Cross-Slavic variation in passives

Berit Gehrke
(HU Berlin)

Workshop on Aspect and Argument Structure of Adverbs/Adjectives and Prepositions/Participles (WAASAP 4)

Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

June 7-8, 2018

What is a 'passive'?

Let's try:

- Demotion of the external argument
- Promotion of the internal argument to subject position
- Agent / causer in (optional) *by*-phrase
  (usually treated as an adjunct / modifier)

Morphology of passives: Some examples

❶ Synthetic verb forms
- Synthetic passive forms: e.g. Latin
- Synthetic non-active forms: e.g. Greek ('middle voice')
  Reflexive forms with a 'passive' meaning: e.g. Spanish, Russian, Czech

❷ Periphrastic forms
- Auxiliary + participle: e.g. English, German, Spanish, Russian, Czech

Which kind of 'auxiliary'?
- BE: e.g. English, Russian, Czech, Spanish *ser* (vs. *estar* **)
- BECOME: e.g. German (vs. BE **)
- (GET ...?)

Which kind of participle?
- Only one, the same for perfect: e.g. English, German, Spanish
- Only one, but a different one for 'perfect': e.g. Russian, Czech
  (vs. l-participle: synchronically 'past', historically a perfect participle)
- Different kinds of participles: e.g. Greek *-tos, -menos* **

e.g. Latin

(1)   Unambiguously passive, synthetic

    a.   Arbor   movebatur   vento.
          tree.NOM.SG move.IPFCT.3SG.PASS wind.ABL.SG
          'The tree was moved by the wind.'

    b.   Pater   amatur   a   filio.
          father.NOM.SG love.PRES.3SG.PASS from son.ABL.SG
          'The father is loved by the son.'

                   (vs. reflexive, e.g. *Pater se amat.* 'The father loves himself.')

(2)   Passive perfect: periphrastic, with a participle

     amatus   est ab   omnibus Orientalibus
     love.PPP.NOM.SG.MASC is   from all.ABL.PL oriental.ABL.PL
     'He was loved by all of the East.'   (AD DIONIS LIBRUM LXXL)

                 (vs. synthetic perfect, e.g. *amavit* '(s)he has loved')

e.g. Russian: Two 'passive' constructions

- Periphrastic passive: BE + past passive participles (PPP) (3-a)
- Reflexive passive: Active form + reflexive -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.'

(seemingly similar situation in other Slavic languages **)

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 be verbal (or adjectival) in both cases.

e.g. German verbal 'Vorgangspassiv' (4-a) vs. adjectival 'Zustandspassiv' (4-b)

(4) 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:

(5) Die Aufgabe {ist/*wird} (un-)gelöst.
     the task   is/becomes un-solved

German adjectival 'Zustandspassiv'

- Restricted compatibility with event-related modification:

    (6)   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

    (7)   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: (6) vs. (7), (8)

  (8) a. *Der Computer ist vor drei Tagen repariert.
            Intended: 'The computer is repaired three days ago.'
      b. *Das Kind war im Badezimmer gekämmt.
            Intended: 'The child was combed in the bathroom.'

  → Only non-referential *by*-phrases (previous examples)
    (and other PP modifiers)

Mini typology

- German: Vorgangs- vs. Zustandspassiv
    - Zustandspassiv: Adjectival participle
        - → Restrictions on event-related modification
    - No reflexive passive

- Spanish:
    - *ser* 'be' vs. *estar* 'be.LOC' + participle
      Similar to German → verbal vs. adjectival (Gehrke and Marco 2014)
    - In addition: reflexive passive

- **Q:** Do we find *estar* whenever we have *werden* et vice versa?

- **Q:** What kind of division of labour between periphrastic and reflexive passive?

Mini typology

- English: No formal distinction like 'Zustands/Vorgangspassiv'
    - Received view: BE + participle can express both passives
    - In 'stative' contexts similar restrictions as in German
      → adjectival (e.g. McIntyre 2013; Bruening 2014; Alexiadou et al. 2014)
    - No reflexive passive

- Greek:
    - Reflexive passive (formally: non-active morphology) → verbal
    - Two types of participles: *-menos* vs. *-tos* (+ BE)
      Received view: stative / adjectival passive

- **BUT:** (In some cases) no restriction on event-related modification.
  (Anagnostopoulou 2003; Alexiadou et al. 2014, 2015)
    - → More verbal structure (incl. perfect operator) in 'adjectival' participles
      (similar: Berro 2017, about Basque)

- **Q:** Or do we get the same ambiguity between verbal and adjectival participles?
  If so: What is the difference between periphrastic and reflexive passive?

Research project:

Cross-Slavic variation in passives

The morphological category Aspect in Russian

- A verb form (in 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:

    (9)   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]

    (10)   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.
  (compare: present tense forms with future meaning; plural forms that can also refer to singularities; etc.)

- IPF forms can have different readings in context:

  Canonical IPF readings:
  - Process/durativity (~ Progressive)
  - Iterativity/habituality

  Non-canonical IPF reading(s): General-factual
  → Typical perfective meaning (~ bounded completed event in the past)

The general-factual IPF

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

1 Existential (11) (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)

(11)   Ne   bylo   somnenij,   čto 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.'

2 Presuppositional/actional (12) (example: Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, terms: Grønn
2004/Padučeva 1996)

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

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

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)

Back to passives: Aspectual restrictions in Russian

- Periphrastic passive: only PF (usually) (13)

- Reflexive passive: only IPF (usually) (14)

  (13) 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

  (14) 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); Fehrmann 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.

(15)   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.'

Russian PPPs

- Positions about Russian (PF) PPPs
    - Babby and Brecht (1975): always adjectival
    - Schoorlemmer (1995); Borik (2014); this talk: verbal or adjectival (depending on the context) [like English]
    - Paslawska and von Stechow (2003), e.g. (16):
        - 'Adjectival/stative' with present tense copula (= null copula)
        - 'Verbal/eventive' with past tense forms of BE

(16)   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) (17).

  (17)   Ėtot   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.
       (building on Anagnostopoulou 2003, for Greek)
     • Resultative semantics as an explanation for the restriction to PF

  Q: Why do we then find the same (alleged) restriction to PF with
     'verbal/eventive' PPPs?

Borik (2014)

- No modification restrictions, with or without BE; e.g. (18)
  - → Verbal PPPs exist in any tense

(18)   Vorota   (byli) otkryty   storožem   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.'

- Conclusion: (PF) PPPs can be either verbal or adjectival.

<div align="right">(see also Schoorlemmer 1995; Borik 2013)</div>

Research project

Cross-Slavic comparison of passives

- Comparison Russian-Czech (later: further Slavic languages)
    - Differences in aspect usage (point of departure)
    - Further differences in passives (e.g. event-related modification)
- Different passive constructions and types, more generally
    - Periphrastic passive (with PPP) vs. 'reflexive' passive   FORM
    - Verbal vs. adjectival passive   MEANING
      Eventive vs. stative passive
    - → Additional comparison with non-Slavic languages
- ⇒ Informs us on
    - Passive theory
    - Formal treatment of cross-Slavic differences in aspect usage

Aspect semantics vs. pragmatics

- Often (more or less implicit) assumption:
  Uniform aspect semantics in Slavic languages

- Parallel corpus studies (e.g. Dübbers 2015):
  No one-to-one correspondence in aspect usage

Q: Are these differences semantic or pragmatic?

Q: Which other factors play a role?

Differences in aspect usage

e.g. Dickey (2000): Differences in 10 Slavic languages

- Contexts: habituality, general-factual, historic present, instructions and commentaries, IPF in chains of events, ingressivity, deverbal nouns

Dickey's analysis: West-east isogloss

- East: Prototype Russian (also: Belorussian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian)
    - PF: Temporal definiteness
    - IPF: Qualitative temporal indefiniteness

- West: Prototype Czech (also: Sorbian, Slovak, Slovenian)
    - PF: Totality
    - IPF: Quantitative temporal indefiniteness

- Peripheral types:
    - Polish (closer to the Western type)
    - Serbo-Croatian [BCMS] (closer to the Eastern type)

(see also Dickey 2015, 2018; Fortuin and Kamphuis 2015, 2018)

Russian vs. Czech

- Theses particularly about this:
  - Eckert (1984): Single vs. multiple events, motion events, spoken vs. written, present, general-factual, negation, imperative (PhD)
  - Stunová (1993): Multiple events, chains of events (PhD)
  - Gehrke (2002): Single vs. habitual events, general-factual (MA)
  - Dübbers (2015): Multiple events, general-factual (PhD)

	Russian	Czech
Single events in chains of events	PF	IPF, PF
Multiple / habitual events	IPF	IPF, PF; frequentatives

- Findings in Gehrke (2002)
  - Single events: Differences only with particular verb classes
    - → States/activities: Czech IPF vs. Russian PF
    - → Accomplishments/achievements: both PF
  - Multiple events / habituality:
    - Marked on the verb form in Russian only (IPF)
    - Aspect usage in Czech more or less like with single events

Cross-Slavic differences in aspect usage

- Further contexts and literature:
    - Ingressivity (Ivančev 1961; Berger 2013)
    - Imperative (Dokulil 1948; Benacchio 2010; Alvestad 2014; von Waldenfels 2014)
    - Negation (Dickey and Kresnin 2009; von Waldenfels 2014)
    - Present tense (Bondarko 1958, 1959; Křížková 1955, 1958; Širokova 1963; Petruxina 1978, 1983, 1998, 2000; Fortuin and Kamphuis 2015)
    - Motion events (Eckert 1991)

Desiderata

- Formal account of the differences (so far only Alvestad 2014, for imperatives)
    - **Q:** Can we have the same semantic formalisation of (I)PF in both (all) Slavic languages, or are the differences semantic in nature (e.g. Dickey's proposal)? → Semantics vs. pragmatics

- Research project: Closer inspection of passives
  (and possible comparison with nominalisations)
    - Also other, not aspectual differences
    - Comparison with non-Slavic languages that are well documented and analysed
- → To inform us on the formal description of the differences more generally

Passive: Czech vs. Russian

- Russian: Aspectual restrictions in the passive
  - Periphrastic passive: mostly PF
    (with 'exceptions'; Knjazev 2007: no process meaning for IPF PPPs)
  - Reflexive passive: maybe only IPF
    (descriptive generalisation; would have to be explored in more detail)

- Czech: no such aspectual restrictions (as far as we know)
  - Both 'passives' with both aspects
  - All IPF meanings possible (again, this would have to be explored)

  Q: What are the differences between reflexive and periphrastic passive?
  Q: Which IPF meanings do we find in both languages and in both passives?

Further differences with reflexive passives

- Differences in reflexive constructions (but no discussion of aspect)
    - Fehrmann et al. (2010): Formal analysis
    - von Waldenfels (2014): Corpus study

  e.g. *by*-phrases possible in RU but not in CZ (from Fehrmann et al.):

  (19)   RU   Dom   stroitsja   (plotnikami).
                house.NOM builds.IPF.RFL carpenter.INSTR.PL
                'The house was built by carpenters.'
           CZ   Šaty   se   právě   šijí   (*babičkou).
                dress.NOM.PL RFL just-now sew.3PL.PRES granny.INSTR
                'The dress is just now being sewn (*by granny).'

    - **Q:** What is the reflexive passive (RU vs. CZ)? A verbal passive in RU, but something else in CZ? (see also Schäfer 2016)
    - **Q:** How does the reflexive passive relate to other reflexive constructions?
    - **Q:** What kind of passive is the periphrastic passive (RU vs. CZ)?
    - **Q:** What kind of *by*-phrases do we get (RU vs. CZ)?

Czech vs. Russian: Nominalisations

- Similar: Nominalisations, e.g. (20) (from Dickey 2000)

(20)   e.g. 'realisation, execution'

CZ   pf. INF provést > NOM provedení   (cp. PPP proveden)
       ipf. INF provadět > NOM provadění   (cp. PPP provaděn)
RU   pf. INF osuščestvit' > NOM osuščestvlenie   (cp. PPP osuščestvlen)
       ipf. INF osuščestvljat' > NOM *osuščestvljanie   (cp. PPP *osuščestvljan)
                                        (also: morphological connection to PPPs)

	Russian	Czech
PPP	(almost only) PF	IPF, PF
Reflexive passive	(almost only) IPF	IPF, PF
Nominalisations in *-nie/-ní* und *-tie/-tí*	'aspectually neutral' (according to Dickey)	IPF, PF

Q: What is the role of finiteness?

A case study:

Russian IPF PPPs
(with Olga Borik, UNED, Madrid)

A case study (joint work with Olga Borik)

- Russian imperfective (IPF) past passive participles (PPPs)
  - Received view: Should not exist
  - Corpus data: They do, but restricted to particular IPF meanings.
  - $\rightarrow$ They 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)
  - $\rightarrow$ 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.

The data

- Russian National Corpus (RNC) (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):

  (21)   *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:

(22)   V leto   7010 mesjaca   avgusta   v šestoe na
        in summer 7010 month.GEN august.GEN in 6th   on
        Preobraženie Gospoda našego lisusa   Xrista
        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?

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:

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

(24)   [...] 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?'

(25)   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:

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

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

(28)   [...] 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

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

- Here: Analysis of the 'presuppositional' cases.

Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

(see also Grønn 2015, for further theoretical assumptions)

(30)   Sdelav^{pf} ėtot xod [26 – Rxc3], ja [predložil^{pf} nič'ju]$_{antecedent}$. [...]
        Navernjaka, černye deržatsja^{ipf} – naprimer, 27 Ba3 Bf8 28 Nf5 d5 29
        Bb2 [...], no mne ne xotelos'^{ipf} načinat'^{ipf} sčetnuju igru, [poėtomu]$_F$ 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)

- 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 (30) or contextually
  derivable (next slide)

Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

- Presupposition as anaphor → contextually derivable:

(31)   Dlja bol'šinstva znakomyx vaš [ot"ezd]$_{(pseudo-)antecedent}$ stal$_{PF}$ polnoj
        neožidannost'ju ... Vy [uezžali^{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.)

Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

(32)   V ėtoj porternoj ja [...] napisal   pervoe ljubovnoe pis'mo. Pisal
        in this tavern   I   wrote.PF first   love   letter   wrote.IPF
        [karandašom]$_F$.
        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):

(33)   [VP]: $\lambda e[x|\text{INSTRUMENT}(e,x), \textbf{pencil}(x)]_{[\ |\textbf{write}(e)]}$

- 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. (34), (35)
- Often marked word order; e.g. (34-a) & many previous ex.s, e.g. (35)
  - Unmarked word order: BE +PPP; marked: PPP + BE + Mod.
  ⇒ The event, denoted by the PPP, is part of the background.

(34)　　a.　Stroeno bylo ėto 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

(35)　　a.　Pisano　　ėto bylo Dostoevskim　　[v 1871 godu]$_F$ [...]
　　　　　　written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year.PREP

　　　　b.　Kryt　　　byl dom [solomoj]$_F$ [...]
　　　　　　covered.IPF was house hay.INSTR

Arguments for presuppositional IPF PPPs

❷ Inference of a completed event survives under negation.

(36)   Stroeno   (ne) bylo ėto vse ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.
         built.IPF not was that all badly lamely with-holes
         ⤳ All that was / has been built.

(37)   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

❸ 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:

(38)   Ėto – ne ja sdelal, ėto – 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:

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

More on anaphoricity: ~ Bridging?

- Anaphoric via a created object:

  (40)   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:

  (41)   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)

(42)   Stroeno bylo ėto vse [ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto]$_F$.
        built.IPF was this all badly lamely with-holes

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

(43) $< \lambda e[x|\textbf{build}(e) \wedge \text{THEME}(e, x)], \lambda e[|\textbf{bad}(e) \wedge \textbf{lame}(e) \wedge \textbf{with-holes}(e)] >$

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

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

- (Speculations on the semantics of IPF in PPPs: appendix)

Conclusion

Summary of the corpus study

- 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 (quasi-obligatory modifier)

Open issues (corpus study)

- 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, especially 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.).
- Back to the research project: Why is Czech different?

Summary of the research questions

1 Differences in aspect usage: Semantic or pragmatic?

- Can we work with one formalisation for both (all) Slavic languages, or are the aspects principally different?
- Which other factors play a role?

2 What is the difference between the periphrastic and the reflexive passive?

- Why is there an aspectual division of labour in Russian?
- Why can the Russian IPF periphrastic passive not express a process meaning?
- Why is Czech different in both points?
- Investigation: Which IPF meanings can we find in both types of passives in both languages?

3 What is the difference between the Russian and the Czech passives?

- What kind of passive is the reflexive passive (RU vs. CZ)?
- What kind of passives is the periphrastic passive (RU vs. CZ)?
- What kind of *by*-phrases do we find (RU vs. CZ)?

Summary of the research questions

4 What is the relationship between reflexive passives and other reflexive constructions?

5 Periphrastic passive and Tense:
  - What is the difference between BE_{PRES} and BE_{PAST} (RU)?
  - What about Czech?

6 What is the role of finiteness in the usage of aspect?

7 Further Q: What about other participles?
  - Periphrastic passive: Short form past passive participles (PPP)

Additional participles:
  - Long form PPP (always adjectival)
  - 3 more: Past active, present active, present passive
  - Adverbial participles ('converbs') (synchr. only in RU)
  - Past tense: 'l-participle' with (CZ) or without (RU) auxiliary BE (diachr. perfect participle)

Cross-Slavic variation in passives

Gràcies!
també als organitzadors

Berit Gehrke
http://www.beritgehrke.com

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 ±PF) (especially because of general-factual IPF)
    - Positive definition also of IPF

Appendix: Semantics of Russian Aspect

- Borik (2002, 2006): PF vs. −PF

  (45) PF: $S \cap R = \varnothing$ & $E \subseteq R$
        IPF: $\neg (S \cap R = \varnothing$ & $E \subseteq R)$
              $= S \cap R \neq \varnothing \lor E \neg \subseteq R$

- Grønn (2015): PF vs. ±PF

  (46) $[\![PF]\!] = \lambda t \lambda e.e \subseteq t$
        $[\![IPF_{factual}]\!] = \lambda t \lambda e.e \subseteq t$
        $[\![IPF_{ongoing}]\!] = \lambda t \lambda e.t \subseteq e$

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

- Altshuler (2012, 2014): IPF is always $t \subseteq e$

  $\rightarrow$ General-factual IPF vs. PF: context

Appendix: Existential IPF PPPs?

<u>Paraphrase</u>: *There was (at least) one event of this type.*

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

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

(48) 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.*

(49) 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.'

(50) 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 ...'

(51) Za čto neodnokratno byla bita [...]
      for what not once was beaten.IPF.FEM.SG
      'For which she was beaten more than once ...'

Appendix: How to account for IPF in PPPs?

- 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):

(52) 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.'

Appendix: How to account for IPF in PPPs?

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

- *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: $t < n(ow)$

- 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.

Appendix: How to account for IPF in PPPs?

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:

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

  (55) $[e_1, e_2, t, n, x | \textbf{payment}(e_1), \textbf{pay}(e_2), \textsc{theme}(e_2, x),$
          $\textbf{6.000R}(x), \textbf{in-cash}(e_2), e_2 \subseteq e_1, \tau(e_1) \subseteq t, t < n]$

- 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]

Appendix: Rhetorical relations

- 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: α's event is part of β's
    - Background: The state described in β is the 'backdrop' or the circumstances under which the event in α occurred.
    - (Maybe also Contrast?)

Appendix: More on 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

  (56) - 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

(57) 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 ėto 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 <u>built</u> badly, lamely, with holes.'

E.g. context of our examples

(58)   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.

       Stroeno bylo éto vse ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto. '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.

References I

Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E. and Schäfer, F.: 2015, *External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations: A Layering Approach*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

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.

Alvestad, S.: 2014, Fake imperfective imperatives in Slavic, *in* S. Ebeling, A. Grønn, K. Hauge and D. Santos (eds), *Corpus-based Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, Oslo Studies in Language 6(1), pp. 29–42.

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. and Brecht, R.: 1975, The syntax of Voice in Russian, *Language* **51.2**, 342–367.

Benacchio, R.: 2010, *Vid i kategorija vežlivosti v slavjanskom imperative: Sravnitel'nyj analiz*, Kubon und Sagner, Munich / Berlin.

Berger, T.: 2013, Imperfektive Verben in Handlungsfolgen im Westslavischen, *in* S. Kempgen, M. Wingender, N. Franz and M. Jakiša (eds), *Deutsche Beiträge zum 15. Internationalen Slavistenkongress Minsk 2013*, Verlag Otto Sagner, München, pp. 57–66.

References II

Berro, A.: 2017, Basque adjectival participles are functionally richer. Workshop on Participles: Form, use and meaning, SLE 2017, Zürich.

Bondarko, A. V.: 1958, Nastojaščee istoričeskoe (praesens historicum) glagolov nesoveršennogo i soveršennogo vidov v češskom jazyke, *Slavia* **27**, 556–584.

Bondarko, A. V.: 1959, Nastojaščee istoričeskoe v slavjanskix jazykax s točki zrenija glagol'nogo vida, *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie* pp. 48–58.

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.

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.

Dickey, S. M.: 2000, *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*, CSLI Press, Stanford.

References III

Dickey, S. M.: 2015, Parameters of Slavic aspect reconsidered: The east-west aspect division from a diachronic perspective, *in* M. Shrager, E. Andrews, G. Fowler and S. Franks (eds), *Studies in Accentology and Slavic Linguistics in Honor of Ronald F. Feldstein*, Slavica, Bloomington, pp. 29–45.

Dickey, S. M.: 2018, Thoughts on the 'Typology of Aspect', *Russian Linguistics* **42.1**, 69–103.

Dickey, S. M. and Kresnin, S. C.: 2009, Verbal aspect and negation in Russian and Czech, *Russian Linguistics* **33**, 121–176.

Dokulil, M.: 1948, Modifikace vidového protikladu v rámci imperativu v spisovné češtině a ruštině, *in* O. Uličný (ed.), *Obsah - výraz - význam I: Výbor z lingvistického díla Miloše Dokulila. Miloši Dokulilovi k 85. narozeninám*, Filozofická fakulta Univerzty Karlovy, Prague 1997, pp. 171–181. First in: Pocta F. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi. Brno 1948, 71-78.

Dübbers, V.: 2015, *Konzeptuelle Motivationen des Verbalaspekts und seiner Variationen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Iterativität und 'faktischer' Funktion im Russischen und Tschechischen*, PhD thesis, Tübingen.

Eckert, E.: 1984, *A Contrastive Study of Czech and Russian Aspect*, PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Eckert, E.: 1991, Prefixed motion verbs of coming and leaving in standard and spoken Czech as compared to Russian, *in* A. A. Barentsen, B. Groen and R. Sprenger (eds), *Studies in West Slavic and Baltic Linguistics*, Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 16, Rotopi, Amsterdam / Atlanta, pp. 85–105.

References IV

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.

Fortuin, E. and Kamphuis, J.: 2015, The typology of Slavic aspect: a review of the East-West Theory of Slavic aspect, *Russian Linguistics* **39.2**, 163–208.

Fortuin, E. and Kamphuis, J.: 2018, Unanswered questions of Slavic aspect: A reply to 'Thoughts on the 'Typology of Aspect'', *Russian Linguistics* **42.1**, 105–121.

Gehrke, B.: 2002, Systemhafte Unterschiede im Aspektgebrauch zwischen dem Russischen und dem Tschechischen. Unpublished MA thesis, Humboldt University Berlin.

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.

Gehrke, B. and Marco, C.: 2014, Different *by*-phrases with adjectival passives: Evidence from Spanish corpus data, *Lingua* **149B**, 188–214.

References V

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.

Ivančev, S.: 1961, *Kontekstovo obuslovena ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesvăršen vid v češkija ezik*, Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet: Filologičeski fakultet, Nauka i izkustvo.

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.

References VI

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.

Křížková, H.: 1955, K problematice praesentu historického v ruštině a češtině, *Sovětská jazykověda* **5**, 241–255.

Křížková, H.: 1958, K problematice aktualního a neaktualního užití časových a vidových forem v češtině a v ruštině, *Československá rusistika* **3**, 185–200.

Landman, F.: 1992, The progressive, *Natural Language Semantics* **1**, 1–32.

Lascarides, A. and Asher, N.: 1993, Temporal interpretation, discourse relations and commonsense entailment, *Linguistics and Philosophy* **16**, 437–493.

Maienborn, C.: 2007, Das Zustandspassiv: Grammatische 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 nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke, *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Serija 9, Filologija* **4**, 19–47.

References VII

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.

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.

Petruxina, E.: 1978, O funkcionirovanii protivopostavlenija v russkom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češskim (pri oboznačenii povtorjajuščixsja dejstvij), *Russkij jazyk za rubežom* **1978.1**, 57–60.

References VIII

Petruxina, E.: 1983, Funkcionirovanie prezentnyx form glagolov soveršennogo vida (s točki zrenija vzaimodejstvija grammatičeskix kategorij vida i vremeni) v češskom jazyke v sopostavlenii s russkim, *in* A. Širokova (ed.), *Sopostavitel'noe izučenie grammatiki i leksiki russkogo jazyka s češskim jazykom i drugimi slovjanskimi jazykami*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, Moscow, pp. 152–172.

Petruxina, E.: 1998, Sopostavitel'naja tipologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennyx slavjanskix jazyxax (na materiale russkogo, zapadnoslavjanskix i bolgarskogo jazykov), *in* M. J. Čertkova (ed.), *Tipologija vida: Problemy, poiski, rešenija*, Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, Moscow, pp. 356–363.

Petruxina, E.: 2000, *Aspektual'nye kategorii glagola v russkom jazyke v sopostavlenii s češskim, slovackim, pol'skim i bolgarskim jazykami*, Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, Moscow.

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.

Schäfer, F.: 2016, Two types of argument expletives: Evidence from *by*-phrases and object-drop. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Impersonality and Correlated Phenomena – Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*, Salzburg, November 2016.

Schoorlemmer, M.: 1995, *Participial Passive and Aspect in Russian*, PhD thesis, Utrecht University.

References IX

Širokova, A.: 1963, O kategorii mnogokratnosti v češškom jazyke, *in* A. Širokova (ed.), *Issledovanija po češškomu jazyku: Voprosy slovoobrazovanija i grammatiki*, Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, Moscow, pp. 61–85.

Stunová, A.: 1993, *A Contrastive Analysis of Russian and Czech Aspect: Invariance vs. Discourse*, PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Švedova, N. (ed.): 1980, *Russkaja Grammatika*, Nauka, Moscow.

Tatevosov, S.: 2011, Severing perfectivity from the verb, *Scando-Slavica* **57**, 216–244.

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.

von Waldenfels, R.: 2014, Explorations into variation across Slavic: Taking a bottom-up approach, *in* B. Szmrecsanyi and B. Wälchli (eds), *Aggregating Dialectology, Typology and Register Analysis*, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 290–323.

Zaliznjak, A. and Šmelev, A.: 2000, *Vvedenie v Russkuju Aspektologiju*, Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, Moscow.