object is unmarked as to its appearance, is not known by the informant or if the photograph includes several participants (the more participants are present in the forefront, the more decreases importance of a single one). Tables 4, 5 and 6 show the relevance degree of these three factors:

Table 4. Number of participants

	Total	Embedded clause	Noun	Verbal noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
1	110	9 (8%)	62 (56%)	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	7 (6%)	3 (3%)
2	106	13 (12%)	41 (39%)	9 (8%)	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)
>2	140	24 (17%)	38 (27%)	20 (14%)	6 (4%)	7 (5%)	6 (4%)

Table 5. Markedness of the OST

	Total	Embedded clause	Noun	Verbal noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
Marked	104	8-9 (9%)	47 (45%)	10 (10%)	6 (6%)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)
Unmarked	249	36-37 (15%)	94 (38%)	21 (8%)	8 (3%)	12 (5%)	11 (4%)

Table 6. Known/unknown participant (OST)

	Total	Embedded clause	Noun	Verbal noun	Noun + participle	Noun + rel. clause	Noun + PP
Known	109	16-17 (15%)	54 (49%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)	3 (3%)	4 (4%)
Unknown	244	28-30 (12%)	87 (36%)	27 (11%)	10 (4%)	14 (6%)	8 (3%)

⁵ Here and further the ratio of the examples for this strategy to the whole number of dynamic/static situations, accordingly, is given.

It can be seen that the properties of the situation itself (dynamicity, markedness) are less important, than the properties of the participants: the latter are much more relevant for the choice of construction.

We assume that such variation of patterns depends not only on the meaning of particular verbs, but also is conditioned by discourse factors. The point is that the case, when the semantic valency slot of the verb is filled not with an object (*Ja seržus' na Vas'u* 'I am angry with Vas'a'), but with a clausal argument (*Ja seržus', čto Vas'a ujexal* 'I am angry that Vas'a went out') is marked in Russian. It is well-known that a noun/NP is a result of abstraction: the speaker ignores some individual properties of an object, which do not have to correspond to the prototypical properties of the class of objects denoted by the said noun/NP (see [Kobozeva 2000: 35-36]). The expressing of the situation as a whole requires a higher level of abstraction, because the situation cannot be perceived directly. Therefore, conceiving a situation from the world of reality requires a greater cognitive effort.

It is important that names of material objects are elements of the lexicon, that the speaker takes "as they are", whereas clausal complements, have to be generated in the course of generating the text, which requires a greater effort from the speaker. Let us consider which way the speaker avoids it.

The SST is a fragment of reality, including a number of participants (*Ja uvidel, čto devuška sidit na motocikle* 'I saw a girl sitting on a motorbike'). In most cases, one of the participants has the highest discourse status according to its semantic and pragmatic properties: animacy, definiteness, pragmatic salience etc. The speaker generates a sentence as if this participant was the only participant of the perception situation: (*Ja uvidel devušku* 'I saw a girl'). The SST can in such cases be expressed by means of a relative clause (*Ja uvidel devušku, kotoraja sidit na motocikle* lit. 'I saw a girl, who is sitting on a motorbike'), a prepositional phrase (*Ja uvidel devušku na motocikle* 'I saw a girl on a motorbike') or even be omitted.

However, if the situation is highly salient pragmatically (more salient than any of its participants), the speaker chooses to express it. In such cases the SST becomes an argument of the matrix verb (*Ja uvidel, čto/Ja slyšal jeho koncert* 'I saw that/I have heard his concert') and the OST is demoted to the position of subject in the embedded clause, or genitive subject of the deverbal noun, or it can even be omitted.

Therefore, the OST and the SST divide the object valency of the matrix verb, attracting the speaker's attention by means of semantic and pragmatic properties, including animacy (see section 2.1), markedness of the appearance (colour, clothes and so on), salience among other participants, quantity of the participants; less relevant is the dinamicity and markedness of the situation.

OST:

markedness of the object
animacy

SST:

markedness of the situation
dinamicity

noun

noun + prepositional phrase
noun + relative clause

embedded clause
verbal noun

Those properties of situations, which make expressing of the OST highly probable (markedness of the object, salience and animacy), are presented on the left side of the scale and those, which make SST probable (markedness of the situation, dinamicity) are on the right side.

We assume that the scale explains the results of the first experiment: in particular, the fact that OST and SST are rarely expressed both as arguments of the matrix verb (see 1.2). The reason is that the situation as a whole and its participants "compete" for the right to fill the valency slot of the matrix verb: if one of the participants is more salient, the situation tends to be expressed as an adverbial, and vice versa, when the situation is more salient, its arguments are demoted.

3. Conclusions

We suppose to have shown that choice of the diathesis of a particular verb is influenced not only by the idiosyncratic semantic properties of the verb, but also by pragmatic factors. In this case we face an important question: whether we must consider the diversity of constructions as distinct lexical meanings or as distinct constructions within one and the same meaning. In the reality, the situation,

designated by mental verbs, has two participants: the one referring to the Stimulus and the one referring to the Experiencer. The syntactic realization of the Stimulus referent can be "narrow", including one participant only, or "wide" – in that case it includes the whole situation (these two cases are related by means of metonymy, see Gak 1976).

We suppose the main result of our work to be the following: we have shown that the diversity of syntactic constructions is not an idiosyncratic feature of one or several verbs – it is a common property of all the matrix verbs under consideration. Above we have defined the factors, which influence the choice of a construction in a particular context. On the level, where the speaker's cognitive task is formed, SST and OST compete for the right to fill the valency slot of the verb. The choice between SST and OST is made after defining the relative weight of a number of pragmatic factors. The speaker decides, whether the SST / OST should be "promoted" to a complement position or "demoted" to an adjunct position and whether they are obligatory to express.

As a result, we consider that these constructions arise as a result of competition between the object and the situation on the cognitive level. It can be said that mental verbs have "narrow" and "wide" diatheses: in the former only a participant of the situation is realized. The latter is a result of abstraction, occurring, when all participants of the situation are not salient.

What is important, there are two types of diatheses independently of relations of these diatheses to each other: for example, the verb *videt'* 'see' has only one valency slot, which can be filled either by OST or by SST, and emotive verbs (like *serdit'sja* 'be angry', *obižat'sja* 'be offended') have two different valency slots for SST and OST (see in detail Padučeva 2004). However, both perception and emotive verbs have narrow and wide diatheses and must choose between them: it is not accidentally that SST and OST are rarely expressed in the same sentence.

We analyzed only some of the principles, which are important for expression of SST/OST. For example, we did not pay any attention to the differences, that depend on the meaning of particular verbs. To account for some differences, the more detailed analysis of concrete matrix verbs (as the analysis of *videt'*), is required.

References

- Apresjan Ju. D. 1964. O sil'nom i slabom upravljenii (opyt količestvennogo analiza) // *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 1964, № 3. P. 32-49.
- Apresjan Ju. D. 1998. Kauzativy ili conversivy? // *Tipologija. Grammatika. Semantika. K 65-letiju Viktora Samuiloviča Xrakovskogo*. Saint-Petersburg. P. 273-281.
- Apresjan Ju. D. Slovarnyje stat'i *znat' 1, videt' 1.1., serdit'sja, radovat'sja*. // Ju.D. Apresjan et al. *Novyj ob'jasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka*. Vol. 1. Moscow: "Jazyki russkoj kul'tury".
- Arutjunova N. D. 1976. *Predloženie i jeho smysl*. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Volf E. M. 1989. Emocional'nyje sostojanija i ix predstavlenija v jazyke. // *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Problemy intensional'nyx i pragmatičeskix kontekstov*. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Gak V. G. 1976. Nominalizacija skazujemogo i ustranjenje subjekta. // *Sintaksis i stilistika*. Moscow: "Nauka". P. 85-102.
- Zaliznjak Anna A. 1992. *Issledovanija po semantike predikatov vnutrennego sostojanija*. München.
- Kobozeva I. M. 2000. *Lingvističeskaja semantika*. Moscow: URSS.
- Padučeva E. V. 2004. *Dinamičeskije modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moscow: "Jazyki russkoj kul'tury".
- Plungian V. A., Raxilina E. V. 1998. Paradoksy valentnostej. // *Semiotika i informatica*, vol. 36. Moscow: "Jazyki russkoj kul'tury". P. 108-119.
- Xrakovskij V. S. 1999. *Ponjatije sirkonstanta i jeho status*. // Xrakovskij V. S. *Teorija jazykoznanija. Rusistika. Arabistika*. Saint-Petersburg: "Nauka". P. 102-112.
- Kirsner R., Thompson S. A. 1976. The role of pragmatic inference in semantics: a study of sensory verb complements in English // *Glossa*, v. 10 (1976).