Conceptual apparatus of the «Meaning – Text» theory suggests a thoroughly elaborated classification of verbal nouns. This classification distinguishes nouns of action and event, nouns of subject, object and second object, nouns of instrument, place, time and other modifiers, see Mel’chuk 1974: 84-88, Apresjan 1974: 48, 199, 326-327. This paper deals with MODE OF ACTION NOUNS (S_mod), such as počerk ‘handwriting’, povedenie ‘behavior’. These nouns are remarkable in that when they are motivated by a transitive verb they may inherit both of the main arguments of the verb, namely, the Subject and the Object. It is generally accepted that both the Subject and the Object are preserved only by SITUATION NOUNS (NEXUS NOUNS in Jespersen’s terminology), and this peculiarity of mode of action nouns remained unnoticed.

Mode of action nouns motivated by transitive verbs have at their disposal a specific diathesis, which includes a possessive. So let’s begin with possessives.

POSSESSIVES in Russian are divided into two groups.

1) Possessive PRONOUNS – personal, such as moj ‘my’, svoj ‘our’, and, with some reservations also 3d person pronouns: ego ‘his’, ee ‘her’, ix ‘their’; reflexive pronoun svoj; relative pronoun čej ‘whose’; indefinite pronouns čej-to, čej-nibud’, čej-libo, koe-čej; and negative ničej.

2) Possessive ADJECTIVES in -ov, -in, -(ov)skij, -(in)skij.

Adjectives ending in -ij: lisa – lisij ‘fox – fox’s’, are drastically different and should be studied separately.

Both groups of possessives are described at length in Shmelev 2008 devoted to possessives in the context of concrete nouns (PREDMETNYE IMENA). I deal with possessives in the context of PREDICATIVE NOUNS, in particular, in the context of morphologically verbal nouns (such as interpretacija ‘interpretation’ from interpretirovat’ ‘interpret’) and semantically verbal nouns, such as koncepcija ‘conception’ from a hypothetical verb meaning ‘to create a conception’. All the readers of Melchuk 1974 are acquainted with the non-existent verb *prestupat’ motivating the noun prestuplenie ‘crime’ in the same way as the verb vystupat’ motivates the noun vystuplenie ‘performance’.

1. Possessive pronouns

In its basic meaning a possessive pronoun expresses the idea of belonging to a person. In other words, it denotes a person as a possessor.

As is known, the idea of possession appears only in the prototypical context – in the context of the name of an object (moja kružka ‘my cup’, ee rasčeska ‘her comb’). In the context of a predicate noun a possessive pronoun does not express possession – it expresses subject-predicate relationships.

2. Possessive adjectives

The following patterns of possessive adjective formation are taken into consideration.

1) Adjectives formed with the help of the suffix -ov from nouns of the 2-d declension (Polikratov persten’), not very productive in modern language – still we have Gulliverovy puteshestvija (Zemskaja 1992: 76) ‘Gulliver’s travels’, Igoreva kurta.

2) Adjectives formed with the help of the suffix -in from nouns of the 1-st declension (Vanin ‘Vanja’s’, Šarlottin ‘Sharlotta’s’), productive model.

3) Adjectives with the suffix -(ov)skij: from family names of the 2-d declention: vendlerovskaja klassifikacija ‘Vendler’s classification’), productive model.
4) Adjectives formed with the help of the suffix -(in)skij from family names ending in
-in: (лятинское исполнение), productive model.

In so far as a noun motivating a possessive is referential it is possible to transform a
possessive construction to a genitive one (example (1) and the majority of the examples that
follow, are taken from the National corpus of Russian, site in the Internet www.ruscorpora.ru):

(1) Inogda sviridovskie vzgljady na grjadušče prosto donel’ zja černy i mračny = vzgljady Sviridova na
grijadaščee ‘Sviridov’s views on the future’ = ‘views of Sviridov on the future’.

A transformation from possessive to genitive is not always possible, which fact will be
touched upon later.

Adjectives in -(ov)skij, -(in)skij can be used in the meaning of property
(«свойственности», термин ... емской, non-translatable into English):

(2) preodolevaja izvestnuju chexovskuju nedoskazannost’ xarakter = ‘overcoming the well-known
non-explicitness of personages characteristic of Chexov’ [not ‘non-explicitness of Chexov’]

Such uses of possessive adjectives are called non-strictly possessive and ignored.

3. Mode of action nouns and their possessive-genitive diathesis

The general rule of expressing arguments of a noun derived from a transitive verb
(“transitive noun”) consists in that the object takes the Genitive and the Subject takes the
Instrumental:

(3) razrušenie Novgoroda moskovskim knjazem [Instrumental]
‘destruction [Genitive] of Novgorod by the Moscow prince [Instrumental]’.

Still there are contexts in which only genitive can be used to express the subject.

– The genitive is the only possibility for a subject of a noun derived from such verbs as
ljubit’, uvažat’, which, being transitive, do not license genitive object for the corresponding
derived nouns (ljubit’ apel’siny ‘love oranges’ gives ljubov’ k apel’sinam ‘love to oranges’
and not *ljubov’ apel’sinov ‘love of oranges [gen]’). Thus, we have:

(4) ljubov’ Cvetaevoj k Pugačevu [the object cannot be expressed by the genitive, so the subject of a
transitive noun is marked by the genitive].

– Genitive of the subject is the only possibility if the verbal noun belongs to the class of
NAMES OF OBJECT (S2), see such nouns as sovet ‘council’, predloženie ‘suggestion’, namerenie
‘intention’, trebovanie ‘requirement’, vospominanie ‘recollection’:

(4b) predloženie Kasparova ‘suggestion by Kasparov’ [the subordinate genitive of the noun
predloženie is interpreted, non-ambiguously, as referring to the subject]

In fact, disappearance of the participant object is inherent in the derivation pattern of nouns of
object: the Object valence of a noun is saturated, so to say, by the noun itself. In such contexts as
predloženije vystupit’ a ‘suggestion to make a speech’, sovet uexat’ ‘advice to leave’ infinitives do
not saturate the Object valence of the noun (in fact, it is absent). They are connected with the noun by
kind of appositive relationship expressing co-reference.

– If a name has a REDUCED DIATHESIS (in the sense of Padučeva 1977), namely,
objectless, the dependent genitive is unambiguously interpreted as the genitive of the subject,
the implied object being expressed somewhere in the context. In the examples below objects
are marked with italics, subjects are underlined:
(5) Mašina ne prošla proverki čekspertov ‘the machine didn’t undergo the check of experts’
On poddalsja na obman zlopyxatelej ‘he yielded to deception of scoundrels’
Èto obeščilo emu podderžku kolleg ‘it ensured to him support of the colleagues’

But if a verbal noun already has a dependent genitive expressing the object then the genitive subject is excluded all together, see (6c). As for possessives, they can express the subject in the context of a predicative noun with a genitive object, see flawless (6a) and (6b) (an example elucidating this distinction between genitives and the possessive pronouns was given in Iordanskaja 1967: 23).

(6) a. tvog [Possessive] ispolnenie Šopena [Genitive] ‘your rendition of Shopen’;

In fact, possessive subjects, unlike genitive subjects, freely co-occur with genitive objects.

It is not the case that two Genitives can never depend on one and the same verbal noun, cf. Jakobson’s example lišenie brata nasledstva. But in the case of the example (6c) it is a matter of principle.

It is remarkable that ALL possessives can carry out the role of the subject – both possessive pronouns, see (7), and possessive adjectives, see (8):

(7) Ego vybor sekundanta byl neudačen; Č’e ispolnenie Šopena Vam ponravilos’ bol’še? A kakoe Vaše ob’jasnenie pričin etoj ssory? Ego upotreblenie metaphor vyzyvaet nedoumenie;
(8) gedelevo dokazatel’stvo teoremy o polnote ‘Goedel’s proof of this theorem’ papino istolkovanie moej pros’by ‘father’s interpretation of my request’ šaljapinskoe ispolnenie etoj arii ‘Shaljapin’s performance of this aria’

<< Note that there is a tiny difference in behavior between possessive adjectives in -(ov)skij, -(in)skij and possessive adjectives in -ov, -in. Adjectives in -ov, -in may fulfill both subject and object function: papina fotografija (papa ‘father’ the subject, fotografija ‘photograph’ – a mode of action noun; and papa the object); while adjectives in -(ov)skij, -(in)skij can only express the subject, as in velaskesovskij portret (Velasquez is unambiguously the subject). The distinction can be blurred, though – in (9) Chexovskij refers to the subject slightly violating the norm:

(9) V etom godu żanrovaja palitra Chexovskix traktovok prostirala’s ot nezhnoj liriki do ogolteloj buffonady ‘the scale of Chexov’s interpretations ranged from lyrics to buffo’ >>

So, examples (6) – (8) exemplify what may be called a POSSESSIVE-GENITIVE DIATHESIS of a verbal noun: <Possessive-subject, Genitive-object>.

Now we must pay attention to the fact that this diathesis isn’t possible for all verbal nouns. For example, (10a), (11a) are not correct – instead one should use (10b), (11b):

(10) a. *moe sobljudenie tajny ‘my keeping of the secret’
b. sobljudenie mnoju tajny ‘keeping of the secret by me’
(11) a. *Vse zavisit ot ego sobljudenija tajny ‘everything depends on his keeping of the secret’
b. Vse zavisit ot sobljudenija im tajny ‘everything depends on the keeping of the secret by him’

Thus, the class of nouns compatible with the possessive-genitive diathesis is to be explored.

In Padučeva 1984 nouns with this possessive-genitive diathesis were attested as MODE OF ACTION nouns – though with some doubt. Such nouns are foreseen in the classification of
predicative nouns in “Meaning – Text” model. But, mode of action nouns that are given as examples are either derived from intransitive verbs (пoxodka ‘step’, povedenie ‘behavior’) or they have a generic object denoting a habitual action or even a property ensuing from habitual actions (počerk ‘handwriting’). For such nouns possessive-genitive diathesis is, naturally, out of the question. Or take the noun pechat’ ‘print’ (krupnaja, četkaja) – it has neither object nor subject valency.

But, in Apresjan 1974: 199, where regular ambiguity is discussed of nouns of manner of action and NOUNS OF RESULT, such nouns as perevod ‘translation’, redakcija ‘edition’ are attested as mode of action nouns. If so then I don’t bother if some of the nouns with possessive-genitive diathesis can be called both mode of action nouns and nouns of result.

Another “source” of mode of action nouns can be found in Apresjan 1974: 327. Such nouns as interpretacija are claimed to have two meanings: that of action and mode of action. These meanings, Apresjan says, are not distinguished in the dictionaries but it is necessary to distinguish them for they behave differently in the rules of synonymic transformations.

Examples of verbs and their synonymic transformations into mode of action nouns:

(12) интерпретиров ть X по-новому – предложить новую интерпрет цию X-a
‘to interpret creatively – to suggest a creative interpretation’;
относиться сдержанно – проявлять сдержанное отношение
to treat with restraint – to display a restrained attitude.

Having acquired such nouns as perevod and interpretacija we arrive at a class of mode of action nouns which is sufficiently broad. Among them we have mode of action nouns motivated by transitive verbs and preserving their subject and object valences, such as traktovka, ispolnenie, ponimanie, osmyslenie, izobraženie, upotreblenie, postanovka, tolkovanie. Note that many of them are ambiguous, i.e. have both mode of action, action and result meaning.

Thus, there are nouns that have subject and object in their argument structure (Grimshaw 1990), though they are not situation names, which, allegedly, were the only class of verbal nouns to preserve the main valences of a transitive verb:

Possessive-genitive diathesis of mode of action nouns has two sources.

Mode of action nouns can be motivated by verbs with valences Who? What and How; for example:

(13) traktuet Y tak ⇒ -ova trakovka Y- takova.
‘X treats Y in this way ⇒ ’s treatment of Y is like this’.

As was said, the common rule for argument nouns $S_i$ is that they saturate their $i$-th valence by themselves. As for the names of circumstances, they may inherit all arguments of the motivating verb. So we are not to be astonished by the fact that a mode of action noun, a name of circumstance, has an argument structure comprising Subject and Object.

Still the main source of mode of action nouns with Subject and Object valences are nouns of result. The fact is that the participant Result occupies a paradoxical place in the argument structure of a verb (Дучев 1999). With verbs of creation it is the Object that expresses the Result (построить дом, создать теорию), so the object is not present in the argument structure of the verb of object:

In сочинение ушкен the word сочинение is the noun of object of the verb сочинить; object valence disappears and the genitive is understood as the genitive of subject.

But in all the other classes of transitive verbs the position of the object is occupied by the Patient (as in проколоть ухо, р зметить корпус) or Goal (as in в решить з д чу,
изобр зить шу). So the participant Result has no syntactic position it could have occupied. When the name of result is formed from the verb (прокол, р змек, решение, изобр жение) the participant Result disappears from the argument structure but the object valence doesn’t disappear, the dependent genitive of a deverbal noun expresses the Patient or Goal прокол ух, р змек корпус, решение з д чи, изобр жение ши.

Now what about mode of action nouns? If I am not mistaken, mode of action nouns are nouns of result used in contexts of characterization.

So, mode of action nouns inherit from the transitive verb both the subject and the object valences. In fact, they are formed along the derivation pattern that doesn’t absorb either subject or object. Still they differ from situation nouns, for their subject valence cannot be saturated by an NP in the Instrumental but only by a possessive pronoun or adjective.

If the subject valence is saturated by the Instrumental then the noun cannot be interpreted as a mode of action noun:

(14) . Ego ponimanie etoj problemy ne sova-padaet s moim ‘his understanding of the problem doesn’t coincide with mine’ [поним ние ‘understanding’ – mode of action name]

6. Ponimanie im etoj problemy svidetel’ stvuet o ego iskusennosti v takix delaх ‘the fact that he understands the problem testifies his experience in the matters like this one

(15) . Ego ispolnenie Shopena bylo velikolepno [ispolnenie – mode of action noun];

6. Ispolnenie im Shopena bylo neumestno ‘Playing Shopen by him was out of place’ [ispolnenie – action noun].

The importance of distinguishing mode of action nouns from the situation nouns can be demonstrated on the following example1:

(16) *Opisanie Tomsonom uslovij, opredeljajuščix vybor padeža, ostaetsja odnim iz lučšix ‘description by Thomson of conditions determining the choice of case is up till now one of the best’

The NP opisanie Tomsonom uslovij, opredeljajuščix vybor padeža is well formed and causes no doubts. But it is out of place in this context – in fact, the noun opisanie is used in the diathesis appropriate for nouns of event or fact, though in the context ostaetsja odnim iz lučšix it should be interpreted as a mode of action noun, so that the subject is to be in the Possessive and not in the Instrumental:

(17) Tomsonovskoe opisanie uslovij, opredeljajuščix vybor padeža, ostaetsja odnim iz lučšix ‘Thomson’s description of conditions determining the choice of case is up till now one of the best’

Thus, if the noun is a mode of action noun the Subject should be in the Possessive. The opposite seemed at first to be also true – if a noun cannot be understood as a mode of action noun a possessive cannot be used as its subject marker. In (18) for example, a possessive pronoun cannot be substituted for the instrumental because the name ponimanie, in this context, is not a mode of action noun:

(18) Neobxodimoe uslovie perevoda – ponimanie eju <машиноj> teksta v polnom ob’eme ‘a necessary condition of adequate translation is a complete understanding by it <the machine> of the text’

Still there are contexts where Instrumental is impossible but this cannot be explained by the fact that the noun belongs to the class of mode of action nouns:

---

1 е льн я фр в из р боты нерусскогоязычного сл вист , прекр сно вл доющего русским языком.
Thus, the thesis that Instrumental is a default case for the subject in the presence of the genitive of object is to be abandoned.

No wonder that mode of action nouns are readily used in the context of characterizing predicate, see (15a), (17) above and (20) below:

(20) *ego izobraženie Napoleona sliškom čelovečnnoe

*his depiction of Napoleon is too human*

4. Diathesis with the genitive object raising

Mode of action nouns have one additional specific diathesis – with the genitive object raising:

(20’) a. *ego izobraženie Napoleona* *his depiction of Napoleon*
b. *Napoleon v ego izobraženii* *Napoleon in his depiction*

In the context of example (21) the synonymy transformation is possible:


b. *V Darvinovskoj koncepcii* èvolucija sostoit v tom, čto imeet mesto mehanizm prisposoblenija; c. *V koncepcii Darvina* èvolucija sostoit v tom, čto imeet mesto mehanizm prisposoblenija;

A genitive object raising is not a synonymy transformation with a wide scope of application. Still in the case of a mode of action noun the construction with the raised object is POSSIBLE in SOME contexts; while for the names of actions the diathesis with object raising is EXCLUDED in ANY context.

Clearly, the construction with the raised object is impossible in the case of example (22) with the additional argument introduced by the conjunction *kak*:

(22) *jungovskoe ponimanie* duševnoj žizni čeloveka “kak vnutrennej dramy so množestvom personažej”

I do not argue that the synonymy transformation of object raising is always possible, as it is possible in the context of (22), synonymy requires a separate set of conditions. The fact is that the construction with the raised object is possible in some conditions, while for the names of actions the diathesis with object raising is excluded “by itself”, i.e. in all contexts:

(4) razrušenie Novgoroda moskovskim knjazem ‘destruction of Novgorod by the Moscow prince’
(3’) *Novgorod v razrushenii moskovskim knjazem.*

In example (23) the verb phrase *markiruet načalo* ‘marks the beginning’ is ambiguous between actional and characterization reading, so *perevod* can be understood both as a mode of action noun and as a name of event, and this is why both diatheses – with possessive and with Instrumental are possible:

(23) a. *Ljuterovskij* [possessive] *perevod* ‘Novogo Zaveta’ (1522) *markiruet načalo principal’no novogo otnošenija k Pisaniju*
b. *perevod Ljuterom* [Instrumental] ‘Novogo Zaveta’ *markiruet načalo principal’no novogo otnošenija k Pisaniju*

‘Luther’s translation of the New Testament marks the beginning of a new attitude towards the Scriptures’

5. Examples

Examples that follow are given in order to demonstrate two diatheses of a mode of action noun – possessive-genitive and attributive. Examples are given for words *analiz* ‘analysis’, *videnie* ‘perception’, *vybor* ‘choice’, *izobraženie* ‘depiction’, *izloženie* ‘account’, *koncepcija*

ANALIZ ‘analysis’
On otmečaet, что saxarovskij analiz opasnosti mirovogo jadernogo samoubijstva v točnosti sovpadaet s dokumentami, opublikovannymi amerikanskimi učenymi = ‘Sakharov’s analysis of the danger …’

VIDENIE ‘view’
… perenos v sovremennost’ dejstvia romana liš’ banaliziruet tragediju oruèlovskogo videnija totalitariizma XX veka... = ‘the tragedy of Orwell’s view of totalitarism’

VOSPRIJATIE ‘perception’
Êti otnošenija pomogajut vyjavit’ nekotorye črezvyčajno suščestvennye aspekty šoloxovskogo vosprijatija žizni = ‘the most important aspects of Šoloxov’s perception of life
The word vosprijatije is the only mode of action noun I know which co-occurs with the Instrumental of the subject and, thus, overrides the restriction observed:
Vprochem, v vospprijatii vlasti naseleni [Instrumental] ochen’ silen emotional’nyj factor ‘In the perception of the power by citizens there is a strong emotional factor’

VYBOR ‘choice’
(1) Vidimo, kontakt s aviapromyšlennost’ju i poval’naja uvlečennost’ aviaciej 30 godov skazalis’ na otcovskom vybore buduĉej professii syna = ‘father’s choice of the future profession of the son’
(2) rabotaet už v 23 goda, i ni razu ne požalela o svoem vybore professii! ‘never regret my choice of profession’
(3) Esli čelovek lišen vozmožnosti vybora zla, to ego vybor dobra polnost’ju deval’viruetsja. = ‘his choice of the Good …’

IZOBRAŽENIE ‘depiction’
Naprimer, k ego izobraženiju revnivca, v lice Otello, nel’zja pribavit’ ni odnoj čerty: tak ono polno. ‘to his depiction of a jealous man not a single feature can be added’

IZLOŽENIE ‘account’
Russkomu že čitatelju, odolevšemu rollanovskoe izloženie ètogo cirkovogo vran’ja, napomnju … = ‘to a Russian reader who overcame Rolland’s account of this intricate lie’.

INTERPRETACIJA ‘interpretation’
I zdes’ snova prixodit na pam’jat’ “Andželo” i ego lotmanovskaja interpretacija ‘ “Andželo” and its Lotman’s interpretation’

KONCEPCIJA ‘conception’
пribližalsja k tolstovskoj koncepcii iskusstva = ‘approached Tolstoj’s conception of art’
Platonovskaja koncepcija ljubvi kak vosxozdenija po lestnici prekrasnogo = ‘Platonov’s conception of love’

OCENKA ‘evaluation’
A nas vse v klasse porazila ego ocenka moix skromnyx uspexov = ‘his evaluation of my achievements’

PEREVOD ‘translation’
Tam she ‘Gamlet’ v pasternakovskom perevode = ‘Hamlet in Pasternak’s translation was performed there’.

PLAN ‘plan’
Čubajsovyj plan restrukturizacji RAO ‘EÈS Rossii’ prokremlevskie frakcii poruchili provodit’
pravitel’stvu M. Kas’janova Čubais’s plan of restrukturization of RAO ‘EÈS Rossii’ was being carried out by the government of Kas’janov

PODBOR ‘choice’
Ja lovlju sebya sejčas na tom, čto moj podbor svidetel’stvi argumentov sliškom tendencioznjy, odnostoronnij, umyšlennjy = ‘I now understand that my choice of testimonies and arguments is too biased’

PONIMANIE ‘understanding’, ‘reading’
Naravstvennye osnovy byli v menja založeny v sem’e, tak čto moe ponimanie grexa – ne cerkovnoe, a žitejskoe. ‘my understanding of sin’
ja ... starajus’ dat’ sebe otčet, čto novogo vnesla ěta fraza v moe ponimanie teksta i kak perestroila staroe = ‘I try to understand how this sentence enriched my reading of the text, how it changed the former reading’
Esli čto moe širokoe ponimanie slova revolucioncja pokazalos’ g. Astaf’evu nepravil’nym, to on mog by prijamo na čto vozrazit’ ‘... whether my broad understanding of the word revolution seemed unacceptable’

POSTANOVKA = ‘staging’
Mandel’stam, očevidno, ulovil karnaval’nuyu storo nu revolucioncynog’o ‘dejstva’, načavšego s mejerxol’dovskoj [Possessive] postanovki “Maskarada” načavšego s postanovki mejerxol’dom [Instrumental] “Masquerade” = ‘carnival aspect of the revolutionary activity that had begun with the staging of “Maskarad”’

PROČTENIE ‘interpretation’
S ‘nabokovskim’ pročteniem Gogolja možno ne soglašat’sja ‘one may not agree with Nabokov’s interpretation of Gogol’

REŠENIE ‘solution’
Svoe rešenie problemy predlagajut neskol’ko amerikanskih kompanij ‘several American companies suggest their solution of the problem’
najti edinstvennyj ključ k ponimaniju rasskaza ili daže najti čexovskoe rešenie voprosov, postavlennyx v nem

SPOSOB ěto – liš’ lužkovskij sposob ogradit’ rossijan ot raspredelenija obščenacional’nogo doxoda

TRAKTOVKA ‘treatment’
Kommu nistčeskie bjurokraty vozmuščalis’ mejerxol’dovskoj traktovkoy “Revizora” = ‘communist bureaucrats were indignant with Mejerxol’d’s treatment of “Revizor”

TOLKOVANIE
a. Interesno, ... čto oni dumajut o moem tolkovani Apokalipsisa? = ‘what do they think about my interpretation of Apocalypse’;
b. o tolkovani mnoju Apokalipsisa? ‘what do they think about the fact that I interpret Apocalypse’
FORMULIROVKA
Ibo četoj “svobody duxa” nikogda i ne moglo byt’ u nas imenno iz-za pervykh dvux položenij
aksakovskoj formulirovki “russkogo puti” ‘because of the first two points in Aksakov’s formulation of
the Russian way.

Concluding remarks

1. Thus, it was demonstrated that mode of action nouns motivated by transitive verbs
constitute a semantically coherent class with a specific possessive-genitive diathesis:
   < Subject – Possessive, Object – Genitive >.
   The derivation models that generate possessive adjectives in -ovskij, -inskij are highly
   productive and neologisms of this kind are widely used in modern Russian. Possessive
   pronouns, possessive adjectives and adjectives in -ovskij, -inskij behave alike.

2. The majority of mode of action nouns have at their disposal also a diathesis with the
raised object, utterly excluded for the nouns of action. It is this diathesis that distinguishes
mode of action nouns from the more general class of nouns of Result.

3. Instrumental of the Subject is excluded not only in the context of mode of action nouns
but also in the context of nouns of result. The limits of extension of the possessive-genitive
diathesis are to be explored.

4. The class of mode of action nouns is not homogeneous. The question is, whether
general rules of valence inheritance are possible. ( Ип того известного пр вил , что у
имени объект проп д ет в лентность н объект; или кт нт проп д ет потому, что
генер лиzuется.) This is a task remaining for the future.*

*I am grateful to Leonid Iomdin for corrections and suggestions.
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