

Gary H. Toops *

RUSSIAN ДА(ВА)ТЬ + INFINITIVE: 'TO GIVE', 'TO LET', OR 'TO HAVE'?

Introduction. In discussing the expression of causative relations in Slavic languages, R. Lötzsch states that "with the exception of a few lexicalized compounds like *дать/давать знать* 'to let/have (somebody) know', *дать/давать понять* 'to have (somebody) understand', Russian *дать/давать* *basically* has permissive meanings" (emphasis added).¹ Together with W. Fiedler and K. Kostov, he also states that this Russian verb, when occurring with infinitive complements, "already displays features of the transition to a causative auxiliary verb, albeit *in essence* only a permissive one" (emphasis added).² These statements suggest (1) that permissivity is not the only causative meaning that the verb *да(ва)ть* can express, and (2) that it is possible to discern in contemporary Russian an evolution whereby the autosemantic verb *да(ва)ть* 'to give' is undergoing or has undergone complete or partial grammaticalization to become a causative auxiliary comparable to the English verbs 'to let' (expressing permissive causation) and/or 'to have (somebody do something)' (expressing factitive causation).³

With the exception of a recent working paper,⁴ no published work, to my knowledge, has thus far examined the grammatical factors underlying the occurrence of the verb *да(ва)ть* as a causative auxiliary. This article therefore examines a variety of sentence types, differing by virtue of the presence/absence of certain syntactic constituents (direct/indirect object) and the semantic properties of those constituents (animacy, physical transferability, etc.)

On the basis of the sentences (i.e., *да(ва)ть* + infinitive constructions) examined, it is concluded that the verb *да(ва)ть* has thus far undergone only partial grammaticalization towards being a

* Gary H. Toops is an Assistant Professor of Russian in the Department of Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures at the Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas.

causative auxiliary (although the extent of grammaticalization may vary according to speaker). It is further suggested that the incompleteness of the verb's grammaticalization as a causative auxiliary is due primarily to the homonymy, and hence ambiguity, of certain surface structures, despite the fact that these can be generated by different underlying structures (represented here simply as S or "shallow" structures). Because of the frequently unpredictable rôle homonymy can play in the acceptability of да(ва)ТЬ+ infinitive constructions, it is finally proposed that да(ва)ТЬ be viewed as two distinct lexical items, да(ва)ТЬ₁ 'to give' and да(ва)ТЬ₂ 'to let' (the latter subcategorized for a number of syntactic and semantic constraints). The factitive causative meaning 'to have (somebody do something)' is determined to derive from the autosemantic verb да(ва)ТЬ₁ 'to give', not from the causative auxiliary verb да(ва)ТЬ₂ -- 'to let'.

Defining да(ва)ТЬ as a causative auxiliary. The primary lexical meaning of the Russian verb да(ва)ТЬ, as well as its etyma in the other Slavic languages, is 'to give'. This meaning is regularly expressed when the complement of the verb is a nominal direct object:

1. Отец дал дочери книгу.

Father^{NOM} gave daughter^{DAT} book^{ACC}

'The father gave a book to (his) daughter (gave [his] daughter a book).'

[S [NP отец] [VP [\bar{V} [V дал] [NP книгу]] [NP дочери]]]

The verb да(ва)ТЬ may also take as its complement an embedded sentence, the subject of which is expressed in the surface syntax in the dative case, in the same way as the indirect object, дочери 'daughter^{DAT}' in example 1. In place of a nominal direct object, however, the complement consists of an infinitive verb form:

2. Отец дал дочери отдохнуть.

Father^{NOM} let daughter^{DAT} rest^{INF}

'The father let (his) daughter rest.'

[S[NP отец] [VP[\bar{V} [V дал] [S PRO_i отдохнуть]]][NP дочери;
]]]

In the syntactic environment illustrated by example 2, the verb дал does not signify '(he) gave', but rather '(he) let', and appears to be grammaticalized as a causative auxiliary with permissive

meaning. Polish and Bulgarian linguists, however, have attempted to explain the semantics of analogous sentences in other Slavic languages not as the result of grammaticalization, but as the result of ellipsis. According to V. Radeva and M. Korytkowska, the meaning 'let' conveyed by the finite verb derives from the ellipsis of such sentences as the following:⁵

3. Отец дал дочери разрешение/возможность отдохнуть.
 Father^{NOM} gave daughter^{DAT} permission^{ACC}/ opportunity^{ACC}
 rest^{INF}
 'The father gave (his) daughter permission/an opportunity to rest.'

While such an observation is interesting in that hints at the extent to which native speakers of Slavic languages apparently discern a semantic connection between the notions of giving and letting, it cannot be accepted at face value. According to Nedjalkov and Nikitina, one peculiarity of auxiliary verbs that distinguishes them from autosemantic verbs is their scope of negation in contrapositive assertions.⁶ For example, if negating the verb да(ва)ть in infinitive constructions likewise entails nonperformance (nonoccurrence) of the action denoted by the infinitive and, further, negation cannot be restricted to the infinitive complement alone, then the verb governing the infinitive complement must be auxiliary, not autosemantic:

- 4a. *Отец даёт дочери не ходить в школу.
 Father^{NOM} lets daughter^{DAT} not go^{INF} to school^{ACC}
 ?'The father lets (his) daughter not to go to school.'
- 4b. Отец даёт дочери разрешение не ходить в школу.
 Father^{NOM} gives daughter^{DAT} permission^{ACC} not go^{INF} to school^{ACC}
 'The father gives (his) daughter permission not go to school.'

The ungrammaticality of Russian sentence 4a, contrasted with the grammaticality of 4b, demonstrates that the permissive causative meaning 'let' cannot be the result of ellipsis, since otherwise there would be no reason why 4a should be ungrammatical; and that the finite verb in 4a is auxiliary, inasmuch as autosemantic permissive causatives (e.g., позволить/позволять 'to allow', разрешить/разрешать 'to permit'), unlike да(ва)ть, can occur with negated infinitive complements. This is shown by the following:

5. Отец позволяет/разрешает дочери не ходить в школу.
 Father^{NOM} allows/permits (his) daughter^{DAT} not go^{INF} to school^{ACC}

'The father allows/permits (his) daughter not to go to school.'

The concept of logical implicature allows us to further specify as causative the auxiliary status of the verb да(ва)ть in infinitive constructions. Periphrastic constructions, in order to be causative, must logically implicate the performance or occurrence of the action denoted by the infinitive complement.⁷ Thus, if sentence 2 above, *Отец дал дочери отдохнуть*, does in fact express a causative relation, then the following sentence should be inadmissible on logical grounds:

6. *Отец дал дочери отдохнуть, но она не отдыхала.

Father^{NOM} let daughter^{DAT} rest^{INF} but she^{NOM} not rested

*'The father let his daughter rest, but she didn't.'

Because *Отец дал дочери отдохнуть* 'The father let his daughter rest' logically implicates that the daughter did in fact rest, we cannot amplify the statement by means of a coordinate clause asserting that she did not rest.⁸ Hence, the inadmissibility of sentence 6. In these ways both the auxiliary and the causative status of the Russian verb да(ва)ть in infinitive constructions are established.

Ambiguity: 'to give' vs. 'to let'. The infinitive complements considered thus far have consisted of an intransitive verb, *отдохнуть* 'to rest'. If infinitive constructions consist of да(ва)ть and a transitive verb, their classification as causative constructions becomes problematic. Consider the grammaticality of the following:

7. Отец дал дочери прочесть книгу, но она её не прочла.

Father^{NOM} gave/let daughter^{DAT} read^{INF} book^{ACC} but she^{NOM} her^{ACC} not read

'The father gave (his) daughter a book to read, but she didn't read it.'

The main clause in example 7, *Отец дал дочери прочесть книгу*, is ambiguous: because of the occurrence of the transitive verb *прочесть* 'to read', the main clause by itself signifies either 'The father gave (his) daughter a book to read' or 'The father let (his) daughter read a book'. Example 7 is nonetheless grammatical, because the coordinate clause *но она её не прочла* 'but she didn't read it' induces the logical elimination of a causative reading of the main clause. A causative interpretation in Russian, as in English, would render the utterance as a whole inherently contradictory, cf.: *'The father let his daughter read a book, but she didn't read it.' The ambiguity of the main clause in example 7 can be accounted for in

terms of two underlying structures that generate homonymous surface sentences:⁹

8a. Отец дал дочери прочесть книгу.

[S[NP отец][VP [\bar{V}][V дал][S PRO_i прочесть книгу]] [NP дочери_i]]]

'The father let (his) daughter read a book.'

8b. Отец дал дочери прочесть книгу.

[S[NP отец] [VP[\bar{V}][V дал] [NP книгу_i]] [NP дочери_i] [S PRO_i прочесть e_j]]]

'The father gave (his) daughter a book to read.'

This same ambiguity can arise even when the infinitive complement of да(ва)ть consists of a transitive verb without an overt direct object. Thus, the sentence in example 9 (below), *Отец дал дочери поесть*, may signify either 'The father let (his) daughter eat' or 'The father gave (his) daughter something to eat.'

9a. Отец дал дочери поесть.

Father^{NOM} let daughter^{DAT} eat^{INF}

'The father let (his) daughter eat.'

[S[NP отец] [VP[\bar{V}][V дал] [S PRO_i поесть e]] [NP дочери_i]]]

9b. Отец дал дочери поесть.

Farther^{NOM} gave daughter^{DAT} (something= \emptyset) eat^{INF}

'The father gave his daughter something to eat.'

[S [NP отец][VP [\bar{V}][Vдал][NPe_j]][NPдочери_i][SPRO_i поесть e_j]]]

Russian example 9b illustrates an instance where the expression of a semantically recoverable, indefinite "something" is omitted in the surface syntax. I have indicated this in the underlying structure with the coreferenced symbol e, representing a lexically empty NP.¹⁰

Incomplete grammaticalization. The lexical meaning of the accusative-case direct object of the transitive verb in the infinitive complement often determines whether or not the ambiguity just described is in fact possible. Consider example 10:

10. ?Отец дал дочери построить новый дом.

Father^{NOM} let daughter^{DAT} build^{INF} new^{ACC} house^{ACC}
'The father let (his) daughter build a new house (have a new house built).'

Here, a noncausative interpretation 'The father gave his daughter a new house to build' is excluded, since a house that has yet to be built, i.e., does not yet exist, cannot be given to someone. However, while sentence 10 is accepted with the indicated permissive causative interpretation by some native speakers, others reject the sentence precisely on the grounds that a person cannot give someone else a house to build. That is to say, for these speakers, the inadmissibility of a noncausative interpretation of the sentence does not automatically prompt an alternate, permissive causative reading of the sentence (viz., 'The father let his daughter build a new house').

This fact is interesting, since it may indicate the point at which causative да(ва)ть + infinitive constructions reach their limit of grammatical acceptability. If we assume that the primary meaning of да(ва)ть and its etyma in other Slavic languages was originally 'to give' and that the verb only secondarily acquired auxiliary status with the meaning 'to let' through a process of grammaticalization (cf. Löttsch's comments in the Introduction above), then we may observe the ongoing grammaticalization of да(ва)ть in Russian even at the present time. Grammaticalization of да(ва)ть has apparently proceeded further for those speakers who accept sentence 10 than it has for those who do not.¹¹

The following examples, which have been unanimously accepted or rejected by all native speakers I have asked, further demonstrate that in contemporary Russian the verb да(ва)ть is only partly grammaticalized as a causative auxiliary verb. This is correlated not only with the lexical meaning of the accusative-case direct object, but also with the occurrence or nonoccurrence of syntactic arguments in surface structure.¹² For example, sentence 11:

11. *Он дал вылечить зубы.

He^{NOM} gave/let heal^{INF} teeth^{ACC}

'He let (his) teeth be fixed' (i.e., 'He let [someone=Ø] fix [his] teeth').

[S [NP он] [VP [V̄ [V дал] [S PRO_i вылечить зубы]]] [NP e_i]]

is inadmissible, unless зубы is understood to mean "вставные зубы" 'artificial teeth, dentures,' which can be removed from the mouth and "given" to someone.¹³ However, if the empty NP in the

illustrated sentence is lexicalized, the resulting sentence is felicitous, cf. 12:

12. Он_j дал дантисту вылечить (себе_j) зубы.
 He^{NOM} let dentist^{DAT} heal^{INF} (himself^{DAT}) teeth^{ACC}
 'He_j let the dentist fix (his_j) teeth.'

[S[NP он_j] [VP[\bar{V} [V дал] [S PRO_i вылечить (себе_j) зубы]]
 [NP дантисту_i]]]

On the other hand, sentences in which the reflexive pronoun occurs as an accusative-case direct object are admissible whether a syntactic argument to which dative case is configurationally assigned is lexicalized or not, cf. the grammaticality of both sentences 13 and 14:

13. Иван дал себя побрить.
 Ivan^{NOM} let himself^{ACC} shave^{INF}
 'Ivan let himself be shaved.' (i.e., 'Ivan_j let [someone= \emptyset] shave him_j')

[S[NP Иван_j] [VP[\bar{V} [V дал] [S PRO_i побрить себя_j]]] [NP
 е_i]]]

14. Иван_j дал парикмахеру побрить себя_j.
 Ivan^{NOM} let barber^{DAT} shave^{INF} himself^{ACC}
 'Ivan_j let the barber shave him_j.'

[S[NP Иван_j] [VP[\bar{V} [V дал] [S PRO_i побрить себя_j]]] [NP
 парикмахеру_i]]]

The data presented thus far support the following observations: The verb да(ва)ть is completely grammaticalized as a causative auxiliary in conjunction with infinitive complements where the nonfinite verb either is intransitive or is transitive and syntactically governs a reflexive direct object that is coreferential with an animate subject. In such syntactic environments, the verb да(ва)ть also exhibits no ambiguity with respect to the meanings 'to let' vs. 'to give.' If the infinitive complement is an objectless transitive verb, there are no constraints on the occurrence of the verb да(ва)ть as a permissive causative auxiliary; however, the resulting sentence may be ambiguous with respect to the meanings 'to let' vs. 'to give.' If the infinitive complement consists of a transitive verb with an accusative-case direct object, the verb да(ва)ть cannot express the meaning 'to let' unless pragmatic or logical considerations connected with the lexical meaning of the direct object are concomitantly

compatible with the notion of “giving” (“manual transferability”), or unless these considerations can be obviated by the co-occurrence of a dative-case object in the sentence. In the first instance, ambiguity with respect to the meanings ‘to let’ vs. ‘to give’ arises; in the second instance, such ambiguity does not arise.

The following table summarizes the foregoing observations:

15. INFINITIVE COMPLEMENT GRAMMATICALIZATION AMBIGUITY EXAMPLES			
1	INTRANSITIVE VERB	COMPLETE	NO 2
2	TRANSITIVE VERB WITHOUT DIRECT OBJECT	COMPLETE	YES 9a,9b
3	TRANSITIVE VERB WITH DIRECT OBJECT	INCOMPLETE	YES/NO 8a,8b 10,11,12
4	TRANSITIVE VERB WITH REFLEXIVE DIRECT OBJECT (COREFERENTIAL WITH ANIMATE SUBJECT)	COMPLETE	NO 13,14

Ambiguity: ‘to give’ vs. ‘to have.’ The following four sentences and English translations appear in *A Phrase and Sentence Dictionary of Spoken Russian* (I reserve judgment regarding their acceptability):¹⁴

16a. Где здесь можно дать починить машину?

‘Where can I have the car fixed?’ (sic)

16b. Она дала переделать своё старое пальто.

‘She had her old coat made over.’

16c. Прежде чем строиться, вы бы лучше дали обмерить ваш участок.

‘Before you start building, you’d better have your land surveyed.’

16d. Мне придётся дать перевернуть эти манжеты.

‘I’ll have to have these cuffs turned up.’

In confronting native speakers with these sentences, I have encountered three problems. First, one speaker rejects 16a as long as the direct object *машину* is intended to mean ‘car.’ If, however, *машину* denotes a manually transferable machine that can be “given” to someone, the sentence is acceptable. Second, another native speaker interprets all four sentences as permissive causatives, i.e., as ‘Where can I *let* the car be fixed,’ ‘She *let* her old coat be made over,’ etc. Third, when confronted with the English factitive causative translations, i.e., ‘to have something done’ rather than ‘to let something be done,’ native speakers prefer using the prefixal derivative *отда(ва)ть* in place of *да(ва)ть*, if in fact one insists upon using a causative auxiliary verb at all. That is to say, the notion of ‘having something done,’ predominantly with verbs denoting

professional, service-type activ is normally implied
contextually.¹⁵ Thus, sentence 16a re naturally expressed in
Russian as sentence 17:

17. Где здесь можно починить машину?

Where here possible repair^{INF} car^{ACC}

'Where can one have a car repaired here?'

The 17-volume Academy Dictionary of the Russian language likewise imputes to the verb да(ва)ть factitive (in addition to permissive) causative meaning ("В сочетаниях с глаголом. 1. Поручать; заставляя, предоставляя что-либо делать, сделать."), and illustrates this causative meaning with the following sentence:

18. Была телеграфисткой, теперь служу в Городской
управе и ненавижу, и презираю всё, что мне только
дают делать.¹⁶

'I used to be a telegraph operator, but now I work in City Hall,
and I detest and despise every single thing they have me do.'

We may note for the time being that the last part of this sentence could just as meaningfully be expressed in English as 'everything single thing they *give* me to do.' This fact will be relevant to my conclusions.

In reconsidering the verb отда(ва)ть, we see that the meaning of this verb is 'to hand over, consign; to give back, render.' This verb occurs in a number of compounds with mostly deverbal nouns in the accusative case governed by the preposition в or на. Following is a list of examples:

19a. отда(ва)ть обувь в починку

consign^{INF} footwear^{ACC} to/for repair^{ACC}

'to have shoes repaired'

19b. отда(ва)ть часы в ремонт

consign^{INF} hours^{ACC} to/for repair^{ACC}

'to have a clock/watch fixed'

19c. отда(ва)ть костюм в чистку

consign^{INF} suit^{ACC} to/for cleaning^{ACC}

'to have a suit cleaned'

19d. отда(ва)ть кресло на перетяжку

consign^{INF} armchair^{ACC} to/for reupholstering^{ACC}

'to have an armchair reupholstered'

19e. отда(ва)ть платье в переделку

consign^{INF} dress^{ACC} to/for alteration^{ACC}

'to have a dress altered'

19f. отда(ва)ть рубашки в стирку
consign^{INF} shirts^{ACC} to/for laundering^{ACC}
'to have shirts laundered'

According to Ju. D. Apresjan, constructions of this type are "absolutely unambiguous" in denoting "causation of an action for one's benefit."¹⁷

The verb отда(ва)ть may also occur with an infinitive complement, as in examples 20a and 20b below:

20a. Я отдал (с)шить костюм портному.
I^{NOM} consign^{PF} sew^{INF} suit^{ACC} tailor^{DAT}
'I am having (was having) a suit made ("sewn") by a tailor.'

20b. Я отдавал (с)шить костюм портному.
I^{NOM} consigned^{IP} sew^{INF} suit^{ACC} tailor^{DAT}
'I had (had had) a suit made by a tailor.'

These examples are significant for two reasons. First, the Russian perfective past-tense verb отдал in 20a translates into English as 'I am having' or 'I was having.'¹⁸ This can be explained by the fact that we are dealing here with the verb in its primary lexical meaning 'to give, hand over.' The Russian perfective verb form here conveys resultative meaning; it expresses the notion that "I have given something to someone for the purpose of his doing something with it." Thus, if one states in Russian that one has given a tailor something to sew, one implies that one is now having a tailor sew it. Since any Russian verb has only one past tense, the verb may also signify that "I *had* given a tailor something to sew," ergo "I *was having* something sewn." The Russian use of perfective past-tense verb forms with resultative meaning to convey present states is common. Thus, the utterances *я устал* and *я привык* are usually understood to mean 'I am tired' and 'I am accustomed to,' resp., though they literally signify 'I have become tired' (hence, 'I am now tired') and 'I have accustomed myself to' (hence, 'I am now accustomed'). Sentence 20b likewise supports the assumption that we are not dealing here with any sort of causative auxiliary. In 20b, the imperfective aspect (отдавал) signifies that the result of the action has been annulled or reversed. In other words, "I gave a tailor something to sew and got it back from him," ergo "I had a tailor sew something."¹⁹

The second reason why examples 20a and 20b are significant is that, while not grammaticalized from the viewpoint of tense and aspect, the verb отда(ва)ть is grammaticalized to the extent that it is possible to "consign, hand over" to someone something that in

reality does not yet exist. The word костюм in examples 20a and 20b need not denote a suit that already exists and has been given to a tailor for the purpose of having it mended or altered; rather, it ordinarily denotes a suit that a tailor has yet to make.

In view of these facts and the ambiguous context in which the verb да(ва)ть occurs in the example from the 17-volume Academy Dictionary (see example 18), I am inclined to conclude that any factitive causative meaning (i.e., 'to have [somebody do something]') is not the result of grammaticalization, but rather a logical extension of the verb's primary meaning 'to give.'

Inanimate subjects and lexicalized compounds. In the foregoing discussion I have ignored inanimate subjects. Being nonvolitional, inanimate subjects cannot "have" someone do something, and, while they may perhaps "let" us do something, they more commonly "allow" or "permit" us to do something.²⁰

Aside from their occasional occurrence as grammatical subjects of lexicalized compounds, inanimate subjects in Russian typically occur in two types of да(ва)ть + infinitive constructions: (1) negated permissive, and (2) so-called modal passive. The first type is illustrated by examples 21 and 22:

21. Матовые стёкла, пропуская свет, не давали видеть
ничего происходящего на дворе.²¹

'The frosted panes of glass, although letting light (shine) through, did not allow (us=∅) to see anything happening outside.'

22. Ветерок из оврага нам спать не даст.²²

'The breeze from the ravine won't allow us to sleep.'

Modal passive constructions are those in which an inanimate sentence subject occurs with a reflexive direct object pronoun as in example 23:

23. Холод давал себя чувствовать.²³
(literally) 'The cold made itself felt.'

Analogous constructions in other Slavic languages have been classified as modal passives by R. Löttsch and M. Gehrman because their semantics are essentially permissive/potential rather than causative.²³ Thus, example 23 is considered to be synonymous with example 24:

24. Холод можно было чувствовать / Холод
чувствовался.

'It was possible to feel the cold.' ('The cold could be fe

Conclusions. Russian да(ва)ть represents two verbs: one autosemantic, signifying 'to give' ("да[ва]ть₁"), the other causative auxiliary, signifying 'to let' ("да[ва]ть₂"). The 'give' vs. 'let' ambiguity exhibited by some sentences should in no way detract from the postulation of two separate verbs: if we consider the ambiguity of the English sentence "He had the letter written when I arrived," then it is safe to conclude that the 'give' vs. 'let' ambiguity in Russian is likewise due to homonymy and not the incomplete grammaticalization of да(ва)ть as a causative auxiliary. Because of this homonymy, there exist severe syntactico-semantic constraints on the occurrence of да(ва)ть₂, imposed by pragmatic and logical considerations connected with the meaning of да(ва)ть₁. Such constraints allow us to speak only of an incomplete grammaticalization of what was originally, one assumes, a single autosemantic verb. Nevertheless, because да(ва)ть₂ can occur in some syntactic environments with which the notion of "giving" is pragmatically or logically inadmissible, we are justified in viewing the verb as a distinct lexical item.

With respect to factitive causative meaning, this is a contextually inferrable, logical extension of да(ва)ть₁ 'to give' and is not part of any "all-purpose" causative meaning inherent in the auxiliary да(ва)ть₂. The rôle of a factitive causative auxiliary verb in Russian has been only partly assumed by the prefixal derivative отда(ва)ть.

NOTES

1. R. Löttsch, "Zum Ausdruck der Kausativität in den slawischen Sprachen," in *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 17, 3 (1972), p. 369.

2. R. Löttsch, W. Fiedler, and K. Kostov, "Die Kategorie des Genus verbi in ihrem Verhältnis zu einigen verwandten morphologischen Kategorien," in *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*, ed. R. Löttsch and R. Ržička (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976), pp. 86-87.

3. The terminological and conceptual opposition between 'фактивная' and 'пермиссивная каузация' is established by V. P. Nedjalkov and G. G. Sil'nickij, "Типология морфологического и лексического каузативов," in *Типология каузативных конструкций. Морфологический каузатив*, ed. A. A. Xolodovič (Leningrad: "Nauka," 1969), p. 28.

4. G. H. Toops, "The Russian Verb да(ва)ть: Its Status as a Causative Auxiliary," in *University of Chicago Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4 (1988),

5. V. Radeva, "Die semantische Struktur des bulgarischen Verbs давам unter Berücksichtigung seiner Äquivalente im Deutschen," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 26, 5 (1981), 698; M. Korytkowska, *Bułgarskie czasowniki modalne* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo PAN, 1977), p. 59.
6. V. P. Nedjalkov and T. N. Nikitina, "О признаках аналитичности и служебности (на материале каузативных конструкций)," in *Аналитические конструкции в языках различных типов*, ed. V. M. Žirmunskij and O. P. Sunik (Moscow/Leningrad: "Nauka," 1965), pp. 188-189. Note that the statements concerning да(ва)ть + negated infinitive do not apply when да(ва)ть is used colloquially to signify "делать возможным" 'to make possible, enable', cf.: *Он даёт мне не думать о таких вещах, как магазин, кухня и т.д.* 'He makes it possible for me not to think about things like shopping, cooking, etc.'
7. See N. D. Arutjunova, *Предложение и его смысл. Логико-семантические проблемы* (Moscow: "Nauka," 1976), p. 59; V. P. Nedjalkov, *Каузативные конструкции в немецком языке. Аналитический каузатив* (Leningrad: "Nauka," 1971), p. 26; M. Shibatani, "The Grammar of Causative Constructions: A Conspectus," in *Syntax and Semantics. 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, ed. M. Shibatani (New York: Academic Press, 1976), p. 1; R. H. Wojcik, "Where do Instrumental NPs Come From?" in *Syntax and Semantics. 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, ed. M. Shibatani (New York: Academic Press, 1976), p. 171.
8. Nedjalkov and Nikitina, p. 190. According to G. E. Fielder, "Aspect of the Russian Infinitive Complement" (Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1983), pp. 230-234, the autosemantic позволить/позволять is, unlike the auxiliary да(ва)ть, both nonimplicative and ambiguous: besides meaning 'to allow,' it may mean 'да(ва)ть возможность' or 'to give permission.'
9. In the noncausative reading, the verb прочесть 'to read' expresses the purpose for which the book was given. I interpret this to be an embedded S with lexically empty NPs ("[in order that] e_i [= the daughter] read e_j [= the book]"). According to Fielder, p. 224, "[s]ince these...are 'will-extending' verbs according to Brecht's classification, they combine with infinitives which are derived from *čtoby* complements..."
10. It is unclear whether a lexically empty direct-object NP need be posited in the underlying structure of the causative sentence at all. Ambiguous sentences of this type appear to occur exclusively with the infinitives of verbs that are marked in dictionaries as being both transitive and intransitive (see, for example, S. I. Ožegov, *Словарь русского языка* (14th ed.), ed. N. Ju. Švedova (Moscow: "Russkij jazyk," 1982), p. 484: "поесть...2. чего и без доп. "). See I. A.

Mel'čuk, "О синтаксическом нуле," in *Типология пассивных конструкций. Диатезы и залогов*, ed. A. A. Xolodovič (Leningrad: "Nauka," 1974), p.353.

11. There appears to be a generation gap separating those who find such constructions acceptable and those who do not. The sentence *Я дал рабочим построить дом*, while initially accepted by younger teachers in Moscow, was later ridiculed by older Russians teaching in the United States. The following parallel construction appeared as a headline in a recent issue of *Аргументы и факты* (vol. 31, no 512 [4-10 August 1990], p. 3): "Дайте народу заработать валюту." The conceivable argument in this case that one cannot "give the people hard currency to earn" is obviously moot. Therefore, such logical considerations constraining the occurrence of these permissive causative constructions can no longer be taken seriously.

12. Syntactic arguments (actants) omissible in surface structure are of two types: (1) lexically unspecified (Rudolf Růžička, "Reflexive versus Nonreflexive Pronominalization in Modern Russian and Other Slavic Languages," in *Generative Grammar in Europe*, ed. F. Kiefer and N. Ruwet [Dordrecht: Reidel, 1973], p.450, semantically marks these as [- definite], [+human], [+anonymous], i.e., as indefinite anonymous human beings), and (2) lexically specified but semantically recoverable (cf. E. R. Klenin, "Russian Reflexive Pronouns and the Semantic Rôles of Noun Phrases in Sentences" [Ph. D. dissertation, Princeton Univ., 1974], p. 37: "Of course, the lexically unspecified NPs must be distinguished from NPs which are lexically specified but omitted from the surface structure.")

13. The sentence *Он дал полечить зубы*, however, was accepted by one Russian-speaking informant. The context provided by the informant was that of a cooperative child opening his mouth so that a dentist could work on his teeth. The acceptability of this sentence appears to be correlated with the use of *полечить* 'to treat, work on (someone's teeth)' in place of *вылечить* 'to cure, heal, fix (someone's teeth)' as well as with a fourth use of *да(ва)ть* not considered in this article, i.e., its use as a nonreflexive counterpart to *да(ва)ться* 'to yield, submit to.'

14. *A Phrase and Sentence Dictionary of Spoken Russian* (Dover: New York, 1958), reprint of U.S. War Department Technical Manual TM30-944, *Dictionary of Spoken Russian*, pp. 73, 110, 182, and 197.

15. G. H. Toops, "Russian Contextual Causatives," in *Slavic and East European Journal*, 31, 4 (1987): pp. 595-611.

16. *Словарь современного русского литературного языка*, 17 vols. (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1950-65), vol. 4, p. 522.

17. Ju. D. Apresjan, *Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства*

языка (Moscow: "Nauka," 1974), p. 209.

18. I am grateful to professor Anelya Rugaleva of the Ohio State University for bringing this to my attention.

19. This property of the imperfective aspect of a number of Russian verbs is described in numerous grammars and textbooks. See, for example, F. M. Borras and R. F. Christian, *Russian Syntax*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1971), pp. 131-132.

20. A similar situation appears to obtain in Russian. Factitive causation in sentences with nonvolitional subjects (e.g., circumstances, reified natural forces, etc.) is expressed with the verb заставить/заставлять 'to force, make (somebody do something)' (e.g., *Дождь заставил её вернуться домой* 'The rain made her return home' - see S. D. Kasnel'son, *Типология языка и речевое мышление* [Leningrad: "Nauka," 1972], pp. 85-86) and various synonyms (обяз[ыв]ать 'to oblige,' побудить/побуждать 'to induce,' понудить/понуждать, принудить/принуждать, вынудить/вынуждать 'to compel, constrain'). Permissive causation is expressed by the verb позволить/позволять (cf. Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut russkogo jazyka, *Словарь русского языка*, 2nd ed., 4 vols., ed. A. P. Evgen'eva [Moscow: "Russkij jazyk," 1983], vol. 3, p. 237).

21. *Словарь современного русского литературного языка*, vol. 4, p. 523.

22. *Словарь русского языка*, vol. 1, p. 366. Non-negated permissive constructions with inanimate subjects appear to occur primarily as "echoes" of negated ones, cf.: *Ветер не давал идти. Ну, ветер давал идти, но с трудом* 'The wind made it impossible to walk; well, the wind did allow us to walk, but with difficulty'.

23. *Словарь современного русского литературного языка*, vol. 4, p. 522.

24. Cf. R. Lötzsch, "Die modalen Passivformen der modernen obersorbischen Literatursprache," in *Letopis Instituta za serbski ludospyt: Rjad A*, 20, 2 (1973), pp. 142-150; M. Gehrmann, "Zu den polnischen Entsprechungen modalpassivischer Konstruktionen im Deutschen," in *Zeitschrift fur Slawistik*, 28, 1 (1983), pp. 9-17.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SUPERScript ABBREVIATIONS

ACC = accusative case
DAT = dative case
GEN = genitive case
INF = infinitive

IP = imperfective aspect
NOM = nominative case
PRE = prepositional case
PF = perfective aspect