1 Introduction

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFINITIVE</th>
<th>LONG FORM PPP</th>
<th>SHORT FORM PPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sdelat’ ‘make.PF’</td>
<td>sdelannyj ‘made.PF’</td>
<td>sdelan ‘made.PF’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rasserdit’ ‘make-angry.PF’</td>
<td>rasseržennyy ‘made-angry.PF’</td>
<td>rasseržen ‘made-angry.PF’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakryt’ ‘close.PF’</td>
<td>zakrytyj ‘closed.PF’</td>
<td>zakryt ‘closed.PF’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFINITIVE</th>
<th>LONG FORM PPP</th>
<th>SHORT FORM PPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delat’ ‘make.IPF’</td>
<td>delannyj ‘made.IPF’</td>
<td>delan ‘made.IPF’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slyšat’ ‘hear.IPF’</td>
<td>slyšannyj ‘heard.IPF’</td>
<td>slyšan ‘heard.IPF’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krasit’ ‘paint.IPF’</td>
<td>krašennyj ‘painted.IPF’</td>
<td>krašen ‘painted.IPF’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (e.g. completed bounded events in the past, see below).

- 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

- General wisdom: The two types of passives are aspectually restricted (in Russian) (e.g., Babby and Brecht 1975).
  - Only IPF in reflexive passives

---
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– Only PF in periphrastic passives

(1) IMPERFECTIVE PARADIGM
   a. Storož otkryval vorota.
      watchman.NOM opened.IPF gates.ACC
      ‘The watchman opened/was opening (IPF) a/the gate.’
   b. Vorota otkryvalis’ storožem.
      gates.NOM opened.IPF.RFL watchman.INSTR
      ‘The gate was (being) opened (IPF) by a/the watchman.’
   c. *Vorota byli otkryvany storožem.
      gates.NOM were opened.IPF.PRT watchman.INSTR

(2) PERFECTIVE PARADIGM
   a. Storož otkryl vorota.
      watchman.NOM opened.PF gates.ACC
      ‘The watchman opened (PF) a/the gate.’
   b. Vorota byli otkryty storožem.
      gates.NOM were opened.PF.PRT watchman.INSTR
      ‘The gate was opened (PF) by a/the watchman.’
   c. *Vorota otkrylis’ storožem.
      gates.NOM opened.PF.RFL watchman.INSTR

• However, there are exceptions on both sides.

– Periphrastic passives of IPFs: This paper, cf.:

(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.’

– Reflexive passives of PFs, e.g. (4) (from Schoorlemmer 1995:208, citing Gerritsen 1988,
  who in turn cites Janko-Trinickaja 1962, 133)

(4) Kniga Polja de Kruij “Oxotniki za mikrobami” pročitaetsja s bol’šim
    book Paul.GEN de Kruif Hunters after microbes reads.PF.RFL with great
    interesom i specialistom-mikrobiologom, i juníošej, ne
    interest and specialist-microbiologist.INSTR and youth.INSTR not
    vidavšim ešče ni odnoj naučnoj knigi.
    see.PST.ACT.PRT.INSTR still not one scientific book
    ‘Paul de Kruif’s book “Microbe Hunters” will be read with great interest both by the
    professional microbiologist and by the youth who has never seen a scientific book in his
    life.’

→ The main views on (the use of) IPF PPPs in the literature are as follows:

– IPF PPPs are rare/idiomatic/frozen forms that functions like adjectives: Academy Gram-
– 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.
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.
- Examine the type(s) of passive(s) that IPF PPPs occur in
- Argue that a subgroup of IPF PPPs in passives constitute a case of the presuppositional factive IPF (in the sense of Grønn 2004)

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 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
  (excludes: PPPs with null BE, PPPs as second conjuncts in coordination with other PPPs, etc.)
- Data we excluded manually (because we used the non-disambiguated corpus version):
  - Biaspectral 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 (LF and SF) PPPs in attributive uses
  - Errors in tagging (e.g., Biordalen, Sezan; strašen ‘terrible/scary.ADJ’ tagged as PPP; otevčen ‘answered.PF’, pereključen ‘over-switched.PF’ tagged as IPF)
  → No quantitative analysis

Our questions

Q1 Are IPF PPPs limited to idiomatic expressions, and/or are they genuine adjectives?
Our answer: No.

Q2 If we find non-idiomatic IPF PPPs in clear passive constructions, in what kind of contexts do they occur; can they express eventive/verbal passives?
Our answers:
  - IPF PPPs occur in both stative/adjectival and eventive/verbal passives
  - There is one prominent group of IPF passives which presuppose a completed event (normally referred to by PF) and focus on some other aspect of this event
  - In this group: obligatory modifiers, special information structure

Q3 What would be a general semantic characterization of an IPF PPP?
Our answers:
  - There are several subclasses of IPF PPPs in passives.
  - Presuppositional factive IPF PPPs constitute one solid subclass.
  - See section 5 for a sketch of an analysis.
3 Q1: IPF PPPs: regular/idiotic/adjectival and compositional

- Of course we found IPF PPPs that cannot be analysed as compositional passive participles, e.g.:
  - Idiomatic cases: (ne) lykom šit lit. ‘(not) sewn with bast fiber’, meaning ‘simple(-minded)’
  - Fixed expressions: rožden/krešen ‘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), prošen (asked.IPF), zvan (called.IPF), kusan (bitten.IPF), kryt (covered.IPF), venčan (married.IPF), njuxan (smelled.IPF), etc.

⇒ Conclusion: There are IPF PPPs whose semantics is built compositionally.

Productive IPF PPPs: No idiomatic/special meanings, compared 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 (5)).

This suggests that there might still be lexical restrictions. (or: limitations of the corpus?)

- Very few SI PPPs in passives, all archaic (i.e. from biblical texts or from before the 19th century):

⇒ First data observations:
  - There are not many IPF PPPs, but there are clearly compositional ones. → need for analysis
  - Although the BE-PPP order is generally much more frequent, for relevant IPF PPPs there are even more instances in the rather marked PPP-BE order.
  - Marked word order with the postverbal subject → word order of ‘explicative’ sentences, which presuppose that an event happened (the event’s existence) and explicate further aspects of this event (cf. Mehlig 2008, and references cited therein).
4 Q2: IPF PPPs in passives

- Main point: There are IPF PPPs that are used productively in passive constructions.

4.1 Q2.1: What kind of passives?

- Are IPF PPPs restricted to just one type of passives or can they be found in both adjectival/stative and verbal/eventive passives?

4.1.1 Background on verbal/eventive vs. adjectival/stative passives

- Russian: (Short form) PF PPPs can be both verbal and adjectival (see, e.g., Schoorlemmer 1995; Borik 2013, 2014).

- English, German, Spanish:
  - Unlike with verbal passives, the underlying event in adjectival passives lacks spatiotemporal location and referential external arguments.
  - Only possible with verbal passives: (event-related) spatiotemporal event modifiers, (referential) by-/with-phrases, agent-oriented adverbs, purpose clauses etc.
  - Possible with both: manner modifiers, state-related modifiers

(cf. Rapp 1997; Kratzer 2000; Maienborn 2007; Gehrke 2011, 2015; Gehrke and Marco 2014; Alexiadou, Gehrke, and Schäfer 2014; Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer 2015, i.a.)

4.1.2 Our findings, applying the diagnostics from English etc. to Russian

- IPF PPPs in possibly stative/adjectival passives:
  - (9): Stative extent reading (cf. Gawron 2009, i.a.), non-referential INSTR-marked NPs that additionally relate to the state
  - (10): State-related modifiers

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

b. [...] ne skazal, čto wagon-to naš učebnikami gružen byl? not said.IPF that waggon-PTL our textbooks.INSTR loaded.IPF was 'He did not tell us that our waggon was loaded with textbooks?'

(10) a. Dver' kvartiry byla krašena svetlo-koričneoj kraskoj [...] door apartment.GEN was painted.IPF light-brown.INSTR paint.INSTR 'The apartment door was painted in a light-brown color.'

b. My oba byli striženy nagolo [...] we both were haircut.IPF bald 'We were both shorn / we both had shaven heads.' [German: kahlgeschoren]

- IPF PPPs in clearly eventive/verbal passives: (11)-(12) (e.g. temporal event modifiers, referential by-phrases, other event-related modifiers)

(11) a. Pisano ěto 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.’

(12) 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.

4.2 Q2.2: Which IPF contexts?

- Knjazev (2007): Passive IPF PPPs are found in non-progressive IPF contexts.
- Our data corroborate this generalization.
- Typical IPF-inducing contexts:
  - Negation, repetition, habituality → see appendix.
  - We focus on the most frequent type in our set of data: Presuppositional factives (see (9)-(12) and below)

5 Q3: The semantics of IPF PPPs

- We argue that a substantial number of the examples found should be analyzed as presuppositional factive IPFs; e.g. (13) (more below).
  - Intonational focus is not on the verb but on some other element in the sentence.
  - The completion of an event is backgrounded and presupposed.
  - In focus: obligatory modifier(s) specifying the manner, quality, purpose or other aspect of the event itself (and not its culmination)

Often marked word order, e.g. (5)-(6), (9), (11), (13-a), (29-c):

- PPP in sentence-initial topic position, modifier after BE, in focus

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

5.1 Some background: The general-factual (obščefaktičeskoe, OF) meaning of the IPF

(Term goes back to Maslov 1959; cf. Mehlig 2016 for recent discussionsee also appendix)

- No consensus in the literature wrt (cf. Grønn 2004: ch. 4 for overview and references):
  - Empirical delineation
  - Subtypes (yes or no; if yes, how many; etc.)
  - Theoretical account: IPF meaning in its own right, or a subtype of core IPF meanings (i.e. process or iterative/habitual)
- Aspectual competition: both IPF and PF can be used, with very subtle meaning differences)
Grønn (2004): Two subtypes (see also Padučeva 1996)

→ Existential factive IPF:

  – (often) intonational focus on the verb
  – only possible with temporal frame adverbials (modify the assertion time) and temporally underspecified (vague) adverbials
  – often with discourse reminders
  – e.g. epistemically indefinite kogda-nibud’ ‘ever’ requires existential factive IPF, e.g. (14)
    (additionally illustrates: with lexical marking of event completion SI is preferred)

(14) Ty kogda-nibud’ {pročityval / #pročital / čital} roman Prusta do konca? ‘Have you ever read a novel by Proust to the end?’ (Grønn 2004, 73)

→ Presuppositional factive IPF:

  – The verb is deaccentuated, the focus is on some other constituent.
  – The verbal predicate has an eventive argument, an event is backgrounded and an instantiation of it is presupposed.
  – This is the type of factive IPF relevant for us is, e.g. (15).

(15) Anna otkrovenno brošila em v lico obvinjenie: ěto ty ubival ix, a Anna openly threw.PF him in face accusation that you killed.IPF them and ispol’zovał dlja ětogo menja! used.(1)PF for that me ‘Anna openly accused him: It was you who killed them, and you used me to achieve your goal!’ (Grønn 2004, 131)

5.2 Arguments for treating these IPF PPPs as presuppositional factive

1. Comparison with a PF variant (in those cases where a PF option exists)

   • E.g. the examples (9)-(12) from above, repeated below, all have a PF variant:

(16) 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

(17) a. Dver’ kvartiry byla (po)krašena svetlo-koričnevoj kraskoj [...] door apartment.GEN was (PF)painted.IPF light-brown.INSTR paint.INSTR
    b. My oba byli (po)striženy nagolo [...] we both were (PF)haircut.IPF bald

(18) (Na)pisano ěto bylo Dostoevskim v 1871 godu [...] (PF)written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year

(19) 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):
2. IPF passives under negation

- The presuppositional part of the sentence meaning, unlike the asserted part (the at-issue content) is not affected by negation.

  → If event completion is implied in the positive counterpart, the same implication holds in a negated sentence, cf. contrast between (21) ((13) from above) and (22):

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

(22) a. Stroeno ěto ne bylo ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.
    built.IPF that not was badly lamely with.holes
    [Or even more neutral word order: Ėto ne bylo stroeno ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.]
b. Zapiski ne byli pisany ne dlja pečati [... no ...]
    notes not were written.IPF not for print but

  → What you seem to negate in both cases is manner, not really the existence of the event itself and not its completion.

- The fact that the negated examples might sound unnatural has an explanation: Sentential negation usually negates the whole predicate, including the event.

- The same observation largely holds for examples (16)-(19) above, all with obligatory or ‘almost’ obligatory modifiers.
  - ‘Almost obligatory’: The acceptability of an example decreases greatly without a modifier.

5.3 The analysis

- Grønn’s (2004) analysis of the presuppositional factive IPF in (23-a) (attributed to Forsyth 1970) is illustrated in (23-b) (semantics of the VP) and (23-c) (the VP embedded under Aspect).

(23) a. V ětoj porternoj ja napisal pervoe ljubovnoe pis’mo. Pisal [karandašom]F.
    in this tavern I wrote.PF first love letter wrote.IPF pencil.INSTR
b. [VP]: λe[x](INSTRUMENT(e,x), pencil(x))[write(e)]
c. [AspectP]: λt[x](INSTRUMENT(e,x), pencil(x))[e(write(e),eat)]

His analysis is couched in 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 (23-b):
  - writing event (background) & with pencil (focus)
- Backgrounded material is argued to be presupposed: The subscripted part introduces presupposed information into the DRS.
- Underspecified meaning of the IPF: e ◦ t (building on Klein 1995)
Presuppositions are treated as anaphora: bound to an antecedent (e.g. PF napisal in the first sentence in (23-a)), or: justified by the input context; e.g. (24)

(24) Dlja bol’šinstva znakomyx vaš [ot’ezd]_{pseudo-antecedent} stalPF polnoj neožidannost’ju ... Vy [uezzali]_{IPF} v Ameriku [ot čego-to, k čemu-to ili že prosto voznamerilis’]PF spokojno provestiPF tam buduščju starost’? ‘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.)

A first attempt at a proposal for (presuppositional factive) IPF PPPs:

– Extension of Grønn’s account; e.g. the analysis of (13-a)/(25) in (26):

(25) Stroeno bylo èto ploxo, xromo, ščeljasto.

built.IPF was that badly lamely with.holes

(26) [VP]: λe[bad(e) ∧ lame(e) ∧ with-holes(e)][build(e)]

Main ingredients of the (still rather informal) analysis for (partially repeated) cases like (27):

– The completion/culmination of the event is not part of the asserted meaning.
– IPF shifts the focus on another aspect of the event, expressed by the obligatory modifier, instead of the culmination of the event itself.

(27) a. Zapiski byli pisany [ne dlja pečati]_{F} [... no ...] notes were written.IPF not for print but
b. [...] kormlen byl [skupo, sderžanno]_{F} [...] fed.IPF was sparingly reservedly
c. Pisano èto bylo [Dostoevskim [v 1871 godu]]_{F} [...] written.IPF that was Dostoevskij.INSTR in 1871 year

Future task: Check the contexts in which IPF PPPs appear to ensure that the presupposed events are indeed bound (ana-/cataphorically to a PF) or justifiable by the input context; e.g. (28).

(28) a. Èto – ne ja sdelal, èto – vedeno bylo moeju rukoj!
this not I did.IPF this led.IPF was my.INSTR hand.INSTR
b. Pis’ma ego pisany byli černo i kruglo [...] letters his written.IPF were black and round
c. Čto kasaetjsa platy deneg, to plačeny byli naličnymi šest’ what concerns payment.GEN money.GEN then paid.IPF were in cash six tysjač rublej [...] thousand roubles

‘As for the payment, six thousand roubles were paid in cash ...’

5.4 Other uses of IPF participles in passives

– Negated events, negation more generally, (29);
– Repeated events: e.g. plural event participants, (30), pluractional markers, (31), habitual contexts, (32), markers of repeatability/iterativity, (33)

(29) a. [...] i ja uže ne byl zvan v gosti [...] and I already not was called.IPF in guests
b. Ja prosil, čtoby dlja menja ne delano bylo nikakix ceremonij. I asked.PF that.MOD for me not made.IPF were any ceremonies ‘I asked that no ceremonies would be held for me.’
c. Mojka byla perepolnena nemytoj posudoj. Ne myto bylo sink was overflown.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. impersonal]

(30) [...] dolgo putešestvoval, kusan byl jadovitymi 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.’

(31) Vsego nagljadelsja – i golodal, i syt byval po gorlo, i bit all.GEN saw.IPF and starved.IPF and full was.FREQ until throat and beaten.IPF byl, i sam bil [...] was and self beat.PST.IPF ‘[I] experienced it all – I starved, and I was full to the top, I was beaten, and I did the beating myself.’

(32) Kormlen byl skupo, sderžanno [...] fed.IPF was sparingly reservedly ‘He was fed very little.’

(33) a. Ne raz ja byl učen, molču i znaju [...] not once I was educated.IPF am-silent and know.1SG ‘Not just once was I lectured, I remain silent and know ...’
b. Za čto neodnokratno byla bita [...] for what not-once was beaten.IPF ‘For that she was beaten more than once.’
c. Skol’ko raz govoreno bylo, čtoby svozit’! how many times said.IPF was that.MOD in-bring.IPF ‘How many times were [you] told to bring people in!’

→ We suggest that those cases that do not involve presuppositional factive IPF could be cases of existential factive IPF:

– There was/were (no) (an) event(s) of that type (cf. Mehlig 2001, 2013; Mueller-Reichau 2013, 2015; Mueller-Reichau and Gehrke 2015).
– Existential factive IPF more generally requires repeatability (kratnost’) and non-uniqueness.
– Furthermore: different information structure compared to the presuppositional IPF PPPs

6 Further open issues

6.1 Why no SIs (if that empirical claim is correct, beyond the corpus data)?

• Grønn (2004):

– No morphological or lexical restrictions on factual IPFs [other than telicity, since his defini-
tion of factual IPFs requires resultativity] → Both simple IPF and SI are possible.
Impressionistic view in the literature (and see also discussion in Grønn 2004, ch. 4):

- “The use of the Imperfective as a general-factual is particularly common with non-prefixed verbs, and rather less common with Imperfective verbs that owe their imperfectivity to a suffix that derives them from a Perfective.” (Comrie 1976, 118)
  → Most of his examples seem to involve presuppositional factive IPFs.
- Czech, which arguably only has presuppositional factive IPFs, judging from examples discussed in the literature (e.g. Eckert 1984; Dickey 2000), seems to rely on simple IPFs for this meaning (cf. Gehrke 2002).

Some wild speculations:

- Presuppositional factive IPFs are most common with simple IPFs because these verb forms are morphologically the least marked for grammatical or lexical aspect, and presuppositional factive IPFs quite generally do not focus on any one aspectual meaning in particular?
- Presuppositional factive IPFs historically first arose with a core group of IPF verbs (which are all simple) and then spread to others?
  → Since IPF PPPs are already quite restricted, maybe only the core verbs are affected?

Why archaic examples with SIs?

- SIs were also used to mark pluractional contexts (plural subjects/objects, frequency adverbs, etc.), maybe up until the 19th century even.
- Afterwards: The pure ‘multiplicational’ meaning of SI disappears?
- Or: Morphological restriction on SI PPP formation in Modern Russian?

6.2 Why don’t we find more cases of IPF PPPs, and why only with a handful of verbs?

- If the event itself has to be presupposed this already limits the contexts in which such a form can even be used.
- Many verbs of creation/consumption: We can infer the event already from the objects. (These are also nouns that lend themselves quite easily to event coercion; cf. Pustejovsky 1995; Egg 2003; Asher 2011.)
- Passives are generally not particularly widely used in Russian.
  → In languages with a fixed word order, such as English, passives take on particular information structural functions that languages with a freer word order, such as Russian, can express in active sentences with different word orders.
  → More restricted use of the passive? (e.g. only aspectual/event structural functions in Russian?; cf. Abraham 2006)

Appendix

A More on the general-factual (OF) meaning

  → Resultative and non-resultative subtypes (Glovinskaja 1981)
  → Most common with finite past tense forms.

(Grønn 2004, ch. 5 & 6: Factual IPFs are confined to finite past tense forms.)

- (Padučeva 1996, 32-52): Three subtypes
– Existential & concrete OF (34-a) & (34-b):
  * resultative, temporally indefinite, isolated from utterance time, retrospective
  * factive: accent is always on the verb
  * only for the existential one: repeatable (kratnost’; the opposite of uniqueness)

(34)  a. Moj djadja voschodil na Everest.
       my uncle climbed.IPF on Everest
  b. Ty otkryval okno?
       you opened.IPF window

– Actional (35-a) & (35-b)):
  * Accent is never on the verb
  * Focus is on some other aspect of the event
  * Requires agentive, controllable event

(35)  a. Ja ubiral komnatu včera. [Kto segodnja dolžen ubirat’ – ne
       I cleaned.IPF room.ACC yesterday who today must clean.IPF not
       know.1SG
  b. Gde apel’siny pokupali?
       where oranges.ACC bought.IPF.PL

B Cross-Slavic variation in the expression of and eventivity in passives

• Russian:

  – Common assumption: Short form (SF) PPPs can be both verbal and adjectival (see, e.g.,
    Schoorlemmer 1995).
  – Babby (1975, 1999, 2009): SF PPPs (as well as SF adjectives) are verbal.
  – Paslawska and von Stechow (2003):
    * SF PPPs are stative (for them: ‘adjectival’) and express target states (in the sense of
      Kratzer 2000), even though they can appear with all kinds of event modifiers, e.g., a
      temporal modifier in (36-b) (from Borik 2014), locating the underlying event.
    → Russian SF PPP are like Greek ‘adjectival’ participles, which, unlike, e.g., German
      PPPs, have been argued to contain Voice (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003).
  – Borik (2013, 2014) sides with Schoorlemmer etc.: Having event-related modifiers licensed
    by Voice does not make sense in what is usually called an adjectival passive, (36).

(36)  a. Dom byl pokrašen za 2 časa / bistro / special’no.
       house.NOM was painted.PF in 2 hours quickly on purpose
       ‘The house was painted in two hours/quickly/on purpose.’
  b. Vorota (byli) otkryty storožem rovno v 6 utra
       gates (were) opened.PF watchmen.INSTR exactly in 6 morning.GEN for 2 hours
       ‘The gates were opened by the watchman at exactly 6 in the morning for 2 hours.’

4However, see McIntyre (2013); Bruening (2014); Alexiadou et al. (2014, 2015) for arguments that also English and
German PPPs can contain Voice. This still will not explain why these languages, unlike Greek, have restrictions on event-
related modification with adjectival participles, but see Gehrke (2015) for an account. Moreover, this raises the general
question whether Greek participles are indeed always adjectival, as the literature on Greek claims (e.g. Anagnostopoulou
2003; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2008).
• Czech:
  – PPPs can be derived from both IPF and PF verbs, across the board.
  – Such PPPs express verbal/eventive or adjectival/verbal passive, including passive ‘events in process’ (IPF ones) (Radek Šimík, p.c.).
  – Unlike Russian, Czech reflexive passives are not full-fledged verbal passives (cf. Schäfer 2016): By-phrases are only possible in Russian (recall (1-b) etc.), vs. Czech, (37) (from Fehrmann et al. 2010).\(^{5}\)

\[(37) \text{ˇSaty } \text{se právě šijí } (*babičkou).\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dress.NOM.PL} & \text{ RFL right-now sew.3PL} \text{ grandmother.INSTR} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The dress is being made right now.’ (by-phrase impossible)

• Back to Russian and cross-Slavic variation:
Judging from the literature and the data, it does not seem to be possible in Russian (unlike what we find in Czech) to have a passive event-in-process reading with periphrastic passives; this can only be expressed by the reflexive passive.

Possibilities:

  – Languages with ‘productive’ IPF/PF PPPs (e.g. Czech) form regular periphrastic verbal passives with all IPF/PF meanings.
    (unclear: status of se-passive, but see Fehrmann et al. 2010; Schäfer 2016, for suggestions)
  – The others, option 1: BE+PPP are adjectival, only reflexive passives are verbal.
  – The others, (our preferred) option 2:
    * BE+PPP are either verbal or adjectival, but can only express result states (Kratzer’s 2000 ‘target states’).
    * Reflexive passives (which are verbal) fill the gap (for verbs that do not have ‘target states’, as well as for passive event-in-process readings).

• Still unclear though: Why can the (Russian) periphrastic passive not have a process meaning, not even with the IPF?
Not clear whether this restriction is due to ...

  – The wide-held assumption that Russian IPF PPPs do not form passives (in that case this is a chicken-and-egg problem), or
  – An actual ban on process readings of periphrastic passives.

More speculations:

  – There might be a split in ‘imperfective meanings’ conveyed by different passives.
  – Process meaning: (only) reflexive passives
  – Other (sometimes called ‘peripheral’) IPF meanings, specifically, habitual/iterative and (all types of) general-factual: periphrastic passives (usually with PF PPPs)

General impression though: It seems that both passives can be habitual.

  – There might be a finer distinction: habitual, as a ‘typical’ IPF, is conveyed by reflexive passives, iteration/multiple occurrences by periphrastic passives (usually with PF PPPs).
  → This would sort of mimic the ‘aspectual’ division of labor in active sentences, where, normally, habituality requires the IPF but iterative events can be described by either aspect.

\(^{5}\)Fehrmann et al. (2010) show that by-phrases with reflexive passives are possible in East Slavic (Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian), Bulgarian and Upper Sorbian, but not in the other Slavic languages.
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