

Anton Zimmerling

To Seem or Not To Seem*

1. Introduction

The Russian verb *kazat'sja* 'seem', 'think' is a challenge to semantic studies. There are four general ideas relevant to its analysis. The first is Frank Ramsey's insight that the probabilities of single events can be measured in terms of epistemic preferences (Ramsey 1931: 177-180, cf. Wright 1962)¹. This approach applies to most operators of problematic modality: if *X* says 'I believe that *p*' or 'Most likely, *p*', she prefers *p* over $\sim p$. For declarative statements, the asymmetry of epistemic alternatives is the default setting while the indifference of the speaker must be marked overtly cf. 'I do not care, *p* or $\sim p$ '. For polar questions, the picture is more complicated. There is a theory that all polar questions are biased, i.e. highlight the expected reply (Biezma *et al.* 2012), and a more traditional view that the bias feature comes from added modal operators (Zimmerling 2023).

The second idea is that subjective assessments escape Ramsey's theory since firm beliefs are arguably linked with the same mental states as rational knowledge of *p* (Ayer 1964). E.g. John can be 100% sure that Jake is a bad guy (subjective assessment) but expect that Jake has a 70% chance of coming late today (probabilistic statement).

The third idea is that there are hybrid propositional attitudes combining the features of putative and perceptual predicates. The processing of sensual information involves its check-up, and the input image can serve as the basis for a hypothetical reasoning (Arutjunova 1989; Il'čuk 1990; Kustova 2004: 357).

The fourth idea is that some propositional predicates denote temporally restricted situations, where the subject is inactive: the Stimulus affects the Experiencer, who returns a mental representation of the input situation (Paducheva 2004: 237; Zimmerling 2000).

* This paper has been written with support from the Russian Science Foundation, project RSCI 25-18-00222 *Control and Raising in the Languages of Eurasia* realized at Puškin State Russian Language Institute. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for the valuable comments and discussion. I am also indebted to Anna Zaliznjak, Anatolij Liberman, Aleksandra Bajuk, and Piotr Sobotka for the consultations. All disclaimers follow.

¹ Ramsey discussed the probabilities of single events as objective values, while Wright argued that to make predictions about single events, a human being needs the basis of induction, which can only be retrieved from his past experience or expectations about the future, therefore the probabilities of single events are always subjective.

All four general ideas are relevant for the description of *kazat'sja*: it can be viewed both from Ramsey's and Ayer's perspectives, analyzed as a hybrid predicate in the spirit of Arutjunova (1989) or split into the perceptual and the putative lexemes (Apresjan 1997). The syntactics of *kazat'sja* and its counterparts in English, Icelandic, etc., is predicted by the grammar of raising verbs. The verbs from this class lack thematic internal arguments and borrow them from the embedded proposition (Postal 1974). Therefore, the Stimulus by verbs like Eng. *seem*, Ger. *scheinen*, Ice. *þykja*, *finnast* must be overt, be it a finite, non-finite or small clause (hence – SC), cf. *It seems (to me) that he is tired ~ He seems to be tired*. As for the Experiencer, it can be both overt and silent, get the direct or oblique case. I show that these predictions are borne out for *kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'*.

In section 2, I render the existing accounts of *kazat'sja*. In section 3, I discuss some parameters that differentiate XIX century Russian from Modern Russian. In section 4, I discuss several features displayed in the texts dating back from 1850 up to 1870 and included in the Russian National Corpus (RNC). Section 5 contains the discussion.

2. *The Verb kazat'sja and Its Portfolio in Russian Studies*

2.1. *The Lexicographic Tradition*

Jurij Apresjan discussed different facets of *kazat'sja* in Apresjan 1995: 375, 381, 384. As a perceptual verb, it is only used in situations excluding intentional behavior. It is opposed to the perceptual verb *vygljadet'* 'look'. While the sentence *mal'čik vygljadel umnym* 'The boy looked smart' suggests some visual diagnostics of the boy's smartness, the sentence *mal'čik pokazalsja mne umnym* 'the boy seemed intelligent/smart to me' is based on less apparent characteristics. As a putative verb, *kazat'sja* is part of the confidence scale. The Russian verb *ščitat'* 'believe' marks a higher degree of confidence compared to *pologat'* 'suppose', while *dumat'* 'think' is hypothetical. The place of *kazat'sja* at this scale is less clear. *Kazat'sja* can imply that the impression was wrong, while *predstavljat'sja* 'to have an impression' and *sdavat'sja* 'seem, think' do not bring about implicatures of this kind. In the *New Explanatory Russian Dictionary of Synonyms* (1997), Apresjan splits *kazat'sja* into the lexemes KAZAT'SJA 1, standing for the synonymic list of mental verbs {*kazat'sja* 1, *sdavat'sja* 2, *predstavljat'sja* 2, *dumat'sja*}², and KAZAT'SJA 2, that stands for the synonymic

² The verb *sdavat'sja* 2 was colloquial in the 19th century but is now perceived as outdated by some speakers. In (i) it contributes an ironic flavour to the speaker's guess:

(i) **Sdačtsja mne**, družok, čto ty ne čital Jakobsona.

'It seems to me, buddy, that you have not read Jakobson.'

The verbs *predstavljat'sja* 2, *dumat'sja* are bookish words used in contexts like (ii)-(iii):

(ii) **Mne predstavljačtsja**, čto Jakobson tut ne prav.

'It seems to me/I have the impression that Jakobson is wrong here.'

(iii) **Dumačtsja**, čto Jakobson tut ošibsja.

'I would risk saying that Jakobson made a mistake here.'

list of perceptual verbs {*čudit'sja* 'have a vague idea', *mereščit'sja* 'seem like a dream', *kazat'sja* 2}³ denoting unreliable impressions. Apresjan capitalizes three features of *kazat'sja* 1: 1) it is linked with abstract representations, not sensual images; 2) its subject is generally less certain than the subject of *sčitat'* 2, *dumat'* 2 and *polagat'*; 3) it expresses a wide range of probabilistic statements, from relative certainty that *p* to the firm belief that $\sim p$. This description is complemented by the entry *SČITAT'* 2 (Apresjan 2000: 423-432). Regarding the relation of *kazat'sja* 1 and *sdavat'sja* 2, Apresjan mentions that XIX century authors licensed *sdavat'sja* in the contexts where some *X* believes that *p*, but the speaker has reasons to assume that $\sim p$. *Vygljadel'* is juxtaposed to *kazat'sja* 1 in the context *X vygljadel' / kazat'sja Y-m* (Apresjan 2004: 198-202).

Marina Dmitrovskaja (1988: 16) draws a distinction between two kinds of propositional attitudes dubbed *mnenija-predpoloženija*, i.e. opinions-and-assumptions, versus *mnenija-ocenki*, i.e. beliefs-and-assessments. The former stand for probabilistic statements about the likeness of *p*, the latter – for the reports that some *X* believes in *p*. In the first group, *p* stands for a verifiable proposition, e.g. 'Jane came late'. In the second group, *p* stands for a non-verifiable proposition or vague statement like 'Fido is a good dog'. Anna Zaliznjak (1991; 2006: 190) linked Dmitrovskaja's 'opinions-and-assumptions' with the verb *dumat'* (Apresjan's *dumat'* 2) and her 'beliefs-and-assessments' with the verb *sčitat'* (Apresjan's *sčitat'* 2). She also discusses the verb *mnit'*, which marks wrong assessments but was more close to *dumat'* and *sčitat'* in the XIX century (Zaliznjak 2013: 352). She explains the use of *pokazat'sja* (the perfective correlate of *kazat'sja* 1-2) in falsification contexts by the change in semantic structure: while non-accented uses of *kazat'sja*, *pokazat'sja* and other putative verbs do not bring about the presupposition that *p* is true, the stressed *pokazat'sja* indicates that *p* is false (*ibid.*, 130). The accent tag '↘ *X*' stands below for the standard falling accent on *X*, the tag '↘↘' stands for the reinforced falling accent on *X*, the tag '↘*X*' marks that the word form *X* lacks any phrasal accent.

- (1) [Kunigunde]. – Mne ↘pokazalos', čto ty čem-to ↘rasstroen.
 'I thought you were upset by something.'
 [Ivar] – Tebe èto (prosto) ↘↘pokazalos'.
 'It just seemed to you', 'You just **imagined** that'⁴.

³ The verbs *čudit'sja* and *mereščit'sja* describe unreliable images and in some contexts can be translated by '*X* has a vague idea', '*X* imagines that *p*'. The meaning of Apresjan's *kazat'sja* 2 is similar, but unlike these two verbs, it combines with confirmation and falsification words like *pravil'no* 'rightly' or *ošibočno* 'mistakenly' (cf. iv).

(iv) Klare **ošibočno pokazalos'**, čto žjuri dovol'no eë peniem, i ona pribavila goslos.
 'Clara **mistakenly thought** that the jury was pleased with her singing and increased her voice.'

⁴ Adapted from Zaliznjak 2013: 130. The names and the accent tags are added by the author.

Zaliznjak interprets (1) in terms of pragmatic presuppositions representing mental states [Stalnaker 1972]. *K.* assumes that *I.* is upset, and Zaliznjak renders the assertive part of *K.*'s reply as '*X* believes that *p* is likely'. However, *K.* does not claim that *p* is true, and the pragmatic presupposition is '*The speaker*'s neither believes in *p* nor in $\sim p$ ' (Zaliznjak 2013: 145). *I.* rejects the assumption that *p*, and the assertive part is rendered as 'The speaker believes that $\sim p$ ', while the pragmatic presupposition is '*X* believes that *p* is likely'. I claim that all subjective probabilities must be linked with the presuppositional component, if presupposition is treated as a semantic value (Von Stechow 2004; Paducheva 2011) and kept apart from mental states and information-structural issues⁶. The generalized formula for likelihood presuppositions (i) reads 'the probability of *p* is higher than the probability of $\sim p$ ' (Ramsey 1931) or '*X* finds *p* more likely than $\sim p$ ' (Wright 1962).

- (i) $P(p) > P(\sim p)$

On this account, *K.*'s reply in (1) brings about the presupposition (i), while *I.*'s reply cancels it. Russian licenses *pokazat'sja* both in the first and the second reply in (1). Neither English *believe*, *think*, *feel*, *seem*, nor Russian *ščitat' 2* or *polagat'* license prosodic reinforcement of the putative verb⁷ in the falsification contexts⁸.

- (2) [A] – Ja polagaju, čto ty čem-to \textsubscript{↘} rasstroen.
 'I think / feel that you are upset by something.'
 [B] – *Ty tol'ko tak polagaeš.
 *'You only feel that.'

⁵ Note that in Zaliznjak's semantic language, '*X*' and '*Speaker*' are different values: *X* stands for the name of the belief holder, i. e. the individual who lives in the world *w*, and the information that *X* believes in *p* is reported by some *Y*, while the tag '*Speaker*' stands for the first person report of the holder.

⁶ Pragmatic presuppositions are sometimes identified with given information (cf. Lambrecht 1994: 92), but 'given' neither means 'true' nor 'previously reflected upon'.

⁷ An anonymous reviewer argues that the verb *dumat' 2* does not impose this condition in Russian and quotes the Google hit:

- (i) Èto ne tak. Ty tol'ko tak **dumaeš**², potomu čto posmotrel na kartinku i vosprinjal eë \textsubscript{↘} bukval'no.

I take the point, albeit the most natural reading of (i) has the focus accent on \textsubscript{↘} *bukval'no*, not on *dumaeš*². I checked two segments of the General Internet-Corpus of Russian (*LiveJournal* and *VKontakte*) totaling 29 billion word forms and got 1884 hits of *tebe tol'ko kažetsja*, 390 hits for *tebe tol'ko tak kažetsja*, 77 hits for *ty tol'ko tak dumaeš*², 10 hits for *ty tol'ko tak ščitaeš*² and 0 hits for *ty tol'ko tak polagaeš*². Thus, *kazat'sja* is 30 times more frequent in this type of contexts than *dumat'*. I thank Aleksandra Bajuk for the technical assistance.

⁸ This constraint holds for Eng. *seem*. The speakers strongly prefer paraphrases 'It is all your fancy/imagination' in contexts like (1).

This deviant use of (*po*)*kazat'sja* is not due to the fact it lies lower on the confidence scale than *polagat'*⁹. What matters is that *kazat'sja*, unlike *polagat'*, *dumat'*, *sčitat'*, retains its ties with perceptual reports. The Stimulus affected the Experiencer, and the latter returned some representation of the input situation. In other words, *kazat'sja* can be analyzed as a hybrid verb. Although Apresjan did not consider this possibility, he acknowledged the uses “lying midway from *kazat'sja* 1 to the perceptual lexeme *kazat'sja* 2” (Apresjan 2004: 460). I argue that falsification contexts pattern with such uses too.

2.2. The Taxonomic Type and the Diatheses of *kazat'sja*

Elena Paducheva, who implemented Vendler's classification (Vendler 1967) compared *kazat'sja* to *vygljadet'* in Paducheva 2004: 210-215. She calls various ways of encoding the arguments of perceptual verbs their diatheses¹⁰. Both *kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'* take one propositional and one obligatory animate argument. Their shared argument is identified as Stimulus (Perceptual Object). Sticking to the term from Apresjan 1986, Paducheva dubs the subject of *vygljadet'* ‘Observer’ (Russ. *nabljudatel'*) but does not assign this role to the subject of *kazat'sja* and calls it ‘Perceptual Subject’ and ‘Experiencer’ (*ibidem*: 237). Before discussing her proposal, I render the basic syntax. Both verbs select argument small clauses (hence – SC) marked by the predicative instrumental case (hence – PRED_{INSTR}), but *kazat'sja* also takes finite complement clauses. This is shown in (3) and (4). The alternation (4a)-(4b) is typical for raising verbs since they lack non-propositional internal arguments. The proof that Russian has raising in SC has been presented in Lyutikova 2022.

- (3) a. Ivar_{NOM.SG} vygljadel_{SG.M} [_{SC}___ustavšim_{INSTR.SG.M}].
‘Ivar looked tired.’
b. Ivar_{NOM.SG} vygljadel_{SG.M} chorošo_{ADV}.
‘Ivar looked nice/smart.’
- (4) a. Ivar_{NOM.SG.M} pokazalsja_{SG.M} Kunigunde_{DAT} [_{SC}___ustavšim_{INSTR.SG.M}].
‘It seemed to Kunigunde that Ivar was tired.’
b. Kunigunde_{DAT} pokazalos'_{SG.N} [_{CP} čto Ivar_{NOM.SG.M} usta_{M.SG}].
‘Ivar seemed tired to Kunigunde.’

The distribution (3)-(4) shows that *kazat'sja* encodes the Stimulus by a sentential argument, while *vygljadet'* either takes an argument SC in (3a) or combines with an adverb in

⁹ It is hard to find contexts like **Da ja ničego ne polagaju, prosto mne kažetsja, čto p*, int. *‘I do not maintain that p, it only seems to me that p.’

¹⁰ Some theories distinguish diatheses and actant derivation, i.e. the mechanisms adding or removing semantic actants (Plungian 2011: 277), but Paducheva's use follows the pioneer work (Mel'čuk *et al.* 1970), where the cover term ‘diathesis’ stands for all transformations preserving or decreasing the number of arguments corresponding to dedicated semantic roles.

(3b), cf. *vygljadet' chorošo/plocho/ubeditel'no* 'to look smart/bad /convincing'. In the latter case, it denotes some accidental property, e.g. of looking smart or providing a convincing impression. However, Russian does not license dropping this element, one cannot say **On vygljadet*. That means that *vygljadet'* has an obligatory slot filled by an argument SC with AP or NP, cf. *Ivar_i vygljadet* [_{SC-ARG} _____i *vygljadet* [_{AP} *ustavšim*]] or an adverbial SC, cf. *Ivar_i vygljadet* [_{SC-ADV} _____i *vygljadet* [_{AdvP} *chorošo*]] depending on the SC predicate¹¹.

Paducheva states that the Observer of *vygljadet'* is never realized overtly and remains behind the scenes, while the Perceptual Subject of the verb *kazat'sja* can be overt or covert. She argues that in the initial diathesis, the Perceptual Subject is overt and gets the dative case, cf. (4a-b) since the presence of the referential dative subject signals the prototypical meaning of *kazat'sja* – the temporally restricted contact of some referential *X* with the Stimulus (Paducheva 2004: 137). The diathesis without the overt subject brings about a generic shift: the sentence *On kazalsja reběnkom* means that *Y* seemed like a child to every Observer *X*. I take this point with a proviso: the generalization of Observers does not make the situation generic. If one replaces *kazat'sja reběnkom* 'seem like a child' by *kazat'sja ustavšim* 'seem tired', one still gets a temporally restricted situation, where *Y* has been observed by some *X*-s, cf. (5).

- (5) *Scenario*. Ivar is playing a chess game. Other people are watching it on the web. They see the moves but do not have visual contact with Ivar. By analyzing his timing, they figure out that Ivar might be tired.

*Ivar*_{NOM.SG.M} *včera* *kazalsja*_{SG.M} *ustavšim*_{INSTR.SG.M}. No svoju partiju vyigral.

'Ivar seemed tired yesterday <to every *X* who could observe his game>. But he still won his game.'

The discourse word *kažetsja*_{DW} is derived from the 3Sg present form of *kazat'sja* *1*. It is not part of the verbal paradigm, but it is instructive to compare it with its historic source *kazat'sja* *1* regarding three parameters: a) type of the input information; b) egocentricity; 3) type of Observer. In (6), the propositional attitude comes from *kažetsja*_{DW}.

- (6) *Ivar*_{NOM.SG.M} #*kažetsja*_{DW} # *ustal*_{PST.3SG.M}. On sliškom dolgo dumaet segodnja nad prostymi chodami.

'Ivar is likely tired. It takes him too much time today to make simple moves.'

Both *kažetsja*_{DW} in (6) and *kazat'sja* in (5) denote temporally restricted situations, where the observation took place. However, *kažetsja*_{DW} is an egocentric particle projecting the speaker's point of view (Paducheva 1996: 200, 248) while the verbal forms of *kazat'sja* do not force egocentric readings. The speaker in (5) could decide that *Y* was tired

¹¹ Some property-denoting predicates can assume in the context of *vygljadet'* both the adjectival, cf. *Zadača*_{NOM.SG.F} *vygljadela*_{3SG.F} [_{SC-ARG} [_{AP} *prostoj*_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.F}]] 'The task looked simple', and the adverbial form, cf. *Zadača*_{NOM.SG.F} *vygljadela*_{3SG.F} [_{SC-ADV} [_{AdvP} *prosto*_{ADV}]] 'the same'.

based on his own intuition, but the status of the Generalized Observer implies that every X would agree that p (Zimmerling 2000). Regarding the input information for *vygljadet'* and *kazat'sja*, Paduceva argues that *vygljadet'* always implies visual contact with the Stimulus¹², while *kazat'sja* is appropriate with all types of perception including simultaneous processing of visual and audial data. The same holds for other perceptual verbs that pattern with *vygljadet'* and for *čuvstvovat'* and *čujat'* 'feel', 'anticipate' that pattern with *kazat'sja* (Paduceva 2004: 237). I suggest we extend this comparison to *kažetsja_{DW}* which is never used as a direct visual evidential. I also classify *vygljadet'* as a hybrid predicate since sentential Stimuli, cf. X is simple \Rightarrow $\langle Y$ believes that \rangle X looks simple, sometimes cannot be visualized.

TABLE I

Types of Observer and sorts of evidentiality with Russian hybrid verbs and discourse word *kažetsja*.

| | <i>vygljadet'</i> | <i>kazat'sja</i> | <i>kažetsja_{DW}</i> |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Input information | + visual | ± visual | – visual |
| Egocentric perspective | – speaker-oriented | ± speaker-oriented | + speaker-oriented |
| Generalized Observer | + | ± | – |

The general problem Paduceva is trying to solve in her comparison of *kazat'sja* with *vygljadet'* is the definition of their predicate type. She treats most propositional verbs as Vendlerian states, i.e. predicates lacking the event variable and denoting a single time point. She nevertheless tells 'mental states' *somnevat'sja* 'doubt', *dumat'* 'think' from 'perceptual states' like *kazat'sja*, and 'emotional states' like *nadejat'sja* 'hope', *bojat'sja* 'fear'. The inchoatives with *načínat'*, cf. *Ja načínaju somnevat'sja v p* 'I start to doubt p ', mark the lack of confidence, not the time point, when the doubts have arisen (*ibidem*: 190). *(Po)kazat'sja* typically occurs with referential dative subjects and classifies as a temporally restricted state¹³. Meanwhile, *vygljadet'* is a so-called 'stable state', i.e. non-actualized characteristics of its object holding for an indefinite period of time (*ibidem*: 237). It should be noted that Vendler's taxonomy has a single class of states, therefore the labels 'stable', 'temporal', 'perceptual' are impressionistic. An alternative classification proposed by Davidson (1980) and

¹² This does not hold for sentences like *Zadača vygljadela prostoj* 'The task looked simple' since the complexity of the task is not a property that can be observed. Apresjan proposes the following definition of X *vygljadit* \langle *kažetsja* \rangle P - m : "the appearance or behavior of X gives the Observer a reason to perceive X as P or assume that X is P , and the Observer can be less certain that X is P " (Apresjan 2004: 198). I nevertheless doubt that abstract objects either have appearance or behavior.

¹³ According to Paduceva, the perfective variants denote achievements, which holds for *pokazat'sja_{PERF}*; therefore, the imperfective *(mne) kažetsja_{IMPERF}* 'It seems (to me) that' is a result state from *(mne) pokazalos'_{PERF}*.

advocated in Maienborn 2019 and Zimmerling 2022 distinguishes <Davidsonian> states as enduring spatiotemporal¹⁴ things that hold for a period of time versus atemporal properties. However, this distinction provides little help here since *kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'* both can denote spatiotemporal situations. I suggest that we recognize the Observer and the Perceptual Subject as different roles and revise the valence frames of *kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'*. In the following, I replace Paducheva's 'Perceptual Subject' with the conventional term 'Experiencer' but reserve this label for the verbs that ascribe a mental state to the attitude holder. Observations and assessments, or in different terms, 'interpretative predicates' [Kustova 2022] do not ascribe any mental state to the holder. Provided that *kazat'sja* in Paducheva's conception is recognized as a single verb and not as pair *kazat'sja* 1 vs *kazat'sja* 2 as in Apresjan's account, we arrive at the generalization (ii):

- (ii) *Kazat'sja* projects three roles {Stimulus_K, Experiencer_K and Observer_K}, while *vygljadet'* projects two {Stimulus_V, Observer_V}.

Note that the Stimulus_{K,V} is always expressed overtly by both verbs, the Experiencer_V is optionally expressed by *kazat'sja*, if the dative argument is overt, cf. $X-u^{\text{EXP}} \textit{kazetsja}$, [čto p]^{STIM}, ~ $X-u^{\text{EXP}} \textit{kazetsja}$ [YZ-m]^{STIM}, while the Observer_{K,V} is never expressed overtly.

- (iii) Overtness hierarchy
Stimulus_{K,V} >> Experiencer_V >> Observer_{K,V}

The hierarchy (iii) is in accord with the raising theory since raising predicates promote their internal arguments to priority positions and demote the Experiencer. I conclude this section by discussing one Russian construction that amounts to raising of embedded clauses that lack overt subjects, cf. (7b). The symbol PRO stands for the covert subject of a controlled predication, the vacant position of the matrix clause subject is marked '∅'.

- (7) a. [_{InfP} PRO Priglasit' Ivara] bylo ∅ umestno_{PRED}.
'It was appropriate to invite Ivar'.
b. Kunigunde_{DAT.SG.F} pokazalos' umestnym_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.N} [_{InfP} PRO priglasit' Ivara].
'It seemed appropriate to Kunigunde to invite Ivar'.

I will argue that structures like (7b) but not (7a) display raising. Before turning to sentential arguments, I render raising conditions in Russian SC. Note that in (7b), the InfP is the complement of the adjective *umestnyj*, not of the verb *pokazat'sja*, since *kazat'sja* and *pokazat'sja* only select SC but do not take infinitival complements.

¹⁴ The notion of spatiotemporality means that events and Davidsonian states take place sometime and somewhere. With *kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'*, spatiotemporality arises if both the Stimulus and the Observer are referential.

2.3. Raising in Russian Small Clauses

Ljutikova (2022: 62) imports a list of 22 intransitive verbs taking SC complements with $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ from Švedova 1980 and argues that SC with $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ by these matrix verbs are triggered by subject raising of the SC subject into the matrix clause. This list contains overt (past, future, and conditional) forms of *byt'* 'be' and 21 so-called semilexical (*poluznametel'nye*) verbs replacing *byt'* in some copular structures. Ljutikova's list includes the verbs *kazat'sja* and *pokazat'sja* that are recognized as semilexical in the Russian academic tradition but not *vygljadet'*, though *vygljadet'* as we argued above in § 2.2., has raising syntax as well. Recall that *vygljadet'* differs from *kazat'sja* in that it licenses both argument and adverbial SC, cf. (8a - b), while *kazat'sja* selects argument SC with $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ or finite complements in standard Russian.

- (8) a. $Zada\check{c}a_{\text{NOM.SG.F}} \text{vygljadela}_{\text{3SG.F}} [\text{SC-ARG} [\text{AP } \text{prosto}_{\text{ADJ.INSTR.SG.F}}]]$
 'The task looked simple.'
 cf. $Zada\check{c}a_{\text{NOM.SG.F}} \text{vygljadela}_{\text{3SG.F}} [\text{SC-ADV} [\text{AdvP } \text{prosto}_{\text{ADV}}]]$
 'The task looked simple.'

The semilexical verbs incl. *vygljadet'* do not license their subjects and must borrow it from SC, it is impossible to say **Boris kazalsja* (ibid., p. 62) or **Zada\check{c}a vygljadela*. Some semilexical verbs with the reflexive postfix *-sja* are morphologically passive forms of the verbs that take argument SC with $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ in the active diathesis, cf. (9a-b):

- (9) a. $\text{Boris}_{\text{NOM.SG.M}} \text{s}\check{c}ital'sja_{\text{PASS.3SG.M}} [\text{SC-ARG} [\text{AP } \text{sku}\check{c}nym_{\text{PRED.INSTR.M}}]]$
 'Boris was considered boring.'
 b. $\text{Borisa}_{\text{ACC.SG}} \text{s}\check{c}itali_{\text{PAST.3PL}} [\text{SC-ARG} [\text{AP } \text{sku}\check{c}nym_{\text{PRED.INSTR.M}}]]$
 'They considered Boris boring.'

(9a) has SC with subject raising, while (9b) has object raising. The verb *kazat'sja* is historically a mediopassive from Old Russian *kazati* 'show', but this simplex no longer exists in the modern language. Unlike *s\check{c}itat'* 'believe', 'consider' in (9b), neither *vygljadet'* nor *kazat'sja* can be passivized. Ljutikova analyzes a SC with *kazat'sja* in the following way, the predP tag standing for the projection into which all Russian SC with the internal syntax of AP, NP, and PP must be embedded in order to make a well-formed non-verbal predicate:

- (10) $[\text{TP } \text{Boris}_{\text{NOM.SG.M}} \text{kazalsja}_{\text{SG.M}} [\text{VP } \text{kazalsja}_{\text{SG.M}} [\text{PredP } \text{t}_1 \emptyset_{\text{Pred}} [\text{AP } \text{ustalym}_{\text{PRED.INSTR.M}}]]]]$
 'Boris seemed tired' (adapted from Ljutikova 2022: 64).

I suggest that the minimalist predP tag can for less formal purposes be replaced by the framework-neutral tags 'SC', 'SC-ARG' above the AP / NP / PP layer, for the argument

SC, and likewise, ‘SC-DEP’ and ‘SC-RES’ for depictive and resultative SC¹⁵. Therefore, the detailed notation [_{PredP} τ_i \emptyset _{Pred} [_{AP} *ustalym*]] can be reduced to [_{SC} [_{AP} *ustalym*]].

The standard diagnostics for raising structures is based on four criteria: (1) raising predicates, unlike control predicates, do not impose the animacy condition on the matrix clauses subjects; (2) raising sentences license narrow scope readings; (3) raising structures preserve the idiom chunks; (4) if the embedded predicate can passivize, the active and passive paraphrases are predicted to be synonymic in raising structures. The criterion (4) does not apply to SC as they lack τ , while the criteria (1) and (2) give positive results: it is evident that *kazat’sja, vygljadet’* and other semilexical verbs license inanimate arguments as in (8a-b) and narrow scope readings, where the matrix verb scopes over the raised argument (*SEEM* > *NP*; *LOOK* > *NP*). The criterion (3) gives positive results too, though most test examples sound unnatural. Still, one can evaluate sentences with subject-verb idioms like *kryša poečala* ‘*X* is gone crazy’, lit. ‘*X*-s roof is gone’. Ex. (11) preserves the idiomatic reading:

- (11) [_{DP} *Kryša*_{NOM.SG.F} *Borisa*] *kažetsja*_{PRES*,3SG} [_{SC-ARG} [_{AP} *sovsem poečavšej*]_{PRED.INSTR.SG.F}]]
 ‘It seems that Boris is gone completely crazy’, lit. ‘The roof of Boris seems to have gone off’

2.4. Raising of Sentential Arguments in Russian

The received wisdom about Russian $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ is that it is assigned by syntactic subjects and licensed by a non-zero verbal head in the matrix clause. Zero heads are not possible: one cannot, e.g. say **Ivar* $\emptyset^{\text{BE.PRES}}$ *ustalym*_{INSTR} or **Èto* $\emptyset^{\text{BE.PRES}}$ *strannym*_{INSTR} with a zero BE-copula (Bailyn 2012: 194; Zimmerling 2018; 2021a: 187). I assume this theory is correct, but some constructions need a special explanation. If $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ is only licensed under subject control, what does assign it in (7b)? The only candidate is the sentential argument [_{InfP} *PRO Priglasit’ Ivara*], but it can take the matrix subject position only via raising. Independent proof that sentential arguments assign case comes from substandard examples, where $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ is assigned in the absence of *kazat’sja*, e.g. with the copulas *stat’ / stanovit’sja* ‘become’ denoting a change of state, cf. *stat’ izvestnym, čto p*. Although examples like (12b) are not accepted in standard Russian, which requires a non-agreeing predicative instead of $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$, cf. (12a), this option is reproduced by a minority of speakers from the XVIII up to the XXI centuries (Zimmerling 2021a: 199). It can therefore be identified as a special ‘dialect’ of Russian (Zimmerling 2018): the term ‘dialect’ is used here in the sense of parametric linguistics (Harris 1996; Henry 1998) and applies to the situations where the language-internal variation can be explained by the different settings of the same microparameter of grammar.

¹⁵ Depictive SC are VP-adjuncts, cf. the subject depictive *Boris*_x [_{VP} *prišël* [_{SC-DEP} [_{AP} *ustavšim*]_x]] ‘*Boris*_x came **tired**_x’ and the object depictive *Oni*_x [_{VP} *zastali*_x *Borisa*_y [_{SC-DEP} [_{AP} *p’janym*]_y]] ‘They_x found *Boris*_y **drunk**_y’. Resultative SC can be analyzed as adjuncts too. A sentence like *Boris*_x [_{VP} *vyter*_x [_{NP} *stol*_y [_{SC-RES} [_{AdvP} *nasucho*]_y]]] ‘*Boris*_x wiped_x the table_y **dry**_y’ conveys the meaning that the result state of *Y* changed because of *X*’s activity described by the main predicate.

In our case, it is the parameter of subject control: $PRED_{INSTR}$ is arguably assigned by grammatical subjects in the presence of the overt T(ense) head in all varieties of Russian, but different idioms have non-identical inventories of case-assigning subjects. I conventionally mark the idiom where $PRED_{INSTR}$ can be licensed by sentential subjects ‘Russian-B’, while standard Russian, where this option is absent, is labeled ‘Russian-A.’¹⁶

(12) a. Standard Russian = Russian-A

Stalo_{3,SG,N} **izvestno**_{PRED} [CP čto mašina Lopatkina l’et truby točno po staromu standartu]_{STIM}.
 ‘One learned that Lopatkin’s machine casts the pipes exactly according to the previous standard.’

b. Russian-B

Stanovitsja_{3,SG} **izvestnym**_{ADJ.INSTR.SG,N} [CP čto suščestvuet mašina Lopatkina, kotoraja l’et truby točno po staromu standartu]_{STIM} (RNC, Vladimir Dudincev, 1956).
 ‘One finds out that there exists Lopatkin’s machine that casts the pipes exactly according to the previous standard.’

In Zimmerling 2018 and 2019, I hypothesized that on a par with assignment of $PRED_{INSTR}$ in raising structures without *kazat’sja*, cf. (8b), Russian-B licenses non-agreeing predicatives instead of $PRED_{INSTR}$, cf. (9b).

(13) a. Russian-A

[_{InfP} PRO Ustraivat’_{IMPERF} dve besedy]_{STIM} kažetsja_{3,SG} mne_{DAT}^{EXP} **nerazumnym**_{ADJ.INSTR.SG,N}.
 ‘To have two conversations seems to me not reasonable.’

b. Russian-B

[_{InfP} PRO Ustroit’_{PERF} dve besedy]_{STIM} kažetsja_{3,SG} mne_{DAT}^{EXP} **nerazumno**_{PRED}. (RNC, Antonius Blum, 1990-1991).
 ‘the same.’

Ex. (13a) has raising syntax. The non-finite clause [_{InfP} PRO *Ustroit’_{PERF} dve besedy*] with the role of Stimulus is raised to the matrix subject position, which triggers the assignment of $PRED_{INSTR}$ to the adjectival head *nerazumn-* ‘unreasonable’ that lacks a lexical agreement controller. Ex (13b) can both be a non-standard raising structure or a structure without raising. These issues are checked below in section 3.

An anonymous reviewer mentions a related construction with the semilexical verb *javljat’sja* ‘be really like’, ‘appear’, where $PRED_{INSTR}$ on the adjective is licensed by the sen-

¹⁶ An anonymous reviewer warns that if some idiom is assumed just on theoretical grounds, and other cases of substandard variation emerge, the linguist can along the same line introduce Russian-C etc. I doubt that the parametrization itself would raise methodological concerns in the situation, where *A, B, C* ‘dialects’ correspond to text collections originating from different areas or representing different strata.

tential argument both in Russian-B and Russian-A, cf. (14a). The point is that *javljat'sja* does not take caseless predicatives in this context, cf. (14b), in which case the assignment of $\text{PRED}_{\text{INSTR}}$ by the sentential argument is not fed by the adjective versus predicative variation, as in (12) and (13).

- (14) a. Do sich por *javljaetsja*_{3SG} [_{SC-ARG} [_{AP} *neponjatnym*_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.N} [_{CP} čto tam vsě-taki proizo-šlo]^{STIM}]]
 'It is still **unclear** what actually happened there.'
- b. *Do sich por *javljaetsja*_{3SG} [*neponjatno*_{PRED} [_{CP} čto tam vse-taki proizošlo]^{STIM}]]

I first state that *javljat'sja* is an obligatory raising verb that requires an overt SC complement, one cannot say **ěto javljaetsja*. Second, *javljat'sja* unlike the change of state verbs *stat'*, *stanovit'sja*, and *delat'sja* does not combine with any predicative like *izvestno* in (12a), *nerazumno* in (13b) and *neponjatno* in (14b), one cannot say **ěto javljaetsa neponjatno, izvestno*. The predicatives from this class are caseless words that do not select nominative subjects (Zimmerling 2021b): contrariwise, *javljat'sja* requires that its subject is overt, be it a nominative DP extracted from SC, cf. [_{DP} *ěta teorija*] *javljaetsja* [_{SG-ARG} *ěta teorija* [_{AP} *neponjatnoj*]] '[_DP **this theory**] is unclear' or an expletive, cf. *ěto javljaetsa* [_{SC-ARG} ∅ [_{AP} *neponjatnym*]] 'It is unclear'. If such expressions are absent, the syntax must raise an embedded sentential argument to the subject position. This is what we get in (14a), which shows obligatory raising of the CP complement embedded into the argument SC. Meanwhile, raising in the substandard Russian-B example (12a) is optional, since the verb *stalo* in its default agreeing form (3SG.N) does not require a nominative subject and can combine with the caseless predicative as in (12b).

3. 19th Century Russian

3.1. The Dataset

I made a sample of the 1850-1870 texts included in the main RNC corpus and retrieved the constructions with the hybrid verbs *kazat'sja* and *sdavat'sja* that take dative subjects and the constructions with the putative verbs *dumat'*, *sčitat'* and *polagat'* that take nominative subjects. The frequencies of these five putative and hybrid verbs were measured in the context 'verb + subject pronoun in the 1-3Sg in the contact position {-1; 1}'. The figures in TABLE 2 stand for the number of hits.

The 1Sg contexts occur 6-7 times more often than the 2-3Sg contexts, but *kažetsja* remains the second most frequent verb in all persons after *dumat'*. *Sdavat'sja* is the least frequent item, with the lion's share of examples coming from the 1Sg contexts. The verb *mmit'* 'allege' is no longer used in our sample in colloquial contexts, therefore I ignore 8 examples, where the authors mimic Old Church Slavonic style. The hybrid verb *vygljadet'* 'look' is infrequent (15 hits, 13 of them in 3Sg contexts).

TABLE 2
Russian putative and hybrid verbs in the RNC texts from 1850-1870

| 1SG | 2SG | 3SG |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>dumat'</i> 2597 (51,9%) | <i>dumat'</i> 770 (89,1%) | <i>dumat'</i> 323 (46,6%) |
| <i>kazat'sja</i> 1371 (27,4%) | <i>kazat'sja</i> 53 (6,2%) | <i>kazat'sja</i> 202 (29,2%) |
| <i>polagat'</i> 625 (12,5%) | <i>polagat'</i> 26 (3%) | <i>ščitat'</i> 137 (19,8%) |
| <i>ščitat'</i> 356 (7,1%) | <i>ščitat'</i> 14 (1,6%) | <i>polagat'</i> 30 (4,3%) |
| <i>sdavat'sja</i> 55 (1,1%) | <i>sdavat'sja</i> 1 (0,1%) | <i>sdavat'sja</i> 1 (0,1%) |
| TOTAL: 5004 | TOTAL: 864 | TOTAL: 693 |

3.2. Preliminary Remarks on Diachronic Sources

The Old Russian verbs *dumati* and *kazati sja* belong to the inherited part of the lexicon, but their current usage can be modeled after some external patterns. Modern Russian *sdavat'sja 2* is probably a late borrowing from Polish *zdaje się* 'it seems', though historical dictionaries keep silent about that¹⁷. The *Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 11th-17th Centuries* registers *sdavati sja* (*zdavatisja*) only in the meaning 'surrender' (Bogatova 1996: 240). The first RNC example conveying the meaning 'I think' is dated 1806-1809 (Stepan Žicharev)¹⁸. The sentences with *kazat'sja 2* denoting a visual contact with the Stimulus are attested since the 12th century, cf. (15), but examples of *kazat'sja 1* conveying the meaning 'I think' come up only the 17th century (Filin 1980: 18).

- (15) ВЪ истину ты ли еси сладъзкъи мои снѣз или стѣнь ми са кажетъ тобою (*Čudesa Nikolaja Čudotvorca*, 71a, 12th century, quoted after Avanesov 1991: 187)
Lit. 'Where it is really you, my sweet son, or the wall appears to me like you?'

The meaning of the reflexive verb in (16) corresponds to *kazat'sja 1*, though its grammar displays two archaic features – 1) the preposition of the reflexive marker *sja* which still

¹⁷ The route and time of the borrowing are unclear, but *zdaje się* and its synonym and cognate *wydaje się* 'it seems' are attested in 16th-18th c. Polish texts (Knapik 2010: 50), while the meaning 'seem' is apparently not characteristic for Russian *sdavat'sja* in this period.

¹⁸ *I čut' li on ne prav: mne sdačetsja, čto stichotvorenje vyigryvaet ot gromkogo čtenija, i Gnedič nedarom nadsaždaet grud' nad svoim perevodom "Iliady"* 'And he is almost right: it seems to me that the poem benefits from being read aloud, and it's not for nothing that Gnedič strains his chest over his translation of the Iliad' (S. Žicharev, 1806-1809).

was a clitic, not an affix; 2) the encoding of the Stimulus by the now extinct Nominative + Infinitive construction.

- (16) Mně_{DAT} sja_{REFL} kažetü_{3,SG} [CP čto lutči_{PRED} gramata_{NOM,SG,F} vzjat'_{INF}] (1616, quoted after Filin 1980: 18).
 'It seems to me that it is better to take a diploma.'

The precursor of *kazat'sja 1-2*, ORus. *kazati sja*, is a middle form of *kazati* 'say', 'tell'. In some texts, it was also used as a passive. The dictionaries add a bizarre meaning of *kazatisja* 'be punished' based on *Antiochus' Pandects* (11th century) *sudimi že ot ġa kačemüsjja da ne sü miromü osuženi budemü* (Avanesov 1991: 188). This is an illusion since the meaning of the raising construction 'let us be instructed to be deemed by God' is ascribed to the verb *kazatisja*.

3.3. Sentential Arguments

The hypothesis that *kazat'sja* in the absence of overt non-sentential subjects could select both adjectives case-marked by *PRED_{INSTR}*, cf. *kažetsja smešnym_{ADJ,INSTR,SG,N} that p*, and non-agreeing caseless predicatives, cf. *kažetsja smešno_{PRED} that p*, is confirmed. It is not clear, whether this variation represents a dialect split. Some authors, e.g. Lev Tolstoj, who favoured the second variant, produced sentences with *PRED_{INSTR}* too. The variant *KAZAT'SJA + PRED* is attested with diverse predicatives denoting affections or reactions, cf. *<X-u> kažetsja stranno, smešno, stydno, diko, dosadno, udivitel'no*. In the pair *<kazat'sja> smešno/smešnym* 'seem funny' the predicative is more frequent than the adjective (12 : 4), but in the pair *<kazat'sja> stranno/strannym* 'seem strange' the proportion is reversed (8 : 60)¹⁹. The Stimulus of *kazat'sja* could be introduced by a complement finite clause with *čto* 'that', by an infinitive clause, or by the situational pronouns *eto, vsë eto, to, ono*. This is in line with the current usage, but some authors also produced elliptic structures, where the Stimulus is neither expressed by *eto* nor by a dependent clause. The ex. (17)-(18) would be considered awkward in Modern Russian.

- (17) Konečno, s pervogo raza kažetsja_{3,SG} ves'ma strannym_{ADJ,INSTR,SG,N}: kakim obrazom nasele-
 nie možet umirat' s golodu v strane, gde vody kišat ryboj, a lesa polny vsjakogo zverja?
 (Nikolai Prževal'skij, 1870)
 'Of course, at first glance, it seems very strange: how can the population die of hunger
 in a country where the waters are teeming with fish and the forests are full of all kinds of
 animals?'

¹⁹ In other pairs, the sample turned too small to provide statistics, cf. *styčno/styčnym* 'ashamed' (1: 2), *diko/dikim* 'wild' (2:1), *dosadno/dosadnym* 'annoying' (1: 0), *udivitel'no/udivitel'nym* 'amazing' (1:0).

TABLE 3
The Stimulus argument in the RNC texts from 1850-1870

| | ADJECTIVE IN THE INSTRUMENTAL CASE | | | | PRED |
|-------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | <i>strannym</i> + INF | <i>strannym</i> , <i>čto p</i> | <i>strannym</i> ∅ | <i>strannym</i> + <i>ěto</i> | <i>stranno</i> + <i>ěto</i> |
| | 7 | 26 | 12 | 15 | 8 |
| + DAT | 6 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| - DAT | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 |

- (18) **Mne**_{DAT} priznat'sja, vsě-taki kažetsja_{3,SG} nemnogo strannym_{ADJ INSTR. SG. N...} (Ivan Turgenev, 1867)
'To be honest, it still seems a little strange to me.'

The options of encoding the Stimulus are shown in TABLE 3. The sample totals 68 sentences, in 50 of them (72, 5%) the dative argument being overt. In the pair *kažetsja strannym* / *stranno* the variation was attested in sentences with *ěto*. In other pairs, the authors dropped *ěto* both with adjectives and predicatives.

Table 3 shows that the Stimulus in most cases is realized overtly by the adjective and by the correlative predicative, but the situational pronouns *ěto*, *ono* are only attested with the predicatives. The collocation *X-u kazalos' smešno* in (14) can either be a pleonastic version of *X-u bylo smešno* 'X had fun' or convey the meaning 'X found that situation funny'. Lev Tolstoj regularly used *kazalos' smešno* in ambivalent contexts of this kind (5 examples in our sample), which was also characteristic for the contemporary authors, incl. Fëdor Rešetnikov (1841-1871):

- (19) **Ivanu**_{DAT} kazalos'_{3,SG} smešno_{PRED}, on čego-to pugal'sja, odnako skoro uže postojanno chodil k Agaške (Fëdor Rešetnikov, 1864).
'It seemed funny to Ivan, he was scared of something, but soon he was constantly going to see Agaška.'

Although sentences like (19) are now marginal, the pattern SEEM + PRED gets parallels in Old Icelandic and Bulgarian (Gradinarova 2017; Zimmerling 2019: 57). In colloquial Bulgarian, the marked epistemic meanings of vague / unreliable impressions can be expressed without the verb SEEM (Bulg. *struva se*) via different dative constructions, cf. Bulg. *Neprilično*_{PRED} *mi*_{DAT.1.SG} *je*_{BE.AUX.3.SG} 'I think it is indecent' (Ivanova et al. 2022: 82).

3.4. Dlja X-a Phrases

The experiential argument of most Russian predicatives is marked by the bare dative case. Modern Russian has a large class of dative predicatives that do not select nominative

subjects, cf. *mne smešno/ne po sebe*, **ja smešno*, **ja ne po sebe*, and conversely, Russian nominative predicatives do not select dative subjects, **mne navešele*, **mne ne v svoej tarelke* (Zimmerling 2021b: 555). Dative predicatives occasionally license paraphrases with the preposition phrase *dlja X-a*, cf. *mne_{DAT} interesno ~ dlja menja_{GEN} interesno* ‘I am interested’. The interaction of *dlja* phrases and bare datives with verbs and predicatives in Modern Russian is discussed in Serdobolskaya *et al.* 2014; Apresjan, Letuchiy 2023. There is a disagreement between the speakers to what extent the paraphrases with *dlja X-a* are accepted. The Academic Grammar of Russian asserts that bare dative forms with predicatives are so-called ‘subject determinants’, i.e. optional adjuncts freely alternating with other expressions encoding the Experiencer (Švedova 1982: 152). This claim is dubious since one can neither add the dative ad libitum, cf. the ungrammaticality of **mne pyl’no int.* ‘It is dusty to me’, **mne solnečno int.* ‘It is sunny to me’, **mne gnevno int.* ‘I am angry’ (Zimmerling 2000), nor replace it by *dlja X-a* phrases via context-free rules, cf. *mne smešno* ‘I find it funny’, **dlja menja smešno*. It is but likely that Švedova’s conception is motivated by the 19th century Russian. The RNC texts hint that while bare datives were dominant, the 19th century authors produced *dlja X-a* paraphrases with a greater ease than our contemporaries. Indeed, Michail Zagoskin, Lev Tolstoj, Michail Saltykov-Ščedrin, Aleksej Pisemskij, Ivan Gončarov, Sergej Aksakov, Aleksandr Družinin, Afanasij Fet, Pëtr Čajkovskij could use *dlja menja_{GEN,ISG}* instead of *mne_{DAT,ISG}* with such dative predicatives as *stranno*, *interesno*, *udivitel’no*, *dosadno*, *prijatno*, *bezrazlično*, *všë ravno*, *tjaželo*, *trudno*, *ljubopytno*, *diko*, *neponjatno*, *neudobno*, *sve-tlo*, *protivno*, *chorošo*, *nužno*, *dostatočno*, *prilično*, *jasno*²⁰.

With the BE-copula and *stat’*, *sdelat’sja*, the alternation *X-y Z-vo ~ Dlja X-a Z-vo* is an option at least for some speakers. Meanwhile, with the raising verb *kazat’sja* the bare dative is generalized, one cannot nowadays say **Dlja menja X kažetsja ustavišim*, **Dlja menja kažetsja strannym*, *čto X ustal*. The 19th century authors did not have this constraint. Cf. the marking of the Experiencer by the phrase *dlja nekotorych_{GEN}* ‘for somebody’ with raising of the non-sentential argument *vychodka* ‘prank’, ‘trick’ out of SC in (20) and the phrases *dlja nas_{GEN,1PL}* *dlja čeloveka_{GEN,SG}* with the sentential Stimulus in (21) and (22).

- (20) V to vremja vychodka_{NOM,SEF} čta_{NOM,SEF} pokazalas’_{3SG,F} **dlja nekotorych_{GEN,3PL}** [SC ____stran-noj_{INSTR,SG,F}]^{STIM}; no kažetsja_{3SG} [CP čto teper’ ona dolžna byt’ vozvedena v obščee pravilo]^{STIM} (Konstantin Ušinskij, 1862).

‘At that time, this trick seemed strange to some; but it seems that now it should be elevated to a general rule’

²⁰ Cf. some examples from our sample: *Pravo, dlja menja všë ravno, soveršenno všë ravno, skazal knjaz’ Andrej* ‘Really, it makes to difference to me, absolutely no difference’, said Prince Andrej (Lev Tolstoj, 1867-1869); *Dlja menja jasno, čto Gëte rodilsja ne očen’ chorošim čelovekom* ‘It is clear to me that Goethe was not born a very good person’ (Aleksandr Družinin, 1855); *Soznajus’, čto možno by najti koe-čto i pobolšë, no dlja menja dostatočno i ètogo* ‘I admit that one could find something bigger, but for me it is enough’ (Michail Saltykov-Ščedrin, 1857-1865).

- (21) <Pjatinica. Dva dnja ne pisal ja v ètu knižku. A èto mnogo značit> **Dlja nas**_{GEN,1PL} to kažetsja_{3SG} [_{CP} èto skoro prochodjat]^{STIM} (Vladimir Čemezov, 1860).
 ‘<Friday. I have not written in this diary for two days. And that means a lot.> However, it seems to us that they will soon pass.’
- (22) Estestvenno, èto [_{PP} **dlja čeloveka**_{GEN,SG} [_{ne} ponimajuščego_{GEN,SG} choda mašiny]], pri vide eë dejstvija **kažetsja**, [_{CP} èto važnejšaja čast’ ètoj mašiny est’ ta ščepka, kotoraja slučajno popala v neë i, mešaja eë chodu, trepletsja v nej]^{STIM} (Lev Tolstoj, 1867-1869)
 ‘Naturally, **for a person who does not understand the operation of a machine**, when seeing its action, it **seems** that the most important part of this machine is that chip that accidentally got into it and, interfering with its operation, flutters in it.’

It is hard to check, whether the alternation $X-u_{\text{DAT}}$ *kažetsja* ~ *dlja X-a_{\text{GEN}}* *kažetsja* was semantically driven. I suggest that it is explained formally, although the assumed syntactic difference does not explain the choice of one of the competing constructions over the other. The generalized dative marking of the Experiencer by predicatives and *kazat’sja* confirms that it is subject-like, while *dlja X-a* phrases are not arguments but adjuncts. Then the replacement of the bare dative by a non-subject phrase is syntactic lowering.

- (iv) The elimination of overt dative Experiencers by Russian predicatives and the verb *kazat’sja* and their replacement by ‘Ø’ or non-subject adjunct phrases amounts to lowering the Experiencer in the syntactic hierarchy.

3.5. Interim Summary

The 19th century Russian had several strategies of promoting the Stimulus of *kazat’sja* and lowering its Experiencer. The alternation $X-u$ *kažetsja* *strannym*_{ADJ,INSTR} / *stranno*_{PRED} *èto p* proves that in some cases the derivation failed to raise the Stimulus to the subject position.

4. The Meaning of *kazat’sja* in the 19th Century Russian

4.1. *Kazat’sja* 2

The distinction between the putative *kazat’sja* 1 and *kazat’sja* 2 denoting unreliable impressions holds. *Kazat’sja* 2 is an obligatory raising verb with a visually perceived Stimulus. Some authors licensed the extraction of the subject out of the finite clause with *kazat’sja* 2, cf. (23), where Modern Russian requires a finite clause or SC – $X-u$ *kažetsja*, [_{CP} *èto Y tak blizko*] ‘X thinks that Y is so close to him’ or Y *kažetsja X-u* [_{SC-ARG} [_{AP} *takim blizkim*]] ‘Y seems so close to X’.

- (23) On vybežit i za vorota: emu by chotelos’ v bereznjak: **on**_{NOM} **tak blizko kažetsja**_{3SG} **emu**_{DAT}, èto vot on v pjat’ minut dobralsja by do nego (Ivan Gončarov, 1859).
 ‘He will run out of the gate: he would like to go into the birch forest; **it seems so close to him** that he could reach it in five minutes.’

4.2. *Kažetsja*_{DW} and *kazat'sja* I with a Generic Subject

Both *kažetsja*_{DW} and *kazat'sja* I with a generic subject were frequent. This is confirmed by two metalinguistic contexts. In 1850, a critic from “Sovremennik” defends an author from the sullen reviewer who blamed him for the overuse of *kažetsja* and *věrojatno* ‘probably’. In 1867, the educator Ušinskij complains that one is used to saying ‘*kažetsja*’ instead of ‘we are convinced’. Such reactions show that the hypercorrect use of the marker ‘this is just my opinion’ could annoy people. At the same time, *kažetsja*_{DW} did not imply that the speaker is insecure. Some contexts bring about the opposite implicature. E.g. in (24) the speaker assumes that the addressee, unless he has a cognitive disorder, realizes that he is speaking to a police officer.

- (24) Vy vidite, #*kažetsja*_{DW}#, [_{CP} čto ja – policejskij činovnik]^{STIM}? (Vsevolod Krestovskij, 1864).
‘I suppose, you see that I am a police official?’

A brand mark of the 19th century is the now defunct cliché *kažetsja, čto p* ‘It seems that it is so’, which expressed the speaker’s confidence.

- (25) *Kažetsja*_{3SG}, [_{CP} čto tak]^{STIM}, moj drug, – otvečaeť djadjuška, – ili čto-nibud’ podobnoe (Fëdor Dostoevskij, 1858-1859).
‘It seems that it is so, my friend – the uncle responds – or something like that.’

The difference between (24) and (25) is that *kažetsja*_{DW} directly marks the speaker’s point of view, while in (25) the speaker sticks to the Generalized Observer strategy and pretends that every X in his position would assert *p*. Note that the cliché is frozen: shifting the verb to the past tense yields counterfactual interpretation, cf. *kazalos’*_{PST,3SG,N}, *čto p, no q* ‘It seemed that *p*, but *q*’, while adding overt Experiencers brings about a potential dissent between different Observers – X thinks that *p*, but some *Y* can think that $\sim p$.

4.3. *Kazat'sja* I versus *sdavat'sja*

The dialogue (26) confirms Apresjan’s point (2004: 459) that in the 19th century *sdavat'sja* could be used in falsification contexts, where Modern Russian only licenses *kazat'sja* I.

- (26) [A] – A *mne*_{DAT}^{EXP} *sdačetsja*_{3SG}, napiral Kirilla... – [_{CP} čto ty iz askerov utek]^{STIM}.
‘And I think – insisted K. – that you deserted from the army’.
- [B] – Nu, čto *tol’ko* ∅ *sdačetsja*_{3SG} (Vasilij Kel’siev, 1866- 1867).
‘Well, it just only seems that way’.

The verb *sdavat'sja* had a colloquial or ethnographic flavour, as in (26), where the memoirist reports the speech of a Russian village in Turkey. It is not attested in formal dis-

course while *kazat'sja* I was common in most text genres, so a scientist could politely add it to a completely rigid hypothesis, cf. (27).

- (27) **Mne**_{DAT}^{EXP} **kažetsja**_{3,SG} [_{CP} čto est' vozmožnost' ob"jasnit' rezul'taty Fridelja i Sil'vy, ne pribegaja k takim predpoloženijam]^{STIM}. (Aleksandr Butlerov, 1851-1856)

'It seems to me that it is possible to explain the results of Friedel and Silva without resorting to such assumptions.'

When Butlerov put down (27), he was quite sure that *p* and ready to prove it. He nevertheless adds *mne kažetsja* to mark that he already has some intuition about *p*. This puzzle shows that while *kazat'sja* and *sdavat'sja* mostly pattern with Dmitrovskaja's and Zaliznjak's 'beliefs-and-assessments', Ayer's perspective is flawed: Butlerov can still say *mne kažetsja*, *čto p*, be *p* a rigid scientific hypothesis or a vague assessment, but the meaning of *kazat'sja* doesn't change.

Discussion: The Baits and Pitfalls of kazat'sja

I started this paper from listing general ideas about probabilities and assessments. We can now sum up what the meaning and grammar of *kazat'sja* contribute to the general theory. The implementation of Ramsey's versus Ayer's theory is conditioned by the depth of analysis. Under Ramsey's approach, attitude verbs represent the degrees of the speaker's confidence. Under Ayer's approach, some belief verbs return vague assessments or images and introduce propositions that cannot be verified in the actual world. At the level of logical structure, all operators of problematic modality introduce likelihood alternatives. However, the lexical meanings of epistemic verbs cannot be reduced to degrees of confidence, which invites Ayer's approach. Its main pitfalls are the temptations to link the propositional attitudes with the type of the proposition and to classify epistemic verbs depending on how often the speakers use them with verifiable statements or with vague assessments. The latter is an accidental characteristics of the chosen text collection, while the label 'verification' can either refer to a scientific procedure or to a communicative meaning triggered by the verum focus accent²¹ and discourse words like *indeed*, *really* that indicate that the speaker considered the alternatives *p* and $\sim p$, and verified *p*. From the natural language perspective, verification, and falsification operators VER and FALS take any propositions as arguments, and discourse elements expressing VER and FALS can be inserted both into

²¹ The verum focus accent is the prosody marking that the speaker made a choice on the set $\{p; \sim p\}$ and confirmed one of the alternatives. It is diagnosed by special prosodic cues as well as by different principles of accent placement involving the accent on the predicate, cf. the neutral prosody in *Boris ukral* ↘ *pirožok* 'Boris stole the pie' with the verum accent in *Boris* ↘ ↘ *ukral*^{VER} *pirožok* 'The hypothesis that B. stole the pie is true'. Verification words like *really*, *indeed* unless they are clitics take the verum focus accent from the verb (Yanko 1995), cf. *Boris* ↘ ↘ *dejstvitel'no*^{VER} *ukral pirožok* 'Boris really^{VER} stole the pie'.

embedded and matrix clauses, cf. *Jake is really^{VER} a reptilian, X really^{VER} believes that Jake is a reptilian*. Moreover, no semantic constraint prevents a speaker from using the markers of problematic modality with propositions that are verifiable in the sense of natural sciences. That a Russian chemist could utter ex. (27) with *kazat'sja* in a scientific dispute has nothing to do with his (in)ability to prove *p*. This puzzle is explained by the non-trivial meaning of *kazat'sja*: in the initial diathesis this verb marks the speaker's intuition that *p* along with the reference to a temporarily restricted situation, where this intuition has arisen.

The ideas that *kazat'sja* is a hybrid verb that at once denotes perception and processing of the input data (Paduceva) or a pair of perceptual and putative verbs (Apresjan) are complimentary. Paduceva focuses on the initial diathesis with the overt referential dative subject. In this case, the Stimulus is always overt, and the type of the input data (sensual or abstract) does not change the taxonomic semantics of the verb. Both the sentence *Zal_{NOM.SG.M} pokazalsja_{3.SG.M} Elene_{DAT} šumnym_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.M}* 'Elena found the hall noisy' and the sentence *Teorija_{NOM.SG.F} Rasselja pokazalas'_{3.SG.F} Elene_{DAT} ekstravagantnoj_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.F}* 'Elena found Russell's theory extravagant' refer to situations, where some *X* got the intuition that *p*. Apresjan's description covers all diatheses of *kazat'sja* sharing the role of Stimulus. Therefore, the distinction of visual (*kazat'sja* 2) vs. non-visual (*kazat'sja* 1) Stimuli turns essential. The splitting of *kazat'sja* into two lexemes is mostly a lexicographer's perspective, but there are several arguments from syntax that support it: 1) the discourse word *kazetsja_{DW}* derived from *kazat'sja* 1 is not used as a direct visual evidential; 2) *kazat'sja* 2 is an obligatory raising verb, while *kazat'sja* 1 is not. In Modern Russian, a sentence like *Lesok_{NOM.SG.M} pokazalsja_{3.SG.M} emu_{DAT} [SC-ARG [AP blizkim_{ADJ.INSTR.SG.M}]]* can be only interpreted as an instance of *kazat'sja* 1 conveying the meaning 'X thought that the forest is close from him', but the 19th century example (23), where the Stimulus is directly visible brings about a hybrid propositional attitude 'X saw the forest, estimated the distance to it and concluded that it is close to him'. There is however a problem for identifying Paduceva's analysis of *kazat'sja* with consistent grammar-oriented approaches. In the Moscow lexicographical tradition championed by Apresjan and his school, different lexemes are postulated iff they have different set of thematic roles. This is exactly what Paduceva does: she assumes for *kazat'sja* the role of Observer in the derived diathesis without overt dative subjects but the role of Perceptual Subject in the primary diathesis with the overt dative argument. This inconsistency is fixed in the Paduceva-style account proposed in the this paper, if we assume that all three roles {Stimulus_K, Experiencer_K and Observer_K} are present in the initial diathesis, so that *kazat'sja* is a hybrid predicate at once projecting a mental state and the observational meaning. Surprisingly, Apresjan himself who recognized *kazat'sja* 1 and *kazatsja* 2 as different verbs and supplied them with separate entries in his *New Dictionary of Synonyms*, does not say explicitly that these items project different thematic roles.

The morphosyntax of *kazat'sja* serves its meaning. In the initial diathesis, the dative Experiencer has a priority over the sentential Stimulus but is not syntactic subject. Raising the embedded clause subjects and embedded clauses without overt subjects, cf. (7b), (8b), (12b) are different cues of promoting the Stimulus of *kazat'sja*. This echoes lowering of the animate argument in the secondary diatheses. In the 19th century Russian, lowering of the

animate argument had an extra marker, notably the replacement of bare datives by *dlja X-a* phrases, cf. *X-y kažetsja* ⇒ *dlja X-a kažetsja*, cf. (20)-(22). This option is no longer available. The raising of the sentential Stimulus is not realized automatically. In some cases, the raising derivation fails and part of Russian speakers generate sentences like (28), (29).

(28) = (13b) Russian-B

[_{InfP} PRO Ustroit'_{PERF} dve besedy]_{STIM} kažetsja_{3SG} mne_{DAT}^{EXP} nerazumno_{PRED}. (RNC, Antonius Blum, 1990-1991).

'To have two conversations seems to me not reasonable.'

(29) = (19) Russian-B

Ivanu_{DAT} kazalos'_{3SG} smešno_{PRED}, on čego-to pugašja, odnako skoro uže postojanno chodil k Agaške. (Fëdor Rešetnikov, 1864)

'It seemed funny to Ivan, he was scared of something, but soon he was constantly going to see Agaška.'

Sentences like *Ivanu kazalos' smešno*, where *smešno* 'funny' either denotes an internal state experienced by an animate subject during a period of time or an evaluation of the external situation, are two-way ambiguous between the reading 'X was having fun', cf. standard Russian *Ivanu bylo smešno*, and the reading 'X thought that it was funny', cf. *Ivanu kazalos', čto èto smešno*. Therefore, the dative argument of *kazat'sja* encodes two different roles – the Experiencer and the Observer/Subject of Evaluation. Let me emphasize that the distinction of Experiencer as an umbrella term for the roles projected by psych verbs ascribing a mental state to the attitude holder versus Observer is a general characteristics of the semantic theory adopted in this paper, but not an empirical observation based on marginal examples like (28)-(29): I only claim that the meaning of *kazat'sja* and the variety of its uses can be predicted on the basis of this theory. A similar distribution of roles has been attested in Bulgarian constructions with the verb 'to be' (Gradinarova 2017; Ivanova *et al.* 2022: 82) and in Russian constructions with predicatives and infinitives (Zimmerling 2000; Serdobolskaya *et al.* 2014; Kustova 2022; Apresjan *et al.* 2023), but not for the same lexeme. Thus, Russian *kazat'sja*, if it is a single verb, is a truly amazing 'Janus-lexeme'²² that can switch the thematic role of its syntactic argument.

²² The notion of 'Janus-phoneme' has been formally introduced to Prague phonology in Steblin-Kamenskij 1965, but I do not insist that my use of the 'Janus' label is strict.

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|---------------------------|
| ADJ: | adjective; |
| ADV: | adverb; |
| AdvP: | adverbial phrase; |
| AP: | adjective phrase; |
| CP: | complement phrase; |
| DAT: | dative; |
| DP: | determiner phrase; |
| DW: | discourse word; |
| EXP: | Experiencer; |
| F: | feminine; |
| GEN: | genitive; |
| IMPERF: | imperfective aspect; |
| InfP: | infinitive phrase; |
| INSTR: | instrumental; |
| M: | masculine; |
| N: | neuter; |
| NOM: | nominative; |
| NP: | noun phrase; |
| PERF: | perfective aspect; |
| PL: | plural; |
| PRES: | present; |
| PP: | preposition phrase; |
| PST: | past; |
| PRED: | predicative; |
| SC: | small clause; |
| SC-ADV: | adverbial small clause; |
| SC-ARG: | argument small clauses; |
| SC-DEP: | depictive small clause; |
| SC-RES: | resultative small clause; |
| SG: | singular; |
| STIM: | Stimulus. |

Literature

- Apresjan 1986: J.D. Apresjan, *Deiksis v leksike i grammatike i naivnaja model' jazyka*, "Semiotika i informatika", XXVIII, 1986, pp. 5-33.
- Apresjan 1995: J.D. Apresjan, *Integral'noe opisanie jazyka i sistemnaja leksikografija*, Moskva 1995.
- Apresjan 1997: J.D. Apresjan (red.), *Novyj ob"jasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka*, I, Moskva 1997.
- Apresjan 2000: J.D. Apresjan (red.), *Novyj ob"jasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka*, II, Moskva 2000.
- Apresjan 2004: J.D. Apresjan, *Novyj ob"jasnitel'nyj slovar' sinonimov russkogo jazyka*. Moskva-Wien 2004².
- Apresjan et al. 2023: V.J. Apresjan, A.B. Letuchiy, *Koncurencija datel'nogo padeža i predloga dlja pri glagolach i predikativach v russkom jazyke: semantika i sintaksis*, "Russian Linguistics", XLVII, 2023, 2, pp. 167-207.
- Arutjunova 1989: N.D. Arutjunova, "Polagat'" i "videt'" (k probleme smešannyh pozicional'nych ustanovok, in: Ead. (red.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Problemy intensional'nych i pragmatičeskich kontekstov*, Moskva 1989, pp. 7-30.
- Avanesov 1991: R.I. Avanesov (red.), *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka XI-XIV vv.*, IV, Moskva 1991.
- Ayer 1964: D.J. Ayer, *Knowledge, Belief and Evidence*, in: *Danish Yearbook of Philosophy*, I, Copenhagen 1964, pp. 13-22.
- Biezma et al. 2012: M. Biezma, K. Rawlins, *Responding to Alternative and Polar Questions*, "Linguistics and Philosophy", XXXV, 2012, 5, pp. 361-406, DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988012-9123-z>>.
- Bailyn 2012: J. Bailyn, *Syntax of Russian*, Cambridge 2012.
- Bogatova 1996: G.A. Bogatova (red.), *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XVII vv.*, XXIII, Moskva 1996.
- Davidson 1980: D. Davidson, *The Individuation of Events*, in: D. Davidson, *Essays on Actions and Events*, Oxford 1980, pp. 163-180.
- Dmitrovskaja 1988: M.A. Dmitrovskaja, *Znanie i mnenie: obraz mira, obraz čeloveka*, in: N.D. Arutjunova (ed.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Znanie i mnenie*, Moskva 1988, pp. 6-18.
- Filin 1980: F.P. Filin (red.), *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI-XIV vv.*, VII, Moskva 1980.
- Gradinarova 2017: A. Gradinarova, *Nekotorye osobennosti predstavlenija sub"ekta vosprijatija v bolgarskich konstrukcijach v sravnenii s russkimi*, "Jazyk. Tekst. Diskurs", XV, 2017, pp. 58-65.

- Harris 1996: J. Harris, *Syntactic Variation and Dialect Divergence*, in: R. Singh (ed.), *Towards a Critical Sociolinguistics*, Amsterdam 1996, pp. 31-59.
- Henry 1998: A. Henry, *Dialect Variation, Optionality, and the Learnability Guarantee*, "Linguistica Atlantica", XX, 1998, pp. 51-71.
- Il'čuk 1990: E.V. Il'čuk, *Nekotorye tipy epistemičeskoj modal'nosti v anglijskom jazyke*, Moskva 1990.
- Ivanova et al. 2022: E.Ju. Ivanova, G.I. Kustova, S. Leseva, *Dativ pri glagolach projavlenija priznaka v bolgarskom jazyke*, "Rhema", 2022, 3, pp. 64-87, DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-2953-2022-3-64-87>>.
- Knapik 2010: K. Knapik, *Czasowniki epistemiczne wyrażające przypuszczenie w polszczyźnie XVI-XVIII wieku*, in: A. Rejter (red.), *Bogactwo polszczyzny w świetle jej historii*, III, Katowice 2019, pp. 45-56.
- Kustova 2004: G.I. Kustova, *Typy proizvodnych značenij i mechanizmy jazykovogo rasširenija*, Moskva 2004.
- Kustova 2022: G.I. Kustova, *Predikativy oščuščeniija i predikativy interpetacii: semantičeskie i sintaksičeskie processy*, "Kritika i Semiotika", 2022, 1, pp. 110-123. DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.25205/2307-1737-2022-1-110-123>>.
- Lambrecht 1994: K. Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge 1994.
- Lyutikova 2022: E.A. Lyutikova, *Est' li sintaksičeskij pod'ëm v russkom jazyke? Čast' 2. Malye klauzy*, "Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Ser. 9. Filologija", 2022, 6, pp. 58-74.
- Maienborn 2019: C. Maienborn, *Events and States*, in: R. Truswell (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Event Structure*, Oxford 2019, pp. 50-89.
- Mel'čuk et al. 1970: I.A. Mel'čuk, A.A. Cholodovič, *K teorii grammatičeskogo zaloga (opredelenie, isčislenie)*, "Narody Azii i Afriki", 1970, 4, pp. 111-124.
- Paducheva 1996: E.V. Paducheva, *Semantičeskie issledovanija. Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom jazyke. Semantika narrativa*, Moskva 1996.
- Paducheva 2004: E.V. Paducheva, *Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*, Moskva 2004.
- Paducheva 2011: E.V. Paducheva, *Prezumpcija*, in: *Russkaja korpusnaja grammatika* <http://rusgram.ru/new/chapter/clauseintro/presupposition/#label_toc309856163> (last access: 10.02.2025).
- Plungian 2011: V.A. Plungian, *Vvedenie v grammatičeskiju semantiku: grammatičeskie značenija i grammatičeskie sistemy jazykov mira*, Moskva 2011.
- Postal 1974: P. Postal, *On Raising*, Cambridge 1974.
- Ramsey 1931: F. P. Ramsey, *The Foundations of Mathematics and Other Logical Essays*, London 1931.

- Serdobolskaya *et al.* 2014: N.V. Serdobolskaya, S.Ju. Toldova, *Konstrukcii s ocennočnymi predikativami v ruskom jazyke: učastniki situacii ocenki i semantika ocennočnogo predikata*, “Acta Linguistica Petropolitana”, x, 2014, 2, pp. 443-478.
- Švedova 1982: N.Ju. Švedova (ed.), *Russkaja grammatika*, II, Moskva 1982.
- Stalnaker 1972: R.C. Stalnaker, *Pragmatics*, in: D. Davidson, G. Harman (eds.), *Semantics of Natural Language*, Dordrecht 1972, pp. 380-397.
- Steblin-Kamenskij 1965: M.I. Steblin-Kamenskij, *Phonemic Merger and Janus Phonemes*, “Philologica Pragensia”, VIII, 1965, 2-3, pp. 370-371.
- Vendler 1967: Z. Vendler, *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca 1967.
- Von Fintel 2004: K. von Fintel, *Would You Believe It? The King of France is Back! Presuppositions and Truth-Value Intuitions*, in: A. Bezuidenhout, M. Reimer (eds.), *Descriptions and Beyond*, Oxford 2004, pp. 315-341.
- Von Wright 1962: G.H. von Wright, *Remarks on the Epistemology of Subjective Probability*, in: *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science. Proceedings of the 1960 International Congress*, Stanford 1962, pp. 330-339.
- Yanko 1995: T.E. Yanko, *Kommunikativnyj status vyraženijs so slovom PRAVDA*, in: N.D. Arutjunova, N.K. Rjabceva (red.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Istina i istinnost' v kul'ture i jazyke*, Moskva 1995, pp. 173-177.
- Zaliznjak 1991: A.A. Zaliznjak, *Ščitat' i dumat': dva vida mnenija*, in: N.D. Arutjunova (red.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Kul'turnye koncepty*, Moskva 1991, pp. 187-194.
- Zaliznjak 2006: A.A. Zaliznjak, *Mnogoznačnost' v jazyke i sposoby eë predstavlenija*, Moskva 2006.
- Zaliznjak 2013: A.A. Zaliznjak, *Russkaja semantika v tipologičeskoj perspektive*, Moskva 2013.
- Zimmerling 2000: A.V. Zimmerling, *Sub'ekt sostojanija i sub'ekt ocenki: predikatnye tipy i epistemičeskaja skala*, in: N.D. Arutjunova, I.B. Levontina (red.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Obraz čeloveka v kul'ture i jazyke*, Moskva 2000, pp. 221-228.
- Zimmerling 2018: A.V. Zimmerling, *Dva dialektu russkoj grammatiki: korpusnye dannye i model'*, “Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies”, XVII, 2018, pp. 818-833.
- Zimmerling 2019: A.V. Zimmerling, *Ėpistemičeskije predikaty i mental'nye sostojanija*, in: N.D. Arutjunova, M.L. Kovšova (red.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Ponnjatije very v raznyh jazykach i kul'turach*, Moskva 2019, pp. 45-70.
- Zimmerling 2021a: A.V. Zimmerling, *Ot integral'nogo k aspektivnomu*, Sankt-Peterburg 2021, DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.31754/nestor4469-1792-1>>.

- Zimmerling 2021b: A. Zimmerling, *Primary and Secondary Predication in Russian and the SLP: ILP Distinction Revisited*, in: V. Warditz (ed.), *Russian Grammar: System – Language Usage – Language Variation*, Frankfurt a. M. et al. 2021, pp. 543–559.
- Zimmerling 2022: A. Zimmerling, *Predikaty sostojanija i semantičeskie tipy predikativ*, in: S. Koeva, E. Y. Ivanova, J. Tisheva, A. Zimmerling (eds.), *Ontology of Stative Situations – Linguistic Modeling. A Contrastive Bulgarian-Russian Study*, Sofia 2022, pp. 31–52, DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.7546/STONTBgRu2022.02>>.
- Zimmerling 2023: A. Zimmerling, *Biased Questions and Hamblin Semantics*, “Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters”, VI, 2023, 2, pp. 92–135, DOI: <<https://doi.org/10.37632/PI.2023.94.43.005>>.

Abstract

Anton Zimmerling
To Seem or Not To Seem

This paper examines the semantics and morphosyntax of the Russian verb *kazat'sja* ‘seem’. *Kazat'sja* and *vygljadet'* ‘look’ are raising verbs that promote their Stimulus argument within the syntactic hierarchy and raise an embedded constituent to the matrix clause. I argue that *kazat'sja* is a hybrid predicate combining properties of putative and perceptual verbs, and I discuss Apresjan’s proposal to distinguish two lexemes in lexicographic description: putative *kazat'sja*¹ and perceptual *kazat'sja*². The postulation of two lexemes is syntactically motivated, since *kazat'sja*² is an obligatory raising verb, whereas with *kazat'sja*¹ raising is optional, at least in some idiolects of Russian. Nevertheless, both *kazat'sja*¹ and *kazat'sja*² project three thematic roles: a Stimulus, realized as a sentential argument; an Experiencer, marked by the dative case; and an Observer, which may be conflated with the Experiencer or remain covert. I compare Modern Russian with nineteenth-century Russian and show that the latter licensed both the raising construction with *kazat'sja* and a competing construction with an expletive subject position. The analysis is based on the distribution of adjectives marked by the instrumental case versus non-agreeing predicatives in structures such as *X-u kažetsja strannym / stranno + [STIMULUS]*.

Keywords

Lexical Semantics; Experiencer; Perceptual Reports; Raising; Epistemic Modality.