Denis P. Kirianov, Maria G. Tagabileva

COMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES OF RUSSIAN VERBS OF REQUEST

Denis P. Kirianov[1], Maria G. Tagabileva[2]

COMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES OF RUSSIAN VERBS OF REQUEST

This paper describes the competition of complementation strategies of Russian verbs of request. We conducted a corpus-based study of six strategies of compelement encoding: infinitive, nominalisation, prepositional phrase with nominalisation, finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby*, non-finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby* (i.e. *čtoby* + infinitive), prepositional phrase with *čtoby* and expletive pronoun *to* (*o tom čtoby*). The results suggest that there are several factors influencing the competition under consideration (such as coreference of different participants, request dictance, etc.) and that these factors belong to different language domains, including semantics. This challenges the classic point of view according to which complementation studies should be focused primarily on syntax.

---

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Philology, student. E-mail: denkirjanov@gmail.com
[2] National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Philology, lecturer. E-mail: mtagabileva@hse.ru

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to the competition of complementation strategies of Russian verbs of request. For this study we shall define a complement as an argument with predicative meaning ([Khrakovskij 1985: 3]). As it is widely known, there are several ways of morphosynactic encoding of complements in the Russian language: "…they [*complements*] might be encoded by subordinate clauses: (51) *Znaju, [čto on prišel]*; prepositional phrases (52) *Znaju [o ego prihode]*, noun phrases (53) *[Tvoje prisutstvije] neobhodimo*, infinitival phrases (the example can be seen above). In the Russian linguistic tradition subordinate clauses of the first type are called complement clauses. Noun phrases in the role of complement usually have a deverbal noun as their head. Such nouns are called nominalisations" [Testelets 2001: 180][3].

Over the last few years studies of complementation have undergone a revival of investigations. The classic point of view (as expressed in, for example, one of the standard references on the subject – [Noonan 2007]) claims that complementation studies should be focused on morphology and syntax – so, according to Noonan, there are three main elements by which complementation types can be distinguished: morphology of the matrix predicate, internal syntax of a clause and external syntax a clause. However, some more recent studies argue there are many other factors influencing complementation and competition between various strategies of complementation. According to them, the role of semantics has been underestimated so far. For instance, the paper by Olga Pekelis [Pekelis 2014] refers to Talmy Givon's notion of semantic binding as to one of the important factors in complementation.

In this study we set out to answer the following questions:
- What are the factors relevant to the competition under consideration?
- What language domain do they belong to?
- Is there a hierarchy of these factors?

To our knowledge, the competition of different complementation strategies in Russian has not been studied in depth, though recently the topic has become more prominent (see, inter alia, [Letuchij 2011], [Zimmerling 2014], [Pekelis 2014]). Moreover, we are not aware of any papers devoted specifically to the verbs of request (except for the dictionary entry [Glovinskaja 2003]) and our research concerns also the semantic properties of such predicates, which makes it relevant for the description of the verbs of request.

Theoretical premises

We assume that nominalisations are deverbal nouns which meet the following criteria:

---

[3] Here and further the translation is ours – *MT, DK*

1) They are derived from a verb (and have the same root) according to those formal models, which are considered to be productive (according to the statistical data) in [Pazelskaja 2006: 101]:

«The following models turned to be productive:

- zero suffix, deriving masculine nouns (*udarit'* — *udar*) <…>;
- zero suffix, deriving feminine nouns (*uplatit'* — *uplata*) <…>;
- suffix *-ij(e)* (*dejstvovat'* — *dejstvije*) <…>;
- suffix *-k(a)* (*obrabotat'* — *obrabotka*) <…>;
- suffix *-stv(o)* (*ručat'sja* — *ručat'el'stvo*) <…>;
- suffix *-tsij(a)* (*evakuirovat'* — *evakuatsija*) <…>;
- suffix *-nij(e)/tij(e)* (*razrušit'* — *razrušenije*, *pribyt'* — *pribytije*) <…>»

2) Semantically: also following Pazelskaja 2006 (p. 25), we suppose that a nominalisation should have predicative semantics: so, for example, *vnezapnaja ostanovka* (a sudden stop) — is a nominalisation, while *avtobusnaja ostanovka* (a bus stop) is not. An overview of different kinds of homonymy of action nouns (i.e., nominalisations) and other participants (time, space etc. nouns) can de found in [Pazelskaja 2006: 25--26] (with a reference to [Apres'an 1974/1995: 193--199]).

We would also like to discuss the problem of the correspondence (that of aspect, first of all) between a nominalisation and its source verb. We think the issues of semantics and derivation are of particular importance here.

Semantically we share the theory of double motivation (see [Lopatin 1977: 96--104]), according to which most nominalisations can correspond to both members of an aspectual pair. However, we suppose this theory only to be correct from the point of view of semantics; as for the derivational aspect, we share the theory developed by Ilja Itkin, see below.

«Following the theory of double motivation, one could expect among the words ending in *tel'* and *-ij(e)* an enormous number of pairs of derivatives, which differ in the aspect of their motivating verb only. However, such pairs are rare [Šmeleva 1983: 16–18], and derivatives ending in *-ij(e)* and *–tel'* are motivated — sometimes in contradiction to their semantics — by perfective verbs, cf. *skazanije, ohlaždenije, sniženije, oslablenije, poklonenije, otčajanije, vospitatel', istrebitel', vyrazitel', predohranitel', uveličitel'* while there are no **skazyvanije, *ohlaždanije, *snižanije, *oslabljanije, *poklonjanije, *otčaivanije, *vospityvatel', *istrebljatel', *vyraža-tel', *predohranjatel', *uveličivatel'*. Taking this into account, we shall assume the following principle: a <u>deverbal noun is derived from a perfective verb if the contrary is not evident</u>» [Itkin 2007: 168]. According to Itkin, formally deverbal nouns are derived from the past passive participle, that's why they share the same vowel. [ibid.: 197].

For example, according to our theory nominalisation *rešenije* 'decision' can correspond both to the verb *rešit'* (which it is derived from), and to its aspectual pair - the verb *rešat'*. One more factor we took into account while trying to establish correspondence between a nominalisation and a verb is transitivity. Deverbal nouns can correspond not only to transitive verbs, but also to decausative ones (as well as to the verbs of other voices - reflexive, reciprocal, and so on) (see [Pazelskaja 2006: 83] with a reference to [Vinogradov 1947: 105]). According to this point of view, for example, nominalisation *razrušenije* can correspond to both the verb *razrušit'*, and the verb *razrušit'sja* (as well as to *razrušat'* and *razrušat'sja*, see above).

In order to determine the scope of research we first have to define which verbs constitute the semantic field of verbs of request. In the dictionary entry written by M. Glovinskaja for the "Novy Objas'nit'elny Slovar' Russkogo Yazyka (New explanatory dictionary of the Russian language, hereafter referred to as NOSS) [2003: 882-888 и 889-892] there are two synonimical rows which are of interest to us. The dominant of the first one is *prosit' 1.1* (the members of this row are the verbs *uprašivat'*, *umol'at'*, *molit'*, *zaklinat' 2*), while the second row has a dominant *prosit' 1.2* (this row is comprised by the verbs *vyprašivat'*, *kl'ančit'*, *vykl'ančivat'*, *vymalivat'*). These rows have the following definitions:

1. Prosit' 1.1 [PERF poprosit'], uprašivat' [PERF uprosit'], umol'at' [PERF umolit'], uncolloquial molit' [<…>PERF umolit'], archaic or lit. zaklinat' 2 [no PERF]: X asks Y to do P = "A person X wants P to be; X, thinking that a person Y can do P and not thinking that Y has to do P, tells Y, that he wants Y to do P; X says it in such a way that the adressee realizes that X doesn't think that he has to do P"
2. Prosit' 1.2 [PERF poprosit'], vyprašivat' [PERF vyprosit'], kl'ančit' [<…> PERF vykl'ančit'], vykl'ančivat' [PERF vykl'ančit'], vymalivat' [PERF vymolit']: X prosit P u Y-a = "A person X wants to have an object P; X, thinking that a person Y can give him or her P and not thinking that Y has to give him or her P, X tells Y to give him or her P".

According to the definitions above, the row of *prosit' 1.1* includes matrix predicates and therefore falls into the scope of our research, unlike the row headed with *prosit' 1.2*. However, if the very verb *prosit'* is employed in a sentence, then it is not always easy to define which meaning of prosit' is used. M. Glovinskaja uses 2 criteria in order to resolve this problem:

1) *Prosit' 1.2* doesn't denote an impulse to any actions, but for an action "to give something to a person": *on prosit čaju* 'he asks for tea'

2) If otherwise is not explicitly stated, *prosit' 1.2* denotes a person's request of an action in the interests of him or herself, cf. *prosit' hleba, pomošči<poščady>* vs *prosit' pomoč'<poščadit'>*.

So one can conclude that according to these criteria, usage of *prosit'* with nominalisations imply the meaning *prosit' 1.2*. However, in the conclusion of this entry the author says that *prosit'/umol'at'/...* o *vstreče/proščenii/poščade* (and other deverbal nouns) imply *prosit' 1.1*,

though such contexts are close to those of *prosit' 1.2*. We can agree that probably these two meanings of *prosit'* form a continuum (interestingly, the system of meanings numeration implicitly shows this continuum: *prosit'* – 1.1 and 1.2, although there are also other meanings: *prosit' 2* and *prosit' 3*), but we think the contexts of nominalisations are characteristic to *prosit' 1.1* and not to *prosit' 1.2*.

So the final list of the matrix predicates under consideration is as follows: *prosit', poprosit', uprašivat', uprosit', umol'at', umolit', molit', umolit', zaklinat'*. We can not agree with M. Glovinskaja that the verb *poprosit'* is an aspectual pair of the verb *prosit'*: we follow another position developed in Russian aspectology (see, inter alia, [Kn'azev 2008], [Bondarko, Bulanin 1966]). According to this position, there can be no aspectual pairs consisting of an unprefixed imperfective verb and a prefixed perfective one. However, the verb *poprosit'* undoubtedly belongs to the matrix verbs of request and therefore falls into the scope of the research.

2.   Data

Data samples were automatically compiled with the help of several queries to the Russian National Corpora (RNC, http://ruscorpora.ru). Then every sample was proofread: only those examples were left where the verbs of request were joined by genuine complements (as these were fewer than the initial number of sentences in every sample). There are several kinds of examples which we excluded:

1) The examples in which there is no syntactic complement. It happens in case if the predicates under consideration are employed as verbs of speech:

(1) — *Игрунчики, хохотунчики, везунчики, будь они прокляты…" — **заклинал** Пал Палыч, не оглядываясь.* [Олег Павлов. Карагандинские девятины, или Повесть последних дней // «Октябрь», 2001]

'Players, laughers, luckies, damn them!' - mutterd Pal Palych without looking back.

2) If the complement is pronominalized. The problem of when a complement can be pronominalised and what is the referent of the pronoun we have exluded from the data under consideration. This problem was studied by A. Letuchij ([Letuchij 2011]). Besides this, it is not always easy or possible to reconstruct from the context (even the expanded one) whether a complement or a noun was replaced by the pronoun; see (2):

(2) *Так если мне суждена смерть, прошу о чаше с цикутой. **Молю об этом**…* [Бахыт Кенжеев. Из Книги счастья (2007) // «Новый Мир», 2008]

So if death is my fate, I ask for a cup of water hemlock. I beg for it…

3) If the complement was not encoded in the way we were looking for:

(3) *Через полчаса Дом опустел от всех сторонних посетителей, кроме Райнера, которого Белоярцев **упросил** ночевать, чтобы посоветоваться.* [Н. С. Лесков. Некуда (1864)]

In half an hour the House became void of all the strangers but for Reiner whom Beloyarcev entreated to stay overnight to ask for advice.

This example was an element of the corpus output for the query *uprosit' + čtoby (1;3)*. However, here the complement is encoded with infinitive, while the *čtoby*-clause introduces a sentential adjunct. Having studied the samples we conclude that it is reasonable to distinguish several subtypes of complements introduced with *čtoby,* as they have a different structure and demonstrate different properties accordingly.

Based on the samples from the corpus, we establish six kinds of complement encoding:
- infinitive
- nominalisation
- prepositional phrase with nominalisation
- finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby*
- non-finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby* (i.e. *čtoby* + infinitive)
- prepositional phrase with *čtoby* and expletive pronoun *to* (*o tom čtoby*)

3. Results and discussion

Preliminary quantitative data

Table 1 presents preliminary quantitative data:

Table 1.

	Infinitive	Nom	PP+nom	*čtoby*-clause fin	*čtoby*-clause nonfin	*o tom, čtoby*
Prosit'	28625	664	543	1412	62	57
Poprosit'	11091	404	100	746	2	6
Molit'	425	0	314	317	13	30
Zaklinat'	190	0	0	10	0	0
Uprašivat'	535	0	3	75	1	0
Uprosit'	488	0	2	53	2	0
Umol'at'	1620	0	182	142	5	3
Umolit'	116	0	3	17	0	0

As it is obvious from the table:

- The most frequent strategy is the infinitival one, however, it is not always easy to define which strategy is the second frequent.
- Different verbs allow for different numbers of strategies: so, *prosit'* allows all the 6 strategies, while *zaklinat'* allows only two.

Diachronic data

We compiled a table showing the diachronic distribution of different complement encoding. We sorted these based on usage in texts from:

- the 18th century or earlier;
- the 19th century;
- the 20th century or later.

Additionally, for each verb (and each time period) we also counted the sum of all its usages with complements (i.e., as a matrix verb, if we exclude all the examples with pronominalized complements), and the overall frequency of the verb in a given period. Thus we observe changes across the time periods for each verb as a matrix predicate (rather than, for example, a verb of speech, which we have excluded from the present study, as noted above). Table 2 represents statistics for all verbs of request.

Table 2.

	Infinitive	Nominalisation	PP+nominalisation	*čtoby*-clause fin	*čtoby*-clause nonfin	*o tom, čtoby*
XX+XXI	42396	1034	846	2193	29	67
XIX	11870	29	299	563	48	28
XVIII	497	5	6	25	8	0

In table 3, we have broken down the data from Table 2 by verb and time period:

Table 3.

	century	Infinitive	nominalisat	PP+nom	fin *čtoby* -clause	non-fin *čtoby* -clause	PP + *čtoby* -clause	as matrix	total
Prosit'	XX+XXI	19169	635	485	1212	18	39	21558	44354

	XIX	9060	24	60	190	36	18	9388	24055
	XVIII	474	5	1	10	8	0	498	2365
Poprosit'	XX+XXI	9431	399	85	629	2	5	10551	20593
	XIX	1645	5	15	122	0	1	1788	4118
	XVIII	10	0	0	5	0	0	15	65
Molit'	XX+XXI	217	0	185	185	7	21	616	2277
	XIX	200	0	125	123	6	9	463	1942
	XVIII	8	0	4	6	0	0	18	184
Zaklinat'	XX+XXI	82	0	0	7	0	0	89	438
	XIX	106	0	0	3	0	0	109	257
	XVIII	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	14
Uprašivat'	XX+XXI	281	0	2	39	0	0	322	813
	XIX	252	0	1	34	1	0	288	633
	XVIII	2	0	0	2	0	0	4	10
Uprosit'	XX+XXI	245	0	2	25	1	0	273	532
	XIX	242	0	0	27	1	0	270	508
	XVIII	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	26
Umol'at'	XX+XXI	1286	0	86	88	1	2	1463	3882
	XIX	334	0	96	56	4	1	491	2400
	XVIII	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	22
Umolit'	XX+XXI	85	0	1	8	0	0	94	193
	XIX	31	0	2	8	0	0	41	159
	XVIII	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	7

We can conclude that the verbs under consideration can be split into three groups, based on the following synchronic and diachronic? properties:

1. The verbs of the first group (consisting of the verbs *umol'at'* and *umolit'* are now more often employed as matrix verbs; as for complement encoding, the perecentage of infinitive complements have grown over time, while *čtoby*-clause complementing strategies tend to be used more rarely;
2. The verbs of the second group, which includes *molit'*, *prosit'* and *poprosit'*, are now more often used as matrix. Infinitival complements become slightly less frequent, while *čtoby*-clause strategies tend to be used either with the same frequency or even somewhat more often.
3. The verbs belonging to the third group, including *zaklinat'*, *uprašivat'*, *uprosit'* are now less often employed as matrix, while the frequency of both infinitive and *čtoby*-clause complements doesn't change significantly.

There is a clear tendency to use infinitives with verbs of request most frequently, and increasingly so over time: for example, regarding texts created in the 18th century we can not always say that this strategy is the most frequent one, while such a statement would always be correct for a text created in the 21st century. The same is true for the verbs of permission, see [Kirjanov 2013], and maybe even for all matrix predicates in Russian as well (though for now the latter obviously lacks proof and needs further research).

As for the third group of verbs of request (and maybe the second one, see above), we have the following hypothesis: it seems that these verbs undergo a reanalysis and as a consequence, for some speakers, they gain another argument structure with only two arguments: an agent and an experiencer: *X uprašivajet Y*, while *čtoby*-clause is understood as an adjunct of purpose. As a consequence these verbs tend to be used as matrix verbs more rarely: they are perceived as non-matrix. So, for example, for the verb *zaklinat'* NOSS distinguishes the meaning *zaklinat' 1*: «to utter special magic words in order to influence the higher power or an object» [Glovinskaja 2003: 885]. As for the verbs *uprašivat'* and *uprosit'*, M. Glovinskaja mentions that «One can *uprašivat'*, if his or her request is not completed or if he or she hasn't got addressee's consent to fulfil it». So one can conclude that these (non-matrix) semes play a key role in some contexts, while a complement is omitted, and the *čtoby*-clause is used to encode a sentential adjunct, as in (4):

(4) — *Не хочешь за тридцать — снимай, я их по шестьдесят буду продавать, — сказал он и, присев, так рьяно стал хватать меня за ноги, что я вынужден был его **упрашивать**… чтобы не идти босиком по снегу.* [Виктор Слипенчук. Зинзивер (2001)]

'If you don't want [to buy them] for thirty, take them off, I'll sell them for sixty'- he said and, having sat down, began to grab my legs with such fury that I had to beg him…in order not to walk barefoot through the snow.

In order to check this hypothesis we employed tests from [Testelets 2001: 181-187]. However, they show ambiguous results: only one out of six criteria ("argument can be encoded with a limited number of ways") indirectly shows that we deal with an argument, while the others do not present valid evidence: both obligatoriness and the criterion of what governs the form of

the entity under consideration, as well as other criteria, depend on the zero hypothesis in many respects. Thus it is possible that *čtoby*-clauses employed with these three verbs are being under reanalysis. However, we need a survey of speakers in order to properly evaluate this hypothesis.

Let us further discuss parameters which influence the choice of encoding. We split the six strategies into three major groups as some of the strategies appear to show similar properties.

3.1 *čtoby*-clauses

All three strategies using this clause can appear under the following circumstances:

1) Request distance: if the request adressee is not the person who is to fulfil it, see (5):

(5) — *А потому,* — *говорит,* — *что он просит меня* **упросить Марию Федоровну, чтобы** **его назначили послом в Данию.** [С. Ю. Витте. Воспоминания (1911)]
'And this is – he says - because he asks me to beseech Maria Fedorovna that [they] appoint him an ambassador to Denmark.'

In this example the request is not given directly to the person who is thought to fulfill it: the request adressee is Maria Fedorovna, although it is not her who will appoint an ambassador. It is impossible to determine who will do so, as the subordinate clause is impersonal, but it is likely the government. This calls to mind Givon's notion of semantic binding: the two situations in (5) - request and appointment - are not bound closely, nor can one can reduce the second clause, which is why there is a clause introduced by a complementizer rather than an infinitive. Request distance can possibly be described as a property of the *čtoby*-clause as a complement encoding strategy in Russian (at least the same is valid for the verbs of permission, see [Kirjanov 2013]).

Here we should also note that, typologically, the distance (in our case it is instead the degree of participant's invovlement in a situation) is grammaticalized in some languages, cf., for example, causatives and double causatives in Turkic languages [Kulikov 1999]. Probably here we can observe a type of context in Russian where there is a subtle grammatical difference as well.

Different strategies employing *čtoby*-clause have various properties. Below we'll consider these strategies in turn.

3.1.1 Non-finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby*

Let us first discuss the most peripheral way of encoding, i.e., non-finite *čtoby*-clauses. There are only 85 examples of such clauses for all the verbs of request overall, and 62 of them are examples of the verb *prosit'*. Aside from the salient diachronic distribution (this strategy is the only one whose absolute number is less in XX-XXI centuries than in the XIX), we managed to find one syntactic property which favours the usage of this strategy: a non-finite *čtoby*-clause

is employed when the one who makes the request and the subject of the subordinate clause coincide:

(6) *Он даже притих и **попросил, чтобы самому нести** сумку со шторой, прижимал ту сумку к груди и нет-нет да залазил в сумку рукою, пальцами щупал красивую вещь.*

[Виктор Астафьев. Затеси (1999) // «Новый Мир», 2000]

He kept quiet and asked to let him carry the bag with the curtain himself, pressed that bag to his chest and put his hands into the bag from time to time to touch the beautiful thing with his fingers

There are 33 (40%) examples with this coreference, and the dative participant may be omitted in the dependent clause. The adressee of request is usually either omitted (as in (6)), or it is a deity, as in (7):

(7) *Скобелев выпил две чашки крепчайшего кофе, приказал окатить себя колодезной водой и, протрезвев, ускакал в штаб, **моля Бога, чтобы только не нарваться** на великого князя главнокомандующего.* [Борис Васильев. Были и небыли. Книга 2 (1988)]

Skobelev drank two cups of the strongest coffee, told to throw some well water on him, and having become sober, he leaped off to headquarters, praying God not to run into the Grand Duke commander-in-chief

The restriction is clear: the verbs under consideration are those of object control so the addressee of the request (which is encoded with accusative) should also be the subject of the subordinate clause. However, due to pragmatic reasons there can be examples like (8) with the past tense instead of the infinitive:

(8) *Я молю Бога, **чтобы** я еще прожил десяток лет, но если не выйдет это и я… кончусь или обессилю…* [Лидия Вертинская. Синяя птица любви (2004)]

I pray God to let me leave another dozen years, but if it doesn't succeed and I…shall come to an end and run out of power…

The problem of how long God will live cannot be a subject to be discussed, and although usually if there is a coreference between the one who makes the request and the subject of the subordinate clause *čtoby*-clause and infinitive are employed, this example is nevertheless acceptable. We conducted a brief survey of speakers in order to check acceptability of this example and found that not all the speakers regard this example as absolutely grammatical. Some of them suppose it would be better to say «*prosit'/molit' u Boga ješče 10 let žizni*», i.e. it's more felicitous for them to encode the subject of the subordinate clause (God) in a "proper" (prescriptive?) way. In modern Russian, if there is such a coreference, one can employ either the nominalisation strategy (however, not each verb can derive nominalisations due to morpho-phoonological restrictions), or the finite *čtoby*-clause using passive voice or subject-oriented impersonal in the subordinate clause: we discuss these and other properties of finite *čtoby*-clause below.

If the non-finite *čtoby*-clause is employed, then the topic of the request is usually some kind of modification (or, on the contrary, non-modification, preservation) of the given situation, but not an action (83,5% of examples show this tendency), as in (6) above.

Thus, the factors favouring the employment of non-finite *čtoby*-clause are:

1. Non-finite *čtoby-clause* is used when the subject of the main clause and the subject of the subordinate clause are coreferential;
2. Diachronically the strategy shows a decrease and synchronically it is virtually non-existent;
3. The subject of the request is usually some kind of modification (or, on the contrary, non-modification, preservation) of the situation in presence, but not an action.

3.1.2 Finite clause introduced with complementizer *čtoby* is used when

1) the adressee of the matrix predicate and the subject of the subordinate clause are not coreferential, e.g. (9):

(9) *А зачем?* ***Просить Гарденина****, **чтобы** все оставалось по-прежнему… Друг мой!*
[А. И. Эртель. Гарденины, их дворня, приверженцы и враги (1889)]
And what for? To ask Gardenin to let everything be the way it used to be?.. My friend!

In the contexts like (9) – provided that Gardenin is not a full controller of the situation – it is impossible to replace the *čtoby*-clause with one of the other strategies discussed above. It doesn't matter if the adressee of request in encoded with a PP headed by preposition *u* (this is a possible strategy if the matrix predicate is *prosit'* or *poprosit'*), or with an NP in accusative case. However, we should mention that in the examples having construction *prosit' u X, ctoby Y čto-to sdelal*, where X and Y are not coreferrential (there are few such examples, only about 10), in all the examples except one, the requestee (X) is God, who usually acts through somebody and rarely acts directly himself. If the infinitival strategy is used, then *prosit' u X* is employed more often: this probably means that the use of the preposition *u* with the verbs *prosit'* and *poprosit'* encode stronger controllers.

However, *čtoby*-clauses can be used in other contexts as well, see (10), where the adressee of the matrix predicate is coreferrential with the subject of the subordinate clause, and (11), where the adressee of the request is not explicitly mentioned:

(10) *Он воистину **заклинал** синюю мышку, **чтобы** она принесла им воды — и ему и отцу.* [Чингиз Айтматов. Пегий пес, бегущий краем моря (1977)]
He actually begged the blue mouse to bring him water – both him and his father.

(11) *Очень много руководителей различного ранга и различных сфер **просят**, **чтобы** на их нужды обратили особое внимание.* [Владимир Федоткин. Власть и оппозиция (2003) // «Советская Россия», 2003.07.03]
Very many managers of different level and from different spheres ask to pay their needs a special attention.

As for the first class of examples (such as (10)), as we already mentioned, it is possible that the *čtoby*-clause is perceived as an adjunct rather than as an argument. As for the second class of examples, there is an interesting fact concerning the voice of the predicate in the subordinate clause: in the majority of examples with *čtoby*-clause, if the addressee of the matrix

predicate is not present, the subject impersonal or the passive voice are used in the subordinate clause. We follow the definition of subject impersonal given in [Plungyan 2011: 201] "Constructions with this kind of argument are called <...> *impersonal*; we'll follow this term, although there is no «absence of a person» (and it is not necessarily a «person»), but there is rather inability or unwillingness of the speaker to mention the argument, in our case this argument is the subject." So the agent is deranked, and the addressee's attention is given to the patient: if, like in (12), the sentence with infinitive is used, then the addressee assumes there is a zero agent, see [Polinsky 2013].

(12) *Графиня, узнав о том, бросилась к ногам его, **просила отменить** ужасный приговор сей, сжалиться — не над нею, но над невинным младенцем, плакала, рыдала, но ничто не помогло, не тронуло варварского сердца его.* [Неизвестный. Истинное приключение благородной россиянки (1803)]

Having found out the truth, the dutchess threw herself to his feet, asked to cancel the awful sentence, to have mercy – not for her, but for the innocent baby, cried, but nothing helped, nothing touched his barbarian heart.

Below we show quantitative data, based on the first 100 examples of each verb we analyzed:

Table 4. Finite *čtoby*-clause and voice

	Subject impersonal and passive	Active
Request adressee is present	24	253
Request adressee is omitted	101	165

The number of examples where the addressee of the request is stated is almost equal to that where it is omitted (277 and 266 examples respectively). However, in the examples where it is omitted, agent-deranking strategies are employed more often than not (38% and 8% respectively).

(13) *Жрецы тотчас вывели его из храма и после просили государя, **чтобы не впускать** его ни в какое капище.* [М. Д. Чулков. Пересмешник, или Славенские сказки (1766-1768)]

The priests immediately led him out of the temple and afterwards they asked the sovereign not to let him enter into any heathen.

So one can conclude that the factors favouring the strategy under consideration are:

1) No coreference between the adressee of the request and the subject of the subordinate clause;

2) There is a need to topicalize patient (or to derank the agent), that's why passive or subject impersonal are often used.

3.1.3 Prepositional phrase and *čtoby*-clause

There is a restrictive modifier (*tol'ko/lish'/edinstvenno* 'only') in 11 out of 96 examples *of what?*, which comprise the sample of this strategy for all the verbs, see (14):

(14) *Я могу сказать, что если мне звонят, то просят только о том, **чтобы** суд повнимательнее подошел к рассмотрению дела.* [Наталья Козлова. Судебная ошибка возможна, но надо стремиться ее избежать (2003) // «Российская газета», 2003.03.02]

I can say that if someone calls me then they only ask the court to be most attentive while examining the case.

The speaker's desire to restrict the scope of his requests favours this strategy: only three out of 1000 examples with finite *čtoby*-clause have such a modifier.

So, the strategy with expletive pronoun and *čtoby*-clause (o tom, *čtoby*) is mostly used with restrictive modificator like *tol'ko* or *lish'* 'only': presumably it means that *čtoby*-clause doesn't have its own focus position. Other factors favouring the employment of this strategy are the same we mentioned for finite *čtoby*-clause: i.e., the request distance and agent deranking.

3.2 Nominalisations are employed under the following circumstances:

Some nominalisation are employed as a part of prepositional phrases more often than others, see table 5. We included into this table those nominalisations which are encountered more than 20 times overall.

Table 5. Nominalisations as members of prepositional phrases

	molit'	poprosit'	prosit'	umolit'	umol'at'	uprašivat'	uprosit'
poščada	116	1	26	0	35	1	0
proščenije	27	0	16	0	33	0	0
pomilovanije	14	1	15	0	20	0	0
spasenije	33	0	0	2	7	0	0
zaščita	9	0	8	0	8	0	0
vstreča	1	32	28	0	4	0	0
naznačenije	0	1	27	0	1	0	0

These 7 nominalisations cover about 40% (466 out of 1147) of all the examples with nominalisations (the total number of nominalisations employed in such contexts is 92).

One additional factor favouring this strategy is syntactic: the coreference between the requester and the beneficiary of the request. If otherwise is not stated, the beneficiary is one who makes a request, see (15). If the infinitive strategy is employed, then the beneficiary must be stated explicitly, see (16).

(15) *И когда к цветам подходил человек, который раньше ломал их, они начинали тревожиться, трепетать, **моля о пощаде**, и даже стрелки приборов дрожали вместе с ними.* [Студия «Вулкан» // «Трамвай», 1990]

When a man who had broken them before, went to the flowers, they started worrying, trembling, begging for mercy, and the needles of the devices were trembling together with them.

(16) *— Зато на том свете, у престола бога буду **молить о** спасении **его** души.* [И. И. Лажечников. Басурман (1838)]

However, in the next world at God's altar I'll pray for the salvation of his soul.

Another factor favouring these strategies is the employment of a quantifier. Quantifiers, due to their syntactic properties, can only be employed with noun phrases (and not with verbs or clauses), see (17):

(17) ***Просить о таком*** *распоряжении надо было опять-таки лично Комарова.* [В. Степанов. История одной приписки // «Человек и закон», 1978]

It was Komarov again who one had to ask for such a decree.

In sum, there are several factors which favour the choice of the strategies employing nominalisations:

- If the nominalisation belongs to a certain closed class of words (whose frequency is high enough compared to the frequency of the motivating verb), it's usually preferred to the correspondent infinitive. Such nominalisations are shown above in table 5;
- If there is a quantifier;
- If the person who makes the request is coreferential to the beneficiary of the subordinate action.

4. Conclusions

Having analysed the combinations of matrix verbs of request *zaklinat', molit', prosit', poprosit', umolit', umol'at', uprašivat', uprosit'* with different morphosyntactic kinds of sentential arguments, we come to the following conclusions:

1) It is reasonable to distinguish six strategies of complementation: finite *čtoby*-clause,

non-finite *čtoby*-clause, prepositional phrase with expletive pronoun and *čtoby*-clause, prepositional phrase with nominalisation, nominalisation and infinitival strategy.

2) a *čtoby*-clause is more likely to be employed under one of the following circumstances:

a) Request distance;

b) The speaker wants to topicalize the patient or to derank the subject;

c) Diachronically, many types of *čtoby*-clauses (particularly non-finite ones) decrease in frequency;

d) The object of request is usually not an action but rather a modification of the situation or, vice versa, the preservation of status quo.

The factor which makes the employment of non-finite *čtoby*-clause more likely is coreference with the requester or the subject of the dependent clause. The factor which favours the employment of prepostional phrase with expletive pronoun and **čtoby** is the employment of a restrictive modifier. A finite *čtoby*-clause is employed if there is no coreference between the recipient of the matrix verb and the subject of the dependent clause. It is possible that some matrix verbs under consideration are being reanalysed by speakers as those which have a sentential adjunct rather than an argument.

3) The nominalisational strategy is employed if:

a) the dependent verb belongs to a closed class: nominalisations derived from eight verbs totally cover 53% of employments of nominalisations;

b) a quantifier is used;

c) If the person who makes the request is coreferential with the beneficiary of the subordinate action.

4) The infinitival strategy is the most frequent and presumably the unmarked one. If the recipient of matrix clause and the subject of dependent clause are coreferrent, then this strategy will be used.

Thus, if one takes a larger view of complementation strategies with verbs of request, it is evident that the factors relevant to the competition of different types of encoding belong to different language levels, from morpho-phonology to discourse, and not only to morphology and syntax, as it was traditionally assumed. This fact should be taken into account in further studies on complementation, and might prove usefil in reconsidering some known facts.

References

Apres'an, Ju. 1974/1995, Leksicheskaja semantika. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Bondarko, A. & Bulanin, L. 1967, Russkij glagol. Posobie dlja studentov i uchitelej. Leningrad: Prosveshhenie.

Glovinskaja, M. 2003, Prosit' 1.1, uprashivat', umoljat', molit', zaklinat' 2. Slovarnaja stat'ja. // Ju. D. Apresjan (ed). Novyj objasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka. Izd. 2, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. Pod obshhim rukovodstvom akademika Ju.D. Apres'ana. Moscow: Shkola «Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury». Pp. 882-889.

Hrakovskij, V. 1985 (ed.), Tipologija konstrukcij s predikatnymi aktantami. Leningrad: Nauka.

Itkin, I. 2007, Russkaja morfonologija. Moscow: Gnozis.

Kirjanov, D. 2013, Konkurencija sentencial'nyh aktantov pri matrichnyh glagolah pozvolenija/zapreshhenija v russkom jazyke. BA thesis. Saint Petersburg. Manuscript.

Kn'azev, Ju. 2008, Glagol // Morfologija sovremennogo russkogo jazyka: uchebnik dlja vysshih uchebnyh zavedenij. Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskij proekt. Pp. 355 – 542.

Kulikov, L. 1999, Remarks on double causatives in Tuvan and other Turkic languages // In: Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 88. Helsinki. Pp. 49-58.

Letuchij, A. 2011, Pronominalizacija sentencial'nogo argumenta v russkom jazyke. // A. E. Kibrik & others (ed.). Komp'juternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye tehnologii: Po materialam ezhegodnoj Mezhdunarodnoj konferencii «Dialog» (Bekasovo). Moscow: RSSU. Pp. 403–414.

Lopatin, V. 1977, Russkaja slovoobrazovatel'naja morfemika: problemy i principy opisanija. Moscow: Nauka.

Noonan, M. 2007, Complementation. // In: Timothy Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description. Vol 2: Complex constructions. Cambridge: CUP. Pp. 42–140.

Pazel'skaja, A. 2006, Nasledovanie glagol'nyh kategorij imenami situacij (na materiale russkogo jazyka). PhD thesis, Moscow, Manuscript.

Pekelis, O. 2014, Infinitiv vs. pridatochnoe s sojuzom chtoby: k voprosu o vybore sposoba oformlenija sentencial'nogo aktanta v russkom jazyke. // Voprosy jazykoznanija, № 4. Moscow: Nauka.

Plungjan, V. 2011, Vvedenie v grammaticheskuju semantiku: grammaticheskie znachenija i grammaticheskie sistemy jazykov mira. Moscow: RSSU.

Polinsky, M. 2013, Raising and control. // In: M. den Dikken (ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax. Cambridge: CUP.

Shmeleva, E. 1983, Nazvanija proizvoditelja dejstvija v sovremennom russkom jazyke (slovoobrazovatel'no-semanticheskij analiz). PhD thesis, Moscow, manuscript.

Testelets, Ja. 2011, Vvedenie v obshhij sintaksis. Moscow: RSSU.

Vinogradov, V. 1947, Russkij jazyk. Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.

Zimmerling, A. 2014, Sententional arguments and event structure // V. P. Selegej & others (ed.). Komp'juternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye tehnologii: Po materialam ezhegodnoj Mezhdunarodnoj konferencii «Dialog» (Bekasovo). Moscow: RSSU. Pp. 754–775.

Denis P. Kirianov

National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Philology, student. E-mail: denkirjanov@gmail.com

Maria G. Tagabileva

National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Philology, lecturer. E-mail: mtagabileva@hse.ru