

## UKRAINIAN EQUIVALENTS TO ENGLISH SENTENCES: WHAT THEY REVEAL ABOUT DATIVE EXPERIENCER AND EXPLETIVE CONSTRUCTION

**Khrystyna Kunets**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000,  
khrystyna.kunets@lnu.edu.ua*

This paper presents a comparative study of Ukrainian sentences with Dative experiencer and their English equivalents. While Ukrainian allows null-subject sentences, in English there is a structural subject *it*. Moreover, in Ukrainian, there are sentences with Dative experiencers in the sentence initial position. Interestingly, the same kind of predicates that licenses Dative experiencer construction in Ukrainian, licenses the *it*-extraposition in English. Thus, the objective of this research is to establish what predicates belong to this category and what there is in the structure of the predicate that allows or disallows the described kinds of construction. We suggest that the adjectival predicates that do not allow *it* (or Dative experiencer in Ukrainian) have CAUSE-head introducing a causing event in their structure which blocks *it*-insertion.

*Key words:* Dative experiencer, expletive, CAUSE, *it*-extraposition, predicate, English, Ukrainian.

**Introduction.** In English, there are various types of sentences with the structural *it*: (i) with no external argument, e.g. *It rains*; (ii) with a Complementizer Phrase (henceforth CP; see the list of other abbreviations at the end of the article) which cannot move to a sentential subject, e.g. *It seems (that) he has been here before*; (iii) with a CP whose movement to the subject position is allowed, e.g. *It is clear that he has been here before*; (iv) with *it* in the object position, e.g. *I thought it worthwhile to talk about expletives*. This is not an exhaustive list, and the listed sentence types can be further subcategorized, including passives, e.g. *It is said that he has been here before*.

Meanwhile, Ukrainian allows null-subject sentences [10, p. 214], and thus the equivalent for (i) above can be seen in (1a) below, apparently without any pronoun; for (ii) – in (1b), where there is no overt subject, and the verb is reflexive [10, p. 113]; for (iii) – in (1c), in which we can see that the structural subject is omitted and the place of the adjective is taken by the adverb; in (1d) we can observe that the impersonal passive translates into Ukrainian with a verb in third person plural (with a generic *they* pronoun); with some verbs the reflexive form is also possible here [10, p. 147, 165].

1. a. Дощить.  
 Rain.pres.3.sing.  
 ‘It rains’.
- b. Здається, що він Був тут раніше.  
 Seem.pres.3.sing.reflexive. that. he.Nom. be.past.sing. here. before.  
 masc.  
 ‘It seems that he has been here before’.
- c. Ясно/Цікаво, що він Був тут раніше.  
 Clearly/Interestingly. that. he.Nom. be.past.sing. here. before.  
 masc.  
 ‘It is clear/It is interesting that he has been here before’.
- d. Кажуть що він був тут раніше.  
 Say.pres.3.plur. that. he.Nom. be.past.sing. here. before.  
 masc.  
 ‘It is said / They say that he has been here before’.

Two things should be noted here. First, the sentence in (1c) differs from the English sentences with a fronted adverb (e.g. *Clearly, he has been here before*) since they take a CP, as we can see in the given sentence (compare: *\*Clearly that he has been here before*); interestingly, an adjective in English corresponds to an adverb in Ukrainian in such instances. And second, although there is no overt subject in any of the sentences in (1), and it can never appear there in the standard formal language, in spoken Ukrainian expletive *воно* “it” is sometimes used in the sentences like (1b) and (1c), as is shown in (2). These also happen to be sentences that allow Dative arguments in the sentence initial position.

- (2) a. Воно зрозуміло, що він був тут раніше.  
 It.Nom clearly. that. he.Nom. be.past.sing. here. before.  
 masc.  
 ‘It is clear that he was here before’.
- b. Можете розмовляти собі латиною, мені воно байдуже  
 You may speak Latin, I.Dat it.Nom [14].  
 You may speak Latin, it doesn’t matter to me. indifferently.



others cannot. For our analysis, we will refer to Deal’s paper [3], in which she explains expletive *there*-insertion; despite the fact that *there* behaves rather differently from *it*, we will try to extend her analysis to other syntactic structures.

Vykhovanets and Horodenska [12] discuss a special class of verbs, which they define as “single-person verbs” [12, p. 268]; among other, they appear in sentences along with the Dat experiencers in sentence initial position. Vykhovanets [11] mentions the instances of the predicative use of adverbs in sentences like (4). However, the structure of these predicates is not discussed, and the features which make them a separate group are not established.

The comparative study of the type of predicates discussed in this paper has not been previously conducted.

**Methodology.** We conducted a questionnaire study in which 9 native speakers of English were asked to rate the grammaticality of a set of sentences on a five-point scale (where 5 is completely grammatical and 1 is completely ungrammatical) to test what predicates are considered grammatical in *it*-extraposition raising constructions, what predicates are considered grammatical in control constructions, and whether their grammaticality is affected by other factors, such as the presence of an experiencer argument and the type of construction they take (infinitival TP/CP). Since language norms may vary from speaker to speaker, the decision was made to consult more than one native speaker. All the participants were speakers of American English; this restricted focus on a single variety may result in the failure of the empirical generalizations to be extended to other varieties. The results were later analyzed and additionally tested with corpus search to build a hypothesis; thus we chose the inductive method for this research. The theoretical aspect was then developed by constructing syntactic models.

**Results and Discussion.** In the table below (Table 1), we can see how the participants of the study evaluated the grammaticality of the English sentences (with Nom experiencer control structure, Nom experiencer+predicate followed with the CP, and *it*-extraposition raising structure, followed with an infinitival TP and a CP, both with and without a non-nominative experiencer DP); first, we can see each individual grade, and then the average.

Table 1

Evaluation of grammaticality of English sentences by study participants

Sentences	Individual grade	Average
<i>Nominative experiencer, control</i>		
I am sad to leave.	2, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.6
I am happy to leave.	4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.7
They are desired to win.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2	1.2
They are desirable to win.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3	1.4
I am cold to stay outside.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 4	1.7
I am too cold to stay outside.	2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.3
<i>Nominative experiencer + CP</i>		
I am sad that I have to leave.	4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.9
I am happy that I can leave.	4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.8
I am useful to exercise.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2	1.1

Cont. table 1

<i>Raising to it-extraposition + infinitival TP</i>		
It is sad to leave.	1, 1, 2, 2, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5	3.2
It is happy to leave.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2	1.2
It is useful to exercise.	5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	5.0
It is desirable to win.	1, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.6
It is desired to win.	1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 5	2.0
It is cold to stay outside.	1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 4, 5, 5, 5	3.0
It is pleasant to walk like this.	1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5	3.8
<i>Raising to it-extraposition + experiencer + infinitival TP</i>		
It is sad for me to leave.	3, 3, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5	3.9
It is happy for me to leave.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 5	1.8
It is cold for me to stay outside.	2, 2, 3, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.1
It is too cold for me to stay outside.	5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	5.0
It is important for me to meet you.	2, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.6
<i>Raising to it-extraposition + CP</i>		
It is sad that you have to leave.	2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.3
It is happy that I can leave.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2	1.2
It is happy that they won.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3	1.3
It is useful that you learned to swim.	5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	5.0
It is glad that you won.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2	1.2
It is desired that you win.	1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 5	2.1
It is desirable that you win.	2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.2
It is glad that they won.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2	1.2
It is eager that you start at once.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3	1.4
It is joyful that they met.	1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5	2.7
<i>Raising to it-extraposition + experiencer + CP</i>		
It is sad for me that you have to leave.	1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.1
It is happy for me that they won.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 5	1.7
It is glad for me that you won.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2	1.1
It is angry for me that they lost.	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2	1.2
It is important that they meet as soon as possible.	1, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5	4.6

As predicted, while some predicates are found acceptable with *it*-extraposition, others are not. For example, *happy*, *glad*, *eager*, *angry*, whereas grammatical with Nom experiencer, are mainly found ungrammatical in *it*-extraposition, while *important*, *useful*, *pleasant*, *joyful*, *desirable/desired* are mainly considered grammatical in the same type of sentence structure; *sad* and *cold* allow both types of constructions. Whether the predicate is followed with an infinitival TP or CP, as well as whether or not it is followed with a non-

nominative experiencer represented by a PP in English does not affect the grammaticality of the given sentences to any extent that would matter for this research.

In a similar manner, in Ukrainian *щасливо* “happily”, *радо* “gladly”, *охоче* “eagerly”, *злисно* “angrily” do not allow Dat experiencer construction with no Nom subject; *важливо* “importantly”, *корисно* “usefully”, *радісно* “joyfully”, *бажано* “desirably” do allow Dat experiencer – but no Nom subject, as well as *сумно* “sadly”, and *холодно* “coldly”. Thus, the question is: what makes certain predicates ungrammatical in this type of construction in both languages?

Our account builds on the work of Deal [3] who suggests that expletive *there* can only be inserted on edge of the *vP* that lacks an external DP or event argument, and in the case of unaccusative predicates it is the CAUSE head which introduces the causing event that blocks the insertion of *there*. While the conditions for the insertion of *it* differ from those of *there*, the adjectival predicates that do not allow *it* appear to have CAUSE in their structure, unlike those which allow it. The causing event of these predicates can be referenced by a PP headed by *from*, e.g. *happy from the outcome*, *angry from news*, etc. Sentences in (5) taken from corpora, as well as Google search, show that these predicates may appear with such a PP, although they are quite rare. In (6) we can see how the participants of the questionnaire evaluated the grammaticality of some of these predicates; none of them has been evaluated as completely ungrammatical. Thus, we can argue that these predicates have CAUSE in their structure.

(5) a. *She was **happy from** other things – the fabric she found at the night market, the celebration at the temple on the mountain...* [14].

b. *I was so **happy from** the game and then it was just gone* [14].

c. *He was quite content, no, **eager from** the look of him* [13].

(6) a. *Eager from their praise, he got down to work:*

1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (2.1)

b. *Reluctant from criticism, he didn't publish his new novel:* 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5 (3.1)

However, since the *it*-insertion is also possible with transitives (e.g. *It hurts me that...*), it does not seem likely that *it* is generated in place of CAUSE; rather, it is somewhere in the *vP* above it, and in case of an adjectival predicate *it* is not close enough to Adj to get licensed by it, as the verbal head is higher than the adjectival one, as shown in (7). With the verbal predicate like e.g. *hurt*, the position in which it is generated is close enough to the predicate it is licensed by, as shown in (8).

(7) \* [TP it T [*vP* <it>CAUSE v [*VP* is [*AdjP* glad [*CP* that you are here]]]]]

(8) [TP it T [*vP* <it>CAUSE v [*VP* hurts [*CP* that ... ]]]]

**Conclusions and prospects.** The same kinds of predicates appear in the sentences with Dative experiencers with an adverbial predicate in Ukrainian and expletive *it* sentences with an adjectival predicate in English; also, the same kinds of syntactic structures are not allowed with another group of predicates. To account for this, we propose that it is the CAUSE head that blocks the latter. This tells more about *it*-insertion. The prospects of this study include

a semantic analysis of the sentences under discussion with the view to further investigate whether *it* has semantic content, and if it does, then to define it. To our knowledge, the structural analysis of this kind of predicates in Ukrainian has not been conducted before, as well as the comparative study of the described predicates in Ukrainian and English. This analysis can be extended to other instances of the expletive subjects. The place of the Dat experiencer in the described type of sentences is still to be investigated.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Adj	Adjective
AdjP	Adjective Phrase
CP	Complementizer Phrase
Dat	Dative
DP	Determiner Phrase
Masc	Masculine
Nom	Nominative
PP	Prepositional Phrase
Sing	Singular
T	Tense
TP	Tense Phrase
vP	little v (voice) Phrase
VP	Verb Phrase

## REFERENCES

1. Alrenga P. A sentential subject asymmetry in English and its implications for complement selection. *Syntax*. 2005. 8(3). P. 175–207.
2. Belletti A. The Case of Unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1988. 19, no. 1. P. 1–34.
3. Deal A. R. The Origin and Content of Expletives: Evidence from “Selection”. *Syntax*. 2009. # 12. P. 285–323.
4. Landau I. The locative syntax of experiencers. In the series *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 53. Cambridge, MA/London : MIT Press, 2009. P. vi + 165.
5. Postal P. M., Pullum G. K. Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1988. Iss. 19. P. 635–670.
6. Poole E. Deconstructing subjecthood. University of Massachusetts: Amherst, 2016. 39 p.
7. Rákosi G. Dative experiencer predicates in Hungarian. Utrecht University Repository (Dissertation), 2009. 265 p.
8. Sigurðsson H. A. The case of quirky subjects. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 1992. Vol. 49. Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University. P. 1–47.
9. Svenonius P. Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002. P. 3–28.
10. Karaban V. I., Mace J. Teoriia i praktyka perekladu z ukrainskoyi movy na anghliysku movu [Theory and Practice of Translation from Ukrainian into English]. Vinnytsia : Nova Knyha, 2003. 606 s.

11. Vykhovanets I. R. Hramatyka ukrayinskoï movy. Syntaksys. [Grammar of Ukrainian Language. Syntax]. Kyiv : Lybid, 1993. 368 s.
12. Vykhovanets I. R. Horodenska K. H. Teoretychna morfologia ukrayinskoï movy [Theoretical Morphology of Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv : Pulsary, 2004. 398 s.

#### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Alrenga P. A sentential subject asymmetry in English and its implications for complement selection. *Syntax*. 2005. 8(3). P. 175–207.
2. Belletti A. The Case of Unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1988. 19, no. 1. P. 1–34.
3. Deal A. R. The Origin and Content of Expletives: Evidence from “Selection”. *Syntax*. 2009. # 12. P. 285–323.
4. Landau I. The locative syntax of experiencers. In the series *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 53. Cambridge, MA/London : MIT Press, 2009. P. vi + 165.
5. Postal P. M., Pullum G. K. Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1988. Iss. 19. P. 635–670.
6. Poole E. Deconstructing subjecthood. University of Massachusetts: Amherst, 2016. 39 p.
7. Rákosi G. Dative experiencer predicates in Hungarian. Utrecht University Repository (Dissertation), 2009. 265 p.
8. Sigurðsson H. A. The case of quirky subjects. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 1992. Vol. 49. Department of Scandinavian Languages, Lund University. P. 1–47.
9. Svenonius P. Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002. P. 3–28.
10. Карабан В. І., Мейс Дж. Теорія і практика перекладу з української мови на англійську мову. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2003. 606 с.
11. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови. Синтаксис. Київ : Либідь, 1993. 368 с.
12. Вихованець І. Р., Городецька К. Г. Теоретична морфологія української мови. Київ : Пульсари, 2004. 398 с.

#### SOURCES

13. British National Corpus. URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>.
14. Corpus of Contemporary American English. URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
15. Корпус української мови [Corpus of Ukrainian language]. URL: <http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>.

#### СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ДЖЕРЕЛ

13. British National Corpus. URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>.
14. Corpus of Contemporary American English. URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
15. Корпус Української мови. URL: <http://www.mova.info/corpus.aspx>.

Article submitted 12.08.2022  
Accepted for publication 07.09.2022



## УКРАЇНСЬКІ ЕКВІВАЛЕНТИ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ РЕЧЕНЬ: ЩО ВОНИ РОЗКРИВАЮТЬ ПРО ЕКСПЕРІЕНСERA В ДАВАЛЬНОМУ ВІДМІНКУ І СТРУКТУРНИЙ ПІДМЕТ

Христина Кунець

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,  
вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, 79000,  
khrystyna.kunets@lnu.edu.ua

У цій статті представлено порівняльне дослідження українських речень з експеріенсером у давальному відмінку та їхніх англійських еквівалентів.

В українській мові допускаються речення з нульовим підметом, а в англійській мові є структурний підмет *it*, наприклад, *Цікаво, що він був тут раніше* та *It's interesting that he's been here before*. Хоча в українському реченні немає фонетично вираженого підмета, такого, як *it* в його англійському відповіднику, і він ніколи не вживається в цій позиції в реченні такого типу в стандартній літературній мові, в розмовній українській мові в таких реченнях інколи вживається слово “воно” (*Воно цікаво...*). Також українській мові притаманні речення з аргументом у давальному відмінку у початковій позиції в реченні (*Мені здається, що він був тут раніше*). Отже, простежуємо таку тенденцію: коли якийсь присудок допускає аргумент у давальному відмінку в українській мові, цей самий присудок допускає конструкцію з *it* в англійській мові. Якщо аргумент у давальному відмінку є неграматичним в українському реченні, то екстрапозиція з *it* є неграматичною в англійській мові з тим самим типом предикатів.

Ми провели опитування, в якому носіїв англійської мови попросили оцінити граматичність речень за п'ятибальною шкалою, щоб перевірити, які предикати вважаються граматичними з *it*-конструкцією, а які ні. Згідно з результатами опитування, *happy, glad, eager, angry*, граматично прийнятні з експеріенсером у називному відмінку і граматично неприйнятні з *it*-екстрапозицією; *important, useful, pleasant, joyful, desirable/desired* – граматично прийнятні в конструкції *it*-екстрапозиції. Так само в українській мові *щасливо, радо, охоче, сердито* не допускають конструкцію з експеріенсером у давальному відмінку без підмета в називному, на відміну від *важливо, корисно, радісно, бажано*. Отже, що робить певний вид предикатів неграматичними в цьому типі конструкції? В результаті дослідження з'ясовано, що предикативні прикметники, які не допускають описаного типу речень, мають у своїй структурі фразу з головою CAUSE (“причина”), яка позначає причину події; вона і блокує вставлення *it*.

*Ключові слова:* експеріенсер у давальному відмінку, вставний підмет, CAUSE “причина”, *it*-екстрапозиція, предикат, англійська мова, українська мова.