Non-standard participles in Russian: a corpus study

Non-standard grammatical phenomena have recently been acknowledged as a separate field of linguistic research. It unifies a several methodologically and theoretically distinct areas: first language acquisition (Ceitlin 2000, a.o.), second language acquisition and heritage language (Ellis 2003; Polinsky, Rakhilina and Vyrenkova 2014; Polinsky 2018 a.o.), adult native speakers’ written and oral discourse (Kukushkina 1998, Rusakova 2013 a.o.). The paper reports on a corpus study performed within the latter area: it systematically describes and explains Russian non-standard participles in written (official and scientific) discourse of adult native speakers, cf. (1)–(4).

(1) V sovremennom mire SMI igraju važnejši rol’, javljajas’ glavnym istočnikom informatsii o in modern world mass.media play very.important role being main source of information about proiskhodjaščem v mire i vokrug nas. Značnost’eta rastjot iz goda v god, kak_ì čišlo potrebitelej what.is.going.on in world and around us significance this grows from year to year as.well.as quantity of consumers

predostavljajëmoj informatsii. (CoRST)
being.granted of.information

(2) Esli čelovek stavit v optravljajëmom sobščenii točku, skoree_vsego on rasseržen na svoego sobesednika. (CoRST)
if person puts in being.sent message dot it.is.likely he angry at his interlocutor

(3) Poslednie neskol’ko let my nabljudaem rastuščij interes k voprosu ispol’zovaniya last several years we observe growing interest to question of using

opasnych khimičeskikh veščestv v produktakh elektroniki. (CoRST)
dangerous chemical substances in products of.electronics

(4) V učreždenijakh kul’tury postojanno vedjotsja razvitie suščestvujuščikh sistem bezopasnosti ob’ektov <…>. (RNC)
in institutes of.culture permanently is.realised development of.objects of.safety

Importantly, following Apresjan (1990), Kukushkina (1998), Rusakova (2013), the paper takes into consideration only regular phenomena viewed as an evidence for microvariation within the contemporary Russian language. Participles represent a grammatical phenomenon difficult even for adult native speakers due to its Old Church Slavonic origin (Borkovsky and Kuznetsov 1981) and due to its non-finite morphosyntax: non-finite clauses are viewed as “wrapped” and denote separate events (Say 2011, Letuchiy 2011). In this regard, they seem hard to be produced. The study was conducted on the basis of the Russian National Corpus (RNC), the Corpus of Russian Student Texts (CoRST), the search system Yandex, electronic mass media texts, email authors’ correspondence (all in all, 71 discourses). Additionally, the participles were evaluated by 21 native speakers who do professional applied work with written Russian language (philologists, translators, editors, journalists) on a 3-point scale ranging from “1” (nobody can say so/I cannot say so) to “3” (one can say so/I can say so). The results of the survey showed that no sentences were judged as standard. The paper reveals 4 types of non-standard participles in Russian written texts: excessive anaphora, explicit presupposition, violation of information structure and excessive quantifier semantics. Moreover, the paper classifies non-standard participles w.r.t. whether they are restrictive, appositive or whether this distinction is not applicable to them. The 1st variety (excessive anaphora) exhibits participles which anaphorically refer to some clause in the previous discourse, cf. (1). A plausible explanation for using this strategy is the speaker’s tendency to make a discourse coherent. One of the ways to make this redundant strategy a standard restrictive participial clause is to add arguments/adjuncts to the participle: for (1) cf. <…> predostavljajëmoj mediasferoj informatsii <…> ‘the information being granted by media (adjunct)’. The restrictiveness/appositiveness is not applicable to this variety. The 2nd variety (explicit presupposition) introduces an appositive participle which makes some presupposition redundant
in the utterance. To illustrate, in (2), not only the presupposition of existence of the message, but also the presupposition of sending it is accommodated in the local context, i.e. in the embedded clause of the conditional (for accommodation see Heim 1983). One of the ways to make the sentence standard is to convert it into a finite clause: cf. Esli čelovek opravljaja soobščenie... ‘If a person sends (finite form) a message’. The 3rd variety (violation of information structure) suggests that participles are appositive and convey new or accessible information (cf. Chafe 1976). This type of information is typically expressed by finite verbal forms in a focused position of a clause. One of the ways to make the sentence (3) standard is to delete the redundant participle. The 4th variety (excessive quantifier semantics) includes both restrictive and appositive participles which function similarly to quantifiers: e.g., participles derived from verbs of existential semantics such as suščestvovat’/imet’/jsja ‘exist’. In (4), one of the ways to make the sentence standard is to delete the redundant participle. We argue that the main reason for all the strategies of using participles redundantly is interference of written standard and oral colloquial Russian speech. Some of the strategies for using written standard Russian speech relevant for our study are as follows: packaging information into “wrapped” structures and, consequently, use of nominalisations and non-finite verbal forms (participles, converbs), coherence and consistency of written discourse. Some of the strategies for using oral colloquial Russian speech relevant for our study are as follows: an oral discourse is given in portions and tends to be packaged in finite verbal forms, reference to the extra-linguistic current state of affairs, conciseness and brevity, excessive explicitness of discourse relations and discourse references, repetitions, use of collocations and clichés (cf. Zemskaya et al. 1981, Kibrik and Podlesskaya 2006 a.o.). The interference of written standard and oral colloquial Russian speech has pragmatic roots: the authors of the presented discourses seem to follow both types of strategies, resulting in redundant use of participles.