

## СЕНТЕНЦИАЛЬНЫЕ АКТАНТЫ ИМЁН В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

*А. Б. Летучий*

*Национальный исследовательский университет Высшая школа экономики*

Тема статьи — сентенциальные актанты (СА) при русских номинализациях (именах, соотносительных с глаголами vs. с прилагательными / предикативами). Показано, что для описания ситуации необходимо несколько параметров: семантическая роль СА, оппозиция собственно аргументов и модификаторов, оппозиция имён сложного события vs. результата — причём ни один из них не описывает всей ситуации. В конце статьи предлагается новый параметр — а именно, противопоставление собственно ситуации и реализации, — который, возможно, описывает наиболее широкую выборку имён и их свойств.

**Ключевые слова:** сентенциальные актанты, номинализации, русский язык, аргумент, модификатор, семантическая роль, реализация, имя сложного события, имя результата.

## COMPLEMENT CLAUSES OF NOUNS IN RUSSIAN

*Alexander Letuchiy*

*National Research University Higher School of Economics*

The article focuses on complement clauses of nominalizations (deverbal and deadjectival nouns) in Russian. It is proposed that several parameters, such as semantic role, the opposition of proper argument vs. modifier, the opposition of complex event vs. result nominals are necessary to account for the distribution of nouns that take vs. do not take complement clauses, and neither of them accounts for the whole distribution. In the end I propose a new parameter, namely, the opposition of situation proper vs. occurrence that, perhaps, can cover the widest range of nouns and their properties.

**Keywords:** complement clauses, nominalizations, Russian, argument, modifier, semantic role, occurrence, complex event nominal, result nominal.

## 1. Introduction

In my paper I consider combinational properties of Russian nominalizations. While aspectual classes and morphological techniques of nominalization have been much studied (see [Pazelskaya 2006], [Paducheva 1986, 2009]), less attention has been given to the syntax of predicate nominals and its correlation with semantic properties.

Nominalizations tend to inherit most properties of the base verb. For instance, they are sometimes compatible with all arguments of the initial situation: if it is a transitive bivalent verb, both Agent and Patient can be expressed. Nominalizations are also often compatible with adverbials, just as finite verbs.

However, as [Grimshaw 1990] shows, sometimes the expression of base predicate arguments is restricted with nominalizations. For instance, some nominalizations are incompatible with complement clauses, which are possible with verbs they are derived from.

The present paper focuses on the distribution of complement clauses in constructions with a nominal head. I show that their distribution is not explained by any one parameter of those proposed by [Grimshaw 1990], [Knyazev 2014] or others, discussed in this article. Rather, several parameters are relevant here.

### 1.1. Research sample

For the study, nouns of several verbs were taken. All of them belong to groups marked by [Noonan 2007] as complement-taking predicates (CTPs)<sup>1</sup>.

Predicate	Noun
<b>Emotion verbs</b>	
<i>ljubit'</i> 'to love'	<i>ljubov'</i> 'love'
<i>bojat'sja</i> 'to fear, to be afraid'	<i>strax</i> 'fear'
<i>razdražat'</i> 'to annoy'	<i>razdraženie</i> 'annoyance'
<b>Property predicates</b>	
<i>stranno, strannyj</i> 'strange'	<i>strannost'</i> 'strangeness'
<i>važno</i> 'important'	<i>važnost'</i> 'importance'

<sup>1</sup> A note should be done on the morphological status of these nominals. They are usually morphologically derived from verbs or predicatives / adjectives. However, some nouns like *strax* 'fear' that semantically correspond to verbs (e.g., *bojat'sja* 'be afraid') but not derived from the are also included. The question if nominals like *vozmožnost'* 'possibility' are derived from the predicative *vozmožno* or the adjective *vozmožnyj* is not discussed here.

*vozmožno* ‘possible’

*vozmožnost'* ‘possibility’

*interesno* ‘interesting’

*interes* ‘interest’

### Modal verbs

*umet'* ‘can, to be able, to know how’

*umenie* ‘ability’

*upominat'* ‘to mention’

*upominanie* ‘mention’

### Cognitive verbs

*dokazat'* ‘to prove’

*dokazatel'stvo* ‘proof’

*otkryt'* ‘to discover’

*otkrytie* ‘discovery’

*privyknut'* ‘to get used’

*privyčka* ‘habit’

*priznavat'* ‘to recognize’

*priznanie* ‘recognition’

*uverennyj* ‘sure’

*uverennost'* ‘sureness’

*znat'* ‘to know’

*znanie* ‘knowledge’

*ponimat'* ‘to understand’

*ponimanie* ‘understanding’

Here I did not make any difference between verbs taking finite vs. non-finite complements.

Below the existing accounts of clausal complements of nouns will be sketched.

## 1.2. Stowell's and Grimshaw's accounts

[Stowell 1981] adopts the most radical point of view, claiming that no nouns can have complement clauses in the proper sense. The clausal constituents of nouns that are virtually similar to complement clauses are in fact something like appositives.

Afterwards, [Grimshaw 1990] introduces a more moderate way of analysis. She classifies nominalizations / predicate nouns into three classes (some of these classes are close to semantic classes distinguished by [Apresyan 1966]):

- 1) Complex event nominals;
- 2) Simple event nominals;
- 3) Result nominals.

She states that Complex Event Nominals (CEN) are the closest to predicates. They are compatible with the same TAM markers and argument expressions as their base verbs.

(1) The government's development of inexpensive housing was applauded.

In (1), the Agent (*government*), the Theme (*inexpensive housing*) are expressed.

By contrast, Result Nominals (RN) tend to prohibit expression of most aspectual and temporal modifiers, as well as arguments. For instance, no argument can be expressed in (2):

(2) The investigation was on the table.

Here, investigation is a RN referring to the result of the dynamic process *investigate* (i.e., the document that reflects what the investigation showed). If NPs referring to the agent and the patient are added, the sentence will become awkward because only the dynamic (Complex Event) reading will be available:

(3) #The investigation of the patient by the medicine was on the table.

(3) is strange because the locative predication *was on the table* calls for a static (result) reading. The expression of the agent and patient calls for a dynamic reading. In the result reading, the agent and patient are not expressed, because they are parts of the dynamic phase. The agent and patient do not participate in the static phase, though the result of their participation (in the dynamic phase) can be observed.

Based on examples like (1), (2) and (3), Grimshaw claims that only CEN have argument structure. Result nominals lack argument structure. Simple event nominals constitute an intermediate class, this is why this class is often ignored in later studies of argument structure.

By contrast, Grimshaw notes that only with result nominals, are complement clauses regularly retained from the verbal construction.

This may seem paradoxical, since in the domain of NP arguments, Result Nominals are incompatible with argument expression. However, in fact, this situation is not a paradox. Grimshaw states that complement clauses of result nominals are not real arguments — they are rather similar to adjectival modifiers.

### 1.3 Noun complements and relative clauses

The account adopted by [Krapova, Cinque 2015] and many others, such as [Simeonova 2018], especially for Slavic languages, says that clausal complements of nouns are relative clauses, though of different types. For instance, with heads like *vopros* ‘question’, the clause is a canonical RC, while with *znanie* ‘knowledge’, it lays between the restrictive and the nonrestrictive types. [Kayne 2008; 2010] and [De Cuba 2017] also represent complement clauses of nouns as relative clauses, though the technical solution is different.

In my opinion, this account does not cover the whole range of complement-taking nouns. Of course, there are contexts that are intuitively close to relative clauses. For instance, when we have something like *The question where I was that night embarrassed me* it is meant that there are various types of questions, each with its own content, some of them embarrassing and others not. Thus, we speak of properties of questions and / or of their classification based on these properties — the function typical for relative clauses and other types of adjectival modifiers. By contrast, arguments are intuitively more exotic in this function: argument structure marks what the participants of the situation are. Participants are, to a certain degree, autonomous from the event they are linked to, thus, their function is not always to define the properties of the event.

However, as I will show, not all clausal complements of nouns are semantically similar to complements of heads like “question”. And, if we use a syntactic criterion to define if the clause is a modifier / relative clause, some CCs of nouns definitely yield the negative answer in this test.

#### 1.4. Knyazev’s account

[Knyazev 2014] adopts an account related both to pragmatic properties and argument status. Among other things, he shows that some predicate nouns can take complement clauses only if the clause occupies the final position and / or have predicate or quasi-predicate status.

(4) *U Van-i by-l-o ponimani-e što nado*  
 at Vanja-SG.GEN be-PST-SG.N understanding-SG.NOM COMP necessary-SG.GEN

*što-to menja-t'.*  
 something.ACC change-INF

‘There was some worries that we would lose.’ [Knyazev 2014: 24]

This account is useful in that it shows that a purely lexical classification of nouns as complement-taking or incompatible with complement clauses is impossible. Many factors, including pragmatic and contextual ones, influence the (un)acceptability of complementation with a particular noun. However, at the same time, Knyazev says nothing about nouns that are unable to take complement clauses at all. Besides this, nonfinite clauses are not considered.

## 2. Introductory remarks on the syntax of nominalization

### 2.1. Standard and non-standard expression of participants with nominalization

First, some words on the syntax of nominalization should be said. By default, Russian uses the following pattern of nominalization:

Intransitive verbs: NOM > GEN

- (5) Otjezd Peti (GEN) ‘Petja’s leaving’

Transitive verbs: NOM > INS, ACC > GEN

- (6) Znanie zakonov (GEN) vsemi ljud’mi (INS) ‘Knowledge of laws by all people’

Thus, nominalization is organized ergatively. The Agent of transitive verb is coded specially, while the DO and the S coding is identical. However, the coding changes if the object is sentential. The instrumental coding of the agent becomes impossible:

- (7) \*znani-e                      vs-emi      ljud'-mi      čto  
 knowledge-SG.NOM      all-PL.INS      people-PL.INS      COMP

zakon-y      nado      vpolnja-t'  
 law-PL.ACC      necessary      obey-INF

Intended: ‘Knowledge of all people (INS) that one should obey the laws.’  
 (complement clause)

For *dokazatel'stvo*, instrumental marking is impossible. The genitive one may sound doubtfully but is possible.

- (8) *Dokazatel'stv-o*      \**Ivanov-ym* / ?*Ivanov-a*  
 proof-SG.NOM      Ivanov-SG.INS / Ivanov-SG.GEN

čto      Zemlj-a      krugl-aja.  
 COMP      Earth-SG.NOM      round-F.SG.NOM

‘Ivanov’s proof that the Earth is round.’

This means that the general nominalization pattern is not only related to the verb’s transitivity, but also to the presence of case category. The instrumental marking is possible only if there is a genitive-marked argument — and this is not the case if the object is clausal. This shows, by the way, that the rule of

case assignment is not fully ergative: at least in some ergative languages, A of transitive verbs is ergative-marked simply because the verb is transitive and is not linked to the presence of another case-marked argument.

It seems, however, that the peculiarity of the case-assigning rule does not show that complement clauses of nouns are not arguments. Of course, complement clauses differ from nominal ones in many respects. However, this particular aspect of behavior only shows that complement clauses lack the category of case.

## 2.2. Some restrictions on complement clauses with nouns

Let us now discuss restrictions on complementation with head nouns. In (9) – (12) I show some examples where the nominalization cannot host complement clauses, whereas the base predicate can.

Property nouns:

- (9) *Stranno*            *èto*    *sejčas*    *obsužda-t'*.  
 strange.PRAEDIC    this.ACC    now    discuss-INF  
 'It is strange to discuss it now.'

- (9') \**strannost'*            *èto*    *sejčas*    *obsužda-t'*  
 strangeness.PRAEDIC    this.ACC    now    discuss-INF  
 Intended: 'the strangeness to discuss it.'

- (10) *Važno*            *vse*    *obsudi-t'*.  
 important.PRAEDIC    all.ACC    discuss-INF  
 'It is important to discuss everything.'

- (10') \**važnost'*            *vse*    *obsudi-t'*  
 importance-PRAEDIC    all.ACC    discuss-INF  
 Intended: 'the importance to discuss everything'.

Some emotional nouns:

- (11) *Ego*    *razdraža-l-o*            *čto*    *nad*    *nim*    *smej-ut-sja*.  
 he.ACC    annoy-PST-SG.N            COMP    above    he.INS    laugh-PRS.3PL-REFL  
 'It annoyed him that they laughed at him.'

- (12) ??*Ego*    *razdraženi-e*            *čto*    *nad*    *nim*    *smej-ut-sja*  
 he.GEN    annoyance-SG.NOM            COMP    above    he.INS    laugh-PRS.3PL-REFL  
 'his annoyance that they laughed at him.'

### 3. Relevant features

In this section, I will consider the parameters that are relevant for (im)possibility of complement clauses with the given noun. Some of these parameters are related to the properties of the head noun, while others are linked to the features of the complement clause itself.

#### 3.1. Argument vs. modifier

The first feature we are interested in is the **argument** vs. **modifier** distinction. The zero hypothesis is that only complement clauses that have modifier properties are compatible with head nouns.

To address the problem, we should first consider what a modifier is and what an argument is. I consider the following criterion to be useful: a modifier can be syntactically parallel to adjectival modifiers like *étot* ‘this’, or *kakoj* ‘which’.

Note that the criterion does not contain a mention of obligatoriness, typical for an argument and not so typical for a modifier. This is because Slavic languages do not strictly oppose obligatory and not obligatory syntactic constituents: on the one hand, almost any type of argument can be omitted under special conditions. On the other hand, some modifiers are almost obligatory.

Another remark is necessary, concerning the use of *étot*. Examples like (13) are irrelevant for the study:

(13) *Ego interesova-l-o, kto pobed-it.*  
 he.ACC interest-PST-SG.N who.NOM win-FUT.3SG

*Étot interes-∅ pojavi-l-∅-sja davno.*  
 this.M.SG.NOM interest-SG.NOM emerge-PST-SG.M-REFL long.ago

‘He was interested in who would win. This interest has emerged long ago.’

In (13), it is unclear if *éto* refers to the content of interest or to the fact that the interest was already mentioned. What is relevant are examples like (14) and (15):

(14) *U Pet-i vseгда by-l-∅ strax-∅ opozda-t'.*  
 at Petja-GEN always be-PST-SG.M fear-SG.NOM be.late-INF

*Étot strax-∅ pojavi-l-∅-sja u nego s junosti.*  
 this.M.SG.NOM fear-SG.NOM emerge-PST-SG.M-REFL at he.GEN from young-SG.GEN

‘Petja was always afraid to be late. This fear began from the time he was young.’

- (15) *U menja by-l-o oščuščeni-e čto ja sejčas umr-u.*  
 at I.GEN be-PST-SG.N feeling-SG.NOM COMP I.NOM now die-FUT.1SG
- Éto oščuščeni-e by-l-o u mnog-ix.*  
 this.N.SG.NOM feeling-SG.NOM be-PST-SG.N at many-PL.GEN
- ‘I had a feeling that I would die. Many people had the same feeling.’

How to identify the relevant use of *étot*? It seems that the referential status can be a criterion. In the relevant use, when *étot* refers to the content of emotion, cognitive act and so on, it can refer to an emotion or cognitive act of another person but with the same content. This is the case in (15), where *éto* introduces the same feeling experienced by other people. By contrast, if *étot* marks the fact that the emotion, cognitive act, etc. was already mentioned, it usually refers to literally the same act (i.e., experienced by the same person that has been mentioned before).

The argument vs. modifier opposition seems to be more relevant for the Russian data than Grimshaw’s opposition of complex event vs. result nominals. For instance, it covers some cases for which Grimshaw’s classes are also relevant. As will be shown below, *oščuščenie* ‘feeling’ is a result nominal, and it is compatible with complement clauses. *Osoznanie* ‘realizing’ is a complex event nominal, and it is incompatible with complement clauses. However, the same opposition can be accounted for by saying that with *oščuščenie*, the complement clause is a modifier, and with *osoznanie*, the complement clause is an argument in the proper sense. (15) above is normal, while (16) sounds strange, though not completely unacceptable:

- (16) *postepenn-oe osoznani-e čto my proigra-em*  
 gradual-N.SG.NOM realizing-SG.NOM COMP we.NOM lose-FUT.1PL
- ‘The realizing that we will lose.’

Of course, both *éto oščuščenie* and *éto osoznanie* are possible:

- (17) *Ét-o osoznani-e / oščuščeni-e*  
 this-N.SG.NOM realizing-SG.NOM / feeling-SG.NOM
- ne dava-l-o emu spa-t’.*  
 NEG give-PST-SG.N he.DAT sleep-INF
- ‘He could not fall asleep because of this realizing / feeling.’

However, the interpretation is different. With *osoźnanie*, the pronoun *ęto* is only possible with the meaning ‘the realizing that has been mentioned.’ By contrast, with *ořčuřęenie*, the pronoun refers to the content meaning ‘the feeling with the given content, the meaning that is relevant for us’ (for instance, it is possible that this feeling has been experienced by many people in different circumstances, thus, it is defined only by its content, and not by the time and space it emerged in).

At the same time, as mentioned before, some nouns problematic for Grimshaw’s account, such as property nouns on *-ost’* (they are derived from stative ‘predicatives’ and can hardly be tested for the CEN vs. RN opposition), are also accounted for by the argument / modifier opposition. Only for *vozmoźnost’* (and, marginally, for *neobxodimost’*) is replacement with the pronoun possible.

- (18) *Ęta*                    *vozmoźnost’-∅*            *ego*            *privleka-l-a.*  
 this-F.SG.NOM    possibility-SG.NOM    he.ACC    attract-PST-SG.F  
 ‘This possibility attracted him.’

- (19) *#Ęta*                    *strannost’-∅*            *ego*            *razdraźa-l-a.*  
 this-F.SG.NOM    strangeness-SG.NOM    he.ACC    annoy-PST-SG.F  
 Intended: ‘This strangeness bothered him.’

In (19), *strannost’* is compatible with *ęta*, but not in the relevant use: it refers here not to a property in general but to one strange feature.

It is thus not surprising that only *vozmoźnost’*, but not *strannost’*, can take a complement clause: constructions like *vozmoźnost’ ęto sdelat’* ‘possibility to do it’ are acceptable, while with *strannost’*, complement clauses are unacceptable, as in (9). We can claim that with *vozmoźnost’*, what may seem a complement clause, is syntactically a modifier. In other words, in examples like *vozmoźnost’ uexat’* ‘the possibility to leave’ the infinitive *uexat’* ‘live’ is not an argument in the proper sense. It rather modifies the head noun and clarifies the type of possibility we are talking about.

The type of *ętot* we speak about is normally not found with nominal arguments. For instance, in (20), the NP genitive *rybaka* cannot be referred to using an adjective modifier:

- (20) *Ęto*    *dom*                    *rybak-a.*                    *Ętot*                    *dom*  
 this    house-SG.NOM    fisherman-SG.GEN    this-M.SG.NOM    house-SG.NOM  
  
*postroen*                                    *st-o*                    *let*                    *nazad.*  
 build-PART.PASS.PST-M.SG    hundred-ACC    year-PL.GEN    ago  
 ‘This is a fisherman’s house. This house was built one hundred years ago.’

Although (20) is acceptable, *étot* does not work in the relevant way here, as referring to the fisher's house as a type of a house. It simply refers to the previous mention of the house (the house we mentioned in the previous text), and it is not important if there is a genitive NP or not.

The same is true for many structures where a nominalization has an NP or PP argument. The adjective pronoun refers to the previous mention and not to the content of emotion, speech act and so on. This is obvious from the difference in referential properties:

- (21) ... *znani-e*                      *zakon-ov.*              *Éto*                      *znani-e*  
 knowledge-SG.NOM      law-SG.GEN              this.N.SG.NOM      knowledge-SG.NOM
- pomoga-l-o*              *emu*              *v*              *žizn-i.*  
 help-PST-SG.N              he.DAT              in              life-LOC
- ‘... knowledge of laws. This knowledge has helped him in his life.’

However, this property is not universal for all NP complements. For instance, some structures with genitive complements show that these complements also behave like modifiers, being syntactically parallel to adjective modifiers.

Property nouns: + *vozmožnost'* ‘possibility’, – *nevozmožnost'* ‘impossibility’, + *strannost'* ‘strangeness’, + – *neobxodimost'* ‘necessity’, – *važnost'* ‘importance’, – *uverennost'* ‘sureness’.

Modal: + *umenie* ‘being able’, + *želanie* ‘wish’.

Emotional: + *strax* ‘fear’, – *radost'* ‘happiness’.

Cognitive: + – *znanie* ‘knowledge’, + *ponimanie* ‘understanding’<sup>2</sup>.

### 3.2. Analogy?

An interesting case is represented by the nominal *nevozmožnost'* ‘impossibility’.<sup>1</sup> Being virtually just a negative derivative of *vozmožnost'* ‘possibility’, in fact it has rather different properties.

- (22) *nevozmožnost'-∅*              *napas-t'*              *na*              *obezjan-u*              *vrasplox*  
 impossibility-SG.NOM              attack-INF              on              monkey-SG.ACC              unawares
- ‘the impossibility to attack the monkey unawares’

- (23) # *ét-a*                      *nevozmožnost'-∅*  
 this-F.SG.NOM                      impossibility-SG.NOM
- ‘this impossibility’

<sup>2</sup> Here “+” means that the complement clause behaves as a modifier, while “–” denotes the fact that it is unable to be syntactically parallel to modifiers and “+–” denotes that it is unclear if the complement clause can or cannot be described as a modifier.

Example (23) sounds strange because the pronoun *étot* ‘this’ does not occur here in the relevant reading.<sup>3</sup> It denotes the relevant occurrence of the situation (‘the situation of impossibility we spoke about before’), and not the type of situation (‘impossibility of the thing we spoke about before’).

It is tempting to consider that the behavior of *nevozmožnost’* results from the analogy with the affirmative noun *vozmožnost’* ‘possibility’. However, this approach is hardly plausible. For instance, other negative forms, such as *neznanie* ‘ignorance’ or *neponimanie* ‘not understanding’ are barely compatible with complement clauses — they occur in contexts like (22), but very rarely.

It seems that *nevozmožnost’* behaves in some respects differently from property nouns like *strannost’*. For instance, it is compatible with the adjectival pronoun *étot*. An interesting fact is that *nevozmožnost’*, when referred to by means of *étot*, occurs mainly with complement clauses, and not genitive complements.

Table 1. Number of occurrences of the noun *nevozmožnost’* immediately before a genitive and an infinitive and number of occurrences with the pronoun *étot* before a genitive and an infinitive

	GEN	INF
total	2077	2482
with <i>étot</i>	5	26

In other words, it seems that *nevozmožnost’* behaves as a sort of a name of occurrence (see Section 3.6). Of course, the meaning of occurrence is modified here because *nevozmožnost’* is a property noun, and properties cannot usually be divided into realizations. However, this nominal, when used with a complement clause, tends to refer to definite situations where the property (‘impossibility’) manifests itself.

### 3.3. Semantic role of the complement clause

Although the argument vs. modifier distinction accounts for properties of many nominals, it is problematic in that it is not intuitive: we do not know in advance if a particular noun has a modifier or an argument. Fortunately, it seems that the argument vs. modifier opposition correlates with another parameter:

---

<sup>3</sup> Of course, examples like ‘this impossibility to express my feelings’ will sound normal, but they contain another use of *étot* ‘this’ referring to the situation mentioned before (‘the impossibility to express my feelings I have mentioned before’).

namely, the semantic role of the complement clause. Note that [Giorgi, Longobardi 1992] and some other authors have proposed that syntax of nominalizations crucially depends on their semantics, but their claims were mainly based on NP arguments. Although complement clauses are not compatible with all semantic roles possible for NPs, some range of roles is accessible to CCs:

content: She asked **where he had been**

reason / cause: It resulted from **the fact that he was late**

purpose: seek **to leave**

It turns out that content complement clauses have the best chance to be retained under nominalizations.

The explanation lies on the surface. Content denotes a participant which does not exist and / or is not regarded autonomously from the main situation. In other words, it is not a full-fledged participant, but rather an additional characteristic of the situation. It is not surprising at all that this characteristic is expressed with something that is syntactically a modifier. By contrast, constituents with argument properties tend to represent autonomous entities participating in the main situation.

Very often, the semantic role parameter and the type of syntactic behavior correlate to each other.

However, it is not always the case. For instance, with *znanie*, the CC does not behave like a modifier, but seems to have the semantic role of content of knowledge. As a result, the head noun *znanie* is compatible with complement clauses: cf. *znanie čto ja ošibsja* ‘the knowledge that I made a mistake’, which is perfectly acceptable.

In the class of emotions, the oppositions of argument vs. modifier and non-content vs. content complements correlates with the (ir)reality opposition. For instance, *strax* is compatible with complement clauses (cf. *strax zabolet'* ‘the fear to fell ill’), *ljubov'* is incompatible with them (*\*ljubov' guljat'* ‘the love to walk’ is ungrammatical), and *razdraženie* is only marginally compatible (cf. (12)). Only with *strax*, does the complement clause have the role of content and behaves as a modifier. This seems to be correlated with the fact that fear is a prospective emotion: it is directed towards an event that has not occurred and perhaps will not. Thus, this event exists only as the content of someone’s fear, not a real event. By contrast, being annoyed is possible only if its stimulus exist (or have existed) and love is used with a CC mainly when the event has occurred at least once.

### 3.4. Grimshaw's classes

Let us now compare the results acquired so far to results that Grimshaw's [Grimshaw 1990] classes based on syntactic and aspectual properties yield. To some degree, the classification is relevant. For instance, this can be seen on the behavior of nouns *oščuščenje* and *osožnanie*.

*Oščuščenje* is a result noun. This is obvious in that it is incompatible with the adjective *postepennyj* 'gradual'. By contrast, *osožnanie* 'realizing' is a CEN, and it is compatible with *postepennyj*:

- (24) *postepenn-oe*      *osožnani-e* / \**oščuščeni-e*      *svo-ej*      *vin-y*  
 gradual-N.SG.NOM      realizing-SG.NOM      feeling-SG.NOM      own-F.SG.GEN      guilt-SG.GEN  
 'the gradual realizing / \*perception of own guilt'

Not surprisingly, as shown above, only *oščuščenje* regularly takes complement clauses. The same is true for cases like *dokazatel'stvo* and *otkrytie*. Both of them take complement clauses. However, none of them are compatible with CCs in the dynamic reading, where the nominalization denotes a process of proving or discovering something.

- (25) *vo vremja*      *dokazatel'stva*      *teorem-Ø*      / \**čto*  
 in time-SG.ACC      proving-SG.GEN      theorem-PL.GEN      COMP

*Zemlj-a*      *krugl-aja*  
 Earth-SG.NOM      round-F.SG.NOM

'in the course (during) proving the theorems / that the Earth is round'

- (26) *posle otkrytij-a*      *v 2002 god-u*      *nov-ogo*      *element-a* /  
 after discovering-SG.GEN      in 2002 year-SG.LOC      new-M.SG.GEN      element-SG.GEN

\**čto est' drug-oj*      *element-Ø*  
 COMP      be.PRS.3SG      other-M.SG.NOM      element-SG.NOM

'after discovering in 2002 of a new chemical element / \*that another element exists'

The difference between *ljubov'* 'love' vs. *privyčka* 'habit' can be accounted for in the same lines. As mentioned above, *ljubov'* does not take an (infinitive) complement: \**ljubov' guljat'* 'love to walk' is ungrammatical or awkward. By contrast, *privyčka guljat'* 'habit to walk' is acceptable. The noun *ljubov'* corresponds to the static verb *ljubit'* — thus, it is not a priori clear if it has the properties of result nouns or complex event nouns (the base verb is already static).

By contrast, *privyčka* is derived from the dynamic verb *privyknut'* / *privykat'* and behaves as a result noun. For instance, the dynamic process adverbial *postепенно* 'gradual' is impossible with *privyčka*, though compatible with the parallel complex even noun of the same stem *privykanie* (not surprisingly, *privykanie* is incompatible with complement clauses):

- (27) *postепенное*            *privykani-e* /        \**privyčk-a*  
 gradual-N.SG.NOM        getting.used-SG.NOM    habit-SG.NOM
- k*    *mestn-omu*        *klimat-u*  
 to    local-M.SG.DAT    climat-SG.DAT
- 'getting used gradually to the local climate / \*gradual habit to the local climate'

However, there is a class of nouns that makes Grimshaw's account problematic. I mean nouns derived from predicatives or adjectives and denoting properties: *važnost'* 'importance', *strannost'* 'strangeness', *vozmožnost'* 'possibility', and so on (as mentioned above, *vozmožnost'* is compatible with complement clauses, while *važnost'* and *strannost'* are not, see examples (9') and (10')). For names of properties, the classification to CEN vs. RN is senseless, because the base words do not denote dynamic situations: thus, we can never know if the static semantics of these nouns is inherited from adjectives or brought about by nominalization. As shown before, the opposition based on semantic roles and the opposition of modifiers vs. argument work better for this class.

Another problematic case, contrary to the previous one, is represented by cognitive state nouns like *znanie* 'knowledge', *ponimanie* 'understanding', which take complement clauses. Knowledge and understanding are often interpreted as stative and they are also difficult to test against the CEN vs. RN properties.

### 3.5. Syntactic position of the complement clause in the base structure

The syntactic position of the complement clause in the base structure with a verb or predicative seems also to be relevant. Notably, nouns generally not taking CCs are heterogeneous. For some of them, mainly property nouns like *strannost'*, *važnost'*, *neizvestnost'*, structures with complement clauses are completely ungrammatical. Others, such as *ljubov'* 'love', *razdraženie* 'annoyance' can be found in some examples, though are not fully acceptable. Some of them change their properties from one period to another.

The reason is that the syntactic position of the complement clause is different. Property nouns are derived from structures where the clausal argument is a subject. This is why, after nominalization, it must be assigned the genitive case. By contrast, nouns like ‘love’, ‘feeling’ and so on can be generalized. In this case, their object is not obligatory. Thus, case marking problem is not relevant for them. This is why subject complement clauses have the worst chance to be retained under nominalization.

### 3.6. Event proper vs. occurrence

I propose that the central parameter that may be responsible for the distribution of complement clauses is the opposition between names of situations in the proper sense and what I call ‘occurrences (names of occurrence)’. I call situation in the proper sense the event with its aspectual properties and participants but not specified for the number of occurrences and the number of participants involved. For instance, in (28) *ubijstvo* denotes a situation in the proper sense: it denotes simply the action that could take place more than once and involve several animals:

- (28) *Ix*            *obvinjaj-ut*        *v*    *ubijstv-e*            *životn-yx*.  
 they.ACC    accuse-PRS.3PL    in    killing-SG.LOC    animal-PL.GEN  
 ‘They are accused in killing animals.’

By contrast, if the object argument is omitted, the noun *ubijstvo* can only refer to one murder (one occurrence of the situation ‘kill’), not to the general process of killing. In (29), the subject carried out only one murder — otherwise, the plural form *ubijstva* would be chosen:

- (29) *Ego*        *obvinjaj-ut*        *v*    *ubijstv-e*.  
 he.ACC    accuse-PRS.3PL    in    killing-SG.LOC  
 ‘He is accused in a murder.’

I claim that names of occurrences in general have more chance to be compatible with complement clauses than names of the situation in the proper sense. For some lexemes, this parameter yields the same results as Grimshaw’s aspectual / syntactic classes. For instance, *oščuščenje* is both a result nominal and a name of occurrence (it can refer only to one feeling, not to feeling of multiple things). However, there are cases when the occurrence account is more productive — for instance, here belongs the nominal *priznanie* ‘recognition’.

When used with NP arguments, *priznanie* can refer to multiple acts of recognizing something:

- (30) *postojann-oe priznanie drugix vinovat-ymi*  
 constant-N.SG.NOM recognition-SG.NOM other-PL.GEN guilty-PL.INS  
 ‘constant regarding other people as guilty’

The same seems impossible with complement clauses. Examples like (31) always refer to one act of admitting something — (31) cannot be used if it refers to several people admitting one fact in different time:

- (31) *No èt-o ob"jasneni-e potrebu-et priznani-ja, čto*  
 but this-N.SG.NOM explanation-SG.NOM require-PRS.3SG admitting-SG.GEN COMP  
*naš-a Vselenn-aja ne izotropn-a...*  
 our-F.SG.NOM universe-SG.NOM NEG isotropic-SHORT.F.SG

‘But this explanation will require that we admit that our universe is not isotropic.’ [Mikhail Vartburg. *Novosti iz sosednei Vselennoi* [News from the neighboring universe]. «Znanie — sila», 2010.

(<http://www.docme.ru/doc/83023>)

Note that *priznanie* is more problematic to be classified as a RN nominal in context like this: Result Nominals rarely occur in prospective / hypothetical context as one in (31).

The situation is more complicated with knowledge items *znanie* ‘knowledge’ and *ponimanie* ‘understanding’. It may seem that knowledge and understanding are indivisible to separate occurrences. However, it turns out that they have different combinational properties when used with NPs vs. complement clauses. With nominal arguments, they are often used as non-referential event denotations (e.g., as markers of situations proper):

- (32) *Znanie zakonov xarakterno dlja ljudej*  
 knowledge-SG.NOM law-PL.GEN characteristic for people-PL.GEN  
*iz razvit-yx stran-Ø.*  
 from developed-PL.GEN country-PL.GEN

‘Knowledge of laws is characteristic of people from well-developed countries.’

By contrast, with complement clauses, nouns like *znanie* and *ponimanie* are mainly used referentially: they denote one situation. When we say something like *znanie, čto my proigraem* ‘the knowledge that we will lose’ we usually refer to one concrete situation when someone knows something, not a generalized one.

An interesting case is represented by the noun *dokazatel'stvo* 'proof', which is apparently used with complements that do not have the role of content. Moreover, these complements are not modifiers: the combination *eto dokazatel'stvo* refers either to one particular act of proving something that has already been mentioned or to the content of the proof (not to the object that has been proven. It can also hardly be said that *dokazatel'stvo* is a result noun: in example (33), it refers to the process of proving, not to the proof that is already finished:

- (33) *A dlja dokazatel'stv-a čto mne nikak ne men'she*  
 and for proving-SG.GEN COMP I.DAT in.no.way NEG less  
  
*dvacat-i četyr-ex otrasti-l-Ø bačk-i.*  
 twenty-GEN four-GEN grow-PST-SG.M whisker-PL.ACC  
 'For proving / to prove that I am not less than 24 I grew whiskers.'

The only feature that can favor the complement close is the fact that *dokazatel'stvo* is used here as a name of realization: it refers to one particular situation. In contexts like (34), *dokazatel'stvo* can only host NPs, not complement clauses:

- (34) *Dlja dokazatel'stv-a teorem-Ø často ispol'zuj-ut-sja lemm-y.*  
 for proving-SG.GEN theorem-PL.GEN often use-PRS.3PL-REFL lemma-PL.NOM  
 'For proving theorems, lemmas are often used.'

In (34), *dokazatel'stvo* refers to the general process of proving something, and this context disfavours complement clauses.

Importantly, the opposition of event proper vs. occurrence can account for the behaviour of property nouns that are hardly explicable by the Grimshaw's opposition. Nouns like *strannost'* 'strangeness' or *vážnost'* 'importance' denote generalized properties (situations proper) and are not dividable into occurrences. By contrast, *vozmožnost'* 'possibility', *neobxodimost'* 'necessity', and, to a certain degree, *nevozmožnost'* 'impossibility' behave like occurrence names: *vozmožnost'* with a complement clause denotes only one definite possibility. Thus, the event proper vs. occurrence opposition seems to cover a broader range of phenomena than the Grimshaw's opposition.

## 4. Conclusions

In this article I considered parameters relevant for (in)ability of nominalizations to take complement clauses. It turned out that Grimshaw's parameter of aspectual / syntactic class (namely, complex event vs. result nominals) is often useful for Russian, but problematic for analysis of some nominals, especially groups of property nouns that do not behave uniformly in the relevant aspect.

Another parameter, namely, the opposition of argument vs. modifier complement clauses, accounts for another part of data. At the same time, it is problematic in another respect. We never know why a particular noun has a modifier vs. an argument: for instance, why is it impossible for the noun *ljubov'* 'love' to have a complement clause that modifies it and clarifies the nature of love.

The semantic ground of the syntactic opposition can be the semantic role. It is important if the clausal complement of the noun has the semantic role of content or another one. Content embedded clauses clarify the nature of the situation denoted by the embedded noun and do not represent an object existing separately from the main situation. This is why content nominals often behave syntactically as modifiers: they do not represent a component / participant of the main situation, but rather show what the nature of the main situation is. For instance, if we have the main situation 'possibility', the thing which is possible has not been realized — it just represents the content of possibility.

It turned out, however, that some nouns like *priznanie* and *dokazatel'stvo* violate the general tendency. They are compatible with complement clauses, though they can hardly be classified as pure result nouns and their complements do not necessarily have the role of content and are not necessary modifiers. I claimed that the key parameter can be the opposition of 'situation proper' vs. 'occurrence'. The thing is that some nominals denote the situation as it is, and it is irrelevant if it has been realized once or several times. Others denote one occurrence of the situation, and if it is necessary to speak of several occurrences of the situation, plural forms or other constructions are used. In my sample, names of one single occurrence of the situation have more chance to take complement clauses than nominals that designate the situation with no reference to the quantity of occurrences. This opposition is related both to Grimshaw's opposition of Complex event vs. Result nominals and to opposition of modifiers and real arguments.

## Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> person; ACC — accusative; COMP — complementizer; DAT — dative; F — feminine gender; FUT — future tense; GEN — genitive; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; LOC — locative; M — masculine gender; N — neutral gender; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; PART — participle; PASS — passive voice; PL — plural; PRAEDIC — predicative (predicative adverbial); PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; REFL — reflexive; SG — singular; SHORT — short form of adjective.

## References

- Apresyan 1966 — Apresyan Yu.D. *Leksicheskaya semantika* [Lexical semantics]. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Paducheva 1986 — Paducheva E.V. O referentsii yazykovykh vyrazhenii s nepredmetnym znacheniem [On the reference of phrases with abstract meaning]. *Nauchno-tekhnicheskaya informatsiya*, Ser. 2, No 1.
- Paducheva 2009 — Paducheva E.V. Possessivy i imena sposoba deistviya [Possessives and names of manner of action]. *Komp'yuternaya lingvistika i intellektual'nye tekhnologii*. Iss. 8 (15). Proceedings of “Dialog 2009”. P. 365–372.
- Pazelskaya 2006 — Pazelskaya A.G. *Nasledovanie glagol'nykh kategorii imenami situatsii: na materiale russkogo yazyka* [Inheritance of verbal categories by situational nouns (based on Russian data)]. Ph.D. thesis. Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2006.
- De Cuba 2017 — de Cuba C. Noun complement clauses as referential modifiers. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*. Vol. 2(1) 3. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.53>
- Giorgi, Longobardi 1992 — Giorgi A., Longobardi G. *The syntax of noun phrases: Configuration, parameters and empty categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Grimshaw 1990 — Grimshaw J. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.
- Kayne 2008 — Kayne R. Antisymmetry and the lexicon. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*. 2008. Vol. 8. P. 1–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.8.01kay>.
- Kayne 2010 — Kayne R. 2010. Why isn't this a complementizer? Kayne R. (ed.). *Comparisons and contrasts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. P. 190–227.
- Knyazev 2014 — Knyazev M. Structural licensing of sentential complements: evidence from Russian noun-complement constructions. Avram L. (ed.). *Bucharest working papers in linguistics 2*. Bucharest University Press, 2014. P. 21–45.
- Krapova, Cinque 2015 — Krapova I., Cinque G. On noun clausal “complements” and their non-unitary nature. Ms. 2015.
- Noonan 2007 — Noonan M. Complementation. Shopen T. (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description, Volume 2: Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. P. 52–150.
- Simeonova 2018 — Simeonova V. Flavors of predicate modification. To be published in Proceedings of CLS 54 Conference.
- Stowell 1981 — Stowell T. *Origins of phrase structure*. Doctoral thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1981.

Статья поступила в редакцию 22.11.2018

The article was received on 22.11.2018

**Александр Борисович Летучий**

кандидат филологических наук; доцент, Национальный исследовательский университет Высшая школа экономики

**Alexander B. Letuchiy**

Ph.D.; associate professor, National Research University Higher School of Economics

[alexander.letuchiy@gmail.com](mailto:alexander.letuchiy@gmail.com)