ON THE GENESIS OF THE STATAL PASSIVE AND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERFECTIVE AND IMPERFECTIVE PASSIVE FORMS IN RUSSIAN

Árpád Orosz
Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary

1.0. The stative–dynamic opposition has a central role in linguistics. There exist various definitions of stativeness. In current semantics the term stative verb refers to one with a homogenous and indivisible temporal structure. Sentences with stative verbs cannot serve as answers to questions like *What is he doing? /What is happening?* English stative verbs do not occur in the continuous tenses, cf. *She is knowing the answer. *Tom was belonging to several libraries*. On the other hand, in languages with an active typology, for example in Chocho, spoken in South-America, we also find verbs that are called stative. However, this stativeness is related to the degree of the activeness of the actor, the person that carries out a certain activity. In both of these cases stativeness as a lexical category characterises verbs as lexical entries. The stative meaning of passive participles in Russian is discussed in the literature as a semantic category, but some linguists claim that forms with a stative (as opposed to the dynamic, or eventive) meaning are not identical with past passive participles; rather, the two are homonymous. Let us look at an example of passives with dynamic and statal meanings:

STATAL PASSIVE	DYNAMIC PASSIVE

(1) *Когда мы были в комнате, она была убрана, но мы не знаем, когда она была убрана.*

'When we were in the room it was clean, but we don't know when it was cleaned.'

Without the dynamic/statal distinction we could not explain why this sentence does not yield a contradiction, i.e. the first clause could be regarded as an answer to the subordinated question in the second clause. An important difference between the two constructions is that the grammatical subject of a dynamic passive sentence bears the patient thematic role, while the subject of a passive sentence with a statal interpretation bears the theme thematic role.

2.0. The categories of voice and aspect are very closely linked in Russian. This is manifested, first of all, in the interdependence of the passive form and the aspect of the verb. Passive forms derived from imperfective verbs (the unmarked aspect) are formed with the postfix (постфикс) *-ся*, whereas passive forms from perfective verbs are formed with the suffix *-н/т*. In addition, it has been pointed out that the dynamic and the statal meanings (or interpretations) of the analytic passive forms are endowed with the characteristics of and can be co-ordinated with perfective and imperfective verbs respectively[1]. For example: ...*князь Волконский был вызван из церкви и получил конверт от князя Кутузова.* 'Prince Volkonskij was called from the church and got an envelope from prince Kutuzov.' *Здание было все время закрыто, и студенты сидели на лестнице* 'The building was always locked and the students were always sitting on the steps.'

2.1. Perfective passive forms are inseparable from the stative (statal) meaning[2]. This is explained by the fact that when the point of termination (предел) is reached a new state comes into being. The logical object, i.e. patient/theme of the action is foregrounded, and the new state of the logical object is highlighted in the case of passive voice, as opposed to the active voice where the subject of the action or state is the centre of attention.

2.2. It is commonly accepted that the perfective aspect in Russian does not refer to a durative action (except for some Aktionsarts (способ действия). For this reason it is not surprising that perfective forms in the passive voice referring to a period of time which follows the point of termination can never refer to an action but only a state. In terms of theoretical linguistics we should speak about the complementary distribution of actions and states: an action is encoded by the reference to the point of termination (dynamic interpretation), whereas a state (statal interpretation) by the reference to the period ensuing after the point of termination is reached. When the state is preserved up to the time of speech the meaning is perfect. In the case of imperfective forms, especially their actual meaning (конкретно-процессное значение) we cannot speak about a point of termination.

2.3. In addition to telicity, transitivity also plays an important role in the voice system of languages. This category, called a lexical-grammatical rank by Bondarko (лексико-грамматический разряд)[3], however, has significance not only in Russian and in other Slavonic languages, but in most languages of the world. It is directly linked with grammatical category of voice being in the centre of the functional-semantic field of voice (залоговость)[4].

1. ХРАКОВСКИЙ, В. С. (1991): *Пассивные конструкции. Теория Функциональной Грамматики: Персональность: Залоговость,*Санкт-Петербург, стр. 141–155, ОРОС, А. (2000): *К вопросу об аспектуальности страдательных конструкций.Köszöntő könyv Krékits József 70. születésnapjára,*Szeged, стр. 263.

2. ХРАКОВСКИЙ, В. С. (1991): *Пассивные конструкции. Теория Функциональной Грамматики: Персональность: Залоговость,* Санкт-Петербург, стр. 141–155.

3. БОНДАРКО, А. В. (1976): *Теория морфологических категорий,* Ленинград.

4. БОНДАРКО, А. В. (1972): «К теории поля в грамматике: Залог и залоговость», *Вопросы Языкознания*; (1976); БОНДАРКО, А. В. (1976): *Теория морфологических категорий,* Ленинград.

Moreover, telicity and transitivity are related to each other. As Klaiman points out, there is a tendency for lowered transitivity to be associated with irrealis and nonpunctual temporomodal categories of the verb, which is observed in Russian as well, although she does not mention Russian[5]. Later she adds that there is a logical affinity between noneventual categories, especially the nonpunctual, and atelic Aktionsart (ibid). These remarks seem too general, so let us look at how they are manifested in a more particular lexical group in Russian.

2.4. As is widely accepted in the literature devoted to the topic of voice, Russian verbs ending on the postfix *-ся* are characterized by intransitivity[6]. There exist a few aspectual pairs in which the postfix is present in the imperfective, but not in the perfective form. The following pairs should be mentioned: *садиться–сесть* 'sit down'*; пересаживаться–пересесть* 'sit over'*; ложиться–лечь* 'go to bed, lie down'. The presence of the postfix in the imperfective forms and its absence in the perfective ones is explained by the above mentioned higher level of telicity of perfective forms and the affinity of telicity to transitivity. It seems that transitivity and telicity have something in common, and are different forms of manifestation of the same abstract phenomenon which plays an integral part in the functional-semantic field of voice. Clearly, intransitivity or telicity alone is not sufficient to justify the presence of the postfix *-ся*. On the one hand, one could raise the question: if the postfix indicates the intransitivity of the verb it is attached to, why is it present in such genuinely intransitive verbs as *становиться* 'become'*, ложиться* 'go to bed'*, проснуться* 'wake up'? On the other hand, Pete notes that verbs with the postfix in question express processes (not states)[7]. But then another question arises: why do we find the postfix on verbs denoting Aktionsarts that express genuinely dynamic activities without the postfix? Consider the following words: *заговориться* 'talk a lot'*, заиграться* 'play a lot'.

3.0. On the one hand, there have been many researchers who wrote about the relationship of reflexivity and passiveness[8]. S. Kemmer's two works are the most exhaustive analyses. The essence of her theory is that in both passive and reflexive structures the participants are not as distinguishable as they are in transitive structures. In other words, these participants are not separated from one another to the same extent as in transitive situations. The following scale is established by Kemmer[9]:

Two-participant Event	Reflexive	Middle	One-participant Event

5. KLAIMAN, T. M. (1991): *Grammatical Voice,* Cambridge 1991, p.95.
6. БОНДАРКО, А. В. (1972): *К теории поля в грамматике: Залог и залоговость*: Вопросы Языкознания; (1976); БОНДАРКО, А. В. (1976): *Теория морфологических категорий.* Ленинград.
7. ПЕТЕ, И. (2000): *Vorgangspassiv и Zustandspassiv в русском языке.* Köszöntő könyv Papp Ferenc 70. széletésnapjára. Szeged.
8. BABBY, L. H., BRECHT, R.D. (1975): *The syntax of voice in Russian.* Language 51/2.; KEMMER, S. (1993): *The middle voice.* Amsterdam; KEMMER, S. (1994): *The middle voice, Transitivity and the Elaboration of Events.* Voice: Form and Function. Amsterdam, pp. 179–230.
9. KEMMER, S. (1993): *The middle voice.* Amsterdam, p. 173.

Degree of distinguishability of events

The lower distinguishability of participants in the case of verbs with the postfix *-ся*, which is accompanied by the lower telicity and lower transitivity of the verbs under discussion, is linked to the evolution of the form *-ся* from the reflexive pronoun *себя* by way of a quantitative reduction. In Russian this form constitutes a single phonological and orthographic word with the verb. According to Kemmer's extensive argumentation, which is not adopted in the present work, the form *-ся* as well as its reflexives in other Indo-European languages can only be analysed as middle, but not reflexive, markers. In fact there is an observable tendency in Russian linguistics to question the traditional classification of verbs ending in *-ся* as reflexives and passive forms. Notable linguists, e.g. Bulanin, agree that the distinction is no longer tenable[10]. The question arises whether the following sentences belong to the class of passives or reflexives:

(2) *Программа конференции продолжается в актовом зале.*

'The programme of the conference continues in the assembly hall.'

(3) *Слухи в нашем коллективе быстро распространяются.*

'Rumour spreads quickly in our working team.'

The intransitivity of verbs ending on the postfix *-ся* was touched upon above. We should point out that it has long been acknowledged by classical Russian linguists that the postfix *-ся* refers to an activity confined to the sphere of the subject. This is especially true for verbs pertaining to some Aktionsarts, e.g. the augmentative: *наговориться* 'talk a lot', *наиграться* 'play a lot'----; the finitive, combined with the meaning of relief: *отвоеваться* 'finish fighting', *отмучиться* 'stop suffering'; the intensive, combined with the meaning of enjoyment: *заговориться* 'talk a lot (and fail to notice something)', *засмотреться* 'take a look at something and enjoy it'. It seems obvious that in these examples the subject plays a central role. On the other hand, there are some phenomena that are common to Russian, which is a representative of the Slavic family (Eastern-Slavic), (Swedish being a Germanic (Northern-Germanic) language and Spanish, belonging to the Neo-Roman language family). The point under discussion is the interrelationship of certain forms that are commonly discussed under the category of reflexive and forms that are treated by linguists as passive forms. The fact that two semantic categories are expressed by similar forms in three such diverse languages raises the possibility that the phenomenon might stem from common Indo-European.

Spanish: (4) *Juan se mortó* 'Juan killed himself' and 'Juan got killed' (Arce-Arenales 1994, 4).

Swedish: (5) *Slottet besöks av många turister.* 'The castle is visited by many tourists.' (6) *När föddes din son?* 'When was your son born?'

10. БУЛАНИН, Л. Л. (2001): *О некоторых сложных проблемах категории залога. Исследования по языкознанию. К 70-летию члена-корреспондента РАН А.В. Бондарко.* Санкт-Петербург, стр. 163–169.

Russian: (7) *Дворец посещается многими туристами.* 'The castle is visited by many tourists.' (8) *Когда родился ваш сын?* 'When was your son born?'

3.1. In section 2.1.–2.2. we suggested that when a Russian passive participle expresses an event (dynamic passive), it is punctual, but when it expresses a state it is durative. In the present section we will look at the distribution of the analytic passive expressed by participles and the synthetic passive expressed by verbs with the postfix -*ся* in light of telicity. We noted above that the statal interpretation of the analytic passive, which is primarily and historically prior[11] to the dynamic (eventive) interpretation, can only be atelic. On the other hand, Pupinin and Bulanin claim that synthetic passive forms can only be made from such imperfective

verbs that are also telic[12]. Although this opinion can be regarded as extreme and exaggerated, we should admit that no absolutive (hence intransitive and atelic) use of a verb occurs in the passive. That said, the difference between the formal markers of the perfective and imperfective passives is naturally explained. Let us look at a table representing the phenomenon:

aspect	imperfective	perfective
passive marker	postfix -*ся*	suffix -*н/т*
the active forms	transitive & atelic/telic	transitive & telic
the passive forms	intransitive & telic (atelic)	intransitive & atelic/telic

3.2. It is significantly easier to explain irregular phenomena in present-day Russian if we consider earlier stages of the language. Earlier stages resemble those of other languages that have a typology other than the nominative. Let us first look at phenomena to be found in some non-European languages.

3.2.1. The referent of the grammatical subject, i.e. agent of the sentence cannot have less potential to control the event described in the sentence than the referent of any other participant. This is called ontological control. The ability to control the event, in turn, assumes consciousness in the first place but also the power to influence the flow of events. For example, in Korean we can only find the equivalent of the sentence 'The man is chasing the ball' in the active voice, whereas the equivalent of the sentence meaning 'The taxi is chasing the car' is possible in both the active and the passive voice, while the equivalent of the

11. JESPERSEN O. (1963): *The Philosophy of Grammar.* London, p. 274.

12. ПУПЫНИН Ю.А. (1980): *Функционирование форм несовершенного и совершенного видов в пассивных конструкциях. Функциональный анализ грамматических единиц.* Ленинград, стр. 29 и 32; ПУПЫНИН Ю.А. (1995): *Взаимные связи грамматических категорий вида и залога в русском языке. Сеиантика и структура славянского вида I.* Варшава, стр. 159–174; БУЛАНИН Л.Л. (1986): *Категория залога в современном русском языке.* Ленинград, стр. 15.

sentence 'I am being chased by time (feel pressured by lack of time)' is only possible in the passive voice[13]. Apparently, this system is driven by the attribution of control, rather than by mere animacy, because the equivalent of the sentence 'The car struck the man' is possible both in the active and the passive voice. Likewise, the equivalent of the sentence 'The horse/baby kicked the man' can only be in the passive voice in Navajo, because an animal or a baby cannot assume more control of an event than a man.

3.2.2. Although we have nothing that could serve as direct evidence of the previous existence of a similar constraint on subjects in Russian, it is acknowledged that neither the postfix *-ся* nor the suffix *-н/т* was originally a truly passive marker. It means that the subject of *-ся* and *-н/т* constructions was not only the grammatical subject, but also the logical one. The postfix *-ся* evolved from the reflexive pronoun *себя* 'self', so verbs with *-ся* were originally reflexive, whereas forms with the suffix *-н/т*, as analytic, or periphrastic, passive forms in other IE languages, had statal meaning. Therefore, (as described above in section 1.0.) the subjects of these constructions assumed the theme rather than the patient thematic role. It is also worth considering the following sentences, which have not been accounted for thoroughly:

> (9) *Лодку унесло водой*
>
> boatACC driftSG.NEUTR.PRAET.ACT waterINSTR
>
> 'The water drifted the boat away.'
>
> (10) *Генерала раздавило танком*
>
> generalACC crushSG.NEUTR.PRAET.ACT tankINSTR
>
> 'The tank crushed the general to death.'

It is noteworthy that these constructions represent the mixture of the active and the passive voices in that the logical object is in the objective case (as in active structures), but the logical subject, that is the force that initiates the event, is in the instrumental (as the agent in passive sentences). The verb in examples 9) – 10) is in the singular and in the neutral form. The peculiar characteristic of these sentences under discussion is that they denote events involving natural forces and as such, the activities cannot have human agents. They have no grammatical subjects, and no participant can be in the subjective, i.e. nominative case. For this reason, they are sometimes classified under the term 'subjectless voice' "бесподлежащный залог". That the initiators in the instrumental case of the events described in the sentence cannot be humans can perhaps be attributed to the fact that humans are endowed with the ability to control an event consciously. It should be added that cross-linguistic studies show that a participant in the objective case is even less capable of controlling the event than a participant in the instrumental case.

3.3. As was mentioned in section 1.0. there are languages spoken on other continents that belong to the active typology. The name is motivated by the presence of active and

---

13. KLAIMAN T.M. (1991): *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge 1991, p.173.

inactive (stative) verbs in these languages. The basis of the distinction between the two types of verbs is the presence/absence of dynamics of the activity or state described by the verb. (So the terms active typology and active verbs are not to be confused with the active voice attested in nominative languages.) Transitive verbs can only be active, whereas intransitive verbs can be active or inactive. A few examples should be furnished: the equivalents of 'play', 'run' and 'fly' are intransitive and active verbs, while the equivalents of 'remain', 'hang', 'be ill', 'stand', 'lie' are intransitive and inactive verbs. It follows that the typology in question differs from the ergative typology, because the latter is characterised by the opposition of transitive and intransitive verbs. However, the majority of linguists consider the active typology only a subtype of the ergative typology. There are also grammarians, for example Klimov, who claim that the ergative and nominative structures are independent branches of development of the active typology[14]. In the nominative typology the subject–object opposition is dominant. From what has been said it follows that the system of transitive and intransitive verbs in languages belonging to the active typology is asymmetric. The asymmetry is also marked, perhaps intensified, by the morphological cases of the first arguments (i.e. the «subjects»), which can be active or inactive accordingly. Active intransitive verbs can be controlled by their subjects more than inactive intransitive verbs. A tendency appeared then to redress the balance. Active languages started to divide transitive verbs into two classes according to whether their subjects had the ability to control the situation denoted by the verb. This change can be compared to how transitive verbs split into active and middle in Sanskrit and Old-Greek according to whether the subject had the ability to control the event. The middle voice in dead Indo-European languages such as Sanskrit and Old-Greek can be defined as follows: «The implications of the middle (when it is in opposition with the active) are that 'action' or 'state' affects the subject of the verb or his interests.»[15]. An example of the active/middle distinction could be the Sanskrit equivalents of the following English sentences taken from Klaiman: 'Devadatta bends the stick' and 'The stick bends'. The first sentence belongs to the active voice whereas the second belongs to the middle voice in Sanskrit.

3.3.1. It is clear that the Sanskrit sentences mentioned in the preceding paragraph, when translated into Russian can be compared to the Sanskrit active/middle pair: *Владимир сгибает палку* 'Vladimir bends the stick.' and *Палка сгибается* 'The stick bends'. Historically, this usage of the postfix was referred to as the middle-reflexive meaning (средне-возвратное значение) by Vinogradov. At the same time, the extreme opinion of Kemmer, who claims that all instances of the postfix *-ся* and its related morphemes in other IE languages are middle rather than reflexive markers, should not be accepted, although it should be admitted that there is a systematic change of meaning when the reflexives of the *себя* 'self' pronoun change to the *-ся* morpheme. If we summarise what has been said by other linguists, we can conclude that the postfix *-ся* expresses intransitivity and the presence of some dynamics. In this way we have unified the descriptions given by Bondarko and Pete above in section 2.4.

14. КЛИМОВ Г.А. (1972): *К характеристике языков активного строя*. Вопросы Языкознания. 1972/4, стр. 1–13.; КЛИМОВ Г.А. (1977): *Типология языков активного строя*. Москва.

15. LYONS J. (1968): *Introduction to theoreticallinguistics*. Cambridge.

3.4. We turn now to past participles with the suffix *-н/т*. If we look at the participle forms, and not the lexical verbs comprising the participles, we find that they cannot collocate with a direct object in the objective case. In this, they share this characteristic with the postfix *-ся*. On the other hand, they do not express the presence of dynamics: on the contrary, if we take the meaning of statal passive, which was historically primary to the dynamic interpretation, the meaning is contrary. We recall the distribution of the two passive markers from section 2.0. and the explanation given in 2.4. and 3.1. The question arises, can we treat verbs with the postfix *–ся,* that are classified as reflexives in traditional Russian linguistics, and past participles with the suffix *-н/т,* as different forms of the same lexeme rather than different lexemes? The following examples should be considered:

(11)a. *Глаза отца часто воспаляются. –* (11)b. *Глаза отца воспалились –* (11)c. *Глаза отца воспалены.* 'Father's eyes often get inflamed – Father's eyes (have) got inflamed. – Father's eyes are inflamed.'

(12)a. *Маша часто огорчается. –* (12)b. *Маша огорчилась. –* (12)c. *Маша огорчена.* 'Mary often gets distressed – Mary (has) got distressed – Mary is distressed'

(13)a. *Иван нелегко расстраивается. –* (13)b. *Иван очень расстроился. –* (13)c. *Иван очень расстроен.* 'Ivan gets frustrated easily. – Ivan (has) got very frustrated. – Ivan is very frustrated.'

(14)a. *Дверь открывается. –* (14)b. *Дверь открылась. –* (14)c. *Дверь открыта.* 'The door is opening. – The door (has) opened. – The door is open.'

(15)a. *Яички мальчиков опускаются не сразу после рождения. –* (15)b. *У него яички опустились слишком рано. –* (15)c. *У трехлетнего мальчика яички уже опущены.* 'Young boys' testicles do not lower right after their birth. – His testicles lowered too early. – A three-year-old boy's testicles are already lowered.'

(16)a. *Замки разваливаются если их не ремонтируют каждые двадцать лет. –* (16)b. *Замок графа развалился после казни хозяина. –* (16)c. *Давай не ехать в Обломовск! Музей закрыт, замок развален.* 'Castles fall to pieces if they are not renovated every twenty years. – The count's castle fell to pieces after the owner's death. – Let us not go to Oblomovsk. The museum is closed, the castle is in pieces.'

(17)a. *Шельф вокруг Антарктиды нередко погружается. –* (17)b. *Шельф погрузился. –* (17)c. *Шельф погружен* 'The ice-layer around Antarctica often sinks. – The ice-layer has sunk. – The ice-layer is sunk'.

The a. and b. sentences describe (repeated) processes in which the point of termination is reached without the help of an external participant, that is an agent. The events described are spontaneous and are related to phenomena of biological organisms, psychology and natural forces. The c. sentences describe states that emerge as a result of reaching the point of termination, so they indicate the termination of the processes in the a. and b. sentences. This type of sentences that describe states that have come about without the instigation of an agent are called statives (статив), or underived statal passives (непроизводный пассив). The opposite is resultatives (результатив), which are states that are preceded by an event

that occurred with the instigation of an agent. The stative–resultative opposition is described in detail in the work of Nedjalkov and Jahontov[16].

3.4.1. We claim that the possibility of a participle ending in the suffix -*н/т* having a stative meaning (in addition to the resultative meaning) is conditional upon the stem verb having a form (but not the genuinely passive form made from imperfective verbs) with the postfix -*ся*. This means that the c. examples (11)–(17) in section 3.4. displaying the suffix -*н/т* would be inconceivable if the a.– b. sentences did not exist. In fact Knazev[17] notes, but does not explain why (18) is grammatical and (19) is agrammatical. (Of course there may be some non-trivial readings under which (19) is correct.)

(18) *На веревке повешены платья*
'There are clothes hung on the rope.'.

(19) **На дереве повешены яблоки*
'There are apples hung on the tree.'
There are many sentences that are not grammatical for the same reason as (19) is bad, cf.:

(20) **На улице поставлены деревья*
'There are trees put on the street'

It is also true, that there is no verb-form with the postfix -*ся* (except for the -*ся* passive marker attached to the imperfective forms of verbs) if the event is inconceivable without an agent instigating it (Babby-Brecht 1975). The verbs *повесить* 'hang', and *поставить* 'put, set' are typical examples. In (11)–(17) there are no agents, which implies that the forms with the postfix -*ся* are not reflexives, and furthermore that the affected entities could not be regarded as patients. The sentences a. –c. describe three stages of the same process, so the verb forms with the postfix -*ся* and the participles with the suffix -*н/т* should be regarded as members of the same paradigm - word forms of the same lexeme and same voice. They were classified as middle verbs by us. Following other linguists, Gavrilova calls passive forms with a statal meaning (so both resultative and stative) objective quasi-passives (объектный квазипассив). However, she does not deal with either the question of the resultative–stative distinction or the interdependence of forms ending in -*ся* and -*н/т*. She classifies the c. sentences in (11)–(17) as (forms of) "statal aspect" (статальный вид)[18]. We contend that the basic difference between forms like *воспаляется* and *воспален* is not one of aspectual character, since both of them express two stages of the same process - the

---

16. НЕДЯЛКОВ В.П., ЯХОНТОВ С.Е. (1983): *Типология результативных конструкций. Типология результативных конструкций* Ленинград.

17. КНЯЗЕВ Ю.П. (1989): *Конструкции с русскими причастиями на н/т. в семантической классификации предикатов.* Вопросы Языкознания. 1989/6стр. 87.

18. ГАВРИЛОВА В.И. (1998): *Краткое причасти на -н/т. как форма статального вида страдательного залога. Типология вида, проблемы, поиски, решения.* Москва, стр. 99–114; ГАВРИЛОВА В.И. (1999): *Сознательные действия, стихийные процессы и ситуация создания и снятия преграды.. Логический анализ языка. Языки динамического мира.* Дубна, стр. 159–174.

former describing the event before the point of termination is reached, and the latter describing the state after it is reached. In Gavrilova's account these forms also constitute one paradigm, but she does not attach importance to the interrelationship of verb forms with the postfix -ся and the verb forms with the suffix -н/m having a stative (underived statal passive) meaning.

3.5. The argumentation presented in the previous section is in line with the theory that the statal passive is historically primary with respect to the dynamic passive. In particular, the subject of the construction that we call middle is not understood as a participant carrying out an action, and neither is it an argument with the patient thematic role upon which something is externally performed. The formation of the dynamic, or eventive, passive from the statal passive can be explained as follows. When the rule requiring that the grammatical subject should have more control over the event described by the sentence ceased to exist (the sentences (11) – (17) raise the possibility that such a rule existed in Indo-European, in particular in Russian) the subject was reinterpreted as the entity that undergoes the process described by the verb. In other words, eventuality and the affectedness of the subject could be expressed in the one form. This change was accompanied by the reinterpretation of the participle. As previously argued, the participle with the suffix -н/m began to be interpreted as a finite verb. As this form started to indicate the reaching of the point of termination in addition to the state following the point of termination, it was also able to determine the aspectual feature of the sentence.

4.0. In conclusion, it has been argued that the statal and dynamic meanings of the passive voice can be linked to different historical stages (prenominative and nominative respectively) of languages. An explanation for the different formal markers of perfective and imperfective passive forms has also been presented.