Russian past passive participles

Berit Gehrke
(HU Berlin)

Turning Slavic aspect inside out
Mini-conference for outsiders and insiders

Leipzig, June 14, 2019

Participles in Russian

(I)PF: (im)perfective

- Present Active, from IPF: *sidja-šč-ij, živu-šč-ij*
- Present Passive, from IPF: *čitae-m-yj, trebue-m-yj*
- Past Active, from (I)PF: *dela-vš-ij* (IPF); *zakonči-vš-ij* (PF)
- Past Passive, from PF: *sdela-n(n-yj), vypit(-yj)*

- Adverbial participles (*deepričastija*)
    - Present, mostly IPF: *govor-ja, dela-ja* (but also PF *prid-ja*)
      ~ adverbial clause with simultaneity (mostly)
    - Past, PF: *sprosi-v(ši), sdela-v(ši)*
      ~ adverbial clause with anteriority

  (Tense is here a relative tense)

Adverbial participles in Russian

- Adverbial participles are not inflected.
- The easiest translation is with a temporal adverbial clause, e.g. (1)

(1) a. Sobiraja   kartofel', Vanja stal   mečtat'.
         gather.AP.IPF potatoe Vanja started.PF dream.INF
         '(While he was) gathering potatoes, Vanja began to
         day-dream.'
     b. Sobrav   kartofel', Vanja stal   gotovit'   obed.
         gather.AP.PF potatoe Vanja started.PF prepare.INF dinner
         'After he had gathered the potatoes / Having gathered the
         potatoes, Vanja started to prepare dinner.'

Present (active, passive) and past active participles

- Present (active, passive) and past active participles usually occur in their long form and are inflected for case, number, gender.
- The easiest translation is with a relative clause or an attributive modifier, e.g. (2)

(2) a. čelovek   sidjaščij   na divane
         person.NOM.SG.MASC sitting.NOM.SG.MASC on couch
         'the person (that is) sitting on the couch'
     b. čitaemaja   molodež'ju gazeta
         read.NOM.SG.FEM youth.INSTR paper.NOM.SG.FEM
         'the paper read by young people / the paper that young people read'
     c. Zapakovavšaja   čemodan   ženščina   obratilas' ko mne.
         packed.NOM.SG.FEM suitcase.ACC woman.NOM turned to me
         'The woman, who had packed the suitcase, turned to me.'

Past passive participles (PPPs)

- Past passive participles (PPPs) can occur in the long form in the same function / inflection pattern as the other participles:

(3) a. napisannoe   mne   pis'mo
         written.NOM.SG.NEU me.DAT letter.NOM.SG.NEU
         'the letter written to me'

   b. stol   sdelannyj   v Moskve
       table.NOM.SG.MASC   made.NOM.SG.MASC   in Moscow
       'the table made in Moscow'

- PPPs can also occur in the short form, in passives:

(4) a. Stol   sdelan   v Moskve.
         table.NOM.SG.MASC   made.SG.MASC   in Moscow
         'The table was made in Moscow.'

   b. Kartina   byla napisana   Sal'vadorom   Dalí   v
       painting.NOM.SG.FEM was painted.SG.FEM   Salvador.INSTR Dalí.INSTR in
       1931 godu.
       1931 year
       'The painting was painted by Salvador Dalí in 1931.'

What is a 'passive'?

(5)   Active Voice:

Sal'vador   Dali   napisal   kartinu   v 1931 godu.
Salvador.NOM Dalí.NOM painted.PF painting.ACC in 1931 year
'Salvador Dalí painted the painting in 1931.'

(6)   Passive Voice:

Kartina byla napisana Sal'vadorom   Dali   v 1931 godu.
painting was painted   Salvador.INSTR Dalí.INSTR in 1931 year
'The painting was painted by Salvador Dalí in 1931.'

⇒ Typical properties of passives:
- Demotion of the external argument
- Promotion of the internal argument to subject position
- Agent / causer in (optional) *by*-phrase (Russian: NP in instrumental case)
  (usually treated as an adjunct / modifier)

Background: Verbal vs. adjectival 'passives'

e.g. German verbal 'Vorgangspassiv' (7-a) vs. adjectival 'Zustandspassiv' (7-b)

(7) 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:

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

→ Adjectival 'passives' are not strictly speaking passives.

German adjectival 'Zustandspassiv'

- Restricted compatibility with event-related modification:

  (9)   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

  (10) 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: (9) vs. (10), (11)

    (11) 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)

Russian passives

Russian: Two 'passive' constructions

(12) Active Voice
      Storož   otkry(va)l   vorota.
      watchman.NOM opened.(I)PF gate.ACC.PL
      'A / The watchman opened a / the gate.'

(13) Periphrastic passive: BE + past passive participles (PPP)
      Vorota   byli otkryty   storožem.
      gate.NOM.PL were opened.PF.PPP watchman.INSTR
      'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'

(14) Reflexive passive: Active form + reflexive -sja/-s'
      Vorota   otkryvalis'   storožem.
      gate.NOM.PL opened.SI.PL.RFL watchmann.INSTR
      'A / The gate was opened by a / the watchman.'

Passives: Aspectual restrictions in Russian

- Periphrastic passive: only PF (usually) (15)

- Reflexive passive: only IPF (usually) (16)

  (15) 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

  (16) 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: e.g. Knjazev (2007); Borik and Gehrke (2018)
  - 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.

Corpus study:

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

Corpus study (Borik and Gehrke 2018)

- Russian IPF PPPs
    - Received view: Should not exist
    - Corpus data: They do, but restricted to particular IPF meanings.
    - → 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)
    - → 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):

    (17)   *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:

(18)   V leto   7010 mesjaca   avgusta   v šestoe na
       in summer 7010 month.GEN august.GEN in 6th   on
       Preobraženie   Gospoda našego Iisusa   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:

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

(20)   [...] 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?'

(21)   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:

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

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

(24) [...] 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?

Background on Russian IPF

- IPF forms can have different readings in context:

  Canonical IPF readings:
  - Process/durativity (~ Progressive) (25-a)
  - Iterativity/habituality (25-b)

  (25) a. Kogda ja vošla,   moj brat čital knigu.
            when I in-went.PF my brother read.IPF book
            'When I came in, my brother was reading a book.'
        b. Ona každyj den' otkryvaet okno.
            she every day   opens.SI window
            'She opens the window every day.'

  Non-canonical IPF reading(s): General-factual
  - Possible with typical perfective meaning
    (~ bounded 'completed' events in the past)
  → Notoriously difficult to account for

The (general-)factual IPF

(Maslov 1959) (see Mueller-Reichau 2018, for recent discussion)

① Existential (26) (from Grønn 2004) (see also Padučeva 1996)

Paraphrase: *There was/is etc. (at least) one event of this type.*
(e.g. Mehlig 2001, 2013; Mueller-Reichau 2013, 2015; Mueller-Reichau and Gehrke 2015)

(26)   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 (27) (example: Zaliznjak and Šmelev 2000, terms: Grønn 2004/Padučeva 1996)

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

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

Back to IPF PPPs: 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

    (28) a. (Na)pisano   ėto 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

- Borik and Gehrke (2018): Analysis of the 'presuppositional' cases.

Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

(see also Grønn 2015, for further theoretical assumptions)

(29)   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 (29) or contextually
  derivable (next slide)

Grønn (2004) about the presuppositional IPF

- Presupposition as anaphor → contextually derivable:

(30)   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.)

Presuppositional IPF PPPs

Arguments for presuppositional IPF PPPs

① Background-focus marking

- Focus on quasi-obligatory modifiers; e.g. (31), (32)
- Often marked word order; e.g. (31-a) & many previous ex.s, e.g. (32)
    - Unmarked word order: BE +PPP; marked: PPP + BE + Mod.
    ⇒ The event, denoted by the PPP, is part of the background.

(31) a. Stroeno bylo èto 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

(32) a. Pisano   èto 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.

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

(34) 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:

(35) 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:

(36) 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:

  (37)   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)

$\rightarrow$ 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:

    (38)   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)

Conclusion

Summary of the corpus study

- There are IPF PPPs with a 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 the paper)
- 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.). → Why is Czech different?

Russian past passive participles

Thanks!

Berit Gehrke
http://www.beritgehrke.com

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.):

  (39)   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. (40) (from Dickey 2000)

(40)   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?

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. (41):
        - 'Adjectival/stative' with present tense copula (= null copula)
        - 'Verbal/eventive' with past tense forms of BE

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

Contra 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) (42).

  (42)   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. (43)
    - → Verbal PPPs exist in any tense

(43)   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.

(see also Schoorlemmer 1995; Borik 2013)

References I

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.

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* D. Lenertová, R. Meyer, R. Šimík and L. Szucsich (eds), *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016*, Language Science Press, Berlin, pp. 53–76.
URL: *http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/189*

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.

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.

References II

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

References III

Mehlig, H.: 2013, Obščefaktičeskoe i edinično-faktičeskoe značenija nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke, *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Serija 9, Filologija* **4**, 19–47.

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.: 2018, *Das Rätsel allgemeinfaktischer Interpretationen im Aspektsystem des Russischen*, Slavistische Beiträge 510, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

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.

References IV

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.

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

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.