

# Anaphoric reference by Russian imperfective past passive participles

Olga Borik<sup>1</sup>  
Berit Gehrke<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UNED, Madrid

<sup>2</sup>CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz

Reference beyond the DP:

Towards a crosslinguistic typology of the syntax and semantics of proforms

DGfS 40, Stuttgart, March 7-9, 2018

# Proforms in the verbal domain

- This talk:
  - Referential anaphoric properties of event descriptions
  - Event counterpart of definite descriptions: Presuppositional imperfective past passive participles in Russian

# The morphological category Aspect in Russian

- Every verb (in a context) is either imperfective (IPF) or perfective (PF).
  - Identical lexical meaning can be expressed by IPF and PF verb forms.
  - Common assumption: Many verb( form)s come in **aspectual pairs**.
- Aspectual pairs derived by **prefixes** from **simple IPFs**:

- (1) a. ipf. *pit'* > pf. *vy-pit'* 'to drink'  
 b. ipf. *risovat'* > pf. *na-risovat'* 'to draw'

- Aspectual pairs derived by **suffixes** from (mostly prefixed) PFs
  - **S(econdary) I(mperfective)s** [descriptive term]

- (2) a. pf. *pro-dat'* > ipf. *pro-da-va-t'* 'to sell' (lit. through-give)  
 b. pf. *ot-kryt'* > ipf. *ot-kry-va-t'* 'to dis-cover, open'  
 c. pf. *dat'* > ipf. *da-va-t'* 'to give'

(Set aside: Suppletive pairs that - at least from a synchronic point of view - are not morphologically transparent; (im)perfectiva tantum; biaspectual verbs; etc.)

# The terms (I)PF

- Labels for forms, not necessarily meanings.
- We will discuss the use of IPF forms in contexts that could semantically be characterised as perfective (~ bounded completed events in the past).  
(compare: present tense forms with future meaning; plural forms that can also refer to singularities; etc.)

- IPF forms can express different meanings in context:

## Canonical IPF meanings:

- Process/durativity (~ Progressive)
- Iterativity/habituality

## Non-canonical IPF meaning(s): General-factual (more on this later)

- Existential (e.g. *Have you ever read War and Peace?*)
- Presuppositional (Grønn 2004) / Actional (Padučeva 1996) (e.g. *The Winter Palace was built by Rastrelli.*)

# Long-standing issue concerning Russian Aspect

(and Slavic Aspect more generally)

- Do PF forms always express a uniform perfective meaning?  
Most agree (e.g. event time is part of reference time).
- Do IPF forms always express a uniform imperfective meaning?  
Much more debated (see appendix):
  - 1 Yes, the negation of the positive definition of PF (e.g. Borik 2006)
  - 2 Yes, a positive definition (e.g. reference time is part of event time); perfectivity effects are contextually induced. (e.g. Altshuler 2012)
  - 3 No, there are various definitions for IPF forms, also one that makes some (the factual ones) very similar to PF. (e.g. Grønn 2015)

(For now we do not have a final opinion about this debate.)

# Russian past passive participles (PPPs)

- Are regularly derived from **PF verbs**:

INFINITIVE	LONG FORM PPP	SHORT FORM PPP
<i>sdelat'</i> 'make.PF'	<i>sdelannyj</i> 'made.PF'	<i>sdelan</i> 'made.PF'
<i>rasserdit'</i> 'anger.PF'	<i>rasseržennyj</i> 'angered.PF'	<i>rasseržen</i> 'angered.PF'
<i>zakryt'</i> 'close.PF'	<i>zakrytyj</i> 'closed.PF'	<i>zakryt</i> 'closed.PF'

- One can also find **IPF PPPs**:

INFINITIVE	LONG FORM PPP	SHORT FORM PPP
<i>delat'</i> 'make.IPF'	<i>delannyj</i> 'made.IPF'	<i>delan</i> 'made.IPF'
<i>slyšat'</i> 'hear.IPF'	<i>slyšannyj</i> 'heard.IPF'	<i>slyšan</i> 'heard.IPF'
<i>krasit'</i> 'paint.IPF'	<i>krašennyj</i> 'painted.IPF'	<i>krašen</i> 'painted.IPF'

# Long vs. short form PPPs

- **Long form PPPs:** always adjectival
  - Attributive use
  - Predicative use with various copulae (e.g. also *seem* etc.)(will not be further discussed here)
- **Short form PPPs:** Used in periphrastic passives with *byt'* 'be'  
(long forms are not possible in this context)

Controversial, which kind of passive (see below):

- Verbal (+ auxiliary *byt'*) vs. adjectival (+ copula *byt'*)
- Eventive vs. stative

## Two passive constructions in Russian

- **Periphrastic passive:** BE + past passive participles (PPP) (3-a)
- **Reflexive passive:** Active form + reflexive postfix *-sja/-s'* (3-b)

(3) Storož                    **otkry(va)l**                    vorota.                    [ACTIVE]

watchman.NOM opened.(I)PF gate.AKK.PL

'A / The watchman opened a / the gate.'

a. Vorota                    **byli otkryty**                    storožem.

gate.NOM.PL were opened.PF.PPP watchman.INSTR

'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'

b. Vorota                    **otkryvalis'**                    storožem.

gate.NOM.PL opened.SI.PL.RFL watchmann.INSTR

'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'

## Passive: Aspectual restrictions in Russian

- Periphrastic passive: only PF (usually) (4)
- Reflexive passive: only IPF (usually) (5)

(4) a. Vorota **byli otkryty** storožem.  
 gate.NOM.PL were opened.PF.PPP watchman.INSTR  
 'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'  
 b. \*Vorota **byli otkryvany** storožem.  
 gate.NOM.PL were opened.SI.PPP watchman.INSTR

(5) a. Vorota **otkryvalis'** storožem.  
 gate.NOM.PL opened.SI.PL.RFL watchmann.INSTR  
 'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'  
 b. \*Vorota **otkrylis'** storožem.  
 gate.NOM.PL opened.PF.PL.RFL watchmann.INSTR

- Exceptions to these "rules":
  - IPF PPPs: This talk (see also Knjazev 2007)
  - PF refl. pass.: e.g. Schoorlemmer (1995), Fehrman et al. (2010)

# Aspectual restrictions: PPPs in periphrastic passives

- Different opinions:

- Standard assumption: Only PF can be used.

- IPF PPPs are idiomatic / frozen adjectives.

→ In analyses of passives, they are therefore not taken into account.  
(e.g. Babby and Brecht 1975, Švedova 1980, Schoorlemmer 1995, Paslawska and von Stechow 2003)

- Knjazev (2007): Sometimes also IPF, but never with a process meaning

→ Corpus study in Borik and Gehrke (2018):

- Periphrastic passives with IPF PPPs are rare but do occur.

- (6) a. Oni byli **šity** kornjami berezy ili vereska i byli  
they were sewn.IPF roots.INSTR birch-.GEN or heather-.GEN and were  
očen' krepki.  
very firm  
'They were sewn from birch or heather roots and were very firm.'
- b. **Pisano** èto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871 godu [...]  
written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year.PREP  
'This was written by Dostojevskij in 1871.'

# Goal of the talk

- To show that **IPF PPPs** can be **regular participles**, not (just) adjectives, based on their:
  - Derivation: Transparent composition
  - Use: in unambiguously verbal periphrastic passives
- Hypothesis: Only non-canonical general-factual IPF meanings
- **Analysis of presuppositional IPF PPPs** (subtype of general-factual)
  - Condition on this use:
    - The event described by the IPF PPP behaves like a definite description which has to be anaphorically linked to a contextually salient eventive discourse referent.
    - This event is backgrounded (in the sense of Krifka 2007).
    - This event is part of the theme (in the sense of Vallduví 2016).
- **Speculations on the role of IPF and the role of passivisation**

# The data

# The data

- Russian National Corpus (RNC) ([ruscorpora.ru](http://ruscorpora.ru))
  - 109,028 documents, 22,209,999 sentences, 265,401,717 words
  - Non-disambiguated version
  - Grammatical feature: partcp,praet,pass,ipf
- IPF PPPs directly preceding or following a finite form of *byt'* 'be'
  - partcp,praet,pass,ipf distance: 1 from *byt'*: 2,632 contexts
  - *byt'* distance: 1 from partcp,praet,pass,ipf: 17,015 contexts

# Qualitative, not quantitative analysis

- The query excludes PPPs with non-finite or null forms of *byt'* (the latter: present tense), PPPs as second conjuncts etc.
- Manual exclusion of the following types of data:
  - Long form PPPs (are not used in periphrastic passives)
  - Biaspectual forms (also tagged as IPF in RNC), e.g.:
    - *obeščan* 'promised', *velen* 'ordered'
    - Verbs in *-ovat'*: *ispol'zovan* 'used', *realizovan* 'realised'
  - Tagging mistakes, e.g.:
    - *Biorndalen* (Ole Einar Bjørndalen), *Sezan* (Paul Cézanne) as PPP
    - *strašen* 'horrible.ADJ' as PPP
    - *otvečen* 'answered.PF', *pereključen* 'off-turned.PF' as IPF

# Non-compositional IPF PPPs

- Idiomatic cases: *(ne) lykom šit* lit. '(not) sewn with bast fibre', meaning 'simple-minded'
- Fixed expressions: *rožden/kreščen* 'born/baptised'
- Genuine adjectives: *viden*, lit. 'seen', meaning 'visible'

(We did not further include these cases.)

# Compositional IPF PPPs

- Regular, productive, repeated forms with transparent, predictable meaning (not idiosyncratic):

(7) *pisan* 'written.IPF', *čitan* 'read.IPF', *pit* 'drunk.IPF', *eden* 'eaten.IPF', *šit* 'sewn.IPF', *delan* 'made.IPF', *čekanen* 'minted.IPF', *bit* 'beaten.IPF', *myt* 'washed.IPF', *brit* 'shaved.IPF', *strižen* 'groomed.IPF', *kormlen* 'fed.IPF', *nesen* 'carried.IPF', *govoren* 'said.IPF', *prošen* 'asked.IPF', *zvan* 'called.IPF', *kusan* 'bit.IPF', *kryt* 'covered.IPF', *njuxan* 'smelled.IPF', etc.

First generalisations:

- Many IPF PPPs of saying verbs and incremental verbs, but not exclusively
- Compositional IPF PPPs are rare, but they cannot simply be ignored.

→ We need a compositional analysis.

## No secondary imperfectives

- Only 3 examples, not Modern Russian; e.g. Church Slavonic:

(8) V leto 7010 mesjaca avgusta v šestoe na  
 in summer 7010 month.GEN august.GEN in 6th on  
 Preobraženie Gospoda našego Iisusa Christa  
 Transfiguration Lord.GEN our.GEN Jesus.GEN Christ.GEN  
 načata byst' **podpisyvana** cerkov' [...]  
 begun.PF.PPP be.3.SG.AOR signed(painted).SI church

→ No secondary imperfective PPPs in Modern Russian

(see also Knjazev 2007)

# What kind of passive?

# Background assumptions on periphrastic passives

- Different terminology; but this also implies a general difference:
  - **Verbal vs. adjectival passive**  
→ Auxiliary + verbal participle vs. copula + adjectival participle
  - **Eventive vs. stative passive**  
→ The participle could still be verbal in both cases.

e.g. **German verbal 'Vorgangspassiv'** (9-a) vs. **adjectival 'Zustandspassiv'** (9-b)

- (9) a. Die Tür **wird** geöffnet. 'The door has been opened.'  
the door became opened
- b. Die Tür **ist** geöffnet. 'The door is open(ed).'  
the door is opened

- General assumption: The participle in the Zustandspassiv is adjectival;  
e.g. compatibility with adjectival morphology:

- (10) Die Aufgabe **ist/\*wird** (un-)gelöst.  
the task is/becomes un-solved

## German adjectival ‘Zustandspassiv’

- Restricted compatibility with event-related modification:

(11) a. Die Zeichnung ist **von einem Kind** angefertigt.  
the drawing is by a child produced

b. Der Brief war **mit Bleistift** geschrieben.  
the letter was with pencil written

c. Das Haar war ziemlich **schlampig** gekämmt.  
the hair was rather sloppily combed

(12) Der Mülleimer ist {**\*von meiner Nichte** / **\*langsam** / **\*genüsslich** / **\*mit der Heugabel**} geleert.

Intended: ‘The rubbish bin is emptied by my niece / slowly / with pleasure / with the pitchfork.’

(e.g. Rapp 1996, Kratzer 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Maienborn 2007)

## German adjectival ‘Zustandspassiv’

- Gehrke (2011, et seq.): Adjectivisation of the participle → no instantiation of the event (no location in time and space, only conceptual information about the event type/kind)
    - No event token modification: (11) vs. (12), (13)
- (13)
- \*Der Computer ist **vor drei Tagen** repariert.  
Intended: ‘The computer is repaired three days ago.’
  - \*Das Kind war **im Badezimmer** gekämmt.  
Intended: ‘The child was combed in the bathroom.’

# Passive cross-linguistically

- General assumption that the verbal/adjectival passive distinction is also found in languages without formal distinction

## e.g. English:

- Standard assumption: BE + participle can express both types of passive.
  - Depending on the context: Adjectival vs. verbal participle
  - In 'adjectival' contexts: Similar restrictions as in German  
→ adjectival (e.g. McIntyre 2013, Bruening 2014, Alexiadou et al. 2014)
- 
- We assume that also Russian passives should in principle be able to be verbal or adjectival.

# Back to Russian

- Positions about Russian short form (PF) PPPs
  - Babby (1975, 1999, 2009): always verbal
  - Schoorlemmer (1995), Borik (2014); **this talk**: verbal or adjectival (depending on the context) [like English]
  - Paslawska and von Stechow (2003), e.g. (14):
    - 'Adjectival/stative' with present tense copula (= null copula)
    - 'Verbal/eventive' with past tense forms of BE

(14) Portret (byl) narisovan karandašom.  
 portrait.NOM (was) painted.PPP pencil.INSTR  
 'The portrait is/was painted with a pencil.'

## Paslawska and von Stechow (2003)

- But: 'Adjectival/stative' PPPs (with a null form of BE) allow for temporal localisation of the event (contrasting, e.g., with German) (15).

(15)    Étot        dom            postroen v prošlom    godu.  
           this.NOM house.NOM built        in last.PREP year.PREP  
           compare German: ?Dieses Haus ist im letzten Jahr gebaut.

- P&vS: 'Adjectival/stative' PPPs contain an additional perfect operator (see Anagnostopoulou 2003, for Greek).
  - Resultative semantics as an explanation for the (alleged) restriction to PF
- Q:** Why do we then find the same (alleged) restriction [for us: tendency] with 'verbal/eventive' PPPs?

## Borik (2014)

- No modification restrictions, with or without BE; e.g. (16)
- Verbal PPP

(16) Vorota (byli) otkryty storozhem rovno v 6  
 gate.NOM.PL (were) opened.PPP watchman.INSTR exactly in 6  
 utra na 2 časa.  
 morning.GEN on 2 hours  
 'The gate is/was opened by the watchmen at exactly 6 in the  
 morning for 2 hours.'

- Our conclusion: Short form PPPs can be either verbal or adjectival.

(see also Schoorlemmer 1995, Borik 2013)

There might still be the possibility that they are always stative (possibly including a perfect operator in their semantics), but that does not necessarily make them adjectival.

# Back to IPF PPPs: What kind of passive?

# What kind of passive?

## Why is the question important?

- Standard assumption: IPF PPPs are exceptions and to be analysed as adjectives (not as PPPs).
- One possible analysis of adjectival passives: adjectivisation in the lexicon.
  - Were we to find only adjectival IPF PPPs, we could maintain the standard assumption (together with this analysis of adjectival participles).

(However, we do assume that also adjectival PPPs should be analysed compositionally.)

## Examples of adjectival IPF PPPs

- At most event kind modification:

(17) Kryt byl dom solomoj [...]  
 covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR  
 'The house was covered with hay.'

(18) [...] ne skazal, čto vagon-to naš učebnikami gružen  
 not said.PF that wagon-PTL our school-books.INSTR beladen.IPF  
 byl?  
 war  
 'Didn't he say that our wagon was loaded with school books?'

(19) My oba byli striženy nagolo [...]  
 we both were groomed bald  
 'We both had our heads shaven.'

## Examples of clearly verbal IPF PPPs

- Modification of an instantiated event:

(20) Pisano èto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871 godu [...] [  
 written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year.PREP  
 'This was written by Dostojevskij in 1871.'

(21) Èto [...] vedeno bylo moeju rukoj!  
 this led.IPF was my.INSTR hand.INSTR  
 'This was orchestrated by my hand!'

(22) [...] sleduja tem putem, kotorym neseno bylo v  
 following this.INSTR path.INSTR which.INSTR carried.IPF was in  
 Gefsimaniju dlja pogrebenija telo Bogomateri [...] [  
 Gethsemane for burial body mother-of-God.GEN  
 "... on the same path, on which the body of the mother of God was  
 carried to Gethsemane to be buried.'

⇒ IPF PPPs can also be verbal.

# Which IPF contexts?

# No process meaning

- Knjazev (2007): IPF PPPs cannot have a process meaning.

→ also not in our data

- Our hypothesis: IPF PPPs are general-factual.

First indication: Exchangeability with PF PPPs

- (23)
- (Na)pisano èto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871  
(PF)written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871  
godu [...] year.PREP
  - (Po)kryt byl dom solomoj [...] (PF)covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR
  - My oba byli (po)striženy nagolo [...] we both were (PF)groomed.IPF bald

- Here: Analysis of the ‘presuppositional’ cases.

# The general-factual IPF

(Maslov 1959) (see Mehlig 2016, for general discussion)

- ① **Presuppositional/actional** (24) (example: Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, terms: Grønn 2004/Padučeva 1996)

Paraphrase: *The (already mentioned or contextually retrievable) event was such and such.*

(24) Zimnij Dvorec stroil Rastrelli.  
winter-.ACC palace.ACC built.IPF Rastrelli  
'It was Rastrelli who built the Winter Palace.'

- ② **Existential** (25) (from Grønn 2004) (see also Padučeva 1996)

Paraphrase: *There was (at least) one event of this type.*

(e.g. Mehlig 2001, 2013, Mueller-Reichau 2013, 2015, Mueller-Reichau and Gehrke 2015)

(25) Ne bylo somnenij, što ja prežde vstrečal ee.  
not was.NEU doubt.PL.GEN that I before met.SI her  
'There is no doubt that I have met her before.'

# Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

(see also Grønn 2015, for further theoretical assumptions)

- (26) Sdelav<sup>pf</sup> ètot xod [26 – Rxc3], ja [predložil<sup>pf</sup> nič'ju]<sub>antecedent</sub>. [...] Navernjaka, černye deržatsja<sup>ipf</sup> – naprimer, 27 Ba3 Bf8 28 Nf5 d5 29 Bb2 [...], no mne ne xotelos<sup>'ipf</sup> načinat<sup>'ipf</sup> sčetnuju igru, [poètomu]<sub>F</sub> ja i [predlagal<sup>ipf</sup> nič'ju]<sub>anaphora</sub>.  
 'Having played this move [26 – Rxc3], I offered a draw. [...] Black can probably hold on, for instance in the line 27 Ba3 Bf8 28 Nf5 d5 29 Bb2 [...], but I didn't want to get involved in heavy calculations, and [for this reason]<sub>F</sub>, I offered a draw.'  
 (Grønn 2004, 207)

- The verb is deaccentuated. **Focus** is on some other constituent.
  - The event given by the verb is backgrounded, its prior instantiation is presupposed.
- Presupposition as **anaphor** → bound in the discourse (27) or contextually derivable (next slide)

# Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

- Presupposition as **anaphor** → contextually derivable:

(27) Dlja bol'sinstva znakomyx vaš [ot' ezd]<sub>(pseudo-)antecedent</sub> stal<sub>PF</sub> polnoj neožidannost'ju ... Vy [uezžali<sup>IPF</sup>]<sub>anaphora</sub> v Ameriku [ot čego-to, k čemu-to ili že prosto voznamerilis'<sub>PF</sub> spokojno provesti<sub>PF</sub> tam buduščuju starost']<sub>F</sub>?

'For most of your friends your departure to America came as a total surprise ... Did you leave for America for a particular reason or with a certain goal, or did you simply decide to spend your retirement calmly over there?' (Grønn 2004, 207f.)

## Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

- (28) V ètoj porternoj ja [...] napisal pervoe ljubovnoe pis'mo. Pisal  
 in this tavern I wrote.PF first love letter wrote.IPF  
 [karandašom]<sub>F</sub>.  
 pencil.INSTR  
 'In this tavern I wrote my first love letter. I wrote it with pencil.'

Grønn's analysis of the 2nd sentence of this example (ascribed to Forsyth 1970):

- (29) [VP]:  $\lambda e[x|INSTRUMENT(e, x), \mathbf{pencil}(x)]_{[|write(e)]}$

- VP: Background-focus division (in the sense of Krifka 2001)
- Backgrounded material is turned into a presupposition.
  - Background/Presupposition Rule in Geurts and van der Sandt (1997)
- DRT analysis: Backgrounded material is subscripted in the DRS
- (further embedding under Aspect and Tense; see Grønn)

# Presuppositional IPF PPPs

# Arguments for presuppositional IPF PPPs

## 1 Background-focus marking

- **Focus** on quasi-obligatory modifiers; e.g. (30), (31)
  - Often **marked word order**; e.g. (30-a) & many previous ex.s, e.g. (31)
    - Unmarked word order: BE +PPP; marked: PPP + BE + Mod.
- ⇒ The event, denoted by the PPP, is part of the background.

- (30) a. **Stroeno bylo** èto vse [**ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto**]<sub>F</sub>.  
 built.IPF was that all badly lamely with-holes
- b. Zapiski byli pisany [**ne dlja pečati**]<sub>F</sub> [... no ...]  
 notes were written.IPF not for print but

- (31) a. **Pisano** èto **bylo** Dostoevskim [**v 1871 godu**]<sub>F</sub> [...]  
 written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year.PREP
- b. **Kryt** byl dom [**solomoj**]<sub>F</sub> [...]  
 covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR

# Arguments for presuppositional IPF PPPs

② Inference of a completed event survives under **negation**.

- (32) Stroeno (**ne**) bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.  
 built.IPF not was that all badly lamely with-holes  
 ~> All that was / has been built.
- (33) Zapiski (**ne**) byli pisany ne dlja pečati [... no ...]  
 notes not were written.IPF not for print but  
 ~> The notes were / have been written.

# Arguments for presuppositional IPF PPPs

- ③ **Anaphoricity**: The anaphoric possibilities in IPF passives are parallel to anaphoric possibilities of definite descriptions.
- Pick up previously introduced discourse referents
    - With identical lexical material (only difference in Aspect)  
~ *A girl entered the room.* ... *The girl* ...
    - With lexically related material: hyponymy/hyperonymy  
~ *A blonde girl/Petra entered the room.* ... *The girl* ...
    - With lexically related material: nominalisation (if nominalisations introduce discourse referents)
  - Anaphoricity via associative contextual relations, parallel to bridging (in the sense of Clark and Haviland 1977)
    - Created objects
    - (In)direct speech
    - (Nominalisations if they do not introduce discourse referents and we need to reconstruct them)

## More on anaphoricity

- Anaphoric to a previously introduced perfective (PF) event, e.g. by hyponymy:

(34) Èto – ne ja **sdelal**, èto – **vedeno** bylo moeju rukoj!  
 this not I did.PF this led.IPF was my.INSTR hand.INSTR  
 ‘Not I did this, this was orchestrated by my hand!’

- Anaphoric to an event introduced by a deverbal noun:

(35) Čto kasaetjsa **platy** deneg, to **plačeny** byli naličnymi  
 what concerns payment.GEN money.GEN so paid.IPF were in-cash  
 šest' tysjač rubelej [...]  
 six thousand rubles  
 ‘What concerns the payment: 6000 rubbles were paid in cash.’

## More on anaphoricity: ~ Bridging?

- Anaphoric via a **created object**:

(36) **Pis'ma** ego **pisany** byli černo i kruglo [...]  
 letters his written.IPF were black and round  
 'His letters were written in black and round letters.'

**Idea**: Created objects presuppose the event that created them.

- This enables the resolution or the accommodation of the presupposition.
  - Created objects have independently been shown to enable event coercion, e.g. *She finished her hamburger.*  
 (e.g. Pustejovsky 1995, Egg 2003, Asher 2011)
- A similar mechanism that enables event coercion with these objects could also resolves the anaphoric link.

## More on anaphoricity: ~ Bridging?

- Anaphoric via (in)direct speech:

(37) **Kak i govoreno** bylo **zaranee**, Vasil'ev [...]
   
how and said.IPF was earlier Vasil'ev

**Idea:** (In)direct speech presupposes a speech event.

- High frequency of speech act verbs among those that express the presuppositional IPF, also with active presuppositional IPF (see also discussion in Grønn 2004)

# Analysis of presuppositional IPF PPPs

(building on Grønn 2004)

(38) Stroeno bylo èto vse [ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto]<sub>F</sub>.  
 built.IPF was this all badly lamely with-holes

- Information structure (signalled by focus and word order)  
 → Background-focus division of the VP (Krifka 2001):

(39)  $\langle \lambda e[x|\mathbf{build}(e) \wedge \text{THEME}(e, x)], \lambda e[|\mathbf{bad}(e) \wedge \mathbf{lame}(e) \wedge \mathbf{with-holes}(e)] \rangle$

- After Background/Presupposition Rule (Geurts and van der Sandt 1997):

(40)  $[[VP]] = \lambda e[|\mathbf{bad}(e) \wedge \mathbf{lame}(e) \wedge \mathbf{with-holes}(e)]_{[x|\mathbf{build}(e) \wedge \text{THEME}(e, x)]}$

# How to account for IPF? Some ideas

- **Grønn (2015)**: Definition of factual IPF that makes it semantically identical to PF (and different from process IPF). (+(in)definite times, events)
  - **An alternative hypothesis**: IPF forms have IPF meaning (either as the negation of PF or positively defined); perfectivity effects come from the context.
- e.g. IPF semantics as a partitive relation, building on Landman's (1992) account of the Progressive (see also Altshuler 2012)
- Commonly thought of as a partitive relation between event time  $\tau(e)$  and reference time  $t$ :  $t \subseteq \tau(e)$
  - **First attempt** (ignoring background/focus):

(41) Čto kasaetjsa **platy** deneg, to **plačeny** byli  
 what concerns payment.GEN money.GEN so paid.IPF were  
 naličnymi šest' tysjač rublej [...]  
 in-cash six thousand rubles  
 'What concerns the payment: 6000 rubbles were paid in cash.'

## How to account for IPF? Some ideas

(43)  $[e_1, e_2, t, n, x | \text{payment}(e_1), \text{pay}(e_2), \text{THEME}(e_2, x),$   
 $\text{6.000R}(x), \text{in-cash}(e_2), e_2 = e_1, t \subseteq \tau(e_2), t < n]$

- *plata* 'payment': Complex event nominal, introduces the event dr  $e_1$
- Event described by the IPF PPP:  $e_2$ , a definite description that is anaphorically related to  $e_1$ :  $e_2 = e_1$
- IPF:  $t \subseteq \tau(e_2)$
- Past tense:  $t < n(\text{ow})$
- Theme of  $e_2$ : 6.000 rubles (in focus)
- Additional information about  $e_2$ : in cash (in focus)

### Potential problem of this analysis:

- We lose the strong sense that overall the payment event  $e_1$  (and thereby also  $e_2$ ) was completed and should therefore be associated with a PF semantics.

# IPF semantics: Second attempt

(still ignoring background/focus)

- The partitive semantics of IPF can also be cashed out as a part-of relation between events; two versions:

- $e_2 \subseteq e_1$
- $\tau(e_2) \subseteq \tau(e_1)$

$$(44) \quad [e_1, e_2, t, n, x | \mathbf{payment}(e_1), \mathbf{pay}(e_2), \text{THEME}(e_2, x), \mathbf{6.000R}(x), \mathbf{in-cash}(e_2), e_2 \subseteq e_1, \tau(e_1) \subseteq t, t < n]$$

- Differences to first attempt:
  - Relation between the two events: part-of-relation, due to IPF;  $e_2 \subseteq e_1$
  - Reconstruction of PF semantics for the nominalisation:  $\tau(e_1) \subseteq t$
- Potential problems of this analysis:
  - Unorthodox IPF semantics
  - Reconstruction of PF semantics for nominalisation (giving a temporal trace to a non-finite verb form) [not a problem for finite antecedents]

# Rhetorical relations between events

- Either analysis leads to a rhetorical relation between  $e_2$  and  $e_1$  under which they necessarily temporally overlap.
- Several possibilities (on which see Lascarides and Asher 1993):
  - Elaboration:  $\alpha$ 's event is part of  $\beta$ 's
  - Background: The state described in  $\beta$  is the 'backdrop' or the circumstances under which the event in  $\alpha$  occurred.
  - (Maybe also Contrast?)

# Backgrounding

Different explanations:

- **Presupposition** (as anaphor) (Geurts and van der Sandt 1997, Grønn 2004)
- **Givenness** (e.g. Krifka 2007)
- **Theme** (e.g. Vallduví 2016)

# Krifka (2007)

- **Givenness:** The expression is in the immediate 'common ground' (CG).
  - Anaphoric expressions (incl. personal pronouns, demonstratives, definite article) signal that the referent is given.
  - Reduction of the prosodic realisation of expressions that are given in the immediate context:  
Omission, deaccentuation, non-canonical word order

⇒ A large part of our IPF PPPs:  
deaccentuation, marked word order

## Vallduví (2016)

- A **theme** elaborates on the maximal 'question under discussion' (QUD) in context C; locus of discourse progression.
    - Typical example: Short answers
- (45)     - What are we having for dinner?  
          - MUTTONBIRD.
- The theme is the *replica* of the max-QUD (without elaborating fragments).
    - Main task: To prepare the context for an update
    - A theme is obligatory in contexts, in which the utterance elaborates a non-max-QUD (that is already part of the QUD set).
    - Utterances with a theme: Parallel to a definite description that specifies a non-local antecedent.
- ⇒ **Events in presuppositional IPF PPPs are like definite descriptions.**
- They signal under which file card / discourse referent the new information (focus, theme) should be stored.

## E.g. context of our examples

- (46) Poslednej stupenju roskoši byl “ljuks”, gde razmesčali generalov i voobsče bol’šoe načal’stvo. Zdes’ byli fikusy, po verxnej kromke sten - zolotoj baget i pri každom nomere vanna. Vpročem, v letnie mesjacy voda šla redko, a kogda šla, to so svistom i soveršenno ržavaja, tak čto raznica meždu derevjannoj, kamennoj i “ljuksom” skazyvalas’ bol’še ne v byte, a v počete. **Stroeno** bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.

‘The last level of luxury was the “lux”, where generals and other big bosses were lodged. There were ficuses, on the upper edge of the walls - golden molding, and each room had its own bathroom. However, in the summer months there was often no water, and when there was, it came with a whistling noise and was absolutely rusty, so that the difference between a wooden (room), a stone (room) and a “lux” was not so much in the level of comfort, but in the honor. All that was built badly, lamely, with holes.’

## E.g. context of our examples

- (47) The last level of luxury was the “lux”, where generals and other big bosses were lodged. There were fuses, on the upper edge of the walls - golden molding, and there was a bath in each room. However, in the summer months there was often no water, and when there was, it came with a whistling noise and was absolutely rusty, so that the difference between a wooden (room), a stone (room) and a “lux” was not so much in the level of comfort, but in the honor.

*Stroeno bylo  to vse ploxo, xromo, ťeljasto.* ‘All that was built badly, lamely, with holes.’

- Max-QUD: *What was the hotel like?*
  - Sub-QUD: Guests? Quality of the rooms? Decoration? Equipment? etc.
  - Sub-QUD that our example answers: *How was it built?*

The building event is not immediately relevant but the manner in which it was built (expressed by a modifier).

→ *The building event is part of the theme.*

# Conclusion

# Summary

- There are IPF PPPs with compositional semantics in periphrastic passives (contra standard assumption).
- Hypothesis: Only general-factual IPF (presuppositional, existential)
- Analysis of presuppositional IPF PPPs:
  - A completed event is given in the context; it is backgrounded, part of the theme. → like a definite description
  - In focus: new information about the event, which is a (partial) answer to the QUD
- Possibility: Cashing out the semantics of IPF as a part-of relation between events?

# Open issues

- Analysis of existential IPF PPPs (examples in appendix)
- Why do IPF PPPs occur so rarely?
  - Is the general-factual meaning that rare? (not our intuition)
  - Are passives that rare? (also not our intuition)
- Why are there no secondary IPF PPPs?
  - Might make sense for presuppositional IPFs: the least marked verb form
  - But why also for existential IPF, if this use could be reduced to (potential) event plurality?

(Note: Active general-factual IPF is possible with secondary imperfectives.)
- Why no process meaning?
  - (also not with PF PPPs, but that could principally be due to PF, rather than to PPP-hood)
  - In, e.g., Czech, IPF PPPs can have a process meaning (Radek Šimík, p.c.).
- Why is Czech different? (e.g. also no aspectual restrictions with either of the two 'passives')

# Anaphoric reference by Russian imperfective past passive participles

Thanks!

**Olga Borik**  
UNED, Madrid

**Berit Gehrke**  
CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz

# Appendix: Semantics of Russian Aspect

- More general:
  - Russian Aspect as a **relation between reference time and some other temporal interval** (Klein 1995, Schoorlemmer 1995, Borik 2002, 2006, Paslawska and von Stechow 2003, Grønn 2004, 2015, Ramchand 2004, Tatevosov 2011, 2015, Altshuler 2012, 2014)
  - ‘Slavic Aspect’ as **event predicate modifier** – total vs. partial events (Filip 1999, et seq.)
- **Two variants:**
  - Most common: positive definition only of PF; IPF ‘unmarked’ (-PF or  $\pm$ PF) (especially because of general-factual IPF)
  - Positive definition also of IPF

## Appendix: Semantics of Russian Aspect

- Borik (2002, 2006): PF vs. -PF

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{PF: } S \cap R = \emptyset \ \& \ E \subseteq R \\ \text{IPF: } \neg (S \cap R = \emptyset \ \& \ E \subseteq R) \\ &= S \cap R \neq \emptyset \vee E \not\subseteq R \end{aligned}$$

- Grønn (2015): PF vs.  $\pm$ PF

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} [[\text{PF}]] &= \lambda t \lambda e. e \subseteq t \\ [[\text{IPF}_{\text{factual}}]] &= \lambda t \lambda e. e \subseteq t \\ [[\text{IPF}_{\text{ongoing}}]] &= \lambda t \lambda e. t \subseteq e \end{aligned}$$

+ system of (in)definite times and events to capture differences between PF and  $\text{IPF}_{\text{factual}}$ , as well as between  $\text{IPF}_{\text{ongoing}}$  and  $\text{IPF}_{\text{factual}}$

- Altshuler (2012, 2014): IPF is always  $t \subseteq e$   
→ General-factual IPF vs. PF: context

## Appendix: Existential IPF PPPs?

Paraphrase: *There was (at least) one event of this type.*

→ With negation: *There was no event of this type.*

(50) [...] i ja uže ne byl zvan v gosti [...]  
and I already not was called.IPF in guests  
'And I was not invited anymore.'

(51) Mojka byla perepolnena nemytoj posudoj. Ne myto  
sink was overfilled.PF unwashed.INSTR dishes.INSTR not washed.IPF  
bylo davno.  
was long-ago  
'The sink was flowing over with unwashed dishes. The dishes hadn't  
been done for a long time.'

## Appendix: Existential IPF PPPs?

Paraphrase: *There was (at least) one event of this type.*

- (52) Vsego nagljadelsja – i golodal, i syt byval po gorlo,  
all.GEN saw.IPF.REFL and starved.IPF and full was.FREQ to neck  
i bit byl, i sam bil [...] *and beaten.IPF was and myself beat.PST.IPF*  
'I saw it all – I was starving, I was completely full, I was beaten, and I did the beating myself.'
- (53) Ne raz ja byl učen, molču i znaju [...] *not once I was lectured.IPF am-silent and know.1SG*  
'I was lectured not just once, I keep quiet and know ...'
- (54) Za što neodnokratno byla bita [...] *for what not once was beaten.IPF.FEM.SG*  
'For which she was beaten more than once ...'

# References I

- Alexiadou, A., Gehrke, B. and Schäfer, F.: 2014, The argument structure of adjectival participles revisited, *Lingua* **149B**, 118–138.
- Altshuler, D.: 2012, Aspectual meaning meets discourse coherence: A look at the Russian imperfective, *Journal of Semantics* **29.1**, 39–108.
- Altshuler, D.: 2014, A typology of partitive aspectual operators, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **32.3**, 732–775.
- Anagnostopoulou, E.: 2003, Participles and Voice, in A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert and A. von Stechow (eds), *Perfect Explorations*, Interface Explorations 2, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1–36.
- Asher, N.: 2011, *Lexical Meaning in Context*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Babby, L.: 1975, *A Transformational Grammar of Russian Adjectives*, Mouton, The Hague.
- Babby, L.: 1999, Adjectives in Russian: Primary vs. secondary predication, in K. Dziwirek, C. Vakareliyska and H. Coates (eds), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL-7). The Seattle Meeting 1998*, Michigan Slavic Materials, Ann Arbor, pp. 1–30.
- Babby, L.: 2009, *The Syntax of Argument Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Babby, L. and Brecht, R.: 1975, The syntax of voice in Russian, *Language* **51.2**, 342–367.
- Borik, O.: 2002, *Aspect and Reference Time*, LOT Dissertation Series 64, LOT, Utrecht.
- Borik, O.: 2006, *Aspect and Reference Time*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Borik, O.: 2013, Past participles and the eventive/adjectival passive in Russian, in E. Chemla, V. Homer and G. Winterstein (eds), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 17*, semanticsarchive.net, pp. 115–132.

## References II

- Borik, O.: 2014, The argument structure of long and short form adjectives and participles in Russian, *Lingua* **149B**, 139–165.
- Borik, O. and Gehrke, B.: 2018, Imperfective past passive participles in Russian, in R. Šimík et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of FDSL-12*, Language Science Press.
- Bruening, B.: 2014, Word formation is syntactic: Adjectival passives in English, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **32.2**, 363–422.
- Clark, H. and Haviland, S.: 1977, Comprehension and the given-new contract, in R. Freedle (ed.), *Discourse production and comprehension*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 1–40.
- Egg, M.: 2003, Beginning novels and finishing hamburgers, *Journal of Semantics* **20.2**, 163–191.
- Fehrmann, D., Junghanns, U. and Lenertová, D.: 2010, Two reflexive markers in Slavic, *Russian Linguistics* **34**, 203–238.
- Filip, H.: 1999, *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*, Garland Publishing, New York.
- Forsyth, J.: 1970, *A Grammar of Aspect*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gehrke, B.: 2011, Stative passives and event kinds, in I. Reich, E. Horch and D. Pauly (eds), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*, Saarbrücken, Universaar - Saarland University Press, pp. 241–257.
- Gehrke, B.: 2015, Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **33.3**, 897–938.

# References III

- Geurts, B. and van der Sandt, R.: 1997, Presuppositions and backgrounds, in P. Dekker, M. Stokhof and Y. Venema (eds), *Proceedings of the Eleventh Amsterdam Colloquium, December 17-20, 1997*, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam, pp. 37–42.
- Grønn, A.: 2004, *The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Russian Factual Imperfective*, PhD thesis, Oslo.
- Grønn, A.: 2015, On (in)definite tense and aspect in Russian, in G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau and M. Yastrebowa (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, Linguistik International, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 175–196.
- Klein, W.: 1995, A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect, *Language* **71**, 669–695.
- Knjazev, J.: 2007, *Grammatičeskaja Semantika: Russkij jazyk v tipologičeskoj perspektive*, Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur, Moscow.
- Kratzer, A.: 2000, Building statives. Ms. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Krifka, M.: 2001, For a structured meaning account of questions and answers, in C. Féry and W. Sternefeld (eds), *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae: A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 287–319.
- Krifka, M.: 2007, Basic notions of information structure, in I. C. Féry and M. Krifka (eds), *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 6*, Universitätsverlag, Potsdam, pp. 13–56.
- Landman, F.: 1992, The progressive, *Natural Language Semantics* **1**, 1–32.

## References IV

- Lascarides, A. and Asher, N.: 1993, Temporal interpretation, discourse relations and commonsense entailment, *Linguistics and Philosophy* **16**, 437–493.
- Maienborn, C.: 2007, Das Zustandspassiv: Grammaticische Einordnung – Bildungsbeschränkung – Interpretationsspielraum, *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* **35**, 83–144.
- Maslov, J.: 1959, Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke, in S. Bernštejn (ed.), *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Nauka, Moscow, pp. 157–312.
- McIntyre, A.: 2013, Adjectival passives and adjectival participles in English, in A. Alexiadou and F. Schäfer (eds), *Non-Canonical Passives*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 21–42.
- Mehlig, H.: 2001, Verbal aspect and the referential status of verbal predicates: On aspect usage in Russian who-questions, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* **9**, 99–125.
- Mehlig, H.: 2013, Obščefaktičeskoe i edinično-faktičeskoe značenija nesoveršenogo vida v ruskom jazyke, *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Serija 9, Filologija* **4**, 19–47.
- Mehlig, H.: 2016, Negation und Verbalaspekt im Russischen, *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* **77**, 229–265.
- Mueller-Reichau, O.: 2013, On Russian factual imperfectives, in U. Junghanns, D. Fehrmann, D. Lenertová and H. Pitsch (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: The Ninth Conference. Proceedings of FDSL 9, Göttingen 2011*, Linguistik International 28, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 191–210.

# References V

- Mueller-Reichau, O.: 2015, Pseudo-incorporation in Russian? Aspectual competition and bare singular interpretation, in O. Borik and B. Gehrke (eds), *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, Syntax and Semantics 40, Brill, Leiden, pp. 262–295.
- Mueller-Reichau, O. and Gehrke, B.: 2015, Event kind formation within the VP: Comparing Russian factual imperfectives and German adjectival passives, in G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau and M. Yastrebowa (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, Linguistik International, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 367–382.
- Padučeva, E.: 1996, *Semantičeskie Issledovanija*, Škola ‘Jazyki russkoj kul’tury’, Moscow.
- Paslawska, A. and von Stechow, A.: 2003, Perfect readings in Russian, in A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert and A. von Stechow (eds), *Perfect Explorations*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Pustejovsky, J.: 1995, *The Generative Lexicon*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Ramchand, G.: 2004, Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes, *Nordlyd* 32.2, 323–361.
- Rapp, I.: 1996, Zustand? Passiv? Überlegungen zum sogenannten “Zustandspassiv”, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 15.2, 231–265.
- Schoorlemmer, M.: 1995, *Participial Passive and Aspect in Russian*, PhD thesis, Utrecht University.
- Tatevosov, S.: 2011, Severing perfectivity from the verb, *Scando-Slavica* 57, 216–244.

# References VI

- Tatevosov, S.: 2015, Severing imperfectivity from the verb, in G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau and M. Yastrebowa (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, Linguistik International, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 465–494.
- Vallduví, E.: 2016, Information structure, in M. Aloni and P. Dekker (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Formal Semantics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 728–755.
- Švedova, N. (ed.): 1980, *Russkaja Grammatika*, Nauka, Moscow.
- Zaliznjak, A. and Šmelev, A.: 2000, *Vvedenie v Russkiju Aspektologiju*, Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, Moscow.