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Plenary talks
Conceptual flooding: A discourse-cognitive approach using Market Basket Analysis

Masako Fidler¹ and Václav Cvrček²
¹Brown University, USA; ²Charles University, Czech Republic

As cognitive linguistics expands its scope of investigation it has brought many insights into political discourse (Cienki 2013) which is analyzed e.g. with the help of metaphor (Zinken 2003, Lakoff and Wehling 2016). Cognitive linguistics is also combined with Critical Discourse Analysis to study discourse that manipulate power (Hart et al. 2005).

This study is an attempt to show how cognitive linguistic approach could benefit from incorporating a data-mining technique called Market Basket Analysis. MBA was originally used in marketing to discover associations between items customers are likely to buy together, e.g. “customers who bought X and Y also bought Z”, i.e. $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$. We use this method after extracting keywords (KWs), i.e. prominent linguistic units extracted from a corpus via keyword analysis (Scott 2010: 43), to identify recurring and widespread conceptual associations (associative links, ALs) in the “antisystem” (ANTS) media class. ANTS is defined by the algorithm that measures social media preferences developed for Czech web portals by Josef Šlerka in his project Mapa médií (http://www.mapamedii.cz/mapa/navstevnosti/index.php). ANTS are on the fringe of the Czech media, unlike e.g. the center-right (CR) media class, the mainstream media class.

MBA reveals that ANTS, unlike the mainstream news-reporting portals, loosely links a large number of disparate concepts. For example, dominant mainstream ALs involving migrant or migration usually contain also KWs related to news events, e.g. European (adj), migrant, summit $\rightarrow$ of migration (adj) or Italian (adj), migrant $\rightarrow$ boat. On the contrary, ALs that are drawn from ANTS contain much less expected associations, such as media, Germany $\rightarrow$ migrant; Europe, our $\rightarrow$ migrant; migrant, Russian (adj) $\rightarrow$ Russia; and migrant, USA $\rightarrow$ Russia.

These seemingly unrelated concepts nonetheless consistently lead to a limited set of implicit ideas. Thus, e.g., the articles may deal apparently with multiple topics, these topics are essentially used to present the future downfall of the EU, the apocalyptic future, and global conspiracy. Our hypothesis is that Conceptual Blending Theory (Fauconnier 2002) could be productively used to account for this discourse feature of “flooding.”

The data will be drawn from the Czech antisystem media class from 2017-2018, the period of migration crisis when displaced people fled to Europe to seek asylum.
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Nominal causal constructions across Slavic: competing cognitive schemata

Sergey Say
Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences

Nominal causal constructions are constructions in which the causing event is expressed by a noun phrase, such as ‘They trembled with fear’ or ‘I missed my train because of my son’. In the Slavic languages, nominal causal expressions are marked by prepositions or sometimes by cases. The choice of the specific marker typically reflects one of a few universally attested cognitive schemata, such as SOURCE OF MOTION or INSTRUMENT, as manifested in the polysemy of specific markers involved. Although some types of semantic contrasts are attested in the Slavic languages across the board (e.g., the contrast between direct and indirect causes), individual Slavic languages also differ in the specific ways in which they differentiate between subtypes of nominal causal meanings. In my talk, I will elucidate these differences drawing on data from a parallel corpus (PARASOL). In particular, I am going to introduce a distance metric based on Mutual Information, and argue that areal convergences among Slavic languages are no less significant than similarities attributed to their genealogical relationships.
The Quantitative Turn Towards Teaching Languages

Steven Clancy
Harvard University

There is a long tradition in Slavic linguistics and cognitive linguistics of adapting our theoretical understanding of language for pedagogical purposes and this is no less true in times of exciting new technologies. Nevertheless, the question remains of how to most effectively adapt findings in cognitive linguistics for an audience of language learners and how to avoid merely turning to technology because it is there. In this talk, we will present some new approaches to language teaching stemming from work in linguistics that effectively integrate the “quantitative turn” in language teaching inspired by cognitive linguistics. We will explore the tools in the Visualizing Russian project (Clancy 2014-202: http://visualizingrussian.fas.harvard.edu), the SMARTool (https://smartool.github.io/smartool-rus-eng/), and the Russian Constructicon (https://constructicon.github.io/russian/) and see how they integrate with two new textbooks for Russian language study: Foundations of Russian (Clancy, Egorova, Green, Willis forthcoming) and Min russiske reise (Nesset, Sokolova, Bjørgve, Kosheleva, Zhamaletdinova forthcoming).
General session
Different Types of Russian Adjectival Polysemy in the Mental Lexicon

Valentina Apresyan\textsuperscript{1}, Anastasia Lopukhina\textsuperscript{1} and Maria Zarifyan\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{1}HSE University, Russia; \textsuperscript{2}University of Potsdam, Germany

The mechanisms of polysemy have enjoyed considerable attention in cognitive linguistics. The two best-researched semantic shifts are metaphor and metonymy. While recent theoretical research focuses on fine gradations and different subtypes within each shift, psycholinguistic research addresses the differences in the storage of metaphor-based and metonymy-based word senses in the mental lexicon. The bulk of experimental research considers nominal and sometimes verbal, but not adjectival polysemy, and does not take sufficient notice of the existing fine-grained classifications of semantic shifts.

The current study approaches adjectival polysemy from a theoretical and corpus perspectives. We focus on the mental representation of different metonymic types in Russian adjectives. Our hypothesis is that semantically different types of adjectival metonymy behave differently with respect to semantic clustering tasks, and that metonymy is not a homogeneous phenomenon with regard to its storage in the mental lexicon. We expect that metonymies with greater semantic shifts from literal senses are stored separately, while closer metonymies are stored together with literal senses. We also expect to find differences in the perception of metonyms derived via regular vs. irregular polysemy. Finally, we expect respondents’ judgments to be affected by the experimental design. Namely, in the semantic clustering task judgments regarding the same type of metonyms may be affected by other simultaneously presented stimuli. We expect close metonyms to be grouped separately from literal senses in the presence of other close metonymcs (eye-sharpener effect os subtle semantic distinctions), but to be grouped together with literal senses when presented with metaphors (eye-blinder effect of striking semantic distinctions).

Close metonymy is represented by the shift \textsc{PROPERTY OF A PERSON} – \textsc{PROPERTY OF A PERSON’S PART OR ACTION}: \textit{umnyj chelovek} ‘intelligent person’ => \textit{umnye glaza} ‘intelligent eyes’; \textit{umnyj chelovek} ‘intelligent person’ => \textit{umnoe povedenie}.

Far metonymies are \textsc{STATE OF A PERSON} – \textsc{OBJECT CAUSING STATE}: \textit{grustnyj chelovek} ‘sad person’ => \textit{grustnaja pesnja} ‘sad song’; \textsc{PROPERTY OF AN OBJECT} – \textsc{STATE CAUSED BY PROPERTY}: \textit{molochnyj sup} => \textit{molochnaja allergija} ‘milk.ADJ soup’ => ‘milk.ADJ allergy’; \textsc{STATE OF A PERSON} – \textsc{TIME PERIOD CHARACTERIZED BY STATE}: \textit{golodnyj chelovek} ‘hungry person’ – \textit{golodnyj god} ‘hungry years’.

Our results indicate that metaphorical meaning in a set of stimuli indeed has a mitigating effect on the ability of respondents to distinguish between literal senses and close metonymies, while the presence of two close metonyms in a set of stimuli has a boosting effect on the respondents’ ability to distinguish between direct and metonymy-based meanings. Thus, decisions concerning the same types of semantic shifts differ in different groups of stimuli. We also demonstrate that far metonymy is less frequently grouped together with literal senses than close metonymy, but more frequently than metaphor. An individual assessment of our stimuli shows that this
distinctive behavior is most pronounced in one type of far metonymy, namely, *molochnyj sup* => *molochnaja allergija*, which represents a rare and irregular shift in Russian. Thus, far metonyms derived via irregular metonymy are perceived as more distinct from the literary senses than far metonyms derived via regular metonymy.
Conceptualizing body parts in the mirror of physical contact verbs: argument expression and semantic shifts

Valentina Apresjan¹,², Alexei Shmelev²,³

¹HSE University; ²Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences; ³Moscow Pedagogical State University, Russia

The work examines the semantic effects arising with different expressions of the Possessor and Part arguments in the Russian verbs of physical contact (tselovat’ ‘to kiss’, obnimat’ ‘to hug’, gladit’ ‘to stroke’, etc.). They allow different morphosyntactic expression: PossessorACC with varying Part expression (gladit’ rebenka ‘childACC po golove ‘headDAT’), PartACC with PossessorGEN (tselovat’ ruki ‘handsACC zheny ‘wifeGEN’), PossessorDAT with PartACC (tselovat’ zhene ‘wifeDAT ruki ‘handsACC’).

As the corpus study shows, each of the possible argument expression models is a construction with preferred lexical filling. The model tselovat’ XACC v YACC’ is preferable with the following body parts in the role of Y: head; parts of the face and head (lips, cheeks, nose, mouth, forehead, ears, crown); parts of the body (back, abdomen, neck). It is impossible or atypical with extremities: ?’tselovat’ v ruki/nogi/pal’tsy ‘in handsACC / feetACC / fingersACC’, although it is possible ‘to kiss in the palmACC’ (tselovat’ v ladon’). The PossessorDAT construction is characterized by compatibility with the designations of the extremities (’XDAT handACC / feetACC / fingersACC), while co-occurrence with the designations of other body parts is impossible or atypical: ?’tselovat’ X-u zhivot/nos/guby/shcheki’XDAT bellyACC / noseACC / lipsACC / cheeksACC’. The model with a possessive pronoun is neutral in this respect and co-occurs, moreover, with designations of shoes and clothes (tselovat’ ee tufli ‘her shoesACC).

Note the cognitive differences between a part of the body and a person’s belongings. The head and torso are directly related to the body; they, as well as their parts, are parts of the person herself. Extremities are perceived as belonging to a person. When we kiss a part of a person, it is conceptualized as kissing a person, and mentioning the Part argument may become optional. When we kiss a person’s belongings, it is conceptualized as kissing something separate from a person, and if it is a semiotic act (like kissing hands or shoes), then the Possessor becomes the Addressee of this semiotic act and, accordingly, is marked with a dative. As an implicature, an opposition of warm feelings and etiquette appears (kissing a person, one expresses warm feelings towards her, and kissing a person’s belongings, one performs an etiquette action). Like any implicature, this implicature can be suppressed: On ravnodushno potseloval ee v guby ‘He kissed her indifferently on the lips’; On strastno tseloval ei ruki ‘He kissed her hands passionately’. Even ritual kisses aimed at parts of the person are described with the v-construction: potselovat’ pokoinika v lob ‘to kiss the deceased in the foreheadACC’.

Different verbs of physical contact interact differently with the conceptualization of an object. Thus, the hugging action may be directed at the person as a whole, and stroking and clapping are directed only at a part of the person (pogladit’ po golove ‘on the head’, po plechu ‘on the
shoulder’, but not *pogladit’ Natasha ‘to pat Natasha’). If the object is not a very large animal, then indicating a part of the body is unnecessary: gladit’ sobaku ‘to stroke the dog’.
Going beyond the medical domain: A cognitive perspective on the semantic extensions of the suffix –oza in contemporary Polish

Rafał Augustyn & Ewelina Prażmo
Maria Curie-Sklodowska University in Lublin, Poland

There has been observed a growing tendency towards linguistic medicalisation of non-medical phenomena in contemporary discourses (The Lancet Psychiatry 2016). Metaphorical framing of e.g. social and political events in terms of diseases and other health and medicine related issues has been very common for years (Frawley 2015). Recently, however, there has been also an increase in the use of quasi-medical terms, i.e. lexical items with affixes conventionally related to medical use that resemble medical terms at the morphological level, in non-specialised contexts, very often for expressive purposes. This trend has also been quite transparent across different social discourses in contemporary Polish.

With this in mind, the present paper attempts to investigate the general proliferation of the Polish suffix –oza [derived from Greek –ōsis and Latin –ōsus; Eng. equivalent of –osis and –ose] outside its usual medical and medicine-related contexts. We claim that its modern uses (e.g. in words such as bilbordoza, urzędoza, znakoza, celebrytoza) point to a gradual semantic extension and the creation of new clusters of meanings. Although this general increase in the productivity of the examined suffix has already been noticed by some Polish linguists (cf. inter alia Waszakowa 2019, 185; Kaproń-Charzyńska 2014, 181–85), none attempts have been made to offer a holistic, cognitive account of this phenomenon.

The present paper is maintained within the methodological framework of cognitive linguistics. We employ Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner’s theory of Conceptual Integration (Fauconnier and Turner 2002) in order to account for the dynamic nature of the resultant polysemisation of the suffix analysed. We illustrate our analysis with ample evidence in the form of self-compiled contemporary examples extracted from Google search engine and manually evaluated in the context.

In our study we have managed to observe the following new semantic clusters of non-medical uses of the suffix -oza in contemporary Polish:
- negative attitude or expression of annoyance at the increase in pathological developments of a given phenomenon (szkolenioza, projektoza, grantoza);
- expression of annoyance at the evolution of the latest events of social significance (pandemioza, maseczkoza, wirusozoa);
- marker of emotional state of the speaking person – from slightly positive to slightly negative (śmiechoza, szaloza, zajebioza);
- strong negative attitude towards a phenomenon or even a metonymic reference to a group of people (idiotoza, kretynoza).
References
Choice of Aspect in a Russian Modal Construction

Beatrice Bernasconi
Roma Tre University, Italy

This study addresses the problem of the choice of aspect in Russian. It takes as its premises a study by Janda and colleagues (Janda & Reynolds, 2019; Janda et al., 2019) in which it was empirically demonstrated that the choice of aspect is not always determined by context, but is relatively open to construal. Among the cases that are open to construal, modal constructions figure prominently. The aim of this study is to provide more evidence for this finding, focusing on the choice of aspect in a particular modal construction. The work is couched within the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics and adopts a usage-based approach. It consists of two quantitative studies concerning the choice of the infinitive in the modal construction prij disjoint’ja/prij disjoint’ + inf, ‘have to’. The hypothesis is that the aspect of the infinitive is not fully determined by grammatical context but, to some extent, open to construal.

A preliminary analysis was carried out on data gathered from the Russian National Corpus (RNC). At this first stage only prij disjoint’ was considered. The distribution of imperfective and perfective infinitives after prij disjoint’ was respectively 38.5% - 61.5% in the past tense and 51.3% - 48.7% in the non-past tense. Four hundred and forty-seven examples were annotated manually for several factors and a statistical test (Classification And Regression Trees) was run. The statistical analysis demonstrated that no grammatical factor plays a significant role in the choice of aspect.

An experiment with native speakers was then carried out. One hundred and ten native speakers of Russian were surveyed and asked to evaluate the acceptability of the infinitive in examples with the construction prixodit’sja/prij disjoint’ delat’/sdelat’ šag/vid/vybor, ‘have to take a step/have to pretend/have to make a choice’. The survey presented seventeen examples from the RNC that were submitted two times: the first time with the same aspect as in the original version, the second time with the other aspect. Participants had to evaluate each case by choosing among “Impossible”, “Acceptable” and “Excellent” ratings. They were also allowed to give their opinion about the difference between aspects in each example. A Logistic Regression with Mixed Effects was run on the answers.

Results showed that prij disjoint’ often admits both aspects in the infinitive, while prixodit’sja is more restrictive and prefers imperfective. Overall, “Acceptable” and “Excellent” responses were higher than “Impossible” responses for both aspects, even when the aspect evaluated did not match with the original. Personal opinions of the participants confirmed that the choice of aspect often depends on the meaning the speaker wants to convey. Only in very few cases the grammatical context was a constraint on the choice.

References
Variation in first person singular non-past forms of new borrowings into the Russian second conjugation of verbs

Martina Björklund
Åbo Akademi University, Finland

The first person singular of Russian second conjugation verbs is of both diachronic and synchronic interest. Historically the consonant alternations that occur are explained through the process of jotation (j-palatalization). A synchronic cognitive linguistic analysis of the problem is provided by Nesset (2008), who proposes a truncation-softening conspiracy, where networks of schemas are used to clarify the alternations as a vehicle for conveying non-past tense as well as first person singular. Nesset (2008:197–198) demonstrates schema interaction with three competing candidates for the first person singular present tense of the verb видеть, viz. ви́д+u, ви́д+u, and ви́д+u. A second-order schema resolves the competition in favour of ви́д+u, whereas in normative Russian the candidate ви́д+u (the default pattern of the plain softening alteration for V-initial non-past tense endings) is blocked by the [u]-initial ending. However, forms with plain softening are common in Russian dialects, and for verbs that are said to lack the first person singular non-past form, two or even three forms are attested in actual language use, e.g. победить: победю, побежу, побежду (Bekasova 2013).

In a written production task among 23 native Russian speakers (average age 21 years), Kulinich, Royle & Valois (2016) found that when asked to produce the first person singular non-past of nine new borrowed computer-related Russian second conjugation verbs with stems ending in dentals (-м, -д, and -с), non-palatalization occurred in almost the same number of responses as palatalization. My paper presents the results of a pilot study of similar new verbs undertaken through Google searches. Fifteen verbs with the following characteristics were identified: They ended in consonants that should undergo j-palatalization (except l, r, and n); their infinitives had more than 5,000 hits (June 2020); and the exact search strings featuring the pronoun я and the verb in the first person singular with palatalization and/or plain softening were attested. The verbs are: чатиться, комментить, апгрейдить, френдить, фрилансить, аутсорсить, браузить, постить, репостить, копипастить, стримить, инстаграмить, фоловить/фолловить, бекапить/бэкапить, and ютубить. The verbs with stems ending in labials were most prone to palatalization (near 100%) for all except ютубить (ютублю 57%). The verbs with least palatalization were those with stems in -с/-з (3–25%). The verbs with stems in -м/-д showed a high degree of palatalization (80–95%), except чатиться (чатюсь near 100%). Both постить and репостить show a preference for palatalization (86% and 84%), whereas копипастить is more liable to plain softening (61%). Thus there seem to be certain tendencies for the different types of consonants, although each group includes exceptions.
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First-person subject of historical present verbs in spoken and written Russian

Evgeniya Budennaya1,2
1National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia;
2Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Russian is known as a language where subject pronoun tends to be overt, yet its omission is also possible. According to various sources, the number of finite clauses with zero subjects ranges from 20 to 35% of occurrences (Grenoble 2001; Zdorenko 2009). It is widely assumed to associate subject omission with colloquial genres (McShane 2009: 107):

(1) Skažu ot sebja – fil’m smotret’ ne stoit
say.PRS-1SG from myself film watch not worth
‘I’ll say for myself – the film is not worth watching” (RNC)

Recent studies based on RNC (Zdorenko 2009: 126-127) indicate greater use of zero subjects in spoken and informal register. However, the comparative data of the “Funny stories” corpus (http://spokencorpora.ru/showcorpus.py?dir=02funny)1 reveals the opposite tendency with the first-person subject of present verbs: in the spoken part of the corpus pronouns are used much more often than in the written part (χ²-square, p-value < 0.001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Spoken subcorpus, entries</th>
<th>Written subcorpus, entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt pronoun</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero pronoun</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Presence and absence of first-person subject pronouns in present clauses of the “Funny stories” corpus

We found that the overall distribution in Table 1 was provided by historical present tense: other entries of present verbs did not show any similar bias towards subject omission. Further analysis of the spoken and the written subcorpus revealed that, despite their strong connotation with oral speech, zero subjects are more common in dialogues than in narratives. Their overt usage in narratives seems to be caused by pragmatics of the situation. In oral speech, an overt pronoun usage can be considered as a marker of politeness (“rapprochement between the speaker and the addressee” [Fougeron, Breillard 2004: 164]) while bare verbs sound harsher [ibid: 163]. As the framework of the corpus implied a polite interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee, the latter tended to produce more overt pronouns. Thus, the work supplements the theory of zero subjects as a special feature of spoken genre, indicating the particular importance of the discourse structure and the special pragmatics of oral speech (“rapprochement” with the interlocutor). Taken together, they cause the "excessive" usage of overt pronouns.

1 The corpus consists of 40 pairs of stories about funny incidents. Each narrator produced two versions of the same story, a spoken and a written one.
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Russian СПРАШИВАТЬ/СПРОСИТЬ as a Verb of Pragmatic Contract

Stephen M. Dickey and Pavlo Popov
University of Kansas, USA

Israeli (2001) analyzes past-tense aspectual usage with some verbs of communication, e.g., приглашатьIMPF/пригласитьPF ‘invite’, предложитьIMPF/предложитьPF ‘offer’ as being dependent on whether there has been a follow-up action by the interlocutor. Let us illustrate the basic mechanism with предложитьIMPF/предложитьPF ‘offer’: If the time envisioned for the response has already elapsed by speech time and the interlocutor has turned down the offer or not responded, the imperfective is used; if the interlocutor has accepted the offer, the perfective is used (see Israeli 2001: 65–66 for discussion).

This paper argues on the basis of data in Vassily Grossman’s novel За правое дело (1952; around 230,000 words) that modern Russian спрашиватьIMPF/спроситьPF ‘ask’ is likewise a verb of pragmatic contract. It provides quantitative data showing that past-tense forms of спроситьPF occur when the interlocutor has made a verbal response to the question, i.e., answered it. If the interlocutor has not made or attempted a verbal response, the past tense of спрашиватьIMPF is strongly preferred. Note that the data are limited to single events—predicates referring to repeated events have been excluded, and no predicates referring to ongoing processes were in the data. The basic statistical breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>спроситьPF</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>спрашиватьIMPF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 314 of 403 tokens of the past tense of спроситьPF (78%), a verbal response is explicitly referred to in the narrative; in 14 of the 403 tokens (3.4%), no verbal response is given at all and in the other 70 tokens there is some other narrative element present (e.g., the asker continues speaking, the discourse is interrupted, etc.). In contrast, all 31 tokens of the past tense of спрашиватьIMPF (100%) involve no reference in the text to a verbal response, and further it is clear that none was given from the narrative (one token involves a non-verbal reaction). A representative example of спроситьPF with a verbal response is given in (1).

(1) — А кто он такой, ты спрашивал его? спросил начальник.
      — А чего спрашивать, я вижу — человек, — ответил Вавилов.
      “And did you ask him who he was?” asked the director.
      “Why would I ask, I could see—it was a man,” answered Vavilov.’

In addition to the basic discussion of the data, the presentation analyzes the assertion of a verbal response as an instantiation of temporal definiteness, and discusses how the remaining 22% of perfective tokens instantiate temporal definiteness as well. It also discusses how imperfective
forms referring both to single and repeated events occur when no verbal response is given/focused upon (only 5 of 29 tokens of repeated actions included a response).

The analysis further considers the perfective спросить as referring not only to a completed event, but to an exchange scenario, which restricts its occurrence in texts (cf. the imperfective question in ex. (1)).
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Lexicalization and grammaticalization of reflexive verbs in modern Slavic: a corpus-based approach

Daria Ermakova
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Slavic reflexive verbs (RVs) have been undergoing two parallel processes in their history: 1) the transition from the compositional combinations of the verb and the reflexive marker (RM) (historically reflexive pronoun) to an independent lexical unit – lexicalization; 2) the development of the range of abstract meanings that RMs can express – grammaticalization. The study aims to explore how the results of these processes are reflected in the frequency distributions of RVs in the modern Slavic languages and to compare languages according to the grammaticalization and lexicalization degrees of their RVs.

The data were collected from the ParaSoL parallel corpus (http://parasolcorpus.org/) and manually annotated for semantic and syntactic functions of RVs. Extracted sample includes parallel examples from 8 Slavic languages: Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Czech, Slovenian, Croatian, Bulgarian and Macedonian. Each set of the 2000 entries contains 8 parallel sentences with at least one occurrence of RV in one of them.

In the East Slavic, RM has advanced most along the reflexive pronoun > clitic > affix path [Geniušienė 1987: 241]. In terms of [Hopper, Traugott 2003: 128], RVs in East Slavic are “contracted” forms, historically tracing back to “full” forms. The question to be addressed here is whether the greatest grammaticalization degree in East Slavic is also reflected by other parameters.

As for grammaticalization of the reflexive meaning, attested scenarios involve the reflexive → autocausative → anticausative → passive chain [Haspelmath 1990]. My data indicate that in terms of token frequency, the largest ratio of the earliest stage – (proper) reflexive – is attested in South Slavic, and the smallest, in East Slavic. Additional indication of the grammaticalization degree is the general frequencies of the RVs – the largest token frequency of reflexives is observed in Russian, Ukrainian and Czech.

To measure the lexicalization degree, I compared the general frequencies of non-oppositional RVs, the classes with the highest lexicalization degree. Non-oppositional RVs include e.g. formally irreversible RVs (Ru бояться ‘to be afraid’, cf. *боять) or semantically irreversible RVs (Ru оказаться ‘to appear’, cf. оказать ‘to render, perform’). The highest ratios of non-oppositional were found in Russian, Ukrainian, Czech, Polish and Slovenian.

Thus, both formally and functionally, RVs in East Slavic display the greatest grammaticalization degree among Slavic. South Slavic are less advanced than Northern Slavic in terms of development of their RVs. A more general conclusion is that grammaticalization does not
contradict lexicalization – both processes can occur in the same language without excluding each other [Himmelmann 2004].

References
Координация взглядов говорящего и слушающего в монологической бимодальной коммуникации

Olga V. Fedorova
Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia

Данная работа выполнена в русле бимодальной лингвистики. В отличие от униканальных (основанных на вербальном канале) и унимодальных (основанных на вербальном и просодическом каналах) исследований, имеющих более долгую историю, бимодальная лингвистика стала популярной только в XXI в.: см. работы Kendon 2004; McNeill 2005; Goldin-Meadow 2014; Müller et al. eds. 2013; Кибрик 2018.

Данная работа посвящена анализу монологической речи. Несмотря на то, что в монологе не происходит чередования реплик, то есть в роли говорящего выступает один и тот же собеседник, вклад второго собеседника в коммуникацию не менее важен и, в некотором смысле, даже более разнообразен. В работе Schober, Clark 1989 авторы описали два типа слушающих: адресата, к которому говорящий обращается непосредственно, и остальных, которые воспринимают информацию (через телевидение или интернет), но не могут непосредственно взаимодействовать («подслушивающих», overhearers).

Основная идея данного исследования состояла в том, чтобы проверить выводы Дж. Бавелас (Bavelas et al. 2002) о существовании определенного окуломоторного паттерна поведения собеседников в монологическом общении. Данный паттерн был выявлен Бавелас на основе анализа видеозаписей, поэтому нуждался в подтверждении более точным методом регистрации движений глаз. В работе были использованы две пары очков-айтрекеров Tobii Glasses с частотой 50 Гц, надетые на каждого из собеседников.

Данный окуломоторный паттерн состоит в следующем. Известно, что в процессе монологического дискурса говорящий смотрит на слушающего относительно редко, а слушающий, наоборот, отвечает частыми взглядами. Когда их взгляды встречаются, возникает «взаимный взгляд», или открывается «глазное окно». Через некоторое время слушающий подает говорящему маркер обратной связи (Yngve 1970), вскоре после чего говорящий закрывает глазное окно, отводя взгляд в сторону.

В данной работе в результате проведенного микроанализа монологических фрагментов записей собранного корпуса «Рассказы и разговоры о грушах» (Кибрик 2018) нам удалось подтвердить предложенный Бавелас паттерн окуломоторного поведения собеседников. Проведя независимое аннотирование в программе ELAN вокального, окуломоторного, мимического и цефалического каналов, мы затем провели детальный анализ каждого случая «глазного окна» собеседников. Оказалось, что, действительно, маркеры обратной связи приходятся именно на моменты «взаимного взгляда». Более того, в подавляющем большинстве случаев мы наблюдаем «классический» сценарий Бавелас, при котором через
небольшое время после открытия «глазного окна» Пересказчик отвечает Рассказчику маркером обратной связи, вскоре после чего Рассказчик отводит взгляд в сторону.

Настоящий анализ показывает, что бимодальная коммуникация устроена не случайным образом, а подчиняется определенным закономерностям, которые почти не знают исключений.
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Comparative Analysis of Aspectual Forms in Translations of the Book of Hiob from Ancient Greek into Old Church Slavonic and Russian

Evgeniy Filimonov
Saint Petersburg State University, Russia

My goal is to explain the cases of translation from Ancient Greek (AG) into Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and Russian in which the translator unexpectedly uses an aspectual form different from the form of the Greek original. Translations of sacred texts were supposed to be almost literal, and when the expected match between the aspectual forms in the original and the translations does not take place (I call this aspectual asymmetry), the deviation can be explained by two different reasons: 1. The translator uses an asymmetrical form because the aspectual system of the target language does not allow a literal translation. 2. The translator uses an asymmetrical form for a stylistic purpose only.

An example of the type 1: the AG aorist is translated by the OCS imperfect: καὶ ὡς ἀν συνετελέσθησαν οἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πότου, ἀπέστελλεν Ἰὼβ ... 1 (5) - И егда скончаваше дние пира, посылаше Иовъ...1 (5). The OCS imperfect expresses iterativity whereas the AG aorist expresses terminativity.

The aspectual asymmetry caused by a stylistic choice of the translator (type 2) can be seen, first of all, by comparing such Russian translations as the Russian Synodal Bible and the translation by S.S. Averintsev. The differences between the two Russian translations show the possibility to use either aspectual form with some difference in their semantics:

GR 1 (6) Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτῆ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἤλθον οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ παραστῆναι (Aor.) ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου.

RUS 1(6) (Averintsev) И был день, когда пришли Сыны Божьи, чтобы предстоять (imperfective) Господу.

RUS 1(6) (Synodal translation) И был день, когда пришли сыны Божии предстать (perfective) пред Господом;

OCS 1(6) И бысть яко день сеи, и се, приидоша аггли бжии пръдстати (perfective) пред гсдем.

The Averintsev’s translation describes this action as a process whereas AG, OCS and the Synodal translation describe it as an instant action.

Another example represents a vice versa situation: the Synodal translation gives an asymmetrical form whereas the Averintsev’s translation stays in accordance with the AG and OCS perfective form:
GR 1(12) ἰδοὺ πάντα, ὅσα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, δίδωμι ἐν τῇ χειρί σου, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἁψῃ (Aor.).

RUS 1(12) (Averintsev) Вот – все, что его, в руке твоей; лишь на него не прости (perfective) руки твоей!

RUS 1(12) (Synodal translation) вот, все, что у него, в руке твоей; только на него не простирай (imperfective) руки твоей.

OCS 1(12) се, вся, елика суть ему, даю в руку твою, но самого да не коснешися (perfective).

Averintsev uses the negative perfective imperative не прости for archaization (cf. Russian forms of OCS origin from the ten commandments: не убий, не укради). In Russian they have not a prohibitive meaning, but the meaning of warning: не упади, не забудь. The choice made by Averintsev shows that Russian aspectual forms used in a poetic context have the potential of deviating from their normal grammatical meaning.
Characterizing Czech Internet Texts through Multi-dimensional Analysis

Jan Henyš
Institute of Theoretical and Computational Linguistics, Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Czech Republic

The rapid development of computer methods in natural language processing in the final decades of the 20th century has brought a significant impetus to most of the linguistic disciplines, including register research. Register, as a concept defined by functional variation, depends on either conscious or unconscious choices of speakers during communication. To be able to detect these choices, it is necessary to measure as many of potentially relevant language variables as possible.

The present paper is based on studies of Douglas Biber (e.g. 1986, 1987, 1990), who has developed a methodology known as multi-dimensional analysis (MDA). The paper aims to apply MDA in the research of Czech internet texts.

Data were obtained from the web-crawled corpus of Czech internet texts Araneum Bohemicum Maximum (Benko, 2014) and sampled for annotation purposes. Each of 1,000 text samples was then manually assigned to one of the web registers (Biber & Egbert, 2016). An exploratory factor analysis (adapted to Czech data (Cvrček et al., 2018a, 2018b)) is then used to discover the dimensions of variation. The distribution of text factor scores within individual registers can be considered a measure for appropriateness of categorization. The modality of data distribution reflects several principles on which the categorization is based (overlaps, fuzziness of borders etc.) Methodological issues including hybrid registers (proposed by Biber & Egbert, 2016) and other options of non-discrete categorization of internet texts will be considered with respect to Egbert et al., 2015, Asheghi 2016 or Santini, 2007.
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How to build a constructicon in five years: The Russian recipe

Laura A. Janda
UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Norway

Constructions are key elements of language structure (Fillmore et al. 1988, Croft 2001, Goldberg 2006), yet constructicons, which are large-scale inventories of analyzed, explained and illustrated constructions (Lyngfelt et al. 2018), are currently being built only for a relatively small number of languages including Swedish, German, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, Korean, Japanese, and Russian.

The further growth of this emergent sub-discipline of Construction Grammar, termed constructicography (Lyngfelt et al. 2018), promises crucial benefits both for language learners and for linguists. Our understanding of how networks of constructions work largely depends on the amount of publicly available data on constructions. It is now high time to build comparable constructicon resources for additional natural languages. The developers of the existing constructicons can make this task easier by disseminating the accumulated findings and revealing the challenges of this work.

In this talk, we provide a practical step-by-step methodology of how to build a full-scale constructicon resource for a natural language, sharing our experience from the nearly completed project of the Russian Constructicon (https://site.uit.no/russian-constructicon/). We report on a large group project administrated over the period of four years (2016-2020), that succeeded to collect, fully describe and illustrate an inventory of over 2200 multi-word constructions of Contemporary Standard Russian (Janda et al. 2018).

The Russian Constructicon is a free open-access electronic resource that offers a searchable database of Russian constructions accompanied with descriptions of their properties and illustrated with corpus examples. Having expanded the database (adding over 1000 constructions) in the past year, we are currently working on finalizing descriptions of construction properties, analyzing construction structure in terms of universal dependencies, translating the content of the resource into English and Norwegian, and modelling relationships of constructions in terms of families and clusters.

We will report on the major stages of our work and present a product that showcases the outcome: a new website that offers various search possibilities so that users can access constructions. We will explain our classification of constructions and share the sources of data and the methods used to expand the inventory of constructions. We will discuss what makes the Russian Constructicon different from other constructicons, focusing on its size, multifunctionality, and relationship with the Russian FrameBank.
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Našli razvlečenie! Patterns of Assessment and Attitude constructions in Russian

Laura A. Janda and Anna Endresen
UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Norway

Construction Grammar (cf. Goldberg 1996, 2005, Langacker 2008) has postulated that constructions structure the grammar of languages, through systemic relationships of meaning and form. We contribute a study that documents how large groups of constructions are related to each other and how they can be compared and contrasted.

We present a case study focusing on two types of evaluative constructions that express Assessment and Attitude in Russian. We understand Assessment as an evaluation of an item external to the speaker (e.g. NP-Nom Cop tak sebe, as in Kartina tak sebe ‘the painting is so-so [lit. thus self]’) and define Attitude as an expression of how the speaker feels about something (e.g. s PronPers-Gen xvatit/xvatilo (NP-Gen), as in S menja xvatit ‘I’m fed up [lit. from me enough]’).

Our data comes from the Russian Constructicon (https://site.uit.no/russian-constructicon/), a new open access electronic resource that offers a searchable database of over 2200 multi-word constructions of Contemporary Standard Russian. In this case study we examined 224 Assessment constructions and 222 Attitude constructions that, taken together, represent the most numerous semantic type in the Russian Constructicon. We model the two networks of constructions in terms of two radial categories (see Figure 1) that contain clusters and families identified on the basis of their semantic and syntactic properties. Crucially, we find that these networks overlap in 58 constructions that express both types of evaluation. One of the families where Assessment and Attitude overlap encode Disapproval of behavior and can be illustrated with the construction najti-Pst NP-Acc!, literally ‘found X!’ as in Našli razvlečenie! ‘What a bad way to amuse yourself! [lit. Found amusement!]’.

Figure 1: Overlap of Assessment and Attitude constructional networks
We analyze patterns of Assessment and Attitude constructions both in terms of semantic types and in terms of polarity values (positive vs. negative). Although the two networks of evaluative constructions are approximately of the same size, they are very different “inside”. We found that almost twice as many constructions encode negative Assessment as opposed to those that express positive Assessment (109 vs. 57 items, or 49% vs. 25%). Quite surprisingly, the Attitude network is even “more negative” overall, with over 72% (159 items) of constructions carrying negative evaluation and only 18% (40 items) of constructions referring to positive Attitude. The remaining subsets of constructions can encode both positive and negative values depending on the fillers, negation, and context. This distribution of data lends support to the hypothesis formulated in the previous scholarship (Arutjunova 1988) regarding a higher number and greater diversity of linguistic means employed for encoding negative evaluation.

Relationships among constructions are observed both hierarchically within the Assessment and Attitude networks as realized by families and clusters, as well as horizontally across all three levels of organization. The analysis of large groups of constructions makes it possible to discover overall patterns.
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The Polish subjunctive. A constructional approach.
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The paper is concerned with the syntactic and semantic characteristics of Polish clausal constructions introduced with the subordinating conjunction ŻEBY. These forms are particularly interesting for their ‘mood affiliation’, which has been subject to some controversy. Polish grammarians are divided as to whether ŻEBY clauses should be considered a part of indicative mood (Nagórko, 2007; Puzylnina 1971), or conditional mood (Laskowski, 1984; Tokarski, 2001). The third position is that ŻEBY clauses represent a separate mood category, the so called subjunctive (Tomaszewicz 2009, Topolińska 2010). In the studies of Indo-European languages, the term subjunctive has been used to refer to structures coding non-actualized events in subordinate clauses. Subjunctives have also been described as carrying meanings connected with the speaker’s stance towards the proposition being expressed (cf. Nordström, 2010; Palmer 2001).

The present paper argues for the last view showing that ŻEBY clauses exhibit a range of semantic functions which distinguish them from the indicative forms, on the one hand, and conditional constructions, on the other. In other words, it is argued that ŻEBY clauses constitute a construction in its own right, i.e. a distinct form-meaning pairing (cf. Goldberg, 1995, 2006; Langacker 1987). Given that ŻEBY is a polyfunctional conjunction/complementizer, occurring, among others, in adverbial clauses of purpose and result, or as the object complement of desiderative predicates, the construction in questions has a highly polysemous character. The paper argues that these various uses form a radial network of interrelated senses, which derive from the central purposive use. This is a new perspective since, thus far, the different functions of the ŻEBY construction have been treated as distinct and unrelated. In arguing for this position, the study takes a usage-based (distributional) approach, that is all the generalizations concerning the semantic import of the ŻEBY construction are derived from the actual instances of use, as extracted from The National Corpus of Polish.
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The language-specific biases in the count / mass distinction of nouns and their analogy in the verbal domain: a comparative study of conceptualization of process in English, Russian and Japanese

Yuriko Kaneko
Kobe City University of Foreign Studies, Japan

Psycholinguists have long been interested in how children acquire the count/mass (or object/substance) distinction and, in particular, whether the acquisition is driven conceptually or linguistically. As opposed to Quine (1969), claiming on the grammatical influence, Soja et al (1991)'s experiment on English speaking children resulted in favor of pre-linguistic ontology. Imai & Gentner (1997), who conducted the study with English and Japanese speaking subjects, came to the similar conclusion, but they also found some cross-linguistic differences between English, having a count/mass syntax, and Japanese as a numeral classifier language. In determining the class membership, English speakers appear to use a shape-biased criterion in the simple object trials, while Japanese speakers tend to use a material-biased criterion in the substance trials.

If there is a possibility of the parallelism of these language-specific biases in the nominal domain and in the verbal domain, it can be assumed that English is more sensitive to “a shape”, or a contour of an action with heterogeneous nature, which makes it possible to divide the process into phases. Then Japanese, by contrast, should show some evidence of the lower degree of breakup of process into phases. Russian, operating on temporal boundaries (Petrukhina 2000), or temporal definiteness (Dickey 2000), is expected to reveal an even stronger phase preference than in English.

I suggest that 1) phasal expressions appear more frequently in Russian and English than in Japanese and 2) that in order to express dynamic, heterogeneous process of action, Japanese employs more complex language devices than English and Russian. In my presentation, I shall show the results of the comparative analysis of data from the parallel corpus of Russian, English and Japanese. The analogy between count/mass distinction for nouns and perfective / imperfective distinction for verbs has been widely discussed mainly in connection to the property of boundedness (telicity) of action (Langacker1991, Janda et al. 2013). In my study, the focus will be on the conceptualization of “durative” process.
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When the foreign accent does not sound foreign: 
The processing of non-native speech reflected in the ERPs

Hanna Kędzierska
University of Wroclaw, Poland

Foreign-accented speech is associated with shallower semantic processing, both in a first language – L1 (Hanulíkova et al., 2012; Romero-Rivas et al., 2016; Grey and van Hell, 2017) and in a second language – L2 (Grey et al., 2018). However, a phenomenon still scarcely investigated so far is the processing of foreign-accented speech which retains the features of the listeners’ L1. The aim of the current study was to shed more light on this issue by examining two groups of comprehenders: monolingual L1 Polish speakers and L2 Polish speakers whose L1 was Ukrainian. Both groups were presented with samples recorded by an L1 Polish speaker and an L2 Polish speaker (L1 Ukrainian).

Two ERP experiments were conducted to investigate neural reactions towards: (a) ‘classic’ semantic anomalies (in the sense of Kutas and Hillyard, 1980) as opposed to semantically plausible items, and (b) categorical templates, i.e., high cloze probability words embedded in sentential context (Vespignani et al. 2010) as opposed to template violations. The high cloze probability template endings and their unexpected counterparts were selected in a pre-test based on native speakers’ judgements. In Experiment 1, 360 Polish sentences recorded by an L1 Polish speaker and an L1 Ukrainian speaker were presented to 28 monolingual L1 Polish speakers. In Experiment 2, the same material was presented to 28 advanced L2 Polish speakers. EEG data was gathered along with behavioural measures (yes-no comprehension question).

In both experiments, comprehension measures were equally high for native and foreign-accented speech, but they were on average higher in the case of native Polish speakers when compared with Ukrainian speakers (i.e., in Experiment 1 when compared with Experiment 2). In Experiment 1, template violations resulted in a sustained globally-distributed N400 effect followed by late positivity (P600) in the case of Polish accent. As for the Ukrainian accent, no late positivity (typically associated with meaning re-analysis) was observed. Semantic anomalies elicited the N400 effect in both accents, but it was more globally distributed in the case of foreign accent. In Experiment 2, template violations elicited the N400 effect only for non-native (Ukrainian) accent, and semantic anomalies – only for native (Polish) accent.
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Куча проблем и море идей: когнитивный анализ конструкций с именными количественными квантификаторами

Elizaveta Kibisova
National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia

Доклад посвящен исследованию группы конструкций русского языка, входящих в базу Русского Конструктикона — ресурса, разработанного сотрудниками Норвежского Арктического Университета в Тромсё и Высшей Школы Экономики в Москве. Русский Конструктиккон представляет собой бесплатную открытую базу конструкций русского языка. Основная целевая аудитория ресурса — студенты и преподаватели РКИ, лингвисты. В результате исследования и классификации каждая конструкция в базе получила семантические и синтаксические пометы - теги, обеспечивающие дополнительные возможности поиска.

Исследуемые конструкции относятся к конструкциям меры. В базе Русского Конструктикона они получили семантический тег Measure с дополнительным значением интенсивности (Intensity). Категория меры — одна из крупнейших семей в базе, в неё входит более 120 конструкций с количественным значением. В докладе исследуется подгруппа конструкций меры, содержащих именной квантификатор в качестве фиксированной части и существительное в родительном падеже в качестве заполняемого слота.

В роли именного квантификатора может выступать ограниченная группа существительных. По данным [Рахилина 2010:353] таких слов около трёх десятков. Семантика именного квантификатора влияет на заполняемость слота конструкции: некоторые существительные имеют широкую сочетаемость, другие же сочетаются лишь с ограниченной категорией слов. Так, конструкция куча NP-Gen является одной из самых частотных в НКРЯ, её слот NP-Gen может заполняться практически любыми существительными: куча камней, куча людей, куча неприятностей. Напротив, у конструкций море NP-Gen и туча NP-Gen слоты заполняются ограниченными, причём различными категориями существительных. Например, носитель русского языка вероятнее опишет жестокость войны как море крови, чем ?туча крови, а очень большое количество насекомых скорее как туча мошкары, чем ?море мошкары. В докладе отражены результаты корпусного анализа сочетаемости некоторых наиболее употребительных конструкций меры с именными квантификаторами. Исследование сочетает два подхода. Во-первых, для анализа корпусных данных применяются количественные методы на базе текстов НКРЯ. Использование статистических инструментов позволило определить и визуализировать распределение существительных различных семантических категорий по именным квантификаторам, с которыми они могут сочетаться в конструкциях меры. Во-вторых, полученные данные рассматриваются с точки зрения когнитивной лингвистики, в частности теории метафоры Дж. Лакоффа [Lakoff 1993]: проведен анализ семантической структуры конструкций, исследованы метафоры и метонимии, лежащие в основе многих конструкций.
Сочетание подходов позволило составить классификацию конструкций с именными квантификаторами по типу использованных метафор, и выделить типы конструкций, представляющих наибольший интерес для дальнейшего изучения. Представление полученных данных в понятной и наглядной форме позволит также применять их на занятиях РКИ.
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Russian future: an inside and an outside perspective

Daria Kosheleva
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Russian verbal aspect is one of the biggest challenges for second language learners of Russian. In the future tense, the use of aspect has additional issues. Traditionally, learners are taught that there are two verb forms that express future meaning: the perfective non-past form *sdelaju* ‘I will do’, which has the same inflectional morphology as the imperfective present; and the periphrastic form comprised of the verb *byt’* ‘be’ in the future tense and an infinitive of an imperfective verb *budu delat’* ‘I will be doing’.

How does performance of native vs. non-native speakers differ in their production of the future tense forms? Native speakers strongly prefer the perfective non-past form: in the Russian National Corpus, the perfective non-past form occurs approximately 13 times more frequently than the imperfective periphrastic form. Non-native speakers tend to overuse the imperfective form (Swan 2017: 825).

Does overt aspect marking morphology facilitate the choice of aspect? (Eckhoff et al. 2017) shows that there is no statistical difference in predicting aspect by overt markers (i.e. prefixes and suffixes) vs. the distribution of forms.

In this article, I present an experiment that addresses the challenges that future tense presents for learners of Russian. I compare learners’ performance with that of the native speakers. The participants are tasked with changing the proposed past tense verb form to the future tense verb form in the corresponding aspect. The targeted form is placed in a context in a sentence and each sentence is illustrated with a picture. The verbs are controlled for aspectual morphology and frequency.

Stimulus for a perfective verb: 
*Katja (sdelala) domašnee zadanie.* ‘Katja did the homework.’

Correct answer: 
*sdelaeet* ‘will do’

Stimulus for an imperfective verb: 
*Katja (delala) domašnee zadanie.* ‘Katja was doing the homework.’

Correct answer: 
*budet delat’* ‘will be doing’

Were native speakers able to choose the “correct” aspect?
In the experiment, only 26.9% (21 out of 78) of the native speakers were able to follow the model shown in the instructions for every verb. There was at least one error in 17.5% (436 out of 2496) of the responses.

If we only focus on errors connected with aspect, the error rate would be 12.1% (i.e. 319 out of 2624 responses). Non-native speakers show better accuracy than native speakers at this task. However, this does not mean that non-native speakers are better at producing future forms overall. Non-native speakers produce errors connected with aspect, tense, or both. Just 5 out of 82 non-native speakers did not make a single error.

In this talk, I will compare the native and non-native performance and show the factors that affected the responses.
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Classifiers in Polish Sign Language (PJM). A Cognitive Grammar account

Hubert Kowalewski
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Polish Sign Language (PJM) includes an open-ended system of classifiers, i.e. gestures signaling the location and relations between entities in the signing space. Classifiers are frequently used to express temporal and atemporal relations (in Langacker’s (1987) sense). For example, when a PJM signer intends to express the proposition “A cat is on a fence,” they may produce the sign for FENCE, preserve the “fence hand-shape,” then produce the sign for CAT, preserve the “cat hand-shape,” and place the latter hand on the former to evoke the spatial relation ON. The “fence hand-shape” and the “cat hand-shape” function as classifiers in the expression.

Most research on classifier both in PJM (Tomaszewski 2011; Linde-Usienkiewicz and Łozińska 2017) and other sign languages (Supalla 1986; Özyürek, Zwitserlood, and Perniss 2010; Zwitserlood 2012) focuses on providing comprehensive categorizations of classifiers, often within the framework of traditionally understood word classes. The Cognitive Grammar (CG) framework shifts the emphasis away from sorting phonological forms into preconceived grammatical categories towards functional descriptions of roles of phonological forms in dynamic negotiation of meaning. In the CG approach, the function of sign-linguistic classifiers is perhaps best characterized as nominal, since their chief purpose in a complex expression is to elaborate e-sites of temporal and atemporal relations (typically verbs and prepositions respectively). Syntactically, a classifier immediately follows a lexical sign (or an indexical pronoun) and functions in the discourse space as a substitute for the referent of the lexical sign. Thus, despite a frequent iconic component – hand-shapes of many classifiers evoke the shapes of the denoted entities – classifiers recruit their semantic content primarily via profile shifts characteristic of metonymies: the reference of classifiers is secured by the syntactic proximity to lexical signs rather than similarity to referents. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that some classifiers are not iconic vis-à-vis their referents, which does not normally lead to vague or ambiguous reference.
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Analysis of the Relationship Between Aspectual Prefixes and Argument Structure in Serbian

Bojana Kuzeljevic
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The focus of this research is on the analysis of the meaning of so-called ‘empty’ prefixes. In recent years, Janda et al. (2013) explored Overlap Hypothesis which disagrees with the idea of semantically empty prefixes in Russian and Miljkovic (2018) also suggested a new approach to the idea of empty prefixes in Serbian. The aim of this paper is to provide new evidence that although empty prefixes do not change the meaning of the verb, they still express meaning in less direct ways.

We take the constructionist approach and assume that semantics of a verb, its argument structure and thematic roles are all interrelated. The biggest challenge to this approach is that not all verbs can be analyzed with same methods since the constructions in which they appear often depend on their semantic properties. Hence, all prefixed verbs were classified into groups based on their semantic and syntactic characteristics in order to make the verbs semantically and syntactically uniform as much as possible. For this task, Levin’s (1993) classification of English verbs was used as a template and adapted for Serbian verbs.

In this analysis only two of these groups were examined as representatives of two very different types of verbs which require two different analyses. Verbs of putting/removing were chosen because their meaning (moving an object to/from a certain location) requires an argument with SOURCE/GOAL thematic role. The spatial meaning of these roles is semantically close to the original spatial meaning of prefixes. Thus, it was assumed that for the thematic role of SOURCE/GOAL, prefixes would attract constructions with form and meaning that matches theirs. Mixed-effects logistic regression and correspondence analysis of corpus examples confirm this assumption to be true for both empty and non-empty prefixes. On the other hand, the verbs of change were chosen as representatives of verbs in which prefixes could be expected to lose their meaning completely. The chi-square analysis of prefixes and arguments of prefixed verbs of change showed a significant difference between prefixes with respect to their preference for subject or direct object in the role of PATIENT, but there was no difference in this preference between empty and non-empty group. These results reveal that empty prefixes still keep the constructional properties of non-empty prefixes. Together, these two analyses show that the degree and expression of prefixal meaning can vary depending on the semantic class of verbs, but it still remains as part of the meaning of the verb, and it can affect its argument structure.

References:
Czech is an understudied language in aphasia research, with the bulk of studies being conducted on English (Beveridge & Bak, 2011). In this paper, I focus on discourse production of Czech speakers with aphasia and consider the benefits of usage-based construction grammar for aphasia research, which has until recently been dominated by rule-based, structure-oriented approaches (e.g. Bastiaanse, Bouma & Post 2009). However, a growing number of studies has shown that constructivist, usage-based approaches better describe and explain patterns of language use in aphasia due to their emphasis on the role of gradience and users’ experience in language representation and processing (cf. Gahl & Menn, 2016 and Hatchard & Lieven 2019).

I will present an analysis of the distribution of silent and filled pauses in relation to several structural and usage factors. The analysis is based on a subcorpus of narrative and descriptive discourse of 11 speakers with chronic aphasia (a total of 1118 conversational units). Conversational units containing one or more disfluencies were extracted and annotated. Sequences of the type “preceding word (PW) - disfluency - target word (TW)” were annotated for TW retrieval success, their position within the unit and syntactic structure (phrase type, clause/phrase boundary or phrase-internal position). PW and TW were coded for word class, frequency and transitional probabilities, based on a corpus of Czech subtitles. Verbs were coded for argument structure which has been used as a measure of retrieval difficulty (Thompson 2003). Following Lind et al. (2009), TWs were also annotated for number of senses based on entries in a dictionary of Czech. An additional measure of semantic neighborhood density based on coocurrence measures was included in the analysis.

I will describe the configurations and distributional properties of syntactic context and grammatical features of PW and TW and compare these with the usage factors in order to assess the effect of these two groups of variables on disfluency occurrence. I expect occurrence of phrase-internal disfluencies to be correlated with the frequency-based variables. I will then focus on the most frequent syntactic contexts in the data and compare these with corresponding contexts with no disfluencies using relative frequency and transitional probabilities between PW and TW. I expect this analysis to reflect differences in frequency distributions of individual lexical items over grammatical constructions.
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Падежное согласование в аппозитивных конструкциях в славянских языках
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Введение. В славянских языках возможно факультативное падежное согласование имен собственных в аппозитивных конструкциях. Пример (1) иллюстрирует факультативное согласование в украинском:

(1) а. <...> який бешкетував на остров-і LOC Родос-і LOC (НКРЯ)
   б. Колосальна статуя бога сонця Геліоса на остров-і LOC Родос NOM (https://studopedia.su)

Как видно из примера (1), в украинском языке имя собственное в аппозиции может либо принимать падеж нарицательного существительного, либо сохранять форму номинатива. Это явление наблюдается также в русском, белорусском, польском, чешском, хорватском и словенском. Далее обсуждаются некоторые факторы, влияющие на согласование в перечисленных славянских языках. Исследование проводилось с использованием корпусов из семьи TenTen1, размещенных на платформе SketchEngine2.

Наритцательное существительное. Процент согласования различается в конструкциях с разными нарицательными существительными. В Таблице 1 суммированы данные о частотности согласования в конструкциях с разными нарицательными существительными в 7 славянских языках. Цветом выделены случаи с процентом согласования > 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Название</th>
<th>Русский</th>
<th>Українська</th>
<th>Беларуская</th>
<th>Польська</th>
<th>Чешська</th>
<th>Словенська</th>
<th>Хорватська</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
<td>город Москва</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
<td>река Волга</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
<td>река Иструм</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
<td>река Дунай</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
<td>река Дуна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
<td>река Ваха</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Таблица 1. Согласование в аппозитивных конструкциях в 7 славянских с разными существительными
Во всех языках согласование было наиболее частотным в конструкциях с существительным город и река и их эквивалентами в других славянских языках. При этом в случае с конструкциями с существительным река, значимым во всех языках был фактор конгруэнтности членов конструкции по грамматическому роду. Языком, допускающим согласование в наибольшем числе контекстов, оказался хорватский.

**Грамматические свойства имени собственно (ИС).** Далее исследовалось влияние факторов неконгруэнтного грамматического рода ИС (город(м) Москва(г)), ингерентной множественности ИС (город Чебоксары) и частотности ИС на процент согласования в аппозитивных конструкциях с существительным ‘город’ и его эквивалентами. Таблица 2 суммирует результаты применения статистической регрессионной модели. В качестве параметра, отражающего частотность ИС, рассматривалось количество вхождений имени на миллион единиц в корпусе (ipm).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Язык</th>
<th>Имя нарицательное</th>
<th>Фактор</th>
<th>Несовпадающий род</th>
<th>Ингерентная множественность</th>
<th>Частотность</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Русский</td>
<td>город (м)</td>
<td>f:-*/ n: ?</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+* (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Украинский</td>
<td>мисто (н)</td>
<td>m: - / f: -</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+* (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Белорусский</td>
<td>город (м)</td>
<td>f: -*/ n: ?</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+ (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Польский</td>
<td>miasto (н)</td>
<td>m: + / f: +</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+ (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Чешский</td>
<td>město (н)</td>
<td>m: + / f: +*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+* (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хорватский</td>
<td>grad (м)</td>
<td>f: +*/ n: +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+* (низкая)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Словенский</td>
<td>mesto (н)</td>
<td>m: +/ f: +*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>+* (низкая)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Таблица 2. Факторы, обуславливющие согласование имени собственного в 7 славянских языках

Значимая отрицательная корреляция между согласованием и неконгруэнтностью по грамматическому роду наблюдалась только в русском и белорусском языках. В большинстве языков ингерентная множественность значимо отрицательно коррелировала с согласованием, в то время как частотность имени собственного положительно влияла на вероятность согласования, хотя коэффициент корреляции был значительно ниже, чем в случае с другими факторами.

На Рисунке 1 показан средний процент согласования в 4 падежах в 7 анализируемых языках. Падежом, в котором наблюдался наибольший процент согласования, практически во всех языках был генитив. Генитивный контекст также был наиболее частотным в исследуемых выборках. Языком, допускавшим наибольший процент согласования, был хорватский, а реже всего согласование наблюдалось в словенском.
В докладе планируется представить другие факторы, влияющие на согласование в аппозитивных конструкциях в славянских языках и обсудить возможные мотивации представленных различий.
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On syntactic structures in the Russian Constructicon entries and beyond

Olga Lyashevskaya
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My talk addresses the task of annotating the Russian Constructicon (Janda et al. 2018) for syntactic structures. On the one hand, this allows one to classify the partially lexicalized syntactic idioms (Fillmore et al. 1988), which is in the core of the Russian Constructicon, according to formal properties; show the syntactic variation in constructions; represent the data as a network of constructions; check the data consistency. On the other hand, we design the future cross-linking of the Russian constructions to constructions in other languages (presumably, represented in other constructicons) and construction mining in other resources such as Russian treebanks.

The scheme of Structures is adopted from the Swedish Constructicon (Lyngfelt et al. 2013), with the construction elements enclosed in nested square brackets and dependency relations assigned to each element. The Structure sketch for the construction (1) is illustrated below. The lexical anchor без малого is a syntactically regular prepositional phrase, which depends on the numeral and thus extends the quantifier phrase such as двадцать лет. The Structures are represented at the level of the entry formula (a) and illustration (b).

(1) без малого Num NP-Gen (без малого двадцать лет) ‘nearly twenty years’.

(a) [root [nummod [obl [case без малого] Num] NP-Gen]
(b) [root [nummod [obl [case без малого] двадцать] лет]


Although the Universal Dependencies labels (UD, de Marneffe and Nivre, 2019) are used, our schema is aimed to reconstruct the syntactically regular patterns in partially lexicalized idioms rather than represent them as syntactically shallow multi-word expressions as suggested by the UD v2.0 guidelines. In example (2), вот то-то и is encoded as three nodes attached separately to the head оно as adverbial modifiers, and the conjunction что is attached to the clause it introduces.

(2) (вот) то-то и оно, что Cl (То-то и оно, что от меня ничего не зависит) ‘There you are, (that) nothing depends on me’.

[root [advmod вот] [advmod то-то] [advmod и оно], [mark что] [ccomp Cl]]

I discuss the pros and cons of such an approach in regard to the data classification and mapping to the external resources, consider the clear cases and the borderline cases of irregular degenerative patterns, and outline the preliminary typology of structures in the Russian Constructicon.
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The role of phonetic word reductions in epistemic-stance-marking insubordination

Pavel Machač and Mirjam Fried
Charles University, Czech Republic

Interactants in natural conversations clearly rely on much more than lexical content and grammatical structures in order to work out the meaning and/or discourse-functional contribution of each turn. Based on the hypothesis that phonetic patterning also provides salient interpretive clues, we have shown, on the example of one insubordination pattern in Czech, that there is a systematic correlation between a particular intonation and different epistemic functions of an ostensibly single syntactic form (1a-b). It remains an open question, though, what other speech parameters are part of the picture; in this paper, we examine specifically the nature of segmental reductions and their potential role in the emergent insubordination.

Using the corpus of conversational Czech (Ortofon), we investigate insubordinate JESTLI ‘if’-clauses, a commonly occurring structure in conversational language. Initial research (Fried 2009) based on syntactic and conversational analysis, proposed a spectrum of functions associated with this pattern, including conventional expressions of speakers’ epistemic stance with differences in polarity: uncertainty about p (1a) vs. probability of not-p (1b). A prosodic probe confirmed that each interpretation is associated with a distinct intonation pattern (roughly, slightly rising vs. sharply falling) and that this split is also present in the most frequently attested form of the hypothesized source of this insubordination structure: the embedded Y/N questions introduced by nevím ‘I don’t know’ (2).

Focusing now on segmental reductions (Machač 2014) of both nevím (2) and jestli (1-2), we test the hypothesis that the segmental qualities of the JESTLI-clause play a role in the erosion of the main clause and the functional split in the resulting insubordination. Detailed auditive analysis, supported by acoustic representations of the speech signal, suggests that the degree of word reduction (articulated through the so-called word-reduction-rate, based on the analysis of actually realized phonetic features) reflects the functional split found in the insubordination pattern: greater reduction tends to signal a high degree of speaker’s uncertainty. It thus confirms our preliminary findings that even the structure shown in (2) comes in two semantic variants (uncertainty about p vs. certainty of not knowing), associated with different intonation contours.

The results support a constructional treatment of the patterns in question, linking together phonetic (segmental, prosodic), semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic properties, which together provide relevant clues serving the interpretive demands of spontaneously produced interaction. But the findings have consequences also for the way we conceptualize the functional and semantic idiosyncrasies of insubordination: they may have their origin in the full hypotactic pattern and need not arise independently of them only as a result of ‘losing’ the main clause.
(1) a. **to bylo celý ta střecha dobouchaná vod krup, jesí to tam předtím spravoval někdo**
   ‘it was, the whole roof was pock-marked from hail, I-guess maybe somebody’d tried to
   fix it before’

   b. **hmm, to esi .. no esi .. esi Oťas vůbec má baterku**
   ‘uh-huh, well.. I doubt Otto even has any battery’

(2) **no já nevím, esi ještě nějak funguje vůbec**
   ‘well I don’t know if he’s still doing anything at all’
The paper addresses a theoretical question of the role of synonymous constructions in a language. Is there always something behind the choice between competing constructions or does pure synonymy exist? What motivates the choice of the speakers? I offer an empirical investigation of this problem by looking at three ways of describing the beginning of an activity in Russian. The preliminary analysis of corpus data suggests that one of the available options is preferred in most cases due to its extreme productivity in modern Russian and despite the risk of ambiguity.

There are at least three ways to describe the onset of an activity in Russian, analytical constructions with načat’/stat’ + imperfective infinitive and ingressive aktionsart prefixed in za-, e.g., načat’/stat’ kričat’, zakričat’ all meaning ‘start screaming’. Flank (1987) and Dickey (1999) have suggested semantic nuances characterizing the different constructions. Modern language corpora enable us to shed further light on the problem and test Flank and Dickey’s assumptions empirically. A simple corpus search reveals large variation in the number of attestations of the three ingressesives (www.ruscorpora.ru). My pilot study of verbs describing sound phenomena (kričat’, kašljat’, govorić’, etc.) and movement (prygać’, letać’, xodić’, begać’, etc.) shows that ingressesives in za- are the preferred option followed by načat’ + imperfective infinitive and stat’ + imperfective infinitive.

Interestingly, all three ways to express ingressivity can be ambiguous. While za- prefixed verbs of movement can and in the vast majority of examples actually mean ‘drop by’ (Zaxodil v gosti ‘used to drop by for a short visit’), analytical constructions with načat’/stat’ can refer to gaining a new habit (e.g. Načal/Stal begać’ po utram ‘started running in the mornings’). In the presentation, a detailed analysis of the distributions of various meanings will be provided. The data indicate that a highly productive construction is preferred not only for sound verbs where it actually helps avoid ambiguity, but even for verbs describing movement where it creates ambiguity. The disambiguation is then left to the context, which needs to provide enough cues to support one of the readings.

The current pilot corpus study of Russian ingressive constructions lends supports Goldberg’s idea about semantic or pragmatic differences that accompany syntactic differences (Goldberg 1995: 67). Furthermore, the study demonstrates the crucial role of context: it is the context that disambiguates the highly productive ambiguous construction.
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Comparative constructions in the Russian Constructicon: Families and Clusters

Daria Mordashova
Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia;
Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

We report on a thorough study of 180 multi-word constructions of Contemporary Standard Russian that employ various combinations of morphological and syntactic means in order to encode the semantics of comparison. We propose a fine-grained classification of these constructions based on their semantic and syntactic properties and model these data in terms of five clusters that contain thirty smaller groups termed families of constructions.

The five clusters correspond to major semantic types of comparative constructions discussed in typological literature, including comparison of inequality and equality as well as comparison of similarity and imitation (simulation). Thus, we account for both the quantitative and the qualitative types of comparison (Treis 2018). Additionally, we distinguish a cluster of comparative constructions that focus on contrast. The distribution of comparative constructions in our dataset is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype of comparison</th>
<th>N of constructions</th>
<th>N of constructional families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Inequality</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Equality</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of Similarity</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation (Simulation)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of 180 comparative constructions across the five clusters that correspond to general semantic types of comparison.
*One of the cxns belongs to two subtypes.

The data is collected as a part of a larger project of building the Russian Constructicon, an open-access electronic resource that offers a searchable database of over 2200 constructions accompanied with descriptions of their properties and illustrative corpus examples (http://spraakbanken.gu.se/karp/#?mode=konstruktikon-rus). We adopt the Construction Grammar approach (Croft 2001; Goldberg 2006; Fillmore et al. 1988) and view constructions as form-meaning pairings at any level of generality. In order to identify families of comparative constructions, we employ a combination of semantic and syntactic tags elaborated in the Russian Constructicon (see an overview of syntactic patterns in Figure 1).
We define a family of constructions as a relatively small and arguably homogeneous group of four to fifteen constructions that exhibit family resemblance and share some semantic, syntactic, and structural properties (e.g. reduplication, negation, inversion, etc.). For each family, we establish more central and more peripheral members. Distinctions between families are based on different ways of encoding e.g. the standard of comparison, the degree of similarity (including lexical, morphological, and syntactic means), etc. We present peculiar families of constructions with semantics of similarity and imitation and show how our analysis can shed new light on the issues of grammaticalization (a case study of derived denominal prepositions) and reduplicative patterns (a case study of nominal patterns).
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Semantic classification of constructions in the Russian Constructicon
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In recent decades, the Construction Grammar framework has generated numerous thorough studies of individual constructions found in various languages. Yet little is known about how the semantics of the entire system of constructions unfolds in a single language. What are the major types of meanings that multi-word constructions can encode? What semantic types of constructions are attested more often than others? Do various types of constructional meaning form a coherent system? Presumably, these questions can be answered only if one can get access to a relatively large inventory of constructions of a single language, and a detailed description of this inventory, a constructicon.

Today we are in a position to offer preliminary answers to these questions, based on data from the Russian Constructicon, an open-access electronic resource that offers a searchable database of over 2200 Russian constructions accompanied with descriptions of their properties and illustrated with corpus examples (https://site.uit.no/russian-constructicon/).

In this talk we present a multi-level semantic classification that accounts for the entire database of the Russian Constructicon. We propose a system of semantic tags that subdivides our items into meaningful classes and smaller groups and eventually facilitates the identification of constructional families and clusters. We argue that this system of tags works well in turning the initial list of constructions as unrelated units into a structured network.

The inventory of semantic tags employed in the Russian Constructicon includes 53 general tags and 175 subtypes of general tags. Many semantic tags are oriented towards the terminology used in typological studies of grammatical meanings. We adopt and adjust this terminology for annotation of constructional meanings, trying to understand which types of meanings encoded grammatically in other languages can be expressed in Russian by means of syntactic constructions. For example, our tag Phase of Action has the subtypes Inchoative, Continuative, Terminative, and Cunctative, according to the distinctions proposed in Plungian 1999. At the same time, our system goes beyond typologically attested and typically grammatical meanings and additionally covers those semantic types that are suggested by our data, e.g. Salient property, Non-existence, Attitude, etc.

We will show that our semantic tags are related to each other and form a hierarchy. General tags are organized in thematic groups, such as Situation structure, Situation modifiers, Properties, etc. Thematic groups of tags form large classes that we term Qualia, Modality & its neighborhood, Subjectivity, Discourse, and Parameters. Over 40% of constructions carry more than one tag that
capture different components of semantics. Thus, semantic types, groups and classes of tags often overlap at the level of individual constructions and we can examine what kinds of overlaps are more frequently attested than others. We will show that our semantic classification gives a multi-dimensional overview of the system of Russian constructions and can potentially be used for cross-linguistic comparisons.
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Agreement with quantified subjects in Russian: interaction of factors over time

Tore Nesset
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Notorious for their complexity, Russian numerals and other quantifiers have been subjected to several empirical studies in recent years (Pereltsvaig 2010, Madariaga & Igartua 2017, Nesset 2019, 2020). However, predicate agreement patterns with quantified subjects have received less attention, and generative studies such as Glushan 2013 and Pesetsky 2013 largely rely on native speaker intuitions and small-scale empirical investigations from the pre-corpus era, e.g. Corbett 1983. Russian quantified subjects combine with agreement targets in the singular or plural:

(1) a. Na zaščitu diplomu prišloSG pjat’ generalov. (Soldat Udači 2004)
   b. PrišliPL pjat’ sestër iz Kimr. (Vstreča 2003)

In the scholarly literature, a number of factors have been claimed to influence the choice between singular and plural agreement targets, including the following:

(2) a. Word order: SV-order favors plural agreement.
   b. The quantifier itself: Paucal numerals (2-4) favor plural agreement.
   c. Animacy: Animate subjects favor plural agreement.
   d. Predicate: Agentive predicates favor plural agreement.
   e. Premodifier: Preposed modifiers in the nominative (e.g. èti ‘these’) require plural agreement.

However, these factors have not been studied from the perspective of cognitive linguistics and the usage-based model (Langacker 1991), and there are no large-scale corpus studies of the interaction of the factors in (2), nor has the diachronic development been studied based on corpus data. What are the prototypical agreement patterns, and how have they changed? The present study aims at filling this knowledge gap. To this end a database of approximately 20 000 examples from the Russian National Corpus (www.ruscorpora.ru) has been constructed. The annotation of the database is still in progress, but preliminary analysis of premodifiers (factor 2e) confirms the conventional wisdom that the premodifier èti ‘these’ requires plural agreement, regardless of word order, quantifier, animacy or predicate type (factors 2a-d). Moreover, this situation appears not to have changed over the last two centuries. Of the 1,479 examples spanning from 1800 to the present day that were analyzed, all have plural agreement:

(3) O čēm že govoriliPL èti dva russkix intelligenta? (Nekrasov 1986)

When the annotation and analysis of the database are completed, we will be in a position to draw conclusions about the interaction of the factors in (2) and the diachronic development of agreement with quantified subjects over the last two centuries. The proposed analysis will also testify to the value of a cognitive approach to this complex and controversial topic in Russian linguistics.
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Feminities in Russian: what can corpus data tell us?
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Traditionally, in Russian masculine words like *advokat* ‘lawyer’ have been used to designate professions, even when the professional in question is female. However, in recent years it has become more widespread to use separate words to refer to female professionals, so-called feminitives (Arkhangelskaya 2014). Should a female lawyer be referred to as an *advokatka*, *advokatsa*, *advokatessa*, *ženščina-advokat* or *advokat-ženščina*? While feminitives have become a hotly debated topic in metalinguistic discussions, little descriptive work has been carried out to shed light on the use of feminitives in present-day Russian. The aim of our research project is to fill this knowledge gap. Without going into the metalinguistic and prescriptivist issues at stake, our research question is: What linguistic factors motivate the distribution of feminitives?

Adopting a usage-based approach (Langacker 1991), we present a thorough analysis of data from two corpora, Araneum Russicum Maximum (a web corpus of about 20 billions tokens, http://ucts.uniba.sk/araneum_about/russicum.html) and the Russian National Corpus (RNC, a balanced corpus with rich annotation of about 300 millions tokens, www.ruscorpora.ru). Quantitative analysis of the Araneum data indicates that morphophonological factors are important for the choice of feminitive, in particular stem-final consonant and stress. The observed tendencies can be analyzed as prototypical schemas (Langacker 2008).

In a qualitative analysis of data from the Russian National Corpus we target ten professions: *advokat* ‘lawyer’, *agent* ‘agent’, *inžener* ‘engineer’, *trener* ‘coach’, *dizajner* ‘designer’, *konsul’tant* ‘consultant’, *režisser* ‘film director’, *kapitan* ‘captain’, *instruktor* ‘instructor’, and *èkskursovod* ‘guide’. In addition to confirming the results of the quantitative analysis, the qualitative analysis of the RNC data show that the distribution of feminitives has changed over time. The model *ženščina*-X (e.g., *ženščina-advokat*) came into use in the first part of the 20th century, followed by the suffix -ka (e.g., *advokatka*) in the middle of the century. The suffix -essa has become widely used for lawyers (*advokatessa*) in the 21st century, but is marginal for the remaining professions under scrutiny. The suffix -ša is in the process of changing from denoting the wife of a professional to denoting a female professional. While in the 19th century *kapitanša* was used about a captain’s wife, this word now frequently refers to a female captain.

Analysis of epithets combining with feminitives reveals interesting patterns. While the model *ženščina*-X is frequently used with the epithet pervyj ‘first’ (e.g., pervaja *ženščina-advokat* ‘first female lawyer’), suffixed models tend to attract gender-related epithets (e.g. xrupen’kaja *advokatessa* ‘frail lawyer’ and obajatel’naja *agentka* ‘charming agent’).

Taken together, our analysis demonstrates that linguistic factors are important in motivating the distribution of feminitives, which is in the process of changing rapidly. Corpus data enable us to
unpack hidden patterns in the language, and a usage-based approach to linguistics thus has the potential to inform metalinguistic discussion and prescriptivist thinking about feminitives.
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Most Russian verbs are said to come in aspectual pairs, consisting of one imperfective and one perfective verb with identical lexical meaning, e.g. *davat´*–*dat´* ‘give’, *pisat´*–*napisat´* ‘write’ or *varit´*–*svarit´* ‘cook’. Among prefixed pairs there is considerable morphological diversity, as at least 16 Russian verbal prefixes are “aspectual”, i.e. able to form a perfective verb when added to an imperfective base verb (Janda et al 2013, 5). For this reason, new verbs and loanverbs have no obvious “regular” way of forming aspectual pairs. Prefixation and the formation of aspectual pairs of loanverbs can thus shed light on the old question of whether aspectual prefixes are semantically “empty” or whether the choice of prefix depends on the meaning of the base verb. The latter view is known as the overlap hypothesis (Janda et al. 2013) which claims that the prefix and the imperfective base verbs in aspectual pairs have the same, or similar, lexical meaning.

Earlier research on Russian loanverbs and aspect has mostly focused on verbs that end on -*ovat´*, most of which are biaspectual, e.g. *izolirovat´* ‘isolate’ and *dezinficirovat´* ‘disinfect’ (Avilova 1968, Čertkova & Či-Čang 1998, Olsson 2018). However, many of the most recent loanverbs in Russian end on -*it´* (e.g. *guglit´* ‘google’ and *trollit´* ‘troll, harass’) or, if the root ends on /k/, on -*at´* (klikat´ ‘click’, lajkat´ ‘like, press the “like” button’). These verbs tend to be colloquial but not biaspectual, making the formation of aspectual pairs more frequent in these classes of verbs than in the *ova*-class.

This paper presents the results of an online survey in which 120 native Russian speakers formed perfective verbs from 19 new, colloquial verbs with the help of compensator verbs (Russian: *glagoly-kompensatory*) following the model *sdelat´ ošibku* ‘make a mistake’ = *ošibit´sja* ‘err’ (in the first construction, *sdelat´* ‘make’ is the compensator verb). Two examples from the survey are *sdelat´ skrinšot* ‘make a screenshot’ and *napisat´ tvit* ‘write a tweet’. The respondents were asked to form a perfective verb from the nominal in the construction, synonymous to the “compensator verb + nominal”-construction. The results of the survey show that for the 19 verbs in the study, the most common perfectivizer was the suffix -*nu--*, which was especially productive in verbs that express a short or momentary action. The second most common perfectivizer was the prefix *za-* , which was productive across many kinds of verbs.
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A discursive study of modality: the dative-infinitive structure in modern Russian and how to classify its different uses
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Many aspects of the dative-infinitive structure were already broadly presented: the syntactic level, i.e. the absence of a formal (modal) predicate, the various modalities expressed (E. Fortuin, F. Maurice), as well as the specific word order and phonetic characteristics (A. Israeli, V. Bricyn). Taking these works into account, I will here present the discursive aspect of this structure.

Based on my work with native Russian speakers and the creation of a full corpus of utterances (mainly based on the online corpus ruscorpora.ru) I will propose a new way of classifying the different discursive uses of the dative-infinitive structure. I will take into account the relation between the speaker and the addressee and the different contexts in which the dative-infinitive structure occurs. These uses will be classified regarding the different types of sentences: affirmative, negative and interrogative.

For the affirmatives, I will show how every dative-infinitive sentence is based on different preconstructed events that can be classified in different groups. It can be based on situational characteristics (1), on defining characteristics (2), on an opposing process, or even on beliefs. I will present these four categories, based on multiple corresponding utterances in context for each of them.

1) Ja otvetila: tvoja kvartira, tebe rešat’.
2) – Na mjasokombine tebe rabotat’!

With the negative sentences, I will include in my analysis the variation of aspect of the infinitive – perfective or imperfective – and how this affects the meaning of the sentence. With the perfective, the speaker refers to an impossibility (3), with an imperfective, to a situation that is not bound to happen (4).

3) Ni za čto mne ne sdat’ ètot èkzamen !
4) Počemu by i net, skazal on. Ved’ zavtra emu ne idti v školu.

For the interrogatives, I will explain why the interrogatives with a perfective infinitive strongly differ from the ones with an imperfective infinitive. As we can see in the two examples given below, with a perfective, the speaker asks a real question (5), with an imperfective, it is often a rhetorical question (6).

2 During the presentation, I will also give an English translation for each example presented.
5) – Ja, sobstvenno, dažne ne znaju... S ____ čego mne načat'?
6) – Začem mne vrat'? – udivljaetsja on.

This classification will allow us to understand why this structure occupies a very special place not only in the expression of modality, but in the whole Russian language.
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Discourse Formulae and Constructions: There and Back
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As a representative resource for Russian constructions, Russian Constructicon (Janda et al. 2018) mainly focuses on their core segment: non-compositional constructions with grammatical meaning. Discourse constructions with pragmatic meaning (Еще бы не Р! Не факт, что Х) form a small peripheral class of Constructicon. With further pragmatization (Heine 2013), most of these constructions become semantic sources for linguistic units of a special sort: discourse formulas (DF). DF are multi-word, idiomatic and often non-transparent, just as “standard” constructions, but have no syntactic variables (Gerasimenko et al. 2019). DF function in a dialogue as isolated remarks, cf. Еще чего! А то! The paper discusses the possible relations between DF and constructions.

Our research is based on a specialized database of Russian DF, an extension for “Russian Constructicon”. The database contains the most frequent of Russian DF and classifies them by their illocutionary force – refusal, confirmation, surprise, etc.

The paper shows that there is a correlation between the DF class and the pattern of pragmatization. For example, many Russian DF of negation result from reduction of the embedded sentence of the negative construction as in:

(1) Не думаю, что ХP [construction] → Не думаю. [DF]

The reduced part of the construction (XP) is presented in the preceding remark of the interlocutor:

(2) ← Он боится темноты? / Наверно, он боится темноты.> – Не думаю. [DF]

Negative polarity constructions with intensifiers, like Ни за что не VP (Ни за что не сказать), Ни в коем случае не VP (Ни в коем случае не отказывайтесь!) are often pragmatized into DF of refusal or prohibition. In accordance with the Jespersen cycle (Jespersen 1917: 4), the negative reaction is expressed with the intensifier (the anchor of a construction). It becomes DF (Ни за что!), and VP becomes a stimulus for the negative response:

(3) – Скажете? (VP) – Ни за что! [DF]

The paper also considers the cases where new schematic constructions emerge on the basis of DF pragmatized from another construction type, cf.:

(4) [construction] Надо же VP (Надо же было ему так ошибиться!) →
← Он ошибся> – Надо же! [DF] →
[construction] Надо же, какой Х / A-ый! (Надо же, какой ливень! / какой вежливый!)
Some of the constructions that are related to DF are already presented in the “Russian Constructicon” and others are being added to it according to the patterns of pragmatalization and constuctionalization detected within our analysis and applied to our DF list.
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Стратегии перевода диминутивов в романе Светланы Алексиевич «У войны не женское лицо» с русского на шведский, норвежский и украинский языки
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Морфологические диминутивы играют особую роль в славянских языках, так как являются одним из распространенных средств языковой выразительности. Наряду со значением малого размера, они также могут выражать субъективное отношение говорящего к объекту обсуждения и собеседнику, передавать широкий спектр эмоций, выполнять прагматические функции или отражать настроение говорящего в целом. Диминутивные суффиксы могут присоединяться в русском языке к таким частям речи, как существительное (курточка (в значении «детская», «красивая», «удобная», «любимая», «легкая» и т.д.), прилагательное (беленький, наречие (быстренько), местоимение (ничегошеньки (совсем ничего)), глагол (спатоньки). Перевод данных экспрессивных компонентов может быть затруднительным в случае таких языков, в которых диминутивы не так распространены и имеют гораздо более узкое значение, особенно в художественной литературе. Понимание читателем нюансов субъективных отношений, выраженных в диминутивных формах, например, имен собственных может оказаться ключевым и может потребовать дополнительных разъяснений или комментариев со стороны переводчика.

В посттравматическом романе «У войны не женское лицо» (Алексиевич 2013) эмоции и опыт переживания тяжелых жизненных испытаний становятся ключевой темой, так как в нём собраны свидетельства женщин-участниц Второй мировой войны. В своём исследовании мы попытались выявить наиболее характерные стратегии перевода диминутивов с русского на ещё один славянский язык, а именно украинский (Алексієвич 2016), в котором диминутивы представлены чрезвычайно широко, а также на два скандинавских языка, шведский (Aileaksjievitj 2015) и норвежский (Aileaksjievitsj 2015), в которых диминутивы менее распространены. Сравнительный анализ переводов оригинального текста на выбранные нами языки раскрывает подходы к выражению спектра значений, передаваемых диминутивами, в тех случаях, когда морфологические средства ограничены либо совсем отсутствуют.
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One case of Addressee of speech marking in Western and Southern Russian dialects

Roman Ronko
HSE University, Russia;
Vinogradov Institute of Russian Language of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

In this talk, we will consider one construction with a preposition na (on) and an addressee of speech with verbs *govorit’* (to speak) and *skazat’* (to say) in some Southern Russian and Western Russian dialects. In standard Russian, the semantic role of the addressee of speech is marked with a dative case:

(1) *Ja jemu govor’-u: ty že nerussk-ij.*

I tell him: you are not Russian (Russian National corpus)

We will focus on the examples from Russian dialects that use a different marker of the addressee of speech: preposition *na* with accusative:

(2) *A na Mixalyč-a govor-it: “id-i dom-oj za nož-ik-om”*

And on Mixalyč-ACC.SG speak-PRS.3SG go-IMP home-ADV for knife-DIM-INS

And (she) says to Mixalych: “Go home to get a knife” (Laptevo village, Opocheckij district, Pskov region)

The research is based on the data extracted from several dialectal corpora. There is the data from the Rogovatka corpus, Starooskol’sky district, Belgorod region, the Malinino corpus, Khlevinsky district Lipeck region and the Opočka corpus, Opočecky district, Pskov region. Thus, we analyzed Western Russian data (Opočka corpus) and Southern Russian data (Rogovatka and Malinino corpus). We have extracted all examples with addressee of speech with verbs *govorit’* (to speak) and *skazat’* (to say) from the corpora.

Constructions with preposition *na* can have several meanings that can be distinguished in 2 groups: contexts with abuse and contexts that contain an impulse (motivation) to action. In the talk we will consider these two groups of meanings as three stages of the semantic shift. We can suggest that the metaphorical transition of the construction occurs as follows: 1. The surface of a real physical object (standard meaning of preposition *na*); 2. A sound wave on a surface, in which the addressee of speech acts with a component of aggression; 3. Influence and control of this addressee.

List of abbreviations
1  First person
3  Third person
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present study investigates the semantics of the future II (future anterior) in BCS on the background of its functional equivalents in Polish and Bulgarian. BCS future II comprises the present perfective of the auxiliary ‘be’ followed by the l-participle (l-future), e.g. _budemo hteli_ ‘(if) we want [future]’. Whereas BCS has a different future tense marking than Polish (auxiliary verb ‘want’ as opposed to ‘be’ in Polish), both languages have l-future, yet with different semantics. In Polish it functions as a general future marker for imperfective verbs, e.g. _będziemy chcieli_ ‘we will want’. At the same time, BCS and Bulgarian share ‘want’ as the future tense auxiliary verb, but the latter does not exhibit l-future (Andersen 2006).

In BCS, l-future is often analyzed as a conditional future form restricted to subordinate clauses and synonymous with the present perfective (PP) in the same syntactic environment (cf. Vuković 2014). However, Kovačević (2008) shows that BCS l-future (like PP) is not limited to subordination: It also occurs in independent clauses with modal adverbs such as _možda_ 'maybe', e.g. _Možda oni budu znali nešto_ ('Maybe they will know something'). It corresponds to the common cross-linguistic features of future anterior (and constructions originated from it) to intersect with the domain of epistemic modality (Penkova 2019). This intersection means that the former future anterior has common grounds in different languages based on universal cognitive mechanisms.

In order to identify the primary semantic component of BCS l-future these are compared, along with PP, to their semantic equivalents in Polish and Bulgarian, using data from parallel corpora ParaSol (von Waldenfels & Meyer 2006-).

The results show that BCS l-future mostly pertains to imperfective verbs and that it exhibits future nonfactual semantics. Their semantic equivalents in Polish consist largely of l-future imperfective verbs. Interestingly, the Bulgarian PP corresponds to PP in BCS and Polish. By contrast, BCS and Polish l-future correspond to Bulgarian imperfective verbs in either the present tense or the ‘want’-future form. The findings suggest the polysemous PP in Bulgarian and BCS has a nonfactual reference which includes future reference (as one of its implicatures), the core meaning of the Polish PP. However, unlike in Bulgarian, in BCS and Polish the present perfective ‘be’ has grammaticalized as an auxiliary verb with future reference. In BCS, the future is combined with nonfactuality, whereas in Polish it is a general future marker restricted to the imperfective verbs.
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Conceptualizing life in language: the Russian verb *zhit’* ‘to live’ and its derivatives in the cross-linguistic perspective

Elena Shmeleva and Alexei Shmelev
Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

This paper deals with the derivational paradigm of *zhit’* ‘to live’ (the verb itself and its derivatives) in comparison with their counterparts in other languages. We distinguish three groups of meanings of the verb *zhit’* reflecting certain features of the Russian linguistic conceptualization of life: *zhit’1*, which corresponds to the semantic primitive ‘to be alive’, *zhit’2* < *v Y*-e> ‘to make Y one’s abode’ and *zhit’3* < *s Y*-om> ‘have a sexual relationship with Y’. These meanings mutate in derivatives.

The specific features of the Russian linguistic conceptualization of life is visible from comparison with other languages. Some of the relevant facts are well known, e.g. the fact that French and German distinguish ‘live1’ and ‘live2’, that Greek has two words for *life* (ζωή usually denotes the state of ‘being alive’ while βίοσ refers to the period from birth to death), and Church Slavonic has three words (*zhivot* and *zhizn’* often correspond to ζωή, and zhitie to βίοσ), etc. Some facts require more detailed consideration (e.g., *zhite’* of the Russian original texts is often translated by means of its quasi-equivalent *life*, and in the English-Russian RNC subcorpus *zhite’* often appears when there is no direct stimulus for it).

Many facts related to the derivatives of *zhit’* are not mentioned in the dictionaries or are described incompletely or inaccurately. The verb *zhit’* in the meaning ‘to have a sexual relationship’ is normally used only with reference to a lasting relationship (occasionally it may also be used with reference to a particular sexual intercourse). The noun *zhizn’* ‘life’ in the reading ‘the state of living1’ applies both to people and animals, and in the reading ‘the time in which one lives1’ to people only (it may apply to animals by personification). The adjective *zhiloi* is language-specific and defy translation: consider the Sovietism *zhilaia ploshchad’, the collocation *zhilaia komnata* (not the same as *living room*). We examine the words *zhile’* and *zhilishche*, the paradoxical linguistic behavior of the verb *zazhit’* (rana zazhila ‘the wound has healed’), and a number of other prefixed derivatives of *zhit’*.

The linguistic conceptualization of reality changes over time. In modern language, the meaning ‘a person who lives2 in Y’ is expressed by the words *zhilets* (Y-a) and *zhitel’* (Y-a), differing in scale: with a small scale, *zhilets* (*zhilets kvartiry* ‘apartment resident’) is used, and with a large scale, *zhitel’* (*zhitel’ goroda* ‘city resident’, *zhitel’ strany* ‘country resident’). The house (*dom* has an intermediate status: *zhitel’ doma* ‘house resident’ (mainly in the plural, *zhiteli doma*) occurs almost as frequently as *zhilets doma*. In the Russian texts of 1800s, the collocations *zhiltsy goroda* ‘city residents’ and *zhiltsy strany* ‘country residents’ were quite common (Pen’kovskii). (The word *zhilets* is also used in the sense ‘who is able to live1’, usually with negation as in the collocation *ne zhilets*.)
In modern Russian, the adjective zhivoi ‘live’ has received a new meaning borrowed from English live (zhivaia muzyka ‘live music’); this indicates the emergence of new nuances in the conceptualization of ‘living’. 
Encoding path in Russian: prefix + preposition combinations

Varvara Shuvalova
Saint Petersburg State University, Russia

In Russian, as a manner-incorporating language [Talmy 1985], path is expressed by special elements other than the verb root. Predominantly it is encoded by a construction with a verb prefix and a prepositional phrase (PP), which can be referred to as a double-framing construction [Croft et al. 2010: 6], see (1).

(1) змея за-ползает [в комнату]
    goal-manner [в + ACC]=goal
    ‘A snake is crawling into the room’

My research aims to explore the ways how the two elements interact within the double-framing construction and to identify factors that affect the expression of path, including aspect and directionality.

I explore path expressions in terms of harmonic and disharmonic combinations. The combination where both the prefix and the PP encode the same information (either source, trajectory or goal) is referred to as harmonic, see (1). The combination where the two satellites have divergent meanings is referred to as disharmonic, see (2).

(2) Он вышел [в гостиную]
    source-manner [в + ACC]=goal
    ‘He came out into the living room’

The data were gathered in the Russian National Corpus (http://ruscorpora.ru/old/). The full sample consisted of 10882 examples with verbs ползти/ползать ‘crawl’ or their prefixed derivatives used in combination with PPs expressing path (this verbal nest was chosen due to the low percentage of metaphorical contexts). It was manually annotated for semantic and syntactic parameters.

The results are as follows. i) PPs are goal-biased, while prefixes tend to express the source. ii) There is a statistical tendency to encode path by harmonic combinations. iii) In disharmonic combinations, the prefix typically expresses the source and the PP, the goal (выползти на поляну ‘to crawl into the meadow’), whereas the reverse combination (вползти с улицы ‘to crawl (into) out of the street’) is extremely rare. iv) Disharmonic combinations are more common with imperfective verbs (проползён к реке ‘(he) was crawling to the river’), while harmonic combinations (especially those encoding the goal), with perfective verbs (заполз под кровать ‘(he) crawled under the bed’). v) The explicit expression of the final point is more frequent for verbs of unidirectional motion than for verbs of non-directional motion (in terms of [Nesset 2000: 106-107]).
These and other empirical results are accounted for by the following generalizations. i) Unlike PPs, prefixes indicate a landmark implicitly; as a result, they are associated with pragmatically less relevant information. ii) Verbs with goal-prefixes often express the onset of a resultant state, rather than the motion itself so they rarely combine with PPs expressing source or trajectory.
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Predictive effects of number-marked copula in sentence processing of Czech 2-year-olds

Filip Smolík and Veronika Bláhová
Institute of Psychology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic

There are conflicting findings regarding the early comprehension of grammatical number marking in verbs (Brandt-Kobele & Höhle, 2010; Johnson, de Villiers, & Seymour, 2005; Lukyanenko & Fisher, 2016). Two preferential-looking studies reported here examined the comprehension and predictive effects of number marking in the comprehension of the Czech copula “být” (to be). They are first such studies in a language with rich inflectional morphology.

In both studies, children saw pairs of pictures showing different objects. In the critical trials, one of the objects was shown in a single instance, while the other object was shown in a group of two to four. Children then heard a sentence that described one of the pictures using a copula structure such as:

Podívej, tady je/jsou na obrázku kniha/knihy.
Look there is/are in the picture book/books.

Children’s faces were recorded and their gaze direction coded, focusing on the effect of the copula on the proportion of looks towards the target picture. Differences were tested using random permutation analysis.

In Experiment 1, 40 children saw 18 trials, 6 each with singular and plural targets, and 6 in control condition, where both pictures showed single or multiple objects and the number morpheme was thus not informative. No significant effects were found. Experiment 2 examined 27-month-olds. Number of trials was increased to 16 experimental and 16 controls, which used the same picture pairs. Control trials had sentences without any number-marking morpheme before the target noun. There was a clear effect of number marking as early as 600 ms after copula, confirmed as statistically significant by random permutation analysis. The effect was stronger in children with better scores in an offline vocabulary comprehension task. Overall, the results show that young 2-year-olds use their knowledge of grammatical number to anticipate upcoming words but the effect requires sufficiently powered experiment to be shown.
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Вербализация главных концептов политического дискурса в официальных речах Президента В. В. Путина

Robert Szymula
University of Bialystok, Poland


Анализируемые концепты занимают важное место в политическом дискурсе, они часто используются, например, в предвыборной борьбе, поскольку понятия свободы и справедливости универсальны и потенциально могут привлечь внимание каждого избирателя. Анализ вербализации этих концептов в посланиях В. В. Путина показывает, однако, что в данном жанре они не играют существенной роли. Их вербализации немногочисленны, они встречаются не во всех выступлениях. «Свобода» и «справедливость» рассматриваются как понятия, тесно связанные друг с другом (чаще перечисляются рядом). Президент не дает дефиниции понятия «свобода», но, исходя из контекста, оно понимается как отсутствие зависимости и способность принимать решения о самом себе и своих действиях («свобода веры», «свободное предпринимательство»). Реализации этого концепта имеют мало конкретный характер, они перечисляются или в сочетании с правами человека / гражданина («права и свободы человека», «права и свободы гражданина»), либо с другими универсальными ценностями («независимость», «равенство», «нравственность»). Однако некоторые вербализации связаны с конкретизацией концепта, например, Президент определяет области, в которых это понятие особенно важно (сфера экономики: «экономическая свобода», «свободное предпринимательство»). Вербализации понятия «свобода» по отношению к гражданам являются редкими, они чаще всего относятся ко всему обществу, не к индивидам.
(«свободная нация», «свободное общество»). Концепт «справедливость» в посланиях Президента реализован реже, но более конкретно. Данное понятие определяется непосредственно в выступлениях как равные возможности для всех граждан. Неудивительно, что наиболее распространенные вербализации этого понятия касаются социальной сферы («социальная справедливость»).
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Exploring the news discourse on the energy sector in the Russian and the US newspapers

Radoslava Trnavac
University of Belgrade, Serbia

In this comparative study, we investigate the linguistic devices that may be used to construct news values in the news items related to the energy sector in the Russian and the US broadsheet newspapers Kommersant and The New York Times. Based on the observations of Thompson and Hunston (2000: 6–7) that one of the three functions of evaluation is to reflect a value system, we turn to the framework for a linguistic analysis of news discourse presented in Bednarek (2006) and Bednarek and Caple (2012a,b, 2017). This framework is situated within the discursive approach and is to be regarded complementary to cognitive approaches that take news values as socially-shared cognitive representations (Van Dijk, 1988). The above methodology provides the means to find out what values are emphasised (foregrounded), rare or absent (backgrounded). The objective of the paper is twofold. Firstly, we investigate whether a given topic on the energy sector is repeatedly associated with particular news values, such as Negative, Novel, Elite, etc., and, if so, what the effect of this may be. Secondly, we analyze attitudinal expressions that are employed to make events more newsworthy. After that, we compare the results from both newspapers since there is no claim that the same resources would work across languages.

In order to fulfill the first objective, we use the following techniques for the news values analysis: analysis of frequency of word forms and clusters, analysis of keywords, semantic tags, dispersion analysis, and concordancing. For our second objective, the analysis of attitudinal expressions, we deploy a combination of the two frameworks: Appraisal framework (Martin & White 2005) and the parameter-based framework of evaluation (Bednarek 2006). The corpus which we annotated includes news items containing 20,000 words for each language for the period of the last three years.

Our preliminary corpus analysis shows that of the news values that can be construed by linguistic devices associated with attitude, Negativity, Superlativeness, and Timeliness appear to be foregrounded in both languages, while the events are constructed as negative, having significant effects and timely in relation to the publication date. In accordance with that, the linguistic devices that are mostly used are the ones that have reference to the events that have real, important and relevant consequences, devices that refer to negative evaluative language, and the ones that indicate change or current trends.
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The polysemy of adverbs of low degree (the case of Slovenian komaj)\(^3\)

Mladen Uhlik
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia;
Fran Ramovš Institute of Slovenian Language, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts Ljubljana, Slovenia

The presentation deals with the polyfunctionality and semantic shifts of adverbs of low degree in Slavic languages. Specifically, we will consider different uses of the Slovenian word komaj ‘hardly, barely’ and compare it with its Russian and South Slavic equivalents. Besides describing the polysemy of the Slovenian word, the aim of the presentation is to highlight some typological features of the adverbs in question. They combine two basic meanings: the first one, ‘with great difficulty’, implies an effort to overcome obstacles, while the second one, ‘almost not’, expresses low intensity of action or state. Unlike Russian едва and еле, Slovenian komaj can be used in constructions having to do with evaluation of quantity (e. g. komaj dva evra ‘barely two euros’ vs. *едва два евро, ‘едва два евро’). Like its equivalents in other Slavic languages, Slovenian komaj can signal an immediate succession of events.

We propose that all these uses go back to the meaning ‘almost not’. A very different case is the construction where komaj is used as an adverbial modifier of predicates of expectation (e. g. Komaj čakam ‘I can hardly wait’). This construction, motivated by the meaning of great effort, represents a slight semantic shift where Slovenian komaj comes close to an intensifier.

The polysemy of the Slovenian komaj will be illustrated with a semantic map in which its semantic shifts will be compared to the ones of its equivalents in Russian and South Slavic languages.
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When Dative becomes Nominative: variation in Russian requests with the modal možno

Elmira Zhamaletdinova
The Arctic University of Norway, Norway

The Russian language uses two types of constructions to express modal meanings of necessity and possibility: impersonal Dative infinitive constructions with modal words možno, nel´zja, nado or nužno and personal constructions with the verb moč´ / smoč´ ‘to be able’ and the adjective dolžen that require a subject in Nominative case (Choi 1994).

An illocutionary act of request for permission to carry out an action in contemporary Russian can be expressed by two constructions with the modal adverb možno ‘be able’: one with an experiencer in the Dative case (1) and the other with the subject in the Nominative case (2), hereinafter možno + DAT and možno + NOM, respectively.

(1) **Možno mne vzjatʹ pirožnoe?**
Is it okay for me to take a pastry?

(2) **Možno ja vozʹmu eščë kusõček torta?**
Is it okay if I take another piece of cake?

Previous scholarship focuses on the properties of možno + DAT, although the možno + NOM construction sporadically appears in some descriptions, for instance, Švedova (1980) treats these two constructions as homonyms. Dubinina and Malamud (2017) marked both možno + DAT and možno + NOM as impersonal constructions.

A preliminary study of 637 examples from the Russian National Corpus (RNC, ruscorpora.ru) shows that until the 20th century only možno + DAT existed in written texts, however at the beginning of the 20th century the first occurrences of možno + NOM appeared. From the middle of the 20th century, the number of occurrences of možno + NOM surpasses možno + DAT and currently is 2.5 times as common.

In this talk, I will discuss two possible interpretations of možno + NOM. One way of interpreting možno + NOM is as a blend of the impersonal construction možno + DAT and a construction with a modal verb moč´ ‘to be able’ and an infinitive (Fauconnier & Turner 2002). I will investigate the relationship between the formal features of each construction such as tense, aspect, the semantic class of the predicate under modality and their pragmatic nuances, hypothesizing that these contextual factors predict the choice of construction. I will explore a whole range of factors that motivate the expansion of the možno + NOM construction.
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Constructions denoting degree of intensity in the Russian Constructicon

Valentina Zhukova
National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia

The current study focuses on various ways to express degree of intensification in Russian, in particular, constructions of different levels of complexity. Degree of intensity can be conceptualized as an imaginary vector that scales upwards and downwards from a contextually relevant norm. When it scales up, it denotes a high degree of intensity, while scaling down means a decrease of intensity.

I propose a classification that shows that the constructions denoting degree of intensity constitute homogeneous meaningful classes that lend themselves to analysis in terms of their semantic and syntactic properties.

The present study is conducted using data from the Russian Constructicon, which is a linguistic repository of constructions in the Russian language designed as a free open-access resource for learners of Russian ([https://site.uit.no/russian-constructicon/](https://site.uit.no/russian-constructicon/)). The Russian Constructicon contains more than 2200 constructions that are classified according to their semantics and syntax. Based on this classification, each construction in the database bears its own set of semantic and syntactic tags. Constructions in the Russian Constructicon project are viewed as form-function pairings at varying levels of abstraction and complexity, according to the Construction Grammar approach (Croft 2001; Goldberg 2006; Fillmore et al. 1988).

The group of constructions with the highest type frequency are the constructions that have the semantic tag “Degree of Intensity”. Altogether there are 302 such constructions, comprising 13% of all constructions in the database. Adapting the terminology from Quirk et al. (1985), I have distinguished six semantic subtypes (Minimizer: Absence, Minimizer: Low degree, Diminisher, Approximator, Booster, Maximizer) to granulate the semantics of intensity and form relatively small and homogeneous groups. The subtypes can greatly overlap, creating a continuum of intensifying meanings. All together six semantic subtypes make up two bigger groups: ‘Amplifiers’ and ‘Downtoners’. Amplifiers scale up and denote high degree of intensity, while Downtoners scale down (potentially all the way to zero point) and denote low degree or even total absence (at zero point). Both Amplifiers and Downtoners can have quantitative extensions and denote large or small quantities of instances respectively.

Table 1 demonstrates the distribution of constructions across semantic subtypes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic subtypes</th>
<th>N of constructions</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizer: Absence</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ni na gramm ne VP (Ona ètomu tony ni na gramm ne verit ‘She doesn’t believe that tone at all [lit. not even for one gram]’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizer: Low degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ele VP (on ele xodit ‘he hardly walks’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminisher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ne takoj už i Adj (ne takoj už i strašnyj ‘not so scary’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>počti/praktičeski VP (My počti priexali. Ostalos’ dve ostanovki ‘We have almost arrived, only 2 stops left to go’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtoners</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>ne v primer Adj-Cmp/Adv-Cmp (on vygljadel ne v primer prijatnee ‘he looked much nicer [lit. not in example]’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>VP do NP-Gen (čemdan zabit do otkaza ‘The suitcase is absolutely full [lit. to denial]’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplifiers</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of 302 constructions denoting degree of intensity across the six semantic subtypes.

I suggest that ‘Degree of Intensity’ should be treated as parameter that can be applied to constructions from various semantic domains, such as Comparison, Manner, Measure, Assessment, etc.
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