

The role of information structure in Russian imperfective passives

Olga Borik (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)¹
Berit Gehrke (CNRS-LLF/Paris Diderot)

1 Introduction

- Russian past passive participles (PPPs) are regularly derived from perfective (PF) verbs:²

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> 'make-angry.PF'	<i>rasseržennyj</i> 'made-angry.PF'	<i>rasseržen</i> 'made-angry.PF'
<i>zakryt'</i> 'close.PF'	<i>zakrytyj</i> 'closed.PF'	<i>zakryt</i> 'closed.PF'

- However, imperfective (IPF) PPPs can be found as well:

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'

NB A note on terminology:

- We reserve the terms (I)PF for morphological forms of a given verb.
- We study IPF forms used in contexts that might semantically be called perfective (in particular: completed bounded events in the past).

The Russian IPF can have various meanings in different contexts:

- Canonical, exclusively IPF: process, habituality, (iterativity; sometimes PF possible)
- Non-canonical, 'aspectual competition': general-factual (sheer fact that event took place)

- **Two types of passives in Russian** (and similarly in other Slavic languages):

- Reflexive passive, formed by the reflexive marker/postfix *-sja*
- Periphrastic passive, formed by a form of *byt'* 'be' + PPP

- Received view for Russian: The two types of passives are aspectually restricted.

(e.g., Babby and Brecht 1975)

- Only IPF in reflexive passives (1)
- Only PF in periphrastic passives (2)

(1) a. Storož otkryval vorota. IPF PARADIGM
watchman.NOM opened.IPF gates.ACC
'The watchman opened/was opening a/the gate.'

¹This research has partially been funded by project FFI2014-52015-P from the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO) and 2014SGR 1013 (awarded by the Generalitat de Catalunya) (1st author).

²We use the following abbreviations: ACC (accusative), ACT (active), DAT (dative), F (focus), GEN (genitive), INSTR (instrumental), IPF (imperfective), PF (perfective), PL (plural), PPP (past passive participle), PTL (particle) RFL (reflexive), RNC (Russian National Corpus)

- b. Vorota otkryvalis' storozhem.
gates.NOM opened.IPF.RFL watchman.INSTR
'The gate was (being) opened by a/the watchman.'
- c. *Vorota byli otkryvany storozhem.
gates.NOM were opened.IPF.PL watchman.INSTR
- (2) a. Storozh otkryl vorota. PF PARADIGM
watchman.NOM opened.PF gates.ACC
'The watchman opened a/the gate.'
- b. Vorota byli otkryty storozhem.
gates.NOM were opened.PF.PL watchman.INSTR
'The gate was opened by a/the watchman.'
- c. *Vorota otkrylis' storozhem.
gates.NOM opened.PF.RFL watchman.INSTR

However, there are exceptions on both sides.

(for examples of PF reflexive passives, see, e.g., Schoorlemmer 1995; Fehrmann, Junghanns, and Lenertová 2010)

• **This paper: Periphrastic passives of IPFs, e.g. (3)**

- (3) Oni byli šity kornjami berezy ili vereska i byli očen' krepki.
they were sewn.IPF roots.INSTR birch.GEN or heather.GEN and were very tough
'They were sewn with birch or heather roots and were very tough.'

• The literature on IPF PPPs in periphrastic passives:

- Received view: IPF PPPs are rare/idiomatic/frozen forms that function like adjectives; cf. Academy Grammar (Švedova 1980), Schoorlemmer (1995), Dickey (2000)
- IPF PPPs are ignored: Babby and Brecht (1975); Paslawska and von Stechow (2003)
- A more refined view in Knjazev (2007): IPF PPPs are (somehow) restricted in use, in comparison to more 'regular' PF PPPs; however, no account is given.

Our goals

- Show that IPF PPPs can be regular participles, not necessarily adjectives, on the basis of
 - Their formation: Fully compositional meaning
 - Their use: IPF PPPs occur in regular periphrastic passive constructions, also verbal ones, in which they cannot possibly be analyzed as adjectives.
- Show that there is a subgroup of IPF PPPs in passives that constitute a case of the “presuppositional” IPF (in the sense of Grønn 2004), but this is not the whole story.
- Argue that what facilitates this use of IPF PPPs is the event being backgrounded (cf. Krifka 2007) or part of the theme (in the sense of Vallduví to appear).

2 The data

- Russian National Corpus (RNC) (ruscorpora.ru)
 - Grammatical features: partcp,praet,pass,ipf
 - 109,028 documents, 22,209,999 sentences, 265,401,717 words

- We focused on IPF PPPs directly preceding or following a finite form of *byt* ‘be’ (BE).
 - partcp,praet,pass,ipf distance: 1 from *byt*: 2,632 contexts
 - *byt* distance: 1 from partcp,praet,pass,ipf: 17,015 contexts
- Only qualitative, not quantitative analysis, also because this excludes too much data.
- The search excludes PPPs with non-finite and null BE, PPPs as second conjuncts, etc.
- Data we excluded manually (because we used the non-disambiguated corpus version):
 - Biaspectual forms (marked as IPF in RNC; e.g., *obeščan* ‘promised’, *velen* ‘ordered’; verbs in *-ovat*: *ispol’zovan* ‘used’, *realizovan* ‘realized’, etc.)
 - Long form PPPs and (long and short form) PPPs in attributive uses
 - Errors in tagging (e.g., *Biorndalen*, *Sezan*; *strašen* ‘terrible/scary.ADJ’ tagged as PPP; *otvečen* ‘answered.PF’, *pereključen* ‘over-switched.PF’ tagged as IPF)

2.1 There are compositional (regular, non-idiomatic etc.) IPF PPPs.

- Of course we found IPF PPPs that cannot be analyzed as compositional passive participles, e.g.:
 - Idiomatic cases: (*ne*) *lykom šit* lit. ‘(not) sewn with bast fiber’, meaning ‘simple(-minded)’
 - Fixed expressions: *rožden/kreščen* ‘born/baptized’
 - Genuine adjectives: *viden*, lit. ‘seen’, meaning ‘visible’
 - **Regular, productive, repeated forms with predictable (compositional) meaning:**

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 (haircut.IPF), kormlen (fed.IPF), nesen (carried.IPF), govoren (said.IPF), prošén (asked.IPF), zvan (called.IPF), kusan (bitten.IPF), kryt (covered.IPF), venčan (married.IPF), njuxan (smelled.IPF), etc.

 - Productive IPF PPPs: No idiosyncratic meanings, in comparison to the base verbs
 - A lot of IPF PPPs formed from verbs of saying (*say, call, ask* etc.) and incremental verbs (*write, sew, read* etc.), though not exclusively (cf. examples above)
- ⇒ There are not many IPF PPPs, but there are clearly compositional ones. → need for analysis

2.2 IPF PPPs are used in periphrastic passives, including verbal ones.

- Background assumptions:
 - Russian: (Short form) PF PPPs can be both verbal and adjectival (see, e.g., Schoorlemmer 1995; Borik 2013, 2014). ⇒ The same should, in principle, also hold for IPF ones.
 - Diagnostics: All kinds of event-related modifiers → verbal participles (cf. Gehrke 2015, and ref.s therein for data from German, English, Spanish, Greek)
- **IPF PPPs in stative/adjectival passives:**
 - (4) a. Kryt byl dom solomoj [...]

covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR
‘The house was covered with hay.’
 - b. [...] ne skazal, čto vagon-to naš učebnikami gružen byl?

not said.PF that waggon-PTL our textbooks.INSTR loaded.IPF was
‘He did not tell us that our waggon was loaded with textbooks?’

- **IPF PPPs in clearly eventive/verbal passives:**

- (5) a. Pisano èto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871 godu [...] written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year
‘That was written by Dostoevskij in 1871.’
- b. Recepty im pisany byli i na drugoe imja [...] prescriptions he.INSTR written.IPF were and on other name
‘The prescriptions were written by him for different names as well.’
- c. Znamenityj pokojnik nesen byl do mogily na rukax [...] Famous deceased.NOM carried.IPF was until grave on arms
‘The famous deceased was carried in arms until the grave.’

⇒ IPF PPPs can have typical features of a verbal passive participle.

2.3 Which IPF contexts?

- Knjazev (2007): No progressive IPF PPPs → corroborated by our data
- Most (if not all) examples involve the general-factual IPF, which comes in two ‘flavors’: existential and “presuppositional” IPF (terminology of Grønn 2004).
→ ‘Aspectual competition’ with the PF

⇒ Here, we focus on the “presuppositional” IPF. (for existential IPF, see appendix)

The “presuppositional” IPF (Grønn 2004), e.g. (6), (7)

~ Padučeva’s (1996) actional IPF; a subtype of the general-factual meaning of the IPF (Maslov 1959) (see Mehlig 2016, for recent discussion of the general-factual IPF)

- The verb is deaccentuated, focus is on some other constituent.
- The verbal predicate has an eventive argument, this event is backgrounded, which leads to the presupposition of its prior instantiation.
- Presupposition as anaphora → bound (6) or justified (7) in the discourse

- (6) Sdelav^{PF} ètot xod [26 – Rxc3], ja [predložil^{IPF} nič’ju]_{antecedent}. [...] Navernjaka, černye deržatsja^{IPF} – naprimer, 27 Ba3 Bf8 28 Nf5 d5 29 Bb2 [...], no mne ne xotelos^{IPF} načinat^{IPF} sčetuju igru, [poètomu]_F ja i [predlagal^{IPF} nič’ju]_{anaphora}.
‘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]_F, I offered a draw.’
(Grønn 2004, 207)

- (7) Dlja bol’šinstva znakomyx vaš [ot’ezd]_{(pseudo-)antecedent} stal^{PF} polnoj neožidannost’ju ... Vy [uežžali^{IPF}]_{anaphora} v Ameriku [ot čego-to, k čemu-to ili že prosto voznamerilis’]_{PF} spokojno provesti^{PF} tam buduščuju starost’]_F?
‘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.)

(see Grønn 2015, for further refinements concerning the contribution of tense and aspect)

3 Presuppositional analysis: pros and cons

3.1 Arguments for a presuppositional analysis

1. Focus-background marking

- Focus on obligatory modifier(s) specifying the manner, quality, purpose or other aspect of the event itself (and not its culmination); e.g. (8)
- Marked word order; e.g. (4), (5), (8-a)
 - The unmarked word order of passives is BE + PPP but many of our cases have a preposed PPP (before BE), with obligatory modifiers following BE.
 - ⇒ The event referred to by the PP is part of the background.

- (8) a. Stroeno bylo éto vse [ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto]_F.
built.IPF was that all badly lamely with.holes
- b. Zapiski byli pisany [ne dlja pečati]_F [... no ...]
notes were written.IPF not for print but

2. Inference to a completed event is preserved under negation

- If event completion is presupposed in the positive counterpart, the same implication holds in a negated sentence, cf. contrast between (8) and (9).

- (9) a. Stroeno ne bylo éto vse ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.
built.IPF not was that all badly lamely with.holes
[Better with a neutral word order: *Éto vse ne bylo stroeno ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.*]
- b. Zapiski ne byli pisany ne dlja pečati [... no ...]
notes not were written.IPF not for print but

3. Interchangeability with a PF variant (in those cases where a PF option exists)

- E.g. the examples (4)-(5) from above, repeated below, have a PF variant:

- (10) a. (Po)kryt byl dom solomoj [...]
(PF)covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR
- b. [...] ne skazal, čto vagon-to naš učebnikami (za/na)gružen byl?
not said.PF that waggon-PTL our textbooks.INSTR (PF)loaded.IPF was
- (11) a. (Na)pisano éto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871 godu [...]
(PF)written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year
- b. Znamenityj pokojnik (do)nesen byl do mogily na rukax [...]
Famous deceased.NOM (PF)carried.IPF was until grave on arms

→ The meaning differences between IPF and PF PPPs are very fuzzy and difficult to describe, just like with active PF vs. factual IPF; cf. ‘classicals’ examples in Padučeva (1996):

- (12) a. Ja ubiral komnatu včera. vs. Ja ubral komnatu včera.
I cleaned.IPF room.ACC yesterday I cleaned.PF room.ACC yesterday
- b. Gde apel'siny pokupali? vs. Gde apel'siny kupili?
where oranges.ACC bought.IPF.PL where oranges.ACC bought.PF.PL

4. Anaphoric uses

- Anaphoric to a previously introduced PF event:

(13) Vse emu budet **skazano** i čto mež toboj i razbojnikom govoreno
everything him will-be told.PF and what between you and robber told.IPF
bylo.
was
'He will be told everything that you and the robber were telling each other.'

- Anaphoric to an event introduced by a deverbal noun:

(14) Čto kasaetjsa **platy** deneg, to plačeny byli naličnymi šest' tysjač
what concerns payment.GEN money.GEN then paid.IPF were in cash six thousand
rublej [...]
roubles
'As for the payment, six thousand roubles were paid in cash ...'

- Anaphoric via a created object (15-a-c) or via (in)direct speech (15-d):

(15) a. **Pis'ma** ego pisany byli černo i kruglo [...]
letters his written.IPF were black and round
b. A napravo šla sama **izba**, s čerdakom i podpol'em. Stroeno bylo
and to-right went self house with attic and cellar built.IPF was
davno i dobrotno, na bol'suju semju [...]
long-time-ago and solidly on big family
'To the right there was the house itself, with the attic and the cellar. It was built a
long time ago, solidly, for a big family.'
c. Malen'kie, s arbyznoe semečko, **monetki** čekaneny byli v Moskve,
small with watermelon- seed coins minted.IPF were in Moscow
Pskove, Novgorode, Tveri.
Pskov Novgorod Tver'
d. **Kak i** govoreno bylo **zaranee**, Vasil'ev [...]
how and said.IPF was earlier Vasil'ev

→ Recall the impression that we found these verb classes more often.

- Created objects already imply the related event (such objects also lend themselves easily to event coercion, cf. Pustejovsky 1995; Egg 2003; Asher 2011).
- Verbs of saying: 'Lexical presupposition' (cf. Grønn 2004)

3.2 Applying Grønn's (2004) analysis of the "presuppositional" IPF

- DRT (cf. Kamp and Reyle 1993), plus Neo-Davidsonian event semantics, λ -calculus, and presuppositional analysis of anaphora (e.g. van der Sandt 1992)
- Background-focus division at the VP level leads to a structured meaning (in the sense of Krifka 2001), represented as a structured DRS; e.g. (16-a) for VP in (8-a)
- Following Geurts and van der Sandt's (1997) Background/Presupposition Rule backgrounded material is transformed into presuppositional material. → subscripted part in the DRS (16-b)

(16) a. [VP]: $\langle \lambda e[x] \mathbf{build}(e) \wedge \mathbf{THEME}(e,x), \lambda e[[\mathbf{bad}(e) \wedge \mathbf{lame}(e) \wedge \mathbf{with-holes}(e)]] \rangle$
b. $\lambda e[[\mathbf{bad}(e) \wedge \mathbf{lame}(e) \wedge \mathbf{with-holes}(e)]_{[x] \mathbf{build}(e) \wedge \mathbf{THEME}(e,x)}$

(see op.cited for further derivation, adding Aspect, Tense)

3.3 Applying at-issue (AI) tests to the “presuppositional” IPF cases

- A presuppositional analysis makes the following prediction:
 - If the (instantiation of the) event is presupposed, it is expected to be not-at-issue (NAI) content just as all projective content (cf. Tonhauser 2012, among others).

→ Applying some of the diagnostics in Tonhauser (2012) to (8-a), repeated as (17):

(17) Stroeno bylo èto vse [ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto]_F.
built.IPF was all that badly lamely with.holes

- **Direct assent/dissent with positive continuation:** NAI should be #, AI should be ok³

(18) a. Da, pravda, stroeno bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
yes truth built.IPF was that all badly lamely with.holes
b. #Da, pravda, stroeno bylo èto vse.
yes truth built.IPF was that all
c. Da, pravda, ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
yes truth badly lamely with.holes

(19) a. Net, ne pravda, stroeno ne bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
no not truth built.IPF not was that all badly lamely with.holes
b. #Net, ne pravda, stroeno ne bylo èto vse.
no not truth built.IPF not was that all
c. Net, ne pravda, ne ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
no not truth not badly lamely with.holes

- **Direct assent/dissent with adversative continuation:** NAI should be ok, AI should be #

(20) a. #Da, pravda, no stroeno ne bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
yes truth but built.IPF not was that all badly lamely with.holes
b. #Da, pravda, no stroeno ne bylo èto vse.
yes truth but built.IPF not was that all
c. #Da, pravda, no ne ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
yes truth but not badly lamely with.holes

(21) a. #Net, ne pravda, no stroeno bylo èto vse ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
no not truth but built.IPF was that all badly lamely with.holes
b. #Net, ne pravda, no stroeno bylo èto vse.
no not truth but built.IPF was that all
c. #Net, ne pravda, no ploxo, xromo, ŝceljasto.
no not truth but badly lamely with.holes

³Note that there is a further problem with aspect under negation, in the sense that IPF is much more common. Furthermore, the marked word order contributes to making (18-b) and (19-b) less acceptable, and they become better (but still not perfect) with the more neutral word order *Da, pravda, èto bylo stroeno.* / *Net, ne pravda, èto ne bylo stroeno.* The same applies to (20-b) and (21-b).

- Summary of the results
 - The results in (18) and (19) indicate that the event seems to be NAI.
 - However, the results in (20) and (21) indicate that the relevant parts of the sentence all belong to the AI content (are part of the assertion).
 - The results of the other tests (not given here) support the latter conclusion, so that those in (18) and (19) seem to be the odd ones out.
 - (We obtained similar results for all the examples that we tested.)

⇒ Two options:

- The tests do not support the hypothesis that the event is NAI, which makes a presuppositional treatment problematic. [First author]
- There is something wrong with the tests: Presuppositions cannot be cancelled easily, and this is shown by (20) and (21). [Second author]

4 Elaboration on ‘The event is backgrounded’

- Backgrounding (non-focus) can have various explanations:
 - Presupposition (as anaphora) (Grønn 2004, building on Geurts and van der Sandt 1997)
 - Givenness (cf. Krifka 2007)
 - Theme (cf. Vallduví to appear)
- Krifka: **Givenness** is the indication that the denotation of an expression is present in the immediate common ground (CG) content.
 - Anaphoric expressions (including personal pronouns, demonstratives, definite articles) indicate that the referent is given.
 - Reduction of the prosodic realization of expressions that are given in the immediate context: deletion, deaccentuation, non-canonical word order

→ In the majority of our IPF PPP examples we find deaccentuation and marked word order.
- Vallduví: A **rheme** updates/elaborates on the maximal QUD in the context C. It is the locus of discourse progression.
 - A typical example of a rheme: a short answer
e.g., *What are we having for dinner?* - MUTTONBIRD

A **theme** spells out a *replica* of the max-QUD, without the fragment that expresses elaboration.

- The main function of the theme is to ‘prepare’ the context for an update.
- Themes are obligatory in those contexts where the utterance elaborates on a non-max-QUD (which is already in the QUD set).
- Theme-containing utterances are parallel to definite descriptions which specify non-local antecedents.

⇒ **The events referred to by “presuppositional” IPF PPPs are parallel to definite descriptions.**

- They signal under which file card/discourse referent the focused material has to be stored.

4.1 The backgrounding analysis

- Examining the larger context for our representative example, i.e., (8-a):

(22) 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 každyj 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 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. All that was built badly, lamely, with holes.’

The max-QUD is *What was the hotel like?*, which includes a number of more specific questions (non-max-QUD), e.g., *What is the quality of the hotel rooms?*, *Who lived in which rooms?*, *How were the rooms decorated?*, etc.

- The non-max-QUD that the relevant example elaborates on is *How was it all built?*
- The event is not relevant for the elaboration, only the focused manner modifiers provide the required elaboration.
 - It is part of the theme, replicating a part of the QUD.
(So is the subject *all that*, which refers back to the previously introduced types of rooms.)
- The main points of this analysis:
 - Marked word order and deaccentuation of the IPF participle fall out directly: These are the means to signal backgrounding.
 - The parallel with definite descriptions (cf. Vallduví to appear) opens up a possibility to broaden the notion of ‘anaphoric’ to include bridging, anaphoric via argument, etc.

4.2 Coming back to the conflicting test results

- How do we explain ...

1. the results of the negation tests?
2. the results of the NAI tests?

- **Negation tests**

- The results of the test in (9) might be due to different factors.
- The negated examples have the same interpretation with PF variant of the participle, as shown in (23), but PF is not presuppositional (see Grønn 2004, for detailed arguments).

(23) a. Postroeno èto vse ne bylo ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.
built.PF that all not was badly lamely with.holes
b. Zapiski ne byli napisany ne dlja pečati [... no ...]
notes not were written.PF not for print but

- This means that the negation is not targeting the event in general, probably because the modifiers are in focus.
- This also makes the negated examples (both IPF and PF) sound less natural.

- **NAI tests**

Examples (18-b) and (19-b) seem to indicate that the event is part of the NAI content.

- An alternative explanation: These answers are odd since they are *thematic* only.
- They do not answer the QUD / do not update the context and are judged as uninformative.

In addition, there might also be a more general problem with this test:

- It does not identify the presupposition of factive verbs as NAI content: Both replies in (24) should be odd, according to the test, but they are not.

- (24) A. Anna znaet čto Vasja sdal èkzamen.
Anna knows.IPF that Vasja passed.PF exam
'Anna knows that Vasja passed the exam.'
- B.' Da, pravda, Vasja sdal èkzamen.
yes truth Vasja passed.PF exam
- B. Net, ne pravda, Vasja ne sdal èkzamen.
no not truth Vasja not passed.PF exam

Also for the tests that are supposed to identify NAI content, we get problems with factive verbs:

- The reply in (25) should be good, since the dissent is supposed to target the presupposition; but it is not. (Recall that we got similar results in (20-b) and (21-b))

- (25) A. Anna znaet čto Vasja sdal èkzamen.
Anna knows.IPF that Vasja passed.PF exam
'Anna knows that Vasja passed the exam.'
- B.' #Da, pravda, no Vasja ne sdaval èkzamen.
yes truth but Vasja not passed.PF exam

→ More generally, presuppositions are much harder to cancel.

5 Conclusion and open issues

- IPF PPPs with compositional meaning in periphrastic passives exist, contra the received view.

- Most, if not all IPF PPPs express the general-factual meaning of the IPF.

1. "Presuppositional" IPF (this paper)
2. Existential IPF (see appendix)

- "Presuppositional" IPF PPPs:

- A completed event is given in the discourse (the event referred to by the IPF PPP behaves like a definite event description).
- The event is backgrounded, part of the theme, the focused material is the assertion, 'new information' given about the event discourse referent, which (partially) answers the QUD.

- Issues we did not address:

- Existential IPF PPPs (see appendix).
- Why do passive IPF PPPs occur so rarely? (the general-factual IPF is not generally that infrequent) Are passives less frequent more generally?

(These (and some other) issues are discussed in more detail in Borik and Gehrke to appear)

A Cases that cannot be analyzed as “presuppositional”: existential IPF

⇒ Existential IPF: An event of this type happened (cf. Mehlig 2001, 2013; Mueller-Reichau 2013, 2015; Mueller-Reichau and Gehrke 2015); e.g. (26)

- First time mention of this event (indefinite), indefinite/nonspecific spatiotemporal location
- Usually with accent on the verb (cf. Padučeva 1996; Grønn 2004, i.a.)

Still: marked word order in many of our examples (and sometimes also additional modifiers)

- (26) a. I kričal Uprjamec, čto ne verit, i bit byl, i ne
and shouted Stubborn that not believes.IPF and beaten.IPF was and not
poveril.
believed.PF
‘And the stubborn one shouted that he does not believe (it) and he was beaten and
he did not believe (it).’
- b. Pytan byl i kleščami žžen.
tortured.IPF was and ticks.INSTR burnt
‘He was tortured and burnt with ticks.’
- c. [...] dolgo putešestvoval, kusan byl jadovitými zmejami i
long travelled.IPF bitten.IPF was poisonous.INSTR snakes.INSTR and
krokodilami [...] crocodiles.INSTR
‘He travelled for a long time, he was bitten by poisonous snakes and crocodiles.’
- d. Bylo pito, bylo edeno, byli slezy prolity.
was drunk.IPF was eaten.IPF were tears poured.PF
‘There was drinking, there was eating, tears were shed.’
[lit.: Was drunk (neutr), was eaten (neutr), tears were shed]

- Seemingly anaphoric uses, but type and not token anaphora → also existential:

- (27) a. [...] plaščanica s izobražennym na nej likom Presvjatoj Devy **perenosilas**’
shroud with image on its front Blessed Virgin over-carried.PF
sjuda iz Gefsimanskogo podvor’ja čerez Sion, sleduja tem
here from Gethsemane- farmstead via Sion following that.INSTR
putem, kotorym neseno bylo v Gefsimaniju dlja pogrebenija telo
path.INSTR which.INSTR carried.IPF was in Gethsemane for burial body
Bogomateri.
Mother of God
‘The shroud with the image of the Blessed Virgin was brought here from the farm-
stead in Gethsemane via Sion on the path on which the body of the Mother of God
was brought to Gethsemane for the burial.’
- b. Ništo vam, **prinjuxaetes**, i ne takoe njuxano bylo.
nothing you.DAT.PL sniff.PF and not such smelled.IPF was
‘It does not matter, you will get used to the smell, there are worse smells.’
- c. Mojka byla perepolnena **nemytoj** posudoj. Ne myto bylo
sink was overflowed.PF unwashed.INSTR dishes.INSTR not washed.IPF was
davno.
long-time
‘The sink was overflowing with unwashed dishes. The dishes had not been done
in a long time.’ [lit.: was not washed (neutr)]

References

- Asher, Nicholas. 2011. *Lexical Meaning in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Babby, Leonard H., and Richard Brecht. 1975. The syntax of voice in Russian. *Language* 51.2:342–367.
- Borik, Olga. 2013. Past participles and the eventive/adjectival passive in Russian. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 17*, ed. Emmanuel Chemla, Vincent Homer, and Grégoire Winterstein, 115–132. semanticsarchive.net.
- Borik, Olga. 2014. The argument structure of long and short form adjectives and participles in Russian. *Lingua* 149B:139–165.
- Borik, Olga, and Berit Gehrke. to appear. Imperfective past passive participles in Russian. In *Proceedings of FDSL-12*, ed. Radek Šimík et al. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Dickey, Stephen M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford: CSLI Press.
- Egg, Markus. 2003. Beginning novels and finishing hamburgers. *Journal of Semantics* 20.2:163–191.
- Fehrmann, Dorothee, Uwe Junghanns, and Denisa Lenertová. 2010. Two reflexive markers in Slavic. *Russian Linguistics* 34:203–238.
- Gehrke, Berit. 2015. Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33.3:897–938.
- Geurts, Bart, and Rob van der Sandt. 1997. Presuppositions and backgrounds. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Amsterdam Colloquium, December 17-20, 1997*, ed. Paul Dekker, Martin Stokhof, and Yde Venema, 37–42. University of Amsterdam: Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Department of Philosophy.
- Grønn, Atle. 2004. The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Russian Factual Imperfective. Doctoral Dissertation, Oslo University.
- Grønn, Atle. 2015. On (in)definite tense and aspect in Russian. In *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, ed. Gerhild Zybatow, Petr Biskup, Marcel Guhl, Claudia Hurtig, Olav Mueller-Reichau, and Maria Yastrebowa, Linguistik International, 175–196. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Kamp, Hans, and Uwe Reyle. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Knjazev, Jurij P. 2007. *Grammatičeskaja Semantika: Russkij jazyk v tipologičkoj perspektive*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2001. For a structured meaning account of questions and answers. In *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae: A Festschrift for Arnim von Stechow*, ed. Caroline Féry and Wolfgang Sternefeld, 287–319. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 6*, ed. In Caroline Féry and Manfred Krifka, 13–56. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.
- Maslov, Jurij S. 1959. Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke. In *Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, ed. Samuil B. Bernštejn, 157–312. Moscow: Nauka.
- Mehlig, Hans Robert. 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, Hans Robert. 2013. Obščefaktičeskoe i edinično-faktičeskoe značenijsa nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Serija 9, Filologija* 4:19–47.
- Mehlig, Hans Robert. 2016. Negation und Verbalaspekt im Russischen. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 77:229–265.
- Mueller-Reichau, Olav. 2013. On Russian factual imperfectives. In *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: The Ninth Conference. Proceedings of FDSL 9, Göttingen 2011*, ed. Uwe Junghanns, Dorothee Fehrmann, Denisa Lenertová, and Hagen Pitsch, Linguistik International 28, 191–210. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Mueller-Reichau, Olav. 2015. Pseudo-incorporation in Russian? Aspectual competition and bare singular interpretation. In *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, ed. Olga Borik and Berit Gehrke, Syntax and Semantics 40, 262–295. Leiden: Brill.
- Mueller-Reichau, Olav, and Berit Gehrke. 2015. Event kind formation within the VP: Comparing Russian factual imperfectives and German adjectival passives. In *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, ed. Gerhild Zybatow, Petr Biskup, Marcel Guhl, Claudia Hurtig, Olav Mueller-Reichau, and Maria Yastrebowa, Linguistik International, 367–382. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Padučeva, Elena V. 1996. *Semantičeskije Issledovanija*. Moscow: Škola 'Jazyki russkoj kul'tury'.
- Paslawska, Alla, and Arnim von Stechow. 2003. Perfect readings in Russian. In *Perfect Explorations*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Monika Rathert, and Arnim von Stechow. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- van der Sandt, Rob. 1992. Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics* 9:33–77.
- Schoorlemmer, Maaïke. 1995. Participial Passive and Aspect in Russian. Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Švedova, Natalija Ju. 1980. *Russkaja Grammatika*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Tonhauer, Judith. 2012. Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content. In *Proceedings of Semantics of Under-represented Languages of the Americas (SULA) 6*, 239–254. UMass, Amherst: GLSA.
- Vallduví, Enric. to appear. Information structure. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Semantics*, ed. Maria Aloni and Paul Dekker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.