

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-6944

ROBST, Susan Gergel, 1943-  
THE IMPERATIVE IN CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN: A  
PARADIGMATIC-SYNTAGMATIC APPROACH.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1972  
Language and Literature, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE IMPERATIVE IN CONTEMPORARY RUSSIAN:  
A PARADIGMATIC-SYNTAGMATIC APPROACH

by  
Susan Gergel Wobst

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Slavic Languages and Literatures)  
in The University of Michigan  
1972

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Ladislav Matejka, Chairman  
Professor James O. Ferrell  
Associate Professor Kenneth C. Hill  
Professor Assya Humesky  
Associate Professor Benjamin A. Stolz

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, James O. Ferrell, Kenneth C. Hill, Assya Humesky, Ladislav Matejka, and Benjamin A. Stolz, for their help and advice during the planning and writing of this study. All the informants gave generously of their time and patience. I especially wish to thank: Professor Assya Humesky, my first Russian teacher whose enthusiasm inspired me to radically alter my post-undergraduate goals; Mrs. Edith Ignatieff and Mrs. Natalia Fischer -- their indefatigable forbearance and guidance throughout the years were of great benefit to me as a language student and a language teacher; Greta Slobin, dear friend, present and future informant. My husband Martin deserves very special mention. Without his unflagging humor, without his support during smutnye vremena, without his munificently endowed mind, and without his help in typing, I would not have been able to finish this work so swiftly and pleasurably.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                 | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....                                           | ii   |
| Chapter                                                         |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION.....                                            | 1    |
| 1.1 Scope of the Imperative.....                                | 1    |
| 1.2 Basic Concepts.....                                         | 6    |
| 1.3 Source of Data and Field Methods.....                       | 23   |
| 1.4 Goals.....                                                  | 25   |
| II. THE PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE IN ITS<br>PRIMARY FUNCTION..... | 27   |
| 2.1 Imperative Semantics.....                                   | 27   |
| 2.2 The Second Person Imperative.....                           | 33   |
| 2.3 The Inclusive Imperative.....                               | 53   |
| 2.4 The Role of <u>-ka</u> .....                                | 63   |
| 2.5 The First Person Singular "Hortative"...                    | 66   |
| III. THE SYNTAGMATIC IMPERATIVE.....                            | 70   |
| 3.1 Introduction.....                                           | 70   |
| 3.2 The Indicative as Imperative.....                           | 75   |
| 3.3 The Conditional as Imperative.....                          | 80   |
| 3.4 The Infinitive as Imperative.....                           | 86   |
| 3.5 The Third Person Imperative with <u>pust'</u> ..            | 93   |
| IV. SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF THE<br>PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE.....  | 102  |
| 4.1 Introduction.....                                           | 102  |
| 4.2 The Obligative/Necessitative.....                           | 107  |
| 4.3 The Narrative Past.....                                     | 113  |
| 4.4 The Conditional.....                                        | 118  |
| 4.5 The Optative.....                                           | 131  |

|         |                                    |     |
|---------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Chapter |                                    |     |
| V.      | CONCLUDING REMARKS.....            | 138 |
|         | 5.1 Summary of the Imperative..... | 138 |
|         | 5.2 Outlook.....                   | 140 |
|         | LIST OF REFERENCES.....            | 142 |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 SCOPE OF THE IMPERATIVE

For Russian, the term "imperative" has been applied to certain morphological forms no matter what modal function they fulfil, as well as to the imperative mood expressed by means other than the morphological forms of the imperative.

1.11 For example, Vinogradov (1947:590-98), in his chapter "The System of the Imperative Mood and Its Agglutinative Structure", discusses examples such as:

- |                                            |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Piši.                                   | "Write."                                                          |
| 2. Eš'te.                                  | "Eat."                                                            |
| 3. Pojdëm.                                 | "Let's go."                                                       |
| 4. Davaj rešat'.                           | "Let's decide."                                                   |
| 5. Pust' čitaet.                           | "Let him/her read."                                               |
| 6. Nate.                                   | "Take [it]."                                                      |
| 7. Provalis' oni vse.                      | "Damn them all."                                                  |
| 8. I bud' ne ja, koptel<br>by ty v Tveri." | "And if it weren't for me,<br>you'd be slaving away in<br>Tver'." |

In his chapter "The Use of the Forms of the Imperative Mood with Other Modal Meanings" (pp. 598-601), Vinogradov

considers, among others, the following constructions:

- |                                                        |                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9. A poprosi u neě<br>vzajmy, ona stanet<br>plakat'.   | "But if you ask her for<br>a loan, she'll start to<br>cry."                          |
| 10. Vot vy grešite, a<br>načal'stvo za vas<br>otvečaj. | "You're the one who's done<br>wrong, but the authorities<br>have to answer for you." |

Vinogradov discusses the imperative mood implemented by the infinitive in the section "Modal Meanings of the Infinitive" (pp. 604-6).

- |                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 11. Sročno ispolnit'. | "Do it quickly." |
|-----------------------|------------------|

Constructions of the type

- |                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12. Ja prišěl k nemu<br>zapisat'sja na kurs, a<br>on, vdrug, voz'mi da i<br>priglasí menja k sebe<br>na večer. | "I went to him to sign up<br>for the course and he<br>suddenly up and invites<br>me to his place for a party." |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

are treated by Vinogradov in three places. The first mention is made in the chapter "The Past Tense of Sudden-Arbitrary Action" (pp. 549-56). Voz'mi da priglasí is analyzed there as a "form of the past tense...which externally coincides with the form of the imperative mood...but which is distinguished from the imperative form by a special intonation of unexpectedness" (pp. 549-50). Vinogradov also discusses this construction in the sections "Embryon of a Special, Voluntative Mood" (pp. 601-2) and "Modal Forms of the Verb Not Entering into the System of Basic Moods" (pp. 603-4).

In addition to examples like 1, 2 and 11 above, Gvozdev's chapter "Exhortative or Imperative Sentences" (1968:50-51) covers types such as:

- |                                         |                                        |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 13. Posideli by so mnoj.                | "I wish you'd stay a while with me."   |
| 14. Zavtra vy poedete na stroitel'stvo. | "Tomorrow you will go to the project." |
| 15. Pošël von.                          | "Get out."                             |

The chapter "Imperative Mood" in the Grammatika russkogo jazyka ANSSSR (hereafter called Academy Grammar) (vol. 1:490-501) contains examples like 1-5, 7-11 and 15 above as well as:

- |                                        |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16. Da zdravstvujut sovetskie lëtčiki. | "Long live the Soviet pilots."                                              |
| 17. Xot' ubej, sleda ne vidno.         | "For the life of me [though you may kill me], there's no trace to be seen." |

In her discussion of the imperative mood, Švedova lists (1967a:30-31) examples like 1-5, 14 and 15 above and also:

- |                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 18. Pust' ja pročitaju. | "Let me read."       |
| 19. Čtob ty pročital.   | "You'd better read." |

Isačenko (1968:299-318) clearly distinguishes the imperative form expressing the imperative mood, as in examples 1-4 above, from what he calls "the transposed usage of the imperative". This latter division includes constructions of the type in examples 7-10, 12 and 17. Isačenko's analysis of the "transposition" of non-imperative forms into the imperative (and exhortative) mood does not include as many types as can be found in the studies by some other linguists. He only discusses examples like 11 (in his section on the infinitive, pp. 346-7) and 15 (in "The Preterite of Perfective Verbs", pp. 293-7).

1.12 Granted, "imperative" is a convenient umbrella under which to group certain morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics; yet, if we do not clearly differentiate form from function, this term by itself will fail to circumscribe the complex modal phenomena illustrated in the examples. Galkina-Fedoruk, for instance, claims (1964:166) that Da budet mir "May there be peace" is a "form of the imperative mood" which has the meaning of the optative. However, in morphological terms, it is evident that this construction consists of a modal particle (da), followed by a finite form of the indicative (budet), which together express the optative.

This lack of consistent distinction between formal and functional criteria is traditional for many Russian linguists. Vinogradov's treatment (1947) of the "imperative" exemplifies this tradition as does his own summary (pp. 549-56) of the ways in which certain other Slavicists have dealt with Russian imperative structures.

1.13 In studying the examples listed above, we observe that the term "imperative" has been applied to

- 1) the morphological form of the imperative which is used to express the imperative mood,

Napiši otcu.            "Write to Father."

- 2) the imperative mood which is not expressed by means of the morphological form of the imperative,

Pošël von.            "Get out."

- 3) the morphological form of the imperative which is

used to express moods other than the imperative,

Pridi on poran'she, "Had he come earlier, nothing  
ničego by ne slu- would have happened."  
čilos'.

Types 1 and 2 are related in that the verb is employed to express the imperative mood. Types 1 and 3 are related in that they employ the morphological form of the imperative. Finally, types 2 and 3 are related in that a verb form commonly associated with the expression of mood X is now used to express mood Y (in this case, type 2 shows the indicative form expressing the imperative mood; type 3 shows the imperative form expressing the conditional mood). Despite these interrelationships, the morphological, semantic and syntactic characteristics of the three types can best be illuminated if each is analyzed separately.

1.14 It is probably only natural that type 1 has received the greatest amount of attention in the literature on the Russian imperative. Nevertheless, there remain some discrepancies in interpretation of features relevant to this type such as word order, aspect usage, number and intonation. Types 2 and 3 have generally been treated in the linguistic literature only by means of a cataloguing of examples wherein the theoretical and practical problem of differentiating form from function tends to remain unelaborated. Until now, no consistent and exhaustive analysis has been carried out which adequately deals with the complex features characterizing the three types.

## 1.2 BASIC CONCEPTS

Prior to analyzing the three types in detail (chapters 2-4), certain concepts which can contribute to a deeper understanding of Russian imperative structures will be discussed.

### 1.21 MODALITY

Numerous theories of modality have been proposed in the linguistic literature. Both Panzer (1967:226-77) and Vinogradov (1947:581-7) summarize especially those theories posited by Slavacists.

In connection with the Slavic languages, modality is most frequently defined as a category which concerns the relation of the action to "reality" (e.g., Gvozďev 1965:183; Vinogradov 1947:581, 1950:41) or the relation of the speaker to the "reality" of the utterance (Đurovič 1956:9). As a result of this definition, the indicative mood is said to signal "real" actions and, by analogy, other moods "unreal" or "unrealized" ones (e.g., Academy Grammar vol. 1:471; Švedova 1967a:8; Mrázek 1967:83). It is interesting that the authors who rely on the term "reality" to explain the indicative mood do not feel compelled to justify its use beyond stating "that the action in fact takes place" (Gvozďev 1965:183) or that the indicative mood "establishes the presence of the action" (Academy Grammar vol. 1:471).

Isačenko (1968:298-9) contends that modality does not signal the speaker's orientation to some extra-linguistic

reality, but rather the speaker's relation to the validity of the content of the utterance. The conditional and imperative moods are defined by their negative reference to the "reality" of the utterance, whereas the indicative is unmarked in this respect. The pivotal term "validity" (Gültigkeitswert) remains, however, undefined.

1.211 Considering these definitions, modality appears to be a most elusive linguistic concept. Perhaps this can partially be explained in that many Slavacists have placed an emphasis on morphological markers and have neglected the syntactic and semantic aspects of verbal communication.

Bühler's Organon model (1965:25-32) treats modality within the framework of the communicative purpose of language. His model distinguishes the sender, the receiver and the message. Depending on the utterance in question, the proportional involvement of these three components varies. To use Bühler's own examples, a military command focuses on the receiver, a scientific treatise on the message, a lyric poem on the sender. Halliday (1970:324) attacked Bühler's model for being based on psychological rather than linguistic phenomena. Yet Halliday's "linguistically-based" model (pp. 325-6), with its emphasis on ideational (content), interpersonal (social) and textual (discourse) functions, seems to be an extension, not a rejection of Bühler's suggestions.

The most fruitful restatement and amplification of Bühler's scheme appears in Jakobson (1957, 1966). Jakobson

(1966:353-6) delineates the six factors each of which determines "a different function of language": context, addresser, addressee, contact, code and message. According to Jakobson, Bühler distinguishes only the first three factors which determine, respectively, the referential (denotative, cognitive), emotive (expressive) and conative functions of language. The three additional factors which Jakobson distinguishes determine, respectively, phatic, metalingual and poetic functions.

Jakobson's purpose in Shifters (1957) is to clarify verbal categories. Here, "message" refers to that which passes between the speaker and listener in the course of communication and "code" refers to that which is necessary for the speaker and listener to have in common in order to communicate (to decode and encode). As a prelude to the analysis of verbal categories, Jakobson distinguishes the narrated event, the speech event, the participants of the narrated event (those spoken about) and the participants of the speech event (addresser and addressee). The particular relationship between these components defines each grammatical category. Thus, mood is defined as characterizing the "relation between the narrated event and its participants with reference to the participants of the speech event" (p. 4).

Jakobson's scheme clearly takes into account important factors in verbal communication. Since it systematizes the relational nature of these factors, this orientation is valuable for analyzing moods.

## 1.22 THE NUMBER OF MOODS IN RUSSIAN

Since the morphological form of the imperative can be employed to express moods other than the imperative, the question arises as to how many moods there are in Russian.

1.221 Ferrell (1953b:116) has proposed that there are only two Russian moods, the indicative and the imperative. The conditional is viewed as "a restricted form of the indicative". Trubetzkoy (1934:6) also posits these two moods. From a purely morphological point of view, this interpretation is valid.

Another opinion (Jakobson 1957:7; Isačenko 1968:298) is that Russian has three moods: indicative, imperative or injunctive, and conditional. Isačenko contends (p. 298) that these three moods are morphologically marked. According to Jakobson (p. 5), they are "grammatical concepts expressed by the Russian verb forms". The indicative is unmarked semantically. The imperative/injunctive signals a focus on the addressee (Isačenko) or implies that the narrated event is imposed upon the participant (Jakobson). The conditional signals the irreality of the event (Isačenko) or the speaker's view of events which could but which do not necessarily happen (Jakobson).

Vinogradov (1947:603) discusses more than three moods: indicative, imperative, conditional-optative (uslovno-želatel'noe), and subjunctive (soslagatel'noe). He treats the conditional apart from the optative, but does not treat the optative as an independent mood. In addition, he posits (p. 601) a voluntative mood but apparently does not grant it

equal status with the others. Švedova (1967a:8) makes the unelaborated claim that Russian has six moods: indicative, conditional, subjunctive, obligatory (dolženstvovatel'noe), optative and imperative.

These disparate attempts to determine the number of moods in Russian underline the fact that there are not only morphological, but syntactic means of modal expression.

1.222 Jespersen contends (1965:313) that we should "speak of 'mood' only if this attitude of mind is shown in the form of the verb..." For Jespersen, then, English has just three moods: indicative, imperative and subjunctive. He demonstrates (p. 320) that, if one uses subjective "notional" criteria, one obtains a great deal of overlap in forms and a great number of "moods" (such as jussive, permissive, intentional, presumptive, dubitative).

Kurylowicz (1964:136) discusses moods as "reflecting the conventionalized attitude of the speaker with regard to the content of the utterance..." His statement conveys that the speaker can make use only of those moods extant in his code. However, the extant moods can be manipulated and modified to express various nuances as long as the addressee properly decodes the utterance. For instance, if the addressee, from the speaker's viewpoint, correctly reacts to "It's cold in here" by closing the door, we could perhaps call this a "situational" imperative.

1.223 For the Indo-European languages at least, the debate on appropriate criteria for establishing the "correct" number of moods still continues. However, if we consider

only the functions related to the morphological form of the Russian imperative, this problem is more readily solvable. Part of the discussion in chapter 4 will be devoted to this question.

### 1.23 GRAMMATICAL PERSON

When analyzing individual moods in a language, it is essential to consider the relationship of the persons involved in the communication (the participants of the speech event in distinction from the participants of the narrated event). The imperative mood differs from other moods in its particular treatment of grammatical person.

1.231 The imperative mood primarily focuses on address to the second person denoting the addressee.

A) Skaži mne o něm. "Tell me about him."

In this utterance, the addresser commands the addressee to fulfil the action denoted by the verb.

The addresser may include himself in the suggestion to fulfil the action.

B) Napišem otcu. "Let's write to Father."

Here the action is being imposed on two (or more) persons one of whom is the "imposer". Although "we" in the imperative means "I" plus "you" (singular or plural), the speaker may symbolically include himself in the action (cf., Jespersen's "paternal we" 1965:217).

The addresser can signal that a non-participant in the speech event is to fulfil the action denoted by the verb.

C) Galja: Ja ne mogu      "Galja: I can't do this.  
           `etogo sdelat'.  
       Borja: Pust' Maksim    Borja: Let/Have Maksim do  
           `eto sdelaet.            it."

This example might be interpreted as a so-called "third person imperative" -- a signal that the addressee is the agent through which the non-participant in the speech event is to receive the command of the addresser. At this point we observe a deviation from the fundamental second person orientation of the imperative mood: the content is primarily concerned with the expressed subject, the third person. However, in an appropriate context, Pust' Maksim `eto sdelaet can signal an indirect or "situational" command to the addressee (Let Maksim do it = Don't interfere with Maksim's doing it).

These two interpretations of C still retain strong links to imperative semantics. But C offers several further problems for the analyst. In other contexts, this pust' sdelaet construction can also be interpreted as a concessive clause and as the speaker's expression of indifference regarding the third person's actions.

1.232 The complexities inherent in construction C have not been systematically explored in the literature. According to the Academy Grammar (vol. 1:496), when using the pust' sdelaet construction, the speaker does not directly impose his will on the person who is to fulfil the action, "but transmits it through the agency of the interlocutor... The imperative mood in the form of the third person can refer to inanimate objects, natural phenomena, expressing

various shades of wish, agreement, etc." Gvozdev (1965: 188-9) also interprets construction C in this way. Galkina-Fedoruk (1964:165) merely states that the imperative mood "has forms which express actions relating to the third person". Švedova (1970:580) terms any sentence containing pust' and an inflected verb form the imperative. For her, pust' imperatives can have first, second and third, singular and plural subjects.

The linguists who include pust' constructions in their discussion of the imperative mood have not offered convincing arguments for their position. This same criticism applies to those who virtually ignore the "third person imperative". Jakobson (1957:6) discusses only the second person (inclusive and exclusive) imperatives; they are subdivisions of the marked member in the correlation of person (signalling the equation of the participant of the narrated event with the participant of the speech event). He treats (1932:26) the third person as the unmarked non-personal member "which does not by itself note the relation of the action to the subject". Trubetzkoy (1934:6) gives sole attention to the second person and inclusive imperatives. Isačenko (1957:8-9) argues for excluding the pust' sdelat' construction because "outside of the dialog situation of direct address the imperative, as an imperative form, does not and cannot exist". He considers pust' constructions exhortative, they "are devoid of imperative intonation and are pronounced with...an exhortative intonation".

Due to its wide semantic range and singular formal features, it is not only reasonable but necessary to make a special case of the pust' sdelaet construction. But it should not be considered so unique as to have no niche at all in an analysis of mood.

#### 1.24 THE PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE

In this dissertation, the term "paradigmatic imperative" is understood as a form which is morphologically specified as imperative in opposition to all other inflectional forms of a given verb. The term "paradigmatic", then, involves morphological identification devoid of contextual restraints. Thus, in the absence of contextual counter-indications, skaži "tell" is identified as the second person singular (2 per sg) paradigmatic imperative in distinction from other imperative forms of that verb (skažemte, skažite "let's tell, tell") and in distinction from all non-imperative inflectional forms of that verb (e.g., infinitive skazat', past gerund skazav, future indicative skažeš'). In the larger sense, the paradigmatic operation would, of course, indicate that skaži is identifiable by its formal properties alone from all other forms used in the language: it is distinct from other 2 per imperatives (napiši "write"), from verbal nouns (vyskazyvanie "utterance"), from adjectives (skazočnyj "fairytale").

1.241 In Russian, what may conveniently be called the 2 per sg imperative is morphologically (paradigmatically) always distinguishable from all other verb forms.

Thus, sdelaj "do" is distinct from

sdelajte "do" (2 per pl),  
 sdelajte "you will do" and  
 sdelaem "we will/let's do".

vstan' "get up" is distinct from

vstan'te "get up" (2 per pl),  
 vstanete "you will get up" and  
 vstanem "we will/let's get up".

napiši "write" is distinct from

napišite "write" (2 per pl),  
 napišete "you will write" and  
 napišem "we will/let's write".

Furthermore, it is interesting that the normal loss of sharpening of dentals followed by the reflexive suffix -sja, as in the infinitive, (obut'sja "to put shoes on" /abutca/) is not observed in the imperative (zabud'sja "doze/forget yourself" /zabut'ca/).

1.242 The so-called 2 per pl imperative form can be distinct. Thus, to reverse the above list

sdelajte ~ sdelaj, sdelajte, sdelaem  
 vstan'te ~ vstan', vstanete, vstanem  
 napišite ~ napiši, napišete, napišem

The exceptions comprise certain -i- stem and -e- stem verbs.

govoríte  
 Govoríte!

"you speak/are speaking"  
 "Speak!"

pómnite  
 Pómnite!

"you remember"  
 "Remember!"

sidíte  
 Sidíte!

"you sit/are sitting"  
 "Sit!"

In the -i- stem verbs with alternating stress, stress alone differentiates between 2 per pl indicative and 2 per pl imperative.

|         |                          |
|---------|--------------------------|
| Nosíte! | "Carry!"                 |
| nosite  | "you carry/are carrying" |

1.243 The 1 pl or inclusive imperative is expressed by several constructions which not only differ from the 2 per imperative, but which differ considerably from each other. Among the ten basic inclusive constructions, some are morphologically simple forms

|             |               |
|-------------|---------------|
| A1 napišem  | "let's write" |
| A2 napišeme | " "           |

and some are morphologically bound compounds

|                         |               |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| A3 davaj napišem        | "let's write" |
| A4 davajte napišem      | " "           |
| B1 budem pisat'         | " "           |
| B2 budemte pisat'       | " "           |
| B3 davaj budem pisat'   | " "           |
| B4 davajte budem pisat' | " "           |
| B5 davaj pisat'         | " "           |
| B6 davajte pisat'       | " "           |

(A = perfective; B = imperfective)

1.2431 Constructions A1 (napišem) and B1 (budem pisat') are morphologically identical to the 1 pl indicative. In fact, for contemporary Russian we should analyze A1 and B1 as paradigmatic indicatives which can be used to express the inclusive imperative. This is necessary since all -m forms as a class can express the indicative mood. Due to semantic constraints, many of them never, or at least do not normally, express the imperative mood (Uznaem ego po

odežde "We'll recognize him by his clothes", \*Uznaem ego po odežde! "Let's recognize him by his clothes!"; Oslabeem i umrēm "We'll grow feeble and die", \*Oslabeem i umrēm! "Let's grow feeble and die!").

We can distinguish these two functions of the A1 and B1 forms by examining non-morphological indicators. Vinogradov (1947:598, 1950:50) and Peškovskij (1959:190) contend that an utterance like Napišem otcu! "Let's write to Father!" is sharply distinguished through the obligatory presence of an imperative intonation contour from Napišem otcu "We will write to Father". When napišem functions as the indicative mood, the subject (e.g., my "we" ja z ženoi "my wife and I") can be expressed lexically. The lexical realization of the subject is prohibited when this form functions as the imperative mood.

1.2432 Due to the presence of the "pl/polite" suffix -te, constructions A2 (napišemte) and B2 (budemte pisat') are morphologically unique forms whose sole function is to express the imperative mood. By virtue of their formal properties, they are paradigmatic inclusive imperatives.

1.2443 Of the remaining constructions, A3-4 and B3-4 could be viewed as forms of the 1 pl indicative preceded by the 2 per imperative davaj(te), and B5-6 could be viewed as the imperfective infinitive preceded by the 2 per imperative davaj(te). However, they must be considered as morphologically bound units: when using just one of the "member" words in an utterance, we generally cannot thereby express

the inclusive imperative; when using the two or three member words in one sentence, even if non-verbal forms intervene, we can express the inclusive imperative. In the sentence Davaj(te) xleb "Give [me] the bread", davaj(te) -- a paradigmatic 2 per imperative -- denotes the addressee. In constructions A3-4 and B3-6, davaj(te) does not serve to express grammatical person: address is not to the exclusive 2 per which is unambiguously implemented by the paradigmatic 2 per imperative, but to the inclusive 2 per (you plus I). The concatenation of davaj(te) and the form of the 1 pl indicative or the imperfective infinitive results in a bound unit which functions to express the inclusive imperative. In this sense, we can treat these constructions as paradigmatic inclusive imperatives.

1.2444 In summary, there are eight constructions, single forms and compounds, which function as the inclusive imperative (A2-4, B2-6). Although A1 and B1 cannot properly be viewed as paradigmatic inclusive imperatives, due to the unifying factor of semantics they will be grouped together with those forms which are paradigmatic.

#### 1.25 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF THE PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE

In the preceding section certain verb forms were designated as the paradigmatic imperative. In the course of interviews conducted for this study, native speakers were consistently able to distinguish an imperative form no matter what function it fulfilled in a given context.

1.251 Indeed the imperative form itself carries a

sufficient amount of information specific to the imperative mood so that it can constitute the sole member of an imperative sentence (e.g., Pridi! "Come!", Čitaj! "Read!", Vstan'te! "Get up!"). These one word sentences refer to future time and to the 2 per denoting the addressee. This information can be reinforced in several ways. To retain the meaning of the imperative mood, a temporal adverb with explicit or implied reference only to the future can be used with pridi (Pridi zavtra/segodnja večerom "Come tomorrow/this evening"). Only proper names, 2 per pronouns and nouns denoting persons can be used for the lexical expression of the subject (Ivan/Drug moj/Ty, pridi "Ivan/My friend/You come"). In addition, the intonation contour of these sentences requires a juncture after the subject indicating the vocative role of the subject with the imperative (Ivan, pridi "Ivan, come").

When the paradigmatic imperative expresses the imperative mood in an utterance, we can call this its primary function. As witnessed by the one word sentences above, the form itself is in a sense predisposed to the expression of the imperative mood. It must be noted that certain imperative forms, due to semantic constraints, rarely or never have this primary function (e.g., slučis' "happen"). Informants, however, identified even these verbs as imperative forms -- a further indication that the paradigmatic operation has more than a theoretical validity at least for some speakers.

1.252 The paradigmatic imperative can also be used

to express moods other than the imperative. This phenomenon will be referred to as the secondary function of the paradigmatic imperative (or the transposition of the paradigmatic imperative into an area associated with the primary modal function of a non-imperative form). The importance of distinguishing between primary and secondary functions of a form in a given context has frequently been suggested in the literature (cf., Kurylowicz 1955, 1964; Křížková 1966a; Koschmieder 1962).

In the sentence Pridi ty v 8 časov, ničego by ne slučilos' "Had you come at 8 o'clock, nothing would have happened", the primary function of the imperative pridi is shifted by syntagmatic subordination into one of its secondary functions (in this case, the expression of the conditional mood). It can now be accompanied by a past time reference: Pridi ty včera... "Had you come yesterday...". Also, it is no longer necessary for the subject to be exclusively the 2 per. Any reasonable subject can be expressed lexically (Pridi ja, Pridi my "Had I come, Had we come"). The intonation contour of this sentence does not permit a "vocative" juncture setting off the subject.

In order for us to determine that the paradigmatic imperative is used in one of its secondary modal functions, minimally there must be more than just the imperative form constituting the utterance. The 2 per (addressee) and future time reference, obligatory to the expression of the imperative mood, can be annulled only through various features

accompanying the form in the syntagma (lexically expressed subject, adverbs, prosody, clausal construction and so forth).

1.253 Once we speak of a form's primary and secondary functions, we are already concentrating on the syntagmatic operation -- the progressive and regressive conditioning of elements in actual utterances. Thus, even though a form like Pridi! "Come!" can constitute the sole member of an imperative sentence, we rely not only on the form but on the larger context (even non-verbal) and perhaps on the intonation contour to arrive at an interpretation. Paradigmatic identification would be an idle pursuit were the syntagmatic operation not integrated with it.

#### 1.26 THE SYNTAGMATIC IMPERATIVE

In certain syntactic environments, a specified set of forms which are not morphologically identifiable as the imperative can be employed to express the imperative mood.

Let us take the paradigmatic indicative past pošli as an example. In My/Vy/Oni pošli v kino "We/You/They went to the movies", pošli is in an environment which reinforces its primary function. Thus, any plural subject (1, 2 or 3 per) may be lexically expressed. Only temporal adverbs referring to past time can be used (Včera my pošli v kino "Yesterday we went to the movies") in order that the verb retain its indicative meaning. The intonation contour permits no juncture setting off the subject.

1.261 For pošli to express the inclusive imperative, the syntactic arrangement must contain reference to future

time and the 2 per (inclusive) whether this reference be explicit or implied. Thus, Pošli v kino! "Let's go to the movies!" can be interpreted as imperative only by referring to the larger context and, assuming the sentence is spoken rather than written, only through a special contour compatible with the imperative. The expression of the inclusive imperative can be made explicit through the use of adverbs referring to (immediate) future time (Pošli sejčas v kino! "Let's go to the movies now!"). Proper names or nouns referring to persons (but usually not pronouns) can be employed to denote the addressee(s): Ivan/Druz'ja, pošli v kino! "Ivan/Friends, let's go to the movies!". When the subject is expressed lexically, it is set off by a juncture.

Unlike pošli, the infinitive per se has no modal function. However, the same conditions designated for pošli apply to the infinitive for the expression of the imperative mood: Pročitat' èto! "Read this!"; Pročitat' èto zavtra! "Read this tomorrow!"; Ivan/Ty, pročitat' èto! "Ivan/You, read this!".

1.262 The linear or syntagmatic arrangement of the elements in an utterance enables us to interpret a non-imperative form expressing the imperative mood. All non-imperative forms functioning as the imperative mood will be grouped together under the label "syntagmatic imperative".

Saussure was the first linguist to systematically incorporate the concepts of paradigmatic and syntagmatic

into his general theory of language. His application of the term "syntagmatic" differs to some degree from the usage in this study. According to Saussure (1966:123-4), "the syntagmatic relation is in praesentia. It is based on two or more forms that occur in an effective series...a term acquires its value only because it stands in opposition to everything that precedes or follows it, or both". Saussure is careful to note that this notion applies to groups of words, phrases and sentences as well as to words. However, most of his illustrative examples (pp. 124-30) concern word formation, an isolated word in a string, or what he calls "pat phrases". In other words, he does not elaborate the term to the extent of discussing mood and the transposition of forms. As used here, "syntagmatic" concerns the reciprocal influence of certain grammatical and intonational features which constitute an utterance.

### 1.3 SOURCE OF DATA AND FIELD METHODS

1.31 The secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative are closely bound to the conversational language and to regional and substandard speech. Some educated speakers comfortably and naturally use nearly all constructions representing these secondary functions in appropriate circumstances; others would use few of them. Fiction writers who attempt to imitate the vernacular frequently employ these structures. Thus, the total corpus to be dealt with

here covers a larger range of social and stylistic levels in contemporary Russian than those which all educated speakers would consider exemplify standard (conversational) usage.

Therefore this dissertation can be said to treat contemporary Russian rather than contemporary standard Russian. It is important to make this distinction for, in its strictest interpretation, "standard" implies a rigid prescriptive norm. For instance, textbooks on Russian rarely acknowledge the secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative since they do not play a central role in the formal language. The label "contemporary Russian" is more neutral; it carries no inherent judgement on the various degrees of social acceptability of imperative structures.

1.32 A large part of the data to be covered here has been drawn from scholarly works on the Russian imperative. The authors of these works have generally relied on themselves as informants or have taken their examples from belles-lettres. Since my aim is to examine the contemporary language, I have tended to avoid quotations from nineteenth-century writers. Some of the material has been taken from pedagogical works and from examples generated by informants.

1.33 A group of ten native speakers of Russian, half of them citizens of the Soviet Union, the others having resided in the United States for a varying number of years, were separately asked to comment on a large portion of the data gathered and to record material for intonation features.

Those informants living in the United States were able to devote more time (six to ten or more hours each) to the interviews. The Soviet informants were then used to spot check selections from the data and were asked about examples which had elicited disagreements among the other informants. In order to have a permanent record, the interviews were taped. The ages of the informants range from the late 20's to the late 60's.

Since all the informants are or have been language teachers (primarily Russian and English), perhaps they are more consciously aware of the linguistic problems treated here than those in other professions might be. In this sense, the conclusions drawn from their opinions may be biased. But because there were a number of areas of considerable disagreement among the informants, there is sufficient ground to believe that the opinions obtained constitute a relatively representative sample of the linguistic habits of educated speakers.

#### 1.4 GOALS

It is to be hoped that this paradigmatic-syntagmatic approach to the Russian imperative may prove to be a fruitful source for further inquiries into Russian imperative structures, for investigating the problems associated with other moods in Russian, and for comparing certain features of the Russian modal system to those of other

languages.

This approach to the imperative material is not only an aid in organizing and illuminating complex phenomena, but also indicates that the speaker and listener at least theoretically make simultaneous reference to the paradigm and the syntagma, to vertical and horizontal relationships, to the code and the message.

The paradigmatic and syntagmatic operations cannot be studied in isolation from each other and the role of both operations must be accounted for in the production and perception of utterances. "The amount of grammatical information contained in the paradigms of a given language (statistics of the code) must be further confronted with a similar amount in the tokens, in the actual occurrences of the various grammatical forms within a corpus of messages. Any attempt to ignore this duality and to confine linguistic analysis only to the code or only to the corpus impoverishes the research" (Jakobson 1961:252).

1.41 In the following chapters I will attempt to treat questions central to the paradigmatic imperative in its primary function, and to comprehensively analyze the syntagmatic imperative and the secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative.

## CHAPTER II

### THE PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE IN ITS PRIMARY FUNCTION

#### 2.1 IMPERATIVE SEMANTICS

2.11 A consideration of imperative semantics should first specify the meaning of this mood. The imperative mood is defined as any linguistic means the speaker uses to attempt to induce someone to fulfil (or not to fulfil in the case of negation) the action denoted by the expressed or implied verb. This definition specifies neither the nuance conveyed in a given context (demand, exhortation, suggestion), nor the person who is to fulfil the action (addressee, addresser plus addressee), nor the form through which the speaker conveys his purpose (paradigmatic imperative, infinitive), nor the nature of the action (physical, mental). If the speaker's intent is to attempt to cause someone to fulfil some action, he will be said to employ the imperative mood.

2.12 Any research on the imperative should be concerned with one of the most fundamental questions: which verbs can form the imperative and, of these verbs, which can express the imperative mood?

The problem of imperative semantics has usually been treated in works on Russian in a purely notional-classificatory way. For instance, Bondarko and Bulanin (1967: 132-3) state that the expression of the imperative mood is prohibited in the following cases: 1) When "the action does not have a purposeful [celenapravlenyj] character, is not accomplished through the will of the subject, therefore exhortation to such an action is excluded" (značit' "to mean", stoit' "to cost", slepnut' "to become blind"). 2) When "the subject of the action can only be an object, address to which is unlikely, not a person" (blizit'sja "to draw near", vtekat' "to flow into"). 3) When there are "impersonal verbs [which] have no imperative forms" (večerēt' as in večereet "night is falling", znobit' as in ego znobit "he feels feverish"). While this listing is useful to a certain extent, it must be noted that the authors treat only those verbs which are least likely to express the imperative mood even though, in most cases, they admit that an imperative form theoretically exists.

2.13 The relationship between imperative semantics, morphology and syntax is considerably more complex than Bondarko and Bulanin's summary would have us believe. G. Lakoff (1966), writing on the English imperative, contends that verbs and adjectives are divisible into two groups according to their semantic and syntactic characteristics: stative and non-stative. He believes (p. I-14) that stative/non-stative is an inherent semantic property which must

be marked in the Prague School manner (+stative, -stative) and that this property is reflected in the syntactic component. Lakoff devises several criteria (pp. I-2-I-6) for determining the exact nature of this division such as: stative verbs take no "will you" tag (Shut the door, will you?; \*Know the answer, will you?), have no "do" form (Do shut the door; \*Do know the answer), have no progressive auxiliary (I am shutting the door; \*I am knowing the answer). He lists (p. I-13) some exceptions, among them "remain", "sit" and "huddle", which are semantically stative, but syntactically non-stative.

With this set of criteria, "know" cannot be a true imperative. Therefore Lakoff treats (p. I-14) the verb in "Know the answer" as a pseudo-imperative derived from a conditional sentence (If you don't know the answer, something bad will happen to you). For Katz and Postal (1965: 177), however, "know" is a true imperative. They posit a so-called underlying imperative morpheme for this verb "(I request that you) know the answer". Bolinger (1967: 347-8) has formed what he considers imperatives from stative verbs: "And hope that nobody sees you"; "Hear me out"; "Be happy"; "Inherit a department store".

2.14 Miller (1970) applied Lakoff's criteria to Russian and, in his brief section on the imperative, listed (p. 490) \*Znaj otvet "Know the answer" as ungrammatical. Miller's assumption is contradicted, though, by actual usage as the following examples illustrate.

Net, už vy, junoša,  
znajte...čto èto nel'zja.  
(Sologub Melkij bes: 304)

"Now listen young man, know  
that this isn't allowed."

--Čem xočeš', čtoby ja  
pokljalsja?  
--Nu, xotja by žizn'ju  
tvoeju...eju kljast'sja  
samoe vremja tak kak ona  
visit na voloske, znaj  
èto.  
(Bulgakov Master i  
Margarita: 36)

"What do you want me to  
swear by?  
Well, how about by your  
life...now's the time to  
swear by it because bear  
in mind [know this] it's  
hanging by a thread."

It is interesting that Russian translations of some  
stative examples (from G. Lakoff 1966: I-16) yield sentences  
showing the imperative mood expressed by the imperative  
form. In the left column are Lakoff's examples; in the  
right column are Russian versions, in a context, with  
translations.

believe

Ver'te v boga.  
"Believe in God."  
Pover'te mne.  
"Believe me."

love

Ljubi menja.  
"Love me."

think (that)

Ne dumaj, čto...  
"Don't think that..."

grateful

Bud' blagodarnym.  
"Be grateful."

ready

Bud' gotov.  
"Be ready."

understand

Pojmi že.  
"Please/Do understand."

The major barrier to Lakoff's acceptance of "stative  
imperatives" as opposed to non-stative ones (Otkroj dver'  
"Open the door") is that many stative verbs denote mental  
processes or emotional states while many non-stative verbs  
denote physical actions. If indeed verbs referring to  
thoughts and emotions cannot be used for the expression  
of the imperative mood, some of the Russian examples might

be considered exclamations or strong wishes (pojmi že); others certainly seem to be more akin to true imperatives (bud' gotov). We could maintain that these are all figurative imperatives, but then we would have no way of distinguishing them from verbs which are generally considered not to have an imperative form in modern Russian (e.g., moč' "to be able, can").

|                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| .Pered tem i posle togo-- | "Laugh as much as you want   |
| smejsja skol'ko vlezet,   | before and after, but during |
| a vo vremja etogo--ne     | it you can't (you don't,     |
| mogi!                     | no)!"                        |
| (Sinjavskij "V cirke":    |                              |
| 35)                       |                              |

For Russian, we cannot characterize these examples as "pseudo-imperatives" derived from the conditional as Lakoff does for English. If there are any universals to be sought in the stative/non-stative theory, Lakoff's English-centered explanation would have to be considered tentative at best.

Lakoff's scheme does not account for those non-stative imperatives which, in certain contexts, lose their original meaning and become figurative imperatives or hortative particles. That is, there is no real shift in mood, but a shift in what might be called modal nuance. For instance:

davat' "to allow, to give"

|                           |                            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Davaj, davaj, čego        | "Come on, come on, why are |
| ložit'sja?                | you laying down?"          |
| (Polevoj <u>Zoloto</u> in |                            |
| Academy Grammar vol. 2,   |                            |
| pt. 1:363)                |                            |

A nu, Čubatyj, davaj povri eščë čego-nižud'.  
 (Pantaleev Indian Cubatyj  
 in Švedova 1960: 105)

"Well, Čubatyj, come on  
 tell us some more stories."

smotret' "to look at"

Bez šumu smotri u menja.  
 (Švedova 1960:24)

"There'll be no noise while  
 I'm in charge (while you're  
 with me)."

ždat' "to wait"

Steny-to, gljadi,  
 naskvoz' prosvečivajut,  
 da i pečka, togo i ždi,  
 povalitsja.  
 (Bažov Ametistovoe delo  
 in Švedova 1960:108)

"Look, you can see through the  
 walls and any minute now  
 [just wait for it] the stove  
 will collapse."

The literature on the Russian imperative abounds in examples of such "idiomatic" expressions. However, the imperative forms cited here are not totally divorced from the semantics of the imperative mood: they are used to turn the addressee's attention to something or to incite the addressee to an action specified elsewhere in the context. We might rather reserve the term "idiom" for imperative forms which, in certain contexts, do not participate grammatically (syntagmatically) in the category of mood.

Okolo nego i šum i krik,  
 a on znaj sebe pišet.  
 (Švedova 1960:72)

"There's noise and shouting  
 all around him, but he just  
 keeps on writing."

2.15 It is quite conceivable that most speakers of English would consider "Be ready" and "Be thankful" as kinds of imperatives and that most would not find suitable contexts for "Be miraculous" and "Be elementary". Yet G. Lakoff (1966:I-16) treats all four of these examples in the same way based on syntactic restrictions.

R. Lakoff (1968:171) seems to return to Katz and Postal's solution (see section 2.13) when she contends that there might be several imperative abstract verbs -- suggest, insist, urge -- which have varying syntactic properties. Although she claims that no verbs of ordering can dominate stative verbs and adjectives (\*I order you to be tall), other imperative abstract verbs could presumably be applied to treating English examples like "Don't think that" as imperatives derived from "I suggest/insist that you don't think that". Those linguists who consider "Know the answer" and "Be grateful" as non- or pseudo-imperative in the surface structure but as true imperative in terms of abstract syntax could use R. Lakoff's suggestion as a means to solve their dilemma. If this concept were developed further for English, then those stative verbs which appear to express imperative semantics can clearly be separated from those which do not.

## 2.2 THE SECOND PERSON IMPERATIVE

### 2.21 NUMBER

To call stoj, kupi and vstan' the 2 per "singular" is not truly accurate but it is convenient. This form is employed to denote a single addressee with whom the speaker is on familiar terms (Kolja, skaži "Kolja, tell"). It may also be used informally to address a group viewed as a collective single unit -- the implication being that the

addresser has a ty, familiar relationship with each member.

1. Derži ego, rebjata. "Hold him, fellows."  
(Unbegaun 1962:237)

2. Deržite ego, rebjata. " " "

Sentence 1, with the 2 per sg verb form, was felt by all informants as a more direct call to action and a more colloquial expression than sentence 2 with the 2 per pl verb form. The verb in sentence 2 was considered more individuating and "more correct", i.e., standard (pl subject address agreeing with pl verb ending).

The question of grammatical number is further intimately bound to the question of person. The 2 per sg imperative can be used with the form of the 3 per subject as in English "Somebody find a box; Nobody move a finger". Jespersen (1966:148) believes that these 3 per subject forms have a 2 per subject function. The speaker addresses some person present at the moment of speech without specifying the exact addressee.

Poprobuju teper' kto-- "Somebody just try and touch  
tron' menja. me now."  
(Fedin in Leška 1968:35)

Nikto ne smej. "Nobody dare."  
(Vinogradov 1947:592)

Spi, kto možet. "Sleep, whoever can."  
(Galkina-Fedoruk 1964:  
167)

In Russian, the 3 per subject forms kto and nikto cannot be set off with a vocative juncture as can the 2 per pronoun subject forms (Ty, rabotaj "You, work" ~ \*Kto, poprobuju "Somebody, try"). On this basis, we might say that

kto/nikto denote the non-participant in the speech event; if so, we would be dealing with a curious type of 3 per imperative in which the addressee is not establishable or in which the non-participant in the speech event is the direct addressee (a contradiction in terms). But, if we assume that kto and nikto plus the 2 per sg imperative form refer to one or several persons of a group present at the moment of speech whom the addresser does not wish to specify, the interpretation of these examples would parallel Jespersen's.

Galkina-Fedoruk (1964:167) and Šmelëv (1961:50) maintain that these constructions are outdated in the twentieth century. To Vinogradov (1947:592), they are unproductive but still frequently used. The informants were in agreement with Vinogradov, both informants who occasionally use such constructions as well as those who do not.

The 2 per sg imperative can be used to denote generic person. As applied by Jespersen (1965:216), the term "generic person" covers situations when the addresser wishes to stress that he includes himself in the utterance, when he "wants to make a kind of special appeal to the person addressed at the moment", and when he wants to keep his "own person in the background, though what is meant is really the first person more than anything else (one, a fellow)". Yet another situation could be added: when the speaker wants to make a special appeal to anyone to whom the content of the utterance may have relevance or application.

The following six Russian examples are nearly all ambiguous in terms of generic person versus true imperative since the larger context is not available. However, all informants interpreted them as generic person (in one of the variants noted above) on the basis of the context given here.

1. Xozjain tol'ko razvël     "The host made a helpless  
rukami. Vot tut i             gesture. Just try and reason  
tolkuj s uprjamym             with a stubborn old man."  
staričonkoj.  
(Mamin-Sibirjak Xleb  
in Švedova 1960:123)

If we take the second sentence in this example as a type of reported speech (or as an interpretation of what the host's gesture meant), the addresser of this sentence -- the host -- differs from the addresser of the two sentences taken in their entirety. The latter addresser can be Mamin-Sibirjak, the narrator in Mamin-Sibirjak's novel, etc. Concerning the second sentence, the addresser of which is (was) the host, the imperative could refer to any addressee present during the moment of that speech (an addressee who cannot be specified given this brief context) and/or it could refer to the addresser himself, i.e., the host.

2. Vid p'janyx ego ras-     "The sight of drunks upsets  
straivaet, drat'sja         him and you also don't dare  
pri nēm tože ne smej.       fight in his presence."  
(Brym 1963:87)
3. Ja takix znaju: xodit     "I know such people: he walks  
--ne podstupis'.             around and you can't  
(Fedin in Šmelëv 1961:     approach him."  
52)

While these two examples could, in an appropriate context,

be true imperatives, they were interpreted as generic person: the injunction is directed to any person, including the addresser, exclusive of the grammatical third person in the narrated event ("he"). The informants felt that the imperative in these two sentences represents a type of reported speech -- "he" at some time had given such an order.

- |                                                              |                                               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 4. Est' čerta, ktoroj<br>ne perexodi.<br>(Unbegaun 1962:237) | "There's a line which<br>mustn't be crossed." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|

In this example, perhaps the sentence construction influences the interpretation. The imperative occurs in the dependent clause and the injunction was felt to apply to any person.

- |                                                             |                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 5. Opjat' ne tak? Vot i<br>ugodi vam!<br>(Švedova 1960:241) | "Not right again? Try and<br>please you!" |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|

The actual addressee-participant of this speech event (denoted by vam) was considered to be the only person to whom the imperative does not refer. If it would refer to vam, the second sentence would represent a type of reflexive (Try and please yourself, you'll see how hard it is).

- |                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6. Delo bylo zimoj,<br>noč', v' juga, vse<br>ljudi--v šubax, raz-<br>beri-ko v toropjax-<br>to, kto kupec, kto<br>d'jakon?<br>(Gor'kij in Šmelëv<br>1961:53) | "It happened in the winter,<br>it was night, there was a<br>storm. All the people were<br>in fur coats. Just try to<br>figure out at a glance who's<br>a merchant and who's a dea-<br>con." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

In this narrational context, none of the participants of the narrated event are specified as addressees denoted by the 2 per imperative form. Therefore, the addresser either refers to himself or to the addressee of the speech

event. Since this is a narrative, if the imperative refers to the addressee of the speech event, he is to imagine that he was present at this past event. If the imperative refers to the addresser and/or any person present at the past event, the addressee of the speech event is excluded (presuming he was not originally present).

Šmelëv (1961:53) relates the imperative form in example 6 to trudno razobrat' "it's hard to figure out" and to ne razberëš' "you/one won't figure out". His analogy points out the similarity between the generic person function of the 2 per sg imperative and the 2 per sg indicative: Tiše edeš', dal'she budeš' "The slower you move, the further you'll get"; Sidiš' i ni o čëm ne dumaëš' "One sits and thinks about nothing" (Isačenko 1968:277).

In addition to the basic function of denoting the addressee (familiar address to one person), the 2 per sg imperative is also used as colloquial-familiar address to a group, as address to one or more unspecified members of a group (with kto and nikto), and as reference to generic person.

2.211 The 2 per pl imperative is used to address one person formally (vy) and to address two or more persons with whom the speaker has a familiar (ty+ty(+ty)=vy) or formal (vy+vy(+vy)=vy) relationship or a combination of both (ty+vy=vy).

- |                                     |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Ivan Ivanovič, idite<br>so mnoj. | "Ivan Ivanovič, come with<br>me." |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

- |                               |                            |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2. Druz'ja, idite so<br>mnoj. | "Friends, come with me."   |
| 3. Gospoda, idite so<br>mnoj. | "Gentlemen, come with me." |

Hence this form will be called the 2 per pl/polite imperative so that its basic functions are granted equal status.

## 2.22 ASPECT

One of the most recent and most thorough analyses of aspect in Russian was carried out by Forsyth (1970). Applying Jakobson's privative opposition approach, Forsyth defines the perfective as the marked member which "expresses the action as a total event summed up with reference to a single specific juncture" (p. 8). The perfective will be used whenever the result or completion of an action is stressed (p. 9); for the imperative, it is used when the speaker introduces a new idea (p. 199). The basic function of the unmarked imperfective "is to denote the type of action without reference to totality, frequency, mode of procedure, etc." (p. 349). Repetition and continuous action are not expressed by the imperfective per se, but by adverbs and the context (pp. 4-5). Since the imperfective is the unmarked member, it has a wider range of functions than the perfective and can take on the basic function of the perfective, reference to a single total event (p. 350).

In their discussions of the imperative, Šmel'ev (1959:13) and Rassudova (1968:109) argue for aspectual synonymity in some contexts. They contend that it is not aspect which lends softness or categorality to the utterance, but rather the larger context and intonational

features. Forsyth, however, generally avoids the contention that the two aspects can be synonymous or nearly synonymous in some situations.

2.221 To indicate the speaker's impatience, the imperfective form is often used as an echo of the perfective. Here a parallel could be drawn not only between the perfective imperative signalling less immediate future versus the imperfective imperative signalling immediate future (Pročitajte zavtra "Read tomorrow", Čitajte sejčas "Read now"), but also between the present perfective indicative signalling future time versus the present imperfective indicative signalling present time (Pročitaeš' "You will read", Čitaeš' "You are reading").

|                              |                            |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Zakroj dver'. Ej, ty,        | "Close the door. Hey, you  |
| vaxlak, dver' zakryvaj.      | lout, come on, you have to |
| (Solženicyn <u>Odin den'</u> | close the door."           |
| in Townsend 1970:59)         |                            |

All informants agreed that the perfective in place of the imperfective (zakroj for zakryvaj) here could, with appropriate attitudinal intonation, also signal the speaker's impatience. The imperfective was felt to stress a general rule: people should always close doors (this despite the singular noun dver').

- |                                                                |                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1. Rasskaži, kak prošël<br>èkzamen?                            | "Tell [me], how did the exam<br>go?"     |
| 2. Kak prošël èkzamen?<br>Rasskazyvaj!<br>(Rassudova 1968:106) | "How did the exam go? Come<br>on, tell!" |

All informants took the perfective in sentence 1 as a more neutral command than the imperfective in sentence 2 which

indicates the speaker's urging. However, they also felt that, by using the perfective in sentence 2, the speaker would likewise indicate urgency and that any aspectual distinction would be precluded; that is, emotive voice takes precedence over aspect.

|                       |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| --Možno otkryt' okno? | "May I open the window?" |
| a.--Otkroj.           | Open it.                 |
| b.--Otkryvaj.         | All right, open it."     |

(Rassudova 1968:110)

The perfective in answer a was considered a more direct and neutral command; the imperfective in b was felt to indicate the speaker's indifference toward the proposed action. But with a change in emotive voice, the informants showed that otkroj could signal indifference and otkryvaj could signal the speaker's interest in having the window open.

2.222 Privative opposition in the negative imperative is more distinct than in the positive. The negative perfective refers to a single action which the addressee is warned or strongly requested not to engage in.

|                          |                             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Smotri, ne upadi.        | "Watch out, don't fall."    |
| Ne vydaj emu naš sekret. | "Don't give our secret away |
| (Rassudova 1968:113)     | to him."                    |

In the case of Nu, ne skaži "Well, you don't say", we are dealing with an exclamation or a "belated" imperative: the addressee has already fulfilled the action before the addresser can enjoin it.

The negative imperfective imperative is regularly used to stop an action in progress and for general prohibitions.

Smotri, ne opazdyvaj.

Ne beri moju tetrad'.  
(Pul'kina and Zaxava-  
Nekrasova 1968:332)

"Watch out, don't be late  
[ever]."

"Don't take my notebook [the  
one you have your hands on  
OR the one you intend to  
take]."

2.223 Verbs of body motion, in particular sest' and sadit'sja "to sit down", have been treated as a special problem in the literature. It has been said that the perfective imperative (sjad', sjad'te) is more familiar than the imperfective imperative (sadis', sadites') since the perfective is often used to reprimand children (Spagis 1961: 372, 1962:87). Conversely, Šmelëv (1959:15) claims that the perfective is neutral and that the imperfective is familiar and sharp. It seems that these conflicting opinions can partially be explained by the more frequent occurrence of the imperfective. Both aspects of this verb can, of course, be used to refer to a single action and they seem to be interchangeable in terms of formality and informality, strength and softness. In this instance at least, Rassudova (1968:109) and Šmelëv (1959:13) are given support for their claim that context and intonational coloring can take precedence over aspect.

1. Sjad', Il'ka! Radi boga, sjad'. Nu, da sadis' že!  
(Čekov Nenužnaja pobeda in Šmelëv 1959:15)

"Sit down, Il'ka! For God's sake, sit down. Come on, sit down, will you!"

2. Sadites'...--No Simon prodolžal stojat' i zaslonjal Bočkovu.--Kartinkin, sjad'te.  
--No Kartinkin vse stojal.--Kartinkin,

"Be seated...But Simon kept standing and hiding Bočkova. Kartinkin, sit down. But Kartinkin kept standing. Kartinkin,

sjad'te.--No Kartinkin  
vsë stojal i sel tol'ko  
togda, kogda podbežavšij  
pristav...tragičeskim  
šëpotom progovoril:  
sidet', sidet'.  
(Tolstoj Voskresenie in  
Smelëv 1959:15)

sit down. But Kartinkin  
kept standing and sat down  
only when an officer ran up  
and said in a tragic whisper:  
sit, sit!"

The perfective verb in sentence 1 was interpreted as a suggestion introducing a new idea and the imperfective as an expression of the speaker's annoyance or pleading. The informants felt that, if the verbs were interchanged, the imperfective would represent a suggestion and the perfective the speaker's annoyance. The imperfective verb in sentence 2 was considered a normal invitation and the perfective verb an order. Again the informants showed that, in this context and given appropriate intonation, the verbs could be interchanged making the perfective an invitation and the imperfective an order.

2.224 The verbs of motion present a unique set of problems due to the double opposition determinate-indeterminate and perfective-imperfective.

Forsyth (1970:342-3) has shown that the negative indeterminate verb of motion can function as a general injunction or a prohibition against a specific single action. The negative determinate verb also has this latter function. Within a minimal pair, the informants always interpreted the negative indeterminate as a general injunction.

Ne xodi tuda.

"Don't go there [ever]."

Ne idi tuda.

"Don't go there [now]."

In other contexts, the negative indeterminate can clearly refer to a single action.

--Lariska, ty kuda  
večerom idti xotela?  
--V kino. Na poslednij  
seans.  
--Ne xodi.  
(Arbuzov Irkutskaja  
istorija in Forsyth  
1970:343)

"Lariska, where did you want  
to go tonight?  
To the movies. To the last  
showing.  
Don't go."

Forsyth (1970:344) speculates that ne pojdi probably does not exist. However, the sentence Ne pojdi tuda "Don't go there" was accepted by some informants as a very strong warning against a single action. Others felt it was a substandard or totally ungrammatical form.

For positive imperatives, the indeterminate is used for repeated actions and the determinate for a single action. Pojdi functions like the determinate, but reference is to future time.

|                  |                                |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Pojdite k vraču. | "Go to the doctor [sometime]." |
| Idite k vraču.   | " " " " [now]                  |
| Xodite k vraču.  | " " " " [regularly]            |

Some informants do not consistently make this distinction between pojdi and idi.

|                    |                                            |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Pojdi kupi gazetę. | "Why don't you go and buy<br>a newspaper." |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------|

|                  |                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Idi kupi gazetę. | "Get going and buy a news-<br>paper." |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|

The informants agreed that, in these examples, pojdi signalled the introduction of a new idea and idi the speaker's impatience. However, several informants showed that, with suitable intonation, they could use idi kupi

as a polite suggestion and pojdi kupi as a sharp repeated order.

Forsyth (1970:336) states that the positive indeterminate can refer to a single action in "uneducated and even vulgar speech".

Ty zavaril, tebe i ras-  
xlěbyvat'. Oprotestovy-  
vaj! Xodi k svoemu  
direktoru.

(Nikolaeva Bitva v puti  
in Forsyth 1970:336)

"You made your bed, now lie  
in it. Go on and protest.  
Go to your director."

The informants, all educated speakers, interpreted xodi here either as a signal of a general rule or as inappropriate for this context (idi is expected).

When the verbs of motion having a prefix other than po- refer to a single action, the imperfective is usually considered less urgent and more casual. The perfective is more restricted in that it cannot be used in a context clearly specifying repetition (Pridite snova "Come again, but \*Pridite kak možno čašče "Come as often as possible").

1. Pridite, požalujsta, "Please come for your pass."  
za putěvkoj.  
(Anikina 1963:163)

2. Pridite, požalujsta, "You can come pick up your  
za putěvkoj. pass."

The perfective in sentence 1 introduces an idea new to the addressee. The imperfective is less abrupt and may imply a fact that the addressee was already aware of.

1. Zaxodite ko mne v "Drop in on me at the end of  
konce nedeli. the week."

2. Zajdite ko mne v "Come and see me at the end  
konce nedeli. of the week."  
(Rassudova 1968:109)

Again the perfective (sentence 2) is more official and implies a specific purpose. The imperfective is more informal, an invitation rather than a command.

2.225 A treatment of aspect based on privative opposition adequately accounts for most occurrences in most contexts. When, in a minimal pair, both the perfective and the imperfective denote a single action, it is the imperfective that tends to carry overtones such as urgency and enthusiasm. But since the perfective can also be used for such nuances, we can consider the opposition to be neutralized in certain instances.

## 2.23 WORD ORDER

Discussions on word order with the 2 per imperative generally center on the position of the personal subject pronoun. The absence of the subject pronoun has been explained as a way to strengthen a command (Gvozděv 1965: 185; Bondarko and Bulanin 1967:127). In using minimal pairs, I found that the informants considered sentences without pronouns to be less specific regarding the addressee (even though the verb remains 2 per oriented). In other words, they interpret the absence of a pronoun as an ellipsis.

Some authors claim that the pronoun preceding the verb strengthens the command and the pronoun following softens it (Galkina-Fedoruk 1964:166; Šaxmatov 1952:102). Others hold the opposite opinion (Peškovskij 1956:185; Rozental' 1965:201). Actually, the position of the pronoun does not inherently determine the softness or sharpness

of the command; the determining factors can be context and/or tone of voice. Several examples from Kothaj (1965: 209) will illustrate this claim.

|                                                                                         |                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vy èto bros'te--serdito<br>skazal Malinin.<br>(Simonov)                                 | "You stop that, Malinin said<br>angrily."                                                               |
| A ty ne volnujsja--tixo<br>zametil Basargin.<br>(Paustovskij)                           | "Don't you get upset, Basargin<br>quietly remarked."                                                    |
| Rešiv prekratit' raz-<br>govor, Volod'ka skazal:<br>Ne lez' ty v èti dela.<br>(Pogodin) | "Having decided to cut the<br>conversation short, Volod'ka<br>said: Don't you get mixed<br>up in this." |
| Kakoe značenie možet<br>imet' kovër?--Možet...<br>pojmi ty.<br>(Pogodin)                | "What significance can a rug<br>have? It can...please under-<br>stand."                                 |

Isačenko (1960:490) has analyzed word order in the following way:

|               |    |           |                   |
|---------------|----|-----------|-------------------|
| 1. ty napiši  | -- | hortative | "you write"       |
| 2. napiši ty  | -- | advice    | "write"           |
| 3. ty ne piši | -- | warning   | "don't you write" |
| 4. ne piši ty | -- | advice    | "don't write"     |

Some informants felt sentences 1 and 3 were stronger commands than 2 and 4. Others expressed the opposite view.

Gvozďev (1965:185) contends that zamolčite "shut up" cannot be used with a pronoun since the absence of the pronoun signals the strengthening of a command.

|                  |                |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Zamolčite vy. | "Shut up."     |
| 2. Vy zamolčite. | "You shut up." |

Sentence 1 was generally considered to express the speaker's impatience and annoyance. Sentence 2 was interpreted as a

strong, direct order or as emphasizing a particular addressee or addressees in a group.

Gvozdëv (1965:185) states that the position of the pronoun in Ty ne bojsja ego "Don't be afraid of him" softens the imperative. Some informants felt that it was softer compared to Ne bojsja ty ego; others pointed out that, for them, intonation was the main means for determining strength or softness.

When a pronoun is used to contrast two persons (1) or as a vocative (2), it will normally precede the verb.

1. Ty sjad' zdes', a on      "You sit here and he'll sit  
   sjadet tam.                there."
2. Ty, Nikolaj, pomogi      "You, Nikolaj, help me."  
   mne.  
   (Belevickaja-Xalizeva  
   n.d.:39)

The results of the interviews indicate that generalizations about the position of the personal subject pronoun are subject to considerable doubt. The informants showed that prosodic features can have greater importance than syntactic arrangement.

## 2.24 INTONATION

Russian intonation studies are in their infancy and will remain so until a convincing methodology is advanced to treat this extremely complex topic. Current studies suffer from the lack of controlled laboratory procedures. Little work has been done with minimal pair utterances, with establishing the range and significance of individual variation, and with defining the influence of word order.

Very little has been written on Russian imperative intonation. Bryzgunova (1967) equates imperative intonation with the interrogative contour. Boyanus (1955) essentially does the same, but he differentiates commands (pp. 87-9) from requests, commands with implication and emphatic warnings (pp. 112-4) due to variations in intervals. Miller (1967) shows imperative sentences occurring with many different contours and indicates that the imperative sentence will typically have a rise-fall contour, the fall being either sharp or prolonged.

Miller defines 2 3 1 (1 the lowest and 4 the highest pitch level) as the typical command contour. In Miller's study (p. 180), this contour is not unique to the imperative: 2 3 1 is also used for "particular questions", "quizzical questions with neuželi", "straightforward statements", "enumerations-emphatic", "temporizers", and so forth. This contour can be neutralized if elements other than the imperative form are stressed in the sentence. The following three examples are from Miller (1967).

|                          |                           |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Tepér' spokójno poxodíte | "Now, quietly walk around |
| 1 2 3 1 1 1 1 1          |                           |
| po kómnate.              | the room."                |
| 1 2 4 4                  |                           |
| (p. 105)                 |                           |

Various emotional and stylistic nuances can also neutralize the 2 3 1 contour. The next example shows the high pitch level used for addressing children.

|                 |                           |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Nú, idí ko mné, | "Well, come to me, little |
| 3 44 433 3      |                           |
| málen'kij.      | one."                     |
| 3 3             |                           |
| (p 99)          |                           |

The low pitch level in the next example indicates mild anger.

|                     |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| Govoríte, govoríte. | "Speak, speak." |
| 1 1 1 21 2 11       |                 |
| (p. 91)             |                 |

In the intonation study of Jurgens Buning and van Schooneveld (1960), there is no mention of the imperative. These authors discuss intervals rather than contours or pitch levels. No specific meanings are given to their figures except that rising indicates dialog and falling is unmarked in this regard. In this approach, "the intonation of the imperative is interpreted in one framework as a combinatory and/or stylistic variant of the falling intonation of the statement. Whatever makes a given imperative intonation differ from a statement will be due to variation in intervals and possible fusion of figures" (van Schooneveld, personal communication). For these authors, there are no formal invariants of imperative intonation -- they would not investigate the imperative in isolation.

Lehiste's summary (1970:95) of intonation studies on the sentence level indicates that specialists have not devised an adequate approach to account for a possible correlation between sentence types and intonation contours, the influence of the context and the lexicon upon intonation contours, and the distinction between "linguistic and attitudinal aspects of intonation". From the results of investigations on a number of languages, Lehiste concludes (p. 105) that "at the sentence level, intonation may be

described in terms of significant levels, in terms of contours, or as a combination of the two".

2.241 In order to determine whether a contour similar to Miller's 2 3 1 could consistently be used whenever an imperative form occurs, I ran a small experiment. This test is of limited scope and does not presuppose that Miller's approach is a final solution. In the light ongoing debates concerning techniques and the kinds of problems which need to be explored, this presentation is meant as a call for more detailed research. The investigation was done with a portable tape recorder.

Miller's 2 3 1 contour seems to be the general neutral pattern for the imperative utterance.

Čítájte.  
2 3 1

"Read."

Napišíte.  
2 2 3 1

"Write."

Brós'te vý.  
3 1 1

"Stop it."

(prolonged fall from the first stressed syllable to the next unstressed one)

Brós'te mjač.  
3 3 1

"Throw the ball."

(sharp fall from the imperative form to the next word)

Boyanus (1955:114) states that emphatic warnings have a fall-rise contour. Some informants instead used a rise-fall contour.

Smotříte, ne upadíte.  
1 2 3 2 2 2 2 3  
OR  
2 3 1 1 1 2 3 1

"Watch out, don't fall."

The 2 3 1 contour will rarely be used when the imperative functions as an exclamation or an echo question.

--Ne gorjačís', požáľujsta. "Please don't get excited."

2 2 2 3 2 1 1  
--Kák ne gorjačís'? "What do you mean don't get excited?"

(example from Švedova 1960:287; markings mine)

--Zabúd'. "Forget."

2 3  
--Vót eščě "zabúd'!" "There it is again 'forget'!"  
3 1 1 2 1

OR

3 1 1 2 3  
(example from Švedova 1960:292; markings mine)

--Idíte! "Come!"

2 3 1  
--Idíte? "[Did you say] come?"  
1 3 3

2.242 Through a second experiment I attempted to learn whether, in a larger context, there are significant differences between imperative and indicative minimal pair phrases. The procedure was to record two sentences in which the imperative and indicative 2 per forms are identical. For example:

- |                                         |                                      |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Govoríte médlenno!                   | "Speak slowly!"                      |
| 2. Vý, mně kážetsja, govoríte médlenno. | "You, it seems to me, speak slowly." |

The first three words in sentence 2 were cut.

The contours of the identical passages resulted in the following (first sentence imperative; second phrase indicative):

- |                          |                    |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Govoríte médlenno!    | "Speak slowly!"    |
| 2 2 3 3 3 1 1            |                    |
| 2. ...govoríte médlenno. | "...speak slowly." |
| 2 2 2 2 3 2 1            |                    |

1. Zakónčite `étu rabótu! "Finish this work!"  
       2 3 3 3 3 3 3 1
2. ...zakónčite `étu "....will finish this  
       3 2 2 2 2 2  
       rabótu. work."  
       2 1 1
1. Pómnite `éti slová! "Remember these words!"  
       23 3 3 3 3 3 1
2. ...pómnite `éti slová. "...remember these words."  
       3 2 2 2 2 2 1

The contours of these pairs, were the entire indicative sentence given, would show an even greater degree of similarity: rise-fall. The differences lie in the pitch levels and the syllables at which these levels change.

It could prove revealing to test the perception of statement versus command on the basis of verbal or physical response. By way of example: if children are noisy and rowdy, their response to Sidíte tíxo "You are sitting quietly" might be verbalized incredulity. Their response to Sidíte tíxo! "Sit quietly!" might be to fulfil the action denoted by the verb.

## 2.3 THE INCLUSIVE IMPERATIVE

### 2.31 NUMBER

If a complete analogy could be drawn between the basic functions of -te with the 2 per and inclusive imperatives, we would expect that

|               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| I) Napišem.   | "Let's write." |
| Budem pisat'. | " "            |
| Davaj pisat'. | " "            |
| Pojdëm.       | "Let's go."    |

denote ja + ty "I + thou" and that

|                 |                |
|-----------------|----------------|
| II) Napišemte.  | "Let's write." |
| Budemte pisat'. | " "            |
| Davajte pisat'. | " "            |
| Pojdëmte.       | "Let's go."    |

denote ja + vy "I + you" with vy as either the polite sg or the pl.

While some linguists analyze the non-te and -te inclusives in this way (Isačenko 1968:308; Vinogradov 1947: 594), others offer different interpretations. To tabulate the latter:

| SOURCE                               | NON- <u>te</u>                                                                                       | - <u>te</u>                                                                                                                                     |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Academy<br>Grammar vol.<br>1:497     | one interlocutor<br>plus speaker                                                                     | polite address as with<br>2 per imperative in<br>- <u>te</u> (presumably to one<br>person) or address to<br>a number of persons<br>plus speaker |
| Bondarko and<br>Bulanin 1967:<br>141 | <u>ja</u> + <u>ty</u> or <u>ja</u> +<br><u>vy</u> (no specifica-<br>tion if <u>vy</u> = sg<br>or pl) | <u>ja</u> + <u>vy</u> (no speci-<br>fication if <u>vy</u> = sg<br>or pl)                                                                        |
| Jakobson<br>1932:28                  | unmarked in<br>respect to number                                                                     | "the will of the<br>speaker is directed<br>toward a plurality"                                                                                  |
| Unbegaun<br>1962:238                 | I + thou                                                                                             | I + you with "you" de-<br>noting pl addressees                                                                                                  |

| SOURCE              | NON- <u>te</u>                                                                                                               | - <u>te</u>                        |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Gvozdev<br>1965:187 | pl addressees plus<br>speaker if uttered<br>"with the intona-<br>tion of an invita-<br>tion" (no statement<br>of <u>ty</u> ) | polite address to<br>interlocutors |

These opposing interpretations are caused by several factors. The age of the speaker should be taken into account; younger speakers have nearly ceased using certain forms which were common a generation or two ago. While it is true that -te with the inclusive can be designated as the pl/polite (paralleling the 2 per imperative), this usage is not the exclusive domain of the -te forms. Forms without -te are used not only as inclusive address to one person with whom the speaker has a familiar (ty) or formal (vy) relationship, but they are also used for inclusive address to two or more persons.

2.311 These problems are more readily approachable if the inclusive is divided into three groups:

(A) napišem/napišete

(B) budem pisat'/budemte pisat'

davaj/davajte napišem  
davaj/davajte pisat'  
davaj/davajte budem pisat'

(C) poedem/poedemte (i.e., verbs of motion)

#### GROUP (A)

Vypolnimte vzjatye  
objazatel'stva.  
(Gvozdev 1965:187)

"Let's fulfil the adopted  
obligations."

This sentence evoked negative responses: vypolnimte was

considered unlikely, pedantic or not modern whether reference was to a single person or to a group. As an address to a group, davajte vypolnim was preferred.

1. Sdelaem èto. "Let's do this."
2. Sdelaemte èto. " " "

All informants would use sentence 1 to address a group or one person (ty or vy). Some felt that they might use sentence 2 in addressing one person toward whom they wished to show great respect. Some made a semantic distinction: 1 as an invitation; 2 as a plea. Generally the younger informants did not prefer to use -te in any situation.

GROUP (B) Constructions of the budem pisat'/budemte pisat' type are similar to the 2 per imperative in terms of number: budemte is the pl/polite form. It must be noted that the informants considered this construction as reflective of a very formal style.

Compound inclusives with davaj/davajte were analyzed as follows. Davajte is the pl/polite form; davaj is used to address one person familiarly or a group informally. The same analysis was given for the perfective-derived particle daj/dajte (it occurs mainly with the perfective inclusive).

Daj/Dajte gostej "Let's see the guests off."  
 provodim.  
 (Svedova 1960:98)

GROUP (C) The function of -te with the verbs of motion in the inclusive constructions is unique. As a general rule, the inclusive verb of motion plus -te is used for addressing a group. The form in -m is used to address one

person, ty or vy, and to address a group informally. Unlike the other categories, with the verbs of motion the informants showed more individuation in speech habits.

1. Rebjata, pojděm domoj. "Fellows, let's go home."
2. Ivan Ivanovič, pojděm domoj. "Ivan Ivanovič, let's go home."  
(Isačenko 1960:488)

Both of these sentences were readily accepted and considered to be more casual than if -te were added. Some informants felt that the use of -te in sentence 2 would indicate a plea. One informant (the oldest) said that sentence 2 without -te represents uneducated speech: the patronymic signals a formal, vy relationship; therefore -te should be used as the polite suffix in reference to a single person.

1. Pojděm so mnoj. "Come with me."
2. Pojděmte so mnoj. " " "  
(Paffen 1958:137)

The -te in sentence 2 was consistently used as pl/polite. These two sentences illustrate a type of "paternal we": they are polite variants of Idi(te) so mnoj "Come with me".

For addressing a group, the informants tended to consider poedem more casual and poedemte more formal. Some made semantic distinctions: poedem introduces a new idea and is more urgent than poedemte which is a specific suggestion.

2.312 In summary, napišem inclusives are almost never used with -te. Constructions with budemte and davajte are used similarly to the 2 per pl/polite imperative. For

verbs of motion, the application of -te varies from speaker to speaker, but the -m form will be used to address one person informally.

In addition to these complexities, the stylistic level of the inclusive constructions should be mentioned. Vinogradov (1947:596) designates 1) budem/budemte rešat' "let's decide" and 2) rešim/rešimte "let's decide" as characteristic of a neutral-literary style. The informants concurred with this opinion. They prefer the following constructions for conversations: 3) davaj/davajte rešim, 4) davaj/davajte rešat', 5) davaj/davajte budem rešat' "let's decide". Constructions 3 and 4 are labelled the conversational-expressive style by Vinogradov (p. 596). Thus, the informants are in general agreement with Vinogradov. They differ from Isačenko (1960:489) who considers all these constructions as stylistically neutral although he singles out 3 and 5 as more intimate and casual.

### 2.32 ASPECT

Aspect with the inclusive differs little from aspect with the 2 per imperative. When the perfective introduces a new idea, the following imperfective can indicate an urgency to engage in the action.

|                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pojdĕmte v izbu, ja pro-vožu. Idĕmte, idĕmte, čto zrja torčat' v ětoj syro-<br>osti.<br>(Tendrjakov <u>Uxaby</u> in<br>Forsyth 1970:334) | "Let's go to the cottage. I'll take you there. Let's go, let's go, it's useless to stay in this dampness." |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

To most informants, idĕm (determinate) represents

a more decisive and urgent suggestion than pojďem which introduces a new idea. A few informants expressed the opposite view.

The imperfective, free from any connotation of repetition, can signal either greater immediacy or a more leisurely action than the perfective.

Davaj pit' čaj. "How about drinking tea."

Davaj zavtrakat'. "How about having breakfast."  
(Forsyth 1970:225)

Davaj vyp'em čaj. "Let's drink tea."

Davaj pozavtrakaem. "Let's have breakfast."

The verb byt' "to be" seems to function both as the perfective and as the imperfective in the inclusive. Švedova (1970:582) cites Davajte byt' pervymi "Let's be first". This refers to a long or indefinite period of time similar to Davajte pisat' pis'ma "Let's write letters". Davajte budem pervymi "Let's be first" refers to a single situation similar to Davajte napišem pis'mo "Let's write the letter".

The perfective-derived particle daj/dajte is normally used only with the perfective inclusives. Because of this restriction and possible ambiguities (Daj rabotat' can mean "Let's work", but more frequently means "Let me work"), the daj/dajte plus verb inclusives are not listed as part of the basic forms.

Dajte gostej provodim. "Let's see the guests off."  
(Švedova 1960:98)

Davajte gostej provodim. " " " " "

In these examples, as with all such pairs presented to the informants, the dajte construction was considered a more

urgent proposal with the implication that another action would follow.

In the negative, only certain verbs of motion can be used without budem: ne pojdēm, ne poedem "let's not go" (Nemešajlova 1963:277). Otherwise, the three possible negative constructions all employ the compound imperfective:

1. Davaj ne budem mešat' "Let's not bother the comrade."  
tovarišču.
2. Ne budem mešat' to- " " " " "  
varišču.  
(Anikina 1963:168)
3. Lušče ne budem mešat' "We'd better not bother the  
tovarišču. comrade."

Sentence 1 was deemed the weakest and sentence 3 the strongest suggestion.

### 2.33 WORD ORDER

Inclusive constructions consisting of more than one verb normally place the verbs together in a sequence.

Ne budem mešat' to- "Let's not bother the comrade."  
varišču.

Davajte ne budem mešat' " " " " "  
tovarišču.

Davajte slušat' koncert. "Let's listen to the concert."  
(Anikina 1963:167-8)

However, one or more words can be inserted between the verb forms.

Davaj-ka my snačala "Let's first buy some furni-  
mebeli kupim. ture."  
(Bondarko and Bulanin  
1967:123)

Daj gostej provodim. "Let's see the guests off."  
(Švedova 1960:98)

The perfective verb followed by davaj signals emphatic

word order.

Sjadem davajte na skame- "Let's sit down on the bench."  
ečku.  
(Troepol'skij Tugodum  
in Švedova 1960:105)

Isačenko claims (1963:51, 1968:306) that no subject pronoun can be used with the inclusive. It cannot be used with napišem, budem pisat' and davaj pisat' types. Otherwise, it may occur.

1. Pojděmte-ka my domoj. "Let's go home."
2. Davaj-ka my snačala "Let's first buy some furni-  
mebeli kupim. ture."
3. Davajte my rešim. "Let's decide."  
(Bondarko and Bulanin  
1967:123)

The pronoun in sentences 1 and 3 was considered a contrastive agent ("we" as opposed to someone else). In sentence 2, it was felt to make the suggestion more emphatic. Švedova (1970:416) shows that the position of my is flexible:

|                       |                           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Davajte-ka my napišem | "Let's write the letter." |
| pis'mo.               |                           |
| Davajte-ka napišem my | " " " "                   |
| pis'mo.               |                           |

By developing an elaborate context, one informant used Davaj my pisat' as an emphatic inclusive ("We've neglected writing for so long and now we'll have to spend a lot of time on it, so we absolutely must get busy writing"). Other informants interpreted this phrase as past tense ("...and we started writing").

## 2.34 INTONATION

In section 1.2431 it was mentioned that some authors posit an imperative intonation contour for the inclusive;

most do not discuss the question at all. My experiments with the inclusive parallel those with the 2 per imperative and again the results are not meant to be conclusive.

2.341 In the first experiment, I wanted to learn whether there is an inclusive intonation contour. Frequently the informants used a contour similar to the 2 3 1 of the 2 per imperative.

Iděm v kinó!  
2 3        3 1

"Let's go to the movies.

Occasionally the informants made no distinction between imperative and inclusive contours.

Kuda vy iděte?  
Iděm v kinó.  
1 2        2 1

"Where are you going?  
We're going to the movies."

Nam nečego delat'.  
Iděm v kinó!  
1 2        2 1  
OR  
2 3        3 1

"There's nothing for us to do.  
Let's go to the movies."

In cases where there is no prosodic difference between the indicative and the inclusive, context is decisive.

2.342 In the second experiment, very elaborate contexts were devised in which one member of a minimal pair signalled the inclusive and the other the indicative. Only the pairs, not the larger context, are given.

A1. Iděm k Víктору!  
2 3        3 1 1

"Let's go to Viktor's!"

2. Iděm k Víктору.  
1 2        2 1 1

"We're on our way to Viktor's."

B1 Obsúdim predložénie  
1 2 2        2 2 2 22  
továrišča Ivanóva!  
2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1

"Let's discuss comrade  
Ivanov's proposal!"

- |                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Obsúdim predloženie | "We will discuss comrade |
| 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2        |                          |
| továrišča Ivanóva.     | Ivanov's proposal."      |
| 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 1        |                          |

Once again it was found that distinctions were not always made between indicative and inclusive pairs. The transcription of set B does not show the subtle variations made within syllables.

A test might also be devised to judge the perception of indicative versus imperative (inclusive) on the basis of verbal or physical response with sentence intonation as the sole variable.

## 2.4 THE ROLE OF -KA

### 2.41 -KA WITH THE SECOND PERSON IMPERATIVE

The function of the enclitic particle -ka with the 2 per imperative has been explained in several ways. Most commonly it is claimed to soften or weaken a command (Galkina-Fedoruk 1964:116; Isačenko 1960: 490; Šaxmatov 1952:102) or to add a nuance of familiarity and tenderness to the utterance (Gvozděv 1965: 185; Bondarko and Bulanin 1967:127; Vinogradov 1947: 395; Avanesov and Sidorov 1945:209). Šapiro (1953: 274) reports that in the dialects -ka strengthens the command.

Jakobson posits (1957:7) a hortative paradigm for the injunctive mood consisting of the imperative form plus -ka. The difference between the hortative

and the imperative appeal forms, according to Jakobson, is that the hortative adds a "coaxing note" and has an exclusive addresser form (Napišu-ka "I think I'll write"). Of course, a "coaxing note" can be added to the 2 per imperative through emotive voice and aspect. Isačenko (1960:490) has questioned elevating the imperative form plus -ka to the status of a (sub) mood because, for him, -ka has a hortative function only with the 1 per sg.

2.411 With the 2 per imperative, the informants generally felt that -ka was a strengthening agent and was representative of a very colloquial speech style.

Polno, Bog s tobój!  
Snimi-ka rubaxu-to, ja  
zaš'ju.  
(Gor'kij Detstvo in  
Forsyth 1970:212)

"Come, come, now. Take  
off your shirt and I'll  
sew it up."

Idi-ka sjuda.

"Come here."

The same interpretations were given for the -te forms (snimite-ka, idite-ka).

The particle -ka can have a different function when two imperative forms occur together in a sentence.

Idi-ka razberis' vo  
vsëm ètom.  
(Švedova 1960:62)

"Just try and figure all  
this out."

In this example, idi functions as a kind of hortative particle (implying "you probably can't"), not as a verb of motion. In Idi razberis'-ka..., idi was considered a verb of motion ("Go and figure...") and a

more direct command ("Your task is to go and...").

#### 2.42 -ka WITH THE INCLUSIVE IMPERATIVE

In general the informants felt that the use of -ka with the inclusive imperative was more natural and less a signal of very colloquial speech than -ka with the 2 per imperative.

Inquiries were made regarding the use and acceptability of -ka with various inclusive constructions.

For instance:

- |                                   |                             |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Davaj-ka povtorim èti slova.   | "Let's repeat these words." |
| 2. Davajte-ka povtorim èti slova. | " " " "                     |
| 3. Daj-ka povtorim èti slova.     | " " " "                     |
| 4. Dajte-ka povtorim èti slova.   | " " " "                     |
| 5. Povtorim-ka èti slova.         | " " " "                     |
| 6. Povtorimte-ka èti slova.       | " " " "                     |

Sentences 1 through 4 were readily accepted. Sentences 5 and 6 were generally not considered (especially among younger informants) natural due to the presence of -ka. Povtorim(te) type inclusives are felt to be more formal than davaj(te) povtorim types. Since the informants use -ka with the inclusive in casual conversation, they consider that it does not combine well with the formality of povtorim(te).

The imperfective inclusives were also queried.

- |                            |                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Davaj-ka pisat' pis'ma. | "Let's write letters." |
|----------------------------|------------------------|

- |                                       |                        |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 2. Davajte-ka pisat'<br>pis'ma.       | "Let's write letters." |
| 3. Davaj-ka budem pisat'<br>pis'ma.   | " " "                  |
| 4. Davajte-ka budem<br>pisat' pis'ma. | " " "                  |
| 5. Budem-ka pisat' pis'ma.            | " " "                  |
| 6. Budemte-ka pisat'<br>pis'ma.       | " " "                  |

Sentence 1 was fully accepted. Sentence 2 was considered pl/polite; as polite address to one person (plus speaker), the informants felt that -ka was inappropriate. Sentences 3 and 4 were both accepted. Sentences 5 and 6 were reluctantly accepted by some, rejected by others. The budem(te) pisat' construction represents a formal style infrequently used in casual conversation. Thus it does not commonly combine with -ka.

## 2.5 THE FIRST PERSON SINGULAR "HORTATIVE"

Jakobson (1957:7) is not the only linguist who has analyzed the Napišu-ka "I think I'll write" construction, but he is probably the first to consider it an integral part of a modal paradigm. He defines the injunctive mood as "signalling the E<sup>n</sup> [narrated event] as imposed upon the participant". The hortative, as opposed to the imperative, appeal form of the injunctive mood signals "a participation in the E<sup>n</sup>"

and "adds a coaxing note". Thus, not only does the hortative differ from the imperative in terms of semantic nuance, but also in terms of morphology. What concerns us here is the exclusive addresser form of the hortative (napišu-ka). In the light of Jakobson's definitions, this form signals the addresser's coaxing himself to participate in the narrated event, he imposes the narrated event on himself.

In conjunction with the definition of the imperative mood given here (section 2.11), napišu-ka would mean the speaker's attempt to induce himself to fulfil the action denoted by the verb. Assuming that this analysis is correct, napišu-ka represents a sole participant in the speech event who is simultaneously addresser and addressee. Therefore the function of -ka with the 1 per sg indicative form appears to be a transposition from indicative to imperative semantics.

Vinogradov (1947:595) defines this construction as the speaker's strong decisive wish. Isačenko (1968: 310) states that it represents the speaker's indecision regarding the action and that it is a variant of the indicative. Of the two examples given by Jakobson, the informants concluded that the perfective (napišu-ka) expressed the addresser's decisive statement after a period of deliberation and that the imperfective (budu-ka pisat') rarely occurs.

2.51 The 1 per sg indicative plus -ka is not the only way to express the 1 per sg hortative (whether "hortative" is understood as, in essence, the addresser's commanding himself or the addresser's stating his relatively firm intention to engage in an action). Frequently, particles derived from the 2 per sg imperative of dat' and davat' "to give, to allow" are used with the 1 per sg verb.

- |                                            |                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Napišu-ka.                              | "I think perhaps I'll write."                      |
| 2. Daj, dumaju, napišu.                    | "Well, I thought to myself, how about if I write." |
| 3. Daj/Daj-ka napišu.<br>(Isačenko 1957:9) | "How about if I write."                            |

The informants thought that these three utterances were nearly identical, but that sentence 1 showed more indecision. Dumaju in sentence 2 has the same function as -ka in the sentence 3 variant with daj-ka. When daj napišu was compared to davaj napišu, the latter was interpreted as a more leisurely, drawn out decision ("Well, I think perhaps I might").

Whether or not these constructions reflect imperative (or injunctive) semantics, the informants did not associate them with the imperative although, of course, they noted the imperative forms daj and davaj.

2.52 As a further complication, sentences consisting of the particles daj and davaj, with or without -ka, followed by the 1 per sg indicative are ambiguous. If such sentences do not contain the subject pronoun ja, they are

more often interpreted as the "hortative".

Ja podumal: "A daj-ka  
napišu nasčët `etoj samoj  
rokovoj ošibki žizni!"  
(Troepol'skij Proxor  
semnadcatyj in Švedova  
1960:105)

"I thought: Well, I think  
I'll write about this most  
fateful mistake of life!"

Šël mimo, dumaju, daj  
zajdu.  
(Švedova 1960:98)

"I was walking past and thought:  
Well, I think I'll drop in."

When the subject pronoun ja is used in these constructions,  
daj and davaj generally function as the 2 per imperative  
(Allow me and I'll...).

Ne xodi. Daj ja sxožu.  
(Švedova 1960:98)

"Don't go. Let me go."

Xazov podplyl k nemu i  
silkom položil ego ruku  
k sebe na plečo.--Togda  
pogodi, smirilsja Ar-  
tjušin.--Daj ja popro-  
buju nogu rasteret'.  
(Sobolëv Zelënyj luč  
in Švedova 1960:106)

"Xazov swam up to him and  
forced his arm onto his own  
shoulder.--Now just wait,  
Artjušin said giving in.  
--Let me try to massage  
your leg."

The example Daj otdoxnu listed in the Academy Grammar  
(vol.1:498) was considered ambiguous. It could be trans-  
lated "I think I'll rest" or "Let me rest". However, Dajte  
otdoxnu was interpreted only as 2 per imperative ("Let me  
rest"). This construction, as a 2 per imperative, also  
allows the imperfective davaj which makes it a more casual  
suggestion than daj which is a more direct command.

2.53 The only unambiguous 1 per sg "hortative" con-  
structions are those which contain dumaju or those which  
consist solely of the 1 per sg indicative plus -ka. Those  
containing daj and davaj without ja tend to be 1 per sg  
"hortative", with ja they tend to be 2 per imperative.

## CHAPTER III

### THE SYNTAGMATIC IMPERATIVE

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

The linguistic conventions of the Russian speech community allow for the expression of the imperative mood by means of certain syntactic arrangements which do not employ the paradigmatic imperative. Although the major portion of the discussion will center on indicative, conditional, infinitive and pust' constructions, there are still other means for expressing the imperative mood in Russian which must be noted.

3.11 Sentences consisting solely of nouns, prepositional phrases, adverbs, etc., can express the imperative mood either if it is assumed that a verb has been elided or provided that the utterance is implemented with an intonation contour compatible with the imperative: Na mesto! "In your places!"; Živo! "Quick!"; Skorej vrača! "Quick, a doctor!" (Gvozděv 1968:51). It is also possible for a noun in the nominative case to function as the imperative where no ellipsis of the verb can be claimed. The example is from Romanov in Leška (1968:31); the scene is a dance

lesson.

|                            |                              |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Nedurno. Nažmite. Akcent.  | "Not bad. Press. Accent.     |
| Gudzonov, figura! Gudzon-  | Gudzonov, the step! Gudzon-  |
| ov, nosok. Rita, žmites',  | ov, toe. Rita, crouch like a |
| kak koška. Passaž. Jaša,   | cat. Passage. Jaša, tempo!   |
| tempo! Gudzonov, napor!    | Gudzonov, pressure! Down!    |
| Opuskajte! Svobodno. Počti | Freely. Almost mechanically. |
| mexaničeski. Akcent.       | Accent. Enough!"             |
| Dovol'no!                  |                              |

Here figura (the only obvious nominative sg) is part of a cataloging which substitutes for a fully expressed command.

3.12 Various particles with a hortative meaning are frequently discussed in the literature (cf., na, nate "here, take this"; ajda "come on" Germanovič 1966:76). Isačenko (1970:202) claims that traces of the old hortative function of the conjunction a can be observed in modern Russian.

|                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Oden'sja poteplee, a to | "Dress warmer or else you'll |
| prostudiš'sja.          | catch cold."                 |

The non-contemporary meaning of a to is cited as "gib Acht" ("watch out").

|                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| A skol'ko vam let? | "And how old are you?" |
|--------------------|------------------------|

Isačenko states that a could be rendered here as "Sagen Sie mal" ("Tell me"), but it seems that, with or without a, most if not all interrogative sentences signal such a latent imperative.

3.13 A group of verbal derivatives variously labeled "visions de gestes" (Karcevski 1939:240), verbal exclamations (Isačenko 1957:13-14) and ultrasudden subaspect (Reformatskij 1963:129) can express the semantics of several moods.

Ty k nemu podojdi  
szadi i trax ego po  
golove!  
(Reformatskij 1963:129)

"You go up to him from behind  
and bang him on the head!"

Bux ego nogami!

"Hit him with your legs!"

Tolk ego v bok!

"Shove him in the side!"

The context in which these forms appear and the possibility of using emphatic intonation aid in identifying them in their imperative function. Reference is to future time, the subject is the 2 per denoting the addressee. In other contexts, these forms function as the conditional or indicative.

Xlop by ja ego po pleču. "I'd clap him on the back."  
(Reformatskij 1963:129)

Ja k nemu podošël i bux "I went up to him and shoved  
ego v bok. him in the side."

3.14 Modal verbs in Russian and in English can convey a certain imperative force if they are not in the past tense and if they have a 2 per subject. Diver's analysis (1964:345) goes no further than the statement that English modals have varying degrees of imperativeness -- "You must/should/might/could close the door". Austin (1965:74) shows that modals as imperative resemble performatives.

You may shut it. I give you permission, I  
consent to your shutting it.

You must shut it. I order you, I advise you  
to shut it.

You ought to shut it. I advise you to shut it.

G. Lakoff (1970:269) goes a step further into what may be called the realm of social commands. He contends that "may" does not only refer to possibility and permis-

sion. When a master says to a servant "You may go", the modal represents a command.

The informants considered modals in the following Russian examples as types of imperative.

1. Vam nado zakryt' dver'. "You ought to shut the door."
2. Vam nužno zakryt' dver'. "You should shut the door."
3. Vam možno zakryt' dver'. "You may shut the door."
4. Vy dolžny zakryt' dver'. "You must shut the door."

Sentence 3 was interpreted as a simple signal of permission and appears to be the weakest of the four.

Modals as imperatives focus on the speaker's opinion regarding the necessity or desirability of the proposed action. At the same time, they signal that the addressee has a greater or lesser amount of choice regarding the fulfillment of the action. The paradigmatic imperative in its primary function generally assumes no such choice on the part of the addressee.

3.15 Verbs which Austin (1965:6) calls performatives are defined as a signal "that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of the action..." According to Austin (1963:25), performatives have only two forms: 1 per sg indicative present ("I promise you that...") and 2 or 3 per present indicative with the verb in the passive voice ("Passengers are requested..."). In her discussion of the imperative, R. Lakoff (1968:161) associates abstract verbs with performatives. Abstract verbs are present in the deep

structure. They have semantic and syntactic properties similar to those occurring in the surface structure but no phonological form. She contends (pp. 170-1) that the imperative abstract verb is a performative. This means all nuances conveyed by the imperative mood can ultimately be derived from a 1 per sg utterance and that the underlying subject of all imperative constructions is the 1 per sg, the addresser.

I (hereby) order you to go home.

I (hereby) advise you to go home.

I (hereby) permit you to go home.

According to McCawley (1968:157), "certain verbs may appear as overt performatives when accompanied by the word hereby but not without it".

I hereby tell you to open the door.

\*I tell you to open the door.

It also seems that the imperative force is weakened in English for the verbs "advise" and "permit" if the word "hereby" is not used.

- |                                                                              |                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Ja prikazyvaju vsë<br>prigotovit' čerez<br>nedelju.<br>(Anikina 1963:177) | "I command [you] to prepare<br>everything in a week." |
| 2. Ja velju tebe zakryt'<br>dver'.                                           | "I order you to close the<br>door."                   |
| 3. Ja sovetuju vam pojti<br>domoj.                                           | "I advise you to go home."                            |
| 4. Ja razrešaju vam za-<br>kryt' dver'.                                      | "I permit you to close the<br>door."                  |

The first two sentences were considered very strong imper-

atives compared to the last two. However, sentence 3 is more direct advice than Ja sovetoval by "I would advise".

Studies on the English imperative can rely on the lack of distinction between forms of the imperative, indicative and infinitive. Thus, some authors derive "Shut the door" from "I order/advise/permit/urge you to shut the door" or "I insist/suggest that you shut the door". Russian verbal morphology does not support deriving Zakroj dver' (imperative) from Ja velju tebe zakryt' dver' (infinitive). The closest Russian analogy to the English would be Ja velju tebe: zakroj dver' "I order you: shut the door".

### 3.2 THE INDICATIVE AS IMPERATIVE

Within certain definable limits, the paradigmatic indicative in the future and past tenses can express the semantics of the imperative mood.

#### 3.21 INDICATIVE FUTURE

Only non-stative verbs in the 2 per future tense form can function as imperative. Stative verbs in this form denote predictions by the addresser as to what will happen to the addressee: Kogda vy poverněte nalevo, vy uvidite... "When you turn to the left, you will see..."; Vy počuvstvujete bol' "You will feel pain". Non-stative verbs denote the addresser's complete confidence in the fulfillment of the action by the addressee.

Ty pojďeš' i skažeš' emu, "You will go and tell him that  
čto ja ždu ego. I'm waiting for him."  
(Karcevski 1927:139)

K večeru vy mne napeč-  
taete etu stat'ju.  
(Gvozdev 1965:188)

"You will type this article  
for me by evening."

--My nedolgo posidim  
zdes'. Xorošo?

"We won't sit here long, ok?"

--Ty daš' znak.  
(Rozov Večno Živye in  
Forsyth 1970:203)

You (will) give the sign."

In addition to the imperative, the imperfective non-stative can refer to continuous future states.

Budeš' učit'sja!  
(Švedova 1970:580)

"You will study!"

Budeš' učit'sja raznym  
slavjanskim jazykam u  
xorošix professorov,  
budeš' znakovit'sja s  
inostrancami...

"You'll be studying different  
Slavic languages under good  
professors, you'll be meet-  
ing foreigners..."

Švedova (1970:581) lists the verb byt' "to be" among her imperative paradigms.

Budeš' pervym.

"You will be first."

While this utterance may be used as a strong stimulus toward the addressee ("Be first, or else"), it can also signal the addresser's strong statement of support ("You'll be first, I just know you will").

3.211 According to Švedova (1970:580), the 3 per indicative future can express the imperative mood.

Budet učit'sja!

"He'll study (or Enough of this  
studying)!"

Poedet!

"He'll go!"

The informants developed contexts in which these sentences represent threats directed by the addresser toward a non-participant in the speech event. There is no inherent signal that the addressee is to transmit this threat.

Furthermore, in an appropriate context, these constructions can indicate hope or strong belief ("I hope he'll go"; "I know he'll study").

3.212 In colloquial speech, constructions are used which contain the verb byt' in the 3 per sg indicative with a 2 per subject pronoun in the nominative or the dative. The speaker employs them to cause the listener to cease engaging in some activity.

Budet vam razgovarivat'. "Stop your talking."  
(Paffen 1958:125)

Da budet, ty! "Hey you, stop it!"  
(Šaxmatov 1941:85)

Ej ty, da budet! "Hey you, that's enough!"

Da budet tebe. "That's enough."

### 3.22 INDICATIVE PAST

The indicative past tense of certain verbs can function both as the inclusive and as the 2 per imperative. The Academy Grammar (vol. 2, pt. 1:390) states that only verbs of motion, vzjat' "to take", končit' "to finish", načat' "to begin" and a few others can be used in this way. Švedova (1967b:74) also cites zamolčali "shut up" and, in the course of the interviews, the informants generated several more: sdelali "do", zapeli "sing", zabyli "forget" and zakončili "finish".

3.221 Only perfective past tense verbs are used to express the imperative. The subject pronoun is only rarely expressed.

- |                                    |                            |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1a. Čto vy segodnja<br>delali?     | "What did you do today?    |
| b. Končili stat'ju.                | We finished the article."  |
| 2a. Malo vremeni nam<br>ostallos'. | "We have little time left. |
| b. Končili stat'ju!                | Let's finish the article!" |

It would be possible to use the 1 pl subject pronoun my "we" in sentence 1b. This usage is precluded in 2b.

Ferrell (1953b:109) has explained that the past as imperative figuratively refers to an action so close to the moment of speech that it is thought to have already occurred. According to Gvozděv (1965:188), pošli "let's go" signals greater immediacy and pojděm "let's go" refers to a more indefinite future time. Some informants concurred with Gvozděv's interpretation. Others pointed out that, in regard to the immediate future, pošli and pojděm "let's go (now)" can be equivalent in urgency. Pošli is limited to this context (\*Pošli zavtra v kino "Let's go to the movies tomorrow") while pojděm is not (Pojděm zavtra v kino "Let's go to the movies tomorrow").

While the past indicative as the inclusive imperative may convey a nuance of urgency, the past indicative as the 2 per imperative can convey not only immediacy, but great rudeness as well. This is especially true for the verb poiti "to go".

- |                                                              |                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| --Barin moj milyj, daj ja<br>tebe pogadaju.                  | "My dear sir, let me tell<br>your fortune. |
| --Pošla k čortu [čěrtu].<br>(Sologub <u>Melkij bes</u> :389) | Go to hell."                               |

Nu, pošël že, radi boga! "Get going, for God's sake!"  
(Paffen 1958:134)

Verbs other than pojti do not necessarily carry overtones of rudeness when used as 2 per imperatives.

|                                |                               |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| --Pusto bez Kati.              | "It's lonely without Katja.   |
| --Esli pusto, tak i pri-       | If you're lonely, it doesn't  |
| nesti eë nedolgo. Vzgl         | take long to bring her. Just  |
| u sosedu lodku da pere-        | take a boat from the neighbor |
| exal.                          | and go over."                 |
| (Nikolaeva <u>Bitva v puti</u> |                               |
| in Forsyth 1970:142)           |                               |

Most informants considered vzgl and pereexal in this context as a sign of colloquial speech or idiolectal style.

In the following example, the past tense forms in -li refer only to the addressees.

|                          |                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Sejčas ja vam skazu:     | "In a moment I'll say to you: |
| "Vstali, pošli". Vy vse  | 'On your feet, march!'        |
| vstanete i budete šagat' | You'll all get up and start   |
| na meste.                | marking time."                |
| (from <u>Krugozor</u> in |                               |
| Forsyth 1970:141)        |                               |

The past tense forms ending in -li are used, then for both the inclusive and the 2 per imperative. Paffen (1958:134) states that the forms in -l can refer to one or more addressees, but the informants used pošël only for addressing a single male listener. Švedova (1967a:35; 1970:587) consistently includes -l forms as just the 2 per sg. A clear distinction is made in 2 per number in some South Russian dialects. Pošël signals the 2 per sg and pošëlte the 2 per pl (Sologub 1957:459).

### 3.3 THE CONDITIONAL AS IMPERATIVE

There are two types of conditional constructions which may express the imperative mood: those with čtob(y) and those with by.

#### 3.31 ČTOB(Y)

This type of syntagmatic imperative represents a categorical command.

|                    |                       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Čtob ty učilsja!   | "You'd better study!" |
| (Svedova 1970:581) |                       |

This construction might properly be called a subjunctive derivative. Its probable source is in subjunctive clauses following verbs of volition.

|                              |                        |
|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Ja xoču, čtob(y) ty učilsja. | "I want you to study." |
|------------------------------|------------------------|

|                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ja velju, čtob(y) ty učilsja. | "I'm ordering you to study." |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|

Švedova (1970:581-2) lists this construction under the 1 as well as the 2 and 3 per imperatives.

|                         |                        |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1a. Čtob ja byl pervym. | "I'd better be first." |
|-------------------------|------------------------|

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| b. Čtob ja byl pervym? | "What, me be first?" |
|------------------------|----------------------|

|                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 2a. Čtob ja učilsja. | "I'd better study." |
|----------------------|---------------------|

|                     |                   |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| b. Čtob ja učilsja? | "What, me study?" |
|---------------------|-------------------|

To her, they signify categorical expressions of will in colloquial speech. This construction can also represent a kind of hortative utterance directed toward the speaker (1a and 2a) or the speaker's protestation against performing the action (1b and 2b).

3.311 With a 3 per subject, this construction was

considered imperative.

1. Čtob ty učilsja. "You'd better study."
2. Čtob on učilsja. "He'd better study."

The 3 per form in sentence 2 possibly derives from sentences containing the 2 per paradigmatic imperative: Skaži emu, čtob(y) on učilsja "Tell him he'd better study". A distinction can be made between this type of 3 per imperative and those with pust'.

1. Pust' on zamolčit. "Have/Get him to shut up."
2. Čtob on zamolčal. "He'd better shut up/See to it that he shuts up."

Sentence 1 was interpreted as a signal to the addressee to transmit the command to a non-participant in the speech event. Although some informants understood sentence 2 in this way, others took it to imply a strong threat toward the addressee. All informants stated that sentence 2 was a more categorical command than sentence 1.

3.312 The 2 per imperative with čtob(y) can be expressed directly (with a 2 per subject pronoun) or indirectly (with an inanimate 3 per subject).

1. Čtob vy prigotovili vsě čerez nedelju. "You'd better prepare everything in a week."
2. Čtob vsě bylo prigotovleno čerez nedelju. "Everything better be prepared in a week."  
(Anikina 1963:177)

Both sentences were considered imperative variants focusing on the addressee. Some informants said that sentence 2 represents a stronger command than sentence 1. Others said that sentence 1, with person specified, is more conde-

scending and rude than the indirect expression in sentence 2.

3.313 The čtob(y) variant of the imperative can also be expressed through impersonal constructions. These were interpreted as indirect, yet strong commands to the addressee.

Čtob bylo tixo.                      "(There should be) quiet."  
(Švedova 1970:577)

Čtob bylo bol'she sveta.      "(Let there be) more light."  
(Švedova 1967a:62)

Švedova also cites these constructions without the verb (Čtob tixo, Čtob bol'she sveta). This ellipsis was felt to be forced although the command does not thereby lose any strength.

### 3.32 BY

Sentences containing the conditional particle by plus the past tense verb can also function as the imperative. In contrast to the čtob(y) imperative, this construction indicates less urgency regarding the fulfillment of the action. It is a suggestion, an attenuated expression of the desire, rather than a command. By using this type of imperative, the speaker can also show that he believes the addressee probably will not fulfil the designated action.

1. Neskol'ko raz ja so-      "Several times I tried to  
biral'sja vstat' iz-za      get up from the table and  
stola i ujti domoj, no      go home, but each time my  
xozjain vsjakij raz      host said: Stay a bit longer!"  
govoril: "Posidite  
eščë!"

2. Kogda gosti odelis' i "When the guests had put on  
 stali proščat'sja, xo- their coats and started to  
 zjain skazal: "Posideli say goodbye, the host said:  
 by eščě!" You should stay a bit longer!"  
 (Anikina 1963:176)

In this context, it would be incongruous if not inconceivable to use posideli by eščě in sentence 1 and posidite in sentence 2.

3.321 To be interpreted as imperative, these constructions must refer to the future and must have a 2 per subject, lexicalized or not. The presence of temporal adverbs and subject pronouns serves to delineate the speaker's intent or expectations regarding the utterance.

- |                                                                                               |                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Vy by napisali sego-<br>dnja (zavtra) xozja-<br>inu.<br>(Borras and Christian<br>1968:151) | "You should write the land-<br>lord today (tomorrow)." |
| 2. Napisali by vy včera<br>xozjainu!                                                          | "You should have written the<br>landlord yesterday!"   |
| 3. Napisali by oni včera<br>xozjainu!                                                         | "They should have written the<br>landlord yesterday!"  |

Sentence 1 signals the speaker's opinion that the action should be fulfilled by the addressee. Sentences 2 and 3 can indicate the speaker's regret or annoyance that the action has not been fulfilled by the subject.

When overt signals of person and time are absent, the context serves to distinguish the imperative function of this construction.

- |                     |                                                         |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Sxodil by k nemu.   | "I/You/He should go/should<br>have gone to him."        |
| Nečital by, a spal. | "I/You/He should sleep/should<br>have slept, not read." |

It is, however, not uncommon to have person or time left unspecified when this construction expresses the imperative.

- |                                               |                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1a. Posideli by so mnoj.<br>(Gvozděv 1968:51) | "I wish you'd stay a while<br>with me."    |
| b. Posideli by vy so<br>mnoj.                 | "I'd like you to stay a while<br>with me." |
| 2a. Požili by zdes' do<br>oseni.              | "You should stay here until<br>fall."      |
| b. Vy by zdes' do oseni<br>požili.            | "You should stay here until<br>fall."      |

Some informants sensed little difference between sentences 1a and 1b, 2a and 2b as imperative variants. In terms of word order, sentences 1a and 2a emphasize the verb; 1b and 2b the person. Sentence 1a was interpreted by some informants as a more casual suggestion and by others as a more formal plea than 1b. To some, 2a represented an elliptical form of 2b; others simply felt it exemplified a more casual suggestion than 2b. One can infer from this variety of responses that the pronoun may be absent or present without considerably altering the tone of the utterance when these constructions denote the 2 per as addressee and the future tense.

3.322 The position of the personal pronoun is significant.

- |                                                                                                        |                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1a. Ty by ne čital, a<br>spal.<br>(Gor'kij <u>Moi univer-</u><br><u>sitety</u> in Forsyth<br>1970:292) | "You should be sleeping rather<br>than reading." |
| b. Ne čital by ty, a<br>spal.                                                                          | "You should be sleeping rather<br>than reading." |

2a. Ty by sxodil k nemu. "You should go to him."

b. Sxodil by ty k nemu. " " " " "  
(Anikina 1963:172)

3a. Ty by poel nemnožko. "You should eat a bit."

b. Poel by ty nemnožko. " " " " "  
(Křížková 1966a:176)

All sentences marked a were considered the most frequent and most neutral way of expressing a request or suggestion. Sentences marked b were felt to be more emphatic. The unmarked word order in Russian is subject-verb-object. This word order may be neutral or emphatic depending on the placement of sentence stress. The verb-subject-object order is marked for emphasis on the verb.

3.323 In the positive, either aspect can be used.

Brosili by kurit'. "You should quit smoking."  
(Gvozděv 1968:51)

Rasskazali by nam čto-nibud'. "You should tell us something."  
(Gvozděv 1965:183)

Govoril by ty pomen'se. "You should talk less."  
(Černyšev 1949:231)

As imperative, this construction is not common in the negative. When negated, only the imperfective can be used.

Ne mešali by vy, doktor. "You shouldn't interfere,  
(Kozlov Ogni in Garde doctor."  
1962:42)

Of the following two sentences, only 1 (with the imperfective) was interpreted as an imperative if reference to the future were assumed.

1. Ne otkryval by ty "You shouldn't open the window."  
okna.

2. Ne otkryl by ty okna... "Had you not opened the window.../You wouldn't have opened the window..."

3.324 Of all the basic syntagmatic imperative types, the conditional with by conveys the weakest force. It indicates that the speaker fears non-compliance, is not actually concerned about compliance, or does not wish to offend the addressee with the relative bluntness and directness of the paradigmatic imperative. The use of this form often implies that the fulfillment of the action would be to the advantage of the listener rather than to the speaker.

### 3.4 THE INFINITIVE AS IMPERATIVE

When the infinitive functions as the imperative, it is generally the sole verb in the clause. The 2<sup>nd</sup> person inclusive subject is implied and occasionally lexicalized. The infinitive may express general rules (cookbooks, signs) in which case the pronoun is not used: Ubrat' urožaj bez poter' "Gather the harvest without loss" (Gvozděv 1965: 186). When the infinitive refers to a specific action to be fulfilled immediately following the moment of speech, the subject may or may not be lexicalized and the use of the infinitive in such cases represents a strong, abrupt command.

Ne puskat', ne puskat' ix "Don't let them, don't let  
dal'se! Drat'sja, drat'sja them get farther! Fight,  
s nimi poka est' sily... fight with them while there's  
still strength..."

polzti, dvigat'sja, dvi-      crawl, move, move forward  
 gat'sja vperėd vo čto by      at all costs."  
 to ni stalo.  
 (Polevoj in Suxotin  
 1960:68)

To some informants, the addresser appeared to be excluded from the proposed actions in this example. Others felt that the addresser was included ("we must not let them..."). These variant interpretations emphasize that this context refers to a general necessity ("one must") and that the infinitive can function as the inclusive and 2 per imperatives.

3.41 In the positive, either aspect may be used. Galkina-Fedoruk (1958:232) notes that the perfective is more definite in time and that it therefore constitutes a stronger imperative than the imperfective which is closer to the "obligatory" mood and more indefinite in regard to time.

Vstat'!

"Get up [now]!"

Vstavat', kogda učitel'  
 vxodit.

"Rise [each time] the teacher  
 enters."

In the negative, generally only the imperfective infinitive signals the imperative. The negated perfective infinitive refers to the impossibility of fulfilling the action or it signifies an expression of amazement or annoyance.

1. Ne poslat' ego!

"Not to send/to have sent  
 it (why that's preposterous)!"

2. Ne posylat' ego!

"Don't send it!"

3. Ne otkryt' okna!

"Not to be able to open the  
 window (ridiculous)!"

4. Ne otkryvat' okna! "Don't open the window!"

Sentence 3 with the negated perfective was unanimously rejected as imperative. Sentence 1 was rejected as imperative by some informants and accepted as a strong imperative warning by others.

3.42 Person can be specified by use of the dative subject pronoun.

1. Opustit' vësla! "Lower oars!"  
(Borras and Christian  
1968:157)

2. Vam opustit' vësla! "You lower oars!"

Sentence 2 was rejected by some informants; others interpreted it to refer to a schedule in a series of orders or to focus on one or several addressees in a group.

In another set, Opustit' vësla was considered to refer to all addressees (even though vsem "everyone" was not expressed) in contrast to Vam opustit' vësla, a drugie pust' grebut "You lower oars and let the others row". In the following example there is naturally no ambiguity regarding the addressees.

Vsem opustit' vorotniki. "Turn down collars everyone."  
(Bondarëv Batal'onny  
prosjať ognja in Bondarko  
1971:45)

The dative pronoun may derive from the unexpressed modal nužno or nado "must/should/ought to": Vam nado opustit' vësla v to vremja, kogda drugie dolžny budut gresti "You must lower oars while the others will have to be rowing".

It is possible to use the subject pronoun in the nominative.

|                           |                             |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| A vy stojat' na kryl'ce   | "You stand on the porch and |
| i ni s mesta.             | don't move."                |
| (Gogol' <u>Revizor</u> in |                             |
| Galkina-Fedoruk 1958:     |                             |
| 230)                      |                             |

Some informants rejected this usage. To others, it signals an even stronger contrast in specifying the addressee than the infinitive with the dative subject or it signifies that the speaker expects complete compliance: A vy -- rabotat' i nikakix razgovorov "And you, work and no back talk". In this latter example at least, the juncture could signal that vy acts as a vocative.

3.43 The imperative force of the infinitive can be strengthened in several ways.

|                      |                              |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Ne šumet' zdes'!     | "Don't make noise here!"     |
| Čtob ne šumet' zdes! | "You'd better not make noise |
| (Švedova 1967a:61)   | here!"                       |

Čtob plus the past tense exemplifies a strong command (section 3.31). Čtob functions here as a particle which adds a more forceful tone to the utterance.

|                          |                       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Nu, spat', spat'.        | "Well, sleep, sleep." |
| (Academy Grammar vol. 2, |                       |
| pt. 2:48)                |                       |

The Academy Grammar considers the repetition of infinitives as a means of softening the command. Most informants were able to show that, with appropriate voice inflection, such repetition can strengthen the order.

Infinitive constructions with tak can signal a strong imperative.

|                    |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Exat' tak exat'.   | "We said we'd go so let's |
| (Švedova 1967a:52) | go."                      |

Čto ž ty, Vanja? Opo-  
zdaeš', exat' tak exat',  
ne sidi!

"What's the matter, Vanja?  
You'll be late. You decided  
to go so go, don't sit around!"

Švedova (1970:581) lists Davaj učit'sja! and Davajte učit'sja! "Come on, study!" under the 2 per sg and 2 per pl imperatives respectively. With no juncture between the two verb forms, this construction can serve as a strong "paternal we": the speaker does not intend to participate in the action. When a juncture is present, davaj(te) acts as a hortative particle which strengthens učit'sja, the infinitive as 2 per imperative.

3.44 The infinitive as imperative can also occur with the conditional particle by in which case the 2 per subject pronoun will usually be expressed. In the positive, both aspects are used. In the negative, generally only the perfective is found. The negated imperfective may be used but not as an independent sentence (Ne molčat' by vam, a otvetit' "You shouldn't be silent, answer").

Idti by tebe tuda ran'še. "You should go there earlier."

Govorit' by tebe pomen'še. "You should talk less."  
(Černyšev 1949:231)

Vam by sxodit' samim. "You should go there yourself."  
(Gvozdev 1965:186)

Ne prostudit'sja by vam. "Don't catch cold."  
(Borras and Christian 1968:157)

If the personal subject pronoun is absent, the construction is ambiguous. Without the pronoun, it can signal a 1 per wish or desire.

Uznat' by èto polušče.  
(Černyšev 1949:231)

"I should find out more about  
this (or This should be  
investigated better)."

All informants interpreted this example as having a 1 per  
sg subject.

1. Ne popast' by vam pod dožd'.  
(Unbegaun 1962:241)

"See that you don't get caught  
in the rain."

2. Ne popast' by pod dožd'.

"I'd/We'd better not get  
caught in the rain."

Sentence 1 clearly excludes the speaker. Sentence 2 includes  
the speaker -- depending on the larger context, as the  
sole participant or one of a number.

Razbudit' by ix zavtra  
poran'she.  
(Anikina 1963:179)

"You should wake them earlier  
tomorrow."

This sentence was interpreted in two ways: the speaker's  
plan or desire ("I should") or an imperative directed  
toward the addressee.

3.441 The particular nuance this construction conveys  
is not as easily definable as the nuances of the other  
syntagmatic imperatives. The infinitive alone was con-  
sistently interpreted as a stronger command than the in-  
finitive plus by. A comparison with the conditional as  
imperative revealed other overtones associated with the  
infinitive plus by.

1. Vam by polečit'sja.  
(Borras and Christian  
1968:156)

"You should take a cure (see  
a doctor)."

2. Vy by polečilis'.

"You should take a cure (see  
a doctor)."

Sentence 1 was said to indicate more involvement on the part

of the speaker ("It would be a good thing for all of us if..."). Some informants interpreted sentence 2 as a more casual suggestion than sentence 1. To others, sentence 2 was the stronger.

1. Sxodit' by tebe v kino. "You should go to the movies."  
(Anikina 1963:174)

2. Sxodil by ty v kino.       "       "       "       "       "

Sentence 1 was interpreted by some as a more tentative, less hopeful suggestion than sentence 2. To others, sentence 1 exemplified a strong suggestion with emphasis on the action.

1. Vam by zdes' do oseni    "You should stay here until  
požit'.                       fall."  
(Čexov Nevesta in  
Anikina 1963:174)

2. Vy by zdes' do oseni    "You should stay here until  
požili.                       fall."

In this set, sentence 1 was taken to imply the addresser's lack of real concern about the fulfillment of the action or as a less hopeful suggestion. Sentence 2 then showed the speaker's enthusiasm; it represents less tentative advice than sentence 1.

1. Vam by sxodit' samim.    "You should go yourself."

2. Vy by sami sxodili.       "       "       "       "  
(Gvozdev 1965:186)

Sentence 1 was considered a more tentative suggestion than sentence 2.

1. Govorit' by tebe po-    "You should talk less."  
men'se.

2. Govoril by ty po- "You should talk less."  
 men'še.  
 (Černyšev 1949:231)

In this case, sentence 1 signified the stronger imperative and sentence 2 the less hopeful suggestion.

3.442 The construction with the infinitive plus by shows an affinity both to the infinitive as imperative and to the conditional as imperative. The problem of revealing the particular nuance or nuances of this construction is complicated by two factors. The lexical items used in each utterance influence comparisons with other syntagmatic imperatives. In the speech of the informants, the infinitive plus by represents an awkward if not totally unacceptable structure. It is one of the least frequent of all the basic syntagmatic imperatives discussed in this chapter. The others are regularly or occasionally used by all informants and thus comprise the major corpus of non-imperative forms which can express various degrees of imperativeness.

### 3.5 THE THIRD PERSON IMPERATIVE WITH PUST'

Some major problems associated with the so-called 3 per imperative using pust' were discussed in sections 1.231-2. In terms of formal features, this construction differs considerably from the other syntagmatic imperatives. Here we observe the 3 per indicative imperfective present or perfective future preceded by the particles pust' (an imperative derivative: 2 per sg pusti > pust') or puskaj

(the form of the 2 per sg imperative of the verb puskat' "to let, to allow"). However, these particles do not function as 2 per imperative; the construction does not use the pl form puskajte (or \*pust'te). Thus the syntactic arrangement neutralizes the primary function of the paradigmatic imperative puskaj.

|                                |                    |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Pust'/Puskaj on<br>(s)delajet. | "Let/Have him do." |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|

|                                 |                     |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Pust'/Puskaj oni<br>(s)delajut. | "Let/Have them do." |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|

In terms of semantics, this construction also differs from other syntagmatic imperatives. This is due, first of all, to the fact that the pust' construction has a number of disparate functions all of which are equally important and all of which are expressed similarly.

It can function as a concessive clause indicator.

|                                                                            |                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Pust' roza sorvana, ona<br>eščë svetët.<br>(Nadson in Gvozdëv<br>1968:283) | "Though the rose be plucked,<br>still it blooms." |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                           |                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pust' nam soobščili, čto<br>nekto propyl 100 metrov<br>za 45 sekund.<br>(Apresjan 1967:7) | "Let us assume/suppose that<br>someone swam 100 meters in<br>45 seconds." |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Pust' in combination with the 1 per sg indicative is referred to in the Academy Grammar (vol. 1:496) as the addresser's strong wish. Švedova (1967a:35), however, cites this as the normal 1 per sg imperative construction.

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Pust' ja rasskažu. | "Let me tell." |
|-----------------------|----------------|

|                     |       |
|---------------------|-------|
| 2. Daj ja rasskažu. | " " " |
|---------------------|-------|

Most informants associated sentence 1 with sentence 2 and

therefore treated it as a type of 2 per imperative. Sentence 1 was generally considered an infrequent construction. Those who use it felt that it indicates more urgency than sentence 2. One informant prefers to use the true imperative of pustit' (Pusti ja rasskažu, no juncture) in place of pust'. This clearly represents a 2 per imperative. It must be noted that some informants did not accept the use of pusti in this context.

Pust' plus the 1 per sg indicative can also signal the addresser's desire or wish if there is no addressee or if the speaker is not asking permission to do something.

|                                                                       |                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Pust' umru sovsem kak<br>rusalka.<br>(Sologub <u>Melkij bes</u> :356) | "Let me/May I die just like<br>a water nymph." |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|

Pust' plus the 3 per indicative and an inanimate subject can signify a command to the addressee alone.

|                                                                       |                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Pust' škaf ostanetsja<br>zdes'.<br>(Bondarko and Bulanin<br>1967:124) | "Let the cupboard stay here." |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|

On other occasions, it may signal the speaker's strong wish or desire.

|                                                                   |                                                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pust' družba studentov<br>mužaet i krepnet.<br>(Anikina 1963:169) | "May the friendship of students<br>develop and strengthen." |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                           |                                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Pust' s vami ničego ne<br>slučitsja.<br>(Rozov <u>Večno živye</u> in<br>Forsyth 1970:258) | "Let/May nothing happen to you." |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|

With non-human subjects and with impersonal verbs, this construction may signify the optative.

|                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Pust' tebja muxi edjat. | "May/Let the flies eat you." |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|

Pust' tol'ko rassvetët. "May/Let it just get light."  
(Karcevski 1927:138)

Under similar circumstances it can be taken as covert reference to the 2 per.

Pust' sobaka živët. "Let the dog live [Don't  
kill the dog]."

In sentences with a 3 per subject, pust' and puskaj can indicate the speaker's indifference toward the action(s) of the non-participant in the speech event.

--U Dolguškina vystupaet "There's some new singer  
kakoj-to novyj kupletist. performing at Dolguškin's.  
--Nu i pust' vystupaet. So let him perform."  
(Nilin Žestokost' in  
Forsyth 1970:223)

The speaker can also show his indifference by using the genitive-accusative in place of the nominative pronoun.

Pust' ego govorit. "So let him talk."

Puskaj ego spit. "So let him sleep."

Most informants interpreted these examples as signals of indifference and all felt the use of ego was colloquial.

3.51 The remainder of the discussion will focus on pust' plus human subject plus 3 per indicative verb form in examples with no explicit indication of concession. In cases when this type of construction is analyzed in the literature, it is traditionally labeled "3 per imperative" (cf., section 1.232). That is, the non-participant in the speech event is meant in some way (generally via the addressee) to receive the information that the addresser wants him to fulfil an action. As has been noted, the relative involvement of the addressee and the 3 per varies

depending on the larger context. The greater force of the imperative may be directed to the addressee (Let John read this = Don't interfere with John's reading this), to the 3 per (Let John read this = John has got to read this), to the addressee and the 3 per (Let John read this = Go tell John he is to read this). Thus, in the absence of a larger context, any construction like Pust' Ivan èto čitaet is ambiguous.

In the examples cited below as 3 per imperatives, most contexts do not specify the degree of involvement regarding the 2 and 3 per. In fact, some contexts are obviously lacking an addressee distinct from the addresser (the speaker talks to himself). Many of these utterances can be used when the 3 per is in hearing range of the verbal communication. Hence, the validity of the category "non-participant in the speech event" here especially can be questioned.

We appear to have made little progress toward an exact definition of "3 per imperative". Once again, if the pust' construction is not considered to be related to the imperative mood, then it seems to have no definable niche in the grammatical system. It must be assigned to some category for otherwise we cannot address ourselves to other important questions (aspect, word order) regarding this obviously extant structure. Although the Slavicists are divided into two camps on this problem, for the informants the pust' construction is 3 per imperative: someone in addition to

1 and 2 per is involved and the speaker indicates that he wants this person to fulfil an action.

3.52 According to Rozental' (1965:169) and Vinogradov (1947:598), pust' is more decisive and puskaj more concessive. Some informants claim to make no distinction between the two particles and others make only a stylistic distinction. For the latter group, puskaj is more colloquial than pust'.

3.521 Aspectual opposition is similar to the 2 per imperative. When the imperfective refers to a single action, it can convey a greater sense of urgency than the perfective.

|                              |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Uexal on, a čerez dva dnja   | "He left and 2 days later    |
| prisylaet telegrammu:        | sent a telegram: Mulja, have |
| "Mulja, pust' sročno         | them send the documents      |
| vysylajut dokumenty".        | right away."                 |
| (Sëmin <u>Semero v odnom</u> |                              |
| <u>dome</u> in Forsyth 1970: |                              |
| 224)                         |                              |

Pust' sročno vyšljut (perfective) in this context was considered less urgent and more official.

In the negative, the perfective lends itself to several interpretations.

1. Pust' ne terjaet deneg. "He shouldn't lose the money."
2. Pust' ne poterjaet       "       "       "       "       "  
deneg.  
(Academy Grammar vol.  
1:498)

Sentence 1 with the imperfective was taken to be a general rule to pass on to the subject who had previously lost money. Sentence 2 refers to a single action as the addresser's wish ("I hope he doesn't") or as a warning to pass on to the subject.

- |                                                                                                        |                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Pust' on ni v koem slučae ne vozvraščajetsja v Moskvu.<br>(Semënov Petrovka 38 in Forsyth 1970:245) | "By no means is he to return to Moscow."                                        |
| 2. Pust' on ni vozvratitsja v Moskvu.                                                                  | "He shouldn't return to Moscow (or Let him just try and not return to Moscow)." |

Sentence 1 was considered a threat to the subject or simply a negation of the suggested activity. Sentence 2 was interpreted in four ways: an implication ("He shouldn't, but if he does"), a concessive ("Suppose he doesn't"), a much more emphatic variant of sentence 1, or a type of threat.

3.522 The 3 per constructions may occur in dependent clauses after 2 per commands.

- |                                                              |                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Skaži emu, čtoby on otdal den'gi.                         | "Tell him to give the money back." |
| 2. Skaži emu, pust' on otdast den'gi.<br>(Isačenko 1960:477) | "Tell him to give the money back." |

Sentence 1 was felt to be a stronger, more direct order. Commands with čtob(y) are always more emphatic (cf., section 3.31). Sentence 2 was considered colloquial style and a suggestion or an imitation of a child's speech.

3.523 When the pronoun or proper name precede pust', this word order is emphatic.

A oni pust' sami rešajut. "Let them decide."

|                                                       |                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Leonov pust' sadit'sja v parter.<br>(Paffen 1958:138) | "Let <u>Leonov</u> sit in the orchestra." |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|

The absence of a noun or pronoun can be interpreted as an ellipsis.

Pust' čitaet.  
(Gvozděv 1965:189)

"Let him/her read."

Stress on the verb emphasizes the designated activity in opposition to any other activity. Stress on pust' can emphasize the speaker's indifference. The absence of a lexicalized subject was not significant: the same was concluded when on "he" was used.

3.524 The enclitic particle -ka may occur with this construction.

1. Pust'-ka podoždět. "Let him wait."  
(Academy Grammar vol.  
1:499)

2. Puskaj-ka pridut. "Let them come."

Here the function of -ka was interpreted in several ways: a signal of regional speech, a threat, a suggestion (sentence 2 only), emphasis.

Davaj as a hortative particle may also occur with this construction in colloquial speech.

Davajte pust' on pojdět. "Let him set out."  
(Švedova 1970:613)

Pust' can be used in conjunction with the conditional particle by and the past tense.

Pust' by k nam prišěl. "He should come to us."  
(Paffen 1958:138)

This sentence was interpreted as non-standard, the speaker's wish or a concessive ("Suppose he were to come").

Pust' by ona tebe mesto "Let her first give you a  
snačala dala, --okrutit'sja job, you'll manage to get  
uspeeš'. hitched."  
(Sologub Melkij bes:38)

Mne, konečno, naplevat'  
 --pust' by boltali, da  
 bojus' čto...  
 (Sologub Melkij bes:108)

"Of course, I don't care a  
 fig. Let them talk, I'm just  
 afraid that..."

Both these examples were felt to be infrequent 3 per imperative variants of pust' plus the indicative present or future.

Kogda byla odna komnata  
 v kommunal'noj kvartire,  
 to puskaj by priezžal  
 xot' celyj tabor s med-  
 vedjami, xuže by ne stalo.  
 (Karbovskaja "Dnevnik  
 novosëla":197)

"When there was just one room  
 in the communal apartment,  
 then a whole gypsy camp with  
 bears could have come, it  
 wouldn't have been any worse."

Here the imperative is hypothetically projected into the past tense: someone could have given such an order but did not.

## CHAPTER IV

### SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF THE PARADIGMATIC IMPERATIVE

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative are all frequently used in emotive, colloquial speech styles and in the regional dialects (cf., Šapiro 1953). Some educated speakers of Russian use very few of the constructions to be discussed here, while others employ nearly all in casual conversation.

4.11 The paradigmatic imperative has four basic secondary functions which are almost exclusively implemented by the 2 per sg form. Leaving aside the variants for the moment, the four functions can be outlined as follows.

Function 1 might be termed the obligative or the necessitative. The subject is bound or obliged to perform the action denoted by the verb.

|                         |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Vy guljat' budete, a ja | "You'll be taking a stroll |
| <u>rabotaj.</u>         | while I have to work."     |
| (Karcevski 1927:136)    |                            |

Function 2 will be called the narrative past. The paradigmatic imperative can be used in an animated narrative which describes actions having taken place in the

past, often unexpectedly.

Položil ja ego na stol,  
čtoby emu operaciju  
delat', a on voz'mi i  
umri u menja pod xloro-  
formom.  
(Čexov Djadjja Vanja in  
Forsyth 1970:221)

"I put him on the table to  
operate on him and he up and  
dies on me under chloro-  
form."

Function 3 will be designated the conditional. The  
paradigmatic imperative can be used in a dependent clause  
to express concession or unrealized events.

Slučis' èto na prošloj  
nedele, ja by ne stal  
bespokoit'sja.  
(Isačenko 1963:47)

"Had this happened last week,  
I wouldn't have begun to  
worry."

Skol'ko ni dumaj, vsë  
ravno ničego ne pri-  
dumaju.  
(Brym 1963:88)

"No matter how much I think,  
I still won't be able to  
devise anything."

Function 4 will be called the optative. By using the  
paradigmatic imperative, the speaker can express a desire  
that an action be performed.

Razrazi menja grom.  
(Vojnova 1967:382)

"May the thunder strike me."

4.12 Several interesting attempts have been made to  
account for the factor unifying all of these functions:  
the 2 per sg imperative form. Jakobson (1932) groups functions  
1 (obligative/necessitative), 2 (narrative past) and 3  
(conditional) together into a single mood, the "mood of  
arbitrary action" (Modus der willkürhaften Handlung).  
This mood is comprised of two basic members: the impera-  
tive, and functions 1, 2 and 3.

Jakobson later (1957) referred to this as the injunctive  
mood. The injunctive is divided into pure appeal forms,

the imperative/hortative (cf., section 2.41), and into the declarative forms. The declarative forms show no distinction in person or number and are divided into two groups. The assumptive form of the declarative injunctive includes function 3 (conditional) and function 1 (obligative/necessitative). The narrative form of the declarative injunctive is function 2 (narrative past). Function 4 (optative) is not mentioned in this scheme.

Whereas Jakobson discusses what are called here primary and secondary functions under the heading of a single mood, Ferrell (1968) clearly separates the three functions in question by treating them as secondary. Ferrell calls function 1 the obligative, function 2 the affective past and function 3 the hypothetical. Once again function 4 (optative) is not treated as a separate group.

Švedova (1970) deals with these problems in a different way entirely. She posits six moods for Russian (indicative, conditional, subjunctive, obligatory, optative and imperative) and indicates the basic paradigms of each mood according to types of simple sentences. The paradigmatic imperative functions as the imperative mood, the conditional, the obligatory and the optative. According to Švedova, function 2 (narrative past) is not a sentence-type problem but rather a question of alternation in the predicate.

Isačenko (1960) treats all four functions in yet another way. Functions 1 and 4 are included under the general heading of transposition of the imperative. Function

2 is referred to as the "dramatic imperative" which is restricted to the perfective aspect. The imperfective variant of function 2 is treated as a transposition of the analytic imperative which is also a dramatic imperative type. Finally, Isačenko deals with function 3 in his section on the imperative in concessive and conditional sentences.

4.121 Those linguists who have offered a comprehensive framework for discussing the secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative consider only three possible distinct functions and usually base their classification system on a few preselected examples. Isačenko treats all four functions as variations on the transposition of the imperative. This transposition is defined only as the use of the form outside the dialog situation (1960:496). This definition is quite inadequate since, for example, in the sentence Pridi ty včera... "Had you come yesterday...", the listener is clearly being addressed with a form of the imperative which does not, however, express the imperative mood. In addition, Isačenko treats the four functions unevenly. Functions 1 and 4 are grouped together as unique expressions involving only the imperative form -- possible paraphrases with non-imperative forms are not discussed. Whereas function 2 is given equal status with certain indicative constructions, function 3 is discussed as a usage subordinate to the conditional.

It is clear that the way in which these functions are dealt with depends to a great extent on the number of

moods an author posits for Russian. This problem cannot be given full attention in a study which is not concerned with the entire modal system. Regarding only the functions of the paradigmatic imperative, Russian is said here to have four functions: imperative, indicative, conditional, optative. Actually the functions of the imperative form can be investigated using a 3, 5 or 6 mood system. I found, however, that the 4 mood system was the most efficient and useful means for analyzing the "grammar" of these secondary functions. Where relevant, I will indicate how my treatment differs from others in terms of equating functions with moods.

4.13 In the following sections, I will present a detailed analysis of the four secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative. I will review the ways in which each of these functions has been treated in the literature and will justify the differentiation of these particular four functions. Consideration will be given to the major and minor variants of each function. A large number of examples were used during the interviews in order to determine how a certain function can be recognized in an utterance, the degree to which these functions are utilized by educated native speakers, and the overtones conveyed by the paradigmatic imperative as opposed to a variety of paraphrases.

## 4.2 THE OBLIGATIVE/NECESSITATIVE

It has often been said that the paradigmatic imperative can signal an arbitrarily imposed obligation (cf., Unbegaun 1962:238) or the absolute necessity of the action (cf., Bondarko and Bulanin 1967:128). When the speaker contrasts the action denoted by the imperative form to another action, he usually thereby indicates that the subject will perform that action unwillingly.

|                         |                             |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Vy guljat' budete, a ja | "You'll be taking a stroll, |
| rabotaj.                | while I have to work."      |
| (Karcevski 1927:136)    |                             |

It is not always necessary to contrast two actions to show the unwillingness of the subject.

|                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ja i podaj, ja i uberi. | "I am the one who must serve |
| (Švedova 1967a:28)      | and I am the one who must    |
|                         | clear away."                 |

This usage can also indicate the necessity of an action without an inherent reference to the subject's willingness or unwillingness to perform it.

|                          |                            |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Obeščalsja pomogat', tak | "He promised to help so he |
| on i pomogaj.            | must help."                |

|                          |                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Soldat on i bud' soldat. | "A soldier must be (act like) |
| (Švedova 1967a:28)       | a soldier."                   |

4.21 In section 3.14, the modals with an imperative function were discussed; i.e., those having a 2 per subject and reference to non-past time. Now we observe the paradigmatic imperative functioning as a modal of necessity subject to the following constraints: the time reference is non-past and the subject of the verb is the 1 or 3 per.

In utterances containing a 1 per subject, the addresser states that he must perform some action, usually unwillingly. In sentences with a 3 per subject, the addresser assumes that the subject must perform some action, whether willingly or unwillingly.

Švedova (1967a:28) establishes an obligatory mood which consists solely of the paradigmatic imperative in this secondary function. Karcevski (1927:136) shows that the imperative form is only one of three variants having the same general meaning.

- |                                                |                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Vy guljat' budete, a<br>ja rabotaj.         | "You'll be taking a stroll,<br>while I have to work."   |
| 2. Vy budete guljat', a<br>ja dolžen rabotat'. | "You'll be taking a stroll<br>and I must work."         |
| 3. Vy guljat' budete, a<br>ja čtob rabotal.    | "You'll be taking a stroll<br>and you want me to work." |

Sentence 2, with the modal dolžen, is the most neutral standard variant. The use of the imperative in sentence 1 represents a colloquial speech style and signals that the speaker feels some person or thing is commanding him to perform the action. Sentence 3 is also a colloquial mode of expression. It is considered a kind of indirect quote of the imperative čtob(y) type (see section 3.31) and can show the speaker's incredulity.

All informants paraphrased sentences like 1 above with the modal dolžen. Some felt that dolžen was preferable to the imperative form. Others considered dolžen less forceful and emotional than the imperative form.

4.211 A fundamental problem concerning this function

of the paradigmatic imperative concerns its placement within the Russian modal system. When an obligatory mood is posited for Russian, it generally consists only of the imperative form -- few or none of the modals of necessity are grouped under this mood. The Russian modals are usually treated together with predicatives or impersonal constructions and as such are not properly distinguished according to their specific semantic range. In terms of semantics and morphology, the modals in Russian and English comprise a unique category. For this reason, they continue to lend themselves to a variety of contradictory solutions regarding classification.

At least as a temporary solution, this function of the paradigmatic imperative will be said to represent a modal of necessity or obligation restricted to non-past time and to a 1 or 3 per subject. The admittedly awkward label "obligative/necessitative" emphasizes two related meanings: the speaker considers it his or someone else's duty to perform the action or feels that he or someone else is being forced to perform the action.

4.22 There are a number of ways in which the paradigmatic imperative functioning as the obligative/necessitative can be recognized. Only those verbs which express the imperative mood can be used in these constructions and only the paradigmatic 2 per sg is employed.

The imperative form occurs either in the first or in the second clause of the sentence, but never as the initial

word. A subject noun or pronoun must be present. It may immediately precede the imperative form or may be separated from it by several words.

Bondarko and Bulanin (1967:128) give an example of this construction without an expressed subject.

|                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| U neë net ni rodneyx, ni<br>doma. Xočeš' ne xočeš',<br>a idi i slušaj razgovory. | "She has neither family nor<br>home. Whether you want/she<br>wants to or not, you just<br>have to/she just has to<br>go and listen to the con-<br>versations." |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

From this example it appears that the obligative/necessitative can refer to generic person as well as to 3 per.

Švedova (1967a:28) cites examples of the obligatory mood with the 2 per subject pronoun.

|                                                                       |                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A esli vzjalsja sovetovat',<br>tak ty i bud' nastojaščij<br>sovetčik. | "But if you've started advising,<br>then (you must) be a real<br>adviser." |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|

It is interesting to note that Švedova later (1970) removed examples with the 2 per pronoun from her paradigms. A modal can express the imperative mood with a 2 per subject (ty dolžen rabotat' "you must work") as can the paradigmatic imperative (ty rabotaj "you work"). Since all the requirements for recognizing the paradigmatic imperative in its primary function are present, there is no way of establishing the obligative/necessitative with a 2 per subject (ty rabotaj "you work" or ?"you must work") unless it could be proven that the addresser is not actually commanding the addressee.

If the subject of the imperative form is inanimate, the verb form signals a strong statement of necessity.

Stroitel'stvo bud' zakon- "The construction must be  
čeno v srok, a materialov finished on time but there  
net. are no materials."  
(Švedova 1970:579)

In this case, the fulfillment of the action could rest with the addresser, the addressee(s) or a non-participant in the speech event.

The obligative/necessitative is usually implemented with the imperfective aspect. Occasionally the perfective is used.

On pokaži porjadok, "He is to show order and the  
zakon pokaži, na to law, that's what authorities  
načal'stvo postavleno. are for."  
(Tolstoj in Šmelëv 1961:  
50)

Ja i podaj, ja i uberi. "I am the one who must serve  
(Švedova 1967a:28) and I am the one who must  
clear away."

When the action denoted by the imperative form is juxtaposed to another, presumably desirable action, the obligative/necessitative can occur in either clause.

My doma ostavajsja, a "We have to stay at home,  
vy v kino. while you can go to the  
(Unbegaun 1962:238) movies."

Vam xorošo, a ja syna "It's all right for you, but  
v universitete soderži, I have to support my son  
malyx v gimnazii vos- at the university and educate  
pityvaj. the little ones at school."  
(Tolstoj in Isačenko  
1960:497)

Through a contrast to a different activity or state, the subject's unwillingness to perform the inevitable action is generally expressed as in the preceding two examples. But it is also possible to express reluctance in an interrogative sentence.

Značit, opjat' ja  
rabotaj na nego?  
(Šmelëv 1961:51)

"Does that mean I have to  
slave for him again?"

The subject of the imperative form is generally in the nominative case but may occur in the dative.

A tak--vy gryzëtes', a  
nam potom rebjat v  
tjur'mu sažaj, da?  
(Semënov Petrovka 38 in  
Forsyth 1970:221)

"This way you bicker and  
then we have to put your  
kids in jail, right?"

This usage of the dative case was considered less common than the nominative. To some informants it represented a corruption of nam nužno budet sažat' or nam pridëtsja sažat' "we will have to put". To others, the dative in this example indicates that the addressers are less willing to perform the action than had the nominative been used.

4.221 Šmelëv (1961:50) comments that with a 3 per subject this secondary function of the paradigmatic imperative is not productive in modern Russian. However, those native speakers who use the imperative form in this way felt equally comfortable with all examples, whether 1 or 3 per.

Ty vinovat, a drugie  
otvečaj.  
(Brym 1963:87)

"You're guilty, but others  
have to answer for it."

This example shows that the imperative form still retains a link to the semantics of the imperative mood. The informants felt that the addressee at least figuratively had given such an order.

Krugom čërt znaet čto  
tvoritsja, a ja molči.  
(Isačenko 1963:48)

"God knows what's going on all  
around and I have to keep  
silent."

Some informants interpreted the imperative form in this example as signalling that someone had given such a command to the subject. Others said it simply indicates that something, perhaps the circumstance, is compelling the subject to be silent.

Those informants who do not use the obligative/necessitative consider it representative of very colloquial speech. They would substitute the imperative form by the modal dolžen and the infinitive. All informants, including those who use the obligative/necessitative in casual conversation, agree that the imperative form in this construction is stronger and more emotive than dolžen.

#### 4.3 THE NARRATIVE PAST

The paradigmatic imperative can be used to express past tense events in a lively narrative. It thus functions as a highly restricted variant of the indicative mood. The particular nuance conveyed by the imperative form in such a context has been described in a number of ways: as the vivid past (Ferrell 1953a:374), as an arbitrary sudden action with the perfective (Unbegaun 1962:238), as the energetic beginning of a prolonged action (Galkina-Fedoruk 1964:32), as the past of sudden-arbitrary action (Vinogradov 1947:556), or as a variant of the historical present which signals an unexpected and unmotivated action (Isačenko 1960:501, 1968:313). The narrative past function

of the paradigmatic imperative expresses all these nuances depending on the semantics of the verb, on the entire context and on the distinctions in aspect. The term "narrative past" is the most neutral one: it stresses that past events are being narrated without specifying whether these events are considered sudden, unexpected, unmotivated and so forth.

4.31 The narrative past function of the paradigmatic imperative can be distinguished in the following ways. Both verbs which express the semantics of the imperative mood and those which do not can be used in these constructions.

Edva on otošěl ot berega, "He had hardly gone away from  
kak lěd pod nim prolomis'. the shore when the ice broke  
(Unbegaun 1962:239) under him."

Only the paradigmatic 2 per sg form is used which can take only a 1 or 3 per subject. The imperative form may not occur as the initial word in the clause. If we consider only those verbs which can express imperative semantics, the imperative form as narrative past must be distinguishable from the obligative/necessitative since the same word order and subject restrictions apply. This distinction is clarified through aspect. The obligative/necessitative is almost exclusively implemented with the imperfective.

Vse otdyxajut, a on begi. "Everyone is resting while  
(Jakobson 1957:7) he has to run."

The narrative past can be implemented with either aspect, but the imperfective form is always periphrastic (davaj plus the imperfective infinitive).

Vse otdyxajut, a on po-  
begi.

"Everyone is resting and he  
starts running."

Vse otdyxajut, a on  
davaj bežat'.  
(Jakobson 1957:7-8)

"Everyone is resting and he  
starts running."

In terms of aspect formation, these two secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative are mutually exclusive.

According to Isačenko (1963:49), the imperfective form of the narrative past is a transposition of the inclusive imperative. Galkina-Fedoruk (1964:32) shows that the imperfective infinitive can be preceded by other particles (among them: nu, da, da nu) which lend almost the same nuance to the utterance as does davaj. In narrative past constructions, davaj must be considered a hortative particle since it complements the infinitive which can by itself express the past tense in a narration.

4.311 During the interviews, the informants had an opportunity to work with minimal pairs in order to determine the difference between aspect, forms with and without voz'mi da (i) "up and" preceding, etc.

1. Vse otdyxajut, a on  
pobegi.

"Everyone is resting and he  
starts running."

2. Vse otdyxajut, a on  
davaj bežat'.  
(Jakobson 1957:7-8)

"Everyone is resting and he  
starts running."

Some informants rejected sentence 1 entirely. Others said that it indicates that the subject somehow feels forced to begin the action. Some informants equated sentence 2 with sentence 1, some felt 2 was marginally acceptable, and others said that 2 stresses the beginning of an action

which the subject chose to perform. These same two sentences with the first verb in the past (otdyxali) place the narrated event further back in time from the moment of observation.

1. Ja vzjal da vernulsja. "I up and returned."  
(Isačenko 1968:314)

2. Ja voz'mi da vernis'. " " " "

Sentence 1 was considered a statement by the addresser about a past decision. Sentence 2 was interpreted as a more vivid variant of 1 which indicates that the action surprised everyone except the addresser.

1. A on bežat'. "And he ran."

2. A on davaj bežat'. "And he took off running."

In this comparison between the bare and modified infinitive as the past tense, the informants offered differing interpretations. Sentence 1: quicker action, elliptic version of 2, unexpected action (if another would be juxtaposed to it), statement of the occurrence of the action. Sentence 2: slower action, more vivid action, emphasis on the beginning of the action.

1. Vstrečaet menja i davaj rugat'. "He meets me and starts scolding."  
(Isačenko 1968:503)

2. Vstrečaet menja i kak načal rugat'. "He meets me and how he starts scolding."

3. Vstrečaet menja i nu rugat'. "He meets me and starts scolding."

Here a comparison was made between two types of modified infinitives functioning as the past tense and the past tense form itself. The informants felt no perceptible differences.

All three structures are in the colloquial style and signal an unexpected action. According to some informants, these sentences may refer not only to a single action in the past, but to a continuous state ("every time he meets me").

1. Ja k nemu po-xorošemu, "I was polite to him and he  
a on i nakriči na shouts at me."  
menja.  
(Isačenko 1960:501)
2. Ja k nemu po-xorošemu, "I was polite to him and he  
a on voz'mi da i up and shouts at me."  
nakriči na menja.

Some informants took sentence 1 to refer to either the past or the continuous present. Sentence 2 was only considered past. The voz'mi construction in sentence 2 was interpreted as being more common and as stressing the suddenness and unexpectedness of the action. Some felt that the imperative form in sentence 1 serves to sharply contrast the attitudes of the subjects.

Isačenko (1960) refers to the narrative past as dramatic imperative since he believes its closest paraphrase to be with the historical present of either aspect. However, there are some differences between the historical present and the imperative as narrative past which should be noted.

1. Ja prišël k nemu za- "I went to him to sign up for  
pisat'sja na kurs, a the course and he suddenly  
on vdrug priglašæt invites me to a party at  
menja k sebe na večer. his place."
2. Ja prišël k nemu za- "I went to him to sign up for  
pisat'sja na kurs, a the course and he up and  
on voz'mi da i priglasi invites me to a party at his  
menja k sebe na večer. place."  
(Isačenko 1960:500)

Whereas both sentences show a contrast between two actions, one of which is sudden and unexpected, sentence 2 with the

imperative form is representative of a more colloquial style. It is an intensive, more emotive expression.

1. Ja k nemu po-xorošemu, "I was polite to him and he  
a on kak nakričit na shouts at me."  
menja.
2. Ja k nemu po-xorošemu, "I was polite to him and he  
a on i nakriči na menja. up and shouts at me."  
(Isačenko 1960:500-1)

Sentence 1 with the perfective historical present was felt to simply contrast two equivalent actions. The imperative form in sentence 2 was considered more colloquial and as placing more stress on the unexpectedness of the action.

4.312 Peškovskij (1956:214) claims that this usage of the paradigmatic imperative as the narrative past is rare when signalling sudden actions. Some informants never use these constructions in their speech and consider them rural or not standard. Others find occasion to use the davaj plus infinitive and the voz'mi (da i) plus imperative form in informal conversation.

#### 4.4 THE CONDITIONAL

The paradigmatic imperative can be used in several types of conditional sentences: real, hypothetical, concessive, and those containing some xot' plus imperative form combinations which are related to the conditional in various ways.

##### 4.41 THE REAL CONDITIONAL

The term "real" conditional is used for those sentences

in which one action is viewed as having a high chance of occurrence if some other action occurs (past, present or future). This construction is normally implemented by the conjunction esli and the indicative.

|                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Esli telo B vozdejstvuet<br>na telo A s siloj $t_1$ , to<br>telo A v svoju očered'<br>vozdejstvuet...<br>(Academy Grammar vol.<br>2, pt. 2:322) | "If body B acts upon body A<br>with a strength of $t_1$ , then<br>body A in its turn acts<br>upon..." |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                            |                                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Esli sprosjať (sprašivali)<br>o čem-nibud', on otvetit<br>(otvečal).<br>(Švedova 1970:718) | "If they ask (asked) about<br>anything, he would answer<br>(answered)." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The use of the imperative form to express real conditions is not frequent. In all examples investigated, reference is to future time.

|                                                                                                  |                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| A poprosi u neě vzajmy,<br>ona staŋet plakat'.<br>(Čexov <u>Čajka</u> in<br>Vinogradov 1947:600) | "But if you ask her for a<br>loan, she'll start crying." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                                |                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Zamolči on--i noč' budet<br>ne tak krasiva i mila<br>duše.<br>(Gor'kij in Gvozdëv<br>1965:190) | "Were he to remain silent,<br>the night would not be so<br>beautiful and sweet to the<br>soul." |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

This usage was not only considered more colloquial than the neutral construction with esli, but was interpreted as a stronger and more definite assertion on the part of the addresser.

#### 4.42 THE HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONAL

More commonly, the imperative form is used to express hypothetical conditions. The term "hypothetical" conditional is used for those constructions which are normally implemented with the conjunction esli and the conditional

particle by plus the past tense. In reference to past time, the action is believed not to have occurred due to the interference of another action (this can be called the "contrary-to-fact" conditional). If reference is to the future, the action is viewed as having a low probability of occurrence unless another action will occur.

Esli by on prišël ko  
mne včera, my by obo  
vsëm dogovorilis'.  
(Švedova 1970:716)

"Had he come to me yesterday,  
we would have reached an  
agreement."

Esli by ja uvidel xot'  
edinstvennyj ogonëk gde-  
nibud' vdaleke, ja by,  
konečno, nemedlenno  
ostanovilsja.  
(Academy Grammar vol. 2,  
pt. 2:321)

"If I would catch (would have  
caught) sight of just a  
single light anywhere in the  
distance, I would, of course,  
stop (have stopped)."

Isačenko (1957:11) states that the paradigmatic imperative in this construction indicates the accidental nature of the action. According to Jakobson (1932:25), the action of the subject is seen as arbitrary. These definitions of the nuances conveyed by the imperative form are too narrow -- they describe only a portion of the examples used in the interviews. Gvozdëv (1965:192) says that the imperative form here represents a more lively, conversational style than the conditional with by plus the -l participle. This is the most general statement possible about the overtone which the imperative form lends to the utterance. Nevertheless, the imperative as the hypothetical conditional conveys still more subtle nuances, the particular nature of which is dependent on the context.

4.421 The paradigmatic 2 per sg imperative is the only form used in such constructions and it occurs with all three persons. The subject noun or pronoun, which may or may not be expressed, rarely precedes the imperative form. The only possible ambiguity between the imperative mood and the conditional mood implemented by the paradigmatic imperative would be with a 2 per sg subject pronoun. Thus, pridi ty could be imperative ("you come") or conditional ("had you come"). As imperative, pridi ty can be a complete sentence. As conditional, it is just part of the complex sentence. Thus, the context will serve to distinguish the two moods. Also, the intonation contour of the phrase pridi ty as conditional gives no indication that the utterance has been completed. The imperative form as conditional can be implemented with verbs which do not express the imperative mood and can have inanimate (3 per) subjects.

Slučis' èto na prošloj  
nedele, ja by ne stal  
bespokoit'sja.  
(Isačenko 1963:47)

"Had this happened last week,  
I wouldn't have begun to  
worry."

The imperative form in these constructions can refer to past and non-past time although more frequently reference is to the past.

Znaj ja kakoj-nibud'  
inostrannyj jazyk, rabo-  
tal by perevodčikom.

"If I knew/had known some  
foreign language, I would  
be/would have been a trans-  
lator."

Okažis' u menja sejčas  
den'gi, ja by objazatel'-  
no kupil mašinu.  
(Townsend 1970:257)

"If I would get some money  
now, I'd buy a car for sure."

The syntactic arrangement in these constructions is

usually of a given type. The imperative form appears in the first, dependent clause (Švedova 1967a:27) and stands as the initial word in the dependent clause which lacks a subordinate conjunction (Ferrell 1968:108). While these observations hold true for the majority of cases, there are exceptions which are generally taken as normal, though less frequent usage. Naturally, in a negative clause the negative particle will precede the verb.

|                                                                      |                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Ne bud' menja, on by<br>umer.<br>(Borras. and Christian<br>1968:240) | "Had it not been for me, he<br>would have died." |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|

In the next example, the imperative form is not in the initial position and the subject pronoun is not expressed.

|                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vam, mama, razreši, vy<br>by vsech našix gorodskix<br>prisposobili k vašemu<br>kolxozu.<br>(Panova in Šmelëv 1961:<br>55) | "If they'd let you, Mama,<br>you could have employed all<br>our town dwellers at your<br>kolxoz." |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The next example was considered less common than the infinitive as the conditional. It was accepted by most informants as a colloquial expression. Here the imperative form occurs in both clauses.

|                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Čto esli na takoj ženis'<br>da privedi domoj--i raz-<br>govaryvaj vsju žizn' na<br>pal'cax, kak slepoj.<br>(Gribačëv in Finkel' and<br>Baženov 1965:426) | "What if you were to marry<br>such a one and bring her<br>home--you'd have to use sign<br>language all your life like<br>a blind man." |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

In the following sentence, the dependent clause is in the second position.

|                                                                                                |                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Vse oni pali by mne v<br>nogi, zaxoti ja togo.<br>(Gor'kij in Finkel' and<br>Baženov 1965:426) | "They'd all fall at my feet<br>if I wanted them to." |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|

The word and clause order in the next three examples represent the most frequent arrangement for this construction. Most informants rejected the possibility of any word order change in these sentences, but a few said that the imperative form might appear elsewhere in the clause for emphasis.

|                                                                                                                           |                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Znaj ja remeslo, žil by<br>v gorode.<br>(Gor'kij <u>Moi universi-</u><br><u>tety</u> in Borras and<br>Christian 1968:240) | "If I knew a trade, I'd live<br>in the city." |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|

|                                                                          |                                                                                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Zagoris' saraj časom pozže,<br>ogon' by potušili.<br>(Unbegaun 1962:239) | "Had the barn begun burning an<br>hour later, they would have<br>put the fire out." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                                    |                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pridi on na čas ran'se,<br>vsě by udalos'.<br>(Křížková 1966a:176) | "Had he come an hour earlier,<br>everything would have been<br>all right." |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Either aspect of the imperative form may be used in these constructions. The imperfective focuses on the action as a process and the perfective on the action in its entirety, whether stress is on the result achieved or on the failure of the action to begin.

- |                                                                                                |                                                                                                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Duj veter s juga,<br>požar ne oxvatil by<br>vsju derevnju.<br>(Isačenko 1963:47)            | "Had the wind been blowing<br>from the south, the fire<br>wouldn't have enveloped the<br>whole village." |
| 2. Rasskaži on o svoix<br>zatrudnenijax, emu<br>byla by okazana pomošč'.<br>(Gvozděv 1965:192) | "Had he told about his troubles,<br>he would have gotten help."                                          |
| 3. Pobegi on, emu by ne<br>sdobrovat'.                                                         | "Had he started to run, it would<br>have turned out badly for him."                                      |
| 4. Begi on, emu by ne<br>sdobrovat'.<br>(Jakobson 1957:7)                                      | "Had he been running, it would<br>have turned out badly for him."                                        |

Some informants considered sentence 3 the only possible expression in comparison to sentence 4. Sentence 4 was not thought to be ungrammatical, but simply nonsensical in the absence of any context.

4.422 So far, the discussion on the hypothetical conditional function of the paradigmatic imperative has centered on the imperative form itself. Švedova (1970: 582) posits two basic types of imperative as conditional: those discussed above and those with the imperative form plus the conditional particle by.

|                                                    |                                                                               |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Piši učenik, učitel' ne<br>delal by emu zamečaniј. | "Had the pupil been writing,<br>the teacher wouldn't have<br>criticized him." |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                                                            |                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Piši by učenik, učitel'<br>ne delal by emu zame-<br>čaniј. | "Had the pupil been writing,<br>the teacher wouldn't have<br>criticized him." |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Švedova does not distinguish these two types in any way except to note that they are both expressive and conversational. The informants were divided among those who said they had never heard much less used this type with by and those who use both. For this latter group, the by type can indicate, in certain contexts, an even greater degree of regret for past events than the type without by.

- |                                                                                        |                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Pridi (by) ty včera,<br>tak my by pogovorili.<br>(Švedova 1967b:74)                 | "Had you come yesterday, we<br>would have talked."                     |
| 2. Ne skaži (by) on mne<br>etogo vovremja, čto<br>s nami by stalo?<br>(Panzer 1967:23) | "Had he not told me that in<br>time, what would have become<br>of us?" |

Sentence 1 with by was said to express more regret. The variants of sentence 2 were not distinguished. Informants

using the imperative form as the conditional rarely employ the by type.

4.423 All informants agreed that these constructions are a part of colloquial, emotive speech. Those who use the imperative form in this way were able to distinguish various nuances conveyed by the form as compared to the -l participle plus by: pride (Ne bud' menja "Had it not been for me"), disapproval and disappointment (Vam, mama, razreši "If they'd let you, mama"), and regret that an action had not taken place as noted above.

#### 4.43 THE CONCESSIVE CONDITIONAL

The concessive conditional can be expressed by the imperative form in two ways. One variant contains the concessive relative plus ni (Skol'ko ni dumaj "No matter how much I think") which is most neutrally expressed with the paradigmatic conditional (Skol'ko by ja ni dumal). The other variant could be rendered into English as "Whether you ... or not" and consists of two imperative forms (Plač' ne plač' "Whether you cry or not"). It can be paraphrased with another concessive conditional (Skol'ko by ty ni plakal).

4.431 The imperative as the concessive of the first type is used with all three persons whether expressed or not. It can be used with either aspect, but only with the 2 per sg paradigmatic imperative form. It may even be formed from verbs which do not express the imperative mood.

Skol'ko ni dumaj, vsë  
ravno ničego ne pri-  
dumaju.

"No matter how much I think, I  
still won't be able to devise  
anything."

Skol'ko ni daj, vsë  
malo.

"No matter how much you give,  
it's too little."

Čto ni slučis', slova  
durnogo vy ot menja ne  
uslišite.  
(Brym 1963:88)

"No matter what happens, you  
won't hear a bad word from me."

Since concessives can be expressed with the paradigmatic conditional and indicative, a comparison was made between the variants.

1. Kak ty tam ni kruti,  
ja tebe ne verju.

"No matter how you twist it  
around, I don't believe you."

2. Kak by ty tam ni  
krutil, ja tebe ne  
verju.  
(Isačenko 1968:317)

"No matter how you twist it  
around, I don't believe you."

Some informants do not use the imperative construction in sentence 1. Those who do consider it a stronger expression and, in this case, a dare to the addressee to keep trying. It is therefore almost a command. Sentence 2 was considered by all as the normal, standard variant and a weaker expression related to Esli xočeš', možeš' "If you want, you may".

1. O čëm ni sprosiš' ego,  
u nego vseгда est'  
otvet.

"No matter what you ask him,  
he always has an answer."

2. O čëm ni sprosi ego,  
u nego vseгда est'  
otvet.

"No matter what you ask him,  
he always has an answer."

3. O čëm by ego ni spro-  
sil, u nego vseгда  
est' otvet.  
(Belevickaja-Xalizeva  
n.d.:20)

"No matter what you ask him,  
he always has an answer."

Sentence 1 with the indicative was considered a colloquial expression and a definite reference to generic person. However, to some informants, it was closest to sentence 2 with the imperative, while to others it was closest to sentence 3 with the conditional. Some informants would use the variant in sentence 2; others would not. The imperative was said to indicate more immediacy and a more emphatic quality than the others. Sentence 3 is the normal standard variant.

4.432 The second type of concessive is used only with verbs which express the imperative mood. It refers to generic person and occurs with the imprefective. Only the 2 per sg paradigmatic imperative is used.

Plač' ne plač', bylogo  
ne vorotiš'.

"Whether you cry or not, you  
can't turn back the clock."

Dumaj ne dumaj, uma ne  
pribudet.  
(Švedova 1960:54-55)

"Whether you think or not, you  
won't get smarter."

Some informants do not use this construction at all; they prefer the indicative or conditional variants. Others not only use and prefer it, but consider it the most normal and best way of expressing this type of concession. It is a more forceful type of expression than the other two variants.

#### 4.44 XOT'

Some constructions containing the conjunction xot' and the paradigmatic imperative express two kinds of conditionals. Šmelëv (1961) has referred to these respectively as the concessive (p. 55) and a reference to the

potentiality of the action (p. 52).

4.441 The concessive type never occurs as an independent expression, but is used to modify or contrast another action. The verb takes a 1 or 2 per subject which is not, however, expressed. If reference is to the pl/polite 2 per subject, the paradigmatic 2 per pl/polite imperative form is used.

Net, gospoda, xot'  
zarež'te, skazal on...  
--ne ponimaju, počemu  
vy protiv ljubvi.  
(Čexov Tri goda in  
Vojnova 1967:170)

"No, gentlemen, for the life  
of me (though you may kill  
me), he said...I don't  
understand what you have  
against love."

With other persons, the paradigmatic 2 per sg imperative is employed (usage with the 3 per is rare).

Išraj pesni, xot'  
lob tresni.  
(Šapiro 1953:105)

"Sing the songs though you  
break your head."

Xot' umri, ja èto  
sdelaju.

"I'll do it at all costs  
(though I may die)."

Many of these expressions can be considered idioms by virtue of their frequency of occurrence. They may be paraphrased with the paradigmatic conditional (Daže esli by vy menja zarezali "Even if you were to kill me") in which case they would lose all their liveliness. Constructions containing verbs not usually associated with idioms can be paraphrased in this way.

1. My govorim o raznom i xot' vek prosper', ni o čëm ne stolkuemsja. (Pasternak Doktor Živa-go in Forsyth 1970: 220) "We're talking about different things and, even though we'd argue a century, we won't come to an agreement."

2. ...daže esli by vek      "...even if we were to argue  
     prosporili.../...      a century.../...if we argue  
     esli vek prosperim...    a century..."

Some informants do not use the construction in sentence 1 with the imperative. Those who do consider it preferable for emphasis and for focusing on the character of the subjects. The paraphrases in 2 are the normal standard versions in the formal or written language; they focus more on the topic than on personalities.

The basic function of this construction is to indicate concession. Other xot' plus imperative constructions basically express the potential occurrence of an action.

4.442 This second type is used with the paradigmatic 2 per sg imperative with reference to generic person. It is distinguished from the paradigmatic imperative in its primary function by the presence of xot' which indicates not only potentiality (as opposed to a command), but which can also indicate the means of solving a difficult situation or simply the expression of despair. In addition, this construction can be paraphrased by a modal (nado bylo by "you'd have to"; možno bylo by "it would be possible to").

Although it makes reference to circumstances in the larger context, this construction can be used as an independent sentence. This is often the case with those xot' constructions which can be considered idioms due to the frequency of fixed usage: xot' plač' "you could just cry"; xot' v petlju lez' "you might as well put your neck in a noose" (Vojnova 1967:34-35).

Either aspect can occur with this construction.

Vsja v vesnuškax...i  
rot do ušej, xot' ljagu-  
ške prišej.  
(Sologub Melkij bes:55)

"She has freckles and a mouth  
so wide you could sew it on  
a frog."

Ja samaja staršaja, a te  
vse--mal mala men'se.  
Veselo! Kogda zapiščat,  
mamka, daj! Xot' iz domu  
begi.  
(Kuznecov in Kothaj  
1967:94)

"I'm the oldest and all the  
others are each smaller than  
the next. Fun! When they  
start to squeak, Mama, give!,  
you just have to run out of  
the house."

This is the one secondary function of the paradigmatic  
imperative that all informants would use in conversation.  
Most would employ it to indicate their desperation and  
even would prefer its use in such a case.

Govorili, što esli by ne  
devuški i ne molodye  
evrei, to xot' zakryvaj  
biblioteku.  
(Čexov Ionyč in  
Forsyth 1970:221)

"They say that if it weren't  
for the girls and the young  
Jews, you might as well  
close the library."

4.443 The concessive with xot' and the imperative  
generally occurs with the perfective and the "potential"  
can be used with either aspect. Given the choice between  
the perfective xot' umri and the imperfective xot' umiraj,  
all informants used the perfective for the concessive.

Ja èto sdelažu, xot'  
umri.

"I'll do this at all costs  
(though I may die)."

Following the phrase Ja tak bol'na "I'm so sick", some  
informants chose the imperfective to express the potential.

Ja tak bol'na, što xot'  
umiraj.

"I'm so sick I could just  
die."

To others, neither aspect would be acceptable in this  
context. One informant in this latter group would use the  
imperfective as a concessive.

Xot' umiraj, vsë ravno  
ja ne daju tebe vody.

"Though you would be dying,  
I'm not giving you any water."

In some utterances, the potential and the concessive occur with both aspects. Only the context in which these structures are used distinguishes between the two possible meanings: xot' umiraj "you just feel like dying" or "though you be dying"; xot' ubej "though you may kill me" or "you might as well kill".

#### 4.5 THE OPTATIVE

In the literature on the Russian modal system the optative is treated either as an independent mood or as a variant of another mood. There are a number of reasons for this dichotomy. Although in contemporary Russian the optative is implemented by forms of the indicative, conditional and imperative, historical evidence shows that imperative and optative forms and functions eventually merged in certain cases. Contemporary Russian contains remnants of these interrelationships. The optative mood does not have a unique form and it is frequently expressed by means of the imperative form. Semantically, the optative and the imperative are similar: they both signal the speaker's desire that an action be fulfilled.

There are, however, differences between these two moods. In formal terms, the contemporary link between optative and imperative is not consistently arguable since certain optative expressions have variants which do not

employ the imperative form: Čěrt poberi, Čtob čěrt pobral "The devil take it". The imperative mood focuses primarily on the addressee, the interlocutor. Concerning the optative mood, the "addressee" can be not only the interlocutor, but the speaker, the 3 per, the elements, God and so forth. Most of our imperative examples in chapters 2 and 3 illustrate actions which can actually be fulfilled by the addressee. With the optative, one generally cannot discuss fulfillment of the action in literal terms. For instance, the action in question can be figurative (Provalis' ty skvoz' zemlju "May you disappear through the earth = Go to hell"); the speaker cannot directly induce the "addressee" to do something (Razrazi grom "May the thunder strike"). The optative is the language of curses and incantations rather than commands.

4.51 In the imperative, the terms denoting addressee can often be set off by a vocative juncture: Ty, rabotaj "You, work"; Druz'ja, pošli/pojdëm "Friends, let's go". This juncture is not normally made in the optative. Peškovskij (1956:195) shows one of the possible similarities between these two moods for this feature: Čěrt ego voz'mi < Čěrt, voz'mi ego "The devil take him < Devil, take him". Certainly this historical link can be observed for the few words still retaining a vocative form: Bog (nom)/Bože (voc) soxrani "God preserve". But it would be difficult to expand this analogy to all optative expressions: Bud' ja prokljat < \*Ja, bud' prokljat "May I be damned < \*I,

be damned"; Rassvetaj tol'ko (Karcevski 1927:38) "May it only dawn" (no subject).

Vinogradov (1950:61) has rightly stated that many optative expressions can simply be considered exclamations or parenthetical expressions. Yet these "exclamatory" optatives are indistinguishable from "true" optatives in terms of construction. It is not satisfactory to deal with some and to relegate others to the graveyard of idioms.

4.52 Since the optative can be implemented by verbs which do not express the imperative mood (Okažis' by rjadom drug "If only a friend would appear" Švedova 1967a: 30), we have further reason for distinguishing optative and imperative semantics.

The optative with the imperative form is almost exclusively used with the perfective. Generally the subject will be expressed; of course, with impersonal verbs it is absent.

Spit,--spi, rebėnok,  
oden' tvoju dušen'ku  
vesėlyj son, prisnis'  
tebe...  
(Gor'kij in Šmelėv  
1961:50)

"He's sleeping, sleep, child,  
may a happy dream dress your  
little heart, may you dream..."

Certain verbs can function as personals and impersonals with the optative.

Razrazi menja grom.

"May the thunder strike me."

Razrazi menja gromom.  
(Vojnova 1967:382)

"May I be struck by thunder."

Ubej menja grom.

"May the thunder kill me."

Ubej menja gromom.  
(Šmelėv 1961:51)

"May I be killed by thunder."

Some informants rejected the personal and accepted the impersonal constructions. Others made the opposite choice.

Generally the imperative form is the first element in the utterance. Certain commonly-used optatives occur with the imperative in either the initial or non-initial position.

- |                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Bog soxrani.      | "God preserve."     |
| 2. Soxrani bog.      | " "                 |
| 3. Bud' on prokljat. | "May he be damned." |
| 4. On bud' prokljat. | " " " "             |

The first two examples are both acceptable. Sentence 3 is the normal, acceptable word order for this expression. Sentence 4 was rejected by most informants. A few felt, however, that this word order might be used for contrast or in a pompous style.

The 2 per sg paradigmatic imperative is almost exclusively used in these constructions with any person and number. The paradigmatic 2 per pl/polite can be used with the subject vy in certain expressions.

- |                                                         |                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Bud' vy prokljaty.                                   | "May you be damned."  |
| 2. Bud'te vy prokljaty.                                 | " " " "               |
| 3. Provalis' vy skvoz' zemlju.                          | "May you go to hell." |
| 4. Provalites' vy skvoz' zemlju.<br>(Šaxmatov 1941:484) | " " " " "             |

To some informants, sentences 2 and 4 were the only correct ones for address to a group or a single person (vy). Others

made a distinction: sentences 2 and 4 represent a vaguer desire or a figurative command, while sentences 1 and 3 signal greater urgency and an invocation of some higher powers. This type of contrast is probably limited to certain kinds of curses. We can call sentences 2 and 4 the figurative imperative: the addressee cannot literally fulfil the action. The true optative in sentences 1 and 3 in a sense formally recognizes that the action is unrealizable; it shows a stronger, even more desperate desire on the part of the addresser.

With certain expressions, the imperative form was not preferred.

--Ja russkij.  
 --Vrěš'...lopni glaza,  
 vrěš': fric!  
 (Polevoj Povest' o  
nastojščem čeloveke  
 in Vojnova 1967:233)

"I'm a Russian.  
 You're lying. May my/your  
 eyes pop out, you're lying:  
 Kraut!"

This particular example was felt to be typical of rural speech which may account for the informants' indecision as to whose eyes are referred to. The optative with čtob or pust' was preferred here.

1. Pust' tol'ko rassvetět. "Let it just dawn."
2. Rassvetaj tol'ko. "May it only dawn."  
 (Karcevski 1927:38)

All informants accepted sentence 1 in terms of construction although (in both examples) this particular verb was considered to be strange for an optative. Some rejected sentence 2; to others, it exemplified a colloquial expression of strong desire.

- |                                                 |                              |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Razrazi menja grom.                          | "May the thunder strike me." |
| 2. Pust' (puskaj) raz-<br>razit menja grom.     | " " " " "                    |
| 3. Da razrazi menja grom.<br>(Vojnova 1967:382) | " " " " "                    |

This time, sentence 1 with the 2 per paradigmatic imperative was preferred as the best, most common and most direct expression. Sentence 2 was felt to be a less intense statement used, for instance, to swear to the truth of one's words. Sentence 3 was generally considered archaic and biblical.

A comparison was also made between čtob and the 2 per imperative as optative.

- |                            |                           |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Čtob čert tebja pobral. | "May the devil take you." |
| 2. Čert tebja poberi.      | "The devil take you."     |

Sentence 1 was felt to be a clear statement of wish. Sentence 2 signals a desire for immediate action and thus is stronger than the conditional variant.

4.53 Švedova (1970:579) lists a variant on the imperative as optative which comprises the 2 per imperative form plus the conditional particle by.

- |                                            |                                               |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Bud' by tišina.                            | "If only there were silence."                 |
| Provalis' by vse `eti<br>bezkonečnye dela. | "May all these endless matters<br>disappear." |

While these were recognized as the optative, they were considered the least frequent of all variants. This type, with the 2 per imperative form, is exactly like the imperative variant of the conditional which Švedova (1967a: 30) posits (Okažis' by rjodom drug "If only a friend would

appear"). The imperative as conditional with by was considered by some informants as infrequent as this type of optative.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

#### 5.1 SUMMARY OF THE IMPERATIVE

This study has been devoted to imperative structures in the widest sense: those which express imperative semantics (Piši!, Pisat! "Write!") and those which merely employ the morphological imperative (Skol'ko ni piši... "No matter how much you write..."). By dividing this material into three groups -- paradigmatic imperative in its primary function (Piši!), syntagmatic imperative (Pisat'), secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative (Skol'ko ni piši) -- an understanding of the interrelationships between form and function is facilitated and all imperative structures are exposed to more complete examination. Thus, we have not only specified the grammar of the constructions in these three groups, but we have attempted to establish the degrees of their acceptability among educated speakers and the details of semantic nuance.

In constructions representing the paradigmatic imperative in its primary function, there is a high degree of permissible variation among such features as word order,

aspect choice, intonation contours. The invariants are reference to future time and focus on the addressee. Conversely, the secondary functions of the paradigmatic imperative show great flexibility in time and person reference, but a relative rigidity in such areas as syntactic arrangement and aspect usage. It would be interesting to consider this phenomenon within the entire Russian modal system: similar observations might then be drawn between certain syntagmatic imperative structures and the primary functions of the conditional and the indicative.

The frequent contradictory interpretations in the literature on the Russian imperative, which have arisen due to lack of breadth and depth of analysis, were taken as challenges to apply more fruitful methods of investigation. For instance, the question concerning the position of the personal pronoun (Ty rabotaj, Rabotaj ty "You work") should not be dealt with solely on the basis of intuition. When a sentence is used to illustrate the significance of word order, frequently the reader is given no indication how various alternations in the example might affect the validity of the author's conclusion. Instead, throughout the interviews, all relevant alternations were considered. Only in this way was it possible to remove the potential influence of a particular context or individual lexical items on the informants' interpretations. The use of minimal pairs proved to be especially rewarding.

There has been a certain amount of indecision in the

literature on the Russian imperative concerning what types of illustrative material to use. Thus, in some works infrequent (or non-contemporary) constructions may be indiscriminately placed together with commonly-occurring ones. In other cases, constructions are omitted because they are felt to be too close to substandard speech, too infrequent or "idiomatic". By allowing the widest latitude in choice of structures and by determining the range of usage for each structure, the present work attempted to minimize this kind of bias and, at the same time, to present conclusions about the imperative in Russian which are replicable and testable.

## 5.1 OUTLOOK

The approach used in this dissertation could serve as a basis for further research on the imperative and other Russian moods. In order to more accurately specify the frequency of the spoken language-bound imperative constructions, it would be necessary to work with informants of varying social and educational backgrounds. It would also be helpful to utilize more natural contexts; i.e., not from belles-lettres, but from recordings of actual conversations. In this way the data can be expanded both in breadth (greater number of unique structures) and in depth (greater number of structures of a given type).

In a wider sense, a full understanding of the con-

ditional and the indicative cannot be accomplished through an examination of their secondary function of expressing the imperative mood. Their primary and other secondary functions need to be integrated and investigated with a unified approach. Especially the optative cannot be productively debated and analyzed if only its implementation with the imperative form is considered. In summary, the conflicting approaches and interpretations in the literature concerning the Russian modal system show that further research, entailing much more attention to detail, is urgently needed.

While the linguist as native informant can contribute greatly to the knowledge of Russian modal structures, there is always the danger that he unconsciously incorporates his idiolectal preferences in his analysis. Each work on mood should clearly state how the hierarchies in stylistic levels were determined and how the degrees of acceptability of modal structures were arrived at. In this way, a comparison of different approaches to mood can be facilitated.

Finally, it would be useful to begin unified contrastive analyses between Russian and other Slavic and Indo-European languages in terms of primary and secondary modal functions. These functions seem to be quite common at least among some Indo-European languages. Such analyses would eventually benefit the language learner (and the linguist) in his quest for accurate and detailed information about mood.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anikina, A. B. 1963. Sbornik upražnenij po morfológii dlja inostrancev, izučajuščix russkij jazyk, no. 1: Glagol, pričastie, deepričastie. Moscow.
- Apresjan, Ju. D. 1967. Èksperimental'noe issledovanie semantiki russkogo glagola. Moscow.
- Austin, J. L. 1963. "Performative-Constative." Philosophy and Ordinary Language, ed. Charles E. Caton, pp. 22-54. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- . 1965. How to Do Things with Words. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Avanesov, R. I. and V. N. Sidorov. 1945. Očerk grammatiki russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, pt. 1: Fonetika i morfológija. Moscow.
- Belevickaja-Xalizева, V. S. et al. n.d. Sbornik upražnenij po sintaksisu russkogo jazyka s kommentarijami. Moscow.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. "The Imperative in English." To Honor Roman Jakobson, pp. 335-62. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bondarko, A. V. 1971. Grammatičeskaja kategorija i kontekst. Leningrad.
- and L. L. Bulanin. 1967. Russkij glagol. Leningrad.
- Borras, F. M. and R. F. Christian. 1968. Russian Syntax. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Boyanus, S. C. 1955. Russian Pronunciation and Russian Phonetic Reader. London: Lund Humphries and Co.
- Brym, Jiří. 1963. "K otázce užití imperativu v ruštině ve srovnání s češtinou." Československá rusistika (Prague), 8:85-89.
- Bryzgunova, E. A. 1967. "Intonacija i smysl predložénija." Russkij jazyk za rubežom, 1:35-41.

- Bühler, Karl. 1965. Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: G. Fischer.
- Bulgakov, Mixail. 1969. Master i Margarita. Frankfurt: Possev-Verlag.
- Černyšev, V. I. 1949. "Opisatel'nye formy naklonenij i vremën v russkom jazyke." Trudy. Institut russkogo jazyka ANSSSR, 1:210-38.
- Diver, William. 1964. "The Modal System of the English Verb." Word, 20 (3):322-52.
- Đurovič, L'ubomír. 1956. Modálnosť: lexikálno-syntaktický vyjadrovanie modálnych a hodnotiacich vzt'ahov v slovenčine a ruštine. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie Vied.
- Ferrell, James. 1953a. "On the Aspect of byt' and on the Position of the Periphrastic Imperfective Future in Contemporary Literary Russian." Word, 9 (4): 362-76.
- . 1953b. "The Tenses of the Russian Verb." The Slavonic and East European Review, 32 (78): 108-16.
- . 1968. "On Some Conditional Clause Indicators in Slavic and Germanic Languages." Word, 24 (1-2-3 ): 99-111.
- Finkel', A. M. and N. M. Baženov. 1965. Kurs sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. 2nd ed. Kiev.
- Forsyth, J. 1970. A Grammar of Aspect. Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb. Cambridge: University Press.
- Galkina-Fedoruk, E. M. 1958. Bezličnye predloženiya v sovremennom russkom jazyke. Moscow.
- . 1964. Sovremennyy russkij jazyk, pt. 2: Morfologija i sintaksis. Moscow.
- Garde, Paul. 1962. L'Emploi du Conditionnel et de la Particule by en Russe. Aix-en-Provence: Faculté des Lettres.
- Germanovič, A. I. 1966. Meždometija russkogo jazyka: posobie dlja učitelja. Kiev.

- Grammatika russkogo jazyka. 1960. vol. 1: Fonetika i morfologija, vol. 2, pts. 1 and 2: Sintaksis. eds. V. V. Vinogradov and E. S. Istrina. 2nd ed. Moscow: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- Gvozdev, A. N. 1965. Očerki po stilistike russkogo jazyka. 3rd ed. Moscow.
- . 1968. Sovremennyy russkij literaturnyy jazyk, pt. 2: Sintaksis. 3rd ed. Moscow.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1970. "Functional Diversity in Language as Seen from a Consideration of Modality and Mood in English." Foundations of Language, 6 (3):322-61.
- Isačenko, A. V. 1957. "K voprosu ob imperative v russkom jazyke." Russkij jazyk v škole, 6:7-14.
- . 1960. Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim, vol. 2: Morfologija. Bratislava: Izdavatel'stvo Slovackoj Akademii Nauk.
- . 1963. "Binarnost', privativnye oppozicii i grammatičeskie značeniya." Voprosy jazykoznanija, 2:39-56.
- . 1968. Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart, pt. 1: Formenlehre. Munich: Max Hueber Verlag.
- . 1970. "Hortativsätze mit a, i, ti, to im Ostslavischen." Scandoslavica, 16:189-203.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1932. "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums." 1966 reprint Readings in Linguistics II, ed. Eric Hamp et al., pp. 22-30. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- . 1957. Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb. Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard Univ.
- . 1961. "Linguistics and Communication Theory." Structure of Language and Its Mathematical Aspects, ed. Roman Jakobson, pp. 245-52. Proceedings of a Symposium in Applied Linguistics, 12. Providence: American Mathematical Society.
- . 1966. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics." Style in Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 350-77. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Jespersen, Otto. 1965. The Philosophy of Grammar. New York: Norton.
- . 1966. Essentials of English Grammar. Alabama Linguistic and Philological Series 1. University: Univ. of Alabama Press.
- Jurgens Buning, J. E. and Cornelis H. van Schooneveld. 1960. The Sentence Intonation of Contemporary Standard Russian as a Linguistic Structure. The Hague: Mouton.
- Karbovskaja, Varvara. 1963. "Dnevnik novosëla." 1963 reprint ALM Russian Level Four, pp. 193-201. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Karcevski, Serge. 1927. Système du Verbe russe. Prague: Librairie "Plamja".
- . 1939. "Remarques sur la Psychologie des Aspects en Russe." Mélanges de Linguistique offerts à Charles Bally, pp. 231-48. Geneva: Georg et Cie.
- Katz, Jerrold and Paul Postal. 1965. An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Koschmieder, Erwin. 1962. "Primäre und sekundäre Funktionen." Die Welt der Slaven, 7 (4):409-22.
- Kothaj, Imrich. 1965. "Funkcie osobných zámen pri tvaroch ruského imperatívu." Československá rusistika (Prague), 10:205-10.
- . 1967. "O všeobecnom význame imperatívu v ruštine a slovenčine." Jazykovedný časopis (Bratislava), 18:94-5.
- Křížková, Helena. 1966a. "Pervyčnye i vtoričnye funkcie i tak nazývaja transpozicija form." Travaux Linguistiques de Prague, 2:171-83.
- . 1966b. "Privativnye oppozicii i nekotorye problemy analiza mnogočlennyx kategorij." Travaux Linguistiques de Prague, 1:203-13.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1955. "Zamетки o značenie slova." Voprosy jazykoznanija, 3:73-81.
- . 1964. The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

- Lakoff, George. 1966. "Stative Adjectives and Verbs in English." Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation Report no. NSF-17:I-1-I-16. Cambridge: The Computation Laboratory of Harvard Univ.
- . 1970. "Linguistics and Natural Logic." Semantics of Natural Logic 2, eds. D. Davidson and G. Harman, pp. 151-271. Synthese. An International Journal for Epistemology, Methodology and Philosophy of Science. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1968. Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lehiste, Ilse. 1970. Suprasegmentals. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Leška, Oldřich. 1968. "Formální a funkčně obsahová struktura ruského imperativu (injunktivu)." Kapitoly ze srovnávací mluvnice ruské a české, vol. 3: 0 ruském slovese, pp. 7-50. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd.
- McCawley, James D. 1968. "The Role of Semantics in a Grammar." Universals in Linguistic Theory, eds. Emmon Bach and Robert Harms, pp. 125-69. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Miller, Herbert. 1967. The Fundamentals of Russian Intonation. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana Univ. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Miller, J. E. 1970. "Stative Verbs in Russian." Foundations of Language, 6 (4):488-504.
- Mrázek, Roman. 1967. "Poznámky k systému českých slovesných modů." Jazykovedný časopis (Bratislava), 18:81-83.
- Nemešajlova, A. V. 1963. "Ispol'zovanie kategorii vida glagola v kačestve sredstva vyražennii xaraktera pobuždenija i ego èmocional'nyx ottenkov." Voprosy sintaksisa i stilistiki russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, ed. V. A. Malaxovskij, pp. 258-81. Kujbyšev.
- Paffen, Karl August. 1958. Die Hauptregeln der russischen Grammatik, pt. 2: Satzlehre. 2nd rev. ed. Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer.
- Panzer, Baldur. 1967. Der slavische Konditional: Form, Gebrauch, Funktion. Munich: W. Fink Verlag.

Peškovskij, A. M. 1956. Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščanii. 7th ed. Moscow.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1959. Izbrannye trudy. Moscow.

Pul'kina, I. M. and E. B. Zaxava-Nekrasova. 1968. Učebnik russkogo jazyka dlja studentov-inostrancev. 4th ed. Moscow.

Rassudova, O. P. 1968. Upotreblenie vidov glagola v russkom jazyke. Moscow.

Reformatskij, A. A. 1963. "Glagol'nye formy tipa xlop." Izvestija. Otdelenie literatury i jazyka ANSSSR, 22 (2): 127-9.

Rozental', D. Ė. 1965. Praktičeskaja stilistika russkogo jazyka. Moscow.

Šapiro, A. B. 1953. Očerki po sintaksisu russkix narodnyx govorov. Moscow.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1966 Course in General Linguistics. eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, transl. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Šaxmatov, A. A. 1941. Sintaksis russkogo jazyka. 2nd ed. Moscow.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1952. Iz trudov A. A. Šaxmatova po sovremennomu russkomu jazyku (učenie o častjax reči). Moscow.

Sinjavskij, Andrej. 1967. "V cirke." Fantastičeskij mir Abrama Terca, pp. 27-41. Inter-Language Literary Associates.

Šmelëv, D. N. 1959. "O značenii vida v povelitel'nom naklonenii." Russkij jazyk v škole, 4:13-17.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1961. "Vneimperativnoe upotreblenie formy povelitel'nogo naklonenija v sovremennom russkom jazyke." Russkij jazyk v škole, 5:50-55.

Sologub, A. I. 1957. "Formy povelitel'nogo naklonenija v russkix govorax." Trudy. Institut jazykoznanija ANSSSR, 7:367-465.

Sologub, Fëdor. 1966. Melkij bes. Chicago: Bradda Books.

Spagis, A. A. 1961. Obrazovanie i upotreblenie vidov glagola v russkom jazyke. Posobie dlja učitelej nerusskix škol. Moscow.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "Značenie glagolov nesoveršennogo i soveršennogo vida v povelitel'nom naklonenii." Materialy 3-ego meždunarodnogo metodologičeskogo seminara prepodavatelej russkogo jazyka stran socializma. June 1960, pp. 81-91. Moscow.
- Suxotin, V. P. 1960. Sintaksičeskaja sinonimika v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke: glagol'nye slovosočetanija. Moscow.
- Švedova, N. Ju. 1960. Očerki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj reči. Moscow.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967a. "Paradigmatika prostogo predloženiya v sovremennom russkom jazyke (opyt tipologii)." Russkij jazyk, grammatičeskie issledovaniya, ed. N. Ju. Švedova, pp. 3-77. Moscow: Institut russkogo jazyka ANSSSR.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967b. "Vystuplenie po dokladu G. Goraka." Jazykovedný časopis (Bratislava), 18:73-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). 1970. Grammatika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moscow: Institut russkogo jazyka ANSSSR.
- Townsend, Charles E. 1970. Continuing with Russian. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Trubetzkoy, N. 1934. "Das morphonologische System der russischen Sprache." 1968 reprint Description Phonologique du Russe Moderne, pt. 2. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 5<sub>2</sub>.
- Unbegaun, Boris O. 1962. Russian Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Vinogradov, V. V. 1947. Russkij jazyk (grammatičeskoe učenie o slove). Moscow.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1950. "O kategorii modal'nosti i modal'nyx slova v russkom jazyke." Trudy. Institut russkogo jazyka ANSSSR, 2:38-79.
- Vojnova, L. A. et al. 1967. Frazeologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka. Moscow.