



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Anastasia A. Bonch-Osmolovskaya*

**THE STATISTIC VERIFICATION  
OF A SEMANTICALLY BASED  
HYPOTHESES: RUSSIAN VERBS  
OF VOLITION: *XOTETЬ* AND  
*XOTETЬСЯ***

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 22/LNG/2015

*Anastasia A. Bonch-Osmolovskaya*<sup>1</sup>

**THE STATISTIC VERIFICATION OF A SEMANTICALLY  
BASED HYPOTHESES: RUSSIAN VERBS OF VOLITION:  
*XOTETЬ AND XOTETЬCЯ*<sup>2</sup>**

This paper investigates the semantic distribution of two morphological forms of the Russian verb of volition *xotеть*. Three hypotheses for semantic grounds for the grammatical distribution are proposed. The hypotheses are checked by statistical analysis of distribution of the infinitive made on the data obtained from the National Russian Corpus. The analysis reveals groups of verbs which show more deviation in their behavior when used with one of the volition verbs than would be expected. The results of the analysis do not favor any of the preliminary hypotheses. A close-up look at the semantics of the constructions with the infinitives that show non-standard behavior helps to understand the semantic opposition realized by the two constructions.

Keywords: Russian language, construction grammar, desiderative constructions, quantitative methods in linguistics

JEL Classification: Z

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics. Faculty of Humanities. School of Linguistics. Associate Professor email: abonch@hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> This study (research grant No 14-01-0191) was supported by The National Research University–Higher School of Economics’ Academic Fund Program in 2014-2015.

## 1. Introduction

The research presented in this paper follows the method of collocation analysis, introduced in [Stefanowitsch, Gries 2003] and [Gries, Stefanowitsch 2004], which distinguishes subtle semantic differences between a pair of grammatically and lexically close word forms. This semantic difference is revealed in the behavior of lexemes that contribute to the constructions and demonstrate strong preference for one of the pair. This research considers the two verbs of volition that coincide in their lexical root, but differ in their morphosyntactic structure: the verb *хотеть* and its derivative *хотеться*.

The main Russian volition verb *хотеть* ‘want’ forms a derivative with the help of reflexive/passive affix *-ся*. The nominative subject receives dative marking, while the object mainly keeps the same marking of partitive genitive:

1. *Я хочу хлеба.*
2. *Мне хочется хлеба.*

How do the two constructions differ in meaning? What is the basis for the choice that the speaker makes between these two? This paper gives a data driven answer to these questions. Section 2 formulates the hypothesis that there is a connection between the semantic characteristics of the volition verb and its infinitive. Section 3 defines the research methodology using a collocation analysis of corpus data. Section 4 considers closely the contextual meanings of the infinitives which are attracted to one of the desiderative constructions in order to determine some semantic invariants of the two constructions.

## 2. The hypotheses of Russian desiderative semantic distribution

There are three possible ways to interpret the semantic processes accompanying the verbal derivation and agent demotion of *хотеться*. I will call them *the De-agentive Hypothesis*, *the Experiential Hypothesis*, and *the Modal Hypothesis*. Though tightly interconnected, each of them profiles a specific semantic property in the opposition of the two constructions:

- a) De-agentive derivation: due to the valency decreasing derivation, the nominative subject receives dative marking, and the situation denoted by the verb is interpreted as uncontrolled by the main participant [Guiraud Weber 1984], cf. for example verbal pairs in (3) and (4)

3. *Он хорошо работал.*
4. *Ему хорошо работалось.*

- b) Experiential construction: the *-ся* derivation is used to form a dative subject experiential construction, where dative is used for semantic coding of the experiencer, the participant that experiences psychological or emotional state. Most of dative experiential verbs in Russian possess the *-ся* affix, even those which cannot be related to nominative pairs, cf *нравиться* ‘like’, *казаться* ‘seem’. This interpretation focuses the experiential role of the undergoer of the desiderative state [Бонч-Осмоловская 2003].
- c) The scope of modal meanings: the basic form expresses intentional volition (plans and intentions) while the derived form with *-ся* is used to denote deontic modality, when the desire is caused by the need of the protagonist to change its current state [Khanina 2008].

Let us consider some examples where the same infinitives follow both the desiderative forms<sup>3</sup>.

5. *Я хочу спать, мне завтра с утра на работу. [Татьяна Моспан. Подиум]*
6. *Всем хотелось спать, даже Коле, хоть ему и было ужасно жалко тратить время на сон. [Вера Белоусова. Жил на свете рыцарь бедный]*
7. *Поднес ее ко рту и хотел пить. [Евгений Попов. Отрицание жилета]*
8. *Колюнчику очень хочется пить, он облизывает пересохшие губы, тихо стонет и оказывается в тёмной комнате с бесформенным существом. [Алексей Варламов. Кунавна]*

The context of the matrix verb in (5) and (7) gives evidence for its intentional interpretation: the subject has a rational plan to accomplish some activity, while *хотеться* in (6) and (8) expresses subject’s inner desire for the action, denoted by the infinitive, whether or not there is the possibility of carrying it out.

In (1–4), the participant, marked with dative as a result of the derivation, loses its property of control, thus two kinds of volition are opposed: the “controlled” one, being understood as active intention, and the non-controlled volition which is understood as inner necessity. So far, the examples (5–8) illustrate both the De-agentive and Modal Hypotheses revealing the ways they are connected. It is more difficult to exemplify the experiencer

---

<sup>3</sup> All the examples have been taken from the National Corpus of Russian Language ([www.ruscorpora.ru](http://www.ruscorpora.ru))

hypothesis, as both desiderative forms do express an inner state. *Хотеться* is not used with inanimates while *хотеть* allows metaphoric and metonymic extensions:

9. *Но ведь ваш театр ее не хочет играть, зачем же вам она? [М.А. Булгаков. Театральный роман]*
10. ?? *Но ведь вашему театру не хочется ее играть, зачем же вам она?*

The examples above are given to demonstrate the semantic difference between the two constructions. At the same time they are insufficient to understand whether we are dealing with specific diagnostic contexts which reveal the semantic opposition, or whether this distinction is realized in a much broader way. It is hard to say whether the opposition of the two types of desiderative meanings is relevant only for some particular class of verbs (for example verbs of physiological needs, such as sleep or drink) or it appears one way or another with different types of predicates. The notion of a control parameter used for verbs of volition is a separate issue. How does the overall meaning of the construction rely on the semantic properties (e.g. control) of the dependent infinitive? Are there any semantic constraints on the construction if the matrix and dependent predicates differ in control parameter?

It seems that the core semantic parameter of the infinitive which influences its compatibility with one of these constructions is the possibility of its main participant controlling the initiation of the action. So far, the active intent construction would be possible only with those predicates which can be started by the agent, while volition as an inner state would introduce an event that begins irrespective of the will of its protagonist. These relations are summarized in Table 1:

Table 1: Compatibility of control parameters of volition verbs and infinitives

	INF [+control]	INF [-control]
ХОТЕТЬ [+control]	[+control]	?
ХОТЕТЬСЯ [-control]	?	[-control]

The filled cells of the table reflect the hypothesis that there is an impact of the +/- control parameter of the dependent infinitive on the choice of the desiderative construction. The value of the parameter is, presumably, preserved if it coincides with the same value of the matrix verb. If not, there could be several strategies to resolve a semantic conflict:

- a) the compatibility of infinitives and desideratives which have the opposite control parameter is constrained or very limited;
- b) the meaning of the dependent verb is reinterpreted so that its control parameter matches the semantic properties of the matrix verb
- c) the meaning of the desiderative verb is reinterpreted so that its control parameter matches the semantic properties of the dependent verb;
- d) the entire construction gets a different non-desiderative meaning.

The core strategies can be identified with the help of an analysis of the infinitive distribution with both desiderative constructions. For this purpose a statistical model based on the corpus material was created.

### 3. Methodology

A selection of the Russian National Corpus (about 9,5 m tokens ) was used for the research. The selection was formed by two searches: 1) *хотеть* + inf and 2) *хотеться* +inf. The maximum distance between *хотеть(ся)* and the infinitive was 2 tokens, and the phrases with infinitives preceding desideratives of infinitives did not get into the selection. The sample contains 6839 instances: 4998 *хотеть* and 1391 *хотеться*.

The lists of infinitives were extracted out of the sample, the usages of the each infinitive with each desiderative verb were counted and a threshold 15 instances was set, i.e. only infinitives with frequent usages were considered. Thus the data consisted of the overall frequency of the both desiderative constructions with an infinitive and the frequencies of the each infinitive in the each construction.

We used binomial distribution to calculate distributions of the infinitives. The expectations were calculated as the probabilities of each construction:

The probability of *хотеть* construction is 0,78:

$$P = \frac{4998}{6839} = 0,78$$

and the probability of *хотеться* is 0,23

$$1 - P = 0,23$$

Let us claim independence of the infinitive choice from the semantic characteristics of the desiderative construction as a null hypothesis. In other words we would expect that any infinitive from our list will be used with *хотеть* with a probability of 0,78 and with *хотеться* with probability of 0,23. For each infinitive on our list, we test this hypothesis at a significance level of 5% to find the actual distribution of desiderative structures is compared to the predicted one. If the probability of the observed or a greater deviation turns out to be over 0.05, then the null hypothesis stating that the use of infinitive is not related to the construction type cannot be rejected. Otherwise, the frequency of the given infinitive does depend on the construct.

The null hypothesis was tested by evaluating the tails of the binomial distribution:

$$P = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1 - p)^{n-k}$$

where  $n$  is the number of times the infinitive was used in a desiderative construction;  $k$  is the overall number the infinitive was used in both desiderative constructions; and  $p$  is the probability of *хотеть* and  $1 - p$  is the probability of *хотеться*. Table 2 illustrates the calculation for three infinitives<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> The following legend is used in table 2:

**inf:** infinitive

**dat:** number of occurrences with *хотеться*,

**nom:** number of occurrences with *хотеть*

Table 2: Distribution of three infinitives with desiderative constructions

inf	dat	nom	total	observed	expected	bi	Result
жить	12	24	36	0,770	0,78	0,827	equal
дать	3	36	39	0,923	0,78	0,032	nom
увидеть	24	36	60	0,600	0,78	0,002	dat

The model determines three groups of infinitives:

1. the nominative group: infinitives which are attracted to the nominative desiderative construction: *сказать* ‘say’, *знать* ‘know’, *жениться* ‘marry’, *давать* ‘give’, *помогать* ‘help’, *понимать* ‘understand’ ().
2. the dative group: infinitives which are attracted to the dative desiderative construction: *верить* ‘believe’, *увидеть* ‘see (get sight of)’, *пить* ‘drink’, *плакать* ‘shed tears’, *делиться* ‘share’, *есть* ‘eat’, *спать* ‘sleep’, *крикнуть* ‘shout’, *думать* ‘think’
3. the normal group: infinitives whose distribution corresponds to the distribution of the desiderative constructions: *быть* ‘be’, *брать* ‘take’, *жить* ‘live’, *делать* ‘make’, *говорить* ‘talk’, *иметь* ‘have’, *стать* ‘become’, *спросить* ‘ask’, *услышать* ‘hear’.

The three groups are heterogeneous: each involves verbs of different lexical classes and of different values of the control parameter. This leads us to conclude that the control parameter may not be the crucial property which defines semantic compatibility with one or other construction. Below I suggest that a semantic analysis of the contexts of occurrences for each infinitive of the nominative and dative groups. The main objective of this analysis is to reveal the

---

**total**: number of occurrences of the infinitive in both constructions,  
**observed**: observed probability of occurrences with *хотеть*  
**expected**: expected probability of *хотеть* with any infinitive,  
**bi**: p-value of observed probability  
**result**: inference on the type of infinitive behavior:  
equal: normal distribution  
nom: infinitive is attracted to *хотеть*  
dat: infinitive is attracted to *хотеться*



semantic properties of each construction and to identify any subtle semantic contrast which distinguishes the use of the two constructions in the normal group as well.

## 4. Semantics of desiderative constructions

### 4.1. Verbs of the nominative group

Four of the six infinitives in the nominative group occur mainly with *хотеть*, their usage with *хотеться* is rare: these are the verbs *давать* ‘give’, *жениться* ‘marry’, *помогать* ‘help’ and *понимать* ‘understand’. There are no examples of the verb *жениться* ‘marry’ with dative desiderative constructions in our selection, and in the Russian National Corpus there are only 11 occurrences of *хотеться жениться*. This fact points to some specific semantics of *жениться* which makes its usage within dative desiderative construction unlikely.

The aspectual class of the verb *жениться* is classified as an achievement. At the same time this lexical item usually refers to much more complicated sequence of events (which includes “preparing for the marriage”) which lasts for some time. These pre-events are not defined lexically but they are determined by socio-cultural frame. The verb of volition is used in this case in the function of immediant/inchoative marker and marks the beginning of the preliminary “preparation” period. Indeed if we consider the marriage frame, the declaration of intent (X wants to marry Y) is regarded as a first performative act which essential to realize the event (11).

11. — *Хорошо, — сказала я. — Ты хотел жениться на мне. Я согласна.* [Алексей Славовский. *100 лет спустя. Письма нерожденному сыну*]

Thus, the desiderative nominative construction is interpreted in this case as a point of initiation of the preliminary scenario, which is initiated by the subject and may lead to a change of state *to be married*. The preliminary scenario idea is also valid for other verbs of the nominative group, for example the verb *помочь* ‘help’ (12).

12. — *Если хочешь помочь, уезжай немедленно.* [Борис Васильев. *Дом, который построил Дед*]

13. *Ты разбередил мне душу. И я очень хочу помочь тебе. Я же вижу твою хватку.* [Вальтер Запашный. *Риск. Борьба. Любовь*]

The micro events of which the help event consists can be absolutely different, but what is important is that the scenario of the “help” accomplishment begins only at the moment the agents fixes the point of its initiation (i.e. the agent regards actions he is going to perform as help). The desiderative construction is used to designate the starting point of agent’s involvement.

The verb *дать* ‘give’ also has this interpretation. ‘To give’ is broadly used as a light verb in desiderative nominative construction: *дать оценку, дать несколько секунд, дать почитать, дать слово, дать концерт, дать понять*, where it functions as an initiation point of the event itself. The volition verb functions as an inchoative marker, emphasizing the starting point of this initiation.

When used in the past tense, nominative desiderative constructions usually express an avertive meaning: the action started but did not end successfully so that no change of state occurred, (14–15):

14. *Олег хотел помочь, но тот уже нажал кнопку звонка. [Виктор Мясников. Водка]*
15. *У Лени бывали страстные влюбленности, и каждый раз он хотел жениться. [Зоя Масленникова. Близкие Бориса Пастернака]*

In the avertive meaning, the agent initiated the preliminary scenario but then failed to complete the action. Avertive semantics are consistently associated with nominative desiderative constructions.

Two experiential verbs, one of them a state verb, also belong to nominative group: *знать* ‘know’ and *понимать* ‘understand’. These predicates refer to non-controlled events and at first sight their attraction to nominative construction is quite unexpected and they behave differently in the nominative desiderative context.

Though the verb *знать* ‘know’ represents a prototypical example of a state verb, the state cannot be attained without a consequence of activities. Although some information is possible to know accidentally, it is important that knowledge is perceived as the result of directed activities. The activities depend mainly on the subject of the verb, and may have (reading, interrogating, investigating) or may have not lexical denotation. Still as in the cases analyzed above the construction *хотеть знать* ‘want to know’ initiates a scenario of actions that have to be performed to attain a certain state of knowledge.

16. *На мой взгляд, если мы хотим знать свое прошлое, если нам не безразлична наша история, то мы должны знать и вспоминать людей, оставивших в этой истории свой след.*

The desiderative construction with *знать* is often used with a logophoric function, being a marker of a question content:

17. *Он выкатил главное: — Я хочу знать, кто их убил. [Александр Терехов. Каменный мост]*

Nominative constructions with *понимать* ‘understand’ occur mainly with negation. Only 3 examples from the 17 instances of the sample are used in a positive context.

18. *Но он просто не хотел понимать, что могут быть какие-то фантазии, не признавал никаких отклонений от того, что сам считал нормой. [Владимир Войнович. Монументальная пропаганда]*

Negation of the nominative desiderative resolves the discrepancy of control parameter in the matrix and dependent predicate. An experiencer’s refusal to understand is interpreted as a controlled event: the experiencer deliberately does not initiate any scenario that can cause understanding as a result. This construction is often used as a rhetoric manipulative expression that imputes responsibility for event to the experiencer.

19. *К сожалению, этого не понимают или не хотят понимать некоторые руководители- «силовики». [Геннадий Трошев. Моя война]*

The negative semantic impact of the nominative desiderative is often used with other experiential predicates, such as *знать* ‘know’, or *верить* ‘believe’ (the latter being an infinitive of the dative group).

20. *Авторы НХ не знают или не хотят знать, что уже двести лет существует научная дисциплина, разрабатывающая методы отличения родственных слов от случайно созвучных, — сравнительно-историческое языкознание. [А. А. Зализняк. Лингвистика по А. Т. Фоменко]*
21. *Новичками мы, работавшие в спортивных отделах, не хотели верить, когда вернувшийся с планерки Тарасов коротко передавал нам содержание редакторских речей и сообщал, какие из наших материалов выкидываются из номера, а какие сокращаются.*

Finally, the nominative desiderative construction with the verb *сказать* 'say' can express two meanings which have been already considered above. This is first of all logophoric meaning: announcement of intention to say serves as a discourse marker which is used to introduce the content of the speech:

22. *Хочу сказать, что каким угодно — но смешным в этой поездке Высоцкий не был ни минуты. [Давид Каранетян. Владимир Высоцкий. Воспоминания]*
23. *Я хочу сказать — обстоятельства сложились так, что он никого не убил, поскольку его опередили... [Вера Белоусова. Второй выстрел]*

Secondly it can be used in the avertive meaning in the past tense: the agent initiated the action but could not accomplish it because of some external reasons:

24. *Та что-то хотела сказать, но вмешался неугомонный гость: [Роман Солнцев. Полураспад. Из жизни А. А. Левушкина-Александрова, а также анекдоты о нем]*
25. *Я хотел сказать что-то, но у меня перехватило в горле. [Михаил Шишкин. Всех ожидает одна ночь]*

Finally, it can be used both as a logophoric expression and an avertive construction, when the speaker suggests some alternative wording to an inaccurate or anticipated utterance:

26. *Почему-то я сразу понял, что он имеет в виду. — Ты хочешь сказать, что он... оттуда? Из органов? [Вера Белоусова. Второй выстрел]*

27. *Она чё-то хочет сказать и не может, — заключил старший над землекопами, Толик Аржанов. — Она хочет сказать,—тихо молвил дядя Вася, — что поминать покойного негде и не на что. [Виктор Астафьев. Пролетный гусь]*

The semantic analysis of the nominative desiderative construction rests on cases of infinitives which show deviant behavior and co-occur with this construction more frequently than a stochastic distribution would predict. It can be assumed that this deviation is the result of a perfect match between the semantics which the construction implies, and the lexical properties of the infinitive predicate. The basic meaning of the nominative construction is the initiation of the preliminary scenario that sets the conditions for the event to occur. This construction is often used with those verbs which semantically accord with the idea of a discrete point of initiation but at the same time this point is lexically unspecified. The logophoric, avertive and negative meanings of the nominative desiderative construction expand the basic concept: the volition verb is used to introduce a logophoric event, or to mark either its start in spite of further failure or its not-starting in spite of the speaker's intentions. These constructional meanings are also exploited within the 'normal' group of verbs and the dative group, though in the latter case the choice of the dative desiderative construction will dominate.

#### **4.2. Verbs of the dative group**

The infinitives of the dative group consist of three experiential verbs—*верить* 'believe', *думать* 'think', *увидеть* 'see, catch sight of', four verbs of the physiological sphere, which differ in control parameter—*есть* 'eat', *пить* 'drink', *плакать* 'shed tears', *спать* 'sleep', and also two unexpected agentive verbs *поделиться* 'share' and *крикнуть* 'shout'. The scope of possible meanings of the dative desiderative construction with each of these infinitives is considered below.

The dative desiderative construction is used with the verbs *есть* 'eat', *пить* 'drink', *плакать* 'shed tears', *спать* 'sleep' to denote the specific state of the subject, which should be overcome by the action denoted by the infinitive. This state is physiological in the sense that it occurs not because of the agent's will but as a result of some natural reaction to the agent's being short of food, drink or sleep or undergoing emotional stress. The fact that the state which causes the action of the infinitive is not initiated by the agent makes the control parameter of the action itself irrelevant: it may be controlled by the agent (eat, drink) or not (sleep, shed tears):

28. *Мне очень хотелось спать и вовсе не хотелось каши, а Лена ела и хвалила.*

29. *В Москве, на вокзале, нас протащили через людской водоворот, и мы долго сидели в каком-то служебном помещении и ждали отца. Нам с братом хотелось есть.*  
[Софья Пилявская. Грустная книга]
30. *Ей хотелось присесть. Ей хотелось пить. Ей хотелось выбраться из закрытого наглухо помещения — обычной, ничем не примечательной комнаты с выцветшими обоями и паркетным полом, которая тем не менее выглядела очень злоеце.*  
[Марианна Баконина. Школа двойников]
31. *Я сидел обессиленный: до смерти хотелось спать.* [Давид Карапетян. Владимир Высоцкий. Воспоминания]
32. *Глядя на нее, мне всегда хотелось плакать, не знаю почему, может, от счастья видеть ее красоту.* [Людмила Гурченко. Аплодисменты]

Nevertheless these infinitives also occur within the nominative desiderative construction, though less frequently than expected. The nominative semantics follow the scope of meaning defined in (4.1). The construction is used to denote immediate future, as in (33), see also (1):

33. *Только теперь он ощутил, что нестерпимо хочет есть. Они уговорили с Петяевой почти две бутылки водки, но сытной закуской хозяйка центра знакомств его не побаловала. Через несколько минут под одобряющим взглядом пожилой женщины он запихивал в рот полные ложки любимого блюда, задорно хрустел квашеной капустой.* [Сергей Романов. Парламент]

or in the avertive meaning: (34–35):

34. *Через час в больнице завтрак. Понимаю, что хочу есть. И что еды у меня с собой нет.* [Олег Гладов. Любовь стратегического назначения]
35. *Мне уже эта история изрядно надоела, я умираю хотела спать, — полночи ушло на сборы Саши и его отъезд на вокзал, а мне самой предстояло через несколько часов улетать в Израиль, и у меня еще было полно дел.* [Нина Воронель. Без прикрас. Воспоминания]

or in the context of denying the necessity of the action (36–37):

36. *Я не хочу есть, я только что поела... в библиотеке. [Вера Белоусова. Жил на свете рыцарь бедный]*
37. *Кассио долго отнекивается, не хочет пить — ему доступны и более возвышенные удовольствия жизни, — но и отказывается неуверенно. [В. Иванов. «Отелло» на перекрестке эпох (Заметки об истолковании героя и некоторых проблемах режиссуры А.Эфроса)]*

The nominative desiderative is also used if the verb has a slightly different meaning, not denoting a physiological need, for example, *есть* ‘to have means of maintenance’ (38), *пить* ‘to consume alcohol’ (39), *пить* ‘to drink one chosen drink of many’ (40). This interpretation also implies a set up scenario which the agent has to carry on to arrive to success:

38. *На веранде сидел бородатый нищий со сворой прижавшихся друг к другу маленьких грязных собак и выставленной перед ними картонкой с текстом: «Мы тоже хотим есть». [Владимир Войнович. Монументальная пропаганда]*
39. *Он спросил, что я хочу пить, но я ещё не ориентировался в названиях напитков, да и был в большом напряжении. [Владимир Голяховский. Русский доктор в Америке]*
40. *Почему вы не пьете, господин Пастухов? Не хотите пить за фашиста? Или не хотите пить с неудачником? [Виктор Левашов. Заговор патриота]*

The usage of the nominative construction with the verb *спать* seems symptomatic. In (41) the meaning of *спать* is not an actual physiological state but the idea of sleeping in a special way which is understood as the subject’s deliberate intention:

41. *Я только хочу спать, как спал в детстве, просыпаясь и снова засыпая в утренней истоме, под дождь, метель, в нагретой солнцем постели, вздрагивая ресницами и засыпая, — вот так научиться не вскакивать, как только свет разлепит глаза, и ты мигом вспомнишь, что с тобой скоро сделают.*

It can be assumed in general that the reinterpretation of an uncontrolled event as an action which is performed in a specific way is a core semantic strategy that allows the usage of the nominative desiderative construction with patientive verbs. Let us consider a few examples with the verb *умирать* ‘die’, which showed a normal distribution between the two constructions:

42. — *Я хочу умереть за идеалы, я готов... я хочу умереть... за... идеалы... [Давид Карапелян. Владимир Высоцкий. Воспоминания]*
43. *Я ответил Ирине резко: — Я хочу умереть хирургом. Пусть я лучше свалюсь замертво возле операционного стола, чем буду медленно загнивать над микроскопом или томиться в длинных беседах с психами. [Владимир Голяховский. Русский доктор в Америке]*

In other words, though it is difficult to initiate and control the event of sleeping or death, the subject pretends to control the conditions or the intrinsic spirit of the event: this meaning is expressed by the choice of the verb *хотеть*.

In much the same way the nominative desiderative is used with the verb *увидеть*, which is an infinitive of the dative group, i.e. occurs with *хотеться* more frequently. The dative volition verb emphasizes the idea of an accidental event, while the nominative construction denotes the idea of the experiencer's influence on the circumstances that stipulate the event, see examples (44–46):

44. *Кому из нас не хотелось увидеть Японию?*
45. — *И я пошел туда, потому что мне было интересно посмотреть на их лица, ты понимаешь? Я хотел увидеть их глаза! А потом всех простил, всех! [Михаил Шишкин. Всех ожидает одна ночь]*
46. *Леночка поставила вазу на стол и мило улыбнулась Сергею, как бы давая понять, что догадывается: приход к начальнику — лишь предлог, Сергей хотел увидеть именно ее... [Анатолий Мельник. Авторитет]*

The experiential verbs *верить* and *думать*, which also fall into the dative group, have a valency for a complement clause. Sentences with these verbs in a desiderative construction consists of three clauses: [*хотеть(ся)*][*верить/думать*,[*что P*]]. The nature of the semantic relation between the volition verb and the dependent clause of the infinitive is interesting. The verbs *верить* and *думать* do not imply the truth value of the proposition P of their complement. At the same time from the subject's point of view the proposition of the dependent clause is true with very high probability.



47. *И я рядом с ним, подавая ему с земли палку, абсолютно верила, что Олег действительно ничего не видит.* [Людмила Гурченко. *Аплодисменты*]
48. *Те, кто ехал в автобусе, думали, что она в машине, а ехавшие в машине, что в автобусе, и лишь когда через полтора часа, проторчав в пробках, добрались до далёкого и непрестижного Домодедовского кладбища, обнаружилось, что её нигде нет.* [Алексей Варламов. *Купавна*]

The dative desiderative construction decreases the probability of P for the subject of *верить* and *думать*. The situation P is viewed as a possible and desirable but not mandatory.

49. *Они для меня и после Анны остались родными людьми, хочется верить, что и я для них тоже.* [Татьяна Тарасова, Виталий Мелик-Карамов. *Красавица и чудовище*]
50. *И хочется верить, что он удовлетворится этим решением и не захочет устраивать скандал.* [Виктор Левашов. *Заговор патриота*]
51. *Хочется думать, что Вера с ее богатыми природными данными попадет когда-нибудь в общество высококонравственных людей, которые помогут ей развить положительные качества ее натуры.* [Александр Морозов. *Прежние слова*]

The meaning of the dative desiderative could be described in this case as follows:

$$X \text{ верит/думает, что } P \rightarrow \text{Pr}(P) \approx 1$$

$$X\text{-у хочется верить/думать, что } P \rightarrow \text{Pr}(P) > 0$$

The verb *крикнуть* stands apart in the dative group, as it is neither experiential, nor a verb of physical state—it denotes a controlled action. The frequency of its occurrence in the context of the dative desiderative construction is much higher than expected. The analysis of the contexts shows that *хотеться крикнуть* expresses an irrealis modality. In contrast to the avertive meaning of *хотеть*, which denotes cancellation or failure of the action of the infinitive, the action of *хотеться крикнуть* cannot even start to perform in the given world. (52–53):

52. *И каждый раз вслед мотоциклисту хотелось крикнуть почему-то только одно слово: «Мерзавец!»* [Фазиль Искандер. *Понемногу о многом*]

53. *Когда меня заматывает жизнь, когда начинаешь клясть все и всех, теряешь веру в людей и тебе хочется крикнуть, как однажды я услышал вопль одного очень известного человека: «Я не хочу быть с людьми, я хочу быть с собаками!» [Виктор Розов. Удивление перед жизнью]*

The action, (*крикнуть*), controlled by the agent is interpreted as a desirable but impossible event in the actual circumstances, which are beyond the agent's control. The same meaning is realized in dative desiderative constructions with other verbs of the non-dative group, for example with speech verbs *сказать* or *спросить*:

54. *Кате очень хотелось спросить, откуда Тамаре известно про Линькова и про пистолет, но она не осмелилась. [Татьяна Моспан. Подиум]*

55. *В первую минуту мне хотелось сказать: «Я не одна, я с мужем». И вдруг меня ударило — идиотка старая! Он остался в машине с двумя батонами, а я пошла с сумочкой, в которой парижское издание ГУЛАГа! Конечно, я ничего не сказала о муже. [Нина Воронель. Без прикрас. Воспоминания]*

Finally, the last verb of the dative group *поделиться* has, in all examples, a meaning to share information:

56. *Вера Алексеевна, чисто вымытая хозяйственным мылом учительница-дева, была переполнена явлением новой родни, ей хотелось поделиться новостями с кем-то, рассказать про Астру («молодежная стрижка, как-то даже неловко, когда открытая шея при наличии дряблости»), про некую Лилию Ивановну («молодая вдова, осталась в большой квартире, потолки три пятьдесят»). [Галина Щербакова. Восхождение на холм царя Соломона с коляской и велосипедом]*

The event *поделиться* would be successful if there is one more participant—the receiver who the agent does not control. Even if the event takes place, the agent may not be sure that he has succeeded in sharing:

57. Видимо, вложила в роль нечто драгоценное, чем хотелось поделиться со зрителем. [Виктор Розов. Удивление перед жизнью]

At the same time, the nominative desiderative construction with this verb is used mostly to denote logophoric, immediant or avertive meaning.

58. И тут хочу поделиться одной своей мыслью, которая не перестает мучить меня и по сей день. [Анатолий Адоскин. Искусство, которое не прекратится никогда]

59. Сорин сначала расстроился, поскольку хотел поделиться с подругой неожиданно открывшимися новыми обстоятельствами, однако потом успокоился и решил, что побыть одному ему тоже не помешает. [Петр Галицкий. Цена Шагала]

We have considered all the infinitives that fall into the dative group. Ultimately the basic meaning of the dative desiderative construction is the lack of subject's control over the situation which immediately precedes the event described by the infinitive. In other words unlike *хотеть*, *хотеться* emphasizes the idea that the subject's will is insufficient to start the event of the infinitive: there are some circumstances—external/non-controlled by the subject—which determine the initiation of the event. This is the core idea for verbs of physiological actions, the properties of the preliminary state may be set lexically, as for the verbs *есть*, *пить*, or may rest unspecified as in *плакать*, *спать*. Verbs of propositional attitude, such as *верить*, *думать*, are used within dative desiderative construction to convey the same idea by changing the subject's attitude to the probability of the events denoted by the complement clause. Finally, the case of *крикнуть* shows that a controlled action can be interpreted as socially impossible in the current situation and the dative construction as a whole is used as a shift to irrealis modality.

## 5. Discussion

Several hypotheses on the semantic bases of the opposition between the two forms *хотеть* and *хотеться* were made in section (2): the De-agentive Hypothesis focused on the control parameter of the volition situation, the Experiential Hypothesis defined *хотеться* as an inner state which the subject undergoes, and the Desiderative Hypothesis opposed two types of volition: active volition (intention) and modal volition (possibility). The analysis of the sample showed that all the three hypotheses in fact complement each other, although an important distinction should be made: the desiderative constructions are focused on the time span which

starts at the moment of the beginning of intent and lasts till the beginning of the event or state itself. The details of this pre-event are determined by the lexical semantics of the infinitive—it may rest unspecified or presuppose some definitive scenario which prepares the event of the infinitive. The de-agentive, experiential and desiderative semantics characterize the degree of the subject’s participation in the preliminary situation which precedes the event denoted by the infinitive. The verb *хотеть* marks subject’s active involvement in this pre-event, while *хотеться* excludes the subject as an active participant emphasizing that the preliminary time span does not depend on the subject’s activity. As a result the meaning of *хотеть* is close to phasal verbs, while *хотеться* refers to modal estimation of the probability of the event. Therefore the control parameter of the event itself is an important, although not crucial, characteristic. Controlled agentive actions such as eating and drinking can be initiated only by an uncontrolled preliminary state. While the stative experiential predicate *know* may imply the subject’s previous deliberate activities to reach this state.

Turning back to the assumption on the possible ways to solve the conflict on the value of the control parameter between the desiderative predicate and the infinitive, I propose the following analysis:

1. There are no restrictions on the compatibility between the two desiderative constructions. Although some infinitives occur within one of the constructions very rarely. Still the limitations are not directly related to the parameter of control, we do have examples of very frequent desiderative constructions where the matrix predicate opposes the infinitive on this parameter. It is more likely that the soft restrictions can be explained by the lexical properties of the infinitives, in particular whether the event denoted by the infinitive is a direct consequence of preliminary external event’s or deliberate subject’s actions, c.f. a “very nominative” infinitive *жениться* vs. a “very dative” *плакать*. The two verbs denote events that occur not “by themselves” but as a result of preceding events: in case of *жениться*—active deliberate subject’s actions, in case of *плакать*—some external independent events that influence the subject’s emotional state. At the same time many verbs allow both interpretations of the properties of preceding time period.
2. There is no basis for concluding that there is a specific lexical meaning which the infinitives derive in the context of desiderative constructions, but there are different examples of semantic reinterpretation of the construction as a whole. For example speech verbs used in the context of nominative desiderative construction function as pragmatic logophoric markers which denote a start of a discursive period. The usage of nominative

desiderative in the past gets aspectual avertive reinterpretation: the action failed to occur. Finally, dative desiderative constructions with experiential predicates of propositional attitude introduce the experiencer's attitude to the probability of the proposition in the complement clause.

## References

Бонч-Осмоловская, АА 2003, Конструкции с дативным субъектом в русском языке: опыт корпусного исследования, Автореферат диссертации а соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. М.

Gries, ST, Stefanowitsch A 2004 "Extending collocation analysis: A corpus-based perspective on alternations" International journal of corpus linguistics. vol. 9, no 1, pp. 97-129.

Guiraud-Weber, M 1984 Les propositions sans nominatif en russe moderne. Paris.

Khanina, O 2008. "How universal is wanting." Studies in Language. vol. 32, no 4, pp. 818-865.

Stefanowitsch, A, Gries ST 2003 "Collocations: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions". International journal of corpus linguistics. vol 8, no 2, pp. 209-243.

Anastasia A. Bonch-Osmolovskaya

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Faculty of Humanities. School of Linguistics. Associate Professor;

E-mail: abonch@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (916) 133-2134

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Bonch-Osmolovskaya, 2015