

JOEL LEVENBERG

University of Pittsburgh

"RESTRICTEDNESS" AS A SEMANTIC INVARIANT OF THE RUSSIAN INSTRUMENTAL AND SHORT ADJECTIVE

1. Among the Russian cases it is the instrumental which provides the clearest and most direct contrast to the nominative. As the case of the grammatical subject, and as the case of dictionary entries, the nominative denotes an entity perceivable independent of any particular described situation. The presence in Russian of an entire syntactic category of "nominative" sentences / *назменные предложения* /, sentences consisting of no more than a grammatical subject in the nominative without an accompanying predicate, i.e. sentences where the grammatical subject by itself is equivalent to an entire predication, and the stylistic function of this category to convey particularly vivid images / *Мелко, робкое дыхание* , ... /, demonstrates the ability of the nominative to depict an entity independent of any other predicational element. In other words, the nominative indicates that its referent is perceivable independent of any context.

The instrumental, in contrast, is the *moc* "predicative" of the Russian cases in that it limits the perception of its referent in some way to a particular situation, to a particular time or place, to a particular viewpoint. Outside that limited situation the instrumental referent is not perceivable. This restricted perception of the instrumental referent v. the non-restricted perception of the nominative referent is clearly seen in such minimal pairs as

1a/ Он был тогда студент.

1b/ Он был тогда студентом.

At that time he was a student.

where 1a indicates an unchanging characterization with no suggestion of cancellation, while 1b indicates a characteristic of the subject perceivable at a given time / *тогда* / and no longer¹.

Similarly, the use of the instrumental in the sentence

2/ Он здесь студентом.

He is a student here.

indicates that perception of the instrumental referent is restricted to a particular place, outside which the perception is cancelled. In both examples 1b and 2 the instrumental denotes a perception restricted to a particular described situation and then cancelled or replaced in an ensuing situation. The same connotation is seen in the phrase "бегать лесом" - "to run through the forest", where the instrumental referent is potentially replaceable. The phrase "летать, воздухом" - "to fly through the air" is impossible for the reason that the medium for performing the action is not replaceable². In other words, while it is possible to run through a forest, a field, an orchard, etc., it is impossible to fly through anything but air. In Russian the instrumental encodes precisely this potential replacement of its referent in an ensuing situation³.

One recent inquirer into the semantic structure of the Russian case system terms the semantic invariant which characterizes the instrumental "restrictedness". While not attempting to justify the application of this term to all uses of the instrumental, I believe that this term is particularly apt when applied to certain uses of this case, in particular the predicate instrumental, the instrumental of circumstance, and the instrumental after verbs of subjective perception and existence. The essence of these uses of the instrumental is impermanence, i.e. the limitation of the characterization denoted by the non-applicability of the instrumental characterization outside that particular situation. Thus the instrumental implies a "break" between perception of its referent within that situation and non-perception outside the situation. In the sentence

3/ Он будет профессором.

He will be a professor.

the use of the instrumental emphasizes the difference between a present situation /characterized by the "non-professor-ness" of the subject/ and another situation where the instrumental refe-

rent will be perceptually valid. The definition of the restrictedness feature emphasizes this break or cancellation of perceptibility: "The perceptibility of the relationships... is ... restricted to the actuality of the given relationship and marked for a cancellation which is to occur minimally at the moment this relationship is terminated"⁴.

Examples 1b, 2, and 3 present various ways of indicating a restricted "given relationship" /i.e. a described situation/ to which perceptibility of the instrumental referent is restricted. In establishing the parameters of such a situation an important role is played by categories traditionally termed "shifters". Such linguistic categories, whether **lexical** or grammatical, indicate the relationship between a particular described event and the participants in a particular speech event. Both lexical shifters, such as personal pronouns and adverbs of time and place, and grammatical shifters, such as the verbal category of tense, individuate both participants in the speech event and their relationship to the described event. Thus example 1b "Он был тогда студентом." the shifter "тогда" and the past tense of the verb locate the action temporally from the point of view of the particular speech situation. This done, the perception communicated by the instrumental referent is restricted to that individuated, limited situation. Similarly, in example 2 "Он здесь студентом." the shifter "здесь" locates the action spatially from the speaker's viewpoint. Thus individuated, the situation provides the background for perception of the instrumental referent. Since shifters present the described event through the "filter" of the participants in the speech event, they provide the once-occurring reference to a limited, bounded, bounded perceptual background necessary for the use of the instrumental. In other words, use of the instrumental is contingent upon creating within a universe of perception an area, restricted in one way or another, within which the instrumental referent is perceivable. Lexical shifters such as those cited above, which by nature describe the described event from the restricted viewpoint of the participants in the speech event, provide just such conditions for the operation of the instrumental. Outside this restricted viewpoint the

instrumental referent is not perceivable.

The same conditions are provided by the grammatical category of tense, which locates the action temporally from the point of view of the speech event. In example 3 "Он будет студентом ." and in the following example:

4/ Он был студентом.

He was a student.

the verbs provides the necessary "break" between the time of the speech event and the time of the described event. In other words the verb indicates a speech event non-co-occurrent with the described event. The use of the instrumental then restricts perception of its referent to the time of the described event. More importantly, the choice of the period of applicability of the perception of the instrumental referent is made from the subjective point of view of the participants in the speech event.

Verbs of subjective perception likewise lexically restrict the perception of the instrumental referent to the point of view of the speaker. In other words, they allow for potential disagreement from another viewpoint or from another speech event. In the sentence

5/ Он считается дураком.

He is considered a fool.

the validity of the quality assigned to the writer is restricted to the participants in the speech event. Similar in connotation is

6/ Михаил кажется хорошим студентом.

Michael seems to be a good student.

The validity of the assigned property is again restricted to the participants in the speech event.

Because of the "connotation of temporariness which /it/ lends to its referent"⁵, the instrumental often denotes a characteristic which is non-inherent, superficial, or limited in scope. Such is the case in the following examples, where the instrumental referents are adjectives:

7/ Председатель объявляет собрание открытым.

The chairman declares the meeting open.

8/ **Эта теория остаётся недоказанной.**

This theory remains unproven.

9/ **Иван выглядит здоровым.**

Ivan looks healthy.

In these cases the instrumental case of the referent emphasizes the nature of the characteristic or that characteristic is perceivable upon a mere superficial inspection of the modified noun.

2. Within the category of the adjective the instrumental encounters competition from another form which likewise denotes a limited, restricted, or situationally perceivable quality, namely, the short form. As is generally known, in modern Russian the short adjective is restricted syntactically to the predicate, this providing the speaker with a choice of long v. short form not permitted in the attributive position, where only the long form occurs. The question then arises as to what factors condition the choice of long or short form in the predicate. In the view of the present writer the choice is based on one particular semantic criterion, namely the restricted/non-restricted nature of the quality assigned to the modified noun. In other words, an adjective, as a modifier, creates a subset of the set defined by the modified. In the phrase "красная книга" the adjective creates a subset, a segmentation, of the universal set defined by the modified noun. Similarly, in the sentence

10/ **Профессора умные.**

The professors are intelligent.

where the adjective appears in the predicate, the adjective segments the set defined by the modified. The essential difference between attribution and predication apparently involves a difference in the order of operations involved in this segmenting process: attribution involves a presupposed segmenting quality, i.e. the quality determining the subset, and then superimposing that quality on a particular set; predication involves a presupposed set which is then segmented. In attribution the set to be segmen-

ted is new information; in predication the segmenting factor is new information. In the phrase "красная книга" a presupposed factor of redness is imposed on the set of books; in the phrase "красная книга" /which may or may not be an independent predication/ the set of books, initially perceived as existing independent of modification, is segmented by the factor of redness.

The difference between long and short form in predication involves a difference in the way the new information, the modifier, segments the modified. The short form in essence places, a constraint on the application of the modifier to the presupposed set, while the long form makes no statement as to its applicability. In other words the short form indicates that while the set defined by the modified is indeed segmented, the segmentation is obligatorily conditional, restricted, or limited to a particular circumstance. The long form makes no statement as to the conditional nature of the segmentation. The short form, therefore, presents a quality which is valid situationally; the long form begs the question of placing constraints on the quality presented.

Such connotations of the long and short forms are most clearly seen in such minimal pairs as:

- 11a/ Иван болен. Ivan is sick.
11/b Иван больной. Ivan is a sickly person.

In 11a the quality imparted to the modified is seen as a function of a particular time or situation, while in 11b no restriction is placed on the perception of the adjective quality: the intersection of Ivan and the quality of sickness is made independent of any particular situation. The long adjective is therefore often used to impart an inherent, essential characteristic to the modified, while the short form, denoting a situationally-bound quality, imparts a quality seen as non-inherent, ephemeral, or superficial.

It is precisely the function of the so-called adjectival complements to indicate the parameters or boundaries of the situation within which the quality denoted by the short adjective is perceived⁶.

In the sentence

12/ Профессор доволен результатами эксперимента.

The professor is satisfied with the results of the experiment.

the validity of the quality of satisfaction manifested by the professor is restricted to the adjectival complement "результатами".

In any situation not related to this adjectival complement the quality is not perceivable in conjunction with the modified. Regardless of whether the adjectival complement is stated syntagmatically, cf.:

13/ Профессор доволен.

The professor is satisfied.

the essential characteristic of the short adjective, the application of its referent in a particular, limited situation, is no less evident: the professor is characterized as not universally, objectively satisfied, but satisfied in a given situation.

Similar in operation is the short adjective согласен:

14/ Мы все согласны с вами.

We all agree with you.

in which the prepositional phrase acts as a constraint on the application of the adjectival quality: "We are all in agreement /as far as you are concerned/." In this case again the adjectival complement need not be stated; the temporary, restricted nature of the imparted quality is retained.

Not all short adjectives operate in this way. In the sentence

15/ Сын похож на отца.

The son looks like his father.

the prepositional phrase, as in the above examples, sets up the parameters, i.e. the limits, within which the adjectival referent applies. Due to the lexical meaning of the adjective, however, the complement may not be omitted.

Replacement of the short adjective by the long form lifts

any obligatory constraint on the perception of the adjectival referent. In other words the adjectival quality is potentially applicable to the modified noun independent of any particularizing context. The long form thus obtains the nuance of an inherent, essential characteristic of the modified. Compare:

16a/ Техас богат нефтью.

Texas is rich in oil.

16b/ Лаврентий Павлович - богатый.

Lavrentij Pavlovic is a rich man.

17a/ Директор доволен планом.

The director is satisfied with the plan.

17b/ Степан Дмитриевич - довольный.

Stepan Dimitrjevich is a satisfied man.

In those cases where the long and short forms of a particular adjective are said to have different meanings, the same distinction applies: the long adjective characteristic is potentially perceivable independent of any given situation; the short adjective implies a characteristic perceived situationally. Regarding the adjective готов/ый/, the 17-volume Academy Dictionary prefers the use of the short form in the meaning "ready to be used:"

18/ Лошади готовы: пора, сударь, ехать.

/Aksakov/

The horses are ready to go; it's time to leave, sir.

19/ Самовар тебе готов - сказал он . . . пойдём чай пить.

/Turgenev/

The samovar is ready for you, he said. Let's go drink some tea.

The long form is used in the meaning "ready-to-wear /clothing/":

20/ Все пальто были готовы, получше.

All the coats were ready-to-wear, a little bit better.

Similarly, the short form намерен denotes a quality of the modified valid only within the parameters indicated by the verb

following in the infinitive:

21/ Командующий фронтом лично намерен прибыть сюда.

The front commander intends to come here in person.

The long form намеренный, on the other hand, describes a quality of the modified perceivable regardless of any particular situation. Likewise прав indicates correctness, i.e. rightness /in a given situation/; правый indicates rightness /of a hand, eye, leg, i.e. non-restricted rightness/. The short form плох indicates serious, hopeless illness, while the long form плохой denotes badness as an internal characteristic.

Like other short adjectives должен denotes obligation in relation to a particular circumstance:

22/ Пётр должен завтра приехать.

Peter is supposed to arrive tomorrow.

As with the above adjectives, the quality imparted is limited to the circumstances stated in the described event, i.e. Peter's obligation is limited to his arrival. In

23/ Ивану нужна книга.

Ivan needs a book.

the quality of necessity which is manifested through the book is restricted to Ivan, i.e. the book is required, but only as far as Ivan is concerned. This example as well as

24/ Ивану нужно поехать в Москву.

Ivan needs to go to Moscow.

leads us to consider the entire range of impersonal sentences known under the general rubric "категория состояния". Are the forms in -о in such sentences as

25a/ Ивану холодно. . Ivan feels cold.

25b/ Ивану грустно. Ivan feels sad.

25c/ Ивану весело. Ivan feels gay.

26/ Кататься весело.

It's fun to go driving.

to be considered adjectives, adverbs, or do such forms comprise their own "category of state"? Vinogradov emphatically defends their constituting a separate category, while other researchers, e.g. Babby, deny the existence of such a category and include such forms in the category of short adjectives on syntactic grounds⁷. A third researcher, Gustavsson, claims that in sentences like example 26 the neuter form is to be considered a short adjective, since the instrumental is equally possible after infinitives, while in sentences like examples 25 a-c the -o forms are not adjectives, since the instrumental is not possible in this environment⁸.

Vinogradov divides the -o forms into four types:

- 1/ words denoting a feeling, an emotional or psychological state: грустно, печально, весело, страшно, смешно, тревожно, etc.,
- 2/ words designating a physical state resulting from external feelings and perceptions:
голодно, жекотно, дурно, горько, тепло, холодно, etc.,
- 3/ words designating natural states:
сухо, темно, светло, холодно, etc.,
- 4/ words denoting the state of one's surroundings:
тумно, уютно, удобно, etc.⁹.

In the opinion of the present writer the common denominator of these types is their replaceability. In other words, these modifiers, like other short adjectives, indicate a qualification, a segmentation which is restricted to a particular circumstance and which is cancelled or replaced outside those circumstances. In other words these words in -o constitute not a separate category of state, but are simply a group of modifiers which, like other short adjectives, indicate circumstantially valid, situationally limited characterizations. From a structural point of view the only difference between

27/ Холодно мне.
I feel cold.

and

28/ Студенты рады мне.
The students are happy for me.

is that example 28 contains an explicit modified noun. Both sentences contain predicates of identical structure: a short adjective, implying a situationally restricted modification, and an element in the dative which states the parameters of the restricted situation. Why the neuter gender plays such an important role in sentences like example 27 is a question yet to be resolved, and which will be addressed by the present writer.

All four of Vinogradov's types describe qualities by nature limited temporally, spatially, or to the viewpoint of the particular speaker. In addition, there is an element of substitutability in these types similar to the substitutability seen in the instrumental type "серая зюк", where use of the instrumental is predicated on the substitutability of its referent. Likewise, the short adjectives in o refer to states or conditions of impermanent, hence episodic, validity. In other words, in a sentence of the type

29/ В комнате было темно.

It was dark in the room.

not only is the quality imparted by the adjectival referent restricted spatially, it is additionally restricted to the given situation. The room was not always, inherently dark, but dark only in a particular set of circumstances.

The restricted nature of the modification indicated by the short adjective may be evident in another form, namely the past tense. As a shifter, the category of tense characterizes the narrated situation from the point of view of the speech event, i.e. the temporal location of the narrated event is made from the subjective point of view of the participants in the speech event. Such a restricted modification would be indicated by the use of the short adjective forms in the marked tense.

What is proposed here is that the past tense form is simply a short adjective, indicating that the modification of the verbal process is restricted to the participants in the speech event. Implied in this point of view is a potential juxtaposition of the past tense form not only to the non-past, but also to the long form of the adjective. An a tergo dictionary of Russian

lists approximately 500 long form adjectives of the type *быва-
ли, бывали, бывали,* etc., which indicates the validity
of the proposed juxtaposition.

The association of the short form of the adjective with the
category of verb is not new in Russian linguistics. Šaxmatov
terms the short adjective a conjugated form¹⁰. Babby sees all
adjectives as underlying verbs with an additional +ADJ feature¹¹.
What is proposed here is that the past tense form is simply ano-
ther manifestation of the short adjective, and demonstrates the
same semantic property seen in other reifications of this form,
namely, indication of a modification restricted circumstantially
or situationally.

The loss of declension by the short adjective may be another
phenomenon connected to this semantic common denominator. In the
course of its historical development, Russian has retained and
even expanded the extent of inflection. On the other hand, inf-
lection has been curtailed in three categories characterized
by situational modification: the short adjective, the short com-
parative, and the verbal adverb. Each of these categories desc-
ribes a modification which is limited to circumstances contain-
ed in the described event or to the speech event. The nature
of the restrictedness indicated by the short adjective has been
examined at length; the short comparative, restricted syntacti-
cally to the predicate like the short adjective, represents a
juxtaposition of two entities lasting no longer than the speech
event itself. The situational nature of this juxtaposition is
signaled by its non-inflection for either gender or case. The
verbal adverbs, historically the short forms of the present and
past active participles, have become invariant forms like other
adverbs.

3. Up to this point the manifestation of the restrictedness
feature in the instrumental and in the short adjective have been
treated separately. It is now important to ask whether there is
any systemic difference in the type of restrictedness which sur-
faces in each form. This question is especially pertinent when
one considers the variations in adjectival forms which may
potentially follow the linking verb *быть*. In the example

30/ Когда я был молодым/молод, мы жили в Москве.

When I was young we lived in Moscow.

we are faced with a choice of instrumental form v. short form. Both forms are characterized by restrictedness. Is there a difference in the type of restrictedness imparted by each form which surfaces in the speaker's choice of one form over the other? What factors condition this choice?

An exhaustive study by Gustavsson points to several stylistic and syntactic criteria which affect the choice of the adjectival predicate form. These criteria include choice of style /literary/ bookish v. colloquial/, the particular form of the linking verb in a given predication, presence/absence of an adjectival adjunct, the nature and grammatical form of the subject, the nature of the predicate, and word order. It is impossible to recapitulate Gustavsson's results within the scope of the present study; suffice it to say that the choice of adjectival form is based on a subtle interplay of all the aforementioned factors. Hence no hard and fast rules are possible: "All we can speak of is a varying predilection for a certain form in a certain context"¹².

While not disputing the relevance and importance of Gustavsson's study, I suggest that the difference between the instrumental and the short form may be semantic, rather than syntactic. Is it the adjectival modification itself which is restricted, or is the restricted element the speaker's perception of that modification? In my opinion the instrumental form indicates that the restricted element is the perception of the speaker. In using this form the speaker informs the addressee that while the adjective may or may not present an inherent or permanent quality of the modified /hence the long form/, the imparted quality is perceivable only from a particular vantage point. In example 30 use of the instrumental would indicate that youth was a potentially inherent property of the modified, but that its perception was restricted. The short form, in contrast, would indicate that the restricted element is the actual adjectival quality. In using the short form the speaker merely comments on the nature of the modification process without reference to the

perception of that process. This would explain perhaps, the use of adjectival complements with the short form more frequently than with the instrumental.

This interpretation of the difference between the instrumental and the short form is based on the fact that the speaker plays a dual role in any communicative act: he is on the one hand an observer of the described event, and on the other hand a commentator on that event. The existence of two manifestations of the feature restrictedness within the category of adjective points to one way in which Russian encodes these distinct roles.

NOTES

- ¹ C.H. Van Schooneveld, Semantic Transmutations /Bloomington, IN: Phylssardt, 1978/, p.208
- ² Ibid., p.209
- ³ See also: J. Levenberg, "A Semantic Analysis of Aspect in Russian and Serbocroatian" /Diss., Indiana University, 1980/ p.160
- ⁴ Van Schooneveld, p.124
- ⁵ Ibid., p.210
- ⁶ See: A. Nakhimovsky and R. Leed, Advanced Russian /Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1980/, pp. 207-212 for a discussion of adjectival complements
- ⁷ Leonard Babby, A Transformational Grammar of Russian Adjectives /The Hague: Mouton, 1975/, p.17n
- ⁸ Sven Gustavsson, Predicate Adjectives with the Copula byt' in Modern Russian, tr. Charles Rougle /Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1976/, pp.10-11
- ⁹ V.V. Vinogradov, Russkij jazyk /Moscow: Vyssaja skola, 1972/ pp. 324-325
- ¹⁰ A.A. Šaxmatov, Sintaksis russkogo jazyka /Leningrad: _____, 1941/, p.190
- ¹¹ Babby, p.32 sqq

¹² Gustavsson, p.383

"RESTRYKCYJNOŚĆ" JAKO INWARIANT SEMANTYCZNY ROSYJSKIEGO NARZĘDNIKA I FORM KRÓTKICH PRZYMIOTNIKÓW

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule semantyczna cecha restrykcyjności jest przedstawiona w odniesieniu do kategorii gramatycznych rosyjskiego narzędnika i przymiotnikowych form krótkich; rozważa się także jej możliwą egzemplifikację w kategorii czasu przeszłego. Istotny problem stanowi też różnica semantyczna pomiędzy formą krótką a narzędnikiem formy pełnej przymiotnika w orzeczeniu; autor konstatuje, że wybór jednej z nich w zdaniu uzależniony jest od szeregu różnorodnych czynników o charakterze semantycznym, stylistycznym i gramatycznym.