ON RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONAL BLAGODARJA

H.P. HOUTZAGERS

"Видно тут не довольно, что я, благодаря твоим, папень..."
А.С. Лукин, "Капитанская дочка"
"...и знаком её благодарил."
М.В. Лермонтов, "Кавказский пленник"

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In grammars and dictionaries of Russian the form **blagodarja** is usually regarded as representing two homonyms:
- The gerund of the verb **blagodarit** 'thank'. Like all other forms of **blagodarit**', the gerund **blagodarja** takes complements in the accusative case. Example:
  
  **Blagodarja sestru za podarok, on poslovil ejh**
  thanking sister [acc.] for present he kissed her
  'Thanking his sister for the present, he kissed her'

  Cf. with past tense of **blagodarit**':
  **On blagodaril sestru za podarok**
  he thanked sister [acc.] for present
  'He thanked his sister for the present'

  - A preposition which has the meaning 'thanks to' and governs the dative case. Example:
    **Blagodarja sestre, on sneat francusskoj jazyk**
    thanks to sister [dat.] he knows French language
    'Thanks to his sister, he knows French'

In the following I shall refer to the former homonym as 'the gerund **blagodarja**', and to the latter, which will be the subject of the present article, as either 'blagodarja+p' ('p' stands for 'dative') or 'prepositional **blagodarja**'.
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2. MAIN POINTS OF ODÍJK 1984

2.1 'The categorial status of idiosyncratic blagodarja.'

Idiosyncratic blagodarja is classified in almost all traditional Russian grammars and grammatical descriptions as a (deverbal) preposition (cf. a.o. Vinogradov (1947), Isačenko (1975)). We will argue against this hypothesis and show that it is an adverb ( ... ).

Prepositions in Russian have the idiosyncratic property that they require third person personal pronouns to be preceded by н when they precede them. Thus the forms of the third person singular male personal pronouns are ego (acc.gen), emu (dat) and im (instr), but a н must precede these pronouns when preceded by a preposition, cf. (5) vs. (6).

(5) a. Ona videla ego/него
She saw him
b. Ona pomogala emu/нemu
She helped him
c. O na zanimalas' im/nim

(6) a. ot *ego/него

(5a) vs. (6a) when tested after adverbs, we see that the n-form is ungrammatical in this position (8), and it is ungrammatical after idiosyncratic blagodarja as well (9).

(8) лучш ного/него
'better than him'

(9) blagodarja emu/nemu
'thanks to him dat'

We conclude that idiosyncratic blagodarja is an adverb, not a preposition. If it were, we would expect emu to be ungrammatical and nemu to be grammatical after it.' (1984:139-140)

2.2 'Chomsky (1981) proposes a Case Theory in which [-N]-categories (verbs, prepositions) are Case-assigners and [+N]-categories (nouns, adjectives) are Case-assignees. This seems to be falsified immediately by Russian, where [+N]-categories can assign Case ( ... ) let us review Case-assignment by [+N]-categories. First, consider (12), which illustrates patterns of Case-assignment by verbs:

(12a) a. Nom Kollektiv rabotaet Collective works
b. Gen Bojat'ssja odinočestva To fear loneliness
c. Dat Sočuvstvovat' drugu To sympathize with a friend
d. Acc Obrabotat' zemlu To cultivate the land
e. Instr šanimat'ssja fiziko To study physics

The subject of a sentence is usually in Nominative Case (12a). Verbs can have complements in Genitive, Dative, Accusative or Instrumental Case (12b-e). Then consider the nominalizations related to these verbs, in (13):

(13a) a. Gen Rabota kollektiva Work of the collective
b. Gen Bojašn' odinočestva Fear for loneliness
c. Dat Sočuvstvovat' drugu Sympathy for a friend
d. Gen Obrabotka zemli Cultivation of the land
e. Instr šanjet' fiziko Study of physics

Notice that (13b,c,e) resemble the related verb qua Case. This is the usual situation for Genitive, Dative and Instrumental Case. In (13a,d) we observe that the Nominative of (12a) are replaced by Genitive Case in the nominalization ( ... ). We conclude that nouns in Russian can assign Case, albeit non-Nominative or -Accusative Case.

A similar phenomenon can be observed when we consider adjectives. Adjectives can take Case marked complements, but not Nominatives or Accusatives ( ... ):

(15a) a. Nom --------
b. Gen dostojnyj uvaženija worthy respect
c. Dat vernoj svoemu slovu true to ones word
d. Acc --------
e. Instr nedovol'n'yj synom dissatisfied with son

Hence we infer that

(16) [+N]-categories cannot assign Nominative or Accusative Case in Russian' (1984:140-141)

2.3 'Adverbs in Russian can assign Case, but not Nominative or Accusative. On the basis of this fact we assume that adverbs are [+N]-categories. Independent evidence for this assumption can be obtained from data originally observed by Babby (1975), who notices that [+N]-categories in Russian can be Case-marked, while [-N]-categories cannot. The fact that adverbs in Russian can be Case-marked is illustrated by Em-phrases (comparable to English than NP): where Em NP can be replaced by a Genitive NP:

(19a) a. On rabotaet lučšе čem Ivan
he works better than Ivan
b. On rabotaet lučšе Ivanа

If čem is followed by an adverb, then the phrase čem adverb can
be replaced by the adverb in Genitive Case:
(20a) a. On govorit bol'še cem obyčno
  He speaks more than usually
b. On govorit bol'še obyčnogo
  He speaks more usually-Gen
'Speaks more than usually'
'Speaks more usually'-Gen
Since only [+N]-categories can be Case-marked in Russian, we conclude that adverbs belong to the [+N]-categories.' (1984:142)

2.4 'In this section we will assume a particular historical development of Russian (...) The gerund is an adverbial form, consisting of a verbal stem and an adverbial affix (...) Given the productivity of gerund-formation, and given its formal and semantic transparency, we will assume that the verb and the gerund are syntactically related. In (21) the dotted line indicates the boundary between syntax and morphology, i.e. elements on or above this line are visible to syntactic rules, elements below this line are not.

(21) v--- ------ ADV------ syntax-morphology boundary
    blagodar' -a
Notice that the V-node in (21) is visible in syntax, which implies that V governs its complements. In particular V can assign Accusative Case to an object NP.

Part of our explanation will also be the assumption that Russian went through two stages, where in stage I idiosyncratic blagodarja did not yet exist. Only the gerund blagodarja existed in this stage, and it had the structure of (21). At some point in this stage blagodarja acquired its idiosyncratic meaning 'thanks to' in addition to its regular meaning as a gerund. Of course, we cannot say why blagodarja acquired the idiosyncratic meaning, how it acquired it, or why this change happened at all. Assuming that it did, however, a number of interesting questions arise to which we do have a tentative answer. In particular one might ask how this new idiosyncratic blagodarja is incorporated in an internalized grammar in the next stage. Although formally related to the verb blagodarit', the semantic relationship between these two is not regular, but idiosyncratic, as formation of the new blagodarja from a verb like blagodarit' is unproductive. These properties suggest that idiosyncratic blagodarja is not syntactically, but morphologically related to the verb. To represent this, we may assume structure (21), but the boundary between syntax and morphology has been shifted upwards, as indicated in (22):

(22) --------ADV------ syntax-morphology boundary
    v--- ------ v
    blagodar' -a
We claim then that the gerund blagodarja is syntactically related to the verb blagodarit', while idiosyncratic blagodarja is morphologically related to this verb.' (1984:142-143)

2.5 'Notice one result from the historical change described here. In (21) the category V is visible in syntax, while in (22) this category is not. A NP-complement to blagodarja in (21) can receive Case from V, in particular it can receive Accusative Case. In (22), however, a NP-complement cannot receive Case from V (since V is not visible in syntax), but only from the higher Adv-node. Since adverbs in Russian are [+N]-categories, and given generalization (16), a NP-complement in (22) cannot receive Accusative Case. We propose that the shift of the syntax-morphology boundary is the reason why Accusative Case cannot be assigned by idiosyncratic blagodarja.

Since every NP must have Case due to the Case Filter (cf. Chomsky 1981), this reanalysis can take place only if the complement-NP of idiosyncratic blagodarja receives Case somehow, and as idiosyncratic blagodarja assigns Dative Case in Modern Russian, one might ask how this is assigned and why particularly Dative Case is assigned, and not some other. We can make two suggestions here. First, it might be possible that Dative Case is the unmarked Case for adjectives and adverbs to assign, just as Accusative Case is the unmarked Case for verbs in Russian and Genitive Case is the unmarked Case for nouns. Some evidence for this hypothesis can be found in the pair tobnit' (V: Accusative complement) vs. to'no (Adv: Dative complement), both meaning 'be nauseated'. If this hypothesis is correct, then idiosyncratic blagodarja will assign Dative Case automatically as soon as other Case-assignment options are unavailable. A second possibility to account for this Dative might follow from a theory of Inherent Case. Inherent Case is assigned by some element if it is specified idiosyncratically to this effect. Although the theory of Inherent Case must be specified for each individual Case-assigner, all sorts of (sub)regularities can be found in this domain. A theory of Inherent Case will capture these regularities and relate instances of assignment of a specific Case to semantic morphological and/or syntactic properties of the element. Given the fact that an adjective like blagodarnyj 'grateful', which shares many syntactic, semantic and morphological properties with blagodarja, takes complements in Dative Case, it will come as no surprise that idiosyncratic blagodarja also starts to assign Dative Case.' (1984:143-144)

2.6 'Summary
In this paper we have given an account of the development of blagodarja in Russian. By assuming that historical changes do not develop arbitrarily, but are constrained by properties of UC [Universal Grammar MPH] and by properties of language specific grammars, we were able to give an account of the properties of blagodarja in Modern Russian.' (1984:144)

3. DISCUSSION OF ODIJK 1984
3.1 (ad §2.1)
The assumption that blagodarja +D is an adverb is of crucial importance for Odijk's analysis. Therefore one would expect that
the categorial status of *blagodarja*D would be dealt with in a sound and principled way. It is not, as we shall presently see.

3.1.1 Before turning to the test proposed by Odijk (henceforth called 'n-test'), let us have a closer look at the last sentence of §2.1: 'We conclude that idiosyncratic *blagodarja* is an adverb, not a preposition'. The inference made here is obviously invalid. If the n-test makes it possible to decide whether or not a given form is a preposition, then it follows from the examples in §2.1 that *blagodarja*D is not a preposition, not that it is an adverb. Why not some other part of speech, e.g. a verb? Though Odijk's inadmissible inference would in itself be enough reason to lay his paper aside altogether (remember that all further steps hang on the hypothesis that *blagodarja*D is an adverb), we shall not do so. For the sake of the argument, I shall assume with Odijk that other categories than prepositions and adverbs are excluded.

Odijk's discussion of the categorial status of *blagodarja*D starts from (at least) the following two assumptions:

a) the existence of the categories 'preposition' and 'adverb';
b) the validity of the n-test.

3.1.2 Ad a) It is well-known that in traditional grammars adverbs constitute a morphologically and syntactically most heterogeneous category. As Issačenko puts it:

'So gleicht denn der dem Adverb gewidmete Abschnitt mancher Grammatik einer Rumpelkammer, in die man alle Wörter steckt, mit denen man nichts Rechtes anfängen weiss.' (1968:176)

Forms traditionally called 'adverbs' show more dissimilarities among themselves than common characteristics, and one even wonders if they have any common characteristic at all. Lyons is probably right that

'It is doubtful whether any general theory of syntax would bring together as members of the same syntactic class all the forms that are traditionally described as "adverbs"' (1968:326)

As regards Chomsky 1981, to which Odijk refers as the theoretical framework within which he is working, nothing is said about adverbs constituting a separate syntactic category (cf. also Babby 1975:84). It is not clear whether Odijk wishes to bring together all traditional 'adverbs' as members of the same class, but there can be no doubt about the following two points:

- he assumes, without any comment, a syntactic category 'adverb';
- he assigns to the category 'adverb' such forms as *tožno* (see §2.5) and *blagodarja*D, which are not (or not unanimously) regarded as adverbs in traditional grammars², therewith giving Issačenko even more reason for his qualification 'Rumpelkammer'.

Why *tožno* should be an adverb is not told at all, in the case of *blagodarja*D, as we have seen, the only justification is that, in Odijk's view, it is not a preposition. In this connection it is worth noting that the internal unity of the category 'adverb' has far-reaching consequences in Odijk's paper. To give only one example: in §2.3 Odijk's 'proof' that the adverb *obyžno* carries the feature [+N] is used as 'independent evidence' for the hypothesis that *blagodarja*D is also [+N].

3.1.3 Ad a) and b) It is clear that if Odijk says that prepositions, in contradistinction to adverbs and other parts of speech, have a certain 'idiosyncratic property', he must have some notion of what prepositions are, and that notion must be independent of the 'idiosyncratic property' referred to. Otherwise he would be saying something like 'words that take n-forms can be distinguished from other words by their taking n-forms', which would be an empty statement. In other words, even if one believes in the validity of the n-test, the grammatical categories must be regarded as fundamentally different things, and the n-test as based on a relatively superficial property of one of them. In view of the importance for Odijk's analysis of the assumption that *blagodarja*D is not a preposition but an adverb, one would expect him to justify his assumption in terms of fundamental properties of adverbs and prepositions. One would wish to be given solid reasons for believing that the distinction Odijk makes is not a trivial one, i.e. that the n-test really distinguishes between two grammatical categories and not merely between presence and absence of n-epenthesis. The following questions could be asked in this context:
almost all these 'secondary prepositions' began to take n-forms (in Hill's terminology: 'made the transition from apparent to actual status'). However, Hill observes that

'THE LAST TIME A NON-GENITIVE-GOVERNING PREPOSITION MADE THE TRANSITION FROM APPARENT TO ACTUAL STATUS WAS A CENTURY AGO (...)

(Compare this with the very large number of genitive-governing prepositions which have made the transition in the same period.)'

(1977:500, original capitals)

At the same time we see a growing tendency towards n-epenthesis after comparative adverbs and adjectives, which assign the genitive case (Hill 1977:201-220). Given this, it is doubtful whether the fact that such words as blagodarja' and soglasno do not take n-forms has much significance, or rather, whether it signifies what Odijk claims it does.

3.2 (ad §2.2)

It is questionable whether within the theories of Chomsky 1981 Odijk's examples (13)a-d contain any real instance of case-assignment by nouns. In (13)b, c and e, case is assigned by the verb that is present in D-structure (cf. Chomsky 1981:51), in (13)a and d the genitive is probably due to some general principle comparable to Chomsky's Genitive Rule and/or his of-insertion (e.g. John's reading the book, the city's destruction/destruction of the city; 1981:49-51). What remains to be explained, of course, is that somewhere in the derivation of such sentences as (13)d the accusative is blocked. Hence, Odijk's conclusion that 'nouns in Russian can assign Case, albeit non-Nominitive or -Accusative Case' lacks support. It is worth noting that, although Odijk is a generative grammarian, his reasoning is based entirely on the comparison of surface structures, without reference to their derivation.

I have two further remarks on §2.2:

- 'This seems to be falsified...' (2nd sentence). This assertion betrays careless reading on the part of Odijk. On page 50 Chomsky writes: 'In other languages [sc. than English HPH], categories other than [-N] are Case-assigners.'
- If (12)a kollektiv rabotaet is an example of Case-assignment by verbs (see however note 5), why not fill in (15)a by
devužka krasiva
girl beautiful
'the girl is beautiful'
(Not that the copula is not a full verb: Chomsky 1981:272; cf. also Babby 1975:76ff.)

3.3 (ad §2.3)

In §2.2 Odijk concluded (as we have seen on highly question-
able grounds) that [ +N ]-categories can assign case, but not nominative or accusative. In §2.3 he proceeds:

'Adverbs in Russian can assign Case, but not Nominative or Accusative. On the basis of this fact we assume that adverbs are [ +N ]-categories'

Odijk's inference is of the following type:

| tables have four legs |
| my dog has four legs |

my dog is a table

Now the reader might object that Odijk lives in a world where the only four-legged objects are tables, in other words that there are only [ +N ]- and [ -N ]-labelled forms and that [ -N ] being excluded, adverbs must be [ +N ]. However, such is not the case:

Chomsky 1981 also allows for forms labelled [ +V ], without reference to the feature [ +N ] (p. 55). The purpose of my remark is not to suggest that adverbs should be labelled [ +V ], but to show to the reader the inaccurate reasoning which is so characteristic of Odijk's article.

'Adverbs in Russian can assign Case, but not Nominative or Accusative. On the basis of this fact...'. What fact? The only examples of adverbs he has given us so far are lučče 'better' and blagodarja+D, the categorial status of which is under discussion in his paper. Apparently Odijk has not searched for adverbs with accusative complements. However, under his strict definition of prepositions (see §2.1), blagodarja+D is not the only form to 'become an adverb' because of the absence of n-epentheses; so do the other 'gerund prepositions', some of which take accusative complements, e.g. ̈

nas bylo ševero, ščitaja ego/*nego i ego ostra
us [gen.] was four counting him [acc.] and his sister
[acc.]

'we were four, counting him and his sister'

Now let us take a look at the 'independent evidence' Odijk gives. On the basis of the fact that the sentences on goverit bot'še ščem obyono and on goverit bot'še obyonymo are both correct in Russian, he concludes that adverbs can be case-marked. I have two remarks to make on this issue:

- The possibilities to replace ščem + adverb by 'the adverb in the Genitive Case' are very restricted in Russian. As a matter of fact, I have tried in vain to find another pair of sentences of the type presented by Odijk. In such sentences as

Ona pošt krasiva a on boсе ščem krasivo
She sings beautifully and he more than beautifully
On xorošo igraет a ona boсе ščem xorošo
He well plays and she more than well
On často xodit v teatr a ona boсе ščem často
He often goes to theatre and she more than often

replacement of ščem + adverb by a corresponding genitive form was not acceptable to my native informants.

- The fact that the sentences presented by Odijk are both grammatical in Russian does not imply that one is derived from the other (remember that such pairs of sentences are rare). Why should obyonymo not be the genitive neuter singular of the adjective obyonymj? Consider the following examples, in which, in contradiction to obyonymj-obyono, the adverb is not derived from the adjectival stem:

on vygljadit lučče ščem prežde
he looks better than before [adv.]

on vygljadit lučče prežde nego
he looks better than previous [adj.gen.neutr.sing.]

on vygljadit lučče ščem včerah
he looks better than yesterday [adv.]

on vygljadit lučče včera nego (colloquial)
he looks better than yesterday's [adj.gen.neutr.sing.]
I wish to stress that I am not aiming at refuting 'adventurous or bold ideas with unexplained data' (Chomsky 1982:45), but it is evident that saying 'If Ćem is followed by an adverb, then the phrase Ćem adverb can be replaced by the adverb in the Genitive Case' is obscuring the facts in an inadmissible way.

3.4 (ad §2.4)
Now that we are nearing the final part of Odijk's account, it is useful to return to the last of the three questions quoted in §1:

'(C) Why is there a difference in Case-assignment properties between these forms, although they have exactly the same form and are obviously both historically and synchronically related?'

I agree that the gerund blagodarja and blagodarja+D are obviously historically related. It would be too much of a coincidence if two homonyms with so similar meanings would have arisen independently of one another. But why are they 'obviously synchronically related'? Why should a synchronical grammar not accept two unrelated homonyms with an evident historical relationship? Must all historical relationships be accounted for in a synchronical grammar?

Even if we assume that both blagodarjas are synchronically related, the question remains strange, because Odijk, following Chomsky 1970, allows for a type of synchronical relatedness which he calls 'morphological relatedness' and which has no implication whatsoever for the syntactic environments in which the related forms may occur. So if we isolate the 'synchronic part' of Odijk's question (C), we see that 'why is there a difference in Case-assignment properties between these forms, although they have exactly the same form and are obviously synchronically related?' is answered by 'because synchronical relatedness does not necessarily say anything about case-assignment', which is rather an empty answer.

If we concentrate on the 'historical part' of Odijk's question (C), we see that 'why is there a difference in Case-assignment properties between these forms, although they have exactly the same form and are obviously historically related?' is an-

svered by: 'at some point in time blagodarja acquired its idiosyncratic meaning and the syntax-morphology boundary was shifted upwards, so that idiosyncratic blagodarja and the verb blagodarit' were no longer syntactically related'. The latter answer is less empty, but it is no more than a complicated way of saying what everyone had already guessed: at some point in time the gerund blagodarja acquired a 'second', idiosyncratic meaning, so that then there were two homonyms blagodarja. The 'second', idiosyncratic blagodarja became isolated from the paradigm of blagodarit'.

3.5 (ad §2.5)
Since from a synchronical point of view blagodarja+D is not in any non-empty sense a form of blagodarit', it is not self-evident that it should take the accusative case. On the other hand, as I have shown in §3.3 (šit'ja 'counting' with accusative), there is also no a priori reason why it should not assign the accusative (as a matter of fact, Hill (1977:221) and Čerkasova (1964:232) observe that in past centuries it often did).

Let us assume for a moment that there is a special reason why blagodarja+D should not assign the accusative case. Why does it assign the dative? Odijk gives two suggestions. The first ('the dative is the unmarked case for adjectives and adverbs to assign') is not sufficiently elaborated to say anything about it. Remember that in the present discussion we have seen adjectives and 'adverbs' with complements in all cases except the prepositional. Of course one can always call one of these cases 'unmarked' and the other ones 'marked'. It is not clear to me why especially tošno and tošnit', which appear in a very specific and limited type of construction (see note 2), should be examples of 'unmarked' case-assignment. The second suggestion ('inherent case') is a complicated way of saying that the case-assignment of blagodarja+D could be idiosyncratic and that related words are known to have related idiosyncrasies, which is not something new and for which we did not need the whole story about [+N] and [-N].
Perhaps the most striking thing about Odijk's 'explanation' of the historical development of blagodarja+O is that no use whatsoever is made of historical data. I even doubt whether he gathered any such data, because if he had, the problems to be solved and the type of answer to be found in his paper would probably have been different. From easily accessible sources he could have obtained the following information:

- In past centuries the verb blagodarit' has, at least for a certain period (late 18th and early 19th century), assigned both accusative and dative case. There has probably always been a statistical preference for the accusative. After approximately 1830, blagodarit' with dative case became obsolete.

- Prepositional blagodarja probably arose in the 18th century and was then predominantly used with the accusative. In the early 19th century use of the dative after prepositional blagodarja rapidly gained ground and after approximately 1830 prepositional blagodarja with accusative case became more and more rare. Thus, the dative after blagodarja+O is not a total surprise and we do not have to discover new principles of universal grammar to account for it. Apparently in the early 19th century there was a tendency toward reducing the case-assignment possibilities after blagodarit' and blagodarja (cf.Čekasova 1964:234). The question which remains to be answered is: why did, out of the two possibilities, prepositional blagodarja 'choose' the dative, whereas the verb blagodarit' 'choose' the accusative?

Although Odijk suggests that the crucial moment in the development of blagodarja is the moment when it acquired a second, 'idiosyncratic' meaning, the meaning of prepositional blagodarja does not play a central role in his explanation of the case assigned by it. Taking into account both the historical data and the difference in meaning between prepositional blagodarja and the verb blagodarit', one can think of another type of explanation than the type of explanation (unsuccessfully) aimed at by Odijk. I shall give an example of such an explanation here, without claiming, however, that it is more than a reasonable guess. No reliable answer can be given without extensive study of the meaning of the cases, the development of case-assignment and the normative tendencies in the 18th and 19th centuries.

The semantic relation between prepositional blagodarja and its complement is different from that between blagodarit' and its complement. The complement of 'to thank' is, to witness the predominant use of the accusative through the ages, regarded as a direct object in Russian. The complement of prepositional blagodarja, however, is not 'someone being thanked', but a person or thing that is considered the cause of a pleasant or unpleasant event. It can be imagined that in the early 19th century, when prepositional blagodarja was still associated with the verb, and for that verb both case-assignment possibilities were still extant, prepositional blagodarja developed a preference for the case which did not have the meaning 'direct object'\textsuperscript{ii}.

3.6 (ad §2.6)

As I have tried to show, the merits of Odijk's article must not be overestimated. Considering the title of the volume in which it was printed (Linguistics in the Netherlands), it is hardly a good advertisement for Dutch Slavistics and linguistics.

University of Groningen

NOTES


2 The form tožno appears in such sentences as me tožno

I [dat.] sick

'I am sick!'

About the categorial status of forms of this type discussion has been going on, according to Isačenko (1968:194), since Śperba 1928. The form blagodarja tu is, as we know, almost always regarded as a preposition.

3 E.g. blagodarjavšo, soglamo 'according to', podobno 'like'.

4 Comparative adverbs which sometimes take s-forms (cf. Hill 1977:201-220).

5 Neither is (12) an instance of case-assignment by a verb (cf. Chomsky 1981:52, 170, 259 ff.).

6 I wish to thank Mrs. O.H. Heuvelman-Godovikova and Mr. A.V. Parchomov for giving their native speakers' judgments on the Russian sentences presented in the present section.
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