

North Russian perfect with non-canonical subject. A diachronic and areal approach.

Ilja A. Seržant

Universitetet i Bergen //
Lietuvių kalbos institutas
Salos, 2010.08.02

cf., inter alia, Maslov (1949); Matthews (1955); Matveyenko (1961); Kuzmina and Nemčenko (1971); Blevins (2003); Christen (1998); Holvoet (2001); Jung (2007, 2009); Tommola (2000); Timberlake (1975); Wiemer and Giger (2005: 29-42); Danylenko (2005). Potebn'a (1888); Ambrazas (1977a); Borkovskij and Kuznecov (1963); Borkovskij (1949); Jung (2007); Matthews (1955); Panzer (1984); Kuteva and Heine (2004); Danylenko (2005).

Standard Russian, Latvian

- Standard Russian:

Ob eto **u nego** uže **vse** **skaza-n-o**
about this at him already all:nom.sg.neutr. say:PPP-
nom.sg.neutr

lit. 'About this he has already said everything'

- Latvian (Holvoet (2001))

Viņam **viss** jau bija **izteik-t-s**
him:dat.sg. all:nom.sg. already be:pret.3 say:PPP-
nom.sg.masc.

'He had already said everything (he had to say).'

Description: Baltic and East Slavic

- Common morphology: *-no-/-to-* deverbals (correspondence in both etymology and function);
- The highest-ranked argument is case-marked with a dative-like Case.
- The lowest argument is case-marked with the nominative or (later) accusative case.
- Functionally an “active” perfect

Finnic

- Estonian (Holvoet (2001):

Tal oli **kõik** juba **öel-tud**

him:adess.sg be:pret.3.sg.all already say:part.pass.

‘He had already said everything (he had to say).’

Lithuanian Evidential: a special case

Ten šuns bėg-t-a

there dog:gen.sg. run:PPP-nom.neutr.sg.

‘A dog must have run here (there are foot-marks).’
(from Holvoet 2007: 90, my glossing)

Senų miškai mylė-t-a

old:gen.pl forrest: nom.pl. love:PR.sg.neutr.

‘The elder [people] [apparently] have loved the
forrests’ (Jablonskis 1922: 141)

Lithuanian Evidential: special case

1. Formal correspondence:

it has etymologically and functionally the same morphology as Latvian and Russian perfect and it has functionally the same morphology as Estonian, Votic, Karelian perfect;

Lithuanian Evidential: special case

2. Functional correspondence

The original meaning of the Lithuanian Evidential construction was one of perfect (close historical relationship between the perfect and Evidential meanings is well-attested cross-linguistically, cf. Litwinow 1989; Bybee and Dahl 1989: 73-4; Bybee et al. 1994).

Thus, Holvoet (2007: 92ff) assumes that the Lithuanian evidential construction, based on passive participles, originated from perfect. On the other hand, the evidential reading is attested in North Russian perfect as well (Wiemer and Giger 2005: 39).

Other languages of the area

- Polish:

Zawie**zio-n-o** **go** do szpitala
carry-PPP-nom.invar he:**acc** to hospital
‘[They] brought him to hospital’

- Ukrainian:

Jomu **obic’ano** robotu
he:dat. promise:PR.neutr. job:**acc.sg.f.**
‘[People/they] promised him a job’ (apud Borkovskij and
Kuznecov 1963: 396)

- Finnish:

On **ol-tu** myös sitä mieltä, että ...
be:aux.3.sg be:PPP.invar. also this:part.sg opinion:part.sg that
‘[People] have also been of the opinion, that ...’ (from Karlsson
1987: 151)

Other languages of the area

- The Polish and Ukrainian constructions correspond exactly to the North Russian perfect in both structure and etymology, in the same way as Finnish perfect corresponds to the Estonian perfect construction.
- The only difference is the lack of an Agent slot in these languages.

Content

0. Introduction

0.1 North Russian; Standard Russian, Latvian, Estonian, Votian, Karelian

0.2 Lithuanian

1. Diachrony

1.1 "Possessive perfect"?

1.2 Developed from passive?

2. Synchrony

2.1 Ergativity?

2.2 Areal phenomenon?

1. Diachrony

1.1. "Possessive perfect"?

- It is commonly assumed that:
North Russian perfect is historically related to the possessive construction of the *mihi est* type, adhered to in a number of papers (inter alia, Drinka 2003; Jung 2007, 2009; Kuteva and Heine 2004) alongside the SAE possessive perfect (with the auxiliary meaning originally "to possess").

1.1. "Possessive perfect"?

Thus, in Russian or in Latvian the *mihī est* type corresponds to the SAE *habeō*-type:

Latvian: Man ir mašīna

English: I have a car

1.1. "Possessive perfect"?

- The possessive-approach assumes an etymological relation between the possessive cxn and the perfect construction, which holds true for the SAE perfect:
 - (0) "I have a glas" ->
 - (1) "I have a broken glas" ->
 - (1b) "I have a glas broken"
 - (2) "I have broken a glas"

North Russian

- North Russian:

U men'a dom **postrojeno**
at me:gen house:nom.sg.m build:PPP-
nom.neutr.sg=invar

'I have built a house'



***U men'a** (jest) **postrojeno** dom
at me:gen is build:PPP- house:nom.sg.m
nom.neutr.sg=invar

'I have a built house'

1.1. "Possessive perfect": contra:

- In East Slavic one cannot attest such a development;
- *-no-/-to-* participles are attested mostly in predicative use:

К večeru že priběgoša ljudije:
in the evening came people

inъ	rane-n-ъ	inъ	naгъ
another:nom	wound-PPP-nom	another:nom	naked

“In the evening there came people [but what they found was:] some were wounded some were naked” (Cod. Laur. 225v, from 1377)

1.1. "Possessive perfect": contra:

1. The attributive use of the non-pronominal (or indefinite) forms of the –no-/-to-participles fell out of use in non-predicative positions already by the 12-13th cc. (cf. Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 231):

инъ **ране-н-ъ**
another:nom wound-PPP-nom
“One is wounded”

But

***ране-н-ъ** / rane-n-yj **чъловѣкъ** **идеть**
wound-PPP-nom man:nom goes
“A wounded man goes...”

1.1. "Possessive perfect": contra:

2. The cxn with the predicative *-no-/-to-* participles originally allowed different kinds of adverbials with the reference to the Agent (not only possessive *u menja*):
- *отъ* + gen. (still preserved in some dialects) in both East Slavic and Latvian;
 - *v* + loc. in some Russian dialects and bare locative in Latvian dainas;
 - instrumental in Belorussian

1.1. "Possessive perfect": contra

3. The corresponding impersonal (perfect) cxns in Polish, Ukrainian where there is no grammaticalized subject slot for the Agent reference cannot be explained within the possessive approach;

- The necessary consequence is that both impersonal *-no-/-to-*cxns and the personal ones have to be treated as etymologically unrelated (Kuteva and Heine 2004: 62, following Shevelov 1991: 201 and Moser 1998: 340).

1.1. "Possessive perfect": contra

Though this seems to be unmotivated:

North Russian:

U men'a ruku porane-n-o
at me:gen hand:acc.sg.f injure:PPP-nom.neutr.sg=invar
'I have injured my hand'

Polish:

Zranio-n-o ręka
injure:PPP-nom.neutr.sg=invar hand:acc.sg.f

To sum up

- the –no-/-to-cxn has evolved out of copular cxn with a predicative, P-oriented resultative participle
 - still preserved in Polish Impersonal and in Latvian perfect "passive"
- parallel to Baltic and Slavic one can then connect etymologically the Finnish cxn (with no reference to the active subject) and the Estonian one (with a reference to the active subject)

1.2 Did the NR perfect
develop from passive?

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

- The origin out of a passive cxn was suggested by many researchers (cf., inter alia, Trubinskiy 1984, in partic. 116f).
- (it was also suggested for Indo-Iranian ergative perfective past)

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

- I assume that the original meaning of the *-no-/-to-* construction was Patient-oriented resultative (cf. English *the door is closed*);
- The *-no-/-to-*resultatives profile a resultant state at the Patient-like argument (in the sense of Nedjalkov 2001, Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 9);
- thus, a meaning that is primarily aspectual and not diathetic

- While passive of a transitive verb usually profiles both participants of the event (irrespectively of whether or not the Agent-like participant is co- or overt), a resultative profiles only one of the participants (cf. the notions of P-oriented and A-oriented resultative in Nedjalkov (2001), Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988: 9)).

- The P-oriented resultative construction can as to voice be regarded as a sort of middle, neither active nor passive. Its main function is aspectual not diathetic, it is valence-decreasing both formally and semantically. Typically for middles, it was originally incompatible with other grammatical middles (e.g. with middles based on reflexive periphrasis),

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

Counterevidence:

1. It has been stated in the literature that resultatives often develop into passives (and not vice versa), cf. Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988: 49), Haspelmath (1990); Croft (1998: 56-7); Nedjalkov (2001: 937-8).

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

Counterevidence:

2. evidence from IE:

- *-no-/-to-* derivatives did not have passive meaning in Proto-IE but functioned as deverbal adjectives (cf. Szemerényi 1990: 352; Meier-Brügger 2002: 289 inter al.).
- the periphrastic passive formed with these adjectives are alltogether a later development (in Latin, Slavic, Baltic, Indo-Aryan)

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

Counterevidence:

3. evidence from Balto-Slavic:

- Only perfective verbs can form *-no-/-to-* passive in Old and Standard Russian, while imperfective verbs form passive by other morphological means.
- Similar tendencies can be observed in both Lithuanian and Latvian

- The diathetic function itself does not motivate aspectual restrictions on the verb.
- The selectional properties of the “proper passives” are usually sensitive to transitivity and not to the lexical aspect / aktionsart of the verb.
- It is, thus, possible to assume that the aspectual implications, as in the Russian and Baltic passives, are instead features that have been inherited from the grammaticalization source of these passives (i.e. can be used to trace back the original meaning of this cxn).

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

- These selectional restrictions in East Slavic and selectional tendencies in Baltic indicate an originally resultative meaning.

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

4. Additionally, the meaning range of the *-no-/-to-* cxns in Modern languages also points out to an originally resultative meaning:

Thus, passive can still have

- the resultative meaning in Modern Russian (especially without copula) (cf. e.g. Tomolla 2000: 463).
- Lithuanian *-to-*passive has resultative, perfect or aoristic readings;
- Latvian (copular) *-to-*passive has only the resultative or perfect reading.

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

- Resultative -> Perfect -> Aorist ->
(cf. inter alia, Kurylowicz 1964: 141 ff;
Serebrennikov 1974: 234-6; Breu 1998:
90-1).

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

5. The case marking of the Agent / Subject slot speaks also against an original passive meaning: the dative Case (or dative-like PP) generally does not mark the agent complements of passives.

- Apart from the Receptient the dative domain typically includes Experiencer and Bene-/Maleficiary: different kinds of **Affectedness**.

1.2 Did the NR perfect develop from passive?

- Affectedness is not compatible with Agents, while
- Affectedness is well compatible with a result

2. Synchrony

2.1 Ergativity

It is important to stress here that *u* + gen. in North Russian perfect and the genitive in the Lithuanian Evidential do not encode ergativity as has been suggested in the literature (cf., inter alia, Lavine 1999; Danylenko 2005: 250-1; Jung 2009: 218).

It is true that in some varieties, intransitive subjects can be encoded like transitive objects, i.e. with nominative case. However, one finds a number of attestations violating the ergativity definition (as, e.g., in Dixon 1979, 1994) as in (53b), which are even more frequent:

North Russian

U men'a ruku/**ruka** porane-n-o
at me:gen hand:acc./**nom**.sg.f injure:PPP-nom.
neutr.sg=invar

'I have injured my hand'

On ujexano (North Russian)
he:**nom** leave:PR.invariant
'**He** is gone away' (apud Trubinskij 1984: 149)

2.1 Ergativity, Contra:

2. the *u* + gen. marked argument in this kind of perfect is by far not the prototypical Agent anywhere in East Slavic, Baltic or Fennic. Even though it is always co-referential with the Agent of the preceding action in North Russian, it still preserves the semantics of Affectedness.
3. a perfect predicate in itself is semantically low on the transitivity scale in terms of Hopper and Thomson's (1981) transitivity parameters (it denotes states, not actions) and, thus, does not profile a prototypical semantic agent that could be encoded by an ergative.
4. A semantically transitive predicate (in the sense of Lazard 1998) in North Russian has only nominative-accusative alignment.
5. there is a tendency for the object argument to acquire accusative case marking

2.2 Areal phenomenon

2.2 Areal phenomenon

- Structural parallelism between the North Russian perfect and analogous perfect constructions in Latvian, Standard Russian, Estonian, Karelian and Votic suggests an areally induced pattern:
 - the original subject is re-analyzed as object;
 - rise of a new, non-canonically, dative-like case-marked subject slot;
 - parallel morphosyntactic make-up of the perfect cxn (copula + P-resultative participle, no agreement);

2.2 Areal phenomenon

- There is also partial correspondence with the impersonal (perfect) cxns in Finnish and Polish
- Lithuanian Evidential does also belong to the area even though the logical subject is case-marked with the genitive and not with a dative(-like) case here.

2.2 Areal phenomenon

- Furthermore, all discussed languages do also have/did have Agent-oriented resultative participle (constructed with the copula) beside the P-oriented resultative;

2.2 Areal phenomenon

- **Early stage:** all mentioned languages have P- and A-oriented resultative cxns
-> Eastern Circum-Baltic area
- **Later stage:** (i) perfect in North Russian, Latvian, Estonian, Karelian, Votic with an overt subject slot (fully grammaticalized only in NR)
-> Area "around" North Russian

(ii) (perfective) passive in Standard Russian, Lithuanian

2.2 Areal phenomenon

Subject	Syntactic role	Case marking
	<p>1.Syntactic subjecthood and exclusively Agent semantics: North Russian, Lithuanian</p> <p>2.Almost no subjecthood and overwhelmingly affectedness semantics: Estonian, Votic, Karelian, Standard Russian, Latvian</p>	<p><u>External possessor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adessive case: Estonian, Votic, Karelian; - dative case: Latvian; - adessive PP: Standard Russian, North Russian <p><u>Internal possessor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - genitive case: Lithuanian
Predicate	3.pers. *copula with PR	
Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agreeing nominative: Latvian, Standard Russian - non-agreeing nom. or acc.: Lithuanian, North Russian, Estonian, Karelian, Votic, (in some rare cases Latvian) 	

- Andersen, L. 1982: The 'Perfect' as a Universal and as a Language-Particular category. In: *Tense and Aspect. Between Semantics and Pragmatics*. Ed. P. J. Hopper. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Benjamins. 227-265.
- Ambrasas, V. 1977a: Netiesoginės nuosakos paplitimas ir kilmės problemos, *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 17, 7-54.
- Ambrasas, V. 1977b: *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. Vilnius. Mokslas.
- Ambrasas et al. 1997: V. Ambrasas, E. Genušienė, A. Girdenis, N. Sližienė, D. Tekorienė *Lithuanian Grammar. Lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Edited by V. Ambrasas. Vilnius. Baltos lankos.
- Anderson, L. 1982: The 'Perfect' as a universal and as a language-particular category. In: *Tense and Aspect*, P. Hopper (ed.). TSL Vol. 1. Amsterdam. Benjamins.
- Andrews, A. D. 1976 The VP complement analysis in Modern Icelandic. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 6, 1–21.
- Barðdal, J. and Molnár, V. 2003: The Passive in Icelandic – Compared to Mainland Scandinavian. In *Structures of Focus and Grammatical Relations*, (eds.) Jorunn Hetland and Valéria Molnár. *Linguistische Arbeiten* 477. Tübingen. 231–60.
- Barðdal, J. 2004: The Semantics of Impersonal Constructions in Icelandic, German and Faroese. In: W. Abraham (ed.), *Focus on Germanic Typology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 105-136.
- Barðdal, J. and Eythórsson, T. 2005: Oblique Subjects: A Common Germanic Inheritance. *Language* 81(4), 824–81.
- Barðdal, J. 2006. Construction-Specific Properties of Syntactic Subjects in Icelandic and German. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(1), 39-106.
- Blevins, J. 2003: Passives and Impersonals, *Journal of Linguistics* 39, 473-520.
- Borkovskij, V. M. 1949: *Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot. Prostoje predloženie*. L'vov.
- Borkovskij, V. I. / Kuznecov, P. S. 1963: *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moscow.
- Borsley, R. D. 1988: A note on impersonal passives, *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 483-487.
- Breu, W. 1998: Sopostavlenije slav'anskogo glagol'nogo vida i vida romanskogo tipa (aorist : imperfekt : perfekt) na osnove vzaimodejstvija s leksikoj. In: M. Ju. Čertkova (ed.), *Tipologija vida. Problemy, poiski, rešenija*. Moscow. 88-98.
- Bybee, J. 1985: *A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. (TSL 9). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, J. L. and Dahl, Ö. 1989: The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world, *Studies in Language* 13 (1), 51-103.
- Bybee et al 1994: J. Bybee, R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Bybee, J. 2003: Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization. In: *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, (eds.) D. Joseph and R. D. Janda. Blackwell. 602-23.
- Bynon, Th. 2005: Evidential, Raised Possessor, and the Historical Source of the Ergative Construction in Indo-Iranian, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103:1, 1–72.
- Christen, S. 1998: Unpersönliche Konstruktionen und sekundäre Personifizierung, *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 51-61.
- Cole, P., W. Harbert, G. Hermon and S.N. Sridhar 1980: The acquisition of subjecthood. *Language* 56, 719–43.
- Comrie, B. 1981: Aspect and voice: some reflections on perfect and passive. In: Ph. Tedeschi, A. Zaenen (eds.), *Tense and Aspect*. (Syntax and Semantics, 14). New York: Academia Press, 65-78.
- Croft, W. 1998: Event Structure in Argument Linking. In: M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors*. Stanford. CSLI Publications, 21-64.
- Danylenko, A. 2005: Is there any possessive perfect in North Russian?, *Word* 56[3], 347-379.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1979: Ergativity, *Language* 55, 59-138.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994: *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Karlssohn, F. 1987: *Finnish Grammar*. Porvoo-Helsinki-Juva.
- Karskij, E. F. 1956: *Belorussky. Jazyk Belorusskogo naroda*. Vyp. 2. and Vyp. 3. Moscow. Izdatelstvo ANSSR.
- Kayne, R. S. 1993: Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection, *Studia Linguistica* 47, 3-31.
- Keenan, E. L. 1976: Towards a Universal Definition of 'Subject'. In: *Subject and Topic*, (ed.) Ch. Li. N. Y. 303-333.
- Keenan, E. L. and Dryer, M. S. 2007: Passive in the world's languages. In: *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Second Edition. Volume I: Clause Structure, (ed.) T. Shopen. Cambridge. 325-361.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. and Wälchli, B. 2001: *The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach*. In: *Circum-Baltic Languages*, Östen Dahl, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), Volume 2. 615-750.
- Kuryłowicz, J. 1964: *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
- Kuteva, T. and Heine, B. 2004: On the possessive perfect in North Russian, *Word* 55(1), 37-71.
- Kuzmina, I. B. 1993: *Sintaksis russkich govorov v lingvogeografičeskom aspekte*. Moscow.
- Kuzmina, I. B. and Nemčenko, Je. V. 1971: *Sintaksis pričastnyx form v russkich govorax*. Moscow.
- Kuznecov, P. S. 1960: *Russkaja dialektologija*. Moscow.
- Lavine, J. 1999: "Subject properties and ergativity in North Russian and Lithuanian." In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 7*, ed. Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, and Cynthia Vakareliyska. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 307-328.
- Litwinow, W. P. 1989: Der Modus relativus baltischer Sprachen aus typologischer Sicht, *Baltistica* 25(2), 146-155.
- Matthews, W. K. 1955: Lithuanian Construction with Neuter Passive Participle, *Slavonic and East European Review* 33, 350-371.
- Matveyenko, V. A. 1961: Osobennosti struktury stradatel'no-bezličnoo oborota. In: *Materialy i issledovanija po russkoj dialektologii* II. Moscow. Izdatelstvo ANSSR. 103-139.
- Maslov, Ju. S. 1949: K voprosu o proisxoždenii possessivnogo perfekta, *Učenyje Zapiski LGU, Serija Filologičeskix nauk* 14, N 97, 76-104.
- Maslov, J. S. 1988: Resultative, Perfect and Aspect. In: *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, ed. by V. P. Nedjalkov. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. pp. 63-86.
- Meier-Brügger, M. 2002: *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 8., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage der früheren Darstellung von Hans Krahe. Unter Mitarbeit von M. Fritz und M. Mayrhofer. Berlin. New York.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. and Jaxontov, S. Je. 1988: The Typology of Resultative Constructions. In: *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, ed. by V. P. Nedjalkov. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. P. 5-62.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. 2001: Resultative constructions. In: *Language Typo-logy and Language Universals Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques*. An International Handbook / Ein in-ter--nationales Handbuch / Manuel interna-tional. Edited by / Herausgegeben von / Edité par M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, W. Raible. Volume 2/ 2. Halbband / Tome 2. Berlin, _New York: 928-940.
- Nikiforov, S. D. 1952: *Glagol i jego kategorii i formy v russkoj pismennosti vtoroj poloviny XVI veka*. Moscow. ANSSR.
- Pagliuca, W. 1994: Introduction. In: *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia. CILT 109. John Benjamins.
- Panzer, B. 1984: Parallel internal development or interference? Post positive article and possessive perfect in North Germanic and northern Russian. In: *Scandinavian language contacts*. Eds. P. S. Ureland and I. Clarkson. Cambridge. Pp. 111-132.
- Peškovskij, A. M. 1956: *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščanii*. Moscw.
- Petrova, Z. M. 1961: O sintaksičeskix i morfoložičeskix osobennost'ax pričastij v pskovskix govorax. In: *Učenyje Zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta im A. I. Gercena* 225, 171- 197.
- Pihlak, A. 1993: *A Comparative Study of Voice in Estonian*. Acta Commentationes, Academia Securitatis Publicae Estoniae. Tallinn.

- Potebn'a, A. 1888: *Iz zapisokъ po Russkoj grammatikě*. II. Vol. Reprint: Moscow 1958.
- Roduner and Privitelli 2006: M. Roduner, T. Privitelli, Der Genitiv des Agens / Experiencers in Litauischen und Russischen Dialekten, *Acta Balto-Slavica* 30, 403-425.
- Roduner, M. 2004: Partizipien, Genitive und ähnliches im Litauischen und darum herum. In: Robert Hodel (Hg.), *Zentrum und Peripherie in den slavischen und baltischen Sprachen und Literaturen*, Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Jan Peter Locher, Bern etc., Peter Lang. 299-310.
- Szemerényi, O. 1990: *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4., durchgesehene Auflage. Darmstadt.
- Selivestrova, O. N. 2004: Glava II. Prostranstvenno-posessivnyje otnošenija. Pon'atije 'oblasti' orientira (rel'atuma). In: *Trudy po semantike*. Moscow. 816-850.
- Serebrennikov, B. A. 1974: *Verojatnostnyje obosnovanija v komparativistike*. Moscow.
- Seržant, I. A. 2009: Tempus und Aspekt im ältesten Russisch-Kirchenslavischen, untersucht an den Texten des Gottesdienstmenäums für Dezember'. In: *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina*. Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag, herausgegeben von Dagmar Christians, Dieter Stern und Vittorio S. Tomelleri, München: Kubon and Sagner. 2009, 309-328.
- Sprinčak, Ja. A 1960: *Očerk ruskogo istoričeskogo sintaksisa (prostoje predloženije)*. Kiev.
- Timberlake, A. 1974: *The Nominative Object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Fennic*. München. Otto Sagner.
- Timberlake, A. 1975: Subject properties in the North Russian Passive. In: Li and Thompson, *Subject and Topic*, New York, Academic Press. 545-594.
- Tommola, H. 2000: On the perfect in North Slavic. In: Tense and Aspect in the languages of Europe. In: Ö. Dahl (ed.), *Empirical approaches to language typology*. Berlin and New York. 441-478.
- Trask, R.L. 1979: On the Origins of Ergativity. Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations. Ed. by F. Plank. London: Academic Press, 385-404.
- Traugott, E. 2003: Constructions in Grammaticalization. In: *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, (eds.) D. Joseph and R. D. Janda. Blackwell. 624-46.
- Trubinskij, V. I. 1984: *Očerki ruskogo dialektного sintaksisa*. Leningrad.
- Trubinskij, V. I. 1988: Resultative, Passive, and Perfect in Russian Dialects. In: *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, ed. V. P. Nedjalkov. Typology Studies in Language 12. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 389-410.
- Vihman, V.-A. 2002: Impersonalized Impersonals. Argument structure and language change. In *Proceedings of the 2002 TAAL Postgraduate Conference, University of Edinburgh*: <http://www.ling.ed.ac.uk/pgc/archive/2002/proc02/vihman02.pdf>
- Weiss, D. 1999: D. Wajs, Ob odnom predloge, sdelavšem blestaščuju karjeru (Vorpros o vozmožnom agentivnom značenii modeli 'u + im'arod'). In: *Tipologija i Teorija Jazyka. Ot opisanija k objasneniju*. K 60-letiju Aleksandra Jevgenjeviča Kibrika. Moscow. 173-186.
- Wiemer, B. 2004: The evolution of passives as grammatical constructions in Northern Slavic and Baltic languages. In: *What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, (eds.) W. Bisang, N. P. Himmelmann, B. Wiemer. Berlin. New York. 271-331.
- Wiemer, B. and Giger, M. 2005: *Resultative in den nordslavischen und baltischen Sprachen. Bestandaufnahme unter arealen und grammatikalisierungstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten*. Lincom Studies in Language Typology. München.
- Zaykov, P. M. 2000: *Glagol v karel'skom jazyke. (Grammatičeskije kategorii lica-čisla, vremeni i naklonenija)*. Petrozavodsk.
- Zalizn'ak A. A. 2004: «Slovo o Polku Igoreve» vzal'ad linavista. Rossijskaia Akademiia Nauk. Moscow

Thank you!