

Салморбекова А.К.

ОРУС ЖАНА КЫРГЫЗ ТИЛДЕРИНДЕГИ АБАЛ ЭТИШТЕРИ

Салморбекова А. К.

ПРЕДИКАТЫ СОСТОЯНИЯ В РУССКОМ И КЫРГЫЗСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Salmorbekova A. K.

STATIVE PREDICATES IN RUSSIAN AND KYRGYZ

УДК 811.111:81

Бул макалада кыргыз жана орус тилдериндеги абал этиштери иликтелет. Кыргыз жана орустилдеринде өз кезегинде англис тилинде жок абал этиштеринин түрлөрү кенен кездешет. Булар бар экендигин жана психологиялык абалын билдирген этиштер.

В данной работе исследуются предикаты состояния на русском и кыргызском языках. Русский и кыргызский языки имеют широкий спектр стативных типов, которые в свою очередь отсутствуют в английском языке. Эти глаголы существования и психологического состояния.

This work investigates the stative predicates in Russian and Kyrgyz. Russian and Kyrgyz have a wide variety of stative types, including a number absent in English. These are verbs of Existence and Psychological State verbs.

Негизги сөздөр: предикат, абал, этиш, убактылуу

Ключевые слова: предикат, глагол, постоянное состояние, временное состояние

Key words: predicate, stative, verb, temporary states, permanent states

The study of the aspectual dimension of lexical semantics has been of interest to students of language since at least the time of Aristotle, but it has recently taken pride of place in theoretical discussion. In Western linguistics a leading influence has been the work of Vendler (1967) who resuscitated an Aristotelian tradition of aspectual analysis. As a result it is now commonplace to distinguish telic situations from atelic situations. The telic situations are those situations which have or imply an endpoint. Vendler defined Achievements as those situations in which an end point is reached instantaneously, as in find the keys. These situations are distinguished from Accomplishments, in which the end point is the result of gradual accretion by prior Activity, for instance build a house or eat the sandwich. Other types of situation are atelic and do not include a delimiting endpoint.

First there are Activities such as run (around in the park). The Activities, Accomplishments and Achievements all involve a situation which evolves over time, the dynamic or episodic situations (sometimes also called 'eventive'). These are to be contrasted with States, which do not

involve any evolution over time but just are. In addition, it is often said that dynamic situations but not states, have to be “subject to a new input of energy” to maintain them¹.

Examples of States in English include verbs such as exist, cover as in snow covers the fields and Psychological State predicates such as know or love. In addition, adjectives generally denote States (be tired, be intelligent). The aspectual class to which a predicate belongs is generally taken to be part of its lexical semantic representation, whether as a primitive or as a derived category, determined by other components of the semantic representation. In addition, many authors have implicated aspectual class membership with a variety of phenomena relating to the expression of argument structure². In the Russian linguistic tradition the problem of the aspectual determinants of lexical semantics has been put into focus over the past century by the awareness of the role of grammatical aspect in Slavic languages. Grammatical aspect interacts in complex ways with lexical semantics, and the key role of lexical semantics in the properties of grammatical aspect has meant that Russian and Kyrgyz linguistics has always accorded considerable importance to the situation types denoted by verb predicates.

Types of stative predicate

According to Paduèeva (1996, Ch. 8) and Osmonova there are the following semantic classes of stative:

permanent properties and relations- soderžat- kamtylgan

temporary states – videt- koruu

permanent states – ljubit- suyuu

In addition, they identifies two closely related subclasses which share certain properties with Activities but which also exhibit properties of permanent states:

Occupations – vorovat’- urdoo

Behaviours- balovat’sja- ermektoo.

These two subclasses are dealt with separately in Spencer (1998c).

The distinction between permanent and temporary states seems to correspond in large part to the distinction between individual-level and stage-level predicates. However, Paduèeva and Osmonova’s distinction is more finely-grained, in that she effectively partitions the individual-level predicates. The permanent properties and relations constitute one subset of the individual-level predicates, while the permanent states constitute another subset. In the literature on stative predicates some of which we shall review later it is rare for properties (or properties and relations) to be discussed separately from permanent states. Indeed, the concept ‘property’ tends to be taken for granted rather than discussed. The main difference between the Properties and Relations on the one hand and States proper on the other is that Properties/Relations are atemporal, that is, they cannot be localized in time Paduèeva and Osmonova adduce five tests to distinguish atemporal predications from individual-level States: Atemporal predicates cannot be used with *sejèas-azyr-now*:

1. *Paket (sejèas) soderžitcennyedokumenty*

Tangakuchurdabaaluudokumentterdikamtyit

The package contains valuable documents

¹ Comrie, Bernard 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P.49

² Tenny, Carol 1994. Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. P. 69

This test can disambiguate a verb such as *xromat'* - *aksoo* 'to limp':

2. *On xromaet*

Al aksapzhatat

He is limping

It is possible to localize even an individual-level State in time 'abstract' time, by using a temporal adverbial with the general sense 'at time t, situation s held'. Thus, we can say:

3. *V naèaleèetvertogokursaonauževladelašvedskimjazykom*

Al 4 kurstunbashindaeleshvedtilindesuiloibashtagan

She already knew Swedish at the beginning of the fourth year

Attempts to localize atemporal properties fail:

4. *V tot moment on xromal*

Osholuchurda al aksapzhatkan

At that moment he was limping

The adverbial *vsegda-* *dayima-* always has two principal uses in Russian and Kyrgyz. One is as a universal quantifier over points in time, especially in the present tense. The other use is found with past and future tenses and denotes, respectively 'there was no point at which situation s had not yet arisen'/'there is no point at which situation s will no longer hold'. The latter interpretation is possible for individual-level States (5) but not for atemporal properties (6):

5. a. *Onavsegdaznala, èto on negodjaj*

Al anynakmakekenindayimabilchi

She always knew that he was a scoundrel

b. *Onavsegdabudetznať, èto on ljubilee*

Al anynakmakekenindayimabilipzhuroť

She will always know that he loved her'

6. a. *Cerkov' stojala/budetstojat' naxolme*

Chirkoodobodoturchu/ turat

The church stood/will stand on the hill

b. *Ètacerkov' vsegdastojala/budetstojat' naxolme*

Bulchirkoodayimadobodoturchu/turat

This church always stood/will stand on hill

Framing temporal adverbials are possible with all situation types, including individual-level States, except atemporal properties:

7. a. *Pjat' let jaljubilètudevušku*

Men bulkyzdy 5 zhylsuyupjurđum

For five years I was in love with that girl

b. *On pjat' let raspolagalzemel'nymuèastkom*

Al bulzherdi 5 zhylkoldondu

For five years he had an allotment at his disposal

The tense of a temporal properties cannot be interpreted in the canonical fashion, as a deictic temporal marker.

The past tense indicates that the subject of the predicate is no longer regarded as in the subjective 'world' of the speaker, so that (8) implies that the package no longer exists:

8. *Paketsoderžalcennyedokumenty*

Tangakbaaluudokumentterdikamtychu

The package contained valuable documents

Likewise, *Džonbylkanadec – Djonkanadalykbolchu- John was a Canadian*

implies that John is somehow no longer in the speaker's sphere of interest (for example, he has died, or he has left the neighbourhood for good) rather than that John has been granted a different nationality. Similarly, in the present tense it is not possible to interpret *Džonkanadec-Djonkanadalyk- John is a Canadian*

has meaning 'at the present time' or 'John is always a Canadian'. Rather, we can perhaps think of the present tense here as simply a default tense for use when we wish to make the least number of claims about the speaker's attitude to the temporal structure of the situation. Paduèeva also offers a number of tests to distinguish permanent (individual-level) States from temporary States. The tests which identify permanent States also identify atemporal properties/relations. An adverbial denoting 'incorporated' time can only combine with a stage-level State and not an individual-level State. The verbs love and hate are intriguing in this respect in that the former seems to be viewed as a permanent characteristic linguistically, while the latter is temporary³

9. a. *V ètuminutuona ego nenavidela*

Osholuchurda al any zhekkorchu

At that moment she hated him

b. *V ètuminutuona ego ljubila*

Osholuchurda al any suichu

At that minute she him loved

Adverbial quantifiers are generally incompatible with individual-level States:

10. a. *On bylèastoprav*

Al dayimatuurasuilochu

He was right often/twice

b. *On bylèastoumny*

Al dayimaakylduubolchu

He was often intelligent

As one would expect, where an adverbial quantifier is possible with such a predicate it is as a quantifier over the subject, and not over eventualities as such⁴:

11. a. *Medsestraèastoznaetluèše, èemvraè*

Medayim kop uchurdadocturga Karaganda zhakshybilet

A nurse often knows better than the doctor

When a stage-level State is predicated of an object-referring phrase we obtain a sentence which can be located in time and has none of the properties of a generic sentence. However, when predicated of a kind-referring term it becomes a generic:

12. a. *Vodakipit*

Suukainapzhatat

³ Paduèeva, Elena Viktorovna 1996. *Semanticheskieissledovanie*. Moskva: Jazykirusskoj kul'tury. P.138

⁴ Osmonova P. Bishkek. 2014. P. 86

The water is boiling' [non-generic]

b. Vodakipitpri 100°

Suu 100gradustakainait

Water boils at 100° [generic]

No such difference is observed with individual-level predicates:

13. *a. On znaet, ètovolkiopasny*

Karyshkyrlarkooptuuekenin albilet

He knows that wolves are dangerous

b. Každyznaet, ètovolkiopasny

Karyshkyrlarkooptuuekeninarbiradambilet

Everyone knows that wolves are dangerous

This is one of the reasons why individual-level predicates are said to be a type of generic predication. Chierchia (1995) has argued that all individual-level predicates are indeed inherently generic predicates. The fourth test uses 'intensive' durational adverbs of the kind 'all day', which require the eventuality to evolve during the interval denoted by the adverb. Thus, we can say (14) but not (15):

14. *Vsesvojedetstvobolel*

Kichinekeikezimdeooruumenenalekbaldum

He was ill throughout the whole of his childhood

15. *Vsesvojedetstvoonaznalanemeckijjazyk, a potomzabyla*

Al kichinekeichagyndanemectilinbilchu, kiyinunutupkaldy

All her childhood she knew German language and then forgot

Bibliography

1. Chierchia, Gennaro 1995. Individual-level predicates as inherent generics. In: CarlsonandPelletier (eds.), 176-223.
2. Comrie, Bernard 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Paduèeva, Elena Viktorovna 1996. Semanticheskiesledovanie. Moskva: Jazykirusskojkul'tury.
4. Tenny, Carol 1994. Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Dordrecht: KluwerAcademicPublishers.
5. Vendler, Zeno 1967. Linguistics in Philosophy. Ithaca: CornellUniversityPress.
6. Spencer, Andrew and Zazretskaya. Marina D. 1998. The stative middle in Russian. Ms. UniversityofEssex.
7. ОсмоноваП. Окутуу орус, өзбек, тажик тилдеринде жүргүзүлүүчү мектептердин 5-9,10-11-класстары үчүн кыргыз тили боюнча предметтик стандарт. Г. Бишкек, 2014

Рецензент: к.ф.н., доцент Салахитдинова Э. Д.
