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Passive formation in OCS

(1) **Reflexive passive**

\[ \text{snь bo } \text{člvčsky imatь prědatи se } \nuь } \]

son-NOM for human-NOM has deliver-PFV.INF REFL into

\[ rосě } \text{člvčscě } \text{(μέλλει } \text{пαραδίδωσθαι)} \]

hand-ACC.DU human-ACC.DU must-IND.PRS.ACT deliver-INF.PRS.PASS

‘For the Son of Man has to be delivered into the hands of men.’

(Luke 9.44)

(2) **Participial passive**

\[ \text{prědanь } } \text{imatь byti } \text{snь } \text{člvčsky } \]

deliver-PFV.PTCP.PST.PASS.NOM has be-INF son-NOM human-NOM

\[ vь } \text{roсě } \text{člvčscě } \text{(Matt 17.22)} \]

into hand-ACC.DU human-ACC.DU
Previous research: Divergent views

[Věčerka: 1996, 119]
- refl. and part. passives were both possible equivalents of Greek passives
- had equal distribution in OCS
- Cf. ex. (1) & (2)

[Gavranek: 1963]
- PPstP = allowed only a resultative reading
- ≠ dynamic passive
- Reflective passive ⇒ original Slavonic passive form

[Janke: 1960]
- refl. passives: found only in OR texts which are influenced by OCS
The 1st Problem

Which period should be considered the starting point of the grammaticalization of the passive?

- Krys’ko [2006]: lack of fixation of the category of voice in OR
- Can we neglect OCS then?

Answer: NO! Because…

- Contrary to Czech and Polish, Russian has not developed any new grammatical means of passive marking
  - Czech: long form of pfv. PPstP in predicative position → only resultative meaning (zámek byl poškozený)
  - Polish: zostac (19th c.) (‘become’) vs byc ‘be’
- The passive paradigm in contemporary Russian looks very similar to the one found in OCS, cf.:
### Asymmetric distribution of passive forms in OCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>PPrsP</th>
<th>PPstP</th>
<th>V-sja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X [22/14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present dyn. iter./dur. etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present resultative</td>
<td></td>
<td>X + byvati</td>
<td>X [59/31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect background:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X [5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter./dur. etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect resultative</td>
<td></td>
<td>X + byvati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X [27]</td>
<td>(x) [7/6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X [53]</td>
<td>X [77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dynamic iter.</td>
<td>X (IPFV)</td>
<td>X (IPFV)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future resultative</td>
<td></td>
<td>X [10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Asymmetric distribution of passive forms in OCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>PPrsP</th>
<th>PPstP</th>
<th>V-sja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present dynamic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [22/14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present dyn. iter./dur. etc.</td>
<td>(x) + byti</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present resultative</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [59/31]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect background: iter./dur. etc.</td>
<td>X + byti</td>
<td>— + byti</td>
<td>X [5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect resultative</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [27]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist dynamic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [27/24]</td>
<td>(x) [7/6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dynamic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [53]</td>
<td>X [77]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future dynamic iter.</td>
<td>X (IPFV)</td>
<td>X (IPFV)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future resultative</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X [10]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The actional/resultative markers [Rix: 2001, 98, 241]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present/Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jestъ/bě</td>
<td>bystъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*h₁es-: ‘be (present)’</td>
<td>*b⁴ueh₂-: ‘grow, become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bě ← *b-est ← *(b)-e-h₁es-</td>
<td>‘come into existence’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) **Pisano** bo *estre*. **Poražo** pastyrě
write-PPSTP.NOM for be-PRS.3SG smite-PRS.1SG shepherd-GEN.SG
‘For it is written, I will smite the shepherd’ (Mark 14.27)

(4) **Bě** že napisano °is °csrø iju deziskø
be-IMPF.3SG but write-PPSTP.NOM Jesus king jewish
‘But it was written: Jesus, the king of the Jews’ (John 19.19)
The actional/resultative markers [Rix: 2001, 98, 241]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present/Imperfect</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>jestъ/bě</strong></td>
<td><strong>bystъ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*h₁es-: ‘be (present)’</td>
<td>*bʰueh₂-: ‘grow, become’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bě ← *b-est ← *(b)-e-h₁es-</td>
<td>‘come into existence’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5)  
\[ Si \quad že \quad pisana \quad byšę \quad da \]
\[ DEM.NOM.PL.N \quad but \quad write-PPSTP.NOM.PL.N \quad be-AOR.3PL \quad so \quad that \]
\[ věrọ \quad iměte \quad ěko \quad °is \quad estъ \quad °xъ \]
\[ faithACC \quad take-PVF.PRS.2PL \quad that \quad Jesus \quad be-PRS.3SG \quad Christ \]

‘But these have been written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ’ (John 20.31)
The syntax-semantic interface: Hypothesis 1

Is it all lexical? Remarks on word order

- At least in passive sentences in the past tense, there is an additional way of marking actionality/resultativity
  ⇒ Word order
  - bě precedes the participle
  - bystъ follows the participle
  - Cf. ex. (4) and (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bystъ</th>
<th>bě</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aux – Ptcp</td>
<td>Ptcp – Aux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1¹</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

osnovana bo bě
sözđanə běaše
otəvalenə bě kamenъ

¹Not a passive in Greek either (‘become’ + Adj.) and main clause +NEG
Analysis of the “anomalous” cases

- In 2 cases: translation of Greek pluperfect forms
  - Active: X бěаšе созодаlо градо
  - Passive: градо созоdanaп běаšе
- Permits a dynamic reading

Explains the following gap:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>PPrsP</th>
<th>PPstP</th>
<th>V-sja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect background: iter./dur. etc.</td>
<td>X + byti</td>
<td>(x) + byvati</td>
<td>X [5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect resultative</td>
<td>──</td>
<td>X [27]</td>
<td>──</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The synt.-sem. interface: Modification of Hypothesis 1

Further “strange” cases

- in most cases, bě follows the PPrsP!

(6) i vσ vЬsei straнě povědaemi běachq vЬsi
and in whole country-LOC tell-PPRSP.NOM be-IMPF.3PL all-NOM.PL
°gli sii (диeλαλειτo)
word-NOM.PL those-NOM.PL (IMPF.MPASS.3S)
‘and all these matters were being talked about in all the whole
country’ (Luke 1.65)

- The same holds for the imperfect forms of byvati (follows PPrsP &
PPstP)
Syntax overrules semantics!

1. *bě* precedes the participle iff the sentence is clearly *resultative*; cf. ex. (7)

2. If *bě* is used to form a *dynamic* imperfect or pluperfect passive it follows the participle; cf. ex. (6)

3. *bystъ* always follows the participle

(7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ženy</th>
<th>ediny</th>
<th>ježе</th>
<th>běachγ</th>
<th>iscěleny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country-NOM.PL</td>
<td>some-NOM.PL</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>be-IMPF.3PL</td>
<td>heal-PPSTP.NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oτσ</td>
<td>Όdχσ</td>
<td>ζβλβ</td>
<td>(̱σαν</td>
<td>τεθεραπευμέναι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from spirit-GEN.PL</td>
<td>evil-GEN.PL</td>
<td>(be-IMPF.3PL</td>
<td>heal-PPERFP.NOM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘and some women who were healed of evil spirits’ (Luke 8.2)
A problematic case: the future forms

- General assumption that \textit{bud}- was a perfective inchoative verb [Miklosich 1926, Potebnja 1958, Werner 1996, Junghanns 1997]

- \textbf{BUT} cf. Křížková:

  \textit{b\text{\r{n}}d\text{\r{n}}} má zpravidla význam latinského \textit{ero}, nikoli \textit{fiam} [1960: 38].

  \textit{b\text{\r{n}}d\text{\r{n}}} usually expresses the meaning of lat. \textit{ero} (‘I will be’) not \textit{fiam} (‘I will become’).

- The etymology is not clear!! [Werner: 1996]

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l l}
\textbf{Future} & \textbf{b\text{\r{n}}det\text{\r{n}}} \\
\hline
\sqrt{} & \text{Nullstufe + n-infix} & \text{o-Hochstufe + i-Stamm} \\
\text{*b\text{\r{h}}eud\text{\r{h}}-} & \text{*bhundh > *b\text{\r{n}}d-} & \text{*bhoud-i- > *budi-} \\
\text{‘wake up’} & \text{‘become’} &
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
A problematic case: the future forms

If the BECOME-reading would have been still dominant in OCS, it would be difficult to explain...

1. the prevalence of the stative reading in combination with NPs and APs
   - NPs: 22; 13 translate Gr. *eimi*+NP (only stative); 5 potential BECOME-cases
   - APs: 52; 39 translate Gr. *eimi*+AP (only stative); 5 potential BECOME-cases

2. the differences between the copular and the auxiliary use of *bqdo*
   - PPstP + aux. → dynamic passive in most cases
   - The resultative cases (translation of Gr. *eimi*+part.perf.pass) are again marked by the **inverted word order**
## Applying the word order hypothesis to the future forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPstP – Aux.</th>
<th>Aux. – PPstP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (ind.fut.pass)</td>
<td>1 (eimi+part. perf.pass)$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (subj.aor.pass)</td>
<td>1 (subj.aor. pass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (ind.pres.pass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (ginomai+adj.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (imp.aor.pass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (subj.aor.act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the word order hypothesis to the future forms

Analysis of the “anomalous” cases

- The “anomalous” WO occurs in negated context
- Negation may influence the word order
- cf. Willis [2000: 329]: conditionals in main clauses always show the WO → negation – auxiliary – participle
- Could serve as an explanation of cases like:
  - *věrují vo ně ne bôdetš osoždènъ* (John 3:18)
  - ev. *ni bystš potaenko* (Mark 4.22) and (Mark 13.20) with conditional
Further differences between the dynamic and the resultative use

Further observations

1. Only in the resultative use, subjects or objects could be inserted between AUX and PTCP

2. Only the sentential clitics že and bo could intervene between PTCP and AUX in the dynamic use

(8) **bođeta** bo otō selē **petŏ** vō edinomē domu
be-FUT.3SG for from now on five-NOM in one-LOC.SG house-LOC.SG

**razdělenŏ** *(Luke 12:52)*
divide-PPSTP.NOM

‘for from now on five members in one household will be divided’
Gradual loss of the semantic & syntactic marking

Laurentian Codex (14th c.)

1. still exhibits both бě and бystο → sometimes confused
2. **partial loss of the semantic marking**, retention of the syntactic marking

(9) ašče dastο rucě svoi ukradyi. da jat budets τěmže u negož capture-PPSTP.M.SG be-FUT.3SG REL.INS.SG at REL.GEN.SG

`budets ukradeno.`

be-FUT.3SG steel-PPSTP.N.SG
‘and if the thief surrenders, he may be captured by the one, from whom it is stolen’ (6420 [912])
Gradual loss of the semantic & syntactic marking

Domostroj (16th c.): Loss of the **lexical** marking, retainment of the **syntactic** marking

1. bě and bystъ → replaced by bylo

2. **Word order:**
   - only resultative sentences in the past
     → WO: Aux. – PPstP
   - in the future as expected
     → resultative: Aux. – PPstP
     → dynamic: PPstP – Aux.

(10) totъ domъ budetъ blagoslovenъ otnyně
    this house-NOM be-FUT.3SG bless-PPSTP.NOM from now on
    i do veka
    and forever

    ‘This house will be blessed from now on and forever’
Gradual loss of the semantic & syntactic marking

(11) dělomě i slovomě ugožajte roditelem [ . . . ], da
deed-SG and word-INS please-IMP.2PL parents-DAT so that
blagosloveni budete otě nichě
bless-PPSTP.NOM.PL be-FUT.2PL from they-GEN.3PL
‘Obey / please your parents both with words and deeds [. . . ]’
so that you will be blessed by them’

(12) WO is not dependent on subordinate / main clause
nikto že bez truda věnčaně
nobody-NOM but without effort-IMP.2PL crown-PPSTP.NOM.SG
budětě
be-FUT.3SG
‘Without putting effort in it, nobody will be rewarded’
Gradual loss of the semantic & syntactic marking

Vesti-Kuranty (17th c.)

→ the syntactic marking is getting lost
→ WO: PPstP – Aux. predominantly used in actional sentences, but also used in clearly resultative contexts
  • 3 (PPstP – Aux.) : 1 (Aux. – PPstP)

Karamzin (18th c.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>past tense</th>
<th>PPstP – Aux.</th>
<th>Aux. – PPstP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gradual loss of the semantic & syntactic marking

20th century (http://ruscorpora.ru/)

- **Aux-FUT+PPstP:** 7'947 [95.4%]
- **PPstP+Aux-FUT:** 379 [4.6%]
- **Aux-PST+PPstP:** 88’015 [93%]
- **PPstP+Aux-PST:** 6’468 [7%]
Despite the loss of actional marking, the Russian periphrastic passive is not a victim of grammaticalization processes because...

1. In comparison to OCS it preserved or rather expanded its scope of application
   - replaced Vsja in the future perfective & past perfective (despite the actional semantics of Vsja)

2. The shift from a temporal to an aspectual asymmetry had no influence on the distribution of the passive forms

3. (Small) benefit of grammaticalization vs. reliance on contextual determination
   - Partial grammaticalization of the dynamic passive in Czech & Polish $\rightarrow$ no complete removal of ambiguities
Thank you for your attention!

(13) *slovo plrück bystə*
and word flesh be-AOR.3SG
‘And the word *became* flesh’
(Cod. Ass., John 1.14)
Gavranek, B.: Zalog (genera verbi) v staroslovjanskom jazyke v sranitel’nom plane.
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