

Accusative-Assigning Participial *-no/-to* Constructions in Ukrainian, Polish, and Neighboring Languages: An Annotated Bibliography

Loren Billings and Joan Maling

Following Corbett's (1986) bibliography of the genitive-of-negation construction, we have compiled the following bibliography on the so-called *-no/-to* construction in Slavic, thus named because the verbal form ends in either *-no* or *-to*, two allomorphs of the historically neut sg form of the past passive participle (now distinct from the neut sg form: *-ne/-te* in both Pol and Ukr).¹ Works on related constructions, primarily in Li and various Slavic dialects, are also included for comparison.

This somewhat unusual construction, in which a seemingly passive verb assigns accusative case to its complement, has received considerable attention recently in the generative literature and has long been described because of its uniqueness in the Slavic linguistic literature. We have attempted to include any work that treats this phenomenon from any linguistic (incl. philological) viewpoint. If a title cites another work which itself doesn't discuss *-no/-to* per se, then that other work will be relegated to a footnote. Likewise, if a title quotes a *-no/-to* ex from a literary, dialectological or ethnographic work which does not otherwise discuss *-no/-to*, then this work will also appear in a footnote. Additionally, because most items (especially journal articles) have proven difficult to find, we have listed the library and call number of the copy we examined.²

¹ The following general abbreviations are used in this bibliography:

acc	accusative	fn	footnote	neut	neuter
adv	adverb	fnn	footnotes	nom	nominative
agr	agreement	gen	genitive	pf	perfective
dat	dative	impf	imperfective	pl	plural
emph	emphasis	incl	including	refl	reflexive
ex	example	inf	infinitive	sg	singular
exx	examples	inst	instrumental	subj	subjunctive
fem	feminine	masc	masculine		

The following abbreviations are adopted for language names:

Bg	Bulgarian	Ger	German	OR	Old Russian
Br	Belarusian	Hun	Hungarian	Pol	Polish
Cr	Croatian	It	Italian	Por	Portuguese
Cz	Czech	Li	Lithuanian	Rus	Russian
Eng	English	Mac	Macedonian	Sr	Serbian
ESL	East Slavic	NR	North Russian	Sk	Slovak
Fr	French	OCS	Old Church Slavic	Ukr	Ukrainian

Finally, our annotation of a work is identified as ANN, e.g., ANN Babby 1994a. ANN without further reference refers to our annotation of the work already under discussion.

² Any such footnoted titles will be as complete as the ordinary bibliographic citations, allowing the interested reader to examine the *-no/-to* example in context.

A bibliography on this construction is especially important because *-no/-to* is an end-of-word phenomenon known by several names, making it difficult to search for it on most conventional bibliographic platforms.³ While this bibliography is intended to be comprehensive, it is by no means complete. We intend to update this electronic version of the bibliography periodically. Any inquiries or suggested inclusions can be sent to the first author (billings@mailier.fsu.edu) or to *JSL* (jsl@indiana.edu) during the indefinite future.⁴

Following most citations we include a brief descriptive annotation. While we have our own ideas about the underlying nature of such constructions—that the Ukrainian *-no/-to* construction is a true passive, while the Polish *-no/-to* is an “unpassive” (an impersonal construction with an unspecified human subject)⁵—to be articulated in future work, we refrain from parading those views here. Any corrections to (or disagreements with) works we list in the bibliography have been relegated to footnotes.

We have examined almost all of the works cited below. Those which we have not seen the published version of are marked with one of three symbols: A single asterisk (*) means that we have confirmed the citation and its availability in some North American library, but for some reason did not examine the item personally. Two asterisks (**) mean that we were able to confirm the existence of the cited item in at least two independent sources, but have not been able to find a library copy in North America (these are mostly *kandidat*-degree dissertation abstracts [*avtoreferaty*] from Russian universities, notoriously hard to find in western archives). Finally, three asterisks (***) signify that the title is cited in a single source, to our knowledge, and that we could not confirm its existence;

³ On transliteration: We use the system common in the Slavic-linguistics field for transliterating Cyrillic (distinct from the Library of Congress/American Library Association transliteration scheme, which most North American libraries use). It is based on the Czech alphabet with the following differences: the voiceless velar fricative is *x* (not *ch*), the hard and soft signs (*ѣ* and *ѣ́*) in East Slavic are *~* and *´*, respectively. Note that the later are straight, to differentiate them from the (curved) apostrophe *’*, a separate orthographic symbol in Ukrainian (cf., for example, the 4th and 9th symbols in the Ukr word *slov’jans’kyj* ‘Slavic’); as a result, *~* and *´* can also be distinguished from the quotation marks used to set off article titles “...” and glosses ‘...’, respectively). Word-final hard signs in Russian are used only if the original source uses such (now-antiquated) orthography. It is especially important to note that Cyrillic *г* is transliterated as *g* in Rus but as *h* in Ukr and Br (*g* in Ukrainian is the transliteration of the special Cyrillic symbol *ґ*). Finally, the letters representing [+hi, -rnd, -cons] phones and their spelling/transliteration deserve special mention: Modern Ukr has *у, і, ї* and *ї*, transliterated as *y, i, j*, and *ji*, respectively. Modern Rus and Br have *ы, у* and *ю*, transliterated here as *y, i* and *j*. Older Rus (up until early this century) also had Cyrillic *и*, transliterated here as *î*. (Br also has the back glide *ѣ́*, transliterated here as *w*.)

⁴ *Editor’s Note*: This electronic version reflects the bibliography as provided to *JSL*, and then formatted using *JSL* fonts (available from the same ftp and www sources); the downloadable file is a stuffed and binhexed MS Word 5.1a/Mac document. The bibliography was then edited and shortened somewhat for publication through the following changes, mandated by the need to keep it to a manageable length: main type face reduced to 10 pts; certain annotations abridged slightly; translations of titles deleted; peripheral entries purged (e.g., bibliographic tools not otherwise discussing the *-no/-to* construction; works mentioning it only in passing; etc.); fnn discussing bibliographic difficulties were shortened or eliminated. While we regret the elimination of information that may be value in particular cases, practical compromises had to be made; the electronic version still preserves all the original information.

⁵ Cf., for example, Billings 1993a; 1993b; forthcoming and Maling 1993.

nonetheless, because of the title (or the reference to it in that single source), we consider it worth including in the bibliography.⁶

Last Revised: 21 April 1996

Loren Billings
Dept. of Modern Languages and Linguistics
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306–1020 USA
billings@mailier.fsu.edu

Joan Maling
Volen Center for Complex Systems
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02254–9110 USA
maling@volen.brandeis.edu

- Apresjan, Ju. D. [J. D. Apreszjan] and Erna Páll. (1982) *Russkij glagol—vengerskij glagol: Upravlenie i soč etaemost' = Orosz ige—magyar ige: Vonzatok es kapcsolódások [Rus verb — Hun verb: Government and combination (Rus/Hun)]. 1 (A–O), 2 (P–Ja). Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó. [Illinois: 494.51139171 Ap68o]*

Babby (1994b) cites this dictionary as a source of Rus adversity-impersonal exx in *-lo*. He observes (pc) that in entry after entry the given verb will be shown in both “active-voice” and adversity-impersonal forms, with the former having SVO order, while the latter has the acc NP in preverbal position. For example (1: 235):

- (1) Volna vybrosila lodku na skaly.
wave_{FEM.NOM.SG} threw_{NEUT.SG} boat_{FEM.ACC.SG} onto rocks
- (2) Lodku vybrosilo na skaly (volnoj).
boat_{FEM.ACC.SG} threw_{NEUT.SG} onto rocks wave_{FEM.INST.SG}

Even though East Slavic languages have “free” constituent order, there are correlations of this sort. See also ANN Fici Giusti 1992b, Ivanycja 1925, Klimonow

⁶ Compilation of this bibliography was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant No. SBR-9223725 to Brandeis University (Maling, primary investigator; Billings, research assistant). The second author gratefully acknowledges the support of the W. M. Keck Foundation. Preliminary research leading to this bibliography was also supported by a travel and maintenance grant from the Council for Regional Studies, Princeton University (to Billings). Thanks to B. Alber, J. Allen, T. Armstrong, H. Baran, D. Bayer, O. Bobrowski, W. Browne, J. Christensen, C. Chvany, A. Cienki, R. Cleminson, G. Corbett, U. Doleschal, K. Dziwirek, D. Embick, J. Farris, R. Feldstein, J. Fizer, M. Flier, G. Fowler, F. Gladney, K. Goeringer, L. Hammer, J. Haney, A. Hestvik, J. Ingersol-Casey, R. Konopka, R. Koropecy, E. Ladna, C. Levelt, W. Mahota, V. Matveenko, I. Mel'čuk, M. Mihaljević, A. Mitchell, W. Mucha, J. Nalon, A. Nedashkivska-Adams, J. Nunes, R. Orr, A. Pilecky-Dekajlo, D. Robinson, K. Rondestvedt, R. Rothstein, J. Rouhier-Willoughby, W. Skorbacki, A. Sosnowski, O. Swan, H. Tommola, A. Urbanic, B. Vine, M. Votruba, B. Wang, and D. Wiczorek for their assistance with certain titles. Thanks also to Alan Pollard (Michigan), Lorraine Reardon (Harvard), Denise Shorey (USC), Ann Spangler (Florida State), and Nevenka West (Manitoba) for their library assistance and to the *Linguist* and *SEELangs* electronic lists. Thanks especially to Zbigniew Kan'ski (U. of Silesia/Pedagogical U. of Cracow) and Victor Lychyk (Georgetown) for painstakingly reviewing the bibliography for errors (especially in the Pol and Ukr sections, respectively). Finally, thanks to Steven Franks for putting the two authors in contact with each other.

1960, Makarova 1956b, Matveenko 1961, Synjavs'kyj 1967 and Zatovkaňuk 1979 regarding possible word-order effects in *-no/ -to* clauses.

- ****Arvat, N. N. (1955)** *Bezličnye predloženiya v drevnerusskom jazyke (Po materialam pamjatnikov novgorodskoj pis'mennosti XI–XV vv.)* [Impersonal sentences in Old Rus Based on textual monuments of Novgorod writing from the 11th-15th cent. (Rus)]. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Odesskij gos. un-t.
- Arvat, N. N. (1960) “K voprosu ob istorii bezličnoj konstrukcii s kratkim stradatel'nyĭm pričastiem v russkom jazyke” [On the history of the impersonal construction with a short-form passive participle in Rus (Rus)]. *Naučnyj žegodnik Černovickogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta za 1958 g. Otdel'nyj vypusk, Filologičeskij fakul'tet. Černovcy: Izdanie Černovickogo gos. un-ta., 191–94.* [Harvard: LSoc 3985.125]
- Arvat, N. N. (1961) “K voprosu o sravnitel'noj xarakteristike bezličnyx predloženiĭ s kratkim stradatel'nyĭm pričastiem v russkom i ukrainskom jazykax” [Comparative characteristics of the impersonal-passive construction in Rus and Ukr (Rus)]. *Pytannja istoriji i dialektolohiji sxidnoslov'jans'kyx mov 2 (= Naukovi zapysky Černivec'koho un-tu, v. 42. Serija filol. nauk, vyp. 11).* Vydavnyctvo L'vivs'koho universytetu, 143–58. [Harvard: LSoc 3985.125.5 (42)]

Compares impersonal sentences in ESl which utilize a short-form participial stem. Assesses the morphological form of that participial stem, the various means of expressing the doer of the action, and whether an acc direct object is used.

- [Arvat, N. N.] (1975) “Grammaticčeskaja i semantičeskaja struktura odnosostavnyx ‘pričastnyx’ predloženiĭ v sovremennyx russkom i ukrainskom jazykax” [The grammatical and semantic structure of monovalent ‘participial’ sentences in contemporary Rus and Ukr (Rus)]. *Sopostavitel'noe issledovanie russkogo i ukrainskogo jazykov.* Kiev: Naukova dumka, 250–73. [Princeton: 3021.86595]

Rus and Ukr *-no/ -to* predicates differ only in the following ways (252–53):

1. Ukr internal arguments can remain in the acc; in Rus they cannot.
2. The expression of the Agent in the inst in Ukr is less acceptable than in Rus.
3. The closest Ukr counterpart to the Rus adversity-impersonal (i.e., *Šljapu uneslo vetrom* ‘hat_{ACC} carried away_{PAST.NEUT.SG} wind_{INST}’), the so-called adversity-impersonal construction, is a *-no/ -to* sentence of the type *Vikno rozbyto vitrom* ‘window_{ACC} broken_[–AGR] wind_{INST}’.

Cf. also Babby 1994b, Filin 1972, Kulyk 1965, and Kurylo 1930: 5 regarding the adversity-impersonal construction.

- Babajceva, Vera V. (1967) *Perexodnye konstrukcii v sintaksise. Konstrukcii, sočetajuščie svojstva dvusostavnyx i odnosostavnyx (bezličnyx imennyx) predloženiĭ* [Transitive constructions in Rus. Constructions which combine properties of one- and two-element (impersonal nominal) sentences (Rus)]. Voronež : Central'no-černozemnoe knižnoe izd-vo. [Berkeley: MAIN PG2380.B3]

Analyzes clauses whose predicate ends in *-o*, e.g., *vredno* ‘unhealthy’, which are traditionally termed as adverbs or as *kategorija sostojanija* ‘category of state’. Cf. ANN Corbett 1980 for a different, default-agreement analysis.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1973) “The deep structure of adjectives and participles in Russian”. *Language* 49(2): 349–60.

A transformational-era comparison of long- and short-form modifiers in Rus. Babby concludes that the long form “is derived from a deeper restricted relative clause,” while the short form “is the main verb of its clause and is not derived from a deeper clause” (360). Note that Ukr no longer shows a long/short distinction. Nonetheless, the same deeper distinction may appear to hold between agreeing and non-agreeing participial forms, respectively.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1975) “A transformational analysis of transitive *-SJA* verbs in Russian”. *Lingua* 35: 297–332.
- Babby, Leonard H. (1983) “The relation between causative and voice: Russian vs. Turkish”. *Wiener slawistischer Almanach* 11: 61–88.

Cf. ANN Maling 1993, Özkaragöz 1986 on the “unpassive”-hood of certain Turkish constructions.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1989) “Subjectlessness, external subcategorization, and the Projection Principle”. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 9: 1–55. [Cornell: P19.M3Z3]

A response to Sobin 1985, arguing that there is no subject at any level of representation in *-no/-to* sentences (i.e., there is no SpecIP node in the tree under Babby’s formulation). Part of Babby’s argument is that a subject position filled with a null (inaudible) element would have to be the null pleonastic.⁷ Babby adds that East Slavic does not have overt pleonastics, much less inaudible ones.⁸ Cf. ANN Borsley 1988.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1993a) “Hybrid causative constructions: Benefactive causative and adversity impersonal”. B. Comrie and M. Polinsky, eds. *Causatives and transitivity*. (= *Studies in language companion series*, 23.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 343–67. [Rutgers: ALEX P292.C38 1993]

Investigates the benefactive- (or service-) causative construction:⁹

Ona sšila sebe novoe plat'e (u modnoj portnixi).
 she_{NOM} sewed_{FEM.SG} selv_{DAT} new dress_{NEUT.ACC} at stylish seamstress

Possible reading: ‘She sowed herself a dress (at a stylish seamstress’s shop).’

Preferred reading: ‘She had a new dress sewn (by a stylish seamstress).’

⁷ Specifically, Babby 1989 interprets Sobin’s (1985) proposed empty category as the “null expletive” (i.e., silent pleonastic) as proposed in the following work, which was published after Sobin 1985 and before Babby 1989: Chomsky, Noam. (1986) *Knowledge of language, its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.

⁸ Cf. Billings 1993a for a correction to Babby’s statement that there are no overt pleonastics in East Slavic languages.

⁹ Despite the words “and adversity passive” in the title of Babby 1993a, the only example of such a construction is in his fn. 7: *Somoleť nakrenilo* ‘airplane_{(MASO)ACC.SG} banked_{NEUT.SG}’. Cf., however, Babby 1994b for a detailed discussion of adversity impersonals.

[combination of his exx 1 and 3, pp. 343, 345; glosses modified—LB/JM.]

Cf. the discussion of PPs in *u* ‘at/by’ in (N) Rus dialects in Doros 1975, Eremin 1926, Filin 1971, Galkina-Fedoruk 1958, Kuz´mina and Nemčenko 1971, Kuznecov 1948, Makarova 1956b, 1957, Maslov 1949/1984, Matveenko 1960; 1961, Petrova 1960; 1961; 1968, Siewierska 1988, Timberlake 1976.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1993b) “A theta-theoretic analysis of *-en* suffixation in Russian”. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 1(1): 3–43.

Looks at non-passive uses of the *-(e)n/-t-* morpheme in modern Russian (i.e., middle voice, stative middles, attributive participles, participial/deverbal adjectives, and nominalizations). The passive uses of this morpheme are—necessarily—never far from Babby’s discussion.

- Babby, Leonard H. (1994a) “Case theory”. C. P. Otero, ed. *Linguistics*. (= Noam Chomsky: *Critical assessments* 1, tome 2) London: Routledge. 630–52. [Princeton: P85.C47N64 1993 v. 1, t. 2]

Babby begins with Ukr and (N) Rus acc-assigning *-no/-to* sentences as exx of the type of data which a theory of case must handle. The remainder of the chapter, however, deals with standard Rus (and some Turkish).

- Babby, Leonard H. (1994b) “A theta-theoretic analysis of adversity impersonal sentences in Russian”. S. Avrutin, S. Franks and L. Progovac, eds. *Annual workshop on Formal approaches to Slavic Linguistics 2: The MIT meeting, 1993*. (= Michigan Slavic materials, 36.) Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 25–67. [Rutgers: PG13.M46 no. 36]

Investigates Rus sentences of the following type:

Lodku vybrosilo (na skaly) (volnoj).
 boat_{(FEM)ACC.SG} threw_{PAST.FEM.SG} onto rocks wave_{(FEM)INST.SG} [Babby’s (1b)]

Such sentences share the common meaning of natural force (incl. out-of-control machinery and warfare!) understood as having caused the action, which is perceived as somehow adverse.¹⁰

¹⁰ While *-no/-to* is **not** discussed in Babby 1994b, a few points are worth mentioning vis-à-vis Pol and Ukr *-no/-to* sentences. First, the Rus-Ukr comparative literature routinely describes Ukr *-no/-to* as a “natural translation” of a Rus adversity-impersonal clause (cf. ANN Arvat 1975, Filin 1972, and Kulyk 1965). Next, note that while Rus adversity impersonals in *-lo* **exclude** any meaning of a human conscious performer of the action, Pol *-no/-to* sentences **require** an understood (but not overtly expressed) doer (cf. also Siewierska 1988). Thus, while the Pol *-no/-to* and Rus *-lo* constructions are mutually exclusive, Ukr can have either structure to describe the same event:

(i) Mosty pozryvalo. (ii) Mosty pozryvano.
 bridges_{(MASC)ACC.SG} broken off_{(V)PAST.NEUT.SG} bridges_{(MASC)ACC.SG} broken off_[–AGR]

That is, whereas (i) is restricted to a natural-force, adversity interpretation, (ii) **can** (but is not required to) have such an interpretation. Temporally speaking, Rus, Ukr, and Pol adversity clauses are not restricted to the past tense (despite the fact that all of Babby’s examples of this type appear to be in the past tense). Due to the gender (and number) agreement of past-tense *-l-* forms in these languages, however, it is convenient to use this tense. (Additionally, for pragmatic reasons, there may be a tendency to describe such adverse events in the past tense.) Modern-Ukr *-no/-to* is likewise not restricted to the past tense (since the advent of overt copulas in such clauses earlier this century). Pol *-no/-to* is, however, restricted to past-tense

- Babby, Leonard H. (forthcoming) “Inflectional morphology and theta role suppression”. J. Toman, ed. *Annual workshop on Formal approaches to Slavic Linguistics 3: The Maryland meeting, 1994*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Includes two sections of interest to this bibliography: §3.0 “Noncanonical use of the -o suffix” and §3.1 “Impersonal sentences in Ukrainian and Lithuanian”. The latter discusses the unique diachronic situation involving the neuter gender. Historically, Li had three grammatical genders: fem, masc, and neut. The entire inventory of neut nouns was lost, however, with many of them becoming fem or masc in gender and the rest lost altogether. As a result, the only environment in which neut predicate agreement is attested in the modern language is in impersonal constructions. That is, unlike Ukr or Pol, which have a non-agreement distinct from any of the fem, masc, neut (or pl) agreement forms, Li has an entire “gender” just for impersonals. Babby argues that if some sort of null pleonastic is posited as the subject of impersonal passives, then it would have to be only neuter noun in the language—a highly dubious proposition in his view. Cf. ANN Nunes 1994b for a list of the various Li passive/impersonal types. In the other sections, Babby looks at certain derivational uses of the otherwise-inflectional neut sg adjectival suffix *-oe*.

- Bańkowski, Andrzej. (1967) “Jeszcze o zdaniach bezpodmiotowych. Uwagi o artykule A. Wierzbickiej w JP XLVI, 1966, 177–96” [More on subjectless sentences. Comments on A. Wierzbicka’s article in JP XLVI, 1966, 177–96 (Pol)]. *Jezyk polski* 57(4): 294–96. [Harvard: Philol 620.3]

An early criticism of the traditional description of Pol *-no/-to* clauses as “impersonal”. Cf. also Dyla’s (1982) similar, but more explicit arguments.

- Barnes, Michael. (1968) “Notes on the passive in Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian. A review article”. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 83: 140–65. [Princeton: 3300.129]

Discusses the different (and often contradictory) uses of the term “passive”, focusing on the difference between passive morphology and passive meaning. Focuses on the reliability of the possible expression of the agent as a criterion for passive-hood.

- Bartnicka, Barbara. (1969) “Imięsłowcy przymiotnikowe w gwarach polskich”. *Prace filologiczne* 19: 126–30. [Princeton: 3013.734 v.19 (1968)]

One datum with a future-tense copula in a dialect-Pol *-no/-to* clause: *ne byń dź e š eš ć rí edž el **dojuno** (p. 129; emphasis added, transcription modified slightly)¹¹ ‘[the cow] not will-be_{3.SG} six weeks milked_[-AGR]’*. Additionally, one datum appears to have non-

interpretations (without overt copulas in the modern language). Thanks to Zbigniew Kan’ski for clarifying these details.

¹¹ Reportedly collected in “Wegój, pow. reszelski”. Bartnicka cites p. 325 of the following source: Nitsch, Kazimierz. (1968) *Wybór polskich tekstów gwarowych*. Warsaw: PWN. [Rutgers: PG6701.N54 1968]. Z. Kan’ski informs us that the boldface word above may just be this particular dialect’s pronunciation of the fem-agreeing participle, spelled with *a*. If so, then it renders this example moot. (Cf. the following fn.)

agreement with a nom underlying object: *gotowano woda* (132) ‘prepared_[-AGR] water_{FEM.NOM?.SG}’.¹²

- Bartnicka, Barbara. (1970) *Adiektiwizacja imiesłowów w języku polskim* [Adjectivization of participles in Pol (Pol)]. (= *Dissertationes Universitatis varsoviensis*, 44.) Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe. [Cornell: OLIN PG6312.B29]

Bartnicka discusses translatability of certain agreement-participial forms into relative clauses with a *-no/-to* predicate (34–35). See also ANN Proeme 1988 regarding Bartnicka’s arguments and Proeme’s objections to them.
- Bevzenko, S. (1960) *Istorična morfolohija ukrajins’koji movy. Narysy iz slovozmyny ta slovotvoru* [Historical morphology of Ukr. Essays on inflection and word-formation (Ukr)]. Užhorod: Zakarpats’ke oblasne vyd-vo. [Princeton: 20393.176]

Refers, on 194, to how the long-form adjectival (incl. participial) *-oje* became *-e* and the short-form *-o* remained *-o*, creating the distinction in modern Ukr of lexical neut-sg agreement in *-e* separate from what Billings (1993a) calls [- agreement] in *-o*. (NB: There is otherwise no longer any long/short distinction in Ukr adjectives and participles.)
- Billings, Loren A. (1993a) “A note on expletives in Ukrainian *-no/-to* passives”. *Slavic syntax newsletter* 3(1) 1–8. [Princeton: PG201.S53]

A correction to Babby’s (1989) claim that Ukr (and ESL in general) has no overt pleonastics (either in *-no/-to* clauses or otherwise).
- Billings, Loren A. (1993b) “On the *-no/-to* construction in Slavic”. Unpublished handout of talk presented at Brandeis University.

Continues Billings 1993a, reporting new exx of the Ukr pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ in the same clause as a nom subject NP, e.g., *Čy vono staršyna pryjde skoro?* (Sulyma 1929: 58, citing A. Teslenko [1882 to 1911]) ‘Is it the case that the chief is coming soon?’ See other such exx in Bukatevič et al (1958: 303), Simovyč (1919: 213), Kurylo (1922/1960: 96–97), Ovsjanniko-Kulikovskij (1900: 1156); cf. also fnn in ANN Kurylo 1922/1960.
- Billings, Loren A. (1995) “Is the impersonal passive in Ukrainian optional?”. Ms., Florida State University. (Talk presented at AATSEEL, Chicago, December 1995.)

Having concluded that both the canonical passive and *-no/-to* are true passives (cf. ANN Billings 1993a, 1993b, Maling 1993), it is then considered whether the two constructions are in free alternation, hypothesizing that the two have differing focus inputs (cf. also Ivčenko 1955).
- Boljux, O.V. (1992) “Vlasne semantyčna i formal’no-hramatyčna interpretacija bezosobovyx rečen’” [Proper semantic and formal-grammatical interpretation of impersonal sentences (Ukr)]. *Movoznavstvo* 26(3): 44–49. [Pitt: shelved alphabetically]

Ukrainian impersonal sentences (ISs) are analyzed within the framework of semantic syntax in which the formal-grammatical structure of a sentence is

¹² No source citation is given for this example. Zbigniew Kan’ski suggests that it might be a Silesian dialect where nom is homophonous with acc even with *-a* stems that show a distinction in other varieties of Pol.

examined in relation to its semantic structure. The predicate as the obligatory and central component of the semantic structure of ISs is studied and its grammatical realization is investigated. Ukrainian ISs in which predicates express physical states by means of morphological forms of verbs in *-no/-to* are examined in greater detail and the process of the passivization of active constructions leading to ISs is analyzed. A typology of ISs based on their grammatical properties is proposed.

- Borkovskij, Viktor I. (1949) *Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot. Prostoe predloženie* [The syntax of Old Russian documents. The simple sentence (Rus)]. L'vov: Izd-vo L'vovskogo un-ta. (Microfiche copy. Tumba, Sweden: International Documentation Centre.) [Princeton: Fiche 1521 I; Harvard: 3282.320]

Numerous exx of *-no/-to* and related data compiled from various Rus dialect studies (78–80).

- Borkovskij, Viktor I. (1950) “Bezličnye predloženiya v drevnerusskix gramotax XIV–XV vekov južnogo proisxoždenija” [Impersonal sentences in 14th- and 15th-century Old Russian grammars of southern origin (Rus)]. *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR. Otdelenie literatury i jazyka* 9(5): 362–75. [Princeton: 3000.116]

Old texts; references, absence of iron-clad exx of the *-no/-to* construction with (fem sg adjective or sg *-a* noun) acc direct object in any OR text, except where there is clear Pol influence. References to studies that apparently reveal loss of agreement in NR passivoid constructions.¹³

- Borkovskij, Viktor I. (1981) *Sintaksis skazok: Russko-beloruskie paralleli* [The syntax of tales: Rus-Br parallels (Rus)]. Moscow: Nauka. [Princeton: PG 2099.B67]

On the existence of acc-assigning *-no/-to* predicates in 15th–17th-century Ukr and Br (34–35).

- Borkovskij, V. I. and P. S. Kuznecov. (1951) Review of (1950 3rd ed. of) Bulaxovskij 1939/1974. *Russkij jazyk v škole* 12(2): 66–76. [Cornell: PG2065.A1 R96]

Criticizes Bulaxovskij (1950: 209) about the verity of the *-no/-to* construction in OR; explains most attestations as influence from Pol (71) (cf. also Borkovskij 1950).

- Borovlev, A. A. (1989) “Funkcional'no-semantičeskie xarakteristiki kategorij vida i vremeni na materiale kratkix pričastij na *-n, -t*” [Functional-semantic characteristics of the categories aspect and tense based on short-form participles in *-n/-t* (Rus)]. *Filologičeskie nauki* 5, 49–54. [Princeton: 3000.665]

A brief analysis of *-n/-t* participles in Rus (with occasional Sr exx) dealing with temporal distinctions in the modern and older stages of Rus.

¹³ Borkovskij (1950: 370) cites, for example, the following work (cf. also ANN Petrova 1961 for another Černyšev study): Černyšev, Vasilij I. (1938) “O narušenii soglasovanija v russkom jazyke”. *Pamjati akademika N. Ja. Marra (1864-1934)*. Moskva/Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 258-274. [Princeton: P26 .M3 1938] [Repr. *Izbrannye trudy v dvux tomax*. Moskva: Prosveščenie, 1970, v. 1, 194–210. [U. Pennsylvania: PG2073.C5 1970 t.1].

- Borsley, Robert D. (1986) “A note on passives in GPSG”. *York papers in linguistics* 12: 35–42. [Heslington, York, England. University of York. Department of Language.] [Cornell: P1.Y63]

A brief mention of the Pol *-no/-to* construction (38–39).
- Borsley, Robert D. (1988) “A note on impersonal passives”. *Journal of linguistics* 24(2): 483–87.

On the necessity to conclude that Case-Absorption is not a universal.¹⁴ This conclusion was apparently arrived at independently of—but after—Sobin’s (1985) similar conclusion about the related construction in Ukr.
- Brajerski, Tadeusz. (1971) “Konstrukcje typu *Tam pierwszy rodzic Adam stworzony*” [Constructions of the type *Tam pierwszy rodzic Adam stworzony* ‘There_{ADV} our_{MASC.NOM.SG} first_{MASC.NOM.SG} father_{(MASC)NOM.SG} Adam_{(MASC)NOM.SG} (was-)created_{MASC.SG}’ (Pol)]. *Jezyk polski* 51(2): 166–77. [Princeton: 3043.496; Harvard: Philol 620.3]

A discussion of this archaism with some reference to *-no/-to* clauses, especially ones with overt copulas (*bylo, bedzie* ‘was, will (be)’ in older Pol *exx* (167).
- Brajerski, Tadeusz. (1972) “O polskiej stronie biernej” [On the Polish passive voice (Pol)]. J. Zaleski, ed. *Symbolae polonicae in honorem Stanislai Jedlowskiego*. (= *Prace Komisji jezykoznawstwa*, 32.) Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 31–39. [Princeton: 3043.8913]

This brief article is mostly on agreement passives, but does mention the option of using a *-no/-to* predicate instead of the canonical passive (34).
- Brajerski, Tadeusz. (1977) “O orzeczeniach typu *jedzono i pito*” [About predicates of the type *jedzono* ‘(someone) ate’ and *pito* ‘(someone) drank’ (Pol)]. *Roczniki humanistyczne* 25: 5–35. [Lublin. Katolicki uniwersytet lubelski. Towarzystwo naukowe. Wydział historyczno-filozoficzny.] [Yale: A44P T57H v.25]

Another philological study of *-no/-to* in Pol. A table on 24 lists various example types, labeling all of them as “factive” but also either “+ passive” or “– passive” according to criteria laid out in the article.
- Brajerski, Tadeusz. (1979) “Geneza orzeczeń typu *(z)jedzono i (vy)pito*” [The source of predicates of the type *jedzono/zjedzono* ‘(someone) ate_{IMPERFECTIVE/PERFECTIVE}’ and *pito/vypito* ‘(someone) drank_{DITTO}’ (Pol)]. *Jezyk polski* 59(2): 84–98. [Princeton: 3043.496]

Whereas Brajerski 1977 deals with impf-aspect predicates, as the data in the title show, this one further considers *-no/-to* forms of the pf forms of such verbs.
- Brooks, Maria Zagorska. (1975) *Polish reference grammar*. (= *Slavistic printings and reprintings. Textbook series*, 2.) The Hague: Mouton. [Rutgers: PG6112.B7]

¹⁴ We would disagree, however, that the Pol *-no/-to* construction is valid evidence for arguing for the non-universality of Case-Absorption since we do not consider Pol *-no/-to* to be a true passive. Cf. ANN Maling 1993. Case-Absorption is first proposed on p. 24 of the following work: Chomsky, Noam. (1981) *Lectures on government and binding. The Pisa lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Comments that Pol *-no/-to* forms are “less concrete and definite than information conveyed by the subjectless third person personal plural of verbs” in the past tense (379).¹⁵

- Brugmann, K. (1895) “Die mit Suffix *-to* gebildeten Partizipie im Verbalsystem des Lateinischen und Umbr-Oskischen: Eine syntaktische Untersuchung” [The participle built with the suffix *-to* in the verbal system of Latin and Osco-Umbrian. A syntactic examination (Ger)]. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 5: 89–152. [Rutgers: alphabetical by journal title]

The same Latin/Italic *-to* is referred to in passing by Siewierska (1988: 270).¹⁶

- Bukatevič, N. I.; I. E. Hrytsjutenko [I. E. Gricjutenko]; G. M. Miževskaja; N. V. Pavljuk; S. A. Savickaja; and F. P. Smahlenko [F. P. Smaglenko].¹⁷ (1958) *Očerki po sravnitel'noj grammatike vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov* [Essays on the comparative grammar of the E. Slavic languages (Rus)]. Odessa: Odesskij gos. un-t. [Princeton: 3015.686] Cf. 1969 reprint (= *Slavistic printings and reprintings*, 137).

This volume is a methodical comparison of the ESL languages, usually using parallel exx from Rus, Ukr, and Br for each “construction” under consideration. Of particular interest to this bibliography is §25.13.1 “Impersonal sentences” (302–03).¹⁸ The section begins with the assertion that impersonal sentences are a “growing phenomenon” in the ESL languages. The so-called adversity-impersonal construction is also mentioned: *vodoju zalilo podval* ‘water_{(FEM)INST.SG} filled-up_{(V)PAST.NEUT.SG} basement_{(MASC)ACC.SG}’ (strangely, without providing Ukr or Br equivalents of this ex; cf. Arvat 1975 and Babby 1994b). The discussion of *-no/-to* itself (303) lists the following three Ukr exx:

- (1) Radiopredaču zakinčevalosja.
radio broadcast_{(FEM)ACC.SG} was ending_{(V.IMPF)PAST.NEUT.SG.REFL}
- (2) Radiopredača zakinčena.
radio broadcast_{(FEM)NOM.SG} was ending_{(PRT.PF)PAST.FEM.SG}
- (3) Radiopredaču zakinčeno.
radio broadcast_{(FEM)ACC.SG} was ending_{(PRT.PF)[-AGR]}

¹⁵ Brooks lists no *-no/-to* examples with unmistakably acc morphology. Hence, her simplistic statement “Any verb which forms a past passive participle can form this impersonal verbal form by replacing the desinences *-y, -a, -e* [with] *-o*” (378) is insufficient. In fact, any nom direct object (of a past-tense, 3rd pl verb) must become acc in a *-no/-to* clause. Furthermore, many verbs that cannot form a passive participle can have a *-no/-to* form (cf. ANN Damborský 1967).

¹⁶ Incidentally, Brent Vine informs us that while Slavic has both *-(e)no* and *-to*, Italic received just *-to* and Germanic inherited just *-(e)no*.

¹⁷ The authors’ names are written in Cyrillic apparently in either Rus or Ukr. Where possible, we have confirmed the authoritative form in the RLIN Name Authority File. Lacking that, we rely on the form used in other titles of this bibliography. If there is neither, then the name is transliterated as if it were in Rus (since the book itself is written in Rus).

¹⁸ On p. 5 of the volume, where the authorship breakdown is spelled out, it is not entirely clear who the individual author of §25 is. Most likely this is S. A. Savickaja, to whom other syntax chapters are attributed. The introductory chapter on syntax, however, is by Bukatevič.

“[(1)] expresses the action as its process, [(2) expresses] the action as a state [and (3) expresses] the action as its result”.¹⁹ In the terminology we use in this bibliography, (2) and (3) are canonical (agreeing) and [– agreement] passives, respectively. Example (1), however, is a passive formed from an impf stem, with the etymologically reflexive clitic *-sja*, discussed at length in Kurylo (1930: 34–36). Because of the uneven distribution of *-no/-to* in the ESl languages, these *exx* are not presented in parallel with Rus and Br. Some Rus archaisms (from fables and literary works) and Br-dialect data (citing Lomtev 1956: 211) are provided, however. The section ends with a brief discussion of the pleonastic use of the neut sg personal pronoun (bold-faced) in each language:

(4) **Rus:** **Ono** poxval´no učitsja.
*it*_{NEUT.SG} laudably studies_{(V)PRES.3.SG.REFL}
 ‘[The] studies are going well.’

(5) **Ukr:** Šcos´ vono kartoplju potoptalo.
 something_{NOM} **it**_{NEUT.SG} potatoes_{(FEM)ACC.SG} trampled_{3.SG}
 ‘[It’s the case that] something trampled the potatoes.’²⁰

(6) **Br:** Dy jano vjadoma.
 after all **it**_{NEUT.SG} known/obvious
 ‘After all, it’s obvious.’

“This particle is most often used in Br, more rarely in Ukr and even more rarely in Rus; in all three languages they are usually employed in conversational speech.”

- Bulaxaw, M. H. [= Mixail G. Bulaxov]. (1957) “Pasiwna-bezasabovyja skazy typu ‘kryvdu čyneno’”. *Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy* [Passive-impersonal sentences of the type *kryvdu čyneno* [‘insult_{(FEM)ACC.SG} done [–AGR]’ (= ‘someone insulted someone’)] (Br)]. Minsk: Džaržawnae vučebna-pedahahičnae vydavectva ministerstva asvety BSSR, 377–79 (§268). [Princeton: PG2832.2.N37]

A concise treatment of extant early examples—and modern remnants—of *-no/-to* in Br; numerous *exx*.

- Bulaxovskij [Bulaxovs´kyj], L. A. (1946) “Z istoryčnyx komentarijiv do ukrajins´koji movy. Spolučnyky i spolučny hrupy (rečennja). Syntaksyčny osoblyvosti pry nyx” [Historical notes on Ukr. Conjunctions and connecting groups (sentences). Their syntactic peculiarities (Ukr)]. *Naukovi zapysky Kyjivs´koho deržavnoho universytetu. Filolohičnyj zbirnyk* 5(2): 31–73. [Harvard: PSlav 392.33]

Apparently continued by Bulaxovskij 1948. While this article deals mostly with clause-connecting and embedding structures, there is some discussion at the end of §7 (47) of *-no/-to* clauses with the subjunctive mood; i.e., embedded clauses introduced by *ščob* (complementizer *ščo* + subjunctive clitic *by*). Bulaxovskij points out that many older-Ukr texts tended not to have the overt (past-tense) copula *bulo*

¹⁹ This distinction is attributed to Shevelov & Veržbyc´kyj (1951: 54).

²⁰ Cf. ANN Billings 1993a, 1993b regarding the emphatic nature of Ukr pleonastic *vono*; hence our cleft gloss.

in such clauses (unlike non-subjunctive *-no/-to* clauses), listing various older exx. “In the modern language, *ščob* without *bulo* is encountered far more rarely,” he adds, noting that the lack of *bulo* has an archaic stylistic effect. See also ANN Damborský 1967 and Jodłowski and Taszycki 1946/1968 about the use of the same particle *by* in Pol *-no/-to* clauses.

- Bulaxovskij [Bulaxovs´kyj], L. A. (1948) “Syntaksyč ni osoblyvosti zvorotiv na *-no*, *-to* i sporidnene. Uvahy do starovynnyx zasobiv syntaksyč noho oformlennja prysudkiv ta jix ekvivalentiv” [Syntactic properties of constructions in *-no/-to* and related matters. Comments on old means of the syntactic arrangement of predicates and their equivalents (Ukr)]. “Z istoričnyx komentarijiv do ukrajins´koji literaturnoji movy. Uvahy do starovynnyx zasobiv sytaksyčnoho oformlennja prysudkiv ta jix ekvivalentiv” [From historical commentaries on literary Ukr. Comments on old means of syntactic formation of predicates and their equivalents (Ukr)]. *Naukovi zapysky Kyjivs´koho deržavnoho universytetu* 7(3): 25–50 (§4). (*Filolohičnyj zbirnyk*, 2.) [Harvard: PSlav 392.33]

Includes: Instrumental ‘by’-phrases (35), animate acc.gen (35), Old Ukr gen of negation (35), ‘that’-clause complements (36), pronominal complements (as in *nas pobyto* ‘us_{ACC.GEN} defeated_[-AGR]’) (36), absence of “animate” acc/gen in the pl (36), to-AUX-or-not-to-AUX? (36), Polonisms and repeated action (iteration) (37), Rus summary (with little detail) (50). Apparently a continuation of Bulaxovskij 1946.

- Bulaxovskij, L. A. (1939/1974) *Istoričeskij komentarij k russkomu literaturnomu jazyku* [Historical commentary on literary Russian (Rus)]. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR [Emory: WG PG2101 .B77 1974] [Photomechanic reprint of 5th ed. (1958), Kiev: Radjans´ka škola, 5th ed. [Princeton: SLAV 3021.224].] [Previous editions: 2nd ed. (1939), 3rd ed. (1950), both from Kiev: Radjans´ka škola; 1st ed. unknown.]

Rus exx with *-no -sja*, e.g., *I so vseimi temi mastery v sorok let ... razlezenosja bez ostudy* (citing Domostroj; 236); no absolute-acc exx (236); quotes Borkovskij and Kuznecov (1951: 71) as saying that the only absolutely acc exx are due to Pol influence (237; incl. fn. 1); quotes Lomonosov (*Rossijskaja grammatika* 1952: §§ 435, 437, 439, 442) as saying that the acc-assigning *-no/-to* was not productive in bygone Rus (238).

- Bulaxovskij, L. A. (1954) “Vinitel´nyj padež, zavisimyj ot skazuemyx slov i form na *-no*, *-to*” [The accusative case, dependent on (or assigned by) predicate words and forms in *-no/-to* (Rus)]. *Russkij literaturnyj jazyk pervoj poloviny XIX veka*. Kiev: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel´stvo, 372. (§25). [Princeton: 3021.224.4]

Although most exx involve forms that may be assigned syntactic acc case, only the following type of example—with either *-a* nouns in the singular or fem sg adjectives—shows overt, morphological acc case: [...] *nadobno ešče tret´ju merku* [...] ‘is needed yet third measure’ (citing “V. Odoevsk., 1833”); such exx, however, are not formed from participial stems. It is well known that a handful of stems (incl. *vidno* ‘visible’) can assign the acc in modern Russian, however. Bulaxovskij does point out some instances of acc-assigning *-no/-to* participial forms in early 18th-century Russian: *Ne znaju, počemu ne upomjanuto v nem nekotorye podrobnosti* ‘I don’t know why certain details_{FEM.PL} in it aren’t/weren’t pointed out_[-AGR]’ (citing Puškin’s letter to Vjazemskij, 1831); *Ljubov´ poslano ej* [...] ‘Love_{FEM.SG} is sent_[-AGR] to

her'. Unfortunately, neither of these exx includes the crucial declensional class mentioned above (sg -a noun or fem sg adjective; *ljubov'* 'love' is an -i stem), making it impossible to definitively prove that these are acc exx. (Bulaxovskij adds that these two might be printing errors.)

- Burjačok, A. A. (1970) "Pro movu populjarnyx žurnaliv" [On the language of popular magazines (Ukr)]. *Pytannja movnoji kul'tury*, 4, 87–96. [Princeton: 30293.742]
 Argues, prescriptively, that Ukr exx of -no/-to with inst 'by'-phrase agent should not be allowed, quoting attested exx from popular magazines (94–95).
- Butorin, D. I. (1966) "Ob osobyx sluč ajax vinitel'nogo prjamogo ob'ekta v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke" [On particular instances of the ACC direct object in contemporary literary Rus (Rus)]. G. A. Kačevskaja and K. S. Gorabčevič, eds. *Normy sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo slovoupotreblenija*. Moscow: Nauka, 125–36. [Princeton: 3020.1153.5]
 Covers non-participial, non-transitive-verbal acc assigners in Rus. (i.e., verbs in -sja and words like *nado* 'must', *nužno* 'needed', *vidno* 'visible', *žal'* 'pity', *doloi* 'down-with!' and *proč'* 'away').
- **Buzuk, A. A. (1926) "Uvahy do dijeprykmetnykiv v ukrajins'kij movi" [Comments on participles in Ukr (Ukr)]. *Visnyk Odes'koji komisiji krajeznavstva pry Ukrajins'kij akad. nauk*, No. 2–3, 168–72.
- Cebenکو, V. (1925) "Analiz movy poezij Johansena" [Analysis of the language of Johansen's poetry (Ukr)]. *Červonyj šljax*, No. 4, 216–30 [Xarkiv]. [Harvard: Film S 3682]
 A few exx apparently from a collection of poetry by M. Johansen, incl. one that Cebenکو refers to as a "pure intelligentsia-ism" because this -no/-to clause has an overt copula (*bude* 'will-be'), a phenomenon just beginning to be attested at the time: *tebe bude rozip'jato* 'thee_{ACC} will-be_{3.SG} crucified_[-AGR]'; all -no/-to data on 227, incl. fnn 1–3.²¹
- Černyx, P. Ja. [P.J. Tschernych]. (1957) *Historische Grammatik der Russischen Sprache* [Historical grammar of Rus (Ger)]. (= *Slawische Bibliothek*, 6.) H. Bielefeldt (transl.). Halle: M. Niemeyer. [Princeton: 3021.252.2]
 Some NR -no/-to data on 260. Cf. also nom objects of infinitives on 46 (also discussed in Timberlake 1973; 1974a; 1974b).
- Cet. [sic] (1943) "Dejaki tendenciji rozvytku našoji literaturnoji movy" [Some tendencies of our literary language's development (Ukr)]. *Naši dni*, No. 6: 9 [L'viv]. [Illinois]
 Apparently a non-linguist's account of a speech by Vasyl' Simovyč. The first paragraph of column 3 describes an apparent change in the -no/-to construction at the time in which the tense auxiliaries *bulo* 'was_{NEUT.SG}' and *bude* 'will-be_{3.SG}' are starting to be attested. The appearance of an inst 'by'-phrase is also described. (Both phenomena are not described as such, but instead prescribed against strongly.) This and other works from around the 1920s provide evidence that the -no/-to

²¹ Ilarion (1936: 1, 194) reports that this article is reviewed in the following work: ***Stanyslavs'kyj, M. (1927) [No title given]. *Holos Ukrajinizatora* [č.] 3, 64–65.

construction took on several features of passives during this period. Cf. Shevelov 1969; 1993.

- Christensen, Jill. (1993) “Polish impersonal constructions in *si e*”. *Harvard studies in Slavic linguistics* 2: 1–14. [Oregon: PG11.S53]

No mention of *-no/-to*, but some interesting discussion of a related construction in Pol. §1, “History and status of nominative vs. accusative case usage in impersonal constructions in *si e*,” reports on a diachronic change in Pol during the last century or more, in which the first ex below, formerly the norm, has become all but ungrammatical; the second ex has taken its place, with an acc noun phrase:²²

- (1) Ta książka łatwo sie czyta.
 this book_{(FEM)NOM.SG} easily REFL reads_{3.SG}
- (2) Te książke łatwo sie czyta.
 this book_{(FEM)ACC.SG} easily REFL reads_{3.SG}

‘This book reads easily.’ [same gloss for both] [her (5b), (5a), respectively; p. 5]

“When older nominative-as-subject generalizing constructions in *si e* [such as (1)] are encountered, speakers of the language interpret such constructions as meaning that the object is performing the object on itself” (12). Cf. also Koneczna (1955: 292) for such minimal pairs in Pol, as well as Bukatevič et al (1958: 303); Kurylo (1930: 34–36); and Shevelov and Veržbyc’kyj (1951: 64) regarding the analogous construction in Ukr. Christensen also reports the results of an empirical study of her own which corroborates the data in the literature she reports.

- *Christensen, Jill. (1994) *Towards an analysis of Polish si.e impersonals: A pragmatic/semantic approach*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. [Harvard Archives (non-circulating): HU 90.14028 Harvard Depository]
- Chvany, Catherine V. (1974) “The grammar of *dolžen*: Lexical entries as a function of theory”. R. Brecht and C. V. Chvany, eds. *Slavic transformational syntax*. (= *Michigan Slavic materials*, 10.) Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 78–122. [Rutgers: ALEX PG13.M46 no.10]

Studies the adjectival stem /*dolžn-*/ in Rus, which can mean ‘must’ [obligative/inferential], ‘expected’, ‘supposed’, ‘proper’, ‘fitting’, or, in *dolžnó byt’*, ‘probably/it must be’. Of interest to this bibliography is the fact that *dólžno* and *dolžnó* constitute the only phonetically distinct minimal pair in Russian (within the same stem) corresponding to *-ne/-te*_{NEUT.SG} and *-no/-to*_[-AGR] forms in Ukr and Pol. That is, whereas there is a (segmental) distinction between a participially-derived predicate agreeing with a neut sg subject and the same predicate stem showing non-

²² Zbigniew Kański informs us that these particular exx, being “perfect middles” instead of passives, do not crucially capture the diachronic phenomenon. He suggests instead sentences without adverbials (which tend to suggest a middle reading), and in the pf aspect (again, to avoid a middle interpretation). He suggests the following crucial exx: **Zupa si e zjad-la*. ‘[The] soup_{(FEM)NOM.SG} REFL has eaten_{(PF)FEM.SG}’, which Kański characterizes “as being as bad in modern Polish” as its English literal equivalent **The soup has eaten*. (The modern Pol grammatical ex has an acc NP and a verb with neut sg (non-)agreement.) “The point is,” Kański adds, “that it used to be a good passive”, which is Christensen’s point in any event.

agreement in Ukr and Pol, Rus has just the same *-no* (or, with some participles, *-to*) ending. (Cf. ANN Bulaxovskij 1954, Butorin 1966 regarding the *vidno* ‘visible’ class of adjectival predicates.)

- Comrie, Bernard. (1977) “In defense of spontaneous demotion: The impersonal passive”. P. Cole and J. M. Sadock, eds. *Grammatical relations*. (= *Syntax and semantics*, 8.) New York: Academic Press, 47–58. [Princeton: 2000.893]

Concludes, based on several languages (Pol, as well as Spanish, Latin, German, Dutch, Welsh and Finnish), that it is subject-“removal” (demotion or deletion), not object-promotion, that underlies all passives—personal and impersonal alike. Limited Pol data. Does show that ‘by’-phrases are not allowed in Pol *-no/-to* constructions. Comrie apparently assumes that the *-no/-to* construction is a true passive (cf. Maling 1993 on the “unpassive”-hood and non-impersonal-hood of Pol *-no/-to* as opposed to the Ukr variant; cf. also Babby (1989) on the displacement of the external argument (subject) as the main phenomenon of the passive).

- Corbett, Greville G. (1979) *Predicate agreement in Russian*. (= *Birmingham Slavonic studies monographs*, 7.) Birmingham: University of Birmingham. [Princeton: PG2830.xC6]

Discusses the related problem of neut-sg agreement versus failure to agree (i.e., default or “neutral” agreement).

- Corbett, Greville G. (1980) “Neutral agreement”. *Quinquereme: New studies in modern languages* 3(2): 164–70. [Princeton: PB1.Q56]

A brief mention of the distinction in Ukr between true neut-sg agreement and “neutral” (or default) agreement in the following pair: *Ce prekrasne* ‘This is beautiful_{NEUT.SG}’ ~ *Ce prekrasno* ‘It is beautiful_[-AGR]’ (166–67), as well as references to Pol. (Presumably *ce* is in the nom in the former and the acc in the latter.) Corbett specifically differs with Shevelov’s (1963: 129) explanation that the latter (*-no*) ending is “adverbial”.

- Corbett, Greville G. (1986) “The use of the genitive or accusative for the direct object of negated verbs in Russian: A bibliography”. R. D. Brecht and J. S. Levine, eds. *Case in Slavic*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 361–72. [Rutgers: ALEX PG 129.C37 1986]

While Corbett’s bibliography does not treat *-no/-to* constructions directly, it does list references on the related gen-of-negation construction in Rus.

- Corbett, Greville G. (1988) “Agreement: A partial specification, based on Slavonic data”. M. Barlow and C. Ferguson, eds. *Agreement in natural language: Approaches, theories, descriptions*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 23–53. [Princeton: P299.A35 A37]

Just a mention of neut versus default agreement, referring back to Corbett 1980.

- Corbett, Greville G. (1991) *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Princeton: P240.7.C67 1991]

Discusses neuter-singular agreement versus failure to agree, with data from a range of languages.

- Damborský, Jiří. (1967) *Neurčité a jmenné tvary slovesné v polštině* [Indefinite and nominal word forms in Pol (Cz)]. (= *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomouciensis, Facultatis philosophica*, 44. *Philologica*, 24.) Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství [Princeton: Annex III 3000.687 No.24]

Under the heading “Participles” Damborský lists those in *-ny/-ty* and those in *-l*. Under *-ny/-ty* he discusses *-no/-to* but specifically points out that these are not participles (50–52). Damborský argues that *-no/-to* forms in Pol are not participles. We repeat his arguments in turn:

1. “The unambiguous **temporal orientation** of forms in *-no/-to* as opposed to the relative temporal flexibility of participles”. *-No/-to* is restricted to the past tense, while participles aren’t (i.e., can be present and future too). Not surprisingly, during the past century Ukr *-no/-to* has developed future-tense forms and the distinction between past and present (depending on the presence/absence of the past-tense copula *buło*); while this isn’t one of the eight criteria in ANN Maling 1993, it is valid, especially since Ukr has developed these new tenses for *-no/-to*.
 2. Many verbs that don’t have participial forms in *-ny/-ty* do have *-no/-to* forms. Moreover, such is also the case with regard to forming the de-verbal nominalizations in *-nie/-cie* (which are similar to English so-called gerundive nominals, but entirely productive in Pol). This corresponds to—but is much less specific than—points 4 and 5 on thematic and valence restrictions in ANN Maling 1993.
 3. “Forms in *-no/-to* [can] select the modal particle *by* just as the [other] impersonal predicates can: *tańczonoby* ‘would have been [some] dancing [going on]/[if only] there were dancing’, *śpiewanoby* [parallel gloss with ‘sing’] ...”.²³
 4. “Forms in *-no/-to* must have a consequential reflexive component in instances where there is a matrix verb. There exists a very tight proximity between *-no/-to* and [de-]verbal nominal[ization]s [i.e., in *-nie/-cie*], but this does not mean functional synonymy”. Unfortunately, Damborský provides no exx. We suspect he means that if the *-no/-to* clause is embedded, then the understood doer of the predicate tends to be the same as that of the matrix clause. This appears to be unreported elsewhere in the literature.
 5. “Forms in *-no/-to* from verbs requiring complements (both transitive and intransitive) [i.e., verbs requiring a complement whether or not the complement is an acc NP], as opposed to passive participles, keep their verbal structure”. This, too, is not explained further.
- Dem’jančuk, Vasyl’. (1928) “Morfolohija ukrajins’kyx hramot XIV-ho i pers’oji polovyny XV-ho viku” [Morphology of Ukrainian textual monuments of the 14th and first half of the 15th century (Ukr)]. *Zapysky Istoryčno-filolohičnoho viddilu UAN* 16: 73–109. [Kyjiv.

²³ David Embick has suggested to us that the fact that *by* encliticizes to the *-no/-to* word is evidence that this word has raised to I (the inflectional functional head); *by* otherwise encliticizes to the tensed verbal stem.

Vseukrajins'kaja akademija nauk. Istoryčno-filolohičnyj viddil. Zbirnyk.]. [Princeton: 0917.949.2 v.16–18]

The ultimate source, according to Shevelov (1969: 180, fn 16) of a mistaken explanation that *-oje* > *-e* in Ukr (97).

- ****Dibrov, A. (1954)** *Bezličnye predloženiya v russkoj delovoj pis'mennosti pervoj poloviny XVII veka (Na materiale sbornika pamjatnikov "Donskie dela")* [Impersonal sentences in early-16th-century²⁴ administrative written Rus (Based on material from the Donskie dela collection of textual monuments (Rus)]. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Rostov-na-Donu [Univ.].
- **Dloževs'kyj, S. (1928/1965)** "Deščo pro pryrodu rečen' typu 'kozačen'ka vbyto' ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy" [Something on the nature of sentences of the type *kozačen'ka vbyto* in literary Ukr (Ukr)]. *Sbornik statej v čest' akademika Alekseja Ivanoviča Sobolevskogo* (= Russian reprint series, 4.) The Hague: Europe Printing, 285–88. [Princeton: 3020.864.81] [Originally in *Sbornik ORJaS AN SSSR 101: 3, 1928.*]
 Another 1920s description of the ongoing changes in Ukr which resulted in several universal passive properties becoming allowed in *-no/-to* clauses, namely: overt auxiliaries *bulo* 'was_{NEUT.SG}' and *bude* 'will-be_{3.SG}' and inst 'by'-phrases.
- **Doros, Aleksander. (1975)** "Zdania bezosobowe z formami na *-no/-to* w funkcji orzeczenia" [Impersonal sentences with forms in *-no/-to* in a predicative function (Pol)]. *Verbalne konstrukcje bezosobowe w jezyku rosyjskim i polskim na tle innych jezyków s lowiańskich.* (= *Prace Komisji s lowianoznawstwa, 32.*) Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 84–116 (ch. 4). [Harvard: 3286.156]
 A comprehensive comparison of Rus and Pol *-no/-to*, with numerous references to other literature. Summarized in English in Siewierska 1988.
- [Dudyk, P. S.] (1972) "Bezsobovi rečennja" [Impersonal sentences (Ukr)]. I. K. Bilodid, ed. *Syntaksys.* (= *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova, 3.*) Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 244–53. [Princeton: 30293.891 v. 3]
 Cf. especially the *-no/-to* exx on 251.
- **Dyła, Stefan. (1982)** "Some further evidence against an impersonal passive analysis of Polish impersonal constructions". *Studia anglica posnaniensia: An international review of English studies 15*; 123–28. [Princeton: 3520.8885]
 The first work, to our knowledge, arguing against the impersonal-passive analysis of the Pol *-no/-to* variant (cf. also Bańkowski 1967). For example, the following ex is used, showing that a *-no/-to* sentence must have a personal (albeit inaudible) subject: **Gwizdano** *nie zgadzając się z decyzją szedziego.* 'Someone/People whistled,

²⁴Doros (1975) apparently mistakenly cites this title as "... XVI veka ...", while Ívedova (1964:241, fn. 1) and Slavjanskoe (1962a:65) cite it as shown here. We have ourselves been unable to locate a copy.

disagreeing with the referee's decision'²⁵ (his (14); 127). Cf. ANN Maling 1993 for consequences of this (and other syntactic distinctions).

- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. (1990) "Default agreement in Polish". K. Dziwirek, P. Farrell, and E. Mejías-Bikandi, eds. *Grammatical relations. A cross-theoretical perspective*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, 147–61. [Princeton: P201.G678 1990]

Nothing on *-no/-to* as such. Dziwirek does, however, discuss default agreement, a key notion in the *-no/-to* literature.

- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. (1992) "Two types of subject demotion contrasted: Evidence from Polish impersonals". *Proceedings of the first meeting of the Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica, 1990* 1: 81–97. [Cornell: OLIN P21 .M49 1990]

Not a treatment of *-no/-to* as such, but a Relational Grammar approach to *sie* clauses in Pol. See our lengthier annotations of such articles (primarily Christensen 1993 and Kański 1985; 1986; 1991).

- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. (1994) "Covert subjects". *Polish subjects*. New York: Garland, 177–235 (ch. 5). [Stanford PG6735.D97 1994] [Published version of her 1991 U. California-San Diego Ph.D. dissertation *Aspects of Polish syntax* [U.C.S.D.: P27.6 1991 .D95].]

Argues that *-no/-to* clauses have an obligatory 3rd-pl interpretation (179–82), especially fnn 3–5 (226). Cf. also ANN Kipka 1989.²⁶

- Eremin, S. (1926) "Programma dlja sobiranija materialov po narodnym govoram, mestnomu slovarju i bytovym nazvanijam. Vvodnaja čast'" [A program for collecting materials on folk dialects, a local dictionary, and household terms. Introduction (Rus)]. *Kraevedenie. Periodičeskij organ Central'nogo bjuro kraevedenija pri Rossijskoj akademii nauk* 3: 199–230. [Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.] [Lib. of Congress: Film 947.005 KRA v. 3–4]

One of the items on this dialect-survey proposal is to see how prevalent sentences like *u nego uexano* 'by him left_[-AGR]' or *na drugoj ženenos'* 'to someone else married_[-AGR]' (210). We have been unable to locate the published findings of Eremin's proposed study. See, however, Kuz'mina and Nemčenko 1971—especially their maps 1, 2, 4.²⁷

- Fici Giusti, Francesca [Francesca Giusti Fici]. (1992a) "A *u nego pis'mo napisano: Analisi del rapporto tra i componenti nominali e verbali nel costruito in -no/-to*" [Analyses of agreement between the nominal and verbal components of the construction in *-no/-to* (It)]. M. Guirard-Weber and C. Zaremba, eds. *Linguistique et slavistique. Melanges offerts a*

²⁵ Zbigniew Kański informs us that he would not use such a participial clause inside a *-no/-to* matrix clause. But even if he were to do so, he "wouldn't be all that convinced about a personal (albeit inaudible) subject. What subject? Someone? Everyone? A man? All (wo)men? Man? People? They? None of these is a good paraphrase."

²⁶ We have uncovered some evidence that the doer of a *-no/-to* clause can be even the speaker (in addition to the scholarly-writing example Dziwirek raises), as in *podano herbat e* 'tea is served' (cf. the title of Lewicki 1966), where, under certain pragmatic circumstances, it can mean that only the speaker has served the tea.

²⁷ See also a 1922 study by the same author footnoted under Kuznecov 1949.

Paul Garde. (= *Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves*, 36.) Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence/Paris: Institut d'études slaves, v. 1, 467–77. [Princeton: PG14.G37 L56 1992]

Specifically, a look at prepositional phrases headed by u 'at/by' in Rus (dialect) *-no/-to* clauses. One interesting comment on word order:

(1) Ne zabito ni odnogo gvozdika.
NEG pounded in_[-AGR] nary one nail_{(MASC)GEN.SG}

(2) *Ni odnogo gvozdika ne zabito.
nary one nail_{(MASC)GEN.SG} NEG pounded in_[-AGR] [both 475]

We have not, however, confirmed this judgment.

- Fici Giusti, Francesca. (1992b) "I costrutti impersonali in *-no/-to*" [The impersonal construction in *-no/-to* (It)]. Wiesław Banyś et al, eds. *Études de linguistique Romane et slave*. Cracovie: Department d'études Romanes, École normale supérieure a Cracovie, 133–48. [Stanford: STK PC61.E88 1992]

A reasonably complete introductory article on this topic. One interesting ex (from a 17th-century letter by Protopope Avvakum) reveals what might be a word-order constraint upon whether the *-no/-to* vs the canonical passive is used:

Poslany gramotki k Moskvě [...] da k vam že **poslano** desjat'
sent_{PL} letters_{PL} to Moscow and to you EMPH sent_[-AGR] ten
krestov [...] A kresty kedrovye **poslano**.
crosses but crosses_{PL} of cedar_{PL} sent_[-AGR]

Probable overall gloss: '[*The] letters were sent to Moscow [... And] to you ten crosses were sent [...] But the cedar crosses were sent.' [bold-facing and italics ours—LB/JM]²⁸

Unfortunately none of the underlying objects in these clauses (the relevant portions of which are italicized) shows unmistakably acc morphological case, since none is either a sg *-a* noun or a fem sg adjective. Nonetheless, assuming that the *-no/-to* form of the predicate signifies non-agreement in these exx, then comparing the first clause to the third clause suggests that there may be a correlation between word order (or definiteness; see gloss) and whether there is participial agreement. (The middle clause involves other factors having to do with the numerical phrase.) That is, predicate-subject order might be correlated with agreement. Cf. also similar Ukr data sets in ANN Ivanycja 1925 and Synjavs'kyj 1967, as well as Klimonow 1960 on Pol.

- Fici Giusti, Francesca. (1994) *Il passivo nelle lingue Slave. Tipologia i semantica* [The Slavic passive. Typology and semantics (Rus)]. (= *Materiali linguistici. Università di Pavia*, 11.) Milano: FrancoAngeli [sic]. [Princeton: PG151.F524 1994]

An overview of the various passive constructions in the Slavic languages and their meanings, incl. those of participial origin and those which are etymologically

²⁸ This example is from: *Pamjatniki literatury drevnej Rusi. XVII vek. Kniga pervaja*. (1988) Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 541. [Princeton: PG3223 .P294 kn.1]

reflexive. Of direct interest to this bibliography are §3.3.2. “Construtti impersonali del tipo *-no/-to* [in Pol]” (115–22) and §3.4. “I costrutti in *-no/-to* dell’ucraino” (122–29). The former deals also with acc-assigning clauses with *sie* (cf. ANN Christensen 1993 for *exx*). The latter includes data from the other ESL languages as well.²⁹

- Fici Giusti, Francesca. (1995) “The perfect in Slavic”. Pier Marco Bertinetto et al, eds. *Typological perspectives*. (= *Temporal reference, aspect and actionality 2.*) Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier *linguistica*, 221–37.³⁰

Apparently a condensed, English version of Fici Giusti 1994. Extensive discussion of emergent *-no/-to* forms in Cz, Mac and Bg.

- Filin, F. P. (1948) “Zametki o zapisjax materialov po sintaksisu” [Comments on recordings of materials on syntax (Rus)]. *Bjulleten’ dialektologičeskogo sektora IRJaS AN SSSR* 4: 23–60. [Moscow/Leningrad: Akademija nauk SSSR. Institut russkogo jazyka. Dialektologičeskij sektor.] [Berkeley: PG2701.A5 v. 4–6]

Numerous *exx* of *-no/-to* predicates in Rus dialects. There are occasional acc-assigning *exx*, as well as the place each was elicited (e.g., *sobakoj **nogu rasxvačeno*** ‘dog_{INST.SG} foot_{ACC.SG} torn/seized apart_[-AGR]’, Bol’šoe Višen’e [village], Novotoržskij district, Kalininskaja oblast’ (45).

- Filin, F. P. (1971) “K istorii oborota s stradatel’nymi pričastijami na *-n-* i *-t-*” [On the history of the construction with passive participles in *-n-* and *-t-* (Rus)]. *Problemy istorii i dialektologii slavjanskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka, 276–85. [Princeton: 3014.199.738]

A discussion of the history of various participial constructions in *-n-/ -t-* in ESL. Filin concludes that there are four basic areal characteristics:

1. non-agreeing bivalent clauses with *-no/-to* participles (throughout early ESL, but have since disappeared);
 2. *-no/-to* with acc (primarily modern Ukr, but also in some other regions);
 3. constructions with *u* + gen to indicate the doer of the action (spread throughout NR, Specifically NW Rus); and
 4. inst ‘by’-phrase for doer—primarily in Br and, rarely, elsewhere (285).³¹
- Filin, F. P. (1972) “Oboroty so stradatel’nymi pričastijami na *-no, -to* ” [Constructions with passive participles in *-no/-to* (Rus)]. *Proisxoždenie russkogo, ukrainskogo i belorusskogo jazykov. Istoriko-dialektologičeskij očerk*. Leningrad: Nauka (Leningradskoe otdelenie), 491–501. [Princeton: 3014.347.2]

²⁹ A work of this breadth (but relative inaccessibility) deserves a full-fledged review in an anglophone journal such as *JSL* as soon as possible. Unfortunately this bibliography is not the proper venue for such a detailed assessment. Nor are we qualified to assess it in every way.

³⁰ A photocopy of this article was sent to us; we have been unable to locate any library in North America which holds this work.

³¹ This last comment is not entirely accurate. One of the developments in the past century in Ukr has been the emergence of inst ‘by’-phrases in *-no/-to* clauses, apparently another step in the passive-hood of this construction. See ANN Maling 1993 for more details.

A very complete summary of *-no/-to* and similar phenomena throughout ESL (with frequent reference to Pol *-no/-to* as well), often citing the major works (annotated throughout this bibliography). As the second part of the title suggests, this work looks both comparatively and diachronically. Some noteworthy points:

1. Filin looks at the differences between the dialect groups, specifically with regard to: a) whether re-analysis of neut sg past passive participles as finite verbs has taken place; and b) whether the doer of the predicate is expressed by some “oblique case with or without a preposition” (in our terms: the equivalent of an English ‘by’-phrase) (493).
2. Apparent *exx* in OR from as early as the 11th century (none of which shows an underlying object in a morphologically unambiguous acc form) which, Filin writes, were quite rare and have apparently not taken hold in ESL (493).
3. Quoting Matveenko (1961: 111): the NR constructions *ruka poraneno* ‘hand_{(FEM)NOM.SG} injured_{NEUT.SG}’ and *ruku poraneno* ‘hand_{(FEM)ACC.SG} injured_{NEUT.SG}’ coexist in the same dialect (and the ramifications of this coexistence) (495).
4. A reasonably precise list of Rus dialects with *-no/-to* passivoid phenomena in Rus (495).
5. A brief excursus into the Pol *-no/-to* construction. Unlike ESL, “in contemporary Pol these forms carry out a finite, active-verbal function. The transfer of passive meaning to active took place during the 200–300 years beginning approximately in the 14th century” (496).
6. In Ukr the first morphologically unambiguous acc forms (i.e., *-a* noun stems) began to be attested in the 14th century and were attested with increasing frequency from then on.
7. In Ukr *-no/-to* predicates without an overt copula render the perfect, while with such a copula there is “absolute past action” (496).
8. Citing Matveenko (1960: 353), Filin reports that *-no/-to* is now attested throughout Ukr dialects but “waningly in the W and NW areas” (496).³²
9. Citing Vaščenko 1958: In modern Poltava-area dialects the following three constructs coexist (“function in parallel”): (i) *joho hromom ubyto* ‘him_{ACC} thunder_{INST.SG} killed_[-AGR]’; (ii) *joho hromom ubylo* ‘him_{ACC} thunder_{INST.SG} killed_{(V)PAST.NEUT.SG}’; and (iii) *joho hrim ubyv* ‘him_{ACC} thunder_{NOM.SG} killed_{(V)PAST.MASC.SG}’; but in Poltava-area fieldwork from the turn of the 20th century and in 17th-century documents only forms such as *tušu dano* ‘carcass_{(FEM)ACC.SG} given_[-AGR]’ are provided (none of which involves a natural force comparable to the adversity-impersonal readings in (i–iii)).³³ Cf. ANN

³² This last qualification—that Ukr *-no/-to* is *least* prevalent in areas closest to Poland—is most surprising to us, considering that there is extensive textual evidence to support the proposal that Ukr borrowed *-no/-to* from Pol. Cf. Shevelov 1969.

³³ Note also that this much earlier example is formed from an *impf*-stem verb, unlike (i–iii), which are from *pf* stems.

Apresjan and Páll 1982, Arvat 1975, and Babby 1994b on adversity-impersonals (496).

10. Whereas Ukr *-no/-to* is widespread, it is extremely rare among the Rus dialects (citing Matveenko's 1961 survey: only 100 of the 2500 Rus-dialect tokens she assessed showed *-no/-to*; 497), and virtually nonexistent in Br (such that even one Br dialect atlas fails to mention the construction altogether; 496–97).
 11. Filin emphasizes that, while assessing *-no/-to*, it is necessary to determine whether the *logičeskij sub'ekt* 'logical prominent entity/protagonist' is present or absent (which, Filin adds, is especially important to Sjatovskij 1963).³⁴
 12. The NR use of *-no/-to* forms functions as an active-verbal construction. The difference between (i) *u moego syna na nej ženenos'* 'by my son_{GEN.SG} on her_{LOC.SG} married_{[PRT][-AGR]REFL}' and (ii) *moj syn na nej ženilsja* 'my son_{NOM.SG} on her_{LOC.SG} married_{[V]PAST.MASC.SG.REFL}' is that clause (i) "emphasizes the result in the present, while in [clause (ii)] a simple statement of completed action is being expressed" (499).
 13. Citing Petrova [1961]: just as short-form active participles have lost separate gender and number forms, so too are *-no/-to* forms undergoing such a level of agreement devolution (499–500).
 14. Finally, citing Veenker 1967, Filin supports the notion that the *-no/-to* passivoid phenomenon in NR might have been borrowed from Finnic (500).
- Franks, Steven L. (1990) "On the status of null expletives". *Lingua* 81(1): 1–24.
Cf. ANN Babby 1989, Billings 1993a; 1993b, and Franks 1995 regarding pleonastics.
 - Franks, Steven L. (1995) *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 287–332 (ch. 7).
Some mention of null and overt pleonastics in ch. 7 ("Null subject phenomena", 287–332,); cf. also ANNs Billings 1993a, 1993b; Babby 1989. Extensive discussion of Pol *-no/-to* in ch. 8 ("Voice Alternations", 333–73).
 - **Galkina-Fedoruk, Evdokija M. [Jevdokia M. Galkina-Fedoruk]. (1951) "Zaperečni rečennja v rosijs'kij i ukrajins'kij movax" [Negated sentences in Rus and Ukr (Ukr)]. *Ukrajins'ka mova v školi* No. 5, 21–30.
 - Galkina-Fedoruk, Evdokija M. (1958) "Bezlič'nye predlož'enija, obrazovannye iz kratkoj formy pričastij stradatel'nogo zaloga" [Impersonal sentences formed from short-form passive-voice participles (Rus)]. *Bezlič'nye predlož'enija v sovremennom russkom jazyke* [Impersonal sentences in contemporary Rus (Rus)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo un-ta, 246–65. [Princeton: 3021.375.2]
Surveys all *-n/-t-* predicates in Russian (incl. dialects). Interesting exx: *U volka ovcu s'edeno* 'by wolf_{GEN.SG} sheep_{(FEM)ACC.SG} eaten_[-AGR]'; *v četverg trgovanos'* 'on Thursday was-traded_{[-AGR]REFL}' (263.)

³⁴ In ANN, we criticize one of Sjatovskij's apparent assumptions, which appear to be empirically untested (or at least gravely outdated): that the Pol and Ukr *-no/-to* constructions act alike.

- Geniušienė, Emma Š. (1976) “Das passive des Litauischen und seine Verwendung” [The passive in Li and its use (Ger)]. R. Löttsch and R. Ružička, eds. *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*. (= *Studia grammatica*, 13.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 139–52. [Penn: PF3025.S87 nr.13]
An analysis of the construction in Li similar in many respects to Ukr and Pol *-no/-to*.
- [Georgieva, V. L.] (1978) “Bezličnye predloženiya” [Impersonal sentences (Rus)]. *Sintaksis. Prostoe predloženie*[Syntax. The simple clause-sentence (Rus)]. (= *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*) Moscow: Nauka, v. 1, 230–96. [Princeton: PG2101.I8 ch.1]
Another relatively extensive summary of *-no/-to* phenomena in Rus.
- Gladney, Frank Y. (1983) “O-impersonal”. *Handbook of Polish*. Urbana, IL: G & G Press, 127 (§37.1). [Rutgers: ALEX PG6112.G55 1983]
Summarizes the differences between acc-assigning “*si e*-impersonal” (cf. ANN Christensen 1993 for *exx*) and *-no/-to*, which he calls the “*o*-impersonal” construction. Implies that *-no/-to* cannot refer to a 1st- or 2nd-person doer (cf. fn in ANN Dziwirek 1994). Whereas *si e*-impersonals can express other tenses, *-no/-to* is restricted to the past tense.³⁵ The *o*-impersonal cannot be used with verbs that have no imaginable doers, or with 1st-conjugation *-éć* verbs.
- Gólab, Zbigniew. (1975) “Endocentricity and endocentrization of verbal predicates: Illustrated with Latin and Slavic material”. *General linguistics* 15(1): 1–35. [Princeton: 2000.384]
Includes a history of *-no/-to* predicates in Slavic. Mentions (32) that *zabito cz·lowieka* ‘killed_[-AGR] person_{MASC.ACC.SG}’, in its interpretation, “exclu[des] the first and second persons”. Cf. ANN Dziwirek 1994 regarding the exclusivity of a 3rd pl interpretation of Pol *-no/-to* clauses.
- Grepl, Miroslav. (1962) “K vyjadřování bezagentního děje v tzv. větách s všeoobecným podmětem” [On expressing an agentless action in so-called clauses with a common[ly understood] subject (Cz)]. J. Bauer et al, eds. *Otázky slovanské syntaxe. Sborník Brněnské snyaktické konference. 17.-21. IV. 1961.* (= *Spisy university J. E. Purkyně v Brně. Filosofská fakulta*, 85.) Praha: Statní Pedagogické Nakladatelství, 161–65. [Yale: A34b 146 85–86]
An investigation of so-called *man*-type clauses in Cz, incl. some participial predicates in *-no*, none of which takes an acc underlying object (163).

³⁵ When the *si e*-impersonal cannot be formed (because the verb lexically already has *si e*), then *-no/-to* can be used and expresses the present tense:

- (i) Z niego sie czasem śmiano.
at him REFL often laugh_[-AGR]
‘He was/is often laughed at.’
- (ii) O tej porze śpieszono sie do pracy
at this hour hurry_[-AGR] REFL to work
‘At this time people were/are hurrying to work.’

We were unable to confirm this particular claim, and Gladney informs us that it is in error. All *-no/-to* clauses in modern Pol have a past-tense interpretation.

- Gvozdev, Aleksandr N. (1961) *Voprosy izučeniya detskoj reči* [problems of child-language learning (Rus)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii pedagogičeskix nauk RSFSR. [Princeton: 3012.421.5]

Generally shows that passives (both participial and with *-sja*) are acquired later than active constructions. See, e.g., the sections “Pričastie” and “Glagol” under each of the formative-stage descriptions (177–334), as well as the overall sections on unisegmental clauses (346), reflexive verbs (427f), and participles (all of which report exclusively short-form past passive participles; 450f).
- Havránek, Bohuslav. (1937) *Genera verbi v slovanských jazycích* [Verbal origins in Slavic languages (Cz)]. (= *Rozpravy Král. české spol. nauk. Tř. fil. jazykozpyt. Nová řáda*, 8(4).) Praha: Náklad kr. České spol. nauk, v. 2. [Princeton: (bound with v. 1, 1928): 3015.441q]

Shows that two apparent acc-assigning *-no/-to* exx in OCS discovered by Miklosich (1873; 1883) are not valid examples: *glas̃ trubny uslyšano budet* ‘voice_{MASC} of trumpet heard_[-AGR] will-be_{3.SG}’ and *vybrano stroki* ‘chosen_[-AGR] lines_{FEM.PL}’. First, neither of the NPs in these two exx has the requisite declensional class/gender and number (*-a* noun in sg or fem sg adjectival). That is, neither *glas̃* nor *stroki* can show distinct morphological acc (*stroki*, a noun of the *-a* declensional class, is unfortunately in the pl here). Havránek also points out that the non-agreement in the first ex can be explained by sloppy translation from the Greek and the second is due to a non-corresponding predicate because of cluttered configuration. Additionally, an apparent instance of optional *-no/-to* only with neut sg nouns in Cz (namely, either with agreeing *-ne/-te* or non-agreeing *-no/-to*) (124).
- Hestvik, Arild. (1986) “Case theory and Norwegian impersonal constructions”. *Nordic journal of linguistics* 9(2): 181–97.

Argues that Norwegian passives assign acc case. The argument is less than fully convincing since only full NPs can occur postverbally due to the definiteness effect, and hence there is no overt evidence for the morphological case of the NP in sentences equivalent to *There was killed a man yesterday night*.
- Hladkyj, Mykola. (1918/1924) *Praktičeskij kurs ukraïnskogo jazyka* [Practical course in Ukr (Rus)]. Gos. izd-vo Ukrainy, 2nd ed. [Harvard: XPA6971] [1st ed., Žitomir: Robotnik.]

Probably the most complete description of pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ in Ukr. We quote the paragraph:

“§97: In incomplete and impersonal clauses, especially when accompanied by a predicate in the 3rd person, there can occasionally be the 3rd-person, neuter pronoun—*vonó* without its own ordinary meaning. The sentence/clause in such circumstances remains incomplete and impersonal, for example: *Vonó šče ne dúže j témno buló nadvóri* [‘it still not very even dark was in the yard’] ...” (83) [our translation—LB/JM].

Axmanova (1966: 263) defines “incomplete sentence” as one in which one of the (subcategorized) actants is not (overtly) expressed.³⁶

- Hladkyj, Mykola. (1930/1992) *Mova suč asnoho ukrajins´koho pysmens´tva* [The language of contemporary Ukr writing (Ukr)]. (= *Ukrajins´ki hramatyki*, 9. O. Horbač [O. Horbatsch], ed.) Munich: Ukrajins´kyj vil´nyj universytet. [Lib. of Congress: PG3875.H57 1992] [1st ed., Kyjiv: Deržavne vydavnytvo Ukrajinjy.]
- Hnatjuk, Halyna M. (1982) “Predykatyvni dijeprykmetyky na *-no* (*-eno*), *-to*” [Predicative participles in *-no* (*-eno*), *-to* (Ukr)]. *Dijeprykmetyk u sučasnij ukrajins´kij literaturnij movi* [The participle in contemporary literary Ukr (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 61–62. [Columbia: PG3864.H55 1982]

A morphological how-to scheme for selecting the proper allomorph—either *-no*, *-eno* or *-to*—based on the verbal stem.
- Horec´kyj, P. and V. Šalja. (1926) “Dijepryslyvnyky [sic] pasyvni mynuloho času na *-no*, *-to*” [Passive, past-tense verbal adverbs in *-no/-to* (Ukr)]. *Ukrajins´ka mova. Praktyčno-teoretyčnyj kurs* [Ukr. A practical-theoretical course (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Knyhospilka, 146–50 (§82). [Harvard: 3285.60.07]

A moderately prescriptive treatment: while they do not allow any inst ‘by’-phrase (147), the authors do allow the overt copula *bulo* ‘was’ or *bude* ‘will [be]’ (149).
- Hruns´kyj, M. and H. Sabaldyr. (1926) *Ukrajins´ka mova: Fonetyka, morfolohija, syntaksa, frazeolohičnyj slovnyk. Poradnyk dlja samonavčannja* [Ukr. Phonetics, morphology, syntax, phraseological dictionary (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: [n.s.]. [Harvard: 3285.60.03]

§40 (67–68), on impersonal sentences (against inst, but allows overt copulas; cf. ANN Horec´kyj and Šalja 1926); §56 (81), on canonical passives (in *-n/-t- +* agreement ending).
- Hrync´yšyn, Dmytro H. (1961) “Substantyvacija dijeprykmetykiv u suč asnij ukrajins´kij movi” [Substantivization of participles in modern Ukr (Ukr)]. *Doslidžennja i materialy z ukrajins´koi movy* [Research and materials on Ukr (Ukr)]4: 26–41. Kyjiv: Vyd-vo AN URSSR. [Michigan: 891.791 A322dp]

On certain participles that have become reanalyzed as adjectives in Ukr.
- Hryščenko [Griščenko], A. A. (1986) “Bezličnye redložennja” [Impersonal sentences (Rus)]. Rusanivs´kyj, V. M. [V. M. Rusanovskij], M. A. Žovtobrjux, E. G. Horodens´ka [Gorodenskaja] and A. A. Hryščenko [Griščenko] *Ukrainskaja grammatika* [Ukr grammar (Rus)]. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 293-96 (§118). [Virginia: PG3819.U37 1986]

A brief description of *-no/-to*. This volume also contains brief biographic sketches of various figures in Ukr linguistics and literature (339-56).
- Ilarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg and all Canada [Ivan Ohijenko]. (1925) *Čystota j pravyl´nist´ ukrajins´koi movy* [The purity and correctness of Ukr (Ukr)]. L´viv: Vydannja Knyharni Arnol´da Bardaxa [Z drukarni Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenka]. [Lib. of Congress: PG 3821.I4 1972]

³⁶ Axmanova, Olga S. (1966) *Slovar´ lingvistič eskix terminov*. Moscow: Sovetskaja ènciklopedija. [Florida: MAIN P29.A4x]

Discussion of Ukr *-no/-to* (152–55); pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ (171).

- Ilarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg and all Canada [Ivan Ohijenko]. (1930) *Ukrajins’ka literaturna mova XVI st. i ukrajins’kyj Krexivs’kyj apostol* [16th-century literary Ukr and the Ukr *Krexiv Apostle* (Ukr)]. Varšava: Drukarnja synodal’na, v. 1. [Harvard: 3285.69.10 (7–8)]

A discussion of *-no/-to* in one set of historical documents (406–09).

- Ilarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg and all Canada [Ivan Ohijenko]. (1935a) “Zprykmetnykovani dijeprykmetnyky” [Adjectivized participles (Ukr)]. (= *Sučasna ukrajins’ka literaturna mova*, 2.) *Ridna mova. Naukovo-populjarnyj misjačnyk prysvjačenyj vyvčennju ukrajins’kyj movy*. Warsaw, 3: 4, col. 161–70. [NY Pub. Lib.: *ZAN-*Q929]

A short excursus on various participles becoming reanalyzed as adjectives in Ukr.

- Ilarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg and all Canada [Ivan Ohijenko]. (1935b) *Sučasna ukrajins’ka literaturna mova. Narysy z skladni sučasnoji ukrajins’koji literaturnoji movy* [Contemporary literary Ukr. Essays on the syntax of contemporary literary Ukr (Ukr)]. Warsaw: Drukarnja OO. Vasylijan u Žovkvi. [Illinois: 491.79I1su]

Argues—and provides evidence—that short-form adjectives (*holoden* ‘hungry’, *zdorov* ‘healthy’, etc.) are not all that archaic in Ukr (43–44). Cf. the literature on the general loss of the short-form in older Ukr: Bevzenko 1960, Dem’jančuk 1928, Samijlenko 1962, and Zatovkaňuk 1979; as well as the parallel phenomenon of short- and long-form adjectives (incl. participles) in Rus: Babby 1973; 1993b; forthcoming; and Galkina-Fedoruk 1958.

- Ilarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg and all Canada [Ivan Ohijenko]. [1936] *Skladnja ukrajins’koji movy* [Ukr syntax (Ukr)]. Warsaw: Drukarnja OO. Vasylijan u Žovkvi, 2 v. [Alberta: PG3871.I27 1935]

V. 2 (*Častyna druha: Holovnij pojasnjuval’ni členy rečennja*) includes a brief discussion of pleonastics (16–17) and a specific bibliography of subjects (20–21). A relatively thorough bibliography on syntax (not just of Ukr) to date is in v. 1 (*Častyna perša: Vstup do skladni*; 175–95).

- Ivanycja, Hr. [Gr. Ivanica]. (1925) *Kurs ukrainskogo jazyka. V kratkom praktičeskom izložennii s xrestomatieju* [Course in Ukr. In brief practical format with chrestomathie (Rus)]. Gos. izd-vo Ukrainy. [Harvard (non-circulating): XP 5086]

A rather prescriptive/pedagogical treatment (e.g., against inst ‘by’-phrases). An interesting correlation of constituent order and choice of *-no/-to* versus the canonical passive (see ANN Synjavs’kyj 1967 and Fici Giusti 1992b for similar Ukr and older-Rus and Ukr exx, respectively): “*posijane žyto* means [...] ‘sowed rye’, while *žyto posijano* means ‘[the] rye is sowed’” (55).³⁷ Definiteness (of the underlying

³⁷ Here Ivanycja is apparently confusing (or oversimplifying) attributive and predicative agreement. It is worth pointing out that *-no/-to* is only predicative, meaning that *posijane žyto* (regardless of constituent order) can mean either ‘sowed rye’ or ‘[the] rye is sowed’, while *žyto posijano* (again, regardless of order) can only mean ‘[the] rye is sowed’. This statement is based on the current state of affairs: Forms ending in *-no* and *-to* can only be non-agreeing. Cf. Shevelov 1969 and Synjavs’kyj 1967 and ANN regarding how this might not have been the case even as late as early this century.

object), is apparently somewhat correlated to NP-V order; see ANN Fici Giusti 1992b, Klimonow 1960, and Synjavs'kyj 1967 for a broader discussion of word order in *-no/-to* clauses.

- Ivčenko, M[akar] P. (1955) *Čyslivnyky ukrajins'koji movy* [Ukr quantifiers (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Vydavnictvo Kyjivs'koho deržavnoho universytetu. [Michigan: 891.795 I93 chy] Numerous *-no/-to* exx. (95–96) in which the underlying object is a (numerically) quantified NP (also discussed in Billings 1995). Cites Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij [1902].
- Ivić, Milka. (1962) “Kategorija ‘MAN-Sätze’ u slovenskim jezicima” [The category called *man-Sätze* [‘(Ger) one-sentences’] in Slavic languages (Sr)]. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 7: 93–98. [Florida: 378.4971 BMf v. 7 1962–62] Includes Eng summary (97–98). A survey of constructions in Slavic with the same meaning as a Ger *man* NP, usually referred to as “*pro arb*” in generative works.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. (1900) “Beiträge zur slavischen Syntax” [Contributions to Slavic syntax (Ger)]. *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische classe* 46: 1–88. [Wien]. [Princeton: 0912.934.6 v.45–46] Some *-no/-to* exx on 21–22.
- Jaworska, Ewa. (1986) “Prepositional phrases as subjects and objects”. *Journal of linguistics* 22: 355–74. Jaworska uses Pol *-no/-to* exx in her discussion of “inherent case” (371).
- Jedlins'ka, U. Ja. (1961) “Vyražennja prysudka za dopomohoju form na *-no, -to*” [Expressing predicates with the help of forms in *-no/-to* (Ukr)]. *Pytannja istoryčnoho syntaksysu ukrajins'koji movy. Na materialy lystiv Bohdana Xmel'nyc'koho* [Questions of historical Ukr syntax. Based on material of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's letters (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Vyd-vo Akademiji nauk URSR. [Princeton: 30293.489] In addition to 14th-century (and later) Ukr exx, Jedlins'ka discusses *-no/-to* exx formed from impf verb stems, and describes them as Polonisms (citing Bulaxovskij 1948).
- Jodłowski, Stanislaw and W. Taszycki. (1946/1968) *Słownik ortograficzny i prawidła pisowni polskiej* [Orthographic dictionary and rules of written Pol (Pol)]. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 7th ed. [Harvard: 3286.65.28] [Previous editions: (1946) Torun, 4th ed. (1955) Wrocław, 5th ed. (1958), 6th ed. (1967); most recent ed.: 13th ed. (1990).] Examples of the subjunctive particle *by* with *-no/-to* clauses in Pol (130).
- Kallas, Krystyna. (1974) *Formalnogramatyczna klasyfikacja zdań pojedynczych dzisiejszej polszczyzny pisanej* [A formal-grammatical classification of simple sentences of contemporary written Pol (Pol)]. (= *Bydgoskie towarzystwo naukowe. Prace wydziału nauk humanistycznych, Seria B, 10.*) Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe. [Yale: PG6375.K34] §IV.B.1 (76–81) discusses Pol *-no/-to*. Cf. also the appendices, where *-no/-to* clauses appear to be characterized as having a *fundamentum* unadorned by other structure

(Appendix B, Superclasses 2.0.1, 2.0.1.1, p. 126; Appendix C, type 20.1, on a fold-out leaf following 131).

- Kański, Zbigniew. (1985) "On the semantic difference between participial and 'reflexive' passives". *Linguistica Silesiana* 7: 33–45. [Princeton: P9.L49 v.7]

A primarily semantic differentiation of passives formed from participles and "reflexive" verbs as their predicates.
- Kański, Zbigniew. (1986) *Arbitrary reference and reflexivity. A generative study of the Polish pronoun się and its English equivalents*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu śląskiego. (= *Prace Uniwersytetu śląskiego w Katowicach*, 820.) [Berkeley: PG6231.K358 1986]

Although there are no direct references to *-no/-to* constructions in this and other works by this author, they all deal with the syntactic and especially the semantic relationship between passivoid reflexive structures and their impersonal counterparts that have come to be used with acc underlying objects and transitive verbs. Thus, the development of these structures may well be parallel to that of *-no/-to* structures, with the same requirement of the (otherwise optional) human interpretation of the predicates involved.
- Kański, Zbigniew. (1991) "Impersonal constructions as a strategy for second-order predication". M. Kefer and J. van der Auwera, eds. *Meaning and grammar. Cross-linguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 95–121. [Columbia: GLX P204 .M4 1991]

A treatment of the related construction in *-sie* in Pol. See ANN Christensen 1993 for exx of this construction.
- Kardela, Henryk. (1985) *A grammar of English and Polish reflexives*. Lublin: Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Wydział Humanistyczny. [Arizona St.: PE1261.K27x]

On separate rules for deriving passive and *-no/-to* forms (95–97).
- Karskij [= Karski], E. F. (1956) *Belorusy; Jazyk belorusskogo naroda* [The Belarusians: The language of the Belarusian people (Rus)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, v. 2–3. [Princeton: 3023.971.52 v.2–3]

Many exx of *-no/-to* in older Br (317ff).
- Karskij, E. (1962) *Trudy po belorusskomu i drugim slavjanskim jazykam*. [Works on Belarusian and other Slavic languages (Rus)] Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR. [Harvard: 3285.485]

One very early ex, ca. 1263, from the Lawrentian Chronicle: *poruč eno že bys jemu straža ...* 'handed over_[–AGR] EMPH AUX to him guard_{(ANIM)ACC.SG}' (68).
- Keenan, E. and A. Timberlake. (1985) "Predicate formation rules in universal grammar". *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 4: 123–38. [Princeton: P21.W472 v.4–5]

An early generative approach to various passivoid phenomena, namely, a phenomenon in Li akin to Slavic *-no/-to*.
- Kempf, Zdzisław. (1978) *Próba teorii przypadków*. Opole: Opolskie towarzystwo przywació-l nauk., cz. 1, 125. [N. Carolina: P253.K4 cz.1]

- Kipka, Peter F. (1989) “Impersonals and inflection in Polish”. I. Laka and A. Mahajan, eds. *Functional heads and clause structure*. (= MIT working papers in linguistics, 10.) Cambridge, MA: Dept. of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT. [Princeton: P291.F863 1989]

An ingenious approach to the *-no/-to* problem (and others) in Pol, using relatively recent Chomskyan theory. We summarize Kipka’s arguments. He draws the distinction that *-no/-to* predicates “can occur in the past tense only [sic]” (137). He points out that certain verbs, namely *być* ‘be’ cannot undergo *-no/-to* (cf. Dziwirek 1994: 188–89 for a slight correction to this statement; cf. also Szwejkowska 1929 for a Pol-dialect ex with the *-no/-to* form of ‘be’: *byto*). Kipka recognizes as well that *-no/-to* is not completely passive in that “the construction has an ‘agentive’ feel to it”, also recognizing that “in true Polish (or English) passives the ‘object’ is raised into subject position and acquires Nominative Case” (boldface ours—LB/JM; 137, fn. 2). Following Chomsky’s (1981) Case-absorption proposal, Kipka “assume[s that] passive participles cannot assign Case to their direct objects, hence movement occurs in standard passive sentences” (147; cf. also Borsley 1988 on Pol, as well as Babby 1989 and Sobin 1985 on the related Ukr construction, and their apparently independent conclusion that Case-absorption cannot be a universal absolute).

“Therefore, in [*jedzono cebule* ‘eaten_[-AGR] onion_{(FEM)ACC.SG}’], the final vowel ‘-o’ must be acting so as to restore the Case assigning properties of the passive participle {[fn. 12:] One mechanism for this is to assume that ‘czyta-’ is a verb, ‘czytan-’ (passive participle modulo agreement) is a verbal adjective [...] and that ‘czytano’ is again verbal. Upon becoming a ‘resurrected verb’—a term suggested to me by S. J. Keyser—verbal powers, like that of assigning Accusative Case to direct objects, are once again available from the lexicon.}. [...] Suppose the ‘-o’ [in *-no/-to*] is generated under AGR [...]. Since ‘-o’ is invariable and thus incapable of showing any agreement, it mandates a VP which disallows any NP in its Spec {[fn. 14:] Such an NP would climb to Spec of AGR, and here agreement would fail.}. The passive participle is just such a form. However, to stop the object from moving to Spec, the object must be Case-marked. To ensure this, the passive participle stem must adjoin to ‘-o’, so that it can become verbal and assign Accusative Case (via its trace). The whole verb now moves to I, where tense checking will take place. The only option for I is [+Past], since this is the only option for passive participles” (147, incl. fnn 12 and 14, shown in braces).

In all, this paper is a fresh look at the Pl *-no/-to* data, unencumbered by the literature to date on the overall issue.³⁸

- Klemensiewicz, Zenon. (1974) *Historia języka polskiego* [History of Pol (Pol)]. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe. [Rutgers: ALEX PG6075.K55 1974]

A very interesting review (420–23) of an argument between a writer and an editor in the 17th century about the grammaticality or stylistic correctness of the *-no/-to* construction, with *exx*.

³⁸ It is somewhat surprising that Kipka 1989 does not mention Sobin 1985, especially considering both authors (and the publications they contributed to) are affiliated with the same department.

- Klemensiewicz, Z., T. Lehr-Spławiński, and S. Urbanczyk. (1965) *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego* [Historical grammar of Pol (Pol)]. Warsaw: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe. [Penn.: PG6101.K5 1965]

A brief treatment of acc-assigning *-no/-to* and *się* constructions in Pol (432–35).
Some older *-no/-to* exx with overt copula *było* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ (433–34).
- Klimonow, W. (1959) “Aspekt i czas w konstrukcjach imiesłowo-biernych w języku polskim” [Aspect and tense in passive-participle constructions in Pol (Pol)]. *Poradnik językowy* 3–4: 132–47. [Warsaw.] [Princeton: 3043.735 1959]

No discussion of *-no/-to* per se, just temporal/aspectual properties of Pol agreement-participial passives.
- Klimonow, W. (1960) “Konstrukcje imiesłowo-beirne z imiesłowem niedokonanym w języku polskim” [Passive-participial constructions with an imperfective participle in Pol (Pol)]. *Poradnik językowy* 5: 207–17. [Warsaw.] [Princeton: 3043.735 1960]

Like Klimonow 1959, this article does not treat *-no/-to*, but does touch briefly on impf “reflexive” passives in Rus: *Kniga čitaetsja mal čikom* ‘book_{(FEM)NOM.SG} reads_{(V)3.SG.REFL} boy_{(MASC)INST.SG}’ (cf. Rouhier-Willoughby 1993 for more discussion) and Pol: *książka się drukuje* ‘book_{(FEM)NOM.SG} REFL prints_{(V)3.SG}’ versus *drukują się książki* ‘prints_{(V)3.SG} REFL book_{(FEM)ACC.SG}’.³⁹ Note, incidentally, the differing orders of these Pol exx. Various other such differentiations have been observed; cf. ANN Apresjan and Páll 1982, Fici Giusti 1992b, Ivanyčja 1925, Synjavs’kyj 1967, and Zatovkaňuk 1979 for other such observations based on data in various *-no/-to* languages.
- Knjažyns’kyj, A. (1934) “Dijeprykmetnyky ukrajins’koji movy” [Ukr participles (Ukr)]. *Ridna mova. Naukovo-populjarnyj misjačnyk prysvjačenyj vyvčennju ukrajins’koji movy ta teoriji literatury* 2(1): col. 11–14; 2(2): col. 63–66. [Warsaw.] [NY Pub. Lib.: *ZAN-*Q929]

An early survey of participles in Ukr. Brief mention of *-no/-to* in 2(1): col. 12–13.
- Koneczna, Halina. (1955) “Od zdań podmiotowych do bezpodmiotowych” [From subject-full to subjectless sentences (Pol)]. *Poradnik językowy* 1: 281–92. [Princeton: 3043.735]

Some discussion on 292 comparing Rus sentences like (1) with their Pol equivalents in (2–3):

(1) Rus:	akademičeskaja	tradycja...	prervalas’
	academic	tradition _{(FEM)NOM.SG}	cut off _{(V)FEM.SG}
(2) Pol:	akademicka	tradycja	zoslala prervana
	academic	tradition _{(FEM)NOM.SG}	became cut off _{(PRT)FEM.SG}
(3) Pol:	akademicke	tradicje...	prervano
	academic	tradition _{(FEM)ACC.SG}	cut off _[-AGR]

³⁹ These are not the most perspicuous examples because the verb is 3rd sg in both. In the past tense (which shows gender and number instead of person and number) the verbs in this pair would be fem sg and neut sg, respectively, indicating agreement in only the former.

On the same page there is mention of Pol *sie* clauses with either nom or acc NPs. Cf. ANN Christensen 1993 for further discussion.

- Koneczna, Halina. (1956a) “O budowie zdania ImćPana Paskowego słów kilkoro: 1. Imiesłowy na *-ac* a *-szy*” [A few words about sentence-construction of the honorable Mr Pasek: 1. Participles in *ac* and *-szy* (Pol)]. *Poradnik jazykowy* 8: 283–92. [Harvard: Philol 620.12]

See ANN Koneczna 1956b. Interesting dialectological datum, in which an apparent *-ne/-te* (neut sg agreeing) form is conjoined with several *-no/-to* _[-AGR] predicates in the same clause (287).

- *Koneczna, Halina. (1956b) “O budowie zdania ImćPana Paskowego słów kilkoro: 2. Orzeczenia na *-no, -to*” [A few words about sentence-construction of the honorable Mr Pasek: 2. Participles in *-no/-to* (Pol)]. *Poradnik jazykowy* 9: 345–56. [Penn.: PG6001.P65]

This is one of a series of articles by this author that use the 17th-century diary of Jan Chryzostom Pasek as corpus for a thorough traditional (mostly synchronic) description of Pol syntax of that period. The Pasek diary is particularly useful in that, unlike most (literary) works of the period, it is written in a style that should approximate the Pol colloquial idiom of the times, as a day-to-day report of military activities. Koneczna argues, using numerous *exx*, that *-no/-to* constructions in Pasek’s diary are unmistakably active. She supports this conclusion with a replacement test: only a fraction of *-no/-to* sentences in the text can be replaced or paraphrased by cognate participial-passive constructions. Koneczna does not comment on the status of one *ex* she cites, in which the agent is in a PP (which is not allowed in modern Pol). The *ex* is all the more interesting since it follows other occurrences of *-no/-to* predicates in the same (matrix) sentence with a switch of an agent from some indefinite set of Pasek’s army suppliers to the hostile Swedes (again, such a switch would be disallowed in modern Polish):

Jak noc przysła, dopiero lepiej **opatrzono** nasze wojsko,
when night came then better supply_[-AGR] our army_{(NEUT)ACC.SG}

koszów **nasprowadzano, ponasypywano, armate**
baskets_{(MASC)ACC} brought_[-AGR] heaped dirt_[-AGR] cannon_{(FEM)ACC.SG}

srowadono a wszystko cichusieńko, bo w dzień trudno tego było
brought_[-AGR] and all [this] silently, for at daytime difficult this was
robić, gdyż **rażono** bardzo od szwedów.
to do for attacked_[-AGR] severely from [the] Swedes

[Koneczna 1956b: 345, citing line 71, ch. 72 of Pasek’s diary]

While the presence of acc case (clear on fem sg nouns like *armate* ‘cannon’) and the absence of a copula in the source material should argue for the non-passive status of these predicates (cf. the criteria in Maling 1993), the agentive PP in *od* ‘from’ (since replaced by PPs in *przez* ‘through’ in modern Pol) and the easy reference-switch should weaken their unequivocally active status. Koneczna states explicitly that she understands “all Pasek’s uses of *-no/-to* forms to be active predicates of subjectless sentences” (347). The *exx* that Koneczna’s paraphrase test rendered “ambivalent”

(i.e., paraphrasable by participial passives with agreement on the predicate) include those with a) an infinitive argument (which can be paraphrased by means of the structure copula + agreeing neut sg past participle in *-ne/-te* + infinitive); b) nominal arguments of neut gender (which exhibit no distinction between their nom and acc forms); c) nominal arguments headed by numbers or measure-nouns (again, because of nom vs. acc non-distinctness; d) plural nominal arguments in the gen case which survive under such a paraphrase; e) no object argument (again, paraphrasable in terms of the neut copula + past participle); f) finite clausal arguments subordinated by a *-no/-to* predicate (paraphrasable by the copular forms to the effect of '[it] was_{NEUT.SG} said_{NEUT.SG} that + clause'). No other *-no/-to* constructions are thus paraphrasable and must be understood to be purely active. Koneczna also speculates that the development of active vs. passive use of the (former) past participle may be related to the slow disappearance of the old aorist and impf forms, and the gradual replacement of simple past forms by compound forms copula + participle (in masc sg *-l*, fem sg *-la*, neut sg *-lo*). The passive participle in *-n/-t*, *-na/-ta*, and *-no/-to*, respectively, could follow the same pattern of the compound but active predicate. Another process that might have facilitated the development of active-reading *-no/-to* forms is what the author calls "semantic repartition" after the replacement of simple past passive participles in masc sg \emptyset , fem sg *-a*, and neut sg *-o* by the compound ones in *-y*, *-a*, *-e*, respectively. The effects of this repartition can be seen in modern Polish: thus both *powiedziane ci bylo, że ...* 'said_{NEUT.SG} you_{DAT} was_{NEUT.SG} that...' (= 'it was said to you that...') and *powiedziano ci, że ...* 'said_[-AGR] you_{DAT} that ...' (= same meaning) are possible with clausal subordinates or, less commonly, with infinitives. Koneczna gives some examples of modern Pol dialects, historically in contact with Ger or Rus, where the copular and agreeing form would be used instead of the *-no/-to* "unpassive" standard. In the final section she compares the form to those in some other Slavic languages.⁴⁰

- Koneczna, Halina. (1957) "O budowie zdania ImćPana Paskowego" słów kilkoro: 10. Zakres użycia zdań jednoczłonowych" [A few words about sentence-construction of the honorable Mr Pasek: 10. The usage of unisegmental sentences (Pol)]. *Poradnik językowy* 3: 110–25. [Penn.: (VPL) PG6001.P65]

See ANN Koneczna (1956b). Some mention of pleonastic *to* 'that' and (dialectal) *ono* (118); *-no/-to* exx (119, 121).
- Kopečný, František. (1958) *Základy české skladby* [Fundamentals of Czech syntax (Cz)]. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství. [Princeton: 3037.537]

Possible *-no/-to* data in Cz, none of which assigns unmistakably acc case.
- Krasnowolski, Antoni. (1897/1909) *Systematyczna składnia języka polskiego* [Systematic syntax of Pol (Pol)]. Warsaw: Arct/Kraków: S. A. Krzyżanowski, 2nd ed. [Berkeley:

⁴⁰ We were unable to locate a copy of this article ourselves in time. Zbigniew Kan'ski was kind enough to send us this annotation.

PG3631.K9] [1st ed., Warszawa: Drukarnia Estetyczna K. Sierpińskiego [Michigan: GRAD \891.855\K91sy\1897a].]

A few *-no/-to* exx, with little commentary (24).

- Křížková, Helena (1962) “K tzv. neosobnímu pasívu v slovanských jazycích” [On the so-called impersonal-passive in the Sl languages (Cz)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 31: 317–22. [Harvard: PSlav 78.20 v.31]

Investigates several passive(-like) phenomena in Slavic, incl. *-no/-to* in Pol, accusative constructions with *się* in Pol (cf. ANN Christensen 1993 for exx), and adversity-impersonal constructions in Rus (cf. ANN Babby 1994b for exx) and Sk: *brata zabilo v hore* ‘My brother was killed in the forest’ (319). Argues that the common trait to all of these is the displacement of the **subject-agent** (= external argument in Babby’s formulation).
- Kryński, Adam A. (1917) *Gramatyka języka polskiego* [grammar of Pol (Pol)]. Warsaw: Księgarnia M. Arcta. [Syracuse: PG6111.K78 1917]

A brief reference to the semantic relation between Pol *-no/-to* and (past-tense) 3rd pl verbs with an independent “indefinite-personal” reading (179).
- Kućanda, D. (1977) “Funcionalni pristup analizi pasiva u hrvatskom”. *Suvremena lingvistika* 34: 175–84. [Columbia: P25.S84]

The only impersonal passives in South Slavic are of the reflexive type (analogous to the Pol exx in ANN Christensen 1993). This article and the works cited in it (not listed here) are an introduction to the reflexive passives in Sr-Cr. The author adduces evidence that reflexive impersonal sentences with an acc-marked patient have a large number of typical passive properties: 1) passive morphology; 2) underlying semantic transitivity; 3) detopicalization of agent; and 4) topicalization of patient. On the basis of this evidence Kućanda argues that it is not justified to describe them as an active construction as is the case in the literature theretofore. Cf. similar argumentation—to support the non-passivehood of Pol *-no/-to* clauses—in ANN Maling 1993.
- Kulyk, Borys M. (1965) “Bezsobovi rečennja, holovnyj člen jakyx vyraženyj bezsobovoju formoju na *-no, -to*” [Impersonal sentences, the main member (= predicate) of which is represented by an impersonal form in *-no/-to* (Ukr)]. *Syntaksys.* (= *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins’koji literaturnoji movy, 2.*) Kyjiv: Radjans’ka škola, 2nd ed., 95–96 (§49). [Penn. St.: PG3814.K8 chastyna2]

A concise but complete summary of the facts of Ukr *-no/-to*, incl. inst ‘by’-phrases, the use of overt copulas *bulo* and *bude*, and adversity-impersonal constructions with *-no/-to*. Cf. also Arvat 1975, Babby 1994b, Filin 1972, and Kurylo 1930.
- Kuraszkiewicz, Władisław. (1934) *Gramoty halicko-wolyńskie XIV–XV wieku. Studium językowe* [14th- and 15th-century Galician Wołyń texts. A linguistic study (Pol)]. Kraków: Gebethner and Wolff. [Cornell: PG 3819.K96]

On the collapse of *ъ* and *o* (under certain environments) and the erroneous interpretation of endings in *-ъ* as participial *-to* forms. Cf. also Shevelov 1969: 176.

- Kurylo, O. B. (1922/1960) *Uvahy do sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoju movy* [Comments on contemporary literary Ukr (Ukr)]. 5th ed. Toronto: Novi dni. [Princeton: 30239.551] [Previous editions: 1922 Kyjiv (reviewed in Sulyma 1923); 1924; 1925 Kyjiv; 1942 L'viv and Xarkiv].

Some mention of *-no/-to* on 25, and again on 35–36, where Kurylo painstakingly explains that inst ‘by’-phrases should not be allowed in *-no/-to* clauses, but that inst of means is allowed. This is a complicated explanation, because Kurylo lacks the notion of semantic/thematic roles to distinguish between the two primary uses of the (prepositionless) inst case in Ukr. She ends up using the interrogatives *kym* ‘who_{INST}’ and *čym* ‘what_{INST}’ to render the intended distinction between ‘by whom’ and ‘with/using what’, but admits that certain words, like *vojskom* ‘army_{(NEUT)INST.SG}’, can have either the meaning ‘by (the) army’ (ruled out in *-no/-to* clauses according to her) and ‘by-mean-of/using the army’ (allowed by her), presumably because the agent/causer—i.e., the army’s commander—is not expressed.⁴¹ Kurylo also mentions that a prepositional phrase in *vid* ‘from’ is attested in place of an inst NP (listing only canonical, or agreeing passives, as well as nominalizations in *-nnja*; 36).⁴² She also treats pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ and *ce* ‘this’ (citing Potebnja 1899 and Ovsjanniko-Kulikovskij 1900 in fn. 83; 96–97). Some exx of overt pleonastic *vono* ‘it’, most interestingly: *Ščo vono za nečysta syła zavelas' na nyvi?*⁴³ ‘What in the blazes has begun to form in the field?’⁴⁴ Some more interesting pleonastic-*vono* exx:

- (1) Jak by z kym sisty xliba zzisty, promovyt' [!]
 how SUBJ with whom sit down_{INF} bread_{GEN} eat up_{INF} speak_{INF}
 slovo, — to vono b xoč i jak nebud' na sim sviti,
 word_{(NEUT)ACC.SG} then it_{NOM.SG} SUBJ just even somehow on this earth
 a vse b taky jakos' žylos'.
 but nonetheless_{SUBJ} somehow live_{NEUT.SG.REFL}

Approximate translation: ‘If only it were possible to sit down with someone, have some bread [together], have a chat, then it would just somehow on this earth nonetheless be livable.’

⁴¹ Cf. also ANN Siewierska 1988 for a similar discussion of ‘soldiers’ as agent or means.

⁴² In fact, ‘by’-phrases are allowed in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses; Kurylo appears to have been resisting their use prescriptively. This book was written during the phase-in period earlier this century.

⁴³ Kurylo (1922/1960: 96) cites this example from: Bilyk, I. (1870) *Narodnyja juž norusskija skazki*. Kiev': [Izdat' I. Rudc'enko V' tipografii E. Ja. Fedorova], vyp. 2. [Stanford: GR203 U5B5 v. 1-2]. Kurylo cites two examples on 96 from: Gnědič', P. A. (1916) *Skazki, legendy, razskazy*. (= *Materiály po narodnoj slovesnosti Poltavskoj gubernii. Romenskij uč'zd'*, 4.) Poltava: Izdanie Poltavskoj Uč'noj Arxivnoj komisii. [Berkeley: GR203.U5M37 1915 v4 MAIN]. Unfortunately, neither example (*De vono taka škola* ‘Where is there such a school?’ and *Pidu podyvljus', xto vono take* ‘I’ll go see who on earth that is?’, reportedly on 15 and 9, respectively) appears on the cited pages.

⁴⁴ Note that our English gloss uses a separate cleft structure. There is no direct evidence of such a separate clause structure in the Ukr example. Cf., however, ANN Synjavs'kyj 1922, where we suggest, following Synjavs'kyj’s less explicit suggestion, that there may be a cleft structure. Recall that the present-tense, 3rd-sg copula *je* in Ukr is not obligatory, which may account for the lack of an overt predicate in such a cleft-clause construction.

[96; emphasis ours—LB/JM]⁴⁵

In this ex, although there is a neut sg noun in the preceding text (*slovo* ‘word’), *vono* ‘it’ nonetheless appears to be pleonastic. See discussion of this in ANN Babby 1989 and Billings 1993a; 1993b.

(2) **Vono** xo[tja]t´ zo mnoju on ščo zrobyty.
 it_{NOM.SG} want_{3.PL} with me there! what_{ACC} do_{INF}
 ‘So that’s what they want to do with me.’ [96]⁴⁶

(3) Vono pomiž´ narodom´ plentalos´, da j
 it_{NOM.SG} among people trudged along_{(V)NEUT.SG.REFL} and even
 bačylo dovoli.
 saw_{(V)NEUT.SG} a lot [98]

(4) Ščo vono za mara taka.
 what_{NOM} it_{NOM} ghost/phantom_{NOM.SG} such_{(ADJ)NOM.SG} [96]

One final ex of what Kurylo refers to as an acc pleonastic (shown in boldface):

(5) **Xto joho** znaje, ščo **vono** vahu maje
 who_{NOM.SG} it/him_{ACC.SG} knows_{3.SG} what it_{NOM.SG} worth_{(FEM)ACC.SG} has_{3.SG}
 dlja zytja: čy vlasne xazjajstveckō dopadne, čy ota
 for life_{(NEUT)GEN.SG} or own household_{(NEUT)NOM.SG} one’s own or that
 pormitnist´— ce ne vhadno.
 wisdom_{(FEM)NOM.SG} this_{ACC} NEG guessed_[–AGR] [97]
 ‘Who knows what has mor importance [lit. ‘weight’] for life: a household of
 one’s own or that wisdom—whether it’s this is unknowable [lit.
 ‘unguessed’].’⁴⁷

See the discussion of pleonastic NPs in ANN Babby 1989 and Billings 1993a; 1993b.

- Kurylo, O. B. (1930) “Pro ukrajins´ki bezpidmetovi konstrukciji z prysudkovymy dijepryketnykamy na *-no, -to* ” [On Ukr subjectless constructions with predicative participles in *-no/-to* (Ukr)]. *Zbirnyk sekciji hramatyky ukrajins´koi movy 1: 1–39*. [Kyjiv: Naukovo-doslidnyj instytut movoznavstva pri Vseukrajins´kij akademiji nauk.] 1970 photorepr. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor. [Harvard: Philol 645.32.15 (1)]

⁴⁵ This example (from Taras Ševčenko, *Kobzar´*) is cited from: Hrinčenko, Borys [= B. Hrynčenko, Boris Grinčenko], ed. *Slovar´ ukrajinskago jazyka, sobrannyj redakciej žurnala “Kievskaja starina”*. Kiev, 1907–09, v. 1, 253. [Repr. Kyjiv: Vyd-vo Akademii nauk URSR, 1958–59, 4 v. [Princeton: 30293.481]]. This Ukr-Rus dictionary is not only useful for searching possibly archaic words, but is also meticulous about citing its sources, be they from literary works (identifying the work, edition and page) or dialectological-ethnological-survey data (identifying the place where elicited).

⁴⁶ This example is also from Hrinčenko 1907–09 (1: 253); see the previous fn. Unfortunately, no original source is provided. Portions within square brackets show the form in the original.

⁴⁷ This example unfortunately does not appear where Kurylo (1922/1960: 97) cites it: Ol. Šramenko, ed. (1914) *Ukrajins´kyj etnografičnyj zbirnyk*. Kyjiv: Ukrajins´ke naukove tovarystvo, v. 1, 39. [Center for Research Libraries RLIN ID: ILRC11208069–S]. Because we were unable to locate the original passage, it is impossible to determine whether the two pronominals *vono* and *ce*, bold-faced in (5) are also pleonastic. That is, if there is no recent neut sg NP for these to refer to, then they are also likely pleonastics.

Rather than attempt to annotate this extensive treatment of Ukr *-no/-to*, we simply list some section topics: origins (pp. 1–2); the meaning of predicative *-no/-to* forms with direct objects (incl. adversity-impersonals) (5–7); the overt copulas *je (jest)* ‘is_{3.SG(EMPH)}’, *bulo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’, *bude* ‘will-be_{3.SG}’ (10–15); ‘by’-phrases (bare inst NPs or PPs in *vid* ‘from’) (23–29). An appendix on subjectless constructions of the type *potrebu zadovol’njajet’sja* ‘need_{(FEM)ACC.SG} satisfies_{(V)3.SG.REFL}’. Such constructions are well documented in Pol (cf., for example, Christensen 1993; 1994), but far less so in Ukr (see, however, Bukatevič et al 1958: 303; Jagić 18900 21; Potebnja 1899/1968: 339; and Shevelov and Veržbyc’kyj 1951: 64). All of Kurylo’s exx of this type are formed from impf verb stems. They all appear to be passives (and not middles) (34–36).

- Kuz’mina, Irina B. and Elena B. Nemčenko. (1962) “O sintaksičeskix različijax russkix govorov (po materialam, sobranym dlja sostavlenija dialektologičeskix atlasov russkogo jazyka)” [Syntactic distinctions of the Rus dialects (based on materials collected for the compilation of Russian-language dialect atlases) (Rus)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 31(1): 8–26. [Princeton: 3013.858 v.31 (1962)]

Precursor to these authors’ later works; see below. Like Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1971, this work has maps of the NR *-no/-to* distribution. Cf. especially Map 5 (18–19; discussed briefly on 20).

- [Kuz’mina, Irina B. and Elena B. Nemčenko.] (1964/1965) “Sintaksis” [Syntax (Rus)]. R. Avanesov and V. Orlova, eds. *Russkaja dialektologija* [Rus dialectology (Rus)]. Moscow: Nauka, 2nd ed., 173–200 (ch. 3). [Princeton: 3023.114.2] [1st ed., Moskva: Nauka [Ctr. for Research Libs.: D-14881]; Eng translation of 2nd ed. (ca. 1965): *Russian dialectology* (= Research & microfilm publications, 1163.), [Arlington, VA]: U.S. Joint Publications Research Service [Photocopy, New York, N.Y. (ca. 1965): CCM Information Corp. [Columbia: PG2711 .A41513 1965a].].]

A relatively straightforward typology of *-no/-to* phenomena in Rus dialects (190):

1. participles without the etymologically reflexive particle *-sja* formed from impf verbs: *Po samomu beregu ideno* ‘along very [river]bank_{DAT.SG} walked_[-AGR]’;
 2. participles without *-sja* formed from pf verbs: *U psa ubeženo kuda-to* ‘by dog_{GEN.SG} ran away_[-AGR] to somewhere’;
 3. participles with *-sja* formed from verbs “with grammatically expressed intransitivity” of pf or (more rarely) impf aspect: *Bylo zapisanos’ v školu-to u menja* ‘was_{3.SG} signed up_[-AGR] into the school by me’; *Na reke nikogda ne kupanos’* ‘at river never not bathed_{[-AGR]REFL}’; various other data through 192.⁴⁸
- Kuz’mina, Irina B. and Elena B. Nemčenko. (1971) *Sintaksis pričastnyx form v russkix govorax* [Syntax of participial forms in Rus dialects (Rus)]. Moscow: Nauka. [Princeton: 3021.5469]

The primary work on NR variants of the *-no/-to* construction. See especially the maps that accompany this volume, showing the general distribution of *-no/-to* and

⁴⁸ This and many other works fail to gloss such dialect data into even standard Rus, making it difficult for us to provide accurate sentence glosses.

-nos' / -tos' (i.e., -no / -to + -sja, a combination not attested in standard Rus or, generally, in ESL; but attested in Pol, as *-no sie / -to sie*).

- Kuznecov, P. S. (1948) “Iz istorii skazuemostnogo upotreblenija stradatel'nyx pričastij v ruskom jazyke. Doktorskaja dissertacija. (avtoreferat)” [From the history of the predicative use of passive participles in Rus. Doctoral dissertation. (abstract) (Rus)]. *Doklady i soobščeniya filologičeskogo fakul'teta MGU* 6: 37–39. [Moskovskij un-t. Filologičeskij fakul'tet. *Doklady i soobščeniya*.] [Michigan: (GL) 805.M8494]⁴⁹

Some mention of the synchronic (geographical) and diachronic diversity of *-no / -to* constructions in Rus.

- Kuznecov, P. S. (1949) “K voprosu o skazuemostnom upotreblenii pričastij i deepričastij v russkix govorex” [On the predicative use of participles and verbal adverbs in Rus dialects (Rus)]. *Materialy i issledovanija po ruskoj dialektologii* 3: 59–83. Moscow/Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR. [Cornell: PG 2701.A3515; Harvard 3284.115.10]

Some exx:⁵⁰ *Da upito bylo u vora Vasil'ja ne uedeno. I u minja do Kievi dā ne vymano, A j Vladimira v oči dā ne vymano.*⁵¹

- Kuznecov, P. S. (1951/1960) *Ruskaia dialektologija. Učebnik dlja učitel'skix institutov* [Rus dialectology. Textbook for teacher institutes (Rus)]. Moscow: Gos. učebno-pedagogičeskoe izd-vo Ministerstva prosvěščenija RSFSR, 3rd ed. [Syracuse: PG2711.K88 1960] [Previous editions: 1951, 1954 (both with same publisher).]

A very clear description of the various *-no / -to* phenomena in Rus dialects: “*U volkov tut ideno* [‘by wolves_{GEN} here walked_[-AGR]’] means not just ‘Wolves walked here’, but ‘Wolves walked and left a trace which remains until now’; *U nego uexano udit'* [‘by him traveled away_[-AGR] to fish_{INF}’] means ‘he went fishing and now he is not at home’ [i.e., the perfect—LB/JM]” (121–22). Kuznecov also mentions that adding *bylo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ renders the pluperfect (cf. also Matveenko 1962b). A related construction: *Ežy u kavo-ta priněšči* [‘hedgehogs_{NOM(?)PL} by somebody [having] brought_{VERBAL-ADV}⁵²’] means either ‘hedgehogs have been brought by somebody’ or ‘someone brought hedgehogs’ (122).

⁴⁹ The dissertation itself is apparently held at the Rossijskaja gosudarstvennaja biblioteka (formerly the Lenin Library) in Moscow, according to Doros 1975, which cites: ***Kuznecov, P. S. [no date given] *Iz istorii skazuemostnogo upotreblenija stradatel'nyx pričastij v ruskom jazyke*. “Maszynopsis pracy w Bibliotece im. Lenina w Moskwie.” [Transliteration of Russian citation modified—LB/JM].

⁵⁰ We do not attempt to gloss these examples. They are cited by Kuznecov (1949: 68) from: Hil'ferding [Gil'ferding], A. F. (1940) *Onežskie byliny*. Moscow/Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 3rd ed., v. 3, 335. [Princeton: 3026.462 v.3]

⁵¹ Other examples come from the following sources: Eremin', S. A. (1922) *Opisanie ulomskogo i baučskogo govorov Č'erepoveckogo uežda Novgorodskogo gubernii*. (= *Sbornik ORJaS AN SSSR*, 99(5).) [Princeton: 3020.116 v.99]; Mansikka, V. (1913) “O govore Šenkurskago uežda Arxangel'skoj gub.”. *Izvēstija otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 17(2): 86–144. [Princeton: 3020.116.2 ser.2 v.17, pt.1-pt.2].

⁵² The parentheses in the preceding glosses represent our attempt at glossing these words. Specifically, we provide what the glosses would be in standard Rus. It is obvious from Kuznecov's paraphrases that this verbal form has a different function in this Rus dialect. The form *ežy* ‘hedgehogs’ is in the morphological nom but may be syntactically acc. Being animate, this noun in standard Rus usually takes the morphological gen form when assigned syntactic acc case.

- Leška, O. (1968) “K voprosu o kategorii zaloga v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke” [On the category of voice in contemporary literary Rus (Rus)]. *Jazykovedný sborník venovaný VI. slavistickému kongresu (= Acta facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Šafarikanae Prešovensis.)*, 81–87. [U. Illinois: 491.8 J3392 STX]

A somewhat strange argument on 85 for the non-passive-hood of Rus participial constructions in *-n/-t-*.
- Levyc'kyj, Josif [Joseph Lewicki]. (1834) *Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien* [Grammar of Ruthenian (= Ukr) or Lesser-Russian (= Ukr) in Galicia (Ger)]. Przemysl. [Penn: 491.77 L58]

One of the earliest treatments of Ukr *-no/-to*: Referred to as “Unbestimmte Art” (145). Some discussion as well in §49, “Von den unpersönlichen Zeitwörtern”: *skázano* ‘es ist gesagt’, *dáno* ‘es ist gegeben’. Note that the Ger glosses are passives, a reasonably reliable indication that this construction in Ukr had already departed from its Pol origins.
- Lewicki, Andzrej M. (1964) “Zdania wyrażające czynności i stany ludzkie bezosobicie (Klasyfikacja semantyczna)” [Sentences expressing human actions and conditions impersonally (A semantic classification) (Pol)]. *Prace filologiczne* 18(3): 311–21. [Princeton: 3013.734 v.18, pt.3]

Some *-no/-to* data on 319 discussed within a framework of other data (as described in the article’s title).
- Lewicki, Andzrej M. (1966) “Geneza struktur typu *podano herbatę*” [The genesis of structures of the type *podano herbatę* ‘served_[-ACC] tea_{(FEM)ACC.SG}’ (= ‘tea is served’) (Pol)]. *Poradnik jezykowy* 5: 203–07. [Princeton: 3043.735]

A rather thorough article on the issue at hand. Lewicki concludes that Pol *-no/-to* has lost its passive meaning (207). Cf. also ANN Maling 1993.
- Lobov, L.P. (1929) “Iz istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka” [Notes on the history of Rus (Rus)]. *Sbornik Obščestva istoričeskix, filosofskix i social'nyx nauk pri Permskom universitete*, vyp. 3, 167–92. [Illinois: FILM 914.787SB532]

Lists examples from the Pushkin (early-1800s) era of participial and similar predicates which do not agree with NPs that appear to be the subject. None of the exx, however, lists a morphologically unmistakably acc NP (cf. ANN Bulaxovskij 1939/1974; 1954 and Fici Giusti 1992b regarding OR exx of this kind).
- Loetzsch, Ronald [R. Löttsch], W. Fiedler, and K. Kostov. (1976) “Die Kategorie des zu einigen verwandten morfologischen Kategorien” [The category of *Genus verbi* in its relation to some related morphological categories (Rus)]. R. Löttsch and R. Ružička, eds. *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi. (= Studia grammatica, 13.)* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 139–52. [Penn: PF3025.S87 nr.13]

Examines the use of *-sja* (or its equivalents) in Slavic, concluding that Rus and Bg (in the impf) use *-sja* verbs with agents, while Pol expresses such agents without *sie*, but with an implicit agent understood. §1.4.1 (73–74), discusses Pol *-no/-to*. §1.4.2 discusses other Pol constructions with *sie*.

- Lomtev, Timofej P. (1956) *Grammatika belorusskogo jazyka. Posobie dlja un-tov i pedagogičeskix institutov* [Grammar of Bel. Textbook for universities and pedagogical institutes (Rus)]. Moscow: Gos. učebno-pedagogičeskoe izd-vo Ministerstva prosvěščenija RSFSR. [Princeton: 3023.971.61]

A brief mention of the *-no/-to* construction in Br (211–12).
- Los', Jan. (1923) "Sk ladnia" [Syntax (Pol)]. Tytus Benni et al. *Gramatyka jazyka polskiego* [Grammar of Pol (Pol)]. Cracow: Nakl. Polskiej akademji Umiejetności, 287–408 (ch. 5). [Duke: 491.855 G745]

A brief reference to using a *-no/-to* form in Pol with a "personal function" (335).
- Macjusovič, Ja. V. (1969) "O dvux sintaksičeskix konstrukcijax sovremennogo pol'skogo jazyka (predloženiya so skazuemym, vyražennym predikativnym pričastiem na *-o* ili bezličnym glagolom s vozvratnym mestoimeniem *si e*)" [On two syntactic constructions in modern Pol (sentences with predicates expressed using a participle in *-o* of using an impersonal verb with the reflexive pronoun *si e*) (Rus)]. Z. N. Strekalova, ed. *Issledovanija po pol'skomu jazyku. Sbornik statej*. Moscow: Nauka, 114–33. [Rutgers: ALEX PG6095.I8]

Concludes, inter alia, that Pol *-no/-to* clauses inherently include the meaning of a human doer.
- Makarova, L. I. (1956a) *Nekotorye osobennosti obrazovanija i upotreblenija stradatel'nyx pričastij prošedšego vremeni v russkix narodnyx govorax* [Some properties the formation and use of passive participles in Rus folk dialects (Rus)]. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Saratov Univ. [Harvard: 3284.50.115]

The discussion of Chapter 3 (pp. 11f in this abstract), includes various Rus-dialect data on *-no/-to*.⁵³
- Makarova, L. I. (1956b) "Nekotorye osobennosti predikativnogo upotreblenija kratkoj formy stradatel'nyx pričastij prošedšego vremeni v russkix narodnyx govorax" [Some properties of the predicative use of short-form, past-tense passive participles in Rus folk dialects (Rus)]. *Učěnye zapiski Balašovskogo gos. ped. in-ta. Istoriko-filologičeskaja serija* 1: 165–202. [Lib. of Congress: Reel Slavic S–3024 LA]

Plenty of data, often divided by region. Makarova notes that in *-no/-to* sentences like *ruku poraneno* 'hand_{(FEM)ACC.SG} injured_[–AGR]' the underlying object NP is usually pre-predicative in order, "i.e., the surface subject [*podlež aš č ee*] is usually put in that position. This evidence cannot be considered especially conclusive," Makarova adds, "for in Russian there is free word order, but nevertheless a tendency is observable in the language toward an order with the logical subject [*sub'ekt*] in initial position" (188). See also ANN Matveenکو 1961 for a sharp criticism of Makarova's observation.
- Makarova, L. I. (1956c) "Ob obrazovanii stradatel'nyx pričastij prošedšego vremeni v russkom jazyke (po materialam pamjatnikov)" [On the formation of past-tense passive

⁵³ Doros (1975: 97, 99) cites the actual dissertation, which we were unable to examine, apparently archived at the Rossijskaja gosudarstvennaja biblioteka (formerly the Lenin Library) in Moscow.

participles in Rus (based on extant texts) (Rus)]. *Učēnye zapiski Balašovskogo gos. ped. in-ta. Istoriko-filologičeskaja serija 1: 203–31. [Lib. of Congress: Reel Slavic S–3024 LA]*

A historical survey complementing Makarova 1956b and consecutive to it in the same issue. A rather extensive list of textual monuments.

- Makarova, L. I. (1957) “Nekotorye osobennosti obrazovanija stradatel’nyx pričastij prošedšego vremeni v russkix narodnyx govorax” [Some properties of the formation of past-tense passive participles in Rus folk dialects (Rus)]. *Učēnye zapiski Balašovskogo gos. ped. in-ta. Istoriko-filologičeskaja serija 2: 304–35. [Lib. of Congress: Reel Slavic S–3024 LA]*

More Rus-dialect data and discussion.

- Małecki, Antoni (1879) *Gramatyka historyczno-porównawcza j.ęzyka polskiego* [A historical-comparative grammar of Pol (Pol)]. Lwów: Nakładem autora [sic], v. 2. [Harvard: 3286.38]

Discussion of the use of overt auxiliaries with *-no/-to* sentences in older Pol (445).

- Maling, Joan. (1993) “Unpassives of unaccusatives”. Handout to talks given at Univ. of California-Irvine (January), Univ. of Massachusetts-Amherst (April), Helsinki Univ. (May), Univ. of Iceland (June).

Proposes a distinction between true syntactic passive and “unpassive” predicates as defined below:⁵⁴

Properties of true passives:

1. Expected case on underlying object is nom
2. Hence, agreement occurs
3. Overt ‘by’-phrase is allowed (albeit infrequent across human language)
4. No thematic restrictions on the understood subject—any subject of active voice can be in ‘by’-phrase (*przez PP* in Pol, *inst NP* in Ukr) of passive (‘by fire’, ‘by lightning’, etc.)
5. Typically occurs only on transitive verbs which take acc objects (passive morphology can attach to intransitive verbs in some languages, but not in English or generally in Slavic)

Properties of unpassives:

1. Expected case on underlying object is acc
2. Hence, no agreement with the underlying object
3. No overt agentive ‘by’-phrase is possible (Theta Criterion violation)
4. Only human subjects possible
5. No lexical restrictions other than human subject (hence, violating the 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law [1AEX]⁵⁵)

⁵⁴ Cf. the following regarding the Unaccusative Hypothesis: Perlmutter, David M. (1978) “Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis”. *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157–89.

⁵⁵ Cf. the following regarding the 1AEX: Perlmutter, David M. and Paul Postal (1984) “The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law.” D. Perlmutter and C. Rosen, eds. *Studies in Relational Grammar 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 81125.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 6. (In Slavic) gen of negation on underlying object not attested ⁵⁶ | 6. (In Slavic) gen of negation on underlying object |
| 7. Reflexive in underlying object NP not attested | 7. pro-arb subject can control reflexive in the underlying object |
| 8. Agent cannot control participial adjuncts | 8. pro-arb subject can control participial adjuncts ⁵⁷ |

Probably the clearest diagnostics have to do with the lexical restrictions (whether or not construction violates 1AEX) and control of reflexives. The later versions of this talk included exx of even ‘be’ in the *-no/-to* form: *przed wojna bywano w Grand Hotelu* ‘before war been_[_AGR, IMPF] in Grand Hotel’ (= ‘Before the war people would frequent the Grand Hotel.’). Cf. also Szwejkowska 1929, which reports the form *byto*, the *-no/-to* form of ‘be’, in border dialects of Pol near Lithuania (as reported in Kurylo 1930: 2, fn. 2). Cf. also Damborský 1967, which also features a list of criteria for distinguishing between agreeing passives and this construction (summarized in ANN).

- Maslov, Jurij S. (1949/1984) “K voprosu o proisxoždenii possessivnogo perfecta” [On the origin of the possessive perfect (Rus)]. *Očerki po aspektologii*. Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo un-ta, 1984, 224–48. [Princeton: PG159.M38] Reprinted from *Učenyje zapiski Leningradskogo gos. un-ta. Serija filologičeskix nauk* 14(97): 76–104, 1949. [Harvard: LSoc 3983.152 (97–98)]

An interesting look at PPs in u ‘at/by’ as so-called possessive-perfect constructions in Rus (primarily dialects).

- Maslov, Jurij S. (1988) “Resultative, perfect and aspect”. V. P. Nedjalkov, ed. *Typology of resultative constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 63–85. [Princeton: P293.4.T5713 1988]

Sections of particular interest to this bibliography: §2.2 “The actional perfect” (65–66); §3.2 “The actional perfect stops being an aspect” (68–69); §7.2.2 “Constructions with *n/t*-participles” (77–80); §8.1 “The possessive type” (80–83).

- Matthews, W. K. (1955) “Lithuanian constructions with neuter passive participles”. *Slavonic and East European review* 33(81): 350–71. [Princeton: 0901.S632]

An early treatment of this phenomenon, akin to Slavic *-no/-to*. See our discussion of this construction in ANN Babby (forthcoming).

- Matveenko, V. A. (1960) “Stradatel’no-bezličnyj oborot v govorax vostočno-slavjanskix jazykov” [The passive-impersonal construction in E-Slavic dialects (Rus)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 29(3): 350–65. [Princeton: 3013.858]

On the voice/diathesis of *-no/-to*, as well as its case/tense meaning. A thorough treatment, mentioning many of the dialects/languages in ESl; includes a lengthy bibliography as well. Matveenko mentions (353; without further comment) that *-no/*

⁵⁶ Ukr *-no/-to* appears to be a hybrid passive in this respect, readily undergoing gen-of-negation (otherwise, with an acc underlying object).

⁵⁷ Cf. ANN Dyla 1982 (incl. fn); Dziwirek (1994: 191–92), incl. fnn.

-to is attested throughout Ukr dialects, but less prevalent in W and NW Ukr. Cf. Filin 1972, specifically, ANN, item (8).⁵⁸

- Matveenko, V. A. (1961) “Nekotorye osobennosti struktury stradatel’no-bezličnogo oborota v russkix govorax” [Some properties of the structure of the passive-impersonal construction in Rus dialects (Rus)]. *Materialy i issledovanija po ruskoj dialektologii. Novaja serija 2*: 103–39 [Moscow]. [Michigan: (GL) 891.706 M426]

An interesting discussion of word-order interactions with case-marking on passives, repeating Makarova’s (1956b) ideas about constituent order and case (see ANN), criticizing Makarova’s conclusion:⁵⁹

“Without lapsing into the theory of [...] word order, we will show using our material the illegitimacy [of Makarova’s (1956b)] conclusion. Thus, if one resorts to quantifiable conclusions, having to do with the first (*ruku poraneno* ‘hand_{(FEM)ACC.SG} injured_[-AGR]’) and second (*vody prineseno* ‘water_{(FEM)GEN.SG} brought_[-AGR]’) types of passive impersonal constructions, then it turns out that here even the opposite word order can be dominant. As the uncontroversial complement, nouns are initial in 86 out of 100 exx of [the] *ruku poraneno* [type] and in 87 of 119 exx of the *vody prineseno* type” (108).

Matveenko goes on to criticize even Makarova’s premise:⁶⁰

“It is not the form of [syntactic] relations that are defined based on the word order, but rather the order based on the relations. [...] The illusion that one can judge the case form based on word order arises only in situations where the case form is already clear because of the singular meaning of the [syntactic] relations” (109).

See ANN Fici Giusti 1992b, Ivanycja 1925, and Synjavs’kyj 1967 for a discussion of possible constituent-order effects. This huge article tracks down all sorts of loose ends associated with impersonal passives. In addition to word order, Matveenko discusses non-agreeing areal patterns (e.g. *odin partizan poxoroneno* ‘one partisan_{(MASC)-nom} buried_[-AGR]’; *korova podoen* ‘cow_{(FEM)NOM} milked_{MASC.SG}’), quantified NPs as the underlying object, negation (and the possibility of the use of gen case), constructions of the type *devuška uexana* ‘girl_{(FEM)NOM} depart_{PASS.FEM.SG}’ (which Matveenko admits are not even passives, but treats for completeness’s sake), and how to express the doer (‘by’-phrase) using either an inst NP or a PP in either *u*

⁵⁸ This article also cites two dialect studies by Vasilij Černyš’ev, footnoted under ANN Borkovskij 1950 and Petrova 1961.

⁵⁹ The word *vody*, as printed (without stress shown), could also be the nom pl (*vódy*), differing from the gen sg (*vody*) only in stress. Although Matveenko does not mark stress, it is clear from her discussion that it is the gen sg which she has in mind

⁶⁰ Whereas we would not quarrel with Matveenko’s empirical evidence, we would not, however, agree with her latter objections to Makarova’s (1956b) suggestion. In dialects where some noun classes have homophonous nom and acc forms, and the participial inventory is either the non-agreeing *-no/-to* type (with an acc underlying object) or the agreeing passive (with a nom underlying object), then it should be a worthwhile undertaking to investigate the correlation of constituent order (NP-predicate or predicate-NP) with regard to the choice of agreeing vs. non-agreeing participial constructs.

‘at/by’ or *ot* ‘from’ (or even a dat NP—probably some sort of experiencer). She ends with a detailed geographical tabulation and an impressive bibliography.

- ****Matveenko, V. A. (1962a)** *Stradatel'no-bezličnyj oborot v vostočnoslavjanskix jazykax* [The passive-impersonal construction in East Slavic languages (Rus)]. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Institut ruskogo jazyka AN SSSR, Moscow.
- **Matveenko, V. A. (1962b)** “Vremennoe značenie glavnogo člena stradatel'no-bezličnogo oborota (na materiale ukrainskogo i belorusskogo jazykov)” [The temporal/tense meaning of the main member [= predicate head] of a passive-impersonal construction (using material from Ukr and Bel) (Rus)]. R. I. Avanesov, ed. *Istoričeskaja grammatika i leksikologija ruskogo jazyka. Materialy i issledovanija* [Historical grammar and lexicology of Rus (Rus)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 85–95. [U. Hartford: PG2101.A31]

This article leads with the assertion that *-no/-to* have one of three temporal interpretations: the perfect (occurrence in the past in force until “the moment of speech”), a present-tense stative reading, or an aorist interpretation (which Matveenko defines as a simple factive statement of some event in the past, following Kuznecov 1948). The article investigates Ukr (historical, contemporary-standard and dialect) and historical Br, as well as forays into Rus and Pol. Some main points:

1. The simple present-tense reading of a *-no/-to* clause is diagnosable by replacing the *-no/-to* word with an (agreeing) past-tense form in *-l-*. If this is allowed, Matveenko writes, then there is no present reading (86).
2. A *-no/-to* clause with the copula *bylo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ corresponds to a past-tense reading, just as a *-no/-to* clause without a copula corresponds to a present-tense reading (86).
3. In Ukr dialects⁶¹ all three meanings are possible: (i) present: *teper tam porivnjano* ‘now there leveled_[–AGR]’ (= ‘now it’s even/level there’); (ii) the perfect: *na semerýx néseno umá* ‘on seven-some_{(ANIM)ACC} carried_[–AGR] mind_{(MASC)GEN.SG}’ (= ‘seven [people] are given brains’); and (iii) the aorist: *načál'nyka ubýto granátoju* ‘chief_{(MASC.ANIM)ACC} killed_[–AGR] grenade_{(FEM)INST.SG}’ (= ‘the chief was killed by/with a grenade’) (87).
4. Whereas a perfect reading of a copula-less *-no/-to* form in Ukr dialects corresponds to a copula-less (agreeing) participial perfect in standard Rus, an aorist reading without a copula in Ukr dialects corresponds in meaning to a Rus participial clause with a copula: (Ukr dialect, aorist reading) *Koly pryxodyly ... načál'nyka ubyto* ‘when entered_{(V)PAST.3.PL} ... chief_{(MASC.ANIM)ACC} killed_[–AGR]’ vs. (standard Rus, aorist reading) *Kogda prixodili ..., načal'nika byl ubit* ‘when entered_{(V)PAST.3.PL} ..., chief_{(MASC.ANIM)ACC} was_{MASC.SG} killed_{(PRT)MASC.SG}’ (87–88).
5. Standard (non-dialect) Ukr *-no/-to* clauses without a copula can have either a perfect or an aorist interpretation (89).

⁶¹ Matveenko admits that the Ukr dialect picture is not clear (at least as of the publication date) and thus no particular dialect (i.e., geographical area) is pinpointed (87, fn 7).

6. A few *exx* (6 out of 50) from Matveenko's corpus⁶² have a pluperfect (*pljuskvamperfekt*) meaning: (*Nastja zastala doma vsix u zamiš annju.*) *Uže za neju poslano bulo znovu Xymu...* '(Nastja found everyone at home in confusion.) Already after her_{INST} sent_[-AGR] was_{NEUT.SG} again Xyma_{ACC.SG}.' (= 'Already Xyma had been sent after her [Nastja] again.') (89–90).
 7. From two 17th-century Ukr textual monuments, out of some 200 *-no/-to* forms only three had a copula: ⁶³ ... *žeby toe na vojskovie potreby oberneno bylo* 'so that this [would] be converted to military needs'.⁶⁴ Matveenko concludes from the handful of *exx* of this type from that period that there was no direct correlation between the presence of an overt copula and any specific temporal reading (note that the preceding *ex* does not appear to have a pluperfect reading) (90–91).
 8. In modern Br there is no attested *-no/-to* in the standard language, but those dialects with *-no/-to* express the perfect without an overt copula (those few *exx* with an overt copula have an aorist reading) (91–92).
 9. In her excursus into Pol *-no/-to*, Matveenko concludes that while an aorist interpretation has been possible throughout the language's history, this reading was rarer in the earliest texts than during later periods (92–93).
 10. Finally, Matveenko reports using either *-no/-to* or neut sg-agreeing *-ne/-te* without an overt copula when the underlying object is a neut sg NP in Br dialects, Cz (citing Havránek 1937: 124), and Pol. In Ukr such data is explainable as being either with or without agreement. In Pol (and Cz) such an explanation is not as easy to make, since a participial construction in *-ne/-te* usually requires an overt copula (94).⁶⁵
- Matvijas, I. H. (1984) "Slovopolučennja typu vydno xatu, čuty pisnju" [Word combinations of the type *vydno xatu*'visible_{ADJ.[-AGR]} cottage_{(FEM)ACC.SG}' and *čuty pisnju*'to-hear_{(V)INFINITIVE} song_{(FEM)ACC.SG}' (Ukr)]. *Polissja, Serednja Naddniprožčyna i sumižni zemli.* (= *Atlas ukrajins'koji movy v tr'ox tomax*, 1.) Kyjiv: Naukova dumka. Commentary 55, map 380.

⁶² Matveenko uses the following literary work as her corpus of literary Ukr. We would suggest, based on observations in the Ukr *-no/-to* literature, that a later, less literary source would yield far more *-no/-to* data (and other innovations that entered the language since early this century (this is especially relevant considering the fact that this work could not have been written later than 1907, the year Vovčok died, according to Shevelov's 1963: 22 data). We were unable to locate this edition: ***Vovčok, M. (1933) *Tvory v odnomu tomi*. Xarkiv/Kyjiv.

⁶³ The fact that *-no/-to* clauses with copulas are infrequent in literary data from the turn of the century at the latest (see previous fn) is not all that unexpected. But the very **existence** of such forms in the 17th century is to our knowledge altogether unreported in the literature.

⁶⁴ This 1687 example is from: *Lětopis' samovidca po novootkrytym spiskam*. Kiev: Kievskaja vremennaja komissija dlja razbora drevnyx aktov, 1878, 173. [Princeton: DK508.6 .L43 1878] (it is added in fn 6, 173, that in some versions the predicate is *oderžano* 'received').

⁶⁵ See ANN Shevelov 1969 for a possible explanation.

This is the only map in either of the first two volumes of this dialect atlas (the only ones which have appeared to date) which even remotely deals with Ukr *-no/-to*. This volume covers N-Central Ukraine (north of the 48th parallel and between 28° E and approx. 34° E). We consulted this atlas in particular because of a statement in Matveenko 1960: 353 that *-no/-to* is less prevalent in W and NW Ukr dialects (v. 2 covers W Ukraine, but has no maps that come anywhere close to discussing *-no/-to*). Matveenko (1962b: 87, fn. 7) refers to an “Atlas of Ukr dialects housed in Kiev, at the A. A. Potebnja Institute of Linguistics”. This atlas set appears to be the since-published version of that atlas. No actual *-no/-to* data appears to have made it into either v. 1 or 2 (v. 3, which deals with southern and eastern dialects, is apparently still not published.) The map we cite above (and its accompanying commentary) shows two separate data types:

1. Whether to say *za goróju výdno xátu* ‘behind mountain visible_[-AGR] cottage_{(FEM)ACC.SG}’ or *za goróju výdno xáta* ‘behind mountain visible_[-AGR] cottage_{(FEM)NOM.SG}’. The general distribution is that the latter datum (non-standard in standard Ukr) is prevalent N and NW of Kyjiv and only sporadically elsewhere.
 2. In the same general distribution were data of the following type (respectively): *pisnju č uty* ‘song_{(FEM)ACC.SG} to hear_{(V)INF}’ or *pisnja č uty* ‘song_{(FEM)NOM.SG} to hear_{(V)INF}’. That is, there is a choice between expressing the direct object of an infinitive verb in the nom. This latter construction appears to be the direct analogue of the NR nom-object construction, as discussed in Timberlake 1973; 1974a; 1974b.
- **Matvijenko, O. (1932) *Syntaksyčni paraleli (Proty puryzmu)* [Syntactic parallels (Against purism) (Ukr)]. Xarkiv: Radjans’ka škola.
 - Matvijenko, O. (1936a) “Pasyvni prysudky na *-no, -to* i *-nyj, -tyj* v ukrajins’koji movi (Materialy do problemy: hramatyčnyj rid, aktyvnyj ta pasyvnyj stan)” [Passive predicates in *-no/-to* and *-nyj/-tyj* in Ukr (Materials on: grammatical gender, active and passive voice) (Ukr)]. *Movoznavstvo* 8: 21–47. [Lib. of Congress: PG3801.A4147]

This first part of two is a reasonably descriptive summary of the *-no/-to* construction in Ukr as of the mid 1930s, openly critical of the purist prescriptions of others. (See especially the summary of item 2, Matvijenko 1936b: 72–73.) Some exx of interest:

- (1) ... sěno svěžo **vezeno**e na stovpax vorotnix
 hay_{NOM.SG} freshly transported_{(PRT)NEUT.SG.NOM} on gateposts
 pozastravalo [!]
 got stuck_{[-AGR]PAST.NEUT.SG}
 ‘Freshly hauled hay got caught in places on the gateposts.’

[25, repeated with more context on 41]⁶⁶

Ex (1) shows a relatively recent use of a(n unshortened) long-form participle. Cf. Ilarion 1935b for further discussion. An even more recent ex is shown in (2):

⁶⁶ This example, originally penned in 1699, comes from p. 150 of the following source: *Storož enki: Famil’nyj arxiv* 6: 150, 1908. Kiev: Tip. Fronckeviča i ko. [Stanford: CS859.S76 S7 v.6]

- (2) Tot, što [!] poletěv v čistoe pole
 that_{NOM.SG} which_{NOM} flew_{(V)MASC.SG} to clean field_{(NEUT)ACC.SG} [27]⁶⁷

Under the heading “Passive *-no/-to* predicates and personal verbs” (31–34), the author entertains the notion of interpreting Ukr *-no/-to* clauses as akin semantically to Ger *man* or French *on* (as in *man sagt* and *on parle*, respectively, both of which are glossed loosely as ‘one says/people say’) (32).⁶⁸ Somewhat abruptly, and within this same heading, Matvijenko shifts to impersonal predicates, showing that Ger *es regnet*, glossed at first as *doščyt* (lit., ‘rains_{3.SG}’), “can more accurately be rendered in Ukr by *vono doščyt*” (lit., ‘it rains_{3.SG}’; i.e., with the overt pleonastic *vono*), providing the following exx (among others):

- (3) Čy vono skoro staršyna pryjde?
 whether it_{NOM.SG} soon chief_{NOM.SG} will arrive_{3.SG} [32]⁶⁹

- (4) Vot ono čto značit čelovek...
 (t)here it_{NOM.SG} what_{ACC} means_{3.SG} person_{NOM.SG} [32, citing Gogol’s *Revizor*]⁷⁰

- (5) Bolše sta čelovek ono budēt [!].
 more than hundred_{GEN} people_{GEN.PL} it_{NOM.SG} will-be_{3.SG [?]} [32, citing Grjazov]

Exx (4) and (5) are Rus, not Ukr. Matvijenko cites Potebnja (1899: 405 [1968: 318–19]) with regard to (4), explaining the use of *ono*, awkward in literary Rus, as Ukrainianisms, influenced by Nikolaj Gogol’s L’vovian upbringing. Ex (5) is quoted from Šaxmatov (1925: 75) as dialect Rus.⁷¹ (See Billings 1993a and Franks 1995 regarding other exx of pleonastic (*vono* in ESL.) Matvijenko goes on to say that “passive *-no/-to* predicates in Ukr are most often used when a greater measure of impersonal-hood is needed,” citing the following ex:

- (6) Pro jix matir hovoreno, ščo vona vid’ma.
 about their mother_{ACC.SG} spoken_[-AGR] that she_{NOM} witch_{NOM.SG} [34]⁷²

Note also the impf aspect of the verb stem in (6), a very rare (if not downright ungrammatical) occurrence in modern Ukr (33–34). Later in the article Matvijenko contradicts the prevailing Ukr grammars of the day by quoting attested uses of

⁶⁷ This example comes from: Holovac’kyj, Ja. F. [F. Golovackij]. (1878) *Raznoč tenija i dopolnenija. Obrajadnyja pěsni.* (= *Narodnye pesni Galickoj i Ugorskoj Rusi* 3(2)). Moscow: Universitetskaja tipografija (M. Katkov’), v. 3, 6. [Indiana: GR203.U3H75 v.3 pt.2]

⁶⁸ We would disagree with this approach for Ukr, but agree with it for Pol. Cf. Maling 1993.

⁶⁹ Matvijenko cites this example with merely the surname Teslenko (i.e., the writer A. Teslenko). Presumably this article’s source is Sulyma 1929: 58, which cites a different order of the same words: *Čy vono staršyna pryjde skoro?* (also quoted in Billings 1993b; cf. ANN). Since neither source provides any bibliographic details beyond the author’s surname, it is extremely difficult to determine which of the two is the accurate word order.

⁷⁰ Potebnja (1899: 405 [1968: 318–19]) does not actually use the ex in (4).

⁷¹ Unfortunately, this example is not glossed into a dialect known to us; thus, our word glosses are tentative. We do not even attempt to render a sentence translation.

⁷² Matvijenko cites: Kulis’, P. (1857) *Zapiski o južnoj Rusi.* St. Peterburg’: Z’ drukarny Petra Bars’koho, v. 2, 37. [Repr. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1989 [CTYG: GR203.U5 Z26 1989].] This example actually appears as follows in the original: *A pro jix matjur hovoreno, ščo vona vid’ma.*

overt copulas (*bulo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ and *bude* ‘will-be_{3.SG}’) and inst ‘by’ phrases in *-no/-to* clauses. Especially rare in the literature are exx of *bude* ‘will-be_{3.SG}’:⁷³

- (7) a. Cijeji vesny bude posadženo [...] 3340 derev [...] [42]
 this spring will-be_{3.SG} planted_[-AGR] 3340 trees_{GEN.PL}
- b. [...] v c’omu roci bude: zabudovano novyx trotuariv [42]
 in this year will-be_{3.SG} built upon_[-AGR] new sidewalks_{GEN.PL}
 12 tysjač kv. metriv ta skil’ky ž vidremontovano [...] [42]
 12 thousand sq. meters and just as much renovated_[-AGR]

On 43 Matvijenko proposes that passives in which the underlying object is a numerical phrase can have a predicate either with *-no/-to* or with a plural-agreeing participle. The following ex shows a special use of the pronoun *vono* ‘it’:

- (8) Ty jomu stryženo, a vono tobi holeno. [43]
 you him/it_{DAT} cut hair_[-AGR] but it_{NOM} your_{DAT.SG} shaven_[-AGR]
 ‘You [tell] him/her “shorn”, and s/he [tells] you “shaven”.’
 [That is, this describes a jerk, who, no matter what you tell him/her, s/he says the opposite.]

Matvijenko admits that something has been elided from (8). Nonetheless, what is the function of *vono*? John Fizer informs us that the neut pronominal paradigm can be resorted to in order to refer to a de-humanized person (i.e., a person one has either disdain toward or no familiarity with yet). Thus, *vono* here means neither ‘it’ in the canonical-referential sense nor ‘it’ in the pleonastic sense, as in (3) above, but is a referential yet highly marked means of referring to a human (either male or female) with whom the speaker shows nearly no empathy.

- Matvijenko, O. (1936b) “Pasyvni prysudky na *-no, -to* i *-nyj, -tyj* v ukrajins’koji movi. (Zakinčennja.) Pasyvni prysudky na *-no, -to* z ob’jektivom diji v znaxidnomy vidminku” [Passive predicates in *-no/-to* and *-nyj/-tyj* in Ukr. (Conclusion.) Passive predicates in *-no, -to* with the object of the action in the ACC case (Ukr)]. *Movoznavstvo* 9: 53–74. [Berkeley: 3801.M68]

In this continuation, Matvijenko concentrates on the acc underlying object. Some noteworthy points:

1. Most often *-no/-to* predicates signify a completed one-time action; therefore they are prefixed (63, fn 1).
2. Returning to overt copulas (cf. exx. (7a–b) in the preceding annotation), consider also [...] *bude pererobleno burjaku* [...] ‘will-be_{3.SG} processed_[-AGR] beets_{GEN.SG}’⁷⁴ (67, citing *Vesti*, 9/17/193).

“Thus, the theory that *bulo* [‘was_{NEUT.SG}’], *bude* [‘will-be_{3.SG}’] are impossible in *-no/-to* [clauses] is falling away. [...] In the following ex, then, a syntagma with

⁷³ All of Matvijenko’s examples of this type, incl. (7a–b), are taken from the same issue of the newspaper *Bil’šovyk Poltavščyny* (3/16/1935), which we were unable to examine personally.

⁷⁴ The noun /burjak-/ ‘beet’ is largely a *singularia tantum* noun in Ukr (i.e., even when referring to more than one plant or tuber). It is shown in the gen to render a partitive meaning (i.e., ‘some beets’).

[agreeing] *-nyj/-tyj* would be most opportune, not because there is a copula verb there, but because the word *vymohy* ['demands'] is better rendered with a protagonist/prominent-entity (*sub'jekt*) meaning[:] *Vymohy tovaryšča Xatajevyča bude zdijnseno* ['Comrade Xatajevyč's demands will-be filled_[-AGR]']" (68, citing *Šaxtar Manhanu*, 3/15/1935).

When the predicate head is preposed, then its form is "most often" *-no/-to*; one functional reason is that preposed agreeing participles can be interpreted as modifiers (69).

3. A discussion of whether to use *-no/-to* or agreement passives in larger discourse contexts (69–71).
 4. A refutation of the prescriptionist attitudes of the "nationalists O. Kurylo, M. Sulyma [and S.] Dloževs'kyj", who, according to Matvijenko, "fals[ify] linguistic reality" (72–73).
- ****Matvijenko, O.; O. Petrenko, and N. Solodkyj. (1933) Review of [the 1932 1st ed. of] Smerečyns'kyj 1990. *Za markso-lenins'ku krytyku* 1: 102–10 [Xarkiv].**
 - **Mel'čuk, I. A. (1974) "O sintaksičeskom nule" [About the syntactic null (Ukr)]. A. Xolodovič, ed. *Tipologija passivnyx konstrukcij. Diatezy i zalogi* [Typology of passive constructions. Diatheses and voices (sic.) (Rus)]. Leningrad: Nauka, 343–61 (ch. 3). [Princeton: 2006.906]**
 A survey of phonetically null entities. Concludes that Pol *-no/-to* clauses consist of a null sentential subject (*podležašče*) + predicate (the verb with either *-no* or *-to*) + direct object.⁷⁵
 - ****Mel'nyčuk, O. S. [Mel'ničuk, A. S.]. (1964) *Razvitie struktury slavjanskogo predloženia. Avtoreferat doktorskoj dissertacii* [The development of the structure of the Slavic clause/sentence. Doctoral-dissertation abstract (Rus)]. Kiev: AN Ukr. SSR. Sekcija obščestvennyx nauk.**
 Apparently a Rus abstract of what was eventually published in Ukr as Mel'nyčuk 1966.
 - **Mel'nyčuk, O. S. (1966) *Rozvytok struktury slov'jans'koho rečennja* [The development of the structure of the Slavic clause/sentence (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka. [Rochester: PG 45 M52r]**
 A discussion of the type of sentences which can allow an overt pleonastic Ukr *vono/Rus ono/Br jano* 'it', citing literary exx (161).
 - **Miklosich, Franz [= F. Myklošyč]. (1865) "Die Verba impersonalia in Slavischen" [The impersonal verb in Slavic (Ger)]. *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische classe* 14: 191–244 [Vienna]. [Princeton: 0912.934.6 v.13–14]**

⁷⁵ Mel'čuk calls Pol *-no/-to* a "passive", and as such admits that this requires a modification of his models. We would suggest, following Maling 1993, that Pol *-no/-to* is not a passive, thus perhaps not disrupting his model after all.

Numerous *-no/-to exx* (232–33). An interesting older-English *ex*: *thou know'st, what has been warned us, what malicious foe seems to work us woe* (124) (citing “Milton, *Parad. Lost*. 9. 253”).

- Miklosich, Franz [= F. Myklošyč]. (1873) *Vergleichende Syntax der slawischen Sprachen* [Comparative syntax of the Slavic languages (Ger)]. (= *Vergleichende Grammatik der slawischen Sprachen*, 4.) Vienna: Braumüller. [Princeton: 3015.643] [2nd ed., 1883]

Numerous *-no/-to exx*, incl. two discussed in Havránek 1937 (364f).

- Miklosich, Franz [= F. Myklošyč]. (1883) *Subjectlose Sätze* [Subjectless sentences (Ger)]. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller, 2nd ed.⁷⁶ [Princeton: (T) 2006 –1]

Cf. especially §III: “Subjectless sentences with passive verbs” (58–64). Includes numerous *-no/-to exx*, incl. two from OCS; cf. ANN Havránek 1937.

- Myronenko, Myx. (1927) *Ukrajins'ka frazeolohija (Pryjmennyky ta jix rolja v rečenni). Za redakcijeju ta peredmovuju prof. M. K. Hrunskoho* [Ukr phraseology (Pronouns and their role in the clause). Edited with a preface by Professor M.K. Hrunskij (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Deržavnyj naukovo-metodolohičnyj komitet Narkomsvity USSR. [Harvard: Wid 3285.60.05]
- **Myšurenko, P. Je. (1964) “Bezособovi rečennja na *-no, -to* v ukrajins'kyx narodnyx prysliv'jax” [Subjectless sentences in *-no/-to* in Ukr proverbs (Ukr)]. *Linhvistyčnyj seminarij. Tezy dopovidej*, 1. Dnipropetrovs'k: Dnipropetrovs'kyj derž. univ., Kafedra ukr. movy, 41–45.
- Napoli, Donna Jo. (1993) *Syntax: Theory and problems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Princeton: P291.N27 1993]

Napoli characterizes the Pol *-no/-to* construction as follows: “Some languages require that their counterpart to the Eng *by* prepositional phrase be present... Other languages disallow the presence of a *by*-phrase. Polish, for example, disallows a *by*-phrase in its passive that makes use of a special verb form (which is also called “impersonal”):

Zapukano [do] drzwi *(przez sasiada).
was knocked at door by neighbor

‘It was knocked at the door.’ [= ‘Someone knocked at the door.’]

If the material in parenthesis in the Polish example is present, the sentence is ungrammatical: we simply cannot overtly state who did the knocking” (67) [diacritic added, preposition corrected (based on example’s likely source: Comrie 1977: 49, ex (6))—LB/JM].⁷⁷

⁷⁶ The first edition of this work, apparently published in serialized form, is cited in Smerečyns'kyj 1932/1990: 271.

⁷⁷ Napoli’s statement, though perhaps true, is at best misleading with regard to Pol: First, Pol does have a true passive—not the construction shown by Napoli—which **does** allow a *przez*-phrase:

Piec został naprawiony (przez fachowca).
stove_{NOM.SG} was_{MASC.SG} fixed_{MASC.SG} through expert_{ACC.SG}
‘The stove was fixed (by an expert).’ [ex 23b in Siewierska 1988: 252]

- Nerbonne, John A., Jr. (1982) “Some passives not characterized by universal rules”. *Ohio State University working papers in linguistics* 26: 59–92.
Discusses Li, Irish, Ger and other impersonal constructions in the framework of Relational Grammar. (Cf. also ANN Postal 1986.)
- Netteberg, Kristine. (1953) “Quelques problèmes de diathèse. Les formes impersonnelles du verbe” [A few problems of diathesis. Impersonal verb forms (Fr)]. *Études sur le verbe polonais* [Studies on the Pol verb (Fr)]. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og bagger, 132–36. [Pitt: PG6271.N473]
Discusses theoretical problems of voice/diathesis raised by Pol *-no/-to* data.
- **Nikiforov, S. D. (1948) “Iz nabljudenij nad značenijem nekotoryx glagol’nyx form v pamjatnikax vtoroj poloviny XVI v.”. [Observations on the meaning of certain verbal forms (Rus)] *Učenyje zapiski Moskovskogo gos. pedagogičeskogo instituta imeni Lenina*, 56. Kafedra ruskogo jazyka, vyp. 2, 116–20.
- Nikiforov, S. D. (1952) *Glagol, ego kategorii i formy v russkoj pis’mennosti vtoroj poloviny XVI veka* [The verb, its categories and forms in the writing of the first half of the 16th century (Rus)]. Moscow: Izd-vo AN SSSR. [Princeton: 3021.676]
Shows (317–24) how Rus in the late 1500s (and modern dialects) differ from the modern standard language in allowing impf verb stems to take *-no/-to* forms.
- **Nimčynov, K. (1925) *Ukrajins’kyj jazyk [sic] u mynulomu j teper. Pidručna knyha do usvidomlennja faktiv ukrajins’koho jazyka*. [Ukr past and present. Handbook for understanding the facts of Ukr (Ukr)] Xarkiv: Derž. vydavn. Ukrajinu.
- **Nimčynov, K. (1927) “Lekciji (XII–XIII) z syntaksy ukrajins’koho movy”. [Lectures (12–13) on the syntax of Ukr (Ukr)] L. Bulaxovskij, ed. *Kursy ukrajinskoji movy dlja včyteliv*. [Ukr-language courses for school teachers (Ukr)] [Appeared in serial publication in weekly supplements to the newspaper *Narodnij učytel’*.] [Lecture 11: supplement to 46: 97 and 47: 98; Lecture 12: supplement 47: 98; Lecture 13: supplement 48: 99].⁷⁸
- [Nimčynov, K. T.] (1933) “Bez sobovi rečennja” [Impersonal sentences (Ukr)]. *Syntaksa* [Syntax (Ukr)]. (= *Hramatyka ukrajins’koho movy* [Ukr grammar (Ukr)], 2.) Xarkiv: Radjans’ka škola, 31–32. [Harvard (non-circulating): XPA 7108]
A very early work which actually prescribes the use of *bulo* ‘was’ copula in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses.
- **Nimčynov, K. (1934) *Proty nacionalistyčnoho škidnyctva v syntaksysi ukrajins’koho literaturnoju movy*. [Against nationalist subversion of the syntax of literary Ukr (Ukr)] (= *Xarkivs’ka filija Nauk. Doslidn. in-tu VUAN*, vyp. 6.) Xarkiv: Radjans’ka škola.
- Nunes, Jairo M. (1994a) *Participle constructions in Lithuanian: A minimalist account*. M.A. thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Maryland-College Park.

Second, we do not consider this example to be a true passive. See our discussion of this in ANN Maling 1993. There are, however, languages that do appear to disallow the equivalent of a ‘by’-phrase in all passives; cf. Comrie (1977: 49).

⁷⁸ The date of issue 47 is given in Sulyma (1929: 53, 59) as “30 XI 1927”; Smerečyns’kyj (1932/1990: 271–72) provides the correspondences of lectures to issues.

An expanded treatment of the Li impersonals discussed in (ANN) Nunes 1994b, further analyzed using the Minimalist framework.⁷⁹

- Nunes, Jairo M. (1994b) “Another look at Lithuanian impersonal passives”. *Studies in the linguistic sciences* 24(1-2) (= *Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica* 5.): 347–60.

A treatment of so-called impersonal passives in Li using recent functional-category theory. Draws on data in Timberlake 1982, Nerbonne 1982, Keenan and Timberlake 1985, Postal 1986, and Matthews 1955, among others. The primary innovation is that the head of the participial functional category Tense Phrase “is a nominal element that assigns genitive Case to its specifier in the same way possessive *-ing* in English does” (§1). The ‘by’-phrase in Li is expressed using a (prepositionless) gen NP. Nunes, following Timberlake 1982, distinguishes between two kinds of “genitives” in the language, which have distinct pronominal forms: “1st person sg, 2nd person sg and reflexive pronouns distinguish two genitive forms: one used to express possession, and the other for complements of verbs or prepositions”. For example, *mano* is the 1sg possessive gen, while *maņes* is the 1sg verbal/ prepositional gen form (§2.2). Nunes also distinguishes between the various participial constructions as shown:

1. In “standard passives” (cf. “true” passives in ANN Maling 1993) the participial verb agrees with the subject (the underlying object) in case, number, and gender.
2. In “impersonal passives” the participial verb surfaces in the neut sg form.
3. In “double passives” there is agreement, as in (1) above, between the subject (underlying object) and the participial main verb and neut sg agreement on the participial auxiliary. [Based on his ex (21) (§5).]

Cf. ANN Babby (forthcoming) regarding the analogous situation between the impersonal passives, in (2), and Ukrainian *-no/-to* (non-)agreement.

- Nunes, Jairo M. (1994c) “Concordância de participio em Lituano” [Participle agreement in Li (Por)]. *Letras de Hoje* 29 (2): 59–83. [Princeton: P25 .L47]

A more specific enumeration of items (1) through (3) in the preceding ANN: Analysis of participial agreement in Li impersonal and personal passives, the latter with and without an agent, in affirmative and negative constructions.

- Obnorskij, S[ergej] P. (1946) *Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka staršego perioda*. [Points on the history of late-period Rus (Rus)] Moscow/Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR. [Princeton: 3021.684]
- Oesterreicher, Henryk (1926) *Imeślów bierny w języku polskim* [The past participle in Pol (Pol)]. (= *Rozprawy Wydziału filologicznego PAU*, 41(6).) Cracow: Polska akademja umięjetności. [Princeton: 3043.685]

⁷⁹ Chomsky, Noam. (1993) “A Minimalist program for linguistic theory”. K. Hale and S. J. Keyser, eds. *The view from Building 20. Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.

Older-Pol *-no/-to* exx with the overt copula *było* ‘was’ (56–58). The following ex is the only one with its underlying object in the morphologically unmistakable acc case:

[...] *co ja bylo przywiazano, [...]*
 that_{REL} she_{ACC} was_{(V)PAST.NEUT.SG} attached_[-AGR]

A similar ex is referred to in ANN Pisarkowa 1984 (fn); cf. also ANN Shevelov 1968. Additional *-no/-to* data (54–55).

- Ohonovs’kyj, O. [Emil Ogonowski]. (1880) *Studien auf dem Gebiete der ruthenischen Sprache* [Studies in the field of Ruthenian [= Ukr] (Ger)]. Lemberg [L’viv]: Verlag und Druck Ruthenischen Šewčenko-Vereines [sic]. [Yale: Hta13 Og6]

A very early Ukr *-no/-to* ex with overt copula:

Nas odnákovo okryvdženo búde . ‘Wir werden ohnedem beeinträchtigt werden’.

- Orr, Robert. (1989) “A Russo-Goidelic syntactic parallel: *u nego svoja izba postavlena/tá sé déanta agam*”. *General linguistics* 29(1): 1–21. [Florida St: 405 G326]
 Orr quotes NR *-no/-to* data in passing from Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1971 and Timberlake 1976 (cited incorrectly as “1975” and “1979”), as well as noting that Ukr and Pol have such data. Orr also mentions work by Janke⁸⁰ which cites OCS data as well (9).
- Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskîj, D. N. (1900) “Iz” sintaktičeskix” nabljudenij: K” voprosu o klassifikacii bezsub’ektnyx” predloženíj” [From syntactic observations: On the classification of subjectless sentences (Rus)]. *Izvěstija otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 5(4): 1146–86. [Princeton: 3020.116.2]
 Discussion of pleonastic pronouns in Sl (1167–68). Compares the so-called indefinite-personal construction to a Ger *man* or Fr *on* (*pro-arb*) interpretation (1169); “*man* and *on* are not pleonastic pronouns but real pronouns” (1170). Discusses pleonastics as strictly grammatical in function as subject place-holders (1178).
- Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskîj, D. N. [1902] *Sintaksis” russkago jazyka. S.-Peterburg”*: Izdanie D. E. Žukovskago. [N. Carolina: PG2361.O984 1900z]
 Refers to equivalents of Ger constructions with *man* ‘one’ (181, 192), some (apparently) dialect-Rus *-no/-to* data (199, 209), Pol *-no/-to* data—without reference to *man* in Ger (200), pleonastic uses of *ono* ‘it’ (206).
- ***Ozarovskij, O. (1964) “Bezlično-pričastnye formy na -NO, -TO i kategorija sostojanija” [Impersonal-participial sentences in *-no/-to* and category of state [a part of speech] (Rus)]. *Materialy XII naučnoj konferencii professorsko-prepodavatel’skogo sostava*. Frunze: Kirgizskij un-t.
 Zatovkaňuk (1984: 2–3, fn 3) cites p. 6 of this work.
- Özkaragöz, İnci Z. (1986) *The relational structure of Turkish syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of California, San Diego. [Rice: PL171.O94 1986]

⁸⁰ Janke, G. (1960) *Der Ausdruck des Passivs im Altrussischen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 60. [Florida St: 082 A313v Nr.22]

Identifies two constructions which violate the 1AEX (cf. ANN Maling 1993): impersonal passives either from unaccusatives (§6.2) or from personal passives (§6.3). See also “Further alternative analyses for impersonal passives of unaccusatives and of personal passives (§6.4). Cf. also Babby 1983.

- Pen’kovskij, A. B. (1970) “K probleme genezisa bezličnyx predložnij” [On the problem of the genesis of impersonal sentences (Rus)]. *Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas. Materialy i issledovanija*. 1969. Moscow: Nauka, 189–201. [Princeton: 3013.6835]

This is a survey article in a periodical precursor to a major dialect-atlas project. Whereas Pen’kovskij does not discuss any *-no/-to* data *per se*, his article has proven quite useful as a source of other references (cf., e.g., ANNs Babajceva 1967, Bukatevič et al 1958, Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij 1900, Potebnja 1899/[1968], and Zatovkaňuk 1958), as well as less directly related references on impersonal constructions in general, such as child-language (cf. ANN Gvozdev 1961) and psycholinguistic⁸¹ findings related to impersonals.

- Peškovskij, A. M. (1928/1956) *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščanii* [Rus syntax in a scientific interpretation (Rus)]. [Moscow: Gos. učebno-pedagogičeskoe izd-vo Ministerstva prosveščeniya RSFSR, 7th ed. [Princeton: SLAV 3021.709.21] [Earlier editions: 1928 Moscow/Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo [Princeton: 3021.709.21]; 1938 Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel’stvo [Princeton: PG2361.P47 1938].]

Discusses OR sentences in which a neut sg past verb in *-lo* co-exists in a sentence with nom NPs (360):

uxvatilo	ego	nekaja	silu
seized _{PAST.SG.NEUT}	him _{ACC}	some kind _{(AS.FEM)NOM.SG}	force _{(N.FEM)NOM.SG}

Exx of *-no/-to* in works by 19th-century (and earlier) Rus writers (361–62).

- Petlyčnyj, I. Z. (1957) “Rečennja na *-NO*, *-TO* ta jix stylistyč na funkcija (na materialy movy tvoriv I. Franka)” [Sentences in *-no/-to* and their stylistic function (based on material from the language of Ivan Franko (Ukr)]. *L’viv. Universytet. Dopovidi ta povidomlennja* 7(1): 66–69. [Berkeley: (MAIN) AS262.L87A21]

This straightforward philological study identifies several facets of the *-no/-to* usage of the W. Ukr writer Ivan Franko (1856–1916). Although Franko does not use overt copulas much, apparently their use indicates an “emphasis on the action itself, and not on its effect” (68). Franko’s *-no/-to* clauses tend to be synonymous with indefinite-personal constructions (68). “The objects of these sentences in I. Franko’s literary prose tends to be in pre- and not post-position” to the *-no/-to* predicate (69); cf. also ANN Ivanycja 1925 and Synjavs’kyj 1967 regarding constituent order in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses. Cf. also Petlyčnyj 1960.

- Petlyčnyj, I. Z. (1960) “Bezobovi rečennja na *-NO*, *-TO* v movi xudožn’oji prozy I. Franka” [Impersonal sentences in *-no/-to* in the language of the artistic prose of I[van]

⁸¹ Vygotskij, L. S. (1934/1956) “Myšlenie i reč’”. *Izbrannye psixologičeskie issledovanija*. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii pedagogičeskix nauk RSFSR, 37–386. [Florida: MAIN BF721.V9x]

Franko (Ukr)]. *Pytannja ukrajins'koho movoznavstva*, kn. 4a, 21–37. [L'viv: Vyd-vo L'vivs'koho un-tu.] [Cornell: PG 3801.P99]

An expanded revision of Petlyčnyj 1958 (cf. ANN), more accurately specifying the sources of data⁸² and with more references.⁸³

1. Discusses at length the emergence of overt copulas in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses, arguing that *bulo* 'was' and *bude* 'will-be' add a pluperfect and future-perfect interpretation. He compares this to a use of such copulas with verbal forms in *-l-* (historically expressing the perfect, which now serve mainly as the unmarked past-tense finite form): *čytala bula* 'read_{FEM.SG} was_{FEM.SG}' (= 'she had read') and *budu_{1.SG} xodyla_{FEM.SG}* (= 'I will have read')⁸⁴ (25). Copulas are rare in Franko's works; out of over 190 *-no/-to* exx, only 18 have *bulo* and three have *bude* (26). (Cf. also Smal'-Stoc'kyj and Gartner 1914: 93, 144 and Shevelov 1969.)

2. Two exx with *se* 'this', which are very likely to be overt pleonastic pronouns:

Ni, se	tobi	nepravdu	skazano.	
No, this _{NEUT.SG}	you _{DAT.SG}	untruth _{ACC}	s poken _[-AGR]	[26] ⁸⁵

'No, you were not told the truth.'

Unlike *vono* 'it' (which, as a personal pronoun, has a distinct acc-case form, *joho*, discussed elsewhere in this bibliography), *se* is homophonous in the nom and acc cases. In this ex, however, there is a clear acc-case NP (*nepravdu*), showing that *se* here is the nom-case form. Cf. also ANN Wiczorek 1994, item 15 (26, 29).

3. Cause-and-effect situations and the use of *-no/-to* forms (27).

4. In only 13/190 tokens is the *-no/-to* form derived from an intransitive verb (34).

- **Petrova, Z. M. (1960) *Osobennosti skazuemostnogo upotreblenija stradatel'nyx pričastij prošedš ego vremeni v pskovskix pamjatnikax pis'mennosti i sovremennyx pskovskix govorax*. [The features of the predicative use of past-tense participles in Pskovian written [historical] texts and in contemporary Pskov dialects (Rus)] Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii. Leningradskij gos. ped. institut [im. Gercena].
- Petrova, Z. M. (1961) "O sintaksičeskix i morfoložičeskix osobennostjax pričastij v pskovskix govorax" [On the syntactic and morphological properties of participles in the

⁸² Petlyčnyj (1960:26, fn. 28) specifically identifies the following collected works as this article's corpus: Franko, Ivan (1950–56) *Tvory v dvadcaty tomax* 1–20. O. Kornijčuk et al (eds.) Kiev: Derž. vyd-vo. xudož. lit-ry. [Georgia: 3948.F834 1950]

⁸³ This article is somewhat haphazard in its quotations of other linguistic works. For example, Petlyčnyj (1960: 24, fn 13) mistakenly cites Potebnja 1958: 148 as "pp. 142–43" and translates the passage (accurately) into Ukr. Elsewhere (23), he quotes Potebnja (1941: 203–04) in Rus: far from verbatim, but without too much deviation.

⁸⁴ The latter occurs in SW dialects; these seem to express the past in terms of past/future points of reference, without necessarily expressing the perfect.

⁸⁵ Petlyčnyj cites p. 24 of the following source of this ex: Franko, Ivan (1951) "Zaxar Berkut; obraz hromads'koho z'yttja karpats'koji rusi v XIII vici." *Povisti*. (= *Tvory v dvadcaty tomax* 6.) O. Kornijčuk et al (eds.) Kiev: Derž. vyd-vo. xudož. lit-ry, 7–139. [Georgia: 3948.F834 1950 v.6]

Pskov dialects (RUS)]. *Voprosy sovremennogo i istoričeskogo sintaksisa russkogo jazyka*. (= *Učenyje zapiski Leningradskogo ped. instituta imeni A. I. Gercena*, 225.) Leningrad: Leningradskij ped. institut im. Gercena, 171–92. [Berkeley: (MAIN) (NEWS) MICROFILM 2657]

Early (14th- and 15th-century) *-no/-to* data from the Pskov region of NR (173–75). Cites dialect studies from the turn of this century with numerous *-no/-to* data.⁸⁶

- Petrova, Z. M. (1968) “Posessivnyj perfekt v pskovskix govorax” [The possessive perfect in the Pskov dialects (Rus)]. *Pskovskie govory*, 2 [Pskov: Min. Prosveščeniya RSFSR], 118–26. [Princeton: (FILM) 3023.739.73]

Discusses the so-called possessive perfect, clauses in which the agent is expressed using a prepositional phrase in *u* ‘by/near’ + gen, which is used to express the possessive (in standard Rus). Such clauses use past-passive-participial stems and express the perfect. These PPs do not trigger predicative agreement,⁸⁷ hence the *-no/-to* non-agreeing form of the participle.

- Petrova, Z. M. (1974) “Stradatel’no-vozzvatnyje pričastnyje formy v russkom jazyke XVIII veka” [Passive-reflexive participial forms in 18th-century Rus (Rus)]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, no. 2, 103–11. [Princeton: 2000.946]

An article packed with *-no/-to* data which also have the (etymologically) reflexive particle *-sja* (*-s*) from 1700s Rus. Unlike most works of this type, Petrova’s exx are meticulously cited to various popular and historical documents of the period, incl. pagination.⁸⁸

kak” vpred” sojdenos” budet”
as in the future gathered together will-be

Mentions modern Pol-data of this sort (103).

- Pisarkowa, Krystyna. (1984) *Historia składni jazyka polskiego*. [= *Prace Instytutu jazyka polskiego*, 52.]. Wrocław: Ossolineum. [Princeton: PG6171.P57]

Pol *-no/-to* data specifically treated in §1.8.1 (41–42); but the whole of §1.7 (27–41) and §1.8 (41–45) on subjectless and passive structures, respectively, present a clear informal overview of the development of impersonal constructions with their intriguing relations to modality, non-finite clauses as objects, and subordinate sentences. Plenty of exx, incl. these older ones, with an overt copula (42):

⁸⁶ (Cf. also other works by Černyšev in ANN Borkovskij 1950 fnn.) Černyšev, Vasilij I. (1931) “Pskovskoe narečie (Nabljudeniya nad govoram b. Pskovskogo uezda v 1917 g.)”. *Trudy komissii po russkomu jazyku*, 1. Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 161–185. [Princeton: PG2013.A6525 (1931) t.1]; Ieropol’skij, K. (1930) “Govor derevni Savkino Pus’kinskogo rajona Pskovskogo okruga”. *Izvestiya po russkomu jazyku i slovesnosti* 3: 585–97. [Columbia: GLX PG2013.A6 1930]

⁸⁷ Cf., however, Shevelov 1963: 56, fn 2 for one W. Ukr “preposition”, the complement of which can trigger predicative agreement (ex quoted in ANN Wiczorek 1994, item 18).

⁸⁸ Petrova (1974: 105) citing pp. 35–36 of “Remarki na protokol”. (1713 g. ijunja 27.)” (1896) V. N. Smoljaninov”, ed. *Arxiv kn. Kurakina* (kniga) 6. Saratov: Tip. V. S. Balaševa, 1896. [Princeton: Microfiche 704] Other documents cited include **Modnoe ežemesjačnoe izdanie, ili Biblioteka dlja damskogo tualeta*. (1779) Moskva: V Tip. Imperatorskago moskovskago universiteta, č. 1. [NY Pub. Lib. (non-circulating): Slav. Reserve 85–725]

(1) I dla tego to za przodków naszych **poczyniono było** na sejmach statuta.
'And that's why in our ancestors' times done_[-AGR] was_{NEUT.SG} in the
parliaments'⁸⁹

(2) To tedy niech **bedzie powiedziano**, iż wielmożność jest cnota.
'Thus then let will-be_{3.SG} said_[-AGR] that prosperity is virtue'

Extensive bibliographies of data sources (263–69) and references (270–74).⁹⁰

- Pivtorak, H. P. (1970) "Opovidannja napysano—opovidannja napysane" [(The) story_{(NEUT)ACC.SG} (is) written_[-AGR]—(the) story_{(NEUT)NOM.SG} (is) written_{NEUT.SG} [i.e., the two ways to express the passive in Ukr when the underlying object is neut sg] (Ukr)]. *Pytannja movnoji kul'tury*, 4. [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 52–55. [Cornell: PG 3801.P986]
A simple aim: collect as much data as possible with neut sg underlying objects (which have homophonous nom and acc forms) in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses and agreeing participial clauses in *-ne/-te*.⁹¹
- Postal, Paul. (1986) "Nerbonne's critique." *Studies of passive clauses*. Albany: SUNY Press, 165–97 (§5.5). [Princeton: P281.P53 1986]
A detailed response to analysis of Li impersonals (also in the Relational Grammar framework) in Nerbonne 1982 (165–84) and Timberlake 1982 (190), as well as of Irish (190–92), Estonian (192), and Ger and Li "medio-passives" (192–97).
- Potebnja, A. A. (1874/1958) *Vvedenie. Sostavnye členy predloženiya i ix zameny v russkom jazyke* [Introduction. Complex members of sentences and their change in Rus (Rus)]. (= *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike* [From the notes on Rus grammar (Rus)], 1–2.) Moscow: Prosveščenie, 2nd ed. [Virginia: PG2105.P64 1958a t.1-2] [1st ed. (of just vol. 1), Voronež" (in *Filologičeskija zapiski* (vyp.) 4–6.).]

⁸⁹ Pisarkowa (1984: 42) citing p. 141 of *Starowolski, Szymon. (1859) *Reformacja obyczajów polskich*. Kraków: Wydanie K.J. Turowskiego. [Michigan: HN538.S78 1859]

⁹⁰ Pisarkowa's bibliography lists the series *Zapomniane konstrukcje · sk ladni ...polskiej ...* ['Forgotten constructions of ... [-century] Pol syntax'], which covers Old through early-1900s Pol. (She does not, however, refer to this series in any of her *-no/-to* exx.) The multi-volume project provides textual examples of those syntactic and morphological structures which are not part of modern usage. We select only the first two volumes—from Old and early-Middle Pol—precisely because they contain examples which show those aspects of the *-no/-to* construction that have disappeared in later stages, notably the copula and the expletive pronoun *ono* 'it' (cf. ANN Billings 1993a; 1993b). The exx are not annotated, nor is there any speculation on the development of *-no/-to* (cf., however, Brajerski 1971, Klemensiewicz et al 1965, Oesterreicher 1926, and Shevelov 1968). Z. Klemensiewicz, K. Pisarkowa, J. Koneczna-Twardzikowa, eds. (1966) *Zapomniane konstrukcje sk ladni staropolskiej. Wybór przyk ladów*. Wroc law: Zak lad narodowy imienia Ossolińskich. [Duke: 491.8552 K64Z]; Z. Klemensiewicz, K. Pisarkowa, A. Kalkowska, K. Oszywianka, J. Twardzikowa eds. (1971) *Zapomniane konstrukcje ·sk ladni s' redniopolskiej (XVI wiek). Wybór przyk ladów*. Wroc-law: Zaklad narodowy imienia Ossolińskich. [Duke: 491.8552 K64ZB] The 1971 vol. contains two *-no/-to* clauses from the 1500s with the overt copula *by-lo* 'was' (14), **possible** pleonastic *ono* exx in *-no/-to* clauses (25, 87) and a fem sg pronoun *je* 'her' (cf. similar ex in ANN Oesterreicher 1926) as the underlying object of a *-no/-to* predicate (27).

⁹¹ Unfortunately for this study, Pivtorak confuses the issue by combining predicative and modifier forms in *-ne/-te*, which obfuscates the comparison with non-agreeing (*-no/-to*) forms (which can only be predicative, not modifiers). Removing the modifiers leaves very few agreeing (*-ne/-te*) forms indeed.

Ger man interpretations (147–48), some Rus *-no/-to* forms (148), Pol *-no/-to* (149).

- Potebnja, A. A. (1899/1968) *Ob izmenenii značeniija i zamenax suščestvitel'noġo* [On nominal change and substitution (Rus)]. (= *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike* [From the notes on Rus grammar (Rus)], 3.) Moscow: Prosveščenie, 2nd ed. [Princeton: 3021.734.1958] [1st ed., Khar'kov': Zil'berberg' (Izdanie M. V. Potebni). [Berkeley: PG2105.P67 1888 v.3]]

Various Sl *-no/-to* phenomena (1899: 432–38/1968: 339–44).

- Potebnja, A. A. (1941/1977) *Glagol* [The verb. (Rus)]. (= *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike* [From the notes on Rus grammar (Rus)], 4, vyp. 2.) Moscow: Prosveščenie. [Princeton: 3021.734 1958 v.4 pt.2] [1st ed., *Glagol. Mestoimenie. Čislitel'noe*. [The verb. The Pronoun. The quantifier. (Rus)]. (= *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, 4.) Moscow/Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR. [Princeton: 3021.734]]

Various Sl *-no/-to* phenomena (1941: 203/1977: 253–54).

- Proeme, Henk. (1988) “On the adjectival nature of the *n/t*-participle in Polish”. A. A. Barentsen et al, eds. *Dutch contributions to the 10th International congress of Slavists, Sofia, Linguistics*. (= *Studies in Slavic and general linguistics*, 11.) Amsterdam: Rodopi, 451–68. [Princeton: PG1.S82]

Specifically excludes *-no/-to* clauses from other participial sentences, referring to them as “perfective finite verbal” forms (460–61).

- Przygoda, Marian. (1976) “*Imiesłów bierny w funkcji orzeczenia w zdaniu bezosobowym.*” *Przygodny konstrukcje syntaktyczne z imiesłowem biernym dokonany w współczesnym języku rosyjskim w aspekcie porównawczym z językiem polskim* [Predicative syntactic constructions with a passive participle in modern Rus in comparison with Pol (Pol)]. Zielona Góra: Wydawnictwo Wyższej szkoły pedagogicznej, 108–39 (§4). [Michigan St: PG2380.P79]

Analyzes Rus forms in *-no/-to* and shows their equivalents in Pol. Occasional discussion of Pol *-no/-to* clauses (111), mentioning the agentivity of such clauses (114), describing them “as personal transitive verbs” (129). Brief reference to dialect-Rus *-no/-to* data (129). Compares (non-acc-assigning) standard-Rus *-no/-to* clauses to Pol *-no/-to* clauses (136):

Rus *-no/-to* clauses:

1. Impersonal
2. Passive
3. Takes the form of the neut past participle
4. Allow past, present and future
5. Past, future with copulas
6. Formed only from transitive verbs
7. Resultative

Pol *-no/-to* clauses:

1. Impersonal [sic]
2. Active (citing Shevelov 1968)
3. Takes the form of the historically neut past participle
4. Only past tense
5. No copulas allowed [in modern Pol]
6. Formed from transitive and intransitive verb stems
7. Resultative and non-resultative

8. Not attested with reflexive *-sja*⁹²8. Attested with reflexive *sie*

Hence the dearth of correspondences of Rus *-no/-to* clauses translated into Pol using *-no/-to* clauses (133):

Rus: dvadcat´ tankov podbito

Pol: dwadzieścia czołgów rozbito
twenty tanks destroyed

Pol *-no/-to* clauses are generally translated into Rus as indefinite personal clauses (133–34), or neut sg agreeing passives in *-ne/-te* (139, fn 1), and are generally not suitable for translation into Rus as *-no/-to* forms (139, fn 4).

- Pupynin, Ju. A. (1992) “Bezličnyj predikat i subʹektno-obʹjektne otnošenija v russkom jazyke.” *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, no. 1, 48–63. [Florida St: 405 V952]

Adversity-impersonals; cf. ANN Babby 1994b (51), especially a playful use of human-agent verbs *kričalo* ‘yelled_{NEUT.SG}’, but in a setting where there could be no human doer (54). Rus-dialect possessive-perfect *-no/-to* clauses (cf. ANN Petrova 1968) and related constructions (59–60).

- Raczy, Józef. (1928) “Kilka słów o polskiej stronie biernej”. *Jezyk polski* 13(1): 14–17. [Virginia: PG6001.J48]

The conspicuous absence of *-no/-to* from the discussion—while even using an ex in the discussion (16)—is evidence of sorts in support of the non-passivity of Pol *-no/-to* clauses.

- Ravljuk, M. (1912) “Dijeprykmetnyky [sic] i djiepryslivnyky [sic] v Ukrarjinsʹkij movi. Čast´ 1. Pro dijeprykmetnyky [sic] i djiepryslivnyky [sic] v tvorax Hrihorija Kvitky-Osnovjanenka [sic], Marka Vovčoka, Jurija Fedʹkovyča i Vasylja Stefanyka” [On participles and adverbs in the works of Hrihorij Kvitka-Osnovʹjanenko, Marko Vovčok, Jurij Fedʹkovyč and Vasylʹ Stefanyk (Ukr)]. *Zvidomlenje [sic] Direkciji c. k. deržavnoji gimnazyji [sic] v Kicmanji [sic] za škilʹnyj rik 1911/1912*. Kicmanʹ: Nakladom škilʹnoho fondu (Z drukarnji [sic] tovarystva “Ruska [sic] rada” v Černivcjax), 3–78. [Harvard: Depository Slavic weak-paper box 81]

A very early work (apparently with no “Part 2”), listing numerous examples from around the turn of the century by the authors Hrihorij Kvitka-Osnovʹjanenko (1788–1843), Marko Vovčok (1834–1907), Jurij Fedʹkovyč (1834–1887), and Vasylʹ Stefanyk (1871–1936). Ravljuk does not even list whole clauses, but rather lists a specific *-no/-to* word (as in *skazano* ‘said/spoken’) and every instance of that word in his corpus. He sometimes apparently fails to distinguish between *-no/-to* participials and adverbials (some of which can end in *-no*): *nespovjidano [sic]* ‘unexpectedly’. Nonetheless, this work is a key to numerous examples from that period, drawing

⁹² Babby (1993b: 17) discusses the otherwise *reflexiva tantum* Rus verb *atrofirovatʹsja* ‘to atrophy’, which does take participial forms in *-n-*, but without *-sja*. Cf. also Wieczorek (1994: 74), who discusses a similar type of correspondence in Ukr.

from a corpus of several more volumes than the three we were able to consult. A near-minimal pair of participial clauses (52):⁹³

- (1) [...] naj djid [sic] panam horlo ne napyxaje, bo vono napxane.
'let grandpa not stuff the lords' throat, for it is stuffed.'
- (2) — Vydyš, stara, naš xrestyk? Tam je vybyto i tvoje nameno.
'You see, old lady, our cross? There [on it] is inscribed too your name.'

Example (1) shows a context in which *horlo* 'throat' is the topic of discourse, and (its pronoun *vono*) is initial in the participial clause, and undergoes agreement. In (2) *nameno* 'name' occurs in only the 8th line of a chapter, in which the preceding lines do not refer to "names" or the like, meaning that *nameno* is new information, focused in the clause, and as such (assuming neutral intonation), appears finally in the participial clause. Here the *-no/-to* form is used. While the *-no/-to* form in the lower example can still indicate agreement (see our discussion of the distinction between agreeing and non-agreeing *-no/-to* in ANN Shevelov 1969 and Synjavs'kyj 1967), this is unlikely, since in (1) Stefanyk uses the neut sg agreeing form in *-ne*. Assuming, then, that (2) represents non-agreement, this pair of examples may indicate a correlation between word order and whether to have participial agreement. Cf. also ANN Zatovkan'uk 1979. (Cf., however, ANN Fici Giusti 1992b, in which examples from 17th-century Rus appear to behave the opposite way.) Another interesting example:⁹⁴

- (3) — Ehe! — kaže, —ščo to durne djivča [sic], skazano vže.
' "Aha!," he says, "[the fact] that this [is a] stupid girl, was mentioned already." '

Crucially, here the patient of the predicate *skazano* 'mentioned' is not the neut sg NP *durne djivča* 'stupid girl', but rather the clause *ščo to durne djivča* '[the fact] that this [is a] stupid girl'. The clausal subject then triggers the non-agreeing predicate. Finally, an early ex with overt *bulo* 'was':⁹⁵

- (4) V šynku bulo nabyto_[-AGR] ljudej_{GEN.PL}.
'In the tavern was [sic] packed in people.'

- Rittel, Teodozja. (1985) *Kategoria osoby w polskim zdaniu*. Kraków: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe. [Virginia: PG6369.R48 1985]

Briefly considers the non-impersonal status of Pol *-no/-to* clauses (112). Also discusses the so-called *pluralis modistiae*, using Pol *-no/-to* to express a sentence in which the doer is the speaker (cf. ANN Dziwirek 1994 and fn there) (184).

- Rothstein, Robert A. (1974) "Relevancy marking in Polish complements". R. D. Brecht and C. V. Chvany, eds. *Slavic transformational syntax*. (= *Michigan Slavic materials*, 10.) Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 51–65. [Rutgers: ALEX PG13.M46 no.10]

⁹³ Quoting Stefanyk, Vasyl'. (1905) *Moje slovo*. L'viv: Spilka, 38 and 167, respectively. [Harvard: WID-LC PG3948.S78 M6x]

⁹⁴ Quoting Vovčok, Marko (1903) *Narodni opovidannja*. L'viv: Spilka, 4th ed., v. 1, 29. [SUNY-Brockport: PG 3948.V66.N3 1903 v. 1]

⁹⁵ Fed'kovyc', Osyp Jurij. (1902) *Povisty j opovidanja Osypa Jurija Fed'kovyc'a*. L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka. [Cleveland Pub. Lib.: Ukr 30-165150]

Briefly entertains the possibility of a “dummy” (= pleonastic) underlying subject in Pol *-no/-to* clauses. That is, a participial (agreeing) passive without an expressed *przez* phrase (*Drzwi został zamknięte* ‘The door was/has -been closed’) corresponds to a *-no/-to* clause (*Zamknęto drzwi* ‘The door was/has -been closed’), as the same passive **with** such a *przez* phrase (*Drzwi został zamknięte przez Jana* ‘The door was closed by John’) corresponds to the active sentence (*Jan zamknął drzwi* ‘John closed the door’) [= his exx 26–29, resp.] (58).

- Rothstein, Robert A. (1993) “Polish”. Bernard Comrie and Greville Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic languages*. London: Routledge, 687–758 (§12). [Princeton: PG41.S58 1993]

A concise description of Pol *-no/-to*: “The subject position is also eliminated in a second construction, which Polish shares only with Ukrainian. The construction is active (that is, a direct object or other governed case is possible) even though the verbal form is related to the passive participle [...] Although not all verbs have this form, it occurs with many verbs that do not otherwise form a passive participle (for example, intransitive and “reflexive” verbs). The construction has the value of past tense and the unspecified subject (singular or plural) is understood to be human and definite” (712–13).

- Rouhier-Willoughby, Jeanmarie. (1993) *The voice-aspect relationship in Russian: A case study of reversible action and phasal verbs*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia. [Virginia: Diss. Slavic 1993.R68]

Examines the related voice-aspect issue in Russian. Reassesses the traditional notion that the passive is expressed using a finite verb + the historically reflexive particle *-sja* if imperfective and an agreeing *-n/-t-* form if perfective.

- Rusanivs’kyj, V. M. (1968) “Dijeprykmetnyky j slova dijeprykmetnykovoho pochodžennja” [Participles and words of participial origin (Ukr)]. *Ukrajins’ka mova i literatura v školi* 18(8): 28–34. [Princeton: 30293.923 no.8–12 1968]

Discusses the morphological derivation from agreeing passive participle to *-no/-to* form (35). Some discussion of overt copulas in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses (35).

- [Rusanivs’kyj, V. M.] (1969) “Predykatywni pasywni dijeprykmetnyky na *-no* (*-eno*), *-to*” [Predicative passive participles in *-no* (*-eno*), *-to* (Ukr)]. I. K. Bilodid, ed. *Morfologija* [Morphology (Ukr)]. (= *Sučasna ukrajins’ka literaturna mova* [Contemporary literary Ukr (Ukr)], [2].) Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 417–19. [Princeton: 30293.891 v. 2]

Mentions that a set of Ukr intransitive *reflexiva tantum* verbs take forms ending in *-no* (without *-sja*) that are distinct from the construction discussed here: *rozhubytysja* ‘to become flustered’, *rozhubleno* ‘flusteredly’ (418, fn 110). While we gloss the latter as an adverb, cf. ANN Corbett 1980 for a different approach, which uses the same notion of non-agreement.

- Rusanivs’kyj, V. M. (1971) “Katehorija stanu”. *Struktura ukrajins’koho dijeslova* [The structure of the Ukr verb (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 281–98 (§66). [Duke: 491.7982 R949 S927 1971]

Discusses Ukr *-no/-to* clauses, incl. historical data (286–87). Examples of *-no/-to* clauses, not all of which have acc objects (288).

- Růžička, Jozef. (1962) “Veta a sloveso (Z problematiky jednoduchej vety” [Clause and verb (Selected problems concerning the simple clause) (Sk)]. J. Bauer et al, eds. *Otázky slovanské syntaxe. Sborník Brněnské syntaktické konference. 17.–21. IV. 1961* [Problems of Slavic syntax. Proceedings of the Brno syntax conference, 17–21 April 1961 (Cz)]. (= *Spisy university J. E. Purkyně v Brně. Filosofská fakulta, 85.*) Praha: Statní Pedagogické Nakladatelství, 141–53. [Yale: A34b 146 85–86]

Examples of Rus, Pol, and Sk adversity-impersonal constructions (149). Pol acc object constructions with a reflexive particle—cf. ANN Christensen 1993 (150).
- Růžička, Rudolf. (1986) “Typologie der Diathese slavischer Sprachen in parametrischen Variationen” [Typology of diathesis in Slavic languages in parametric variations (Ger)]. *Die Welt der Slaven* 31(2): 225–74.

A detailed analysis of passive constructions in Slavic, incl. *-no/-to* exx from Ukr, Pol, and Rus dialects.
- Rytel-Kuc, Danuta. (1990) “Polskie konstrukcje bezosobowe na *-no* i *-to*”. *Niemieckie passivum i man-Sätze a ich przeklad w języku czeskim i polskim.* (= *Prace Slawistyczne, 84.*) Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, 128–35 (§5). [Virginia: PG6285.R96 1990]

The fact that Rytel-Kuc devotes an entire (albeit brief) chapter to Pol *-no/-to* in this book on translations of Ger *man* sentences testifies to the compatibility of the two constructions (cf. *pro-arb* analysis of both in ANN Maling 1993).
- Saloni, Zygmunt. (1976) *Cechy sk ladniowe polskiego czasownika* [Typology of diathesis in Slavic languages in parametric variations (Ger)]. (= *Prace jezykoznawcze, 76.*) Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich. [Center for Research Libs.: C26693]

Discusses several facets of Pol *-no/-to* (87–90), such as: verbs requiring a non-human doer (e.g., *gęgać* ‘cackle’, *wrzec* ‘boil’) cannot take *-no/-to* forms.
- Saloni, Zygmunt. (1986) “Obligatory and optional arguments in the syntax of Polish verbs”. *International journal of Slavic linguistics and poetics* 3: 17–25.

Point II (21–23) discusses *-no/-to* sentences, mentioning that they “function as finite (i.e. predicative) forms”, “the impossibility of joining them with either a subject (nominative) phrase or any equivalent of a subject transformed in any way” (i.e., the equivalent of an Eng *by*-phrase).⁹⁶

⁹⁶ Saloni makes one description that is not, however, entirely accurate: “[*-no/-to* clauses] are used only in situations when the actant corresponding to the omitted argument (expressed by the nominative in active constructions) is indefinite: the speaker may not know nor be interested in who was involved in the action, in any case he is not in a position to express it” (21). We have elicited sentences (*podano herbat e* ‘tea is served’) in which the speaker definitely knows who has prepared the tea (and indeed might have done so him-/herself). We would correct Saloni’s characterizations as follows: “... the speaker—either because s/he doesn’t know, is not interested, or otherwise does not find it necessary—does not express who the doer of the action is”. (Incidentally, this same scenario also defeats the twofold characterization made in the literature that the doer in *-no/-to* sentences is understood to be 3rd pl. See, for example, ANN Dziwirek 1994 (incl. fn). This example—in the 1st sg—is neither 3rd nor pl. The most usual pragmatic interpretation is, however, that of 3rd pl.)

- [Samijlenko, S. P.] (1962) “Zminy form člennyx prykmetykiv v ukrajins’kij movi” [Changes in long-form adjectives in Ukr (Ukr)]. O. P. Bezpál’ko, M. K. Bojčuk, M. A. Žovtohrjux, S. P. Samijlenko, and I. J. Taranenکو. *Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins’koji movy. Pidručnyk dlja studentiv movno-literaturnyx fakul’tetiv pedahoh. in-tiv URSR. Kyjiv: Radjans’ka škola, 2nd ed., 287–96, §72. [Brandeis: PG 3819.I8 1962]*

A brief discussion of transitional examples of the old long-form neut sg adjectival (and participial) ending from *-oe* > *-ee* > *-e*. Samijlenko does not discuss the short-form *-o*, which remained the same, and which now contrasts with *-e*. In modern Ukr *-o* appears only in predicate position (and only with participles, not with adjectives) when there is no subject with agreement feature, while *-e* appears on adjectival stems in the remaining three environments: 1) as the predicate of a passive clause with a noun phrase headed by a lexical neuter noun in the nom sg; 2) as a modifier within a noun phrase headed by a lexical neut noun in the sg; and 3) as the lone overt member of the NP (i.e., without a head N). See Babby (forthcoming) for a different interpretation of this last environment.
- Šapiro, A. B. (1949) “Tipy bezličnyx predloženíj v russkix govorax” [Types of impersonal sentences in Rus dialects (Rus)]. S. Obnorskij, R. I. Avanesov, and F. P. Filin, eds. *Materialy i issledovanija po russkoj dialektologii 2*. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 202–16. [Princeton: 3023.622 t.2]

Reports an array of dialect-Rus *-no/-to* and related data (208–09). Of particular interest: *-no/-to* predicates with nom-patient NPs—i.e., non-agreement but non-acc-assigning predicates—in NR and Urals dialects (208); the habitative existential in *-no/-to* form (NR, Arxangel’sk region): *byvano* (209); and NR *-no/-to* forms from motion verbs with the doer in a PP with *u* ‘by/near’ (209).
- Šapiro, A. B. (1953) “Bezličnye predloženiya.” *Očerki po sintaksisu russkix narodnyx govorov* [Notes on the syntax of Rus folk dialects (Rus)] *Stroenie predloženiya*. Moscow: AN SSSR, 136–46. [Princeton: 3023.852]

Plenty of data from Rus dialects (cf. preceding ANN). Some data on adversity-impersonals (cf. Babby 1994b) (136–37).
- Šaxmatov, Aleksej A. (1925/1963) *Sintaksis russkogo jazyka* [Rus syntax (RUS)], 1. (= *Slavistic printings and reprintings*, 61.) The Hague: Mouton. [Florida St: 491.752 S527s 1941]. [Photomechanic reprint of 2nd ed. (1941), Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoje učebno-pedagogičeskoe izd-vo NarKomProsa RSFSR.]

Several points of interest: 1. Pol *-no/-to* exx formed from *reflexiva tantum* verbs (111); 2. Numerous historical-Rus *-no/-to* exx (112); 3. More discussion of and data on Rus *-no/-to* (127); 4. The perfect defined (489); cf. ANN Wiczorek 1989 (item 1).
- Sektor istorii russkogo jazyka i dialektologii, Institut jazykoznanija, AN SSSR. (1957) “Nekotorye novye dannye o russkix narodnyx govorax (po materialam dialektologičeskix atlasov)” [Some new data on Rus folk dialects (based on material for dialect atlases) (Rus)]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, no. 5, 82–92. [Princeton: 2000.946]

This article mentions various *-no/-to* phenomena in Rus dialects (90–91). Of particular interest are the following, which don’t appear to be stressed elsewhere in

the Rus-dialect literature: While it is well known that doers are expressed using a PP with *u* ‘by/near’, and occasionally pointed out that the NP in this PP can be a non-human animal, there is apparently the possibility of natural forces in such a PP (91): *zdes’ verno u dožžá byto* ‘here indeed by/near rain been_[-AGR]’ (= ‘indeed there has been rain here’). Note also the *-no/-to* form of the copula (cf. ANN Szwejkowska 1929). Next, apparently some Rus dialects allow a bare-inst NP in place of a PP: *mnoj xozeno* ‘me_{INST} walked_[-AGR]’ (91). Finally, there appears to be another means of expressing the past in terms of a reference point in the past: *devuška uexala byla v Leningrad/teper’ vernulas’* ‘girl departed_{(V)PAST.FEM.SG} was_{(V)PAST.FEM.SG} to Leningrad/now has returned_{(V)PAST.FEM.SG}’; cf. the apparently parallel phenomenon in Ukr described in (ANN) Petlyčnyj 1960: 25 (91). Unfortunately, none of these phenomena is cited or linked to specific place names.

- Shevelov, George Y. [Ju. Ševel’ov]. (1943) “Try profili (Do perevydannja prac’ naddniprjans’kyx movoznavciv u L’vovi)” [Three profiles (On re-publishing the works of three Upper Dnipro-region linguists in L’viv (Ukr)]. *Naši dni* 4: 6–7 [L’viv]. [Stanford: (HOV) Ukrainian Serial O.S.]

Discusses three E. Ukr linguists—Kurylo, Smerečyns’kyj, and Synjavs’kyj—in a W. Ukr intellectual magazine. Shevelov briefly mentions overt copulas and inst ‘by’-phrases in *-no/-to* clauses (6).

- Shevelov, George Y. (1963) *The syntax of modern literary Ukrainian*. (= *Slavistic printings and reprintings*, 38.) The Hague: Mouton. [Princeton: 3013.808]

The original manuscript of this book was reportedly written in 1940 for publication at Kyjiv: *Radjans’ka škola*, but never appeared. This is an impressive description of modern Ukr. His discussion of *-no/-to* clauses—“Impersonal sentences with forms ending in *-no*, *-to*” (139–46; §6.10)—is concise and complete, probably the best (primary) reference on Ukr *-no/-to* to date. Some highlights:

1. “In modern Ukrainian the principal function of this form is to convey a past action in its consequences which still exist or do it regularly [sic] (perfective, and in the verbs of imperfective aspect—iterative-perfective)” (139).
2. “In more recent times impersonal sentences ending in *-no*, *-to* with the predicates in the imperfective aspect, are rarely found” (140).
3. The “absolute past tense” is conveyed using the overt copula *bulo* ‘was’ (140).
4. “Gradually the original limitation of sentences containing such forms—to convey only human activity, has been forgotten” (140).
5. “Every impersonal sentence of the *-no*, *-to* type may be transformed into a binomial sentence and vice versa: *strav[u] navareno* [‘dish_{(N.FEM)ACC.SG} cooked_[-AGR]’]—*strava navarena* [‘dish_{(N.FEM)NOM.SG} cooked_{(PRT)FEM.SG}’]” (142).⁹⁷

⁹⁷ We would disagree slightly with this point. Cf. ANN Wiczorek 1994 (item 18, incl. fnn). When the underlying object is a quantified NP, then only the *-no/-to* form is allowed. We agree that in theory this quantified NP can be either the subject or the direct object. In either event, however, there is no NP subject with a morphologically nom head for the *-no/-to* predicate to agree with. (This point will be discussed in Billings, forthcoming.)

6. “The specific value of the impersonal sentences of the *-no*, *-to* type consists in their ability to convey action though primarily not in its course, but in its end-result, while parallel binomial [agreeing–passive] sentences [in *-n/-t-*] generally impart a given state apart from its dependence on action” (142).
7. Shevelov summarizes the prescriptivist battle against certain changes in this construction during the early 1900s (overt copulas, inst ‘by’-phrases), incl. the frequent argument by the prescriptivists that these changes were “Russianisms” (142–45).
8. Whether pronominals, incl. *vono* ‘it’ (cf. ANN Billings 1993b regarding pleonastics) are truly the subject of such clauses (145–46); cf. also §8.1 “Personal pronouns” (244–47), where pleonastic-like phenomena are also discussed.

Shevelov’s book also discusses the acc-assigning construction with a past-tense verb and *-sja* (147–48; §6.11); cf. ANN Kurylo 1930.

- Shevelov, George Y. (1968) “Orzeczenia bezpodmiotowe odimiesłowowe na *-no/to* w języku polskim przed rokiem 1450” [Departicipial subjectless predicates in *-no/-to* in Pol before 1450 (Pol)]. *Slavia Orientalis* 17(3): 387–93. [Princeton: 0907.861]

Tracks the very earliest attestations of *-no/-to* (in Pol). Changes in Pol during the late 1300 and early 1400s precipitated the evolution of the *-no*, *-to* construction. Numerous exx, incl. those with overt copulas (389–90). It is startling that none of the *-no/-to* predicates with overt copulas has an underlying object of a declensional class that exhibits unmistakably acc case (i.e., sg nouns of the *-a* declension or adjectives in the fem sg).⁹⁸

- Shevelov, George Y. (1969) “The vicissitudes of a syntactic construction in Eastern Slavic (impersonal sentences in *-no*, *-to* with the acc sg of object)”. *Scando-Slavica* 15: 171–86. [Princeton: 3013.808]

This article complements Shevelov 1968 by investigating the *-no/-to* construction in ESl (primarily Ukr).⁹⁹

1. The NR *-no/-to* phenomena are apparently not linked to the Ukr (and Br) phenomena (172); cf. Veenker 1967, which argues for a Finno-Ugric effect on NR. Shevelov discusses the sparse use of *-no/-to* in Br and possible phonetic reasons for its loss (172–73). More importantly, acc-assigning *-no/-to* “may be said to be alien to Old Russian [i.e., old ESl] as a whole” (173); Shevelov dispels the handful of exx of acc-assigning *-no/-to* in OR (174–76). The majority of

⁹⁸ Cf. discussion in ANNs Grepl 1962, Havránek 1937, Kopec`ny´ 1958, Matveenko 1962b (item 10), Siewierska 1988 (incl. fn), and Trávníček 1951. Note, however, the pronominal ex in ANN Oesterreicher 1926 and another referred to in a fn under ANN Pisarkowa 1984. Those exx notwithstanding, it is conspicuous that in these data sets there are no NPs of this *-a* declension—the only inflectional class which distinguishes the acc case morphologically from both nom and gen.

⁹⁹ Shevelov (1969: 177, fn. 11) incorrectly cites the following very early Pol *-no/-to* ex: *kedi zapissz zapisowano* as “26 in Ulanowski” (but Shevelov 1968 correctly cites this source); in fact this ex appears in item 24 on p. 189 of Ulanowski, Boles law. (1884) “Roty przysi ag krakowskich z lat 1399–1418”. *Sprawozdania Komisji językowej Akademii umiejętności 3*: 186–97. [Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.] [Harvard: LSoc 3751.80.85]

- no/-to* data occur when the underlying object is numerically quantified; cf. ANNs Wieczorek 1994, item 18, and Shevelov 1963, item 5 (incl. fnn there).
2. Non-agreement when the quantified NP follows the *-no/-to* predicate (176).
 3. Somewhat sketchy historical evidence regarding the dates when *-no/-to* was borrowed from Pol, possibly as early as 1418 (176), but surely by the 1700s (177).
 4. Modern-Pol and -Ukr *-no/-to* forms differ significantly (176–77), as discussed extensively elsewhere; cf, e.g., the preceding ANN.
 5. This article's greatest contribution perhaps lies in the following, somewhat complicated observation: Shevelov analyzes Petlyčnyj's (1960) data on Ivan Franko¹⁰⁰ (1856–1915) with regard to overt copulas, which bring into question some of Shevelov's earlier conclusions (in Shevelov and Veržbyc'kyj 1951). Shevelov lists those seven *exx* (of the reported 21) overt copulas in Franko's prose (179). Of these seven, three have no acc object, the other four each have (at least one) neuter NP which might be in the acc (but have homophonous acc and nom forms). It is not coincidental that all these NPs are neuter. Such *exx*, Shevelov argues, have nom, and not acc, neut NPs: "At this point I will take the liberty of advancing a new hypothesis, which, of course, to be accepted, would require many more facts from Franko and other writers of his time. I propose that *-no/to* with acc were borrowed into Ukrainian from Polish in the 15th-16th centuries; along with the Polish constructions of the type, by the 17th century they had acquired the function of denoting past action by unspecified person(s). However, with neuter nouns Ukrainian preserved its original use of *-no/to* as participles of personal sentences. Hence while (as in Polish) *bulo*, *bude* were lost in impersonal *-no/to* sentences, they were retained in personal ones [i.e., agreeing passives—LB/JM] with neuter nouns. [...]" (180). That is, a (lexical, non-pleonastic) neut sg NP continued to trigger either agreeing participial endings in *-ne/-te* (from the long-form adjectival ending *-oe*) or forms in *-no/-to* (corresponding historically to the short-form neut.sg ending in *-o*). Thus, either *slovo movleno* or *slovo movlene* 'word_{(N.NEUT)NOM.SG} spok-en_{NEUT.SG}' were attested in Franko's time. Such clauses, as agreeing passives, tolerated as well the overt copulas *bulo* 'was_{NEUT.SG}' and *bude* 'will-be_{3.SG}'. NPs of any other gender (or in the pl) would require their respective agreeing-participle and -copula forms (*pravda bula/bude movlena* 'truth_{(N.FEM)NOM.SG} was_{FEM.SG}/will-be_{3.SG} spoken_{FEM.SG}', *sklad buv/bude movlenyj* 'syllable_{(N.MASC)NOM.SG} was_{MASC.SG}/will-be_{3.SG} spoken_{MASC.SG}', *slová buly/budut' movleni* 'syllable_{(N.NEUT)NOM.PL} were_{PL}/will-be_{PL} spoken_{PL}'). If, however, any NP—incl. neut sg ones—appears in the acc, then no copula is allowed (*pravdu movleno* 'truth_{(N.FEM)ACC.SG} spoken_[-AGR]', *sklad movleno* 'syllab-le_{(N.MASC)ACC.SG} spoken_[-AGR]', *slová movleni* 'words_{(N.NEUT)NOM.PL} spoken_[-AGR]').

¹⁰⁰ Shevelov somewhat hastily criticizes Petlyčnyj for not reporting which of Franko's works were consulted. In fact, Petlyčnyj (1960: 26, fn. 28) specifically cites Franko's 20-volume collected works. Cf. fn in ANN Petlyčnyj 1960.

6. In connection with the preceding point, Shevelov attempts to show, using Sulyma 1929 and a corpus study of his own, that there is some dialectal variation. Closer to Poland, there is a tendency toward the Pol simple-past model, while the more eastern regions seem to have tolerated the overt copulas sooner. In fact, in Shevelov's study of Oleksandr Oles' (1878–1944, from Xarkiv) shows that, aside from neut sg nouns with agreeing *-no/-to*, there are only four other (non-neut) *-no/-to* exx. One is particularly telling: *Zamknuti v mene dveri, začyneno vikno* 'locked_{PL} by me door_{(N.FEM)NOM.PL}, closed window' [= 'I have the door locked (and) the window closed'], where *vikno* is arguably nom and *začyneno* is possibly an agreeing neut sg form (183).¹⁰¹ More than likely, however, *vikno* is acc and *začyneno* is the non-agreeing form.¹⁰²
- Shevelov, George Y. [Jurij Šerex]. (1987) *Ukrajins'ka mova v peršij polovyni dvadcatoho stolittja, 1900–1941* [The Ukrainian language in the first half of the twentieth century: 1900–1941]. [New York]: *Sučasnist'*. [Princeton: PG3815 .S47 1987]
See ANN of the Eng edition, Shevelov 1989, below. This edition, although it preceded the English-language edition in print, is a translation into Ukr (4). The most significant difference between editions to the researcher might be that the index of this Ukr edition (279–94) includes many more entries (place names, personal names, journals) than that of the Eng edition (Shevelov 1969: 235–42), which appears to be limited to personal names and serial titles.
 - Shevelov, George Y. (1989) *The Ukrainian language in the first half of the twentieth century: 1900–1941*. Cambridge, MA: Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. [Princeton: PG3815 .S52]
Only the briefest of references to “passive constructions” (139). Shevelov's book provides the necessary background on no less than thirty of the authors and publications in this bibliography. For example: “The main representatives of the ethnographic, extremely puritanistic school were... Je. Tymčenko, O. Kurylo in her early writings, M. Hladkyj..., and outside the Soviet Ukraine, V. Simovyč in his early writings and I. Ohijenko [= Ilarion]. The syntactic, moderately puristic trend was represented by O. Synjavs'kyj, M. Sulyma, ... O. Kurylo in her later writings... The extreme puristic trend was stronger in Kiev [Kyjiv], the moderate one in Kharkov [Xarkiv]” (138). These general observations of Shevelov's about overall “purism” correspond to the prescriptiveness of the *-no/-to* treatments in our bibliography. Shevelov also makes sense of the political situation during the period—during which Ukr was spoken in parts of the Russian and Austrian empires—in the latter Ukr was called Ruthenian, *ruthenische Sprache* (Ger), *rus'ka mova* (Ukr).¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Oles', Oleksandr (1964) *Poeziji*. Kyjiv: Radjanska škola, 145. [Harvard: Slav 5074.2.15]

¹⁰² Shevelov's (1969) corpus study also uses the following work: Hončar, O. (1966) “Opovidannja riznyx lit”. *Vitčyzna* 34:11, 24-37. [Princeton: 0907.939]

¹⁰³ Some of Shevelov's observations about this period are first-hand, from when he was a young linguist in Xarkiv (cf., e.g., 167), making this book a cut above Wexler's (1974) similar work (which Shevelov cites extensively as well, but does not list in his index).

- Shevelov, George Y. (1993) “Ukrainian”. Bernard Comrie and Greville Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic languages*. London: Routledge, 947–98 (§17). [Princeton: PG41.S58 1993]
A brief mention of the *-no/-to* construction (987). Additionally, Shevelov describes the conditions under which the *-n-* or *-t-* form of participial (incl. *-no/-to*) stems are formed (972).
- [Shevelov, G. Y. and O. Veržbyč'kyj]. (1951) “Bezособovi i vidnosno-bezособovi rečennja” [Impersonal and relative-impersonal sentences (Ukr)]. *Syntaksys (1. Proste rečennja, 2. Skladne rečennja, 3. Puntuacija)* [Syntax (1. The simple sentence, 2. The complex sentence, 3. Punctuation) (Ukr)]. [(= *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajinskoji literaturnoji movy, 2. L. A. Bulaxovskij [L. A. Bulaxovs'kyj], ed.)* Kyjiv: Radjans'ka škola, 52–69, §5. [Michigan: FILM 20006]
Some discussion of overt pleonastics; cf. ANN Billings 1993a; 1993b (59, 67–68); data and discussion of acc-assigning passive in *-sja*; cf. ANN Kurylo 1930 (64); a lengthy discussion of *-no/-to* (65–67).
- Siewierska, Anna. (1988) “The passive in Slavic”. M. Shibatani, ed. *Passive and voice*. (= *Typological studies in language*, 16.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 243–89. [Princeton: P281.P385 1988]

Contrary to its broad-reaching title, this is primarily a look at the various passive and passive-like phenomena in Pol and attempts to compare these with analogous constructions elsewhere in Sl. Following an introduction, in which the theoretical definitions of what constitutes a passive (“clauses in which the active subject has been demoted or elided qualify as passive irrespective of whether the potential active non-subject has been subjectivized”; 244), Siewierska determines the aspectual factors of passives (e.g., Rus no longer allows *-n-/-t-* passives to be formed from imperfective verb stems), how a demoted doer is expressed (she primarily looks at the difference in Pol between means, expressed by an NP in the inst, and the so-called ‘by’-phrase, expressed by a PP in *przez* ‘through’; 251–53),¹⁰⁴ pointing out that overt expression of the agent in Pol *-no/-to* clauses is ungrammatical. Siewierska also discusses reflexive passives (256–69; cf. Christensen 1993; Kański 1991). Her primary treatment of the *-no/-to* is in §4, 269–75,¹⁰⁵ beginning with this morpheme’s Indo-European roots in *-to* (cf. ANN Brugmann 1895); she writes that the allomorphy choice of *-to* versus *-no* has to do with verbal roots in *i, er, el, em, en*, and *ě, a*, respectively (270). The ensuing discussion primarily compares Pol and Rus. She reports that *-no/-to* clauses were historically passive in both languages “though a noticeable reduction in the use of *be* can be observed in

¹⁰⁴ Like Kurylo (1922/1960), Siewierska uses the NP ‘soldiers’ to show how as the agent this word is expressed with a *przez* PP, but as the means an NP in the inst is used. Ukr can use the inst for either semantic role, making Kurylo’s treatment more complicated.

¹⁰⁵ Siewierska writes that in addition to Pol and East Slavic, *-no/-to* occurs “in some dialects of Serbo-Croatian and very rarely in Czech” (269–70). There are several references to the latter; as to the former, M. Mihalević informs us that there is no *-no/-to* passive in Sr-Cr. Siewierska does not follow up this statement with data. Cf., however, Petlyčnyj (1960: 25) for a very brief discussion and references to Cz and Sr *-no/-to* (in none of the exx from either language is there an irrefutably acc underlying object).

Polish from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards, culminating in its total disappearance in the contemporary language” (271). Siewierska also points out that while (standard) Rus tended towards only perfective verbs in *-no/-to* clauses, intransitive in Pol stems can also take the *-no/-to* form.

- Simovyč, Vasyl'. ([1919]/1986) *Hramatyka ukrajins'koji*. [Ukr grammar (Ukr)]. (= *Ukrajins'ki hramatyky*, 5. O. Horbač [Horbatsch], ed.) Munich: Ukrajins'kyj vil'nyj un-t, Filosofičnyj fakul'tet. [Penn: PG3823 .S55 1986] [Photoreprint of 2nd ed.¹⁰⁶ Kyjiv: Ukrajins'ka nakladnja/Kolomija: Halyc'ka nakladnja/Winnipeg: Ukrainian [sic] Publishing. [Princeton: 30293.858]

Mentions *-no/-to* (282ff, 482ff). Discusses various pleonastic forms on 213, to include the following one, in which *vono* 'it_{NOM}' is apparently in the same clause as a nom subject: *Čy vono čolovik bez talanu rodyt'sja, čy talanu v Boha ne zarobyt?* [quoting Tobilevyč (no citation)] 'Is it true that man is born without talent, or is it possible for him to earn it from God?'

- Simovyč, Vasyl'. (1924/1981) "Na temy movy" [On language (Ukr)]. *Ukrajins'ke movoznavstvo. Rozvidky j statti. Uporjadkuvannja j vstupna statti Jurija Ševel'ova*. (= *University of Ottawa Ukrainian studies*, 4.) Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1981. [Rutgers: ALEX PPG3802.S55 1981] [Originally published as a monograph. Prague: Nova Ukrajina, 1924. [Brigham Young: PG 3814.S46x].]

A lengthy discussion of *-no/-to* (1924: 16–20/1981: 83–87).

- Simovyč, V. (1934) "Do morfologiji [sic] ukrajins'kyx prykmetykiv" [On the morphology of Ukr adjectives (UKR)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii*, 12: 26–34. [Princeton: 3013.858]

On exactly when the neut sg adjectival (incl. participial) ending changed from *-oe* (long form) to *-e* (42–43).

- Sjatovskij, S. I. (1963a) "Nekotorye voprosy tipologičeskogo i sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo sintaksisa (V svjazi s sostavleniem sintaksičeskogo voprosnika k obščeslavjanskomu lingvističeskomu atlasu)" [Some questions on typological and comparative-historical syntax (In connection with compiling the syntax questionnaire for a common/pan-Slavic linguistic atlas) (Rus)]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 12(6): 69–83. [Princeton: 2000.946]

A thorough survey of the diversity of acc-assigning passive(-like) constructions in Slavic (incl. ones with the reflexive clitic, not discussed in this bibliography per se). While Sjatovskij's aim is to develop an adequate questionnaire for a dialect(-atlas) survey, this article is nonetheless a valuable fount of data, or source thereof. The *-no/-to* constructions in Pol and Ukr are mentioned repeatedly throughout the article. We provide a sampling here:

¹⁰⁶ The second edition is almost double the size of the first edition; for details see Horbač's afterword to the 1986 ed. and Shevelov's foreword to the 1981 reprint of Simovyč 1924.

1. “In contemporary Pol and Ukr indefiniteness of the person doing the action in the past tense is often rendered in *-no/-to* forms” (70).¹⁰⁷
2. “The impossibility of using an oblique-case form for the logical subject” in Pol and Ukr *-no/-to* clauses, i.e., the ‘by’-phrase cannot be overtly expressed (70).¹⁰⁸
3. “The syntactic nature of forms in [...] *-no/-to* in the Slavic languages cannot be determined without considering whether it is structurally possible to use oblique-case forms (with or without prepositions) with the meaning of logical subject” (71); cf. item 2 above. In his fn 71 Sjatovskij criticizes Matveenko (1961; 1962b) for apparently not taking this into consideration.¹⁰⁹
4. Some apparent examples of the overt copula *byŭo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ in certain Pol dialects (71), citing Koneczna (1957: 350):
 - (1) Navet zakazano byŭo po polsku godać [sic] tutaj.
 even forbidden_[-AGR] was_{NEUT.SG} in Polish_{ADV} to speak here
 ‘It was even forbidden to speak Polish here.’
5. An explanation of sorts for the emergence of *-no/-to* in Pol, with a very brief reference to the modern Pol *-no/-to* construction “with an active meaning” (76).
6. “Counting sentences in *-no/-to* among impersonals contradicts the historical facts. In the history of Rus and Pol, for example, syntactic re-formations consistently took place as to activeness/passiveness of the action of the **indefinite plurality of persons**” (77). We take this to mean that Rus *-no/-to* clauses, like Pol ones, also require an indefinite-3pl reading.¹¹⁰
7. “Forms in *-no/-to*, which in Rus, Cz, and Sr-Cr have a passive meaning, but in Polish and Ukrainian have an active one” (79).¹¹¹ “The indefiniteness of the doer in the past tense is expressed in contemporary Polish and Ukrainian is often expressed using *-no/-to* forms (70):

¹⁰⁷ Throughout his article Sjatovskij consistently describes Ukr and Pol *-no/-to* constructions as acting alike with regard to “indefiniteness of the person doing the action” or doer. In fact, as of 1963, when his article was published, Ukr *-no/-to* had quite decisively become a true syntactic (albeit impersonal) passive construction. That is, this construction, unlike its Pol counterpart, is not restricted to a human doer of the action. See, for example, item (3) in ANN Arvat 1975 for exx of *-no/-to* clauses with natural-force “doers”. See also ANN Maling 1993 for a list of differences between the Pol and Ukr *-no/-to* constructions.

¹⁰⁸ This generalization, too (see preceding fn), while accurate for Pol *-no/-to*, is inaccurate with respect to contemporary Ukr. See Shevelov 1963 and Wiczorek (1994: 44ff) for numerous examples of such ‘by’-phrases (expressed using the inst case in standard Ukr).

¹⁰⁹ This is a valid consideration, but not a sufficient one. Cf. ANN Maling 1993 (it is pointed out in item 3 that, while no overt ‘by’-phrase is allowed in unpassives, true passives can allow ‘by’-phrases, but some true passive constructions do not have ‘by’-phrases. Thus, the presence of a ‘by’-phrase indicates passiveness, while its absence does not indicate anything conclusively).

¹¹⁰ There does not appear to be any such tendency in Rus. Regarding whether there is a **required understood doer** in Pol, cf. ANN Dziwirek 1994 (incl. fn).

¹¹¹ Again, as in the first two fnn of this ANN, we do not agree that Ukr *-no/-to* is active.

(2) **Pol:** [...] biegano bowiem tamtedy
 ran_[-AGR] after all that way

‘...after all, they ran that way’

(3) **Ukr:** [...] čamodany ukradeno
 suitcases_{ACC.SG} stolen_[-AGR]

‘... the suitcases were stolen’

8. “It is necessary to establish what meaning *-no/-to* forms in all Slavic languages possess: active or passive. This is especially needed for constructions in *-no/-to* with a noun that does not agree in gender or number with the main member [i.e., predicate]” (80).¹¹²

9. Certain Cz-dialect (as well as Rus-dialect and Ukr) *-no/-to* examples with acc underlying objects (81); citing Trávníček 1951—see ANN below.

- ****Sjatovskij, S. I. (1963b)** “Neopredelenno-ličnye predloženiya v sovremennyx slavjanskix jazykax”. [Indefinite-personal sentences in the modern Slavic languages (Rus)] *Slavjanskaja filologija* 5.
- **Slyn’ko, I. I. (1980)** “Paradyhmatyka prostoho rečennja ukrajins’koji movy (odnoskladne rečennja)”. [Paradigms of the simple clause in Ukr (the single-member clause) (Ukr)] *Movoznavstvo* 5: 22-29. [Michigan: GL 891.796 M9354]

A relatively brief discussion of how *-no/-to* clauses fit into the typology of simple clauses in modern Ukr, including examples in various tenses and the irrealis (25).

- **Smahlenko, F. P. (1961)** “Pro bezosobovi rečennja z slovamy na *-NO, -TO* u prysudky” [On subjectless sentences with words in *-no/-to* in the predicate (Ukr)]. *Praci Odes’koho universytetu* 151, *Seriya filolohičnyx nauk*, vyp. 11, 85–88. [Princeton: 3013.864]

Looks at the pedagogical aspect of Ukr *-no/-to* constructions. Smahlenko maintains that these are not emphasized enough, causing (native-speaking) schoolchildren to “confuse” this construction with the (agreeing) passive constructions.

- ***Smal’-Stoc’kyj, Stefan and Fedir Gartner. (1914)** *Hramatyka rus’koji movy* [Ruthenian (= Ukr) grammar (Ukr)]. Vienna: Nakladom vlasnym [sic], 3rd ed. [UCLA: Microform Service PG3819.S53]

Reportedly (according to Sulyma 1927b: 76, fn) discusses forms such as *čytav bulo* ‘he had been reading’ (93, 144); cf. ANN Petlyčnyj 1960, item 1, for more discussion.

- **Smerečyns’kyj, Serhij. (1932/1990)** *Narysy z ukrajins’koji syntaksy. U zv’jazku z frazeolohijeju ta stylistykoju* [Essays on Ukr syntax. In connection with phraseology and stylistics (Ukr)]. Munich: *Ukrajins’kyj vil’nyj universytet, Filosofičnyj fakul’tet* (= *Ukrajins’ki hramatyki*, 8. O. Horbač [O. Horbatsch], ed.) [Photo-reprint of 1st ed., Kyjiv: Radjans’ka škola.] [Berkeley: PG 3871.S64 1990 MAIN]

An extremely prescriptive treatment against many of the developments in Ukr *-no/-to* during the early 1900s (8–22); discussion of adversity-impersonal sentences with

¹¹² Cf. Damborský 1967, ANN Maling 1993 for such “establish”-ment.

verbal forms in *-lo* (22–26); a very extensive bibliography on Ukr syntax (263–77), supplemented by an updated bibliography in the 1990 reprint.

- Smirnckaja, Olga [sic] A. (1972) “The impersonal sentence patterns of the Edda in the Sagas”. *Arkiv för Nordisk filologi* 87: 56–88. [Harvard: PScan 118.5]

An analysis, from a decidedly Slavic perspective, of constructions similar to *-no/-to* in Nordic.

- **Smirnova, A. M. (1955) *Bezličnye predloženiya v pamjatnikax literatury i delovoj pis'mennosti XVI veka* [Impersonal sentences in (extant) literary and business-writing texts of the 16th century (Rus)]. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Moskovskij gos. un-t.
- Sobin, Nicholas J. (1985) “Case assignment in Ukrainian morphological passive constructions”. *Linguistic inquiry* 6: 4: 649–62.

The first article, to our knowledge, in which the universality of Chomsky’s Case-Absorption (the proposal that accounts for the apparent requirement that underlying objects be realized as surface subjects, because a passivized verb can no longer assign acc case¹¹³) is challenged using Ukr *-no/-to* data (cf. ANN Borsley 1988). Sobin assumes that there is an inaudible constituent in the surface-subject position of Ukr *-no/-to* clauses (following an early version of the empty category).

- Spencer, Andrew. (1991) *Morphological theory. An introduction to word structure in generative grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. [Princeton: P241.S64 1991]

Discusses both the Pol and Ukr *-no/-to* versions, without much new data, repeating data from Sobin 1985 for Ukr (239–40, 242–43, 266, 293).

- **Sprinčak, Ja. A. (1958) “Sravnitel’no-istoričeskoe izučenie konstrukcij bezlično-predikativnogo stradatel’nogo pričastija na *-no, -to* vin. p. ob’ekta v vostočnoslavjanskix jazykax” [Comparative-historical study of constructions (with) an impersonal-predicative passive participle in *-no/-to* (with) an acc object in East Slavic languages (Rus)]. *Naukovi zapysky Dnipropetrovs’koho universytetu* 63. (= *Movoznavstvo*, 14.) Xarkiv.
- Sprinčak, Ja. A. (1960) “Bezličnaja konstrukcija predikativnogo stradatel’nogo pričastija na *-no, -to* s vinitel’nym padežom prjamogo ob’ekta i bez nego v istorii russkogo jazyka.” *Očerki russkogo istoričeskogo sintaksisa (prostoe predloženie)* [Essay on Rus historical syntax (the simple sentence) (Rus)]. [Kiev: Radjans’ka škola, 99–105 (§23). [Princeton: 3021.872 v.1]

Investigates the historical roots of acc-assigning *-no/-to* in Rus.

- Staniševa, Dina S. (1966) *Vinitel’nyj padež v vostočnoslavjanskix jazykax* [The acc case in East-Slavic languages (Rus)]. Sofija: Izd-vo Bolgarskoj akademii nauk. [Florida St: PG467.S83]

Despite this volume’s ambitious title, Staniševa does not discuss *-no/-to* in any of the sections indexed as “non-prepositionally governed accusative” in Ukr (and Pol). There is even a *-no/-to* ex (155), but no discussion of this phenomenon. Staniševa does discuss the so-called nom-object construction (cf. ANN Matvijias 1984 and

¹¹³ Chomsky, Noam. (1981) *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris, 124.

Timberlake 1973; 1974a; 1974b), a phenomenon in NR and Ukr dialects in which an infinitival verb takes a nom direct object (145–47).

- Sulyma, Mykola F. (1927a) “Deščo pro znykli dijeprykmetnyky”. [On participles that have disappeared (Ukr)] *Červonyj šljax*, no. 5: 145–67. [Berkeley: MICRO FILM 2653 1927: 5–10 FILM]
- Sulyma, Mykola F. (1927b) “Rehuljatory j dysonantory ukrajins’koi literaturnoi movy” [Regulators and dissonators (!) in literary Ukr (Ukr)]. *Žyttja j revoljucija* 3(1): 74–78. [Kyjiv: Deržavne vyd-vo Ukrajinny] [Harvard: FILM SC 227]

A brief, but significant comment on the use of overt copulas in *-no/-to* clauses, linking their use to clauses with past-tense verbs in *-l-* and overt copulas (76, fn). Cf. item 1 of ANN Petlyčnyj 1960 for exx.

- Sulyma, Mykola F. (1928/1988) *Ukrajins’ka fraza* [The Ukr sentence (Ukr)]. (= *Ukrajins’ki hramatyki*, 6. O. Horbač [O. Horbatsch], ed.) Munich: Ukrajins’kyj vil’nyj universytet, Filosofičnyj fakul’tet. [Penn: PG3871.S85 1988] [Photo-reprint of 1st ed., Xarkiv: Rux.]

A lengthy discussion of neut pronominal forms, incl. pleonastics (12–14). Discussion of *-no/-to* and other forms of predicative non-agreement (14–15). Extensive, rather prescriptive treatment of Ukr *-no/-to* (56, 78–82).

- Sulyma, Mykola F. (1929) “Rečennja z prysudkom na *-NO*, *-TO* v movi Lesja Ukrajinky” [Sentences with a *-no/-to* predicate in the language of Lesja Ukrajinka (Ukr)]. *Naukovi zapysky Xarkivs’koi naukovo-doslidčoi katedry movoznavstva* 2: 51–61. [Harvard: 3282.2.4 (2)]

Sulyma apparently read through the collected works of Lesja Ukrajinka¹¹⁴ (1871–1913) and extracted every single *-no/-to* example. Of particular interest: four *-no/-to* exx with *vono* ‘it’ in the clause. In three of these Sulyma supplies the noun which antecedes this pronoun. In the fourth he suggests that *vono* may be pleonastic (58).¹¹⁵

- [Švedova, N. Ju.] (1964) “Izmenenija v pričastnyx bezličnyx predloženijax”. N. Ju. Švedova and I. I. Kovtunova. *Izmenenija v sisteme prostogo predloženijskogo sistema v Russkom literaturnom jazyke XIX veka* [Changes in the simple-sentence system in 19th-century literary Rus (Rus)]. (= *Očerki po istoričeskoj grammatike russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XIX veka*. V. V. Vinogradov and N. Ju. Švedova, eds. [3].) Moscow: Nauka, 290–304. [Princeton : 3021.1162.6 v.3]

An extended discussion of *-no/-to* in 1800s Rus (290–99).

- Synjavs’kyj, O. (1922) *Poradnyk ukrajins’koi movy* [Ukr handbook (Ukr)]. Xarkiv/New York: Ukrajino-Amerykans’ke vyd. Kosmos. [Harvard: 3285.135]

In §76 (110–12), Synjavs’kyj discusses subjectless sentences, incl. *-no/-to* clauses and the apparent diachronic change that took place in Ukr during the early 1900s, which began to allow the equivalent of Eng *by*-phrases (expressed using the inst case in

¹¹⁴ Ukrajinka, Lesja. (1923-25) *Tvory*. Kyjiv: Knyhospilka, v. 1–7. [Harvard (all but *vol. 3): WID-LC PG 3948.U4x 1923]

¹¹⁵ Having reviewed the context of this fourth *-no/-to* ex with *vono*, however, it’s clear that *vono*, while not referring to any neut sg NP, is not pleonastic, but rather refers to what is being worked on in general. Cf., however, ANN Wiczorek 1994, item 18 (incl. fn) for more discussion.

Ukr), which, Synjavs´kyj asserts, is foreign and “utterly unknown” in folk Ukr, but nonetheless enriches the language (111). In §77, on “psuedopronouns” (= pleonastic, expletive, dummy), while not providing any examples in *-no/-to* clauses, Synjavs´kyj does list examples of pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ apparently in a clause which already has a nom subject:

- (1) a vono vže j ljude [!] počalu zbihatysja
 but it_{NOM.SG} already and persons_{NOM.SG} began_{PL} run together_{INF} [113]
 ‘and [it was the case that] people were already beginning to converge [running]’
- (2) vono vže j sonce zajšlo
 it_{NOM.SG} already and sun_{(NOM.SG)NEUT} set_{PAST.NEUT.SG} [113]
 ‘[it was the case that] the sun had set’
- (3) vono b i ja pišov, ta nikoly
 it_{NOM.SG} SUBJ_{CL} and I_{NOM.SG} set out_{PAST.MASC.SG} and is no time [113]
 ‘[it’s the case that] I would go, but there’s no time to [do so]’

Synjavs´kyj adds that *vono* “acts as the subject of the sentence, where the entire two-place sentence acts as the predicate” (114). See Babby 1989, Billings 1993a about the existence of pleonastic pronominals in Ukr and elsewhere in East Slavic. Franks (1995) discusses the emphatic interpretation of these pleonastics (hence our optional cleft glosses). Billings 1993b adds new examples similar to these (see ANN). While it has been difficult to test this suggestion directly—i.e., there might be a null present-tense copula in such a cleft clause, but it appears impossible for various unrelated reasons for this null copula to be replaced by overt past- or future-tense copulas such as *bulo* ‘was_{NEUT.SG}’ or *bude* ‘will-be_{3.SG}’—this suggestion by Synjavs´kyj provides independent (albeit impressionistic) evidence that this is what is going on. Cf. also ANN Bilyk 1870.

- **Synjavs´kyj, O. (1924) *Dialektol. poradnyk* [Dialectological handbook (Ukr)]. Xarkiv: Deržvyd-vo Ukrajinu.
 Sulyma (1929: 60) quotes Synjavs´kyj (1924: 13) as having written a *-no/-to* ex with the overt copula *bude* ‘will-be_{3.SG}’.
- Synjavs´kyj, O. (1931/1967) *Normy ukrajins´koji literaturnoji movy* [The norms of literary Ukr (Ukr)]. State College, PA: Žyttja j škola, 1967. [Princeton: 30293.893.1967] [1st ed., Xarkiv: Literatura j mystectvo.]
 Discussion of *-no/-to* in §91 (101) “The predicate in *-no, -to*”, §146 (199–203) “Subjectless sentences in *-no, -to*”. Other passive/impersonal constructions are discussed in the ensuing §§, ending in §152 (210–11) “Comments on subjectless sentences”, in which pleonastic *vono* ‘it’ is discussed somewhat. One example of *vono* in apparently the same clause as a different, overt nominative subject:

Dumala sobi: de ce ja vas bačyla? Ale ja
 thought_{FEM.SG} REFL_{DAT} where this_{NEUT.SG} I_{NOM.SG} you_{ACC.PL} saw_{FEM.SG} but I
 vas u dvori pans'komu bačyla.
 you in courtyard lords' saw

'She thought to herself, "Where is it that I've seen you? But I saw you at the lords' courtyard." ' [210, quoting B. Hrinčenko]

Such examples are discussed in Billings (1993b); see ANN for exx. Here *ce* 'this' is also described as pleonastic. Cf. also ANN Synjavs'kyj 1922, specifically comment (144) on such exx. Another interesting passage is the following: "Again, various types of impersonal sentences are interwoven, and even together with two-place [i.e., active-voice] ones, and, often, it is not always possible to know the obligatoriness of one or the other form. For example, in the sentence

Dyvyt'sja, z odnoho boku *napysano* **verstvy**, a z druhoho **tablycja** prybyta.
 looks on one side written miles and on other tablet nailed-on
 3.SG [-AGR] PL FEM.SG FEM.SG

'S/he looks; on one side are written the miles, and on the other a tablet's nailed on.'

nothing, it seems, would stand in the way of using the two clauses with the underlined predicates in the same form—either *-no* and *-to*, or [...] in *-ni* and *-ta* [resp.], or even in switched forms (that is, *napysani* *verstvy*; *tablicju* *prybyto*). And the variety of ways of expression in and of itself represents stylistic value" [211, citing a "folk story" in ex; our translation, glosses, and bold-facing—LB/JM].

Note the differing predicate-subject and subject-predicate orders, apparently depending on whether there is non-agreement or agreement, respectively (in the original example). Similar data from Ukr, Pol, and 17th-century Rus are analyzed in ANN Ivanycja 1925, Klimonow 1960, and Fici Giusti 1992b, respectively. See also ANN Shevelov 1969, in which an example from Synjavs'kyj 1941/1967 is criticized. In connection with ANN Shevelov 1969, item 5, an ex in which referential (neut sg) *vono* triggers a *-no/-to* predicate (200).

- Szwejkowska, Helena. (1929) "W las' ciwoś ci skladniowe dope lniacza przy imiēs lowie biernym w polszczyźnie litewskiej" *Jezyk polski* 14(5): 133–36. [Berkeley: (MAIN) PG6001.J48]

Some interesting examples resembling the Li "double passive" construction (described in Nunes 1994b): *ńevádomo bylo, skont ĩeĩ byto pšyĩžono* (glossed into standard Pol as 'niewiadomo bylo skąd ona przyszła')¹¹⁶ 'it was unknown where from she came' (134). This is, if not expected, then at least consistent with the data in standard Pol, which does allow *-no/-to* form of the copula *byvano* (cf. ANN Maling 1993), and standard Li, which has so-called double passives.

- *Timberlake, Alan. (1973) *The objective nominative*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. [Harvard (non-circulating): Archives HU 90.10469 Harvard Depository]
 Cf. ANN Timberlake (1974b) below.

¹¹⁶ This example is shown in transcription; subscript changed to superscript in glides: *ř*.

- Timberlake, Alan. (1974a) “The nominative object in North Russian”. R. D. Brecht and C. V. Chvany, eds. *Slavic transformational syntax*. (= *Michigan Slavic materials*, 10.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 219–43. [Rutgers: ALEX PG13.M46 no.10]

Argues that in NR constructions like *zemlja paxat* ‘land_{(N.FEM)NOM.SG} plow_{(V)INFIN}’ (= ‘the land needs plowing’) the nom NP is the object of the verb.
- Timberlake, Alan. (1974b) *The nominative object in Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnic*. (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 82.) München: Otto Sagner. [Florida: PG129.T5]

Published version of Timberlake (1973). Cf. also preceding ANN. This construction is also attested in Baltic dialects and West Finnic. Cf. ANN Veenker 1967 regarding a possible Finnic source of this construction. Matvijas 1984 appears to show a correlation between *-no/-to*(-like) phenomena and the nominative-object in N-Central Ukr dialects. Cf. also Staniseva 1966. Shevelov (1969) suggests that *-no/-to* in Ukr and NR are not from the same source.
- Timberlake, Alan. (1976) “Subject properties in the North Russian passive”. Charles Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, 547–70.

Investigates the subject properties (e.g., controlling reflexives) of doer NPs within PPs with *u* ‘by/near’.
- Timberlake, Alan. (1982) “The impersonal passive in Lithuanian”. M. Macaulay et al, eds. *Proceedings of the 8th Annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–24.

Shows that the Li impersonal passive (cf. also Nunes 1994a; 1994b; 1994c, Wang 1994) is problematic to some of the tenets of Relational Grammar.
- Timberlake, Alan. (1988) “Case agreement in Lithuanian”. M. Barlow and C. Ferguson, eds. *Agreement in natural language*. Stanford: CSLI, 181–99, ch. 8. [Princeton: P299.A35A37]

Timberlake revisits the Li data (cf. preceding ANN) in the framework of Categorical Grammar.
- Tokarski, Jan. (1973) “Imieś lów bierny przys lówkowy.” *Fleksja polska* [Pol inflection (Pol)]. [Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe, 197–98 (§7.D)]. [Princeton: 3043.907.2]

Verbs in Pol which cannot take agreeing passives do have *-no/-to* forms (198).
- Topolińska, Zuzanna. (1967) “Miejsce i funkcja konstrukcji V3sg *si.e* w polskim systemie werbalnym”. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 10(3): 29–34. [Penn: P19.M3A15]

Compares, *inter alia*, Pol *-no/-to* forms with indefinite-personal constructions (31) and acc-assigning constructions in *sie* (32); cf. ANN Christensen 1993 for *exx*.
- Trávníček, František. (1951) *Skladba* [Syntax (Cz)]. (= *Mluvnice spisovné češtiny* [Grammar of literary Cze (Cz)], část 2.) Prague: Slovanské nakladatelství. [Princeton: 3037.912.4 v.2]

Certain examples from Cz dialects of *-no/-to* which apparently assign acc case to the underlying object (both *exx* from 1366):

- (1) Města bylo dobyto.
 town_{GEN.SG(NEUT)} was_{NEUT.SG} obtained_{NEUT.SG}
- (2) Papíry bylo obchodovano
 papers_{NOM.PL(MASC)} was_{NEUT.SG} traded_{NEUT.SG}

Note that it is unlikely that these examples are theoretically as interesting as the Pol or Ukr data, because the same participial form in Rus (in *-no*) serves both as the neut sg agreement ending and for [-AGR]. Pol and Ukr have distinct forms for these two. (In none of the Slavic languages is there to our knowledge a distinct non-agreeing form for the past-tense copula.)

- Trubinskij, Valentin I. (1961) “Vzaimootnošenie leksičeskix i grammatičeskix značenij v oblasti glagol’nyx vremen (po materialam russkix narodnyx govorov)” [Interrelations between lexical and grammatical meanings (in materials on Rus folk dialects) (Rus)]. *Vestnik Leningradskogo gos. un-ta* 14: 142–48. [Princeton: 0917.577.5]
 Numerous dialect-Rus *-no/-to* exx (146).
- Trubinskij, Valentin I. (1984) “Russkij posessivnyj perfekt” [Essays on Rus dialectal syntax (Rus)]. *Očerki russkogo dialektного sintaksisa*. Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo un-ta., 142–49 [Princeton: PG 2731.T78]
 Dialect-Rus *-no/-to* data and discussion throughout section.
- Tymčenko, Je. (1918) *Ukrajins’ka hramatyka dlja III i IV kljasy š kil serednix* [Ukr grammar for 3rd and 4th grades of secondary school (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Krynycja. [Harvard: 3285.63.55]
 A very early treatment—especially for a school textbook—of *-no/-to* in Ukr, allowing overt copulas in *-no/-to* clauses (44). Also lists exx of acc-assigning passives in *-sja* (44); cf. ANN Kurylo 1930.
- Tymčenko, Je. (1926) *Vokatyv i instrumental’ v ukrajins’kij movi* [The vocative and instrumental (cases) in Ukr (Ukr)]. (= *Zbirnyk istoryč no-filolohič noho viddilu*, 45.) Kyjiv: Druk. UAN. [Princeton: 0917.949]¹¹⁷
 Alternatives to inst ‘by’-phases, using PPs with *vid* ‘from’ (74). This is apparently not prescribed against by Tymčenko.
- Vaščenko, V. S. (1958) *Stylistyčni javyščča v ukrajins’kij movi* [Stylistic phenomena in Ukr (Ukr)], (č.) 1. Xarkiv: Vydavnyctvo Xarkivs’koho derž avnoho un-tu. [U. Washington: 491.79 V442s v.1]
 Discusses the stylistic effect of Ukr *-no/-to* (160–61), characterizing such constructions as *folksy* (161).
- Veenker, Wolfgang. (1967) “Konstruktion u nego uechano [sic]”. *Die Frage des finnougriſchen Substrats in der russischen Sprache* [The question of a Finno-Ugric substratum in Rus (Ger)]. (= *Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series*, 82.)

¹¹⁷ This is part of a series of monographs on the assignment of the various cases in Ukr. Strangely, the following volume, devoted to the acc case, doesn’t appear to deal with *-no/-to*: Tymčenko, Je. (1928) *Akuzatyv v ukrajins’kij movi*. (= *Zbirnyk istoryč no-filolohič noho viddilu*, 67.) Kyjiv: Druk. UAN. [Harvard: 3285.240.80]

Bloomington: Indiana University/The Hague: Mouton, 137–39 (§4.6) (and notes, 255–58). [Princeton: 3021.931]

Argues that constructions like *u nego uexano* ‘er ist abgereist’ [‘he has departed’] (literally: ‘by/near him_{GEN} departed_[-AGR]’), *inter alia*, reached (N) Rus by an areal effect with Finno-Ugric. Veenker cites several sources to support this contention, incl. Černyx 1957, Kuz’mina and Nemčenko 1964/1965, Kuznecov 1951/1960, and others.¹¹⁸

- Veselovs’ka, Z. M. (1927a) “Mova H. Xv. Kvitky-Osnov’janenka. Syntaksa ukrajins’kix opovidan’ H. Kvitky v zvjazku z nastupnym rozvytkom literaturnoji movy”. *Naukovi zapysky Xarkivs’koji naukovo-doslidč oji katedry movoznavstva* 1: 93–109. [Harvard: 3282.2.4 (v.1) 1927]

Another novelist-centered philological study (cf. Petlyčnyj 1957; 1960, Sulyma 1929), studying the works of Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov’janenko (1788–1843). Veselovs’ka devotes a brief section to the *-no/-to* construction (94).

- Veselovs’ka, Z. M. (1927b) “Mova ‘leksikonu’ Pamvy Beryndy. Do tr’oxsotriččja pam’atky” [The language of Pamva Berynda (The syntax of P.B.). The syntax of 17th-century literary Ukrainian Ukr Academy of sciences (Ukr)]. *Syntaksa ukr. literaturnoji movy XVII v. UAN*. Jubilejnyj zbirnyk na poš anu Akademyka Dmytra Jvanovyč a Bahalija 2. (= *Zapysky Istoryč no-filolohič noho viddilu*, 13–14.) Kyjiv: Ukrajins’ka akademija nauk, 311–39. [Minnesota: Mfilm 3296]

Yet another author study (cf. preceding ANN), this time covering the works of Pamva Berynda (middle Ukr). A brief summary of *-no/-to* constructions (330).

- *Vyxovanec’, I. R. (1971) *Syntaksys znaxidnoho vidminka v suč. ukr. movi* [Syntax of the acc case in modern Ukr (Ukr)]. [Syntax of the acc case in modern Ukr (UKR)] Kyjiv: Naukova dumka. [Princeton: 30293.947]

The gen of negation is becoming less and less prevalent in Ukr literary works (10).

- Vyxovanec’, I. R. (1987) *Systema vidminkiv ukrajins’koji movy* [The case system of Ukr (Ukr)]. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka. [N. Carolina: PG3849.V94 1987]

The gen of negation is becoming less and less prevalent in Ukr literary works (104). Cf. preceding ANN. Cf. also ANN Wieczorek 1994, item 12.

- Wang, Beata I. [Mirska] (1994) *Genitive-agent constructions in Lithuanian*. Undergraduate senior honors thesis, Linguistics Program, Brandeis University.

Another treatment of so-called impersonal passives in Li, in which an even an unaccusative verb’s (underlyingly internal) argument can appear as the subject of

¹¹⁸ *Grammatika finskogo jazyka*. Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR (Leningradskoe otdelenie), 1958, 89, 156f. [Center for Research Libs.: B15797] P. 104 of Päll, Eduard, E. Totsel, and G. Tukumcev. (1962) *Sopostavitel’naja grammatika èstonskogo i ruskogo jazyka dlja prepodavatelej i studentov. Eesti ja vene keele kõrvutav grammatika; õpetajaile ja üliõpilastele*. Tallinn, Eesti Riiklik Kirjastus, 1962, 104. [Yale: PH609.P3] Polák, V. (1964) “Les éléments finno-ougriens en slave”. *Orbis* 13(2): 568–88 (esp. 585). [Princeton: 3000.689] Ringheim, Allan. (1953) “Notules à la dialectologie russe. I”. *Orbis* 2(2): 445–47 (esp. 446–47). [Princeton: 3000.689]

such clauses. This is in violation of the 1AEX (cf. ANN Maling 1993). Other works that discuss this construction: Nunes 1994a; 1994b; 1994c and Timberlake 1982; 1988.

- Weiss, Daniel. (1977) *Syntax und Semantik polnischer Partizipialkonstruktionen im Rahmen einer generativ-transformationellen Sprachbeschreibung* [The syntax and semantics of Pol participial constructions in the framework of a generative-transformational language description (Ger)]. (= *Slavica Helvetica*, 10.) Bern: Peter Lang. [Harvard: WID-LC PG6312.W44 1977]

A brief consideration of the participle-hood of Pol *-no/-to* forms (65–67, incl. fn 76). Some discussion of *-no/-to* sentences in fn 121 (102–03).

- Wexler, P. N. (1974) *Purism and language: A study in modern Ukrainian and Belorussian nationalism (1840–1967)*. Bloomington: Research Center of the Language Sciences, Indiana University. [Rutgers: ALEX PG3814 .W4]

Discusses the issue of long- vs. short-form adjectives (incl. participles) (118; fn 53, 143). Briefly mentions the socio-political nuances of the changes happening to the *-no/-to* construction in Ukrainian earlier this century (136; fn 168, 155; 162; fn 45, 169; 174–75; fn 19, 179). More importantly, this book has an immense bibliography, mostly on language and Ukr (and Br) nationalism. Cf. esp. the list of obscure journals (331–34) and holding libraries. Cf. also the related Shevelov 1987/1989.

- Wieczorek, Diana. (1987) “Formy na *-no*, *-to* z instrumentalis agentis (subiecti) we współczesnej ukraińszczyźnie” [Forms in *-no/-to* and the instrumental of agent (subject) in contemporary Ukr (Pol)]. *Slavia Orientalis* 36(3–4): 551–59. [Columbia: (GLX) DK401.S5]

Discusses the emergence in modern Ukr of *-no/-to* clauses with inst ‘by’-phrases.

- Wieczorek, Diana. (1989) “Konstrukcii tipa *mnoju oderżano lysta* v sovremennom ukrainskom jazyke”. A. Bartoszewicz, ed. *Z problemów ewolucji współczesnych języków słowiańskich w aspekcie socjolingwistycznym*. (= *Studia z filologii rosyjskiej i słowiańskiej*, 17.) Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu warszawskiego, 113–18. [Princeton: PG51.Z17 1989]

More discussion (cf. preceding ANN) of Ukr *-no/-to* clauses with inst doers.¹¹⁹

- Wieczorek, Diana. (1994) *Ukrainskij pierfekt na -NO, -TO na fonie polskiego pierfiekta* [The Ukr *-no/-to* perfect in light of the Pol perfect (Rus)].¹²⁰ (= *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis*, 1613; = *Slavica Wratislaviensis*, 83.) Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uni-tu Wrocławskiego. [Berkeley: MAIN PG1.S627 v.83]

This monograph is, without a doubt, the most extensive work devoted solely to *-no/-to* phenomena. We single-out several points:

¹¹⁹ Note that *lysta* in the title’s ex is a morphologically gen form of *lyst* ‘letter’ (as in ‘epistle’). This phenomenon is generally described as “grammatically animate but semantically inanimate” (animate nouns of this declensional class take the morphological gen to express the syntactic acc case).

¹²⁰ This is how the title appears on both the cover and title page; it reflects the customary transliteration of Russian Cyrillic into Pol. Under the system used in this bibliography the transliteration would be *Ukrainskij perfekt na -NO, -TO na fone pol’skogo perfekta*. The entire text of the monograph is in Cyrillic Russian.

1. Wieczorek's central point (hence the book's title): in Ukr "the perfect [a result of a past action still in force as of the point of time reference, usually the moment of speech] finds its formal expression by means of [agreeing-passive] forms in *-n/-t-* and [non-agreeing passive forms] in *-no/-to* with a null copula" (21). She relies on the definition of the perfect in (*inter alia*) Šaxmatov 1925/1961: 486, 489. Additional data on 22 (exx 82–84).
2. The last third of the monograph (67–105) deals with the Vendlerian distinction of *akcional'nost'* 'actionality' and *statal'nost'* 'stativity'. This distinction is grammaticalized in Pol (agreeing) passives based on the choice between the tensed verbs *zostać* 'get' and *być* 'be', respectively [cf. Eng, which makes the same distinction—LB/JM] (69). Ukr *-no/-to* clauses do not have this overt distinction; if any tensed verb form is overt, it will be a form of the copula *buty* 'be'. Likewise, Pol *-no/-to* clauses have no copula (or other tensed verb) whatsoever. Hence, Wieczorek sets out to determine what factors yield actional and statal interpretations in the *-no/-to* constructions of Pol (90) and Ukr.
3. Use of the *-no/-to* form (instead of the agreeing participle) adds an overtone of "hot news";¹²¹ using *-no/-to* forms in sequences of narrated events is discussed (24). "Forms in *-no/-to* really stop the narration, holding the attention on an important—and, occasionally, unexpected—event" (25).
4. Semelfactives (unprefixed perfective verb stems suffixed with *-nu-*) are allowed, but not plentiful in Ukr. "The existence in Ukrainian of semelfactive forms in *-no/-to* groups Ukrainian with Polish and, for example, Czech, in which these forms are likewise common, and at the same time distinguishes these languages from Russian, where semelfactive *-no/-to* forms are virtually unattested" (18). Here Wieczorek is not necessarily referring to acc-assigning *-no/-to* forms.
5. In modern Ukr, *-no/-to* predicates formed from imperfective stems sound archaic (17). In modern Pol such forms, even if in the minority, exist.
6. Overt copulas in *-no/-to* clauses are discussed repeatedly, for various reasons: Wieczorek distinguishes between "the present perfect (*Vikno vidčyneno* 'The window **has-been** opened'), the past perfect, i.e., the pluperfect (*Vikno bulo vidčyneno* 'The window **had been** opened') and the future perfect (*Vikno bude vidčyneno* 'The window **will have been** opened')" (27 [glosses ours—LB/JM]). More discussion of the pluperfect (28) and future perfect: "The use of the perfect in *-no/-to* with the future-tense copula *bude* in Ukrainian is not a frequent phenomenon. This is dictated, however, clearly by pragmatics: there is no practical reason to express a resultative state in the future. Indeed, Kuz'mina and Nemčenko (1971: 195) observed this with regard to [N] Russian dialects [...]" (29). Such forms, however pragmatically strained, do exist:

¹²¹ We tested Wieczorek's exx of this kind in with agreeing participles instead of *-no/-to* forms. Indeed, our informants volunteered that the event was not seen as "new".

Najbliższym czasem do wydawnictwa **bude** **peredano** *Encyklopediju* [...] ‘Soon the [...] *Encyclopedia* **will (have) be(en)**_{(V)NEUT.SG} **transferred**_[-AGR] to the publisher.’ [30, her ex 140]

That is, at some point in the near future, there will be the state of having transferred the *Encyclopedia*. Another important reason for raising the issue of copulas is the heated debate over these forms’ acceptability between prescriptive and descriptive linguists of the early 1900s. Wiczorek summarizes much of this debate, citing Sulyma 1928[/1988]: 81, Smerečyns’kyj 1932[/1990]: 11, and (the 1941 ed. of) Synjavs’kyj 1931[/1967]: 203 (31–32). Pol also once had overt copulas in *-no/-to* clauses. Cf. ANN Pisarkowa 1984.

7. Wiczorek also discusses numerous means of expressing the doer (cf. Eng *by*) in Ukr and Pol (which she calls the *agentivnoe dopolnienie*): “Ukrainian has gone further than Polish on the path of isolation from the other Slavic languages; it has innovated the ability to introduce a [‘by’-phrase] into a [transitive clause].” Namely, the doer is expressed in the *inst* case. This is far from agreed-upon; cf. (ANN) Tymčenko 1926: 73 and Wiczorek 1989: 114–15. The phasing-in period of *inst*-doer NPs appears to have coincided with the onset of overt copulas (cf. above, this ANN) (45). Pol, historically, also utilized the *inst* case for this purpose:

to wszystko toba jest stworzono
that_{ACC.SG} all_{ACC.SG} you_{INST.SG} is_{3.SG} created
‘all that was created by you’ [45, iting Kempf (1978: 125)]¹²²

Several other means of expressing the doer overtly are discussed: NPs such as ‘troops’ and ‘soldiers’, which can be either instruments or agents (46); expressing the doer using ‘hand/mouth’ (46); PPs in *vid* ‘from’ (which is still attested in Ukr dialects) in place of an *inst* NP, incl. one older Pol ex (with cognate *od*): *śniedziono od zwierza* ‘eaten by an animal’ (48, citing Kempf 1978: 96); using ‘between’ PPs to express the doer of verbs denoting reciprocal interaction, which is allowed in modern Pol: *Mówiono o tym między nami* (literally:) ‘spoken about that between us’ [= her ex 82] (48); PPs such as Ukr *z boku...* and Pol *ze strony...* ‘on the part of ...’ (49); and overt expressions of the doer NP in a different clause of the same complex sentence containing the *-no/-to* clause (49–50). Note that the standard means of expressing the ‘by’-phrase in agreeing passives is with a *przez* ‘through’ PP. Such a PP is disallowed in modern-Pol *-no/-to* clauses. Wiczorek clarifies exactly the kind of (understood) doer in such clauses in Pol and Ukr: “Accordingly, in Polish forms in *-no/-to* which refer to a spontaneous action or state are excluded. For example, in the sentence *Okno otwarto* [‘window_{(N)ACC.SG} opened_[-AGR]’] only the meaning ‘Someone opened the window/ Some person opened the window/Some people opened the window’ is avail-able. As for the meaning ‘The window opened on

¹²² Kempf is apparently quoting “Rozm. Przem 5, 24”, which does not appear in his list of abbreviated references, 133–34.)

[-AGR] under *hotove* as well. In keeping with this bibliography, however, [-AGR] is used only for unmistakably non-agreeing forms.

11. In connection with the two preceding points, the following ex shows consecutive instances of 1) predicative adjective agreeing with neut sg subject *misce* ‘seat’; 2) predicative participle agreeing with (the same) neut sg subject; and 3) a non-agreeing participle with a (neut sg) NP, *vikno* ‘window’, as its object:

Misce [...] *porožnje*, *pobyte* *kuljamy*,
 seat_{(N)NOM.SG.NEUT} *empty*_{(ADJ)NEUT.SG} *shot up*_{(PRT)NEUT.SG} *bullets*_{(N)INST.SG}
kuljami *pobyto* *vikno*.
 bullets_{(N)INST.SG} *shot up*_[-AGR] *window*_{(N)ACC.SG.NEUT}

‘The seat [...] is empty, shot up with bullets; bullets have shot up a window.’

[85, her ex 134, quoting Janovs’kyj]

Other exx are provided for combinations of *-no/-to* predicates with impersonal forms (87) and past-tense (finite) verbs (103).

12. Extensive discussion of the gen of negation: Citing Vyxovanec’ (1971: 10), who reports the gradual loss of the gen of negation in Ukr, Wieczorek lists exx to support the loss of this phenomenon in *-no/-to* clauses as well (41)—cf. point 5 in ANN Maling 1993, which predicts that gen of negation should not be attested in real passives. It is unclear whether the loss of the gen of negation in *-no/-to* clauses is more advanced than in other transitive clauses. Pol *-no/-to* clauses [and other transitive verbs—LB/JM] require the gen of negation (41).
13. Wieczorek also discusses *-no/-to* clauses in the subjunctive. Unlike Damborský 1967 (cf. ANN, point 3, incl. fn) and Jodłowski and Taszycki 1946/1968: 130,¹²³ in which the Pol subjunctive particle *by* is enclitic to the *-no/-to* word, Wieczorek’s ex shows the particle in apparent second position: *Bo by drukarza zabito* ‘For the printer would[’ve] be[en] killed’ [her ex 131, quoting Jastrun] (54).
14. Numerous examples point to the influence of discourse factors on constituent order in *-no/-to* clauses (22). “In the Ukrainian *-no/-to* perfect construction the logical object (*ob’ekt*) is the focus of empathy”:

- (1) *Budynky* *novi* *pobudovano*, *ostrivok* *u* *parku* [...],
 houses_{(N)ACC.PL} *new*_{ACC.PL} *built-up*_[-AGR] *island*_{(N)ACC.SG} *in* *park*
vporjadkovano
 laid out_[-AGR]

‘New buildings have been built-up; an island... has been laid out in the park.’

¹²³ One of Jodłowski and Taszycki’s (1946/1968: 130) exx is a clause with an initial *-no/-to* word, thus making the particle both enclitic to the predicate and in second position. Katarzyna Dziwirek informs us that *-no/-to* clauses with subjunctive *by* do not have a required past-tense interpretation. We thus qualify our statements throughout this bibliography (incl. fn in ANN Gladney 1983) which require a past-tense reading. The past tense is the required interpretation, however, in any non-subjunctive *-no/-to* clause.

[63, her ex 199, quoting Le]

In her comparison of *-no/-to* with indefinite-personal clauses, Wieczorek lists minimal pairs with consistently different constituent orders:

- (2) Vnesly lampu/ Lampu vneseno
 brought in_{(V)PAST.PL} lamp_{(N)ACC.SG} lamp_{(N)ACC.SG} brought in_[-AGR]
 ‘A lamp was/has-been brought in.’
- Pidnjaly tryvohu/ Tryvohu pidnjato
 raised_{(V)PAST.PL} alarm_{(N)ACC.SG} alarm_{(N)ACC.SG} raised_[-AGR]
 ‘The alarm was/has-been raised.’ [63]

Presumably the (present-)perfect gloss corresponds to the *-no/-to* variant in each. See also ANN Apresjan and Páll 1982 and the other references cited there regarding other constituent-order correlations in constructions of this kind (63). More data on word order (64). There are several exx in which the focus is on the result, and hence not on the doer (100).

15. Several exx of *-no/-to* clauses with overt pleonastic pronouns:

- (1) Jak to skazano: dohnav čy ni, a pohnatysja možna.
 as that_{NOM.SG.NEUT} said_[-AGR] caught up or not but chase possible
 ‘As it is said: whether or not you catch up, it’s worthwhile chasing after.’
 [41, her ex. 10]
- (2) Jak ce dobre skazano: ne kydaj biseru svynjam [...]
 as this_{NOM.SG.NEUT} well said_[-AGR] NEG throw pearls pigs_{DAT}
 ‘As it was well said: don’t cast pearls before swine...’ [41, her ex. 11]

Alas, none of these exx includes the pleonastic pronoun *vono* ‘it’, which, as a personal pronoun, has a distinction between nom and acc case (*vono* and *joho*, resp.). We did successfully elicit *vono* in place of *to* or *ce* in these examples (*joho* could not be substituted). This is confirmation that there can be an overt pleonastic pronoun in *-no/-to* clauses (cf. Billings 1993a; 1993b).¹²⁴ In the following ex, although there is no overt pronominal form, our informants likewise allow *ce*, *to*, or *vono* (**joho*) to be inserted (between *Jak* and *mudro*):

¹²⁴ The following example, cited in Kurylo 1930: 3, also has the same structure in the relevant respects:

Ščo ce ponaklejuvano za bumažky?
 this_{NOM.SG.NEUT} stuck on_[-AGR] papers_{NOM.SG}
 ‘What’s with these stuck-on pieces of paper?’

The words *ščo ... za* are a formulaic expression meaning something like *what’s with* (in colloquial English), followed by a nom noun phrase. The use of the perfective verb *ponakléjuvaty* (instead of the standard *nakléjity*) is referred to as “folksy” in the literature on stylistics. Kurylo cites p. 149 of the following dictionary, of which apparently only v. 1 actually appeared: **Javornyc’kyj, D. I. [= Dmitrij I. Evarnickij]. (1920) *Slovnyk ukrajins’koji movy 1 (A–K)*. Katerynoslav: Slovo. This ex is also cited in Kurylo (1930:3).

- (3) Jak mudro pidmičeno v narodi, ljutnevyj snih vesnoju paxne.
 as wisely pointed out_[-AGR] in people February snow spring_{INST} smells
 ‘As was wisely pointed out among the people, a February snow hints of
 coming spring.’ [95, her ex. 231, quoting Skurativs’kyj]
16. A discussion of the possible person (1st, 2nd, 3rd) of the implied doer in Ukr and Pol. Wieczorek conceives of an ex that pragmatically forces a 2nd-person interpretation:
 Wykonano? Wykonano.
 done_[-AGR] done_[-AGR]
 ‘“Is it finished?” “It’s finished.”’
- Wieczorek goes on to discuss various exceptions to the generalization that the understood doer is 3rd person (and pl), incl. Rittel’s (1985: 184) *pluralis modestiae*. Cf. ANN Dziwirek 1994 (incl. fn) for more discussion of this issue (55–56).
17. Wieczorek also discusses the interaction of *-no/-to* with the (etymologically) reflexive particle *si e* in Pol, showing that some verbs which obligatorily take this particle can take a *-no/-to* form. Cf. ANN Christensen 1993 and Gladney 1983¹²⁵ (58, 61). Interestingly, Wieczorek mentions one Ukr verb which must take *-sja* in its non-participial forms (*nabytysja* ‘fill up/be packed’), but which can take *-no/-to* forms without *-sja*¹²⁶ (74).
18. Certain exx, in which the underlying object of the *-no/-to* predicate is quantified, can only have *-no/-to* predicates (cf. also ex in item 10 above):
- (1) Stvoreno kil’ka soten firm [...]
 created_[-AGR] some_Q hundreds_{(N)GEN.PL} firms_{(N)GEN.PL}
 ‘Several hundred firms were created...’ [22, her ex 83]

¹²⁵ In this connection Wieczorek (1994: 58) lists an apparent progression (transformation) of the type *zalu perepovнено* coming from *zala perepovnylasja* (both: ‘the auditorium overflowed [with people]’). Wieczorek is apparently unaware that Ukr has an acc-assigning passive construction with an imperfective verb in *-sja*; cf. ANN Kurylo 1930 and the references cited therein.

¹²⁶ Babby (1993b: 17) discusses the Rus verb *atrofirovat’sja* ‘atrophy’, which must take *-sja* except in its passive forms *noga atrofirovana* ‘the foot_{(N.FEM)NOM.SG} has [become] atrophied_{(PRT)FEM.SG}’. It is unclear whether agreeing passives of this verb also take forms without *-sja*. To be fair, Wieczorek is discussing the statal meaning of *nabyto* ‘filled up’, likening it to a category-of-state form (*kategorija sostojanija*, a statal part of speech in ESL linguistics). If *nabyto* is really a category of state, then it is probably not derived (productively) from *nabytysja*. An additional complication of this Ukr verb is that it denotes loading/filling; indeed, Wieczorek discusses such verbs on the next page (76). Leonard Babby informs us that in yet-unpublished work he characterizes loading verbs as having two internal (non-DO) thematic roles. Due to the Theta Criterion, which requires a one-to-one mapping of roles to argument expressions [Chomsky, Noam. (1986) *Knowledge of language, its nature, origin and use*. New York: Praeger, 9], at least one of these thematic roles must be mapped to the empty DO argument expression. The remaining role is realized as a PP or using a semantic case.

- (2) **Simdesjat** **vidsotkiv** **materialu** **pidredahovano** [...]
 seventy_{(NUM)NOM} **percent**_{(N)GEN.PL} **material**_{(N)GEN.SG} **edited**_[-AGR]
 ‘Seventy percent of the material has been edited...’ [23, her ex. 97]
- (3) [...] **bulo** **pryv’jazano** **dvoje** **konej** [...]
 was_{(V)PAST.NEUT.SG} **tied up**_[-AGR] **two**_{(NUM.COLL)ACC} **horses**_{(N)GEN.PL}
 ‘... two horses had been tied up...’ [88, her ex 167, quoting Panč]
- (4) [...] **i** **dvi** **holovy** **viddileo** **vid** **šyj** —
 and two_{(NUM)ACC} **heads**_{(N)NOM.PL} **separated**_[-AGR] **from** **necks**
 Kočubejeva **i** Iskyna
 Kočubejeva_{GEN} and Iskyn_{GEN}
 ‘... and two heads were separated from [their] necks—[those of] Kočubejev and Iskyn’ [104, her ex 354, quoting Ivanyčuk]
- (5) **Skil’ky** **ubyto** **i** **rozip’jato**,
 how many_{(Q)ACC} **killed**_[-AGR] **and** **crucified**_[-AGR]
 Znaje zemlja, jak stara vdova
 knows earth like old widow
 ‘How many were killed and crucified; the earth, like an old widow, knows.’ [97, her ex. 268, quoting A. Malyško]
- (6) Na monastyr’skim kladovyšči poxovano **nemalo** **vyznanyx**
 at monastery cemetery buried_[-AGR] many_(Q) famous_{(ADJ)GEN.PL}
dijačiv **Kyjivs’koji** **Rusi**
 figures_{(N)GEN.PL} **Kyjivan** **Rus**
 ‘Many famous figures of the Kyjivan Rus’ are buried at the monastery’s cemetery.’ [99, her ex 304]
- (7) [...] **ponad** **pivtora** **metra** **porožn’oji** **kišky**
 over one and a half_{(NUM)NOM} **meter**_{(N)GEN.SG} **empty** **intestine**_{(N)GEN.SG}
z’jiden **hanhrenoju** [...]
 eaten up_[-AGR] **gangrene**_{(N)INST.SG}
 ‘... over one and a half meters of empty intestine have been consumed by gangrene...’¹²⁷ [85, ex 133, quoting Šovkopljas]
- In general, a *-no/-to* clause can be paraphrased grammatically using an agreeing passive. That is, the acc direct-object NP can be changed into the nom, and the predicate can be made to agree with that NP. It is impossible, however, for any of the preceding quantified NPs to have any predicate form other than *-no/-to*. This is perhaps because, whether or not the quantified NP is in sentential-subject position, there is nonetheless no NP (headed by a morphologically nom

¹²⁷ This ex is complicated by the preposition *ponad* ‘over’, which can take nom or acc complements even in literary Ukr (cf. Shevelov 1963: 56, fn 2 for discussion and exx; cf. next fn below). Regardless of the case assigned by *ponad* (or even if this preposition were absent altogether), the predicate would still obligatorily take the *-no/-to* form, since *pivtora* is a numeral, and still quantifies the NP.

- Witkowski, Wiesław. (1969) “Orzeczenia na *-no, -to* w zdaniach bezpodmiotowych.” *Jezyk utworów Joannicjusza Galatowskiego na tle jezyka piśmiennictwa ukraińskiego XVII wieku* [Joannicjusz Galatowski’s language in the context of written 17th-century Ukr (Pol)]. (= *Prace j.ęzykoznawcze*, 25.) Kraków: Nakł. Uniwersytetu Jagiełłowskiego, 60 (§96). [Penn: PG6014.K732 zes.25]

A very brief listing of Pol *-no/-to* clauses from the 1600s, all without copulas (60).
- Wolińska, Olga. (1978) “Konstrukcje bezmianownikowe z formami na *-no, -to*”. *Konstrukcje bezmianownikowe we współczesnej polszczyźnie* [Nominative-less constructions with forms in *-no/-to* (Pol)]. (= *Prace naukowe Uniwersytetu śląskiego w Katowicach*, 254.) Katowice: Uniwersytet śląski, 64–72, (§1.1). [Harvard: WID-LC PG 6315.P52 W64 x 1978]

This book is reviewed critically in Kański 1986: 19. An impressive collection of *-no/-to* data from Pol. Proposes an algorithm to transform agreeing passives into *-no/-to* clauses, specifically deleting overt expletives (65). Much of Wolińska’s discussion deals with the indefinite-personal meaning of Pol *-no/-to* clauses. E.g.,

Lubiano go [...] i ceniono [...]
 loved_[-AGR] him_{ACC.SG} and valued_[-AGR]
 ‘He was loved ... and valued ...’ [65]
- Xvylja, Andrij. (1933) “Pro stan na ukrajins’komu movoznavčomu fronti”. *Znyščyty korinnja ukrajins’koho nacionalizmu na movnomu fronti (zbirka)* [Reducing the roots of Ukr nationalism to the linguistic front (a collection) (Ukr)]. Xarkiv: Radjans’ka škola, 19–51 (§2). [NYPL (non-circulating pamphlet volume): *Q p.v. 608]

A brief (and early) criticism of Smerecyns’kyj’s (1932[/1990]) prescription against overt copulas in Ukr *-no/-to* clauses (25-26).
- Zahrods’kyj, Andrij O. (1954) “Prysudok u bezosobovyx rečennjax.” *Syntaksys*. (= *Hramatyka ukrajins’koho movy. Pidručnyk dlja 6 i 7 klasiv semyričnoji ta seredn’oji školy*, 2. Kyjiv: Radjans’ka škola, 9th ed, 67–69 (§33). [Indiana: PG3823.Z198 v.2]

Likens Ukr *-no/-to* clauses to adversity-impersonals (69).
- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš. (1958) “K vzniku a vývoji neosobních predikativ”. *Československá rusistika* 4: 210–25. [Princeton: 3013.247 1958]

Compares impersonal constructions (very loosely defined) in Rus, Ukr, Pol, and Cz.
- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš. (1959) “Identifikace adjektivných a neosobných tvarů na *-o*” [Identifying adjectival and impersonal forms in *-o* (Cz)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 28: 31–59. [Harvard: 3013.858]

Discusses the related issue of non-agreement (cf. Corbett 1979; 1980; 1988; 1991).
- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš [Mikolaš Zatovkanjuk]. (1979) “K sopostavitel’noj charakteristike russkix i ukrajinskix kratkix prilagatel’nyx” [On the comparative characteristics of Rus and Ukr short-form adjectives (Rus)]. *Bulletin ruského jazyka a literatury* 22: 37–46. [Praha:

overt copulas, restricted to just pf verbs, parallel acc-assigning passives of imperfective verb with reflexive *-sja*) is quite clear evidence that Ukr *-no/-to* is passive.

Universita Karlova. Filosofická fakulta. Ustav ruského jazyka a literatury.] [Cornell: PG2013.P89]

This article assesses how Rus short-form participles are translated into Ukr, which has lost the long-/short-form distinction. Zatovkaňuk's corpus consists of novels by Gogol', Il'f and Petrov, Leonov, and Popov. Some discussion of the effect of constituent order on whether the agreeing or *-no/-to* passives will be used in the Ukr translations of Rus short-participial clauses (cf. other word-order effects in Apresjan and Páll 1982, Fici Giusti 1992b, Ivanycja 1925, and Synjavs'kyj 1967).¹³⁰

- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš. (1983) “K sopostavitel'noj charakteristike ruskix i ukrainskix mestoimenij” [On the comparative characteristics of Rus and Ukr pronouns (Rus)]. *Bulletin ruského jazyka a literatury* 25: 119–38. [Praha: Universita Karlova. Filosofická fakulta. Ustav ruského jazyka a literatury] [Cornell: 2013.P89]

One set of pronoun comparisons is of interest to this bibliography; in §6 (123–25) Zatovkaňuk compares the various uses of Ukr *vono* and Rus *ono*, which both generally mean ‘it’, the neut sg nom personal pronoun. In addition to its ordinary pronominal sense (which he calls *anaforičeskoe značenie* [sic]), present also in Rus *ono*, Ukr *vono* has the following meanings/usages: (§6.1) an indicative sense, for which Rus uses other words, such as *tut*; (§6.2) an emphatic sense, often glossed in Rus as *ono*, but also with *samoe* or *èto*; (§6.3) a “moment of consideration/ deliberation” (*moment obdumyvanija*), often also expressed with the subjunctive particle *b/by* or certain interrogative clauses in Ukr, which is conveyed in Rus using subjunctive *by* and other means, but not using *ono*; (§6.4) the use of *vono* to refer to male or female humans (cf. ANN Matvijenko 1936a, ex (8)), a meaning not expressible using Rus *ono*. In our framework we have been referring to the emphatic and moment-of-consideration/deliberation uses of *vono* as pleonastic.

- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš [M. Zatovkanjuk]. (1984) “Do charakterystyky ukrajins'kyx konstrukcij typu ‘kozač'en'ka vbyto’ ” [On the characteristics of Ukr constructions of the type ‘kozač'enka vbyto’ (Ukr)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 53(1): 1–11. [Harvard: 3013.858]

Packed with Ukr *-no/-to* exx and references to other works dealing with this construction. Sections include “The passive” (2–5), “Instrumental-case doers” [= ‘by’-phrases] (5–7), and “Tense, aspect, and transitivity” (7–9).
- Zatovkaňuk, Mikoláš. (1985) “O statusu ukrajins'kyx participij” [On the status of Ukr participles (Cz)]. *Slavia: Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 54(3): 225–34. [Harvard: 3013.858]

An introduction to the participial system of modern Ukr (225–26). Conspicuously absent: *-no/-to* constructions in the discussion of past-passive participles.

¹³⁰ Except for one datum (40) attributed to Popov, all the data in which the Russian short-form participle is translated into Ukr as a *-no/-to* form happen to be from the following novel (specifically, its Ukr translation): Il'f, Il'ja and Jevgenij Petrov. (1957) *Dvenadtsat' stul'ev. Zolotoj telenok*. Kiev: Radjanskyj Pysmennyk. [Princeton: 3027.64.331]; Il'f, Il'ja and Jevgenij Petrov [Il'ja Il'f and Jevhen Petrov]. (1972) *Dvanadcat' stil' civ. Zolote telja. Pereklad z rosij's'koji*. Kyjiv: Dnipro. [Harvard (depository): HW6E3F]

- *Zavhorodnja, N. F. (1953) “Pro pasyvnist’ konstrukcij z -NO, -TO” [On the passive-hood of constructions in -no/-to (Ukr)]. *Ukrajins’ka mova v školi* 3(5): 13–16 (poss. 13–15).
- Zelenov, A. N. (1963) “Sootnositel’nost’ dejstvitel’nyx i vozvratnyx stradatel’nyx oborotov v sovremennom ruskom jazyke”. *Učenyje zapiski Leningradskogo un-ta*, no. 322. *Seriya filologičeskix nauk*, vyp. 68, 32–34. [Cornell: P9.L56]
Discusses Rus passives in -sja (cf. ANN Rouhier-Willoughby 1993). Briefly considers the relation of adversity-impersonal clauses—cf. ANN Babby 1994b—to the former (40, fn 12).
- Žovtobrjux, M. A. (1957) “Odnoc’lenni rečennja” [Single-member sentences (Ukr)]. Bajmut, T. V., M. K. Bojčuk, M. K. Volyns’kyj; M. A. Žovtobrjux; T. P. Malyna, and S. P. Samijlenko. *Porivnjal’na hramatyka ukrajins’koi i rosijjskoi mov*. Kyjiv: Radjans’ka škola, 198–200, §77. [Princeton: 30293.732]
Cites a very old Ukr -no/-to example with a decidedly acc direct object (sosnu):
Med^{ACC.SG.MASC} vybrano i sosnu spaleno
honey^{ACC.SG.MASC} extracted_[-AGR] and pine^{ACC.SG.FEM} burned down_[-AGR]
[199, citing “Volodymyrs’ka mis’ka kn. 1608 r.”]
Otherwise, there is very little mention of -no/-to.
- Zubatý, J. (1907/1954) “Die ‘man’-sätze” [The so-called man ‘one’ sentences (Ger)]. *Studie a články* [Studies and articles (Cz)], 2. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 437–76. [Princeton: (Indo) 2305.998 v.2] [Originally published in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 40: 478–520.]
Considers Sl (and other Indo-European) constructions with a so-called *pro-arb* interpretation, as in *man* ‘one’ in Ger (cf. ANN Maling 1993).¹³¹ Surprisingly, despite repeated references specifically to Pol, there is no apparent mention of -no/-to. In his “Excurs zu [...] es-sätzen” Zubatý discusses some Sl data with pleonastic *to* ‘that’ (1907: 514-15/1954: 471) and emphatic *ono* ‘it’ in Cz (1907: 515/1954: 472, fn); cf. ANN Franks 1995 regarding the emphatic interpretation of some overt pleonastics in Sl. Cz adversity-impersonal clauses (1907: 517–19/1954: 473–76); cf. ANN Babby 1994b.

¹³¹ The issue of a 3rd pl interpretation of *man* sentences in Ger is discussed further in: Wackernagel, J. (1920) *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Basel: Emil Birkhauser & Cie, item 1, 111. [Northwestern: 415 W115 v.1]