8. SIMPOZIJ MLADIH SLAVISTOV

ZGODNJI NOVI VEK IN NJEGOVA DEDIŠČINA V SLOVANSKEM PROSTORU

TRST, 3.–4. 12. 2020

PHILOSLAVICA

8. Simpozij mladih slavistov

ZGODNJI NOVI VEK IN NJEGOVA DEDIŠČINA V SLOVANSKEM PROSTORU

Zbornik prispevkov

Uredili:

Neža Kočnik, Lucija Mandić, Rok Mrvič

Študentska sekcija
Zveze društev Slavistično društvo Slovenije

Ljubljana 2020

Marco Biasio

Università degli Studi di Padova / Univerza v Padovi;
Univerzitet u Novom Sadu / Univerza v Novem Sadu

marco.biasio.1@phd.unipd.it

Where Grammar Meets Use: Towards the Normativization of Russian Future Participles (Or Perhaps Not?)

The scientific debate on the existence of a set of morphologized future participles in the inventory of tempo-aspectual forms of contemporary (standard) Russian has been relevant at least since Meletij Smotrickij's *Slavonic Grammar* (1619). Relying on data gathered from the General Internet Corpus of Russian, this contribution explores the interplay between normative grammar and corpus linguistics, addressing the topic from a qualitative point of view, i.e. whether or not and to what extent future participles are structurally prevalent in the grammatical system of contemporary Russian and, consequently, whether prescriptivists should implement these data into their grammatical (normative) model.

Keywords: future participles, Russian language, normative grammar, corpus linguistics, qualitative research

На перекрестке грамматики и узуса: к нормативизации т.н. будущих причастий в русском языке (верно ли?)

Начиная с исследований М. Смотрицкого, вопрос о том, являются ли морфологизованные формы причастий будущего времени частью инвентаря видовременных форм современного русского языка не терял свой первоочередной характер. В центр внимания исследователей попадает не само существование этих форм в языковой способности носителей русского языка (которое убедительно засвидетельствовано как в речевом узусе, так и в письменном стиле), а скорее всего их грамматический статус, т.е. их существенная принадлежность к парадигме видовременных форм современного русского языка. Целью настоящей работы, при качественном анализе данных, почерпнутых прежде всего из Национального интернет-корпуса русского языка (ГИКРЯ), является предварительный ответ на вопрос, встраиваются ли причастия будущего времени, и в какой степени, в глагольную парадигму видовременных форм русского языка и, следовательно, уместно ли включить их в грамматическую систему русского языка.

Ключевые слова: причастия будущего времени, современный русский язык, нормативная грамматика, корпусная лингвистика, качественный анализ

1. The aim of this contribution is to understand how and to what extent corpus linguistics can help in reassessing and widening the parameters of normative grammar.[1] In this article the convergence of a set of (already given and well-established) grammatical rules and recent insights from qualitative (data-driven) research will be taken into account with particular reference to electronic sources. More specifically, in light of some recent studies on the topic – cf. for instance (Glovinskaja 2010), (Vlahov 2010), (Saj 2017) et al. – we will be focusing on the long-debated grammatical (viz. normative) status of what has been labelled future participles (*pričastija buduščego vremeni*)[2] in contemporary Russian (henceforth CR).[3] This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, I provide a brief outline of the *status quaestionis*, including both diachronic studies and recent work on the formal and functional status of future participles in CR to outline some possible reasons for their peripheral position in relation to the grammatical core of the system. In Section 3, I present some selected data from the General Internet Corpus of Russian (GIKRJa)[4] to show how prevalent this construction is within the CR grammatical system, and how researchers in normative grammar could take this into account to integrate electronic data into theory.[5] In Section 4, some preliminary conclusions are drawn.

---

1   The author would like to express his gratitude to two anonymous reviewers for their thorough and challenging remarks on the first draft of this paper, as well as to James Hartstein for revising the text and checking its internal consistency.

Given the limited length of this paper, we cannot discuss in detail which issues are to be considered at the core of norm formation and how, if so, they might differ from language to language. As long as contemporary Russian is concerned (see right below), throughout this article I limit myself to the sociohistorical definition of norm which is given and briefly discussed in (Švedova et al. 1980: 10–11).

2   Although this label has been widely adopted in the literature (and used as well in this paper to avoid confusion), it is worth noting that this formulation is somewhat misleading, for *future* is only one of the possible – not even the most – basic semantic functions of these participles. A more suitable definition would be *present perfective participles* (see below).

3   CR is here defined as the standard, literary variant of Russian (*sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk*), mostly based on Moscovian dialectal isoglosses and first codified in Lomonosov's normative grammar (1755). Besides those already specified in the main text, the following abbreviations are in use: PF – perfective, IPF – imperfective, OCS – Old Church Slavonic, NKRJa – Nacional'nyj Korpus Russkogo Jazyka (Russian National Corpus; permalink: https://ruscorpora.ru/new/; last access November 9th, 2020), GIKRJa – General'nyj Internet Korpus Russkogo Jazyka (General Internet Corpus of Russian; permalink: http://www.webcorpora.ru; last access November 9th, 2020).

4   The GIKRJa is a mega-corpus in the making, containing around twenty billion total occurrences. Unlike the NKRJa, the vast majority of the texts collected in the GIKRJa is derived from a variety of electronic sources, such as social networks, the blogosphere, and news agencies, reflecting both current linguistic trends in CR mainstream sources (e.g. in the language of newspapers) and a number of peculiarities found in less normed language registers (such as, for example, the multi-layered language used on the Internet).

5   For the sake of clarity, I focus here exclusively on a non-Chomskyian (i.e. non-generative) and non-descriptive (i.e. prescriptive) concept of "grammatical theory". I thank one of the anonymous reviewers for prompting me to address this point in more detail.

2. It is widely known that CR participial forms are structurally organized among three discrete sets of binary oppositions, affecting respectively aspect (perfective vs imperfective), tense (past vs non-past), and voice (active vs passive). The interplay between these oppositions gives rise to a quadripartite model, comprising present active (e.g. *čitajuščij*[IPF] 'that is reading'), present passive (e.g. *čitaemyj*[IPF] 'that is being read, that can be read'), past active (e.g. (*pro*)*čitavšij*[PF/IPF] 'that read / has been reading') and past passive participles (e.g. *pročitannyj*[PF] 'that was / has been read').[6] Along with these forms, which make up the bulk of the grammatical system, there is a traditional consensus on the presence of the so-called future participles – that is, a set of (allegedly) sub-standard participial forms in which present participle suffixes (-(*j*)*ušč*-, -(*j*)*ašč*- for active participles, -*e* (/*o*, *i*)*m*- for passive participles) are attached to the present stem of PF verbs. The usage of these forms is presented in the examples below.[7] In (1), the active participle *sumejuščie* (from *sumet'*[PF] 'to be able to') is used, while in (2), the passive participle *sotvorimyj* (from *sotvorit'*[PF] 'to do', 'to create') is used:

(1)   On polagal, čto sredi zaverbovannyh okažutsja ljudi, sposobnye stat' krupnymi agentami, *sumejuščie*[PF] probrat'sja v organy sovestkoj vlasti. [NRKJa: Vadim Koževnikov. Ščit i meč. Kniga pervaja (1968)]

'He assumed that between those recruited there will be some units capable of becoming major agents, who will be able to sneak in the bodies of Soviet power.'

(2)   Ljuboj greh, *sotvorimyj*[PF] ljud'mi, ne budet takovym javljat'sja, esli samo ego ubeždenie v lice ispolnenija ne budet takovym. [Sergej Pilipenko. Imperija. Online: last access November 9th, 2020]

'Every sin which will be conceived by men will not appear as such, if the very belief in them upon the act of their committing will not be such.'

Even though such participles had already entered scientific discussion at the beginning of the 17th century with Meletij Smotrickij's *Slavonic Grammar* (1st ed. 1619),[8] it is not uncommon to find relevant occurrences in earlier texts as well. In

---

6   An additional participial form, which can be sporadically formed by adjoining past participle suffixes to the infinitive stem of IPF verbs (e.g. *čitannyj*[IPF] 'that was being read') and whose grammatical status is even more controversial, will not be taken into account due to the lack of space and relevance.

7   All the examples, unless indicated otherwise, are translated by the author.

8   See a more thorough historical reconstruction in (Vlahov 2010: 35–38). One must always bear in mind, however, that Smotrickij's grammar was essentially meant to provide the reader with a reliable source to help translate texts from Ancient Greek to OCS. As scholars have been heavily debating the existence of a set of autonomous, grammaticalized future participles in OCS – cf., for instance, (Galton 1976: 262–268) for a detailed report of the then-ongoing scientific discussion – it goes without saying that future participles were perfectly integrated into the grammatical system of Ancient Greek and thus it may very well be that OCS future participles were simply calqued from Greek ones. The only exception which seems to have persisted within the CR grammatical system is *buduščij*, which is for-

(3), it is used in an excerpt from a tale by Maksim Grek, where the substantivized future participle *pročitajuščih* [*spisanie sie*] 'those who will read [this text]' is used as the direct object of the explicit directive performative *molju* 'I ask':

(3)   Pověst' někuju strašnuju načinaja pisaniju predati, molju *pročitajuščih*[PF] spisanie sie ne mněti im" mene črez estestvenaja lžuščago. [NKRJa: Maksim Grek. Povest' o Savonarole (1515–1525)]

'Before I begin to commend some haunting story to writing, I ask those who will read this text not to think that I am telling lies.'

It is quite revealing that the vast majority of scholars who have been working on this topic do not appear to question the existence of such participles, nor do they focus on the formal constraints on their general availability to CR native speakers.[9] Instead, they argue about their unclear grammatical status in CR with special reference to their alleged contextual infrequency, as well as their morphological unsystematic derivation (Glovinskaja 2010: 195–197).[10] In the (prescriptive and descriptive) grammatical tradition, future participles are often mentioned in passing, mostly as ever-developing forms which, for one reason or another, are still considered distinct from the standardized language system (cf. Švedova et al. 1980: 665, Vinogradov [4]2001: 231 et al.). Nevertheless, their likelihood of being integrated into the CR grammatical system in the near future is often hinted at – if not explicitly called for (Forsyth 1970: 303).

In more recent years, however, with the rise of corpus linguistics and the upsurge of formal (e.g. Kir'janov, Šagal 2011) and functional studies on the topic, it has become clearer that future participles are intrinsic to the CR linguistic system.

---

med from the present stem (traditionally considered PF) of the otherwise biaspectual *byt'* 'to be' and has completely ousted the archaic *suščij* 'being'. Nowadays however, *buduščij* is almost exclusively used in adjectival function (e.g. *buduščij prezident* 'the future President'). Moreover, it is still noteworthy that its neuter version *buduščee* 'future' has long completed its categorical transition towards substantivization, retaining its original participial functions only in rare and marginal contexts, such as *pokolenie, buduščee žit' posle nas* 'the generation which will be living after us' (note also that complex verbal phrases such as *buduščee* [*žit'*] are called "analytic imperfective future participles" in (Krapivina 2009: 24). I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this last example to me.

9   This, however, has been explored as well in recent years: see, for instance, (Krapivina 2009) and (Vlahov 2010: 15–35).

10   Glovinskaja is certainly right in concluding that contextual (relative) infrequency and unsystematic derivation are valid features of future participles (but see the discussion below). However, these features also extend to other participial forms which, unlike future participles, are traditionally considered an integral part of the CR grammatical system. Reference is made in particular to present passive participles which, for reasons that cannot be explored here, are not usually found in a variety of verbs of different verb classes, including a great number of monosyllabic verbs (Švedova et al. 1980: 665–666). Another remark by Glovinskaja is also quite revealing: it concerns how CR native speakers can regularly produce future participle forms given the right context, although they tend to find (at least some of) them clumsy to listen to, when prompted to judge their grammaticality. This apparent contradiction may indeed be a sign of the pervasive influence of social biases on norm formation – an influence that is slowly fading away in the case at hand (see also below and Glovinskaja 2010: 194–195).

Contrary to the current opinion of normative grammarians, future participles have been said to display a certain regular morphosyntactic pattern with respect to their formation (Epštejn 2007), and it has also been stated that their distribution is much wider than previously thought (Vojvodić 2016: 175–178). Moreover, on the grounds of independent syntactic and semantic motivations,[11] it has been shown that future participles are the only option available in certain contexts to CR native speakers.[12]

We are thus left with a question: if future participles could be a standard feature of CR, why are most grammarians still reluctant to recognize their grammatical status? A threefold tentative answer can be outlined here. Firstly, the CR standardization process's historically prevalent influence has been exerting its pressure for centuries, imposing a concrete sociolinguistic bias on all self-perceived sub-standard and dialectal features – often distinguishing them as separate from the CR grammatical system.[13] Secondly, revisiting the grammatical status of CR future participles would be tantamount to recognizing the linguistic discreteness of the semantic category of "future"[14] which, following Jakobson's renowned bipartition of the CR tense system into "past" and "non-past" (Jakobson 1984), appears to be problematic *per se*.[15] Lastly, the alleged idiosyncratic

---

11 For instance, it has been proposed that future participles are almost mandatory when the phrasal category in a relative clause does not dominate the relative pronoun and is therefore not subject to pied-piping (Kir'janov, Šagal 2011).

12 An anonymous reviewer raises the issue of the marginality of such contexts, which can be also successfully avoided – especially in written language. Although I do not intend to underestimate the validity of this remark, it does not directly question the grammatical status of CR future participles, nor does it provide a direct explanation for their (nonsporadic) occurrences in written, stylistically unmarked texts (including translations).

13 Other noticeable tendencies of spoken and written language, such as the iconicity-driven spread of tonic -*à* endings to form the nominative plural of hard stem masculine nouns and the loss of cyclic declension in complex numerals (including fractions), seem to have suffered the same fate, regardless of the fact they came to prominence over the last decades. With respect to future participles, it has been frequently noticed – see, for instance, (Kir'janov, Šagal 2011: 97) – that a certain discrepancy between prescriptive grammar and native speakers' linguistic competence, prompting them to deem certain utterances featuring future participles not ungrammatical *per se* but rather stylistically undesirable. It should also be remembered that no Russian (historical and/or normative) grammar mentions future participles as part of the linguistic norm, which may have contributed to their peripheral position with respect to the core of the CR grammatical system.

14 This, of course, has nothing to do with the cognitive salience of the 'future' category, which is naturally present in the mind of the CR native speaker, despite its not being formalized within the language. As for the imperfective periphrastic future, the construction is problematic for a number of reasons, none of which can be adequately addressed in this paper.

15 One might wonder whether participial forms like *sdelajuščij* 'that will do' or *napišuščij* 'that will write' raise further issues in overall analysis once they are linked back to their corresponding PF future forms *sdelaju* 'I will do' and *napišu* 'I will write'. This intuitively makes sense as long as we treat *sdelaju* and *napišu* as true futures, which I believe is undesirable for several reasons. Firstly, from a morphological standpoint it has been shown that such tempo-aspectual forms, which are traditionally considered to be of Late Common Slavic origin (Maslov 2004), are

character of most future participles, which tend to be perceived as spontaneous creations prompted by native speakers' linguistic creativity and communication needs, seems to inhibit their natural integration into the CR grammatical system.[16] In the next section, however, we will briefly argue for such an alternative, taking into account a data sample from the GIKRJa.

3. The bulk of recent research on CR future participles makes use of quantitative approaches to data. On the one hand, in (Vlahov 2010), the productivity of the construction is tested across all the morphological classes in which the CR verbal lexicon is distributed, calculating the number of total occurrences for each verbal form of the respective future participle, while on the other hand, through a more qualitative-driven approach to data, it is possible to support the hypothesis of a

---

essentially present perfective forms that have been reinterpreted as aspectual futures in all Slavic languages, lacking a dedicated paradigm for the future tense (e.g. East and West Slavic languages; hence the label "non-past" as an umbrella term covering all the temporal properties of verbal forms that do not express "past"). On the one hand, evidence for this comes from the fact that their primary, original reference to the non-actual present – although subject to several syntactic restrictions – has been retained to varying degrees in East and West Slavic languages (this being the case, for instance, of the various non-futural meanings of CR non-past forms, such as *potencial'noe* 'potential', *nagljadno-primernoe* 'visual-exemplary' and the like). On the other hand, in all Slavic languages that developed a distinct formal strategy for expressing the future tense (e.g. Balkan Slavic *want*-periphrastic constructions, licensing both PF and IPF infinitives), PF non-past forms have not undergone a temporal reanalysis and cannot be found – except in rare and syntactically motivated cases, such as in factual syntactic environments (e.g. in matrix clauses). Secondly, addressing this last point, it needs to be said that not all occurrences of CR future participles are linked to the future tense, as they also lead back to some of the aforementioned modal, non-futural meanings of CR PF non-past (such as potentiality, the speaker's mental and/or physical ability, and the like). Moreover, variation in their tactic functions of (immediate) consequentiality and precedence (for instance, when they are used to denote a future event which is set to happen before another future event, i.e. fulfilling the semantic functions of a future perfect) have also been widely explored, see (Epštejn 2007), (Zorihina-Nil'sson 2015). This is one of the reasons why I believe the label *future participles* should be replaced with the more straightforward label *present perfective participles*, although it is noteworthy that future participles crosslinguistically tend to show such tactic ambiguities (see an excellent recent overview in Shagal 2017: 118–147).

16   Two distinct observations may contradict this hypothesis. Firstly, as already discussed in much previous work on the topic (e.g. Vlahov 2010: 17–20; Zorihina-Nil'sson 2015: 74 et al.), not only are some morphological classes, viz. classes I and II, distinctively more productive than others when it comes to future participle derivation (a closer and more thorough examination of the material will be needed to provide a satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon, which at the present moment lies beyond the scope of this paper), but also single future participial forms (e.g. *sumejuščij*, *sdelajuščij* and the like, i.e. the so-called "leaders of the process [of the outreach of the innovation, *M.B.*]", following Glovinskaja 2010: 196) frequently recur in certain syntactic chunks [e.g. along with preverbal negation, especially for verbs of perception such as (*ne*) *uvidjaščij* 'that will (not) come to see'] and/or fixed lexical collocations (in Vlahov 2010: 17 the sole future participle *sumejuščij* is esteemed to hit more than 4500 token occurrences). Secondly, as recognized in (Glovinskaja 2010: 195–196), the productivity of the morphological mechanism of future participles derivation, which seems to parallel other morphosyntactic models of verbal derivation (cf., for instance, the upsurge of new preverbed delimitatives with *po-* which remain largely unattested in vocabularies: on that point, see Mustajoki, Pussinen 2008), has substantially increased over the last two decades. At the same time, a great number of future participial forms (such as *napečatajuščij* 'that will print out', *opozdajuščij* 'that will come late', and the like), which around twenty years ago were rejected by many CR native speakers, have now apparently become perfectly acceptable grammatically. It may thus be the case that idiosyncrasy, as the most salient conceptual trigger underlying the mechanism of future participle derivation, is slowly receding in favour of analogical processes.

structural prevalence of future participles in CR by further studying the actional characteristics of the predicates involved. It is important to underline that this kind of research does not aim to reassess the statistics calculated in much of the previous work on the topic, but rather to provide an overview of its distribution with an emphasis on predicate semantics and text types. In fact, if we discount the fact that the general productivity of the model has increased (including its application to new lexical items, as already noted by Glovinskaja), their frequency remains more or less unchanged.

In the following section, I discuss a snippet of the examples collected through the GIKRJa. The research was first narrowed down to five possible morphosyntactic configurations (i.e. transitive predicates, both natural and specialized perfectives;[17] reflexives; unaccusative preverbed motion verbs; semelfactives)[18] encompassing all four Vendlerian actional characteristics (i.e. states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements). For each class, ten representative (i.e. commonly used) predicates were picked up. For reasons of morphological coalescence I restricted every manual research in the GIKRJa to three specific word forms (i.e. the nominative masculine singular in -*yj*/-*oj*/-*ij*; the instrumental masculine and neuter singular and the dative plural in -*ym*/-*im*; the genitive, accusative animate, and prepositive plural in -*yh*/-*ih*), taking only the first one hundred results into account. Every suitable context was judged grammatically by five well-educated informants, all of whom are native speakers of CR, and preference has been consistently given when possible to the language of newspapers and news agencies, which is not stylistically marked as much as the variety of registers often employed on the Internet.

From a morphosemantic standpoint, despite the fact that active forms are much more frequent than passive forms,[19] it is interesting to note that future participles

---

17 The terms "natural" and "specialized perfectives" are borrowed from (Janda et al. 2013). Note also that such future participles can be regularly declined.

18 At first, a number of different atelic *Aktionsarten* had been tested as well, with special reference to *po*-delimitatives. However no consistent results were obtained, which still correlates with Vlahov's previous analysis (Vlahov 2010: 20–22). Note that these configurations, from either a syntactic or an actional standpoint, do not form by any means a unitary classification (the only exception being, obviously, aspect marking). On the contrary, they have been chosen in order to test the productivity of future participles (and the possible internal variation in their derivation) on a variety of different classes.

19 In my sample only the passive future participles *sotvorimyj* and *sdelaemyj* 'that will be done' are attested, albeit with very low frequencies. In some works (e.g. Krapivina 2009: 25; Vlahov 2010: 23) the existence of such future passive participles is explicitly called into question, challenging more radical approaches (Epštejn 2007). The reasons for this discrepancy, which is probably found in the internal syntax of these verbal forms, cannot be explored here. It is noteworthy, however, that in CR, as already mentioned before, even present passive participles (which share with future participles the same underlying morphological mechanism of formation) are subject to heavy lexical restraints:

can be obtained from a variety of predicates. In the following example (4), an active future participle form from the natural perfective *otkryt'* 'open' is featured in a newspaper article:

(4)   Takim obrazom v Germanii, meždu Gamburgom i Zemlej Šlezvig-Gol'štejn pojavitsja novyj naučnyj centr, *otkrojuščij*[PF] soveršenno novye vozmožnosti dlja eksperimentatorov v različnyh oblastjah nauki. [Online: last access November 9th, 2020]

'Therefore there will be a new research center in Germany between Hamburg and the Schleswig-Holstein region, which will open brand new possibilities for experimenters in various scientific fields.'

Examples (5) and (6) are technical descriptions featuring future participle forms from the specialized perfectives *dopisat'* 'finish writing' and *perezvonit'* 'call back, redial'.[20] Note that *perezvonjaščij* in (6) fulfils an adjectival function:

(5)   Proekt budet besplatnym s otkrytym kodom, no v zamen konečnomu pol'zovatelju ponadobitsja programmist *dopišuščij*[PF] (sic!) kod dlja konkretnyh nužd i konkretnogo oborudovanija. [Online: last access November 9th, 2020]

'The project will be free and open source. However, the end user will in return require a programmer who will finish writing the code for particular needs and specific equipment.'

(6)   Tol'ko *perezvonjaščij*[PF] nomer javljaetsja vernym dokazatel'stvom togo, čto on dejstvitel'no prinadležit vyzyvajuščemu abonentu, no daže v etom slučae važno proverit' nomer, prosmotrev ego v Internete ili v telefonnoj knige. [Online: last access November 9th, 2020]

'Only a number that will call back is a valid proof of the fact that it belongs to a specific user. Even then, however, it is important to check the telephone number, searching it on the Internet or in a phone book.'

As already hypothesized in previous studies (e.g. Vlahov 2010: 22), the heavy morphology of reflexive predicates may be attributed to one of the possible reasons hindering the derivation of future participles, although some sparse occurrences can be found in both newspaper articles and narrative fiction – including translations. In the following example (7), i.e. a translation of a science fiction novel by Larry Niven, the future participle of the reciprocal-reflexive predicate *vstretit'sja*

---

for instance, while *čitaemyj* is perfectly acceptable, forms such as **b'emyj* 'that is being beaten, that can be beaten' (from *bit'*[IPF] 'to beat') or **beremyj* 'that is being taken, that can be taken' (from *brat'*[IPF] 'to take') are not.

20   Future participles are also obtained from specialized perfective states and activities, e.g. the perdurative *prožit'* 'to live (for some time)', as in the following excerpt from science fiction (e.g. *V tot tumannyj poluprozračnyj mir, živšij zadolgo do nego i posle nego proživuščij*[PF] *ešče ne odin vek...* 'In that foggy, translucent world, which had been living long before him and was about to outlast him for many more years...'), but their number is overall negligible.

'to meet' is used. Interestingly enough, the participle is used here as a future-in-the-past, in contrast to the imperfective active past participle *vstrečavšihsja*:

(7) Dlja ljudej vne i vnutri Gospitalja, dlja ljudej, nikogda ne vstrečavšihsja i ne *vstretjaščihsja*[PF], eto byla noč', kogda vse slučilos' odnovremenno. (<u>Online</u>: last access November 9th, 2020)

'For all those outside and inside the Hospital, for all those who never met and would never meet, that was the night when everything happened at the same time'

Examples of future participles formed from preverbed motion verbs are both featured in spontaneous, stylistically neutral texts (see the Christmas greetings in (8), where the instrumental neuter singular *priduščim* is synonymous of the more formulaic imperfective active present participle *nastupajuščim*) and in contexts characterized by the presence of some kind of wordplay (as in (9)):

(8) Prežde vsego – s vot-vot *priduščim*[PF] k nam Roždestvom vseh! (<u>Online</u>: last access November 9th, 2020)

'First of all, happy Christmas-on-its-way to you all!'

(9) Vot ja – *pojduščij*[PF] i *najduščij*[PF]. Vot ja – dorogu *perejduščij*[PF]. Ne to v grjaduščee breduščij, ne to v breduščee grjaduščij. (<u>Online</u>: last access November 9th, 2020)

'Here I am the one who shall go and find. Here I am the one who shall cross the road. Sometimes wandering towards the future, some others approaching what is roaming.'

In this respect semelfactives set themselves apart from the other verbal classes.[21] Future participle forms can only be found in isolated, often exceptional examples – replete with self-expression – that are mostly deemed to be only on the verge of grammaticality by the native speakers we consulted. Compare the potentially iterative *stuknuščij* (from *stuknut'* 'to knock, hit')[22] in the example (10) and the prospective *prygnuščij* (from *prygnut'* 'to make [a jump]') in the example (11):

(10) Ponjatno, čto čelovek, *stuknuščij*[PF] sebja molotkom po pal'cu, vskriknet. (<u>Online</u>: last access November 9th, 2020)

---

21 Infixed semelfactives, which make up the bulk of classes III and IV, rarely form future participles, with the possible exception of (the lexicalized?) *vozniknuščij* 'that will arise' (Vlahov 2010: 18). The reasons of this gap are to be further addressed, although it is well known that infixed semelfactives pose several formal and functional problems for the CR aspectual system overall. These considerations should be included in a further, more detailed study.

22 It goes without saying that the low frequency of future participles obtained from semelfactives such as *stuknut'* directly correlates with the overall low frequency of these verbs with respect to much more commonly used lexical predicates, say, *sdelat'*. Compare in the GIKRJa, for instance, the very low frequency of the 1st p. sing. of the PF present *stuknu* (IPM (instances per million): ≈ 0,075) with the correspective *sdelaju* (IPM: ≈ 4,37), or the 1st p. sing. of the PF past (masculine singular) *stuknul* (IPM: ≈ 0,228) with *sdelal* (IPM: ≈ 62,312) or, again, the infinitive forms *stuknut'* (IPM: ≈ 0,167) and *sdelat'* (IPM: ≈ 166,423).

'It goes without saying that every man who will hit himself on his finger with a mallet will scream'

(11) Rebenok, vot-vot *prygnuščij*[PF] v ogromnuju lužu, i otraženie emocij – neverojatnogo sčast'ja ot predkuvšenija na ego detskom lice i počti otčajanija na lice roditelja (Online: last access November 9th, 2020)

'A kid who is about to jump into a huge puddle and how emotions are reflected – extreme happiness for the foretaste on his childish face and almost despair on the face of his parent.'

From a textual point of view, although caution is much needed when trying to draw generalizations on the base of the language of the Internet,[23] it is still noteworthy that in our sample, future participles are found in different kinds of texts, with a relative prevalence of objective newspaper articles (see examples (4) and (6)), technical descriptions (as in (5)) and informal exchanges, such as greetings on message boards (as in (8)). This might hint that future participles are not limited to a specific register, nor are they dialectically marked or necessarily idiosyncratic in their morphological fashion (see above).

Finally, the grammatical legitimacy of these forms also seems to be attested by the fact that they can freely co-occur within the same context as other (normed) participial forms, such as the imperfective active past participle *vstrečavšihsja* in (7) and the imperfective active present participles *breduščij* 'wandering' and *grjaduščij* 'approaching' in (9).[24] This is an interesting observation, which was previously pointed out in the literature (Zorihina-Nil'sson 2015) that helps distinguish future participles from other sub-standard constructions, mostly belonging to specific dialectal isoglosses (e.g. the much discussed Northern Russian resultative participial construction in *-n(o)/-t(o)*, as in *U lisicy uneseno kuročka* 'A fox has carried off a chicken').

4. In this short paper I have explored the interplay between normative grammar and qualitatively driven corpus linguistics research by taking into account the peculiar case of CR future participles. After summarizing more recent studies on the topic (Section 2), I turned to the data to provide some evidence in favour of

---

23   Although one might wonder that it is not infrequent for non-native speakers and/or speakers with speech disorders to produce this kind of text on the Internet, I find it revealing in this respect that no CR native speaker questioned the grammaticality of examples (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9).

24   It can be argued that when future participles co-occur with other participial forms, they are used contrastively to fill a gap in the paradigm that is recognized as such by the speaker (even though they know the choice is not optimal). I believe it is precisely this consciousness that may feed the analogical process at the base of the productivity of the model (see above). This ever-increasing productivity, in turn, could legitimately call for the inclusion of future participles in the CR grammatical system.

the structural prevalence of these participial forms, which are present among the verbal lexicon independently of morphosemantic, actional, and/or textual considerations (Section 3). Although more linguistic work is needed on the formal and functional constraints to make such forms available, it seems reasonable to state – judging from the above – that future participles should no longer be labelled as a sub-standard feature of the spoken language, but instead recognized as an integral part of the CR grammatical system and treated as such in normative grammar. If we assume (as we did) that linguistic norm is essentially influenced (and defined) by socio-historical processes, the important fact that even well-educated native speakers of CR regularly recognize, derive, and use future participle forms from a wide variety of predicates (Glovinskaja 2010: 196) could play a crucial role in the implementation of future participles (or, following what was proposed in this paper, "present perfective participles") into normative grammar.

References

James Forsyth, 1970: *A grammar of aspect. Usage and meaning in the Russian verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herbert Galton, 1976: *The main functions of the Slavic verbal aspect*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

Roman Jakobson, 1984: Structure of the Russian verb. *Russian and Slavic grammar: Studies 1931-1981*. Ed. Linda R. Waugh, Morris Halle. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers. 1–14.

Laura A. Janda et al., 2013: *Why Russian aspectual prefixes aren't empty. Prefixes as verb classifiers*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.

Ksenia Shagal, 2017: *Towards a typology of participles*. Academic dissertation. Helsinki: Department of Modern Languages, University of Helsinki. Online.

В. В. Виноградов, ⁴2001: *Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове*. Москва: Русский язык.

[V. V. Vinogradov, ⁴2001: *Russkij jazyk. Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.]

А. В. Влахов, 2010: *Причастия будущего времени в русском языке. Выпускная квалификационная работа бакалавра филологии*. Санкт-Петербург. В сети.

[A. V. Vlahov, 2010: *Pričastija buduščego vremeni v russkom jazyke. Vypusknaja kvalifikacionnaja rabota bakalavra filologii*. Sankt-Peterburg. V seti.]

Д. П. Войводич, 2016: К проблеме грамматического статуса причастных форм / конструкций в славянских языках. *Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2. Языкознание* 15/2. 174–187. В сети.

[D. P. Vojvodić, 2016: K probleme grammatičeskogo statusa pričastnyh form / konstrukcij v slavjanskih jazykah. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Serija 2. Jazykoznanie* 15/2. 174–187. V seti.]

М. Я. Гловинская, 2010: Потенциальные глагольные формы. *Современный русский язык: система-норма-узус*. Ред. Л. П. Крысин. Москва: Языки славянских культур. 171–199.

[M. Ja. Glovinskaja, 2010: Potencial'nye glagol'nye formy. *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: sistema-norma-uzus*. Red. L. P. Krysin. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskih kul'tur. 171–199.]

Н. В. Зорихина-Нильссон, 2015: Таксисные конструкции с действительными причастиями будущего времени совершенного вида в современном русском языке. *Аспектуальная семантическая зона: типология систем и сценарии диахронического развития (Сборник статей V Международной конференции Комиссии по аспектологии Международного комитета славистов)*. Ред. М. Китадзе. Киото: Университет Киото Санге. 74–80.

[N. V. Zorihina-Nil'sson, 2015: Taksisnye konstrukcii s dejstvitel'nymi pričastijami buduščego vremeni soveršennogo vida v sovremennom russkom jazyke. *Aspektual'naja semantičeskaja zona: tipologija sistem i scenarii diahroničeskogo razvitija (Sbornik statej V Meždunarodnoj konferencii Komissii po aspektologii Meždunarodnogo komiteta slavistov)*. Red. M. Kitajo. Kioto: Universitet Kioto Sangyo. 74–80.]

Д. П. Кирьянов, К. А. Шагал, 2011: Действительное причастие будущего времени совершенного вида в русском языке. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований*. Том VII, часть 3. Санкт-Петербург: Наука. 93–98.

[D. P. Kir'janov, K. A. Šagal, 2011: Dejstvitel'noe pričastie buduščego vremeni soveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvističeskih issledovanij*. Tom VII, čast' 3. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. 93–98.]

К. А. Крапивина, 2009: *Причастный таксис в русском языке. Выпускная квалификационная работа бакалавра филологии*. Санкт-Петербург. В сети.

[K. A. Krapivina, 2009: *Pričastnyj taksis v russkom jazyke. Vypusknaja kvalifikacionnaja rabota bakalavra filologii*. Sankt-Peterburg. V seti.]

Ю. С. Маслов, 2004: Роль так называемой перфективации и имперфективации в процессе возникновения славянского глагольного вида. *Избранные труды. Аспектология. Общее языкознание*. Ред. А. В. Бондарко, Т. А. Майсак, В. А. Плунгян. Москва: Языки славянской культуры. 445–476.

[Ju. S. Maslov, 2004: Rol' tak nazyvaemoj perfektivacii i imperfektivacii v processe vozniknovenija slavjanskogo glagol'nogo vida. *Izbrannye trudy. Aspektologija. Obščee jazykoznanie*. Red. A. V. Bondarko, T. A. Majsak, V. A. Plungjan. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury. 445–476.]

А. Мустайоки, О. Пуссинен, 2008: Об экспансии глагольной приставки ПО в современном русском языке. *Инструментарий русистики: корпусные подходы*. Ред.: А. Мустайоки, М. В. Копотев, Л. А. Бирюлин, Е. Ю. Протасова. Helsinki: University of Helsinki (Slavica Helsingiensia, 34). 247–275. В сети.

[A. Mustajoki, O. Pussinen, 2008: Ob ekspansii glagol'noj pristavki PO v sovremennom russkom jazyke. *Instrumentarij rusistiki: korpusnye podhody*. Red.: A. Mustajoki, M. V. Kopotev, L. A. Birjulin, E. Ju. Protasova. Helsinki: University of Helsinki (Slavica Helsingensia, 34). 247–275. V seti.]

С. С. Сай, 2017: Действительные причастия. *Материалы к корпусной грамматике русского языка. Выпуск II. Синтаксические конструкции и грамматические категории*. Ред. В. А. Плунгян, Н. М. Стойнова. Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-История. 463–524.

[S. S. Saj, 2017: Dejstvitel'nye pričastija. *Materialy k korpusnoj grammatike russkogo jazkyka. Vypusk II. Sintaksičeskie konstrukcii i grammatičeskie kategorii*. Red.: V. A. Plungjan, N. M. Stojnova. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istorija. 463–524.]

Н. Ю. Шведова и др., 1980: *Русская грамматика, Том I. Фонетика. Фонология. Ударение. Интонация. Словообразование. Морфология*. Москва: Наука.

[N. Ju. Švedova et al., 1980: *Russkaja grammatika, Tom I. Fonetika. Fonologija. Udarenie. Intonacija. Slovoobrazovanie. Morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.]

М. Эпштейн, 2007: Есть ли будущее у причастий будущего времени? *Лингвистика и поэтика в начале третьего тысячелетия: Материалы международной научной конференции (Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградов РАН. Москва, 24-28 мая 2007 г.)*. Ред.: Н. А. Фатеева. Москва: Институт русского языка РАН. 259–266.

[M. Erštejn, 2007: Est' li buduščee u pričastij buduščego vremeni? *Lingvistika i poetika v načale tret'ego tysjačeletija: Materialy meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii (Institut russkogo jazyka im. V. V. Vinogradov RAN. Moskva, 24-28 maja 2007 g.)*. Red.: N. A. Fateeva. Moskva: Institut russkogo jazyka RAN. 259–266.]

Резюме

Предметом анализа данной статьи являются т.н. русские будущие причастия. «Будущими причастиями» принято считать вытесненные на периферию нормативной грамматики причастные формы, образованные от презентной формы глаголов совершенного вида, к которым прибавляются окончания причастий настоящего времени, действительного (-*ущ*-/-*ющ*- или -*ащ*-/-*ящ*-, напр. *прочитающий, увидящий*) или страдательного (-*ем*-/-*ом*-/-*им*-, напр. *сотворимый*) залога. Хотя существование этих форм давно засвидетельствовано (одно из их первых упоминаний обнаруживается уже в «Грамматике» Мелетия Смотрицкого 1619 г.), их существенная принадлежность к парадигме видовременных форм современного русского языка до сих пор оспаривается, прежде всего по социолингвистическим и структуральным причинам (в том числе из-за их недостаточной регулярности в текстах, а также их несистематической деривации). В настоящей статье при качественном анализе ряда контекстов из Национального интернет-корпуса русского языка (ГИКРЯ) приводятся некоторые возможные аргументы в пользу интеграции будущих причастий действительного залога в грамматическую систему русского языка. Во-первых, доказывается, что эти формы, хотя еще контекстуально ограничены, в современном русском языке все чаще могут образоваться от самых

различных глагольных классов (в том числе от естественных и специализированных перфективов, от возвратных глаголов, от приставочных глаголов движения и, хотя более ограниченным и несистематическим образом, от семельфактивов). Во-вторых, выявляется, что эти причастные формы обнаруживаются в разных типах текстов (особенно в нейтральных по стилю журнальных статьях) и их употребление далеко не свойствено субстандартным лингвистическим регистрам. В-третьих, показывается, что будущие причастия могут свободно появляться наряду с другими (грамматически нормированными) причастными формами. Все эти факты свидетельствуют о том, что такие формы следует включить в перечень нормированных видовременных форм современного русского языка.