

'TO BE' IN RUSSIAN

Galina Tuniks

University of Colorado and the University of California, Davis

ABSTRACT

The Russian verb byt' 'to be' has different functions in different constructions. It is argued that it therefore represents several different verbs. A number of tests applied to sentences containing byt' show that there are four such verbs: a tense marker, which is a surface structure insert, and three deep, or deeper, surface inserts: the copula, the form that links the subject with an adverb, and the true verb.

-TU2-

1. The scope of the problem. The aim of this paper is to study some aspects of the deep structure of the verb byt'. Judging by the variance in the behavior of this "colourless," short surface realization of to be in Russian, there exist several different verbs: a tense marker, a copula and a full-fledged lexical verb. These differences can first of all be brought out by their synonyms, such as:

sushchestvovat' - to exist (as in 1. "Truth exists.")

imet'sa - to be available (as in 2. "Many books are available in the library.")

nakhodit'sa - to be found (as in 3. "The painting is to be found in the museum.")

imet' mesto - to take place (as in 4. "The meeting took place on Friday.")

proiskhodit' - to go on (as in 5. "What is going on there?")

sluchat'sa - to occur, to happen (as in 6. "What happened there?")

poiti - to go (as in 7. "You will go to them.")

priiti - to come (as in 8. "Will you come for dinner?")

imet' - to have (as in 9. "Ivan has a car.")

iavliat'sa - to appear, to constitute (as in 10. "Hydrogen constitutes a part of water.")

All these parallels of byt' are listed here just to illustrate the complexity of its use and difference of meaning that it can have.

The verb byt' could be substituted for any of its equivalents in the sentences above, but in formal or scientific texts these equivalents are preferred over byt'.

The only use of byt' that does not have an equivalent is that of a tense marker in the analytic future of verbs and passive participles as in

(11) Ia budu rabotat' (I will work).¹

In order to show the different meanings illustrated in (1) - (10), the following constructions with byt' are presented below:

1. As a tense marker used with verbs and participles: NP byt' V Part
- (12) Ivan budet rabotat' (Ivan will work)
 - (13) Ivan byl priglashon (Ivan was invited)
 - (14) Ivan priglashon (Ivan is invited)
 - (15) Ivan budet priglashon (Ivan will be invited)
2. As a copula between two noun phrases: NP₁ byt' NP₂
- (16) Ivan byl studentom (Ivan was a student)
 - (17) Ivan student (Ivan is a student)
 - (18) Ivan budet studentom (Ivan will be a student)
3. As a copula between a noun phrase and an adjective: NP byt' Adj
- (19) Ivan byl dobrym (Ivan was kind)
 - (20) Ivan dobryi (Ivan is kind)
 - (21) Ivan budet dobrym (Ivan will be kind)
4. As a link between a noun phrase and an adverb: NP byt' time
manner
loc
loc byt' NP
- (22) Ivan byl rano (Ivan was early)
 - (23) *Ivan rano (Ivan is early)
 - (24) Ivan budet rano (Ivan will be early)
 - (25) *Ivan byl khorosho (Ivan was well)
 - (26) *Ivan khorosho (Ivan is well)
 - (27) *Ivan budet khorosho (Ivan will be well)
 - (28) Ivan byl doma (Ivan was home)
 - (29) Ivan doma (Ivan is home)
 - (30) Ivan budet doma (Ivan will be home)
 - (31) Kniga byla u Ivana (The book was at Ivan's)
 - (32) Kniga u Ivana (The book is at Ivan's)
 - (33) Kniga budet u Ivana (The book will be at Ivan's)
 - (34) U Ivana byla kniga (Ivan had a book)

-204-

(35) U Ivana kniga (Ivan has a book)

(36) U Ivana budet kniga (Ivan will have a book)

5. As a full-fledged intransitive verb: NP byt'

(37) Bog byl (God was)

(38) Bog est' (God is)

(39) Bog budet (God will be)

A working assumption will be made here that these constructions take care of all uses and occurrences of byt'. In the paragraphs below, it will be attempted to distinguish the transformationally inserted byt' from the deep-structure one.

2. Byt' as a tense marker. Darden's (1969) main argument against considering the verb to be, in English and in several other languages, a deep-structure verb is that "if it has no semantic meaning, it cannot exist on the level of deep structure." On the basis of this assumption it can be claimed that in the analytic future the form byt' is introduced by the combination of tense and aspect features, and that it has no semantic meaning, because the differences between the present, which is always imperfective,

(40) On chitaet (He is reading),

and the future imperfective,

(41) On budet chitat' (He will be reading),

lies merely in the tense; no other changes in the meaning could be found.

Another indication of an absolute lack of semantic value in this occurrence of byt' is the fact that it has no lexical equivalents.

The tense marker byt' also has no indication as to being plus or minus stative; or, one should say that it can be both in the same construction.

If we consider the verb phrase in

(42) On budet spat' (He will be sleeping),

to be stative, and the verb phrase in

(43) On budet puteshestvovat' (He will be travelling), nonstative, then, stativeness is determined by the infinitive of the regular verb.

The test of gapping shows the dependence of byt' on the verb, as in

(44) On budet chitat' knigu, a ia gazetu (He will be reading a book, and I a newspaper).

The tense marker must be omitted together with the main verb. Since the tense marker cannot be omitted without the verb, no gapping can take place.

The participial constructions differ from the analytic future in the sense that byt' may not be omitted in the past and future as a result of gapping:

(45) On byl ranen, a soldat byl ubit (He was wounded, but the soldier was killed).

(45a) *On byl ranen, a soldat ubit (He was wounded, but the soldier is killed).

The omission of byl in the second conjoined sentence in (45a) is the present tense marker, and would not give the idea that the verb byt' or any other verb is implied. This is the reason why (45a) cannot be interpreted as a case of gapping, but rather as a case where two sentences with different tenses have been conjoined.

It is impossible to test the tense marker by questioning it; the language simply does not have a question for it.

The test of conjoining of sentences containing byt' as a tense marker with sentences, where the function of byt' is different, depends on the semantic value of the verb in the infinitive:

(46) *On budet chitat' i budet chitat' (He will be a student and will read);

(47) On budet chitat' i budet umnym (He will read and will be smart);

(48) On budet rabotat' i budet pisat' (He will work and read).

Sentence (46) is ungrammatical from the semantic point of view, because "budet

-106-

studentom" (will be a student) is understood to be the result of "On budet chitat'" (He will read). (46a) however, for reasons of the meaning of chitat' (to read) is quite possible. (47) also does not render the meaning of simultaneity, but rather a resultative meaning. Conjoining two sentences where byt' functions as a mere tense marker results in sentence (48), where the second manifestation of byt' is redundant. In sentences (46) and (47) byt' is indispensable in the second conjoined sentence. This test of conjoining points in the direction that the tense marker byt' conjoins well only with another tense marker, i.e., where we have NP byt' V + NP byt' V.

3. Byt' as a copula. It is possible to assume that whenever byt' links a noun phrase with another noun phrase or with an adjective, it is a copula possessing semantic meaning. Its function is to connect two nominals in a definite way, namely with a meaning of "equality," "being the same," or "being two things at the same time":

- (49) Ivan byl studentom (Ivan was a student);
- (50) Ivan student (Ivan is a student);
- (51) Ivan budet studentom (Ivan will be a student).

Křižkova (1970), in analyzing different verb phrases, says that a nominal predicate, as opposed to predicates with an object or an adverbial phrase, expresses a characteristic by means of the verb in such a way that the subject is either included into the class of some objects or is identified with an object, or certain qualities are ascribed to it.

The copula byt' is subject to changes in different tenses as was the case with the tense marker; in the past and future there is a surface realization of the copula. Křižkova (1970:23) mentions that in some constructions the congruent nominal in the predicate must be subjected to the instrumental transformation. In the present tense the surface realization is normally a zero,

but in cases of emphasis or definitions in scientific texts, byt' appears in the surface structure even in the present tense:

(52) Liubov' est' vysshee chuvstvo cheloveka (Love is the finest emotion in man);

(53) On est' luchshiĭ (He is the best).

The third person singular form est' is practically the only form of the paradigm; however, the archaic form sut' can be found in rare cases. The stylistic equivalent of the copula to be is iavliatsa, as illustrated in sentence (10).

Byt' as copula is always stative.

The copula gaps just like a full-fledged verb:

(54) On p'et vodku, a ia vino (He drinks vodka, and I - wine);

(55) Ivan budet studentom, a ia professorom (Ivan will be a student, and I - a professor);

(56) Ivan budet khoroshim, a Sasha plokhim (Ivan will be good, and Sasha bad).

It is impossible to conjoin a sentence with a copula with another sentence where to be is a tense marker, except in the past tense; in other words, the tense marker may not be reduced in the future.

(57) *On budet studentom i rabotat' (*He will be a student and work);

(57a) On budet studentom i budet rabotat* (He will be a student and will work);

(58) *On budet dobrym i rabotat' (*He will be kind and work);

(59) On byl studentom i rabotal (He was a student and worked).

(57a) is grammatical, because the tense marker in the second conjoined sentence is not reduced. The structure of (57a) is identical to that of (46), however the latter is ungrammatical, while the first is grammatical due to the semantic difference of the infinitives in these two sentences. If the order of the conjoined sentences is reversed, the results do not change.

(60) *On budet rabotat* i studentom (*He will work and a student);

-TU8-

(61) *On budet rabotas' i dobrym (*He will work and kind).

The results are also ungrammatical, if we attempt to conjoin a sentence containing a copula with a sentence where byt' is a link between a noun phrase and an adverbial phrase or an adverb:

(62) *On byl studentom i doma (*He was a student and at home);

(63) *On byl studentom i khorosho (*He was a student and well);

(64) *On byl studentom i vchera (*He was a student and yesterday).

So far an attempt has been made to establish a definite difference between the meaning and function of byt', the tense marker, and byt', the link between nominals; for the latter form the term 'copula' has been adopted in this paper.

4. Byt' with adverbs. Different kinds of adverbs bring out different functions of byt'.

4.1 Adverbs of time. The following examples show byt' linking a noun phrase with an adverb of time:

(65) Ivan byl rano (Ivan was early);

(66) *Ivan rano (Ivan is early);

(67) Ivan budet rano (Ivan will be early);

(68) Konferentsiia byla segodnia (The conference was today);

(69) Konferentsiia segodnia (The conference is today);

(70) Konferentsiia budet segodnia (The conference will be today).

In sentence (65) we are dealing with a synonym of to come, to go. Sentence (66) is ungrammatical, because, in isolation, it does not convey any meaning.

This lack of meaning is due to the fact that it is not known what verb the adverb rano (early) modifies; the listener assumes that any verb could be implied: "Ivan gets up early," "Ivan works early," "Ivan comes early."

For this reason it is assumed that (66) does not have byt' in the deep structure.

In the past and future, where byt' appears on the surface, the fact that it is

in a sentence where the subject is an animate noun it gives the meaning of

to come or to go. In (68), where the subject is nonanimate and nonliving and denotes some sort of an event, byt' is the equivalent of to take place.

Because of this semantic load it is possible to assume at this moment that these uses of byt' are deep structure phenomena.

4.2 Adverbs of manner. The adverb of manner, as shown in sentences (25)-(27), yields totally ungrammatical results except for the present tense: sentence (26) is grammatical, but is unrealistic without a context, such as "How is Ivan?" Or, perhaps, a regular transitive or intransitive verb could have been omitted. This shows that byt' does not link noun phrases with adverbs of manner, because it does not appear in the deep structure.

4.3 Adverbs of location. Byt' can also link a noun phrase with an adverb of location:

- (71) Ivan byl doma (Ivan was home);
- (72) Ivan doma (Ivan is home);
- (73) Ivan budet doma (Ivan will be home);
- (74) Ivan byl v klasse (Ivan was in the classroom);
- (75) Ivan v klasse (Ivan is in the classroom);
- (76) Ivan budet v klasse (Ivan will be in the classroom);
- (77) Ivan byl u stola (Ivan was at the table);
- (78) Ivan u stola (Ivan is at the table);
- (79) Ivan budet u stola (Ivan will be at the table).

There is again zero realization of byt' in the present tense. This adverbial construction has to be brought out as an adverb of location rather than any adverb, because it behaves differently from the adverbial constructions of time or manner.

To establish the function of byt' with adverbial constructions of location (as well as time) containing an animate subject we can try to substitute one

-TU10-

of the equivalents (1)-(10). We find that the possible substitutes are the verb to go, to be found, to come, to drive, to visit (Kochetkova and Matreeva 1970:52). Thus, "Ivan was home" may be the equivalent of "Ivan was to be found home," as well as "Ivan went home." This will be an important distinction for understanding the difference between the negation of these two sentences. These differences in meaning point to a deep structure origin of this copula. Catherine Chvany (1970) also assumes that byt' of existence, byt' of occurrence and byt' of location are "true verbs," or cases of "deep structure copula" as I would like to label them.

Byt' of occurrence is nonstative, while the others are stative. Stative-ness is determined not only by the contextual features, but also by the mandatory absence of byt' in the present tense, where it is stative:

- (80) Ivan doma (Ivan is home);
- (81) Ivan v klasse (Ivan is in the classroom);
- (82) Ivan u stola (Ivan is at the table);
- (83) Kniga na polke (The book is on the shelf);
- (84) Kniga pod stolom (The book is under the table);
- (85) Kniga tut (The book is here).

The lexical equivalent for this form of byt' is nakhodit'sa (to be found).

The test of gapping applied to constructions with adverbs of time and location yield results identical to those obtained in sentences with regular verbs:

- (86) Ivan byl rano, a Sasha pozdno (Ivan was early, but Sasha was late);
- (87) Ivan budet doma, a Sasha v klasse (Ivan will be home, but Sasha will be in the classroom);
- (88) Kniga byla na polke, a karandash v iashchike (The book was on the shelf, but the pencil was in the drawer);
- (89) Kniga na polka, a karandash v iashchike (The book is on the shelf, but the pencil is in the drawer).

-TUII-

Conjoining shows the following results:

- (90) *Ivan budet rano i budet studentom (Ivan will be early and will be a student);
- (91) *Ivan budet rano i budet khoroshim (Ivan will be early and will be good);
- (92) *Ivan budet rano i budet rabotat' (Ivan will be early and will be working);
- (93) Ivan budet doma i budet studentom (Ivan will be home and will be a student);
- (94) Ivan budet doma i budet khoroshim (Ivan will be home and will be good);
- (95) Ivan budet doma i budet rabotat' (Ivan will be home and will be working).

The constructions of time do not conjoin with sentences where byt' is a copula or a tense marker, but the constructions of location do.

4.4 Adverbs of location denoting possession. A special case of NP byt' Loc in reversed order (Loc byt' NP) renders the meaning of possession. The word order is crucial for regular non-emphatic sentences of possession:

- (96) U Ivana est' kniga (Ivan has a book);
- (97) U Ivana byla sobaka (Ivan had a dog);
- (98) U Ivana budet lakei (Ivan will have a butler).

Otherwise a very emphatic intonation is necessary in order to maintain the meaning of possession without the reversed word order:

- (99) Kniga est' u Ivana (Ivan does have a book).

Sentences with the subject predicate order without the surface realization of byt' do not mean possession, but rather presence in a location.

- (100) Kniga u Ivana (The book is at Ivan's);
- (101) Sobaka u Ivan (The dog is at Ivan's);
- (102) Lakei u Ivana (The butler is at Ivan's).

The same constructions, but in the predicate-subject order render the meaning of a less permanent ownership or ownership in the presence of the speaker:

-TU12-

(103) U Ivana kniga (Ivan has a book);

(104) U Ivana sobaka (Ivan has a dog);

(105) U Ivana lakei (Ivan has a butler);

while sentences with the surface realization of byt' definitely render the meaning of permanent and general possession.

Another requirement for rendering the meaning of possession is that the predicate noun phrase be <+living>, as in

(106) U rosy shipy (The rose has thorns);

and not in

(107) U stola Ivan (Ivan is at the table).

The latter, of course, renders the meaning of 'Ivan is at the table' rather than 'Ivan is owned by the table'. In order to use the verbal equivalent of byt' of possession, namely imet', the noun phrase of the predicate must be the subject, as in

(108) Rose imeet shipy (The rose has thorns).⁴

Sentences without the surface realization of byt', where the noun being owned by someone is animate, or especially, human, are ambiguous: sentences (102) and (105) may mean that the butler went to Ivan's and is with him now.

Gapping may occur here as well as in sentences with regular verbs:

(109) U Ivana est' lakei, a u Sashi povar (Ivan has a butler, and Sasha has a cook);

No conjoining is possible when we deal with sentences of possession (Loc byt' NP) on one hand, and sentences of identity (NP byt' $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{NP} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right\}$) on the other:

(110) *U Ivana byl lakei i byl uchitelem (Ivan had a butler and was a teacher);

(111) *U Ivana byl lakei i byl khoroshim (Ivan had a butler and was good);

(112) *U ivana byl lakei i byl doma (Ivan had a butler and was home);

(113) *U Ivana byl lakei i rabotal (Ivan had a butler and was working).

In sentences denoting possession the form byt' seems to be stative.

It is obvious from the examples in this chapter, that byt' cannot be used with the adverbs of manner, even if there is no verb on the surface structure. Such is the case in sentence 26: the tests have shown that byt' does not exist on the level of deep structure.

However, byt' used with adverbs of time and place has a very definite meaning as well as semantic synonyms with a strong semantic load. The gapping test shows a behavior identical with full-fledged verbs. It is also true that one may not conjoin a sentence where byt' links a nominal with an adverb with a sentence where byt' links a nominal with a nominal. This is the case simply because of an entirely different function of these two types of byt' and therefore, a certain "independence" in the sentences conjoined. Yet, the form byt' in this chapter conjoins perfectly well with full-fledged lexical verbs. All these facts point in the direction that byt', which links nominals with adverbs, may be considered a deep structure phenomenon.

5. Byt' as a full-fledged verb. There are numerous cases where byt' does not link the subject with another part of speech, but rather plays the role of a regular intransitive verb:

(114) Pravda est' (Truth is).

Among all the different functions of byt' this usage is the only real lexical verb, because it may be the only member of a verb phrase and may be modified by adverbs. It is stative and does not need to derive its stativeness from the contextual features in the verb-phrase.

At first glance it may look like NP byt' Time
Loc :

(115) Pravda budet vseгда (Truth will be always)

(116) Podvig est' i v sražen'i, podvig est' i v bor'be... (Heroism is in battle, heroism is in fighting...),

but there is a difference between these examples and the copula simply because

-TU14-

there must be the surface realization of byt' in these sentences, in the present tense. The verb which is the lexical equivalent of this verb is sushchestvovat' (to exist).

6. Questions and negations. It is unfortunate that the only form in Russian used to question a verb is "chto delaet?" It cannot be used for any of the uses of byt' described above. It is not only because delat' is nonstative, but also because of the presence of chto, the direct object, which presupposes that 'someone is doing something'; but even the most "verb-like" usage of byt' as in (114), completely excludes any direct object or any transitive activity.

The constructions outlined above may be subjected to question transformations which will yield a wh-question, an intonation question, a -li-question, or a tag question.

- (117) Chto Ivan budet delat'? (What will Ivan do?);
- (118) Kem Ivan byl? (What was Ivan?);
- (119) Kto Ivan? (Who is Ivan?);
- (120) Kem Ivan budet? (What will Ivan be?);
- (121) Kakim Ivan byl? (What was Ivan like?);
- (122) Kakoi Ivan? (What is Ivan like?);
- (123) Kakim Ivan budet? (What will Ivan be like?);
- (124) Chto s Ivanom bylo sdelano? (What was done with Ivan?);
- (125) Chto s Ivanom sdelano? (What is done with Ivan?);
- (126) Chto s Ivanom budet sdelano? (What will be done with Ivan?);
- (127) Kogda Ivan byl? (*When was Ivan?);
- (128) *Kogda Ivan? (*When is Ivan?);
- (129) Kogda Ivan budet? (When will Ivan be?);
- (130) Kak Ivan? (How is Ivan?);
- (131) Gde Ivan byl? (Where was Ivan?);

-TU15-

- (132) Gde Ivan? (Where is Ivan?);
 (133) Gde Ivan budet? (Where will Ivan be?);
 (134) U chego student? (What is the student at?);
 (135) Kto u Ivana? (Who is at Ivan's?);
 (136) Chto u Ivana? (What does Ivan have?);
 (137) Kto u Ivana est? (Whom does Ivan own?);
 (138) Chto u Ivana est'? (What does Ivan have?);

Intonation questions:

- (139) Ivan budet rabotat'? (Will Ivan work?);
 (140) Ivan student? (Is Ivan a student?);
 (141) Ivan dobryi? (Is Ivan kind?);
 (142) Ivan priglashon? (Is Ivan invited?);
 (143) Ivan u dveri? (Is Ivan at the door?);
 (144) Ivan u professora? (Is Ivan at the professor's?);
 (145) Kniga u Ivana? = U Ivana kniga? (Is the book at Ivan's?);
 (146) U Ivana kniga? (Does Ivan have a book?);
 (147) U Ivana povar? (Does Ivan have a cook?);
 (148) U Ivana est' kniga? (Does Ivan have a book?).

In the *-li*-questions the word questioned is placed in the beginning of the sentence and the question particle *-li* follows the word questioned.

This can be done with any nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs.

In case of the tag questions *ne pravda* or *ne npravda li* (with rising intonation) is attached to the statement.

Essentially, one rule could give us all the question transforms: the word questioned is subjected to intonation or it is preposed with the particle *-li* following it, or it is preposed and replaced by the respective question word. In case of a tag question, the tag has to be attached.

-2016-

Negation operates in a similar manner: nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs or prepositional phrases may be negated by preposing ne before them. Verb negation is the unmarked form of negation.

It is interesting to point out here that if one judged merely by the surface structure, then NP byt' Loc (Ivan doma) would appear to have two negative transformations:

(149) Ivan ne doma (Ivan is not home);

(150) Ivana net doma (Ivan is not home);

and so would the past and the future tenses:

(151) Ivan ne byl doma (Ivan was not home);

(152) Ivana ne bylo doma (Ivan was not home);

(153) Ivan budet v klasse (Ivan will be in class);

(154) Ivana ne budet v klasse (Ivan will not be in class).

This is, however, not true; because "Ivan byl v klasse" is a perfect case of ambiguity: it may mean 1) that Ivan was present in the classroom, and 2) it may mean that Ivan went to the classroom and came back. This distinction comes out very clearly after the negative transformation is applied: in the case of the absence of a person we obtain a transform with the logical subject of the verb byt' in the Genitive case, and, in the case of a living being's not having been to a place, the subject of the verb to be remains in the Nominative case. The first type of a negative transform may be explained as a sentence where a dummy subject of a neutral type it is inserted: 'Of Ivan it was not there'.

It becomes more complicated when negative questions have to be generated. It seems more economical to subject a sentence to a negative transformation first and then to the question transformation, because in some cases the highest pitch of question intonation must fall on the particle ne which must

be introduced by negation first, as in:

(155) On ne byl studentom?

The rule of subject raising may be used as a test to show that byt' behaves just like a regular verb in an embedded sentence. Only such verbs as schitat' (to consider), nakhodit' (to find) (of which there are very few) in the main sentence will trigger subject raising. Subject raising must be stated in such a manner as to exclude true verbs and tense markers from the complements that undergo raising. The same can be said about the surface realization of byt': it must be excluded from the complement. If the complement is "Ivan student" or "Ivan budet studentom," subject raising results in "Ia schitaiu Ivan studentom," or "Ia budu schitat' Ivana studentom." There is no way of expressing tense in the complement.

Subject raising may be applied only to sentences in which byt' is used as a copula, and not to sentences containing any other byt'. This fact distinguishes the copula from a true verb on one hand and, on the other hand, for reasons outlined above (such as the existence of lexical equivalents and others), the copula could not be a surface structure insert.

7. Concluding remarks. As a result of tests and operations outlined in the chapters above, there seem to be four basic types of byt':

1. the tense marker,
2. the copula,
3. the form that links the subject with an adverb,
4. the true verb.

If the first is a surface-structure insert, then the others - as a result of what has been attempted to show here - should be introduced in the deep structure. At this point, however, it is not clear at which levels of depth the second, the third and the fourth types of byt' are inserted. The fact that they are introduced at different levels of depth is a necessary assumption resulting partly from the tests carried out, partly from native intuition. Establishing

-TU18-

the variants of byt' in more exact terms would depend on further research in whether tense should be treated as a note or a feature, and on the solution of many other problems in Russian, such as the types of complements byt' can take (Tuniks, 1969), and the formation of imperatives.

My reach possibly exceeds my grasp, but, perhaps, it may not be too much to assume that this analysis could serve as a step towards the discovery of some regularity in this corner of the jungle of the Russian grammar.

NOTES

1. Byt' is the Russian infinitive form of the Russian verb to be. In the present tense there are only two forms: est', which is the third person singular, and sut', which is more a different stylistic form of est', rather than the third person plural, which it is in old Russian. In the future tense there is a complete paradigm: budu, budesh, budet, budem, budete, budut. In the past tense the forms differ only according to gender and number: byl, byla, bylo in the singular, and byli in the plural. The imperative forms are bud' in the singular or familiar, and bud'te in the plural or polite.
2. See section 4.1 for an explanation of why (23) is ungrammatical.
3. (26) does occur; it is not an instance of the copula, but rather of a deleted verb.
4. This is only an approximation to the exact conditions for this construction.

-TU19-

REFERENCES

- Chvany, Catherine Vaker. 1970. Deep structure with dolžen and moč.
Dissertation, Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Darden, Bill J. 1969. "On the Question of the Copula," Paper from the Fifth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Křižkova, Helena. 1970. "Imennoe skazuemoe i struktura predložheniia v sovremennykh slavianskikh iazykakh," International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, Vol. 13.
- Kochetkova, N. P. and Matveeva, V. M. 1970. Posobie po sintaksisu russkogo iazyka. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo L.G.U.
- Tuniks, Galina. 1969. Verb Phrase Complementation in Russian; a Transformational analysis. Ph.D. Dissertation. Washington: Georgetown University.